UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 101—PART 1

JANUARY 5, 1955, TO FEBRUARY 9, 1955
(PAGES 1 TO 1420)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1955

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 5, 1955

The 5th day of January being the day prescribed by Public Law 700, 83d Congress 2d session, for the meeting of Congress, the 1st session of the 84th Congress commenced this day.

RICHARD M. NIXON, of California, Vice President of the United States, called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock meridian.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers in ages past, and God our help in these tumultuous and testing days, before in this forum of a people's hope we dare discuss the pressing affairs of the Nation and of this torn and tortured world we would first of all in reverence and contrition lift our hearts to Thee whose light alone floods our life with eternal splendor. In this hour of solemn convocation, as citizens of the Republic chosen by the people in this free land convene to open a new volume of destiny in our Nation's history—the few among the many called in a stern time to weigh vast issues and face tangled problems—may they bring their fallible judgments to Thy wisdom; may they lean their human limitations upon the deathless assurance, "The eternal God is our refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms." In this day of beginnings we are conscious of the cloud of witnesses out of heroic yesterdays who look down upon us from the sacred spaces beneath the white dome, as the ancient vow is here this day uttered anew, "So help me God."

Keep before us ever the undimmed goal of a better world cleansed of its want, its fetters, and its agony. May we be counted by the future as among the builders of a redeemed earth radiant with brotherhood, knowing—

"That's not done by sword or tongue or pen,
There's but one way, God make us better men."

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

RESIGNATIONS FROM THE SENATE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate two letters of resignation from the United States Senate, which will be read and placed on file.

The letters were read by the legislative clerk (Edward E. Mansur, Jr.), and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

DECEMBER 16, 1954.

The Honorable ROBERT B. CROSBY,
State Capitol, Lincoln, Nebr.

DEAR GOVERNOR CROSBY: I herewith tender my resignation as United States Senator, effective at the close of business, December 31, 1954.

This is in line with my statement last July that if elected to the Senate I would cooperate to permit our new Senator to be sworn in at an early date so as to assure prior position for him on committees.

With all good wishes.

Sincerely,

HAZEL H. ABEL.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., December 24, 1954.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
Vice President of the United States,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I am enclosing a copy of my letter to the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Governor of South Carolina, submitting my resignation as a United States Senator. This is being made in the interest of our State and for the benefit of my elected successor, the Honorable J. STROM THURMOND.

It gives me pleasure to also send to you my sincere thanks for the magnificent contribution that you are making for the peace and prosperity of our great country.

I also want to extend to you my appreciation of the many courtesies and the consideration you so graciously extended to me during my service in the Senate.

With warm personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. DANIEL.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., December 24, 1954.

Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES,
Governor of South Carolina,
Columbia, S. C.

DEAR GOVERNOR: I confirm below my telegram to you of even date:

"I hereby tender my resignation as United States Senator from South Carolina effective immediately."

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. DANIEL.

CREDENTIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate two certificates of appointment of Senators.

Inasmuch as the terms for which these appointments were made have expired, no action of the Senate is required, and, without objection, the letters and certificates of appointment will be printed in the RECORD and placed on file.

The certificates of appointment were ordered to be printed in the RECORD and placed on file, as follows:

STATE OF NEBRASKA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Lincoln.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of Nebraska, I, Robert B. Crosby, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint CARL T. CURTIS, a Senator from said State, to represent said State in the Senate of the United States to fill the unexpired term caused by the resignation of the Honorable Hazel H. Abel.

Witness: His excellency our Governor and our seal hereto affixed at Lincoln, Nebr., this 17th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1954.

ROBERT B. CROSBY.

By the Governor:

[SEAL]

FRANK MARSH,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Columbia, December 24, 1954.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of South Carolina, I, James F. Byrnes, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint STROM THURMOND a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the resignation of Charles E. Daniel, is filled as provided by law.

Witness: His excellency our Governor, James F. Byrnes, and our seal hereto affixed at Columbia, this 24th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1954.

JAMES F. BYRNES,
Governor.

By the Governor:

O. FRANK THORNTON,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair also lays before the Senate the certificates of election of Senators for unexpired terms.

The certificates of election were read, and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION, UNITED STATES SENATOR

STATE OF OHIO.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1954, GEORGE H. BENDER was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Ohio a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the unexpired term ending on the 3d day of January 1957.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Frank J. Lausche, and our seal hereto affixed at Columbus, Ohio, this 7th day of December, in the year of Our Lord 1954.

FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] TED W. BROWN,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1954, THOMAS H. KUCHEL was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of California a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term ending on the 3d day of January 1957.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Goodwin J. Knight, and our seal hereto affixed at Sacramento this 10th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1954.

GOODWIN J. KNIGHT,
Governor.

[SEAL]
FRANK JORDAN,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials of certain Senators elected or re-elected for 6-year terms, which began on the 3d instant, were received and laid before the Senate prior to its sine die adjournment on December 2, 1954.

The Chair now lays before the Senate certificates of election for the Senators elected for 6-year terms commencing on the third day of January, which were received subsequent to the sine die adjournment on December 2, 1954.

The credentials were read and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1954, GORDON ALLOTT was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Colorado a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1955.

Witness: His excellency our Governor, Dan Thornton, and our seal hereto affixed at Denver this 10th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1954.

DAN THORNTON,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] HOMER M. BRUCE,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1954, CLINTON P. ANDERSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New Mexico a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1955.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, Edwin L. Mechem, and our seal hereto affixed at Santa Fe, this 23d day of November, in the year of our Lord 1954.

EDW. L. MECHEM,
Governor.

By the Governor:
JAMES B. MCGHEE,
Chief Justice of New Mexico.

[SEAL]
BEATRICE B. GOTTLIEB,
Secretary of State.

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Frankfort.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November, 1954, ALBEN W. BARKLEY was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the Commonwealth of Kentucky a Senator from said Commonwealth to represent said Commonwealth in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1955.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor Lawrence W. Wetherby, and our seal hereto affixed at Frankfort, Ky., this 13th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1954.

LAWRENCE W. WETHERBY,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] CHARLES K. O'CONNELL,
Secretary of State.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

STATE OF NEW JERSEY.

The board of State canvassers hereby determines that at a general election held in the said State on the 2d day of November in the year of our Lord 1954, CLIFFORD P. CASE was duly elected a Member of the United States Senate to represent the State of New Jersey as Senator for a term of 6 years.

In testimony whereof, are hereunto affixed my hand and the official seal at Trenton this 14th day of December, A. D. 1954.

[SEAL] EDWARD J. PATTEN,
Secretary of State.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

STATE OF NEBRASKA.

At an election held on the 2d day of November 1954, CARL T. CURTIS was elected to the office of United States Senator for the term 6 years from the 3d day of January 1955.

Given at Lincoln this 22d day of November 1954.

ROBERT B. CROSBY,
Governor.

Attest:
[SEAL] FRANK MARSH,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND
AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Providence.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1954, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Rhode Island a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1955.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Dennis J. Roberts, and our seal hereto affixed at Providence, R. I., this 10th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1954.

DENNIS J. ROBERTS,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] ARMAND H. COTE,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Mrs. Mike Holm, secretary of state of the State of Minnesota, do hereby certify that on the 3d Tuesday of November, A. D. 1954, the duly constituted State canvassing board met and opened and canvassed the returns of the votes cast at the last general election in accordance with law, and that said board duly declared HUBERT H. HUMPHREY elected to the office of United States Senator in Congress for the term of 6 years beginning on the 3d day of January, A. D. 1955.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Minnesota, at the capitol, in St. Paul, this 29th day of November, A. D. 1954.

[SEAL] Mrs. MIKE HOLM,
Secretary of State.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1954, ROBERT S. KERR was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Oklahoma a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1955.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Oklahoma to be affixed on this 30th day of November 1954.

JOHNSTON MURRAY.

By the Governor of the State of Oklahoma:
Attest:
[SEAL] JOHN D. CONNER,
Secretary of State.
JEFF F. KENDALL,
Assistant Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1954 PATRICK V. MCNAMARA was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Michigan a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1955.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, G. Mennen Williams, and our seal hereto affixed at Lansing, Mich., this 24th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1954.

G. MENNEN WILLIAMS,
Governor.

By the Governor:
OWEN J. CLEARY,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF IOWA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1954 THOMAS E. MARTIN, of Iowa City, Johnson County, Iowa, was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Iowa a Senator from the said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1955.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Leo Elthon, for the State of Iowa, and our seal hereto affixed at Des Moines, this 7th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1954.

LEO ELTHON,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] MELVIN D. SYNHORST,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1954 KARL E. MUNDT was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of South Dakota a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1955.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Sigurd Anderson, and our seal hereto affixed at Pierre, the capital, this 2d day of December, in the year of our Lord 1954.

SIGURD ANDERSON,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] GERALDIN OSTROOT,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF MONTANA,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBERS.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1954 JAMES E. MURRAY was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Montana a Senator from this State to represent the State of Montana in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1955.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, J. Hugo Aronson, and our seal hereto affixed at Helena this 24th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1954.

J. HUGO ARONSON,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] SAM W. MITCHELL,
Secretary of State.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

STATE OF OREGON,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To All to Whom These Presents Shall Come, Greeting:

Know ye, that it appearing from the official canvass of the votes cast at the regular general election held within and for the State of Oregon on Tuesday, the 2d day of November A. D. 1954, that RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Multnomah County, State of Oregon, received the highest number of votes cast for the office of United States Senator at said election.

Now, therefore, I, Paul L. Patterson, Governor of the State of Oregon, by virtue and in pursuance of the authority vested in me under the laws of the State of Oregon, do hereby grant this certificate of election and declare said RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Multnomah County, State of Oregon, to be duly elected to the office of United States Senator of the State of Oregon for a term of 6 years.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the State of Oregon to be hereto affixed. Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 13th day of November A. D. 1954.

PAUL C. PATTERSON,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] EARL T. NEWBRY,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1954, A. WILLIS ROBERTSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Virginia a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 5th day of January 1955.

Given under my hand and the lesser seal of the Commonwealth, at Richmond, this 8th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1954, and in the 179th year of the Commonwealth.

THOS. B. STANLEY,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] MARTHA BELL CONWAY,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November, 1954, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts a Senator from said Commonwealth to represent said Commonwealth in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January, 1955.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Christian A. Herter, and our seal hereto affixed at Boston, this 9th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1954.

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of Commonwealth.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will now proceed to administer the oath to the 34 Senators in alphabetical order, and in groups of four. The clerk will call the first four names on the list.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARKLEY, and Mr. BENDER.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, and Mr. BRICKER, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk; and the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

[Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senators will subscribe to the oath in the official oath book of the Senate.

The Senators thereupon subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. DOUGLAS.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. COTTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. DIRKSEN, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk; the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President, and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

[Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. FREAR.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. WELKER, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. LONG, and Mr. WILLIAMS, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk; the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President, and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

[Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. GREEN, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. KEFAUVER.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. PASTORE, Mr. THYE, Mr. DANIEL, and Mr. GORE, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk; the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President, and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

[Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. KERR, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, and Mr. MCCLELLAN.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. FULBRIGHT, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk; the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President, and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

[Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. NEELY.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. POTTER, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. KILGORE, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk; the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President, and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

[Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. ROBERTSON, and Mr. RUSSELL.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. MORSE, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BYRD, and Mr. GEORGE, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk; the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President, and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

[Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SCOTT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. ERVIN, and Mr. PAYNE, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President, and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

[Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. SPARKMAN and Mr. THURMOND.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. HILL and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President, and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

[Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

LIST OF SENATORS, BY STATES

Alabama.—Lister Hill and John J. Sparkman.

Arizona.—Carl Hayden and Barry M. Goldwater.

Arkansas.—John L. McClellan and J. William Fulbright.

California.—William F. Knowland and Thomas H. Kuchel.

Colorado.—Eugene D. Millikin and Gordon Allott.

Connecticut.—Prescott S. Bush and William A. Purtell.

Delaware.—John J. Williams and J. Allen Frear.

Florida.—Spessard L. Holland and George A. Smathers.

Georgia.—Walter F. George and Richard B. Russell.

Idaho.—Henry C. Dworshak and Herman Welker.

Illinois.—Paul H. Douglas and Everett M. Dirksen.

Indiana.—Homer E. Capehart and William E. Jenner.

Iowa.—Bourke B. Hickenlooper and Thomas E. Martin.

Kansas.—Andrew F. Schoeppel and Frank Carlson.

Kentucky.—Earle C. Clements and Alben W. Barkley.

Louisiana.—Allen J. Ellender and Russell B. Long.

Maine.—Margaret Chase Smith and Frederick G. Payne.

Maryland.—John Marshall Butler and J. Glenn Beall.

Massachusetts.—Leverett Saltonstall and John F. Kennedy.

Michigan.—Charles E. Potter and Patrick V. McNamara.

Minnesota.—Edward J. Thye and Hubert H. Humphrey.

Mississippi.—James O. Eastland and John C. Stennis.

Missouri.—Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., and Stuart Symington.

Montana.—James E. Murray and Mike Mansfield.

Nebraska.—Roman L. Hruska and Carl T. Curtis.

Nevada.—George W. Malone and Alan Bible.

New Hampshire.—Styles Bridges and Norris Cotton.

New Jersey.—H. Alexander Smith and Clifford P. Case.

New Mexico.—Dennis Chavez and Clinton P. Anderson.

New York.—Irving M. Ives and Herbert H. Lehman.

North Carolina.—Samuel J. Ervin, Jr., and W. Kerr Scott.

North Dakota.—William Langer and Milton R. Young.

Ohio.—John W. Bricker and George H. Bender.

Oklahoma.—Robert S. Kerr and A. S. Mike Monroney.

Oregon.—Wayne Morse and Richard L. Neuberger.

Pennsylvania.—Edward Martin and James H. Duff.

Rhode Island.—Theodore Francis Green and John O. Pastore.

South Carolina.—Olin D. Johnston and J. Strom Thurmond.

South Dakota.—Karl E. Mundt and Francis Case.

Tennessee.—Estes Kefauver and Albert Gore.

Texas.—Lyndon B. Johnson and Price Daniel.

Utah.—Arthur V. Watkins and Wallace F. Bennett.

Vermont.—George D. Aiken and Ralph E. Flanders.

Virginia.—Harry Flood Byrd and A. Willis Robertson.

Washington.—Warren G. Magnuson and Henry M. Jackson.

West Virginia.—Harley M. Kilgore and Matthew M. Neely.

Wisconsin.—Alexander Wiley and Joseph R. McCarthy.

Wyoming.—Frank A. Barrett and Joseph C. O'Mahoney.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	McNamara
Allott	George	Millikin
Anderson	Goldwater	Monroney
Barkley	Gore	Morse
Barrett	Green	Mundt
Beall	Hayden	Murray
Bender	Hennings	Neely
Bible	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bricker	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Pastore
Bush	Hruska	Payne
Butler	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Jackson	Purtell
Capehart	Jenner	Robertson
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kerr	Scott
Clements	Kilgore	Smathers
Cotton	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Langer	Sparkman
Dirksen	Lehman	Stennis
Douglas	Long	Symington
Duff	Magnuson	Thurmond
Dworshak	Malone	Thye
Eastland	Mansfield	Watkins
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	Wiley
Flanders	McCarthy	Williams
Frear	McClellan	Young

Mr. CLEMENTS. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent because of illness, and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 1), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and to inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 2), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

HOUR OF DAILY MEETING

Mr. CLEMENTS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 3), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the hour of daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian, unless otherwise ordered.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to elect a President pro tempore of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas submitted a resolution (S. Res. 4), which was read and considered by unanimous consent, as follows:

Resolved, That Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE, a Senator from the State of Georgia, be, and he is hereby, elected President of the Senate pro tempore, to hold office during the pleasure of the Senate, in accordance with the resolution of the Senate adopted on the 12th day of March 1890, on the subject.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the resolution, and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment offered by the Senator from California.

The amendment was to strike out "WALTER F. GEORGE, a Senator from Georgia," and to insert in lieu thereof "STYLES BRIDGES, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution offered by the Senator from Texas.

The resolution was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia is elected President pro tempore. The Chair appoints the Senator from New Hampshire to escort the newly elected President pro tempore to the rostrum to take the oath of office.

Mr. GEORGE, escorted by Mr. BRIDGES, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath was administered to him by the Vice President.

ELECTION OF SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas submitted a resolution (S. Res. 5), which was read and considered by unanimous consent, as follows:

Resolved, That Felton M. Johnston, of Mississippi, be, and he is hereby, elected Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the resolution and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment offered by the Senator from California.

The amendment was to strike out "Felton M. Johnston, of Mississippi," and to insert "J. Mark Trice of Maryland."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs on agreeing to the resolution offered by the Senator from Texas.

The resolution was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary-elect will present himself at the desk to take the oath of office, and the Chair appoints the retiring Secretary, Mr. J. Mark Trice, to accompany him.

Mr. Johnston, escorted by Mr. Trice, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office was administered to him by the Vice President.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas submitted a resolution (S. Res. 6), which was read, considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be notified of the election of Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE, a Senator from the State of Georgia, as President of the Senate pro tempore, and of Felton M. Johnston, of Mississippi, as Secretary of the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas submitted a resolution (S. Res. 7), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE, a Senator from the State of Georgia, as President of the Senate pro tempore, and of Felton M. Johnston, of Mississippi, as Secretary of the Senate.

ELECTION OF SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas submitted a resolution (S. Res. 8), which was read and considered by unanimous consent, as follows:

Resolved, That Joseph C. Duke, of Arizona, be, and he is hereby, elected Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from California.

The amendment was to strike out "Joseph C. Duke, of Arizona" and insert in lieu thereof "Forest A. Harness, of Indiana."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now recurs on agreeing to the resolution offered by the Senator from Texas.

The resolution was agreed to.

ELECTION OF SECRETARY TO THE MAJORITY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 9), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That Robert G. Baker, of South Carolina, be, and he is hereby, elected secretary for the majority of the Senate.

ELECTION OF SECRETARY TO THE MINORITY

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 10), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That J. Mark Trice, of Maryland, be, and he is hereby, elected secretary for the minority of the Senate.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF PROGRAM AND ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a brief announcement to make to the Senate.

As is customary, the Senate will transact no further business in the way of the introduction of bills or other matters until after the President has delivered his message on the state of the Union.

The President will come to the Capitol tomorrow at 12:30 p. m. to address a joint session of Congress in the Hall of the House of Representatives.

It is planned to have the Senate meet at 12 o'clock, and then, after a quorum call, to proceed in a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives at about 12:10 or 12:15 p. m.

I now move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 6, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 5, 1955

This being the day fixed by the provisions of Public Law 700 (83 Cong., 2d sess.), approved August 28, 1954, for the annual meeting of the Congress of the United States, the Members-elect of the House of Representatives of the 84th Congress met in their Hall, and at 12 o'clock noon were called to order by Hon. Lyle O. Snader, Clerk of the 83d Congress.

PRAYER

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., Chaplain of the 83d Congress, offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, with a humble spirit and a contrite heart we worship and adore Thee for Thou art the supreme ruler of the universe and the guiding intelligence in the life of men and nations.

We render unto Thee the tributes of praise and gratitude, for the coming in and the going out of all our days and years have always been in the beneficent care and control of Thy divine providence.

Grant that we may enter upon this 1st session of the 84th Congress with faith, hope, and love and with the glad assurance that Thou art willing and ready to place at our disposal the infinite and inexhaustible resources of Thy grace and goodness.

May it be the goal of all our aspirations and endeavors to build a finer social order and may our vision of the ultimate triumph of justice, righteousness, and peace never become eclipsed by fear as we lay hold of tasks and responsibilities which challenge and demand the fidelity and consecration of our noblest manhood and womanhood.

Hear us as we bow in adoration and unite in offering unto Thee the prayer of our Saviour, the Prince of Peace:

Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, on earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever.

Amen.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The CLERK. Representatives-elect, this is the day fixed by law for the meeting of the 84th Congress and, as the law directs, the Clerk of the House has prepared the official roll of the Representatives-elect. Certificates of election covering all but 1 of the 435 seats in the 84th Congress have been received by the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the 83d Congress, and the names of those persons whose credentials show that they were regularly elected as Representatives in accordance with the laws of their respective States or of the United States will be called. As the roll is called, following the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the State of Alabama, Representatives-elect will please answer to their names to determine whether a quorum is present.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll by States, and the following Representatives-elect answered to their names:

[Roll No. 1]

	ALABAMA	
Boykin	Roberts	Elliott
Grant	Rains	Jones
Andrews	Selden	Huddleston
	ARIZONA	
	Rhodes	Udall
	ARKANSAS	
Gathings	Trimble	Hays
Mills	Harris	Norrell
	CALIFORNIA	
Scudder	Sisk	Holt
Engle	Teague	Doyle
Moss	Hagen	Lipscomb
Mailliard	McDonough	Hillings
Shelley	Jackson	Roosevelt
Baldwin	King	Sheppard
Miller	Hosmer	Utt
Younger	Holifield	Phillips
Gubser	Hinshaw	Wilson
Johnson	Hiestand	
	COLORADO	
Rogers	Chenoweth	Aspinal
Hill		
	CONNECTICUT	
Dodd	Cretella	Patterson
Seely-Brown	Morano	Sadlak
	DELAWARE	
	McDowell	
	FLORIDA	
Cramer	Fascell	Matthews
Bennett	Herlong	
Sikes	Haley	

GEORGIA

Preston	Davis	Landrum
Pilcher	Vinson	Brown
Forrester	Lanham	
Flynt	Blitch	

IDAHO

Pfost	Budge

ILLINOIS

Dawson	Yates	Arends
O'Hara	Hoffman	Velde
Murray	Sheehan	Simpson
McVey	Boyle	Mack
Kluczynski	Church	Springer
O'Brien	Reed	Vursell
Bowler	Mason	Price
Gordon	Allen	Gray

INDIANA

Madden	Beamer	Wilson
Halleck	Harden	Harvey
Crumpacker	Bray	Brownson
Adair	Denton	

IOWA

Schwengel	LeCompte	Jensen
Talle	Cunningham	Hoeven
Gross	Dolliver	

KANSAS

Avery	George	Hope
Scrivner	Rees	Smith

KENTUCKY

Gregory	Chelf	Perkins
Natcher	Spence	Siler
Robsion	Watts	

LOUISIANA

Hébert	Brooks	Long
Boggs	Morrison	
Willis	Thompson	

MAINE

Hale	Nelson	McIntire

MARYLAND

Miler	Fallon	Friedel
Devereux	Lankford	
Garmatz	Hyde	

MASSACHUSETTS

Heselton	Bates	O'Neill
Boland	Lane	McCormack
Philbin	Macdonald	Wigglesworth
Donohue	Nicholson	Martin
Rogers	Curtis	

MICHIGAN

Machrowicz	Wolcott	Diggs
Meader	Bentley	Rabaut
Johansen	Thompson	Dingell
Hoffman	Cederberg	Lesinski
Ford	Knox	Griffiths
Hayworth	Bennett	Dondero

MINNESOTA

Andresen, August H.	McCarthy	Andersen, H. Carl
O'Hara	Judd	Knutson
Wier	Marshall	

MISSISSIPPI

Abernethy	Smith	Winstead
Whitten	Williams	Colmer

MISSOURI

Karsten	Bolling	Cannon
Curtis	Hull	Jones
Sullivan	Short	Moulder
Christopher	Carnahan	

MONTANA

Metcalf	Fjare

NEBRASKA

Weaver	Harrison	Miller
Chase		

NEVADA

Young

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Merrow	Bass

NEW JERSEY

Wolverton	Williams	Addonizio
Hand	Widnall	Kean
Auchincloss	Canfield	Sieminski
Thompson	Osmers	Tumulty
Frelinghuysen	Rodino	

NEW MEXICO

Fernandez	Dempsey

NEW YORK

Wainwright	Ray	Wharton
Derounian	Powell	O'Brien
Becker	Coudert	Taylor
Latham	Donovan	Kearney
Bosch	Klein	Kilburn
Holtzman	Davidson	Williams
Delaney	Zelenko	Riehlman
Anfuso	Fine	Taber
Keogh	Dollinger	Cole
Kelly	Buckley	Keating
Celler	Fino	Ostertag
Dorn	Gamble	Miller
Multer	Gwinn	Pillion
Rooney	St. George	Reed

NORTH CAROLINA

Bonner	Chatham	Alexander
Fountain	Durham	Jonas
Barden	Carlyle	Jones
Cooley	Deane	Shuford

NORTH DAKOTA

Burdick	Krueger

OHIO

Scherer	Jenkins	Hays
Hess	Bolton, Oliver P.	Kirwan
Schenck	Vorys	Feighan
McCulloch	Baumhart	Vanik
Clevenger	Ayres	Bolton, Frances P.
Polk	Henderson	Minshall
Brown	Bow	
Betts	McGregor	
Ashley		

OKLAHOMA

Belcher	Albert	Jarman
Edmondson	Steed	Wickersham

OREGON

Norblad	Green	Ellsworth
Coon		

PENNSYLVANIA

Barrett	Flood	Kelley
Granahan	Fenton	Saylor
Byrne	McConnell	Gavin
Chudoff	Rhodes	Kearns
Green	Walter	Clark
Scott	Mumma	Morgan
James	Bush	Fulton
King	Simpson	Eberharter
Dague	Quigley	Corbett
Carrigg	Van Zandt	Buchanan

RHODE ISLAND

Forand	Fogarty

SOUTH CAROLINA

Rivers	Dorn	Richards
Riley	Ashmore	McMillan

SOUTH DAKOTA

Lovre	Berry

TENNESSEE

Reece	Evins	Murray
Baker	Priest	Cooper
Frazier	Bass	Davis

TEXAS

Patman	Thompson	Burleson
Brooks	Thornberry	Rogers
Gentry	Poage	Mahon
Rayburn	Wright	Kilday
Alger	Ikard	Fisher
Teague	Bell	Dies
Dowdy	Kilgore	
Thomas	Rutherford	

UTAH

Dixon	Dawson

VERMONT

Prouty

VIRGINIA

Robeson	Tuck	Jennings
Hardy	Poff	Broyhill
Gary	Harrison	
Abbitt	Smith	

WASHINGTON

Pelly	Holmes	Magnuson
Westland	Horan	
Mack	Tollefson	

WEST VIRGINIA

Mollohan	Bailey	Kee
Staggers	Burnside	Byrd

WISCONSIN

Davis	Reuss	Byrnes
Withrow	Van Pelt	Johnson
Zablocki	Laird	O'Konski

WYOMING

Thomson

The CLERK. The rollcall discloses the presence of 428 Members-elect. A quorum is present.

The Clerk will state that credentials, regular in form, have been filed showing the election of EDWARD L. BARTLETT as Delegate from the Territory of Alaska and of Mrs. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON as Delegate from the Territory of Hawaii.

The Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico is elected quadrennially. A certificate of election signed by the Governor of Puerto Rico showing the election of ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN as Resident Commissioner for a period of 4 years, beginning January 3, 1953, is on file in the Clerk's office.

Since the regular election of Representatives to the 84th Congress, one change has occurred, as a result of which a vacancy now exists in the Sixth Congressional District of Florida, occasioned by the death of the late Honorable DWIGHT L. ROGERS.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER

The CLERK. The next order of business is the election of a Speaker of the House of Representatives. Nominations are now in order.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Clerk, by unanimous vote of the Democratic caucus, I am directed to nominate for Speaker of the House of Representatives of the 84th Congress the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, a Representative-elect from the State of Texas.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Clerk, as directed by unanimous vote of the Republican conference, I nominate for Speaker of the House of Representatives the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., a Representative-elect from the State of Massachusetts to the 84th Congress.

The CLERK. The Honorable SAM RAYBURN, a Representative-elect from the State of Texas, and the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., a Representative-elect from the State of Massachusetts, have been placed in nomination.

Are there further nominations? [After a pause.] If there are no further nominations, the Clerk will appoint tellers.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE], the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH], and the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] are appointed to act as tellers.

The tellers will please take their places at the desk in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The roll will now be called, and those responding will indicate by surname the nominee of their choice.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The tellers having taken their places, the House proceeded to vote for Speaker.

The following is the result of the vote:

[Roll No. 2]

RAYBURN—228

Abbitt	Barden	Boykin
Abernethy	Barrett	Boyle
Addonizio	Bass, Tenn.	Brooks, La.
Albert	Bell	Brooks, Tex.
Alexander	Bennett, Fla.	Brown, Ga.
Andrews	Blitch	Buchanan
Anfuso	Boggs	Buckley
Ashley	Boland	Burleson
Ashmore	Bolling	Burnside
Aspinall	Bonner	Byrd
Bailey	Bowler	Byrne, Pa.

Cannon	Harris	Patman
Carlyle	Harrison, Va.	Perkins
Carnahan	Hays, Ark.	Pfost
Celler	Hays, Ohio	Philbin
Chatham	Hayworth	Pilcher
Chelf	Hébert	Poage
Christopher	Herlong	Polk
Chudoff	Holifield	Powell
Clark	Holtzman	Preston
Colmer	Huddleston	Price
Cooley	Hull	Priest
Cooper	Ikard	Quigley
Davidson	Jarman	Rabaut
Davis, Ga.	Jennings	Rains
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Wis.	Reuss
Dawson, Ill.	Jones, Ala.	Rhodes, Pa.
Deane	Jones. Mo.	Richards
Delaney	Jones, N. C.	Riley
Dempsey	Karsten	Rivers
Denton	Kee	Roberts
Dies	Kelley, Pa.	Robeson, Va.
Diggs	Kelly, N. Y.	Rodino
Dingell	Keogh	Rogers, Colo.
Dodd	Kilday	Rogers, Tex.
Dollinger	Kilgore	Rooney
Donohue	King, Calif.	Roosevelt
Donovan	Kirwan	Rutherford
Dorn, S. C.	Klein	Selden
Dowdy	Kluczynski	Shelley
Doyle	Knutson	Sheppard
Durham	Landrum	Shuford
Eberharter	Lane	Sieminski
Edmondson	Lanham	Sikes
Elliott	Lankford	Sisk
Engle	Lesinski	Smith, Miss.
Evins	Long	Smith, Va.
Fallon	McCarthy	Spence
Fascell	McCormack	Staggers
Feighan	McDowell	Steed
Fernandez	McMillan	Sullivan
Fine	Macdonald	Teague, Tex.
Fisher	Machrowicz	Thomas
Flood	Mack, Ill.	Thompson, La.
Flynt	Madden	Thompson, N. J.
Fogarty	Magnuson	Thompson, Tex.
Forand	Mahon	Thornberry
Forrester	Marshall	Trimble
Fountain	Matthews	Tuck
Frazier	Metcalf	Tumulty
Friedel	Miller, Calif.	Udall
Garmatz	Mills	Vanik
Gary	Mollohan	Vinson
Gathings	Morgan	Walter
Gentry	Morrison	Watts
Gordon	Moss	Whitten
Granahan	Moulder	Wickersham
Grant	Multer	Wier
Gray	Murray, Ill.	Williams, Miss.
Green, Oreg.	Murray, Tenn.	Williams, N. J.
Green, Pa.	Natcher	Willis
Gregory	Norrell	Winstead
Griffiths	O'Brien, Ill.	Wright
Hagen	O'Brien, N. Y.	Yates
Haley	O'Hara, Ill.	Zablocki
Hardy	O'Neill	Zelenko

MARTIN—198

Adair	Cederberg	Hand
Alger	Chase	Harden
Allen, Ill.	Chenoweth	Harrison, Nebr.
Andersen, H. Carl	Church	Harvey
	Clevenger	Henderson
Andresen, August H.	Cole	Heselton
	Coon	Hess
Arends	Corbett	Hiestand
Auchincloss	Coudert	Hill
Avery	Cramer	Hillings
Ayres	Cretella	Hinshaw
Baker	Crumpacker	Hoeven
Baldwin	Cunningham	Hoffman, Ill.
Bass, N. H.	Curtis, Mass.	Hoffman, Mich.
Bates	Curtis, Mo.	Holmes
Baumhart	Dague	Holt
Beamer	Davis, Wis.	Hope
Becker	Dawson, Utah	Horan
Belcher	Derounian	Hosmer
Bennett, Mich.	Devereux	Hyde
Bentley	Dixon	Jackson
Berry	Dolliver	James
Betts	Dondero	Jenkins
Bolton, Frances P.	Dorn, N. Y.	Jensen
	Ellsworth	Johansen
Bolton, Oliver P.	Fenton	Johnson, Calif.
	Fino	Jonas
Bosch	Fjare	Judd
Bow	Ford	Kean
Bray	Frelinghuysen	Kearney
Brown, Ohio	Fulton	Kearns
Brownson	Gamble	Keating
Broyhill	Gavin	Kilburn
Budge	George	King, Pa.
Burdick	Gross	Knox
Bush	Gubser	Krueger
Byrnes, Wis.	Gwinn	Laird
Canfield	Hale	Latham
Carrigg	Halleck	LeCompte
Lipscomb	Pillion	Taber
Lovre	Poff	Talle
McConnell	Prouty	Taylor
McCulloch	Ray	Teague, Calif.
McDonough	Reece, Tenn.	Thompson, Mich.
McGregor	Reed, Ill.	
McIntire	Reed, N. Y.	Thomson, Wyo.
McVey	Rees, Kans.	Tollefson
Mack, Wash.	Rhodes, Ariz.	Utt
Mailliard	Riehlman	Van Pelt
Mason	Robsion, Ky.	Van Zandt
Meader	Rogers, Mass.	Velde
Merrow	Sadlak	Vorys
Miller, Md.	St. George	Vursell
Miller, Nebr.	Saylor	Wainwright
Miller, N. Y.	Schenck	Weaver
Minshall	Scherer	Westland
Morano	Schwengel	Wharton
Mumma	Scott	Widnall
Nelson	Scrivner	Wigglesworth
Nicholson	Scudder	Williams, N. Y.
Norblad	Seely-Brown	Wilson, Calif.
O'Hara, Minn.	Sheehan	Wilson, Ind.
O'Konski	Short	Withrow
Osmers	Siler	Wolcott
Ostertag	Simpson, Ill.	Wolverton
Patterson	Simpson, Pa.	Young
Pelly	Smith, Kans.	Younger
Phillips	Springer	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Martin Rayburn

NOT VOTING—6

Allen, Calif.	Chiperfield	Radwan
Blatnik	Passman	Smith, Wis.

The CLERK. The tellers agree in their tally. The total number of votes cast is 426, of which the Honorable SAM RAYBURN has received 228, and the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., has received 198. There were two Members-elect voting "present."

Therefore, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, a Representative-elect from the State of Texas, having received a majority of all the votes cast, is duly elected Speaker of the House of Representatives of the 84th Congress.

The Clerk appoints the following committee to escort the Speaker-elect to the chair: The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

(The Doorkeeper announced the Speaker-elect of the House of Representatives of the 84th Congress who was escorted to the chair by the committee of escort.)

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. My colleagues, this shifting about that Speaker Sam and I have practiced in recent years makes me think of an old ditty that went something like this: "Off again, on again, gone again Finnigan."

I am off again and in a few seconds I will be gone again. But as I gaze into the crystal ball I would just sound a little cautionary note: Mr. Speaker, do not become too attached to this chair. Nineteen hundred and fifty-seven is just around the corner.

Seriously, it is a very pleasant duty that has been assigned to me today to present to you your Speaker and my Speaker. [Applause.] He is a man of great parliamentary skill and experience. No man in American history has ever presided longer over this House than the man whom we have chosen to guide our destinies in the next 2 years. A man of character, a man of integrity, a man of fairness, and, above all, one who believes in the great traditions of Congress. He realizes, as we all do, that this is the greatest parliamentary body in all the world. It is the citadel of popular government. We are very fortunate that we have a Speaker-to-be who will maintain and cherish our great traditions. Under SAM RAYBURN there will be no diminishing of the prestige of Congress. My colleagues, I am very happy to present to you your Speaker and my Speaker, Speaker RAYBURN. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER [Mr. RAYBURN]. Speaker MARTIN—once a Speaker always a Speaker. [Applause.] I treasure the friendship, the personal friendship that has existed between JOE MARTIN and me over the years. It has been a friendship of understanding, because he and I both believe in the same things when it comes to honesty and truthfulness. There are no degrees in truthfulness. There are no degrees in honesty. You are 100 percent or you are not. I have found JOE MARTIN a hundred percent upon both. I know no one that I had rather succeed or precede in this high office than my old friend Joe, and if I can be as fair and impartial in the execution of the duties of this office, they are both arduous and onerous, as he has been, I will have met my fondest expectations.

To my colleagues of the House of Representatives, especially those on my right, who throughout the years have given me loyalty, and I think love, unsurpassed in the annals of American politics, to you I return today my grateful thanks. I shall never cease to hold in grateful memory your many kindnesses, your support; and for the many kindnesses and favors that have been done me by the Members on my left throughout these years, I also return my grateful thanks.

To the new Members of the Congress—if I may say a word, and that applies to both sides—after having been here what is considered a long time: On the 4th of March it will have been 42 years—your constituents have done you a high honor. To be chosen for any office in the gift of the people is a high honor. For your people to select you and honor you by giving you an opportunity to play a part on the highest theater in the world you should be and I know you are grateful. You can read the rules of the House month in and month out and not know them; you have got to see the rules practiced in the House before you will know the rules.

And I would say to the new Members: If you want to know and learn what is going on in the House of Representatives, the time for you to be on the floor is when the House convenes, because in the first 30 minutes, probably on Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday, the whole program of the week will be laid out; and if you want to know what it is and be a part of it I would suggest that you get through with your office work and come to the floor of the House promptly and be here when the House is called to order.

We live in a great country; we are proud of it, all of us; and I want to say to you now as I say everywhere I go: When people talk about those who hold office and especially an office as a Member of the House of Representatives or of the Senate, I have served with more than

3,000 men and women in the House of Representatives, and to date I have more faith in America under their leadership than I ever had before.

In my opinion, we live in the most dangerous time that the world has ever looked in the face during the life of this Republic, and probably during the time that civilization as we know it and love it has existed. It is not a little thing to be faced with potential enemies such as we have.

We are all in this thing together whether we be Republican, Democrat, or what not. This Republic is going to live; if we do our duty, if we do the things that will preserve, protect, defend, and perpetuate these great institutions, we will be a free people.

The leadership in this House of Representatives has changed; the parties' responsibilities have changed. I want to say as I said on the stump last fall, that we as Democrats do not indulge in personalities; we are not an accusing kind of people; we do not have to be that way.

Just because a member of another party is at the head of the executive branch of the Government we are going to look on measures recommended by the President of the United States, not from a partisan standpoint but from the standpoint of what we think is in the best interests of the people of the United States. It matters not what the heat may be, here or out there, we are not going to indict people en masse. We are not going to say that just because we do not like somebody politically he is soft on communism or that he believes in subversion, and no Democrat in this House in a position of responsibility, nor a Democrat out there in a position of responsibility, is going to act or talk like that without being frowned upon and repudiated by me.

We are going to look upon the President's recommendations with kindliness because he is the leader of our country. He is the President of the United States and should be honored and respected as that, and when he and those who work with him send a program to Congress we are not going to be against it just because a Republican President has recommended it. We are going to look into it.

We believe in the strongest possible foreign policy. We think it should be a nonpartisan foreign policy, and I have the hope to believe it is going to be. We believe in a strong defense. I dislike levying taxes on myself and other people as much as anybody else in the world, but, looking the world in the face, like I must today, and seeing the dangers that lurk for our freedom and our opportunities, as long as times are like they are, I am going to vote to levy the taxes and to appropriate a sufficient amount of money to make our country so strong that no international desperado will dare attack us.

So when the President's message comes on defense, it will be our duty and it will be our purpose to look into it very carefully. As I have said to him before when budgets for defense have been discussed, I hope it is enough, and it must be enough.

I have been here during two world wars. We were attacked both times because our enemies knew we were not prepared. Many of you remember the months before Pearl Harbor, when some of us pleaded for a few billions more for ships, guns, and men. We were not heeded; however, by not expending those few billions we were forced to expend more than $400 billion in less than 5 years and added to that we lost thousands upon thousands of the flower of the young womanhood and manhood of our country. And today, those that are not planted in foreign fields, hundreds of hospitals are bulging with young men who will never walk again and who will never see again.

I trust, I hope, I pray that our vision in these troublesome and dangerous times will be such that we will not be called upon to upbraid ourselves by bringing about a holocaust that we could have prevented if we had been willing to do the things that would make us strong and make us feared in the world.

So, we are going to do this business in good humor, not angry with anybody, but trying to work with the instruments that we have to keep our country great, keep it prosperous, and bring happiness to the American people.

Again, let me say how deeply grateful I am for the confidence and for the respect that you have shown me. I crave your respect on both sides of the aisle, and it matters not from where a Member comes or what his apparent ability may be, as long as I hold this gavel he is going to be recognized to speak his mind and represent the people who honored him by sending him here.

My deepest gratitude to all of you.

I am now ready to take the oath of office, if my distinguished friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] will be good enough to administer it.

Mr. VINSON then administered the oath of office to Mr. RAYBURN, of Texas.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. If the Members will rise, I will now administer the oath of office.

The Members- and Delegates-elect rose, and the Speaker administered to them the oath of office.

MAJORITY LEADER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Democratic caucus, I have been directed to report to the House that the Democratic Members have unanimously elected as majority leader the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

MINORITY LEADER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Republican conference, I am directed by that conference to officially notify the House that the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., has been selected as the minority leader of the House.

ELECTION OF CLERK, SERGEANT AT ARMS, DOORKEEPER, POSTMASTER, AND CHAPLAIN

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 1) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That Ralph R. Roberts, of the State of Indiana, be, and he is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That Zeake W. Johnson, Jr., of the State of Tennessee, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives;

That William M. Miller, of the State of Mississippi, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives;

That H. H. Morris, of the State of Kentucky, be, and he is hereby, chosen Postmaster of the House of Representatives;

That Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., of the District of Columbia, be, and he is hereby, chosen Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I intend to offer a substitute resolution but, before offering the substitute, I request that there be a separate vote on the Chaplain.

The SPEAKER. That will be done.

The question is on agreeing to that portion of the resolution providing for the election of the Chaplain.

The question was taken; and that portion of the resolution referring to the election of the Chaplain was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Lyle O. Snader, of the State of Illinois, be, and he is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That William R. Bonsell, of the State of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives;

That Tom J. Kennamer, of the State of Missouri, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives;

That Beecher Hess, of the State of Ohio, be, and he is hereby, chosen Postmaster of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the substitute resolution.

The substitute resolution was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the remainder of the resolution offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

The resolution was agreed to.

The officers-elect presented themselves at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

NOTIFICATION TO SENATE OF ORGANIZATION OF HOUSE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 2) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That a message be sent to the Senate to inform that body that a quorum of the House of Representatives has assembled; that SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas, has been

elected Speaker; and Ralph R. Roberts, a citizen of the State of Indiana, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the 84th Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 3) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of three Members be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as the committee to notify the President the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO INFORM THE PRESIDENT OF THE ELECTION OF THE SPEAKER AND THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 4), as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk be instructed to inform the President of the United States that the House of Representatives has elected SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas, Speaker, and Ralph R. Roberts, a citizen of the State of Indiana, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the 84th Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 5), as follows:

Resolved, That the rules of the House of Representatives of the 83d Congress, together with all applicable provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, be, and they are hereby, adopted as the rules of the House of Representatives of the 84th Congress.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Virginia yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield for a question.

Mr. SCOTT. May I ask the gentleman at this time whether he will accept as an amendment to the rules of this House those proposed amendments contained in House Resolution 571 of the 83d Congress, the so-called fair-play resolution, to improve congressional investigating procedures, a resolution which you and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] and myself all endorsed in a subcommittee report as desirable rules changes?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I would say to the gentleman that I do not think this is an appropriate time for such an amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Not today.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question on the same subject as a matter of clarification?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman state whether or not it will be the purpose of his committee to take up this problem in the near future?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I would not like to indicate what the committee is going to do when it has not been elected yet. I will be glad to tell the gentleman a little later.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

RESIGNATIONS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communications:

SEPTEMBER 17, 1954.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I wish to inform you that I have this day transmitted to the Governor of Ohio my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the 15th District of Ohio, effective September 26, 1954.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. SECREST.

DECEMBER 23, 1954.

SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to the Governor of Nebraska my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the First District of Nebraska, effective at the close of business December 31, 1954.

Respectfully submitted.

CARL T. CURTIS.

NOVEMBER 6, 1954.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SIR: I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to the Governor of New Hampshire my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Second District of New Hampshire to take effect on November 7, 1954.

NORRIS COTTON.

NOVEMBER 8, 1954.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is to advise that today I filed with the Governor of the State of Nebraska—effective at once—my resignation as Representative in Congress for the Second Congressional District of Nebraska, as per duplicate original attached.

Respectfully yours,

ROMAN L. HRUSKA.

DECEMBER 14, 1954.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
Speaker, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender to you my resignation as a Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States from the 23d Congressional District of Ohio effective at the close of business December 15, 1954.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE H. BENDER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *December 31, 1954.*

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to His Excellency Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York,[1] my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the 21st Congressional District of New York.

Respectfully,

J. K. JAVITS.

MATTER OF LEE LORCH, ROBERT M. METCALF, AND NORTON ANTHONY RUSSELL

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication.

The Clerk read the communication, as follows:

JANUARY 5, 1955.

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives, United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I desire to inform the House of Representatives that subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the 83d Congress the Committee on Un-American Activities reported to and filed with me as Speaker a statement of facts concerning the refusal of Lee Lorch, Robert M. Metcalf, and Norton Anthony Russell to answer questions before the said committee of the House, and I, pursuant to the mandatory provisions of Public Resolution 123, 75th Congress, certified to the United States attorney, southern district of Ohio, the statement of facts concerning the said Lee Lorch and Robert M. Metcalf on December 7, 1954, and certified to the United States attorney, District of Columbia, the statement of facts concerning the said Norton Anthony Russell on December 7, 1954.

Respectfully,

JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,

THE GOLD COAST AND NIGERIA

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 17, 1954.

The Honorable JOSEPH MARTIN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Reference is made to the Department's letter of October 6, 1954, informing you of the action taken by the Department of State in connection with the joint resolution of the Congress to extend greetings to the Gold Coast and Nigeria (Public Law 667, ch. 1005, 83d Cong., 2d sess.).

The Department of State has been informed by the British Embassy that the Gold Coast Legislative Assembly passed a resolution on October 27, 1954, with no dissentient, reading as follows:

"That this assembly extends its thanks to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States for the greetings contained in the joint resolution made at the 2d session of the 83d Congress, and declares that it would welcome most cordially at the appropriate time a delegation to represent the United States at the ceremonies marking

[1] And to the secretary of state of New York.

the attainment of independence for the Gold Coast."

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 40, sections 175 and 176, United States Code, the Chair appoints the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS] members of the House Office Building Commission to serve with himself.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 6) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations and the subcommittees thereof be authorized to sit during the sessions and recesses of the 84th Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed on the part of the House to join a like committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled and is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make has performed that duty. The President asked us to report that he will be pleased to deliver his message at 12:30 o'clock p. m., January 6, 1955, at a joint session of the two Houses.

PROVIDING FOR JOINT SESSION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Thursday, January 6, 1955, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

MINORITY EMPLOYEES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 7) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That pursuant to the Legislative Pay Act of 1929, as amended, six minority employees authorized therein shall be the following-named persons, effective January 5, 1955, until otherwise ordered by the House, to wit: Lyle O. Snader and William R. Bonsell, to receive compensation at the basic rate of $7,000 per annum, respectively; Tom J. Kennamer and Beecher Hess, to receive compensation at the basic rate of $5,000 per annum, respectively; James P. Griffin (minority pair clerk) to receive compensation at the basic rate of $4,500 per annum; and John McCabe to receive compensation at the basic rate of $4,300 per annum.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 8), which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Appropriations: Clarence Cannon (chairman), Missouri; George H. Mahon, Texas; Harry R. Sheppard, California; Albert Thomas, Texas; Michael J. Kirwan, Ohio; W. F. Norrell, Arkansas; Jamie L. Whitten, Mississippi; George W. Andrews, Alabama; John J. Rooney, New York; J. Vaughan Gary, Virginia; John E. Fogarty, Rhode Island; Robert L. F. Sikes, Florida; Antonio M. Fernandez, New Mexico; Prince H. Preston, Jr., Georgia; Otto E. Passman, Louisiana; Louis C. Rabaut, Michigan; Sidney R. Yates, Illinois; Fred Marshall, Minnesota; John J. Riley, South Carolina; Alfred D. Sieminski, New Jersey.

Committee on House Administration: Omar Burleson (chairman), Texas; Charles B. Deane, North Carolina; Edward A. Garmatz, Maryland; James Trimble, Arkansas; Robert C. Byrd, West Virginia; John E. Moss, California; Samuel N. Friedel, Maryland; Robert T. Ashmore, South Carolina; Wayne L. Hays, Ohio.

Committee on Ways and Means: Jere Cooper (chairman), Tennessee; John D. Dingell, Michigan; Wilbur D. Mills, Arkansas; Noble J. Gregory, Kentucky; Aime J. Forand, Rhode Island; Herman P. Eberharter, Pennsylvania; Cecil R. King, California; Thomas J. O'Brien, Illinois; Hale Boggs, Louisiana; Eugene J. Keogh, New York; Burr P. Harrison, Virginia; Frank M. Karsten, Missouri; A. S. Herlong, Jr., Florida; Eugene J. McCarthy, Minnesota; Frank Ikard, Texas.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 9), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That during the 84th Congress the Committee on Appropriations shall be composed of 50 members.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

HOUR OF MEETING OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 10), which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That, until otherwise ordered, the daily hour of meeting of the House of Representatives shall be at 12 o'clock meridian.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADMINISTERING THE OATH OF OFFICE TO HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 11), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas EDMUND P. RADWAN, a Representative-elect from the State of New York, from the 41st District thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Speaker, or deputy named by him, be, and he is hereby, authorized to administer the oath of office to said EDMUND P. RADWAN at Buffalo, N. Y., and that the said oath, when administered as herein authorized, shall be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said EDMUND P. RADWAN.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the authority of House Resolution 11, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints Mr. Edward A. Rath, Erie County clerk, Buffalo, N. Y., to administer the oath of office to the Honorable EDMUND P. RADWAN.

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 12) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas LAWRENCE H. SMITH, a Representative-elect from Wisconsin, from the First District thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Speaker, or deputy named by him, be, and he is hereby, authorized to administer the oath of office to said LAWRENCE H. SMITH at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, D. C., and that the said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said LAWRENCE H. SMITH.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] to administer the oath of office to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] has asked that I announce to the House that he is ill, confined to the hospital in Monroe, La., his home; that he hopes to be present on Monday to take the oath of office.

AUTHORITY TO DECLARE A RECESS ON JANUARY 6

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, January 6, 1955, it may be in order

for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AUTHORITY TO COMMITTEES TO HIRE AND PAY EMPLOYEES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 13) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That standing committees of the House shall have authority to approve the employment and compensation of committee employees from January 3, 1955, or such subsequent date as their service commenced.

The resolution was agreed to.

INTRODUCTION AND REFERENCE OF BILLS TODAY

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to make a statement concerning the introduction and reference of bills today.

As Members are aware, they have the privilege today of introducing bills. Heretofore on the opening day of a new Congress, several hundred bills have been introduced. It will be readily apparent to all Members that it may be a physical impossibility for the Speaker to examine each bill for reference today. The Chair will do his best to refer as many bills as possible but he will ask the indulgence of Members if he is unable to refer all of them that may be introduced. Those bills which are not referred and do not appear in the RECORD as of today will be included in the next day's RECORD and printed with a date as of today. The Chair feels that he should make this statement at this time so Members may be aware of the difficulties that immediately present themselves.

ADMISSION TO THE JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS JANUARY 6

The SPEAKER. After consultation with the majority and minority leaders of the House, the Chair desires to make this statement, remembering the terrific jams we have had on the floor on occasions of joint sessions of Congress.

With the consent and approval of the floor leaders, the Chair announces that on tomorrow the doors immediately opposite the Speaker will be opened, and the doors on the Speaker's left and right, and none other. No one will be allowed upon the floor of the House of Representatives who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House. The Chair certainly hopes that is lived up to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolutions:

Senate Resolution 1

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and to inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

Senate Resolution 2

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

Senate Resolution 7

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE, a Senator from the State of Georgia, as President of the Senate pro tempore, and of Felton M. Johnston, of Mississippi, as Secretary of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed the Senator from New York, Mr. IVES, the Senator from South Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, the Senator from Virginia, Mr. BYRD, and the Senator from Missouri, Mr. HENNINGS, as members on the part of the Senate of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolutions:

Senate Resolution 323

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK, late a Senator from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives when it next assembles, and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, adjourn until 10 o'clock antemeridian tomorrow.

Senate Resolution 324

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. PAT MCCARRAN, late a Senator from the State of Nevada.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives when it next assembles, and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, adjourn until 10 o'clock antemeridian tomorrow.

Senate Resolution 335

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. DWIGHT L. ROGERS, late a Representative from the State of Florida.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives when it next assembles, and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, do adjourn.

THE LATE SENATOR BURNET R. MAYBANK

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I have the sad duty of announcing to the House the death of Senator BURNET RHETT MAYBANK. At the time of his passing last fall, the House of Representatives had adjourned and there was no opportunity then to present the resolution which I shall present here today.

Few Members of the Senate have enjoyed the universal esteem which was accorded BURNET MAYBANK. That fact is attested to by public statements and messages of condolence at the time of his passing in September. The press throughout the Nation was just in its praise of his ability and achievements in the service of his country.

Senator MAYBANK holds a unique spot in South Carolina politics: throughout his entire career, he was never defeated for public office. That surely speaks for itself of the respect in which he was held by his fellow Carolinians.

Son of a prominent old southern family, MAYBANK was born and lived the majority of his life in Charleston, and that is where he began his illustrious political career in 1927 upon election to the city council. He was elected Governor of the State in 1938 and led a progressive administration until his election in October 1941 to fill the Senate seat vacated by resignation of the Honorable James F. Byrnes. He was easily reelected for 2 additional terms and was the undisputed choice of his people for election in the November 2 general election having been nominated without opposition in the Democratic primary 3 months before his untimely death.

Senator MAYBANK's other public positions and services are almost too numerous to mention. He was one of the principal voices of the South in affairs of the Democratic National Party. He was a member of all city, county, State, and national Democratic conventions since 1930 and national committeeman from 1940 to 1944 and from 1948 until his resignation in 1952. In addition, he made outstanding records as chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, mayor of Charleston, chairman of the South Carolina Public Service Authority, the Public Works Administration, and the American Battle Monuments Commission.

As a close personal friend, I shall miss BURNET MAYBANK greatly in our work here. He was a real statesman. His first consideration was the welfare of his country. He was listened to with respect by his colleagues in the Senate and his advice was sought by the members of his State delegation in this body.

The remembrance of Senator MAYBANK and his high ideals will be with us as we work for the security and prosperity of the country he loved and served so well.

May his closely knit and loving family find faith and courage from his example in all the days ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I present a resolution.

Mr. Speaker I send to the desk a resolution (H. Res. 14) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK, a Senator of the United States from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the life and character of the late Senator MAYBANK.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, South Carolina and the Nation have just lost one of its greatest citizens in the passing of Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK, of Charleston, S. C. I, with 2 million other South Carolinians, mourn the passing of this great American. Senator MAYBANK was a statesman and gained the respect of all his colleagues in the Senate and every other person privileged with his acquaintance.

I became acquainted with Senator MAYBANK while he was serving as mayor of the city of Charleston, S. C. I watched his career very closely from that time until his untimely passing. Senator MAYBANK made South Carolina one of its ablest governors and since that time has served with distinction as a Member of the United States Senate.

I wish that every person in the State of South Carolina had been privileged to know the late Senator MAYBANK as intimately as I was privileged to know him. He was a man with high principles, a heart of gold and a character of steel. He would never compromise any principle.

I shall greatly miss Senator MAYBANK as we assisted each other on numerous occasions in solving mutual problems. I remember very distinctly having Senator MAYBANK accompany me through the Pentagon Building on 2 or 3 distinct occasions in connection with securing an Army airbase for Florence, S. C., and Myrtle Beach, S. C., during World War II. He was also of great assistance to me in securing a Marine base at Georgetown, S. C., and in solving numerous other problems affecting the people of my District.

Senator MAYBANK called on me to assist him on a number of problems affecting our State and Nation. We usually saw eye to eye on the majority of the problems affecting our State and country. Our State and Nation can ill afford to lose many men of Senator MAYBANK'S character and ability. I feel extremely honored to have been considered one of Senator MAYBANK'S friends.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I shall long remember the morning of September 1, 1954. For some unknown reason, I had failed to turn on my radio to get the early news as I ate breakfast that morning. On my way to work one of my neighbors stopped me in the street and said, "Did you know BURNET MAYBANK died last night?" I replied, "Oh, no. You do not mean it."

This sad news was not only shocking to me, but to all the people of South Carolina. We knew we had lost a most worthy representative and a real statesman.

I first knew BURNET MAYBANK when he ran for Governor of South Carolina. At our first meeting I was impressed with his abounding energy, strong personality, and firm, but friendly, handclasp. He never lost any of these attributes, but on the contrary, attained many more during his years of public service.

He gained new friends fast, because he knew how to be a friend.

Soon after coming to the United States Senate, it became evident to the people of South Carolina that BURNET MAYBANK was not only a man of ability, but also one of great influence. Although he represented a State solidly Democratic, some of his closest friends in the Senate and Nation were Republicans. They, like many of his own party, respected, admired, and esteemed him for his clear thinking, sound judgment, and complete integrity.

He was loved by all who knew him for his sincerity and devotion to duty. But of his many fine qualities I think his honesty stood out like a lighthouse to a struggling seaman. I am sure he never took a tainted dollar. He was absolutely honest, not merely in the business world, but honest in his political life as well. The spoils of high political office never infected his body or soul.

His willingness to accept responsibility and his capable and conscientious service to the people of South Carolina and the Nation made him almost invulnerable as a candidate in his home State. His constituents recognized him as the great Senator he was. In South Carolina, it is almost unheard of for a United States Senator to be unopposed in a primary election. But BURNET MAYBANK had just been accorded that honor a few weeks before his untimely death.

He loved his family deeply. Since I have been in Washington, he never saw me without inquiring about the welfare of his son who for several years has lived in my home city of Greenville.

The people of his State and Nation share with his family the loss of this great man.

THE LATE SENATOR PAT McCARRAN

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I have the sad duty of reporting to the Members of the House today the passing of PATRICK A. McCARRAN, late a Senator of the United States from the State of Nevada.

With his passing last September the State of Nevada lost one of its greatest leaders, the West lost one of its greatest champions, and our country an outstanding patriot and citizen.

There is probably no Member of Congress who has been responsible for more significant legislation than the late Senator McCARRAN. He was the father of the Civil Aeronautics Act and the Federal Airports Act. He was author of the Internal Security Act, the Administrative Procedures Act, and the Immigration and Naturalization Act. He was foremost in the fight against the subversive forces that threatened our country. It was at his instigation that the Internal Security Committee of the Senate was created.

Of humble origin, he was successively rancher, legislator, lawyer, district attorney, chief justice of the Nevada Supreme Court, and finally in 1932 he was elected to the United States Senate. He served continuously in that body until his death last September.

In the minds of many people he set a standard for Americanism, not only in his fight against Communists and subversive influences but in his determination to preserve our constitutional form of government. When he first came to the United States Senate in the early thirties there were those who would have abandoned some of our great constitutional principles. Senator McCARRAN resolutely fought against this move and in so doing demonstrated not only his faith in his fellow men but also in the form of government which made it possible for him to rise from a humble beginning to membership in one of the greatest deliberative bodies of the world. His work will serve as a living inspiration to those who desire to preserve the American Constitution and our form of government.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution (H. Res. 15) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. PAT McCARRAN, a Senator of the United States from the State of Nevada.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the life and character of the late Senator McCARRAN.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult for me to contemplate Congress divested of the presence of the Honorable PAT McCARRAN, of Nevada. With all deference to the other distinguished men who have been privileged to represent this great State of Nevada, it had seemed for more than 20 years that Nevada and PAT McCARRAN were virtually synonymous in Washington. Nevada never had cause to complain that its interests were not being diligently and courageously represented. Senator McCARRAN was the vigilant sentry, the tenacious battler.

Coming to Washington with a distinguished background as lawyer and jurist, he soon demonstrated that he was, above all, a lawmaker of great craftsmanship. He abhorred careless legislating. He believed that the great body of the law could and should be shaped and reshaped to serve the changing requirements of an ever-growing Nation, but he demanded the painstaking approach. His resistance to legal tinkering and experimentation was prodigious.

Senator McCARRAN strove for orderliness in the complex of Federal statutes. His service as chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary gave him

countless opportunities to work for sensible legal reforms, and he welcomed them as a passionate believer in the importance of firm legal basis for every action of Government.

Few Members of the Congress have had the capacity for so wide a range of legislative interests. Among the measures in which his authorship loomed large were the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, the first Urban Redevelopment Act passed by Congress in 1944, the Reorganization Act of 1944, the Federal Airport Act of 1945, the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946, the Internal Security Act of 1951, and the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

Senator McCARRAN was a dedicated patriot. He was born and reared among pioneers in a pioneering State. He knew from personal experience that the greatness of the United States of America was built by hard work. He could not abide apathy where the national interest was concerned. During most of his service in Congress, he lived and worked in an atmosphere of present or impending dangers.

He never underestimated the perverted skills of the agents of international communism, but he never doubted the ability of a republic to meet and best them without compromising its own liberties in the doing. Because he knew the measure of the Communist menace, Senator McCARRAN fought for the improvement of domestic legal weapons against its operatives. In the field of diplomacy, his views were equally realistic. Never a warmonger, he believed in preparation against the horrible worst, and he advocated seeking allies among those who not only said they opposed communism but also gave evidence of their willingness to take up arms against the evil movement, should eventualities dictate.

It was my privilege to enjoy the counsel of Senator McCARRAN on numerous occasions. As a fellow lawyer, I came to know and marvel at the breadth of his legal comprehension and the incisiveness of his thinking. His passing, an incalculable loss to the Nation and to his great State, represents a deep personal loss to me. My sympathy goes out to the fine family he left in moving on to his reward.

THE LATE DWIGHT L. ROGERS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to revise and extend my remarks, and for all Members to have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point on the death of the late Honorable DWIGHT L. ROGERS.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I take the floor on this occasion, for I have the sad duty to announce to the House the death on December 1 at Fort Lauderdale, Fla., of our beloved and distinguished colleague, DWIGHT L. ROGERS. Many persons knew and worked with DWIGHT ROGERS during his period of service in this great deliberative body. Each of them knew him as one of the most beloved, one of the ablest, one of the most sincere and conscientious of men; a true husband and father; an outstanding patriot and statesman.

There were many wonderful things about him. To me it was significant that he always had a smile and a friendly word of greeting for everyone that he met. It was part of the man that he wanted to do something good for every living being. Because of things like this, and there were many such traits, few men have been more popular or more respected on both sides of the aisle, few men more genuinely appreciated by both Democrats and Republicans, than DWIGHT ROGERS.

His responsibilities were many and great. As private citizen and as public official, he lived up to all of them. He knew what a wonderful thing it is to be a citizen of this great land, and he showed his appreciation of that privilege in the fullest sense. Very importantly, he knew the secret of finding happiness in dealing with his fellow man and in carrying on his work.

DWIGHT ROGERS was the only Congressman that Florida's Sixth District has had. He was elected to the 79th Congress on November 7, 1944, as its first Congressman when the new Sixth District was created; and he was reelected, usually without opposition, to each succeeding Congress, including the 84th Congress. His record of accomplishments in this body has been both constructive and impressive, both sound and progressive. He has been the author of many important measures and of far-reaching amendments. His effectiveness in debate was widely known and highly appreciated.

Dwight was born near Reidsville, Tattnall County, Ga., on August 17, 1886. He was the son of William Millard and Augusta Laing Rogers. He was educated in the public schools of Reidsville and Locust Grove Institute. He was graduated from the University of Georgia in 1910 and admitted to the practice of law at Ocilla, Ga. In 1925 he moved to Fort Lauderdale, Fla., and there engaged in the practice of law, where he soon was recognized as one of Florida's ablest members of the bar. He served as representative from Broward County in the Florida State Legislature from 1930 to 1938; was speaker pro tempore of the house in 1933. His legislative achievements there were outstanding. He was a member of the Century of Progress at the World's Fair in Chicago; chairman of appeal board No. 4 of the Selective Service System for 3½ years; member of the Methodist Church, of Phi Delta Theta, a member of Sphinx honorary society at the University of Georgia, and a member of Kiwanis.

He is survived by his wife, Mrs. Florence Rogers, a wonderful, faithful, and loving companion throughout the many years of their married life. She, too, is known and loved by the membership of this House for her sterling qualities and her devoted loyalty to her family.

He also is survived by three sons, Dwight L., Jr., Paul G., and Doyle, each of them a fine, respected, upstanding young man in his own right, each of them respected for the splendid manner in which he is carrying on the wonderful traditions established by their illustrious father, DWIGHT ROGERS. To Florence and to their sons, I extend my deep and earnest sympathies at their great loss.

I was one of those privileged to be with the family at the time that the last services were held for Dwight, and on that occasion one of the ministers who conducted those services recalled to the great and sorrowing audience there a book known to most of you, entitled "Mr. Jones, Meet the Master." He said of Dwight at that time, "I believe that when DWIGHT ROGERS enters the Pearly Gates and someone says to him, 'Mr. ROGERS, Meet the Master,' Dwight will say, 'I already know the Master.'"

That is the way DWIGHT ROGERS lived. That is the kind of man he was. For his great service to his Nation, for his great Americanism, for being just DWIGHT ROGERS, we shall always treasure the memory of the man with whom we served and whom we loved.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG].

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] in expressing my deep regrets, and I am sure the regrets of all of us, on the passing of our beloved colleague, DWIGHT ROGERS. I know of no man who was more loved in the House of Representatives or who had more friends than did DWIGHT ROGERS. DWIGHT ROGERS had friends because he was a friend to every man and woman in this body. I was in Washington on the occasion of his passing and when the news spread around Capitol Hill that we had lost DWIGHT ROGERS. Everywhere I went people were speaking of him as though they had suffered a great personal loss—and they had. It was not just his colleagues who were saddened by his passing. Elevator operators, cafeteria employees, and other workers here had tears in their eyes as they spoke of their personal affection for Mr. ROGERS.

DWIGHT ROGERS had many fine characteristics. Love of God was truly exemplified by him in his love of his fellow men. He had the most cheerful disposition I have ever seen. It was a joy to be around him.

Someone once compared death with a ship sailing out to sea. We stand on the shore and watch as it passes out of sight over the horizon. We sigh and say, "There she goes." But on the other side there are those waiting to greet it, and as its sails appear on the horizon an enthusiastic shout goes up from that shore, "Here she comes." I am sure that glad cry went up with Dwight's arrival on the other shore. Of course, we do not know what kind of place heaven is, but we do know that it must be a more cheerful place now that DWIGHT ROGERS is there.

My deepest sympathy goes out to those he left behind—his faithful and loving wife and three fine sons, as well as a myriad of warm, personal friends. His family, his friends, his district, Florida, and our country suffered a great loss.

We shall all miss him more than words can say.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, our Nation lost an able statesman when death took Congressman DWIGHT ROGERS from us. He was a warmhearted man and this showed itself not only in his personal relationships but also in the character of his statesmanship. He was always quick to sense a place where the Government should extend a helping hand to the weak, the aged, or the needy. He was not prone to find excuses for not giving assistance to worthy objectives, but on the contrary he was ahead of most of his fellowmen in taking the leadership to help those who really needed assistance.

In his years of service in the State Legislature of Florida, his monument of legislative service is the homestead amendment, freeing Florida homes from real-estate taxes. Here in Congress there are many monuments to him. Perhaps Floridians will chiefly remember his successful work to establish the south and central Florida flood-control project. Certainly, that will always be a great monument to him. Throughout the Nation, his terminal-leave law, to give enlisted men benefits similar to those enjoyed by officers will always be remembered as symbolic of his successful efforts for those of limited advantages. In the last session of Congress his successful work toward eliminating the stringency of the "work clause" in the social-security law is again typical of his efforts to help those most deserving help.

As I close, I humbly pay tribute to him as a treasured friend of mine and as a wonderful husband and father and as a good Christian man. My deepest sympathy goes out to his lovely mate and their three fine sons who survive him.

I understand that he knelt in earnest prayer at least once each day, seeking guidance in his work and in his personal life. I know he now stands face to face with God.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the death of DWIGHT ROGERS was an irreparable loss to the Members of this House and to the Nation and State which he served so well.

It was my good fortune to be associated with him on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and I count that association as one of the most valuable of the privileges which have come to me through my membership in this body. He was unfailingly kind and courteous, a man in whose company it was a pleasure to be, ready and anxious to be helpful to all with whom he came in contact.

He was the loyal servant of the district which he represented but, more important, he had a broad and comprehensive knowledge of the needs of the Nation and worked with devotion, skill, and diligence to meet those needs.

I join my colleagues in expressing our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Rogers and to their three fine sons.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, DWIGHT ROGERS was a Christian gentleman. What finer tribute could words pay to anyone? Association with him emphasized the qualities that endeared him to his friends. Always kind, thoughtful and sincere in his attitude to others. Never an unkind word or thought. Anxious and willing to be helpful to everyone. His life was a continuous expression of good will. He had an outward tranquility of demeanor that reflected an inward tranquility of soul. He enjoyed a peace within that came as a result of kind thoughts toward others, and, with a sincere desire to so live and act that what he said and did would find acceptance by his Father in heaven, whom he sought to serve with simplicity and sincerity.

I wish there were more of the kind DWIGHT ROGERS was. The earth would be a better place in which to live. What a heritage he has left to his good wife and splendid sons, of whom he thought so much, and, of whom he so often spoke in terms of admiration and love. His life has indeed been an inspiration to all who knew him emphasized by a Christian life exemplified each day in his home to those who were so close and dear to him, and to his colleagues in the Halls of Congress, and to his fellow man as he met them in the varied activities of his busy life.

There will be those who on this day will speak of the fine, able, conscientious and patriotic service rendered by DWIGHT ROGERS to the people of the Sixth Congressional District of Florida. All that they say will echo similar thoughts within myself. As Chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, a great committee of this House, with a jurisdiction that gives abundant opportunity to express the humane instincts that are a part of every true legislator, I can, as chairman of that committee, testify that throughout the entire period of his membership on that committee DWIGHT ROGERS was constantly aware of his responsibility to his fellow man and sought at all times the enactment of legislation that would be uplifting and promote the welfare of our people, especially the underprivileged.

He had a keen mind that went to the heart of every issue. He had a reservoir of knowledge based upon experiences gained through the several activities that had claimed his attention, both before and after he came to Congress. He had a practical way of applying his knowledge to the problem at hand that would leave no doubt in his mind as to what was right or wrong as a solution. His adherence to what he considered the right solution was one of his strongest qualities, a quality that was most commendable. However, he was always charitable toward those of a differing viewpoint and never showed rancor or expressed any unkind thought in pressing his own convictions.

Words fail me to give the tribute that a man of the character of DWIGHT ROGERS is entitled to have. I do hope, however, that these feeble words will convey in some measure to his family and friends the high regard I had for our departed colleague, and, I further trust that my words, and, those of the other colleagues that pay tribute to his memory, will ever awaken and inspire each one of us to live the friendly life he did, and, when we come to life's end, enable us to "wrap the draperies of our couch about us and lie down to pleasant dreams," as did DWIGHT ROGERS.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I was profoundly shocked when I heard over the radio the news of the sudden death of our former colleague, DWIGHT ROGERS. I had no reason to think that he was in anything but the best of health and I was looking forward to seeing him upon the opening of this Congress today.

DWIGHT ROGERS was one of the first friends I made when I came to Congress 10 years ago and the memory of his friendship will live with me always.

He was an able Representative of his district, a conscientious and hard-working member of his committee, and a deeply religious person.

It is a privilege to join with his other colleagues today in paying tribute to him and in extending deepest sympathy to Mrs. Rogers and their children.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. It was with much sorrow that I learned of the death of our colleague, the Honorable DWIGHT L. ROGERS. He was kind and courteous and a most capable and devoted public servant. He was a man of great charm and ability who was loved by all his associates. I counted him as one of my dear friends. He was also highly respected by the people he represented in the Sixth District of the State of Florida. I had the opportunity to learn first hand of his popularity with his constituents as on numerous occasions I had visited Fort Lauderdale, his home city. My son and his family were constituents of his. I was in Fort Lauderdale last week and noted the profound sorrow there as the result of Mr. ROGERS' death.

I join with my colleagues in the House in expressing sympathy to his wife and family on their great loss.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the sudden passing of our friend, DWIGHT ROGERS, leaves all of us with a feeling of great personal loss. He had been a friend to me as he had been a friend to everyone with whom he came in contact. He had no enemies.

DWIGHT ROGERS lived a clean and wholesome life, and he lived it in the fullest measure. He had a heart that was big, and it was so full of love that there was never room in it for bitterness, hatred, or rancor. Not only did DWIGHT ROGERS have an infinite and abiding faith in God, but he also had an unshakeable belief in the innate goodness of man; which accounts, perhaps, for the multitude of friends he always made wherever he went.

We join his family and friends in mourning his departure from this mortal vale, comforted in the knowledge that he enjoys a special place in heaven, reserved by God for the very best among His children.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, here on this first day of the 84th Congress, it is with great sadness and sorrow that the friends and colleagues of DWIGHT L. ROGERS pause to pay their respect and their love to his memory.

DWIGHT ROGERS was a man of wisdom. He had the happy faculty of understanding people. He was a living example of the current expression, "how to win friends and influence people." Dwight was to his colleagues here in the House of Representatives, and to his legion of friends everywhere, a ray of sunshine. He was happy in heart, happy in his outlook on life. In the years I have spent in Congress, I have never met a man with a greater love for his fellow man, with a keener desire to serve them.

In the debates in the House of Representatives, in the cloakrooms, in the halls and corridors of this historic Capitol, and in the hearts of friends all over the country, DWIGHT ROGERS will be sorely missed. To his family, to whom he was devoted, my deepest sympathy.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, DWIGHT ROGERS was a friendly, kindly and lovable man. He liked people and people liked him. In my 8 years of association with him in the Congress, I never heard DWIGHT ROGERS say an unkind word about anyone, and I never heard anyone speak of him except in the kindest words of praise.

DWIGHT ROGERS was able, too. He was one who got things done. I, often, observed that when he proposed an amendment to legislation his amendment usually carried. That was in part due to the fact that the things DWIGHT ROGERS proposed were sound and in part due to the fact that everyone had confidence in Congressman ROGERS, his judgment and his word. Both were good.

During the past 2 years, when I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, Mr. ROGERS often came before my committee to urge the wisdom of the Federal Government speeding work on the central Florida project. He was persistent in a friendly sort of way. He always had his facts well in hand and his arguments were logical and effective. DWIGHT ROGERS got results for his district and his State.

Florida has lost a great Congressman, the Congress has lost a most likable and effective Member, and the Nation a fine citizen. We all shall miss him.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I know that I cannot add to the many magnificent tributes which have been given to our beloved friend and colleague, DWIGHT L. ROGERS, but I cannot let this opportunity pass without an expression of the affection and high regard which I had for him.

The sudden passing of Congressman ROGERS was a shock to all who knew him, but it was especially keen to those of us who were privileged to know and serve with him on the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. His abilities will be greatly missed in the House, and even more, will the hearty laugh and the cheerful personality that was his, be missed. Although he was a veteran Member, I never thought of him as being advanced in age. He was progressive, forward looking and vigorous in his approach to solution of problems. Yet he was ever courteous, kindly, and considerate. He loved life, and lived it to the fullest.

I shall miss him greatly, and the task here in the House will be a little heavier because of his absence. His optimism was infectious—his hearty laughter was good to hear, and his devotion and faith in God shown in his every act and undertaking.

To me his outstanding quality was his love of his fellow man. He had the capacity for friendship, and his friendships were warm and generous. He worked hard, he spoke vigorously for his district and the people, yet he had the gentility of the Christian gentleman. Florida has lost one of her strongest sons, the House one of its sweetest spirits.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of the 84th Congress convened in this Hall today to be sworn in, I was saddened by the fact that my long-time devoted friend, Congressman DWIGHT L. ROGERS, of Florida, was not here to take the oath along with those of us elected to this Congress.

One of the most treasured recollections I have of my 8 years service in Congress is the association I have had during all that time with DWIGHT ROGERS. He was an able and conscientious public official. He was a kindly, considerate, and helpful friend. He was noted for his gentleness and for his unruffled temperament. He always had a smile for his friends. Nothwithstanding his kindly disposition and his consideration for others, he had the courage of his convictions. During a speech I heard him make one day on the floor of the House, he quoted this little poem which I have carried in my memory ever since:

Dare to be a Daniel,
Dare to stand alone,
Dare to have a purpose,
Dare to make it known.

One could not have a better or finer motto, and the spirit which it expresses is typical of the character of our beloved colleague.

He made an outstanding contribution to good government during his service here. His passing is a tragic loss to his district, his State, and our country. I shall miss him greatly. I extend deepest sympathy to Mrs. Rogers and his children.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in expressing my sorrow at the passing of our friend, DWIGHT L. ROGERS.

When I came here at the beginning of the 81st Congress, it was my good fortune to become acquainted with DWIGHT ROGERS early in the session. The friendship formed then continued until his death.

DWIGHT ROGERS had great capacity for friendship. His inherent friendliness bred friendship for him by all those who knew him.

DWIGHT ROGERS had a great sense of humor that gave him balance and stability in the face of the problems of the difficult period in which he served.

DWIGHT ROGERS had character, and courage, and conviction.

He thus leaves a great heritage for his family, and for his legion of friends.

And the king said unto his servants, "Know ye not that there is a prince and a great man fallen this day in Israel?"

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, DWIGHT ROGERS' death came as a terrible jolt to me. I have never known a finer, kindlier man. Among his colleagues here he was loved and respected. He had a rare talent for friendship. With it he combined a deep and sincere sense of duty and public service. And he had the courage to speak out for his convictions, clearly and eloquently. Those qualities are about all a man needs to be a great public servant. DWIGHT ROGERS was a great Congressman and public servant. But I cannot let this occasion pass without registering my own sense of personal loss. DWIGHT ROGERS was my friend. We enjoyed a deep understanding and genuine affection for each other. And so it is as one who shares their grief that I extend my sincere sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States can ill afford to lose men like DWIGHT ROGERS. There was little difference in our ages and he started his service in the Congress only a short time after I did. From the beginning it was abundantly evident that he was a fine American and a worthy Member of the House of Representatives. keen sense of humor, a devotion to duty which was outstanding, and a facility for making friends which won many to him. His love for his country and his abiding faith were equaled by few men, and his was a distinct contribution to the preservation of good government and the American principles of liberty and freedom. A large part of his life was devoted to public service, and being recognized as a leader among men, he held many positions of trust. He performed his duties with zeal and fidelity and would not compromise with evil. I glory in the fact that we were friends, and it is nothing less than the truth to say that the world is richer for his life.

My warm sympathy goes out to his family at this time, and I trust that the tender mercies of Almighty God may assuage their grief.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, notice of the untimely passing of our late colleague, the Honorable DWIGHT L. ROGERS, came to us, I know, and to all of his many friends, with grievous and stunning impact.

I join with all those whose lives have been brightened by his friendship and whose days have been saddened by his death, in sorrow.

It has been my great privilege to be DWIGHT ROGERS' closest neighbor in the House Office Building since the day I came into this body 6 years ago, and the memory of his helpful attentions and courtesies to me as a freshman will stay with me forever.

A friendly man by nature and a kindly man, he made friends easily and held friendships securely. Pleasant memories of Mr. ROGERS, we may be sure, will long remain in the minds and in the hearts of all those whose great privilege it has been to know him.

I extend to his devoted wife and his splendid sons my most profound sympathy in this time of their bereavement.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I would join in the remarks of my distinguished colleagues from Florida in expressing

my sincere regret and the sense of deep loss that has come to our State with the passing of one of its outstanding leaders and great Congressmen, DWIGHT L. ROGERS. It was not my pleasure to know him well. It was my privilege to have met Mr. ROGERS and to have known well his many great efforts in the Florida legislature and in these Halls of Congress. From his many close friends and associates I feel that I have been privileged to learn of the many great achievements that are counted in his long record of service. Mr. ROGERS was an outstanding Floridian whose great personal charm and friendly nature made friends for himself and our State wherever he went. He was counted among the most able men in this legislative body and the reflection of his labors for Florida and the Nation is clearly shown in the development of our State and the dignity of our country. Such men are not to be replaced. We who serve here now may only persevere in emulating their patterns of achievement and devoted service.

At this time I would express my humble regret and join with all his many friends and neighbors in bereavement over his passing.

To his widow and devoted family I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the State of Florida and the Nation have suffered a great loss in the passing of our colleague, DWIGHT L. ROGERS.

I shall personally miss Congressman ROGERS every time I attend a session of Congress as he was always present at practically every session of Congress since he was first elected to represent the great State of Florida in the National House of Representatives.

I certainly join with the Members of his fine family in mourning his untimely passing.

Congressman ROGERS was always interested in every piece of legislation pending before the House that had for its purpose the preservation of our Constitution and the betterment of the people of this country in general.

Again let me state that this Nation can ill afford to lose men of Congressman ROGERS' character and ability during these critical times.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of our colleague, DWIGHT L. ROGERS, his district, his State, and the Nation lost a valuable public servant.

He was honest and honorable and highly respected by Members on both sides of the aisle. I do not think he had an enemy anywhere. He loved people. Nothing gave him more pleasure than to help someone.

He was born and reared in the State of Georgia, and graduated from the University of Georgia. A young man in his teens when he entered the university, he was admired by all and was elected president of the freshman class. Following his graduation at the university he practiced his profession for many years in Ocilla, Ga. He was a brilliant lawyer and highly esteemed by the judges and the lawyers.

His life was not a life spent in a mad struggle for material wealth. He possessed dignity without arrogance, and firmness without intolerance.

DWIGHT ROGERS will be greatly missed by all who knew him. I feel that I have lost one of my dearest friends. He always looked for the best in man and found it. Throughout his wonderful career I have never heard anyone speak ill of him.

I think every Member of this Chamber who knew DWIGHT ROGERS loved him and feels a great loss in his passing.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his beloved wife and children.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, of few Members of this House could it be more truly said than of DWIGHT L. ROGERS that every colleague was his good friend. The late gentleman from Florida proffered his sterling friendship freely, and only a petrified heart could rebuff it. No matter how gray the day or grim the legislative task at hand, it seemed that he had always with him the essence of Florida sunshine to share with one and all.

Mr. ROGERS came to this House with a fine background in the law and substantial experience as a State legislator. He applied himself conscientiously to the committee tasks assigned him, and he won quickly the respect and confidence of his colleagues here. It was my privilege to serve with him for a time on the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and I profited from the association. I do not believe anyone could have failed to be the gainer from knowing DWIGHT ROGERS.

In the committee room, in the House Chamber, wherever he was in these Halls of Congress, there was the spirit of genuine friendliness. This is not to suggest that Mr. ROGERS took his legislative labors lightly. He was a gentleman of natural dignity who demonstrated a deep consciousness of the honor and responsibility which were his as the Representative of the Sixth District of Florida.

The fine citizens who sent DWIGHT ROGERS to serve with us lost in his passing an earnest and effective legislator and a kindly and engaging ambassador of goodwill. All of us who knew and loved him were deeply saddened in the knowledge that we were to return to the Capitol and find him no longer here. Our sincere sympathy goes to his widow and sons.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, every Member of the House who had the great privilege of serving with DWIGHT ROGERS begins this session with a sense of grief. His death robs us of an association we cherished, and the Nation of the service of an able and devoted public servant. His responsible use of his rare endowments of mind and heart for the advancement of his State and Nation was widely recognized, and the passing of such a leader brings great personal sorrow.

In one of his last utterances in this Chamber, DWIGHT ROGERS spoke of the curtain of death. It is our faith that the drawing of this curtain opens the way to a larger life, and certainly our beloved Member from Florida was prepared for the adventure. We may say of him, as Georgia Harkness said of her friend, Galen Fisher:

He was a gentle soul of valiant strength.
In him was life forever young and strong;
Around the world men loved him, for the length
Of shadow that he cast was straight and long.

The new year comes—the old must have an end—
And many a wish is spoken, kind and true.
So, forward turns the spirit of our friend
To work with God in fields of service new.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, when I heard of the sudden death of DWIGHT L. ROGERS I was shocked. I had just left him several weeks before this occurred. In fact, I believe that he and I played the last game of golf in which he participated at the Burning Tree Club. When we left the clubhouse he told me he was going home to Fort Lauderdale to help his sons in their law practice and also to play some golf at Fort Lauderdale, Fla. Little did I think that this would be the last time that I would see my friend. He looked like a person in perfect health, both mentally and physically.

During our service in Congress, DWIGHT ROGERS and myself became very good friends. He was an able pleader for the things that he thought were right. I never saw him exhibit any acrimony in debate, but he zealously and effectively pleaded for legislation which he supported.

He was a member of the great Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and I have personal knowledge that he was very highly regarded by his colleagues on the committee. A man's legislative life in the House of Representatives revolves around his committee assignment.

Mr. ROGERS also was a Christian gentleman in every sense of the word. He was a man who had a keen sense of humor. He had a fine family life, and in every way was an excellent citizen. His sudden death reminded me of the expression "Nothing is so certain as death and nothing so uncertain as the time of death."

He died the way I hope I may die. He was in perfect health and had his full mental vigor up to the last minute of his life.

DWIGHT L. ROGERS was a true representative of his people. He listened to his constituents, he studied the proposals on which he was called upon to vote, and he made his decision as to what course of action he should take by his vote. Knowing him as I did, I know that whatever his vote was it was for what he believed to be for the best public interest.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by the distinguished gentlemen from Florida [Mr. SIKES and Mr. HERLONG]. I should like to add just a bit of my own personal relationship with DWIGHT ROGERS.

He was one of the finest men I have ever known. I always felt that Dwight and I had a great deal in common. For example, we both represented the Sixth

District of our respective States. The State of Florida and the State of Iowa came in as counterparts back there in the 1840's when a northern and a southern State usually came in together.

We were members of the same committee in the House of Representatives, a fine and a great committee, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Although we were adherents of different parties, more often than not we found ourselves in complete agreement with respect to legislative proposals that came before that committee.

I had a deep affection for him. I have an abiding affection for his memory. He was a man of loyalties. There was an American philosopher who told us that the greatest human virtue is loyalty. Certainly DWIGHT ROGERS was loyal in all his relationships. He was loyal to his friends. He was loyal to his church. He was loyal to his party. He was loyal to his country and to his family. And his loyalties were of the finest grade and of the highest order.

In addition, as Mr. HERLONG has pointed out, he was a friendly person. No one could know DWIGHT ROGERS and not feel that he was a friend. He was always that way. I never knew of his failing to give a friendly greeting to all and sundry, high and low, distinguished and undistinguished.

Then, too, he was kind. I suppose one of the humbler virtues is that of being kind, just kind to people, not sharp, not harsh, not angry, not showing the sharp points of disagreement, but just being kind. Certainly DWIGHT ROGERS in all his human relationships showed that humble virtue of kindness.

I certainly can agree with the distinguished clergyman who said that Dwight would find friends on the farther shore. The denizens of that unknown country will welcome him with open arms.

I loved DWIGHT ROGERS.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I would not want this moment to pass without saying a few words about DWIGHT ROGERS. It was several days after his passing away before I learned of his death, and the news of that death came to me as a shock and brought me great grief and sorrow.

I think the gentlemen who have preceded me, including the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], have discussed already all of those great qualities that made DWIGHT ROGERS so universally close to all of us and to those who knew him everywhere. He was one of the most genial men I ever knew. As a matter of fact, the very genuineness of his genial disposition many times invited his colleagues to joke with him and sometimes to play jokes on him. Dwight enjoyed this as much as anybody else; he was so kind and genial and friendly.

For a good many years he and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] and I sat very close together near the top of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I look back on those moments now and the memories of those associations as something that I shall cherish all the days of my life.

As the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] has said, DWIGHT ROGERS had a very high sense of moral and spiritual values. He was devoted to his church and to all causes at any time that emphasized the finer and higher spiritual and moral values of life. His devotion to the public service was constant and deep.

I shall personally miss him as one who has been very close to me and with whom I have felt very close in the years gone by.

My deepest sympathy is extended to his widow and other members of a closely knit and devoted family circle.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, with a very heavy heart I pay tribute to our former colleague, DWIGHT ROGERS. He was more than a colleague. He was my friend, one whom I respected and loved, one for whom I had the greatest admiration.

DWIGHT ROGERS lived the kind of life that few people live. He has shown us what is meant by righteous living and has set an example that all of us might well emulate.

Never have I heard such wonderful tributes paid to an individual as on the occasion of his funeral. In flowers and in words, countless numbers expressed their love for a kindly, godly man. The outpouring of the citizens of that district in expression of affection and respect for DWIGHT ROGERS was absolutely amazing.

I have played golf with DWIGHT ROGERS on many occasions. I think you really get to know a man when you play golf with him. You see him, and how he reacts, under pressure of competition. You see him in victory and you see him in defeat. As you walk the golf course, competing in skill, nerves, and stamina, you get to understand an individual, to see him at his best and his worst, and to appreciate him for what he really is. DWIGHT ROGERS was at all times and under all circumstances the very best. He was the most sincere, honest, and fair man it has been my privilege to know. As I look back on my service in this body, one of the things which will inspire me and will always be a privilege to say is that I knew DWIGHT ROGERS. He was my truly, loyal friend. His wonderful wife and family have my heartfelt sympathy. To them I extend my deepest personal sympathy.

I repeat, DWIGHT ROGERS was the kind of man and lived the kind of life from which all of us drew inspiration. If I were to try to express Dwight's philosophy of life, I believe I would say this: Keep your heart free from hate; your mind from worry. Live simply; expect little, give much; fill your life with love; scatter sunshine. Forget self. Think of others, and do as you would be done by.

That was his way of life. I loved DWIGHT ROGERS. I always will. I know I speak for all on my side of the aisle when I say we shall miss him. We shall miss him always.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, DWIGHT ROGERS was a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He was, I believe, the most universally loved man on that committee. I say that because he was always glad and happy to meet his colleagues when the committee went into session and his voice was always a cheerful voice, a voice that we always liked to hear. Never did he promote discord, although he was a strong and able advocate of what he believed to be right. I had the privilege of visiting DWIGHT ROGERS in his home city of Fort Lauderdale, where I found that he was as well loved at home and, yes, even more so than he was here. Everyone loved him—everyone in the entire congressional district which he represented without exception had a good word to say for DWIGHT ROGERS because he was good and kind. He was admired by the little man whose advocate he was, as well as the gentlemen who sat in the high seats of his congressional district. We shall miss him on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and we shall miss his presence on the floor of this House. His membership in this body increased the worth of the House of Representatives. His loss is the loss of this House and the loss of the country. Our hearts go out to his beloved wife and family in this hour of their bereavement.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I feel a very deep personal loss in the passing of Dwight. DWIGHT ROGERS was endowed with so many of the blessings that make a great American that it is difficult for me to assess which one of those, in my opinion, made him one of the most lovable characters I have ever had the privilege of associating with. I think, however, that DWIGHT ROGERS' sense of humor gave to him one of the greatest blessings that a human being can be endowed with. I had the privilege of not only associating with Dwight here in this House, but I knew him before he came to this body. I had the privilege, as the gentleman from Illinois has mentioned, of associating myself with him in one of the greatest sports in America. It is my opinion that if there is one place that you can get to know an individual, it is in the field of sports. I am saddened when I think of the foursome that I played golf with here on what is commonly known as the cow pasture at the Old Soldiers' Home because today I and the gentleman from Mississippi, BILL COLMER, are here in this body who for years played in that foursome. DWIGHT ROGERS had a sense of duty to his church. He was a Christian gentleman. He was a man who believed in God. He was a man who also believed in his duty to America. I extend to his family my deepest sympathy. May God bless them.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, DWIGHT ROGERS and I were longtime friends. We attended the University of Georgia together.

Dwight was in the graduate school—the school of law—while I was an undergraduate. He was a few years older than I. I used to kid him in the House and tell other Members that he had been my instructor at the time we were at the University of Georgia together. As a matter of fact we were students—I do not know whether I should say students or not, but at least we were attendants upon the university at the same time.

In the House Office Building his office adjoined mine. I already miss him. Only this morning, which is the first time this year I have come to my office, I missed his welcome and his genial smile.

I had the privilege of attending his funeral at Fort Lauderdale, and I am happy that I went, because that was an unusual occasion in some respects. Somehow it took away a little of the sting of his going, to see how his people thought of him, the huge outpouring of people at that funeral, and flowers, the like of which I have never seen. Dwight was buried in a beautiful memorial park, the first grave in that park. The grass was green and the flowers were laid out on that green carpet, to look like a flower garden. Grief there was, of course, but a feeling of sadness that was not akin to pain; for somehow everybody seemed to feel that a good man had gone to his last reward and had gone in a manner that he would have desired. He had played golf that morning. He voted in a local election that day. He had just spoken to the junior chamber of commerce when he became ill and was taken to the hospital. He was gone within an hour. No long days and weeks of suffering. How appropriate were the words of Tennyson's Crossing of the Bar read by the minister at the graveside. "And may there be no moaning of the bar when I put out to sea." I am happy that I could be there and see the respect in which he was held by the people of his own city, and to feel the reverence and respect that those people had for him. As I say, I am already missing him, and I am going to miss him through the years. Two of my nearest and dearest friends have gone within the past year, Sidney Camp and DWIGHT ROGERS. I am going to miss both of them, as other Members of this House will. Somehow Dwight's life and his kindness remind me of the words of the poet, "that best part of a good man's life—those little nameless, unremembered acts of kindness and of love." They represented DWIGHT ROGERS. They were a part of his life; if not the best part, a large part.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, it is a most sad occasion upon the opening of a new Congress that we should be paying tribute to a very beloved friend who has passed to the Great Beyond.

As one of those associated with DWIGHT ROGERS during all of his service in Congress upon the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I do not know of any person I have met who left more of an impression upon me than did DWIGHT ROGERS. In the first place, he was a gentleman at all times. He conducted himself in committee toward the end that he was fully informed on legislation, but in doing so he always treated everyone with courtesy and respect.

As has been said so often, Dwight was one of the most lovable people I have known. On some of our committee trips we used to facetiously accuse Dwight of campaigning when he was many hundred miles away, but actually he instinctively liked people and they instinctively liked him. It was the easiest thing in the world for Dwight to meet and make friends when he was thousands of miles away from his home.

I think Dwight was one of the most devout Christians that I have ever known. I cannot help but think of the depth and sincerity of his Christian belief. He practiced what he believed, with sincerity and without ostentation.

As I stand before you here I think probably what Dwight would like to say was expressed most beautifully in the Bible in that one line:

> I have loved, O Lord, the beauty of Thy house and the place where Thy glory dwelleth.

Dwight was one who loved the Lord, and he loved the beauty of his faith. I think as a result of that he was a great example to his colleagues in the House.

Another beautiful thing about Mr. ROGERS was the lovely family life, the depth of devotion between himself and his family. Certainly my most deep and heartfelt sympathy goes to his lovely wife, Mrs. Rogers, and to his three fine sons, because he was to them a wonderful husband and father, and they were as devoted to him as he was to them.

To his congressional district, to the State of Florida, and to the country as a whole his passing is a distinct loss of a fine American, a splendid Christian, and a most valued public servant.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply grieved and had a heavy heart when I learned on the afternoon of December 1 of the passing of our beloved colleague, DWIGHT ROGERS.

I have known Dwight since he came to Congress in 1945. We sat side by side for many years on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This close association permitted me the privilege of knowing Dwight as he really was.

I am very glad to have known DWIGHT ROGERS; in fact, I have personally been lifted up and inspired by the character and life of DWIGHT ROGERS, and through this association.

He was a man who was devoted to public service. We all have observed his activities and actions here on the floor of the House and particularly those of us who have served with him in so many of the controversial matters before our committee.

He was devoted to the people he served, always had their welfare in mind.

He was devoted to his country, the country that he loved and admired; and like so many other Americans he would have given his life gladly for it.

He was devoted to his church. I think we could say that if any Member of this Congress lived a beautiful life certainly it was DWIGHT ROGERS. That did not begin when he came to Congress. One could not associate with him without realizing that throughout his life he had had that great devotion to the church that he loved and to his God. A number of us have been with him on various occasions, especially at times on the radio programs with Dale Crowley, and we know from these experiences and associations that DWIGHT ROGERS not only loved his Lord but he loved the Bible and was a student of the Bible.

Then, above all, he was devoted to his fine family. Everyone knows that his home life was a beautiful example of the traditional family life of America.

We have lost one of our most beloved colleagues. Florida and the Nation have lost one of their most capable servants.

I wish to join my colleagues in extending my deepest sympathy to the delegation from the State of Florida and to the people that DWIGHT ROGERS represented; and certainly to extend my heartfelt sympathy to his lovely wife and three fine sons.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK].

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, it was a great privilege to know and serve with our late colleague, DWIGHT ROGERS, and a deeply appreciated honor to have him as a friend.

It was my good fortune to serve with DWIGHT ROGERS on the great House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He was sincerely and deeply interested in every legislative proposal considered by our committee. His ability to quickly analyze the effect of such legislative proposals and his keen questions proposed to witnesses in the hearings conducted by our committee were extremely helpful to those of us with less experience in the work of this important committee. While DWIGHT ROGERS' questions directed to the witnesses and to other members of the committee were very much to the points at issue under discussion, he was also always very considerate of others and never sought to embarrass them in any way. DWIGHT ROGERS was especially helpful to me as a new member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the 83d Congress. Although we were members of different political parties, he did not hesitate to participate on several of my weekly radio programs which were broadcast in the Third District of Ohio. These programs assisted me in explaining the work of our committee and the various legislative proposals we were considering. DWIGHT ROGERS was always conscious of his obligations and loyalty to the great political party of which he was a Member, but he was also always extremely conscious of his loyalty and obligations to our great

Nation and its citizens. Hence, he never hesitated to speak his mind and cast his vote in what he believed to be his obligation in the matter of public interest and public trust. DWIGHT ROGERS was a statesman and we have lost an able legislator as well as a good friend.

I was deeply shocked and saddened to learn of his untimely and unexpected passing and I am grateful for the privilege and honor of having known him as a good friend. I am also grateful to our former Speaker, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., for appointing me as a member of the official delegation of this House of Representatives so that I might pay my personal respects to the memory of our late colleague by attending the funeral services. It was a very sad occasion and yet a most impressive one. As an example, I am told that more than 1,200 people were crowded into the Methodist Church in Fort Lauderdale and many more had to remain outside because they were unable to get into the church. They came from all walks of life, and one could tell by looking into their faces how very deeply they felt, because of the loss of their friend. I have also never seen more beautiful floral tributes and I have never heard more sincere tributes spoken than were said by the clergyman who knew our late colleague so intimately.

DWIGHT ROGERS was a humble, sincere, dedicated, Christian gentleman; a devoted husband, an understanding father of a wonderful family; a real Representative of all the people in his congressional district, a great American, a true friend, and a loyal and devoted follower of his Heavenly Father. To his wonderful wife and family, to all of his constituents, to all of his friends, I want to express my most profound and deep sympathy.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I was in Montevideo, Uruguay, when our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. SCOTT] informed me of the passing of my beloved friend, DWIGHT ROGERS. Being 6,000 miles away, unable to reach his family, unable to attend the funeral, I somehow felt the shock to a greater degree than I would have had I been able to go to the family and present my feelings to them.

Mr. Speaker, I did feel a keen shock in the passing of DWIGHT ROGERS. I had a reason to. Dwight was born in my district. The majority of his family live there yet. He came from good stock; honest, God-fearing people. When I came to Washington, Dwight took an interest in me because, representing his old home county, we became very fast friends. I think Dwight's greatest attribute was his capacity to love people. One cannot be loved unless he has himself the capacity to love others. Dwight had a heart big enough to permit him to love many people, and he did not fail to let people know that he loved them. I suppose he was about as popular an individual as we had in the House of Representatives. He perhaps had more warm friends than anybody in the House. He had many friends on the Republican side. He associated just as much with the Republicans as he did with the people in his own party. So, he was loved by many people.

Mr. Speaker, little can be said to add anything to what has already been said about him. I think this eulogy here today has perhaps been as warm as any I have ever heard since I came to Congress 9 years ago. But he deserves everything that has been said. I know that the House will be glad to know that his son, Paul, who is very much like his father, is likely to succeed him. That district historically has been a Democratic district. He has no opposition from the Democratic Party, and on next Tuesday it is most likely that he will be elected to succeed his father, and we will come to love him, I am sure, as we all did DWIGHT ROGERS. We hope he will be up here by next Wednesday to assume his office.

I certainly want to express my deepest sympathy to all of Dwight's family and those in my district as well as his immediate family in Florida. I talked to his son, Paul, when I came through returning from Montevideo. He is a resident of the city of West Palm Beach and is one of the outstanding young men in that community.

So, in conclusion, I would like to express the hope that the House can be blessed with more men like DWIGHT ROGERS, because he shed a lot of sunshine among his colleagues here in this body. He converted some dark hours into happiness for us by his good humor and his wit.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I think that those of us who have the privilege of speaking upon this occasion can feel honored that our first words at this session of the Congress can be said in memory of such a wonderful character as DWIGHT ROGERS. Some men appear well at certain times and under certain circumstances and conditions. DWIGHT ROGERS, under all circumstances and conditions, measured up to the very highest standards. DWIGHT ROGERS was a Christian gentleman of the highest order and in every sense of the word, every day of the week, and under all circumstances at work or at play. His example has been a tremendous force for good in the Congress and in the country.

I have been much pleased, as the friend of DWIGHT ROGERS, with the very fine tributes which have been paid to him this afternoon, and I want to join with others in expressing my sympathy to his family. We honor ourselves in honoring the memory of a great leader and legislator who has fallen.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with all the fine tributes which our colleagues have paid to the memory of the Honorable DWIGHT ROGERS, of Florida. I cannot improve on those statements either in their content or sincerity. I can only add a word of my own personal loss in his passing. It was my privilege to know him for only 2 years, but as a new Member of Congress I found no one who was a more willing adviser, or a more considerate and understanding colleague. He left us a great heritage here in this House, and we are all the better for his having lived and worked among us.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to voice my deep sorrow and regret at the passing of our colleague, DWIGHT ROGERS. In the many years I have been a Member of this House, we have had, unfortunately, many expressions of regret voiced by Members on the passing of a colleague, but I find it difficult to recall having ever before listened to such sincere and spontaneous tributes paid to anyone as have been paid DWIGHT ROGERS here today. I think they were well earned.

I have had the privilege of serving on the same committee with DWIGHT ROGERS and, as a matter of fact, of sitting alongside him. I shall occupy the seat that he occupied and would have occupied had he been able to serve with us again in this Congress. Thus he shall be in my mind much of the time.

I shall miss him indeed. I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that when we go, as we all must, if we can go the way Dwight went, and leave behind us such a heritage as he did, not only here in Washington, not only in the Congress, but in our home districts, it will indeed be the greatest tribute which can be paid a man.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield at this time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MOULDER].

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I join with my colleagues in expressing my deep sorrow on the death of our great friend, DWIGHT ROGERS, of Florida. All of us will miss DWIGHT ROGERS. He was one of the finest and most honorable men I have ever known or been associated with. He was blessed with a congenial personality. His noble character and friendliness will always remain in my temple of memory as one of my most valued possessions.

He strived and worked hard in his able and outstanding representation of the interests of the people of his congressional district and for the best interests of the people of Florida and America. The great work performed by him in the Halls of Congress, together with his spirit of cheerful friendliness and his charming personality, and solid character, will always remain as a monument to his memory far more permanent than marble.

I will miss my great friend and statesman, DWIGHT ROGERS. We all deeply regret his passing.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN].

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I can add but little to that which has already been said so beautifully about DWIGHT ROGERS. He preached and practiced the Golden Rule. We shall all miss him.

I extend to his family my deepest sympathy.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SHUFORD].

Mr. SHUFORD. Mr. Speaker, the death of Hon. DWIGHT L. ROGERS, Representative from the Sixth District of Florida, on December 1, 1954, brought sadness to all who knew him.

His life was an inspiration to those of us who were privileged to serve with him in the Halls of Congress.

In his nearly 10 years of service here men may have differed with him but no one has ever questioned his superb integrity in all things, both great and small. His lofty ideals and love for the fundamental institutions of the American Government stimulated in others the desire to emulate his public service.

Few men have been blessed with the power to make friends and hold them throughout a lifetime as was the late DWIGHT L. ROGERS. Such power is not possible in one who lacks that sincerity and ability that characterized his whole life. He was a devout Christian, richly endowed with those beautiful qualities of gentleness, kindness, and generosity.

It was not my privilege to know DWIGHT ROGERS until after I was elected a Member of the 83d Congress. When I came to Washington he extended to me every possible kindness and courtesy, and from then until his death I saw him frequently and every contact with him increased my affectionate regard for him both personally and officially.

DWIGHT ROGERS served his State and Nation well. His works will long be remembered. I extend to his widow and stalwart sons my deepest sympathy.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY].

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, DWIGHT ROGERS was a good man. He was a man who never said a word or performed an act that would injure his fellowman.

As has been indicated by many of our colleagues who have spoken today in tribute to the memory of DWIGHT ROGERS, I had the privilege of serving with him on the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I am glad I had the privilege of knowing and serving with him.

His friends have suffered a loss. One can understand the grief that comes to the members of his family, but the members of his family as they pass through grievous days can take comfort in the knowledge of the fact that as a husband, as a father, DWIGHT ROGERS was a man who lived his life well and set a wonderful example for us all. To them goes my deepest feeling of sympathy.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, when I learned that the great privilege of close association with our friend, DWIGHT L. ROGERS, had come to an abrupt end, a question came to my mind as to whether or not he had realized how we, his colleagues, felt toward him. For surely the warmth of his personality, his kindliness, his keen humor, his strong sense of right and wrong, and his love of his fellowman, as well as his recognized legislative ability, had given him a place, truly a unique place, in the hearts and minds of those of us who had the good fortune to claim him both as colleague and friend.

I recall, as will other members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, one morning toward the end of the last session, when the statement was made as the committee was being called to order, that the period for filing for Representative in Congress from the Sixth District of Florida had closed the previous day and that DWIGHT ROGERS would have no opposition. He was referred to as the first Member of the 84th Congress; and truly such was our regard and affection for him the news made us feel warm and good. I am sure the other members of the committee, like myself, on that occasion thought of their own situations and hoped to come back and particularly because it meant further contact and fellowship with him. Contemplation of our own return to Congress without the day-in and day-out pleasure of DWIGHT ROGERS' greeting and good thoughts and kind words would have made the prospect of our own reelection less desirable.

It is human to react to the loss of our friend in a selfish or personal way, and our sympathy for his family exceeds the power of mere words, but more properly today emphasis should be given to the heritage of DWIGHT ROGERS' life, his ability, his high ideals, and his contribution to mankind. I will sum up this very simply: He was a great and good American and his greatness and goodness live on.

Like the good farmer who works the soil, DWIGHT ROGERS put back more than he took out of life, and yet I venture to say that few get more than he did from life and living. I shall cherish the memory of DWIGHT ROGERS until I too am put to rest. Meanwhile I shall remain richer in true values for an all-too-brief association with one of the finest and most endearing men I have ever met.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend and colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CARRIGG].

Mr. CARRIGG. Mr. Speaker, in expressing my sympathy to the widow of DWIGHT ROGERS on the passing of her husband and in expressing my sympathy to the delegation from the great State of Florida, I can only say that DWIGHT ROGERS and I were geographically and politically as far apart probably as the poles, he being a Democrat and I being a Republican, and he being from the great State of Florida and I being from the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. But during the last year, I had the privilege of living with him very closely for a week or 10 days on one of the committee trips throughout the West, and I came to know DWIGHT ROGERS as one of my fondest friends. I know there is a saying that it is holy and wholesome to pray for the dead. My prayer today is that Almighty God in his charity and mercy will grant to the soul of DWIGHT ROGERS eternal peace and also grant strength to Mrs. Rogers that she may carry the heavy cross which has been bestowed upon her.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with these wonderful tributes being paid to DWIGHT ROGERS from Florida. I first knew Dwight when he and I were members of the Florida State Legislature back in 1935. I recall, as the distinguished dean of our delegation has said, and our colleague from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] has said, the fight that he made there for the homestead exemption amendment, which we have in the State of Florida. I remember him in that session of the legislature as an unsuccessful candidate for the speakership of the house, and yet a man who despite that defeat was very effective and very active, as was typical of his character; he never bore any resentment because of that particular defeat which he had in that session. I knew DWIGHT ROGERS when I came to the Congress of the United States, and I do not think it improper, Mr. Speaker, for us to emphasize his wonderful sense of humor, which has already been mentioned here this afternoon, the sense of humor which made life worth while to be around him.

As a Member of Congress, DWIGHT ROGERS was a man who thought of the common man; he was always gracious and friendly. I remember one of his arguments last year about a bill. The main thought of his talk was "This bill harms no one and yet it is helpful to a colleague. Let us do it just to help our fellow man."

Dwight was a public servant of high integrity. Then, as has been said, he was a great father and husband. I knew him as he exemplified that beautiful relationship. I know personally his three fine boys who attended the University of Florida. How proud Dwight was of them, and how rightly so. They are all great men. They are all real chips off the ROGERS' block of high integrity and real Christian character.

Then I knew DWIGHT ROGERS as a servant of God. I remember an old professor I had many years ago who used to tell us this little rhyme:

Four things a man must learn to do
If he would keep his record true;
To think without confusion clearly;
To love his fellowman sincerely;
To act from honest motives purely,
To trust in God and heaven securely.

If those be the characteristics of a godly man, and I believe they are, DWIGHT ROGERS had those characteristics. Whenever the time comes for me to go to the Great Beyond, I go with a clearer sense of destination because I feel that somewhere in God's infinite spaces DWIGHT ROGERS is there waiting. I offer to his lovely, gracious widow, Florence, and to his sons, Dwight, Jr., Paul, and Doyle, my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, it was a great shock to me to learn of the passing of my good friend and colleague,

DWIGHT L. ROGERS. The State of Florida has lost a most worthy Representative; the Congress has suffered the loss of an outstanding legislator and its Members a friendly counselor.

My first committee assignment upon coming to Washington was on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, where I had the good fortune to serve with DWIGHT ROGERS. I found him to be friendly and cooperative. We held many philosophies of government in common. In the 83d Congress, we each took different committee assignments, but it was my pleasure to work with him in his great desire to benefit his district and the State of Florida in combating the flood conditions of his adopted State. He was a great advocate of those things which he felt necessary in the development of his State, never propounding a cause which was unreasonable, but always looking to the welfare of his constituency and his country as a whole.

California and Florida are referred to as competitors in recreation and agricultural production, but I have always said that we are not competitors, but cooperators.

On many occasions I was with my late colleague and we had many pleasantries. His refreshing personality was a great asset to him and was so recognized by his colleagues.

I feel honored in being privileged to express my personal feeling regarding this fine gentleman and to extend to his family my heartfelt sympathy in their great loss.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of visiting with our friend, DWIGHT ROGERS, in his district just a few days before his untimely passing. It was my great pleasure and privilege at that time to see how his friends and neighbors appreciated him—just as we in the Congress have come to love him—because he was interested in each of them just as he was interested in each of us. He was a fine person. We shall not see his like again for a long time.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my colleagues that I have enjoyed listening to the sincere outpouring of feeling here on the part of our colleagues in beloved memory of DWIGHT ROGERS. We cannot, of course, be glad that he has gone; but we can be happy that he was here, because DWIGHT ROGERS belonged in great company. We have lost a colleague from this body who lived life as we feel it should be lived and the composite of which makes the House of Representatives what we want it to be.

Reference has been made several times this afternoon to Dwight's love of golf. That is where I got to know him best; our lockers were near each other where we played golf. He never lacked for golfing partners. Everyone enjoyed a healthful and pleasant round with him. He was honest, he was cheerful; he never blamed a bad shot on his colleague, or on the caddy; he never complained about the course; and, above all, he counted all his strokes. I think in play as in work we enjoy and appreciate honesty and effort. Dwight did that cheerfully and fully. Certainly I think his honest playing at times, as well as his honest work, extended his life. We are proud of him.

I got to know him—and I close with this little anecdote—DWIGHT ROGERS would bring his son Doyle out to play at this club when Doyle was here on leave from Fort Eustis as a commissioned officer. My enlisted son also served at Fort Eustis. I told him I had met Doyle Rogers out at the club and asked him if he knew Doyle. He said: "I certainly do. Among the enlisted men at Fort Eustis, Doyle Rogers is one of the most popular and most respected."

I mention that because we serve here in this body only briefly. It is the fruits of our life and our acts that count. It is what we leave behind that determines our eternities for in the eyes of eternity we live but a few short breaths. The most we can do to honor our Creator and our God is to try to make a better place to live in; DWIGHT ROGERS did that.

His friends in the State of Florida, his family, his colleagues in this body here in the House of Representatives are proud of his record and we grieve at his leaving.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Member of this body I cannot help but be impressed this afternoon. I have never witnessed nor heard in my lifetime tributes spoken of any man by his friends with such deep feeling and sincerity.

It was not my privilege to have served with my deceased colleague, DWIGHT ROGERS, while he was a Member of Congress; but I am fortunate indeed that in the short space of this past year the path of my life crossed the path of the life of Hon. DWIGHT ROGERS. I know that he was a statesman of ability, and that he was conscientious; but also I found in my short acquaintance with him that he was a warm human being; a man who smiled; a man who took time to encourage the lowly; a man who forged, I believe—and I know and I feel today—a great chain of friendship link by link of solid gold, smile by smile, extending from here to eternity.

The Congress knows—Florida knows—that we have lost an able statesman; and his colleagues and I know that we have lost a friend.

I extend my sympathies to his wife and to his family.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, like the gentleman from Georgia who has spoken, I was many thousands of miles away when the news came to me of the death of DWIGHT ROGERS. I had had no idea of his illness and for that reason the news of his passing came to me with all the greater shock.

It happens that on the 13th of September when we held our Maine elections DWIGHT ROGERS was in my home town. The kind words which he spoke to me that day, which would have meant much in any event, mean all the more to me now because they were the last words I ever heard him speak.

I served for many years with DWIGHT ROGERS on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of which he was certainly one of the most valuable, respected and honored members.

Other Members have testified very eloquently to his character. I can only say that he was one of the most affectionate, lovable and loveworthy people I have ever known. He was a man who was extraordinarily conscientious in the performance of his public and his private duties. I have accompanied him in his district, I have been his guest in his home town, Fort Lauderdale, and, therefore, I know something about the relations which he had with his constituents.

I want to express my sympathy to his family and to the constituency which he so ably represented, as I do for the House of Representatives which is far the poorer by reason of his loss.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I shall not detain the House long but feel that I cannot permit this occasion to pass without rising in my place and expressing to the membership of the House and to the family of our departed friend my personal sense of loss in the passing of this great and good man. I did not have the opportunity of serving on a committee with DWIGHT ROGERS. I knew him only as a Member of the House and in a social way. But he was among the first of the Members senior to me to extend the right hand of fellowship when I came to this body in 1953. I am proud of the friendship he gave me and of the opportunity to know him during these last 2 years.

I cannot add anything to the beautiful tributes that have been paid to the memory of DWIGHT ROGERS today. The thing that has impressed me more about them than anything else is that they all seem spontaneous and sincere. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues here this afternoon and to extend to Mrs. Rogers and to the three fine sons of this happy union my deep sympathy in their great loss of husband and father.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY].

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, each of us assembled here today realize that one chair is empty. A chair that was filled so capably by our departed colleague and friend, DWIGHT ROGERS. DWIGHT ROGERS served the people of Florida for many years, both in public office and as a private citizen. His service is marked by those principles which he held so dearly. Among those principles that he adhered to so steadfastly were a sense of Christian moral duty, commonsense in thinking, and integrity.

Many years ago I had the opportunity of meeting DWIGHT ROGERS. Our friendship grew throughout the years, and was culminated in a close companionship during the last 2 years of his life on this

earth. The memory of this noble soul shall remain with me for the remainder of my time. My friendship with DWIGHT ROGERS emanated from a warm heart, an able and keen mind, and a charitable soul. DWIGHT ROGERS rendered able and distinguished service to our fair State of Florida and the Nation. As a member of the Florida Legislature from Broward County for 8 years, he fathered one of the finest pieces of legislation in our State, one which has helped the State of Florida to grow and prosper. In talking of the homestead exemption law in Florida one automatically thinks of our departed colleague.

DWIGHT ROGERS served as chairman of the appeals board of the Selective Service System for several years. He was known to be very diligent and fair in all of his dealings in this position.

While serving in the Congress with DWIGHT ROGERS, I became very close to him. When one has a problem peculiar to another's district, there is a natural tendency to work together for the common good of both districts. We had such a common problem and I credit him with working so hard and ably to help solve this problem. In the creation of the central and southern Florida flood control district one of the greatest services of his career was rendered.

DWIGHT ROGERS accomplished many great and noble things during his sojourn in life, but to me the greatest single accomplishment of his mortal life came early to him: He learned at an early age that life is more pleasant and worth while if led in the paths of Christianity. His noble and dependable character was anchored from early life in the knowledge, fear, and love of God.

By having known DWIGHT ROGERS for a long period of time, I can say that my life has been enriched. I offer my sincere and heartfelt sympathies to his widow and family. Let us be comforted in this interlude of life until we can meet again in that eternal land of Thine.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER].

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, DWIGHT ROGERS, a colleague and friend of all of us, now has joined that innumerable caravan that leads to a mysterious realm which all of us will enter some day. I had the privilege of becoming acquainted with DWIGHT ROGERS as one of the first men I met when coming to the 82d Congress. I did not know his politics at the time and still do not know it. I believe DWIGHT ROGERS served his country beyond the realm of petty politics because he was interested in those things good for the people of his State, the Members of the Congress, and the people of the United States.

So, I am joining with all of those who have expressed themselves today and who will continue to express themselves in reverent memory of a man who rendered service and did it out of the bigness of his heart and the graciousness of his living. I had the privilege of serving on the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with DWIGHT ROGERS. We found him to be a most valuable member. We found him to be faithful and loyal and sincere in all his attendance.

Our committee, as you may know, is called upon to travel very extensively. DWIGHT ROGERS was one of the best travelers of them all. I can remember so well on several trips when he added not only to the gayety and the pleasure of the journey but also to the worthwhileness of it. On our recent trip he was supposed to join our committee at Johannesburg, South Africa, but when we arrived at that city we received a cablegram informing us of his demise. You can appreciate the shock that came to all of us, and, for some reason, the remainder of the journey did not seem the same because we knew that one of our own had gone. I now join with the others who have expressed themselves so beautifully, eloquently, and sincerely today to his family, to his State, to this Congress, and to our country about a man who has lived a life that all of us would like to have lived.

As the poet to whom I referred in the opening sentence of my statement has indicated, he has wrapped the draperies of his couch about him; he has approached the end of his path in the manner of one who lies down to pleasant dreams.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON].

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a very real privilege to join with the other Members of this House to express something of what we all feel now that the veil has been drawn between us and a man whom we all loved.

I did not serve on any committee with DWIGHT ROGERS. We worked together on some matters which concerned Lake Worth, the inlets there, and Fort Lauderdale. I was his constituent in Florida. For many years my family have had land there and homes. I was taking my holiday there when I picked up the paper and learned that he had suddenly gone.

There was little one could do except express to his family what one hoped they knew was very sincere sympathy.

There was something so very real in DWIGHT ROGERS; in the matter of his understanding of what life, with a big L was all about. One day we sat in the back of this Chamber and talked a little of these less transitory things. One of our mutual friends had gone. I asked him if he had ever come across a translation of one of the great religious books, which says:

Never the spirit was born; the spirit shall
cease to be never;
Never was time it was not; End and Beginning are dreams!
Birthless and deathless and changeless remaineth the spirit forever;
Death hath not touched it all, death
though the house of it seems.

He believed that, too, that the spirit is something that is part of the eternal stream of life. And today, as we have stood here and tried to express what is in our hearts, I want to say very simply that DWIGHT ROGERS has taken a more vital place in that stream of life than we are yet able to do. I am sure we will go through this session more tolerant of each other; more understanding of the fact that our aim is a mutual one because he has been among us. I am sure we will serve more truly this country that he loved and served, that we, too, love and serve, because of his influence.

I join with all the rest who have spoken and those who would have spoken had they been able to stay for the entire session today, in extending an understanding sympathy to his family. Three finer sons never lived. A sweeter and a lovelier wife no man ever had. May they be comforted by the certainty that he is close, perhaps even closer than he has ever been. And may we, too, have that sense of his presence, God keeping us all.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CARLYLE].

Mr. CARLYLE. Mr. Speaker, my conscience would reprove me should I fail at this time to express my thanks for the great privilege which has been mine of knowing and working with our departed colleague, Hon. DWIGHT ROGERS. He was a good man. I learned to know him. We lived in the same hotel for a while. Our offices were not far removed from each other. He believed in God and followed His teachings.

I really enjoyed my service with him on the committee. I found him to be one possessed of character and characteristics that you seldom find so thoroughly embedded in a person. He was at all times cheerful, faithful, and loyal. I have never seen a situation present itself when he was not at all times considerate of those who disagreed with him. I think it can truly be said that Dwight spread an abundance of Florida sunshine everywhere he went.

I learned a good many things of value from him. He has enriched my life, because I saw that if one can hold his temper and remain cheerful at all times he could really accomplish much that would not otherwise be possible.

I think all of us appreciate the fact that one thing that caused us to become so closely associated with Dwight was the fact that we loved that cheerful disposition. He was a dependable person. There was nothing about him that would mislead you. He was the soul of honor.

He thought that he was in good health. I talked with him shortly before his passing and we were discussing the fact that public service is a strenuous life. He told me that he thought he was in good, sound physical condition. We can never tell about those things. From the press report, he was actively engaging in his work at the time of his passing, and the death angel almost caught him at his desk.

I found him to be strong in action, loyal to his purpose, and upright in life.

When I think of the sudden, and what many of us would consider the untimely, passing of this good man, it makes me believe more strongly in the words of the poet:

There is no death, I am sure of that,
The thing that seems to be
Is but a touch of winter
That lays bare the spreading tree.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 16) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. DWIGHT L. ROGERS, a Representative from the State of Florida.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 6, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The following executive communications were submitted subsequent to the adjournment of the 83d Congress, 2d session:

1856. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Inland Waterways Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 502). September 2, 1954, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed (pursuant to H. Res. 712, 83d Cong.).

1857. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Tennessee Valley Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 506). October 7, 1954, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed (pursuant to H. Res. 712, 83d Cong.).

1858. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 25, 1954, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a survey of the West Branch of the Susquehanna River, Pa. This interim report considers improvements for flood control and incidental benefits and is submitted in partial response to a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on May 29, 1946, requesting a review of report on the Susquehanna River and tributaries, with a view to determining whether any modifications of the recommendations contained therein with respect to the West Branch and its tributaries are advisable at this time (H. Doc. No. 29, 84th Cong., 1st sess.). October 7, 1954, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations (pursuant to Public Law 453, 83d Cong.).

1859. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 27, 1954, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, Wash., with a view to determining the advisability of modifying the existing project in any way at this time, particularly with regard to extension of the existing Westhaven breakwater. This investigation was requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 29, 1953 (H. Doc. No. 30, 84th Cong., 1st sess.). October 2?, 1954, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration (pursuant to Public Law 453, 83d Cong.).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

The following reports of committees on public bills and resolutions were submitted subsequent to the adjournment of the 83d Congress, 2d session:

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Report pursuant to House Resolution 89 pertaining to an investigation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs; without amendment (Rept. No. 2680). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. September 20, 1954.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee: Special Committee To Investigate Tax Exempt Foundations. Report entitled "Tax Exempt Foundations"; without amendment (Rept. No. 2681). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. December 16, 1954.

Mr. BATES: Select Committee on Survivor Benefits. Report entitled "Survivor Benefits"; without amendment (Rept. No. 2682). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. Part 1, December 17, 1954. Part 2, January 3, 1955.

Mr. HILL: Select Committee on Small Business. Final report of the Committee on Small Business pursuant to House Resolution 22; without amendment (Rept. No. 2683). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. December 28, 1954.

Mr. KERSTEN: Select Committee on Communist Aggression. Report on Communist takeover and occupation of certain countries. Parts 1 to 16, inclusive; without amendment (Rept. No. 2684). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. December 30, 1954.

Mr. BISHOP: Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures. Report pursuant to House Resolution 439; without amendment (Rept. No. 2685). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. January 3, 1955.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Clerk, House of Representatives, transmitting a list of reports which it is the duty of any officer or department to make to Congress, pursuant to rule III, clause 2, of the rules of the House of Representatives (H. Doc. No. 24); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Clerk, House of Representatives, transmitting a report for the period from July 1, 1953, to June 30, 1954, inclusive, pursuant to provisions of paragraphs 102, 103, 104, and 111 of title 2 of the Code of Laws of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

3. A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Annual Report of the Farm Credit Administration (including the report of the Federal Farm Credit Board), covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 3 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended; paragraph 3, section 4, of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended; the Executive order of March 27, 1933, creating the Farm Credit Administration; and section 6, of the Farm Credit Act of 1953 (H. Doc. No. 19); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

4. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the General Accounting Office report on the audit of the Postal Savings System for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1952 and 1953, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Post Office Department Financial Control Act of 1950 (39 U. S. C. 794c) (H. Doc. No. 50); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

5. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting the 19th Quarterly Report on the Administration of the Advance Planning Program, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 352, 81st Congress (H. Doc. No. 51); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the "Retired pay, Department of Defense," for the fiscal year 1955, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior (Chairman, Migratory Bird Conservation Commission), transmitting the report of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 3 of the act of Congress approved February 18, 1929 (45 Stat. 1222, U. S. C. title 16, sec. 715b); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting a special report of the Federal Farm Credit Board containing its recommendations for legislation, pursuant to section 2 of the Farm Credit Act of 1953; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the Annual Report of the Federal Extension Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 7 of Public Law 83, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

10. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report on a technical violation of the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, in connection with the expenditures of funds from one of the appropriations of this Department in excess of the amount apportioned for the first quarter of the current fiscal year, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

11. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting certain information concerning two violations of subsection (h) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C., Sup. V. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

12. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report concerning certain information on the circumstances surrounding the overobligation of an allotment issued to the Director, CSS Commodity Office, Commodity Stabilization Service, New Orleans, La., to finance the operations of that Office for the fiscal year 1954, pursuant to section 3679, Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

13. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report showing that the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board," for the fiscal year 1955,

has been apportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

14. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report showing that the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for "Compensation and pensions," for the fiscal year 1955, had been apportioned on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

15. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report showing that the appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social Security Administration, for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance," for the fiscal year 1955, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

16. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a report pertaining to a lump-sum appropriation that shall be made annually for the purpose of crediting postal revenues with the postage payable on mail matter sent and received under the franking privilege, pursuant to Public Law 286, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

17. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of obligations incurred in excess of the quarterly limitation in an allotment, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by section 1211 of the General Appropriation Act, 1951, and administrative regulations promulgated thereunder by the Department of Agriculture and procedures of the Agricultural Marketing Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

18. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report showing that an adequate soil survey and land classification of lands not previously certified and to be benefited by the Lovewell Dam and Reservoir, Bostwick Division, Missouri River Basin project, Kansas, has been completed, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

19. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report showing that an adequate soil survey and land classification of lands in Nebraska and Wyoming which may be benefited by the Glendo Unit, Oregon Trail Division, Missouri River Basin project, Wyoming and Nebraska, has been completed, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

20. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, relative to interstate civil-defense compacts entered into between the State of Utah and the States of California and Colorado, pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

21. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, relative to interstate civil-defense compacts entered into between the State of Utah and the States of Arizona, Montana, Oregon, and Wyoming, pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

22. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the quarterly report of property acquisitions for the quarter ending September 30, 1954, pursuant to subsection 201 (h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

23. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the quarterly report of property acquisitions for the quarter ending June 30, 1954, pursuant to subsection 201 (h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

24. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the report of the Department of Defense on the payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records for the period January 1, 1954, through June 30, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 220, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

25. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report by the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force showing that no new contracts under sections 2 (c) (11) and 2 (c) (16) were negotiated during the 6 months from January 1 through June 30, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 413, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

26. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report pertaining to the furnishing of transportation for certain Government personnel, and for other purposes for the period July 1, 1953, through June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 560, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

27. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report showing the number of officers in the Department of the Army and of the number of officers on or with the Army General Staff on June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 201 (c), Public Law 581, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

28. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report on Department of the Army research and development contracts awarded during the period January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 4 of Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

29. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report showing transportation facilities furnished personnel attached to or employed by naval establishments to and from their places of employment for fiscal year 1954, pursuant to section 2 of the act of May 28, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

30. A letter from the Acting Commandant, United States Coast Guard, transmitting the report of contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work executed during the period January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 2 (c) (1) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, Public Law 413, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

31. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report pertaining to transportation furnished by the Air Force for the period July 1, 1953, to June 30, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 560, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

32. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a quarterly report showing that there was an aggregate of 2,575 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of the Government, pursuant to section 201 (c) of the Air Force Organization Act of 1951, Public Law 150, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

33. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the quarterly report of contributions for the quarter ending June 30, 1954, pursuant to subsection 201 (i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

34. A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the semiannual report to the Congress on the stockpiling program covering the period from January 1 to June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 4 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, Public Law 520, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

35. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report showing the amount of money credited to the helium-production fund and the amount of disbursements made therefrom during the preceding fiscal year, and the unexpended and unobligated balances on hand in such fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 3 (c) of the Amendatory Helium Act approved September 1, 1937 (50 Stat. 885; U. S. C., sec. 164); to the Committee on Armed Services.

36. A letter from the Chairman, Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission, transmitting report No. 5 prepared by Federal Facilities Corporation, the operating agency, with respect to its expenditures for repairs, replacements, additions, improvements, or maintenance of the Government-owned rubber-producing facilities during the 2-month period for fiscal 1955 ending August 31, 1954, pursuant to section 15 of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 408); to the Committee on Armed Services.

37. A letter from the Executive Director, Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission, transmitting report No. 6 prepared by Federal Facilities Corporation, the operating agency, with respect to its expenditures for repairs, replacements, additions, improvements, or maintenance of the Government-owned rubber-producing facilities during the 3-month period for fiscal 1955 ending September 30, 1954, pursuant to section 15 of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 408); to the Committee on Armed Services.

38. A letter from the Executive Director, Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission, transmitting a report prepared by Federal Facilities Corporation, the operating agency, with respect to its expenditures for repairs, replacements, additions, improvements, or maintenance of the Government-owned rubber-producing facilities during the 1-month period in fiscal 1955 ending July 31, 1954, pursuant to section 15 of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 408); to the Committee on Armed Services.

39. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Facilities Corporation, transmitting the Report of Reconstruction Finance Corporation on Synthetic Rubber Operations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to the provisions of the Rubber Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

40. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting relative to a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of obsolescent palm oil now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to section 3 (e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (60 Stat. 597, 50 U. S. C. 98b (e)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

41. A letter from the Commissioner, General Services Administration, transmitting relative to a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of 668 pieces of raw optical glass blanks now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to section 3 (e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (60 Stat. 597, 50 U. S. C. 98b (e)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

42. A letter from the adjutant general, Veterans of Foreign Wars, transmitting a report of the proceedings of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for the

fiscal year ended August 31, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 630, 74th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

43. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air, transmitting the fourth semiannual report of contracts, in excess of $50,000, for research, development, and experimental purposes awarded by the Department of the Navy, for the period January 1 through June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 4 of Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

44. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the annual report for the year ended December 31, 1953, pursuant to the provisions of section 17 (a) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

45. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 28th Quarterly Report on Export Control, pursuant to the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

46. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting the Seventh Annual Report of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, pursuant to section 301 (b) of the Housing Act of 1948; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

47. A letter from the Managing Director, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting the 18th Semiannual Report of the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the period January–June 1954, pursuant to section 9 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

48. A letter from the Administrator, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (in liquidation) for the period ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 163, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

49. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Second Semiannual Report of the Small Business Administration covering operations between February 1, 1954, and July 31, 1954, pursuant to section 215 of the Small Business Act of 1953 (Public Law 163, 84th Cong.); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

50. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Facilities Corporation, transmitting the Report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation on Tin Operations for fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 125, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

51. A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President transmitting the quarterly report on borrowing authority for the quarter ending June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 304 (b) of the Defense Production Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

52. A letter from the president, Commission on Licensure, Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, transmitting the annual report showing the activities of the Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 47 of "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1949; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

53. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, transmitting the annual report for the fiscal year 1954 and plans for the coming year, pursuant to section 15, Public Law 592, 79th Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

54. A letter from the Deputy Director for Mutual Defense Assistance Control, Foreign Operations Administration, transmitting the fifth semiannual report for the period January through June 1954 on operations under the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

55. A letter from the Acting Director, United States Information Agency, transmitting 2 copies of the second semiannual report for the 6 months' period from January 1 to June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 1008, Public Law 402, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

56. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting a photostat copy of an editorial from the Lagos Daily Success of September 2, 1954, with reference to the favorable reception of the joint resolution extending greetings to the Gold Coast and Nigeria, pursuant to Public Law 667, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

57. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the audit report on the audit of the Sugar Act program, Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

58. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the audit report of the government of the Virgin Islands of the United States for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

59. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the audit report of the United States Coast Guard for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

60. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the audit report of the Army Industrial Fund at Picatinny Arsenal, Ordnance Corps, Department of the Army, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1952 and 1953, pursuant to provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

61. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the audit report of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

62. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the review of certain activities of the Office of Price Stabilization, a component agency of the Economic Stabilization Agency, from its inception on January 24, 1951, to April 30, 1953, pursuant to the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53) and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

63. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting the third report on activities of the Department of State for the period July 1, 1952, through June 30, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 152, 81st Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

64. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work; and for the manufacture or furnishing of supplies for experimentation, development, research or test, for the period January 1 through June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 302 (c) (10) Public Law 152, 81st Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

65. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed award of a concession permit to Albert Weiss, doing business as Friant Garage in Millerton Lake National Recreation Area, Calif., for the period of 1 year from January 1, 1955, pursuant to the provisions of the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

66. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed award of a concession contract to the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Society of Black Hills, S. Dak., for a period of 20 years from January 1, 1955, pursuant to the provisions of the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

67. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of public laws enacted by the Second Guam Legislature (2d regular session and 3d special session) pursuant to section 19 of Public Law 630, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

68. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed award of a concession contract to Fred Harvey which will, when executed by the Director of the National Park Service on behalf of the Government, authorize the furnishing of accommodations, facilities, and services to the public on the south rim of the Grand Canyon National Park and Grand Canyon National Monument, Ariz., for a period of 20 years from August 1, 1954, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

69. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a bill passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

70. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed contract to the Glacier Park Co. which will, when executed by the Director of the National Park Service on behalf of the Government, authorize it to provide continued public accommodations and services in Glacier National Park, Mont., for a period of 20 years from January 1, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

71. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed award of a concession permit to Evelyn Hill Corp. which will, when approved by the regional director, region No. 1, National Park Service, on behalf of the Government, authorize it to sell post cards, literature, souvenirs, and soft drinks at Fort McHenry National Monument, Md., for a period of 5 years from January 1, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

72. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract with the Cottonwood Cove Corp. which will, when executed by the Director of the National Park Service on behalf of the Government, authorize it to provide boat rental service, sale of boating and fishing equipment, limited feeding and lodging accommodations, and related services at the Searchlight Ferry site in Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Nev., for a period of 10 years from July 1, 1954, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

73. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting two proposed

awards of concession permits, No. 14–10–447–176 to Larry E. Winters covering the operation of ski lifts, and No. 14–10–447–177 to Joseph E. Niemeyer covering ski equipment rental, within Olympic National Park, Wash., for the period December 1, 1954, to April 30, 1956, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

74. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting two proposed concession contract awards to I. H. and Janice C. Whitehouse, husband and wife, which will, when executed by the Director of the National Park Service on behalf of the Government, authorize them to furnish marine and related services to the public at Las Vegas Wash and Boulder Beach (including Hemenway Wash) within Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Nev., for a period of 15 years and 4 months from September 1, 1954, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

75. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter to Peaks of Otter, Inc., which will, when approved by the regional director, region No. 1, National Park Service, renew for the period January 1, 1955, through December 31, 1956, concession permit No. I–3np–549, under which the company is authorized to provide bus service to the summit of Sharp Top Mountain, and provide refreshment and gift sales services in the bus terminal building, Blue Ridge Parkway, Va., pursuant to the provisions of the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

76. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed contract which will, when executed by the superintendent of Olympic National Park, Wash., on behalf of the Government, authorize Carl G. Hansen to operate the Lake Crescent log cabin resort in Olympic National Park for a period of 5 years from January 1, 1955, provided he constructs and equips a store and fountain building by December 31, 1956; otherwise the contract will be for a period of 2 years from January 1, 1955, pursuant to the provisions of 67 Statutes 271, approved July 31, 1953; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

77. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of bills passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix and the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, together with other printed matter, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

78. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of bills passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

79. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of bills passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

80. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of bills and resolutions, together with other printed matter passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, and the Municipal Council of St. Croix, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

81. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of bills passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

82. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of bills passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

83. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of bills and resolutions passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

84. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that the following claims have been finally concluded: *Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe of Michigan, and James Strong, Plaintiffs,* v. *United States of America, Defendant* (Docket No. 13–H) and *The Delaware Tribe of Indians, Petitioner,* v. *The United States of America, Defendant* (Docket No. 27–D), pursuant to section 21 of the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1055; 25 U. S. C. 70); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

85. A letter from the Secretary, Territory of Hawaii, transmitting a copy of the Journal of the Senate, Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, regular session of 1953, pursuant to section 69 of an act of Congress, entitled, "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

86. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases as of October 31, 1954, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

87. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 5 (e) of Public Law 554, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

88. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of August 31, 1954, pursuant to section 5 (e) of Public Law 554, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

89. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of July 31, 1954, pursuant to section 5 (e) of Public Law 554, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

90. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of September 30, 1954, pursuant to section 5 (e) of Public Law 554, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

91. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual financial report for the fiscal year 1954 on the commissary and messing facilities activities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration outside the continental United States, pursuant to the Public Law 390, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

92. A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, transmitting the 10th and final report of the activities of the War Claims Commission for the period ending June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 9 of Public Law 896, 80th Congress, approved July 3, 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

93. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting three copies of recently issued publications for information of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

94. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report of claims paid for the fiscal year 1954, pursuant to section 404 of the Federal Tort Claims Act, title IV, Public Law 601, 79th Congress (28 U. S. C. 2673); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

95. A letter from the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting a report of claims paid for the fiscal year 1954, pursuant to section 404 of the Federal Tort Claims Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

96. A letter from the Acting Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a report of claims paid for the fiscal year 1954, pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C. 2673); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

97. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of claims paid during the fiscal year 1954, pursuant to section 404 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C. 2673), part 2; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

98. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting a report showing that no tort claims were paid for the fiscal year 1954, pursuant to section 2673 of the Federal Tort Claims Act of 1946, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

99. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on tort claims paid by the General Services Administration during the fiscal year 1954, pursuant to section 2673, title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

100. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens found admissible into the United States, pursuant to the provisions of section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

101. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases of certain aliens where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in their behalf, pursuant to the provisions of section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

102. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting additional evidence relating to certain cases involving the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, and requesting that they be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

103. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting additional evidence relating to certain cases involving suspension of deportation and requesting that they be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

104. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, De-

partment of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible into the United States, pursuant to section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

105. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible into the United States, pursuant to section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

106. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible into the United States, pursuant to section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

107. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible into the United States, pursuant to section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

108. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, together with a list of names of the aliens covered, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

109. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, together with a list of names of the aliens covered, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

110. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, together with a list of names of the aliens covered, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

111. A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the court's opinion entered on November 30, 1954, in re: *Keddie Resort, Inc.*, v. *The United States* (Congressional No. 17874), pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and House Resolution 461, 82d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

112. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a report of the amounts paid and received by the Department of the Air Force for the fiscal year 1954, pursuant to section 5 of the Maritime Claims Act of October 20, 1951 (65 Stat. 572; 10 U. S. C. 1861–1866); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

113. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill for the relief of Joe Kawakami"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

114. A letter from the National Commandant, Marine Corps League, transmitting a report of proceedings and activities, including complete statement of receipts and expenditures for the preceding calendar year, with a list of newly elected officers for the year 1954–55, pursuant to section IV of the act of Congress which incorporated the Marine Corps League, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

115. A letter from the National Shipswriter, Navy Club of the United States of America, transmitting the annual report as of April 30, 1954, also a list of meetings from April 30, 1953, through April 30, 1954; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

116. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report listing the tort claims approved for payment for the fiscal year 1954 and setting forth the name of each claimant, the amount claimed, the amount awarded, etc., pursuant to title 28, United States Code, section 2673; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

117. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a report of claims paid by the Department of the Air Force for fiscal year 1954, pursuant to the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, as amended (ch. 135, sec. 1, 59 Stat. 225; 31 U. S. C. 222c; 61 Stat. 501, 66 Stat. 321), Public Law 439, 82d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

118. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a report of claims paid for the fiscal year 1954, pursuant to section 2673 of the Federal Tort Claims Act, as amended and codified (28 U. S. C. 2671–2680); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

119. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report of the Maritime Administration covering the activities and transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 pursuant to section 13 of the act, for the period from July 1, 1954, through September 30, 1954; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

120. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report on the activities providing war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public as of September 30, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 763, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

121. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report covering activities under the Federal aid in fish restoration program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 11 of the act of Congress approved August 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 430, 16 U. S. C. 777); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

122. A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting the 33d Annual Report of the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 16 of the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

123. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report regarding the transfer of jurisdiction over certain public lands in the District of Columbia, pursuant to Public Law 143, approved May 20, 1932 (40 U. S. C. 122); to the Committee on Public Works.

124. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 3, 1954, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of report on the Wabash River, with a view to determining the feasibility of works of improvements in the interests of bank stabilization and flood protection at and in the vicinity of Maunie, Ill. This investigation was requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on July 5, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

125. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 10, 1954, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of reports on Columbia and lower Willamette Rivers below Vancouver, Wash., and Portland, Oreg., with particular reference to increasing the depth and width of the navigation channel in the vicinity of Desdemona Shoal. This investigation was requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on June 7, 1952; to the Committee on Public Works.

126. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 13, 1954, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of reports on Alamitos Bay, Calif., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 15, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

127. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 10, 1954, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a preliminary examination of Alsea Bay, Oreg., with a view to the construction of a harbor of refuge, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

128. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 9, 1954, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of reports on San Rafael Creek, Calif., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on April 22, 1947; to the Committee on Public Works.

129. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 29, 1954, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the Missouri River, with a view to determining the advisability of a cutoff in the Missouri River in the vicinity of Kansas Citys, Mo. and Kans., in the interest of flood control. This investigation was requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, United States Senate and House of Representatives, adopted on January 8, 1952, and July 29, 1953, respectively; to the Committee on Public Works.

130. A letter from the director, national legislative commission, the American Legion, transmitting the financial statement of the American Legion up to and including October 31, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 47, 66th Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

131. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the quarterly report of contributions for the quarter ending September 30, 1954, pursuant to subsection 201 (i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

132. A letter from the Executive Director, Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission, transmitting Report No. 7 prepared by Federal Facilities Corporation, the operating agency, with respect to its expenditures for repairs, replacements, additions, improvements, or maintenance of the Government-owned rubber-producing facilities during the 4-month period for fiscal 1955 ending October 31, 1954, pursuant to section 15 of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 408); to the Committee on Armed Services.

133. A letter from the Secretary, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation on abaca fiber operations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 683, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

134. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report of the United States Air Force flying pay showing by grade and age all flying officers above the grade of major during the 6-month period March 1 to August 31, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 301, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

135. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the report on the liquidation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the quarter ended September 30, 1954, pursuant to provisions of the RFC Liquidation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

136. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract with James O. Bishop authorizing the operation of the Bear Lake and Fern Lake Lodges in Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo., for a period of 5 years from January 1, 1954, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

137. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with Harris Pictures, a partnership, covering operation of accommodations, facilities, and services within Castillo de San Marcos National Monument for 5 years from January 1, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

138. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with the Southern Highland Handicraft Guild, Inc., authorizing the operation of a handicraft center in the Moses H. Cone Memorial Park on the Blue Ridge Parkway, for 5 years from September 15, 1954, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

139. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of several bills passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

140. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report of various claims pursuant to section 21 of the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1055; 25 U. S. C. 70); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

141. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the annual report of revolving credit fund transactions for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 10 of the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984, 986; 25 U. S. C. 470); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

142. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the 20th Annual Report of the Federal Communications Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 554, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

143. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a report furnishing required information on licensed hydroelectric projects and on personnel of the Federal Power Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 4 (d) of the Federal Power Act, approved August 26, 1935; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

144. A letter from the Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to provide for the preparation of plans and specifications for a museum building for the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Public Works.

145. A letter from the Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission, transmitting a report for the fiscal year 1954, showing lands acquired for the development of the park, parkway, and playground system of the National Capital in nearby Maryland and Virginia, pursuant to section 13 of Public Law 592 approved July 19, 1952; to the Committee on Public Works.

146. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 17 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 (60 Stat. 801) (H. Doc. No. 52); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

147. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of the Federal Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 53); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

148. A letter from the Director, the American Legion, transmitting the proceedings of the 36th Annual National Convention of the American Legion, held in Washington, D. C., August 30, 31, September 1, 2, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 54); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

149. A letter from the adjutant general, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, transmitting the proceedings of the 55th National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in Philadelphia, Pa., August 1–6, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 55); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

150. A letter from the national adjutant, Disabled American Veterans, transmitting the report and the proceedings of the national gathering, held in Miami Beach, Fla., August 16–21, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 56); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

151. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the Sixth Rubber Report of the Department of Commerce for the period July 1, 1953, through June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 10 (e) of the Rubber Act of 1948 as amended and supplemented by the Defense Production Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

152. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of the National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53) and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

153. A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of the Southwestern Power Administration, an agency in the Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53) and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

154. A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, an agency in the Treasury Department, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53) and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67) and the act of August 4, 1950 (31 U. S. C. 181d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

155. A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to the act of May 7, 1928 (22 U. S. C. 278a) and (31 U. S. C. 841); to the Committee on Government Operations.

156. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed award of a concession contract to J. B. Tillett authorizing him to provide and operate a fishing center on the north shore of Oregon Inlet within Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, N. C., for a period of 10 years from January 1, 1954, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

157. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract with William W. and Barbara W. Myers, authorizing them to operate a concession within Death Valley National Monument, during the 5-year period from January 1, 1955 to December 31, 1959, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

158. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with Edgar H. Lane authorizing him to operate a gasoline service station in the Big Stump area of Kings Canyon National Park, Calif., for a period of 1 year from January 1, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

159. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with Mr. and Mrs. Charles Roening, authorizing them to operate a cabin camp, store, lunch counter, and gasoline station at Waumila Lodge, on Lake Mills in Olympic National Park, Wash., during the 1955 calendar year, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

160. A letter from the Clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting a statement of all judgments rendered by the Court of Claims for the year ended October 1, 1954, together with other information, pursuant to section 791 (c) of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

161. A letter from the Board of Directors, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting the 21st annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954; to the Committee on Public Works.

162. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report giving information with respect to various methods of production control and various methods of price support which could be made applicable to milk and butterfat and their products (H. Doc. No. 57); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

163. A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of the Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 58); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

164. A letter from the Postmaster General, Chairman, Board of Trustees, Postal Savings System, transmitting the report of operations of the Postal Savings System for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 1 of the act approved June 25, 1910 (H. Doc. No. 11); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

165. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on co-

operation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of July 1954, pursuant to Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

166. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of August 1954, pursuant to Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

167. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of September 1954, pursuant to Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

168. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of October 1954, pursuant to Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

169. A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the semiannual "Statistical Stockpile Report to the Congress," covering the period January 1 through June 30, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 520, 79th Congress * * *, and in accordance with Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1953; to the Committee on Armed Services.

170. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting the Air Force's semiannual report entitled "Research and Development Procurement Action Report," covering the period from January 1 through June 30, 1954, pursuant to section IV of Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

171. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a Combined Statement of Receipts, Expenditures, and Balances of the United States Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 15 of the act of July 31, 1894 (5 U. S. C. 264); to the Committee on Government Operations.

172. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an itemized report covering transactions during the fiscal year 1954, for account of the Pershing Hall Memorial Fund, pursuant to the act approved June 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 426, Sec. 3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

173. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report of the Comptroller General of the United States on the work of the General Accounting Office for the fiscal year 1954, pursuant to section 312 (a) of the Budget and Accounting Act of June 10, 1921; to the Committee on Government Operations.

174. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting a "comprehensive report," as of December 31, 1954, pursuant to section 9 (b) of Public Law 108 (ch. 184), approved July 10, 1953; to the Committee on Government Operations.

175. A letter from the Director, Naval Petroleum Reserves, Department of the Navy, transmitting an annual report showing certain agreements relating to operations in the Naval Petroleum Reserves which were entered into during the calendar year 1954, pursuant to the act of June 17, 1944 (58 Stat. 280); to the Committee on Armed Services.

176. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of the number of officers on duty with the Department of the Army and the Army General Staff on September 30, 1954, pursuant to section 201 (c) of Public Law 581, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

177. A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Munitions Control Board, transmitting the semiannual report of the National Munitions Control Board, pursuant to subsection (h), section 12, of the Neutrality Act of 1939 (Public Res. No. 54, 76th Cong.); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

178. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a statement of the adjudications rendered during the year 1954 under the act of July 2, 1948 (50 U. S. C. App. secs. 1981–1987), amended by Public Law 116, 82d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

179. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting additional evidence pertaining to a list of certain cases involving suspension of deportation, and requesting that they be withdrawn from those pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

180. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting additional evidence pertaining to a list of certain cases involving suspension of deportation, and requesting that they be withdrawn from those pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. GAMBLE: Joint Committee on Defense Production. Fourth annual report of the activities of the Joint Committee on Defense Production; without amendment (Rept. No. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GAMBLE: Joint Committee on Defense Production. Report pertaining to United States Tin Corp. loans; without amendment (Rept. No. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 1. A bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2. A bill to increase from 5 percent to 10 percent the amount which corporations may deduct for tax purposes for charitable contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 3. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 5. A bill to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 6. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 7. A bill to establish a Tax Settlement Board; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIES:

H. R. 8. A bill amending the Communist Control Act of 1954 and repealing the first sentence of subsection 4f of the Internal Security Act of 1950 so as to provide penalties for membership in, or participation in the revolutionary activity of, the Communist Party, or any other organization furthering revolutionary conspiracy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 9. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 10. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 11. A bill—

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE AND POLICY

To reaffirm the national public policy and the purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, commonly designated "antitrust" laws, which, among other things, prohibit price discriminations; to aid in intelligent, fair, and effective administration and enforcement thereof; and to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Anti-Price Discrimination Act and the protection which it affords to independent business, the Congress hereby reaffirms that the purpose of the antitrust laws in prohibiting price discriminations is to secure equality of opportunity of all persons to compete in trade or business and to preserve competition where it exists, to restore it where it is destroyed, and to permit it to spring up in new fields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 12. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 13. A bill to provide for permanent price support at 90 percent of parity for basic agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 14. A bill to authorize Federal payments to the States to assist in constructing schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 15. A bill to authorize Federal payments to the States to assist in constructing schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 16. A bill to repeal provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 granting special income-tax treatment for dividends received by individuals, and to increase the amount of each personal exemption allowed by such code as a deduction for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 17. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 18. A bill to provide for a system of cross-country superhighways; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 19. A bill to provide that a portion of the manufacturers' excise tax on gasoline shall be set aside and used exclusively for the purposes of the Federal-Aid Road Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 20. A bill to increase the usefulness of the St. Lawrence Seaway by increasing

the width and depth of certain locks, increasing the controlling depth of channels and canals, and by providing for the deepening of certain connecting waterways in the Great Lakes area so as to permit oceangoing vessels using such seaway to reach all the Great Lakes ports; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 21. A bill creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 22. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide for price support for basic agricultural commodities at 90 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 23. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 so as to increase acreage allotments for the 1955 crop of cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 24. A bill to increase the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer for himself and his spouse, and the additional exemptions for old age or blindness, from $600 to $1,000, and to increase the exemption for a dependent from $600 to $800; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 25. A bill to extend the application of the Classification Act of 1949 to certain positions in, and employees of, the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 26. A bill to provide for the denial of bail to defendants in certain criminal cases involving crimes affecting the national security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 27. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 28. A bill to assist individuals to provide financial security upon retirement and to make provisions for surviving members of their families by allowing an income-tax reduction for premiums paid on annuity and life-insurance contracts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 29. A bill to amend section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 30. A bill to provide that Federal expenditures shall not exceed Federal revenues, except in time of war or grave national emergency declared by the Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 31. A bill to authorize Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of privately owned real property as well as the shores of publicly owned real property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 32. A bill to repeal certain restrictions imposed by the Agricultural Act of 1954 on payments under the agricultural conservation program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 33. A bill to provide for loans to enable needy and scholastically qualified students to continue post-high-school education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 34. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 35. A bill to authorize the Farm Credit Administration to make loans of the type formerly made by the Land Bank Commissioner; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 36. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans to eligible veterans for the purchase, repair, alteration, construction, or improvement of farm property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 37. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718), as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 38. A bill to provide for temporary measures of flood control and anthracite mine drainage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 39. A bill to protect and conserve labor union health and welfare funds; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 40. A bill to authorize the Attorney General and his assistants and United States attorneys and their assistants to act as notaries public; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 41. A bill to exempt the retirement income and pensions of members of the Armed Forces who are under the age of 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 42. A bill to appropriate money for the construction of the Calumet-Sag Channel, Ill., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 43. A bill to equalize taxation and provide revenue; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 44. A bill to provide Federal funds to assist the States in the acquisition and construction of plant facilities urgently and immediately needed for public schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 45. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce the age at which individuals may become entitled to benefits thereunder from 65 to 62 in the case of men and from 65 to 60 in the case of women; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 46. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the city of Anniston, Ala., of certain real property within Fort McClellan, Ala.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 47. A bill to provide a cost-of-living pay increase for officers and employees of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 48. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to repeal the $75 work clause; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 49. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 50. A bill to provide for a pay increase for Government employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 51. A bill to protect the right of individuals to be free from discrimination or segregation by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 52. A bill to provide that World War II prisoners of war shall be paid the sums which they would have received as increases in pay and allowances if promotions which they received on their return had been made for pay purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 53. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that the value of imported hops shall be computed, for purposes of determining the applicable rate of duty thereon, as of the date of purchase; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 54. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 55. A bill to provide an additional exemption for income-tax purposes in the case of scoutmasters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 56. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to $1.25; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 57. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 58. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 59. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 60. A bill to provide for price supports for dairy products at 85 percent to 90 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 61. A bill to require a premarital examination of all applicants for marriage licenses in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 62. A bill for the relief of the county of Monmouth, N. J.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 63. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 with reference to claims arising out of the death of members of the Armed Forces of the United States as the result of enemy action after cessation of hostilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 64. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 65. A bill to amend the act of August 23, 1954 (Public Law 632, 83d Cong.); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 66. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 67. A bill to provide for the training of candidates for appointment as doctors and dentists in the military services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 68. A bill to provide for the construction of a nonsectarian chapel at the Veterans' Administration hospital at Northampton, Mass.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 69. A bill to create a United States Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 70. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that no deduction on account of outside earnings shall be made from the benefits of certain widows having dependent children in their care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 71. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that a woman who is entitled to old-age insurance benefits based on her own wages and self-employment income may in addition be entitled to wife's insurance benefits based on the wages and self-employment income of her husband; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 72. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be reduced from 65 to 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 73. A bill to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class parcel post; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 74. A bill to provide increases in the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 75. A bill to provide for payment of an annuity to widows of justices and judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 76. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to intercepted communications; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARRIGG:

H. R. 77. A bill to provide for temporary measures of flood control and anthracite mine drainage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COLE:

H. R. 78. A bill to provide rewards for information concerning the illegal introduction into the United States, or the illegal manufacture or acquisition in the United States, of special nuclear material and atomic weapons; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

H. R. 79. A bill relating to the detail of certain officers of the Armed Forces retired with full pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 80. A bill to amend section 9 (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 81. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to give United States district courts jurisdiction of certain offenses committed by Americans outside of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 82. A bill to provide a new method for apportioning Representatives in Congress among the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 83. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the control of floods on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, and for other purposes," approved May 15, 1928; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 84. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt home workers in rural areas from the minimum-wage and maximum-hours provisions of that act in certain cases; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 85. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, with respect to the annuities of certain retired employees who served in Alaska and on the Isthmus of Panama; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 86. A bill to amend sections 3182 and 3183 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to authorize the use of any information filed by a public prosecuting officer for making demands for fugitives from justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 87. A bill to provide for the garnishment, execution, or trustee process of wages and salaries of civil officers and employees of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 88. A bill authorizing the construction of certain public works on the Mississippi River for the protection of St. Louis, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 89. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, as amended (15 U. S. C. 13 (b)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 90. A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 91. A bill to limit the removal of civil actions from State to Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 92. A bill to provide for the procurement and installation of mechanism for recording and counting votes in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 93. A bill to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows and children, at the same rates as apply in the case of veterans of the Spanish-American War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. R. 94. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the late Senator Robert A. Taft; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 95. A bill to provide a program of national health insurance and public health and to assist in increasing the number of adequately trained professional and other health personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 96. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 97. A bill to provide that the Attorney General shall prepare and publish a list of subversive organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 98. A bill to amend section 502 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 so as to increase the maximum amount in which farm realty loans may be guaranteed thereunder; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 99. A bill to increase the penalty provisions of certain acts dealing with narcotics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 100. A bill to permit the mining, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 101. A bill relating to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of section 9, subsections (d) and (e), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 102. A bill to amend section 9 (d) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 103. A bill to provide for the construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal reclamation projects by irrigation districts and other public agencies; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 104. A bill to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 105. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain as additions to the Central Valley project, California, the Trinity River division and the San Luis unit of the West San Joaquin division; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 106. A bill to withdraw the privilege of free transportation of official mail matter from certain Government corporations and agencies; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 107. A bill to provide paid-up insurance for certain aged veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 108. A bill to provide for Federal financial assistance to the States in the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 109. A bill to grant the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the conservation, development, and utilization of water, land, and other related resources of the Missouri Basin and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 110. A bill to protect the surface values of lands within the national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 111. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Kansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 112. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing the Medicine Lodge Indian Peace Treaty site as a national monument and historic shrine; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 113. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to conform the time for filing the annual report required from beneficiaries whose earnings exceed the amount specified in the retirement test, and the time limitation governing the correction of records of earnings with the time allowed for filing income-tax returns under section 6072 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 114. A bill to provide for the regulation of the business of making loans of $600 or less in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 115. A bill to provide for the coinage of gold $10 pieces; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 116. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national war memorial theater and opera house, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 117. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, in order to facilitate the freedom of association of professional personnel; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 118. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, so as to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. R. 119. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 so as to remove domestic trade barriers affecting milk and milk products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 120. A bill to amend section 3466 of the Revised Statutes to subordinate tax claims of the United States to wage claims in State insolvency proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 121. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that old-age and other monthly insurance benefits shall be payable at age 60 in lieu of at age 65, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 122. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 123. A bill to provide for the granting of national service life insurance to certain blind veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. R. 124. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1954 so as to provide new criteria to be used by the Secretary of Agriculture in determining the percent of parity price to be established by the Secretary of Agriculture in support of milk and products thereof; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 125. A bill to require that circulars and pieces of advertising mailed in bulk at the third-class rate bear definite and complete addresses; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 126. A bill to amend the act of July 1, 1948, to authorize the erection of appropriate Government headstones or markers in cemetery plots in memory of certain members of the Armed Forces who died while serving in the overseas theaters of operations and whose bodies have not been recovered or identified or have been buried at sea; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 127. A bill to amend the act incorporating the American Legion so as to redefine (a) the powers of said corporation, (b) the right to the use of the name "The American Legion" and "American Legion"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 128. A bill to provide for the procurement and installation of mechanism for recording and counting votes in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 129. A bill to amend part II of title III of the Communications Act of 1934, so as to require the installation of an automatic radio call selector on cargo ships of the United States carrying less than two radio operators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 130. A bill to increase the penalties for violation of certain narcotic laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 131. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 132. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 133. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 134. A bill to increase to $1,000 the amount a dependent may earn without loss of exemption to the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 135. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 136. A bill to amend the act of August 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 459), relating to the expenditure of funds for cooperating with the public school board at Walker, Minn., for the extension of public-school facilities to be available to all Indian children in the district; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 137. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to require manufacturers of farm machinery sold in interstate commerce to identify each such machine by a serial number; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 138. A bill to make the retirement benefits of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 available to certain persons who rendered active Federal service during the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 139. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 140. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of Illinois State Normal University; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 141. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of February 18, 1922, so as to transfer from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Attorney General jurisdiction for determination of undue enhancement of prices by cooperative associations monopolizing or restraining trade and proceedings in connection therewith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 142. A bill to preserve the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and River, to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement on that river for power purposes, and to further the interests of national security by authorizing the prompt development of such works of improvement for power purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 143. A bill to release and quitclaim all rights and interests of the United States in certain real property to Walnut Ridge, Ark.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 144. A bill to release and quitclaim all rights and interests of the United States in certain real property to Newport, Ark.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 145. A bill to amend section 502 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, so as to increase the maximum amount in which farm realty loans may be granted thereunder; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 146. A bill to provide that pension for non-service-connected permanent and total disability may be paid to single veterans who have a dependent parent, and whose annual income does not exceed $2,700; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 147. A bill relating to compensation for veterans of World War II who have a service-connected or a service-aggravated tuberculous condition; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 148. A bill to amend the act of December 5, 1945, entitled "An act granting travel pay and other allowances to certain soldiers of the war with Spain and the Philippine Insurrection who were discharged in the Philippine Islands"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 149. A bill to permit any veteran of both World Wars to elect to have his service in World War I counted as service in World War II for the purpose of determining eligibility for certain benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 150. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 151. A bill relating to the practice of law in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 152. A bill to provide for fuel allocations and priorities during emergencies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 153. A bill to eliminate any liability of a collector of internal revenue for uncollected taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 154. A bill to provide for a nationally uniform system of automobile registration; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H. R. 155. A bill to extend certain benefits to persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in Mexico or on its borders during the period beginning May 9, 1916, and ending April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON:

H. R. 156. A bill to repeal section 10 of the act entitled "An act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1936 (the so-called Walsh-Healey Act); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 157. A bill to increase the national minimum wage to $1 an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 158. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing projects for the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 159. A bill to provide for the reconveyance of certain lands in the Belton Reservoir project, Texas, to former owners of such lands; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 160. A bill to provide for the reconveyance of certain lands in the Whitney Reservoir project, Texas, to former owners of such lands; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 161. A bill to authorize the sale of certain lands administered under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 162. A bill to provide that the United States shall aid the States in wildlife-restoration projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 163. A bill to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads, and to protect the public by requiring certain common carriers by railroad to install and maintain communication systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 164. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp honoring the coal miners and coal industry of America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 165. A bill to equalize certain retirement benefits for commissioned officers of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 166. A bill to provide for payment of compensation to certain Government employees improperly discharged, suspended, or furloughed, or improperly reduced in compensation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 167. A bill to establish permanent firing squads for national cemeteries in which burials are conducted; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 168. A bill to provide for the performance of heraldic services for the United States by the Quartermaster General; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 169. A bill to amend the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928 so that certain awards of the Mixed Claims Commission having a residual balance of $15,000 or less will be paid in full immediately, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 170. A bill granting pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependent children equivalent to the pensions granted to veterans of the war with Spain and their widows and dependent children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 171. A bill to change the names of the Gatun locks, the Gatun Dam, and the town of Gatun in the Canal Zone to "Sibert locks," "Sibert Dam," and "Sibert," respectively, in memory of the late Maj. Gen. William L. Sibert, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 172. A bill to provide an additional income-tax exemption for a taxpayer supporting a child who is an invalid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 173. A bill prohibiting lithographing or engraving on envelopes sold by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 174. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to impound mail in certain cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROBESON of Virginia:

H. R. 175. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine the claims of prisoners of war permanently disabled; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 176. A bill to provide for the establishment in the Department of Labor of a Federal Safety Division, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 177. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require licensees to investigate persons and organizations on whose behalf contributions are solicited on radio and television programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 178. A bill to establish a postal rate-making procedure in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 179. A bill to extend the benefits of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to certain volunteer firemen injured while performing duty as firemen on real property under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 180. A bill to provide that post-office fixtures and equipment for use in first-, second-, and third-class post offices shall be furnished by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 181. A bill to create the position of mail handler in charge in the postal transportation service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 182. A bill to provide that railroad employees may retire on a full annuity at age 60 or after serving 30 years; to provide that such annuity for any month shall be not less than one-half of the individual's average monthly compensation for the 5 years of highest earnings; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 183. A bill to provide rates of pay for training periods of substitute rural carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 184. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 185. A bill to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 186. A bill to increase the income-tax exemptions allowed a taxpayer for himself, his spouse, and his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 187. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 188. A bill to provide that Government surplus property may be donated to 4–H Clubs for the construction, equipment, and operation of camps and centers; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 189. A bill to amend the act of August 7, 1946, so as to provide for the disposition by the Secretary of the Navy of certain surplus engines, equipment, and material; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 190. A bill to authorize payment of a monetary allowance in lieu of transportation in kind to members of the uniformed services who transport their dependents, baggage, and household effects in a house trailer; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 191. A bill to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 192. A bill to amend Public Law 526 of the 79th Congress, section 10 of the Flood Control Act, July 24, 1946 (Rappahannock River); to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 193. A bill for the relief of the city of Philippi, W. Va.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 194. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 65 to 60 the age at which old-age and other monthly insurance benefits shall be payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 195. A bill to provide a system of transcontinental superhighways; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 196. A bill to create a Department of Peace; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 197. A bill to provide increased cotton acreage allotments for 1955 for certain disaster areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 198. A bill to provide that one floating ocean station shall be maintained at all times in the Gulf of Mexico to provide storm warnings for States bordering on the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 199. A bill to increase from $600 to $700 the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 200. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the leprosy situation in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 201. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Rayne, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 202. A bill to amend section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, so as to increase minimum cotton-acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 203. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Sulphur, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 204. A bill to assist certain classes of municipalities to finance vitally needed and specific types of public works by providing for a guaranty by the United States of approved bonds hereafter issued by these municipalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 205. A bill to provide for an ad valorem duty on the importation of shrimp; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 206. A bill to provide for taxation by the State of Wyoming of certain property located within the confines of Grand Teton National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 207. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide emergency tax relief to livestock growers who are forced to dispose of their herds because of drought; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 208. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Arkansas and Oklahoma to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries as they affect such States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 209. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 210. A bill to continue existing price supports, marketing quotas, and acreage allotments at 1954 levels under present conditions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 211. A bill to increase marketing quotas and acreage allotments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 212. A bill to provide for the advancement on the retired lists of the Armed Forces of individuals who did not receive promotions after having been held as prisoners of war or placed in a hospital and from there retired on a disability during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 213. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 214. A bill to provide supplementary unemployment compensation benefits in certain cases to workers unemployed during the national emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 215. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 216. A bill to repeal the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, to reenact the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 217. A bill to increase the equipment-maintenance allowance payable to rural carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 218. A bill to provide for a minimum price support for the 1955 crop of peanuts at 90 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 219. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Canton reclamation project, Oklahoma, by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 220. A bill to extend the time within which claims may be presented to the Indian

Claims Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 221. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery in western Oklahoma; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 222. A bill to increase the special pay of enlisted persons of the uniformed services for sea and foreign duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 223. A bill to appropriate $2,400,000 for the study of the causes of the vesicular exanthema and assistance in its eradication; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 224. A bill to repeal certain restrictions on cotton-acreage reports; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 225. A bill to terminate the war tax rate on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 226. A bill to terminate the war tax rate on admissions to theaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 227. A bill to terminate the tax on admissions to theaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 228. A bill to terminate the tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. R. 229. A bill to provide assistance to communities, industries, business enterprises, and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 230. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 231. A bill making the 12th day of February in each year a legal holiday to be known as Lincoln's Birthday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 232. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to exempt operations in the transportation of livestock, fish, and agricultural, floricultural, and horticultural commodities from the act and from regulation by the Civil Aeronautics Board thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 233. A bill to create a United States Academy of Foreign Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 234. A bill to revise the Federal-aid highway laws of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 235. A bill to revise the Federal-aid highway laws of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 236. A bill to amend the Agriculture Act of 1949 to provide for price support at 90 percent of parity for the basic agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 237. A bill relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 238. A bill to extend the time within which claims may be presented to the Indian Claims Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 239. A bill to promote the rehabilitation of the Five Civilized Tribes and other Indians of eastern Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 240. A bill to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 241. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 242. A bill to provide for the gradual elimination of salmon traps in the waters of Alaska; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 243. A bill to amend section 212 (d) (7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 244. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 245. A bill to amend the act approved January 27, 1905, as amended (48 U. S. C., sec. 322); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 246. A bill making grants of land in Alaska to the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 247. A bill relating to moneys received from mineral lands in Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 248. A bill to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 249. A bill relating to the regulation of nets in Alaska waters; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 250. A bill to permit mining within Katmai National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BECKER:

H. R. 251. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the late Senator Robert A. Taft; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 252. A bill to provide for standards to be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture governing imported agricultural food products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 253. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to provide that a discharge in bankruptcy shall release a bankrupt from provable debts due as a tax levied by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 254. A bill to provide that when a proposed dam across any navigable waters and the pool to be caused by the dam will be located entirely within one State, a license or permit must be granted by the State for the construction of the dam; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 255. A bill to provide for refund of the Federal tax paid on gasoline where the gasoline is destroyed by fire or other casualty while held for resale by a jobber, wholesaler, or retail dealer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 256. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to the priority of debts owed by a bankrupt to workmen, servants, clerks, and certain salesmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 257. A bill to amend section 112 (n) (8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that in certain cases of a sale or exchange of a taxpayer's residence, certain periods of limitation shall not run against the taxpayer while he is on extended active duty in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 258. A bill to amend sections 241 and 242 of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 259. A bill to provide protection of persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 260. A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 261. A bill to implement article I, section 7, of the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 262. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to reduce the rate of tax applicable to distilled spirits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 263. A bill to amend section 2879 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 264. A bill to amend section 1001, paragraph 412, of the Tariff Act of 1930, with respect to hardboard; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 265. A bill to provide for an ad valorem duty on the importation of shrimp; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 266. A bill to provide that certain amounts expended by individuals for the purchase of non-interest-bearing United States bonds may be deducted in computing net income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 267. A bill to permit the postponement of income tax with respect to a portion of earned net income paid to a restricted retirement fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 268. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951, so as to provide that in the absence of a designation of beneficiary thereunder by a person having national service life insurance or United States Government life insurance, the designated beneficiary of such insurance shall also be the designated beneficiary of any indemnity payable under such act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 269. A bill to encourage the use of private benefit plans in lieu of social security by providing that individuals who are eligible for certain benefits under such plans shall not be entitled to social-security benefits or subject to social-security taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 270. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 271. A bill to provide a remedy for persons slandered, libeled, or defamed by Members of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 272. A bill to increase criminal penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 273. A bill to repeal certain miscellaneous excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 274. A bill to provide for a pay increase for postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 275. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, so as to impose a duty upon the importation of montan wax produced in certain Communist-controlled countries or produced from raw materials originating in such countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 276. A bill to authorize the Farm Credit Administration to make loans of the type formerly made by the Land Bank Commissioner; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 277. A bill to increase the national minimum wage to $1 an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 278. A bill to promote the national security of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 279. A bill to provide for the termination of Government operations which are in competition with private enterprise; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 280. A bill to provide for the admission to St. Elizabeths Hospital, in the District of Columbia, of certain citizens of the United States adjudged insane in foreign countries; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 281. A bill providing that there will be equal pay for equal work for women; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 282. A bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 283. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 284. A bill to amend section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to authorize disposal of surplus farm products to Federal, State, and local hospitals and penal and correctional institutions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 285. A bill to prohibit the assignment of certain duties to members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 286. A bill to provide a system of scholarships for persons of unusual ability in certain sciences; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 287. A bill to provide that Imperial and San Diego Counties in the State of California shall constitute a new and separate judicial district to be known as the southern district of California, and to redesignate the present southern district of California as the central district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 288. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Horse Shoe Bend National Military Park, in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 289. A bill to amend section 3672 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to requirement of filing notice of lien for taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 290. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to exempt from the manufacturers' excise tax certain automobiles furnished without charge to schools for use in driver-training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 291. A bill to extend the retirement income-tax credit to members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 292. A bill to provide that, notwithstanding the termination by Presidential proclamation of the period within which veterans of service subsequent to June 27, 1950, may accrue eligibility for wartime benefits, such period shall not terminate while individuals may be inducted for training and service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT (by request):

H. R. 293. A bill to readjust size and weight limits on fourth-class (parcel post) mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 294. A bill to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands of the Cheyenne and Arapaho Indian Tribes of Oklahoma for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 295. A bill to amend section 403 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to permit the granting of free or reduced-rate transportation to ministers of religion; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 296. A bill making an appropriation for the Washita Valley flood-prevention program in the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 297. A bill to provide for national recognition of Adelaide Johnson, the sculptor of The Woman's Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 298. A bill to provide for national recognition of Adelaide Johnson, the sculptor of The Woman's Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 299. A bill to extend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to ministers and members of religious orders; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 300. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to construct certain works of improvement for runoff and waterflow retardation, and soil-erosion prevention, on the Beaver Creek watershed in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 301. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of the Beaver Creek watershed, in Oklahoma, for purposes of runoff and waterflow retardation and soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 302. A bill to increase the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness) from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 303. A bill to extend the watershed programs authorized in section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 304. A bill to terminate the war-tax rate on admissions to public parks, and to provide that no tax on admissions shall apply in the case of admissions to public parks where the cost of admission is less than 60 cents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 305. A bill to terminate the war-tax rate on admissions to theaters, and to provide that no tax on admissions shall apply in the case of admissions to theaters where the cost of admission is less than 60 cents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 306. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act to provide that a railroad employee who has completed 30 years of service may retire on a full annuity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 307. A bill to amend and extend until June 30, 1956, the provision of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941, as amended, and to prescribe standards for the implementation of such provisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 308. A bill to increase the minimum level of price support for the 1955 cotton crop; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 309. A bill to establish a temporary commission to investigate the costs and effects of watershed programs for flood control in agricultural watersheds; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 310. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washita River Basin reclamation project, Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 311. A bill to establish fifth-class mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 312. A bill to grant equitable compensatory time to postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 313. A bill to amend the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 to improve the procedure for the selection for promotion of certain naval officers designated for engineering duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 314. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 315. A bill to provide for the establishment of preexamination procedures for determining in advance the admissibility of certain aliens into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 316. A bill to amend section 3731 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to appeals by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 317. A bill to permit judicial review of decisions of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 318. A bill to provide books and sound-reproduction records for certain physically incapacitated persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 319. A bill to punish the malicious destruction of aircraft and attempts to destroy aircraft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 320. A bill to prohibit certain acts and transactions with respect to gambling materials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 321. A bill to prohibit the transportation of obscene matters in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 322. A bill to extend to fishermen the same treatment accorded farmers in relation to estimated income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 323. A bill to make Flag Day a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 324. A bill to repeal the retailers' excise tax on toilet preparations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 325. A bill to amend section 1701 of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to exemptions from the tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 326. A bill to repeal section 1701 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt from tax admissions to certain events conducted for the benefit of religious, educational, and charitable organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 327. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving-picture theater; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 328. A bill to repeal the retailers' excise tax on purses, handbags, and certain other articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 329. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the American schoolteacher; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 330. A bill to provide for the construction of a customhouse building at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 331. A bill to provide for the construction of a post-office garage building at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 332. A bill to provide for the extension and remodeling of the Terminal Annex Post Office at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 333. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code by the addition of a new section; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 334. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide a 3-year carryover for medical and dental expenses in excess

of the maximum deduction allowable under section 23 (x); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 335. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to allow, as a deduction from gross income, certain amounts paid as life-insurance premiums, and to provide more liberal income-tax treatment for amounts paid for hospitalization insurance and amounts paid under voluntary medical care plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 336. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 337. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide increased retirement benefits for certain officers and employees of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 338. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for the payment of benefits thereunder to certain Gold Star Mothers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 339. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide compensation for employers required to withhold income tax at source on the wages of employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 340. A bill to amend paragraph (A) (1) of Public Law No. 662, 79th Congress, chapter 869, second session, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veteran's Affairs.

H. R. 341. A bill to prohibit the establishment of a valley authority in any State that would be substantially affected thereby until the people of the affected areas of such State have voted affirmatively for such valley authority; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 342. A bill establishing a general policy with respect to payments to State and local governments on account of Federal real property and tangible personal property by providing for the taxation of certain Federal property and for payments in connection with certain other Federal property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 343. A bill to increase the compensation of Members of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 344. A bill to incorporate the Pan American Round Tables of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 345. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 346. A bill providing a direct Federal old-age pension at the rate of $100 per month to certain citizens 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 347. A bill to increase the amount of disability pension payable to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 348. A bill authorizing an appropriation to aid the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College in establishing an experimental farm; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 349. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims for basic and overtime compensation of employees of the Alaska Road Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 350. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce the age at which old-age and survivors insurance benefits become payable from 65 to 55 in the case of widows, and from 65 to 60 in the case of other individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 351. A bill to increase criminal penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 352. A bill to increase the rates and amounts of compensation which may be earned by retired commissioned officers when employed by the United States, and to provide that such rates and amounts shall increase or decrease as the level of prices increases or decreases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 353. A bill to increase the fee for executing an application for a passport or a visa from $1 to $3; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 354. A bill to amend the Census Act of June 18, 1929, so as to prohibit inquiries as to income of individuals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 355. A bill to provide for loans to enable needy and scholastically qualified students to continue post-high-school education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 356. A bill to provide for programs of public facilities construction which will stimulate employment in areas having a substantial surplus of labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 357. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 358. A bill to amend section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, so as to provide that all quota numbers not used in any year shall be made available to immigrants in oversubscribed areas in the following year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 359. A bill to provide assistance to communities, industries, business enterprises, and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 360. A bill to allow certain members of the Armed Forces to designate the Eastern Orthodox faith as a religious preference on their identification tags; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 361. A bill to provide for emergency Federal financial assistance to the States and Territories in the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities urgently needed because of overcrowding, and to encourage full and efficient use of State and local resources in meeting school-construction needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 362. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 363. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act in order to provide that revenues under the provisions of such act shall be used as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 364. A bill to provide for payment of pension for non-service-connected permanent and total disability to veterans of any war, regardless of length of service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 365. A bill to provide that certain Veterans' Administration activities involving Alabama veterans shall be handled in the regional office in Montgomery, Ala.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 366. A bill to extend the time for initiating a course of education or training under Public Law 550, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 367. A bill to extend the direct loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to correspond to the expiration dates provided for guaranteed loans under such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 368. A bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to eliminate the requirement that education and training allowances payable to veterans pursuing institutional on-farm training under that act be periodically reduced; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 369. A bill to remove the requirement of automatic periodic reduction of the education and training allowances of veterans pursuing on-the-job training or institutional on-farm training under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 370. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 371. A bill to provide free mailing privileges for patients in or at veterans hospitals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 372. A bill to provide for emergency furlough or leave for members of the Armed Forces serving outside the United States in the event of the death of a member of such person's immediate family; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 373. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to establish for persons who served in the Armed Forces a statutory award for the total loss of hearing in one ear; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 374. A bill to authorize the adjustment and clarification of ownership to certain lands within the Stanislaus National Forest, Tuolumne County, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 375. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to permit Federal participation in public assistance for patients in private institutions for tuberculosis and for patients in private institutions for mental diseases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H. R. 376. A bill to increase from $600 to $800 the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 377. A bill to restore the public housing program provided for in the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, by removing the existing limitations upon the number of dwelling units which may be authorized or contracted for under such act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 378. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of December 19, 1913, so as to permit the sale of water rights thereunder to public utilities which are subject to the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. R. 379. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 380. A bill to provide that certain alien spouses of American servicemen may be admitted to the United States, if they

were married with the consent of the appropriate military authority, notwithstanding paragraph (6) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 381. A bill to authorize the President to issue posthumously in the name of George Washington a commission as General of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 382. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army in certain cases to undertake small river and harbor improvement projects not specifically authorized by Congress; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 383. A bill to relinquish the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States over Federal lands within the State of Maryland, and to provide that the United States and the State of Maryland shall hereafter exercise concurrent jurisdiction over such lands; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 384. A bill to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H. R. 385. A bill to offset declining employment by providing for Federal assistance to States and local governments in projects of construction, alteration, expansion, or repair of public facilities and improvements; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 386. A bill to provide for the purchase by the Federal Civil Defense Administrator of certain radiological detection instruments, devices, and equipment, and the leasing thereof to the States for civil-defense purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 387. A bill to authorize and direct the Federal Power Commission to issue a license for a certain proposed hydroelectric power project on the Namekagon River, Wis.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 388. A bill to provide an increased penalty for the sale of narcotic drugs to persons under 17 years of age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 389. A bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 390. A bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and reenact the Wagner Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 391. A bill to provide that Fort Montgomery, N. Y., may tap the West Point water supply line, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. R. 392. A bill to provide for the return to the former owners of certain lands, acquired in connection with the Demopolis lock and dam project, of certain mineral interests in such lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 393. A bill to provide for the establishment of a policy of placing certain contracts in States having the lowest per capita income; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 394. A bill to authorize certain additional appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 395. A bill to provide that standard time shall be the measure of time for all purposes and to authorize Congress to establish daylight saving time for any year by concurrent resolution; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H. R. 396. A bill to permit the consolidation of District of Columbia banks and the conversion of national banks into and the consolidation of national banks with District of Columbia banks; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 397. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide mortgage-loan insurance for hospitals and medical facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 398. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide mortgage-loan insurance for hospitals and medical facilities used in connection with voluntary prepayment health plans; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 399. A bill to assist voluntary nonprofit associations offering prepaid health service programs to secure necessary facilities and equipment through long-term, interest-bearing loans; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 400. A bill to improve the public health by encouraging more extensive use of the voluntary prepayment method in the provision of personal health services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 401. A bill to facilitate the broader distribution of health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 402. A bill to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the deduction of certain payments for health insurance without regard to the 3-percent limitation contained therein; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 403. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of public health services, to provide for a more effective use of available Federal funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 404. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to change the formulas for computing the Federal share of State public-assistance programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 405. A bill to abolish free transmission of official Government mail matter and certain other mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 406. A bill providing that no treaty now existing or hereafter to be created shall contain any provision abridging the sovereign power of the United States, nor of any State thereof, nor shall any treaty amend or abridge any law of the United States or of any State thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 407. A bill limiting the power of the Security Council of the United Nations or any other agency created by treaty to call for troops of the United States to serve in foreign countries, without the consent of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 408. A bill providing that in the interpretation of any treaty made between the United States and any other independent state, the Supreme Court of the United States shall be the sole judge hereof, notwithstanding the provision of any treaty now existing or hereafter to be made, to the contrary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 409. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the former owners of mineral interests in certain lands in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana acquired by the United States under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 410. A bill to regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling, and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 411. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to conduct preference primaries for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 412. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 413. A bill to provide reimbursement for the purchase of uniforms and equipment by retired officers of the Regular Army, Air Force, and Navy who are recalled to active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 414. A bill to extend the duration of the Water Pollution Control Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 415. A bill to provide that students away from home while attending college shall be enumerated for census purposes as residents of the enumeration district in which their home is located; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 416. A bill to provide for the preparation of plans and specifications for a museum building for the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 417. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, with respect to the terms and conditions to be contained in contracts for the sale of power; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 418. A bill to authorize the grant or retrocession to a State of concurrent jurisdiction over certain land; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 419. A bill to rescind the authorization for construction of Libby Dam project, Montana; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 420. A bill to preserve the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and River, to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement on that river for power purposes, and to further the interests of national security by authorizing the prompt development of such works of improvement for power purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 421. A bill to increase the amount of guaranty by the Veterans' Administration on certain home loans made pursuant to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 422. A bill to amend section 502 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, so as to increase the maximum amount in which farm realty loans may be guaranteed thereunder; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 423. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide that no citizen shall be excluded from service as juror by reason of his or her sex; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 424. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to provide that certain chronic and tropical diseases becoming manifest within 2 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service-connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 425. A bill to provide that permanently disabled individuals (including the blind) who are under 65 shall be entitled to the same tax treatment of their medical expenses as they would be entitled if they

were 65, to grant permanently disabled individuals an additional tax exemption, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 426. A bill to provide for the establishment of townsites and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 427. A bill to exempt certain additional foreign travel from the tax on the transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 428. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 429. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Little Brown Church in the Vale; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 430. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 431. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, with respect to the duty of the Federal Power Commission to report to Congress regarding the effect and operation of State compacts dealing with the conservation, production, transportation, or distribution of natural gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 432. A bill to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution consenting to an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas," approved August 28, 1951; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 433. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to authorize the Federal Power Commission to prescribe safety requirements for natural-gas companies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 434. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 435. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 436. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to conduct preference primaries for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 437. A bill to restrain further deterioration of our currency and to restore confidence in the dollar by returning the currency of the United States to the gold standard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 438. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of heliports on or near Government buildings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 439. A bill to aid in meeting the defense mobilization requirements of the United States by providing for the training or retraining of civilian aviation personnel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 440. A bill to offset declining employment by providing for Federal assistance to States and local governments in projects of construction, alteration, expansion, or repair of public facilities and improvements; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 441. A bill authorizing an appropriation to enable the Secretary of Labor to make additional unemployment compensation payments to States having large numbers of unemployed persons in labor surplus areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 442. A bill to amend section 265 of the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to notification to the Attorney General of changes of address by aliens within the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 443. A bill to provide for voluntary coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system for lawyers engaged in the practice of their profession; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 444. A bill to provide for publication in the roll of honor in the Army Register of the names of the individuals who volunteered and served in trench-fever experiments in the American Expeditionary Force during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 445. A bill to extend coverage of Federal old-age and survivors insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 446. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide a direct Federal pension of at least $100 per month to all American citizens who have been citizens 10 years or over, to be prorated according to the cost of living as on January 3, 1953; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 447. A bill to provide for the establishment of certain priorities in the awarding of military procurement contracts within regions suffering economic distress through unemployment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 448. A bill to provide supplementary unemployment compensation benefits in certain cases to workers unemployed during the national emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 449. A bill to provide for the award of certain public contracts to bidders from areas of very substantial labor surplus where their bids do not exceed by more than 5 percent the most advantageous bids submitted from other areas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 450. A bill to recognize the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., a national nonprofit nonpolitical war veterans' organization, for purposes of bestowing upon it certain benefits, rights, privileges, and prerogatives; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 451. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, so as to require the preparation of passenger lists for all flights of commercial airlines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 452. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility in the vicinity of Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 453. A bill to provide that the outer covering of income tax returns mailed to taxpayers shall not bear colored stripes or other identification devices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 454. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 65 to 60 the age at which old-age and survivors insurance benefits become payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 455. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 456. A bill to name the Veterans' Administration hospital at 150 South Huntington Avenue, Boston, Mass., the William P. Connery, Jr., Memorial Veterans' Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 457. A bill creating a Commission on Federal Reimbursement to States and Local Governments by reason of Federal ownership of improved and unimproved real property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 458. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1941, to include Public Health Service officers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 459. A bill to repeal section 618 of the Revenue Act of 1951 (relating to a prohibition upon the denial of Social Security Act funds); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 460. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 461. A bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 462. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 463. A bill to offset declining employment by providing for Federal assistance to States and local governments in projects of construction, alteration, expansion, or repair of public facilities and improvements; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 464. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to conduct preference primaries for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 465. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to increase the deductions for personal exemptions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 466. A bill to amend section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, so as to provide that all quota numbers not used in any year shall be made available to immigrants in oversubscribed areas in the following year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 467. A bill to admit 50,000 immigrants, natives and citizens of Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 468. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the case of admissions all the proceeds of which inure exclusively to the benefit of the Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts, the Camp Fire Girls, or similar organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 469. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit certain water district taxes to be deducted from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 470. A bill to provide a pay increase for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 471. A bill to provide additional compensation for Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 472. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemption of a taxpayer and the additional exemption for his spouse from $600 to $1,000, and to increase the exemption for a dependent from $600 to $750; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 473. A bill to authorize an investigation and report on the advisability of a national monument in Brooklyn, N. Y.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 474. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 475. A bill to extend to certain naturalized citizens of the United States the benefits of the act of May 29, 1944, entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, en-

gaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 476. A bill to amend Public Law 410, 78th Congress, with regard to compensation for overtime, Sunday, and holiday work of employees of the United States Public Health Service, Foreign Quarantine Division; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 477. A bill to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts, and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 478. A bill to enable the mothers and widows of deceased members of the Armed Forces now interred in cemeteries outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska to make a pilgrimage to such cemeteries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 479. A bill to provide that the compensation the United States shall pay the Borough of Blairsville, Pa., for certain land and improvements thereon, shall include the replacement costs of such improvements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 480. A bill for the allowance of certain claims, not heretofore paid, for indemnity for spoliations by the French prior to July 31, 1801, as reported by the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 481. A bill to facilitate the broader distribution of health services, to increase the quantity and improve the quality of health services and facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 482. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the former O'Reilly General Hospital, Springfield, Mo., to the State of Missouri, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 483. A bill to amend the Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947, as amended, so as to provide for appointment of doctors of osteopathy in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 484. A bill to amend section 1 (d) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 485. A bill to provide benefits for members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces who suffer disability or death while performing travel to and from specified types of active duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 486. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that State welfare agencies may be furnished with information regarding the income-tax exemptions claimed by individuals receiving or applying for certain public-assistance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 487. A bill to provide that certain officers of the uniformed services who have been retired for disability incurred in line of duty, and who hold civilian office or employment with the United States, may receive retired pay and civilian pay totaling $6,000; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H. R. 488. A bill to provide for the acquisition by the Secretary of the Air Force of the public school located adjacent to the northwest corner boundary of Bergstrom Air Force Base at Austin, Tex.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 489. A bill authorizing the transfer of a portion of the Camp Mabry Militia rifle range tract in the city of Austin, Tex., comprising 189.11 acres, to the State of Texas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 490. A bill to increase acreage allotments for the 1955 crop of cotton so that the allotment for each farm shall be at least equal to its allotment for the 1954 crop; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 491. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 so as to authorize loans for farm housing to be guaranteed or insured under the same terms and conditions as apply to residential housing; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 492. A bill to authorize the construction of shore-protective works in the vicinity of Anaheim Bay Harbor, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 493. A bill to provide that Imperial and San Diego Counties, in the State of California, shall constitute a new and separate judicial district to be known as the southern district of California, and to redesignate the present southern district of California as the central district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. R. 494. A bill to amend section 1020c, title 12, banks and banking, United States Code, and to provide for the orderly retirement of joint-stock land-bank bonds declared by Congress to be instrumentalities of the Government of the United States by providing for an exchange of bonds of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation for the balance unpaid on joint-stock land-bank bonds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 495. A bill to authorize research work in weed control, grass culture, and soil-fertility maintenance at Panhandle Agricultural and Mechanical College, Goodwell, Okla.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 496. A bill authorizing an appropriation to aid the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College in establishing an experimental farm; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 497. A bill designating the 27th day of October in each year as Navy Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 498. A bill to provide that Imperial and San Diego Counties in the State of California shall constitute a new and separate judicial district to be known as the Southern District of California, and to redesignate the present Southern District of California as the Central District of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 499. A bill to increase the maximum travel allowance for postal transportation clerks, acting postal transportation clerks, and substitute transportation clerks; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 500. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide certain benefits for the widows of employees who died prior to February 28, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 501. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. R. 502. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that the duty on refractory grade bauxite (regardless of the purpose for which it is imported) shall be $1 per ton; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 503. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to require reasonable bonds from packers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 504. A bill prohibiting lithographing or engraving on envelopes sold by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 505. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that annuities received under the Civil Service Retirement Act shall be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 506. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe of the Standing Rock Reservation in North and South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 507. A bill to grant civil-service employees retirement after 30 years' service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 508. A bill to establish a commission on the legal status of women in the United States, to declare a policy as to distinctions based on sex, in law, and administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 509. A bill to provide for the adjustment of royalties and like charges for the use of inventions for the benefit of or by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 510. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to maintain the Sacramento River Channel in conjunction with operation and maintenance of the Central Valley project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 511. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the Original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 512. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 513. A bill to establish in the Department of Commerce a Consumers' Advisory Bureau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 514. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that those monthly insurance benefits which under present law are not payable until age 65 shall hereafter be payable at age 60 in the case of men and at age 55 in the case of women; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 515. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement annuities and pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 516. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 517. A bill to provide Federal assistance to the States for the construction of public-school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 518. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that a fully insured individual who becomes totally and permanently disabled shall be deemed to have reached retirement age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HESS:

H. R. 519. A bill for the relief of the Board of County Commissioners of Hamilton County, Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 520. A bill to provide military status for women who served overseas with the

Army of the United States during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 521. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to make the Small Business Administration a permanent agency of the Government; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 522. A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 523. A bill to amend chapter 1, subchapter C, of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 524. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to its application in the case of subscription radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 525. A bill to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 526. A bill to amend section 401 (e) (2) of the Civil Aeronautics Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 527. A bill to amend subsection 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 528. A bill to amend section 5 (a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain unfair methods of competition in connection with the sale of motor vehicles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 529. A bill for the relief of Grant County School District No. 165, Ephrata, Wash.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 530. A bill for the relief of Clarkston School District No. 250, Clarkston, Wash.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 531. A bill to retrocede to the State of Maryland exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over lands within boundaries of Camp Detrick; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 532. A bill terminating issuance of immigration visas to natives of certain countries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 533. A bill to provide financial assistance to the Oakdale and South San Joaquin Irrigation Districts, California, in the construction of the Tri-Dam project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 534. A bill to amend subsection (a) of section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 535. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to provide that certain church robes and vestments shall be exempt from duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 536. A bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 537. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 538. A bill to provide for the rescission of the order of the Postmaster General curtailing delivery of mail and certain other postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 539. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 540. A bill to prohibit the registration of trade-marks containing the words "White House"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 541. A bill to make the United States Merchant Marine Academy library a public depository for Government publications; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 542. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 543. A bill to provide study periods for post-office clerks and terminal and transfer clerks; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 544. A bill to amend section 514 of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 545. A bill to permit enlisted service, previously counted as double time, to be credited for retirement purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 546. A bill to further amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, approved October 12, 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 547. A bill to amend section 302 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 548. A bill to extend section 124A of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to amortization deductions for emergency facilities) to cover certain facilities in distressed areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 549. A bill appropriating money for the improvement of the Merrimack River from its mouth to Lawrence, Mass.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 550. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of freedom of the press, with a likeness of Heywood Broun on said stamp; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 551. A bill to grant a pension of $100 per month to all honorably discharged veterans of World War I who are 62 years of age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 552. A bill to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of toys and other manufactured articles which contain nitrocellulose or are otherwise found to be dangerously flammable; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 553. A bill to authorize Federal loans to assist local communities in building modern industrial plants in labor-surplus areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 554. A bill to provide for awarding the combat infantryman badge to certain members of the Armed Forces of the United States who fought in wars prior to World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 555. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 556. A bill to terminate the withholding of Oregon State income tax from the wages of certain residents of the State of Washington who are employed by the Corps of Engineers at Bonneville Dam; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 557. A bill to make certain changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 558. A bill to provide for a Christopher Columbus Memorial Arbor in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 559. A bill to increase the expense allowance of Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 560. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase from 75 cents to $1.25 the minimum hourly wage prescribed by section 6 (a) (1) of that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 561. A bill to provide that for the purpose of disapproval by the President each provision of an appropriation bill shall be considered a separate bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 562. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to extend coverage to certain persons engaged in civil defense; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 563. A bill to amend section 10 (d) of the Administrative Procedure Act so as to broaden judicial relief under that section pending review of administrative action; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 564. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to require United States obligations to be sold at not less than par value, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 565. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide that State law shall, in certain cases, determine the number of jurors which constitute a jury and the number of jurors who must agree in order that there be a valid verdict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 566. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the Bunker Hill Monument, Charlestown, Mass., to the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 567. A bill relating to certain discriminatory pricing practices affecting commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 568. A bill to amend the Second Liberty Bond Act so as to provide that, in issuing bonds under that act, preference shall be given to trust funds and other subscribers seeking to invest funds which represent real savings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 569. A bill to increase to 12 the number of members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and to provide that their terms of office shall be 6 years, and to abolish the Federal Open Market Committee and transfer its functions to such Board; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 570. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 571. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 572. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 573. A bill proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 574. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Old-Age and Retirement Benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 575. A bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 576. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25

minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 577. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 578. A bill to provide increases in the monthly rates of pension payable to veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 579. A bill to provide increases in the monthly rates of compensation and pension payable to certain veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 580. A bill to amend section 13 (c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to the exemption from the child-labor provisions of such act of certain employees employed in agriculture; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 581. A bill to allow certain members of the Armed Forces to designate the Eastern Orthodox faith as a religious preference on their identification tags; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 582. A bill to exempt States and political subdivisions thereof from the tax on conveyances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 583. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 584. A bill to incorporate the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 585. A bill to authorize the conveyance to Lake County, Calif., of the Lower Lake Rancheria; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 586. A bill to amend section 512 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide that certain veterans not now eligible for a direct housing loan may obtain such a loan; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 587. A bill to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 588. A bill to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean service period in combat or from an instrumentality of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 589. A bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to provide that education and training allowances paid to veterans pursuing institutional on-farm training shall not be reduced for 12 months after they have begun their training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 590. A bill to incorporate the Military Order of the Purple Heart, a national organization of combat wounded composed solely of Purple Hearters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 591. A bill to provide for the administration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 592. A bill to convey by quitclaim deed certain land to the county of Hill, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 593. A bill to convey by quitclaim deed certain land to the State of Texas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 594. A bill to provide for the enlargement of the Veterans' Administration facility at Fayetteville, Ark.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. R. 595. A bill to amend section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the maintenance of the Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 596. A bill to regulate the hours of service, compensatory time, and overtime in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 597. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718), as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 598. A bill to provide that the United States shall aid the States in wildlife-restoration projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 599. A bill to indemnify drivers of motor vehicles of the postal service against liability for damages arising out of the operation of such vehicles in the performance of official duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 600. A bill to authorize the construction of a new general medical-surgical hospital at the Veterans' Administration Center, Wood, Wis., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 601. A bill to encourage the States to hold preferential primary elections for the nomination of candidates for the office of President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 602. A bill to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to revise the boundary of the Mount McKinley National Park, in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes" (47 Stat. 68), approved March 19, 1932; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 603. A bill to amend the act of January 21, 1929, which relates to the grant of additional land for the support and maintenance of the University of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 604. A bill to provide port of entry and related facilities on the Alaska Highway at the Alaska-Canadian border in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 605. A bill to provide for the abolition of the 80-rod reserved spaces between claims on shore waters in Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 606. A bill to permit the sale of gold within the United States, its Territories and possessions, including Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 607. A bill to provide that lands reserved to the Territory of Alaska for educational purposes may be leased for periods not in excess of 55 years; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 608. A bill to make the workmen's compensation laws of Alaska applicable to land and premises of the United States in such Territory; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 609. A bill to amend the Federal Import Milk Act, approved February 15, 1927 (44 Stat. 1101, 21 U. S. C. Annotated, 141–149); to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 610. A bill to provide for the hospitalization and care of the mentally ill of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 611. A bill to amend subsection 3 (a) of the act approved August 8, 1947, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell timber within the Tongass National Forest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 612. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 613. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims for basic and overtime compensation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 614. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Government service, and for other purposes," approved August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 806) as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 615. A bill to define the word "Enemies" for the purpose of section 3 of article III of the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 616. A bill to provide that individuals who give aid and comfort to certain agents of foreign governments shall suffer fine or imprisonment, or both; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 617. A bill to prohibit the employment by the Government of the United States of persons who are disloyal or who believe in the right to strike against the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 618. A bill to authorize the withholding from the salaries of Government employees of amounts for certain charitable contributions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 619. A bill to provide that all United States currency shall bear the inscription "In God We Trust"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 620. A bill to permit members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and their dependents to occupy substandard quarters on a rental basis without loss of basic allowance for quarters; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 621. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harborworkers' Compensation Act so as to provide increased benefits in cases of disabling injuries and to require employers to pay attorneys' fees and witness fees in connection with certain proceedings under such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 622. A bill to provide for the release by the United States of its rights and interests in certain land located in Saginaw County, Mich.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 623. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 624. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to make it clear that the admissions tax does not apply to initiation fees and dues paid to Knife and Fork Clubs and similar organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 625. A bill to provide for the adjustment of tolls to be charged by the Wayland Special Road District No. 1 of Clark County, Mo., in the maintenance and operation of a toll bridge across the Des Moines River at or near Saint Francisville, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 626. A bill to amend the Federal Communications Act of 1934 so as to prohibit commercial sponsorship of televised or

radio coverage of congressional hearings or proceedings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 627. A bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 628. A bill to amend sections 1581, 1583, and 1584 of title 18, United States Code, so as to prohibit attempts to commit the offenses therein proscribed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 629. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 630. A bill creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 631. A bill to establish a program of grants to States for the development of fine arts programs and projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 632. A bill to amend the act which regulates the employment of minors within the District of Columbia so as to permit the employment of minors in television and motion picture productions on the same terms as minors are employed in stage performances; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 633. A bill to assure the provision of all necessary services to prepare disabled persons for and establish them in remunerative employment, to make special provision for the blind and other severely disabled persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 634. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 635. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment-insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 636. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 637. A bill to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 638. A bill to amend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to provide insured aged persons and their dependents, and survivors of deceased insured persons, with insurance against the cost of hospitalization; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 639. A bill to authorize the establishment of an Inventions Awards Board within the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 640. A bill to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 641. A bill to provide that no Senator or Representative shall be immune from civil liability for any defamatory statement inserted by him in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when such statement was not actually made in the Chamber of the Senate or House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 642. A bill to amend the Clayton Act, so as to provide that domestic corporations may be required by subpena to produce the records of their foreign affiliates and subsidiaries, to require that foreign corporations doing business in the United States register with the Secretary of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 643. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain widows and widowers of retired employees and certain widows of employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 644. A bill to increase the annual income limitations governing the payment of pension to certain veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 645. A bill to regulate commerce among the several States and with foreign nations, to regulate supply of crops and to thereby guard against famine and destitution in any part of the United States and its possessions and in other nations, to promote orderly marketing of crops, to insure against unduly depressive price levels, and to establish a board and corporations for such purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 646. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to relieve innocent purchasers of fungible goods converted by warehousemen from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 647. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the computation of net capital loss and net capital gain; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 648. A bill relating to the discharge status of members and former members of the Army Air Forces Enlisted Reserve Corps who have participated in the Civil Aeronautics Administration war-training-service program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 649. A bill making the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, in every even-numbered year, a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 650. A bill to amend section 216 of the Interstate Commerce Act, so as to provide that shippers may designate the routing of property transported by motor carriers in cases where two or more through routes have been established, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 651. A bill to provide for the procurement and installation of mechanism for recording and counting votes in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 652. A bill making the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, in every even-numbered year, a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 653. A bill to authorize a temporary program of Federal aid to public-school agencies for the construction of public elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 654. A bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 655. A bill to amend the Clayton Act with respect to the recovery of triple damages under the antitrust laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 656. A bill to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and children at the same rates as apply in the case of veterans of the Spanish-American War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 657. A bill to provide for promotion by merit of employees in the postal service and to establish uniform procedures for examination and appointment of candidates for promotion to supervisory positions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 658. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 659. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act with respect to the amount of active service which certain former members of the Armed Forces of the United States and its allies may be required to serve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 660. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 661. A bill to authorize private transactions involving the sale, acquisition, or holding of gold within the United States, its Territories and possessions, including Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 662. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 663. A bill to repeal the Immigration and Nationality Act of June 27, 1952, and to reenact all acts repealed or amended by the Immigration and Nationality Act of June 27, 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 664. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for widows or widowers of certain Federal employees who have rendered 35 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GARY (by request):

H. R. 665. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, effective for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1954, to provide a deduction from gross income for losses sustained by reason of voluntary demolition of a building, acquired with intent to demolish, by a taxpayer operating a trade or business, if the land upon which the demolished building stood is to be used in the trade or business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 666. A bill to amend the act increasing the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service in order to make such increase permanent; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 667. A bill to repeal section 10 of the act entitled "An act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1936 (the so-called Walsh-Healey Act); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 668. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide for transfer of cases between the district courts and the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 669. A bill to establish and maintain a domestic gold coin standard; to restore the right of American citizens to own gold and gold coins; to return control over the public purse to the people; to restrain further deterioration of our currency; to enable holders of paper money to redeem it in gold coin on demand; to open up foreign trade through the channels of private enterprise; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 670. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory

thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 671. A bill to provide that Imperial and San Diego Counties in the State of California shall constitute a new and separate judicial district to be known as the southern district of California, and to redesignate the present southern district of California as the middle district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 672. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by individuals, to promote thrift, and to stimulate expansion of employment through investment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 673. A bill to provide that a general assignment for benefit of creditors shall not constitute an act of bankruptcy unless connected with some other act of bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 674. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, so as to impose certain duties upon the importation of tunafish, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. R. 675. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1954 so as to continue and increase the consumption of fluid milk by children in nonprofit schools of high-school grade and under; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 676. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 72 to 70 the age beyond which deductions will not be made from benefits on account of outside earnings, and to liberalize the provisions under which such earnings are charged for purposes of such deductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 677. A bill to increase the salaries of Federal judges and the compensation of Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 678. A bill to provide for payment of an annuity to widows of Justices and judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 679. A bill to remove certain restrictions with respect to clerk hire for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 680. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 681. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to increase the deductions for personal exemptions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 682. A bill to withhold Federal aid from National Guard organizations which practice discrimination or segregation on account of race, color, or creed; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 683. A bill to amend title 18, Criminal Code, to declare certain papers, pamphlets, books, pictures, and writings nonmailable, to provide a penalty for mailing same, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 684. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 685. A bill to provide for the control and regulation of bank holding companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 686. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 687. A bill to establish a Federal policy concerning the termination, limitation, or establishment of business-type operations of the Government which may be conducted in competition with private enterprise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 688. A bill to establish a Commission on Tax Policy to study various methods for limiting the taxing, appropriating, spending, and borrowing powers of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 689. A bill to provide that newspapermen shall not be required to reveal the sources of their information in Federal courts or before committees of Congress, except where disclosure is found to be necessary in the interests of national security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 690. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 691. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 692. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of a special canceling stamp or postmarking die bearing the words "Pray for Peace", to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 693. A bill to amend section 112 (n) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that gain from the sale or exchange of the taxpayer's home will not be taxed whether or not he replaces it with another residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 694. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to relieve innocent purchasers of fungible goods converted by warehousemen from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 695. A bill to extend certain benefits to persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in Mexico or on its borders during the period beginning May 9, 1916, and ending April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 696. A bill to provide benefits under the Social Security Act for the survivors of certain individuals who died prior to 1940; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 697. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 698. A bill to increase the maximum travel allowance for postal transportation clerks, acting postal transportation clerks, and substitute postal transportation clerks; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 699. A bill to grant additional income-tax exemptions and deductions to taxpayers who are permanently disabled, and to allow additional income-tax exemptions to taxpayers supporting dependents who are permanently disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 700. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for permanently and totally disabled individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 701. A bill to increase the normal tax and surtax exemption, and the exemption for dependents from $600 to $800; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 702. A bill to protect the right of individuals to be free from discrimination or segregation by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 703. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 704. A bill to provide increases in the monthly rates of compensation payable to veterans with service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 705. A bill to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 706. A bill to exclude life-insurance payments from any source in the annual income computation for death-pension purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 707. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, 74th Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended, to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 708. A bill to amend the law granting education and training benefits to veterans of service on or after June 27, 1950, to extend the period during which such benefits may be offered; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 709. A bill to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide that psychoses or multiple sclerosis developing a 10 percent or more degree of disability within 3 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 710. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration center for domiciliary and chronic care at the Cushing Veterans' Administration Hospital at Framingham, Mass.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 711. A bill to provide additional time to disabled veterans for filing application for assistance in purchasing an automobile or other conveyance and to make such assistance available to certain disabled persons who have not been separated from the active service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 712. A bill to amend the veterans regulations to provide an increased statutory rate of compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of an eye in combination with the loss or loss of use of a limb; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 713. A bill to provide an educational grant to children of certain veterans who died of service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 714. A bill to provide greater security for veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection, in the granting of emergency hospital care by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 715. A bill to liberalize the definition of "widow of a World War I veteran" governing the payment of compensation or pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 716. A bill to amend the act of July 2, 1948 (Public Law 877, 80th Cong.), as amended, to include persons whose service-connected disability is rated not less than 40 percent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 717. A bill to amend the veterans regulations to provide that malignant tumors developing a 10 percent or more degree of disability within 2 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 718. A bill to authorize restoration of a remarried widow to the rolls upon termination of her remarried status; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 719. A bill to provide for the construction of certain Veterans' Administration hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 720. A bill to amend subparagraph (c), paragraph I, part I, of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to establish a presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases becoming manifest within 3 years from separation from service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 721. A bill to amend the World War Veterans Act, 1924, as amended, to mature United States Government life insurance when the insured becomes 70 years of age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 722. A bill to extend the direct loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to correspond to the expiration dates provided for guaranteed loans under such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 723. A bill to regulate the membership of sections of the Board of Veterans' Appeals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 724. A bill to provide that it shall be a misdemeanor to misbehave in the presence of either House of Congress, or any committee thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 725. A bill to provide that the carrying of a deadly weapon on or about the person in the presence of either House of Congress, or any committee thereof, shall be a felony, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 726. A bill to extend the application of the Classification Act of 1949 to certain positions in, and employees of, the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 727. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain land to the Pecwan Union School District for use as the site of a school; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 728. A bill to provide for the suspension by the President under certain circumstances of certain provisions of law embodying the buy-American principle; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 729. A bill to provide that a manufacturer or producer of nonbeverage products containing distilled spirits shall not be required to pay the tax imposed on such spirits by section 2800 of the Internal Revenue Code if he is appropriately licensed and bonded, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 730. A bill to prevent persons who engage in activities contrary to the interest of the United States from pursuing a course of education or training in a foreign country under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 731. A bill to extend the direct loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to correspond to the expiration dates provided for guaranteed loans under such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 732. A bill to amend the veterans regulations to provide an increased statutory rate of compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of an eye in combination with the loss or loss of use of a limb; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 733. A bill to extend the time for filing application by certain disabled veterans for payment on the purchase price of an automobile or other conveyance and to authorize assistance in acquiring automobiles or other conveyances to certain disabled persons who have not been separated from the active service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 734. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make a full and complete investigation and study of the effect the education and training benefits furnished veterans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 have had; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 735. A bill to increase the rate of special pension payable to certain persons awarded the Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 736. A bill to provide that compensation of veterans for service-connected disability, rated 20 percent or less disabling, shall be paid quarterly rather than monthly; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H. R. 737. A bill to authorize the Farm Credit Administration to make loans of the type formerly made by the Land Bank Commissioner; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 738. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act which reduce the annuities of the spouses of retired employees, and the survivors of deceased employees, by the amount of certain monthly benefits payable under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 739. A bill to provide the death penalty in certain cases of peacetime espionage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 740. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to include in the definition of "agriculture" the maintenance and operation of ditches, canals, reservoirs, and waterways when maintained and operated for farming purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 741. A bill to require Federal officers, agencies, and employees to act in accordance with and submit to the laws of the several States relative to the control, appropriation, use, and distribution of water and providing that the United States shall sue and be sued in the courts of such State in litigation arising therefrom; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 742. A bill to terminate executive power to authorize the appointment to a permanent position in the classified civil service of any specified individual who has not passed a competitive examination; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 743. A bill making it unlawful for any Member of the Congress of the United States of America to receive or accept any part of the salary, directly or indirectly, of any person employed by him in the discharge of his official duties whose compensation is paid by the United States, providing a penalty therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 744. A bill making it a criminal offense for any officer of the Armed Forces or any member of the Armed Forces or any member of the Chiefs of Staff to take retaliatory measures against any officer or enlisted man in the Armed Forces of the United States for any testimony he gives or answer he makes under oath before any committee of the Congress, providing a penalty therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 745. A bill to prohibit certain reservations of mineral interests by Federal land banks, the Land Bank Commissioner, and the Federal Farm Mortgage Association, and to provide for disposition of certain mineral interests heretofore reserved by them; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 746. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that annuities received under the Civil Service Retirement Act shall be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 747. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to permit individuals entitled to old-age or survivors insurance benefits to earn $100 a month without deductions being made from their benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 748. A bill to provide marketing quotas for certain agricultural commodities measured in terms of quantity rather than acreage, to establish a program of price support based on such quotas, to provide that such commodities may be marketed in excess of such quotas without penalty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 749. A bill to authorize the payment of damages to the landowners of certain drainage districts in Missouri, arising from the construction and operation of navigation pools in the Mississippi River, to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 750. A bill providing for construction of a highway, and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 751. A bill to extend and improve the old-age and survivors insurance system, to provide permanent and total disability insurance and rehabilitation benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 752. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to suspend deportation and admit for permanent residence under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act certain aliens who have served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 753. A bill to amend the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 754. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, 74th Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces in the Philippine Islands during hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 755. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Polk County, Iowa, and described as Camp Dodge, to the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 756. A bill to relieve persons in the military service from refunding to the United States the amount of life-insurance premiums, and interest thereon, guaranteed under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 757. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Social Security Act to eliminate those provisions which restrict the right of a spouse or survivor to receive benefits simultaneously under both acts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 758. A bill to provide for representation of independent labor organizations on the Wage Stabilization Board, Economic Stabilization Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 759. A bill to increase the amount of wages that may be earned by individuals entitled to old-age and survivors insurance benefit payments under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 760. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 761. A bill to amend section 124 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H. R. 762. A bill to authorize the admission into evidence in certain criminal proceedings of information intercepted in national security investigations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 763. A bill to provide that certain lands acquired by the United States shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as national forest lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 764. A bill to provide for emergency Federal financial assistance to the States and Territories in the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities urgently needed because of overcrowding, and to encourage full and efficient use of State and local resources in meeting school construction needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 765. A bill to amend section 5 (a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain unfair methods of competition in connection with the sale of manufactured products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 766. A bill to designate the lakes created by the McNary Dam, the John Day Dam, and the Dalles Dam in the Columbia River, Oreg., and Washington, as Lake Wallula, Lake Umatilla, and Lake Celilo, respectively; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 767. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Fort Larned as a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 768. A bill to authorize Federal payments to enable the States to expand their school-construction programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 769. A bill to provide that the declaration of attorney or agent executed by a person who prepares an estate tax return need not state that it is executed under penalties of perjury and need not imply any expression of opinion as to the value of items listed in the return; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 770. A bill for the relief of the State of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 771. A bill to provide that failure of any officer or employee of the United States to answer certain questions shall result in removal from his position or office; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 772. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that all quota numbers not used in any year shall be made available to immigrants in oversubscribed areas in the following year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 773. A bill to provide for the erection of a memorial to the four heroic chaplains who sacrificed their lives in the sinking of the steamship *Dorchester*; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 774. A bill to provide uniformity in the rates of disability compensation payable to certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 775. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the unauthorized wearing, manufacture, or sale of medals and badges awarded by the War Department," as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 776. A bill to prevent citizens of the United States of questionable loyalty to the United States Government from accepting any office or employment in or under the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 777. A bill to authorize in certain cases the appointment of special counsel and investigators to assist grand juries in the exercise of their powers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 778. A bill to provide that each member of the bar of the highest court of a State or of a Federal court shall be eligible to practice before all administrative agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 779. A bill to indemnify drivers of motor vehicles of the postal service against liability for damages arising out of the operation of such vehicles in the performance of official duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 780. A bill to prescribe a method by which the Houses of Congress and their committees may invoke the aid of the courts in compelling the testimony of witnesses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (by request):

H. R. 781. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" to provide for a statute of limitations with respect to civil actions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 782. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to provisions governing notice of copyright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 783. A bill to punish the use of interstate commerce in furtherance of conspiracies to commit organized crime offenses against any of the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 784. A bill to revise the laws relating to the claims and services of former employees in matters affecting the Government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 785. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by individuals, to promote thrift, and to stimulate expansion of employment through investment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 786. A bill providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real properties owned by the United States of America or its agencies; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 787. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so that the taxes imposed under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system will not be imposed on account of service performed by individuals who have attained the age of 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 788. A bill to preserve seniority rights of 10-point preference eligibles in the postal service transferring from the position of letter carrier to clerk or from the position of clerk to letter carrier, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 789. A bill to improve the enforcement of laws pertaining to gambling by suppressing the transmission of certain gambling information; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 790. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 791. A bill to amend part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) so as to provide entitlement to educational benefits for those individuals who enlisted or reenlisted prior to October 6, 1945, on a same basis as for those individuals who enlisted or reenlisted within 1 year after October 6, 1945; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 792. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 793. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to provide for payment of overtime compensation to substitute employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 794. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws, establishing a uniform statute of limitations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 795. A bill to require persons who obtain commissions for rendering assistance in the obtaining of Government contracts to register with the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 796. A bill to provide for the credit of subscription charges or insurance premiums with respect to health or medical service plans or programs, or health or medical insurance for the purposes of the Federal income tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 797. A bill to amend chapter 19, title 5, of the United States Code, entitled "Administrative Procedure," so as to prohibit the employment by any person of any member, official, attorney, or employee of a Government agency except under certain conditions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 798. A bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 799. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, chapter 79, to add a new section, 1623, to extend the law relating to perjury to the willful giving of contradictory statements under oath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 800. A bill to amend section 1201 of title 18 of the United States Code to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation to initiate investigation of any kidnaping in which the victim has not been released within 24 hours after his seizure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 801. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide for certain disabled war veterans a deduction for income-tax purposes of necessary expenses for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 802. A bill to provide supplementary benefits for recipients of public assistance under Social Security Act programs through the issuance to such recipients of certificates to be used in the acquisition of surplus agricultural food products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 803. A bill to extend the time within which certain insane veterans may apply for insurance under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 804. A bill to provide a method of voting and to facilitate voting by members of the land, air, and naval forces, members of the merchant marine, and others absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 805. A bill to provide that the United States shall reimburse the States and their political subdivisions for real property taxes not collected on real property owned by a foreign government and therefore exempt from taxation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 806. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of a special canceling stamp or postmarking die bearing the words "In God We Trust"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 807. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 808. A bill to extend the benefits provided by title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to certain persons who served as technical advisers to the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 809. A bill to exempt graduates of the United States Merchant Marine Academy who hold commissions in the Naval Reserve from induction or service under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 810. A bill to exempt persons who served as cadets in the United States Merchant Marine Academy in excess of 90 days at sea beyond the continental limits of the United States between September 16, 1940, and September 2, 1945, from induction or service under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 811. A bill to establish the seniority status of employees in the field postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 812. A bill granting leave of absence to postal employees on account of death in family; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 813. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 814. A bill to change the designations of certain positions in the postal field service and Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 815. A bill to provide for the furnishing of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to members of the Federal judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 816. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, relating to resignation and retirement of judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 817. A bill to amend the penalty provisions of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 818. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Narcotics to require the production of books, papers, and records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 819. A bill to amend chapter 203 of title 18 of the United States Code, so as to extend certain powers, including the power of arrest, to narcotics officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 820. A bill to create a Federal Unemployment Relief Administration to relieve unemployment by providing work on local public improvement and maintenance projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 821. A bill to authorize, for a temporary period, the purchase by the Government of worsted fabric in amounts sufficient to maintain normal production and employment in the worsted-fabric industry, to promote the general national welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 822. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to provide that old-age assistance otherwise payable to an individual thereunder shall not be reduced on account of certain increases in any insurance benefits to which such individual is entitled under title II of such act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 823. A bill to create a United States Academy of Foreign Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 824. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 65 to 60 the age at which women may become entitled to benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 825. A bill to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 826. A bill to provide for the erection at the Memorial Avenue entrance to the Arlington National Cemetery of the sculptural piece known as The Last Farewell, and for the establishment of the Christopher Columbus Memorial Grove; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 827. A bill to amend various provisions of law with reference to employment of administrative assistants for Members of Congress, with regard to clerk hire for Members of Congress, with regard to official office expenses of Members of Congress, and to increase the compensation of Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 828. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code with respect to the eligibility of members of the bar of the United States Supreme Court to practice before all courts of appeals and district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 829. A bill to amend section 201 (c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to authorize the employment of administrative assistants by Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 830. A bill to provide that certain Government officers and employees shall be excused from duty for a sufficient period of time to vote in elections; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 831. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide that the surviving widows or widowers of retiring employees shall automatically be entitled to an annuity equal to 50 percent of the annuity earned by the retiring employee without requiring the retiring employees to elect to take reduced annuities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 832. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1948, so as to provide that disability and death benefits based on military service shall be excluded from net income in establishing rents for certain low-rent housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 833. A bill to amend section 41 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 834. A bill to extend the authority of the American Battle Monuments Commission to all areas in which the Armed Forces of the United States have conducted operations since April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 835. A bill to provide for intensified research into the causes, hazards, and effects of air pollution, and the methods for its prevention and control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 836. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to increase the penalties presently applicable, and to authorize the imposition of the death penalty, in the case of persons convicted of certain subversive activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 837. A bill to amend section 2 (a) of the act of April 6, 1949, so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to farmers or stockmen to assist in orderly marketing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 838. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to require that all decisions of the Supreme Court shall be participated in by the full Court, and that any vacancies or absences in the membership of the Court shall be temporarily filled by circuit judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 839. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to reduce to 60 years the age at which women may qualify for old-age and survivors insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 840. A bill to provide for programs of public facilities construction which will stimulate employment in areas having a substantial surplus of labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 841. A bill to provide for closer supervision of the costs of constructing irrigation and reclamation projects, and projects in the Territories and possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 842. A bill granting increases in the annuities of certain former civilian officials and employees engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 843. A bill to make certain changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 844. A bill to incorporate the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 845. A bill to reduce the rate of tax on transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 846. A bill to extend the rights, benefits, and privileges granted to World War II veterans to certain citizens of the United States who entered the armed forces of governments allied with the United States during World War II, and to their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 847. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit accelerated amortization with respect to certain facilities constructed or acquired in foreign countries which will help make available to foreign investors and labor the economic benefits of American production, distribution, and management techniques; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 848. A bill to increase acreage allotments for the 1955 crops of cotton so that the allotment for each farm shall be at least equal to its allotment for the 1954 crop; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 849. A bill to provide that the titles and grades of officers of the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service shall correspond to the grades of officers in the Navy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H. R. 850. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, so as to eliminate the 3 percent absorption requirement; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 851. A bill authorizing the modification of the general plan for the comprehensive development of the White River Basin

to provide for additional hydroelectric power development, for the control of floods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 852. A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 853. A bill to provide for research into and development of practical means for the production of alumina, abrasives, refractories, and cements from domestic clays in the interests of national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 854. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 855. A bill to extend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to individuals engaged in the practice of law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 856. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide full annuities, at compensation of half salary or wages based on the 5 highest years of earnings, for individuals who have completed 35 years of service or have attained the age of 60; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 857. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act to provide that the annuity of the widow of a deceased employee shall not be reduced on account of any benefits to which she may be entitled under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 858. A bill to provide that railroad employees may retire on a full annuity at age 60 or after serving 30 years; to provide that such annuity for any month shall be not less than one-half of the individual's average monthly compensation for the 5 years of highest earnings; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 859. A bill to provide for a 25-percent increase in the annuities and pensions payable to railroad employees and to their survivors; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 860. A bill to provide for programs of public facilities construction which will stimulate employment in areas having a substantial surplus of labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 861. A bill to provide temporary unemployment benefits to certain individuals who have, or will have, exhausted their rights to benefits for days of unemployment under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act in the year ending June 30, 1955; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 862. A bill amendment to prohibit State plan provisions requiring transfer to State of title or control of property or a lien or other encumbrance for purpose of recovery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 863. A bill to provide for the distribution of certain surplus food commodities to needy persons in the United States, by use of a food stamp plan; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 864. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to provide a permanent procedure for adjustment of tariff rates on a selective basis, to regulate the flow of imported articles on a basis of fair competition with domestic articles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT (by request):

H. R. 865. A bill to repeal certain laws directing the Postmaster General, with the consent of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to reform the classification, rates of postage, weight and size limits, zones, and other conditions of mailability of fourth-class mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 866. A bill to provide an additional method for computing certain benefits payable under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to persons who continue their employment after sustaining injury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 867. A bill to authorize the admission into evidence in certain criminal proceedings of information intercepted in national security investigations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. J. Res. 1. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. J. Res. 2. Joint resolution amending the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to provide for the adjudication by a Commissioner of claims of American nationals against the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics," approved August 4, 1939; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to empower Congress to regulate the use and ownership of trade-marks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. J. Res. 4. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. J. Res. 5. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. J. Res. 6. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the term of office of Members of the House of Representatives shall be 4 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. J. Res. 7. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the United States Department of Labor to report periodically on labor conditions in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. BUCHANAN:

H. J. Res. 8. Joint resolution designating March 30 of each year as "Shut-In's Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 9. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the nomination of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 10. Joint resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Subversive Activities; to the Committee on Rules.

H. J. Res. 11. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. J. Res. 12. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the right of citizens of the United States 18 years of age or older to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. J. Res. 13. Joint resolution providing for the American Joint Commission to assist in the unification of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution directing the President to sever trade relations with the Soviet Union, Communist China, and their satellites; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution providing that the next transport-type vessel commissioned in the United States Navy shall be named the *Paul Revere;* to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. J. Res.16. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the power of Congress to impose income taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. J. Res. 17. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the term of office and qualifications of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

H. J. Res. 19. Joint resolution declaring Inauguration Day to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 20. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal memorial commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. J. Res. 21. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal memorial commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution empowering Congress to provide by legislation for representation in the Congress of, and for granting the right to vote for presidential and vice presidential electors to, the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. J. Res. 23. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the ratification of treaties by the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. J. Res. 24. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim Sunday, April 3, 1955, as a day of prayer for the Man and Woman in White; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. J. Res. 25. Joint resolution declaring the right of sovereignty of the United States over certain areas of the Antarctic Continent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. J. Res. 26. Joint resolution to compensate for estimated underplanting of the 1955 cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. J. Res. 27. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of

treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 28. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to service in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. J. Res. 29. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution with respect to the admission of new States as sovereign States of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. J. Res. 30. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to authorize Congress, in admitting any new State, to limit its representation in the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 31. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide that a new State may be admitted only pursuant to the procedure established by the Constitution for amending the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 32. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that Federal expenditures shall not exceed Federal revenues, except in time of war or grave national emergency declared by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. J. Res. 33. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 34. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to fix the number of Justices of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 35. Joint resolution designating the first Tuesday of March of each year as National Teachers Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. J. Res. 36. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America providing for a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution to create a Great Lakes Water Level Commission; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. J. Res. 39. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 40. Joint resolution to provide for an increased acreage allotment for the 1955 cotton crop; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. J. Res. 41. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

H. J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the International Joint Commission on United States-Canadian boundary waters to make a survey of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. J. Res. 43. Joint resolution to extend emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen in disaster areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. J. Res. 44. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. J. Res. 45. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Science; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. J. Res. 46. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to provide for the adjudication by a commissioner of claims of American nationals against the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics," approved August 4, 1939; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Planning Committee for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to redefine treason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 49. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discover of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. J. Res. 50. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to enable the Congress, in aid of the common defense, to function effectively in time of emergency or disaster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 52. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating Memorial Day, 1955, as a day for a nationwide prayer for peace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 53. Joint resolution designating November 19, the anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, as Dedication Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 54. Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday in September of each year as Interfaith Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 55. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval of items in general appropriation bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 56. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. J. Res. 57. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, of a permanent memorial to the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. J. Res. 58. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday in June of each year as Shut-In's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the effect of treaties and international agreements upon the civil and property rights of citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 61. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday of June of each year as National Teachers Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. J. Res. 62. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the International Joint Commission on United States-Canadian boundary waters to make a survey of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution declaring that the Yalta agreement is no longer binding on the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 64. Joint resolution to provide that the United States shall withhold from representatives of foreign nations privileges which such nations withhold from representatives of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. J. Res. 65. Joint resolution placing certain individuals who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, and in the islands of Leyte and Samar after July 4, 1902, and their survivors, in the same status as those who served in the Armed Forces during the Philippine Insurrection and their survivors; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MASON:

H. J. Res. 66. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to prohibitions upon the giving or lending of property of the United States to any foreign government or international governmental organization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the taxing and spending powers of the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 68. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON:

H. J. Res. 69. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the International Joint Commission on United States-Canadian boundary waters to make a survey of the proposed Passamaquody tidal power project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. J. Res. 70. Joint resolution to provide for the conversion of the Newington Veterans' Administration Hospital, Connecticut, to a hospital for the treatment of neuropsychiatric patients; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution to constitute the Federal Civil Defense Administration an executive department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. J. Res. 72. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal memorial commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution to increase 1955 cotton allotments of certain farms receiving 5 acres or less; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAY:

H. J. Res. 74. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal memorial commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. J. Res. 75. Joint resolution to constitute the Federal Civil Defense Administration an executive department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution authorizing the formulation and carrying out of a program for sending freedom messages behind the Iron Curtain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution designating the 3d day of February in each year as "Dorchester Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 78. Joint resolution designating the period beginning August 10 and ending August 16 of each year as Orphans Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. J. Res. 79. Joint resolution declaring Inauguration Day to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 80. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11, 1955, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 81. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. J. Res. 83. Joint resolution designating the third Sunday in June of each year as Father's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution to provide for the creation of an international food reserve; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for a term of 4 years for Representatives in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. J. Res. 87. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require the apportionment of Representatives among the several States on the basis of the number of citizens of the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 88. Joint resolution providing for continuation of the emergency hay program of the Department of Agriculture until April 30, 1955; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. J. Res. 89. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution to grant to the State of Oklahoma consent to sue the United States in the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 91. Joint resolution to establish a National Children's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim January 30 of each year Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the birth of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the 31st President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the right of citizens of the United States 18 years of age or older to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIER:

H. J. Res. 94. Joint resolution placing certain individuals who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, and in the islands of Leyte and Samar after July 4, 1902, and their survivors, in the same status as those who served in the Armed Forces during the Philippine Insurrection, and their survivors; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution proposing a code of ethics for Government service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROWNSON:

H. Con. Res. 3. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 4. Concurrent resolution to amend the rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. Con. Res. 5. Concurrent resolution favoring universal disarmament; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution to provide protection for communities along the shores of the Great Lakes against damage from changes in water levels resulting from projects authorized and approved by the International Joint Commission; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution requesting the International Joint Commission to amend its order of approval of the St. Lawrence power project to specify the range of water levels to be maintained in Lake Ontario; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. Con. Res. 8. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the arrest, trial, and imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty, of Hungary; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution to express the condemnation of the people of the United States of religious and political persecutions behind the Iron Curtain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution to express the condemnation of the people of the United States of religious and political persecutions behind the Iron Curtain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain secret agreements; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 13. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the return of 944 American prisoners of war who have not been accounted for by the Communists; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution favoring universal disarmament; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Con. Res. 15. Concurrent resolution providing for support of the credit of the United States of America by the Federal Reserve System; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution favoring universal disarmament; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution providing a code of ethics for Government service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the meetings of the United Nations Assembly, and similar world organizations of which the United States is a member, should be opened with prayer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that a civilian physical fitness and training program should be established in the interest of national security; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. Con. Res. 20. Concurrent resolution promoting through the United Nations an effective and enforceable system of worldwide disarmament and calling for a crusade for world peace and freedom; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Con. Res. 21. Concurrent resolution providing for the creation of a Joint Committee on Consumer Interests; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent resolution providing for the creation of a joint committee to study and investigate all matters pertaining to the election of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BECKER:

H. Con. Res. 23. A bill providing that the United States mission to the United Nations shall take such steps as might be necessary to have each day's session in the United Nations opened with a prayer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. Con. Res. 24. A bill setting aside the Charter of the United Nations as approved by the Senate under alleged treaty powers, which approval was unconstitutional and void; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. Res. 17. Resolution to provide a residence for pages; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. Res. 18. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the Civil Aeronautics Board; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 19. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies in the conduct of hearings before committees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 20. Resolution providing a code of fair procedure for the committees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 21. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 22. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COLE:

H. Res. 23. Resolution providing for a page matron, to supervise the housing welfare of the pages of the House; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. Res. 24. Resolution creating a select committee to inquire into the commercial and proprietary activities of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. Res. 25. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives so as to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Independent Unions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DIES:

H. Res. 26. Resolution proposing a special committee to investigate public property; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. Res. 27. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to investigate recent policies, practices, and procedures which have had or will have the effect of weakening the protections afforded by the civil-service laws and related statutes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. Res. 28. Resolution appointing a committee to investigate governmental contributions to the spread of communism; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. Res. 29. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the movement and shipment of unlawful narcotics into the United States, its Territories and possessions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. Res. 30. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 31. Resolution providing funds for the expenses of the investigations authorized by House Resolution 30; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. Res. 32. Resolution providing for the unity of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. Res. 33. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the subsidies paid by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 34. Resolution providing funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 33; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HARDY:

H. Res. 35. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the benefits provided under Federal law for the surviving dependents of deceased members and former members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia:

H. Res. 36. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the selective service system; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. Res. 37. Resolution creating a special committee to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of educational and philanthropic foundations and other comparable organizations which are exempt from Federal income taxation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. Res. 38. Resolution to amend the rules of the House to provide that the pledge of allegiance to the flag shall be rendered at the beginning of each day's sitting; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. Res. 39. Resolution creating a select committee to inspect the gold reserve at Fort Knox and other places; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 40. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the distribution of pornographic materials; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. Res. 41. Resolution authorizing inquiry into manner of selecting candidates for the United States Military and Naval Academies; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. Res. 42. Resolution providing a code of fair procedure for the committees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 43. Resolution to provide for the unity of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 44. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the illegal imprisonment of 13 Americans by the Chinese Communist Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. Res. 45. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the more frequent display of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. Res. 46. Resolution for the relief of Daniel Marsh; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. Res. 47. Resolution to affirm the American people's opposition to the Communist enslavement of captive nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Res. 48. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the operation of accident, health, and hospitalization insurance companies, associations, societies, and funds; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 49. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies and investigations authorized by H. Res. 48; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 50. Resolution to increase personal income-tax exemptions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. Res. 51. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to discharge of committees; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 52. Resolution to authorize the House Commitee on Banking and Currency, or a subcommittee thereof, to conduct an investigation and study of the housing situation, and the operation of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and all its subsidiaries and affiliates, throughout the United States, its Territories and possessions; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 53. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Banking and Currency, or a subcommittee thereof, to investigate and study the need of a permanent domestic tin-smelting industry, and related problems; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. Res. 54. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of employment problems of American citizens who are between the ages of 40 and 65; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 55. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 56. Resolution providing for a committee to consider removal of the United States Capitol or providing a supplemental Capitol; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. Res. 57. Resolution for the study and investigation of health and sanitary conditions in the commercial slaughtering and processing of poultry; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. Res. 58. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House to provide that the pledge of allegiance to the flag shall be recited annually by the Members of the House, led by the Speaker, on Flag Day, June 14, when the House is in session; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RAY:

H. Res. 59. Resolution for the appointment of a committee to investigate governmental contributions to the spread of communism; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. Res. 60. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the subsidies paid by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. Res. 61. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House in respect to investigative procedure; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. Res. 62. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives so as to impose certain limitations with respect to action on appropriation bills other than those which provide appropriations for support of the Government pursuant to the budget; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Res. 63. Resolution to conduct an inspection of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 64. Resolution providing for the printing of a compilation of veterans' laws; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YATES:

H. Res. 65. Resolution authorizing the creation of a select committee on problems of the aging; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 66. Resolution providing for a code of fair procedure for committees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Res. 67. Resolution condemning action of the Soviet regime in Poland in taxing gift packages from the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 68. Resolution designating October 11, 1955, to commemorate the death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 868. A bill for the relief of Kazuo Zajiki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 869. A bill for the relief of David Del Guidice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 870. A bill for the relief of Hildegart Liselotte Budesheim and her minor child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 871. A bill for the relief of Generoso Paglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 872. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Saccatti Salliani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 873. A bill for the relief of Angelina Lanza Buldo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 874. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anne P. Perceval; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 875. A bill for the relief of Buonaventura Giannone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 876. A bill for the relief of Alberto Dal Bello and Mrs. Dina Bristot Dal Bello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 877. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose Amoresano and her children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 878. A bill for the relief of Stefano Fiore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 879. A bill for the relief of Margers Nulle-Siecenieks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 880. A bill for the relief of Paul Y. Loong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 881. A bill for the relief of Gabriella Sardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 882. A bill for the relief of Paul I. Kier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 883. A bill for the relief of Markos Demetrius Spanos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 884. A bill for the relief of Charles H. Skidmore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 885. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Drina Sinovcic and Vincence (Vincent) Sinovcic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 886. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mounira E. Medlej; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 887. A bill for the relief of Filippo Iuliucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 888. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elsa Danes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 889. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Luisa Gallegos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 890. A bill for the relief of Eliseo Felix Hernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 891. A bill for the relief of Alberto Cortez Cortez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 892. A bill for the relief of Elpidio A. Aliga and Mrs. Fernandina C. Aliga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 893. A bill for the relief of John Mathewdakis, Mrs. Sophie Mathewdakis, and Helen Mathewdakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 894. A bill for the relief of Wong Kam Hong and Ida Susan Wong, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 895. A bill for the relief of Maria Edda Ferigni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 896. A bill to provide preference right to certain land in Alaska to Joseph Booth of Anchorage, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 897. A bill to provide preference right to certain land in Alaska to Robert Henry Soyk of Kenai, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 898. A bill to provide for the issuance of an unrestricted deed to Mrs. Edith Hollywood, of Sitka, Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 899. A bill to authorize and direct the sale of certain land in Alaska to Oscar H. Vogel, of Anchorage, Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 900. A bill for the relief of Eugene B. Lowman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 901. A bill to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to Kenneth B. Laughlin, of Anchorage, Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 902. A bill to provide preference right to certain land in Alaska to Patrick Harold Johnson, of Anchor Point, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 903. A bill for the relief of Harold C. Nelson and Dewey L. Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 904. A bill to provide preference right to certain land in Alaska to Bert Arthur Paraday, of Anchor Point, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 905. A bill to provide preference right to certain land in Alaska to Carl E. Robinson, of Anchor Point, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 906. A bill for the relief of William Martin, of Tok Junction, Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 907. A bill for the relief of Justin G. Maile and Theodore R. Hilbig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 908. A bill for the relief of August J. Strigga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 909. A bill for the relief of Charles O. Ferry and other employees of the Alaska Road Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 910. A bill to authorize and direct the sale of certain land in Alaska to John Ekonomos, of the Fairbanks Precinct, Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 911. A bill for the relief of Gloria Minoza Medellin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 912. A bill for the relief of Jaffa Kam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 913. A bill for the relief of Hildegard Noble; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 914. A bill for the relief of Erika Marie Dietl and her two children, Caroline Dietl and Robert Dietl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 915. A bill for the relief of Hajna Sepsi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 916. A bill for the relief of Joseph Di Folco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 917. A bill for the relief of Maria Gersos, Demetrious Gersos, and Afority Gersos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 918. A bill for the relief of Olga Siapkaris and her four children, Maria Siapkaris, Pantelis Siapkaris, Kastas Siapkaris, and Thomas Siapkaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 919. A bill for the relief of Felix D. Barlow, Fredrico Barlow, and Felicia Barlow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 920. A bill for the relief of Angel Shirvanian Aykanian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 921. A bill for the relief of Chia-Tseng Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 922. A bill for the relief of Antonio Calvanese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 923. A bill for the relief of Dr. Danuta Oktawliec; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 924. A bill for the relief of Joseph Marrali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 925. A bill for the relief of Benito Vargas Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. R. 926. A bill for the relief of Bruno Michael Kiuru; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 927. A bill for the relief of George Tyson Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 928. A bill for the relief of Eugenio Maida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON:

H. R. 929. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Del Mul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWNSON:

H. R. 930. A bill for the relief of John Daniel Popa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 931. A bill for the relief of Haseep Milhem Esper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 932. A bill for the relief of Ludwika Hedy Hancock (nee Nikolajewicz); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON (by request):

H. R. 933. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chii Sugiura, Motoko Sugiura, Atsushi Sugiura, and Kumi Sugiura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE:

H. R. 934. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emmy Rothe Hirsch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 935. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marion Josephine Monnell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 936. A bill authorizing and requesting the President to award the Legion of Merit posthumously to Maj. William V. Holohan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 937. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. George Holden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 938. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elena Apostolescu Bustiuc; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 939. A bill for the relief of Laura Safir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 940. A bill for the relief of Kam-Kwan Kwok and son, Chin-Lin Kwok, also known as Frank Chin Lin Kwok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 941. A bill for the relief of Zoe Zitsa Casanova, also known as Zoe Riginos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 942. A bill for the relief of the Ragheb family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 943. A bill for the relief of Luzie Biondo (Luzie M. Schmidt); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 944. A bill for the relief of Nicola Teodosio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 945. A bill for the relief of Erna Zenau and her minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 946. A bill for the relief of Carroll O. Switzer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 947. A bill for the relief of Carl E. Edwards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 948. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Homer G. Hamilton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 949. A bill for the relief of Alma Wharff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 950. A bill for the relief of Margaretha Gooden, of Munich, Germany, and her minor children, Ronald Gooden and Marjorie Gooden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 951. A bill for the relief of Sfc. Celestino Abellar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 952. A bill for the relief of Frank Kreft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 953. A bill for the relief of Peter G. Coutavas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 954. A bill for the relief of Janis Lamberts and Pauline Leontine Lamberts, his wife, and Harold Lamberts and Arnis Lamberts, their minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 955. A bill for the relief of M. Sgt. Robert A. Espe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 956. A bill for the relief of Mary Sears; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 957. A bill for the relief of Dr. Cristjo Cristofv, Jordana Dilova Cristofv, his

wife, and his children, George and Daphne-Kremena Cristofv; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 958. A bill for the relief of Howard Carl Kaiser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 959. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Harriet Sakayo Hamamoto Dewa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 960. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Stanley J. Nietupski and Sarah Jane Nietupski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 961. A bill for the relief of Guy Robert Gordon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 962. A bill for the relief of Maria Louise Andreis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 963. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dvora Gershkovitz and Moisha Gershkovitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 964. A bill for the relief of Chiara Drew (nee Mazzocato); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 965. A bill for the relief of Shukri Elias Ajlouni (Ajluni); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 966. A bill for the relief of Antonio Alvarez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 967. A bill for the relief of Frank S. Aquilina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 968. A bill for the relief of Max Kozlowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD (by request):

H. R. 969. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Thomas L. Davidson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 970. A bill for the relief of Kyung Ho Park (Syung Sil Park) and his wife, Mrs. Young Sil Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 971. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Erato Aranopoulou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 972. A bill for the relief of Ana De Moura Lopes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 973. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Dowds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 974. A bill for the relief of Emery Geller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 975. A bill for the relief of Francesco Mibelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 976. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Franciska Mihalka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 977. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Hillier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 978. A bill for the relief of Jose Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 979. A bill for the relief of Aurelio (Mitjans) Amor (also known as Aurelio Amor Mitjans); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 980. A bill for the relief of Nicolas Schwartz and Vera Schwartz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 981. A bill for the relief of Mendel Kuchcik and Civia Kuchcik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 982. A bill for the relief of Erna H. Gleissner and her minor son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 983. A bill for the relief of Lawrence Edward Noonan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 984. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lycourgos E. Papadakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 985. A bill for the relief of Shamail Shamilzadeh, Shoushan Shamilzadeh, David Shamilzadeh, and Bila Shamilzadeh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 986. A bill for the relief of Shlomo Meyersdorf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 987. A bill for the relief of Antonio Scorza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 988. A bill for the relief of Susanne Fellner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 989. A bill for the relief of Dr. Louis J. Sebille; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 990. A bill for the relief of Takako Riu Reich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 991. A bill for the relief of Mohamed Abdul Kerim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 992. A bill for the relief of Dr. Bela Anthony L. C. H. de Tolnay, otherwise known as Dr. Louis Tolnay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 993. A bill to provide for the extension of a certain patent relating to one-piece dresses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 994. A bill for the relief of Yuriko Ito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 995. A bill for the relief of Frieda Quiring and Tina Quiring; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 996. A bill for the relief of Robert Francis Symons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 997. A bill for the relief of Irmgard Emilie Krepps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 998. A bill for the relief of Meiko Shikibu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 999. A bill for the relief of Nurith Spier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 1000. A bill for the relief of Leslie A. Batdorf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 1001. A bill for the relief of Hipolito C. DeBaca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1002. A bill for the relief of L. S. Goedeke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1003. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lorenza O'Malley (de Amusategui), Jose Maria de Amusategui O'Malley, and the legal guardian of Ramon de Amusategui O'Malley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 1004. A bill for the relief of Eugene Paul Cohen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 1005. A bill for the relief of Alice Duckett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1006. A bill for the relief of Theodoros Symeonidis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1007. A bill for the relief of Leuntje Jansens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 1008. A bill for the relief of Alexander Turchaninova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1009. A bill for the relief of William Ligh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 1010. A bill for the relief of Miss Else Widdel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 1011. A bill for the relief of Edith Mary Thom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1012. A bill for the relief of Federico Ungar Finaly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1013. A bill for the relief of Vytautas Stanislau Bacevicius; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDY:

H. R. 1014. A bill for the relief of Chung Fook Yee Chung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia (by request):

H. R. 1015. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Derfery William Wright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 1016. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ida Bifolchini Boschetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1017. A bill for the relief of Maria Teresita Reyes Derouin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1018. A bill for the relief of You Soo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1019. A bill for the relief of Casimir Krzyzanowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1020. A bill for the relief of Boris Ivanovitch Oblesow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1021. A bill for the relief of Amalia Teresa Delfin y Noyes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1022. A bill for the relief of Antonio Andrea Chitato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1023. A bill for the relief of Natan and Anna Berenholz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESS:

H. R. 1024. A bill for the relief of Tokiyo Nakajima and her child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 1025. A bill for the relief of Osborne W. Rutherford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1026. A bill for the relief of Isabelle Choueiri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 1027. A bill for the relief of Pacifica Alido Boco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1028. A bill for the relief of Melina Bonton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1029. A bill for the relief of Froylan Lira-Gonzales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1030. A bill for the relief of J. Ross Reed, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1031. A bill for the relief of Peter H. J. Fiek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1032. A bill for the relief of Ludwig, Isabel, and Milly Model; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1033. A bill for the relief of Carlo Panno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1034. A bill for the relief of Erwin S. DeMoskonyi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1035. A bill for the relief of Julia Meszaros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1036. A bill for the relief of Robert Wellington McClintock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1037. A bill for the relief of Ian McKay Valentine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1038. A bill for the relief of Marie Jeanne Lapierre O'Donnell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1039. A bill for the relief of Mary Ann Wilkinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS (by request):

H. R. 1040. A bill for the relief of Vittorio Alinolfi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 1041. A bill for the relief of Hebbani Krishnamurthi Jairaj; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1042. A bill for the relief of Hector Mokhtarian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1043. A bill for the relief of George Fusek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1044. A bill for the relief of Teresa Alice Townsend; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1045. A bill for the relief of Rolf Peter Weber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1046. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Szabo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 1047. A bill for the relief of Armenouhi Assadour Artinian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 1048. A bill for the relief of Christine Susan Caiado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1049. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Partheniades; his wife, Catherine; and their son, Constantine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1050. A bill for the relief of Aba Szejnbejm, Mrs. Dvora Szejnbejm, Shlmo Szejnbejm, and Daniel Szejnbejm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN (by request):

H. R. 1051. A bill for the relief of Zsuzsanna (Suzanne) Szekely; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1052. A bill for the relief of Habibollah and Nona Y. Z. V. Farahnik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1053. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Vartzar Avedian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1054. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Koung-Shin Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 1055. A bill for the relief of Ng May Ngon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1056. A bill for the relief of Jose Maria Vilas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1057. A bill for the relief of Donata Giorgio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1058. A bill for the relief of Joseph (Giuseppe) Ventura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1059. A bill for the relief of Osmo Lehtinen; his wife, Hilkka; and their children, Erja and Tarja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 1060. A bill for the relief of Grace Casquite Hwang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 1061. A bill for the relief of Mario Angelini and Mrs. Anna Maria Sodani Angelini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1062. A bill for the relief of Luigi Cianci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1063. A bill for the relief of Bogdan Chylinski (also known as Dennis Bogdan Chylinski); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1064. A bill for the relief of Richard Karl Hoffmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1065. A bill for the relief of Walter E. Durham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1066. A bill for the relief of Shaikh Abdullah Galedary, Mrs. Zinat Rafii Galedary, Lili Galedary, and Mahsheed Galedary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1067. A bill for the relief of the estate of David Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1068. A bill for the relief of Michael Logothetis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1069. A bill for the relief of Hussein Kamel Moustafa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1070. A bill for the relief of Luigi Santovito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1071. A bill for the relief of Inge (Ines) K. Lang and Liselott (Lilo) K. Lang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1072. A bill for the relief of Clyde M. Litton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1073. A bill for the relief of Miguel Ulloa Reynoso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1074. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Esther Chan Lee (Eta Lee); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1075. A bill for the relief of Yvette Sassoon Safdeye; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1076. A bill for the relief of Sriramamurti Venkata Yadavalli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1077. A bill for the relief of Tony Ion Bonescu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES:

H. R. 1078. A bill for the relief of Dr. Robert C. Jalbuena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1079. A bill for the relief of George C. Sayo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1080. A bill for the relief of Domenico Scaramuzzino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1081. A bill for the relief of Anna Tokatlian Gulezian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 1082. A bill for the relief of Golda I. Stegner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1083. A bill for the relief of Robert Shen-yen Hou-ming Lieu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1084. A bill for the relief of Dorothy Antonia (Suk-fong) Leong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 1085. A bill for the relief of Moses Aaron Butterman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1086. A bill for the relief of Mayer Rothbaum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 1087. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maisie K. Bartholomew (nee Fisher); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 1088. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Sciarrino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1089. A bill for the relief of Wieslaw Kiniczak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1090. A bill for the relief of Leo A. Ribitzki, Mrs. Charlotte Ribitzki, and Marion A. Ribitzki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1091. A bill for the relief of Dr. James Archibald Pabarue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (by request):

H. R. 1092. A bill for the relief of George Henry Mahoney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1093. A bill for the relief of Follett L. Greeno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1094. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Warren; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1095. A bill for the relief of Eber Bros. Wine & Liquor Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1096. A bill for the relief of Nathan Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1097. A bill for the relief of John Meredith McFarlane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1098. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Isolde Frohne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1099. A bill for the relief of Theodore J. Hartung and Mrs. Elizabeth Hartung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1100. A bill for the relief of Apostolos Vasili Percas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1101. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jennie Maurello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1102. A bill for the relief of Mrs. John H. Wagenblass; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1103. A bill for the relief of Nicola Mastrofilippo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1104. A bill for the relief of Guenther Kaschner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1105. A bill for the relief of Dr. Fawzi Pualwan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 1106. A bill for the relief of Khushad Ullah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1107. A bill for the relief of Henry Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1108. A bill for the relief of Rose Mazur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1109. A bill for the relief of Richard Kieve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1110. A bill for the relief of Ragland Joseph Biggs (also known as Vincent Doig); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1111. A bill for the relief of Philip Mack; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1112. A bill for the relief of Lemuel A. Wynne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1113. A bill for the relief of Pearl Abrams, Christina Agatha Brown, Roslyn Ashley, Lucille Daley, Ida Grey, Mary Eugenie Smith, Hazel Steward, Inez Thomas Sharp, Lena Osborn, Ruby Amelia Walters, and Isola Mamby Lindo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1114. A bill for the relief of Ida Kaganowicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1115. A bill for the relief of Irving Beilin Chang, and Wonona Wong Chang (or Yit Chen Wong), and Amos Hwei Chang (or Amos Hwei Cheh Chang); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 1116. A bill for the relief of Paul Bernstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1117. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Amato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1118. A bill for the relief of Nachum Samuel Leitner and his wife, Anna Leitner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1119. A bill for the relief of Eliasz, Chawa, and Moses Kraut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1120. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Catapano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1121. A bill for the relief of Nicolaos Papalexatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1122. A bill for the relief of Joseph Mancini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1123. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Ciacio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1124. A bill for the relief of Leiser, Rachela, and Enoch Lampart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1125. A bill for the relief of Meyer Urechi, Estera Urechi, and Nathan Urechi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1126. A bill for the relief of Chaskiel and Frejda Lewinton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1127. A bill for the relief of Miriam and Mordechaj Rymland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1128. A bill for the relief of Manolis N. Triantafillou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1129. A bill for the relief of Faiga Kunda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1130. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anita Scavone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1131. A bill for the relief of Irma Elina Vcela; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1132. A bill for the relief of William Henry Lyster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1133. A bill for the relief of Zofia Kuchta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 1134. A bill for the relief of Sullivan Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 1135. A bill for the relief of Pasqualino E. Magno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1136. A bill for the relief of Alfred Hanzal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1137. A bill for the relief of Harry John Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1138. A bill for the relief of Charles B. Medola and Ernest H. Macias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1139. A bill for the relief of Harold Kageff-Kay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1140. A bill for the relief of the Southwest Research Institute; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1141. A bill for the relief of Joseph Vyskocil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1142. A bill for the relief of Capt. Moses M. Rudy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1143. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Betty M. Boyersmith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1144. A bill for the relief of Sister M. Conleith, Ellen Agnes Cousins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1145. A bill for the relief of Ora L. Powers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 1146. A bill for the relief of the Pacific Music Supply Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1147. A bill for the relief of Saturnina M. August; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1148. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Benita G. Manusca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1149. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tsuma Ueda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1150. A bill for the relief of Edward Martin Rasmussen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1151. A bill for the relief of Lt. (jg.) Svend J. Skou; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KING of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1152. A bill for the relief of Horst Marcell Cleinow, Mrs. Regina Olga Maria Cleinow, Dieter Cleinow, and Barbara Anna Elizabeth Cleinow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1153. A bill for the relief of Harilaos Filippos Ikonomou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1154. A bill for the relief of Michele Fasullo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1155. A bill for the relief of Solomon Wiesel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1156. A bill for the relief of John Jordan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1157. A bill for the relief of Milad S. Isaac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1158. A bill for the relief of Emanuel Frangeskos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOX:

H. R. 1159. A bill for the relief of Anna Wiesneth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1160. A bill for the relief of Vittorio Capano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1161. A bill for the relief of the American Barrel Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1162. A bill for the relief of Anakaleto Maria de Oliveira or Joseph Oliveira or Anacleto Oliver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1163. A bill for the relief of Lee Houn and Lily Ho Lee Houn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1164. A bill for the relief of Loucia Hannouche; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1165. A bill for the relief of Maria Theresia Reinhardt and her child, Maria Anastasia Reinhardt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1166. A bill for the relief of Florence Meister; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1167. A bill for the relief of Mr. Giovanni Pane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1168. A bill for the relief of Ardemis Nahabedian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1169. A bill for the relief of Jacob Baronian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1170. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Szajna Sapir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1171. A bill for the relief of Georg Gahn and Margarete Gahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1172. A bill for the relief of Allison B. Clemens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1173. A bill for the relief of Mauro Messina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1174. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hanum Nigogoshian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1175. A bill to provide for the award of a suitable medal to George E. Clark; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1176. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Mortatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1177. A bill for the relief of Zbigniew Wolynski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1178. A bill for the relief of Antranik Hovsepian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 1179. A bill for the relief of Salih Hougi, Bertha Catherine, Noor Elias, Isaac and Mozelle Rose Hardoon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 1180. A bill for the relief of Kimiko Sueta Thompson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 1181. A bill for the relief of Shau Lam Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1182. A bill for the relief of Gloria May Sin King Woo Loh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1183. A bill for the relief of Baldomero R. Garcia, Teresa Garcia y Braganza, Francisco Garcia, Teresita Garcia, and Eduardo Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1184. A bill for the relief of Mihai Patrichi and Victoria Viorica Patrichi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1185. A bill for the relief of Jose Domingo Quintanar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1186. A bill for the relief of Marko Radic and Irene Radic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1187. A bill for the relief of Constancio Loyola Abracia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1188. A bill for the relief of Mary Zadourian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1189. A bill for the relief of William H. Barney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 1190. A bill for the relief of Sarkis Jamil Bou-Mansour; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1191. A bill for the relief of Marcel Duvivier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1192. A bill for the relief of Angelita Haberer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 1193. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Ivan Pernar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1194. A bill for the relief of Yvonne Dee Burnaman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1195. A bill for the relief of Garabed Charles Nigolian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1196. A bill for the relief of Li Chiu Fu and wife, Leung Sue Wa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1197. A bill for the relief of Louis Graves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1198. A bill for the relief of Kenneth K. W. Lau and Romana Say Soat Kheng, also known as Mrs. Anne Say Lau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1199. A bill for the relief of Kiyoko Kaida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1200. A bill for the relief of Kingway Hsi-Ku Lowe, Mary C. Lowe, Lily Lowe, and Benjamin Lowe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1201. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nazenik Deyirmendjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1202. A bill for the relief of Robert H. Merritt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1203. A bill for the relief of Ivan Bruno Lomm, also known as Ivan B. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1204. A bill for the relief of Antonio Alvarez Sobral, Lourdes Diaz Sobral, and Carlos A. Sobral III; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1205. A bill for the relief of Cynthia Jacob; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1206. A bill to restore United States citizenship to a former citizen, Atsuko Kiyota Szekeres, who has expatriated herself; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1207. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Aram Ajderian and Sona Ajderian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1208. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Esther Moreno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1209. A bill for the relief of Numeriano Lagmay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1210. A bill for the relief of Stephen Moe Jung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1211. A bill for the relief of Isaac Piha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1212. A bill to restore United States citizenship to Saburo Akune, a former citizen who has expatriated himself; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1213. A bill for the relief of George Masirevich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 1214. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Tsiolkas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 1215. A bill for the relief of Wilmore E. Balderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 1216. A bill for the relief of Cathryn A. Giesener; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1217. A bill for the relief of Evagelos B. Tzarimas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1218. A bill for the relief of Mira Domenika Grgurinovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 1219. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Margaret A. Swift; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1220. A bill for the relief of Kleoniki Argendeli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1221. A bill for the relief of Elsa Huni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1222. A bill for the relief of Jose A. Crespo, Mrs. Isabel T. Crespo, and Bonifacio Bitanga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1223. A bill for the relief of Lewis G. Carpenter, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1224. A bill for the relief of Light Liang-liang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1225. A bill for the relief of Vicente and Maria Arias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1226. A bill for the relief of Federico Cano-Valera, Angela Da Silva De Valera, Jose Federico Valera, and Ricardo Valera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1227. A bill for the relief of Kanekichi Kumasaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1228. A bill for the relief of Ernest E. and Olga V. Lommatsch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1229. A bill for the relief of Alexander August Lohmus, Nina Lohmus and Marie Berejetski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1230. A bill for the relief of Bernardo Regino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1231. A bill for the relief of Bernhard and Gertrude Horowitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1232. A bill for the relief of Salvador, Mercedes, and Miguel Chofre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1233. A bill for the relief of Alexander A. Nifiodoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1234. A bill for the relief of Roberta Enriquez Macaspac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1235. A bill for the relief of Vera Gregovich Kenter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 1236. A bill for the relief of Josephine Bianconi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1237. A bill for the relief of Gertrud Koch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 1238. A bill for the relief of Victorio Caropreso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1239. A bill for the relief of Costas Kikilis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1240. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of Ira T. Todd and Major C. Todd, copartners, trading as Todd Bros.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1241. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of G. W. Todd and Lloyd Parks, copartners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York (by request):

H. R. 1242. A bill for the relief of Mario Martinucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 1243. A bill for the relief of Elza H. Byler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H. R. 1244. A bill for the relief of Ektor Dikeles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1245. A bill for the relief of Marianne Anita Zelinka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 1246. A bill for the relief of Emilio Federico Aikler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1247. A bill for the relief of Carol Brandon (Valtrude Probst); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1248. A bill for the relief of Gaetanina Lombardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1249. A bill for the relief of Frances Pompa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1250. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Liselotte Steffan McDonnell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1251. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Minardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1252. A bill for the relief of Olivia Mary Orciuch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1253. A bill for the relief of Antonio Aikler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1254. A bill for the relief of Antonio Joseph Aikler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1255. A bill for the relief of Ferenc Babothy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1256. A bill for the relief of Andrew Frey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1257. A bill for the relief of Francesco Iurman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1258. A bill for the relief of Haig, Zabelle, Louise, and John Gulbenkian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1259. A bill for the relief of Nikolai, Gerda, and Annerose Korotkevich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1260. A bill for the relief of Raffaele Gisueppe Collura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1261. A bill for the relief of Antonio Del Ponte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1262. A bill for the relief of Jacob-David Leszczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1263. A bill for the relief of Chahine Ohannes Khosrofian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1264. A bill for the relief of Imre de Cholnoky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1265. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Cirillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1266. A bill for the relief of Alberto Yurman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1267. A bill for the relief of Peter F. de Ullmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1268. A bill for the relief of Michele Agostino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1269. A bill for the relief of Spyros Papalexiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1270. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Butera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1271. A bill for the relief of Nino Bertini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1272. A bill for the relief of Ahmed Shaban Gench; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1273. A bill for the relief of Antonio Romano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1274. A bill for the relief Yechiel Shulman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1275. A bill for the relief of Gennaro Savarese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1276. A bill for the relief of Erik Oskar Ehn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1277. A bill for the relief of Marie-Luise H. Generali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 1278. A bill for the relief of Josefina V. Guerrero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1279. A bill for the relief of Mary Wyshoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1280. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Labibe Salibi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 1281. A bill for the relief of Carlo Nonvenuto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1282. A bill for the relief of Irene Rogers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1283. A bill for the relief of Olga Joannou Georgulea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1284. A bill for the relief of Linda Yacoub Beyda and Cohen Alfred Beyda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1285. A bill for the relief of Rabbi Francisc Friedmann, Sara Friedmann, Cipore Malke Friedmann, and Gizela (Gitla) Friedmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1286. A bill for the relief of Francesco Cavero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1287. A bill for the relief of David Mordka Borenstajn, Itta Borenstajn nee Schipper, and Fella Borenstajn Reichlinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1288. A bill for the relief of Renee Hamwee, Charles Hamwee, Shelia Hamwee, and Lillian Hamwee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1289. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Motisi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1290. A bill for the relief of Rosario Gambino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1291. A bill for the relief of Josef Aszer Grosman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1292. A bill for the relief of Ann Yellin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1293. A bill for the relief of Leon Narol or Leo F. Narroll; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON:

H. R. 1294. A bill for the relief of the former employees of Clinton Woolens, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 1295. A bill for the relief of Brigida Valiquet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1296. A bill for the relief of Edwina L. Lincoln, widow of W. Irving Lincoln; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1297. A bill for the relief of Francis C. Pollard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1298. A bill for the relief of Malvina Raphael David; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1299. A bill for the relief of Miss Toshiko Hozaka and her child, Roger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1300. A bill for the relief of Luther Rose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 1301. A bill for the relief of Karlis Abele; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1302. A bill for the relief of Adelheid Walla Spring; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1303. A bill for the relief of Alexander Hahnl, his wife, Ninon Hahnl, and their children, Ninon Marie and Alexander Fritz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1304. A bill for the relief of Sister Giovina (Rosina Vitale) and Sister Olga (Calogera Zeffiro); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1305. A bill for the relief of Mother Amata (Maria Cartiglia) and Sister Ottavia (Concetta Zisa); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 1306. A bill for the relief of Nicolaos Serras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1307. A bill for the relief of Serantis Serras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 1308. A bill for the relief of Victor Manuel Caetano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1309. A bill for the relief of Kyu Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1310. A bill for the relief of Frank K. (Frantisek) Binder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1311. A bill for the relief of George Paul Khouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1312. A bill for the relief of Bernard Kalos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1313. A bill for the relief of Biaggio D'Alessandro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1314. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Romana Michelina Serini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1315. A bill for the relief of Agavnie Moutoukian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1316. A bill for the relief of Cherine Khalil Matta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1317. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Borelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1318. A bill for the relief of Garabed Papazian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1319. A bill for the relief of Vasilios Liakopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1320. A bill for the relief of Luis Laca Cristobal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1321. A bill for the relief of Manuel Garcia Marcos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1322. A bill for the relief of Antonio (Antonino) Attardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1323. A bill for the relief of Sister Ramona Maria (Ramona E. Tombo); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1324. A bill for the relief of Biricio O. Acosta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1325. A bill for the relief of Mary Riley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1326. A bill for the relief of Anthony Asprakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1327. A bill for the relief of Eugene Michael Doran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 1328. A bill for the relief of Nicholas John Manticas, Anne Francis Manticas, Yvonne Manticas, Mary Manticas, and John Manticas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1329. A bill for the relief of Marie Vartenissian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1330. A bill for the relief of Ruth Margot Hansen and Ivar Refne Hansen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 1331. A bill for the relief of Luigi Tozzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 1332. A bill for the relief of Armando Alfaro-Arciniega; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1333. A bill for the relief of Ebolya Wolf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1334. A bill for the relief of Ulf Krabbe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1335. A bill for the relief of Elvira Villasenor Din; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1336. A bill for the relief of Neil De Wilde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1337. A bill for the relief of Victorine May Donaldson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1338. A bill for the relief of Erich Wolf, also known as Laislov Wolfenstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1339. A bill for the relief of Maria Nizzia Constantino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 1340. A bill for the relief of George Shukri Koudsi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 1341. A bill for the relief of Adeline Nixon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1342. A bill for the relief of Mohamed Bin Omar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1343. A bill for the relief of Leon W. Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1344. A bill for the relief of Charles Whaley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1345. A bill for the relief of Solomon Manulkin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1346. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anatoly Batenko and Vladimir Batenko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1347. A bill for the relief of Feliciano Lazay Manendez and Josefina Vallin y Lambillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1348. A bill for the relief of Joaquim Tomas Lieno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1349. A bill for the relief of Hiromi Kashiwagi Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1350. A bill for the relief of Agnes Alberta R. Nixon Francis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1351. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lottie Longo (formerly Lottie Guetler); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1352. A bill for the relief of Fumiyo Maeda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1353. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maisie A. Long; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1354. A bill for the relief of John Abraham and Ann Abraham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1355. A bill for the relief of Karin Elisabeth Lang and Jurgen Michael Peter Lang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1356. A bill for the relief of David Clarence Hines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1357. A bill for the relief of Chin York Gay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1358. A bill for the relief of Samuel Pilicer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1359. A bill for the relief of Arthur Alexander McFarlane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1360. A bill for the relief of Joaquin Rivademar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1361. A bill for the relief of Samuel Pilicer (also known as Szmul Pilicer) and Mrs. Ann Pilicer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1362. A bill for the relief of Jose R. Lourenco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1363. A bill for the relief of Eulah Hannah Basden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1364. A bill for the relief of Patrick Joseph Blewett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1365. A bill for the relief of Hassan Ali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1366. A bill for the relief of Clayton Holmes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1367. A bill for the relief of Walter Adolphus Burke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1368. A bill for the relief of Herbert Arnold Sparks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1369. A bill for the relief of Gerard and Yelva Salnave; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1370. A bill for the relief of Isidro Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1371. A bill for the relief of Amin Rahmin Roubin, Mrs. Esther Mordkhay Roubin, and Abdul Rahmin Roubin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1372. A bill for the relief of Alma Oleta Gentle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1373. A bill for the relief of Anthony Valamvanos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1374. A bill for the relief of Edson Rhodes Mills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1375. A bill for the relief of Natan Zepelovitch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1376. A bill for the relief of Cecil Edgar Deonarine, Mrs. Gloria Deonarine (nee Ramjattansingh), and Jessel J. Deonarine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1377. A bill for the relief of Americo Discepolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1378. A bill for the relief of Hilbert Ewart Fitz-Maurice Homer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1379. A bill for the relief of Alberto Araujo Silveira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1380. A bill for the relief of Arthur Frank Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1381. A bill for the relief of Jose Victor Villapol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1382. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Strazzullo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1383. A bill for the relief of Rista Milosevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1384. A bill for the relief of Thomas A. Harris, Mrs. Lydia E. Harris, and Olney Elva Harris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1385. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Myrtle Richardson Beane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1386. A bill for the relief of Kuo-Yen Ai, Mrs. Josephine Yueh-Li Ai, and Rosemary Patricia (Melba) Ai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1387. A bill for the relief of Ryon Gzoon Chough and her minor child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1388. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Prudence Hicks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1389. A bill for the relief of James Neville Beaton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1390. A bill for the relief of Henry Mason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 1391. A bill for the relief of Michael Gerdelan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1392. A bill for the relief of Seu Shuit Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1393. A bill for the relief of E. J. Albrecht Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1394. A bill for the relief of Herman Wobbe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1395. A bill to provide for the renewal of patent No. 1,596,994, issued August 14, 1926, relating to shoe button snaps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1396. A bill for the relief of Franz Joseph Horwath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1397. A bill for the relief of Antonio Lopez Aldama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1398. A bill for the relief of Eleftheria P. Skorlopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 1399. A bill for the relief of Jessie W. McWhorter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1400. A bill for the relief of David R. Click; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1401. A bill for the relief of Ewing Choat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 1402. A bill for the relief of Santiago Gonzalez Trigo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1403. A bill for the relief of Anthony J. Varca, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1404. A bill for the relief of Bernard F. Elmers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1405. A bill for the relief of Vassiliki D. Papadakou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1406. A bill for the relief of Sister Antonina Zattolo and Sister Antonina Cali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1407. A bill for the relief of Henry Kraemer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1408. A bill for the relief of Caterina Ruello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1409. A bill for the relief of H. W. Robinson & Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1410. A bill for the relief of Giacomo Scano, Giovanna Scano, Guido Scano, and

Valerio Scano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1411. A bill for the relief of Antonio DiSarro, Mrs. Maria DiSarro, Nicola DiSarro, and Rita DiSarro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1412. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Castelli, Mrs. Francesca M. Castelli, and Angelo Castelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1413. A bill for the relief of Teresa Langone Venafra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1414. A bill for the relief of Joseph C. Mousitano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1415. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Frederick Redmond; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1416. A bill for the relief of J. B. Phipps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1417. A bill for the relief of Charles (Carlos) Gerlicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1418. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margot Elizabeth Schaeffer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1419. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Leo Goetz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 1420. A bill for the relief of Herman E. Mosley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1421. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josette Filandre Hollingsworth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1422. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hester Bynum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBESON of Virginia:

H. R. 1423. A bill for the relief of Raymonde Rouxel Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1424. A bill for the relief of Edward Smiley, formerly Eddie Nichichuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1425. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. William V. Stepp, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 1426. A bill for the relief of George S. Ridner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1427. A bill for the relief of Francis P. Meehan, trustee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 1428. A bill for the relief of George Karl Heinrich Willy Junker and Mrs. Elly Augusta Junker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY (by request):

H. R. 1429. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Theodora Bourlotos (nee Hangepetros); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1430. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Del Gatto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1431. A bill for the relief of Maurice Devlin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1432. A bill for the relief of Martha Fries Moskal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1433. A bill for the relief of Vito Recchia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 1434. A bill for the relief of Paula Bernstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1435. A bill for the relief of Paul Compagnino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1436. A bill for the relief of Ervin Benedikt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1437. A bill for the relief of James J. Bach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1438. A bill for the relief of Guglielmo Iacono; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1439. A bill for the relief of Menachem Hersz Kalisz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1440. A bill for the relief of Ciro Picardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1441. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vassiliki P. Theodorou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1442. A bill for the relief of Herminegilda Sanz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1443. A bill for the relief of Michele Santoro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1444. A bill for the relief of Moishe David Piotrkovski and his wife, Chana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1445. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Okun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1446. A bill for the relief of Frejdla Fogel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1447. A bill for the relief of Aleksandra Borkowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1448. A bill for the relief of Ralph Moschitta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1449. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sidney Nevil Milford and his wife, Danuta Maria Milford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1450. A bill for the relief of Johann August Josefsson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1451. A bill for the relief of Kieran Patrick Kenny; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1452. A bill for the relief of Joseph Deutsch and his wife, Sprinca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 1453. A bill for the relief of Albert Frederick Mayne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 1454. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alexandrine von Saldern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1455. A bill for the relief of Grietje Visser Verhoeve van der Molen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1456. A bill for the relief of David W. S. Ahn and Margaret Y. A. Ahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1457. A bill for the relief of Jerry Pagoulatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1458. A bill for the relief of Rosa Edith Manns Monroe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1459. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a tract of land in Orange County, N. Y., to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCHENCK:

H. R. 1460. A bill for the relief of Carl R. Marten; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1461. A bill for the relief of Helen E. Cox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT (by request):

H. R. 1462. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Kousounis and Athena Kousounis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 1463. A bill for the relief of Rudolfo M. Gomez (Capaz); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1464. A bill for the relief of Magdalena Rose Denes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1465. A bill for the relief of Margarete Dillinger and Gudrund Dillinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1466. A bill for the relief of Petar Rudolf Valentic, also known as Peter Valentic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 1467. A bill for the relief of Stijepo Buich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1468. A bill for the relief of Barbara V. Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1469. A bill for the relief of Philip G. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1470. A bill for the relief of Joseph Righetti and Marjorie Righetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1471. A bill for the relief of William J. Robertson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1472. A bill for the relief of Victor Manuel Soares De Mendonca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1473. A bill for the relief of Eleanore Hauser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1474. A bill for the relief of Ross Sherman Trigg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1475. A bill for the relief of Wing Chong Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 1476. A bill for the relief of the Spicer Ice & Coal Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. R. 1477. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Duncan Crowder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 1478. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Evelyne Thomassett Moss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 1479. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sigrid Brinkhoff Bigelow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 1480. A bill for the relief of Constantine George Kaltsoyannis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 1481. A bill for the relief of Dezso Szilagyi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 1482. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor Annie Welch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 1483. A bill for the relief of Capt. James B. E. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1484. A bill for the relief of Garrett Norman Soulen and Michael Harvey Soulen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1485. A bill for the relief of William E. Nash; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1486. A bill for the relief of Anna Anita Hildegard Sparwasser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1487. A bill for the relief of Rosa Marie Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 1488. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Esther Reed Marcantel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H. R. 1489. A bill for the relief of the minor children Kathryn Rose (Burdulinska) Cook and James David Nesselmann) Cook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1490. A bill for the relief of Stylianos Haralambidis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 1491. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marion Leigh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1492. A bill for the relief of Krsevan Spanjol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1493. A bill for the relief of Dr. Leiv Kvamme; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 1494. A bill for the relief of Irenka Petranovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 1495. A bill for the relief of Joseph J. Porter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1496. A bill for the relief of Leong Ding Foon Quon and Ken C. Quon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1497. A bill for the relief of Christine Robinson (nee Schonig); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1498. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nina Camarata, Florence Camarata, Joseph Camarata, and Louis Camarata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1499. A bill to authorize the appointment of Sidney F. Mashbir, colonel, Army of the United States, to the permanent grade of

colonel in the Regular Army, on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1500. A bill for the relief of Charles F. Brickell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1501. A bill for the relief of Andrea Hernandes Montes Rocha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1502. A bill for the relief of Elisabeth Thalhammer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. R. 1503. A bill for the relief of Helga Kutschka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1504. A bill for the relief of Andreas Kafarakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1505. A bill for the relief of Steve Elefteriou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1506. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gayton O. Larson (nee Eleonore Therese Uttenreuther); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1507. A bill for the relief of Harvey E. Grasse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1508. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Perouz Derderian Donaldson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1509. A bill for the relief of Gerhard Rothauer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT (by request):

H. R. 1510. A bill for the relief of MA. Dr. Shan-ho and Tsui Ou Cheng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 1511. A bill for the relief of Robert George Bulldeath and Leonora Patricia Bulldeath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1512. A bill for the relief of Phil Wallace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1513. A bill for the relief of Frances Irene Smart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1514. A bill for the relief of Nettie E. Whitfield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1515. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Morris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1516. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to present the Distinguished Flying Cross to Col. Bennett Hill Griffin; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1517. A bill to authorize the issuance of a patent-in-fee to Presley T. LaBreche; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1518. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent-in-fee to Almira Gilbreath Ramser; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. R. 1519. A bill for the relief of certain Spanish aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1520. A bill for the relief of certain American employees of the former Shanghai Municipal Council; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1521. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Marie Masche; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1522. A bill for the relief of Elmo Johanson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1523. A bill for the relief of Aleksander Kupiszewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1524. A bill for the relief of Mario Valeriano Sessarego; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1525. A bill for the relief of Ardes Albacete Yanez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1526. A bill for the relief of Ohan Evrenian and Mrs. Vehanoush Evrenian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1527. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emma Isabel Butler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1528. A bill for the relief of Ida Yolanda Niro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 1529. A bill for the relief of Peter James O'Brien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1530. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ern-Gret Birkholz Seim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1531. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosa Georges Yacoub (Jacob); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1532. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Marszalek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 1533. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emma Green; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1534. Bill for the relief of Mrs. Enriqueta Velarde de Boyce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1535. A bill for the relief of Cabrillo Land Co. of San Diego, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1536. A bill for the relief of Priscilla Anne Stephenson (Shizuko Hosokawa); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1537. A bill for the relief of Rogerio Santana de Franca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1538. A bill for the relief of Jean Isabel Hay Watts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1539. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruthe Graves Messer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1540. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Joan Craig Newell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1541. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Dicran Simon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1542. A bill for the relief of Abdul Haleem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. R. 1543. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ella Stern Herzfeld; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 1544. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Moli (Mali) Sobel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1545. A bill for the relief of Yin Mow Moy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1546. A bill for the relief of Dr. Eugene C. K. Tsai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 1547. A bill for the relief of Eosin, Linda, Walter, and Hsien King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1548. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Annamarie Kuhn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1549. A bill for the relief of Salvacion Carbon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1550. A bill for the relief of Julian, Dolores, Jaime, Dennis, Roldan, and Julian, Jr., Lizardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1551. A bill for the relief of Gualberto Estralla Alabastro, Pura Zarco Alabastro, and Arlene Alabastro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1552. A bill for the relief of Dalisay Lourdes Cruz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to an interstate civil-defense and disaster compact entered into by the State of Idaho with the State of Arkansas, pursuant to the provisions of chapter 277, Idaho Session Laws of 1951; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to interstate civil-defense and disaster compacts entered into between the State of Idaho and the States of Delaware, Oklahoma, Texas, and Pennsylvania, pursuant to chapter 277, Idaho Session Laws of 1951; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the rescinding of a resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the limitation of taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Ohio, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the Ohio interstate civil defense compact being brought into conformity with the model civil-defense compact, and relating to the amendments of existing interstate compacts between the Governor of the State of Ohio and the States of Alabama, Arizona, Connecticut, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas, and Virginia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Ohio, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to amendments of existing interstate civil-defense compacts between the State of Ohio and the States of Colorado, Delaware, Nevada, and New Mexico; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Virginia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to an interstate civil-defense compact between the Commonwealth of Virginia and the State of New Jersey, pursuant to Public Law 920, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Douglas Horton, minister and secretary, Congregational Christian Churches of America, New York, N. Y., relative to a resolution adopted at their biennial meeting June 23–30, 1954, with reference to surplus commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2. Also, petition of Dr. F. E. Wilson, director, American Medical Association, Washington, D. C., relative to a petition adopted in the house of delegates of the American Medical Association at its annual meeting, June 21–24, 1954, regarding support for a new building to house the Armed Forces Medical Library; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3. Also, petition of Nicolas Nogueras Rivera, president, Puerto Rico Free Federation of Labor, San Juan, P. R., relative to a resolution adopted by the 22d convention requesting that the Sugar Act of 1948 be amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4. Also, petition of Nicolas Nogueras Rivera, president, Puerto Rico Free Federation of Labor, San Juan, P. R., relative to a resolution adopted by the 22d convention urging the President and the Congress to keep Puerto Rico under the National Labor Relations Act and the National Labor Relations Board be maintained in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

5. Also, petition of National Association of Pro America, San Francisco, Calif., petitioning consideration of a resolution that they go on record in support of all congressional investigating committees leading to legislation that would correct subversion, etc., in

all branches of Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6. Also, petition of supreme secretary, Knights of Columbus, New Haven, Conn., petitioning consideration of a resolution adopted at its annual meeting in Louisville, Ky., asking that the whole of Ireland be declared the Republic of Ireland and be so recognized by the United States of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7. Also, petition of officers, executive committee of Gapa, Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting the British colonial and tyrannical rule of the Greek island of Cyprus; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8. Also, petition of Fillmore Post, No. 16, AMVETS, Brooklyn, N. Y., relative to violently opposing the action of the Chinese Communist government's sentencing of American citizens and military men to prison on questionable spy charges; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9. Also, petition of Charles Rozmarek, president, Polish American Congress, Inc., Chicago, Ill., relative to a resolution adopted by the fourth meeting of the supreme council of the Polish American Congress at Washington, D. C., on October 12, 1954, expressing the sentiments of 7 million Americans of Polish ancestry united in the Polish American Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10. Also, petition of Mrs. Lyle J. Howard, State corresponding secretary, National Society, DAR, Rome, N. Y., relative to several resolutions passed at the 58th State conference of the New York State organization of the DAR; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

11. Also, petition of president, Polish National Democratic Committee, Washington, D. C., relative to a petition of appeal to the people of Poland regarding the elections to national councils to be held on December 5, 1954; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

12. Also, petition of Nicholas J. Papadakos, supreme president, Pan-Laconian Federation of America, Inc., New York, N. Y., relative to a resolution unanimously passed by the delegates of the seventh convention, relative to the people of Cyprus being granted the right of self-determination in accordance with the Atlantic Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

13. Also, petition of August Schou, Oslo, Norway, relative to the regulations for the awarding of the 1955 Nobel Peace Prize; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

14. Also, petition of B. Ragas Labur and others, Filipino Crusaders World Army, Northern Mindanao Corps Area, Alegria, Mainit, Surigao, Philippine Islands, relative to a petition for the peace of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

15. Also, petition of Marcelino M. Rodriguez, Barrio Cuchillas, Moca, P. R., relative to the introduction of legislation calling upon the President of the United States to take decisive action for the freedom of the enslaved GI's still held in violation of the Panmunjom truce; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

16. Also, petition of Ki Poong Lee, Chairman, the National Assembly, Republic of Korea, relative to a message on opposition to the withdrawal of the United States forces from Korea, adopted on September 20, 1954, by the National Assembly of the Republic of Korea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

17. Also, petition of Z. Kawamura, chairman, the Fishery Group of the Japanese Diet, requesting speedy settlement by immediate payment in full for damages to Japanese fishermen and fisheries suffered from the experimental explosions of the hydrogen bomb; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

18. Also, petition of R. D. Young, president, Rubber Trade Association of New York, Inc., New York City, relative to a cable of regret with respect to the death of Hon. Paul Shafer, from the Rubber Trade Association of London, England; to the Committee on House Administration.

19. Also, petition of Helen L. Lichtweis, Peoria, Ill., requesting that Chauncey W. Reed of West Chicago, Ill., be denied the Federal oath of office; to the Committee on House Administration.

20. Also, petition of general secretary, the American Council of Christian Churches, New York City, relative to a resolution on juvenile delinquency which was adopted unanimously at the 13th annual convention; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

21. Also, petition of Board of Supervisors, County of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif., relative to a resolution adopted November 30, 1954, requesting the Federal Government to provide assistance in solving problems of air pollution; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

22. Also, petition of Kathleen McIntyre, corresponding secretary, the Associated Organizations, Queens, N. Y., relative to being on record as opposed to the fluoridation of water; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

23. Also, petition of Benjamin Milley, and others, 46 Keystone Street, Buffalo, N. Y., relative to a petition asking for legislation amending the Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

24. Also, petition of president, Oklahoma Municipal League, submitting a resolution adopted by the Oklahoma Municipal League with reference to an amendment to the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

25. Also, petition of W. Dudley Gunn, secretary-treasurer, Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission, New Orleans, La., relative to a resolution adopted by the commission regarding shellfish certification; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

26. Also, petition of Wayne D. Heydecker, secretary-treasurer, Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, Mount Vernon, N. Y., relative to a resolution adopted at its 13th annual meeting regarding shellfish certification; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

27. Also, petition of Norman Baker, Miami, Fla., relative to an amendment to petition No. 1131, August 3, 1954, with reference to the impeachment of Federal Judge Thomas C. Trimble; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

28. Also, petition of Thomas C. Maurer, Winter Park, Fla., petitioning Congress regarding his civil rights as an American citizen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

29. Also, petition of Mrs. Helen Lichtweis, 2203 North Sheridan Road, Peoria, Ill., relative to copies of letters and documents with reference to the Marie Fuller bankruptcy case; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

30. Also, petition of the chairman, Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, St. Thomas, V. I., with reference to granting to the people of the Virgin Islands and other United States Territories and offshore areas, the privilege of voting for the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

31. Also, petition of Mrs. Gloria F. Schrock, Quezon City, Philippine Islands, relative to the decision of the appeals board affirming the action of the Claims Service in disallowing the claim for payment of compensation for the loss of personal property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

32. Also, petition of Luis Ross Torres, secretary, Consistories of the Church of the Prince of Peace, Mexico City, Mexico, relative to the Mexican Presbyterian Church joining the American Christian people on the National Day of Prayer in praying for the peace of the world; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

33. Also, petition of Mr. A. Chacin, Juarez, Chihuahua, Mexico, with reference to a letter regarding a patent in question on an elevator for luminous advertising signs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

34. Also, petition of Mr. Francisco Cepero, 1051 Blanca Cerra Street, Santurce, P. R., relative to a petition for a new trial in the case of Francisco Cepero, plaintiff, versus United States Government, defendant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

35. Also, petition of Nicolas Nogueras Rivera, president, Puerto Rico Free Federation of Labor, San Juan, P. R., relative to a resolution adopted by the 22d convention backing the Communist Control Act of 1954; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

36. Also, petition of Ernesto De La Fe, president, the American Movement of Democratic Integration, Habana, Cuba, relative to a cable approving the law which illegalizes the Communist Party in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

37. Also, petition of Morris E. Miller, 200 Almond Street, Georgetown, 6 Demerara, British Guiana, appealing to the Congress of the United States for entry into the United States as a foreign student; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

38. Also, petition of Charles Telfian, Raiford, Fla., relative to his petition, *Charles Telfian* v. *United States of America;* to the Committee on the Judiciary.

39. Also, petition of Mrs. Gladys E. O'Shea and others, Toledo, Ohio, relative to a resolution adopted by Toledo Lodge No. 58, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, etc., condemning the proposal to remove key administrative positions from the protection of the merit system of civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

40. Also, petition of Harry E. Eaton, clerk, Sanitary District of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., relative to a resolution adopted by the Board of Trustees of the Sanitary District of Chicago expressing their appreciation for the passage of H. R. 3300; to the Committee on Public Works.

41. Also, petition of Gerald M. Thomas, mayor, village of Hibbing, Minn., relative to a resolution that the people of the village of Hibbing, Minn., through their village council, be heard and be given consideration through public-works projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

42. Also, petition of L. M. Fine, Who Is Who in Music, Inc., Chicago, Ill., relative to conducting a congressional investigation of the mail frauds in Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Rules.

43. Also, petition of executive director, American Civil Liberties Union, New York, N. Y., relative to referring the record and publications of the House Special Committee To Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations to the Rules Committee for study and investigation; to the Committee on Rules.

44. Also, petition of Richard B. Mossman, Bettendorf, Iowa, relative to having the 84th Congress appoint a special joint committee to investigate acts of attainder against the petitioner; to the Committee on Rules.

45. Also, petition of Hilaria Rezoso, Laois, Labrador, Pangasinan, Philippine Islands, relative to claim for death compensation of Luis, Jesus, and Rogelio, all surnamed Malong, killed during the landing of the American forces at Laois, Labrador, on January 9, 1945; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

46. Also, petition of William Carromero, Humacao, P. R., relative to his case for disability, claim No. C–6102386 filed with the United States Veterans' Administration, and requesting that favorable action be taken on it; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

47. Also, petition of director general, the Minute Men of America, New York, N. Y., requesting that full consideration be given to the establishment of American valuation as the basis of assessing all duties on imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received for the third calendar quarter of 1954.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the third calendar quarter 1954:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy questions are not repeated, only the answers are printed and are indicated by their respective letter and number. Also for economy in the RECORD, lengthy answers are abridged.)

File two copies with the Secretary of the Senate and file three copies with the Clerk of the House of Representatives.
This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.
Place an "X" below the appropriate letter or figure in the box at the right of the "Report" heading below:
"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.
"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____	REPORT PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT	P	QUARTER 1st	2d	3d	4th
		(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) In General: This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee," state in Item "B" the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer." (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee.").
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer," write "None" as answer to Item "B."
(b) Separate Reports.—An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report.
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING.—(1) State name, address, and nature of business; (2) if this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers; except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—Section 302 (e).
(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Regulation).
(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place ☐ an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed, in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) *description,* (*b*) quantity distributed, (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed.)

4. *If* this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. *If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this Item "C 4" and fill out Items "D" and "E" on the back of this page.* Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

NOTE ON ITEM "D".—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302 (a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $_____Dues and assessments
2. $_____Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $_____Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $_____Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter

5. $_____Received for services (e. g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")

7. $_____Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. $_____TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (a).

9. $_____TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $_____Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $_____Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $_____"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more (from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors? Please answer "yes" or "no": _____
14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

("*Period*" from Jan. 1 through _____, 19____)

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor*
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N. Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E".—(a) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302 (b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $_____Public relations and advertising services
2. $_____Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $_____Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $_____Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $_____Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $_____Telephone and telegraph
7. $_____Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $_____All other expenditures

9. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $_____Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year

11. $_____TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (b).

12. $_____TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $_____Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $_____Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7–11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshblanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7–15, 8–15, 9–15: Britten & Blatten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D. C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL

A. J. Carson Adkerson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting strategic minerals, including manganese. Amendment to Contract Settlement Act, H. R. 4672, S. 1963 (for).
E. (7) $14.40; (8) $1.25; (9) $15.65; (10) $18.90; (11) $34.55.

A. Claris Adams, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All existing and prospective legislation which may affect the life insurance business.
D. (6) $900.

A. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Generally any legislation which will affect the aircraft industry.
D. (6) $4,380.20.
E. (2) $3,750; (4) $154.28; (7) $475.92; (9) $4,380.20; (10) $9,814.62; (11) $14,194.82.

A. Allied Wool Industry Committee, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $50.
E. (1) $2,500; (9) $2,500; (10) $2,000; (11) $4,500.

A. W. R. Allstetter, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy.
D. (6) $125.

A. Thomas H. Alphin, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All bills (Senate and House) relating to health and welfare.
D. (6) $620.
E. (7) $8.60; (9) $8.60; (10) $60.75; (11) $69.35.

A. Joseph Amann, 711 West Lake Street, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Engineers and Scientists of America, 711 West Lake Street, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. Any legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers and other members of affiliated units.

A. American Association of University Women, 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
E. (2) $710; (4) $281.26; (6) $83.49; (9) $1,074.75; (10) $2,032.36; (11) $3,107.11.

A. American Cancer Society, 47 Beaver Street, New York City.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health.
E. (1) $4,999.98; (7) $1,621.31; (9) $6,621.29; (10) $12,766.52; (11) $19,387.81.

A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203–A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $2,036.74.
E. (2) $1,890.94; (4) $1.47; (5) $63.09; (6) $7.84; (7) $73.40; (9) $2,036.74; (10) $5,420.13; (11) $7,456.87; (15).[1]

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $8,154.94.
E. (2) $7,943; (6) $36.01; (7) $175.93; (9) $8,154.94; (10) $24,886.56; (11) $33,041.50; (15).[1]

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, general office: Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill. Washington office: 425–13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting agriculture. (3) Nation's Agriculture.
D. (6) $10,464.
E. (2) $18,917; (4) $4,581; (5) $2,209; (6) $2,078, (7) $777; (9) $28,562; (10) $55,305; (11) $83,867.

A. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the interests of working people. (3) American Federationist.
E. (1) $6,814.44; (2) $21,593.83; (4) $3,994.85; (5) $862.90; (9) $33,266.02; (10) $58,553.25; (11) $91,819.27.

A. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped.
E. (2) $1,000; (4) $200; (6) $100; (7) $100; (9) $1,400; (10) $7,200; (11) $8,600.

A. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) All bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $129,569.80.
E. (9) $10,849.84.

A. The American Legion, national headquarters, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) The American Legion and all veterans of world wars and their dependents, etc. (3) The American Legion magazine and legislative bulletin.
D. (6) $1,296.59.
E. (1) $510; (2) $9,732.84; (4) $4,909.39; (5) $2,320.81; (6) $448.12; (7) $3,514.88; (9) $21,436.04; (10) $38,663; (11) $60,099.04.

A. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $62.30.
E. (2) $2,598.78; (5) $1,079.55; (6) $514.89; (7) $37.78; (8) $22.58; (9) $4,253.58; (10) $7,402.69; (11) $11,656.27; (15).[1]

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. All existing and prospective legislation which may affect the life-insurance business.
D. (6) $1,801.02.
E. (2) $1,485.13; (5) $293.79; (7) $22.10; (9) $1,801.02; (10) $11,360.90; (11) $13,161.92.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) The general legislative interest of the American Medical Association is to advance the science and art of medicine.[1]
D. (6) $10,000.
E. (2) $6,538.81; (4) $7.92; (5) $848.15; (6) $510.32; (7) $232.99; (8) $391.87; (9) $8,530.06; (10) $20,041.11; (11) $28,571.17.

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
C. Supported or opposed legislation affecting cattle industry.
D. (6) $18,496.16.
E. (6) $88.46; (7) $915.07; (8) $20.75; (9) $6,274.28; (10) $16,864.62; (11) $23,138.90.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) All legislation which has a direct bearing on nurses, nursing, or health.
D. (6) $47,405.18.
E. (2) $1,255.38; (5) $616.24; (6) $141.70; (7) $120.26; (9) $2,133.58; (10) $4,450.84; (11) $6,584.42.

A. The American Optometric Association, Inc., development fund (legislative), care of Dr. Hoyt S. Purvis, 212 East Washington Avenue, Jonesboro, Ark.
C. (1) Continuing interest in legislation in the health field affecting the practice of optometry.[1]
D. (6) $5,399.
E. (2) $3,450; (6) $100.37; (7) $22.25; (8) $3; (9) $3,575.62; (10) $2,634.93; (11) $6,210.55.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Bills affecting the public health.
D. (6) $518.32.
E. (2) $375; (4) $52.53; (5) $69; (6) $21.79; (9) $518.32; (10) $1,005.80; (11) $1,524.12.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C., and 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Support of Federal aid for school construction, etc.[1]
D. (6) $9,315.
E. (2) $1,170.14; (4) $49.90; (5) $150.05; (6) $115.56; (8) $458.55; (9) $1,944.20; (10) $7,119.60; (11) $9,063.80.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.
D. (6) $8,251.
E. (2) $6,145; (5) $4,000; (8) $1,508; (9) $11,653; (10) $23,215; (11) $34,868.

A. American Pulp & Paper Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests are those affecting the pulp and paper industry, its operations, properties, and practices.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests are those affecting the pulpwood industry, its operation, practices, and properties.

A. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $18,512.23.
E. (2) $8,750; (4) $71.59; (5) $773.33; (6) $501.19; (7) $217.91; (9) $10,314.02; (10) $21,023.04; (11) $31,337.06; (15).[1]

A. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,097.12.
E. (2) $737.50; (4) $100.88; (5) $210.16; (6) $41.10; (7) $423.69; (9) $1,513.33; (10) $5,097.12; (11) $6,610.45.

A. American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (15).[1]

A. American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The association is interested in amending existing shipping legislation in order to extend operating and construction differential subsidies to American-flag vessels engaged in so-called tramp trades.
E. (2) $2,062.50; (5) $160.18; (6) $282.36; (7) $123.81; (8) $588.50; (9) $3,217.35; (10) $20,908.99; (11) $24,126.34; (15).[1]

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. General legislative interests of ATA include all bills, resolutions, and investigations affecting the trucking industry.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $10,290.06.
E. (2) $1,586.60; (4) $19.25; (7) $133.85; (9) $1,739.70; (10) $10,987.06; (11) $12,726.76.

A. American Veterans Committee, Inc., 1751 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) AVC is concerned with legislation affecting the general welfare, especially in the fields of international affairs, civil rights and liberties and veterans benefits.
D. (6) $272.65.
E. (9) $510; (10) $3,000; (11) $3,510.

A. American Veterans of World War II, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in veterans' legislation, armed services legislation, international affairs, Americanism, and general welfare. (3) National AMVET.
E. (2) $1,330; (7) $75; (9) $1,405; (10) $1,125; (11) $2,530.

A. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) In favor of the mutual security program.
D. (6) $2,460.99.
E. (1) $609.33; (2) $734.77; (4) $456.23; (5) $195.13; (6) $81.46; (7) $211.42; (8) $147.73 (9) $2,436.07; (10) $1,710.81; (11) $4,146.88.

A. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 6584 and H. R. 9476.
D. (6) $2,760.
E. (2) $2,815; (8) $3.28; (9) $2,818.28; (10) $6,285.75; (11) $9,104.03.

A. Hector M. Aring, 826 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Revenue bill of 1954, social security, housing, and reciprocal trade.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (8) $782.67; (9) $782.67; (10) $1,023.09; (11) $1,805.76.

A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, 1115 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Class 1 railroads operating in the State of Arkansas.
C. (2) Generally legislation affecting Arkansas railroads.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (7) $646.29; (9) $646.29; (10) $6,211.63; (11) $6,857.92.

A. W. C. Arnold, 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.

A. Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 23 West 45th Street, New York City.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health.
E. (1) $900; (7) $291.85; (9) $1,191.85; (10) $2,297.99; (11) $3,489.84.

A. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) The association concerns itself with only proposed legislation affecting physicians and surgeons in the practice of their profession.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (4) $1,500; (9) $1,500; (11) $1,500.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $27,519.02.
E. (2) $21,155.30; (4) $427.73; (5) $2,445.92; (6) $277.27; (7) $1,010.54; (8) $2,202.26; (9) $27,519.02; (10) $124,464.35; (11) $151,983.37; (15).[1]

A. Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies. (3) Casualty and Surety Journal.
D. (6) $1,982.48.
E. (2) $1,456.26; (4) $88.94; (5) $132.70; (6) $28.85; (7) $80.77; (8) $194.96; (9) $1,982.48; (10) $4,005.09; (11) $5,987.57.

A. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Activity in favor of S. 906.
D. (6) $883.82.
E. (2) $411.96; (7) $471.86; (9) $883.82; (10) $506.67; (11) $1,390.49.

A. Edward Atkins, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation regarding labor laws and revenue act.
D. (2) $125; (7) $125; (9) $125.
E. (3) $125; (9) $125; (11) $125.

A. Awalt, Clark & Sparks, 822 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
E. (10) $8.86; (11) $8.86.

A. Charles E. Babcock, Route 4, Box 126, Vienna, Va.
B. Junior Order United American Mechanics, 302 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Control of immigration, improvement of free public schools, and suppression of communism.
D. (6) $147.
E. (5) $14; (6) $3.57; (7) $16.75; (8) $1.25; (9) $35.57; (10) $95.91; (11) $131.48.

A. John A. Baker.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,400.
E. (7) $259.34; (9) $259.34; (10) $906.69; (11) $1,166.03.

A. J. H. Ballew, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to free enterprise system and opposition to legislation unfavorable to that system.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Hartman Barber, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation affecting labor, especially railroad labor.
D. (6) $1,903.16.
E. (6) $184.99; (7) $47.35; (8) $403.25; (9) $635.59; (10) $1,108.71; (11) $1,744.30.

A. Fowler W. Barker, 17 Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of Professional Photogrammetrists, 17 Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Appropriation bills for mapping and surveying agencies of United States Government.
D. (6) $5,044.23.
E. (4) $6.80; (6) $2; (7) $10; (9) $18.80; (10) $256.75; (11) $754.55.

A. Joel Barlow, Walter Slowinski, and Walker Winter, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Corp., Bangor, Maine.
C. (2) General legislative interest concerned revenue revision.

A. Joel Barlow, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hudson Bay Mining & Smelting Co., Ltd., 500 Royal Bank Building, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada, et al.[1]
E. (4) $3.30; (6) $34.06; (7) $97.10; (9) $134.46; (10) $52.31; (11) $186.77.

A. Joel Barlow, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 10525 Carnegie Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the machine-tool industry.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $558.25.
E. (7) $93.56; (8) $6.05; (9) $99.61; (10) $159.83; (11) $259.44; (15) $23.

A. Irvin L. Barney, Room 412, Railway Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) H. R. 7840 and S. 2930.
D. (6) $2,424.99.

A. Roy Battles, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) My legislative interests will be those required by this organization in its broad national agricultural policy as defined each year in its annual convention. (3) National Grange Monthly.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Julia D. Bennett, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Interested in legislation affecting libraries and librarians.
E. (2) $1,511.20; (5) $16.92; (7) $10.70; (8) $4.20; (9) $1,543.02; (10) $3,304.32; (11) $4,847.34.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) All legislation affecting railroad employees and labor in general.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Mrs. Louella Miller Berg, 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Association of University Women, 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $710.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Preston B. Bergin, Room 1121, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District of Columbia Business Practices Council, 1030 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting businessmen in the District of Columbia, including fair-trade legislation for the District of Columbia.
D. (6) $4,000.
E. (2) $708.10; (5) $241.18; (6) $88.18; (7) $231.85; (9) $1,269.31; (11) $1,269.31; (15).[1]

A. Preston B. Bergin, Room 1121, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., Room 1121, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general legislative interests of my client are to obtain repeal of the excise tax on jewelry and jewelry-store merchandise.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (2) $370.66; (5) $997.16; (6) $176.28; (7) $675.44; (9) $2,219.54; (10) $5,622.28; (11) $7,841.82.

A. Tell Berna, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting machine-tool industry.

A. J. Raymond Berry, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. Legislation affecting stock fire-insurance companies.
E. (10) $1,168.30.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.
D. (6) $3,010.
E. (6) $27.65; (7) $177; (8) $65.35; (9) $270; (10) $757; (11) $1,027.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y., and 932 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The American Institute of Marine Underwriters, the Association of Marine Underwriters of the United States, American Cargo War Risk Reinsurance Exchange, American Marine Hull Insurance Syndicate.
C. (2) General questions affecting the insurance of ships and their cargoes against marine risks.
E. (5) $58; (6) $5; (7) $30; (9) $93; (10) $186; (11) $279.

A. Henry Bison, Jr., 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Retail Grocers, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the business enterprises of independent retail grocers.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (4) $45.87; (5) $90; (6) $15.40; (7) $15.95; (9) $167.22; (10) $285.27; (11) $452.49.

A. John H. Bivins, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. James C. Black, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting employer.
D. (6) $600.
E. (7) $500; (9) $500; (10) $1,000; (11) $1,500.

A. William Rhea Blake, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting the raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $104.15.
E. (7) $74.38; (9) $74.38; (10) $130.36; (11) $204.74.

A. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) General interest in legislation for payroll deductions for Federal employees, war damage, economic controls, taxation of fringe benefits, health programs for Federal employees, and hospital and health matters.

A. Sanford H. Bolz, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Cigarette Lighter Manufacturers Association, Inc., 303 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Revision of method of collection of manufacturers excise tax on cigarette lighters.
E. (10) $3.30.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Labor relations, wage and hour matters, controls over wages, and salaries and social security.
D. (6) $375.
E. (5) $130; (6) $5; (7) $51; (9) $186; (10) $585.50; (11) $771.50.

A. R. B. Bowden, 100 Merchants Exchange, St. Louis, Mo., and 600 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the grain and feed trade.
D. (6) $52.
E. (9) $2.50.

A. Charles M. Boyer, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation for development of a military policy for the United States which will guarantee adequate national security. (3) The Reserve Officer.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) All legislation involving or in the direction of national prohibition, taxation of alcoholic beverages, etc. (3) The Brewery Worker.
E. (10) $434.93.

A. Harold P. Braman, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing; oppose legislation adverse to savings and loan associations.
D. (6) $500.

A. Harry R. Brashear, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 2647, in opposition.

A. Breed, Abbott, and Morgan, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 1850, a bill for the relief of Dr. John D. MacLennan.
D. (6) $500.
E. (6) $20; (9) $20; (11) $20.

A. James M. Brewbaker, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. David F. Brinegar, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
C. (2) Water and soil legislation affecting Arizona.
D. (6) $2,250.
E. (7) $130.99; (9) $130.99; (10) $301.23; (11) $432.22.

A. Homer L. Brinkley, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

A. W. S. Bromley, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Derek Brook, 5709 Franklin Avenue, Falls Church, Va.
B. New York Board of Trade, 291 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Guarantees against the risk of nonpayment by foreign debtors due to currency inconvertibility, exchange transfer block, and other noncommercial hazards.
D. (6) $1,016.01.
E. (5) $75; (6) $10; (7) $174.34; (9) $249.34.

A. C. R. Brown, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) All bills affecting railway labor and labor in general.
D. (6) $1,940.

A. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., 2 Rector Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Revenue Act of 1954.
D. (6) $1,666.66.
E. (6) $88.18; (8) $38.03; (9) $126.21; (10) $158.89; (11) $285.10.

A. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Dow Chemical-Detroit Edison and Associates, care of Detroit-Edison Co., Detroit, Mich.

C. (2) To amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes.
E. (6) $106.68; (7) $40.10; (8) $11; (9) $157.78; (11) $157.78.

A. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the National Association of Electric Companies.
D. (6) $5,949.99.
E. (2) $5,477.49; (5) $262.50; (6) $7.04; (8) $21.53; (9) $5,768.56; (10) $11,555.22; (11) $17,323.78; (15).[1]

A. Paul W. Brown, 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Postal legislation.
E. (10) $546.40.

A. Thad H. Brown, Jr., 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation which affects the broadcasting industry.

A. John M. Brumm, 2212 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for the Nation's Health, 2212 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation regarding national health insurance.
D. (6) $2,374.98.
E. (8) $42.10; (9) $42.10; (10) $41.55; (11) $83.65.

A. Henry H. Brylawski, 1030 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. District of Columbia Business Practices Council, 1030 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting businessmen in the District of Columbia.
D. (6) $300.
E. (7) $16; (10) $20; (11) $36.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 4805 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
C. (2) Potentially interested in all legislation affecting river and harbor works, flood control, and other water use and conservation, and related subjects.
D. (6) $1,350.
E. (6) $6.35; (8) $8.50; (9) $14.85; (10) $48.72; (11) $63.57.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 4805 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. George J. Burger, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y., and 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 240 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y., and National Federation of Independent Businesses, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Senate Resolution 213 and all legislation affecting independent small business.

A. Donald T. Burke, 1200 18th Street NW., suite 510, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $200.
E. (7) $47.27; (8) $6.58; (9) $53.85; (10) $156.27; (11) $210.12.

A. Thomas H. Burke, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $1,495.
E. (7) $962; (9) $962; (10) $1,924; (11) $2,886.

A. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $450.
E. (2) $3,686.88; (5) $390.47; (6) $138.19; (7) $987.46; (8) $810.01; (9) $6,013.01; (10) $5,062.05; (11) $11,075.06.

A. George B. Burnham, 132 Third Street NE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To amend the Trading With the Enemy Act.
D. (6) $981.20.
E. (2) $658.86; (4) $234.58; (5) $10.12; (6) $15.51; (7) $32.13; (8) $30; (9) $981.20; (11) $981.20; (15).[1]

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation dealing with the electrical workers in particular and labor in general.
D. (6) $2,874.99.

A. Lawrence V. Byrnes, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L. E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting labor and transportation.
D. (6) $3,313.50.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203–A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $760.20.
E. (6) $3; (7) $10; (8) $10; (9) $23; (10) $46; (11) $69.

A. James A. Campbell, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills of interest to Federal Government employees and District of Columbia Government employees.
D. (6) $2,692.27.
E. (7) $269.22; (9) $269.22; (11) $269.22.

A. Julian W. Caplan, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation that affects retail trades.

A. James K. Carr, 2101 K Street, Sacramento, Calif.
B. Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 2101 K Street, Sacramento, Calif.
C. (2) Matters pertaining to Central Valley project (California) which affect the interest of the Sacramento Municipal Utility District.
D. (6) $385.43.
E. (8) $98.07; (9) $98.07; (10) $666.03; (11) $764.10.

A. T. C. Carroll, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) All legislation of interest to railroad employees.

A. Henderson H. Carson, 600 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio.
B. East Ohio Gas Co., 1405 East 6th Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) All legislation of interest to the natural gas industries.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (1) $153.23; (2) $30; (4) $25; (5) $32.70; (6) $10.70; (7) $63.90; (8) $12; (9) $327.53; (10) $1,017; (11) $1,344.53.

A. Albert E. Carter, 1026 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (5) $720; (6) $32.80; (7) $382.90; (8) $296.50; (9) $1,432.20; (10) $2,215.66; (11) $3,647.86.

A. Ralph H. Case, 889 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Sioux Tribe of Indians, Cheyenne River Reservation, South Dakota.
C. (2) Public Law 776.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Benjamin F. Castle, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.

A. Larry Gates, 861 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Clarence N. Sayen, 55th Street and Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Aviation legislation and Railway Labor Act.
D. (6) $590.
E. (8) $1.20; (9) $1.20; (11) $1.20.

A. Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
C. (2) Water and soil legislation affecting Arizona.
D. (6) $2,522.24.
E. (2) $4,998; (4) $125.27; (5) $1,234.51; (6) $190.39; (7) $423.10; (8) $56.01; (9) $7,027.28; (10) $16,040.56; (11) $23,067.84; (15).[1]

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Justice M. Chambers, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. M. Golodetz & Co., 120 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Congressional activity in the development of the strategic stockpiling program of the United States.
D. (6) $625.

A. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) Promoting a proposed Christian Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. (3) The Christian Patriot.
D. (6) $4,832.81.
E. (1) $1,556; (2) $2,427.85; (4) $2,680.44; (5) $143.78; (6) $21.41; (7) $618.82; (9) $7,448.30; (10) $16,494.94; (11) $23,943.24; (15).[1]

A. Abiah A. Church, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Any legislation—local, State, Federal, or international—which affects the broadcasting industry.

A. Clarence B. Carter, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
B. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
C. (2) For H. R. 122—to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937.
E. (10) $20.80; (11) $20.80.

A. Omer W. Clark, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) All legislation affecting veterans, their dependents and survivors of deceased veterans; (3) DAV Semi-Monthly.
D. (6) $2,769.24.

A. Robert M. Clark, 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Pending and prospective legislation affecting the interest of the railway company.
D. (6) $5,025.

A. Classroom Periodical Publishers' Association, 389 W. Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.
C. (2) General interest in H. R. 6052 and S. 2836.
D. (6) $1,316.16.
E. (2) $1,300; (8) $16.16; (9) $1,316.16; (10) $3,068.21; (11) $4,384.37.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Opposed to any proposed legislation calling for the duplication of class I–A clear-channel frequencies or the limitation of the power of class I–A standard-broadcast stations. CCBS opposes ratification of the so-called NARBA agreement signed November 15, 1950.
E. (7) $14; (9) $14; (10) $142.31; (11) $156.31; (15).[1]

A. The Coal Producers' Committee on Underground Gas Storage Safety, care of W. G. Stevenson, Grant Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) Legislation pertaining to underground storage of gas.
D. (6) $6,000.
E. (2) $6,000; (9) $6,000; (11) $6,000.

A. Clay L. Cochran, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the rural electrification program; (3) Rural Electrification magazine.
D. (6) $2,664.55.

A. Russell Coleman, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy.

A. The Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee 615 C. A. Johnson Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Railroad companies as stated above.[1]
C. (2) All legislation, both general and special, that affects the above-named railroads.
E. (2) $300; (7) $225.88; (9) $525.88; (10) $826.20; (11) $1,352.08.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2).[1]
E. (3) $300; (4) $2,715.42; (5) $1,398.16; (6) $576.50; (7) $200; (9) $5,190.08; (10) $10,342.70; (11) $15,532.78.

A. Committee for Defense of the Constitution by Preserving the Treaty Power, 36 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2).[1]
E. (4) $48.93; (6) $41.77; (9) $90.70; (10) $26,365.63; (11) $26,456.33; (15).[1]

A. Committee on Foreign Trade Education, Inc., Building A, room 801, 270 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting import and export trade of United States.
D. (6) $482.29.
E. (4) $197.10; (5) $143.22; (6) $104.10; (7) $30.88; (8) $3.69; (9) $478.99; (10) $291.17; (11) $770.16.

A. Committee on Laws, National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting stock fire-insurance companies.
D. (6) $668.
E. (2) $175; (4) $250; (5) $220; (7) $171; (9) $816; (10) $9,533; (11) $10,349; (15).[1]

A. Committee for the Nation's Health, 2212 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation regarding national health insurance.
D. (6) $12,446.85.
E. (2) $5,240.38; (4) $574.63; (5) $1,267.25; (6) $155.37; (7) $134.35; (9) $7,371.98; (10) $20,614.98; (11) $27,986.96.

A. Committee for the Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To support legislation providing for the return of confiscated German and Japanese property.
D. (6) $510.
E. (2) $670; (4) $400; (5) $375; (6) $20; (7) $131.23; (9) $1,597.13; (10) $465.73; (11) $2,062.86; (15).[1]

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Amana Refrigeration, Inc., Amana, Iowa.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc., successor to Trucking Industry National Defense Committee, Inc. No change from previous report.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Salt Producers Association 726 LaSalle-Wacker Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Lawrence R. Condon, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Estate of Mary Clark DeBrabant and Katherine C. Williams, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests relate to a possible revision of section 7 of the Technical Changes Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 895).

A. John C. Cone, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pan American World Airways System 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Supporting or opposing any aviation legislation that might have a bearing on the operation of Pan American World Airways System.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Conference for Inland Waterways Dry-Bulk Regulation, 402 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bring about an amendment of Section 303 (b) of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U. S. C. 903 (b)).
E. (1) $300; (4) $39; (7) $39.85; (9) $378.85; (10) $14,182.36; (11) $14,561.21.

A. Conference on State Defense, 111 8th Avenue, New York City, N. Y.
C. (2) Opposition to Federal taxation of State and local government bond interest.
E. (10) $1,848.47; (11) $1,848.47.

A. Richard J. Congleton, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
B. The Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
C. (2) General interest in all legislation affecting the business of the company.
E. (7) $1,113.03; (9) $1,113.03; (10) $3,864.75; (11) $4,977.78.

A. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to those objectives.
D. (6) $36,768.03.
E. (2) $14,672.40; (4) $11,959.95; (5) $2,127.67; (6) $1,106.19; (7) $5,286.42; (8) $1,615.40; (9) $36,768.03; (10) $53,393.81; (11) $90,161.84.

A. Cooke & Beneman, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The J. R. Watkins Co., Winona, Minn.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Amusement Parks, Pools, and Beaches, 203 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) H. R. 8224.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, 15th and H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interests are general in character and those affecting the coal industry.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Nationwide Trailer Rental System, 512 South Market Street, Wichita, Kans.
C. (2) Excise tax on utility trailers.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Sullivan, Bernard, Shea & Kenney, attorneys-at-law, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 8300.

A. Wilmer A. Cooper, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $1,312.50.
E. (6) $6.74; (7) $272.93; (8) $2.35; (9) $282.02; (10) $219.69; (11) $511.72.

A. Cotton, Brenner & Wrigley, 225 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Martin Aloysius Madden, 27 West 96th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) For the relief of Martin Aloysius Madden.
E. (6) $18.26; (7) $328.92; (8) $9; (9) $356.18; (10) $1,376.42; (11) $1,732.60.

A. Paul L. Courtney, 3210 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle St., Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Interested in promoting the interests of groups at a disadvantage because of existing tax disparities and Government-owned business competition.
D. (6) $300.
E. (7) $73.85; (9) $73.65; (10) $320.55; (11) $394.40.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
C. (2) Legislation affecting credit unions.
D. (6) $51,092.09.
E. (2) $525; (7) $6.75; (8) $1.25; (9) $533; (10) $1,029.77; (11) $1,562.77.

A. Robert A. Crichton, 1701 K Street, Washington, D. C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All existing and prospective legislation which may affect the life-insurance business.
D. (6) $362.50.
E. (7) $22.10; (9) $22.10; (10) $375.75; (11) $397.85; (15).[1]

A. Edward B. Crosland, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Matters affecting communications.
D. (6) $6,291.67.

A. Leo J. Crowley, 540 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, 615 C. A. Johnson Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) All legislation both general and special that affects railroads operating in Colorado.
D. (6) $525.88.
E. (2) $300; (7) $225.88; (9) $525.88; (10) $826.20; (11) $1,352.

A. John C. Cuneo, Box 1054, Modesto, Calif.
B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) The Townsend bills in Congress.
D. (6) $2,577.36.
E. (1) $646.80; (4) $62.44; (5) $569.85; (6) $96.54; (7) $103.88; (8) $33.75; (9) $1,513.26; (10) $3,215.92; (11) $4,729.18.

A. John B. Curan, 16 East Sixth Street, Media, Pa.
B. International Brotherhood of Firemen & Oilers, 330 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All matters of interest to labor in general.
D. (6) $200.
E. (7) $125; (9) $125; (11) $125.

A. Ralph E. Curtis, 944 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting tavern and restaurant industry.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $2,350.
E. (6) $3.47; (7) $307.75; (9) $311.22; (10) $222; (11) $533.22.

A. Dairy Industry Committee, 519 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the dairy industry.
D. (6) $4,050.

A. Paul J. Daugherty, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Ohio Chamber of Commerce, 820 Huntington Bank Building, Columbus, Ohio.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $720.
E. (10) $320.48; (11) $320.48.

A. Joan David, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Committee on Parcel Post Size and Weight Limitations, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Parcel Post Size and Weight Limitations.
D. (6) $1,800.
E. (7) $76.08; (9) $76.08.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Chicago Bridge and Iron Co., 1305 West 105th Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Proposed Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to the tax treatment of income derived from foreign sources.
E. (6) $6.37; (7) $20; (9) $26.37; (10) $156.96; (11) $183.33.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Clearing Industrial District, Inc., 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Provisions of 1954 revenue revision bill relating to taxation of gains and losses upon sale of real property by dealers.
E. (6) $3.03; (7) $50; (9) $53.03; (10) $289.78; (11) $342.81.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Copley Press, Inc., 428 Downer Place, Aurora, Ill.
C. (2) Provisions of 1954 revenue revision bill relating to corporate distributions and adjustments.
E. (6) $92.83; (7) $440.83; (9) $533.66; (11) $533.66.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Proposed Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to the tax treatment of income derived from foreign sources.
E. (6) $50.31; (7) $121.25; (9) $171.56; (11) $171.56.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. John Stuart, 345 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Provisions of 1954 revenue revision bill relating to corporate distributions and adjustments.
E. (10) $572.49; (11) $572.49.

A. Sherlock Davis, 1117 Barr Building, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Anything which pertains to sugar or trade with Cuba.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. T. C. Davis, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Missouri Pacific Railroad Co., 25 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) S. 978 and any legislation affecting Missouri Pacific Railroad Co.

A. Waters S. Davis, Jr., League City, Tex.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
C. (2).[1]

A. Clarence E. Dawson, Esq., 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Western Union Telegraph Co.
D. (6) $200.
E. (8) $28.94; (9) $28.94; (11) 28.94.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Motor Carriers Leasing Conference, 4195 Central Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) H. R. 3203 (trip leasing) for passage.
D. (6) $625.

A. Delaware River Valley Association, Burlington County, N. J., and Bucks County, Pa., (P. O.)—Mayor George T. Becton, Riverton, N. J.
C. (2) Objection to the proposed dredging of a 40-foot channel in the Delaware River from Philadelphia to Trenton, N. J.
E. (2) $216.73; (4) $134.23; (7) $20.03; (9) $370.99; (11) $370.99.

A. Denver Association of Building Owners and Managers, 624 17th Street, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for deductibility for Federal income-tax purposes of taxes levied by the Moffat tunnel improvement district.

A. R. T. DeVany, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Ralph B. Dewey, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Maritime matters.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (2) $600; (4) $5; (5) $400; (6) $305; (9) $1,310; (10) $4,147.07; (11) $5,457.07.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 4587 and legislation affecting the motion-picture industry.
D. (6) $3,900.
E. (7) $1,300; (9) $1,300; (10) $2,600; (11) $3,900.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Sacramento-Yolo Port District, 312 Court House, Sacramento, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation in support of the Sacramento River deep water channel project.
D. (6) $2,465.
E. (8) $65.50; (9) $65.50; (10) $206.25; (11) $271.75.

A. Direct Mail Advertising Association, Inc., 381 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Against H. R. 569, H. R. 6052.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (6) $25; (7) $30; (9) $55; (10) $110; (11) $165.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Disabled American Veterans National Headquarters, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) All legislation affecting veterans, their dependents and survivors of deceased veterans. (3) DAV Semi-Monthly.
E. (2) $7,846.21; (7) $878.55; (9) $8,724.76; (10) $9,929.55; (11) $18,654.31.

A. Walter L. Disbrow, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,286.53.
E. (7) $229.60; (9) $229.60; (10) $111; (11) $340.60.

A. Wesley E. Disney, 501 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Zinc Co., St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) H. R. 5496, with reference to the inclusion of fluorspar.
D. (6) $250.

A. Wesley E. Disney, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests include any matters affecting the natural gas industry.
D. (6) $1,666.66.
E. (10) $10.35.

A. Wesley E. Disney, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Building Granite Quarries Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Specific legislation is for percentage depletion relating to granite and other minerals.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Wesley E. Disney, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Ozark-Mahoning Co., Tulsa, Okla.
C. (2) Legislation involving percentage depletion.
D. (6) $250.

A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general.
D. (6) $13,002.04.
E. (2) $6,047.31; (4) $500; (5) $1,373.11; (6) $599.81; (7) $530.73; (8) $6,538.78; (9) $15,089.74; (10) $33,881.70; (11) $48,971.44; (15).[1]

A. Doherty, Rumble & Butler, E-1006 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W-1451 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (2) Amendment of Internal Revenue Code.
D. (6) $3,500.
E. (6) $2.64; (7) $495.97; (9) $498.61; (10) $507.06; (11) $1,005.67.

A. James L. Donnelly, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation of general interest to manufacturers. (3) Industrial Review.
E. (7) $159.73; (9) $159.73; (10) $1,212.26; (11) $1,371.99.

A. Robert F. Donoghue, 236 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the merchant marine, particularly the tanker division thereof.
D. (6) $1,625.
E. (4) $29.03; (6) $168.98; (9) $178.01; (10) $39.17; (11) $217.18.

A. Thomas J. Donovan, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting excise tax on alcoholic beverages.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.
D. (6) $112.50.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,199.60.
E. (7) $110.50; (9) $110.50; (10) $48.50; (11) $159.

A. John E. Dougherty, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interest of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

A. James W. Douthat, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 913 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A Fayette B. Dow, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, Tulsa, Okla.
C. (2) Opposed to S. 3075 which if enacted would divorce pipelines.

A. M. J. Dowd, El Centro, Calif.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
C. (2) Palo Verde diversion weir, Colorado River storage project, purchase of transmission facilities, Water Resources Policy Act of 1954.
D. (6) $1,095.
E. (7) $1,079.79; (9) $1,079.79; (10) $637.83; (11) $1,717.62.

A. Adin M. Downer, 610 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
C. (2) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents. (3) VFW magazine (Foreign Service) and VFW legislative newsletter.
D. (6) $1,750.
E. (7) $45.30; (9) $45.30; (10) $243.90; (11) $289.20.

A. W. A. Dozier, Jr., 17 Molton Street, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 537 Dexter Avenue, Montgomery, Ala.
C. (2) All health matters covered by legislative action. (3) P. R. notes.
D. (6) $1,800.
E. (4) $225; (9) $225; (10) $450; (11) $675.

A. Stephen M. DuBrul, 5-141 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Read Dunn, Jr., 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting the raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
E. (10) $60.26.

A. Joseph L. Dwyer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.
D. (6) $3,276.
E. (7) $406.02; (9) $402.02; (10) $1,084.23; (11) $1,490.25.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Hotel Statler, New York, N. Y., and 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Matters affecting meat packers.
D. (6) $68.85.
E. (2) $52.72; (7) $1.62; (9) $54.34; (10) $85.43; (11) $139.77; (15).[1]

A. Herman Edelsberg, 1003 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 212 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Supports legislation which promotes the civil rights of all Americans, and opposes undemocratic discrimination against any Americans.
D. (6) $140.
E. (7) $15; (9) $15; (10) $30; (11) $45.

A. Joseph H. Ehlers, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Society of Civil Engineers, 33 West 39th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests relate to matters affecting the engineering profession.
E. (4) $15; (5) $25; (9) $40; (10) $140; (11) $180.

A. Bernard H. Ehrlich, 1367 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 418 Homer Building, 13th Street at F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interest previously on all bills relating to the education and training of veterans and all other legislation affecting proprietary schools.

A. Oscar Elder, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is interested in any legislation which affects the broadcasting industry.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the rural-electrification program. (3) Rural Electrification Magazine.
D. (6) $5,174.59.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Otis H. Ellis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, Suite 708, Ferguson Building, Springfield, Ill.
C. (2) Interested in general legislation which might affect the business interests of independent oil jobbers and marketers.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. John H. Else, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Housing and labor legislation and all matters affecting retail lumber dealers.
D. (6) $3,050.
E. (7) $260.50; (9) $260.50; (10) $646.50; (11) $907.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting public power projects generally.
D. (6) $337.64.
E. (7) $261.29; (8) $76.35; (9) $337.64; (10) $138.14; (11) $475.78.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting a city's rights in the Colorado River and related matters, and legislation affecting public power projects.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 512 16th Street, Oakland, Calif.
C. (2) Interior Department appropriation bill, 1955, and legislation affecting social security coverage for municipal employees.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the district's rights in the Colorado River and related matters.
D. (6) $2,100.
E. (6) $37.52; (8) $16.49; (9) $54.01; (10) $67.45; (11) $121.46.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting California's interest in the Colorado River and legislation relating to reclamation and water-resources policies.
D. (6) $10,702.84.
E. (4) $15.50; (6) $20.08; (7) $108.52; (8) $51.24; (9) $195.34; (10) $229.93; (11) $425.27; (15).[1]

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Water Project Authority of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
C. (2) Interior Department appropriation bill, 1954; waterfowl management, Central Valley project; irrigation distribution systems bills; and legislation affecting the Central Valley project and Federal reclamation and power policies generally.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Water Resources Board of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
C. (2) Army civil functions appropriations bill, 1955, and legislation affecting flood-control projects generally.
D. (6) $750.

A. Robert E. Ely III, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Petitioner is interested in an appropriation act providing for payment of claims arising from French spoliations where claims have heretofore been reported to Congress by the Court of Claims.

A. K. Blyth Emmons, 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Small Business Men's Association, Inc., 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to small business, either directly or indirectly; (3) Pulling Together.
D. (6) $2,475.
E. (7) $195.55; (9) $195.55; (10) $689.20; (11) $884.75.

A. Engineers and Scientists of America, 711 West Lake Street, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers and other members of affiliated units.

A. Myles W. English, 966 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 966 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation pending before the Congress dealing with Federal grants-in-aid to States for highways, repeal, modification, or extension of Federal excise taxes on motor vehicles, gasoline, oil, tires, or auto parts.

A. Charles J. Fain, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the rural electrification program. (3) Rural Electrification Magazine.
D. (6) $2,700.02.

A. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1417 California Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All Federal legislation, bills, resolutions, appropriations and other proceedings affecting American agriculture and farmers, either directly or indirectly.
D. (6) $29,560.87.
E. (2) $10,946.25; (3) $187.50; (4) $312.47; (5) $2,296.76; (6) $1,722.95; (7) $1,329.34; (8) $108.72; (9) $16,903.99; (10) $53,294.73; (11) $70,198.72; (15).[1]

A. Harold E. Fellows, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is interested in any legislation which affects the broadcasting industry.

A. John A. Ferguson, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation pertaining to natural gas.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Sugar Corporation, Clewiston, Fla.; Fellsmere Sugar Producers Association, Fellsmere, Fla.; American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La.

A. James Finucane, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 1013 18th Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To support legislation providing for the return of confiscated German and Japanese, Swiss, and American property, through amending the Trading With the Enemy Act, through other appropriate legislation or through a treaty.
D. (6) $670.90.
E. (7) $131.23; (9) $131.23; (11) $131.23.

A. Bernard M. Fitzgerald, Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the National Association of Electric Companies.
D. (6) $472.50.

A. Stephen Fitzgerald and Company, 502 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Creole Petroleum Corp., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $6,700.
E. (1) $1,033.27; (4) $3,409.77; (6) $141.69; (7) $325; (8) $2,282.87; (9) $7,192.60; (10) $66,398.80; (11) $73,591.40.

A. Stephen Fitzgerald and Company, 502 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,700.
E. (1) $351.87; (4) $1,377; (6) $47.43; (7) $177.49; (8) $296.21; (9) $2,250; (10) $3,937.70; (11) $6,187.70.

A. F. Stuart Fitzpatrick, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 745 McKnight Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Rust Prevention Association, 745 McKnight Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) Legislation affecting funds for research on plant disease control and crop improvement.
D. (6) $2,225.
E. (2) $162.44; (4) $20; (5) $235.66; (6) $103.94; (7) $142; (9) $664.04; (10) $2,342.57; (11) $3,006.61.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual (Legislative Fund), Lakeland, Fla.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation that affects the citrus industry and against any legislation that affects it unfavorably.
E. (2) $2,499.99; (5) $40; (6) $41.74; (7) $205; (8) $1.28; (9) $2,788.01; (10) $5,630.71; (11) $8,418.72; (15).[1]

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
C. (2) Potentially interested in all legislation affecting river and harbor works, flood control, and other water use and conservation, and related subjects.
E. (2) $1,350; (8) $14.85; (9) $1,364.85; (10) $2,748.72; (11) $4,113.57.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. John J. Flynn, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation affecting the welfare and security of working men and women and their families.
D. (6) $1,425.
E. (7) $336.01; (9) $336.01; (10) $230; (11) $566.01.

A. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
C. (2) 1955 Agricultural appropriations bill and general tax revision bill. (3) The Forest Farmer.
E. (10) $781.84.

A. J. Carter Fort, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting transportation.
D. (6) $4,322.08.
E. (7) $48.27; (9) $48.27; (10) $331.23; (11) $379.50.

A. Charles E. Foster, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) All legislation affecting veterans, their dependents or survivors of deceased veterans. (3) DAV Semi-Monthly.
D. (6) $2,076.96.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Matters affecting communications.
D. (6) $4,167.

A. L. S. Franklin, Box 401, Greensboro, N. C.
C. (2) Tax limitation.
D. (6) $250.
E. (2) $375; (9) $375; (10 $1,510; (11) $1,885.

A. George H. Frates, 1163 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Retail Druggists.
C. (2) To oppose legislation detrimental to independent retail druggists and to further legislation favorable to the profession. (3) N. A. R. D. Journal.
D. (6) $2,800.
E. (2) $675; (5) $399; (6) $80; (9) $1,154; (10) $2,396; (11) $3,550.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $11,826.61.
E. (2) $10,251.80; (3) $5; (4) $904.43; (5) $1,823.83; (6) $405.58; (7) $1,203.17; (8) $743.77; (9) $15,337.58; (10) $32,295.05; (11) $47,632.63; (15).[1]

A. Nolon J. Fuqua, Duncan, Okla.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tenn.
D. (6) $223.38.

A. John F. Gale, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy.
D. (6) $30.

A. Lawrence H. Gall, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation pertaining to natural gas.
D. (6) $1,450.

A. Earl H. Gammons, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation applicable to or affecting the radio and/or television industry.

A. Gwynn Garnett, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Foreign Aid; Farm Program.
E. (7) $26.20; (9) $26.20; (10) $131.60; (11) $157.80.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops; The Alert.
D. (6) $2,500.96.
E. (8) $1; (9) $1; (10) $123.48; (11) $124.48.

A. Francis J. Garvey, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Explanation and analysis of Federal bills.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $175.93; (9) $175.93; (10) $1,277.82; (11) $1,453.75; (15).[1]

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) In general, legislation which concerns or affects members of the Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc.
D. (6) $2,691.74.
E. (2) $2,000; (4) $679.05; (6) $12.69; (9) $2,691.74; (10) $2,520.52; (11) $5,212.26.

A. Gus F. Geissler.
B. Farmers Educational & Cooperative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1000.
E. (7) $135; (9) $135; (10) $125; (11) $260.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. The Interstate Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,500.

A. J. M. George—H. K. Brehmer & C. S. McMahon, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Leo E. George, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to the postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees.
(3) Union Postal Clerk.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (10) $200; (11) $200.

A. Stanley Gewirtz, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting welfare of airlines and air transport industry.
E. (7) $61; (9) 61; (10) $904; (11) $151.40.

A. Walter A. Giblin, room 412, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) Railroad retirement legislation.
D. (6) $1,616.66.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislation-Federal Relations Division of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the 83d Congress relating to public education.
D. (6) $1,404.75.
E. (7) $120.79; (9) $120.79; (10) $197.92; (11) $318.71.

A. Hugh V. Gittinger, Jr., 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Real Estate Board, Inc., 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All local measures affecting the District of Columbia are of interest.

A. Nathaniel H. Goodrich, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $162.49.
E. (7) $7.50; (9) $7.50; (10) $9; (11) $16.50.

A. Philip P. Gott, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Confectioners' Association of the United States, Inc., 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislative proposals affecting the confectionery industry.
E. (8) $500.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Bills affecting the public health.
D. (6) $375.

A. Government Employees' Council, American Federation of Labor, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation that affects Government employees is of interest to this council.
D. (6) $5,653.17.
E. (2) $3,623.24; (4) $253.20; (5) $620.60; (6) $1,059.43; (8) $1,621.02; (9) $7,177.49; (10) $11,140.82; (11) $18,318.31. (15).[1]

A. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the grain and feed trade.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $15C.
E. (2) $52; (4) $50; (6) $8; (8) $8.20; (9) $118.20; (10) $181.46; (11) $299.66.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318–418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) To promote general interests of locomotive firemen and enginemen.
D. (6) $15.50.
E. (2) $4,050.24; (5) $612.47; (6) $300.66; (7) $1,608.46; (8) $36.05; (9) $6,607.88; (10) $15,328.45; (11) $21,936.33; (15).[1]

A. Charles A. Grant, 1450 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Silk and Rayon Printers and Dyers Association of America, Inc., 1450 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2).[1]

A. S. R. Grauten, 1722 Harrison Street, Evanston, Ill.
C. (2) Recognition of services of civilians employed on construction of Panama Canal, by amending act of May 29, 1944 (P. L. 319, 78th Cong.).
E. (4) $19.52; (5) $9.96; (7) $18; (9) $47.48; (10) $53; (11) $100.48.

A. Cassius B. Gravitt, Jr., 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National League of District Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation which affects the interests of postmasters. (3) The Postmasters Advocate.
D. (6) $1,700.

A. Paul S. Green, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) In favor of the mutual security program.
D. (6) $600.
E. (7) $48.97; (9) $48.97; (10) $22.60; (11) $71.57.

A. Ernest W. Green, 723 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Francis Thornton Greene, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General legislative interest is to support all legislation favorable to and to oppose all legislation hostile to, maintenance of the American merchant marine.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (7) $428.15; (9) $428.15; (10) $692.76; (11) $1,120.91.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation which affects the coal industry.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Warren Griffiths, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $280.
E. (9) $2.07; (11) $2.07.

A. Weston B. Grimes, 436 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) Agriculture and the processing and transportation of the products thereof, etc.[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $6,874.98.
E. (7) $5; (9) $5; (10) $8; (11) $13.

A. Gypsum Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) For percentage depletion on gypsum.
E. (6) $119.54; (7) $3,033.38; (9) $3,152.92; (10) $2,608.12; (11) $5,761.04.

A. Frank E. Haas, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation which affects western railroads.
D. (6) $411.96.
E. (7) $471.86; (9) $471.86; (10) $266.36; (11) $738.22.

A. Eleanor M. Hadley, 1825 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Association of Social Workers, 1 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Social security.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Hugh F. Hall, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Taxation; trip leasing; agricultural appropriations; farm credit legislation.
E. (7) $5.56; (9) $5.56; (10) $49.89; (11) $55.45.

A. Radford Hall, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Legislation affecting cattle industry.
D. (6) $1,950.
E. (6) $60.69.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to the postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) Federation News Service Bulletin.
D. (6) $2,874.96.
E. (7) $569.68; (9) $569.68; (10) $932.64; (11) $1,502.32.

A. Jess Halsted, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Gypsum Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) For percentage depletion on gypsum.
E. (6) $79.43; (7) $1,181.77; (9) $1,261.20; (10) $3,852.78; (11) $5,113.98.

A. Lloyd C. Halvorson, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $2,000.
E. (7) $51.20; (9) $51.20; (10) $88.77; (11) $139.97.

A. Joseph J. Hammer, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to the petroleum industry.
D. (6) $1,210.30.
E. (6) $0.80; (7) $84.50; (9) $85.30; (10) $882.67; (11) $967.97.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. William A. Hanscom, Suite 4, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Oil Workers International Union, 1840 California Street, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare—oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $2,055.
E. (7) $180; (9) $180; (10) $540; (11) $720.

A. Hardboard Association, 30 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Concerned with bills to correct tariff classification of hardboard.
E. (2) $750; (6) $77.92; (7) $1,751.36; (8) $3,333.99; (9) $5,163.27; (10) $1,541; (11) $6,704.27.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 2 East 48th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Ralph W. Hardy, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation which affects the broadcasting industry.

A. L. James Harmansen, Jr., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation—General: Transportation and taxes, antitrust matters.
D. (6) $2,749.98.
E. (7) $83.46; (9) $83.46; (10) $265.07; (11) $348.53.

A. Don V. Harris, Jr., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Admiral Corp., 3800 Cortland Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) General legislative interest concerned Federal excise taxes.

A. Don V. Harris, Jr., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United Aircraft Corp., 400 Main Street, East Hartford, Conn.
C. (2) General legislative interests concern Federal income taxes.

A. Winder R. Harris, 441 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Maritime matters.

A. Merwin K. Hart, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation to support private enterprise and maintain American independence.
D. (6) $500.
E. (10) $123.78; (11) $123.78.

A. Stephen H. Hart, 520 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Interested in general livestock tax matters.

A. Bernard C. Harter, 5402 Albemarle Street, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, University Hospital, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) To get increased appropriations for research in neurology.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Edward S. Hartman, Rural Route 2, Delavan, Wis.
B. National Tax Equity Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Interested in promoting the interests of groups at a disadvantage because of existing tax disparities and Government-owned business competition.
E. (10) $864.04.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation and legislative proposals affecting the retail industry.[1]
D. (6) $3,375.
E. (7) $52.20; (9) $52.20; (10) $165.20; (11) $217.40.

A. Edward B. Hayes, room 2500, 135 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. A. L. Mechling Barge Lines, Inc., 51 North Desplaines Street, Joliet, Ill.
C. (2) All legislative activities relating to or affecting the transportation of commodities by water.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (3) Washington Situation.
D. (6) $2,475.
E. (7) $92.30; (9) $92.30; (10) $62.02; (11) $154.32.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislative proposals which may or do affect western railroads.

A. John C. Hazen, suite 808, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2).[1]
E. (7) $69; (8) $1.25; (9) $70.25; (10) $126.42; (11) $196.67.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) The names of any papers, periodicals, magazines, or other publications in which the person filing has caused to be published any articles or editorials; News for Dairy Co-ops; The Alert.
D. (6) $2,501.97.
E. (8) $2; (9) $2; (10) $10.25; (11) $12.25.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support of Federal aid for school construction, etc.[1]

A. George R. Heidrich, Charles Town, W. Va.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $29.18.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Long-range plans for agriculture and other legislation directly affecting the food canning industry, and opposition to mandatory marketing orders.
D. (6) $833.33.
E. (7) $120.15; (9) $120.15; (10) $450.71; (11) $570.86.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Savings and Loan League, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing. Supporting in general H. R. 7839 and S. 2933.
D. (6) $200.

A. Laurance G. Henderson, 1190 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. North American Airlines, Lockheed Air Terminal, Burbank, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting air transportation.
D. (6) $750.
E. (1) $6,612.16; (4) $165.75; (5) $50; (6) $75; (7) $75; (9) $6,977.91; (10) $598.80; (11) $7,576.71.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 1002 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y., and 1002 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation which affects, directly or indirectly, local property insurance agents. (3) The American Agency.
D. (6) $235.75.
E. (7) $235.75; (9) $235.75; (10) $246.90; (11) $482.65.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 426 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Boston Wool Trade Association, Philadelphia Wool and Textile Association, National Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the wool trade industry.
D. (6) $600.
E. (6) $10.13; (9) $10.13.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 426 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Hot House Vegetable Growers, Post Office Box 659, Terre Haute, Ind.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the hot house vegetable industry.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 426 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Brewers Foundation, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the brewing industry.
D. (6) $5,000.
E. (6) $70.43; (9) $70.43.

A. Robert C. Hibben, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation which may affect the ice cream industry.
E. (4) $127.36; (6) $36.90; (9) $164.26; (11) $164.26.

A. W. J. Hickey, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washton, D. C.
D. (6) $187.50.

A. Ray C. Hinman, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to the petroleum industry.
D. (6) $1,330.94.
E. (6) $2.48; (7) $78.46; (9) $80.94; (10) $346.90; (11) $427.84.

A. John L. Hoen, 1101 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interest of the American Merchant Marine.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose all legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $3,200; (9) $3,200; (10) $6,400; (11) $9,600.

A. John R. Holden, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Veterans of World War II, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in veterans' legislation, armed services legislation, international affairs, Americanism, and general welfare. (3) National AMVET.
D. (6) $875.
E. (7) $75; (9) $75; (10) $75; (11) $150.

A. Charles M. Holloway, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the 83d Congress relating to public education.
D. (6) $216.60.
E. (7) $14.50; (9) $14.50; (10) $13.50; (11) $28.

A. J. M. Hood, president, American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Victor Hood, 4310 Queensbury Road, Riverdale, Md.
B. Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists, and Proprietors International Union, 1141 North Delaware, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) Legislation affecting labor, District barber law, veterans' education laws, social security laws, workmen's compensation laws, etc.
D. (6) $896.32.
E. (7) $276.32; (9) $276.32; (10) $652.58; (11) $928.90.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., 1305 West 105th Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) The proposed Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to the treatment of income derived from foreign sources.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of Thomas C. Dennehy, deceased.
C. (2) Legislation affecting taxation of decedents' estates.
E. (6) $30.10; (9) $30.10; (11) $30.10.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Samuel E. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The proposed Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to the treatment of income derived from foreign sources.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Underwriters Service Corp., Meridian, Miss.
C. (2) Tax revision legislation.

A. Jesse V. Horton, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting postal employees, including supervisors, and the postal service. (3) The Postal Supervisor.
D. (6) $2,375.
E. (7) $137.95; (9) $137.95; (10) $316.60; (11) $454.55.

A. S. H. Howard, 1414 Evergreen Avenue, Millvale, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to railway employees and labor in general.
D. (6) $600.

A. Harold K. Howe, Suite C, 2480 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, Box 1187, Joliet, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the laundry industry and the members thereof.
D. (6) $2,649.90.
E. (2) $1,154; (7) $160.74; (9) $1,314.74; (10) $3,192.42; (11) $4,507.16.

A. Harold K. Howe, 207 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Lawn Mower Institute, Inc., 207 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All matters of interest to the lawnmower industry.
D. (6) $1,800.

A. Raymond E. Hughes, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting stock fire-insurance companies.
D. (6) $175.
E. (5) $220.50; (7) $171.15; (9) $391.65; (10) $1,415.23; (11) $1,806.88.

A. C. E. Huntley, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $250.

A. John M. Hurley, 515 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
D. (6) $256.63.
E. (7) $325.57; (9) $325.57; (10) $997.18; (11) $1,322.75; (15).[1]

A. Kenneth N. Hurley, 2700 16th Street South, Arlington, Va.
C. (2) Tax and finance.

A. W. C. Hushing, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.
D. (6) $3,430.
E. (6) $55.20; (7) $279.50; (8) $89.30; (9) $424; (10) $762; (11) $1,186.

A. Illinois Railroad Association, Room 1526, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation effecting railroads.

A. Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc., 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., suite 501, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation pertaining to natural gas.
D. (6) $23,586.34.
E. (2) $7,200; (5) $375; (9) $7,575; (10) $15,150; (11) $23,725.

A. Ingoldsby & Coles, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The association is interested in amending existing shipping legislation in order to extend operating and construction differential subsidies to American-flag vessels engaged in so-called tramp trades, and in other legislative matters affecting American-flag shipping.
E. (6) $10.10; (7) $154.04; (9) $164.14; (10) $218.15; (11) $382.29; (15).[1]

A. Kenneth W. Ingwalson, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2).[1]
E. (7) $2.27; (9) $2.27; (10) $9.48; (11) $11.75.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $350.

A. Insurance Company of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Interested in having the present Congress pass an appropriation act providing for payment of claims arising from French spoliations where claims have heretofore been reported to Congress by the Court of Claims.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in substantially all legislation affecting the socioeconomic and political interests of the American workingman.
D. (6) $2,150.
E. (1) $1,250; (4) $250; (5) $150; (6) $200; (7) $300; (9) $2,150; (10) $4,300; (11) $6,450.

A. International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, CIO, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation affecting the welfare and security of working men and women and their families.
E. (2) $1,425; (7) $336.01; (9) $1,761.01; (10) $3,080; (11) $4,841.01.

A. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $6,000.
E. (4) $5.16; (9) $5.16; (10) $62.25; (11) $67.41.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W–1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (2) Amendments of Internal Revenue Code.[1]
D. (6) $5.
E. (2) $10,500; (4) $64.55; (5) $122.28; (7) $7,799.06; (9) $18,445.89; (10) $16,582.78; (11) $34,928.67; (15).[1]

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203–A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $737.50.
E. (7) $50.40; (9) $50.40; (10) $185.24; (11) $235.64.

A. C. Clinton James, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District of Columbia Building and Loan League, secretary's office, 1 Thomas Circle, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) A nominal interest in Federal legislation affecting savings and loan business.
D. (6) $349.98.
E. (5) $125; (8) $125; (9) $125; (10) $250; (11) $375.

A. Delos L. James, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $225.
E. (10) $50.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1759 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States and Hawaii.
D. (6) $375.
E. (2) $300; (9) $300; (10) $600; (11) $900.

A. Ray L. Jenkins, 541 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Societe Internationale, Pour Participations Industrielles Et Commerciales, S. A., Peter Merianstr, 19 Basle Str., Switzerland.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the client.

A. Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general legislative interests of the corporation are to obtain repeal of the excise tax on jewelry and jewelry store merchandise.
D. (6) $9,488.50.
E. (2) $4,600; (4) $4,247.93; (5) $1,823.91; (6) $296.53; (7) $1,063.48; (9) $12,031.85; (10) $18,719.36; (11) $30,751.21; (15).[1]

A. Peter Dierks Joers, Mountain Pine, Ark.
B. Dierks Lumber & Coal Co., 1006 Grand Avenue, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) Flood Control Act of 1945, Millwood Dam, and legislation affecting lumber industry.

A. Johns-Mansville Corp., 22 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Revenue bill of 1954, social security, housing, and reciprocal trade.
E. (2) $1,250; (8) $782.67; (9) $2,032.67; (10) $3,523.09; (11) $55,555.76.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation relating to Great Lakes shipping.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (10) $149.56; (11) $149.56.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Reuben L. Johnson, Jr.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,350.
E. (7) $39.08; (9) $39.08;

A. W. D. Johnson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O. R. C. and B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
C. (2) All legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor generally and employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act in particular.

A. Bascom F. Jones, 930 Broad Street, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I railroads in Tennessee.
C. (2).[1]

A. Charles W. Jones, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting the raw-cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $378.
E. (7) $31.64; (9) $31.64; (10) $138.91; (11) $170.55.

A. J. M. Jones, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (6) $202.01; (7) $1,820.77; (8) $275.80; (9) $2,298.58; (10) $6,831.33; (11) $9,129.91.

A. Lyle W. Jones, 705 Warner Building, 501 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The United States Potters Association, East Liverpool, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the pottery industry.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (5) $293.83; (6) $117.51; (7) $24.55; (8) $109.83; (9) $545.72; (10) $1,068.33; (11) $1,614.05.

A. Phillip E. Jones, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting sugar.
D. (6) $4,250.

A. Rowland Jones, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation and legislative proposals affecting the retail industry.[1]
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $155.71; (9) $155.71; (10) $360.87; (11) $516.58.

A. Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists, and Proprietors, International Union of America, 1141 North Delaware, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) Legislation effecting labor.[1]
E. (2) $896.32; (9) $896.32; (10) $2,227.58; (11) $3,123.90.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Robert C. Keck, 134 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Hardboard Association, 30 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Concerned with bills to correct tariff classification of hardboard.
E. (6) $8.42; (7) $525.69; (9) $534.11; (11) $534.11.

A. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 315 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. City and County of San Francisco, City Hall, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to the city and county of San Francisco.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (5) $950; (6) $621.45; (7) $911.29; (8) $371.55; (9) $2,854.29; (10) $3,373.13; (11) $6,227.42.

A. Nathaniel S. Keith, 3212 Macomb Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Redevelopment Builders of New York, 110 East 42d Street, New York City.

A. James P. Kem, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation involving the interests and welfare of the American merchant Marine.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. James P. Kem, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Johnston, Lemon & Co., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The legislative interest is opposition to H. R. 3998, a bill to authorize the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia to regulate and condition the declaration and payment of dividends by public utilities in the District of Columbia.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. James P. Kem, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. T. H. Mastin & Co., 1907 Grand Avenue, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) Sections of the 1954 revenue bill affecting taxation of partnerships.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) In favor of the mutual security program.
D. (6) $145.83.
E. (7) $100.34; (9) $100.34; (10) $32; (11) $132.34.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 203 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio, engaged in the production, transportation, refining, and marketing of petroleum and petroleum products.
C. (2) Generally interested in all legislative matters that would affect the oil and gas industry.
D. (6) $500.
E. (2) $125; (5) $75; (7) $35; (9) $235; (10) $435; (11) $670.

A. Miles D. Kennedy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2).[1] (3) American Legion Magazine and Legislative Bulletin.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $3,100.
E. (8) $51.60; (9) $51.60; (10) $503.93; (11) $555.53.

A. Ronald M. Ketcham, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, 1151 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $2,750.
E. (2) $2,750; (9) $2,750; (10) $5,500; (11) $8,250.

A. Omar B. Ketchum, 610 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
C. (2).[1] (3) VFW Magazine and VFW Legislative Newsletter.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $273; (9) $273; (10) $495; (11) $768.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Hotel Statler, New York, N. Y., and 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Matters affecting meat packers.
D. (6) $875.01.
E. (10) $80.87.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Posting of bonds for livestock purchasing, Taft-Hartley Act revision, and tax law revision.
D. (6) $110.35.
E. (7) $54.66; (9) $54.66; (10) $73.24; (11) $127.90.

A. Joseph William Kinghorne, 1365 Iris Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Broiler Association, Box 44, Lombard, Ill.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation that may tend to affect the production and/or marketing of commercial broilers.
D. (6) $300.
E. (9) $6.84; (10) $150.59; (11) $157.43.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting the raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $360.
E. (7) $39.44; (9) $39.44; (10) $63.12; (11) $102.56.

A. Allan B. Kline, Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting directly American agriculture.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. C. W. Kitchen, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting the marketing and distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables.
E. (6) $12.46; (9) $12.46; (10) $100.23; (11) $112.69.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Robert E. Kline, Jr., 917 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Palmer-Bee Co., Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) Bill for relief of Palmer-Bee Co.
E. (8) $0.50; (9) $0.50; (10) $315.63; (11) $316.13.

A. Burt L. Knowles, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. John T. Koehler, 1039 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Embassy of Denmark, 2374 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation authorizing final settlement of claims arising from the requisitioning of 40 Danish vessels by the United States in 1941.

A. John Kolanda, room 413, Railway Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Employees' Department, A. F. of L., 220 South State Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) H. R. 7840, S. 2930, and all other legislation of interest to railroad employees and labor in general.
D. (6) $1,999.98.

A. Kreeger, Ragland and Shapiro, Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Eastern Corp., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) For Mutual Security Act of 1954.
E. (9) $9.05.

A. Kreeger, Ragland and Shapiro, 516 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Silk and Rayon Printers and Dyers Association of America, Inc., 1450 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Enactment of a law for a regulatory commission.
E. (4) $37.11; (7) $20.55; (9) $57.66.

A. Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Horace R. Lamb, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. St. Regis Paper Co., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense, on behalf of the United States, to execute and deliver a deed to St. Regis Paper Co. conveying to said company certain rights in real property located in Jefferson County, N. Y., erroneously conveyed to the United States by said paper company.
E. (10) $10.24.

A. A. M. Lampley, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) All legislation affecting labor generally and railroad labor in particular.
D. (6) $2,750.

A. Alfons Landa, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc.

A. Alfons Landa, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Salt Producers Association, 726 La Salle-Wacker Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $500.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. State Tax Association, Post Office Box 2559, Houston, Tex.
C. (2).[1]

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 1308 Commercial Standard Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
D. (6) $1,275.

A. La Roe, Winn & Moerman, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Statler Hotel, New York, N. Y.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (5) $2,311.91; (6) $2.87; (7) $45.17; (8) $17.55; (9) $2,377.50; (10) $4,430.03; (11) $6,807.53.

A. La Roe, Winn, and Moerman, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $4,500.
E. (5) $2,311.91; (6) $35.99; (7) $131.50; (8) $9.24; (9) $2,488.64; (10) $5,529.30; (11) $8,017.94.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $7,500.
E. (10) $29.90.

A. John G. Laylin and Wallace G. Dempsey, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Embassy of Denmark, 2374 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To provide for the payment of the balance of the compensation promised in connection with the requisition in 1941 of 40 Danish vessels.
E. ((2) $8.25; (6) $23.54; (7) $343.39; (8) $17.25; (9) $392.43; (10) $169.10; (11) $561.53.

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the United States merchant marine.
D. (6) $7,153.54.
E. (2) $1,653.56; (4) $466.60; (6) $68.99; (7) $164.85; (8) $229.54; (9) $2,653.54; (10) $11,627.16; (11) $14,280.70; (15).[1]

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the importation by the United States of sugar produced in Cuba and trade between the United States and Cuba.
D. (6) $1,633.35.
E. (6) $6.33; (8) $127.02; (9) $133.35; (10) $4,589.65; (11) $4,723; (15).[1]

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. James R. Lee, 604 Albee Building, 1426 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Water Heater Division, Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) In general, legislation which concerns water heater manufacturers, particularly the excise tax.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (5) $585; (6) $34; (7) $105.75; (9) $724.75; (10) $1,127.61; (11) $1,852.36.

A. Legislation-Federal Relations Division of the National Education Association of the United States (J. L. McCaskill, director), 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the 83d Congress relating to public education.
E. (2) $2,353.60; (4) $1,870.16; (5) $277.03; (6) $955.77; (7) $296.10; (9) $5,752.66; (10) $16,327.67; (11) $22,080.33; (15).[1]

A. Legislative Committee of Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Mrs. Newton P. Leonard, 341 Sharon Street, Providence, R. I.
C. (2) Measures which affect the welfare of children and youth. (3) National Parent-Teacher.

A. William N. Leonard, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Transportation legislation.
D. (6) $500.

A. Stephen Levitsky, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare.
D. (6) $2,625.
E. (7) $1,200; (9) $1,200; (10) $2,400; (11) $3,600.

A. Liaison Committee of the Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 848 and H. R. 1825, bills to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes.
D. (6) $4,818.09.
E. (2) $4,500; (8) $318.09; (9) $4,818.09; (10) $16,623.04; (15).[1]

A. Frederick J. Libby, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills affecting world peace.[1]
D. (6) $1,437.38.
E. (7) $212.39; (9) $212.39; (10) $173.42; (11) $385.81.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y., and 1701 K Street, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.
D. (6) $6,183.73.
E. (2) $4,233.04; (5) $1,743.88; (6) $139.95; (7) $66.86; (9) $6,183.73; (10) $13,885.93; (11) $20,069.66.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) In support of increase in personal tax exemption on corporation dividends.
D. (6) $4,765.50.
E. (2) $1,208.68; (4) $1,527.39; (5) $674.86; (6) $338.26; (7) $1,357.92; (9) $5,107.11; (10) $10,198.34; (11) $15,305.45; (15).[1]

A. Leo F. Lightner, 717 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Engineers and Scientists of America, 711 West Lake Street, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers and other members of affiliated units.

A. Donald Linville, 30 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Hardboard Association, 30 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Concerned with bills to correct tariff classification of hardboard.
D. (6) $750.
E. (6) $69.50; (7) $1,225.67; (8) $3,333.99; (9) $4,629.16; (10) $1,541; (11) $6,170.16.

A. Miss Esther Lipsen, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Transportation legislation.
D. (6) $450.
E. (6) $75; (7) $300; (9) $375; (10) $631.59; (11) $1,006.59.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Suite 510, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $495.
E. (6) $0.83; (7) $39.63; (8) $8.53; (9) $48.99; (10) $283.88; (11) $332.87.

A. Walter J. Little, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Major steam railroads of California.[1]
C. (2) In opposition to amendment to Railroad Retirement Act; in support of time lag bill.
D. (6) $1,060.84.
E. (6) $29; (7) $516.58; (8) $16; (9) $561.58; (10) $2,388.86; (11) $2,950.44; (15).[1]

A. John M. Littlepage, 840 Investment Building, 15th and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Tobacco Co., Inc., 111 5th Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting a company engaged in the manufacture and sale of tobacco products; also technical changes covering method of payment for excise taxes on tobacco products.

A. Gordon C. Locke, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, 35 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $5,000.

A. Benjamin H. Long, 2746 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Payroll deductions for Federal employees, war damage, economic controls, taxation of fringe benefits, health programs for Federal employees, and hospital and health matters.
E. (6) $112.44; (7) $487.59; (8) $36.19; (9) $635.22; (10) $1,863.90; (11) $2,500.12.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Leonard Lopez, room 303, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District No. 44, I. A. of M., Room 303, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general.
D. (6) $1,749.99.
E. (7) $10; (9) $10; (10) $10; (11) $20.

A. Lord, Day and Lord, 25 Broadway, New York 4, N. Y., and 500 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Agency of Canadian Car and Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation having relation to World War I claims.

A. Lord, Day and Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y., 500 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. S. A. Healy Co., 61 Westchester Avenue, White Plains, N. Y.
C. (2) S. 1702.

A. Otto Lowe, 820 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting canning of food products.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (7) $350; (9) $350; (10) $1,000; (11) $1,350.

A. James C. Lucas, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $750.

A. Lucas and Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co. Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in aiding the company as consultant counsel in connection with Federal tax matters affecting life insurance companies.
D. (6) $750.

A. Lucas and Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) General legislation affecting mobile homes.
D. (6 $1,000.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Revere Copper & Brass, Inc., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Interested in enactment of legislation providing for continuation of suspension of certain import taxes on copper.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Adolph von Zedlitz, 100 Park Avenue, New York, N. W.
C. (2) S. 155 and H. R. 3594, to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

A. Gerald J. Lynch, 3000 Schaefer Road, Dearborn, Mich.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn Mich.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2).[1]
E. (7) $17.10; (9) $17.10; (10) $198; (11) $215.10.

A. A. E. Lyon, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Labor Executive Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation, affecting labor, especially railroad labor.
D. (6) $750.

A. Avery McBee, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hill and Knowlton, Inc., public relations counsel to Aircraft Industries Association.
C. (2) Am generally interested in legislation affecting aviation, the steel industry, and other industries.

A. Robert J. McBride, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general legislative interest is protection and fostering of the interest of federally regulated motor common carriers of general commodities.
D. (6) $466.67.

A. John A. McCart, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills of interest to Federal Government employees and District of Columbia employees.
D. (6) $1,803.83.
E. (7) $43.70; (9) $43.70; (10) $44.65; (11) $88.35.

A. Frank J. McCarthy, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2).[1]

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of legislation and Federal relations, National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the 83d Congress relating to public education.
D. (6) $550.
E. (7) $34.75; (9) $34.75; (10) $387.30; (11) $422.05.

A. McClure & Updike, 626 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W-1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (2) Amendments of Internal Revenue Code.
D. (6) $6,000.
E. (6) $185.70; (7) $907.47; (9) $1,093.17; (10) $2,266.73; (11) $3,359.90.

A. Angus McDonald, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,875.
E. (7) $279.30; (9) $279.30; (10) $501.82; (11) $781.12.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Edwin McElwain, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 10525 Carnegie Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting machine-tool industry.

A. A. J. McFarland, 126 North Eighth Street, Sterling, Kans.
B. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (3) The Christian Patriot.
D. (6) $810.
E. (7) $300; (9) $300; (10) $600; (11) $900.

A. Ernest W. McFarland, Florence, Ariz.
B. American Cable & Radio Corp., RCA Communications, Inc., and Western Union Telegraph Co., New York City, N. Y.

A. M. C. McKercher, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.
B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, O. R. T. Building, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the welfare of railroad employees.
D. (6) $480.

A. Thomas Edward McGrath, 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Joseph V. McLaughlin, 1503 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Express Agency, Inc., 219 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation in connection with parcel post.
D. (6) $5,000.
E. (7) $301.15; (9) $301.15; (10) $1,734.51; (11) $2,035.66.

A. W. H. McMains, 1135 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1135 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the domestic distilling industry.

A. Joseph P. McSparron, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the socio-economic and political interests of the American workingman including all pending legislation dealing with railroad matters.
D. (6) $318.75.
E. (7) $615; (9) $615; (10) $1,200; (11) $1,815.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Optometric Association, care of Dr. Hoyt S. Purvis, 212 East Washington Avenue, Jonesboro, Ark.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $3,450.
E. (6) $29.99; (7) $1.32; (8) $25; (9) $56.31; (10) $141.24; (11) $197.55.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Frankel Bros., 512 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) H. R. 8300.
E. (5) $1; (6) $9.24; (9) $10.24; (10) $9.63; (11) $19.87.

A. James E. Mack, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Confectioners' Association, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Supported proposals for flexible price support system and legislation which would modify food and drug laws pertaining to confectionery.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (8) $519.75.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. W. Bruce Macnamee, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Support legislation favorable to the maintenance of the American merchant marine.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (7) $35.20; (9) $35.20; (10) $57.99; (11) $93.19.

A. James B. Madaris, Room 412, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
(2) H. R. 7840 and S. 2930.
D. (6) $1,616.66.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Fall Church, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,000.
E. (6) $3,850; (7) $111.67; (9) $154.17; (10) $297.52; (11) $451.69.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,800.
E. (6) $38.50; (7) $111.67; (9) $154.17; (10) $297.52; (11) $451.69.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the chemical industry.
D. (6) $2,375.
E. (1) $500; (8) $1,875; (9) $2,375; (10) $4,750; (11) $7,125.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., 1200 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $3,600.
E. (5) $1,186; (6) $168.75; (9) $1,354.75; (10) $2,555; (11) $3,909.75.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting independent tire dealers. (3) Dealer News.
D. (6) $29.
E. (7) $3.50; (9) $3.50; (10) $5; (11) $8.50.

A. Fred T. Marshall, 1112–18 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.

A. Edwin G. Martin, 717 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Norton Co., Worcester, Mass.
C. (2) Tariff status of silicon carbide.
D. (6) $875.
E. (7) $9; (9) $9; (10) $142.37; (11) $151.47.

A. Robert F. Martin, 931 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Vitrified China Association, Inc., 931 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 1737 H. Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Japanese-American Citizens League, 1759 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States and Hawaii.
D. (6) $300.
E. (8) $32.25; (9) $32.25; (10) $40; (11) $72.25.

A. Walter J. Mason, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of our country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.
D. (6) $3,010.
E. (6) $36.75; (7) $199; (8) $73.25; (9) $309; (10) $756; (11) $1,065.

A. P. H. Mathews, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $4,749.99.
E. (7) $930.42; (9) $930.42; (10) $1,028.96; (11) $1,959.38.

A. C. V. and R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Waste Material Dealers, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to or affecting the waste materials industry.
D. (6) $600.
E. (4) $28.33; (6) $6.35; (7) $5.28; (9) $39.96; (10) $109.90; (11) $149.86.

A. Cyrus H. Maxwell, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All bills relating to health and welfare.
D. (6) $625.
E. (7) $8.57; (9) $8.57; (10) $106.74; (11) $115.31.

A. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 537 Dexter Avenue, Montgomery, Ala.
C. (2) All health matters covered by legislative action. (3) PR notes.
E. (2) $1,800; (4) $225; (9) $2,025; (10) $4,050; (11) $6,075.

A. Merchants National Bank and Trust Co. of Syracuse, 216 South Warren Street, Syracuse, N. Y.
(2).[1]
E. (10) $334.02.

A. William R. Merriam, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Transportation legislation.
D. (6) $200.
E. (7) $125; (9) $125; (10) $155; (11) $280.

A. J. T. Metcalf, 1002 L. & N. Building, Louisville, Ky.
E. (7) $411.99; (9) $411.99; (10) $675.47; (11) $1,087.46.

A. Clarence R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of U. S. A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
C. (2) General legislation affecting Dallas and Texas.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (5) $49.79; (6) $71.07; (7) $853.55; (8) $42.50; (9) $1,016.91; (10) $1,828.10; (11) $2,845.01.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, 1028 Electric Building, Houston, Tex.
C. (2) For adequate river and habor authorization and appropriations.
D. (6) $2,250.
E. (6) $18.32; (7) $63.56; (9) $81.88; (10) $250.63; (11) $332.51.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General legislation affecting sulfur industry.
D. (6) $2,250.
E. (5) $1,026.81; (6) $158.66; (7) $280.10; (8) $11.40; (9) $1,476.97; (10) $2,893.12; (11) $4,370.09.

A. Paul I. Miller, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1] (3) Washington Newsletter.
D. (6) $716.67.
E. (7) $25.65; (9) $25.65; (10) $190.60; (11) $216.25.

A. John Ninadeo, Room 412, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) H. R. 7840 and S. 2930.
D. (6) $ 404.17.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, William T. Plumb, Jr., and Robert K. Eifler, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. John H. Davis et al.,[1] Seattle, Wash.
C. (2) Tax legislation.
E. (6) $72.90; (8) $25.45; (9) $98.35; (11) $98.35.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, William T. Plumb, Jr., and Robert K. Eifler, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hughes Tool Co., Houston, Tex.
C. (2) Revision of proposed Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

A. F. E. Mollin, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Supported or opposed legislation affecting cattle industry.
D. (6) $3,300.
E. (6) $27.77; (7) $327.46; (8) $15.75; (9) $370.98; (10) $1,102.11; (11) $1,473.09.

A. Albert H. Monacelli, 161 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Stockholders of Bessemer Securities Corp., 465 East 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) H. R. 8300.
E. (6) $12.65; (9) $12.65; (10) $20,14; (11) $32.79.

A. Donald Montgomery, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $2,000.
E. (7) $187.60; (9) $187.60; (10) $285.85; (11) $473.45.

A. Monument Builders of America, Inc., 20 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,317.
E. (2) $1,364; (4) $421.32; (5) $20; (6) $155.67; (7) $1.492.47; (8) $70; (9) $3,523.46; (11) $3,523.46.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. George W. Morgan, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Morris Plan Corporation of America, 103 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Bank holding company bills and similar legislation.
E. (4) $370.80; (7) $119.12; (9) $489.92; (10) $11,027.06; (11) $11,516.98.

A. Giles Morrow, Suite 610, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Freight Forwarders Institute, Suite 610, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $4,374.99.
E. (5) $40; (6) $34.88; (7) $22.10; (9) $96.98; (10) $228.54; (11) $325.52.

A. Harold G. Mosier, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation of interest to the aircraft manufacturing industry.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (7) $360.45; (9) $360.45; (10) $1,491.97; (11) $1,852.42.

A. William J. Mougey, 802 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (10) $110.

A. Allen P. Mullinnix, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1] (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Howard E. Munro, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Central Labor Union and Metal Trades Council of the Panama Canal Zone, P. O. Box 471, Balboa Heights, C. Z.
C. (2) All legislation affecting A. F. of L. union members employed on the Canal Zone.
D. (6) $960.
E. (3) $172; (5) $35.48; (6) $58.39; (7) $429.04; (9) $694.91; (10) $2,537.30; (11) $3,232.21.

A. Walter J. Munro, Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
C. (2) Advocating favorable labor legislation and opposing unfavorable labor legislation.

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., Webster City, Iowa.
C. (2) Legislative interest of employer is to promote the welfare of its policyholders and prevent discrimination against the chiropractic profession.
D. (6) $300.
E. (8) $300; (9) $300; (10) $600; (11) $900.

A. Ray Murphy, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.
D. (6) $112.50.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., P. O. Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, P. O. Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
C. (2) 1955 Agricultural appropriation bill and H. R. 8300—general tax revision bill. (3) The Forest Farmer.
E. (10) $629.84.

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Laws affecting businessmen, particularly taxation, social security, and business activities of Government.
D. (6) $44,813.69.
E. (2) $14,596.20; (4) $16,155.35; (5) $1,389.89; (6) $200.94; (7) $1,765.91; (8) $183.44; (9) $34,291.73.

A. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 601 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation concerning education of all kinds, particularly bills relative to GI education for Korean veterans.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $14,031,25.
E. (4) $23.22; (6) $15; (9) $38.33; (10) $226.30; (11) $264.52.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $3,246.24.
E. (1) $6,743.67; (2) $18,869.61; (4) $594.90; (5) $1,772.87; (6) $496.64; (7) $1,130.58; (8) $460.76; (9) $30,069.03; (10) $47,649.59; (11) $77,718.62.

A. National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $80.57.
E. (2) $29; (4) $48.07; (7) $3.50; (9) $80.57; (10) $128.18; (11) $208.75; (15).[1]

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) War Damage Corporation legislation, social-security legislation, insurance legislation, tax-equality legislation, and Internal Revenue Code, 1954. (3) American Agency Bulletin.
D. (6) $3,079.
E. (2) $3,986.56; (5) $563.94; (6) $160.07; (7) $235.75; (9) $4,946.32; (10) $8,826.33; (11) $13.772.65; (15).[1]

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The general legislative interests consist of any legislation which the mutual savings banks have a legitimate interest in.
D. (6) $90.
E. (2) $90; (9) $90; (10) $1,060.50; (11) $1,150.50.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting postal employees. (3) The Postal Supervisor.
D. (6) $5,247.50.
E. (2) $2,375; (4) $3,413.45; (5) $300; (6) $55; (7) $137.95; (9) $6,281.40; (10) $12,424.08; (11) $18,705.48.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Association of Postmasters of the United States, 1111 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. To handle general legislation appertaining to the United States Postal Service.
D. (6) $4,380.30.
E. (2) $1,000; (5) $8; (6) $3.47; (9) $1,011.47; (10) $2,126.78; (11) $3,138.25.

A. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting retired civil employees. (3) Retirement Life.
D. (6) $275.
E. (2) $275; (9) $275; (10) $550; (11) $825.

A. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
C. (2) All bills relating directly or indirectly to the Federal concern with natural soil and water resources.
D. (6) $467.34.
E. (4) $184.60; (7) $269.68; (9) $454.28.

A. National Association of Storekeeper-Gaugers, 1218 Locust Avenue, Baltimore, Md.
C. (2) All legislation affecting Federal classified employees, and that in particular which would affect our position—United States storekeeper-gaugers.
D. (6) $796.80.
E. (2) $500; (9) $500; (10) $1,000; (11) $1,500.

A. National Broiler Association, Box 44, Lombard, Ill.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation that may tend to affect the production and/or marketing of commercial broilers.
D. (6) $300.
E. (2) $300; (6) $10.49; (9) $310.49; (10) $531.28; (11) $841.77.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Long-range plans for agriculture and other legislation directly affecting the food canning industry, and opposition to mandatory marketing orders, title IV, S. 3052.
D. (6) $296,236.20.
E. (2) $1,833.33; (4) $123.82; (7) $922.27; (8) $11.63; (9) $2,891.05; (10) $16,274.04; (11) $19,165.09; (15).[1]

A. National Coal Association, 802 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All measures affecting bituminous coal industry.

A. National Committee on Parcel Post Size and Weight Limitations, Room 601, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Parcel-post size and weight limitations.
D. (6) $1,541.
E. (2) $1,817.80; (4) $462.23; (5) $193.34; (6) $138.13; (7) $76.85; (8) $33.20; (9) $2,815.98; (10) $6,751.55; (11) $9,587.53; (15).[1]

A. National Committee of Shippers and Receivers, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Section 402 (c) of the Interstate Commerce Act.
D. (6) $100.
E. (10) $294; (11) $294.

A. National Conference for Repeal of Taxes on Transportation, c/o Mr. D. G. Ward, Mathieson Building, Baltimore, Md.
C. (2) This conference has been organized recently for the specific purpose of urging the enactment of legislation which will repeal the existing excise taxes on the transportation of persons and property.
D. (6) $50.
E. (2) $54; (4) $202.77; (9) $256.77; (10) $1,497.40; (11) $1,754.17; (15).[1]

A. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) All matters affecting the cotton compress and cotton warehouse industry.
D. (6) $115.37.
E. (2) $55.50; (7) $59.87; (9) $115.37; (10) $695.30; (11) $810.67.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting the raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $3,363.70.
E. (2) $2,642.90; (5) $199.80; (6) $14.34; (7) $506.66; (9) $3,363.70; (10) $8,016.15; (11) $11,379.85; (15).[1]

A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation relating to the postal service.
D. (6) $3,207.53.
E. (1) $1,500; (3) $1,425; (4) $2.40; (6) $408; (7) $186.05; (8) $90; (9) $3,207.53; (10) $3,792.20; (11) $6,999.73; (15).[1]

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,434;.
E. (2) $829.65; (4) $1; (5) $172; (6) $22.62; (7) $26; (8) $128.73; (9) $1,170; (10) $3,847; (11) $5,017; (15).[1]

A. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills affecting world peace.[1] (3) Peace Action.
D. (6) $4,762.53.
E. (2) $4,059.46; (3) $25; (4) $553.32; (5) $1,265.36; (6) $130.41; (7) $418.89; (8) $904.02; (9) $7,356.46; (10) $17,233.14; (11) $24,559.60; (15).[1]

A. National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Our legislative interests are in favor of any legislation that tends to support private enterprise and maintain American independence, and to oppose any measures that work contrariwise.
D. (6) $709.40.
E. (2) $500; (4) $515.77; (5) $100; (6) $25; (8) $25; (9) $2,338.88; (10) $1,094.20; (11) $4,598.85; (15).[1]

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washing, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation that affects the building construction and electrical industries. (3) Qualified Contractor.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation with respect to imports of electrical products into the United States.
D. (6) $849.56.
E. (2) $615.61; (7) $233.95; (9) $849.56; (10) $3,025.78; (11) $3,875.34.

A. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Suite 502, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) The Union Postal Clerk.
D. (6) $145,037.98.
E. (2) $5,772.68; (4) $516.32; (5) $380; (6) $20,403.68; (7) $486.11; (8) $25,712.34; (9) $33,680.13; (10) $57,799.79; (11) $111,479.92.

A. National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,554.42.
E. (2) $1,000; (4) $524.42; (5) $30; (9) $1,554.42; (10) $4,371.20; (11) $5,925.62; (15).[1]

A. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $8,350.00.
E. (7) $51.20; (9) $51.20; (10) $164.72; (11) $215.92.

A. National Housing Conference, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $17,090.74.
E. (2) $7,795.46; (4) $5,138.26; (5) $1,606.97; (6) $296.29; (7) $881.99; (8) $2,093.36; (9) $17,812.33; (10) $40,946.42; (11) $58,758.75; (15).[1]

A. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 2404, posting of bonds for livestock purchasing; Taft-Hartley Act revision; tax law revision, H. R. 8300.
D. (6) $477.25.
E. (1) $436.17; (2) $552.82; (4) $113.97; (5) $125.72; (6) $29.85; (7) $104.07; (8) $71.84; (9) $1,434.44; (10) $1,999.86; (11) $3,434.30; (15).[1]

A. National Institute of Diaper Services, 67 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. The National Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 6584 and H. R. 9476 (customs simplification bills).
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (2) $2,200.94; (3) $1,000; (4) $868.13; (5) $712.23; (6) $590.42; (7) $1,064.78; (8) $115; (9) $6,551.50; (10) $8,264.24; (11) $14,815.74; (15).[1]

A. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $232.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops; The Alert.
D. (6) $66,970.89.
E. (2) $29,521.07; (3) $700; (4) $3,736.27; (5) $382.03; (6) $2,187.25; (7) $3,930.47; (8) $2,528.52; (9) $44,594.83; (10) $140,901.30; (11) $185,496.13.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue, New York City, N. Y.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health.
E. (1) $600; (7) $194.55; (9) $794.55; (10) $1,532; (11) $2,326.55.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2).[1] (3).[1]
D. (6) $4,125.
E. (2) $3,375; (4) $1,299.64; (5) $517.60; (6) $103.04; (7) $69; (8) $2.50; (9) $5,366.78; (10) $12,530.40; (11) $17,897.18.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation that affects retail trades.
E. (4) $50; (9) $50; (10) $75; (11) $125.

A. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 N Street, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All matters pertaining to river and harbor improvement, flood control, navigation, irrigation, reclamation, soil and water conservation, and related subjects.
D. (6) $2,952.90.
E. (1) $35; (2) $2,144.40; (4) $472.72; (5) $307.59; (6) $53.92; (7) $785.67; (8) $881.23; (9) $4,640.53; (10) $13,664.40; (11) $16,344.93; (15).[1]

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the rural electrification program provided for under the REA Act of 1936 as amended. (3) Rural Electrification Magazine.
D. (6) $25,473.18.
E. (8) $25,473.18; (9) $25,473.18; (11) $44,687.60.

A. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing.
D. (6) $2,174.82.
E. (2) $700; (4) $450.73; (9) $1,150.73; (10) $3,679.68; (11) $4,830.41.

A. National Small Business Men's Association, 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (2) $4,597.92; (5) $1,192.61; (6) $182.52; (8) $9.30; (9) $5,982.33; (10) $12,624.94; (11) $8,607.29.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 1121 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers.
D. (6) $36,064.92.
E. (2) $1,183; (4) $820.83; (9) $2,003.83; (10) $3,403.02; (11) $5,406.85.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) General legislative interests relate to corporate income tax legislation.
D. (6) $5,185.
E. (1) $1,060.63; (2) $1,569.59; (4) $4,142.28; (5) $261.37; (6) $839.20; (7) $710.37; (9) $8,583.44; (10) $19,840.05; (11) $28,423.49.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $9,667.
E. (1) $3,000; (2) $2,500; (6) $527.35; (7) $3,249.60; (8) $1,674.60; (9) $10,951.55; (10) $23,891.47; (11) $34,843.02.

A. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture and Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 6584 and H. R. 9476 (customs simplification bills). (3).[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $17,600.
E. (1) $5,133.22; (2) $4,001.58; (4) $580.44; (5) $311.42; (6) $603.67; (7) $152.08; (8) $154.38; (9) $10,936.79; (10) $59,409.21; (11) $70,346.

A. William S. Neal, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C, D, and E.[1]

A. Alan N. Nedry, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Otis H. Ellis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative matters which might affect business interests of independent oil jobbers.
D. (6) $225.
E. (7) $75; (9) $75; (10) $90; (11) $165.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the mortgage banking industry.
D. (6) $6,359.43.
E. (2) $245.07; (5) $1,381.79; (6) $372.77; (7) $608.80; (9) $2,609.43; (10) $5,404.91; (11) $8,014.34.

A. J. L. Nellis, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) House Resolution 407.
D. (6) $4,868.55.
E. (1) $1,600; (2) $1,730.92; (4) $735.22; (5) $542.40; (6) $325; (7) $546.56; (8) $132.60; (9) $5,612.70; (10) $3,225.46; (11) $8,838.16; (15).[1]

A. George R. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the socio-economic and political interests of the American workingmen.
D. (6) $900.

A. Herbert U. Nelson, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the real estate industry.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (2) $254.10; (6) $38.70; (7) $578.10; (8) $50; (9) $920.90; (10) $5,024.19; (11) $5,945.09.

A. Herschel D. Newsom, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,125.

A. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.
E. (2) $3,000; (9) $3,000; (10) $6,891.12; (11) $9,891.12; (15).[1]

A. Nordlinger, Riegelman, Benetar & Charney, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Silk and Rayon Printers and Dyers Association of America, Inc., 1450 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2).[1]
E. (6) $26.42; (7) $24.50; (8) $4.24; (9) $55.16; (10) $112.23; (11) $167.39.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Nordlinger, Riegelman, Benetar & Charney, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Webb & Knapp, Inc., 383 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $6,000.
E. (11) $326.25.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,616.50.
E. (4) $13.64; (7) $22.37; (8) $5.51; (9) $41.52; (10) $21.08; (11) $62.60; (15).[1]

A. George L. Norris, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
D. (6) $1,501.25.
E. (8) $1.25; (9) $1.25; (10) $3.85; (11) $5.10.

A. Harry E. Northam, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2).[1]

A. Northern Hemlock & Hardwood Manufacturers Association, Washington Building, Oshkosh, Wis.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the timber industries of Wisconsin and Michigan, taxation, forestry and labor management relations.
D. (6) $100.
E. (10) $25; (11) $25.

A. E. M. Norton, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops; The Alert.
D. (6) $4,484.13.
E. (7) $234.15; (9) $234.15; (10) $177.92; (11) $412.07.

A. Frank Norton, Mercantile Securities Building, Dallas, Tex.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation having anything to do with transportation including pending bills before the House and Senate.

A. Donald W. Nyrop, 710 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Conference of Local Airlines, 710 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation which is in the interest of a sound national air transport policy.
D. (6) $879.
E. (2) $840; (4) $23.09; (7) $16; (9) $879.09; (10) $758.28; (11) $1,637.37.

A. Edward H. O'Connor, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All bills proposing to amend the Social Security Act.
D. (6) $8,415.46.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Herbert R. O'Conor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C, D, and E.[1]

A. Herbert R. O'Conor, Mathieson Building, Baltimore, Md.
B. Worthington Corp., 99 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Tax-revenue legislation.

A. Herbert R. O'Conor, Jr., 10 Light Street, Baltimore, Md.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 3596, in support thereof.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (6) $8.20; (7) $91.98; (9) $100.18; (10) $54.40; (11) $154.58.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General interest in proposed legislation having direct or specific impact on the wool textile industry.
E. (6) $41.47; (7) $27.46; (8) $9.25; (9) $78.18; (10) $188.58; (11) $266.76.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wilbur-Ellis Co., Inc., 320 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) General interest in any proposed legislation having direct or specific impact on any food products produced or handled by this company.

A. W. Raymond Ogg, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2).[1]
E. (7) $5.79; (9) $5.79; (10) $52.10; (11) $57.89.

A. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroad interests.
E. (7) $72.96; (9) $72.96; (10) $422.48; (11) $495.44.

A. A. E. Oliver, 100 Merchants' Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo., and 600 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants' Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) General legislation affecting the grain and feed trade.
D. (6) $15.
E. (7) $1; (9) $1.

A. Fred N. Oliver, 110 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y., and Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The general legislative interests consist of any legislation which the mutual savings banks have an interest in opposing or supporting.

A. Robert Oliver, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare.
D. (6) $1,624.98.
E. (7) $1,230.66; (9) $1,230.66; (10) $1,230.66; (11) $2,461.32.

A. Clarence H. Olsen, care of the American Legion, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2).[1] (3).[1]
D. (6) $2,250.
E. (7) $116.75; (9) $116.75; (10) $330.25; (11) $447.

A. Morris E. Osburn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee.
C. (2) Legislation affecting Missouri railroads.
E. (7) $275.38; (9) $275.38; (10) $1,719; (11) $1,994.38; (15).[1]

A. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the merchant marine.
D. (6) $200.
E. (2) $1,625; (4) $29.03; (6) $286.65; (9) $1,860.68; (10) $3,270.65; (11) $5,131.33.

A. Lovell H. Parker, 611 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Asociation and National Council of Coal Lessors, both of Washington, D. C.; Iron Ore Lessors Association, St. Paul, Minn.; Maryland Electronic Manufacturing Corp., College Park, Md.; Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.; and W. A. Sheaffer Pen Co., Fort Madison, Iowa.
C. Tax legislation affecting the bituminous coal industry, the iron-ore industry, the plate glass industry, the pen and pencil industry, and legislation dealing with excess-profits tax relief in hardship cases.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Parker, Milliken & Kohlmeier, 650 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Farmers and Merchants National Bank of Los Angeles, as trustee of the Mary Paula Ball trust, Fourth and Main Streets, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) To establish the value at the date of death of Mary Paula Ball, deceased, as the income tax basis for certain property included in the estate of said decedent for Federal estate tax.
E. (10) $968.51.

A. James G. Patton.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1417 California Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (7) $398.44; (9) $398.44; (10) $509.96; (11) $908.40.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Allstate Insurance Co., 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
C. (2) Elimination of disparities in tax treatment between stock, mutual, and reciprocal fire and casualty insurance companies.
E. (6) $13.15; (7) $3.20; (9) $16.35; (10) $135.56; (11) $151.91.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Equitable tax treatment of payments made by employers for employee coverage and benefits received under prepaid hospitalization and medical plans.
E. (5) $1.62; (6) $41.47; (7) $6.75; (9) $49.84; (10) $106.50; (11) $156.34.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. 50 Broadway Building, Inc., New York, N. Y.
C. (2) To obtain amendment in new Revenue Code affecting corporate liquidations.
D. (6) $11,000.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of Mary Clark de Brabant and Katherine C. Williams, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Propose revision of section 7 of the Technical Changes Act of 1949, as amended.
E. (10) $30.60.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Field Enterprises, Educational Division, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) To obtain change in tax treatment for taxpayers electing to use the installment method of accounting.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (6) $4.40; (7) $17.40; (8) $10.50; (9) $32.30; (10) $506.34; (11) $538.64.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Field Foundation, Inc., 135 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) To obtain amendment in proposed tax law affecting real-estate holdings of charitable organizations.
D. (6) $12,500.
E. (6) $12.38; (7) $22.74; (9) $35.12; (10) $331.88; (11) $367.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. S. Gumbel Realty & Security Co., Inc., New Orleans, La.
C. (2) To obtain change in sections of the Internal Revenue Code dealing with corporate liquidations.
D. (6) $500.
E. (6) $26.12; (9) $26.12; (11) $26.12.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Howard F. Knipp, 3401 South Hanover Street, Baltimore, Md.
C. (2) Amendment to the partnership provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that a partnership's fiscal year does not terminate upon the death of a partner.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Sixty Trust, 1109 Hospital Trust Building, Providence, R. I.
C. (2) To obtain amendment in proposed tax law affecting investments of pension and profit-sharing trusts.
D. (6) $3,500.

A. Albert A. Payne, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
D. (6) $2,650.
E. (6) $17.79; (7) $121.28; (8) $52.50; (9) $191.57; (10) $468.38; (11) $659.95; (15).[1]

A. Philco Corp., Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Pershing, Bosworth, Dick, & Dawson, 320 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Denver Association of Building Owners and Managers, 624 17th Street, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) For passage of section 164 (b) (5) (B) of Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to pro-

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

vide for deductibility for Federal income tax purposes of taxes levied by the Moffat Tunnel improvement district.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Cochrane Building, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation that affects the citrus industry.
D. (6) $2,499.99.
E. (5) $40; (6) $41.74; (7) $205; (8) $1.28; (9) $288.02; (10) $540.33; (11) $828.35; (15).[1]

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Tomoka Land Co., 8–10 West Center Street, Sebring, Fla.
C. (2) For modification of section 1237, H. R. 8300, making same applicable to corporations on lands held more than 10 years and for similar legislation.
D. (6) $500.
E. (5) $4.65; (6) $3.64; (8) $0.80; (9) $8.09; (11) $8.09.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Cochrane Building, Lakeland, Fla.
B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, a governmental corporation, handling matters relating to intercoastal waterways, Courthouse, Bradenton, Fla.
C. (2) River and harbor bill affecting the intercoastal waterway from the Caloosahatchee to the Anclote on the west coast of Florida.
D. (6) $600.
E. (5) $20; (6) $32.61; (7) $56.84; (8) $1.08; (9) $110.53; (10) $13.48; (11) $124.01; (15).[1]

A. Albert T. Pierson, 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
B. The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
C. (2) All legislation which might affect the New Haven Railroad and its subsidiaries.
D. (6) $2,300.
E. (6) $3.57; (7) $185.13; (9) $188.70; (11) $188.70.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.
D. (6) $115.
E. (6) $0.30; (7) $40.20; (9) $40.50; (10) $42.52; (11) $83.02.

A. James F. Pinkney, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16 Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $250.
E. (10) $118.24.

A. Rufus G. Poole, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Amendments to Taft-Hartley Act affecting retail automobile and truck dealers.
D. (6) $1,560.
E. (10) $615.43.

A. Poole, Shroyer & Denbo, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Metal Co., Ltd., 61 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any legislation directly affecting lead or zinc industry.
E. (10) $239.44.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Stanley I. Posner and Bernard H. Ehrlich, 1367 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Institute of Diaper Services, 67 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interest previously to secure deduction for income-tax purposes for amounts paid for antiseptic diaper service.

A. Frank M. Porter, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2).[1]

A. Homer V. Prater, 90 0F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills of interest to Federal Government Employees and District of Columbia employees.
D. (6) $1,750.
E. (10) $3.50.

A. Allen Pretzman, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Scioto-Sandusky Conservancy District, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Charles M. Price, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Gypsum Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) For percentage depletion on gypsum.
E. (10) $342.29.

A. Harry E. Proctor, 1110 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York City, N. Y.
C. (2) In support of S. 975, savings and loan branch bill.
D. (6) $90.
E. (10) $112.63.

A. The Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
C. (2) General interest in all legislation affecting the business of the company.
E. (2) $7,500; (6) $67.78; (7) $2,708.89; (9) $10,276.67; (10) $16,669.04; (11) $26,-945.71.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) General legislative interests of client are those affecting foreign commerce of the United States, including tax and tariff legislation.
E. (6) $3.52; (8) $2.90; (9) $6.42; (10) $39.28; (11) $40.70.

A. Alexander Purdon, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislation in connection with the promotion and advancement of the American Merchant Marine.
D. (6) $750.
E. (7) $94.09; (9) $94.09; (10) $271.80; (11) $365.89.

A. C. J. Putt, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. The Atchison, Topeka, & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
C. (2) General legislative interest in matters affecting railroads.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (7) $365.01; (9) $365.01; (10) $749.54; (11) $1,114.55.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cancer Society, 47 Beaver Street, New York City; United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 369 Lexington Avenue, New York City; Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 23 West 45th Street, New York City; National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue, New York City.
C. (2) Public health. The specific interest is to present the need for adequate appriations by the Federal Legislature for research in the fields of diseases which kill and disable people.
D. (6) $8,499.97.
E. (2) $921; (5) $1,425.69; (6) $256.69; (7) $2,218.64; (9) $4,822.02; (10) $9,494.11; (11) $14,316.13.

A. F. Miles Radigan, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $22.25.
E. (7) $63.83; (9) $63.83; (10) $215.04; (11) $278.87.

A. Alex Radin, 1757 K. Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the generation, transmission, and distribution of electrical energy by local publicly owned electric systems, and the management and operation of such systems.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
C. (2) For H. R. 122, to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937.
D. (6) $56.
E. (4) 89.19; (5) $41.26; (8) $5.40; (9) $136.03; (10) $563.47; (11) $699.40.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting railroad labor.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting the marketing and distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables.

A. DeWitt C. Ramsey, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the aviation industry.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, legislative counsel, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation involving silver.
D. (6) $4,250.02.
E. (7) $844.15; (9) $844.15; (10) $1,319.11; (11) $2,163.26.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Regular Common Carrier Conference of the American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general legislative interest is protection and fostering of the interest of federally regulated motor common carriers of general commodities.
D. (6) $1,748.72.
E. (2) $1,386.67; (4) $287.05; (5) $75; (9) $1,748.72; (10) $6,858.42; (11) $8,607.14; (15).[1]

A. Gerard D. Reilly, 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Foremanship Foundation, 512-20 Harries Building, Dayton, Ohio.
C. (2) Supporting provisions relating to supervisors in the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. James Francis Reilly, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Potomac Electric Power Co., 929 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect Potomac Electric Power Co.
E. (6) $10; (7) $40; (8) $10; (9) $60; (10) $180; (11) $240.

A. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation for development of a military policy for the United States which will guarantee adequate national security. (3) The Reserve Officer.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1] (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) $28,011.71.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Room 314, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees' Compensation Acts.
D. (6) $10,123.45.
E. (2) $3,058.81; (4) $422.50; (5) $774.25; (6) $49.32; (7) $340.10; (8) $3,442.16; (9) $8,887.14; (10) $11,513.72; (11) $19,600.86; (15).[1]

A. Hubert M. Rhodes, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
C. (2) Legislation affecting credit unions.
D. (6) $525.
E. (7) $6.75; (8) $1.25; (9) $8; (10) $13.10; (11) $21.10.

A. Charles S. Rhyne, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mytinger & Casselberry, Inc., 1700 Santa Fe Avenue, Long Beach, Calif.
C. (2) Food, drug, and cosmetic legislation, tax legislation, postal legislation.
D. (6) $500.

A. Andrew E. Rice, 1751 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Veterans Committee, Inc., 1751 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the general welfare, especially in the fields of international affairs, civil rights and liberties, and veterans benefits.
D. (6) $500.
E. (7) $10; (9) $10; (10) $40; (11) $50.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Roland Rice, 618 Perpetual Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of the American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Protection and fostering of the interests of federally regulated motor common carriers of general commodities.
D. (6) $870.

A. Siert F. Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. John J. Riggle, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $2,749.98.
E. (10) $27.95.

A. George D. Riley, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.
D. (6) $3,010.
E. (6) $36.65; (7) $171; (8) $65.35; (9) $273; (10) $761; (11) $1,034.

A. E. W. Rising, 1215 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Water Conservation Conference, 341 Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) All legislation relative to development, utilization, and conservation of natural resources, including bills to authorize projects, and appropriations for construction of projects.
E. (2) $210; (4) $72.60; (5) $105; (6) $18; (9) $405.60; (10) $1,157.38; (11) $1,562.98.

A. E. W. Rising, 1215 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Beet Growers Association, Post-Office Box 742, Great Falls, Mont.
C. (2) Legislation that may affect or limit the right of the American farmer to grow and market sugar beets.
D. (6) $300.
E. (2) $40.10; (4) $105.07; (5) $28; (6) $27.66; (7) $454.48; (9) $655.31; (10) $647.11; (11) $1,302.42.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 1121 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 1121 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers.
D. (6) $250.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the rural electrification program. (3) Rural Electrification magazine.
D. (6) $1,650.

A. Edward O. Rodgers, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests for the proper advancement of the airline industry.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $1,250.
E. (7) $48; (9) $48; (10) $921.77; (11) $969.77.

A. Frank W. Rogers, Suite 801, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Oil and Gas Association, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Federal legislation affecting the petroleum industry in Washington, Oregon, California, Arizona, and Nevada.
D. (6) $3,300.

A. Watson Rogers, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,000.

A. George B. Roscoe, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 848 and H. R. 1825, bills to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, etc. (3) Qualified contractors.

A. Delbert L. Rucker, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy.
D. (6) $25.

A. Albert R. Russell, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting the raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $180.
E. (7) $52.91; (9) $52.91; (10) $168.70; (11) $221.61.

A. Francis M. Russell, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting National Broadcasting Co., Inc., and/or affiliated companies.
E. (7) $341; (9) $341; (10) $175.75; (11) $516.75.

A. Horace Russell, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation directly or indirectly affecting the savings and loan business.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (10) $235.69.

A. M. O. Ryan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (7) $233.05; (9) $233.05; (10) $883.91; (11) $1,116.96.

A. William H. Ryan, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District Lodge, No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees, and incidentally organized labor in general.
D. (6) $2,250.
E. (7) $60; (9) $60; (10) $50; (11) $110.

A. Robert A. Seltzstein, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Smaller Magazines Postal Committee, 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Interested in matters affecting second-class postal rates.
D. (6) $1,250.01.
E. (4) $15.95; (6) $68.53; (7) $100.73; (8) $80.61; (9) $265.82; (10) $374.72; (11) $640.54.

A. L. R. Sanford, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (7) $261.62.

A. John T. Sapienza, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Fulton Land & Timber Co., 711 Orchard Road, Hagerstown, Md.
C. (2) Current revenue proposals.

A. John T. Sapeinza, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Lessees of B. V. Hedrick Gravel & Sand Co., Lilesville, N. C.
C. (2) Depletion legislation.

A. John T. Sapienza, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hudson Bay Mining & Smelting Co., Ltd., 500 Royal Bank Building, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada, et al.[1]
C. (2).[1]
E. (4) $3.30; (6) $34.06; (7) $97.10; (9) $134.46; (10) $52.31; (11) $186.77.

A. Harrison Sasscer, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of legislation and Federal relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the 83d Congress relating to public education.
D. (6) $182.25.
E. (7) $16.20; (9) $16.20; (10) $17.50; (11) $33.70.

A. Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Nurses' Association, 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation relating to nurses, nursing, or health. (3) The American Journal of Nursing.
D. (6) $4,400.
E. (7) $90.45; (9) $90.45; (10) $126.62; (11) $217.07.

A. Henry P. Schmidt, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, etc., 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation affecting labor and especially railroad labor.
D. (6) $990.

A. Schoene and Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Labor Executives Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Against H. R. 356; for S. 2930 and H. R. 7840.
E. (6) $6.10; (9) $6.10; (10) $14.02; (11) $20.12.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Ed D. Schorr, 33 North High Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Coal Producers Committee on Underground Gas Storage Safety, care of W. G. Stevenson, Grant Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) Legislation pertaining to underground storage of gas.
D. (6) $6,000.
E. (7) $195.05; (9) $195.05; (10) $1,198.32; (11) $1,393.37.

A. Jack Garrett Scott, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Operators.
C. (2) All proposed legislation which would affect the intercity motor bus industry.

A. Mildred Scott, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $300.
E. (7) $25; (9) $25; (10) $75; (11) $100.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting the marketing and distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Opposed to any proposed legislation calling for the duplication of class I–A clear channel frequencies or the limitation of the power of class I–A standard broadcast stations.
E. (7) $14; (9) $14; (10) $142.31; (11) $156.31.

A. Harry See, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
C. (2) Advocating favorable labor legislation and opposing unfavorable labor legislation.
E. (7) $32.20; (9) $32.20; (10) $74.31; (11) $106.51.

A. A. Manning Shaw, Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Brown, Lund and Fitzgerald, Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C., for National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the N. A. E. C.
D. (6) $3,793.99.

A. Mark R. Shaw, 114 Trenton Street, Melrose, Mass.
B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
E. (7) $119; (9) $119; (10) 103.51; (11) $222.51.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Association of Port Authorities and Airport Operators Council, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (7) $267.66; (8) $5; (9) $272.66; (10) $712.02; (11) $984.68.

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.
D. (6) $120.

A. Robert H. Shields, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting sugar.
D. (6) $10,000.

A. Earl C. Shively, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroad interests.
D. (6) $72.96.
E. (7) $72.96; (9) $72.96; (10) $422.48; (11) $495.44.

A. Silk and Rayon Printers and Dyers Association of America, Inc., 1450 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Seeks enactment of a law creating a regulatory commission for printers, dyers, and finishers of silk and manmade fibers.
E. (4) $39.49; (6) $56.94; (7) $1,299.19; (8) $4.24; (9) $1,399.86; (10) $1,108.34; (11) $2,508.20; (15).[1]

A. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 2555, to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes.
D. (6) $945.
E. (2) $5,537.60; (5) $957.33; (6) $313.41; (7) $844.15; (8) $574.19; (9) $8,226.68; (10) $17,904.80; (11) $26,131.48.

A. Six Agency Committee, 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting California's interest in the Colorado River legislation relating to reclamation and water resources policies.
D. (6) $10,000.
E. (2) $5,152.50; (8) $195.34; (9) $5,347.84; (10) $9,534.93; (11) $14,882.77; (15).[1]

A. Stephen Slipher, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. U. S. Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Interested in legislation affecting savings and loan associations, housing, home financing, thrift, and financial institutions.
D. (6) $1,600.
E. (7) $10.05; (9) $10.05; (10) $67.45; (11) $77.50.

A. Smaller Magazines Postal Committee, 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Postal rate legislation.
D. (6) $255.
E. (2) $2,172.52; (4) $14.69; (7) $51.86; (9) $2,239.07; (10) $4,043.37; (11) $6,282.44.

A. Elizabeth A. Smart, 144 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.
B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C.(2).[1]
D. (6) $606.12.
E. (5) $133.28; (6) $49.49; (9) $182.77; (10) $889.03; (11) $1,071.82.

A. Anthony W. Smith, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Forestry, regional development; resource conservation, labor relations.

A. Cary K. Smith, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 330 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) H. R. 7840 and S. 2930.
D. (6) $1,323.

A. James R. Smith, 719 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement, the American merchant marine, soil conservation, flood control, and regulation of domestic transportation.
D. (6) $2,400.
E. (10) $368.79.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 416 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. and Great Northern Railway Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.; and 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting directly or indirectly the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. and the Great Northern Railway Co.
D. (6) $3,500.

A. Purcell L. Smith, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electrical Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $4,375.
E. (6) $54.12; (7) $253.76; (8) $54.74; (9) $362.62; (10) $583.01; (11) $945.63.

A. Robert E. Smith, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) In support of tax revision bill (H. R. 8300).
E. (7) $482.65; (9) $482.65; (10) $1,361.75; (11) $1,844.40.

A. Sylvester C. Smith, Jr., 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
B. Prudential Insurance Company of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
C. (2) General interest in all legislation affecting the business of the company.

A. J. D. Snyder, 1040 La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads.
D. (6) $825.

A. J. Taylor Soop, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 330 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) H. R. 7840 and S. 2930.
D. (6) $585.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to free-enterprise system and opposition to legislation unfavorable to that system.
D. (6) $12,057.50.
E. (2) $16,062.50; (4) $5,603.27; (5) $1,915.23; (6) $145.57; (7) $124.99; (8) $356.44; (9) $24,208; (10) $50,192.39; (11) $74,400.39; (15).[1]

A. Spaulding, Reiter & Rose, 1311 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Standard Coil Products Co., Inc., 2085 Hawthorne Avenue, Melrose Park, Ill.
C. (2) Excise taxes on materials manufactured by employer.[1]

A. Spence & Hotchkiss, 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

A. Lyndon Spencer, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Thomas G. Stack, 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation relative to increasing benefits for all railroad employees covered by the Railroad Retirement Act. (3) Rail Pension News.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (1) $214.50; (2) $1,500; (4) $1,400; (6) $114.80; (7) $559.80; (9) $3,789.10; (10) $9,527.26; (11) $13,316.36.

A. Howard M. Starling, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of Casualty and Security Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.
D. (6) $150.
E. (7) $16; (9) $16; (10) $21.85; (11) $37.85.

A. Samuel Elliot Stavisky, 9307 Singleton Drive, Bethesda, Md.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to sugar and Cuban trade.

A. Mrs. Nell F. Stephens, Post Office Box 6234, Northwest Station, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Health, education, welfare.

A. Charles T. Stewart, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
D. (6) $3,651.65.
E. (7) $129.26; (8) $22.39; (9) $151.65; (10) $375.49; (11) $527.14.

A. Erskine Stewart, Sheraton Building, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2).[1]
E. (8) $1.25; (9) $1.25; (10) $2.50; (11) $3.75.

A. Edwin L. Stoll, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $2,533.15.
E. (8) $33.15; (9) $33.15; (10) $137.65; (11) $170.80.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the American merchant marine and transportation generally. No activities during quarter for which this report is filed.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Paul A. Strachan, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped.[1]
D. (6) $700.
E. (7) $75; (9) $75; (10) $225; (11) $300.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 6584 and H. R. 9476 (customs simplification bills).
D. (6) $2,815.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 6616 and S. 2559 (copyright bills).
D. (6) $625.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 6584 and 9476 (customs simplification bills).
D. (6) $1,625.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 6584 and 9476 (customs simplification bills).
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Arthur Sturgis, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $625.
E. (7) $5.50; (9) $5.50; (10) $18.50; (11) $24.

A. J. E. Sturrock, Post Office Box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
B. Texas Water Conservation Association, Post Office Box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation concerning the development, conservation, protection and utilization of Texas land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies. (3) Texas Water.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (2) $46; (5) $59.73; (6) $1.35; (7) $315.39; (8) $141.58; (9) $564.05; (10) $2,125.47; (11) $2,689.52; (15).[1]

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. National Tuberculosis Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting general public health, tuberculosis in particular.
E. (10) $892.51.

A. Barrett Godwin Tawresey, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. Insurance Company of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Interested in having the present Congress pass on Appropriation Act providing for payment of claims arising from French spoliations where claims have heretofore been reported to Congress by the Court of Claims.

A. Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 310 Commerce Building, Louisville, Ky.
C. (2) Advocating revision of section 101, IRC.
D. (6) $1,002.50.
E. (1) $1,250; (2) $146.25; (4) $15; (5) $135; (8) $2.94; (9) $1,549.19; (10) $1,882.03; (11) $3,431.22.

A. Dwight D. Taylor, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting civil aviation.
D. (6) $600.
E. (7) $195; (9) $195; (10) $469; (11) $664.

A. Edward D. Taylor, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Manufacturers Institute, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Jay Taylor, 712 First National Bank Building, Amarillo, Tex.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Maude M. Taylor, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation having anything to do with transportation.

A. Randolph S. Taylor, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., 620 South Broadway, Lexington, Ky.
C. (2) All legislation which might affect tobacco growers, dealers, and warehousemen.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $643.09; (8) $43.15; (9) $686.24; (10) $652.31; (11) $1,338.55.

A. Tyre Taylor, 917, 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
C. (2) Legislation favorable to the maintenance of a free-enterprise system.
E. (4) $20.51; (5) $264.56; (6) $55.88; (9) $340.95; (10) $834.78; (11) $1,175.73.

A. Ruth H. Tegtmeyer, Statler Office Building, Boston, Mass.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation having anything to do with transportation.

A. John U. Terrell, 407 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) H. R. 4449, S. 1555, S. 964, H. R. 236.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Texas Water Conservation Association, 207 West 15th Street, Post Office Box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Interested in all legislation concerning the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of Texas' land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies. (3) Texas water.
D. (6) $11,072.
E. (1) $568.80; (2) $1,908.60; (4) $1,244.40; (5) $691.30; (6) $146.93; (7) $209.59; (8) $909.06; (9) $5,678.68; (10) $12,363.62; (11) $18,042.30.

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev.
B. Nevada Railroad Association, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev.
C. (2) All Senate and House bills and resolutions affecting the interests of Nevada railroads.
D. (6) $675.
E. (11) $1,267.33.

A. Chester C. Thompson, 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All matters affecting barge and towing vessel industry and water transportation.
D. (6) $6,500.
E. (7) $181; (9) $181; (10) $440.15; (11) $621.15.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) All legisation which has a direct bearing on nurses, nursing, or health.
D. (6) $1,255.38.

A. E. W. Tinker, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Pulp & Paper Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests are those of employer.
E. (10) $700.

A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

A. S. G. Tipton, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests for the proper advancement of the airline industry in the public interests.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (7) $34.08; (9) $34.08; (10) $84.74; (11) $118.82; (15).[1]

A. H. Willis Tobler, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperative through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops: (a) The Alert.
D. (6) $2,599.14.
E. (6) $46.50; (7) $52.67; (9) $99.17; (10) $696.22; (11) $795.39.

A. John H. Todd, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) Any matters affecting the cotton compress and cotton warehouse industry.
D. (6) $55.50.

A. Tomoka Land Co., 8–10 West Center Street, Sebring, Fla.
C. (2) For modification of section 1237, H. R. 8300, making same applicable to corporations on lands held more than 10 years and for similar legislation.
E. (2) $500; (6) $3.64; (8) $0.80; (9) $504.44; (11) $504.44; (15).[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Wallace Townsend, 306 Commercial Bank Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Southwestern Gas & Electric Co., Shreveport, La.
C. (2) My only interest has been in the size of the appropriation for the Southwestern Power Administration.
D. (6) $600.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Immigration legislation; Mexican farm labor importation; transportation legislation; grazing land; St. Lawrence Seaway; ICC decision on prohibition of trip leasing; Watershed Protection Act; Water Facilities Act; irrigation legislation.
E. (7) $10.98; (9) $10.98; (10) $245.20; (11) $256.18.

A. Paul T. Truitt, 817 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Plant Food Council, Inc., 817 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Generally interested in legislation affecting the fertilizer industry.

A. Harold J. Turner, 626 Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co., Southern Pacific Co., and Union Pacific Railroad Co.
C. (2) All bills which directly affect railroads of Oregon.

A. William S. Tyson, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Local No. 30, Canal Zone Pilots, National Organization of Masters, Mates, and Pilots' of America, Post Office Box 493, Balboa, C. Z.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting Panama Canal pilots.
D. (6) $4,000.
E. (4) $2.40; (6) $8.77; (7) $144.10; (8) $28.44; (9) $183.71; (10) $387.63; (11) $571.34; (15).[1]

A. United Cerebral Palsy Association, Inc., 369 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health.
E. (1) $1,999.99; (7) $324.26; (9) $2,324.25; (10) $3,886.66; (11) $6,210.91.

A. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
E. (1) $6,624.64; (2) $1,239.50; (4) $633.63; (5) $268.12; (6) $87.77; (9) $8,853.66; (10) $11,778.55; (11) $20,632.21; (15).[1]

A. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2).[1]
E. (2) $4,185.44; (4) $4,417.18; (5) $706.90; (6) $114.89; (7) $10.05; (8) $383.35; (9) $9,817.81; (10) $35,649.29; (11) $45,467.10.

A. Arvin E. Upton, 1826 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. St. Regis Paper Co., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2).[1]
E. (6) $10.56; (9) $10.56; (10) $12.26; (11) $22.82.

A. Weston Vernon, Jr., Esq., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Western Union Telegraph Co.
D. (6) $174.38.
E. (7) $53.62; (9) $53.62; (11) $53.62.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Vitrified China Association, Inc., 931 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

A. The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street, Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General: Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.
D. (6) $125.

A. Claude R. Wallace, 203 Eighth Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. POSSE, 625 Realty Building, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Social security and old age benefits.
E. (6) $200; (8) $300; (9) $500; (11) $500.

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,673.
E. (6) $4.94; (7) $44.36; (8) $1.74; (9) $51.04; (10) $176.35; (11) $227.39.

A. Thomas G. Walters, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Government Employees' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Duties are to represent the member unions and the Government Employees Council on matters affecting them before the Congress.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. Quaife M. Ward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative proposals affecting the retail industry.[1]
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (7) $4.50; (9) $4.50; (10) $27.45; (11) $31.95.

A. Milo J. Warner, National Bank Building, Toledo, Ohio.
B. The Prudential Insurance Company of America, Newark, N. J.
C. (2) Attention to legislation which may affect the interests of the mutual policyholders of The Prudential Insurance Company of America.
D. (6) $7,500.
E. (6) $67.78; (7) $1,595.86; (9) $1,663.64; (10) $2,304.29; (11) $3,967.93.

A. William C. Warren, 116th Street and Amsterdam Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Webb & Knapp, Inc., 383 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Interested in proposed tax legislation.
E. (6) $28; (7) $145; (9) $173; (11) $173.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 1728 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 2413, a bill to provide local self-government for the District of Columbia.
D. (6) $1,796.06.
E. (2) $1,293.30; (4) $313.29; (5) $260.47; (6) $131.41; (8) $280.12; (9) $2,278.59; (10) $8,503.25; (11) $10,781.84; (15).[1]

A. Washington Real Estate Board, Inc., 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All local measures affecting the District of Columbia are of interest.
E. (10) $500.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Vincent T. Wasilewski, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation which affects the broadcasting industry.

A. Frank J. Waters, 727 West 7th Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Hughes Tool Co., Houston, Tex.
C. (2) Revision of proposed Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (H. R. 8300).

A. Waterways Council Opposed to Regulation Extension, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
C.[1]
D. (6) $785.
E. (2) $76.30; (4) $37.08; (5) $154.87; (9) $268.25; (10) $7,370.42; (11) $7,638.67.

A. J. R. Watson, Room 1, I. C. R. R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
B. Mississippi Railroad Association, Room 1, I. C. R. R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads in Mississippi.

A. Henry B. Weaver, Jr., et al., 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The liaison committee for the mechanical contracting industries, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation respecting mechanical specialty contracting industries.
D. (6) $4,500.
E. (4) $23.76; (7) $143.42; (8) $51.10; (9) $218.28; (10) $1,789.02; (11) $2,007.30.

A. Henry B. Weaver, Jr., et al., 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Philco Corp., Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. William H. Webb, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All matters pertaining to river and harbor improvement, flood control, navigation, irrigation-reclamation, soil and water conservation, and related subjects.
D. (6) $2,278.47.
E. (4) $55; (5) $15.05; (7) $324.09; (8) $84; (9) $478.14; (10) $1,231.81; (11)) $1,709.95; (15).[1]

A. E. E. Webster, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) All bills affecting railroad employees and labor in general.
D. (6) $1,894.49.

A. Wayne M. Weishaar, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Aeronautical Training Society, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting aviation training or contract overhaul of aircraft.
D. (6) $3,300.
E. (4) $3.20; (9) $3.20; (10) $11.68; (11) $14.88.

A. Bernard Weitzer, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington 9, D. C.
D. (6) $2,499.96.
E. (6) $22.85; (7) $328.58; (8) $24.91; (9) $376.34; (10) $919.19; (11) $1,295.53.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Edward M. Welliver, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,350.
E. (7) $100; (9) $100; (10) $234; (11) $334.

A. Wenchel, Schulman & Manning, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of Mary Clark deBrabant and Katherine C. Williams, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests relate to a possible revision of section 7 of the Technical Changes Act of 1949.
E. (6) $46.73; (9) $46.73.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.
C. (2) Any River and Harbor bill affecting the Intercoastal Waterway.
E. (2) $600; (6) $32.61; (7) $56.84; (8) $1.08; (9) $690.53; (10) $213.48; (11) $904.01; (15).[1]

A. George Y. Wheeler II, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting National Broadcasting Co., Inc., and/or its affiliated companies.
E. (7) $17.50; (9) $17.50; (10) $27.20; (11) $44.70.

A. Wheeler and Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Missouri Pacific Railroad Co., 25 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (6) $10; (7) $10; (8) $5; (9) $25; (10) $160; (11) $185.

A. Richard P. White, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the nursery industry directly.
D. (6) $3,375.
E. (2) $33.75; (4) $12.02; (5) $19.81; (6) $4.19; (7) $8.59; (9) $78.36; (10) $152.37; (11) $230.73.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Associations, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all legislation particularly affecting the interests of manufacturers of gas appliances and equipment.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation pertaining to natural gas.
D. (6) $750.

A. Joseph F. Wildebush, 7 Church Street, Paterson, N. J.
B. Silk and Rayon Printers and Dyers Association of America, Inc., 1450 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Seeks enactment of a law creating a regulatory commission for printers, dyers, and finishers of silk and manmade fibers.
E. (10) $92.51.

A. A. E. Wilkinson, 417 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Anaconda Copper Mining Co., 616 Hennessy Building, Butte, Mont.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. W. E. Wilkinson, Glenn Building, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) I am interested in all legislation having anything to do with transportation.

A. Franz O. Willenbucher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1] (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) $1,800.

A. Leon W. Williams, 2 Gouverneur Place, Bronx, N. Y.
D. (6) $1.66.
E. (4) $3.65; (8) $10; (9) $13.65; (10) $33.84; (11) $47.49.

A. Hugh S. Williamson, 1621 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

A. James M. Williamson, 1000 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The J. R. Watkins Co., Winona, Minn.
C. (2) Proposed Revenue Code of 1954.
D. (6) $750.
E. (7) $120; (9) $120.

A. John C. Williamson, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
D. (6) $4,800.
E. (7) $289.03; (8) $20.29; (9) $309.32; (10) $1,545.40; (11) $1,854.72; (15).[1]

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,875.
E. (6) $11.76; (7) $111.50; (8) $5.10; (9) $128.36; (10) $674.10; (11) $802.46.

A. Frank E. Wilson, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All bills relating to health and welfare.
D. (6) $900.
E. (7) $109.18; (9) $109.18; (10) $619.65; (11) $728.83.

A. Everett T. Winter, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement, the American Merchant Marine, soil conservation, flood control, regulation of domestic transportation.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (7) $231; (9) $231; (10) 1,040.36; (11) $1,271.36.

A. Walter F. Woodul, Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex., et al.[1]
C. (2) Generally legislation affecting Texas railroads.
D. (6) $6,583.78.
E. (6) $113.27; (7) $1,154.20; (9) $1,267.47; (10) $3,368.34; (11) $4,635.81; (15).[1]

A. Walter F. Woodul, Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Houston, Tex.
C. (2) Legislation that may affect the oil and gas industry.
D. (6) $808.12.
E. (6) $56.64; (7) $577.10; (9) $633.74; (10) $1,684.17; (11) $2,317.91; (15).[1]

A. Frank K. Woolley, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2).[1]
E. (7) $198.66; (9) $198.66; (10) $181.29; (11) $379.95.

A. Edward W. Wootton, 900 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting California wine and brandy industry.

A. Donald A. Young, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. .C
B. Chamber of Commerce of U. S. A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. J. Banks Young, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting the raw-cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $1,224.
E. (7) $41.63; (9) $41.63; (10) $40; (11) $81.63.

A. O. David Zimring, 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.; and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, et al.
D. (6) $1,223.55.
E. (10) $1,223.55.

A. Harry E. Zwinggi, Clark Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation having anything to do with transportation.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the third calendar quarter 1954:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy, questions are not repeated, only the answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number. Also for economy in the RECORD, lengthy answers are abridged.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.
"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:
1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302 (e).
(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports. ☐

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed, in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

A. American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All matters relating to the soft-drink business.

A. William J. Barnhard, 351 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Gold Star Wives of America, Inc., 352 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation dealing with welfare of war widows, war orphans, and other survivors of deceased servicemen. (4) Anticipated expenses, $50; compensation, $250 per annum.

A. Ralph E. Becker, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Trade Council, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interests of trade and commerce. (4) $5,000 annual retainer fee.

A. Paul G. Benson, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation under consideration in the Congress which will affect postal employees. (3) The National Rural Letter Carrier. (4) Monthly compensation, $121.45.

A. Kenneth W. Bergen, 84 State Street, Boston, Mass.
B. E. Barton Chapin, 84 State Street, Boston, Mass.
C. (2) Amendment to section 681 (c) of H. R. 8300.

A. Preston B. Bergin, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District of Columbia, Business Practices Council, 1030 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting businessmen in the District of Columbia.

A. Brown, Lund, & Fitzgerald, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Dow Chemical-Detroit Edison & Associates, care of Detroit-Edison Co., Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) To amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946.

A. G. B. Burnham, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To amend the Trading With the Enemy Act. (4) Approximately $1,000 per month.

A. Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee, Inc., 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Development of the Calumet-Sag Channel to strengthen the internal defenses and facilities of the United States, to facilitate trade and commerce on the Inland waterways, and to increase employment opportunities in the midcontinent area. (4) $75,000 per year.

A. Committee, Presidential Primaries, Box 281, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) To get a bill passed to compel our presidential nominees to be selected by a primary vote, or place the proposition on ballot next election and give States chance to ratify it if necessary.

A. Council of Conservationists, 161 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) All legislation involving conservation principles and practices.

A. John B. Curan, 16 East Sixth Street, Media, Pa.
B. International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers, 330 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All matters of interest to labor. (4) $460 per month, plus certain expenses.

A. Denver Association of Building Owners and Managers, 624 17th Street, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) For amendment of Internal Revenue Code.

A. Ben DuBois, Sauk Centre, Minn.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.
C. (2) Legislation applying to banking. (4) $12,000 per year.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Letter Carrier Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation under consideration in the Congress which will affect postal employees. (4) $113.12 per month.

A. James F. Fort, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (4) $225 per month and anticipated expenses of $75 per quarter.

A. John A. Gosnell, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General interest in legislation affecting the chemical industry. (4) $5,000 annually and expenses.

A. Warren Griffiths, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.

A. Don V. Harris, Jr., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Admiral Corp., 3800 Cortland Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) General legislative interests concerning Federal excise taxes.

A. Don V. Harris, Jr., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United Aircraft Corp., 400 Main Street, East Hartford, Conn.
C. (2) General legislative interests concerning Federal excise taxes.

A. Laurance C. Henderson, 1190 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. North American Airlines, Lockheed Air Terminal, Burbank, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting air transportation, including the McCarran Act. (4) $300 per month.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of Thomas C. Dennehy, deceased, 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting taxation of decedents' estates.

A. Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc., 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation related to the national defense and mobilization program.

A. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.
C. (2) Banking.

A. Independent Producers of Fissionable Materials, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The Atomic Energy Acts of 1946 and 1954. (4) Approximately $150.

A. Independent Refiners Association of America, 201 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation threatening the effective contribution of independent refiners to the Nation's economy and national security. (4) $15,000.

A. James William Johnston, 625 Henry Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Graham, Green, Howe & Dunn, 625 Henry Building, Seattle, Wash.
C. (2) Tax legislation.

A. Robert C. Keck, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Hardboard Association, 30 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) H. R. 9666 to correct tariff classification of hardboard. (4) Approximately $750.

A. Bill Kirchner, Sauk Centre, Minn.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.
C. (2) Banking. (4) Compensation $8,000 per year.

A. Kreeger, Ragland & Shapiro, 516 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Eastern Corp., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Mutual Security Act of 1954.

A. Kreeger, Ragland & Shapiro, 516 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Silk & Rayon Printers & Dyers Association of America, Inc., 1450 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Seeks enactment of a law creating a trade regulatory commission.

A. Richard K. Lyon, 700 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. William T. Dorminy, 3126 Buena Vista Terrace SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 10017, a bill for the relief of William T. Dorminy.

A. Frank A. Mathews, Jr., 203 Bank Avenue, Riverton, N. J.
B. Delaware River Valley Association, Riverton, N. J.
C. (2) Opposition to proposed deepening of the Delaware River Channel between Philadelphia, Pa., and Trenton, N. J.

A. J. Clarke Mattimore, 1740 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Independent advisory committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc.
C. (2) Legislation related to the progress and development of a national transportation system.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. The Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) H. R. 8300, a bill to revise the internal revenue laws of the United States.

A. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) In favor of private enterprise, ownership and operation of off-street parking facilities.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation under consideration in the Congress affecting postal employees. (3) The National Rural Letter Carrier. (4) Approximately $6,000 quarterly.

A. National Trade Council, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interests of trade and commerce. (4) $5,000 annual retainer fee.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. S. Gumbel Realty & Security Co., Inc., New Orleans, La.
C. (2) To obtain change in sections of the Internal Revenue Code dealing with corporate liquidations.

A. Pershing, Bosworth, Dick & Dawson, 320 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Denver Association of Building Owners and Managers, 624 17th Street, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) For amendment of Internal Revenue Code so as to provide for deductibility for Federal income tax purposes of taxes levied by the Moffat Tunnel Improvement District.

A. Riegelman, Strasser & Spiegelberg, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Peach Springs, Ariz.
C. (2) All legislation of concern to Indians as such and the Hualapai Tribe in particular.

A. Riegelman, Strasser & Spiegelberg, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho, Lapwai, Idaho.
C. (2) All legislation of concern to Indians as such and the Nez Perce Tribe in particular.

A. Riegelman, Strasser & Spiegelberg, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.
C. (2) All legislation of concern to Indians as such and the Oglala Sioux Tribe in particular. (4) Retainer fee of $150 per month.

A. Riegelman, Strasser & Spiegelberg, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pueblo of Laguna, Leguna, N. Mex.
C. (2) All legislation of concern to Indians as such and the Pueblo of Laguna in particular. (4) Retainer fee of $75 per month.

A. Riegelman, Strasser & Spiegelberg, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.
C. (2) All legislation of concern to Indians as such and the San Carlos Apache Tribe in particular. (4) Retainer fee of $200 per month.

A. Riegelman, Strasser & Spiegelberg, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska, Winnebago, Nebr.
C. (2) All legislation of concern to Indians as such and the Winebago Tribe in particular. (4) Retainer fee of $300 per year.

A. Selvage, Lee & Chase, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Carpet Institute, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the Carpet Institute.

A. Shearman & Sterling & Wright, 20 Exchange Place, New York, N. Y.
B. Wintershall A. G., Kassel; Salzdetfurth A. G., Bad Salzdetfurth; Kalisyndikst (in liquidation); Schering A. G., Berlin N-65; Siemens & Halska A. G., Munich; Nünchener Rückverricherungs-Desellschaft, Munich.
C. (2) Return of vested property. (4) $10,000 fee and $5,000 expenses.

A. Spaulding, Reiter & Rose, 1311 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests—electronics.

A. William S. Tyson, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Local No. 30, Canal Zone Pilots, Post Office Box 493, Balboa, C. Z.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting Panama Canal pilots. (4) Annual rate of compensaton, $8,000.

A. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to thrift and home ownership. (4) Expenditures in recent quarters have ranged from $6,913.74 to $19,416.40.

A. C. R. Wallace, 203 Eighth Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Posse, 625 Realty Building, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Social security and old-age and survivors insurance.

A. William C. Warren, 116th Street and Amsterdam Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Webb & Knapp, Inc., 383 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) I am interested in proposed tax legislation. Expenses approximately $200.

A. Elaine O. Wells, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation having anything to do with transportation.

A. Wilkinson, Boyden, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, Fort Duchesne, Utah.
C. (2) Legislation dealing with settlement of claim of Uintah and White River Bands of Ute Indians.

A. Howard Zahniser, 6222 43d Avenue, Hyattsville, Md.
B. Council of Conservationists, 161 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation involving conservation principles and practices.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 6, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in whose peace our restless spirits are quieted, the fierce storms sweeping across our world leave us weary with anxious watching. These testing times are finding out our every weakness. While the tempest still is high we bow at this wayside shrine, praying that the infinite calm of Thy changeless love may bring to our jaded souls inner sustenance. Here may we find wells of living water springing up, courage in battling for truth, and serenity under the strain of these days that try our souls.

Give us a readiness to accept the austere disciplines of self-control, never mistaking license for liberty, so that our minds and bodies may be the channels for Thy holy purposes. Grant to Thy servants here in the ministry of public affairs the will and the power to match great needs with great deeds. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 5, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, informed the Senate that a quorum of the House was present; that SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas, had been elected Speaker; and Ralph R. Roberts, a citizen of the State of Indiana, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the 84th Congress.

The message also informed the Senate that a committee of three Members had been appointed by the Speaker, on the part of the House of Representatives, to join with the committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House had assembled and that Congress was ready to receive any communications that he may be pleased to make.

The message communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. Burnet R. Maybank, late a Senator from the State of South Carolina.

The message also communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. Pat McCarran, late a Senator from the State of Nevada.

The message further communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Dwight L. Rogers, late a Representative from the State of Florida, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) providing for a joint session of the two Houses on January 6, 1955, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KENNEDY was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate because of illness.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate next week, in order that I may attend the 53d Annual Convention of the American Roadbuilders Association, to be held at New Orleans, where I am scheduled to deliver an address on the subject of vital proposed legislation pending before Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. KNOWLAND advanced in the center aisle, and

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas said: Mr. President, the joint committee appointed by the Senate and the House of Representatives on yesterday to notify the President that quorums of the 2 Houses have assembled, and are ready to receive any communication he may desire to make, have performed that duty, and now report that in the Hall of

the House of Representatives the President will submit in person his annual message to the 2 Houses at 12:30 o'clock today, January 6, 1955.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution coming over from the House of Representatives.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Thursday, January 6, 1955, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk (Emery L. Frazier) called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	McNamara
Allott	George	Millikin
Anderson	Goldwater	Monroney
Barkley	Gore	Morse
Barrett	Green	Mundt
Beall	Hayden	Murray
Bender	Hennings	Neely
Bible	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bricker	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Pastore
Bush	Hruska	Payne
Butler	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Jackson	Purtell
Capehart	Jenner	Robertson
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kerr	Scott
Clements	Kilgore	Smathers
Cotton	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Langer	Sparkman
Dirksen	Lehman	Stennis
Douglas	Long	Symington
Duff	Magnuson	Thurmond
Dworshak	Malone	Thye
Eastland	Mansfield	Watkins
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	Wiley
Flanders	McCarthy	Williams
Frear	McClellan	Young

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent because of illness, and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of hearing the address of the President of the United States on the state of the Union, and that the Senate reconvene thereafter on call of the Presiding Officer, at which time Senators may present petitions and memorials, introduce bills, submit resolutions, and transact such other legislative business as may be necessary.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate, preceded by its Secretary (Felton M. Johnston), its Sergeant at Arms (Joseph C. Duke), and the Vice President, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear the annual message of the President of the United States.

ANNUAL MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 1)

(The annual message of the President of the United States, this day delivered by him to the joint session of the two Houses of Congress, appears at pp. 121–127 of the proceedings of the House of Representatives in today's RECORD.)

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The joint session of the two Houses having been dissolved, the Senate returned to its Chamber at 1 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF PROPOSED ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a brief anonuncement to make for the information of the Senate, while the Members are present. After the business of the day shall have been concluded it is planned that the Senate shall adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock meridian. I have conferred with the minority leader, and the plan is agreeable to him.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT RELATING TO VARIOUS METHODS OF PRODUCTION CONTROL AND PRICE SUPPORT

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relating to various methods of production control and of price support applicable to milk and butterfat and their products (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 4)

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, President of the National Forest Reservation Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORT OF FEDERAL EXTENSION SERVICE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Extension Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

Two letters from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, two confidential reports on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the months of July and October 1954 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SPECIAL REPORT OF FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Farm Credit Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, together with recommendations for legislation (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON COMPROMISE SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS BY FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Director, Agricultural Credit Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on compromise settlement of claims due the Farmers Home Administration in excess of $1,000 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATION OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, reporting, pursuant to law, the overobligation of appropriations for the first quarter, fiscal year 1955; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON VIOLATIONS OF OVEROBLIGATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, two violations of the overobligation of expenditures by that Department; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS ON OVEROBLIGATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

Two letters from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligations of appropriations by the Agricultural Marketing Administration and the Commodity Stabilization Service Administration, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Three letters from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, on the reapportionment of appropriations for the Veterans' Administration entitled "Compensation and Pensions," the Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for "Salaries and Expenses," Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, and the Railroad Retirement Board, for "Salaries and expenses," all for the fiscal year 1955; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, the reapportionment of an appropriation for retired pay, Department of Defense, for the fiscal year 1955 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY COURT OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 3)

A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of all judgments rendered by that court, for the year ended October 1, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON NUMBER OF OFFICERS ON DUTY WITH DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY AND ARMY GENERAL STAFF

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the number of officers on duty with the Department of the Army and the Army General Staff, on September 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

RETENTION IN THE SERVICE OF DISABLED COMMISSIONED OFFICERS AND WARRANT OFFICERS, ARMY AND AIR FORCE

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of June 19, 1948 (ch. 511, 62 Stat. 489), relating to the retention in the service of disabled commissioned officers and warrant officers of the Army and Air Force (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADDITIONAL PERMANENT PROFESSORS, UNITED STATES MILITARY AND AIR FORCE ACADEMIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize at the United States Military Academy and at the United States Air Force Academy an additional permanent professor (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PURCHASE AND SALE OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES AND RAW MATERIALS IN OCCUPIED AREAS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal Public Law 820, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 1098), entitled "An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADVANCE PAYMENTS OF CERTAIN PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 201 (e) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for advance payments of certain pay and allowances of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF CAREER COMPENSATION ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 508 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, relating to the compensation of cadets and midshipmen (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

TRANSFER OF HOSPITALS AND RELATED FACILITIES BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the transfer of hospitals and related facilities between the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Defense, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF CAREER COMPENSATION ACT OF 1949 RELATING TO CREDIT FOR CERTAIN SERVICES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to allow credit for certain service for purposes of pay, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PUBLICATION OF OFFICIAL REGISTERS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to cause to be published official registers for their respective services (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF UNIVERSAL TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT RELATING TO FINAL PHYSICAL EXAMINATION FOR CERTAIN INDUCTEES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to remove the requirement for a final physical examination for inductees who continue on active duty in another status in the Armed Forces (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON NUMBER OF OFFICERS IN DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY AND WITH ARMY GENERAL STAFF

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the number of officers in the Department of the Army and of the number of officers on or with the Army General Staff as of June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON TRANSPORTATION FURNISHED TO CERTAIN GOVERNMENT AND OTHER PERSONNEL

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on transportation furnished for certain Government and other personnel (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PERSHING HALL MEMORIAL FUND

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on transactions relating to the Pershing Hall Memorial Fund for the fiscal year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON HELIUM-PRODUCTION FUND

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, the amount of money credited to and disbursements from the helium-production fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES FOR CERTAIN NAVAL PERSONNEL

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on transportation facilities to personnel of naval establishments for the fiscal year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT RELATING TO INCLUSION OF AMERICAN SAMOA, GUAM, AND VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 62 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 198), as amended (32 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 4c), to include American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED FOR INDUSTRIAL MOBILIZATION-TYPE PROJECTS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, on contracts negotiated for research and development projects and for industrial mobilization-type projects for the period January 1 through June 30, 1954; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON AGREEMENTS ENTERED INTO RELATING TO NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

A letter from the Director, Naval Petroleum Reserves, Navy Department, reporting, pursuant to law, on agreements entered into during the calendar year 1954 relating to naval petroleum reserves; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CONTRACT NEGOTIATED FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Acting Commandant, United States Coast Guard, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts on experimental, developmental, or research work by the United States Coast Guard for the period January 1 to June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CONTRACTS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on research and development contracts, Department of the Army, for the period January 1 through June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON NUMBER OF OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO PERMANENT DUTY IN EXECUTIVE ELEMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that there were 2,575 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of government, for the quarter ended September 30, 1954; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON ANNUAL FLYING PAY, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual flying-pay report of the United States Air Force as of August 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON TRANSPORTATION FURNISHED BY THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report pertaining to transportation furnished by the Air Force, for the period July 1, 1953 to June 30, 1954 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS ON FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS PROGRAM

Two letters from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the Federal contributions program, Federal Civil Defense Administration, for the quarter ended June 30, 1954 and the quarter ended September 30, 1954 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS, FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

Two letters from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions by that Administration for the quarter ended June 30, 1954, and the quarter ended September 30, 1954; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CONTRACTS IN EXCESS OF $50,000, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of research and development contracts in excess of $50,000 awarded by the Department of the Navy, for the period January 1 through June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON LIQUIDATION OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the liquidation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the quarter ended September 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 28th quarterly report on export control (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION (IN LIQUIDATION)

A letter from the Administrator, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (in liquidation), for the period ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON ABACA FIBER OPERATIONS, RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Corporation on Abaca Fiber Operations, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON SYNTHETIC RUBBER OPERATIONS

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Facilities Corporation, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation on synthetic rubber operations, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the Managing Director, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that bank for the period January–June 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency for the calendar year 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF RUBBER PRODUCING FACILITIES DISPOSAL COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report (No. 5) prepared by the Federal Facilities Corporation, with respect to expenditures for repairs, replacements, additions, improvements, or maintenance of the Government-owned rubber producing facilities, for the 2-month period ended August 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Three letters from the Executive Director, Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, three reports prepared by the Federal Facilities Corporation with respect to expenditures for repairs, replacements, additions, improvements, or maintenance of the Government-owned rubber producing facilities for the 1-month period ended July 31, 1954, for the 3-month period ended September 30, 1954, and for the 4-month period ended October 31, 1954 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON TRANSFER OF JURISDICTION OVER PUBLIC LANDS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, reporting, pursuant to law, on the transfer of jurisdiction over public lands in the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN LANDS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the acquisition of lands by that Commission for the development of the park, parkway, and playground system of the National Capital and its environs in nearby Maryland and Virginia, for the fiscal year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency, for the fiscal year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

A letter from the director, national legislative commission, the American Legon, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the financial statement of the Legion for the period ended October 31, 1954 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

A letter from the Acting Director, United States Information Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency for the period January 1 to June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

GREETINGS TO THE GOLD COAST AND NIGERIA

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Department of State had transmitted certified copies of the joint resolution of the Congress to extend greetings to the Gold Coast and Nigeria (Public Law 667, 83d Cong., 2d sess.), to the American consulates general at Accra, Gold Coast, and Lagos, Nigeria (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State embodying a resolution of the Gold Coast Legislative Assembly with respect to the joint resolution of the Congress to extend greetings to the Gold Coast and Nigeria; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES UNDER FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities of that Department under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, for the period July 1, 1952, through June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PUBLICATION OF NOTICES OF DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN MATERIALS FROM NATIONAL STOCKPILE

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice of disposal for the disposition of obsolescent palm oil now held in the national stockpile, to be published in the Federal Register (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Commissioner, General Services Administration, Emergency Procurement Service, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice of disposal for the disposition of 668 pieces of raw optical glass blanks now held in the national stockpile, to be published in the Federal Register (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work, and for the manufacture or furnishing of supplies for experimentation, development, research, or test, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Treasury Department, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON BUREAU OF STANDARDS

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Southwestern Power Administration, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON GORGAS MEMORIAL INSTITUTE OF TROPICAL AND PREVENTIVE MEDICINE, INC.

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION, HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, for the fiscal year ended

June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the National Capital Housing Authority, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON SUGAR ACT PROGRAM

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Sugar Act Program, Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON THE POSTAL SAVINGS SYSTEM

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Postal Savings System, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1952 and 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the United States Coast Guard, Department of the Treasury, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Inland Waterways Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON ARMY INDUSTRIAL FUND, PICATINNY ARSENAL, ORDNANCE CORPS

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Army Industrial Fund, Picatinny Arsenal, Ordnance Corps, Department of the Army, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1952 and 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON THE GOVERNMENT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the government of the Virgin Islands of the United States, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF CERTAIN ACTIVITIES OF THE OFFICE OF PRICE STABILIZATION

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of certain activities of the Office of Price Stabilization, a component agency of the Economic Stabilization Agency, from its inception on January 24, 1951, to April 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, as of December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED CONCESSION AWARDS IN CERTAIN RECREATIONAL AREAS

Four letters from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of proposed concession awards in the Big Stump area of Kings Canyon National Park, Calif., Olympic National Park, Wash., Death Valley National Monument, Calif., and the Cape Hatteras national seashore recreational area, North Carolina (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ANNUAL CREDIT FUND REPORT, BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the revolving credit fund transactions, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON ADEQUATE SOIL SURVEYS AND LAND CLASSIFICATIONS

Two letters from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, that adequate soil surveys and land classifications have been made of the lands to be benefited by Lovewell Dam and Reservoir, Bostwick Division, Missouri River Basin project, Kansas, and the Glendo unit, Oregon Trail Division, Missouri River Basin project, Wyoming and Nebraska (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONDOLENCES ON DEATH OF LATE SENATOR MCCARRAN

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Department of State, transmitting a translation of a communication received from the mayor and president of the Permanent Commission of the Corporate Municipality of Burgos, Spain, extending condolences on the death of the late Senator McCarran (with accompanying papers); ordered to lie on the table.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS OF SAGINAW CHIPPEWA INDIAN TRIBE OF MICHIGAN, AND JAMES STRONG, AND THE DELAWARE TRIBE OF INDIANS AGAINST UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, that the claims of the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe of Michigan, and James Strong, and the Delaware Tribe of Indians against the United States had been settled (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN INDIAN CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the opinions and orders entered in the claims of *The Assiniboine Indian Tribe* v. *United States, and Kalapuya Tribe of Indians, Clakamas, Cow Creek Tribe, Lakmiut Tribe, Mary's River Tribe, Molalla Tribe, Tillamook Tribe, Rogue River Tribe, Santiam Tribe, Shasta Tribe, Tumwater Tribe, Umpqua Tribe, Wapato Tribe, Yamhill Tribe, Coquille Tribe, Too-Too-To-Ney Tribe, Willamette Tribe, Chetco Tribe, Chinook Tribe, Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community, Oregon* v. *United States* (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE, LEGISLATURE OF HAWAII

A letter from the Secretary of Hawaii, Honolulu, T. H., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the Journal of the Senate of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1953 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a law entitled "Electoral Law for the Virgin Islands of the United States," enacted by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY SECOND GUAM LEGISLATURE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Second Guam Legislature (Second Regular Session and Third Special Session) (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Two letters from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF ST. CROIX, AND ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

Two letters from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Councils of St. Croix, and St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RENEWAL OF CONCESSION PERMIT, SHARP TOP MOUNTAIN, BLUE RIDGE PARKWAY, VA.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law,

a proposed renewal of a concession permit at Sharp Top Mountain, Blue Ridge Parkway, Va. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED CONCESSION AWARDS IN CERTAIN RECREATIONAL AREAS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession permit in the Moses H. Cone Memorial Park on Blue Ridge Parkway, Va. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Eleven letters from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of proposed concession contracts at the Searchlight Ferry site, Lake Mead national recreation area, Nevada; the Fort McHenry National Monument, Md.; Millerton Lake national recreation area, California; Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo.; Castillo de San Marcos National Monument; Mount Rushmore National Memorial, S. Dak.; Lake Mead national recreation area, Nevada; Olympic National Park, Wash.; Grand Canyon National Monument, Ariz.; Glacier National Park, Mont.; and Olympic National Park, Wash. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF COMMISSARY AND MESSING FACILITIES ACTIVITIES, CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting pursuant to law, a report on the commissary and messing facilities activities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration outside the continental United States, for the fiscal year 1954 (with accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF MARITIME ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, on the activities and transactions of the Administration under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, for the period July 1, 1954, through September 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PROVISION OF WAR-RISK AND CERTAIN MARINE AND LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR AMERICAN PUBLIC

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, as of September 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Three letters from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission as of August 31, 1954, September 30, 1954, and October 31, 1954 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, together with a supplement thereto (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

RECENTLY ISSUED PUBLICATIONS OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, copies of the Commission's recently issued publications entitled "Steam-Electric Plant Construction Cost and Annual Production Expenses, 1953," "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, Privately Owned, 1953," and "Consumption of Fuel for Production of Electric Energy, 1953" (with accompanying documents); to the Committee in Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS ON LICENSED HYDROELECTRIC PROJECTS AND PERSONNEL OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on licensed hydroelectric projects and on personnel of the Federal Power Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, Chairman of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON PAYMENT OF CLAIMS ARISING FROM CORRECTION OF MILITARY AND NAVAL RECORDS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records for the period January 1 through June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJUDICATION OF CLAIMS OF PERSONS OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on adjudication of claims of persons of Japanese ancestry during the year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS UNDER MILITARY PERSONNEL CLAIMS ACT OF 1945

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on claims paid under the provisions of the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, for the fiscal year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of tort claims paid by that Department during the fiscal year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Department of Commerce, for the fiscal year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Treasury Department, for the fiscal year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Administration, for the fiscal year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Acting Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Commission for the period July 1, 1953, through June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, that no tort claims were paid by that Administration for the fiscal year 1954; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF TORT CLAIMS PAID BY CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

A letter from the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by that Agency, for the fiscal year 1954; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANT OR RETROCESSION TO A STATE OF CONCURRENT JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN LAND

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the grant or retrocession to a State of concurrent jurisdiction over certain land (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JOE KAWAKAMI

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Joe Kawakami (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COL. WALTER E. AHEARN, AND OTHERS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Col. Walter E. Ahearn, and others (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the tenth and final report of the activities of the War Claims Commission, as of June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ANN ARBOR CONSTRUCTION CO. *v.* UNITED STATES

A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to Senate resolution 224, 82d Congress, 1st session, the opinion of that Court in the case of *Ann Arbor Construction Company, a Construction Supplies Corporation of Ann Arbor in the State of Michigan* v. *The United States* (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

A letter from the chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourth annual report of that Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30,

1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF CLAIMS PAID UNDER MARITIME CLAIMS ACT

A letter from the Secretary of the Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of amounts paid and received under the Maritime Claims Act of 1951, for the fiscal year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of Ying Hin Young, Branimir V. Popovitch, and Mila B. Popovitch from reports transmitted to the Senate on May 14, 1954, and April 15, 1954, respectively, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, with a view to the adjustment of their immigration status (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of certain aliens from reports relating to aliens whose deportation has been suspended, heretofore transmitted to the Senate (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Five letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIEN DEFECTORS

Five letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting admission into the United States of certain alien defectors (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of Kao Pei Chan nee Lung or Cecile Chan and Pao-Ming Yen from reports transmitted to the Senate on April 15, 1954, and April 1, 1954, respectfully, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, with a view to the adjustment of their immigration status (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ESTIMATED APPROPRIATION FOR HANDLING MAIL UNDER FRANKING PRIVILEGE

A letter from the Postmaster General, reporting, pursuant to law, an estimated appropriation for handling mail under the franking privilege for the purpose of crediting postal revenues; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF BOARD OF ACTUARIES OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS, TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the Chairman and members of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

MUSEUM BUILDING FOR SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

A letter from the Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the preparation of plans and specifications for a museum building for the Smithsonian Institution (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT ON ADVANCE PLANNING PROGRAM

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the administration of the advance planning program, dated June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

VOTING FRANCHISE OF FEDERAL PERSONNEL AND MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

A letter from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report of receipts and expenditures for the period July 1, 1953, to June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolution rescinding a resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on income, inheritance and gifts, adopted February 25, 1944, and rescinding and withdrawing the application to the Congress of the United States of America to call a convention for the purpose of proposing such amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Whereas the 168 legislature adopted a joint resolution in the following form:

" 'Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances and gifts

" '*Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:*

" 'That application be and it hereby is made to the Congress of the United States of America to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. The 16th article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

" 'SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration. The maximum aggregate rate of all taxes, duties, and excises which the Congress may lay or collect on, with respect to, or measured by, income, however, shall not exceed 25 percent. In the event that the United States shall be engaged in a war which creates a national emergency so grave as to necessitate such action to avoid national disaster, the Congress by a vote of three-fourths of each House may, while the United States is so engaged, suspend, for periods not exceeding 1 year each, such limitation with respect to income subsequently accruing or received.

" 'SEC. 3. The maximum aggregate rate of all taxes, duties, and excises which the Congress may lay or collect with respect to the devolution or transfer of property, or any interest therein, upon or in contemplation of or intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after death, or by way of gift, shall not exceed 25 percent.

" 'SEC. 4. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect at midnight on December 31 following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax on, with respect to, or measured by, income for any period ending on or prior to said December 31 laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect.

" 'SEC. 5. Section 3 shall take effect at midnight on the last day of the sixth month following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax with respect to any devolution or transfer occurring prior to the taking effect of section 3, laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect; and be it further

" '*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide as the mode of ratification that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislature of three-fourths of the several States; and be it further

" '*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State be, and he hereby is, directed to send a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Senate of the United States and one to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States.'

"Whereas it is now desired to rescind such action and to withdraw the application made to the Congress of the United States of America to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the article set forth in said resolution as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"*Be it resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:*

"1. The action of the 168 Legislature of the State of New Jersey in adopting the resolution hereinbefore set forth hereby is rescinded.

"2. The application made to the Congress of the United States of America to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the article therein set forth as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States hereby is rescinded and withdrawn.

"3. The Secretary of State be and he hereby is directed to send 1 duly certified copy of this resolution to the United States Senate and 1 duly certified copy of this resolution to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the 18th Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands of the United States; to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

"Resolution petitioning the President and the Congress of the United States of America to grant to the people of the Virgin Islands and other United States Territories and offshore areas, the privilege of voting for the President and Vice President of the United States

"Whereas under the provisions of the Constitution of the United States it is within the authority of Congress to adopt amendments to the Constitution, subject to the ratification by the States, as well as the power to grant whatever political rights it deems necessary and proper to the people

residing in United States Territories and offshore areas; and

"Whereas the people of the Virgin Islands and the residents of the United States Territories and offshore areas are citizens of the United States; and

"Whereas one of the essentials of American Government is government by representation, so accurately described by Abraham Lincoln as 'government of the people, for the people, and by the people'; and

"Whereas the two important political parties of the United States have recognized this doctrine of the Government of the United States of full participation by all United States citizens by allowing the Commonwealth, Territories, and offshore areas of the United States to send delegates to the national political conventions for the selection of party candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the United States; and

"Whereas the Constitution of the United States now provides for the election of the President and Vice President by electors appointed by the States; and

"Whereas this method as provided for in the Constitution does not permit United States citizens to participate directly in the election of the President and Vice President of the United States and allows no participation whatsoever for United States citizens residing in the Commonwealth, Territories, and offshore areas of the United States; and

"Whereas there are approximately 3 million United States citizens permanently residing in the United States Commonwealth, Territories, and offshore areas who are disfranchised because of article II of the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas it appears to be desirable and proper in keeping with the fundamentals on which the Government of the United States is based, that United States citizens should vote directly for the President and Vice President of their Nation, without discrimination as to place of residence, provided that such place of residence is within the jurisdiction of the Government of the United States; and

"Whereas granting this privilege to American citizens who reside in the American Commonwealth, Territories, and offshore areas will be an outstanding example to the people of the entire world of the principles of American democracy which are standards of government so constituted as to be in fact "Government of the people, for the people, and by the people"; and

"Whereas the people of the Virgin Islands are keenly desirous of the opportunity and privilege of casting their ballots for the President and Vice President of the United States, as well as to see the same privilege granted to all other United States citizens residing in the American Commonwealth, Territories, and offshore possessions: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, and it is hereby resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands in session assembled, That the President and Congress of the United States be petitioned, and they are hereby petitioned to adopt amendments to the Constitution, subject to the ratification of the States, as follows:

"1. That the election for President and Vice President by votes of electors appointed by the States, as now provided for in the Constitution of the United States, be abolished and repealed;

"2. That all citizens of the United States, whether residing in the States, the Commonwealth, Territories, or offshore areas of the United States be given the right to vote directly for the President and Vice President of the Nation; and it is hereby further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Governor and Legislature of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Governors and legislatures of all American Territories and offshore areas, with the request that they also petition the President and Congress to grant to their peoples (American citizens) the privilege of voting for the President and Vice President of the United States; and it is hereby further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of the Department of the Interior, the Governor of the Virgin Islands, the Council of State Governments, the American Civil Liberties Union, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, all Virgin Islands civic and political organizations in the islands and on the mainland of the United States; and to any other civil rights organizations, soliciting their assistance in petitioning Congress to implement the provisions of this resolution.

"Thus passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands at its formal session held on August 20, 1954.

"Witness our hands and the seal of the legislative assembly of the Virgin Islands this 20th day of August A. D. 1954.

"EARLE B. OTTLEY,
"Chairman.

"[SEAL] HENRY V. RICHARDS,
"Secretary."

A resolution adopted by the Executive Committee of the National Tuberculosis Association, New York, N. Y., relating to the United States contribution to the United Nations World Health Organization; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter in the nature of a petition, from the American Public Health Association, Inc., New York City, N. Y., signed by Reginald M. Atwater, M. D., executive secretary, embodying a resolution adopted by that association, relating to the World Health Organization; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the American National Retail Jewelers Association, New York City, N. Y., signed by Charles M. Isaac, executive vice president, embodying a resolution adopted by the 49th annual convention of that association, at New York City, N. Y., favoring the elimination of unnecessary Government expenditures; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Two letters from the Governor of the State of Idaho, transmitting, pursuant to law, certified copies of interstate civil defense and disaster compacts entered into between that State and the States of Delaware, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Arkansas (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Two letters from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Battle Creek, Mich., transmitting copies of interstate civil defense compacts entered into between the State of Utah and the States of California, Colorado, Arizona, Montana, Oregon, and Wyoming (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Two letters from the deputy director, State of Ohio adjutant general's department, Civil Defense Corps, Fort Hayes, Columbus, Ohio, transmitting amendments of existing interstate compacts entered into between the State of Ohio and the States of Alabama, Arizona, Connecticut, Colorado, Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas, and Virginia (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the coordinator, Office of Civil Defense, Commonwealth of Virginia, Richmond, Va., transmitting a certified copy of an interstate civil defense compact entered into between the State of Virginia and the State of New Jersey (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the American Lutheran Church, Columbus, Ohio, signed by Herbert Nottbohm, secretary, embodying a resolution adopted by that church at a convention held at Beatrice, Nebr., relating to the provision of a religious ministry at the United States Military Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the mayors of the Southeastern Alaska Mayors Conference, at Ketchikan, Alaska, favoring the restoration of the facilities of the Federal National Mortgage Association in Alaska; to the Committee on Banking Currency.

A letter in the nature of a petition, from the Colorado-Wyoming Numismatic Association, Arvada, Colo., signed by C. G. Klein, secretary, embodying a resolution adopted by that association, relating to a new design for the 1-cent piece; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the mayors of the Southeastern Alaska Mayors Conference, at Ketchikan, Alaska, favoring the granting of a 20 percent income-tax exemption on all income in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Jack M. Scott, known as Chief Su Wohrom, of Hoopa, Calif., transmitting two letters in the nature of petitions, relating to Indian priority rights pertaining to the Hoopa Indian Reservation, Calif. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Knights of Columbus, New Haven, Conn., signed by Joseph F. Lamb, Supreme Secretary, embodying a resolution relating to freedom for the Republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter from the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., Forest Hills, N. Y., signed by Mrs. Amanda Shaw Hirsch, Chairman, relating to the basic guide of conduct contained in the United Nations International Civil Service Board's Standard of Conduct; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission, New Orleans, La., relating to the establishment of a weather station in the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the American Association of Oilwell Drilling Contractors, Dallas, Tex., relating to the authority of the Federal Power Commission to fix the price of gas paid to the producer and sold in interstate commerce for resale; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Resolutions adopted by the National Voters Committee, New York, N. Y., favoring the adoption of the so-called Bricker amendment relating to the treaty-making power, and so forth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the American Physiological Society, Madison, Wis., protesting against any abridgment of the basic tenets of the United States Constitution and its amendments, relating to civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition, from Capt. Don DuMont, Lake Forest, Ill., relating to emergency powers of the President (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Puerto Rico Free Federation of Labor, in convention at Arecibo, P. R., favoring the outlawing of the Communist Party; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition, from the Circle of the Croatian Knights, Cleveland, Ohio, signed by Rudolph Erich, president, expressing gratitude to the Congress for its decision to accept Croatian war refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the American Council of Christian Churches, at Boston, Mass., relating to juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Petworth Citizen's Association, Inc., Washington, D. C., protesting against the substitution of any song for the Star-Spangled Banner as our National Anthem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the three Baltic Foresters' Associations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, Chicago, Ill., relating to the brush-up course sponsored by the United States Government in various aspects of forestry for students and graduates from Baltic countries; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter from the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, Mount Vernon, N. Y., signed by Wayne D. Heydecker, secretary-treasurer, embodying a resolution adopted by that commission relating to the sale of certain imported shellfish; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission, in San Antonio, Tex., relating to the sale of certain shellfish; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Resolutions adopted by the California Christian Endeavor Union, at Berkeley, Calif., relating to the winning of the youth of the country to the church, etc.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors, Los Angeles County, Calif., relating to air-pollution control; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Santa Clara County (California) Pharmaceutical Association, relating to the issuance of a special commemorative stamp honoring pharmacists; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter in the nature of a petition, from Who Is Who in Music, Inc., Chicago, Ill., signed by L. M. Fine, relating to a congressional investigation of mail frauds committed by fraudulent use of the mails, with the knowledge of the postmaster at Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the mayors of the Southeastern Alaska Mayors Conference, at Ketchikan, Alaska, favoring the amendment of the Alaska Public Works Act so as to specifically exclude the bonds issued under the terms of that act from the 10 percent limitation established by the Organic Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the board of trustees of the Sanitary District of Chicago, Ill., relating to the passage of House bill 3300, relating to improvements in the Illinois waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

Resolutions adopted by the Burlingame and the Santa Maria Chapters of the California Junior Statesmen of America, both in the State of California, favoring the strengthening of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act relating to campaign expenditures; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A letter from the California State Federation of Labor, San Francisco, Calif., signed by C. J. Haggerty, secretary-treasurer, embodying resolutions adopted by that federation, relating to the adoption of codes of fair procedures by congressional investigating committees, and so forth; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A memorial signed by Edith J. Backes and sundry other citizens of New York, N. Y., protesting against the censure of Senator McCarthy; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the national executive committee of the American Legion, at Indianapolis, Ind., expressing regret on the death of Senator Patrick A. McCarran; ordered to lie on the table.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN MINING INDUSTRY—RESOLUTION OF VILLAGE COUNCIL, HIBBING, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the village council of the village of Hibbing, Minn., with regard to the creation and assignment of public-works projects be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the mining of iron ore is a very vital link in our economy and has contributed much toward the development of business and industry, as well as the safety and welfare of our great country especially so in two world wars; and

Whereas the many layoffs that have and are now occurring in the mining industry has and is bringing about a serious situation in the iron range communities from the standpoint of labor and business; and

Whereas many of our good citizens now find themselves without work with which to furnish the means to provide for themselves and their families, thereby creating a serious condition, both from the standpoint of human relations and business; and

Whereas many of these good people have been without employment during the summer ore season and are now faced without employment during the coming winter, which winters in northern Minnesota are long, extremely cold, and difficult, creating adverse conditions such as misery and suffering which should have no place in a country blessed by our Creator as America has been, and it is fitting and proper that State and national attention and recognition should be focused on the great contributions, past and present, that the people of the great Mesabi Iron Range have made to the national welfare and security: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the people of the village of Hibbing, Minn., through their village council, be heard and be given consideration through public works projects, affording them a means to again earn their living as well as to contributing to the further building of our country in a material, as well as a moral way, in keeping and restoring to our citizens a firm belief in our American and democratic way of life; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be made a record of our meeting and copies be forwarded to the proper State and national authorities, asking them to consider all possible ways of giving worthwhile work on proper projects this winter, and as long as the emergency exists, and especially State highway projects long overdue in the many Iron Range communities, thereby providing useful employment to the unemployed due to mine layoffs.

INTERNATIONAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM — RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive from Mr. Jerry Voorhees, executive director of the Cooperative League of the U. S. A. a resolution on the subject of increased international technical assistance. This resolution had been adopted by the delegates to the 19th biennial congress of the Cooperative League last October. These delegates represented organizations having a total membership of around 12 million American families.

I, for one, am a strong believer in the value of technical assistance.

I send the resolution to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 21—19TH BIENNIAL CONGRESS COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE U. S. A., CHICAGO, ILL., OCTOBER 25–27, 1954

INTERNATIONAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Whereas the expanded technical assistance program of the United Nations and its associated agencies, and similiar activities by the United States Government, have already made substantial contributions to improving the standards of living and strengthened institutions of democracy and freedom of people in the economically underdeveloped countries; and

Whereas the gap between these standards of living and those of the United States and the economically developed countries is steadily increasing: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we urge the Government of the United States to continue and increase its support of such programs, especially through the United Nations and its agencies, on a basis which will enable the responsible organizations to plan their work over a period of years.

CLOSING OF FIELD OFFICES OF BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have long been deeply interested in the training of skilled workers for American industry. Along this line, I send to the desk now the text of a resolution which was forwarded to me by Mr. Arthur W. Nickels, acting secretary of the Wisconsin State council, International Association of Machinists. This resolution was adopted at the last quarterly conference of the State council at its meeting in Baraboo on November 27.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it has come to our attention that two field offices of the Bureau of Apprenticeship, United States Department of Labor, located in the State of Wisconsin, have been closed because of curtailment of funds; and

Whereas the training of tradesmen is absolutely essential to the national health and welfare; and

Whereas history shows that governmental assistance is needed in the promotion of on-the-job training for the youth of our land as part of the civilian defense program which sustains the front line of defense; and

Whereas the curtailment of promotional efforts to train young men as tradesmen in the metal and manufacturing firms will seriously jeopardize our position in national and international prestige: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin State Council of Machinists, assembled in convention in the city of Baraboo, Wis., on November 27, 1954, go on record as vigorously opposing any reduction in the personnel of the Bureau of Apprenticeship, United States Department of Labor; and be it further

Resolved, That every effort be made to reestablish those offices already closed in Wisconsin; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to all Wisconsin Senators and Representatives; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of Labor, United States Department of Labor; William F. Patterson, Director of Bureau of Apprenticeship, United States Department of Labor, and to Brother Al. Hayes, president, International Association of Machinists.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. NEELY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. LANGER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. MCNAMARA):

S. 1. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 2. A bill to provide a vitalized and equitable Reserve program for the Armed Forces; to provide for the operation of the National Security Training Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. RUSSELL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 3. A bill further amending the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 4. A bill providing aid to States for the purpose of assisting school districts in constructing urgently needed school facilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLEMENTS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. LONG, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. GREEN, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KERR, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 5. A bill to provide for emergency Federal financial assistance to the States and Territories in the construction of urgently needed public elementary and secondary school facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HILL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 6. A bill to preserve the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and River, to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement on that river for power purposes, and to further the interests of national security by authorizing the prompt development of such works of improvement for power purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 7. A bill to permit payment of certain cost-of-living allowances outside the continental United States at rates in excess of 25 percent of the rate of basic compensation;

S. 8. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to apply through judicial procedures for the impounding of mail in certain cases;

S. 9. A bill to authorize the Civil Service Commission and the heads of all establishments in the Federal Government to make available, on a voluntary prepayment basis, group hospital, medical, and other personal health service benefits for civilian officers and employees in the Federal service, and for other purposes; and

S. 10. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the memory of Amelia Earhart; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. SYMINGTON):

S. 11. A bill amending the Robinson-Patman Act with reference to equality of opportunity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 12. A bill to require that the motto "In God We Trust" appear on all postage stamps printed from plates hereafter made; and

S. 13. A bill to amend section 1715 of title 18, United States Code, to permit the transmission of firearms in the mails to or from persons or concerns having lawful use for them in connection with their businesses or their official duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. DANIEL):

S. 14. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Austin, Travis County, Tex., to the State of Texas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 15. A bill to convey by quitclaim deed certain land to Brownsville Navigation District of Cameron County, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 16. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to provide that loans may be made to certain small-business concerns which have suffered a substantial economic injury as a result of a drought; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 17. A bill to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on automobiles, trucks, motorcycles, buses, trailers, tires and tubes, and automobile parts and accessories; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 18. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to establish a minimum wage of $1 an hour; to the Committee on Labor and Public Works.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 19. A bill for the relief of Vladimir Landow and Irina Landow; and

S. 20. A bill for the relief of Anica Janezic Rak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

S. 21. A bill for the relief of Wielaw Jan Bartnicki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 22. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act for acquired lands to require competitive bidding for leases of deposits of oil and gas not within any known geological structure of a producing oil or gas field; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 23. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to relieve innocent purchasers of fungible goods converted by warehousemen from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation; and

S. 24. A bill to provide for a specific contribution by State governments to the cost of feed or seed furnished to farmers, ranchers, or stockmen, in disaster areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 25. A bill to regulate the granting of free or reduced-rate transportation of passengers by common carriers by water engaged in foreign commerce and in commerce between the United States and its Territories and possessions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 26. A bill for the relief of Donald Hector Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 27. A bill relative to the jurisdiction over criminal offenses or civil actions committed or arising on Indian reservations;

S. 28. A bill for the relief of George K. Jue;

S. 29. A bill for the relief of Rica, Lucy, and Salomon Breger;

S. 30. A bill for the relief of Louis Domenique Laurent Bragoni;

S. 31. A bill for the relief of Shih Ming Wang; and

S. 32. A bill for the relief of Gaston Henry Oliver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 33. A bill relative to the exploration, location, and entry of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation; and

S. 34. A bill providing for the leasing by Indian owners of restricted Indian lands in the State of Arizona for certain purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 35. A bill to permit the transportation in the mails of live scorpions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 36. A bill for the relief of Lupe M. Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE:

S. 37. A bill to amend the act increasing the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service in order to make such increase permanent; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 38. A bill for the relief of Joseph Jerry Earl Sirois (also known as Jeremie Earl Sirois); and

S. 39. A bill for the relief of Stanislavas Racinskas (Stacys Racinskas); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 40. A bill for the relief of Mrs. William A. Curran; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 41. A bill for the relief of Evangelos Zambelis;

S. 42. A bill for the relief of Selma Rivlin; and

S. 43. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Nitsolas, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 44. A bill for the relief of Thea Delich (nee Thea Deml); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 45. A bill to safeguard the health, efficiency, and morale of the American people; to provide for improved nutrition through a more effective distribution of food supplies through a food-allotment program; to assist in maintaining fair prices and incomes to farmers by providing adequate outlets for agricultural products; to prevent burdening and obstructing channels of interstate commerce; to promote the full use of agricultural resources; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. DUFF, Mr. ROBERTSON, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

S. 46. A bill to further amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers

from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 47. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Agosta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY (for himself and Mr. PAYNE):

S. 48. A bill to provide for the disqualifications of certain former officers and employees of the District of Columbia in matters connected with former duties; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 49. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii and Alaska each to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 50. A bill to provide for the distribution of motor-vehicle tires, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; and

S. 51. A bill to amend the act entitled "To confer jurisdiction on the States of California, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, and Wisconsin, with respect to criminal offenses and civil causes of action committed or arising on Indian reservations within such States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 52. A bill to amend the act to protect scenic values along Oak Creek Canyon and certain tributaries thereof within the Coconino National Forest, Ariz.; and

S. 53. A bill to enable the State of Arizona and the town of Tempe, Ariz., to convey to the Salt River Agricultural Improvement and Power District, for use by such district, a portion of certain property heretofore transferred under certain restrictions to such State and town by the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 54. A bill to promote the rehabilitation of the Papago Tribe of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Papago Tribe, and for other purposes; and

S. 55. A bill to authorize the acceptance on behalf of the United States of the conveyance and release by the Aztec Land & Cattle Co., Ltd., of its right, title, and interest in lands within the Coconino and Sitgreaves National Forests, in the State of Arizona, and the payment to said company of the value of such lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HENNINGS (for himself and Mr. SYMINGTON):

S. 56. A bill authorizing construction of certain public works on the Mississippi River for the protection of St. Louis, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. HENNINGS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 57. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to 90 cents; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 58. A bill to grant civil service employees retirement after 30 years' service;

S. 59. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended;

S. 60. A bill to provide that equipment for use in post offices shall be furnished by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes;

S. 61. A bill to repeal certain laws authorizing the Postmaster General, with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to revise parcel post rates, size limits, zones and other conditions of mailability;

S. 62. A bill to reduce certain rates of postage on parcels sent to or by members of the Armed Forces of the United States stationed outside the United States;

S. 63. A bill to provide for the appointment of the heads of regional and district offices of the Post Office Department by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

S. 64. A bill to grant equitable compensatory time to postal employees;

S. 65. A bill to amend section 1 (d) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; and

S. 66. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. NEELY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. LANGER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. McNAMARA):

S. 67. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 68. A bill for the relief of Evantiyi Yorgiadis;

S. 69. A bill for the relief of Rolf S. Nielsen;

S. 70. A bill for the relief of the late Henry Barncastle Fitch; and

S. 71. A bill for the relief of Ursula Else Boysen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 72. A bill to provide that certain lands acquired by the United States shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as national forest lands; and

S. 73. A bill relating to the disposition of moneys received from the national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. SCHOEPPEL):

S. 74. A bill to authorize the Farm Credit Administration to make loans of the type formerly made by the Land Bank Commissioner; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 75. A bill to prohibit the blending of wheat imported as unfit for human consumption with wheat suitable for human consumption; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. KNOWLAND):

S. 76. A bill authorizing appropriations for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the western land boundary fence project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 77. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the city of Anniston, Ala., of certain real property within Fort McClellan, Ala.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 78. A bill to amend section 20 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, to extend the time for filing certain claims for compensation; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 79. A bill to provide for the recruitment and training of Foreign Service officers; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 80. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Neapolitakis;

S. 81. A bill for the relief of Victor Bartl;

S. 82. A bill for the relief of Nicholaos Serras and Sarantis Serras;

S. 83. A bill for the relief of Ottilie Hitzlberger Lachelt;

S. 84. A bill for the relief of Wolodymyr Krysko;

S. 85. A bill for the relief of Rosetta Ittner;

S. 86. A bill for the relief of Wilhelmine Schelter;

S. 87. A bill for the relief of Golda I. Stegner;

S. 88. A bill for the relief of Maximilian Karl Manjura;

S. 89. A bill for the relief of Margaret Isabel Byers;

S. 90. A bill for the relief of Nejibe El-Sousse Slyman;

S. 91. A bill for the relief of Luzia Cox;

S. 92. A bill for the relief of Irene C. (Karl) Behrman;

S. 93. A bill for the relief of Ahti Johannes Ruuskanen; and

S. 94. A bill for the relief of Esther Cornelius, Arthur Alexander Cornelius, and Frank Thomas Cornelius; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 95. A bill for the relief of Peter Charles Bethel (Peter Charles Peters);

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 96. A bill for the relief of certain aliens;

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 97. A bill for the relief of Barbara D. Colthurst;

S. 98. A bill for the relief of Marion G. Denton;

S. 99. A bill for the relief of Xanthi Georges Komporozou;

S. 100. A bill for the relief of Hermine Lorenz;

S. 101. A bill for the relief of Fernanda Milani;

S. 102. A bill for the relief of T. C. Elliott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 103. A bill for the relief of Eleanor Clapp;

S. 104. A bill for the relief of the Massachusetts College of Pharmacy; and

S. 105. A bill for the relief of Thomas F. Harney, Jr., doing business as Harney Engineering Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 106. A bill to allow certain members of the Armed Forces to designate the Eastern Orthodox faith as a religious preference on their identification tags;

S. 107. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the Fort Devens Military Reservation, Mass., to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; and

S. 108. A bill for the relief of Comdr. Edward K. Shanahan, United States Navy (retired), and Comdr. Edward White Rawlins, United States Navy (retired); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 109. A bill for the relief of Mary J. Reitz; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 110. A bill for the relief of Community Bailey Hospital;

S. 111. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Theres Schickl Dutton and daughter, Laura Theresia Schickl;

S. 112. A bill to amend section 1073 of title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the punishment of any individual who travels in interstate or foreign commerce to avoid prosecution or punishment for indecent molestation of a minor; and

S. 113. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association," approved May 31, 1920, as heretofore amended, so as to permit such corporation to consolidate with Women's Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 114. A bill to provide that Federal expenditures shall not exceed Federal revenues, except in time of war or grave national emergency declared by the Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 115. A bill to provide additional rehabilitation assistance for certain seriously disabled veterans by authorizing assistance to such veterans in acquiring specially adapted housing; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 116. An act to authorize the extension of patents covering inventions whose practice was prevented or curtailed during certain emergency periods by service of the patent owner in the Armed Forces or by production controls;

S. 117. A bill for the relief of Ana P. Costes;

S. 118. A bill for the relief of Leon J. de Szethofer and Blanche Hrdinova de Szethofer;

S. 119. A bill for the relief of David Wei-Dao Lea and Julia An-Fong Wang Lea;

S. 120. A bill for the relief of Vasilios Demetriou Kretsos and his wife, Chryssa Thomadiou Kretsos;

S. 121. A bill for the relief of Sultana Coka Pavlovitch;

S. 122. A bill for the relief of Dr. James C. S. Lee;

S. 123. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, regarding published articles and broadcasts by foreign agents;

S. 124. A bill for the relief of Max T. Robertson;

S. 125. A bill for the relief of the State of Illinois;

S. 126. A bill for the relief of Dr. Bernard S. Maloy;

S. 127. A bill for the relief of the estate of Sinclair G. Stanley; and

S. 128. A bill for the relief of Francis Bertram Brennan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 129. A bill for the relief of Miroslav Slovak;

S. 130. A bill for the relief of Antonin Volejnicek;

S. 131. A bill for the relief of Bohumil Suran;

S. 132. A bill for the relief of Serina Moser;

S. 133. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Michela Federico;

S. 134. A bill for the relief of M. Roman Decker;

S. 135. A bill for the relief of the Elkay Manufacturing Co., of Chicago, Ill.;

S. 136. A bill for the relief of Arnold Leonard Ferris; and

S. 137. A bill for the relief of Renzo Petroni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 138. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to relieve innocent purchasers of fungible goods converted by warehousemen from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 139. A bill to repeal the amendment to sections 348 and 374 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, made by section 311 of the act of August 28, 1954 (Public Law 690, 83d Cong.); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry;

S. 140. A bill to amend section 13 (h) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, to extend the date prior to which surplus real property owned by the United States must have been acquired to be subject to conveyance by the United States for historic monument purposes, without monetary consideration, from January 1, 1900, to January 1, 1910; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 141. A bill for the relief of Pauline Ellen Redmond;

S. 142. A bill for the relief of Thomas Kunhyuk Kim; and

S. 143. A bill for the relief of Kurt Glaser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 144. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Kansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. LANGER, Mr. THYE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 145. A bill to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 146. A bill for the relief of Isabel Tre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 147. A bill to require that international agreements other than treaties, hereafter entered into by the United States, be transmitted to the Senate within 30 days after the execution thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:

S. 148. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Polk County, Iowa, and described as Camp Dodge, to the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself and Mr. MARTIN of Iowa):

S. 149. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the northern and southern districts of Iowa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 150. A bill to give the Small Business Administration permanent status; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 151. A bill to authorize projects for the improvement of the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 152. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THYE (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 153. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 154. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Foley; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 155. A bill to provide for promotion by merit of employees in the postal service and to establish uniform procedures for examination and appointment of candidates for promotion to supervisory positions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 156. A bill for the relief of Earl L. DeWitt.

S. 157. A bill for the relief of Louis S. Thomas and D. Grace Thomas.

S. 158. A bill for the relief of the East Coast Ship & Yacht Corp., of Noank, Conn.

S. 159. A bill for the relief of Michael Solomonides.

S. 160. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Henri Revilliod.

S. 161. A bill for the relief of Ivan Powell.

S. 162. A bill for the relief of Antonia Ribeiro.

S. 163. A bill for the relief of Philopimin Michalacopoulos (Mihalakopoulos); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 164. A bill to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 165. A bill to increase the salaries of judges of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SMATHERS, and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 166. To establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean service period in combat or from an instrumentality of war; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 167. A bill for the relief of Ernesto DeLeon;

S. 168. A bill for the relief of Araxi Mazarian;

S. 169. A bill for the relief of Marouf Najjar; and

S. 170. A bill for the relief of William Murray; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 171. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing projects for the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. J. Res. 1. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRICKER when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and Mr. BYRD):

S. J. Res. 2. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for the imposition of Federal taxes to provide revenues at least equal to appropriations, except in time of war declared by the Congress or when the United States is engaged in open hostility against an external enemy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRIDGES when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUNDT when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. J. Res. 4. Joint resolution to provide for the continuation in office of certain members of the Commission on Governmental Operations; which was read twice by its title, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. J. Res. 5. Joint resolution granting to the State of New Mexico certain lands for the use and benefit of the Museum of New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. J. Res. 6. Joint resolution to provide for investigating the feasibility of establishing a coordinated local, State, and Federal program in the city of Boston, Mass., and general vicinity thereof, for the purpose of preserving the historic properties, objects, and buildings in that area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. J. Res. 7. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1955, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. J. Res. 8. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to authorize governors to fill temporary vacancies in the Congress caused by a disaster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. J. Res. 9. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the nomination and election of candidates for President and Vice President, and to succession to the office of President in the event of the death or inability of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appears under a separate heading.)

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING CORPS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide a vitalized and equitable Reserve program for the Armed Forces; to provide for the operation of the National Security Training Corps, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me pertaining to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2) introduced by Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The statement submitted by Mr. RUSSELL is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR RUSSELL

Public Law 51 created the National Security Training Commission and Corps and provided the authority for inducting young men into the Armed Forces. This latter provision will expire on June 30, 1955.

Therefore, to maintain the strength of our active forces and as the means of more nearly equalizing the responsibility of military service among our citizens and of promoting greater participation and effectiveness within the Reserve forces, the American Legion proposes that the Congress act favorably on legislation which would:

1. Extend the Selective Service Act of 1948 for a period of 4 years—from July 1, 1955, to July 1, 1959—as a means of maintaining the strength of the Regular military forces (sec. 3).

2. Provide compulsory Reserve service by providing authority to reinduct for the remainder of their obligated period of 24 months trainees failing or refusing to perform such duty (sec. 18).

3. Implement a national security training program, for although Public Law 51 established a predominantly civilian commission and corps and the basic regulations governing this program, it specifically provided that before training could begin law must be enacted to provide the broad outline for a military training program; measures for the protection of the trainees' health, safety, welfare, and morals; a code of conduct; disability and death benefits; measures to implement the policies and standards established by the Commission and finally, the obligations, duties, liabilities and responsibilities granted or imposed upon trainees.

The American Legion's plan is based upon the following provisions:

Registration and induction will be scheduled by the Selective Service System for all men between the ages of 18 and 26. Until the program is in full operation, inductions will be by lot within each geographical subdivision of the Selective Service System (sec. 4).

Training period shall be not less than 1,000 hours (sec. 8).

Concurrent operation of NST and inductions for service shall be limited to 5 years to provide an orderly replacement of NST for the present system requiring 24 months of service (sec. 7).

Basic training will be of a military nature conducted by the Army, Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps at installations nearest the trainee's residence. Training will be in accordance with policies and standards of the Civilian National Security Training Commission (sec. 33).

Budget for the NST Corps will be prepared by the Department of Defense and submitted to the Commission for approval prior to its submission to the President. The Commission will submit the budget for its own operations directly to the President. These controls serve to maintain the civilian character of the training program (sec. 17).

Existing facilities shall be used to the greatest possible extent, with no new construction until existing facilities are in operation at their capacity (sec. 9).

Reserve obligation can be reduced to 3 years and relieved of further training by accepting service in the active Army or Air National Guard or other Reserve component giving comparable training and service (sec. 5).

Credit for NST will reduce the period the trainee must serve if inducted into the armed services during the period of concurrent operation (sec. 5).

Reduction in the standing forces shall begin when 300,000 persons have completed their NST training and have been transferred to the Reserve. Reduction shall be on a ratio of 1 member of the Regular forces for each 3 trainees assigned to the Reserve (sec. 11).

Designation of month for induction as far as practicable will be given to each trainee with priority of such selection given to young men who volunteer for training prior to the required registration date, and to those who present documentary evidence of their intent to enter an institution of higher learning (sec. 14).

Certificate of training and discharge shall be given to each trainee after satisfactory completion of his 1,000 hours in the National Security Training Corps. Discharges shall be honorable, general, undesirable, bad conduct, or dishonorable (sec. 18).

Benefits will include: Transportation to and from the place of induction and training; insurance, quarters and subsistence, clothing and equipment; hospitalization, medical and dental care, death, disability, and burial benefits and reemployment rights for 30 days after release from training; benefits of the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act of 1940 as amended (sec. 19).

Uniforms will be the same as prescribed for enlisted men of the Regular forces but with distinctive insignia. Trainees will be permitted to retain uniforms for use in Reserve training (sec. 20).

Morals of trainees are protected by Federal restrictions against the sale of intoxicants to them or permitting them to enter houses of ill fame which offenses are punishable by fine and imprisonment (sec. 32).

Ratio of trainers shall not exceed those for the Regular services except chaplains, medical, and dental personnel (sec. 33).

Leave will be given trainees by the appropriate agency during the training period (sec. 36).

Conscientious objectors will be required to serve for a period equal to that provided under NST and such persons shall devote the same number of hours as trainees (sec. 38).

Training period may be extended by consent of trainee's parents or guardians for needed medical, dental, or surgical care. Trainees may be required to make up time lost from training due to leave, desertion, absence without leave or confinement resulting from sentence by courts-martial or civil court (sec. 41).

Inspections to all training agencies may be made by the Commission or its inspectors to report on costs, interview trainees and personnel of the training agencies, and to assure compliance with regulations and policies established by the Commission (sec. 42).

Communication with Congress is specifically authorized for all members of the National Security Training Corps (sec. 46).

Code of conduct: The Uniform Code of Military Justice will apply to all trainees with due consideration being given to their youth. When charged with certain major offenses, trainees after consulting with their parents or guardians, may elect trial by United States District Court or by courts-martial. The provisions of this code will be carefully explained to each trainee upon induction or no later than 6 days thereafter (secs. 202–206).

Pay: Public Law 51 of the 82d Congress provides compensation at the monthly rate of $30 for all persons inducted into the National Security Training Corps.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I am sure no one will controvert the statement that there is dire need for additional school construction throughout the United States. The need has been apparent for a long time and is now so extremely pressing that action by Congress should no longer be delayed. As a step toward fulfilling this need, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing aid to States for the purpose of assisting school districts in constructing urgently needed school facilities. I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement prepared by me in connection with the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4) providing aid to States for the purpose of assisting school districts in constructing urgently needed school facilities, introduced by Mr. CLEMENTS, was received, read twice by its

title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement submitted by Mr. CLEMENTS is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CLEMENTS

The bill which I have introduced would distribute $500 million for each of the fiscal years beginning July 1, 1955 and July 1, 1956. Each State's share would be allotted on the basis of (1) need, (2) the effort being made in each State to maintain its own school building program and (3) the school age population of the State. Basically for the purposes of the distribution formula, the bill would divide the appropriation into two equal sums, distributing the first of such sums by use of a formula, utilizing the total State and local expenditures for school purposes as the prime factor to determine what effort is being made by a particular State to bring its own school building standards up. The second sum is distributed by virtue of a formula utilizing as its prime factor the per capita income of the State as contrasted with the per capita income of the United States, which with considerable accuracy should determine the relative needs of the States for school building construction.

Because of the great necessity for school building construction, this bill recognizes that need should be a primary consideration in making a distribution of funds. The consideration in the formula given to the effort being made on the part of the State to raise its own school standards by its own expenditure is none the less important, not only because it operates to reward that State for its commendable efforts but also because it acts as an incentive to States making below average effort to redouble their contribution in the educational field.

The design for the legislation is patterned after the Hill-Burton Act which should assure those who might have some fear that any participation by the Federal Government in the field of education would be an encroachment upon a domain of educational policy which should be reserved to the States.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL FACILITIES

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for emergency Federal financial assistance to the States and Territories in the construction of urgently needed public elementary and secondary school facilities, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me pertaining to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 5) to provide for emergency Federal financial assistance to the States and Territories in the construction of urgently needed public elementary and secondary school facilities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. HILL is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HILL

The measure calls for a Federal outlay of $500 million for each of 2 years to aid construction of public elementary and secondary schools. It closely follows the pattern of the bill favorably reported last year by the Senate Labor Committee.

The bill I am offering today is based solidly on the traditional principle of absolute State and local control of education.

This year enrollment again broke all records. We entered the school year lacking at least 370,000 classrooms to house the flood of students. We faced a net lack of about 135,000 new teachers. Almost a million pupils are going to school on a part-time basis because of these shortages.

The picture will grow blacker every year as the birthrate continues at record heights, as costs grow, and as teachers' salaries remain below adequate levels. New schools are needed throughout the Nation, both to meet the rising school population and to replace outworn or unsafe buildings.

People throughout America are demanding, rightfully, that Congress act to remedy these intolerable conditions. They are concerned not only with the well-being of the children themselves, but with the danger that our superiority in the struggle against Communist imperialism may be threatened by failure to maintain American brainpower to overbalance the Soviet bloc's massive manpower.

As of today, the Russians are outstripping us in engineering graduates, in scientific specialists, in the production of those skills essential to national strength and security. We dare not fall behind. We dare not neglect our elementary and secondary schools, where training of physicists, mathematicians, engineers and other highly skilled and educated personnel must begin. We dare not neglect our institutions of higher learning.

I intend shortly to reintroduce the oil for education bill, which can go far toward solving the long-range, as distinct from the emergency needs of our educational system on all levels—grammar schools, high schools and colleges.

AMENDMENT OF ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT RELATING TO EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill amending the Robinson-Patman Act with reference to equality of opportunity. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me in explanation of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 11) to amend the Robinson-Patman Act with reference to equality of opportunity, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. KEFAUVER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

Along with 29 of my colleagues I am today offering a bill to plug a glaring loophole in the Robinson-Patman amendment to the Clayton Act. I may add that Representative WRIGHT PATMAN is introducing an identical bill in the House.

Here in the Senate I am joined in offering this bill by Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. MCNAMARA.

The loophole is the so-called good-faith defense which permits any price discrimination, regardless of its effect upon small business or competition as long as it is made in good faith.

The burden is upon enforcement agencies to prove the discrimination was not in good faith—which is almost impossible as a practical matter.

The loophole stemmed from the decision of the Supreme Court in the Standard Oil of Indiana case (340 U. S. 231). In that decision the Court held that good faith is a

complete defense to a charge of price discrimination under the Robinson-Patman Act.

The Robinson-Patman Act was intended merely to give all business, large and small, an equal opportunity in the competitive race for survival. At the time of its enactment in 1935, small business was being driven to the wall. Large buyers were obtaining price concessions which enabled them to sell at prices that the smaller merchants, regardless of their efficiency, could not possibly meet. The evidence presented in reports of the Federal Trade Commission, hearings before congressional committees, and investigations by State authorities was conclusive. Favoritism had come to replace efficiency and service to the public.

In passing the Robinson-Patman Act Congress acted to remedy this situation. The rule underlying the new law was a simple one. A seller must not discriminate in price where such discriminations are not justified by differences in his costs of servicing his different customers and where the effect of such unjustified discriminations may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.

This rule is a good one, and it ought to be preserved. Experience has shown that big suppliers, selling in many markets, can destroy smaller competing suppliers selling in only one market. The big supplier can drive these smaller competitors out of business by reducing his price in one market at a time, making up any losses through high prices charged elsewhere. Experience has also shown that where a supplier offers discriminatory prices beyond what is justified by differences in his costs, those concessions are usually granted only to the big buyers while the smaller buyers must pay higher prices.

In the Standard Oil of Indiana decision, however, the Court largely nullified the rule underlying the Robinson-Patman Act. The essence of the Court's interpretation is that wherever the FTC challenges a discriminatory practice and the supplier shows that he has carried on that practice in good faith, the Government is stopped from issuing a cease-and-desist order, and the supplier is free to continue the practice, regardless of its effects on competition.

As the law now stands, there is no limit on discriminations, as long as they are made in good faith. Once this simple test is met the big firm is given carte blanche to drive his smaller competitors out of business, to destroy competition, and to create monopolies. He can even sell below his competitor's costs, because his good faith is held to be more important than the protection of competition, and more important than the right of all smaller buyers whose business is ruined. This is a far cry from the original objectives of the Robinson-Patman Act.

The present bill would go a long way toward attaining the objectives which the authors of the Robinson-Patman Act thought they had secured when the act was passed some 19 years ago. I say it would go "a long way." But it would not go all the way. The good faith defense would still be a complete defense in all cases where the effect of the discrimination fell short of probable injury to competition. It would still be a complete defense where only an individual competitor, or individual competitors, as distinct from competition, were injured. But it would not be a complete defense where the discrimination was of such breadth and proportions as to result in a probable injury to competition.

The substance of the present bill has had a legislative history of some 5 years. On June 1, 1949, I introduced a somewhat similar provision as an amendment to the so-called "basing-point bill," S. 1008. Although passed by the Senate, the protecting amendment was eliminated in conference. On August 2, 1951, I introduced a similar amendment to S. 719. The amendment was defeated in the Senate by only 1 vote, 39 to 38. Last year, along with many of those who are cosponsoring the present bill, I again introduced this amendment, and while it was unanimously approved in subcommittee, it was never acted on by the full Judiciary Committee.

The purpose of these amendments was the same as the purpose of the present bill—to prevent the destruction of competition through price discrimination. Like the present bill, they were supported by virtually all of the legitimate small business organizations.

In offering this legislation we are seeking no special favors for small business. We are merely urging that small business be given an equal opportunity with big business to compete on the basis of efficiency and service. We are confident that, given this opportunity, small business will prosper and the free competitive system will be immeasurably strengthened.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII AND ALASKA

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, on my own behalf and that of 25 other Senators of both political parties, a bill to enable the strategic American Territories of Hawaii and Alaska to become States of the United States. Appropriately, I have asked that the number 49 be assigned to this measure.

The bill I am introducing is identical with H. R. 3575, of the 83d Congress, as it passed the Senate last April after prolonged and thorough debate. The Members of the Senate will recall that we joined Alaska to the Hawaii measure and then passed the combined bill by the substantial vote of 57 to 28. Unfortunately, no action was taken in the other body on the Senate amendments to the House bill.

The only changes that have been made in last year's bill, which was so well considered, is the deletion of references to dates in 1954.

Mr. President, I was happy indeed to hear the President of the United States urge in his state of the Union message, just delivered, the admission of Hawaii, and to accept in principle the admission of Alaska. The Members of the Senate will recall that President Eisenhower stated:

> As the complex problems of Alaska are resolved, that Territory should expect to achieve statehood. In the meantime, there is no justification for deferring the admission to statehood of Hawaii. I again urge approval of this measure.

Mr. President, I agree heartily with Mr. Eisenhower in his sponsorship of immediate statehood for Hawaii. As to Alaska, I would like to point out that it was the firm conviction of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the 83d Congress that the measure worked out with such care would go a long way toward solving the problems that would be presented by statehood for Alaska. In fact, a distinguished former Governor of Alaska, Hon. Ernest Gruening, in his outstanding new book, The State of Alaska, shows that only through statehood can those problems be solved.

An overwhelming majority of the Members of the Senate of the 83d Congress agreed with the committee on the measure we worked out. Therefore, I respectfully urge the President to reappraise the situation in the light of the provisions of S. 49, and would remind him of his statement in 1950 unequivocally supporting statehood for Alaska as well as for Hawaii.

The continuing members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on both sides of the table have indicated their intention to give prompt attention to this statehood bill, and it is my hope that we can bring the measure before this body very early in the first session of the 84th Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii and Alaska each to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. YOUNG) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON MISSISSIPPI RIVER

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague from Missouri, [Mr. SYMINGTON] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the construction of flood-protection works for the city of St. Louis at an estimated cost of $112,880,000. I introduced a substantially similar bill in the last Congress, but it was not acted upon before the end of the session. The need for flood protection for this important commercial and industrial center—and the Nation's eighth largest city—is no less urgent now. Indeed, it is even more urgent because more time has elapsed without any constructive steps being taken. Repeated floods at St. Louis have resulted in losses totaling hundreds of millions of dollars, as well as in the disruption of transportation and industry. To allow these needless losses to occur year after year when they can be prevented is, in my judgment, irresponsible and inexcusable.

This bill authorizes local protection at St. Louis substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engneers in his report submitted on July 26, 1954. I am satisfied that this project is economically sound and I urge that it be authorized as promptly as possible in order to prevent repetition of these wasteful and unnecessary flood disasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 56) authorizing construction of certain public works on the Mississippi River for the protection of St. Louis, Mo., introduced by Mr. HENNINGS

(for himself and Mr. SYMINGTON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT RELATING TO MINIMUM HOURLY WAGE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to 90 cents. This bill will carry forward into legislative form the recommendation of President Eisenhower on this matter which the President urged in his challenging state of the Union message which we just heard. This bill provides that the increase shall take effect January 1, 1956.

I introduce this bill as the senior Republican member, and former chairman, of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I shall urge that committee to proceed as rapidly as possible with hearings on this bill so that it can be reported to the Senate at an early date.

The President in his state of the Union message, as we have heard, also has asked the Congress to consider whether there should be wider coverage under the Fair Labor Standards Act. However, the increase in the minimum wage should not be delayed pending decisions on the broadening of coverage, which is a related but separable problem.

The bill which I have just introduced is so short and the meaning so clear on its face that no explanation is required. However, in order that it appear in the RECORD I ask unanimous consent that the text be printed at the conclusion of these remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 57) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to 90 cents, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (1) of section 6 (a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (52 Stat. 1060; 29 U. S. C. 206 (a) (1)), is hereby amended by striking out "not less than 75 cents an hour" and inserting in lieu thereof "not less than 90 cents an hour."

SEC. 2. This amendment shall take effect January 1, 1956.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce for apropriate reference a bill for the establishment of a permanent Small Business Administration. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 150) to give the Small Business Administration permanent status was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. THYE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THYE

I am introducing a bill to provide for continuing the Small Business Administration as an independent agency. As chairman of the Small Business Committee of the Senate, I was privileged last year to offer the original legislation creating the Small Business Administration, which was embodied in title II of Public Law 163, 1st session, 83d Congress, the title being known as the Small Business Act of 1953.

This act was finally passed by Congress on July 30, 1953, and signed into law the same day by President Eisenhower. The present law provides for this agency only until June 30, 1955. The bill I am now offering will extend the life of this important agency.

A statement of policy expressing the philosophy underlying this legislation is contained in section 202 of the act, as follows:

"The essence of the American economic system of private enterprise is free competition. Only through full and free competition can free markets, free entry into business, and opportunities for the expression and growth of personal initiative and individual judgment be assured. The preservation and expansion of such competition is basic not only to the economic well-being but to the security of this Nation. Such security and well-being cannot be realized unless the actual and potential capacity of small business is encouraged and developed. It is the declared policy of the Congress that the Government should aid, counsel, assist, and protect insofar as is possible the interests of small-business concerns in order to preserve free competitive enterprise, to insure that a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts for supplies and services for the Government be placed with small business enterprises, and to maintain and strengthen the overall economy of the Nation."

While the Small Business Administration has made a splendid record in its 17 months of existence, experience has shown that much more can and should be done, within the proper scope of Government, to assist, counsel and foster small businesses and thereby maintain healthy, free, competitive enterprise and keep open the doors to opportunity.

Every department and agency of the Government has a part in fostering a healthy economic climate. The Small Business Administration is serving in an area, which, until the creation of the Small Business Administration, had never been adequately recognized and served.

The functions and procedures of the Small Business Administration are designed to serve the peculiar needs of small firms. This Agency is a service organization. It does not regulate business.

The wisdom of the Congress and the President in establishing the Small Business Administration to specialize in the needs of small firms has been demonstrated by the record of this Agency. Now let us go forward and strengthen SBA so that it can broaden the services it has pioneered.

The four major functions of the Small Business Administration are: (1) To assist small businesses to obtain a fair share of Government orders for goods and services; (2) to counsel owners of small firms on their management and technical problems; (3) to give financial assistance to sound small firms when this is not available from private sources; and (4) to make loans at 3 percent interest to owners of homes and businesses damaged or completely destroyed by hurricanes, floods, and other natural disasters.

More than $360 million in Government contracts have been reserved for exclusive award to small firms as a result of joint determinations between the Department of Defense and the Small Business Administration. More than 2,300 individual contracts totaling $160 million already have been awarded to small firms as a result of representations made by SBA to the Department of Defense.

There is room for much improvement in the awarding of contracts to small firms. Procedures for accomplishing this are being improved. It seems to me that aside from the equity in giving the owner of a small firm an equal opportunity to bid on a contract that he is competent to perform, the national defense would be strengthened by wide diffusion of orders. This would maintain scattered geographical production facilities and more general know-how management and skilled workers in this era of atomic warfare.

A total of more than 150,000 individual notifications to small firms of Government contract bidding opportunities has been made by the Small Business Administration and approximately 1,000 subcontract referrals are made by the agency's field offices every month.

The Small Business Administration makes loans to small firms that meet credit requirements, if needed financial aid is not available at reasonable rates from private sources. Loans are made in participation with local lending institutions, or if participation loans are not available, directly to borrowers.

The Agency is now administering 5,341 loans amounting to approximately $80,125,405. A total of 2,091 loans has been approved by the Agency. These include 1,122 business loans, totaling $59,400,433 of which more than two-thirds are in participation with banks.

To assist in rehabilitating business concerns and homes destroyed or damaged by storms and other natural disasters, SBA has approved 969 loans for a total of $5,476,535. The remaining loans being administered by the Agency are Reconstruction Finance Corporation disaster loans which have been transferred to SBA for collection.

The average gross amount of the business loans approved by SBA is approximately $54,000. As of December 31, 1954, instalment payments on only two loans, involving $1,925, were past due, and only one of these was more than 30 days delinquent. This is a remarkably good record. It shows the proper regard for the taxpayers' money.

The Small Business Administration's business-counseling service has produced much favorable comment among businessmen. Articles by authorities on management and technical problems are distributed upon request and SBA is cosponsoring with colleges 24 courses on problems of small business. These are attended by owners and supervisors in small industries.

In view of the splendid record of the Agency in meeting the needs of worthy small businesses, I believe the Small Business Administration has definitely shown the necessity for it as an important factor in fostering small business, which is the backbone of the whole national economy. I am confident the Committee on Banking and Currency will conduct suitable hearings to determine if changes are desirable in the provisions of the present act, which the bill I have introduced merely extends.

It is highly essential, in my opinion, to maintain the individual identity of agencies established to assist small business, both in the executive branch and in Congress.

AMENDMENT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Vermont

[Mr. AIKEN], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me in regard to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 153) to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, introduced by Mr. THYE (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. YOUNG), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The statement presented by Mr. THYE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THYE

In connection with the bill which I have introduced together with the senior Senator from Vermont and the junior Senator from North Dakota, providing for amendment of the Rural Electrification Act to eliminate the state allotment formula for distribution of Electrification Loan Funds on the basis of percentage of unelectrified farms.

The allotment formula is found in subsections (c), (d), and (e) of section 3 of the Rural Electrification Act. These subsections have not been revised since their enactment in 1936, when only 10.9 percent of our farms were electrified. The purpose of the formula was to assure equitable distribution of loan funds on the basis of need as determined by the ratio of unelectrified farms to the total for the United States. This purpose has substantially been achieved. By the close of fiscal year 1955, 95 percent of our farms will have been electrified. It is now recommended that the allotment formula be eliminated for the following reasons:

1. As indicated, it is no longer required to assure equitable distribution of loan funds so as to bring up the percentage of electrified farms. Extension of service to unelectrified farms is no longer the major concern of REA borrowers and will continue to decline in relative importance in future years.

2. Need for electrification loan funds is increasingly measured by requirements of REA borrowers for system improvements and the provision of generation and transmission facilities to meet ever-increasing farm demands. This need bears little relationship to the number or percentage of unelectrified farms. The allotment formula unnecessarily hampers the satisfying of this need.

3. Elimination of the State formula would clarify and simplify the budget process for REA. The artificial and outlived restrictions of the allotment formula have in recent years required provisions by the Congress of greater amounts of loan funds than were required annually to meet specific needs. The device of the contingency fund, to be drawn upon if needed for loans, was developed to offset these restrictions. Its use, however, has involved the drawing down of larger sums than were actually required due to the limitations of the allotment formula, and their carryover into subsequent years. It has also tended to obscure the determination of needs in subsequent years which must initially be made months before the need for and amount of the draft of contingency funds can be established. With the formula out of the way, loan requirements can be estimated and presented to the Congress on the basis of actual loan needs rather than geared to an outmoded mathematical equation.

4. Elimination of the formula would do away with the increasingly difficult task of estimating annually the number of unelectrified farms in each State. The difficulty arises from varying classification of consumers in the utility industry, so that there is substantial uncertainty as to number of farm consumers and from the use of the total number of farms reported in the last preceding census as a base without regard to changes which are substantial. As the State estimates approach 100 percent, these factors increasingly invalidate the formula as a means of assuring distribution of electrification loan funds to bring about area coverage rural service.

5. The distribution of telephone loan funds since the inception of the telephone loan program in 1949 has been effected free of formula limitations and without complaint as to the equity of this arrangement.

MODIFICATION OF EXISTING PROJECTS FOR THE GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS ABOVE LAKE ERIE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to deepen the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie.

This bill will in effect help complete the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway, a job which was begun under Public Law 358, of the 83d Congress, which I was proud to sponsor in the Senate.

The deepening of these channels to a 27-foot depth is an indispensable requirement, not only for the great heartland of America, but for the United States as a whole, and for the entire North American Continent.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 171) to authorize the modification of the existing projects for the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the projects for improvement of the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie are hereby modified to provide controlling depths of not less than 27 feet, the work to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with plans to be approved by the Chief of Engineers.

SEC. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATYMAKING POWER

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements, introduced by Mr. BRICKER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. BRICKER is as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHN W. BRICKER

The text of the amendment just introduced is identical with that introduced by me on August 5, 1954. At that time I explained in considerable detail the purpose of the amendment.

It is misleading to say that the major purpose of my amendent is to "limit the treaty-making power of the President." The President and the Senate are constitutional partners in the treaty-making process. My amendment is designed to limit the treaty-making power of the President and the Senate, but only in the following respects:

1. To prevent any treaty in conflict with the Constitution from having any force or effect; and

2. To prevent any treaty from becoming internal law except through valid legislation.

There can be, and there should be, but one paramount law—the Constitution itself. The theory that international agreements can alter or amend the Constitution should not be allowed to develop or to exist.

Legislation should be required to make a treaty effective as domestic law. All other countries, with the possible exception of France, the Netherlands, and Mexico, follow this practice.

Legislation should be required to make executive agreements effective as domestic law. The possibility of one-man law within the United States must be ended.

I am absolutely certain that President Eisenhower would not wittingly abuse the power to make treaties and international agreements. I am confident that he is just as sincere as I am in wanting the Constitution to be supreme over every form of international agreement. I am just as anxious as the President to preserve all the powers of his high office essential to the conduct of foreign policy in this age of the atom.

Inasmuch as the President and I have these common objectives, I continue to hope that we may be able to agree on appropriate language.

The text of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) is as follows:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution, or which is not made in pursuance thereof, shall not be the supreme law of the land nor be of any force or effect.

"SEC. 2. A treaty or other international agreement shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation valid in the absence of international agreement.

"SEC. 3. On the question of advising and consenting to the ratification of a treaty, the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate.

"SEC. 4. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission."

The threat of treaty law has not abated. The treatymaking ambitions of the United Nations and its agencies continue to reflect a zeal to regulate the political, economic, and social rights and duties of people everywhere. Those who seek to make the United States a mendicant province in some U. N.-operated world government are determined to destroy the concept of national sovereignty. This they hope to accomplish at the U. N. Charter Revision Conference in 1956. These are but a few of the recent developments underlining the need for a strong treaty control amendment. Before discussing these and other recent developments, however, I would like to explain briefly the origin and legal effect of the new language.

ORIGIN OF SECTION 1

Section 1 of the proposed amendment reads as follows:

"A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution, or which is not made in pursuance thereof, shall not be the supreme law of the land nor be of any force or effect."

This section has been endorsed in principle by the Eisenhower administration.

The language making a treaty in conflict with the Constitution of no force or effect originated with the American Bar Association. Later the American Bar Association and I recommended the same limitation for international agreements other than treaties. The Senate Judiciary Committee, only 4 of its 15 members dissenting, reported the proposed amendment in that form. This portion of section 1 was approved by the Senate on February 15, 1954, by the overwhelming vote of 62 to 20.

Section 1 of the new amendment contains the additional requirement that treaties and other international agreements must be made in pursuance of the Constitution. Credit for this suggestion must go to the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. Ferguson]. On February 17, 1954, the Senate approved the "in pursuance" provision offered by Senator Ferguson by a vote of 44 to 43. This narrow margin was not due to strong opposition but primarily because the "in-pursuance" requirement had not been the subject of committee consideration.

ORIGIN OF OF SECTION 2

Section 2 of the new amendment provides:

"A treaty or other international agreement shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation valid in the absence of international agreement."

This section represents the area of disagreement between myself and administration spokesmen. Language substantially similar to that quoted above was first proposed by the American Bar Association and on June 15, 1953, approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

That portion of the language above requiring legislation to make treaties effective as domestic law was voted down in the Senate by a vote of 50 to 42 on February 25, 1954.

That portion of section 2 requiring legislation to make executive agreements effective as domestic law failed by 1 vote—60 for and 31 against—to receive the required two-thirds. This provision was the heart of the substitute amendment proposed by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. Several Senators voted against the George substitute because it did not prevent the Congress from enacting legislation implementing an executive agreement that would be unconstitutional in the absence of such agreements. The proposed new language remedies that defect.

ORIGIN OF SECTION 3

Section 3 reads as follows:

"On the question of advising and consenting to the ratification of a treaty, the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate."

The distinguished majority leader, Senator KNOWLAND, is responsible for the above language to prevent treaties from being approved by only a handful of Senators. Both the administration and I have endorsed Senator KNOWLAND's contribution to the amendment. On February 16, 1954, the Senate approved this provision by a vote of 72 to 16.

LEGAL EFFECT OF THE REVISED TEXT

A word as to the meaning and effect of the various provisions of the joint resolution just now introduced is appropriate.

Section 1 will have two related effects.

First. It will carry into effect the principle as to which there seemed to be substantial unanimity of opinion when Senate Joint Resolution 1 was under debate, namely, that a treaty or other international agreement should have no force or effect if it was in conflict with the Constitution.

Second. It will provide that treaties and other international agreements in order to be valid must be made in pursuance of the Constitution.

Testifying in the hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 1, Secretary of State Dulles indicated that a treaty to effectuate internal social reforms, even though not in direct conflict with the Constitution, would not be one made in pursuance thereof. The Attorney General expressed the same opinion when he told the Senate Judiciary Committee:

"Our Federal system did not contemplate having treaties deal with matters exclusively domestic in their nature."

Addressing the annual meeting of the American Bar Association in September 1953, Mr. Dulles suggested that the treaty power would not be exercised in pursuance of the Constitution if it were used in the following manner: "to effectuate domestic reforms, particularly in relation to economic and social matters, and to impose upon our country socialistic conceptions which many felt were alien to our traditional American ideals."

Accordingly, the administration, although not convinced of the necessity of an amendment, interposed no objection to the provision requiring the treaty power, like the legislative power, to be exercised only in pursuance of the Constitution.

Article VI of the Constitution, the supremacy clause, today provides that laws of the United States in order to be the supreme law of the land must be made in pursuance of the Constitution although treaties in order to be such supreme law are those "made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States."

While some opponents of the amendment have asserted that under the supremacy clause treaties and statutes stand on an equal footing, both being subordinate to the Constitution, this difference in language led Mr. Justice Holmes to remark in *Missouri* v. *Holland* that, while "acts of Congress are the supreme law of the land only when made in pursuance of the Constitution," it was open to question whether the authority of the United States means "more than the formal acts prescribed to make the convention."

And *Missouri* v. *Holland*, in turn, led the late Chief Justice Hughes to say to the American Society of International Law in 1929 that he was unwilling to give an opinion that there was any implied limitation on the treatymaking power—that the Supreme Court had intimated that there was none.

Section 1 would thus insure that the Constitution would set the limits on the substance of treaties and not merely prescribe the method of their making.

Section 1 will put treaties and other international agreements where they belong—subject to the Constitution and invalid if they either conflict with it or are not made, as Federal laws must be, in pursuance of it. Any contrary inference from the language of the Constitution or from the cases would be impossible.

There can be and there should be but one paramount law—the Constitution itself. Both laws of the United States and all actions of the Federal Government should be subject to it. The theory that treaties stand on a level with the Constitution itself or can alter or amend that Constitution should not be allowed to develop or to exist.

Section 2 would prevent any treaty from being internal law of the United States simply by reason of its own existence. There would be no more self-executing treaties as domestic law. Legislation would be necessary to effectuate a treaty as internal law.

This is substantially the same as section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 1, with the difference that the new section 2 has eliminated as superfluous the words "which would be" immediately preceding "valid in the absence of."

Section 2 also deals with international agreements other than treaties, including executive agreements not previously authorized or approved by Congress. Section 2 would prevent an executive agreement from having the effect of internal law of the United States by virtue of its terms self-executing in form. There would be no possibility of one-man law within the United States. The doctrine of the Belmont and Pink cases would be nullified.

Obviously, if the Congress authorizes executive agreements by legislation in advance, such legislation would have to be within the already delegated powers of Congress. No reason is apparent why subsequent implementing legislation giving effect to such an agreement as internal law should not be confined within the same limits, and section 2 would do this.

Because it is widely conceded that the Congress now has power to regulate executive agreements under the "necessary and proper" clause, the present joint resolution does not contain the following provision included in Senate Joint Resolution 1:

"Congress shall have power to regulate all executive agreements."

No objection was made to the elimination of that provision during the Senate debate since it was regarded as merely declaratory of existing law. To prevent a repetition of the disastrous experience at Yalta, legislation to regulate the making of executive agreements is now pending before the Congress.

Section 3 is self-explanatory, and its substance, in one form or another, has been regarded as advisable by almost everyone. It would tend to prevent approval of treaties with a mere handful of Senators present and voting.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE FIELD OF TREATY LAW

Since the defeat of Senate Joint Resolution 1 in the United States Senate, four important new developments have strengthened the position of the proponents of the amendment.

First. The United Nations Human Rights Commission has refused to insert a provision in the Human Rights Covenants recognizing the right to own property and to have it protected against arbitrary interference by government.

Second. Mr. Dulles announced on March 16, 1954, that the President can now wage war without a declaration by Congress in the event of attack on one of our treaty allies in Europe or South America, thus *reaffirming* his Louisville speech of April 1952 before the American Bar Association that a treaty can take powers from Congress and confer them on the President.

Third. Sir Winston Churchill disclosed on the floor of the House of Commons in April 1954 the terms of the secret executive agree-

ment of President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill relating to the use of atomic weapons and peacetime application of atomic energy.

Fourth. The current debate on the subject of United Nations Charter revision has revealed a determined effort on the part of influential persons and organizations to scuttle the sovereignty of the United States at the proposed UN Charter Revision Conference in 1956 in favor of some form of limited or full world government. In hearings before the Wiley subcommittee on UN Charter revision, many world government enthusiasts have made it clear that they seek to transform the United Nations from an organization of sovereign states into a superstate either by treaty or by executive agreement, or if that is not feasible, by the even more dangerous process of informal charter amendment, that is, by far-fetched interpretation or by unwarranted usurpation of power.

Indicative of the philosophy dominating the United Nations Commission on Human Rights is the fact that after holding over 400 meetings, the Commission has refused to approve for the so-called draft of the so-called International Covenant on Human Rights, a provision recognizing the right to own private property and to be secure in its enjoyment against the arbitrary seizure by government. This discloses the extent to which the Human Rights Commission is controlled by Communists and Socialists.

On March 3, 1954, over United States and Turkish objections, the 18-nation Human Rights Commission voted to shelve indefinitely all discussion of property rights.

The chairman of the United Nations Human Rights Commission at the eighth session, Dr. Charles Malik, of Lebanon, had this to say of the Socialist and Communist influences dominating its work:

"I think a study of our proceedings will reveal that the amendments we adopted to the old texts under examination responded for the most part more to Soviet than to western promptings. For the second year an unsuccessful attempt was made to include an article on the right to own property. * * * The concept of property and its ownership is at the heart of the great ideological conflict of the present day. It was not only the Communist representatives who riddled this concept with questions and doubts, a goodly portion of the non-Communist world had itself succumbed to these doubts. A study of this particular debate will reveal the extent to which the non-Communist world has been communistically softened or frightened. It seems incredible that in these economic matters, which reflect indeed much more than mere economic divergencies, the western world is so divided itself as to be incapable of presenting a common front against communism."

On March 16 Secretary of State Dulles asserted that in his opinion President Eisenhower had authority, without consulting Congress, to wage war in Europe or South America in the event any of our treaty allies under the North Atlantic Treaty and the Rio de Janeiro Treaty were attacked. At a press conference that day the following questions were directed to Mr. Dulles and the following answers given by him—New York Times, March 17, 1954:

"Question. Sir, does the fact that the Senate of the United States has ratified the North Atlantic Alliance mean in the event of an attack on an ally we could, within constitutional procedures, retaliate against the attack without action in the Congress?

"Answer. This is a matter which, as you know, was debated very thoroughly in the Congress and in the Senate; at the time that treaty was ratified I was in the Senate; it is my opinion that the provisions of the treaty, which state that an attack upon one of the allies is the same as an attack upon all—or, in other words, that an attack upon one of our allies is the same as an attack upon the United States—and that is also, I may say, in the Rio pact—that gives the President of the United States the same authority to react as he would have if the United States were attacked.

"Question. Thank you, sir.

"Answer. Whether he would use that authority in every case is a matter for his discretion. In my opinion, he has it.

"Question. He has the right?

"Answer. In my opinion, he has the right.

* * * * *

"Question. Mr. Secretary, if I may go back to one point of yours, you said that in Europe the President had the same authority under the NATO and Rio treaties to retaliate as if the United States was attacked. Well, last Wednesday he seemed to give a pledge that he would not use that because he said that there would be no involvement in war without congressional approval.

"Answer. But if the Senate has given approval in advance, that is a different matter.

* * * * *

"Question. Mr. Secretary, in order to clarify something in my own mind at least, is it your understanding that the President's right to order instant retaliation applies only in the case of an attack either on the United States or another North Atlantic Treaty power because of the understanding that Congress has given?

"Answer. The United States has two treaties that I referred to: One is the so-called Rio Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, which contains the provision that an attack upon one is the same as an attack upon all; that same provision is found in the North Atlantic Treaty. In my opinion—whatever it is worth as a lawyer, and as one who was in the Senate when the North Atlantic Treaty was adopted—I believe that that authorizes, is a consent in advance to, the President reacting against an attack upon one of our allies named in those treaties in the same way that he would be authorized to react in the event of an attack upon the United States itself. I repeat, however, that the fact that the President has that constitutional authority as the result of those treaties in my opinion does not necessarily mean that he would use it. He would use his discretion, I think, as to whether or not to react instantly, or whether to get either a formal declaration of war by the Congress, or whether to have consultations which satisfied himself that that was the will of the Congress. That would be discretionary with the President.

"Question. Mr. Secretary, doesn't the President have that same power under the United Nations Charter itself?

"Answer. In my opinion, no."

It is thus plain that Mr. Dulles still firmly believes just as he did in his address before the American Bar Association in Louisville in April 1952, namely:

"Treaty law can override the Constitution. Treaties, for example, can take powers away from the Congress and give them to the President; they can take powers from the States and give them to the Federal Government or to some international body, and they can cut across the rights given the people by their constitutional Bill of Rights."

The disclosure by Sir Winston Churchill in April 1954 of the secret Roosevelt-Churchill atomic agreement has produced consternation, at least in this country. On April 18, 1954, the columnist Raymond Tucker had this to say in the Sunday papers carrying his column:

"The furious storm in the American Congress and British House of Commons over the ultrasecret Roosevelt-Churchill atomic agreement has renewed and reinforced demand for the Bricker and George amendments to the Constitution. That proposal, which was defeated by a single vote in the Senate, would outlaw personal and private diplomacy involving the destinies of peoples and nations."

The secret executive agreement made by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill at Quebec gave Britain a veto power over our diplomatic and military policies insofar as the use of A-bombs and H-bombs are concerned. It is without precedent. It involved an international commitment of the gravest character. It was made in wanton disregard of the security interests of the United States. The provisions of the secret Quebec agreement relative to the postwar uses of atomic energy ignored Congress' general power to legislate and the specific legislative power conferred on the Congress by article IV, section 3, of the Constitution:

"The Congress shall have power to dispose of and to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States."

Finally, the nature of the opposition to any limitation on the treaty power has been revealed in the current debate on United Nations Charter revision. To be sure, many advocates of world government seek that end only through formal amendment of the Constitution of the United States. I have commended such people for the respect they have shown for the spirit of our Constitution. In addition, I have always recognized that many sincere and high-minded people who oppose my amendment are not attracted by the world-government idea. The fact remains, however, that the primary source of opposition to my amendment comes from those who seek to set aside the American Declaration of Independence and nullify many of our constitutional protections.

This has been made clear in the hearings before the Wiley Subcommittee on U. N. Charter Revision.

Our Declaration of Independence would necessarily become a meaningless document and an historical relic if the United States were ever reduced to a province in any form of Federal world government. This recommendation, however, has been presented time and again to the Wiley subcommittee in the form of amendments to the charter that would destroy the independence of the United States. Any charter amendments that may be adopted at any U. N. Charter revision conference would no doubt be regarded as treaties, and hence would require the advice and consent of the Senate. If any such amendments that may be adopted undermine the concept of national sovereignty, they can, under our present Constitution, be made effective by the action of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting at any time over the next hundred years. We must, therefore, have a constitutional amendment that will assure the American people an opportunity to pass judgment on any revision of the U. N. Charter that compromises or undermines the independence of the Republic.

A number of world-government enthusiasts advance the reactionary theory that the United Nations Charter should be amended, if necessary, by interpretation rather than by formal amendment. This theory is advanced in staff study No. 2 of the Wiley Subcommittee on U. N. Charter Revision. In fact, the authors of that remarkable document maintain that the charter, without the advice and consent of the Senate, has already been validly and substantially amended. They say:

"We are by no means examining the charter that was drafted in San Francisco in 1945. We are examining the charter of 1954 as it has been amplified by custom and usage, resolutions of the various U. N. organs, and treaties, like the Atlantic Pact, which are consistent with the charter and have a heavy impact on the U. N. system. If we should proceed now to consider amendments to the old charter rather than the new, it would be very much like a surgeon planning a major operation on the basis of a diagnosis made 9 years ago."

That the U. N. Charter can be amended without Senate approval is the most illiberal proposition ever advanced in a Senate document. It is based on the wholly false premise that the United Nations Charter is a world constitution. The United Nations Charter is a treaty. The Senate advised and consented to its ratification in 1945. I shall never stop insisting that the United Nations Charter and all other treaties to which the United States is, or may become a party, are contracts rather than constitutional documents. That was the sense in which the Founding Fathers used the word "treaty" in the Constitution.

For example, Hamilton explained the treaty power in the Federalist, No. 75, as follows:

"The power of making treaties * * * relates neither to the execution of the subsisting laws, nor to the enaction of new ones. * * * Its objects are contracts with foreign nations, which have the force of law, but derive it from the obligations of good faith. They are not rules prescribed by the sovereign to the subject, but agreements between sovereign and sovereign."

To repeat, the advocates of world government seek to repeal the American Declaration of Independence. Some would do it by amending the United States Constitution, others seek the approval of the Senate on U. N. Charter amendments, while still others hope to reach world government by informal amendment of the United Nations Charter. The end result is the same—the United States would cease to be a sovereign, independent nation. When independence is destroyed, our liberties are lost. That is one of the most important reasons why we need a constitutional amendment safeguarding the power to make treaties and executive agreements.

Many opponents of my amendment advocate a system of international or world law directly applicable to individuals. More specifically, they urge adoption of the United Nations Draft Statute for an International Criminal Court. This proposed treaty is inconsistent with the complaint lodged against George III in the Declaration of Independence "for transporting us beyond seas to be tried for pretended offenses."

The principle of the U. N. draft statute for an International Criminal Court has already been embodied in the NATO Status of Forces Agreement approved by the Senate on July 15, 1953. By the terms of this treaty, and for the first time in American history, American soldiers serving abroad in the uniform of their country are made subject to trial in foreign courts under foreign law and without the constitutional protections to which they would otherwise be entitled. The making of this treaty proves how threadbare is the argument that the President and the Senate can always be trusted not to make any dangerous treaty. Although no constitutional amendment can empower the Supreme Court to order the release of Americans in foreign custody, the adoption of an adequate treaty-control amendment will go very far toward eliminating the discrimination as between State Department diplomats stationed abroad and American soldiers drafted and sent abroad to defend foreign soil.

The Constitution of the United States and its Bill of Rights cannot survive the loss of national sovereignty. Most world government plans call for a universal bill of rights along the lines proposed in the U. N. human-rights covenants. These proposed covenants, if adopted by the United States, would repeal the heart of the Bill of Rights, including the great first amendment freedoms of speech, press, religion, and assembly.

At the time I first proposed a constitutional amendment to safeguard the exercise of the treatymaking power, I said that the sovereignty and the Constitution of the United States were at stake. That was on February 7, 1952. The danger is just as great today as it was then. Now is the time for all patriotic Americans to insist on a policy of enlightened nationalism and to reject in no uncertain terms the rabid internationalism that has brought to so many American homes such untold sorrow and to the Nation itself unprecedented danger.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TERMINATION OF DEFICIT SPENDING

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for the imposition of Federal taxes to provide revenues at least equal to appropriations, except in time of war declared by the Congress or when the United States is engaged in open hostility against an external enemy. I ask unanimous consent that an article appearing in the Exeter (N. H.) Newsletter of June 15, 1954, relating to the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 2) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for the imposition of Federal taxes to provide revenues at least equal to appropriations, except in time of war declared by the Congress or when the United States is engaged in open hostility against an external enemy, introduced by Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and Mr. BYRD), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The article presented by Mr. BRIDGES is as follows:

Senators STYLES BRIDGES and HARRY BYRD have proposed an amendment to the Constitution that would require the Federal Government to maintain a balanced budget except in the event of war.

Senator BYRD has long been a powerful influence in opposition to efforts to increase the public debt now set at $275 billion. He was successful last year in balking administration proposals to raise the limit to which the Federal Government may borrow, and it would appear that his opposition now will prevent an increase to the $290 billion limit that the administration requests. Senator BRIDGES, as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, must be considered as a strong voice in the opposition. He cites that a continuance of present United States fiscal policy for the next 40 years, or the estimated period that the Nation faces in maintaining a costly defense program would reduce the American dollar in 1994 to a value of about 12½ cents.

The amendment as proposed by BRIDGES and BYRD would mean that Congress at the close of each session, except in time of war, must balance appropriations with income. If appropriations exceeded Government receipts they would have to be met by the levying of new taxes.

The voices of economy are not entirely lost in the midst of the heavy spending of the past two decades. They grow louder now to slow down if possible the policy of inflation to which the Government has long committed itself.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, earlier today I introduced a joint resolution. I now ask unanimous consent that the text of the joint resolution and a statement in connection therewith be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 3) and the statement in connection therewith were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as part of the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Each State shall choose a number of electors of the President and Vice President, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress, in the same manner in which its Senators and Representatives are nominated and elected. But no Senator or Representative or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States shall be chosen elector.

"SEC. 2. The electors shall meet in their respective States, and vote by ballot for President and Vice President, one of whom, at least, shall not be an inhabitant of the some State with themselves; they shall name in their ballots the person voted for as President, and in distinct ballots the person voted for as Vice President; and they shall make distinct lists of all persons voted for as President, and of all persons voted for as Vice President, and of the number of votes for each, which lists they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate; the President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and the House of Representatives, open all the certificates and the votes shall then be counted; the person having the greatest number of votes for President shall be the President and the person having the greatest number of votes for Vice President shall be the Vice President, if such numbers be majorities of the whole number of electors chosen.

"SEC. 3. If no persons voted for as President or Vice President have a majority of the whole number of electors chosen, then from the person having the highest numbers, not exceeding 3, on the lists of those voted for as President and Vice President, the Senate and the House of Representatives, assembled and voting as 1 body, shall choose immediately from the respective lists the President, and then the Vice President, or either, as the case may be; a quorum for these purposes shall consist of three-fourths of the whole number of the Senators and Representatives, and the persons receiving the greatest number of votes for President and for Vice President on the respective roll-calls shall be the President and Vice President. But no person ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to the office of Vice President."

The statement submitted by Mr. MUNDT is as follows:

In today's troubled world freedom has become man's most cherished possession. Self-government is man's greatest weapon in protecting man's freedoms. For self-government to operate effectively and efficiently it

is necessary that free men remain constantly vigilant in protecting the machinery by which self-government is perpetuated and through which the individual citizen finds it possible to assert his preferences and his policies by use of the secret ballot.

For years students of government have had a growing feeling that if Americans in every area of our great country are to have an equally strong voice in determining our decisions at the polls, it is essential that we bring about some reforms in the manner in which our electoral college is elected. Today I am introducing a Senate joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to bring about such needed reforms. Congressman FREDERIC R. COUDERT, Jr., of New York, is introducing a companion resolution in the House today. It is our sincere conviction, shared by many other Americans, that adoption of these proposed reforms will greatly strengthen the voice of individual Americans in shaping the destiny of our great, free Republic.

CONTINUATION IN OFFICE OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENTAL OPERATIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution to provide for the continuation in office of certain members of the Commission on Governmental Operations.

I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 5 minutes in explanation of the bill, after which I shall ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and, without objection, the Senator may proceed.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 4) to provide for the continuation in office of certain members of the Commission on Governmental Operations, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, was read twice by its title.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I request that the clerk read the joint resolution which I have introduced.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act for the establishment of a Commission on Government Operations," approved July 10, 1953 (67 Stat. 143), is amended, effective December 31, 1954, by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Continuation of membership upon change of status: Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), a person appointed to the Commission in the status of a Member of Congress or in the status of a person in the executive branch of the Government, but who thereafter ceases to have such status, shall nevertheless continue as a member of the Commission. If such person returns to private life (except for his membership on the Commission), he shall, from and after such change of status, receive the same compensation as a person originally appointed to the Commission from private life."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the passage of the joint resolution is necessary in order that a former Member of this body, the distinguished former Senator from Michigan, Mr. Ferguson, may be permitted to continue to serve on the Commission on Governmental Operations, better known as the Hoover Commission, or the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

Under the original act creating the Commission, it was provided that 4 of the members of the Commission should be appointed by the President of the Senate, 2 of whom should be members of the Senate. Senator Ferguson was appointed as one of the members of the Commission at the time the Commission was created. It is necessary for legislation of this character to be enacted in order that Senator Ferguson may continue to serve on the Commission, since he is no longer a Member of the Senate.

I have discussed the question with both the majority and the minority leadership. So far as I know, there is no objection to the proposal.

With that explanation, I therefore ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 4) to provide for the continuation in office of certain members of the Commission on Governmental Operations was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO ELECTION OF CANDIDATES FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT AND SUCCESSION TO OFFICE OF PRESIDENT IN EVENT OF DEATH

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the nomination and election of candidates for President and Vice President, and to succession to the office of President in the event of the death or inability of the President. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 9) proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the nomination and election of candidates for President and Vice President, and to succession to the office of President in the event of the death or inability of the President, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Senator SMATHERS is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMATHERS

I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the nomination and election of candidates for the offices of President and Vice President, and to the succession to the office of President in the event of the death or inability of the President. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me relating to the joint resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

The proposed resolution is aimed at modernizing the national election procedures, and is predicated upon a continued widespread interest on the part of the American people to revise the present archaic convention system of nominating candidates for the offices of President and Vice President. This is the sixth time that I have urged the Congress to take some action in bringing about election reforms. Many of us here fervently believe in these reforms and feel no discouragement over previous failures. It is my hope that in this Congress we will finally meet with success.

Radio and television have awakened the voting public to the undemocratic methods used by both political parties in selecting candidates for the highest offices of the land. They are shocked to say the least, and demand that corrective action be initiated through their representatives in the Congress to do away with the selection of candidates for these high offices by machinations of party leaders and backroom political bosses.

Popular polls have demonstrated that over 73 percent of the American people are anxious to have the archaic practice of selecting Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates at a smoke shrouded politically controlled national convention laid to rest. Within both major political parties the average voter is irritably conscious of the fact that he has little, if any, voice; choice or influence in determining who is to be his candidate for President. He is sick and tired of having his party's candidate thrust upon him, and of being forced to vote for handpicked candidates. There is no doubt in my mind that the methods now used have demonstrated themselves to be nothing short of a national disgrace. It is up to us here in the Congress, the duly elected representatives of the American people, to answer their demands by enacting appropriate legislation which will allow them to more actively participate in the selection and election of public officials. My resolution is designed to accomplish this objective.

Efforts to revise and reform the outmoded election machinery of this Nation should be nonpartisan and both major political parties should share the responsibility and be vitally interested in achieving changes in the direction to which my resolution points, for in so doing we will make a substantial contribution toward creating a stronger democracy.

The first proposal contained in my resolution would establish a nationwide primary to nominate party candidates for the office of President. This is not a new proposal. It was previously advocated by former President Woodrow Wilson in his first annual message to the Congress in 1913.

Similar proposals were advocated by the late Senator George Norris, of Nebraska, one of the most able and distinguished Members ever to occupy a seat in this great body, and by the able and distinguished Senator from Illinois, Senator DOUGLAS. Numerous other distinguished leaders in political life also recognized that the selection of a candidate for the high office of President of the United States is all too important to leave solely in the hands of a few haggling, ambitious, and professional politicians.

The second change which the proposed resolution would accomplish would be to abolish the electoral college system and establish a system under which the electoral votes of each of the States would be divided among the candidates on the basis of the percentage of popular votes received by each candidate in the States. This proposal was more recently identified with the former able Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Lodge, and the former distinguished Congressman from Texas, Mr. Ed Gossett. A similar provision

was previously passed by the Senate in 1950 but failed to pass in the House of Representatives. From the very beginning of this Republic, it has been apparent to more critical observers that the electoral college was not functioning as the framers of our Constitution had intended. No other provision of the Constitution of the United States has produced more dissatisfaction and inspired more demands for improvement than that of the provisions of the 12th amendment. This change is long overdue.

The third proposal embodied in the proposed resolution provides for the election of a President and Vice President to be held at the next succeeding regular congressional elections whenever a President dies or is removed and who has still more than 2 years and 90 days remaining of his uncompleted term. Numerous editorials, letters, and polls disclose that the people are firmly of the belief that when the Vice President assumes the office of President under such circumstances that he, the Vice President, should get the endorsement of the people before serving as President for a period of more than 2 years. The proposal has popular support and merits the most serious consideration of the Congress.

The foregoing is generally what my proposed resolution provides. I have not gone into details on these proposals, for it is obvious that there are many technical aspects regarding each of them, and I do not feel that this is the time or the place to go into a long discussion on the many ramifications which they involve. My primary purpose in offering the resolution today is to get it into the machinery of the Congress with the fervent hope that we can have action taken upon it which will eventually materialize in further strengthening our system of democracy. We cannot long continue the further use of the outmoded election procedures which have on several occasions in the past permitted a man to become President of these United States even though he did not receive the largest popular vote, and which permit political leaders and backroom cigar-smoking barons to nominate and elect candidates for the highest offices in this land without regard for the wishes of the American people.

I claim no proprietorship of any of these proposals. All of them have previously been discussed on forums, in debate, and even in the Congress. The task of undertaking the much-needed election reform belongs to all of us, regardless of party affiliation. The voting public of your State and mine are anxious that we cease debating the issue academically and take positive action in the Congress to make these reforms a reality. Good government demands the support of Democrats and Republicans alike to bring about these much needed changes. They are a matter of vital concern to the strength and well-being of our entire democracy. It is up to us in the Congress to go about our labor in the vineyard and diligently work toward accomplishing that which will carry out the wishes of and best serve the American people.

It is my genuine hope that prompt and efficient action will be taken on the proposed resolution in this session of the Congress.

TEMPORARY CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN POST OFFICES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 1) which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that hereafter the Postmaster General should not discontinue any United States post office until the expiration of sixty days after he shall have reported to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives on the necessity and advisability of such action.

UNITY OF IRELAND

Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. MURRAY) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 11), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the House of Representatives, 65th Congress (1919), 3d session, by House Joint Resolution 357, duly passed a resolution declaring that the people of Ireland should have the right to determine the form of government under which they desire to live; and

Whereas the maintenance of international peace and security requires settlement of the question of the unification of Ireland; and

Whereas 26 of the 32 counties of Ireland have been successful in obtaining international recognition for the Republic of Ireland which has, as its basic law, a constitution modeled upon our own American Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless a clear majority of all of the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite, determine and declare to the contrary.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO PROCEDURE IN COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution to amend the rules of the Senate. The text of the resolution is identical with the text of a resolution reported to The Senate by the Select Committee To Study Censure Charges. In the confusion and haste to conclude the special session of the Senate in December, this resolution was overlooked.

The resolution is offered by me in my personal capacity and on behalf of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 12), submitted by Mr. WATKINS (for himself and other Senators) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That subsection 3 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(c) No witness shall be required to testify before a committee or subcommittee with less than two members present, unless the committee or subcommittee by majority vote agrees that one member may hold the hearing, or the witness waives any objection to testifying before one member.

"(d) Committee or subcommittee interrogation of witnesses shall be conducted only by members and authorized staff personnel of the committee or subcommittee and no person shall be employed or assigned to investigative activities until approved by the committee or subcommittee.

"(e) No testimony taken or material presented in an executive session shall be made public, either in whole or in part by way of summary, unless authorized by majority vote of the committee or subcommittee.

"(f) Vouchers covering expenditures of any investigating committee or subcommittee shall be accompanied by a statement signed by the chairman that the investigation was duly authorized and conducted under the provisions of this rule."

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN PROBLEMS RELATING TO INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 13), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of any and all matters within its jurisdiction as set forth in section (1) (j) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and especially all matters pertaining to—

(1) maritime matters generally, including a continuation of the study of the maritime subsidy program;

(2) communication by telephone, telegraph, radio, and television;

(3) domestic surface transportation;

(4) civil aeronautics; and

(5) fisheries and wildlife, including research, restoration, refuges, and conservation.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized, from February 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President on behalf of the minority leader and myself, I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration. The resolution would effect the necessary change in the committee structure so as to maintain the same size and seat distribution as prevailed during the 2d session of the 83d Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 14) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That during the 84th Congress section (1) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to standing committees) is amended—

(1) by striking out "eleven" in subsection (e) (relating to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service) and inserting in lieu thereof "thirteen"; and

(2) by striking out "eleven" in subsection (n) (relating to the Committee on Public Works) and inserting in lieu thereof "thirteen."

SEC. 2. During the 84th Congress section (4) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, as amended, is further amended by inserting "(a)" after "(4)" and by striking out "fourteen" and inserting in lieu thereof "sixteen," and by adding the following new paragraph:

"(b) In the event that during the 84th Congress members of one party in the Senate are replaced by members of the other party, the 21 third-committee assignments shall in such event be distributed in accordance with the following table:

"Senate seats

Majority	Minority
48	48
49	47
50	46
51	45

"Third committee assignments

Majority	Minority
18	3
16	5
14	7
12	9"

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, may I inquire what the purpose of the resolution is?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The resolution would distribute committee seats on the same basis which prevailed during the 2d session of the 83d Congress. The previous resolution pertained only to the 83d Congress. I assure the Senator from Louisiana that the majority leader and the minority leader are in complete agreement on the resolution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I fully concur in the statement made by the majority leader.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

PROCEDURE IN COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution to amend the standing rules of the Senate to prevent future abuses of committee power. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 15) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by deleting subsection 3 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"3. (a) Committee meetings, other than regular meetings authorized by section 133 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 837), held within the District of Columbia, shall be called only upon a minimum of 16 hours' written notice to the office of each committee member. Committee meetings outside the District of Columbia shall be called only upon a minimum of 96 hours' written notice to the office of each committee member. These provisions may be waived by the assent of the majority of the members of the committee.

"(b) Each committee is authorized to fix the number of its members (but not less than one-third of the entire membership) who shall constitute a quorum thereof for the transaction of such business as may be considered by said committee, subject to the provisions of section 133 (d) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

"(c) Subcommittees, as required, shall be appointed by the committee chairman, subject to the approval of the majority of the committee, and shall ordinarily consist of no less than three members, a proportionate ratio of whom shall be members of the minority (the designation of the majority and minority members of a subcommittee shall be subject to the approval of the majority and minority members of the committee respectively in caucus assembled). Subcommittees of less than three members may be designated by the chairman, subject to the approval of the majority of the committee.

"(d) Committee hearings (whether public or in executive session) and committee investigations shall be scheduled and conducted upon the majority vote of the full committee in a meeting at which a majority of the committee is actually present.

"(e) A resolution or motion scheduling hearings or ordering a particular investigation shall state clearly and with particularity the subject thereof, which resolution may be amended only upon a majority vote of the full committee in a meeting at which a majority of the committee is actually present. No hearing shall be initiated by a subcommittee without the approval of a majority of the members of the full parent committee.

"(f) The chairman, or a member designated by him, shall consult with appropriate Federal law-enforcement agencies with respect to any phase of an investigation which may result in evidence exposing the commission of Federal crimes, and the results of such consultation shall be reported to the committee before witnesses are called to testify therein.

"(g) No committee report shall be issued unless a draft of such report is submitted to the office of each committee member 24 hours in advance of the meeting at which it is to be considered and is adopted at a meeting at which a majority is actually present.

"(h) No testimony taken or material presented in an executive session shall be made public, either in whole or in part or by way of summary, unless authorized by a majority vote of the committee.

"4. (a) Witnesses at committee hearings (whether public or in executive session) shall have the right to be accompanied by counsel, of their own choosing, who shall have the right to advise witnesses of their legal rights and to make objections concerning the propriety of questions and to matters of procedure, as well as to submit legal memorandums in support of his objections.

"(b) Rulings on motions or objections shall be made by the member presiding, subject to appeal to the members present on motion of a member.

"(c) At least 24 hours prior to his testifying, a witness shall be given a copy of that portion of the motion or resolution scheduling the hearing stating the subject of the hearing; at the same time he shall be given a bill of particulars or a statement of the subject matters about which he is to be interrogated.

"(d) It is the policy of the Senate that only evidence and testimony which is reliable and of probative value shall be received and considered by a committee. The privileged character of communications between clergyman and parishioner, doctor and patient, lawyer and client, member of the press and confidential source of information, and husband and wife shall be scrupulously observed.

"(e) No testimony shall be taken in executive or public session unless at least two members of the committee are present. But the full committee, by majority vote, may authorize the taking of testimony by a single member.

"(f) Committee interrogation of witnesses shall be conducted only by members and authorized staff personnel of the committee.

"(g) All testimony shall be given under oath or affirmation.

"(h) (i) Every witness shall have the right to make complete and brief answers to questions and to make concise explanations of such answers.

"(ii) Every witness who testifies in a hearing shall have a right to make an oral statement and to file a sworn statement which shall be made part of the transcript of such hearing, but such oral or written statement shall be relevant to the subject of the hearing.

"(i) A stenographic verbatim transcript shall be made of all committee hearings. Copies of such transcript, so far as practicable, shall be available for inspection or purchase at regularly prescribed rates from the official reporter by any witness or person mentioned in a public hearing. Any witness and his counsel shall have the right to inspect only the complete transcript of his own testimony in executive session.

"5. (a) Insofar as practicable, any person whose activities are the subject of investigation by the committee, or about whom adverse information is proposed to be presented at a public hearing of the committee, shall be fully advised by the committee as to the matter into which the committee proposes to inquire and the adverse material which is proposed to be presented. Insofar as practicable, all material reflecting adversely on the character or reputation of any individual which is proposed to be presented at a public hearing of the committee shall be first reviewed in executive session to determine its reliability and probative value and shall not be presented at a public hearing except pursuant to majority vote of the full committee.

"(b) If a person is adversely affected by evidence or testimony given in a public hearing or in an executive hearing the transcript of which is to be released, in whole or in part, that person shall have the right to request that he be allowed to appear before the committee, upon subpena or otherwise, and testify in his own behalf. If allowed by the committee to appear, such person shall have the rights secured to witnesses under section 4 (above). If this request is not granted by the committee, such person shall be permitted to file with the committee a sworn statement concerning such testimony, which statement will be incorporated into the record of the hearing at which he was adversely mentioned, unless the full committee, by majority vote, decides to publish such statement elsewhere in the record.

"(c) Subject to the provisions of section 4 (d), any witness who gives testimony before the committee in an open hearing which reflects adversely on the character or reputation of another person may be required by the committee to disclose his sources of information, unless to do so would endanger the national security.

"6. Subpenas shall be issued only with the approval of a majority of the full committee, unless the full committee by majority vote delegates such authority to the chairman and the ranking minority member acting jointly. Upon the request of any member of the committee the question of whether a subpena shall be issued or remain in force if already issued shall be decided by majority vote of the full committee.

"7. The composition and selection of, and changes in, the professional and clerical staff

of a committee shall be subject to the vote of a majority of the members of the committee.

"8. (a) Subject to the physical limitations of the hearing room and consideration of the physical comfort of committee members, staff and witnesses, equal access for coverage of the hearings shall be provided to the various means of communications, including newspapers, magazines, radio, newsreels, and television. It shall be the duty of the committee chairman to see that the various communication devices and instruments do not unreasonably distract, harass, or confuse the witness and interfere with his presentation.

"(b) No witness shall be televised, filmed, or photographed during the hearing if he objects on the ground of distraction, harrassment, or physical handicap.

"9. The application of this rule shall be supervised in the Senate by the presiding officer of the Senate and four Members selected by the Senate (not more than two of the members selected shall be of the same party), who shall have authority (1) to receive and investigate complaints of alleged violations of the rule filed by persons claiming to be aggrieved or by members, (2) to advise committee chairmen of their conclusions and their suggestions, and (3) to present their findings to the Senate, with such recommendations for remedial and disciplinary action, if any, they deem appropriate.

"10. As used in this rule:

" 'Committee' shall mean any standing, select, or special committee of the Senate (except the majority and minority policy committees) and any subcommittees of the foregoing.

" 'Person' includes an individual, partnership, trust, estate, association, corporation, or society."

SEC. 2. Such rule XXV is further amended by redesignating subsection 4 thereof as subsection 11.

The statement presented by Mr. HENNINGS is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENNINGS

I am introducing today a resolution to amend rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate. I should like to make a brief statement explaining the purpose of this resolution and enumerating my reasons for introducing it.

For some years now, the American people, and, indeed, freedom-loving peoples in all corners of the earth, have been increasingly concerned with the alleged abuse of power by certain committees and subcommittees of the United States Congress. Some of these allegations and fears have been ill-founded, certainly, but all too frequently a substantial basis for concern has existed. Increasingly, I am glad to relate, Members of Congress have become aware of this legitimate concern, as is evidenced by the constantly growing number of proposed codes of fair procedure which have been introduced in both Houses of this greatest of legislatures. In the 83d Congress alone, 8 different measures proposing such codes were introduced in the Senate. Extensive hearings were conducted by a subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration. Seventy prominent Americans, including many of the most alert and able Members of the Congress, either appeared and testified before the subcommittee or submitted statements explaining their opinions toward such proposals. Events in the recent congressional elections indicate full well that the voters of the United States have decided that abuse of committee powers shall not be tolerated.

In the last session of the Senate, I joined with 18 other Senators to sponsor S. Res. 256, which provided for rules to prevent committee abuse of power. I felt at that time, and I still feel, that the provisions of S. Res. 256 were good, and that they would, if enacted, substantially improve the conduct of inquisitorial investigations and hearings.

However, as a member of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, I have for some time been conscious of a special obligation in this matter of reform of committee procedure. Accordingly, I feel that I must again urge the Senate to improve its procedures at the earliest possible moment.

Because I have become aware of certain substantial objections to Senate Resolution 256, I am introducing a resolution which I feel meets these objections. My resolution is similar, in many respects, to Senate Resolution 256, but it has been framed with full consideration for the objections raised to that resolution by persons who testified at the subcommittee hearings. I have also given full attention to the Report on Congressional Investigations of the American Bar Association's Special Committee on Individual Rights as Affected by National Security. I might add that members of that committee consulted with me in the course of their activities, and their recommendations are in accord with my long-held opinions on this subject. I have taken full account of the recommendations of the American Bar Association, as approved by the House of Delegates in August 1954.

My resolution differs from Senate Resolution 256 in several important respects. While Senate Resolution 256 proposed a special "Code of Fair Committee Procedure" for Senate committees, I have framed my resolution as an amendment to the Standing Rules of the Senate. Senate Resolution 256 was intended to apply only to committees when acting "as organs of inquiry and investigation," and did not apply to committees pursuing "normal legislative functions." I am concerned lest this distinction prove unworkable; consequently, my resolution will apply to all committees at all times, and provides essentially for ultimate control of all committee activities by a majority of the members of the full committee.

Senate Resolution 256 was intended to extend certain guaranties and rights to persons adversely affected by testimony before Senate committees; these rights were quite detailed and could, perhaps, be abused by unscrupulous persons to obstruct the processes of such committees. In any case, these rights would be operative only if a committee majority decided that a person had been "adversely affected." In the absence of such determination, aggrieved persons would have no opportunity formally to present their answers to such testimony. My resolution assures all such persons of the opportunity to present their answers to such damaging allegations, while it contains no provisions which could be used by such persons to hamper the course of committee activity.

Senate Resolution 256 was intended largely to eliminate "one-man investigations." I agree with the objective of this provision. But I also realize that the tremendous range of the responsibilities confronting the Senate frequently necessitates such investigations or hearings. My resolution allows for such. But it also requires that a majority of the full committee must first authorize the holding of such a "one-man hearing," thus assuring to the full committee the right to control and check irresponsible members of the committee, and at the same time, allowing the work of the Senate to go forward.

Recently, we have all witnessed the distressing spectacle of subcommittees, often one-man subcommittees, launching recklessly forth on investigative paths which seem to afford opportunity for personal publicity. This situation is deplorable. Consequently, my resolution will require that subcommittee hearings be approved in advance by parent committees, thus restoring to such committees the authority and responsibility which has, on occasion, been usurped from them.

One additional provision of my resolution should be mentioned today. On several occasions in the past, I have been notified that a meeting of a committee or subcommittee of which I was a member was to be held the next day, or perhaps the second day following, in a place far removed from the District of Columbia. Several other Senators have related to me similar experiences which befell them. Obviously, no Senator can always be able immediately to drop everything with which he is occupied, and board a plane or train for some distant corner of the country. Accordingly, my resolution requires that meetings outside of the District of Columbia can be called only upon a minimum of 96 hours' written notice to the office of all committee members, thus insuring that all members will be able to make plans to attend the meetings of the committees to which they are assigned. To facilitate prompt action, where such is necessary, however, this provision may be waived by a majority vote of the committee.

My resolution contains many other changes from the original provisions of Senate Resolution 256—changes which, I feel, are improvements thereupon. I will not detail these further at this time.

I would like to emphasize at this point, however, my strong belief that all congressional committees should make strenuous efforts to follow the rules of evidence applicable in the courts of law and other judicial and quasi-judicial tribunals. These rules of fair play have been tested through the ages and for the most part are based on reason and logic.

In past speeches on congressional investigations, I have noted that these investigations or hearings have, in general, been of two substantially different types—one, the legislative hearing and the other, the inquisitorial hearing. It is the latter type that has aroused so much public concern.

Nearly all congressional committees at one time or another conduct both types and, at times, a legislative hearing may easily develop into a probe or exposé of conditions or individuals and take on an inquisitorial aspect. Procedures that seem adequate for the conduct of legislative hearings are not necessarily appropriate for purely investigative or inquisitorial hearings. And, as I have said before, one of the principal difficulties with the investigative type of hearing in the recent past, I think, stems in great part from our failure to note the basic difference between the two types of hearings and our consequent failure to apply different rules to them.

In legislative hearings the purpose is to develop concise and adequate information in order to formulate intelligent legislative policy. Such hearings often involve the wisdom of actions that Government officials have taken and invariably explore questions of governmental policy and the administration of particular programs. Such hearings seldom, however, explore the integrity or loyalty of individuals, and the committees holding such hearings have not had to concern themselves with the problem of providing persons under attack with an adequate opportunity to defend themselves. When the problem presents itself, however, I think committees ought to give it special attention.

In the case of inquisitorial investigations to ferret out disloyalty or dishonesty, the purpose is, or at least it ought to be, to supplement the extensive investigatory machinery at work in the executive branch and to provide information on which to base legislation, that is, to strengthen our laws dealing with crime and corruption generally, and in particular, with acts and conspiracies against national security.

While I suggest that all congressional committees may with profit in all types of hearings follow the rules of evidence of the law courts, I think it absolutely imperative that

a committee, when conducting a hearing, inquisitorial or investigative in nature, follow the rules of evidence.

In conclusion, I think it can be fairly said that the basic problem of orderly procedure and fair play in all congressional hearings cannot, in the end, be reached by rules alone. They can only help. Committee chairmen must be always conscious of the great responsibility imposed upon them in the conduct of investigations.

This responsibility involves moral standards, self-restraint, and traditional ideals of fair play. In Anglo-Saxon countries, since King John's time, this has been known as due process of law.

In my 4 years as a member of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration I have seen many legislative proposals for changing the Senate rules governing committee procedure. During this same time, I have been conscious of the Senate's failure to make any progress. No measure has yet reached the Senate floor. With this in mind, I shall urge the Rules Committee not only to consider the problem immediately, but to report some adequate measure to the Senate at the earliest opportunity and I shall further urge the adoption of such measure by the Senate.

I ask the Senate of the United States to give careful consideration to this resolution, and I again emphasize my belief that we must act at once to prevent future abuses of senatorial power. The time for temporizing is long past. Our citizens demand that we act.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. THYE (for himself, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENDER, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERR, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WELKER, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. YOUNG), submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 16), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"(5) (a) A standing committee to be known as the Committee on Small Business and to consist of 13 Senators shall be appointed at the commencement of each Congress.

"(b) It shall be the duty of such committee to study and survey by means of research and investigation all problems of American small-business enterprises, and to obtain all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest, but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation, and to report to the Senate from time to time the results of such studies and surveys. No proposed legislation shall be referred to such committee and such committee shall not have power to report by bill or otherwise have legislative jurisdiction."

SEC. 2. The Select Committee on Small Business established by Senate Resolution 58, 81st Congress, agreed to February 20, 1950, is hereby abolished. The employees, records, and property of the Select Committee on Small Business on the effective date of this resolution shall thereupon become the employees, records, and property, respectively, of the standing committee established by this resolution.

SEC. 3. Section (4) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"(4) Each Senator shall serve on two standing committees and no more; except that not to exceed twenty-one Senators of the majority party, and not to exceed nine Senators of the minority party, who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Small Business, or the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may serve on three standing committees and no more."

SEC. 4. This resolution shall be effective on and after the date of beginning of the second regular session of the Eighty-fourth Congress.

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON MINERALS, MATERIALS, AND FUELS OF COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be printed as a Senate document as of January 4, 1955.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FHA INVESTIGATION—REPORT OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, pursuant to Senate Resolution 229, I submit a report (No. 1) on the FHA investigation by that committee, and ask that it be printed, with illustrations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION (H. REPT. NO. 1)

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, from the Joint Committee on Defense Production, I submit, pursuant to section 712 (b) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, the Fourth Annual Report of the Joint Committee on Defense Production together with a report from each agency performing functions under authority of that act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION ON UNITED STATES TIN CORP. LOANS (H. REPT. NO. 2)

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, in accordance with section 712 (b) of the Defense Production Act, as amended, I submit a report of the Joint Committee on Defense Production on Government loans and Government-guaranteed loans extended to the United States Tin Corp. under authority of that act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

MUTUAL DEFENSE TREATY WITH REPUBLIC OF CHINA—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate Executive A, 84th Congress, 1st session, a mutual defense treaty between the United States and the Republic of China, signed at Washington on December 2, 1954. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the treaty, and the treaty, together with the President's message will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of China, signed at Washington on December 2, 1954.

I transmit also for the information of the Senate a document containing statements made by the Secretary of State and the Chinese Minister for Foreign Affairs on the occasion of the initialing of the treaty on December 2, 1954, together with a joint statement regarding conclusion of negotiations for the treaty issued simultaneously in Washington and Taipei on December 1, 1954.

There is further transmitted for the information of the Senate the report made to me by the Secretary of State regarding the treaty.

Finally, there are transmitted for the information of the Senate texts of notes exchanged by the Secretary of State and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of China on December 10, 1954, which, while not a part of the treaty, express agreed understandings as to certain phases of its implementation.

The Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of China is defensive and mutual in character, designed to deter any attempt by the Chinese Communist regime to bring its aggressive military ambitions to bear against the treaty area.

This Mutual Defense Treaty, taken in conjunction with similar treaties already concluded with Japan, Korea, the Philippines, and Australia and New Zealand, reinforces the system of collective security in the Pacific area. It is also complementary to the action taken in the signing of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty at Manila on September 8, 1954.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the treaty submitted herewith, and advise and consent to its ratification.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 6, 1955.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State. 2. Mutual Defense Treaty with the Republic of China. 3. Joint statement regarding conclusion of negotiations for the Mutual Defense Treaty. 4. Statements by the Secretary of State and the Chinese Foreign Minister on the occasion of the signing of the treaty. 5. Texts of notes exchanged on December 10, 1954.)

VISIT TO SENATE OF PARLIAMENTARY REPRESENTATIVES AND OTHER PERSONS ATTENDING THE WORLD ASSEMBLY FOR MORAL REARMAMENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we are privileged today to have with us eight representatives from parliaments of other countries. Besides these gentlemen, there are in the galleries representatives of about 40 nations who are in Washington attending the Moral Rearmament Conference. They represent politics, industry, labor, and military organizations. The asesmbly has been held under the leadership of Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman, the founder of Moral Rearmament. Parliamentary members from 11 nations have been in attendance, and present on the floor of the Senate, pursuant to the rules of the Senate, are those whose names I shall read, and I ask them to rise as I call their names:

The Honorable John McGovern, for 24 years Labor member of the British Parliament for Shettleston, Glasgow.

The Honorable Oskar Leimgruber, Chancellor of the Swiss Confederation, 1943–51.

The Honorable P. N. Rajabhoj, member of Parliament, India; secretary of political organizations representing 60 million of the scheduled castes.

The Honorable R. T. Lim, member, House of Representatives, the Philippines.

The Honorable Takeshi Togano, member, Japanese Upper House; executive member, Right-Wing Socialist Party, Japan.

The Honorable G. W. A. Duthie, member of the Federal Parliament of Australia, and executive member, Australian Labor Party.

The Honorable Abolfazl Hazeghi, former member of the Iranian Parliament; personal representative of the Shah of Iran.

Brigadier Abdel el Fettah Hassan, Deputy Minister of State for Sudan in the Egyptian Government, Cairo; personal representative of the Prime Minister of Egypt to the World Assembly.

(As their names were read the distinguished visitors rose in their places in the rear of the Chamber to the left of the center aisle, and were greeted with applause by the Senate.)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I also ask that the visitors from abroad who are present in the galleries and who have been in Washington for about 10 days, attending the Moral Rearmament Conference, also rise in their places, in order that Senators may be given the opportunity of greeting them.

[The visitors rose and were greeted with applause.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The representatives of the foreign governments who are guests of the Senate today are assured that they are heartily welcome.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I rise to join my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] former chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, in extending a cordial welcome to the distinguished visitors now present, and to express our appreciation of the wonderful work they are doing in the cause of world peace, understanding, and good will among men.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, to what has been said by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin and by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey I should like to add that it was my privilege to attend one of the sessions of the Moral Rearmament Assembly at the Shoreham Hotel a few evenings ago, and to hear some of the representatives of parliaments from other countries speak. I was inspired by the message they presented. It was my pleasure also to view a play entitled "The Dictator's Slippers." I wish every Member of the House and the Senate would see that play as presented by the members of the Moral Rearmament Assembly. It is a most inspiring and thoughtful production, and well adapted to make people think of the basic changes which must be made if the purposes of freedom are to be realized. I welcome the presence here today of the representatives of the participating countries. I understand presentations of plays will continue throughout the week at the Shoreham Hotel, and I am sure Members of the House and the Senate will be free to attend the presentations of the several plays which the Moral Rearmament Assembly has prepared.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the remarks made by the Senator from Wisconsin, the Senator from New Jersey, and the Senator from South Dakota. I, too, have come in contact with many of our distinguished visitors who are in attendance upon the Moral Rearmament Conference, and I know they are very zealous in the cause of peace. I have found they are doing a great deal of good in the world. In their approach to world problems they evince a spirit and ideals which, if generally followed, should lead toward lasting peace. I think it is wonderful that these representatives of the various nations should be associated together in this fine effort.

I had the pleasure of visiting with Moral Rearmament in Caux, Switzerland, and I found that they were doing fine work there. Present at that time were representatives from all over the world, who had met in the cause of peace. It was inspiring to see the spirit of brotherhood which existed. We all thank them for their very fine work.

THE RULES OF THE SENATE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, 2 years ago, on the opening of the 83d Congress, a number of us, under the leadership of the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], moved to proceed to the adoption of rules for the guidance of the proceedings of the Senate.

We did this, at that time, on the ground that it was the duty and responsibility of each newly organized Senate to adopt, anew, its own rules of procedure. We felt that it would be timely, at the opening of the new Senate, to adopt such critical changes in the rules as might be urgently required. All of us who joined in this move felt that one such rule which required modification was rule XXII, the cloture rule—the rule that permits a minority of the Senate to enforce its will upon the majority.

When that motion was made 2 years ago, the presiding officer of the Senate was the then Vice President of the United States, the Honorable ALBEN W. BARKLEY, who is today, to the great joy and satisfaction of all of us, a Member of this body, a colleague and fellow Senator. Vice President BARKLEY received the motion and, by implication, ruled it to be in order.

After some debate, a motion to table was made; and that motion carried. Thus, the Senate sidestepped the issue of adopting new rules at the opening of the session.

Mr. President, I believed at the time with all my heart that this was the correct, the proper, and the mandatory procedure to be followed. I still believe it today. This year, Mr. President, the opening day of the new Congress passed without the making of a motion to adopt new rules. This did not mean however—certainly, so far as I am concerned, and I think I can speak for a number of my colleagues in the Senate—that we have abandoned the position we took 2 years ago. We maintain that position. We subscribe to it.

I think it is inevitable that on the opening day of some new Congress in the not too distant future, the Senate will agree to adopt rules of procedure as a part of the process of newly organizing the Senate. I believe that is the democratic way and the proper way. I hope it will not be necessary by that time to seek a change in rule XXII. I hope that by that time rule XXII will have been modified in the course of the legislative session. I hope it will be modified this year.

I must, in all good conscience, tell my colleagues that I am going to do everything I can to see that rule XXII is modified at the earliest possible date, thus freeing the Senate from the straitjacket of paralysis in which it has been confined by rule XXII in its present form.

And I shall do all I can, as a Member of this body, to fight for reasonable and equitable civil-rights legislation—meaningful legislation, legislation that will mark real progress on the civil-rights front.

Mr. President, it is sometimes forgotten that when we urge civil-rights legis-

lation, we are not pleading for special interest or special privilege; we are not asking for special favors for a specially privileged group. Instead, we are asking for equal rights for all groups of our fellow citizens. We are asking for simple justice, even a small measure of justice for some of our fellow citizens who for too long have been denied the equal justice under law that is guaranteed them by the Constitution.

Mr. President, I maintain—and I believe there is a wealth of supporting evidence on the point—that the Senate must adopt new rules at the opening of each new Congress, and that past failure to do so represents an impairment of the democratic process, and of the dignity and prerogatives of the Senate.

Rules, Mr. President, are procedural safeguards; and I know of no body in the world in which procedural matters are superior in quality or sanctity to substantive matters. Yet here in the Senate we have, in the past, acquiesced in a practice which places the rules of the Senate in a vastly more privileged position than the substantive matters which it is our high function to consider and to act upon. No Congress can bind a previous Congress in matters of legislative substance. Yet it is maintained that the Senate of today, the Senate of the 84th Congress, is bound absolutely by rules adopted more than a century ago, and is even powerless to change them in the face of the determined will of a minority of the Senate, which can debate indefinitely any proposal for a change in the rules, without being subject to limitation or cloture of any kind. No other kind of motion is thus placed beyond the reach of limitation of debate. This gives the preexisting rules a privileged and sacrosanct position beyond any other matter with which the Senate concerns itself.

Mr. President, is ours a government of law or a government of self-perpetuating rules?

Much is made of the argument that the Senate is a continuing body. I do not know quite what that means. I do not believe it. But this is an abstract notion. The concrete question is: Are the rules of the Senate automatically continuing, like the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the United States?

There is no parliamentary or legislative body on earth of which I have knowledge in which the rules of procedure are thus privileged, and immune from readoption at the opening of each new parliament, or legislature, or congress.

No Member of this Senate—not a single one—has ever had a voice in the adoption of the full body of the rules of the Senate. No one of our Members has ever voted "Yea" or "Nay" as to whether this particular set of rules should be adopted by the Senate, to guide its procedures.

On Wednesday a number of new Members took their oaths, under the Constitution, to represent their States, the people of their States, and the general welfare of the Nation in the Senate of the United States. Those new Senators have taken their seats and have become Members of this august body. They have thus become equals among us, theoretically equal in voting privilege and other fundamental prerogative to every other Member of the Senate. Yet not one of them has had, or will have had, a voice in the adoption of the rules of the Senate. Each one of them will have been denied that voice and that authority, which were exercised by their distant predecessors who actually moved and adopted the rules of the Senate.

When these new Senators stood for election, did they ask their constituents to vote for them as Senators subject to the rules adopted by the Senate 150 years ago? No, Mr. President; they were elected by the people as full and equal Members of this body, entitled to the full authority of the representation of their constituencies.

The Constitution says, in article V, that—

> No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

Yet, Mr. President, many States here represented have had no voice, either recently or at any time in the past, in the adoption of the whole body of the rules of the Senate.

Those States were admitted to the Union subject to the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the United States; but nowhere do our Constitution or laws provide that they were admitted to the Union subject to the rules of the Senate. Yet, under prevailing practice, the many States admitted since the adoption of the rules of the Senate have been bound by the rules of the Senate without their consent or participation in the formulation of those rules. I submit that this is contrary to the spirit of the Constitution. I submit that we should, of right, adopt our rules at the opening of every new Congress, just as the House of Representatives does, and just as every other parliamentary body on earth does. For instance, that is true of the British House of Lords.

All of us know that at the end of a Congress everything the Senate has pending in the way of legislation comes to an end, and we must begin all over again. The committees cease to exist; the calendar is cleared.

On Wednesday we organized the Senate anew. We elected a new President pro tempore, a new Secretary, and a new Sergeant at Arms. Soon we shall elect new committee chairmen and new committees. We shall begin a new calendar and shall introduce new bills. We should also have adopted our rules anew.

Mr. President, in the early days of our country, when the membership of the Senate was small, and the men who composed the Senate were intimately familiar with each others' views, as the result of long association in the formation of our great Republic, the early Senates simply acquiesced in the adoption of rules at the opening of new Congresses. The same type of acquiescence was true in the House of Representatives for some 30 years, when the rules adopted contained provision that they were to carry over into subsequent Congresses.

In 1890, the House of Representatives realized the necessity for fundamental changes in its rules, in order to prevent the abuse of majority rule; and at the opening of the 51st Congress the House proceeded to abolish the carryover of House rules, and again to readopt its rules at the opening of each new Congress.

The only real difference between the House's experience and that of the Senate is that until today the Senate has continued to acquiesce in continuing its rules from one Congress to the next. It is my belief that we should follow the practice of the House.

Mr. President, I, personally, feel that a number of changes in the rules are eminently desirable.

I feel that rule XIX should be changed, so as to require a ruling from the Chair, before a Senator can be compelled to take his seat, under that rule.

I believe that rule XXXVII should be changed, so as to require a yea-and-nay vote on all treaties and international agreements coming before the Senate for concurrence.

I believe that rule XII should be similarly changed, so as to require a yea-and-nay vote on constitutional amendments adopted for submission to the States for ratification.

And above all, Mr. President, I feel that rule XXII should be changed—the presently ineffective and self-perpetuating cloture rule. I feel that paragraph 3 of that rule, which forbids cloture on any proposal to change any rule, is the most undemocratic—indeed the most antidemocratic—provision in any rule, regulation, or statute to be found in the United States.

Rule XXII should be appropriately amended, so as to make it conform to democratic practice.

Mr. President, I remember that 2 years ago when this motion was made, the then designated chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration promised to bring upon the floor an amendment to rule XXII. Such a proposal—not a satisfactory one, from my viewpoint—was reported from the Rules Committee, but it was never brought up for debate. I fear a similar development this year.

I assure you, however, Mr. President, that whatever I can do, as a Member of the Senate, to prevent a stalemate on rule XXII, will be done.

Cloture, Mr. President, must be included among the effective instruments of legislative action. There must always be assurance of adequate debate; but the unlimited filibuster must go.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on January 3, 1953, a motion was made in the Senate by the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Anderson, jointly with the Senator from New York, Mr. Lehman, who has just addressed the Senate; the senior Senator from New York, Mr. Ives; the late Senator Tobey, of New Hampshire; the Senators from Rhode Island, Mr. Green and Mr. Pastore; the then Senator from New Jersey, Mr. Hendrickson; the Senators from West Virginia,

Mr. Kilgore and Mr. Neely; the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. Duff; the Senators from Montana, Mr. Murray and Mr. Mansfield; the Senators from Washington, Mr. Magnuson and Mr. Jackson; the Senator from Illinois, Mr. Douglas, who is now present in the Chamber; the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy; the Senator from Oregon, Mr. Morse; the late Senator Hunt, of Wyoming; and myself.

The motion declared that "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings" in accordance with article I, section 5, of the Constitution, and provided that the Senate should take up for immediate consideration the adoption of rules for the Senate of the 83d Congress.

That motion was debated energetically and intelligently on January 6 and January 7. A motion was made on January 7 by the late distinguished Senator Taft, of Ohio, to table the motion of the Senator from New Mexico. The motion to table was agreed to by a vote of 70 to 21.

That debate during the early days of the 83d Congress was a historic debate. Those of us who participated in it did so with the conviction that the Senate of each new Congress had the right—and we believe it still has such right and should exercise it under article I, section 5—to establish its own rules of procedure. During the 83d Congress the Senate decided not to do so. Many of us who participated in that debate still believe that the Senate has the right and should exercise the right to establish its own rules.

I make this statement for the RECORD in order to make our position clear. It is not my intention, nor is it the intention of a number of my colleagues with whom I have discussed this question, to make a similar motion at this time. We do want the Senate to understand, however, and we do want the RECORD to note, that our convictions remain unchanged.

In view of the fact that the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 6 and 7, 1953, contain all the arguments that support our position, I shall not burden the Senate or the RECORD at this time with a repetition of those arguments.

In conclusion I desire to make one statement to the Senate. It is my sincere and honest conviction that the present rules of the Senate governing debate are not consistent with the requirements of orderly procedure in a democracy. A number of us will again move in an orderly manner to change those rules, and it is our hope that the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration will give our proposal fair and favorable consideration.

It is also my sincere and deep conviction that the United States Congress should enact new legislation in the area of human rights which will guarantee by law the dignity of every human being living in this great Nation. It is my intention to join with a number of my colleagues in introducing a series of specific legislative proposals to accomplish that objective. Those bills will be referred to the appropriate committees. We will seek hearings for those proposals and congressional action looking to their adoption.

I pray and hope that the 84th Congress will make progress toward achieving our objective. We have no pride of authorship. We have no set of priorities. Any step forward toward the goal of human dignity and opportunity for all Americans is a step we will enthusiastically and wholeheartedly support.

With this statement, Mr. President, I resume my seat.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by the able junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and the eminent junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

I desire to invite attention to a point which was referred to by the Senator from New York. I suppose there is no more permanent body in the world than the House of Lords in England, in which the members hold membership, not for a stated period of time, but for life, once they attain their majority. This is the permanent and continuing body par excellence; and yet, as the Senator from New York had pointed out, at each session the House of Lords proceeds to adopt anew the rules which will govern its procedure. I hardly think we can claim to be more royal than the King, or greater lords than the members of the British House of Peers.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, 2 years ago when I first became a Member of the United States Senate I listened—I believe it was on the occasion of the first debate in this Chamber on the subject—to the discussion of a motion which was made, by which the cloture rule of the Senate would have been changed.

When the time came for a vote on that motion I was one of a very few Members of the Senate who voted in favor of changing the rules with respect to unlimited debate. I believe my vote was in the public interest.

As I look back on my brief experience in the Senate, I can recall at least two occasions upon which a full-blown filibuster took place in the Senate. Members of the Senate were required to remain in attendance all day and all night, and all the next day, and all the next night, until the very health of some Members of the Senate was impaired. I think it was the ugliest spectacle I recall having witnessed as a Member of the United States Senate. It added particular weight to what I thought were impelling reasons for the Senate itself changing that portion of the rules. Indeed, the filibuster almost became the reason for killing a piece of legislation. in which the people of my State were vitally interested. I refer to the submerged lands legislation.

Of course, the filibuster was finally broken. If it had not been broken, Members of the Senate would never have had an opportunity to cast their votes either in favor of that piece of legislation or against it.

One comes to the United States Senate to stand up and be counted on issues. One comes here to vote either in favor of pending proposals or against them. Yet when a filibuster is resorted to, it means that Members of the Senate are precluded from an opportunity of standing up and being counted for or against proposed legislation.

So I wish to associate myself with my friends who have preceded me in this brief discussion today, and to say that I look forward to an opportunity to limit what seems to me to be the ugliest type of undemocratic procedure by which this great body attempts to conduct its business.

I wish to make passing comment upon a new recommendation which has been made by many of my seniors with respect to rules by which the procedures of Senate committees should be conducted. In that regard I am most happy that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] has permitted me to become a cosponsor with him of a series of suggested amendments to the rules of the Senate, by which committee proceedings would be required to follow a definite pattern, which would enable committees to approach a little nearer to the dignity and decorum of courts of law, and would afford some guaranty that the rights of individuals would be protected.

I hope, therefore, that the Senate, in an American fashion, not in a partisan fashion, will, before too long, lay down rules and guide lines by which, in these modern days, modern business can be conducted along modern legislative lines.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to commend the junior Senator from California for the vote he cast when the original proposal for cloture was voted on in the Senate. It was a courageous vote, and it commended the junior Senator from California to me.

However, I should like to refer to the statement he made in which he implied that the extended discussion on the offshore oil giveaway was a filibuster. It was not a filibuster. It was an extended discussion, intended to educate, not only the Members of the Senate, but the people of the country at large. We were always ready, at the appropriate time, to have the Senate vote on the issue. The purpose of a filibuster is to prevent a vote. We wished to have extended discussion. However, we were quite willing that, at the end of that extended discussion, the Senate should vote on the issue. Indeed, we wanted a vote taken on the question before the Senate.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, first let me say that I acquit my good friend and able colleague from Illinois of any desire to participate in a filibuster 2 years ago. However, I cannot acquit some of my other colleagues in the Senate who participated in that debate, because it is my distinct recollection that some of them stated during the debate that their purpose was not to inform the public but to prevent a vote from being taken on the issue then pending.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I merely wish to say to my good friend from California that I occupied the floor during that extended debate perhaps as long as any other Senator occupied it. Certainly it was not my intention to participate in a filibuster.

However, I believe that the debate to which the Senator from California refers is the debate on the atomic energy bill of last year. I did not take part in that debate for reasons of health, al-

though I voted with Senators who had subjected the bill to an extended examination on the floor of the Senate.

I realize that the dividing line between what is extended debate and what is a filibuster is a shadowy one, and it is a very difficult one to draw in individual instances. I do say, however, in behalf of those Senators who believe as I do, that it has never been our intention to so prolong any discussion as to prevent a vote.

Occasionally Members of the Senate are not thoroughly advised as to the nature of certain bills under consideration, and it is also true that the public is not always thoroughly advised with respect to such bills. Therefore a thorough discussion of the issues is essential in the interest of democratic government.

It is true that last year one Member of the Senate did say that he was engaged in a filibuster. I believe it was an inadvertent statement on his part, made during the course of an impromptu and extemporaneous speech, which did not represent the real conviction of the Senator who made it. Certainly that statement did not represent the convictions of those of us who entertained ideas similar to his on the matter under discussion.

I apologize for speaking at such great length on this subject, but it is very important that the RECORD be kept straight. I could not sit idly by and permit my good friend from California to imply that those of us who opposed the offshore oil giveaway and the atomic energy bill were trying to prevent a vote. We were trying to educate the public on monstrous proposals to give away public rights.

Mr. KUCHEL. All I wish to add is that the RECORD speaks for itself. When one Senator concedes on the floor of the Senate that he is participating in a filibuster, I believe some of us may be pardoned for believing that that is his desire.

I may also say to my very good friend from Illinois that some Senators who spoke during the off-shore oil debate told me—and I assume that they were speaking their minds—that there was not going to be a vote in the Senate on that bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I suggest to the Senator from California that if he will look at the record of the debate on the offshore oil bill, and also on the atomic energy bill, he will find that not once, but a great many times, we made it clear that we had no intention of blocking a vote on those bills, but would join in urging that a vote be had on both issues after there had been a reasonable debate. We never claimed—with one exception—that there was a filibuster in progress.

I believe the Senator from California will recall that I made the suggestion to his colleague, who was then the majority leader, that we lay aside the consideration of the atomic energy bill and take up the question of changing the cloture rule.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am sure the Senator from New York will concede that there were other Members of the Senate who indicated, whether in good faith or in jest I do not know, that we would not have an opportunity to vote.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not recall any Senator making the suggestion that we were not willing to have a vote within a reasonable time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 10, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 6, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, as we daily assemble in this Chamber to legislate for the highest welfare of our beloved country, may our thoughts and desires, our deliberations and decisions, always be in harmony with Thy holy will and Thy divine plans and purposes.

Inspire us with a clear perception of those moral and spiritual laws and principles which Thou hast ordained as the only sure foundation on which to build a nation with an expanding character and influence and an enduring civilization.

Grant that we may be men and women in whom our fellow men and all mankind can repose the utmost confidence and who are walking worthy of the high vocation with which we have been entrusted.

May our President, our Speaker, and all our chosen representatives be blessed with wisdom and understanding, with faith and fortitude, as they strive to hasten the dawning of that glorious day when there shall be peace on earth and good will among men.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution fixing the hour of assembly of the two Houses of Congress to receive communications from the President.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1 TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER of the House presided.

The Doorkeeper announced the Vice President and the Members of the United States Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MCCORMACK; the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. COOPER; and the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MARTIN.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate, the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort the Senator from Texas, Mr. JOHNSON; the Senator from Georgia, Mr. GEORGE; and the Senator from California, Mr. KNOWLAND.

The Doorkeeper announced the ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the high privilege and the great honor of presenting to you the President of the United States. [Applause, the Members rising.]

THE STATE OF THE UNION—ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 1)

The PRESIDENT. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, my friends, first, I do most sincerely thank you from the bottom of my heart for the cordiality of your welcome, and I extend cordial greetings to the 84th Congress. We shall have much to do together; I am sure that we shall

get it done, and that we shall do it in harmony and good will. And here I am certain you will permit me this morning a personal allusion. The district where I was born has been represented in this Congress for more years than he cares to remember, I suppose, by our distinguished Speaker. Today is his birthday and I want to join with the rest of you in felicitating him and in wishing him many happy returns of the day. [Applause, the Members rising.]

Now, ladies and gentlemen, at the outset, I believe it would be well to remind ourselves of this great fundamental of our national life: our common belief that every human being is divinely endowed with dignity and with worth and inalienable rights. This faith, with its corollary—that to grow and flourish people must be free—shapes the interests and the aspirations of every American.

From this deep faith have evolved three main purposes of our Federal Government:

First, to maintain justice and freedom among ourselves and to champion them for others so that we may work effectively for enduring peace;

Second, to help keep our economy vigorous and expanding, thus sustaining our international strength and assuring better jobs, better living, better opportunities for every citizen;

And third, to concern ourselves with the human problems of our people so that every American may have the opportunity to lead a healthy, productive, and rewarding life.

It is under these three headings that I shall present to you today, ladies and gentlemen, the thoughts that I believe appropriate to this occasion.

Now, foremost among these broad purposes of government is our support of freedom, justice, peace.

It is of the utmost importance, then, that each of us understand the true nature of the world struggle now taking place.

It is not a struggle merely of economic theories, or of forms of government, or of military power. The issue is the true nature of man. Either man is the creature whom the Psalmist described as "a little lower than the angels," crowned with glory and honor, holding "dominion over the works" of his Creator; or, man is a soulless, animated machine to be enslaved, used and consumed by the state for its own glorification.

It is, therefore, a struggle which goes to the roots of the human spirit, and its shadow falls across the long sweep of man's destiny. This prize, so precious, so fraught with ultimate meaning, is the true object of the contending forces in the world.

In the past year there has been progress justifying hope for the ultimate rule of freedom and justice in the world. Free nations are collectively stronger than at any time in recent years.

Just as nations of this hemisphere, in the historic Caracas and Rio conferences, have closed ranks against imperialistic communism and strengthened their economic ties, so free nations elsewhere have forged new bonds of unity.

Recent agreements between Turkey and Pakistan have laid a foundation for increased strength in the Middle East. With our understanding support, Egypt and Britain, Yugoslavia and Italy, Britain and Iran have resolved dangerous differences. The security of the Mediterranean has been enhanced by an alliance among Greece, Turkey, and Yugoslavia. Agreements in Western Europe have paved the way for unity to replace past divisions which have undermined Europe's economic and military vitality. The defense of the West appears likely at last to include a free, democratic Germany participating as an equal in the councils of NATO.

In Asia and the Pacific, the pending Manila Pact supplements our treaties with Australia, New Zealand, the Phillippines, Korea, and Japan, and our prospective treaty with the Republic of China. These pacts stand as solemn warning that future military aggression and subversion against the free nations of Asia will meet united response. The Pacific Charter also, adopted at Manila, is a milestone in the development of human freedom and self-government in the Pacific area.

Under the auspices of the United Nations, there is promise of progress in our country's plan for the peaceful use of atomic energy.

Finally, today the world is at peace. It is, to be sure, an insecure peace. Yet all humanity finds hope in the simple fact that for an appreciable time there has been no active battlefield on earth. This same fact inspires us to work all the more effectively with other nations for the well-being, the freedom, the dignity, of every human on earth. In the ultimate achievement of this great purpose lies the only sure promise of security and permanent peace for any nation, including our own.

These developments are heartening. But sobering problems remain.

The massive military machines and ambitions of the Soviet-Communist bloc still create uneasiness in the world. All of us are aware of the continuing reliance of the Soviet Communists on military force, of the power of their weapons, of their present resistance to realistic armament limitation, and of their continuing effort to dominate or intimidate free nations on their periphery. Their steadily growing power includes an increasing strength in nuclear weapons. This power combined with the proclaimed intentions of the Communist leaders to communize the world, is the threat confronting us today.

To protect our nations and our peoples from the catastrophe of a nuclear holocaust, free nations must maintain countervailing military power to persuade the Communists of the futility of seeking to advance their ends through aggression. If Communist rulers understand that America's response to aggression will be swift and decisive—that never shall we buy peace at the expense of honor or faith—they will be powerfully deterred from launching a military venture engulfing their own peoples and many others in disaster. Now this, of course, is a form of world stalemate. But in this stalemate each of us—every American—may and must exercise his high duty to strive in every honorable way for enduring peace.

The military threat is but one menace to our freedom and security. We must not only deter aggression; we must also frustrate the effort of Communists to gain their goals by subversion. To this end, free nations must maintain and reinforce their cohesion, their internal security, their political and economic vitality, and their faith in freedom.

In such a world, America's course is clear:

We must strengthen the collective defense under the United Nations Charter and gird ourselves with sufficient military strength and productive capacity to discourage resort to war and protect our Nation's vital interests.

We must continue to support and strengthen the United Nations. At this moment, by vote of the United Nations General Assembly its Secretary General is in Communist China on a mission of deepest concern to all Americans: seeking the release of our never-to-be-forgotten American aviators and all other United Nations prisoners wrongfully detained by the Communist regime.

We must also encourage the efforts being made in the United Nations to limit armaments and to harness the atom to peaceful use.

We must expand international trade and investment and assist friendly nations whose own best efforts are still insufficient to provide the strength essential to the security of the free world.

We must be willing to use the processes of negotiation whenever they will advance the cause of just and secure peace.

In respect to all these matters, we must, through a vigorous information program, keep the peoples of the world truthfully advised of our actions and purposes. This problem has been attacked with new vigor during the past months. I urge that the Congress give its earnest attention to the great advantages that can accrue to our country through the successful and expanded operations of this information program.

We must carry forward our educational exchange program.

Now, to advance these many efforts, the Congress must act in this session on appropriations, legislation, and treaties. Today I shall mention especially our foreign economic and military programs.

The recent economic progress in many free nations has been heartening. The productivity of labor and the production of goods and services are increasing in ever-widening areas. There is a growing will to improve the living standards of all men. This progress is important to all our people. It promises us allies who are strong and self-reliant; it promises a growing world market for the products of our mines, our factories, our farms.

But only through steady effort can we continue this program. Barriers still impede trade and the flow of capital needed to develop each nation's human and material resources. Wise reduction of these barriers is a long-term objective of our foreign economic policy—a policy of an evolutionary and selective nature, assuring broad benefits to our own and to other peoples.

We must gradually reduce certain tariff obstacles to trade. These actions should, of course, be accompanied by a similar lowering of trade barriers by other nations, so that we may move steadily together toward economic advantage for all. We must further simplify our customs procedures. We must facilitate the flow of capital and continue technical assistance, both directly and through the United Nations. This must go to less developed countries to strengthen their independence and raise their living standards. Many another step must be taken in the free world to release forces of private initiative.

On January 10, by special message, I shall submit specific recommendations for carrying forward the legislative phases of our foreign economic policy.

Our many efforts to build a better world include the maintenance of our military strength. This is a vast undertaking. Over 4 million Americans—servicemen and civilians—are on the rolls of the Defense Establishment. During the past 2 years, by attacking duplication and overstaffing, by improved procurement and inventory controls, by concentrating on the essentials, many billions of dollars have been saved in our defense activities. I should like to mention certain fundamentals underlying this vast program.

First, I repeat that a realistic limitation of armaments and an enduring, just peace remain our national goals; we maintain powerful military forces because there is no present alternative—they are forces designed for deterrent and defensive purposes, able instantly to strike back with destructive power in response to any attack.

Second, we must stay alert to the fact that undue reliance on one weapon or preparation for only one kind of warfare simply invites an enemy to resort to another. We must, therefore, keep in our Armed Forces balance and flexibility adequate to our needs.

Third, to keep our Armed Forces abreast of the advances of science, our military planning must be flexible enough to utilize the new weapons and techniques which flow ever more speedily from our research and development programs. The forthcoming military budget therefore emphasizes modern airpower in the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps and increases the emphasis on new weapons, especially those of rapid and destructive striking power.

It seeks continuous modernization of our Army. It accelerates the continental defense program and the build-up of military reserve forces. It continues a vigorous program of stockpiling strategic materials and strengthening our mobilization base. It provides for reduction of forces in certain categories and their expansion in others, to fit them to the military realities of our time. These emphases in our defense planning have been made at my personal direction after long and thoughtful—even prayerful—study. In my judgment, they will give our Nation a defense accurately adjusted to the national need.

Fourth, pending a world agreement on armament limitation, we must continue to expand our supplies of nuclear weapons for our land, naval, and air forces. We shall continue our encouraging progress, at the same time, in the peaceful use of atomic power.

Fifth, in the administration of these costly programs, we demand the utmost efficiency. We must assure our people not only of adequate protection but also of a defense that can and will be resolutely carried forward from year to year until the threat of aggression has disappeared.

To help maintain this kind of armed strength and to improve its efficiency, I urge the enactment of several important measures.

The first concerns the Selective Service Act which expires next June 30. For the foreseeable future, our standing forces must remain much larger than voluntary methods can sustain. We must, therefore, extend the statutory authority to induct men for 2 years of military service.

The second kind of measure concerns the rapid turnover of our most experienced servicemen. This process seriously weakens the combat readiness of our Armed Forces and is unnecessary and extravagantly expensive. To encourage more trained servicemen to remain in uniform, I shall, on the 13th of this month, propose a number of measures to increase the attractions of a military career. These measures will include more adequate medical care for dependents, survivors' benefits, more and better housing, and selective adjustments in military pay and other allowances.

And, third, I shall present a program to rebuild and strengthen the civilian components of our Armed Forces. Because it will go far in assuring fair and equitable participation in military service, it is of particular importance to our combat veterans. In keeping with our historic military policy, the program is designed to build civilian reserves capable of effective military service in an emergency in lieu of maintaining active forces in excess of the Nation's immediate need.

Through this program the individual will be able to discharge one of his obligations to the Nation; equally, the Nation will be able to discharge one of its obligations to a potential future serviceman: namely, to give him the greatest possible chance of survival in time of war.

An effective defense requires continuance of our aggressive attack on subversion at home. In this effort we have, in the past 2 years, made real progress. FBI investigations have been reinforced by a new Internal Security Division in the Department of Justice; the security activities of the Immigration and Naturalization Service have been revitalized; an improved security system is in effect throughout the Government; the Department of Justice and the FBI have been armed with new legal weapons forged by the 83d Congress.

We shall continue to ferret out and to destroy Communist subversion.

We shall, in the process, carefully preserve our traditions and the basic rights of every American citizen.

Our civil-defense program is also a key element in the protection of our country. We are developing cooperative methods with State governors, mayors, and voluntary citizen groups in building the civil defense. The significance of this organization in time of war is obvious; its swift assistance in disaster areas last year proved its importance in time of peace.

An industry capable of rapid expansion and essential materials and facilities available in time of emergency are indispensable. I urge, therefore, a 2-year extension of the Defense Production Act and title II of the First War Powers Act of 1941. These are cornerstones of our program for the development of an adequate mobilization base.

At this point, I should like to make this additional observation.

Our quest for peace and freedom necessarily presumes that we who hold positions of public trust must rise above self and section—that we must subordinate to the general good our partisan, and our personal pride and prejudice. Tirelessly, with united purpose, we must fortify the material and spiritual foundations of this land of freedom. As never before, there is need for unhesitating cooperation among the branches of our Government.

At this time the executive and legislative branches are under the management of different political parties. This fact places both parties on trial before the American people.

In less perilous days of the past, division of governmental responsibility among our great parties has at times produced indecision approaching futility. We must not let this happen in our time. We must avoid a paralysis of the will for peace and international security.

Now in the traditionally bipartisan areas—military security and foreign relations—I can report to you that I have already, with the present leaders of this Congress, exchanged assurances of unreserved cooperation. Yet, the security of our country requires more than maintenance of military strength and success in foreign affairs; these vital matters are in turn dependent upon concerted and vigorous action in a number of supporting programs.

I say, therefore, to the 84th Congress:

In all areas basic to the strength of America, there will be—to the extent I can insure them—cooperative, constructive relations between the executive and legislative branches of this Government. Let the general good be our yardstick on every great issue of our time. In that pledge I should include, also, the similar pledge of every head of department or independent agency in this Government.

Our efforts to defend our freedom and to secure a just peace are, of course, inseparable from the second great purpose of our Government: to help maintain a strong, growing economy—an economy vigorous and free, in which there are ever-increasing opportunities, just rewards for effort, and a stable prosperity that is widely shared.

In the past 2 years, many important governmental actions helped our economy adjust to conditions of peace. Controls were removed from wages, prices,

and materials. Tax revisions encouraged increased private spending and employment. Federal expenditures were sharply reduced, making possible a record tax cut. These actions, together with flexible monetary and debt management policies, helped to halt inflation and stabilize the value of the dollar. A program of partnership in resource development was begun. Social security and unemployment insurance laws were broadened. New laws started the process of balancing farm production with farm markets. Shipbuilding and stockpiling programs strengthened key sectors of the economy while improving our mobilization base. A new housing law brought impressive progress in an area fundamental to our economic strength and closed loopholes in the old law that permitted dishonest manipulation. Many of these programs are just beginning to exert their stimulating effect upon the whole economy and upon specific communities and industries throughout the country.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-four was one of the most prosperous years in our history. Business activity surges with new strength. Production is rising. Employment is high. Toward the end of last year average weekly wages in manufacturing were higher than ever before. Personal income after taxes is at a record level. So is consumer spending. Construction activity is reaching new peaks. Export demand for our goods is strong. State and local government expenditures on public works are rising. Savings are high, and credit is readily available.

So, today, the transition to a peacetime economy is largely behind us.

The economic outlook is good.

Now the many promising factors I have mentioned do not guarantee sustained economic expansion; but they do give us a strong position from which to carry forward our economic growth. If we, as a people, act wisely, our annual national output can rise within a decade from its present level of about $360 billion to $500 billion, measured in dollars of stable buying power.

The budget message of January 17, the economic report on the 20th of the month, and several special messages will set forth in detail programs to foster the growth of our economy and to protect the integrity of the people's money. Today I discuss these only in general terms.

Government efficiency and economy remain essential to progress toward a balanced budget. More than $10 billion were cut from the spending program first proposed in the budget of January 9, 1953. So expenditures of that year were six and a half billions below those of the previous year. In the current fiscal year Government spending will be nearly four and a half billion dollars less than in the fiscal year ending last June 30. New spending authority has been held below expenditures, reducing, thus, Government obligations accumulated over the years.

Last year we had a large tax cut and, for the first time in 75 years, a basic revision of tax laws. It is now clear that defense and other essential Government costs must remain at a level precluding further tax reductions this year. Although excise and corporation income taxes must, therefore, be continued at their present rates, further tax cuts will be possible when justified by lower expenditures and by revenue increases arising from the Nation's economic growth. I am hopeful that such reductions can be made next year.

At the foundation of our economic growth are the raw materials and energy produced from our minerals and fuels, lands and forests, and water resources. With respect to them, I believe that the Nation must adhere to three fundamental policies: First, to develop, wisely use, and to conserve basic resources from generation to generation; second, to follow the historic pattern of developing these resources primarily by private citizens under fair provisions of law, including restraints for proper conservation; and, third, to treat resource development as a partnership undertaking—a partnership in which the participation of private citizens and State and local governments is as necessary as is Federal participation.

This policy has encouraged local public bodies and private citizens to plan their own power sources. Increasing numbers of applications to the Federal Power Commission to conduct surveys and prepare plans for power development are evidence of local response.

The Federal Government and local and private organizations have been encouraged to coordinate their developments. This is important because Federal hydroelectric developments supply but a very small fraction of the Nation's power needs. Such partnership projects as Priest Rapids in Washington, the Coosa River development in Alabama, the Markham Ferry in Oklahoma already have the approval of this Congress. This year justifiable projects of a similar nature will again have administration support.

Now, of course, the Federal Government must shoulder its own partnership obligations by undertaking projects of such complexity and size that their success requires Federal development. In keeping with this principle, I again urge the Congress to approve the development of the Upper Colorado River Basin to conserve and assure better use of precious water essential to the future of the West.

In addition, the 1956 budget will recommend appropriations to start 6 new reclamation projects and more than 30 new Corps of Engineers' projects of varying size. Going projects and investigations of potential new resource developments will be, of course, continued.

A great need in this broad field is a nationwide comprehensive water-resources policy firmly based in law. Such a policy is under preparation and, when completed, will be submitted to the Congress for its consideration.

Continued vigilance will be maintained over our fisheries, wildlife resources, the national parks and forests, and the public lands; and we shall continue to encourage an orderly development of the Nation's mineral resources.

A modern highway system is essential to meet the needs of our growing population, our expanding economy, and our national security. We are accelerating our highway improvement program under existing State and Federal laws and authorizations. But, this effort will not, in itself, assure our people of an adequate system. This problem has been carefully considered by the Conference of State Governors and by a special advisory committee on a national highway program, composed of leading private citizens. I have received the recommendations of the Governors' Conference, and will shortly receive the views of the special committee. Aided by their findings, I plan to submit on January 27 recommendations which will meet our most pressing national highway needs.

In further recognition of the importance of transportation to our economic strength and security, the administration, through a Cabinet committee, is thoroughly examining existing Federal transportation policies to determine their effect on the adequacy of transportation services. This is the first such comprehensive review ever undertaken directly by the executive branch of the Government in modern times. We are not only examining major problems facing the various modes of transport; we are also studying closely the interrelationships of civilian and Government requirements for transportation. Legislation will be recommended to correct such policy deficiencies as we find.

The Nation's public works activities are tremendous in scope. It is estimated that more than $12 billion will be expended in 1955 for the development of land, water, and other resources; control of floods and navigation and harbor improvements; construction of roads, schools, and municipal water supplies, and disposal of domestic and industrial wastes. Many of the Federal, State, and local agencies responsible for this work are highly efficient. But public works activities are closely interrelated and have a substantial influence on the growth of the country. Moreover, in times of threatening economic contraction, they may become a valuable sustaining force. Efficient planning and execution of the Nation's public works require the coordination of Federal activities and effective cooperation with State and local governments.

The Council of Economic Advisers, through its public works planning section, has made important advances during the past year in effecting this coordination and cooperation. To give more emphasis and continuity to this essential coordination, I shall request the Congress to appropriate funds for the support of an Office of Coordinator of Public Works in the Executive Office of the President.

Now a most significant element in our growing economy is an agriculture that is stable, prosperous, and free. The problems of our agriculture have evolved over many years and cannot be solved overnight; nevertheless, governmental actions last year hold great promise of fostering a better balance between production and markets and, consequently,

a better and more stable income for farmers.

Through vigorous administration and new authority provided by the 83d Congress, surplus farm products are now moving into consumption. From February 1953 through November 1954, the rate of increase in Government-held surpluses has been greatly reduced by our moving into use more than 2 billion 300 million dollars' worth of Government-owned farm commodities. Domestic consumption remains high, and farm exports will be higher than last year. As a result of the flexibility provided by the Agricultural Act of 1954, we can move toward less restrictive acreage controls.

Thus, farm production is gradually adjusting to markets, markets are being expanded, and stocks are moving into use. We can now look forward to an easing of the influences depressing farm prices, to reduced Government expenditures for purchase of surplus products, and to less Federal intrusion into the lives and plans of our farm people. Agricultural programs have been redirected toward better balance, greater stability, and sustained prosperity. We are headed in the right direction. I urgently recommend to the Congress that we continue resolutely on this road.

Greater attention must be directed to the needs of low-income farm families. Twenty-eight percent of our farm operator families have net cash incomes of less than $1,000 per year. I shall later submit recommendations designed to assure the steady alleviation of their most pressing concerns.

Because drought also remains a serious agricultural problem, I shall recommend legislation to strengthen Federal disaster assistance programs. This legislation will seek an improved appraisal of need, better adjustment of the various programs to local conditions, and a more equitable sharing of costs between the States and the Federal Government

The prosperity of our small business enterprises is an indispensable element in the maintenance of our economic strength. Creation of the Small Business Administration and tax laws facilitating small-business expansion are but two of the many steps this Government has taken to encourage smaller enterprises. I recommend that Congress extend the Small Business Act of 1953 now due to expire next June.

We come now to the third great purpose of our Government—its concern for the health, productivity, and well-being of all our people.

Every citizen wants to give full expression to his God-given talents and abilities and to have the recognition and respect accorded under our great traditions. Americans want a good, material standard of living—not simply to accumulate possessions, but to fulfill a legitimate aspiration for an environment in which their families may live meaningful and happy lives. Our people are committed, therefore, to the creation and preservation of opportunity for every citizen, opportunity to lead a more rewarding life. They are equally committed to the alleviations of unavoidable misfortune and distress among their fellow citizens.

The aspirations of most of our people can best be fulfilled through their own enterprise and initiative, without Government interference. This administration, therefore, follows two simple rules: First, the Federal Government should perform an essential task in this field only when it cannot otherwise be adequately performed; and second, in performing that task, our Government must not impair the self-respect, the freedom and the incentive of the individual. So long as these two rules are observed, the Government can and must fully meet its obligations without creating a dependent population or a domineering bureaucracy.

During the past 2 years, notable advances were made in these functions of Government. Protection of old age and survivors' insurance was extended to an additional 10 million of our people by action of Congress. Legislation was enacted to provide unemployment insurance protection to some 4 million additional Americans. Stabilization of living costs and the halting of inflation protected the value of pensions and savings. A broad program now helps to bring good homes within the reach of the great majority of our people. With the States, we are providing more clinics, hospitals, and nursing homes for patients with chronic illnesses. Also with the States, we have begun a fruitful expansion in the restoration of disabled persons to employment and to useful lives. In the areas of Federal responsibility, we have made historic progress in eliminating from among our people demeaning practices based on race or color.

All of us may be proud of these achievements during the past 2 years. Yet essential Federal tasks remain to be done.

As part of our efforts to provide decent, safe, and sanitary housing for low-income families, we must carry forward the housing program authorized during the past Congress. We must also authorize contracts for a firm program of 35,000 additional public housing units in each of the next 2 fiscal years. This program will meet the most pressing obligations of the Federal Government into the 1958 fiscal year for planning and building public housing. By that time the private building industry, aided by the Housing Act of 1954, will have had the opportunity to assume its full role in providing adequate housing for low-income families.

The health of our people is one of our most precious assets. Knowledge available to combat disease and disability should be fully used. Otherwise we as a people are guilty not only of neglect of human suffering but also of wasting our national strength.

Advances in medical care are not available to enough of our citizens. Our Nation must do more to reduce the impact of accident and disease. Two fundamental problems confront us: First, high and ever-rising costs of health services; second, serious gaps and shortages in those services.

By special message on January 24 I shall propose a coordinated program to strengthen and improve existing health services. This program will continue to reject socialized medicine. It will emphasize individual and local responsibility. Under it, the Federal Government will neither dominate nor direct, but it will serve as a helpful partner.

The recommendations will include a Federal health reinsurance service to encourage the development of better voluntary health insurance coverage by private organizations. I shall recommend measures to improve the medical care of that group of our citizens who, because of need, receive Federal-State public assistance.

To reduce the gaps in medical services I shall propose:

New measures to facilitate construction of needed health facilities and help reduce shortages of trained health personnel;

Vigorous steps to combat the misery and national loss involved in mental illness;

Improved services for crippled children and for maternal and child health;

Better consumer protection under our existing pure food and drug laws; and finally,

Strengthened programs to combat the increasingly serious pollution of our rivers and streams and the growing problems of air pollution.

Last year's expansion of social-security coverage and the new program of improved medical care for public-assistance recipients together suggest modification of the formula for Federal sharing in old-age-assistance payments. I recommend modification of the formula where such payments will in the future supplement benefits received under the old-age and survivors insurance system.

It is the right of every American, from childhood on, to have access to knowledge. In our form of society, this right of the individual takes on a special meaning, for the education of all our citizens is therefore imperative to the maintenance and invigoration of America's free institutions.

Today we face grave educational problems. Up-to-date analyses of these problems and their solutions are being carried forward through the individual State conferences, and the White House conferences to be completed this year.

However, such factors as population growth, additional responsibilities of schools, and increased and longer school attendance have produced an unprecedented classroom shortage. This shortage is of immediate concern to all our people. Affirmative action must be taken now.

Without impairing in any way the responsibilities of our States, our localities, communities, or families, the Federal Government should serve as an effective agent in dealing with this problem. I shall forward a special message to the Congress on February 15, presenting a program dealing with this shortage.

To help the States do a better job, we must strengthen their resources for preventing and dealing with juvenile delinquency. I shall propose Federal legislation to assist the States in dealing with this nationwide problem. We shall carry forward the vigorous efforts of the administration to improve the international control of traffic in narcotics and, in cooperation with State and local agencies, to combat narcotic addiction in our own country.

I should like to speak to you now of additional matters of importance to all our people, and especially to our wage earners.

During the past year certain industrial changes and the readjustment of the economy to conditions of peace brought unemployment and other difficulties to various localities and industries. These problems are engaging our most earnest attention. But for the overwhelming majority of our working people, the past year has meant good jobs. Moreover, the earnings and savings of our wage earners are no longer depreciating in value. Because of cooperative relationships between labor and management, fewer working days were lost through strikes in 1954 than in any year in the past decade.

The outlook for our wage earners can be made still more promising by several legislative actions.

First, in the past 5 years we have had economic growth which will support an increase in the Federal minimum wage. In the light of present economic conditions, I recommend its increase to 90 cents an hour. I also recommend that many others, at present excluded, be given the protection of a minimum wage.

Second, I renew my recommendation of last year for amendment of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 to further the basic objectives of that statute. I especially call to the attention of the Congress amendments dealing with the right of economic strikers to vote in representation elections and the need for equalizing the obligation under the act to file disclaimers of Communist affiliation.

Third, the administration will propose other important measures, including occupational safety, workmen's compensation for longshoremen and harbor workers, and the 8-hour laws applicable to Federal contractors. Legislation will also be proposed respecting nonoccupational disability insurance and unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia.

On January 11 I shall propose a pay adjustment plan for civilian employees outside the postal field service to correct inequities and increase individual pay rates. I shall also recommend voluntary health insurance on a contributory basis for Federal employees and their dependents. In keeping with the Group Life Insurance Act passed in the 83d Congress, this protection should be provided on the group insurance principle and purchased from private facilities. Also on January 11, I shall recommend a modern pay plan, including pay increases, for postal field employees. As part of this program, and to carry forward our progress toward elimination of the large annual postal deficit, I shall renew my request for an increase in postal rates. Again I urge that in the future the fixing of rates be delegated to an impartial, independent body.

Needed improvements in survivor, disability, and retirement benefits for Federal personnel have been extensively considered by an appropriate committee. The committee's proposals would strengthen and improve benefits for our career people in government. I endorse their broad objectives. Full contributory coverage under old-age and survivors' insurance should be made available to all Federal personnel, just as in private industry. For career military personnel, the protection of the old-age and survivors' insurance system would be an important and long-needed addition, especially to their present unequal and inadequate survivorship protection. The military retirement pay system should remain separate and unchanged. Certain adjustments in the present civilian personnel retirement systems will be needed. However, these systems also are a basic part of a total compensation and should be separately and independently retained.

I also urge the Congress to approve a long overdue increase in the salaries of Members of Congress and of the Federal judiciary. In my opinion, this raise should be substantial because I believe it should be to a level commensurate with their heavy responsibilities.

Our concern for the individual in our country requires that we consider several additional problems.

We must continue the program to help our Indian citizens improve their lot and make their full contribution to national life.

Two years ago I advised the Congress of injustices under existing immigration laws. Through humane administration, the Department of Justice is doing what it legally can to alleviate hardships. Clearance of aliens before arrival has been initiated, and except for criminal offenders, the imprisonment of aliens awaiting admission or deportation has been stopped. Certain provisions of law, however, have the effect of compelling action in respect to aliens which are inequitable in some instances and discriminatory in others. These provisions should be corrected in this session of the Congress.

As the complex problems of Alaska are resolved, that Territory should be expected to achieve statehood. In the meantime, there is no justification for deferring the admission to statehood of Hawaii. I again urge approval of this measure.

We have three splendid opportunities to demonstrate the strength of our belief in the right of suffrage. First, I again urge that a constitutional amendment be submitted to the States to reduce the voting age for Federal elections. Second, I renew my request that the principle of self-government be extended and the right of suffrage granted to the citizens of the District of Columbia. Third, I again recommend that we work with the States to preserve the voting rights of citizens in the Nation's service overseas.

In our determination to keep faith with those who in the past have met the highest call of citizenship, we now have under study the system of benefits for veterans and for surviving dependents of deceased veterans and servicemen. Studies will be undertaken to determine the need for measures to ease the readjustment to civilian life of men required to enter the Armed Forces for 2 years of service.

In the advancement of the various activities which will make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities. I shall recommend the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to advise the Federal Government on ways to encourage artistic and cultural endeavor and appreciation. I shall also propose that awards of merit be established whereby we can honor our fellow citizens who make great contributions to the advancement of our civilization and of this country.

Every citizen rightly expects efficient and economical administration of these many governmental programs I have outlined today. I strongly recommend extension of the Reorganization Act and the law establishing the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, both of which expire this spring. Thus, the Congress will assure continuation of the excellent progress recently made in improving Government organization and administration. In this connection, we are looking forward with great interest to the reports which will soon be going to the Congress from the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. I am sure that these studies, made under the chairmanship of former President Herbert Hoover with the assistance of more than 200 distinguished citizens, will be of great value in paving the way toward more efficiency and economy in the Government.

And now I return to the point at which I began—the faith of our people.

The many programs here summarized are, I believe, in full keeping with their needs, interests, and aspirations. The obligations upon us are clear:

To labor earnestly, patiently, prayerfully for peace, for freedom, for justice throughout the world;

To keep our economy vigorous and free, that our people may lead fuller, happier lives;

To advance, not merely by our words but by our acts, the determination of our Government that every citizen shall have opportunity to develop to his fullest capacity.

As we do these things, before us is a future filled with opportunity and with hope. That future will be ours if, in our time, we keep alive the patience, the courage, the confidence in tomorrow, the deep faith of the millions who, in years past, made and preserved us this Nation.

A decade ago, in the death and desolation of European battlefields, I saw the courage and resolution, I felt the inspira-

tion of American youth. In these young men I felt America's buoyant confidence and irresistible will to do. In them I saw, too, a devout America, humble before God.

And so, I know in my heart—and I believe that all Americans know—that, despite the anxieties of this divided world, our faith and the cause in which we all believe will surely prevail.

And now, my friends, my apologies for the length of this address, and thank you for your great courtesy. [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 1 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m., the President, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargé D'Affaires of foreign governments.

The members of the President's Cabinet.

JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses now dissolved.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF UNITED STATES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and of course I shall not object, I wonder if the majority leader can give us any information as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is nothing that I can tell the gentleman at this time and so far as the transaction of business on the floor of the House is concerned, I do not anticipate any legislation for next week.

Mr. HALLECK. I was quite sure that that would be the situation, but I was simply inquiring for the benefit of the Members.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, there is the matter of the organizing of committees.

Mr. HALLECK. Yes, I thoroughly understand that under the normal circumstances, nothing would be expected next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

ACCEPTANCE OF OATH OF OFFICE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with your designation of me, pursuant to House Resolution 12, 84th Congress, adopted by the House of Representatives, to administer the oath of office to Representative-Elect LAWRENCE H. SMITH, of the First District of Wisconsin, I have the honor to report that Wednesday, January 5, 1955, at Washington, D. C., I administered the oath of office to Mr. SMITH, form prescribed by section 1757 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, being the form of oath administered to Members of the House of Representatives, to which Mr. SMITH subscribed.

Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 69) and asked for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas LAWRENCE H. SMITH, a Representative from the State of Wisconsin, from the First District thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of this House, but has sworn to and subscribed to the oath of office before the Honorable JOHN W. BYRNES, authorized by resolution of this House to administer the oath, and the said oath of office has been presented in his behalf to the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said LAWRENCE H. SMITH as a Member of this House.

The resolution was agreed to.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. IKARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESPECT TO THE ILLEGAL IMPRISONMENT OF 13 AMERICANS BY THE CHINESE COMMUNIST GOVERNMENT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I am today filing a resolution the purpose of which is to serve notice on the Chinese Reds, that not only the President and the Secretary of State, but the entire Congress is determined to effect the release of the 13 American citizens illegally held as prisoners by the Chinese aggressors.

Our main objective is to protect the rights of our citizens.

That is our sworn duty.

And it is the basis of our faith in those freedoms which no government can take away from any human beings, anywhere.

Public opinion the world over has been shocked by the barefaced contempt of the Chinese Reds for elemental human rights.

I am sure that the Chinese people themselves are disturbed by this arrogance of power, which holds itself superior to every civilized value.

We, the Congress of the United States, directly represent almost 164 million Americans.

We reject appeasement, or peace at any price.

We believe that every human being, no matter how humble, has certain God-given rights that no government can ignore or violate.

Speaking for the people of the United States, we assert that there can be no peace as long as there is no respect for the fundamental rights of our own citizens, no matter where they may be.

We expect and insist upon the same consideration for our nationals abroad that we extend to foreigners in the United States.

Whether they be civilians or military personnel.

Where exchange may be necessary, there must be a mutual honoring of agreements.

Only on this basis can the world depend upon an international law to promote world peace.

Since the end of World War II, in our efforts for peace, we have leaned backward.

Time and again we have told the Communist world what we would not do.

Apparently this has been taken as a sign of weakness, encouraging the aggressors.

Now, so that there shall be no mistake concerning our faith in freedom, and our courage in its behalf, we must be prepared to tell the Communist world what we shall do if the Communists do not purge themselves of continuing aggressions.

Although we shall make every reasonable concession to avoid an atomic war, we are not paralyzed by fear of it to the point where we shall surrender principle and abandon self-respect.

The time has come to draw the line.

If the Communists refuse to release the 13 Americans in this test-case issue, we must move to impose a blockade of Red China in several ways.

There must be no more aggression.

Let Communist Russia also take heed of this warning.

In order to make our policy crystal clear, I ask the United States House of Representatives to approve this resolution condemning Red China for holding 13 Americans as prisoners without cause or justification.

American public opinion will not countenance delays, evasions, or secret trades.

I therefore urge the House by resolution to demand the release of our 13 fellow Americans before 60 more days have passed.

Serving notice to the Chinese Reds and to the world that if this great wrong is not righted by that time we shall be obliged to adopt more positive measures to effect their liberation.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. POWELL asked and was given permission to address the House on Wednesday, January 12, 1955, for 30 minutes, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on two subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I thought we had an understanding that there would be no at-this-point-in-the-RECORD extensions today.

The SPEAKER. There is no legislative program today, the Chair may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, and we can do it in this way. The Chair, of course, will not allow extensions of remarks or anything else before the President's speech.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

FARM FAMILIES MADE HAPPIER, MORE COMFORTABLE AND ENJOY GREATER PROSPERITY BY REASON OF LEGISLATION SPONSORED BY SPEAKER SAM RAYBURN

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on the birthday of our distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], it is appropriate to point out that two laws enacted by Congress, under his sponsorship, and the policies pursued under them have meant more to the happiness, comfort, and prosperity of the farm people of this Nation than any other two laws enacted during the last half century. They are the Rural Electrification Act and the Farm-to-Market Roads Act. It will possibly be of interest to know how these two acts originated.

January 6, 1936, Representative RAYBURN, chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives, introduced H. R. 9861, to promote electrification in rural areas and to provide facilities for the financing thereof. On the same day, Senator Norris, of Nebraska, introduced a similar bill, S. 3483, in the United States Senate.

On April 9, 1936, when a motion was before the House for the consideration of S. 3483—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 80, page 5281—the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] stated that in their essentials, the House and Senate bills were the same:

> After the bill passed the Senate in the essential form that it was introduced in the House, we took up in the committee and considered the Senate bill. We made several important amendments, and, therefore, instead of putting these amendments into the Senate draft, we struck out all after the enacting clause in the bill and inserted as an amendment the result of the work of the House.

Representative RAYBURN participated at some length in the debate on the measure in the House—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 9 and May 14, 1936, volume 80, pages 5281–5286, 5294–5296, 5312, 5314–5317, 7245, 7247, 7248.

UNDER REA

At the time of the passage of the REA Act, there were 743,954 or 10.9 percent of the farms of the United States that were electrified. In 1954, there were 4,950,962 or 92.3 percent of the farms in the United States electrified. REA is now a $3-billion program that serves 4,367,045 members, considering four to each farm, nearly 20 million users are now receiving the benefit of the REA program in 46 States and Alaska by 1,387,441 miles of REA lines.

FARM-TO-MARKET ROADS

During the 78th Congress, Representative J. W. Robinson, of Utah, was chairman of the Committee on Roads in the House of Representatives. The Honorable SAM RAYBURN was Speaker of the House of Representatives at that time. By a coincidence, I was in the office of Speaker RAYBURN when Representative Robinson approached him with a request that he be permitted to take up the Federal aid road bill, which his committee had just finished considering and had agreed to report favorably to the House of Representatives. This bill carried an appropriation of $450 million.

The following conversation in substance took place:

Mr. Robinson: "Mr. Speaker I would like to get your permission to take up before the House of Representatives at an early date a $450-million bill, which the Committee on Roads has just agreed to favorably report."

Speaker RAYBURN: "Have you made any provision in the bill for rural roads or farm-to-market roads?"

Mr. Robinson: "No, we have not earmarked any particular amount for rural roads or farm-to-market roads, but we assume that each State will make provisions for them."

Speaker RAYBURN: "I suggest you take this matter up with your committee again and try to persuade the committee to agree to a provision that will earmark at least 30 percent of all Federal funds that are allocated for rural roads. Then we can take the bill up and secure its passage."

Mr. Robinson: "I think that is a good idea and your request will be complied with."

Subsequently, an amendment to this bill was introduced by Representative Robinson, with the approval of the Committee on Roads, which contained a flat apportionment of funds for projects on the principal secondary and feeder roads, including farm-to-market roads, rural free delivery mail, and public school bus routes. Commencing with that year, 1944, 30 percent of all Federal aid funds were earmarked and designated for rural roads as specified in H. R. 4915. Ever since that time, a similar provision has been carried in laws passed providing for Federal aid to highways and roads.

The Bureau of Public Roads reported that since the first effective programing of Federal funds for secondary or farm-to-market roads in 1944, a total of 103,248 miles of projects have been completed. This figure includes about 15,000 miles on which further improvements have been made. The total cost of the 10-year program was reported at $558 million, of which approximately $286 million was Federal aid.

The secondary Federal aid road system now includes 482,972 miles. In addition there are many thousands of miles of secondary roads which are not in the Federal aid system. These secondary roads, both those in the Federal aid system and those which remain outside of the system, are vitally important to the farmer. Their importance has been well summed up in this statement:

> Adequate roads are essential to integrate farm people into the social and economic life of the community; to provide access to schools, churches, recreational facilities, medical service, postal service, and police and fire protection; to enable farm people to engage in the organizational, social, and political activities of the community; to permit members of the farm family to obtain part or full-time employment off the farm or on other farms; to provide economic access to markets and ready availability of supplies, machinery, and services needed in farm production.

RURAL HOMES TODAY

In most of the rural homes of America today, the farm family enjoys every comfort and convenience that is available to a guest at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York City, and, in addition, the occupants of the home have the privilege of breathing fresh air and have a place to park their automobiles.

In the typical farm home, butane gas is available, which is used for fuel and makes available hot water. Electricity is available, which includes refrigeration, lighting, radio, television, and other electrical appliances. The all-weather road in front of the house is used for rural free delivery, milk route, school bus route and for all forms of needed transportation. America is greater and stronger and the people in rural areas are happier, more comfortable, and more prosperous by reason of the enactment of these two laws that Speaker SAM RAYBURN pioneered in the United States Congress.

NEW EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY BILL TO STRENGTHEN ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT: KEFAUVER-PATMAN BILL

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill, H. R. 11, to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act. One part of it was weakened by a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the *Standard Oil Company* v. *FTC Case* (340 U. S. 231). The new bill is to correct the Supreme Court decision and to carry out the original intent of the law.

This bill is not an anti-chain-store bill; it is not an anti-big-business bill; it applies to all businesses, big and little, by merely giving to each a fair opportunity to buy from a supplier on the same terms and conditions under similar and like circumstances.

This act—the Robinson-Patman Act—is intended to and does give the small man an opportunity to stay in business. It has demonstrated its usefulness over the years.

This new bill will not be opposed by any concern that does not seek an unfair advantage or opportunity.

The Robinson-Patman Act makes unlawful price discriminations and unearned discounts and allowances. The original act placed the burden of proof on the violator when it was shown that a discrimination had been granted. The Supreme Court decision mentioned above weakens this particular provision to the extent that adequate and proper enforcement is not possible. The new bill will correct this one weakness that has been made in the law.

The other parts of the act have been upheld by the Supreme Court. I doubt that any law has been placed upon the statute books during the last century that has meant more to the small and independent business than the Robinson-Patman Act.

This bill is endorsed by every genuine small-business organization in the United States. It is helpful to the consumers because it assures competition, which always leads to better prices to the consumer.

The following Members of the House are coauthors and cosponsors: CARL ALBERT, Oklahoma; HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, New Jersey; WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Colorado; CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, West Virginia; RICHARD BOLLING, Missouri; USHER L. BURDICK, North Dakota; ROBERT C. BYRD, West Virginia; CLIFFORD DAVIS, Tennessee; JOHN D. DINGELL, Michigan; THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut; CLYDE DOYLE, California; HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, Pennsylvania; JOE L. EVINS, Tennessee; SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, Maryland; EDWARD A. GARMATZ, Maryland; DON HAYWORTH, Michigan; CHET HOLIFIELD, California; LESTER JOHNSON, Wisconsin; EUGENE J. KEOGH, New York; AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, Pennsylvania; CECIL R. KING, California; HENDERSON LANHAM, Georgia; JOHN LESINSKI, JR., Michigan; GEORGE S. LONG, Louisiana; EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, Minnesota; THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, Michigan; DON MAGNUSON, Washington; LEE METCALF, Montana; THOMAS E. MORGAN, Pennsylvania; JOHN E. MOSS, JR., California; ABRAHAM J. MULTER, New York; THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, Illinois; JAMES G. POLK, Ohio; ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., New York; MELVIN PRICE, Illinois; GEORGE M. RHODES, Pennsylvania; PETER W. RODINO, JR., New Jersey; BYRON G. ROGERS, Colorado; JAMES ROOSEVELT, California; HARRY R. SHEPPARD, California; BOB SIKES, Florida; T. A. THOMPSON, Louisiana; HOMER THORNBERRY, Texas; JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, Mississippi; CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Wisconsin; GEORGE MILLER, California; and OVERTON BROOKS, Louisiana.

Under the rules of the House, only one Member can introduce a bill. This is not true in the other body. Although I am introducing the bill in my name, I am doing it for all the other Members, who are also interested in this proposal and are listed as coauthors and cosponsors.

There will be others who will join us and their names will appear in the RECORD at a later date.

The Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, United States Senator from Tennessee, will introduce the same bill in the Senate as we are working together, along with other cosponsors, on the proposal.

THE HONORABLE ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for the first time during his distinguished career in this body yesterday our colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD] was not present at the opening of a new Congress. He was where he should have been, at the bedside of his wife, Mrs. Chiperfield, in a hospital in California, where the day previous she underwent major surgery for a serious illness. His office informs me that he expects to be in Washington next week.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF THE HONORABLE SAM RAYBURN

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I know that the Members of the House would not want this day to pass without there being an expression by some Member or Members of the House of the deep respect and friendship that we have for our beloved Speaker.

Today is SAM RAYBURN's birthday anniversary. The President of the United States very thoughtfully and graciously referred to it at the opening of his message on the state of the Union to the Members of the Congress. We in the House, who not only honor SAM RAYBURN but esteem and love him, extend to him our very best wishes on this, his birthday anniversary, and we hope that God will shower on him for many, many years to come an abundance of his choicest blessings.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], I am sure, expresses the sentiments of all of us. We all join in the gentleman's expression of good wishes to the Speaker on this day, and we hope for him many years of happiness and prosperity in the days ahead.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I thank my friend. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, speaking on behalf of the entire Tennessee delegation in Congress, as well as every citizen of the Volunteer State of Tennessee, I concur in the splendid remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts and to state that all of the people of Tennessee take great pride in the fact that our distinguished Speaker was born in our State, and we join in conveying to him our hearty greetings and felicitations and best wishes for many happy returns.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I thank my friend. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, first, I congratulate the Speaker on his birthday and express the hope that he will be privileged to celebrate many, many more happy birthdays. The Speaker has brought great credit and honor to our fine State of Texas. He has served longer as Speaker of the House of Representatives than any other person. He has been effective in Congress because of his honesty, ability, sincerity of purpose, trustworthiness, and dependability. In the exercise of these wonderful qualities he has earned and now enjoys the respect and confidence of his colleagues and the people of the United States. He is an outstanding example of an American citizen of the highest type.

I think it is appropriate to point out on the Speaker's birthday that two laws enacted by the Congress and the policies pursued under them have meant more to the happiness, comfort, and prosperity of the farm people of this Nation than any other two laws enacted during the last half century. I refer to the rural electrification administration bill. The Speaker, who at that time was chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, was the author and sponsor of that bill. In addition to that, he insisted that a certain road bill not be given clearance until the committee earmarked at least 30 percent of the Federal funds for farm-to-market roads. That was in 1944. Since that time that earmarking has gone forward, and I am inserting in the RECORD today a statement outlining the enormous benefits that have come to rural people by reason of the enactment of these two laws that Speaker RAYBURN had so much to do with.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I thank my friend from Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, and the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, representing the delegation from the Speaker's neighboring State of Louisiana, I should like to join and concur in the expressions and felicitations concerning our great Speaker. SAM RAYBURN is one of the great leaders of America, honored throughout the free world.

I should like to make just one personal note. I first came to the House of Representatives about 14 years ago. At that time I was 26 years of age. The Speaker was more or less of a father to me. His wise counsel and advice have been of immeasurable help to me. His friendship I shall ever cherish. I think the experience that I have had as a young man and as a younger Member of this body has been shared by all of the other

Members. It is a real pleasure to participate on this occasion. I wish him happy birthday and many, many more.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank my friend. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I think I bespeak the sentiment of the entire delegation of the State of Mississippi when I say that we join in the felicitations and congratulations upon our distinguished Speaker's arrival at a new mark in his life. He is not only my Speaker, but I regard him as my personal friend. It has been my privilege practically ever since I have been here to vote for our present distinguished Speaker for that position. I hope that I will have that privilege in the future for as many more years as he might like to serve or I might be present. I join with my colleagues here in the House in congratulating the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, the second most powerful man in the Government, in again being selected for this great honor.

Many happy returns of the day, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank my friend. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Massachusetts in the sentiments he expressed on this, your birthday.

I am sure I express the sentiments of all the members of the Pennsylvania delegation in saying to you, sir, that I wish you many more birthdays; that you may be with us a long time so that you can continue to give us the benefit of your wisdom and encouragement.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY]. I yield now to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker and Members on the House, of course the birthday of any individual from childhood through life is a great occasion and one that all of us remember with reverence, but certainly today is one of those days that all Americans can celebrate and be thankful for and proud of because we are celebrating here in this Chamber the birthday of SAM RAYBURN who has given most of his life to this greatest deliberative body on earth. Over the past years, I have had the privilege of voting for Speaker RAYBURN on three different occasions to preside over this body. It has given me great comfort to know Speaker RAYBURN, and the country at large should be proud of the fact that such an able American will continue to guide this body and all of us hope and pray that his health will continue and that he will have many more happy birthdays. My delegation from North Carolina joins me in felicitating him on this memorable occasion.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, from the North Star State to the Lone Star State I want to extend to the Speaker not only my own personal congratulations, and wishes for many more happy years to come, but speaking for the Minnesota delegation, we all join in sending our congratulations to that great leader from the Lone Star State.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, as I sat here listening to the laudatory and deserved remarks of the membership about our distinguished Speaker, I turned to my friend JIMMY ROOSEVELT and said that I must sever my discourse with him for the moment to pay my humble tribute to a very dear friend, the noblest Texan that ever came from that great State; to say on his birthday that, as I visualize it, there is a heavenly glow upon that noble head, which reflects wisdom and fairness and friendship for us all. I hope that God may spare him and keep him for us for many years to come.

God bless you, Sam.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, while the distinguished and beloved Speaker is one of the few great men the country has produced who was neither born nor raised nor has lived in Virginia, I should like to say that the Virginia delegation is delighted to join in this tribute to our distinguished fellow citizen from Texas. We take pride in the great affection in which he is held by all the membership of the House on both sides of the aisle, which is a tribute to his fairness, his honesty, his devotion to his duty and to his friends.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and I might add that what he said applies not merely to Virginia, but Massachusetts.

I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the California delegation, it is my great pleasure to express to you, Mr. Speaker SAM RAYBURN, our most affectionate—and I mean affectionate—regard and best wishes and esteem. You are not only rightfully appraised one of the greatest of all the statesmen in the history of our beloved Nation, but you are also appraised by the California delegation, as well as by all others, as a distinguished colleague and Speaker and friend. May I say for myself that during all these 8 years I have served in this distinguished legislative body I have had occasion to realize that Speaker SAM RAYBURN is not only interested in Members of Congress in their official capacities, and in helping them in these official capacities to dispatch their work with thoroughness, promptness, and utmost worthiness, but I have had occasion to realize that SAM RAYBURN, the distinguished American statesman, has interest and takes time to express his own personal good will and friendly interest in the personal welfare and happiness and satisfaction of all the Members of this great legislative body, regardless of political party affiliations.

The California delegation wishes you, Mr. Speaker SAM RAYBURN, very, very many happy returns of this day and also very, very many happy birthdays.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I may be presumptuous in undertaking to speak for the Georgia delegation, but I am sure no one will question the propriety of my doing so because I know in what high esteem the entire Georgia delegation holds the Speaker. Further, I know the people of Georgia have great respect and admiration for our great Speaker. I am glad to join with others in wishing him many happy returns of the day, and in trying to tell him just how much we in Georgia think of him.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished Democratic majority whip, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Oklahoma delegation I wish to extend the felicitations of our people to our great Speaker. SAM RAYBURN is loved in Oklahoma. He lives within about 6 miles of our State. In all sections of Oklahoma he is referred to affectionately and I think literally as the Congressman at Large from Oklahoma. He could establish residence in our State and be elected to any office within the gift of the people. For many, many years he has been the No. 1 citizen of the Southwest. It is certainly pleasing to us to know that all sections of the country hold him in the same high esteem in which he is held in the area in which he lives. We wish him many happy returns of the day.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. POLK].

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Ohio Democratic delegation I wish to convey our heartiest birthday greetings to you, Speaker RAYBURN. As other Members have said, the name SAM RAYBURN typifies the best in the leadership of the Democratic Party. To us in Ohio you are Mr. Democrat. You have come into our State on many occasions. We have learned from your lips and from your eloquent addresses the outstanding principles of democracy, for which our party stands. We are happy to felicitate you on this occasion and wish for you many, many more happy birthdays.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Florida delegation and on behalf of the people of Florida, it is my privilege and happiness today to extend felicitations to our wonderful Speaker, a fine American, who is greatly loved in the State of Florida and who has meant much to our Nation and much to peace and prosperity throughout our entire country. I take this opportunity to express my congratulations to him and my desire that he may have many more happy returns of this day as a person and as the Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Arkansas delegation I want to join in felicitating our great Speaker today on the occasion of his birthday. All of us recall the very pleasant messages we have received from our Speaker on the occasion of our birthdays felicitating us. Certainly it is highly appropriate that we pay this tribute at this time in respect to a man we all love.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a word to what has been said here, and on behalf of the entire delegation and myself personally wish the Speaker all happy returns of this day. We in Alabama, of course, have always felt very close to SAM RAYBURN. When we in Alabama were honored by having our distinguished and illustrious and beloved William Bankhead as Speaker, his right arm at that time was SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, who, after Mr. Bankhead's passing, was elected Speaker of this House. So I say, many happy returns of the day, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, of course I cannot speak for the North Carolina delegation in the House, but I can bespeak the unanimous sentiment of the minority Members from North Carolina in extending congratulations to the Speaker on this occasion. I wish for him many more happy returns of the day.

My father served in Congress with him and enjoyed a warm friendship over the years with him. I have appreciated the opportunity of serving with him during the past 2 years. I have followed him on some occasions and expect to do so again. I am happy to join my colleagues in the House in extending to the Speaker my very best wishes on this his birthday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the West Virginia delegation, I take a great deal of pleasure in expressing good wishes and congratulations to our Speaker on his birthday.

A long time before coming to Congress I had heard about the distinguished gentleman from Texas because West Virginians have known him as a great American and a great statesman. During my first term as a Member of this House, I found him to be a real friend, willing at all times to give me help and advice, and one whose pleasant greeting and warm smile penetrate the human heart. There is something inexpressibly fine about this man, and it leaves its lasting impression upon the lives of all who meet him.

The roses red upon my neighbor's vine,
Are owned by him but they are also mine,
His was the cost and his the labor too,
But mine as well as his, the joy, their loveliness to view.
They bloom for me and are for me as fair,
As for the man who gives them all his care,
Thus I am rich because a good man grew,
A rose-clad vine for all his neighbors' view.

I know from this that others plant for me,
That what they own, my joy may also be,
So why be selfish, when so much that's fine,
Is grown for me upon my Texas neighbor's vine.

Mr. Speaker, the author of this poem must have had someone like you in mind when he wrote these words. The flower which you have planted in the bosoms of men throughout the years will continue to shed its fragrance throughout eternity. May God continue to bless our Nation with your service, and may he shower upon your life many more happy birthdays.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from West Virginia.

May I say in conclusion and repeat an observation I have made on a number of occasions in the past in relation to our beloved Speaker: SAM RAYBURN is a man with a heart of gold.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the birthday anniversary of the Honorable SAM RAYBURN.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the annual occasion when we are privileged to rise and voice feelings of high regard and esteem on the birthday anniversary of the Honorable SAM RAYBURN is a traditional time of pleasure for the Members of the House.

While we are in close and constant contact with the distinguished Member from Texas and the Speaker and dean of the House, it is upon the occasion of his birthday that we are most free to express in personal terms the high esteem and affection in which we hold him. We look forward to this occasion—on his birthday—for it gives us the great pleasure of expressing for ourself and for the citizens of the great Fourth District of Tennessee our high regard and our congratulations.

Speaker RAYBURN is a Texan—and certainly a most worthy representative of that great State. But we of Tennessee pridefully recall and remind you that Speaker RAYBURN was first a Tennessean—and nowhere could we find a more worthy native of the great Volunteer State.

To him I am most happy to extend heartiest congratulations and best wishes for many more anniversaries to come—years which we trust will find him still the dean of the House and its illustrious Speaker.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, newly elected Speaker of the 84th Congress, on this day, his birthday.

It has been said that one embarks on a new venture in his lifetime upon the occasion of the anniversary of his birth. No truer words could be spoken of Mr. RAYBURN, who upon the anniversary of his birth has, on six occasions to date, assumed control of the House of Representatives and thereby took control of the Democratic Party. Mr. RAYBURN has held this post during this country's darkest moments and has led this legislative body in the writing of his country's history.

Upon this occasion, it is my birthday wish for Mr. RAYBURN and I know that the majority of the Members here today join with me in hoping that his new tenure of office will be a pleasant one marked with harmony and will be recorded as a happy chapter of his life.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, you have been honored on the occasion of your birthday by many of this great Nation's most esteemed people. I hope that it is not presumptuous of me, as a freshman Congressman, to speak at least for me and the people of Texas' great 15th District in offering congratulations on your anniversary and a prayer that many more years are yours to serve our Nation and guide this, the greatest deliberative body the world has yet known.

It has never before been my pleasure to serve with you, but it has been my pleasure to closely watch you and your activities through my comparatively few years. It is my extreme pleasure to now be a Member of this body and to be among those to wish for you, on behalf of the 15th District of Texas, many, many happy returns of this memorable day.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. REED of New York in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDMONDSON in one instance and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia.

Mr. RABAUT in three instances.

Mr. DOYLE and to be accompanied by appropriate material.

Mr. ENGEL and to include additional material.

Mr. LANE and to include additional matter.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VURSELL.

Mr. COOPER and to include a release by him on yesterday in reference to the bill, H. R. 1, introduced by Mr. COOPER providing for the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.

Mr. SCRIVNER and to include the text of a speech he recently made.

Mr. MACK of Washington in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include an address made in Boston some few weeks ago.

Mr. WOLVERTON in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 10, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

181. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

182. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the relief of certain members of the Armed Forces who were required to pay certain transportation charges covering shipment of their household goods and personal effects upon return from overseas, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

183. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to further amend section 106 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 so as to provide for certain adjustments in the dates of rank of nurses and women medical specialists of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force in the permanent grade of captain, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

184. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to repeal certain laws relating to professional examinations for promotion of medical, dental, and veterinary officers of the Army and Air Force"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

185. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to enact certain provisions now included in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act and the Civil Functions Appropriation Act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

186. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize permanent appointments in the United States Navy and in the United States Marine Corps"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

187. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide that the enlistment contracts or periods of obligated service of members of the Armed Forces shall not terminate by reason of appointment as cadets or midshipmen at the Military, Naval, Air Force, or Coast Guard Academies, or as midshipmen in the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

188. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of February 21, 1946 (60 Stat. 26), to permit the retirement of temporary officers of the naval service after completion of more than 20 years of active service"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

189. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the crediting of certain service toward retirement of reserve personnel"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

190. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to increase the annual compensation of the academic dean of the United States Naval Postgraduate School"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

191. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the tonnage composition of the United States Navy with respect to vessels, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

192. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to repeal the act of January 19, 1929 (ch. 86, 45 Stat. 1090), entitled 'An act to limit the date of filing claims for retainer pay' "; to the Committee on Armed Services.

193. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to remove certain inequities by fixing the hours of work and overtime compensation practices in the case of certain employees of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

194. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize reciprocal fire-protection agreements between departments and agencies of the United States and public or private organizations engaged in fire-fighting activities, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

195. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to donate certain property to the American National Red Cross"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

196. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

197. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

198. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to further amend the act of July 3, 1943 (ch. 189, 57 Stat. 372), relating to the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or certain civilian employees of the United States, by removing certain limitations on the payment of such claims and the time within which such claims may be filed"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

199. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the relief of certain Army and Air Force nurses, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

200. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

201. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to further amend the act of January 2, 1942, entitled 'An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries' "; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

202. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to permit the naturalization of certain persons by reason of honorable service in the United States Navy prior to December 24, 1952"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

203. A letter from the assistant to the Governor, Canal Zone Government, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code by the addition of provisions authorizing regulation of the sale and use of fireworks in the Canal Zone"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

204. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to further amend section 622 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

205. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 300 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 in relation to the entitlement of servicemen discharged or dismissed by court-martial to veterans rights"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

206. A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting the 38th Annual Report of the United States Tariff Commission, pursuant to section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEAMER:

H. R. 1553. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the first electrically lighted city in the world, Wabash, Ind.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1554. A bill to amend the Foreign Trade Zones Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1555. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in or near Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1556. A bill to offset declining employment by providing for Federal assistance to States and local governments in projects of construction, alteration, expansion, or repair of public facilities and improvements; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1557. A bill to amend section 1701 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the case of admissions to a planetarium, or a museum, or similar educational institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1558. A bill to amend chapter 1, subchapter C, of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1559. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1560. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims for basic and overtime compensation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. R. 1561. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 1562. A bill to promote the education and rehabilitation of the Indians of the United States and its Territories; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1563. A bill to extend the time within which claims may be presented to the Indians Claims Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1564. A bill relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 1565. A bill to provide for emergency Federal financial assistance to the States and Territories in the construction of urgently needed public elementary and secondary school facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 1566. A bill to increase acreage allotments for the 1955 crop of cotton so that the allotment for each farm shall be at least equal to its allotment for the 1954 crop; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1567. A bill to provide for payment to members of the Armed Forces of compensation at the rate of $1 per day for each day spent in hiding during World War II to evade capture by the enemy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 1568. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to provide that receivers and trustees in proceedings under chapter XI shall receive compensation on the same basis as those in proceedings under chapter X; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 1569. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new postal building to house the Wicker Park postal station in Chicago, Ill., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 1570. A bill to incorporate the Legion of Guardsmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 1571. A bill to grant permanent and total disability ratings to veterans suffering from severe industrial inadaptability as a result of war service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 1572. A bill to amend the wheat-marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1573. A bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 1574. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1575. A bill to provide for a commission to regulate the transportation of passengers by common carriers operating over regular routes within the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1576. A bill to advance officers on the retired list of the Army to the highest general officer grade for which they satisfactorily performed the duties in time of war; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 1577. A bill to provide for Federal cooperation in non-Federal water-facility projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 1578. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1579. A bill to increase the salary of Federal judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KRUEGER:

H. R. 1580. A bill to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1581. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to authorize the United States and the District of Columbia to grant temporary employment for not more than 30 days in any calendar year to certain annuitants under such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1582. A bill to amend section 4 (a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1583. A bill to provide a widows' annuity upon death of employee, prior to attainment of age 50 of surviving widow; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1584. A bill to grant civil-service employees retirement after 25 years' service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1585. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to change the formula to one based on a 3-year average; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1586. A bill to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 1587. A bill to provide for payments by the Federal Government to States or local taxing units adversely affected by Federal acquisition, ownership, or use of defense production facilities, to provide for the taxation of certain Federal properties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1588. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to permit the rental of military housing for periods of less than 30 days to individuals having official business at a military installation in the vicinity; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 1589. A bill to authorize aid to needy American nationals in connection with their repatriation from foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 1590. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 1591. A bill to assist the several States in providing scholarships to enable high-school graduates of Indian blood to pursue their education at colleges and universities; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 1592. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1593. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1594. A bill to amend section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, so as to extend its protection to postmasters, officers, and employees of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 1595. A bill to amend the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1955, with reference to official office expenses of Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1596. A bill to provide that pension, compensation, and retirement pay shall be paid during periods of active service and the amount thereof deducted from the amount payable for such active service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1597. A bill to provide free postage for first-class letter mail matter sent by or to members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1598. A bill to remove inequalities between the compensation to which members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces are entitled for death or disability incurred in line of duty and that to which other members of the Armed Forces are entitled; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PILCHER:

H. R. 1599. A bill to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Jim Woodruff Reservoir, Ga., by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 1600. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 1601. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe regulations relating to qualifications of persons who assist taxpayers in the determination of their Federal tax liabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 1602. A bill to enable the State of Arizona and the town of Tempe, Ariz., to convey to the Salt River Agricultural Improvement and Power District, for use by such district, a portion of certain property heretofore transferred under certain restrictions to such State and town by the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1603. A bill to terminate the prohibition against employment of Mongolian labor in the construction of reclamation projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1604. A bill providing for the refund of employment taxes paid by farmers on services performed between January 1, 1951, and July 12, 1951, by agricultural workers recruited from Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1605. A bill to permit shipment by mail of live scorpions to be used for medical research purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1606. A bill to extend the benefits of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to certain members of the Reserve components of the United States Army and the United States Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1607. A bill to establish a Federal Committee on Migratory Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 1608. A bill to authorize tax refunds on cigarettes lost in the floods of 1951; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 1609. A bill granting an exemption from income tax in the case of certain pensions and annuities of policemen and firemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1610. A bill to authorize additional funds for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1611. A bill to provide that the Interstate Commerce Commission may determine toll charges over certain bridges and

tunnels crossing State lines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1612. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1948, so as to provide that disability and death benefits based on military service may be excluded from net income in establishing rents for certain low-rent housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1613. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H. R. 1614. A bill to amend the veterans regulations to provide an increased statutory rate of compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of an eye in combination with the loss or loss of use of a limb; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1615. A bill to permit court review of Veterans' Administration decisions on issuance, reinstatement, or conversion of insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1616. A bill to provide for the granting of honorable discharges to certain persons who served in the United States Army during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1617. A bill to amend section 622 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1618. A bill to revise the basis for establishing wartime service connection for multiple sclerosis and the chronic functional psychoses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1619. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1620. A bill to liberalize procedures relating to furnishing medical and hospital care to persons retired from the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1621. A bill to afford education and training under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 in the cases of certain seriously disabled veterans, notwithstanding the time limitations of such act; to the Committee on Veteran's Affairs.

H. R. 1622. A bill to provide for the payment in a lump sum direct to counsel of a reasonable attorney's fee in a suit brought by or on behalf of an insured during his lifetime for waiver of premiums on account of total disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1623. A bill to authorize the granting of national service life insurance to veterans who were unable to produce evidence of good health on the date of enactment of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951 because a sympton-free waiting period had not expired on that date; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1624. A bill to revise the requirement for award of additional disability compensation to veterans who have dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1625. A bill to provide for the designation of a United States Veterans' Administration Hospital at Chicago, Ill., as the Albert A. Sprague Veterans' Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1626. A bill to provide a further opportunity for veterans of World War II who were in active military, naval, or air service of the United States on the delimiting date for initiating a course of education or training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and who had not initiated a course prior to said date, to initiate such a course; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1627. A bill to restore the right of certain veterans to apply for insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1628. A bill to provide hospital care and medical treatment for certain disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1629. A bill to amend section 304 of the World War Veterans Act, 1924, relating to reinstatement of war risk yearly renewable term insurance and United States Government life insurance by service-connected disabled World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON (By request):

H. R. 1630. A bill to provide a vitalized and equitable Reserve program for the Armed Forces; to provide for the operation of the National Security Training Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1631. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 1632. A bill to amend section 13 (h) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, to extend the date prior to which surplus real property owned by the United States must have been acquired to be subject to conveyance by the United States for historic monument purposes, without monetary consideration, from January 1, 1900, to January 1, 1910; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 1633. A bill providing aid to States for the purpose of assisting school districts in constructing urgently needed school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 1634. A bill to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, with respect to the procurement of supplies from small-business concerns; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 1635. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 65 to 60 the age at which women may become entitled to benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1636. A bill to amend section 1020c, title 12, Banks and Banking, United States Code to provide for the orderly retirement of joint stock land-bank bonds declared by Congress to be instrumentalities of the Government of the United States by providing for an exchange of bonds of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation for the balance unpaid on joint stock land-bank bonds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOW:

H. J. Res. 95. Joint resolution to make Constitution Day a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that a provision of a treaty which conflicts with any provision of the Constitution shall not be of any force or effect; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 97. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. J. Res. 98. Joint resolution to constitute the Federal Civil Defense Administration an executive department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. J. Res. 99. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. J. Res. 100. Joint resolution designating the 6th day of January of each year as Haym Salomon Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. J. Res. 101. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1955, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the closing of Indian hospitals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution requesting the United States Mission to the United Nations to take all possible steps expeditiously to bring about consideration by the United Nations of the question of self-determination of the population of Cyprus; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 70. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 55; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 1637. A bill for the relief of Sam H. Ray; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEAMER:

H. R. 1638. A bill for the relief of Janis Arvids Reinfelds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:

H. R. 1639. A bill for the relief of Laura Olivera Miranda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1640. A bill for the relief of Constantine Nitsas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1641. A bill for the relief of Mary Mancuso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1642. A bill for the relief of Danica Stevoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1643. A bill for the relief of James F. Casey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1644. A bill for the relief of Vinicio Soto Pena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1645. A bill for the relief of Regina Berg Vomberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1646. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret O'Rourke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1647. A bill for the relief of Maria Softerios Sergiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 1648. A bill for the relief of Sister Luigia Pellegrino, Sister Angelina Nicastro, and Sister Luigina Di Martino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1649. A bill for the relief of Charles Daly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 1650. A bill for the relief of Peter A. Beklemishev, Michael Linden, and Serge Oulassuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. R. 1651. A bill for the relief of Lucette Helene Adams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 1652. A bill for the relief of Luciano L'Abate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 1653. A bill for the relief of Paul Gonzales Jio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1654. A bill for the relief of Lloyd W. C. Tang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 1655. A bill for the relief of the Wojcik family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1656. A bill for the relief of Chen Chih-Keui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1657. A bill for the relief of Louis B. Prus-Latkiewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1658. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Stein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1659. A bill for the relief of Jan Hajdukiewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1660. A bill for the relief of Wencenty Peter Winiarski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 1661. A bill for the relief of Kim Dong Su; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1662. A bill for the relief of Hiroko T. Sato Stewart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 1663. A bill for the relief of Theodore David Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1664. A bill for the relief of Charles Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1665. A bill for the relief of David Manuel Porter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 1666. A bill for the relief of Jose Canencia-Castanedo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1667. A bill for the relief of Lieselotte Boehme; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER (by request):

H. R. 1668. A bill for the relief of Frank Budman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 1669. A bill for the relief of Sigrid Helene Manson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1670. A bill for the relief of Istvan Benko (also known as Steven Benko); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 1671. A bill for the relief of Clement E. Sprouse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1672. A bill for the relief of Ernest Ludwig Bamford and Mrs. Nadine Bamford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1673. A bill for the relief of Spiros Tzaferis and Erini Averino Tzaferis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1674. A bill for the relief of June Rose McHenry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 1675. A bill for the relief of Karel Aloys Kase; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 1676. A bill for the relief of Alex Grosinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1677. A bill for the relief of Rev. Julian Chrosciechowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1678. A bill for the relief of Lech Szczepan Korgol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1679. A bill for the relief of Marek S. Korowicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1680. A bill for the relief of Marie Fernande Yvette Leschzenier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1681. A bill for the relief of Gerardo Rabanel Luzod; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1682. A bill for the relief of Alice Petrides or Alice Defotiou or Alice Mathews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1683. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helena Nowicka and her daughter, Irena Nowicka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1684. A bill for the relief of Rev. Zdzislaw Aleksander Peszkowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1685. A bill for the relief of Leon Piorkowski, Elzbieta Piorkowski, his wife, and Maria Piorkowski, their daughter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1686. A bill for the relief of Anton Stanak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1687. A bill for the relief of Martha Starke and child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1688. A bill for the relief of Sotirios Tselepis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1689. A bill for the relief of George S. Zambrzycki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 1690. A bill to provide for the relief of Ruth Blakely and others by providing for determination and settlement of certain claims of former owners of lands and improvements purchased by the United States in connection with the Canyon Ferry Reservoir project, Mont.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUMMA:

H. R. 1691. A bill for the relief of Henry L. Stamm, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1692. A bill for the relief of Frederick F. Gaskin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1693. A bill for the relief of Barbara Knape; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 1694. A bill for the relief of Nickolas Bodner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1695. A bill for the relief of Nurhan Akarakcian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 1696. A bill for the relief of Shih Ming Wang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1697. A bill for the relief of George K. Jue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 1698. A bill for the relief of Anne Cheng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 1699. A bill for the relief of Eric Joseph; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1700. A bill for the relief of Pivtr Krzentowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1701. A bill for the relief of Kunibert Franciszek Grabe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1702. A bill for the relief of Stefan Jankielewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1703. A bill for the relief of Andrew Radlicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1704. A bill for the relief of Lech Prvszynski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1705. A bill for the relief of Czeslaw Trzcinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1706. A bill for the relief of Wiktor Grygielko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1707. A bill for the relief of Milthadis Skordos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1708. A bill for the relief of Eugene Albert Bailly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1709. A bill for the relief of Phillip Bonino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1710. A bill for the relief of Roman Smolemec; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1711. A bill for the relief of Rodrigo D. Brito Peres; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1712. A bill for the relief of Bronislaw Matuszczak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1713. A bill for the relief of Wladyslaw Majkowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1714. A bill for the relief of Anthony Duppke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1715. A bill for the relief of Michael George Bohlman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1716. A bill for the relief of certain Polish sailors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1717. A bill for the relief of Joseph Antoniak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1718. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Tsirigotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1719. A bill for the relief of William V. Dobbins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1720. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Aurelia Milewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1721. A bill for the relief of Bronislaw Grabowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1722. A bill for the relief of Andrew Bulavczak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1723. A bill for the relief of Emile Druyts and Mrs. Czeslawa (Plichta) Druyts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1724. A bill for the relief of Gioacchino Varsalona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1725. A bill for the relief of Dr. Constantine E. Constantinidis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1726. A bill for the relief of Renata Cambi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1727. A bill for the relief of Jozef Podlacki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1728. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cecylia Kaminer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1729. A bill for the relief of Joseph Cieplinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1730. A bill for the relief of Maurice Ghnassia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1731. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Kuty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1732. A bill for the relief of Stamatis Karastamatis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1733. A bill for the relief of Stanley Brodzinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1734. A bill for the relief of the estate of Henry F. Aniszewski, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1735. A bill for the relief of Stanley Dankowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary;

H. R. 1736. A bill for the relief of William and Helen Kobielski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1737. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sau Fong Chang Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 1738. A bill for the relief of Howard Carl Kaiser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1739. A bill for the relief of William J. Bohner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 1740. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Raymunda Panart de Zanino and her minor son, Julio Zanino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 1741. A bill for the relief of Nejdat Mulla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1742. A bill for the relief of Pai Shiu Chuan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 1743. A bill for the relief of George C. Papanicolaou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1744. A bill for the relief of John C. K. Yu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1745. A bill for the relief of Paul E. Milward; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. R. 1746. A bill for the relief of Rosa Gelassen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 1747. A bill for the relief of Utica Brewing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1748. A bill for the relief of Sigrid Krause Peters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1749. A bill for the relief of Waltraud Muller Tournay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1750. A bill for the relief of Elena Gigliotti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 1751. A bill for the relief of Priscilla Louise Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1752. A bill for the relief of Johanna Juresic Grgurich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Research in Blinding Eye Diseases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, because those disease of the eyes which result in blindness have been brought close to home to me, my interest in the research programs being carried on has certainly increased.

Recently a group of doctors conducting research in retrolental fibroplasia, an eye disease which has affected 50 percent of those premature infants weighing 3½ pounds or less at birth, discovered a practical prevention of almost all of this disease. There is no doubt that this discovery is far more important to the people of our country than any other medical discovery; as this might well pave the way for the eventual cure of the majority of our eye diseases.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a short statement with reference to this discovery.

Today, we are spending less than $2 million for medical research in the blinding eye diseases—a group of conditions which more than any other group stakes a claim on the American taxpayer—for the education, training, and support of the blind. What we are spending for research today is just a little more than we have been spending for the past decade—in spite of the overwhelming evidence that such research can either prevent or cure disorders of the eye.

Last year and, indeed, the year before, I asked that the appropriations of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness be increased with a view toward strengthening the weak national research programs in both the neurological and sensory disorders. As you know, those increases were given, so that now the budget of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness stands at $7,600,000 and the number of investigations on blinding eye disorders conducted throughout the United States has burgeoned by 25 to 30 percent.

This research attack is still pitifully small, but to the citizens of this country, Congress' action on the Institute's appropriations may well be a source of deep gratitude. In the short span of 2 years, rapid progress has been made against eye disease; modes of prevention and treatment have been developed with the results that thousands now are escaping the helpless fate of darkened vision and the economic burden of their care, which is the country's responsibility, has been lightened.

Let me illustrate just one of the many achievements made under the eye research programs of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness. This achievement represents the virtual conquest of retrolental fibroplasia, a blinding eye disease which affected 50 percent of those premature infants weighing 3½ pounds or less at birth. Retrolental fibroplasia may be an unfamiliar disease to you, but for 5,000 mothers in this country whose children have completely lost their sight because of this condition its name spells constant despair. It is the leading cause of blindness in children; and each of the 5,000 children individually costs the community, State, and Federal governments more than does a single victim of any other disease—$100,000 for education, training, and support from birth to death, or for all, a grand total of $500 million.

This past month, however, the practical prevention of almost all retrolental fibroplasia became a dramatic reality. On September 14, Dr. V. Everett Kinsey of the Kresge Eye Institute in Detroit, summed up the results of a 1-year study of retrolental fibroplasia before a large gathering of eye specialists from all over the United States and from all over the continent as well. What he had to say was simple—the major contributing cause of the disease was oxygen, the oxygen which was routinely administered to premature children in hospital incubators. The way to stop retrolental fibroplasia was to stop using oxygen, except where urgently needed in crisis.

Dr. Kinsey, I should point out, was speaking on behalf of more than 75 pediatricians and ophthalmologists who during the past year have worked in close coordination in 18 hospitals throughout the United States to come up with the answer. The answer was made possible by the Government through support of the study by the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness. The answer—oxygen—perhaps sounds simple to you, yet it represented the end of what had been a long, hard 12-year hunt for the cause of the disease on the part of hundreds of scientists.

Their quest may prove as interesting to you as it is for me. Retrolental fibroplasia, I should tell you, was first described in the United States in 1942 by a Dr. T. L. Terry. Dr. Terry, himself, tried to explain why the blood-carrying tissues of the eyes were affected in retrolental fibroplasia. He thought the condition was due to factors affecting the mother during pregnancy—possibly toxemia or hemorrhage. Many others believed as Terry did, though they could not find sufficient evidence to support their beliefs.

Retrolental fibroplasia mysteriously continued to grow in incidence from 1942 on, and it began to appear as well in England, on the Continent and elsewhere. More and more it became evident that the disease was probably not related to the condition of the mother during pregnancy but to the changing care of infants in hospitals. Many causes for the disorder were suggested—nutritional deficiencies in the infant or, again, nutritional excesses; irritation of light on the infants' eyes or possibly not sufficient light; mother's milk was first implicated, then cow's milk. As one set of facts were established to support a given theory, another set arose to contradict them. None of them were statistically sound.

By 1951, oxygen had also been suggested as the cause of retrolental fibroplasia—too little oxygen, however, not too much. At the same time, one hospital had noted that the incidence of retrolental fibroplasia seemed to parallel the increasing introduction and use of oxygen-bearing incubators in their maternity wards. But the real possibility that oxygen was the contributing cause could not be substantiated elsewhere.

In 1953 the first real breakthrough came. Dr. Arnall Patz, of Georgetown University, working with newborn rats, proved that constant oxygen administration, such as was routinely given to premature infants in our hospitals, could cause retrolental fibroplasia. Dr. Patz' work was supported by the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness.

Whether what was true for animals would prove true for humans remained to be proved. A clinical study of premature infants weighing 3½ pounds or less at birth posed a major problem. Such a study, if conducted at a single hospital, might take 3, 4, or even 5 years before enough premature infants were born so that results of the study would

be statistically valid. If the vital answer were to be obtained as rapidly as possible—and with children blinded each day by retrolental fibroplasia, speed was essential—then a number of hospitals working on the same problem at the same time under the same strict scientific rules of evidence would be needed.

Such a study as this would require considerable funds. The National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness with its increased appropriations could now make most of the funds available. Just as important, to muster the combined research strength of a large number of distinguished investigators would require organizational capacity of a high order. Through its grantees, however, the Institute had access to some of the leading scientists in the country who might participate in the investigation. With the creation of a subcommittee composed of some of those scientists who worked closely with the Institute, so was born one of the broadest research studies on a single medical problem ever conceived.

The results of this study you now know. That study, you should know, cost the Government just $40,000. To this sum was added another $11,000 by the National Foundation for Eye Research and the National Society for the Prevention of Blindness. It appears that the cause of blindness for 5,000 babies has been prevented at a cost of $51,000—$10.50 per baby blinded from this cause in this country. The cost of care for 5,000 blind babies will be, for our generation, 100,000 times the cost of the prevention for the future. It appears that we have also removed one more source of pain and misery from the world.

The scientific attack on disease is not always so productive so rapidly. Yet there can be no question that the more effort science can devote to medical problems, the more successful science can be. Let science, through us, in short, attack the dreadful problems of glaucoma, cataract, and diabetic retinopathy on the scale these problems deserve and we count on their answers too—sooner rather than later.

Moro Province Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reintroduced in the House today the bill which is commonly known as the Moro Province bill.

This bill is designed to provide long-delayed justice to a small group of less than 500 war veterans and to less than 300 of their dependent widows and children.

The 500 veterans who will benefit from this legislation fought valiantly and nobly 50 years ago in the Moro Provinces and in the islands of Samar and Leyte in the Philippines. They have been deprived of pensions all of these years due to a minor technicality. The injustice done them can be corrected only by an act of Congress. To correct that injustice is the purpose of my Moro Province bill.

That the members of the Veterans' Committee, who have studied this bill closest and know most about the case, believe an injustice has been done and should be corrected is indicated by the fact that the House Veterans' Affairs Committee four times has approved unanimously bills to provide pensions to the Moro Province veterans.

In the 78th and 79th Democratic Congresses, the Veterans' Committee unanimously reported a Moro Province bill similar to the one which I introduced today.

In the 80th and 83d Republican Congresses, the Veterans' Committee, like the ones in previous Democratic-controlled Congresses, unanimously reported favorably bills similar to the Moro Province bill I have introduced.

In the 78th Congress, the Moro Province bill was passed by both Houses of Congress, but was vetoed by President Roosevelt. In the 79th Congress, the House again passed this bill, but it died for lack of action in the Senate.

In the 80th and 83d Congresses, the Veterans' Committee again unanimously approved a Moro Province bill. The Rules Committee, however, held up these bills, and they never were reported for House action.

The cost of the Moro Province bill for its first year was estimated at about $700,000. This figure will decrease rapidly after the first year since the Moro veterans are of an average age of 78 years.

The case for the Moro Province bill is this:

Technically and legally, the war with Spain and the Philippine Insurrection ended on July 4, 1902, when the President issued a proclamation of peace. Actually, however, the fighting did not stop. It continued for several years in the Moro Provinces and on Leyte and Samar. American soldiers fought there. A total of 1,548 casualties and deaths from disease occurred. Soldiers engaged in this fighting received 13 Congressional Medals of Honor.

Despite the severity of the fighting and the many casualties these veterans never have been recognized as wartime fighters and have been denied veteran pension rights. Half a century has elapsed since the hostilities. The Moro Province bill which I introduced today would merely provide delayed justice to the handful of Moro veterans who are still alive. The cost is very small.

These veterans have been denied war status and pensions because officially the war had, by proclamation, been terminated. Recently, soldiers in Korea have been granted war and pension rights even for services rendered after the fighting had stopped. Here in the Moro Province and on Samar and Leyte, where the fighting continued after the proclamation of peace, veterans are denied pensions.

Obviously, justice to these Moro Province war veterans has been overlooked. This injustice should be corrected even if Congress is 50 years late in doing so.

I hope that the House Veterans' Committee will report my Moro Province bill favorably and that the Rules Committee will permit it to come to a vote. I am sure that if it is permitted to come to a vote the Moro Province bill will, as it did in two previous sessions, be approved unanimously or almost unanimously.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERE COOPER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

CHAIRMAN JERE COOPER OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS INTRODUCES H. R. 1, PROVIDING FOR A 3-YEAR EXTENSION OF THE PRESIDENT'S AUTHORITY TO ENTER RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

Chairman JERE COOPER, Committee on Ways and Means, today introduced H. R. 1, which would extend for 3 years the President's authority to enter trade agreements. The bill is patterned along the lines of the President's recommendations to the last Congress on foreign economic policy of the United States, which were based on the findings and recommendations of the Randall Commission.

In addition to the 3-year extension, H. R. 1 would authorize the President to reduce duties in three alternative ways: (1) 15 percent below the July 1, 1955, rates by reductions of not more than 5 percent in each of the 3 years under the extension; or (2) to 50 percent of the rate existing on January 1, 1945, in the cases of items which are not being imported or which are being imported only in negligible quantities; or (3) to 50 percent ad valorem, in the case of any rates now in excess of 50 percent ad valorem.

As under the first alternative, the reductions under the other alternatives would be gradual with no reduction becoming effective until the previous one had been in effect for a year. In the case of the first alternative authority, no decrease could be made effective after June 30, 1958.

The bill would also require the President to report annually on the trade-agreements program, and would authorize the President to reduce duties by 50 percent below the January 1, 1945, rate unilaterally in the case of products which are not being imported or which are being imported only in negligible quantities.

Mr. COOPER stated:

"Our trade-agreements program is now at the crossroads. Through such programs as economic aid, technical assistance, and our efforts to bolster production in the free nations of the world, we have helped reestablish their war-torn economies. These nations are now in a position where they can and are willing to stand on their own feet. We must try to, on our part, help lay the foundations on which a stable foreign trade can be built. If we do not permit the free nations to trade with us, they will be forced to trade elsewhere, and in many cases this can only mean Russia and her satellites.

"Our reciprocal trade-agreements program occupies a prominent place in our overall

foreign policy, and it is essential that we reaffirm at this time our determination to continue and to liberalize this program in the interest of constructive and cooperative international effort and relations. The foreign policy of the United States depends to a great extent upon the cooperation of strong and healthy free nations. Our tariff and trade policies are especially significant because of our outstanding position of leadership and economic importance. We must help the free nations in every way possible to find the means with which to earn dollars by which to buy our exports. Otherwise their shortages of dollars will force them to restrict imports from us, and this will result in a further loss of our export markets which will mean less wages to labor, profits to businesses and farmers, and taxes to our Government.

"The main way in which we can help provide dollars to the free nations with which to buy our goods is to buy imports from them. With world conditions being what they are today, none of the free nations can afford to become either economically, politically, or militarily isolated from the others. One of the best known tenets of communism is that the way to divide and conquer the free nations of the world is through trade wars. Russia and the countries which she dominates are making an all-out effort to encourage the free nations to trade with them.

"A realistic foreign trade policy on our part will contribute to an expanding world economy, establish and maintain in all the free countries rising levels of employment and real income and create economic conditions which are conducive to world peace. We must strive, in making our decisions on foreign-trade policy, to base them to the maximum extent possible on our national interests. Such a policy will benefit all segments of our economy—agricultural, labor, and industrial alike.

"In my opinion, H. R. 1 is a modest though realistic step in the direction of an expanded market for our exports, while at the same time permitting free nations to earn their own way by increasing their exports to us. I do not now, nor have I ever, advocated the surrendering of our markets to foreign goods; however, I do feel that we can—through enactment of H. R. 1—greatly strengthen the economies of the free world as well as our own, while at the same time still providing realistic protection for our own industries and agriculture.

"A realistic and constructive foreign-trade policy on the part of all the free nations of the world is more important today than it has ever been in the past. If we fail on our part to do our share to bring about such a foreign-trade policy, the other free nations of the world will despair in their cooperative efforts with us to fight communistic aggression and subversion. Our position of leadership in the world today demands that we be a moving factor in expanding world trade."

Four-Year Tenure for Members of the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for the election of Members of the House of Representatives for a 4-year tenure.

The 2-year term provided for Members of the House of Representatives written into the Constitution in 1787, in the days of limited communication, was designed to keep the Members in close touch with their constituents. The authors of the Constitution, who wanted the Government to be controlled by the people, also felt that such control would be more effective if all Members of the House of Representatives were compelled to stand for reelection every 2 years.

They feared that a long term in this important body of the Congress might cause the Members to disregard the will of the people to a greater degree, and become more dictatorial as a legislative body.

With the rapid development of travel by train, on paved highways, and by air, and with the rapid development of communications through the press, the mails, and the radio, the people are so well advised on legislative matters as to make biannual elections of the Members of the House of Representatives unnecessary in the future.

In fact, the authors of the Constitution when this subject was under discussion said that the frequency of elections of the Members of the House of Representatives must depend upon a variety of circumstances, and that experience should be the guide to follow.

Through experience we now know that the Senate with 6-year terms has worked well; that the Senators, due to rapid communications, are in close touch with their constituents, as are Members of the House. Modern communications now enable the Members of the House and Senate to preserve the close tie between legislator and constituents that the framers of our Constitution thought was necessary.

The 2-year term for Members of the House has become antiquated. Too frequent elections of Members of the House of Representatives with our increased population, business growth, and the complexity of problems coming to the Congress for solution has reached the point where the biennial election of Members of the House places an unnecessary burden upon such Members, and is a deterrent to better and more efficient governmental service in such capacity.

Mr. Speaker, if the Members of the House are given a 4-year tenure, a much greater amount of their time can be employed in the study of legislation and the investigation of governmental problems. If a 4-year term of office is provided, a Member of the House, when elected, will have at least 3 years in which he can give all of his attention to the problems of government before he has to give a part of his time to the consideration of his reelection.

If the Members of the House are provided a 4-year tenure, it will give them greater resistance against the powerful pressure groups that have developed in our politics, which seek to influence the voting of the Members of the House by their power of numbers rather than by the merit of the proposed legislation they are supporting. It will place the Members of the House in a position where they can courageously support and pass legislation which they know to be in the interest of the Nation, and in which they know such legislation will have time to demonstrate its value in the public interest, and become acceptable to the majority of the people before they have to stand for reelection again.

For instance, Members of the House who voted for the Taft-Hartley law were marked for defeat by the big labor leaders who falsely branded the legislation as a "slave-labor law," and many Members had great difficulty and some failed at election because the law had not had time to become sufficiently understood by the rank and file of labor. This is only one instance in many which points out the necessity of giving the Members of the House a 4-year tenure, and the benefits it will bring to the people in better government.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides that the 4-year tenure will become effective on the year we elect a President. The people elect a President for a 4-year term. If this resolution becomes law, they will elect all of the Members of the House at the time they elect the President. Generally, under our two-party system of government, if the people lose faith in an administration, they put the other party in power, seeking to hold it responsible for the ensuing 4 years.

If a Republican President is elected, he has a right, and the people generally want him, to have a majority of his own party, so that they may hold that party responsible. If a Democrat President is elected, they want him to have a majority so that they can hold that party responsible. This is one of the great advantages of the two-party system, and if this resolution is adopted, it will strengthen the two-party system for the future, which will be of untold benefit in the future to our processes of government, as it has been in the past.

We cannot hold a party responsible, we cannot achieve the best in government for the people with the President of one party, and the legislative branch controlled by the opposite party.

In closing, may I say that there is utterly no sense, rhyme or reason for the continuance of the election of the Members of the House for a 2-year term. The time and expense of election is a burden that prevents more able men from being willing to enter public service. It is a deterrent to good progressive government, is antiquated, and I sincerely hope that this Congress will take the great and progressive step toward better government that a 4-year tenure for Members of the House of Representatives would assure.

Wanted: A 49th State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, our forefathers who founded

this Republic fought a costly and bloody war to free themselves from the tyranny of taxation without representation. Yet we, their descendants, today, impose taxation without representation upon the 523,000 inhabitants of Hawaii.

Hawaiian youths are drafted to serve in the Armed Forces of our country. The Hawaiian people must pay the same tax rates as those levied upon the citizens of our 48 States. The Hawaiians must abide by our laws. But Hawaiians have no vote in the making of draft laws, in the fixing of tax schedules or in enacting any law.

This obviously is unfair and not in keeping with America's historic traditions. The situation should be speedily remedied by the enactment early in this new session of Congress of a law that will make Hawaii the 49th State.

The people of Hawaii, during the past year, paid a greater amount of taxes into the Federal Treasury than did the citizens of 11 of our present States; these being Arizona, Idaho, Nevada, New Hampshire, Montana, New Mexico, North Dakota, Utah, Vermont, and Wyoming.

Hawaii, today, has a greater population than four of our States; these being Delaware, Nevada, Vermont, and Wyoming.

Some say Hawaii is too remote from the Capitol in Washington, but she is closer to it, in travel time, than was Nebraska or Kansas at the time of their admission to the Union.

Congress should act quickly to right an old injustice by voting statehood to Hawaii soon so that her people may exercise the American right of voting for citizens to represent them in the Congress and for others to be President and Vice President of the Republic.

Haym Salomon Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution which would authorize and direct the President to proclaim January 6 of each year as Haym Salomon Day.

Haym Salomon is possibly the least known patriot of the American Revolution. Today is the anniversary of the death of this great Jewish-American who helped to bring this country into being.

He came to this country from Poland, settled in New York, and there engaged in business. He became active in the Sons of Liberty which was organized in the colonies for the purpose of breaking away from Britain and setting up an independent country, which subsequently was set up as the United States of America. In 1776 he was arrested by the British and confined to jail. He was released a year later and immediately reengaged actively in the effort to set up this country as a free and independent nation.

He was arrested again in 1778, court-martialed for spying and sentenced to be hanged. With the aid of his fellow patriots, he escaped to Philadelphia, where he continued his activities on behalf of the cause of liberty and freedom.

When the efforts of the Founding Fathers were at their lowest ebb, when their leaders did not know where to turn, Haym Salomon came to the front and contributed his entire fortune to finance the continuance of the Revolutionary War.

He gave to the cause $640,000, his entire wealth. While it is a small sum, as we look at money today, it was a tremendous sum in those days. In addition to that, he went out and pledged his personal credit and borrowed additional sums.

General Washington and others of that day have given him credit for having financed the successful continuation of that war, as a result of which our fine Nation came into being and has since grown into a great and prosperous country. Neither his estate nor his descendants were repaid the loans he made to our Government nor those guaranteed by him. Haym Salomon died penniless.

I think that we could do little less than honor his memory by asking or authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim each year January 6 as Haym Salomon Day in commemoration of that great American patriot, not by making it a national holiday but by proclaiming it as a day of commemoration and directing that the United States flag be flown on all Government buildings on that day.

The Program of the United States Information Service in Italy, Spain, Algeria, Morocco, and Tunisia, With Specific Information Concerning Rome, Naples, Palermo, Madrid, Barcelona, Algiers, Casablanca, and Tunis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the following is an outline of the program of the United States Information Service in Italy, Spain, Algeria, Morocco, and Tunisia, with specific information concerning Rome, Naples, Palermo, Madrid, Barcelona, Algiers, Casablanca, and Tunis:

ITALY

In Italy the job of the United States Information Service—USIS—is to win Italian support for the development of free world strength and to help expose and defeat the Communist conspiracy. We are trying to show the Italian people that the policies of the United States are based on interests compatible with Italy's own legitimate aspirations, and wherever possible we are trying to stimulate the Italians to a more vigorous defense of their own democracy. In Italy all the media of the agency are employed in accomplishing our objectives, namely, radio, press, motion pictures, libraries, and exhibits.

USIS Rome, where Ned Nordness is public affairs officer and John MacKnight his deputy, has, with the Italy branch offices, been concentrating in recent months on a special cultural program to counter the still widely held concept among Italians of United States immaturity and cultural barrenness. USIS officers, through cultivation of key personalities in Italian education, have been instrumental in the establishment of, or in initiating procedures for establishing, chairs in American studies at 4 major Italian universities—1 in Venice, 2 in Florence, 1 in Rome—thus placing American studies for the first time on an equal footing with other academic subjects in the Italian university curriculum. The Atoms for Peace Exhibit, which opened in Rome last June and by now has toured some 20 other Italian cities, has been a tremendous success in stimulating Italian awareness of the President's atoms for peace program and of the United States commitment to the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

Walter Wien is public affairs officer in Naples, a post that is especially important not only as the center of NATO naval effort but as one of the principal cities, along with Palermo, of a vast economically backward and previously isolated area which offers the greatest danger today for Communist growth. Here an economic development and reform program, set in motion by democratic Italian governments since the war, is producing a slow awakening which the Communist Party is attempting to exploit to its own advantage.

Paul Wheeler is acting public affairs officer in Palermo, a post that is faced with special problems in serving an isolated, in many ways still backward, island community.

SPAIN

In Spain, Morrill Cody is public affairs officer in Madrid, and William Hart is public affairs officer in Barcelona. Our USIS program there has made increasingly active and effective use of all media—radio, press, films, exhibits, and our library centers. We are concentrating in Spain on helping to insure the success of the United States aid agreements with that country by bringing about a clear understanding of their purposes. We are trying also to convince the Spaniards of the importance of the Western European Community and the value of international cooperation and collective military strength. The Madrid office is increasing its efforts in areas of defense activity and is giving special support to the United States military program for establishing good troop-community relations.

In Barcelona, which is the center of the rapidly developing industrial area of Catalonia, a special effort is being made, under the educational exchange program, to increase the number of leader and specialist grants to Catalonian industrialists in order to give those who

will have a hand in developing the area a broader point of view.

ALGERIA

The strategic importance of Algeria, together with Tunisia and Morocco, in western defense and its vital contribution to the economic health of France are among the reasons for a USIS program in this country. Communist propaganda strives constantly to deepen the differences between the French and the Arab population on the "colonial issue" and to create suspicion and hatred of the United States.

Mr. John Rhodes is public affairs officer in Algiers. The United States Information Service works through an information center, press and publications, and radio to expose Communist motives and strengthen confidence in the United States. The past year has featured a successful effort to extend the influence of the program into a growing number of population centers throughout Algeria.

TUNIS

Although the political situation in Tunisia is restrictive, as in Morocco, the atmosphere of conciliation permits association with many Arab groups. The fact that the public affairs officer is fluent in Arabic, and well as French, and had established association with the Arab population prior to the period of violence, further increases the program opportunities.

Mr. Leslie Lewis is public affairs officer at Tunis. Through the use of the four media—press, radio, films, and the library—the USIS operation in Tunis explains and exploits American foreign policy with regard to Tunisia in particular, founded on the Byroade statement regarding American foreign policy in colonial areas. This is directed at the mixed middle-group audience of politically conscious French-Tunisians, Arab-Tunisians, and minority groups—Italians, Jews, Corsicans, Maltese, and so forth. The program is not directed to the political extremists, which are an unlikely audience because of the exclusiveness of their interests.

MOROCCO

The USIS American staff in Morocco consists of a country public affairs officer, Mr. James Carter, and two subordinate public affairs officers, Mr. Donald R. Norland, at Rabat, and Miss Annadele Riley, stationed at Casablanca. The activities at Casablanca are conducted by Miss Riley, under the supervision of Mr. Carter, who visits Casablanca frequently.

In addition to this American complement, which is assigned to carry forward the aims of the United States Information Agency among the Moroccan population, the International Broadcasting Service—IBS—of the Agency, known as the Voice of America, maintains a relay station at Tangier which transmits short-wave programs to Europe and Iron Curtain countries. No programs are broadcast to Morocco, this being technically impossible because the short-wave radio beam rides over the area adjacent to the transmitters.

The present political situation in Morocco, and resulting restrictions imposed on the Information Service by the local French administration, severely limits the scope of the USIS activities there. There is virtually no possibility of personal association with the Moroccan population. The realities of the local situation permit factual news reporting by press, radio, and films and the publicizing of American cultural activities through the Information Center. These programs contribute to United States objectives by displaying the United States in a favorable light, and through its subject matter tends to enlist the cooperation of the French and Moroccans.

My experience with the United States Information Agency is that insufficient appropriations have been allotted to this Agency. This is an agency which is involved in the battle of men's minds, and ideas are more important than bullets. We appropriated $77,114,000 for propaganda purposes, which included funds for the Voice of America and the United States Information Agency. Against this figure, it is interesting to note that the Soviet Union spends about one and one-third billion dollars on propaganda. In comparison, our expenditure is minuscular.

In my contact with the United States Information Service, I wish to state that I have found the staff both here and abroad to be made up of hardworking, painstaking, and patriotic public servants.

The President, significantly, in today's state of the Union message urged enhancement of our USIA information facilities.

Impact on Veterans' Benefits of Presidential Proclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the proclamation of the President terminating certain benefits now available to veterans of the Korean conflict was issued last Saturday—January 1, 1955. Its effective date is January 31. One of the results of this proclamation is to bar accumulation of eligibility for education or training under Public Law 550, after this cutoff date. I have introduced legislation which will permit all those members of the armed services on January 31, 1955, to gain the full education benefits if they serve for as much as 2 years after that date. Many recruiting offices have promised the full benefits of the GI bill of rights to those men now serving and unless legislation such as my bill is enacted, the Government will not make good on its promises. I am sure that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will give this subject early action.

I am indicating below some of the results flowing from the proclamation:

Basic service period: Korean service, by the terms of the proclamation, has been officially set as on or after June 27, 1950, and through January 31, 1955.

Education and training: Public Law 550 of the 82d Congress authorizes 1½ days of education or training for each day of service performed during this basic service period with a maximum of 36 calendar months of entitlement. The proclamation means that no additional eligibility may be accumulated under this law after January 31, 1955, and persons first entering service after such date acquire no eligibility for the benefits. The proclamation also ends eligibility for training under the vocational rehabilitation laws.

Compensation: Today disabled veterans of the Korean conflict are entitled to service-connected disability compensation ranging from $17 per month for a 10-percent disability to $181 per month for total disability. In certain severely disabled cases special rates may go as high as $420 per month. Any veteran who has a service-connected disability as a result of service after January 31, 1955, will be entitled, as a peacetime veteran, to 80 percent of the rates mentioned previously. Certain presumptions of service connection in chronic disease cases will not be available to veterans separated from service after January 31, 1955. After that date eligibility for service-connected death compensation will also be on a peacetime basis, with rates based on 80 percent of the wartime rate.

Pensions: Veterans of World War I, II, and Korea today are entitled under certain conditions to non-service-connected disability pension at rates of $66.16, $78.75, or $135.45, depending upon age, condition, and other factors. Service after the date of January 31, 1955, will be considered peacetime, but any veterans serving, for example, as little as 1 day prior to the delimiting date and 89 additional days continuously thereafter will be eligible for non-service-connected disability pension under the existing laws.

Widows and children of veterans of the Korean conflict period—June 27, 1950, through January 31, 1955—are eligible for pension based upon the non-service-connected death of such veterans. The basic rate for a widow is $50.40 per month. This program will not be available to dependents of persons first entering the service on or after February 1, 1955.

Automobiles: Veterans of exclusive service after January 31, 1955, will not be eligible for the benefits of Public Law 187, 82d Congress, which provides $1,600 toward the purchase of a specially equipped automobile for service-connected veterans who have suffered the loss or loss of the use of one or both hands, or feet, or who are blind as defined.

Hospitalization: No entitlement to VA hospitalization for non-service-connected disabilities where the service of the veteran is solely after January 31, 1955.

Insurance: The proclamation does not affect in any way provisions of Public Law 23 which automatically insures any serviceman in the amount of $10,000 while in active service. It is payable over a 10-year period to beneficiaries defined in the law.

Housing: The issuance of the proclamation means that in order for a veteran to obtain a loan guaranty—maximum $7,500—the loan must be made prior to February 1, 1965. So long as there is service prior to January 31, 1955, additional service to complete the required 90 days may be had after that date, if continuous.

Mustering-out payments: Mustering-out payments in the amount of $100, $200, or $300, depending upon the length and place of service will no longer be available to veterans who serve exclusively after January 31, 1955.

Public housing preference: Those serving exclusively after January 31, 1955, will no longer enjoy preference in the occupancy of low-rent public housing. They also will not have the benefits of certain provisions of the National Housing Act and certain assistance in the acquisition of family-size farm under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

Unemployment compensation: Public Law 550, 82d Congress, makes veterans serving on or after June 27, 1950, eligible for unemployment compensation of $26 per week not to exceed 26 weeks. This program is administered by the States. The proclamation ends this right as of January 31, 1955, for those serving exclusively after that date.

Income tax: Enlisted men serving in combat zone defined in Executive Order 10195, December 20, 1950, did not have to pay taxes on their pay. Executive order issued in conjunction with proclamation terminates this tax exemption.

Legislation To Make Tax Free the Gain on the Sale of a Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I dropped a bill in the hopper to amend section 112 (n) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that gain from the sale or exchange of the taxpayer's home will not be taxed whether or not he replaces it with another residence.

The purpose of this bill is to rectify a longstanding situation which now places an unfair financial burden on the parents of our Nation, when they find it necessary to dispose of a large home after the children have grown and married and have families of their own.

Most young married couples rent an apartment at first. Then, when they have children, they buy a modest home. As more children come along and grow up, it is necessary to purchase a larger home which becomes the scene of many happy hours which include birthday parties and holiday festivities as well as courtships and weddings. When the father and mother have completed the lifelong task of rearing their children and the days of the past are fond memories, they desire to move to a smaller home or an apartment to enjoy the peace and rest that is due them.

This is when the Government steps in to levy a huge tax bill on the total profit realized by the sale of the former homes. This is penalizing the parents who brought into this world our future citizens who will play an important part in the progress and growth of our Nation.

This situation should be changed and it is my hope that the Congress will enact proper legislation to alleviate the hardship resulting from the present law.

The Fight Against Illegal Narcotics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, there is one battle in the cold war of today which is in critical need of attention by this House. I am speaking of our country's continuing fight against the vicious and deadly traffic in illegal narcotics, a traffic which has apparently become one of the major weapons of the international Communist conspiracy throughout the world.

Although our small Government forces in this specialized field are fighting valiantly and tirelessly, the battle is not being won. On the contrary, as recently as June 1 of 1954, the United Nations Bulletin reported:

> The Commission on Narcotic Drugs noted that there was a high level of illicit traffic in narcotic drugs which seemed to be increasing.

The Honorable Harry J. Anslinger, United States representative on this Commission, has issued several reports in recent months which paint an alarming picture of the extent and danger of this illicit traffic, which is worldwide in its scope and devastating in its effects upon the health and morale of its victims.

Yet, in the face of abundant evidence that the danger is mounting throughout the world, the 83d Congress was responsible for further cuts in the already slender manpower of the United States customs inspection force, the Border Patrol, and other agencies having some responsibility in this vital field of law enforcement and protection of our Nation.

The same Congress, I regret to say, failed to take any action on the numerous bills before it which called for a strengthening of existing penalties for narcotics violations, especially in the field of second and third offenses.

If this new Congress does nothing else in the field of law enforcement, we owe it to our children to restore at the earliest possible date a fully effective customs inspection and border patrol force, as our coastal line of defense against illegal importation of narcotics. We should also act immediately to strengthen the penal provisions of our narcotics laws, particularly for criminal repeaters who destroy the very souls of American manhood and womanhood through their evil traffic.

I believe we also have an obligation to our Armed Forces and civil servants in occupied areas, as well as to humanity in general, to investigate to the fullest extent the organized and depraved conspiracy of international communism in its effort to subvert free people through promotion of narcotics addiction.

Continuing and complete exposure of this evil practice, with the documentation and human evidence available to us, will not only serve as a true and effective answer to the false propaganda of germ warfare still being circulated by Moscow and Peiping, but will also point the way to more efficient countermeasures by the free world.

To these ends, I have offered a House resolution authorizing a full and complete investigation of illegal narcotic traffic as an instrument and weapon of the international Communist conspiracy, and have also reintroduced the bill which I sponsored as H. R. 4453 in the 83d Congress, which would increase the penalty provisions of certain acts dealing with narcotics.

At the proper time, I trust that many Members will join with me in sponsorship of whatever amendments are necessary to restore our first-line fighting strength in the battle to stop illegal narcotic traffic in our ports and along our borders.

The cost of these measures will be small. The cost of our failure to take them—in terms of increased crime and broken lives—could be too great to reckon.

Fireman of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is always a privilege to do honor to those who devote their lives to the service of others. Men and women who find happiness in doing what they can to make life a bit easier for others and to bring encouragement and faith to the stricken are great people, the kind of people who make our country great. Such spirit of service is common among the members of our police and fire departments which are made up of brave men, always prepared to risk their lives in the protection of ours. These thoughts are prompted by a member of the District of Columbia Fire Department who has recently been selected as Fireman of the Year, and I consider it a privilege to do honor to this man.

Charles M. Chamberlin, Jr., assigned to No. 1 platoon of engine company 16, and presently detailed to the deputy fire chief, has received this honor and he richly deserves it. Mr. Chamberlin has been a member of the District Fire Department for more than 17 years, during which he served in different engine and truck companies, and 5 years with

rescue squad No. 1. He also acted as aide to various battalion fire chiefs, and for the past 3 years he has been aide to Deputy Fire Chief Handback. Let me quote from a statement made about him by one of his superior officers:

Private Chamberlin has always demonstrated a keen interest in the Fire Department and is always ready to give his time to help others, from the lowest private to the highest ranking officer. When any member is sick or wounded he can always count on a visit from Charlie or "Doc" as he is called by all members who know him. In this respect he is largely responsible for the starting and smooth operating of the firemen's blood bank. His interest in this respect is not confined to the Fire Department alone since his record shows he has donated 52 pints of blood through the American Red Cross for the use of the Armed Forces or for other purposes for which they need it.

Private Chamberlin is a family man with a wife and one son. He is an active member of his church, a Mason, and has served as den father to a Cub Scout pack and on the executive committee of the Boy Scouts of America. He is popular with his comrades and is recognized as one who is always ready to help in a good cause.

I am proud to be able to speak of Charlie Chamberlin as my friend, and it is indeed a privilege to know him. The inspiration received from a character with such high and unselfish standards makes us very proud and eager to do our own tasks better and in a more cheerful spirit.

Persons Serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, Should Be Entitled To Continue To Accrue Educational Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has acted under the provisions of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 and issued a proclamation declaring the emergency period at an end on January 31, 1955. The effect of this declaration will be that persons in the Armed Forces will cease accruing eligibility as war veterans on January 31, 1955.

Entitlement to education and training is on an accrual basis. Entitlement is accrued at the rate of 1½ days of education or training for each day of service during the emergency period; therefore, the President's proclamation has the effect of discontinuing accrual of educational entitlement on January 31, 1955, for all persons in service on that date. This will mean that those individuals who have entered the armed services during the past few months will not have the opportunity to accrue sufficient educational entitlement to be of any practical value. A great many persons entered the armed forces during the past few months with the belief that they would have the opportunity of accruing the maximum entitlement to education. Some of these persons maintain that they were urged by armed services recruiters to enter the service and discharge their military service obligation as soon as possible and at the same time gain entitlement to a free college education. I have received letters from service personnel contending that armed services recruiters appeared in high schools last June and urged high school graduates to join the service and stated that they would be entitled to maximum educational entitlement if they entered the service promptly.

In order that those individuals who have entered the service during a recent period will be dealt with fairly, I am introducing a bill which will permit an individual in the armed services on January 31, 1955, to continue to accrue entitlement to education and training on the basis of 1½ days educational entitlement for each day of service up to the date of his discharge or until he accrues maximum entitlement. Enactment of this bill will permit individuals who have been in service less than 24 months on January 31, 1955, to continue to count their service for the purpose of accruing educational entitlement up to a maximum of 24 months' service.

I believe that enactment of this legislation will eliminate the possibility that any individual has been misled or has been dealt with unfairly and at the same time will serve the basic intent of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952. I hope that the Veterans' Affairs Committee can give prompt consideration to this question as soon as it is organized.

Unjust Discrimination Against Members of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill to correct an inequity of our tax laws which results in an unjust discrimination against members of our Armed Forces.

Last year, in our work on the mammoth new tax law, the House included a provision, section 37, which provided a tax credit equal to 20 percent of retirement incomes up to $1,200 for individuals aged 65 and over. When the bill reached the other body, this section was amended to provide similar treatment for individuals under 65 with respect to pensions received from a public-retirement system. However, the amendment made by the other body specifically defined the term "public-retirement system" so as to exclude a retirement system operated for the benefit of the Armed Forces. That amendment with the exception I have just described finally prevailed in conference.

As a result, under the law as it now stands, a retired schoolteacher, policeman, fireman, or other civil servant is entitled to the retirement income-tax credit even if he retires before age 65. On the other hand, a member of our Armed Forces who similarly retires before age 65 is not entitled to equivalent treatment. I can find no justification whatsoever for continuing this type of discrimination against individuals who have served in their country's uniform. The bill which I have introduced today simply removes the exclusion of the Armed Forces from the definition of public-retirement system. The amendment would be effective for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1953, the effective date of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

States Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. SMITH
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I today introduced a very brief and comprehensive bill (H. R. 3) on the subject of States rights, with particular reference to the present rule of the United States Supreme Court that where Congress has enacted legislation on any subject, the States are deprived of all power to enact or enforce similar laws on the same subject even though not in conflict with the Federal act.

What the bill seeks to do is to modify this doctrine so as to permit concurrent jurisdiction in order that the State act, where not in conflict with the Federal act, can be also enforced in the State courts for the protection of the State and its citizens.

The bill reads as follows:

That no act of Congress shall be construed as indicating an intent on the part of Congress to occupy the field in which such act operates, to the exclusion of all State laws on the same subject matter, unless such act contains an express provision to that effect. No act of Congress shall be construed as invalidating a provision of State law which would be valid in the absence of such act, unless there is a direct and positive conflict between an express provision of such act and such provision of the State law so that the two cannot be reconciled or consistently stand together.

For a long time the Supreme Court has held that whenever the Congress enacted legislation on any subject, its jurisdiction becomes exclusive and no State law can be enforced. In late years, as you know, Congress has legislated pretty well all over the waterfront. Congress has stretched the Interstate Commerce laws and the general welfare laws to the point where they cover all the ills of mankind, while the Supreme Court has consistently held to its original decision that when Congress acts all State laws are nullified, whether in conflict with the Federal law or not.

I do not quarrel with the Supreme Court about its consistency in its decisions. As a matter of fact, I devoutly wish that that Court would stand by its own decisions so that we lawyers could know not only what the law is today, but what it will be tomorrow.

Understand, please, that this doctrine that the Federal jurisdiction is exclusive in all cases is not due to any constitutional provision.

On the contrary, the 10th amendment to the Constitution especially reserves to the States all powers not granted, and the Constitution itself only gives to the Federal courts jurisdiction in a very limited number of subjects. You will all recall from your study of history that a great stumbling block in the adoption of the Constitution lay in the stubborn reluctance of all the Colonies to relinquish any of their sovereign powers, and during the debates preceding the adoption of the Constitution in the various States there developed a general understanding that in order to further protect the sovereignty of the States and the rights of individuals there would immediately be proposed the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights. The 10th, and final, amendment was the one that specifically reserved to the States and to the people all of the powers not granted to the Federal Government. The principle which I am now discussing and seek to modify is a rule of law enacted by the Supreme Court and has come to have as much force and effect as if it had been adopted as a part of the Constitution. The principle was debated and discussed in numerous early decisions of the Supreme Court, but the final decision which so drastically changed the intent of the framers of the Constitution was decided in 1842 in the famous case of Gibbons against Ogden, and was even then regarded as of such doubtful validity that it was adopted by a divided Court of 5 to 4, and that decision established the flat theory that when Congress passed a law Congress intended that all State laws should be superseded. I seek by this bill to have Congress say it had no such foolish intention in any case unless it said so.

Let me illustrate the iniquitous results of such a doctrine. I will use the decision of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania that caused me to introduce this bill. I am the author of the Smith Act that, among other things, makes it a crime to teach or advocate the overthrow of the Government by force. Forty-seven of the 48 States have some kind of laws against sedition and subversion. Pennsylvania undertook to prosecute a notorious Communist who was a citizen of that State under the State Sedition Act. The Supreme Court of that State, following the decisions above referred to, decided that as Congress had enacted the Smith Act it had withdrawn from all of the States the power to protect themselves from treasonable acts, and nullified all State laws on the subject whether the Congress intended to do so or not.

I was asked to introduce an amendment to the Smith Act to say that Congress in enacting the law intended no such harmful construction of it.

Obviously that case was merely a symptom of a dangerous disease that threatened to destroy completely the sovereignty of the States and was not the disease itself, and I decided to offer a separate bill to seek a cure of the whole malady.

The bill I have read is the result. To illustrate further, in a similar case of Cloverleaf Co. against Patterson, the State of Alabama for the protection of the health of its citizens sought to inspect the product of the Cloverleaf Co., which was engaged in the renovation of butter, some of which was shipped in interstate commerce and subject to inspection under the Federal Pure Food and Drug Act. The Supreme Court held that as Congress had enacted the pure food laws it has assumed entire jurisdiction over the subject and the States were powerless to enforce their laws for the protection of the health of their citizens. I mention that case because the best argument I can think of for my bill is contained in the dissenting opinion of Justice Frankfurter who can, by no stretch of the imagination, be called a reactionary. He said:

> The Department of Agriculture not only urged the enactment (of the Federal statute involved in the case), it drafted its provisions. If the Department wanted Congress to withdraw from the States their power to condemn unsanitary packing stock and to confide such power in the Federal Government, it could easily have made appropriate provision in the draft submitted by it to Congress. However, the Department did not do so. It did ask Congress to make some restrictions upon the authority which had been exercised by the States in regulating the manufacture and sale of butter for the protection of their citizens. But the restrictions did not include withdrawal from the States of the power to condemn unhealthful packing stock butter. The sponsors of this legislation, the experts of the Department of Agriculture, could have submitted to Congress appropriate language for the accomplishment of that result. They did not do so. The Court now does it for them even though the Department has no such desire.
>
> To require the various agencies of the Government who are the effective authors of legislation like that now before us to express clearly and explicitly their purpose in dislodging constitutional powers of States—if such is their purpose—makes for care in draftsmanship and for responsibility in legislation. To hold, as do the majority, that paralysis of State power is somehow to be found in the vague implications of the Federal renovated butter enactments is to encourage slipshodness in draftsmanship and irresponsibility in legislation.

It must be obvious to you that with the multitude of subjects which the Congress is now dealing, that it is inevitably merely a question of time before the States will be deprived of practically all power and sovereignty in enactment and enforcement of laws for the protection of the health and welfare of their local citizens. In many Federal laws action to remedy wrongs must be initiated by some Federal bureau. Under present law, if the Federal bureau fails to act or refuses to act, the citizen is without remedy. In many instances adequate remedy requires immediate injunctive relief. Delay incident to bureaucratic redtape or indifference can mean financial ruin. Such instances have occurred and are occurring with more frequency.

Under present conditions, if the Federal authorities fail or refuse to act, the citizen is utterly without remedy.

The overall objective of the bill was well stated by the President when speaking on the subject of States rights. He made the following statement:

> I want to see maintained the constitutional relationships between the Federal and State Governments. * * * For, if the States lose their meaning, our entire system of government loses its meaning. And the next step is the rise of the centralized, national state in which the seeds of autocracy can take root and grow. * * * We will see that the legitimate rights of the States and local communities are respected. * * * We will not reach into the States and take from them their powers and responsibilities to serve their citizens.

I hope the measure may have the support and active aid of all those who believe in the sovereignty of their States, who believe that local self-government is the best government, and who believe, as expressed by the President, that the rise of the centralized national state creates the atmosphere in which "the seeds of autocracy can take root and grow," to help me to help the President to put life and meaning into his inspired words.

Don't Bankrupt the American Crabbing Industry

REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, Japan, last year, supplied about 60 percent of all the canned crab that was sold in the United States. American producers supplied only about 40 percent.

Despite the fact that there is, under existing law, a 22½ percent ad valorem—on value—tariff on imported canned crab and a 15 percent ad valorem duty on fresh and frozen crab, Japan dominates the American crab market. Japan is able to do this because wages in canned food industries are 8 cents an hour for women and not more than 19½ cents for men. American wages in the crabbing industry are many times those paid workers in Japan. In fact, most workers in the American crabbing industry are paid more for an hour's labor than the corresponding Japanese worker is paid for an entire day's work.

Despite the fact that Japan already sells 60 percent of all the canned crab marketed in the United States, the Committee on Reciprocity Information has announced that it will consider at an international conference at Geneva in February granting reductions in the existing 22½ percent tariff on canned crab and 15 percent on fresh and frozen crab. If these crab tariffs are reduced, I am convinced American crab producers

will lose most of the 40 percent of the domestic sales they still enjoy. If this happens the American crabbing industry will face ruination and bankruptcy.

American canners have invested millions of dollars in building fine, modern, and sanitary canneries that are a model of cleanliness for the packing of crab. Fishermen have invested other millions in fishing boats and gear. A lowering at Geneva of the existing tariffs on crab will wipe out most of these investments. The fishermen and the cannery workers are not the only ones, however, who will suffer if the American crabbing industry is wrecked, as it surely will be, if existing crab tariffs are lowered.

Boatbuilders, the manufacturers of crabbing gear and those who supply goods and services to fishermen and cannery workers also will suffer.

Even under existing tariffs, Japanese producers are giving the American crabbing industry a tough time. In 1950, crab imports from Japan were 1,761,000 pounds and by 1953 had increased to 3,860,880 pounds. Crab imports from Japan more than doubled in those 3 years.

During the same years, the American canned crab pack declined from 137,490 cases to 114,886 cases, a decrease of more than 20 percent.

In short, during the years 1950 to 1953, the latest years for which complete statistics are available, Japan increased her shipments of crab into the United States by more than 100 percent and our domestic American pack of crabmeat declined 20 percent.

There is a strong feeling among most Americans that our country should do nothing that in any way will aid or strengthen Russia whose leaders, nowadays, are doing everything they can to embarass and harass the United States. If we, at Geneva, lower tariffs in an effort to aid Japan, we are apt also to be helping Russia.

If additional markets for Japanese crab are opened in the United States by lower tariffs on crab imports, Japan, then naturally, will seek to expand her crab take and crab production. Under the Yalta Treaty the Allies gave to Russia great areas of the crabbing waters which Japan, previously, had owned, controlled, and fished.

Japan to fill orders for the expanded American market, which will be created for Japanese crab if tariffs on crabmeat are lowered, undoubtedly, will buy crab from the Russians and pack it under a canned-in-Japan label and then ship this Russian crab into the United States. Or, if not that, Japan could obtain from Russia at a price fishing rights for Japanese fishermen to fish the waters that once belonged to Japan but which we, at Yalta, gave to Russia. Thus, opening our American market to increased imports of crab by lowering existing tariffs could prove to be of great financial benefit to the Russians.

The American crabbing industry is not the only American industry which will suffer from the increased influx of foreign crab meat which the lowering of crab tariffs will encourage. All American shell fish industries—oyster, lobster, and shrimp industries—also will be hurt.

If Japanese shipments of crab into the United States increase due to lowered tariffs—and these shipments will increase if tariffs are lowered—the imported crab produced by low-wage, low-living standard Japanese labor, will be sold at prices below that of shrimp, oysters, lobsters, and other shellfish. As a result of low priced Japanese crab flooding our market, the price on crab cocktails will drop below those made of other shellfish. Oysters, shrimp, and lobster will have to meet these lower Japanese crab meat prices which American oyster, lobster, and shrimp producers cannot do because they, like those in the American crabbing industry, cannot compete with Japanese cannery labor which is paid as little as 8 cents an hour.

We also have a great and growing oyster industry on the Pacific coast which if the import duty on oysters is lowered at Geneva will suffer in the same ways the American crabbing industry will suffer.

In one community on Willapa Harbor, named Nahcotta, there are 5 oyster canneries, each of which employs 50 to 70 people. Other canneries operate on Willapa Harbor. This oyster industry is rated as a $10 million one. It can be greatly weakened, even wiped out, by further growth in the oyster imports from Japan.

Most of those who are engaged in the oyster and crabbing industries of the Pacific coast have their life savings invested in canneries, boats, and gear. Their continued activity is of utmost importance to all the people in the fishing communities where these businesses operate. Lowering of tariffs on Japanese crab and oysters very well might make ghost towns out of these fishing communities.

Health Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the 84th Congress I introduced several bills to make available means by which facilities to promote the health of our people would be more generally available than at the present time.

The seven bills I have introduced are designed to help the American people to bear the burden of hospital and medical expenses and to provide for a more effective use of available Federal funds in promoting the health of the American people. These bills are the result of very extensive hearings and committee consideration of health programs proposed to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce during the 83d Congress during which I had the privilege of being chairman of the committee.

My first bill—H. R. 397—is a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide mortgage-loan insurance for hospitals and medical facilities. The purpose of this bill is to stimulate investment of private capital in the construction of hospitals and medical facilities and thus to increase the availability of adequate medical facilities in which health services may be rendered to the American people. This bill would supplement the hospital-construction amendments—Public Law 482, 83d Congress—by channeling private funds into the construction of hospitals and medical facilities.

My second bill—H. R. 398—is a reintroduction of the bill, H. R. 7700, introduced by me during the 83d Congress.

This bill is based on the same principle as my first bill, but the mortgage-loan insurance provided for in the bill for hospitals and medical facilities would be available only for hospitals and medical facilities used in connection with voluntary prepayment health plans. These plans, of which the Kaiser Foundation in California and the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York, and Group Health Association, Inc., of Washington, D. C., are outstanding examples, have been particularly successful in furnishing comprehensive medical care to the members and subscribers of these plans in return for monthly premiums paid by the members and subscribers.

My third bill—H. R. 399—which is a reintroduction of H. R. 6950, 83d Congress, is designed to assist nonprofit associations offering prepaid health service programs to secure necessary facilities and equipment through long-term interest-bearing loans advanced to such associations by the Federal Government.

While the first three bills introduced by me are designed to facilitate the construction of hospitals and medical facilities, my fourth bill—H. R. 400—is designed to provide improved protection for an increased number of our citizens under prepayment health plans. This bill is a reintroduction of H. R. 8356 which was reported favorably by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee during the 83d Congress. The bill would establish a limited Federal reinsurance service with a self-sustaining fund derived from reinsurance premiums paid by the sponsors of health service prepayment plans participating in the program.

My fifth bill—H. R. 401—is a reintroduction of the bill, H. R. 6949, introduced by me during the 83d Congress. Like my fourth bill, it is designed to expand health services through the medium of Government reinsurance. However, the bill is limited to non-profit associations which render or secure medical and hospital services and does not extend to commercial health insurance companies. This bill is of particular importance, I feel, because it sets forth minimum standards which insurance plans must meet in order to become eligible for reinsurance under the plan proposed by the bill.

My sixth bill—H. R. 402—would amend the Internal Revenue Code and authorize a deduction up to $100 for income-tax purposes for any taxpayer, and $100 for each of his dependents for insurance premiums or fees paid to

health insurance companies and voluntary prepayment plans. This deduction would be in addition to deductions for medical expenses now authorized under the Federal income-tax laws. This deduction would stimulate individuals to prepay their medical expenses by participating in health insurance plans.

My last bill—H. R. 403—is a reintroduction of H. R. 7397 introduced by me during the 83d Congress. This bill was reported favorably by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and was passed by the House of Representatives. The purpose of this bill is to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of public health services by providing for a more effective use of available Federal funds.

It is my hope that this series of bills will enable the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—and in the case of the tax deduction bill, the Committee on Ways and Means—and the House of Representatives to give careful consideration to plans designed to ease the economic burden which illness, and particularly prolonged illnesses, places on the American people. The 83d Congress enacted much-needed amendments to the Hospital Survey and Construction Act. It is my hope that the 84th Congress will follow up the action of the 83d Congress by enacting several of the measures which I have introduced.

Production of Wheat for Feed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill which will permit the farmers of the Nation to produce wheat for feed, without penalty, if all of the wheat produced is fed where grown and no price support is desired.

Under the present law, when marketing quotas have been voted for wheat, farmers who harvest wheat in excess of their allotment are subject to penalty. Farmers who produce wheat only for feed and who do not want price support on their wheat or any other crop are forced to curtail their operations and are in violation of the law and subject to penalty if they fail to do so. This is true even though the farmer uses his entire production of wheat solely to feed his own cattle or poultry. This situation is an intolerable and unnecessary interference with the operation of our country's farms and has been the source of widespread dissatisfaction among our farmers.

The ridiculousness and downright injustice of the situation are obvious. Many small farmers who raise wheat solely to feed their own cattle or poultry are forced to put that wheat into storage and then buy the wheat they need for feed purposes. This is an indefensible example of Government regulation run wild.

Wheat used for feed on the farm where produced does not enter any marketing channels. Its production does not affect the operation of price supports and, therefore, should be exempted from marketing quotas. My bill will accomplish that purpose. I shall press for its early consideration by the Congress.

Saline Water Conversion Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation to amend the Saline Water Act of 1952, to provide for its uninterrupted continuation and to enable the officials in charge of the program to have the advantage of a limited amount of technical assistance from existing Federal scientific facilities. I authored the 1952 legislation which initiated the saline water conversion program. This program, under the direction of the Department of the Interior, has the objective of developing economically feasible processes for converting saline water to fresh water. I am concerned at all times over our diminishing water supplies, both in this country and throughout the world. As the water needs of our country grow and our available supplies dwindle, the importance of water to our well being and to our overall national economy is impressed upon us more and more.

I have followed closely the program which has been conducted under the 1952 legislation. Much progress has been made and it now seems clear that the results of the research and the studies now under way will, if given time, result in large-scale conversion of salt water to fresh water for municipal and industrial purposes. It also seems clear that, in time, conversion of sea water as well as brackish water for agricultural purposes in certain areas will be achieved. Although it had been thought that the extension of the program should be made toward the close of the initial 5-year period progress now indicates clearly the desirability of assuring at this time continuity and some minor expansion of activity to accommodate and make full use of the initial results now flowing in. There should be no slowdown or interruption in the program, and both the Department and private industry, which has assisted in the research, should be given assurance by this Congress that the program will be continued. For these reasons, I am introducing legislation at this time.

The Secretary of the Interior has just transmitted to the Congress his third annual report covering this program, and I am pleased to report briefly to my colleagues upon the progress that has been made.

The Department of the Interior accomplishes this saline water conservation program by conducting scientific research and development through federally financed grants and contracts, encouraging such development by correlating and coordinating efforts in this field, and stimulating the interest of private and public organizations and individuals in the problem. Private development of processes is being encouraged, and a few industrial firms have undertaken independent research in this field during the past year, and the Department has received wholehearted cooperation from several organizations now engaged in these activities.

At the beginning of the program, the cost of converting sea water to fresh water by the best processes in use was about $400 to $500 an acre-foot. Accordingly, an arbitrary criterion was set for the intial phase of the program, for water for municipal and industrial purposes. This goal was $125 per acre-foot—38 cents per 1,000 gallons—which was believed, on the basis of available data, to represent about the maximum that could be borne by these types of use. It was thought that if this goal could be approached during the initial phase, further reduction might be possible in a second phase.

The work accomplished so far indicates that attainment of the first goal of obtaining fresh water from sea water at a price which municipal users and some industries might pay, and the conversion of brackish water to irrigation uses, seems to be in sight although much work will be necessary before either can be brought to realization. The task of converting sea water for irrigation is more difficult but the researches continually produce new ideas and one of these may well point a way to its attainment.

Some of the investigations initiated earlier in this program have been completed and the results described. Other research investigations are being continued and many new research and development problems are being studied. All of these are described in some detail in the third annual report covering the program.

The report indicates that during the past year 39 proposals for research were evaluated formally and several dozen additional suggestions were considered. Eleven new research and development contracts were let. Work under 11 other research contracts initiated earlier was completed with affirmative results definitely justifying further research in 8. Two processes give promise of converting sea water at less than half present costs, and one for brackish water has reached pilot-plant stage and is being field tested. Information has been obtained and exchanged on developments in this field in the United States and more than a dozen other countries from Europe to Australia.

I am advised that progress during the year has demonstrated the need for a central governmental program of this nature having no interest in the development of one industrial process over another. Few industrial firms appear to

feel justified in carrying the development of saline water conversion equipment further than improvements in present equipment. However, to reach the ultimate objective of the program—demineralized water in large quantities at a small fraction of present costs for the general economic benefit—more than minor improvements in processes are needed. The governmental program would assure that research and development would be continued persistently, including minor local improvements in processes, until in time, low-cost water in large quantities was made available to the general public.

The report indicates that, during 1954, new light has also been cast upon the direction which the program should take in the development of unconventional energy sources for demineralization. The energy required for extracting 1 acre-foot of fresh water from sea water is about 900 kilowatt-hours. From research under the program, it has been estimated that the minimum that might be reached in practice would probably be 4 to 5 times that quantity. Thus the energy cost alone would not be less than about $20 per acre-foot at 5 mills per kilowatt-hour. The amortized cost of equipment and the cost of operation would probably at least equal the energy cost. This is for sea water, and the costs are generally less for brackish waters. Thus it becomes important that nonconventional low-cost energy such as solar energy, for example, be explored in connection with process development and use.

I am pleased to hear that the nine eminent members of educational, scientific, and industrial organizations who, at the beginning of the program, agreed to serve as advisers to the Secretary on broad policy matters, are all continuing to serve in this capacity and that they have provided some very substantial advice and assistance.

Pray for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I reintroduced a bill to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of a special canceling stamp, or postmarking die bearing the words "Pray for Peace."

An identical measure which I introduced in the 83d Congress was passed in the House on August 18, 1954, but Congress adjourned before the Senate took action. It is my hope that the bill which I introduced yesterday will be enacted into law during this Congress. This legislation would send the message of "Pray for Peace" on United States mail throughout the land, and to the far corners of the world. It would remind the world of our dependence upon God.

An Explanation of Health Bills Introduced in the 84th Congress by Congressman Wolverton, Republican, of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, as previously stated I introduced on the opening day of this 84th Congress, January 5, 1955, several bills, the underlying purpose of which is to provide improved facilities and ways and means to promote the health of our people. I believe each of these bills, or bills similar thereto, and, embodying the fundamental principles thereof, would have a very beneficial effect in meeting the present tremendously high cost of hospitalization and medical attention.

In order that these bills may have the fullest possible understanding and thereby create sufficient interest to bring about enactment, I am making an explanation of each of them, as follows:

H. R. 397, A BILL TO AMEND THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT TO PROVIDE MORTGAGE-LOAN INSURANCE FOR HOSPITALS AND MEDICAL FACILITIES

The principal purposes of the bill, H. R. 397, are:

First, to stimulate lending institutions, through Government insurance of mortgages, to loan funds for the construction of privately owned medical centers, hospitals, clinics, and other health facilities operated on a self-sustaining basis; and

Second, to encourage the extension of voluntary prepayment health plans providing comprehensive medical and hospital care of high quality to the people at reasonable costs within their means.

In order to accomplish these purposes, the bill would create a Health Facilities Mortgage Insurance Fund. The amount of contingent insurance liability would be limited to $200 million, except that with the approval of the President, such amount may be increased by additional amounts aggregating $150 million. Mortgages on qualified health facilities would be insured (subject to 10-percent co-insurance) up to 80 percent of the value of such facility. Interest would be fixed at 5 percent with a maximum of 6 percent if the Secretary finds the higher interest rate necessary.

Title II of the bill would set aside for a period of 2 years after the date of the enactment of the bill not less than $40 million of the total insurance liability authorized by the bill for the insurance of mortgages covering health facilities used primarily in connection with the operation of group prepayment health service plans. This reservation is designed to make certain that a sufficient share of the fund will be available to encourage the extension of group practice prepayment health plans.

The principal objective of the bill, H. R. 397, is to encourage the flow of private capital into the construction and equipment of hospitals and medical facilities. This bill would supplement the Hospital Construction Act, as broadened by the 83d Congress, Public Law 482, which makes available Federal funds for the construction of hospitals and medical facilities.

The bill is based on the extensive experience which the Federal Government has had with the insurance of mortgages on residential housing, including single-family residences and apartments, and contains all of the legislative safeguards provided for in the Housing Act of 1954, enacted by the 83d Congress—Public Law 560—designed to prevent certain abuses which were discovered in connection with the housing program.

H. R. 398, A BILL TO AMEND THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT TO PROVIDE MORTGAGE LOAN INSURANCE FOR HOSPITALS AND MEDICAL FACILITIES USED IN CONNECTION WITH VOLUNTARY PREPAYMENT HEALTH PLANS

H. R. 398 is a reintroduction, in substance, of the bill H. R. 7700, introduced by me on February 3, 1954, during the 83d Congress. The purpose of the bill is to stimulate private lending institutions, through Government insurance of mortgages, to loan funds by which medical centers, hospitals, clinics, and other medical facilities operated in conjunction with voluntary prepayment health plans, can be constructed and operated on a self-sustaining basis.

The further purpose of the bill is to increase the opportunities and facilities by which doctors may associate themselves together in groups, partnerships, and other private initiative arrangements of their own choosing, in order to broaden the distribution of high quality medical care through general practitioners and specialists working together, making the most efficient use of medical schools, facilities, and equipment and emphasizing preventive medicine, detection of diseases, and early diagnosis.

The bill, H. R. 398, is based on the extensive experience of prepayment plans offering comprehensive services in many parts of the country today, as for example, the Kaiser Foundation in California, the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York, and Group Health Association, Inc., of Washington, D. C.

The bill would create a medical facilities mortgage insurance fund. The amount of contingent insurance liability at any one time may not exceed $300 million, except that with the approval of the President, such aggregate amount may be increased at any time by additional amounts aggregating not more than $150 million. Mortgages on qualified health facilities would be fully insured up to 90 percent of the value of such facility. Interest would be fixed at 5 percent with a maximum of 6 percent if the Secretary finds the higher interest rate necessary.

The bill is based on the extensive experience which the Federal Government has had with mortgage loan insurance in the field of residential housing, including both single family residences and apartments.

H. R. 399, A BILL TO ASSIST VOLUNTARY NONPROFIT ASSOCIATIONS OFFERING PREPAID HEALTH SERVICE PROGRAMS TO SECURE NECESSARY FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT THROUGH LONG-TERM, INTEREST-BEARING LOANS

H. R. 399 is similar to H. R. 6950, 83d Congress which was introduced by me on January 6, 1954. The purpose of the bill is to stimulate the organization of additional, and assist in the expansion of existing, voluntary nonprofit prepayment health associations by making available long-term Government loans. The bill would authorize the appropriation of $5 million each for the current and following fiscal years and $10 million for each of the next 3 succeeding fiscal years.

The bill H. R. 399 is designed to supplement other bills introduced by me which are intended to stimulate the flow of private capital into the construction of health facilities used by voluntary health associations.

The bill would be administered by the Surgeon General acting with the advice of the Health Services Facilities Council. The Council would consist of representatives of the Department of Agriculture, Department of Labor, and 12 members to be appointed by the Surgeon General with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare who are recognized as leaders in the field of medical economics, medical administration, or public affairs.

H. R. 400, A BILL TO IMPROVE THE PUBLIC HEALTH BY ENCOURAGING MORE EXTENSIVE USE OF THE VOLUNTARY PREPAYMENT METHOD IN THE PROVISION OF PERSONAL HEALTH SERVICES

This bill is similar to H. R. 8356, 83d Congress, in the form in which that bill was reported favorably on July 9, 1954, by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee—House Report 2106. H. R. 8356 was introduced in the House by me on March 11, 1954, to implement President Eisenhower's recommendations contained in his health message submitted to the 83d Congress on January 18, 1954.

The present bill, H. R. 400, provides for the establishment of a health reinsurance program in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It creates a reinsurance fund and authorizes an appropriation of not to exceed $25 million to provide advances of working capital for the fund. The fund would be built up over a period of time from reinsurance premiums and from earnings of the fund. Reinsurance would be available on a voluntary basis and upon payment of a reinsurance premium, to private insurance companies, voluntary nonprofit health associations, such as Blue Cross and other organizations offering prepayment health insurance plans. The proposal is designed to encourage private insurance organizations to experiment in providing broader voluntary health insurance to more people.

The bill also provides for technical and advisory information services to health service prepayment plans.

The bill H. R. 400 incorporates certain provisions, which were adopted by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in reporting favorably H. R. 8356, 83d Congress, to meet questions raised by various witnesses in the course of the committee hearings held during the 83d Congress. The most important of such questions was based on the fear that the bill could be interpreted to permit some degree of Federal regulation of the health-insurance industry. This bill seeks to remove any and all fear in that respect.

The central philosophy of the bill is one of building on our existing system of voluntary insurance and of providing supporting services and a financial backstop for private effort toward the expansion of prepayment protection. The bill, if enacted, would not of itself directly provide insurance coverage for individuals. Its goal is the removal of obstacles to the extension of coverage for broader ranges of benefits and to additional groups of people.

H. R. 401, A BILL TO FACILITATE THE BROADER DISTRIBUTION OF HEALTH SERVICES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The bill, H. R. 401, is similar to H. R. 6949, 83d Congress, introduced by me on January 6, 1954. A similar bill was first introduced by me at the close of the 81st Congress—H. R. 8746.

Like H. R. 400, it is designed to expand health services through the medium of Government reinsurance. However, the bill makes eligible for reinsurance only nonprofit associations which render or secure medical and hospital services and does not extend to commercial health insurance companies.

The bill H. R. 401 differs from H. R. 400 in other important respects. H. R. 401 sets forth detailed standards which must be met by a voluntary health association in order to be eligible for reinsurance. Subscription fees charged by the association must be fixed as a percentage of income. The association must accept any nongroup applicant subject to certain limitations with regard to subscribers residing outside the geographical area which the association serves. Additional hospital and physician's charges to subscribers must not exceed 25 percent of benefits. Subscribers must pay $1 per day, or 5 percent, whichever is less, of any hospital bill incurred by the subscriber. The association must provide for payment of 75 percent of the cost of 12 doctor visits during any year, excluding however the first visit. The association must pay 95 percent of the cost of all medical services rendered to subscribers in hospitals.

Eligible associations would pay as reinsurance premium 2 percent of their premium income. They would be reimbursed out of the reinsurance fund to the extent of two-thirds of any claim in excess of $1,000 submitted by a subscriber to an association. The reinsurance fund would be administered by a Government corporation to be known as the Federal Health Reinsurance Corporation.

H. R. 402, A BILL TO AMEND SECTION 213 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 TO PERMIT THE DEDUCTION OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS FOR HEALTH INSURANCE WITHOUT REGARD TO THE 3 PERCENT LIMITATION CONTAINED THEREIN

The bill, H. R. 402, is similar in principle to the bill H. R. 6952, 83d Congress, introduced by me on January 6, 1954. The bill is designed to provide an inducement to individuals to prepay their medical expenses by participating in health insurance plans. H. R. 402 would amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit deduction from adjusted gross income of up to $100 for amounts paid for health insurance and, similarly, up to $100 for health insurance paid for each of the taxpayer's dependents. This deduction would be without regard to the 3 percent limitation now contained in section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

H. R. 403, A BILL TO AMEND THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT TO PROMOTE AND ASSIST IN THE EXTENSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES, TO PROVIDE FOR A MORE EFFECTIVE USE OF AVAILABLE FEDERAL FUNDS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The bill, H. R. 403, is similar to H. R. 7397, 83d Congress, in the form in which that bill passed the House of Representatives on April 27, 1954.

The bill, H. R. 403, is designed to provide a simplified formula for the distribution of Federal funds among the several States for public health programs and to permit the States to use greater initiative and to take more responsibility in the administration of these programs.

Under existing law, six separate grant-in-aid programs to assist the States in developing and operating public health services are administered by the Public Health Service. One of these is a grant program for general public health services. The other programs are each for a separate disease category: venereal disease, tuberculosis, heart diseases, mental health, and cancer.

The bill H. R. 403, would consolidate and simplify the public health grant-in-aid system. In lieu of the general public health category and five separate disease categories, the bill would establish three new types of grants:

First. Support grants to assist the States in maintaining basic public health services;

Second. Extension and improvement grants to assist the States in meeting the cost of adding to and improving their public health services; and

Third. Special project grants to assist States or political subdivisions in meeting emergency public health problems in specific geographical areas, or public health problems common to several States, or public health problems for which the Federal Government has a special responsibility.

Support grants would be distributed in accordance with the present Hill-Burton formula.

Extension and improvement grants would be made on the following basis: During the first 2 years of a project, the Federal share would be 75 percent; during the second 2 years 50 percent; and during the final 2 years 25 percent.

No allotment formula is prescribed in the bill for special project grants. Instead, such awards are made by the Surgeon General on the basis of the comparative importance and immediacy of the various projects.

Invitation to House Members To Give House Un-American Activities Committee Their Ideas About Committee Rules of Procedure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, at the executive meeting of the House Un-American Activities Committee for the 84th Congress, which committee meeting was held on January 20, presided over by the new chairman, Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania, the following three members were named as a subcommittee to consider and report back to the full committee on the subject of committee rules of procedure for the committee investigations and hearings during the 84th Congress. The subcommittee appointed was Hon. CLYDE DOYLE, Democrat, California, chairman; Hon. EDWIN E. WILLIS, Democrat, Louisiana; and Hon. HAROLD H. VELDE, Republican, Illinois.

During the 83d Congress your Committee on Un-American Activities operated under a printed and publicly announced and distributed set of rules from July 1953, and the same rules were approved for the committee's operations for the 84th Congress, subject to changes and amendments which may be adopted by the full committee, based upon the report of the Subcommittee on Rules in this statement announced. It was my pleasure to be chairman of the Committee on Rules for the committee during the 83d Congress. Mr. VELDE, full committee chairman, was the other member. We have been informed that it is probable that the rules promulgated and published by us on July 15, 1953, is the first time in recent history, at any rate, of Congress, that such a set of rules was printed and distributed for the benefit of witnesses before congressional committees and for their legal counsel and also for the information of the public.

Pursuant to the continued desire of the House Un-American Activities Committee to have and receive the benefit at all times of the considered opinions of all Members of the House on this important subject of rules of procedure, I this day sent to all Members of the House the following invitation to participate in aiding the subcommittee in its submission of any changes or amendments to the full committee:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1955.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: Good morning. Your House Un-American Activities Committee on yesterday named the following subcommittee to bring back to the committee, by February 20, its report and recommendation relating to the committee rules. The subcommittee is as follows: CYDE DOYLE, California, chairman; EDWIN E. WILLIS, Louisiana; and HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois.

The Committee on Un-American Activities has been operating under a printed set of rules which was publicly announced on July 15, 1953. I am placing those rules in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to help you the better to cooperate with your committee and to have an opportunity for your expression of opinion and recommendations as to any additional or different rules and procedures which you may wish to recommend to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

This is a cordial invitation for you to send me on or before Tuesday, February 1, what you wish your Committee on Un-American Activities to consider in this matter of rules of procedure for the committee.

Address your communication as follows: Representative CLYDE DOYLE, of California, 1030 House Office Building.

With best wishes to you for a year of achievement and satisfaction, I have the honor to be,

Your colleague,

CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress.

P. S.—The present rules of the House Un-American Activities Committee will appear in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Monday, January 24, or Tuesday, January 25, with extension of remarks by me.

Said full committee will receive the subcommittee report on or about February 20. Although the rules of procedure which guided the committee during the 83d Congress, subsequent to July 1953, when they were adopted were announced in the appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD promptly after adoption and were reported to the full committee by the subcommittee consisting of Hon. CLYDE DOYLE, chairman, and Hon. HAROLD H. VELDE. I am sure that all the Members of the House, and especially the new Members, will appreciate having the text of the existing rules brought to their attention, as it will clearly help all the Members to promptly consider what changes, amendments, or additions they would recommend; and then to promptly send these changes and recommendations to me on or before February 1.

The Committee on Un-American Activities for the 84th Congress consists of the following: FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman; HAROLD H. VELDE; BERNARD W. KEARNEY; DONALD L. JACKSON; EDWIN E. WILLIS; GORDON H. SCHERER; MORGAN M. MOULDER; CLYDE DOYLE; and JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR.

Said rules now in effect, and which were printed in a handy, attractive booklet for distribution to all witnesses, counsel, and other interested parties are as follows:

RULES OF PROCEDURE, COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D. C.

CONTENTS

	Page
Public Law 601, 79th Congress (excerpt)	IV
Rules adopted by 83d Congress (excerpt)	V
Rules of procedure:	
Initiation of investigations	1
Subjects of investigation	1
Subpenaing of witnesses	1
Executive and public hearings	2
Testimony under oath	3
Transcript of testimony	3
Advice of counsel	3
Conduct of counsel	4
Statement by witness	5
Rights of persons affected by a hearing	5
Admissibility of testimony	7
Relationship of husband and wife	7
Televised hearings	7
Committee reports	8
Witness' fees and travel allowance	8
Contempt of Congress	9
Distribution of rules	9

PUBLIC LAW 601, 79TH CONGRESS

The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress (1946), chapter 753, 2d session, which provides:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, * * *.

"Part2—Rules of the House of Representatives

"Rule X

"Section 121. Standing committees

* * * * *

"17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

"Rule XI

"Powers and duties of committees

* * * * *

"(q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.

"(A) Un-American Activities.

"(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

"The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

"For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member."

RULES OF PROCEDURE

I. Initiation of investigations: No major investigation shall be initiated without approval of a majority of the committee. Preliminary inquiries, however, may be initiated by the committee's staff with the approval of the chairman of the committee.

II. Subjects of investigation: The subject of any investigation in connection with which witnesses are summoned or shall otherwise appear shall be announced in an opening statement to the committee before the commencement of any hearings; and the information sought to be elicited at the hearings shall be relevant and germane to the subject as so stated.

III. Subpenaing of witnesses:

A. Subpenas shall be signed and issued by the chairman of the committee, or any member of the committee designated by said chairman.

B. Witnesses shall be subpenaed at a reasonably sufficient time in advance of any hearing, said time to be determined by the committee, in order to give the witness an opportunity to prepare for the hearing and to employ counsel, should he so desire.

IV. Executive and public hearings:

A. Executive:

(1) If a majority of the committee or subcommittee, duly appointed as provided

by the rules of the House of Representatives, believes that the interrogation of a witness in a public hearing might endanger national security or unjustly injure his reputation, or the reputation of other individuals, the committee shall interrogate such witness in an executive session for the purpose of determining the necessity or advisability of conducting such interrogation thereafter in a public hearing.

(2) Attendance at executive sessions shall be limited to members of the committee, its staff, and other persons whose presence is requested, or consented to by the committee.

(3) All testimony taken in executive sessions shall be kept secret and shall not be released or used in public sessions without the approval of a majority of the committee.

B. Public hearings:

(1) All other hearings shall be public.

V. Testimony under oath: All witnesses at public or executive hearings who testify as to matters of fact shall give all testimony under oath or affirmation. Only the chairman or a member of the committee shall be empowered to administer said oath or affirmation.

VI. Transcript of testimony:

A complete and accurate record shall be kept of all testimony and proceedings at hearings, both in public and in executive session.

Any witness or his counsel, at the expense of the witness, may obtain a transcript of any public testimony of the witness from the clerk of the committee.

Any witness or his counsel may also obtain a transcript of any executive testimony of the witness:

(1) When a special release of said testimony prior to public release is authorized by the chairman of the committee or the chairman of any subcommittee; or

(2) After said testimony has been made public by the committee.

VII. Advice of counsel:

A. At every hearing, public or executive, every witness shall be accorded the privilege of having counsel of his own choosing.

B. The participation of counsel during the course of any hearing and while the witness is testifying shall be limited to advising said witness as to his legal rights. Counsel shall not be permitted to engage in oral argument with the committee, but shall confine his activity to the area of legal advice to his client.

VIII. Conduct of counsel:

Counsel for a witness shall conduct himself in a professional, ethical, and proper manner. His failure to do so shall, upon a finding to that effect by a majority of the committee or subcommittee before which the witness is appearing, subject such counsel to disciplinary action which may include warning, censure, removing from the hearing room of counsel, or a recommendation of contempt proceedings.[1]

In case of such removal of counsel, the witness shall have a reasonable time to obtain other counsel, said time to be determined by the committee. Should the witness deliberately or capriciously fail or refuse to obtain the services of other counsel within such reasonable time, the hearing shall continue and the testimony of such witness shall be heard without benefit of counsel.

[1] The committee seeks factual testimony within the personal knowledge of the witness and such testimony and answers must be given by the witness himself and not suggested to witness by counsel.

IX. Statement by witness:

A. Any witness desiring to make a prepared or written statement[2] for the record of the proceedings in executive or public sessions shall file a copy of such statement with the counsel of the committee within a reasonable period of time in advance of the hearing at which the statement is to be presented.

B. All such statements so received which are relevant and germane to the subject of the investigation may, upon approval, at the conclusion of the testimony of the witness, by a majority vote of the committee or subcommittee members present, be inserted in the official transcript of the proceedings.

X. Rights of persons affected by a hearing:

A. Where practicable, any person named in a public hearing before the committee or any subcommittee as subversive, Fascist, Communist, or affiliated with one or more subversive-front organizations, who has not been previously so named, shall, within a reasonable time thereafter, be notified by registered letter, to the address last known to the committee, of such fact, including:

(1) A statement that he has been so named.

(2) The date and place of said hearing.

(3) The name of the person who so testified.

(4) The name of the subversive, Fascist, Communist, or front organization with which he has been identified; and

(5) A copy of the printed rules of procedure of the committee.

B. Any person, so notified, who believes that his character or reputation has been adversely affected or to whom has been imputed subversive activity, may within 15 days after receipt of said notice:

(1) Communicate with the counsel of the committee,[3] and/or

(2) Request to appear at his own expense in person before the committee or any subcommittee thereof in public session and give testimony, in denial or affirmation, relevant and germane to the subject of the investigation.

C. Any such person testifying under the provisions of B (2) above shall be accorded the same privileges as any other witness appearing before the committee, and may be questioned concerning any matter relevant and germane to the subject of the investigation.

XI. Admissibility of testimony: A witness shall be limited to giving information relevant and germane to the subject under investigation. The committee shall rule upon the admissibility of all testimony or information presented by the witness.[4]

[2] Statements which take the form of personal attacks by the witness upon the motives of the committee, the personal characters of any Members of the Congress or of the committee staff, and statements clearly in the nature of accusation are not deemed to be either relevant or germane.

[3] All witnesses are invited at any time to confer with committee counsel or investigators for the committee prior to hearings.

[4] The House Committee on Un-American Activities is a congressional committee, not a court (see pp. IV and V). Moreover, the committee has neither the authority nor the vast powers of a court of law.

A congressional committee conducts a search for information, not a trial.

The requirements of time, the nature of the fact-finding hearing, the complications of travel, the realities of expense, and the voluminous duties of Members of Congress all add together to make it impractical for courtroom procedure to be followed.

The committee has given frequent and diligent consideration to this subject, and has determined that in order to carry out its responsibilities imposed by law, the rules of evidence, including cross-examination, are not applicable.

XII. Relationship of husband and wife: The confidential relationship between husband and wife shall be respected, and for reasons of public policy, one spouse shall not be questioned concerning the activities of the other, except when a majority of the committee or subcommittee shall determine otherwise.

XIII. Televised hearings:

A. If a hearing be televised:

(1) Television facilities in the hearing room shall be restricted to two cameras, the minimum lighting facilities practicable, and the television production shall be available on a pool basis to all established television companies desiring participation.

(2) Telecasts of committee hearings shall be on the basis of a public service only, and this fact shall be publicly announced on television in the beginning and at the close of each telecast. No commercial announcements shall be permitted from the hearing room or in connection therewith, and no actual or intimated sponsorship of the hearings shall be permitted in any instance.

B. Upon the request of a witness that no telecast shall be made of him during the course of his testimony, the chairman shall direct that television cameras refrain from photographing the witness during the taking of his testimony.

XIV. Committee reports:

A. No committee reports or publications shall be made or released to the public without the approval of the majority of the committee.

B. No summary of any committee report or publication and no statement of the contents of such report or publication shall be released by any member of the committee or its staff prior to the official issuance of the report.

XV. Witness fees and travel allowance:

Each witness who has been subpenaed, upon the completion of his testimony before the committee, may report to the office of the clerk of the committee, room 227, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C., and there sign appropriate vouchers for travel allowances and attendance fees upon the committee. If hearings are held in cities other than Washington, D. C., the witness may contact the clerk of the committee, or his representative, prior to leaving the hearing room.

XVI. Contempt of Congress: No recommendation that a witness be cited for contempt of Congress shall be forwarded to the House of Representatives unless and until the committee has, upon notice to all its members, met and considered the alleged contempt, and by a majority of those present voted that such recommendation be made.

XVII. Distribution of rules: All witnesses appearing before the House Committee on Un-American Activities shall be furnished a printed copy of the rules of procedure of the committee.

A Bill To Have the Members of the House of Representatives Recite the Pledge of Allegiance on Flag Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, during the 83d Congress, you will recall that my bill, House Joint Resolution 243, to include the words "under God" in the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, received unanimous approval and it is now Public

Law 396, signed by the President on Flag Day, June 14, 1954. Yesterday, I introduced a House resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives by inserting after "First. Prayer by the Chaplain" the following: ", pledge of allegiance to the flag by the Members," led by the Speaker, to be recited annually, when the House is in session on Flag Day, June 14.

My Recent Visit to North Africa—Status of Jews in Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, during my recent trip to North Africa, I conferred with French Government officials, native chieftans, leaders of Jewish communities, Moorish Berbers, Moorish Jews, with Europeans and American military, naval, and Air Force personnel. I give, herewith, my impressions of Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia, with particular reference to the conditions of the Jews in those countries.

French Morocco has a population of 8,500,000. Of this number, roughly 214,000 are Jews. There are two divisions of Moroccan Jews: The Berbers, who live in the southern part of Morocco in the neighborhood of the Atlas Mountains, have been there for centuries—even before the Jews were banished from Spain. It is thought that they are the descendants of the Israelites driven out of Palestine by Joshua. The others are the Sephardic Jews—descendants of those who fled from Torquemada, who live in northern French Morocco.

The Berber Jews are nomadic and live chiefly in Saharan mountain villages. They are conspicuous by their black cloaks, black skull caps and round black hats. They hold steadfastly to the customs and faith of their ancestors.

In addition to these Jews, there are some tribal Jews—a fanatical sect who live deep in the Sahara Desert and in the Atlas Mountains. They are warlike and are a fierce looking people, and are known as the fighting warrior Jews of Morocco. They are said to be able to trek for hours and hours across the Atlas Mountain ranges with their children strapped across the backs of their women.

There are also some albino Jews residing in the mountain fastnesses along the coast. They are blond and have yellowish hair, pinkish eyes, and a reddish complexion.

The Sephardic Jews, to a great extent, live in the mellahs or ghettos. A mellah is found in every Moroccan city—Casablanca, Rabat, Marakeesh. In the mellah thousands of Jews have lived and suffered, persecuted for centuries. In the old days they never ventured forth. To remain within the mellah was their best protection from the onslaughts of the Moors. The Jews have suffered and still suffer injury, misery, and humiliation. They are not even second-class citizens in Morocco. The very word "mellah" means salt. The Moor Caids in the old days were wont to decapitate the infidel or unfaithful or non-Moor and place the head upon a pike to be exhibited in the public square. The head, however, was first salted and pickled in vinegar. This was done by the Jewish butcher, and the word "mellah"—salt—was finally applied not only to the place or abode of the Jewish butcher but to the ghetto where the Jews lived as well.

The only protection for the Jews of Morocco is the French Government. If the French should now leave and independence is achieved, the life of no Jewish person would be worth a sou.

The independence party is called the Istiqlal Party. It is supported by the Moors of the north, but opposed by the Moorish Berbers of the south. The Berber Moors are controlled by an old feudal chieftain called El Gloui. El Gloui and the Berbers are opposed to independence and support the French. The French deposed the former Sultan Sidi Mohammed Ben Yussuf, who was a huge landowner and opposed French reforms. It was essential for the French to get rid of him. The French set up a new Sultan, Sidi Mulai Ben Araffa. This change of Sultans infuriated the Istiqlal Party, but was acceptable to El Gloui. The latter is friendly to the Jews, hates the Arab League, and is an admirer of the strides made by Israel. Incidentally, the private secretary is a Jew, Albert Berdugo.

The Jews take no part in the independence movement. They dare not. Silently, however, they are generally with the French. This is a natural point of view, since their survival and the safety of their families depend upon the French. However, they know they are sitting on a keg of dynamite. Recently some 6,000 have been screened by the Jewish agency for emigration to Israel. Most of the Jews in the mellah wish to go to Israel. The rich and middle-class Jews outside the mellah have not made up their minds. They do not want to lose their possessions in Morocco, yet they realize the danger that lurks around the corner.

I wish to emphasize that there is no disposition on the part of the Jewish agency, or any agency representing Israel, to encourage emigration from Morocco. There are enough voluntary applications for entrance to Israel to overtax the abilities of the Israeli representatives already. In other words, there is no need for encouragement.

Statements made that a "panic migration" has been stimulated are contrary to fact. There is no pressure from any source save the pressure of inner fear that possesses most Moroccan Jews. They realize that their safety lies with the French and that if the French go and independence descends upon Morocco with Istiqlal in power, then their doom is sealed. Then the pogrom at Petit-Jean would become the genocide of Morocco. Almost 30,000 will be taken into Israel during the coming year. That is not "panic migration." More are clamoring to go if conditions do not become better. Israel may in the future be compelled to siphon off more than 30,000 a year. The numbers that covet entry into Israel will depend upon the degree of banditry of the Istiqlal and the terrorists.

I honestly believe that Jews would be content to remain if they were given a fair degree of equality with their Moorish neighbors, were assured of their personal security, and that of their dear ones. But one would be insane to deny the menace to all Jewry if an uninhibited nationalist Morocco and a frenzied Moslem Brotherhood would control.

Presently the great roadblock to Moroccan Jewry's road to human dignity is the question of nationality. Citizenship in Morocco cannot be acquired. A Jew is merely the feudal subject of the Sultan. The Sultan and his Caids are the ruling cult. There is no political equality, no social integration. The Jew is a Moroccan but with no rights of a Moroccan. Such condition of servitude was bearable so long as Jewry lived within the small confines of the mellah. But enlightenment could not be kept from the Jews even in the dark dismal mellah. Their aspirations have been raised. Their alien status has become obnoxious and intolerable.

Now superimposed upon their misery is the danger of extermination. No wonder they really and truly pray: "Next year in Jerusalem."

There are many wealthy and cultivated Jews in Morocco. They have a long tradition of cultivation reaching back into medieval Spain, but the great mass of Jews in Morocco live in mellahs. There in squalor, despair, degradation they live more like animals. Their position is beyond description. This is especially so in the Casablanca mellah.

Organizations like the Joint Distribution Committee, the World Jewish Congress, the ORT, The Jewish National Fund, and so forth, are doing heroic work amongst the Jews. The French Government does its best with its limited resources. The French are increasing their subventions to help ameliorate the condition of the Jews. They have set up some housing to relieve mellah congestion. The government granted to the Alliance Israelite considerable sums for schools. But vast sums of money are needed to deal with the perplexing problems of housing, education, cultural development, and political emancipation. The entire Jewish world must give these questions most anxious consideration. I particularly stress the good work of the Alliance Israelite which brings education into the remotest and darkest parts of the Jewish dispersion in Morocco. I have seen some of the magnificent schools built by this worthy organization.

The Istiqlal Party is encouraged by the Spanish radio beamed into Morocco from Tetuan, capital of Spanish Morocco—encouraged also by Nasser's radio in Egypt and by the Communist radio in Budapest, Hungary. The opposition to the French make strange bedfellows

out of the Communists, Egypt, and Spain. The Istiqlal Party draws some of its funds by way of extortion. Letters are frequently received by Jewish merchants demanding sums of money to be deposited in a given place at a given time. If the demands are not complied with, their places of business or residence are threatened with fire, or they are threatened with kidnaping. The defenseless smaller Jewish merchant complies with the demand of extortion. The rich Jew, who knows how to protect himself refuses to comply. A few months ago, eight Jews were killed in cold blood in Petit-Jean, a village not far from Casablanca. Their bodies were soaked in oil and burned in public. They were victims of the riotous Istiqlal.

As recently as January 6, a bomb was thrown into a Jewish shoeshop in Casablanca. Fifteen persons were wounded by the blast and the anti-French terrorists, the Istiqlal Party, are believed responsible for this barbarous deed. It is just such acts of violence that drive Jews to Israel.

The United States has expressed neutrality in the feud between the French and the Moroccans. United States has 5 bases, necessary for the defense of the free world, spread over Morocco—4 airbases and 1 naval base. We cannot long remain neutral for the good and sufficient reason that if the French leave, it would take 5 to 6 divisions of our troops to defend those bases. If the French remain these bases can be held with a battalion. Our important stake in Morocco requires at least an expression of opinion favorable to the French. Assuredly if the Istiqlal outrages are stepped up our State Department has the duty of protesting. Usually persecution is not confined into any tight compartment. Persecution of Jews becomes persecution of Europeans and other minorities. It would eventually embrace all foreigners including Americans.

If the French leave, the new Moroccan Government would say, "What right have you Americans to hold these bases?" The answer could be: "We made a 99-year treaty with the French." The Moroccans would retort: "You made no treaty with us. We recognize no treaty with the French. Get out."

Moroccan Jews, understandably, take no outward sides in the political controversy raging between Istiqlal and the French. They do at times differ among themselves as to the degree of severity and repression, or even the wisdom thereof, that some local French officers take against the nationalists. Many think that extreme force begets more violence and hastens the coming of a revolution. Some prefer a gradual liberal approach of the French leading to eventual independence.

But if Jews in Morocco deliberately are fearful of taking sides, Jews outside of Morocco cannot bury their heads in the sand. They can take sides. I must take sides with fellow Jews and against the persecution of the Istiqlal.

The Istiqlal, it should be noted, has an extremely active office in Washington, D. C., and its principal protagonist there, I am told, is a man who was born a Polish Jew, became a British Protestant, and is now a Catholic American.

The French, having been taught a costly lesson in Indochina, are no longer guilty of colonialism in Morocco. At long last they are now keenly interested in raising the standard of living of the natives and are putting into Morocco far more treasure than they are taking out.

It is my firm conviction that the Moroccans are not yet ready for independence. Considering their centuries-old illiteracy, their religious fanaticism, and feudalism it will take time to educate and alert them to the ways of independence. Freedom does not always mean democracy. Their freedom would not bring democracy. They do not know the meaning, yet, of the word. I am not going into the reasons for their despair and illiteracy. True democracy would mean protection for minorities, including the Jews, European inhabitants from France, Spain, Italy, and other inhabitants. But an independent Morocco at this time would not mean true democracy. These minorities would be unsafe if independence were to be given to the Moroccans at the present time. Giving independence to Morocco would be like giving an automobile to a child. The child would not understand the mechanism of the automobile. Even with a book of rules the child would not understand how to apply them. So Moroccans would not now understand the constitution that might be given them, nor its application to government. Morocco must wait for independence.

The French are as sensitive as eels to criticism. They resent criticism. Such an attitude is damaging and unrealistic. They are not free of blame. They waited too long before bringing genuine aid. Associate Justice William O. Douglas recently wrote an article which appeared in Look magazine. Therein he laid heavy strictures upon France vis-a-vis Morocco. He charges that "the French have fastened a milking machine on Morocco for their benefit." Yet in another breath he says:

> The French have done good things in Morocco since they made it a protectorate in 1912. They have built fine communication systems—highway, railway, telephone, and telegraph. There are good French hotels and resturants everywhere, and in the larger towns there are good French shops also. The French opened mines, built factories, cleared ground for large farming enterprises, and established new industries. They introduced public-health measures, eradicated malaria, and supplied the towns with pure water. They undertook a tree-conservation program that has produced good results; and they have done much to plant forests.

The judge, whom I consider my dear friend and for whom I have great respect, I believe has been misinformed and is enthusiastically misguided when he plumps for immediate Moroccan independence and disparages the French. His emphasis is strictly one-sided.

With a large but politically unschooled population badly divided within itself, Moroccans will be reaping a whirlwind of trouble with independence now. Meanwhile the French have the bear by the tail. I do not blame them for hesitating before pulling out now.

I quote from the New York Herald Tribune's editorial of October 19, 1954:

> Thus, after acknowledging a very few of the achievements of the French protectorate since its establishment in 1912, the author [Justice Douglas] cites housing as an example of how these achievements have largely benefited a French milking machine. He is silent about French-financed modern housing projects for Moroccans like those in Casablanca and Rabat, and neglects the French effort to get Moroccans into schools above the level of the traditional Koranic institutions, making the extraordinary statement that "education is reserved for the French." He totally ignores the vast diversities and divided allegiances of Arab, Berber, and Jew, making it sound as though nearly every Moroccan wanted the French to leave tomorrow.
>
> Justice Douglas also attributes to the ex-Sultan a degree of interest in Western parliamentary institutions that would astonish Ben Youssef's strongest partisans. In fact, last year's move to depose him, however wise or unwise it may have been, was made in large part because he had blocked French-sponsored reforms that would have paved the way for many of the changes Justice Douglas urges.

Americans rightfully and traditionally support self-determination and freedom. But self-determination must be tinctured with commonsense. Immediate freedom for Morocco would mean not only anarchy but intense hostility toward the United States. Can we afford chaos and intense enmity in an area which contains five of our important long-range bomber bases? I doubt it. We must be on the side of the French.

ALGERIA

The French have been in Algeria for over 100 years. Algeria is a part of metropolitan France and is represented in the French National Assembly and its inhabitants are citizens of France, whereas Tunisia and Morocco are monarchies under French protection. Under the Cremieux decree of 1870, Jews have been citizens of France, and this includes the Algerian Jews. The protection of Jews in Algeria parallels the period during which France has been in possession. The French have had a protectorate over Morocco only since 1912, but they have been in Algeria since the early part of the 19th century, and in Tunisia since 1880. The longer the French have been in control the greater has been the security of the Jew. Many Jews occupy positions of public influence and authority. Numbers of them have been elected to the French National Assembly. The Jewish population numbers about 140,000 out of a total population of about 8 million.

The position of the Jews is strongest in Algeria and weakest in Morocco. There is little or no evidence of any independence movement in Algeria. There was a flare-up of Fellaghas or outlaws, who operate in the southern part of Algeria in the province of Constantine, as well as in the western part of Tunisia. They seek independence for Tunisia and Algeria. As far as Algeria is concerned, the movement is quite negative.

Most of the Jews live in Algiers and are happy and contented. A small number have gone to Israel. The Jews in Algeria have great faith in the French.

TUNISIA

Tunisia presents a different picture at present. There are about 110,000 Jews in Tunisia—most of them in Tunis—out of a total population of about 3½ million. The backbone of the independence movement in Tunisia is the Neodestour Party. The Bey of Tunisia, the nominal head of the protectorate under the French, is friendly to the Jews. Some Jews are members of the Neodestour Party. At the present time, the Neodestour Party is conducted honestly and decently. Publicly, the Jews are for it, but privately they express fear that at some future date, this party might become infiltrated with Moors who are oriented toward the Moslem Brotherhood and the Fellaghas. That is why many Jews in Tunisia would, if they could, go to Israel. Privately, they are much concerned with the promise made by Premier Mendes-France that independence will be given to Tunisia with the qualification that the French will control the common defense and conduct the foreign affairs of Tunisia. With the departure of the French soldiers and police, the Jews of Tunisia might eventually be in danger.

One prominent Jew may become a member of the Tunisian Cabinet.

It is my belief that Tunisia is ready for independence by virtue of its present state of literacy and democracy which exists there today.

In conclusion, the position of the Jews in Tunisia at present is salutary. The future is in doubt. No obstacle is placed against any Jew desiring to emigrate to Israel. Both the French and Tunisians desire them to remain to help build up the new economy. There is indeed very good hope that the problem of Tunisian independence will be solved by the wisdom and diplomacy of Mendes-France and the patience and prudence of the Tunisian leaders, including the Bey of Tunisia. I say this despite the efforts of the Arab League, which incessantly radios vicious propaganda from Cairo and drafts and arms insurgents from across the long and unguarded frontier from Libya.

Neither in Tunisia nor in Algeria does any representative of the Israeli Government encourage emigration to Israel.

The future will witness the emigration of many thousands of North African Jews to Israel, if such huge emigration will be possible. There is the question, of course, of the absorptive capacity of Israel. Can Israel take many more thousands of the swiftly breeding Jews of that area—that is without creating more arable land—particularly in the sanded wastes of the Negev?

LIBYA

It is interesting to note that it was the Israel vote in the United Nations which decided the independence of Libya. After independence, the Jews in Libya were persecuted. There are only about 2,500 Jews left there out of a Jewish population of 30,000. The Fellaghas, who back the operations against France in western Tunisia and southern Algeria, received their training in camps situated in Libya, and the Libyan Government gave them arms and uniforms. Libya has permitted great discomfort if not persecution of its Jews. This despite Israel's vote for her independence. What poetic justice.

The Folly of Low Tariffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to H. R. 1, a bill designed to open the American market further to products made by cheap foreign labor.

Mr. Speaker, in order to maintain prosperity on our farms and in our factories and to maintain our standard of living, which is at once both the pride and the envy of the world, we must maintain reasonable tariffs to protect our industries and our workers from the competition of cheap foreign labor. I am as convinced of this as I am that to open our markets to a flood of low-cost foreign goods spells economic disaster to our Nation.

This deep-seated conviction of mine was not reached hastily. It is not the result of theoretical reasoning. Nor is it based on some nebulous economic hypothesis. It is the conclusion of experience.

If there were only one lesson which history had taught us since the founding of the Republic, it would be this—that tariff protection has brought us prosperity and that low tariffs have always left economic disaster in their wake.

Mr. Speaker, let us consider for a few moments the history of our Nation. Let us see how the raising and lowering of our tariffs over the years has had its impact on the economy and prosperity of the country. Let us listen with an attentive ear to what the great men of another generation, Democrat and Republican alike, have had to say concerning this historic issue.

After the war with England and the ratification of the treaty of Ghent, President Madison sent a special message to Congress in which he cautioned against destroying our commerce in the framing of a new tariff law. He urged consideration for our industrial enterprises, and had his Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander J. Dallas, make an estimate of what amount of reduction would be safe. He made it plain that the protective feature of our tariff system was to be cautiously preserved. Contrary to his recommendations, the duties contained in the new tariff law were low and the economic progress of the infant Republic was checked.

Let me offer the testimony of a great Democrat. In the third volume of his History of the American Republic, Woodrow Wilson says on this early phase of a low-tariff policy:

> It was manifestly injurious to every young industry that a flood of English imports should continue to pour into the country at the open ports. The remedy was a protective tariff.

Commenting on the results of the Tariff Act of 1816, Senator Tom H. Benton, of Missouri, a southern Democrat, declared:

> No price for property, no sales except those of the sheriff and the marshal; no employment for industry; no demand for labor; no sale for the products of the farmer. Distress was the universal cry of the people.

In similar vein, Henry Clay had this to say:

> If one desires to find the 7 years of greatest adversity in this country since the adoption of the Constitution, let him examine the 7 years before 1824.

Even Thomas Jefferson, living in retirment at Monticello, wrote to Silliam Simpson and spoke of the grave danger of tariff duties so low that British merchants could override them.

What was done following the period of distress caused by the low Tariff Act of 1816? In 1818, 1824, and 1828, protective measures were enacted. Industrial progress was so substantial that Daniel Webster surrendered his free-trade theories in the face of the overwhelming physical facts and was forever afterward a stanch protectionist. Moreover, Andrew Jackson also testified to the benefits derived from the higher duties under the act of 1824 in these words:

> Our country presents on every side marks of prosperity unequaled perhaps in any portion of the world.

A compromise bill to pacify the free-trade element, the exporters of cotton, which act was introduced by Henry Clay, became law on March 2, 1833. What happened? Foreign commerce rode over these reduced duties and calamity followed; 1837 was the year of the first great American depression. Distress followed until duties were again advanced to the protection point.

This disaster caused by the compromise act, reducing duties on imports, was repaired by a tariff bill in 1842, which carried duties high enough to encourage American industries. Under this tariff act in the 4 years between 1842 and 1846, the country entirely recovered from the depression.

Let me call as a witness to the effect of the increase on duties under the Tariff Act of 1842, the Honorable John M. Berrin, United States Senator from Georgia. He declared:

> The credit of the Government was prostrate and has been redeemed. The Treasury was empty, it is now replenished. The commerce and navigation of the country have increased. Its agricultural condition has improved.

Next came the election in 1844. The election of Polk called for reduction in import duties. As a result, the Democratic Congress reduced tariffs under the Tariff Act of 1846.

The country was prosperous when the so-called Walker tariff bill became a law. The evidence of this is recorded in President Polk's message to Congress in that same year, which reads as follows:

> Abundance has crowned the toil of the husbandman, and labor in all its branches is receiving an ample reward. * * * The

progress of our country in her career of greatness, not only in the vast extension of our territorial limits and the rapid increase of our population, but in resources and wealth, and in the happy conditions of our people, is without an example in the history of nations.

Three physical events staved off the evil day of this low Tariff Act of 1846. The Mexican War, discovery of gold in California, and the Crimean struggle in Europe which involved Great Britain, France, Germany, and Turkey.

The day of doom to American industry, labor, and agriculture came when peace came.

When peace came to the Old World the vessels which had been employed in supplying strength for each battling nation were released and the importers' flag flew through our open ports. American markets were flooded with cheap wares from abroad, and the political sin of a low tariff brought its inevitable disaster.

As usual, the free traders, refusing to profit by past experience, closed their eyes and ears to facts and logic and instead of meeting the problem by protection, forced a further reduction in tariffs in 1857.

Let a Democrat describe what followed. President Buchanan in his message to Congress in 1858 said:

> With all the elements of national wealth in abundance our manufacturers were suspended, our useful public enterprises were arrested, and thousands of laborers were deprived of employment and reduced to want. Universal distress prevailed among the commercial manufacturing and mechanical classes.

A financial crisis swept the country. The depression of 1857 in many ways exceeded in violence that of 1837. After the low tariffs had been in operation for 3 years, President Buchanan, on December 4, 1860, said, regarding the widespread disaster:

> Indeed all hope seems to have deserted the minds of men.

This indisputable evidence of the devastating result to the country under a low-tariff policy was recorded not only when President Buchanan went out of office in 1861; but also, to look ahead for a few years, when Grover Cleveland went out of office in 1897, and when Woodrow Wilson went out of office in 1921.

Horace Greeley has left his testimony as to one of these devastation periods in these words:

> The 3 years of low duties, as in two former periods of relatively free trade, had been years of general depression, of numerous bankruptcies, of labor widely destitute of employment, of enormous and harassing commercial indebtedness abroad and of stagnation in improvements at home. Protection has proven beneficial to all the American people.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt but that during the 14 years prior to the Civil War when the party in power made no effort to safeguard enterprise of an industrial nature in this country, the fatal and unavoidable consequence was that few competitive mills or factories were built and labor and agriculture suffered.

This surrender to foreign influence and interest came to an end when the Morrill Tariff Act of 1861 restored the American protective tariff policy. Industry and agriculture were immediately rejuvenated. Under the protective tariff the Nation had expanded tremendously, and, by 1872, was nearing the crest of a new era of prosperity. However, the country had still not learned the lesson of bitter experience. Again there was agitation for lower tariffs, and in the act of 1872 very substantial reductions were made. Again the Nation entered into a period of depression marked by the panic of 1873.

There was some upward adjustment of tariffs by the act of 1883, although, however, on the whole, no important changes were made until 1890.

In 1890 Congress passed the so-called McKinley tariff, intended to stimulate further development of agriculture and industry. The result was an average rate of duty of about 49 percent during the 3 fiscal years 1892–94. President Harrison said in December 1892, relative to the Nation's economic condition:

> There never has been a time in our history when work was so abundant or wages were so high, whether measured by the currency in which they are paid or by their own power to supply the necessities and comforts of life.

When Grover Cleveland was returned to office in 1893, he immediately began to work for lower tariffs. Little wonder then that uncertainty and pessimism spread throughout the country, culminating in the financial panic of 1893. But still the lesson had not been learned. The freetraders remained blind to the teachings of history. President Cleveland epitomized this refusal to face the facts when he said:

> With plenteous crops, with abundant promises of remuneration production and manufacture, with unusual invitations to safe investment and with satisfactory assurance to business enterprise, suddenly financial distress and fear have sprung up on every side. * * * Values supposed to be fixed are fast becoming conjectural and loss and failure have invaded every branch of business.

The political campaign of 1896 was waged almost solely on the issue of free silver, but following the election of William McKinley as President, steps were immediately taken for returning our tariffs to protective standards. The Dingley Tariff Act, passed in 1897, provided a general increase in rates, and the country was quickly brought back to health, strength, and prosperity.

Following a split in the Republican Party, Woodrow Wilson was elected President in 1912, and once again the agitation for tariff reduction began. In 1913 the Underwood Tariff Act, adding many items to the free list, was enacted.

It is interesting in the light of the present low-tariff trade-agreement policy to listen to the prophecy made by Jonathan P. Dolliver during the debate on the Wilson measure. He said:

> I, for one, am not discouraged even if Congress should enact this into law because I know that the people of the United States, having learned their lesson in the midst of broken fortunes and impoverished industries, will come back speedily to the historic standards of American commonsense.

Another prominent Democrat, commenting on the bill, said:

> The disregard of experience, the closing of our eyes to truths chiseled on the walls of time, forever send us to the mourner's bench, sinners against political wisdom.

Mr. Speaker, it does, indeed, appear to have been our unhappy fate over the years—and apparently is still our fate today—to ignore those lessons of history for which we have paid so dearly.

The Democratic Party conducted a rebellion against reason and experience when it lowered the tariff rates in 1913. The country had been prosperous, but what were the consequences by the middle of 1914? Four million people walked the streets of America in idleness; industry was in distress; business lay prostrate; want had its foot inside the door of every home. It was a repetition of the same old free-trade tragedy.

Of course, the World War intervened and raised a wall of protection around the United States as high as the Embargo Act employed by Thomas Jefferson. War orders from Europe poured in like a torrent; imports declined; exports boomed. The day of reckoning was postponed.

However, the low Tariff Act of 1913 was on the statute books when war ceased. Let me quote from a Democrat as to what followed:

> But after the World War was over, after the vessels of the Old World were released from their burdens to fly the shippers' flag, after Europe caught up in production and had something to sell, England with her surplus lying in warehouses, Australia with an abundance of wool, South America with cheap meats, and the Far East with vegetable oils, all turned to the land of gold, to America, and commenced dumping their wares upon our shores. * * * A situation was immediately brought about which beggars description—ruin ran riot from the Atlantic seaboard to the Pacific coast.

And then he said:

> This could not have happened with a protective policy in effect.

He refers to the situation of the cattlemen in these dramatic words:

> Stockmen, rich and powerful one day, found themselves almost the next without credit and without equity in their vast herds roaming the broad prairies and thousands of hills. The work of years wasted, the earnings of the hazardous task of a midnight guard riding by running steers when the deadly lightning played upon their barns, were scattered in the winds of tariff heresy.

The cattle industry suffered in particular. Every cattleman knows that when the First World War was over the foreign accumulated supply of wool and beef came into our ports, overwhelmed the domestic markets, and one of the most flourishing industries of America was laid waste. That was under a low tariff bill. It was then that the Argentine began to send boat loads of frozen carcasses into New York and other American ports below the cost of production on the ranges of the Southwest. Also be it remembered that a cattle raiser of the Argentine can put his cattle upon the consuming markets of this country for less shipping rate than the producers of the South and West.

The negotiations for an Argentine trade agreement is temporarily suspended, but negotiations can be resumed. If it is, are the cattlemen of the United States again to be subjected to the same character of competition as they were under the tariff bill of 1913? It must not be forgotten that it was under the low tariff of 1913 that the cattlemen of Texas and New Mexico, and Arizona, and Wyoming, and other producing States saw their market glutted, paralyzed, and their credit destroyed in 1920.

The flood of imports which followed the war led to the Emergency Act of May 1921, which increased duties on agricultural commodities, and provided against unfair methods of competition, especially dumping. A qualified embargo was placed upon dyes and certain other chemicals. In 1922 the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act was passed again providing protection to American industry. What did the Fordney-McCumber law do? It produced more revenue the first year of its operation than any tariff law that ever existed in this country. It opened up factories. It put 5 million idle men back on the payrolls of America. It made purchasers and consumers for the farmers.

The Fordney-McCumber law went into operation in September 1922. By the time it had been in operation 12 months the sheep and wool industry showed complete recovery and agricultural conditions in the South had made notable gains. The cotton and peanut producers of Texas, Mississippi, Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Tennessee, Virginia, and the Carolinas were enjoying unparalleled prosperity. It was in May 1923, following the passage of this law that a commission of southern governors came to Washington and told President Harding that their States were doing well since a duty had been placed on vegetable oils and urged that the existing schedule be retained.

The postwar decade, 1920 to 1930, was one of great national prosperity and expansion. In 1930 the Smoot-Hawley Act was enacted containing a complete general tariff revision. Of course, the world-wide financial and economic depression had already commenced to spread to the United States from foreign areas by June 1930, when the act was passed. As a result, there is no statistical basis for estimating its effect upon the foreign commerce of this country since during the period 1930 to 1933 prices of practically all commodities in the world collapsed and international trade was completely disorganized.

From 1934 on the trade agreements authority has been in effect. During this period the country has been in the depths of depression or engaged in war or busy rebuilding the war-torn economies of the rest of the world. There is, thus, little basis for estimating the effect on the economy of the present tariff program. Of course, one of the most tragic aspects of our pre-World War II trade was our tremendous shipments of war materials to Japan. Millions of tons of scrap metals were shipped from the United States to Japan during that period. The free traders insisted at that time that we were increasing the chances for peace by bolstering Japan's economy. On December 7, 1941, this folly was rewarded. Pearl Harbor was our first dividend on our investment in peace. Once again the lesson had to be learned—this time in the blood of American boys.

Mr. Speaker, once more we are approaching the fateful crossroad. The world is again in arms. The Soviet menace stretches from the banks of the Elbe to the shores of the Pacific. We are asked to delegate to the Executive even broader powers to lower our tariffs—once more in the name of peace and prosperity.

I wish to quote from a speech made by our beloved ex-President Herbert Hoover on his 80th birthday at West Branch, Iowa, the place of his birth. On this occasion Mr. Hoover, among other things, said:

In our foreign relations there are great dangers and also vital safeguards to freemen. During the last war we witnessed a special encroachment of the Executive upon the legislative branch. This has been through a new type of commitment of the United States to other nations. I am not going to argue legalisms—

Said Mr. Hoover—

for they do not go to the center of the issue. The real issue is in whether the President, through declaration or implication or by appeasement or by acquiescence, or by joint statement with foreign officials, can commit the American people to foreign nations without the specific consent of the elected representatives of the people.

Continuing, Mr. Hoover said:

There has been a grievous list of such commitments. They include international agreements which shackle our economy by limiting a free market. But more terrible were such executive agreements as our recognition of Soviet Russia which opened the floodgates for a torrent of traitors. Our tacit alliance with Soviet Russia spread communism over the earth. Our acquiescence in the annexation by Russia of the Baltic States at Moscow and the partition of Poland at Tehran extinguished the liberties of tens of millions of people.

Worse still—

Said Mr. Hoover—

was the appeasement and surrender at Yalta of 10 nations to slavery. And there was the secret agreement with respect to China which set in train the communization of Mongolia, North Korea, and all of China. These unrestrained Presidential actions have resulted in a shrinking of human freedom over the whole world.

From these actions came the jeopardies of the cold war. As a byproduct these actions have shrunk our freedoms by crushing taxes, huge defense costs, inflation, and compulsory military service.

We must make such misuse of power forever impossible. And let me say I have no fears of this evil from President Eisenhower, but he will not always be President.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, have the greatest confidence in President Eisenhower and his use of such powers as are granted to him by Congress; but in the light of what has been done by other Presidents in the use of executive power without reference to the people's representatives, the fact must not be ignored that President Eisenhower will not always be our Chief Executive.

Mr. Speaker, it is a fine thing to be concerned for our friends abroad, to wish to raise their standards of living, to strengthen the economies of the rest of the world. But, Mr. Speaker, in so doing let us not forget the United States. Unless our own economy is strong and our own people prosperous, the free world will indeed be in a hopeless plight.

Mr. Speaker, let us learn the lessons of experience before it is forever too late.

Christmas, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I delivered over WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Saturday, December 18, 1954:

It may seem a long way from the manger at Bethlehem to a New York penthouse high in the sky.

From a camel to a jet plane.

Across the distance of 1,954 years.

And yet the stars above seem the same.

While the life of a person who lives to be 80 is only a brief moment of awareness.

The world today is in fearful worship of atomic energy, the primitive pagan deference to a terrifying force that we have not learned to control, just as our so-called uncivilized ancestors made sacrifices to the powerful but vengeful gods of the sun and the sea.

Man, with all his proud, material accomplishments, faces the future with greater uncertainty than ever before.

For now his finger rests lightly but nervously on the trigger of a mechanism, the two-edged weapon that could sear his whole world with fire and leave the few survivors in prehistoric darkness.

Ignoring at this Christmas of 1954 the miracle that took place at Bethlehem over 19 centuries ago, the miracle of love that is always available to save him from his weakness and his cruelty, if he will only try to live his life as God intended that he should.

Christmas, 1954, with its message of peace on earth to men of good will is an inspiring religious festival.

That brings faith and hope and purification to hundreds of millions of people.

To others it is but the commercial climax of the year.

While heads of government search for answers to the unknown in the danger and the darkness beyond the neon-lighted streets, far off in the secret recesses of the brains that rule Moscow and Peiping, and plot to master the world by force and fraud and terror in place of God's redeeming love, we in the United States can be thankful for many blessings on this Christmas of 1954.

That we live in freedom under governments responsible to us, the sovereign people. Without masters, or slaves.

With signs of progress all around us as America builds upward and outward. The only servants are machines, tens of millions of them, that we control most of the time. Motor cars and planes, a loved one speaking to us across a continent, and pictures coming to us through the air as science gives us the magic eye and ear to be present

at great events, no matter where they happen.

In laboratories, hospitals, and universities new miracles are unfolding to bring us health and happiness and greater understanding.

Everything quickens with life as express highways arch over our cities to expedite trade and travel, and people find the elbowroom for sunlit homes instead of dark tenements, in the countryside that is growing more ranch houses than crops.

And you think how wonderful it is to be 20 years of age and standing on the threshold of man's greatest progress.

Here in America, where all the machines and tools and techniques are banishing the poverty and the back-breaking toil, and the worry, that have stunted the growth of many.

We are thankful for the schools and churches of our land. For the good that people do, because they are free to develop the best within them without fear of Government reprisals. Freedom to think, and speak, and do, and pray.

With these liberating powers, we can eventually solve any problem—if we have enough time.

We Americans have weathered many storms—for independence, for unity, for progress, and survival.

We suffered hardship and despair, but our faith in what is right gave us the strength to surmount all difficulties.

Sometimes our leaders made tragic blunders. Sometimes we were late in waking up to the betrayers; to those who put money, power, and pride above all else; to the fanatics of the right and of the left.

In spite of these dangers, the good commonsense of the average American, his decency, and his regard for other people, managed to keep us on a steady course.

These are the gifts we have received from freedom under God, for which we are grateful at this Christmastide, as we commemorate the Birthday of our Saviour whose life on earth pointed the way to brotherhood and peace to men of good will.

Most of the world longs for peace and equality of opportunity, but a few evil men are not satisfied with this. In the name of the false god of communism, they would enslave mankind, stripping their fellow humans of mind and soul and dignity—to satisfy their consuming lust for power and to heal the sickness of their own insecurity.

We could be sorry for these tyrants because their desperate cruelty is a confession that they are lost and are trying to cut through the jungle of their own hates and fears.

We could be forgiving but for their present brutality and their continuing aggressions.

On December 10 Molotov declared before a rally of would-be conquerors—and I quote: "There is no force in the world strong enough to stop the march of communism."

Mr. Molotov is in error.

There are forces to crush the Communist assault upon humanity, if we had the determination to employ them effectively.

One is military: The use of our presently superior weapons to win a quick and decisive preventive war.

Another is economic: Aid to free nations that will enable them to develop a higher standard of living—and, by contrast, expose the failures of communism—similar to the progress of West Berlin as compared with the rundown condition of East Berlin, which is under Soviet control.

A third is moral: Reaching through to the captive peoples under the hammer and sickle, with the beliefs and the aspirations that we share in common, encouraging them to prepare for the day of their own liberation.

As to military means, time is the diminishing factor.

The United States, which has a clear superiority in nuclear weapons and the means of bringing them on target, did not unleash this overwhelming power against communism. Instead, it asked Russia and other nations to join in a workable plan, guaranteed by inspection and supervision, to outlaw nuclear weapons as a step toward disarmament and genuine world peace.

The Communists rejected this generous offer.

Why?

There can be only one answer.

Communist Russia is playing for time to assemble a sufficient supply of A-bombs and H-bombs, and long-range aircraft and guided missiles, that will force Europe and Asia to capitulate to its demands, thereby isolating the United States.

Our positions would be reversed.

The Nation would be at the mercy of the Communists, and no clear-thinking person could expect them to exercise the charity and forbearance that is guiding our foreign policy today as time, that is now on our side, is running out.

What should we do before it is too late?

The power advantage may be ours for 2 or 3 or possibly a few more years.

How are we going to use it in order to establish a foolproof peace?

By helping other nations to become materially strong and confident as a bulwark against communism.

By carrying psychological warfare to the Russian people, so that they will rise up to overthrow their despotic rulers?

By preventive war now to destroy the Communist regimes in Russia and China and replace them with governments representative of the Russian and Chinese peoples, who will cooperate with the United Nations to outlaw aggression forever?

This last is a hard alternative.

It may be the only one if the other alternatives do not show results, and soon.

Even preventive war is a choice that is limited by time.

Once Communist Russia catches up with us that chance is gone.

If anyone thinks that the Communists will change their design for world conquest if we will only be nice to them, or believes that we should just wait for a revolution by the oppressed peoples of Russia and China, then that person should consult a psychiatrist.

We will not survive without leadership and without a positive program to defeat communism.

Perhaps, as some suggest, we should serve an ultimatum upon the Communist tyrants through the United Nations while we still have the upper hand, establishing a deadline before which they must agree to a universal program of disarmament, made effective by U. N. inspection and control, or suffer atomic annihilation of their military and industrial centers.

Drastic? Yes.

But the need to establish and enforce an international system of law and order is imperative if the world is to escape enslavement or utter destruction, as time is running out for this as well as other alternatives.

How can we reach through to our fellow human beings behind the Iron Curtain now to build a common cause that will forever outlaw aggression?

So many of these captive peoples treasure the meaning of Christmas, hoping for freedom as they pray before home altars, safe for the moment from the secret police.

Christmas, 1954, is but 1 week away.

When freedom and slaves ask for the greatest gift of all—the way to find peace with honor for all men of good will.

Keep Your Guard Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, on December 18, 1954, I had the pleasure and privilege of making the dedicatory address at the ceremony dedicating the Kansas National Guard Armory, at Ottawa, Kans., the future home of Headquarters Battery, 127th Field Artillery Battalion, Capt. Thomas E. Gleason, commanding.

As I began my remarks, which follow, jet planes, flown by Air National Guard men, roared over in salute:

If I were to give my remarks any title—I would call it "Keep Your Guard Up," for in this world of international conflict, just as in the fight ring, any relaxation in our defense might very well give any determined enemy the opening he has looked and waited for. Those jets which have just roared overhead are proof of the modernization of the National Guard.

To many, a small local unit of the National Guard may seem unimportant. If it were the only such unit it might be—but this battery is but one of thousands throughout the country—all of which put together makes up 27 divisions of ground troops, to which we can add 27 Air National Guard wings—a very vital and important part of our entire national defense.

The National Guard is not new—it is the successor to the old militia—the Minute Men of the Revolutionary War—and the advance made in those long historic years is made evident in this very unit.

Once we heard the phrase that we can "call a million men to arms overnight." If that ever was true, even in the day and age of the soldier armed with a musket, it certainly is far from true today.

For today, the National Guard man, as you have seen in the parade, is equipped with modern complex weapons, which require skill to operate—and skill to maintain; motor vehicles by the thousands, instead of foot travel or animal traction; radio and other complex communications equipment, instead of the simple semaphore flags; complex electronic computers, instead of pencil and pad of paper; radar detection, instead of far-flung outposts, or clumsy observation balloons.

All of these new weapons, not to mention automatic hand weapons, recoilless artillery and so many other items including the Honest John rocket and NIKE antiaircraft installations require time to master their effective operation; they require adequate efficient classrooms, such as you'll find here.

Too much credit cannot be given these citizen soldiers of the National Guard, who give up their time from pleasures and families during the week, and their vacations in summer—all that this Nation may be secure. No one knows when again our Guard units will be called into Federal Service. Maybe tomorrow—maybe not till next year, 10 years from now; perhaps never. But whenever it is they will again perform their services as they have in the past.

In World War I, over one-quarter of the troops in combat in Europe were National Guard troops—including the 35th Division from Kansas and Missouri, in which I served as a private first class.

World War II saw 9 National Guard units in Europe, again the 35th was there, and 9 units in the Pacific. All of these turned in magnificent records of combat.

From the ranks of the National Guard came officers and noncommissioned officers to train new troops.

In fact, the contribution of the National Guard in both those wars was so great that one shudders to think what might have happened to our country without them ready to answer the call of their country.

Again, Korea made the need of National Guard units quite apparent.

With all of our Regular troops withdrawn from this country—National Guard troops were ready to defend the continental United States, if needed, just as they have always been, and now are ready to do.

Citizens of Ottawa can well be proud of their national guardsmen—and proud of themselves for the part they have played in making the new fine armory available—not only for training of this local unit, but available for community affairs of many kinds.

Looking at it from a selfish angle, you have made a good investment, not only in having well-trained military men in your midst, but from a financial angle as well. Every 3 months new money in the form of drill pay comes into town—and it turns over 7 times, which here in Ottawa means new business. It means greater national security, upon which the security of each individual depends.

So, I join with you in the joy you have in dedicating this building to the services of our State and Nation, to be used for the training of the youth of your community for service in time of peace—or war. Young men, who I am sure, will—in the future, as their fathers in the past—serve with loyalty, courage, and skill—serving in such a fine manner that they, and you, will have great pride in them and their exploits.

Though they will be prepared, and better prepared, with these facilities, than they would have been otherwise, let us hope—yes—let us fervently pray—that they need never be called upon to serve in time of war.

In conclusion, as a part of this dedication ceremony, I wish to present to Captain Gleason, battery commander, a United States flag, which, at my request, was recently flown over the United States Capitol.

This flag, no different from any other, is more than mere threads of red, white, and blue. In its folds are contained all of the past and future of this great Nation.

And, as Francis Scott Key said, in those closing words of our national anthem—

"Long may it wave o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave."

And it will wave long, because this is the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Free because our men are brave.

Brave because they have faith.

Faith in themselves.

Faith in their country.

Faith in its future.

And above all because they have an abiding faith in God—the divine providence that has guided and guarded our beloved Republic.

Peaceful Coexistence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me at the banquet of the New England Regional Tax Conference of Public Accountants, December 10, 1954, Hotel Bradford, Boston, Mass.:

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

Uppermost in the minds of our people, and of countless millions of others throughout the world, is the desire for permanent peace—for a world of peace. It is only a small group of evil-minded men, through their domination of countries and of peoples, who prevent world peace of a lasting nature being established.

The world of today is confronted with a condition and not a theory.

You and I know that the evil forces of atheistic communism are bent on conquering the world and subjecting all peoples to communistic enslavement, persecution, and even, death.

We must face the fact that we are dealing with a cold, ruthless, destructive force, the leaders of which are possessed of the minds of what might well be termed "world killers."

If we permit ourselves to be deceived, or to become complacent, or disunited, or frustrated, it might prove dangerous to us. It is therefore imperative that we think calmly, rationally, and soundly, and in order to do so, the American people should be given all information possible.

The American people, when told the facts, are willing to make any sacrifice necessary for the best interests of our country. And our people should be given as much information as possible so that they may understand, and may be able to evaluate the situation, and form a sound, healthy, public opinion. For in a democracy, public opinion is the most necessary, pertinent, and powerful factor.

Under dictatorships, public opinion is suppressed and unable to assert itself because of fear.

And our people should be informed so that a sound, rational public opinion might be developed.

The withholding from our people of information that could and should be released tends to create uncertainty, confusion, frustration, fear, and disunity—and that is an unhealthy condition to have existing, and should be avoided.

For example, we read a great deal about peaceful coexistence. We all subscribe to that in principle. We would like to see it accomplished in fact—not only peaceful coexistence but peace of a lasting nature.

But what do you and I know, even to the slightest extent, about this new policy which could easily lead to appeasement, and how it can be brought about?

What does peaceful coexistence mean to the Kremlin?

Can peaceful coexistence, whatever it means in fact and in results, be accomplished unless the Communist leaders change their minds and their intent to ultimately conquer the world? Does peaceful coexistence to the Kremlin mean submission to them and their ideology, which would result in slavery, persecution, and death? Does peaceful coexistence mean that the hopes of the people of Poland, of Lithuania, and other Communist-dominated countries to regain their independence and liberty are to be destroyed and these countries permanently frozen into the Soviet Union?

These, and many other questions, are involved and should be discussed publicly, and should be considered seriously by the Congress of the United States in order that the facts and the truth can be ascertained so that a sound public opinion can be developed in favor or against this policy before our country becomes committed to it.

I am talking about facts and information that can and should be made known to our people.

For unnecessary secrecy could be a dangerous road for a country like ours to travel.

And let me ask you what I consider to be a pertinent and proper question. Can peaceful coexistence be accomplished if the Communist leaders are still bent on world aggression? The answer to that question seems to me to be emphatically "No."

The evidence clearly shows that aggression is still the Communist policy; that while their strategy might temporarily change, their intent of world domination has not; that the Communists are using the slogan of peaceful coexistence as another deceptive move in their efforts to divide and conquer.

It was only a few days ago on November 23, that the President in a press conference said that while "The Russians have lately been talking a different tone than they had for sometime past" and that "there was one underlying, unchanging motive, world revolution and the dominance of a Communist centrally controlled world state."

And on November 11, while appearing before the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, Secretary Dulles said, in relation to the aggressive intent of Red China, and I quote, "That Communist China is showing aggressive intent in Asia which belies its protestations of peace."

On the same day that the President, talking in Boston, said in substance that "Peace was nearer now than it has been for many years." And at the same gathering, Ambassador Lodge said that the "U. N. is succeeding despite unending Soviet attempts to sabotage it."

It is difficult for me to reconcile these statements. It is difficult for me to believe that peaceful coexistence can be brought about with the Kremlin still determined to conquer the world; with its ally and present junior partner, Red China, persecuting and imprisoning American airmen; shouting defiance to the dignity and honor of our country and making preparations for another shooting conflict.

For once committed to a policy, we must follow it through.

It therefore seems to me that before our country is committed to this policy, we should view it and all of its implications with extreme caution having in mind always the national interests of the United States of America.

One of the main purposes of diplomacy, where differences exist between countries, is to try and reduce as much as possible the area of differences. That is a wise policy for diplomats to follow.

However, this involves good faith on the part of both sides to try to solve or reduce the area of differences.

It is most difficult for me to believe that any real progress can be made where bad faith exists on the part of one of the negotiating countries.

And mark you, I am discussing a major matter—not a minor one—of concern to our people.

We have traveled from the policy of liberation and of massive and instant retaliation to that of impending peaceful coexistence.

We had better stop, look, and listen and thoroughly inquire and deliberate before we become committed to this policy, where the results of a mistake or a wrong guess is a picture that I would not want to paint.

I think that the old saying, "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty" would be a better one for us to follow. Whether we like it or not, whether we want to or not, we must face the fact that the only thing the Communists respect is what they fear, and that is military force and power greater than they possess.

The Communists do not fear God, because they do not love Him. In fact, they hate Him and are fighting God and His natural law on earth. Their god is materialism and power, carrying with it the imposition of their vicious ideology, and in its wake, imperialism, slavery, persecution, and death.

But even Communists, despite the fact that they attempt to deny it, are subject to the law of self-preservation, just the same

as is any other person. And in the hidden resources of their minds, the Communist leaders know that the law of self-preservation applies to a nation just as well as it does to an individual.

And the one thing that they will respect, because of fear—fear of defeat and destruction—is military power and strength greater than they possess.

And in relation to our diplomats dealing with the diplomats of such a force and movement, the Soviet Union, the weapon that will enable us to carry out our national objectives in the field of foreign affairs is the strength and power of our military force. And the strength and power of our military force must be in relation to the strength and power of the Soviet Union and its satellites and dominated nations.

For if we are stronger, respect through fear will exist, with favorable results.

If we are weaker, arrogance and contempt will exist with other results.

There is no question but that we possess strong military strength and power—in our Army, our Navy, and our Air Force. There is no question of the genius of our scientists, our engineers, our businessmen, our workers, our members of our Armed Forces, particularly in their specialized training, of our people as a whole, and of our will and determination to remain a free people.

But the principal question is not whether we are militarily strong—but is our overall military strength and power greater than that of the potential enemy? Is it such as to command respect through fear so as to deter attack and prevent another general conflict and to make a contribution toward ultimate world peace?

There are many among us, military men, Members of Congress, and among our people who feel that we should be stronger, having in mind the military strength possessed by the forces of world revolution and aggression.

In order to determine if our military strength and power in relation to that possessed by the Soviet Union is powerful enough to instill respect through fear, there must be not only an understanding of our own strength but of the strength of the Soviet bloc.

While it is difficult to obtain definite information, there is enough reliable information available to give us a current appraisal of the Soviet strength. It is known that from 1947 to the present time the numerical strength of the Soviet ground forces of 175 divisions has remained fairly constant. Nevertheless, significant changes have been made in favor of increased mechanization with sturdy and efficient modern equipment. It is reliably understood that 65 divisions of their present establishment are tank and mechanized divisions, that rifle divisions have been provided motorized equipment, and that they also have organic tanks and additional artillery. This means that the mobile and fire power have been increased through the introduction of improved weapons and equipment.

The Soviet Union, Eastern Germany, and Eastern European satellites today have over 6 million men under arms. Approximately 4,500,000 of these are in ground forces, with a high state of preparedness maintained as a result of a rigorous training program. It is known that the number of satellite divisions have almost doubled since 1947, bringing their total to at least 80 divisions.

The Soviet Union has a readymade spearhead for a rapid advance into Western Europe, if that decision is ever made. This spearhead is composed of at least 22 Soviet divisions in Eastern Germany. The bulk of these are armored divisions with nearly a complete complement of tanks and self-propelled guns—and behind this spearhead, there are additional 60 Soviet divisions located in the Eastern European satellite countries and in western Russia. This does not take into account satellite country divisions.

It is also known that their mobilization system is exercised periodically to insure its effectiveness by the ability of the Soviet and satellite ground forces to quickly increase to 400 divisions.

The numerical strength of the Soviet air force in recent years has been constant, having been stabilized at about 20,000 aircraft, but the rapid increase in Soviet air potential is shown by the rate of changeover to jet aircraft. For example, in 1951, about 20 percent of their fighters were jet types. By the year 1954, almost all of their fighters were jet types.

In connection with the light bombers, a similar development has occurred.

For example, in early 1951, jet bombers had not been introduced by the Soviet into operational units. By 1954, well over two-thirds of their light bomber force were jets.

In the medium bomber category, the TU–4's, which are similar to the United States B–29, the Soviets have doubled the number of this type in operational units since 1951, and still newer types of medium bombers, including jet models also have been observed.

The development of a comprehensive aviation training program, according to information received, has been one of the most significant contributions in Soviet postwar program to improve the capability of its air power.

The program for airfield construction has been and still is in progress with attention in recent years being directed to the construction of fields with very long runways. In the past 4 years, the Soviets have almost tripled the number of major airfields in eastern Europe that will accommodate jet fighters.

It is known that the combat value of the satellite air forces has increased significantly since 1951. In 1951, their aircraft was obsolete. By 1954, the numerical strength of satellite air forces had been doubled with one-half by jet fighters, with their facilities improved and the training, from a military angle, having reached a fairly satisfactory standard.

The Soviets have attached great importance to providing an effective air defense belt along the western perimeter of Russia through the construction of airfields throughout eastern Europe, and of aircraft control, warning systems, and antiaircraft artillery.

They have also since the end of World War II, improved their potential for the use of airborne troops and weapons.

From a naval angle, the information available is most striking. Their principal naval threat is the submarine capability. They are building other types of naval vessels at the same time. It is known that the Soviet Navy has over 300 submarines in service, and that about one-half of them are large or medium oceangoing types, and that the current large-scale naval construction program lays emphasis on the continued production of large oceangoing submarines.

It is known that the Soviet bloc has developed a strong capability in the special fields of atomic, chemical, and biological warfare, as well as in the field of guided missiles. The stockpile of the Soviets is of such a tremendous size, that they have more than enough tanks, mortars, and antitank guns for some three-hundred-odd Soviet divisions, with a stockpile of sea mines, field artillery, and antiaircraft artillery that is amazingly large, with the annual production of these items continuing at a sizable rate.

These facts have been made public at one time or another, but I am giving them to you in collected form because I feel that it is information that should be given to our people. It is information clearly showing the military strength and power of the Soviet and its satellites. And I might add that this does not include Red China.

If our people are made aware and awakened, I know that a sound public opinion will be developed as a result of which steps in connection with the increasing of our military strength and power will be taken.

You will remember, that our policy of a few years ago was the building of an Air Force to 143 air-wing groups by latter 1955. That policy was scrapped in 1953 by reducing our objective to 120 air wing groups. This reduction was fought in Congress, and I was one of the Members who opposed it. But the reduction took place. Many outstanding military leaders opposed it as unwise, as a sign of weakness, and as too great a calculated risk to take for budgetary reasons.

Fortunately, a year later, the present administration changed its policy in this respect, and recommended appropriations to increase our Air Force to 137 air-wing groups by the middle of 1957. In doing this, however, for budgetary reasons, our Army has taken a sharp reduction during this fiscal year from 20 divisions to 17 divisions. A second year reduction had been ordered, but has, fortunately, been canceled.

There were a number of Members of Congress who expressed deep concern in this reduction, having in mind the known military strength and power of the Soviet bloc and their sinister purposes. We felt it was too great a calculated risk to take. Able military leaders also expressed their concern.

There was also a reduction in our Navy during this fiscal year. That is now taking place.

There is no question but that we have the advantage today in the possession of destructive bombs and other weapons of destruction and in our ability to produce them, as well as an advantage in the means of delivering them, if necessary, to determined targets. But the information available shows that the Soviet Union is narrowing down the advantage we possess in this field of offensive military action.

I am sure that you were amazed not so long ago to read in the newspapers that 90 to 95 percent of attacking planes from abroad could get through to their targets in the United States. In other words, the defense of our cities and our people from air attack was so weak that only from 5 to 10 percent of attacking planes, carrying their terrible instruments of destruction, would probably be intercepted and shot down.

This was information that not only amazed me but stunned me.

I am glad to advise you that as a result of speeches made in Congress, and I have made several of them, appropriations have been made to improve this situation. But we have a long way yet to go, and we should move faster.

While it is known that no defense can be built that will prevent any plane from getting to a target, it is known too that we can build defenses against air attack that would be reasonably certain of destroying anywhere from 40 to 50 percent of attacking planes. If such defenses were built, it is felt by competent authority that the "kill" to attacking forces would be so great that they would think and hesitate long before attacking.

It would seem to me to be of imperative importance that the most effective continental defense should be constructed as rapidly as possible. However, I repeat, that decided improvements have been made in this respect during the past year.

If we err, it is better that we err on the side of strength than on the side of weakness.

It is better for us to have too much military strength and power and not need it than to have too little and need it.

As long as the Kremlin adheres to its policy of world revolution and enslavement, the most effective way, as I see it, to stop Communist aggresison, to deter war, and to ultimately bring about peace is through strength.

And I close my remarks with the statement that I have already made, and which

I have made in and out of the Congress on a number of occasions, and which, as an American, I shall continue to make because I consider it my duty to do so, that the only thing the Communists respect is what they fear, and that is military power and strength greater than they possess.

And with such a force, with the spiritual values of America, with public opinion when aroused, and a united America, we can approach the trying days that lie ahead with confidence and success.

Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, in the month of December I headed a group committee representing the National Rivers and Harbors Congress which had an audience with the Bureau of the Budget, in Washington, regarding the civil functions at the coming session of Congress. This group included representatives from the States of California, Florida, Louisiana, Maryland, Iowa, and the District of Columbia, and they undertook to state the case for flood control and rivers and harbors work to the Bureau of Budget for every section of the Nation. Following this, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress sent out to its members a newsletter, a copy of which is presented for inclusion in my remarks. I think this matter is an extremely important one and will be of interest to every Member of the Congress. The newsletter is as follows:

NATIONAL RIVERS
AND HARBORS CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C., December 27, 1954.

To the Members of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress:

During the course of the current month, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress took strong action to help build up the budget recommendations for civil functions in the coming session of Congress. President OVERTON BROOKS led a strong committee from the National Rivers and Harbors Congress which called up the Budget Bureau and talked to its officials for over an hour. On this committee were representatives from the States of California, Florida, Maryland, Louisiana, Idaho, and the District of Columbia; and the committee therefore spoke for the entire country.

We pointed out to the Bureau of Budget that for the last 4 years budget recommendations for rivers, harbors, and flood control work had been steadily falling in the face of further inflation which constantly lessened the purchasing power of the dollar. We further pointed out that the needs of the country have been steadily increasing with our growing population and that the pressure due to long delay in starting projects had been steadily increasing. We showed that this was the case although our national policy had been to pour billions of dollars into foreign aid, neglecting or postponing the development of internal improvement in our own Nation.

Your committee recommended to the Bureau of Budget three important policies, namely:

1. A larger yearly budget for civil functions until this recommended budget shall reach the figure of $650 million per year.

2. A policy of recommending new starts in order that many projects approved for years may be given the green light.

3. The build-up of a backlog of new projects badly needed by this country in the rapid development of our internal resources. In other words, waterway development should keep pace with road, highway, and airway development.

Officials of the Bureau of Budget to whom we talked made no comment regarding the backlog. In reference to the first suggestion, namely, an increased overall budget, these officials indicated that some relief could be expected in recommendations made year after next to the Congress. During that year, some of the very large multiple-purpose dams will be completed and funds will then be available.

Mr. Carl H. Schwartz, Chief, Resources and Civil Works Division, made the statement in reference to the second suggestion that consideration was being given to "new starts" to be recommended to Congress for approval for the coming fiscal year; and that information regarding this matter would be released to the public during the early part of 1955. While we did not get all that we wanted, I feel that our committee accomplished a very useful mission on behalf of our membership and as your president, I am passing this information on to you.

Yours for a happy and prosperous New Year,

Cordially yours,

OVERTON BROOKS,
President.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 10, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou companion of the pilgrim years, as with renewed powers and with restored souls, Thy servants in the ministry of public affairs face the high tasks of this National Chamber of deliberation, help them in all things, we pray, to be masters of themselves that they may indeed be the servants of others.

With the dim lamps of our own devices we cannot find a sure and clear path through the tangled maze of this stricken generation. Be Thou the guardian and guide of the unbeaten way our feet must take. Above all, give us a consuming passion, not to have our own way, but to find Thy holy will. May no cherished resentment, no camouflaged selfishness, no small loyalties nor ingrained prejudices, choke and clog the channels of our national service. Enlarge our spirits to meet the stupendous dimensions of these epic days. O God, to whom the future belongs, use us as pioneers of a better world for ourselves and for all peoples. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 6, 1955, was dispensed with.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

Mr. IRVING M. IVES, a Senator from the State of New York, appeared in his seat today.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 63)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to recommendations for further developing the foreign economic policy of the United States, which was read, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

(For message from the President, see House proceedings of today.)

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES UNDER THE AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 62)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States relating to activities under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, which was read and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(For message from the President, see House proceedings of today.)

REPORT OF TRADE AGREEMENT ESCAPE CLAUSES — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 64)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States relating to a report on trade agreement escape clauses, which was read and referred to the Committee on Finance.

(For message of the President, see House proceedings of today.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORTS ON OPERATIONS UNDER SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT, ETC.

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of operations under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, together with a report of the "on-farm" assistance through direct act to rehabilitate farm land damaged by disastrous floods, and a report of the operations under the emergency wind erosion control program (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of August 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, on the reapportionment of an appropriation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare entitled "Grants to States for Public Assistance," which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL COMMISSIONED OFFICERS IN REGULAR ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Reguar Army, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

CLARIFICATION OF STATUS OF CERTAIN CITIZENS OR NATIONALS OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to clarify the status of citizens or nationals of the Republic of the Philippines who are retired members of the uniformed services and who hold offices of profit or trust under the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper) to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE FACILITIES ACT RELATING TO FACILITIES NECESSARY FOR TRAINING OF UNITS OF RESERVE COMPONENTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 to provide for additional facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONSERVATION AND OPERATION OF THE NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL-SHALE RESERVES

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the part of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1920, as amended, relating to the conservation, care, custody, protection, and operation of the naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

ENLISTMENT CONTRACTS OR PERIODS OF OBLIGATED SERVICE OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide that the enlistment contracts or periods of obligated service of members of the Armed Forces shall not terminate by reason of appointment as cadets or midshipmen at the Military, Naval, Air Force, or Coast Guard Academies, or as midshipmen in the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

CREDITING OF CERTAIN SERVICE TOWARD RETIREMENT OF RESERVE PERSONNEL

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the crediting of certain service toward retirement of reserve personnel (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

COMPENSATION OF ACADEMIC DEAN OF UNITED STATES NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the annual compensation of the academic dean of the United States Naval Postgraduate School (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

RETIREMENT OF CERTAIN TEMPORARY OFFICERS OF NAVAL SERVICE

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of February 21, 1946 (60 Stat. 26), to permit the retirement of temporary officers of the naval service after completion of more than 20 years of active service (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPEAL OF ACT RELATING TO LIMIT OF DATE OF FILING CLAIMS FOR RETAINER PAY

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal the act of January 19, 1929 (ch. 86, 45 Stat. 1090), entitled "An act to limit the date of filing claims for retainer pay" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

VESSEL TONNAGE COMPOSITION OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the tonnage composition of the United States Navy with respect to vessels, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PERMANENT APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize permanent appointments in the United States Navy and in the United States Marine Corps (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

ENACTMENT OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS NOW INCLUDED IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION ACT AND CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION ACT

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to enact certain provisions now included in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act and the Civil Functions Apppropriation Act, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF ARMY-NAVY NURSES ACT RELATING TO CERTAIN ADJUSTMENTS IN DATES OF RANK IN THE REGULAR ARMY AND REGULAR AIR FORCE

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend section 106 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 so as to provide for certain adjustments in the dates of rank of nurses and women medical specialists of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force in the permanent grade of captain, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROFESSIONAL EXAMINATIONS FOR PROMOTION OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE ARMY AND AIR FORCE

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal certain laws relating to professional examinations for promotion of medical, dental, and veterinary officers of the Army and Air Force (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ARMY AND AIR FORCE NURSES

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the relief of certain Army and Air Force nurses, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the relief of certain members of the Armed Forces who were required to pay certain transportation charges covering shipment of their household goods and personal effects upon return from overseas, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

STATISTICAL STOCKPILE REPORT

A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the secret semiannual Statistical Stockpile Report for the period January 1 through June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF NAVY CLUB

A letter from the National Shipwriter, Navy Club of the United States of America, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that club, as of April 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON TIN OPERATIONS

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Facilities Corporation, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation on tin operations, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON LICENSURE, HEALING ARTS PRACTICE ACT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities of the Commission of Licensure, under the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that company for the year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to furter amend section 622 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944 RELATING TO VETERANS RIGHTS FOR CERTAIN SERVICEMEN

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 300 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 in relation to the entitlement of servicemen discharged or dismissed by court martial to veterans rights (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the 38th annual report of that Commission, for the period October 1, 1953, through September 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON REVISION OF STRATEGIC TRADE CONTROLS

A letter from the Deputy Director for Mutual Defense Assistance Control, Foreign Operations Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "The Revision of Strategic Trade Controls," for the first half of the year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF NATIONAL MUNITIONS CONTROL BOARD

A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Munitions Control Board, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to law, a confidential semiannual report of that Board for the period July 1 to December 31, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RECIPROCAL FIRE PROTECTION AGREEMENTS BETWEEN DEPARTMENTS OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC OR PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize reciprocal fire protection agreements between departments and agencies of the United States and public or private organizations engaged in fire-fighting activities, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT, RELATING TO DONATION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to donate certain property to the American National Red Cross (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the operations of the General Accounting Office, fiscal year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED AWARDS OF CONCESSION CONTRACTS IN CERTAIN RECREATIONAL AREAS

Two letters from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, proposed awards of concession contracts in Mount Ranier National Park, Wash. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CERTIFICATION OF COST OF REHABILITATION AND REPAIR OF DAMAGES CAUSED BY THE NAVY AT MERCER COUNTY AIRPORT, TRENTON, N. J.

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the certification by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics of the cost of rehabilitation and repair of damages caused by the United States Navy at Mercer County Airport, Trenton, N. J. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AUTHORIZATION TO TRANSFER CERTAIN PROPERTY TO PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer certain property to the Panama Canal Company, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

LIFE PRESERVERS FOR RIVER STEAMERS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 4482 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U. S. C. 475) relating to life preservers for river steamers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF REVISED STATUTES RELATING TO VERIFICATION UNDER OATH OF CERTAIN CERTIFICATES OF INSPECTION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 4421 of the Revised Statutes, in order to remove the requirement as to verifying under oath certain certificates of inspection, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

NATURALIZATION OF CERTAIN PERSONS FOR HONORABLE SERVICE IN THE NAVY

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit the naturalization of certain persons by reason of honorable service in the United State Navy prior to December 24, 1952 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGE CAUSED BY CERTAIN PERSONNEL OF UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend the act of July 3, 1943 (ch. 189, 57 Stat. 372), relating to the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or certain civilian employees of the United States, by removing certain limitations on the payment of such claims and the time within which such claims may be filed (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES OCCASIONED BY ARMY, NAVY, AND MARINE CORPS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend the act of January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF MILITARY PERSONNEL CLAIMS ACT OF 1945

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

G. F. ALLEN, DECEASED

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of G. F. Allen, deceased, former Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PENALTIES FOR THREATS AGAINST PRESIDENT-AND VICE-PRESIDENT-ELECT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend 18 U. S. C. 871 to provide penalties for threats against the President-elect and the Vice President (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Nick A. Mavros or Nicholas P. Cimeon or Nicholas Simeon or Nicholas Symeon from a report relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on July 1, 1954; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF TORT CLAIMS PAID BY NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

A letter from the Executive Officer, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Committee, for the calendar year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

A letter from the chairman, board of directors, Future Farmers of America, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the audit of the accounts of that organization for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, on behalf of the Judicial Conference of the United States, a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REMOVAL OF CERTAIN INEQUITIES BY FIXING HOURS OF WORK AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION PRACTICES

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of legislation to remove certain inequities by fixing the hours of work and overtime compensation practices in the case of certain employees of the United States, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

UNIFORM RETIREMENT DATE FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL PERSONNEL

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of April 23, 1930, relating to a uniform retirement date for authorized retirements of Federal personnel (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

HUGH S. GIBSON

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to say a few words concerning the recent death of one of my old and dear friends, the Honorable Hugh S. Gibson.

Hugh Gibson was one of the finest diplomats and most energetic humani-

tarians America has ever produced. He devoted his entire life to the promotion of international understanding and to the betterment of men's lives everywhere.

For 30 years Hugh Gibson played a role in almost every major development in international affairs. He entered the Foreign Service in 1908 as secretary at the Legation in Tegucigalpa, Honduras. From 1911 to 1913 he was secretary to the legation in Habana, Cuba, and in 1915 he moved to a similar post in Brussels.

It was when Hugh was secretary to the Embassy in Brussels that I first became acquainted with him. We were both identified at the time with former President Hoover's Commission for the Relief of Belgium, just after World War I broke out. It will be recalled that Hugh Gibson, acting under Ambassador Brand Whitlock, made the noble effort which, unfortunately, was unavailing, to save the life of the famous nurse, Edith Cavell, who was condemned to death by the German occupation in Belgium, and who was shot by a firing squad on the charge of being a spy.

From the time of the early organization of the famous Commission for the Relief of Belgium to the time of his death I had the privilege of being a close friend of Hugh Gibson, and of serving with him in many common undertakings initiated by former President Hoover.

After brief service as first secretary to the United States Embassy in Paris, Hugh became, in 1918, Director General of the American Relief Administration, which provided food to the war-torn countries of Europe. With the exception of that Administration's Chairman, former President Herbert Hoover, no man did more to help the people of the ravaged countries of Europe survive those terrible postwar months. At the same time Hugh Gibson served on the Inter-Allied Commission that made the first postwar survey of conditions in the Balkans.

In 1919 he was appointed Minister to Poland, and from 1924 to 1927 he served as Minister to Switzerland. In this latter capacity he played a large part in the preparation for the Geneva Conference of 1927 on disarmament. In the same year he was chairman of the United States delegation to the Conference for Limitation of Naval Rearmament.

In 1927 he returned to Belgium, where he served as our Ambassador from 1927 to 1933. As Ambassador to Brazil from 1933 to 1937, he played a decisive role in bringing the conflict between Bolivia and Paraguay to an end.

From 1937 until his retirement in 1938 he was again our Ambassador to Belgium.

From 1938 until his death last month Hugh Gibson continued to contribute to international understanding by his many books and articles on international affairs, some of which were written with the collaboration of former President Hoover.

His great diplomatic experience, his knowledge of relief programs, and the high regard in which he was held by all European leaders, led to his appointment as Director of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, a post which he held until his death.

Few men have contributed so much for the betterment of mankind. The people of Europe and of America will not soon forget his great services.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that there be printed in the body of the RECORD at the close of my remarks an editorial from the New York Times of December 13, 1954, and an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of December 13, 1954, both extolling the wonderful career of former Ambassador Hugh Gibson.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of December 13, 1954]

HUGH GIBSON

Hugh Gibson, who died yesterday in Geneva, Switzerland, at the age of 71, was not only a distinguished career diplomat—he might also be called a career humanitarian. Whether the enterprise at hand was the vain one of trying to save Edith Cavell from a German firing squad in the First World War, or ending the war in the Chaco, or administering vast war or postwar relief projects; whether it was working for disarmament or considering, as in one book he did, The Problems of Lasting Peace; whether it was representing his own Government with effectiveness and dignity or directing a committee for finding new homes for refugees and migrants—the work on which he was engaged when he died—Hugh Gibson gave to the task a brilliant mind, a deep understanding of other persons and nations and a profound sympathy.

Never advertising his own virtues or achievements, always giving himself unselfishly and single-mindedly, he was not in his later years much in the public eye. He took his joy in the useful work he was able to do, and it was his good fortune to go on doing it to the very day of his death.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of December 13, 1954]

Hugh Gibson, who has just died in Geneva at the age of 71, was one of the most devoted, energetic and resourceful emissaries America ever sent forth into the world of diplomacy. He once referred to himself as a diplomat who did "not wear spats." He might have said with equal accuracy that he was a diplomat who was not afraid to roll up his sleeves, and a human being whose concern was for people as well as for nations. When to these traits were added his capacity to make friendships, his abilities as an organizer, and his talents as a writer, a picture of Mr. Gibson's unusual attainments began to emerge.

From 1914 to 1938 hardly a great event in international affairs took place in which Mr. Gibson did not play some part. As secretary of the American Legation in Brussels in 1914 he did what he could to mitigate the effects of warfare upon the populace, and his strenuous efforts on behalf of Edith Cavell, the English nurse executed by the Germans, brought him wide notice. Later on he represented America in many countries, holding the ambassadorships to Switzerland, Belgium, and Brazil. A close friend of President Hoover, he continued in the diplomatic service under President Roosevelt, retiring in 1938.

Although he left the diplomatic service years ago, Mr. Gibson never ceased his efforts to bring help and hope to the international scene. Since 1951 he had been director of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, organized by 20 nations. He was in the midst of work on its behalf when he collapsed, dying as he had lived, in the service of his fellow men.

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXV OF THE SENATE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original resolution to amend rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate. With the resolution, I also submit a report (No. 2) of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. President, let me say this has been a very controversial subject for some time before the Senate. The Committee on Rules and Administration, of which I am still chairman, assured this body on more than one occasion that it would complete its hearings and would report immediately to the Senate. The action I now take is in compliance with the statement I have made to the Senate.

I may say that the original resolution being reported today from the Committee on Rules and Administration follows the report of the subcommittee, which was unanimously approved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 17), reported by Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"5. The following shall be the rules of the standing committees of the Senate and subcommittees thereof, and the term 'committee' as used in this subsection (except in paragraphs (b) and (c)) means any such committee or subcommittee:

"(a) Special meetings: In addition to meetings called pursuant to section 133 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, a majority of the membership of any committee may call a special meeting of the committee by filing a notice thereof with the committee clerk, whose duty it shall be to notify each member.

"(b) Subcommittees: A subcommittee of any standing committee shall be established by majority vote of such committee.

"(c) Committee staffs: The professional and clerical staff personnel of each standing committee and subcommittee thereof shall be appointed, and the services of such personnel terminated, by majority vote of such standing committee.

"(d) Subpenas: The authority to issue subpenas or otherwise to require the attendance of witnesses or the production of documentary material may be delegated by majority vote of any committee to its chairman or to any member.

"(e) Interrogation of witnesses: The interrogation of witnesses at committee hearings shall be conducted, on behalf of the committee, by members and authorized staff personnel only.

"(f) Executive session testimony: No testimony given in executive session shall be publicly released in any form unless such release has been authorized by the committee before which the testimony was given.

"(g) Notice to witnesses: The subject matter of the investigation in which he is called to testify shall be stated to each witness prior to his appearance, for his information only, and not as a limitation upon the scope

of the interrogation to be conducted at the hearing.

"(h) Counsel for witnesses: Unless otherwise provided by a majority of the committee members present at the hearing, a witness may be accompanied by counsel.

"(i) Statements: Witnesses shall be required, so far as practicable, to submit written statements of their proposed testimony in advance of the hearing at which they testify.

"(j) Distraction by communications equipment: A witness may request, on grounds of distraction, harassment, or physical discomfort, that during his testimony television, motion picture, and other cameras and lights shall not be directed at him; such request to be ruled on by the committee members present at the hearing.

"(k) Transcripts: Accurate verbatim transcripts shall be made of all committee hearings where witnesses testify under oath. Transcripts of testimony given at public hearings shall be made available for inspection or purchase by witnesses and persons mentioned therein.

"(l) Requests for remedial action: Any person whose name is mentioned or who is specifically identified, and who believes that testimony or other evidence presented at a public hearing of a committee, or comment made by a committee member or counsel at such a hearing, tends to defame him or otherwise adversely affect his reputation, may (a) request to appear personally before the committee to testify in his own behalf, or (b) file a sworn statement of facts relevant to the testimony or other evidence or comment complained of. Such requests and such statements shall be submitted to the committee concerned for its action.

"(m) Reports: No measure or recommendation shall be reported by a committee unless a majority of its membership is actually present at the meeting at which such action is taken.

"(n) Controversy as to jurisdiction: In any case in which a controversy arises between committees as to the jurisdiction of any committee of the Senate to make any inquiry or investigation, the question of jurisdiction shall be decided by the Presiding Officer of the Senate without debate, but such decision shall be subject to an appeal. Such decision finally arrived at, with or without appeal, shall not operate to invalidate proceedings of the committee prior thereto.

"(o) Notice to Senate: The chairman of each committee shall from time to time and at the earliest date practicable report to the Senate the general nature of inquiries or investigations the committee proposes to undertake, or, in any case he deems the national security might be endangered by such report, he shall in writing advise the President of the Senate of that fact."

REPORT ON SUBVERSION AND ESPIONAGE IN DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENTS AND INDUSTRY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations, pursuant to Senate Resolution 189, 83d Congress, I submit a report (No. 3) of that committee on investigation of subversion and espionage in defense establishments and industry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS—(S. REPT. NO. 4)

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations, I submit the annual report of that committee. The report is entitled "The Activities of the Senate Committee on Government Operations." I ask that the report be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. CARLSON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation three lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

CONTINUATION OF CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES—RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation realizes the tremendously vital job which has been and is being performed by the various investigating committees exposing the Communist conspiracy in our land and throughout the world.

I was pleased, therefore, to receive from Miles D. Kennedy, director of the American Legion's National Legislative Commission, the text of a resolution which had been adopted at the 1954 national convention urging continuation of the respective investigating committees and subcommittees.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 74

SUPPORT CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES

Whereas the Congress of the United States through its duly constituted committees has performed an outstanding service to the United States and the people thereof by continued investigating and exposing the activities of the Communist conspiracy and the individuals participating in the Communist conspiracy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion in national convention assembled in Washington, D. C., August 30–September 2, 1954, hereby commends the House Un-American Activities Committee, Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, House Committee To Investigate the Seizure and Forced Incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and strongly recommends the continuation of these committees with no limitation of their present powers and with ample funds for their proper function so vital to the national defense and internal security of the United States.

UNITY OF IRELAND—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last week I submitted a Senate resolution, which was given the number 11, relating to the unity of Ireland. Since that time the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] have desired to join in the sponsorship of that resolution. I therefore ask unanimous consent that Senate resolution 11 be reprinted showing the names of those two Senators as additional cosponsors of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 172. A bill to establish a board of claims within the Atomic Energy Commission to hear and determine claims for injury to or loss of livestock as a result of any nuclear or thermonuclear explosion caused by any agency of the United States; to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide for suit in certain cases upon such claims in the district courts of the United States; and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

S. 173. A bill for the relief of Georges and Athena Demetelin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 174. A bill for the relief of Rosa Tomasina Maria Puglisi (Rosa Tomasina Maria Sano); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 175. A bill to provide for the relief of Milton Beatty and others by providing for determination and settlement of certain claims of former owners of lands and improvements purchased by the United States in connection with the Canyon Ferry Reservoir project, Montana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 176. A bill for the relief of Gerda Irmgard Kurella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. KNOWLAND):

S. 177. A bill for the relief of Porfirio Punciana Vila, his wife, Tatiana Abatooroff Vila, and children, Porfirio P. Vila, Jr., Anne Marie Vila, and Josephine Anne Vila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 178. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain as additions to the Central Valley project, California, the Trinity River division and the San Luis unit of the West San Joaquin division; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. KUCHEL when he introduced the last above named bill.)

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 179. A bill for the relief of Ralston Edward Harry; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 180. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washita River Basin reclamation project, Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 181. A bill for the relief of Manhay Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE:

S. 182. A bill to require a premarital examination of all applicants for marriage licenses in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 183. A bill for the relief of Shima Shinohara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. BEALL, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 184. A bill to make certain changes in the regulation of public utilities in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 185. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Thompson (nee Mannhardt);

S. 186. A bill for the relief of Spirodon Karousatos;

S. 187. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Goto;

S. 188. A bill for the relief of Paul Ichikawa;

S. 189. A bill for the relief of Manuel Rodrigues;

S. 190. A bill for the relief of Kreste Fantulin;

S. 191. A bill for the relief of Liselotte Warmbrand;

S. 192. A bill for the relief of Borys Naumenko; and

S. 193. A bill for the relief of Louise Russu Sozanski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 194. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Hsi-Lin Tung;

S. 195. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Minardi;

S. 196. A bill for the relief of Olivia M. Orcuich;

S. 197. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Santagata;

S. 198. A bill for the relief of Fillipo Mastroianni; and

S. 199. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. F. M. S. Shu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 200. A bill to authorize the sale of Welles Village War Housing project in Glastonbury, Conn., to the housing authority of the town of Glastonbury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 201. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to Richland County, S. C., lands surplus to the needs of the Veterans' Administration hospital reservation, Columbia, S. C.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 202. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the former owners of mineral interests in certain submarginal lands acquired by the United States in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Colorado, and Montana; and

S. 203. A bill to provide for cancellation of certain feed and seed loans; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 204. A bill for the relief of Fred P. Hines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. IVES, Mr. LANGER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. NEELY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 205. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HILL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 206. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the observance of the 25th anniversary of National Cotton Week; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. 207. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 so as to authorize loans for farm housing to be guaranteed or insured under the same terms and conditions as apply to residential housing; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 208. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Arizona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLANDERS:

S. 209. A bill for the relief of Ingeborg Magdalena Slania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 210. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain property to the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 211. A bill to repeal section 10 of the act entitled "An act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1936 (the so-called Walsh-Healey Act); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. LANGER):

S. 212. A bill for the relief of Nicolo Impostato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY

S. 213. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ingeborg C. Karde;

S. 214. A bill for the relief of Ahmet Suat Maykut; and

S. 215. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of international conventions, and for other purposes," approved July 5, 1946; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 216. A bill to establish a separate custom collection district comprising the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Finance;

S. 217. A bill to authorize a program for runoff and waterflow retardation and soil-erosion prevention for the Pecos River watershed in New Mexico and Texas; to the Committee on Public Works;

S. 218. A bill for the relief of the town of Clayton, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce;

S. 219. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lorenza O'Malley (de Amusategue), Jose Maria de Amusategui O'Malley, and the legal guardian of Ramon de Amusategue O'Malley;

S. 220. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims arising as a result of the construction by the United States of Elephant Butte Dam on the Rio Grande;

S. 221. A bill for the relief of Dora Papara and Ethel Stathis Papara;

S. 222. A bill for the relief of Ariadni Vasiliki G. Stathis; and

S. 223. A bill for the relief of Mary Freida Poeltl Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNER (for Mr. MCCARTHY):

S. 224. A bill to prohibit aid to foreign countries which carry on trade with Communist China while American citizens are being held prisoner by Communist China; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 225. A bill prohibiting lithographing or engraving on envelopes sold by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 226. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing the Shawnee Mission as a national monument;

S. 227. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing as a national monument a site on the Old Santa Fe Trail near Dodge City, Kans.;

S. 228. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Fort Hays as a national monument;

S. 229. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Alcove Springs, located in Marshall County, Kans., as a national monument;

S. 230. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Fort Larned as a national monument;

S. 231. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing the Medicine Lodge Indian Peace Treaty site as a national monument and historic shrine; and

S. 232. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Waconda Spring, Mitchell County, Kans., as a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 233. A bill for the relief of Rev. Arno A. Lehmann;

S. 234. A bill for the relief of Rev. Lorenzo Rodriguez Blanco and Rev. Alejandro Negredo Lazaro;

S. 235. A bill for the relief of Melanie Schaffner Baker; and

S. 236. A bill for the relief of Johanna Schmid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 237. A bill for the relief of Rudolf A. Tomaschewski;

S. 238. A bill for the relief of Andreas Georges Vlastos (Andreas Georges Vlasto);

S. 239. A bill for the relief of Apostolos Vasili Percas; and

S. 240. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helena Planinsek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 241. A bill for the relief of Sarkis Jamil Bou-Monsour; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 242. A bill for the relief of Shizue Yoshimi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 243. A bill for the relief of Szjena Peison and David Peison;

S. 244. A bill for the relief of Anna C. Giese;

S. 245. A bill for the relief of Ahmet Haldun Koca Taskin;

S. 246. A bill for the relief of Marina Bernardis Zivolich and Mirko Zivolich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 247. A bill to increase the national minimum wage to $1 an hour; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 248. A bill to amend the Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947, as amended, so as to provide for appointment of doctors of osteopathy in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy; and

S. 249. A bill to provide for the purchase by the Federal Civil Defense Administrator of certain radiological detection instruments, devices, and equipment, and the leasing thereof to the States for civil defense purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 250. A bill for the relief of Iris Olsson;

S. 251. A bill amending the Communist Control Act of 1954 and repealing the first sentence of subsection 4f of the Internal Security Act of 1950, so as to provide penalties for membership in, or participation in the revolutionary activity of, the Communist Party or any other organization furthering revolutionary conspiracy;

S. 252. A bill for the relief of Sono Mary Theresa Nishimura;

S. 253. A bill for the relief of Sumie Legasse; and

S. 254. A bill for the relief of Giussepina Cervi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine (by request):

S. 255. A bill to authorize free medical, surgical, and dental treatment and hospitalization at Public Health Service hospitals for seamen having at least a certain period of maritime service; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself and Mr. BRICKER):

S. 256. A bill to eliminate cumulative voting of shares of stock in the election of directors of national banking associations unless provided for in the articles of association; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 257. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. FLANDERS):

S. 258. A bill for the relief of the widow and children of Irvin Scranton Ross; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and Mr. FULBRIGHT):

S. 259. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

S. 260. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

S. 261. A bill to amend the cotton marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

S. 262. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

S. 263. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. 264. A bill to increase the minimum national marketing quota for cotton to 11,500,000 bales; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 265. A bill to amend the acts authorizing agricultural entries under the nonmineral land laws of certain mineral lands in order to increase the limitation with respect to desert entries made under such acts to 320 acres; and

S. 266. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to transfer certain property of the United States Government (in the Wyoming National Guard Camp Guernsey target and maneuver area, Platte County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming; to the Committee of Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 267. A bill for the relief of Ellen Kjosnes and Unni Kjosnes;

S. 268. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Georgios Aslanis; and

S. 269. A bill for the relief of Berc I. Parsegyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 270. A bill to protect trade-mark owners, producers, distributors, and the general public against injuries and uneconomic practices in the distribution of competitive commodities bearing a distinguishing trademark, brand, or name in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia;

S. 271. A bill for the relief of June Rose McHenry; to the Committee on the Judiciary; and

S. 272. A bill to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 to authorize the disposal of certain Federal surplus property to State and local units of the United States Civil Defense Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 273. A bill to amend section 21 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, so as to increase the maximum amounts and terms for which loans may be made under such section; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 274. A bill to increase the insurance protection of depositors in federally insured banks from $10,000 to $15,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 275. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to increase the individual exemption for income-tax purposes from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 276. A bill to provide aid to persons in the United States desirous of migrating to the Republic of Liberia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations;

S. 277. A bill for the relief of Jean Pfeifer;

S. 278. A bill for the relief of Otto Dahn, Sr.;

S. 279. A bill for the relief of Stanley Rydzon and Alexander F. Anderson;

S. 280. A bill for the relief of Theodore J. Harris;

S. 281. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. McNulty and Eugenia Mary McNulty;

S. 282. A bill for the relief of Tom Hellander Co., Superior, Nebr.;

S. 283. A bill for the relief of Andrew Wolfinger;

S. 284. A bill for the relief of Margarita Oy Wan Chan;

S. 285. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Astri Gro Anderson;

S. 286. A bill for the relief of Alexander Abdul Ghane Tassie;

S. 287. A bill for the relief of Melitta Elizebeth Rhone;

S. 288. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of Meadow School District No. 29, Upham, N. Dak., for loss of revenue resulting from the acquisition of certain lands within such school district by the Department of the Interior;

S. 289. A bill for the relief of Johanna Rampitsch and Frederick Rampitsch;

S. 290. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edward J. Smith (nee Concetta Chiodo) and her daughter, Roberta Smith;

S. 291. A bill for the relief of Joseph Eugene Minasian;

S. 292. A bill for the relief of Ahamad Meah;

S. 293. A bill for the relief of Miss Cecile Patricia Chapman;

S. 294. A bill for the relief of Adamantios Arakas; and

S. 295. A bill for the relief of Leon Roman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 296. A bill to provide for loans to individuals for the purpose of enabling them to obtain a college or university education; and

S. 297. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to pay a certain sum for school construction under the provisions of Public Law 815, 81st Congress, to Underwood School District No. 8, Underwood, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 298. A bill for the relief of Banjamin Mintz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIKIN (for himself and Mr. ALLOTT):

S. 299. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo.; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 300. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. J. Res. 10. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, providing for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President, and for election of such candidates by popular vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. J. Res. 11. A joint resolution designating the rose as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine (for herself and Mr. PAYNE):

S. J. Res. 12. A joint resolution to authorize and direct the International Joint Commission on United States-Canadian boundary waters to make a survey of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DANIEL (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas):

S. J. Res. 13. A joint resolution to create an advisory commission for the Department of State to assist in determining title to Chamizal Zone, between United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. J. Res. 14. A joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1960 Olympic Games at Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONSTRUCTION OF ADDITIONAL UNITS OF CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to construct additional units of the great Central Valley project in California. These are the Trinity and San Luis features, which are essential to advancing our ambitious irrigation, reclamation, and power program which is contributing so much to the progress, wealth, and good of our Nation.

This measure, of which my colleague, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is a cosponsor, would assure supplemental and additional water for vital sections of our rapidly growing State, and would utilize the hydroelectric potentialities of untapped streams. It is similar to proposals which were presented in the last Congress, and it authorizes a development which has been under consideration for many years.

The Trinity-San Luis undertaking will supply some 600,000 acres of land in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys. It also will provide an additional supply of necessary electric power to satisfy the ever-expanding market. From an economic standpoint, the combined Trinity and San Luis units make up one of the soundest and most attractive projects remaining in the West.

I wish to advise my colleagues that the proposal has the endorsement of Governor Knight, on behalf of California. In his message to the legislature, last week, on the occasion of his inauguration, Governor Knight declared the project is feasible from both engineering and economic viewpoints, and should be constructed as rapidly as possible. I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, appropriate excerpts from Governor Knight's inaugural address.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, because of the increasing need for additional water and power, I trust that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will give this bill early and favorable consideration. The urgency of this matter is clearly apparent. In some areas to be served by the Trinity-San Luis development, the water table is dropping rapidly, and lands already are being withdrawn from cultivation. In some sections the supply for municipal use is unfit for drinking purposes, and water has to be imported at almost excessive cost.

The Trinity-San Luis features of the Central Valley project would be a boon to the entire State of California, and would carry forward the constructive program which is making possible utilization of tremendous resources of this wide and rich area.

The magnitude and diversity of the Central Valley development require that the Trinity-San Luis project be carried on under Federal auspices. This undertaking, which would transfer both water and power for considerable distances, and would be integrated with the Central Valley project, is in complete accord with established Federal principles. I hope and believe that it will have the support of the Congress of the United States and of the Department of Interior, just as it has the backing of the people of the State of California.

EXHIBIT A

EXCERPTS FROM MESSAGE TO CALIFORNIA STATE LEGISLATURE BY GOVERNOR KNIGHT, JANUARY 3, 1955

WATER PROBLEMS

The careful conservation and development of our water resources is of paramount importance to the people of our State.

We can anticipate the construction in the near future of two more mammoth projects which will insure extensive additional supplies of water and power for our expanding population. These are the Feather River project and the Trinity River project. The Feather River project is a major unit of our long-range California water plan and will be financed, constructed, and operated by the State of California. The State engineer will present a report of this session of the legislature which will contain a step-by-step construction program for the project, a schedule of deliveries from the project, an estimate of the funds which will be required for construction and suggested means of financing. When this report is presented to the legislature, we will have ended the era of planning on the Feather River project, and we will have entered the era of financing and construction. There is immediate need for the project. I urgently recommend that the legislature take immediate steps to determine the proper and most effective means of raising the funds necessary for construction, for without affirmative action, the project will remain only a grandiose dream. I am hopeful that you will act expeditiously, so that right-of-way acquisition can begin without delay and that initial phases of construction may be under way by this time a year hence.

NOW BEING PLANNED

The Trinity River project is now being planned by the Federal Government. California has informed the Secretary of the Interior that the project is feasible from an economic and an engineering standpoint and should be constructed at the earliest possible date. I recommend that this session of the legislature approve a joint resolution urging the Congress to begin consideration of this construction project, including all of its power facilities, at the earliest possible date.

Studies have been made by both State and Federal agencies on the San Luis project on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley. This project could utilize surplus waters obtained from either the Trinity River or Feather River projects. There are conflicting views on whether the San Luis project should be a part of one or the other. My view is that we should endeavor to include the San Luis development in whichever project will be finished first.

I oppose the State purchase of the Central Valley project at this time. The United States Government has indicated that it has no interest in selling the project. We have greater and more immediate needs for the construction of the Feather River project, the Trinity River project, and other necessary State water-and-power developments on which we can use the several hundred million dollars which the Central Valley project would undoubtedly cost.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 178) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain as additions to the Central Valley project, California, the Trinity River division and the San Luis unit of the west San Joaquin division, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICES IN RURAL AREAS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to promote the further development of public library services in rural areas, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me setting forth the reasons why prompt passage of this proposed legislation is desirable, together with a section by section analysis of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 205) to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement and analysis presented by Mr. HILL are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HILL

I believe everyone will agree that our farm and other rural families can and should have the same advantages as urban dwellers now enjoy and profit by through the ready access to books, newspapers, magazines, and other sources of information which our well-developed city library systems provide.

Rural America lives in a rapidly changing and extremely complex world. In its day-to-day life, the farm family in America needs to keep abreast of new ideas and current facts regarding new products, new markets, new methods of farming, new sources of income, and new ways of farm family living. As responsible citizens, our rural people are just as concerned as their city friends in keeping up with those rapidly changing developments in the Nation and the world which must be understood by all of us if we are to cope with the many problems that threaten the economic strength and security of our country and the peace of the world.

Over 26 million Americans, some 90 percent of whom live on farms or in small communities, are still without access to modern library services. The bill which I shall introduce today and which will be cosponsored by Senators AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont; DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois; JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana; CARLSON, Republican, of Kansas; IVES, Republican, of New York; and LANGER, Republican, of North Dakota, aims at filling this important gap in our educational machinery. It is based on a 5-year program of grants to be used by State library agencies to foster the development of rural library services. It is, of course, so drafted as to guarantee that there can be no possibility of Federal interference with or control over State or local library agencies. The cost of the program, not to exceed $7½ million per year, will depend on how rapidly the States move to improve and extend library services.

The bill has the support of the American Library Association, which realizes that in spite of its importance to democracy the public library, like the public school, has been neglected. The Senate in twice approving Federal aid to education has recognized the national crisis that exists in our public schools. The Senate by approving a bill similar to that being introduced today has also recognized the need for public library service throughout the Nation as an aid to education.

As I have already said, over 26 million people in the Nation are today without library service. Ninety percent of these live on farms and in small communities. More than 400 counties, or, roughly, 1 out of every 6, in this richest country on earth have no public libraries at all.

The urgent need for strengthening our public schools and library service is once again proven by the high rate of rejection of men under Selective Service for educational deficiencies.

We are experiencing again the same waste of manpower demonstrated in the last war through failure to gear our education system to meet the rising requirements of national security. Since Korea over 750,000 men have been rejected under Selective Service for educational deficiencies. That is the equivalent of some 40 infantry divisions. This is a loss too serious to disregard.

Reports by both House and Senate committees during the last session of Congress have made it crystal clear that the quality of public education in the United States is suffering by virtue of the great financial hardship under which our public schools are struggling. The detailed survey of the need for school construction throughout the United States released by the Office of Education last year portrayed a situation which is nothing short of appalling. The President himself told us just last week that immediate action must be taken in an attempt to correct this situation. Nonetheless, and even if this Congress does act promptly and effectively—as I hope it will—to pass legislation calling for school construction, it will be some years before the deterioration in the

quality of public school instruction which has occurred in this country can be corrected. In the meantime, those young people who have been and are being deprived of the proper quality of education must look to the public library system to help make up the deficiency.

Library service complements and supplements the work of our schools by carrying the school into the home. Schools cannot serve their maximum usefulness without adequate libraries to provide home reading and other educational materials. The public library extends the educational process for the adult who may find that his schooling of 10 or 20 years ago is inadequate in meeting today's problems. This bill provides the cheapest and most effective way I know for bringing within the reach of every citizen the tools for continuous education.

Never in our history have the people had greater need for knowledge upon which to base their opinions and build their decisions. With the many grave problems facing our Nation today our national welfare demands that the ordinary citizen be able to get books, newspapers, and other sources of knowledge about the world he lives in.

The tasks of peace are the most difficult ever to challenge the genius of a nation. A highly trained, fully informed citizenry is essential to the defense of our freedom, the preservation of our country, and the building of lasting peace.

ANALYSIS OF THE LIBRARY SERVICES ACT

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Section 2: (a) Its purpose is to stimulate the States to extend public library services to small towns, villages, and farming communities, now without such services or with inadequate services. By definition, no incorporated or unincorporated town with a population of more than 10,000 is eligible for the benefits of the act. The term "State" includes all the States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. The term "public library" means a library that serves free all residents of a community, district, or region and receives its financial support in whole or in part from public funds.

(b) Specific safeguards are set up to prevent Federal control. The act stipulates that the States and local communities are to have full power over the management of the public library services carried on with the aid of the Federal grants, over the appointment of librarians and other library workers, and over the selection of books, periodicals, films, recordings, and other library materials. In addition, the act specifies that the States and local communities shall determine what constitutes the best use of the funds in attaining the objectives of the legislation. Furthermore, in section 5c, the State library administrative agency is given the authority to decide which areas in the State have inadequate library service. As provided in section 5b, the Commissioner of Education is required to approve any State plan which fulfills the specifications set forth in section 5a.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 3: The act would authorize an annual appropriation of $7,500,000 to the States for a 5-year period, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956. In order to receive the payments, a State must submit to and have approved by the Commissioner of Education a State plan for the extension of public library service to rural areas, which have either no service or else inadequate service.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

Section 4: (a) Of the $7,500,000 to be appropriated each fiscal year during the 5-year period, the Commissioner of Education would allot $10,000 to the Virgin Islands and $40,000 to each of the other States. Of the remainder of the $7,500,000 after these initial allotments, the Commissioner would allot to each State an additional amount based on the ratio of the rural population of the State to the total rural population of the United States according to the 1950 decennial census.

(b) If any part of the allotment to a State remains unpaid at the end of a fiscal year, it would be available to that State until the end of the next fiscal year, under the conditions governing the payments to the State as set forth in section 6. A State must exhaust this carried-over allotment before it can receive any payment out of the allotment in that following fiscal year.

STATE PLANS

Section 5: (a) In order to receive approval, a State plan for the further extension of public library services must include the following:

1. Provision for the administration, or the supervision of the administration, of the plan by the official State agency charged by State law with the extension and development of public library services throughout the State. It must show that this State agency has adequate authority under the State law to administer the plan in accordance with its proposals and the provisions of the act.

2. Provision for the receipt and safekeeping by the appropriate State officer of all funds paid to the State under the terms of this act. Provision must be made also for guaranteeing that the funds will be expended solely for the purpose of the act and for the repayment by the States to the United States of any funds which are lost or not spent in accordance with the purposes of the act.

3. Provision for establishing policies and administrative methods to be followed in using any funds made available for expenditure under the State plan for extending public library services to rural areas. The State library agency administering the plan must certify that the policies and methods proposed will, in its judgment, assure the use of the funds to maximum advantage in attaining the objectives of the act.

4. Provision for the State library agency administering the plan to make reports on such items of information as the Commissioner of Education may reasonably require from time to time to keep the Congress and the public informed.

5. Provision that any public library services furnished to an area under the plan shall be made available free of charge, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the State library administrative agency.

PAYMENTS TO STATES

Section 6: (a) The Secretary of the Treasury would pay from time to time to each State with an approved plan an amount equal to the computed Federal share of the total sums expended by the State and local communities for extending public library services to the specified areas. No payment would be made to a State until the Commissioner of Education finds for the fiscal year in question that—

1. The State or local communities will have available sufficient funds which would entitle them to receive at least the minimum Federal allotment of $40,000, and $10,000 in the case of the Virgin Islands.

2. That the total amount available for public library services from State and local sources in the area under consideration for the fiscal year in question will not be less than the total amount actually expended for public library services from State and local sources for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

3. That the amount of State aid for public library services in the fiscal year under consideration will not be reduced below the amount of State aid actually expended for public library services for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

(b) The Commissioner of Education would be required, at least semiannually and prior to the period for which a payment is to be made, to estimate the amount likely to be needed to pay the Federal share of expenditures for carrying out the approved State plan for the period in question. The Commissioner would then certify to the Secretary of the Treasury this estimated amount, reduced or increased by a sum depending on whether his estimate for a prior period was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to a State for that prior period. The Secretary of the Treasury is required to pay to the State, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, the amount certified by the Commissioner and at the time or times fixed by him.

(c) In the calculation of the Federal share of the total expenditures for carrying out an approved State plan, the formula used for the purpose of matching takes into account the relative ability of the States to pay which is explained in section 6d. As stipulated in the act, the Federal share for any State is 100 percent less the State percentage. This State percentage is that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 percent as the per capita income of that State bears to the per capita income of the continental United States (excluding Alaska). In other words, if a State with a per capita income of $1,544, as compared with the national per capita income of $1,645, is entitled to a maximum Federal allotment of $131,560 (the flat allotment of $40,000 plus the $91,560 based on the rural population ratio), it must put up $116,199 from State and local sources to obtain that amount of Federal money.

The calculations for the State used as an example are as follows:

Ratio of State per capita income to the per capita income of continental United States (excluding Alaska)—

$$1544 \div 1645 = 0.9386$$

Ratio of State share to 50 percent is the same as the ratio derived above, or

$$\frac{\text{State share}}{50} = 0.9386$$

State share $= 0.9386 \times 50 = 46.9$ percent
Federal share $= 100 - 46.9 = 53.1$ percent

To obtain the maximum Federal amount available, $131,560, the State must match in the ratio of—

46.9 to 53.1, or
State share (x) : 131,560 as 46.9 is to 53.1
53.1 x = 61,701,640
State share = 116,199

Ceilings and floors have been placed on the Federal shares. In no case can it be more than 66 percent nor less than 33 percent. Furthermore, the Federal share in the case of Hawaii is to be 50 percent, and in the case of Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, it is to be 66 percent.

(d) The Commissioner of Education would be required to announce officially between July 1 and August 31 of each even-numbered year the Federal percentage of the total expenditure for public library services under the plan for each State. This Federal percentage would be calculated on the basis of the averages of the per capita incomes of States and of the continental United States (excluding Alaska) for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such official announcement would be in effect for each of the 2 fiscal years beginning with the first July 1 which follows the official announcement establishing the Federal percentage. The Commissioner would be required, however, to announce the Federal percentages as soon as possible after the enactment of the Library Services Act, and these percentages would be in effect until July 1, 1956.

(e) States are prohibited from purchasing or erecting any building or buildings, or purchasing any land by the use, directly or

indirectly, of any Federal money paid to it under the provisions of this act.

(f) Federal funds can be used only to provide or improve public library services in rural areas which are defined as areas not including an incorporated or unincorporated town with a population of more than 10,000. However, the State library agencies may utilize existing public libraries in urban areas to extend library service to the rural areas, provided such a proposal has been included in the approved State plan.

WITHHOLDING

Section 7: The Commissioner must withhold further payments to a State, if he finds (1) that the State plan has been so changed as to be no longer in accordance with the requirements of the Library Services Act, or (2) that there has been a failure to comply substantially with the provisions required and set forth in the State plan. Before such action is taken, the Commissioner must give reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of the previously approved State plan. The Commissioner is required to make no further certification to the Secretary of the Treasury until he is satisfied that the State is no longer failing to comply with the requirements of the Library Services Act.

ADMINISTRATION

Section 8: (a) The Commissioner of Education would administer the act under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and would issue, with the approval of the Secretary, such regulations as might be necessary for the administration of the act.

(b) The Commissioner would be authorized also to make such studies, investigations, and reports as might be necessary to carry out the purposes of the act. This would include among other things periodic reports for public distribution on the values, methods, and results of the various State activities in the extension of public library services in rural areas, undertaken under this act.

(c) Authorization would be given for the appropriation of such sums as would be necessary to enable the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Commissioner of Education to carry out the functions required by this Library Services Act.

ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL SERIES OF POSTAGE STAMPS IN COMMEMORATION OF 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF NATIONAL COTTON WEEK

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce a bill authorizing the Postmaster General to issue a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the observance of National Cotton Week, and ask that it be referred to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

I hope that the Postmaster General will cooperate with this effort to encourage and generate the sale of cotton goods throughout the United States. Such a program will do much good for the cotton growers, the cotton industry, and the people of America as a whole.

National Cotton Week will be used by an estimated 16,000 retail stores this year as the basis for special promotions for cotton goods. The fact that the number of stores cooperating in the nationwide promotion increases each year is effective proof of the sales generating value of National Cotton Week. During the week, local newspaper advertising featuring cotton goods, as well as store displays, reach their peak.

National Cotton Week is America's number one fiber promotion. None of the other fibers have a promotion scheme which remotely approaches cotton week in scope and effectiveness. It provides a showcase for cotton products.

Moreover, cotton week serves the important purpose of reminding the retailer and the public of the vital part cotton plays in our everyday life. About 12 million persons depend directly or indirectly upon cotton for their livelihood. Through the medium of cotton week, the Nation is reminded of the importance of cotton to the country's overall economy.

Cotton week also serves to dramatize the desire of the cotton farmer and others in the industry to move more cotton and cotton goods into consumption. Farmers want and desperately need the market for cotton expansion. For this reason they and other segments of the industry contribute to the financing of cotton week and other activities designed to increase the consumption of cotton.

A commemorative stamp would give added emphasis to cotton week. It could be used as a springboard for vast amounts of publicity. Additional stores would be persuaded to participate. The added publicity created by a special stamp would encourage all stores to expand their promotion efforts such as newspaper, radio and TV ads, and window displays. Special editions of newspapers and special celebrations in cotton-growing areas could be built around the stamp. It would offer an excellent opportunity for stepped-up campaigns to sell more cotton and cotton products.

The current prospects indicate that the carryover of cotton in this country on August 1, 1955, will be slightly larger than a year earlier. This is in spite of full compliance by cotton farmers in the 1954 acreage-reduction program and an estimated increase in both domestic consumption and exports during the current year. Exports and consumption are expected to total almost 13½ million bales this year, which is about a million bales more than the previous year. With no reduction in the surplus, a further reduction in acreage allotments has been called for in 1955 under the present law. The 10-million-bale quota set for the 1955 crop by the Department is about 40 percent below the average production in the years 1951, 1952, and 1953.

In the face of this situation, the cotton industry is redoubling its efforts to further expand the markets for American cotton. Domestically, cotton is facing its stiffest competition in many years. For the first time in history, synthetic-fiber manufacturers are operating their plants at only about two-thirds of capacity. They cannot let these costly facilities lie idle long. Already they have sharply stepped up their research and sales-promotion efforts. They realize that the sales-promotion program of the cotton industry has successfully told the story of cotton's superior qualities and is primarily the reason why consumers prefer and insist on cotton for many household and apparel items. Finding it increasingly difficult to take additional markets, they are encouraging cotton mills, through the most aggressive type of selling methods, to blend synthetic fibers with cotton in many items previously made exclusively of cotton. They have just recently been able to get manufacturers to use synthetics in the tapelike border of towels. In the last few months, they have introduced a newly developed fiber which is taking over a substantial part of the very large outlet for cotton rugs and carpets.

The cotton industry must—and is—fighting this war of competition with every means at its command. One of the principal sales-promotion campaigns conducted by the cotton industry is National Cotton Week. In 1955, the week of May 9–14 has been selected. It will mark the 25th anniversary of this event.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 206) to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the observance of the 25th anniversary of National Cotton Week, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

CONTINUATION OF INVESTIGATIONS OF COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY AND SUBVERSION

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and 53 other Senators, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the need for continuing vigorous and diligent investigation of the Communist conspiracy and subversion.

I ask unanimous consent that the names of the cosponsors and the full text of the resolution appear at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the names and the text of the resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. DANIEL (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. THYE, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. BUSH, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. LONG, Mr. KERR, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. POTTER, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. FREAR, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. JENNER, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. FLANDERS).

TEXT OF RESOLUTION (S. RES. 18)

Resolved, That the Communist Party of the United States is recognized to be a part of the international Communist conspiracy against the United States and all democratic forms of government. It is the sense of the Senate that its appropriate committees should continue diligently and vigorously to investigate, expose, and combat this conspiracy and all subversive elements and persons connected therewith, including the

completion of all pending and unfinished investigations of such nature.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be extended to 4 minutes in order that I may make a few remarks concerning the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. DANIEL. During the recent special session, the then Senator from Colorado, Mr. Johnson, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and I twice offered amendments to the censure resolution having a purpose and wording similar to that of the resolution I am now submitting. Charges had been made that the Senate would terminate or soften its investigation of communism and subversion. Some said that criticism even of unrelated actions of a Senator who conducted such investigations would give comfort to the Communist Party. Knowing that this was quite contrary to the attitude and intention of the Senate, we offered our amendments to express the true sense of the Senate on this subject. These were objected to on the ground that they were not germane to the pending resolution, and the objections were sustained.

Although not widespread, there has been enough continued misinterpretation of the attitude of the Senate toward the investigation of communism and subversion to lead many of us to believe that it is still appropriate for the Senate to express itself on this subject. In fact, it is my opinion that this should be one of the first expressions of the Senate as we begin the new session.

Every Member of this body, and a majority of the people of the country, undoubtedly know that Members of the Senate of the United States yield to no one in their opposition to and their fight against the Communist conspiracy. Our recent actions during the 83d Congress speak louder than words. During 1954 the Congress passed perhaps more antisubversive measures than during any peacetime year. Eight bills were enacted into law, including one which outlawed the Communist Party. In addition, the Senate passed two other antisubversive bills which were not acted upon by the House.

The Senate was liberal in providing all funds requested by its committees investigating communism and subversion. We cited for contempt several witnesses who refused to testify before our committees, and in many other ways indicated by decisive action the true attitude of this body against the conspiracy which would overthrow and destroy our Government.

Likewise, I am sure that actions will speak louder than words on this subject in the present Congress. Under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] it is certain that the pending and unfinished investigations of subversion in Government agencies will be completed by his committee with dispatch. The experience, ability, and attitude of the Senator from Arkansas on this subject inspire great confidence among us all, and the purpose of this resolution with respect to him and his committee is more in the nature of approving and supporting what we know they will do. They need no suggestion or direction in this regard, but it will of course strengthen and encourage them and the members of other appropriate committees in the work already planned if the Senate makes a renewed expression of its approval and support of diligent and vigorous investigations of the Communist conspiracy and subversive elements and persons connected therewith.

The resolution, although not naming the pending case of a member of the Communist Party, that of Maj. Irving Peress, is broad enough to include our approval of the completion of that investigation. In fact, I consider it to be one of the most important pending items of unfinished business. After being advised of the intention of the Senator from Arkansas and his committee, as well as the possible interest of other committees and of the purpose of this resolution, the Secretary of the Army decided Friday to make public the facts of his investigation and his report on the promotion and honorable discharge of Major Peress. This action was long overdue. It is probable that it will answer most of the questions concerning this particular case, but our committees will be able to determine this after studying the evidence now made available to them for the first time.

It is likely that the Peress case will be remembered in the future not so much for the bungling and inefficiency which resulted in a member of the Communist Party receiving a promotion and honorable discharge from the Army, but for the confusion, suspicion, and discord which can result when the cloak of secrecy and censorship is thrown around the actions of public agencies on matters of public concern.

The Peress case is an outstanding example of the misunderstanding and discord which can result when facts about the people's business are unnecessarily withheld from the Congress and the public. At least a great deal of the fear, doubt, and disunity could have been avoided by a full disclosure of the facts long ago.

Let us hope that the resulting harm from long delay in disclosing the facts in this case will serve to convince other public agencies that there should be the fullest possible disclosure to Congress and the people of nonsecurity information.

While we may rightfully fear unauthorized disclosures of information affecting our national security, we have more to fear from unwarranted concealment of such information. This was one of my first utterances as a Member of the Senate when on April 15, 1953, in a speech entitled "Information on the People's Business—Time for a New Policy," I called upon President Eisenhower to revoke Executive Order 10290—the Truman censorship order. The order has been improved materially by modification, but much yet remains to be done to change the spirit of secrecy and censorship which remains in some of our public agencies.

Mr. President, I am pleased to note that the cosponsors of this resolution are from both political parties and of various shades of opinion on other subjects. It is heartening that so many not only can agree but are willing to join together in clearing the atmosphere and beginning this new session of Congress with a united expression supporting vigorous and diligent investigation and exposure of those who would destroy our way of life. If there is one subject upon which we should have sincere unity and common purpose of action, this should be it.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Texas for his complimentary reference to the senior Senator from Arkansas. I can assure the Senator from Texas and all other Members of this body that such unfinished business as may be in the files of the investigating subcommittee when the Democrats take control of it and organize it will be given early attention.

That includes the matter which the distinguished Senator has identified as the Peress case. A few days ago, when interrogated upon this subject by the press, I stated that I regarded the Peress case as coming in the category of unfinished business. I think that was before the report of the Secretary of the Army to the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

I have not seen the report which came to the Senator from Massachusetts. All I know about it at present is what I have read in the press. However, let me say to the distinguished Senator that the Peress case will be regarded and treated as unfinished business. It will be given prompt consideration by the committee, and we shall undertake to make such final disposition of it as, in our judgment, is warranted by the circumstances.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Arkansas. I reiterate what I previously said with respect to the Senator and his committee. I am sure that by adopting this resolution the Senate merely would be approving and supporting what the Senator and his committee intend to do.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be received, and will lie on the table.

The resolution (S. Res. 18), submitted by Mr. DANIEL (for himself and other Senators), was received and ordered to lie on the table.

ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 20), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the

Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period ending January 31, 1956, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $250,000 (in addition to amounts heretofore made available for such purposes), shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Statement prepared by him on the President's state of the Union address.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

Address entitled "Congress Charts a New Course for Agriculture," delivered by him before the American Farm Bureau Federation, at its 36th annual meeting, in New York City, on December 15, 1954.

CONDITIONS IN EUROPE AND ASIA — ADDRESSES BY SENATOR MANSFIELD AND GEN. WILLIAM J. DONOVAN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on December 8 I had the privilege of appearing with General William J. Donovan before the Academy of Political Science, in New York City. Of course, everyone knows that General Donovan is the former head of the OSS, and our former Ambassador to Thailand.

I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated at this point in the RECORD the address entitled "Germany and the Future of Europe," delivered by me on that occasion. I also ask unanimous consent to have incorporated at this point in the RECORD the address entitled "The Asiatic Question and Its Relation to Europe," which was delivered by General Donovan on that occasion. I suggest to the Senate that it read very carefully General Donovan's remarks, because in them there is much to think about.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GERMANY AND THE FUTURE OF EUROPE

(Text of Remarks of Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, at fall meeting of the Academy of Political Science, December 8, 1954, Hotel Astor, New York City)

In the interim between the rejection of the European Defense Community by the French parliament and the London-Paris Conferences, I had a conversation with Chancellor Konrad Adenauer in Germany. Mr. Adenauer made a significant comment in discussing the collapse of EDC, a comment which he has since repeated in public, "The best Europeans," the Chancellor said somewhat despairingly, "live in the United States." The remark expressed the disappointment of many dedicated Europeans at the failure of EDC. It was also an acknowledgement of the strenuous but unsuccessful efforts of this country to secure its acceptance.

It seems to me that the observation, pointed as it is, obscures one important fact. Removed as we are from the fears and pressures of the continent, it is easier to be a dedicated "European" in the United States. It is easier to ask and even to ask with some impatience, "Why don't they get together?" It is as easy as a Member of Congress urging the elimination of the tariff on wool, provided his district is in the city of New York.

I am afraid, therefore, that I must take issue with Chancellor Adenauer's observation. His great contribution to the cause of western unity in itself, is evidence that the best Europeans live not in the United States, but in Europe.

If that were not the case the future would hold little promise for the free nations. For it is in Europe that there has unfolded one of the principal challenges to freedom in our times. It is in Europe that it must be faced and it is primarily by Europeans that it must be overcome.

The challenge is the challenge of unity. The nations of Western Europe are confronted with the necessity of developing a pattern of progressive integration within the larger but looser unity of the North Atlantic Community. If Western Europe does devise such a pattern, we may look forward to an era of peace and material progress and we may anticipate a steady growth of those concepts of the freedom of man which give meaning and dignity to human life.

If Western Europe fails, however, the future promises little more than an extension of the decade of fear through which we have just passed. Sooner or later, in the years ahead lies inevitable war, an age of chaos and an enlargement of the totalitarian void which already spreads over vast areas of the globe. It is possible that the price of failure may even be the extinction of human life itself.

I have deliberately stated the challenge to Europe in the positive terms of unity rather than in terms of defense against the Communist threat as it is usually defined. I do so with the full awareness of the destructive implications of communism. Few movements in history have been more erosive of the foundations of our civilization.

The growth of totalitarian communism, however, is more a measure of the weakness of the free nations, particularly in Western Europe, than of the inherent strength of the Communist ideology. I think it essential to recognize and to emphasize this distinction. Failure to do so, is to concede the superiority of totalitarianism over freedom as a motivator of mankind, a concession which I, for one, cannot make.

Communism has intensified the need for European integration within the larger community of free nations. It has highlighted the challenge of unity that confronts the West. But only a dangerous misreading of history would suggest that communism created the need. Even if Communist pressures should abate, as they well may do for the moment, the urgent necessity for unity would remain.

Twice in this century, our civilization has skirted the edge of doom. Twice our heritage has been tossed recklessly into the fires of war. Both conflicts began within Western Europe and both spread great damage in that region. Communism fed on these conflagrations. After the wars had burned themselves out, the Communists probed among the charred and smoking ruins. They tore down nations and ideals which had been severely weakened by the conflicts; some might have been salvaged had they not been subjected to this second onslaught. That is the destructive role which communism occupies in the contemporary world and we must not lose sight of it. By the same token, however, it is essential not to permit this destructiveness to obscure the fact that the greatest damage to the free nations has been largely self-inflicted. It has resulted from their own inner disunity, and particularly the disunity of the Western European region.

Both great wars of this century, in the first instance were attempted suicides on the part of Western Europe. The critical danger of communism came after, not before, these massive assaults which the region launched upon itself. And only as a way is found to cope with tendencies of this kind will the free nations develop real security against communism and other forms of totalitarianism.

The most dangerous of these tendencies is associated with the inability of modern Germany to find a stable place in the common destiny of Western Europe. Many explanations have been offered for this phenomenon. Historians have attributed it to the policies of the Germans, the French, and the British and to numerous other causes. Regardless at what door or doors responsibility is laid, however, there can be little doubt that this failure more than any other has gnawed at the vitals of our civilization during the last half century.

It is to this problem, the problem of Germany's place in the European community, that I wish to address the main body of my remarks tonight. More specifically, I want to consider with you the solution to the problem which is proposed in the recent London-Paris accords. On this solution hinges the future of Europe, and in a larger sense the fate of all the free nations.

The London-Paris accords are primarily mechanisms by which Western Germany is to be brought into the Western European and North Atlantic communities on what is hoped will be a stable and enduring basis. In this respect, in principal objective, they do not differ substantially from the EDC. The differences that do exist are essentially those of method and degree of integration. In the present accords the links are not as tight as were contemplated in the EDC. They are not as clearly the ties of a supranationalism.

The retreat from that ideal has been deplored by many in Europe and in this country. It is understandable that men of the caliber of Spaak, of Belgium, and Schuman, of France, who had done so much to further Europeanism should be deeply disappointed by this development. The concept, however, is not dead and will not die. Europeanism is a force which will make itself felt in everything that happens in Europe. But Europeanism, like all great ideals, to grow strongly must be rooted in the acceptance of the people who are to live by it. And the simple fact is that European integration of the depth and degree contemplated in EDC was not possible at this time.

At the London-Paris Conferences, therefore, a shattered promise of far-reaching unity was exchanged for a new promise of lesser dimensions. In substituting the recent accords for the EDC the Europeans did not abandon the ideal of Europeanism nor did they give up anything which had actually been achieved toward its realization. The retreat, if it may properly be called that, was from a hope not an actuality. Viewed in this light, the present agreements are not necessarily a step away from unity. They may yet prove to be a step toward it.

The speed with which the London-Paris accords were reached after the rejection of EDC is a tribute to the Europeanism of the present leaders of the Continent, and particularly to Adenauer, Eden, and Mendes-France. It is also striking evidence of the vitality of the European idea. Most significant, perhaps, it may indicate widespread recognition in Europe that the time to move positively toward integration is now or never.

Under the terms of the London-Paris accords, the people of Western Germany will regain sovereignty and so achieve coequal national status with the other free nations

of Europe. Western Germany will adhere to the Brussels Treaty of 1948, thereby becoming a full-fledged member of the Western European community. The Germans will also enter directly into the larger grouping of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Each of these provisions is an interlocking part of a grand design. Taken together, they hold the promise of providing a stable and more permanent place for Germany in the Western World.

Also involved in the design, however, is the rearmament of Western Germany. This question, more than any other, has heretofore stood in the way of the integration of Western Europe. To put the problem bluntly, many Europeans including Germans have had doubts as to the wisdom of German rearmament. These are not solely Communist doubts, the purposes of which are clear—to keep Western Germany defenseless and ripe for totalitarian absorption. They are for the most part the doubts of sincere people who in this generation have learned first-hand to associate the appalling devastation of war with a militant Germany on the march. The grim reminders of this association are still to be seen in many cities of Europe. A decade of rebuilding has not fully obliterated the scars of war.

From our vantage point in the United States we should not dismiss such fears lightly. It is to the credit of the European countries that in spite of these fears they have recognized the more immediate and overwhelming menace of Soviet expansionism. They have understood that a disarmed Germany is a greater danger to peace than a Germany with some capacity to defend itself.

In the London-Paris accords, Western Europe now has a plan for West German rearmament with certain safeguards. A new German national army of 500,000 men will join those of other continental powers under the NATO commander in the common defense of the West. Western Germany pledges never to employ these forces to change existing frontiers or to achieve unification with Eastern Germany.

There are technical safeguards against a resurgent German militarism in these accords which take the form of maximum level of forces and prohibitions on the manufacture of certain types of offensive armaments in Germany. Perhaps the most significant deterrent, however, is that provided by the United Kingdom. The British have committed four divisions and a tactical air force to the mainland of Europe. In so doing they have clearly bound their future with that of the Continent for the first time in centuries. It was a transcendent decision, and they made it courageously and unequivocally.

For the first time in modern history the three great powers in the core of Europe—the United Kingdom, Germany, and France—will be linked in specific arrangements for the common defense. These ties are reinforced by the pledges of continuing concern in Europe's future which the President and Secretary of State have made on behalf of this country. Partnership, I am glad to say, is now the keynote in our relations with the Western European countries.

That, in bare outline is the substance of the London-Paris accords. In part, the significance of the agreements lies in the provision they make for the creation of 12 German divisions. I do not mean to suggest that this increase in the armed power of Western Europe will be decisive in discouraging a massive Soviet assault on that area. The deterrent to aggression of this type remains, as it has been since the end of World War II, the superiority of the total strength of the free nations as against that of the Soviet bloc. In this broad equation of power, the German divisions will not make a substantial difference, for total strength is measured not only in conventional military factors, but in atomic, economic, diplomatic, and others as well.

In many ways we have been prepared for a decade to deal with a massive Soviet assault, a test of total strength. In the present administration the phrase "instant retaliation" has been coined to describe at least the atomic aspect of these preparations. But while the Communist advance has continued in a confounding fashion, there has not been a situation in which to retaliate instantly.

What is the explanation of this dilemma? It is simply that the pattern of postwar Soviet expansionism has not been by massive assault which we have spent billions in preparing to meet. Rather, the pattern has been, as I mentioned previously, an expansion by scavenging among war-weakened nations. It is an advance carried out largely, not by Russian soldiers—few have died in combat since the end of World War II—but by millions of the disinherited, the discontented, and the driven of many lands who have been caught up in the growing web of international communism.

It is with this kind of an advance that we have had the greatest difficulty in coping in the past and it is evident that the Soviet Union had hoped to employ the same techniques throughout a war-devastated Germany. The chosen instruments were the satellite government in the Eastern Zone and the German Communist Party. Both have failed miserably in their mission. In the Eastern Zone, the Berlin riots of 1953 suggest that the very existence of the satellite government depends upon Russian bayonets. In Western Germany, the remarkable recovery from the war appears to make the area increasingly invulnerable to Communists' tactics of erosion and infiltration.

There is, however, in the East German Communist army and police still another potential instrument of Communist advance. It is in deterring a sudden coup by this force of 250,000 armed men in a Korean-type internal aggression, that the proposed West German divisions can be most effective.

In this limited sense and in linking the German divisions with NATO, the London-Paris accords add to the military bulwark against further Communist penetration of Western Europe. Important as this contribution may be, however, it is not the principal promise of the agreements.

I began my remarks tonight by stressing that the issue facing Western Europe and, in a broader sense, other free nations is the positive challenge of unity. It is in this connection that the London-Paris accords may eventually make their most significant contribution. The agreements, of course, must first be ratified. Ratification alone, however, is not enough. They must be carried out with some sense of the cooperation and national forebearance that characterized their formation.

If these conditions are fufilled, then the accords can and should lead first toward a unified Germany. No issue in Germany is more compelling. It has so far been held in reasonable perspective by the leadership of Chancellor Adenauer. Even during the difficult months of drift on the ratification of EDC, Adenauer insisted that a united Germany before firm ties had been established with Western Europe could mean only a satellite Germany. He stood firm in the face of mounting political pressure on the principle of first things first.

Once the London-Paris agreements have been ratified, however, it may be expected that the demands for unification will grow rapidly inside Germany. Unification will inevitably become the primary objective of any sovereign German Government. It is a valid objective, as valid today as in the days of Bismark. The reasons why it must be sought are sound in a political, economic, and moral sense. Until it is achieved, there can be little hope of stability in Europe.

What is of primary concern to Western Europe and to this country is the way unification is pursued. We have a right to insist that the Germans seek their unification peacefully and patiently, with full recognition that what is at stake is not only their own future but the future of the entire continent; in short, that they continue to follow the course which has been set by Adenauer.

So long as they do so, the West Germans warrant the full support of Western Europe and ourselves in their quest for unification with their eastern provinces. Nor is it sufficient in our policies to pay lip service to the principle of unification. It must be clear to the German people that the western nations are prepared to go far in settling this issue with the Soviet Union. All proposals should be explored which offer promise that a unified Germany shall be a peaceful and independent Germany able to participate in the common development of Europe and to cooperate with free nations everywhere.

So far the Soviet Union has shown no inclination to negotiate German unification on these terms. This does not mean that the objective must be abandoned. Nor does it mean that the only alternative to its abandonment is a western equivalent of the Communist war of liberation to regain the eastern provinces.

It is possible that the Soviet Union may be impelled to accept genuine German unification by rising tide of public insistence in Germany and by other pressures. A development of this kind, however, will not come easily. It is likely to appear only if the policy of the West German Government and the western powers with respect to unification is just, restrained, and compassionate.

In the pursuit of such a policy, time can be on the side of the free nations. There are indications that the weight of disunity, disillusion, and discontent is being felt on the Communist side. That this is so is suggested, for example, by the Berlin rioting last year and the incessant flow of refugees. So long as a high rate of economic, political, and social progress is maintained in the Western Zone, it is bound to act as an attraction to those Germans living in the East and the difficulties of the Soviet Union in maintaining totalitarian control over them will multiply. A situation could develop where the Soviet pattern of advance into weakness may operate in reverse. The Russians may be compelled to withdraw from the Eastern Zone and permit unification not because of military pressure from outside but because of the crumbling of their position from within.

It is possible that the Russians may risk the resurgence of German militarism rather than face the inevitable prospect of a unified Germany integrated with Western Europe. If they choose this course, they are in a position to make important economic, territorial, and other concessions to the Germans. Moreover, they could withdraw their occupation forces and expand the nucleus of German militarism which already exists in the East German Communist Army. They could, in other words, offer Germany a unification with real nationalistic inducements and ask in return only that the Germans separate themselves from Western Europe.

I do not know if a Soviet attempt of this kind to split the western nations and lay the groundwork for a new world conflict would succeed. It would depend, I suppose, ostensibly on the German people, since they would make the final decision for unity or chaos, for peace or ultimate war. The decision, however, would not occur in a vacuum. It would be governed by many factors, none more significant than the London-Paris accords.

That is a principal reason why these agreements must be something more than an ingenious device to create 12 German

divisions against a Soviet advance. They must begin at once to fulfill their larger promise, the promise of progressive European integration within the larger grouping of the North Atlantic community.

Under the agreements immediate progress in this direction will have been made in the integration of the military power of the Western European nations and of the members of NATO. It is essential to perfect these military relationships, but that alone is not enough. The hope of freedom is not only to die together in the defense of freedom if that should be necessary but to live together in its light.

In this sense, the challenge of unity is much broader than integrated military defense. It means a deepening of the integration of the Western European nations in the economic field, in the political field, in all matters in which governments can better serve their citizens by working together rather than separately. It means, above all, a willingness to face common problems together and to work together with national restraint in their solution. The need for an approach of this kind is urgent in Western Europe; it is necessary throughout the Western World; it is desirable with all nations who are free to cooperate wherever they may be on the globe. On my return from Europe several months ago, I reported to the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate that the immediate need was for a series of special economic conferences which might serve to define boldly and clearly the economic problems which must be overcome if the nations of Western Europe and the North Atlantic community are to maintain sound economies, and to lay the groundwork for their solution. I reiterate that view tonight. In doing so, I am aware that most free nations are in a relatively prosperous state, but that is precisely the time to act to avert a collapse. And an economic collapse could be the shoal on which the hope for unity would flounder.

What, then, if this challenge of unity is met? Where does it lead? If this challenge is met, we shall see, in my opinion, an end to the erosion of western civilization. We shall see a vast growth in the strength of free nations built not primarily on a military base, but on the power of their creative accomplishments and the power of their ideals to inspire the faith of mankind. We shall see a positive but patient leadership in the world, a leadership of freemen who will not concede that any part of the human race, regardless of its present status is forever beyond the reach of liberty. We shall see, in short, the beginning of a new cycle and I trust a peaceful cycle, in the never-ending struggle between tyranny and freedom. This cycle will belong to freedom.

THE ASIATIC QUESTION AND ITS RELATION TO EUROPE

(Address by Gen. William J. Donovan before the Academy of Political Science at the Hotel Astor, New York City, December 8, 1954)

To us in America the Asian question is: "What are Communist China and Soviet Russia going to do?" How far will they go in their aggression?

To the Asians, this is not "the Asian question," although it is a question many of them are also asking. To them, the Asian question is tied in with the issue of nationalism and self-assertion. Many of them are still thinking as recently liberated colonial peoples, long dominated by Western powers.

Of course this is an oversimplification. We cannot speak correctly of a single Asian question nor for that matter, of a single Asia. There are many Asias—each with its own point of view, its own problems and questions. There are many nations in Asia, many political groups, many ethnic and racial groups, many economic interests.

We must start with the assumption that our major problems are not necessarily their major problems. They have different points of view from ours concerning communism and the U. S. S. R.

What are we doing to understand Asia and Asian problems? We must present our needs and our interests in the light of their problems.

In the last 10 years, we have watched a course of dynamic changes in southeast Asia—the key strategic position across the main lines of communication between Europe and the Far East.

This area has a population of some 600 million people—4 times the population of the United States; 3 times the population of the Soviet Union; 12 times the population of the United Kingdom.

These changes are the continuing repercussions of that "shot heard round the world" which a New England Minute Man aimed at a representative of colonialism in 1776. We have learned since then to understand and to cherish the culture and history inherited from Europe. This appreciation was only possible after we had become confident that our independence was secure.

It is in the context of the colonial past that we must interpret the bitterness and distrust we find inherent in many of the new nations of Asia agaisnt their former governors.

There are two approaches to policy: One short run, one long run. Far from being exclusive, they must be mutually supporting.

We found in Europe that our objectives were reasonably long term. As a result, the United States never lost sight of the ultimate objective of European unity, and our policies on the whole have therefore been successful.

The Marshall plan, the North Atlantic Alliance, and now the Paris Treaty have helped reestablish the balance of power in the West.

In the Far East our policies have not had that long-range point of view. Too often there we have been forced to respond in haste to an immediate military thrust of attempted Communist expansion.

For that reason our policies have seemed conflicting not only to our friends but to ourselves. For instance, we excluded Korea from our "defensive perimeter." Yet we fought a long, costly, and indecisive war to keep South Korea free. In Indochina we announced our intention to resist any further Communist advance. The time for decision found us unready, and by the middle of 1954 we had to accept an agreement at Geneva which now puts the survival of Vietnam in doubt.

Our partnership in Europe creates problems and paradoxes for our policy in Asia. The interests of the European Continent are not always the same as our own interests. We cannot ignore the fact that when Dien Bien Phu fell it carried a government in Paris with it. Yet on the same occasion we were concerned lest the peoples of Asia associate our interests with those of the colonial powers.

An example is our aid program to Indochina which, until a few months ago, was operated through French channels. It is no secret that only American dollars enabled the French Union forces to remain in Vietnam. That aid was extended to give resistance to Viet Minh aggression. But this honorable goal did not prevent the defeat of French arms. In fact, it encouraged delay with regard to European integration.

Communist propaganda associated us in Asian eyes with an archaic and detested form of colonialism. This was certainly not our intention. We had hoped that by supporting the French forces we would gain time to allow Vietnamese nationalism to gather strength for its struggle against the well-organized Communist-supported Viet Minh. Our military aid was doomed to be ineffective as long as the needed political and economic reforms were not forthcoming. We believe in the cause of Vietnamese nationalism enough to invest nearly $2 billion of assistance.

We did not underestimate the sacrifices and difficulties which confronted France as a result of the Indochina conflict. A frank and honest conference with France and interested Asian countries would have done much to dispel the suspicion of our motives. They would have seen that our compelling thought was the preservation of the opportunity for Vietnam to become an independent nation.

Instead, Asian observers concluded that our interest in a European Defense Community was paramount and that to secure that objective we were prepared to join forces against Asian nationalism. This is an ironic twist of history for a country which less than a decade ago risked the esteem of its European friends by supporting the independence movements in India and Indonesia.

One of the main criticisms Asians address to us is that we seem to treat Asia as an appendage of Europe. There is some truth in this criticism. Although we recognize the importance of the Far East—and sometimes even become emotional about it—there is still a tendency to approach our relations with Asia as accessory to our relations with Europe.

The same Communist conspiracy faces us in Europe and Asia, but in each area this conspiracy takes on a different form. There are substantial differences in every major field—political, economic and military.

In Europe in good measure, we share a common culture with long-established national states, the structure of which is not unlike our own.

A very different situation prevails in Asia. Nationalism is the dynamic unifying force. A new leadership began to emerge early in the 20th century. With great skill it used the rising tide of popular discontent to further the cause of national independence from colonial domination.

World War II was a powerful stimulus to the colonial revolt.

We should be ready to support Asian nationalism wherever it is clearly manifest. In the East this is the reality of tomorrow.

The Asian leaders are only beginning to recognize that independence is not the final word. They must now tackle the complex problems arising out of the revolutionary changes in Southeast Asia.

We have used our support of nationalism as an expression of policy. At the same time we have urged the colonial powers to associate themselves with us in the crusade against Communism.

In our political efforts we must be careful to dispel any impression that we are seeking to take the place of the former colonial governors.

What is necessary is that we ask the countries of Asia to be our partners in economic and military assistance. This we have successfully accomplished in Europe.

In the military field, we are also inclined to carry over the experience gained in Europe to the challenge in Asia. Although the threat is the same to both continents this is not so with Communist tactics.

Direct aggression is the principal threat in Europe. In Asia with the exception of Viet Nam and Formosa, the Communists may be relying on their subversive forces to gain their victory. For that reason, the theory of massive retaliation is not a completely effective answer.

It can hardly be applicable where there is no industrial mass to retaliate against. Nor should we expect NATO to be our prototype because there is no counterpart in Asia to

that military strength of England, France, and Germany which gives substance to our defense in Europe.

If the new nations of Asia can maintain their own internal stability we have won a substantial victory.

It is in no one's interest to allow our military assistance to be taken for granted. We cannot help other countries unless they want us to help them. It is the task of our leaders to seek first a basis of mutual confidence and good will before offering our armies and our resources.

We were informed yesterday that our Government would submit to the next Congress a program for economic development in Asia. It was said that the principle of economic aid reflected a recognition that the struggle between the free and Communist world had shifted to some extent, for the time being perhaps, from military to economic competition. The national composition of such an aid program is an extremely delicate matter. And the inclusion or exclusion of certain nations must be determined by a number of factors. These factors are political and psychological as well as economic. Perhaps not the least obstacle in that part of the world is the unwillingness of certain countries to work together under any circumstances so far envisaged.

Red China leads from strength in that part of the world at this moment. It has the political advantage of its recent victory in Indochina and a psychological advantage that it is an Asian nation.

In the economic field she can impress her neighbors with an impressive rate of industrialization. It doesn't matter that this is being accomplished at great social cost, and on human hardships and sacrifices. To offset this approach to the people of southeast Asia the West must present its competing programs.

In the field of economic assistance it should be remembered that the conditions in Europe that brought the response of the Marshall plan were very different from those which confront Asia today. Europe was a mature, industrial economy whose production capacities were shattered in the destruction of two world wars.

Asia, with Japan the exception, has but the bare beginnings of an industrial fabric. Her basic ventures are agricultural—and even those are built on methods which centuries have left unchanged. In Europe we faced the threat that communism would come to power through the dissatisfaction of unemployment and disregard of progressive welfare measures; in Asia, the populations are concerned with equitable land reform and the results of public-health programs. The great emphasis that writers put on the problems of food shortages in Asia must be looked at against a background of the basic problem of distribution.

Thailand, for example, would like nothing more than markets for its rice. It is not reasonable for us to distribute our surpluses of rice and wheat in Asian markets and then wonder at an imbalance in the economy of Thailand because she cannot dispose of her growing bulk of rice which has always been a major export and dollar earner.

Economic development should not be considered the panacea which will stop Communist subversion in Asia. Blind economic development destructive of existing cultural patterns may be itself a source of instability which the Communist conspiracy can and will exploit. The effectiveness of our aid programs in Europe—but especially in Asia—cannot be measured by their cost. Nor can technical assistance be considered the solution to every problem. What is important is not how much but how. The main issue is the reconciliation of new skills and ancient cultures. This again is a problem best considered and solved by Asian effort. Theirs is the responsibility to fix the pace for raising the standards of living for their countrymen, and they can best suggest the means to integrate the methods of 20th century technology into the ways of their distinguished cultures.

In seeking an approach to reconcile the interests and conflicts between Europe and Asia we would do well to remember the course President Eisenhower so eloquently defined last week. It is the courage to be patient while making certain that our efforts to promote peace are not interpreted as appeasement or any purchase of immediate favor at the cost of principle.

Our global responsibilities have involved us in a substantial way in both Europe and Asia. What we do or fail to do in Europe is of crucial importance but we will be guilty of misjudging the future unless we regard our decisions in Asia of at least equal importance.

THE CASE OF DR. IRVING PERESS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, during the second session of the 83d Congress the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate held a number of hearings on personnel security in the armed services. At that time the Peress case was discussed on a number of occasions. Another committee of the Senate was given the task of studying the matter, but the Committee on Armed Services did not abandon its investigation.

During the period after the other committee's report was made public, I made a number of efforts to get from the Pentagon a complete chronology of the Peress case. I was unable to get a satisfactory report, even though a chronology dated November 3 was published. I did not feel that the chronology contained all the answers, so during the debate on the select committee's report I made personal inquiries, and held several personal interviews with secretaries from the Pentagon. A complete and a sufficiently suitable chronology, however, was not made available.

On January 6, 1955, I wrote Secretary of Defense Wilson, urging that a complete chronology be made available to the Members of the Senate. I received an answer to my letter on January 8, 1955, enclosing a chronology which had been made public by Secretary of the Army Stevens. I also received a letter from the Secretary dated January 7, 1955.

I believe this information should be made available to all Members of the Senate, and for that reason I ask unanimous consent that the letters and the chronology be published in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters and the chronology were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 6, 1955.

Hon. CHARLES E. WILSON,
The Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Last December there was much debate in the Senate concerning the promotion and discharge of one Major Peress. During the course of that debate, I attempted to get a full understanding of the picture regarding the enlistment, the promotion, and the discharge of Major Peress. I was unable to do so to my satisfaction and consequently said nothing on the subject. There is, I believe, a great misunderstanding and possible misinterpretation of the facts concerning this matter.

During the current session of the Congress, the Department of Defense will have before it some very important legislation involving the security of our country. There will be the problem of reserve training, of pay increases, of the size of the forces, and other matters of equal importance. I believe it will accelerate the consideration of these important questions if this misunderstanding regarding the service of Major Peress is cleared up at once clearly and with no holding back by the Department of Defense or the Department of the Army of any information that can be properly made public.

Unquestionably, there were mistakes and errors of judgment in the handling of this case. A clean breast of the whole situation should be made in order that the misunderstandings may be cleared up and the records of responsible officers who are patriotic citizens, may be cleared from misinterpretations of their actions being placed upon them.

For all these reasons, I have joined in a resolution to be offered by Senator DANIEL, of Texas, concerning communism and as a part of that resolution a request that the Senate and the American people be given the facts about this case. I enclose copy of the resolution.

As former chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I was disappointed that I was not given any information last December. As one who has given close consideration and much thought to the security of our country and the problems that come before us in Congress involving security, I am hopeful that you will give me now in view of the difficult problems that face us a complete statement regarding the case. In this way, I believe the misunderstandings and misinterpretations may be cleared up once and for all.

With kind personal regards, I am,
Sincerely,

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
United States Senator.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, January 8, 1955.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: Since receipt of your letter of January 5, 1955, in regard to the question of Major Peress, the Secretary of the Army has written you a letter in which he informs you that he is releasing to the press a detailed chronology of the military record in the case of Dr. Irving Peress.

I feel sure that the chronology which Secretary Stevens has made public, copy of which is attached, answers the questions which were raised in your letter to me.

With kindest regards.
Sincerely,

C. E. WILSON.

JANUARY 7, 1955.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: Reports in the press indicate that there has been renewed interest by Members of Congress in obtaining further details on the handling of the Peress matter. I further understand you have requested that a chronological record of the Peress case be released to the public. Accordingly, I am taking the liberty of sending you a detailed chronology of the military record of Dr. Irving Peress, and I am also making this chronology available to several other Members of Congress and to the press. The substance of most of the information in this chronology has already been furnished to Members of Congress and the public with the exception of the names of the individuals themselves.

I call your particular attention to my letter of June 23, 1954, to the acting chairman of the Special Subcommittee On Investigations wherein I referred to a list of individuals, as prepared by the Inspector General,

who had some connection with the case. I requested that the names be held in confidence because, while there was evidence of administrative errors, there was no evidence of culpability or subversion. My request for confidential handling of these names was respected and the names have not been made public to date. However, since this handling of those names has been misinterpreted in some places, I have concluded that a detailed chronology should be prepared in order to furnish the details and the names of the individuals themselves in one document.

It so happens that I was en route home from the Far East at the time Peress was honorably discharged and knew nothing about the case. I have cooperated in every way in correcting the faults in the administrative system, and have caused them to be rectified.

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

CHRONOLOGY OF THE MILITARY RECORD OF DR. IRVING PERESS WITH APPENDIX CONTAINING SERVICE HISTORY OF DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY PERSONNEL MENTIONED IN THE CHRONOLOGY

CHRONOLOGY OF THE MILITARY RECORD OF DR. IRVING PERESS

According to his statements, Dr. Irving Peress was born in the Bronx, New York City, N. Y., on July 31, 1917. Irving Peress was graduated from the School of Dentistry, New York University, in 1940 with a D. D. S. degree, was licensed to practice dentistry by the State of New York in August 1940, and subsequently practiced dentistry from September 1940 to January 1, 1953, when he entered military service.

Since Dr. Peress was not a member of a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, he was subject to the provisions of Public Law 779, 81st Congress, September 9, 1950 (Doctors Draft Act), which amended the Selective Service Act of 1948 to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories. Dr. Peress had no prior service in any of the Armed Forces, and had not received specialized training at Government expense during World War II, so he was classified in the third priority for the purposes of induction.

Local board No. 59, Forest Hills, Long Island, N. Y., reported that Dr. Peress registered with that board on January 15, 1951. On May 26, 1952, he accomplished DD Form 390 (Initial Data for Classification and Commissioning in Medical Services for Medical, Dental, and Veterinary Corps), in triplicate. The box in item 30 of DD Form 390 was checked to read:

"I do hereby apply for a commission."

Item 31, Remarks, is completed in hand lettering as follows:

"I apply for a commission if I am selected for military service."

Item 32 thereof, as completed, reads:

"I am not, nor have I been, a conscientious objector, and I am not now and have not been a member of any foreign or domestic organization, association, movement, group, or combination of persons advocating a subversive policy, or seeking to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means."

All copies of this form were later forwarded to headquarters, First Army (hereinafter referred to as "First Army") in New York City.

On July 14, 1952, Dr. Peress accomplished standard form 89 (Report of Medical History) and was medically examined at the New York City recruiting and induction main station on the same date. He was hospitalized at the United States army hospital, Fort Hamilton, N. Y., on July 15, 1952 for further examination. The results of these examinations were recorded on Standard Form 88 (Report of Medical Examination). On August 11, 1952, the report of the medical examination and allied papers, including the DD form 390, in triplicate, were received by First Army, from the New York Recruiting and Induction Main Station, New York City. On August 12, 1952, Dr. Peress was determined to be physically qualified for general military service, by the Medical Section, First Army. On September 12, 1952 he was notified by letter that he had been found to be physically qualified and information regarding the date he preferred to be called to duty was requested. This letter was signed by Captain F. E. Van Sickle, Jr., MSC, Office of the Surgeon, First Army.

Maj. Vernon McKenzie of the Office of the Surgeon General in Washington drafted a message for dispatch by The Adjutant General on August 20, 1952 notifying all major commanders of the October draft requirement for medical doctors and dentists. The message was dispatched on the same day.

Since Dr. Peress had applied for a commission and had been selected for induction by the Selective Service System, he was notified by letter of September 25, 1952 that he was scheduled for induction and if he still desired a commission to contact First Army. This letter was signed by a Capt. F. E. Van Sickle, Jr., MSC, in the Office of The Surgeon, First Army. On the same date Dr. Peress requested by telephone that he be commissioned in the Dental Corps Reserve.

On October 4, 1952, Captain Van Sickle prepared a recommendation to the Reserve Forces Division, First Army, that Dr. Peress be tendered an appointment in the Dental Corps Reserve in the grade of captain, stating that the applicant was physically and professionally qualified. This recommendation was signed by Lt. Col. G. H. Hage, Chief of the Personnel Division of the Medical Section, First Army.

Based upon this recommendation, Capt. Curtis R. Kirkland, Assistant Adjutant General, Reserve Forces Division, First Army, prepared and dispatched a letter to Dr. Peress on October 10, 1952. This letter inclosed, among other material, (1) a letter of appointment as captain, USAR, dated October 7, 1952, (2) oath of office, (3) WD AGO form 170 (Application for Appointment and Statement of Preferences for Reserve Officers), (4) DD form 98 loyalty certificate, and (5) two copies of DD form 398 (Statement of Personal History). Instructions directed completion and return of the oath of office within 72 hours of date of receipt. The remaining forms were required to be completed and returned as soon as possible but in any event not later than 15 days from date of receipt.

Dr. Peress executed his oath of office form before a notary public on October 15, 1952, thereby accepting the Reserve commission in this language:

"I, Irving Peress, O1893643, having been appointed a Reserve commissioned officer in the grade of captain in the Army of the United States, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign or domestic, that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office upon which I am about to enter; so help me God."

The oath of office form was mailed to First Army as required.

Under date of October 27, 1952, Peress completed the WD AGO Form 170 (Application for Appointment) in which he indicated that he was not a conscientious objector, that his application was submitted pursuant to regulations governing appointment of Reserve officers of medical, dental, and veterinary specialties, and that he had read and understood the regulations concerning the rejection for military service of disloyal or subversive personnel.

On October 28, 1952, Peress completed DD Form 398 (Statement of Personal History), in duplicate, in which he claimed Federal constitutional privilege in answering items pertaining to membership in Communist, Fascist, or other organization, association, movements, group or combination of persons which advocate the overthrow of our constitutional form of government. He signed these forms as the person completing them and also as witnessing officer.

On the same date, in completing DD form 98, the loyalty certificate, he certified that he had not engaged in any conduct specified therein as undesirable. However, he claimed Federal constitutional privilege in answering questions concerning membership or association with cited organizations. This form was witnessed by Capt. Charles A. Lyon, who was assigned at that time as unit advisor, AGC-USAR Postal Units, 30 West 44th Street, New York City. Captain Lyon witnessed the execution of the form by Peress and returned it to him. Peress then departed with the form.

The procedure followed by First Army in tendering an appointment to Peress prior to execution by him of forms 170, 398, and 98 was in accordance with the provisions of the then applicable regulations which were designed to expedite appointment of medical, dental, and veterinarian specialists as Reserve officers. This procedure provided for the commissioning of these specialists prior to completion of these forms, although personnel being commissioned in other branches of the Army were requested to execute the forms prior to commissioning. (This procedure was subsequently changed on November 28, 1952, to require that all applicants for a commission execute form 98 (loyalty certificate) before being tendered an appointment.)

After receipt of the oath of office from Peress, and before his executed forms 170, 398, and 98 were returned, Captain Van Sickle of First Army notified the Surgeon General, Department of the Army, in Washington, that Peress and others, as Dental Corps Reserve officers in priority III of the so-called Doctor Draft Act, had received notice of induction for the period October 21–31, 1952, prior to accepting a commission. This report indicated that Peress and others were available for call to active duty.

Based on this information, Maj. Arthur E. Britt, MSC, Office of the Surgeon General, Department of the Army, notified First Army on November 5, 1952 to issue orders calling Peress, among others, to active duty. This notification also included instructions to assign Peress to the Student Detachment, Medical Field Service School, Brooke Army Medical Center, Fort Sam Houston, Tex., for the purpose of attending the Associate Medical Service Company officers' course, reporting thereat not later than January 7, 1953. On November 10, 1952, First Army issued orders in compliance with these instructions. These orders were authenticated by Capt. A. E. Moreda, Assistant Adjutant General, First Army.

It cannot be definitely established whether DD forms 398 and 98, executed by Peress on October 28, 1952, had been received by First Army prior to the issuance of these orders calling him to active duty. The presence or absence of these forms, however, would have had no effect on the call to active duty of Peress since the provisions of the then applicable regulations stated in effect that Reserve personnel would not be deferred or rejected for nonvoluntary active duty for disloyalty or subversion, unless the investigation of the case had been completed and the results thereof had been determined to warrant removal action. It has been established, however, that on November 14, 1952, Captain Kirkland returned both copies of DD

form 398 to Peress for the signature of a witness other than himself. Peress secured the signature of one Henry Getzoff as witness and on November 18, 1952 returned both copies of the form to Headquarters, First Army. They were received on November 20, 1952.

At this point all forms sent to Captain Peress for completion had been returned to First Army. Captain Kirkland's office examined the forms submitted by Peress for completeness only, no evaluation of the content was made, and normally within 1 or 2 days after receipt, completed Forms 398 and 98 were forwarded to the Intelligence Branch, First Army.

On December 1, 1952, the Intelligence Branch of First Army requested the Reserve Division to obtain from Peress a fingerprint card and three additional copies of DD Form 398. These were requested for use in the investigation of Peress. After receiving these forms, Captain Kirkland in the Procurement Branch, Reserve Division, sent them, together with the DD form 98 to the Intelligence Branch, on January 5, 1953.

After receipt of his orders to active duty, Peress, on December 4, 1952, requested a 15 to 20 day delay in reporting for duty. He desired this time to wind up some personal and professional matters. This request was not favorably considered. Peress was so advised by mail on December 8, 1952 by Capt. F. E. Van Sickle, Jr.

Peress entered on active duty on January 1, 1953 in New York, N. Y., and reported as ordered to his assigned duty station, Brooke Army Medical Center, Fort Sam Houston, in San Antonio, Tex. on January 3, 1953. He was to attend an orientation course at the Medical Field Service School from January 7, 1953 to March 7, 1953.

The Office of the Surgeon General in Washington determined that the need for the services of medical and dental officers was greater than the benefits derived from the course, and all such officers, 319 in number, were withdrawn for duty assignments. Department of the Army Special Orders, No. 16, dated January 26, 1953, effected this action by which Peress was ordered from the Texas station on February 7, 1953. He was to report to Fort Lewis, Wash., along with 27 others not later than February 26, 1953, for shipment to, and further assignment by, the United States Armed Forces Far East, Yokohama, Japan.

Meanwhile, back at First Army in New York the Counter Intelligence Division directed an investigation of Peress on February 5, 1953 and, on the same day, notified Captain Van Sickle in the medical section, and Captain Kirkland in the reserve division, that such an investigation was being initiated because of Peress' claim of "Federal constitutional privilege" in executing DD Form 98 and DD Form 398. By letter of February 5, 1953, signed by Capt. C. F. Maxwell for Col. Wendell G. Johnson, the Intelligence Branch, First Army, notified the Intelligence Branch at Fort Sam Houston, Tex., of the institution of and reasons for the investigation. Peress, however, had departed from the Texas station prior to receipt of this information.

Under date of February 12, 1953 the Chief of the Counter Intelligence Division at First Army in New York notified the Intelligence Division, Department of the Army; the Office of the Surgeon General; and Office of The Adjutant General in Washington on the initiation of the investigation. This notice was filed in the Personnel Information Branch of the latter office on February 27, 1953 and in the Surgeon General's Security Branch between February 12 and March 11, 1953.

The official travel time by automobile from Fort Sam Houston, Tex., to Fort Lewis, Wash., is 11 days. This, with the 7 days delay en route, permitted Peress to report to Fort Lewis, Wash., on February 26, 1953. On February 18, 1953, while at his home in New York City, Peress wrote to the Commanding Officer, Army Personnel Center, Fort Lewis, requesting cancellation of his overseas orders and consideration for reassignment in the United States. He inclosed letters from two psychiatrists, Dr. Edward M. Bernecker and Dr. Max Gruenthal, to substantiate his request and to indicate reasons for granting it. The letter from Dr. Bernecker stated that a daughter of Peress was then being treated for character behavior disorders. The letter from Dr. Gruenthal stated that Mrs. Elaine Peress, the wife, at one time was treated for severe anxiety neurosis, and had suffered a relapse.

On February 24, 1953, 1st Lt. Alfred M. Gade, acting for the commanding officer of the Army Personnel Center, Fort Lewis, Wash., sent a wire message to Peress in New York. This message notified Peress that the personnel center was not authorized to reassign officers and referred him to the Adjutant General in Washington. The message also directed him to comply with his orders and report to Fort Lewis by February 26, 1953.

On February 26, 1953, Peress was at Fort Lewis when a message was received at the headquarters from the New York chapter of the American Red Cross, New York, N. Y., summarizing the "complicated" home situation of Peress and stating that Dr. Gruenthal recommended emergency leave as a temporary alleviation measure. It was stated that this doctor had earlier strongly recommended Peress' permanent assignment to stateside duty; further that the "entire home situation much better when wife constantly near officer." Based upon the communication from the American Red Cross, and in accordance with regulations providing for emergency leave, the commanding officer, Army Personnel Center, Fort Lewis, granted Peress 15 days' emergency leave. Peress was ordered to report at Fort Lewis not later than midnight on March 15, 1953.

On February 27, 1953, Peress addressed a letter to The Adjutant General, Department of the Army, requesting cancellation of his overseas orders and consideration for reassignment in the United States. Inclosed were the same documents previously used to substantiate his request to Fort Lewis and a copy of the Red Cross telegram referred to above. His letter stated that he was leaving for home immediately on emergency leave and that he would be there for the duration of that leave. He further requested that his application be given urgent attention.

On March 9, 1953, Capt. Einar Berge, AGC, Assignment Branch, Office of the Adjutant General, Department of the Army, prepared a memorandum which was subsequently signed by Lt. Col. C. J. Crumm, Office, The Adjutant General, referring this request and accompanying documents, without recommendation, to the Chief, Medical Career Management Division, Office of the Surgeon General, Department of the Army, for consideration. On this same day, the Surgeon General referred the request to a board of officers (Brig. Gen. Egbert W. Cowan, DC, and Col. O. Elliott Ursin, MC), appointed to consider requests of this nature. Based on the statements of the doctors and the telegram from the American Red Cross, both officers recommended approval of the request. The board recommendations were signed by Maj. W. O. Prettyman, Jr., Office of the Surgeon General, acting in his capacity as recorder for the board.

The board handled the application in a routine fashion and was not aware of the derogatory information which was of record elsewhere in the office of the Surgeon General. General Cowan personally determined that Peress should be sent to Camp Kilmer, a station near his home, on the basis of the then current needs. On March 11, 1953, the recommendation that Peress' application for deferment from overseas shipment should be approved and that he should be assigned to Camp Kilmer, N. J., was forwarded to the Adjutant General, DA, by Maj. Arthur E. Britt, MSC, office of the Surgeon General.

On March 13, 1953, by message authenticated by Capt. Howard Wagner, AGC, Peress was informed that his overseas orders had been revoked and that he had been assigned to Camp Kilmer. Information copies of this message were furnished to the commanding general, First Army; the commanding officer, Camp Kilmer, N. J.; and other headquarters concerned. Inasmuch as there was no indication in Peress' files in Reserve Forces Division, First Army, that he was subject to an investigation, that section failed to notify the Counter Intelligence Division, First Army, of Peress' reassignment to Camp Kilmer within the First Army area. In compliance with the message referred to above, Peress reported to Camp Kilmer March 13, 1953, whereupon he was assigned to duty as a dental officer in the dental clinic at that station. He did not have access to classified information. He remained at Camp Kilmer until separated from the service on February 2, 1954.

The investigation of Peress at First Army was completed on April 15, 1953, and the report filed with the Counter Intelligence Division of First Army on April 21, 1953. That office, under date of April 24, 1953, reported to the Intelligence Division and the Surgeon General's Office, both in Washington, that facts and circumstances disclosed during the investigation provided sufficient evidence of disloyal and subversive tendencies to warrant removal of Peress from the service, pursuant to the applicable security regulation, SR 600–220–1. This report was signed by Capt. Albert Robichaud for Col. Wendell G. Johnson, Intelligence Chief at First Army.

On April 28, 1953, Lt. Col. Ronald F. Thomas signed a letter for Colonel Johnson, First Army Intelligence Chief, going to the Surgeon General and the Chief of the Intelligence Division in Washington. This letter had inclosed a complete report of the investigation and recommended that action be initiated to remove Peress from the service.

On April 30, 1953, Col. R. G. Prentiss, Jr., executive officer in the office of the Surgeon General, sent the file on the investigation to the Chief of the Intelligence Division from the Office of the Surgeon General. He concurred in the recommendation of Peress' elimination from the service and stated that Peress would not be reassigned from Camp Kilmer prior to final action in the matter.

Since the completed investigation had not been reviewed by the commanding general at Camp Kilmer, it was returned to First Army on May 21, 1953, from the Intelligence Division in Washington, by Maj. James D. Anders, acting for Col. W. A. Perry, Chief Security Division.

Lt. Col. Ronald F. Thomas, Chief, Counter Intelligence Division, at First Army, sent the file to the Intelligence Branch of Camp Kilmer, N. J., with directions to maintain a copy of the report in Peress' intelligence field file there. This action was dated May 25, 1953.

Lt. Col. C. T. Brown, of the Intelligence Branch at Camp Kilmer, N. J., returned the file to the Intelligence Branch at First Army in New York on June 15, 1953. He reported that Peress was assigned to a nonsensitive position and recommended that he be separated from the service.

On July 7, 1953, from First Army Counter Intelligence Division, Lt. Col. Ronald F. Thomas sent the file to the Intelligence Division in Washington with an opinion that retention of Peress as an officer in the military service was "not clearly consistent with the interests of national security," and recommended that he be separated from the service.

The pertinent Army regulation in such cases provides for the accomplishment of an interrogatory by a member of the service

who has been investigated prior to final action, when considered appropriate by the Intelligence Division. Such an interrogatory was prepared by the Intelligence Division in Washington. It was sent on August 10, 1953, to the Counter Intelligence Division at First Army in New York by Lt. Col. W. P. Meredith for Col. W. A. Perry, Chief, Security Division. Lt. Col. E. E. Winn, Counter Intelligence Division, First Army, forwarded the interrogatory to the Intelligence Branch at Camp Kilmer on August 20, 1953.

The interrogatory was accomplished by Peress at Camp Kilmer on August 25, 1953. Other than furnishing name, address, date, and place of birth, names of parents and denial of use of any alias, Peress entered "Federal constitutional privilege is claimed" in response to all remaining questions.

The completed interrogatory was returned to Intelligence Division, First Army in New York under date of August 26, 1953, by Lieutenant Colonel Brown, Intelligence Branch, Camp Kilmer. He recommended separation of Peress.

The Intelligence Division, First Army, sent the interrogatory from New York on September 2, 1953, reiterating the recommendation for removal of Peress from the service. The file passed through the Office of The Surgeon General on September 8, 1953, where Col. R. G. Prentiss, Jr., repeated his recommendation that Peress be removed from the service.

The interrogatory, with accompanying recommendations of all echelons through which it passed, was received in the Intelligence Division in Washington September 10, 1953.

On June 29, 1953, Public Law 84, 83d Congress, the amendment to the so-called Doctor Draft Act under which the rank of Peress was later adjusted, was enacted. This law required that persons who had been ordered to active duty under the Doctor Draft Act would be reappointed in the rank commensurate with their professional education and experience.

By letter of September 9, 1953, Peress requested determination of his eligibility for promotion to the grade of major in accordance with provision of the new law referred to above. Col. Ruluff F. Leverich, dental surgeon, Camp Kilmer, on the same date forwarded this request to the commanding general, Camp Kilmer, for necessary action without comment. He also informed the intelligence officer, Camp Kilmer, of this action. On September 10, 1953, at the direction of 1st Lt. William L. Vinette, Personnel Branch, Camp Kilmer, C. W. O. J. T. La Marca, assistant adjutant general, forwarded the request without further comment to First Army for determination.

At First Army, Major Van Sickle and Major Kirkland conferred and prepared a forwarding endorsement to this request, the pertinent portions of which are quoted as follows:

"2. Available information indicates that Dr. Peress possessed the minimum of 11 years of qualifying dental professional experience prescribed for appointment in the grade of major and that his original appointment in the grade of captain was in error.

"5. Recommend action be initiated to reappoint Captain Peress in the grade of major in accordance with eligibility requirements set forth in SR 140–105–6 and SR 140–105–9."

No cognizance was taken by either Major Van Sickle or Major Kirkland of the fact that Peress was under investigation.

This endorsement was signed by Capt. L. Dude, AGC, assistant adjutant general, First Army, and was dispatched to The Adjutant General, Department of the Army, on September 23, 1953. (It has since been established that Peress was entitled to have been appointed initially in the grade of major under the regulations in effect at the time he was commissioned.)

On October 2, 1953, The Adjutant General, Department of the Army, returned the request to First Army stating that no further examination of the case could be made until the records incident to the initial appointment of Peress were received. The request was again returned to The Adjutant General on October 16, 1953, by First Army with the remark that appointment records of Peress had been forwarded to the Department of the Army on October 10, 1953. The records indicate that no further action was taken on Peress' request for promotion due to the impending review of the records of all Reserve medical personnel for possible automatic adjustment of rank in accordance with Public Law 84, 83d Congress, and appropriate implementing directives.

Accordingly, it becomes necessary to consider the steps taken in connection with the establishment of this procedure.

On May 21, 1953, the Department of Defense established an ad hoc committee to (1) review DOD directives pertinent to the doctor draft and (2) submit a proposed directive to consolidate current policies and procedures. This committee was made up of 2 representatives from each of the 3 military departments. The Department of the Army representatives were Col. Coy L. Curtis, Personnel Division, and Maj. Vernon McKenzie, Office of The Surgeon General. It was necessary for this committee to consider the provisions of Public Law 84, 83d Congress, in preparing its report. The pertinent provision with respect to adjustment of rank reads as follows:

"Notwithstanding subsection 217 (c) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 481) or any other provision of law, * * * (An individual) who has been or shall be ordered to active duty * * * as a physician, dentist, or in an allied specialist category * * * shall, under regulations prescribed by the President, be appointed, reappointed, promoted to such grade or rank as may be commensurate with his professional education, experience, or ability."

On August 6, 1953, this ad hoc committee forwarded a draft of a proposed directive to the Director of Personnel Policy, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, which reads as follows concerning adjustment of rank:

"Any physician, dentist, or veterinarian now serving on active duty, whether with or without his consent, who would have been entitled to a higher grade than that in which he is now serving if the applicable provisions of this directive or of Public Law 84, 83d Congress, had been in effect at the time of his current appointment will, at the earliest practicable date, be reappointed or promoted to such higher grade 'if a board of officers convened by the military department concerned so recommends.' "

This portion of the proposed directive was concurred in by all members of the ad hoc committee.

On August 26, 1953, the Department of the Army's concurrence in the proposed directive submitted by the ad hoc committee was requested. Concurrence was given by the Department of the Army on September 4, 1953. The proposed directive, concurred in by the Department of the Army, included the words single quoted above which required board action prior to promotion or grade adjustment.

On October 7, 1953, the Department of Defense issued Directive No. 1205.1 in implementation of Public Law 84, 83d Congress, and the recommendations of the ad hoc committee. However, the wording of the directive was not the same as that recommended by the ad hoc committee or concurred in by the three services. The requirement for board action prior to effecting grade readjustment of medical personnel was not included.

This requirement was deleted because such a requirement would be contrary to Public Law 84, 83d Congress. When it was decided by Congress to change the law and make it mandatory that a person commissioned pursuant to the act must be appointed or reappointed to a rank based upon his professional education, experience, or ability, Congress realized that subsection 217 (c) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 required, with certain limited exceptions, that appointments to the grade of lieutenant colonel or commander, and up, could only be effected through a board of officers. Therefore, Congress wrote into the Public Law 84, "notwithstanding subsection 217 (c) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 481) or any other provision of law." The express purpose of this language was to remove the requirement for a board of officers. Therefore, it was deemed to be contrary to the statute to require such a board of officers. Accordingly the Department of Defense included in the October 7, 1953, Directive No. 1205.1 the following which provides that if the individual is otherwise qualified for appointment it will be done without board action:

"Pursuant to subsection 4 (a), Public Law 779, 81st Congress, as amended, any person who is otherwise qualified for appointment in a grade higher than major or lieutenant commander will be appointed in such grade without referral of his case to a board of officers convened by the Secretary of the service concerned."

Also: "Any physician, dentist, or veterinarian now serving on active duty, whether with or without his consent, who would have been entitled to a higher grade than that in which he is now serving if the applicable provisions of this directive or of Public Law 84, 83d Congress, had been in effect at the time of his current appointment will, at the earliest practicable date, be reappointed or promoted to such higher grade."

Upon receipt of the Department of Defense directive of October 7, 1953, the Department of the Army moved promptly to carry out its provisions. However, the Office of the Surgeon General, as head of the Medical Service of the Army, began screening the qualification records of all officers of the Medical, Dental, and Veterinary Corps for medical professional qualifications only.

On October 8, 1953, Maj. Vernon McKenzie prepared a memorandum for the Chief, Personnel Division, Department of the Army, indicating the changes the Department of Defense directive made in the criteria for grade determination of persons being inducted under the provisions of the Doctor Draft Act and requesting dissemination of this information to all commands. It was signed by Col. R. G. Prentiss. This request was approved and forwarded to The Adjutant General for execution by memorandum prepared by Lt. Col. Emery E. Hyde and signed by Col. Samuel R. Lewis, Personnel Division, for Col. William P. Wansboro.

By a second memorandum, also dated October 8, 1953, prepared by Major McKenzie and signed by Colonel Prentiss, The Surgeon General informed the Chief, Personnel Division, Department of the Army, that his office was reviewing the qualification records of officers already commissioned under the provisions of the Doctor Draft Act, as directed by the Department of Defense and requested that The Adjutant General be directed to reappoint those eligible for reappointment under the changed criteria as determined by The Surgeon General, and to inform all commands of the changes occasioned by Public Law 84, 83d Congress, as implemented by the Department of Defense. This second memorandum pertained to the reappointment of officers already commissioned, whereas the first of the same date pertained only to initial commissioning. However, the same proposed message was enclosed with both. Apparently, assuming that both memorandums concerned the same subject and that the latter was, therefore, unnecessary,

this second memorandum was returned without action to The Surgeon General on October 13, 1953, by memorandum prepared by Lieutenant Colonel Hyde and signed by Colonel Wansboro. However, reappointment action by The Adjutant General, as proposed by this second memorandum, was authorized by Lieutenant Colonel Hyde in conversation with Lt. Col. B. E. Babcock, Office of The Adjutant General, at the time the initial list of persons eligible for reappointment was received from The Surgeon General by The Adjutant General.

From their qualification records, Maj. James F. Dolson, MSC, Special Projects Branch, Personnel Division, Office of the Surgeon General, prepared a list of 538 medical officers, 125 dental officers, and 18 veterinary officers considered to be entitled to reappointment under criteria as changed by Public Law 84, 83d Congress, and the Department of Defense directive referred to above. Upon completion of this list, applicable portions were transmitted to the Medical, Dental, and Veterinary Corps career management sections, Office of the Surgeon General, for verification. On October 14, 1953, the reassambled list was transmitted to The Adjutant General by memorandum prepared by Major McKenzie and signed by Col. H. W. Glattley, Medical Corps, Chief, Personnel Division, Office of the Surgeon General, recommending reappointment of the officers listed thereon to the grades indicated. The name of Peress was on that list.

All plans to screen personnel records for material, other than that relating to medical professional qualifications, which is a primary responsibility of a promotion board, and to coordinate lists through security channels were abandoned in the Department of the Army following receipt of the DOD directive which was interpreted by Army officials to preclude consideration of anything other than medical professional qualifications. Neither Major Dolson nor anyone else in the Special Projects Branch, Personnel Division, Office of the Surgeon General, had knowledge of the derogatory information which had been developed on Peress. This information was, however, available in another branch of the Office of the Surgeon General and would undoubtedly have been discovered had normal promotion screening procedures and safeguards been employed in this group readjustment of rank.

Meanwhile, at the Intelligence Branch at Camp Kilmer, Lt. Col. C. T. Brown addressed a memorandum to the commanding general, Brig. Gen. Ralph W. Zwicker, concerning the case. This memorandum, dated October 21, 1953, related that Peress was denied access to classified material; that the post dental surgeon had been advised; that Peress had requested that a determination be made of his eligibility under Public Law 84, 83d Congress, for promotion to major; that the post adjutant general had been advised of this request; and it included a recommendation that a letter be sent to First Army requesting immediate action to relieve Peress from active duty.

On October 21, 1953, also, General Zwicker sent a letter to the commanding general, First Army, Lt. Gen. W. A. Burress. The letter contained a summary of the derogatory information on Peress, related previous recommendations to relieve Peress, and concluded that his retention was clearly not consistent with the interests of national security. The recommendation for relief was reiterated by General Zwicker.

On October 23, 1953, The Adjutant General issued a letter of appointment in the grade of major to Peress. This letter was addressed through the Commanding General, First Army, to Peress at Camp Kilmer, N. J., and was signed by Maj. James E. Harris for Maj. Gen. William E. Bergin, The Adjutant General. The letter enclosed an oath-of-office form for execution and return by Peress. First Army forwarded these documents by separate letter on October 29, 1953, to the Commanding Officer, United States Army Hospital, Camp Kilmer, for necessary action.

On October 27, 1953, in the Department of the Army in Washington, the interrogatory completed by Peress on August 25, 1953, was incorporated in the file of Peress in the Disposition Section of the Intelligence Division. Two days later this Section started action leading to preparation of a summary of the Peress file to be used by the Personnel Division of the Army Staff.

Peress executed the oath of office as major on November 2, 1953. The oath was administered by Maj. Herbert F. Bordeau, MSC, Chief, Personnel Division, Headquarters, United States Army Hospital, Camp Kilmer. This oath of office was returned to First Army through the Commanding General, Camp Kilmer, that same date and forwarded to The Adjutant General by First Army on November 19, 1953. (It should be noted that Peress' reappointment to major was contained in the group readjustment of rank and was completely independent of his letter request of September 9, 1953, for such action.)

On November 3, 1953, General Burress visited Camp Kilmer, where General Zwicker again brought up the matter of Peress and informed him of Peress' reappointment to major on orders from Washington and opposed this action. General Burress immediately telephoned his Chief of Staff, Maj. Gen. John B. Murphy, requesting him to look into Peress' reappointment right away.

On the same day General Murphy talked with Col. C. O. Brunner, Chief of Staff, at Camp Kilmer, to discuss the matter. General Murphy stated he would draft a letter to Washington for signature by General Burress.

General Murphy also had Col. D. H. Smith, Personnel Division, First Army, telephone the Personnel Division, Department of the Army, on this matter on November 3, 1953.

Colonel Smith asked the reasons for Peress' reappointment as major in the face of three recommendations for separation, and was advised by Lt. Col. B. E. Babcock, Reserve Branch, Office of The Adjutant General, that the reappointment was authorized by the Department of Defense directive. Colonel Smith was then referred to Major Dolson, Office of the Surgeon General, who informed him that the reappointment was an administrative adjustment of rank based solely on years of professional experience, but that other material on file would have been considered had the Department of Defense permitted a board of officers to pass on the reappointments.

Also, late on November 3, 1953, General Zwicker again wrote General Burress and discussed the Peress case among other things.

A personal letter dated November 6, 1953, was sent by General Burress to the Vice Chief of Staff in Washington, Gen. Charles L. Bolte. An outline of the actions taken in the case in First Army was set forth in the letter. This letter noted that Peress' grade readjustment had been handled in personnel channels and without knowledge of intelligence personnel. The following paragraph taken from that letter expressed the views of General Burress in this matter:

"I have taken the liberty of writing to you personally about this case, believing that you should know about it in view of its obvious implications. It also seems to me that this order for adjustment of grade should be revoked if it is possible to do so, and that Peress should be separated from the Army as soon as this can be accomplished."

On November 10, 1953, General Bolte sent the letter from General Burress to the personnel branch of the Army staff for necessary action in conjunction with the staff intelligence branch.

On November 13, 1953, a special summary of the case, which had been prepared in the Intelligence Division of the Department of the Army, was sent to the Personnel Division at request of the latter.

On November 18, 1953, the recommendations of the Intelligence Division for elimination and termination of Peress' commission were sent to the Personnel Division. In the latter branch on the same day the case was sent to The Adjutant General for referral to the Army Personnel Board. The case, as forwarded, had been prepared by Lt. Col. George B. Moore. It was sent over the signature of Col. Gerald G. Epley, Chief, Personnel Actions Branch.

The Army Personnel Board was established as an advisory board on personnel matters within the Office of the Secretary of the Army. The membership is composed of general officers with long experience in the handling of personnel matters. The case was referred to this Board for consideration and recommendation as to whether:

1. Peress should be designated substandard and relieved from active duty with the first increment of the involuntary-release program, or

2. Released with later increments of the involuntary-release program, or

3. Eliminated through proceedings before a board of inquiry, or

4. Retained on active duty.

Attention of the board was invited to the fact that Peress was a possible security risk and that First Army and the Surgeon General had recommended his removal from the service.

On November 20, 1953, the recorder of the board, Lt. Col. Lowell L. Forbes, presented the case to the board. The board members were:

Maj. Gen. Miller B. White, president.

Maj. Gen. Daniel B. Strickler.

Brig. Gen. Frank C. McConnell.

Colonel Forbes suggested the action numbered 1, above, as "best of alternative actions (gets him out soonest)" with his "commission automatically terminated by law." It was his opinion that "in no event should he (Peress) remain on active duty longer than necessary."

The Army Personnel Board concurred with this suggestion. It considered action by a board of inquiry to be time consuming and expensive. The Army Personnel Board recommended relief from active duty under the involuntary-release program with concurrent termination of Peress' Reserve commission without board action. The case was returned to the Personnel Division of the Army staff by Lieutenant Colonel Forbes on November 23, 1953.

On November 25, 1953, Lieutenant Colonel Moore, of the Personnel Division, prepared a memorandum to the Chief of Staff of the Army on the case stating that "determination was made to relieve Peress from active duty after completion of 12 months' service under the involuntary-release program since after that length of service his commission may be revoked as a special registrant, (doctor draft) under section 4, Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended." This memorandum had attached a reply to General Burress' letter of November 6, 1953, for signature of General Bolte. The memorandum was signed by Maj. Gen. Robert N. Young, Chief, Personnel Division, Army General Staff.

On December 4, 1953, the Personnel Division was advised that the Deputy Chief of Staff (Operations and Administration), Lt. Gen. Walter L. Weible desired that the following material be sent to him on the case:

"1. File of subject officer and the recommendations of the Army Personnel Board be forwarded with this case.

2. Include with the case copies and Forms 98, 98a, and DD Form 393, and mark the

area that subject officer claimed constitutional privileges.

3. Include present DA policy and DD policy to cover cases of this sort."

On December 12, 1953, a memorandum forwarded the requested material to General Weible. The memorandum repeated the recommendation in the November 25, 1953, memorandum and was prepared by Lieutenant Colonel Moore of the Personnel Division and signed by Brig. Gen. Herbert B. Powell, deputy to Maj. Gen. Robert N. Young. This memorandum was concurred in by Maj. W. R. Buelow, Intelligence Division, Department of the Army.

Upon reviewing the case once more Gen. Weible was of the opinion that in view of the nature of the case he required additional verification of the legality of the proposed course of action as recommended. Accordingly, the file was sent by him to the Office of the Judge Advocate General on December 21, 1953, for examination and return by December 23, 1953.

Under date of December 23, 1953, concurrence for the Judge Advocate General was given by Col. Stanley W. Jones and the file was sent to General Weible for the third time with no changes in the original recommendations of November 25, 1953.

Another review of the case and of the staff recommendations by General Weible at this time caused him to pass the case with his approval of those recommendations. On December 30, 1953, the action recommended was approved by the Vice Chief of Staff, Gen. Charles L. Bolte. On the next day General Bolte addressed a personal letter to Lieutenant General Burress, commanding general, First Army, to inform him that Peress would be relieved from active duty under the Involuntary Release Program as "the most expeditious appropriate means of returning Major Peress to civilian status."

DD Form 390, executed by Peress, was not in the file being reviewed by the officials considering the most appropriate means of effectuating Peress' separation from the service. Having served their initial purpose in connection with his appointment in October 1952, the three copies of the DD Form 390 were distributed by First Army in accordance with applicable regulations—one copy was returned to the Local Draft Board, Forest Hills, L. I., N. Y.; one copy was sent to The Adjutant General for transmittal to the Surgeon General; and one copy was retained in First Army. In accordance with the then established procedures the copy furnished to the Department of the Army was retained in the Office of the Surgeon General and was not returned for inclusion in the official personnel file of Peress, which was maintained by The Adjutant General, until after he was discharged. (On April 2, 1954, the procedures were changed to require that, upon completion of review of the DD Form 390, the Surgeon General would return the form to The Adjutant General for incorporation in the official personnel file of the individual to whom it pertains. The procedures were also subsequently changed on August 9, 1954, to eliminate the referral to the Surgeon General for review. Upon receipt by the Department of the Army the form is now placed immediately in the officer's official personnel file.)

By letter of January 6, 1954, which was signed by Capt. Albert Robichaud for Lt. Col. Ronald F. Thomas, Counter Intelligence Division, First Army, Brigadier General Zwicker was informed of the content of General Bolte's letter of December 31, 1953, to General Burress.

In a memorandum dated January 11, 1954, which was prepared by Lt. Col. G. B. Moore and signed by Lt. Col. Arthur W. Allen for Col. Gerald G. Eply, of the Personnel Division, The Adjutant General was directed to take the necessary action to:

(1) "Relieve from active duty Maj. Irving Peress, O1893643, DC, upon completion of 12 months' active military service, granting officer up to 90 days' notice if he so desires."

(2) "Discharge Major Peress from his commission under the provisions of section 4 (b), Public Law 84, 83d Congress, as amended"; and

(3) "Ensure that Major Peress (a) is not permitted to retain his commission at the transfer point at his request and (b) that he is never recommissioned."

These instructions were in accordance with the recommendations of the Army Personnel Board and the December 30, 1953, decision of the Vice Chief of Staff, General Bolte.

The authority for granting Peress up to 90 days notice of his separation is contained in a Department of the Army letter to all major commanders, dated September 11, 1953, subject "Involuntary relief from Active Duty of Non-Regular Officers," which states in part:

"Orders directing separation will provide for relief from active duty 90 days following notification unless the individual concerned requests an earlier release date."

In compliance with the foregoing instruction, The Adjutant General by letter of January 18, 1954, signed by CWO R. C. McDaniel, directed First Army to relieve Peress from active duty and honorably discharge him from the Army at the earliest practicable date. Applicable portions of the letter are quoted as follows:

"1. It is desired that Maj. Irving Peress, O1893643, DC, be relieved from active duty and honorably discharged from the Army at the earliest practicable date depending on officer's desires, but in any event not later than 90 days from date of receipt of this letter. * * *

"4. All commissions held by him will be terminated on effective date of discharge and he will not be tendered a reappointment in the USAR except by authority of the Department of the Army. * * *

"5. Officer will not be separated prior to determination that he is physically qualified for separation by your headquarters. A prompt report will be made to this office in the event action cannot be taken without undue delay."

By letter of January 21, 1954, signed by Lt. Col. J. G. Basbas, First Army directed Camp Kilmer to comply with these instructions.

On January 21 or 22, 1954, Mr. Anastos, an investigator from the McCarthy subcommittee staff called Brigadier General Zwicker and said that he understood that there was a major at Camp Kilmer who was under investigation and that he, Anastos, would like his name. General Zwicker returned the call and contacting Mr. Anastos stated that he believed the name of the person to whom Anastos referred in his call is Major Peress. On January 23, 1954, General Zwicker again called Mr. Anastos and told him that he had just received a Department of the Army order, dated January 18, 1954, directing the separation of Major Peress.

Major Peress signed a statement on January 25, 1954, acknowledging receipt of the notice of his release from active duty and electing to be released on March 31, 1954.

On January 28, 1954, Mr. John Adams, Department Counselor, Department of the Army, received a request from a staff member of the Senate Subcommittee on Investigations that he arrange for the appearance of Peress before that subcommittee in New York on January 30, 1954. Mr. Adams states that he was of the opinion at that time that Peress had already been discharged until he learned that day for the first time of the 90-day election period.

Mr. Adams states that he had been called at his home on January 3, 1954, by Mr. Roy Cohn of the staff of the McCarthy subcommittee; that Mr. Cohn informed Mr. Adams that the subcommittee had some derogatory information on a doctor or dentist who was a major at Camp Kilmer and that the next day Mr. Adams sent a memorandum concerning that call to the Chief of the Intelligence Division, Maj. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau. General Trudeau later that day advised Mr. Adams that the officer undoubtedly was Peress whose discharge had been directed and was about to be processed. Mr. Adams states that he furnished this advice to Mr. Cohn within a few days without revealing Peress' name.

Mr. Adams states that since he had been informed on January 4, that Peress was to be discharged as a possible security risk he felt the Army should have been rid of him as soon as possible. Accordingly, about noontime on January 28, 1954, he requested G–2 to secure information as to whether Peress had been discharged and, if not, whether he could be discharged by January 29, 1954. Mr. Adams stated that it was his thought to have Peress in civilian status if possible when appearing before the McCarthy subcommittee on January 30, 1954.

Mr. Adams stated that he learned that Peress had not been discharged. He also stated that when he learned that day for the first time of the 90-days election period granted by the September 11, 1953, Department of the Army letter, upon being informed that Peress had selected March 31, 1954, as his discharge date, he dropped his efforts to accomplish Peress' separation prior to Peress' appearance before the subcommittee.

At 4 p. m. on January 28, 1954, Mr. Adams relayed the request for the appearance of Peress to General Zwicker at Camp Kilmer by telephone. General Zwicker notified Peress at 8:15 a. m. on January 29 of the request. Also at that time General Zwicker granted Peress permission to wear civilian clothes and be absent from duty on January 30, 1954.

Peress appeared before the McCarthy subcommittee in New York City on January 30, 1954, in accordance with the request made upon Mr. Adams.

On February 1, 1954, during the morning Peress requested that the date of his election for relief from active duty be changed from March 31, 1954, to provide for an immediate discharge. This was explicitly authorized by regulations.

General Zwicker at approximately 9:30 a. m. on February 1, 1954, telephoned Maj. Gen. John B. Murphy, Chief of Staff, First Army, in New York to inform him of this request. He advised General Murphy that, in consonance with the decision of the Department of the Army to release Peress as soon as possible, he had informed Peress that his discharge would be effected by 2 p. m., February 2, 1954.

Lieutenant Colonel Moore, Personnel Division, Department of the Army, called Col. Donald H. Smith, Chief, Personnel Division, First Army, in the morning of February 1, 1954, to learn the status of Peress' discharge, Brig. Gen. H. B. Powell, Deputy Chief, Personnel Division, Department of the Army, believes that this call was directed by him. While General Powell is not certain it is his impression that this information was furnished to Mr. Adams.

Later that morning Colonel Smith called Lieutenant Colonel Moore in Washington to tell him that he had since learned that Peress had requested an immediate release at Camp Kilmer and was scheduled for release by 2 p. m. the next day, February 2, 1954. Colonel Smith stated that General Zwicker had called General Murphy at 9:30 that morning on the matter. He also told Lieutenant Colonel Moore that Peress' separation had been recommended by First Army long before the grade adjustment of Peress had been effected.

In the afternoon of February 1, 1954, Col. C. O. Bruce, Military Assistant to the Secretary of the Army, received a telephone call from the office of Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY. The colonel was informed that a

letter to the Secretary of the Army was being sent to his office by messenger and that the contents of the letter were being released to the press services.

Some time after 4 p. m., Colonel Bruce received the letter. He took it to the office of Mr. Adams, the Department Counselor, between 4:30 and 5:10 p. m.

At or about 5:10 p. m. Mr. Adams took the Senator's letter to the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Administration, Lieutenant General Weible. There were extended discussions between General Weible and Mr. Adams in the evening of February 1 during which General Weible learned of the pending discharge date of February 2, 1954, for Peress.

General Weible having handled the matter previously and having directed staff action to insure that the recommended discharge was the proper course, requested information that evening on (1) whether there was any new evidence to be considered; and (2) whether there was any evidence available to support the inferences contained in Senator McCarthy's letter as to possible subversive activities by Peress at Camp Kilmer.

During a conference between General Weible and Mr. Adams a conclusion was reached that the answers to both these inquiries were in the negative. Accordingly, there existed no basis for reconsideration of the case. General Weible, therefore, with Mr. Adams concurring, decided to adhere to the previously approved staff course of action, i. e., get Peress out of the service as expeditiously as possible.

On February 2, 1954, at 2 p. m., Peress was given an honorable discharge and his commission in the Army Reserve was irrevocably terminated. The discharge document given Dr. Peress at Camp Kilmer, N. J., in accordance with Department of the Army instructions of January 18, 1954, was signed by Maj. John J. McManus.

APPENDIX CONTAINING SERVICE HISTORY OF DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY PERSONNEL MENTIONED IN THE CHRONOLOGY

(Histories current as of November 22, 1954)

INDEX

Name	Page and item in appendix	Page(s) in chronology
Adams, John	iv, A	22, 23, 24, 25
Allen, Lt. Col. Arthur W.	iv, B	21
Anders, Maj. James D.	iv, C	9
Babcock, Lt. Col. Bernard E.	iv, D	15, 17
Basbas, Lt. Col. James G.	iv, E	22
Berge, Capt. Einar	v, F	7
Bergin, Maj. Gen. William E.	v, G	16
Bolte, General Charles L.	v, H	18, 19, 20, 21
Bordeau, Maj. Herbert F.	v, I	17
Britt, Maj. Arthur E.	v, J	4, 8
Brown, Lt. Col. Chester T.	v, K	9, 10, 16
Bruce, Col. Charles O.	v, L	24
Brunner, Col. Clarence O.	vi, M	17
Buelow, Maj. Wallace R.	vi, N	20
Burress, Lt. Gen. Withers A.	vi, O	16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21
Cowan, Brig. Gen. Egbert W.	vi, P	8
Crumm, Lt. Col. Clifton J.	vi, Q	7
Curtis, Col. Coy L.	vi, R	12
Dolson, Maj. James F.	vi, S	15, 17
Dude, Capt. Ludwig	vii, T	11
Epley, Col. Gerald G.	vii, U	18, 21
Forbes, Lt. Col. Lowell L.	vii, V	19
Gade, 1st Lt. Alfred M.	vii, W	7
Glattley, Col. Harold W.	vii, X	15
Harris, Maj. James E.	vii, Y	16
Hage, Lt. Col. Gunnar H.	vii, Z	2
Hyde, Lt. Col. Emery E.	viii, AA	14, 15
Johnson, Col. Wendell G.	viii, BB	6, 9
Jones, Col. Stanley W.	viii, CC	20
Kirkland, Capt. Curtis R.	viii, DD	2, 5, 6, 11
LaMarca, CWO Joseph T.	viii, EE	11
Leverich, Col. Ruluff F.	viii, FF	10
Lewis, Col. Samuel R.	viii, GG	14
Lyon, Capt. Charles A.	ix, HH	4
McConnell, Brig. Gen. Frank C.	ix, II	19
McDaniel, CWO Robert C.	ix, JJ	22
McKenzie, Maj. Vernon	ix, KK	2, 12, 14, 15
McManus, Maj. John J.	ix, LL	25
Maxwell, Capt. Charles F.	ix, MM	6
Meredith, Lt. Col. William P.	ix, NN	10
Moore, Lt. Col. George B.	x, OO	18, 19, 20, 21, 24
Moreda, Capt. Armand E.	x, PP	4
Murphy, Maj. Gen. John B.	x, QQ	17, 24
Perry, Col. Willis A.	x, RR	9, 10
Powell, Maj. Gen. Herbert B.	x, SS	20, 24
Prentiss, Col. Roger G., Jr.	x, TT	9, 10, 14
Prettyman, Maj. William O., Jr.	xi, UU	8
Robichaud, Capt Albert	xi, VV	9, 21
Smith, Col. Donald H.	xi, WW	17, 24
Strickler, Maj. Gen. Daniel B.	xi, XX	19
Thomas, Lt. Col. Ronald F.	xi, YY	9, 21
Trudeau, Maj. Gen. Arthur G.	xi, ZZ	23
Ursin, Col. O. Elliot	xii, AAA	8
Van Sickle, Capt. Floyd E., Jr.	xii, BBB	2, 4, 5, 6, 11
Vinette, 1st Lt. William L.	xii, CCC	11
Wagner, Capt. Howard	xii, DDD	8
Wansboro, Col. William P.	xii, EEE	14, 15
Weible, Lt. Gen. Walter L.	xii, FFF	19, 21, 24, 25
White, Maj. Gen. Miller B.	xiii, GGG	19
Winn, Lt. Col. Eric E.	xiii, HHH	10
Young, Maj. Gen. Robert N.	xiii, III	19, 20
Zwicker, Brig. Gen. Ralph W.	xiii, JJJ	16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24

SERVICE HISTORY OF DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY PERSONNEL MENTIONED IN THE CHRONOLOGY

A. John Adams: Mr. Adams has completed over 3 years of active military service and 16 years of nonactive service; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff School; has been awarded the Bronze Star Medal; served in North Africa, the Mediterranean, and Europe during World War II; was relieved from active duty in January 1946 as a major, and was promoted to the grade of lieutenant colonel USAR in August of 1950; he was chief clerk of the Senate Armed Services Committee during the 80th Congress and acted as deputy general counsel of the Department of Defense prior to assuming his current duties as Department counselor.

B. Lt. Col. Arthur W. Allen: Lieutenant Colonel Allen has completed over 15 years of active military service, is a graduate of the United States Military Academy, the Command and General Staff School, the Armored Officers' Advanced Course, and the Armed Forces Staff College; has been awarded the Legion of Merit and the Bronze Star Medal with one Oak Leaf Cluster; served in Europe during World War II; and has a top secret security clearance.

C. Maj. James D. Anders: Major Anders has completed over 11 years of active military service; is a graduate of the Advanced Infantry Officers' Course and the Strategic Intelligence School; has been awarded the Silver Star Medal and the Bronze Star Medal; served in the Mediterranean theater during World War II; and has a top secret security clearance.

D. Lt. Col. Bernard E. Babcock: Lieutenant Colonel Babcock has completed over 14 years of active military service; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff College; has been awarded the Legion of Merit and the Bronze Star Medal; served in the Far East during World War II and the Korean emergency; and has a top secret security clearance.

E. Lt. Col. James G. Basbas: Lieutenant Colonel Basbas has completed over 27 years of active military service; has the educational equivalent to the Adjutant General's School Advanced Course and to the Command and General Staff School; has been awarded the Bronze Star Medal with one Oak Leaf Cluster and the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; served in the Middle East and in Europe during World War II and in Korea during the hostilities there; and has a top secret security clearance.

F. Capt. Einar Berge: Captain Berge has completed over 8 years of active military service; has been awarded the Bronze Star Medal; served in Korea during the recent hostilities there; and has a top secret security clearance.

G. Maj. Gen. William E. Bergin: Major General Bergin had completed over 36 years of active military service at the time of his retirement on May 31, 1954; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff School and has the additional equivalent to the National War College; has been awarded the Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Merit, and the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; served in the China-Burma-India theater during World War II; and had a top secret security clearance at the time of his retirement.

H. Gen. Charles L. Bolte: General Bolte has completed over 37 years of active military service; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff School and the Army War College; has been awarded the Distinguished Service Medal, the Silver Star for gallantry in action near Bologna, Italy, on April 20, 1945, the Legion of Merit, and the Purple Heart; commanded the 34th Infantry Division in Italy, the unit which cracked the historic Gothic line of the German defense in September 1944; and has a top secret security clearance.

I. Maj. Herbert F. Bordeau: Major Bordeau has completed over 15 years of active military service and 10 years of nonactive service; was promoted to the grade of lieutenant colonel on November 16, 1954; served in Europe during World War II and in the Far East during the first year of the Korean conflict; and has a secret security clearance.

J. Maj. Arthur E. Britt: Major Britt has completed over 13 years of active service; is a graduate of the Advanced Officers' Course, Medical Field Service School; has been awarded the Bronze Star Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster; served in the European Theater during World War II; and has a top secret security clearance.

K. Lt. Col. Chester T. Brown: Lieutenant Colonel Brown has completed over 16 years of active military service and 14 years of nonactive service; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff School; has been awarded the Bronze Star Medal; served in Europe during World War II and in Korea during the hostilities there; and has a top secret security clearance.

L. Col. Charles O. Bruce: Colonel Bruce has completed over 18 years of active military service; is a graduate of the Medical Field Service School; has been awarded the Legion of Merit, and the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; served in the Mediterranean and European theaters of operations during World War II; and has a top secret security clearance.

M. Col. Clarence O. Brunner: Colonel Brunner has completed over 20 years of active military service and 7 years of nonactive service; has been awarded the Legion of Merit with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Bronze Star Medal with 2 Oak Leaf Clusters, and the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; served in Europe during World War II and in Korea during the hostilities there; and has a top secret security clearance.

N. Maj. Wallace R. Buelow: Major Buelow has completed over 12 years of active military service, is a graduate of the Command and General Staff College, has been awarded the Bronze Star Medal, served in Europe during World War II, and has a top secret security clearance.

O. Lt. Gen. Withers A. Burress: Lieutenant General Burress has completed over 37 years of active military service; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff School and the Army War College; was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal for service as commanding general of the 100th

Infantry Division in Europe during World War II; the Silver Star for gallantry in action near Neckargartach, Germany, on April 5, 1945, the Legion of Merit, and the Bronze Star Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster; and has a top secret security clearance.

P. Brig. Gen. Egbert W. Cowan: Brigadier General Cowan has completed over 36 years of active military service at the time of his retirement in May of 1954; he served in the Mediterranean and North African theaters during World War II; he had a top secret security clearance prior to his retirement.

Q. Lt. Col. Clifton J. Crumm: Lieutenant Colonel Crumm has completed over 27 years of active military service; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff School; and has a top secret security clearance.

R. Col. Coy L. Curtis: Colonel Curtis has completed over 17 years of active military service; is a graduate of the United States Military Academy, Command and General Staff College, and the Armed Forces Staff College; has been awarded the Silver Star, the Bronze Star Medal, and the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; served in the European theater of operations during World War II; and has a top secret security clearance.

S. Maj. James F. Dolson: Major Dolson has completed over 7 years of active military service and 4 years of nonactive service; has been awarded the Bronze Star Medal, served in the Pacific during World War II and in Korea during the recent hostilities there; and has a top secret security clearance.

T. Capt. Ludwig Dude: Captain Dude has completed over 14 years of active military service; is a graduate of the Counterintelligence Corps School; and has a top secret security clearance.

U. Col. Gerald G. Epley: Colonel Epley has completed over 22 years of active military service; is a graduate of the United States Military Academy, the Infantry School, the Command and General Staff School, and the Army War College; has been awarded the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal for valor, and the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; served in the Far East following World War II and in Korea during the hostilities there; and has a top secret security clearance.

V. Lt. Col. Lowell L. Forbes: Lieutenant Colonel Forbes had completed over 13 years of active military service and 9 years of nonactive service at the time of his retirement on January 31, 1954; he served in the southwest Pacific during World War II; and he had a top secret security clearance up to the time of his retirement.

W. 1st Lt. Alfred M. Gade: First Lieutenant Gade has completed over 9 years of active military service and 2 years of nonactive service, was promoted to the grade of captain in September 1954, served in the CBI during World War II, and has a secret security clearance.

X. Col. Harold W. Glattley: Colonel Glattley has completed over 28 years of active military service; has the educational equivalent to graduation from the Armed Forces Staff College; has been awarded the Silver Star with one Oak Leaf Cluster, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal, and the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; was surgeon of the United States Forces on Bataan, Philippine Islands, at the time of the fall of the Philippines; was a prisoner of war of the Japanese during which time he was a leading United States surgeon in various prisoner of war camps; and has a top secret security clearance.

Y. Maj. James E. Harris: Major Harris had completed over 25 years of military service prior to his retirement on August 31, 1954; he had been awarded the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; he served in the European Theater during World War II and in the Far East during the recent hostilities in Korea; and he had a top secret clearance prior to his retirement.

Z. Lt. Col. Gunnar H. Hage: Lieutenant Colonel Hage has completed over 14 years of active military service; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff School and of the Armed Forces Staff College; has been awarded the Bronze Star Medal and the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; served in Korea during the recent hostilities there; and has a top secret security clearance.

AA. Lt. Col. Emery E. Hyde: Lieutenant Colonel Hyde has over 12 years of active military service and 11 years of nonactive service; is a graduate of the Armed Forces Staff College; served in the North African and Mediterranean Theater Campaigns during World War II; and has a top secret security clearance.

BB. Col. Wendell G. Johnson: Colonel Johnson had completed over 31 years of active military service at the time of his retirement on September 30, 1954, he is a graduate of the United States Military Academy and the Command and General Staff School; he had been awarded the Legion of Merit with one Oak Leaf Cluster; served as military attaché in Cuba and in Spain during World War II; and he had up until the time of his retirement a top secret security clearance.

CC. Col. Stanley W. Jones: Colonel Jones has completed over 35 years of active military service; is a graduate of the United States Military Academy; has been awarded the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal, and the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant with Oak Leaf Cluster; served as Judge Advocate of the Ninth Army in Europe during World War II; was promoted to Brigadier General on October 5, 1954; and has a top secret security clearance.

DD. Maj. Curtis R. Kirkland: Major Kirkland had completed over 16 years of active military service at the time of his separation on April 2, 1954; served in the Southwest Pacific during World War II, had been awarded the Bronze Star Medal with one Oak Leaf Cluster; and had a top secret security clearance during the time of his handling of the Peress case.

EE. CWO Joseph T. LaMarca: Chief Warrant Officer LaMarca has completed over 14 years of military service; served in North Africa and Europe during World War II; was relieved from active duty on August 31, 1954, and reenlisted as a Master Sergeant on September 1, 1954; and has a top secret security clearance.

FF. Col. Ruluff F. Leverich: Colonel Leverich has completed over 13 years of active military service and 11 years on nonactive duty; has been awarded the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; served in the Far East during the Korean hostilities; and has a secret security clearance.

GG. Col. Samuel R. Lewis: Colonel Lewis has completed over 24 years of active military service and has been awarded the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant, with one Oak Leaf Cluster; served in Europe during World War II; and has a top secret security clearance.

HH. Capt. Charles A. Lyon: Captain Lyon has completed over 26 years of active military service, was promoted to the grade of major in April 1953, and was released from active duty on February 1, 1954. He is now serving as a master sergeant at the Presidio of San Francisco, Calif.; and has a secret security clearance.

II. Brig. Gen. Frank C. McConnell: Brigadier General McConnell has completed over 32 years of active military service; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff School; has been awarded the Legion of Merit with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Bronze Star Medal, and the Air Medal; served in the Southwest Pacific during World War II and in the Far East during the Korean emergency; was designated as a principal delegate to the United Nations Command Armistice Delegation in Korea in 1952; and has a top secret security clearance.

JJ. CWO Robert C. McDaniel: Chief Warrant Officer McDaniel has completed over 13 years of active military service; has been awarded the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; and has a top secret security clearance.

KK. Maj. Vernon McKenzie: Major McKenzie has completed over 13 years of active military service; served in the India-Burma theater during World War II; and has a top secret security clearance.

LL. Maj. John J. McManus: Major McManus had completed over 11 years of active military service and 14 years of nonactive duty at the time of his release from active duty on November 4, 1954; had been awarded the Bronze Star Medal; served in the Far East Command during World War II and in Korea during the recent hostilities there; had a secret clearance up until the time of his relief from active duty.

MM. Capt. Charles F. Maxwell: Captain Maxwell has completed over 12 years of active military service; is a graduate of the Counter Intelligence Corps School and the Provost Marshal General's School; was promoted to the grade of major on April 17, 1953; served in the India-Burma theater during World War II; and has a top secret security clearance.

NN. Lt. Col. William P. Meredith: Lieutenant Colonel Meredith has completed over 10 years of active military service and 9 years of nonactive service; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff College and the Strategic Intelligence School; has been awarded the Bronze Star Medal; served in the Far East during World War II; and has a top secret security clearance.

OO. Lt. Col. George B. Moore: Lieutenant Colonel Moore has completed over 12 years of active military service; is a graduate of the United States Military Academy and the Command and General Staff School; has been awarded the Silver Star for gallantry in action in Tunisia during 1943, the Bronze Star Medal with 2 Oak Leaf Clusters for valor and the Purple Heart; and has a top secret security clearance.

PP. Capt. Armand E. Moreda: Captain Moreda has completed over 14 years of active military service; has been awarded the Bronze Star Medal; and has a top secret security clearance.

QQ. Maj. Gen. John B. Murphy: Major General Murphy has completed over 36 years of active military service; is a graduate of the United States Military Academy, the Command and General Staff School, and has the educational equivalent to the National War College; has been awarded the Silver Star for gallantry in action at Bitche, France, on December 16, 1944, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, and the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; was promoted to the grade of major general on November 6, 1953; and has a top secret security clearance.

RR. Col. Willis A. Perry: Colonel Perry has completed over 24 years of active military service; is a graduate of the United States Military Academy, the Command and General Staff School, the National War College; and has the educational equivalent to the Armed Forces Staff College; has been awarded the Legion of Merit; and has a top secret security clearance.

SS. Brig. Gen. Herbert B. Powell: Brigadier General Powell has completed over 28 years of active service; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff School and the National War College; has been awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, the Silver Star, the Legion of Merit with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Bronze Star Medal with 2 Oak Leaf Clusters, the Air Medal, the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant, and the Purple Heart; served as Chief of Staff of one of the Infantry Divisions in the European theater during World War II and commanded the 17th Infantry Regiment in Korea at the time that unit spearheaded the

advance to the Manchurian Border becoming the only United States unit to reach the Yalu River; and has a top secret security clearance. He was promoted to major general on October 1, 1954.

TT. Col. Roger G. Prentiss, Jr.: Colonel Prentiss has completed over 26 years of active military service; has been awarded the Legion of Merit; and has a top secret security clearance.

UU. Maj. William O. Prettyman, Jr.: Major Prettyman has completed over 13 years of active military service; has the educational equivalent to the Medical Field Service School; served in Europe during World War II; and has a top secret security clearance.

VV. Capt. Albert Robichaud: Captain Robichaud has completed over 12 years of active military service; is a graduate of the Counter Intelligence Corps School; has been awarded the Bronze Star Medal with one Oak Leaf Cluster; served both in Europe and in the China theater during World War II and in the Far East during the Korean hostilities; and has a top secret security clearance.

WW. Col. Donald H. Smith: Colonel Smith has completed over 13 years of active military service; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff College; has been awarded the Bronze Star Medal and the Purple Heart; served in the Mediterranean theater during World War II and in the Far East during the Korean conflict; and has a top secret security clearance.

XX. Maj. Gen. Daniel B. Strickler: Major General Strickler has completed over 11 years of active military service and 26 years of nonactive service; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff School; has been awarded the Silver Star with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster for valor, and the Purple Heart; served as a battalion and regimental commander in Europe during World War II and later commanded an infantry division in Europe; and has a top secret security clearance.

YY. Lt. Col. Ronald F. Thomas: Lieutenant Colonel Thomas has completed over 14 years of active military service and 12 years of nonactive service; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff School and the Counter Intelligence Corps School; has been awarded the Bronze Star Medal; was a battalion commander in Europe during World War II; and has a top secret security clearance.

ZZ. Maj. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau: Major General Trudeau has completed over 30 years of active military service; is a graduate of the United States Military Academy, the Engineer School, the Command and General Staff School, and the Army War College, and has the educational equivalent of the Command and General Staff College, the Armed Forces Staff College, and the National War College; has been awarded the Distinguished Service Medal with one Oak Leaf Cluster, the Silver Star Medal with one Oak Leaf Cluster for gallantry in action on April 12, 1953, and July 8, 1953, near Sokkagae, Korea, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal, the Air Medal and the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; has served in the Western Pacific during World War II and as commanding general, 7th Infantry Division in Korea during the recent hostilities there; and has a top secret security clearance.

AAA. Col. O. Elliot Ursin: Colonel Ursin has completed over 15 years of active military service; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff School; has been awarded the Bronze Star Medal and the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; served in the Southwest Pacific during World War II; and has a top secret security clearance.

BBB. Capt. Floyd E. Van Sickle, Jr.: Captain Van Sickle has completed over 14 years of active military service, has been awarded the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant, served in the Pacific Ocean area during World War II, was promoted to the grade of major in May of 1953, and has a top secret security clearance.

CCC. 1st Lt. William L. Vinette: First Lieutenant Vinette has completed over 7 years of active military service and 1 year of nonactive service; is a graduate of The Adjutant General's advanced officers' course; was promoted to the grade of captain on September 16, 1954; and has a secret security clearance.

DDD. Capt. Howard Wagner: Captain Wagner has completed over 15 years of military service; has been awarded the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; served in Europe during World War II; and has a top secret security clearance.

EEE. Col. William P. Wansboro: Colonel Wansboro has completed over 16 years of active military service; is a graduate of the United States Military Academy and the Army War College; has been awarded the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant, served in Europe during World War II; and has a top secret security clearance.

FFF. Lt. Gen. Walter L. Weible: Lieutenant General Weible has completed over 36 years of active military service; is a graduate of the Coast Artillery School, the Chemical Warfare School, the Command and General Staff School, the Army War College, the Army Industrial College, and has the educational equivalent to the National War College; has been awarded the Distinguished Service Medal with one Oak Leaf Cluster, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal, and the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; served in the Pacific during the last few months of World War II and in the Far East during the Korean conflict; and has a top secret security clearance.

GGG. Map. Gen. Miller B. White: Major General White has completed over 18 years of active military service and 15 years of nonactive service; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff School; has been awarded the Distinguished Service Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster and the Purple Heart; served as Director of Personnel, War Department General Staff, and also in the Mediterranean theater during World War II; and has a top secret security clearance.

HHH. Lt. Col. Eric E. Winn: Lieutenant Colonel Winn had completed over 29 years of active military service at the time of his retirement on September 30, 1954; was a graduate of the Counter Intelligence Corps School and the Strategic Intelligence School; served in Europe during World War II and in the Far East during the latter part of the Korean conflict; and had a top secret security clearance at the time of his retirement.

III. Maj. Gen. Robert N. Young: Major General Young has completed over 31 years of active military service; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff School and has the educational equivalent to the National War College; has been awarded the Distinguished Service Medal with one Oak Leaf Cluster, the Silver Star for gallantry in action in France on January 30, 1945, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal with one Oak Leaf Cluster, and the Purple Heart; served in Europe during World War II and commanded the 2d Infantry Division in Korea; and has a top secret security clearance.

JJJ. Brig. Gen. Ralph W. Zwicker: Brigadier General Zwicker has completed over 27 years of active military service; he is a graduate of the United States Military Academy, the Naval War College, and the National War College; he has been awarded the Silver Star for gallantry in action on the coast of Normandy on June 6, 1944, the Legion of Merit with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Bronze Star Medal with two Oak Leaf Clusters, and the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; he commanded an infantry regiment in combat during World War II, and was later made chief of staff of one of the infantry divisions in Europe; and he has a top secret security clearance.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Massachusetts for finally obtaining from the Army the information he has submitted for the RECORD. It was long overdue.

I also wish to thank the Senator from Massachusetts for joining in the resolution proposed by other Senators and myself to complete the investigations of this case and other cases of this nature which are still pending.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Texas for his statement.

ANIMADVERSIONS ON THE PRESIDENT AND THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I trust that my sense of humor will never forsake me in the new year. I made a resolution to that effect. I trust also that I shall not lack restraint and violate a rule of the Senate, and thus invite censure.

However, according to the morning newspapers, certain Democratic Members of a very distinguished legislative body enjoyed a political feast of reason and flow of wit on Sunday by assailing the Vice President and scoffing at the President's popularity, and flexed their vocal muscles for the front pages in the days to come.

One of them is quoted as saying: "We're not afraid of Eisenhower."

Another is quoted as saying, "I went after Eisenhower and my opponent."

Still another remarked, "This is open season on the Vice President," and then added, "We're not particularly afraid of the Vice President."

It is a little difficult for me to understand whether this is a naive kind of immaturity speaking, whether it is unconscious humor, or whether the cold-war drums are already beating. It sounds as if the happy slogan "I like Ike" is about to be changed to "I fight Ike."

Mr. President, the new theme song seems to be, "Who's Afraid of the Big Bad Wolf?"

The harmony which the President invited is apparently becoming the music of the spears—not spheres.

On the other hand, I remember, from my examinations of Shakespeare's Julius Caesar very long ago, the words: "The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars, but in ourselves, that we are underlings."

It may also be, in the words of that old English poet Pope, that all discord is "harmony not understood."

May it be that way.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and the minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], as acting majority leader I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution provides for the amendment of Senate Resolution 14, which was unanimously adopted by the Senate on last Thursday. The resolution deals with the size of committees during the 84th Congress and with the distribution of third-committee assignments.

On last Thursday third-committee assignments for the minority party were left at 3, when they should have been increased to 5. The resolution of amendment simply takes care of the oversight, and provides that, while the distribution between the majority and the minority in the Senate shall be 49 to 47, the majority party shall have 16 third-committee assignments and the minority party 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 19) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That during the 84th Congress rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, as amended by Senate Resolution 14, 84th Congress, agreed to January 6, 1955, is further amended by striking out "three", where it first appears in section (4) (a) of such rule, and inserting in lieu thereof "five."

PROPOSED COMMISSION ON PERSONNEL SECURITY—THE CASE OF WOLF LADEJINSKY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it had been my intention to introduce a joint resolution today, which I had prepared, having to do with a joint commission for the purpose of studying our personnel security program. I have prepared a short statement on the subject, which will explain the purpose I had in mind, and also the reason for the delay in the presentation of this particular legislative proposal.

Mr. President, many of us are seriously concerned with the present operations of our Government's security program, as it pertains to Federal personnel.

All of us put foremost the security of our country and want the program to fully serve that purpose, but believe, as the President apparently does, that such security can and must be achieved with fairness and justice to Government employees.

The President has set forth his own personal code of fair play on many occasions, and most recently emphasized his pledge of fairness and respect for individual rights in his message to this Congress. Our task now is to see that such fair treatment of individuals is exemplified by deed rather than word.

The most recent example of inconsistency and injustice under this program is that of Wolf Ladejinsky, a veteran career officer of our Government, with an outstanding record of combatting communism which is recognized by leaders of both parties. The full background of this unfortunate case has been publicly aired, and need not now be fully reviewed. Yet the tragic fact remains that even after supposedly full clearance, a cloud hangs over this man, in spite of the fact that he is being asked to undertake a sensitive position in a vital area of the world.

According to the FOA, the decision to clear Mr. Ladejinsky was based on an up-to-date review of all available information, which included a full background investigation by the FBI. Mr. Ladejinsky is being given a very important assignment in one of the crucial and critical areas of the world, Vietnam.

Mr. President, I digress from my prepared statement to say that in that particular area of the world we are in the very important stages of the aftereffects of a negotiated truce and agreement. What develops there may very well indicate to us what will develop in all southeast Asia.

It is in Vietnam, or in Indonesia, where the struggle between freedom and communism is at white heat. Yet our Foreign Operations Administration finds Mr. Ladejinsky qualified in every degree for this very sensitive assignment.

Despite this fact, the Secretary of Agriculture persists in maintaining that Mr. Ladejinsky is a security risk and could not be cleared for employment in the Department of Agriculture as an agricultural attaché.

This is a preposterous, incredible, and almost unbelievable example of cruel and inhuman treatment of a fellow American. It is one thing for responsible officers of this Government to argue privately their respective positions on an important matter or case. It is an entirely different thing, however, to have an officer of the Government of Cabinet rank persist in making charges against a public servant who has given many years of service to his country when other high officials and Government departments have publicly stated that the public servant—in this case Mr. Ladejinsky—was cleared and was suitable for responsible assignment.

The Ladejinsky case has gotten out of hand. Mr. Ladejinsky is being persecuted, he is being abused, and he is being asked to take a very important assignment in a critical area of the world while a Cabinet officer of the Government continues to harass him and question his loyalty and fitness.

To be sure, this makes a mockery of the President's security program. It exposes our Government before the whole world as being one of confusion and contradiction. It truly challenges the leadership of the President as the Chief Executive of this Nation.

Either Mr. Ladejinsky is a good security risk or a poor one; he is either loyal or disloyal; he is either competent or incompetent, and we can no longer tolerate having high officials of the administration publicly making conflicting charges and countercharges on this matter.

Mr. President, I digress to point out that the State Department cleared Mr. Ladejinsky. The Foreign Operations Administration cleared him. Both departments hold him available for assignment on sensitive projects. Does the Department of Agriculture have some information so supersecret that the security clearance of Mr. Ladejinsky in the State Department, under Mr. McLeod, and the security clearance by the Foreign Operations Administration, were not sufficiently good, honorable, and acceptable to the Department of Agriculture?

I think it would be well if our colleagues find out what is the secret which the Department of Agriculture may have.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not at this moment. I shall yield to the Senator from Vermont at the conclusion of my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota declines to yield at this time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the real tragedy in this case is what is being done to a fellow human being. Where is the humanity of this administration? Where is the compassion, the decency, and the morality of this administration? Did not the President tell us that the difference between communism and democracy is essentially one of how we treat people? I ask the administration this question: How are you treating Mr. Ladejinsky? When will this man be confronted with the charges against him, charges by a Cabinet officer who has continued to assail his character and his fitness to serve his Government? Where is the rule of fair play in this case?

Frankly, the time has arrived for the President of the United States to put his official house in order. The rule of law is giving way to the rule of stubborn men. High sounding pious phrases are no substitute for straightforward honest talk and explanation.

No person in Government is safe or secure if this kind of capricious action is permitted to continue. The entire civil service of our Government is under attack and being slowly undermined.

Mr. President, I wish to make it crystal clear that I support a security program. I believe in a most careful scrutiny in carrying out such a program. I would say that if all departments of Government had found Mr. Ladejinsky a poor security risk, there would be no argument. But the truth is that only one department has found Mr. Ladejinsky to be a bad risk; two other departments have found him to be a good risk and a good servant of the Government, competent, fit, and available for a sensitive assignment.

The morale of Government workers in key positions can no longer stand this kind of confusion, contradiction, and castigation.

If Mr. Benson really believes that Mr. Ladejinsky is such a bad security risk, then he should take his case to the White House for a decision, because two of his fellow Cabinet members have disagreed with him.

The Ladejinsky case is now a top priority subject of Presidential decision. Apparently, according to the FOA and the press dispatches, Mr. Ladejinsky has been cleared with White House approval. If this be true, then Mr. Benson should either apologize or resign, because he is in open conflict with his own Government.

But the Ladejinsky case is but a symbol of the flaws in our security program that would ever let such a situation develop. It is to the removal of such flaws that we should direct our attention. It is proper for the appropriate committees of the Congress to act without delay toward analyzing, studying, and exposing such flagrant abuses and inconsistencies in our security program.

Mr. President, the security program is important. It must not be played with, and it must not be made to look as if it has no continuity, consistency, or coherence.

But our responsibility goes behind that. Confidence of the public must be restored in both the effectiveness of our security program, and its fairness. It is very important that we emphasize its fairness. To do that, the entire unfortunate situation that has developed around our security program, including attempts to use it as a political weapon, must be lifted above the realm of politics, and above the realm of partisan bias either on the part of the administration or the majority party or the minority party in the Congress.

It has been in a sincere attempt to reach that high level that I have publicly proposed a bipartisan commission on personnel security, composed both of people from within our Government and distinguished citizens from outside the Government in whom the American people can have full confidence.

I appreciate the constructive interest that has been shown by a number of my colleagues in this proposal. I am pleased at the support that has been voiced for it by Members of the Senate and Members of the House of Representatives. I have made it in good faith, and I believe it to be in the best interests of the American people as a whole, regardless of party.

My proposal is to get the entire question on higher ground, because we are talking about the security of our Nation and we are talking about people. We want both security and fairness, and the program does not need to become the plaything of anyone. Instead, it is the solemn, hard duty, and responsibility of all of us. Security is something that cannot be lightly tampered with, nor should the fundamental rights of individuals under our democratic processes.

Although it was my intention to introduce today a joint resolution calling for the creation of such a Commission, the widespread interest that has been manifested in this proposal has led me to defer such action pending further consultation with leaders of all committees which might be concerned and with other Senators on both sides of the aisle who have expressed interest and concern about this problem. I should like to say we wish to have support and help from Senators on both sides of the aisle.

It is my hope that common accord can be reached on the scope of activities of such a Commission as the one I have in mind in making a bona fide, constructive, long-range approach to providing our country with effective security protection, without jeopardizing fundamental rights of individuals under our Constitution—in other words, to prove that a free society can guard itself against subversion and at the same time can protect the liberties and the rights of its citizenry. In this way we shall prove to ourselves and to the rest of the world that we can exercise careful guard over the liberties of our people and the security of our country. They are not incompatible; in fact, they stand together, and they must be protected together.

Therefore, Mr. President, the joint resolution will be presented to this body as soon as the consultations I have in mind have been completed. I wish to receive the benefit of the counsel and judgment of all who have expressed interest similar to my own.

In concluding these remarks, Mr. President, I say that I welcome whatever help, guidance, and assistance may come from my friends on the Republican side or from my friends on the Democratic side. My hope is that we shall be able to proceed in an orderly way and to conduct ourselves in a fashion which will bring respect to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I am merely seeking information. Can the Senator from Minnesota advise the Senate as to when Mr. Ladejinsky was first cleared by the State Department for service in Japan?

Mr. HUMPHREY. He was cleared twice, let me say, according to the information I have.

Mr. AIKEN. Can the Senator from Minnesota give the approximate dates when Mr. Ladejinsky was cleared?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be glad to submit that information in the RECORD. The detail of the dates is not clear. But I have checked with the State Department. He has been cleared twice. The last time—if I am not mistaken—was in March 1953. But I am not sure of that date.

Mr. AIKEN. When was the first time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. He was cleared twice by this administration.

Mr. AIKEN. But he was working in Japan before this administration took office, was he not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, yes; he was working with General MacArthur; and I understand that General MacArthur held him in high esteem.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. Ladejinsky was cleared by the State Department for service in Japan before the present administration took office, was he not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand he was cleared before this administration took office, and that he was cleared twice by this administration. He is a career civil servant.

Mr. AIKEN. But the question I asked was whether he was cleared by the State Department.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; in this administration.

Mr. AIKEN. Was he cleared by the State Department before this administration took office?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Both; he was cleared before this administration took office, and he was cleared twice by Mr. McLeod.

Mr. AIKEN. In other words, the Senator from Minnesota thinks, does he not, that Mr. Ladejinsky was voluntarily cleared by Secretary Acheson?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not sure whether Secretary Acheson cleared him or not. I am sure that Mr. Ladejinsky was cleared twice by the present State Department and present administration.

Mr. AIKEN. But the Senator from Minnesota agrees, does he not, that Secretary Acheson should have cleared Mr. Ladejinsky before he went to work in Japan?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I imagine so, and that undoubtedly he should have been cleared under the loyalty program. But obviously he was cleared by General MacArthur, who had a very good security system.

Mr. AIKEN. But my question is whether Mr. Ladejinsky was cleared by Secretary Acheson.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In honest answer to that question, I must say I do not know. But I do know that he was cleared twice by the present State Department officialdom.

I should like to give the Senator from Vermont an answer to his question; I am not evading it. If Mr. Ladejinsky worked for the State Department, the presumption is that he was cleared. But I do not think that is at all the problem presently before us.

Mr. AIKEN. But I think it is very important.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What is important, in my opinion, is that he has been cleared by the Foreign Operations Administration; and he has been cleared twice by the State Department since January 1953; and he has been cleared within the past 10 days. Yet one officer of this Government persists in saying that Mr. Ladejinsky is a security risk.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator from Minnesota agree that much of the so-called magnificent work that Mr. Ladejinsky performed in Japan—and I do not say it was not good work; in fact, I understand it was—was done before the present administration took office?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Therefore he must have been cleared by Secretary of State Acheson.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I imagine he was. The Senator from Vermont wanted a statement of facts. I am giving him what facts I know, and I would be delighted to look into the question he raises and ascertain the facts. I called up the State Department 2 days before Christmas, when I saw that this cruel and inhumane act had occurred, and in some sense of righteous indignation, I spoke to the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Brown. The Assistant Secretary of State and the Secretary of State were not available; I could not reach them. So I spoke to the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, and I asked the pointed question, "Has Mr. Ladejinsky been cleared by your Department?"

The answer was, "Yes; he has been cleared twice."

I asked, "When?"

The reply was, "Under the administration of Mr. Dulles, since January 1953."

I presume Mr. Ladejinsky was cleared by the Acheson State Department administration. If Mr. Ladejinsky worked overseas, he should have been so cleared. But that is not the point. The point in this matter is that there is one security program, and it is operated under executive order. That security program should operate uniformly. There should be a board of review or a board of appeals, in case there may be conflict between agencies. But there is no such board.

Mr. President, in this instance we see equally responsible high officials disagreeing on the basis of findings and on the basis of investigatory examination by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. We see the State Department, which prides itself today on top-level security clearance, being told by officers in the Department of Agriculture, "Your clearance in the State Department is not adequate for clearance in the Department of Agriculture."

I say, first, that that is an insult to the State Department. Or, perhaps, in the light of the charges, the State Department is not sufficiently careful. I happen to believe that it is. I am not in possession of the facts. All I know is that there is an honest disagreement.

In the meantime, not only is our Government embarrassed, not only are Members of Congress embarrassed, but the character of a distinguished public servant, Mr. Wolf Ladejinsky, who has proved for 20 years to be an outstanding opponent of communism and a proponent of effective democracy, has been attacked. I say that is not fair. This man is either good or bad. Either he is a security risk or he is not. I ask that the question be cleared up.

PRICES OF POULTRY AND OTHER FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to bring to the attention of all Senators one of the most important letters I have received in a long time. It is from an outstanding lady in the State of North Dakota, a member of a pioneer family. I received the letter this morning. It comes from Lake Williams, N. Dak., and reads as follows:

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: For a long time I've been thinking about writing to you but put it off. I have wondered to myself, just why, but think the main reason was that I didn't have any faith in it as to doing any good to write and when one doesn't have faith and hope one doesn't have much, does one?

Several days ago over the news reports I heard that Senator YOUNG from North Dakota was going to try to have all North Dakota declared a disaster area so we would be eligible for loans. Why? We farmers don't want loans. We don't need loans, if we get a fair price for our produce, unless we have a drought, of course.

I sold old hens last fall for 6 cents a pound. A Leghorn hen, and a fair one, too, weighs 3 pounds alive. I got 18 cents for her.

In order that there may be no misunderstanding, I want every Senator to realize that this woman received 18 cents for a fine Leghorn hen.

Continuing with the letter:

I sold at least 100 spring chickens for 50 cents each. How can one raise and produce for the market at that price? I hope our pal Benson has chicken for dinner once in a while at that price.

I sold pullet eggs for 6 cents a dozen.

I notice that my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], is listening quite interestedly. I know that this letter will remind him of the drought area. We were in a terrible situation during the drought. Even at that time, however, the prices of eggs and chickens were no less than they apparently are at the present time.

I sold pullet eggs for 6 cents a dozen. We got that back in the thirties, but then we bought coffee for 25 cents a pound. Today it is $1.25. To be fair, we should have 35 cents to 40 cents a dozen for eggs, and at least $1 to $1.25 for live chickens. We farmers are good spenders if we can make it. We also like nice cars to drive, nice bathrooms and refrigerators, and so forth. Our men like new tractors and modern machinery to lighten the work, but our hog and cattle prices are so far out of line that we just can't buy them after paying our taxes and buy everyday things; and every year we are getting older, too.

Why can't we have things more balanced so we could all make a good living and have a little security?

Well, Senator, I am sorry if I have wasted some of your valuable time, but I have wanted to write this for a long time.

Thank you anyway.

Sincerely,

Mrs. LLOYD RANDALL,
A Farm Wife.

LAKE WILLIAMS, N. DAK.

This outstanding, fair-minded lady is a member of one of the pioneer families of the State of North Dakota. She is not a crank. I think she has a legitimate complaint. I am placing this letter in the RECORD because I have received similar complaints from other sources. Some are not quite so serious as this one. I ask that the letter be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, in the hope that some action may be taken which will eliminate the situation with which, apparently, farmers all over the country are faced in connection with chicken and egg prices.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ADDRESS BY BERNARD M. BARUCH AT ANNUAL WINGS CLUB DINNER

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I should like to place in the RECORD the text of an address delivered by one of our most outstanding Americans, Mr. Bernard M. Baruch. His talk was given at a recent annual dinner of the Wings Club, in New York City.

I believe my colleagues will be particularly interested in that part of the address which embraces a thought-provoking recommendation of this patriotic and experienced citizen, namely, the enlargement of the National Security Council so as to include some outstanding patriotic citizens. Their sole task would be to study and think through, for the Council's benefit, the growing problems in connection with our domestic and foreign policies in their relationship to our national security.

I ask that this interesting address be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. BERNARD M. BARUCH AT ANNUAL WINGS CLUB DINNER

It is the strange and ironic paradox of our times that the fruits of human genius are so versatile that they may be employed for either the destruction or salvation of mankind. The airplane may shower death upon the earth or bind the peoples and nations of the world together in ties of peaceful commerce. Atomic energy is capable of extinguishing civilization or of raising it to undreamed-of heights of prosperity and progress. If this be the paradox of our time, it is also the challenge. We must so order the world that the power of modern science and technology will be devoted only to the enrichment of life. If we have courage and the wisdom atomic energy may, as Sir Winston Churchill noted, eliminate war itself instead of destroying civilization.

I do not intend to lecture an audience such as this on the problems and potentialities of aviation. But it seems to me that this industry faces the same basic problem and dilemma that confronts us all.

That basic problem is, of course, the cold war. Strange as it may seem, for 40 years we have been either going into or coming out of war. We Americans understand peace and its ways. To a much lesser extent we understand war and its ways. Though we have committed grievous errors in the domestic and economic aspects of war—errors for which we are still paying in the inflation which wracked our economy—in the huge national debt—still, we have managed to pull through. But in these times we are neither at war nor at peace. Some might say that we are both at war and at peace. We have had to adjust ourselves to a situation new to our experience and, indeed, alien to our understanding. The aviation industry, for example, must maintain its military program and devote its research and resources—its best minds—to the unpleasant prospect of war. At the same time it must follow its legitimate peacetime interests. If the industry—and the Nation—have taken on a split personality, it is not surprising. The cold war has generated a good deal of confusion in the land. Unhappily, after 6 years,

I have seen no determined and constructive effort to dispel this confusion.

We simply have not thought through all the problems confronting us, in all their interrelationships. After 6 years of cold war have we, for example, decided what our economic policy should be toward our antagonists, our allies, or the neutralists? Have we devised a global strategy to replace the disjointed and piecemeal responses with which, for so long, we met the Soviet challenge? Have we determined the condition upon which we are willing to reach an agreement with the Soviets? Have we cataloged all the elements of our strength and weakness and have we succeeded in correcting the latter?

These and many other problems are still to be thought through. The course we would pursue in peace will not do now. Nor will the course which war dictates. We need fresh thinking.

I have long advocated the enlargement of the National Security Council to include the most able and experienced men whose sole task would be to study and think through the problems of our times. The present members of the National Security Council are already overburdened with administrative and departmental duties. They simply do not have time for continuous thought. The group I envision, composed of men of the highest caliber, would be nonpartisan not bipartisan. Their examination of a problem and their recommendations would be free from any taint of politics or political controversy which exists between parties and even branches of Government.

I do not advocate that thinking be confined to a select body in Washington. Each of us must do some fresh thinking for himself. Our arsenal for war is mighty. Our instruments for peace are many—but they are all useless unless reason and intelligence direct them. We need a new campaign in America—a campaign to get the facts, not as we would like them to be, but as they are. If the facts are not palatable we are entitled to change them. If we cannot do that, we must adjust to them. But we cannot ignore them or run away from them save at our own peril.

This search for the facts is particularly important now when the Soviet Union seems to be showing an interest tending toward a modus vivendi. No one hopes more fervently than I that peace can be made a reality. But it will not come easily and we must not permit ourselves to be deceived. Now, more than ever before, we need clear thinking. Until peace is attained we must be prepared for war. I have urged a standby mobilization program which would permit us, in an instant, to throw all our strength, economic and spiritual as well as military, into any conflict. Such a program is still essential.

We need strength and we need clear thinking. These we can have only if we devote our hearts and our minds to the well-being of our Nation as we do to the success of our personal affairs. We must remember always that our fate is one with the fate of America. We cannot separate our own best interests from the best interest of the country. We must—all of us—think of our own problems, our own needs, our own hopes within the context of the problems, the needs, and the objectives of the country. This land is our proud possession and protector. It is one for all. It must be all for one—America.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLEMENTS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 11, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 10, 1955:

Department of State

George V. Allen, of North Carolina, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

Diplomatic and Foreign Service

Henry A. Byroade, of Indiana, now an Assistant Secretary of State, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Egypt.

John L. Tappin, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Kingdom of Libya, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

Department of Agriculture

Ervin L. Peterson, of Oregon, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Department of Commerce

Philip Alexander Ray, of California, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

Treasury Department

David W. Kendall, of Michigan, to be General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Department of the Navy

Albert Pratt, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

Comptroller General of the United States

Joseph Campbell, of New York, to be Comptroller General of the United States for a term of 15 years, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Lindsay C. Warren, retired.

Export-Import Bank of Washington

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

Glen E. Edgerton, of the District of Columbia, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

Lynn U. Stambaugh, of North Dakota, to be First Vice President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

Hawthorne Arey, of Nebraska, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

George A. Blowers, of Florida, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

Vance Brand, of Ohio, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

Commodity Credit Corporation

Ervin L. Peterson, of Oregon, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Federal Communications Commission

George C. McConnaughey, of Ohio, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1950, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

Federal Maritime Board

Ben H. Guill, of Texas, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1957, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

G. Joseph Minetti, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1958, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

Director of Locomotive Inspection

John A. Hall, of California, to be Director of Locomotive Inspection, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

Atomic Energy Commission

John Von Neumann, of New Jersey, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the term expiring June 30, 1959, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

National Labor Relations Board

Theophil Carl Kammholz, of Illinois, to be general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 4 years, vice George J. Bott, term expired.

National Security Training Commission

Albert J. Hayes, of Maryland, to be a member of the National Security Training Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 19, 1958, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

Collector of Customs

Walter B. Heisel, of Alaska, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 31, with headquarters at Juneau, Alaska, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

Supreme Court of the United States

John Marshall Harlan, of New York, to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, vice Robert H. Jackson, deceased.

United States District Judges

Edward J. Devitt, of Minnesota, to be United States district judge for the district of Minnesota. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

William E. Miller, of Tennessee, to be United States district judge for the middle district of Tennessee, to fill a new position.

United States Marshal

M. Frank Reid, of South Carolina, to be United States marshal for the western district of South Carolina. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

United States Public Health Service

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service:

I. FOR APPOINTMENT, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW AND REGULATIONS, TO BE EFFECTIVE DATE OF ACCEPTANCE

To be senior assistant surgeons

Kenneth W. Momeyer, Jr.
Len H. Andrus

To be assistant surgeons

Allen C. Pirkle
John F. Lee, Jr.

II. FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION

To be surgeons

William L. Ross, Jr.
Roger L. Black

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers

Lawrence C. Gray
Melvin W. Carter
Shinji Soneda

To be scientist

Colvin L. Gibson

To be senior sanitarian

Maurice E. Odoroff

To be veterinarian

Samuel Abramson

To be nurse officer

Marie F. Hansel

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Ralph A. Ofstie, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

Vice Adm. Thomas S. Combs, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Air).

Rear Adm. Harold P. Smith, United States Navy, to be Director of Budget and Reports in the Department of the Navy for a term of 3 years.

Adm. John E. Gingrich, United States Navy, retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

Vice Adm. Murrey L. Royar, Supply Corps, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Chief of Naval Material.

Rear Adm. Ralph J. Arnold, Supply Corps, United States Navy, to be Paymaster General and Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the line and staff corps indicated:

LINE

John H. Sides
Victor D. Long
Henry Crommelin
Redfield Mason
Edward N. Parker
Edmund B. Taylor
Frederick B. Warder
George C. Wright
David M. Tyree
Lewis S. Parks
Willard K. Goodney
Frederick N. Kivette
Ira E. Hobbs
Harry H. Henderson
Joseph H. Wellings
Joseph M. Carson
Charles F. Chillingworth, Jr.
John Sylvester
John M. Taylor
James S. Russell
Henry C. Bruton
Robert B. Pirie
Edwin T. Layton
Frederick R. Furth
Robert L. Swart
Schuyler N. Pyne
Robert E. Cronin
Chester C. Smith
Harold O. Larson
Thomas Burrowes
Donald C. Varian
Albert E. Jarrell
William G. Beecher, Jr.
Charles H. Lyman III
Paul D. Stroop
Fitzhugh Lee
Frank O'Beirne
Francis D. McCorkle
Elton W. Grenfell
Charles A. Buchanan
William G. Cooper
Clifford H. Duerfeldt
George C. Weaver
Albert G. Mumma

MEDICAL CORPS

James R. Fulton
Ocie B. Morrison, Jr.

SUPPLY CORPS

Lloyd H. Thomas
Joel D. Parks
William L. Knickerbocker

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

William Sihler

DENTAL CORPS

Ralph W. Taylor

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, section 306 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948, and section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

MAJOR TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL

Air Force

Leggette, Frank Browne, 18072A.
Patty, Homer Emmitt, 18102A.
Hills, Kenneth Bruce, 5680A.
Goodmanson, Murel Matthew, 5681A.
Holden, Paul Cole, 5682A.
Atwell, Lawrence Austin, 5683A.
Cope, William Samuel, 5684A.
×Leverette, William Lawrence, 5685A.
Edwards, Robert Bruce, 5687A.
Conkling, Emmett Virgil, 5688A.
Walsh, Michael Joseph, 5689A.
Taylor, Thomas Edward, 5690A.
Norcia, Benjamin, 5694A.
Pettit, Weldon Monroe, 5695A.
Milliff, John, 19652A.
×Anderson, Arlo Sell, 5696A.
Hohs, Robert Leo, 5697A.
Ray, Robert Homer, 5698A.
Brill, Norris, 5700A.
Hogg, Robert, 5701A.
Scruggs, John Alexander, 5702A.
Carney, John Kilker, 5703A.
Hallem, Louis Carlyle, 5704A.
Hibbits, Francis Leonard, 5705A.
Mellinger, Robert Thomas, 5706A.
Glaenzer, Charles F., 5707A.
Wilson, Walter George, 5710A.
Nudell, Fred Wellington, 5711A.
Staskewitz, Benjamin Edward, 5712A.
×Gromak, Anthony Edward, 5713A.
Dean, David Kennedy, 5714A.
Mayberry, Samuel Waller, Jr., 5716A.
Johnston, William Edward, 5717A.
Chilcote, Charles Arthur, 5718A.
Hensley, Joseph Woodrow, 5719A.
Barr, Jennings Monroe, 5720A.
Reeves, Elmo, 5723A.
McCombs, Harold Kelly, 5725A.
Gray, Russell Earl, 5726A.
White, Richard Durwin, 5728A.
Sutton, John Liggett, 5729A.
Bailey, Harry Banks, 5730A.
Norman, William Roy, 5732A.
Griffin, Julious Columbus, 5733A.
Rigney, Charles Edward, 5734A.
Reising, Albert John, 5735A.
Pryor, Charles Donald, 5736A.
Koenig, Perier Arnold, 5738A.
Duty, William Burkett, 5739A.
Slough, Andrew Elmer, 5741A.
Mellor, Elfred Lionel, 5743A.
Ahrens, William Carl, 5744A.
Tigner, Edwin Brown, 5745A.
Myers, Earle Russell, 5746A.
Kappeler, Frank Albert, 5747A.
Stiglich, John Jack, 5748A.
Jenkins, Leaton Elbert, 5749A.
Hunter, Russell Bruce, 5750A.
Holmes, Merrill Dennis, 5751A.
Swanson, Charles Kenneth, 5752A.
Dougal, Robert Elliot, 5754A.
Finley, William H., 5755A.
Hays, John Bennett, 5756A.
Doornbos, Philip Ogden, 5757A.
Decker, Robert Young, 5758A.
Roberts, Gore Frederick, 5759A.
Youngman, Reginald Bunker, 5760A.
Buttmann, Oscar, 5761A.
×Mills, Eugene Spencer, Jr., 5762A.
Smith, Clyde Harrison, 5763A.
×Leavitt, William Job, 5764A.
Lockman, Daniel Barkley, 5765A.
Townsend, Barry Baldwin, 6847A.
Morrison, Harry James, 5767A.
George, John Louis, 5768A.
Sturgis, James Edwin, 5769A.
Eliasen, Arnold Clarence, 5770A.
Gordon, William Price, Jr., 5771A.
Parr, Albert Thomas, 5772A.
Babb, Claude Andrew, 5773A.
Acker, Halbert Hammond, 5775A.
Nickels, Loren Smith, 5777A.
Therrien, Patrick Elogius, 5780A.
Barrow, Tom Lee, 5781A.
Ross, John Samuel, 5782A.
Shaw, Donald Adrian, 5783A.
Wansley, Theodore, 5784A.
Verbeek, Harry Peter, 5786A.
Raley, Claude Mason, 5787A.
Carson, William James, 5788A.
Pedersen, Carl Emil, 5789A.
Bowden, William Martin, 5790A.
Toye, Edward Eugene, 5792A.
Jensen, Ralph Soren, 5793A.
Bazan, Edward Theodore, 5794A.
Bradley, Francis Trenholm, 5795A.
Mann, Edward Milton, 5796A.
Miller, Thomas Aldred, 5797A.
Wood, Thomas Donnelley, 5798A.
Kellum, George Glenn, Jr., 5799A.
Goodwin, Vaughn Kirk, 5801A.
Sherborne, Henry Hall, 5803A.
Thompson, Dillard Norman, 5804A.
Spieth, Robert, 5806A.
Larson, Edwin Cecil, 5808A.
Thiele, Harold Edwin, 5809A.
Riley, Joseph Richmond, 5811A.
Cram, Reginald Maurice, 5812A.
McCracken, Rufus LeRoy, 5813A.
Schweitzer, John Henry, 5814A.
Nyblade, Walter Frederick, 5815A.
Harlow, Paul Norman, 5816A.
Lichter, Carl Jerome, 5817A.
Weaver, Frederick, 5820A.
Westwood, John Raymond, 5821A.
Thomas, Clarence Lamar, 5822A.
Pittman, Bernard Merrill, 5823A.
Foster, Gilbert, 5824A.
Copeland, Lewis Anderson, 5826A.
Horvath, John, 5828A.
Fiss, Robert Wendell, 5829A.
Sullivan, Frederick Edward, 5830A.
Beck, Abe Jack, 5831A.
Minahan, John Carroll, 5832A.
Schudel, Charles Richard, 5833A.
Fowell, Byron Ronald, 5834A.
×Lewis, Samuel Henry, 5835A.
Lyons, Charles Maxwell, 5836A.
Goetzke, Kenneth Herman, 5839A.
Whittle, Frederick James, 5840A.
Pollock, Keith Kermit, 5841A.
Hartbrodt, Frederick Alexander Vincent, 5842A.
Markovich, George Michael, 5843A.
Bottoms, Robert Leland, 5845A.
Walker, Roy Ralph, 5846A.
Purcell, Charles Joseph, 5849A.
Donohue, Elwood Paul, 5852A.
James, Newton Elder, 5854A.
Sawrie, William Ernest, 5855A.
Dinsmore, Dwight Reginald, 5856A.
Vickery, Benjamin Patterson, Jr., 5857A.
Archer, Oneal John Thomas, 5858A.
Behrens, George Herman, 5859A.
Jones, Allen Newton, Jr., 5862A.
Longino, Dick Randolph, Jr., 5864A.
Wilson, Frederick William Hildebrand, 5865A.
Greene, Benjamin Olin, Jr., 5866A.
Query, Jack DeWitt, 5868A.
True, Oscar Harold, 5869A.
Wolf, John Joseph, 5870A.
Perry, Horace Edward, 5871A.
Berger, Kenneth Stephen, 5872A.
×Cowan, Marion Glenn, 5873A.
Urbach, Leonard Henry, 5874A.
Taylor, William Vaughn, 5875A.
Mattison, Robert Martin, 5877A.
Hudson, John Henry, 5878A.
Jordan, Ralph Schaffer, 5879A.
Simmons, Joe Linn, 5880A.
Eichholz, Jerome Charles, 5882A.
Rotkis, Walter Anton, 5883A.
Miller, Walter Frederick, 5885A.
Dalton, Bernard Vincent, 5886A.
Salome, Richard Arlan, 5889A.
Prewitt, Jack Kenneth, 5890A.
Kirkpatrick, Marshall Armine, 5891A.
McCash, Donald Kendall, 5892A.
Stuart, John Montgomery, Jr., 5893A.
Griffin, Harry Norval, 5894A.
Craig, Joe Congdon, 5895A.
Gibson, William Herf, 5896A.
Dalto, John, 5897A.
Voss, Nathaniel Reid, Jr., 5898A.
Summers, Clarence Eugene, Jr., 5899A.
Matthews, Edward Everett, 5901A.
Leet, Jonathan, 5902A.
Youngblood, Curtis Nolan, 5903A.
McCarthy, John Francis, Jr., 5904A.
Reeves, Ernest Arthur, 5905A.
Manthos, Atlee George, 5906A.
Hennessy, Robert John, 5907A.
Hehrer, Kenneth, 5908A.
Davey, Kenneth William, 5909A.
Brandau, Otto Henry, 5910A.
Hall, Charles Edward, 5911A.
Warren, John Edgar, 5912A.
Carr, Richard Pendleton, 5913A.
Garrett, Skidmore Neale, 5915A.
Mosman, Ormond John, 5916A.
Callaway, Richard Dowdy, 5917A.

Couch, Alexander Pritchard, 5918A.
Montgomery, Guilford Roland, 5919A.
McCauley, Clarence Vernon, 5920A.
Chick, Lewis William, Jr., 5921A.
Konopacki, Hubert John, 5923A.
Baker, Ancil David, 5924A.
Green, Franklyn Thomas, 5925A.
Pardee, Elliott Thomas, 5926A.
Olmsted, Charles Thaddeus, 5927A.
Carmack, John Edgar, 5928A.
Sturges, Claude C., Jr., 5929A.
North, Charles Lewis, 5933A.
Ranck, Nathan Hoover, 5935A.
Maas, Charles Fundin, 5936A.
Hollier, Frederick Frank, Jr., 5937A.
Powell, Joseph Harllee, 5940A.
Moritz, Gene Phillip, 5941A.
Thornton, Julian Roy, Jr., 5942A.
Watts, John Ruben, 5943A.
Druhe, Hubert Kenneth, 5944A.
Joseph, Franklin Arthur, 5947A.
Harrington, George Elliott, 5948A.
Williams, Leslie Benjamin, 5949A.
Geanetos, George Stephen, 5950A.
Moore, John Alton, 5951A.
Wilson, Charles Smith, 5952A.
Sansone, Rocco, 5953A.
Heene, Fred Lewis, 5954A.
Sulloway, Alexander Mark, 5955A.
Durham, Benjamin Jasper, Jr., 5957A.
Stitts, Glenn Theodore, 5958A.
Helfort, Albert Francis, 5959A.
Works, Le Eustis, 5960A.
Payton, Theodore Franklin, 5961A.
Del Missier, Bruno Carl, 5962A.
Archuleta, Rubel Vigil, 5963A.
Taylor, Ben, 5964A.
Allen, Samuel Lawrence, 5965A.
Oliver, Robert Russell, 5967A.
Huston, Sherman Leroy, 5968A.
Woods, Everett Newton, 5969A.
Cox, Robert Lewis, 5970A.
McNally, Joseph Edward, 5971A.
Hajek, Raymond Rowland, 5973A.
Gardner, Laurence Ernest, 5974A.
McGarry, James Michael, Jr., 5976A.
Smith, Robert Channell, 5978A.
Tillery, James Hightower, 5979A.
Gaddis, Albert Crawford, 5980A.
Edwing, Donald Edwin, 5981A.
Dice, Evan Adams, 5983A.
Neely, Russell Wayne, 5984A.
Bonvicin, Emanuel Frank, 5985A.
Strom, Charles Walter, 5986A.
Barrett, John Patrick, 5987A.
Forrest, Edward Lester, 5988A.
Allensworth, Hubert Lasater, 5990A.
Fornal, Joseph John, 5991A.
Koontz, Thomas Gale, 5992A.
Rowan, M. C., Jr., 5993A.
×Hounshell, Claude Eugene, 5994A.
Smith, Rodney Ellsworth, 5995A.
Schaffner, William Joseph, 5996A.
Wilson, John McLain, 5997A.
Dixon, Brendan, 5998A.
Beville, Claude, Jr., 5999A.
Marks, Russell Herbert, 6000A.
Shepperd, Virgil Earl, 6002A.
D'Annibale, Vincent James, 6004A.
Magee, Ernest Maurice, 6006A.
Langford, Karl Albert, 6007A.
Darnold, Charles Reese, 6008A.
Pike, Robert Francis, 6009A.
Coffey, John Donald, 6010A.
Tribble, Randolph Louis, 6011A.
Lind, Harold August, 6012A.
Shaka, Napoleon Athan, 6013A.
Tunks, Emerson Ambrose Anthony, 6014A.
Nichols, Thomas Brooks, 6015A.
Carney, James Franklin, 18070A.
Gilmore, John Thomas, 6016A.
Heran, Paul James, 6018A.
McGinnis, Paul Benedict, 6019A.
×Williams, James Willis, 6020A.
Uhrig, Robert A., 6021A.
Wildinger, Joseph Valentine, 6022A.
Watwood, Louis V., 6024A.
Knowles, Kenyon Leroy, 6025A.
Grimm, Charles Burton, 6027A.
Fisher, Philip Fitzgerald, 6028A.

Medical

Hoffman, Archie Arthur, 19222A.
McDonough, Joseph Francis, 19223A.
Miller, Hubert Wainright, 19224A.
Rizzolo, John, 19225A.

Dental

Traynham, Charles Hightower, 18892A.
Waldmann, Raymond George, 18893A.
Garrison, Grayson Gwynne, 18894A.

Veterinary

McIntyre, James Clayton, 18993A.

Medical Service

Baer, Reuben Albert, 19428A.
Miller, Rahe August, 19429A.
Clark, Robert Emory, 19430.
Currier, Clyde Charles, 19432A.

CAPTAIN TO MAJOR

Air Force

Douglas, Robert Emmet, 10572A.
Shaw, John Blackshire, Jr., 10846A.
Zick, Marvin Darrell, 10911A.
×Eddy, Harvey William, 10912A.
Rudig, James William, 10913A.
Ashton, Morton Ross, 10914A.
Benson, August Gerald, 10915A.
×Latkovich, George, Jr., 10916A.
×Melendez, Ismael Felix, 10917A.
Gallogly, William Francis, 10918A.
Sherman, John Edward, 10921A.
×Shepperd, William Morris, 10922A.
Timmons, Durward Earl, 10923A.
Brady, Bernard John, 10924A.
Huebner, William Anthony, 10925A.
×Vance, Zeb, Jr., 10926A.
Goller, Fred Franquet, 10927A.
Crawford, John Douglas, Jr., 10928A.
×Teliczan, Raymond Joseph, 10929A.
Bearden, Joe, 10930A.
Bralley, Walter Suvier, 10931A.
×Gudith, Roy Elmer, 10932A.
Sells, Orliff Vincent, 10933A.
Carson, Charles Raymond, 10934A.
Atkinson, Ivan Charles, 10935A.
Stow, Kenneth Reeves, 10936A.
×Smith, Charles Crowe, Jr., 10937A.
Wisniewski, Stanley Joseph, 10938A.
Tacker, Lawrence James, 10939A.
Krier, Rene John, 10940A.
Dannelly, Frank Porter, 10941A.
×Thomas, David Bernard, 10942A.
Werner, Crowell B., 10944A.
Miller, Emmett Hart, Jr., 10945A.
Radar, Thomas Owen, 10946A.
Sowerby, Theo James, 10947A.
Coakley, Donald Virgil, 10948A.
×Giddings, Richard Elmer, 10949A.
×DeGiacomo, Gene Michael, 10950A.
Dufresne, Roland Joseph, 10951A.
×VandeBogart, Warren Melendy, 10953A.
Rollings, Raymond Sydney, 10954A.
Royce, Ralph Scott, 10955A.
Lambert, Dwight Arden, 10957A.
Spears, Byron Polk, 10958A.
Jensen, Willard Cecillius, 10959A.
Davis, Paul Allen, 10960A.
Poe, William Edwin, 10961A.
Zeuty, Edward James, 10962A.
Friedline, George Jonathan, 10963A.
Garber, Harold Gregory, 10964A.
LeGrand, John Joseph, 10965A.
Donahue, Donald Augustine, 10966A.
Dent, George Herndon, 10967A.
×Miller, Clyde George, 10968A.
Syslo, Benedict Francis, 10970A.
Matthews, Thurman R., 10971A.
Harrington, Jasper Jackson, 10972A.
Mlotkowski, Henry Francis, 10973A.
×Sullivan, Robert James, 10974A.
Winham, Lucien Chesley, Jr., 10975A.
Benoy, Harlan Hults, 10976A.
×Odom, Felton Harris, 10977A.
Holden, William John, 10978A.
Hislop, James Stewart, 10979A.
×Thomas, Harry Jack, 10980A.
Lewin, Walter William, 10981A.
Riddle, Cecil Edward, 10982A.
Illing, Richard George, 10983A.
Van Epps, John Siegfus, 10984A.
Anderson, John Herman, 10986A.
Bradley, Leonidas Cicero, Jr., 10987A.
Roitsch, Clarence Alfred, 10988A.
Fleming, David Thomas, 10989A.
Gawthorp, Paul, 10990A.
Garrison, Harry Anthony, 10991A.
Bye, George Ewing, 10992A.
Ferguson, Roy Eugene, 10993A.
Secor, Howard J., 10994A.
×Furbee, Charles Elbert, 10995A.
×Merritt, Herschel Roscoe, 10998A.
×Taylor, Daniel James, Jr., 10999A.
Wilson, Richard Alvin, 11000A.
Bird, Sidney Albert, Jr., 11001A.
Roath, William Roderick, 11002A.
Warden, Ray Sterling, 11003A.
Yelton, John Fred, 11004A.
Cavoli, William Joseph, 11005A.
Cronkhite, John Lyle, 11006A.
Nichols, John Clark, 11007A.
Murphy, Thomas Lavelle, 11008A.
Duncan, Cecil Charles, 11009A.
Simpson, Drewry Narvin, 11011A.
Caldwell, John James, Jr., 11012A.
Sheffield, James Russell, 11013A.
Gladstone, James Tatum, 11014A.
Smith, Franklin Quick, 11015A.
Fehrenbacher, Joseph Harold Thomas, 11016A.
Mann, Linn Embry, 11017A.
Deakyne, Howard Carl, Jr., 11019A.
Rees, John Edward, 11021A.
Britt, Jessie Willard, 11022A.
Hubbs, Edgar Henry, 11023A.
Larsen, Marvin Henry, 11024A.
Turner, Stevens Heyward, 11025A.
×Johnson, Frank Burtis, 11026A.
×Schleier, Erich Edwin, Jr., 11027A.
Hallett, Duane Hartley, 11028A.
Spencer, William Lewis, 11029A.
×Moore, Earl Lester, 11030A.
Oldham, Nile William, Jr., 11031A.
Briley, Carlus Lindon, 11032A.
Aitken, John, Jr., 11033A.
Urban, John Alexander, 11034A.
Militefr, Lud James, 11035A.
Readhimer, Thomas Cecil, 11036A.
×Kelly, Doran Louis, 11037A.
Boyer, Max Weldon, 11039A.
Deitch, Raymond Roland, 11040A.
Saabye, Herbert John, Jr., 11041A.
Fields, Lloyd Fondren, 11042A.
Davis, William Francis, 11043A.
×Hensley, Harold Storey, Jr., 11044A.
Abernethy, Robert Joseph, 11045A.
Brennan, David Thomas, 11046A.
Plocher, Martin Ernest, 11047A.
Wockenfuss, Wilbur Eugene, 11048A.
Arens, Herbert William, 11049A.
Frost, Foy Benson, 11050A.
McVicker, Maurice Francis, 11051A.
Sickels, George Harrington, Jr., 11052A.
McGill, John Raymond, 11053A.
Beebout, Vance LeeRoy, 11054A.
Berman, Harold, 11055A.
Durston, Glyn, 11056A.
×Caplan, Aaron Edward, 11057A.
Lake, Robert Schmidt, 11058A.
×Hobson, Richard Eugene, 11059A.
Grant, John Clifford, Jr., 11060A.
Brandstrom, Alfred Raymond Williams, 11061A.
Crowder, Noral Farrel, 11062A.
Hockett, Chester A., 11063A.
Mack, Ernest Wilmer, 11064A.
Mapes, Byron Alvin, Jr., 11065A.
Brazile, Berry Dee, 11067A.
×Matthews, Allen Randolph, 11068A.
Oxman, Jaffee Victor, 11069A.
Correll, Tommy Elbert, 11070A.
Karhuse, Carl Andrew, 11071A.
×Plott, Paul Aril, 11072A.
Scott, Charles Sidney, Jr., 11073A.
×O'Neil, Donald Edward, 11074A.
Miller, Joseph Atlee, 11075A.
Nicholson, Jack, 11076A.
Cauble, Mark Waverley, Jr., 11077A.
Marsiglia, Joseph Pasquale, 11078A.
McMurray, Robert Auburn, 11080A.
Paap, Donald Herbert, 11081A.
Cronin, Harold Joseph, 11082A.
Redman, Frank Owen, 11084A.
O'Sullivan, Francis Joseph, 11085A.

Byers, Howard Earl, 11086A.
Crampton, William Cowles, 11087A.
Pearson, William Paul, 11088A.
Slade, Alliston, 11089A.
Dugger, James Ernest, Jr., 11090A.
×McClendon, Lee, 11091A.
Reed, Donald Albert, 11092A.
Lamb, Gordon Douglas, 11093A.
Speight, John Josh, Jr., 11095A.
Holmes, Elwin Franklin, 11097A.
×Bell, Gerald Benjamin, 11098A.
Stanley, Richard Edward, 11099A.
Bledsoe, Samuel Black, Jr., 11100A.
Friedman, Leon Jerome, 11101A.
Dillon, Francis Joseph, Jr., 11102A.
Weir, Gordon Thomas, 11105A.
Stout, Thomas Edward, 11106A.
×DuBois, William Jay, 11107A.
Smith, Kenneth A., 11108A.
McAuley, Walter J., Jr., 11109A.
Czapski, Edmund, 11110A.
DeVore, Ralph Nelson, 11111A.
Ferrari, Joseph Salvadore, 11112A.
×Hathway, James Ayers, 11113A.
Hume, Robert Adelbert, 11115A.
Schwaderer, Willard Eugene, 11116A.
Cox, Nicholas Henry, 11117A.
×Manlove, Clifford Thomas, 11118A.
Whipple, Donald Eugene, 11119A.
McAuley, Milton Kenneth, 11120A.
Colchagoff, George Demeter, 11121A.
Gray, Billy Cooper, 11123A.
Nelson, Douglas Towle, 11124A.
×Miller, James Andrew, 11125A.
Netherton, Clyde Bryant, 11126A.
Lehman, Hugh Roberts, 11127A.
Hesterberg, Raymond Chester, 11128A.
Baker, William Virgil, 11129A.
Gold, Joe Milton, Jr., 11130A.
Fross, Horton Lawrence, 11131A.
Huston, James Leslie, Jr., 11132A.
Plattner, Milton, 11133A.
Allison, Eugene, 11135A.
Cain, James Walter, 11136A.
Loomer, Perry Douglas, Jr., 11137A.
×Shimanek, Robert James, 11138A.
Foxx, James Martin, 11139A.
Gardinier, Russell John, 11140A.
Mathis, Charles Eugene, 11141A.
Gisel, Clarence Paul, 11142A.
Barrett, James Herman, Jr., 11143A.
Wilson, Billy Baldwin, 11144A.
Conners, Thomas Aloysius, 11145A.
Wilemon, Max Walter, 11146A.
Moffatt, Robert, Jr., 11148A.
Alba, Michael, 11149A.
Purdom, Brooks Elbert, 11150A.
Sealy, Harry Haller. 11151A.
Millar, Harry Alvin, 11152A.
Griffin, Ralph Harvy, 11153A.
Little, Robert Dickson, 11154A.
Lynn, Bert Hausmann, Jr., 11155A.
King, Lester Stanley, 11157A.
Burwell, John David, 11158A.
Gunther, Robert William, 11159A.
Littrell, William Leon, 11160A.
Remele, Courtney Albert, 11161A.
×Powell, Clarence Linton, 11162A.
Libby, William Albert, 11163A.
Henry, Charles Fogg, 11164A.
×Smith, William Henry, 11165A.
×Nixon, Horace Cecil, 11166A.
Brown, Claude Joseph, 11168A.
×Wylie, Harold Greever, 11169A.
×Schultz, Chester Martin, 11170A.
Donohue, John William, 11171A.
Simmons, Herbert Walter, 11172A.
Adams, William Henderson, Jr., 11173A.
Junker, Jules Xavier, 3d, 11174A.
Andresen, Malcolm Knapp, 11175A.
Davis, Robert Emmett, 11177A.
Mazza, Vincent, 11178A.
Rich, Robert Stewart, 11179A.
×Marr, Frederick William, 11180A.
Sculley, Raymond, 11181A.
Barker, Glenn Snyder, 11182A.
×Rea, William Robinson, 11183A.
Mastropaolo, Salvatore, 11184A.
×Gannon, John Ernest, 11186A.
Brant, Francis Arthur, 11187A.
Rainwater, James Allen, 11188A.
Ostman, Byron Reynold, 11189A.
×Griffin, Ira Lester, 11190A.
Polio, Nicholas Samuel, 11191A.
Cox, Luther Christian, 11193A.
Jones, Garland Maurice, 11194A.
×Nicholls, Walter Lee, Jr., 11195A.
North, Charles Anthony, 11196A.
Skawienski, Theodore Louis, 11197A.
×Stephens, Sidney Alexander, 11198A.
Brimberry, Will Olan, 11199A.
Bilyeu, Hal Errett, 11200A.
Black, William Howard, 11203A.
Pennington, Donald Jeffris, 11204A.
Welti, Conrad Joseph, 11205A.
Searle, Maurice Ortiz, 11206A.
Foster, Otis, Jr., 11207A.
Neal, Robert Jack, 11208A.
Booth, Clifford Richard, 11209A.
×Edelen, Carroll Lee, 11210A.
Hopper, Roy James, 11213A.
Sullivan, John Willys, 11211A.
×Jones, Harry Arthur Lawrence, Jr., 11214A.
Bickerstaff, Curtis Ergil, 11215A.
Washburn, Jesse Eugene, 11216A.
Saylor, David Wallie, 11218A.
Brinegar, Marion Frederick, 11219A.
Hogan, Floyd Hyer, 11220A.
Hostler, Gilbert Earl, 11221A.
Martin, William Albert, 11223A.
Myrick, Morris Nichols, 11224A.
Larson, Milo George, 11225A.
Geck, John James, 11226A.
Hanlen, Joseph Richard, 11227A.
Wallace, Arthur Lee, 11228A.
×Cook, Edwin Jarecki, 11229A.
Skaggs, Jesse Sparks, Jr., 11230A.
×Klemme, Meade, 11231A.
×Campbell, Claude Whitner, 11232A.
Parkerson, Eugene Campbell, 11233A.
Beary, Kermit Edwin, 11234A.
Ryden, Reinhardt August, 11235A.
Sigler, Kerney Lee, 11236A.
Bauer, James Earl, 11237A.
Black, John Lewis, 11238A.
Staebell, Edward Franklin, 11239A.
Burgeson, Darell George, 11240A.
Jarrell, Howard Ray, 11241A.
Sanford, Raymond Pape, 11242A.
×Clark, John Max, 11243A.
Greenwood, Thomas William, Jr., 11244A.
Hodgson, Charles Willis, 11245A.
Siegismund, Robert Wentling, 11246A.
Binnell, Francis Elwin, 11248A.
Hancock, Jack Leland, 11249A.
×Truman, Robert Virgil, 11250A.
Fowler, John Russell, 11251A.
Bush, John E., 11253A.
Davis, James Daniel, 11254A.
Jones, Jerome Judson, 11255A.
×Wickman, Robert John, 11256A.
Ledbetter, Llewellyn Harper, 11257A.
Crawford, Richard Wallace, 11258A.
Hollinger, Llewellyn Earl, 11259A.
Jarvis, Melvin Eugene, 11261A.
Jones, Fred Guy, 11262A.
×Berthiaume, Raymond Francis, 11263A.
Stephens, Glenn Frederick, 11264A.
×Miller, Samuel Ford, 11265A.
Smith, William Dulty, Jr., 11266A.
Brown, Robert Gardiner, 11267A.
Linebaugh, John Harvey Moore, 11268A.
Kehoe, Nicholas Bernard, Jr., 11269A.
Steiner, Irwin Oscar, 11270A.
Tormos, Jose Ramualdo, 11271A.
Moore, Floyd William, Jr., 11272A.

Medical

Randel, Hugh Wayne, 19357A.
Nauert, Nicholas Henry, Jr., 19606A.
Class, Robert Nelson, 19662A.
Vivian, Donald Norman, 19988A.
Condit, Norman Irving, 19956A.
×Merkle, Robert Woods, 19955A.
Lutz, Stanley, Jr., 19958A.
Hammers, Benjamin Nicol, 20006A.

Dental

×Thornberry, Wayne Walter, 18957A.
Myers, Warren Charles, 18958A.
Massey, John Thomas, 18959A.
Herring, Woodward Miley, Jr., 19628A.

Veterinary

Nelson, Robert Kenneth, 19010A.

Medical Service

×Doidge, William Thomas, 19493A.
Van Horn, Robert Moir, 19494A.
Rossi, Joseph Patrick, 19498A.
Hensley, Howard Crawford, Jr., 19495A.
×Gaines, Robert Lee, 19496A.
Lord, Douglas Venable, 19497A.
×Howell, Louis Grady, 19500A.
×Smith, Stuart Springer, 19502A.
×Horton, Russell Ervin, 19501A.

Chaplain

×Spellman, Richard Edward, 18801A.
×Schaefer, Roman Joseph, 18802A.
×Ressel, Delvin Edgar, 18803A.

Nurse

Hayden, Grace Josephine, 21915W.
Norred, Annice Elberta, 21928W.
McKenzie, Margaret Elizabeth, 21933W.
Berendsen, Dorothy Mildred, 21941W.
Krieble, Alice Rosalie, 21956W.
×Slattery, Lucile Constance, 21965W.
Jahr, Rhoda U., 20905W.
×Fintak, Florence Frances, 21983W.
Montgomery, Alice Lorena, 20980W.
Young, Eunice Florence, 20929W.
Smith, Mildred Elizabeth, 20934W.
Fill, Wanda Irene, 21096W.
Kelly, Evelyn Aleda, 20950W.
×Deason, Bernice Y., 20951W.

FIRST LIEUTENANT TO CAPTAIN

Air Force

Mahoney, Daniel Crowley, 23006A.
Marsh, Wesley Chandler, Jr., 23007A.
Faulkner, Norman Albert, 23008A.
Bryan, James Thomas, 23009A.
×Ouder, Melvin Lonny, 23010A.
×White, Thomas Leonidas, 25607A.
×Burks, Thomas Wilson, 24266A.
×Fahrney, John William, 25608A.
Yoder, Keith Jay, 25609A.
×Sloop, Everett Eugene, 25610A.
Forrest, Stephen Mitchell, 26673A.
Pearson, Carl Russell, 21796A.
Chew, John Cottle, 25611A.
Kelly, William Joseph, 23183A.
Rankin, John Maynard, 21801A.
×Burton, Charles Rhoades, 23184A.
×Burckle, Alton George, Jr., 24267A.
×Crawford, William Arthur, Jr., 21797A.
×Haggard, Richard Lowell, 17725A.
×Olivera-Barroso, Manuel, 17744A.
Rotstan, Robert, 17723A.
Blount, Buford Charles, 17699A.
Kane, Richard Weidner, 17711A.
×Eckmann, Frederick Charles, 17718A.
×Watkins, Marvin Maurice, 17742A.
×Moir, James Ferriss, 17712A.
×Clements, Ben Hill, Jr., 17733A.
Bieber, Robert Warren, 17739A.
×Brennan, Joseph Xavier, 17728A.
Montgomery, Bill Alexander, 17705A.
Mullan, Alfred William, Jr., 17709A.
Scroggin, Orville Oliver, 3d, 17738A.
×Horn, Robert Paul, 17743A.
×Brumm, Robert Ellsworth, 17717A.
Titus, Frank Alvin, 17741A.
×Meredith, Jim Tom, 17706A.
Springer, Paul Richard, 17715A.
McCleary, George Carlton, 17715A.
×Potter, Edward Mac, Jr., 17716A.
Thompson, George Willard, 17726A.
Burns, Robert Bernard, 17727A.
Escue, Walter Harbin, 17702A.
×Boyle, William Frederick, 17729A.
×Thomas, Alan Brainerd, 17721A.
×Rea, Thomas Samuel, 17707A.
×Allison, Thomas I., 17713A.
×Son, Herman Franklin, 17734A.
×Neville, Harry Walter, 17704A.
×Boone, Warren Wallace, 17708A.
Trammell, Andrew Jack, 17720A.
Moore, Winston Eugene, 17722A.
Ahrens, George Leo, 17732A.
Boswell, Marion Lillard, 17719A.
Anderson, Hunter Wilson, 17737A.
Baker, Wilson Kirby, Jr., 17740A.
×Schwalier, Charles Dale, 17731A.
×Riley, Eldon Stanley, 17703A.
×Schwaner, Charles Fred, 17714A.

Smith, Clark Bridgland, 17730A.
×Pettitt, Bert Edward, Jr., 17698A.
Kent, Joseph Francis, Jr., 17724A.
Hink, Harry Devere, 17710A.
×Chapman, John Monroe, Jr., 17700A.
Winner, Donald Carlton, 17973A.
Smith, Mart Gary, Jr., 17976A.
×Phillips, Lowell Gene, 18050A.
×Hawes, Warren Harding, 18160A.
Stone, James Samuel, 18247A.
×Theus, Lucius, 18270A.
Snyder, George Francis, 18153A.
×Brisley, Bernard Anthony, 18265A.
Weeks, Roy Franklyn, Jr., 18189A.
Schmidt, George Robert, 18202A.
×Perry, Roland Archibald, 18231A.
×Lineham, Thomas Uriah, Jr., 18112A.
Gray, Donald Underwood, Jr., 18223A.
Kar, Edward George, 18252A.
×Van Bloom, Jay Clark, 18147A.
×Violet, Leonard, 18174A.
Smith, Bennie Cozzena, 18141A.
×Hicks, Malcolm Glenn, 18185A.
×Wilborn, William Thomas, 18194A.
×Schuering, Alvin George, 18166A.
×Malloy, William James, 18197A.
×Green, Norman Morgan, 18237A.
Spencer, Loren James, 18255A.
×Pierce, Russell Kurtz, Jr., 18118A.
×Talbot, George Edward, 18126A.
×Sanna, Francis Patsy, 18148A.
Urquhart, Roland Leslie, Jr., 18162A.
×Kester, Clifford Daniel, 18163A.
×Miller, John William, 18198A.
Lauterbach, Harris Young, 18256A.
Hinerman, Maurice Elwyn, 18218A.
×Crowther, Frederick Earl, 18221A.
Raphun, Leland Richards, 18130A.
×Hurlburt, Dana Follett, 18119A.
×Peters, Francis David, Jr., 18137A.
Humphries, Buford Milton, 18175A.
Randall, Richard Clary, 18212A.
×Bostick, Arthur Worth, 18239A.
Locklear, James Quinton, 18133A.
×Mandina, Sidney Reginald I., 18125A.
×Traylor, Horace Cleveland, Jr., 18165A.
Goppert, Jean Glen, 18167A.
×Jones, Richard Ernest, 18170A.
×DuMontier, Louis Devine, 18171A.
×Hansen, Robert Paul, 18159A.
Adams, Gordon Sackett, 18186A.
×Philips, Thomas Roland, Jr., 18266A.
Morton, Walter Pinckney, Jr., 18129A.
×Alexander, Ernest Lee, 18143A.
×Doe, Irving Chester, 18155A.
×Gourley, Edwin Parker, 18181A.
Crowley, John McBride, 18217A.
Foote, Richard Harold, 18219A.
×Johanson, Alvin Lars Anton, 18248A.
Kennedy, Dean Lewis, 18235A.
Griffard, Robert Marcel, 18264A.
×Peterson, Harry William, 18275A.
×Luber, Vernon Norton, 18127A.
×Merino, Robert Francis, 18224A.
×Moehle, Charles Fred, 18131A.
×Gilpin, Harry Duncan, 18124A.
×Bray, Leslie William, Jr., 18136A.
×Shewan, Clifford Wayne, 18150A.
×Werber, William Alexander, 18178A.
×Eberhardt, Donald Elwin, 18182A.
×Byrn, John Stanford, 18196A.
×Gregory, Willie Preston, 18236A.
Kirschman, Ivan Paul, 18258A.
×Moore, Jack Kenneth, 18135A.
Anderson, George Olaf, 18184A.
×Houghtby, James Kenneth, 18240A.
Rutherford, Richard Thomas, 18134A.
×Mills, Arthur Julius, 18180A.
×Curry, Ralph Jack, 18245A.
×Bennett, George Alfred, 18154A.
×Kenyon, Benjamin Clarence, Jr., 18215A.
×Hochstetler, George Edward, 18216A.
×Howes, Lewis Langdon, 18220A.
Newton, Frederick Carter, 18228A.
×Hutchinson, Paul Eugene, 18158A.
Lopez, Donald Sewell, 18164A.
Schoeffler, Clifford, 18179A.
Hanigan, Edward James, Jr., 18222A.
×Pendergraft, Wesley Lael, 18242A.
×Rementer, William John, 18250A.
Cook, William, Jr., 18257A.
Donegan, Charles Edward, 18283A.
Taylor, Charles Kersey, Jr., 18113A.
×Light, Herbert Myron, Jr., 18128A.
×Eubank, Graydon Knox, 18132A.
×Reuteler, Bruce Ervin, 18168A.
×Barter, John Wallace, 18208A.
×Baumann, Robert Price, Jr., 18203A.
McCully, Robert Humes, 18274A.
×Wolfe, Charles Spurgeon, 18176A.
×Rosenberg, Leslie Benjamin, 18210A.
Brinson, William Leslie, 18117A.
×Mertely, Frank, 18201A.
Beno, William George, 18205A.
×Borders, Charles Wesley, 18149A.
×Hamilton, Calvin Lee, 18139A.
Paige, Carl Addison, 18241A.
×Jones, Donald Alfred, 18157A.
×Little, David Lee, 18253A.
×Melton, Carl Mudgett, 18190A.
×Payant, Peter, 18232A.
Stephenson, Wayne Louis, 18238A.
Williams, James Coleman, 18261A.
×Long, Robert Francis, 18142A.
×Reeder, William Dean, 18161A.
Melvin, Robert Elwood, 18193A.
×Lloyd, Glenn Howard, 18226A.
Baldwin, Richard Allen, 18262A.
×Burkhart, James Murrell, 18230A.
×Fahrney, Richard Lee, 18191A.
Ristau, Siegfried Edward, 18169A.
×Wilson, Elbert, Jr., 18263A.
Martin, Eugene, Jr., 18233A.
Beisner, Gerald Jean, 18251A.
Eagle, Comly Joel, 18115A.
Nanney, James Thomas, 18177A.
Davis, Bruce, 18120A.
Hanton, John Thomas, 18138A.
×Johnson, Clarence LaVerne, 18213A.
×Hall, Benny Bob, 18272A.
×Schmidt, Howard Richard, 18123A.
×Avise, Herbert Jack, 18114A.
×Bell, Robert Malcolm, 18145A.
Selbie, Frederic Donald, Jr., 18225A.
Penick, Everett Smith, Jr., 18234A.
×Doran, Patrick Leo, 18207A.
×McNeil, Edwin Evan, 18192A.
×Cooper, Dewey Glenn, 18260A.
×Sinnett, Jefferson David, 19269A.
×Ellzey, J. Murray, 18204A.
×Ayres, Frank Lawrence, 18173A.
Hurst, Guy, Jr., 18243A.
Reisner, Horace Jackson, 18271A.
×Hoffman, Charles Addison, Jr., 18244A.
Marshall, Sidney Currier, 18206A.
Preller, Gordon Charles, 18144A.
×Wilson, Richard Stanley, 18121A.
×Simpson, Russell Reavely, 19565A.
×Stevens, Wendelle Castyle, 18195A.
×Kenyon, Donald Edward, 18268A.
×Bohannon, James Raymond, Jr., 18146A.
×Collins, Perry Velmont, 18156A.
Jones, David Boone, 18183A.
×Peters, Warren Edmund, 18276A.
×McMinis, Jonathan Burns, 18249A.
Moore, Richard Raymond, 19795A.
Farnsworth, Al W., 18229A.
×Raley, Theodore Maxwell, 18200A.
Williams, Lawrence, 18152A.
×Yeager, Paul Meryald, 18116A.
×Niemczyk, Julian Martin, 20671A.
×Baker, Marshall Erbie, 20675A.
×Adcock, James Kenneth, 20589A.
×Suttie, James, 20646A.
×Sandvig, Kenneth Leslie, 20595A.
×Warner, Walter Eugene, 20610A.
×McKay, Allen Fraser, 20613A.
Glover, Jerry C., 20659A.
×Gruber, Kenneth Willis, 20623A.
×Ecklund, Eugene, 20600A.
×Craig, Robert Peter, 20649A.
×Collington, Frederick, 20663A.
×Fowler, Oscar Frank, 20583A.
Brown, Jack Riley, 20599A.
Dotson, Herbert Forrest, Jr., 20587A.
Bobbitt, Aubrey Malcolm, 20644A.
Holt, Garland Edward, 20607A.
×DeGennaro, Carlo Nicola, 20570A.
Herrera, Alfred Charles, 20608A.
Moore, James Conway, Jr., 20664A.
×Jensen, Lloyd Kenneth, 20624A.
Henry, Mervin Lester, 20604A.
Elliott, Donald Ancil, 20636A.
×Cummins, James Dirickson, Jr., 20618A.
Singer, Solomon Elias, 20666A.
×Barry, Russell John, 20656A.
×McGowan, Samuel Benjamin, 20572A.
×Glines, Carroll Vane, Jr., 20579A.
×Jewell, Malcolm Eugene, 20588A.
×Stroff, Michael John, Jr., 20648A.
Long, Paul Henry, 20635A.
×Haynes, Clarence Gilbert, 20653A.
×Melucas, Paul Joseph, 20640A.
Perry, James Wallace, 20673A.
Doiron, Claude Joseph, Jr., 20596A.
×Rath, Leland John, 20620A.
×Williams, Wilson Byron, 20668A.
Barns, William Frederick, 20630A.
×Spiro, Bernard, 20627A.
McAnally, Paul Edward, 20581A.
Jones, William Monroe, 20641A.
Burnett, Elvin Earl, 20601A.
×Sharp, Stuart Mayer, 20629A.
Hall, Harvey Preston, 20674A.
Busha, George Francis, 20628A.
Anderson, Charles Keller, 20616A.
Ernst, William Joseph, 20609A.
×Clifton, Leecroy, 20650A.
Hill, Marcus Lee, Jr., 20622A.
×Myers, Andrew Jackson, Jr., 20769A.
×Bush, Frederick Eugene, 20643A.
×Monaco, Anthony William, Jr., 20605A.
×Vincent, Robert Wilson, 20575A.
Prager, John William, 20586A.
×Urquhart, Charles Thomas, Jr., 20584A.
×Greene, Sidney, 20658A.
×Woolf, Simpson Molen, 20569A.
Johnson, George Alvin, 20672A.
×Vogler, Alfred Fritz, 20670A.
×Miller, Edgar Cornelius, 20614A.
×Loman, William Thomas, Jr., 20669A.
×Sever, James Edward, 20592A.
×Magill, Francis William, 20652A.
McGaughey, Donald Keith, 20662A.
Maher, Thomas Joseph, 20655A.
Price, Robert Harold, 20571A.
×Jensen, Sigurd Lars, Jr., 20651A.
×Slade, William Arthur, 20573A.
Staples, Johnston Raleigh, 20578A.
Canning, Douglas Strickland, 20577A.
×Welsh, Stephen Jackson, 20634A.
×Saylor, Warren Daniel, 20637A.
×Wendt, Willard Arthur, 20625A.
×Radcliffe, John Bilton, 20667A.
Montgomery, Joe Shelton, 20633A.
×Nole, Jack Dean, 20598A.
×Gaertner, Adolph, Jr., 20603A.
×Taylor, Joseph Thomas, 20611A.
Bass, Robert Allan, 20632A.
×Kohrman, Elwood Netherton, 20602A.
Lockhart, George Andrew, Jr., 20594A.
×Lawson, Francis Robert, 20606A.
×Lunos, Austin Edward, 20645A.
Stewart, Walter Claiborne, Jr., 20639A.
×Pedersen, Stanley Cartwright, 20617A.
×Sturm, Wilmer Ross, 20676A.
Scarpero, William John, 20677A.
×Taylor, Jay Johnson, 20580A.
×Rogers, Dan Terrance, 20665A.
Orillion, Arthur Joseph, Jr., 20593A.
Crosby, Samuel Eugene, Jr., 20612A.
×Brownfield, Paul Wehrle, 20597A.
×Littlewood, Theodore Peterson, 20642A.
Farr, John Wesley, 20660A.
×Shawhan, Zac George, 20576A.
×Cooney, Jack Bernard, 20657A.
Newgarden, George Joseph, 3d, 20591A.
Yusievicz, John Joseph, 20582A.
White, Boyd Barnard, 20626A.
×Sheperd, Olen Dean, 20619A.
Fraser, Paul Victor, 20654A.
×Smith, J. B., 20638A.
×King, Edwin Vernon, 20585A.
×Gallagher, Rial Frederick, 20621A.
Gentzler, Robert Francis, 20678A.
×Spencer, Jack, 20661A.
Blanton, Franklin Dickinson, 21458A.
×Kelly, James Wyatt, 21462A.
×Cude, Willis Augustus, Jr., 21463A.
Aust, Abner Maurice, Jr., 20631A.
Henry, David Watters, Jr., 20590A.
×Miller, Sidney Harry, 21459A.

Tony, Nicholas, 21464A.
×Shusta, Chester Joseph, 21461A.
Kemerling, William Earl, 21460A.
Lewis, Oliver Wendell, 18227A.
×Frazier, Max Eugene, 21456A.
Hubbard, George Maurice, 21457A.
×O'Donnell, William Joseph, 20574A.
Vollmer, Charles David, 22630A.
×Pulling, Barton Sebring, 22569A.
Wood, Thomas Burke, 22686A.
Solomon, William George, 22627A.
Clay, Richard Laurence, 22647A.
Hagemann, Joseph Anthony, 22657A.
Hopkins, Robert Webster, 22660A.
×Miller, Orville Eugene, 22629A.
×Maxwell, Oren Vinson, 22637A.
×Gailer, Frank Lewis, Jr., 22592A.
×Kipping, Joseph Harding, 22582A.
×Doom, Richard Clinton, 22579A.
Harding, Warren Wilson, 22685A.
Key, Oran Richard, Jr., 22589A.
×Gonge, John Foster, 22600A.
×Mills, Clarence Howard, 22650A.
×Smoak, Andrew Washington, 22652A.
×Paul, Charles Timothy Arthur, 22622A.
×Kalin, Byron Roger, 22626A.
×Taylor, Jimmie, 22572A.
×Christensen, Keith La Var, 22639A.
×Bledsoe, Carroll Harris, 22682A.
×Parman, Henry Oland, Jr., 22697A.
×Dill, Glenn Estes, Jr., 22615A.
Copher, Paul D., 22619A.
×Feagin, Luther Wesley, 22687A.
×Phillips, William Charles, 22689A.
Watkins, Audrey Harold, 22663A.
Babb, James Walton, 22606A.
×Deffebach, Harry Wolsey, 22604A.
×Bush, Russell Lloyd, 22654A.
×Coletti, Victor Philip, 22609A.
Gulinson, Joseph Louis, 22671A.
×Porter, Fletcher Schley, 22672A.
×Keils, Walter Anthony, 22599A.
×Edgar, William Robert, 22665A.
×Cook, Archie Lanier, 22695A.
×Ames, Douglas Melbourne, 22584A.
×Warren, Joseph Baker, 22586A.
Roberson, Harvey B., 22587A.
Loughnan, Victor James, 22573A.
×Abraham, Bruce Howard, Jr., 22591A.
×Myers, George Boyd, 22621A.
Owens, Charles Durwood, 22610A.
×Lykins, David William, 22635A.
×Petkus, Walter Adam, 22613A.
×Gillespie, Keith Lamar, 22576A.
×West, Fielding Franklin, 22614A.
Clark, Kenneth Bemis, 22625A.
Abendhoff, Gerhard Robert, 22628A.
Elliott, Frank Worth, Jr., 22664A.
Wilson, Richard Carroll, 22588A.
Williamson, Willie George, 22692A.
Grace, Harold Wayne, Jr., 22694A.
LaLonde, Robert Frederick, 22703A.
Van Hoy, Leslie Bryant, 22645A.
Rolfe, Wilson, 22670A.
Davies, Joseph Potter, Jr., 22702A.
×Callahan, John Gregory, 22700A.
Mitchell, Collins Parks, 22570A.
Ezell, William Otis, 22649A.
Johnson, Fon Edwin, 22598A.
×Stewart, Douglas Donald, 22680A.
×McDonnell, Robert Henry, 22696A.
×Bridges, John Lunsford, 22643A.
×Derrick, Irvin Hendrix, 22605A.
×Walding, William Harvey, 22611A.
Neal, Arthur Mehard, 22617A.
Wood, William Amos, 22595A.
×Johnson, Robert Colman, 22648A.
×Cotellesse, Peter, 22699A.
McDonald, William Tommy, 22673A.
×Rood, Eric Westburg, 22620A.
×Hansen, Leroy Blaine, 22578A.
Burnham, Welbon De Kalb, 22640A.
×Rodewald, Warren August, 22679A.
Davidson, B. H. 22575A.
×Fish, Bruce Baker, 22623A.
×McDermott, Chauncey Lereign, 22633A.
×McAllister, Floyd Melvin, 22636A.
×Wilson, William Walter, 22571A.
×Jones, Robert Lee, 22693A.
Smith, Lloyd Dixon, 22585A.
Daniel, Harlan Frederick, 22580A.
Lunsford, George Mortimer, 22646A.
×Page, Waldo Mark, 22602A.
Johnson, Arthur Hiram, 22684A.
Steves, Walter Thomas, 22581A.
Thomchak, Howard Michael, 22601A.
Fenley, Relf Albert, 22608A.
Hanna, Keith Chance, 22642A.
×Horey, Raymond Stephen, 22593A.
×Alden, William Ames, 22658A.
Bartholomew, Gabriel Peter, 22659A.
×Morgan, D. P., Jr., 22688A.
Burriss, Richard Clark, 22641A.
×Clisham, Winston Harold, 22618A.
×Marshall, Gerald Roy, 22596A.
×Herrewig, Alvin Paul, 22634A.
×McDonnell, James Godfrey, 22705A.
×Cummins, Harry Timothy, Jr., 22594A.
×Silliman, James Gordon, 22644A.
Hubbard, Thomas Parker, 22590A.
×Kovach, Michael Martin, 22683A.
×Brunson, Lloyd Earl, 22669A.
×Saxton, David William, 22674A.
Davis, Charley Lee, 22701A.
×McKone, Joseph Francis, 22666A.
×Kohl, Don Resseguie, 22655A.
Braeunig, Ewald Christian, 22597A.
Lafferty, William Anderson, Jr., 22667A.
×Findlay, Ralph Farner, 22631A.
×Welsh, William Florence, 22676A.
Lien, Arthur Marvin, 22574A.
Muldoon, James Edward, Jr., 22651A.
Burgess, John Raymond, 22698A.
Murphy, William John, Jr., 22681A.
×Smith, Richard Willis, 22583A.
×Grovert, Robert Eugene, 22577A.
Roberts, Howard Grey, 22603A.
×Tremblay, Armand Laval, 22624A.
White, Raymond Eldon, 22661A.
×Butz, John Louis, 22678A.
Adams, Charles J., 22656A.
×Williams, Morris Franklin, 22632A.
×Eckman, Robert Lee, Jr., 22638A.
×Kinkead, Joseph Clyde, 22677A.
×Stewart, James Lenzey, 22691A.
×Gillingham, Rowley Ems, 22616A.
×Anderson, George Robert, 23653A.
×Miller, Myron Dale, 23708A.
Rymer, Frank Pierce, Jr., 23689A.
Cecil, Thomas, Jr., 23654A.
Farnum, Mark, Jr., 23667A.
Blake, Thomas Alfred, 23698A.
×Vohs, Lester John, 23670A.
Marshall, Richard William, 23705A.
Ramsdell, George Raymond, 23661A.
×Smith, William Harrison, Jr., 23685A.
Shimonkevitz, William Francis, 23711A.
Noziglia, Robert Everett, 23675A.
Murray, John Edward, 23656A.
×Smith, Edward Frank, 23674A.
Russell, Charles Clark, 23660A.
×Dunn, Buel Albert, 23701A.
Clowry, John Patrick, 23687A.
Fish, Howard Math, 23704A.
×McAllister, Warren William, 23672A.
Statum, Glen Wade, 23668A.
×Hoban, Richard Matthew, 23658A.
×Keller, Floyd Eugene, 23712A.
Wilson, Donald L., 23662A.
Nestle, Roger William, 23669A.
×Foust, William Lee, 23690A.
Sims, William McNaire, Jr., 23680A.
×Francis, Philip Bruce, 23663A.
Cahill, Joseph Eugene, 23713A.
Scherler, Arnold Eduard, Jr., 23697A.
×Gates, Talbert Mark, 23688A.
Weyhrich, Melvin Peter, 23700A.
×Kougias, George Christopher, 23682A.
×Fromm, Robert Arthur, 23679A.
×Kuhlmann, Duane Arthur, 23702A.
Light, Delbert John, 23692A.
Poladian, Robert, 23695A.
Minow, James Wallace, 23651A.
Lyndes, Harry Everett, Jr., 23706A.
Lincoln, Brian Jerome, 23703A.
Segura, Wiltz Paul, 23681A.
×Page, Donald Grey, 23683A.
Smith, Edgar Harrison, 23684A.
Boyd, Henry LeRoy, 23652A.
×Whitley, Albert Grant, 23707A.
Caylor, William Robert, 23665A.
×Piercy, Jeff Johnston, 23677A.
Christie, Robert Lee, 23710A.
Blake, John Edward, 23671A.
×Hardcastle, Frank Lockwood, 23693A.
×Ziegler, John Christopher, 23657A.
Shelton, William Ernest, 23659A.
First, David Frederick, 23664A.
Teel, Wilford Lamar, 23691A.
Culbertson, Leon Gail, 23696A.
×Heller, Emerson Earl, 23678A.
×Wilson, Ernest Riley, 23694A.
Pohl, Nelson Otto, 23709A.
Chamberlain, Clarence Newton, Jr., 23686A.
×Stoneberger, Harold William, 23699A.
Naylor, Harold Linkey, 23676A.
×Woody, Rufus, Jr., 23655A.
×Perry, William Edward, Jr., 23673A.
Alger, Robert Allaire, 23666A.
×Macauley, Bill Thomas, 24332A.
Haigler, Claude Sweringer, 24308A.
Watson, Albert Thomas, Jr., 24337A.
Harris, Elsey, Jr., 24309A.
×Samuelson, Dale Leroy, 24310A.
×Pine, Forrest Stanley, 24323A.
Hall, Roland Paige, 24342A.
Johnson, George Albert, 24341A.
Peterson, Howard Warren, 24307A.
×Phillips, Wendell, 24322A.
×Sullivan, William Joseph, 24334A.
×Syphers, Victor Kendrick, 24316A.
Pacharzina, Carl Alvin, Jr., 24311A.
×Johnson, Wendell Andrew, 24333A.
Allard, Lionel Charles, Jr., 24331A.
Morris, Jack Bret, 24326A.
Wiley, Robert Bernard, 24338A.
Schmidt, David Julius, 24320A.
Christopher, Frederick Lenwood, 24315A.
Krynovich, George, 24313A.
Edwards, Lloyd Carol, Jr., 24314A.
×Jenkins, Willard Dolphas, 24344A.
×Egender, Herbert Franklin, 24317A.
×Malone, Paul Edward, 24329A.
Hill, James Arthur, 24324A.
Stapleton, Leroy Earl, 24343A.
Booton, Glen Eugene, 24335A.
×Kuhn, Joseph Anthony, 24321A.
×Shepard, Van Huber, 24339A.
×King, Stephen Joseph, 24330A.
Baisden, Orville Ray, 24336A.
×Riordan, Daniel Williams, 24327A.
×O'Hara, David Bailey, 24319A.
×Cavalli, George August, 24340A.
Reed, Charles Shelby, 24328A.
×Becker, Robert Herbert, 24318A.
Audick, Albert Eugene, 24345A.
×Hector, Arnold Ernest, 24325A.
Leech, Richard Gerald, 24312A.
×Bodinger, Norman Barron, 23715A.
×Kirby, Elwin Glenn, 23714A.
Stevens, Jack Duane, 20679A.
×Gasaway, Nicholas Edwin, 21798A.
French, Fay Eugene, 23716A.
×Slover, Julius Elwood, 23012A.
DuFault, William Francis, 20680A.
×Botte, David Anthony, 21799A.
Steele, William Nicholas, 22707A.
Prager, Arthur, 20681A.
×Winfree, Douglas Woodson, Jr., 18278A.
×Salyards, John Albert, Jr., 18279A.
×Wheeler, James Isaac, 23717A.
×Vega, John William, 18280A.
×Clark, Earl Otis, Jr., 20682A.
Bocken, Richard Charles, 25612A.
×Torvestad, Robert James, 24268A.
×Fishel, Martin David, 24698A.
White, Lee Wayne, 24696A.
Mulvey, Gordon Ernest, 24697A.
Albright, John Scott, 24703A.
×Bennett, Henry Wayne, 24695A.
×Goyne, Carroll Heard, Jr., 24728A.
Keutman, Charles Henry, 24699A.
×Johnson, Robert Manon, 24706A.
Farrar, Aubrey O'Neal, 24702A.
Mason, Wendell Leon, 24708A.
Brush, Donald John, 24700A.
×Post, Gerald Joseph, 24707A.
Crisman, Marcus Blair, Jr., 24704A.
×Shannon, William Earl, 21802A.
×Pace, Robert Eugene, 22710A.
×Gleaves, Donald Heavner, 18282A.
×Thorn, James Read, 25613A.
Matte, Joseph Zannet, 20615A.

×Jackson, Charles Wilbur, 18284A.
Williams, Donald Alan, 26674A.
×Gardner, Edith Rose, 26675W.
Rigsby, Cecil Harding, 18285A.
Smith, Norman Stanley, 24346A.
Bernard, Duane Richard, 25615A.
×Moberley, Ralph Herbert, Jr., 25614A.
×Consta, Arthur Leo, 23718A.
Hament, Carrol, 20045A.
League, Miles Richard, 18286A.
×Tanner, Theodore John, 18287A.
×Schleuss, Louis Frederick, 23719A.
Gross, Kenneth Eugene, 18289A.
×Pulley, John Hubert, Jr., 18288A.
Edwards, Robert Frederick, 22711A.
×Werbeck, Donald Louis, 18290A.
Terrell, Harry Evans, Jr., 18291A.
×Snyder, Orrin William, 3d, 22712A.
×Pattillo, Charles Curtis, 23720A.
×Buchanan, Robert Sylvester, 18292A.
×Sharp, David Martin, 18293A.
×Shiver, Morris Eugene, 18294A.
×Smith, Gayle LeRoy, 20683A.
Jashinski, Victor Harry, 24709A.
×Ferrato, Theodore Peter, 22713A.
Thompson, Lawrence A., Jr., 18295A.
×Peters, Earl William, 20684A.
Rothery, William James, Jr., 23721A.
×Walter, Harvey Peter, 18296A.
Bialock, Woodrow Wilson, 18297A.
Toothman, Byron Rimbey, 20686A.
×McQuown, John Ragan, 23722A.
Jordan, Vincent Anthony, 26676A.
Lockridge, Clarence Reynolds, 18298A.
Sexton, Roy Denver, 26677A.
×Hilton, Garland Bruce, Jr., 23723A.
×Kasten, Nelson, 22714A.
Stevens, Robert Merrill, 23724A.
Thornell, John Francis, Jr., 24347A.
×Reichart, Stuart Richard, 24269A.
Galpin, Harry Tower, 24348A.
×Trommershausser, John, 18300A.
×Jenks, Harford Perry, 18299A.
May, Edward Stanley, 18301A.
×Pattillo, Cuthbert Augustus, 22715A.
×Braddock, James Edward, 24349A.
Snyder, John Thomas, 18302A.
×Reid, Addison Taylor, 18303A.
Tannenbaum, Leon Marvin, 20687A.
×Schwab, Jack Clifford, 22716A.
Palmer, William Joseph, 18304A.
×Gehri, Donald Harry, 22717A.
×Lewis, William Henry, 23725A.

Medical

×Snedden, Hal Edward, 23123A.
Koehn, Robert Cecil, Jr., 25732A.

Dental

Turner, James Allen, 26321A.
×Hagen, Sidney Allen, 23178A.

Veterinary

Grau, William Henry, Jr., 23073A.
Greer, Russell Flagg, 21867A.
Davis, Harold Clayton, 23075A.
Bilderback, William Riley, 23216A.
Douglas, Jack Donnalee, 25331A.
Garner, Howard Scott, 25669A.
Harris, Milford Douglas, Jr., 25670A.
×Ringley, Donald William, 24225A.
×Griffin, Thomas Ponton, 23217A.
×Barnes, Charles Miller, 23218A.
Benson, Richard Earl, 24226A.
×Reeves, Johnie Lee, 23220A.
Clayton, Frederick Ware, 23219A.
×Moe, Douglas Ford, 26645A.
Barron, Charlie Nelms, 25671A.
×Young, Robert Joiner, 24227A.
×Nold, Max Marcell, 23597A.
×McGown, Murlin Lee, 23598A.
Howells, William Veatch, 25672A.
×Crandell, Robert Allen, 24229A.
×Bailey, Robert William, 24231A.
×Houk, Donald Clement, 24228A.
×Phelps, Gene Collins, 24230A.
×Terry, John Leary, Jr., 24232A.

Medical Service

×Herrin, Daniel Monroe, Jr., 21620A.
×Little, Herman Ivy, 21616A.
×Holihan, Francis Leonard, 21607A.
Ruffing, Donald Joseph, 21621A.
×Schult, Harold George, 21617A.
Johnson, John Alfred, 21611A.
Beck, William Stanislaus, 21612A.
×Cook, Raymond John, 21610A.
Nicely, Harry Benson, Jr., 21622A.
×Zellers, Billy Bob, 21614A.
×Maroif, Kenneth Loyd, 21613A.
Winkelblech, Donald Ray, 21624A.
×Woolf, Henry McCune, 21615A.
Garner, Walter Frank, 21609A.
×Allinson, John Nils, 21626A.
×Whitt, Orbin Russell, 21625A.
×Weller, William Edger, 21618A.
Roftis, Robert Jesse, 21623A.
×Smyth, Kenneth Eugene, 21619A.
Werderman, Charles John, 21872A.
Connolly, Owen Francis, 21868A.
×Foley, Frank Robertson, 21870A.
×Saul, Lee Irvin, 21871A.
×Kimball, Lorenzo Kent, 21869A.
×Tayloe, Leon Thomas, 23076A.
×Swimmer, Adolph Harold, 24233A.
×Lubrant, Anthony John, 21627A.

Chaplain

Graeber, Joseph Marlin, 23210A.
Denehy, John Francis, 24683A.
×Ketter, Leander Joseph, 23211A.
Boardman, William Armistead, 25631A.
×Verbeke, Robert Henry, 24684A.
×King, William Joseph, 24685A.
×Kullowatz, Vernon Frederick, 24686A.

Women's Medical Specialist

×Deming, Elsie L., 20901A.

SECOND LIEUTENANT TO FIRST LIEUTENANT

Air Force

Walters, Marvin Lee, 23116A.
Bronner, Edmond James, 23115A.
Johnson, Samuel Robert, Jr., 25936A.
O'Malley, Gene Jolliffe, 25937A.
×Bennett, John Harley, 23139A.
Gray, David Lawrence, 23142A.
×Gustafson, George Alan, 23140A.
×Yanecek, Earl Eugene, 23144A.
×VanGorder, Francis Cleve, 23145A.
Mayo, Jack Bernard, 25938A.
Humphrey, Eugene Channing, 25939A.
×Welch, Billy Jack, 23146A.
×Smith, Arthur Clair, Jr., 24605A.
Lawson, Richard LaVerne, 25940A.
×Donohue, William John, Jr., 24173A.
×Buckland, Alwyn Charles, 23153A.
×Rozsa, Allen Claire, 24606A.
×Davila Aponte, Luis Angel, 23147A.
×Astrella, Ralph John, 24609A.
×Christenson, Arnold Petri, 24610A.
Bond, Jack David, 26583A.
×Stoltenberg, Richard Edward, 24612A.
×Brown, William Earl, Jr., 23193A.
Brown, Stuart LeRoy, Jr., 23192A.
×Larue, James Eugene, Jr., 23191A.
×Low, James Frederick, 23194A.
Berger, Warren George, 23198A.
Miller, Alfred Marion, Jr., 23195A.
Ingram, Benjamin Franklin, Jr., 23210A.
×Parks, Roland William, 23197A.
×Moore, Thomas Lee, 23196A.
Hunt, Billie Bob, 23200A.
×Hayford, Robert Louis, 25942A.
Kauttu, Paul Alfred, 25941A.
O'Connell, Donald Roger, 26586A.
Tracy, Fred Lewis, 26587A.
×Pate, William Bernard, 26584A.
×Pratt, Carl Ely, Jr., 26585A.
Chapman, Henry Alan, 26588A.
Milstead, Robert Evans, 24613A.
×Mitchell, Robert Jean, 24614A.
×Wood, Richard Jack, 24615A.
Winston, Marjory Eva, 25943W.
Tarver, William R., 26590A.
×Brown, Norma Elaine, 26589W.
Dellaripa, James Michael, 26591A.
×Swing, Herbert Ralston, Jr., 23149A.
Paul, William Sidney, 23151A.
Green, Elmer Harold, Jr., 23150A.
Herrick, Ronald Charles, 26592A.
James, Francis Edward, Jr., 26593A.
Miller, Charles B., 26595A.
Ashe, Mary Ellen, 26596W.
King, Gilberta, 25944W.
×Kramer, Edward Francis, Jr., 23154A.
×Cooper, Byrum Wilson, 24867A.
Koetting, Donald Joseph, 23629A.
Thomas, John Powers, 23624A.
×Doak, Malcolm Robert, 23628A.
×Gillory, Byron Morris, 23621A.
×Athanas, George Lyke, 23619A.
×Bounds, Jesse Clemson, Jr., 23620A.
×Saville, David Barnhardt, 23623A.
×Disch, Thomas Harold, Jr., 23627A.
Forsman, Billy Baker, 23626A.
Toma, Joseph Shaker, 25946A.
Bakken, Robert Wayne, 25945A.
Collins, Kenneth Stanley, 26597A.
Spencer, James Hoyte, Jr., 26598A.
×Warner, William Ayres, 23158A.
×Light, Wilbur Smith, 23156A.
×Bauman, Wendall Carter, 23159A.
×Quinn, James Lester, 23155A.
Browning, George Moore, Jr., 23157A.
×Hoffman, Charles Raymond, Jr., 23160A.
Doerty, Walter Lafayette, Jr., 22777A.
×Bridgman, Oscar Cleon, Jr., 25947A.
Whitaker, Benjamin Merrill, 24868A.
Folline, William Benjamin, 26599A.
×Valentine, Garrison Norton, 24617A.
Myers, Richard Lee, 24616A.
×Walker, Ian Gordon, 24618A.
Puryear, Edgar Francis, Jr., 23252A.
×Foster, Murphy James, Jr., 23253A.
×Akers, George Storms, 24967A.
×Jones, Aldred Wilson, 24970A.
×Vanderheide, Norma Gail, 24971W.
×Anding, Thomas Earl, 24968A.
Foster, Harl Randal, 26600A.
Gaylord, Bradley, Jr., 23635A.
×Fisher, John Levi, 23641A.
×Shearon, James Thomas, 23644A.
Somers, Eugene Kinkead, 23649A.
Rose, Charles Kenneth, 3d, 23647A.
×Lee, John Thomas, Jr., 23642A.
×Jancauskas, Alidore Anthony, 23638A.
×Sanet, Edward, 23648A.
×deClairmont, Ralph Gregg, 23636A.
×Romack, Joseph Conrad, 23646A.
×Roesener, Arlie Keith, 23640A.
×Smith, Edwin Luther, 23645A.
×Randerson, John Tremper, 23643A.
×Kline, Cozier Snider, 23632A.
×Neuner, Louis George, Jr., 23633A.
×Cameron, Lyle Willis, 23634A.
×Kohlmeier, Edward John, 26604A.
×Kelly, Henry Miles, 26601A.
Seufert, William Sherman, 206603A.
Donnelly, Charles Lawthers, Jr., 26605A.
Weissgarber, Martin, Jr., 26606A.
Gray, Fred William, 26602A.
×Ford, Claude Junior, 24619A.
×Partridge, Robert Wilson, 26607A.

Medical Service

×Little, Robert Lorenzo, 24256A.
×March, James Edward, 25346A.
Moyer, James Earl, 25683A.
×Cortner, Robert Harold, 25347A.
×Dowell, Frank Herbert, 25348A.
Mengebier, Robert Arthur, 25742A.
×Mixson, Marion Hagood, Jr., 25349A.
×Brenner, Theodore Engelbert, 25684A.
×Hirsch, Jerome Albert, 25350A.
×Buckeridge, Francis Arthur, 25351A.
Archibald, Erwin Roger, 25685A.
Clayton, Eugenia, 25686W.
Huggins, Henry Alexander, Jr., 25687A.
×McLain, George Hobson, Jr., 25352A.
Hadley, Neil Blaine, 26669A.

Nurse

×Sands, Mary Louise Ryder, 23246W.
×Wells, Helen, 23247W.
×Maisey, Alberta Frances, 23243W.
×King, Wanda Mae, 23244W.

Women's Medical Specialist

×Potter, Olive Justine, 23248W.

(NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 10, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Frank F. Warren, president of Whitworth College, Spokane, Wash., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God our Father, in the spirit of reverence we would come into Thy presence this day. Thou hast told us that we ought to pray and not to faint. We look at our world and at the tasks which are ours, and too often we grow faint in the realization of our personal shortcomings. Help us to realize anew the divine strength which is ours for the asking, the wisdom which is ours for the seeking, and the understanding of Thy divine will for ourselves, our Nation, and the world.

We ask this day for Thy divine blessing upon the Congress of the United States. The problems that confront us as a nation are multitudinous and the decisions made this day may be momentous. May each Member of the House realize anew the wisdom that comes from above, and may hearts and minds be open to Thy leadership. Help us to be great enough to put behind us the trivia of life and may we unite on all that is essential. Forgive us for all that Thou dost see in our conduct and conversation unworthy of us and cleanse our hearts through the indwelling of Thy Spirit through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 6, 1955, was read and approved.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 4. Joint resolution to provide for the continuation in office of certain members of the Commission on Governmental Operations.

THE HONORABLE EDMUND P. RADWAN

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JANUARY 7, 1955.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: In accordance with your designation of me, pursuant to House Resolution 11, 84th Congress, adopted by the House of Representatives, to administer the oath of office to Representative-elect EDMUND P. RADWAN, of the 41st District of New York, I have the honor to report that on the 7th day of January 1955, at Buffalo, Erie County, State of New York, I administered the oath of office to Mr. RADWAN, form prescribed by section 1757 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, being the form of oath administered to Members of the House of Representatives, to which Mr. RADWAN subscribed.

I have the honor to be,
Yours respectfully,
EDWARD A. RATH,
County Clerk, Erie County, N. Y.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 71) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas EDMUND P. RADWAN, a Representative from the State of New York, from the 41st District thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of this House, but has sworn to and subscribed to the oath of office before Mr. Edward A. Rath, Erie County clerk, Buffalo, N. Y., authorized by resolution of this House to administer the oath, and the said oath of office has been presented in his behalf to the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said EDMUND P. RADWAN as a Member of this House.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. PASSMAN appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEES

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 72) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Appropriations: John Taber, New York; Richard B. Wigglesworth, Massachusetts; Ben J. Jensen, Iowa; H. Carl Andersen, Minnesota; Walt Horan, Washington; Gordon Canfield, New Jersey; Ivor D. Fenton, Pennsylvania; John Phillips, California; Errett P. Scrivner, Kansas; Frederic R. Coudert, Jr., New York; Cliff Clevenger, Ohio; Earl Wilson, Indiana; Glenn R. Davis, Wisconsin; Benjamin F. James, Pennsylvania; Gerald R. Ford, Jr., Michigan; Edward T. Miller, Maryland; Charles W. Vursell, Illinois; T. Millet Hand 2d, New Jersey; Harold C. Ostertag, New York; Frank T. Bow, Ohio.

Committee on House Administration: Karl M. LeCompte, Iowa; Albert P. Morano, Connecticut; Paul F. Schenck, Ohio; Joseph L. Carrigg, Pennsylvania; Robert D. Harrison, Nebraska; Robert J. Corbett, Pennsylvania; John B. Bennett, Michigan; Patrick J. Hillings, California; Oliver P. Bolton, Ohio; Glenard P. Lipscomb, California.

Committee on Ways and Means: Daniel A. Reed, New York; Thomas A. Jenkins, Ohio; Richard M. Simpson, Pennsylvania; Robert W. Kean, New Jersey; Noah M. Mason, Illinois; Hal Holmes, Washington; John W. Byrnes, Wisconsin; Antoni N. Sadlak, Connecticut; Howard H. Baker, Tennessee; Thomas B. Curtis, Missouri.

The resolution was agreed to.

SELECTION OF MAJORITY WHIP

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make an announcement. Those Members who served in the 83d and past Congresses know that the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. PRIEST, has been the Democratic whip.

Mr. PRIEST now assumes the very responsible position of chairman of the very important Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He has himself made the decision that the duties of that chairmanship are such that he feels constrained to confine his activities to that position.

As a result of that it became necessary to select a majority whip. I am very pleased to announce to my colleagues today that the Speaker and I, in conference, have designated and selected the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. CARL ALBERT, to be the majority whip during this Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 3, 1955.

The Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: In replying to your urgent request that I continue as the Democratic whip, let me say first of all that I am deeply grateful to you for extending to me the opportunity to serve again in that position.

I shall always cherish among my finest memories the very close and fine relationships with you and Speaker RAYBURN during the time I served as the Democratic whip.

I wish very much that I could feel that it would be possible for me to continue as the whip and at the same time assume the chairmanship of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I have served on that committee for 12 years and I know something about the load that the chairman of the committee must carry. This has been a difficult decision for me to make, but I feel that I cannot do both jobs as I think they should be done and I shall give to the position of chairman the best I have in energy, effort, and thought.

Let me assure you again that this is a decision that has not been easily reached and further assure you that I shall always be grateful for your friendship and your cooperation during the time I served as the Democratic whip and to pledge to you and to whoever may be appointed to this position my very closest cooperation at all times.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely yours,
J. PERCY PRIEST.

JANUARY 7, 1955.

Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR PERCY: I am in receipt of your letter of January 3 and I want you to know I regretted very much the decision you made that you did not feel you could continue as Democratic whip, that the arduous duties of your chairmanship of the all-important Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce constituted your first attention and required your constant attention. You performed your duties throughout the years you were Democratic whip in an outstanding and most effective manner. I always valued the close relationship that existed between you and Speaker RAYBURN and myself, and your loyalty and devotion to both the Speaker and myself.

As chairman of the very important Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce you will make an outstanding record for

yourself and make marked contributions to the progress of our country and the benefit of our people. It is needless for me to tell you that in any way I can cooperate with you, either personally or officially, it will always be a pleasure for me to do so.

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours.

SELECTION OF MINORITY WHIP

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce on the part of the Republican Members that we have reappointed our very efficient whip, Mr. LES ARENDS, of Illinois.

FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 63)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

For the consideration of the Congress, I submit my recommendations for further developing the foreign economic policy of the United States. Although largely based upon my special message to the Congress of March 30, 1954, these proposals are the product of fresh review.

The Nation's enlightened self-interest and sense of responsibility as a leader among the free nations require a foreign economic program that will stimulate economic growth in the free world through enlarging opportunities for the fuller operation of the forces of free enterprise and competitive markets. Our own self-interest requires such a program because (1) economic strength among our allies is essential to our security; (2) economic growth in underdeveloped areas is necessary to lessen international instability growing out of the vulnerability of such areas to Communist penetration and subversion; and (3) an increasing volume of world production and trade will help assure our own economic growth and a rising standard of living among our own people.

In the worldwide struggle between the forces of freedom and those of communism, we have wisely recognized that the security of each nation in the free world is dependent upon the security of all other nations in the free world. The measure of that security in turn is dependent upon the economic strength of all free nations, for without economic strength they cannot support the military establishments that are necessary to deter Communist armed aggression. Economic strength is indispensable, as well, in securing themselves against internal Communist subversion.

For every country in the free world economic strength is dependent upon high levels of economic activity internally and high levels of international trade. No nation can be economically self-sufficient. Nations must buy from other nations, and in order to pay for what they buy they must sell. It is essential for the security of the United States and the rest of the free world that the United States take the leadership in promoting the achievement of those high levels of trade that will bring to all the economic strength upon which the freedom and security of all depends. Those high levels of trade can be promoted by the specific measures with respect to trade barriers recommended in this message, by the greater flow of capital among nations of the free world, by convertibility of currencies, by an expanded interchange of technical counsel, and by an increase in international travel.

From the military standpoint, our national strength has been augmented by the overall military alliance of the nations constituting the free world. This free world alliance will be most firmly cemented when its association is based on flourishing mutual trade as well as common ideals, interests, and aspirations. Mutually advantageous trade relationships are not only profitable but they are also more binding and more enduring than costly grants and other forms of aid.

Today numerous uneconomic, man-made barriers to mutually advantageous trade and the flow of investment are preventing the nations of the free world from achieving their full economic potential. International trade and investment are not making their full contribution to production, employment, and income. Over a large area of the world currencies are not yet convertible.

We and our friends abroad must together undertake the lowering of the unjustifiable barriers to trade and investment, and we must do it on a mutual basis so that the benefits may be shared by all.

Such action will add strength to our own domestic economy and help assure a rising standard of living among our people by opening new markets for our farms and factories and mines.

The program that I am here recommending is moderate, gradual, and reciprocal. Radical or sudden tariff reductions would not be to the interest of the United States and would not accomplish the goal we seek. A moderate program, however, can add immeasurably to the security and well-being of the United States and the rest of the free world.

TRADE AGREEMENT AUTHORITY

I request a 3-year extension of Presidential authority to negotiate tariff reductions with other nations on a gradual, selective, and reciprocal basis. This authority would permit negotiations for reductions in those barriers that now limit the markets for our goods throughout the world. I shall ask all nations with whom we trade to take similar steps in their relations with each other.

The 3-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act should authorize, subject to the present peril and escape clause provisions:

1. Reduction, through multilateral and reciprocal negotiations, of tariff rates on selected commodities by not more than 5 percent per year for 3 years;

2. Reduction, through multilateral and reciprocal negotiations, of any tariff rates in excess of 50 percent to that level over a 3-year period; and

3. Reduction, by not more than one-half over a 3-year period, of tariff rates in effect on January 1, 1945, on articles which are not now being imported or which are being imported only in negligible quantities.

THE GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

For approximately 7 years the United States has cooperated with all the major trading nations of the free world in an effort to reduce trade barriers. The instrument of cooperation is the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Through this agreement the United States has sought to carry out the provisions and purposes of the Trade Agreements Act.

The United States and 33 other trading countries are now reviewing the provisions of the agreement for the purpose of making it a simpler and more effective instrument for the development of a sound system of world trade. When the current negotiations on the revision of the organizational provisions of the General Agreement are satisfactorily completed, the results will be submitted to the Congress for its approval.

CUSTOMS ADMINISTRATION AND PROCEDURE

Considerable progress has been made in freeing imports from unnecessary customs administrative burdens. Still more, however, needs to be done in the three areas I mentioned in my message last year: (1) the simplification of commodity definitions, classification and rate structures; (2) improvement in standards for the valuation of imports; and (3) further improvement of procedures for customs administration.

An important step toward simplification of the tariff structure was taken by the Congress last year with the passage of the Customs Simplification Act which directs the Tariff Commission to study the difficulties of commodity classification of imports. The interim report of the Tariff Commission to be made by next March 15 should help enable the Congress to determine whether further legislative steps should then be taken or should await submission of the final report.

The uncertainties and confusion arising from the complex system of valuation on imported articles cause unwarranted delays in the determination of customs duties. I urge the Congress to give favorable consideration to legislation for remedying this situation.

The improvement of customs administration requires continuous effort, as the Congress recognized by enacting the Customs Simplification Acts of 1953 and 1954. The Treasury Department in its annual report to the Congress will review the remaining reasons for delay or difficulty in processing imported articles through customs and will propose still further technical amendments to simplify customs procedures.

UNITED STATES INVESTMENT ABROAD

The whole free world needs capital; America is its largest source. In that light, the flow of capital abroad from our country must be stimulated and in such

a manner that it results in investment largely by individuals or private enterprises rather than by Government.

An increased flow of United States private investment funds abroad, especially to the underdeveloped areas, could contribute much to the expansion of two-way international trade. The underdeveloped countries would thus be enabled more easily to acquire the capital equipment so badly needed by them to achieve sound economic growth and higher living standards. This would do much to offset the false but alluring promises of the Communists.

To facilitate the investment of capital abroad I recommend enactment of legislation providing for taxation of business income from foreign subsidiaries or branches at a rate 14 percentage points lower than the corporate rate on domestic income, and a deferral of tax on income of foreign branches until it is removed from the country where it is earned.

I propose also to explore the further use of tax treaties with the possible recognition of tax concessions made to foreign capital by other countries. Under proper safeguards, credit could be given for foreign income taxes which are waived for an initial limited period, as we now grant credit for taxes which are imposed. This would give maximum effectiveness to foreign tax laws designed to encourage new enterprises.

As a further step to stimulate investment abroad, I recommend approval by the Congress at the appropriate time of membership in the proposed International Finance Corporation, which will be affiliated with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. This Corporation will be designed to increase private investment in less developed countries by making loans without Government guaranties. Although the Corporation will not purchase stock, it will provide venture capital through investing in debentures and similar obligations. Its operation will cover a field not dealt with by an existing institution.

The executive branch will continue through our diplomatic representatives abroad to encourage a climate favorable to the private enterprise concept in investment.

We shall continue to seek other new ways to enlarge the outward flow of capital.

It must be recognized, however, that when American private capital moves abroad it properly expects to bring home its fair reward. This can only be accomplished in the last analysis by our willingness to purchase more goods and services from abroad in order to provide the dollars for these growing remittances. This fact is a further compelling reason for a fair and forward-looking trade policy on our part.

TECHNICAL COOPERATION

The United States has a vast store of practical and scentific know-how that is needed in the underdeveloped areas of the world. The United States has a responsibility to make it available. Its flow for peaceful purposes must remain unfettered.

United States participation in technical cooperation programs should be carried forward. These programs should be concerned with know-how rather than large funds. In my budget message next week, I shall recommend that the Congress make available the funds required to support the multilateral technical cooperation programs of the United Nations. The bilateral programs of the United States should be pressed vigorously.

INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL

The United States remains committed to the objective of freedom of travel throughout the world. Encouragement given to travel abroad is extremely important both for its cultural and social importance in the free world, and for its economic benefits. Travel abroad by Americans provides an important source of dollars for many countries. The executive branch shall continue to look for ways of facilitating international travel and shall continue to cooperate with private travel agencies.

One legislative action that would be beneficial in this field is the increase of the present duty-free allowances for tourists from $500 to $1,000 exercisable every 6 months. I recommend the passage of such legislation.

TRADE FAIRS

International trade fairs have been of major importance to foreign countries for many years, and most of the trading nations have strengthened the promotional aspects of their industrial displays in many fairs with a central exhibit designed to emphasize the industrial progress and achievement of the nation.

Soviet and satellite exhibits, for example, have been costly, well planned, and housed in expensive structures designed to convey the impression that the U. S. S. R. is producing on a large scale for peace and is creating a paradise for workers.

The United States, which has a larger volume of international trade than any other nation, until recently has been conspicuous by its absence at these trade fairs. American visitors and participants have pointed out the failure of their Government to tell adequately the story of our free-enterprise system and to provide effective international trade promotion cooperation.

As a result, I have undertaken an international trade fair program under the direction of the Department of Commerce. Since the inauguration of this program in August, participation has been authorized in 11 fairs to be held before June 30. Sixteen additional fairs are being considered for exhibition purposes in the latter part of the year. The first fair in which the United States presented a central exhibit is that at Bangkok, which opened December 7, 1954. At it our exhibit was awarded first prize. Over 100 American companies supplied items for inclusion in it.

I shall ask the Congress for funds to continue this program.

CONVERTIBILITY

Convertibility of currencies is required for the development of a steadily rising volume of world trade and investment. The achievement of convertibility has not been possible in the postwar period due to dislocations caused by the war, inflation, and other domestic economic difficulties in many countries, which have contributed to an imbalance in international trade and payments. However, steady progress, particularly by Western European countries, is being made toward our mutual objective of restoring currency convertibility. The foreign economic program proposed here will make an important contribution to the achievement of convertibility.

AGRICULTURE

No single group within America has a greater stake in a healthy and expanding foreign trade than the farmers. One-fourth to one-third of some major crops, such as wheat, cotton, and tobacco, must find markets abroad in order to maintain farm income at high levels.

If they are to be successful, programs designated to promote the prosperity of agriculture should be consistent with our foreign economic program. We must take due account of the effect of any agricultural program on our foreign economic relations to assure that it contributes to the development of healthy, expanding foreign markets over the years.

CONCLUSION

The series of recommendations I have just made are all components of an integrated program, pointing in a single direction. Each contributes to the whole. Each advances our national security by bringing added strength and self-sufficiency to our allies. Each contributes to our economic growth and a rising standard of living among our people.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 10, 1955.*

PERMISSION TO CONSIDER EMERGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL ON THURSDAY

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have leave on Thursday next to report and take up for consideration an emergency appropriation bill.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that funds appropriated by this bill will be needed before the close of the week, and for that reason, if I have the approval of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], I ask that the committee be permitted to bring it up on the day reported, the 3-day rule to the contrary notwithstanding. The bill is otherwise privileged for immediate consideration.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I can see nothing for us to do except to pass some bill along the line of the budget estimate that will be presented. Therefore, I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES UNDER PUBLIC LAW 480—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 62)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith my first semiannual report on the activities carried on under Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as required by that law.

Public Law 480 is an expression by Congress of its determination to deal with the abundance of our agricultural production in a constructive way. Despite the problems created by this abundance, we may be thankful we live in a land which is able to produce plentifully rather than one which suffers the affliction of food shortages.

The enclosed report includes the dollar value of the foreign currency for which commodities exported pursuant to section 102 (a) of the act have been sold, as well as the estimated order of magnitude of the total country programs which have been generally agreed on but not fully negotiated, together with the cost to the Commodity Credit Corporation of such sales. The report also contains a summary of the policies and operating techniques envolved for the administration of the act during the first 6 months of its existence.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 10, 1955.*

POSITIONS OF CLERK FOR THE MAJORITY WHIP AND MESSENGER IN THE MAJORITY CAUCUS ROOM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution, (H. Res. 73).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 6, 1955, the positions of clerk for the majority whip and messenger in the majority caucus room at the basic salary rates of $3,000 and $1,740 per annum, respectively, shall be vacated, and in lieu thereof there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation for office personnel for the majority whip to be appointed by him at rates of compensation totaling not more than $5,000 basic per annum.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, this does not change the amount?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. It permits the majority whip to allocate the amount as he desires. I may say that I obtained that permission 2 years ago as minority whip. This now applies to the majority.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POSITIONS OF SECRETARY, LEGISLATIVE CLERK, CLERK, ADDITIONAL CLERK, ASSISTANT CLERK, AND STENOGRAPHER IN THE MAJORITY LEADER'S OFFICE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution (H. Res. 74).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 6, 1955, the positions of secretary, legislative clerk, clerk, additional clerk, assistant clerk, and stenographer, in the majority leader's office shall be vacated and in lieu thereof there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation for office personnel for the majority leader to be appointed by him at rates of compensation totaling not more than $18,340 basic per annum.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I may say that the same situation applies here. There is no increase in the total amount, but it does give the majority leader freedom as to the allocation of the amount rather than being frozen to a certain amount for certain positions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION TO THE CHIEF JANITOR AND ASSISTANT CHIEF JANITOR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution (H. Res. 75).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 6, 1955, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, additional compensation to the chief janitor and the assistant chief janitor (minority), Doorkeeper's department at the basic salary rate of $1,100 and $300 per annum respectively.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this represents a $300 increase in the base salaries for two employees, one majority and the other minority, whose positions are mentioned in the resolution I have just offered.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, this is agreeable to us.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] obtained unanimous consent in relation to bringing up certain emergency appropriation items on Thursday next. That resolution, including those items, will come up at that time with my understanding that they are noncontroversial, so there will be no rollcall. Those items would not come out of committee unless they were unanimous, and I am making this statement so that the Members might be aware of the fact that those are emergency appropriation items. One relating to the FHA involves windfalls and additional employees. The second involves foreign claim settlements and an appropriation in connection with that. The third involves the Commodity Credit Corporation in connection with group team work for which funds are lacking, and fourth, an item or items in connection with the legislative aspects of the appropriation bill.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I wonder if the gentleman could tell us at this time what the House might expect this week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no knowledge of anything else.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it the purpose to adjourn from Tuesday to Thursday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. Tomorrow, as I understand, a message will come up on the postal-civil-service pay Government group health.

Mr. MARTIN. A message from the President?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; and there is a message on Thursday on the Armed Forces reserve plan and military pay. And, it is the intention to go over from Tuesday to Thursday.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The legislation Thursday will not include any funds to pay those 11 characters who were suspended from the United Nations?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. My understanding, may I say to the gentleman from Iowa, is that it is a unanimous report from the 40 members as of now. Of course, there are 20 on the Democratic side and 20 on the Republican side with 10 vacancies still to be filled on our side. One appropriation relates to FHA and the other one is a foreign claims settlement. What it is, I am unable to answer.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. I just wanted to be sure that no funds appropriated by this Congress will pay those 11 persons, the fifth-amendment Communists, of the United Nations.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I am not a member of the committee.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. There is nothing in here except some ordinary routine items, administrative costs for the Foreign Settlement Commission, and for FHA, and I understand there is one item on agriculture. It will not give anybody any trouble.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was sure that was so but I could not definitely answer the gentleman's question and I never want to make a statement unless I can back it up. I am glad the gentleman from Texas furnished the information that I could not give.

THE LATE JOHN G. COOPER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I arise to call the attention of the House to the fact that on last Friday a very distinguished former Member of this House passed away. I refer to the Honorable John G. Cooper, who served with distinction in this House for 22 successive years.

Mr. Cooper was born in 1872 and spent most of his life in Youngstown, Ohio. He had by reason of his industry and good character been elevated to a position of responsibility with one of the railroads in his section of the State. His first political service was that rendered as a member of the State Legislature for the State of Ohio. After serving one term in the State legislature, he was elected to membership in the United States House of Representatives. His service in the House of Representatives began on March 3, 1915. He served 11 successive terms, for a total service of 22 years in Congress.

Mr. Cooper was a man of high character and great natural ability. These, with his fine qualifications, brought to him the esteem and respect of all his colleagues, with the result that he had a great deal of influence in Congress. Soon after he left Congress, he was given the position of chairman of the board of claims of the Ohio Industrial Commission. He served in this capacity with distinction until 1945.

Mr. Cooper died last Friday at the home of his son in Hagerstown, Md. His body was taken to Youngstown where he was buried at the side of his wife.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that Mr. Cooper was a fine citizen, a very capable Congressman, and a true American in every way. We who knew him will miss him.

May he rest in peace.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON].

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with everything my distinguished Ohio colleague [Mr. JENKINS] has said, and to add my word of respect and admiration for the man who, after a long life of service slipped away 2 or 3 days ago. John Cooper was a man one could not but admire, respect, and love. Yes, he was a locomotive engineer who rose, as men can and do in this free land of ours, to sit in this great body. And how he loved his country and how well he represented the heart and soul of America, every moment that he was here, indeed every moment since he left us. Those of us who knew him are better off for his living.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to know John Cooper very well and to serve with him upon a special committee a little over 25 years ago, which laid out a program for the construction of the present Federal prison system. Mr. Cooper was the chairman of that committee and made a fine record. I am very sorry to hear of his passing.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] in paying my respects to John Cooper. He represented for 22 years the district which I now represent.

John Cooper was a gentleman, one of the finest characters who ever came to this House; so well loved that he was known all over the district he represented as John G. He represented the district well, had a fine family, truly a good American. As I say, he was loved and respected.

I repeat that I join my colleague from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] in paying my respects to John G., and may God have mercy upon him.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress our beloved late colleague, John Cooper, was one of the outstanding Members of Congress and one of its finest Members; a mental giant, a man who served his people, his State and country and the Congress of the United States with great distinction, making marked contributions to the progress of sound, constructive legislation through the Congress.

I was grieved when I read of his death. I join the Ohio delegation in their expressions of sympathy on this occasion.

Mr. JENKINS. I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues in these words of regret at the passing of former Congressman John Cooper, with whom I was privileged to serve. He was a man of outstanding ability and a great legislator. Always kind and courteous he was beloved by all. His death is a great loss to the State of Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Ohio in the expressions to which he has given voice with respect to the character and life of the late John G. Cooper, of Ohio.

When I came here in 1927, John G. Cooper was one of the ablest and most distinguished Members of this body. I soon learned to appreciate his high qualities of heart and mind and it was not surprising to find the high regard in which he was held by the membership of the House. It was with very great regret and sorrow that I learned of his death.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point, on the life and achievements of the late John G. Cooper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in an expression of respect and regret at the passing of the Honorable John Gordon Cooper, who served in this body with honor and distinction for nearly a quarter of a century. He had been a member of this body for 14 years when my father began his first term here. As dean of the Ohio delegation, John Cooper was looked up to by the younger members for his fairness, fatherly counsel, and kindliness. He represented his district for a total of 22 years until 1936, yet there are many, many of my constituents in the counties of Ashtabula and Trumbull who still have close personal remembrances of him, their last Republican representative for 16 years. I extend to his family my sympathy for their loss, but they can be proud, I know, of the mark he made in his four score years of devoted service to his country in these halls.

THE LATE HONORABLE CLYDE WILLIAMS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret and a feeling of personal loss that I announce to the House the death of the Honorable Clyde Williams, former Member, who died November 12, 1954. Congressman Williams, for many years represented the Eighth Congressional District of Missouri, the district I now have the honor of representing.

Congressman Williams is an excellent example of the typical American success story. From an humble beginning as a farm boy in Jefferson County, Mo., to the Halls of Congress; a gulf that could only be bridged in a free country, that is the story of Clyde Williams.

The people of the Eighth District knew they had a great statesman in Clyde Williams. They consistently sent him back term after term to represent them in the Congress of the United States. Mr. Williams was first elected to Congress in 1926. During this session he served capably on the House Naval Affairs Committee. From 1931 to 1943 Mr. Williams was one of the most influential Members on the Banking and Currency Committee. It was while serving on this very important Committee that Mr. Williams coauthored major amendments to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation laws that enabled our domestic industry to successfully meet the demands of World War II.

Clyde Williams was born on a farm near Grubville, Jefferson County, Mo., on October 13, 1873. He attended country

schools, De Soto High School, and the State Normal School at Cape Girardeau, Mo. He was graduated from the law department of the University of Missouri in 1901.

He was admitted to the bar the same year and commenced practice in De Soto, Mo. Mr. Williams was elected prosecuting attorney of Jefferson County in 1902 and served in that capacity until 1908. He also held the honored post of Democratic State Chairman in 1938.

After leaving Congress, Mr. Williams engaged in legal work for the RFC in Washington from 1943 until 1945. At that date he retired from public and political activity and lived in retirement at his home in Hillsboro, Mo.

I am sure many of you remember Clyde Williams. The recollection of his warm smile, his ready wit, his marvelous mastery of the spoken word and his unquestioned honesty, will live on in the hearts of his many friends in the Congress and in his beloved State and district. And with the passing of time the great legislative accomplishments of Clyde Williams will effectually blend into their well-earned place in history.

I join his many friends in sending to his family deepest sympathy in their great loss.

THE LATE MARTIN F. SMITH

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty today to announce to the House the death in this city on October 25, 1954, of the Honorable Martin F. Smith who for 10 years, from 1933 to 1943, was a Member of the House of Representatives from the Third District of Washington, which I now represent.

Martin Smith was born in Chicago. He was educated in the schools of that city and studied law at Northwestern University. When 20 years of age he decided to go West. He settled in the little lumbering, seaport town of Hoquiam, Wash. In Hoquiam he did accounting while pursuing his studies of the law. In 1912, when only 21 years of age, Martin Smith was admitted to the Washington State bar.

He served as a private in World War I.

Always interested in politics, Martin Smith served his city as municipal judge, as councilman and later as its mayor, winning the office by the largest majority ever obtained by any mayoralty candidate. Later, in 1932, he was nominated on the Democratic ticket for Congress from the Third District and in November 1932 became the first Democratic candidate in the then 22-year history of the district ever to carry it. He won reelection to Congress 4 times, serving a total of 10 years.

The Third District of Washington is in fact a peninsula. It is bounded for its full length on the west by the Pacific Ocean, on the south by the navigable waters of the great Columbia River, and on the north by the navigable waters of Puget Sound. The Third District of Washington has more ports than any congressional district in the Nation. Martin Smith, therefore, naturally sought and secured a place on the river and harbor committee, where he became an influential member. He obtained several waterway projects of interest to his district.

He was much interested in public power and was among those who worked to bring about the first power dam developments on the Columbia. His interest in behalf of Spanish-American War Veterans caused that organization to elect him to honorary membership.

But tides in politics change. In 1942 after he had been in office 10 years, the political tide ran out for Martin Smith and he was defeated by a Republican.

Soon thereafter Mr. Smith was appointed to the Board of Immigration Appeals from which he resigned 2 years later to run unsuccessfully in 1944 for the Democratic nomination for United States Senator. A month later he was appointed as a special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States which position Martin Smith was holding at the time of his death.

Martin Smith never lost interest in Congress and the friends and associates he made there and several times each year he would come on to the Hill to sit through an afternoon session of the House and to visit with old timers who knew him when he was a Member.

We extend to his widow and the two daughters and their families, who survive him, our sincerest sympathy.

FIELD PRICES OF NATURAL GAS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, may I call the attention of the membership of the House to the special order granted this afternoon to my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD] to speak on the subject of the authority of the Federal Power Commission to set field prices on natural gas. Mr. IKARD'S speech will deal with the decision rendered by the Supreme Court in the so-called Phillips case in June of last year.

If you are from oil- and gas-producing areas, you are, of course, intensely interested in this decision and will be interested in hearing my colleague's discussion. If you represent areas where natural gas is consumed, you will be interested in what he has to say from that standpoint. This should include many Members of the House of Representatives, but if it does not include all, then I call your attention to the fact that a fundamental philosophy is involved. It has to do with whether we allow government by bureaucracy and a further control of a vital industry by the Federal Government.

If you are from an oil- and gas-producing area, you will be interested in Mr. IKARD'S discussion of how this decision and the orders of the Federal Power Commission will affect this most important industry. If you are from those areas where natural gas is consumed, I think you may be convinced by Mr. IKARD'S discussion that your consumers will not receive cheaper gas by reason of prices at the production and gathering point being controlled by the Federal Government. All, of course, are interested in our national defense, and this factor will be developed. I hope before many weeks we will have legislation on the floor of this House to clarify the authority of the Federal Power Commission in the control of price on natural gas. In my opinion, it was never the intent of Congress that the Federal Power Commission should have such control, and, as will be pointed out by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD], the Federal Power Commission itself, after long and careful consideration, came to that conclusion. The Supreme Court in the so-called Phillips case decided otherwise, and now the Commission, unless Congress acts, has the responsibility of such control and will proceed to impose its regulations.

I hope you will be on the floor to hear the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD], a man eminently qualified to speak on this subject.

TARIFFS ON TEXTILES

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, with the extension of my own remarks in the RECORD, I am including a statement made before the Committee for Reciprocity Information on behalf of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute by R. Houston Jewell, vice president of the Crystal Springs Bleachery, of Chickamauga, Ga., and Mr. Robert Jackson the executive vice president of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc.

This statement is a most illuminating and really an alarming one and I hope it will be read by every Member of this House in whose district cotton textiles are produced.

In the name of protecting Japan it looks like the bright-eyed boys in the State Department and the do-gooders are willing to destroy the American cotton textile industry. Japan was formerly our enemy and it was due to the impressive record of the cotton industry that we were able to clothe our soldiers and give them tents under which to sleep and be protected from the elements thus aiding us to defeat Japan and the other members of the Axis. Shall we now destroy our cotton textile industry just to prevent Japan from trading with other nations? The question answers itself. I am sure that we are not going to stand by and see this happen to one of the great industries of our country.

I have today introduced a bill which would prevent the President from entering into any trade agreements with any country that would further reduce the tariffs on textiles. Already they have

been drastically reduced and to reduce them further would be a peril threatening the very life of the industry. I will have more to say about this threat as the year goes on if any attempt is made to lower these tariffs.

TARIFF NEGOTIATIONS ON AMERICAN COTTON MANUFACTURES AND RELATED ITEMS IN FORTHCOMING AGREEMENTS WITH JAPAN AND OTHER COUNTRIES

(Statement before the Committee for Reciprocity Information, December 21, 1954, of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute presented by R. Houston Jewell, vice president, Crystal Springs Bleachery, and Robert C. Jackson, executive vice president, American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc.)

(Other associations expressly endorsing this statement: Association of Cotton Textile Merchants, the Narrow Fabrics Association, National Association of Cotton Manufacturers, Southern Garment Manufacturers Association, the Thread Institute, Tufted Textile Fabrics Association, the Underwear Institute, the Yarn Distributors Association)

The cotton manufactures to be considered for tariff concessions in forthcoming trade agreements comprise almost the entire cloth production of the American cotton textile industry. It includes all countable cotton cloth, that is, cloth which can be basically described by the number of threads per inch and by yarn numbers and by weight. In addition, the list covers the products of the industry's chief customers. This coverage includes most apparel items made either of woven or knitted fabrics, with the single exception of cotton hose.

The published list does not necessarily imply that concessions will actually be granted on every item. It does imply, however, that every item is the subject of a potential concession. The comprehensive nature of the list leaves us with the conclusion that the entire cotton textile industry of the United States is regarded as potentially expendable.

This conclusion is reinforced by reference to schedule XIII, Manufactures of Rayon or Other Synthetic Textile. Here are listed synthetic yarns and filaments of rayon or other synthetic textile, of cut fiber or staple fiber or any other type. This is a listing of the most extraordinary significance to the cotton industry of the United States. Tariff concessions on cotton goods are a threat to domestic cotton consumption and therefore a threat to the American cotton farmer.

Tariff concessions on synthetic yarns are another danger. Such an action taken when the price of cotton is being upheld by the agricultural program can have no other result than a wide disparity between the price of rayon yarns and the price of raw cotton. The competitive effect would be to compel the cotton mills of the United States to switch from cotton to rayon. No better device could be contrived to sound the doom of the American cotton farmer along with the American cotton-manufacturing industry.

We feel that it is highly relevant to point out that no other major industry is to any important degree exposed to the potential sacrifice considered for the cotton industry. The American people feel that the great mass-production industries of the United States are so much more efficient than foreign industries as to be immune to the dangers of unlimited foreign competition.

Hence we expect that the articles selected for tariff reduction would include the products of these great superefficient mass-production industries. They are either not on the list at all, or are relatively minor items.

With respect to the other great industries of the mass-production type, we can say from the list of negotiable items that they are most tenderly treated.

Stating our proposition in positive terms, the list supports strongly the conviction that the tariff program of the United States, as currently set up, strikes at the little fellows, especially those who most need protection. It is a program which threatens to undermine the small business of America. It is a program that admits that a number of industries will be hurt and that Government aids and subsidies will have to be relied on to put the bread of charity into the mouths of their workers. We now know what industries and activities are in danger. Cotton agriculture, threatened by tariff reductions on synthetic yarns, is a great segment of our economy. But, it is made up of little fellows.

The cotton-manufacturing industry of the United States, taken as a whole, is a giant industry with an invested capital of more than $6 billion and an army of workers exceeding a million and a quarter. But its component parts are mostly little fellows. Seventy-five percent of the industry is made up of small independent units, no one of which has as much as 1 percent of the total business.

The great iron and steel industry, whose giant proportions tax the imagination, comes under Schedule III, Metals and Manufacturers of. There is listed there thumbtacks, needles, nail files, surgical and dental instruments, shotguns and pistols. As an example of complete mopping up on a little fellow is the inclusion of bicycle bells, which is about all that is left of the bicycle industry. And so it goes throughout the entire list, whether we look at chinaware and glassware, or agricultural products where the direct targets are the poultrymen, the fishermen, the dairymen, the berry pickers, and the growers of lily bulbs and mushrooms.

The authors of the negotiable list have a long and varied assemblage of articles in Schedule XV, Sundries. From a host of small industries, they list rubber balls, beads, hats and bonnets, toothbrushes, handbags, laces, dog leashes, candles, hair combs, tobacco pouches, umbrella handles, and frog legs. We consider the formulation of this list of expendable industries as a proper subject of congressional investigation. We shall request such investigation.

The Small Business Administration, which is one of the leading bipartisan constructive efforts on Capitol Hill, will be sorely put to it to find applicants in the future for their loans and other aids to small business.

In the case of the cotton textile industry, at least 75 percent of which is small business, previous trade agreements have already imposed tariff reductions on about 91 percent of the industry's production. The cuts have averaged about 37 percent. For many individual items they have amounted to as much as 50 percent, and on a limited number the cuts have already reached the permissible maximum of 75 percent.

All of the important concessions granted have gone to the major textile exporting countries of Western Europe—the United Kingdom, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Italy, Germany, France, Belgium, and Austria. As a result of these concessions, the average ad valorem equivalent on imported cotton goods as computed by the Tariff Commission as of January 1, 1952, is 22.4 percent. Were this computation brought down to date, it would probably show an appreciably lower average duty because of the increased proportion of higher quality finished imports which carry a lower ad valorem rate.

Of the concessions granted to the United States, most have been nullified, some have been revoked, and in only one instance, namely the concession granted by Canada, has there been continuous and complete fulfillment.

The import restrictions of Western Europe have amounted to a virtually complete embargo against textiles from the United States and incidentally from Japan. The same import restrictions have also been typical of most of the underdeveloped countries of the world and have been strengthened by a continued uptrend of textile tariff rates in most countries.

Despite all these developments, the United States has not only kept faith in its concessions, but has generalized them to all the free countries. As a consequence Japan has become the chief beneficiary. Her exports to the United States exceed those of all other countries combined and currently our imports from Japan are sharply rising. Continuance of this trend will make American tariff rates a matter of little importance to the United Kingdom and the countries of Western Europe. Whatever our rates may be, Western Europe will be unable to compete with Japan in the American market except on limited ranges of specialty goods.

The truth is that the United Kingdom and all of the textile-manufacturing countries of Europe fear Japanese competition quite as much as does the American industry, even though their manufacturing costs are lower than those of the United States.

For a long period proponents of lower tariffs have declared that lower wages in foreign countries were offset by correspondingly lower efficiencies. Textile managements know that this is not so. Japan now has a cotton-manufacturing industry whose efficiency is equal to or above the industries of Europe and which compares favorably with the average efficiency of the American industry.

The Japanese industry is new. At the end of World War II, its residue of spindles from the losses of war was less than 1½ million. Since that time the spindleage has grown to about 8½ million, the growth representing completely new and modern equipment. In fact a considerable number of Japanese cotton mills now stand at the world's top level of textile efficiency. Yet their average wages are in the neighborhood of 13 cents an hour, which is one-tenth of the average cotton textile wage in the United States. Raw material costs are essentially the same in Japan, the United States, and Western Europe. Of the remaining costs about one-half consist of wages. With a wage cost, therefore, which is roughly one-third of that prevailing in Western Europe and one-tenth of that in the United States, Japan has a competitive advantage over the entire Western World which reaches its maximum in comparison with the United States.

The wage picture for the major cotton textile-manufacturing countries is as follows, on an average hourly straight-time basis:

United States	$1.30
Switzerland	.43
United Kingdom	.40
France	.38
Italy (estimated)	.30
India	.095
Germany	.317
Japan	.136

It is the position of the American industry that present tariff rates constitute no barrier to expanding imports of Japanese goods. In fact the volume of imports from that country could have been vastly greater during the past 2 or 3 years had the Japanese chosen to invade the American market. They did not so choose for the following reasons: (1) The volume of Japanese exports was expanding at a reasonably satisfactory rate without necessity of large exports to the United States. Japan is once more the world's leading exporter of cotton goods and this year the total volume is expected to reach 1.2 billion yards; (2) the

Japanese industry knows that the United States industry is also an overcapacity industry, dependent on its export trade to avoid heavy surpluses and domestic market depression. In this view, the Japanese have been very realistic. They have not joined with the United Kingdom and the countries of Western Europe in the clamor for American tariff reductions on textiles; (3) the Japanese dollar position has been kept very comfortable by the enormous expenditures of the United States in that country. For the past 2 years, in fact, dollars have been far more abundant in Japan than the soft currencies. Japan has had to draw heavily upon her dollar account to buy goods from the sterling area, from Latin America, and from a number of the European countries. On several occasions she has been forced to use dollars for the purchase of sterling because of the virtual sterling area embargo against Japanese goods.

These things being so, the question may be asked why the inflow of Japanese cotton goods has doubled and possibly quadrupled during September, October, and November of the current year, as indicated by cargo manifests at the port of New York and by cabled reports of shipments from Tokyo but not yet reported by the Bureau of the Census. During these 3 months Japanese textile imports on an annual basis would be the equivalent of 150 million yards or more, thus reaching the peak levels of 1936 and 1937. The explanation may be the statements from the United States Government regarding the liberalization of Japanese imports into the United States. The Japanese have been made to feel that they now have an open invitation to invade the American market.

During the past several years the American industry has come to have respect for the Japanese, both as textile manufacturers and as sound appraisers of the economic and political difficulties which beset the world textile trade. In a number of textile conferences we have joined them in a study of international textile trade difficulties and the means of their solution. We have not been in disagreement on any major point.

At Buxton, England, in September 1952 the Japanese stated their analysis of cotton textile problems as did the American delegation. The Japanese report is published in the proceedings of that conference. We recommend this analysis to the attention of the committee and submit herewith a copy as part of the record.

Representative excerpts are, and I quote: "The postwar trade recession is due, we believe, to a decline in consumption in the agricultural countries. * * * Consumption in the countries of Asia and Africa fell from 7.8 yards before the war to 5.6 yards after the war, showing a 30-percent decrease, which comes to as low as one-fifth of the consumption level in the major cotton manufacturing countries. * * * Consequently it is not too much to say that the trend of world cotton textile trade is affected more by the level of consumption in the underdeveloped areas than by any other factors. * * * To increase consumption in the underdeveloped countries is the most effective way to expand trade. The road therefore to expanded trade is to elevate the income level of those underdeveloped countries."

The great paradox of world textiles is the enormous production over capacity of the major manufacturing countries in contrast to the distressing undersupply and scarcities of underdeveloped countries which are the natural importing areas.

The Japanese textile export problem is not different from that of the United States, the United Kingdom, and Western Europe. They share an overall problem which cannot be solved by these manufacturing countries selling their surpluses to each other. What has happened to Japanese trade has happened to our trade and the British trade and is exactly measured in the following table:

Principal markets for Japanese cotton cloth exports

[Millions of square yards]

Country	Annual average, 1934–39	January–August 1954
Aden	53.2	11.5
Argentina	76.0	
Australia	63.6	36.4
British East Africa	104.0	1.1
British West Africa	7.6	29.9
Burma	24.4	38.2
Canada		.625
Ceylon	18.4	13.0
Cuba		.13
India	425.6	.71
Pakistan		76.1
Indonesia	336.4	231.8
Iran	35.6	32.0
Iraq	64.4	13.2
Malaya	36.0	25.1
Manchuria	120.0	
China		3.7
Philippines	41.2	13.1
Thailand	80.0	70.3
Sudan	72.0	
South Africa	33.2	14.3
United Kingdom	16.0	25.9
United States of America	70.4	19.6
Total	2,423.2	833.2

The comparisons show that almost all of the Japanese trade losses have occurred in Asia, Argentina, and in sterling areas outside Asia. The British takings of Japanese goods since the war, were wholly for reexport. British consumption of Japanese goods is debarred.

The relatively high United States imports in the prewar period were due to the concentrated invasion of Japanese goods from the autumn of 1936 to the spring of 1938, which was the major factor in bringing about in 1938 the deepest depression the American industry has known. That peak level has been regained in the months since August.

In other words the American industry is now being laid open again to the disastrous consequences which past experience all but guarantees.

In former years our Government could see no grounds for a reciprocal trade agreement with Japan. After a survey by the Tariff Commission an increase was recommended in the customs duties on Japanese cloth. This recommendation was promptly put into effect.

Since that time the Japanese industry has become vastly more efficient, the range and quality of their production have increased, and our tariff duties have been lowered.

We now reproduce for the committee a consolidation of 9 weeks of cargo manifests showing the imports at New York of Japanese piece goods and articles of apparel.

Manifests from other ports are not available for this recent period, September 15 to November 17. For the 9-week period, imports of piece goods are indicated as being in excess of 20 million yards, and imports of apparel items and specialty articles are estimated to approximate 5 million more. Converted to an annual equivalent the total figure would approach 150 million yards.

PARTIAL LIST OF IMPORTS OF TEXTILE CARGOES FROM JAPAN COMING INTO THE PORT OF NEW YORK SEPTEMBER 15 TO NOVEMBER 17, 9 WEEKS

Gray broadcloth, 2,358 bales.
Gray printcloth, 1,811 bales.
Gray shirting, 2,220 bales.
Gray poplin, 1,033 bales.
Gray sheeting, 30 bales.
Piece goods and textiles (not described), 2,287 bales and 871 cases.
Needlepoint, cotton, 41 cases.
Colored piece goods, 150 bales.
White piece goods, 187 bales and 5 cases.
Printed piece goods, 60 cases.
Indian prints, 71 cases.
Handkerchief cloth, 159 bales and 18 cases.
Gingham, 312 bales and 108 cases.
Combed gingham, 366 bales.
Rayon gingham, 48 bales and 79 cases.
Seersucker, 8 bales.
Rayon piece goods, 226 bales and 253 cases.
Cotton and rayon ticking, 53 bales.
Velveteens, 23 bales and 1,102 cases.
Tablecloth, damask, and manufactures thereof, 215 bales and 3,197 cases.
Handkerchiefs (cotton, rayon, and mixed), 137 bales and 245 cases.
Kitchen and dish towels, 911 bales and 20 cases.
Cotton and rayon bedspreads, 64 bales.
Pillowcases, 45 bales and 69 cases.
Cotton gloves, 31 cases.
Rayon robes, 5 cases.
Ladies' blouses, 150 bales and 941 cases and 194 cartons.
Men's and boys' shirts (chiefly of flannel, corduroy, or gingham), 1,214 cases and 1,272 cartons.

In the doctrine of lower tariffs, one of the central planks is that industrial adjustments forced by international competition are the same as those caused by internal competition.

That can best be answered by some specific illustrations. When horses and buggies were superseded by automobiles, the automobiles didn't come in from Europe, they were made in the United States of America. When the old-fashioned water wheels on a thousand rivers were superseded by turbines and dynamos, the turbines and dynamos were built in the United States, not abroad. When the iron and steel industry and much of the boot and shoe industry left New England years ago, they landed in the Middle West, not in Czechoslovakia. When New England later lost most of her spindles, they found haven in the South, not in Japan. When the bulk of cotton agriculture left the Southeast, it didn't go to Brazil. It went to Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Arkansas, and California.

To these could be added a thousand more illustrations to show that adjustments from internal forces produce a net gain which remains in our own national economy instead of taking flight to foreign countries.

Could anyone suppose that the United States would be better off if its boot and shoe industry had gone to Czechoslovakia, its automobile industry to Great Britain, its dynamo manufacturing to Switzerland, its textile industry to Japan, its chemistry to Germany, and its cotton culture to Latin America?

Another dangerous doctrine is the assumption that trade should be balanced on a country-by-country basis, particularly where the United States is concerned.

A particular country can economically balance its trade only in relationship to the entire world of trading nations. If a country's trade policy represents normal economic intelligence, its imports are supplementary to its own production and will be procured from the most advantageous sources. Thus a country's most advantageous areas of supply may be entirely different from the most advantageous areas of export. This simple natural principle is the basis of all multilateral trade.

Prior to the war Japan's balance of trade with the United States was one of academic interest. She had the essential overall balance in her total world trade. She sold the bulk of her products to the underdeveloped areas of the world—mainly Asia and Oceania—and from the proceeds bought her foodstuffs, cotton, and other raw materials from the United States and elsewhere. That was the normal natural pattern of Japanese trade.

It is now protested that Japan can no longer do this. Why? Inconvertible currencies, trade restrictions, political embar-

goes. If these are the answers, these constitute the problem.

Thus viewing its component parts, we see that the problem is not within but without the borders of the United States. There the solution must be found.

It is not found by setting up the United States tariff system as a substitute problem. This recourse not only postpones attack on the real problem; it does no favor in the meantime to Japan or the world trade. An unnatural trade pattern cannot long stand.

There is no more reason to permit unrestricted access of Japanese cotton goods into the United States than to permit the unrestricted import of raw cotton from Brazil, or of dairy products from Denmark and Holland, or wheat and wheat flour from Canada, or of certain nuts and fruits from southern Europe. In each instance, equally, there would be, in effect, the same type of attack on American employment, incomes, investment, and standards of life.

Such outcomes cannot be tolerated for agriculture. Neither should they be tolerated for the manufacturing industries whose raw-material consumption and whose payrolls are indispensable to the progress and prosperity of agriculture.

We, therefore, hope that our foreign economic policy may find its guidance in world realities and carry through to those solutions which are basic and enduring.

With such a program and code of faith, there would be little concern that for a short time continued aid might be advisable for Japan. That is of slight significance when measured against the restoration of normal and natural markets for Japan and the maintenance of economic health in the United States.

MINIMUM WAGE LEGISLATION

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express some views with regard to my interest in the minimum wage of $1.25 per hour as provided for in the bill I have introduced today.

According to press reports and his state of the Union message President Eisenhower will recommend to the 84th Congress an increase to 90 cents per hour in the minimum wage under the Fair Labor Standards Act. His recommendation is far from adequate and demonstrates an unrealistic consideration of the current economic situation.

Thirty-six dollars a week for a 40-hour week does not provide a family with the minimum budget required in any part of the country under present prices according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Millions of workers in this country are working for substandard wages in seasonable industries and living under depressed conditions. This threatens to undercut the wage levels of all workers. In fact these conditions have destroyed the wage level and working standards of thousands of workers. Many have been forced out of jobs entirely through plant liquidations and relocations to areas where manufacturers have an unfair competitive advantage because they exploit their employees by paying submarginal rates. This practice makes it increasingly difficult for us to bring new industry into the areas of the coal fields where the acute and chronic unemployment is a national disgrace.

The national minimum of $1.25 an hour is thoroughly justified and is certainly not excessive in view of rising living standards and living costs. A minimum wage based upon increases in the cost of living and worker productivity since the establishment of the 1938 and 1939 minimum would be in excess of $1 an hour. Moreover, since the minimum of 40 cents an hour was provided for by Congress, average gross hourly wages of manufacturing production workers have risen 182 percent and per capita disposal income has risen 189.5 percent. An increase in the minimum wage corresponding to these increases would require a minimum of $1.25 an hour.

A realistic floor beneath wages would be important factors in preventing undesirable industrial dislocation and unfair competition as well as exploitation of low-wage employees; would boost purchasing power, living standards, and productivity; create more jobs; and would be important economic stabilizing factors.

THE LATE HONORABLE HUGH GIBSON

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include certain editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House the great loss suffered by the United States by the death of Hugh Gibson, the Director of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration.

Mr. Gibson served the United States on numerous occasions in many capacities, and his service reflected great credit on him and on the Republic he loved so well.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to associate myself with the remarks the gentleman has made regarding the Honorable Hugh Gibson. He served his country well and will long be remembered for the very magnificent job he did with this committee.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Gibson devised various methods of taking surplus populations from Europe that ultimately would have relieved a great deal of pressure. It is the hope and prayer of those of us interested in this problem that someone can be selected to succeed him who to some degree at least can carry on this fine work. Personally I have lost a dear friend of many years. His guidance and enthusiasm gave me an insight of a great problem I otherwise would not have had.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I may say to the gentleman that I have known no finer diplomat or more patriotic gentleman than Hugh Gibson. I knew him well; my husband knew him well. We worked with him throughout the time he was in the diplomatic field. We also knew of the great work he did before he entered the diplomatic service. His passing leaves me with a very full heart, full of deep gratitude.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me, I include the following newspaper editorials regarding Mr. Gibson and his great work:

[From the New York Times of December 13, 1954]

HUGH S. GIBSON DIES AT GENEVA—LONG A DIPLOMAT AND RELIEF AIDE—FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER 30 YEARS, HEAD OF COMMITTEE FOR MIGRATION, WAS 71

GENEVA, December 12. Hugh S. Gibson, retired United States diplomat and Director of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, died this morning at the age of 71.

The veteran diplomat, who had served the United States at many posts throughout the world and had represented his country at dozens of international conferences, succumbed to a heart attack at about 9 o'clock at his home outside Geneva.

Mr. Gibson's son, Michael, who was on a visit to Paris, returned to Geneva.

Although suffering from a broken bone in his foot and able to move about only in a wheelchair, Mr. Gibson had presided at the principal sessions of his committee's semiannual meeting 10 days ago. He told the opening session of the 24-nation group that European political and economic stability for the next 10 years could be assured only through the emigration of 5,000,000 Europeans.

During 46 years in international affairs, 30 of them as a Foreign Service officer, Mr. Gibson represented the United States on many important and dramatic occasions.

His name first became known when, as Legation secretary in Brussels, Belgium, he took part with Brand Whitlock, United States Minister, and others, in vain efforts to save Miss Edith Cavell, a 50-year-old British nurse, from being shot by the Germans for acts allegedly inimical to their invading army early in World War I.

From this time until his death, Mr. Gibson held many and varied posts in the United States diplomatic service and with organizations having a semiofficial governmental standing. In World War I and later, he was associated with Herbert Hoover in international relief work, and many of his State Department assignments were made to areas in which this training could be useful.

Hugh Simons Gibson was born in Los Angeles on August 16, 1883. He was a son of Frank Gibson and Mary Simons Gibson. His father was a Scottish-born bank cashier.

Mr. Gibson received his preliminary education from private tutors and completed courses in the Ecole Libre des Sciences Politiques in Paris in 1907. His first post in the Foreign Service was that of secretary at the legation in Tegucigalpa, Honduras, in 1908.

From 1911 to 1913 he was secretary at the legation in Havana.

After service in Belgium and at other posts, during World War I, Mr. Gibson became first secretary to the United States Embassy in Paris toward the close of the war. He left this post in 1918 when Congress appropriated $100 million to establish the American Relief Administration to provide food for certain European countries. He served as director general of this organization, of which Mr. Hoover was chairman. In the 8 months between the end of the fighting and the signing of the final treaty of peace, Mr. Gibson and Mr. Hoover had distributed nearly 5 million tons of foodstuffs.

In addition to his duties with Mr. Hoover, Mr. Gibson served on an interallied commission that made the first post-World War I

report on the condition of the war-ravaged Balkans.

In 1919 Mr. Gibson was appointed Minister to Poland, a post that called for more relief administration work than diplomacy during the formative years of the new republic.

From 1924 to 1927 Mr. Gibson was Minister to Switzerland, then a key post because of the presence in Geneva of the headquarters of the League of Nations.

In this and other similar duties, Mr. Gibson took a lead in movements to reduce armaments, but these efforts for the most part were not entirely successful. In that same year he was chairman of the United States delegation to the Conference for Limitation of Naval Rearmament, which had wider, if more controversial, results.

He returned to Belgium as Ambassador in 1927. He held this position until 1933 and was returned to it by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1937. He retired from the post the next year.

In the period between his two terms as envoy to Belgium, Mr. Gibson was Ambassador to Brazil. While in this post, he served as the United States representative on a mediation group that ended the 7-year-old Chaco war between Bolivia and Paraguay.

Mr. Gibson retired from the Foreign Service in 1938. His long experience in relief work later resulted in his appointment to the migration committee.

In 1921 Mr. Gibson married Mlle. Ynês Reyntiens, a daughter of Maj. Nicholas Reyntiens, of the Belgian Army. She was a maternal granddaughter of the seventh Earl of Abingdon of England. Mrs. Gibson died on March 19, 1950.

HOOVER LAUDS GIBSON—PRAISES HIM AS A "GREAT PUBLIC SERVANT"—DULLES IN TRIBUTE

Former President Herbert Hoover yesterday termed Hugh S. Gibson "one of America's great public servants."

"He was a man of complete integrity and devotion to our country," Mr. Hoover said. "He was trusted all over the world. His election to his present position as director of the Intergovernmental Committee on European Migration by the representatives of a score of nations is but an indication of that trust."

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY

WASHINGTON, December 12.—John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, said he was deeply grieved by the news of Mr. Gibson's death, saying Mr. Gibson had been a close personal friend for many years.

"Mr. Gibson was a man of unusual personal charm and wit and endeared himself to a wide circle of friends," Mr. Dulles said.

"The American people will, I know, regret the passing of this great American who served his country under the most difficult conditions with distinction and honor."

LANE HAILS FORMER CHIEF

Arthur Bliss Lane, who was United States Ambassador to Poland, 1944–47, and who previously had served under Mr. Gibson when the latter was Minister to Poland, said:

"The regrettable passing of Hugh S. Gibson creates a grievous chasm in human achievement. He had a wit and brilliant intelligence which were outstanding. He had also the adventurous quest of goals to conquer."

HUGH GIBSON

Hugh Gibson, who died yesterday in Geneva, Switzerland, at the age of 71, was not only a distinguished career diplomat, he might also be called a career humanitarian. Whether the enterprise at hand was the vain one of trying to save Edith Cavell from a German firing squad in the First World War, or ending the war in the Chaco, or administering vast war or postwar relief projects; whether it was working for disarmament or considering, as in one book he did, "The Problems of Lasting Peace"; whether it was representing his own Government with effectiveness and dignity or directing a committee for finding new homes for refugees and migrants—the work on which he was engaged when he died—Hugh Gibson gave to the task a brilliant mind, a deep understanding of other persons and nations and a profound sympathy.

Never advertising his own virtues or achievements, always giving himself unselfishly and single mindedly, he was not in his later years much in the public eye. He took his joy in the useful work he was able to do, and it was his good fortune to go on doing it to the very day of his death.

[From the New York Times of December 14, 1954]

RITES FOR GIBSON TOMORROW

GENEVA, December 13.—Western diplomats assembled in the Chateau de Genthod today to pay their last respects to Hugh S. Gibson, former American diplomat. Mr. Gibson died yesterday in his Geneva lakeside home of a heart attack at the age of 71. A funeral service will be held in the Roman Catholic Church of Notre Dame in Geneva at 11 a. m. Wednesday. Mr. Gibson will be buried in Geneva.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of December 13, 1954]

HUGH GIBSON

Hugh Gibson, who has just died in Geneva at the age of 71, was one of the most devoted, energetic, and resourceful emissaries America ever sent forth into the world of diplomacy. He once referred to himself as a diplomat who did "not wear spats." He might have said with equal accuracy that he was a diplomat who was not afraid to roll up his sleeves, and a human being whose concern was for people as well as for nations. When to these traits were added his capacity to make friendships, his abilities as an organizer and his talents as a writer, a picture of Mr. Gibson's unusual attainments began to emerge.

From 1914 to 1938 hardly a great event in international affairs took place in which Mr. Gibson did not play some part. As secretary of the American Legation in Brussels in 1914 he did what he could to mitigate the effects of warfare upon the populace, and his strenuous efforts on behalf of Edith Cavell, the English nurse executed by the Germans, brought him wide notice. Later on he represented America in many countries, holding the ambassadorships to Switzerland, Belgium, and Brazil. A close friend of President Hoover, he continued in the diplomatic service under President Roosevelt, retiring in 1938.

Although he left the diplomatic service years ago, Mr. Gibson never ceased his efforts to bring help and hope to the international scene. Since 1951 he had been director of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, organized by 20 nations. He was in the midst of work on its behalf when he collapsed, dying as he had lived, in the service of his fellowmen.

[From the Washington Evening Star of December 14, 1954]

HUGH S. GIBSON

When news of the death of Hugh S. Gibson came to Washington on Sunday, there must have been many whose minds flashed back to 39 years ago and one of the great stories of all time—the execution of Nurse Edith Cavell by the Germans in Brussels, October 12, 1915. He was among the Americans who strove in vain to save her. The memory abided with him all the rest of his days, and it influenced him toward noble humanitarian achievement.

Mr. Gibson was already a career Foreign Service officer when World War I started. He was Herbert Hoover's principal lieutenant in the Belgian relief work. Later he was United States Minister successively to Poland, Switzerland, Belgium and Luxembourg, Brazil, and again Belgium and Luxembourg. He represented his country also at the London Naval Conference, the Geneva Disarmament Conference, and the Buenos Aires Mediatory Conference which settled the Chaco War. The last task of his life was that of directing the enterprises of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, finding new homes outside Europe for thousands of displaced individuals and families.

A small, frail, gray man, Mr. Gibson always was immersed in his job. His sympathies were boundless, and he never was too heavily burdened to accept additional responsibilities. The clarity and efficiency of his mind were demonstrated in his books on foreign affairs, in some of which he had Mr. Hoover as his collaborator. But his outstanding quality was his consecrated spirit. He was selfless in his devotion to humanity, and for that especially he is entitled to grateful remembrance.

SPEECH OF THE HONORABLE HUGH S. GIBSON BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE ICEM AFTER HIS REELECTION AS DIRECTOR ON NOVEMBER 30, 1954

Honorable members of the council, I thank you most sincerely for the honor you have bestowed upon me by electing me to continue as Director of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration under its constitution.

It is an honor which I highly appreciate. The Committee has become part of my life, and is my chief and constant personal concern.

I have an unbounded faith in its value to mankind and in its vast potentialities.

Long and varied experience of international bodies has made me realize that this is the most constructive organization for close and fruitful collaboration between governments of free sovereign states on an expanding scale of membership and activities.

It is bound to succeed in the accomplishment of its task, being firmly based on the community of interests of all its members—that most sound but so rare foundation of mutual understanding and coordination of efforts.

The coming into force of the constitution marks the beginning of a new era in the Committee's history. It provides the hitherto missing element of stability, indispensable to future development by means of expanded services and of more definite long-range planning. It comes at a time when past experience allows the member governments more competently to appraise the Committee's effectiveness and more confidently to plan its future.

A new chapter of the Committee's history is about to open.

The final draft of the constitution was adopted on October 19, 1953, by the sixth session of the Committee in Venice. Considering the wide variety of legislative procedures of the 16 governments who have now ratified it and made possible its coming into force, and the vast volume of legislation on problems of urgent importance which their respective parliaments have been faced with, it is gratifying to note that this constitution should have been officially accepted by so many governments in so short a time. It shows their interest in the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, in its stabilization and its future development. I am particularly happy that Chairman CHAUNCEY W. REED, who so ably presided over the adoption of the constitution in Venice, and steered it through the legislative procedures of the United States Congress to its final enactment by the United States Government, is present here

today. I am sure that we all regard the eminent chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary in a sense as the father of this document which is so important to the Committee. I express the fervent hope that the acceptance of the constitution by the remaining member governments will soon follow and that, fortified by the increased stability provided by its constitution, the Committee will attract the governments of other interested countries to join its membership, thereby expanding the scope of its effective international collaboration.

THE ISLAND OF CYPRUS

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced a concurrent resolution declaring that it be the sense of the Congress that the United States Mission to the United Nations should take all possible steps expeditiously to bring about a consideration by the United Nations of the applicability of the principle of self-determination of peoples in the case of the population of the Island of Cyprus.

Mr. Speaker, on the agenda of the ninth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, there appeared as item 62 for consideration by the General Assembly:

Application, under the auspices of the United Nations, of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples in the case of the population of the Island of Cyprus.

On December 17 of last year, the General Assembly, by a vote of 50 to 0, with 8 abstentions, approved the following resolution:

The General Assembly, considering that, for the time being, it does not appear appropriate to adopt a resolution on the question of Cyprus, decides not to consider further the item entitled "Application, under the auspices of the United Nations, of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples in the case of the population of the Island of Cyprus."

I have constantly supported the United Nations and United States participation in that organization. I feel, however, that this decision to take no action now when it is so crucially needed strikes a blow at justice and the principle of self-determination. This is all the more so when we consider that over 80 percent of the population of this island in the Mediterranean are Greek. It has always been inhabited by Greeks. In 1878, the British administration, under the nominal sovereignty of the Sultan, succeeded the Ottoman domination. In November 1914 Cyprus was annexed to the British Empire, and in 1925 the Government of the United Kingdom made the island a crown colony.

Today, in Cyprus—

As stated in the letter of the President of the Council of Ministers of Greece to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, under date of August 16, 1954—

one of the most ancient cradles of western civilization, the colonial status still survives, imposed on a people whose destiny has been linked with the cause of freedom.

The failure on the part of the United Nations to assume its moral responsibility to act on an issue which is being watched by the entire world is particularly difficult to comprehend when it is recalled that one of the cardinal principles of the United Nations is "to develop friendly relations among nations based on the respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples."

One of the encouraging results of our foreign-aid program has been the revival of Greece into a strong member of the free world alliance and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The Greeks have done a magnificent job in restoring their country to a position of strength in a vital area of the world. In this area and elsewhere the Communists are steadily at work, through constant attempts at subversion and through their insidious propaganda. To deny Cyprus its self-determination gives aid and comfort to the Communists in their propaganda drive.

Cyprus is relatively small. Its population is only 520,000, but the issue is a large and important one. It is the issue of colonialism versus self-determination. Have we learned nothing from Indochina? Are we learning nothing from North Africa? The strong feeling aroused by United Nations failure to act has resulted in civil disorder and riots in Cyprus and Greece.

On August 14, 1941, there was issued by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom a Declaration of Principles, known as the Atlantic Charter. The third principle of the Atlantic Charter contains a declaration of respect for "the right of all people to choose the form of government under which they will live." The British victory in the United Nations over the small island of Cyprus is a denial and mockery of a principle to which she has pledged herself in the Atlantic Charter.

The vote in the General Assembly has been described by the British representative to the United Nations, Anthony Nutting, "as a great and important victory for commonsense." Mr. Speaker, this is not my concept of commonsense, common decency, or common justice, and I know it is not the American concept. I hope, therefore, that as expressed by the Greek representative to the United Nations. "Very soon the United States Government will be back to its traditional policy for the principle of self-determination" and that our delegation to the United Nations will press this matter at every possible opportunity.

Cyprus is not a local colonial squabble; it is an international matter of the highest importance involving, in the final analysis, the security of the United States.

AMENDING THE TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, we have just heard President Eisenhower's special message to the 84th Congress outlining his foreign-trade policy.

The cornerstone of the President's foreign-trade program, in my opinion, will be the section to amend the Trade Agreements Act. Briefly, this legislation will give the President the power to negotiate to reduce annually those tariffs which he believes should be reduced in the country's best interest by 5 percent each year for the next 3 years, and it will provide for a 3-year extension of the President's authority to negotiate trade agreements.

I concur wholeheartedly with the administration's philosophy in its foreign-trade program.

I feel that the 84th Congress should let the world know what our future trade policy is to be, that the economic policy of the United States—where we stand and in what direction we are going—must be known soon by our friends of the free world so that they can plan their economic future and enact legislation to implement the policies they must adopt.

I feel that unless the 84th Congress enacts the President's Trade Agreements Act the United States will be seriously handicapped in its role as leader of the free world.

Failure to act would be to play directly into the hands of the Kremlin and would effectively undermine our efforts to halt the flow of strategic material to the Soviet bloc.

In the Republican 83d Congress I was glad to introduce the bill to carry out the President's program. This Congress is controlled by the Democrats. Fortunately, the new chairman of the Ways and Means Committee is in agreement with the President on foreign-trade legislation. He has also introduced a bill to implement the program. By introducing my bill again, I am pleased to give my endorsement to the President's program. I believe that a majority of Republicans in the House of Representatives will also endorse this worthwhile legislation when they are called to vote on it on the floor of the House of Representatives.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A further message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON TRADE AGREEMENT ESCAPE CLAUSES (PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 6 (b) OF THE TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1951)—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 64)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was

read, and together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of subsection (b) of section 6 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 (65 Stat. 72, 73), I hereby submit to the Congress a report on the inclusion of escape clauses in existing trade agreements.

This report was prepared for me by the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 10, 1955.*

(Enclosure: Report on Trade Agreement Escape Clauses.)

THE ROSE SHOULD BE OUR NATIONAL FLOWER

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a resolution to designate the rose as the national flower of the United States. An identical resolution is being introduced in the Senate by the Honorable MARGARET CHASE SMITH.

The United States is the only major country in the world without a national flower, and I feel we should add this symbol to the national identification of the United States. The rose has long represented courage, loyalty, love and devotion, and has become an international symbol of peace.

I am told that recent opinion polls show roses to be the overwhelming favorite of the American people. This year it is estimated that more than 75 million roses will be sold in the United States to persons who will wear them—as I am doing today—or give them to others, or use them to beautify their homes. Some 30 million American gardners and housewives grow roses each year, and public parks in virtually every major city in the country cultivate rose gardens for the benefit and enjoyment of the public.

THE PRESIDENT'S SECURITY PROGRAM HITS PAY DIRT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it always seems to be more newsworthy to attack a program or a person than to defend. A case in point is the new security program instituted by this administration which has been attacked by the extremists on both sides.

A man by the name of Joseph Petersen, a former code expert in the National Security Agency, has just been sentenced to 7 years in prison for espionage. It has now been revealed that the way he was caught was by means of a routine check under the new security program instituted by President Eisenhower.

Here was a very serious security risk who had been working for the Government for years and who would still be on the payroll today, undetected and unapprehended, had this administration not acted promptly and vigorously.

There are bound to be mistakes made in the administration of any such program, but let us remember this Petersen case before indulging in too violent criticism.

One of Washington's most alert and able journalists, Jack Steele, of the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance, is the enterprising reporter who has dug into the facts and disclosed the manner in which Peterson was caught. Under leave granted, there follows his column as it appeared in the Washington Daily News:

A ROUTINE CHECK

(By Jack Steele)

Joseph Sidney Petersen, Jr., the former National Security Agency code expert sentenced to 7 years in prison for espionage, was caught as a direct result of the Eisenhower administration's security program.

The fact that Petersen was apprehended through the operations of the security program—which is now under heavy Democratic fire—was not disclosed when he was indicted or sentenced.

He pleaded guilty to passing code secrets to a foreign power.

A Defense Department spokesman confirmed today that the first leads in the case came from a routine reinvestigation of Petersen.

Military intelligence agents making this security check came across the first evidence of Petersen's activities.

Since the leads pointed to possible espionage, the Defense Department called in J. Edgar Hoover and turned the case over to the FBI.

The FBI then made the full investigation which led to Petersen's arrest and indictment.

Under the security program, the Defense Department has jurisdiction over the National Security Agency. The Agency's supersecret code and communications work is mainly for the military services.

The Department spokesman said military intelligence agents were convinced Petersen was a "lone wolf" and was not linked with any espionage ring.

Federal Judge Albert Byran, in sentencing Petersen yesterday, said the former code expert had "deliberately violated the trust and confidence placed in him by our country."

Judge Bryan was permitted to examine in private some of the information Petersen admitted having turned over to a Dutch military attaché.

He said passing two of the documents "could have led to very, very serious consequences for the security of the United States."

Petersen insisted he had pleaded guilty to safeguard "the security of the Nation," noting that a trial might have led to public disclosure of the secret documents.

Peterson's attorney also contended that two documents stamped "top secret" were grossly overclassified.

Judge Bryan conceded that Petersen's confession and his cooperation with the FBI and intelligence officers after his arrest were extenuating circumstances.

But he said that did not soften Petersen's deliberate leak of secret information which might have had terrific consequences to United States security.

The 40-year-old clerk faced a possible maximum sentence of 10 years in prison and a $10,000 fine. The Government withdrew two other espionage counts in return for his guilty plea.

Disclosure that the Petersen case was uncovered through the security program came as this program was under heavy criticism for the Agriculture Department's firing of Wolf Ladejinsky, the Department's attaché in Tokyo.

LOWERING OF TARIFFS ON TEXTILES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] in strongly protesting to the President any reduction or any lowering of tariffs on textiles.

I appeared before the Tariff Commission a few weeks ago when the cotton manufacturers had a hearing and also appeared on the same day before the Committee on Reciprocity protesting the lowering of the tariffs on cotton and woolen textiles.

May I remind the Members of the House that we had the same battle some years ago prior to the war with Japan against that country's tremendous increase in the volume of cotton textiles being brought into the country. The great volume of importations did not elevate the low standard of living in Japan or change its general economic condition. These importations did however come very close to breaking the back of the American textile industry. It did threaten ruination to many of our communities. The allowing of these textiles to come into our country did not prevent war and it would be well for us to keep this fact very firmly in mind.

A day or so ago one of our excellent newspaper reporters informed me the Pentagon is now authorizing the purchase of and is actually buying woolen and cotton underwear from Japan for our servicemen in the armed services. I am checking on this report to discover if this is actually the fact. It would be a rather horrible situation if we permitted the unemployment of people of our own country in order to help other countries reduce and avoid unemployment. We have sacrificed billions of our substance to rehabilitate other nations some of whom were enemies in World War II. Must we now sacrifice our skilled labor here at home and sacrifice our standard of living? We have generously provided the capital for these countries to purchase new, modern, up-to-date textile machinery for their new plants which we also built. Must we now give them our domestic market and force our own industries into oblivion? Is this sound economics for our country? Certainly it is the contrary. It is unsound economics and un-

sound thinking. Based upon sound economic thinking this proposal to reduce the tariffs on textile importations cannot be supported. I am completely opposed to any reduction. Our textile industry needs protection and adequate protection if it is to survive in world competition without a reduction in the American standard of living. I have been a Member of Congress for quite a number of years and I do not intend to stand by and see the great American textile industry ruined and used as a pawn for temporary political favor on the international chessboard of politics. Instead I intend to fight.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today and 15 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENTAL OPERATIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 4 to provide for the continuation in office of certain members of the Commission on Governmental Operations.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act for the establishment of a Commission on Governmental Operations," approved July 10, 1953 (67 Stat. 143), is amended, effective December 31, 1954, by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Continuation of membership upon change of staus: Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), a person appointed to the Commission in the status of a Member of Congress or in the status of a person in the executive branch of the Government, but who thereafter ceases to have such status, shall nevertheless continue as a member of the Commission. If such person returns to private life (except for his membership on the Commission), he shall, from and after such change of status, receive the same compensation as a person originally appointed to the Commission from private life."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have cleared this with the minority leader. The prime purpose of this resolution, which has passed the Senate, is to enable the former Senator from Michigan, Mr. Ferguson, who has been a member of the Commission, to continue as a member. Of course, it is a wise thing, if any others are affected, to have it apply to them, because they have been on the Commission for months, and we will have the benefit of their studies and their experiences rather than to put a new man on. So, that is the purpose of this resolution.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I hope the gentleman will not insist on the passage of this resolution now. I would like to say something about it when it comes up. I am opposed to it not because of the gentleman from Michigan because I like Senator Ferguson very much and my objections do not concern Senator Ferguson personally. But, it is a matter of principle that is involved. I do not like the resolution in so far as it sets a new precedent and I would like to say something against it when it comes up regularly.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. I understand that there is no partisanship connected with it. If Mr. Ferguson was not permitted to continue on the Commission, another Republican would be named. That being the case, why is it not good judgment to permit one to continue who has had experience, for several months longer?

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman would like me to go into it more fully, I will be very glad to do so. It dates back to the time when Mr. Truman was President. The idea was sold to him that there should be a bipartisan commission, and Mr. Truman sponsored it. He was for it. He asked that the Commission be appointed, that a bill be passed by the Congress creating it, and then Mr. Hoover was made Chairman of the Commission on the theory that it would be bipartisan; that a Democratic President would select an outstanding Republican Chairman of the Commission, and then they had an equal number of Democrats and Republicans on the Commission so as to show it was bipartisan. Well, later on under this administration it was recreated, but instead of the President selecting an outstanding Democrat, a member of the opposite party to be the head of it like President Truman did, Mr. Hoover was reappointed, and instead of having an equal number of Republicans and Democrats, I think you will find that there is a larger number of Republicans. Now, questions like that are questions I want to look into and have something to say about it when it comes up. In fact, the Legislative Branch of the Government should not delegate its power, anyway. I am opposed to that part of it. We should not farm out our legislative duties. We are in reach of the people. They can reach us through their votes as intended under our Constitution and laws.

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman is opposed to the Commission, is that it?

Mr. PATMAN. They cannot reach the Hoover Commission.

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman, as I understand, is opposed to the Commission.

Mr. PATMAN. I want to find out about the status of the membership and personnel to make sure it is bipartisan as intended and I want to give further consideration to this proposed new policy of permitting a Member of Congress to continue his legislative powers after he is no longer a Member of Congress.

The Hoover Commission has unusual legislative powers. It can even present bills for Congress to consider.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman indicates that he might object?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances, I withdraw the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 42, section 1815, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the following Members on the part of the House: The gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. DURHAM; the gentleman from California, Mr. HOLIFIELD; the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. PRICE; the gentleman from Texas, Mr. KILDAY; the gentleman from New Mexico, Mr. DEMPSEY; the gentleman from New York, Mr. COLE; the gentleman from California, Mr. HINSHAW; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. VAN ZANDT; and the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. PATTERSON.

FEDERAL REGULATION OF PRODUCTION AND GATHERING OF NATURAL GAS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, the production and gathering of natural gas within the gas-producing States has recently been subjected to centralized Federal regulation for the first time in history.

This resulted from a decision of the United States Supreme Court. The case is known as the Phillips Petroleum case, and is reported as Phillips Petroleum Co. against Wisconsin in 347th United States reports, page 672. Prior to this decision, the independent companies engaged in the production and gathering of natural gas had planned and conducted their business under the careful regulation of State conservation commissions without interference from Washington. However, the Phillips decision interprets the Natural Gas Act of 1938 so as to give the Federal Power Commission jurisdiction over the sale of natural gas by independents, to interstate carriers. The Federal Power Commission itself had previously decided that it possessed no such jurisdiction. The Commission's decision had been made after the taking of 10,000 pages of testimony, and was reflected in a well-thought-out decision with only one Commissioner dissenting.

Natural gas comes both from wells which produce only natural gas and from oil wells as the gas adjoining or dissolved in the oil deposit is released as the oil comes up out of the well. In both cases, the natural gas instead of being stored near the well as is sometimes the case with oil, is piped directly away unless there is no market for the particular well, in which case gas is flared off by being burned. When gas is sold, it passes through a meter by which it is measured and goes then to the pipelines of a concern which gathcrs and resells it to an interstate pipeline company. The

gathering company may also produce its own gas and gather it for similar resale.

The Phillips Petroleum Co., although a large oil company, also produces, gathers, processes, and sells natural gas. It sells its own natural gas and also natural gas produced by others. The gas which it buys is approximately 50 percent of the gas sold by Phillips Petroleum Co. The Supreme Court case did not concern itself with the oil operations of the company, but only with its natural-gas operations.

Phillips is known as an "independent" natural-gas producer in that it does not engage in the interstate transmission of gas from the producing fields to consumer markets and is not affiliated with any interstate natural-gas pipeline company. (*Phillips Petroleum Co.* v. *Wisconsin* (347 U. S. 674–675).)

Phillips sells gas to five interstate pipeline transmission companies. These interstate carriers transport the gas to consumer markets in which they resell it to consumers and to local distributing companies located in 14 different States. The Phillips gas flows from the wells "through a network of converging pipelines of progressively larger sizes to 1 of 12 processing plants, where extractable products and impurities are removed." Two of these systems are located in two States. Each of the remaining 5 is located in only 1 State.

After processing is completed, the gas flows from the processing plant (which is owned by Phillips) through an outlet pipe, of varying lengths up to a few hundred feet, to a delivery point where the gas is sold and delivered to an interstate-pipeline company. The gas then continued its flow through the interstate-pipeline system until delivered in other States.

The Natural Gas Act, as enacted in 1938, provided in section 1 (b) as follows:

The provisions of this act shall apply to the transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce, to the sale in interstate commerce of natural gas for resale for ultimate public consumption for domestic, commercial, industrial, or any other use, and to natural-gas companies engaged in such transportation or sale, but shall not apply to any other transportation or sale of natural gas or to the local distribution of natural gas or to the facilities used for such distribution or to the production or gathering of natural gas.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is making a very fine statement concerning an act which has been important to the gas industry and to decisions of the Supreme Court. Does it not boil itself down to this, that under the Phillips Petroleum Co. case, contrary to anything that had ever been anticipated, the Federal Government is controling the natural gas production right at the wellhead? Is that a fair statement?

Mr. IKARD. The distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma is exactly right. As I will attempt to develop here, that is something that was not in any way intended by the Congress at the time of the enactment of the Natural Gas Act, and it is beyond the farthest dreams of those people that considered it.

Mr. ALBERT. I want to congratulate the gentleman on the fine statement he has made.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Is it fair to say that there are but 2 bases on which we might justify control, 1 being the interstate character of the movement from the gathering plants, from the point where Phillips sells his gas to some distant consumer in some other State? That is the basis on which the Federal Gas Act was passed and justified, was it not?

Mr. IKARD. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. Then, as I understand it, there is the theory that public utilities or a monopoly should be regulated by government, but we have generally agreed that if there were not an interstate movement there the regulation should be by the States. Does the gentleman agree that that is generally sound?

Mr. IKARD. I do.

Mr. POAGE. In this case there is not even any natural monopoly or public utility feature involved, is there?

Mr. IKARD. That is right. One other thing is that most public utilities are thought of as operating in an area where speculation has been removed.

Mr. POAGE. And where there is a guaranteed return.

Mr. IKARD. Certainly, as the gentleman well knows, there is probably no more speculative business in the country today than the search for and development of natural gas.

Mr. POAGE. I cannot think of a more hazardous undertaking than going out and trying to find the gas and produce the gas. Once the gas is produced and is moved in commerce, after it gets into interstate commerce, it ceases to be a speculative undertaking, because there is a return at the end and that is known, and the amount of gas coming in and the amount coming out and the prices are all known. But these people producing gas have no knowledge of whether they are going to get gas or not when they drill. They have no monopoly in the production because if you have land that is suspected of being productive of gas you can sell it to the highest bidder.

Mr. IKARD. Yes. They not only have no assurance they are going to get gas, but the odds are something like 6 to 10 against them that they will not get it.

Mr. POAGE. So there is neither the interstate character nor the utility character present that would justify any Government regulation of the business of producing gas. Is that right?

Mr. IKARD. That is right.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. It might also be said, and I am sure the gentleman will agree, that about 85 percent of all the drilling for oil and gas is done by what might be termed the small-business man in the oil and gas business. In other words, the small, independent operator goes out to search for oil and gas, and 6 times out of 10 he misses. He must find an area where oil and gas can be produced. Then what happens? The major companies move in and develop it. Is that not the history of the oil and gas industry?

Mr. IKARD. I think it is important here to understand we are not talking about tremendous companies and combines, but we are talking about small, independent businessmen like the corner merchant, or somebody like that, people who are relatively small and who are in a business that has a high mortality rate.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. At the present time do the public utilities commissions, as for instance in the State of Michigan, have anything to do with or have any jurisdiction over the sale of gas in the State of Michigan which comes in from Texas?

Mr. IKARD. I am not sure I understand the gentleman's question, but did I understand him to ask if this had anything to do with the gas which goes into Michigan from Texas?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right.

Mr. IKARD. We are not talking here about the authority of the Federal Power Commission to regulate the movement of natural gas in interstate commerce which would affect the thing that the gentleman is talking about. What we are talking about here is the right of the Federal Power Commission to regulate the price of gas from the initial producer at the well head, which is entirely different. We are talking about something here which represents about 10 percent of the cost of your gas in Michigan. So you see, I really think, if you did away with the producer entirely, in other words, if the people in Michigan got their gas free, it would not affect the price that they pay a great deal, because about 90 percent of the cost of the gas is laid down up in this part of the country which goes into transmission, distribution, gathering, and that sort of thing.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. I should like to compliment the gentleman on the statement that he is making. I have the honor to represent a large oil- and gas-producing district. There is no issue which confronts our industry at the present time which is more important than the one to which the gentleman is addressing himself. I hope the gentleman will acquaint the whole country with the vital issues involved.

Mr. IKARD. I thank the gentleman very much.

Section 4 of the Natural Gas Act authorizes the Federal Power Commission to regulate the "rates and charges made, demanded, or received by any natural-gas company for or in connection with the transportation or sale of natural gas subject to the jurisdiction of the Com-

mission." And a natural-gas company is defined as "a person engaged in the transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce, or the sale in interstate commerce of such gas for resale"—section 2 (6).

The Phillips Petroleum case involved one question which concerned the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission and involved a dispute as to whether "the rates charged by a natural-gas producer and gatherer in the sale in interstate commerce of such gas for resale" are subject to regulation by the Federal Power Commission.

Phillips admitted that it had engaged in "the sale in interstate commerce of natural gas for resale." Although that admission would bring it within a phrase in the first part of the Commission's jurisdictional charter, it did not bring it within the definitive last part of the section. The admission was properly made in view of earlier decisions of the United States Supreme Court—*Interstate Natural Gas Co.* v. *Federal Power Commission* (331 U. S. 682, 687–689; and *Michigan-Wisconsin Pipe Line Co.* v. *Calvert* (347 U. S. 157, 166–168).

However, Phillips contended that it was exempted from the jurisdiction of the Commission by the latter part of section 1 (b) of the Natural Gas Act which provided that the provisions of the act "shall not apply to any other transportation or sale of natural gas or to the local distribution of natural gas or to the facilities used for such distribution or to the production or gathering of natural gas."

The petitioner particularly emphasized its contention that its sales are part of the "production or gathering of natural gas" to which the Commission's jurisdiction does not extend, according to the express language of the last part of section 1 (b) of the Natural Gas Act.

The producers and gatherers of natural gas had since 1938 conducted their business on the justified assumption that the independent production and gathering of natural gas were not subject to Federal regulation, even though the gas was sold to interstate pipeline transmission companies whose operations were subject to the Federal Power Commission's jurisdiction.

As is pointed out by the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Douglas, the hearing and debates in Congress on the bills which evolved into the Natural Gas Act were concerned with interstate pipelines, not with independent producers of gas.

These hearings gave little or no consideration to any need for regulating the sales by independent producers to the pipelines. The case of Columbian Fuel Corp, second FPC, pages 200, 207—exempted from regulation an independent producer of gas which Mr. Justice Douglas said was in all material respects comparable to Phillips Petroleum Co. As he pointed out, that decision was made by officials intimately familiar with the background and history of the Natural Gas Act. There was only one dissent even at that time. The Supreme Court Justice continued by saying:

> That construction of the act by the Commission has persisted from that time (see Billings Gas Co. (2 F. P. C. 288); the *Finker Oil and Gas Production Co.* (6 F. P. C. 92); *Tennessee Gas & Transmission Co.* (6 F. P. C. 98) down to its decision in the present case (10 F. P. C. 246).
>
> That construction by the Commission, especially since it was contemporaneous (*United States* v. *American Trucking Assns.* (310 U. S. 534, 539)) and long continued (*Federal Power Commission* v. *Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co.* (337 U. S. 498, 513)), is entitled to great weight (347 U. S. at 689).

Regulation by the Federal Government of the price at which an independent producer sells his natural gas will bring all of his operations under Federal control because it is necessary as part of the machinery of regulation, to establish a rate base in the light of the expenses of all the operations of the company. As Mr. Justice Douglas concludes:

> The effect is certain to be profound. The price at which the independent producer can sell his gas determines the price he is able or willing to pay for it (if he buys from other wells). The sales price determines his profits. And his profits and the profits of all the other gatherers, whose gas moves into the interstate pipelines, have profound effects on the rate of production, the methods of production, the old wells that are continued in production, the new ones explored, etc. Regulating the price at which the independent producer can sell his gas regulates his business in the most vital way any business can be regulated. That regulation largely nullifies the exemption granted by Congress (347 U. S. at 690).

Mr. Justice Clark also wrote a dissenting opinion with which Mr. Justice Burton concurred.

Clark took the position that the regulatory gap which the Natural Gas Act was intended to fill with Federal regulation was at the end of the interstate pipeline transmission between the pipeline company and the local distribution system; that it was not at the beginning of the interstate journey. He pointed out that the general language in the opinion which referred to the situation at the end might also seem to cover the situation at the commencement of the pipeline, but that it was not intended to do so and should not be construed to have done so. He emphasized that the majority brings every gas operator, from the smallest producer to the largest pipeline, under Federal regulatory control, contrary to the intention of the Congress, the understanding of the States, and that of the Federal Power Commission itself."

He adds:

> By today's decision, the Court restricts the phrase "production and gathering" to "the physical activities, facilities, and properties" used in production and gathering. Such a gloss strips the words of their substance. If the Congress so intended, then it left for State regulation only a mass of empty pipe, vacant processing plants, and thousands of hollow wells with scarecrow derricks, monuments to this new extension of Federal power. It was not so understood. The States have been for over 35 years and are now enforcing regulatory laws covering production and gathering, including pricing, proration of gas, ratable taking, unitization of fields, processing of casinghead gas including priority over other gases, well spacing, repressuring, abandonment of wells, marginal area development, and other devices. Everyone is fully aware of the direct relationship of price and conservation.

He points out that Phillips Petroleum Co. "performs no such middleman or transmission functions" as Interstate Natural Gas Co. had done—347th United States Reports, page 697—and concludes at 347th United States Reports, page 698:

> In the words of Mr. Justice Jackson, we believe "that observance of good faith with the States requires that we interpret this act as it was represented at the time they urged its enactment, as its terms read, and as we have, until today, declared it, viz, to supplement but not to supplant State regulation. (*Federal Power Commission* v. *East Ohio Gas Co., supra,* at 490.)

The majority opinion was written by Mr. Justice Minton with whom Mr. Justice Frankfurter concurred in a separate opinion. The majority concluded that the finding of the Federal Power Commission that the sale was within the production or gathering of natural gas exemption was without adequate basis in law. This, in effect, nullified the expert deliberation which had gone into the collection and analysis of the 10,000 pages of testimony in the case before the Federal Power Commission. The majority of the Supreme Court held that production and gathering, in the sense that those terms are used in section 1 (b), end before the sales by Phillips occur. The majority opinion attempts to distinguish the Columbian Fuel Corp. case and to indicate that the subsequent decisions of the Federal Power Commission have not all been consistent.

In the Phillips case the Court relies heavily upon its earlier decision in *Interstate Natural Gas Co.* v. *Federal Power Commission* (331 U. S. 682). That company produced or purchased natural gas which it sold within the same State to three interstate pipeline companies. In that case, the Supreme Court said:

> We have held that these sales are in interstate commerce. It cannot be doubted that their regulation is predominantly a matter of national, as contrasted to local concern * * *. Unreasonable charges enacted at this stage of the interstate movement (of gas) become perpetuated in large part in fixed items of costs which must be covered by rates charged subsequent purchasers of the gas, including the ultimate consumer.

The earlier opinion noted that exceptions to the primary grant of jurisdiction in section 1 (b) of the Natural Gas Act are to be strictly construed.

The majority opinion in the Phillips case points out that petitioner attempts to distinguish the Interstate Gas case on the grounds "that the interstate company transported the gas in its pipelines after completion of gathering and was affiliated with an interstate pipeline company and therefore subject to Commission jurisdiction in any event." However, Mr. Justice Minton concluded that the Court has based its decision in the Interstate case "on the broader ground that sales in interstate commerce for resale by producers to interstate pipeline companies do not come within the 'production or gathering' exemption."

In answer to the petitioner's contention that Congress intended to regulate

only the interstate pipeline companies, the Court said that the act gave the Commission jurisdiction over either the transportation or over the sale for resale in interstate commerce of natural gas. It pointed out that this grant of power was in the disjunctive and added that the transportation and the sale could have been connected by the conjunctive word "and," and would thereby have required both the transportation and the sale by a company as the basis for the Commission's jurisdiction over the company and its transactions. The Court felt that the Congress had intended to give the Federal Power Commission control over "all wholesales of natural gas in interstate commerce."

The Court's opinion concluded—at 347th United States Reports, page 685:

> Regulation of the sales in interstate commerce for resale made by a so-called independent natural-gas producer is not essentially different from regulation of such sales when made by an affiliate of an interstate pipeline company. In both cases, the rates charged may have a direct and substantial effect on the price paid by the ultimate consumers. Protection of consumers against exploitation at the hands of natural-gas companies was the primary aim of the Natural Gas Act. *Federal Power Commission* v. *Hope Natural Gas Co., supra* at 610. Attempts to weaken this protection by amendatory legislation exempting independent natural-gas producers from Federal regulation have repeatedly failed, and we refuse to achieve the same result by a strained interpretation of the existing statutory language.

In a footnote to this statement it was said that:

> Among the bills introduced in recent Congresses to restrict the existing jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission over natural-gas producers are: H. R. 4051, 80th Congress, 1st session; H. R. 4099, 80th Congress, 1st session; H. R. 1758, 81st Congress, 1st session; and S. 1498, 81st Congress, 1st session.

In concurring with the majority, Mr. Justice Frankfurter wrote a separate opinion emphasizing his view that the Court's construction of 1 (b) of the Natural Gas Act was supported by what he called an authoritative gloss coming from the history of the act. It was his contention that the Natural Gas Act was intended to give the Federal Power Commission jurisdiction over that part of the natural gas industry which the States were prohibited from regulating by the decision of the Supreme Court in *Missouri* v. *Kansas Gas Co.* (265 U. S. 298) and *Public Utilities Commission* v. *Attleboro Steam and Electric Co.* (273 U. S. 83). He concluded that Congress "wrote the doctrine of the Attleboro case in the Natural Gas Act and said in effect that an Attleboro situation was to be taken over by Federal regulation and was not to be left to the fluctuation of adjudications under the commerce clause."

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us if it is physically or economically possible for anybody to engage in the gathering of natural gas and to furnish the money necessary to gather the gas if he is not going to be allowed to sell it.

Mr. IKARD. They just are not going to do it.

Mr. POAGE. He cannot eat it, he cannot store it; consequently he has got to sell it.

Mr. IKARD. He cannot store it.

Mr. POAGE. And he has got to sell it to somebody who is going to move it; consequently it is perfectly clear that the decision of the Supreme Court completely nullifies any exemption for anybody gathering natural gas.

Mr. IKARD. Absolutely.

Mr. POAGE. He simply will have to sell it.

Mr. IKARD. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. There will be corrective legislation proposed before the present Congress and possibly by the gentleman from Arkansas who occupies the chair, who has studied this question very extensively. I am hopeful that corrective legislation will be enacted during this session.

Mr. IKARD. The gentleman from Arkansas who now occupies the chair is one of the best-informed men in the country on this question. I know there will be several bills introduced. I intend at some later date to introduce one myself and I know there are many others that will be introduced for consideration.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. The history of this situation is that the Federal Power Commission originally refused to take jurisdiction of these people the gentleman is talking about. Then the Supreme Court came along and actually violated the substantial evidence rule in overruling the Federal Power Commission, did it not?

Mr. IKARD. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. In other words, they have upheld these various bureaucratic ideas about bringing people under Federal control, but the first time one of the bureaus said it did not have control of somebody the Supreme Court reversed itself and took them in.

Mr. IKARD. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is the situation we are facing and that is the reason we must have legislation on the subject to define it completely.

Mr. IKARD. The gentleman has touched upon a rather unique part of this. It is probably one of the few cases in history where a Federal commission or bureau has said, "We do not have jurisdiction," but the courts have made them assume it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Would the passage of legislation such as the gentleman suggests be construed in any way as advising the Supreme Court that it should confine itself to the interpretation of laws that we enact rather than to itself legislate?

Mr. IKARD. I am afraid it does not have that purpose. It does, though, amend the act so that it may be subject to just one interpretation and I think that would be that the Federal Power Commission did not have jurisdiction.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then it would be in the way of an explanation to the Court as to what the Congress meant?

Mr. IKARD. Yes. Some people are sometimes fuzzy as to what the Congress intends.

In the light of the Supreme Court's decision in the Phillips case, the Federal Power Commission on July 16, 1954, issued an order with respect to the independent producers and gatherers of natural gas covered by the Court's decision. It was estimated that more than 4,000 of them would be included in this category. The new rules were made retroactive to June 7, the date of the Court's decision. They required sales contracts which were in effect on that date to be filed with the Commission by October 1, 1954. They also prohibited an increase in rates without their first being filed with the Commission so that any proposed increase could be suspended pending hearings and decision.

In addition, applications for certificates authorizing transportation and sale in interstate commerce were required to be filed by October 1. This was order No. 174. One of the Commissioners dissented from the issuance of this order on the grounds that it was ex parte, retroactive, and that it denied persons subject to it rights guaranteed them by the Natural Gas Act and by the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Can the gentleman tell us what the numerical division of the Court was in this decision?

Mr. IKARD. Five to three.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Can the gentleman tell us how the Chief Justice voted on this matter, the present Chief Justice?

Mr. IKARD. He voted for the measure.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Bringing all these people under Federal control?

Mr. IKARD. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Now, had he voted against that, we would not have this situation, would we?

Mr. IKARD. Well, that is true, yes.

On October 6, 1954, the Commission issued order 174–A which revised and superseded its order 174. Upon petition the Commission on September 8 scheduled oral argument on the revised order for September 22, in its offices in Washington, D. C. On September 24, the Commission modified its order 174–A by extending its deadline from October 1 to December 1, 1954, and by making certain clarifying amendments. Two companies subject to the order obtained stays from Judge Wayne G. Borah of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit in New Orleans, La., in cases brought by them for review of the Federal Power Commission's Order 174–A. These companies were Magnolia Petroleum Co. and the Ohio Oil Co. The stays were issued on November 15 and 16, respectively.

The General Counsel of the Federal Power Commission on November 23, 1954, published an opinion that those stays were effective only with respect to the two companies involved in those two suits, and that the Commission was therefore, under no restraint to refrain from further consideration of order 174–A as applied to other companies. Other companies are not seeking similar stays. The companies which obtained the stays are said to believe that the stay orders permit them to cancel their contracts with pipeline transmission companies under a clause authorizing cancellation in the event that the Federal Power Commission assumes jurisdiction of the company's sale of natural gas to the pipeline.

Proceeding under the Administrative Procedure Act, the Union Producing Co. obtained a temporary stay in the United States District Court, District of Columbia. On December 20, 1954, Judge Holtzoff refused the FPC's motion to dismiss, and, therefore, this case will go to trial on its merits, namely, that the plaintiff, as a producer of natural gas, is not subject to the Natural Gas Act, and on the further ground that the orders—174 and 174–A—are said to have been illegally issued.

On November 24 the Federal Power Commission announced that it expected to modify its order 174–A in order to afford such companies an opportunity to seek Court review of the order. The Commission nevertheless said that it anticipated substantial compliance with the order. The same Commissioner who dissented from the original order renewed his dissent in an opinion accompanying order 174–A.

On December 17, 1954, order 174–B was issued, which again amended 174–A. Although this new amendment made a few technical changes that eliminated some of the paper work required of the independent producer, it was of no benefit to him as far as basic regulation by the FPC is concerned. In fact, it provided for more regulation in that certain escalator clauses in sales contracts would not be recognized by the FPC after May 1, 1955.

The latest development in the series of actions the FPC has undertaken since June 7, 1954, is to set a hearing for January 11, 1955, in which the FPC will hear from producers, consumers, State regulatory bodies, and so forth, on the subject of Fixing of Rates To Be Charged by Independent Producers for Natural Gas Sold in Interstate Commerce for Resale—Consideration of Principles and Methods To Be Applied. In this connection, it is to be noted that while many independent producers will appear, still others will not appear because they take the position that in this instance the FPC is exceeding its jurisdiction as set out in the Supreme Court's decision in the Phillips case.

The Commission is following the policy of promptly enforcing the power given it by the Supreme Court in an across-the-board freeze of natural-gas prices, and of later giving consideration to the problems and views of the industry.

The Chairman of the Commission has said that the Commission was not confined to any inflexible method of determining natural-gas prices, and would soon ask industry members, State commissioners, and representatives of consumer interests to submit suggestions. Although it is somewhat heartening to learn that the Commission is intent on listening to the views of those affected by its natural-gas price regulations, nevertheless, his statement emphasizes the powerful discretion lodged in the Commission to use its own judgment as to how the price of natural gas should be determined and what, in the final analysis, that price will be. No regulation has a more persuasive effect than price regulation, as those who were subject to OPA—as who was not—will well remember.

The Chairman of the Commission went on to say, in effect, that the necessity for financial rewards commensurate with the risks of exploring and developing natural-gas reserves will be recognized by the Federal Power Commission. "We intend to recognize this indisputable fact, in our ratemaking," he said. However cooperative this expression of goodwill may appear, it is not to be forgotten that price for risk taking, in our free-enterprise economy is determined in the market place. Only when risk becomes stabilized and there is little or no competition can one identify the enterprise as a public utility to be subjected to Government regulation.

The FPC order suddenly freezes prices and contractual terms retroactively as they were last June 7. An industry, particularly such a spectaculative one as the production of natural gas, is constantly in a state of flux. To freeze it suddenly brings its myriad units and its dynamic growth to a jarring halt.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. Has the gentleman observed that there is considerable propaganda around over the country to the effect that if the Federal Government controls the price of natural gas at the gathering point or in the field, that they will receive cheaper rates for gas? Contrarily, is it not very reasonable to assume that if the small producers and gatherers of natural gas are controlled by the Federal Power Commission, it is going to have the effect of contracting the natural gas business to the point that a few corporations in the country will have control of the gathering and the distribution of natural gas and also that the lack of exploration, of discovering new reserves for natural gas, will be contracted and therefore, in the long run, mean that the consumer is bound inevitably to pay a higher price for his gas?

Mr. IKARD. That is exactly right. The effect of the order eventually will be to force out of business the small-business men who are the independent producers of natural gas and to concentrate these great natural reserves in the hands of a few tremendous companies, the result of which will be increased prices to the consumer. There is no question about that.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I want to say that I am listening with a great deal of interest to the gentleman's remarks. At a later date I want to get some time of my own to speak on this subject extensively. In the meantime I want to say that in my judgment—and I have studied this question—the road we are following now, if it is unchecked, is going to lead to the nationalization of oil and gas and perhaps coal and perhaps other industries. So, I think we are making a serious mistake if we do not do something in the Congress to check the march that we are making down that road toward nationalization.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I should like to remind the distinguished gentleman that there is another special order to follow.

Mr. IKARD. In that case, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I believe I have the next special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct. The gentleman has 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I should be very glad to yield to the gentleman, because I should like to hear the finish of his discussion, if he is allowed to proceed without too many interruptions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman, that he be permitted to speak for an additional 10 minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is making a very excellent presentation, and I do not want to interrupt except to say that I think he is performing a service to the House and to the country by presenting this issue early in the Congress. I hope, with him, that during the session favorable action may be taken to remedy this situation.

Mr. IKARD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. This question was asked by one of our colleagues from Texas a little while ago. It had to do with members of the Supreme Court and on which side they were. As I recall it, the gentleman asked about the Chief Justice. To get away from any partisan feeling or any implications of that kind, so that the gentleman can continue, I should like to suggest this. Is it not true that the Chief Justice is what is commonly known as a moderate progressive or a progressive moderate?

Mr. IKARD. I will say to the gentleman that my purpose here is not to indulge in shades of political definitions.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did not think it was.

Mr. IKARD. Gas producers, including such companies as Humble Oil & Refining Co., Phillips Petroleum Co., Texas Co., Magnolia Petroleum Co., and Stanolind Oil & Gas Co. are refusing to contract more gas to interstate pipelines. One official of a major company is quoted as saying:

We are not offering any gas for sale in interstate commerce at this time.

This attitude on the part of producers is not a capricious one and warrants an explanation. It is not that the producers are going on a sit-down strike or that they are demanding higher prices for their gas. The answer lies in the simple, economic and practical fact that a producer cannot continue to sell, or contract to sell for long periods of time, his product when he cannot tell what price the FPC will allow him. All he wants is his contract price which in all instances is the fair field price or the prevailing market price at the time he sold. Very few producers completely finance themselves, and it is their bankers who must demand some certainty as to price. Therefore, the producing industry cannot continue to grow if the FPC regulates the producer in the manner as they now contemplate doing.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. If the Federal Power Commission may regulate the price of gas at the wells, what is to stop them from issuing an order to regulate the price of oil? That would be the next phase of the situation. I wonder if the gentleman would care to discuss that.

Mr. IKARD. I should like to say to the gentleman that I intend to discuss that in a very few moments. I think the gentleman's point is well taken, and I intend to say more about it in a few moments.

The effect of the Commission's order freezing gas prices at the wellhead has been practically to stop cold the industry's national expansion. The seven States in the South and Southwest which produce gas have been exporting to other parts of the country almost as much as they consume themselves. There were ambitious plans to supply other areas. These have been put on the shelf because of the order. Consequently, some communities which would soon have been supplied with natural gas will go without it. If this and other heating fuels are subjected to the kind of regulation enforced by this order, competition will stagnate, and lack of competition is the best way to exploit consumers. Contrast this result with what Mr. Justice Minton wrote in the Supreme Court's majority opinion:

Protection of consumers against exploitation at the hands of the natural gas companies was the primary purpose of the Natural Gas Act.

Much gas produced along with oil will be wasted by venting—or burning—if the State regulatory commissions, in the interest of conservation, do not prevent it. The State commission sometime shut down oil wells to prevent wastage of gas. And, consequently, often the oil companies are willing to go to the expense of building gas pipelines to gather the gas, in order to be allowed to open their oil wells. This absorption of gas transportation cost by the profits of oil operations results in gas at low prices to consumers. If the gas operation were separated, as Federal regulation may force it to become, gas cost and so prices would have to rise; and Federal regulation might cause an increased gas price to consumers.

A conflict between State conservation policy and Federal price policy seems to be arising in Oklahoma where a minimum price for which gas can be produced has been set by the Oklahoma Corporation Commission in order to justify pipeline construction. The price was set at 9.8262 cents per thousand cubic feet and upheld by a United States circuit court of appeals on the ground that the State could set prices for conservation purposes. If there is conflict of views between State and Federal commissions as to what price is necessary to protect a natural resource and what price is necessary to satisfy demands of those who urge Federal regulation, how can the issue be resolved?

The States right to regulate the price charged by natural gas producers is involved in another case now on appeal in the United States Supreme Court by the Natural Gas Pipeline Co. of America. Two other pipeline companies, Panhandle Eastern and Michigan-Wisconsin, joined in the request for review of the order of the Oklahoma court upholding an Oklahoma Corporation Commission order fixing minimum prices for natural gas sold to interstate pipelines. If the idea of Federal domination and absolute control of this vital industry is carried out, then would not conservation of an essential natural resource suffer? If price does not justify building a pipeline to a gas field, will a State commission continue to bar wasting of gas? Certainly there could be no law to require a company to build a pipeline.

The Federal Government can and has exercised wide powers in many fields. It has been demonstrated time and time again that it can require men to do any number of things such as to serve in the military, or pay taxes, but I doubt if even the greatest advocate of Federal control of the gas industry would venture a prediction that even an all-powerful Federal Government could force anyone to hunt and explore for gas when the price of that product is unknown and undetermined. On the contrary, the regulations of the Federal Power Commission will certainly discourage producers to continue their never-ending search for new supplies of natural gas which are so essential to maintain an adequate supply at a fair price for our expanding economy.

There has been some respectable opinion to the effect that Federal control of the petroleum industry would mean cheaper prices for the consumer. This line of thinking is hard to follow, when it is a known fact that less than 10 percent of the price paid by the consumer for natural gas goes to the producer. The rest of the price represents the cost of gathering, transportation, and distribution. In view of this, it can be readily seen that even if the producer made a gift of the gas to the consumer, the price would not be materially affected.

The production of oil and gas is so closely related that it is impossible to divorce one from the other. The production of gas is an integral part of oil production, and it certainly seems reasonable to assume that the next step that those who would impose dictatorial Federal control on the gas industry would be the regulation of the production of oil. What would happen if the policy of the Texas Railroad Commission might come into conflict with the policy of the Federal Power Commission? I am fearful that there are many who would argue long and loud that the policy of the Federal Commission would prevail if the policy established by the Commission is not changed by proper legislative action. We can all prepare ourselves for the Federal Power Commission to move in and take over the oil industry. No other conclusion can be reached, for the gas industry, which they now, under the doctrine of the Phillips case, has set out to control is such an integral part of oil recovery that forcing the separation of oil from gas by artificial regulation is not only uneconomical and wasteful but is also impossible from a practical point of view.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. I think a study of the oil and gas business of the Nation shows they have to operate together to operate efficiently and furnish the country with plenty of their products at the lowest possible price.

I am a little alarmed to find the Supreme Court taking the position it has taken now, which is absolutely against the consumer, against the producer, for greater regulation, for more application of bureaucracy, and against a business that has been able to furnish oil and gas together to the people of the Nation in unlimited quantities of the finest possible grade at only a little more than it could be gotten for 20 years ago. In fact, if you took the taxes off oil today, it would have cost you 7 cents more 20 years ago than it does now, and they put this high-grade gasoline, which is a byproduct of oil, into your cars, service your cars, and wipe off the windshield. Yet we find certain people in Government that would stop the progress and turn the wheels back and interfere with these two great business organizations that have done so much not only for the defense of our country but for the industrial development and happiness and comfort and use of all of the American people. I hope a remedy can be found to override this decision of the Supreme Court. I shall be happy to support the gentleman in his efforts toward that end.

Mr. IKARD. I thank the gentleman very much. I know that he is probably one of the best-informed men in this body on the problems affecting the oil

industry. I am certainly glad to have his views.

Although the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission denies any intention to bring oil or other industries under the jurisdiction of the Commission, I think everyone would feel a lot better, and obviously we would all be safer from further encroachment of Federal authority, if an amendment to the Natural Gas Act were enacted clearly reflecting the intent of Congress as to the jurisdiction of the Commission.

It is my hope that this brief review of the complicated problems arising out of the decision of the Supreme Court in the Phillips case has made clear the confusion that this decision and the subsequent actions under it by the Federal Power Commission has created in the production and gathering of natural gas. Effective public practices which have been developed over the years have been undermined. It should be repeated here that the production of natural gas does not possess the attributes of a public utility, and it is one of the most speculative and competitive enterprises in our whole American economy in which there exists not the slightest hint or suspicion of monopoly. Those engaged in this business face high odds against finding and bringing in paying fields of natural gas. They are not in any sense in that type of business which heretofore has been thought of as a public utility which requires Government regulation for the public good; however, they have effectively and increasingly been regulated in the public interest by State bodies which have kept close to the problems in properly developing gas fields. Are these effective working relationships between the State governments and private business to be permanently disrupted by a decision based on a forced interpretation of statutory language? Certainly the answer should be "No." It is necessary that Congress quickly consider and pass amending legislation which will clarify the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission and make clear that the producing and gathering of natural gas which Congress had intended to exempt from the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission is really as a matter of fact exempt; that such producing and gathering is a matter of State concern which the Federal Government should let alone. I am introducing legislation that will have this effect, and it is my hope that many of you will join in urging immediate favorable action on this question by the Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following my announcement of the appointment of the majority whip and the remarks I made about the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, I may be permitted to include an exchange of letters between me and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE KOHLER STRIKE—A STRANGE WAY TO LESSEN UNEMPLOYMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a strange way to minimize unemployment. Let me read to you from an issue of the UAW–CIO News which, I think, came to the desk of all of us yesterday, Sunday.

Under a picture which, of course, cannot be printed in the RECORD, I find this: "Protest United States Strikebreaking—President Allan J. Graskamp of CIO Auto Workers Local 833 (right), presents to Bradley Welfare, Pentagon aide, petitions from 7,500 Sheboygan County, Wis., citizens protesting awarding of defense contract to strike-bound Kohler Co., near Sheboygan."

On page 9, of the same paper, at the top line, we find the following: "Long Strike in Tenth Month."

Then across the page—in large type—"Uncle Whiskers Gives Kohler Helping Hand."

I suppose "Uncle Whiskers" refers to Uncle Sam.

Then we have an article by Charles Baker, UAW-CIO publicity department, which reads this way:

The Kohler strike last week went into its 10th month.

Among the members of strikebound local 833 of the CIO Auto Workers, the feeling is growing that the biggest remaining obstacle to a just settlement is "Uncle Whiskers."

They point out that Federal laws and Federal action are the chief support to their tear-gas-loving employer.

For example: Since the approaching building season is the second in which Kohler Co. will not be a major factor in the construction market they should have real bargaining power. But the Defense Department has just put props under Kohler Co. by awarding it a $2 million shell contract.

Kohler Co. spokesmen have admitted losing $46,000 a day on the strike, but much of this can be absorbed by carry-back and carry-forward provisions of tax laws covering corporations.

Kohler Co. has been found guilty of violating National Labor Relations Board regulations. The company has refused to comply with NLRB order, and has it bottled up in the courts where it may remain for months.

The company is getting partial production, but only by recruiting scabs, most of them unskilled workers with no factory experience. While refusing to comply with NLRB suggestions that it bargain in good faith, the company is encouraged to continue its monumental strike-breaking effort by Taft-Hartley provisions enabling decertification votes by scabs only.

Few present-day locals have been subjected to the caveman tactics employed by Kohler Co. Its president, Herbert V. Kohler, admitted under oath that the use of tear gas (now removed from the plant) has his approval.

Traitors to the work force who led early (and unsuccessful) efforts to recruit a significant scab force from Kohler workers were rewarded with fine new homes inside Kohler Village.

Other turncoats have been made deputies on the Kohler Village police force which has a tear gas supply which union attorneys contend is a clear violation of the law.

Kohler Co. has turned down a dozen attempts by State, local and Federal institutions to get it to bargain in good faith; has run to court more than a dozen times in efforts to hogtie the union.

The Kohler Co. president even threatened a man on the picket line with a billy club. (He was on the policymaking levels in the 1944 strike when the company's private army fired on a crowd, killing two persons and wounding 46.)

The Kohler situation is a striking example of how Federal laws are rigged against unions.

And how are the Kohler workers reacting to all this? Recently they voted 98.5 percent in favor of continuing their strike until they get a just contract.

And they'll get it.

The article in the same issue refers to certain correspondence. The first is a letter from Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, to Herbert V. Kohler, president of the Kohler Co., dated December 31, 1954, which is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 31, 1954.*

HERBERT V. KOHLER,
President, Kohler Co.,
Kohler, Wis.:

I have been advised that the labor-management dispute between Kohler Co. and its employees which has been going on since April 5, 1954, has been characterized by flagrant and persistent violations of National Labor Relations Board orders and complaints issued under the Labor-Management Relations Act. I am further advised that union members in Kohler are intimidated by the fear that your company has built up an industrial munitions arsenal within the plant and that company policy in its relations with the union is predicated on a willingness to resort to use of such arms rather than to the collective-bargaining procedures which the Congress has established. I am further advised that our Federal tax law may be used by your company indirectly and in violation of the intent of those laws as a means of prolonging the dispute and as a strike-breaking weapon. Should these allegations have substance, I believe the Senate's Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will most certainly want to investigate the situation at Kohler. Will you therefore please advise me immediately as to:

1. What quantities and types of industrial munitions if any, are or have been stored on the company premises at any time since the beginning of the current labor dispute on April 5, 1954?

2. Your company's policy with respect to the intended use of any such industrial munitions, including tear gas, during the current dispute?

3. If the Kohler Co. is losing $46,000 a day in expenses because of the strike, as you are reported to have stated to the United States District Court in Milwaukee, what if any part of this $13 million in strike costs, will your company attempt to recapture under the carryback-carryforward provisions of the tax law?

4. Why have you and other company officials rejected efforts to negotiate an agreement with the employees' recognized collective bargaining agent, including the proposal to submit the dispute to arbitration made by Gov. Walter J. Kohler?

JAMES E. MURRAY.

The answering letter reads:

DEAR SIR: Answering your day letter dated December 31, 1954, the advice you say you have received is completely erroneous.

1. The charge of "flagrant and persistent violations of the National Labor Relations Board orders and complaints" on the part of the company is absurd. No NLRB order has ever been issued in connection with the strike or events relating to it, so none could be violated.

As you should be aware, a complaint issued by the Board is not equivalent to conviction, and there can be no violation of a complaint.

A complaint, dated October 26, 1954, was issued by the regional office of the NLRB on charges filed by the union July 12, 1954, and is scheduled for hearing January 25, 1955. The complaint alleges unfair labor practices commencing in February 1954, but the charges were not filed by the union until 5 months later, as a last desperate expedient after a campaign of illegal coercion, mass picketing, and violence had failed.

2. No one has been intimated by any action or threat of action by the company.

Many persons have been intimidated by the reign of terror carried on by the United Auto Workers—CIO since the first day of the strike, which has included assaults and beatings, some so brutal that the victims were hospitalized for extended periods and their recovery was in doubt; kidnaping, mass picketing, shotgun blasts into homes, picketing of homes, smashing of windows and paint bombings of homes and automobiles, slashing of tires, damaging of property with acid and chemicals, threats and coercion. There have been over 300 of these acts of violence and vandalism which still continue.

One UAW-CIO goon imported from Detroit is now serving a sentence in the State penitentiary for assault with intent to do great bodily harm, while another imported UAW-CIO goon is a fugitive from justice on a similar charge, and is being assisted by the union's lawyers in fighting extradition.

In answer to your specific questions:

1. The company has had armed guards since the beginning of the war, as was required by Government security regulations in connection with defense contracts.

During the early part of the strike there was stored on company premises 275 teargas shells and 2 guns for discharging them. This materiel was in the custody and control of a deputy sheriff, and the district attorney of Sheboygan County has determined, after investigation, that no law was violated in the possession or control of this tear gas.

2. The materiel was kept for the protection of the plant, including Government property for which the company was responsible, as well as the personal safety of persons lawfully in the plant. No one who did not contemplate an illegal assault on the plant or on persons lawfully in it has ever had any reason to fear the use of any means of plant protection.

Knowing, as all employees did and do, that the company had these protective responsibilities and had had armed guards long before the strike, the union made this a subject of questioning at a hearing before the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board in order to create a phony issue solely for publicity purposes. The hearing resulted in an injunction against the union for mass picketing and other violent, coercive, and illegal conduct during the strike.

There was reasonable cause for the company to apprehend an assault on its plant and make preparations to meet it, as shown by the following facts:

(a) From the first day of the strike the company's plant was besieged by a riotous mob, estimated by the union at as high as 2,500.

(b) The sheriff of Sheboygan County publicly expressed his inability or unwillingness to restore law and order, stating that he feared attempts to do so would lead to bloodshed.

(c) In 1934 the company experienced extensive damage to its plant and injury to the persons of its employees as a result of a riot during a strike.

(d) Invasions of plants have occurred during strikes conducted by this same union, the UAW-CIO. The CIO assault on the Shakespeare plant in Kalamazoo, Mich., resulted in brutal beatings of the personnel and made the plant a shambles.

The company intends to exercise its right to defend its plant and the safety of persons lawfully within it from any riotous and unlawful assault in the event that law-enforcement officers refuse or fail to do their duty.

3. The company has not stated that it is losing $46,000 a day in expenses because of the strike.

In a proceeding in the United States District Court in Milwaukee last May, the company pointed out that it had been completely deprived of the use and occupancy of its plant by an illegal mass picket line from April 5.

It estimated this loss, based on insurance policies covering loss of use and occupancy from other causes, at $46,000 per day.

The company's operations for the year 1954 cannot result in the application of the carryback-carryforward provisions of the tax law, since we operated at a net profit.

4. We have not rejected efforts to negotiate an agreement with the collective bargaining agent.

We executed a contract with the UAW-CIO in 1953 and have at all times been willing to execute another contract provided agreement could be reached as to its terms.

We have had 62 bargaining meetings, 47 of which were with the assistance of Federal conciliators, State conciliators, and other mediators, a total of over 260 hours.

We have refused, and will continue to refuse, to be coerced by illegal conduct of the union into agreeing to demands which we know to be against the best interests of the company and its employees.

We are enclosing herewith copy of our reply to Gov. Walter J. Kohler, Jr., which sets forth in full our reasons for rejecting his proposal that we give an arbitrator the authority to write a contract for us.

In summary, we refuse to divorce authority and responsibility by giving a person who has no experience with our business or responsibility for its successful operation the authority to prescribe vital elements of cost, including wages, fringe benefits, and working schedules, while we remain responsible for operating the business and providing employment.

The practice of bailing labor unions out of impossible positions in which their own rash demands and conduct have placed them has increased labor disputes, not decreased them.

If an investigation is undertaken by the Senate's Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, we shall insist that this company be given an adequate opportunity to present its case.

Such an investigation, to be impartial, must include the illegal and coercive conduct of the union beginning the first day of the strike and continuing to date.

Your telegram is merely a rehashing of propaganda the union has carried on for months and could well have been lifted from their publications.

That you intended it as propaganda is evidenced by the fact that it is the union that has given it to the newspapers and radio stations.

Accordingly, our reply is being made available to the channels of news distribution and will be given the widest possible publicity.

Very truly yours,

KOHLER CO.,
Per HERBERT V. KOHLER,
President.

Also I call attention to a letter written previous to that dated July 9, 1954, addressed to Gov. Walter J. Kohler, Jr. I have no knowledge as to whether Walter is related to Herbert, but in any event the letter is the company's answer to a proposition that an arbitrator be appointed to write the contract. The letter reads as follows:

GOV. WALTER J. KOHLER, Jr.,
State of Wisconsin,
Executive Office, Madison, Wis.

DEAR SIR: This will acknowledge your letter of July 8, 1954, suggesting that we have an arbitrator make a contract for us with the UAW–CIO.

We are fully aware of the economic consequences of the strike at Kohler Co. It was the union which called this strike and must bear the responsibility therefor.

The economic and other consequences have been greatly aggravated by the fact that for eight weeks the plant was closed by an illegal mass picket line which by coercion and violence prevented employees who desired to come to work from doing so.

They have been further aggravated by the reign of violence and intimidation which still persists in this county despite the cease and desist order the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board issued against the union.

We believe this phase of the matter should be your proper concern as chief law enforcement officer of the State.

We are concerned not only with the immediate consequences of the strike, but with the long term effects upon the economic welfare of the company, the community, and the State, were we to submit to an improvident settlement under the pressure of illegal coercion.

Such a settlement would—

1. Impair the ability of the company to compete successfully and, in the long run, be to the detriment of its employees, the community and the State.

2. Insure that illegal violence and coercion would continue to be concomitants of strikes. We are convinced that so long as violence in connection with a strike is rewarded by favorable settlements, it will continue.

The offers which we have made to the union represent, in our considered judgment, the maximum which we can offer, giving due consideration to the future of the company as a producer and as an employer of labor.

In the past 2 years, since we have been dealing with this union, we have granted wage increases of 18 cents per hour, plus fringe benefits estimated by the union at an additional 6 cents per hour.

We have granted wage increases of 6 cents per hour in the past year.

Our wages, including our present offer to the union, exceed the average for Sheboygan, where the plant you head is located, by 43.4 cents per hour, and by $23.30 per week.

Experience has shown that arbitration of the terms of a labor contract, or of wages, leads to settlements based on "peace at any price," which promote further labor unrest and do not result in any permanent solution.

As you are aware, one of the principal issues in dispute is the extent to which the judgment of an arbitrator having no knowledge of the business or its problems and no responsibility for its successful operation, should be substituted for the judgment of the management of the company.

We have agreed to arbitration on the application and interpretation of any contract we have made or may make.

We have refused to divorce authority and responsibility by giving an arbitrator the authority to manage the business while the responsibility for mistakes remains ours.

We will not grant to anyone, having no experience with the business and no responsibility for it, the ultimate authority to pre-

scribe such vital elements of cost as wages, working schedules, fringe benefits, etc.

One of the major demands of the union is for the union shop.

We have refused to coerce our employees to join a union against their will and will continue to refuse.

We will not give anyone the authority to order us to grant the union shop or other form of compulsory union membership.

We have been unable, even with the assistance of the mediation officers of both the State government and the Federal Government, to get this union to agree to terms which we can in good conscience accept.

We will not yield to any pressure to make a "peace at any price" settlement. This would assure that the union, having been rewarded for its rash and illegal conduct, would continue it and that we could look forward to continued trouble in the future.

The practice of bailing labor unions out of impossible positions in which their own rash demands and conduct have placed them has increased labor disputes, not decreased them.

We do not accept your suggestion that we turn the making of a contract and the decision as to wages over to an arbitrator.

You are so far wrong in your suggestion that our refusal to let an arbitrator write a contract for us will embarrass us before the public, that we shall see to it that the stand we have expressed in this letter gets the fullest publicity.

Sincerely,

HERBERT V. KOHLER,
President, Kohler Co.

The only statement I care to make in addition to this correspondence and what I have already said is that this is a very strange way to increase employment. If you will read the correspondence, of which I assume each and every Member of the House has a copy this morning, you will learn that that strike has been on for 10 months.

Of course, there is a great deal of unemployment. Because it needs the material, the Government—the Defense Department—proposes to award a contract for $2 million for the production of defense material to Kohler, yet the president of the union who is presumed to represent the employees, protests the awarding of that contract to the company. Does he wish to put the company out of business? If he does, has he arranged for jobs for members of his union?

What his action means is this: If you are in business and I am your employee, and we cannot agree, I hope you fail.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. KEE and to include a statement.

Mr. FLOOD and to include a statement.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LONG and to include a letter.

Mr. HOPE.

Mr. SCOTT in three separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENTLEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BROYHILL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALE.

Mr. YOUNGER in two instances.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include an address by General Ridgway.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. MOULDER) for 10 days, on account of death in family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 11, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

207. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the part of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes,' approved June 4, 1920, as amended, relating to the conservation, care, custody, protection, and operation of the naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

208. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1948 (ch. 511, 62 Stat. 489), relating to the retention in the service of disabled commissioned officers and warrant officers of the Army and Air Force"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

209. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 to provide for additional facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

210. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize at the United States Military Academy and at the United States Air Force Academy an additional permanent professor, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

211. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to cause to be published official registers for their respective services"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

212. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to repeal Public Law 820, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 1098), entitled 'An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold'"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

213. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 508 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, relating to the compensation of cadets and midshipmen"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

214. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to remove the requirement for a final physical examination for inductees who continue on active duty in another status in the Armed Forces"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

215. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to clarify the status of citizens or nationals of the Republic of the Philippines who are retired members of the uniformed services and who hold offices of profit or trust under the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

216. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to allow credit for certain service for purposes of pay, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

217. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to amend section 201 (e) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for advance payments of certain pay and allowances of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

218. A letter from the vice president, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting the annual report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1954; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

219. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with the Naches Co., Inc., which will, when executed by the superintendent on behalf of the Government, authorize the company to operate portable and/or semiportable rope ski tows and to provide light lunch service, to sell ski accessories and supplies, and to rent skis within Mount Rainier National Park during the term of 9 months from October 1, 1954, through June 30, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

220. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed award of a concession operating permit to the Ranier National Park Co. which will, when executed by the Director of the National Park Service on behalf of the Government, authorize the furnishing of accommodations, facilities, and services for the public in Mount Rainier National Park, Wash., for a period of 5 years from January 1, 1954, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

221. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a certification by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics of the cost of rehabilitation and repair of damages caused by the United States Navy at the Mercer County Airport, Trenton, N. J., in the sum of $110,854, pursuant to section 17 (b) of the Federal Airport Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

222. A letter from the chairman, board of directors, Future Farmers of America, transmitting a report on the audit of the accounts of the Future Farmers of America for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 14, paragraph (b), of Public Law 740, 81st Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

223. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Col. Walter E. Ahearn, and others"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

224. A letter from the executive director, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, Inc., transmitting the audit report of the Reserve Officers Association of the United

States, Inc., for the period as of March 31, 1954, pursuant to section 15 (b) of Public Law 595, 81st Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

225. A letter from the executive officer, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting the annual report of all tort claims paid by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, for the period January 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 773, 80th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

226. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, relative to the case of Nick A. Mavros or Nicholas P. Cimeon or Nicholas Simeon or Nicholas Symeon, Case No. A-1119913, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

227. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of April 23, 1930, relating to a uniform retirement date for authorized retirements of Federal personnel"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

228. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the grant or retrocession to a State of concurrent jurisdiction over certain land"; to the Committee on Public Works.

229. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the transfer of hospitals and related facilities between the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Defense, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

230. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to the fiscal year 1955 for the Department of Agriculture (H. Doc. No. 59); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

231. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision increasing limitations for the fiscal year 1955 for the Federal Housing Administration (H. Doc. No. 60); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

232. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to the fiscal year 1955 for the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission (H. Doc. No. 61); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

233. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to reproduce and to sell copies of official records of their respective departments, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

234. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a report showing certain final valuations of properties on a list of carriers, pursuant to section 19a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

235. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the 68th Annual Report of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

236. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 490 of title 14, United States Code, relating to the settlement of claims of military and civilian personnel of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

237. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize biennial inspection of the hulls and boilers of cargo vessels, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

238. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 1753. A bill to promote the further development of public-library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 1754. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 so as to remove domestic trade barriers affecting milk and milk products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1755. A bill to extend certain benefits to persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in Mexico or on its borders during the period beginning May 9, 1916, and ending April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1756. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, so as to extend the benefits of such act to persons captured or interned by, or in hiding from, the Japanese Government in China during World War II; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1757. A bill providing for construction of a highway, and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1758. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to permit individuals entitled to old-age or survivors insurance benefits to earn $250 per month without deductions being made from their benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1759. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to remove the restrictions on the importation of feathers of wild birds for use in the manufacture of artificial flies used for fishing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 1760. A bill to provide for the construction of certain Government buildings in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 1761. A bill to relieve certain veterans who relied on an erroneous interpretation of the law from liability to repay a portion of the subsistence allowances which they received under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H. R. 1762. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the city of Woodward, Okla.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 1763. A bill to permit retired personnel of the uniformed services and their widows and children to receive benefits under the Federal Employee's Compensation Act without relinquishing retirement pay or annuities based on retirement pay, to which they are otherwise entitled; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 1764. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act in order to allow credit for certain periods of civilian employment abroad by the Government of the United States in satisfying the requirements of 5 years' residence within the United States immediately preceding the date of filing petition for naturalization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 1765. A bill to amend the wheat-marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 1766. A bill to amend section 7237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide penalties for certain narcotic-law offenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1767. A bill to revise the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1768. A bill for the relief of the Jefferson and Plaquemines Drainage District and certain persons whose properties abut on the Federal Government's right-of-way for Harvey Canal in Louisiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1769. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in the southern portion of Louisiana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1770. A bill to provide for the improvement of the waterway between Barataria Bay, La., and the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1771. A bill to amend the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920, so as to facilitate marine-mortgage transactions by eliminating certain procedural difficulties arising under that act; and to make preferred marine mortgages available on all towboats; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 1772. A bill to amend subsection 216 (c), part II, of the Interstate Commerce Act to require the establishment by motor carriers of reasonable through routes and joint rates, charges, and classifications; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. R. 1773. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the sanitary district of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 1774. A bill to abolish the Verendrye National Monument, and to provide for its continued public use by the State of North Dakota for a State historic site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 1775. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHER:

H. R. 1776. A bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which prohibits payments under the Agricultural conservation program in certain cases; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COLE:

H. R. 1777. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 1778. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COON:

H. R. 1779. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Juniper division of the Wapinitia Federal reclamation project, Ore-

gon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 1780. A bill to provide tax equity through the taxation of cooperative corporations and to provide tax credits for recipients of dividends from genuine cooperatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. R. 1781. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide for payment of taxes or payments in lieu of taxes with respect to real property transferred from Government corporations to other agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 1782. A bill to extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1783. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to authorize the refund of manufacturers' excise taxes paid on gasoline and lubricating oils used exclusively for agricultural purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1784. A bill to provide for apprentice or other training on the job in agricultural occupations; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 1785. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that certain gains and losses in respect of contracts for the sale of real property, or in respect of mortgages on real property, shall be capital gains and losses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 1786. A bill to provide for the sale of certain lands in Haskell County, Okla.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1787. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Oklahoma, to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries as they affect such States; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1788. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Arkansas and Oklahoma, to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries as they affect such States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 1789. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 1790. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to fix the minimum wage at $1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 1791. A bill to provide for Federal financial assistance to the States in the construction of elementary and secondary school facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 1792. A bill to permit the President under certain circumstances to suspend certain provisions of law embodying the buy American principle; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1793. A bill to prescribe certain limitations with respect to outpatient dental care for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1794. A bill to effectuate the recommendations in the report of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries pursuant to the act of August 7, 1953 (Public Law 220, 83d Cong.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1795. A bill to increase the amount of articles acquired abroad by residents of the United States which may be brought into the country without payment of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 1796. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer, including the exemptions for a spouse and dependents and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness, from $600 to $800; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 1797. A bill to provide the United States with a gold standard and redeemable currency, and to correct other defects in the monetary system of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 1798. A bill to establish a National Superhighway Commission to provide for plans and surveys for the construction of a national superhighway system; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1799. A bill to provide for the deduction and credit of contributions or subscription charges to certain prepayment health service plans for the purposes of the Federal income tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 1800. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 1801. A bill to authorize the purchase, sale and exchange of certain Indian lands on the Yakima Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1802. A bill to authorize the leasing of certain lands of the Yakima Tribe to the State of Washington for historical and for park purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 1803. A bill to provide for the disposal of certain Federal property in the Coulee Dam area, to provide assistance in the establishment of a municipality incorporated under the laws of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1804. A bill to authorize a survey and investigation with respect to the relocation of the Ferry County Highway, paralleling Lake Roosevelt, Columbia Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 1805. A bill to provide a limitation on the application of section 691, Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and of section 126, Internal Revenue Code of 1939, to prevent confiscatory double taxation of livestock, growing and harvested crops in the estates of deceased farmers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 1806. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association," approved May 31, 1920, as heretofore amended, so as to permit such corporation to consolidate with Women's Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association, Inc.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 1807. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1808. A bill to provide that certain individuals who served on active duty with the Armed Forces for a period of 180 days and who served overseas shall not be liable for induction under the Universal Military Training and Service Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 1809. A bill to increase from $600 to $700 the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1810. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Codes to extend to fruit and vegetable storage facilities the same amortization deduction now provided for grain-storage facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1811. A bill to provide salary increases for teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia whose salaries are fixed and regulated by the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 1812. A bill to provide that the rates of duty on certain goods manufactured from cotton shall not be reduced below the rates applicable to such goods on January 1, 1955; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 1813. A bill to amend the wheat-marketing-quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 1814. A bill to amend section 345 of the Revenue Act of 1951; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1815. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to $1.25; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1816. A bill to declare the tidewaters in the waterway (in which is located Fort Point Channel and South Bay) above the easterly side of the highway bridge over Fort Point Channel at Dorchester Avenue in the city of Boston nonnavigable tidewaters; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1817. A bill to authorize the expenditure of public funds for the assistance of State, municipal, and other nonprofit youth projects; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 1818. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H. R. 1819. A bill to provide uniformity in the rates of disability compensation payable to certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1820. A bill to provide for a Veterans' Administration neuropsychiatric hospital of 1,000 beds at Gainesville, Fla.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1821. A bill to provide that checks for benefits provided by laws administered by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may be forwarded to the addressee in certain cases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 1822. A bill creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents, and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1823. A bill to establish public use of the national forests as a policy of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 1824. A bill to establish national policy respecting the development and use of

water resources, to redefine the authority of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to water resource development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 1825. A bill creating a Federal Commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 1826. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 1827. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1828. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 1829. A bill to authorize the construction of certain public works for navigation and flood control on the Big Sandy River and the Tug and Levisa Forks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. R. 1830. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain employees' cooperative earnings shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 1831. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to protect innocent purchasers of fungible goods converted by warehousemen from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 1832. A bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which prohibits payments under the Agricultural conservation program in certain cases; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 1833. A bill to amend the Water Pollution Control Act, so as to confer authority upon the Surgeon General to assist in the elimination, control, and abatement of pollution in certain international waters; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 1834. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 1835. A bill to provide for the discharge of tax liens on certain real property deeded to the United States of America subject to unpaid taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RILEY:

H. R. 1836. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to Richland County, S. C., lands surplus to the needs of the Veterans' Administration hospital reservation, Columbia, S. C.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1837. A bill giving the Commissioner of Education the authority to issue to certain local educational agencies quitclaim deeds to certain temporary facilities, upon a showing of need therefor; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 1838. A bill to allow a deduction for income-tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by the taxpayer for the education of a dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 1839. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1840. A bill to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act and amend the antitrust law prohibiting price discrimination; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 1841. A bill to prohibit an individual from traveling in interstate or foreign commerce in connection with the abandonment of his dependent child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H. R. 1842. A bill to further amend section 622 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 1843. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to transfer certain property of the United States Government (in the Wyoming National Guard Camp Guernsey target and maneuver area, Platte County, Wyo.) to the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1844. A bill to amend the acts authorizing agricultural entries under the nonmineral land laws of certain mineral lands in order to increase the limitation with respect to desert entries made under such acts to 320 acres; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 1845. A bill to provide a 1-year period during which certain veterans may be granted United States Government life (converted) insurance or national service life insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1846. A bill to provide that pensions shall be extended to the widows and children of deceased World War II veterans on the same conditions as they are now extended to the widows and children of deceased World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1847. A bill to provide for payments to the States with respect to certain lands of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1848. A bill to provide the House of Representatives with a staff to make reports on proposed legislation, and objective analysis of the reports from the executive branch on proposed legislation; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1849. A bill directing that special consideration be given to excess agricultural commodities produced in the United States when entering into foreign trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1850. A bill to provide for the waiver of premiums on the national service life insurance and United States Government life (converted) insurance issued to certain former servicemen who are disabled; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1851. A bill to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture be included as a member of the Advisory Board of the Export-Import Bank of Washington and as a member of the National Advisory Council of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1852. A bill to provide that 75 percent of all moneys received by the United States from the sale or lease of mineral rights in certain of its lands be paid to the former owners of such lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1853. A bill to promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in providing more effective programs of public education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1854. A bill to authorize the construction of highways and other facilities within the boundaries of Government-owned lands for recreational or other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1855. A bill to amend the act approved April 24, 1950, entitled "An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1856. A bill providing for construction of a highway, and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1857. A bill defining certain unfair trade practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 1858. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H. R. 1859. A bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which prohibits payments under the agricultural conservation program in certain cases; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 1860. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow the deduction of certain premiums paid for life and fire insurance in computing the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1861. A bill to provide for determination through judicial proceedings of claims for compensation on account of disability or death resulting from disease or injury incurred or aggravated in line of duty while serving in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1862. A bill to repeal those provisions of law which exclude from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system service performed by an individual in the employ of his son, daughter, or spouse, and service performed by a child in the employ of his father or mother; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 1863. A bill to provide that the sale of narcotic drugs to a minor shall be a criminal offense punishable by death or life imprisonment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1864. A bill to create a Department of Urbiculture, and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 1865. A bill to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to medical expenses); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. J. Res. 102. Joint resolution designating the rose as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BOW:

H. J. Res. 103. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution to provide for the creation of a Commission on Security in Industry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution to increase 1955 cotton allotments of certain farms receiving 5 acres or less; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. J. Res. 106. Joint resolution declaring the 14th day of June in each year to be a legal holiday, and requesting the President to issue a special proclamation commemorating the 176th anniversary of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution to permit the United States of America to release reversionary rights in a 36.759-acre tract to the Vineland School District of the County of Kern, State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAND (by request):

H. J. Res. 108. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday in June of each year as Shut-In's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. J. Res. 109. Joint resolution relating to Father's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 110. Joint resolution placing certain individuals who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, and in the islands of Leyte and Samar after July 4, 1902, and their survivors, in the same status as those who served in the Armed Forces during the Philippine Insurrection and their survivors; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. J. Res. 111. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RILEY:

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to release reversionary right to improvements on a 3-acre tract in Orangeburg County, S. C.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEED:

H. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to establish the Highway Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution designating the 26th day of May of each year, beginning with the year 1955, as National Hillbilly Music Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. Res. 76. Resolution amending the rules of the House of Representatives so as to restore the 21-day rule; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HILL:

H. Res. 77. Resolution creating a Standing Committee on Small Business in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. Res. 78. Resolution to appoint a select committee regarding the conduct of investigations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. Res. 79. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the use of facilities and manpower by the Department of Defense and by other departments and agencies of the Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. Res. 80. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the select committee authorized by House Resolution 60; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 1866. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas V. Compton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 1867. A bill for the relief of Henry J. Lim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 1868. A bill for the relief of Ernest Tomassich and Yoko Matuso Tomassich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1869. A bill for the relief of Luis Deriberprey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1870. A bill for the relief of Eliseva Kaufman (Saltz); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H. R. 1871. A bill for the relief of Marian Wojcik-Wojnowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1872. A bill for the relief of Joao Henriques Gravato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 1873. A bill for the relief of James Flying Horse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 1874. A bill for the relief of the Employers' Liability Assurance Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1875. A bill for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1876. A bill for the relief of Martin M. Sorensen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1877. A bill for the relief of Roberto Fantuzzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1878. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrud Maria Schurhoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 1879. A bill for the relief of Luisa Gemma Toffani and Rosa Sometti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1880. A bill for the relief of E. Brevard Walker and E. Brevard Walker, Jr., trading as E. B. Walker & Son Lumber Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1881. A bill for the relief of Bianca Carpensee and Margherita Bruni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 1882. A bill for the relief of Eva Elisabeth Uber English; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1883. A bill for the relief of Margarete Gartner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 1884. A bill for the relief of Vitus Johannes De Vries and his wife, Antonie Paula Else De Vries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1885. A bill for the relief of Orlando Lucarini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1886. A bill for the relief of Irving I. Erdheim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1887. A bill for the relief of Dr. Tsi Au Li (Tsi Gziou Li), Ru Ping Li, Teh Yu Li (a minor), and Teh Chu Li (a minor); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1888. A bill for the relief of Sister Lelia Juditta Roral; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 1889. A bill for the relief of Dr. George Hsi-Sun Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1890. A bill for the relief of Dr. T. F. Tsai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H. R. 1891. A bill for the relief of Chung Herp Youn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1892. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lu Ho Tung and his wife, Ching-hsi (nee Tsao) Tung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1893. A bill for the relief of Myung Sik Hong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 1894. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Cecil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. R. 1895. A bill for the relief of Lorenzo Aglipay (also known as James or Jimmy Flores); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 1896. A bill for the relief of Sandra Lea MacMullin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 1897. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Tumbarello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1898. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hezekiah Nicodemus, his wife Grace, and daughter Sally; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 1899. A bill authorizing the United States Government to reconvey certain lands to R. R. Crew, A. G. Gibson, C. F. Bliss, Jr., and others; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1900. A bill authorizing the United States Government to reconvey certain lands to George C. Stratton and Ellen J. Stratton; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 1901. A bill for the relief of Galen H. Clark Packing Co., Inc., to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 1902. A bill for the relief of Paul Skuntz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1903. A bill for the relief of Rabbi Moshe Rosenblatt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL (by request):

H. R. 1904. A bill for the relief of Ioannis (John) Kritikos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1905. A bill for the relief of Hugo Edward Kullberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1906. A bill for the relief of Fay Jeanette Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 1907. A bill for the relief of James Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1908. A bill for the relief of Chu Hai-Chou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1909. A bill for the relief of Rodolfo Pugeda de la Cerna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 1910. A bill for the relief of Blanka Goldstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1911. A bill for the relief of Charlotte Schwalm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1912. A bill for the relief of Howard Rieck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1913. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Elizabeth Doherty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 1914. A bill for the relief of Shalom Fred Ron; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 1915. A bill for the relief of Donata Giorgio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1916. A bill for the relief of Markos G. Kaminis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1917. A bill for the relief of Ezra Chitayat; his wife, Violet; and their daughters, Georgette and Linda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 1918. A bill for the relief of Hal A. Marchant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1919. A bill to authorize the award of a medal to Clyde Pangborn and Hugh Herndon, Jr.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 1920. A bill for the relief of Ane Karlic Vlasich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1921. A bill for the relief of Alexandria S. Balasko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1922. A bill for the relief of Everett A. Ross; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1923. A bill for the relief of Kevin Murphy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1924. A bill for the relief of Hermos Michael Esho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1925. A bill for the relief of Henry Brambila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 1926. A bill for the relief of Nellie A. Ridings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 1927. A bill for the relief of Ralph Michael Owens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 1928. A bill for the relief of Basil Constantine Mavromichalis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1929. A bill for the relief of Eufemia Bencich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1930. A bill for the relief of Anna Anzalone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1931. A bill for the relief of Bartolomeo Montalto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1932. A bill for the relief of Sotirios Peppas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1933. A bill for the relief of Dason Equipment Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1934. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Rosario DiStefano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1935. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Curro Tati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1936. A bill for the relief of Antonio Doncovio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1937. A bill for the relief of Andrea Ferrara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1938. A bill for the relief of Elsa Schott Ciccia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1939. A bill for the relief of Rosa Stangl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1940. A bill for the relief of James J. Andrews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1941. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mateo Ortiz Vazquez, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1942. A bill for the relief of Rosario Piacentino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1943. A bill for the relief of John G. Zeros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1944. A bill for the relief of Chin Yam Yee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1945. A bill for the relief of Albert Rossi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1946. A bill for the relief of Fritz Hauser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1947. A bill for the relief of Katarzyna Pienkos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 1948. A bill for the relief of John Grady Cobb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1949. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alfredo Garcia Gordillo, Mrs. Concepcion Garcia Benet, Alfredo Garcia Garcia, and Maria Angeles Garcia Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 1950. A bill for the relief of Stjepan B. Carija, Nevenka Olga Carija, Tatjana Mira Carija, and Igor Ivan Carija; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 1951. A bill for the relief of George Lahood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1952. A bill for the relief of Clarence Christensen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 1953. A bill for the relief of Virginia Hell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 1954. A bill for the relief of Ingrid Samson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H. R. 1955. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hilda Rinn Marchand and her daughter, Gudrun Rinn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1956. A bill for the relief of Arthur Guilherme Dos Reis Melo Pereira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1957. A bill for the relief of Namiko Nitoh and her child, George F. X. Nitoh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1958. A bill for the relief of Ingeborg Luise Fischer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1959. A bill for the relief of Elfrieda Haberl and her children, Frank Haberl, Rosemary Haberl, and Peter Haberl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1960. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ingeborg Maria Zoechbauer Horgan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1961. A bill for the relief of Miss Martha Kantelberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1962. A bill for the relief of Miss Athena Kitsopoulou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1963. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence M. Augustine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1964. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hildegard Herrmann Costa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1965. A bill for the relief of Robert Finley Delaney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 1966. A bill for the relief of Tai Jong (Billy) Ryu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1967. A bill for the relief of Onorato Biagioni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 1968. A bill for the relief of Maria do Santo Christo Amaral Moniz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 1969. A bill for the relief of Chin Buck Sun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 1970. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bertha Bider; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 1971. A bill for the relief of Leila Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 1972. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Lucente; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 1973. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chiu-An Wang (nee Alice Chiacheng Sze); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1974. A bill for the relief of Shirley W. Rothra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. R. 1975. A bill for the relief of Hanka and Kenneth Kerman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 1976. A bill for the relief of Luigi Tomasella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1977. A bill for the relief of Julio Martinez-Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1978. A bill for the relief of Ying Kie Mok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 1979. A bill for the relief of Chokichi Iraha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1980. A bill for the relief of Hamdi Ahmad-Tamini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1981. A bill for the relief of Dora Camalich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1982. A bill for the relief of the Denver Live Stock Exchange; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 1983. A bill for the relief of George Karl Heinrich Willy Junker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1984. A bill for the relief of Zivoin Mitich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 1985. A bill for the relief of Maria Rosa Largaiolli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1986. A bill for the relief of Robert M. Deckard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 1987. A bill for the relief of Kimie Hayshi Crandall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHUFORD:

H. R. 1988. A bill for the relief of Gerasimos Athanase Haberis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1989. A bill for the relief of George D. Hopper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1990. A bill for the relief of Michael Aristides Tseperkas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1991. A bill for the relief of Nouritza Terzian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 1992. A bill for the relief of Jabor Hassan El Assaad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 1993. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Alkos Giagtzis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1994. A bill for the reconveyance by the General Services Administration of certain surplus realty to the Hermann Hospital estate, Houston, Tex.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 1995. A bill for the relief of Mrs. John William Brennan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 1996. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Battista Campoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 1997. A bill for the relief of Linda Beryl San Filippo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 1998. A bill for the relief of Jose Ramon Pineiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1999. A bill for the relief of Heinz Kohn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

48. By Mr. HOSMER: Petition of Dr. Olin S. Proctor, a resident of the 18th Congressional District of California, relating to a claim to certain submerged lands within the continental limits of the United States and off the shores of Los Angeles and Orange Counties, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

49. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Helen L. Lichtweis, Peoria, Ill., requesting that the Federal oath of office be denied to Robert Bruce Chiperfield for the term of office for the 84th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

50. Also, petition of Helen L. Lichtweis, Peoria, Ill., relative to amendments to the Constitution of the United States of America: Amendment I—"To petition the Government for a redress of grievance"; to the Committee on House Administration.

51. Also, petition of Francisco Cepero, 1951 Blanca Cerra Street, Santurce, P. R., relative to Civil No. 95–4, legal protection to filing fees paid on Civil No. 4833 and liquidated damages, *Francisco Cepero, Plaintiff* v. *United States Government, Defendant*, southern district of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The President's State of the Union Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 10, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief statement which I released on January 10, 1955, regarding the President's state of the Union address, and the comments contained therein on the role of the Federal Government in developing hydroelectric power.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, OF OREGON

In his state of the Union message on January 6, 1955, President Eisenhower abandoned the pretense of an impending Federal power monopoly, which has so long served as a political scarecrow for the opponents of continued public power development in the Columbia River Basin.

Inasmuch as the likelihood of a Federal power monopoly has been cited by Secretary McKay as a main reason for abandoning the magnificent Hells Canyon power site to the Idaho Power Co., I call upon the Secretary to reverse his stand.

At McNary Dam in Oregon, on September 23, 1954, the President warned against Federal operation of a gigantic, overwhelming nationwide power monopoly.

On November 4, 1954, Budget Director Hughes warned against committing the Nation to a policy of establishing a nationwide Federal power monopoly.

In campaign speeches in Oregon, the Secretary of the Interior likewise warned frequently against this so-called Federal power monopoly.

But in his 1955 state of the Union message to the Congress, the President flatly declared that "Federal hydroelectric development supply but a small fraction of the Nation's power needs."

I think this is symbolic of the administration's confusion in the field of power. It emphasizes why our great public-power program in the Pacific Northwest has come to a standstill under this administration. For many months the President and his leading subordinates warned us of the imminence of a Federal power monopoly. Now the President himself tells the Nation that the Federal Government generates only a tiny portion of the country's waterpower.

This, of course, is the true situation, rather than the misleading talk of Federal monopoly used to swing votes last fall. The Federal Government today generates only about 13 percent of our electricity, as contrasted with 81 percent by private utility corporations.

With the President recognizing that Federal kilowatts are but a small segment of the national total, Hells Canyon cannot be considered as in any way contributing toward a possible Federal power monopoly.

Thus the state of the Union address effectively repudiates one of the principal arguments used to oppose and block a high multipurpose dam in Hells Canyon—the kind of dam advocated in the famous 308 report of the Army engineers.

I urge authorization of such a project by the 84th Congress.

Imports of Foreign Residual Fuel Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced in the House of Representatives a bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil. This bill is designed to check the present unfair competition now facing the coal industry of the United States. The continued unrestricted flow of cheap, foreign residual fuel oil created this unfair competition.

The depression now existing in the coal producing areas of the United States is unprecedented in the history of the entire industry. It is heartbreaking to see the mass unemployment; workers denied the right to employment through no fault of their own in one of America's major and most important industries. This unemployment, with its resultant unrest, has also spread to the railroads and other major industries dependent upon the production of coal.

On a recent trip to Europe I had an opportunity to see at first hand a number of communities where industrial recovery has been slow and real prosperity is still not in sight. Let me point out, however, that nowhere did I find the economic stagnation that has enveloped the coal producing communities of West Virginia since foreign residual oil began its relentless surge into the fuel markets of the east coast.

To my way of thinking, our first obligation is here at home, and for that reason I would say that the time for action is long since past due. From experience we know that the executive branch of government will not correct this grossly unjust situation. In fact, it has yet to take the first effective step to limit this importation of foreign residual fuel oil. Therefore, this limitation of imports must come through congressional action and we must act now.

In conclusion, let me point out that this same foreign product has washed out coal production capacity that is vital to a defense program. If an emergency should come, none of the platitudinous statements about high levels of trade will be of any value in meeting the demands of a stepped-up industrial effort in a fuel-hungry mobilization economy. We will need coal and more coal, but we will not get it unless we act now to keep our coal mines open in the interim period.

A Department of Urbiculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1955

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker I am today reintroducing my bill for the creation of a Department of Urbiculture at Cabinet level to deal with the special problems and welfare of municipalities.

These include such economic and social problems as slums, dope, juvenile delinquency, housing, and smog.

Smog, fast becoming a nationwide problem in metropolitan areas, was mentioned by the President in his state-of-the-Union message as a problem in need of a strengthened combative program. This would fall under the jurisdiction of the new department, if created.

The bill, which I introduced last July shortly before adjournment of the 83d Congress, has created tremendous interest among Washington legislators, who feel it could lead to the solution of one of the most important problems of American cities.

When the Department of Agriculture was established in 1862, 80 percent of the population lived on farms. Now the situation is reversed, with 85 percent in urban communities and only 15 percent rural.

It is only natural then that Government emphasis should be placed on solving the problems of this new majority of urban dwellers as it formally was for the majority of rural dwellers.

The bill, which has received extensive press coverage on a national scale, has brought forth a volume of correspondence from interested citizens and groups approving the action.

The term urbiculture was a coined word to describe a "new science" which would result from the discovery and application of natural law to the utilization of urban lands.

The new department would consolidate the urban functions of various other Federal agencies—notably Home Finance, Housing, Public Health, Department of Justice—which have dealt with areas of the problems of city folk.

Rules of Procedure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1955

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, when the rules of the 84th Congress were before the House for adoption I proposed an amendment in the form of House Resolution 61, a resolution which was approved by the Subcommittee on Legislative Procedure of the Committee on Rules of the 83d Congress. This subcommittee was composed of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and myself as chairman.

Since this amendment was not adopted at the beginning of the session I plan to request the Committee on Rules to hold a hearing on this proposal.

House Resolution 61 provides as follows:

House Resolution 61

Resolved, That paragraph 25 (a) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by striking out "standing" and by adding at the end thereof the following: "The rules of committees are hereby made the rules of subcommittees so far as applicable. Committees and subcommittees may adopt additional rules not inconsistent with the Rules of the House."

SEC. 2. Paragraph 25 (e) of such rule is amended by inserting ", finding," after "measure."

SEC. 3. Paragraph 25 (g) of such rule is amended by striking out "standing committees or their subcommittees" and inserting in lieu thereof "committees."

SEC. 4. Paragraph 25 of such rule is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) Unless otherwise provided, committee action shall be by vote of a majority of a quorum."

SEC. 5. (a) Paragraph 26 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by inserting "(a)" after "26." and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) No person shall be employed for or assigned to investigative activities until approved by the committee.

"(c) Unless otherwise provided, subpenas to require the attendance of witnesses, the giving of testimony, and the production of books, papers, or other evidence shall be issued only by authority of the committee, shall be signed by the chairman or any member designated by the chairman, and may be served by any person designated by the committee, the chairman, or the signing member.

"(d) No witness shall be compelled to give oral testimony for broadcast, or for direct reproduction by motion picture photography, recording, or otherwise in news and entertainment media if he objects.

"(e) Oaths may be administered and hearings may be conducted and presided over by the chairman or any member designated by the chairman. Unless the committee otherwise provides, one member shall constitute a quorum for the receipt of evidence and the taking of testimony; but no witness shall be compelled to give oral testimony before less than two members if, prior to testifying, he objects.

"(f) Witnesses shall be permitted to be advised by counsel of their legal rights while giving testimony, and unless the presiding member otherwise directs, to be accompanied by counsel at the stand.

"(g) Witnesses, counsel, and other persons present at committee hearings shall maintain proper order and decorum; counsel shall observe the standards of ethics and deportment generally required of attorneys at law. The chairman may punish breaches of this provision by censure or by exclusion from the committee's hearings, and the committee may punish by citation to the House as for contempt.

"(h) Whenever the committee determines that evidence relating to a question under inquiry may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate persons called as witnesses therein, the committee shall observe the following additional procedures, so far as may be practicable and necessary for the protection of such persons:

"(1) The subject of each hearing shall be clearly stated at the outset thereof, and evidence sought to be elicited shall be pertinent to the subject as so stated.

"(2) Preliminary staff inquiries may be directed by the chairman, but no major phase of the investigation shall be developed by calling witnesses until approved by the committee.

"(3) All testimony, whether compelled or volunteered, shall be given under oath.

"(4) Counsel for witnesses may be permitted, in the discretion of the presiding member and as justice may require, to be heard briefly on points of right and procedure, to examine their clients briefly for purposes of amplification and clarification, and to address pertinent questions by written interrogatory to other witnesses whose testimony pertains to their clients.

"(5) Testimony shall be heard in executive session, the witness willing, when necessary to shield the witness or other persons about whom he may testify.

"(6) The secrecy of executive sessions and of all matters and material not expressly released by the committee shall be rigorously enforced.

"(7) Witnesses shall be permitted brief explanations of affirmative or negative responses, and may submit concise, pertinent statements, orally or in writing, for inclusion in the record at the opening or close of their testimony.

"(8) An accurate verbatim transcript shall be made of all testimony, and no alterations of meaning shall be permitted therein.

"(9) Each witness may obtain transcript copies of his testimony given publicly by paying the cost thereof; copies of his testimony given in executive session shall be furnished the witness at cost if the testimony has been released or publicly disclosed, or if the chairman so orders.

"(10) No testimony given in executive session shall be publicly disclosed in part only.

"(i) Whenever the committee determines that any testimony, statement, release, or other evidence or utterance relating to a question under inquiry may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate persons who are not witnesses, the committee shall observe the following additional procedures, so far as may be practicable and necessary for the protection of such persons:

"(1) Persons so affected shall be afforded an opportunity to appear as witnesses, promptly and at the same place, if possible, and under subpena if they so elect. Testimony relating to the adverse evidence or utterance shall be subject to applicable provisions of part (h) of this rule.

"(2) Each such person may, in lieu of appearing as a witness, submit a concise, pertinent, sworn statement which shall be incorporated in the record of the hearing to which the adverse evidence or utterance relates.

"(j) The chairman or a member shall when practicable consult with appropriate Federal law-enforcement agencies with respect to any phase of an investigation which may result in evidence exposing the commission of Federal crimes, and the results of such consultation shall be reported to the committee before witnesses are called to testify therein.

"(l) Requests to subpena additional witnesses shall be received and considered by the chairman in any investigation in which witnesses have been subpenaed. Any such request received from a witness or other person entitled to the protections afforded by part (h) or (i) of this rule shall be considered and disposed of by the committee.

"(m) Each committee conducting investigations shall make available to interested persons copies of the rules applicable therein."

SEC. 6. Rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"7. All bills and resolutions to authorize the investigation of particular subject matter shall define such subject matter clearly, and shall state the need for such investigation and the general objects thereof."

Mr. Speaker, I have also included copies of various reports of our Subcommittee on Legislative Procedure containing these and other recommendations which will be found elsewhere in this issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Rules of Procedure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1955

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted I would like to have the following report of the Subcommittee on Legislative Procedure of the Committee on Rules of the 83d Congress inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

House Resolution 571 has been reintroduced as House Resolution 61 of the 84th Congress.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE PROCEDURE

(Statement by Mr. SCOTT to the Committee on Rules, May 1954)

Your subcommittee was appointed June 10, 1953, to make a study of legislative proce-

dure with particular reference to procedure governing the conduct of investigations by congressional committees. This summary of findings and recommendations which I am submitting today is in the nature of an interim report. In the past 11 months we have held extensive hearings, have studied various pending proposals and suggestions made to us, and have developed a proposed set of rules which is submitted, in its latest version, herewith.

A formal analysis and report, intended to accompany the proposed rules, is in preparation. This latest revised draft is submitted meanwhile, for consideration by the full committee, in order to expedite its being reported out in final form at an early date. A copy of House Resolution 571 is attached.

I am deeply appreciative of the contributions of both my colleagues, Mr. SMITH and Mr. CHENOWETH, have made throughout this undertaking. We have differed among ourselves from time to time, so our conclusions—in which we all now concur—have resulted from deliberation, discussion, and a good measure of amiable give-and-take. The end product of our efforts is doubtless much improved on this account.

THE NEED FOR RULES OF PROCEDURE

Public interest in problems relating to congressional investigations has been growing steadily. In recent years, the entire Nation has been made conscious of the sweeping powers vested in Congress for the purpose of conducting factfinding inquiries. It is unfortunate that the public knows so little of the scores and hundreds of routine investigations which are quietly and efficiently conducted each year by committees of Congress, and that only the most sensational and controversial fall under the spotlight.

But because of this distorted observation, and because a few regrettable episodes have been so widely publicized, a large segment of the public has come to believe that congressional investigations are not infrequently unfair, or even outright abusive of the rights of persons affected.

At the same time, and this impressed your subcommittee very much, both Members of Congress and responsible members of the public at large seem urgently aware that the coin has another side, that persons called as witnesses before these congressional bodies have sometimes contrived, in their turn, to affront the investigators, to defy their powers, and generally to frustrate the investigative purpose without being in any way penalized or punished therefor.

So the apparent need for rules of procedure is twofold, to satisfy everyone concerned that proceedings before investigating committees will be held to reasonable standards of fair play, on the one hand, and to assure potentially defiant witnesses that congressional committees have adequate powers to get tough if they need to, on the other. As will be emphasized hereafter, the danger of weakening the necessary powers of committees has been kept in view throughout this work; your subcommittee adopted as a starting premise the proposition that no rules of procedure would be proposed which could operate in any way to impair the legitimate investigative activities of congressional committees.

Thus while a need for rules of procedure exists, and while the promulgation of such rules is strongly recommended, yet we note that even the word rules is almost too restrictive in its connotations. What is called for seems more accurately describable as principles, i. e., precepts of fair play, set forth for the guidance of committees and the reassurance of witnesses.

Your subcommittee heard more than a score of witnesses, including 10 Members of Congress and representatives of bar associations, labor groups, church groups and veterans' organizations. The testimony was overwhelmingly in favor of an exercise of Congress' rule-making powers in this field, though we were repeatedly warned of the danger already noted, i. e., the danger of unduly restricting Congress in the process.

One witness, the Honorable George MEADER, urged upon us the proposition that under the doctrine of *Christoffel* v. *U. S.* (338 U. S. 84 (1949)), any rules whatsoever, promulgated to govern the conduct of investigations by congressional committees, would subject committee action pro tanto to review by the courts. Representative MEADER therefore opposed all rule-making efforts. We have given this point careful study, and have concluded that the doctrine of the Christoffel case (wherein the Supreme Court relied upon a rule of the Senate for guidance in interpreting and applying a Federal perjury statute) would be inapplicable to rules of the type it is recommending.

In sum, it is concluded that rules of procedure for committee investigations are both necessary and proper—with the reservation that such rules should be conservatively cast to serve as standards of guidance without imposing burdensome procedural restrictions. Committees are not courts. It is a mistake to equate committee hearings with the highly technical and formalized procedures that have been developed in the judicial domain. Your subcommittee has carefully rejected proposals and suggestions which appeared to be cast in the rigid form of judicial rules.

Furthermore, we have taken a relatively conservative position in other respects as well. The original version of House Resolution 447, prepared to consolidate all the seemingly meritorious ideas and suggestions which had been submitted in the hearings and in earlier bills and resolutions, contained a number of features which have subsequently been deleted. The version submitted herewith by your subcommittee is the product of repeated revisions, so that it represents a fair minimum, and in no sense a radical maximum.

At the end of this presentation we shall summarize briefly, for your information, the more important additional suggestions which have been considered and rejected in our deliberations.

Finally, in concluding this presentation, we shall note briefly three pending bills which would strengthen the hands of investigating committees, and which are deemed appropriate for consideration and endorsement by your subcommittee since they also concern procedures, and tend to complement the rules proposed herein.

EXISTING RULES

The power of each House of Congress to determine its own rules of procedure is directly conferred by the Constitution (art. I, sec. 5, cl. 2). It seems clear that this is the appropriate power to be called into play for the instant purpose. Determining procedures to be followed by its committees is within the province of each House of Congress, and should not be attempted by joint action of the two Houses; for even if uniformity between the two were insisted upon and achieved at the outset, each would remain free to depart from the uniform pattern at any time. Rules currently in force in the Senate differ materially from those now observed by the House of Representatives.

Indeed, it is precisely this absolute, unqualified, and continuous control by each House over its own rules that provides ultimate assurance against the dangers of unduly hampering House proceedings, if the new provisions are adopted as House rules. No rule thus adopted will be enforcible, as a practical matter, if the House does not wish to enforce it; and no rule will remain binding, as a precedent or otherwise, if the House wishes to drop it. This is the status of existing rules. It is the status properly to be accorded the new provisions recommended by your subcommittee. Even the rights directly conferred on witnesses (and there are only three—see paragraph 26 (d), (e), and (f) of the draft) would merely operate to excuse witnesses who relied on them from compulsion, i. e., from punishment for contempt. They do not create any basis for outside intervention.

The present rules of the House of Representatives number 42; of these, only 3 relate to committees. Rule X governs the creation and composition of the House's 19 standing committees; rule XI determines the powers and duties of committees; and rule XIII concerns procedures for the calendaring and consideration of the reports of standing committees.

Matter pertaining to the investigative function thus logically belongs in rule XI. This rule contains in turn 29 numbered paragraphs, of which only 2, paragraphs 25 and 26, presently relate to the general factfinding powers and functions of committees.

The amendments which your subcommittee proposes are therefore designed to be incorporated within paragraphs 25 and 26 of rule XI. The existing text of these two paragraphs is unaffected, except for slight editorial changes. Thus the structure of the rules is undisturbed and the entire proposal (except the slight addition to rule XXII, on the subject of resolutions) consists only of enlarging 2 subdivisions of 1 rule.

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED RULE

The changes proposed to be made in the present text of paragraph 25 (i. e., by the draft attached), are indicated in the following full reproduction thereof; their purpose needs no elaborate explanation. They merely broaden the paragraph so as to make it applicable to special and select committees and to all subcommittees, as well as to standing committees:

"25. (a) The rules of the House are hereby made the rules of its committees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is hereby made a motion of high privilege in said committees. The rules of committees are hereby made the rules of subcommittees so far as applicable. Committees and subcommittees may adopt additional rules not inconsistent with the rules of the House.

"(b) Each committee shall keep a complete record of all committee action. Such records shall include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded.

"(c) All committee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the Member serving as chairman of the committee; and such records shall be the property of the House and all Members of the House shall have access to such records. Each committee is authorized to have printed and bound testimony and other data presented at hearings held by the committee.

"(d) It shall be the duty of the chairman of each committee to report or cause to be reported promptly to the House any measure approved by this committee and to take or cause to be taken necessary steps to bring the matter to a vote.

"(e) No measure, finding or recommendation shall be reported to the House from any committee unless a majority of the committee were actually present.

"(f) Each committee shall, so far as practicable, require all witnesses appearing before it to file in advance written statements of their proposed testimony, and to limit their oral presentation to brief summaries of their argument. The staff of each committee shall prepare digests of such statements for the use of committee members.

"(g) All hearings conducted by committees shall be open to the public, except executive sessions for marking up bills or for

voting or where the committee orders an executive session."

The new subsection (h), added at the end of paragraph 25 (by sec. 4 of the draft) establishes the general principle, "unless otherwise provided," that all committee actions shall be taken by vote of a majority of a quorum of the committee. This is a very generalized provision intended to suggest that committee authority must not be usurped by the chairman or by any individual member, unless the same has been specifically delegated.

The present language of paragraph 26 of rule XI, incorporated into the rules from the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, is unchanged by the draft, and reads in its entirety as follows:

"26. To assist the House in appraising the administration of the laws and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the House shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee; and, for that purpose, shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the House by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government."

The meat of the proposals contained in the draft are incorporated in the new subsections to be inserted immediately after the present text of paragraph 26. These begin at page 2, line 9 of the draft, and will be briefly explained in the order in which they appear.

26 (b). This recognizes a new problem which has proved acute in some instances, namely, the authority of any single member to select people to go forth as investigators and to deal with the public in the name of the committee. It is believed that the committee itself should have the final say in this matter, at least in the rare instances when controls become important. Note that regular professional staff members hired by standing committees are already subject to a similar requirement (rule XI–27 (a)).

26 (c). This subsection on the issuance and service of subpenas is paraphrased from the special provisions in rule XI which control the subpena powers conferred specially on three standing committees (rule XI–2 (b), 8 (d), and 17 (b). Such subpenas are to be issued "only by authority of the committee" unless the committee makes other provisions and, in effect, delegates its authority to the chairman or a single member. The terms as to signature and service are intended to be as broad as possible to defeat any purely technical attack on the validity of a committee subpena.

26 (d). This is the first of the three absolute rights conferred personally upon witnesses appearing before committees. It is the right to be spared compulsory appearances in news and entertainment broadcasts via television or radio, if the witness interposes an objection. It is noteworthy that some of the views expressed to the subcommittee on this point supported a far stronger rule, namely, an unqualified prohibition against such coverage of committee hearings. Your subcommittee believes that the instant middle-of-the-road provision affords adequate protection.

26 (e). The first sentence of this subsection affirms the statutory power of any member to administer oaths, and resolves all questions as to who may preside over committee hearings. The second sentence deals with the thorny problem of whether one member may sit alone to hear witnesses and receive evidence. It is very desirable to establish the validity and regularity of the one-man quorum in ordinary circumstances, because of the holding in the Christoffel case alluded to above. But at the same time so-called one man subcommittees have been severely criticized from time to time. The proposal therefore contains two safeguards: It is specified that the committee may "otherwise provide," i. e., may pass a rule of its own imposing a more rigid quorum requirement; and—the second absolute right conferred on witnesses—no one may be compelled to testify before a single member if he makes timely objection. In the latter event, at least two members must be present to hear the testimony. Consideration was given to requiring the presence of more than two members and/or members representing more than one political party, but it was concluded that two would suffice to prevent the abuses sometimes charged to one alone, while the requirement as to partisan representation might make it possible for a minority to block a committee's work entirely by merely absenting itself.

26 (f). This is the third absolute right of witnesses, to be "advised by counsel of their legal rights." Counsel may also accompany the witness at the stand "unless the presiding member otherwise directs." The last-noted limitation is to make it perfectly clear that counsel may be ordered to stand aside if he indulges in the commonplace practice of coaching the witness so that the latter is in effect merely parroting the testimony of his adviser.

26 (g). This subsection merely prescribes general standards of behavior for counsel and other persons attending the hearings. The chairman's right to punish by censure or exclusion and the committee's right to cite offenders to the House are specifically noted.

26 (h). Into this subsection have been gathered all the seemingly meritorious protections which have been urged from time to time for the special benefit of witnesses involved in investigations aimed at their own reputations or possible guilt. Emphasis on the fact that the rules are really mere precepts and principles of fair play are obviously most apposite here.

It will be noted that the introductory language of subsection (h) leaves complete and absolute discretion in the committee as to the application of all which follows. The entire subsection applies only "whenever the committee determines" that some particular evidence to be adduced may tend to injure some particular person or persons to be called as witnesses—and even after such a finding the committee is bound only to follow the specified procedures "so far as may be practicable and necessary for the protection of such persons." Thus, it will be seen that the sudivisions of subsection (h), numbered (1) through (10), truly have the force of suggestions of fair play, and nothing more.

Subdivisions (1) through (3) of 26 (h) are self-explanatory. Subdivision (4) pertains to the rights of counsel (i. e., under these circumstances, where the witness is somewhat in the position of a defendant), and it will be noted that here, out of an excess of caution, still further qualifications have been added: "in the discretion of the presiding member" and "as justice may require." The rights, so diluted and qualified, are: to be heard briefly by the committee in argument, to examine their own clients briefly for clarification, and to question other witnesses by means of written interrogatories submitted through the committee.

Subsection 5 provides that to the extent necessary to shield the witness and other persons about whom he may testify, testimony should be taken in an executive session, if the witness is willing. The last clause is in recognition of an opposite consideration, namely, the possibility of affording protection to witnesses against potential abuses of the secret session, which your subcommittee considered and abandoned. Subdivisions (6) through (10) appear to be self-explanatory.

26 (i). This subsection is designed to protect persons who, while not called as witnesses, may nevertheless be injured by evidence adduced before a committee. Note that the same elaborate modifications, reducing the entire subsection to a mere affirmation of principle, are incorporated in the introductory language. The two subdivisions that follow merely give persons so affected a double option: to appear as witnesses in their own behalf (and to enjoy the benefits and protections conferred by 26 (h) if they do so), or to submit a sworn statement in lieu of such appearance. The words "under subpena" have been added merely to assure payment of mileage fees, etc., which are available only to witnesses appearing under compulsion, in case extensive travel is necessary to enjoy the benefits of the provision.

26 (j). This is another provision which is rendered advisory only by insertion of the words "when practicable," and which is narrow in its application but potentially important when it does come into play. Whenever investigating committees approach fields where Federal law-enforcement agencies are active, there is danger that the former may defeat efforts of the latter. An unimportant Communist hanger-on, for example, called as a witness by an investigating committee, might easily defeat long-laid plans to apprehend and prosecute his important bosses; and the same is true of other Federal law enforcement, including the enforcement of regulatory statutes and the punishment of tax evasion. This subsection therefore suggests that a representative of the committee should confer with Federal law-enforcement agencies involved, and should report the results of such conference back to his colleagues before the committee plunges into the field.

26 (k). This provision concerns a problem which occasionally presents itself where a witness, or a nonwitness involved in a particular hearing, believes he has a meritorious case for demanding that the committee should call additional witnesses on his behalf. It is simply specified that such requests shall be considered by the committee itself if they emanate from a person who has been found to be threatened with injury under subsections (h) or (i).

26 (l). This requirement is self-explanatory. It is contemplated that if rules such as those proposed here are adopted, a single standard print could be made available for use and distribution by all committees having need of them.

Finally, the new paragraph proposed to be added at the end of rule XXII—which pertains not to procedure but to the form and content of petitions, memorials, bills, and resolutions submitted to the House—is offered as a suggested improvement in the investigative process at another point, namely, in relation to the subjects upon which investigations are authorized in the first place. Resolutions calling for special investigations are presently sometimes worded so generally that it is not clear what is sought to be studied, and the suggested language would enjoin the sponsors of such measures to take pains to reveal and justify the objects which they are pursuing.

ADDITIONAL PROPOSALS REJECTED

As has been emphasized already, the draft resolution analyzed in the foregoing discussion is conservative in scope and operation. Several of the proposals now pending in the House go further. Your subcommittee studied all of these with care, and considered, besides, numerous suggestions offered in the course of the testimony it heard.

The features which are noted hereafter were rejected during the deliberations of your subcommittee, and are not contained in the final version of our draft resolution. Nonetheless, several of the most interesting are discussed briefly, since it is believed they will likely be the subjects of further discus-

sion when the final version of the draft is reported.

Generalizing the investigative power: Under present rules of the House of Representatives, as established by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, only three standing committees enjoy subpena powers—Appropriations, Government Operations, and Un-American Activities. Other standing or select committees desiring to send for persons or papers must seek and obtain special authorization from the House for this purpose. It is noted that such powers are vested in all committees of the Senate by a single blanket provision. While a similar provision would make for greater uniformity of authority and practice among House committees, it would, at the same time, remove a potentially important check, i. e., the necessity of affirmative action by the House before any but the three named committees is entitled to make use of these investigative prerogatives.

The witness' absolute right to be heard in public: There is some basis for urging that witnesses should be entitled, if they insist, to be interrogated in public rather than before a secret session. It was suggested to your subcommittee that secret hearings could be used as star chamber proceedings to place the witness at a very unfair disadvantage. Nevertheless, the opposite consideration seemed more weighty: Certain witnesses, especially uncooperative individuals summoned from the executive branch, could seriously embarrass certain inquiries by demanding publicity. The executive session is more frequently a device for protecting witnesses than a threat, and it is to be hoped that other safeguards, such as the requirement of an accurate transcript in the case of witnesses whose reputations are in jeopardy, etc., will prove adequate. Note that the phrase "the witness willing" has been retained in subsection (h) (5) (draft, p. 4, line 13), as a suggestion that the witness' desire to be heard publicly ought always to be taken into account.

Appeal, review, or enforcement machinery: It has been suggested that reference should be made to the manner in which rules governing the conduct of investigations might be enforced. Proposals embracing elaborate enforcement provisions were considered. It is recognized that enforcement problems in connection with rules of procedure differ slightly from problems relating to general rules of the House in that personal, adversary interests of outsiders are not at stake in usual applications of the latter.

Nevertheless, we believe elaborate machinery and detailed procedures should not under any circumstances be considered for this purpose, for essential flexibility would be sacrificed thereby. At most, an informal submission of problems arising under such rules might be made at the outset to some body less than the full House, e. g., to the Rules Committee or a similar House group. This matter seems best left open for further consideration after experience has been accumulated with actual problems of enforcement, etc.

The right of cross-examination: Opinions are widely divided on whether counsel for a witness should ever be permitted to cross-examine his client or other witnesses directly. After carefully considering the alternatives, your subcommittee decided to recommend the use of written interrogatories only. In appropriate circumstances, the committee could still permit limited cross-examination if it wishes to do so; thus the omission merely serves to discourage potential abuses by contentious advocates.

RELATED PROPOSALS IN PENDING LEGISLATION

In conclusion, we wish to note briefly three bills now pending before the House, which deserve consideration in connection with these proposed rules of procedure: H. R. 4975 and H. R. 6899, introduced by Mr. KEATING, and H. R. 7955, introduced by myself.

H. R. 4975 would greatly improve the machinery now available to congressional committees to deal with persons who refuse to testify or otherwise to comply with committee subpenas and orders. At present, the only recourse for a committee when so defied is to submit a resolution citing the defiant person for contempt before the full House, after which, if the resolution is passed, the matter must be referred to a United States attorney for prosecution as a criminal offense under title 2, United States Code, section 192.

The result is delay, often amounting to months or even years, before the issue comes to trial. And in consequence, contempt convictions under this statute are very rare; defying the authority of congressional committees has become relatively safe; excepting the cases of Communists, Federal courts have bent over backward to exonerate persons hailed before them under this statute. Under Mr. KEATING'S proposal, the committee would be given another alternative. It could address itself forthwith to a Federal district court, and make application for an order of the court compelling obedience to its own subpena, etc. If the relief sought by the committee were improper for some reason, the defiant witness would be entitled to a hearing and to immediate exoneration; if the committee's position proved sound, immediate compliance would be compelled, by the sanctions of the court's own plenary contempt powers. It is noteworthy that the proposal has ample precedents. Federal agencies such as the FTC, the SEC, the ICC, etc., have long enjoyed precisely this power in aid of their fact-finding prerogatives, and have found it to work admirably for all parties concerned.

Mr. KEATING'S second bill, H. R. 6899, is an immunity measure, aimed at reviving the powers once enjoyed by Congress under title 18, United States Code, section 3486, but which have been virtually dead for many years. With such powers, congressional committees could once again overcome pleas of privilege under the fifth amendment by granting immunity for any incriminating effects of testimony sought to be compelled. Such legislation in slightly different form has already been favorably acted upon by the Senate, (S. 16, 83d Cong.). H. R. 6899 has the unqualified endorsement of Attorney General Brownell, and has also been formally approved by the American Bar Association. The passage of such immunity legislation would tend to reduce or eliminate a number of difficulties now encountered in congressional investigations dealing with controversial matters.

My bill, H. R. 7955, makes a simple change in the existing congressional contempt statute, title 2, United States Code, section 192, by adding the offense of misbehavior. At present, a witness whose affront consists not in defying the authority of a committee but in offensive conduct in its presence, etc., is not punishable under the statute. Committees have occasionally been obliged to put up with very serious abuses on account of this deficiency. H. R. 7955 corrects the situation, so that such offenders can be properly dealt with in the courts.

Rules of Procedure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1955

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I insert the following statements concerning House Resolution 571, 83d Congress. This resolution has been reintroduced as House Resolution 61, 84th Congress.

RULES OF PROCEDURE, HOUSE RESOLUTION 571

Representative HUGH SCOTT, Republican of Pennsylvania, today introduced a revised version of the proposed rules of procedure for committees in the House of Representatives being developed by a subcommittee (SCOTT, chairman; CHENOWETH, Republican, of Colorado; SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia) of the House Rules Committee. The new resolution is House Resolution 571. SCOTT emphasized that this final version has yet to be considered by the full Rules Committee of the House. He added that he had been assured of such consideration by the full committee (of which he is a member) in the near future.

Said SCOTT, "This is the product of more than a year's work; we have been through four revisions, and I feel that we are very close to a final version which should be acceptable to everyone."

The Scott subcommittee was created in 1953 to make a study of House Resolution 29 (introduced by Representative KEATING, Republican, of New York) and other proposals then pending on the subject of rules of procedure. After holding extensive hearings, the subcommittee introduced a set of rules incorporating its own views, together with ideas and suggestions it had received. This was House Resolution 447, introduced on February 17, 1954. Subsequently, House Resolution 447 was widely circulated for criticism, and modified in successive revisions. House Resolution 571 is the result.

Senate Resolution 253, introduced on May 24, 1954, by Senator BUSH, Republican, of Connecticut, for revision of the Rules of the Senate, closely follows the Scott subcommittee's proposals for House Rules revision. The similarity between the two resolutions may serve to expedite action during the present session of Congress. Both SCOTT and BUSH are urging their respective Houses to take action on these proposals at once.

"I think the administration tends to share our viewpoint; the American people want something to be done to insure fair play before congressional committees. And current interest is at an all-time high because of the televised hearings which have attracted so much attention to the whole investigative process. There is a widespread feeling that the pursuit of desirable ends requires clear statement of the ground rules governing the means (i. e. the methods) employed.

"In both Houses, rules proposals have become so popular that there is no serious question of partisan disagreement. Our subcommittee's work has proved more timely and fruitful than we dared hope. My only regret is that we did not have the benefit of so much support and emulation earlier, when the calendar was less crowded with priority items.

"The only substantial difference between House Resolution 571 (and Senate Resolution 253) and those currently sponsored by our Democratic colleagues is in the matter of enforcement of the rules we propose. Our subcommittee considered suggestions as to special enforcement procedures and rejected them—at least for the present—on the ground that the mere adoption of a real set of ground rules will probably suffice. When everyone knows the rules, no one will be likely to flout them. The whole trouble now is that there is no accurate standard to measure by. The American people have a very strong sense of fair play. If we give them something definite to judge by, they will insist on reasonable compliance. And of course Congress already has ample enforcement machinery if it wants to compel obedience to its rules by its own Members."

SCOTT explained that his resolution is proposed for adoption by the House of Representatives only, since the existing rules of the House and the Senate differ in some particulars and since neither House could be expected to surrender exclusive power over its own proceedings. The resolution is thus in the form of an amendment to the existing rules of the House (a feature accepted in the Bush resolution in the Senate).

In brief summary, the resolution provides:

1. All committees and subcommittees of the House are to be subject to uniform rules of procedure.

2. All committee action must be approved by a vote of a majority of a quorum of the committee (or subcommittee).

3. Committee personnel to be assigned to investigative activities must be approved by the committee.

4. The committee shall have control over the issuance of subpenas, unless it expressly delegates this power.

5. Witnesses shall have the absolute right to bar television and radio broadcasting of their testimony if they object to it.

6. One-man quorums are allowed only if the witness is willing to give his testimony before a single member; otherwise, on demand of the witness, at least two members must be present. This is designed to meet criticism of the so-called one-man subcommittees, without, at the same time, unduly hampering committees in the conducting of routine hearings.

7. Witnesses are given an absolute right to legal counsel.

8. All participants in a hearing must observe proper order and decorum, subject to censure and punishment.

9. Whenever a witness is likely to be injured in his reputation or defamed or incriminated, by the nature of the inquiry, the committee will be expected to follow certain additional procedures:

(a) The subject of each hearing must be clearly stated and all evidence adduced must be relevant to the subject.

(b) No new line of investigation can be developed until the committee approves it.

(c) Everyone appearing in such proceedings must testify under oath.

(d) Counsel for witnesses may address the committee briefly and may ask questions of his own client to clear up points on the record. Questions to other witnesses, when pertinent, may be submitted in writing.

(e) Executive sessions must be used to protect the witness when necessary.

(f) The secrecy of executive sessions must be protected.

(g) Witnesses will be permitted to submit brief-written statements for inclusion in the record.

(h) An accurate transcript must be kept.

(i) Transcript copies must be made available to the witness.

(j) No testimony heard in executive session shall be released in part only.

10. Anyone, not being called as a witness, who is named in a derogatory or irresponsible fashion in a hearing shall be entitled to appear promptly as a witness and testify in his own behalf, in refutation of charges or alleged "smears," or to submit a written statement for incorporation in the record. This provision is designed to protect innocent persons from unwarranted assaults upon their reputations by any participant in, or before, an investigative committee.

11. The committee will be required to consult with law-enforcement agencies, such as the FBI, before undertaking investigations into areas where they might conflict with law-enforcement activities. The purpose of this is to avoid blundering into criminal cases which the enforcement agencies have already prepared—a real danger where extensive undercover work has been done but not yet presented to a grand jury.

12. The committee will entertain proper requests to call additional witnesses, from witnesses or others who feel that such additional testimony is necessary in their behalf.

13. The foregoing rules of procedure shall be freely available to all interested persons. It is essential that witnesses be advised of the "ground rules" relating to their rights and responsibilities.

14. Resolutions introduced in the House for the purpose of authorizing investigations must specify exactly what is proposed to be investigated and what is expected to be accomplished by the investigation.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE HUGH SCOTT, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE PROCEDURE, HOUSE RULES COMMITTEE ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 571, AND INTERIM REPORT RELATING THERTO

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am submitting today an interim report on the work of our subcommittee in developing rules of fair play to be proposed for congressional committees.

Because of the heavy workload that always falls on this committee during the last weeks of a session, it has not been possible to secure an earlier hearing. Also, we have wished to avoid any interpretation of these proceedings as being in anyway in conflict with hearings before a committee of the other body. The objects of general rules of fair play are much broader than any of the issues that attracted so much attention during recent hearings; it would have been harmful to confuse the two—just as, I think, it was greatly harmful to let people confuse the televised proceedings with courtroom standards or practices as much as they did.

I aimed from the outset to be able to have a set of rules revision proposals considered by our full committee and reported out to the House before this session ended. That is still my hope. The American people are concerned with the problem; the President has alluded to it a number of times; and it is an exclusive, internal responsibility of ours which must be met, in recognition of the need for clarification of existing rules.

The full analysis and formal report referred to in our interim report has been deferred to await this presentation. But we can complete it rapidly if you wish to act before adjournment.

Otherwise, I suggest that you authorize us to prepare and submit our formal report on or before the opening day of the first session of the new Congress. If I have the honor to serve again next year, and if we have not achieved our goal before then, I intend to offer these revisions of the rules as the first order of business when we reconvene.

We have worked long and carefully and our proposals are sound. One additional item, which has been developed in the deliberation of the recently-formed Senate subcommittee addressing itself to the same subject, is a special limitation on the creation of subcommittees—whether the chairman can do it or whether only the full committee ought to have the power. In my opinion this would have to be "committee action," subject to the rule we propose at lines 3 and 4 of page 2 of House Resolution 571. But you might wish to consider it specially.

In concluding, let me reaffirm my strong disagreement with the estimable people who have suggested from time to time that all new rules are undesirable. To some of these, the existing rules are seemingly as sacred and inviolable as the Ten Commandments; to others any efforts to establish principles of fair play raise the terrifying spector of total interference and total failure of the workings of Congress. These attitudes are totally unrealistic.

Here, for example, is an excerpt from this immutable body of precepts, House rules XIV, paragraph 7, provides (and has always provided) that "during the session of the House no Member shall wear his hat." This ironclad pronouncement is unqualified by any limitation as to the places where it applies, nor does it make any exception for our charming lady colleagues. So, literally and in the inflexible tradition urged upon us, we wear headgear anywhere in or out of the Capitol during a session at the peril of clashing head-on with the overbearing wisdom of our ancestors in the matter. And worse than that, any John Doe opposing a law we have enacted, if he can show a hatted Member at the time of the vote would have a clear argument that we were acting in violation of our rules—ergo, the law is not a law at all. Incidentally, while our rules forbid wearing hats, there is no prohibition against the carrying of firearms.

Despite my respect and affection for some of the people who have expressed similar alarm over our proposals, I think it may be fairly observed that there is nothing sacroscant about the rules governing the conduct of the House. If the occasion arises for improvement in our laws, we change the laws. If our present rules do not meet present day situations, it is worse to endure them supinely than to change them intelligently.

Size and Weight Limitations on Parcel Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1955

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege in the 83d Congress to sponsor in the House of Representatives a bill designed to repeal the discriminatory Public Law 199 of the 82d Congress, and restore parcel-post size and weight to the historic limits in effect for 20 years prior to January 1952.

Eight days of hearings were held a year ago this month on the subject of parcel-post size and weight limitations by the St. George Subcommittee on Postal Operations. Ninety-four witnesses submitted statements to the subcommittee urging repeal of Public Law 199. They represented all segments of business; two farm organizations and other agricultural and consumer groups. There were spokesmen from the Post Office Department; a witness appeared for a postal workers' organization, and one from a housewives' organization—all urging repeal of the law. There were only five witnesses appearing in opposition, all representing the Railway Express Agency, or the railroad interests—the only interests in all the world that stand to gain anything under this inequitable law that operates to the inconvenience and expense of all senders of small parcels.

Letters poured in to the Members of this body, urging passage of my bill. Many of my colleagues told me of their hope that my bill would be favorably reported in committee so they could vote for its passage on this floor. The advisory council to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in the other body said quite forthrightly that Public Law 199, 82d Congress, should be repealed, and weight and size limitations should apply uniformly to all post offices.

But, in spite of the overwhelming support for my bill, it was never reported out of committee.

On Wednesday, January 5, 1955, I again introduced a bill to restore the parcel-post size and weight limits to the reasonable limits the postal patrons of this country had come to look upon as standard through 20 years of use.

Enactment of my bill will be looked upon as desirable by the vast majority of the people of this country, including the Post Office Department, whose own figures show that its financial position would be bettered by some $70 million a year by repeal of Public Law 199. Enactment of my bill will greatly facilitate the flow of goods to market and to the ultimate consumer, with a maximum of convenience and economy through the use of the nationwide distribution system now held by the Post Office Department and paid for by the users of parcel post, with the ultimate savings in distribution costs going to the consuming public.

I know that the beneficiaries of the special advantages under Public Law 199 will again wave the banner of free enterprise. But, Mr. Speaker, the only interests who stand to benefit by retaining Public Law 199 on the statute books are not really free enterprise at all; they are a wholly owned monopoly.

On the other hand, my bill will have the support of at least two of the major farm groups. It will be upheld by the housewives of America, many of whom trudged back home with their relatively small packages in the recent Christmas season, because Public Law 199 had denied them the use of their own postal facilities for mailing those packages of good cheer. My bill will have the support of all businessmen, but particularly the small businessmen who are unable to hire traffic experts or cooperate in joint shipping endeavors to save themselves heavy transportation expenses. My bill will have the support of such business organizations as the National Retail Dry Goods Association, which is very well known for its espousal of ideas for good government, and which is on record for not opposing any postal rate increases necessary to put the Post Office Department on a self-sustaining, efficient operating basis.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for the support of every Member of this body for my proposal to repeal Public Law 199. Passage of my bill would be to place the interests of 160 million American people above those of a single special interest.

Penalty for Sale of Narcotics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1955

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which provides for the death penalty or life imprisonment for anyone convicted of the sale of narcotics or marihuana to minors.

Selling narcotics to young people, in my estimation, is the most vicious crime that can be committed and it must be stopped through drastic Federal legislation calling for the death penalty for violators.

I feel that the introduction and distribution of narcotics to teen-agers in the Nation's high schools condemns them to a fate worse than death and should be punished by death or life imprisonment to offenders.

My decision to introduce the bill has been endorsed in statements from numerous parents throughout my San Mateo County district and environs.

A typical parent wrote a letter in which she said:

> My son is now 23 years old but has been on the stuff since he was a teen-ager, and if this bill is passed it will not only protect my son from further contamination from this evil, but also save many boys and girls from a slow death.

She went on to state:

> My son is at present serving a term in prison for forgery. Of course, he wanted money for this stuff and would do anything to get it.

Several doctors have written me their enthusiastic endorsement of the bill.

I also propose that marihuana, not now included as a narcotic under Federal definition, be incorporated in its definition by this bill.

I cite the logic of the Lindbergh law, which has virtually stopped kidnaping in the Nation through fear of the death penalty, in strong support of the bill.

Eighty-fourth Congress of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1955

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, all of us who are honored to serve our great people in their Federal Congress, are of course, and properly so, the recipients of large amounts of mail from them. Indeed, it is traditional in our land for the citizen to write to his Congressman or his Senator on the least provocation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, too many of us upon whom rests the responsibility for our legislative affairs are inclined to ignore the importance of these letters. Nothing could be more foolish. These letters are, in a very real sense, instructions from our employer; and, if we want to be good and faithful servants, it behooves us to take heed of the counsel with those who employ the people of the United States. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, one of these letters, which I am sure has been received by all of my distinguished colleagues, is the inspiration for this address. The gentleman who wrote it, Mr. Bluford H. J. Balter, is an outstanding citizen of my own State, although not of my district. He is no personal friend of mine, although I wish that he were. I do know, however, that this patriotic man has spent a fortune in his efforts to aid in the survival of his country. Is it any wonder, then, that his letter has inspired this address? Mr. Speaker, the letter of which I speak is worthy of a permanent place in our national archives, and I make it a part of this address.

> All experience hath shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed.

The little-noticed words quoted above were inserted in our Declaration of Independence before the meeting of the First Congress of the United States of America. They gave clear and ringing notice to the world that Americans, though disposed to be long suffering in the face of governmental oppression, did have within them a point beyond which no king nor potentate might proceed in interfering with their inalienable rights.

When His Britannic Majesty, George III, disregarded this warning from his American subjects they proceeded to turn from long-suffering subjects of a European nation, to violent and aggressive citizens of their own free and independent nation, determined to preserve their freedoms with their lives, and responsible only to their God for their actions. Now, 179 years later, that same grave and portent warning is in order. Our Nation again stands in grave peril; whether or not it survives may well depend upon the strength and integrity of the men and women who make up the 84th Congress of these United States.

Our valorous Founding Fathers rose up and "abolished the forms to which they are accustomed" because they valued the freedom and honor of themselves and their descendants more than they feared the horrors and sufferings of war. That freedom might not perish from the earth, they did not hesitate to face death as traitors if they failed in their high endeavor. They did not fail.

Having won their fight for human freedom and human liberty, our great forefathers on this continent then proceeded to draft, adopt, and promulgate the Constitution of the United States, one of the greatest documents ever devised by the mind of man. That Constitution and its first 10 amendments guaranteed to all Americans for all time that "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" that was promised in the Declaration of Independence. Today, after some 164 years of the existence of our Constitution, we have life but precariously, dependent upon the whim of the brutal rulers of those governments who have embraced atheistic communism; if we have liberty at all, it is at the whim of some government functionaire, intent upon taking of our sustenance in order that the habitants of foreign shores may live better than we, and who fails to exercise the absolute power that government has wangled and decadent judges have affirmed, to take all of our property and all of our earnings to satisfy the needs of an ever-expanding worldwide giveaway program, designed to enrich and strengthen our enemies while pauperizing us; and if we may pursue liberty at all, we are pursuing only

an unobtainable myth, made unobtainable by unreasonable, unconstitutional, and confiscatory taxes that are driving our people to desperation, and which will inevitably destroy our Nation just as they have already destroyed the individual initiative that has made our country great.

Where along the way did we lose the freedom and independence for ourselves in the present and the hope for our descendants in the future, so carefully created and nurtured by our valiant forefathers on this continent? We have more than once demonstrated our valiance in war and our magnanimity in victory.

During the years 1941–45 our country, rightly or wrongly, was at war, and our people labored long and hard, and without thought of themselves, to carry the immense financial burden imposed upon them by the necessities of their native land. They did so gladly and cheerfully. With victory in Europe and Japan, our people continued giving of their sustenance without complaint in order that the enemies they had just made prostrate might have food and drink and continue to live. But now some 14 years have elapsed, during which the people of the United States of America have carried the financial burdens of most of the world, and with what results? In 1940, before we began our wasteful giving, we had friends all over the world. Today we have hardly a friend outside our own hemisphere.

But even with this dismal background our thoughtless leaders in our National Capital now propose to tax our people even more grievously and to assume now the additional burden of the support of the uncounted masses of the great land mass of Asia. What fools we are. If our generosity made only enemies among the Christian peoples of Europe, by what logic may we expect friends as a result of foolish give-aways in hostile, non-Christian lands?

Our great Constitution guarantees us the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. All of these guaranties become meaningless in the face of illegal and confiscatory taxes. We could serve the cause of communism no better by sending them vast shiploads of armaments than we do by senseless spending ourselves into chaos and national bankruptcy.

Too long have we played the fool. Our national survival depends upon a sane reappraisal of the policies of folly that have made our continued existence a serious question at this tense moment of history.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I tender the letter from my fellow citizen of our wonderful State of Louisiana, Mr. Bluford H. J. Balter, the letter which was the inspiration for this address, and I ask that it be made a part of this address and take its place in the historical archives of our great Nation as witness to the fact that in our great land of the United States of North America the humble citizen as well as the statesman is aggressively determined that our free land shall survive and that our descendants shall enjoy, under our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, that freedom and liberty to which we ourselves were born and which we are obligated to hand on to them undefiled.

NEW ORLEANS, U. S. A., *January 1, 1955.*

Hon. GEORGE S. LONG,
United States Represenetative from the Eighth Louisiana Congressional District, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Exercising that inalienable right of free men to petition their government for redress of wrongs, as guaranteed by your illustrious predecessors gathered in constituent assembly to frame the Constitution of the United States, I now address you and implore you to save the very existence of our beloved Nation.

The Declaration of Independence, that great document by means of which our ancestors cast the die for freedom rather than tyranny, promises to us, as inalienable rights, "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

After the bitter struggle for independence was won, that promise was made reality in the Bill of Rights comprising the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, and especially the due-process requirement of the fifth amendment.

Living under the Bill of Rights from 1789 to 1913, the United States of North America attained the highest standard of wealth, of living, and of culture that the world of man has ever known.

Then an iniquitous blight was impressed upon our constitutional system, the 16th amendment, declaring, in effect, that all the earnings of the citizen belonged not to him, but to the Government. Whatever amount of his earnings he was allowed to keep was by the grace of his all-powerful Government and not by reason of his natural and inalienable rights.

The 16th amendment had within itself the seeds that have now turned a proud Nation of free men into a Nation of ignominious slaves and regimented robots. The graft and corruption in high places, the mink coats and the freezers, yes, even the alleged action of Alger Hiss, Harry White, William Remington, and the Rosenbergs, as documented by the House Un-American Activities Committee, all are byproducts of a Nation of slaves, a people devoid of all hope of ever living in the blessed light of freedom and exercising the dignity inherently possessed and rightly expressed by all men who live not under tyranny.

For 14 years our people have supported from their earnings most of the rest of the World. During the great war that ended in 1945, they did so gladly; at the end of the decade that has since elapsed, they find the burden intolerable and the proposal to spend untold billions upon the teeming masses of Asia unthinkable.

History will hold to stern account the 84th Congress of these United States. It is to you that we look for the restoration of freedom and sanity in our beloved Nation. If you continue giving of our wealth and earnings to ungrateful and indifferent Europeans who give us only hate and ridicule in return and if you saddle us with the burden of supporting hordes of atheistic Asians, then truly we shall die as a free nation. If you take the first step toward returning us to sanity and Americanism, then shall you see a miracle among us. If you will but restore to us the right to use the fruits of our labor and our undertakings as we choose, limiting the arbitrary power of government to confiscate our wealth to some reasonable and predetermined amount, then shall you see American initiative and ingenuity come to the fore again and raise our living standards and our national prosperity to such undreamed-of heights that the rest of the world will live better than it ever has on the mere byproducts of American civilization.

Members of the 84th Congress:

If you fail us we die. If we die you and the hopes of mankind everywhere die with us.

Respectfully submitted.

BLUFORD H. J. BALTER,
Balter Building,
New Orleans, La.

The Late Kenneth Charles Morton Sills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1955

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to memorialize, briefly as I know I must, the life and services of a citizen of Maine who died on November 15 last. I refer to Kenneth Charles Morton Sills, president emeritus of Bowdoin College, one of the best known and best loved men who ever lived in our State.

Born in Halifax, Nova Scotia, on December 5, 1879, he came to Portland, Maine, with his parents in the year following. His father was for several years dean of St. Luke's Episcopal Cathedral in Portland. Kenneth Sills graduated from Bowdoin in 1901. He returned in 1903 as instructor for a single year in classics and English. He came back to the college again in 1906, to teach Latin, and remained at the college until his retirement in 1952. As it happens, I was a freshman at Bowdoin in 1906 and from the day of his advent to the college down to the moment of his death I was his devoted and admiring friend.

In 1910 Mr. Sills became dean of the college, in 1917, acting president, and in 1918, president. His services as president terminated with his retirement at the close of the academic year in 1952. For the rest of his life he was president emeritus. In the later years of his incumbency as president of Bowdoin, he was senior in point of service to most of the college presidents in the country. His judgment was sought and followed by educators everywhere. After his official retirement in 1952, he was constantly active in the cause of education and in an endless succession of good works.

I shall attempt no lengthy biographical sketch of former President Sills, nor shall I list his honors academic or otherwise. I should have made these remarks more seasonably had not the House been in recess at the time of his death, and thereafter until this month.

Kenneth Sills was above all an educator, concerned with the great responsibility of helping immature minds to become mature—of making boys into effective men. He believed in the liberal arts and in the humanities. In his life he exemplified the famous words of Terence, "Homo sum, humani nihil a me alienum puto."

As president of Bowdoin College for 34 years and a member of its faculty for an even longer period, Kenneth Sills naturally left a strong impress on the college. No one who attended it in all

those years will gainsay his influence on the college and few will gainsay his influence on their own individual lives. That influence was unfailingly for good. He believed in men. He believed in men's hearts, and in their intellects.

Although we was primarily an educator his mind, like all first-rate minds, wandered into many fields and illumined whatever it touched. It goes almost without saying that he took an acute interest in everything that went on in the world about him. He was deeply concerned with the government of his State and of his Nation. A lifelong Democrat, and his party's candidate for the United States Senate in 1916, he was nevertheless no narrow or hidebound partisan. Though he had not the temperament of the professional reformer, he was always thinking about how things could be better done. Only a few weeks before his death he and I were corresponding vigorously about possible amendments to our State constitution.

President Sills was a profoundly religious man. He was for many years one of the leading laymen in the Protestant Episcopal Church.

One cannot write about Kenneth Sills in terms of particular things he did or said or even of his opinions and judgements. He will be most remembered by everybody who knew him for his capacity for friendship, and the generosity of feeling which endeared him to all with whom he came in contact. He had a warm, responsive nature. To the students of the college, to its alumni, to the members of its boards of trustees and overseers, he gave himself ungrudgingly. His friendship was always stimulating. He brought out the best in people because he believed in them. I can never forget his kindness to me on occasions without number and for much more than a generation.

Also I cannot forbear to mention his devoted wife, now left a widow. The hearts of all his friends go out to her in her sorrow.

Thirty-fourth Anniversary of the Temporary Establishment of Freedom in the Armenian Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1955

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I understand that Friday, February 18, marks the 34th anniversary of the temporary establishment of freedom in the Armenian Republic, a freedom which only lasted a few months and was then overthrown by the dictatorship of the Soviet Union.

I am pleased to call the attention of the House to this anniversary in view of the often-expressed hope of the administration and the Congress that the day will soon come when all subjugated peoples now behind the Iron Curtain will again enjoy the right of self-determination and a government of their own choice. I, therefore, trust that the Armenian people will continue to keep alive the spirit of hope for the time when they, too, will once again breathe the air of freedom which they enjoyed so briefly 34 years ago.

Congress Charts a New Course for Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 10, 1955

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on December 15 I had the honor of delivering an address at the annual convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation in New York City. I ask unanimous consent that my address be incorporated in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS CHARTS A NEW COURSE FOR AGRICULTURE

(Address by Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, of Florida)

I am happy, indeed, to be the guest of the American Farm Bureau Federation and to appear on your program today. I was sorry that I was forced, by a very bad throat, to cancel my visit with you at Chicago last year. I count it a very special courtesy that you have invited me a second time.

My association with your splendid organization has been, to me, a succession of pleasant and helpful experiences. At the national level I have found my own thinking on agricultural legislation, in most instances, in quite close accord with your official positions, and I have frequently sought and obtained valuable assistance from the members of your exceedingly capable Washington staff. When you have not agreed with me you have always been courteous and tolerant.

On the State level there is no other organization besides the Florida Farm Bureau which contains strong representation from all branches of our highly diversified Florida agriculture, and which can therefore speak with such authority for the agricultural groups in our State as a whole. In my opinion your approach to all questions, both National and State, has been both constructive and well informed, and I look forward to a permanent continuance of my friendly association with you.

I am glad, too, that my appearance today happens to be at the same time as your visit from the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson. I feel that Mr. Benson has rendered very great service to American agriculture and that his leadership has been fundamentally in the right direction. The sooner we all realize that agricultural problems are economic problems of great national importance and that they may never be dealt with upon any narrow partisan basis, the better it will be for American agriculture and for the American people. In my judgment, Secretary Benson's approach has been courageous and essentially nonpartisan, and I think that Congress has been similarly broad in its reaction. Both Houses of Congress have given Mr. Benson bipartisan support, which is as it should be.

A noted speaker once said that no greater misfortune could befall any speaker than to be on a program where everybody present knows more about his subject than he does, yet that is precisely the situation in which I find myself. I shall hope, however, that my point of view, as a legislator, may contribute some small new light upon the problems of American agriculture—my subject being "Congress Charts a New Course for Agriculture."

The 83d Congress, during its 2 years, 1953 and 1954, has probably passed more legislation than any earlier Congress which vitally affects agriculture. It is timely to analyze this mass of new legislation to determine what has been the general philosophy of this Congress in enacting laws for agriculture. I shall leave for later discussion the price-support programs, which are included in the Agriculture Act of 1954, the most important single law passed by us. At this time I shall mention three general fields of legislation which the 83d Congress evidently regarded as of great importance to agriculture.

1. EMPHASIS ON INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY

It is quite clear that the Congress placed much emphasis on the responsibility of the individual farmer and made available additional tools which farmers can use, either individually or collectively, in solving their own problems relating to the production of their crops or to the distribution of their crops in the American market.

The Water Facilities Act, for instance, was expanded and enlarged so as to apply to all areas of the Nation, rather than simply to the arid and semiarid States of the West as heretofore. This legislation will enable and encourage the expansion of conservation practices and improved use of soil and water throughout the Nation by allowing substantial loans to any individual farmer or rancher for water facilities and general conservation development, and much larger loans to associations of farmers. The extended Water Facilities Act also sets up a new program under which, in addition to direct Government loans, many loans for these same purposes may be insured by the Government, thus making commercial loans much easier to obtain. This act should be of great importance everywhere, but particuarly in drought areas or where reclamation or drainage is under way.

A second act which creates new tools for the use of farm producers is the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. Its purpose is to recognize the fact that the Federal Government has an interest, in the upper watersheds of streams, in doing those things that go beyond ordinary soil-conservation practices which already receive some repayment out of Federal funds. As to those things which require collective action, such as the building of dams over the upper streams, where the question is not one of direct flood control, navigation, or waterpower, this act makes it possible to bring about better practices above the dams and improved conditions downstream. This act requires an integrated community approach to the development of small watersheds. The Federal Government participates in the planning and the cost, but the work is done and the project administered by the local soil conservation district or some similar public body, which must also have State approval.

A third new measure, which gives added encouragement to the adoption of conservation practices by farmers, is a section of the general tax revision law under which, for the first time, an income-tax deduction is permitted to the farmer for his reasonable cost of conservation practices up to 25 percent of his gross income.

Additional tools are also given to various groups of producers by two interesting amendments of the law relating to marketing agreements and orders. In the case of grapefruit producers, the law was changed so as to permit the bringing of grapefruit for canning within the terms of a marketing agreement which formerly could only control grapefruit consumed as fresh fruit. If used, this provision will afford an interesting test of whether or not two-thirds of the producers of the fruit, who are equally interested in the sales price of their raw product, regardless of whether it is to reach the consumer in fresh form or in cans, may, with half of the canners joining them, bring to an end a situation under which their processed fruit has sometimes brought them only salvage prices.

Another interesting change in the Marketing Agreement Act, which is applicable in the case of tomatoes, Irish potatoes, avocados, grapefruit and other fruits and vegetables which meet with direct competition from fresh foreign imports, should make the marketing agreements and orders much more useful by applying to imported competitive products the same standards of grade, size, quality and maturity which the marketing agreements impose on the domestic products.

Still another change in the law which makes the farmers much more the masters of their own destiny than heretofore is that by which the Farm Credit Administration is taken out of the Department of Agriculture and made an independent agency governed by a board of 13 members, of whom 12 are named from lists nominated by the farmers who make up the various regional farm credit organizations.

To close on this point, it seems clear to me that the changes in law which I have mentioned, and others which were enacted by the 83d Congress, greatly accentuate both the responsibility and the opportunity of farmers to handle their own problems and also greatly increase the effectiveness of the various helpful tools and devices which are given to them by Federal law.

2. EXPANSION OF RESEARCH

I am sure that every American farmer knows that not only the 83d Congress, but also the present national administration, has placed great emphasis on the expansion of agricultural research and education. This step is in complete accord with the recognition of greater individual responsibility for the farmers, as already mentioned, and is the best method of developing new information which, when passed on to individual farmers, should enable them to produce more economically, more abundantly, and in higher quality, thus giving them increased opportunity to solve their own problems. The plan of reorganization for the Department of Agriculture which was developed by the present administration and approved by Congress combines into one major division—called the Agricultural Research Service—the many agricultural research activities which had been scattered through various divisions under the earlier hodgepodge organization. The fixing of responsibility in one place, as well as the assignment of major importance to the Research Service, properly reflect added emphasis upon the benefits of research as well as upon the educational process by which the new information is communicated to the farmers.

To keep in step with the increased emphasis given to research activities, the Congress appropriated for the current fiscal year 1955 increased funds for research in the amount of $12,311,000 above fiscal year 1954, much of which is for expanded work in the State experiment stations, and also increased funds for education in the amount of $8,248,000, most of which goes to the Federal-State Agricultural Extension Service, making a total Federal increase of more than $20½ million for research and education above the amounts appropriated for last year.

In a further effort to assist the Department of Agriculture in the field of research, a bill was passed in the second session of the 83d Congress which authorized the Department of Agriculture to contract with private persons and agencies for production research, which relates to growing crops in the fields, plant diseases, etc. The Department had already been authorized in the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 to contract for utilization and marketing research and presently is contracting approximately $1,700,000 in this research, and now that the contract authority is extended to include production research, the amount of contracted research should increase substantially to the benefit of all agriculture.

It is my feeling that the important new emphasis which has been placed on research activities by the 83d Congress will be further expanded in the future, since the benefits of research have been so pronounced in the past, and since there can be no possible question as to the propriety of organizing, operating, and financing increased research activities by Government. Individual farmers and even groups of farmers are rarely in position to handle research programs adequately, and it is inconceivable to me that there should be any difference of opinion on the fact that we are on sound ground in enlarging the research program for the Federal Government, as well as in its cooperation with the several States, and in expanding the educational machinery by which the benefits of research may be promptly communicated to individual farmers so that they may make effective use of new and valuable information. This, then, is but another important method by which farmers are enabled to help themselves.

3. EXPANSION OF FOREIGN MARKETS FOR FARM PRODUCTS

One of the most important fields of new legislation enacted by the 83d Congress is that of expanding the use of our agricultural products in foreign markets. Agriculture has been acutely conscious of the fact that the major part of the loss in the export trade of our Nation in recent years has fallen on agriculture, despite the fact that many friendly peoples have actual need of our products.

One important accomplishment was the transfer of agricultural attachés in our foreign Embassies from the State Department to the Department of Agriculture. We have had many disappointing experiences in recent years growing out of the fact that the agricultural attachés have been completely controlled by the Department of State. It is, of course, true that the State Department is unfamiliar with agricultural problems and that it has the heavy burden of handling many problems which relate directly to its primary field of foreign diplomatic relations. Nevertheless, our agricultural people have been keenly disappointed that they have been unable to take advantage of promising openings in foreign markets, particularly for the greater export of perishable commodities. Now it will be possible, I hope, for such matters to receive prompt and sympathetic handling by persons experienced in agricultural trade, and I am confident that our foreign markets will be enlarged thereby.

There are now 59 agricultural attachés assigned to 44 posts in 42 countries. They will continue to be stationed at our Embassies, but their activities will be reported directly to the Department of Agriculture, and they will devote their full time to representing United States agriculture. I am sorry to hear that already there is some indication that State Department redtape is reappearing, and I think we should be most diligent to prevent the thwarting of the completely clear intent of Congress in this matter.

The extension of the International Wheat Agreement and the inclusion in the new Mutual Security Act of 1954 of a provision earmarking $350 million to finance the export and sale of surplus agricultural products both constitute important machinery for the disposal abroad of substantial additional amounts of American wheat and other American farm products.

Perhaps the major effort of the 83d Congress, however, in the field of expansion of foreign markets was the enactment of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, which makes available for a 3-year period the sum of $1 billion for the expansion of foreign use of our agricultural products. Of this, $700 million is provided to expedite the acceptance of foreign currency for our products by allowing the Federal Government to absorb the difference in exchange, a factor which has heretofore discouraged the sale of our farm products to foreign nations whose currencies were softer than ours. A major difficulty we have experienced heretofore has been not to find markets, but to absorb the loss required by unfavorable exchange rates.

To a certain degree, this large sum will represent a new subsidy of our foreign agricultural exports, but much of the investment will not be lost in view of the fact that we have need for foreign exchange in connection with the maintenance of our military forces, our embassies, and other activities in many friendly foreign nations and also in the purchase of needed strategic materials. And so we have strong hope that this Federal financing of $700 million to increase the use of agricultural commodities for export will enable our Nation to sell more of its surpluses and our private traders to trade more effectively with foreign nations by allowing the Federal Government to absorb the loss resulting from unfavorable exchange rates.

I am happy to report that the Department of Agriculture is pushing this program and, with the cooperation of the State Department, is now negotiating with various nations under the authority of this law. In November it was announced that Turkey was the first to sign a surplus disposal commodity agreement, which provided for Turkey to take $35½ million of our surplus wheat and feed grains. At about the same time the Department announced the details of a $85 million surplus commodity program for Japan. I hear that similar negotiations are nearing completion with Pakistan and Yugoslavia.

The remaining $300 million under the Agricultural Trade Development Act, available, also, for the next 3 years, will permit the President to use our own surplus commodities in said amount in doing errands of mercy, or of strategic national importance, such as those which we have done in East Germany, Pakistan, and India. The President may donate commodities from our overabundance if he determines that such will alleviate human suffering, or will serve our cause in our worldwide conflict with communism.

Still another program coming out of the 83d Congress may not have been noticed by you. We made an appropriation of $5 million at the request of the President, which is to be used to give our agricultural and other industries the opportunity to exhibit in trade fairs all over the world in an effort to show foreign purchasers what great things are being accomplished through American genius. In his message, the President stated that he hoped to go into not less than 30 of the 75 great trade fairs which are to be held this year. Our Florida delegation has asked for processed citrus to be represented in these fairs because we are proud of the progress which we have made in citrus processing and want our achievements to be better understood by the rest of the world. I am sure

that there are similar values in various other industries represented by this great group of producers which would justify exhibits in other lands so that the people there may be more impressed by the fact that free men know how to get things done.

Then, too, our program is expanding for the export of agricultural products through the payment of subsidies from section 32 funds. I shall not enlarge upon this subject, but will say that large sums of money are still available for such use and that they are being helpfully utilized in greater measure than heretofore.

I am sure that all of you recognize that the very large program for the expansion of our exports of agricultural products, which is covered by the measures which I have mentioned and by other acts of the Congress, represents an aggressive and extremely worthwhile effort through which the Nation should enlarge its disposal of surplus commodities acquired under its price-support programs, and at the same time private initiative will be encouraged, through the use of these new tools, to vastly enlarge its activities in foreign markets. It seems self-evident that much further expansion in this field must be accomplished in the future. The furnishing of more food and other farm products to the people of other nations not only serves a good domestic purpose, but it also enhances our standing abroad, since there is no doubt whatever that millions of people within our sphere of influence badly need the food and other values which flow from our agricultural abundance.

OUR PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAMS

The principal agricultural measure enacted during the 83d Congress is, of course, the new general price-support law, known as the Agriculture Act of 1954, which, in my opinion, could not have been passed without the vigorous support of your fine organization. I strongly commend your leaders and particularly your president, Mr. Kline, and your legislative counsel, Mr. Woolley, for the strong and effective support which you gave this legislation.

Except for the production of sugar, by producers of both beets and sugarcane, this act, taken in conjunction with the Anderson Act of 1949, which it amends and supplements, covers all agricultural production throughout the Nation, and is therefore of very great importance to agriculture as a whole, to those industries which supply agriculture, or handle or process agricultural products, and to the general public. This act is the most exhaustive effort to accomplish stabilization of agriculture in time of peace that has ever been enacted by any Congress.

So many different devices and formulas for different branches of agriculture are set up by the act that I can make only brief reference to those programs which apply to the principal agricultural groups. I mention first the program for wool, under which production payments are authorized at a rate not to exceed 110 percent of parity. Since wool is a storable product, of high strategic importance, and since we produce only a fraction of what we need for our own use, this wool program must be strongly differentiated from the other programs which deal with major crops which are already in surplus production or could quickly become in surplus. As to wool alone, we are endeavoring to substantially increase our domestic production.

In the case of only one of the so-called basic crops, tobacco, was the high rigid price support of 90 percent continued as embraced in earlier law. There are compelling reasons for this distinction between tobacco and the other basic crops, chief of which is that tobacco has become such an important crop from the standpoint of the vast public revenue from excise taxes which it makes available to the Federal Government, the States, and the municipalities. It is now a matter of important national concern that a fairly constant level of tobacco production shall continue without heavy surplus or deficit, and that the producers of tobacco shall have a stable economy so that there will be minimum fluctuation of the volume of tobacco production. You know, I am sure, that the annual tax revenue derived from tobacco is about $2¼ billion, which is about equal to the farm price for a bumper crop of wheat. The 83d Congress increased the penalty for the overplanting of tobacco, but otherwise left the 90 percent rigid price support structure undisturbed, with all of its regulations and controls.

In the case of the other five basic commodities, wheat, cotton, corn, rice, and peanuts, the rigid 90 percent price support program was replaced by a flexible support base, which is at the rate of 82½ to 90 percent of parity for 1955 and 75 to 90 percent in subsequent years.

Of course this return to a flexible price support base was the issue which produced the heaviest controversy, and which also proved to be most highly emotional. I cannot at this time discuss in detail this grave issue, with which I am sure most of you are completely familiar. Suffice it to say that until World War II flexible price supports had been regarded as the proper and most helpful approach. The 1938 law, which was the most generous peacetime law on the books, prescribed a support program at from 52 to 75 percent of parity. The 90 percent rigid price support program was a war device which was designed to greatly increase production to meet war needs, and which accomplished that end.

When extended into peacetime, the high rigid price support program continued this greatly increased production, which rapidly created large surpluses in the hands of the Government. The losses sustained by the Government in connection with these surpluses became heavy and even greater losses were impending. The warehouse expense to the Government for storing surpluses reached about three-quarters of a million dollars a day. The confidence of the general public and of large segments of agriculture which produce nonbasic supported crops or unsupported crops was also greatly impaired, and dangerous divisions appeared among agricultural leaders and groups.

It seemed clear to me and apparently to the majority of Congress that restoration of a peacetime flexible price support program had become of primary importance, from the points of view of protecting agriculture itself and of being fair to the general public. A flexible price support program had been voted by Congress in 1948 and again in 1949, but its effect had been postponed in recent years. Furthermore, the measure which we enacted this year has for its minimum or floor rate 75 percent of parity, which was the ceiling or highest rate under the 1938 law. It seems to me that this fact alone increases the inducement to farmers to reasonably control their production rather than to continue excessive production in order to sell their products to Uncle Sam.

Three other features in the new law were of maximum effect in their application to these five basic commodities, though they also apply to other crops. These three features are, first, the gradual transfer to modernized parity so as to bring the computation to the immediate past rather than to leave it in the unrealistic, remote past, under which it had generally been based on prices obtaining from 1910 to 1914; second, the provision for so-called set-asides which operate to remove substantial quantities of the surpluses from consideration in figuring the current carryover of supplies for price support purposes; and third, the provision for control of acreage which will be diverted from the excessive amounts of land which were being used in the production of the surplus crops, particularly wheat, corn, and cotton. It is obvious, I think, that these three major provisions in the new law were designed to make the law more reasonable, to cushion the impact of the application of the flexible price support structure to the five basic crops which were affected, and to give greater protection to that vast number of agricultural producers who do not produce either the basic crops or any other price-supported commodity. In passing, I think it is necessary that we shall always remember that the value of the five basic crops now affected by the flexible program is less than 20 percent—less than one-fifth—of the total value of our national agricultural production.

It is obvious that the flexible program will allow, at least in part, for essential differences among the several basic crops which were not being recognized under the rigid price support program, and this is highly important. Each basic commodity has peculiar characteristics or unique competition which sets it apart from other basics and from other crops in general, and require for it a distinctive support program. To some extent flexible price supports should allow for these differences. Flexible supports should also greatly increase the responsibility of farm groups which produce basic crops to better adjust their production to the needs of the market and to bring to an end the recent excessive production and dumping on the Federal Government which has given the whole price-support program a black eye and has threatened its very existence.

Many hours could be spent in discussing details of price support for milk and milk products, which presented one of our most perplexing problems. These commodities were not price-supported until wartime, but thereafter the 90-percent support rate was allowed them for some years even though they did not come within the basics, nor within any group on which a rigid 90-percent support was ever contemplated. Milk products are, in some respects, much like Irish potatoes and eggs, on both of which price-support programs proved to be so expensive, so wasteful and so indefensible that those programs were abolished.

Dairy products present a spotty problem, existing on a large scale in relatively few areas where generally local production greatly exceeds the demands of nearby milksheds. This problem pertains to an industry which has not done, for itself, anything like what it should do in decreasing costs, in research, in better distribution and marketing, in diversification, in advertising and in increasing good will and average consumption. Too frequently dairying has played second fiddle to its processors.

And yet the dairy industry presents a very large public problem, vitally affecting many thousands of good people and numerous splendid communities. It received much attention from this last Congress and certainly will receive much attention in the future. The reactions of prices in the industry to the 75 percent price figure which I think was correctly applied by Secretary Benson under the law will be awaited with anxiety. The Congress did not, in this field, change the support setup under the old law because of our feeling that the old provision fairly gives to dairying its full recognition as compared with other price-supported agricultural industries.

As you know we did enact several helpful additions to the dairy products program, apart from direct supports. And we likewise required an intensive study of dairy problems by the Secretary of Agriculture and his report and recommendation of the best available support program, or alternative programs, by January 3, 1955, which is next month.

Frankness compels me to say that many in Congress favor the entire abolition of

price support for dairying—just as was true earlier in the case of Irish potatoes and eggs. There is certainly much public sentiment to that effect. I personally feel that more than any other industry covered by the 1954 law, dairying must show greater alertness, as well as greater willingness and ability to help solve its own problems than it has yet manifested. I shall hope strongly to see indications of such an attitude in the near future, and I congratulate the dairy industry on the good beginning which it is now making.

I regret that time is lacking to discuss the various other programs for price support which are embraced in the new law. Suffice it to say that this new law, together with the Sugar Act, will afford many oportunities for comparison and contrast of differing types of price-support programs, some directly fixed by law and some growing out of the administration of the law by the Department of Agriculture. I am sure that additional progress is possible, which will be reflected in subsequent legislation or changed administrative handling or both. In summary there are certain observations which I wish to make on this vastly important field.

First, products under the flexible program for both basics and nonbasics are not barred by the new law from having 90 percent price support, but to the contrary such support is within reach, if the producers use such cooperation and restraint in production as to prevent the accumulation of disturbing surpluses. I hope that we may never lose sight of this open invitation to agriculture to cooperate more fully with Government as a good partner.

Second, though there are very great differences of opinion in this controversial field of price support, I hope that they may not bring about any further postponement of the use of the flexible price support provisions. It is manifestly in the Nation's interest that a full and fair trial be given to the flexible program, as well as to all the other programs, so that we may have a clear comparison of results upon which to base future decisions. I shall strongly insist upon such a full and fair trial. No one contends for a moment that we have yet attained perfection.

Third, every emphasis must be placed on confining Government controls and regimentation to a minimum and leaving the producer the maximum amount of freedom of action, always assigning greatest importance to his willingness to use restraint and self-discipline. In every program and for the overall effort, no unnecessary curbs must be placed on private initiative and on the opportunities for practical and scientific advancement by the development of more economical production methods, improved products, wider consumer demand, new uses of products, better distribution and selling and every other improvement which can be attained in the American way by keen and ambitious producers. A frozen or static agricultural industry cannot long remain prosperous. We must not forget that for many farm commodities high prosperity already prevails, despite the absence of price support or regimentation. It is my hope that as a result of the great and varied effort which will be under way, and the numerous contrasts and comparisons which will be available, agriculture will be assisted to make tremendous and permanent advances, but always by leaving to the individual farmers a high degree of private initiative.

At this point, I want to say that regardless of strong differences of opinion which led our Senate Committee on Agriculture to divide, for instance, on an 8 to 7 basis on the flexible price-support program, I recognize that all members of our committee are sincerely devoted to the cause of agricultural producers and are equally anxious to work out the best possible program for a stabilized and prosperous agriculture. I am sure that this same observation applies generally to Congress as a whole, to the personnel of the Department of Agriculture, and to all of the interested producing groups throughout the Nation.

Surely by the combined efforts of all of us, and by taking full advantage of all of the new facts which will be developed in the many and varied programs which will be under way, we shall be able to come up with answers which will bring sound permanent conditions for agriculture, which will be wholly compatible with American traditions.

Historically, American agriculture has always been one of the strongest bulwarks and one of the proudest illustrations of what the American system of private enterprise can accomplish. I strongly hope, and I deeply feel, that it must always remain such a bulwark and such an illustration. It is my unyielding conviction that only in this way can agriculture continue to make its maximum contribution to our great American experiment in self-government.

Unemployment in Pennsylvania Coal Fields

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following press release:

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, expressed concern, in a statement made today in Washington, with the failure of the President's state of the Union message to deal with the chronic unemployment problem in the coal fields in Pennsylvania. Congressman FLOOD, who represents Luzerne County in the anthracite coal fields in northeastern Pennsylvania, made the following statement:

"I was terribly disappointed that the President, in his state of the Union speech, failed to mention, in any way whatsoever, the desperate economic problems which are well known by the Government to exist as a chronic unemployment condition, in the anthracite and bituminous coal fields in Pennsylvania, and in particular am I concerned with this situation in the anthracite coal fields in northeastern Pennsylvania centered in Luzerne County.

"In his message to the joint session of the Congress, I quote, '1954 was the most prosperous year in our country.' Yet in the 1954 year end, total nonfarm employment is about 1 million below the level of the previous year. The average unemployment in 1954 was nearly 2 million higher than in 1953.

"In Luzerne County we have over 25,000 unemployed men between the ages of 18 and 60, who are employable and eager and anxious for jobs. Seventy-five percent of these men are veterans of our Armed Forces. I had hoped that the administration would recommend a public-works program, on a standby basis for the Nation at large, but for immediate application to any distressed area if and when the percenteage of unemployed to the employable population reaches a danger mark to be determined by the United States Department of Labor in conjunction with all other United States Government agencies and State agencies which would be concerned also with this specific problem. It is said that the world cannot be free as long as any of its people anywhere are slaves. I say that this Nation cannot be considered as prosperous as long as the Government ignores and refuses to help the Nation's basic fuel industry and fuel potential, which is coal; and at the same time being indisputably aware of all the facts, fails at this time to propose and use all its influence, the great prestige of the President himself, to pass legislation in the form of a public-works program to give immediate employment to all who seek employment in these distressed areas.

"Without going into detail, I would like to make it clear that by public-works program I mean an intelligent, constructive and desirable plan of necessary and essential and worthwhile projects which will contribute to the permanent general welfare such as schools, hospitals, sanitariums, and so forth.

"I have given much thought to this matter and I am preparing now the necessary legislation which I will introduce in the House within the next 30 days."

Agriculture Must Tell Its Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1955

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith a copy of a speech which I made at the annual meeting of the National Grange at Spokane, Wash., on November 16, 1954:

AGRICULTURE MUST TELL ITS STORY

(Address by Hon. CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of Kansas)

I greatly appreciate the honor which you have conferred upon me by inviting me to address this 88th session of the National Grange.

I am a member of many organizations, but in none do I value my membership more highly than in the Grange. I must confess that I am not a working Grange member. I am proud to have been a member of the Pioneer Grange near Lakin, Kans., for more than 20 years, but my work in Washington makes it impossible for me to attend many meetings. That is my loss.

In Washington I have enjoyed and profited by my association with the officers and representatives of the National Grange at national headquarters. I have had the privilege of working with three great Grange leaders—National Master Louis J. Taber, National Master Albert Goss, my dear friend for many years, and now with our present able and distinguished National Master, Herschel Newsom, and his associates in the Washington office.

Today as always the Grange represents the best in American rural life. During almost a century of service it has exerted tremendous influence for good in the life of farmers throughout the length and breadth of the land.

Since 1867, the Order of Patrons of Husbandry has adhered to the covenant of its declaration of purpose so well stated in these words: "To develop a better and higher manhood and womanhood among ourselves; to enhance the comforts and attractions of our homes and strengthen our attachments to our pursuits; to foster mutual understanding and cooperation; to maintain inviolate our laws and to emulate each other in labor; to hasten the good time coming."

There is something inspiring and stirring in these words. They ring with a constant reminder that while we have just pride in the accomplishments of our fraternity, the challenge of the work yet ahead transcends all else.

We are meeting here in Spokane in the midst of a critical period, both for this Nation and for the world which today is divided into armed camps in a state of cold conflict.

Bombs are not falling, but the men in the Kremlin are frank to tell us that they are waiting for the day when the economy of this and other free countries will collapse; when people will be hungry and ragged in the streets.

On that day they hope communism will ride triumphantly over freedom.

I do not know whether we can keep Russia from dropping bombs on this country. I do know our best hope is to maintain a position of strength.

That means not only military strength, even more important, it means economic and moral strength.

I sincerely believe that while we must maintain our defenses in a military way, our greatest protection against Communist domination throughout the world lies in the field of economic and moral strength.

Even more than on force, the Kremlin is betting that America does not have the economic and moral strength to win a cold war.

This puts a great responsibility upon the men and women who live and work on the farms of our country.

Historically, we know that depressions begin on the farms.

The lessons of history teach us also that the moral strength of every nation has found its greatest bulwark in the people living on the land.

It is of the utmost importance, therefore, that agriculture in this country remain the strong economic and moral force that it has been in the past.

Whether it does or not constitutes a great challenge to such an organization as the National Grange, because all is not well with agriculture. For several years past our national income as a whole has been increasing; our population is growing by leaps and bounds; but at the same time farm income is declining and people are leaving the land.

A hundred years ago almost 70 percent of our people were farmers, and even as late as 1910 a third of them were directly engaged in agriculture. Today less than 14 percent live and work on our farms.

It is a great tribute to the industry and efficiency of our farmers, however, that, although their numbers have been declining both relatively and actually, since 1939 we have increased our over-all agricultural production by more than 40 percent.

This has enabled us to not only take care of the needs of an increasing population for food and fiber, but it has enabled us also to carry on a great moral and economic battle against communism because we have had food and fiber to feed and clothe hungry and distressed people in all parts of the world.

If we win the cold war the part played by the farmers of America will stand out in bold relief.

Along with the decline of agricultural population great changes have taken place in the whole economic structure of agriculture.

Until comparatively recently farming was largely a self-contained industry. The farm itself produced most of the family food; woodlots and forests most of the fuel; horses and oxen produced on the farm furnished the power. They were fueled by hay and grain grown on the farm. The farm produced its own fertilizer.

There was little expense for hired labor, because families were large, and work was interchanged with neighbors.

Taxes were negligible.

Capital investment was low.

Interest charges were unimportant.

In other words, until comparatively recent times the farmer had little need for cash income.

Contrast that with the situation of the farmer today—not only the big farmer and the medium-sized farmer, but even the little farmer requires a heavy cash outlay to carry on his operations.

He must purchase his power on the farm in the form of tractors and other equipment.

He must buy gasoline and distillate as fuel.

He must buy fertilizer.

Hired labor is costly, if he can get it.

His large investment in plant and equipment, and necessary working capital makes interest charges an important item.

He has a heavy outlay for insurance and taxes.

In other words, the farmer today is in the same position as any other businessman.

He must have substantial cash receipts to meet his current operating expenses, and his prices must be high enough to pay for these charges and lay aside a reserve for depreciation, to say nothing of the reasonable profit to which he is entitled as legitimately as any other businessman.

So while the market price of farm products may have been unimportant in the past, today it is everything and it determines whether or not a farmer is going to be able to stay in business.

Thus one of the greatest if not the greatest problems of the farmer is to have something to say about the prices of the things he buys and the things he sells.

With few exceptions his costs are determined by someone else. He has no bargaining power to enable him to reduce them.

If he consumes electric power, the price is fixed by a public commission.

The wages of his hired labor are fixed by competition with industrial enterprises where wages, hours, and working conditions are determined by collective bargaining between well entrenched labor unions and industries which can pass high labor costs on to consumers.

His taxes, his transportation costs in getting his products to market centers, his insurance rates are all fixed by the action of State and Federal agencies.

The price of his fuel, his fertilizer, and his farm machinery and equipment is not the subject of bargaining as far as he is concerned.

He pays what the seller demands.

On the other hand, with certain unimportant exceptions, and in the absence of help from farm programs the farmer has nothing to say about the price of his products. If he ships his cattle and hogs to Kansas City or Chicago he takes what the buyers offer him, and they all offer him substantially the same.

His alternative is to ship his livestock home again.

When he takes his grain to market he doesn't say how much he will take for it.

He says, "How much will you give me?"

Furthermore, the farmer is subject to all the vagaries of the weather as well as the destructive effects of plant diseases and insect pests. These factors very largely determine his yields, and his unit cost of production depends upon the yield.

His corn may make 80 bushels an acre one year and 40 bushels the next. In the latter case, assuming that his expenses are the same, the cost per bushel is twice as much as it was in the previous year.

That is not to say that good farming does not pay or that efficiency does not reduce costs. The point is that no farmer can tell in advance what his costs are going to be.

What other businessman could stay in business if his costs and selling prices were determined by someone else and the quantity and quality of his product was determined in most cases by weather and other factors beyond his control?

It is the recognition of these facts which has brought about Government farm programs in recent years. The fundamental purpose of these programs has been to enable farmers to maintain some balance between supply and demand in connection with the marketing of their products.

Most of these programs have been on a trial and error basis. We have been dealing with something new, and have had to feel our way as we went along, but they have been reasonably successful. Changes have been made as we went along, and a considerable variety of programs has been developed.

I do not want at this time to get into the controversy over price-support programs except to say that experience has demonstrated as we have gone along that the Grange position is right, and that our greatest mistake as far as farm programs is concerned, is to attempt to apply one magic formula, one cure-all, that will answer the problems of all agricultural products.

Furthermore, I think we have to recognize that there are some commodities which do not adapt themselves to direct price-support programs.

That great man in agriculture, Albert Goss, warned us years ago that there is no such cure-all and that there are almost as many problems as there are commodities.

I remember he used to tell our committee that just as we can't cure appendicitis with castor oil or smallpox with surgery, we must have a bag full of remedies as a country doctor carries a bag full of different pills, so to speak.

Our experience has demonstrated the value of attempting to tailor a program to meet the needs of a particular commodity.

Take the case of sugar, with which many of you are familiar. The sugar program stands by itself. It was worked out to meet the particular needs of that commodity, and it has worked more successfully, perhaps, than any other program.

The same can be said of the tobacco program. Ninety-percent price supports with strict controls have worked so well on that commodity that practically everyone has agreed—no matter what his views might be as to other commodities—that such a program should be continued for tobacco.

In the last Congress, recognizing the fact that wool has peculiar problems of its own, we set up a wool program to meet the needs of that commodity.

All of this is in accord with the views expressed by President Eisenhower in his message to Congress on January 11, 1954, entitled "Recommendations Affecting the Nation's Agriculture."

In that message he said, and I quote: "No single program can apply uniformly to the whole farm industry. Some farm products are perishable, some are not; some farms consume the products of other farms; some foods and fibers we export, some we import. A comprehensive farm program must be adaptable to these and other differences, and yet not penalize one group of farmers in order to benefit another."

In the farm bill which the House Committee on Agriculture reported to the House, we carried out the policy recommended by the President in this regard. That is, we provided for keeping tobacco supports at 90 percent of parity with strict controls. We set up a separate program on wool. We did not deal with the sugar program because that has always been carried out as separate legislation.

But we went further than this in applying the principle laid down by the President, in that we set up a plan for wheat along the lines of the cerificate form of a two-price system.

We set up some special provisions for the dairy industry and directed the Department of Agriculture to make a study of two price plans for rice.

The Senate did not go along with us with respect to the new program for wheat, nor with most of our provisions relating to the dairy industy.

In conference we were able to keep many of the dairy provisions, however; among them a provision directing the Secretary to

make a special study of dairy price-support programs, including the self-help plan proposed by dairy producers.

The final form of the bill also contained the direction to the Department of Agriculture to make a study of a two-price system for rice.

In these matters we had the invaluable support of your great leader, Herschel Newsom, one of America's greatest farm leaders of all times, who speaks with a strong, clear voice on all agricultural problems.

To sum it up, I feel, that while agriculture in the overall may be one big industry, contained in it are a great many smaller industries, some of which are in a degree in conflict with each other.

No one plan can meet all of the many problems.

In the overall program, we must keep and use the best tools we can devise but at the same time we must constantly study and test new approaches, always keeping in mind the interests of both farmers and all of our citizens.

Personally, I want to use fixed supports when fixed supports work best. I want to use flexible supports in areas where they work best. I want to employ marketing agreements and orders where they work best.

I want to manage and remove surpluses in such a way as will be in the best interests of farmers, consumers, and taxpayers.

However, while I feel we should be flexible as to the tools and methods that we use, in our objectives where agriculture and the good of this country are concerned, we should be rigid and inflexible.

What I want to see is economic equality; that is, a fair share of the national income for agriculture. I believe that this is only simple justice, and furthermore I am convinced that the health of the whole economy and the well-being of all our people depend upon it.

There are of course many vital Government programs in agriculture besides those relating to price supports, including soil and water conservation, adequate credit, research, education, cooperative marketing, expansion of markets, crop insurance, rural electrification and telephones and many more.

I shall not go into them at this time, but there is one thing we must stress in all of our programs: that is the encouragement and preservation of the family type farm.

We hear too much talk now about getting rid of the so-called inefficient farmer, of consolidating his land with somebody else's and sending him to town to look for a job. I am afraid this may cause some people to believe that a small farmer is an inefficient farmer. Quite often the case is directly the contrary.

One great motivation, one of the strengths of our free-enterprise system, is the hope of every young man that some day as a reward for his labor and frugality he may have his own farm or his own small business.

We have long since realized the dangers of monopoly in business through enactment of our antitrust laws. It is equally as important that we protect the opportunities for individual ownership in agriculture.

So it would behoove all of us to talk less of liquidating the so-called inefficient farmer and put greater emphasis on improving the position of the family farm. We should do everything possible to improve and adapt machines, methods, and programs to make this the most productive and prosperous unit of agriculture. Otherwise we will be losing one of our greatest moral assets, both in agriculture and in the Nation.

I mentioned a while ago that those engaged in agriculture now represent less than 14 percent of our population. That poses a real danger for agriculture, because it means that only a comparatively small number of our people understand its problems. And so great have been the changes in agriculture that even men and women who grew up on farms a generation ago and have since gone to the cities know little about agriculture and its problems today.

I think it is entirely possible that at least 80 percent of the people of this country have little or no knowledge of the problems which now confront the farmers of this country. This is a dangerous situation because the farmer must depend upon the understanding of the people in the cities if he is to obtain economic equality and justice through fair and just laws and economic policy.

Moreover there seem to be influences at work that tend to separate the interests of rural and urban peoples, and which are even building conflicts among the farmers themselves.

Our Committee on Agriculture took note of this in presenting to the House the Agricultural Act of 1954, when in our report we said, "the committee deplores any tendency in the consideration of farm programs toward a separation of the interests of the farmers and our great consuming population of the cities. These interests are one and the same. They are inseparable. Stability of agriculture is equally as important to urban people as to people on farms."

Many thousands of fine people whom we respect differ with us on the nature or even the need of a farm program.

They are intelligent people.

They are fairminded people.

But they have been misinformed.

We of agriculture are largely at fault because we have the poorest public relations of any large group in our national life. That is the situation which must be changed not only in the interest of agriculture but of the country as well.

Frankly I am amazed at some of the misconceptions which exist in the minds of nonfarmers with respect to farming.

There is no use denying that this misinformation exists.

What we must do—all of us who are interested in agriculture—is to frankly face the situation and then take steps to build up better public relations for the farmers of this country.

It isn't a difficult thing to do provided we get out and do it, because all that needs to be done to refute the erroneous impressions which exist is to tell the truth—the real truth about farmers and their problems.

What are some of the misconceptions that we find in the minds of nonfarmers?

Well, for one thing we find an impression among a lot of people that farmers as a class are getting rich.

We find that there are many who think that farm prices and food prices are high with respect to other prices.

There are others who think that farm programs have worked to the disadvantage of consumers.

There are still others who are convinced that agriculture is being subsidized in vast amounts by the Federal Government and that Government subsidies are exclusive to agriculture.

Not one of these misconceptions is based upon fact, and their very existence demonstrates that in some way agriculture has failed to get its story across to the country.

Take the first misconception I mentioned: that farmers as a class are getting rich.

I know of no reason why the opportunities which other Americans have to achieve material prosperity should not also apply to farmers, and it is true that some farmers through frugality and good management have achieved a competence.

But the answer to those who think that farmers are getting rich as compared to the rest of the population is given by the cold statistics compiled by the Department of Agriculture. These figures show that in 1953 the farm population had a per capita income of $882, including cash from marketings, Government payments, value of home consumption, and rental value of buildings.

For each person in the nonfarm population the average income was $1,898.

Thus the average income of a person on the farm is less than half of that of the average person living off the farm.

But tell that to your nonfarm friends and see how many of them believe it.

Now perhaps the greatest resentment against farmers and agriculture comes from the prevalent fallacy that farm prices and food prices are high with respect to other prices. Before going into that, I think it should be pointed out that of each dollar spent by the American housewife for domestically produced food, 57 cents now goes for processing, marketing, and transportation charges. The farmer receives 43 cents.

That figure has been going down year by year since 1946, when the farmer's share was 52 percent and the processor's and distributor's share was 48 percent.

This is reflected in the fact, as shown by a study made by the Committee on Agriculture, that as of last July farm prices had fallen approximately 19 percent since 1951 while in contrast, retail food prices remained right at the postwar peak.

Since 1948 the price of wheat has declined 32 percent, but the price of bread has advanced 23 percent. The amount of wheat in a 17-cent loaf of bread comes to 2¾ cents.

In June, New York and Chicago housewives paid 25 cents per quart for milk delivered at their doors, while farmers who supply milk to the Chicago market received 6½ cents per quart for class I milk and farmers participating in the New York City market received 9½ cents for this milk.

Similarly, there is less than 30 cents worth of cotton in a $3.95 cotton shirt.

In the case of tobacco, Federal, State, and local taxes on the 1953 crop amounted to almost three times as much as farmers received for that part of their crop consumed in the United States.

The Grange had something to say about middlemen in its declaration of purpose written in 1874 and now called the Farmers Declaration of Independence: "For our business interests, we desire to bring producers and consumers, farmers, and manufacturers into the most direct and friendly relations possible, hence we must dispense with the surplus of middlemen, not that we are unfriendly to them, but we do not need them. Their surplus and their exactions diminish our profits."

We want no surplus of middlemen or unfair profits among them at the expense of the producers on the farm. In all fairness, however, the consumer should understand the essential part distributors, processors, and transporters play in the drama of food and that much of the costs added to food after it leaves the farms is due to the consumer's demand for better processing, new mixtures, improved sanitation and more convenient and attractive packaging, plus increased labor costs in processing, distribution, and marketing.

The food industry must continue to give consumers what they want and what they are willing to pay for. But at the same time the industry should let consumers know that these increased costs occur after the products leave the farm and do not add to the income of the farmer.

And that brings me to the third fallacy I mentioned a while ago, namely, that farm programs have worked to the disadvantage of consumers.

The fact is consumers get more and better food today with an expenditure of a smaller percentage of their total income than at any other period in history.

Figures prepared by the Department of Agriculture show that in 1929 the average

factory worker could buy 6.4 pounds of bread with an hour's earnings. Today the average hour's earning will buy 10.3 pounds.

The average hour's wage would buy 1 pound of butter in 1929 and 2.6 pounds today; 3.9 quarts of milk in 1929 and 7.9 quarts today; 1.4 dozen eggs in 1929 and 2.9 dozen today; 17.7 pounds of potatoes in 1929 and around 30 pounds today; 4.4 No. 2 cans of tomatoes in 1929 and 10.3 cans today; 1.2 pounds of round steak in 1929 and 2 pounds today, and so on down the list.

Our earliest farm programs began in 1929. Thus it will be noted that this large reduction in the price of food in relation to wages has occurred during the years of the development of the present program, which has for its overall aim a parity of income for agriculture.

In other words, it is clear that consumers have gotten the greatest real reductions in prices of food and fiber during the time of growth toward farm income stability.

And then we come to the belief that agriculture is being subsidized in vast amounts by the Federal Government and to a greater extent than other industries.

While it is the hope of all of us in agriculture that modifications of our programs which will better balance supply and demand, and the tailoring of specific programs to meet the needs of particular commodities, plus improved marketing policies and practices will reduce and perhaps in time eliminate most agricultural subsidies, I think we should point out to our friends in the cities that the subsidy is the oldest economic principle known in our Government, and only in fairly recent years has it been used to any appreciable extent to protect agriculture.

The First Congress in 1789 set up a subsidy program to encourage the development of an American merchant fleet. Many billions in subsidies have gone to business and industry. The House Appropriations Committee in January 1954, published figures indicating subsidies amounting to about $45 billion have been paid to business and to consumers during and since World War II. A large part of this was in business reconversion payments.

In contrast, farm price supports and surplus removal operations for the 20 years up through 1953 cost only $3,500,000,000, or 1 percent of the value of crops and livestock marketed.

What is the answer to all of this? I think it has very largely with agriculture itself.

I think it should be the first duty of the Department of Agriculture, of farm organizations, of the farm press, and of the agricultural committees in Congress to tell the truth about agriculture and to point out to those who are misinformed on these matters just what the facts are.

We must plant a new crop—a universal crop with a universal harvest—a harvest of understanding. We must tell the people in the cities what they do not know—tell them of the fallacies that tend to separate us.

Let them know that the people on the farms have less than half the average income of people who live elsewhere.

Let them know that fewer than half the farm homes in the United States have running water. They perhaps will be surprised at this, but it is true.

Tell them that farmers cannot conserve their soil and maintain its fertility for future generations unless they have adequate incomes with which to do it.

Emphasize the social and moral values as well as the general economic necessity of maintaining the prosperity of the family-size farm.

Tell our city friends why we need the farm program, that as an individual the farmer has no control over the prices he receives and no adequate way of adjusting his production to the total market demand for his commodities.

Ask how long our free-enterprise system would last if all industry operated as must the producers of major crops in agriculture producing 11 months in the year and selling on overflowing markets at one season, not at what producers fix as a fair price as an industry, but at what buyers are willing to pay.

Tell them the safety of the consuming population requires that we have on hand more food than can currently be used, that this margin of safety is known as a surplus in the market place and constantly depresses the farmer's prices unless we have a farm program.

Tell them that one carload of potatoes on the market in New York City—just one more car than is needed—can depress the price of potatoes all over the United States.

Impress upon all our friends that we must recognize the interdependence of all segments of our economy; that what we are talking about is a tremendous economic problem affecting every phase of our national life; that any farm program must be fair to farmers and consumers alike and serve the best interests of all our people.

All of us who are interested in agriculture must have a part in this public relations program to convince the consumers that the farm problem is everybody's problem.

I know of no organization or group better fitted to undertake leadership in such a program than the National Grange. With its background of almost 100 years as a great farm organization, its record of standing for the solid, traditional American virtues, with the prestige that comes from generations of wise leadership, and with the respect in which it is held by farmers and nonfarmers alike—the Grange and its officers and members can do much to bring about that sympathetic understanding by everyone of the problems of the people who live on the land.

I am sure that this is a matter which has been given consideration and attention by the officers and leaders of this great fraternity. I am bringing it up today because I am convinced of its urgency and importance.

It is a problem which cannot be met in a passive way. It constitutes a challenge and an opportunity which I am sure must appeal to you as leaders in agriculture and as good citizens who are striving to make a better nation of this great land of ours.

Address of Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway Before the West Point Society of New York

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the views of Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, Chief of Staff, United States Army, whenever expressed, are always worthy of profound consideration and study.

I include in my extension an address made by General Ridgway on December 14, 1954, in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, before the West Point Society of New York.

Every part of his address is significant and particularly when he said:

It is only through possession of adequate military strength that the efforts of the splendid leaders of American diplomacy can realize their fullest success.

I have stated in and out of the House that "the strength and power of our military force is the main avenue by and through which our national objectives in the field of foreign affairs is attained."

There are many Americans, of which I am one, who are very much concerned with the reduction in our Army in recent months, and particularly with the sharp reduction proposed during the next 18 months. I have a feeling of confidence that General Ridgway is also one of those Americans.

It is a pleasure and a privilege for me to be here today with you who share the deep love of country and the ideal of service which West Point engenders and exemplifies. The words "duty," "honor," "country" express tersely the soldier's ideals of purposeful service, ennobled by high standards of personal integrity and personal dedication. These are times when ideals or spiritual values of the highest type are called for, if our Nation is to endure, and its precious heritage of freedom is to be preserved unimpaired. Our Nation's spiritual resources, more than its material resources, will be the ultimate determinant of our place in history.

Our Nation today is faced with a military threat unique in its history. It is a threat, though, which menaces, not our Nation alone, but every nation outside the Communist bloc. The military strength of the Communist world is such that if it were thrown against us, an adequate defense could only be through the combined efforts of those free nations who see the peril for what it is and who have therefore allied themselves, with their combined strength, in unswerving opposition to it.

The alliances that add strength to the free world were formed in the face of this common danger. If they are to endure, they must be nourished by mutual trust and confidence arising from mutual understanding and common interest.

These alliances, and their military significance to us, form my topic today.

The military man is deeply concerned with the strength of our alliances because he appreciates full well the contributions to our Nation's security which such allies can make. Our national goals of deterring war by all honorable means, and of achieving victory should war be thrust upon us, are best attainable within a framework of effective alliances.

Were we as a nation to rely solely upon our own industrial and manpower resources to defend ourselves against the full military strength of militant and aggressive communism, our Nation might find the task desperately difficult. The threat against us is total in its maleficence, and in the various areas in which its influence is being exerted—in the psychological, economic, sociological, diplomatic, and cultural fields—as well as in the purely military.

Perceiving the comprehensive nature of the defenses we must erect in all these areas of human activity, and fully realizing their interdependence—I should like to discuss with you some of the military implications of our alliances, and the extent to which the security of our Nation is bound up with the security of our allies—how much they contribute to our military strength, as we contribute to theirs.

In any approach to a military problem, a logical starting point is the military capability of the potential adversary as revealed by

his forces in being in reserve, and in his capability to employ those forces against us.

The catalogue of Soviet military strength in being is an impressive list. Briefly stated, the Soviets have 175 divisions, and there are a million men in the armies of European captive states under varying degrees of Soviet control. In addition, the Red Chinese Army boasts 2½ million men. This Soviet-controlled ground strength, then, represents a military force far exceeding purely defensive needs. Its existence, in the light of the clearly demonstrated aggressive policies of the men of the Kremlin constitute a grave threat to world peace. And not only in ground strength, but at sea and in the air the Soviets continue to increase the effectiveness of their armed forces. The Soviet Navy is now estimated to be the second largest in the world with much of its strength concentrated in submarines. In the air the Soviets are estimated to have a total of 20,000 active planes, with an ever-increasing effort devoted to the production of jet fighters and long-range bombers, and a continuing buildup in the air strength of their satellites.

These formidable military forces respond to the orders of a small clique of powerful and ruthless men whose avowed aim is world domination and who, on the record, respect only force as the ultimate arbiter in the affairs of men. Their basic philosophy, abhorrent to us, stands revealed in historical record by their willingness to expend human lives on whatever scale the achievement of their aggressive aims demands.

Now the Soviet and satellite governments have certain military advantages which derive from the physical resources they control. The have an advantage in freedom of action which dictators always enjoy over democratic nations responsive to public support, and to the conscience of God-fearing peoples.

The Soviet bloc controls more than one-fourth of the earth's land surface. Applied to military considerations, this is an extremely significant fact.

Wars are fought, not for control of the seas or control of the air. These are but intermediate steps toward attainment of the final objective. That final objective is control of land and of the people living on it. Control of essential land areas is vitally necessary to the effective exercise of sea and air power, since seapower is dependent upon the continued use of land bases, and air forces upon the continued availability of landing fields. I scarcely need point out, however, the essential role of sea and air power in modern war, particularly in our case, with a continent to defend and worldwide allies to support. Yet, I do wish to put in clear and proper perspective the vital role of land power and the decisive instruments of land power—ground forces or armies—in the sum total of armed strength.

The more land an aggressive force controls, the more sea, air, and land power it can sustain. With the land comes the food for the armed force, the steel and coal to forge its weapons, the oil to power its engines of war, the industrial capacity to enlarge its warmaking potential, the manpower to labor for its aggrandizement. Moreover, with conquered land comes space to add depth to the defense of an aggressor's homeland from retaliation.

It is not only that more land, with all the resources of that land, becomes available to strengthen the aggressor, the conquered land, and the people on it, are unable to join with those powers which would normally be its allies. Thus, to the extent an aggressor can establish and maintain his control, the conquest of more land strengthens and enlarges his capabilities for further aggression, while simultaneously weakening the capabilities of every other power successfully to resist him.

At present, Kremlin-led Communist control is exercised over some 800 million human beings—roughly, one-third of the earth's population, inhabiting one-quarter of its land surface. Beyond the periphery, this force continues to infiltrate and attempt to subvert the governments of free countries. It seeks to exploit every weakness. Those who direct it have only too often stated their basic aim of world domination, and the pattern of their deeds continues clearly to support their words. They would, if able, destroy the institutions and ideals which have enabled man, with God's guidance, to achieve new heights of dignity. These men would, if they could, extinguish the light of freedom itself, for in their basic attitude toward life there is no place for freedom, no purpose of man, except to serve them and the state they represent.

It is, therefore, with due regard for the broad nature of the Communist threat and the urgency of that threat, that our Nation must build and maintain its defenses. It is enlightened self-interest for us to recognize that our safety is joined with the safety of other free peoples, that our strength is augmented by theirs and theirs by ours.

Only a part of the free world's important production centers and important sources of vital raw materials are located in the United States, or even in the Western Hemisphere. Other continents are rich in the materials on which our security and the continued progress of civilization depend. Africa holds much of the uranium required for our defense effort. Southeast Asia is a primary source of natural rubber and a rich source of tin. More than half of the world's known oil reserves are located in the Middle East. Japan, while short of many raw materials, possesses an industrial capacity of increasing importance. And in Western Europe there are rich deposits of coal and iron, as well as a population of 300 million, closely akin to us, with a high proportion of skilled workers and technicians.

All other considerations apart, the importance of such resources and capabilities to the strength of the free world makes it urgent that they remain on our side. If a Kremlin-launched war should succeed in seizing and controlling the vast productive capacity of Western Europe, the balance of military power would swiftly shift to our grave disadvantage. Then, even if many industrial centers behind the Iron Curtain were to be destroyed by allied retaliatory efforts, the seizure of Western Europe by the Soviets would have compensated, perhaps much more than compensated them, for what they had lost.

Besides the resources which we and our allies can contribute collectively to mutual defense, there are other distinct military advantages which accrue from our united efforts.

In a world in which time and space continue to shrink, our regional defense groupings would give more timely warning of aerial attack, more precious time to alert our collective defenses, both here and overseas. Bases on allied soil would enable the United States to employ its striking power against aggressors in any part of the globe. Land, sea, and air bases in the European and Mediterranean area and in the Far East make a vital contribution to the security of these coalitions, and no less so to the security of the United States. These numerous dispersed bases offer added insurance against the possibility of successful multiple surprise attacks, by which an enemy might seek to deliver a knockout punch, before the free world's men and planes and ships could retaliate.

Another advantage of mutual benefit is the increased effectiveness of combined intelligence efforts, so essential to the conduct of successful military operations. Further, our forces overseas are daily gaining familiarity with the language and characteristics of the nations with which we are working, and of the characteristics of the terrain over which we may be called upon to fight. Such knowledge is of scarcely less importance in peaceful pursuits than in time of war.

Obviously, one of the great contributions of our allies is in the military forces which they contribute to the common cause and which, combined with ours, constitute a deterrent to Soviet armed attack and, if launched, an obstacle to its advance.

In proportion as the menace of Kremlin-inspired aggression has become more apparent and the power of Kremlin-controlled military strength a more ominous and obvious threat to world peace, the free nations of the world have increasingly recognized their common danger and the necessity for combining their military strenth. Unfortunately, the converse has likewise been generally true. The more the Kremlin has disguised its designs and preached of peace, the more the Western World has tended to relax its efforts and drop its guard. Nothing could better serve the Kremlin's cause, or more injure our own.

The military contributions of Western Germany would add still further strength to Western Europe's defenses, and it is for this reason, among others, that so much significance attaches to the continuing efforts to bring Western, and ultimately all of, Germany into NATO, efforts which have come closer to realization through signature of the recent London and Paris agreements.

The military arrangements I have mentioned are dependent for their motivating power on much more than a mere pooling of our military and other material resources. There must likewise be some pooling of spiritual forces in support of the principles we all profess, some meeting of the minds in a great moral purpose—a purpose sufficiently idealistic to lift it above the purely material, yet sufficiently practical to promise true progress if fulfilled. In the moral factor lies that vital spark of vision and strength and determination which alone can bring our efforts to flower into a finer civilization. The destruction of our moral and spiritual standards therefore remains the final deadly aim of the Kremlin-controlled communism.

It well recognizes the importance and significance of cooperation—spiritual as well as military—among the nations of the free world. Wherever it operates, it strives to turn our allies against us, and to destroy the strength of the alliances that its own aggressive policies have forced into being. One theme is consistent through all the devious twists and turns of the Kremlin line, the "Hate America" theme. Simultaneously, the attempt is made to lull the peoples of the free world into complacency by constant repetition of hypocritical offers of world peace.

By propaganda, psychological warfare, subversion, and all methods short of open war, the struggle to isolate the United States continues. Its success would vastly increase our difficulties and our peril.

It is well, therefore, for the citizens of our Nation to appreciate the contributions of our allies and their importance to our national security. We should realize that alliances require both "give" and "take." We must likewise realize the necessity for patience and understanding, and bear in mind that the issues which unite free nations are far greater than those which divide them.

Any alliance—and, of course, I am here dealing with military alliances—must be of mutual benefit to the parties concerned. Trying to get something for nothing is no more praiseworthy or practicable in international than in personal affairs. Efforts to do so are rightly regarded as unethical. That our alliances meet the test of practicality is indicated by the fact that they were voluntarily entered into by free governments with the support of their respective peoples.

I have had occasion to serve with our allies in both Europe and Asia. I have served both here in the United States as well as in the Caribbean, with the military representa-

tives of our Latin American allies. The degree of unity and cooperation which I have observed in all those regions among the military men of the nations concerned, is a highly encouraging sign of the mutuality of interest that prevails and of a strong aspiration to achieve a common objective of strength through unity. It is an asset of intangible yet incalculable value.

Since military commitments are a necessary part of military alliances, international military arrangements by the United States must be carefully scrutinized to ensure that our commitments do not exceed our capabilities and that the benefits expected to accrue are worth the commitments. Obviously, perspective is required. The capabilities of our Nation, while enormous, are not unlimited, and selfishness still rides high in this practical world.

Yet, we can take pride in the leading and enlightened role our statesmen have played helping to forge a structure of international, or collective defense the better to safeguard our own national security.

American military men have played a prominent part, advisory in the formulation and executive in the implementation, of these arrangements. They have added greatly to the prestige and high reputation that our Nation's military forces enjoy in the world. Because our military capability is an important element of our diplomatic effectiveness, the significance of a potential enemy's respect for the capabilities of our military forces should be obvious. It is only through our possession of adequate military strength that the efforts of the splendid leaders of American diplomacy can realize their fullest success.

American officers of all our armed services are working with allied officers in all parts of the free world as partners in an international effort to preserve principles and to defend ideals, which basically have a great deal in common. In 39 countries of the world, officers of the United States Army, though relatively few in number, are helping to train and supply the fighting forces of our allies. These officers are securing excellent results in assisting allied military establishments to contribute more effectively to their own defense and so to ours, and perhaps of even more importance, in interpreting our way of life by precept and example. Our two United States field armies overseas—the Seventh in Europe and the Eighth in the Far East, together with their associated fleets and air forces—are conclusive evidence of our Nation's determination to help our allies to resist aggression, and to participate as a full partner in the common defense.

The great efforts we are exerting to secure world peace in partnership with the free nations of the world—efforts in which the United States Army is proud to have a major share—have for their goal the preservation of the freedom we have inherited from our forebears, the freedom we are determined to preserve for our children and our children's children, the freedom we continue to seek to extend by peaceful means for all men to enjoy everywhere.

For the sake of all of this, we must not isolate ourselves. He who advocates such a course is, I think, a dangerous counselor.

Lee, Maury, and Jackson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 20, I had the privilege of hearing United States Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina, deliver a very inspiring speech at the meeting of the District of Columbia division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. By unanimous consent, I include Senator JOHNSTON'S speech as an extension of my remarks:

Mrs. Harlee and my friends in the United Daughters of the Confederacy, there is more of realism than sentiment which keeps organizations like yours alive. An attachment to ideals and principles, often misunderstood, binds us together. A communion with the past strengthens us as we face our present and future problems.

Several years ago a friend of mine whom I have known since my college days received a letter from the distinguished and now deceased president of our college. In that letter was the statement, casually written:

"Whenever a people forgets its worthy past, the day will come when it will not have a past worth remembering."

Let that casual thought be the theme of our brief discussion and reflection this evening. It is no waste of our time to reflect upon the lives of some of the great men whose memory we honor tonight. Preeminent among the leaders in the tragic fratricidal conflict between the North and the South will always be the names of Lee, Maury, and Jackson.

To you, Daughters of the Confederacy, belongs a distinction I have always liked to recall. Besides the testimonials and enduring monuments of granite and marble which dot the Southland as living memorials of your evaluation of your heritage, the glory of our past and as a bulwark of hope for the future, there is the universally accepted national holiday—Memorial Day, May 30, of each year—which is credited to your acts of remembrance in placing flags and fresh-cut flowers on the graves of the Confederate and Union soldiers alike. The inspiration for the issuance of General Logan's famous order establishing Memorial Day in 1869, had its origin when he was witnessing the evidence of your patriotism. Later by act of Congress, Memorial Day on May 30 was established for the Nation. This fact has not altered the happy custom of celebrating other memorial days on other and separate dates in our Southern States. Your objects and purposes and those preceding you in this patriotic organization were to perpetuate the recollections of the sacrifices, hardships, and deeds of valor of our brave forebears in the struggles of 1861 to 1865. Just and righteous to them was their conception of duty and principle. They labored for a time in vain, but not without permanent rewards to us, the beneficiaries of their valor, heroism, and ideals. The pages of unbiased history record for all time their unprecedented genius for being able to accomplish so much with so little.

While we reflect with great and justifiable pride upon the achievements of our great generals and Commander Maury, I doubt but few, if any, there are who now would have history reverse the conclusion of the Civil War. The scars of that conflict are healed and these assemblages have higher purposes than to keep alive the strife of the days gone by.

We have builded upon the heritage of their sacrifices. The courage and loyalty to principle, exemplified in our leaders, are the common property of us all.

On Palm Sunday almost 90 years ago an undernourished, poorly equipped, and scantily clad army of less than 150,000 men began to slowly disperse from the several surrendering posts to wend its weary way homeward. Surviving loved ones welcomed their return as though they were conquering heroes. The plenty and security which they had left behind when they had volunteered to fight in a lost cause had disappeared. They found instead shattered and destroyed homes. Cities, villages, and farms had been laid waste and pillaged. Pestilence, poverty, famine, distress, destitution, and desolation stalked every countryside. Indiscriminate waste, death, and destruction lay in the path of Sherman's march, 60 miles wide and 300 miles long. What a spectacle of hopelessness faced the veterans of our southland.

There was no money. The currency was valueless. The entire economy was wrecked. What small industries and manufacturers there were had been destroyed or rendered useless. Four years of neglect had rendered homes and dwellings almost uninhabitable. Farms had been scorched. Storehouses, mills, and small factories had been denuded. Our railroads were torn apart; communications were chaotic. Precious little of material value remained after the Civil War. The tangibles of life were few.

Under the beneficence of an almighty God, our men and women had preserved some of the great intangibles of life. There was courage, faith, hope, character, and a determination to rise again.

Contrast this condition with the problems of the war-torn nations of today. There is no parallel in all history. For 12 years following the Civil War, the South suffered under the unspeakable domination, economic and political, of its conquerors. Sordid pages of history record brother's mistreatment of brother. A sustained, calculated, and premeditated design of oppression was practiced upon a once proud but now subdued segment of our American Nation. Revenge, greed, avarice, and treachery were the daily experience of a struggling and suffering people.

A kind providence stood at our side. In gracious benediction. He lighted our paths and kept our spirits alive. Congress refused all relief appropriations. Less than $1 million was donated for our relief by several philanthropic societies in Philadelphia and Baltimore.

Lend-lease was not then in the English or American dictionary. No point 4 program was projected. There was no Economic Cooperation Administration. No War Claims or War Damage Commission was created for us. No Marshall plan was established for the South. The ingenuity and kindness of man had not progressed to the point of being able to conceive of the term of "mutual assistance or mutual aid." Eighty-nine years had to elapse before the phrase "Foreign Operations Administration" could be born. The administration of the affairs of the South was marked with a suppression compounded by oppression.

I need only to refer to one illustration of the ruthlessness and utter indifference of the times with which you are all too familiar. The ancestral home of the Custis family, we known as the Custis-Lee Mansion, was appropriated by the Government. It has only been recently and within our lifetime, following years of persistent struggle, that meager compensation has been paid the survivors of the Lee family for this wanton act of banditry. Contrast this condition with the manner of our treatment of friend and foe alike after the close of World War II. We have spent many billions of dollars in rehabilitating the economies and restoring the damage caused by the war to the various countries all over the world. Even many countries rely on our bounty who took little part in the recent war. And in this connection, unless we keep constantly on guard, this generosity may become a permanent part of our national existence and to the point of so weakening our own economy as to make us the easy prey of our enemies.

But the spirit of the South would not die. Your early members kept it alive. Your recollections of the past and your intermittent meetings serve to refresh the spirit and to keep it alive. This is nurture for ourselves and future generations.

When the name of Lee is mentioned to the unprejudiced, at once he is associated with the great generals of all time. We link him with Alexander the Great, Caesar, Napoleon, Washington, Jackson, and a few others. Born the son of a distinguished Revolutionary soldier, his scholarly attainments at West Point made his recall there as superintendent a natural sequence. While he at first opposed secession with such means available to him as an Army officer and was offered the supreme field command of the United States Army, he, nevertheless, through loyalty and devotion to his native Virginia resigned his commission and became the leader of all the southern forces. His ability and leadership was demonstrated under General Scott in the War with Mexico. While he may have resisted to the bitter end, his regard for the welfare of his men, his beloved Southland and her future caused him to tender his sword to Grant at Appotomax on April 9, 1865. His greatness, his humility, and his reverence for the things eternal are reflected in his final order to his troops which he issued on the following day of April 10, 1865. His words in that order were:

HEADQUARTERS, ARMY OF
NORTHERN VIRGINIA,
April 10, 1865.

After 4 years of arduous service, marked by unsurpassed courage and fortitude, the Army of Northern Virginia has been compelled to yield to overwhelming numbers and resources. I need not tell the survivors of so many hard-fought battles, who have remained steadfast to the last, that I have consented to this result from no distrust of them; but, feeling that valor and devotion could accomplish nothing that could compensate for the loss that would have attended the continuation of the contest, I have determined to avoid the useless sacrifice of those whose past services have endeared them to their countrymen. By the terms of the agreement, officers and men can return to their homes and remain there until exchanged. You will take with you the satisfaction that proceeds from the consciousness of duty faithfully performed; and I earnestly pray that a merciful God will extend to you His blessing and protection. With an increasing admiration of your constancy and devotion to your country, and a grateful remembrance of your kind and generous consideration of myself, I bid you an affectionate farewell.

R. E. LEE, *General.*

The eloquent tribute to the bravery and devotion of his men were expressed in Lee's last order to his troops. His affection for them and consideration for their future led to the cessation of hostilities.

Matthew Fontaine Maury, of Fredericksburg, Va., having been educated at the United States Naval Academy, became an officer in the United States Navy. Historians say he was trained to the sea. After a few years, due to an accident, he retired but continued his devotion to naval affairs as a civilian. His worldwide fame was achieved at a conference in Brussels in 1855. This resulted in his restoration to active naval service as a commander. He had distinguished himself as head of the United States Naval Observatory and Hydrographic Office. His authorship of the Physical Geography of the Sea, Wind and Currents Charts, and other meteorological works resulted in the renown for him in his day as the world's most distinguished oceanographer and hydrographer. When the War Between the States began, he resigned his command in the Navy of the United States and assumed the harbor defenses of the meager southern navy. Upon the close of the war, he retired to Lexington as the professor of meterology at the Virginia Military Institute. By training, study, and excellence in naval affairs we are happy to acclaim him as one of the leading naval authorities of our country and particularly of the Southland.

Thomas Jonathan Jackson, one of the most daring and successful military tacticians ever to wear a soldier's uniform was much younger than either Lee or Maury. From Clarksburg, then a part of Virginia, he entered and graduated from West Point. He gave evidence early in life of his military genius. His army career with the United States was of rather short duration, for we find him as military instructor at Virginia Military Institute when hostilities began. He became a colonel in the Virginia Militia and soon rose to the rank of brigadier and major general. His achievements, his courage, and valor have become the topics of discussion among military men of all succeeding generations. His surprise attacks and sudden exploits in the Shenandoah Valley confounded and surprised the Union forces to the extent that Jackson soon had the reputation of being the ablest of Lee's generals. While a strict disciplinarian, he was an ardent Calvinist and a devout Christian. His troops loved him for his genius, his abilities, and his personal worth. General Lee once said that had he had the services of Jackson at Gettysburg, the outcome there would have been different.

To praise these men is not to minimize others; nor does that praise detract from the respect and admiration, for the rank and file of our men and women; yea the debt, we shall never be able to pay.

Defeats and sorrows give us a better nature. They add to our resourcefulness. In crises we surprise ourselves with what can be accomplished. I am indebted to the great minister who conducts the national pulpit of the air on Sunday mornings for the thought that in despair and reverses that Dante wrote his masterpriece. John Milton wrote his greatest work when blindness had fallen upon him. Tennyson, in struggle for light during his sorrow over the death of a friend, gave us his great In Memoriam. Continuing, Doctor Sockman said:

"Dr. Edwin Mims, of Vanderbilt University, once declared that Robert E. Lee did more for the South in the 5 years after his surrender at Appomattox than during the 5 years he was so brilliantly leading his troops. He took the leadership of a college in Virginia and with no rancor of spirit, he manifested a magnanimity and nobility which made him revered in the South and respected throughout the whole Nation."

While we could spend hours rehearsing the lives and deeds of any one of the three whom we honor tonight, vain would be our proceedings unless from "Defeat we receive its dividends." Surely the morale of the human race has been lifted more by those who have courageously borne their defeats than those whom success have ever attended. The inspiration of these lives to our fathers and mothers are ours to transmit to our children and they to theirs. In complete succession we shall ever keep fresh in the minds and hearts of our people the measure of gratitude to these illustrious men of our past. Back of me on the wall of my office is an almost life-size picture of Robert E. Lee. As I gaze upon it, my spirit from day to day is refreshed by thought and hope that in defeat, sorrow, and surrender comes crowning achievements if we will but persist in the right. So my friends, it is well that you have dedicated yourselves to carrying on in the paths your parents treaded. Surely, the joy, the happiness and blessings which are ours shall then increase for all. The faith of our fathers and mothers must remain with us as a constant reminder. In that faith, sustained by the influence of the Supreme Being are born the virtues of our existence exalted in the lines:

"God in all His glory rules
Watching over us with care
He sends us wisdom, love and truth
With his fellowman to share."

To Lee, Maury, and Jackson, representative as they are of all that is noble in a cause dear to their hearts, we of the South must never cease to acknowledge our debt of gratitude and appreciation. Their names as symbols of many others must ever be spoken of in reverence. To remember them is both an opportunity and a pleasure. To you and me it shall ever be a sacred duty.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 11, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, in the white light of whose presence all our motives stand revealed, for this hallowed moment, turning from our divisive loyalties and our party cries, we would bow humbly in a unity of spirit with a vivid realization of our oneness in Thee. Closing the door of prayer upon the outer world, with its tumult and shouting and its unpredictable trends, and bowing now in the searching light of Thy holiness, we know ourselves for what we are, petty and proud creatures who too often seek their own wills and whims in spite of the polished courtesies and noble professions with which we come to Thee.

Cleanse the inner fountains of our hearts from all defiling foulness and from the secret sin of pretense. In tense days, when the words that are uttered here may affect the uttermost parts of the earth, fit us faithfully to protect the Republic from outward aggression and subversion and from the treason of inner selfishness. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 10, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed as members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on the part of the House, Mr. DURHAM, of North Carolina; Mr. HOLIFIELD, of California; Mr. PRICE, of Illinois; Mr. KILDAY, of Texas; Mr. DEMPSEY, of New Mexico; Mr. COLE, of New York; Mr. HINSHAW, of California; Mr. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania; and Mr. PATTERSON, of Connecticut.

FEDERAL PERSONNEL LEGISLATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—(H. DOC. NO. 66)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States relating to Federal personnel legislation, which was read and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(For President's message, see House proceedings of today.)

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, we have heard the President's message, recommending the enactment of legislation which would further improve the position of Government career employees. This message includes recommendations for increased pay, adjustments in pay scales, group health insurance, employee training, personnel practices affecting Government employees stationed overseas, and increased travel allowances.

It is my sincere hope that we may obtain early consideration of this proposed legislation, and favorable action on the part of the Senate and the House of Representatives. In my opinion, the Federal employees merit these proposed recommendations.

Last evening I was presented a citation by the Federal Club for outstanding service to the career employees of the Federal Government. The membership of the Federal Club is composed of men in responsible career positions in the Federal Government. This was a great honor, and was greatly appreciated by me.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a copy of the citation.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In recognition of outstanding services rendered to the common weal in civic, State, and Federal activities, in his professional and legislative career, and for his vigorous advocacy of the improvement of the quality and public recognition of the integrity of the career service, and for fostering of the welfare of Federal civilian personnel, the Federal Club, Inc., hereby confers its honor award citation on the Honorable FRANK CARLSON.

In testimony whereof there is affixed the seal of the Federal Club, Inc., and the signature of the president, the secretary, and the chairman of the awards committee this 13th day of December 1954.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of the speech I made on receiving the award, and I ask that it be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CARLSON

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and my good friends and members of the Federal Club. I shall long remember the gracious remarks which accompanied the presentation of this wonderful award by the Federal Club. When I think of the distinguished public figures who have received this annual award from your fine organization, I realize your great kindness to me. I shall cherish this honor and I will keep faith with you.

At the outset, I wish to commend the Federal Club for its many contributions to our Government service. Your members have been responsible for developing ideas which have helped maintain our Federal service in the respected place it occupies among the governments of the world. Over the years you have been complimented by chief executives of the Nation and other high public officials. I wish to add my commendation to the many richly deserved compliments you have already received.

For over a quarter of a century I have served the people of my State in the House of Representatives, as Governor of Kansas, and as a Member of the United States Senate. In all of this public service I have firmly believed in a merit civil-service system for public employees.

In the capacity of chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the past 2 years I worked for the improvement of the Federal civil service. I will continue to work toward securing fair and just benefits for Federal employees in the future as I have in the past.

Under the leadership of our great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, the past 2 years have been great milestones on the road of civil service progress.

Federal employees have secured benefits and privileges which they have strived for years to obtain.

Upon recommendation of the President the Congress last year approved low-cost life insurance and unemployment compensation for Federal employees.

I introduced legislation which became known as the fringe benefits bill. Following the hearings when our committee considered the views of Federal employees organizations and the endorsements of the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget, this bill was approved and became law. In my opinion, it is one of the most progressive laws to improve the civil-service system which has been enacted in recent years.

Among the important provisions contained in this law are: a more realistic overtime pay structure; authority to pay above the minimum rates in grades where competition with private industry requires additional compensation to attract well-qualified Federal employees; the repeal of the restrictive provisions of the so-called Whitten amendment which have interfered with necessary civil-service reforms; a uniform allowance for Federal employees who are required to wear uniforms in connection with their official duties; and a more effective incentive awards program for Federal employees under which initiative and contributions to the public service by Federal employees are recognized through higher monetary awards to individual employees.

For retired Federal employees the last Congress provided for making permanent temporary annuity increases and under the tax law which was approved—retired Federal employees are granted a generous exemption. As a member of the Senate Finance Committee, it was a pleasure to assist in writing and securing approval of this legislation.

I was the author of the pay-increase bill for Federal and postal employees which was approved by the Congress but vetoed by the President. I believed that bill was fair to all Federal employees and it is my earnest hope that at an early date the Congress will pass similar legislation which will be approved by the President.

Tomorrow, January 11, President Eisenhower will send a special message to the Congress outlining his views with respect to a proposed salary adjustment for Federal and postal employees. From what I have learned, this proposal will not differ materially from my bill which was approved by the Congress last summer.

Federal employees deserve a salary adjustment because for many positions the salaries paid Federal employees are substantially less than those paid for similar work in private industry. While I recognize that Government salaries in top-level positions will never be comparable to salaries paid persons in private industry for similar work, yet I think the Government owes an obligation to all of the people of the United States to make certain that its employees are treated as fairly as possible within a reasonable budget.

In my opinion, the cost of such a pay adjustment and the cost of other fringe benefits which were approved during the last Congress are necessary and vital operating costs of conducting the business of the finest Government in the world.

I look upon these expenditures as an investment, an investment in the future of America. Those who devote their working years to public service are entitled to at least two things: First, reasonable security with an expectation of adequate retirement benefits; and, second, adequate compensation for the work performed as well as entitlement to those fringe benefits now enjoyed by most workers in private industry. Federal employees demand no more and the people of our Nation expect no less for those persons who conduct the day-by-day affairs of our Government.

During my service in Congress I have had an opportunity to know and cherish the friendship of many hundreds of Federal employees. From the many things they have told me about their problems, I know that there is more to their work than is generally realized by the public outside our Nation's Capital.

First, I know the zeal and integrity with which they approach their daily work; I know that the overwhelming majority are loyal to our country. The vast majority are not concerned with politics and they readily adapt themselves to whatever changes in Government the American people decide.

It is these thousands upon thousands of Federal employees who are responsible for the continuity of Government operations through good years and bad years, war and peace, depression and prosperity.

It is for these reasons that I cannot consider Federal employees in terms of statistics, personnel actions, 201 files or pieces of paper.

We have made great progress in many fields relating to personnel administration which has produced a better civil-service system. But there remains yet a vast unexplored field which relates to the important functions of proper placement, improved training programs, management-employee relations, executive development, recruiting methods, promotion policies, and a host of other factors which daily affect the lives and futures of Federal employees and their families.

It is in this relatively unexplored and uncharted sea that remains in the future's challenge to all of us to make greater progress and to obtain improvements.

This is why I feel that we must devote our energies and attention to the improvement of the individual dignity of each Federal employee, and make certain each employee understands the role he plays in the important activities of Government. It will be from this new sense of pride in a job well done and the fact that each employee will understand the part he plays in making our Government strong, that the true measure of Federal employee morale will be determined in the future.

In spite of the outstanding record of the last Congress toward improving the civil-service system and providing liberal benefits for Federal employees, there are those who contend that Federal employee morale has suffered during the past 2 years. Nothing could be further from the truth. The recent election did not demonstrate that Federal employees are dissatisfied with the record of the Congress or of the administration. As a matter of fact, I believe the rank

and file of Federal employees consider themselves as having received as fair treatment during the past 2 years as at any other time in history. I believe, too, that these charges of lowered employee morale are based on political considerations. They have no substance.

In my opinion, the President will submit legislative proposals to the Congress within a short time to raise further the standard of the Federal service and to provide additional benefits for Federal employees. In addition to the pay adjustments which will be requested tomorrow, I believe the President will submit proposals strengthening the new life-insurance program and providing health insurance for Federal employees. From time to time during the session additional legislative proposals will be submitted to Congress strengthening the civil-service system generally which will react to the benefit of all Federal employees.

During the past few months there has been considerable discussion in regard to the dismissal of Federal employees for security reasons and rumors are current that the new Congress, under new leadership, will initiate an investigation of the entire security program.

Permit me to observe that I do not oppose any honest inquiry or study which will be productive or result in a better civil-service system.

I know that nothing has been done during the past 2 years in the executive branch that requires concealment from the public.

President Eisenhower is surrounded by an excellent group of able and conscientious public officials. They have been fair and honest with the people of the United States. I would consider it shameful if the present congressional leadership would seek to initiate any kind of investigation which would tend to destroy the progress which has been made or will use their present authority for partisan political demagoguery.

I am and have always been a strong supporter of the true merit system, but I desire to differentiate between that and the equally illustrious group of those in policymaking positions. I have always felt that to aid the administration in power all of this latter group should be selected carefully by the administration so that the philosophy of that administration would be implemented throughout the entire Government.

I believe everyone must agree that the administration in power is entitled to and must have men and women in key positions whose thinking is attuned to that of those in authority.

We cannot afford the luxury of indulging in political fights of this nature while larger issues involving the maintenance of a sound domestic economy, military preparedness, and a firm foreign policy are of paramount importance.

This month we begin a new year. Most of us here are engaged in the great work of making our Government stronger to resist the dangers inherent in an atheistic philosophy which seeks to engulf and destroy the free nations of the world.

I have thought of what ideals and principles should motivate us during the coming year. I can think of no better description of our point of view than to recall for you a poem written by Walter Reed Hunt, a famous New England church official in the 19th century whose ideas are as appropriate today as they were during his lifetime:

"A MORNING WISH

"The sun is just rising on the morning of another day, the first day of a new year. What can I wish that this day, this year, may bring to me? Nothing that shall make the world or others poorer, nothing at the expense of other men; but just those few things which in their coming do not stop with me, but touch me rather, as they pass and gather strength:

"A few friends who understand me, and yet remain my friends.

"A work to do which has real value without which the world would feel the poorer.

"A return for such work small enough not to tax unduly any one who pays.

"A mind unafraid to travel, even though the trail be not blazed.

"An understanding heart.

"A sight of the eternal hills and unresting sea, and of something beautiful the hand of man has made.

"A sense of humor and the power to laugh.

"A little leisure with nothing to do.

"A few moments of quiet, silent meditation. The sense of the presence of God.

"And the patience to wait for the coming of these things, with the wisdom to know them when they come."

LEGISLATION FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—(H. DOC. NO. 65)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to legislation for postal employees, which was read, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(For President's message, see House proceedings of today.)

FORMER SENATOR GUY M. GILLETTE—RESOLUTION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, very recently the Young Democratic Club of the State University of Iowa adopted a resolution commending former Senator Guy M. Gillette for his service to the State of Iowa. It gives me considerable pleasure, having served with Senator Gillette for many years, to read this resolution into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the request of that organization:

Whereas Guy M. Gillette has very ably served the State of Iowa for 16 years in the United States Senate and has been a leader in Congress,

We, the State University of Iowa Young Democrats, extend to Senator Gillette our thanks and appreciation for this faithful service.

DEVELOPMENT OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN CUTOFF—RESOLUTION

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Burlington, Vt., relating to the Lake Champlain cutoff.

I hope very much that the administration will make the necessary investigations as to the cost and usefulness of the proposed cutoff.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution relating to Lake Champlain cutoff

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Burlington, as follows:

Whereas in the past this board has repeatedly expressed its wholehearted support of proposed legislation in the Congress for the development of the Lake Champlain Cutout in connection with the St. Lawrence Seaway project; and

Whereas it is increasingly apparent that the prosperity of this area is becoming more and more dependent upon the enactment of such legislation; Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That this board hereby requests the active support of such proposed legislation by the members of the Vermont delegation in the Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk forward to the members of such delegation a certified copy of this resolution.

REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON PRODUCTION OF DURUM WHEAT—LETTER FROM WARD COUNTY (N. DAK.) CROP IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have received a letter dated December 30, 1954, from the Crop Improvement Association, Ward County Courthouse, Minot, N. Dak., signed by its president, Joe Parizek, dealing with the matter of an increase in acreage in durum wheat and also with the subject of crop insurance.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WARD COUNTY CROP IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION,
Minot, N. Dak., December 30, 1954.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: The Ward County Crop Improvement Association unanimously adopted the following resolution at a meeting held November 29, 1954:

"Whereas the production of amber durum wheat in the United States during the past 2 years has been approximately one-third of the amount normally consumed; and

"Whereas the available varieties of amber durum wheat are more susceptible to stem rust than hard wheat, the risk involved in raising durum is much greater than for hard wheat; and

"Whereas the cost of amber durum seed is nearly twice that for hard wheat of comparable quality and difficult to secure; and

"Whereas crop insurance is not now available to growers of amber durum in much of the durum producing area of North Dakota, farmers will seed hard wheat instead of durum on their allotted wheat acres, thus the potential supply of amber durum will be further reduced: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Ward County Crop Improvement Association, That the Secretary of Agriculture and the United States Congress be requested to remove all acreage restrictions for seeding amber durum wheat in 1955 to provide an incentive for increasing production of this wheat of which there is a critical shortage."

Sincerely,

JOE PARIZEK,
President.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DANIEL (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas):

S. 301. A bill to promote the preservation of the history of the United States as recorded in pioneer weekly newspapers and as currently published in weekly newspapers of the United States by the establishment of the National Library of Weekly Newspapers and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. DANIEL when he introduced the above-named bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 302. A bill amending section 500 of The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above-named bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FREAR (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS):

S. 303. A bill to provide for the appointment by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 304. A bill authorizing the construction of a highway bridge across the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal at Summit, Delaware; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 305. A bill for the relief of Francesco Sebastiano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. NEUBERGER and Mr. LEHMAN):

S. 306. A bill to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 307. A bill for the relief of Eva Elisabeth Uber English; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 308. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 309. A bill for the relief of Rosette Sorge Savorgnan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 310. A bill to require that automobiles introduced into, delivered for introduction into, or operated in, interstate commerce be equipped with safety belts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 311. A bill to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover officers and employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 312. A bill to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts, and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 313. A bill to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of tests of alcohol in the blood, urine, or breath of persons tried in the District of Columbia for certain offenses committed while operating vehicles; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 314. A bill for the relief of Stanley William Wheatland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 315. A bill for the relief of Asher Ezrachi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 316. A bill to extend the period within which farmers may file petitions for relief under section 75 (c) of the Bankruptcy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 317. A bill to supersede certain provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946 with respect to the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

S. 318. A bill for the relief of Chih Shing Hwa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 319. A bill for the relief of John B. Gibbons, Jr.;

S. 320. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Diana Cohen and Jacqueline Patricia Cohen;

S. 321. A bill for the relief of Anni Marjatta Makela and son, Markku Paivio Makela; and

S. 322. A bill for the relief of Malbina Rouphael David, nee Gebrael; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 323. A bill for the relief of Luigi Orlando;

S. 324. A bill for the relief of Vesa Reijo Luukkonen;

S. 325. A bill for the relief of Elvira Tocchio Anzedei;

S. 326. A bill for the relief of Leopoldine Maria Lofblad;

S. 327. A bill for the relief of Joao-Pinguel Rodrigues;

S. 328. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chii Sugiura, Motoko Sugiura, Atsushi Sugiura, and Kumi Sugiura; and

S. 329. A bill for the relief of Jean Jing Peo Feng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 330. A bill to declare the tidewaters in the waterway (in which is located Fort Point Channel and South Bay) above the easterly side of the highway bridge over Fort Point Channel at Dorchester Avenue in the city of Boston nonnavigable tidewaters; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 331. A bill for the relief of the city of Baltimore, Md.;

S. 332. A bill for the relief of Hava Shpak, A. A. Shpak, and Sympcha Shpak;

S. 333. A bill to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the Union Iron Works; and

S. 334. A bill for the relief of Dr. Tanash H. Atoynatan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 335. A bill to provide for a heliport in the District of Columbia for use in helicopter service between the Friendship International Airport and the downtown area of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. BEALL):

S. 336. A bill to authorize an investigation and report on the advisability of a national monument in Brooklyn, N. Y.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY (for himself and Mr. CASE of South Dakota):

S. 337. A bill to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 338. A bill to establish an effective student exchange program with Latin American countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLEMENTS when he introduced the above bill for Mr. SMATHERS, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 339. A bill to exempt certain additional foreign travel from the tax on the transportation of persons; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLEMENTS when he introduced the above bill for Mr. SMATHERS, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution to assure the equal application of the Constitution and laws of the United States to individuals of both sexes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF WEEKLY NEWSPAPERS

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to promote the preservation of the history of the United States as recorded in pioneer weekly newspapers and as currently published in weekly newspapers of the United States by the establishment of the National Library of Weekly Newspapers, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement made by me last year in connection with a similar bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 301) to promote the preservation of the history of the United States as recorded in pioneer weekly newspapers and as currently published in weekly newspapers of the United States by the establishment of the National Library of Weekly Newspapers, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. DANIEL is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DANIEL

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF WEEKLY NEWSPAPERS

This bill would help to preserve that great portion of the true history of our Nation which is recorded in pioneer weekly newspapers and in currently published weekly papers of the United States.

There are many public and private agencies which have preserved the files or the microfilms of our great daily newspapers. They are an excellent primary source of recorded history. However, the full and complete story of our Nation's history and progress cannot be preserved unless we save that which is recorded in the weekly newspapers published throughout the land.

During the early years of our Nation's history we had only weekly newspapers. Even today, the educational, social, political, and religious history of a great portion of our population can be found only in the files of these weekly publications. As a boy I learned to appreciate this fact. My father published weekly newspapers in four different towns of Texas. He left the publishing business in later years, but always retained

and carefully preserved the bound volumes of all issues of his newspapers. First I knew them as carefully guarded family treasures, but later I found that they were a constant source of the history of the communities in which they were published. They are now preserved in the library of one of our leading universities.

There are thousands of weekly newspaper files which have been preserved. Others have been destroyed, and in the future there is likely to be continued loss of this valuable historical material unless something is done to encourage its preservation.

Mr. Garland R. Farmer, owner and publisher of the Henderson Times at Henderson, Tex., a weekly newspaperman for over 25 years, saw the need for a national library of weekly newspapers several years ago. With private funds and at his own expense he established such a library and began a nationwide campaign for preservation of weekly newspaper files. His work has inspired me to offer this legislation.

The following is an article written by Mr. Farmer:

"WHY WE NEED THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF WEEKLY NEWSPAPERS

"For many years this Nation had only weekly newspapers. Even today, the educational, political, social, and religious history of the major part of our people can be found only in the files of these publications.

"As a weekly newspaperman for over 25 years, I learned that little or nothing was being done to preserve this rich store of information, and make it available to all, even though much was being lost every day.

"So I called this neglect to the attention of the Library of Congress, American foundations, historical and press associations, colleges, libraries, and the general public.

"The response was immediate and almost unanimous. They agreed the idea of a National Library of Weekly Newspapers was excellent—should have been started generations ago—but where to get the funds to "get the show on the road?"

"Not satisfied to allow the campaign to bog down, I started using my own personal funds to set up the National Library of Weekly Newspapers here in Henderson. About 96 percent of the services and contacts are by mail, so location of the library is not important.

"Too, it is one of the primary functions of this library to work with and through press and historical associations; State, college, and local libraries to encourage and assist the 48 States in setting up their own programs to preserve this vital store of historical information. The job is too big for one organization, but one organization is needed for the overall work.

"With the financial aid of a few other firms and individuals, I have this program on a national and nonprofit basis, but the problem is one that involves everyone—even you. The burden should not be borne by one or just a few.

"So, I am offering to turn all my accumulated data, microfilmed weeklies, cabinets, files, etc., to the Federal Government, if only a staff of three is provided to carry on the work.

"My program has been strongly endorsed by such colleges as: Stanford, Florida State, University of Texas, Columbia, Michigan, Iowa, Missouri, and so on across the Nation.

"Students, teachers, and historians say the work has already been neglected too long. Leaders of both major political parties, in and out of Congress, say they are ready to act, and asked me to draw up a bill which could help at a minimum cost.

"That makes good sense, for there are over 8,000 weekly newspapers in the United States, and their readers elect 75 percent of the United States Senators and 61 percent of our Representatives.

"This letter, with enclosures, should give you a fair picture of the need, which has been neglected too long.

"Cordially,

"GARLAND R. FARMER,
"*Henderson (Tex.) Times.*"

AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944, AS AMENDED

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill amending section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a brief statement relating to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Alabama may proceed.

The bill (S. 302) amending section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the bill I have introduced will extend the life of the GI loan program which first was authorized by the Congress in title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. It is my hope that this bill will receive the wholehearted support it so richly deserves. If the GI loan program is not continued millions of our World War II veterans will fail to share in this benefit.

Under the GI loan program of the Veterans' Administration the generous terms of GI financing are made available by private banks, savings and loan associations, insurance companies, and other investors, since the partial guaranty of VA encourages the lenders to make loans at moderate interest rates and on very liberal credit terms. Most GI loans are made with no downpayment, or with a much smaller cash downpayment requirement than is normally required by a lender, and a maximum maturity of 30 years is permissible.

The Veterans' Administration has underwritten nearly 3,900,000 loans made to veterans by these private lending institutions. More than 3,600,000 were made for the purchase or construction of homes, 218,000 were business loans and another 67,000 were made in connection with farming activity. The dollar volume of closed loans is in excess of $26½ billion with the VA guaranty or insurance in excess of $14 billion. More than 760,000 of these loans have been paid in full, and it is estimated that the outstanding loan balances total about $19.3 billion on which the Government's contingent liability amounts to approximately $10.6 billion.

The repayment record which our veterans have maintained is little short of astounding. The VA has been called upon to pay a total of 34,000 claims, which represents less than 1 percent of all loans closed. In the case of home loans the VA has been called upon to pay claims on about one-half of 1 percent of the cases. This fine record is a tribute not only to the individual veterans, but also demonstrates the care with which the loans were made by the private lending institutions and the diligent manner in which they were serviced.

And now let us consider how expensive this program has been to the Government. The largest single cost item to the Government to date has been the gratuity payment which was in an amount equal to 4 percent of the guaranteed or insured portion of the loans. The gratuity was limited to $160 for each veteran and the payments totaled slightly more than $400 million. However, this gratuity has not been paid on any loans approved after September 1, 1953. A total of about $125 million has been expended in connection with claims and the purchase of properties incident to the salvage operation. Of this amount about $61.5 million represents claim payments and the balance was disbursed in acquiring properties, purchasing loans where foreclosure was imminent and other property management and sales expenses involved in liquidation. Of the $125 million gross expenditure, more than $41.5 million has been returned to the Treasury from property sales and rentals, from recoveries on claim payments, and from principal and interest payments on properties sold on credit terms and acquired loans. In addition, there are assets on hand, comprised of the balances due from properties sold on terms and acquired loans, totaling about $53 million, and unsold properties on hand valued at about $12 million. Thus the assets together with the funds already returned to the Treasury total $106.5 million, and in addition there is $23.5 million due from veterans and others as a result of the guaranty payments. When we consider that more than 3½ million veterans have gotten started down the road toward debt-free home ownership, or helped in their business or farm endeavors, the price truly has been small. There is nothing which will contribute more to the preservation of our American way of life than making it possible for people to own their own homes or to assist energetic young people in getting started in a farm or business operation. The whole Nation has gained by reason of the increased stability and civic responsibility which necessarily follows from the establishment of vast numbers of veterans' families in their own homes, which never could have been attained without the benefits of the preferential financing terms of the GI loan.

The GI loan program for World War II veterans will terminate on July 25, 1957. Veterans of the Korean conflict will have 10 years from the recently established January 31, 1955, cutoff date, and my bill will have no application to them. However, there still are about 11 million eligible veterans with World War II service only who have not made any use of their GI loan benefit, and most of those who have made use of their entitlement have a substantial amount remaining which may be used for the purchase, construction, or repair of residential property. It has been estimated that between one and three million more veterans of World War II will

not be able to take advantage of their GI loan rights if we allow this law to expire on July 25, 1957. This would mean that between eight and ten million World War II veterans would not, for one reason or another, have been able to obtain the benefit Congress intended for them. Many have held off buying in the belief that there would be a general leveling off so that they could better project their future plans. Others found that there was a general unavailability of mortgage money when they endeavored to obtain their loans.

Furthermore, when the original 10-year limitation was imposed we had no way of foretelling that there would be an additional disruption in our economy made necessary by the action we were forced to take in Korea. This had the natural consequence of upsetting the timetable of many World War II veterans even though they were not called upon to return to active duty. In addition, for a period of nearly 3 years credit controls were imposed which required that cash payments of substantial amounts be made in some cases and that the maximum maturities be shortened. In all fairness to these veterans they should be afforded a further opportunity to take advantage of their GI loan benefits in order to compensate for the general upheaval caused in our economy by the Korean conflict.

We also should consider carefully the industrial impact which the GI loan program has had and the consequences which would result from its discontinuance. All of us are aware of the large part played by the construction industry in maintaining high economic levels during the past several years. During the past year it is estimated that nearly 25 percent of all homes completed were financed with GI loans. About 17,000 builders are engaged in the construction of homes which are sold to veterans with the assistance of GI loans. Since the beginning of the program it is estimated that about $17 billion was paid by veterans in connection with the purchase of new residences. In turn, this sum can be translated into proportionate amounts paid to construction workers, to the producers and sellers of building materials, and then returned to the economic stream. When viewed in this light it will be seen that in producing $17 billion worth of veterans' homes a large lift is given to a broad segment of our national economy.

Since the current law will not expire until July 25, 1957, the question naturally occurs of why we should consider an extension in this session. I alluded earlier to the estimated number of World War II veterans who were likely to use their benefit before the present law expires. Whether this figure is 1 million or 3 million there are bound to be undesirable consequences, and the larger the number the more magnified will be the problem. I have reference to the natural rush which will occur to get in under the wire. It very well could result in considerable panic buying, and the competition which will occur in the bidding for the existing housing supply may have dire results. There truly could develop a boom-and-bust proposition, with greatly accelerated activity during the next 2½ years followed by a sharp breakoff in the latter part of 1957. I fear that this would have a much too disruptive effect, and, in fact, might be a disservice rather than a benefit to the veterans involved.

Furthermore, the financing plans of investors and the planning of projects by builders ordinarily are projected over a considerable period of time. It therefore becomes necessary for both the lenders and builders to know what lies ahead in the field of Government-aided financing so that they may take it into account in determining future outlook. This is much too important a program, both to the veterans and to the industry groups, to leave the Government's role in the field of uncertainty. The Government's position must be clarified promptly in order to avoid any possibility of allowing a slowdown to occur which will result in consequences that it will take many months to repair.

I am proud to be identified as the sponsor of this bill which will do so much by way of assisting a great many veterans and which as an agreeable by-product will furnish a substantial bolstering ingredient to our economy. I urge that this bill be favorably considered in this session of Congress.

STUDENT EXCHANGE PROGRAM WITH LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES—EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL FOREIGN TRAVEL FROM TAX ON TRANSPORTATION OF PERSONS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] I introduce for appropriate reference two bills. I ask unanimous consent that the explanatory statements on the bills, prepared by the junior Senator from Florida, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statements will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills introduced by Mr. CLEMENTS (for Mr. SMATHERS) were received, read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. 338. A bill to establish an effective student exchange program with Latin American countries, and for other purposes.

The statement by Senator SMATHERS, presented by Mr. CLEMENTS, is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMATHERS

The proposed bill would provide for a more extensive student exchange program on a reciprocal basis with Latin American countries. It would authorize the Secretary of State to conduct this program on a graduate student and an undergraduate student basis where the undergraduate student has completed at least 2 years of education above the secondary level.

The proposed legislation would also authorize the Secretary of State to provide for interchanges between the United States and Latin American countries of books, periodicals and publications and for the preparation, distribution, and interchange of other educational materials.

To assist the Secretary of State in the conduct of a broader student exchange program, my bill contains a provision which sets up a Latin American Scholarship Board consisting of 10 members to be appointed by the President. This Board would make a selection of American students accepted for study in various Latin American countries, as well as to make recommendations to the Secretary of State concerning the operation and administration of the exchange program.

The proposed legislation would also authorize the Secretary of State to cooperate with the heads of the various Departments and agencies of the Government for the purpose of utilizing the services and facilities of such Departments and agencies whenever practicable in connection with carrying out the program. In line with this provision he is also authorized to consult the Secretary of Commerce and the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board with a view toward utilizing surface and air transportation facilities which are recipients of subsidies from the United States in connection with the transportation of students.

There is much need for this proposed legislation for the reason that the present student-exchange program now in operation is limited only to graduate students and professional leaders and is wholly inadequate. For example, in the fiscal year of 1954 there were only 73 students from Latin America in the United States. For the fiscal year of 1955 this number was increased to 132. These figures amply demonstrate the meager Latin-American student-exchange program now in effect and the extreme necessity that Congress take prompt action to correct the situation to promote better hemispheric mutual understanding since we all recognize that Latin America is of vital importance to us and we of equal importance to that area.

To carry out the purposes of this bill, there is a provision which would authorize an appropriation of $5 million for the first fiscal year after its enactment and such sums as may be deemed necessary for each fiscal year thereafter.

Latin America today is beset with gigantic economic problems which must be met and solved if this hemisphere is to remain secure. We must help solve their problems or else be prepared to suffer the consequences. The proposed student-exchange program is one way in which we can make a very substantial contribution in this respect for there is no doubt in my mind that it will pay off in years and in generations to come by developing closer ties of friendship and culture, as well as resulting in mutual economic advantages to each other. It is the soundest long-term investment that the United States can conceivably make, and at the same time demonstrate by positive action that we are sincerely interested in giving more than lip-service to the term "good neighbor." In addition, the adoption by the Congress of this broader student-exchange program would give renewed faith in the ultimate triumph of democracy in this hemisphere and the world.

I sincerely hope that prompt and effective action on this legislation will be taken in this session of the Congress.

To the Committee on Finance:

S. 339. A bill to exempt certain additional foreign travel from the tax on the transportation of persons.

The statement by Senator SMATHERS, presented by Mr. CLEMENTS, is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMATHERS

In introducing the proposed legislation at this time, it is my hope that adequate opportunity will be had by the committee to report it out favorably in time to permit action to be taken on it when the next tax legislation is referred by the House to the Senate for consideration.

Briefly stated, the purpose of my bill is to remove the unjust and discriminatory provisions of existing law against travel to the Caribbean, Central America, Mexico, and Canada, since these are the only areas of foreign travel subject to tax. The bill would simply treat all foreign travel equally.

The original transportation-tax law, enacted in 1941, was adopted as a wartime measure to discourage civilian travel at a time when the railroads, airlines and other forms of public transportation were vitally needed for troop movements and other essential travel.

In 1947, the law was amended by exempting from its provisions the tax on all foreign travel except travel within the northern portion of the Western Hemisphere which was defined as an area lying west of the 30th meridian west of Greenwich, east of the international dateline and north of the Equator, but not including any country of South America. Its objective was to encourage travel to Europe and South America in order to bring United States dollars to those countries for the purpose of offsetting unfavorable balances of trade as well as to assist Europe to recover from the ravages of World War II. (At that time the tax was at the rate of 15 percent. It was subsequently reduced to 10 percent by the passage of the Excise Tax Act of 1954.) While the amendment in my opinion produced the beneficial results sought to be accomplished, it created an inequitable situation by making the tax on foreign travel only applicable to travel to the Caribbean, Central America, Mexico, and Canada. It is in this respect that the present law is discriminatory against our nearby Latin American neighbors to the south, as well as to Canada, our good neighbor to the north. That these countries should be singled out in this manner is manifestly unjust particularly in view of the fact that we are vitally interested in further developing a sound and effective good-neighbor policy. I might point out here that both Canada and Mexico have long since repealed their travel tax embracing practically the same area to which our tax is now for the most part applicable.

Tourism and transit trade are important segments in the economies of our Latin American neighbors for it is in these activities that United States dollars are obtained which aid in offsetting unfavorable balances of trade that presently exist. The Caribbean area, for example, imports heavily and represents a large nearby market for our exports. The repeal of the transportation tax would undoubtedly increase the flow of American dollars to this area and the purchasing power thus provided would result in a net benefit to our own national economy.

Latin America today is beset, among other things, with economic difficulties and in view of our dependency upon each other we must assist this area in the solution of its problems or suffer from the consequences. We can take a step in the right direction by repealing the discriminatory transportation tax which represents a chief impediment toward the flow of dollars to these areas.

My bill simply provides that only the domestic portion of international travel purchased in the United States is taxable, thus removing the discriminatory provisions of existing law and putting all international travel on the same basis. In other words, that part of the trip from the point of origin in the United States to the last point in the United States at which the carrier makes a stop enroute to their foreign destination is subject to the tax. If the carrier makes no intermediate stop in the United States, no tax would apply. No other change is made in existing law. The proposed legislation retains the exemption now provided for steamship travel when the vessel does not make full traffic stops in the United States.

In the last Congress I introduced similar legislation but unfortunately it was not acted upon, despite the fact that favorable views were given by the interested executive departments of the Government. In submitting its views on that legislation the Department of State in a letter dated July 20, 1954, addressed to the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, stated as follows:

"Reference is made to your letter of April 5, 1954, requesting the comments of the Department of State on S. 1353, 'To amend section 3469 of the Internal Revenue Code to exempt from tax the transportation of persons to and from Mexico, to and from Central America, and to and from the West Indies,' and the Department's acknowledgment of April 6, 1954.

"The Department favors repeal of the tax on travel to the countries affected, on the grounds that it discriminates between them and other foreign countries and thereby tends to reduce the potential volume of tourist movement to the areas covered by the tax.

"Because of the discriminatory nature of this tax, it continues to be a source of irritation in our foreign relations with the countries in the area. The tourist trade is a major economic activity there, and a principal source of dollar income in some of these countries, and such revenue is necessary to help meet their balance of payments. Assisting these countries to improve their economic position is one of the major items in the United States economic foreign policy.

"At the 16th meeting of the Caribbean Commission, held in Surinam in May 1953, a resolution was adopted as follows:

" 'The Commission, having regard to the earnest desire of the peoples of the countries served by it to stimulate the inflow of visitors from the North American Continent into the Caribbean area and the fact that the 15-percent excise tax on travel does not apply to all countries in the surrounding area, with the result that the tax has a discriminatory effect upon the countries served by the Commission, strongly urges that each national section take steps, through diplomatic channels, to make representations requesting the United States Government to give immediate consideration to abolishing the tax on travel to this area.'

"The Department has received notes from the embassies of all of the countries affected by the tax expressing the hope of their governments that the United States would amend its revenue laws to eliminate the 15-percent tax on transportation to their countries which is working to their economic detriment by impeding the flow of tourist dollars.

"The Department respectfully suggests that your committee give careful consideration to the passage of this legislation amending the Internal Revenue Code, which affects adversely and in a very direct manner the economic well-being of friendly neighboring countries.

"The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of this report to your committee, and that it concurs in recommending enactment of this legislation.

"Sincerely yours,

"THRUSTON B. MORTON,
"Assistant Secretary
"(For the Secretary of State)."

Similarly the Department of Commerce in a letter dated July 22, 1954, addressed to the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee stated as follows:

"This letter is in reply to your request of April 5, 1954, for the views of this Department with respect to S. 1353, a bill to amend section 3469 of the Internal Revenue Code to exempt from tax the transportation of persons to and from Mexico, to and from Central America, and to and from the West Indies.

"In 1948 the 15-percent tax in effect on all foreign travel by United States citizens since 1945 was repealed, except for travel to and from the northern portion of the Western Hemisphere. By act of Congress, April 1, 1954, this tax was reduced to 10 percent. Thus the existing discrimination against travel to the Caribbean and Central America remains in effect, although modified, while travel to other Latin American destinations and Europe is untaxed.

"Section 3469 of the Internal Revenue Code was adopted as a wartime measure to discourage travel. Not only has this necessity passed, but President Eisenhower in his economic-policy message to the Congress on March 30, 1954, pointed out the importance of an increased flow of United States travel to the national economy, and international trade. Repeal of the tax as envisaged by S. 1353 would stimulate travel to an area which relies in large part upon tourist income for its dollar revenue.

"Since the Caribbean in particular imports heavily, it presents a large nearby market for American exports. An increased flow of American dollars spent by American tourists would increase the area's ability to pay for American goods with resulting net benefits to our national economy.

"The Department accordingly recommends enactment of S. 1353.

"We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that they would interpose no objection to the submission of this letter to your committee and, further, that they concur in recommending enactment of the legislation.

"Sincerely yours,

"SINCLAIR WEEKS,
"Secretary of Commerce."

It is apparent, therefore, that the purpose of this legislation has the full support, not only of the countries affected, but also of the President and the interested executive departments of the Government.

The attitude of our Government was well expressed in the official instructions issued to the United States delegation which attended the Pan American Economic Conference recently held in Rio de Janiero. The instructions stressed the necessity of promoting international travel in tourism to these areas, and pointed out that such development necessitated the elimination of the travel tax since it is considered to be one of the chief impediments to travel in these areas. Our Latin American neighbors have bitterly and justly criticized the tax as discriminatory, and have advocated its repeal as one of the means which should be employed to assist them in establishing a sound economy to our mutual advantage.

At the recent Inter-American Economic Conference, held in Rio de Janiero, which I attended as a delegate, our Latin American friends pointed out very strongly their opposition to this extremely unfair tax and its effect upon their economies. At that conference the United States delegation strongly endorsed the principle of increasing the trade among the Americas and the removal of various restrictions on travel and commerce. In addition we indicated to our Latin American friends that we would do everything possible to consider the repeal of this tax.

Removal of this tax will contribute greatly towards strengthening the economies of our Latin American neighbors by increasing the flow of tourist dollars to these areas. In so doing, we will make a substantial contribution toward better hemispheric defense, and at the same time strike a devastating blow against the international Communist conspiracy.

There has been no testimony in connection with similar legislation introduced by

me in the past session of the Congress from any governmental agency, private individual or geographical area that the imposition of the present transportation tax to these areas is good, fair, or beneficial. Attempts to justify it are based solely on the argument that it produces some revenue. However, the amendment which I propose would have an insignificant effect on the total proceeds of the transportation tax, for it is estimated that the loss in tax would be approximately $10 million which is indeed a very small sum in comparison to the beneficial effects which its repeal would have in cementing better relationships with our Latin American neighbors as well as our good neighbor to the north, Canada.

In addition it seems obvious to me that by increasing travel to these areas, tax revenues from the domestic portion of this travel would be increased sufficiently to equal or exceed the estimated revenue loss.

I am sure that the Members of the Senate recognize that there is much that needs to be done to help Latin America and while my bill does not provide an entire solution to the many problems we must face, it is very definitely a step in the right direction.

As a member of the Senate Finance Committee, I am going to recommend that the bill be given early consideration, as well as to urge my colleages to give their support to the bill in committee, and on the floor of the Senate, for in so doing they will actively demonstrate to our Latin American friends that the words "good neighbor" are more than just mere platitudes.

UNITY OF IRELAND

Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. PURTELL, and Mr. MANSFIELD) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 21), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the House of Representatives, 65th Congress (1919), 3d session, by House Joint Resolution 357, duly passed a resolution declaring that the people of Ireland should have the right to determine the form of government under which they desire to live; and

Whereas the maintenance of international peace and security requires settlement of the question of the unification of Ireland; and

Whereas 26 of the 32 counties of Ireland have been successful in obtaining international recognition for the Republic of Ireland which has, as its basic law, a constitution modeled upon our own American Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless a clear majority of all of the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite, determine and declare to the contrary.

TESTIMONY OF FORMER RUSSIAN CODE CLERK RELATING TO THE INTERNAL SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 5)

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, on January 4, 1954, representatives of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the United States Senate Committee on the Judiciary journeyed to Canada to question Igor Gouzenko, former code clerk in the Soviet Embassy at Ottawa, under a cooperative agreement worked out between the Canadian Department of External Affairs and the United States Department of State.

A transcript of the testimony of Mr. Gouzenko subsequently was released by the Canadian Government, pursuant to the request of the Internal Security Subcommittee, transmitted through the Department of State.

Unfortunately, this transcript was made available only in mimeographed form, and only a very few copies, relatively speaking, were distributed. The Internal Security Subcommittee has received requests for copies of this testimony, but has been unable to supply them. We are informed that Canadian officials have no copies available for distribution.

Because this questioning of Igor Gouzenko was in a very real sense a part of the activities of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate, and the transcript of testimony should be formally and permanently recorded, I propose to ask that this testimony may be printed as a Senate document.

Before I make that request formally, let me say that the Gouzenko testimony is both valuable and informative. While a substantial part of Gouzenko's story already had been told, the questioning by members and counsel of the Internal Security Subcommittee did bring out some facts not previously known, and the testimony did furnish some leads which were useful to the committee. Furthermore, in view of the public statements Mr. Gouzenko had made that he had information of value which he desired to give to the Internal Security Subcommittee, that committee would have been remiss in its duty if it had not sought and taken advantage of the earliest opportunity to question Mr. Gouzenko.

In view of the entire situation as outlined, this testimony by Mr. Gouzenko should be preserved as an official paper of the United States Senate; and I therefore ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the transcript of the testimony of Igor Gouzenko, given on January 4, 1954, under questioning by members and the counsel of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the United States Senate, may be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sundry nominations have been received from the President and have been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Without objection, the nominations will be printed in the RECORD; and pursuant to a rule adopted by the Committee on Foreign Relations in the 83d Congress, the nominations will be considered by the committee at the expiration of 6 days.

(For nominations referred to, see end of Senate proceedings of today.)

BETTER USE OF SCIENTIFIC MANPOWER — THE FORTHCOMING CHICAGO CONFERENCE AND CORRESPONDENCE WITH NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a brief statement prepared by me, with attachments, on the subject of accelerating United States scientific progress in both civilian and military fields.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement and the attachments be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement and attachments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

I have long been deeply interested in the effective utilization of the Nation's scientific manpower.

I regard this as a twofold necessity: (a) for the very survival of our Nation in this atomic-hydrogen-jet age; (b) for the prosperity of our expanding economy.

It is clear from great many evidences that the gap of superiority between American science and technology over that of the U. S. S. R. is being increasingly narrowed. Why? Because of the all-out Soviet effort to broaden Russia's industrial-military-scientific base.

SENATOR WILEY'S PREVIOUS COMMENTS

I commented on this phase in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 16, 1954, on page A6844 when I reproduced a grim analysis of Soviet engineering progress by M. H. Trytten, Director of the Office of Scientific Personnel of the National Research Council.

I also commented on November 10 on page 15913 with regard to the important work of the National Inventors Council of the United States Department of Commerce.

Earlier, on August 6, in the RECORD on pages 13505 and 13506, I had cited the need for improved military utilization of our scientists. In my judgment, it is folly to concentrate exclusively on training our manpower on today's weapons, when some of the most skilled young and older brains could be at work preparing tomorrow's weapon systems.

CHICAGO SYMPOSIUM, FEBRUARY 10 AND 11

I am pleased, therefore, that on February 10, there is being held a symposium by the Society of American Military Engineers, and cosponsored by a great many other fine public and private groups. At this meeting, there will be considered more effective military utilization of the Nation's scientific resources.

I have in my hand the text of the announcement, listing the numerous scientific, business, and military leaders who will participate in the important conference.

I congratulate these men on their forthcoming patriotic contributions to this important discussion.

While, unfortunately, it now appears that it will not be possible for me personally to be on hand, I want to say that I regard this conference as one of the most significant such gatherings which has been held in the post-war era.

The subject matter affects American education; it affects selective service and reserve policy; it affects American business and labor and agriculture.

The United States has around 300,000 scientists and 500,000 engineers. Our engineer shortage alone is around 90,000. Every major newspaper in the United States, particularly on Sundays, is full of advertisements urgently soliciting engineers to apply to fill critical job vacancies, particularly in defense plants.

I AM INTERESTED FROM TWO STANDPOINTS

Now, I want to say that wholly aside from our military effort, as crucial as that is, it is essential that America greatly increase her research effort in both pure and applied research in order to serve the expanding needs of our Nation.

I am especially interested in this subject, from the standpoint of both the committees on which I am privileged to serve. Thus, from my position on the Foreign Relations Committee, I have always sought to emphasize the need for greater scientific cooperation—civilian and military—between the Allied Nations.

I am convinced that we have not begun adequately to tap either the scientific genius of our own citizens, nor that of the great western bloc of nations. According to information compiled at my direction by counsel for our committee, this lag in interallied scientific coordination is a particularly important problem in our western defense-economic effort.

Secondly, it is my privilege to serve as the chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Patents, Trade-Mark, and Copyright Law. From that position, I have sought to encourage inventions as such, as a part of our overall technological progress.

LETTER FROM NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

In performing my role, I have been in constant touch with numerous heads of agencies of our Government, including Dr. Arthur Flemming, of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

Along a similar line, I have also been in contact with the distinguished Director of the National Science Foundation, Dr. Alan T. Waterman.

Dr. Waterman promptly and thoroughly responded to a recent inquiry as to the past, present, and future work of his distinguished Foundation.

He reported, among other things, I am pleased to say, that my own State of Wisconsin has contributed significantly to the Foundation's work. Thus, 32 research grants have been awarded to educational institutions or organizations within my State.

I append the text of the announcement of the Chicago symposium, along with the text of the reply by Dr. Waterman to my most recent inquiry.

MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE

(Thursday and Friday, February 10 and 11, 1955, Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, Ill.)

SPONSORS

The Society of American Military Engineers.

Industry

The National Industrial Conference Board.
Chamber of Commerce of the United States.
National Association of Manufacturers.
The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc.
Illinois Manufacturers Association.
Illinois State Chamber of Commerce.
Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry.

Government

United States Department of Defense.
Corps of Engineers, United States Army.
Bureau of Yards and Docks, Civil Engineer Corps, United States Navy.
United States Air Force (installations).
Industrial College of the Armed Forces.
United States Coast and Geodetic Survey.
Arctic Institute of North America.
United States Department of Labor.

Professional societies

Scientific Manpower Commission.
Engineering Manpower Commission of Engineers Joint Council.
Constituent Societies of Engineers Joint Council
American Society of Civil Engineers.
The American Society of Mechanical Engineers.
American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers.
American Institute of Electrical Engineers.
American Society for Engineering Education.
The Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers.
American Institute of Chemical Engineers.
American Waterworks Association.
National Science Teachers Association.
Western Society of Engineers.
Armed Forces Chemical Association, Midwest chapter.
Engineers Society of Milwaukee.

WHY THIS CONFERENCE

The number of engineers and scientists graduating from our technical schools is considerably less than that needed to meet the demand. American industry, school faculties and the Armed Forces are increasingly feeling the shortage of technically trained manpower which could well be the deciding factor in another national emergency. Well qualified committees and commissions are studying this entire situation, and their reports are receiving more and more attention from news media.

With the expiration of the Selective Service law in June 1955, another bill dealing with military manpower will be introduced in the Congress. This bill will have far-reaching effects on the future welfare of this country. Certainly, it will require exhaustive reconsideration of our entire manpower policy by the Congress.

The Society of American Military Engineers with the cooperation of those in the technical branches of the Armed Forces, American industry, technical education, and engineering and scientific societies will bring together high ranking representation from all of these groups and organizations at this conference in Chicago on February 10–11, 1955.

This conference has received the attention of a number of experienced educators and military and industrial men. It is their united opinion that people occupying positions of responsibility in our legislative, military, educational, and industrial life could well come together to direct their thinking to the utilization of our especially trained manpower and skilled craftsmen in ways which will best serve the Nation.

OBJECTIVES

There is great public interest in our comparative world position in technological matters, as well as in all matters concerning military service. This interest, plus the varied viewpoints and responsible positions of those in attendance at this conference, should result in the conference serving as an unusual source of reliable public information. In addition, specific recommendations coming from this conference should receive most careful consideration of all those concerned with any phase of manpower utilization.

LENOX R. LOHR,
President.

PRELIMINARY PROGRAM

Thursday, February 10

8: 30–10: 30 a. m.: Registration, mezzanine floor.

10: 30–12 noon: Opening session, grand ballroom.

General chairman: Lenox R. Lohr, president, the Society of American Military Engineers and president, Museum of Science and Industry.

Invocation: Rt. Rev. Monsignor George J. Casey, Vicar General, Archdiocese of Chicago.

Chairman: Lt. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, vice president, Remington Rand, Inc.

Speaker: L. J. Fletcher, vice president, Caterpillar Tractor Co., What It Takes To Get Production (a visual presentation of the specific contributions made by technical people in typical mass production industries).

12 noon: Luncheon.

Chairman: Gen. Lucius D. Clay, United States Army (retired) chairman of the board, Continental Can Co., Inc.

Speaker: Dr. M. H. Trytten, Director, Office of Scientific Personnel, National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council—"Our Technical Manpower Situation Today."

2 p. m.: Afternoon session. The development and Utilization of Our Technical Manpower.

Chairman: Rear Adm. John R. Perry, CEC, United States Navy, Chief, Bureau of Yards and Docks.

Speakers: Dr. Robert E. Wilson, chairman of the board, Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), The Needs of Industry.

Dr. John T. Rettaliata, president, Illinois Institute of Technology, Technical Education and Technical Societies.

Brig. Gen. Carlton Dargusch, Military Service Legislation.

Discussion: Dr. Walter H. Zinn, director, Argonne National Laboratory; Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, United States Army, Director of Selective Service; Thomas R. Reid, chairman, subcommittee on manpower, national defense committee, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and director, office of civic affairs, Ford Motor Co.; Dean D. H. Loughridge, Technological Institute, Northwestern University.

Friday, February 11

9:30 a. m.–12 noon: Panel symposium.

NOTE.—The entire time of this session will be devoted to the various panel members replying to questions on the general subject of the conference. These questions will be those submitted in advance or during the conference.

Chairman and moderator: Ralph L. Goetzenberger, vice president, Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co.

Panel members: Dr. John T. Rettaliata, president, Illinois Institute of Technology; Carter Lane Burgess, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Personnel; United States Senator Alexander Wiley (tentative); Dr. M. H. Trytten, director, Office of Scientific Personnel, National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council; Leo R. Werts, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Manpower, United States Department of Labor; Dr. Blake R. Van Leer, president, Georgia Institute of Technology; Dr. Robert E. Wilson, chairman of the board, Standard Oil Co. (Indiana); Dr. J. Roscoe Miller, president, Northwestern University; Dean A. A. Potter, Purdue University; M. H. Isenberg, president, Combustion Engineering, Inc.; Maj. Gen. Lee B. Washbourne, United States Air Force, Assistant Chief of Staff, Installations; L. J. Fletcher, vice president, Caterpillar Tractor Co.; M. M. Boring, engineering manpower consultant, General Electric Co.; Dr. Thomas H. Chilton, technical director, development engineering division, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.; Edwin L. Yates, central office personnel activities, General Motors Corp.; Dr. Howard A. Meyerhoff, Executive Director, Scientific Manpower Commission; W. T. Cavanaugh, executive secretary, Engineering Manpower Commission of Engineers Joint Council; Dean W. L. Everitt, chairman, administrative division, American Society for Engineering Education; Thomas R. Reid, chairman, subcommittee on manpower, national defense committee, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and director, office of civic affairs, Ford Motor Co.; Dr. Edmond Claxton, director of research, Armstrong Cork Co., and chairman, subcommittee on manpower and research, National Association of Manufacturers.

(Panel discussions will continue from 2 p. m. to 4:30 p. m.)

12 noon: Luncheon.

Chairman: United States Senator ALEXANDER WILEY (tentative).

Speaker: Victor E. Cooley, Deputy Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Defense Mobilization Program—With Emphasis on Manpower Aspects.

Panel consultants: M. T. Carpenter, president, Scientific Manpower Commission; Dr. Joseph O. Hirschfelder, University of Wisconsin; Hon. Dewey Short, House of Representatives, Armed Services Committee; Hon. Overton Brooks, House of Representatives, Armed Services Committee; H. H. Armsby, Chief for Engineering Education, Department of Health, Engineering, and Welfare, United States Office of Education; Theron H. Rice, secretary, national defense committee, Chamber of Commerce of the United States; Rear Adm. R. F. A. Studds, Director, United States Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Representatives of the American Legion: Seaborn P. Collins, national commander; Bruce P. Henderson, chairman, national security council; James P. Ringley.

COMMITTEES

General chairman: Lenox R. Lohr, president, the Society of American Military Engineers and president, Museum of Science and Industry.

Program committee

Chairman: L. J. Fletcher, vice president, Caterpillar Tractor Co.

Dr. Thomas H. Chilton, technical director, Development Engineering Division, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

Gail A. Hathaway, Engineering Manpower Commission.

W. T. Cavanaugh, executive secretary, Engineering Manpower Commission of Engineers Joint Council.

Dr. Howard A. Meyerhoff, executive director, Scientific Manpower Commission.

Dr. M. H. Trytten, director, Office of Scientific Personnel, National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council.

M. T. Carpenter, president, Scientific Manpower Commission.

Ralph L. Goetzenberger, vice president, Minneapolis-Honeywell Regular Co.

Maj. Gen. Douglas L. Weart, national director, the Society of American Military Engineers.

Dan A. Sullivan, national director, the Society of American Military Engineers.

Publicity committee

Chairman: John F. O'Keefe, secretary, Chicago Newspaper Publishers' Association.

Walter J. Murphy, editor, Chemical & Engineering News.

J. Earl Harrington, executive secretary, Western Society of Engineers.

D. M. MacMaster, director, Museum of Science & Industry.

Stewart Howe, vice president in charge of Development & Public Relations, Illinois Institute of Technology.

Finance committee

Chairman: Dan A. Sullivan, national director, Society of American Military Engineers.

Maj. Gen. Douglas L. Weart, national director, Society of American Military Engineers.

Arrangements committee

Gen. Lucius D. Clay, chairman of the board, Continental Can Co., Inc.

Dr. Robert E. Wilson, chairman of the board, Standard Oil Co. (Indiana).

Willis Gale, chairman, Commonwealth Edison Co.

Lt. Gen. Hobart R. Gay, United States Army, commanding, Fifth Army.

Maj. Gen. Carl R. Gray, former commanding officer, Transportation Corps, United States Army.

Rear Adm. Daniel V. Gallery, United States Navy, Commandant, Ninth Naval District.

Maj. Gen. Samuel D. Sturgis, Jr., Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

W. A. Roberts, president, Allis-Chalmers Mfg. Co.

Merrill C. Meigs, vice president, the Hearst Corp.

William V. Kahler, president, Illinois Bell Telephone Co.

Lt. Gen. C. C. Haffner, Jr., chairman of the board, R. R. Donnelley & Sons Co.

James L. Donnelly, executive vice president, Illinois Manufacturers' Association.

Walker L. Cisler, president, the Detroit Edison Co.

H. A. Barber, president, Barber-Greene Co.

Dr. John T. Rettaliata, president, Illinois Institute of Technology.

Lt. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, vice president, Remington Rand, Inc.

Dr. Leverett Lyon, chairman, executive committee, Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry.

John S. Knight, publisher, Chicago Daily News.

H. S. Eberhard, president, Caterpillar Tractor Co.

James F. Oates, Jr., chairman, the Peoples Gas Light & Coke Co.

John L. McCaffrey, president, International Harvester Co.

Walter J. Cummings, chairman, Continental, Ill., National Bank and Trust Co.

Ross D. Siragusa, president, Admiral Corp.

Marshall Field, Jr., editor and publisher, Chicago Sun-Times.

Rear Adm. John R. Perry, CEC, United States Navy, Chief, Bureau of Yards and Docks.

J. Lewis Powell, Office, Assistant Secretary of Defense, Supply and Logistics.

Lt. Gen. W. B. Kean, executive director, Chicago Housing Authority.

Carlton S. Proctor, Moran, Proctor, Mueser & Rutledge.

Charles W. Bryan, Jr., president, Pullman Standard Car Manufacturing Co.

Dr. Louis C. McCabe, Chief, Fuels and Explosives Division, Bureau of Mines, United Statcs Department of the Interior.

Maj. Gen. Douglas L. Weart, national director, the Society of American Military Engineers.

Walter J. Murphy, editor, Chemical and Engineering News.

Col. Henry Crown, Chairman, Material Service Corporation.

Maj. Gen. Lee B. Washbourne, Assistant Chief of Staff, Installations, United States Air Force.

Gail A. Hathaway, Engineering Manpower Commission.

Thomas H. Coulter, chief executive officer, Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry.

Brig. Gen. L. H. Whiting, president, American Furniture Mart.

A. M. Thompson, chairman, Mississippi Valley Barge Line Co.

A. T. Etcheson, executive vice president, Illinois Bankers Association.

Dr. Gustav Egloff, director of research, Universal Oil Products Co.

F. M. Rich, general superintendent, Indiana Harbor Works, Inland Steel Co.

E. J. Albrecht, E. J. Albrecht Co.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION,
Washington, D. C., January 10, 1955.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: It was very heartening, indeed, to receive your letter of December 27, 1954, which showed such understanding of the problems confronting us in the National Science Foundation. It is now commonly accepted that our national security and welfare depend in no small degree upon the strengthening of our scientific effort. The problem is primarily one of finding ways and means to insure a satisfactory level of basic scientific research and to have sufficient fully trained, highly qualified, scientists in the country. As Dr. James B. Conant stated in the first annual report of the Foundation: "In the advance of science and its application to many practical problems, there is no substitute for first-class men. Ten second-rate scientists or engineers cannot do the work of one who is in the first rank." The administration's present concern with this problem is shown by the fact that a special Interdepartmental Committee on the Training of Scientists and Engineers, of which I was a member, has considered the problem and recently made a report to the President.

The National Science Foundation has been attacking this problem on several fronts.

First of all, we have a program of grants for support of basic research, almost entirely in the universities. Besides supporting valuable basic research, this grants program provides opportunities to potential young scientists to participate as assistants to established researchers and thus increase their competence. We are recommending a substantial increase in this program for fiscal 1956.

Second, the Foundation since its inception has had a program of graduate fellowships which assists selected science students in continuing their training in science. These fellowships to date have been awarded for the most part to students who have achieved their bachelor's degree and are working toward their doctor's degree. As an indication of the demand for these predoctoral fellowships, we received last year applications from 2,865 students, 657 of whom were awarded fellowships. An additional 1,359 received honorable mention as being of fellowship caliber.

We believe that a Federal fellowship program, particularly at the predoctoral level, should be used primarily to stimulate interest and to assist the truly outstanding student. Therefore, while we are recommending to the Congress this year a small increase for predoctoral fellowships, we are recommending a relatively more substantial increase for our program of postdoctoral fellowships, and are also proposing that a special postdoctoral fellowship program be instituted for senior scientists.

Third, since the problem of increasing the quality and number of scientists must be attacked across a broad front, we have initiated a program called "education in the sciences." This program recognizes that a widening gap between the demand for and supply of teachers of science in the years ahead is possibly the greatest obstacle to the training of adequate numbers of high-caliber scientists. If we are to meet the requirements of an ever-expanding economy and the military demands created by international tension, we must make certain that our high schools and colleges are adequately staffed with well qualified and stimulating science teachers. To cope with these problems the Foundation has under way a 3-point program relating to help for teachers, improvement of the science curriculum and motivation of students. We are recommending a substantial expansion in this program for the 1956 fiscal year.

However, the problems are intricate and are not susceptible of easy solution. We believe that many more facts need to be known and analyzed before wise decisions as to Federal policies to achieve the desired results can be made. To this end, the foundation now has a comprehensive program of studies underway. These studies include:

(a) Comprehensive survey of the present and future supply and use of scientific and technical manpower in the United States, with special reference to Government, industry and educational institutions.

(b) A technical study of methods of measuring demand-supply relationships with respect to scientific manpower.

(c) Studies of doctor of philosophy degrees granted in science and a study of various methods of increasing the competence and effectiveness of our teachers of science.

(d) A study of factors influencing our most talented high-school graduates in deciding whether or not to continue formal education.

(e) Study of feasibility and desirability of scholarship aid to college students.

These studies will be extended in the future. The information assembled will be helpful in determining the effectiveness of present Federal policies and in isolating particular problem areas to which new solutions must be found. Among the major problems which must be examined will be those relating to the need for undergraduate scholarship aid and for assistance to States and educational institutions in support of the teaching of science. As conclusions are arrived at, we will make appropriate recommendations.

We feel, therefore, that the budget proposed to the Congress for the foundation for fiscal 1956 represents an appropriate step forward. In reply to your kind offer of cooperation we must state that while it would be possible administratively to enlarge any of our programs beyond the amounts recommended to Congress, we are not prepared to recommend such action at this time. If Congress approves our budget as submitted, we will be able to expand our programs somewhat and to conduct the studies necessary to determine whether more ambitious Federal programs should be undertaken in the future.

You will be interested to know, I believe, that to date 32 research grants totaling $421,920 have been awarded to educational institutions or organizations within the State of Wisconsin. In addition, the foundation has awarded six grants to scientists in the State of Wisconsin to assist them in travel to international scientific meetings. Since the foundation fellowship program was established, there have been 54 recipients of fellowships who were residents of Wisconsin. In addition, 56 have received honorable mention in fellowship competition. It may be of particular interest to you to know that 86 recipients of foundation fellowships have elected to pursue their studies at the University of Wisconsin. Finally, in addition to Dr. Edwin B. Fred, who is a member of the National Science Board, there are 14 residents of the State of Wisconsin who are serving or have served on the foundation's science advisory panels.

I have tried to give you our general approach and plans in reply to your kind letter. We will take the liberty, if we may, of keeping you advised as to our progress and plans from time to time. If you would care to go into the matter further, I should of course be pleased to visit you at your convenience. I particularly appreciate your interest and will welcome your views at any time.

Sincerely yours,

ALAN T. WATERMAN,
Director.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Address entitled "Future of American Foreign Policy," delivered by him at Philadelphia, Pa., on January 10, 1955.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Statement containing biographical sketch and description of career of Dr. Abraham Shaoni, grand master of Masons of the State of Israel.

MEMBERSHIP OF STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If there is no further routine business to be transacted, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk the recommendations of the majority for the consideration of the Senate with reference to the respective chairmen and the majority membership of the standing committees of the Senate. I understand that the distinguished minority leader is prepared to submit recommendations from the minority conference.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, by direction of the Republican conference, I submit a list of Republican appointments to the standing committees of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the respective lists of the majority and minority conferences.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

On Agriculture and Forestry: Allen J. Ellender, of Louisiana, chairman; Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina; Spessard L. Holland, of Florida; Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico; James O. Eastland, of Mississippi; Earle C. Clements, of Kentucky; Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota; W. Kerr Scott, of North Carolina; George D. Aiken, of Vermont; Milton R. Young, of North Dakota; Edward J. Thye, of Minnesota; Bourke B. Hickenlooper, of Iowa; Karl E. Mundt, of South Dakota; John J. Williams, of Delaware; and Andrew F. Schoeppel, of Kansas.

On Appropriations: Carl Hayden, of Arizona, chairman; Richard B. Russell, of Georgia; Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico; Allen J. Ellender, of Louisiana; Lister Hill, of Alabama; Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia; John L. McClellan, of Arkansas; A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia; Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington; Spessard L. Holland, of Florida; John Stennis, of Mississippi; Earle C. Clements of Kentucky; Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire, Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts; Milton R. Young, of North Dakota; William F. Knowland, of California; Edward J. Thye, of Minnesota; Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin; Karl E. Mundt, of South Dakota; Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine; Henry C. Dworshak, of Idaho; Everett McKinley Dirksen, of Illinois; and Charles E. Potter, of Michigan.

On Armed Services: Richard B. Russell, of Georgia, chairman; Harry Flood Byrd, of Virginia; Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas; Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee; John Stennis, of Mississippi; Stuart Symington, of Missouri; Henry M. Jackson, of Washington; Samuel J. Ervin, Jr., of North Carolina; Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire; Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts; Ralph E. Flanders, of Vermont; Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine; Francis Case, of South Dakota; James H. Duff, of Pennsylvania; and Herman Welker, of Idaho.

On Banking and Currency: J. W. Fulbright, of Arkansas, chairman; A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia; John Sparkman, of Alabama; J. Allen Frear, of Delaware; Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois; Herbert H. Lehman, of New York; A. S. Mike Monroney, of Oklahoma; Homer E. Capehart, of Indiana; John W. Bricker, of Ohio; Irving M. Ives, of New York; Wallace F. Bennett, of Utah; Prescott Bush, of Connecticut; J. Glenn Beall, of Maryland; Frederick G. Payne, of Maine; and Wayne Morse, of Oregon.

On District of Columbia: Matthew M. Neely, of West Virginia, chairman; Albert Gore, of Tennessee; Alan Bible, of Nevada; Pat McNamara, of Michigan; J. Glenn Beall, of Maryland; Roman L. Hruska, of Nebraska; Clifford P. Case, of New Jersey; Gordon Allott, of Colorado; and Wayne Morse, of Oregon.

On Finance: Harry Floyd Byrd, of Virginia, chairman; Walter F. George, of Georgia; Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma; J. Allen Frear, of Delaware; Russell B. Long, of Louisiana; George A. Smathers, of Florida; Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas; Alben W. Barkley, of Kentucky; Eugene D. Millikin, of Colorado; Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania; John J. Williams of Delaware; Ralph E. Flanders, of Vermont; George W. Malone, of Nevada; Frank Carlson, of Kansas; and Wallace F. Bennett of Utah.

On Foreign Relations: Walter F. George, of Georgia, chairman; Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island; J. W. Fulbright, of Arkansas; John Sparkman, of Alabama; Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota; Mike Mansfield, of Montana; Alben W. Barkley, of Kentucky; Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin; H. Alexander Smith, of New Jersey; Bourke B. Hickenlooper, of Iowa; William Langer, of North Dakota; William F. Knowland, of California; George D. Aiken, of Vermont; Homer E. Capehart, of Indiana; and Wayne Morse, of Oregon.

On Government Operations: John L. McClellan, of Arkansas, chairman; Henry M. Jackson, of Washington; John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts; Stuart Symington, of Missouri; Samuel J. Ervin, Jr., of North Carolina; Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota; Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina; Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin; Karl E. Mundt, of South Dakota; Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine; Norris Cotton, of New Hampshire; George H. Bender, of Ohio; and Thomas E. Martin, of Iowa.

On Interior and Insular Affairs: James E. Murray, of Montana, chairman; Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico; Russell B. Long, of Louisiana; Henry M. Jackson, of Washington; Joseph C. O'Mahoney, of Wyoming; W. Kerr Scott, of North Carolina; Alan Bible, of Nevada; Richard L. Neuberger, of Oregon; Eugene D. Millikin, of Colorado; George W. Malone, of Nevada; Arthur V. Watkins, of Utah; Henry C. Dworshak, of Idaho; Thomas H. Kuchel, of California; Frank A. Barrett, of Wyoming; and Barry Goldwater, of Arizona.

On Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington, chairman; John O. Pastore, of Rhode Island; A. S. Mike Monroney, of Oklahoma; George A. Smathers, of Florida; Price Daniel, of Texas; Samuel J. Ervin, Jr., of North Carolina; Alan Bible, of Nevada; Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina; John W. Bricker, of Ohio; Andrew F. Schoeppel, of Kansas; John Marshall Butler, of Maryland, Charles E. Potter, of Michigan; James H. Duff, of Pennsylvania; William A. Purtell, of Connecticut; and Frederick G. Payne, of Maine.

On the Judiciary: Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia, chairman; James O. Eastland, of Mississippi; Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee; Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina; Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., of Missouri; John L. McClellan, of Arkansas; Price Daniel, of Texas; Joseph C. O'Mahoney, of Wyoming; Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin; William Langer, of

North Dakota; William E. Jenner, of Indiana; Arthur V. Watkins, of Utah; Everett McKinley Dirksen, of Illinois; Herman Welker, of Idaho; and John Marshall Butler, of Maryland.

On Labor and Public Welfare: Lister Hill, of Alabama, chairman; James E. Murray, of Montana; Matthew M. Neely, of West Virginia; Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois; Herbert H. Lehman, of New York; John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts; Pat McNamara, of Michigan; H. Alexander Smith, of New Jersey; Irving M. Ives, of New York; William A. Purtell, of Connecticut; Barry Goldwater, of Arizona; George H. Bender, of Ohio; and Gordon Allott, of Colorado.

On Post Office and Civil Service: Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina, chairman; Matthew M. Neely, of West Virginia; John O. Pastore, of Rhode Island; A. S. Mike Monroney, of Oklahoma; Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., of Missouri; W. Kerr Scott, of North Carolina; Richard L. Neuberger, of Oregon; Frank Carlson, of Kansas; William E. Jenner, of Indiana; William Langer, of North Dakota; Carl T. Curtis, of Nebraska; Thomas E. Martin, of Iowa; and Clifford P. Case, of New Jersey.

On Public Works: Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico, chairman; Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma; Albert Gore, of Tennessee; Stuart Symington, of Missouri; Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina; Pat McNamara, of Michigan; Richard L. Neuberger, of Oregon; Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania; Francis Case, of South Dakota; Prescott Bush, of Connecticut; Thomas H. Kuchel, of California; Norris Cotton, of New Hampshire; and Roman L. Hruska, of Nebraska.

On Rules and Administration: Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island, chairman; Carl Hayden, of Arizona; Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., of Missouri; Albert Gore, of Tennessee; Mike Mansfield, of Montana; William E. Jenner, of Indiana; Frank A. Barrett, of Wyoming; Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin; and Carl T. Curtis, of Nebraska.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the membership lists be adopted.

The motion was agreed to.

FARM PRICE SUPPORT LEGISLATION

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, as the 84th Congress begins its legislative work, I should like to speak for a few moments on a controversial matter which was the subject of great debate during the 83d Congress; and which, from all indications, is likely to become again the subject of congressional inquiry, although I hope not legislation. I refer to the field of farm price support legislation.

The Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, in an address before the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives Convention at Chicago, Ill., made a statement, with respect to the flexible price support features of the Agricultural Act of 1954, which merits magnification at this time. Secretary Benson rightly concluded that, since all basic commodities, except wheat, will be supported at or near 90 percent of parity in 1955, "if farm income from some of the basic crops is lower this year than last, it will not be because of flexible price supports. The reduction will come, if it comes at all, from the curtailment of acreage and production made necesary by surpluses accumulated under the earlier program." In addition, the Secretary discussed the methods and programs being used to attack this problem of shrinking farm profits.

Since farm-price-support policy is a complex subject, I most sincerely commend this talk to the Members of the Senate for their reading, and to that end, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COOPERATIVES FACE THE FARM PRICE SQUEEZE

(Address by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson before 26th annual meeting of National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, Chicago, Ill.)

This represents another homecoming for me and, as always, it is an inspiring experience to visit again with so many good friends. Among my most treasured remembrances are the years when I served as executive secretary of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

It is a great pleasure to be back with you today and to have this challenging opportunity to discuss our mutual interest in developing a prosperous, stable and free agriculture. The theme of this 26th annual meeting—"Farmer Cooperatives Attack the Price-Cost Squeeze"—is an appropriate one. It ties together the immediate problem facing farmers and an effective method of meeting it.

For nearly 4 years now, farm prices have been declining. Since February of 1951, prices received by farmers have plunged 24 percent, while the prices they pay have fallen only 4 percent. These figures constitute an eloquent explanation of why farm pocketbooks are being pinched.

The financial pangs which go with readjustment to a peacetime economy are not new to agriculture. We have suffered them following every war in our history. Just as farm commodity prices go up farther than the general price level under the stimulus of war and inflation, they also drop farther and faster than most nonfarm prices while the economy is readjusting to more nearly normal conditions. We are making the transition this time with fewer and less severe dislocations in agriculture and other segments of our economy than ever before.

The depression which was so freely predicted a year ago failed to materialize. From an economic point of view, 1954 proved to be the best peacetime year in history, although agriculture did not fully share in this prosperity. The changeover has hurt and is hurting most of our farm people. I would not minimize the seriousness of the situation.

Yet I believe all of the evidence indicates we have seen the worst. I am convinced that for agriculture the road ahead will be smoother than the one we have been traveling.

For several months now, most farm prices have been relatively stable. For the last 2 years, in fact, the parity ratio has averaged about 90, fluctuating narrowly between 94 and 86. It will be recalled that there was a 19-point plunge in the parity ratio during the 2 years preceding January 1953 when the new administration was installed.

We must not be content with mere stability of farm prices at current levels, however. But the price decline had to be halted before it could be reversed. The first half of that objective is being attained. The job at hand now is to get farm prices back into better balance with the general price level.

While we are doing this, we must never lose sight of the fact that price alone does not insure farm prosperity. It is price times volume that makes gross income. The story does not end even there. It's what remains in a farmer's pocket after the bills are paid—his net income—that measures whether he has had a good year or a bad one. The theme you have chosen for this meeting shows that you clearly recognize the importance of these other factors besides price.

There are four obvious fronts on which we can attack this problem of shrinking farm profits. We are moving forward on all of them.

First, Government price-support programs help farmers market many of their products in a more orderly manner, minimizing the severity of seasonal gluts and surpluses. Nonrecourse storage loans on a variety of crops provide guaranteed minimum prices to qualified farmers. Authority to set aside up to $2½ billion worth of surplus commodities has helped to take some of the pressure off free market prices of wheat and cotton.

Second, we are expanding our markets abroad through the billion dollar Agricultural Trade Development Act which permits the sale of surplus farm products for foreign currencies and provides additional outlets through donations for relief and famine aid. We are moving increased quantities of Government-owned surpluses into channels of consumption at home through school lunch programs and gifts to needy persons, institutions, and welfare agencies. In addition to stepped-up consumption of dairy products by the Armed Forces, we are expanding our school lunch milk program by $50 million a year.

These actions tend to reduce the supply and strengthen demand for farm products. Their cumulative effect upon agricultural prices should become even more apparent in the year ahead.

The third line of attack upon the farm cost-price squeeze is through research, education, and improved marketing. Government outlays for these programs have been increased by approximately $20 million during the current fiscal year. The great gains of agriculture in the past have come about largely through this approach and so, I am confident, will those of the future.

Greater efficiency, broader use of the better feeds, seeds, and breeds, the adoption of improved cultural practices and employment of sound marketing methods—all taken together—will do more to help farmers meet the cost-price squeeze than any program of Government aid which could be devised by mortal man.

Fourth, farmers themselves, through their cooperative efforts, are attacking—and effectively attacking—this perplexing cost-price problem. I am certain that your discussions here will give further impetus to that drive. I mention this phase of the over-all campaign last—not because I think it is least important but because I should like to discuss it more fully at this point.

During the lifetime of most of us gathered here, the American cooperative movement has progressed from a small, struggling upstart to a vast, thriving enterprise. Cooperatives formed by a handful of men two or three decades ago have mushroomed into flourishing organizations, serving many thousands of farmer members.

Cooperatives operate in many fields today, with varying success. I believe that a major reason for their growth and their greatest opportunity to be of further service to agriculture is found in two main areas: the marketing of farm commodities and the cooperative purchasing of the fertilizers, seeds, feeds, and other products which farmers require in their operations. In carrying out these principal functions, farmer cooperatives are hitting the cost-price squeeze from two directions. Cooperative marketing can bring better prices, while cooperative buying often reduces costs.

In an age which places so much emphasis upon size and the dramatic, our sense of values may sometimes become confused.

When we buy a new automobile, it is likely to be horsepower, rather than safety features, which guides our choice. The home-run hitter, who strikes out oftener than he connects, wins the popular applause while the solid team player often goes almost unnoticed. The corporation executive who has guided his firm through a year of record-breaking profits makes the front pages while an important scientific advance may rate a line or two back near the classified ads.

It is understandable enough that we should measure the success of some of our farmer cooperatives by similar standards—by their financial statements, by their volume of business, or even by their total membership. Yet all of us know that the real test is a very simple one: Has this cooperative contributed to a better standard of living for its individual farmer members? Has it increased their income? Has it brought real benefits and services which would not have been theirs except for this cooperative?

If the answer to these questions is "Yes," then we have a farmer cooperative in the true sense of the term.

All of us who are interested in the continuing success of the cooperative movement—members and officials alike—must never lose sight of the real objective. Farmer cooperatives must not adopt abuses once practiced by some commercial enterprises—the very abuses which, in many instances, originally led to the formation of these same cooperatives.

Recently I issued a memorandum relating to the responsibilities and activities of employees of the Department. One section is of particular interest to cooperatives. It provides that no employee of the Department of Agriculture shall approve contracts with any cooperative or other commercial organization which deducts, or checks off from payments owed to farmers, membership dues in any general or specialized farm organization, except with the consent of the individual farmer.

The reason for this order is obvious. It is not the function of the Department of Agriculture to recruit farmers, directly or indirectly, as involuntary members of any organization. I am pleased to report that most cooperatives and farm organizations are apparently in agreement with this philosophy.

As we move into this new year, the Agricultural Act of 1954, with its flexible price supports for basic commodities, will get its first test. It marks a change of direction, rather than any revolutionary upheaval. Adjustments in the level of support will be gradual, in line with President Eisenhower's recommendations.

Tobacco will continue to be supported at 90 percent of parity, and it seems probable that will also be the level for peanuts and cotton in 1955. Current estimates are that corn will be supported at 88 percent of parity. Rice may be supported at about the same level as last year if marketing quotas are approved. Only in the case of wheat will price supports be at the minimum of 82½ percent.

These figures strongly indicate that if farm income from some of the basic crops is lower this year than last, it will not be because of flexible price supports. The reduction will come, if it comes at all, from the curtailment of acreage and production made necessary by surpluses accumulated under the earlier program.

In the case of such feed grains as oats, barley, grain sorghums, and rye—which have been under a system of discretionary flexible price supports for many years—the level for 1955 will be at 70 percent of parity. This represents a reduction from the 85 percent supports prevailing during the last year.

It is apparent that large acreages diverted from wheat, corn, and cotton will go into feed grains—more even than in 1954, which saw a sizeable shift in this direction. Continued supports at 85 percent of parity could only mean the Government would wind up as the owner of a considerable portion of the increased feed grain production.

At the same time, the serious and protracted drought which still grips more than 900 counties in 18 States has created severe local feed shortages. Drought-hit farmers must be given every opportunity to produce as much feed as possible when rains do come. If drought continues, lower price supports will make feed grains available to farmers at less cost than if the Government were bidding a higher price. This will encourage the movement of these grains into channels of consumption, rather than into storage.

I am convinced that our new program of flexible price supports for the basic commodities will work toward better balanced production in the years ahead. And I should like to see this balance restored primarily through an increase in consumption both here and abroad, rather than through continued strict production controls. Flexible supports will help restore the function of price in our marketing system.

We can best insure a continuation of our great progress as a Nation by maintaining a free and fluid economy. Government policy must not be permitted to freeze our agricultural production in uneconomic patterns. Neither should we freeze people in farming or in any other occupation. It is the basic freedom of the individual to shift to new pursuits with the changing times that has helped to make us the most productive country on earth.

All Americans share in the benefits which spring from a free society. The rapid advances brought about through the application of agricultural research and education and improved marketing methods have permitted millions of people to leave the land in recent decades for other productive enterprises in the cities and towns. They are making the automobiles, the radios, the television sets, and a variety of other goods which add to our better living standards. The remarkable efficiency of agriculture has made possible this important contribution to our entire economy.

Select, if you will, any Nation on the face of this globe where one-half or even one-fourth of the total labor force is producing food and fiber to meet domestic needs and you will also find a country barren of most luxury goods and even many of the things we regard as necessities. I have little sympathy for the anguished cries of those who insist that America will be ruined unless Government somehow makes farming so attractive that no rural lad will ever again venture forth to the city. As a Nation, we would never have come this far under such a philosophy. Under it, we wouldn't get where we are going, either.

Who shall say what the future limitations may be upon our national development? In agriculture, what new crops will tomorrow bring? What new uses for old crops? In a world just now entering the atomic age, some of the most exciting laboratories ever known to man may be right on our farms.

Back in 1924 American farmers harvested just under 5 million bushels of soybeans. In 1954 our soybean production was a record-breaking 343 million bushels, with a market value of nearly $1 billion. Thus in the short space of three decades we have seen the development of a new major crop in this country and with it a new major industry.

We may be approaching the day when it won't be possible to coax that one additional egg from our top laying hens. Sometime the top-producing cow on one of our experimental farms will perhaps cock a disapproving eye at a scientist and say, "Look, this has gone far enough—you've got the last pint."

But future generations need fear no shortages of food or fiber if we succeed in bringing the average output of our farms up somewhere near the productive levels of our more efficient units. This, we know, can be done.

For the year ahead the outlook is generally good for agriculture and the Nation as a whole. Business activity is at the highest peacetime level in history. In total we are consuming more food than ever before and our tastes are running more and more to the higher priced protein diet items. This trend seems likely to continue and it emphasizes that the needs of tomorrow will be for more feed and forage to provide the livestock products which our population is demanding.

As I indicated earlier, the new Trade Development Act is helping us expand our foreign markets. To date we have concluded or are in the process of negotiating sales for foreign currency involving $453 million worth of surplus farm commodities owned by Commodity Credit Corporation. Wheat and cotton are the principal items involved, although tobacco, rice, barley, and other commodities will also be included.

There is another comparatively recent development that holds tremendous promise for agriculture. Thanks to President Eisenhower's personal and official concern and the action of the 83d Congress, the Department of Agriculture for the first time has the tools to deal effectively with the problems of small watersheds. We are now prepared to help technically and, to a limited extent, financially, in carrying out projects which the individual cannot complete on his own.

We may now bring the water element into balance with the soil element in our national soil and water program. We have new authorization for approaching soil and water problems on a watershed basis. This will accelerate and implement the soil and water program that has gained so much momentum over the past two decades. It offers new opportunities to work on problems that require community action.

No one can grow up on a southern Idaho farm, as I did, and be oblivious to the anxieties and heartaches surrounding the problems of water development and management. Still fresh in my memory are the disastrous floods that time and again wrought havoc with the canal systems and buried whole farms under sterile debris.

Nor am I unaware of the suffering and anguish which the last 4 years of continued drought have brought farmers and ranchers in the Southeast, parts of the Midwest and southern Great Plains.

These are reasons why I am firmly convinced that our water problem is welded to problems of land and people. Land and water are inseparable in planning and in use. It is the water which carries away so much of our soil. The water problem is not just one of shortages or floods affecting cities and industries. The problem has its beginning up on the farms and in the forests of our small watersheds.

In the Department of Agriculture we are determined to assist farmers to carry out a more effective program of soil and water development and wise utilization on a nationwide basis. This naturally includes protection and development of soil and water resources on individual farms and ranches and also in the small watersheds or subwatersheds.

Everywhere farmers are interested in the efficient use of water. It is the lifeblood of the West, both for irrigated and dryland farming. And in the East, many farmers could use supplementary irrigation at some time during the growing season.

Farmer cooperatives have a vital stake in this whole problem which is tied so closely to the future welfare of agriculture. Currently there is broad interest in the new provision of the amended Water Facilities Act which authorizes direct or insured loans in all

States for soil and water conservation practices—for irrigation, drainage, pasture improvement and reforestation on farms. We may now insure such loans up to a total of $25 million per year.

Farmers who participate in cooperative water developments may now borrow up to $250,000 through the Farmers' Home Administration for a single joint project. The former limitation was $100,000. Private lending agencies are matching the interest of farmers and groups of farmers in this expanded program. Private funds for FHA-insured loans for soil and water development and farm ownership are now available in an amount four times that of a year ago.

I have sought to emphasize in these remarks today several, though by no means all, of the programs which are being directed toward assuring a stable, prosperous and free agriculture. In many of them, farmers are playing the major role. Trade development, market expansion, research, education, conservation and progress through cooperative efforts are continuing, day-in-and-day-out operations. They are seldom dramatic. Consequently they do not always receive the attention they deserve, even though they are responsible for most of the great gains of agriculture.

The future of American agriculture is bright. A kind providence has blessed this Nation with vast natural resources—with soils and climate which with American ingenuity and courage have provided the basis for a standard of living unmatched in any other land. May God guide us in the wise use and conservation of these resources for the benefit of posterity and, indeed, for all mankind.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if no other Senators wish to speak, I desire to make a brief announcement concerning the business of the Senate.

At the conclusion of business today, I plan to move that the Senate adjourn until Friday next. On Friday consideration will be given to Senate Resolution 18, submitted by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and by a substantial majority of the other Members of this body. The subject of the resolution, the continuation of investigations of Communist conspiracy and subversion, was considered briefly on the floor during the recent interim session of the Senate. It may be that after the distinguished minority leader has counseled with Members on his side of the aisle, and perhaps with some of the Members on this side of the aisle, it will be desired to have the resolution referred to a committee.

However, if it be agreeable to the minority leader and the Members on his side of the aisle, and also agreeable to Members on this side of the aisle, I shall move on Friday to take the resolution from the table and ask for its consideration at that time.

I should like to place the Senate on notice that the text of the resolution has been printed in the RECORD and has been discussed on the floor of the Senate previously.

It may very well be that orderly procedure would indicate that the resolution should be referred to a committee; and if that be the feeling of any Member of the Senate, I believe that the distinguished minority leader would join with me in moving that that course be followed. However, that procedure would not be necessary; and if all Senators were in agreement, the resolution might be considered on Friday.

Mr. President, I now move that the Senate adjourn until Friday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 55 minutes) the Senate adjourned until Friday, January 14, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 11, 1955:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Loy W. Henderson, of Colorado, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

James C. H. Bonbright, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal, vice M. Robert Guggenheim, resigned.

James Clement Dunn, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Brazil.

Robert C. Hendrickson, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to New Zealand.

John Lodge, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 2, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Belton O'Neal Bryan, of South Carolina.
J. Robert Fluker, of Kansas.
Harold G. Kissick, of Maryland.
Leonard H. Price, of Virginia.
Louis F. Thompson, of Indiana.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

James S. Beddie, of Maryland.
William L. Hamilton, Jr., of Maryland.
Charles N. Manning, of Virginia.
Norman M. Pearson, of Maryland.
Charles F. Pick, Jr., of Virginia.
George M. Pollard, of Virginia.
Joseph Rosa, of Wisconsin.
Ancel N. Taylor, of Idaho.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

William E. Beauchamp, Jr., of California.
Robert L. Brown, of New Jersey.
Darwin J. DeGolia, of Maryland.
Paul W. Deibel, of Ohio.
Miss Selma G. Freedman, of the District of Columbia.
John K. Havemeyer, of Illinois.
T. Greig Henderson, of the District of Columbia.
John J. Janke, of Ohio.
Miss Elizabeth Jorzick, of the District of Columbia.
Northrop H. Kirk, of California.
Duncan A. D. Mackay, of New Jersey.
John B. Penfold, of Missouri.
Richard B. Peters, of Oklahoma.
Hilding A. Peterson, of Minnesota.
James A. Ramsay, of Massachusetts.
Robert L. Redding, of Florida.
Miss Genevieve F. Rifley, of Nebraska.
Melvin E. Sinn, of Virginia.
Horace L. Talley, of Virginia.
Niemann A. Terry, Jr., of South Carolina.
John C. Thornburg, of Maryland.
Christopher Van Hollen, of the District of Columbia.
Miss A. Dorothea Wool, of Maryland.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Miss Alma M. Armstrong, of Maine.
Howard J. Ashford, Jr., of Colorado.
James H. Ashida, of Washington.
Herbert Corkran, Jr., of Virginia.
Miss Mary G. Crain, of Maryland.
Miss Lois M. Day, of Ohio.
Miss Hazel C. Dougherty, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Eleanor Ebert, of Pennsylvania.
Arne T. Fliflet, of South Carolina.
Miss Helen F. Foose, of California.
Miss Anna G. Foster, of Texas.
Joseph R. Jacyno, of Massachusetts.
Lawrence J. Kennon, of California.
Mrs. Elvira P. Martin, of Connecticut.
Miss Anne W. Meriam, of Massachusetts.
George C. Mitchell, of Nebraska.
Miss Charlotte M. Morehouse, of Virginia.
Peter J. Raineri, of New York.
Clyde F. Roberts, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Miss Harriet C. Thurgood, of Florida.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Richard W. Boehm, of New York.
Richard J. Brynildsen, of California.
Miss Pamela F. Craig, of Pennsylvania.
Daniel H. Daniels, of Virginia.
John R. Davis, Jr., of California.
Donald B. Easum, of Wisconsin.
Louis P. Goelz III, of Pennsylvania.
Lewis D. Junior, of Missouri.
Richard G. Long, of Illinois.
Charles N. Rassias, of Massachusetts.
William F. Ryan, of New York.
Miss Frances A. Usenik, of Minnesota.

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION DIRECTOR

Joseph F. Finnegan, of New York, to be Federal Mediation and Conciliation Director.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 11, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Charles M. Coulter, Epworth Methodist Church, Toledo, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

Father of all men and God of peace, we praise Thee for the innumerable blessings, both spiritual and material, which Thou hast bestowed upon us.

We thank Thee, Father, that Thou hast sent Thy witnesses in every period of our national life; that Thou hast raised up in our legislature noble men and women of clear vision, high ideals, unfaltering courage and with devotion to freedom, truth, and justice, who have enriched our individual and national life.

Our Father, we confess before Thee with sorrow and shame that too often we have tried to live without Thee. May we as a nation humble ourselves now under Thy mighty hand.

Most gracious God, we pray for these Representatives in Congress assembled. Thou knowest the difficult problems which confront them. Endow them with understanding, a pure purpose, and sound speech. Enable them to realize

that Thou dost offer them light to guide, wisdom to understand, and strength to overcome the forces of evil.

We earnestly pray for insight to guide us in these difficult days, that we may build a society worthy of being called the Kingdom of God on earth. This we ask in the name of our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 66)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The 83d Congress made an outstanding record in progressive personnel legislation for the benefit of the Government and its employees. Among other steps forward, the new laws improved overtime pay practices, established a governmentwide incentive awards program, removed restrictive controls on appointments, authorized group life insurance, and extended the benefits of the unemployment insurance system to Federal workers. These changes have taken us a long way toward the goal of combining the best practices of private employers with the special demands of public service.

I am now recommending the enactment of legislation to improve other aspects of Federal personnel management, including adjustments in basic pay scales, group health insurance, employee training, personnel practices affecting Government employees stationed overseas, and increased travel allowances. Specific legislative proposals for carrying out these recommendations will be submitted shortly by the Civil Service Commission, the State Department, and the Bureau of the Budget. Their purpose will be to bring the average governmental remuneration into line with prevailing nongovernmental standards. I earnestly urge favorable consideration of them by the Congress.

ADJUSTMENTS OF PAY SCALES

Pay adjustments are needed (1) to recognize more fully the differences between the duties and responsibilities of positions of varying levels, (2) to relieve as far as possible, under the present ceiling, the increasing compression between the lower and higher salaries, and (3) to take into account the decline in the real income of many Federal employees.

The inequities and deficiencies existing in the present pay scales of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, should be corrected. Similar adjustments should also be made in the pay schedules provided for employees subject to the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and employees in the Veterans' Administration Department of Medicine and Surgery who are subject to Public Law 293, the 79th Congress, as amended.

In a separate message submitted to the Congress today, I am recommending appropriate pay adjustments covering employees of the postal field service.

The recommended changes for the Classification Act group provide for an upward adjustment of pay rates for each grade, except that no change is recommended at this time in the ceiling pay rate of $14,800. Emphasis is placed upon a greater and more meaningful differential between pay scales of successive grades. The proposal recognizes the fact that, in general, compensation rates in the lower grades of the Classification Act are fairly well in line with those prevailing outside the Federal Government while rates in the middle and upper grades have lagged behind.

Insofar as possible, adjustments in the Foreign Service and Veterans' Administration pay schedules should parallel the dollar amounts of pay adjustments provided for Classification Act employees at similar levels.

For Classification Act employees, the recommended pay adjustments would add an additional $202 million or approximately 5 percent to present payroll costs. Even though the correction of inequities in the middle and upper pay levels is a primary objective of the Classification Act pay adjustments, 45.5 percent of the cost results from additional pay proposed for the lowest 5 grades. Only 4.5 percent will be applied in the highest 5 grades. The proposed pay schedules are presented in an appendix to this message.

Proposed changes for employees subject to the Foreign Service Act and those in the department of medicine and surgery of the Veterans' Administration, which are incorporated in the comprehensive proposal, will add approximately $8,500,000 to the cost, making the over-all total approximately $210,000,000.

The Classification Act of 1949, as amended, sets a ceiling on the number of positions that can be placed in grades 16, 17, and 18. Without regard to this ceiling, 19 other statutory authorities permit or require the establishment of additional positions in these 3 highest grades. The Classification Act limitation coupled with this complex array of other authorizations seriously hampers our ability to meet the changing needs of the Government. These conditions prevent sound pay administration and handicap the Federal service in recruiting and retaining top level personnel. Therefore, I am recommending the removal of this ceiling, and urge the consolidation of all existing authorities.

GROUP HEALTH INSURANCE

As another means for strengthening the Federal service, I propose for the consideration of the Congress a contributory system of voluntary health insurance for civilian employees in all branches of the Government and their dependents.

This contributory system has been designed to meet the requirements of the Federal service and to take into account the experience of private employers. The system would permit employees to choose either a standard plan of uniform benefits or an approved plan operating in an individual community when more suitable to employees in that location. It is proposed that the Government contribute approximately one-third the cost of the insurance for the employees and their dependents. It is estimated that the annual cost to the Government will be approximately $55,000,000.

Under the standard plan, a comprehensive set of uniform benefits will be offered, including reimbursement for the costs of hospitalization, surgery, and other personal health services. The newest health insurance features, such as major medical or catastrophe coverage, are included. Appropriate provisions will be made for the continuance of substantial protection for employees and their dependents after they retire in the future—a valuable feature inasmuch as health insurance protection is frequently beyond the reach of those at the older ages.

Where the standard plan is not desired, provision is also made for employees in the various localities to purchase, with Government contributions, approved plans of health insurance especially suited to their needs.

All types of insurers are to be utilized under orderly processes established and supervised by the Civil Service Commission. This contributory system has been developed through the cooperative efforts of representatives of employee groups, insuring organizations and the leaders among the professions in the field of health.

EMPLOYEE TRAINING

Attainment of the greatest possible efficiency in governmental operations is a major goal of this administration. Achievement of this goal requires the effective use of training facilities outside as well as within Government to maintain a high level of competence in the Federal civilian career service.

Most civilian agencies of Government do not have comprehensive and adequate training programs, chiefly because there is no general statutory authority to use outside training facilities. Although it is clearly in the Government's interest to do so, many agencies now cannot send employees to private laboratories, industrial plants, universities, or State agencies for critically needed training in the use of new methods, techniques and machines.

A comprehensive training program should be authorized that will (1) permit Government agencies to use outside facilities for training required to meet operating needs when it is in the Government's interest, (2) consolidate in one law the training authorities now carried in many separate statutes, and (3) permit the establishment of Government-wide policies and effective

controls on the use of outside training facilities.

OVERSEAS PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

At present many different Government agencies conduct a wide variety of governmental functions in the Territories and foreign countries ranging from such activities as postal service and aid to veterans to such newer operations as economic and military aid and technical development programs. The development of sound personnel practices has not always been able to keep pace with the necessarily accelerated growth of Federal operations overseas.

The Civil Service Commission is now taking action, in cooperation with the Federal agencies concerned, to extend the competitive service to those operations overseas that should be included within the regular civil-service system. This will be done in the near future and does not require new legislation.

The State Department already has underway an action program designed to improve personnel administration in both its overseas and departmental activities at home. This program results from the recommendations made by a committee of distinguished citizens appointed by the Secretary of State in March 1954. Certain features of the program will require new legislation in the form of amendments to the Foreign Service Act of 1946. These are now in preparation by the State Department.

There is also a need for improvements in certain conditions affecting all United States citizens employed overseas. Such matters as allowances, leave, housing, retirement, and health, and medical care as well as the whole range of problems posed by the management of alien personnel, require attention. As a first step, the Civil Service Commission will propose for consideration by the Congress comprehensive recommendations on allowances and leave for overseas personnel.

TRAVEL ALLOWANCES

The per diem allowance of $9 for civilian employees who travel on official business was established in 1949. Since that time the cost of lodging, meals, and incidental expenses has increased. It is not fair to ask Government employees to defray part of their official travel and subsistence expenses from their personal funds. Recommendations soon will be submitted to the Congress for an appropriate increase in the present rate.

The various measures, described in this message, are essential to the further improvement of the Federal career service. I earnestly urge that the necessary legislation be enacted by the Congress.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 11, 1955.*

APPENDIX

Analysis of proposed schedules, Classification Act of 1949, as amended

GENERAL SCHEDULE

	Present		Proposed		Increase over present entrance rate [1]		Aggregate increase	Progression of new minimum rate amount
	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Amount	Percent		
1	$2,500	$2,980	$2,625	$3,105	$125	5.0	$791,500	
2	2,750	3,230	2,885	3,365	135	4.9	13,111,875	$260
3	2,950	3,430	3,100	3,580	150	5.1	27,246,300	215
4	3,175	3,655	3,340	3,820	165	5.2	21,871,905	240
5	3,410	4,160	3,600	4,350	190	5.6	17,783,620	260
6	3,795	4,545	4,000	4,750	205	5.4	7,520,835	400
7	4,205	4,955	4,415	5,165	210	5.0	18,642,960	415
8	4,620	5,370	4,850	5,600	230	5.0	4,956,960	435
9	5,060	5,810	5,300	6,050	240	4.7	18,837,600	450
10	5,500	6,250	5,800	6,550	300	5.5	4,114,800	500
11	5,940	6,940	6,300	7,300	360	6.1	18,927,720	500
12	7,040	8,040	7,500	8,500	460	6.5	16,528,720	1,200
13	8,360	9,360	8,800	9,800	440	5.3	9,570,880	1,300
14	9,600	10,600	10,200	11,200	600	6.3	5,239,200	1,400
15	10,800	11,800	11,600	12,600	800	7.4	3,240,000	1,400
16	12,000	12,800	12,800	13,600	800	6.7	373,600	1,200
17	13,000	13,800	13,800	14,600	800	6.2	143,200	1,000
18	14,800	14,800	14,800	14,800	0	0	0	1,000

CRAFTS, PROTECTIVE, AND CUSTODIAL SCHEDULE

1	$1,810	$2,170	$1,885	$2,245	$75	4.1	$1,800	
2	2,420	2,840	2,495	2,915	75	3.1	1,868,325	$610
3	2,552	3,032	2,625	3,105	73	2.9	1,603,445	130
4	2,750	3,230	2,885	3,365	135	4.9	1,717,470	260
5	2,974	3,454	3,100	3,580	126	4.2	1,552,446	215
6	3,200	3,680	3,340	3,820	140	4.4	2,645,160	240
7	3,435	4,035	3,600	4,200	165	4.8	1,603,635	260
8	3,740	4,490	4,000	4,750	260	7.0	1,319,500	400
9	4,150	4,900	4,415	5,165	265	6.4	462,425	415
10	4,565	5,315	4,850	5,600	285	6.2	409,260	435

[1] Each rate of the respective grade increased by same dollar amount, GS-18, single rate of $14,800, unchanged.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT SALARIES AND POSTAL RATES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 65)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Post Office Department, in its daily operations, affects the entire life of the Republic from the family home to the great industry. A vast business-type enterprise within Government, the Post Office Department, consequently, requires a continuing vigilance that its methods, practices, and policies assure the most efficient possible service to the public. The measures recommended in this message are designed to that end.

Last August 23 in announcing my disapproval of H. R. 7774, "An act to increase the rates of compensation of classified, postal, and other employees of the Government, and for other purposes," I expressed a purpose to continue to encourage the enactment of legislation to correct obvious distortions in the pay scales of the postal service and to provide for a more proper and effective relationship between pay and work performed.

I also pointed out the necessity of adequate postage rates in order to check a deficit in the operation of the Post Office Department which, since World War II, has reached the staggering total of more than four billions of dollars.

An increase in the average wage of postal employees along with correction of the serious inequities in the salary structure is an essential step in bringing the wage scale into line with nongovernmental standards and in furthering the progressive personnel program to which the administration is committed. The increase must be accompanied by a salary plan which will place the wages for postal service positions in proper relationship to each other so that inequities will be eliminated, incentive for advancement offered, and the principle of higher pay for more difficult and responsible work followed.

In order to accomplish these objectives, the Postmaster General will submit to the Congress a new postal salary plan along with a 5-percent increase in basic salary rates. This plan will include reasonably detailed descriptions of the series of key positions to which the great majority of postal employees are assigned. A rate range for each of these positions will be recommended, and together this series of rate ranges will make up a related, uniform, and equitable salary schedule.

The Congress will be asked to include the key position descriptions and their appropriate salary ranges in the legislation, thus assigning specific wage rates to the bulk of the positions common to all offices of the postal service.

The Post Office Department should then be granted the authority to allocate the remaining positions, held by the relatively few employees whose work is not covered by a key position, to the proper level in the salary schedule on the basis of a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of these positions with the duties and responsibilities of the key positions.

In the allocation of the positions other than the key positions to the proper salary level an appeal procedure will be provided. Further, to insure that the salary plan will not work to the disadvantage of any employee, the legislation proposed will incorporate a guaranty against reduction of salary so long as the employee occupies the same or a position comparable to that which he held at the time of the installation of the plan.

This legislation would eliminate the inequities inherent in the present inflexible system which requires assignment of all employees to a limited number of job titles, in many cases having no relation to the work actually performed. The present practice of paying salaries to some employees on the basis of the number of cubic feet in the area they supervise, or solely in relation to the number of employees under their direction, would be replaced by a system requiring that salaries be based on the actual duties and responsibilities of the position.

Under this plan, postmasters of the Nation would receive salaries commensurate with the volume of work and the level of the responsibility of their offices rather than solely on the basis of cash receipts which presently govern their compensation. This practice results in discrimination against those holding offices where incoming mail represents most of the business volume.

The total cost of wage adjustments in the postal service is estimated at $129,000,000 a year. I recommend adoption of legislation incorporating these proposals.

The 83d Congress authorized appropriations to be made for the furnishing of uniforms or the payment of an annual allowance to employees, including those of the Post Office Department, required by law or regulation to wear a prescribed uniform while on official duty. This measure, when Congress makes funds available, will benefit post office employees by an estimated $13,500,000 a year.

I am recommending in another special message today a health insurance plan to round out the Federal personnel benefits program enacted by the 83d Congress. This program already has provided group life insurance, unemployment compensation, elimination of restrictions on permanent promotions and reinstatements, adjustment of the statutory limit on the number of career employees, elimination of arbitrary restrictions on accumulation of annual leave, and a liberalized incentive awards system.

I wish to reaffirm my position that sound fiscal management requires consideration of revenues as well as costs. To this end, I am requesting that Congress also consider legislation to adjust postal rates to provide needed revenue.

The combined postal deficits of the 156 years of our history as a nation, up to 1945, are far less than the losses sustained in the last 9 years. The anomaly of this situation is that the period which has witnessed this recordbreaking deficit in the operation of the postal service has also been a decade of unprecedented national prosperity. Employment, production and use of the mails have been at an all time high and yet postal deficits have occurred year after year. Clearly it is time to reaffirm the need for sound fiscal management of the Post Office Department and to develop a positive program toward this end.

In fiscal 1954 the Post Office Department received revenues of $2,268,000,000 for services performed at a cost of $2,667,000,000, thus leaving a deficit of $399,000,000 in its operation. The services performed by the Post Office Department are of measurable value to the recipients. When the rates of postal services fail to provide sufficient revenues to meet the total cost of the service, the difference must be made up by general tax revenues.

A practice of this kind is neither equitable nor reasonable; it is neither good business nor good government. Even if a case could be made for regarding the postal patron and the taxpayer as one and the same, prudence and good sense would compel us to face the fact that it is far more efficient to collect the necessary revenues in direct exchange for services at the post-office window than by the more costly methods of general taxation.

The Post Office is constantly working to reduce the deficit by improving the efficiency of its operations. During the last 2 years substantial progress has been made in organization, mail handling, transportation, mechanization, record keeping, and accounting methods. The Postmaster General has also taken the initiative in increasing rates and fees within his jurisdiction.

As a result of these measures there has been a recent reversal of the postwar trend of ever-increasing postal deficits. These are the operating deficits for each of the last 5 years:

Fiscal year:	*Operating deficit*
1950	$589,500,000
1951	551,500,000
1952	727,000,000
1953	618,800,000
1954	399,100,000

The large deficits in the postwar years are, in part, a direct consequence of the same inflationary increases in costs which all business operations have faced. Private business has increased prices of goods and services to offset increased costs of production. The Post Office operates in the same economic climate as private business. It must meet rising costs in very much the same way.

Since 1945, the largest part of the increase in postal expenditures is accounted for by salary increases legislated by Congress, as follows:

Date	Public Law	Annual increase in cost to Post Office Department
July 1, 1945	134	$178,767,000
Do	106	786,000
Jan. 1, 1946	381	190,631,000
July 1, 1946	390	684,000
Nov. 1, 1949	428	112,489,000
	500	
Do	429	278,000
July 1, 1951	204	248,600,000
July 8, 1951	201	1,100,000

These wage adjustments, combined with an expansion in the number of postal employees necessary to handle the greater volume of mail, have resulted in an increase in total salary costs from $858,000,000 in 1945 to $2,002,000,000 in the last fiscal year.

The increases in wages and other costs since the end of World War II have affected all classes of mail. It is desirable that the rates governing each class of mail be advanced in fair proportion. The committees of Congress responsible for postal-rate legislation will, of course, want to consider carefully the specific rates for each class of mail. The Postmaster General will soon submit to Congress, in addition to his views on increases in postal pay, detailed recommendations for raising postal rates to more reasonable levels. I wish to emphasize at this time a few of the major considerations which seem to me important in raising rates.

1. First-class mail has always provided by far the greater part of postal revenues. In 1933 the revenue contribution of first-class mail was more than 55 percent of total post office revenues. In the last fiscal year first-class mail provided only 40 percent of such revenues, although the proportion of first-class volume to the total volume was only 3 percentage points lower than in the earlier year. The failure of this type mail to maintain its revenue contribution is a major factor in the present postal deficit. There is, therefore, an urgent need to increase the rate of postage of first-class mail.

Postal rates are payments made by users of the mails for services received. The rate established for each service should reflect the value of that service in terms of speed, priority of handling, and the privileges incorporated in each class of mail. If these factors are taken into consideration in ratemaking, the revenue contribution of first-class mail is clearly inadequate.

The privacy, security, and swift dispatch of letter mail; the priority of service at all times, in all places; and the intrinsic value of such mail are factors which are pertinent to postal ratemaking in addition to the cost factor.

But the present 3-cent rate for first-class letter mail has not been increased in almost a quarter of a century. During this period the costs of all goods and services have almost doubled. I am convinced that the American people will understand, appreciate, respect, and support congressional action to provide for a long-overdue rate increase on letter mail which will go far toward balancing the postal budget.

2. The revenues derived from second-class mail are clearly inadequate. These rates which apply to newspapers and magazines should be increased until such matter makes a fair and reasonable contribution to postal revenues. The Postmaster General will recommend a two-step increase in second-class rates which will enable publishers to adjust more readily to the proposed rate changes.

3. Third-class mail consists largely of advertising matter. In fiscal year 1954 the revenue contribution of such mail fell substantially below the cost of providing this service and was a major factor contributing to the postal deficit. The rates of postage on such matter should be increased so that the users of this class of mail pay a proportionately fair share of postal revenues.

In view of the recurring fiscal problems of the Post Office Department, and of the heavy burden which postal deficits continue to impose on the Federal Treasury, I strongly recommend to Congress the formal adoption of a policy which will insure that in the future the Post

Office Department will be essentially self-supporting.

Certain services which are performed by the post office, such as those for the blind, are a part of general welfare services. The cost of such services should not be borne by users of the mails. Expenditures for them, and for services performed for the Government, should be identified and met by direct appropriation.

If the post office is successfully to meet the challenge of the future its prices must be sufficiently flexible to reflect changes in costs and the developing needs of a dynamic economy. It is my belief that an independent commission entrusted with the authority to establish and maintain fair and equitable postal rates can best provide this needed flexibility.

There are also other advantages. Such a commission, guided by policies laid down by the Congress, would have the time and facilities to make thorough analytical studies before prescribing rate changes. A commission well versed in the economics of modern pricing practices can continuously appraise and reappraise the soundness of the postal-rate structure. Legislation to secure these ends should be enacted by Congress.

With these views in mind I recommend to Congress the adoption of a temporary increase in postal rates as an interim measure and the establishment and activation within the interim period of a permanent commission to prescribe future rate adjustments under broad policy guidance of Congress.

Let me reiterate—the financial problems of the postal service result, in large measure, from lack of a positive program leading toward a well-defined fiscal goal. I am, therefore, recommending to Congress the following five-point program for the Post Office Department:

1. Approval of the new salary plan and a 5-percent increase in basic salary rates.

2. Adoption by Congress of the policy that henceforth the Post Office Department shall be self-supporting.

3. Separation of those postal costs to be paid by the patron from those costs which should be paid by general taxation.

4. Establishment by Congress of a permanent commission authorized to prescribe postal-rate adjustments under policy guidance of Congress.

5. Enactment by Congress of an interim rate bill which will, pending activation of the Rate Commission, provide immediate revenue to meet proposed pay increases and reduce the postal deficit.

Approval of this program will be in the public interest for it will further assure efficient service by the Post Office Department.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 11, 1955.*

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

OFFICE OF THE DOORKEEPER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 81) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 6, 1955, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, additional compensation to the special employee, Office of the Doorkeeper, at the basic rate of $700 per annum.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 82) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 6, 1955, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, additional compensation to the two floor managers of telephones (one for the minority), Doorkeeper's Department, at the basic rate of $500 per annum each in addition to the total basic amount they are now receiving.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE HONORABLE KENT E. KELLER

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House the passing of Kent E. Keller, a former distinguished Member of this House. Mr. Keller passed away at his home in Ava, Ill., on September 3, 1954, a few miles away from the log cabin in which he was born.

Kent Keller served the people of Illinois in the 72d to the 76th Congresses; a number of his colleagues who mourn his passing are here today.

An able and energetic man, Kent Keller called on the variety of his experience as a teacher, newspaperman, writer, and lecturer, as well as on his background and training in the law, to become the benefactor of the 25th District of Illinois. His accomplishments were many and of the highest order, and always had the welfare of the people as their basis. When he assumed office, there were no bridges over the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers in his area; when he left, there were many. A veterans' hospital was built, and so were other projects during his tenure, such as a large defense plant, known as Crab Orchard Lake. Yet Kent Keller was far from being only local in his interests and efforts.

Legislation worked for by Kent Keller resulted in greater equity in wage and work-hour conditions for labor; in the establishment of the National Archives Building here in Washington; constantly he worked for assistance to the unemployed throughout our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, in my own hometown of West Frankfort, Franklin County, in the great State of Illinois, I can look around in any direction and see the accomplishments achieved by Kent Keller, the man from Ava, Ill., to whom not only the people of Illinois but also the people of our Nation owe grateful memory. For no greater tribute can be paid to anyone than to say, "The welfare of others was his greatest concern."

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my remarks to those of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] in paying tribute to the memory of a great son of Illinois, the Honorable Kent E. Keller.

Everyone who knew Kent Keller loved him. When I heard of his passing it was with a grieving heart.

Kent Keller served in this Chamber as a Member of the 72d, 73d, 74th, 75th, and 76th Congresses. No Congressman ever did more or got more for his district and its people. As a freshman he surprised older and experienced colleagues by getting a total of 42 young women from his district jobs with the Library of Congress. Through his efforts a large Federal project, Crab Orchard Creek Dam, was started in his district, entailing an expenditure of some $82 million and opening southern Illinois to industry.

He was the close friend and counselor of President Franklin D. Roosevelt and either fathered or was active in the support of many major legislative measures of the first rich decade of the Roosevelt ian era.

He will be remembered by old Chicagoans and surviving victims of the real-estate bond tragedy as their fighting friend and champion when the Congress, responding to their petition with a million signatures which they commissioned me to bring to Washington, created a select committee to inquire into their grievances. The late beloved Congressman A. J. Sabath was the chairman of that committee and both Sabath and Keller did a herculean job that gave to many thousand plundered and penniless holders of $8 billion in defaulted real-estate bonds the first glimpse of sunshine in a long night of depression and black hopelessness.

In 1940 the district for which he had done so much failed him. By a narrow vote he was defeated for membership in the 77th Congress. He tried again in 1942, again in 1944. President Roosevelt dispatched him to Mexico City for 2 years of outstanding service as special adviser to the United States Ambassador. Then back to his beloved home at Ava in Jackson County, the home with the garden of roses famous for miles around, and another try for his old seat in the Congress. Again in 1948 he tried and again the smile of political fortune was denied him.

The last time I saw Kent was in 1950. It was shortly before the date of the Democratic primaries. Kent was going

back to make another valiant battle. He was then 83 years old, tall, erect, majestic in bearing, still an optimist, still every inch of him a fighter.

He shook my hand warmly—I felt in his clasp an unworded message of an affection of four decades of friendship—as we parted.

"I'll be back," he said in parting. "They won't fail me this time. I'll be back in the 82d Congress and together you and I will be in a legislative body, catching up where we left off in the old Senate Chamber at Springfield."

Kent did win in the primary election that year. The party organization was not with him, the nod going to a younger man. But Kent, fighting it out on his own, won the day in the primaries. He thought fate at long last was to smile upon him as it had in earlier years. He put everything that he had into the election campaign. But again the fruit of victory was denied him.

It was Kent Keller's last battle. After that he gave more and more of his time to his books, to the friends who came to Ava as pilgrims to a shrine of democracy, and to his garden of roses. It was there among the roses, the patch of flowers of his cultivation and his love, that the stroke, ending in his death, came.

I have hanging on my wall a photograph of the State Senate of Illinois of which Kent Keller was a brilliantly distinguished member, and of which I was honored to be the president. The late Honorable Morton D. Hull, later for 5 terms a Member of this body from the district I now represent, and the late Honorable Niel Juul, for 2 terms a Member of this body, also served in the Illinois Senate of many years ago, the picture of which hangs in my office to hearten and to inspire me in the activities of the present by memories of the great statesmen and great Americans of the Woodrow Wilson era.

To the young man whose maiden speech in the well of this House was to remark the passing of Kent Keller, I wish to say that had my beloved friend and our late colleague been privileged to be here in understanding consciousness, he would have said with me that no speaker could have conveyed a message of bereavement and of tribute with more feeling and eloquence and framed in better diction. Kent Keller would be proud that the first Democrat from his district since Kent's defeat in 1940 is so well equipped to carry on for our democracy and our people where the gallant battler left off.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] may address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next, after the disposition of the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

TRANSFER OF THE NARCOTICS DIVISION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Secretary General Dag Hammarksjold of the United Nations has before him a recommendation of the Third Committee at the U. N. to transfer the United Nations' Narcotics Division from New York to Geneva. This proposal is clearly not in the best interests of the United States, the United Nations, or of the effective control of the illicit narcotics traffic.

The reasons for suggesting the transfer to Geneva are shrouded in deep political mystery. There are many offices or divisions of the U. N. which could be taken out of this country. Why was the Narcotics Division selected? This is all the more strange when one realizes that President Eisenhower recently appointed a special interdepartmental committee to review and coordinate the Federal Government's programs to combat narcotic addiction in this country. In a letter from the White House to Secretary Humphrey, dated November 27, 1954, the President said:

> Receipt of the committee's report on both subjects (to define more clearly the scope of the problems which we face and to promote effective cooperation among Federal, State, and local agencies) as promptly as possible will expedite systematic review and improvement of our narcotics programs—local, national, and international.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it would be most unwise for the Secretary General to effect this transfer, and a grave mistake to do it before the President's committee has an opportunity to report. Our most effective work in combating this terrible evil may call for an energetic international office in this country. To eliminate at this time the New York division of the U. N. with its specialized laboratory could be disastrous. The United States for years has been the world leader in opposition to the illicit dope traffic. Right now the problem is as serious as ever. Recognizing this the American Legion, Department of California, through its commander, Mr. Malcolm M. Champlin wrote Mr. Hammarksjold on December 2, 1954, as follows. I include the first two paragraphs of his letter:

> The American Legion of California has noted a press report a few days ago of the proposal to transfer the United Nations Narcotic Division from New York to Geneva.
>
> We wish to protest this move on the grounds that the United States has a serious narcotic problem which is due entirely to the international illicit traffic, and that there are many international narcotic treaties being administered by the United Nations in New York which attempt to stop the smuggling of narcotics from abroad to the State of California. We, therefore, consider it vitally important to retain at the United Nations headquarters in New York its Narcotic Division in order to maintain close cooperation with the United States, which is one of the most important victim countries of this traffic. We feel that the transfer to Geneva will result in a psychological defeat for your narcotic program, and we predict that if this transfer goes through it will result in a decided lessening of international narcotic controls.

It is quite evident that the transfer of the Narcotic Division to Geneva would remove it from the watchful eye of American newspapermen and that its efforts would receive less news coverage. Likewise, it will be removed from a country which is vitally interested in the strictest control of narcotics.

The man probably most interested in this problem, Commissioner of Narcotics H. J. Anslinger, wrote me on December 30, 1954, to say:

> We are not in favor of this transfer.

The recent chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY, has been deeply concerned with this proposed transfer. On November 9, 1954, he wrote our Ambassador to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge, saying:

> I cannot help but feel that in view of the fact that the preponderant effect on narcotics research and on enforcement effort against worldwide illicit traffic is made by the United States, that the Division should definitely be kept here in this country.

I certainly hope that the Secretary-General will give considerable weight to the opinion of these distinguished gentlemen. In fighting this international evil the U. N. needs the complete cooperation and assistance of the United States and the United States needs the same from the United Nations. This mutual cooperation and assistance will not be increased by moving the U. N. Narcotics Division to Geneva.

Not only does this proposed transfer come at a time when the President's interdepartmental committee is at work, but it follows shortly on the return of Clement Attlee from Red China. The France-Turkey-United Kingdom resolution passed in Committee Three seems to have resulted from some of the information Mr. Attlee obtained on his visit. We should insist that nothing be done by the U. N. which would in any way increase the influence of Red China either in the U. N. or in the world at large. We in the United States must be alert to any effort by the Chinese Communists to decrease the effectiveness of international control of the illicit narcotic traffic. Not only are the lives of our children and young people involved, but also those of many other enlightened nations of the world.

Some will say that this is an economy measure and that money will be saved by building a laboratory in Geneva and transfering all narcotic work to the Switzerland city. This claim cannot stand close scrutiny. It will take many years to amortize the additional cost, estimated at $25,000, required for moving to Geneva.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would urge that Secretary-General Hammarksjold exercise his prerogative to keep the Narcotics Division in New York. We cannot risk weakening an effective

weapon against an international enemy; we do not want to endanger the lives of potential victims of the vicious dope peddlers by neglecting to protest this move. I ask my colleagues to urge the Secretary-General to keep this Division in New York. We want to see nothing done which will weaken the power of the U. N. or which will cause the people of the United States to be less enthusiastic in their support of the United Nations.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am not quite ready to make my speech. I ask unanimous consent to address the House today at the conclusion of the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

JOSEPH B. KEENAN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, our country enjoys the services of many men of profound talent and achievement—and even greatness—who, while not without recognition, are rarely accorded the eminent place in history which it seems to me they abundantly deserve. One of these distinguished citizens who served his country well and mightily was Joseph B. Keenan who died on December 8, 1954, in Asheboro, N. C. I cannot let his passing go without some memorial—if only in the form of brief and simple words—in the Congress of the United States. For Joe Keenan was not only a patriot whose great abilities were given to his country at the peak of his career, but he was my friend and the friend of many here in the Congress to whom his death strikes deep bereavement.

Keenan's friendship had a certain special dignity because—speaking from personal knowledge—it was interwoven with his love of country and his loyalty to his job, his loyalty to his chief—whether it was a senior law partner or the President of the United States—and, most of all his loyalty to his deeply held principles and his deep religious faith. Someone said that a friend should be one in whose understanding and virtue we can equally confide, and whose opinion we can value at once for its justness and its sincerity. Those lines may well serve as a kind of epitaph for Joe Keenan. But here I must add that Joe Keenan was not some cold and aloof embodiment of all the virtues cast in chilly marble but rather a warm and ingratiating human being whose talk had wit and candor and whose personality sparkled with the thinking of an educated man who could be cordial as well as courteous and who enjoyed his fellow man as his fellow man enjoyed him.

Seeing it in retrospect, Keenan's life, before he achieved national fame, seems to have been a preparation—as if by God's design—for the several jobs he eventually performed for his State, his country, and for justice on the international stage. He was born in Pawtucket, R. I., the neighbor State to my own Massachusetts, getting his degrees in due course from Brown University and the Harvard Law School. He served with the cavalry—an almost forgotten military term these days—on the Mexican border. In World War I he served in France and his natural proclivity for the law soon found him in the office of the Judge Advocate General. His civil career really began in Cleveland where he headed the law firm of Keenan & Butler after a tour of duty with Day, Day, & Wilkin.

The fighting tenacity of Joe Keenan emerged first perhaps to the point of public recognition when Gov. James M. Cox selected him to stand at the side of the Ohio attorney general and clean up the crime problems plaguing Cleveland. That was the beginning of his spectacular and successful career as one of the first of the Nation's foremost "gangbusters," a title the newspapers of the country and the magazines were soon to give him. It was purely in the logic of events that the then United States Attorney General under President Franklin Delano Roosevelt—Homer S. Cummings—should bring Keenan to Washington as a special assistant to bust up the cloud of crime and kidnapings that afflicted the Nation. With even more sensational success and on an even more enduring level Joe Keenan did for his country what he had just completed doing for Cleveland. He deadened the impact of crime in the United States. Many a gangster and hoodlum, many a kidnaper and killer, was rendered harmless behind prison walls because, so to speak, Keenan had picked him up by the scruff of the neck and the seat of the pants and removed him from society. Where the Federal law was weak he strengthened it, where it was lacking he helped to create it. And the Congress after due deliberation and in accordance with its own final judgment enacted the measures it found fit to accept on his recommendation.

That is what I mean when I use the word "enduring," for Joe Keenan's usefulness to the American people lives today in the statutory law of the land. It was, of course, in this very Chamber that the laws he framed were debated and passed, as they were in the Senate. The now live and potent Lindbergh kidnaping law which stands as a threatening deterrent to every would-be kidnaper was of Joe Keenan's making. But for the overwhelming tragedy that precipitated it and the famous name the tragedy involves it might well have been called today the Keenan law. A new dynamism electrified the Department of Justice and in a matter of weeks and months the long arm of retribution developed the speed and the sinews it needed to stop crime dead in its tracks. There are 10 crime laws he either authored, sponsored, or fought for and which owe their existence more or less to his initiative and dogged determination.

Attorney General Cummings, to be sure, had moved Joe Keenan up to head the Criminal Division in the Department of Justice.

It was again inherent in the logic of events that Joe Keenan should come to the attention of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who had no mean genius at picking good men and who soon began to refer to Keenan as "Joe the Key." His canny judgment and unique quality for mingling candor with tact made him an ideal liaison man when the White House had a particularly important and delicate program for which it sought support on the Hill. I am sure that when duty and loyalty to his Chief demanded it—consonant with his patriotic convictions—he performed as an advocate for the White House whatever his own views may have been.

For many of us evaluating the life of Joseph B. Keenan it must seem that his outstanding service in history was his prosecution of the Japanese war crimes cases, a job to which President Harry Truman appointed him. It was perhaps the most arduous and the most exacting of the tasks which had been tossed in his competent lap and he plunged into it with indefatigable energy and directness. That story is a great chapter in the annals of our time. Seven Japanese war criminals including War Premier Hideki Tojo—Japanese leaders who had caused untold horror to the world and to our troops went to their justly sentenced death. There was a period between 1939 and 1945 when Joe Keenan returned to the private practice of the law. But there can be no doubt about it that the most productive period of his life as a great lawyer was given to his country. Joe Keenan understood politics and was a great publicist for the causes he espoused. His work as a prosecutor and author of legislation contributed to the internal safety of the Nation and the American home. For many of us here today he was a familiar and popular figure in Washington and an immensely dependable one.

This is for me—gentlemen of the Congress—a reverent moment and I cannot help but feel that the hearts of many of his friends are right now in the grave with Joseph B. Keenan.

WHY WE NEED AN ADEQUATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, when we talk about small business, what usually happens is that each of us is thinking in terms of his own peculiar imagery. The picture each of us usually has in mind is some particular business firm or group of firms that we have come to think of as typical of small business. We frequently forget how many small businesses there are, and what a wide variety of activity they are engaged in. What is more important, we sometimes forget why it is that we must preserve small business. Consequently, we sometimes lose a sense of proportion concerning the things that require our attention, and concerning the adequacy of the things we do to insure that kind of climate to which small business can adapt itself shall be preserved.

I should like, briefly, to remind the Members of a few facts and precepts which help to put these matters in perspective.

IMPORTANCE OF SMALL BUSINESS

All told, there are about 4 million business firms in the United States—the total business population as of the end of 1953 is estimated by the Department of Commerce to be 4.2 million. See also Department of Commerce, Survey of Current Business, January 1954, page 11. This is not counting professional offices, such as doctors' and dentists' offices and law firms. Of these 4 million firms, more than 3 million are firms which have 3 or less paid employees—all data relating to size distribution of firms by number of employees are from Department of Commerce, Survey of Current Business, May 1954, page 15 and the following. Many of these, of course, have no paid employees. The proprietor and other members of the family do all the work.

Perhaps we can get a better grasp of these figures if we recall that there are less than 5½ million farm families in the United States—data on number of farm families are by telephone to the Farm Population Division, Department of Agriculture, January 5, 1954. I shall not develop the point, but I invite you to compare, in your own minds, the amount of necessary attention we give to farmers, and the amount of Federal money properly spent on agriculture—on the Department of Agriculture, the county agents, the experiment stations and research laboratories, on the conservation and other programs—with the amount of attention and assistance given to small business. I am not suggesting that the attention and assistance given to farmers is too much. On the contrary, the point of my remarks will be that the House should at least continue the life of its committee for keeping itself informed about small business, and that this committee should be given funds which are in somewise adequate to the job of keeping you informed.

Coming back to the figures, we find that about 95 percent of the 4 million business firms have less than 20 paid employees, and about 98 percent have less than 50 paid employees—Survey of Current Business, May 1954, page 15 and the following.

These small firms—which are the overwhelming majority of all firms—are scattered throughout almost every conceivable line of business. In every major division of business—in mining and quarrying; in contract construction; in manufacturing; in transportation, communication, and other public utilities; in wholesale and retail trade; in finance, insurance, and real estate; and in the service industries—a major share of the operating businesses are quite small. Tiny firms, firms with less than 4 employees, account for more than 60 percent of the firms in every division, with the exception of manufacturing—Survey of Current Business, May 1954, page 15 and the following. And even in manufacturing, such firms account for more than 42 percent—Survey of Current Business, May 1954, page 15 and the following. These figures are from a very excellent study published by the Department of Commerce, and they are as of 1951. They are, however, sufficiently up to date for our purpose here. An official of the Department has expressed an opinion that the figures would not have changed very much by December of 1954.

FEW CONTROL MOST BUSINESS

Now there is another side to the coin. Business firms are not the same as amount of business done. A lion's share of all the business done in the United States is controlled by a very few but very large corporate empires. Quite a few corporations have more than 10,000 employees apiece. They account for less than one-tenth of 1 percent of all the business firms, but they also account for more than 38 percent of all the paid employees—Survey of Current Business, May 1954, page 15 and the following. By this count, moreover, each subsidiary in the corporate family is counted as a separate firm. If we had combined figures we would find even fewer firms at the top of the heap, but accounting for well over half of all the employees.

Turning to the reports of Internal Revenue, we find that for the year 1951 about 650,000 corporations reported assets totaling $648 billion—asset and income data are from Internal Revenue Service, Statistics of Income for 1951, part 2. A few of the corporations, 757 of them, each had assets of more than $100 million. And these assets totaled $336 billion, or more than half of all the corporate assets. Some 551 corporations reported net incomes—not sales, but profits—of more than $10 million each. And altogether the net income of these 551 totaled $22 billion, or about half of all the corporate net income. Here, too, the figures are not fully consolidated for the various subsidiaries of the same corporations.

CONCENTRATION OF BUSINESS

If we had time to examine this matter further, we would find that no large sector of business is typically small business, and conversely there is no sector of business which has not been invaded by the big corporations.

It was only about two generations ago that big corporations appeared in more than a few sectors of business. This was after a few Wall-streeters and stock manipulators began buying up and merging large numbers of independent companies. Since that time, business has become more and more concentrated into the hands of the few. There have been new small businesses of course, and in recent years there have been more business firms in operation than ever before. But the growth of small business has not kept pace with the general growth of business. This has continued to be true up to and through World War II, although in the later years the big corporations did not take over at so rapid a pace as in the earlier decades of this century. Studies made for the years 1935 and 1950 show that several industries became highly concentrated in this period, whereas they had been small business industries before—data on changes in concentration of manufacturing are 1935 to 1950 and are from Federal Trade Commission. In manufacturing as a whole, the 200 largest corporations produced 37.7 percent of all the manufactured goods produced in 1935—data on changes in concentration of manufacturing are 1935 to 1950 and are from Federal Trade Commission. In 1950 this percentage rose to 40.5 percent—data on changes in concentration of manufacturing are 1935 to 1950 and are from Federal Trade Commission. This was a significant increase in concentration, when we consider that there was a great growth in business between the depression year of 1935 and the boom year 1950. In periods of business decline, it is inevitable that small business loses out. Consequently, in periods of business expansion, small business would have to make gains just to hold its own over the long stretch. In the post-World War II years, small business has, we think, about held its own. Although this too has been a period of expansion, when gains should have been made. Up through 1952, small business was in a fairly sound position. It was in some measure, in a position to expand.

FACING NEW PERIOD OF BUSINESS EXPANSION

We are now coming into a new period of business expansion—or so we hope. That is the administration's announced hope, and presumably the administration's policies will be keyed to this objective. But small business is not now in a position to make its proportionate share of the new expansion. In 1952 small-business profits compared not too unfavorably with big-business profits. In the first half of that year, the rate of profits—after taxes—of the smallest size class of manufacturers was almost on a parity with the biggest manufacturers. Those firms with less than one-fourth million dollars of assets were making profits at an annual rate of 10.6 percent after taxes—rates of profits are computed as percentages of stockholders' equity. They are from Federal Trade Commission and Security and Exchange Commission, Quarterly Financial Report, second quarter, 1954. The biggest firms, those having more than $100 million of assets, had a corresponding profit rate of 11.8 percent. In the first half of 1954, profits of the smallest group had dropped to 4.1 percent, while the rate for the biggest corporations had increased to 12 percent. This was after the new tax law took effect. In other words, in the course of 2 short years

profits after taxes of the smallest manufacturers dropped 61 percent, while corresponding profits of the biggest firms increased by 6 percent.

DETERMINE CAUSE OF SHIFT IN PROFITS

Your Small Business Committee should look into this matter, and try to find out what is behind this shift in profits. And there are many other important matters that need looking into. These are complex matters. We live in a complex age; the economic forces, the laws, the rules and regulations, the executive policies affecting business are all complex—and they are interrelated.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE FOR 14 YEARS IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The Small Business Committee, which has now been in existence for 14 years, is not a legislative committee. And I am not now asking that it be made a legislative committee. The great need, and the proper function of a small-business committee, is to specialize in understanding the problems of small business in all of their interrelated aspects, and to call attention of the appropriate legislative committees to the effects upon small business, of specific legislative proposals. It is the Small Business Committee of the House that several million small businesses have come to look to, over the years, for this wholesome and proper function.

Now, in nothing I have said have I given or intended to give a precise definition of small business. That is a complicated subject, and needs no precise definition here. It is not as if we had to draw a boundary line and declare that business on one side of the line is friend and that on the other is foe. Obviously, it will always be the policy of Congress to help all business, large and small. We are not out to destroy big business; we merely wish to see, and we must see, that in the course of our decisions as to how the economic pie shall be cut, who shall have the advantages and who the disadvantages, small business is given an opportunity to keep pace in the race.

WHY SMALL-BUSINESS COMMITTEE?

Why, then, do we need a special committee to be the eyes and ears of small business? The answer is—and I say this only for the benefit of some of the new Members—big business has fully adequate ways of knowing what is going on here in Washington, and of making its wishes known. You will come to learn that big business has lobbyists on top of lobbyists, and they are expert lobbyists. Big firms have, right here, expert legal counsel, expert public-relations counsel, and expert counsels of other kinds. And elsewhere they have facilities for making their wishes known in both direct and indirect ways. They control national organizations, they have special organizations that can, when the occasion demands, create grassroot lobbies. They have trade journals and powerful advertising organizations.

Altogether, about $7 billion a year is spent on advertising in this country. This sum is almost equal to the cost of all the civilian functions of the Federal Government, including all other subsidies to big business. I will not call this $7 billion spent on advertising waste, but I will, as a Harvard economist has done, refer to it as "fat" in our economic system. The same economist has pointed out that if we were a poor Nation, where everybody had to work to produce sufficient beans and potatoes and other necessities of life, we would not have to spend so much money to persuade people to buy things they don't know they want—see Kenneth Galbraith, American Capitalism: The Concept of Countervailing Power.

This $7 billion spent for advertising is mostly spent by big business. It is the lifeblood of the communications business—the radio, the television, the national magazines, and the newspapers. It would be surprising, therefore, if these media were not influenced to a big business point of view.

It is even thought that big business may have some high representation in the present administration.

IF A FEW GIANTS CONTROL

We do not know what the result will be if a few giant corporations come to control all of the economic activities of this country. Perhaps we would have fewer problems to worry our heads about if we lived under an economic oligarchy, where all of our decisions would be made for us by a hidden, self-perpetuating management which is largely divorced even from any ownership control. But, certainly, this would mean a radical change in our form of government. One of the fundamental precepts upon which our form of government is based is that power shall be largely diffused among the people. This has, from the very beginning of this Nation, been recognized to mean both economic power and political power, for the two are inseparable.

Small business also needs a way of communicating with its House of Representatives. I hope that you will continue your interest in the several million small-business firms of the country by continuing the life of your Small Business Committee, and by providing it with adequate funds.

WHAT IS BEHIND THE CHANGES IN BUSINESS PROFITS?

We have all been reading that business profits held up remarkably well in 1954. The preliminary indications are, moreover, that this will prove to be true. We know, of course, that profits before taxes have dropped precipitously. But with the lower tax rates which became effective in 1954, profits which may be retained by business will probably compare not too unfavorably with retained profits in the previous year. And as we know, during the first year of the new administration, business profits as a whole continued about the same as in 1952, the last year of a Democratic administration.

According to reports compiled by the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Federal Trade Commission, profits of manufacturing corporations before taxes were at an annual rate of 22.1 percent in 1952; 22.6 percent in 1953; and 19.2 percent in the first half of 1954. Thus, before taxes the profit rate in the first half of 1954 was 15.8 percent lower than in the first half of 1952. If we compare the rates after taxes, however, we find that for all manufacturing corporations combined, the rate in the first half of 1954 was only 2 percent less than in the first half of 1952. More specifically, manufacturers' profits after taxes were at an annual rate of 10.1 percent in the first half of 1952; 11 percent in the first half of 1953; and 9.9 percent in the first half of 1954. Both official and unofficial reports agree that the business recession which was in evidence in the first half of 1954 continued into the third quarter of that year, and that thereafter there was a substantial recovery in the fourth quarter. Today, there is a note of business optimism—at least in some quarters. The administration predicts a great expansion of business capacity and pins our economic future on that prediction. There is a wave of mergers taking place, in which big firms are buying up small firms of all kinds. And there is a speculative boom in the stock market.

In view of all this activity and this official optimism, we may reasonably ask then, Is there any legitimate basis for all complaints from small business? Why are small firms so generally pessimistic and why are so many of them folding up and selling their plants to their larger competitors? The answer is not hard to find; we need only to look behind these figures on overall profits to find that the very biggest corporations have substantially increased their profits; that profits of corporations of lesser sizes have dropped; and in the case of the smaller ones, they have dropped to a comparative nothing.

In the first half of 1952, the last year of a Democratic administration, the smallest size group of manufacturers—those firms having total assets of less than $250,000—had a profit rate which was almost on a parity with the profit rate of the very largest size group—those firms having assets of more than $100 million. More specifically, profits of the smallest size group were at an annual rate of 10.6 percent, after taxes, while profits of the giants were at an annual rate of 11.3 percent, after taxes. But in the first half of last year, 1954, the after-taxes profit rate of the smallest size group had dropped to 4.1 percent, a drop of 61.4 percent. The profit rate of the giants, on the other hand, had risen to 12.0 percent, or an increase of 6.1.

These figures should shake every man in this Chamber out of his seat. For they will surely shake the foundations of our Nation unless something is done to correct them and to correct the causes which bring them about. Let me put it to each of you: What do you think the eventual effect will be when in the course of 2 short years the profit rate after taxes drops 61.4 percent for the smallest manufacturers and increases 6 percent for the biggest manufacturers?

What about the size groups in between? The answer is as a general, but not unvarying, rule that the smaller the corporation, the lower the profit rate after taxes. And also as a general, but not unvarying, rule, the smaller the corporation, the bigger the decrease in its profit rate between the first half of 1952 and the first half of 1954. The profit

rates, on an annual basis, after taxes were as follows:

Corporations with total assets of:	Profit rate Percent
Under $250 thousand	4.1
$250 thousand to $1 million	6.4
$1 to $5 million	5.7
$5 to $10 million	7.6
$10 to $50 million	8.7
$50 to $100 million	8.6
Over $100 million	12.0
All sizes	9.9

Similarly, the changes in profit rates, after taxes, between the first half of 1952 and the first half of 1954 were as follows:

Corporations with total assets of:	Change in profit rate Percent
Less than $250 thousand	−61.4
$250 thousand—to $1 million	−28.8
$1 million to $5 million	−28.8
$5 to $10 million	−10.6
$10 to $50 million	− 8.5
$50 to $100 million	− 9.5
Over $100 million	+ 6.1
All sizes	− 2.0

The profit rates we have been discussing are computed as percentages of what is called the stockholders' equity. Stockholders' equity is paid in capital, plus earned surplus, and thus it includes all investment in the corporation except borrowed capital. But whether we look at profits on stockholders' equity or profits per dollar of sales, we find the same results—except that in the latter case we find in the picture an even greater disparity between large and small corporations. In the first half of 1954, profits per dollar of sales, after taxes, for the biggest corporations was more than six times the rate for the smallest-size group. And the rate for the smallest-size group had dropped 60.9 percent from the first half of 1952, while the rate for the giants had risen by 10.5 percent.

Profit rates per dollar of sales for each size group, together with the change in rate from the first half of 1952, were as follows—this is after taxes:

	Profit per dollar of sales	Change in profit rate from 1st half of 1952
Corporations with total assets of—	*Cents*	
Less than $¼ million	0.9	−60.9
$¼ to $1 million	1.9	−17.4
$1 to $5 million	2.1	−19.3
$5 to $10 million	3.4	−2.9
$10 to $50 million	4.0	0
$50 to $100 million	4.0	−2.5
Over $100 million	6.3	+10.5
All sizes	4.5	+7.1

Thus in the manufacturing fields at least, we find that instead of a general expansion of business, the giant corporations are becoming more profitable and growing, while the smaller corporations are becoming less profitable, drying up, and selling out. As for firms in other lines of business, the distribution and service trades, we have no authoritative profits reports. I know, however, of no difference in the economic forces playing upon these trades, or in the Government-made forces affecting these trades, with this one exception: Profits of manufacturers are much more affected by the way Federal procurement contracts are distributed than are profits in other fields, since most of the Federal procurement is from manufacturers. At least I would expect that the shift has not been quite so great in the nonmanufacturing fields as it has been in the manufacturing fields. It should be remembered, however, that these firms whose profits have been reported are not engaged in manufacturing exclusively. Many, if not most of these, perform also some distribution and service functions. Many have their own wholesale and even retail and service outlets. They are classified as manufacturers merely because the principal phase of their business is manufacturing and, moreover, the profits from all phases of their business are included in the figures we have considered. Hence, we may expect that the profits shift from small to large firms among these companies will not be greatly unlike the experience of all companies.

What then is the answer to this problem? Surely it is not to sit idly by and allow all business activity in this country to come under the control of a few corporate empires. Surely we cannot expect to have an expansion of business, nor even maintain a stable level of business, when all business has become a privileged monopoly and opportunity for independent business has disappeared.

Actually, the answer or answers to this question will depend upon a fuller exploration and understanding of the problem. And I have no doubt there are many problems of a complex and interrelated character. I have said that the answer to small business complaints and to the general pessimism of small business is easy to find—that it lies in this profits picture. But the profits picture is merely the end result of unknown, and perhaps many, underlying problems. These may not be so easy to isolate and appraise. It will, however, be the unvarying purpose of our committee to explore these problems and to make the facts and appraisals known, so that when the House acts upon matters affecting small business, it may act with informed judgment.

Annual rates of profits (as percent of stockholders' equity) of manufacturing corporation, by size of corporation

BEFORE TAXES

	1st half of 1952	1st half of 1953	1st half of 1954	Change 1952 to 1954
Corporations with total assets of—				
Less than $¼ million	18.0	17.5	8.1	−55.0
$¼ to $1 million	18.5	19.6	13.2	−28.7
$1 to $5 million	20.5	20.7	13.3	−35.2
$5 to $10 million	21.8	26.4	17.3	−20.7
$10 to $50 million	23.4	25.4	18.1	−22.7
$50 to $100 million	22.3	24.6	17.7	−20.7
Over $100 million	24.2	27.9	22.1	−8.7
All asset sizes	22.8	25.7	19.2	−15.8

Annual rates of profits (as percent of stockholders' equity) of manufacturing corporation, by size of corporation—Continued

AFTER TAXES

	1st half of 1952	1st half of 1953	1st half of 1954	Change 1952 to 1954
Corporations with total assets of—				
Less than $¼ million	10.6	10.1	4.1	−61.4
$¼ to $1 million	7.8	9.1	6.4	−18.0
$1 million to $5 million	8.0	8.9	5.7	−28.8
$5 to $10 million	8.5	10.6	7.6	−10.6
$10 to $50 million	9.5	10.6	8.7	−8.5
$50 to $100 million	9.5	10.0	8.6	−9.5
Over $100 million	11.3	12.0	12.0	+6.1
All asset sizes	10.1	11.0	9.9	−2.0

Profits per dollar of sales of manufacturing corporations, by size of corporation

BEFORE TAXES

	1st half of 1952	1st half of 1953	1st half of 1954	Change 1952 to 1954
Corporations with total assets of—	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Percent*
Less than $¼ million	3.9	3.9	1.9	−51.3
$¼ to $1 million	5.5	5.3	4.0	−27.3
$1 to $5 million	6.8	6.9	4.9	−28.0
$5 to $10 million	8.9	9.9	7.6	−14.7
$10 to $50 million	9.9	10.3	8.3	−16.2
$50 to $100 million	9.7	10.1	8.2	−15.5
Over $100 million	12.4	12.8	11.5	−7.3
All asset sizes	9.6	10.2	8.7	−9.4

AFTER TAXES

Corporations with total assets of—				
Less than $¼ million	2.3	2.3	0.9	−60.9
$¼ to $1 million	2.3	2.5	1.9	−17.4
$1 to $5 million	2.6	3.0	2.1	−19.3
$5 to $10 million	3.5	3.9	3.4	−2.9
$10 to $50 million	4.0	4.3	4.0	0
$50 to $100 million	4.1	4.1	4.0	−2.5
Over $100 million	5.7	5.5	6.3	+10.5
All asset sizes	4.2	4.4	4.5	+7.1

Annual rates of profits (as percent of stockholders' equity) of manufacturing corporations, by size of corporation

BEFORE TAXES

	Full year		1st half 1954
	1952	1953	
Corporations with total assets of—			
Less than $¼ million	17.0	12.4	8.1
$¼ million to $1 million	16.7	15.6	13.2
$1 to $5 million	19.6	17.4	13.3
$5 to $10 million	21.2	22.3	17.3
$10 to $50 million	22.8	22.5	18.1
$50 to $100 million	21.9	21.8	17.7
Over $100 million	23.6	25.1	22.1
All asset sizes	22.1	22.6	19.2

AFTER TAXES

Corporations with total assets of—			
Less than $¼ million	9.3	6.8	4.1
$¼ to $1 million	7.2	7.1	6.4
$1 to $5 million	8.0	7.5	5.7
$5 to $10 million	8.8	9.2	7.6
$10 to $50 million	9.7	9.9	8.7
$50 to $100 million	9.9	9.4	8.6
Over $100 million	11.8	12.1	12.0
All assets sizes	10.3	10.5	9.9

RESOLUTION TO CREATE SMALL-BUSINESS COMMITTEE

I have introduced the following resolution. The chairman of the Commit-

tee on Rules, Mr. SMITH of Virginia, has promised consideration as soon as the Committee on Rules is set up or as soon thereafter as convenient for the chairman and the committee.

It is as follows:

House Resolution 55

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1955, there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of 12 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, 7 from the majority party and 5 from the minority party, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of all types of small business, existing, arising, or that many arise, with particular reference to (1) whether the potentialities of small business are being adequately developed and, if not, what factors have hindered and are hindering the optimum operation of established small business and/or its development and enterprise; (2) whether agencies, departments of the Government, or Government-owned or controlled corporations are properly, adequately, or equitably serving the needs of small business; (3) whether small business is being treated fairly and the public welfare properly and justly served through the allotments of strategic and other materials in which there are shortages, in the granting of priorities or preferences in the use, sale, or purchase of said materials; and (4) the solution of the problems of small business during the continuance of the existing national emergency.

The committee may from time to time submit to the House such preliminary reports as it deems advisable; and prior to the close of the present Congress shall submit to the House its final report on the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session may be filed with the Clerk of the House.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any properly designated chairman of a subcommittee thereof, or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL COURT BACKLOG

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include two articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, there have recently appeared in the Washington newspapers some very illuminating articles concerning the condition of the United States courts. These articles point up the fact that we have been derelict in our duty to see to it that the machinery of justice is kept in order. I insert these two articles in the hope that the membership generally will examine them and cooperate to the end that justice may be done to all of the people who go into our courts.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I am anxious to associate myself with the gentleman from Pennsylvania with reference to these articles. I have read them, and I think they are well worth reading by all of the Members. I have talked with the gentleman about this matter before, and hope that this approach which is suggested in those articles can be made a bipartisan approach and that we will be able to work out a constructive method whereby the Chief Justice of the United States may be permitted to address the Houses of the Congress.

Mr. WALTER. I am not so certain that the proper way to make the country cognizant of the seriousness of the situation is by having the Chief Justice address a joint session of the Congress. It may well be that a communication from him to the appropriate committee of the Congress would be sufficient. However, these articles do point up the gravity of the situation.

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 9, 1955]

SUPPORT GROWING FOR REPORT TO CONGRESS BY CHIEF JUSTICE—CAPITOL ADDRESS VIEWED AS DRAMATIC WAY TO INFORM PEOPLE OF COURTS' PROBLEMS

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

Congress will be asked to make history this session by inviting the Chief Justice of the United States to address the Congress on the state of the judiciary.

The unprecedented proposal, first advanced publicly in November, is gaining wide support from judges, lawyers, and legislators.

Such an invitation would require action by both Houses. A survey by the Star indicates that legislators most familiar with the problems of the courts favor the invitation.

These legislators reason that the people have a right to know the condition of their third branch of Government as described by its chief.

They feel that an informed Congress would take steps to remedy some of the conditions that create delay and inefficiency in the administration of justice. The searchlight of public opinion trained on the courts could remedy others.

These are some of the conditions likely to be publicly aired if Chief Justice Warren addresses the Congress:

The Federal courts are seriously handicapped by insufficient funds, insufficient judges, and delays in appointing new judges.

These handicaps are reflected in some parts of the country by time lags of up to 45 months in getting cases tried. Justice so delayed often means justice denied.

While the vast majority of the Federal judges devote full time to the bench, there are others who from illness, age, or indifference fail to carry their share of the load.

The refusal of some courts to adopt such modern methods as pretrial procedures has prevented these courts from cutting down their backlog of cases.

On the other hand, delays in trying cases have given ammunition to those who would short-cut justice and eliminate jury trials by establishing commissions and arbiters to hear cases.

The Federal courts now have jurisdiction over some types of cases that might well be transferred to the State courts.

Some of the Federal judiciary districts are set up so unrealistically as far as population and case loads are concerned that one court will stand idle while a court in a neighboring district is far behind in its work because of an enormous case load.

The Judicial Conference of the United States, which sets up the requested budget for the courts, tends to be overconservative in its requests for funds and for more judges.

The Federal courts, up to 1939, had a powerful spokesman—the Attorney General. Then, because the Justice Department was the chief litigant before the courts and because it was thought preferable to make the judiciary branch financially independent of the executive branch, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts was established.

The courts now have a separate budget which cannot be touched by the Budget Bureau. Now, only Congress can cut the court budget. The Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts, usually accompanied by one or more judges, appears before Appropriations Subcommittees.

Obviously, their message is not getting across. The budget was cut by a million dollars for this year. The funds to finance the Federal courts comprise one twenty-fifth of 1 percent of the total appropriation to operate the Government during the current fiscal year.

The Judicial Conference of the United States—the Chief Justice and the chief judges of the circuits—recommends legislation and additional judgeships as well as budget needs. Its reports go to Congress, as do the annual reports of the Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts. But busy legislators can't be expected to read all the volumes that cross their desks.

For some time, members of the bench and bar have been saying privately that something should be done to arouse public concern over delayed justice. In November, Deputy Attorney General William P. Rogers proposed in a speech at Cleveland that the most effective way to focus public attention on the judiciary was through an address to Congress by the Chief Justice of the United States.

LETTERS COMMEND PLAN

After the speech, scores of approving letters reached him from judges and lawyers throughout the country.

"Without doubt," wrote one judge, "the efficiency of the courts is being seriously impaired by the failure of Congress to provide sufficient funds for the efficient operations of the courts."

A west coast judge cited the absurd situation in a Southwestern State where a judge, already ill when he was confirmed, has spent 5 hours in court in the past 4 years.

A midwestern judge reported that his court was fairly current with its calendar of cases because he and his colleague took no extended vacations—despite the fact that for 75 days between June and September 30 the

temperature fluctuated between 100 and 111. The court was not air-conditioned. In some other courts, the judges make no effort to hold court during the summer because the courtrooms are stifling—and the backlog of cases continues to grow.

PENNY-PINCHING IMPAIRS JUSTICE

A judge whose district covers a wide territory wrote: "Any conscientious judge hesitates to dispose of a criminal case without a full report of the probation officer and often these reports cannot be obtained without great delay simply because of the lack of travel funds."

Mr. Rogers also heard from a judge who wrote: "The failure to supply the judges with the necessary libraries often results in injustice to litigants."

The Deputy Attorney General emphasized in his speech that he believed the problem was not wholly budgetary and that many of the court's ills could be corrected if the whole Congress and the people knew about them.

TENDENCY TO LOAF

Explaining his position further to the Star, he said:

Federal judgeships are lifetime appointments and they are subject to no supervision. Although the great majority of Federal judges work hard, some take advantage of their lifetime tenure with long vacations and short hours on the bench. There is, for instance, one district with a tremendous backlog of cases where two of the judges haven't tried a case in more than 2 years and a third sits only occasionally.

"An annual or biennial address to Congress by the Chief Justice would focus public attention on the areas of the country where the calendar is up to date and those where the calendar is far behind.

"Then, local publicity would lead to finding out what the causes of delays are in each district and what can be done to correct them. By calling attention to the problems, much support also would be generated for necessary legislation.

"The judiciary has set up a very intelligent system for deciding what its needs are. The only trouble is that its recommendations never come to public notice. At present, the only people who know the inadequacies of the system are those who go into court as litigants. Then they find out how long they have to wait for their cases to be tried.

"It is obvious that delays of 3 or 4 years in the trial of a case can result in great injustice both to plaintiffs and defendants.

"Where people have to wait years to have their cases tried—for whatever reason—justice is in default."

COURT DELAY COSTS GOVERNMENT $3 MILLION A YEAR, OFFICIAL SAYS—EXPENSE IS CITED AS SUPPORTING PROPOSAL FOR REPORT BY CHIEF JUSTICE TO CONGRESS

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

Delays in getting cases to trial in Federal courts are costing the Government at least $3 million a year, a Justice Department spokesman reported today.

This needless expense is one of the reasons why Justice Department officials are supporting the move to invite the Chief Justice of the United States to address the Congress on the state of the judiciary.

Federal court delays—ranging up to 45 months—cost the Government approximately $2.5 million in interest payments on civil suits alone, according to the Justice Department.

The costs run over $3 million with interest payments on Indian claims and contested tax refunds, as well as the expense of locating witnesses.

"When a case has been pending for years," the Justice official explained, "witnesses disappear. Deputy marshals have to cover many miles to locate them and then the traveling expenses of the witnesses must be paid. Also, when a case is stale, the expert witnesses may have to spend 2 weeks going over material which they could have covered in 1 day when the case was fresh. And these experts have to be paid $50 to $100 a day.

Delays in the disposition of cases also hit hard at the private individual who takes his case into a Federal court. If he sues, he may lose his property while he's waiting to collect. If he is defending and his cause is just, he suffers interference with his business and personal affairs during the waiting period.

For both the Government and the private litigant, legal observers point out, delays in getting cases to trial can mean that key witnesses forget the facts or they cannot be located when the case finally comes to trial. That is what is meant when attorneys and judges say justice delayed is often justice denied.

If the Chief Justice is invited to address the Congress on the state of the judiciary, these delays—and what can be done about them—presumably would figure importantly in his report.

RECENT STUDY CITED

A recent study of the time consumed from the filing of a case to its disposition in the Federal courts and the backlog of cases in these courts shows:

During the year ending July 1, 1954, United States district courts disposed of 93,161 cases but left pending an additional 78,531.

This backlog has accumulated over years but in recent years has increased at a swifter rate.

During the past 3 years the backlog of criminal cases increased 31 percent and the backlog of civil cases 23 percent.

On the basis of last year's rate of disposing of cases it would take all the district court judges 10 months merely to eliminate the backlog without touching the current business.

In theory, the courts should try to dispose of cases within 6 months after they are filed. But a cross section of district courts showed 13.5 months elapsed from the time a suit was filed until its disposition during the past fiscal year. In these courts it took 8.1 months from calendaring to trial.

DELAY IN NEW YORK

Some courts were in far worse shape. In the southern district of New York, which encompasses New York City, the litigant could expect to wait 35.9 months for his civil case to get to trial after calendaring and 45 months from the time he filed suit until the case was decided.

In the eastern district of New York, located in Brooklyn, the usual time from filing suit to disposition was 39.5 months.

In the District of Columbia it took an average of 23 months after the case was ready for trial to get to trial in a civil jury case last year. In the eastern district of Pennsylvania, which includes Philadelphia, the interval from filing suit to disposition was 24.7 months. In the eastern district of Michigan, which includes Detroit, the interval from filing to disposition was 16.9 months.

In the northern district of Illinois, which includes Chicago, the interval from filing to disposition was 15.1 months, in the district of New Jersey it was 19.2 months, and in the district of Nebraska 15.6 months.

If the case is appealed, the litigant faces more delays. For the 11 United States courts of appeals the normal time from filing of the complete record in the appellate court to final disposition of civil cases was 7.1 months during the last fiscal year. The time from filing the complaint in the lower court to decision in the court of appeals was 21.4 months.

REASONS ANALYZED

What causes these delays in the disposition of cases? Some observers cite the judges who fail to carry their fair share of the load, scorn modern time-saving methods or take long summer vacations. Court figures show, however, that more cases were disposed of per judge last year than in any year since 1947 and the total disposition of cases was the highest since 1933.

But justice still is delayed. These factors are cited:

1. The increase in the number of judges has failed to match the increase in the case load. In 1900, the case load per judge was 236. In 1954, the case load per judge was 403.

While the number of cases increased fourfold, the number of judgeships was a little more than doubled. If the increase in judgeships had been commensurate with the increase in case load, there would presently be 404 district court judgeships, rather than 251.

APPELLATE COURT SHORTAGE

In the courts of appeals, too, the case load outdistanced the judges. In 1900, there were 29 appellate judges with a case load of 38 per judge. In 1954, there were 68 appellate judges with a case load of 51 each. If the number of judges had increased as fast as the case load, there would now be 87 appellate judgeships rather than 68.

2. The overconservatism of the Judicial Conference of the United States in recommending new judgeships. This group of judges has recommended judgeships only after the case load has begun to overwhelm rather than at the first sign of trouble.

3. Delays in getting the new judgeships once they are recommended. Since 1945, Congress has created 63, of which 57 were recommended by the Judicial Conference. But of those 57, only 6 were created during the year in which the recommendation was made; 23 not until the following year, 9 not until 2 years later, 12 not until 3 years later, 4 not until 4 years later, and 3 not until 5 years later.

There are delays in creating the judgeships, delays in selecting the appointees and sometimes delays in confirmation.

Thus, by the time the judge takes his place on the bench, the caseload which prompted the recommendation for the new judgeship has mounted to the point where another judge is needed.

BUDGETS REDUCED

4. Annual cuts in the budget for the Federal courts. Typical of the crippling cuts in the 1955 budget was the provision of staff salaries for only 15 new judges although 30 new judgeships were created.

The million-dollar cut in the budget for this fiscal year prompted the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts to notify the judges to:

Avoid temporary extra help such as those necessary to meet peak workloads.

Make no appointments of personnel until leave payments of the former employee had expired.

Avoid employing substitutes for regular employees ill or on vacation.

Travel funds were cut. So were funds for legal publications.

The cuts hit at courts already understaffed in the clerks and probation offices. With a high rate of turnover in the clerks' offices because of low salaries, inexperienced help must handle vital legal papers. With too few probation officers, sentencing is sometimes delayed for a month or more to await presentence investigations. Probationers in need of much attention to keep

from sliding back into crime may get no more than an hour's help a month from their probation officers.

Legislators, attorneys, and judges backing the move to have the Chief Justice address the Congress believe these facts should be made known to all the legislators and to the people.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LECOMPTE and include a statement of counterpart funds used by committees in Europe during the past year.

Mr. BENTLEY and include a speech, notwithstanding the fact that it is estimated by the Public Printer to exceed the limit and is estimated to cost $200.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. BEAMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HILL and include a report from the Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

Mr. SADLAK and to include a brief resolution.

Mr. HOSMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey and to include an editorial appearing in today's Washington Post and Times-Herald.

Mr. RODINO in three instances.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. PRICE) in three instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, January 13, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

239. A letter from the president, Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., transmitting the 27th annual report of the work and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 3 of the act of Congress approved May 7, 1928, as amended (22 U. S. C. 278) (H. Doc. No. 10); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

240. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of November 1954, pursuant to Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

241. A letter from the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., transmitting the annual report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co. for the year ended December 31, 1954, pursuant to the act of Congress approved September 26, 1888; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2000. A bill to state explicitly the long standing national policy to preserve and strengthen the family-farm pattern of American agriculture, and to provide means of implementing that policy more effectively; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 2001. A bill to provide hospital care for certain veterans residing in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 2002. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital in south Texas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 2003. A bill to amend section 402 (d) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to eliminate discrimination against certain personnel of the uniformed services incapacitated prior to physical examination for promotion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CARRIGG:

H. R. 2004. A bill to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 1 year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 2005. A bill to further amend the provisions of the acts authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child, or dependent relative of persons in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 2006. A bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 2007. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to relieve innocent purchasers of fungible goods converted by warehousemen from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 2008. A bill to provide for a heliport in the District of Columbia, for use in helicopter service between the Friendship International Airport and the downtown area of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 2009. A bill to authorize a program for the construction of county agricultural buildings, through assistance in planning and financing such projects in counties where agriculture is a predominant industry, thereby providing centralized housing and facilities for Federal, State, and local offices engaged in administering agricultural and related programs concerned with the welfare of the farm population; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2010. A bill to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 2011. A bill to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 2012. A bill to amend section 6 (a) of Public Law 377 of the act of May 13, 1946, entitled "An act to provide Federal aid for the development of public airports," as amended by Public Law 382 of October 25, 1949 (63 Stat. 903); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2013. A bill to amend section 302, title III, of the act of June 23, 1947, known as the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 (61 Stat. 157; 29 U. S. C. 186); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H. R. 2014. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H. R. 2015. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital in south Texas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 2016. A bill to provide for income-tax purposes a deduction with respect to the amortization of devices for the collection of atmospheric pollutants and contaminants; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

H. R. 2017. A bill to amend section 403 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to permit the granting of free or reduced-rate transportation to ministers of religion; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2018. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote export trade, and for other purposes," approved April 10, 1918, to provide that no export trade association shall restrict any foreign buyer from dealing, directly or through an agent of his own selection, with any producer, manufacturer, or seller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2019. A bill to allow a deduction for income-tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by the taxpayer for the education of a dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2020. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from taxation the interest received from loans guaranteed under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2021. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the finality of determinations relating to the assessment of duties or charges on certain imported merchandise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2022. A bill to provide income-tax exemptions for members of the Armed Forces serving outside the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2023. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to review de novo claims for benefits and payments under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2024. A bill to provide for payments in lieu of taxes to be made to local taxing authorities with respect to Federal real property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY of Illinois:

H. R. 2025. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 2026. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 2027. A bill to state explicitly the long-standing national policy to preserve and strengthen the family-farm pattern of American agriculture, and to provide means of implementing that policy more effectively; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 2028. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended, so as to increase the limit of amounts payable thereunder in connection with the funeral and burial of deceased veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2029. A bill to amend the act of July 2, 1948 (Public Law 877, 80th Cong.), to include persons whose service-connected disability is rated not less than 10 percent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 2030. A bill authorizing the construction of certain public works on the Mississippi River for the protection of St. Louis, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SILER:

H. R. 2031. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2032. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, so as to provide that an injured employee shall have the right to select his own physician, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2033. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to increase the maximum and minimum rates at which disability compensation may be paid thereafter; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2034. A bill to enact certain provisions now included in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act and the Civil Functions Appropriation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2035. A bill to provide for the crediting of certain service toward retirement of Reserve personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2036. A bill to provide for the tonnage composition of the United States Navy with respect to vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 2037. A bill to authorize the improvement of the Sammamish River, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2038. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide a direct Federal pension of at least $100 per month to all American citizens 65 years of age and over who have been citizens 10 years or more, to be prorated according to the cost of living as on January 3, 1953; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution placing certain individuals who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, and in the islands of Leyte and Samar after July 4, 1902, and their survivors, in the same status as those who served in the Armed Forces during the Philippine Insurrection and their survivors; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. Res. 83. Resolution opposing the seating of Communist China in organs of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 2039. A bill for the relief of Agostino Gentile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2040. A bill for the relief of the F. & M. Schaefer Brewing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 2041. A bill for the relief of Damiano Mario Carmine Palusci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOKS of Texas:

H. R. 2042. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margarete Schober Frugia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHATHAM:

H. R. 2043. A bill for the relief of Nathaniel Ross Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 2044. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Monchen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2045. A bill for the relief of Joe Bargas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 2046. A bill for the relief of Robert O. Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON (by request):

H. R. 2047. A bill for the relief of Isaac Sciaky and Isabella Sciaky (also known as Isaac Siaki and Isabella Siaki); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2048. A bill for the relief of Charles S. Stutzer and Haiya Stutzer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2049. A bill for the relief of Anastasios Selelmetzidis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 2050. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Norman Rowe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2051. A bill for the relief of Dustean Alexander Youngs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2052. A bill for the relief of the United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2053. A bill for the relief of Peter M. Shikany; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2054. A bill for the relief of Induk Pahk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2055. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Niniema (Taha) Mansour; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2056. A bill for the relief of Vasilios Soumplis (also known as Tom Makres) to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2057. A bill for the relief of Edwin K. Stanton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. R. 2058. A bill for the relief of Dr. Domingo Abella, Mrs. Maria Llado Abella, Eva Abella, Laura Abella, Ernesto Abella, and Elizabeth Abella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 2059. A bill for the relief of Edward Patrick Cloonan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2060. A bill for the relief of Erna Oprischko Speciale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 2061. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nellie White Houck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 2062. A bill for the relief of Delmara Jerucia Roper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H. R. 2063. A bill for the relief of MacArthur Mining Co., Inc., in receivership; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 2064. A bill for the relief of Paul Joseph Splingaerd, Helen Colette Splingaerd, and Renee Anne Splingaerd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 2065. A bill for the relief of Sada Zarikian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 2066. A bill for the relief of Spyrangelos Vagelatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2067. A bill for the relief of Georgios Vagelatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 2068. A bill for the relief of William F. Friedman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 2069. A bill for the relief of Cornelius A. Frouin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUMMA:

H. R. 2070. A bill for the relief of Dr. Carlos Recio and his wife, Francisca Marco Palomero de Recio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 2071. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Celeste Hall Oliver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2072. A bill for the relief of Julian Nowakowski, or William Nowak (Novak); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2073. A bill for the relief of Bengt Wikstam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 2074. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marianne Ptak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 2075. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Walker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H. R. 2076. A bill for the relief of Victoria Clita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 2077. A bill for the relief of Antonio Carreri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 2078. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Cannizzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2079. A bill for the relief of Ingrid Liselotte Poch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 2080. A bill for the relief of Ertugrul Ilgin and Mrs. Nukhet Ilgin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2081. A bill for the relief of Joseph Antony Russ; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN (by request):

H. R. 2082. A bill for the relief of Rosa Maria C. Tiampo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2083. A bill for the relief of Walter Oppenheim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 2084. A bill for the relief of Gerassimos V. Palmos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2085. A bill to refer to the United States Court of Claims H. R. 1485, a bill for the relief of William E. Nash; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2086. A bill for the relief of Rudolf Fritz Liermann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2087. A bill for the relief of Erika Rambauske; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 2088. A bill for the relief of Swami Shivananda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2089. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Fred Fletcher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Statement of Counterpart Funds Charged to Committees of the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 11, 1955

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, on January 27, 1954, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement with reference to the history and use of counterpart funds by Members of the House of Representatives who had traveled abroad on official committee business. I also inserted in the RECORD at that time a preliminary report received from the Secretary of State listing the names of the countries in which counterpart funds were available, together with a series of tables showing the amount of counterpart funds expended by members of committees of the House of Representatives for the fiscal year 1954 insofar as information was available at that time.

On January 3, 1955, as chairman of the Committee on House Administration, I received from Assistant Secretary of State Thruston B. Morton a statement based on reports to the Department of State by United States disbursing officers abroad, giving the total net amounts of counterpart funds drawn by committees of the House of Representatives from July 1, 1953, through June 30, 1954, expressed in United States dollar equivalents. While it is believed that most of the obligations incurred by committees which traveled during the fiscal year 1954 were liquidated during fiscal year 1954, and are reflected in this statement, it is possible that additional payments have been or will be made on behalf of these groups during the current fiscal year 1955, and have not as yet been reported to the State Department. Any such payments will be included in the fiscal year 1955 reports and designated as payments against 1954 travel. The statement furnished by the Department of State follows:

Statement of counterpart fund charges to committees of the House of Representatives, July 1, 1953, through June 30, 1954

[Expressed in United States dollar equivalent values]

Total net charges:	
House Appropriations Committee	$48,914.29
House Armed Services Committee	14,713.28
House Committee on Foreign Affairs	19,965.34
House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce	20,265.70
House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs	1,020.18
House Committee on the Judiciary	52,587.61
Grand total of net charges	157,466.40

Public Law 665, 83d Congress, provides that any committee of the House of Representatives which uses counterpart funds shall make a full report thereof to the Committee on House Administration, showing the total amount of such currency so used in each country and the purposes for which it was expended.

Revision of the McCarran Immigration Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 11, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today an immigration and naturalization bill to revise our present immigration laws. The title of my bill is "Immigration and Citizenship Act of 1955," and it is intended to replace the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

Let me state at the very outset that the chief objection to the McCarran-Walter Act is that it is based on the national-supremacy doctrine which maintains that the people of some nations were superior to others. According to the McCarran-Walter Act, this idea is reflected in our present immigration policy. Needless to say, it is a fallacious theory because there is no such thing as a superior race or a superior people. A law reflecting such outmoded ideas has no place on our statute books and should be removed as soon as possible. We need an immigration law that will conform with American concepts of justice, fair play, and basic traditions.

Mr. Speaker, I represent a cosmopolitan district in the city of New York. The people of our great city are for the most part of immigrant stock. They are either immigrants themselves or children and grandchildren of immigrants. Their roots are solidly planted in this country. They are intensely loyal and patriotic citizens of the United States. It is because they have known the adversities of life abroad at firsthand that they can best appreciate the American way of life.

They and many millions of others throughout our country are intensely interested in the problem of immigration and are anxious for the United States to follow a liberal policy in the matter. I recall that during my service in the 82d Congress I had been approached by numerous people to help them in their immigration matters. Some of these were very tragic cases: Parents who wanted to be united with their children; broken families because the husband or the wife could not come here; deportation of the husband which left an entire family without support, and similar other cases. I did my utmost to help these people in every possible way.

Unfortunately, our immigration laws in recent years have been rather harsh, discriminatory, and often inhumane. The McCarran-Walter Act was intended to be a codification of all previous immigration and naturalization laws, but actually turned out to be a codification of all the discriminations and the prejudices against immigrants thought up during the past few decades. I am referring particularly to the quota system, the method of selecting immigrants who seek entry to this country, which dates back to the early 1920's when it was first enacted in an atmosphere of isolationism and hatred of all foreigners.

Under the quota system a total of 154,000 immigrants may be admitted annually to the United States. The original law enacted in 1921 set up the quotas on the basis of the 1910 census. It also contained the obnoxious implication that the people of southern and eastern Europe are inferior to those of northern and western Europe. In 1924, the law was amended and made even more discriminating against those of southern and eastern European origin. Quotas were reduced from 3 to 2 percent, and the census basis was moved back from 1910 to 1890, the reason being that immigration from southern and eastern Europe had hardly begun by 1890. Naturally, the quotas for those countries were drastically reduced. Thus, Italy's quota was cut from 42,000 under the 1921 law to less than 6,000 under the 1924 amendments; Poland's quota was reduced from 31,000 to 6,500, and the same was true for other countries.

Mr. Speaker, when a codification of our immigration laws was undertaken several years ago, million of our citizens had hoped that the biased and intolerant laws would be eliminated and a new approach toward the selection of immigrants would be established, but those who drew up the McCarran-Walter bill included the worst and most obnoxious features which had accumulated on our statute books over the past 30 years. The restrictive quota system was retained, large quotas were again assigned to countries unable to use them up, and the unused portions of the quotas were wasted instead of permitting low-quota countries to use them.

So much for the quota system. Now, let us examine briefly another set of regulations in the McCarran-Walter Act which constitute an insult to all Americans who believe in the concept of equality. I mean the provisions which deal with naturalized citizens. Under the McCarran-Walter Act it is easier to deprive such people of their citizenship and deport them from the United States. In the past it was necessary to provide proof of fraud at the time of naturalization, but now it merely needs to be shown that a person failed to mention some minor incident in his past and he stands to lose his citizenship. It is a threat which hangs over his head for the rest of his life. This, in effect, sets up two classes

of citizenship, since no naturalized citizen can ever feel secure of his citizenship status any more; it is something which we have never before had since this Republic has been founded.

There are many other injustices in that act, perhaps too numerous to mention. Suffice it to mention the findings of a Presidential commission, named by President Truman in 1952 to study the act. In January 1953 this commission reported its findings of the McCarran-Walter Act as follows:

First. It discriminates against human beings on account of their national origin, their religious belief, and their color.

Second. It is based on hatred and distrust of all aliens.

Third. It ignores the needs of the United States in domestic affairs and foreign policy.

Fourth. It contains unnecessary and unreasonable restrictions and penalties against individuals.

Fifth. It is badly drafted, confusing, and in some respects unworkable.

In the 2 years since the Eisenhower administration is in power and in the 83d Congress nothing was done to wipe out the inequities of the McCarran-Walter Act and to restore sanity and dignity to our immigration system. The President has made no effort to keep his 1952 campaign pledge to support legislation to revise the McCarran-Walter Act. The 83d Congress, likewise, made no attempt to amend the act, but adopted the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 to admit 214,000 European refugees over a 3-year period. By now, many of us are aware that this act turned out to be a hoax, since its many restrictions make it so unworkable that only about 10,000 persons have been admitted under this law which went into effect on August 7, 1953. This is a separate issue to which I hope to return in the very near future with some constructive suggestions.

Many of my colleagues, I am sure, will recall that I was strenuously opposed to the McCarran-Walter measure when it came before the House in 1952, and then when President Truman vetoed it I voted to uphold the President's veto. Since then I have followed all developments in connection with this act; I have sought means and ways of revising it, and I have given the matter much thought and study.

Here are some of the major changes recommended in my bill:

First. The so-called national origins quota system is abolished as a basis for admission and in its place is proposed a unified quota system to be comprised of three groups of eligible immigrants:

A. Those coming under the family unification preference, but not more than one-third of the quota numbers are to be allocated for this purpose;

B. Those coming under occupational preference, which is to be limited to 10 percent;

C. The remainder shall be allotted to newcomers, including those seeking religious or political asylum, and those needed here in the national interest.

Second. There is to be no discrimination against any person seeking to enter this country as an immigrant, because of national origin, religion, race, or color.

Third. The number of annual quota visas is to be established on the basis of one-sixth of 1 percent of the United States population according to the 1940 census, the last prewar decennial census. On this basis a total of 220,000 immigrants may be admitted annually, which is about 75,000 more than under the present quota system. Furthermore, the allocation of quotas for all countries would be more equitable because the 1940 census is more representative of our population now than is the census of 1890.

Fourth. The allocation of visas to the above three groups and the quotas assigned to each nation shall be determined by an Immigration and Naturalization Commission, proposed in the bill, and with the approval of the President. The Commission is to operate as an independent agency, thus avoiding much of the confusion now existing.

Fifth. Unused quotas are to be pooled and distributed among those countries whose quota allotments had been used up. It will be of interest to note that since 1924 only about 40 percent of the quota numbers have been used, namely, 1,500,000 entered the United States under the quota system while 2,500,000 visa numbers remained unfilled and unused.

Sixth. Aliens shall not be deported if they were admitted before their 14th birthday, or have lived in the United States for 20 years or more. The bill also provides that no alien can be deported by reason of conduct which occurred more than 10 years prior to the institution of the deportation proceedings.

Seventh. Several provisions are contained in the bill which would permit an alien who is under a final order of deportation to seek judicial review under the Administrative Procedure Act or the Declaratory Judgment Act. In this way it is hoped to eliminate the contradictory standards of justice applied to alien residents in this country and the severe penalties meted out for minor errors and infractions of the law.

Eighth. All distinctions and discriminations between native-born and naturalized American citizens are eliminated and equality of all citizens under the law is established. In a democracy such as ours there is no room for second-class citizenship nor is discrimination against the naturalized citizens to be tolerated. The grounds for deprivation of citizenship, whether acquired by birth or naturalization, are remedied.

There are numerous other changes and remedies suggested in the bill to improve our immigration laws, which I trust will be adopted at an early date so that the United States will be able to maintain its tradition as the haven of the oppressed and the asylum for the persecuted. Continuation of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act on our statute books is a blot on the good name of our country. If we permit this discriminatory measure to remain unaltered and unrevised, then much which is precious to American ideals and traditions is destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, I maintain that the McCarran Act is not a true reflection of the thinking and the spirit in this country, or that it represents American opinion concerning the immigrant. The McCarran Act is not the proper law for a nation which has been settled and developed by immigrants throughout its history, and which has been built to its present greatness and world leadership with the help of immigrants.

For the sake of America's greatness, its international prestige, and its position of moral leadership among the nations of the world, I urge this Congress to take swift action to undo the wrongs of the McCarran-Walter Act and to adopt my proposed revision of it.

Social Security Benefits at Age 60

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, today in this wonderfully productive country of ours, some 6 million pecple between the ages of 60 and 65 are being denied the right to social-security benefits on the arbitrary grounds that they cannot receive such benefits until their 65th birthday. Last year we made a number of revisions and improvements in the social-security system. But for some reason, which I fail to understand, no change was made in the eligibility age of 65 years which was adopted away back in 1935. Very simply, this restriction says to millions of Americans over age 60 who are physically unable to work—or who are unable to persuade any employer to hire them—that they must starve until they reach their 65th birthday.

I have long been concerned with this gross inequity in a system which is designed to provide at least a minimum of security for our senior citizens, and have introduced several bills which would right this inequity. Because I believe a lower eligibility age is the logical next step in improving our social-security system, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 703, which will pay benefits at age 60 instead of the present age 65.

Surely it is clear that no one can predict the precise day or year in which he will be completely disabled by a devastating illness. Neither can anyone predict that he or she will be able to continue in his job at least to a 65th birthday. Can there be any doubt in our minds that the need for retirement benefits varies greatly with individual circumstances? Some of us are able to work far beyond our 65th birthday. Others, through no fault of their own, are forced to retire from their job at much earlier ages. There is certainly no reality, then, to this idea that the need for retirement benefits begins only at age 65, and not before. Can we then, in equity, continue to perpetuate this antiquated idea that

the 65th birthday is the proper criterion as to eligibility for old-age benefits?

I have asked this question repeatedly—and the only answer I get is that such a liberalization of the system would cost money. For example, when an amendment which would have lowered the eligibility age to 60 years was introduced on the floor of the Senate during the last Congress we were told that the purpose of the amendment was laudable; that everyone hoped the retirement age could be reduced to age 60—but that it must be rejected because it would cost money.

Mr. Speaker, let us ask ourselves in all seriousness—what is the basic purpose of the social-security system? Is the major purpose of this program to provide a minimum of security for those of us who can no longer work because we are too old by the standards of our industrialized economy? Or is its major purpose to save money?

Now I recognize that no organized social-security system can be without some limitations. But I say to you that the crucial test with regard to such limitations should be chiefly concerned with the needs of our senior citizens as they change with the times. Let us be clear about the reasons why it is appropriate at this time to lower the eligibility age, because of changes in our economy. All studies show that a phenomena of America's industrial expansion is the fact that the average worklife has been shortened. For example, in 1890, about two-thirds of all men aged 65 and over were in the labor force. By 1950 this proportion had dropped to less than two-fifths. Even under the pressure of a wartime labor market in the 1940's, many employers were reluctant to take on older workers until supplies of younger men were exhausted.

The changes in the national economy which have added so remarkably to the total wealth of the country and to the improvements in our standard of living have also, then, had the net effect of restricting employment opportunities of older workers. The shift from a rural to a highly industrial economy is reflected in the long-term decline in farm employment and in the expansion of such occupations as semiskilled operators and clerical and sales workers. And these two expanding occupational fields use the lowest proportion of workers who are over age 45.

The problem of older workers in finding and holding jobs has been thoroughly documented in hundreds of careful studies and dozens of symposiums. Recently Ewan Clague, Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, summed up the situation in the following significant sentences:

> Industrial change is proceeding at a rate faster than ever before in history—

He said.

> The new process of automation (which substitutes machines and energy for manpower) is sure to bring about the decline and disappearance of many jobs and occupations. * * * Industries will naturally prefer younger people whom they can train and develop. Furthermore, the average business concern will have enough older people on its rolls already, so that they will hesitate to hire any more.

Now, I agree with those people who are working to increase the job opportunities for older workers as one means of counteracting this trend. But let us not delude ourselves by believing that jobs for our senior citizens can ever provide any kind of a total solution. If we are realistic about it, I think we will all have to agree that it is only a piecemeal solution which will gradually benefit only those fortunate older people who are able to work, and are fortunate enough to find an employer who is willing to hire them.

For the majority of older people, who have been retired from their jobs because they are unable to work, increased job opportunities for the elderly are, of course, no solution at all. I am, then, here concerned with the elderly carpenter or machine-tool operator who is forced to retire from a lifelong job because he had a heart attack, or other ailment which makes it impossible for him to continue to work. I am concerned with women widowed at age 60, after a lifetime of making a home, who must, under our present system, wait 5 years until they are eligible for social-security benefits. I believe, further, that we must lower the eligibility age in order that we may increase job opportunities for younger workers.

I urge your support of my bill, H. R. 703 on the ground that it is a necessary revision of our social-security system to bring it in line with the dynamic economic conditions of today. I am convinced we must adjust that system to the changes in the average work life which I have described. But most of all, I believe we must lower the eligibility age by at least 5 years because, in so doing, we will be increasing the protection offered to those of our aged people who need it most—and that, as I understand it, is the major purpose of our social-security system.

Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 11, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, during the 83d Congress eight Republican and Democrat members of the Judiciary Subcommittee of the other body issued a unanimous report entitled "Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments." The document lifted the lid on over 20 years of Communist conspiracy inside our Government.

Inasmuch as there has been considerable wailing and weeping from certain quarters during the past few weeks relating to the conduct of the 1954 election campaign, I feel impelled to set before my colleagues a summary of the factual record as it was disclosed officially and unanimously by these Democrat and Republican Members of the other body.

This report reveals that previous administrations were guilty of laxity, evasion, and obstinacy in dealing with the issue of communism in government. When read in light of recent political exaggerations expressed by Democratic Party leaders of GOP campaign language, it most positively dispels their complaint that the Democratic Party was charged with disloyalty.

Contrarily, it fully substantiates the laxity, evasion, and obstinacy allegations that were the sum and substance of GOP charges.

The report begins by describing the activities of the Soviet conspirators in the following language:

> When the principal concern of the Government was economic recovery, they were in the AAA, the NRA, and new sections of old departments. During the war they joined such wartime agencies as the Board of Economic Warfare, the Foreign Economic Administration, the OSS, and the like. Toward the end of the war and in the postwar period, they were operating in the foreign policy field. At the end of the war they gravitated toward the international agencies.

Speaking of Government employees involved in the conspiracy, the report says:

> They colonized key committees of Congress, helped write the laws, conducted congressional hearings, and wrote congressional reports.
>
> They advised Cabinet members, wrote speeches for them, and represented them in Government conferences, staffed interdepartmental committees which prepared basic American and world policy.
>
> They traveled to every continent as emissaries of the American people; attended virtually every international conference where statesmen met to shape the future, influenced the State Department with disastrous results.
>
> There was an interlacing combination of these people in almost every agency which had to do with labor.

The Senators investigated how subversives got key Government posts and reported:

> They used each other's names for references, hired each other, promoted each other, raised each other's salaries, transferred each other from bureau to bureau, department to department, assigned each other to international missions, vouched for each other's loyalty, protected each other when exposures were threatened.

The committee heard a former courier for the conspirators say:

> We didn't have too much trouble (in moving agents). Two of our best (avenues for placing people in positions) were Harry Dexter White and Lauchlin Currie. Once we got one person in, he got others, and the whole process continued like that.

On the extent of this penetration into the United States Government, part of the report reads:

> According to the evidence in our records, those involved in the secret Communist underground included an Executive Assistant to the President of the United States (Lauchlin Currie), an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury (Harry Dexter White), a United States Treasury attaché in China (Solomon Adler), the Director of the Office of Special

Political Affairs for the State Department (Alger Hiss), the Secretary of the International Monetary Fund (Frank Coe), a member of the National Labor Relations Board (Edwin S. Smith), Secretary of the NLRB (Nathan Witt), chief counsel, Senate Subcommittee on Civil Liberties (John J. Abt), Treasury Department representative and adviser in Financial Control Division of the North African Economic Board, in UNRRA and at meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers in Moscow (Harold Glasser), Director, National Research Project of the Works Progress Administration (David Weintraub).

On the question of when the plot started, the Senators found:

The first organized subversion encountered was that accomplished by the Harold Ware underground cell of the Communist Party in the early 1930's. The subcommittee took testimony from two members of this cell. They were Whittaker Chambers and Nathaniel Weyl. In setting forth the members of the Ware cell we are listing how they testified when they were subpenaed: Nathan Witt (invoked constitutional privilege that he could not be compelled to bear witness against himself), Lee Pressman (admitted Communist membership before House Un-American Activities Committee), John J. Abt (invoked privilege), Charles Kramer (invoked privilege), Henry H. Collins, Jr. (invoked privilege), Victor Perlo (invoked privilege), Harold Ware (deceased), Alger Hiss (denied Communist Party membership before House Un-American Activities Committee).

The report publishes for the first time part of a secret memo dated November 25, 1945, prepared by an intelligence agency of the Government, identifying other and later espionage groups. It reads in part:

The head of (one group) was N. Gregory Silvermaster, now connected with the United States Treasury. Another member is William L. Ullman, a major of the Air Force stationed at the Pentagon, who has been obtaining and photographing classified information regarding United States Government war plans and also reports of the FBI which had been furnished to G–2 of the Army. Other members of this group included A. George Silverman, a civilian employee of the War Department; Harry Dexter White, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury; Lauchlin Currie, Administrative Assistant to the President, and lesser figures.

The head of the next group of Soviet espionage agents was Victor Perlo, of the War Production Board. Members of this group were introduced to (Elizabeth) Bentley at the apartment of John Abt in New York City. The individuals in this group include Charles Kramer, an investigator for Senator KILGORE'S committee; Henry Magdoff, of the War Production Board; Donald Wheeler, of the Office of Strategic Services. There were various other minor Government employees in this group, including employees of the UNRRA.

On the distribution of the above 1945 secret memo, page 1 of the report says:

(It) was circulated among several key Government agencies and made available to the President of the United States.

Assessing the damage done to our country by the operation of these conspiracies, the Senators wrote:

How many priceless American secrets have been conveyed to Moscow through the tunnels of the American Communist underground will never be known.

The report uses testimony of ex-Communists to show how American policy could be influenced from a key position. Example:

Question. What you say is that (the Morgenthau plan) was a Communist plan to destroy Germany, weaken her to where she could not help us?

Answer. That is correct. She could no longer be a barrier that would protect the West * * *

Question. You say that Harry Dexter White worked on that?

Answer. And on our instructions he pushed hard.

Question. And that Mr. Morgenthau, who was Secretary of the Treasury, was used by the Communist agents to promote that plot?

Answer. I am afraid so; yes.

Question. He was unsuspectingly used?

Answer. Of course, the way the whole principle works is like dropping a pebble into a pond and the ripples spread out, and that is the way we work.

Commenting on the activities of the FBI, the report carried these lines:

(The conspirators) stayed in their jobs, received promotion, and influenced policy for several years after impressive information had been marshaled.

The FBI cannot expose and cannot force action once it has reported the results of its investigation.

There is ample evidence that the FBI and other agencies learned the underlying facts of the Communist conspiracy and time and time again performed their duty and notified the proper administrative agencies.

The Senators sought to determine precisely what aspect of the loyalty machinery failed during these former years and concluded:

Primarily, the breakdown came in the failure on the part of the responsible executive agencies to act on the information which was available.

Describing its experience with witnesses, the committee had this to report:

In public session 36 persons about whom it had substantial evidence of membership in the Communist underground in Government [were examined]. All of them invoked the fifth amendment and refused to answer questions. Many refused even to acknowledge their own signatures on official Government documents in which they had sworn to nonmembership [in the Communist Party] in the past.

All who invoked the fifth amendment were unyielding, uncooperative, and even abusive. All assumed a cloak of innocence that was inconsistent with the record and with their refusals to testify.

The record is replete with instances of identified Communists appearing who have sworn on Government applications they have never been members of the Communist Party. In many of the cases it was apparent there was false swearing when the oath was taken, but the statute of limitations provided that no action could be initiated after 3 years from that offense.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me admonish those guilty of misstatements about the 1954 campaign carefully to reread the foregoing and carefully to reread what was charged during the 1954 campaign by Vice President NIXON and others. Let them also contemplate the monstrous losses of life and substance America has suffered by reason of these recorded derelictions in dealing with the issue of communism in Government.

Advancing Activities Which Will Make Our Civilization Endure and Flourish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, many millions of dollars and much talent and shrewd organizing brains are going into the Russian propaganda drive to picture the citizens of our great country as gum-chewing, insensitive, materialistic barbarians, without souls.

It was pointed out in the report on the 14 cultural bills considered by the 83d Congress that—

One of the major ways in which we might turn reluctant and uneasy military allies—and the 800 million of uncommitted people—into friends would be to earn their respect for our own culture. It is obvious, however, that if we have no respect for and are officially indifferent to our own best cultural efforts, if we show no concern as a people and as a nation with our own contemporary culture and our living artists, then the peoples of other countries are hardly to be blamed if they ignore and underrate the cultural contributions which we have to give the peoples of the world. We have only ourselves to blame, for they take their cues from our own Federal Government. In this situation the Communist parties in the various countries and the Russians find it extremely easy to spread their lies that we are gum-chewing, insensitive, materialistic barbarians.

One place to begin righting things is in the Federal City which is singularly underprivileged regarding cultural matters as compared with other capital cities of the world and even as compared with most of the leading cities of the United States. We find W. M. Kiplinger reporting in his book, Washington Is Like That, published in 1942, for instance:

Despite the wealth of national tradition attached to Washington, there is very little native culture. The city has never been a notable breeding place for art, or music, or literature. Unlike other great capitals of world thought, such as prewar London and Vienna and Paris, where the native-born leaders of the cities shaped the intellectual patterns which influenced the nation, Washington as a city has no homegrown culture. Its influence in cultural matters is not by Washington, but rather via Washington. Whatever culture there is here was started elsewhere and brought in and pasted on.

Some 10 Representatives and 6 Senators joined Congressman Charles R. Howell in presenting bills in the 83d Congress for a national cultural program including a cultural center in the Nation's Capital. Hearings were held on them, but they were rejected by the majority in a report that will surely go down in history as a classic example of disinterest in the cultural heritage of the West.

In a speech to the National Symphony Orchestra Association in September 1952, when he was given a testimonial scroll calling him the most musical

President in the history of our country, former President Harry S. Truman said Washington should be developed into the greatest musical center in the history of the world. In urging an auditorium and opera house, Mr. Truman recalled that as a Senator he had twice helped to push through the Senate legislation providing such a building. But he said the bills had been murdered in the House by the efforts of lobbyists acting for cities around Washington. "They did not appreciate the fact that Washington was to be the capital of the world," he said.

Mr. Truman pointed out that he had seen show places in Mexico City, Paris, Rio de Janiero, and he remarked:

There isn't a reason in the world why Washington shouldn't have a place where the greatest symphony in the world can play for the public.

The gentleman from New York, EMANUEL CELLER; the gentleman from Montana, LEE METCALF; and the gentleman from Louisiana, JAMES H. MORRISON have joined me in introducing in the Congress H. R. 21, H. R. 630, H. R. 1822, and H. R. 1825, respectively—legislation "creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an inaugural hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center." Very broad support has been expressed for this legislation in principle by leaders in business, labor, education, recreation, city planning, libraries, and the fine arts generally. I cordially invite other Members of Congress, from both sides of the aisle, who may be interested in advancing the cultural status of our country, and our Nation's Capital as well, to join in sponsoring this legislation.

The bill would authorize an appropriation of $25,000 for the commission whose members would serve without pay in considering a suitable site, procuring plans and designs, and formulating a method of financing the civic cultural center on a self-liquidating basis. The people of the District of Columbia pay more than $170 million in Federal taxes and Congress, in its role as the City Council of Washington, should sympathetically consider the city's need for a civic and cultural center. In this connection I would like to call to your attention the following splendid editorial which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 11, 1955:

ENCOURAGING THE ARTS

In the long view of history, a society is likely to be judged most definitively by its cultivation of the arts. American culture has frequently been criticized abroad—to a large extent unjustly and as a consequence of shrewd Soviet propaganda—as materialistic; but increasingly American artists have been making significant contributions in music, literature, drama, painting, and sculpture. What is perhaps lacking in the United States is a diffusion of the arts to the people. And it was no doubt to remedy this lack as well as to counter some of the current misconceptions about American culture that President Eisenhower promised in his state of the Union message to "recommend the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission of the Arts within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to advise the Federal Government on ways to encourage artistic and cultural endeavor and appreciation."

Art is never likely to flourish under governmental direction. Nothing could be further from the American tradition, or from the thought in President Eisenhower's mind, we are sure, than the kind of Commissariat of Culture which operates in the Soviet Union to make art an instrumentality of the state. Artists cannot be mobilized. But they can be encouraged by recognition and appreciation of their work; they can be stimulated by increased public understanding of the arts and by expanded opportunities for the public to see and hear their work. In the promotion of popular interest in the arts, the Government can play a most helpful role.

We hope that the President will give consideration, in this connection, to the admirable proposal put forward sometime ago in a House bill by former Representative Charles Howell for the construction of an auditorium and art center in the Nation's Capital. There could scarcely be a more appropriate beginning for a Federal program to foster interest in the arts. Creation of the means through which music, drama, and pictorial art can be brought to the people is one important contribution which can be made by government. But the sine qua non, of course, is the propagation of an atmosphere in which innovation, experimentation, and unorthodoxy can find free expression.

Pay Increase for Postal and Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 11, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, one of my first duties after taking my oath of office as a Member of the 84th Congress was to introduce a bill to increase the salaries of all postal workers and Federal employees, including those in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government, as well as those employed by the Government of the District of Columbia.

My bill provides for a pay increase of $1,000 per annum to all such employees; those who are employed on an hourly or part-time basis are to receive additional compensation at the rate of 50 cents per hour.

Mr. Speaker, the prime justification for this measure is to compensate the postal workers and Government employees for the inadequate salaries paid them in recent years. I have maintained all along that their salaries have never been adequately adjusted to meet the high cost of living, particularly since the war in Korea. This has resulted in real losses of actual earning capacity for them and caused great hardship to many of these employees who are unable to cope with such problems as the increased cost of food, higher rents, and other essentials.

During the past few years the salaries of postal and Federal employees have lagged behind those doing comparable work in private industry. Government employees in the lower income brackets are finding this situation almost intolerable as they struggle to maintain their family, upkeep of a household, education of their children. In many instances it was found that they had to supplement their income by part-time work outside the Government, or have their wives seek employment when they should give their full attention to the children and maintenance of the household.

I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues that, unlike other workers in private industry, postal and Government workers are prohibited by law from engaging in political activity in order to improve their situation. Furthermore, long before the United States Government inserted no-strike provisions in the laws affecting Federal employees, the postal workers had voluntarily relinquished all rights to declare strikes—which, as you well know, is one of labor's most potent weapons in its efforts to improve conditions for the laboring masses.

Mr. Speaker, I was extremely disappointed when the 83d Congress dragged out this issue until the very end of its second session and then adopted only a 5-percent increase in salaries, which was subsequently vetoed by the President. Surely, the 83d Congress could have taken earlier action in the matter and adopted a more adequate measure.

Postal workers and Federal employees are a conscientious and loyal group, hard working, industrious. They deserve full consideration. They deserve fair remuneration for the important services they perform to keep our Government functioning smoothly and efficiently. They should not be placed in a position of being forced to seek outside income to obtain the necessary essentials for themselves and their families. I want to stress as strongly as possible that the proposed pay increase will be used largely for meeting normal living expenses, and not for luxuries.

Mr. Speaker, we have started a new congressional session. Let us avoid the mistakes of the past by taking prompt and early action on this matter. Let it not be said of us that we ignore the postal and Federal workers whose pay increases are long overdue. Action today is worth more than all the promises for tomorrow.

Federal Regulation of Production and Gathering of Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 11, 1955

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to comment concerning the fine address presented yesterday in the House by my colleague from Texas [Mr. IKARD], who speaks with authority and accuracy

in outlining the danger we are facing today in gas production. I join him in deep concern and recognize the need for legislation correcting the present interpretation of the Natural Gas Act. I wish to commend him for his presentation of the facts and his making clear the need for legislative action. I hope to join my colleague from Texas, as well as others, in this effort.

A National Materials Handling Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 11, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my remarks in behalf of my resolution proclaiming a National Materials Handling Week. Many of you may not be familiar with the term "materials handling" and what it constitutes. Actually, materials handling is just what the words mean—the handling of materials. It represents much, if not most of the physical activity in any plant. From receiving yard to shipping dock, materials are unloaded, moved, stored for minutes, moved, stored for hours or days, and moved again into manufacturing. Thereafter, they are moved from one process to the next, and so on, for 10, 20, or 100 such processes, each followed by another movement and often by one or more temporary storages. And, finally, comes movement to inspection, to storage, to shipping dock, and to common carrier, at which point they enter the distribution cycle—and that is a series of moves and waits.

The story is the same in steel mills and dairies, department stores, machine-tool plants, in arsenals and toothpaste factories. Handling materials is a large part, if not the major part, of the activity. It is large in man-hours absorbed and large in costs hidden in such things as inventory, space utilization, output per square foot of plant, and other such measures. It is the very heart of many industries, for example, mining, and the key to superiority in others, for example, automobile manufacturing.

During World War II, men engaged in this type of work were taken from industry and placed in positions where their all-round know-how of material handling, supply, warehousing, transportation and related operation and equipment, was utilized to great advantage in the battle of the supply lines. The familiar expression "get there fustes' with the mostes" is the epitome of materials handling during a national emergency. The Seabees carved the airfields out of the jungles of the Pacific Island with bulldozers, earthmovers and similar material handling devices. The derricks and cranes raised the sunken ships at Pearl Harbor; the forklift trucks moved vast mountains of materials to and from ships at dock-side operations; the tractor-trailer trains serviced the bomb-loading operations at airfields. The entire supply line of our Armed Forces was dependent upon material handling and material handling devices. Anything moved in any direction, whether fluid or solid, whether the device used is a pipeline, freight car, pneumatic tube, elevator, forklift truck, or a hand truck is a material handling operation.

Great strides have been made in the last 25 years because of the developments brought forth by the material handling profession. In the constant battle against occupational hazards and diseases, material handling equipment has been the basic factor in reducing these hazards. Today one can see conveyors miles-long bringing ore, coal and slag from mines far underground to the surface without back-breaking labor. The thousands of men of yesterday, old and broken before their time by exhaustive back-breaking labor, would be amazed today at the sight of a giant forklift truck moving through a steel mill carrying an 80,000-pound coil, with one man operating it as comfortably and effortlessly as the average man operates the family car.

Better methods of material handling have greatly benefited our way of life by adding to our comfort, well-being and leisure hours. As a matter of fact, the automobile, radio, television, electric refrigerator, washing machine and the supermarket are available to every individual in this country today because better methods of handling material have made them available.

Interchangeable parts manufacturing and mass production methods were used on the Springfield rifle during the Civil War. The punch press and automatic screw machine have been in existence for many years but the greatest strides in industry were not realized until better material handling methods were devised.

It is only since World War II that the materials-handling function has begun to get needed recognition. A few companies have made real progress and are reaping the benefits, and more companies have made a good start. The first independent technical group of its kind was organized in Pittsburgh in 1945 as the Material Handling Society. Another group was organized in 1946 as the Material Handling Society of Philadelphia and in 1947 the Indiana Material Handling Society was formed.

In 1947 the Material Handling Institute, an association of equipment manufacturers, helped to organize groups in various parts of the country. In the same year independent societies were organized in Boston and Cleveland. In 1948 other societies were organized in Chicago, Toledo, Detroit, Syracuse and Houston. An organization very similar in its aims and purposes, The Society of Industrial Packaging and Material Handling Engineers was incorporated and received its charter in June 1945 in the State of Illinois. The science of packaging is important to the handling of material—consider the development of the waterproof package.

The American Society of Mechanical Engineers has a division devoted exclusively to material handling as does the Society for the Advancement of Management.

With the increasing interest in materials handling, it became evident that a national organization composed of local chapters was needed. So in January 1949, steps were taken to form the American Material Handling Society, Inc. A charter was obtained and temporary officers were elected. The first annual meeting was held in June 1949, and the society was formally organized and chapter charters were issued in Boston, Chicago, Detroit, Houston, Indianapolis, Louisville, Pittsburgh, and Syracuse. Chapters in many other cities across the country have since been added. As a matter of fact, since 1949 the society has grown to 34 chapters in the United States from coast to coast, and 5 chapters in Canada. It is expected that with the beginning of the New Year there will be a total of 45 chapters, one of which will be in Mexico City, Mexico.

The scope of interest in materials handling is today truly international. In January 1954, the society affiliated with the Institute of Material Handling of London, England, whose membership approximates our own in size. The British society includes 88 members at large from 26 foreign countries.

The activities of the American Material Handling Society have included such things as the sponsorship of technical sessions at Material Handling Exhibitions in Cleveland, Philadelphia, and Chicago and regional conferences in every corner in the country. A national education committee and a college-industry committee cooperate with various colleges to increase the quality and scope of material handling education. For example, the New Jersey Chapter and Stevens Institute of Technology have cosponsored a forum for the past 3 years at Stevens Institute. The society has cooperated with the armed services to develop better material handling methods and personnel has been furnished to government agencies to assist them in specific investigations.

The aims and purposes of the American Material Handling Society, Inc., include: the advancement of the theory and practice of materials handling; the promotion of the welfare and future of the profession; keeping its members in touch with materials handling information and influence not ordinarily available through their individual occupations; conducting and promoting studies of the principles governing the art and science of materials handling; publishing technical, statistical and engineering data covering all phases of the profession; determining and encouraging the formation of operating and safety codes; cooperating with other engineering societies and educational institutions in furthering the interest of the engineering profession; and establishing a better understanding of the scope of the Materials Handling Engineers' field of operation.

Because materials handling is so basic to our whole economy, the economy of the greatest manufacturing country the world has ever known, the 4,000 members of this growing society and myself urge the enactment of this special legislation

setting aside a "National Materials Handling Week", a week to pay tribute to the man who pushes the wheelbarrow and to all the men who contribute to our vast production lines. Each one of them is doing his share in making our life more comfortable and secure in peacetime and giving us greater protection in wartime.

Future of American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 11, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last night it was my privilege to deliver an address in Philadelphia on the subject of the Future of American Foreign Policy.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BASIC PRINCIPLES FOR AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

It is a great privilege to speak to you in this distinguished forum.

It is a particular pleasure to share the platform with my able colleague from the State of Washington, a man young in years but broad in experience, one who has already contributed significantly to the effective functioning of the United States, the Honorable HENRY JACKSON.

It is most appropriate to consider with my colleague and with you, tonight, the future of American foreign policy as the new 84th Congress gets underway.

Here, in Philadelphia, hallowed birthplace of American liberty, we will contemplate how best we may preserve our own liberty and others' liberty throughout the world.

With the new Congress but 5 days old, we are entering into a new chapter of American history, a continuing chapter in unfolding American foreign policy.

NEED FOR BIPARTISAN TEAMWORK

The presence of my colleague here tonight, emphasizes perhaps the most important single point which I or anyone else, can make tonight. It is simply this: The success of foreign policy—now more than ever before—depends upon genuine teamwork—not lip-service teamwork between the two major political parties. I am certain that we are going to have genuine, effective teamwork.

I am certain that under the leadership of our great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and our able Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, that friendly constructive liaison will be maintained so that there is real consultation on the major issues involved in the future conduct of our foreign affairs.

No one here tonight need probably be told that never before has it been more important that we, as a people, be truly united at the water's edge.

In this atomic-hydrogen age, this age of jet propulsion and soon, possibly, this age of an intercontinental ballistic missile, we cannot have a "Republican foreign policy"; we cannot have a "Democratic foreign policy"; we must have an American foreign policy.

That is precisely what we are going to have.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR GEORGE, CONGRESSMAN RICHARDS

We are fortunate indeed in having two statesmen on whom much of the legislative burden will fall in foreign affairs in the new Congress. I refer to the Honorable WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, President pro tempore of the Senate, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the Honorable JAMES RICHARDS, of South Carolina, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. They are men of the highest caliber. They are legislative leaders in the finest sense of the word, deeply aware of their responsibilities to their Nation.

I know, too, the other members of both the Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs Committees, and I can assure you that they, too, are deeply sensitive to their obligations to carry out a constructive foreign policy.

That is especially the case with our distinguished committee Member, our Senate minority leader, WILLIAM KNOWLAND, and it is the case with the Senate's Majority Leader Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, who has already contributed much particularly to inter-American relations.

CURRENT CHALLENGES AND PERILS

Against this background, let me say that in my judgment the outlook for our future foreign relations is bright.

To be sure, it is full of immediate challenges, full of critical dangers.

You are all aware of these perils. You are aware of the continued crisis in southeast Asia, notably in southern Vietnam.

You are aware of the nationalist ferment which is sweeping North Africa—site of several of our strategic bases—as well as the tension in many other underdeveloped areas of the world.

You are perhaps aware of recent Soviet diplomatic-economic developments with regard to Afghanistan and Finland, to cite two widely separate points, which give us cause for concern.

You are aware of the problem raised by the position of the new Japanese Government. It is a position which, I feel, in all frankness and friendship, is not sufficiently realistic about the danger of Communist aggression, the danger involved in the fake Soviet trade offensive—an offensive which is being used as a crude disguise for Soviet penetration of underarmed Japan.

DANGER OF SOVIET VERSION OF PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

You are aware of how significantly the Soviet Union is emphasizing the worldwide propaganda theme—the supposedly soothing lullaby—of "peaceful coexistence."

Now, by our United States definition that concept—those two words—can be sound. But, the Soviet definition of "peaceful coexistence" implies a great deal more than the ordinary definition, a great deal of which is absolutely unsound for the free world.

It implies compulsory neutralism to keep in the good graces of the Kremlin; it implies breaking up the western alliance; it implies ignoring the fact that international communism is still bent upon ruthless conquest.

No realistic power can, therefore, accept the misleading Soviet definition of peaceful coexistence with all its dangerous implications.

But, every realistic person believes we must do everything within our power to prevent a nuclear Armageddon—a terrible world war III.

War can be prevented. It will, I believe, be prevented, provided—I emphasize, provided—we are strong, provided we are prepared, provided we are united. Peaceful coexistence—yes, but only through free world strength, free world unity, free world realism.

Peaceful coexistence through actual, ironclad Soviet demonstration, for the very first time, that she means what she says and says what she means, that is what the West must seek.

Glib Soviet promises, meaningless Soviet gestures, more Soviet soft-soap, of these we have had our fill. We are not going to heed more of the same.

We insist on hard and fast and irrevocable Soviet actions truly aimed at peace. In other words, let's see the Soviet Union agree to the sound Austrian state treaty. Let's see the Soviet Union agree to absolutely free and uncontrolled elections in East Germany and in North Korea and to an enforceable system of gradual world disarmament.

Let's see if the Soviet Union will do these or any of the other constructive deeds which she has so consistently refused.

PEACE PROGRESS EXPECTED

These, then, my friends, are some of the problems before us.

And, yet, as we review them, I am convinced that in spite of them, in the next 12 months, we are going to make further tremendous progress in helping to assure peace and prosperity. The Senate is going to ratify overwhelmingly the very helpful Southeast Asia Treaty Organization Pact. Moreover, at the meeting in Thailand late in February, I am convinced that SEATO is going to be strengthened. It must be strengthened.

We are going to ratify our mutual defense arrangement with the Republic of China.

We are going to witness final ratification of the Western European Union. Thus far, only 3 of the 14 NATO powers have ratified West Germany's admission. But, I am convinced that in spite of all the pitfalls ahead for WEU, in spite of all the roadblocks and traps which we are certain the Soviet Union will try to set in order to sabotage the setting up of the new West German Army—I am convinced that we are definitely on the high road toward the bringing into being of the Western European Union with West German membership.

I am conviced, too, that there is forthcoming new vitality in cooperation in our own Western Hemisphere and in particular in the Organization of American States. We are going to see a greater emphasis on sound inter-American relations—political, cultural, economic, defensive.

I believe, and so stated at the recent Inter-American Conference at Rio, that there is going to be far more abundant private American investment in Latin American lands. Thrilling new frontiers for the world, and particularly for these countries themselves exist in the lands below the Rio Grande. There are magnificent opportunities for growth, development, and exchange. Standards of living within the next few years are going to be tremendously raised there.

What is needed is, of course, a favorable climate for greatly expanded American and other foreign investment, and I believe that it will be forthcoming in many of these Latin countries.

GREAT PROMISE IN ATOMS-FOR-PEACE

And there is other progress that is going to be made. Few avenues offer brighter promise than the famous atoms-for-peace plan offered by President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

This is one of the most dramatic, one of the most inspiring, one of the most fruitful channels of international cooperation now lying before us. It will be fruitful in the field of medicine, fruitful in the field of industrial power, fruitful in the field of overall scientific advancement, fruitful in helping to ease East-West tensions.

All this lies before us, and it is capable of realization.

So, we are moving ahead. We are doing so in spite of the pessimists, in spite of the "spreaders of gloom," in spite of some morbid people who almost seem to prefer predicting crisis rather than making realistic predictions of good things to come.

I, for one, have never believed in over-optimism, but I do believe in faith: Faith in ourselves, faith in our allies, faith in our chances for peace, faith in our Creator. And that is why I believe that we are going to continue to have a successful bipartisan foreign policy in time to come.

Let me say, too, that we are going to expand our program of technical assistance particularly in free Asia. This program, with modest expenditures, has already done incalculable good in helping to reduce illiteracy, disease, malnutrition, in helping to improve housing, sanitation, agriculture in a great many countries. I believe that this program should be expanded, not only through our own efforts, but, through the medium of the United Nations because it pays off in a thousand and one constructive ways for the good of mankind.

And, speaking of the U. N., I believe that the United States Senate will submit important suggestions for strengthening of the U. N. Charter.

I do not believe that they can or will be very radical proposed changes, but they may affect such vital matters as helping to broaden membership in the U. N., more effective Pacific settlement of disputes, and other phases which definitely do lend themselves to improvement, in spite of the possibility of Soviet veto.

This, then, is the partial shape of some of the things to come, as I see it. I am not a prophet or the son of a prophet, but I believe that all that I have mentioned thus far is feasible.

Tomorrow will bring changes. The scenes on the world stage are constantly in flux. Great political personalities rise and fall, party coalitions change, circumstances unfold, new facts come to light, but these goals I have mentioned are all attainable.

In anticipating our future foreign policy goals, I should like to stress several principles which I think can be a sound guide to our action.

AMERICAN ACTIONS OBSERVED BY WORLD

The first principle which we must follow is that our own domestic actions here at home will, to a great extent, determine our success or failure abroad and that we have got to watch our step.

The eyes of the world are on America. The eyes of friends and neutrals and foes. We may, in George Washington's words, "raise a standard to which the wise and the honest may repair," or we may drag down our cause by folly and error and by being untrue to our own principles of fair play.

I must frankly state to you that the bungling initial decisions in the so-called Ladejinsky case did us no good in the eyes of the free world.

I say that any man who can win the confidence of Gen. Douglas MacArthur or that of one of my own leading colleagues like Congressman WALTER JUDD, any man with almost two decades of unblemished service is entitled to a fairer "shake" than this Government employee apparently got in the initial arbitrary handling of his case. I say to you further that certain of our immigration policies have done us little good in the eyes of the free world.

I am not of course reflecting on a blanket basis on our security program, either with respect to our own Government servants or with respect to screening would-be immigrants to our land.

On the contrary, no sensible patriotic person would want us to ignore the obvious serious security problems which we face, and which for too long, was given little consideration.

But neither would a sensible person want a security system to be distorted or mismanaged to such an extent that it harms our own country at home and abroad.

I recently released a report summarizing the candid reactions of members of our Foreign Service. That report reflected the deep concern which these patriotic men and women feel over the administration of our present security system. That does not mean that they want a single genuine security risk to tarnish the Foreign Service. But neither does it mean that they want this system to impair the effective functioning of their own Foreign Service to which they are dedicating their lives. These officials in our diplomatic corps are entitled to our respect and faith, as are the uniformed men in our armed services. Both groups are in the front lines of our worldwide defense. They are entitled to fair dealing, and I am sure that our outstanding Secretary of State, a man who has labored so long and so well for the success of our foreign policy will do everything he can to help relieve the concern in the minds of our Foreign Service workers.

PATIENCE AND JUDGMENT

2. The second principle is that we must be patient in our foreign policy dealings.

There is too much of a tendency among some Americans to want to seek a quick decision always. There is too much of a tendency in some unofficial quarters toward hasty, ill-considered impulsive action.

And let me say, there is too much of an "either/or" philosophy. "Either the Soviets do this or else. * * *" "Either an allied or neutral power does this or else. * * *"

There is too much of a tendency to ignore the fact that diplomacy is an art of patient, careful, detailed, often necessarily quiet negotiation. It consumes a great deal of time, particularly with an adversary like the Soviet Union and its satellites, as we learned at the lengthy Korean peace discussion at Panmunjom. So, we have got to get out of the immature habit of toying with "ultimatums" and arbitrary deadlines. We have got to realize that we cannot solve all our problems overnight.

In stressing this point, I am not arguing for delay or inaction or "donothingism" or weakness. On the contrary, there are issues which definitely require speed, decision, and strength and vigor of expression and action.

But, we must not assume that every single policy question lends itself to those characteristics. Our problems have been a long time in the making. They will be a long time in solving.

ALLIED TEAMWORK ESSENTIAL

3. The principle that we must bear in mind is that our strength is a team strength.

A teammate does not try to order the rest of the team, even if he is a captain. He works with his men as their equal. He is respected because of the rightness of his position, the intelligence of his decision.

We of the United States have never sought, do not now seek, a master-servant relationship with our allies. They are our sovereign equals. They are entitled to and will receive our respect and consideration.

There is too much of a tendency among some Americans to want to go off "half-cocked" every time the United Nations, or the Organization of American States, or NATO, or our partners in any of the other multilateral or bilateral groupings may not want to do something precisely as we suggest.

But, let's now act like team players and let's continue to urge our allies to do likewise.

WATCH POSSIBLE CHAIN REACTIONS

4. The fourth principle that we must follow is that we must think through our actions and ponder where our actions may lead.

There is too much of a tendency for some people to suggest some reckless action without giving the slightest thought to where that action might plunge us. The fact of the matter is that not even in nuclear physics are there more dangerous chain reactions than in the field of diplomacy. A diplomatic decision on our part may cause reverberations throughout the world—so vast as to be almost uncontrollable.

To cite an illustration, take the instance of those who loosely suggest that today—right now—we break relations with the Soviet Union and the satellites.

Now, we keenly recognize why there is so much clamor for severance—the fact that the Soviet and satellites embassies are invariably beehives of espionage and subversion. We fully recognize the extreme difficulties which our own embassies are placed under inside the Iron Curtain and we recognize many other disadvantages of the status quo. But, the fact of the matter is that the whole world hungers for peace and diplomatic contacts for peace and symbols of the possibility of peace. There are few free powers on earth which do not want us to explore reasonable bases with the Soviet Union to try to work out an equilibrium of peace.

For us rashly and independently to sever relations would be tending almost to confirm some of the worst lies in Soviet propaganda. It would be like our saying, "we don't want to explore, we don't want to negotiate." It would tend to give unjustified credence to false Soviet propaganda to the effect that all we allegedly want to do is "to rattle atomic bombs."

Nothing could be further from the truth. No one wants peace more than we do. No one wants more than we to achieve peaceful use of the miracles of nuclear energy.

And so we should maintain our contacts, our listening posts, while protecting our own security here at home from espionage.

We must not drive the neutral powers toward the Soviet orbit by our own ill-considered action. We must impress upon the neutrals the truth that it is the Soviet Union which has consistently sabotaged all genuine diplomatic negotiations for peace, particularly by its hollow demands for phony new conferences which get nowhere.

In the spring, 30 Asian-African nations will meet in Indonesia. It is up to us to strengthen our record so that all will see that it is we, contrary to the Soviets, who are leaving no stone unturned in our efforts for peace and prosperity and security and freedom.

EVENTS COMPLEX AND INTERRELATED

The fifth principle that I want to mention is that we must realize the complexity and the interrelation of foreign events.

There is too much of a tendency to give snap reactions to particular problems on the foreign scene, as if these problems existed in isolation. A great many people who have hardly given the slightest study to certain key questions, are always offering "packaged" solutions.

Let me just mention a few key problems. Any man who thinks that any one of these problems is simple or can be solved all by itself had better go back and do some homework.

Here they are: The Cyprus question, the New Guinea question, the Morocco-Tunisia-Algeria question, the Kashmir prolem, world disarmament, and the general agreement on tariffs and trade.

I could cite 20 or 30 more key problems.

But I think that you can appreciate the fact that the State Department, in seeking the solution of these problems and of the big overall problem of East-West tensions, has a tremendous job on its hands. It is a difficult, complex, detailed, challenging job.

We should first seek to understand that job, to understand these interrelated problems before we offer snap criticisms or snap solutions.

LEARN PAST LESSONS

6. The sixth and final principle that I want to mention tonight is that we have got to

learn from the past, to learn from our successes, and yes, from our failures. But we must also learn that we cannot try identically to duplicate successes under greatly dissimilar conditions.

Now, what illustrations do I have in mind?

Well, we should have learned from the lessons of Indochina that there is no country in this world which can be defended today unless a native government has the respect and eager support of its own population. No amount of foreign armies or foreign aid can hold any underdeveloped or other country unless the domestic population is eagerly committed to its own defense.

The loss of northern Vietnam was a serious loss, but what now about our successes? Well, the Marshall plan, which contributed so magnificently to the revival of western Europe, was a great success.

But for us to attempt to duplicate the Marshall plan, with its outpouring of billions of dollars in an area like southeast Asia, would be utter folly. The countries there are obviously in a different state of development than the highly industrialized countries of what was then war-ravaged western Europe. The capacity of native governments efficiently to administer aid programs is far more limited in southeast Asia. What southeast Asia needs particularly is technical assistance, greatly expanded, for improved health, improved housing, sanitation, education, administration, shelter.

Of course, they need firepower, too, defensive firepower, against the internal and external foe, and we have got to help them get it. But guns are of little use unless there is the will to shoulder them on behalf of a cause in which one truly believes.

KEEP OUT PARTISAN POLITICS

Thus, I have referred to six basic principles.

Obviously, by no means are they the only basic principles in the conduct of our foreign policy, but, at least, they may help serve as a guide to some of our future actions.

I should like to conclude with the thought that the greatest obligation upon all of us in public life is this: To think of the next generation rather than the next election.

Both parties obviously are squaring off for the 1956 Presidential election. There is nothing wrong about the two major parties laying plans so as to put their best foot forward in November 1956.

But I submit to my own party and to the Democratic Party that to put their best foot forward they must put America to the fore. The American people will continue to insist that we keep partisan politics out of foreign policy.

NEITHER PARTY IS FOR TREASON OR WAR

We can't do so if irresponsible, unfair criticism is made by one party of another party; if in ill-tempered, ill-justified zeal, one party is falsely tagged a "party of treason" or another party "a war party."

I say that both parties are patriotic; both parties are for peace. Of course, there are substantial differences within and between parties, but that is no excuse for misrepresenting the others' stand.

Let's stick to the issues. Let's get away from personalities and from false tags on people or parties. Let the facts speak for themselves. Let's fight our political campaigns far more fairly than has been occurring in some places heretofore.

The American people won't tolerate low blows. We believe in sportsmanship—in playing hard but clean—in playing to win, but not in using any foul means to do so.

And may I submit, too, that the American people will ask that all of us stand behind the great man who occupies the White House and his Secretary of State. That does not mean that there should not be intelligent scrutiny of the administration's foreign policy actions and proposals. Obviously this Congress, or any other Congress, must fulfill its constitutional obligations, including careful review of appropriation requests and evaluating how past appropriations have been spent.

But, we have seen in certain foreign countries, notably in our long-time ally France, how the executive branch, time after time, has been paralyzed by irresponsibility and pettiness and partisan chaos in the legislative branch.

I do not want to see that recur among our French friends or, particularly, to see it happen in this country. And for the reasons which I stated earlier in this address, I definitely do not believe that it will happen here.

I do not want the legislative branch to usurp the prerogatives of the executive branch, nor the executive branch to usurp those of the legislative branch. I believe to the depth of my being in a government of checks and balances, of three separate coequal and independent branches of Government.

I do not believe that any member of the legislative branch can or should set himself up as an omniscient alternate Secretary of State. I do not believe that any member of the legislative branch should attempt to interfere with the constitutional obligation of the Chief Executive of our land to spearhead the conduct of foreign relations.

The Founding Fathers of this Nation knew what they were doing in allocating the division of powers.

Let us oppose any move from any quarter in any party which would impair the vitality of that division of power.

In so doing, we will be adequate to the challenge of our times. We will advance the welfare of the next generation, and each of us will have made a record which will command the respect and admiration of the American electorate and most important, of our own conscience.

Thank you.

Tribute to a Mason: Dr. Abraham Shaoni, Grand Master of Masons of the State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 11, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Dr. Abraham Shaoni, grand master of Masons of the State of Israel, and a distinguished citizen of that country, is now visiting in the United States. On Wednesday next he is to be honored at a reception tendered to him by Benjamin Franklin Lodge, No. 50, F. A. A. M., of the District of Columbia.

On this occasion there will be present the grand master of Masons of the District of Columbia, Gregor Macpherson, who is also one of the Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate, and many other Masonic dignitaries from this and other jurisdictions.

It is a pleasure to me to join in a tribute to this distinguished visitor to our shores.

Dr. Shaoni has traveled throughout Europe and the United States, gaining friends and recognition for himself and his grand lodge. His visit to the United States is in pursuance of that objective.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief description of some of the highlights in the career of this distinguished man.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dr. Abraham Shaoni is an attorney of scholarship and distinction who has the degree of doctor of jurisprudence. He was one of those pioneering and energetic lovers of freedom who helped found the new State of Israel. His dedication to the principles of liberty led him to an active Masonic career beginning on April 18, 1935, when he was initiated into Moriah Lodge. On February 9, 1942, he ascended to the throne of King Solomon as the 10th master of Moriah Lodge. On April 24, 1944, he was elected as grand junior deacon and as member of the Grand Lodge of Israel. On March 18, 1946, he was elected grand senior warden. On May 13, 1953, he was elected to the greatest prize that the Masonic order can bestow upon its brethren, the office of grand master.

Social-Security Benefits for Widows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest traditions of our country is the sustained concern which Americans have always shown for the protection of widows and orphans. We are proud of our record in this regard.

But, if I may so, this is an area in which our social-security system is too often discriminatory. As this law is now written, a widow is entitled to a benefit only if she is at least 65 years of age or if she has minor children in her care. Because I am convinced that the widows of this country are entitled to full survivor benefit rights, without the above restrictions, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 2189 which will allow widows to collect social-security benefits whether or not they have reached the age of 65 and whether or not they have children under their care.

I wonder how often the Members of this House have had the unhappy task of explaining to widowed constituents that they will have to wait until their 65th birthday before they would be entitled to social-security benefits? How many times has the letter from a despairing widow described her tragic circumstances. Sometimes she is ill and unable to work. Sometimes she cannot find a job because of lack of work experience—for the good reason that she has spent her life in the home caring for her family. Sometimes she has managed to live for a time on accumulated savings—but has been unable to stretch those savings until her 65th birthday. Still the only answer we can make, under existing law, is to tell her she must get along somehow until she is 65.

My first consideration in introducing H. R. 2187, then, grows out of humanitarian reasons. I believe that appropriate benefits for the widows of wage earners should be part of any genuinely protective social-security system in America.

I am convinced, as well, that there are equally good reasons drawn from the cold facts of our time which call for enactment of my bill. Let me review them for you briefly.

First of all, statistics show that there is, on the average, a difference of about 3 years between the ages of husband and wife. Because wives are usually younger than their husbands the family is often, under existing law, actually removed from the social security benefit role at the time of the death of her husband. For example, if the husband is over age 65 and receiving his own retirement benefit when he dies, that benefit is stopped at the time of the widow's bereavement unless she has also reached the age of 65. In too many cases, therefore, the widow is denied a benefit at the time she most needs one—at the death of the family breadwinner.

Secondly, all studies show that the average woman is less likely to have an adequate retirement income, from any source, than are men. The median income for persons with income is substantially lower for women than for men in all age groups. More specifically to the point, perhaps, is the data assembled in a recent survey of widows receiving old-age and survivors insurance benefits which showed that only 10 percent had independent money retirement income of $1,200 or more per year. In considering my proposal, therefore, I ask you to bear in mind the evidence that roughly 9 out of 10 of the widows of workers covered by the social security system are in need of the protection of its benefits because they do not have adequate income from other sources.

We know how difficult it is for older persons with little work experience to find a job. We know that it is especially difficult for the older woman to secure any work, other than the most menial, because of the many years she has devoted to the role of wife and mother. So we surely cannot believe that widow's benefits have been withheld until the 65th birthday for the reason that, without such benefits, they could easily take care of themselves.

The only argument which has been presented to me against the proposal made in H. R. 2187 for providing benefits for all widows of insured workers, is that it would cost too much. I am informed that the level premium cost of providing such benefits would run somewhat in excess of 1 or 1¼ percent of payroll. If this is the case, I maintain that such costs are warranted if we propose to have a social security system which offers any kind of genuine assurance against hardship caused by the death of the family breadwinner. For my own part, I believe such added costs are more than justified in the name of the kind of protection they would furnish the wives and mothers in our country at a time of great tragedy.

Let us remember that the breadwinner has, throughout his working life, made regular contributions toward such protection for his family. He has had no way of anticipating when and how his death would occur. Is it equitable to say to one man: "Your wife will be entitled to benefits because she is 65 years of age"—and to another, "Your wife is not entitled to benefits because she is not yet 65 years of age."

Let us remember, as well, that because of his early death the breadwinner himself will usually receive no benefits at all whereas, if he had been fortunate enough to live to a ripe old age, both he and his wife would have been receiving benefits for each month beyond their 65th birthday. For this reason, alone, it seems only just to me to make up to the bereaved wife for the benefits her husband will never receive—in spite of his payroll contributions.

I urge your support for my bill H. R. 2187 in the names of the wives and mothers of this country. Surely reasons of humanity and of equity argue for the enactment of this legislation. In my confirmed opinion, we can never feel that we have provided really genuine security against distress caused by loss of wages until we have enacted this legislation.

Sixth Anniversary of the Arrest of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1955

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following speech which I made in New York on December 26, 1954, on the occasion of the sixth anniversary of the arrest of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty:

SPEECH OF HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY, OF MICHIGAN, IN CONNECTION WITH SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF ARREST OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

I feel greatly privileged and honored to have been invited as guest speaker at the ceremonies commemorating the sixth anniversary of the arrest and imprisonment of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty which took place on December 26, 1948. I am also happy to have this occasion to deliver some of my thoughts regarding the present problem which besets the Hungarian nation and all the rest of the 800 million people who today find themselves living under Communist slavery.

We have all of us seen in the papers the past few days rumors and reports emanating from Austria to the effect that the cardinal has recently been released from prison. I have been informed by official sources of our Government that there has been no confirmation or substantiation of such reports. Naturally all of us would rejoice if these rumors were found to have some basis in fact. But lacking this, we must assume that Josef Mindszenty is still languishing in a Communist prison, in the power of the same ruthless force which seized upon his person 6 years ago today.

I well recall the events which took place in Hungary at that time so far as they were known to the general public. Most of you know that I was then in Budapest, attached to the American Legation there. Although we heard of the arrest almost as soon as it had occurred, not a word appeared in the government-controlled press until 2 days later, December 28. The brief communique from the Ministry of the Interior merely said: "Josef Mindszenty, Archbishop of Esztergom, has been arrested by police authorities under charges of low (petit) treason, conspiracy to overthrow the republic, and currency violation." The announcement must have been somewhat unexpected as only one paper, Szabad Esti Szo, commented editorially on the announcement that day. It took at least 24 hours for the rest of the Communist press to get into the act.

Many will have noted and remarked on the fact that the arrest took place on the day after Christmas, incidentally, also on a Sunday just as it is today. The explanation is, of course, due to the fact that the Communists feared to touch him before the holiday, knowing that demonstrations in his favor might have occurred on Christmas Day when millions of Hungarian Christians would be attending the church of their faith. News of the arrest, of course, did not reach the people until well after they had returned home from Sunday worship.

The story of the arrest, imprisonment, interrogation, trial, and subsequent confinement has been told and retold, and I will not further develop it here. It was my privilege to address the United States House of Representatives last February on the fifth anniversary of Mindszenty's sentencing, at which time I reviewed the facts regarding these developments as they have become known to the world outside. I think it appropriate, however, to comment briefly upon one of the cardinal's most oft-quoted remarks, an answer he so often gave to those who tried to persuade him to take refuge in the free world.

All of you have heard of this statement many times. It is very brief: "Now men are needed here."

There are with us today many persons, formerly prominent in their own occupations in Hungarian life, who have escaped from the country of their birth and have sought shelter in these United States, the traditional home of refugees and exiles even long before the time of Louis Kossuth. There is no criticism intended in my remarks for such persons, either from Hungary or from any other Iron Curtain country. They are performing a vital function here in America by their tireless efforts to keep the memory of the enslavement of their people constantly before the American public. They have also many other useful tasks to perform which they are doing ably and well. Not only their own homelands but the entire free world owes them a debt of gratitude for their work, a debt which I hope will one day be repaid in full. Such individuals are needed, and will continue to be needed.

But the human memory is of such frailty that it is not enough to need exiles and refugees. To keep the awareness of these terrible events alive in the conscience of the free world and of the slave world, we also need martyrs. Their task is immeasurably harder for in many cases they die or vanish almost unknown and unsung. But, fortunately, there are those, such as Mindszenty, whose bravery and courage is known every-

where and who will never be forgotten. We need such martyrs as examples to all of us, no matter on which side of the Curtain we live.

Cardinal Mindszenty knew he was a man in a peculiar position. He knew that at any time he could have become an exile or a refugee and continued his fight against communism from abroad. But he also knew that that was not enough, that his country and the cause of freedom everywhere needed men to remain at home, men who were willing to face the terrors of communism, men who were willing to suffer martyrdom, even of the degrading kind which he underwent. And he knew that, because of his peculiar position that his martyrdom would leave such an indelible impression on the conscience of the world that the cause of communism would be the loser thereby even though his mind would be perverted by drugs into self-confession and denial of the principles he had formerly championed. He knew that the complete contrast between Mindszenty the cardinal and Mindszenty the prisoner in the dock would be so revealing of Communist barbarities that the conscience of the free world would be aroused as perhaps nothing else could arouse it. And knowing this, he deliberately chose martyrdom, knowing that his cause, the cause of freedom, would be the stronger thereby. In such a belief, he was eminently correct.

I wish now to speak briefly to the captive peoples, not only of Hungary, but everywhere behind the Iron Curtain. Recently there has been much talk in the press of peaceful coexistence between this country and the Soviet Union. Some have interpreted such talk as an indication that we have abandoned the captive peoples to their fate, that we are willing to sit down with the Soviet ruler and divide the world into so-called spheres of influence, that we are prepared to permit the Communists to have Hungary, let us say, if they will agree to abandon their infiltrative efforts in perhaps Guatemala or Chile or Brazil. I want to answer such interpretations this afternoon.

I say to all those who hear my voice that the policy of this Government toward the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain has not changed one iota nor will it change under our present administration. Under date of December 16, merely 10 days ago, I have the following assurances from the State Department, from which I quote: "This Government is not reconciled to the present fate of those peoples; it will not be a party to any arrangement or treaty confirming or prolonging their subjection to Soviet despotism, and it seeks by peaceful means conditions permitting these enslaved national groups to recover genuine freedom and independence."

You may have heard or read of the recent speech which Secretary of States Dulles made in Chicago in which he stated, and I quote: "The scope of conferences with the Soviet Government is necessarily limited by our attitude toward the captive peoples, for the Soviets know that we will not make any deal which would condone and perpetuate the captivity of men and nations." And the State Department has personally assured me that our objective remains unchanged which is to work in all peaceful ways for the creation of a Europe in which the captive peoples will again enjoy governments as well as social and economic institutions of their own free choice.

I hope that these official statements of policy on the part of our Government will act as a reassurance to the captive peoples that they are not and will not be forgotten and that no so-called deal will be made with the Soviets that would in any sense of the word be an acceptance on our part of their conditions of bondage. Moreover, I will say that I am convinced that the great majority of the American people are desirous and hopeful that the eventual day of liberation will come and that it will come soon.

I wish to make one thing clear about which there has been much misunderstanding. There will be no so-called war of liberation in its literal sense. The American people are not prepared and do not intend to fight a war solely and simply for the liberation of the captive peoples. The horrors of an atomic and thermonuclear war are too great for us ever to seek war of our own choosing. But if, in spite of all our efforts for peace, war should be thrust upon us we will not shrink from its horrors, however catastrophic they may be.

All the peoples of the world ardently desire peace. No one wished for peace more than Cardinal Mindszenty himself. But on the other hand we will not pay any price, however unworthy, to buy peace. And I am convinced that if war with the Soviets should come, albeit not of our choosing, we would not hesitate but would wage it until the power of international communism, everywhere, was beaten and trampled into the ground.

So, I tell you that, while there may be talk of peaceful coexistence, a concept which I personally believe can never be realized, the policy of liberation is still as much a part of our national objective as it ever was. And there are peaceful means and ways in which we can work for this liberation and I want to discuss some of them briefly.

In working for peaceful liberation, I believe we would be, in effect, working toward a victory over the Soviet Union in the only way which would avoid either shameful surrender to the Soviets or an all-out atomic war in which there would be neither victor nor vanquished. Therefore, you can see that the achievement of liberation by peaceful means would be very much in the interest of our own national security, and therefore, must of necessity be and remain a part of our Government's international policy toward the Soviets.

Before we can deal effectively with the Communists abroad, we must first settle with them here at home. There can be, and should be, no room in the United States for anyone who has sworn prime allegiance to the Soviet Union and who acts as a traitor and fifth columnist within our midst. Many effective steps have recently been taken against the American Communist Party and its members, I hope that these steps will be continued and increased to a point where communism, as an internal threat and menace, no longer exists in our midst. Outlawing of the Communist Party, expatriation and deportation of its members, Government seizure of its assets, the most ruthless steps to root out and eradicate its influence from every part of our economy and our way of life, these are some of the steps which I would suggest in the interest of our own national self-preservation. Once we have dealt effectively with the Communist menace here at home, then, and then only, can we logically turn our attention abroad.

In this connection I would hope that we use all our influence, political and economic especially, to urge our friends and allies to take similar steps against the Communist organizations in their own countries. The great worth of friendship with this country, to say nothing of military and economic assistance which may have been received from us, would not make this too unreasonable a demand on our part. But we should definitely take the leadership in this respect. We cannot, in good conscience, ask any free country to take action with regard to their own problem of domestic communism which we have been unwilling or unable to take in regard to ours.

The weapon of trade can be an important one in our hands. I have been greatly distressed recently to read that current restrictions are being loosened to permit the exportation of more and more articles behind the Iron Curtain. Excuses have been made that these are merely articles for domestic consumer consumption. But it is important to bear two theses in mind. In the first place, whatever is done to raise the standard of living of the captive people, even assuming that the average person is able to buy such consumer goods, thereby merely entrenches the Communist regime in power. In the second place, to the extent that the Soviets can import consumer goods from abroad, to that extent can they divert their industrial production from consumer to industrial and armaments production. We have had clear-cut evidence that trade embargoes have in the past seriously embarrassed and hampered the Soviet economy. I do not believe that our efforts in that direction should now be relaxed. There is no such thing in my language as a distinction between strategic and nonstrategic goods; even foodstuffs are strategic when used to the ultimate benefit of your enemy.

Legislation has been introduced into the Congress in the past and will be reintroduced in the future to provide some means of assistance and encouragement to Communist escapees, defectors, etc. Difficult as it is today, ways can still be found to cross the Iron Curtain. I am sure that the fear of insecurity and uncertainty in the free world acts as a great a deterrent to the would-be refugee as do all the mines, barbed wire fences, and other physical impediments. Every encouragement should be given to those persons who defect from Soviet communism not only to benefit the acquisition of valuable information on our part but also to increase the feeling of mutual distrust that the Reds hold toward one another. Every assistance should be given to those refugees who successfully pierce the Iron Curtain with assurances of resettlement and the chance to earn a decent livelihood. As I have said before, some must remain but those who do emerge from slavery into freedom should be considered and treated as welcome immigrants, not as fugitive criminals.

In this connection, I should make particular mention of the military units which are authorized to be formed in Western Europe from among those escapees of military age. Although large sums have been appropriated for such a purpose, progress has so far been disappointingly slow. I believe the presence of so-called legions of freedom from each of the satellite countries, as well as the Soviet Union itself, in Western Europe would act as powerful magnets to draw more and more of the Communist military manpower from behind the curtain. The existence of such groups under their own national, patriotic standards could serve as rallying points for freedom-loving exiles everywhere. It should also be worthy of note that they could contribute immeasurably to the defense of free Europe itself and would thereby enable us to relieve ourselves of some of our own weighty commitments in that continent.

The shameful treaties of Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam which delivered so many of the captive peoples into Soviet slavery should be carefully reviewed by our Government. It is my belief that the Soviets should be presented with an ultimatum to honor immediately the broken provisions of these treaties, especially with regard to Germany, Austria, and Poland. Should this ultimatum be rejected, I believe our Government would be completely justified in denouncing these treaties and declaring to the world that they no longer exist as far as

the United States of America is concerned. It would be my sincere hope that our British allies would feel able to join us in such a course of action.

Much has been said about the possibility of a top-level conference with the Soviet leaders in the near future. I can conceive of only one excuse for our attending such a conference and that would be to present further proof to some of our wavering allies as to the complete and utter futility of ever reaching any agreement with the present Soviet rulers. We have had too many sad experiences in the past to hope that some benefit might be derived from a new meeting. Even if a satisfactory solution to many existing problems could be reached with the Communists, what guarantee, based on the lessons of history, would we have that an agreement could or would be honored on the part of the Reds? In my opinion it is next to useless to negotiate with a government whose standards of international morality are so completely at variance with our own. The only language the present Soviet rulers appear to understand and respect is that of forceful pressure and no international meetings are needed to make use of that application.

I now come to a question which has been much debated in public circles recently and is certain to be revived again and again—the matter of severing diplomatic relations with the Soviet and satellite governments. I have recently had occasion to make some study of the reasons for which this Government refused to recognize the Soviet Union in the decade following World War I. Chief among these, of course, was the manner in which the Bolshevik minority seized power in that country and established a tyrannical government so obviously unrepresentative of the majority of the Russian people. The unmistakably amoral standards of the Soviet leaders in the conduct of international relations also played a large part. The lack of good faith, the failure to recognize normal international obligations and the noncooperativeness in regard to all forms of intercourse were also weighty considerations. But reluctant as this Government was to indicate its approval of the tyranny which had settled over the people of Russia, that in itself was not the principal reason for our failure to extend diplomatic recognition. It was rather the fact that the Soviets openly supported and directed movements of international communism everywhere which were nothing more than flagrant interferences into the internal and domestic affairs of every free country in the world, not excepting this one. It was felt that no possible indication of approval could be given such unprincipled conduct on the part of an alleged member of the family of nations.

Even after such misgivings had been overcome and diplomatic relations between the two countries had been established in November 1933, the Soviet Government merely increased its activities in this regard. The Soviet leaders themselves openly boasted of the inevitability of world revolution through the Communist fifth columns throughout the world. When they were reminded of their solemn promises in this respect and their pledges to refrain from any such activities which had been undertaken at the time of recognition, they repudiated, for all intents and purposes, such pledges by declaring that they could undertake no obligations with respect to the Communist International. Such barefaced violations of solemn international commitments very nearly caused the rupture of relations as early as 1934. Had it not been for the emergence of the Nazi menace which threatened both countries equally and forced a form of modus vivendi, it is probable that American-Soviet relations would have been strained to the breaking point.

Much has been made of the value of so-called listening posts provided by the American embassies and legations behind the Iron Curtain. Having served myself at one of these posts for more than 2 years, I state it as my personal opinion that such value is of extremely limited content. Much, if not all, of the information thus acquired is readily available through other sources and can hardly compensate for the intense propaganda and espionage activities carried on in this country by Soviet diplomatic officers. Further, as I have reason to know from personal experience, it is official Soviet policy to place every conceivable handicap and hindrance in the way of the operations of our Government representatives in Communist-controlled countries. The indignities and hardships, many of a personal nature, which our people are forced to undergo there are not only degrading to them as individuals but are even more degrading to the prestige and influence of this country. It must be extremely difficult for the captive peoples to retain any degree of respect or admiration for the United States when they see its servants treated with the scorn and contempt which has been the custom ever since we have been officially represented behind the Curtain.

It is my firm and sincere conviction, therefore, that a complete severance of diplomatic relations with the Soviet and satellite regimes would be one of the best steps which this Government could take to reassert its position of moral leadership of the free world. Regardless of whether or not all of our allies joined us in such action immediately, we would have asserted, not only to the free peoples but also to the captive peoples, our determination that a course of ruthless and deliberate violations of international agreements will not be endorsed by continued diplomatic recognition. Much as we dislike and disapprove of the manner in which the internal affairs of the Soviet Union are conducted, it would not be for this reason that we would take the step of breaking relations. It would rather be due to the systematic course of interference in our own domestic affairs which the Soviet Union has pursued ever since its inception.

If we are determined, as we are, to do all possible to avoid an open clash with the Soviet Union, the weapons of international morality are among the strongest which remain in our arsenal. The fullest exertion of moral force is perhaps the only way in which a change can be achieved in the present policies of international communism. No one realized this better than the man in whose honor we are gathered here this afternoon.

By his willing martyrdom, Josef Cardinal Mindszenty succeeded in rallying the moral indignation of the free world against Communist barbarity and tyranny as perhaps no other single individual has been able to do. When he was arrested and imprisoned 6 years ago today, he knew of the possibility of death, of the likelihood of degradation. Whatever his fate was to be, he faced it as bravely and courageously as the martyrs of imperial Roman times faced the lions in the amphitheater of the Colosseum. And the fate which befell him has done more to advance the cause of freedom which he so passionately and earnestly championed than any other single action on his part could possibly have accomplished.

Only the Communists know whether or not Mindszenty will ever emerge alive from his prison. Regardless of this we can only hope that somehow some word may have reached him that his dauntless sacrifice was not in vain. But it will only continue to be of avail if the example of moral leadership and moral courage which he left us will continue to be remembered long after he is gone.

I earnestly hope that my words today will be heard in captive Hungary. To those who may receive them I urge you to carry on the spirit of moral resistance to the Communist domination which Mindszenty so splendidly typified. Your country has suffered foreign domination before, many times in its long and glorious history. But the spirit of men such as King Bela IV, John Hunyadi, Louis Kossuth, and many others always kept the flame of freedom and independence alive and Hungary always eventually threw off her foreign shackles and emerged triumphant. Josef Mindszenty now takes his place among the heroes of Hungarian history as one whose deeds and words will inspire those who survive to carry on the fight and insure that Hungary will not forever remain crushed and downtrodden. Remember the spirit of your ancestors. Remember the example of Cardinal Mindszenty. Get off your knees and hold up your heads again. Talpra Magyar.

And for those of us who carry on the fight in the world outside, be we Americans or Hungarians or of any other oppressed people, let us also never give up the fight against the forces of godless, totalitarian communism. Let us be firm in our faith that right and justice will one day triumph everywhere. Let us continually keep before the eyes of free peoples the plight of the captive nations and let us insure that the great examples of moral strength and courage displayed by such men as Mindszenty are never forgotten. For such an undertaking, no effort on our part is too great. We should be eternally grateful that we have men like Mindszenty who are willing to contribute so much and we should on our part be grateful that we have the opportunity to contribute our little, our bit, to bringing freedom again to the slave half of the world, to seeing that justice will again triumph and to insuring that peace will return to reign over us. May the good Lord bless and strengthen us in this, our crusade.

The President's Message on the State of the Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1955

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement as given to the Indiana press following the state of the Union message of January 6:

I join President Eisenhower in his estimate and evaluation of the 83d Congress as expressed in his state of the Union message. I am glad to have been a Member of that body that did so much for everybody and that helped to produce the greatest prosperity that this country ever has seen, with peace at the same time.

I believe that the President will be very realistic in the matter of tariffs and the extension of reciprocal trade agreements. The industries of the United States do not ask for selfish protection but for equalization of tariff rates. It is realized that re-

ciprocal trade agreements must work two ways and that we should be entitled to the same consideration from all other nations that we, in turn, extend to them.

In regard to the spending for defense, I certainly join with President Eisenhower instead of Speaker RAYBURN. The present administration has proven that more defense can be secured for less money. Apparently, the proposal of the Democratic Party, as stated by Speaker RAYBURN at the time of his installation as Speaker, will be to spend for the sake of spending with no mention about the waste which everybody knows must be watched.

I also raise the question whether or not foreign aggression might be invited by excessive saber rattling on the part of our country or on the part of any other country. President Eisenhower has had a lifetime of experience and prefers peace prudently secured instead of aggression by provocation.

The President's concern about Communist infiltration and subversives should be shared by all. Both major political parties will do well to clean their house immediately of any extremist groups.

Eastern Orthodox Faith Preference Designation Asked for Servicemen of That Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1955

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of this Congress, I introduced H. R. 581, a bill to allow certain members of the Armed Forces to designate the Eastern Orthodox faith as a religious preference on their identification tags. The bill has been referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

I was genuinely pleased to introduce this measure, the purposes of which were first brought to my attention at a banquet at Bridgeport, Conn., on Sunday, December 19, 1954. The affair was sponsored by eight Eastern Orthodox churches in the community, comprising the Carpatho-Russian, Russian, Ukrainian, Rumanian, Greek, Syrian, and Albanian nationalities. In attendance was His Eminence Archbishop Antony Bashir, Metropolitan of the Syrian Antiochian-Orthodox Church in America, who officiated at morning services signifying the founding of the new St. Nicholas Syrian Orthodox Parish, which also became affiliated with the Council of Eastern Orthodox Churches of Greater Bridgeport. The banquet also celebrated the feats of St. Nicholas, archbishop of Myra and Wonderworker.

During the program, speeches were made by the pastors of the participating churches and Mayor Jasper McLevy. Following this, there was the presentation of a resolution which was unanimously approved by the large number of persons in attendance. I then commented upon the procedures that had to be followed in order to bring about the passage of a bill to accomplish the objective.

Incidentally, Rev. John Kivko, pastor of the Holy Ghost Russian Orthodox Church, informed me that he was the first chaplain of the Eastern Orthodox faith in the armed services during World War II.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the resolution as adopted. Senator SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, introduced S. 106, a companion measure. Together, we shall request earliest possible consideration of this meritorious request.

Whereas Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL will introduce in the Senate and Congressman ANTONI N. SADLAK will introduce in the House of Representatives, in the 84th Congress, a bill to allow certain members of the Armed Forces to designate the Eastern Orthodox faith—one of the major Christian faiths in the world—as a religious preference on their identification tags:

Resolved, That the Council of Eastern Orthodox Churches of Greater Bridgeport, representing approximately 25,000 Eastern Orthodox Christians of the Albanian, Carpatho-Russian, Greek, Rumanian, Russian, Syrian, and Ukrainian nationalities:

1. Highly approves of such bill, which the council firmly believes will beneficially contribute to the spiritual welfare and morale of the many Eastern Orthodox servicemen in the Armed Forces of the United States; and

2. Strongly recommends to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress that such bill be enacted into law; and

3. That the council undertake whatever measures it may deem necessary or appropriate to lend its fullest support to the passage of such bill.

Unanimously approved by the Council of Eastern Orthodox Churches of Greater Bridgeport this 19th day of December 1954:

Rev. JOE G. SIMKO,
Chairman.
SERGEI M. GUDEN,
Vice Chairman.
JEANETTE SKIRKANISH,
Secretary.

The Small Business Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, recognizing the importance of keeping the doors to opportunity for small businesses open, are grateful for the wholehearted support for this policy given by President Eisenhower in his message on the state of the Union this January 6. It will be recalled that in his message to the joint session of the Senate and House, the President said:

The prosperity of our small business enterprises is an indispensable element in the maintenance of our economic strength. Creation of the Small Business Administration and tax laws facilitating small-business expansion are but two of the many steps this Government has taken to encourage smaller enterprises. I recommend that Congress extend the Small Business Act of 1953 now due to expire next June.

Since I had the honor of introducing into the House of Representatives the bill which finally resulted in the legislation that established the Small Business Administration, my interest in the President's message is apparent. Last week I introduced a bill, H. R. 521, to continue the SBA, which I hope this body soon will be considering, and in view of this we will want to examine the record of this Agency to consider how its services may be broadened and strengthened.

The Small Business Administration in a large measure is pioneering in a field of Government service, specializing in assistance to owners of small businesses. Obviously some time was required to staff the agency and to develop policies and programs. An examination of the record, I believe, will satisfy anyone that encouraging progress has been made. Wendell B. Barnes, the Administrator, and his coworkers have given excellent public service.

In a New Year message to all employees of the Small Business Administration, Administrator Barnes summarized results in the major programs. With the thought that Members of this body would be interested in seeing this letter from the Administrator to his coworkers as contained in Small Business Action, the agency's intraoffice information bulletin, the full text is presented to you:

ADMINISTRATOR'S NEW YEAR LETTER TO ALL EMPLOYEES

DEAR SBA COWORKER: At the opening of a new year, I would like to write you directly to thank you for your loyal and energetic work during the past year. You and your associates in the Small Business Administration have responded so promptly and energetically each time one of the Deputy Administrators or myself have called upon you for extra effort on our programs that the Agency has been able to compile a noteworthy record.

Work has been accomplished in spite of the fact that you were at times handicapped by a heavy workload and a large backlog, lack of sufficient coworkers and the fact many people could only be given temporary employment status. The extra hours that you worked and the interest you took in our programs are deeply appreciated by me and by the Deputy Administrators, office heads, and regional directors.

I know that you were pleased to hear President Eisenhower say in his message to Congress:

"The prosperity of our small-business enterprises is an indispensable element in the maintenance of our economic strength. Creation of the Small Business Administration and recently enacted tax laws facilitating small business expansion are but two of many important steps we have taken to encourage our smaller enterprises. I recommend that the Congress extend the Small Business Act of 1953 which is due to expire next June."

I am confident that the quality of your work will also be recognized by the Congress during this session, when its committees review the accomplishments of our agency.

The compiling of a good record is not the result of the work of any one office. All have contributed. An organization can operate effectively only if the mail clerks, the administrative services employees, the filing and stenographic clerks as well as the financial specialists, production specialists, and executives all do their part. That has been the situation during the past year, and the record must be considered the result of the work of each employee in the agency.

It is not possible to review in detail each of the activities, but I would like to point out to you a few of the things in which you can have a feeling of pride for having contributed your part.

CERTIFICATES OF COMPETENCY IMPORTANT

The certificate of competency program of the Small Business Administration is one of the most important functions in the Agency. Through it small companies obtain prime contracts with the Department of Defense which they otherwise would be denied, due to disqualification by a procuring office regarding capacity or credit, or both.

Requests for certificates of competency are initiated by a small-business concern when its low bid on a specific procurement has been rejected by a contracting officer. The small company submits an application for certification to the Small Business Administration regional office. A careful and thorough plant survey and financial analysis are then conducted by the field engineering and financial staff. The regional report is then sent to the national office for review and evaluation. The Administrator's committee makes a final determination and recommendation as to whether the certificate of competency is to be issued.

This part of the program, namely, the processing of applications, is probably the most important single item in determining whether the certificates of competency program is to be a real help to small firms. Applications must be scrutinized with the greatest care in order to insure that only those companies that can actually produce are awarded certificates.

GOVERNMENT SAVED $425,235.23

As of December 31, 1954, the Small Business Administration received 113 applications totaling $25,930,957. Of this number, 53 certificates were granted, which had a value of $6,745,610. Of these 53 cases, 15 contracts have been completed, including 8 which were completed ahead of schedule. The cumulative savings to the Government resulting from these certified contracts as of December 31, 1954, amount to $425,235.23. These certificates all were awarded after the most careful analysis of application data, and each contractor's progress is followed closely for any situation arising where the Small Business Administration production specialists can offer technical assistance which would be helpful in completing a contract.

The majority of the cases to date have been from the Department of the Air Force, followed closely by the Department of the Army. Some of the types of military defense items procured under these certified contracts include rocket launcher assemblies, smoke generators, aircraft platform assemblies, grenade launchers, bomb slings, bomb racks, bomb trailers, boats and tents.

The certificate of competency program of the Small Business Administration has been in operation since the start of the agency in August 1953. In addition the Small Business Administration assumed the responsibility at that time for 91 active certificates of competency from its predecessor agency, the Small Defense Plants Administration. Of those 91 certificates, 21 are still in active status as of December 31, 1954. Of the 21 cases, 16 are behind schedule in their production. They are behind schedule, in spite of the fact that we have worked with the companies holding these certificates originating with SDPA just as hard as we work for those which hold our own certificates.

I do not mean to make invidious comparisons of our work with that of the Small Defense Plants Administration or the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, but the figures we have are the only ones available by which we can measure the work of our agency.

What do we find regarding the 53 certificates of competency issued by the Small Business Administration in the past 18 months?

SBA RECORD GOOD

Fifteen of these have been completed, including eight ahead of schedule. Twenty-seven of the contracts are active at the present time and, of these, 23 are ahead of, or right on, schedule and only four contracts are behind schedule. Contrast that with the 16 behind schedule in the inherited cases.

These figures should give assurance to the Department of Defense procurement officers that they may rely on action taken by the Small Business Administration and we, of course, should continue to regard our power to issue certificates as a serious responsibility to be exercised only when we are informed and certain of all the facts in each particular case.

Negotiations have recently been concluded with the Department of Defense making it mandatory for contracting officers to indicate those situations where a certificate of competency application would be in order.

JOINT DETERMINATION PROGRAM

Under our joint determination program with the Department of Defense more than $360 million in Government contracts have been reserved for exclusive award to small firms. More than 2,300 individual contracts, totaling $160 million already have been awarded to small firms as a result of representations made by employees of the Small Business Administration to the Department of Defense. The tremendous total of more than 150,000 notifications to small contract firms of Government bidding opportunities has been made by offices of our agency.

In addition each month our field offices have made approximately 1,000 referrals to small firms of opportunities for subcontracts. It is difficult to measure what this means in increased employment and greater business volume, but we can be certain that this work has kept many small firms active and in a healthy condition and has brought pay checks to many thousands of American workers.

PRODUCTS ASSISTANCE

Through our products assistance program, we have been able to assist several hundred firms which are turning from defense work to the production of civilian products and in many cases this provides as much opportunity for a small firm as does a defense contract.

PRINTED AIDS

The Small Business Administration management publications are reaching a wider circle of small businessmen each month.

By the close of 1954, 262,832 copies of the 16 titles in the small business management series, were sold by the Government Printing Office. During the past 6 months, 112,608 copies were sold. Most popular titles were "Cost Accounting," "Cutting Office Costs," and "Human Relations."

Over 1,193,000 copies of management-aid leaflets have been distributed to date, more than 900,000 of them free of cost. Of the number, 314,000 were requested during the last 6 months of 1954. The most popular of the 57 titles are: "Loan Sources in the Federal Government," "How to Set Up Sales Territories," and "How Small Plants Can Sell to the Federal Government."

Distribution of technical aids on shop problems total 448,000 to date: 93,000 over the past 6 months. The most popular titles are "Sharpening of Drills, Lathes, Tools, and Milling Cutters," "Proper Alinement of Machine Tools," and "Precision Measurement of Work Pieces." The number of aids distributed does not tell the whole story, since many of them have been republished by trade associations, many of which regard this as one of the most helpful of our programs. Of the other publications which are sold at a small cost we have learned that more than 260,000 have been sold by the Government Printing Office and through the Department of Commerce offices. The proceeds of these sales have returned $80,000 to the Treasury which has paid in full the cost of printing these publications.

MANAGEMENT COURSES

Following two successful experimental administrative management courses, held last spring at Richmond, Va., and University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee, Wis., 35 similar courses, cosponsored by the Small Business Administration are being offered this school year by 30 educational institutions ranging from Boston to Los Angeles and Chicago to Norman, Okla.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

A year ago we had 36 financial specialists and in 3 months had approved 26 business loans and 37 disaster loans for a total of 63. We had taken action on 89 cases. Twelve months later at the close of December 1954, we had staffed our offices with 180 financial specialists and during the calendar year had taken action on 4,104 cases.

We are now administering 5,341 loans amounting to $80,125,405. We have approved 2,091 loans, which included 1,122 business loans for a total of $59,400,433, of which more than two-thirds are in participation with banks.

We have also approved 969 disaster loans for a total of $5,553,834. Of the total, the remaining 3,252 are disaster loans transferred to the Small Business Administration for collection.

SOUND LOANS

One of the most significant figures indicating the quality of the loans made during the past year is the record of delinquent loans. If a loan installment is not received within 3 days of the date the installment is due, we list it as delinquent. As of December 31, 1954, only a single borrower was more than 30 days delinquent in meeting his loan installment payments.

Of course, our experience in the collection field is still brief but when one realizes that every office in the country had to cooperate to compile this fine record of loan administration, one can feel a sense of pride in the work being done by all of the other offices.

BACKLOG REDUCED

You were asked to make every effort to get the loans in from the field by December 20 in order that we could clear up the backlog during the calendar year and end with the best possible record. You will be interested to know that after the loans came in from the field, the loan examiners in Washington and the review committee worked long and hard, even during the holiday season, to complete the job.

The result is shown in the figures given above for the year 1954.

This record should be compared not with the last year of operation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, during which

many more employees were available than we have had, but with the first calendar year in which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was authorized to make business loans.

In 1935 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had 2,392 applications for business loans. In that year they approved 1,171 loan applications, of which direct loans were $70,930,288 and the participation loans amounted to $12,146,351.

Of course, there was no fixed limitation on the amount of loans, but it is apparent that approximately one-sixth were participation loans as compared with the two-thirds figure for the Small Business Administration loan program.

STILL ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT

In reciting some of the matters about which we can take pride, I do not mean to imply that there is not still room for improvement. We are working on improvements in each of our programs and should resolve to do an even more effective job during the coming year. I ask each of you to join with me in resolving that we will find improvement and ways to increase efficiency each in his own position during the ensuing year.

In closing, I once again want to thank you and each of your coworkers for the contribution you made to the accomplishments of our agency during the year 1954.

Sincerely,

WENDELL B. BARNES,
Administrator.

No Coexistence of Religion and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal these days about coexistence of one sort or another. In the field of religion we all know that coexistence with communism is impossible because of the godless philosophy of communism.

This was the theme of my address last Sunday, January 9, 1955, at the Holy Family Church in my district in Brooklyn, popularly known as the Slovak Church, which is celebrating the 50th anniversary of its founding. I was privileged to be the guest speaker at this celebration, over which Auxiliary Bishop Raymond A. Kearney presided.

The text of my address follows:

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN VICTOR L. ANFUSO, ON SUNDAY, JANUARY 9, 1955, IN CELEBRATION OF 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF SLOVAK CHURCH

My fellow Americans, it is impossible for me—a Member of the Congress of the United States—to face this devoutly religious audience in this safe and free environment, and close my mind to the outrages that are being perpetrated, even as I speak, against the religious spirit of man wherever communism holds sway. For me the significance of the event we celebrate today—the 50th anniversary of this church—is symbolic of the eternal victory of the Christian Church that was born on the Rock of Peter. It is a manifestation of the challenge of the faithful to the enemies of Christendom, whose brutal strength in our day derives from the Communist total state. We here at this hour, in this church, in this community, are but a fragment—but I hope a potent one—of a monumental and historic world struggle. My assignment today in this celebration limits me to but a moment, and yet that moment will be rich in fruitfulness for the free religious world if I can associate this event, local as it is, with the holy cause into which world affairs have swept us all.

The cause of which I speak has to do with the religious soul of man and is not—for the moment—concerned with territorial aggression as such, with political or with economic considerations. And in that sphere—as perhaps in all spheres—let me make it plain, there can never be any coexistence of any kind, in any way, between the free and the slave world. The Communists themselves have thrown the gantlet into the face of God. Kopecky, the Iron Curtain's Minister of Information in Czechoslovakia, said in July 1952: "People who go to church demonstrate their opposition to the people's democracy" (people's democracy is their word for the total state). He goes on: "They gain courage in church to invoke American imperialism." "In the struggle against such enemies," says Kopecky, "we stop at nothing." Stalin put it just as baldly: "Communism," he said, "will agitate against both Catholicism and Protestantism, and against orthodoxy in order to bring about the triumph of the socialistic-world outlook."

To me, this church is one of the millions of fortresses against these openly declared enemies of God. I will not distress you with the antireligious tortures and the massacres and the purges, the confiscation of church property, and the deliberate, cunningly contrived misuse of the church itself, as an instrument of the total state. You know the cruelties that have been perpetrated upon Mindszenty in Hungary, upon Budkiewicz and Wyszynski in Poland, and upon saintly Slovak churchmen and Catholics generally beyond counting; in Czechoslovakia where the Catholics constitute 10 million out of a population of 12 million. Our job here is as plain as day. We must strengthen ourselves in our own faith. We must assure this religious edifice an enduring and a vital place as a voice in support of spiritual growth and freedom. The Slovak people have a long tradition of progress in architecture, in music, in literature, with which the whole of western civilization has enriched itself. And the very fiber and sinew of this great tradition of culture is the Catholic faith of the Slovak people.

The people of the Slovak racial strain are no newcomers to the struggle for liberty. When Czechoslovakia won its independence after the First World War, that struggle was part of a story that goes back to the Middle Ages, back to the ninth century even and to the great Moravian Empire. Masaryk and Benes carried in their hearts the fire of the ancients. You who know so well the story of Czechoslovakia's fight for independence in our own time, know also that much of the struggle was carried on here on this free American soil, so hospitable to human liberty everywhere. I urge you in the same way to let this church serve as a base for the strengthening of the faith. By paths that you know better than I, you must help the people of your racial strain in Czechoslovakia to surmount the crisis that now confronts them. They must feel confidence in your devotion to the altar of God at which in your hearts you both pray—you in freedom, they in slavery.

I hold that the degree of your devotion to the Roman Catholic faith is the degree of your weight and your valor in the fight against communism as, indeed, I believe it to be the degree of your faith in your country and your patriotism. For the 50 years of the existence of this church community are integrated into the 2,000 years of the existence of the Roman Catholic faith. And the Roman Catholic faith is beyond all peradventure of a doubt the most formidable weapon spiritually against the great antireligious conspiracy of communism. It is this conspiracy, which is indigenous to communism and to the total state, that points up the basic struggle between communism and religion. It makes what is called coexistence spiritually as impossible as it is incomprehensible. Communism and the church must remain forever mutually antagonistic.

To put it in a word, communism—now that nazism has been whipped—is today's embodiment of the total state. It coils its poisonous tentacles from its center in the Kremlin beyond the borders of the Soviet Union into the heartland of Europe and the Far East. It represents a clear and present danger to civilization itself. This danger goes to the very roots of life. It is political. It is geographical. It is economic. It is personal. It affects every department of living.

For us the danger is above all—spiritual.

In our form of government there is no conflict between God and loyalty to country. Our literature is replete with such expressions as "This Nation under God." The two—God and country—represent an amalgam of the spiritual and the political. Our system of government accepts the supremacy of God. The Soviet state does not. There is the underlying difference.

You can divide geographically. You can share economically. You can endure politically. But no system has yet been devised for cutting the human soul in twain and making it serve two masters. Our soul belongs to God—and only to God. The total state is the absolute state. It has no room for God. It cannot share its monolithic authority with any other institution. Its basic credo forbids it to accept the supremacy of the people in government or the principle of obedience to God. With diabolical cunning—especially in recent months—it seeks to subvert religion and God to a position of subordination to the state. By raw tyranny, by defection, it is reducing religion to the position of serving as a creature and utensil of the state.

This is the most wicked element of all in the total fraud that is the total state.

This calls for war against a devastating enemy on the spiritual plane.

In such a spiritual war none of us can afford to rest.

It is a war that will have to be fought in the Halls of the Congress of the United States. It will have to be fought—as indeed in many ways it is being fought—in the United Nations.

It will have to be fought—and the campaign will have to be sustained—in institutions like this church. By giving voice to your faith, by meeting the crisis when the hour of decision arrives, by offering succor to your friends and relatives abroad, you will, all of you—perhaps in our own time—bring about the doom of the enemies of God. You who are so loyally American and have contributed so much in life, in treasure, in culture, to the upbuilding of this country, will serve its free institutions best by giving yourselves to your God and your country in the next 50 years as you and your forebears gave yourselves in the 50 years we celebrate today.

We who have faith know that regardless of its temporary gains communism will be eventually defeated and destroyed because of its godless philosophy.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 13, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Father Edward J. Kammer, C. M., executive vice president of DePaul University, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

O God, the Creator and Ruler of the universe, look with favor and help with Thy grace this group of Thy creatures upon whose intelligence, strength, and integrity Thou hast placed the terrible burden of world leadership.

Mayest Thou grant to each of them the cardinal virtues of prudence, justice, fortitude, and temperance: prudence that they may say and do the right thing at the right time; justice that they may be to the world a beacon of hope; fortitude that thay may not be swayed by the expediency of the moment; temperance that they may have patience and understanding when things go awry.

These virtues we humbly ask of Thee, O God, in the name of Thy Son, our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 11, 1955, was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

Mr. CHIPERFIELD and Mr. ALLEN of California appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 84) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Ways and Means and the subcommittees thereof be authorized to sit during sessions and recesses of the 84th Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer another privileged resolution (H. Res. 85) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Agriculture: Harold D. Cooley (chairman), North Carolina; W. R. Poage, Texas; George M. Grant, Alabama; E. C. Gathings, Arkansas; John L. McMillan, South Carolina; Thomas G. Abernethy, Mississippi; Carl Albert, Oklahoma; Watkins M. Abbitt, Virginia; James G. Polk, Ohio; Clark W. Thompson, Texas; Paul C. Jones, Missouri; John C. Watts, Kentucky; Harlan Hagen, California; Lester Johnson, Wisconsin; Victor L. Anfuso, New York; Ross Bass, Tennessee; Coya Knutson, Minnesota; Pat Jennings, Virginia.

Committee on Appropriations: Clarence Cannon (chairman), Missouri; George H. Mahon, Texas; Harry R. Sheppard, California; Albert Thomas, Texas; Michael J. Kirwan, Ohio; W. F. Norrell, Arkansas; Jamie L. Whitten, Mississippi; George W. Andrews, Alabama; John J. Rooney, New York; J. Vaughan Gary, Virginia; John E. Fogarty, Rhode Island; Robert L. F. Sikes, Florida; Antonio M. Fernandez, New Mexico; Prince H. Preston, Georgia; Otto E. Passman, Louisiana; Louis C. Rabaut, Michigan; Sidney R. Yates, Illinois; Fred Marshall, Minnesota; John J. Riley, South Carolina; Alfred D. Sieminski, New Jersey; Joe L. Evins, Tennessee; Henderson Lanham, Georgia; Charles B. Deane, North Carolina; John F. Shelley, California; Edward P. Boland, Massachusetts; Don Magnuson, Washington; William H. Natcher, Kentucky; Daniel J. Flood, Pennsylvania; Winfield K. Denton, Indiana; James C. Murray, Illinois.

Committee on Armed Services: Carl Vinson (chairman), Georgia; Overton Brooks, Louisiana; Paul J. Kilday, Texas; Carl T. Durham, North Carolina; L. Mendel Rivers, South Carolina; Philip J. Philbin, Massachusetts; F. Edward Hébert, Louisiana; Arthur Winstead, Mississippi; Melvin Price, Illinois; O. C. Fisher, Texas; Porter Hardy, Jr., Virginia; William J. Green, Jr., Pennsylvania; Clyde Doyle, California; Victor Wickersham, Oklahoma; George P. Miller, California; Charles E. Bennett, Florida; Lester Holtzman, New York; Robert H. Mollohan, West Virginia; Richard E. Lankford, Maryland; George Huddleston, Jr., Alabama.

Committee on Banking and Currency: Brent Spence (chairman), Kentucky; Paul Brown, Georgia; Wright Patman, Texas; Albert Rains, Alabama; Abraham J. Multer, New York; Hugh J. Addonizio, New Jersey; William A. Barrett, Pennsylvania; Barratt O'Hara, Illinois; Vera Buchanan, Pennsylvania; Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.) Sullivan, Missouri; L. H. Fountain, North Carolina; Henry S. Reuss, Wisconsin; Martha W. Griffiths, Michigan; Thomas Ludlow Ashley, Ohio; Charles A. Vanik, Ohio; Irwin D. Davidson, New York; John J. Bell, Texas.

Committee on the District of Columbia: John L. McMillan (chairman), South Carolina; Oren Harris, Arkansas; Thomas G. Abernethy, Mississippi; Howard W. Smith, Virginia; Arthur G. Klein, New York; Olin E. Teague, Texas; James C. Davis, Georgia; James H. Morrison, Louisiana; William L. Dawson, Illinois; John Bell Williams, Mississippi; Tom Steed, Oklahoma; Roy W. Wier, Minnesota; Woodrow W. Jones, North Carolina; J. T. Rutherford, Texas.

Committee on Education and Labor: Graham A. Barden (chairman), North Carolina; Augustine B. Kelley, Pennsylvania; Adam C. Powell, Jr., New York; Cleveland M. Bailey, West Virginia; Carl D. Perkins, Kentucky; Roy W. Wier, Minnesota; Carl Elliott, Alabama; Phil M. Landrum, Georgia; Lee Metcalf, Montana; James B. Bowler, Illinois; Earl Chudoff, Pennsylvania; Edith Green, Oregon; James Roosevelt, California; Herbert Zelenko, New York; Harris B. McDowell, Jr., Delaware; Frank S. Thompson, Jr., New Jersey.

Committee on Foreign Affairs: James P. Richards (chairman), South Carolina; Thomas S. Gordon, Illinois; Thomas E. Morgan, Pennsylvania; A. S. J. Carnahan, Missouri; Thurmond Chatham, North Carolina; Clement J. Zablocki, Wisconsin; Omar Burleson, Texas; Brooks Hays, Arkansas; Edna F. Kelly, New York; Thomas J. Dodd, Connecticut; Wayne L. Hays, Ohio; James G. Donovan, New York; John Jarman, Oklahoma; Robert C. Byrd, West Virginia; Armistead I. Selden, Jr., Alabama; J. L. Pilcher, Georgia; Harrison A. Williams, Jr., New Jersey.

Committee on Government Operations: William L. Dawson (chairman), Illinois; Chet Holifield, California; John W. McCormack, Massachusetts; Earl Chudoff, Pennsylvania; Jack B. Brooks, Texas; Lester Holtzman, New York; Robert H. Mollohan, West Virginia; L. H. Fountain, North Carolina; Porter Hardy, Jr., Virginia; John A. Blatnik, Minnesota; Robert E. Jones, Jr., Alabama; Edward A. Garmatz, Maryland; John E. Moss, Jr., California; Joe M. Kilgore, Texas; Dante B. Fascell, Florida; Martha W. Griffiths, Michigan; Henry S. Reuss, Wisconsin.

Committee on House Administration: Omar Burleson (chairman), Texas; Robert C. Byrd, West Virginia; Samuel N. Friedel, Maryland; Robert T. Ashmore, South Carolina; Wayne L. Hays, Ohio; Paul C. Jones, Missouri; George M. Rhodes, Pennsylvania; John Lesinski, Jr., Michigan; Frank E. Smith, Mississippi; John Dowdy, Texas; George S. Long, Louisiana; James A. Haley, Florida; Hugh Q. Alexander, North Carolina; Frank S. Thompson, Jr., New Jersey.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Clair Engle (chairman), California; Wayne N. Aspinall, Colorado; Leo W. O'Brien, New York; Walter Rogers, Texas; Gracie Pfost, Idaho; James A. Haley, Florida; George A. Shuford, North Carolina; Adam C. Powell, Jr., New York; Ed Edmondson, Oklahoma; Lee Metcalf, Montana; George H. Christopher, Missouri; B. F. Sisk, California; Stewart Udall, Arizona; Charles C. Diggs, Jr., Michigan; J. T. Rutherford, Texas.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: J. Percy Priest (chairman), Tennessee; Oren Harris, Arkansas; Arthur G. Klein, New York; William T. Granahan, Pennsylvania; F. Ertel Carlyle, North Carolina; John Bell Williams, Mississippi; Peter F. Mack, Jr., Illinois; Kenneth A. Roberts, Alabama; Morgan M. Moulder, Missouri; Harley O. Staggers, West Virginia; Isidore Dollinger, New York; Walter Rogers, Texas; Martin Dies, Texas; Samuel N. Friedel, Maryland; John J. Flynt, Jr., Georgia; Torbert Macdonald, Massachusetts; Don Hayworth, Michigan.

Committee on the Judiciary: Emanuel Celler (chairman), New York; Francis E. Walter, Pennsylvania; Thomas J. Lane, Massachusetts; Michael A. Feighan, Ohio; Frank Chelf, Kentucky; Edwin E. Willis, Louisiana; James B. Frazier, Jr., Tennessee; Peter W. Rodino, Jr., New Jersey; Woodrow W. Jones, North Carolina; E. L. Forrester, Georgia; Byron G. Rogers, Colorado; Harold D. Donohue, Massachusetts; Sidney A. Fine, New York; Jack B. Brooks, Texas; William M. Tuck, Virginia; Robert T. Ashmore, South Carolina; James M. Quigley, Pennsylvania; Charles A. Boyle, Illinois.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Herbert C. Bonner (chairman), North Carolina; Frank W. Boykin, Alabama; Edward A. Garmatz, Maryland; Edward J. Robeson, Jr., Virginia; Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.) Sullivan, Missouri; T. A. Thompson, Louisiana; George P. Miller, California; John C. Kluczynski, Illinois; James A. Byrne, Pennsylvania; John J. Bell, Texas; T. James Tumulty, New Jersey; Irwin D. Davidson, New York; Herbert Zelenko, New York; Frank M. Clark, Pennsylvania; Thomas Ludlow Ashley, Ohio.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Tom Murray (chairman), Tennessee; James H. Morrison, Louisiana; James C. Davis, Georgia; George M. Rhodes, Pennsylvania; John Lesinski, Jr., Michigan; John Dowdy, Texas; Hugh Q. Alexander, North Carolina; John E. Moss, Jr., California; Edward J. Robeson, Jr., Virginia; Gracie Pfost, Idaho; Dante B. Fascell, Florida; Frank M. Clark, Pennsylvania; T. James Tumulty, New Jersey; Joe M. Kilgore, Texas.

Committee on Public Works: Charles A. Buckley (chairman), New York; George H. Fallon, Maryland; Clifford Davis, Tennessee;

John A. Blatnik, Minnesota; Robert E. Jones, Jr., Alabama; John J. Dempsey, New Mexico; Frank E. Smith, Mississippi; Thaddeus M. Machrowicz, Michigan; John C. Kluczynski, Illinois; Tom Steed, Oklahoma; T. A. Thompson, Louisiana; Brady Gentry, Texas; M. G. (Burnie) Burnside, West Virginia; Iris Faircloth Blitch, Georgia; Jim Wright, Texas; W. R. Hull, Jr., Missouri; Kenneth J. Gray, Illinois.

Committee on Rules: Howard W. Smith (chairman), Virginia; William M. Colmer, Mississippi; Ray J. Madden, Indiana; James J. Delaney, New York; James W. Trimble, Arkansas; Homer Thornberry, Texas; Richard Bolling, Missouri; Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., Massachusetts.

Committee on Un-American Activities: Francis E. Walter (chairman), Pennsylvania; Morgan M. Moulder, Missouri; Clyde Doyle, California; James B. Frazier, Jr., Tennessee; Edwin E. Willis, Louisiana.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Olin E. Teague (chairman), Texas; W. J. Bryan Dorn, South Carolina; Elizabeth Kee, West Virginia; George S. Long, Louisiana; James A. Byrne, Pennsylvania; D. R. (Billy) Matthews, Florida; Ed Edmondson, Oklahoma; Frank W. Boykin, Alabama; Wayne N. Aspinall, Colorado; Leo W. O'Brien, New York; George A. Shuford, North Carolina; George H. Christopher, Missouri; Charles C. Diggs, Jr., Michigan; B. F. Sisk, California.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMPOSITION OF ARMED FORCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 68)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The military security of the United States requires armed forces, disposed and alerted for instant action, quickly reinforceable by units ready for mobilization, assured an adequate pool of trained manpower for necessary expansion. Three elements are necessary to this military posture: (1) active forces in the strength and effectiveness necessary to meet, to repel, and to punish a first massive assault or to conduct a lesser operation that does not require mobilization; (2) reserves so organized and trained as units that they can be speedily mobilized to reinforce the active forces in combat or to man defense operations at home; (3) an unorganized reserve pool, adequate in training and numbers, to permit a quick general mobilization of all our military strength.

Never, in peacetime, have we achieved this proper military posture. The penalties of our unreadiness have been manifold—in treasure, in blood, in the heartbreak of a mighty Nation buying time with the lives of men. Now, in an uneasy peace, we can and must move toward this proper posture—at tolerable cost, with due regard for tradition, without disruption of human plans or the material economy.

Korea and Indochina are bitter reminders of the ever-present threat of aggression. The masses of armed men and the vast array of warmaking machines, maintained by the Soviets and their satellites along the frontiers of the free world, sharpen the reminders.

The first purpose of our defense planning remains the maintenance of a just, secure peace. If, however, unwanted war should come, it should find us ready with every resource at our command to repel and defeat the enemy. And, at home, we must have forces trained for every emergency, should an aggressor be so criminally unwise as to attempt an atomic attack.

In seeking to attain these goals, we must remember that the active military forces are only the cutting edge of our Nation's full strength. A vigorous economy, a strong mobilization base, and trained citizens are the invincible elements in our military striking power.

But we cannot possibly keep armed and in uniform the total forces that might ultimately be required in all-out war. The inescapable burdens would endanger the liberties and the economic system we are determined to defend.

On the other hand, in case of a global war, the Nation could not count on having time to marshal its strength while the enemy was engaged elsewhere. Unquestionably, the United States would be involved from the outset of such a conflict. We must be prepared.

The Defense Establishment, through the past 2 years, has concentrated on effectiveness, economy, and efficiency within the active military forces. The result is a formidable assurance to any aggressor that we would react to attack instantly and powerfully.

In the same period, exhaustive studies have been made on manpower—the key to a proper military posture. The recommendations herewith submitted, dealing with both the active and the reserve forces, are based on them.

In summary, I recommend (1) that the present statutory provisions authorizing the induction of young men by the Selective Service System for 24 months of training and service, scheduled to expire July 1, 1955, be extended until July 1, 1959; (2) that the existing special statutory provisions authorizing the registration and induction of doctors and dentists, also scheduled to expire on July 1, 1955, be extended until July 1, 1957; and (3) that legislation be enacted by the Congress to permit the strengthening of the reserve forces to meet essential mobilization requirements.

The extension of Selective Service is necessary because experience demonstrates that active Armed Forces of the size we must maintain cannot be raised by voluntary enlistments alone. The maximum number of volunteers will continue to be the recruiting goal of the services. But realistic estimates set the probable ceiling on voluntary forces, in the present economic situation, at a million and a half—more than 1,300,000 men short of the planned strength goal for the end of the fiscal year 1956.

Active force strengths are continually under review in the light of changing missions and technological improvement of weapons. A major purpose is economy in the use of men. But I see no reasonable prospect that the world situation or technological advances, in the next 4 years, will render the draft unnecessary. I earnestly recommend, consequently, that the extension be for 4 years. In the case of doctors and dentists I recommend that the extension be for another period of 2 years only. By that time, it is expected that the medical personnel requirements of the Armed Forces can be met adequately by other means.

The term of service should be retained at the 24-month level established by the 82d Congress after weighing the military efficiency and dollar-cost arguments involved. Those arguments, whose soundness was proved in the experience of the 3 past years, are now compellingly persuasive that shortening the term of service would seriously damage the combat readiness of our active forces.

The present operation of selective service is recognized by the American people as an equitable and necessary solution to a national problem. The calm planning for a call, the unquestioning acceptance of it, the smooth adjustment to a new way of life, manifested by millions of our young men and their families, evidences the maturity of their attitude toward the problem of national security.

Under the new national reserve plan, selective service and the reserve forces, in conjunction with our regular establishment, will fulfill our security needs with the least possible disruptive impact on the life of the individual citizen and the civilian economy. Flexibility is a primary characteristic of the plan. Constant scrutiny and review of its operation by the services will assure its increasing efficiency.

The reserve program has been the subject of extensive study in the Congress, in various Government agencies and in the military services themselves over long periods of time. As in our active forces, we will rely as heavily as possible on voluntary service. To further this purpose, recent surveys indicate that certain improvements can be accomplished within the services, without legislation, and steps have been taken to remedy existing deficiencies. I shall follow this action personally with particular attention to training for combat missions.

In addition, however, there is need for certain changes in present laws relating to the reserves. There are five principal areas where affirmative legislation is needed to provide the basis for a strengthened reserve plan.

First, present law divides reserve personnel into categories that do not lend themselves fully to strategic requirements. I recommend that this be altered so as to provide one group of reservists who can be organized into a force maintained in a high degree of readiness to meet immediate mobilization requirements, and a second nonorganized group with prior service who would be called into military service by a selective process, if the need for their services should develop in a general mobilization.

The first group should be kept ready through training, through the constant flow of new men into the group, and through the screening from the group of combat veterans and persons of essential

civilian skills in excess of military requirements whenever possible. This makes provision for meeting the essential manpower needs of defense supporting activities as well as those of the Armed Forces. Both these needs must be met if we are to realize our maximum national strength in time of emergency.

Second, present legislation does not make adequate provision for bringing young men directly into the reserve forces without either adversely affecting the readiness of the active forces or reducing the capability of the active forces to recruit long-term volunteers.

At present, the reserves are composed of older men who have completed their terms of active service. For example, less than 17 percent of the men now in the Army Reserves are under 24 years of age. I recommend that legislation be adopted by which physically fit young men between the ages of 17 and 19 may volunteer for 6 months' basic training, to be followed by active reserve participation for a period of 9½ years.

During the 6-month period of training, these young men would receive pay at the reduced rate of $30 a month. The total numbers accepted in the basic type training should be subject to quotas, fixed by the President, to avoid bringing the manpower pool down to an undesirably low level; on the other hand, if an adequate number do not volunteer for this program, authority should be given to induct the needed young men through the Selective Service System. Men so selected would be between the ages of 18½ and 19.

The 6-month training program should be authorized for a term of 4 years, covering the same period as the requested extension of the draft. In connection with this program, the National Security Training Commission should serve in an advisory capacity to the Secretary of Defense and to the President as Commander in Chief.

Third, under present legislation, there is no assurance that the National Guard, which by law is in the first line of defense and dependent on voluntary enlistments, receives an adequate supply of young men with appropriate basic training. Young men who enlist in the National Guard receive no concentrated initial training of the type provided by the active services. I recommend that legislation be enacted by which the men enlisting in the National Guard receive basic training in the active services. There must be further assurance that the National Guard contain a hard core of men who have been schooled in leadership and technical military skills through longer periods of active training and service.

Primary emphasis on voluntary recruitment of personnel for the National Guard should continue. However, subject to constitutional limitations, the legislation should provide that in the event of failure to recruit the necessary numbers and quality of volunteer personnel, and at the request or approval of the governor of a State, personnel completing training or service in the active forces may be assigned to the National Guard for their obligated period of reserve participation.

Fourth, I recommend that legislation be adopted to induce participation in reserve training by providing that men who have served less than 2 years may be recalled to active duty in order to maintain or restore proficiencies.

It is also contemplated that reservists who fail or refuse to participate in the reserve training that may be required of them and choose not to restore lost proficiencies, will be given other than an honorable discharge at the end of their period of military obligation. Such action, which will be taken in accordance with existing statutory authority and procedures, is based upon the concept that honorable military service includes complete fulfillment of all service obligations, reserve as well as active. I ask that the Congress reaffirm this concept which is already contained in the law.

Fifth, existing law does not permit States to maintain troops in addition to the National Guard. In view of the fact that the potential enemy possesses weapons of mass destruction and means for their delivery, it is a matter of urgent importance that there be no break between the time that National Guard units might be called into Federal service and the time that the States could raise additional forces to replace them. I therefore recommend that the Congress enact legislation which would permit the States to raise and maintain in time of peace organized militia forces which would take over the National Guard's domestic missions and support civil-defense activities upon its withdrawal.

These five remedies are suggested as amendments to our existing legislative pattern, which is an essentially sound one. Through these amendments, certain broad objectives can be attained. To begin with we will give each young man the maximum possible right of self-determination by offering him a choice of methods of meeting his military obligation. At the threshold of his career, he will understand his obligations, so that he can make definite plans for his future.

In addition, a more equitable sharing of the military obligations will be accomplished. The program will go far toward assuring combat veterans that they will not be called in an emergency until younger men who have not had combat duty are called, thus alleviating an inequity made apparent during the Korean conflict.

In sum, the program will constitute a substantial improvement in our present defense arrangements. It will make our determination evident to every would-be aggressor.

I believe that, under today's conditions, steps generally as outlined above represent the best available approach to the problem of military security. I earnestly urge that Congress promptly initiate its studies of the detailed measures necessary and that legislation incorporating the principles of the program be enacted.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1955.*

COMPENSATION OF MILITARY PERSONNEL—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 69)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

We are traditionally a peace-loving people with a heritage founded on the dignity of the individual. Because our defense planning is developed within this framework, we seek to man our Armed Forces with volunteers to the greatest extent possible. This is a basic objective.

To sustain our active forces at required levels of strength and efficiency, it is necessary to increase the present rate of voluntary enlistments. It is also necessary to induce volunteers, both officers and enlisted men, to continue in the service on a career basis in order to obtain maximum usefulness from the skills and leadership which are achieved after long and costly training. The increasing mechanization and complexity of defense forces make technical skills and a wide background of experience vastly more important than ever before.

The need for forces of the size now contemplated in our planning is obvious. The responsibilities and obligations imposed on us by our position of leadership in world affairs require that we stand prepared to shoulder the accompanying burdens.

PERSONNEL TURNOVER IN THE MILITARY SERVICES

But at this time when we must still maintain large forces under arms and alerted throughout the world, it is difficult to attract and retain volunteers, both enlisted and commissioned.

For example, only 11.6 percent of Army personnel reenlisted in 1954 compared with a rate of 41.2 percent in 1949. The other services, particularly the Marine Corps, have also experienced sharp drops in the rate of reenlistments and today the composite rate for all services is 20 percent.

Approximately 1 million enlisted men will become eligible for release from the military services during the coming year. Under present low reenlistment rates, it will be necessary to replace about 800,000 of these men.

The investment in this skilled manpower is enormous. For example, it costs approximately $3,200 to put 1 man through the normal course of basic training. It costs an additional $2,000 to $5,000 to train a man in the typical technical skills that are so essential in the military system of today. It costs $120,000 to train a jet pilot.

These are just a few indications of the expense associated with training alone. Moreover, the cost of equipment, transportation, and other items goes up as the rate of personnel turnover increases.

The seriousness of the situation was recognized by the 83d Congress when it substantially raised reenlistment bonuses.

REASONS FOR THE HIGH PERSONNEL TURNOVER

Field studies made by the services have attempted to pinpoint reasons for the high personnel turnover rate. A very large portion of the military personnel surveyed expressed dissatisfaction with traditional service benefits such as PX facilities, dependents' medical care, family housing, death benefits for survivors, and related items. Wherever administrative action can improve conditions, action is being taken by the services. However, legislation is necessary for changes in most benefits and in the level of compensation.

Since 1949, there has been one increase in pay which along with increases in allowances, amounted to an aggregate advance in compensation of 5.7 percent. Military pay, nevertheless, has fallen behind that of industry. In addition, supplementary pay practices, health, security, and retirement benefits, and bonus systems are now widespread throughout industry, and this fact tends to neutralize such advantage as the military services had in these fields.

EFFECTS OF HIGH TURNOVER RATE ON OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY

While the high turnover in military personnel is costly in dollars, even more costly is the loss of experience and operational efficiency which results from it.

We are losing too many men trained in leadership and technical skills—the experienced hard core of a modern fighting force. To maintain required percentages of young officers we must obtain them from the service Academies and from Reserve training units. A certain number should elect to continue a service career beyond the required minimum time. Yet not enough of our younger officers currently continue in military service. In 1954, 4,000 young Naval Reserve officers completed their obligated period of service. Only 200 of these elected to remain in the career service.

As a result of the loss of younger officers, there is a noticeable shortage of officers and men in the services with intermediate levels of experience. In the Army, for example, there are substantially fewer officers with 4 to 10 years' service than with 10 to 15 years' experience. In the other services a similar situation exists. A large percentage of officers in the older age group who saw service in World War II and in Korea outnumbers a proportionately smaller group of younger officers. We must not allow this trend to continue.

A continuing shrinkage in the rolls of young experienced commissioned and noncommissioned officers will blunt the battle readiness of our combat units.

HAZARDOUS AND SPECIAL DUTY

Peacetime military service has become more arduous, more dangerous, and more disruptive of normal living habits. The era of nuclear weapons and jet propulsion has drawn our services into new dimensions of hazard and uncertainty. For example, jet flying is ranked by insurance companies as the most hazardous of all occupations. Many young flyers find it impossible to secure insurance coverage and those who can get it must pay a sizable premium differential.

While we are in a peacetime situation, many men in the Strategic Air Command, the Air Defense Command, and various naval units are on alert up to 60 hours per week, subject to sudden and prolonged absences from home and loved ones. Airborne troops of the Army and submarine crews of the Navy are also exposed to discomforts and dangers not found in civilian pursuits.

CONCLUSIONS

The fundamental objectives to be attained by the proposed legislation are the attraction of young men to a military career and the retention of men in this career once they have chosen it. In addition, it is necessary to offer special attractions to men who undertake the particularly hazardous jobs that are becoming more important as weapons become increasingly complex.

These objectives require compensation which is more in line with that offered by private industry. They also require strengthening of traditional service benefits in recognition of the unusual difficulties facing the serviceman and his family. Servicemen frequently live in isolated areas and under circumstances that can be extremely trying. They are subject to frequent and long absences from their families, enforced on them by their defense missions.

Both pay and the nonpay benefits are important, varying with the status of the men we are trying to attract. At the present time 60 percent of personnel on active duty are unmarried. These men are less likely to be attracted by deferred or family benefits than by an increase in pay.

So our problem is twofold. On the one hand, we must attract more of the young, unmarried men into a military career. On the other, we must provide advantageous benefits for those who have families.

In proposing adjustments in pay, I do not recommend that any across-the-board increase should be authorized. Such pay adjustments should foster career service. Specifically, no increase is proposed in the first 2 years for enlisted men, because this is the least valuable period of a man's service, and no increases are proposed in the first 3 years for officers. Our efforts should be directed at inducing men to stay on after those periods. For this reason, I consider it highly important that a schedule of selective adjustments be approved.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In summary, my recommendations are as follows:

(1) The compensation of military service personnel should be increased on a selective basis. The aggregate increase proposed would add approximately 6.7 percent to the present level of pay and allowances.

(2) Hazardous duty pay for airmen and submarine crews should be increased, also on a selective basis, and increases also should be made in the hazardous duty pay for parachute duty, demolition work, deep-sea diving, and certain other specialties.

(3) Other nonpay benefits should be provided, including:

(a) A "dislocation" allowance for military personnel with dependents who are ordered to a new permanent duty station.

(b) An increase in the per diem allowance for temporary duty travel from $9 to $12, in keeping with a comparable proposal for civilian Government employees.

(c) More housing for service families in areas where present facilities are insufficient and authority for reduced rentals where men and their families must live temporarily in substandard housing.

(d) Removal of existing inequities and provision for better medical care for military families.

(e) Equalization of survivor benefits according to rank for active and retired personnel.

These recommendations are vitally important to the welfare of our military people and to the sustained security of the Nation. It is the objective of the Government that the size of the active Military Establishment shall be no greater than is consistent with the needs of national security. It shall always be our objective, in the present world situation, to maintain a military force that we can support for the many years that may be necessary to dispel the shadow of Communist threat. In my judgement, the measures herein presented will strengthen our security and preserve our way of life.

I urge that the Congress give early and favorable consideration to the recommendations I have herein submitted.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1955.*

RETIRED OFFICERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to rerefer the bill H. R. 487 from the Committee on the Armed Services to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1955

Mr. CANNON from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 2091) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 3), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2091) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; and

pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it seems to me we might be able to get through with this in a half hour unless there is some special demand for time. I would suggest one-half hour.

Mr. CANNIN. Mr. Speaker, that is agreeable to me and I therefore revise the request and ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to one-half hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2091, with Mr. BOLLING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, this is the first appropriation bill of the session and the Congress.

And I want to take advantage of the occasion to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], on the splendid record that was made by him and his committee in the last Congress. I am satisfied I express the deep gratification of the country at the determined efforts he made to retrench expenditures and bring the budget within the national revenues.

It is to be regretted that notwithstanding his dynamic leadership none of the assurances given us in this respect in the fall of 1952 have been carried out. We have not yet balanced the budget. We have increased instead of decreased the national debt, and we have failed to live within our means the last 2 years.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. My friend from Missouri, having mentioned the failure to balance the budget, I would like to state to the gentleman that I have information that the budget is unbalanced as of November 30 by $6.7 billion. They started out with a $3 billion estimate and then revised up to $4.8 billion, and I understand the deficit up to November 30 is $6.7 billion. Has the gentleman any information in that respect?

Mr. CANNON. I regret to say that the gentleman's information is correct.

Not only was the budget more than $6 billion out of balance on December 1 last, but on January 7, 1955, it was out of balance the sum of $9,059,197,354.93.

Of course, it must be remembered that we are now at the peak of the deficit period, and we are just at the beginning of the era in which large revenues will accrue to the Treasury from the annual income-tax payments.

However, it must be remembered that when it finally became evident that they were not going to be able to balance the budget in the last Congress, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, announced that while they could not balance the budget under the circumstances, it was his intention to keep the deficit down to not more than $3 billion. Now he comes out, within the last few days, with a newspaper statement in which he says he proposes to keep the deficit down to $4.7 billion.

But, the fact remains, as has been emphasized by the gentleman from Massachusetts, that at the present time the deficit is in excess of $9 billion.

May I also take advantage of the occasion to assure the gentleman from New York and the Director of the Budget of our earnest cooperation on this side of the aisle in reducing expenditure at every opportunity in the coming session.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have before us, Mr. Chairman, the first apropriation bill for this session of Congress. This is not a bill with which we could make any very substantial effort toward balancing the budget. However, the committee has been very careful in going over the items that were presented and I believe the bill itself is probably as small as we can get by with at the present time.

I appreciate what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] said about me. I am hoping that I may be able to give the same kind of cooperation in the committee to him that he gave to me the last 2 years. I expect that that will happen. I hope that the committee will be able to make a good record on appropriations.

With reference to the matter of balancing the budget, I want to call attention to these facts and these are, to me, the hot facts in connection with the situation confronting the country.

The last periods that are reported on the daily Treasury statement show an increase of approximately 30 percent in the withholding tax and the tax upon income other than of corporations. That is a most encouraging factor because that, more than anything else, indicates that in the November and December periods for which the withholding taxes are now presented, there is a rising trend of employment and a prospect of balancing the budget.

While the overall picture at this time indicates a large deficit, nevertheless the deficit is a couple of hundred million dollars less than it was at this time a year ago. That means that with this rising trend of income-tax collections, our prospects of making headway in balancing the budget are good.

We have to consider that as of any 1st of January, the way income taxes are paid at the present time and the way they will be under the law as it is, prospects are always such that we have a deficit indicated. That deficit is going to be big on the 1st of January right along, because there is only 1 income-tax period in the first half of the fiscal year and there are 3 in the last half of each fiscal year. My own opinion is that the budget will show for this year a substantial reduction in that deficit as compared with last year. If we are careful about our expenditures in this session of the Congress and the one to come next year, I have hopes that we can balance the budget. For my own part I shall do everything in my power to bring financial stability to my country.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, this bill carries approximately $7,200,000 in administrative authority or the authority to use funds by the Commodity Credit Corporation for administrative expenses. The committee has gone along with this request because these funds are necessary because of the huge quantities of agricultural commodities which the Commodity Credit Corporation owns.

We read about our Secretary of Agriculture and others talking about the more than $6 billion we have invested in farm commodities, and that is true. We saw last Congress where the administration, including the Secretary, reduced price-support levels on basic farm commodities from 90 to 82½ percent of parity, the Secretary of Agriculture said: "to prevent the holding of such huge supplies of farm commodities."

Dairy support levels we reduced because of the butter CCC owned. Last year drastic reductions in acreages in wheat, cotton, and decreased production were ordered. This year still further drastic reductions in acreage were ordered, which is working a tremendous hardship and putting lots of people out of business in the area I come from.

Our hearings will disclose that all the time the Commodity Credit Corporation had authority to sell these commodities in world markets for dollars but simply would not do it. If you will read the hearings on this bill you will see it is admitted by the Department of Agriculture that they have not offered to sell those commodities, yet the Commodity Credit Corporation charter itself authorizes the sale of these commodities in world trade on a competitive basis. We have held our commodities back, and thereby helped to increase foreign production. I tried to get a change in policy last year. Later in the year we got them to offer some commodities in world trade on a competitive basis, and they sold $453 million worth of them, reducing CCC stocks to a minimum.

Earlier this week we heard the statement of our distinguished President of the United States, in which much was made of the administration's efforts to move the CCC-owned agricultural commodities into foreign trade for foreign currency under Public Law 480. What

does Public Law 480 provide? A close reading of that speech will show you that 90 percent of that foreign currency we would receive is not even subject to the control of the Congress. By far the greater part of that foreign currency will be used for economic development in those countries. The last 10 percent of it can be given to them if the President just says the word. What the President did not tell you is that his administration is trying to give them away under Public Law 480 instead of selling them under the general authority of the law.

These hearings will disclose that those commodities have not been offered for sale for dollars. In other words, the representatives of the United States Government are going around over the world trying to give away that which they will not offer for sale, for which they have the authority to sell, but which they will not sell, all to add to foreign aid.

And all the time foreign production increases, and the American farmer gets his production cut more and more. There is ample evidence of the fact that the Corporation could sell to be found in the experience that they have had in those items, which we finally got them to offer for sale on a competitive bid last year. Let me read to you a list of those commodities which they will not even offer for sale: Cotton, cheese, corn, rice, seeds, naval stores, tobacco, wool, and until very recently, butter. Furthermore, do not try to tell me that we must sell these commodities from one government to another government. All we have to do is to announce periodically that given quantities of those commodities will be sold on a competitive bid basis to American exporters for export. I know those who want American farmers to absorb increases in foreign production say that they do not have the dollars in foreign countries. Let me tell you Europe is now more than 150 percent of prewar. The records of these hearings show that we will this year spend $3,200,000,000 in Europe. They do have the dollars, but this shortsighted policy of not selling our commodities competitively, on world markets amounts to holding an umbrella over world prices. We have been inviting and getting increased production in every country which produces such commodities. We are making competitors out of our customers. This failure to use the general authority of law is cutting back the income of our own farmers more and more so as to leave many of them far below any kind of a reasonable standard of living; and if it is continued, it will result in American agriculture being limited to the domestic market. What I charge here is proven by the testimony of the Department of Agriculture in these hearings.

May I read to you the report of our committee:

> In the opinion of a majority of the members of the committee, actions of the Department to reduce price supports, change parity formulas and reduce acreage allotments will not cure the problem of the increasing commodity holdings of the Corporation. They believe that this difficulty is due to the failure of the Corporation to discharge its responsibility under its charter to sell its commodities competitively in world markets. Testimony before the committee shows that none of the large stocks of cotton, cheese, corn, rice, seeds, naval stores, tobacco and wool have been or are being offered for sale on a competitive basis, despite basic authority in law to do so.
>
> The program for moving commodities under Public Law 480, for which much is claimed, actually is a means of giving commodities away in preference to attempting to sell them through normal trade channels. In involves prior clearance from a committee composed primarily of representatives of nonagricultural interests, which is a serious hurdle in getting agricultural commodities exported. Also, under the law, the major portion of the local currencies received for commodities shipped abroad will be used for foreign aid purposes in the countries from which received.
>
> The majority of the committee feels that steps should be taken as early as practicable to begin the movement of these commodities into world markets on a competitive bid basis through American exporters. The committee also feels that an immediate announcement of such change in policy should be made to discourage further increases in foreign production to the detriment of American farmers.
>
> Such an action will eventually make possible reductions in administrative costs of the Corporation. It should also help to correct the present practice of making competitors out of former customers and should benefit foreign consumers who have a real need for products surplus to United States domestic needs. Further, and most important, it will enable the American farmer to compete with foreign producers and make additional acreage available to relieve undue hardships existing in many areas of the country under present orders.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I agree perfectly with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] in everything that he has said. I have contended, as have many other Members of the Congress as well as other folks who have kept up with this problem over the past many, many years, that we have been playing the big sucker in not selling or offering our surpluses for sale at a price which would move these agricultural surpluses which we have piled up. I am quite proud of the fact that the 83d Republican Congress did last year pass a bill which made it possible to dispose of these surpluses. I hope that this Congress will insist on continuing in force the program started last year. And so, Mr. Speaker, I indorse what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has said, and say that certainly we were most unfair to our own people and to needy people of the world when we priced our surplus farm commodities off the world market. Instead, let us continue to put a price on these surpluses that will move them, as we did last year when we sold over $450 million worth of them after the 83d Congress passed a bill which made it possible to do so.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. I wanted to point out that the tragedy of not selling these commodities—cotton, cheese, corn, rice, and so forth—and they could have been sold, is that those same commodities for which there was a market and for which there is authority to sell, were used and counted to cut support levels, to reduce acreage, and restrict American production; to restrict the cotton acreage of American farmers. It was used as an argument to reduce the price-support levels on basic commodities from 92 percent to 82½ percent. It was used to change the parity formula so that it will almost automatically go down to 75 percent within the next several years. All the time the commodities that were used for this purpose could have been sold, and there was authority to sell them. When these fights were up last year, Secretary Benson did not tell the American people he had full authority to sell these commodities, but would not offer them for sale in world trade. The major harm or loss is not the amount of money we have invested in these commodities, it is not the fact that the longer you keep them the more storage we have to pay, but the commodities which we have, which we would not sell, have been used to do these other injuries to the American farmer, leaving thousands of tenants without a means of livelihood in the South and many, many small landowners reduced below the barest minimum essential to a decent living.

Mr. JENSEN. I agree perfectly with what the gentleman has just stated. We were told that other countries did not have the dollars to buy our surplus commodities. Now there are many nations which have nice reserves of American dollars with which they can buy these commodities at a price which they can afford to pay.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, we all realize that we have tremendous surpluses of usable foodstuffs in America. The Congress in its wisdom last session, through the House Committee on Agriculture, passed legislation that, at long last, broke down some of the road barriers, to get us started on a surplus-disposal program. We are now tooling up for that job. We have given to needy people in the United States great quantities of food—about 221,000 tons—since last July up to the 31st of December.

Almost a million needy people were given these surplus foods in one of our States. Thirty-three States and Alaska participated in them. With all these surpluses and this tremendous storage bill, we think it is only commonsense that we use every facility to put these foods into consumption, and that we are doing. We are also retooling our Foreign Service for agriculture so that agriculture products can move with increasing volume into foreign markets. We are in the process of doing that. I predict that before the year is over we will see great progress in clearing up and balancing our granary budget also.

I will not have time in 3 minutes to read these things to you, but on page 146 of the hearings you will find the various

programs we have for getting rid of these surpluses in foreign markets:

1. Section 32 export payment programs, under which the Department makes an export differential payment to exporters to encourage increased exports. Two such programs are currently in effect:

Fresh and processed citrus:		
Fresh oranges	cents per box	75
Fresh grapefruit (comparable rates on process citrus)	do	60
Raisins	cents per pound	1½

2. International Wheat Agreement: The Department makes payments to exporters to cover the difference between the United States price and the price under the agreement. The average rate of payment for the fiscal year 1954 was 50.8 cents per bushel. The current rate is 75 cents per bushel.

In addition, CCC makes wheat available for export, as either wheat or flour, from its own stocks on the same terms at which sales are made under the agreement.

3. CCC sales at less than domestic market prices: Under the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the CCC Charter Act, CCC can sell any commodities for export without restriction as to price. Currently (January price list) CCC is offering to sell for export at prices below domestic market prices: Cheese, butter, nonfat dry milk, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghums, cottonseed oil, pinto beans, linseed oil, dried whey.

4. Public Law 480: Commodities will be sold by CCC under Public Law 480 for foreign currencies on the same price basis on which they are available for dollar transactions under other CCC export sales programs.

5. Barter: From its own inventories, CCC arranges to release against barter contracts an equivalent value in agricultural commodities based on the same prices at which they are available for dollar transactions under other CCC export sales programs.

Then I call attention to the Secretary's statement on page 118, in which he reviews the program:

Secretary BENSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, Mr. Morse, Under Secretary of Agriculture, and President of the Commodity Credit Corporation, appeared before this subcommitte yesterday in behalf of the supplemental authorization for CCC administrative expenses for the fiscal year 1955. I understand that questions relating to the necessity for the increased authorization were covered in that hearing.

You discussed with Mr. Morse certain policy and procedure questions having to do particularly with disposal of surplus farm products abroad. Mr. Morse testified with full authority from me and as President of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I am glad to respond to your request that I also discuss these matters with the committee. I understand the principal questions on policy and procedure were along the following lines:

1. We are selling increasing numbers of surplus commodities on the world markets and expect the sales and disposals abroad to be expanded under the broadened authority given under the laws passed by the 83d Congress. During 1954 we sold, competitively on the world markets the following surplus commodities: Peanuts, cottonseed oil, linseed oil, butter, rye, oats, grain sorghums, whey, flaxseed, olive oil, hairy vetch, common vetch, dry edible beans, tung oil, and barley.

Wheat is being sold under the International Wheat Agreement and outside of the agreement at world prices.

Cotton is being sold on the world markets by the cotton trade.

In the 1953 marketing year the sales were 3,200,000 bales.

The estimate for the 1954 marketing year is 4,500,000 bales.

We are getting the active cooperation and help of other departments of Government such as State, Treasury, Foreign Operations Administration, and so forth.

2. The transfer of agricultural attachés is being completed, as authorized by the 83d Congress. We expect to aggressively carry forward a program of redirecting the efforts of the agricultural attachés in a way that will best serve the interests of American argiculture. As Mr. Morse explained yesterday, there will be increasing emphasis on development of markets through the assistance of the agricultural attachés.

3. We are definitely encouraged with the progress that is being made in the movement of agricultural products into use both domestically and abroad. As the work of Congress progresses, we will be reporting more in detail on what has been accomplished and what the future holds.

We expect 1955 exports of farm products to exceed those of last year by 10 percent.

I think what we are doing now is helpful for American agriculture. I hope that we can bear with the program for a while, encourage it, and not criticize it to death, and see what happens. We are all friends of the American farmer. Let us stay that way, and when we have a program in its infancy like this, let us encourage it and not discourage it.

We were pleased with the work of our chairman of the subcommittee in criticizing some of the program. I think that was helpful; also I want to report to the House that the Secretary took cognizance of that criticism regarding the offering of cotton and promised to talk to the Cotton Council and the cotton trade and to the producer cooperatives. They are the ones who have put a block in the way of offering this on the competitive markets. It may be they are wrong.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to commend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] for calling to the attention of Members of the House the failure of the Department of Agriculture to use the authority made available to dispose of surplus farm products.

With all due respect to those who have suggested that we rely on hope and promises that the Department of Agriculture will at some time in the future make full use of legislative authority, I would reply that it is impossible for farmers to operate successfully on hopes and promises. Too long have they been fed that bill of fare.

I suspect that time and events will prove that at the bottom of the reasons why the Department of Agriculture has not sold more surpluses abroad will again be found the long arm of the State Department which, in all too many instances, is apparently more concerned with the welfare of foreigners than our own people.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly will read the hearings before the Appropriations Committee on this subject, and at the earliest date I will relay pertinent information on this subject to the people of the Third District in Iowa.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, we have two items in here from independent offices: One dealing with the Foreign Claims Commission and the other with the FHA. Let me speak first of the FHA item. This calls for about $5,500,000 of which $5,300,000 will be used in the field where they are some 2 to 4 months behind in the processing of new applications for housing. About $125,000 will be used in the District of Columbia for the employment of some 15 or 20 lawyers to investigate the windfall proposition.

None of these are appropriated funds; they come from fees collected by FHA. FHA is from 2 to 4 months behind in the processing of applications. They missed their guess by 40 percent, yet it was nobody's fault; it was due to the fact that the new housing bill which passed late last August and the appropriation bill was passed the previous April or May.

The other item deals with the Foreign Claims Commission. Again, that is not appropriated funds: An item of about $45,000 represents a transfer. An item of $100,000 represents a new authorization. They asked for $130,000; we gave them $90,000.

This comes from the Alien Property Custodian. This is just another good example of how the most permanent thing on earth is a temporary Government agency. It should have been wound up the 31st of March this year. It goes back to the old War Claims Commission, and now it has 2 more years to go.

Mr. Chairman, that is the story as far as the independent offices section is concerned.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply appropriations (this act may be cited as the "Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1955") for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, namely:

CHAPTER I

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

House of Representatives

For payment to Florence R. Rogers, widow of Dwight L. Rogers, late a Representative from the State of Florida, $12,500.

For payment to Nora King, mother-in-law, and Isabel Kanaga and Florence R. King, sisters of Paul W. Shafer, late a Representative from the State of Michigan, $12,500.

Architect of the Capitol

Terraces of Capitol Building: Not to exceed $44,500 of the balance of the appropriation for "Terraces of Capitol Building" contained in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1954, unobligated on December 31, 1954, is hereby continued available, and in addition to the purposes heretofore authorized shall also be available for reconstruction of the House and Senate walkways adjacent to the terraces.

CHAPTER II

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Commodity Credit Corporation

The limitation under this heading in the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration Appropriation Act, 1955, on the amount available for administrative expenses of the Corporation is increased from "$18,000,000" to "$25,290,000."

CHAPTER III

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Housing and Home Finance Agency

Federal Housing Administration

The amount made available under this head in title II of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1955, as amended by the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955, for administrative expenses, is increased from "$5,500,000" to "$5,625,000," and the limitation on the amount available for the expenses of travel is increased from "$250,000" to "$267,600": *Provided,* That the limitation under said head on the amounts available for certain nonadministrative expenses of said Administration is increased from "$26,250,000" to not to exceed "$31,560,000": *Provided further,* That no part of the funds contained herein shall be available for transfer, but shall be available for use exclusively by the Federal Housing Administration.

Foreign Claims Settlement Commission

Administrative expenses

For an additional amount for "Administrative expenses," for carrying out the provisions of the act of August 31, 1954 (Public Law 744), $90,000, to be derived from the War Claims Fund created by section 13a of the War Claims Act of 1948 (Public Law 896, approved July 3, 1948); and this amount and amounts previously made available from this source to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission for "Administrative expenses" shall remain available until June 30, 1955: *Provided,* That the limitation under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1955, as amended by the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955, on the amount available for expenses of travel of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission (War Claims Commission) is increased from "$8,000" to "$12,000."

CHAPTER IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States, or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided,* That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further,* That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this or any other act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further,* That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House without amendment, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. COOPER having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. BOLLING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2091) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPENDENCY ALLOTMENT CLAIMS IN PUERTO RICO

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, for the past 24 months an investigation of dependency allotments, which investigation is now known as Project Big, has been underway in the military services. I urged this investigation in January 1953 and have had intimate knowledge of its progress since that time. This investigation has been conducted in Puerto Rico, the continental United States, and Hawaii. I wish to announce that the Army is now in the process of extending their investigation of these allotments to all areas in the world where investigation is feasible and effective today, has begun the investigation in Germany, France, Austria, and Italy. This involves secondary dependents, that is, parents who actually reside in these countries.

Late in 1952 the Comptroller General of the United States, the Department of Defense, and the Army conducted a limited survey of dependency allotment claims in Puerto Rico. The specific claims under investigation were known as secondary dependents—or parents—claims in connection with class Q allotments. Part of the allotment comes from the enlisted person's pay and part is contributed by the Government. The sums contributed by the Government vary from $51.30, for a private with 1 dependent, to $96.90, for a sergeant with 3 or more dependents. Dependency on the enlisted person for more than one-half of their support is the key to class Q allotments for parents, and both the serviceman and the dependent parent or parents making the claim must make an affidavit that this is the case. These allotments are authorized by the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, Public Law 771 of the 81st Congress.

The results of the limited survey in Puerto Rico became known to me in January 1953, at the time I became chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. My first official act, as a matter of fact, as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, was a conference with Army officials who were disturbed over the Puerto Rico findings and requesting my advice on the course of action which should be taken by them. From the known results in Puerto Rico, I was convinced that every secondary allotment claim in Puerto Rico should be investigated and, therefore, I urged the Army to undertake such an investigation. It was a big job due to the limited number of trained investigators obtainable, but the Army readily agreed to my request and a full investigation of all claims in Puerto Rico was promptly undertaken. During that conference I recalled the tremendous sums which were lost during World War II through the payment of unjustified or fraudulent dependency claims. This promptly led me to request that a substantial sampling of the secondary allotments to dependents of Army personnel in the United States be investigated. The results of such an investigation would be used as a guide for possible future action. The Army readily agreed and thereafter completed this limited investigation of paying allotments in the United States in the late summer of 1953.

The initial findings from the sampling of claims in the United States indicated that about 30 percent of the secondary allotments were improper. I then had another conference with the Army representatives and it was agreed that the Army would investigate all of the secondary dependency allotment claims being paid by the Army in the United States. This was the birth of Project Big.

The Army has completed its initial investigation in Puerto Rico. A total of 21,973 secondary dependency allotments have been readjudicated and 7,781, or 35 percent, have been rejected in Puerto Rico. The Army has investigated 63,537 cases in the United States, rejecting 17,941, or 28 percent. Army savings in Puerto Rico and in the United States are $27,596,281.20, based on the normal life of a class Q allotment.

These investigations have cost money—perhaps almost a million dollars—but when compared to the savings to the taxpayers already produced in the Army phase alone, I feel sure that no one can say that it has not been a worthwhile undertaking. Their psychological value cannot be calculated, but it is pertinent to note that some servicemen have even voluntarily canceled their dependency allotments and there has been a noticeable decrease in the percent number per thousand troops of applications received.

It is regrettable to know that a number of cases involving certain fraud have been uncovered, but I feel that the action which is now taking place with regard to those who have committed fraud will serve as a lesson to others. A number of cases have been referred to the United

States district attorneys for possible prosecution. Also, a number of service personnel have already, or will, face military courts-martial. The Army alone has convicted a number of service personnel with sentences ranging up to dishonorable discharge. This, too, is regrettable; however, it is time for that small minority who commit willful fraud on their fellow citizens to understand that they must surely pay the penalty.

In view of the results obtained in the investigations in the United States and Puerto Rico, I felt that all allotments being paid by the Army for secondary dependents, regardless of where these dependents are located, should be investigated to determine their eligibility to receive the allotment and also to insure that those dependents who are eligible, receive such allotments. Therefore, it was decided that the Army would investigate all such allotments regardless of the location of the dependents, where such an investigation is feasible. While the number of allotments in these overseas areas is small, I feel that all allotments should be treated in the same light and such investigation will give the ultimate in protection to the taxpayer, as well as the dependent, in insuring proper payments.

The Army has also included in Project Big a limited investigation of claims submitted for reimbursement for transportation of dependents. I have encouraged this phase and will also encourage the Army to extend this type of limited investigation to all other fields considered sensitive in that they lend themselves to fraudulent or improper payments.

I wish to make note that special credit is due to the field investigators who have undertaken this difficult task. It is most obvious to me that the perseverance and good judgment which they have continually exercised has been the major factor in the success of this somewhat large undertaking. They have performed a real service to the armed services and to the taxpayers. I feel that it is considerable tribute to them to say that through the long difficult course of this investigation, I have not received a single justified complaint from anyone in or out of Congress, based upon the manner in which these investigators have conducted themselves.

As a fundamental matter, I am unshaken in my conviction that most Americans are honest. As a matter of fact, while there have most certainly been willfully fraudulent dependency claims submitted, relatively few of the claims investigated and rejected by the Army have been fraudulent. The reason for many of these rejections may be traced to the fact that the serviceman and his family did not fully understand the dependency requirements of the law or to some few instances where the dependency was just under the more than one-half support requirement. Nevertheless, the evidence developed to date demands that the Army continue their investigations. Those who are qualified to receive dependency allotments and other benefits have no cause to worry, but those who are in doubt had better make sure. The relatively small minority who are guilty of fraud against their fellow taxpayers had better take cover because the full force of justice will be used against them.

Since a few bad apples can spoil the barrel, now is the time to remove the bad ones. We must and will fully protect the rights of individuals who are entitled to Federal financial aid in the form of allotments, but we will not permit people who do not fully qualify for such aid to unjustly receive this form of Federal financial support.

The Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force have conducted similar investigations on a lesser scale, but sufficiently broad to determine the size of the problem in each those services. The results have been gratifying and have brought about improved procedures which should serve to minimize the problem in the future.

I wish to commend all of the services, particularly the Army, for the initiative which they have shown in this difficult task. Complete fairness to the parents of service personnel and to the Government has been the goal and it is my firm conviction that it is being achieved.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of announcing to the House at this time that the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] will serve as deputy Democratic whip in the 84th Congress.

ADJOURNMENT FROM TODAY UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, I think this might be a good time for the majority leader to tell us what he has planned for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, 2 messages will come up next week, 1 on Monday and 1 on Thursday. There is no legislation that I know of next week, and I so state to the House, except any matters that might be of an emergency nature noncontroversial, or which will pass by unanimous consent. Of course, the Members know that any legislation that passes by unanimous consent—and I say this for the benefit of the new Members particularly—is very carefully screened by the leadership on both sides.

On Monday next I shall ask unanimous consent that a resolution that passed the Senate in relation to the Hoover Commission enabling former Senator Ferguson to continue as a member to be brought up.

At this time I see nothing in the way of legislation and the Members may govern themselves accordingly except those matters that will be passed by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. SHEPPARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. BAILEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

MORAL REARMAMENT

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to associate myself with the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD]. During the past 2 weeks I have, with my wife, attended several of the sessions and witnessed each of the 4 outstanding Moral Rearmament ideological plays.

For several years, I have been challenged by this world force of trained men and women who have accepted the challenge of Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman, a great Pennsylvanian, who initiated Moral Rearmament, that peace is not just an idea but people becoming different.

Since June 1951 our two daughters, Cree and Carol, have been fulltime with Moral Rearmament. They have recently come back from a 7-month trip through Ceylon, India, Kashmir, and Pakistan with Frank Buchman and a force of 200 men and women from 25 countries.

The response was so significant that I am convinced that here lies the secret of a new foreign policy for America that can win all nations.

Ambassador Corea, of Ceylon, said about that trip:

> The two great events in Asia in the last 5 years have been the coming of independence to 500 million people and the coming of Dr. Buchman and the force of Moral Rearmament.

The vice chancellor of Madras University in India said about his 23,000 students:

> Before you came all my students talked about was communism. Now all they talk about is Moral Rearmament.

Prime Minister Mohammed Ali, of Pakistan, recently said here in America:

> Military and economic aid alone will not stop communism in Asia. What we need is Moral Rearmament.

Sixty Japanese leaders on their way back to Japan from a Moral Rearmament assembly said:

> If the West becomes expert in the practice and philosophy of Moral Rearmament, all Asia will listen.

That I believe is the key to holding Asia and Africa and eventually winning China.

Mr. Speaker, as we enter this crucial session of the Congress, I propose that we accept Moral Rearmament as our national policy. No problem we face will be too great that will not yield to the application of the ideas and absolute moral standards of Moral Rearmament.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I know of no group in the world who have done more than Moral Rearmament to spark the spiritual progress of this age. Their work for freedom under God's guidance is the heart of the answer to the problems which face the world today.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the Members' attention to a play which is being given tomorrow night by the Moral Rearmament group called The Man With the Key. I, with other Members, have been attending some of the other plays that have been given in Washington in the last week. I am not a member of the group, but I am tremendously impressed with these troupes of actors and actresses, one of 26 groups now appearing around the world, to emphasize the moral approach to the settlement of our world problems. We have tried military force. It does not seem to work as we expect it to work. Let us try Moral Rearmament.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with those speaking about the work of the Moral Rearmament group. I have attended some of the sessions this year and in previous years. I call attention to the fact that I am a member of your own House Committee on Un-American Activities, and I wish to say that the testimony of the former Communist leaders from England, France, Germany, Italy, and so forth, which I heard the other night at the Shoreham Hotel was, in fact, a revelation to me. I had the privilege of speaking with Mr. McGovern of the British House of Commons, and he gave me of his experience. Some I heard speaking out of their own mouths the other night on the public platform and giving due credit to the Moral Rearmament policy and program for their leaving the Communist totalitarian conspiracy, made it crystal clear that the Communist, atheistic program was whipped to a standstill in their own lives and experience by the superprogram of Moral Rearmament which places the Fatherhood of God as paramount and love of fellowmen and absolute honesty, purity, and righteousness supreme in command. Early in the 79th Congress, on the floor of this House, during my first term, I extemporaneously stated that legislation enacted by us would not endure unless it was grounded in moral and spiritual foundations. The reason I reminded you I was a Member again of your own House Un-American Activities Committee, which deals with the problem of investigating subversive activities and propaganda of the Communist conspiracy, or any other subversive groups, is that the other night when I heard these former leading European Communists give testimony of the dynamic power in their own experience of Moral Rearmament principles, I again realized that this foundation program of moral and spiritual values, adequately and sincerely applied to their individual and world problems could and would destroy the false propanganda and program of the Communist totalitarian conspiracy.

I wish to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE] on their remarks, and I wish to associate myself with any of the gentlemen of this body who make remarks in approval of this great program.

A NEW APPROACH TO EQUAL PAY

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a new bill dealing with the wage differentials between men and women. On the strength of the findings I have made as well as studies going well over a year and a half, I am taking an entirely new approach to it. My own studies have developed that there is all too little authoritative data on the whole subject. Obviously, without facts we cannot legislate fairly or intelligently. My new bill would authorize the Secretary of Labor to make a study of the wage differentials now existing. We need to know the possible effect on wage scales. We need to know the psychological effect of the discrimination that now exists. We need to know how effective State legislation has been in dealing with the problem. We need to know many such things. You will probably be interested to know that at no point do I find that people do not want equal pay. They all want it; they are all in favor of it. The problem is how it might be brought about.

MORAL REARMAMENT CONFERENCE

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in endorsing the plan of our colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] in regard to the Moral Rearmament plays. I have attended some of them and cannot speak too highly of their appeal from a domestic standpoint nor their impact as advocating an ideology capable of winning converts from communism.

COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENT

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced House Joint Resolution 116, which provides:

That notwithstanding any other provision of the law within 15 days after enactment of this joint resolution, the Secretary of Agriculture shall estimate for each State receiving a State acreage allotment for the 1955 crop of cotton the number of acres of such allotment which, on the basis of previous experience, will probably not be planted to cotton in 1955 and shall apportion to each such State an additional allotment for 1955 equivalent to the underplanting so estimated. The additional acreage required for such apportionment shall be in addition to the national acreage allotment and the production from such acreage shall be in addition to the national marketing quota. Such additional State acreage allotments shall be apportioned to counties within the respective States for the purpose of correcting inequities and preventing hardships especially on family operated farms where the 1955 cotton allotment heretofore determined has resulted in a reduction in cotton acreage on such farm below that required for an economic farming unit.

I believe this resolution, if properly administered, will provide sufficient acreage to ease the worst of our hardship cases. It places on the State and county ASC committees the responsibility for increased allotments on the basis of individual merit. It does not increase the acreage in counties that have not been adversely affected.

In presenting this resolution to the Congress I have stressed that the conditions in much of my district are extremely serious and if permitted to continue could result in a growing depression. Conditions are uncomfortably similar to those which led to the great depression of 1929. The stock market is high and industry is booming, but farmers are facing disaster. We cannot afford to take any further chances.

My resolution will correct the present situation, but it still remains for us to find a permanent method of acreage allotment by which a small farmer will not be cut below the minimum required for an economic farming unit. This should be permanent legislation rather than a temporary expedient, and I expect to introduce it as soon as this emergency resolution has been disposed of.

MORAL REARMAMENT CONFERENCE

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join with my colleagues who have spoken in behalf of the Moral Rearmament Conference. It was my pleasure and privilege to attend. I saw people from many nations of the world who have come here with but one purpose in mind and that is to help in God's good work all over the world in the hope that finally every nation on earth will join under the flag of God to bring peace and good will among men everywhere.

I want to compliment them for their good work, and I wish them Godspeed in all their doings.

INCREASING OUR WATER SUPPLIES

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a measure to continue and strengthen the important studies now in progress on the conversion of saline waters as a means of increasing our water supplies.

Due to our growing populations, expanding industry, agriculture, and new technology, the demand for ever-increasing quantities of fresh water has grown tremendously. This expansion is causing our water resources to be gradually exhausted or contaminated, or both. In many instances, such as my State of Ohio, existing water supplies have been supplemented by new wells, which tend to lower the water table in certain areas. In other places new reservoirs have had to be constructed and water transported over ever-greater distances.

A new attack on this problem was initiated by the Congress when it enacted Public Law 448, with which I took an active part. Under the act, processes are being developed for the removal of dissolved salts, both from the inexhaustible water of the oceans and from brackish inland water, which is becoming increasingly saline to a point where, in many cases, it cannot be safely used.

The objective of the saline-water conversion program is to develop economically feasible processes for producing from sea water, or from other saline waters, water of a quality suitable for agriculture, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses. The Department of the Interior accomplishes this program by conducting scientific research and development by means of federally financed grants and contracts and stimulating the interest of private and public organizations and individuals in the problem.

By amendments which I introduced in 1952, the act provides that most of the research and development be carried out by private industrial and scientific organizations. It is gratifying to learn of the splendid cooperation exhibited between industry, other organizations and the saline-water-conversion program. One of the firms in my district, the Griscom-Russell Co., of Massillon, Ohio, has been serving the Department in a consulting capacity. Supporting evidence of such cooperation as this, progress made during the past year, and the excellent work that is being done, may be found in the third annual report recently released by the Secretary of the Interior.

Much of the initial research on process development consisted of small-scale laboratory work. When certain processes developed in the laboratory show sufficient promise, field tests became necessary in order to determine feasibility on a large-scale basis. Such tests, on a pilot-plant scale, are a necessary part of any process development and are much more costly than the original research.

The difference between present costs of converting sea water and the program objective costs is still large. The work completed to date, however, indicates that attainment of the first goal of winning fresh water from sea water at a price which municipal users and some industries might afford, and the conversion of brackish water to irrigation uses, seems to be in sight. The need to reduce the cost still further points out the fact that nonconventional low-cost energy such as solar energy must be explored in connection with process development and use.

In briefly summarizing the work of the program for 1954, I would like to mention the following typical investigations.

Of several methods showing promise, the critical pressure process is of interest. Essentially this process of extracting fresh water from sea water is similar to the evaporation process. However, since the conversion is accomplished at or near the critical state of water the net energy requirements for the process are quite small.

At one time this process was investigated by the Swedish scientists Baltzar von Platen, A. G. Olander, and Halvard Liander. In a mission of foreign aid in reverse, in which the United States benefited considerably, the director of the saline water-conversion program and two other scientists visited these men in Stockholm, Sweden, during 1954.

On the basis of their findings a new research and development contract amounting to some $70,000 has been negotiated for development of the process. Nuclear Development Associates, of White Plains, N. Y., assisted by the Griscom-Russell Co., of Massillon, is conducting this research and development work.

Other firms and organizations which are engaged in research or development of similar processes or membranes are Rohm & Haas Co.; Permutit Co., of the United States; and Permutit, Ltd., of England; Gulf Research and Development, of Pittsburgh; Netherlands Central Technical Institute; British National Physical Laboratory; Farbenfabriken Bayer Co., of Leverkusen, Germany; Imperial College, London, and the National Chemical Research Laboratory, of the Union of South Africa, all of which have cooperated in supplying information on their research.

Other processes under development involve an ion transfer membrane demineralizer which is undergoing field tests in Arizona and South Dakota; various aspects of the vapor compressor distillation process some of which will reach field testing stage next year; solar distillation makes use of the sun's energy; and the use of such processes as osmosis, solvent extraction, separation by freezing and ultrasonics.

Increased attention is being focused on the potential use of demineralized water for industrial purposes and a survey of such uses is being initiated.

The program is well conceived. To permit continuity, and the attainment of its goals, extension of time and a slightly increased budget are needed, and a small amount of research in existing Federal laboratories is needed for confirming results. This is the purpose of the measure I have introduced today. I trust that it may have early and favorable consideration by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MRA AND SPIRITUALIZED INDIVIDUALISM

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, some say there is nothing new to Moral Rearmament. Like prose, man has been using it on and off all his life. It is commonsense.

Others say that MRA can harmonize the innerman with the outer, that it can attune man on the offbeat with man on the downbeat. It can do the same for citizens, communities, and continents, the one with the other. Thus, MRA is a catalyzer. It fuses harmony by consent and example, not by fiat, force or extermination.

Like the sun and the moon, the stars and the sky, some say that moral principles have always been with us. Successful navigators use them. Shoals await those who discount them. Love, purity, honesty, and unselfishness harmonize man. Their opposites tear asunder and destroy. The degree of division in the world is in proportion to the hatred, impurity, dishonesty, and greed that is in the world.

Moral Rearmament, it appears, holds that man can, with God's guidance, chart a course of conduct for himself, with men, nations, and continents that will allow each to live in confidence while awaiting the disclosure of His next mystery. Love, honesty, purity, and unselfishness are the absolutes by which men can thus move.

The above is what I have discerned about Moral Rearmament since I came in contact with it a few years ago here in Washington while serving in the Congress. Mr. Speaker, I wish it well.

Listed now is a card I found on a chair the other evening at the Shoreham Hotel where I saw one of Peter Howard's MRA plays called We Are Tomorrow.

The card tells a story:

You are cordially invited to performances of Peter Howard's stage plays.

We Are Tomorrow, Tuesday, January 11—Our decisions of today and the world they will build.

The Dictator's Slippers, Wednesday, January 12, behind the scenes behind the Iron Curtain.

The Real News, Thursday, January 13—The struggle for power in a newspaper office.

The Man With the Key, Friday, January 14—Inside drama of a modern international conference.

Presented in connection with the World Assembly for Moral Re-Armament each evening at 8:30, Shoreham Hotel, main ballroom.

For reserved seats, without charge: Moral Rearmament, Shoreham Hotel, Adams 4–0700.

"I wish every Member of the House and Senate would see that play. It is a most inspiring production." (Senator CASE of South Dakota, speaking of one of the MRA plays on the Senate floor, January 5, when 400 delegates to the MRA World Assembly were welcomed by Senators GEORGE, WILEY, SMITH of New Jersey, CASE and WATKINS.)

From the World Assembly:

"Moral Rearmament has the answer to the most burning questions of the day. I know of no stronger unifying force in the world." (Ole Bjorn Kraft, former Foreign Minister of Denmark and Chairman of NATO.)

"What Abraham Lincoln did for America, Moral Rearmament is doing for Africa." (The Tolon Na, Member of Parliament; political leader of 1½ millions in the Gold Coast.)

"Military defense alone will never be adequate to meet Communist aggression. Whatever our economic or defense programs, we must have this ideological backbone of MRA." (Senator Takeshi Togano, member of the executive, right wing Socialist Party, Japan.)

CONDUCT ON THE FLOOR OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by my colleagues on both sides of the aisle regarding Moral Rearmament.

I now wish to call the attention of the House to another subject. Twice during the last 22 years, through the graciousness of the Speaker and the House, I was privileged to address this body on the rules governing our conduct on this floor. It has been 8 years since such remarks were made the last time. During that time more than a majority of the House are new Members.

We all make mistakes on this floor. Therefore, I propose in the very near future when opportunity presents itself to address the House again on the rules of conduct which govern us toward our colleagues and in our legislative duties on this floor.

THE LATE DR. HENRY WILSON TEMPLE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House the passing of Dr. Henry Wilson Temple, a former Member of the House, at his home in Washington, Pa., on January 11, 1955. Dr. Temple had been ill for several months and was in his 91st year.

He was a retired minister, Congressman, and college professor. He was born March 31, 1864, at Belle Centre, Ohio, and was the son of John B. and Martha Jameson Temple. He attended the public schools in his hometown and then entered Geneva College, from which he graduated in 1883 at the age of 19. He entered Allegheny Theological Seminary in Pittsburgh and graduated in 1887. Four years later he accepted a call to the First United Presbyterian Church in Washington, Pa.

In 1898 Dr. Temple was elected professor of political science at Washington and Jefferson College in Washington, Pa. In 1905 he gave up his pastorate to devote his entire time to college work.

Dr. Temple was elected to Congress from the district, which I now represent, on the Bull Moose ticket in 1912. He served in the House of Representatives for 20 years. He was a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and established himself as the foremost authority in Congress on international affairs.

He was defeated for Congress in the Democratic landslide in 1932 and did not seek public office again. He returned to his teaching at Washington and Jefferson College and taught until he retired in 1948 with the title of professor emeritus.

Dr. Temple never lost his interest in Congress or in national and international affairs. He was known as Washington's "grand old man" and was beloved by all.

His passing is a distinct loss to Washington County and to the entire State of Pennsylvania.

I join his many friends in extending to his survivors sincere and heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. I join with the gentleman from Pennsylvania in expressing my regret at the death of Dr. Temple. It was my privilege to serve with Dr. Temple for a number of years on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He was a great scholar, a student of foreign affairs, and a man of outstanding ability. With all his ability, he was a kindly man, considerate of others, and one who was a great honor to the House. His death will be regretted by all who knew him.

Mr. MORGAN. I thank the former Speaker for those remarks.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I had the honor and privilege of serving with Dr. Henry Temple. I think he was one of the finest men I ever knew. He had the confidence of both sides of the House. Whenever he spoke here he received undivided attention.

Mr. MORGAN. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The late Mr. Rogers and I for many years had the privilege of knowing Dr. Temple and his wife. My husband served on the Foreign Affairs Committee with him. Later I had the same privilege. No finer Member of Congress ever came to this body. Dr. Temple possessed a vast knowledge of international affairs and parliamentary procedure. Able and brilliant, he added a very great deal to the running of our Department of State and our Foreign Service. His wisdom and wise counsel were invaluable to the Congress and the Nation.

Mr. MORGAN. I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

IMPORTATION OF RESIDUAL FUEL OIL

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House Resolution 4, a bill for the relief of the coal industry by doing something about the dumping of residual fuel oil on the eastern shores of this country. Great damage has been done to the industry in the past several years. Attention has been called to it many times by Members who come from the coal mining areas and who are familiar with the distress that the dumping of this residual oil has caused in these coal areas. Approximately 35 million tons of coal a year have been displaced by this cheap oil. Approximately 22,000 men have lost their jobs in the coal industry as a result of it. Furthermore, many mines have been forced into inactivity and as a result many millions of tons of coal are lost because you cannot go back into the coal mines after years of idleness and resume the operation of the mines without a great deal of expense. I hope that the Committee on Ways and Means will offer some relief to this great industry which is basic to our national economy, and which it is necessary to preserve so that this industry will be in a position to share in the defense of our country if the time should ever come.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday, January 20, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on February 15, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

THE KOHLER STRIKE—SOME ADDITIONAL FACTS

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include some correspondence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on January 10, 1955, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] read into the RECORD an article which appeared in the recent issue of the UAW–CIO News, together with three pieces of correspondence which were furnished to him and to other Members of Congress by Mr. Herbert V. Kohler, president of the Kohler Co., Kohler, Wis. The insertions appear on pages 209–211 of the RECORD, and they deal with the prolonged and unfortunate labor-management dispute at the Kohler plant.

I wish to take this opportunity to set the RECORD straight by calling attention to the fact that the Kohler Co., appears to have imposed on the credulity of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and other Members of Congress by sending us an incomplete and therefore somewhat distorted picture of the Kohler strike. Missing from the collection of documents which my colleague from Michigan, I, and presumably other Members of Congress received from the president of the Kohler Co. is an informative and vital statement made on July 8, 1954, by the Governor of Wisconsin, Hon. Walter J. Kohler, Jr.

Governor Kohler is the nephew of Mr. Herbert V. Kohler, president of the Kohler Co. Two months after the strike began, the Governor proposed that the company and the union settle their differences by arbitration. This suggestion was welcomed by many people in Wisconsin, was editorially endorsed by the Sheboygan Press—published in the county in which the Kohler plant is located—and was accepted by the union. It was summarily rejected by the company, in a letter included in the collection which the gentleman from Michigan, acting, I am certain, in all good faith, inserted in the RECORD.

In the belief that the membership of this body ought to have the benefit of both sides of the picture, I wish at this point to read into the RECORD the letter of Governor Kohler and the editorial from the Sheboygan Press. It is my hope that, for the convenience of historians, these documents will be appropriately cross-referenced in the index.

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Madison, July 8, 1954.

KOHLER CO.,
Kohler, Wis.
(Attention: Mr. Herbert V. Kohler, president.)

KOHLER LOCAL 833, UAW–CIO,
Sheboygan, Wis.
(Attention: Mr. Allen W. Grasskamp, president.)

GENTLEMEN: Throughout the current dispute between Kohler Co. and Local No. 833, UAW–CIO, I have hoped that the issue would be speedily resolved. Recently, however, I have become increasingly concerned at the lack of progress in negotiations.

As you know, I have no financial interest in or other connection with Kohler Co. However, as a life-long resident of Sheboygan County I have a deep interest in the welfare of that community.

Moreover, as governor, I would be negligent if I were indifferent to the serious economic consequences to Wisconsin arising from a prolonged controversy such as that existing at Kohler.

Obviously, these consequences are staggering. The losses entailed by the company, the employees, the community, and the State can never be regained. It should be the desire of all parties, and certainly would serve the interests of all parties, if the questions at issue were promptly resolved and the strike ended.

It had been my hope that these issues might be resolved before now at the bargaining table. It became obvious last week, however, in conferences with representatives of the company and the union, that broad areas of disagreement still exist on many of the principal issues. Negotiations appear to have reached an impasse, and little prospect exists that these disagreements can be speedily resolved through collective-bargaining procedures.

It would appear, therefore, that unless new methods are applied in the dispute, this prolonged strike will continue until a contract is imposed upon one side or the other through the sheer force of economic pressure. Such a contract is apt to be a bad contract under which one side or the other would be restive and dissatisfied and would be good neither for the company nor for the union.

This fact, coupled with the serious economic consequences of a prolonged dispute, impels me to propose that the remaining issues in the dispute be submitted to arbitration and that each party agree to accept the findings of an impartial arbitrator.

Arbitration, while not the usual procedure in contract negotiation, nevertheless would be by no means unique. Similar action in other extended disputes has produced amicable settlement of differences between labor and management, and I see no reason why that should not be the case in this instance.

There is, certainly, great virtue in submitting the respective merits of the dispute to an impartial arbitrator detached from the heat and bitterness engendered in conflicts such as this. Charges and countercharges, recriminations and counterrecriminations, breed emotional attitudes which are not conducive to composed and objective analysis, and the merits or demerits of the original points at issue are lost. Submission of the issues to an impartial arbitrator can restore dispassionate consideration of the fundamentals originally involved.

I need not tell you how disturbed I am over the severe personal hardship being endured by those who are unemployed because of this dispute. Extension of the conflict is good for neither the company nor the union. It is emphatically not good for the community nor for the State.

It is my hope, therefore, that both parties will agree to submit the remaining issues to arbitration, and I am happy to offer the facilities of the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board in the selection of a qualified, impartial arbitrator.

In consideration of this request both the company and the union should bear in mind that refusal to submit the issues to arbitration undoubtedly would be interpreted by the public as indicative of a lack of desire to see the strike at an end, and a lack of confidence in the merits of its case by the party which declined.

I shall look forward to an early response to this request.

With good wishes.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER J. KOHLER, *Governor.*

(Copy to Harvey Kitzman, director, region 10, UAW–CIO, Milwaukee, Wis.)

[From the Sheboygan Press of July 10, 1954]

MERIT IN GOVERNOR'S PLAN

Governor Kohler, in his capacity as chief executive of the State and a lifelong resident of Sheboygan County, was acting in the interests of the people of Wisconsin in his efforts to break the stalemate resulting from the suspension of negotiations in the Kohler strike.

As he said in his letter proposing arbitration of the strike, he would be negligent if he were indifferent to the serious economic consequences arising from the controversy, now at the end of the 14th week. The consequences include the loss of income to the company, the men on strike, nonstriking employees who have not returned to work, and the State of Wisconsin. The State's loss is in regard to tax revenue that would normally come from both the company and the workers. There is further loss to suppliers of the company and to merchants and other businesses with whom the employees normally trade.

Governor Kohler, therefore, should be commended for his efforts, even though the Kohler Co., has rejected the proposal. Nothing is accomplished by not trying.

This brings up the question of, "Where do we go from here?"

We believe the logical move would be the resumption of negotiations by the company and union. The Kohler Co., broke off negotiations on June 29 because of "violence." There have been numerous such instances. At the same time, we believe the company could accept at face value the union officials' repudiation of the use of violence. In a prolonged controversy, involving a great number of persons, it is almost inevitable that there would be "incidents." We are convinced that responsible union officials have sought to prevent these occurrences. There may be some among the membership who have done otherwise, but such persons are defeating their own purposes. We must concede, at least, that the leaders of the union recognize that any resort to violence would have an adverse effect on the union as far as the public is concerned.

We appeal to any person, no matter what his views may be in regard to the merits of the stand taken by either side, to refrain from any action, including word of mouth, that would tend to promote violence of any kind. Let everyone be honest and sincere about it.

While we regret that the Kohler Co. did not see fit to support the arbitration proposal, it must be conceded that there is merit to the argument advanced in opposition to it. We refer especially to their statement "we will not grant to anyone having no experience with the business and no responsibility for it the ultimate authority to prescribe such vital elements of cost as wages, working schedules, fringe benefits, etc."

We can agree with the Kohler Co. that to accept in advance the results of arbitration concerning the union shop and wages amounts to an abdication of the responsibility naturally inherent in management. But, we have reason to believe that these are not the paramount issues in this controversy and when there is disagreement between the parties as to the effect of certain other proposals, we see no harm in submitting to impartial minds the final determination of whether the company or the union's thinking is correct in the matter. We refer especially to such fringe benefits under discussion as hospitalization insurance where the company contends that the union's proposals would be less beneficial to the employees than its own program. The matter of pensions is another subject that has received pretty general approval in industry throughout the country. There are literally hundreds of plants that have established pension plans. No doubt they are all different; but again, there are experts in this field; there is a broad field of national experience in varied industries that can be drawn from to determine whether or not the pension plan in force at the Kohler Co. is fair.

The serious fact of the matter is that the negotiation machinery has stopped at dead center, and for the welfare of both sides to the controversy as well as to the entire community, something must be done to get the machinery in operation again, even if certain items are eliminated from the arbitration program.

There is no question here of winning a strike. Nobody has ever won in a strike that has gone on for 14 weeks. Nobody is going to win this strike. We are all losers. There remains only the question of settling the controversy that brought about the strike, and we want to emphasize that it is our belief that it cannot be settled on a basis of unconditional surrender by either side. There is going to have to be some give and take and we do not accept either side's statement to the effect that offers already made are the last word.

We do not believe that the governor's proposal should be dropped simply because there are unacceptable features in it to one side or the other. We believe there should be meetings for the purpose of discussing the proposal with a view of bringing it to a point where it is acceptable to both sides.

Certainly it would be helpful at this stage to have some fresh thinking on the subject and we are certain that the controversy is of such importance that the help of the best minds in the Nation could be enlisted.

Arbitration, even though limited to certain fields would at least break the stalemate. Such a development would provide new hope that a reasonable settlement can be reached.

Governor Kohler asserted in his letter that "extension of the conflict is good for neither the company nor the union." He added that it is not good for the community nor for the State. Let's agree with those assertions and get back to the business of negotiating a settlement.

THE KOHLER STRIKE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, now I am extremely grateful to the gentleman who just left the floor [Mr. ZABLOCKI] for adding the statement of the Governor of Wisconsin to what I said and which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 209, on Monday last. I did not have the statement of the Governor of Wisconsin at that time. If I had, I certainly would have included it.

If I am correct, and the gentleman can correct me if I am wrong, the proposition from the Governor of Wisconsin was that the company arbitrate its differences with the union.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not subscribe to the doctrine that there should be compulsory arbitration of so-called labor disputes. I never have and I do not expect that I will ever agree to the doctrine that those who disagree as to the terms or conditions of employment should be forced to submit to compulsory arbitration by a third person or group not financially interested in the result, not in any way responsible for the execution of an award which may be made. I cannot subscribe to a policy which decrees that if you and I are carrying on a business transaction we should be forced to call in a third party to fix the terms of that business deal. I just do not go along with that, because if you are one party, then you or the other individual who is interested will be deprived of an opportunity to operate his own business, or to seek his own employment on whatever terms he may wish. No. I cannot go along with that compulsory arbitration idea. Let somebody who has no responsibility, no financial interest, run my business? No; and neither would you.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

MORAL REARMAMENT MOVEMENT

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that several years ago I joined with my distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] and my distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] on a trip to Caux, Switzerland, MRA headquarters, representing this body, and great were the things we learned there. Those people believe in God. They have the answer to communism. As a Catholic, I wish to point out as well, that this is a nonsectarian movement, and in no way trespasses upon the beliefs or the teachings of any organized religion.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes, following any other special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. POWELL asked and was given permission to address the House on Thursday next for 30 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered, on the subject of placing civil rights in their proper perspective.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida, Mr. PAUL G. ROGERS, be permitted to take the oath of office today. He was elected to succeed his illustrious and distinguished father, the late Honorable Dwight L. Rogers. The certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida presented himself at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

THE LATE HONORABLE ROBERT L. DOUGHTON

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound regret that I announce the death of the Honorable Robert L. Doughton, a former Member of this body from the Ninth Congressional District of North Carolina, whom I succeeded upon his retirement from Congress in 1952.

Mr. Doughton was apparently in good health on the evening of September 30, 1954, but passed away sometime during that night.

My distinguished predecessor, Mr. Doughton, was a man who held the confidence and respect of his people. Before coming to Congress in 1911 he held many positions of trust in the State of North Carolina. He was a farmer, banker, member of the Board of Agriculture of North Carolina, member of the State senate and served as director of the State's prison. He was elected to the United States House of Representatives 21 times and served in this body with distinction for 42 years, and at the time of his retirement in 1952 was Dean of the House of Representatives. He was elected chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in 1932—the 73d Congress—and, with the exception of the 80th Congress, served in this capacity until his retirement, having the distinction of being chairman of this great committee longer than any other man in the history of our Government. He also served in the Congress as alternating chairman of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and also as vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

Mr. Doughton was a man beloved and held in the highest esteem by his colleagues and all those who knew him. He was a man of sound judgment, homespun humor and wit, and impeccable integrity, with a devout sense of loyalty to

his friends and his duty. His district, the State of North Carolina, and the Nation sustained an irreplaceable loss in the passing of this great statesman.

To his children I extend my sincere and heartfelt sympathy.

It has been aptly said, "They did not bury Farmer Bob Doughton; they just think they did. He just moved on to larger and greener pastures." May God rest his soul and prepare a special place for him in that great mansion on high—that place not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.

The following tribute to Mr. Doughton in an editorial of his hometown paper, the Alleghany News, Sparta, N. C., expresses the high esteem, respect and affection of his people:

Much of the majesty and strength of the Blue Ridge Mountains, where he was born and finally came home to rest, have often been reflected in the long and useful life of Robert Lee Doughton. Because he made it possible for millions to share his love for the scenic beauty and peacefulness of these mountains, through the Blue Ridge Parkway, this will loom high among the monuments erected to this great man. In the years ahead when travelers pause at Doughton Park to gaze in wonder at the scenery and find the likeness of this leader on a bronze plaque, may they be inspired to render service like this man.

The son of a Civil War captain, Robert L. Doughton was born November 7, 1863 when people of this section and throughout the Southland knew poverty and hardship. But these conditions served to develop his initiative, strength of character and love for hard work, the qualities which helped to make him great in the years ahead. He was a self-educated man, but never ceased to study and seek out information. Born as he was on a farm, his first ambition was to become the best farmer possible. In those days there was more hard work and fewer opportunities than today; but such conditions served to quicken his interest in agriculture for the remainder of his days. It was to many that he was forever known as "Farmer Bob."

His first public service was as a member of the State board of agriculture. He next went to the State legislature; but it was in 1911 he broadened his scope of public life when he was elected to Congress, where he stayed until 1952, 41 years of continuous service.

From the beginning of his career in Congress, he not only demonstrated his ability, but his understanding of large and small problems of big and little people. He showed that he was a Democrat in the true sense that he was democratic and worked for the best interest of all people, never being swayed by special groups.

It was in the eventful year of 1933 that he became the chairman of the powerful Ways and Means Committee, a position he retained longer than any other man, until his retirement, except for 2 years when the Republican Party controlled Congress. It was through his leadership that many of the important bills dealing with economic recovery from the depression were passed. The financing of the war and other problems of worldwide scope fell heavily on his committee and his broad shoulders. Year after year he met and solved problem after problem for this Nation.

He was a big man in the real sense of the word, both mentally and physically. Long hours of work did not trouble him if he could reach a solution to a tough problem. He was usually as calm as the mountains from which he came, but could become aroused if the occasion called for indignation.

He inherited from his parents a strong sense of patriotic duty and abiding love for this country of ours. It was this, rather than any self-seeking after personal glory, so noticeable in many public officeholders, which sent him back to Washington year after year to serve his district, State, and Nation. It was indeed fortunate that he inherited a capacity for good health and the good sense to take care of it, that he might better serve the people he loved. Typical of the family's long life and unceasing interest in public affairs was the fact that his mother, Mrs. Rebecca Doughton, went to the polls to vote for her famous son when she was 92 years old, in spite of inclement weather.

He was a close personal friend of President Roosevelt, but did not hesitate to tell even him when he thought he was wrong on tax matters. He had the courage of his convictions, based on knowledge and years of experience. There was no foolishness about this man who was possessed with a seriousness of purpose; but he also had a keen sense of humor. When there were demands from some officials that taxes be increased among certain groups, he aptly remarked that a sheep might be sheared many times, but only skinned once.

He was a man of deep religious convictions and made every effort to serve his fellow men to the best of his ability at all times. There was no pettiness in his life, and at the end of his long career of public service he remarked that if he had one enemy, he did not know it.

He was a kindly man and busy as he was with big problems confronting the Nation, he always took time to help any individual who came to him for aid if he could possibly do so. It was this untiring, helpful attitude which won for him so many friends and supporters.

Serving other people as he did, he was always quick to show appreciation for any service rendered him, no matter how small it was. Only a few days before his death he expressed his special appreciation to this paper. This was typical of his thoughtfulness. His sense of fairness in dealing with the press was outstanding. Often he has telephoned this paper from Washington to be sure that the story he was releasing would reach this paper at the same time larger publications received it.

He has been called the father of the social-security program. But this is only one of the many vital bills he is responsible for. It has been aptly said that he has been responsible for the passage of more good legislation than any other man in Congress and has helped to defeat more unwise bills.

Back of all the legislation he sponsored, was the conviction that the bills were sound and right and would serve the needs of the greatest number of people. He was progressive and yet had the practical commonsense to know that some one must pay the bills.

With all his years of public service spent in Washington, he never forgot the smell of new-mown hay and delighted in his farm at Laurel Springs. It was here amid the peace and quietness of this beautiful countryside, that death came to this stalwart statesman as he slept. He lies buried on the hillside at the Laurel Springs church and we will not see his like again.

On the courthouse lawn in Sparta, a figure of his head looks down on the people he and his brother, Rufus A. Doughton, served so well. There is his likeness again on the bronze plaque in Doughton Park. But there are many other monuments to this great man, not in bronze, but on the Nation's law books and in the hearts of thousands who will tell those who come after them of what this big-hearted man of the mountains accomplished through his long and purposeful life.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I could not fail to embrace this opportunity to raise my voice in brief but very sincere tribute to the life, character, and public service of my warm close friend, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, the late Honorable Robert L. Doughton. He was a man who possessed the highest attributes of Christian character and all of the sterling qualities of manhood, a man of great ability, a man of unimpeachable honesty and integrity, and a man devoted to the public service.

Members who served between the 71st and the beginning of the 83d Congress will recall that it was my privilege to work shoulder to shoulder with him for many years as members of the Ways and Means Committee. It was my privilege to try to be of such assistance as I could within the limits of my capacity to help him carry the very arduous duties that he bore so nobly throughout the years as chairman of this great committee.

As has been stated by his distinguished successor, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ALEXANDER], Mr. Doughton served in this body with great credit and distinction for 42 years. He served as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means longer than any other man in the history of this country. I believe that by scanning the pages of the history of this Nation during the period of his service as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means it will be found that he steered through this House more important and far-reaching legislation than had ever been handled by any chairman of that great committee.

He was a man of the greatest industry, always devoted to the discharge of his duties in a most credible manner.

I certainly share the feeling of all those in the House and throughout the country who express deep regret at his passing. He lived to the ripe old age of some 90 years and his life was filled with outstanding service to his district, his State, and his Nation. I join with others in conveying my sincere sympathy to members of his family in the time of their great bereavement.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, we are met here today to pay tribute to a truly great American, our former colleague, Hon. Robert L. Doughton, who was a Representative from the sovereign State of North Carolina.

It is most appropriate that we should do this.

I am glad that I had an opportunity while Mr. Doughton was living to join with the members of the Ways and Means Committee, of which Mr. Doughton was the distinguished chairman, to express to him the high esteem and deep affection in which he was held by his colleagues.

It was at a breakfast in the Speaker's dining room on August 18, 1952, just after Mr. Doughton had announced that he would not be a candidate for re-

election, that our beloved then chairman heard from the lips of his colleagues the love and affection they had for him.

As the ranking Republican member of the Ways and Means Committee it was my privilege to preside over the breakfast and meeting at which we presented Mr. Doughton with a silver loving cup.

I can do no better today than to mention those who were present at that breakfast and what I was privileged to say in behalf of Mr. Doughton's wonderful record.

Those present that morning were the entire membership of the Ways and Means Committee: the guest of honor, Hon. Robert L. Doughton; Speaker of the House of Representatives, Hon. Samuel Rayburn; Chief Justice Fred Vinson; Hon. John McCormack, majority leader; and Hon. Joseph Martin, minority leader. Mr. Colin Stam, chief of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation; and the majority and minority clerks of the Ways and Means Committee were also present.

This is what I said on that day:

We are met here to express our deep affection for our beloved chairman, who has rendered long and conspicuous public service to his country. I wish to briefly review the remarkable legislative record of our distinguished chairman. Hon. Robert L. Doughton was elected a member of the Ways and Means Committee on December 7, 1925, in the 69th Congress. When his party came into power in 1933, he was elected chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, March 3 of that year, in the 73d Congress. His tenure was interrupted during the 80th Congress. He became chairman again in January 1949. Upon completion of his service in the House of Representatives he will have been chairman of the Ways and Means Committee a total of nearly 18 years. This wonderful service will have been longer as chairman of this most powerful committee than any other man in the history of our country has known.

Of 25 major tax bills enacted, 18 bear his name. He is the author of the original Social Security Act of 1935, also author of the reciprocal-trade bill.

My colleagues, it is sometimes asked, "How do men in public life attain public influence? By rank? By wealth? By office? By talent? By eloquence? By ability? By intergrity of character?"

The author of these quotations supplies the answer in these words: "Character is the invulnerable armor which will withstand every assault and march triumphant to the highest positions of honor and trust within the gift of the people."

It is the sterling character of our distinguished chairman which has made him a great legislative leader.

In 1932 Representative Doughton defied the leadership of his political party, and in one of the most bitter legislative battles against the sales tax he won an overwhelming victory by a vote of 223 against and 153 for. His answer to his hostile political leaders reminded me of the words of Edmund Burke, the great English statesman, when chided by his colleagues for not following the sentiments of his constituents.

"Certainly, gentlemen," he declared, "it ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him: their opinion high respect: their business unremitted attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasures, his satisfactions, to theirs: and above all, ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interest to his own.

"But," Edmund Burke continued, "his unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you: to any man, or to any set of men living. These he does not derive from your pleasure: no, nor from the law and the Constitution. They are a trust from Providence, for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable. Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion."

Now, then, it is with pleasure that on behalf of your colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee I present to you a loving cup as an expression of the affection and esteem in which you are held. May you enjoy throughout the years to come health, happiness, and prosperity.

I wish at this time to conclude my remarks by quoting this short poem by Georgia Harkness:

HE DIED, SERENELY, TRIUMPHANTLY

A giant pine, magnificent and old,
Stood stanch against the sky and all around
Shed beauty, grace, and power, within its fold
Birds safely reared their young. The velvet ground
Beneath was gentle, and the cooling shade
Gave cheer to passers-by. Its towering arms
A landmark stood, erect and unafraid.
As if to say, "Fear naught from life's alarms."
It fell one day. Where it had dauntless stood
Was loneliness and void. But men who passed
Paid tribute—said, "To know this life was good.
It left its mark on me. Its work stands fast.
And so it lives. Such life no bonds can hold—
This giant pine, magnificant and old."

Mr. Speaker, I kept up a personal correspondence with Chairman Doughton until just a very short time before his death. We were close friends. I admired him; I honored him, and I extend my sympathy to his many friends, some of whom I have heard from very recently.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, on January 5, 1952, many of our colleagues arose on the floor to pay a deserved tribute to the late Robert L. Doughton on his retirement from Congress after completing 42 years of outstanding service to his district, State and our country.

Bob Doughton returned to North Carolina and to the great hill country of western North Carolina he loved so well.

It was not easy for Mr. Doughton to give up his happy associations in the Congress, but I am satisfied he felt he was making the right decision. His spirit is with us today. It will remain through the years. The record of achievement of Uncle Bob in his State and here in the Congress will ever stand as a great monument to his rugged character and disciplined life that will ever be a challenge to those of us who knew him.

We all can certainly say amen and amen.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in the tributes they have paid my distinguished friend, Mr. Doughton. I associated with him nearly every day for about 20 years. I had, as did other members of the Ways and Means Committee, the opportunity to know him intimately. I am glad to say that there were one or two things in his life that left a lasting impression upon me, and, while I shall not take the time to delineate them now, I shall include them in my remarks in the RECORD.

I should like to say this: I shall never forget that I saw him the last 5 minutes he was in Washington. I saw him move away in his car, and I said to myself, "Goodby, Uncle Bob; I will never see you again." I never did, but I hope I may in the great hereafter.

Further, by way of extension of my remarks, I wish to say that Mr. Doughton was a remarkable man in many ways. He was a man of very strong opinions and great determination. He had his likes and dislikes, which he manifested very strongly. In this connection, I should like to say that the love and affection that Damon and Pythias had for each other never was as strong as the love and affection Mr. Doughton and former Chief Justice Fred Vinson had for each other. Fred Vinson and I served together several years on the Ways and Means Committee, and he was one of the most capable men on tax matters that I have ever known. He and Mr. Doughton worked together in a most cordial fashion. When Mr. Vinson left the committee, their friendship continued, and when Mr. Vinson was appointed to the position of Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court he and I and Mr. Doughton frequently met, and I ofttimes commented to them about their fast friendship and loyalty to each other. They both seemed to appreciate my comments so much because of the strong character of both of them and the strong affection they had for each other. While Fred Vinson was filling the highest position in the Government as the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, Mr. Doughton, his warm friend, was filling the highest place in the Congress from the standpoint of legislation that provided the finances with which the Government was carried on.

I shall always be proud of my close association with these two great men and great friends.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I have known and admired Uncle Bob, as we used to call him, for 18 years. I knew him intimately for the last 6 years. I had breakfast with him many, many mornings during that time.

In searching for one word that would truly characterize Mr. Doughton, for the benefit of the new Members and of the younger Members who did not know him so well, I can think only of the word Lincolnesque—like Lincoln. Bob

Doughton was great in body, great in mind, great in character, and great in soul. He had an inexhaustible supply of earthy backwoods stories to illustrate the points that he wanted to make in any speech. Also, he had an inexhaustible supply of quotations from the Bible which he used on many occasions.

Paraphrasing Shakespeare, I want to say this: Here was a man. Whence comes such another?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in the tributes which have been paid to a great man. I had the pleasure of serving on the Committee on Ways and Means with Chairman Doughton for a good many years. I doubt if a more rugged character, or a man of greater integrity, or greater ability ever passed through the portals of this great body.

If one were to attempt to describe Bob Doughton, I think first he would have to put character, because he was a man of character. He had strong opinions and strong convictions. Those convictions stood him well throughout his life.

Likewise, he was a man of great integrity, something of very vital importance to a chairman of that great committee, which has the responsibility for the fiscal affairs of our country. Likewise, he was a man of almost unbelievable ability.

I had the misfortune on occasion in the committee to take the opposite side from my chairman. I discovered that most of the time he could teach me lessons, and some very keen ones, in how to win a debate.

Finally, the good Lord blessed him with tremendous energy. A man who has brains and character and ability and also has energy is bound to be a great man. I used to marvel at the fact that at 87 he would sit in the committee, beginning at 10 o'clock in the morning, after having been on the job since perhaps 6 or 7 o'clock, through all the sessions until 5 in the afternoon. Then he would go into a series of conferences in his office, and start all over again the next day, bright and chipper and ready to go back to work. We will seldom again see a man of the stature and the greatness of Bob Doughton.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to embrace all of the fine things said about our friend, "Uncle" Bob Doughton. Coming from North Carolina, I, of course, knew him well. I was for many years associated with him. I knew his family; served in the North Carolina Legislature with his brother before I came to Congress.

In listening to the kind statements made about "Uncle" Bob, I heard someone make reference to some of his statements as being earthy. When the going was tough and tempers sometimes would flare, "Uncle" Bob possessed that very, very unusual ability to make his position clear in very few words.

I recall on one occasion when the question of taxation was up and there was a tax being considered which "Uncle" Bob did not regard as being fair. He felt the tax was so severe it would destroy financially the group involved. He came up with a statement that I am quite sure virtually all of you have heard before. He said, "My friends, you can shear a sheep once a year, but you can skin him only once."

Many of us could have talked for half an hour and not so clearly illustrated the point as he did in that brief moment.

My admiration for him, my trust and my confidence in him were simply boundless. I love to think of the fine contributions he has made to his Government and to his fellow man. I wish more men in America had known him, for I am quite sure had they had this opportunity they would lift the dignity of man just a little higher. All who love the United States of America and our American way of life mourn his loss.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, it was a great loss to this Congress and to the country when Mr. Doughton died. It was equally a great loss to North Carolina when Mr. Doughton passed away. He was truly loved in the State. He was held in the highest esteem by all who had the pleasure and honor of knowing him. There he was esteemed as he was here in this body. He had been a stalwart leader for the right not only in political affairs but in civic and religious affairs. He was a great father, a true statesman, and a respected North Carolinian and citizen.

I had the highest personal regard for him. On many, many Sunday mornings it was a pleasure and a pride to me to visit with him in his office. He was wise in his counsel and I learned much. He gave me great aid and strength in efforts that I made myself here in this body and in private life.

I will miss him, like those others who knew him and esteemed him. It was with regret that I learned of his passing. I offer my deepest sympathy to his family, his children, and to those others who held him in such high regard.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, as a small child, I frequently sat on the floor and listened to Uncle Bob Doughton talk to my father and my grandfather. Mr. Doughton, from time to time, drove cattle and horses from his stronghold in the Blue Ridge Mountains to the railroad at Elkin, N. C., where I was born and raised. He and my father were practically the same age and until my father died in 1929, they were more like brothers than friends.

I naturally inherited these close associations and until his death last summer, I truly believe that Uncle Bob looked upon me as he would upon his own kin. He was a mentor and counsellor upon whom I could depend. His unfailing patience, his commonsense, his frankness and fairness were attributes none of us will ever forget. He represented his district for so long that to his people and to the people of North Carolina he typified the finest and strongest public servant that has come out of a long line of distinguished North Carolinians.

He lived to a ripe old age but his death was a catastrophe to our State and Nation. He was above politics. He leaves a distinguished family of sons and daughters who have a heritage beyond compare. I glory with them in having known him, loved him, and his memory will be forever green.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CARLYLE], who is indisposed today with a cold, to ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLYLE. Mr. Speaker, I had heard and known of our former colleague, Congressman Robert L. Doughton, practically all of my life, because he had occupied high positions of trust and responsibility even before he came to Congress more than 43 years ago. You can never know how delighted I was to have the pleasure of personally meeting him and working with him in the 81st Congress. He proved to be a loyal and helpful friend from the very beginning and I learned to love him more with each passing day.

Congressman Doughton had a burning and fervent desire to be of outstanding service to his country and to his State and certainly he succeeded in accomplishing these purposes over a long number of years and to a very high degree. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to find another person who has ever assisted in the formation and passage of more wholesome legislation for this country. And it would also be extremely difficult to find a person who has prevented more unwholesome measures from becoming law than former Congressman Doughton.

He was long known as the best loved man in our State, and his passing created statewide sorrow and the realization that an irreparable loss had been sustained. He was at all times loyal and cooperative with his colleagues from North Carolina and of course, by reason of his long tenure of service, we all looked to him for advice and counsel. He never failed us. Congressman Doughton was a deeply religious man and was closely associated with the Baptist denomination in our State. He was a family man and enjoyed being with the members of his family at all times. He was a stanch and great American, and his work in Congress will always be a memorial to him.

I shall never forget the deep feeling of sorrow which came over me when I learned of his passing because I knew that a truly good and great man had left

us. To the members of his family I wish again to express my deepest sympathy. I shall always be grateful to him for his many acts of kindness and consideration to me. To have known him and worked with him in Congress has been a real enrichment to my life.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN].

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, it was a great experience to have had the privilege of sitting at the feet of Bob Doughton and being able to absorb his great strength and wisdom.

To work with him was to love him.

For 5 of the 7 years I served with him on the Ways and Means Committee, he was chairman. He was always most considerate of the minority.

Though representing a rural area he understood the needs of all the Nation, rural and industrial, and worked for the good of all the American people.

His service in the Congress for almost half a century was outstanding.

His bereaved family can take comfort in knowing that his statesmanship has left an indelible mark for our country's welfare.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, on many occasions before and in many places in my own State and here in Congress I have risen to pay tribute to his noble soul we are honoring here today and who so ably represented his home State of North Carolina in this body for 42 years. The career of Mr. Bob Doughton, whom we are honoring because he honored us so effectively in so many ways, certainly we cannot touch on but a few high spots. It is my firm conviction that no other individual has served with more diligence to build here in this Hall a body of law that will continue to serve this country of ours so we may maintain and remain forever a free people. In this connection he served not only as an architect but as a master builder. He was a man who believed that freedom can never be an end in itself, but that it will be at its richest and its best only when it exists to serve a larger and a more creative purpose. He was a man who could reconcile himself to the possibility that hardship and sacrifice face us in battling for the right.

Mr. Bob Doughton also was a pioneer in the truest sense, and he was an energetic lover of those things that built for him a reputation of honesty, integrity, and statesmanship not only in his own State but all America. He never lost an opportunity to offer to us sound and good advice in our conduct. His dedication to the principles of liberty was evident from his young manhood days. He ably served in the legislative body of his native State as a young man. He was born in a section of our State in the foothills of the Blue Ridge Mountains, where men grow strong not only physically but mentally and morally also. Such individuals are needed and will continue to be needed in the years to come. No one wished for peace and quiet more than Mr. Doughton, but he felt so devoted to his responsibilities in our national life that he felt he should forget his physical care. So he turned not aside for a moment from the heavy duties that faced him in his last years in this body. Many times I have heard him say he would like to go back home, and I think it appropriate to say that his happiest days were when he was spending his time on his farm at home.

The loss is not ours alone, but his passing on September 30, 1954, was a loss to the Nation and a loss to mankind.

He held all the essentials and qualities that made an ideal American statesman—a Christian gentleman who walked with God.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I join with my colleagues in paying a tribute to the life and services of a great North Carolinian, the late Honorable Robert L. Doughton. No man in the history of America rendered any finer or longer service to our Government. When the history of this era is written, Mr. Bob, as he was affectionately called, shall occupy a prominent and lasting position. He was known in North Carolina as a good farmer, an outstanding statesman, and a fine Christian gentleman.

Born and bred in the Blue Ridge Mountains of western North Carolina, he came from the hardy pioneer stock so prevalent in our mountain section. During his long years of public service, Mr. Bob never left his beloved hills for very long. His body now sleeps on the side of one of those mountains whose strength symbolized his character and his entire being.

The people of his congressional district sent him to Congress 4 years before I was born and I shall always count it as one of the greatest privileges of my life that I was permitted to serve in the Congress with this great man. His good humor and pleasant disposition, his fierce devotion to duty and strong patriotism were a great inspiration to me and shall continue to be so long as I live.

He presided over that powerful Committee on Ways and Means during some of the most trying days in the history of our country. Every man who served with him will testify to the excellent service which he rendered during those days. Mr. Doughton served in the Congress of the United States for 42 years, and then retired and returned to his beloved mountains of North Carolina. While enjoying the rest and retirement which he so richly deserved, he passed on to the Great Beyond on the 30th day of September 1954. I extend to the members of his family my heartfelt sympathy in their great sorrow. Truly, a great and good man has passed to his reward. North Carolina and the Nation have lost a great statesman.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SHUFORD].

Mr. SHUFORD. Mr. Speaker, Robert L. Doughton was one of North Carolina's best loved citizens, and his passing was and is mourned throughout the State. His life is an inspiration to all of us, and its study clearly shows why America is great.

Mr. Doughton's legislative achievements are well known to all. As chairman of the Ways and Means Committee it was his privilege and responsibility to direct much of the beneficial legislative program we enjoy today. He was an untiring worker and did his work well.

Mr. Doughton was a devout Christian, a loyal friend with a tremendous understanding of his fellowmen, and it was his delight to be of service to others. North Carolina and the Nation will greatly miss Mr. Doughton in the years to come.

I extend my very deep sympathy to the members of his family and his loved ones.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN].

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with my distinguished fellow colleagues in paying tribute to and in mourning the passing since we last met of the Honorable Robert Doughton, of North Carolina. Uncle Bob, as he was best known to most of us, was truly a great man, a statesman of the first order, a great American, a humanitarian in every sense of the word, a stanch defender and protector of little people everywhere; above everything, a friend of the poor, the needy, and the downtrodden.

Our State and the Nation have lost a great leader. The memory of his life and record of public service is something we in North Carolina will always cherish and hold near and dear to our hearts as long as we live.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues from North Carolina, and the many others who have spoken in the House today, in paying tribute to the memory of one of the great men of my time, the late Honorable Robert L. Doughton.

It was not my privilege to serve in the House with "Mr. Bob," or "Uncle Bob," as he was affectionately known throughout North Carolina and among his intimate friends here. Nor could I even claim close personal acquaintance with him. He was a contemporary of my father, and they were warm personal friends for many years despite their different viewpoints in matters political. But I knew Mr. Doughton by reputation. He was perhaps as well known as any citizen of our State, because he represented his district here for nearly half a century and his service was so outstanding. His name came to be almost a household word in North Carolina.

It was a shock to me, as well as a shock to the people of my State, when Mr. Doughton passed away. We had come to think of him as a person as indestructible as the hills from which he came. He was strong of body, strong of mind, and strong of will. He enjoyed the trust and confidence of the people of his district to an unusual degree, as is evidenced by the fact that they sent him back so many times to represent them. They are going to miss him in the years that lie ahead, although they

do have a worthy successor in the person of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ALEXANDER] who was kind enough to yield to me in order that I might make these few remarks.

The citizens throughout our State—in every walk of life and regardless of political affiliation—mourned his passing. Upon his voluntary retirement from Congress, North Carolina lost a valuable representative, one who had been as influential and as effective in the passing of far-reaching legislation as any man in my memory. Upon his death, our State and Nation lost a most distinguished citizen, one whose accomplishments in the field of government will fill many chapters in any history of our times.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly most fitting that the House of Representatives pause in its proceedings to pay tribute to Bob Doughton. He was truly a great man, a great American, and a great statesman.

There are many experiences that I have had as a Member of this House which I will cherish, but I doubt that there will be any experience I will cherish more than the experience of having the opportunity to serve under the chairmanship of our great friend Uncle Bob, as he was known to so many of us. He was a man of the highest principle, and a man of real and firm conviction. When Uncle Bob decided, in his own judgment, what he thought to be a proper course to take on any issue, he stuck by that determination against any and all pressures, because, Mr. Speaker, he had convictions, and he was willing to live by them and, if necessary, die by them.

If Members of the Congress, new or old, desire any former Member as a guide to emulate, or whose footsteps to follow, they could do no better than to follow the life and character of Bob Doughton.

Our country is a better place to live in because Bob Doughton served in the Congress. History must list him among the great public servants of the Nation.

I join in the tribute being paid him today, even though words will always be inadequate to properly describe this great man and the contributions he has made toward the betterment of his country.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Endorsing or, rather, seeking to join in all that has been said, I might add that it was my privilege for something like 10 years to live in the same building with our colleague, just one door removed from the apartment where he and his family resided. Going over to the House office building in the earlier years when I served here he was always found there whether it was half past six or seven, he was always just a little on the job ahead of you.

Never but once did I see him at a loss for words, and that was at a time when before the Ways and Means Committee appeared Dr. Townsend in explanation and advocacy of the Townsend plan. The good doctor spent some little time, an hour or more, explaining that plan. When he had finished Mr. Doughton very courteously asked him if he had finished. The doctor replied that he had. He sat back in his swivel chair, his fingers in the armholes of his vest and asked if there was anything further the committee desired to hear, and said he was ready to answer all questions. Then the chairman of the committee, Mr. Doughton, asked the very pertinent question. "Well Doctor, you explained this plan rather completely"—some of you will remember that it was a plan to give $200 a month to people who had reached a certain age to be expended by them in that particular month, to give some action to the velocity dollar. So Mr. Doughton asked him: "Doctor, have you any idea, or plan, as to how the Congress could or should get the money to put this plan into operation?"

The doctor, very well satisfied with what he said, leaned back, swung around in his chair, and said: "Mr. Chairman I have explained the plan. It is up to you and the Congress to get the money."

The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means did not really have an answer to that one and, so far as I have been able to learn, no one else has ever found the answer.

Had it been my privilege to have changed his life, I would have said this: "I am sorry he was not born in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan so that the people of that district might have had his able service as their public servant."

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with the members of the North Carolina delegation in their tribute to our former colleague, Mr. Doughton. I have a feeling of personal loss at his passing. He was a true friend to so many of us in the Congress. I deeply sympathize with his family to whom he was greatly devoted.

As the gentleman so well knows, Mr. Doughton was a great statesman, he was of fine upright character and intellectually honest with himself. If he felt legislation was good for the country he voted for it; if he thought it was bad legislation he voted against it. America is greatly indebted for his splendid services. The people of my distict and State owe Mr. Doughton a great deal as he was very helpful in arranging revenues for them in agreeing with their objectives. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts mourns with the State of North Carolina in the passing of this great man.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, all Members were given permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and achivements of the late Robert L. Doughton.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there is no task in my 37 years of public life that I have approached with so much reverence, so much loving kindness, so deep a feeling of the need of restraint against the surge of emotion, as the task I set myself today.

For I propose to evaluate—in terms as brief almost as an epitaph—the life of Robert Lee Doughton.

I do it humbly, using the materials—simple and profound—of a life that covers 90 years. It is a life so interwoven with the meaning of America that for me it is impossible to think of this country without men like him, or to think of men like him, without thinking of this country.

On Friday, October 1, 1954, death came to Robert Lee Doughton.

The end came at his home in Laurel Springs, N. C., amid the Alleghany hills he loved so well. He died full of years, full of honors, and full of the love and respect of his fellowman. Perhaps not so intimately as some of you, perhaps more so than others, I can speak from my own knowledge, my own friendship, my own long and productive association with this typical American. Through the decades we worked, so to speak, elbow to elbow in the Congress of the United States. We toiled 10 of these years in the closest association on the Ways and Means Committee. Our families enjoyed a warm mutual relationship. The gigantic forces that swept the world through two devastating wars and a world crippling depression found Congressman Doughton, of the Ninth District of North Carolina, in a position of great national strategic significance. For years he was one of the leaders and most effective Members of the Congress of the United States. His personal force was bulwarked by the prestige of an unimpeachable reputation. He was elected to the 62d Congress and reelected to each suceeding Congress up to and including the 82d. He had, besides, the official eminence that came with the mightily important chairmanship of the House Ways and Means Committee. He held this post steadily from the 73d Congress—with the exception of the 80th—through the 82d Congress and retirement from public life.

We look with a telescopic eye down through the long corridor of Robert Lee Doughton's four score years and ten and we come to the inescapable conclusion that here was a man who represents a remarkable and quite common phenomenon in American biography. Like so many men of extraordinary leadership whose voices have been heard amid these walls in a century and a half, he was of the very essence of the stuff that is America. His was a cumulative contribution to the strength of our country. Every day of his 42 years of service in the House of Representatives left, sometimes boldly, sometimes subtly, the weight of his influence on the life of our time.

Yet, if I had it put to me to specify the most singular contribution of all that he made to the greatness of his country, I think I would find the answer. It would not be in his work on this piece of legislation or on that. It would not depend upon his leadership at some critical hour in a dramatic session of the

Congress when the fate of great decisions on taxation and social security and fiscal policy hung in the air. No; extraordinary as some of these services were, and as enduring for this country probably for all time, the most singular gift that Robert Lee Doughton gave to the United States lies in another and a more impressive direction even than that. To me his life is a phenomenon, individually outstanding, because he gave a distinctly American focus to some of the most intrepid, the most daring, the most needfully dynamic legislation of the most overwhelmingly turbulent years of the legislative history of the United States. His sponsorship of forwardlooking laws helped to make them palatable to areas of criticism that at first wrongly associated them with thinking inconsistent with our ideals. The truth of his judgment and its accuracy is demonstrated by the fact that this legislation has become an integral and permanent part of American life and is almost as much indigenous to our way of thinking as the Washington Monument and Bunker Hill.

In periods of suspicion and uncertainty and distress, in atmospheres of disunity and recrimination, Robert Lee Doughton, like some mighty man of valor, held the vital pieces together, and from the key vantage point of his chairmanship, up to the limit of his considerable capacity, he piloted the problems of the Ways and Means Committee off the shoals of confusion to safe seas and secure anchorage.

I say phenomenon almost as one uses the world miracle. Consider that here was a farm boy who never quite finished high school and yet became one of our country's outstanding legislative experts in the most complex and involved, and the most technically difficult area of Government—taxation. It is a phenomenon that one must ally with that other phenomenon of an even greater backwoods American who had only a rudimentary formal education, yet produced the most classic orations that have been delivered in the Halls of Congress. The record in the simplest terms shows that Robert Lee Doughton was a horse trader, a farmer, a banker, and a legislator who, in just about all things, had the habit of success. He never lost a nomination or met defeat in an election. But if you examine into the basis for this success which was so consistent and so steady over the decades of time you find two root factors. One was an unswerving integrity, the other a homely philosophy of fairness. And of course he did the work.

Such a man is deeply human and has a legion of friends.

We have only to recall how in this very Chamber in July of 1952, amid scenes I shall never forget, the grand old man sat here among us, while many of us stood up, one by one, and paid him tribute in brief and warm and heartfelt expressions of admiration and affection on the occasion of his retirement—retirement for an old warrior who had served in this House under seven Presidents, beginning with William Howard Taft. To us, he had all the stature of an elder statesman in the truest and finest sense of the word. Yet it was easy to call him Bob. And just as accurate to refer to him, as one did, as the "noblest Roman of them all." We appreciated his firmness, for he was never a puppet and never a mouthpiece, and never just an instrument of someone else's bidding. Perhaps a suggestion of his sense of conviction, of his adamant will, of his courage, and rocklike determination is to be recognized in that still other nickname he had: Muley Doughton. Once he knew his position to be just, after the exhaustive study he gave the problems before him, it would have been easier to move all the 9 counties in the 9th district of North Carolina clear to the moon and back again than to budge Robert Lee Doughton from the line he knew to be right and fair. That is why it warmed the depth of my heart, as I am sure it warmed the grand legislator and statesman, to hear tributes to his fairness from the gentlemen on both sides of the aisle in July of 1952. As evidence of the respect our Republican friends had for him, I take time out to quote Congressman DANIEL A. REED, of New York, because his tribute in the course of debate in 1951 on this floor is so pertinent.

We have just listened—

Congressman REED said of Congressman Doughton—

to a great and grand American. We may not agree in our philosophy on some things, but as far as concerns the patriotism, and the earnestness, and the sincerity, and the justice of the great man from North Carolina * * * I think we can all agree that he is outstanding in every respect.

That, I emphasize, was the voice of the opposition spoken in the very heat of the contest over the tax bill of that year.

No American in our history has so deeply stamped himself on the tax law of our country as Robert Lee Doughton. And wherever you find the imprint of his influence, you find the law breathing the philosophy of his sense of justice. He never believed in soaking the rich for the benefit of the poor nor would he countenance burdening the weight of the Nation's tax load on the poor as he was so strenuously urged to do. He joined the principles of mathematics with the principles of justice and emerged with tax laws through the years that were invested with the highest concepts of equity. It was Robert Lee Doughton who piloted our social-security law through the House. It is the life of Robert Lee Doughton that represents to me the finest example of individual rectitude in constitutional government. In the long and sometimes dreadful periods of crises when grave decisions had to be taken Robert Lee Doughton stood up and was counted and gave to measures some considered extreme the imprimatur of the deepest and the strongest Americanism of his time. People knew also that measures he fought for were not only in the the public interest, but belonged in the tradition of America. His greatness was in many things, but especially it was in that.

In this spirit of gratitude for the help he has been to all of us, to his district, to the State of North Carolina, to the Nation, and to the world, America says farewell to this great partner in the making of American history.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, we shall always miss the Magnificent Man of the Mountains, Robert Lee Doughton. He always lived above the fog in public duty and private thinking and by his life and labor made a grand contribution to the greatness of his State and Nation. At the time of his death he was North Carolina's most beloved and distinguished citizen. He was one of God's noblemen and always labored in the vineyards of his Lord. I am certain that we shall not in our generation see another man like him. The unfortunate, the lowly laboring man, and the orphan and the widow will long cherish his memory because of his great efforts in their behalf as the father of the social-security legislation. One of his many monuments which will endure through generations yet unborn is this program. This great man thought with Hans Christian Andersen that—

The best love man can offer
To a God of love, be sure,
Is mercy to God's little ones
And kindness to God's poor.

We, his colleagues, will always remember him by the eloquence of his actions, the nobility of his soul, and the simplicity of his life, in which were exemplified all the fine virtues and tender sensibilities of true manhood.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, Members who have preceded me in speaking of the high regard and respect in which Mr. Doughton was held by his colleagues in the House of Representatives, have expressed more eloquently than it is possible for me to do so regarding the former chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means on which I served for 12 years. I join wholeheartedly in all of the sentiments so feelingly presented by so many who knew him intimately.

The Congress of the United States has truly been enriched by his great character, his keen perception, his devotion to duty, and the general all around example he has given to not only his colleagues but to the people in the Nation as a whole.

His district has been indeed fortunate in having him as their Representative in Congress.

I can say that I myself have become a better citizen because of the opportunity that has been given me to serve under a chairman of his caliber. His influence in molding important legislation will remain in effect for the good of the country for many generations to come.

All of us keenly regret that he was not able to serve longer in the interests of his constituents and of the Nation as a whole.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, approximately 2½ years ago it was my sad privilege to address the House on the occasion of the retirement from Congress of one of its most distinguished Member—a man whose career of public service has seldom, if ever, been equaled. I refer to our late beloved friend and my former chairman, the Honorable Robert L. Doughton.

On October 1 of this past year, Mr. Doughton peacefully passed away in his sleep in his beautiful home near Laurel

Springs in his beloved North Carolina. I am sure that I am correct in saying that our great sadness on learning of his passing is beyond expression.

Our beloved Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, described Mr. Doughton more aptly than has anyone. I recall the remarks of our distinguished Speaker in commenting on Mr. Doughton at the time the latter retired from Congress. Our Speaker then said, "When I think of Bob Doughton, I think of a great forest of big trees, and the biggest tree in the forest is inscribed 'Bob Doughton.'" To see Mr. Doughton you knew he was a giant physically. To work with Mr. Doughton made you realize he was also a giant in character and in wisdom.

Mr. Doughton was first elected to the 62d Congress in 1910. His subsequent service in the House was continuous for 42 years. Mr. Doughton became chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in the 73d Congress. No other man has ever equaled his tenure of service as chairman of our great committee. During the time that I was honored to serve with Mr. Doughton, I came to know him as a man of outstanding ability, uncompromising integrity, and complete devotion to his country. Mr. Doughton brought qualities of wisdom, understanding, and great patriotism to his duties. With the convening of this 84th Congress, the memory of Mr. Doughton remains very vivid in my mind. The stalwart and energetic gentleman from North Carolina made such a contribution to our tax, social security, and tariff laws that there is never an occasion when we consider these matters that I do not recall the tireless energies that Mr. Doughton devoted to the development of landmark legislation in these areas.

Mr. Doughton is properly known as the father of our social-security system. He authored more tax laws than any other man in the history of our Nation. He lived through one tariff act after another, beginning in 1911 and ending with our trade-agreements program as we know it today.

Mr. Doughton was not only a friend to me, he was a teacher and adviser. It was my privilege to serve with Mr. Doughton in the House since 1939 and as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means since 1942. Mr. Doughton was a man of outstanding ability and tireless energy.

Few men have or ever will equal Mr. Doughton's long and selfless career of service to his State and to his country. His example and memory will long remain an inspiration to those who serve in this Chamber as Members of the Congress of the United States.

I pay humble tribute to the memory of the Honorable Robert L. Doughton. His guiding hand will be sorely missed by all of us.

THE TRAINING OF ADDITIONAL SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, within 3 years our country will be a second-class technological power. Within 3 years Soviet Russia will have more scientists and engineers than we possess today. This catastrophe is of recent origin, for up until 4 years ago we were keeping pace with Soviet Russia in the production of engineers and scientists; however, within the past 4 years the graduation of engineers and scientists from our technical schools has decreased 500 percent.

The New York Times last Sunday was crowded with four solid pages of advertisements from private industry pleading, soliciting, begging American men and women to work with them as engineers and scientists.

I spent this morning at the White House with the Secretary of Cabinet Operations, Mr. Maxwell M. Rabb, discussing this problem which is before the Cabinet of our executive branch now. I am introducing a bill which I trust will solve this problem.

Mr. Speaker, possession of the atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb by both of the leaders of the two opposing poles of thought in our world has minimized, if not ruled out, the use of force as a technique for victory. Regardless of who struck first, the power to retaliate would be still held by the opposing side so that the victory, indeed, would be a pyrrhic one. Therefore, the conflict, the fight, and the victory must be based almost totally upon ideas.

The survey made by the New York Times and released to us through Dr. Benjamin E. Fine on Sunday, November 7, should be as alarming to us as the news that Russia possessed the hydrogen bomb. That study conducted by the New York Times showed that Moscow is overtaking the United States in the training of engineers. The free world is in danger of losing the important technological race for trained scientists, engineers and technicians. While the democracies of the world, including the United States, are looking the other way, the Soviet Union and its satellites are training scientists and engineers at an almost feverish pace. The Soviet Union has set out on a definite state policy to first reach, and then outstrip, the free world in the preparation of scientists and engineers essential for survival in the atomic age. At the same time, the quality of the Soviet technical schools and colleges is steadily rising. Not many educators are aware of the tremendous Soviet spurt in the scientific fields. Despite the urgent need for additional engineers and other technically trained personnel in this country, the supply has gone down in the last 4 years. In 1950, the peak was reached when the Nation's colleges graduated 50,000 engineers. This has dropped each year since then, going to a low 20,000 last June. At the same time the trained engineers and scientists in the Soviet Union have taken a directly opposite stand. In 1928, 11,000 engineers were graduated. By 1950 the number had jumped to 28,000. The number of graduates rose to 40,000 in 1953, and to 54,000 in 1954.

Dr. John R. Dunning, dean of the Columbia School of Engineering, stated, "We have almost lost the battle for scientific manpower." He further stated that Soviet technical schools seem to be equal in quality to those of this country.

Several weeks ago, in the allocation of jobs to the Democratic Party, there was a call for a chemical engineer and a mechanical engineer, with a starting salary of $6,000. It is absolutely impossible to fill these two jobs even with men freshly graduated from our engineering schools. The commissioner of water supply of the city of New York, an engineer himself, Mr. Arthur Ford, appeared before the board of estimate recently and stated the inability of his office in securing any trained personnel due not only to the low salaries but the shortage of men in the field.

Within 5 years our military leadership with the atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb will be completely wiped out by the Soviets' overpowering scientific and engineering leadership.

The fact that the Soviet Union is now graduating three times as many engineers each year as is the United States is not an accident. There is no way of catching up with the Soviet Union under our present system. Special inducements are offered engineering students. All students in scientific and engineering schools are either exempted from the draft or deferred for 5 years.

Today the scoreboard is: United States, 500,000 engineers; Russia, 400,000; United States, 200,000 other scientists; Russia 150,000 scientists. That means within 3 more years, at the most, we will be a second-class power in terms of technology.

I applaud the grant by the Carnegie Foundation of New York to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to determine the quality and quantity of Russian technicians but you cannot stop the world from burning with a fiddling $20,000. I want to distinctly and specifically take issue with Dr. Henry Wasser, acting coordinator of humanities at City College, who stated recently that Americans need not be fearful of reports that Russia is outpacing the United States in training engineers. He said the Soviet increase in engineer's training is being achieved by eliminating the study of humanities in Russian technical schools. So what? His reasoning is facetious. The hard, cold fact is that we are training 3 times as many Americans in the humanities and they are training 3 times as many Russians in technology and science. Men who have studied the humanities only will be the slaves in tomorrow's world of the men technically trained to live in an age of atomic energy.

I have immediately acted in this field. I have had drawn up a bill to immediately start a solution to this problem. I do not claim that this bill is perfect, nor that it is the last word, but I do claim that it is the first word and that we should not delay 1 minute more than is necessary in passing this bill. We should not waste time with too long committee hearings, even though the bill will be assigned to my committee—the Committee on Education and Labor. Whatever mistakes are made can be amended as time goes on. My bill is called the na-

tional defense scientific education bill. This bill believes:

First. That we must immediately begin catching up with the Soviet Union in scientific and technological training.

Second. It calls for a crash program for the Federal Government to subsidize the training of 25,000 candidates for scientific and engineering degrees beginning September 1, 1955.

Third. The Federal Government shall pay $2,000 per year to the scientific school of the candidate's choice. The entire program is to be administered by the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Fourth. Competitive aptitude examinations are to be held in the spring of each year. All Members of Congress, including Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Territorial possessions may nominate a minimum of 50 candidates each.

Fifth. Scholarships are to be awarded to men, upon the graduation from high school, or those who are already in colleges or universities who desire to shift their emphasis to the field of science or engineering.

Sixth. Candidates shall come from both sexes and shall be chosen without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin.

Seventh. Once a candidate receives an award, he is to continue the award until the completion of all his undergraduate and graduate work. All candidates shall be deferred from military service until the awarding of their scientific or engineering degree.

Eighth. There shall be established a commission of outstanding scientists, educators—including members of the Atomic Energy Commission and bipartisan representation from both Houses of Congress—all to be appointed by the President of the United States, which will have complete power to oversee and administer this operation.

This will call for an expenditure of $50 million a year—not including the cost of extra personnel for the Office of Education and the expenses of the President's Commission. Surely this is a cheap enough price to pay for survival in the atomic age.

Inasmuch as this program will be available to men who are already doing their undergraduate or graduate work in fields other than the fields of science and engineering, I envision an immediate pickup of 10,000 extra graduates in 1956. With that amount increasing about 50 percent per year and within 5 years, by 1960, I am confident that the scoreboard will indicate that our Government has reached the output of Soviet Russia.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman has made a very interesting statement. I do not know whether or not I followed all the details, but certainly he pointed up the fact that the conservation of our intelligent young people is one of the great conservation problems of America. I think that is an aspect of the problem.

Mr. POWELL. That is correct. I thank the gentleman.

WHO PROTECTED AND PROMOTED PERESS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain letters written by other Members of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, many urgent inquiries, verbal and written, have come to me—as no doubt they have to practically all Members of Congress—requesting, some demanding, why and by whom Dr. Irving Peress, who was commissioned as a captain in the Army, on October 15, 1952, was promoted and given an honorable discharge from the armed services by the Defense Department, after he had refused to answer the Army's question as to whether he was a member of a subversive group, after the Army had been advised by its own officers in April of 1953 that there was in his record "sufficient evidence of disloyalty and subversive tendencies to warrant removal of Peress from the service."

On November 2, 1953, notwithstanding the recommendation by Army's Counter Intelligence that he be discharged, Peress was promoted from captain to major, and on February 2, 1954, in spite of the written protest of Senator MCCARTHY, he was given an honorable discharge.

Major Peress was questioned by Senator MCCARTHY on January 30, 1954, at which time he again refused to answer questions about membership in subversive organizations, claiming privilege under the fifth amendment.

The above facts were known to General Zwicker, Major Peress' commanding officer, when, on February 18, 1954, he was questioned by Senator MCCARTHY. On that occasion, perhaps because he had been so instructed by his superiors, General Zwicker refused to answer questions as to why and by whom Peress had been promoted, later given an honorable discharge. Exasperated, Senator MCCARTHY said:

> Any man who has been given the honor of being promoted to general and then says, "I will protect another general who protected Communists" is not fit to wear that uniform, General.

Apparently that statement was the spark which touched off two congressional hearings and a special session of the Senate.

On December 4, 1954, bypassing and dropping the Zwicker-McCarthy flareup, the Senate adopted a resolution condemning Senator MCCARTHY for conduct "contrary to senatorial traditions" and for conduct "contrary to senatorial ethics and tended to bring the Senate into dishonor and disrepute, to obstruct the constitutional processes of the Senate, and to impair its dignity."

Senator MCCARTHY, exasperated—of course no Member of Congress should ever lose his temper or become exasperated—vividly, vigorously, in unparliamentary language, condemned the action of the Watkins committee and of some of his colleagues.

But neither senatorial investigation determined, nor was Senator MCCARTHY able to get the answer, as to why or by whom Peress, after he had twice refused to answer questions about membership in subversive organizations, and after Army's Counter Intelligence had recommended that he be discharged because its investigations disclosed "sufficient evidence of disloyalty and subversive tendencies to warrant removal of Peress from the service," was first promoted, then given an honorable discharge.

Not until January 7, 1955, did the Secretary of Defense, on demand of a Republican Member of the other body, attempt to supply the answers to the repeated requests and demands as to why and by whom Peress was promoted, then given an honorable discharge.

The answer apparently is that, though some 60 officers in the armed services had a look at the record, either none noted the evidence of disloyalty and subversive tendencies, or thought it of sufficient weight or importance to block the routine promotion.

The seven-page Army report shows that, when Senator MCCARTHY, almost a year after the facts were on the Army's record, protested Major Peress' honorable discharge—with all the benefits that go to an honorably discharged officer—both Lt. Gen. Walter L. Weible, Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Administration, and John G. Adams, the Army's counselor, to whom the matter was finally referred, in refusing to review the record, by their action approved the discharge.

The responsibility for the promotion of Peress from captain to major rests upon the Army. The record discloses that either Army Personnel or Intelligence or both were negligent.

The final responsibility for the honorable discharge of Major Peress rests upon General Weibel and John G. Adams, Counselor of the Army, but the reasons for their action, neither they nor the Army have yet disclosed.

But the record and the hearings show that General Weible and Army Counselor John G. Adams, as well as administration strategists, did not hold up Major Peress' honorable discharge, permitted it to go through, because they did not intend to let MCCARTHY make the record public.

The Army, when MCCARTHY attempted to show that it was not fully diligent in its pursuit of Communists, would not admit that it had made a mistake in the Peress case. They did not intend to let MCCARTHY make the record public.

Our Democratic friends took full political advantage of the situation. There is now no evidence that they will willingly relinquish that advantage. They have forced the armed services to do what Senator MCCARTHY was trying to do but was unable to accomplish.

Additional congressional hearings may emphasize the administration's effort to help the Army in covering up, but in my humble judgment will continue to prove that MCCARTHY was highballing down

the right track toward a worthwhile objective. Such hearings, if held, would also indicate that the Democratic organization pulled a boner when they joined in a slap at Joe.

DOES PAPA KNOW BEST?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, permit me to talk about another subject.

Are the States to be denied the right to spend any part of the taxpayers' dollars?

When in May of 1946 the Federal Airport Act—Sixtieth United States Statutes at Large, page 170, Public Law 377, 2d session of the 79th Congress—was adopted and approved, at least some Members of Congress were of the opinion that section 6 (a) would require appropriated funds to be expended in the manner and at the locations selected by State authorities.

Many Members of the House had the same thought in mind when that section was amended in October of 1949 by Public Law 382 of the 80th Congress.

It is doubtful that the Congress, had the Members not expected that funds appropriated were to be used in the manner and for the purposes indicated by various State authorities, would have provided—as it did in section 6 (a)—that 75 percent of the amount made available for grants for projects in the several States should be apportioned by the Administrator among the several States in the manner provided by the act.

Not so long ago, in fact on October 5, 1954, the Civil Aeronautics Authority announced through our colleague, JERRY FORD of the Fifth District of Michigan, and former Senator Homer Ferguson, that certain funds would be given to the State of Michigan for the improvement of its airports.

Under the long-range program were allocations for: Detroit-Wayne Major, $500,000; Grand Rapids—Kent—$400,000; Willow Run, $300,000; Flint, $300,000; Lansing, $250,000; Muskegon, $100,000; and Tri-Cities, $100,000.

Under the original Civil Aeronautics Authority current allocation plan, $190,000 would have been given to the Kent Airport at Grand Rapids, Kent County, Mich.

The Michigan Department of Aeronautics recommended a reallocation, and under that reallocation, made on December 8, Grands Rapids—Kent—was at this time to be given $90,000.

Naturally the reallocation pleased those communities and the representatives of those communities who were to receive money and who had originally been ignored. Naturally, too, the communities which would not, under the reallocation receive as much as originally allocated, were not pleased.

The basic, fundamental issue is whether the tax dollars of the citizens are to be spent under the direction and at the whim or will of the Federal authorities, or in the manner and for the purposes determined by the State authorities.

It should be noted that under the law as it now exists 25 percent of any sum appropriated is expended by the Federal authorities.

In view of the fact that it was undoubtedly the intention of the Congress, when it passed the original act and when it was amended, that at least 75 percent of the funds appropriated were to be used for the purposes and in the manner determined by a State organization, there would seem to be no reason why now, insofar as the expenditure of the funds in Michigan is concerned, the intention of the Congress and the recommendations of the State authority should not be followed.

Nevertheless the Federal Civil Aeronautics Authority, following the thought entertained by most Federal agencies, is insisting that it determine where the tax dollars shall be spent.

Once again it appears that big business, especially big business in Michigan, is to have a monopoly, not only of Federal big business, but of all expenditures of the citizens' tax dollars.

This policy will result in a centralization and a building up of air transport facilities. This at the time when the Federal Government, as a measure of safety and of national defense, is advocating decentralization of Federal bureaucratic activities.

To remedy what I consider the misinterpretation and maladministration of the act earlier, a bill H. R. 2012 to amend section 6 (a) so as to make mandatory the States expenditure of all funds appropriated under this act, has been introduced by me.

Let me cite the situation in the Fourth Congressional District.

St. Joseph and Benton Harbor have an airport which is on a direct line from several eastern cities, also from Detroit through to Chicago and northwestern cities. It has an airport which is small, which needs expansion.

The citizens of those two communities have spent some $35,000 to purchase additional land to expand the airport so as to make it available as an emergency field for the largest ships on direct flights of commercial lines and as a local field for air shipments which are handling an ever-expanding freight and passenger business.

Local citizens, relying upon the reallocation statement put out by the Michigan State department of aeronautics and which provided for $50,000 from the Federal Government, have raised $100,000 to match $100,000 contributed by the State so that the $285,000 proposed improvement will go through.

Now Uncle Sam's spokesmen here in Washington apparently are telling us that we cannot have that $50,000 allocated by the Michigan State department of aeronautics and by so doing will kill a needed expenditure of $285,000 for the improvement of an airport which not only is needed for commercial development but which would, if completed as suggested, greatly contribute to the national defense.

So we are back again to the question of whether the taxpayer's dollars are to be spent in accordance with the will of the Congress, in furtherance of the needs of the States, or whether some "father knows best" in Washington is to tell us what to do with our own money.

This comparatively minor incident—minor from a national standpoint but vital to the local communities—is but another illustration of the way bureaucratic power grows and expands, once given a toehold.

H. R. 2012 was introduced to force expenditure by the State authorities of the funds appropriated and allocated to the States under the Federal Airport Act.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. KNOX. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan 100 percent on the statement he has made.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Just a minute, you want to be a little cautious about that because I said that Benton Harbor ought to have so much and as I understand it, you want Escanaba to have so much and Iron Mountain to have so much. I am not quarreling with that.

Mr. KNOX. I was about to proceed along that line.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank you.

Mr. KNOX. In the allocation of the funds for airport construction for the State of Michigan, undoubtedly, the civil aeronautics board in Michigan made two recommendations to the CAA, but in their recommendations they requested that if any change was to be made from the original that they be notified before the change was made.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is my understanding.

Mr. KNOX. That is true. Now from all of the files I have, and I assume I have the full report from the Michigan Board of Aeronautics, they were never notified by the CAA that there was going to be any change made. My chief interest in the allocation of the fund for airport construction in the State of Michigan is that the board of aeronautics on the State level have some jurisdiction where the money is going to be spent. The particular airport I am directly interested in is the airport at the city of Escanaba in Michigan which has only one runway. The money that was to be allocated, which was only $30,000 from the Federal level, was to be used for the construction of another runway. Now there is only one airline that serves the northern part of Michigan outside of the area of Sault Sainte Marie, Mich., and that is the North Central Lines. In one quarter of 1954 they had 57 flyovers because of wind conditions which prohibited a landing.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You mean in a period of 3 months?

Mr. KNOX. In 3 months they had 57 flyovers.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What do you mean by flyovers? Do you mean that they could not land?

Mr. KNOX. That is right. In other words, the winds were in directions which would not permit the use of the runway so the plane was unable to set down with safety and they had to fly over it, and the people who were on board the airplane had to be incon-

venienced by being transported back by automobile or bus or some other means. I have always felt that the Nation as a whole should be interested in the safety of our airlines from point to point. And there is only one way that we are going to have that safety factor and that is to have airfields, so in case of an emergency or necessity, they will be able to land. I believe the CAA is absolutely wrong in their endeavors to try to allocate one-third of the entire appropriation which was allocated to the State of Michigan to one airport.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And that is where?

Mr. KNOX. That is in the city of Grand Rapids.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. They are dipping into that 75 percent which Congress said should go to the States and compelling it to be spent where they want it to be spent. Is that not true?

Mr. KNOX. Of course, now you get into the situation of the discretionary fund.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is 25 percent.

Mr. KNOX. Normally Michigan receives 25 percent. This year Michigan receives no part of the discretionary fund that was set up by congressional act a year ago. Therefore, all we have is the allocation of $551,000. The city of Grand Rapids is receiving $190,000, and of that $100,000 is going for land acquisition, where the land had been acquired years ago and paid for. Now the Civil Aeronautics Authority wants to give Grand Rapids reimbursement of $100,000 instead of going forth as recommended by the Michigan Aeronautics Commission, and have these additional airport facilities made available to take care of the airlines.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In Benton Harbor they have already spent $130,000 for additional land, and have not asked for reimbursement. They will give another $100,000 to match the State's $100,000 if the bureaucrats here in Washington will make good on that $50,000 that they have agreed to pay.

Mr. KNOX. That is as I understand it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Have you any worthwhile rail transportation there into Escanaba or Iron Mountain?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. We are having constant trouble, as communities throughout the Nation are having, with railroads, over the discontinuance of so-called terminal runs. Of course each time the Interstate Commerce Commission permits a railroad to discontinue service on one of these terminal runs, the people have to find another mode of transportation. One of the results has been an increase in air travel. But I want to associate myself with what the gentleman from the Fourth District of Michigan has said on this problem, and to say this, that while we are discussing primarily conditions in Michigan, something is going on in the administration of our airport program that Members from other States perhaps ought to be interested in as well. That is the present attitude of the CAA, that it has the sole authority to allocate these funds for specific airport projects in the several States, and that the people at the State level have nothing to say about it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As I understand it, that is no criticism of the present administration, because this policy is just held over from the other administration.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Well, we have been criticizing that policy on this side of the aisle for the past 20 years. I am sorry to say that our people in the Department of Commerce are taking the same position that the people in the Department of Commerce took prior to this administration, insofar as the airport program is concerned.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. A letter expressing the views of at least two of my colleagues, addressed to the Secretary of Commerce and sent him yesterday, the 12th of January, reads as follows:

The Honorable SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WEEKS: This letter is written you in support of the position which we took earlier this week at the meeting held in your office to discuss the Federal-aid airport program as it applies to the State of Michigan for this fiscal year.

We think the Civil Aeronautics Administration has made a serious mistake in ignoring the recommendations of the Michigan Aeronautics Board, particularly in failing to follow recommendations of the State agency insofar as the airports at Iron Mountain and Escanaba are concerned.

On August 16, 1954, the Michigan Department of Aeronautics wrote the Civil Aeronautics Administrator setting up some recommendations based upon two assumptions. First, that the State would receive its allocation under the regular formula, plus 25 percent in discretionary funds (which is the percentage ratio of these funds it had received in prior years) amounting to a figure of $659,000; and, second, a set of recommendations for the same airports based upon a program of completing a full unit of work, in which event the total would have been $984,000. At that time the State agency had no definite information as to what Michigan's share would be.

All of the recommendations were based on the Civil Aeronautics Administration priority-point system under criteria established by the CAA, even though the State agency did not agree with the validity of the criteria thus established. Therefore, each of the projects listed by the State agency do meet all of the CAA criteria and priority-point system as well.

In the August 16 letter the State agency also stated "we strongly urge that you contact us before you make any major changes, such as deletion from the program or a major reduction in funds." For some reason unknown to them the CAA had no further consultation with the State agency, but went ahead and set up its own allocation, making major changes in the recommendations by the State agency and made its announcement of these allocations on October 4, 1954.

On October 7, immediately after the announcement came from CAA, the Michigan Department of Aeronautics, through its director, wrote to Mr. Lee, the CAA Administrator, vigorously protesting the changes which had been made in the State's recommendations of August 16, and specifically took issue with the CAA as follows:

"In your allocations, while you took projects which had high priority, according to your criteria, you substantially increased the amounts we jointly recommended for some of these projects and ignored other recommendations, to wit:

"We recommended $30,000 for Flint, and you granted them $60,000.

"In the case of Grand Rapids, we recommended $90,000, and you increased the amount to $190,000.

"Cities like Ironwood, Iron Mountain, and Escanaba, all airline stops in the Upper Peninsula, were ignored, even though the latter two cities have serious flyover problems.

"Also ignored were the cities of Benton Harbor and St. Joseph, operating an airport jointly. They have an excellent airport expansion program which our commission gave the No. 1 priority in our State airport plan submitted to you in January of 1954 because of the potential air-freight business in marketing fruit and vegetables out of southwest Michigan.

"In addition, the city of Pontiac, with 125 based aircraft, requested the modest amount of $30,000 to construct a single paved landing strip, which was deleted by you.

"The Michigan Aeronautics Commission is meeting at 10 a. m. on October 14 at the Capital City Airport, Lansing, and invite you or a member of your Department to attend this meeting to explain your reasoning in increasing some of the allocations and ignoring others."

Again on December 8, 1954, the director of the Michigan Department of Aeronautics wrote Mr. Lee, pointing out the fact that the Administrator had changed the State recommendations without consultation and reiterating specifically that if Michigan was only to receive $551,530 that it should be allocated as follows:

Willow Run	$80,000
Lansing	66,000
Grand Rapids	90,000
Detroit-Wayne Major	80,000
Flint	30,000
Muskegon	65,530
Pontiac	30,000
Iron Mountain	30,000
Benton Harbor-St. Joe	50,000
Escanaba	30,000
Total	551,530

Inasmuch as the above recommendations by the Michigan agency are completely in line and fully meet the criteria established by the CAA, we can see no basis or justification whatsoever for the CAA or the Department of Commerce substituting their judgment for the judgment of the agency within the State of Michigan designated to handle our program. If the recommendations of the State agency are not to be followed when they are clearly made in accordance with your established procedures, then the States might well abolish their agencies and cease to function and let CAA do the whole job. We do not believe this was the intent of Congress. If your Department is to completely dominate this program and ignore the people at the State level, then Congress should amend the CAA Act as it did the Hospital Construction and Survey Act, the Federal Aid to Highways Act, and many others to give the States some voice in the selection of projects upon which Federal funds are to be spent.

Here you have a situation where the Civil Aeronautics Administrator in his October 4 order has designated over one-third of Michigan's entire allocation for the city of Grand Rapids. Even if there were no other factors involved, such a distorted allocation would be completely unfair to other areas in the State. Of this $190,000, $100,000 is to be used to reimburse the city for land it purchased sometime ago, and not for actual construction of runways or operational equipment. In order to make this recommendation the CAA found it necessary to

delete entirely $30,000 designated for the airports at Iron Mountain and Escanaba, respectively. So, notwithstanding the fact that these two airports meet the complicated criteria established by your Department, they are still to be excluded and the recommendations of the State agency ignored, in order to give the city of Grand Rapids an unrealistic share of the entire State allotment. To say that this action was unfair, in view of the urgent needs of other cities and communities, would be a gross understatement.

The fact that the airports are small does not detract from their national importance or significance. In the case of Iron Mountain and Escanaba there are only single runways available. We need not call your attention to our severe winters and variable winds necessitating many flyovers at these two airports because of the safety factors involved.

The small sums which were recommended by the State agency would help in part to alleviate these very serious conditions at these two airports.

We hope that you will cause a complete review to be made of this whole situation, having in mind particularly that CAA made its allocation in complete disregard of the State agency, and also having in mind the question of whether the people at the State level are to have something to say about where this money should be spent within their respective States, or whether the whole program is to be controlled from here in Washington.

We earnestly urge you to approve the allocations submitted by the State agency referred to in this letter.

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR A. KNOX,
Member of Congress, 11th District, Michigan.

JOHN B. BENNETT,
Member of Congress, 12th District, Michigan.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

MORAL REARMAMENT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, into my office this week came a man who had been a leader of the Communist Party in Italy and who used to write songs for Togliatti, the head of the Italian Communist Party. He said he had changed from being a Communist because he saw a new kind of American who gave him an ideology superior to communism. Now if Americans are living a way of life that is reaching and winning trained Communists, that is of profound importance for all of us in the free world today.

That may be the ideological initiative that can answer the dilemma between armed conflict or default to communism. If we can develop an ideological strategy to unite the West and change the Communists, that would assure that our economic, political, and military appropriations will be effective.

This changed Italian Communist is not an isolated instance. Right here in Washington last week the former Chairman of NATO, Mr. Ole Bjorn Kraft, leader of the Danish Conservative Party, said:

Moral Rearmament has the answer to the burning needs of the world today. There cannot be found in the world a stronger unifying force. It is a miracle that decades ago Dr. Frank Buchman, initiator of MRA, foresaw what has since become our most urgent need, and now can offer us a trained and disciplined international force with a quarter century's experience in ideological combat.

He was speaking to the 1,200 delegates from 50 countries attending the World Assembly for Moral Rearmament which has been in progress at the Shoreham Hotel. Among these were 11 Asian and 5 African countries, including the official representatives of the Shah of Iran, the Prime Minister of Egypt, and the Government of Thailand. I would like to give you some of the statements made by distinguished parliamentarians attending.

The Tolon Na, member of Parliament and political leader of 1½ million people in the Gold Coast, said:

What Abraham Lincoln did for America, Moral Rearmament is doing for Africa.

Cabinet Minister Michael Ogon from Nigeria reports that his Prime Minister Azikiwe, of eastern Nigeria stated:

There would be Mau Mau in Nigeria today but for the work of Moral Rearmament.

The man representing 60 million untouchables in the Indian Parliament, P. N. Rajabhoj, said:

Moral Rearmament is offering the millions of India a positive alternative to communism. It is the one force that can keep our nations free.

From what this Italian ex-Communist told me, I would like to pay tribute to one of my constituents, William Baumann, the three Colwell brothers, of Los Angeles, and other young Americans who have taken this program of Moral Rearmament into the Communist-controlled industrial centers of northern Italy. For instance, they have spent many months living in the homes of Italian workers in cities such as Sesto San Giovanni, popularly known as "little Stalingrad." When these men first went there 4 years ago, the city was over 80-percent Communist. They were instrumental in changing many Communists and in raising up a fearless leadership among the democratic forces in the city. In the last election, when the vote in the rest of Italy went further Communist, the democratic forces reversed the national trend and won Sesto San Giovanni by 50 votes.

The personnel director of the Montecatini Chemical Combine, Italy's largest chemical industry, says that American economic assistance has proved 10 times as effective in the factories where Moral Rearmament has been at work.

It is an interesting fact that Moscow radio recently broadcast for the ninth time against the force of Moral Rearmament. Moscow radio said:

Moral Rearmament substitutes for the inevitable class struggle the eternal struggle of good and evil. It has the power to win over radical revolutionary minds, and it has now entered on its decisive phase—total expansion throughout the world.

We all recognize that we are in an ideological war. But have we ever stopped to ask ourselves, "What are our ideological weapons?"

We have on our doorstep ideological weapons of proved effectiveness in the hot spots of the world struggle. I refer to the MRA plays being presented at the Shoreham Hotel tonight—Thursday—and Friday night at 8:30 p. m. They have been seen by hundreds of thousands of leaders in Europe, Africa, and Asia. The Bombay Chronicle said:

For the first time millions in Asia have been confronted with a positive alternative to communism.

The man who is doing possibly more than any other in Kenya to answer Mau Mau found his answering ideology through these plays. I suggest you may want to see these and consider how we can help put them to use on a global scale. It seems to me that it is of first importance that we should study seriously this force of Moral Rearmament which offers the democracies a moral ideology upon which men of all races and classes are in fact uniting.

THE NATURAL GAS INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, one needs only to observe the great struggle that is presently going on at the Federal Power Commission to obtain a definite impression as to the chaotic condition that exists in one of our great industries in this country, the natural-gas industry. The Federal Power Commission is wrestling with a problem that it did not ask for and neither did it want.

There is one thing that is certain, as I believe all will agree, and that is confusion, indecision and chaos exists throughout the industry which is destined to affect producers and consumers of America if it is not resolved by Congress. There can be no better illustration than to take a look at the vast pile of reports which have been received and which the Commission, with all of its personnel, could not possibly get to within years should they undertake it. A further illustration is the hearing that has been going on this week before the Commission in an effort to find some kind of a formula which apparently does not exist to meet this condition, which has been brought about by judicial fiat.

A most interesting discussion took place here in the House only last Monday on this problem wherein some dozen or more Members of this House participated, indicating the wide interest that prevails.

The manner by which this condition has developed, culminating perhaps through the hearings ending today before the Federal Power Commission presents a clear challenge—fundamental to free enterprise—which poses a threat to industry and consumers alike.

There could be no clearer illustration of the need for the Congress of the United States to again give definite and explicit expression to its intent by positive action in providing basic legislation affecting the natural-gas industry, than that the impossibly complex task of price regulation, with its threat to a vital na-

tional resource, should not be extended to the production phase simply because the commodity enters into interstate commerce.

The Federal Power Commission, which has the responsibility of administering the law, has never so construed the Natural Gas Act of 1938. But when this interpretation of the administrative agency, supported by the legislative history of the act, was challenged in the Supreme Court, a sharply divided opinion of our highest tribunal gave a mandate to the Commission to undertake this new and novel task.

Again, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the record is clear that the Congress contemplated no such extension of Federal regulation to the normal operation of producers. If this precedent were to stand unchallenged, there would be no reason why by the same method a similar Federal price control might not be extended to the production of oil and coal, as competing fuels, or even to any other basic commodity.

The immediate effect of this departure from our traditional policy is abundantly manifest in statements submitted by representatives of all phases of the industry.

Take, for example, the effect on the credit position of the industry as it attempts to meet the growing demand for this fuel. Consumer demand has risen much faster than the expansion of reserve supplies even without the paralyzing hand of Federal price regulation in this field. Yet, under free competition and arms' length bargaining, the price has remained relatively stable in comparison to other fuels or commodities generally. From 1945 to June 1954, when the historic Supreme Court decision was announced, the cost of gas to the household consumer rose only 12 percent as compared to a 49.7 rise in the general index of the cost of living.

With demand from both householders and commercial clients bringing new pressure for further exploration, banks, insurance companies, and other sources of necessary credit warn that they cannot lend money on contracts subject to the uncertainty of FPC rate revision. This points to a dangerously shrinking supply, harmful to industry and consumers alike.

As an illustration, the Prudential Insurance Co., with some $287 million in loans to natural gas producers and pipeline operators, has told FPC that it cannot extend further credit of this type in the present state of uncertainty concerning the extent and character of the rules and regulations now made subject to FPC jurisdiction.

A similar warning came from Guy C. Kiddoo, vice president of the First National Bank of Chicago, which now has some $200 million in oil and gas loans. He estimates that commercial banks have a total stake of probably more than a billion dollars.

The Investment Bankers Association also has cited the peril of inadequate financing resulting from the present uncertainties.

Frances Kernan, representing IBA, bluntly told the Federal agency that an earlier decision allowing a 6-percent return on gas reserves owned or developed by transmission companies was "the greatest piece of crackpot regulation with which I am familiar."

Asserting that the fundamental interest of the consumer is best served by encouraging exploration for new gas reserves, this spokesman for a major source of industry financing concluded:

> To take a chance on the future of consumers by not permitting the industry to continue on an arm's length bargaining basis would, in my opinion, be playing with fire.

May I add, Mr. Speaker, that such recklessness involves not only the private interests of consumers and industry but the national defense itself.

I would also like to cite the statement of the Peoples Gas System of Chicago, representing a major distributing company which has 135,000 applicants on the waiting list for natural gas residential heating. Its problem is duplicated in many areas outside the principal producing States.

"The public," the Chicago company said, "will best be served by keeping the interstate phase of the production of the natural-gas business free of all price regulation," relying instead on "the free interplay of market forces to do the pricing job in a way most likely to assure the continuing availability of adequate supplies."

As a member of the District of Columbia Committee as well as the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee that has dealt with this legislation, I was interested to note the statement of the Washington Gas Light Co., serving some 400,000 dwelling and commercial units in the Washington metropolitan area. This distributing company told the FPC that it was not advocating the desirability or propriety of such regulation, but believed that the agency should seek to achieve an adequate incentive for exploration, drilling, and production of natural gas and to promote an orderly growth of the market for this product.

Yet I was disturbed to note a statement by the Public Utility Commission of the District of Columbia, joined in by the State regulatory bodies of Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia. They assert that the services of independent producers of natural gas have many characteristics in common with other utilities.

It should be clear, I believe, that the production of natural gas is no more a public utility than the production of coal or oil.

Such confusion, I submit, reaches to the vital concepts of free and democratic government. It calls, most urgently, for a clear declaration by the Congress which will reaffirm most explicitly the historic policy of our Government.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MCGREGOR (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), indefinitely, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include certain schedules and tables which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $474.

Mr. MORANO and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. MORANO).

Mrs. KEE and to include a statement.

Mr. HORAN to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACK of Washington in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. YOUNGER.

Mr. TOLLEFSON (at the request of Mr. YOUNGER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey and to include a summary.

Mr. BYRD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FORRESTER and to include a letter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a report entitled "Foreign Trade and Milwaukee" prepared at his request by the Library of Congress notwithstanding that it is estimated by the Public Printer to exceed the limit and cost $740.

Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. METCALF in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILLIPS (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) and to include extraneous material.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 17, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

242. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report covering the receipts, expenditures, and work of the agricultural experiment stations in the States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1954, approved July 28, 1953, the Purnell Act, approved February 24, 1925 (43 Stat. 972), and the Adams Act, approved March 16, 1906 (34 Stat. 64); to the Committee on Agriculture.

243. A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, Department of State, transmitting the 13th semiannual report on the educational exchange activities conducted under the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong., for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1954) (H. Doc. No. 67); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

244. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the activities of the Department of Agriculture with regard to the disposal of foreign excess property for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 404 (d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, Public Law 152, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

245. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the proposed award of a concession permit to Dale Whitney, Inc., which will, when approved by the superintendent, authorize the permittee to conduct sales of Pres-to-logs or similar fuel through vending machines at specified locations in Mount Rainier National Park, extending the permit from May 1, 1955, to April 30, 1960, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

246. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of certain bills passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

247. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the third annual report of action initiated and completed by the Secretary of the Interior in carrying out the saline water-conservation program, pursuant to Public Law 448, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

248. A letter from the chairman, Council on Law Enforcement in the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of the official operations of the Council on Law Enforcement in the District of Columbia from February 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, pursuant to title IV, section 401 (c), of an act approved June 29, 1953; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

249. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report showing the payment of claims for damage occasioned by vessels in the Coast Guard Service, which have been settled by the Treasury Department during the period January 1 through December 31, 1954, pursuant to section 646 (b) of title 14, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANNON: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 2091. A bill making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 3). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2090. A bill to include certain service performed for Members of Congress as annuitable service under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 2091. A bill making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 2092. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by individuals, to promote thrift, and to stimulate expansion of employment through investment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 2093. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 2094. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BEAMER:

H. R. 2095. A bill to provide a method for protecting the domestic stem and table glassware, machine and blown, and sheet-glass industry against injury caused by certain imported glass products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 2096. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Armed Forces Medical Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 2097. A bill to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 2098. A bill to insure that reductions in the manufacturers' excise tax on automobiles and other motor vehicles, and on parts and accessories therefor, which are scheduled for April 1, 1955, will take effect on such date; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 2099. A bill to abolish the Fossil Cycad National Monument, S. Dak., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. R. 2100. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Labor to make a study of wage differentials between men and women; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 2101. A bill providing for the examination and survey of Wright's Creek, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 2102. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, so as to permit the return under such section of property which an alien acquired, by gift, devise, bequest, or inheritance, from an American citizen; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2103. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by individuals, to promote thrift, and to stimulate expansion of employment through investment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOW:

H. R. 2104. A bill to amend the act of July 3, 1952, relating to research in the development and utilization of saline waters; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 2105. A bill to provide for the relief of certain Army and Air Force nurses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2106. A bill to provide that the enlistment contracts or periods of obligated service of members of the Armed Forces shall not terminate by reason of appointment as cadets or midshipmen at the Military, Naval, Air Force, or Coast Guard Academies, or as midshipmen in the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2107. A bill to amend the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 to provide for additional facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2108. A bill to repeal certain laws relating to professional examinations for promotion of medical, dental, and veterinary officers of the Army and Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2109. A bill to authorize permanent appointments in the United States Navy and in the United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2110. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2111. A bill to authorize the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to cause to be published official registers for their respective services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2112. A bill to amend the act of February 21, 1946 (60 Stat. 26), to permit the retirement of temporary officers of the naval service after completion of more than 20 years of active service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 2113. A bill to authorize the grant or retrocession to a State of concurrent jurisdiction over certain land; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2114. A bill to provide for the preparation of plans and specifications for a museum building for the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2115. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide safeguards against mergers and consolidations of banks which may adversely affect competition or unduly tend to create a monopoly in the field of banking; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2116. A bill relating to the basis for income-tax purposes of property held by surviving joint tenants and surviving tenants by the entirety; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 2117. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2118. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2119. A bill to prohibit prior approval or clearance on a political basis of appointments to positions in the classified (competitive) civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 2120. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to review reports on Clinton River (Red Run), Mich.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 2121. A bill to provide for the relief of certain members of the Armed Forces who were required to pay certain transportation charges covering shipment of their household goods and personal effects upon return from overseas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2122. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to reproduce and to sell copies of official records of their respective departments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2123. A bill to repeal Public Law 820, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 1098), entitled "An act to provide a revolving fund for the pur-

chase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 2124. A bill to amend section 4233 (a) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the case of admissions to privately operated swimming pools, skating rinks, and other places providing facilities for physical exercise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 2125. A bill to abolish the Lakeview Federal sustained-yield unit, Fremont National Forest, Oreg.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2126. A bill to amend the act of July 3, 1952, relating to research in the development and utilization of saline waters; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 2127. A bill to revise the Federal-aid highway laws of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 2128. A bill to authorize the extension of patents covering inventions whose practice was prevented or curtailed during certain emergency periods by service of the patent owner in the Armed Forces or by production controls; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 2129. A bill to provide for intensified research into the causes, hazards, and effects of air pollution, and the methods for its prevention and control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2130. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal," approved May 29, 1944; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 2131. A bill to incorporate the Sky Pilots of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 2132. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, providing trustees for welfare funds for workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 2133. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to remove the limitation on the amount of regular annuity to which the increase in annuity provided by the act of July 16, 1952, is applicable; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 2134. A bill to provide the United States with a gold standard and redeemable currency, and to correct other defects in the monetary system of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2135. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, so as to permit the return under such section of amounts payable to aliens under trust funds created by American citizens; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 2136. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing as a national monument a site on the Old Santa Fe Trail near Dodge City, Kans.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2137. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to relieve innocent purchasers of fungible goods converted by warehousemen from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2138. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 2139. A bill to designate the lakes created by the McNary Dam, the John Day Dam, and the Dalles Dam in the Columbia River, Oreg. and Wash., as Lake Wallula, Lake Umatilla, and Lake Celilo, respectively; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 2140. A bill to exempt the retirement income and pensions of members of the Armed Forces who are under the age of 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 2141. A bill to modify the tax on effervescent wines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2142. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act so as to earmark not less than 40 percent of duck-stamp receipts for the refuge-acquisition program; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 2143. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by individuals, to promote thrift, and to stimulate expansion of employment through investment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 2144. A bill to provide for the presentation by the United States of a statue of Gen. George Washington to the people of Uruguay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 2145. A bill to offset declining employment by providing for Federal assistance to States and local governments in projects of construction, alteration, expansion, or repair of public facilities and improvements; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 2146. A bill to amend sections 4261 (a) and 4262 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2147. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from taxation the interest received from certain loans guaranteed under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 2148. A bill to repeal the act of January 19, 1929 (ch. 86, 45 Stat. 1090), entitled "An act to limit the date of filing claims for retainer pay"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2149. A bill to increase the annual compensation of the Academic Dean of the United States Naval Postgraduate School; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2150. A bill to further amend section 106 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 so as to provide for certain adjustments in the dates of rank of nurses and women medical specialists of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force in the permanent grade of captain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 2151. A bill to provide that the Federal Government shall not give preference to certain firms in the awarding of contracts or the making of purchases; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 2152. A bill to increase from $600 to $700 the income-tax exemptions allowed for a taxpayer, his spouse, and his dependents, and the additional exemptions allowed for old age and blindness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2153. A bill to prohibit an individual from traveling in interstate or foreign commerce in connection with the abandonment of his dependent child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 2154. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by individuals, to promote thrift, and to stimulate expansion of employment through investment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 2155. A bill to provide for increases in proportionate shares established for the 1955 sugar crop for farms in the mainland cane-sugar area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 2156. A bill to grant a new 6-month period within which applications may be made to the Secretary of the Navy for donation of the U. S. S. *Olympia*, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 2157. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2158. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 2159. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 899), as amended, to provide for terms of local and county committees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 2160. A bill to require that an office of the United States marshal be maintained in the capital city of each State, Hawaii, Alaska, and Guam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 2161. A bill to release and quitclaim all rights and interests of the United States in certain real property to the Newport Special School District, Jackson County, Ark.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 2162. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the payment of child's insurance benefits to certain individuals who are over the age of 18 but who are unable to engage in any regular employment by reason of permanent physical or mental disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. R. 2163. A bill to provide for issuing policies of national service life insurance to veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2164. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2165. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, with respect to interest upon amounts in the civil-service retirement and disability fund credited to the individual accounts of certain former officers and employees of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2166. A bill to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide that the interest on certain obligations issued by the States and their political subdivisions shall not be tax exempt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2167. A bill to allow a parent, under certain circumstances, to deduct for income-tax purposes amounts paid for the care of children while the parent is working; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 2168. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to repeal the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 2169. A bill to amend section 203 of the National Housing Act to provide that the rate of interest on mortgages insured thereunder shall not exceed 4 percent, and to authorize the Federal Housing Commissioner to make direct loans for certain residential housing when private capital is not available; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2170. A bill to provide that the interest rate on loans guaranteed, insured, or made by the Veterans' Administration shall not exceed 4 percent per annum; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 2171. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to increase from $100 to $200 the exemption allowed each minor child in determining the eligibility of a family for occupancy of low-rent public housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 2172. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to reduce, for purposes of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, the age requirement from age 65 to 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 2173. A bill to authorize a nationwide survey of costs of production for major farm-produced commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2174. A bill to amend the act of August 28, 1937, as amended, to provide additional credit facilities for farm enlargement and development and to assist beginning farmers to become farm owners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2175. A bill to provide for stockpiling 500 million bushels of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2176. A bill to provide for stockpiling an adequate national safety reserve of food and fiber; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2177. A bill to state explicitly the long-standing national policy to preserve and strengthen the family-farm pattern of American agriculture, and to provide means of implementing that policy more effectively; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2178. A bill to provide for price supports for whole milk, butterfat, and the products of such commodities at 100 percent of parity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 2179. A bill to increase the supply of scientific and technical manpower in the United States by providing a system of scholarships for college and graduate level study of scientific subjects, to be administered by the Commissioner of Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 2180. A bill to amend section 203 of the National Housing Act to reduce the rate of interest which mortgages insured thereunder may bear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 2181. A bill to require safety closing devices on the doors of household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 2182. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing projects for the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2183. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2184. A bill creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass-communications center; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2185. A bill to grant equitable compensatory time to postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2186. A bill to provide relief for veterans erroneously required to reimburse the United States for overpayment on the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 2187. A bill to provide that persons who served in the Army or Navy during World War I may, if they possess certain qualifications, wear the Distinguished and Presidential Unit Emblems and Combat Infantryman's and Medical Badges; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2188. A bill to provide for the award of the Good Conduct Medal to certain veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 2189. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the widow of a fully insured individual shall be entitled to benefits thereunder regardless of her age and whether or not she has minor children in her care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 2190. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2191. A bill to grant civil-service employees retirement after 30 years' service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 2192. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2193. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide for the sale at certain post offices of tobacco, cigar, and cigarette tax stamps; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2194. A bill for the relief of the Military Department of the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2195. A bill to appropriate funds for dredging of a boat basin at Apalachicola, Fla., to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 2196. A bill to regulate commerce among the several States, with and among the Territories and possessions of the United States, and with foreign countries; to protect the welfare of consumers of tung oil and of those engaged in the domestic tung nut and tung oil producing industry; to promote the export trade of the United States; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2197. A bill to establish an effective student exchange program with Latin American countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 2198. A bill relating to the tax treatment to be afforded under section 117 (j) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code in certain cases involving the sale, exchange, or conversion of land with unharvested crops thereon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2199. A bill to provide for the return to the former owners of certain lands acquired in connection with the Jim Woodruff Dam project of mineral interests in such lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2200. A bill to exempt certain additional foreign travel from the tax on the transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2201. A bill to appropriate funds for the construction of a channel at East Point in Apalachicola, Fla.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 2202. A bill to appropriate funds for the construction of a channel across St. George Island from the Gulf of Mexico into Apalachicola Bay, Fla.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2203. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 2204. A bill to amend section 202 of the Social Security Act to permit certain beneficiaries of an insured individual to meet the applicable proof-of-support requirements even though such individual was unable by reason of illness or injury to provide such support during a period ending with his death; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2205. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the payment of child's insurance benefits to certain individuals who are over the age of 18 but who are unable to engage in any regular employment by reason of permanent physical or mental disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2206. A bill to increase the amount of articles acquired abroad by residents of the United States which may be brought into the country without payment of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H. R. 2207. A bill to extend the time for filing application for payment on the purchase price of an automobile or other conveyance by disabled veterans whose qualifying disabilities occurred after their discharge or release from active service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 2208. A bill to amend section 2 of the Missing Persons Act, so as to provide that benefits thereunder shall be available to certain members of the Philippine Scouts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H. R. 2209. A bill to amend section 300 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 in relation to the entitlement of servicemen discharged or dismissed by court-martial to veterans rights; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 2210. A bill to establish a program of grants to States for the development of fine arts programs and projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2211. A bill to establish a program of financial aid to students in higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2212. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that any person covered under old-age and survivors insurance shall be entitled to the same primary and survivors benefit rights during a period of disability as he would be entitled to had he attained retirement age on the initial date of such period of disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2213. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to allow credit for certain service for purposes

of pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2214. A bill to amend section 201 (e) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for advance payments of certain pay and allowances of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2215. A bill to amend the part of the act entitled, "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1920, as amended, relating to the conservation, care, custody, protection, and operation of the naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2216. A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1948 (ch. 511, 62 Stat. 489), relating to the retention in the service of disabled commissioned officers and warrant officers of the Army and Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2217. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to remove the requirement for a final physical examination for inductees who continue on active duty in another status in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2218. A bill to authorize at the United States Military Academy and at the United States Air Force Academy an additional permanent professor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2219. A bill to amend section 508 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, relating to the compensation of cadets and midshipmen; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2220. A bill to clarify the status of citizens or nationals of the Republic of the Philippines who are retired members of the uniformed services and who hold offices of profit or trust under the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 2221. A bill that this act may be cited as the "Individual Retirement Act of 1955"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2222. A bill to amend the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, so as to provide that standard time shall be the measure of time for all purposes and to establish daylight-saving time throughout all time zones; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2223. A bill to provide for the ascertainment of claims of American citizens for spoliations committed by the French prior to the 31st day of July, 1801; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 2224. A bill relating to the exchange of certain properties for purposes of the Vicksburg National Military Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2225. A bill to amend section 401 (e) (2) of the Civil Aeronautics Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 2226. A bill to provide a United States aviation ensign for display on aircraft and at airfields, to serve as a symbol that America gave the world the airplane; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2227. A bill relating to the annual adjustment of the basic pay of members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H. R. 2228. A bill to prevent discrimination against fiscal year taxpayers with respect to depletion allowance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 2229. A bill to continue existing price supports, marketing quotas, and acreage allotments at 1954 levels under present conditions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2230. A bill to increase marketing quotas and acreage allotments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 2231. A bill to create a Czechoslovakian Claims Fund and to provide for the settlement of certain claims of United States nationals who have suffered severe losses and damages by reason of the nationalization or other taking of their business or commercial property by the Government of Czechoslovakia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 2232. A bill to create a United States Academy of Foreign Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 2233. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNGER (by request):

H. R. 2234. A bill to authorize the President to issue posthumously in the name of George Washington a commission as General of the Armies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution to utilize underplanted cotton acreage to correct inequities especially on family operated farms; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H. J. Res. 118. Joint resolution to utilize underplanted cotton acreage to correct inequities on family farms; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. J. Res. 119. Joint resolution declaring Inauguration Day to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. J. Res. 120. Joint resolution to provide for an increased acreage allotment for the 1955 cotton crop; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. J. Res. 121. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE (by request):

H. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution designating the fourth Saturday of August of each year as Children's Day in sports; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to prohibiting the United States Government from engaging in business in competition with its citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG:

H. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution placing certain individuals who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, and in the islands of Leyte and Samar after July 4, 1902, and their survivors, in the same status as those who served in the Armed Forces during the Philippine Insurrection and their survivors; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. J. Res. 125. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. J. Res. 126. Joint resolution to amend section 84 (a) (2) of title 28 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. J. Res. 127. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLK:

H. J. Res. 128. Joint resolution to provide for the creation of an international food and raw materials reserve; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. J. Res. 129. Joint resolution proposing an equal-rights amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. J. Res. 130. Joint resolution to increase 1955 cotton allotments of certain farms receiving five acres or less; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim a National Materials Handling Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. J. Res. 132. Joint resolution regarding the revocation of certain reclamation projects for which construction funds have not been appropriated; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the International Industrial Exposition to be held at Houston, Tex., May 3 through 8, 1955; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to redefine treason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution to compensate for estimated underplanting of the 1955 cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution recommending a new 60-nation conference to consider the advisability of reorganization, revision, and amendment of the Charter of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. Res. 86. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to investigate and study the publication and distribution of offensive and undesirable books; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H. Res. 87. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the problems involved in controlling illicit traffic in narcotic drugs and marihuana; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 2235. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margarete Gick Scordas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 2236. A bill for the relief of Mary Rose and Mrs. Alice Rose Spittler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2237. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Hatridge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 2238. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Greco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2239. A bill for the relief of Dr. Benjamin Blumenfeld Fielding; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 2240. A bill for the relief of Oy Wan Leung, also known as Margarita Oy Wan Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2241. A bill for the relief of Amalia Bertolino Querio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2242. A bill for the relief of Kim Joong Yoon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2243. A bill for the relief of Ruben Barrow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2244. A bill for the relief of the estate of Joseph Alfonso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2245. A bill for the relief of George Petrossian Minassians, Albertouhi Petrossian Minassians, Eda Petrossian Minassians, Vahag Petrossian Minassians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2246. A bill for the relief of Andrew W. Garfield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2247. A bill for the relief of Peter M. Mihalovici; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2248. A bill for the relief of Jose Cristiano Vieira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2249. A bill for the relief of Mir Kazem Kashani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2250. A bill for the relief of Cesar Grana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2251. A bill for the relief of Michael Alexis Melgunow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2252. A bill for the relief of Celia Estebanez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2253. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Young See Louie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 2254. A bill for the relief of Eugene Herskovitz and Mrs. Elly Herskovitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2255. A bill for the relief of Matteo Crupi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2256. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nehama Buchwald; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 2257. A bill for the relief of Abdol Ali Moghbel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 2258. A bill for the relief of Luis Jaramillo-Rosas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 2259. A bill for the relief of Alessandra Barile Altobelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2260. A bill for the relief of Vittorio Cottone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H. R. 2261. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Carollo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES (by request):

H. R. 2262. A bill for the relief of Luigi Caddeo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 2263. A bill for the relief of Mother Maria Maestre Marcos and Mother Bernarda Clemente Cosqui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):

H. R. 2264. A bill for the relief of Gertrude Maria Gugerel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2265. A bill for the relief of Freidun Kurt Andolsun, his wife, Munevver, and children, Ayshe, Suleyman, Orhan, and Osman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2266. A bill for the relief of Maurice Mumford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2267. A bill for the relief of Morton J. Krakow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2268. A bill for the relief of Capt. Walter C. Wolf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2269. A bill for the relief of William H. Spowers, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON (by request):

H. R. 2270. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Skoufis (Nicolas Soufis); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. R. 2271. A bill for the relief of Charalampos Socrates Iossifoglu, Nora Iossifoglu, Helen Iossifoglu, and Efrossini Iossifoglu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H. R. 2272. A bill for the relief of Aida I. Totah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 2273. A bill for the relief of Der Chuck Yee and Wu Mei On; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 2274. A bill for the relief of Alejandro Florentino Munoz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 2275. A bill for the relief of Barbara D. Colthurst; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. R. 2276. A bill for the relief of Vida Kosnik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 2277. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Anastasios Loukas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 2278. A bill for the relief of Consuelo Calderon de Villarreal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2279. A bill for the relief of Sister Mary Berarda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2280. A bill for the relief of Elly Akilloglou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2281. A bill for the relief of Arnold Rosenthal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2282. A bill for the relief of Rev. Thomas Kolakowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 2283. A bill for the relief of Wilhelmus Marius Van der Veur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H. R. 2284. A bill for the relief of Maj. Robert D. Lauer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois:

H. R. 2285. A bill for the relief of Marie Lim Tsien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2286. A bill for the relief of Lubomir Pejsa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2287. A bill for the relief of Gregory Livas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 2288. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sylvia Simonson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 2289. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Fligor (nee Sproul); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 2290. A bill for the relief of Pedro Fermin Bade; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 2291. A bill for the relief of Sophie K. Valmas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 2292. A bill for the relief of George Zogos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2293. A bill for the relief of Aristotelis A. Karapanagiotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2294. A bill for the relief of Ho Kon Chun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2295. A bill for the relief of Ho Dong Ne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 2296. A bill for the relief of Simone Gilliland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2297. A bill for the relief of Leyla Seyman McGovern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2298. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Staropoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H. R. 2299. A bill for the relief of Robert M. Paulus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2300. A bill for the relief of Antonio Aste; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2301. A bill for the relief of Battista Rosso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 2302. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Demetrias Petropoulous, sometimes known as Petropol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 2303. A bill for the relief of Alessandro, Carmela, Pasqualina, Massimo, and Michele D'Antonio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2304. A bill for the relief of John On Pong Young and Mrs. Ivy Elana Ho Asjoe Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2305. A bill for the relief of Fatulla, Agha Bibi, Albert, and David Amini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2306. A bill for the relief of Maria de Rehbinder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2307. A bill for the relief of Julius, Ilona, and Henry Flehner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2308. A bill for the relief of Anna D'Oria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 2309. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Bossio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 2310. A bill for the relief of Magdalena F. Bristol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2311. A bill for the relief of Carl A. Willson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2312. A bill for the relief of Paul E. Sevigny; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2313. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agnethe Gundhil Sundby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2314. A bill for the relief of Antonio Anici, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2315. A bill for the relief of Antonio (Orejel) Cardenas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2316. A bill for the relief of Charlie Sylvester Correll; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 2317. A bill for the relief of Paolo Longo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 2318. A bill for the relief of Osvaldo Augusto Riba or Riba-Casal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2319. A bill for the relief of Pericles G. Callimanopoulos and his family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. R. 2320. A bill for the relief of Marietta DiLiberto (nee Bevacqua); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2321. A bill for the relief of Evangelos Foradis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2322. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Fortunato Salamone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2323. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eirini Basili Pagonis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2324. A bill for the relief of Helen Zafred Urbanic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2325. A bill for the relief of Joseph Santo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 2326. A bill for the relief of Mitsuko Miyaoka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2327. A bill for the relief of Mah Ying Og; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 2328. A bill for the relief of Geralda Lillo and Karl Heinz Lillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 2329. A bill for the relief of Kurt Glaser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2330. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Julian C. Harlowe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 2331. A bill for the relief of Angela Bottkos de Karaday, Laszlo Karaday, Gyongi Karady, Laszlo Karady, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2332. A bill for the relief of Duncan McQuagge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2333. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josephine Greis Ockenfels Rice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2334. A bill for the relief of Constantin Phedon Manoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2335. A bill for the relief of Magda Manoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 2336. A bill for the relief of John B. Sutter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2337. A bill for the relief of Lothar G. Seeger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2338. A bill for the relief of Charles F. Bullette; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2339. A bill for the relief of Monika Schefbanker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2340. A bill for the relief of Edward V. DeFreitas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN (by request):

H. R. 2341. A bill for the relief of Sister Mary Coronita Dacanay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 2342. A bill for the relief of Robert B. Cooper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT (by request):

H. R. 2343. A bill for the relief of Shiou-Chuan Sun and E-tu Zen Sun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 2344. A bill for the relief of Arcangelo Gustaferro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2345. A bill for the relief of Jean Henri Buchet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2346. A bill for the relief of John P. Farrar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2347. A bill for the relief of Heinrich Wolfgang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2348. A bill for the relief of Theodora Sammartino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2349. A bill for the relief of Charles S. Youngcourt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2350. A bill for the relief of Harry Vondas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2351. A bill for the relief of Harry Vondas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2352. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Stavros Kapsalis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2353. A bill for the relief of John Odabashian, doctor of medicine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2354. A bill for the relief of Basil Theodossiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2355. A bill for the relief of Maria Englesis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2356. A bill for the relief of Pai Shiu Chuan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2357. A bill for the relief of James Moustakas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2358. A bill for the relief of Pietro Murgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2359. A bill for the relief of Bernhard Butsch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2360. A bill for the relief of Gloria Fan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2361. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Ann Giampietro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2362. A bill for the relief of Emanuel Frangescos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2363. A bill for the relief of Lino Santi and his wife, Dinora Santi, nee Balestri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2364. A bill for the relief of Aldo Martini and his wife, Maria Martini, nee Balestri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER (by request):

H. R. 2365. A bill for the relief of Viktor Palango, Agnes Palango, and Toivo Palango; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 2366. A bill for the relief of Guy H. Davant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 2367. A bill for the relief of Joseph Diana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 2368. A bill for the relief of Ranka Pejovic Gajic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

52. By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: Petition of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, Conway, Ark., expressing approval of legislation which would prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

53. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city clerk, Chicago, Ill., urging Federal aid for reconstruction of highway bridges involved in the Calumet-Sag project and giving assurance concerning the Indiana Avenue Bridge over the Calumet River; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Program of Financial Aid to Students in Higher Education and the Crisis in Western Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am joining with the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, CARL ELLIOTT, in sponsoring a bill to establish a program of financial aid to students in higher education. This bill was first developed by the United States Office of Education about 2 years ago in cooperation with some 30 leading national organizations in the field of education.

The Federal Government has now, as it has had in the past, an active responsibility for the education of our youth. This means not only institutional support as under the Morrill Land-Grant College and University Act of 1862, and special programs on a regional basis in such fields as public health and veterinary medicine, but also a concern for the post-high-school education of this Nation's students, who are not able, otherwise, to continue their formal schooling. The Federal Government's responsibility is not merely residual, as has been maintained by some who have held important national positions during the past 2 years but must, for the good of the Nation, be conceived of as a dynamic one where the national interest is directly involved. Federal funds should be available for this purpose where State and local support is lacking in view of the fact of the high percentage of young people who, though qualified in all other respects, are financially unable to continue their education. The active participation of the Federal Government may be needed in a variety of ways, for instance, to assist in identifying needy students who should be helped.

It should be obvious to everyone that the minimum need for this Nation in the world of today is to hold its own in all ways against Russian communism and to attempt to win friends in other countries. These efforts must include all fields of knowledge such as the natural and social sciences and the humanities.

In 1900 the United States spent $2 per capita on general governmental tasks as compared to $1 per capita on education. In 1953 the Federal educational effort was $76 per capita while general Federal expenditures, including

defense, was $467 per capita. In other words, the ratio of educational to general Federal expenditures, which in 1900 was 1 to 2, had declined, in the intervening 50 years, to a ratio of 1 to 6. This has taken place at a time when Russian communism has risen to commanding power leading a totalitarian power bloc of hundreds of millions of people. The correlation between these facts seems fairly evident.

It is very important that we develop ways and means to bring to the hundreds of millions of people who are still free and who look to us for leadership a true picture of our form of government so that in the struggle that is going on for the loyalty, the minds, the hearts, and the souls of men throughout the world they will turn to us rather than to the Russians. Strong and courageous leadership is needed. This bill will assist in the development of the kind of leadership without which we may well lose the cold war. A short summary of the provisions of the bill I am sponsoring follows:

SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED STUDENT AID ACT OF 1955

Under the bill, Federal aid would be made available to selected students in higher education in the form of scholarship stipends. The bill would also provide for Federal insurance of loans to students made by institutions of higher education. The institution, however, could assign its rights under such insurance to a financial institution as security to obtain funds for making loans to students.

Any high-school graduate would be eligible to apply for a scholarship. From among those applying, those showing greatest promise would be granted certificates showing that they are American scholars. Stipends would be granted to the neediest among these scholars, the amount of the stipend varying with the demonstrated need of the recipient, but not exceeding $800 per academic year. The recipient could attend any bona fide college or university of his choice which admits him; and so long as he continued in good standing at the educational institution, his stipend would be paid directly to him in installments suited to the demands of the academic year.

During a time of active hostilities or when found by the President to be necessary in the interest of national defense, at least 60 percent of the stipends must go to students engaging in studies which are determined in a manner prescribed by the President to be related to the national defense or defense-supporting activities. Scholars receiving stipends thus earmarked must, in general, contiue their studies in the designated fields if they wish to continue receiving stipends.

The stipends are subject to annual renewal for the normal course of time necessary to complete the work for the first post-high-school degree, the amount of the stipend being fixed each year in terms of the financial need of each student.

The bill would authorize appropriations not exceeding $32 million for scholarship stipends for the fiscal year 1956, $64 million for the next year, $96 million for the third year, and $128 million thereafter. Each State would be allotted a proportionate share of the funds available each year, the amount being based on the number of high school graduates in the State and the number of youths between the ages of 18 and 21. The number of persons aided would depend on the amount of money appropriated by Congress; but the bill contemplates that when the program is in full operation approximately 50,000 to 60,000 men and women will enter college or university each year with the aid of Federal stipends of varying amounts.

Scholarship commissions in each State would receive applications from students, conduct the objective examinations to select the abler among the applicants, assess the financial need of those qualifying as scholars, and certify to the Commissioner of Education the persons eligible to be certified as scholars and those among the able whose financial need justifies the payment of a stipend, with the amount of the stipend in each case.

A national council on student aid, composed of 12 persons representative of individual, organizational, and professional interests in education and of the public, would advise and assist the Commissioner in the development of principles to guide the State commissions in the selection of persons for scholarship certificates and stipends, and on other important policy matters arising in the administration of the act. Provision is also made for consultation between the Office of Education and the various Federal agencies, such as the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Science Foundation, and the Department of Defense, which operate special programs of aid to undergraduate and graduate students. The bill is so drawn as to assure full coordination of the Federal scholarship program with other federally supported programs which aid students in higher education.

The loan insurance program would eventually be self-financing, with the participating colleges and universities paying insurance premiums in to a revolving fund established in the United States Treasury, out of which 80 percent of the loss on each insured student loan would be paid. The interest rate charged the student would be geared to the average interest paid on marketable United States Treasury obligations. The institution would be permitted to charge the student this rate plus an additional amount of not more than 1 percent, plus the insurance premium charged by the Federal Government.

The student would not have to start repaying the principal of his loan until 4 years after he completes his education, and then would be given an additional 6 years to repay it. The institution could charge an additional 1 percent interest beginning at the time payments on the principal become due.

With their losses thus insured by the Federal Government, it is expected that the educational institutions would have no difficulty in borrowing money from banks or other financial institutions with which to make loans to students. They could, if they wished, use their own funds or student loan funds over which they have control.

Any student would be permitted to borrow from educational institutions up to $600 a year and up to $2,400 in the aggregate. The total principal amount of new loans to students covered by insurance under the act in any fiscal year would be limited to $10 million.

Proposed Tariff Reductions on Textile Goods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. FORRESTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1955

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee for Reciprocity Information has been conducting hearings concerning tariff reductions on textile goods to be brought into this country from Japan and other countries.

This is most alarming inasmuch as these tariffs have been steadily reduced during the years of reciprocal trade agreements, and this country is already flooded with goods manufactured in other countries.

To consider further tariff reductions on textile goods indicates that our leaders are not familiar with the fact that our American textile industries are already in a precarious condition and can be forced into bankruptcy.

In the district I represent there are many textile manufacturers and approximately 100,000 people earn their living by working in these factories. These mills are efficient and modern, but they made no money last year and they cannot stand more unfair competition from goods manufactured abroad by cheap labor. I am incorporating herein a letter written me by Hon. Henry W. Swift, executive vice president, Swift Spinning Mills, Inc., Columbus, Ga., who happens to be an outstanding textile man. That letter is completely sound and portrays eloquently the textile situation. The letter reads as follows:

SWIFT SPINNING MILLS, INC.,
Columbus, Ga., December 31, 1954.

Hon. E. L. FORRESTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR TIC: I am quite sure that you are thoroughly familiar with the hearings now going on in Washington prior to the formal hearings to be held in Geneva in February of next year with respect to the overall tariff situation.

While there are always two sides to every question, I would like to tell you that in my personal opinion, anything that is done to hurt the textile business can very well be disastrous as we have been in a very serious recession for the past 18 months. You no doubt are familiar with the fact that Columbus is very dependent upon the textile industry and, as a matter of fact, there are over 100,000 people in the State of Georgia

employed in the textile mills. Any downward revision of the present tariffs could have a very profound effect upon Georgia's overall economy.

The objective of these forthcoming tariff discussions is—and should be—to develop a sound world trade program and to strengthen the economy of our Allies. We in the cotton textile industry, far from having any quarrel with those objectives, are all for them.

But we do say that it would be the height of folly to take such steps as would undermine a large and important segment of our own economy and which, at the same time, would not accomplish the purpose for which they are designed.

The truth of the matter is that the American textile market already is the widest open of any great consumer market in the world. And what may not be generally recognized is that United States textile tariffs have been steadily reduced during the past 2 decades of reciprocal trade agreements.

Now what has been happening while we have been cutting our tariffs? Simply this: Every other country—with the important exception of Canada—has been violating the spirit and the ideal of reciprocity. Since the end of the last World War, many foreign countries have proceeded to impose import quotas, exchange controls, exorbitant tariffs, and numerous other artificial barriers to trade. And most of these actions have been aimed deliberately against the United States.

Now it seems to me that the objective of a sound foreign trade policy should be to correct this state of affairs—to induce these countries abroad to set their own economic houses in order. But instead of that, our policymakers seem determined to create an economic booby trap—a trap that will sacrifice our textile and apparel employees and workers in related industries, while actually benefiting nobody.

I don't want to bore you with figures, but figures prove beyond any doubt that the flood of Japanese cloth into this country is becoming increasingly great. Why can foreign cloth come into the United States and sell in the American market? For one reason and one reason only—because it is cheap. And why is it cheap? For one reason and one reason only—because it is made with cheap labor.

Our textile wage rates are 10 times those of Japan. Some folks may say: "Oh, well, the American industry can overcome this tremendous wage gap because its more efficient."

Let me say to that, that the Japanese textile industry has become a new textile industry since the war. The Japanese mills are modern in every respect. They are equipped or can be equipped with the same machines we have.

Far from being monopolistic, our textile industry is composed chiefly of small independent units which are highly competitive with one another. And we own no patents of any consequence. We have to be efficient—or we go out of business.

Compare this with our foreign competition, which operates under the cartel system or some system of state trading. The purpose of the cartel is usually to protect the least efficient of its members. And such systems facilitate the dumping of goods when and where the cartel or Government decides to dump them.

I say to you that if these proposed textile tariff reductions are put into effect, we here in the southeast will have to prepare ourselves for a catastrophe. Our mills will be forced out of business; our employees out of jobs, and our living standards and our economic strength will be lowered tragically.

And I say that instead of cutting further our already low tariffs, we ought to work for a positive foreign trade program that will eliminate artificial barriers and enable the underdeveloped countries to achieve a more abundant life.

This letter has been very lengthy; however, there was much ground to be covered, and I trust that you will do everything possible to look after our best interest.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes for the new year, I am,

Yours sincerely,

HENRY W. SWIFT.

Mr. Speaker, there is a limit to what we can do to build up other countries and we have reached that limit on textiles and on many other commodities. If further tariff reductions are ordered, Congress will have to correct the mistakes speedily, or witness the closing down of our textile mills with the textile laborers being without employment and suffering the humiliation of living off of Government doles.

As I understand the President's message on the state of the Union, the administration has envisioned that unemployment will result from tariff reductions, but that the unemployed will be given doles and handouts. That is tragic thinking and planning. I sincerely hope we will never do anything deliberately which will take work from our laboring masses on the theory that we can care for them through handouts.

A few days ago the United States Tariff Commission conducted hearings for the purpose of determining whether 200,000 tons of foreign peanuts would be brought into this country. If that permission is granted, it will be against the will of the Congress and will annul the laws of Congress, and it will be the first time this Government has willfully and deliberately caused a surplus. There are enough peanuts now in this country to fill the demands of all legitimate consumption until the 1955 crop is harvested.

Mr. Speaker, if there are any further tariff reductions on textiles and agricultural products, such as peanuts, or any other agricultural product, and if these products are brought into this country to compete against our textile factories, textile laborers, and farmers, we can all be certain that the economy of this country will suffer irreparable damage.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1955, the President announced the issuance of a proclamation setting January 31, 1955, as the end of the period of eligibility for certain veterans' benefits of the Korean conflict administered by the Veterans' Administration and other Federal agencies.

However, on my own part, so long as the Government faces the necessity for drafting our young men for service in this country or overseas, I will favor full veterans' benefits for these men and their dependents, regardless of whether or not this country is actively engaged in war.

The issue is a moral one. So long as the Government asserts the right to draft young men for military service, I feel that it assumes, at the same time, sizable responsibilities for their future welfare. No one can tell what effect will be had upon the life of a young man, often less than 21 years of age, who has his normal life disrupted, and his own personal wishes and plans completely changed.

With many other Members of Congress, I am sure a majority, I deeply regret the necessity for drafting these young men, but in view of the present world situation, I do not see any workable alternative.

With this in mind, I shall do what I can to see that all veterans' benefits are continued on the present basis so long as men continue to be drafted.

The History of a 55-Year Struggle by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in Behalf of the Veteran and His Dependent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the history of the Veterans of Foreign Wars is truly the history of a dramatic 55-year struggle to keep the American people conscious of their patriotic obligations to the Nation's welfare—and to the men who have risked their lives in defense of America in time of war.

This tabulation of VFW historical highlights accents only a few of the significant milestones in the progress of this organization as a national body. Unfortunately, it is impossible to point up the countless thousands of examples of great good that have been accomplished by VFW posts deeply concerned with the betterment of the communities in which they exist.

To the younger members of the VFW—as well as to the old timers who have contributed so much personally to this glowing record of VFW achievement—this review of the past should serve as a magnificient inspiration—one that fully justifies continuous membership loyalty and support in the future.

Here is the record that gives millions of Americans good reason to say, "The VFW is a good outfit."

Eighteen hundred and ninety-nine: Founding of the Colorado Society of the Army of the Philippines, the American Veterans of Foreign Service in Ohio, and a similar organization with the same name in Pennsylvania. Composed of overseas veterans exclusively—these three groups established the tradition that men who fought together overseas in time of war should join together in an organization dedicated to the service of their country, and to the needs of their less fortunate comrades.

Nineteen hundred and fourteen: The amalgamation of the above-named groups to form one single nationwide organization to be known henceforth as the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Nineteen hundred and seventeen: As urged by the VFW, Congress adopted the War Risk Insurance Act, under which compensation and pension benefits were created for World War I disabled veterans and the widows and dependents of the Nation's war dead.

Nineteen hundred and eighteen: Enactment of Public Law 178 marked achievement of another major VFW objective. For the first time in United States history, the Federal Government adopted the basic principle of vocational training for disabled veterans whose handicaps required special training for complete rehabilitation.

As advocated by the VFW, pensions were granted to widows and orphans of Spanish-American War veterans.

Nineteen hundred and twenty: Due primarily to the organized efforts of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Congress passed the first pension bill for Spanish-American War veterans. Representative Thomas Crago, of Pennsylvania, author of this pension bill, served as commander in chief of the VFW in 1914–15.

Nineteen hundred and twenty-one: In response to VFW pleadings, Congress adopted legislation creating an independent agency known as the Veterans Bureau for the handling of all veteran affairs pertaining to hospitalization, compensation, pensions, training, and so forth.

As forerunner of the present Loyalty Day program, the VFW designated April 27 to be observed each year as National Americanization Day—a counterdemonstration to Communist May Day rallies each year on May 1.

Nineteen hundred and twenty-two: The VFW became the first veteran organization to launch a nationwide sale of symbolic memorial flowers made by disabled Veterans—the VFW buddy poppy—as a means of raising funds for veteran welfare and relief purposes.

Nineteen hundred and twenty-three: National headquarters of the VFW, located at 32 Union Square, New York, N. Y., was transferred to Kansas City, Kans.

Nineteen hundred and twenty-four: Enactment of the World War Veterans Act of 1924, as recommended by the VFW, authorized the establishment of approximately 100 regional offices of the Veterans Bureau throughout the country.

Nineteen hundred and twenty-five: The VFW national home for widows and orphans was founded at Eaton Rapids, Mich.

Nineteen hundred and twenty-six: At its 27th national encampment, El Paso, Tex., the Veterans of Foreign Wars became the first major veteran organization to adopt resolutions asking Congress to outlaw the operations of the Communist Party in the United States—and to establish a permanent system of universal military training.

Nineteen hundred and twenty-seven: Under VFW leadership, the national commanders of five major veteran organizations endorsed the following definition: "Americanism is an unfailing love of country; loyalty to its institutions and ideals; eagerness to defend it against all enemies; undivided allegiance to the flag; and a desire to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

Nineteen hundred and twenty-nine: Vigorously urged by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Congress voted approval of a Gold Star Mothers' pilgrimage to the graves of World War I dead in France.

Nineteen hundred and thirty: As strongly recommended by the VFW, Congress authorized the consolidation of all Federal agencies handling matters pertaining to veterans under the control of one agency, the Veterans' Administration.

The offices of the National Headquarters in Kansas City, Kans., were moved to Broadway at 34th Street, Kansas City, Mo.

Despite opposition from other major veteran organizations, the VFW waged a single-handed victorious fight for the payment of disability allowances to non-service-connected disabled veterans with permanent disabilities. Under this law, veterans suffering with disabilities ranging from 25 percent to 100 percent received pensions from $12 to $40 per month. Although only 100 percent totally and permanently disabled veterans are entitled to disability pensions under existing laws—the precedent of pension payments to non-service-connected disabled World War I veterans was established by this law—marking a significant achievement to the exclusive credit of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The bodies of 86 American war dead buried in Russia were exhumed and returned to the United States for burial by a special VFW mission. In the absence of diplomatic relations between the United States of America and Russia, the project to retrieve these American war dead was sponsored exclusively by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Nineteen bodies were shipped from Brooklyn to relatives in various States, with burial arrangements supervised by local VFW units; the bodies of 56 were shipped to Detroit, Mich., for burial under the auspices of VFW Polar Bear Post 436, Detroit, and the Polar Bear Association. Three of the bodies were buried in Arlington Cemetery, Washington, D. C., under VFW auspices.

Nineteen hundred and thirty-one: Climaxing an intensive Nationwide campaign conducted exclusively by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Congress enacted legislation that made The Star Spangled Banner the official national anthem.

In response to VFW demands for cash payment of World War I veteran adjusted compensation certificates (the so-called bonus) Congress enacted legislation granting 50 percent payment.

Nineteen hundred and thirty-three: VFW achievements in veteran welfare suffered a severe blow when the National Economy Act became effective on Black Friday, June 30. This law nullified disability pensions for about 400,000 World War I veterans; pensions for 170,000 Spanish-American War veterans; hospitalization and domiciliary care for countless thousands.

Nineteen hundred and thirty-four: A long standing VFW objective was accomplished when Public Law 484 was adopted, granting outright pensions to the widows and children of deceased World War I veterans, regardless of service connection.

Nineteen hundred and thirty-six: Acting again in response to persistent VFW demands, Congress voted to pay World War I veterans the cash balance due on World War I bonus certificates.

Nineteen hundred and thirty-eight: VFW posts gathered millions of signatures in a nationwide campaign petitioning Congress to create a national-defense system strong enough to keep America out of war.

Nineteen hundred and forty: In December 1940 the VFW launched the Speak up for Democracy series of monthly Americanism talks, a project that continues to earn the cooperation of approximately 800 radio stations.

Nineteen hundred and forty-two: At the request of the War Department, the VFW promoted an intensive drive for Air Force recruits through the sponsorship of a nationwide air cadet scholastic training program designated to assist enlistees in meeting eligibility requirements. Within 1 year the War Department gave credit to the VFW for more than 42,000 recruits.

The VFW contributed $150,000 to the War Department for the purchase of 15 trainer planes.

Nineteen hundred and forty-three: On March 17, 1943, Congress responded to VFW appeals for veteran-welfare justice by passing Public Law 10, creating benefits for World War II veterans and their dependents similar to those in force for World War I veterans.

Nineteen hundred and forty-four: Adoption of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, the so-called GI bill of rights, incorporating most of the basic veteran-welfare principles advanced by the VFW ever since its founding in 1899.

Nineteen hundred and forty-five: With VFW representatives serving as consultants, the United Nations Conference of International Organization met in San Francisco to formulate the Charter of the United Nations.

Nineteen hundred and forty-six: The 12-story office building in which the national headquarters is located in Kansas City, Mo., was purchased by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

For the first time in history, VFW membership passed the 1-million mark.

Nineteen hundred and forty-seven: The first VFW national marble tournament was held in Boys Town, Nebr.

Endorsed by the VFW, Congress voted for immediate cash payment of World War II terminal-leave bonds; a 20-per cent increase in Spanish-American War veteran pensions; unification of the Armed Forces.

Nineteen hundred and forty-nine: In observance of the 50th anniversary of the founding in 1899, the period of April 3–9 was celebrated as Golden Jubilee Week. Highlight of the week was a special hour-long NBC radio network show

featuring Bob Hope, Dinah Shore, and Janis Page.

Another VFW Golden Jubilee project enlisted the cooperation of 637 radio stations and 850 newspapers in advertising the free distribution of more than 300,000 booklets listing the various benefits to which all veterans and their dependents were entitled under Federal laws.

Nineteen hundred and fifty: An organized American sovereignty campaign to combat the United World Federalist movement was launched by the VFW—a drive that has succeeded to date in persuading all but 3 of 21 State legislatures to rescind the adoption of favorable resolutions.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-one: With cash prizes valued at $35,000 the VFW inaugurated the most intensive nationwide community service campaign ever sponsored by any organization—one that produced a total of 503,000 separate VFW community service projects during the year 1953–54.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-two: The tradition of annually observing National VFW Week during the last week of January was established.

Donald D. Dunn, World War II veteran and a victim of the 1951 floods in Kansas, was picked as the winner of a $50,000 farm in the Columbia Basin reclamation project, Washington. The big search for the Nation's most deserving veteran to receive this prize was conducted by the VFW in cooperation with the Columbia Basin donors.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-three: Heroic VFW efforts forced administration leaders to abandon a nearly successful effort to make drastic reductions in the VA budget for disabled veteran care. The proposed reductions threatened a repetition of the evil effects of the National Economy Act of 1933.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-four: In response to widespread VFW demands on the post, State and national levels, the administration gave approval to the passage of two measures granting a 5-percent increase in compensation and pension rates for all disabled veterans, and the widows and orphans of deceased veterans.

Congress adopted legislation designed to outlaw the Communist Party in the United States—an objective the VFW has recommended since 1926.

A United States Academy of Foreign Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1955

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill calling for a school for the training of the diplomatic corps of the Nation.

The purpose of the bill will be "to promote peace, greater understanding, and good will throughout the world, and to provide for a trained force for the Foreign Service of the United States."

We have schools for training our future Army, Navy, and Air Force leaders, but we leave to chance the training of our diplomatic corps personnel who must skillfully deal with representatives of all other nations of the world.

The United States Academy of Foreign Service, title of the proposed school, would be located in the Washington area, and entrance would be by competitive examination, with students chosen according to a system of State allocation.

In addition to intensive instruction in government, the curriculum would include select liberal arts offerings, studies in comparative culture, and military and naval observation. Graduates would be required to spend a year of in-service training in a foreign country.

Foreign Trade and Milwaukee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1955

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in a few weeks, this House will once again consider the question of United States foreign trade policy. In the belief that the information appearing below will prove of interest and help to the membership of this body in conjunction with that issue, I wish to place in the RECORD the complete text of an informative study entitled "Foreign Trade and Milwaukee."

This study was initiated at my request during the early months of 1953, and it was completed and released on November 4, 1954. The survey was conducted under the general supervision of Dr. Howard S. Piquet, senior specialist in international trade of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, with the collaboration and assistance of Mr. Harold T. Lamar, of the Senior Specialists Division of the Legislative Reference Service, who prepared the report.

I should like to express my sincere appreciation for the very fine work which Dr. Piquet and Mr. Lamar did on this study. We are also indebted to Dr. Ernest S. Griffith, Director of the Legislative Reference Service, without whose cooperation this study could not have been possible.

Much of the routine and clerical work incident to the gathering of the data for the report on "Foreign Trade and Milwaukee" was done at my office, and I have carefully followed each stage of the survey. The entire study consumed very much effort, and I sincerely hope that the resultant findings will prove of value to the Members of this body and to all other persons interested in the question of our foreign trade policy.

It should be mentioned at this point that this study was not intended to be all-inclusive. Its main emphasis is on the primary impact of foreign trade on manufacturing firms in the Milwaukee metropolitan area. Within this and other limitations described in detail below, the study constitutes, in my opinion, a constructive and valuable contribution to a better understanding of what foreign trade means to all of us.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., October 14, 1954.

The Honorable CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ZABLOCKI: We are pleased to submit herewith the report Foreign Trade and Milwaukee which we have prepared at your request.

As you know, this report was written in the Senior Specialists Division by Harold T. Lamar, under the general supervision of Howard S. Piquet, senior specialist in international trade.

We want to take this opportunity to thank you and your staff for the splendid cooperation rendered to us in the preparation of this survey.

Cordially yours,
ERNEST S. GRIFFITH,
Director.

FOREIGN TRADE AND MILWAUKEE

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

This report was prepared by the Legislative Reference Service at the request, and with the cooperation of, Representative CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, of the Fourth Congressional District, Milwaukee, Wis.

Considerable attention is being given to United States foreign-trade policy. The time-honored arguments of the protectionists and free traders are still being used, but to many, the tariff remains a pretty dry subject. In these postwar days of renewed competition in world markets and the threatened splits in the economic solidarity of the free world the general public should have a clear idea, as individuals, of their economic position with regard to foreign trade. By examining the impact of foreign trade on their own communities, citizens will be better equipped to know the direction in which their interest lies as between encouraging imports and exports by lowering trade barriers and maintaining import barriers when necessary to protect industries whose continued healthy operation is in their own interest.

Surveys or studies of the impacts of foreign trade upon particular cities, counties, and other political subdivisions have been criticized by some on the ground that they do not present a picture of the full impact of foreign trade. These areas are hardly ever self-contained economic entities, and economic forces in other parts of the economy inevitably affect the local situation. Admittedly, it would be difficult to trace all of the indirect effects of foreign trade on a particular region's economy.

This is a survey of the initial impact of foreign trade on the Milwaukee metropolitan area. The word "initial" is emphasized because a study covering all the ramifications of the effects of foreign trade on Milwaukee would entail much more exhaustive and detailed analysis than time or available tools permit. Since no field work was possible in connection with this survey certain aspects of Milwaukee's foreign trade position have possibly been overlooked.

As a survey of the initial impact of foreign trade the main emphasis in this study has been on the manufacturing firms and their employees in the metropolitan area. The less direct effects of foreign trade on other sectors of the economy such as transportation, trade and services are less adaptable to a detailed analysis on a community basis.

Since Milwaukee is a manufacturing center the direct effects of foreign trade on agriculture are not of immediate concern. The manufacturing firms and their workers in the area produce goods that are exported, or that are competitive with imports. They also use the raw and semifinished materials that are imported.

The 145,000 workers employed in the 180 manufacturing firms that responded to the questionnaire represent about three-fourths of all manufacturing workers in Milwaukee. The manufacturing workers covered by this survey also account for one-third of all employees in the Milwaukee metropolitan area.

No attempt has been made to analyze the extent of the interests of the workers, as between exports and the displacement effects of imports, upon an individual company basis. To attempt to do this would lead to blind alleys and would involve a risk of logical error. The proportion of a company's output that is exported cannot be used to measure the export interest of that firm any more than can the displacement effects of highly competitive imports, in the final analysis, be measured by the number of workers affected in the first instance.

The logical presumption, throughout, is that segments of an economy that have no direct interest in foreign trade will be benefited by the achievement of the greatest good for the greatest number of those who are affected directly by changes in imports and exports. Thus, if the industries that are on an export basis were to suffer from a loss in exports, the effects would be felt in all parts of the economy of the area in question and in adjacent areas. Similarly, companies which are forced to contract their operations in whole or in part because of import competition would transmit that effect throughout the community and the adjacent economy.

If, then, the companies which are confronted with import competition employ more workers than those which would be benefited by increased exports, the presumption is that the economy of the entire area would suffer if competitive imports were to increase—at least insofar as immediate effects are concerned. Contrarily, if companies which export some of their products or which, in importing raw materials, employ more workers than do the companies protected by import barriers, the presumption is that the economy of the area would suffer if foreign trade were to contract.

To study the secondary, tertiary, and more indirect effects of increased foreign trade both with regard to exports and import competition would necessarily involve, ultimately, a study of the economy of the entire Nation. The parts of the national economy are all tied together, and a stress or strain anywhere is felt everywhere in greater or less degree. What would be gained by more completeness of logic would be lost in terms of closeup facts at the community level. Just as a stone thrown into a lake makes an initial splash with ripples extending to all shores, so would the economic fact of a substantial change in imports or exports reverberate throughout the economy. Those who emphasize the displacing effects of increased imports, or those who, on the contrary, stress the indirect expansive effects of increased exports, are sometimes prone to concentrate entirely upon the one set of effects at the expense of the other. In the lake analogy, just alluded to, it would be incorrect to concentrate on the ripples extending to only one shore of the lake. A complete picture would require that the ripples extending in all directions be studied. That is to say, the indirect effects of increased imports should not be studied unless, at the same time, similar attention is devoted to the positive and indirect effects of increased exports.

Yet, the fact that it is not feasible to analyze all of the indirect effects of changes in foreign trade is no reason why, at the community level, we should not know as much as possible, in concrete terms, about the immediate impacts of foreign trade. The size of the initial splash, to revert to the analogy, has much to do with the size and the extent of the ripples in both directions. If the initial impact is not great the chances are that the indirect effects will not be great either.

On the basis of the replies to the questions contained in the questionnaire it appears that about 3½ percent of the workers employed by manufacturing establishments answering the questionnaire in the Milwaukee area work for companies that are conscious of direct competition between the products which they produce and imports. (See table I.) Another 33 percent of the workers are employed by companies that are conscious of such competition, but which also export some of their own products to foreign countries. Here the interest is mixed and it would be incorrect to count the entire number of workers as either protected or as on the export side of the question.

TABLE I.—*Summary: Workers in manufacturing firms of Milwaukee classified according to reported interest in foreign trade, 1953*

Derived from replies to questionnaires, representing about three-fourths of all manufacturing workers in the Milwaukee area]

Type of interest	Number of firms	Number of workers represented in survey	
		Number	Percent of total
I. Faced with import competition	15	4,933	3.4
II. Mixed interest (interested in both exports and in import competition)	42	48,158	33.2
III. Export interest	54	76,630	52.8
IV. No expressed interest (no direct interest in export or in import competition)	69	15,435	10.6
Total	180	[1]145,566	100.0

[1] Accounts for about 75 percent of all manufacturing workers in the Milwaukee area.

TABLE II.—*Percentage distribution of workers in manufacturing establishments of Milwaukee, classified according to foreign trade interest of industry groups* [1]

[Derived from replies to questionnaires, representing about ¾ of all manufacturing workers in the Milwaukee area]

Industry group	Foreign trade interest				
	I Faced with import competition	II Mixed (interested in both exports and import competition)	III Export interest	IV No expressed interest	Total
Food products	0.8	25.9	62.6	7.2	100.0
Textile products	11.3	66.2	1.5	21.1	100.0
Wood and paper products	23.3	5.9	33.7	37.1	100.0
Chemical, petroleum, clay products, etc	34.0	17.0	41.4	7.6	100.0
Leather products	17.6	53.1	19.5	9.9	100.0
Metal products	3.1	19.2	31.0	46.7	100.0
Machinery	.1	33.7	63.5	2.7	100.0
Miscellaneous	4.7	55.0	39.8	.5	100.0
Total	3.4	33.2	52.8	10.6	100.0

[1] For actual number of workers see table "Summary of number of workers of replying firms on basis of exports and competitive imports" in section on "Results of the survey."

Almost 53 percent of the workers, however, are employed by manufacturing establishments that export some of their products to foreign countries and which are not concerned about competition from imports. About 10½ percent of the workers are employed by companies that express no interest in either exports or in import competition. This last-named group to which should be added mercantile workers, transportation workers, professional people, and others, would be affected to lesser or greater degree by increased exports or increased imports presumably only to the extent that such changes in foreign trade would make for greater, or less, prosperity in the economy of the city as a whole.

In table II these facts are broken down according to industry groups. The upper section of this chart shows the importance of these eight groups, in terms of number of workers. Largest of all is the machinery group, with over 89,000 workers employed. Next are the metal products and the food products groups, with about 16,000 workers in each.

The lower portion of the chart shows, in terms of percentage distribution, the proportion of workers in each industry group according to the interest of the firms in the group with regard to exports and with regard to import competition.

The greatest percentage of workers who are employed in firms likely to be affected by import competition are in the chemical, petroleum, clay, and glass products group. Next in importance are the wood and paper products, leather products and textile products groups. It should be noted, however, that these are the four groups that have the smallest number of workers, as is indicated in the upper portion of the chart.

The export interest is dominant, on the other hand, in the machinery group, which accounts for over 89,000 workers, the food products group and the metal products group, and the miscellaneous groups. Even in the wood and paper products, and the chemical products groups, however, the export interest is considerably greater than the import competitive interest. In the leather products group the export interest is only slightly greater than the competitive import interest.

From table II, it is clear that some industries have a high proportion of firms and workers which have a mixed interest as regards exports and competitive imports. As pointed out previously, there has been no attempt to measure the extent of interest in exports or imports on an individual firm basis. Companies and industries which encounter import competition are more inclined to raise questions of protection from unfair competition or cheap labor imports than are exporting firms inclined to stress the importance of markets abroad. On the other hand, the immense size and potentials

of the American market are such that internal market considerations often outweigh the attention which might be given to the possibility of export markets in the future resulting from a reduction in trade barriers.

The availability of dollars abroad, the maze of currency restrictions and other import barriers which American exporters face, the resurgence of competition in export markets, both in terms of well-made highly competitive goods and in terms of extensive credit facilities used by other exporting countries, are all mentioned in the replies to the questionnaire as of significance to Milwaukee manufacturers.

Finally, many firms in every industry in Milwaukee need and use goods produced abroad. Imports of hops and malt for the breweries, newsprint for the paper industry, special hides and leather for the leather goods industry, nickel and many other metals and alloys for the metal products industry, special lenses and instruments for the instruments industry, all link Milwaukee with the rest of the world. The facilities of its excellent deepwater harbor, the opportunities to be provided by the St. Lawrence Seaway, and its advantageous position in regards to routes of the major railroads, give Milwaukee a deepening interest in foreign trade.

METHOD AND LIMITATION

Method

Since Milwaukee's economy is devoted largely to manufacturing, the main emphasis of this study is on manufacturing firms in its metropolitan area. By consulting census data as to sizes of firms, types of industries, and total manufacturing employment a fair idea of the industrial make-up of Milwaukee was developed. With this industrial picture in mind a list of 250 firms was selected to be surveyed by correspondence.

A letter was sent to these 250 firms, explaining the purpose of the survey and asking their cooperation by answering the following questions:

1. What are the principal products produced by your company?
2. What was your annual output of these principal products in 1953? (in value and in units of quantity, if possible).
3. With which of your products do you regard imports as competitive? Which imports?
4. Which of your products do you sell for export abroad? (in value and in units of quantity, if possible).
5. Are any of the materials used by you imported from abroad? If you do not have this information will you please furnish us with a list of materials that go into your products?
6. What is your total average employment?
7. We shall appreciate any comment you may care to make regarding the significance of (a) exports and (b) imports to:

(i) Your own company.

(ii) The industry of which your company is a part.

(iii) The city of Milwaukee.

About three-fourths (180) of the firms replied. Responses to the letters differed as to the completeness of their answers. Some firms merely supplied short answers to the questions 1–6. Others commented at length on the importance of exports and imports to their own firms, to their industry and to the city of Milwaukee.

For the purpose of analyzing the impact of foreign trade on the present or potential markets of the products of Milwaukee's manufacturers the 180 replies were classed into the following broad categories:

1. Firms which stated that imports are competitive with their products and which do not export.
2. Firms with a mixed interest which stated that imports are competitive with their products and which also export.
3. Firms which export and which are not concerned with import competition.
4. Firms which stated that they do not export and do not consider imports to be competitive with their products.

By totaling the number of workers of the firms in each of the four categories a quantitative measure of the importance of each category was established. Also analyzed were the commodities produced abroad on which Milwaukee manufacturers are dependent.

Other sources have also been utilized to throw light on the position of Milwaukee with respect to foreign trade, especially businesses and workers in transportation and in the trade and service industries. Census data, as previously mentioned, directories, State and private publications, magazine articles, and general reference works were all used.

Limitations

Economic forces in operation throughout the entire country have an impact on the economy of Milwaukee. This is especially true in the case of this city since it is a center of capital equipment industries, often designated as "feast or famine" lines of activity. It is probable that some producers in Milwaukee are affected by import competition indirectly through the customers which they supply in other parts of the country. Likewise, in some instances, Milwaukee manufacturers sell their products to other industries which have a substantial export interest not apparent to the supplying firms in Milwaukee. These relationships often are not apparent, although several such situations were indicated in the replies. When such information is not available, it is impossible to note, much less to trace, these secondary and tertiary effects of foreign trade on the region.

The effects of competitive imports, exports, or dependence on imports is less clear on such industries as transportation, trade, and services than on manufacturing industries. To the extent that the reverberations from the initial impact of foreign trade are not traceable the scope of this survey and the conclusions which might otherwise be drawn are limited.

Another limitation inherent in this study and closely related to the one above is the lack of field work. There was no opportunity for first-hand interviews with the people in industry and labor in Milwaukee. Census tables are an inadequate substitute for personal inspection of the economic character of a city or community. Neither is correspondence altogether satisfactory as a means of collecting information. Fortunately, a substantial number of firms replied to the questionnaire, and many of the replies were fully expository as to the importance of foreign trade to the area.

The interest of a number of manufacturing firms and industries with respect to foreign trade is divided. On the one hand, they export a substantial proportion of their products; on the other hand, part of their production is apparently faced with keen import competition. This appears to be true of some firms manufacturing heavy electrical equipment which is said to be facing stiff competition from Britain, and to a lesser extent from Germany and Italy. Without more facts than are presently available it is not possible to measure the balance of interest in these cases. Indeed, for the country as a whole, it would appear that many of these industries and firms have themselves not arrived at a complete answer as to the effects of foreign trade on their operations.

Finally, it must be added that the extent and direction of adjustments in domestic industries and firms is not foreseeable if exports were to be sharply curtailed or if imports were to be allowed to compete freely with domestic production.

To conclude that a particular community has, in fact, an export interest on the basis of the number of workers in exporting firms, and, therefore, an interest in lower trade barriers and higher levels of trade does not take into account the adjustments that might be necessary if imports were to be allowed to compete more freely by reducing import barriers. Or to say that a region faced with import competition of a damaging magnitude has an interest in higher import barriers and a protected domestic market merely on the basis of the number of firms and employees clearly threatened by import competition, again, does not take into account the adjustments to the economy that would be necessitated by a curtailment of exports.

Too many other economic forces are at work in a dynamic economy to allow characterization of a community as proof positive of the benefits of freer trade or as an infallible example of the advantages of protection. The purpose of surveys such as this is to place in more local and, it is hoped, more understandable, terms the problems that the United States faces in finding and following a foreign trade policy in the national interest.

THE ECONOMY OF MILWAUKEE

Milwaukee is the largest metropolitan area in Wisconsin. It is located 85 miles north of Chicago, Ill., on the southwestern shore of Lake Michigan and has a population of approximately 900,000. The metropolitan area embraces the whole of Milwaukee County.[1] Besides the city of Milwaukee, which accounts for 73 percent of the area's population, such cities as Cudahy, South Milwaukee, West Allis, Wauwatosa, and others are also included in the metropolitan area.

In terms of population Milwaukee is the 16th ranking metropolitan area. In recent years it has ranked eighth or ninth among metropolitan areas in terms of "value added by manufacture."

The Milwaukee metropolitan area has a labor force of over 380,000 workers.[2] According to the 1950 Census of Population the labor force is engaged in the following types of employment.

TABLE III.—*Labor force employed in the Milwaukee metropolitan area, 1950*

Industry	Number employed	Percent of total
Agriculture, mining, and forest and fisheries	2,604	(1)
Construction	18,966	5
Manufacturing	160,545	43
Transportation, trade, and services	192,640	51
Total	374,755	100

[1] Less than 1 percent.

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census. United States Census of population: 1950 vol, II, Characteristics of the population, pt. 49, Wisconsin. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1952: 61.

Agriculture, forest and fisheries, and mining

Employment and economic activity in agriculture, forest and fisheries, and mining

[1] Reference to Milwaukee in this study is to the Milwaukee metropolitan area and not to the city of Milwaukee alone.

[2] U. S. Bureau of the Census. United States Census of Population: 1950. Vol. II, Characteristics of the Population, pt. 49, Wisconsin. According to the 1950 Census of Population, Milwaukee County in 1950 had a population of 871,047, a labor force of 374,755, and 160,545 workers engaged in manufacturing. The May 10 issue of the Sales Management, a survey of buying power, estimates that the 1953 population of Milwaukee County was 908,000 with 199,800 workers in manufacturing industries. The Bureau of Labor Statistics also estimates the manufacturing employment at about 200,000.

are very limited in the Milwaukee metropolitan area. Of the 2,600 workers employed in these 3 industries in 1950, approximately 2,200 were engaged in agricultural pursuits. For Milwaukee County the value of all crops sold was $6.5 million in 1949 (the latest agricultural census). Horticultural specialists, $3.1 million, and dairy products, $1.1 million, together, accounted for two-thirds of the total value of farm products sold in Milwaukee County.[3] Within the metropolitan area itself farming is very limited, although Milwaukee, as a commercial center, services the products of the rich farmland to the west. The initial impact of foreign trade on Milwaukee is of little direct consequence to agriculture in the region. The same can be said for the mining and for the forest and fisheries industries.

Transportation

Approximately 17,500 workers were engaged in the transportation industry of Milwaukee in 1950. The city's transportation facilities are good and include 3 major railroads, 11 airlines, numerous trucking firms, convenient warehousing terminals, and modern port facilities serving an excellent deepwater port.

The three major railroads that serve the Milwaukee metropolitan area are the Chicago & North Western Railway System, the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co., and the Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Sainte Marie Railroad Co. Milwaukee's proximity to Chicago, the Nation's railroad hub, puts the area within reach of most major rail lines, and Milwaukee's freight rates to the east are the same as Chicago's. This freight rate advantage is due, at least in part, to the efficient car ferry services which cross Lake Michigan between Milwaukee and the Michigan cities of Muskegon and Ludington. The car ferry lines are operated by the Grand Trunk Western Railway and the Chesapeake & Ohio, which give Milwaukee direct rail connections to the east across Lake Michigan.

The trucking firms which serve the Milwaukee metropolitan area include: Advance Express, Cushman Motor Delivery, Hancock Trucklines, Interstate Dispatching, Interstate Motor Freight, Trans-American Freight, Ziffrin System, and Olsen Service. These companies and others in the area are used extensively to handle the freight which moves over the docks of the port, especially fuels and building materials. Trucking firms also provide a more than auxiliary transportation service connecting Milwaukee with other commercial and industrial centers in the Midwest.

With a new terminal to be completed in the fall of 1954, it is said that the modern facilities at General Mitchell Field in Milwaukee will match most of the airfields in the country. The field is operated by the county. Milwaukee is also fortunate in having an airport conveniently located near its business district. The terminal facilities at the Maitland airfield include accommodations for seaplanes, amphibian, and land-type aircraft. With a growing emphasis on air cargo and air travel, Milwaukee is at present well served by such airlines as: American, Capital, Flying Tiger Air Freight, Northwest, United, Emory Air Freight, Acme Air Cargo, Wisconsin Central, Anderson Air Activities, and Braniff.

The port of Milwaukee

Milwaukee's port, one of the leading Great Lakes ports, handles a large volume of bulk traffic, mainly coal. In recent years, petroleum products have been increasing in importance as a bulk commodity in the port's commerce. Included in an annual average of 8 million tons, in addition to bulk traffic, is the car-ferry traffic and foreign commerce. Package freight on the Great Lakes has been considerably reduced since the beginning of World War II.

The port itself consists of an outer basin or harbor of refuge, and the inner commercial harbor located in the three rivers, the Milwaukee, the Menominee, and Kinnickinnic, and a system of artificial slips and canals which flow through the city. It is said that the port of Milwaukee is commercial rather than industrial in character.[4] It remains to be seen whether, in conjunction with the planned development of the port and the growing industrialization of the region, the port will acquire a more industrial flavor. The position of the port of Milwaukee in foreign trade is discussed below.[5]

Commercial and financial services

Milwaukee is also an important commercial and financial center. Although its nearness to Chicago probably has discouraged development to some extent, Milwaukee's commerce has grown with the increased tempo of its manufacturing industries. It is estimated that the Milwaukee metropolitan area has an effective annual buying income of $1.9 billion. Retail sales are estimated to have reached $1.2 billion in 1953, while wholesale sales amounted to an estimated $769 million.[6] Milwaukee's 30 banks and 12 branch banks have resources of $1.3 billion. At least five of Milwaukee's banks have foreign-trade departments. With the advantages of its excellent transportation connections to the east and the vast marketing area to the west as far as the Rocky Mountains, Milwaukee probably will continue to grow in commercial importance.

Manufacturing

Milwaukee's manufacturing industry is highly diversified. Among its products are turbines, trucks, farm machinery, automobile bodies, bulldozers, and many other kinds of earth-moving machinery, motorcycles, gasoline and diesel engines, outboard motors, beer, leather and leather products, iron pipe and high-pressure steel pipe, and many types of special machines such as food-product machinery and baling presses. The following table shows employment and value added by manufacture for 1947 and 1953 (estimated):

TABLE IV.—*Manufacturing establishments, manufacturing employment, and value added by manufacture for the Milwaukee metropolitan area, 1947 and 1953 (estimated)*

Industry group	Establishments, 1947 [1]	All employees		Value added by manufacture	
		1947 [1]	1953 [2]	1947 [1]	1953 [2]
				Thousands of dollars	*Thousands of dollars*
Food and kindred products	248	19,532	19,800	176,240	255,000
Tobacco manufactures	15	153	100	(3)	(3)
Textile mill products	31	4,368	4,600	20,033	21,000
Apparel and related products	90	5,324	3,200	21,882	15,000
Lumber and products	52	1,188	1,800	5,467	11,000
Furniture and fixtures	47	1,216	1,200	5,632	8,000
Paper and allied products	34	3,455	4,000	22,235	33,000
Printing and publishing	247	9,051	9,200	48,727	62,000
Chemicals and allied products	119	2,909	3,100	21,111	32,000
Petroleum and coal products	8	703	800	5,387	7,000
Rubber products	9	210	(3)	(3)	(3)
Leather and leather products	76	8,962	8,600	47,065	50,000
Stone, clay, and glass products	79	1,368	1,300	7,137	10,000
Primary metal industries	81	13,755	15,300	73,211	122,000
Fabricated metal industries	217	12,957	14,500	74,407	120,000
Machinery (except electrical)	390	53,690	54,900	262,546	422,000
Electrical machinery	65	20,679	26,600	123,018	200,000
Transportation equipment	32	14,775	19,000	65,395	127,000
Instruments and related products	20	992	1,200	4,897	10,000
Miscellaneous manufactures	103	1,915	(3)	7,525	(3)
Total	1,963	177,202	199,800	973,335	1,502,000

[1] Census of Manufactures: 1947, Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, vol. III, Statistics by States, table 5, pp. 648, 649.
[2] Sales Management (New York), May 10, 1954, pp. 58-78.
[3] Not available.

A study of the table shows that the six major industry groups—machinery, except electrical; food and kindred products; electrical machinery; transportation equipment; fabricated metal and primary metals—account for over three-fourths of the value added by manufacture as well as three-fourths of total manufacturing employment. Other important manufacturing industries are leather and leather products, printing and publishing, and paper and allied products industries.

According to the 1950 census, approximately 43 percent of the labor force in the Milwaukee metropolitan area is engaged in manufacturing and over two-thirds of the manufacturing employment is in the durable-goods field.

Milwaukee, as a manufacturing center, has a high degree of skilled labor. It has excellent supplier-consumer relationships in the primary to fabricated metal to finished machinery and equipment industries. Indicative of its skilled workmen are the successes of Milwaukee's inventors; Milwaukee can claim such early "firsts" in machines as the first practical typewriter, the outboard motor, a recording meter, and a pig-iron casting machine. These and many other inventions and innovations mark the substantial contributions that have been made to the advancement of business and industry by the industrial skills of Milwaukeeans.

RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

The letters that were sent to 250 firms elicited 180 responses. These 180 firms employ over 145,000 workers, or almost three-fourths of all manufacturing employment in the metropolitan area.

Every major type of manufacturing enterprise in Milwaukee is represented in the replies that have been received. Practically every shade of opinion has been expressed regarding the importance of foreign trade to the Milwaukee manufacturing community.

[3] U. S. Bureau of the Census. United States Census of Agriculture: 1950. Vol. I, Counties and State Economic Areas, pt. 7, Wisconsin. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1952: 40–111.

[4] Hamming, Edward. The Port of Milwaukee. Chicago, the University of Chicago, Department of Geography, December 1952: 61.

[5] See p. 63 of this report.

[6] Survey of buying power. Sales Management, the magazine of marketing. (New York) May 10, 1954: 120 and 752.

Opinions are to be found among the replies ranging from extreme indifference to well thought-out statements of company or industry position on foreign trade and foreign trade policy.

Exports and competitive imports

The following analysis is concerned with the effects of foreign trade on manufacturers of the Milwaukee area with respect to markets and sales. The extent to which the manufacturers of Milwaukee are dependent upon imports of raw and semifinished materials will be discussed below.[1]

It is clear that a number of the firms in the area are faced with import competition. In other cases a division of interests exists in that the firms which export also produce commodities with which imports are competitive. On the other hand, many firms which export do not find imports to be competitive at all. Finally, many firms do not export and do not produce commodities which compete with imports.

The replies are broken down into the following categories:

I. Firms which are confronted with import competition and which do no exporting.

II. Firms with a mixed interest, in that they export and are also confronted with import competition.

III. Firms which export and which are not concerned with import competition.

IV. Firms which reply that they have no interest in exports and that they are not concerned with import competition.

The replies have been tabulated on the basis of the information contained in the replies. If a firm states in its reply that imports are competitive and that it has no exports it is placed, automatically, in category I. If the reply states that the company exports and produces commodities competitive with imports it is placed in category II, etc. No attempt has been made to go beyond the reply in order to force a company into any category.

In summarizing the replies under the categories above in quantitative terms, the number of employees is used since the number of employees is the only common denominator in the replies. The following table shows the results of the analysis of the replies on the basis of the above categories by number of workers.

TABLE V.—*Summary of number of workers of replying firms on basis of exports and competitive imports*

Industry groups	Number of workers in firms with—				Total
	Import competitive interest (I)	Mixed interest (II)	Export interest (III)	No expressed interest (IV)	
Food and kindred products	125	4,855	10,300	1,180	16,460
Textile mill products, and apparel and related products	770	4,530	100	1,443	6,843
Lumber and wood products, paper and allied products	1,100	278	1,590	1,747	4,715
Chemical and allied products, petroleum and coal products, and stone, clay, and glass products	801	400	975	180	2,356
Leather and leather products	1,487	4,490	1,650	835	8,462
Primary metal and fabricated metal industries	510	3,150	5,100	7,666	16,426
Machinery, including electrical and transportation equipment	100	29,985	56,575	2,380	89,040
Miscellaneous	40	470	340	4	854
Total	4,933	48,158	76,630	15,435	145,156
Number of firms replying	15	42	54	69	180

Summary of the replies

Fifteen of the manufacturing establishments responding to the questionnaire state that imports are competitive with their products and that they have no export sales. These firms (designated category I) employ about 5,000 workers. There are 42 firms employing over 48,000 workers in category II, those which find imports competitive and which also export. In category III—companies with some interest in exports—there are 54 firms employing 76,600 persons. There are 69 firms which indicate in their replies that they neither export nor produce commodities which are competitive with imports. These firms (category IV) employ slightly more than 15,000 workers.

On an industry basis the replies give a closer picture of the impact of exports and competitive imports on Milwaukee manufacturers. The replies are classed in broad manufacturing industry groups since many Milwaukee manufacturers are fully integrated companies producing a variety of products.

Food and kindred products: Along with its beer, Milwaukee, once an important milling center, still has several millers and grain products manufacturers. Being in what the citizens of Wisconsin term, "the dairyland of America," dairy products are also an important item in the manufacture of food and kindred products in Milwaukee.

Replies were received from 17 firms (16,500 employees) in the food and kindred products industry in Milwaukee. Among the commodities produced by these companies are: beer, canned vegetables, meat products, malt, corn products, yeast and similar products, chocolate and cocoa products, candies, cookies, fountain topping, and chocolate dairy powders, dairy products, and nutritional supplements.

I. Import competitive interest: Only one firm in the food and kindred industry fell into the category of not exporting, but experiencing import competition. This firm producing chocolate and cocoa products states that cocoa powders in bulk are being imported from Holland, England, France, and Italy. The firm expresses its position in the following way:

"Cocoa powders from these various countries are not particularly troublesome in the city of Milwaukee, as much as they are in other parts of the country to which we ship. Even in Milwaukee, however, cocoa powder from Holland is being delivered at prices far below our cost. * * *

"These imports of foreign cocoa powders have cut deeply into the cocoa powder business of the entire American chocolate manufacturing group. Since the manufacture of cocoa powders also yields cocoa butter which is vital in the manufacture of chocolate products themselves disturbance to the United States chocolate manufacturers goes far deeper than any loss in cocoa powders business itself."

II. Mixed interest: Eight manufacturers of food and kindred products indicate in their replies that they find imports competitive and also export their products. Two malt manufacturers which consider imported malt to be competitive also export. One malt producer exports only 1 percent of total production, the other 8 percent.

A manufacturer of crackers, cookies, packaged candies, etc., evidently has very little export sales, with the exception of military sales abroad; the firm replies:

"Imports of European candies in boxes, bags, and also bars at lower prices than we can possibly manufacture for are now on the upgrade and commonly seen in the United States markets. This could seriously affect not only our sales picture but the sales of the entire candy industry in the near future."

A dairy which produces bottled milk, ice cream, evaporated milk, and powdered milk, considers powdered milk from Holland to be competitive. However, it also exports sweetened powdered milk in small quantities.

A producer of corn grits, corn meal, corn flakes (brewers and confectioners), core binder, processed flours, hominy feed, and corn oil considers various grains used for feeding to be competitive with hominy feed. Otherwise, this firm exports corn grits, meal, flakes, and core binder. The amount of exports is not known.

Two major meat and meat-products producers in Milwaukee consider canned hams as generally competitive. Both export lard, and one also exports dry salted pork, dry sausage, and smoked meats. One firm states that it "attaches no special significance to either imports or exports to (its) operations in Milwaukee."

A small firm producing food seed products for feeding cage and outdoor birds, and lawn-seed and grass-seed mixture, exports its bird products on a limited scale. This firm considers imports of both bird products and lawn seed to be competitive. It is, however, dependent on importations of niger, canary, poppy, sesame, poa trivilis, and fescues seed.

III. Export interest: Among the food and kindred product producers which export are three breweries. Although exports of beer do not appear to be very important to these firms, one beer company exported 5 percent of its production in 1953. It would appear on the basis of the replies that imports of beer are not considered to be of much concern, competitively speaking. A small firm manufacturing nutritional supplements exported 3 percent of its production to Canada in 1953 and has no competition from exports.

The above firms employ 10,300 workers.

IV. No expressed interest: There are 4 firms manufacturing food and related products employing about 1,200 workers which state that they are not affected by import competition or availability of export markets. Among the products of these firms were canned vegetables, meat products, and yeast and similar products.

Textile mill and apparel and related products: Replies were received from 11 firms employing approximately 6,800 workers in the textile and apparel industries.

I. Import competitive interest: In the manufacture of apparel and related products two manufacturers having no export sales express concern about import competition. The first manufactures women's fabric gloves, made from nylon, cotton, and rayon materials, and men's and ladies' leather dress gloves. In answer to the question concerning import competition the company replies that:

"All of our products are in direct competition with imports. Our industry does not require a large investment in buildings, land, and machinery, but a substantial investment in the training costs of help. Because

[1] See p. 58 of this report.

it is in the needle trades and does not require a large initial capital investment, it encourages many people as individuals to enter into the industry. Labor is a high percentage of the total cost, and because of the fact that there are such wide differentials in labor costs in foreign countries, we find that they are able to manufacture at substantially lower costs, even in spite of the nominal duty rates that exist at the present time."

With regard to the significance of foreign trade the company comments as follows:

"Exports are of no significance to our company or our industry, as long as we have to compete in those foreign markets with sources of supply that are paying labor rates of from $1 a week to 25 cents an hour. The city of Milwaukee obviously is interested in exports because many of the industries here are manufacturers of heavy goods and are interested in expanding their world markets. They are producing goods in an industry that requires a high capital outlay but one that does not have the competition on a worldwide basis that an industry such as ours has. Imports are highly significant to our company in our industry because they seriously compete with the products that we are making and jeopardize the possibility of our continuing to produce these items in this country. From that standpoint, it can well affect the economy of our city since the largest share of our employees are women, which helps to stabilize the labor force."

A very small amount of women's nylon dress gloves is exported by this firm, although the exports are insignificant in terms of total company operations.

The second firm, a manufacturer of millinery, although not affected directly, lists the following competitive imports: Wool felt (hat) bodies, fur felt and velour bodies (produced in Connecticut and Massachusetts), imported from Italy and France and at one time Czechoslovakia and Austria. The reply states further that, "Occasionally there are imported ready-to-wear felt and straw berets of various kinds, principally from Italy."

In commenting on the significance of foreign trade the company states:

"Being in a style business exportation of our product is not very practical. Because of the Canadian import duties it is not practical to ship millinery products into Canada as Canadian factories can undersell us. * * *

"We are largely dependent for raw materials, principally straw braids and bodies, on imported goods because the domestic manufacturers of these items have not developed, and even during the war, when domestic braid manufacturers tried to supplement the limited imports, they were not very successful. However, there are a few domestic manufacturers still producing yarn and belastraw braids for the industry. The millinery industry has declined in volume during the last 25 to 30 years because of increasing hat-less-ness, in spite of the increase in population, so that the industry is largely made up of many small factories. As for the city of Milwaukee there are at present only two factories doing a small percentage of the total volume."

This particular firm is dependent on imports of straw braids and bodies and other accessories. The competition from imports is only one of many factors affecting their total sales picture.

II. Mixed interest: Two hosiery companies manufacturing both men's and women's hosiery export both and consider imports of both men's and women's hosiery to be competitive. The replies indicate, however, that neither exports nor competitive imports are very significant in the Milwaukee metropolitan area.

III. Export interest: Only one small firm which has no import competition expressed any interest in exports. This firm manufactures cotton felt for automotive seat pads and women's sportswear. The reply states that seat pads are sent abroad directly by automotive companies, and the company has no idea how many are exported.

IV. No expressed interest: Among the manufacturers of apparel and related products there were six replies from firms indicating no interest in foreign trade. These firms employ about 1,400 workers and manufacture such things as cloth caps, infant underwear; junior dresses, suits, and sportswear; and hospital and institutional apparel. A manufacturer of truck and tractor seating is included in this group also.

Lumber and wood products and paper and allied products: These industry groups employ approximately 7,000 workers in the Milwaukee area with the paper and allied products industry apparently being the most important activity of the 3. Fifteen firms with about 4,700 workers replied to the questionnaire.

I. Import competitive interest: Two firms employing 1,100 workers find imports competitive and have no export markets. A producer of paperboard, corrugated, and solid fibre containers and folding cartons states that paperboard is the principal item produced by the firm which is competitive with imports.

"Exports are not important to our own company due to our location in the Middle West. We believe that this is generally true of most companies in our industry similarly located.

"Imports are an important factor as all grades of paperboard are manufactured in foreign countries with labor rates and similar costs substantially below those prevailing in the industry in this country. From this standpoint, the subject of imports is important to us."

No breakdown is available as to the importance of paperboard in the total production of the company, but the firm considers import competition to be an upsetting factor in the domestic marketing of their paperboard production.

A manufacturer of seasonal toys, sporting goods, advertising displays all manufactured from molded pulp considers the imports of papier mache toys from Europe, particularly Western Germany, and from Japan to be competitive.

II. Mixed interest: Two firms (280 employees) which have a small export interest consider imports to be competitive. A manufacturer of lace paper, paper cups, napkins, etc., considers imports to be competitive with about 10 percent of its production. The company exports less than 1 percent and considers exports to be unimportant to its operations. A second firm indicates that some of the local industries for whom they are a source of supply for paper requirements have been affected by competitive imports and states that, "Sales have been depressed to these accounts * * * (notably Harley Davidson)." The firm is concerned with exports because it furnishes some packing materials for the firms which export.

III. Export interest: The export interest of firms in the wood and paper products industry is expressed in the replies of two firms employing 1,600 workers. One is a producer of packaging materials, including cellophane, pliofilm, polyethylene, glassine, wax laminated glassine, foil acetate paper, various foil laminations, folding cartons, letterpress printing and lithography. Also produced by the firm are silk screen process printing, and fabricating bags, pouches, and tubes. This firm states that all of its products are available for export, but cites no figure of the amount of its production exported. The reply stated that, "Beginning with the year 1954 our plans are to take a more active interest in export sales. * * *"

A firm producing export boxing and crating, also manufactures food freezers and air conditioners. It states that its exports consist of "packaging and boxing of goods for export—freezers and air conditioners just beginning to enter the foreign market." This firm also states that:

"The significance of export trade to our company is quite apparent in view of the fact that boxing and processing of shipments for export constitutes the major part of our industry and without this we would almost be out of existence. This applies to our boxing and packaging industry as a whole as manufacturers could very well handle their domestic boxing and crating without the service which we offer. The exports are of extreme significance to the city of Milwaukee as it employs quite a number of people and fills in the low spots in production. It is significant that export business is usually greater when we have a slowing up of our normal business."

IV. No expressed interest: Replies from nine firms employing about 1,750 workers producing wood products and allied paper products indicated they had no import competition and no export sales. The products of this group of firms include: lace paper products; business supplies; stationery; posters, labels, displays, etc.; corrugated shipping containers; and paper boxes and cartons. Also included in this group is a manufacturer of television, phonograph, loud speaker and similar types of cloth-covered and painted plywood cabinets.

Chemicals and related products, petroleum and coal products, and stone, clay, and glass products: These three industry groups are considered together because some of the firms produce several products that are classed in all three industry groups. Replies were received from 9 firms employing about 2,200 workers in these 3 industry groups.

I. Import competitive interest: Two firms employing 800 workers state in their replies that imports are competitive with their products. Neither firm exports. One company producing paint, mirrors, and church windows mentions that stained glass and plate glass are competitive. However, this firm imports mosaic, stained glass, and plate glass, and it is not possible to ascertain just how troublesome imports are.

A manufacturer of coke, gas, tar, ammoniacal liquor and light oil products states that the products that they produce and which are affected by imports are principally tar and light oil. The company exported a very small amount of coke and ammonia in 1953 and apparently considered these sales to be insignificant. The company feels that:

"Our own company is adversely affected by the low-price imports of creosote, naphthalene, and benzol. The United States coal chemical industry is also affected adversely by low-priced imports. Since benzol, toluol, and xylol are strategic materials, the importation of these products affecting their production in any way can prove detrimental to our war efforts. Also, unemployment in the city of Milwaukee is increased when the plant is not operating at capacity."

II. Mixed interest: A firm manufacturing flat glass products, paint, varnish, and lacquer products, soda ash, caustic soda, and chlorine considers flat glass products from Europe to be highly competitive with flat glass products produced in this country. This company also exports flat glass specialties, paints, varnishes, and lacquer products, soda ash, and caustic soda. Figures are not available for the Milwaukee operations separately, but on a national basis the company exports 3 percent of its production. It states that:

"We do little, if any, exporting of products made in the city of Milwaukee because of its distance from the coast. The market for our products in Milwaukee is little affected by imports for the same reason."

III. Export interest: Four firms employing about 800 workers, mostly in the chemical

and allied products industry, export their products and do not find imports to be competitive. A small firm producing pharmaceutical specialties exports 24 percent of its production and seems concerned about its competitive position in export markets in regards to credit facilities available to exporters in other countries. A manufacturer of private label cosmetics states that some of its production of cosmetics for national distributors finds its way into export markets, but the firm has no way of knowing how much. Two small firms produce leather finishes and industrial finishes, including wax emulsions for the shoe industry, and leather dyes, oils, and soaps. One firm exports 1 percent of its production, the other 10 percent. On the significance of foreign trade, one of these firms states that:

"Improvement in both importing and exporting raw material could be obtained with a better port of Milwaukee facilitated by the St. Lawrence Waterway, which would enable larger ships and more frequent sailings."

IV. No expressed interest: Two firms, one a chemical company producing detergents, the other a manufacturer of storage batteries and paints and varnishes, state that they do not export and do not consider imports to be competitive with their products. These firms together employ 180 workers.

Leather and leather products: Milwaukee has long been an important producer of leather and leather products. This industry is still an important part of Milwaukee's manufacturing picture. Replies were received from 20 firms with 8,460 employees in the leather and leather products industry.

I. Import competitive interest: Three manufacturers of leather and leather products which do no exporting feel that imports are competitive with their products. A lambskin tanner and dyer states that, "Imports are a distinct threat despite present inadequate tariff; tariff reduction or elimination would invite disastrous consequences.

A manufacturer of men's dress shoes, growing girls' shoes, misses' and children's shoes feels that "Men's shoe imports are unfair competition at present." Men's shoe production accounts for well over half of this firm's production.

The firm comments that:

"Imports of men's shoes from England sometimes sold in two Milwaukee department stores are priced below what they can be produced for here and are therefore unfair competition. Tannery and shoe factory labor in England is much below us."

Another firm producing men's shoes mentions that British men's shoes are competitive, but adds that "imports of footwear to this area are negligible."

II. Mixed interest: In the leather and leather goods industry in Milwaukee firms employing about 4,500 workers find some imports competitive and also export to some degree. A company which tans shearlings exports 6 percent of its production and considers imports of mouton competitive. A company manufacturing leather principally for use in shoes and gloves feels that imports are not very competitive, except on rare occasion in certain types of lining and strap leather. Exports of shoe splits amount to 1 to 2 percent of production annually. This company comments on the significance of foreign trade to the leather industry as follows:

"Exports are a very small end of our business, and imports as a general rule do not interfere directly with our business. As far as the leather industry [is concerned], the exporting of hides, during the last 2 or 3 years, because of the high world market, has had a tendency to firm our domestic hide market, which in reality has had an effect on leather prices. In this writer's knowledge, it is the first time that we have ever become an exporting nation, as far as hides [are concerned]. Normally we usually import more than we export."

Another leather manufacturer (calf and kip leather) exports less than 2 percent of its production and feels that "exports are not vital to either our company or our industry." As to import competition, the firm states in the reply:

"Importation of finished leathers is a grave threat to the industry, as our rates of pay are four times or more what our foreign competitors pay. During the period 1920 to 1930 when calf leather was on the free list we lost progressively up to 40 percent of the domestic market to sweatshop foreign produced leathers. I might add that the calf industry is far more vulnerable to cheap labor foreign competition because of the light weight and high value of our product. Heavier leathers of course benefit by higher relative transportation and distribution costs."

About the same comments were given by a leather manufacturer of cattle hide shoe upper leather which exports about 1 percent of its production and considers imports of cattle hide shoe upper leather from Europe and South America to be a particular threat in view of the subsidies on the part of exporting nations and low labor costs abroad.

Two shoe manufacturers, one making men's dress and work shoes, one making men's work and dress shoes and children's shoes, consider men's dress shoes to be competitive. One firm states that imports of medium high priced men's shoes directly compete with its potential marketing field. Both firms export, but the amount of exports is not significant.

Another firm making children's and growing girls' shoes maintains imports of both are competitive. Both types of shoes are exported. The amount exported or the degree of import competition is not known. A small firm making general footwear exports 2 percent of its production and considers all slipper items to be competitive with imports.

III. Export interest: One manufacturer of men's fine shoes exports 1 to 2 percent of total production and does not find imports to be competitive.

IV. No expressed interest: Nine firms manufacturing leather and leather goods which express no fear of import competition and no interest in exports employ about 850 workers. These firms manufacture tanned split leather; sideleather for the shoe and the leather goods industries; work gloves and work shoes; children's shoes; racing harness and accessories; industrial leather goods; hand luggage and sample cases.

Primary and fabricated metals industries: As mentioned previously, Milwaukee has an excellent supplier-feeder system in its metal industries. Replies were received from 38 firms in the primary and fabricated metals industries. These firms employ almost 16,500 workers.

I. Import competitive interest: In the primary and fabricated metals industry, three manufacturers feel that imports are competitive. A foundry supplies firm feels that no imports are competitive, except those which may harm our customers. In this connection the firm mentioned that imports are harmful to producers of motorcycles.

A firm producing hardware specialities, metal stamped specialities and carpet sweepers listed the following competitive imports: brass and aluminum continuous hinges, hinge butts, ball bearings and wheel parts for velocipedes and baby carriages.

A manufacturer of brass plumbing goods states that imports are competitive to all brass plumbing goods. As to the significance of imports the firm comments as follows:

"As far as our own company is concerned, we experience some competition from Italy and Japan because of the importation of some items of brass plumbing goods. In general, the quality of the product imported was considerably under that of the American product, but on the other hand the price was very low.

"As far as the city of Milwaukee is concerned, being away from either coast there is less likelihood of some of the imported goods being shipped to the Midwest than there is on either seaboard. However, what affects the rest of the country, also affects Milwaukee."

II. Mixed interest: Seven firms in the general field of primary and fabricated metals employ approximately 3,150 workers and furnish their products to both exporting firms and import competitive firms. Four of these firms have no competitive imports nor do they export their products. All appear to be aware of the secondary effects of foreign trade.

A company producing malleable iron castings states:

"Our products are largely used on farm machinery, railroad, automotive, earth moving equipment, electrical equipment, etc. most of which are heavy capital goods. Anything that curtails the exportation and encourages the importation of such products concerns our business. At the present time one of our customers, a manufacturer of motorcycles, had their market for their product considerably curtailed by the importation of motorcycles to this country, and the loss of their export market. This has materially reduced the tonnage of castings that we used to make for them, and has decreased employment in the city of Milwaukee for this company."

Another company, also manufacturing malleable and gray iron castings, as well as railroad car handbrakes and other railroad car specialties states:

"The question of foreign trade and imports are tremendously important to us for our products are components which are incorporated into end products such as farm equipment, railroad equipment, road-building machinery, hardware specialities, miscellaneous machinery, automobile, trucks, etc. For that reason if our customers within this country are discriminated against whether in the possibility of their exporting their manufacture or protection against imports manufactured in countries where lower wages and lower standards of living prevail the level of our business and the possibility of our employing local labor will be affected.

A company making steel forgings reports that:

"About 60 percent of our output goes into farm equipment, principally 4-wheeled tractors. Some of these tractors are exported, but we do not have any information as to which of our products are included in these exports. * * * We also furnish forgings to the machine-tool industry. These people have direct competition from imports."

A manufacturer which does contract metal stampings and produces builders hardware, metal shower stalls, and metal toilet partitions regards imports as competitive with all of its products. This firm also exports metal toilet partitions, builders hardware, and metal shower stalls in small quantities. The actual dollar amounts are not available.

III. Export interest: Two firms which employ 5,100 workers export both primary and fabricated metal products. One large firm producing made-to-order forgings and high-pressure steel pipe fittings apparently considers exports to be important to the operation. This firm mentions meeting increased competition in the export markets of Cuba, Mexico, and Canada, which are importing these products from the United Kingdom, and more recently, from Germany.

A firm producing bronze castings, forgings, weldrods, wire pipe and condenser tubes, ingots, sheets and plates, fabrications and other bronze products now exports 2 percent of its total production. However, the firm

comments on the significance of foreign trade as follows:

"We consider exports as well as imports to be of considerable significance to both our company and the city of Milwaukee. Our export business, while not large at the present time, is increasing yearly and we have coverage throughout Europe, Mexico, and South America. Imports of special metals, such as tin, are of course, quite vital to the foundry and metal industries and are naturally of very deep concern to us. As you know, the city of Milwaukee is one of the most important inland seaports and if the St. Lawrence Waterway project is ever completed, Milwaukee will be even more important and both imports and exports will be of vastly greater value to the city."

IV. No expressed interest: Twenty-six firms state that they do not export, nor do they consider imports to be competitive with their products. These 26 firms, employing 7,600 workers, produce: non-ferrous castings, steel castings, malleable iron castings, grey iron and semi-steel castings, drop forgings, electric processed steel castings, sheet metal fabrication, structural steel, including fabricated structural steel, steel tanks, wire, metal cans and other metal containers, stamping hardware, tools, dies, jigs, and fixtures.

Machinery, including electrical, and transportation equipment: These three industry groups account for over 50 percent of the manufacturing employment in the Milwaukee metropolitan area. They are considered together since the larger firms in Milwaukee are fully integrated operations producing several different products. Replies from 54 firms employing 89,000 workers were received.

I. Import competitive interest. A small firm manufacturing transformers, principally dry type, and substations, feels that its production is competitive with all imports coming principally from England, Sweden, Switzerland, and Germany. This firm states that, "Imports are a serious competitor to us and our industry and may result in reduced employment in Milwaukee." This firm exports but in negligible amounts.

II. Mixed interest. Eleven firms in the machinery and equipment field indicate that, although they export, they also find imports competitive. In a few cases it is not difficult to ascertain in which direction the interests of the firm are considered to be. In other cases the balance of interest as between exports and competitive imports is less clear.

Milwaukee is the center of production of motorcycles. The industry's position as regards foreign trade is well known since imports of motorcycles are considered to be a very serious threat to the domestic industry. In a very complete reply outlining the effects of imports, one company states:

"On September 18, 1949, European currencies were devaluated by 30½ percent and immediately prices of European motorcycles comparable to ours in performance dropped 25 to 30 percent in the American market. We have never been able to meet this competition pricewise. * * *

"Immediately imports went up and each year our domestic production went down."

This firm in years past exported as high as 40 percent of its production. The present export situation is described as follows:

"The situation so far as our exports are concerned is this. We are shut out of the British Empire except Canada. We find it almost impossible to do business in countries whose currencies are tied to sterling. Our exports to South America are sharply curtailed by the high prices of our motorcycles as compared to the lower priced comparable motorcycles from Europe. The motorcycles in Europe are lower priced because they pay anywhere from 35 cents to 58 cents an hour whereas in our factory with fringe benefits we pay $2.18 an hour. Our exports now represent between 7 percent and 8 percent of our total production."

Allis-Chalmers' plant in Milwaukee manufactures wheel tractors; crushing and cement machinery; electrical machinery; steam and hydraulic turbines; centrifugal pumps and condensers. This company is a multiplant organization as are several machinery manufacturers in Milwaukee. Total company export sales are approximately 9 percent of total billings in 1953 according to the annual report of Allis-Chalmers for 1953. Large hydraulic turbines, electrical generators and large power transformers are competitive with imports.

A company producing large herringbone and helical gears, flexible couplings, speed reducers, motoreducers, special drives including propulsion drives for different types of vessels, as well as steel castings and weldments states that imports are competitive with its standard product lines, such as flexible couplings, motoreducers, speed reducers and more recently propulsion drives in the tow and tug line. This company states that:

"We compete with foreign builders of ship propulsion drives in the same manner as American shipyards compete with foreign builders. Generally speaking, if a ship is built in this country it is equipped with a drive of domestic manufacture and, to the best of our knowledge, all ships built with American capital in foreign countries have been equipped with foreign drives."

As to exports the company replies that:

"Since we are essentially machine component manufacturers, we sell principally to other machinery manufacturers who in turn sell abroad. It is our guess that less than 10 percent of our products end up in foreign countries, most of which would be in the motor reducer, speed reducer, and helical gear lines."

As to the significance of exports and imports this company gave, perhaps, the most complete comment:

"We are essentially a jobbing company. We are not mass producers of any particular product or size of product (except for small flexible couplings) as even the standard lines are produced in batch lots. Furthermore, all of our products, except castings, and weldments, fall into the precision machinery class; therefore labor and supervision is a much higher percentage of cost than is material. Consequently, we are in an entirely different labor-wage market than are any foreign competitors and have little or no edge in technology, principally because of the lack of mass production. Obviously we have much more to lose than to gain if trade barriers were lowered; and were we to be washed out of the picture, the mass producers would suffer as we make much of the special equipment used by these people for high-volume production.

"The foregoing applies to all others in the gear and steel-casting industries. All of us are specialists in these fields and therefore serve the special requirements of other manufacturers—not users or consumers—and must be considered as a part of mass-production machinery manufacturers to the same degree as the tool and die makers, bearing manufacturers, etc.

"Any change in the balance of export-import trade would directly affect the economy of Milwaukee as its metropolitan area includes a dozen or more large manufacturers in the same category that we are in. It is well known that Milwaukee has a big concentration of skilled labor and it is because of this fact that manufacturers like ourselves can operate successfully in the precision machinery field. Were the economy to be upset downwardly it would cause a transfer and dilution of the skilled labor force which would be a detriment in normal times and a serious handicap in emergencies."

A manufacturer of air-cooled combustion engines exports 8 percent of its production. It finds imports competitive with its entire line. On the significance of foreign trade it states:

"If, and when, the St. Lawrence Seaway becomes a reality it should certainly help Milwaukee because of its diversified industry, both for exports and imports, as well as place this country in a better competitive position in world markets."

A manufacturer of medical industrial and dental X-ray apparatus; X-ray supplies and accessories; and electromedical apparatus states that imports are competitive with its medical X-ray line which accounts for about three-fourths of its total production. This firm exports its complete line; exports amounted to about 10 percent of production in 1952.

A large electrical-control apparatus and electronic-parts manufacturer considers imports to be competitive to both to a small extent. This firm exports 2½ percent of its production. A small firm manufacturing industrial counting and measuring instruments also exports approximately 2 percent of its production. It stated that "about 20 percent of our product line has foreign competition." The same situation is applicable to a manufacturer of paper converting machinery and special machine tools.

A manufacturer of water meters stated its present competitive position in the following terms:

"Exports: As mentioned before, we used to export about $1,500,000 to $2,000,000 worth of meters a year. This has dried up to nothing only because we cannot compete with the European and Japanese watermeter manufacturers. During the time of an emergency, such as Korea and at the present, it seems to me it would be advantageous for the welfare of our Nation not to jeopardize the meter industry, considering the effective way its techniques were used in World War II for the manufacture of ammunition for the Armed Forces.

"Imports: It is obvious that any reduction in tariff barriers on our product could be catastrophic to our company. In fact, it could prove catastrophic to the industry as a whole. The only effect on the city of Milwaukee would be that our present employees would be idle."

A manufacturer of baling press equipment states that "We have lost sales recently to * * * German competition involving some extremely large shipments." Exports of this firm "are very nominal."

III. Export interest: The major exporters in the Milwaukee area are the firms in the machinery and equipment field. Thirty-nine firms employing 56,000 workers indicate in their replies that they export some or all of their products and that they do not consider that imports are seriously competitive with their products.

A large manufacturer of overhead cranes, excavators, hoists, welders, electrodes, heavy-duty cranes, diesel engines, and prefabricated houses states that it exports excavators, welders, electrodes, hoists, and heavy-duty cranes. Some of these items are export commodities of a substantial degree.

A manufacturer of portable and stationary concrete mixers, truck mixers, and agitators states that all of its products are exported; the same situation applies to a producer of sawmill machinery, steam engines, and waterworks equipment. In both cases export figures are not available.

A milk-bottling equipment firm replies that it exports limited quantities of its products while a bottling machinery manufacturer states that all of its products are exported to some degree. It appears from the comment in the reply of this firm that as regards the export market, "competition in all foreign countries is becoming terrific." The reply states that:

"While no appreciable foreign competition is encountered by producers in the domestic United States market in our indus-

try, the competition in all foreign countries is becoming terrific. From a situation when more than 50 percent of our entire output was shipped overseas 2 years ago, today foreign business has trickled down to only a nominal fraction of what it was formerly. The potential foreign business that is available, due to a combination of prices, terms, controls, etc., that restrict purchases from the United States is consistently being lost to American industry."

As to the importance of exports to the firm and industry, the bottling-machinery manufacturer replied:

"Certainly we and our industry are both directly and indirectly dependent upon foreign business to maintain production up to available capacity. With present high costs and high break-even point, larger volume of production is a necessity in order to keep operating in the black."

A manufacturer of baling presses, malting equipment, valves, and cylinders states that "a relatively small amount of all our products" are exported. A producer of railroad supplies (mostly small parts for locomotives and special lifting jacks) exports some locomotive parts. The firm stated that the exports are rather minor in terms of value, except for Canada. In several other instances manufacturers tend to treat shipments to Canada as part of the American market. Of course, insofar as foreign trade is concerned, shipments to Canada are exports in the same way as are shipments to Brazil or Indonesia.

A portable electric tool manufacturer exports its entire line. A manufacturer of diesel industrial and marine engines and diesel electric generators exports all of its products and spare parts, but the amount exported is not known.

A manufacturer of temperature regulation and air conditioning control systems stated that very little sales are made abroad. Electric ranges and electric water heaters are both exported by one firm but in a nominal sum; a firm making gas, oil and coal fired furnaces, along with cast iron boilers, cooling equipment, incinerators and dehumidifiers also exports a small amount of its total production. A small firm making automatic switches, manual controls and metal stamping, exports replacement switches, evidently a small item of its total business.

A firm making a standardized line of padlocks and hasps states that:

"Although we are not free to divulge all of the information requested, we can tell you that our export business has for years constituted a substantial portion of our total sales. We continue to actively promote the sale of our products in overseas markets and would suffer a serious blow if we were forced to discontinue our overseas business. It should be remembered that our export business helps pay for the general overhead and other fixed charges. Without the returns earned by our overseas business, our domestic business would have to carry the entire load, which would probably be reflected in price increases."

A firm producing magnetic separation equipment, magnetic clutches, disk brakes, etc., indicated that it has been meeting increased competition abroad, although the reply did not state the amount of total production that is exported. As to the export market this manufacturer comments as follows:

"We have, however, had serious foreign competition with respect to the sale of our products abroad. There is virtually an embargo on the shipment of our products to the sterling area. This was especially noticeable after the devaluation of the pound sterling a few years ago. German competition has been growing and this has affected our markets in South America and other parts of the world. We have about reached the conclusion that the only basis on which we can compete in foreign markets is licensing foreign concerns to manufacture our products under a lease or royalty contract.

"Our export market has shrunk considerably and this has therefore affected our growth, employment, and progress as well as having corresponding effect on the city of Milwaukee and our community."

Another firm making industrial motor control systems and accessories as well as low-voltage distribution apparatus, gas measuring and mixing equipment, and newspaper printing press drives and conveyor systems stated that:

"All of the products we manufacture here are sold for export in some degree. Here again it is impossible for us to establish any units of quantity due to the wide variety of these products so sold. Exports are a relatively minor activity with regard to our overall sales, but we consider it quite important. In this respect we do not feel it is possible to divulge the exact dollar volume of our exports."

On the significance of foreign trade to Milwaukee the comment was as follows:

"We estimate that to the city of Milwaukee exports are relatively important due to the broad diversification of capital equipment manufacturing organizations in this city. We are of the opinion, however, that imports are not particularly important to the city of Milwaukee except the basic raw materials unobtainable except by importation."

Another multiplant firm producing electrical distribution and transmission equipment stated that, the larger part of the export business is done from and through Milwaukee.

A producer of oil burners, road machinery, steam generators, and distillating units exports approximately 4 percent of its total production. This firm comments as follows:

"Our export market is principally Central and South America. All of our boilers are powered by either fuel oil or gas, and due to the lack of these materials in Europe, our sales on the Continent have been very small."

A manufacturer of crawler and rubber-tired shovels, cranes, draglines, clamshells, trenchoes and attachments and spare parts exports 3 percent of its production. The same ratio of exports to production was given by a producer of front end loaders and bullclams for track type tractors. A producer of foundry flasks and wheelbarrows exports 4 percent of its foundry flasks to Canada.

A large manufacturer of 4-cycle, single cylinder, gasoline engines, as well as automotive locks and keys, switches and related equipment exports 3 percent of its production. This firm comments as follows:

"We and our industry are continuously promoting export business—greater availability of United States dollars would, no doubt, increase our exports materially. * * * We believe export business is good for Milwaukee. Opening of the St. Lawrence River to larger boats will, undoubtedly, make Milwaukee, a much more important export, import, seaport."

Another manufacturer of gasoline engines and air compressors also exports 4 percent of its production.

A firm manufacturing industrial control equipment, including switchboard apparatus, states that only about 1 percent of its production is exported. The export business is handled through an agency in New York which has informed the Milwaukee firm that their prices are often too far out of line with those of European concerns to expect that exports might amount to any appreciable value.

A firm which manufactures electrical, industrial, and laboratory heat-treating furnaces, dry-type transformers, and constant-current regulators exports about 2 percent of its total production.

A firm making drying tumblers for commercial and self-service laundries and dry-cleaning plants and other similar products exports 5 percent of its production. This firm believes that it could export more, but the currency situation in various countries prevents this.

A firm manufacturing automatic wire-measuring, cutting, and tipping machines, and other special products exports 5 percent of its production, mostly wire-stripping machines, although all the firm's products are exported.

A machine-tools manufacturer sums up its export situation as follows:

"The entire machine-tool industry, of course, has been historically dependent upon a large percentage of foreign trade. This trade has diminished greatly because of the economic situation in foreign countries and the problem involving currency exchange. Also great inroads upon the market have been made by machine-tool manufacturers on the Continent and in England, with the result that the percentage of exported machine tools from our company (and the effect has been industrywide, also) has been reduced to something approximating 5 percent in recent years. This compares with a normal export market of about 25 to 30 percent."

A manufacturer of outboard motors exports 9 percent of total production, while a very large firm manufacturing automobile frames and parts, vessels, electrodes, pipe, and oil-well casing, exports 6 percent of all of its products.

A large manufacturer of several products such as petroleum transport equipment, dump bodies and hoists, road machinery, dehydrators, oil burners, furnaces, boilers, stainless steel milk transport and storage tanks, and general steel fabricated products exports about 9 to 10 percent of its production. This firm states:

"With reference to question 7, the city of Milwaukee depends a great deal on the export of its manufactured products for its full employment. * * * Figures as to the total dollar volume and number of people employed for export products is available. * * * As the figures on the form will indicate, export means a great deal to our company, for virtually 10 percent of our civilian output goes into that field."

A manufacturer of shovels and cranes, pavers, mixers, dumptors, finishers, and mud jacks exports all of its products, exports amounting to 12 percent of production. Another large company's numerous products include power transmission and conveyor chains, conveying machinery roller bearings, and construction machinery; exports are 12 percent of total production. This company replies that:

"Our export business is of substantial interest and importance to our company and by reason of its volume and the employment which it provides should be of fair importance to the city of Milwaukee."

A large manufacturer of power shovels, cranes, and draglines, oil well, water well and blast hole drills, and tractor equipment exports 25 percent of its production. Another large firm produces component parts for use in end products of other company operations. Diesel injection pumps, gears, forgings, and castings make up the bulk of the component parts produced. The end products of the receiving operations are motortrucks, farm implements, farm tractors, industrial tractors, and equipment refrigeration products, and related service parts. Approximately 27 percent of the Milwaukee plant's output is eventually exported.

A firm manufacturing magnetic separators, electromagnets of all types, permanent magnets and magnetic brakes exports about 20 percent of total sales. This firm comments on its export market as follows:

"Our export market amounts to approximately 20 percent of our total business, exports, including Canada, and needless to say 20 percent of any business is a rather healthy amount. From our observations of other companies in these specialty manufacturing industries, particularly those industries

which have a large proportion of their products going to the mining industry, indicate that a 20 percent export market is about normal, in fact, a little bit less than some companies that specialize entirely in mining machinery."

IV. No expressed interest: Three firms employing 2,400 workers replied that they do not export and do not consider that imports are competitive. One firm, a manufacturer of machine tools states that, "Our machinery is of the special high production type used primarily by the automotive industry." A firm manufacturing automatic dishwashers, food waste disposals, dehumidifiers and aircraft turbo-superchargers states that almost all of their production is for the domestic market and that, therefore, they are not affected by foreign trade. A third firm manufacturing a complete line of automatic temperature controls, does no exporting and does not consider imports to be competitive.

Miscellaneous manufactures: In this miscellaneous industry group there are eight firms with 850 employees.

I. Import competitive interest: A manufacturer of toys states that imports of toys are extremely competitive in individual price categories. The company does not export.

II. Mixed interest: Three firms in this group of manufacturers have an apparent export interest as well as import competition.

A manufacturer of vulcanizers, hot patches, and automotive accessories such as directional-signal lights and mirrors for passenger cars and trucks, aparently exported 80 percent of its production in 1953. However, because of increased competitive imports of tube patches from Germany in recent years, this firm states that it has lost an amount in domestic sales greater than its exports in 1953.

A small firm producing photographic darkroom equipment, dental equipment, and motorcycle accessories exports 6 to 7 percent of its total production valuewise, all of which is in photographic equipment. As to competitive imports this firm considers motorcycle accessories competitive. It also states: "Imports from Britain hurt sales of the Harley-Davidson Motor Co. very badly and naturally reflects on our accessory business."

A firm manufacturing engineers' levels and transits, builders' and farm levels, theodolites, astrolabes, alidades, army transits, stereo cameras, viewers, and productors states that imports are competitive with these products, particularly from Germany and Japan. Exporting 1 percent of its production this firm comments as follows:

Exports of photographic equipment are depressed because of world money status and lack of processing facilities for color film in foreign countries.

III. Export interest: Three firms indicate in their replies that they export and experience no competition from imports. A small manufacturer of industrial brushes for the beverage and food industry considers its export sales of 2 percent of production to be of minor importance. A producer of paint rollers and trays of all types and a manufacturer of inkstands and other desk equipment both export their products; the extent of exports of the two firms is unknown. The inkstand and desk-equipment manufacturer states that, "Exports are a very desirable part of our business and an essential part of the industry and the city of Milwaukee."

IV. No expressed interest: A small firm making latex rubber adhesives does not feel that exports or competitive imports are of any concern to its operations.

MILWAUKEE AS A CAPITAL GOODS CENTER

Milwaukee has been called the principal capital of the capital goods business in the world.[8] Almost two-thirds of the manufacturing employment in the Milwaukee metropolitan area is in the durable goods field. Of the replies received in this survey, about 90,000 workers are in firms in the industries producing machinery and equipment, including electrical machinery and transportation equipment. These 90,000 employees account for almost two-thirds of the workers in firms covered by this survey. If the workers of the replying firms in the primary and fabricated metals industries are included almost 75 percent of the workers covered by this survey are in these five industries: Primary and fabricated metals, machinery, including electrical machinery, and transportation equipment. This group of industries provides the products that go to make Milwaukee the capital goods center that it is.

A study was recently made of the export market for capital goods. The results of the study were published in a bulletin by the Council for Technological Advancement in July of 1953.[9] In summary, the bulletin gave the following general conclusions:

"1. Machinery and equipment comprises by far the largest group of commodities exported from the United States. The $3 billion of machinery and equipment exported in 1952 accounted for 20 percent of total United States exports, or almost 25 percent of nonmilitary exports. Thus capital goods manufacturers and Government have a great mutual interest in the formation and impact of national policy affecting foreign trade.

"2. The importance of export markets to capital goods producers is pointed up by the fact that during the past years about 11 or 12 percent of total machinery and equipment sales have been in these markets, ranging from 4 percent for railroad and transit equipment to almost 23 percent for tractors, parts, and accessories. A recent CTA survey of capital goods manufacturers revealed that exports of many individual firms were an even higher proportion of their total sales than the industry percentages presented here." [10]

The following is a list of ratios of exports to total national production for some of the more important products that are made by Milwaukee manufactures:

TABLE VI.—*Ratio of exports to production (1952)*

Commodity:	Percent
Electrical machinery and apparatus:	
Storage batteries	2.5
Primary batteries	10.4
Power and distribution transformers	3.8
Refrigerators	13.1
Industrial machinery:	
Internal-combustion engines	9.8
Industrial trucks and tractors	7.8
Construction and mining equipment	[1] 21.8
Graders	[1] 31.0
Machine tools	[1] 10.2
Food products machinery	18.9
Agricultural machinery and implements	13.0
Implements of cultivation	12.4
Harvesting machinery	12.8
Combines	20.2
Tractors	37.2
Tracklaying type	[1] 45.1
Contractors, wheel type	[1] 37.2
Other wheel type, except garden	[1] 16.7
Transportation equipment:	
Passenger cars	[1] 3.0
Motortrucks and coaches	[1] 15.7

[1] 1953.

Source: Foreign Commerce Weekly, June 28, 1954.

In line with the replies received in this survey it appears that, as a capital goods equipment center, Milwaukee shares in the importance of exports to the total production of capital goods in the country as a whole.

On the other hand, Milwaukee's capital goods manufacturers face import competition. Imports appear to be competitive with electrical equipment such as transformers, hydraulic turbines, large electrical generators, electric motors, and some electrical control apparatus and X-ray equipment. Imports are also competitive with motorcycles; internal combustion engines; large gears, propulsion drives and special heavy castings and forgings; water meters; and special machinery such as baling presses and paper-converting machinery.

Milwaukee, as a center of industrial skills, is a good example of the advancement and advantages of American industry that make its products so wanted and desired throughout the world. On the other hand, imports from countries where lower wages are paid can sometimes compete effectively with manufactures in Milwaukee that require highly skilled, highly paid labor, and where the manufacturing process is not adaptable to mass-production techniques.

However, export sales and competitive imports are not the only way in which foreign trade affects Milwaukee.

IMPORTS USED BY MILWAUKEE MANUFACTURERS

Manufacturers of Milwaukee use commodities originating in all parts of the world necessary to produce their finished goods. While some of these materials are obtainable within the United States, many of them are not produced in this country and must be obtained from abroad.

In the manufacture of food and related products Milwaukee manufacturers import cocoa beans for use in the manufacture of chocolate and cocoa products. Other manufacturers of cookies, cakes, and candies must import spices, nuts, dates, irish moss, coconuts, and coconut oil. Meat-product companies use spices, fuller's earth, and burlap, all import items. Malt manufacturers occasionally import barley, while the brewers of Milwaukee import hops. The beer, ale, and soft-drink producers also must have tin, for plating of cans, and cork for inserts in crowns and kegs. The United States is entirely dependent upon imports for its supply of tin; very little, if any, cork is produced in the United States.

Leather tanners in Milwaukee import such items as chromium, sodium bichromate, quebracho, wattle, eucalyptus extracts, and other tanning materials. Some leather producers import calfskin, while shoe manufacturers import special calf, buck, and kangaroo leather, as well as shoe machinery from Germany and Italy.

The paper and allied products industry and the printing and publishing industry are dependent on newsprint from Canada and, to a lesser extent, on woodpulp imports. Smaller manufacturers of such items as automotive seat pads and truck and tractor seating import burlap, sisal and some cotton. One millinery producer imports straw hat bodies and braids.

Manufacturers of wax emulsion and leather finishes for the shoe and leather goods industries must import shellac, carnauba wax, ouricury wax, manila, gums, casein, castor oil, and other waxes. A cosmetic firm in Milwaukee also imports castor oil and carnauba wax, as well as candelilla wax.

Producers of hardware specialties and a manufacturer of industrial brushes imports hog bristles, as well as goat and horsehair, bass, bassine, and piasava fiber. While the manufacture of rubber products is a relatively small operation in Milwaukee, many machinery and equipment firms use rubber in some form. Natural rubber and other gums must be imported.

[8] Made in Milwaukee. Fortune (New York), vol. XLII, November 1950: 7.

[9] Council for Technological Advancement. The export market for capital goods. (Chicago) July 1, 1953: 1 and 3. (Its bulletin No. 13.)

[10] Ibid., p. 3.

The primary metals, fabricated metals, and machinery and equipment industries are most dependent on imports of raw materials. Firms manufacturing iron and steel and other metal castings and forgings import manganese, nickel, copper, tin, chromium, cadmium, beryllium, zinc, lead, cobalt, titanium, lithium, phosphorous, magnesium, antimony, silicon, calcium, zirconite sands, ferromanganese, and other metal alloys, mica and various clays. These metals are used along with basic iron and steel in the manufacture of the machinery, electrical apparatus, and transportation equipment that are produced in the shops of Milwaukee.

In a study, Raw Materials: Area of Growing Dependency, it was pointed out that the United States is dependent on imports for 75 percent of its antimony and must import 95 percent of its asbestos consumption. There is also a 90-percent import dependency on beryl, a 99-percent import dependency on chromite, which is used extensively by the tanning industry in Milwaukee, a 90-percent dependency on imported cobalt, a 90-percent dependency on imported manganese, and a 99-percent dependency on imported nickel. These and other raw materials used extensively in the metal and machinery industries are examples of the strong ties that Milwaukee industry has with the rest of the world in terms of foreign trade.[11]

INCREASED COMPETITION IN WORLD MARKETS

Just as competition from imports has increased to some extent in the domestic market since the reconstruction and development of industry in Europe since 1948, it is evident that competition has increased in the world markets to which American manufacturers have been exporting many of their products in the postwar years.

From the replies received in this survey, it is apparent that Milwaukee manufacturers are experiencing increasing competition in world markets, especially from the United Kingdom, Germany, Italy, and Japan. Some of the exports from Milwaukee were financed by the foreign-aid program of the past 7 or 8 years; however, the amount of exports from Milwaukee under the foreign-aid program is not known. There is no doubt that with the decreasing amounts of foreign aid available exporters find it more difficult to make sales when payment must be made in dollars. The lack of dollars and the recovery of European industry weighs heavily upon the competitive position of American exporters in world markets.

One manufacturing company comments on increased competition in export markets as follows:

"While no appreciable foreign competition is encountered by producers in the domestic United States market in our industry, the competition in all foreign countries is becoming terrific. From a situation when more than 50 percent of our entire output was shipped overseas 2 years ago, today foreign business has trickled down to only a nominal fraction of what it was formerly. The potential foreign business that is available due to a combination of prices, terms, controls, etc., that restrict purchases from the United States is being consistently lost to American industry."

A manufacturer of pharmaceutical specialties replies that:

"We have noticed an increasing competitive trend in our export business mainly from former German, French, and Italian manufacturers who were once predominant in the export pharmaceutical markets. We are able, thus far, to compete with these European manufacturers on a price basis. However, we find it increasingly difficult to compete with them on the terms which they are extending to our foreign distributors. Whereas formerly we sold on letters of credit or sight draft basis, we have been gradually extending this to time draft, 30, then 60, then 90, then 120 days. We now find that the European manufacturers are allowing terms as long as 1 or 2 years. Obviously, to extend such terms, they must receive some major subsidy from their governments. We cannot allow terms extending over that long a period of time without some comparable assistance on the part of our own Government.

Another company is also concerned with the terms which exporters from other companies are able to give. It comments as follows:

"The big problem confronting Milwaukee exporters—in fact all exporters today—is the inability to meet long term financing offered by foreign competition.

"We, of course, recognize that funds are available through such organizations as the Export Import Bank, but this organization, as well as other existing governmental organizations, is not in a position to take care of the majority of extended term orders offered manufacturers in this country.

"Because of such extended terms of 3 to 5 years offered by foreign competition, many orders which should come to the United States are going elsewhere, and unless some legislation is passed to permit banks and insurance companies, such as the Canadian plan, to carry paper without recourse for foreign countries, we are going to lose considerable business in the years to come. This is a serious situation and should have the immediate attention of our legislative groups in Washington."

THE PORT OF MILWAUKEE AND FOREIGN TRADE

Milwaukee is one of the leading ports on the Great Lakes and it is one of the most diversified. It has excellent facilities for handling such bulk cargoes as coal and petroleum products which make up the greater share, volume-wise, of the port's commerce. Grains, building materials, and other bulk commodities are also large items in total port traffic. The car ferry service across Lake Michigan adds to the diversity of commodities handled by the port, and this service aids Milwaukee in taking advantage of its location on the trade routes between the productive interior and the eastern sections of the United States.

It is said that the port of Milwaukee's facilities for handling foreign exports are superior to any other port on the Great Lakes. Although foreign commerce is but a small part of the 8 million tons annually that move across the docks it is of much greater value than is indicated by its volume. The following table gives the shipping weight and the total value of waterborne exports and imports for the port of Milwaukee for the years 1951–53:

TABLE VII.—*Shipping weight and value of United States waterborne exports and imports of the port of Milwaukee, 1951–53*

	Quantity (millions of pounds)		Value (millions of dollars)		Total	
	Imports	Exports	Imports	Exports	Quantity	Value
1951	441.4	54.6	17.9	5.9	496.0	23.8
1952	528.3	136.3	22.2	12.7	664.6	34.9
1953	983.6	76.7	36.3	15.4	1,060.3	51.7

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce. Waterborne Trade by United States Port. January-December 1952. Summary Report FT 972, May 19, 1953. Waterborne Foreign Trade Statistics, January-December 1953. Summary Report FT 985. June 15, 1954.

The amount of waterborne foreign commerce of the port has been increasing in recent years, and, although the Canadian trade is by far the greater share of the total, the increase in overseas sailing is indicative of the growth in overseas trade through the port.

Pioneers of the Great Lakes ocean services were the Fjell and Oranje lines of Norway and the Netherlands, respectively. The ships of these two lines were calling at Milwaukee before World War II. There were 45 sailings from Milwaukee to ports of Europe by these lines in 1939.

During World War II there were no foreign sailings from Milwaukee. With the revival of foreign trade on the Great Lakes in 1946, the Fjell and the Oranje lines started their services again. They were followed by the Swedish-American and Swedish-Chicago lines; Hamburg-Chicago, the first German line to service Milwaukee, and the Fabre lines of Marseille, linking Milwaukee with Mediterranean and north African ports.

In 1953 four new lines were added: the Metron Shipping, Inc., linking the Great Lakes with Hamburg, Antwerp, and Bremen; the Ahlmann Trans-Caribbean Line, sailing between the Great Lakes and Colombia and Venezuela; the West Line to Cuba and Haiti; and the Cuban American Line with direct service to Habana. In 1953 there were 154 sailings to foreign ports from Milwaukee and it is estimated that in 1954, sailings to overseas ports will increase to 170.

The commodities that are important in the foreign commerce of the port of Milwaukee differ as between overseas and Canadian trade. Overseas imports consist of fish and fish products; fruits and preparations; building and monumental stone; and iron- and steel-mill products (principally Swedish steel). Exports to overseas ports include meat and meat products; animal fats and oils; wheat flour; and distilled spirits and malt liquors. Machinery and vehicles are by far the largest items in terms of tonnage exports to overseas ports. In fact, Milwaukee is the leading overseas exporter of machinery on the Great Lakes.

Canadian waterborne trade appears to consist mostly of bulk items such as barley and rye, wheat and oats and newsprint that are imported, and corn and iron and steel scrap that are exported.

In a study of the port of Milwaukee, Mr. Edward Hamming summarized the foreign trade situation as follows:

"Although the Canadian trade is larger in volume than the overseas traffic, the more colorful aspects of the latter and the potentialities of that trade are highlights in the waterborne commerce of Milwaukee. It offers the Midwest manufacturer an opportunity to compete in foreign markets on an equal basis with eastern industry. The Great Lakes ports, however, do not have import-export rates similar to the ocean ports, but application has been made to the western trunk line railways to allow more liberal demurrage regulations to permit more free time on railroad cars carrying export shipments. Whenever an improved St. Lawrence Seaway becomes a reality Milwaukee, with its superior harbor facilities, is ready to serve the needs of any increase in overseas traffic. Besides, it is in a favorable position to draw the trade from the upper Midwest because the pull of the competing ocean ports is felt far more strongly in Chicago than in Milwaukee." [12]

Many people in Milwaukee have been ardent supporters of the St. Lawrence Seaway. When Public Law 358, for the creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation, was passed in the 2d session of the 83d Congress there were many predictions of the economic effects of the seaway. The port director of Milwaukee expects to see the

[11] U. S. Office of Defense Mobilization. Raw Materials: Area of Growing Dependency. February 1953 (pt. II, 8 p.).

[12] Hamming, Edward. The Port of Milwaukee. University of Chicago Press. 1952: 128–129.

total foreign commerce tonnage to rise to 1 million tons annually. It would appear that the port of Milwaukee with its excellent facilities will certainly handle more foreign commerce after completion of the seaway since without the seaway the foreign commerce of the port has been increasing.

Residual Oil Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, proponents of more liberal tariff laws are appearing before the House Ways and Means Committee this week. In much of the testimony there is total disregard of the economic disaster inflicted upon American communities by unwise foreign-trade policies. In subsequent hearings, international oil representatives are scheduled to testify, but there is little likelihood that their testimony will vary fundamentally from the preposterous excuses that have perennially been offered by those firms which ruthlessly subordinate the interests of United States economy and safety to the practice of profit at any cost.

The importing oil companies base their defense on a trilogy of deceit. First they dramatize the necessity for imports to supplement domestic production, but all the while they are supplanting the supplies normally provided by this country's oil producers. What is worse, they ship from Venezuela and the Dutch West Indies only a small portion of the yield of gasoline and other higher grade products which we supposedly need, and instead they flood our east-coast markets with almost half of all the residual oil exported from that area. This residual oil, as you well know, serves only to displace coal, of which the United States has sufficient reserves to last for a thousand years.

In the second place, the importing oil companies stage a fantastic yarn about the need for foreign sources of petroleum in time of emergency, yet they well remember that it was practically impossible to ship oil even in coastwise traffic during World War II. At that time, Germany had less than 60 submarines to operate against our tanker fleet; today Russia is estimated to possess more than 400, many of them the snorkel type. Under the circumstances, how would we be expected to transport oil through dangerous ocean lanes in a new emergency if in the past it was so difficult to send a ship safely from Houston to Philadelphia?

Finally, the representatives of importing oil companies appearing at congressional hearings have since 1950 cloaked themselves in the costumes of benevolent patriots who are conscious of the dangers of too much imported oil and who presume to be willing to cut back shipments voluntarily rather than permit the Government to exercise its constitutional duty in this matter. Yet the record shows that since the first of these sanctimonious roles was assumed, following a record deluge of residual oil imports in 1949, shipments into this country from foreign refineries have increased by upwards of 75 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I say that these conditions should no longer be tolerated. This Government cannot in conscience permit our citizens in West Virginia and other coal-producing States to remain out of work in order that a comparatively few greedy corporations might prosper. It is imperative that we place a quota limitation on residual oil imports and make whatever other tariff adjustments are necessary to protect our domestic industries and workers.

A provision on residual oil is included in the resolution on competitive fuels adopted by the board of directors of the Nation Coal Association in its meeting in Washington last month. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert this resolution in the RECORD, along with a resolution on reciprocal trade which the association passed at that time.

Careful study of both these resolutions may go a long way toward helping this legislative body decide upon the course that our fuels policies—immediate and long-range—are to take. The injurious effects of excessive residual oil imports must be neutralized through a quota law. In addition, the Congress must be alert to the threat of bringing natural gas across our borders to the further detriment of the coal industry. Finally, there is the question of whether it is not time to disccourage the wasteful use of natural gas, and instead inaugurate a sensible program for the practical utilization of our energy resources.

I respectfully commend these National Coal Association resolutions to your attention:

RESOLUTION ON COMPETITIVE FUELS ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NATIONAL COAL ASSOCIATION, SHOREHAM HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., DECEMBER 9–10, 1954

Whereas divergent points of view have been expressed on the advisability of the legislative overthrow of the decision of the United States Supreme Court of June 7, 1954 (Phillips Petroleum Co. case) wherein it was held that the Federal Power Commission has rate-fixing jurisdiction over sales of natural gas by independent producers and gatherers to interstate natural-gas pipeline companies; and

Whereas the Nation's limited natural gas reserves are being rapidly depleted because of the certification of natural gas pipelines without adequate consideration for necessary principles of conservation in the administration of the Natural Gas Act by the Federal Power Commission in the absence of definitive legislative standards designed to channel the valuable natural gas resource to wiser uses; and

Whereas important questions in the fields of safety, States' rights, and conservation make it desirable to determine whether support should be given for the broadening of the Federal power of eminent domain for the purpose of permitting natural gas companies to acquire rights in land for the underground storage of natural gas in order to encourage wiser uses of natural gas; and

Whereas notwithstanding continuous efforts of the National Coal Association as an active intervenor in natural gas certificate cases, the Federal Power Commission has not established policies which would materially lessen the unfair competition to coal from natural gas or direct the wiser use of natural gas, indicating the need for additional legislative standards in the Natural Gas Act; and

Whereas extensive discoveries of natural gas in Canada and Mexico, coupled with the filing of numerous applications with the Federal Power Commission for authority to import great quantities of natural gas to compete with domestic fuels (particularly bituminous coal) on a duty-free basis, gives rise to the need for a public policy with respect to anticipated foreign natural gas competition because of the absence of standards in the Natural Gas Act to guide the Federal Power Commission in the exercise of its jurisdiction over such importations; and

Whereas the flood of residual oil continues unabated, notwithstanding the economic distress and unemployment which have been the end result for the bituminous coal industry because of the importations of this residual product into the eastern seaboard; and

Whereas the Federal Government has encouraged successive reductions in the applicable import tariff on residual oil without due regard for the impact of this foreign fuel upon the domestic coal industry; and

Whereas it has been repeatedly demonstrated in congressional and administrative proceedings that coal and railroad industries and their employees have suffered great damage, particularly in the coal-producing areas supplying the eastern seaboard markets, because of the unrestricted importations of residual oil; and

Whereas there is great danger to the Nation's welfare and defense interests in thus encouraging total dependence upon this foreign fuel in the industrially important eastern seaboard; and

Whereas governmental policies have benefited these competitive fuels and contributed to the accelerated displacement of bituminous coal in the overall fuel market, making it impossible for coal to obtain its fair share of the expanding energy market in consonance with the established principles of the American free competitive enterprise system; and

Whereas the public interest, the general welfare, and the Nation's defense potentials are not best served by continued unwarranted attrition against the capacity of the bituminous coal industry to meet the fuel needs of the Nation in time of peace or war; and

Whereas effective action with respect to these problems requires the united cooperation of the coal producers, distributors, dealers, deliverers, users, and transporters, their respective employees, and all other elements of the coal and related industries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the directors of the National Coal Association, That the officers of the National Coal Association are hereby authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary to secure recognition by the President, the Congress, and the administrative agencies of the Government that the Nation's best interests will be served by maintaining the productive capacity of the coal industry at a safe level and urge the adoption of such principles as will contribute to the restoration of a fair competitive balance between the industries competing for available fuel markets; and be it further

Resolved, That the office of the National Coal Association, in the name of the National Coal Association and on behalf of its membership, sponsor, seek the introduction of, and support such legislation in the 84th Congress as will best achieve the aims and purposes herein set forth.

Thirty-seventh Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, of the ancient and medieval Ukraine relatively little is known; one thing we do know, however, is that the country was overrun and ravaged many times by invaders from the East who inflicted much suffering on the Ukrainians. When the wave of invaders receded, the Ukrainians were able to regain their full independence, recoup some of their losses, and rebuild their homeland. From the late Middle Ages down to the middle of the 17th century, they were successful in preserving their independence. But then, by a treaty signed in 1654, between the Russian Czar and the Ukrainian leaders, their independence was placed in jeopardy and soon after that the Ukraine became part of the Russian Empire.

One might justifiably say that virtually all of the Ukraine's misfortune and the misery of its people stem from that treaty signed almost exactly 300 years ago. From that time until 1918 Ukrainians living within and outside of their beloved land thought, dreamed, and studied little else than ways of obtaining the independence of the Ukraine.

With the signing of the treaty of 1654 the independence of the Ukraine vanished into history. For once under the oppressive Russian rulers, the Ukrainians were forced to abandon their national traditions and to be attached to the great Russian family. In other words, the Czar's government set out to Russianize, by compulsion if necessary, all Ukrainians. Imperial decrees banned the use of Ukrainian as an official language. In schools the teaching of Ukrainian was not permitted, and the whole country was treated as a colonial adjunct of the Imperial Russian Government. And that Government ruled over it with a ruthless hand.

During all those years, however, the Russians were not able to denationalize the Ukrainians. The more oppressive the hand of the Government, the more the Ukrainians resented and rebelled against their overlords. At the same time their yearning increased for the return of the glorious days gone by. As a result, Ukrainian nationalism was kept alive as a powerful living force in the country. At the same time the idea of freedom and independence was carefully nursed in their hearts. Finally, some 250 years later, when they saw their chance for independence in 1918, they seized upon it and proclaimed the Ukrainian National Republic. The day of that proclamation, January 22, 1918, is a momentous landmark in recent Ukrainian history. Since then it has been customarily celebrated as a great Ukrainian holiday.

The republic which the Ukrainians proclaimed was a fragile being—young, weak, and beyond the reach of aid from its sympathetic friends. It was surrounded by powerful enemies. All of these were ready, at any moment, to pounce upon the new state and put an end to its existence. Most dangerous of these foes were the Communist Russians. Even though some 35 years ago we had our misgivings about the Communists, we did not know their inhuman methods and their real aims in the same way we know them today. The Ukrainians, who were their neighbors, had quickly diagnosed the evil character of Russian communism and for that reason fought it with all their might. In the end, of course, they had to yield to brute, superior force. In 1920 the Ukraine was overrun by the Communists. Independent-minded able-bodied men were placed under arrest, subjected to indescribable tortures, and many were put to death. It is impossible to say how many million innocent Ukrainians lost their lives under this most abominable of tyrannies.

Today that fair land of riches and plenty, that fertile home of the peasant, is a deserted and desolate steppe land as far as liberty and freedom are concerned. It is, one might say, a large prison camp where some 40 million toilers are crushed by the grinding, all-powerful steamroller of Moscow. There is no freedom of movement, no freedom of expression, and the Communists have even tried to eliminate freedom of thought. Under such circumstances, of course, patriotic Ukrainians are not allowed to celebrate their independence day. However, we in this country are glad to join with all Americans of Ukrainian ancestry in the celebration of that day and ardently hope that soon the Ukrainians will have the freedom to do the same in their beloved homeland.

Closing of Deputy United States Marshal's Office in Helena, Mont.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, last month I was informed that the deputy United States marshal now stationed in Helena, Mont., had been transferred to Great Falls, Mont. After inquiry, I learned that it was proposed to close the deputy United States marshal's office in Helena and have the branch office in Great Falls, together with the main office in Butte, serve papers and perform other duties of the marshal's office for the people in and around Helena.

At that time I wrote Attorney General Brownell protesting closure of this office in the State capital. I was joined in this protest by members of the Helena Bar Association, the president of the Montana Bar Association, and others. It was urged that the office remain open in order that service to the State and Federal agencies located in the capital be most efficiently maintained.

As yet I have not received a reply to my letter of protest, and, as far as I know, the other interested organizations and individuals in Montana have received no response to their letters. They have written me requesting further information on this proposed transfer.

As a result, I have joined with Senator MANSFIELD in sending the following telegram to Attorney General Brownell:

> Montana Bar Association, Helena, Mont., Chamber of Commerce, and local bar associations in Montana are continuing to press for your decision with respect to closing of the marshal's office in Helena, Mont., on February 1. May we have a reply to our letters of December 22, December 27, and January 10?

I have today introduced a bill to require the United States marshal to maintain an office in the State capital of every State so that in the future this situation cannot recur. Apparently only the passage of legislation can prevent arbitrary elimination of those needed facilities and require the Department of Justice to respond to the protests of the individuals and organizations such facilities are designed to serve.

MRA Merits Admiration and Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1955

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join in the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] and others with respect to MRA and wish to commend all of them for their statements. It has been my privilege to attend several MRA sessions and plays. To say that they have been most worthwhile is to state it mildly.

We live in a critical era—in a world filled with tensions and problems. People all over the world are seeking solutions to those problems which exist in almost endless number and in varying degrees of magnitude. We find nation pitted against nation, race against race, and class against class. Solutions must be found if civilization is to endure with a maximum of freedom and liberty for all people. But those solutions will be difficult, if not on occasion impossible, to find if our objectives are not higher than the mere material. The objectives must involve that of which our President spoke in his state of the Union message when he said "man is a little lower than the angels—holding dominion over the works of his Creator."

MRA points up the need of such objectives, and seeks to show contending forces how those objectives might be achieved. MRA has accomplished what may be termed wonders throughout the world. It merits the admiration and support of all of us.

Federal Assistance for School Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, in a discussion of President Eisenhower's statement on Federal assistance for school construction in the state of the Union message, Dr. Edgar Fuller executive officer of the Council of Chief State School Officers, suggests that there might be some significance in the last-minute change of the word "catalyst" to "agent."

In the mimeographed text released immediately before the delivery of the message, President Eisenhower's statement reads:

> Without impairing in any way the responsibilities of our States, localities, communities, or families, the Federal Government can and should serve as an effective catalyst in dealing with this problem.

That is, classroom shortage.

In the official version of the message as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 125, the word "catalyst" was changed to "agent."

The use of the word "agent" certainly makes the nature of the proposed Federal contribution uncertain, but present indications are that catalyst is probably the more accurate word. In the budget message sent up to the Congress 11 days after the state of the Union message, the President, on page M56, says:

> Concurrently, without impairment in any way of State, local, community, and family responsibility, the Federal Government should serve as an effective catalyst in dealing with the problem of classroom shortages.

In essence, this is the same statement made in the advance releases before President Eisenhower substituted the word "agent" for "catalyst."

Dr. Fuller says that if the function of the Federal Government is that of a catalyst, then it may easily damage rather than assist in the construction of schools.

Of course, we will not know the administration's proposal until February 15, when the special message promised by the President will be sent to the Congress. But, already, indications of the contents of the proposal are circulating among Members of Congress and newsmen. Mr. Eric Sevareid described the first tentative reports and his reaction in the following broadcast:

> Good evening. In his state of the Union message the President said the country faces grave educational problems; his first really serious recognition of the school situation which is not only grave, but critical and rapidly growing worse; not only in terms of the classroom shortage he mentioned, but in terms of the desperate teacher shortage, and, in consequence of all this, in terms of the relentless decline of standards and training; the harsh truth is that unless bold and imaginative steps are taken, and quickly, the United States is on the way to becoming an intellectually second-rate nation.
>
> It doesn't look as if the bold steps are going to be taken by the Federal Government, unless the Executive is forced to big-scale action by a group of some 30 Senators supporting a bill for a billion-dollar emergency school construction program over the next 2 years; a bill to which the new chairman of the subcommittee concerned, Mr. HILL, of Alabama, is pledging top priority.
>
> The Presidential scheme to alleviate the educational crisis is due in a special message 1 month from tomorrow. The first tentative reports on its contents reached Capitol Hill and this reporter today, and failed to impress school-conscious legislators who heard them. These reports indicate the President will propose a bonding authority, providing Federal guaranty of State school bond issues, $25 million in Federal aid to schools in especially distressed districts, selected by a rigid test of need; $5 million to continue current studies of the crisis of elementary and secondary schools, another $5 million for study of college needs, and a system of college scholarships, involving a total of $250 millions over a period of several years.
>
> The whole program represents a small fraction of the funds, effort and imagination that have gone into the President's $100 billion scheme for developing the roads and highways of the country. There is no doubt that when the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare appears to testify, she will be severely questioned on the need for any more drawn-out studies and conferences on the school situation. This is one subject on which there is a superabundance of information already; studies of the matter are legion; the Federal Office of Education, in fact, is just completing a study authorized by Congress 2 years ago with an appropriation of $3½ million.
>
> The facts are at hand; what is required is action. In a capsule, the situation is this: There is an annual school enrollment increase of a million children and the flood will get heavier in the future. Add to this the fact that of the total tax dollar, Federal, State, and local, only 8 cents goes to the schools, as compared with 16 cents before World War II; add to it the fact that we are losing teachers each year, not only proportionately, but in absolute numbers.
>
> Some States are making valiant efforts to cope with the crisis. But it is still true that more than a million and a half children go to school in barracks, church basements, rented garages, and the like; that there are children now finishing the eighth grade who have never attended school on anything but a part-time basis.
>
> Mr. Eisenhower has long been concerned about the danger of Federal control of educational content. This can be avoided very simply by the terms of the legislation; what is stranger is the popular illusion that the Federal Government traditionally leaves the school problem to the States and localities. In fact, the history of Federal school action goes back to the Continental Congress and includes at least 50 major congressional acts. The Federal Government now finances over 200 educational activities, the largest being the annual three-quarter million dollar program for veterans. The President has a new program for educating soldiers and veterans for which there seems pressing need. But there are many who remain convinced that it is much wiser in the long run to eradicate ignorance and illiteracy at their source level. And that means a public-school system befitting the most important country in the free world.
>
> This is Eric Sevareid in Washington.

The implication of the catalytic approach is that the Federal contribution will be minute in proportion to that of the States and local districts and that the Federal Government is going to insist on getting back its contribution after the process of school construction theoretically has been accelerated.

Such a program will not begin to reach the real need. It will do nothing for districts that have already reached the limit of their capacity. The Kearns subcommittee last October learned that it is going to take at least $22 billion to have enough classrooms for our children in 1960. So the appropriation of $25 million is a minute amount, and the establishment of State authorities to borrow money either from the Federal Government or from private agencies under a Federal guaranty would mean that the Federal Government was going to insist on getting its funds back.

The bills introduced by Mr. BAILEY and Mr. KEARNS—H. R. 15 and H. R. 14—authorizing grants-in-aid for public-school construction should be given immediate consideration. There is no point in awaiting the President's February 15 message. The statements already made indicate that awaiting the President's program will only cause additional delay without any beneficial results.

Tariff Rates on Oysters Should Not Be Lowered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1955

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, oyster taking and processing is an important American food industry. In an average year about 60 million pounds of raw oysters, valued at $25 million to $30 million, are taken by American oyster fishermen from American waters. The value is further increased by the canning or deep-freezing of these oysters. The industry employs large numbers of people, both on fishing boats, on the oysterbeds, and in the canneries.

A proposal will be under consideration at the International Trade Conference in Geneva which starts next month to lower the tariff on imported oysters. If the present tariff rates on oysters are lowered, increased quantities of oysters, mostly from Japan, will flood the American market, thereby working great hardship on American oysterbed owners, oyster fishermen, oyster cannery owners and workers.

American oyster cannery labor cannot and should not be expected to compete with the low wages prevailing in the oyster canneries of Japan.

The Japanese women and girls who work in the oyster canneries of Japan receive a wage of only 8 cents an hour, compared to a wage of $1.50 an hour in the oyster canneries of the United States.

Men who work in the canneries of Japan at cleaning, shelling, smoking, and shoveling oysters receive an average wage of $0.197 or less than 20 cents an hour. In the United States, the average wage for similar labor is $1.50 to $1.78 an hour.

In short, the hourly wage paid in the United States is 15 to 20 times that paid in Japan. Unless reasonable tariffs or quota limits are imposed on Japanese shipments of oysters into the United States, Japanese oyster producers will drive the American oyster industry out of business.

The United States Tariff Commission should be proposing increasing the duty on Japanese oysters instead of the Committee on Reciprocity Information now considering lowering the tariff on Japanese oyster imports.

Four Days Is Short Notice for California Witnesses on H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1955

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, under unanimous consent, to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two telegrams which were received in my office this morning, protesting the scheduling of hearings on the proposed reciprocal trade agreements, and H. R. 1, to begin next Monday the 17th. That is only 4 days away, which is hardly time to get Californians to Washington, let alone to prepare themselves adequately for the hearing.

I have written the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], calling his attention to this situation, which I am sure was unintentional. I know that the hearings will be extended to give an opportunity for our people to prepare themselves and appear. The situation will affect various commodity groups in California, although the walnut growers and the almond growers are the only two from whom I have as yet received wires:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 13, 1955.*
Hon. JOHN PHILLIPS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Vigorously protest hasty scheduling of hearings by Ways and Means Committee on reciprocal-trade agreements, H. R. 1, beginning next Monday, because does not allow interested parties adequate time to prepare presentations. Tree-nut industries constantly endangered by excessive import competition, and believe committee exhibits prejudice against our viewpoint.

CALIFORNIA WALNUT GROWERS ASSOCIATION.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *January 13, 1955.*
Hon. JOHN PHILLIPS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Rush hearings on H. R. 1 as set for January 17 are indicative of attempt to railroad measure seeking to dissipate existing congressional tariff authority. We earnestly urge you exert your fullest possible opposition to such steamroller tactics. Letter follows.

D. R. BAILEY,
General Manager,
California Almond Growers Exchange.

Lowering Our Tariffs on Japanese Goods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons why the proposed extension of the President's authority to enter into trade agreements assumes such vital importance to the American people at this time is the pending agreement with Japan.

Trade negotiations with Japan are expected to get underway shortly. They may have already begun. Included among the hundreds of items with respect to which tariff concessions will be considered are the products of many American industries which are already feeling the devastating effect of foreign competition. These include chemicals, china and porcelainware, glassware, optical instruments, machinery, fish, and a wide variety of textile products. There are many others.

I believe that up-to-date information on the negotiations with Japan is essential to our enlightened understanding of the issues presented by current trade legislation. For that reason, I am presenting for the information of each Member a list of the items announced by the State Department to be subject to negotiation with Japan:

LIST OF ARTICLES IMPORTED INTO THE UNITED STATES PROPOSED FOR CONSIDERATION IN TRADE AGREEMENT NEGOTIATIONS WITH JAPAN AND OTHER COUNTRIES

TARIFF ACT OF 1930, TITLE I. DUTIABLE LIST

Schedule 1. Chemicals, oils, and paints

Paragraph 5: Ajinomoto and other monosodium glutamate preparations.

Paragraph 27 (a) (1) (5): Acetanilide not suitable for medicinal use, alphanaphthol, aminobenzoic acid, aminonaphthol, aminophenetole, aminophenol, aminosalicylic acid, aminoanthraquinone, aniline oil, aniline salt, anthraquinone, arsanilic acid, benzaldehyde not suitable for medicinal use, benzal chloride, benzanthrone, benzidine, benzidine sulfate, benzoic acid not suitable for medicinal use, benzoquinone, benzoyl chloride, benzyl chloride, benzylethylaniline, beta-naphthol not suitable for medicinal use, bromobenzene, chlorobenzene, chlorophthalic acid, cinnamic acid, cumidine, dehydrothiotoluidine, diaminostilbene, dianisidine, dichlorophthalic acid, dimethyl aniline, dimethylaminophenol, dimethylphenylbenzylammonium hydroxide, dimethylphenylenediamine, dinitrobenzene, dinitrochlorobenzene, dinitronaphthalene, dinitrophenol, dinitrotoluene, dihydroxynaphthalene, diphenylamine, hydroxyphenylarsinic acid, metanilic acid, methylanthraquinone, naphthylamine, naphthylenediamine, nitroaniline, nitroanthraquinone, nitrobenzaldehyde, nitrobenzene, nitronaphthalene, nitrophenol, nitrophenylenediamine, nitrosodimethylaniline, nitrotoluene, nitrotoluylenediamine, phenylenediamine, phenylhydrazine, phenylnaphthylamine, phenylglycine, phenylglycinerothocarboxylic acid, phthalic acid, phthalimide, quinaldine, quinoline, resorcinol not suitable for medicinal use, salicylic acid and its salts not suitable for medicinal use, sulfanilic acid, thiocarbanilide, thiosalicylic acid, tetrachlorophthalic acid, tetramethyldiaminobenzophenone, tetramethyldiaminodiphenylmethane, toluene sulfochloride, toluene sulfonamide, tribromophenol, toluidine, tolidine, tolylenediamine, xylidine, carbazole having a purity of 65 percent or more; all the foregoing products (not including phthalic anhydride, anthracene, or naphthalene) whether obtained, derived, or manufactured from coal tar or other source.

Paragraph 27 (a) (3) (5): All products (except products chiefly used as assistants in preparing or finishing textiles and except azo salts, fast-color bases, fast-color salts, and naphthol AS and it derivatives), by whatever name known, which are similar to any of the products provided for in paragraph 27 or 1651, Tariff Act of 1930, and which are obtained, derived, or manufactured in whole or in part from any of the products provided for in either of said paragraphs.

Paragraph 27 (a) (4) (5): All mixtures, including solutions, consisting in whole or in part of any of the products provided for in subdivision (1), (2), or (3) of paragraph 27 (a), Tariff Act of 1930 (except sheep dip and medicinal soaps, and except products chiefly use as assistants in preparing or finishing textiles).

Paragraph 41: Agar agar.

Paragraph 47: Licorice, extracts of, in pastes, rolls, or other forms.

Paragraph 51: Camphor, natural (crude and refined) and synthetic.

Paragraph 51: Menthol.

Paragraph 58: Oils, distilled or essential, not mixed or compounded with or containing alcohol: Sandalwood.

Paragraph 60: Safrol, not mixed or compounded, not containing more than 10 percent of alcohol, not marketable as cosmetics, perfumery, or toilet preparations, and not specially provided for.

Paragraph 66: Pigments, whether dry, mixed, or ground in or mixed with water, oil, or solutions other than oil, not specially provided for: Vandyke brown and Cassel earth.

Paragraph 67: Barytes ore, crude or unmanufactured, or ground or otherwise manufactured.

Paragraph 83: Potato starch.

Paragraph 84: Dextrine, not otherwise provided for (not including dextrine made from potato starch or potato flour), burnt starch or British gum, dextrine substitutes, and soluble or chemically treated starch.

Paragraph 87: Cerium nitrate, cerium fluoride, and other salts of cerium not specially provided for.

Schedule 2. Earths, earthenware, and glassware

Paragraph 204: Dead burned and grain magnesite, and periclase, not suitable for manufacture into exychloride cements.

Paragraph 206: Pumice stone, wholly or partly manufactured.

Paragraph 210: Rockingham earthenware.

Paragraph 211: Earthenware and crockery ware composed of a nonvitrified absorbent body, including white granite and semiporcelain earthenware, and cream-colored ware, terra cotta, and stoneware, including all articles wholly or in chief value of such ware; any of the foregoing which are tableware, kitchenware, or table or kitchen utensils, however provided for in paragraph 211, Tariff Act of 1930.

Paragraph 211: Articles, other than tableware, kitchenware, or table or kitchen utensils, however provided for in paragraph 211, Tariff Act of 1930, if valued under $10 per dozen.

Paragraph 212: China, porcelain, and other vitrified wares, including chemical stoneware (but not including chemical porcelain ware, sanitary ware and fittings and parts therefor, or electrical porcelain ware), composed of a vitrified nonabsorbent body which when broken shows a vitrified or vitreous, or semivitrified or semivitreous fracture, and all bisque and parian wares, including clock cases with or without movements, plaques, pill tiles, ornaments, charms,

vases, statues, statuettes, mugs, cups, steins, lamps, and all other articles composed wholly or in chief value of such ware; all the foregoing, however provided for in paragraph 212, Tariff Act of 1930, not containing 25 percent or more of calcined bone.

Paragraph 213: Graphite or plumbago, crude, or refined: Amorphous (except artificial).

Paragraph 218 (c): Illuminating articles of every description, finished or unfinished, wholly or in chief value of glass, for use in connection with artificial illumination:

Chimneys, globes, and shades, and parts thereof, wholly or in chief value of glass.

Paragraph 218 (f): Table and kitchen articles and utensils, and all articles of every description not specially provided for composed wholly or in chief value of glass, blown or partly blown in the mold or otherwise, or colored, cut, engraved, etched, frosted, gilded, around (except such grinding as is necessary for fitting stoppers or for purposes other than ornamentation), painted, printed in any manner, sand-blasted, silvered, stained, or decorated or ornamented in any manner, whether filled or unfilled, or whether their contents be dutiable or free:

Christmas tree ornaments valued under $7.50 per gross;

Other articles or utensils valued not over $1.66⅔ each (except articles or utensils commercially known as bubble glass, if produced otherwise than by automatic machine but not cut or engraved and valued at $1 or more each, and except Christmas tree ornaments).

Paragraph 225: Spectacles, eyeglasses, and goggles, and frames for the same, and parts thereof, finished or unfinished, valued not over $2.50 per dozen.

Paragraph 226: Lenses of glass or pebble, molded or pressed, or ground and polished to a spherical, cylindrical, or prismatic form, and ground and polished plano or coquille glasses, wholly or partly manufactured; all the foregoing (except lighthouse lenses and except eyeglass and spectacle lenses with edges unground and value at $10 or more per dozen pairs).

Paragraph 228 (a): Spectrographs, spectrometers, spectroscopes, refractometers, saccharimeters, colorimeters, cathetometers, interferometers, haemacytometers, polarimeters, polariscopes, photometers, ophthalmoscopes, slit lamps, corneal microscopes, optical measuring or optical testing instruments, testing or recording instruments for ophthalmological purposes, frames and mountings therefor, and parts of any of the foregoing, finished or unfinished.

Paragraph 228 (a): Prism binoculars having a magnification of 5 diameters or less and valued at not over $12 each; frames and mountings therefor, and parts of any of the foregoing; all the foregoing, finished or unfinished.

Paragraph 228 (b): Opera or field glasses (not prism binoculars), frames and mountings therefor, and parts of any of the foregoing; all the foregoing, finished or unfinished, not specially provided for (except opera or field glasses valued over $1 each).

Paragraphs 228 (b) and 1551: Photographic lenses, frames and mountings therefor, and parts of any of the foregoing; all the foregoing, finished or unfinished, not specially provided for (including cameras and parts of cameras of which a photographic lens is the component of chief value).

Paragraph 228 (b): Telescopes, valued not over $2 each; frames and mountings therefor; parts of any of the foregoing, suitable in type and not excessive in quantity for use with, and imported in the same shipment with, telescopes valued not over $2 each; frames and mountings for, and parts of telescopes and of frames and mountings therefor, imported separately; all the foregoing, finished or unfinished, not specially provided for.

Paragraph 228 (b): Azimuth mirrors, parabolic or mangin mirrors for searchlight reflectors, mirrors for optical, dental, or surgical purposes, projection lenses, sextants, octants, microscopes, all optical instruments (not including photographic lenses, opera or field glasses, and telescopes), frames and mountings therefor, and parts of any of the foregoing; all the foregoing, finished or unfinished, not specially provided for.

Paragraph 229: Incandescent electric-light bulbs and lamps, with or without metal or other filaments.

Paragraph 230 (b): Glass mirrors (except framed or cased mirrors in chief value of platinum, gold, or silver), not specially provided for, not exceeding in size 144 square inches, with or without frames or cases.

Paragraph 233: All articles composed wholly or in chief value of agate or other semiprecious stone (not including rock crystal), except such as are cut into shapes and forms fitting them expressly for use in the construction of jewelry, not specially provided for.

Schedule 3. Metals and manufactures of

Paragraph 301: Iron in pigs and iron kentledge, whether or not containing vanadium, tungsten, molybdenum, or chromium in quantities specified in paragraph 301, Tariff Act of 1930.

Paragraph 302 (c): Tungsten ore or concentrates.

Paragraph 302 (d): Ferromanganese containing 4 percent or more of carbon.

Paragraph 302 (n) Titanium.

Paragraph 312: Sheet piling.

Paragraph 329: Chains of iron or steel, used for the transmission of power, of not more than 2-inch pitch and containing more than three parts per pitch, and parts thereof, finished or unfinished; and all other chains used for the transmission of power, and parts thereof.

Paragraph 331: Upholsters' nails and thumb tacks, of two or more pieces of iron or steel, finished or unfinished.

Paragraph 343: Needle cases or needle books furnished with assortments of needles or combinations of needles and other articles.

Paragraph 343: Needles for knitting machines of every description, not specially provided for.

Paragraph 354: Cuticle knives, corn knives, nail files, tweezers, manicure or pedicure nippers, and parts thereof, finished or unfinished, by whatever name known.

Paragraph 359: Surgical instruments, and parts thereof (except hypodermic and other needles, but including hypodermic syringes and forceps), composed wholly or in part of iron, steel, copper, brass, nickel, aluminum, or other metal (but not in chief value of glass), finished or unfinished.

Paragraph 359: Dental instruments, and parts thereof, wholly or in part of iron, steel, copper, brass, nickel, aluminum, or other metal, finished or unfinished: Dental burrs.

Paragraph 359: Surgical instruments and parts thereof and dental instruments and parts thereof, any of the foregoing in part of iron, steel, copper, brass, nickel, aluminum, or other metal, and in chief value of glass, finished or unfinished.

Paragraph 364: Bicycle, velocipede, and similar bells, finished or unfinished, and parts thereof.

Paragraph 365: Shotguns, valued over $25 each.

Paragraph 365. Barrels for shotguns, further advanced in manufacture than rough bored only; stocks for shotguns, wholly or partly manufactured; parts of shotguns, and fittings for shotgun stocks or barrels, finished or unfinished; and shotgun barrels, in single tubes, forged, rough bored.

Paragraph 366: Pistols and revolvers, automatic, single-shot, magazine, or revolving, valued not over $8 each.

Paragraph 372: Sewing machines, not specially provided for, valued over $10 but not over $75 each.

Paragraph 372: Parts of sewing machines, not specially provided for, wholly or in chief value of metal or porcelain.

Paragraph 372: Printing machinery; and parts of printing machinery, not specially provided for, wholly or in chief value of metal or porcelain: Duplicating machines (not including printing presses), and parts thereof.

Paragraph 372: Knitting machines (except full-fashioned hosiery and circular knitting machines), finished or unfinished, not specially provided for, and parts thereof, not specially provided for, wholly or in chief value of metal or porcelain.

Paragraph 382 (a): Aluminum foil less than six one-thousandths of 1 inch in thickness.

Paragraph 397: Articles or wares, not specially provided for, not plated with platinum (unless in chief value of platinum, gold, or silver, or colored with gold lacquer, whether partly or wholly manufactured.

Composed wholly or in chief value of lead.

Composed wholly or in chief value of base metal other than iron or steel: Screws, commonly called wood screws, having shanks not exceeding twelve-one-hundredths inch in diameter; and screws other than those commonly called wood screws, having shanks or threads not exceeding twenty-four-one hundredths inch in diameter.

Composed wholly or in chief value of platinum.

Schedule 4. Wood and manufacture of

Paragraph 404: Japanese white oak and Japanese maple: In the form of sawed boards, planks, deals, and all other forms not further manufactured than sawed, and flooring.

Paragraph 409: Split bamboo.

Paragraph 409: All articles not specially provided for, wholly or partly manufactured of rattan, bamboo, osier or willow (except tennis-racket frames, valued at $1.75 or more each).

Paragraph 410: Toothpicks of wood or other vegetable substance.

Paragraph 411: Porch and window blinds, baskets, bags, chair seats, curtains, shades, or screens, any of the foregoing wholly or in chief value of bamboo, wood, straw, papier-mâché, palm leaf, or compositions of wood, not specially provided for (except baskets and bags wholly or in chief value of straw or willow or osier).

Paragraph 412: Bentwood furniture, wholly or partly finished, and parts thereof.

Paragraph 412: Folding rules, wholly or in chief value of wood, and not specially provided for.

Paragraph 412: Manufactures of wood or bark, or of which wood or bark is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for:

Brush backs.

Schedule 5. Sugar, molasses, and manufacture of

Paragraph 505: Levulose.

Schedule 7. Agricultural products and provisions

Paragraph 703: Hams and shoulders, prepared or preserved: If cooked and packed in air-tight containers, but not made into sausage.

Paragraph 710: Cheese, made from sheep's milk, in original loaves, not suitable for grating.

Paragraph 712: Birds, prepared or preserved in any manner and not specially provided for (except chickens, prepared by removal of the feathers, heads, and all or part of the viscera, with or without removal of the feet, but not cooked or divided into portions).

Paragraph 713: Eggs of poultry (except of chickens), in the shell.

Paragraph 713: Dried egg albumen, whether or not sugar or other material is added.

Paragraph 717 (b): Fish, fresh or frozen (whether or not packed in ice), filleted, skinned, boned, sliced, or divided into portions, not specially provided for: Swordfish.

Paragraph 717 (c): Fish, dried and unsalted (except cod, haddock, hake, pollock, and cusk, and except shark fins).

Paragraph 718 (a): Fish, prepared or preserved in any manner, when packed in oil or in oil and other substances: Tuna.

Paragraph 718 (b): Fish, prepared or preserved in any manner, when packed in airtight containers weighing with their contents not more than 15 pounds each (except fish packed in oil or in oil and other substances): Tuna.

Paragraph 721 (a): Crabmeat, fresh or frozen (whether or not packed in ice), or prepared or preserved in any manner, including crab paste and crab sauce.

Paragraph 721 (b): Clams other than razor clams, and clams in combination with other substances (except clam chowder), packed in airtight containers.

Paragraph 721 (e): Oysters, oyster juice, or either in combination with other substances, packed in airtight containers.

Paragraph 727: Broken rice, which will pass readily through a metal sieve perforated with round holes five and one-half sixty-fourths of 1 inch in diameter.

Paragraph 730: Soy bean oil cake and soy bean oil-cake meal.

Paragraph 730: Vegetable oil cake and oil-cake meal, not specially provided for: Coconut or copra, linseed.

Paragraph 736: Berries, edible (except blueberries), prepared or preserved (not including berries in brine, dried, desiccated, evaporated, or frozen), and not specially provided for.

Paragraph 738: Cider.

Paragraph 743: Oranges, Mandarin, packed in airtight containers.

Paragraph 748: Plums, prunes, and prunelles, green, ripe, or in brine.

Paragraph 753: Lily bulbs.

Paragraph 760: Walnuts of all kinds, shelled, or blanched, roasted, prepared, or preserved, including walnut paste.

Paragraph 761: Cashew nuts, shelled (including blanched) or unshelled.

Paragraph 763: Grass seeds and other forage crop seeds: Clover, not specially provided for.

Paragraph 764: Tree and shrub seeds.

Paragraph 768: Mushroom, dried.

Paragraph 775: Vegetables (including horseradish), if cut, sliced, or otherwise reduced in size, or if reduced to flour, or if parched or roasted, or if packed in oil, or prepared or preserved in any other way and not specially provided for (not including dehydrated onions in any form of vegetables pickled, or packed in salt or in brine).

Paragraph 775. Soybeans, prepared or preserved in any manner.

Paragraph 775: Pastes, balls, puddings, hash (except corned beef hash), and all similar forms, composed of vegetables, or of vegetables and meat or fish, or both, not specially provided for.

Paragraph 776: Chicory, crude (except endive), or ground or otherwise prepared.

Paragraph 779: Rice straw, and rice fiber.

Paragraph 781: Curry and curry powder.

Schedule 8. Spirits, wines, and other beverages

Paragraph 804: Rice wine or sake.

Schedule 9. Cotton manufactures

Paragraph 904 (a) (b) (c) (d): Cotton cloth, however, provided for in paragraph 904, Tariff Act of 1930 (not including tire fabric or fabric for use in pneumatic tires).

Paragraph 905: Cloth, in chief value of cotton, containing silk, or rayon or other synthetic textile.

Paragraph 909: Pile fabrics (not including pile ribbons), cut or uncut, whether or not the pile covers the entire surface, wholly or in chief value of cotton, if velveteens.

Paragraph 910: Table damask, wholly or in chief value of cotton, and all articles, finished or unfinished, made or cut from such table damask.

Paragraph 911 (a): Blankets or blanket cloth, napped or unnapped, wholly or in chief value of cotton, whether in the piece or otherwise, if Jacquard-figured.

Paragraph 911 (a): Quilts or bedspreads, wholly or in chief value of cotton, whether in the piece or otherwise, not Jacquard-figured, if block-printed by hand.

Paragraph 911 (a): Towels, other than pile fabrics, wholly or in chief value of cotton, whether in the piece or otherwise, and whether or not Jacquard-figured.

Paragraph 911 (b): Sheets and pillowcases, wholly or in chief value of cotton.

Paragraph 911 (b): Table and bureau covers, centerpieces, runners, scarfs, napkins, and doilies, made of plain-woven cotton cloth, and not specially provided for.

Paragraph 912: Boot, shoe, or corset lacings, wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber.

Paragraph 915: Gloves and mittens, finished or unfinished, wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber, made of fabric knit or a warp-knitting or other machine.

Paragraph 917: Underwear, outerwear, and articles of all kinds, knit or crocheted, finished or unfinished, wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber, and not specially provided for (except knit underwear valued over $1.75 per pound, and crocheted underwear).

Paragraph 919: Clothing and articles of wearing apparel of every description, manufactured wholly or in part, wholly or in chief value of cotton, and not specially provided for (except coats valued $4 or more each; vests valued $2 or more each; dressing gowns, including bath robes and beach robes, valued $2.50 or more each; underwear valued 75 cents or more per separate piece; and except pajamas valued $1.50 or more per suit).

Paragraph 921: Rag rugs, wholly or in chief value of cotton, of the type commonly known as hit-and-miss; chenille rugs, wholly or in chief value of cotton; and all other floor coverings, including carpets, carpeting, mats, and rugs, wholly or in chief value of cotton (except cut-pile and hand-hooked floor coverings and imitation oriental rugs).

Paragraph 922: Rags, including wiping rags, wholly or in chief value of cotton, except rags chiefly used in papermaking.

Paragraph 923: Manufactures, wholly or in chief value of cotton, not specially provided for (except articles of pile construction other than terry-woven towels, and except bougies, catheters, drains, explorateurs, instillateurs, probes, sondes, and other urological instruments, yarns containing wool molded, cotton and rubber packing, and printers' rubberized blanketing).

Schedule 10. Flax, hemp, jute, and manufactures of

Paragraph 1001: Flax, hackled, including dressed line.

Paragraph 1001: Flax, not hackled.

Paragraph 1003: Jute yarns or roving, single; and jute sliver.

Paragraph 1006: Gill nettings, nets, webs, and seines, and other nets for fishing, wholly or in chief value of flax, hemp, or ramie, and not specially provided for.

Paragraph 1015: Fabrics with fast edges, not exceeding 12 inches in width, and articles made therefrom: Webbing wholly or in chief value of jute.

Paragraph 1019: Bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and similar fabrics, suitable for covering cotton, composed of single yarns made of jute, jute butts, or other vegetable fiber, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, not exceeding 16 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, and weighing not less than 15 ounces nor more than 32 ounces per square yard.

Paragraph 1021: Common China, Japan, and India straw matting, and floor coverings made therefrom.

Paragraph 1021: Floor coverings not specially provided for: Grass or rice straw.

Paragraph 1022: Pile mats and floor coverings, wholly or in chief value of cocoa fiber.

Schedule 11. Wool and manufactures of

Paragraph 1101 (a), (b): Hair of the camel, however provided for in paragraph 1101, Tariff Act of 1930.

Paragraph 1111: Blankets and similar articles (including carriage and automobile robes and steamer rugs), made as units or in the piece, finished or unfinished, wholly or in chief value of wool, not exceeding 3 yards in length.

Paragraph 1114 (b): Hose and half hose, finished or unfinished, wholly or in chief value of wool.

Paragraph 1114 (d): Outerwear and articles of all kinds, knit or crocheted, finished or unfinished, wholly or in chief value of wool, and not specially provided for:

Hats, bonnets, caps, berets, and similar articles (except infants' headwear), valued over $2 per pound.

Other (except infants' headwear and other infants' outerwear).

Paragraph 1117 (c): Floor coverings, including mats and druggets, wholly or in chief value of wool, not specially provided for, valued over 40 cents per square foot (except such floor coverings wholly or in chief value of hair of the alpaca, guanaco, huarizo, llama, misti, suri, or a combination of the hair of two or more of these species, or wholly or in chief value of hair of the Angora goat).

Paragraph 1117 (c): Floor coverings, including mats and druggets, wholly or in chief value of wool, not specially provided for:

Wholly or in chief value of hair of the Angora goat.

Schedule 12. Silk manufactures

Paragraph 1201: Silk partially manufactured, including total or partial degumming other than in the reeling process, from raw silk, waste silk, or cocoons, and silk noils exceeding 2 inches in length; all the foregoing, if not twisted or spun.

Paragraph 1202: Spun silk or schappe silk yarn, or yarn of silk and rayon or other synthetic textile, and roving, whether or not bleached, dyed, colored, or plied.

Paragraph 1205: Woven fabrics in the piece, wholly or in chief value of silk, however provided for in paragraph 1205, Tariff Act of 1930 (except fabrics with fibers wholly of silk, not bleached, colored, dyed, or printed, if Jacquard-figured; with fibers chiefly but not wholly of silk, not bleached, colored, dyed, or printed, if Jacquard-figured, or bleached, colored, dyed, or printed, whether or not Jacquard-figured; and except silk bolting cloth).

Paragraph 1208: Gloves and mittens, knit or crocheted, finished or unfinished, wholly or in chief value of silk.

Schedule 13. Manufactures of rayon or other synthetic textile

Paragraph 1301: Yarns of rayon or other synthetic textile, singles or plied, not specially provided for (except single yarns weighing 150 deniers or more per length of 450 meters), and regardless of the number of turns twist per inch.

Paragraph 1302: Filaments of rayon or other synthetic textile, not exceeding 30 inches in length, other than waste, whether known as cut fiber, staple fiber, or by any other name.

Paragraph 1309: Gloves and mittens, knit or crocheted, finished or unfinished, wholly or in chief value of rayon or other synthetic textile, valued under $1.50 per dozen pairs.

Schedule 14. Papers and books

Paragraph 1403: Masks composed of paper, pulp, or papier mâché, not specially provided for.

Paragraph 1404: Papers commonly or commercially known as stereotype paper, copying paper, or bibulous paper, not specially provided for, colored or uncolored, white or printed, whether in sheets or any other form,

and weighing less than 10 pounds to the ream.

Paragraph 1405: Bags and other articles, except printed matter, composed wholly or in chief value of any of the papers provided for in any of the provisions of paragraph 1405, Tariff Act of 1930, preceding the provision for bags, and not specially provided for (not including boxes of paper or papier mâché or wood covered or lined with any such paper).

Paragraph 1405: Sensitized paper to be used in photography.

Paragraph 1409: Hanging paper, printed, lithographed, dyed, or colored.

Paragraph 1409: Papers, not specially provided for (except stencil paper, unmounted, and except strawboard and straw paper, under 0.012 but not under 0.008 inch thick).

Paragraph 1410: Books, unbound or bound (except those bound wholly or in part in leather), and sheets or printed pages of books bound wholly or in part in leather, not specially provided for, if of bona fide foreign authorship: Prayer books and sheets or printed pages of prayer books.

Paragraph 1410: Blank books and slate books: Diaries, notebooks, and address books.

Schedule 15. Sundries

Paragraph 1502: Baseballs and balls wholly or in chief value of rubber (except golf and lawn-tennis balls), finished or unfinished, primarily designed for use in physical exercise (whether or not such exercise involves the element of sport), all the foregoing, not specially provided for.

Paragraph 1502: Tennis rackets.

Paragraph 1503: Beads of ivory; hollow or filled imitation pearl beads of all kinds and shapes, of whatever material composed; imitation solid pearl beads; and iridescent imitation solid pearl beads.

Paragraph 1504 (a): Braids, plaits, laces, and willow sheets or squares, composed wholly or in chief value of straw, chip, paper, grass, palm leaf, willow, osier, rattan, real horsehair, cuba bark, or manila hemp, and braids and plaits, wholly or in chief value of ramie, all the foregoing suitable for making or ornamenting hats, bonnets, or hoods, whether or not bleached, dye, colored, or stained, and whether or not containing a substantial part of rayon or other synthetic textile (but not wholly or in chief value thereof), except any of the foregoing (other than willow sheets or squares) not containing a substantial part of rayon or other synthetic textile and not bleached, dyed, colored, or stained.

Paragraph 1504 (b) (1) (2): Hats, bonnets, and hoods, wholly or in chief value of chip, paper, grass, palm leaf, willow, osier, rattan, real horsehair, cuba bark, or manila hemp, whether wholly or partly manufactured, not blocked, trimmed, or sewed, whether or not bleached, dyed, colored, or stained (not including any of the foregoing known as harvest hats and valued under $3 per dozen, or hats and hoods, not bleached, colored, dyed, or stained, wholly or in chief value of fiber of the carludovica palmata, commercially known as toquilla fiber or straw).

Paragraph 1504 (b) (2) (4): Hats, bonnets, and hoods, whether wholly or partly manufactured: Wholly or in chief value of straw or ramie, bleached, dyed, colored, or stained, but not blocked, trimmed, or sewed; or wholly or in chief value of straw, if sewed (whether or not blocked, trimmed, bleached, dyed, colored, or stained).

Paragraph 1504 (b) (3): Hats, bonnets, and hoods, composed wholly or in chief value of straw, chip, paper, grass, palm leaf, willow, osier, rattan, real horsehair, cuba bark, ramie, or manila hemp, whether wholly or partly manufactured, blocked or trimmed (whether or not bleached, dyed, colored, or stained).

Paragraph 1506: Toilet brushes (not including tooth brushes), the handles or backs of which are composed wholly or in chief value of any product provided for in paragraph 31, Tariff Act of 1930.

Paragraph 1506: Handles and backs for tooth brushes and other toilet brushes, composed wholly or in chief value of any product provided for in paragraph 31, Tariff Act of 1930.

Paragraph 1506: Hair pencils in quills or otherwise.

Paragraph 1506: Brushes, not specially provided for (except paint brushes).

Paragraph 1510: Buttons not specially provided for (except horn and composition horn buttons, buttons wholly or in chief value of any compound of casein and valued over 60 cents per gross, buttons wholly or in chief value of glass, buttons commonly known as Roman pearl, fancy buttons with a fish-scale or similar to fish-scale finish, buttons wholly or in chief value of wood, and buttons wholly or in part of textile material).

Paragraph 1511: Cork tile in the rough or wholly or partly finished.

Paragraph 1513: Dolls wholly or in chief value of china, porcelain, parian, bisque, earthenware, or stoneware, or wholly or in chief value of any product provided for in paragraph 31, Tariff Act of 1930, and parts of dolls (including clothing), and doll heads, however provided for in paragraph 1513, Tariff Act of 1930 (except dolls and doll clothing composed in any part, however small, of any of the laces, fabrics, embroideries, or other materials or articles provided for in paragraph 1529 (a), Tariff Act of 1930).

Paragraph 1513: Toys, and parts of toys (not including dolls or parts of dolls) composed wholly or in chief value of any product provided for in paragraph 31, Tariff Act of 1930.

Paragraph 1513: Toy games, toy containers, toy favors, toy souvenirs, of whatever materials composed; toy balloons; and toy books without reading matter (not counting as reading matter any printing on removable pages), other than letters, numerals, or descriptive words, bound or unbound, and parts thereof.

Paragraph 1513: Toys, not specially provided for:

Wholly or in chief value of china, porcelain, parian, bisque, earthenware, or stoneware.

Wholly or in chief value of rubber.

Toys having a spring mechanism (except figures or images of animate objects, wholly or in chief value of metal).

Stuffed animal figures not having a spring mechanism.

Paragraph 1513: Parts of toys, not specially provided for.

Paragraph 1515: Bombs, rockets, roman candles, and fireworks of all descriptions, not specially provided for (not including firecrackers).

Paragraph 1516: Matches, friction or lucifer, of all descriptions, in boxes containing not over 100 matches per box.

Paragraph 1518: Artificial or ornamental fruits, vegetables, grasses, grains, leaves, flowers, stems, or parts thereof, composed wholly or in chief value of yarns, threads, filaments, tinsel wire, lame, bullions, metal threads, beads, bugles, spangles, or rayon or other synthetic textile, or composed wholly or in chief value of other materials (except feathers) and not specially provided for; and boas, boutonnieres, wreaths, and all articles not specially provided for, composed wholly or in chief value of any of the foregoing fruits, vegetables, grasses, grains, leaves, flowers, stems, or parts.

Paragraph 1523: Hair press cloth, not specially provided for.

Paragraph 1526 (a): Hats, caps, bonnets, and hoods, trimmed or untrimmed, including bodies, hoods, plateaux, forms, or shapes, for such hats or bonnets, composed wholly or in chief value of fur of the rabbit, beaver, or other animals, and valued over $24 but not over $48 per dozen.

Paragraph 1527 (a) (2): Jewelry, commonly or commercially so known, finished or unfinished (including parts thereof), of whatever material composed (except jewelry and parts thereof composed wholly or in chief value of gold or platinum, or of which the metal part is wholly or in chief value of gold or platinum); all the foregoing valued over 20 cents but not over $5 per dozen pieces.

Paragraph 1527 (c) (2): Articles valued above 20 cents per dozen pieces, designed to be worn on apparel or carried on or about or attached to the person, such as and including cardcases, chains, cigar cases, cigar cutters, cigar holders, cigar lighters, cigarette cases, cigarette holders, coin holders, combs, match boxes, mesh bags and purses, millinery, military and hair ornaments, pins, powder cases, stamp cases, vanity cases, watch bracelets, and like articles; all the foregoing and parts thereof, finished or unfinished, composed wholly or in chief value of metal other than gold or platinum (whether or not enameled, washed, covered, or plated, including rolled gold plate), or (if not composed in chief value of metal and if not dutiable under clause 1 of paragraph 1527 (c), Tariff Act of 1930) set with and in chief value of precious or semiprecious stones, pearls, cameos, coral, amber, imitation precious or semiprecious stones, or imitation pearls (except cigar and cigarette lighters and parts thereof, buckles, collar, cuff, and dress buttons, ladies' handbags set with and in chief value of rhinestones, mesh bags and parts thereof, all the foregoing valued above 20 cents and not above $5 per dozen pieces or parts; and except all articles and parts, other than cigar and cigarette lighters and parts, valued above $5 per dozen pieces or parts).

Paragraph 1528: Diamonds, rubies, and sapphires, cut but not set, and suitable for use in the manufacture of jewelry.

Paragraph 1528: Pearls and parts thereof, drilled or undrilled, but not set or strung (except temporarily), if cultured or cultivated; imitation half pearls, and hollow or filled imitation pearls of all shapes, without hole or with hole partly through only; imitation solid pearls and iridescent imitation solid pearls, unpierced, pierced or partially pierced, loose, or mounted, of whatever shape, color, or design.

Paragraph 1529 (a): Laces, lace fabrics, and lace articles, made wholly by hand and containing no machine-made material or article provided for in paragraph 1529 (a), Tariff Act of 1930, all the foregoing not wholly or in chief value of vegetable fiber other than cotton, if over 2 inches wide and valued not over $50 per pound, or if not over 2 inches wide, regardless of value.

Paragraph 1529 (a): Fabrics and articles (not wearing apparel), in part but not wholly of handmade lace and containing no machine-made material or article provided for in paragraph 1529 (a), Tariff Act of 1930, if all or part of the lace is over 2 inches wide and the fabrics or articles are valued not over $50 per pound, or if none of the lace is over 2 inches wide, regardless of the value of the fabrics or articles.

Paragraph 1529 (a): Fabrics and articles embroidered (whether or not the embroidery is on a scalloped edge), tamboured, appliqued, ornamented with beads, bugles, or spangles, or from which threads have been omitted, drawn, punched, or cut, and with threads introduced after weaving to finish or ornament the openwork, not including one row of straight hemstitching adjoining the hem; all the foregoing, and fabrics and articles wholly or in part thereof (not including fabrics and articles in any part of lace), however described in paragraph 1529 (a), Tariff Act of 1930; any of the foregoing if wholly or in chief value of cotton and included in subdivision [6] of paragraph 1529 (a) of "United States Import Duties (1952)" (but not including wearing apparel), or if included in subdivision [9] of paragraph 1529 (a) of said "United States Import

Duties" (except gloves and mittens included in such subdivision [9] wholly or in chief value of wool and except other wearing apparel included in such subdivision [9] wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber or wholly or in chief value of rayon or other synthetic textile).

Paragraph 1529 (a): Bureau and table covers, centerpieces, doilies, napkins, runners, and scarfs, made of plain-woven cotton cloth, block printed by hand, and in part of fringe.

Paragraph 1529 (a): Quilts or bedspreads, wholly or in chief value of cotton, in the piece or otherwise, block printed by hand, and in part of fringe.

1530 (b): Upper leather made from calf or kip skins, rough, partly finished, or finished, but not cut or partly or wholly manufactured into uppers, vamps, or any forms or shapes suitable for conversion into boots, shoes, or footwear.

Paragraph 1530 (e): Boots, shoes, or other footwear, made wholly or in chief value of leather, not specially provided for: Slippers (for housewear).

Paragraph 1530 (e): Boots, shoes, or other footwear (including athletic or sporting boots and shoes), the uppers of which are composed wholly of in chief value of wool, cotton, ramie, animal hair, fiber, rayon or other synthetic textile, silk, or substitutes for any of the foregoing:

With soles wholly or in chief value of leather.

With soles wholly or in chief value of india rubber or substitutes for rubber.[1]

With soles wholly or in chief value of other materials (except boots, shoes, or other footwear with uppers wholly or in chief value of vegetable fiber other than cotton, or with uppers and soles both in chief value of wool felt, and except alpargatas with uppers wholly or in chief value of cotton).

Paragraph 1531: Bags, baskets, belts, satchels, cardcases, pocketbooks, jewel boxes, portfolios, and other boxes and cases, not jewelry, wholly or in chief value of leather or parchment, and manufactures of leather, rawhide, or parchment, or of which leather, rawhide, or parchment is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for (except straps and strops):

Belts and buckles designed to be worn on the person.

Coin purses, change purses, billfolds, bill cases, bill rolls, bill purses, banknote cases, currency cases, money cases, card cases, license cases, pass cases, passport cases, letter cases, and similar flat leather goods, not wholly or in chief value of reptile leather.

Women's and children's handbags or pocketbooks, not wholly or in chief value of reptile leather.

Leads, leashes, collars, muzzles, and similar dog equipment.

Wearing apparel (other than belts and buckles).

Bags, baskets, belts, satchels, pocketbooks, jewel boxes, portfolios, and boxes and cases, not jewelry (except articles named in any of the above subdivisions, whether or not wholly or in chief value of reptile leather).

Paragraph 1531: Articles provided for in paragraph 1531, Tariff Act of 1930, if wholly or in chief value of reptile leather and permanently fitted and furnished with traveling, bottle, drinking, dining or luncheon, sewing, manicure, or similar sets.

Paragraph 1532 (b): Gloves, wholly or in chief value of leather made from horsehides or cowhides (except calfskins), whether wholly or partly manufactured.

Paragraph 1535: Artificial flies, snelled hooks, leaders or casts, finished or unfinished; fishing rods, and parts thereof, finished or unfinished, not specially provided for; fishhooks, artificial baits, and all other fishing tackle and parts thereof, fly books, fly boxes, fishing baskets or creels, finished or unfinished, not specially provided for, except fishing lines, fishing nets, and seines (and not including fishing reels and parts thereof).

Paragraph 1536: Candles.

Paragraph 1536: Manufactures of amber or bladders or of which these substances or either of them is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for.

Paragraph 1537 (a): Manufactures of bone, chip, grass, sea grass, horn, straw, weeds, or whalebone, or of which these substances or any of them is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for.

Paragraph 1537 (a): Manufactures of chip roping.

Paragraph 1537 (b): Manufactures of india rubber or gutta-percha, or of which these substances or either of them is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for (including boots, shoes, or other footwear, wholly or in chief value of india rubber), except the following: Bougies, catheters, drains, sondes, and other urological instruments; gloves; gaskets, packing, and valves; golf-ball centers or cores, wound or unwound; nursing nipples or pacifiers; tires wholly or in chief value of india rubber; heels and soles for footwear wholly or in chief value of india rubber; hose and tubing; and other articles (not including automobile, bicycle, or motorcycle tires), wholly or in chief value of gutta-percha only.

Paragraph 1537 (c): Combs of whatever material composed, not specially provided for: Combs composed wholly of rubber or compounds of cellulose.

Paragraph 1541 (a): Musical instruments and parts thereof, not specially provided for: Stringed instruments (not including pianos) and parts thereof (not including bows).

Paragraph 1541 (c): Carillons containing not over 34 bells, and parts thereof.

Paragraph 1549 (a): Pencils of paper, wood, or other material not metal, filled with lead or other material, and pencils of lead, not specially provided for.

Paragraph 1549 (a): Pencils stamped with names other than the manufacturers' or the manufacturers' trade name or trade-mark.

Paragraph 1549 (a): Pencil point protectors, and clips, whether separate or attached to pencils.

Paragraph 1550 (c): Mechanical pencils.

Paragraph 1551: Photographic cameras and parts thereof, not specially provided for (except motion-picture cameras and parts thereof and cameras, other than fixed-focus, valued $10 or over but not over $50 each).

Paragraph 1551: Photographic dry plates, not specially provided for.

Paragraph 1552: Pouches for chewing or smoking tobacco, finished or partly finished (except pouches wholly or in chief value of leather).

Paragraph 1553: All thermostatic bottles, carafes, jars, jugs, and other thermostatic containers, or blanks and pistons of such articles, of whatever material composed, constructed with a vacuous or partially vacuous insulation space to maintain the temperature of the contents, whether imported, finished or unfinished, with or without a jacket or casing of metal or other material, and parts of any of the foregoing.

Paragraph 1554: Walking canes, finished or unfinished.

Paragraph 1554: Handles and sticks for umbrellas, parasols, sunshades, and walking canes, wholly or in chief value of wood and valued under $2.50 per dozen or wholly or in chief value of compounds of cellulose.

Paragraph 1558: Raw or unmanufactured articles not enumerated or provided for: Frogs (not including live frogs) and frog legs.

Paragraph 1558: Articles manufactured, in whole or in part, not specially provided for: Coconut shell char.

TARIFF ACT OF 1930, TITLE II, FREE LIST

Paragraph 1656: Coir yarn.

Paragraph 1677: Fish imported to be used for purposes other than human consumption: goldfish.

Paragraph 1686: Gums and resins: Kadaya.

Natural gums, natural gum resins, and natural resins, not specially provided for: Talka.

Paragraph 1688: Hair of horse, cattle, and other animals, cleaned or uncleaned, drawn or undrawn, but unmanufactured, not specially provided for: goat and kid hair (except dressed soft hair).

Paragraph 1703: Joss stick or joss light.

Paragraph 1705: Kelp.

Paragraph 1731: Oils, distilled or essential, not mixed or compounded with or containing alcohol: camphor.

Paragraph 1754: Santonin, and salts of.

Paragraph 1756: Tuna fish, fresh or frozen, whether or not packed in ice, and whether or not whole.

Paragraph 1761: Shellfish, fresh or frozen (whether or not packed in ice), or prepared or preserved in any manner (not including pastes and sauces) and not specially provided for (except shrimps, prawns, lobsters, crabs, clams, quahaugs, unfrozen fresh scallops, fresh or frozen oysters other than seed oysters, and abalone).

Paragraph 1762: Silk cocoons and silk waste.

Paragraph 1763: Silk, raw, in skeins reeled from the cocoon, or rereeled, but not wound, doubled, twisted, or advanced in manufacture in any way.

Paragraph 1768 (2): Spices and spice seed: Cardamom.

Paragraph 1796: Wax, vegetable, not specially provided for: Japan.

Paragraph 1803 (1): Sawed lumber and timber, not further manufactured than planed, and tongued and grooved, not specially prvoided for: Japanese white oak, Japanese maple, and teak.

[1] Listed subject to amendment of par. 1530 (e), Tariff Act of 1930, by Public Law 479, 83d Cong., approved July 8, 1954.

Costa Rica

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1955

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a telegram I dispatched on January 12, 1955, to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and a copy of a press release which I prepared in connection therewith. They follow:

JANUARY 12, 1955.

Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.:

Grave situation in Costa Rica constitutes serious menace to the peace and security of the Panama Canal and of the entire Western Hemisphere. I respectfully urge immediate and vigorous action by the United States under your personal direction within the framework of the Organization of American States to bring about cessation of hostilities and needless bloodshed.

ALBERT P. MORANO,
Member of Congress.

Representative ALBERT P. MORANO, Republican, of Connecticut, a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, has called upon Secretary of State John Foster Dulles to intervene in the grave Costa Rica situation to

end a serious menace to the peace and security of the Panama Canal and the entire Western Hemisphere.

MORANO's message to Dulles said, "Grave situation in Costa Rica constitutes serious menace to the peace and security of the Panama Canal and the entire Western Hemisphere. I respectfully urge immediate and vigorous action by the United States under your personal direction within the framework of the Organization of American States to bring about cessation of hostilities and needless bloodshed."

Elaborating on his message, MORANO said, "The sending of a peace observation commission by the OAS is a good, positive first step. We must have the facts. However, all immediate steps must be taken to insure that the increasingly bitter struggle does not further expand into a major holocaust which will endanger the peace of the Western Hemisphere.

"I am in hopes that the situation can be settled swiftly through OAS action under the direction of our able Secretary of State."

Filbert Growers Ask More Time for Tariff Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1955

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, there are in the States of Oregon and Washington about 1,000 families who make their livelihood by the raising of filbert nuts. It requires many years to bring one of these nut orchards into a bearing state. Every orchard therefore represents a tremendous investment in time, money, and labor.

If anything happens that undermines the prosperity of nut raising, the growers lose not only a year of profits. They must abandon their orchards, cutting them down in order to go into some other activity. They lose all of the investment made in effort and money to get the orchards into a production stage.

It is this possibility of sacrificing years of labor that causes nut growers generally to be greatly concerned in tariff rules and regulations, for the nut growers, chief competition comes from low-wage foreign nations which, like our own, have large nut crops.

Hearings have been set in a new reciprocal trade bill known as H. R. 1. This bill may have a bearing on the entire future of the American filbert-nut industry and all persons engaged in it. The nut raisers want a chance to be heard on this bill. The hearings have been speedily called on H. R. 1 and the nut growers fear may be quickly ended. They fear they may be denied a chance to be heard. The nut growers should be given that opportunity. The hearings should be long enough so that they and those of all other interested industries may get their viewpoint into the record.

The Congress or any of its committees should not proceed so fast that it is unfair to any industry or the people engaged in it.

A typical letter, deploring the haste with which hearings on H. R. 1 have been called, is the following one which I have received from John E. Trunk, general manager of the Northwest Nut Growers. Mr. Trunk's letter follows:

Hon. RUSSELL V. MACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MACK: While we have been anticipating the introduction of legislation advocating the lowering of tariffs, we find ourselves totally unprepared to cope with the haste in which this has been done during the current session of Congress.

Very much to our surprise, the Cooper tariff bill, H. R. 1, is the first to be introduced at this session, and even more alarming is the fact that hearings are scheduled to start on Monday, January 17. This notice is so short that we are simply not able to prepare and present our case.

The congressional delegations from Oregon and Washington have always stood solidly behind the efforts of our filbert and walnut industries in resisting tariff reductions and the ultimate destruction of our business. I am confident we will have the same wonderful support from you and the others during this session. Apparently it is going to be a rugged fight, but we had better win it or we are going to be out of business.

Probably the best immediate service which you can render to us is to get the hearings on H. R. 1 delayed until the nut industry can prepare itself for an adequate presentation.

Sincerely yours,

NORTHWEST NUT GROWERS,
JOHN E. TRUNK,
General Manager.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 14, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everliving God, as we bow in this quiet moment dedicated to the unseen and eternal, confirm our abiding faith, we beseech Thee, in the supremacy of spiritual verities, in those deep and holy foundations which the Founding Fathers laid, lest in foolish futility we attempt to build on sand instead of rock. In a day of violence and of swift and shifting change, when the wicked imagine a vain thing, when the angry passions of men are constantly bursting into devouring flame, enable Thy servants here in the discharge of grave responsibilities of public trust to be calm and confident, wise and just, their hope in Thee as an anchor sure and steadfast, their faith unshaken, that out of the ruin and wreck of today Thou art making all things new. Make us ever loyal to the high adventure which seeks the larger, nobler way for our struggling race to live together in concord, according to Thy will for the good of all Thy children. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 11, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2091) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

WALLACE F. BENNETT, a Senator from the State of Utah, appeared in his seat today.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance on the session of the Senate next Tuesday, as we have an extraordinary occasion in Pennsylvania, the inauguration of a Democratic Governor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMPOSITION OF ARMED FORCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 68)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States relating to composition of the Armed Forces, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For President's message, see House proceedings of January 13, 1955 (pp. 277–278, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).)

COMPENSATION OF MILITARY PERSONNEL—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 69)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States relating to compensation of military personnel, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For message of the President, see House proceedings of January 13, 1955 (pp. 278–279, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).)

REPORTS OF PANAMA CANAL COMPANY AND THE CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and with the accom-

panying reports, referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Second Annual Reports of the Panama Canal Company and the Canal Zone Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1955.*

REPORT ON FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State, showing the condition of the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1953 and 1954, in accordance with section 862, Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724), 79th Congress.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1955.*

(Enclosure: Report concerning Retirement and Disability Fund, Foreign Service.)

REPORT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 507, 81st Congress, I transmit herewith the Fourth Annual Report of the National Science Foundation for the year ending June 30, 1954.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1955.*

REPORT OF THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 10 of Public Law 358, 83d Congress, I transmit herewith for the information and consideration of the Congress the report of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1955.*

REPORT OF CORREGIDOR BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 193, 83d Congress, 1st session, I hereby transmit to the Congress of the United States a report of the activities of the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1955.*

REPORT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 13, Public Law 806, 80th Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1955.*

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and other routine business, and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a brief announcement to make. At the last session of the Senate I stated to the Senate that there was on the table the Daniel resolution, Senate Resolution 18, and that, if it was agreeable to the minority leader and to Senators on the other side, as well as those on this side, at the conclusion of the morning hour we would proceed to the consideration of that resolution, in the hope that action would be taken today.

So far as I know, there is no desire, in view of the fact that some Members of the Senate are absent, to ask for the yeas and nays on the resolution. Of course, any individual Senator may make such a request. If that should be done, a request may be made that the resolution go over until there can be a fuller attendance.

I desired to make this announcement so that Senators who have plans for today may know that as soon as the morning hour is over I shall ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 18, with the hope that prompt action will be possible.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PRESIDENT'S APPROVAL OF ACTIVITIES OF VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

A communication from the President of the United States giving his approval of the emergency undertaking by the Virgin Islands Corporation of certain activities; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering receipts, expenditures, and work of agricultural experiment stations in the States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on the cooperation of the United States with Mexico, in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of November 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SALE OF COPIES OF OFFICIAL RECORDS BY DEPARTMENTS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to reproduce and to sell copies of official records of their respective departments, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FLIGHT PAY OF CERTAIN OFFICERS IN THE NAVY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Personnel and Reserve Forces), reporting, pursuant to law, on the average monthly flight pay of certain officers in the Navy, for the 6-month period ended January 1, 1955; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON STOCKPILING PROGRAM

A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the stockpiling program, for the period January 1 to June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROCUREMENT ACTION REPORT

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of the Air Force entitled "Research and Development Procurement Action Report," for the period January 1 to June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON NUMBER OF OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO PERMANENT DUTY IN THE EXECUTIVE ELEMENT, AIR FORCE, AT THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that at the end of the

second quarter of fiscal year 1955 there was an aggregate of 2,662 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF GEORGETOWN BARGE, DOCK, ELEVATOR & RAILWAY CO.

A letter from Steptoe & Johnson, attorneys at law, Washington, D. C., signed by Frederick S. Hill, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., Inc., for the calendar year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission for the period July 1 to December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROPOSED AWARD OF CONCESSION PERMIT, MOUNT RAINIER NATIONAL PARK

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed award of a concession permit in Mount Rainier National Park, Wash. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON SALINE WATER CONVERSION

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report under the saline water conversion program (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

BIENNIAL INSPECTION OF HULLS AND BOILERS OF CARGO VESSELS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize biennial inspection of the hulls and boilers of cargo vessels, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

FINAL VALUATIONS OF CERTAIN PIPE LINE CARRIERS

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, final valuations of properties of certain pipeline carriers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the 68th annual report of that Commission, dated November 1, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ROBERT BURNS DEWITT

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Robert Burns DeWitt (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON ESTABLISHMENT OF CERTAIN MEDALS FOR BRAVERY AND SERVICE BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General, reporting, pursuant to law, on the establishment of a Young American Medal for Bravery and a Young American Medal for Service and the awards thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PAYMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGE OCCASIONED BY VESSELS OF COAST GUARD

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the payment of claims for damage occasioned by vessels of the Coast Guard, for the period January 1 through December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL OF COAST GUARD

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 490 of title 14, United States Code, relating to the settlement of claims of military and civilian personnel of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIM OF JOHN LLOYD SMELCER *v.* THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 335, 81st Congress, 2d session, that court's opinion in the case of *John Lloyd Smelcer* v. *The United States* (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF DISPOSALS OF FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on disposals of foreign excess property, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petition of Col. W. H. Boshoff, United States Army, retired, of Bad Nauheim, Germany, relating to the release of his house in Bad Nauheim requisitioned by the Army of occupation of the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the Director, Office of Civil Defense, Pierre, S. Dak., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an interstate civil-defense compact entered into by the State of South Dakota with the State of Arkansas (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the National Association of State Racing Commissioners, at Asbury Park, N. J., relating to the imposition of additional taxes on pari-mutuel wagering; to the Committee on Finance.

A petition signed by Henry J. Melloy, and sundry other citizens of the State of New York, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Richard Bladel Mossman, of Bettendorf, Iowa, praying for a redress of grievances (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Caroline McDonald Wismiller, of Washington, D. C., relating to the settlement of her claim against the estate of Henrietta E. Garrett, deceased (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Chicago, Ill., relating to Federal aid for reconstruction of highway bridges involved in the Calumet-Sag project; to the Committee on Public Works.

Memorials of sundry citizens and organizations of the United States, remonstrating against the censure of Senator MCCARTHY; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to make available to the United States Department of Agriculture, Forestry Service, funds necessary to insure that growing timber in the Sumter National Forest can best be utilized

"Whereas Sumter National Forest in South Carolina contains 341,194 acres of growing timber; and

"Whereas to best utilize this bountiful supply of timber, it is necessary that the forest be cruised, thinned, identified, and marked so that it can be selectively marketed; and

"Whereas the Forestry Service has insufficient personnel to survey the timber and recommend the selective cutting, and as a result the forest now has a heavy undergrowth of young timber which, to insure the maximum benefits from this natural resource, should be thinned; and

"Whereas the United States Department of Agriculture, Forestry Service, has advised that with the employment of 7 additional foresters for a period of 3 years this national forest could be properly surveyed and the maximum benefit realized, but the same cannot be accomplished because of lack of funds to employ such personnel: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Carolina (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to make available an appropriation in an amount sufficient to enable the United States Department of Agriculture, Forestry Service, to employ 7 skilled foresters for a period of 3 years, to cruise, mark, cut, and scientifically market timber now growing in the Sumter National Forest, located in the State of South Carolina; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of the two Members of the United States Senate and to each of the Members of the House of Representatives from the State of South Carolina, and to the clerk of each House of the Congress of the United States."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL PARK ON LOOK-OUT MOUNTAIN, MINN. — RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF VIRGINIA, MINN.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution, signed by the mayor, which was adopted by the City Council of Virginia, Minn. The resolution requests that the Senators and Representatives representing Minnesota join in the introduction of proposed legislation to establish a national park at Look-Out Mountain, north of Virginia, Minn. At a later date I shall introduce appropriate proposed legislation embodying the establishment of such a national park.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on

Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution requesting our Congressman and Senators to establish a national park on Look-Out Mountain north of Virginia, Minn.

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Virginia, That—

Whereas the city of Virginia and the surrounding communities have long desired to secure for this area a suitable monument to commemorate the important function the Mesabi Range has played in the development of this country; and

Whereas Look-Out Mountain situated north of Virginia on the Laurentian Divide and in the heart of the Mesabi Range is a suitable and proper place to erect such a memorial of such a nature that it could develop a year around recreational center; and

Whereas Duane Bryers, a recognized artist, formerly of the city of Virginia, has created a statue of the "Mesabi" which properly commemorates the importance of the Mesabi Range has played in the history and development of these United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the city of Virginia request the appropriate department of our Federal Government to establish a national park as outlined and that a copy of this resolution be sent to Congressman BLATNIK and Senators HUMPHREY and THYE.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 340. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Bertolani (Gino Mancini); and

S. 341. A bill for the relief of Vittoria Alberghetti, Daniele Alberghetti, Anna Maria Alberghetti, Carla Alberghetti, and Paolo Alberghetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 342. A bill for the relief of the Highway Construction Company of Ohio, Inc.;

S. 343. A bill for the relief of Milos Hamza and Mrs. Jirina Hamza;

S. 344. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Summers (nee Gebauer); and

S. 345. A bill for the relief of Richard Karl Hoffman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 346. A bill for the relief of Klara Anna Maria Fleischer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 347. A bill for the relief of Babusaheb Aminsaheb Kamadoli;

S. 348. A bill for the relief of Charalampos Socrates Iossifoglu, Nora Iossifoglu, Helen Iossifoglu, and Efrossini Iossifoglu; and

S. 349. A bill for the relief of Aron Klein and Zita Klein (nee Spielman); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 350. A bill for the relief of Siegfiend Rosenzweig;

S. 351. A bill for the relief of Ellen Henriette Buch;

S. 352. A bill for the relief of Isaac Glickman, Reghina Glickman, Alfred Cismaru, and Anna Cismaru;

S. 353. A bill for the relief of Arthur Sroka; and

S. 354. A bill for the relief of Xaralampos Jiannoulos, also known as Harry Noulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 355. A bill to permit accelerated amortization for Federal income-tax purposes of facilities constructed to relieve unemployment; and

S. 356. A bill for the relief of Theodore E. Straus; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 357. A bill for the relief of Demetrios A. Mitropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUFF:

S. 358. A bill for the relief of Domenico Bompiani;

S. 359. A bill for the relief of Domenico Scaramuzzino;

S. 360. A bill for the relief of Ralph Piccolo (Raffaele Piccolo); and

S. 361. A bill for the relief of Lothar G. Seeger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 362. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 363. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce; and

S. 364. A bill to amend the first section of the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 365. A bill for the relief of Cesare Buia and his wife Gabriella Buia and their minor daughter Daniella Buia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIKIN (for himself and Mr. ALLOTT):

S. 366. A bill for the relief of Bart Krijger; and

S. 367. A bill for the relief of Maria Stela Leitao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 368. A bill for the relief of Marcelina Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 369. A bill for the relief of Elena Spacapan; and

S. 370. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hellen M. Sargent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 371. A bill for the relief of Paul G. Hamel and certain dependents of the late Michael P. O'Donnell; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BRIDGES (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. IVES, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 372. A bill to amend section 12 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide for the payment of annuities thereunder to the widowers of female employees who die in service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 373. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws;

S. 374. A bill to provide for extension, and suspension in certain cases, of statutes of limitation on false swearing by Government employees with respect to subversive activities and connections;

S. 375. A bill for the relief of Alexy W. Katyll and Ionna Katyll; and

S. 376. A bill making it a felony to import or ship in interstate commerce any commodity or goods produced by slave labor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. JENNER when he introduced the last above-named bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 377. A bill for the relief of Jose Correia Dos Santos;

S. 378. A bill for the relief of Giuseppina Latina Mozzicato and Giovanni Mozzicato (John Mozzicato);

S. 379. A bill for the relief of Gerassimo Troianos; and

S. 380. A bill for the relief of Mario Remato Talin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 381. A bill to make capital more readily available for financing small business and thus to promote, foster, and develop the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 382. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953, and for other purposes; and

S. 383. A bill to make credit more readily available for financing small business and thus to promote, foster, and develop the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FLANDERS (by request):

S. 384. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Gubbins & Co., of Lima, Peru, and Reynaldo Gubbins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 385. A bill for the relief of Micele Pizzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 386. A bill for the relief of George J. MacMullin;

S. 387. A bill for the relief of George J. Athanassopoulos;

S. 388. A bill for the relief of Petre and Liubitza Ionescu;

S. 389. A bill for the relief of Sergio I. Veira; and

S. 390. A bill for the relief of Umberto Marandola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 391. A bill to provide for the bonding of certain officers and employees of the government of the District of Columbia, for the payment of the premiums on such bonds by the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S. 392. A bill to consolidate and make uniform the laws relating to public assistance in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 393. A bill for the relief of Chieki Suzuki;

S. 394. A bill for the relief of Ali Hassan Waffa;

S. 395. A bill for the relief of Carmen S. N. Cabrera;

S. 396. A bill for the relief of Theresa Pok Lim Kim; and

S. 397. A bill for the relief of Maria Bertagnolli Pancheri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 398. A bill for the relief of Roy Walker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 399. A bill to provide that the Governor and the secretary of the Territory of Alaska shall be elected by the people of that Territory;

S. 400. A bill to encourage and assist the production of strategic and critical metals, minerals, and materials in the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 401. A bill to abolish the functions of the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior, to remove the guardianship over Indians and trusteeship over Indian lands, and to repeal the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), as amended; and

S. 402. A bill to provide for the election of the Governor and secretary of the Territory of Hawaii by the people of the Territory; for the appointment by the Governor of the justices and judges of the courts of the Territory; and for the formation of a constitutional government by the people of the Territory; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 403. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and

incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 404. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MALONE (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. BIBLE):

S. 405. A bill to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 406. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 407. A bill for the relief of Helen Zafred Urbanic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 408. A bill to amend section 512 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide that certain veterans not now eligible for a direct housing loan may obtain such a loan; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 409. A bill for the relief of Inge Krarup;

S. 410. A bill for the relief of Dragutin Sostarko;

S. 411. A bill for the relief of Beri Denovi; and

S. 412. A bill for the relief of Jan Hajdukiewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. BUSH, and Mr. ERVIN):

S. 413. A bill for the relief of the Committee of Reference and Counsel of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 414. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of the New England, New York, Long Island, and New Jersey coastal and tidal areas, for the purpose of determining possible means of preventing damages to property and loss of human lives due to hurricane winds and tides; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUSH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. STENNIS (for Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 415. A bill for the relief of Ernest B. Sanders;

S. 416. A bill for the relief of Anastasia Alexiadou;

S. 417. A bill for the relief of Pearl O. Seilaz;

S. 418. A bill for the relief of Mervin Walter Ball;

S. 419. A bill for the relief of Eli E. Hood;

S. 420. A bill for the relief of Evelyn Hardy Waters;

S. 421. A bill for the relief of Jose Alvarez; and

S. 422. A bill for the relief of William C. Irvine, chief warrant officer, United States Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 423. A bill for the relief of Paul Burkhart; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 424. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain national forest land to Coconino County, Ariz.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 425. A bill for the relief of Anthony A. Ballora;

S. 426. A bill for the relief of Nickolay Alexeivich Semenov;

S. 427. A bill for the relief of Geo. D. Emery Co.;

S. 428. A bill for the relief of Young Bae Kim and his wife Susie H. Kim;

S. 429. A bill for the relief of Franciszek Janicki and his wife Stefania Janicki;

S. 430. A bill for the relief of Hedwig Marie Zaunmuller;

S. 431. A bill for the relief of Klaus W. Jonas and his wife Ilsedore Barkow Jonas;

S. 432. A bill for the relief of Aniceto Sparagna; and

S. 433. A bill for the relief of Markos Demetrius Spanos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES (for himself, Mr. FLANDERS, and Mr. CASE of New Jersey):

S. 434. A bill to facilitate the broader distribution of health services, to increase the quantity and improve the quality of health services and facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. IVES when he introduced the above bill which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THYE:

S. 435. A bill to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Pipestone National Monument in the State of Minnesota and the transfer of certain lands to such State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 436. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Petrielli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 437. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to establish a presumption of service connection for progressive muscular atrophy becoming manifest within 3 years from separation from service; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 438. A bill for the relief of Takeko Ann O'Neill;

S. 439. A bill for the relief of Lucy Personius; and

S. 440. A bill for the relief of Nicos Nicholas Mouratides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 441. A bill to provide that the basic salaries of officers and members of the police force for the Washington National Airport shall be the same as the basic salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, and for other purposes; and

S. 442. A bill to increase the maximum travel allowance for postal transportation clerks, acting postal transportation clerks, and substitute postal transportation clerks; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 443. A bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUNDT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 444. A bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 so as to extend until January 31, 1957, the basic service period for establishing eligibility for educational benefits and to permit certain service performed after January 31, 1957, to be included in computing the period of entitlement to educational benefits; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HENNINGS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 445. A bill to amend section 1701, title 18, United States Code;

S. 446. A bill to amend chapter 13, title 18, United States Code, to prevent the use of the mails or instrumentalities of commerce for the dissemination of libelous matter, and for other purposes;

S. 447. A bill to amend section 144 of title 28 of the United States Code, relating to the disqualification of a judge for bias or prejudice;

S. 448. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, or any judge thereof, to issue writs of habeas corpus with respect to persons held in the reformatory at Lorton or the workhouse at Occoquan, both in the State of Virginia, for criminal offenses committed in the District of Columbia; and

S. 449. A bill for the relief of George Pantelas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 450. A bill to establish Admiralty Island National Park in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 451. A bill to provide for the investigation of the practicability of constructing a new section of the Alaska Highway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. LANGER when he introduced the last above-named bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER (for himself, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 452. A bill to enable the people of Alaska to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 453. A bill to provide for the hospitalization and treatment of members of the Coast Guard and their dependents in hospitals and other medical facilities of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLLAND (by request):

S. 454. A bill for the relief of Henry Haurl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 455. A bill to authorize the construction of certain public works for navigation and flood control on the Big Sandy River and the Tug and Levisa Forks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 456. A bill relating to the regulation of nets in Alaska waters; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 457. A bill to provide for the creation of a Commission on Security in Government and Industry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the last-named bill above, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 458. A bill to amend section 4421 of the Revised Statutes, in order to remove the requirement as to verifying under oath certain certificates of inspection, and for other purposes;

S. 459. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer certain property to the Panama Canal Company, and for other purposes; and

S. 460. A bill to amend section 4482 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U. S. C. 475), relating to life preservers for river steamers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. LANGER):

S. 461. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Esther Chan Lee (Eta Lee); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE (for Mr. KILGORE):

S. 462. A bill to increase the salaries of justices and judges of United States courts, Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. GORE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DUFF (for himself and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania):

S. 463. A bill to authorize the issuance of commemorative medals to certain societies

of which Benjamin Franklin was a member, founder, or sponsor in observance of the 250th anniversary of his birth; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. DUFF when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate hearing.)

By Mr. STENNIS (for Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 464. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands in Florida bordering upon Indian River; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 465. A bill for the relief of Ernest Ludwig Bamford and Mrs. Nadine Bamford;

S. 466. A bill for the relief of Eugenia Gafos and Adamantios George Gafos; and

S. 467. A bill for the relief of Dr. Luciano A. Legiardi-Laura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 468. A bill for the relief of Marie T. Gonsalves;

S. 469. A bill for the relief of Dorothy Whitman;

S. 470. A bill for the relief of Edith Winifred Loch;

S. 471. A bill for the relief of Aina Brizga;

S. 472. A bill for the relief of Lee In Ja;

S. 473. A bill for the relief of Urho Paavo Patokoski and his family;

S. 474. A bill for the relief of Maria Elena Venegas and Sarah Lucia Venegas;

S. 475. A bill for the relief of Margarete R. Zimmerman;

S. 476. A bill for the relief of Harold Swarthout and L. R. Swarthout;

S. 477. A bill for the relief of Aldo Timossi; and

S. 478. A bill for the relief of Tomas Gumtang Subia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 479. A bill to require safety-closing devices on the doors of household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. IVES):

S. 480. A bill to authorize Federal payments to the States to assist in constructing schools; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FREAR:

S. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp in commemoration of the life of Emily P. Bissell; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STENNIS (for Mr. SMATHERS):

S. J. Res. 17. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week beginning the last Monday in June of each year as See America First Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

S. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. IVES, Mr. JENNER, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. WELKER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. J. Res. 19. Joint resolution to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. PAYNE when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. KERR, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. NEELY, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. LANGER):

S. J. Res. 20. Joint resolution to state explicitly the longstanding national policy to preserve and strengthen the family-farm pattern of American agriculture, and for other purposes.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

PENALTY FOR IMPORTATION OR SHIPMENT IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE OF CERTAIN GOODS PRODUCED BY SLAVE LABOR

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill making it a felony to import or ship in interstate commerce any commodity or goods produced by slave labor. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me made in the Senate on June 18, 1954, relating to this matter, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 376) making it a felony to import or ship in interstate commerce any commodity or goods produced by slave labor, introduced by Mr. JENNER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. JENNER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JENNER

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCarran], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill making it a felony to import or ship in interstate commerce any commodity or goods produced by slave labor. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me pertaining to the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3632) making it a felony to import or ship in interstate commerce any commodity or goods produced by slave labor, introduced by Mr. Jenner (for himself, Mr. McCarran, and Mr. Welker), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

"A bill making it a felony to import or ship in interstate commerce any commodity or goods produced by slave labor

"Be it enacted, etc., That, from and after the effective date of this act, it shall be unlawful to import into the United States or to ship in interstate commerce in the United States any commodity or goods produced by slave labor.

"SEC. 2. Any person who shall violate this act shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by imprisonment of not more than 2 years, or by a fine of not more than $1,000, or both."

The statement by Senator JENNER is as follows:

"STATEMENT BY SENATOR JENNER

"In the recent past, as chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate, I appointed a task force for the purpose of maintaining a continuing study and investigation of the strategy and tactics of world communism. This task force, which consists of myself as chairman, with Senators HERMAN WELKER and Pat McCarran as members, has been conducting a series of hearings on this general subject because we know that to adequately appraise the operation of the Communist conspiracy in this Nation it is essential that we keep abreast of the world strategy and tactics of international communism.

"In the hearings which we have thus far conducted one of the principal subjects which has been under consideration is the worldwide trade offensive of the Kremlin which has as its ultimate goal economic strangulation of the West through ruinous competition of the products of slave labor. This threat presents to us not only the issue of protecting the American workingman in his job, but it also presents a moral issue of the highest order. Every shipload of goods produced by slave labor in Iron Curtain countries which we import into this country merely whets the appetite of the Kremlin for greater numbers to be subjected to this inhuman exploitation.

"Accordingly, the bill (S. 3632) has been patterned after our laws which prohibit the shipment in interstate commerce of goods produced by child labor. If those laws are right, then this bill is right. If it is right to protect the American workingman from ruinous competition by slave labor then this bill is right. If it is right to protect ourselves and the free world from the spreading menace of international communism then this bill is right."

PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION AND SURVEY OF NEW ENGLAND, NEW YORK, AND NEW JERSEY COASTAL AND TIDAL AREAS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of the New England, New York, Long Island, and New Jersey coastal and tidal areas, for the purpose of determining possible means of preventing damages to property and loss of human lives because of hurricane winds and tides.

In order to save the time of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared in this connection be printed in the RECORD at this point, and that it be followed by the printing of excerpts and tables from a report prepared by Army engineers on the question of the hurricanes. I ask that the bill be first printed, then the statement by myself, and then the statement by the Army engineers.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, statement, excerpts, and tables will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 414) authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of the New England, New York, Long Island, and New Jersey coastal and tidal areas, for the purpose of determining possible

means of preventing damages to property and loss of human lives due to hurricane winds and tides, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in view of the severe damages to the coastal and tidal areas of the northeastern seaboard of the United States resulting from the hurricanes of August 31, 1954, and September 11, 1954, the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause a preliminary examination and survey of the New England, New York, Long Island, and New Jersey coastal and tidal areas, for the purpose of determining possible means of preventing damages to property and loss of human lives due to hurricane winds and tides, and the economics thereof, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The statement by Senator BUSH and the excerpts and tables from a report prepared by the Army engineers are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUSH

The damages caused by hurricanes have imposed financial burdens on thousands of families in the coastal areas of Connecticut and other States. Damages to Government installations and private facilities have been great. Preliminary estimates furnished to me by the Army engineers place the economic loss in New England due to hurricanes Carol and Edna in 1954 at approximately $240 million.

In recent years, four hurricanes have ravaged the coast of Connecticut and other States in the Northeast. The hurricane of 1938 was the first to strike this area in many years. The recurrence of these terrible storms, once in 1944 and twice last year, indicates the strong possibility of a change in weather patterns which may bring them with increasing frequency in the years to come.

A survey to determine methods of controlling beach erosion was authorized in 1946. Based on studies made by the Corps of Army Engineers under this authorization, legislation permitting Federal participation in beach-erosion-control projects in Connecticut and other States was adopted by the 83d Congress last year. In the present session, we are seeking appropriations to cover the Federal Government's share of the cost.

The hurricanes of 1954 aggravated the beach-erosion problem in some areas. This, however, is only one of the problems arising from hurricanes. Protective works against tidal flooding are needed at some parts of the coast. Repairs to damaged breakwaters and other aids to navigation are essential.

The cost of protective works is beyond the capacity of local and State governments to bear alone. This is a case where the assistance of the Federal Government, on a partnership basis with towns and cities, is desirable and essential.

It is my hope that the Committee on Public Works will schedule this bill for early hearing.

EXCERPTS FROM A REPORT PREPARED BY ARMY ENGINEERS ON THE HURRICANES

The storm of August 31 caused by far greater destruction in the New England area than the storm of September 11, although the latter received greater publicity as it approached the New England Coast. The August hurricane, designated "Carol," moving in the north-northeasterly direction from Cape Hatteras, crossed over the easterly end of Long Island and entered into the New England area at the south shore of Rhode Island. The September hurricane, designated "Edna," moving in a north-northeasterly direction from offshore of Cape Hatteras, approached New England on a course somewhat easterly of the preceding storm and entered New England in the vicinity of Marthas Vineyard. The course of Carol extended across Rhode Island, eastern Massachusetts, and along the Maine-New Hampshire border into Canada through the St. Lawrence Valley. The course of Edna extended across Cape Cod, the Gulf of Maine to the vicinity of Eastport, Maine, and thence through New Brunswick, Canada. The northeasterly movement of Carol accelerated from 12 to 40 miles an hour as it approached New England, whereas the acceleration of Edna increased up to 35 miles an hour as it traversed the New England coast. Hurricane Carol struck the Rhode Island area in full strength at approximately 10:30 a. m. (eastern standard time) with sustained winds up to 90 miles per hour and gusts up to 105 miles per hour. The eastern Massachusetts coastal area received the full impact of the storm at approximately 11:30 a. m. (eastern standard time) when winds at 86 miles per hour were recorded at weather bureau station at Logan Airport, with gusts up to 100 miles per hour. Heavy rains accompanied the storm, 2.60 inches being recorded at both Boston and Providence. With rapidly diminishing effect, the storm moved northward into Maine and New Hampshire. Hurricane Edna passed over southeastern New England in the early afternoon of September 11, 1954, the center moving over Marthas Vineyard. Winds of 73 miles per hour were recorded, with gusts up to 90 miles per hour. Boston and Portland, both lying westerly of the storm's center, were buffeted with winds up to 48 and 60 miles per hour respectively, and gusts up to 78 and 74 miles per hour. Precipitation over the entire coastal area was torrential, with Providence reporting 4.37 inches, Boston 5.64 inches, and Portland 7.49 inches. Most of the damage resulting from the storm was due to flooded streams in the island areas. The storm moved into New Brunswick, Canada, leaving relatively minor damage along the New England coast.

COASTAL FLOODING AND WAVE PRODUCTS EFFECT OF THE HURRICANES

The chance circumstance of the normal high water coinciding with the full easterly intensity of the hurricane's strength, as the storm of August 31 struck the southern New England coast and Massachusetts Bay area, resulted in abnormally high tides and destructive wave action. In comparison, the September storm, with winds of somewhat lesser intensity offshore and with the time of high tide generally at considerable variance with the maximum velocity of the storm, produced relatively minor flooding and wave action.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF COASTAL DAMAGE, HURRICANE CAROL

(a) Connecticut: Damage resulting from flooding caused by extreme high water at low shore areas was general along the coast. Damage from wave attack was noted between New Haven and Old Saybrook, but was particularly severe east of the Connecticut River, increasing in severity toward the Rhode Island boundary, with greatest damage at New London ($1 million) and Stonington ($5 million). Erosion of beaches and destruction of seawalls and other shore protective structures were not generally severe. At some locations quantities of sand were washed landward from low beaches. At several locations beaches appeared to have benefited by accretion. The greater part of all losses throughout the State resulted from floodwater and wind damage to industrial plants, business establishments, shore-front homes and cottages, and east of the Connecticut River damage to fishing and pleasure craft, harbor facilities, destruction of shore-front homes and cottages and beach establishments. Detailed estimate of losses at only a few locations was available.

(b) Rhode Island: Heavy damages from tidal flooding and wave attack occurred throughout the coastal area, with some beach developments almost completely wiped out. Hundreds of summer homes west of Point Judith were destroyed on their foundations or were swept off the low barrier beaches. Cliffs and dunes out of reach of ordinary wave action were eroded, and numerous breaches through the shore barriers were cut by the floodwater runoff from the ponds behind the barrier beach. All natural beach grass protection was completely destroyed. Damage to seawalls, groins, and other shore protective structures was comparatively moderate, many such structures being overtopped by the extreme high tides with consequent destruction of property which they were intended to protect. Damage or total loss to boats, piers, wharves, and shore-front buildings were widespread. Water damage in the business section of the city of Providence caused by tidal flooding during Carol was extremely heavy.

(c) Massachusetts: South shore and islands off the coast. Damage from flooding and wave attack occurred throughout the entire area. Heavy damage to beaches and shore developments was limited largely to the area between Westport and Wareham, Falmouth, and Hyannis, and on the island of Marthas Vineyard. Erosion of beaches and destruction or damage to shore protective structures were comparatively moderate. Heavy wave attack occurred generally at a higher level than the berms of beaches, eroding bluffs and cliffs, and sand dunes. Destruction and damage to all types of vessels were heavy and widespread, occurring at practically all harbor areas.

East shore: Waterfront damage north of Cape Cod was caused principally by wave attack and exceptionally high water which resulted in heavy damage to small craft ranging from skiffs to expensive yachts. A large number of pleasure boats were sunk or blown ashore, with resulting destruction. Erosion of beaches and damage to shore protective structures were comparatively moderate.

(d) New Hampshire: The principal losses along the coastal area resulted from destruction of or damage to small craft and flooding of beach areas. No serious erosion of beaches or destruction of shore protective structure was reported.

(e) Maine: The principal losses along the coastal area resulted from destruction and damage to fishing and pleasure craft and fishing gear, and from flooding of low beach developments. Pleasure craft damage was reported at Portland, Camden, Casco Bay, and Lake Sebago. Seawall washouts were reported at Wells Beach.

COASTAL DAMAGE, HURRICANE EDNA—NEW ENGLAND—GENERAL

Damage along the entire coast during hurricane Edna was comparatively moderate. The heaviest losses occurred as a result of flooding brought on by exceptionally heavy rainfall, overflowing culverts and flooded streets, with several minor washouts.

Recapitulation of damage caused by hurricanes Carol and Edna

Damage to Federal structures and channels	$1,215,000
Damage to vessels (commercial and pleasure)	12,455,000
Damage to shore properties (public and private)	[1] 151,656,000
Loss of life	58

[1] Additional damage, in the estimated amount of $74,114,000, was incurred by public works and public and private utilities. Segregation between coastal and inland damage is difficult in these cases, but by far the major portion of damage occurred in coastal areas.

Damage to Government structures and installations, hurricanes Carol and Edna [1]

	Structure	Cost to repair	Channel shoaling	Cost
Connecticut:				
Southport	Breakwater	$50,000	Entrance channel	$25,000
Bridgeport	Fayerweather breakwater	75,000		
Milford	East jetty	35,000	Entrance channel	30,000
Clinton			Channel and anchorage.	50,000
Duck Island	Breakwater	35,000		
Saybrook	do	25,000	Channel, outer bar	25,000
Stonington	do	50,000		
Total		270,000		130,000
Rhode Island:				
Point Judith	West breakwater	10,000	Channel	50,000
	Main breakwater	150,000		
	East breakwater	250,000		
Block Island:				
Harbor of Refuge	Main breakwater	10,000	Entrance channel	50,000
Great Salt Pond	South jetty	10,000		
Total		430,000		100,000
Massachusetts:				
Menemsha Creek	West jetty	15,000	Channel	50,000
	East jetty	10,000		
Edgartown Harbor			Channel	50,000
Hyannis Harbor	Breakwater	50,000		
Provincetown Harbor	do	25,000		
Boston Harbor, Deer Island	Seawall	40,000		
Total		140,000		100,000
Maine:				
Kennebunk River	Breakwater	5,000		
Isle of Shoals	do	10,000		
Total		15,000		
Grand total		855,000		330,000

[1] Damage to Government structures in New England coastal area is negligible from storm of Sept. 11.

NOTE.—Damage to Coast Guard facilities and installations, most of which were on shore, is estimated to be $896,050. This damage was caused mostly by hurricane Carol, in the amount of $791,900. Damage to Navy installations is estimated at $3,858,300.

Boat losses, hurricanes Carol and Edna [1]

Location	Type (pleasure)			Type (commercial)		
	Wrecked	Damaged	Value	Wrecked	Damaged	Value
Connecticut	65	395	$1,000,000	10	35	$390,000
Rhode Island	400	1,365	5,000,000	50	200	650,000
Massachusetts	240	990	3,000,000	25	100	1,000,000
Maine	40	270	750,000	50	100	450,000
New Hampshire	10	45	150,000	5	20	65,000
Total	755	3,065	9,900,000	140	455	2,555,000

[1] The major part of listed damage is chargeable to Carol. Not listed above is damage to Coast Guard vessels in the area. A cutter, lightship, and 2 buoy tenders were damaged in the August storm, in the amount of approximately $150,000. In the September storm, 1 cutter received damages of about $60,000.

Shore damage

HURRICANE CAROL

Location	Commercial	Industrial	Private and personal property damage
Connecticut	$2,910,000	$5,339,000	$13,242,000
Rhode Island	44,934,000	13,938,000	13,913,000
Massachusetts	5,063,000	17,281,000	23,015,000
New Hampshire	280,000	99,000	954,000
Maine	317,000	32,000	580,000
Total	53,504,000	36,689,000	51,704,000

HURRICANE EDNA

Connecticut	$489,000	$205,000	$2,687,000
Rhode Island	941,000	591,000	1,616,000
Massachusetts	539,000	867,000	1,343,000
New Hampshire		21,000	22,000
Maine	197,000	24,000	217,000
Total	2,166,000	1,708,000	5,885,000

NOTE.—Estimated damage to public works (not including Federal installations) and cleanup attendant upon such damage in New England, most of which occurred in the coastal area, is $42,738,000 for Carol and $8,105,000 for Edna. Estimated damage to railroad transportation facilities in New England is $1,158,000 for Carol and $837,000 for Edna. Estimated damage to utilities in New England, exclusive of damage suffered by several large private powerplants and transmission lines, is $11,711,000 for Carol and $9,565,000 for Edna.

NATIONAL HEALTH ACT OF 1955

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which, among other purposes, will facilitate the broader distribution of health services and increase the quantity and improve the quality of such services and facilities. If enacted, this bill will be called the National Health Act of 1955. It will provide a voluntary program of health insurance in response to the health needs of the people of this country.

This is essentially the same bill which the junior Senator from Vermont and I introduced in the 81st and the 83d Congresses. The junior Senator from New Jersey also introduced similar proposed legislation in the 81st Congress when he was then serving as a Member of the House of Representatives. We are reintroducing it in modified form in the belief that it is designed to provide adequate health care in a manner consistent with our country's tradition of freedom, and that it should be seriously considered along with other proposals having a similar purpose, which may come before the Senate. The health needs of the Nation can be met realistically within the framework of our free institutions without resorting to Government intervention and control.

The cornerstone of the national health-insurance program advocated in this bill is the local, voluntary, prepayment health service plan. Many such plans are in operation today. Unfortunately their cost is beyond the means of a large segment of the population. The increasing popularity of these plans, however, demonstrates that the voluntary approach to the exigencies imposed by ill health is the solution desired by the majority of the people if it is designed in consideration of their financial resources.

The voluntary health and medical service program embodied in this bill basically is financial assistance to voluntary, nonprofit, prepayment health plans.

Primary responsibility for the development of adequate health services is placed in the States and local communities, with the fullest encouragement to local initiative. The people are thus offered the maximum in assistance with the minimum of governmental interference.

By this proposed legislation the health problems of the Nation are met in terms of presently available services, while the necessary incentives are provided for additional medical facilities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD a résumé of the bill I am introducing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the résumé will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 434) to facilitate the broader distribution of health services, to increase the quantity and improve the quality of health services and facilities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. IVES (for himself, Mr. FLANDERS, and Mr. CASE of New Jersey), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The résumé presented by Mr. IVES is as follows:

RÉSUMÉ OF NATIONAL HEALTH ACT OF 1955

The proposed National Health Act of 1955 would amend the already existing Public Health Service Act by (a) adding a new title VII which provides an immediate health and medical service program; (b) adding a new title VIII which provides for a long-range survey of national health needs; (c) expanding existing provisions for hospital construction and adding new provisions for aid to medical and nursing schools; and (d) adding provisions for local public health units.

NEW VOLUNTARY HEALTH AND MEDICAL SERVICE PROGRAM

The purpose of this program is to provide immediate assistance so as (1) to enable voluntary prepayment health service plans to make their services generally available in the communities which they serve at charges based on the income of the subscribers; (2) to encourage the establishment of local administrative facilities embracing functional health service regions and districts in order to facilitate the effectuation

of present and future health programs; (3) to enable nonprofit hospitals and medical and nursing schools to maintain and improve their services and facilities; and (4) to assist voluntary prepayment health service plans to construct and equip personal health-service centers.

The key to the new health and medical program is the local voluntary prepayment health service plan. Many such plans are in operation today. Both new and existing plans, to qualify for Federal-State aid, would be required to base their rates of payment by subscribers upon a percentage of the subscribers' adjusted gross income (up to $5,000); and under each plan a majority of the board of directors must be laymen.

Primary responsibility for the development of adequate health services would be placed in the States and local communities. In order to participate in the program, each State would set up a State health council. This council would divide the State into several regions, a number of which have already been established under the Federal Hospital Construction Act. Each region would be managed by a health region authority, composed of laymen appointed by the Governor.

Individuals would obtain medical care for themselves and their families by voluntarily subscribing to a cooperating, voluntary, nonprofit, prepayment health plan. Membership would be in a group plan or on an individual basis—with the health region authority determining the number of nongroup applicants the plans can accept. Further provision would be made regarding the limit on the number of out-of-State beneficiaries a plan might include.

A national yardstick in the form of a comprehensive range of benefits would be established. The cost for this particular coverage would be estimated by the health region authorities for each health region. The subscription charge for this range of benefits could not be less than 3 percent of the subscriber's income under $5,000. Plans could offer more or less comprehensive benefits than those contained in the national yardstick and as the range of benefits offered might vary, so the rates would be required to vary from the 3-percent minimum for national-yardstick benefits. The State, through the State health council, would determine the maximum range of services all the plans in the State might offer. The minimum charge for participation in a plan would be $6 a year.

FEDERAL-STATE AID TO LOCAL PLANS

The States would be able to expend funds, a percentage of which would be reimbursable by the Federal Government, for payments to voluntary plans to meet any deficit between the aggregate of income from subscription charges and the allowed cost calculated by each health region authority, as the normal cost of supplying benefits under each approved contract.

The basic formula for Federal aid under this bill would follow the lines of the Hospital Construction Act. Federal aid would be granted a State in inverse proportion to its per capita income. States qualifying for the maximum percentage would receive Federal aid at a ratio of 3 Federal dollars for every State dollar devoted to the program; those with the highest per capita income, subject to the minimum percentage, would get 1 Federal dollar for 2 State dollars. The amount of Federal aid could not exceed $15 a year for each person covered under health plans in the respective States.

A State would begin to receive its Federal contribution as soon as it passed the appropriate legislation and the required machinery was in operation.

When financial help might be needed for the inception of a qualified nonprofit plan, the Federal Government would also help. Provision would be made for State noninterest-bearing loans, reimbursable under the Federal percentage, to match funds provided for the establishment of a plan from private contributions or noninterest-bearing loans.

LONG-RANGE SURVEY OF NATIONAL HEALTH NEEDS

A bipartisan commission to be known as the Federal Health Study and Planning Commission would be created under this act. This Commission, to be appointed jointly by the Congress and the President, would direct, supervise, and coordinate continuing health studies with respect to the most pressing problems, such as the financial condition of the country's hospitals, the recruitment and training of health personnel, the provision for care for the chronic diseases (heart disease, cancer, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy, poliomyelitis, and other crippling diseases of children, etc.), and provision for dental care. The Commission would utilize the research facilities of existing governmental agencies and other organizations as far as practicable.

The Commission would be instructed to formulate and submit to the President and to the Congress within a period of 4 years a 20-year national health program. Provision would be made for interim reports to the President and to the Congress pending submission of its findings and program. In formulating this long-range plan the Commission would be required to take into account the recommendations of the cooperating local and national organizations. Thereafter the Commission would submit, every 2 years, further plans, on a 20-year basis, designed constantly to improve the Nation's health services.

HOSPITAL-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

The present hospital-construction program would be modified to permit State grants and Federal contributions for the construction of personal health service centers, serving ambulatory patients—as well as hospitals, diagnostic centers, rehabilitation centers, and public health centers. The appropriation authorization under this program would be increased $25 million.

ASSISTANCE TO MEDICAL AND NURSING SCHOOLS

The act would provide assistance in maintaining and increasing the number of individuals trained annually in the fields of medicine and nursing.

Payments to medical schools of $500 for each enrolled student, plus an additional $1,000 for each enrolled student in excess of average past enrollment would be authorized. Comparable provisions would be provided for nursing schools.

The Surgeon General would be authorized to grant up to 50 percent of the costs of construction and equipment of new medical or nursing schools or expansions of existing schools.

LOCAL PUBLIC HEALTH UNITS

The act would make provision for assistance to States for the development and maintenance of local public health units organized to provide basic full-time public health services in all areas of the Nation and for the training of all types of personnel for public health unit work.

If a State were to provide a plan for extending the coverage and services of local public health units, it would be entitled to receive a percentage of the expenditures under the plan, the percentage varying inversely with the State's per capita income, but not exceeding 66⅔ percent.

REPEAL OF SECTION 348 OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

At present, a farmer who exceeds his acreage allotment for wheat and corn is prohibited from receiving financial reimbursement for work he has done on the soil-conservation program.

In the interest of maintaining good, sound soil-conservation practices, I believe these programs should not be made contingent upon each other. The proposed legislation would serve the purpose of separating the programs, so that farmers would continue to receive encouragement, both financial and technical, for their soil-conservation efforts.

This is a companion bill to a similar measure introduced in the House by Congressman LOVRE, of South Dakota. I ask unanimous consent that a pamphlet by Edmund Pendleton, Jr., of the District of Columbia Bar Association, entitled "Barter—A New Approach to Government Procurement" be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the pamphlet will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 443) to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The pamphlet presented by Mr. MUNDT is as follows:

BARTER [1]—A NEW APPROACH TO GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

(By Edmund Pendleton, Jr., of the District of Columbia Bar)

"The United States Government today sits atop the greatest hoard of food and fiber in the world's history. The Commodity Credit Corporation is the holder of investments totaling more than $6 billion, made up of commodities and commodity loans. And it is a flourishing corporation, if continuing growth of investment is used as our criterion. Before this fiscal year is over, total CCC commitments are expected to become substantially higher than $6 billion—probably well over $7 billion and possibly past 8 billion." [2]

The American farmer today is well aware of the problem created by the tremendous commodity holdings of the Commodity Credit Corporation. He realizes the depressing effect on prices which the stocks produce. He may not be so conscious of the cost of this program to the American taxpayer. Every day the Commodity Credit Corporation pays out $70,000 to store the agricultural commodities which it has acquired by purchase or loan.

The 83d Congress recognized the mounting problem created by the price-support program. On July 10, 1954, the President signed into law the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, Public Law 480, 83d Congress. The Congress set forth in this act three programs for the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities.[3]

---

[1] Barter: To traffic or trade by direct exchange of one commodity for another. Webster.

[2] Address by Earl L. Butz, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, at 41st National Foreign Trade Convention, National Foreign Trade Council, Inc., New York City, N. Y., Nov. 16, 1954.

[3] Not all the commodity holdings of the Commodity Credit Corporation are classified as "surplus." For the purposes of some of its programs, the Secretary of Agriculture has so designated only certain dairy products, including dried milk and butter. Throughout this article, however, the expression "surplus commodities" will include all of the various holdings of the CCC, since that is the popular understanding of the expression.

(a) Title I authorizes sales for foreign currencies. Such sales may not exceed $700 million over a period of 3 years. A government-to-government agreement is a prerequisite to commercial sales. The petitioning country must establish the commodities moving under such agreement will be over and above usual purchases from the United States. This program is patterned on the Foreign Operations Administration program authorized by section 550 of the Mutual Security Act of 1953—Public Law 118, 83d Congress.

(b) Title II authorizes the President to make grants in the form of agricultural commodities for famine relief to friendly foreign peoples. This program is limited to $300 million over a period of 3 years and is based on government-to-government negotiations.

(c) Title III strengthens the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to enter into barter transactions.[4] Barter is the only one of these programs which involves tangible acquirements by the Federal Government as quid pro quo payment for agricultural commodities.[5] The barter program is unique in today's pattern of Federal Government procurement.

The Congress and the administration are relying on the Commodity Credit Corporation to make a substantial effort to rid itself of its surplus stocks through the barter program. CCC apparently is doing so. Recently Secretary of Agriculture Benson stated that "as much as $105 million worth of surplus farm products now in Commodity Credit Corporation inventories will be bartered during the next few months for foreign-produced strategic and other materials."[6]

For the first time many businessmen wishing to sell to the American Government are becoming aware of the barter program. In spite of the tremendous complexities involved in barter many grain firms are seeking to participate in the program in order to obtain agricultural commodities from CCC on a barter basis.

LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Prior to July 10, 1954, when the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 came into effect, the Commodity Credit Corporation was operating a barter program. It was procuring strategic materials for the stockpile and nonstrategic materials for the foreign assistance programs of the United States. The basic authority for the operation of these programs is found in the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (15 U. S. C. 714 b and c). Section 4 (h) of the Charter Act authorizes the Commodity Credit Corporation to barter for strategic materials:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized, upon terms and conditions prescribed or approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, to accept strategic and critical materials produced abroad in exchange for agricultural commodities acquired by the Corporation. Insofar as practicable, in effecting such exchange of goods, normal commercial trade channels shall be utilized and priority shall be given to commodities easily storable and those which serve as prime incentive goods to stimulate production of critical and strategic materials. * * * Nothing contained herein shall limit the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to acquire, hold, or dispose of such quantity of strategic and critical materials as it deems advisable in carrying out its functions and protecting its assets."

Section 5 (f) of the Charter Act authorizes the CCC to procure nonstrategic materials:

"In the fulfillment of its purposes and in carrying out its annual budget programs submitted to and approved by the Congress pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act, the Corporation is authorized to use its general powers only to—

* * * * *

"(f) Export or cause to be exported, or aid in the development of foreign markets for, agricultural commodities."

Under the authorities cited above the CCC disposed of approximately $121 million worth of agricultural commodities from March 10, 1950 (the time of the first barter contract) through September 30, 1954.[7] Strategic materials acquired included extra long staple cotton, industrial diamonds, chromite, waterfowl down, and mercury; nonstrategic, fertilizers and blankets. Very little business was done between July 10 (effective date of the new act) and September 30, 1954, pending action of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Board of Directors of CCC to implement title III of Public Law 480.

If the CCC already had the authority to barter, why did the Congress include a section on barter in the new law? The reasoning of the legislators in enacting section 303 of Public Law 480 (dealing with the barter authority) is best summarized in the report of the House Committee on Agriculture accompanying the bill which was adopted.[8]

"Although barter of surplus agricultural commodities for critical and strategic materials is specifically contemplated and authorized by the Agricultural Act of 1949, and the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, the Department of Agriculture has participated in relatively few such transactions and, apparently, had taken an attitude discouraging, rather than encouraging, the making of such exchanges."

Section 303 of Public Law 480 was not intended to replace the barter authority contained in the Charter Act of the Commodity Credit Corporation. It amounted rather to a restatement of legislative intent. It is a clear statement of the authority which the Secretary of Agriculture now has to dispose of surplus agricultural commodities through barter for either strategic materials or economic assistance or other items. Section 303 of Public Law 480 reads in part as follows:

"Whenever the Secretary has reason to believe that, in addition to other authorized methods and means of disposing of agricultural commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation, there may be opportunity to protect the funds and assets of the Commodity Credit Corporation by barter or exchange of such agricultural commodities for (a) strategic materials entailing less risk of loss through deterioration or substantially less storage charges, or (b) materials, goods, or equipment required in connection with foreign economic and military aid and assistance programs, or (c) materials or equipment required in substantial quantities for offshore construction programs, he is hereby directed to use every practicable means, in cooperation with other Government agencies, to arrange and make, through private trade channels, such barters or exchanges or to utilize the authority conferred on him by section 4 (h) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, as amended, to make such barters or exchanges. Agencies of the United States Government procuring such materials, goods, or equipment are hereby directed to cooperate with the Secretary in the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities by means of barter or exchange."

EFFECT ON BARTER AUTHORITY OF SECTION 303, PUBLIC LAW 480

Even though this section did not change substantially the barter authority of the CCC, it is an important statement of legislative intent. Viewed in light of the report of the House Agriculture Committee, cited earlier, the following directives emerge:

1. The CCC is encouraged to protect its assets by action—inaction is not favored.[9]

"Among other deterrents to an effective barter program, the Department has maintained the policy of declining to accept in trade for its agricultural surplus any strategic materials that it did not have an immediate sale for to the appropriate Government agency. While not criticizing the Department for this attitude (since there was no legislative policy statement to guide it) the committee believes that the funds and assets of the CCC can be much better protected by exchanging, when the opportunity offers, some of its costly to store agricultural surplus for nondeteriorating, easily stored strategic materials, even though these may have to be held for some time as the property of the CCC. Indeed, to refuse to make such exchanges simply because no Government agency is in a position at the moment to buy the strategic materials from the CCC, is to negate the very reason for barter—which is an exchange of materials for materials when money with which to purchase such materials is unavailable or is less useful than materials."

2. The authority of the CCC to barter for its own account (i. e., the strategic materials acquired becoming assets of the Corporation) is reemphasized.[10]

3. Section 303 specifically included all of the foreign military and economic aid procurement as appropriate areas for barter programs.

4. The Secretary of Agriculture is directed to use every practicable means to arrange barters.

5. Other Federal Government agencies are directed to cooperate with the Department of Agriculture in the extension of the barter procurement procedure.

WHAT IS A BARTER CONTRACT?

The discussion throughout this article deals with barter or exchange contracts

[4] Title III places the barter authority in the Secretary of Agriculture and the CCC. Thus there is some confusion as to the meaning of par. 6 of a letter of the President of September 9, 1954, in which he requests "* * * the Secretary of Commerce to provide the focal point in the Government for assisting private enterprise with respect to barter transactions referred to in the act."

[5] Other commodity disposal programs, not involving barter include:

(1) Offshore procurement: Sec. 402 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, Public Law 665 of the 83d Cong., authorizes $350 million to finance normal purchases of agricultural commodities in the United States. In addition the Congress continued available $55 million of unobligated balances to be used for assistance to Spain in the form of agricultural commodities. Sec. 122 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 provided $35 million worth of agricultural commodities to pay for the manufacture in the United Kingdom of military aircraft.

(2) Surplus dairy products: Sec. 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C. 1431) as amended by sec. 302 of Public Law 480, authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to donate for overseas relief commodities in danger of spoiling. This program has operated almost exclusively in the disposal of dairy products. The section authorizes other agencies than the Department of Agriculture to barter with commodities furnished by the Department. This authority has never been utilized.

[6] USDA Press Release 2776–54, Oct. 27, 1954.

[7] USDA press release 2681–54, Oct. 20, 1954.

[8] P. 10 H. Rept. No. 1766 83d Cong., 2d sess., to accompany S. 2475.

[9] Pp. 10 and 11, H. Rept. No. 1766.

[10] Section 303 of Public Law 480.

"Strategic materials so acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be considered as assets of the Corporation and other agencies of the Government in purchasing strategic materials, shall purchase such materials from Commodity Credit Corporation inventories to the extent available in fulfillment of their requirements."

where the CCC is one party. Businessmen have engaged for a number of years, perhaps centuries, in barter contracts whose terms may or may not resemble those now being written by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The fundamentals of these CCC barter contracts may be summarized: (1) the contractor undertakes (posting stringent performance guaranties) to supply material for the national stockpile or for some foreign aid program; (2) the Commodity Credit Corporation undertakes to pay for this material in the form of available agricultural commodities;[11] (3) the Contractor undertakes (again with guaranties) to export the agricultural commodities to friendly foreign countries.

NEGOTIATING A BARTER CONTRACT

Most businessmen and attorneys who have participated in cash procurement programs of the Federal Government are aware of the procedures employed. They will know that purchases can be negotiated or competitive. It may be interesting to review the pattern of CCC procedure, which falls within the category of negotiated contracting. Since the steps involved are slightly different, where CCC is procuring strategic materials, from those in the case of non-strategic materials, the two procedures will be viewed separately.

Procurement of strategic materials: At the present time the Commodity Credit Corporation is procuring strategic materials for the national stockpile on the basis of an Office of Defense Mobilization release of September 21, 1954.[12] This release specifies which strategic materials will be considered for procurement by barter.[13] Any contractor who wishes to supply one of these materials through a barter contract must make a firm offer to the CCC. Offers subject to confirmation are not considered. The material must meet national stockpile specifications. It must be from a non-Communist source. The quantity which he offers must not exceed the stockpile objective (a classified figure), although he will have no way of knowing how much of this objective remains unfilled.

Upon receiving his offer the officials of the CCC review it with the liaison office of the General Services Administration. This latter agency is the authority designated by the Office of Defense Mobilization to procure strategic materials for cash. If the offer is rejected, the CCC officials may indicate that the price is too high, that ODM/CCC have decided against buying at that moment, or some condition has not been fulfilled in the proposal. No further indication of an acceptable price is given. If the offer is accepted, it is accepted conditionally, subject to the negotiation of terms of the barter contract.

Following such acceptance the negotiation of a contract may take several weeks. Involved are clearances with various offices of the Department including fiscal, legal, and commodity offices. The contractor soon learns that the execution and implementation of the barter contract with its double aspect of financing and moving commodities in two directions is twice as complicated and risky as the normal cash contract with the American Government.

Procurement of nonstrategic materials: The CCC program for the procurement of nonstrategic materials is much smaller in dollar volume. To the present time it has not been developed to the same extent as has the program for strategic materials and, it seems, not to its full potential. Fundamental in the difference is the support given the barter program for strategic materials by the Office of Defense Mobilization. Government agencies involved in nonstrategic procurements have found it harder to overcome established cash-purchasing procedures.[14]

The first step in the procurement of these materials generally comes with the solicitation of bids by the procuring agencies. Based on the terms and conditions of the invitation, offers are received by CCC from private United States firms who desire to participate on a barter basis. Firm offers must be made to CCC in response to the invitations prior to the closing date. Thereafter CCC translates these offers into offers of its own and files with the buying agency its own proposal to furnish the desired materials on an intragovernmental transfer basis. Thus CCC itself, in effect, appears as a bidder in competitive solicitations of GSA and other procurement agencies. If the bid of CCC is successful, thereafter negotiation of the barter contract for the nonstrategic material follows the same steps as for strategic materials.

OUTLOOK FOR BARTER

There is a tremendous potential involved in the total program which could be developed for barter. It is anticipated that CCC commodity stocks may exceed $8 billion this year. There is no indication in the near future that the price-support program will be eliminated. The only conclusion which can be drawn is that no real limit to the size of barter procurement exists.

If, as suggested earlier in this article, there is a substantial advantage to the Government and to the taxpayer in the operation of this program, are there and advantages which induce the participation of businessmen as suppliers? At best the operation of the program is complicated and bidding is highly competitive. What are the conditions under which the contractor operates and what could be done to simplify implementation of congressional intent?

1. The Office of Defense Mobilization and the General Services Administration have ruled that certain strategic materials will be acquired only through means of barter and not for cash. In addition, procurement for the supplemental stockpile (sec. 104 (b), Public Law 480) should be authorized on a barter basis.

2. Section 303 of Public Law 480 directs agencies of the United States Government to cooperate with the Secretary of Agriculture in the barter program. So far this preference for barter has been interpreted to permit the award in case of a tie-bid to the firm undertaking to receive payment in agricultural commodities. As a matter of policy this preference should be broadened to an actual percentage or amount based on savings of storage charges and other costs.

3. Contractors entering into barter contracts receive certain facilities and assume certain obligations in acquiring agricultural commodities in addition to those granted cash buyers. The Department of Agriculture must continue to support in all of its aspects the barter program. A way must be found to overcome the inertia created by the tendency to favor established procedures. As a sales program barter must not be undercut by giveaways.

4. In some cases involving the procurement of materials for foreign-assistance programs the barter contractor is able to supply them through a negotiated contract instead of through competitive bidding. In other ways the various procurement agencies must cooperate actually and actively as contemplated by the Congress in Public Law 480.

---

[11] Just what commodities are available remains somewhat obscure. Monthly export sales prices lists, showing commodities available for export are issued by the Department of Agriculture. Since these lists apply to cash as well as barter sales, they do not always state the full story. The contractor may or may not be able to obtain a specified agricultural commodity on terms which were in effect at the time he first proposed business with CCC.

[12] The role of ODM is specified in sec. 4 (h) of the CCC Charter Act, 15 U. S. C. 714b, reading in part:

"The determination of the quantities and qualities of such materials which are desirable for stockpiling and the determination of which materials are strategic and critical shall be made (by ODM) in the manner prescribed by section 98a of title 50 (Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act). Strategic and critical materials acquired by Commodity Credit Corporation in exchange for agricultural commodities shall, to the extent approved by the Munitions Board of the National Military Establishment, be transferred to the stockpile provided for by the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; and when transferred to the stockpile the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be reimbursed for the strategic and critical materials so transferred to the stockpile from the funds made available for the purpose of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, in an amount equal to the fair market value, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, of the material transferred to the stockpile."

The functions vested in the Munitions Board were transferred to ODM June 12, 1953, by Reorganization Plan No. 3.

[13] Aluminum; asbestos, amosite; asbestos, chrysotile; bauxite, metallurgical; beryl; chromite, chemical; chromite, metallurgical; chromite, refractory; copper; diamonds, industrial bort; diamonds, industrial stones; graphite, amorphous lump; graphite, lubricant flake; manganese ore, chemical; mica, block; mica, film; patinum; selenium; talc, steatite block; titanium.

[14] The Corps of Engineers has been the most successful.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN PERSONS ENTERING THE ARMED FORCES PRIOR TO JANUARY 31, 1957

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 so as to extend until January 31, 1957, the basic service period for establishing eligibility for educational benefits and to permit certain service performed after January 31, 1957, to be included in computing the period of entitlement to educational benefits. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me regarding the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 444) to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 so as to extend until January 31, 1957, the basic service period for establishing eligibility for educational benefits and to permit certain service performed after January 31, 1957, to be included in computing the period of entitlement to educational benefits, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. HENNINGS is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENNINGS

I am introducing today a bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, so as to extend the education and training benefits thereof to all persons entering the Armed Forces of the United States

prior to the 31st day of January 1957. I would like to explain briefly the factors which have entered into my decision to propose such action.

There is no necessity for me to detail the arguments advanced in this body when the original GI bill was first discussed and then adopted. It will suffice to point out that it was the sense of the Congress that the young men and women who entered the Armed Forces of our country and spent the wartime years in the military service of the United States were making a special contribution to the welfare of this Nation. Other generations had made similar contributions, only to find in many instances that their country seemed unaware, and unappreciative, of the sacrifices of its youth. The Congress determined, during World War II, that a profoundly grateful America should this time express its gratitude to its veterans, and enacted the GI bill of rights to accord many substantial and well-earned benefits to those who had served.

Likewise, in 1952, when hundreds of thousands of young American men and women were once again defending the United States, this time against Communist aggression, Congress wisely decided to extend similar benefits to persons who served in the Armed Forces during the period of the Korean conflict. Public Law 550, the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act, was enacted in 1952 to accomplish that end, and soon came to be known popularly as the Korean GI bill.

These two laws have materially assisted the veterans of our Armed Forces in their return to civilian life. They have been aided in buying homes, in establishing independent small businesses, in securing attractive and suitable employment. They have benefitted in numerous other ways. And, certainly, among the most successful and widely acclaimed provisions of each of these laws were those extending education or training opportunities.

Under the two GI bills, many Americans were enabled to begin or resume their education or training after separation from service. Millions of veterans received college educations, and in frequent instances were able to pursue extensive programs of postgraduate work. Countless others received vocational rehabilitation or on-the-job training. And the United States is a better country as a result. There is no profession, career, or vocation which today does not include in its ranks many, many persons who received their education or training through the assistance of the GI bills. Our defense industries, our building trades, our hospitals, our universities, our schools, our courts, indeed, every trusted and revered institution in American life, including the Congress of the United States, is today richer and much more adequately staffed as a result of the wisdom which inspired this legislation.

In an age in which democracy is under attack from all sides by isms which feed on fear and ignorance, it is imperative that we have an informed and educated and resolute citizenry. The GI bills have gone far to further this objective. Each of us knows literally hundreds of fine Americans who are today occupying positions of trust and responsibility, and are contributing to America's security and prosperity in a far greater degree than they otherwise would have been able to do, largely through the education and training provisions of these GI bills.

The Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 provided, in brief, that a veteran who had served in the Armed Forces between June 27, 1950, and a date to be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, would be entitled to certain benefits, including medical services, disability compensation, guaranteed loans, unemployment compensation, mustering-out pay, vocational rehabilitation, housing, and education and training opportunities. The President on January 5 of this year signed proclamation 3080 establishing January 31, 1955, as the terminal date in the computation of such veterans' benefits. Consequently, persons who enter the Armed Forces after the 31st day of January 1955, will no longer be entitled to any of the benefits afforded by the 1952 law.

I do not intend, at this time, to question the wisdom which directed the promulgation of Proclamation 3080. Certainly, the continuance of all of the benefits concerned would be an expensive proposition, and consequently should receive thoughtful consideration from both the Executive and the Congress. I shall urge the Senate to study this entire subject with care and thoughtfulness, to decide whether the termination of these benefits will operate to increase the morale of our Armed Forces at this critical hour. As the representative branch of Government, the Congress cannot abdicate its responsibility in this matter.

But one provision of Executive Order 3080 is in need of immediate consideration, and it is to this feature that my bill is partially directed.

Under the provisions of the 1952 law, and the terms of Proclamation 3080, any person in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, will be fully entitled to all of the diverse benefits of the act. Persons entering service after that date will have no such entitlement. As I say, the wisdom of this must be determined by Congress. At least all such persons will enter service with a full awareness of their eventual rights and benefits, or lack of the same. A special situation exists regarding the educational provisions of the 1952 law, however.

Section 214 (a) of Public Law 550 provides that each eligible veteran shall be entitled to education or training for a period equal to 1½ times the eduration of his active service in the Armed Forces during a basic service period, up to a maximum of 36 months. This basic service period is defined, in section 201 (1) of that law, to mean the period beginning on June 27, 1950, and ending on such date as shall be determined by the President or by Congress. Proclamation 3080 establishes January 31, 1955, as the terminal date of this period.

A person in service on January 31, 1955, and subsequently honorably discharged is entitled fully to education and training benefits. But the amount of these benefits now is restricted not to 1½ times his period of service, but rather to 1½ times his service between June 27, 1950, and January 31, 1955. Thus, a person who entered our Armed Forces on November 31, 1954, let us say, is fully entitled to education or training. But in this case he would be entitled only to 3 months' training, even though he might remain in service for the duration of a 4-year enlistment.

Proclamation 3080 thus operates to reduce the extent of education and training opportunity available for all persons who entered military service after January 31, 1953. In some instances, where persons have very recently entered the Armed Forces, they will be entitled to a period of education or training so limited as to be nugatory.

Our armed services in soliciting enlistments have capitalized greatly on the benefits promised to service personnel by the Korean GI bill. Many persons have entered the service partially motivated by a belief that they would be able, after discharge, to attend a college or university of their choice or to pursue a course of vocational or on-the-job training. Now, although still entitled to some education or training, they find that the period of enrollment has been, after their entry into service, so narrowly defined as to limit the duration of that training, irrespective of the duration of their service. Surely this constitutes a most serious breach of faith.

Many letters from service personnel already have been received in my office, even though a mere 9 days have elapsed since the issuance of proclamation 3080. These letters are in some cases indignant, and others are stern and bitter. The writers feel that they have been betrayed. I cannot in good conscience disagree. And so I strongly feel that Congress should amend the 1952 law and redress the grievances and injustices which will result from proclamation 3080.

My bill also proposes to extend the education and training opportunities of the GI bill to all persons entering the Armed Forces prior to January 31, 1957. I believe that this is the least that we can do. No unswerving desire to balance the budget and reduce taxes should blind us to the immense good which these opportunities have accomplished for our veterans and our country. We must remember that the young men and women who enter our country's military service in wartime or in days of relative peace give unhesitatingly all that is asked of them, including years of their life. We should be prepared to assure them some minimal benefits in return, particularly when we know that the United States as a whole will benefit most significantly.

Only yesterday the President requested Congress to extend the draft law for a 4-year period. In all probability, we shall be drafting and enlisting persons into our defense forces for some years to come, and all qualified persons will be required to give years of service to their country. We certainly can give something in return.

We recently have seen many ideas advanced as to how the morale of our Armed Forces can be improved. Bills to raise their pay, extend greater fringe benefits, including hospitalization and other services, are at present before the Congress and will continue to appear. And yet, at the same time, the President himself, greatly concerned over the problem of such morale, takes an action which can only operate to depress that morale.

I believe that the Senate has an obligation to act to repair the damaged morale of our Armed Forces. My bill will assist in such repair. I am confident that the Senate will accord this bill its immediate and profound attention and will act at the earliest opportunity.

COMMISSION ON SECURITY IN GOVERNMENT AND INDUSTRY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the creation of a Commission on Security in Government and Industry. I ask unanimous consent that a newspaper release and a statement relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the release and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 457) to provide for the creation of a Commission on Security in Government and Industry, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The newspaper release and statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

WASHINGTON.—Senator MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, reintroduced in Congress today his resolution proposing the setting up of a "Hoover type" commission to coordinate all Government and industry security investigations intended to avoid

confusion, insure there be no infringement on personal liberties and avoid duplication.

The Commission would be composed of 12 members appointed by the President who will designate the chairman. The members would be selected from leaders in labor, business management and the general public while 3 Members of the Senate and 3 Members of the House would be named as advisory members. The Congress Members would have all rights given the other Commission members except they could not vote upon matters before the Commission. They would be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House.

MAGNUSON said he felt it is necessary to coordinate all security investigations declaring that some investigators "have tried to use the security issue not against our real enemy, but against their particular political opponents." He said that some investigators have failed to think through the problem of how to conduct security programs in such a way as to protect the very rights of the individual that would be taken away by a triumphant enemy.

The Senator said that even among Government agencies no clear pattern exists for conducting a security program. Instead, he continued, there is a crazy quilt patchwork that has been built in a hurry, clearly showing that not enough care has been taken to avoid duplication.

"Identical personnel, locations and activities are subjected to security clearings by more than one Government agency," Magnuson said. "This duplication is not only wasteful and exasperating, but can be dangerous. It does not safeguard us—it ties our hands with red tape."

The expenses of the Commission would be paid from the contingent funds of the House and the Senate. The Commission members would receive $25 a day while attending meetings away from home, together with transportation and incidentals. MAGNUSON asked that $50,000 be allotted by Congress to pay the cost of the Commission activities.

"Security is not something to trifle with" the Senator said. "We must protect ourselves, our rights, our traditions and form of Government against either internal or external aggression. I point out, however, that any security program must likewise protect the very liberties it seeks to preserve.

"Among other things, this means that provisions must be made for appeal and clearance of the innocent as well as detection and prosecution of the guilty."

The Senator's resolution last year was introduced late in the session and did not come to a vote on its merits.

MAGNUSON SUBSTITUTE FOR S. 3706, SUBVERSIVE ORGANIZATION CONTROL BILL

The Magnuson substitute proposed a Commission on Security in Government and Industry. It proposed a Commission of 12 members to be appointed by the President and consisting of men and women who are outstanding leaders of labor, of business management, and of the general public.

In addition, the Magnuson substitute proposed an advisory committee to the Commission consisting of 6 members to be appointed from the House and Senate, 3 of whom would be appointed from the Senate and 3 from the House of Representatives. This would then insure close liaison between Congress and the Commission itself. The committee was instructed to report to the Congress and the President by January 15.

The Magnuson resolution was defeated 56–31.

Senator IVES, one of the outstanding labor authorities in the Senate and a Republican, supported the Magnuson amendment. In a colloquy with Senator BUTLER, of Maryland, over an amendment the Senator from New York proposed, the following exchange took place:

"Mr. BUTLER. Because I did not think that amendment was sound, and neither do I believe the amendment of the Senator from New York is practicable."

"Mr. IVES. I think it is sound.

"With regard to the question of making a study, I have had some experience in dealing with labor-management relations and labor-management problems. From long experience in that field, one learns that the way to resolve a question, when there is a conflict of feeling of this type, is to get the groups together, as proposed by the amendment of the Senator from Washington.

"For that reason I voted for the amendment of the Senator from Washington. The amendment itself would have delayed action on this matter for a period of only approximately 5 months, and I think it would be far better to get the parties in interest to sit down and arrive at something on which they would at least be in agreement.

"By the way, let me point out that the amendment provided for consultation with Members of the House of Representatives and Members of the Senate. I believe it is far better to legislate in that way than to legislate out the whole cloth, as we are now legislating."

INCREASED COMPENSATION OF JUDGES OF UNITED STATES COURTS AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill, to increase the salaries of justices and judges of United States courts, Members of Congress, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement in explanation of the bill by the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 462) to increase the salaries of justices and judges of United States courts, Members of Congress, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GORE, for Mr. KILGORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement by Mr. KILGORE, presented by Mr. GORE, is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KILGORE

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to increase the salaries of justices and judges of United States courts, Members of Congress, and for other purposes.

It will be recalled that the 83d Congress created a Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries, Public Law 220, 83d Congress. It was the responsibility of that Commission to determine, insofar as it was able to do so, what constituted fair and reasonable compensation for Members of Congress and the Federal judiciary. The Commission was instructed to report back to Congress and Congress itself was to consider and act upon the report within 60 legislative days. In fact, Congress was to enact legislation establishing the salaries of justices and judges of the courts of the United States and the salaries and mileage of Members of Congress, including the Vice President and Speaker of the House. However, no action was taken by the Congress upon the Commission's report.

The President in his state of the Union message strongly recommended that the 84th Congress take favorable action on increased salaries for Members and judges.

The proposed legislation in part is based upon the recommendations reported to the Congress by the Commission.

The bill incorporates the identical salary recommendations suggested by the Salary Commission which are as follows:

Chief Justice of the United States	$40,000
Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States	39,500
Vice President of the United States	40,000
Speaker of the House of Representatives	40,000
Members of Congress	27,500
Judges of the United States court of appeals	30,500
Judges of the U. S. Court of Claims	30,500
Judges of the Tax Court of the United States	27,500
Judges of the Court of Military Appeals	30,500
Judges of the U. S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals	30,500
Judges of the U. S. Customs Court	27,500
Judges of the United States district courts (including the United States district courts for the districts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico, the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, and the District Court of the Virgin Islands)	27,500

The Commission further recommended that the Congress establish a fund out of which the necessary expenses incurred by the Vice President of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and attributable to their offices be paid on a voucher basis. No specific sum was recommended by the Commission. The bill which I have introduced increases the expense allowances for these officers. At present, under existing law, the Vice President is provided with an expense allowance of $10,000, for which no accounting, other than for income-tax purposes, is made by him. The proposed legislation retains the present $10,000 expense allowance and provides that there shall be paid to the Vice President, upon vouchers certified by him and submitted to the Secretary of the Senate, an additional amount not to exceed $10,000 in any calendar year for reimbursement of necessary expenses incurred and which are properly attributable to his office.

The proposed legislation retains the existing $10,000 expense allowance for the Speaker of the House of Representatives and provides an additional amount not to exceed $10,000 to the Speaker, upon vouchers certified by him and submitted to the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives for reimbursement of necessary expenses incurred by him and which are properly attributable to his office.

Section 4 of the bill implements the recommendations of the Salary Commission which recommended that Members of the Congress should be reimbursed, upon a voucher basis, for the expenses incurred in making not to exceed six round trips per year between the District of Columbia and his residence in the State, District, or Territory which he represents. Present law provides that each Senator, Representative, and Delegate shall receive mileage at the rate of 20 cents per mile, to be estimated by the nearest route usually traveled in going to and returning from each regular session.

This measure retains the present mileage allowance authorized by law and in addition provides that each Senator, Representative, and Delegate, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, shall be entitled to reimbursement upon vouchers certified by them and submitted to the Secretary of the Senate or the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives as the case may be, for expenses incurred in making not to exceed five round trips in any calendar year, based upon the nearest route, between the District

of Columbia and his residence in the State, District, or Territory which he represents.

In its report to the Congress the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries concluded that judicial and congressional salaries:

1. Have not kept pace with the growth of the duties and responsibilities of these offices.

2. Are too low compared with salaries paid for similar ability and less responsibility in private enterprise.

3. Have lagged behind while salaries of other Federal officials were being adjusted upward.

4. Are, and for a long time have been, grossly inadequate.

5. Tend to confine these important positions to persons of independent wealth or outside earnings.

6. While no exact formula exists, standard job evaluation criteria and standards historically applied indicate what are fair and reasonable amounts.

7. The net cost of the Government of the recommended increases is small related to the immense benefit to the public welfare—$4,527,302 for Members of the Congress and $2,981,491 for Federal judges, an aggregate of one one-hundredth of 1 percent of the Federal budget.

8. Present methods of payments of official expenses of Members of the Congress are antiquated and unrealistic.

A detailed review of the reasons which prompted the Commission to arrive at the recommendations represented in this proposed legislation will be found in the report of the Commission set forth in House Document No. 300, 83d Congress, 2d session.

The increases recommended by the Commission are substantial. This, however, as the Commission observes, results from the lack of frequent and periodic reviews of congressional and judicial salaries and their relationship to increases in cost of living and comparable salary payments in private industry.

The present bill would go far toward correcting inequities in the compensation of the judicial and legislative branches.

It is believed that the public interest will be served if the Congress devotes early attention to this important legislation.

COMMEMORATIVE MEDALS FOR CERTAIN SOCIETIES OF WHICH BENJAMIN FRANKLIN WAS A MEMBER

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill intended to authorize the issuance of commemorative medals to certain societies of which Benjamin Franklin was a member, or a founder, or a sponsor, at a time when we are about to observe the 250th anniversary of his birth. The date of this anniversary will be on the 17th day of January 1956.

Benjamin Franklin was one of the greatest of the galaxy of great men to whom we owe the creation of this Nation. The older we grow as a nation the more powerful and influential we become in the councils of the world, the more necessary it is for us to be ever mindful of our humble beginnings, and to retain in grateful remembrance the names and examples of those whose wisdom guided us along the paths by which we achieved our eminence. It is fitting upon proper occasion to make public acknowledgment of those to whom we are so greatly indebted. The 250th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin is most assuredly one of those occasions.

Benjamin Franklin was the first of the long line in the series of those who, solely by their energy, initiative, and ability, have made the American success story the wonder of the modern world. By the age of 40, Franklin had acquired sufficient substance to be able to devote his entire time to the public service. Abroad in that service, he became the most skillful diplomat of his time. At home, he aided in the drafting of and was a signer of, the Declaration of Independence. He was a signatory to the treaty of peace with Great Britain. He was a member of the Constitutional Convention. In the Convention he was the most effective and persuasive influence in reconciling differences of opinion, and by suggesting with infectious good humor that by having every member give up somewhat of his infallibility, a full accord and accommodation might be achieved. And so it was.

In science, he was a towering figure in his age; by a kite and a string and a key, he induced the lightning from the skies to obey his will; in domestic science, he invented the first practical stove; in agriculture, he was the first to demonstrate the advantageous use of commercial fertilizer; in human relations, his almanac became the common medium for the exchange of homely and practical advice among all the American people; in literature, his autobiography is one of the classics of the English language, and still is esteemed throughout the world.

Such is the briefest thumbnail sketch of a man who in many ways dominated the life of his native country and extended his influence in many ways throughout the whole civilized world.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 463) to authorize the issuance of commemorative medals to certain societies of which Benjamin Franklin was a member, founder, or sponsor, in observance of the 250th anniversary of his birth, introduced by Mr. DUFF (for himself and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE ON INTRODUCING CERTAIN RELIEF BILLS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], I introduce for appropriate reference several private bills.

I wish to make a brief comment on the policy of the introduction of such bills. The bills are being introduced by request. I wish the RECORD to show, however, that in this case, as in the case of all private bills, I have studied them sufficiently to satisfy myself that a prima facie case exists to justify a study of the bills by a committee. Some of the bills relate to immigration.

I am certain that my colleagues in the Senate know that from time to time we are asked to introduce so-called private bills involving immigration rights, when the purpose is to get a stay of the deportation of the person concerned. I do not believe it is sound public policy to introduce such bills as dilatory tactics, so far as deportation is concerned, unless a Senator is convinced that a prima facie case exists justifying a stay.

When I introduce such bills, as I am doing today, by request, I want the Senate to know that I am carrying out the policy of introducing the bills after satisfying myself that a prima facie case exists.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 468. A bill for the relief of Marie T. Gonsalves;

S. 469. A bill for the relief of Dorothy Whitman;

S. 470. A bill for the relief of Edith Winifred Loch;

S. 471. A bill for the relief of Aina Brizga;

S. 472. A bill for the relief of Lee In Ja;

S. 473. A bill for the relief of Urho Paavo Patokoski and his family;

S. 474. A bill for the relief of Maria Elena Venegas and Sarah Lucia Venegas;

S. 475. A bill for the relief of Margarete R. Zimmerman;

S. 476. A bill for the relief of Harold Swarthout and L. R. Swarthout;

S. 477. A bill for the relief of Aldo Timossi; and

S. 478. A bill for the relief of Tomas Gumtang Subia.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN CONSTRUCTION OF SCHOOLS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize Federal payments to the States to assist in constructing schools. It is a pleasure for me to announce that joining with me in introduction of this bill is the distinguished senior Senator from New York. Joining with us in the House of Representatives is the distinguished Representative from West Virginia, Mr. BAILEY, and the distinguished Representative from Pennsylvania, Mr. KEARNS.

The bill is a result of extensive hearings in both the Senate and the House during the past several years. It will authorize Federal financial assistance to build schools, but it will leave responsibility for administering the actual construction with the State and local school authorities who are acquainted with local needs. Its requirements for State plans to be approved by the United States Commissioner of Education will insure that the Federal funds will go where they are most needed in each State.

Our bill will do what the Federal Government should do to help solve one of our most pressing national domestic problems.

No specific amount of Federal funds is provided for in the bill, but, in view of the need, they would be as determined by the Congress. These funds would be distributed to the States according to the number of persons 5 to 17 years of age in

each State. The States and local school districts would be required to match the Federal funds dollar for dollar.

In order to make certain that the Federal funds will not be substituted for State and local funds that would otherwise be spent for school construction, each State educational agency would be required to submit a State plan of operation. This State plan would describe the program developed in each State, provide for full fiscal accountability by the State agency to the Federal Government for all Federal funds, provide for the establishment of standards for locating, planning, and constructing school facilities, and provide for reports to the Commissioner of Education concerning how the Federal funds have been expended.

The most important aspect of the State plan required by the bill, however, is that each State would be required to set forth principles for determining the relative priority of school facility construction projects, taking into account the relative financial resources of local school districts, the relative local efforts which have been and are being made to meet school needs out of State and local funds, and the relative urgency of local needs for the school facilities according to the extent of overcrowding and lack of facilities, and the extent to which unsafe and obsolete facilities are currently in use.

The United States Commissioner of Education would approve the plan of each State, but after that the administration among local school districts would be by the State agency for education.

Under the provisions of this bill, it would be impossible for any Federal agency to control in any way the programs of instruction in schools. The Federal Government would be a financial partner with the States and local school districts in constructing schools where they are most needed in each State, but the actual planning and construction of the schools would be left to the State education agencies and to the local school districts within each State.

The need is great for the Congress to act quickly to meet the school construction problem all over the country. Members of the Senate will recall that during the 81st Congress I was chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on School Construction. Our hearings demonstrated a crying, urgent demand for action by the Congress to help alleviate the school construction need. The hearings before our committee showed the untold numbers of children—the future leaders of tomorrow—attending school in unsafe firetraps and in shifts like factory workers. This is indeed a sorry reflection on the values of our society.

The administration is today talking of a plan for the building of roads which will cost more than $100 billion. We need roads, Mr. President, and I intend to support any intelligent and moderate plan to help build roads, but can any of us say that the building of roads has a priority over the building of schools? The interest by men in high places in the road needs of the United States is commendable, but let us never lose sight of the fact that the basic strength of our Nation is in our people, in our children, and in our educational system. It indeed would be unconscionable and unwise for us to concentrate on road building and on the Federal Government's role in that activity and then to ignore the Federal Government's responsibility for the building of schools for our children.

In my own State of Minnesota the need is great. The State education commissioner reported that to provide sufficient classroom space for all the Minnesota children who will be in school by 1960 would cost $330,471,856.

In Minnesota a school district may borrow up to 50 percent of its assessed valuation. A large number of districts can borrow this amount of money, but there are 257 that cannot borrow sufficient money in order to provide sufficient classrooms. If they borrowed the limit they would still need in Minnesota $75 million net to provide for classroom space for these 257 school districts.

Prior to 1947 the State provided to the school districts in the form of special State aids for maintenance purposes about $16 million. For the current school year the legislature provided $64 million. The State pays 40 percent of the maintenance operation of school districts in our State. Minnesota needs the assistance for school buildings this bill would authorize, although I am well aware that many other States have an even more serious problem than has Minnesota.

Let me illustrate: Bloomington is south of Minneapolis. It is a consolidated school district, but the population has greatly increased. They have borrowed to the maximum of their ability and their assessed valuation is about $10 million. They have bonded themselves for $5 million. They cannot borrow any more money. In 3 out of the last 5 years the district operated the elementary schools on half-time schedules. This year they are operating the secondary schools, the junior and senior high schools, on half-time schedules. The superintendent says that if they do not secure some help they may have to run their high school on a triple schedule sometime in the near future.

It is estimated that by 1960 we should have at least 10,000 additional classrooms in Minnesota. Our school population is increasing by 20,000 a year. Our records show that in our elementary and secondary school districts, they are pouring in in increasing numbers. This condition is common throughout the Nation.

There is a real national interest in education because our national strength, future growth, and ability to make wise decisions in the years to come depend largely upon it. We need to make the Federal Government a real partner of the States and local school districts in meeting this urgent problem. I hope the 84th Congress will alleviate the critical school-building shortage along the lines of the bill that the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and I are proud to introduce.

The Congress recognized its responsibility in the area of school construction during the 81st Congress when it enacted a bill, of which I was proud to be the author, authorizing a survey of school-construction needs. That survey is now completed. It reaffirms the need. There is no need for further delay in order to obtain more facts and additional studies. The time to act is now. I request the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee to begin hearings on our proposal and other proposals for school construction as soon as possible so that we in the Congress can fulfill our responsibilities to the Nation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 480) to authorize Federal payments to the States to assist in constructing schools, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. IVES), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REAPPOINTMENT OF DR. JEROME C. HUNSAKER AS CITIZEN REGENT OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. I ask unanimous consent that a statement with reference to Dr. Hunsaker, together with the joint resolution, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution, together with the statement, will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 18) introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, which will occur by the expiration of the term of Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker, of Cambridge, Mass., on April 7, 1955, be filled by the reappointment of the present incumbent for the statutory term of 6 years.

The statement presented by Mr. ANDERSON is as follows:

[From Who's Who in America]

Hunsaker, Jerome Clarke, aeronautical engr.; b. Creston, Iowa, August 26, 1886, s. Walter J. and Alma (Clarke) H; grad. U. S. Naval Acad., 1908; M. S., Mass. Inst. Tech., 1912, D. Sc., 1916; D. Sc. Hon., Williams Coll., 1943; Eng. D., Northeastern Univ., 1945; married Alice Porter Avery, June 26, 1911; children—Mrs. Sarah Porter Swope, Jerome Clarke, James Peter, Mrs. T. A. Bird. Officer, later advancing to commander, Construction Corps, United States Navy, 1909-23; in-

structor of aeronautic engineering, Mass. Inst. Tech., 1912–16; in charge aircraft design, Navy Dept., Wash., D. C.; designed airship *Shenandoah* and flying boat *NC–4;* 1st to fly Atlantic, 1916–23; asst. naval attaché, London, Paris, Berlin, Rome, 1923–26; asst. vice pres., Bell Telephone Labs. (wire and radio services for airways), 1926–28; vice pres., Goodyear Zeppelin Corp., 1928–33; head of dept. aeronautical engineering, Mass. Inst. Tech., 1933–51; now prof. emeritus; lecturer; director, McGraw Hill Pub. Co., Sperry Corp., Shell Oil Co., Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.; chairman, N. A. C. A.; captain, U. S. N. R.; retired officer, Legion of Honor (France). Fellow American Phys. Soc., Am. Acad. Arts & Sciences; hon. fellow Inst. of the A. S., Royal Aeronautic Soc. of Britain; hon. mem., Am. Soc. Mech. Engrs., Inst. Mech. Engrs.; mem., Soc. Naval Architects and Marine Engineers (London), Amer. Soc. Automotive Engrs., Nat. Acad. of Sciences, Am. Philos. Soc., Delta Kappa Epsilon, Sigma Xi. Awarded Navy Cross, Medal for Merit (U. S.); Daniel Guggenheim medal, Franklin medal; Wright Brothers memorial trophy. Clubs: Century (New York, N. Y), Army & Navy (Wash.), St. Botolph (Boston). Contributor to journals of professional societies. Home: 10 Louisburg Square, Boston. Office: Mass. Inst. Tech., Cambridge, Mass.

OMNIBUS NARCOTICS CONTROL ACT OF 1955

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, since the end of World War II, there has been an alarming increase of traffic in narcotic drugs. The increased use of narcotics by 'teen-agers has been of great concern, since it is closely related to the increase in juvenile delinquency. With the present strained international situation, it is no consolation to know that Communist China is the leading source of supply of the illicit drugs being used to corrupt our young people.

The apparent failure of present national and international methods of narcotic control has aroused interest at all regulatory levels in discovering the nature of the entire narcotic problem and, thus, the basis of its solution. In November, President Eisenhower approved the creation of an Interdepartmental Committee on Narcotics, which is in the process of making a comprehensive survey of the extent of narcotic addiction in the United States. Several States are currently revising and strengthening their narcotic laws. The Bureau of Narcotics, under the able leadership of Commissioner Harry J. Anslinger, continues to be one of the chief deterrents to further increase in narcotic addiction, in spite of presently inadequate laws and funds.

It is felt that the time has come for a comprehensive review by Congress of our narcotic laws in order to determine what should be done on this national social problem so as to strengthen the hands of the appropriate Federal and State officials with responsibility in this field. Organizations such as the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce have interested themselves in the need for new legislation on this subject.

During the 83d Congress, various bills dealing with different phases of the narcotics problem were introduced. Last fall, I prepared an omnibus bill incorporating many of the previous legislative proposals and some new material, and 41 Senators have agreed to cosponsor the bill with me. This omnibus bill is a comprehensive measure covering the organization and powers of the Bureau of Narcotics and its personnel; providing increased penalties for regular narcotics violations, with even more severe penalties for sales to minors; authorizing expansion of treatment and rehabilitation facilities and programs; and, perhaps most important of all, authorizing the establishment of educational and research activities in the field of narcotics addiction.

It is intended that this omnibus bill shall serve as a starting point in reviewing the Federal narcotics laws and programs. It is recognized that the bill contains controversial features on which there can be honest disagreement. The appropriate committee will be in a position to evaluate these differences of opinion after hearings on the bill have been held.

I should like to invite all interested citizens and organizations to join in this campaign for reviewing and strengthening our narcotics laws and programs as an essential first step in stamping out this national social problem.

So, Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I introduce, for appropriate reference a joint resolution entitled "Narcotics Control Act of 1955." I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the joint resolution and a memorandum explaining it section by section, along with an article entitled "The Story Behind Red China's Dope Peddlers," by Irwin Ross, from the New Leader for December 20, 1954; a brief pamphlet entitled "Living Death: The Truth About Drug Addictions," issued by the Bureau of Narotics; and a series of five articles entitled "The Nation's Narcotic Problem," written by Milton Lewis, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune in December, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution, together with the matters referred to, will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19), submitted by Mr. PAYNE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the postwar period has witnessed a substantial and alarming increase in the illicit supply and demand for narcotic drugs in the United States, notwithstanding strenuous efforts on the part of Federal and State authorities; and

Whereas illicit traffic in narcotic drugs for profit are the primary and sustaining sources of addiction and are of material danger to public morals, health, safety, and welfare; and

Whereas narcotic-drug addiction on the part of minors is particularly undesirable, is observed similarly to have increased in the postwar period, and is known historically to occur during periods of increased juvenile delinquency such as appears today; and

Whereas strongly deterrent penal laws, with alert enforcement, are acknowledge to be the most effective method of terminating illicit traffic and supply of narcotic drugs for profit; and

Whereas the need continues and grows for reduction of the demand for such drugs through proper treatment, cure, and rehabilitation of persons already addicted to the use of narcotics: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That this act, divided into titles, may be cited as the "Narcotics Control Act of 1955."

TITLE I—ORGANIZATION

TRANSFER OF BUREAU OF NARCOTICS

SEC. 101. (a) There are hereby transferred to the Attorney General all functions of the Bureau of Narcotics, and all functions of the Secretary of the Treasury in relation thereto.

(b) The Attorney General may from time to time make such provisions as he may deem appropriate authorizing the performance by any other officer, or by any agency or employee, of the Department of Justice of any function transferred to such Attorney General by the provisions of this section.

(c) There are hereby transferred to the Department of Justice, to be used, employed, and expended in connection with the functions transferred by the provisions of this section, the records and property now being used or held in connection with such functions, the personnel employed in connection

with such functions, and the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds available or to be made available for use in connection with such functions. Such further measures and dispositions as the Director of the Budget shall determine to be necessary in order to effectuate the transfers provided in this subsection shall be carried out in such manner as the Director shall direct and by such agencies as he shall designate.

POWERS OF BUREAU OF NARCOTICS

SEC. 102. (a) Chapter 203 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 3061. Powers of the Bureau of Narcotics.

"The Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner, Assistant to the Commissioner, and agents of the Bureau of Narcotics of the Department of Justice may carry firearms, execute and serve search warrants and arrest warrants, serve subpenas and summonses issued under the authority of the United States, and make arrests without warrant for violations of any law of the United States relating to narcotic drugs (as defined in the first section of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act (21 U. S. C., sec. 171)) or marihuana (as defined in sec. 3238 of the Internal Revenue Code) where the violation is committed in the presence of the person making the arrest or where such person has reasonable grounds to believe that the person arrested has committed or is committing such violation."

(b) The analysis of chapter 203 of title 18 of the United States Code, immediately preceding section 3041 of such title, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"3061. Powers of the Bureau of Narcotics."

DIVISION OF NARCOTIC CLINICS

SEC. 103. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized and directed to establish in the Public Health Service a Division of Narcotic Clinics for the treatment of narcotics addicts which shall—

(1) establish and maintain hospitals, farms, and other institutions for the care and rehabilitation of those suffering from drug addiction;

(2) assist the several States and reputable private agencies to establish and maintain hospitals, farms, and other institutions for the care and rehabilitation of those suffering from drug addiction;

(3) train and educate personnel for the several States and reputable private institutions in its approved methods for treatment, cure, and rehabilitation of those suffering from drug addiction;

(4) utilize the facilities of the United States Employment Service in obtaining useful and suitable employment for those former sufferers from chronic alcoholism and drug addiction who have been discharged from hospitals of the Bureau and assist States and reputable private institutions in placement of discharged patients; and

(5) cooperate with, advise, consult with, and encourage the organization of associations, public and private, engaged in work with drug addiction.

SEC. 104. The Director of the Division of Narcotic Clinics and all other necessary personnel, shall be appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare without regard to the civil-service laws and without reference to political affiliations, solely on the grounds of fitness to perform the duties of their office. The compensation of all employees shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949.

SEC. 105. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of sections 103 and 104 of this title.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE AMENDMENTS

SEC. 201. The Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A) is amended by redesignating section 345 as section 346 and by inserting after section 344 the following new section:

"PERSONS COMMITTED BY STATE COURTS

"SEC. 345. (a) The Surgeon General is authorized to admit for care and treatment in any hospital of the Service suitably equipped therefor, and thereafter to transfer between hospitals of the Service in accordance with section 321 (b), any addict who is committed by a court of competent jurisdiction of a State or by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, to the Service or to a hospital thereof for care and treatment and who the Surgeon General determines is a proper subject for such care and treatment. No such addict shall be admitted unless suitable accommodations are available after all eligible addicts convicted of offenses against the United States have been admitted, and unless the State agrees to pay to the United States, either in advance or otherwise, as may be determined by the Surgeon General, all costs involved in providing such care and treatment (including the cost of transportation to and from facilities of the Public Health Service). Such costs may be determined for each addict or on the basis of rates established for all or particular classes of patients.

"(b) Any person admitted to a hospital of the Service pursuant to subsection (a) shall be discharged therefrom when he is found by the Surgeon General to be cured and rehabilitated, or at the request of the proper authorities of the State in which is situated the committee court.

"(c) With respect to the detention, transfer, parole, or discharge of any person committed to a hospital of the Service in accordance with subsection (a), the Surgeon General and the officer in charge of the hospital, in addition to authority otherwise vested in them, shall have such authority as may be conferred upon them, respectively, by the law of the State in which is situated the committing court or by the order of the committing court.

"(d) Moneys paid to the United States for the care and treatment of persons committed in accordance with subsection (a) shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. Appropriations available for the care and treatment of addicts admitted to a hospital of the Service under this section shall be available, subject to regulations, for paying the cost of transportation to any State, including subsistence allowance while traveling, for any such addict who is indigent and is discharged."

SEC. 202. The first sentence of section 341 of such act is amended to read: "The Surgeon General is authorized to provide for the confinement, care, protection, treatment, and discipline of persons addicted to the use of habit-forming narcotic drugs who voluntarily submit themselves for treatment, addicts who have been or are hereafter convicted of offenses against the United States, including persons convicted by general courts-martial and consular courts, and addicts who are committed to the Service or to a hospital thereof pursuant to section 345."

SEC. 203. The third sentence of section 344 (b) of such act is amended to read as follows: "No such addict shall be admitted unless he agreed to submit to treatment for the maximum amount of time estimated by the Surgeon General to be necessary to effect a cure, and unless suitable accommodations are available after all eligible addicts convicted of offenses against the United States and all eligible addicts committed pursuant to section 345 have been admitted."

SEC. 204. Such act is further amended by adding the following new section after the section herein redesignated as section 346:

"RELEASE OF PATIENTS

"SEC. 347. For purposes of this act, an individual shall be deemed cured of his addiction if the Surgeon General determines that he has received the maximum benefits of treatment and care by the Service for his addiction or if the Surgeon General determines that his further treatment and care for such purpose would be detrimental to the interests of the Service."

PENALTIES

SEC. 205. Section 2 (c) of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 21, sec. 174), is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Whoever fraudulently or knowingly imports or brings any narcotic drug into the United States or any territory under its control or jurisdiction, contrary to law, or receives, conceals, buys, sells, or in any manner facilitates the transportation, concealment, or sale of any such narcotic drug after being imported or brought in, knowing the same to have been imported contrary to law, or conspires to commit any of such acts in violation of the laws of the United States, shall be fined not more than $3,000 and imprisoned not less than 5 or more than 10 years. For a second offense, the offender shall be fined not more than $5,000 and imprisoned not less than 10 or more than 20 years. For a third or subsequent offense, the offender shall be imprisoned for life. Upon conviction for a second or subsequent offense, the imposition or execution of sentence shall not be suspended and probation shall not be granted. For the purpose of this subdivision, an offender shall be considered a second or subsequent offender, as the case may be, if he previously has been convicted of any offense the penalty for which is provided in this subdivision or in section 2557 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code, or if he previously has been convicted of any offense the penalty for which was provided in section 9, chapter 1, of the act of December 17, 1914 (38 Stat. 789), as amended; section 1, chapter 202, of the act of May 26, 1922 (42 Stat. 596), as amended; section 12, chapter 553, of the act of August 2, 1937 (50 Stat. 556), as amended; or section 2557 (b) (1) or 2596 of the Internal Revenue Code enacted February 10, 1939 (ch. 2, 53 Stat. 274, 282), as amended. After conviction, but prior to pronouncement of sentence, the court shall be advised by the United States attorney whether the conviction is the offender's first or a subsequent offense. If it is not a first offense, the United States attorney shall file an information setting forth the prior convictions. The offender shall have the opportunity in open court to affirm or deny that he is identical with the person previously convicted. If he denies the identity, sentence shall be postponed for such time as to permit a trial before a jury on the sole issue of the offender's identity with the person previously convicted. If the offender is found by the jury to be the person previously convicted, or if he acknowledges that he is such person, he shall be sentenced as prescribed in this subdivision.

"Whenever on trial for a violation of this subdivision the defendant is shown to have or to have had possession of the narcotic drug, such possession shall be deemed sufficient evidence to authorize conviction unless the defendant explains the possession to the satisfaction of the jury."

SEC. 206. Section 2557 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Whoever commits an offense or conspires to commit an offense described in this

subchapter, subchapter C of this chapter, or parts V or VI of subchapter A of chapter 27, for which no specific penalty is otherwise provided, shall be fined not more than $3,000 and imprisoned not less than 5 or more than 10 years. For a second offense, the offender shall be fined not more than $5,000 and imprisoned not less than 10 or more than 20 years. For a third or subsequent offense, the offender shall be imprisoned for life. Upon conviction for a second or subsequent offense, the imposition or execution of sentence shall not be suspended and probation shall not be granted. For the purpose of this paragraph, an offender shall be considered a second or subsequent offender, as the case may be, if he previously has been convicted of any offense the penalty for which is provided in this paragraph or in section 2 (c) of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 21, sec. 174), or if he previously has been convicted of any offense the penalty for which was provided in section 9, chapter 1, of the act of December 17, 1914 (38 Stat. 789), as amended; section 1, chapter 202, of the act of May 26, 1922 (42 Stat. 596), as amended; section 12, chapter 553, of the act of August 2, 1937 (50 Stat. 556), as amended; or sections 2557 (b) (1) or 2596 of the Internal Revenue Code enacted February 10, 1939 (ch. 2, 53 Stat. 274, 282), as amended. After conviction, but prior to pronouncement of sentence, the court shall be advised by the United States attorney whether the conviction is the offender's first or a subsequent offense. If it is not a first offense, the United States attorney shall file an information setting forth the prior convictions. The offender shall have the opportunity in open court to affirm or deny that he is identical with the person previously convicted. If he denies the identity, sentence shall be postponed for such time as to permit a trial before a jury on the sole issue of the offender's identity with the person previously convicted. If the offender is found by the jury to be the person previously convicted, or if he acknowledges that he is such person, he shall be sentenced as prescribed in this paragraph."

SEC. 207. (a) Whoever sells, transfers, barters, exchanges, or gives away, or facilitates the sale, transfer, barter, exchange, or giving away, of any narcotic drug as defined in section 1 of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 21, sec. 171), in violation of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 21, secs. 171–185), or of sections 2550–2565 or 3220–3228 of the Internal Revenue Code, to any person who has not attained the age of 21 years, shall, notwithstanding any other penalties provided by law, be punished by imprisonment for 20 years. For a second offense, notwithstanding any other penalties provided by law, the offender shall suffer death, unless the jury qualifies its verdict by adding thereto "without capital punishment", in which event he shall be sentenced to imprisonment for life.

(b) Whoever sells, transfers, barters, exchanges, or gives away, or facilitates the sale, transfer, barter, exchange, or giving away, of marihauna as defined in section 3238 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, in violation of sections 2590–2603 or 3230–3238 of the Internal Revenue Code, to any person who has not attained the age of 21 years, shall, notwithstanding any other penalties provided by law, be punished by imprisonment for 10 years. For a second or subsequent offense, notwithstanding any other penalties provided by law, the offender shall be punished by imprisonment for 20 years.

(c) For the purposes of this section, an offender shall be considered a second offender if he previously has been convicted of any offense the penalty for which is provided in this section. After conviction, but prior to pronouncement of sentence, the court shall be advised by the United States attorney whether the conviction is the offender's first or second offense. If it is not a first offense, the United States attorney shall file an information setting forth the prior convictions. The offender shall have the opportunity in open court to affirm or deny that he is identical with the person previously convicted. If he denies the identity, sentence shall be postponed for such time as to permit a trial before a jury on the sole issue of the offender's identity with the person previously convicted. If the offender is found by the jury to be the person previously convicted, or if he acknowledges that he is such person, he shall be sentenced as prescribed in this section. Upon conviction for an offense, the penalty for which is provided for in this section, the imposition or execution of sentence shall not be suspended and probation shall not be granted.

(d) The provisions of this section shall apply only with respect to offenses committed on or after the effective date of this act.

EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

SEC. 208. (a) It is the purpose of this section to encourage the establishment in teachers' colleges of courses to instruct teachers and prospective teachers in the causes and effects of narcotic addiction, so that they may be better prepared, as teachers, to minimize or prevent narcotic addiction among their students.

(b) As used in this section—

(1) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(2) The term "teachers' college" means any college, university, or other educational institution which offers courses designed to prepare individuals to teach in elementary or secondary schools.

(c) (1) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, such sums as Congress may determine for grants to carry out the purpose of this section. From the sums available therefor for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall make grants to eligible teachers' colleges to pay, in whole or in part, the compensation of instructors teaching courses in the causes and effects of narcotic addiction. Payments under this subsection may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, as determined by the Secretary, and shall be made on such conditions as the Secretary finds necessary to carry out the purpose of this section.

(2) A teachers' college shall be eligible for a grant under this section if it offers a course of not less than hours of instruction in the causes and effects of narcotic addiction, and if it complies with such other conditions of eligibility as the Secretary prescribes by regulation in order to carry out the purpose of this section.

(d) (1) The Secretary may delegate any of his functions under this section (except the making of regulations under subsection (c) (2) to any officer or employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(2) The Secretary shall make annual reports to the Congress as to the administration of this section.

SEC. 209. (a) In order to enable the Office of Education more effectively to determine the best methods of educating students enrolled in and pursuing a program of education or training leading to a teacher's certificate or a teacher's degree to all aspects of the narcotic addiction problem, the Commissioner of Education is authorized to enter into contracts or jointly financed cooperative arrangements with State educational agencies, local school systems, and public and nonprofit educational institutions and organizations for the conduct of research, surveys, and demonstrations with respect to all phases of such problem with particular reference to the prevention of narcotic addiction.

(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, such sums as the Congress determines to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 210. This act shall become effective on the first day of the second month beginning after the date of enactment of this act.

The matters presented by Mr. PAYNE are as follows:

MEMORANDUM ANALYSIS OF PAYNE NARCOTICS BILL

TITLE I—ORGANIZATION

Section 101. Transfer of Bureau of Narcotics: This section would transfer the Bureau of Narcotics from the Treasury Department to the Department of Justice as recommended by the first Hoover Commission. In its report on the Treasury Department the Hoover Commission stated:

"The work of the Bureau of Narcotics is of two kinds. Law enforcement, or the detection and apprehension of violators of the narcotic laws, accounts for about 80 percent of the work of the Bureau. About 20 percent of its work consists of regulating the flow and manufacture of drugs and preparations made from narcotics. This latter phase of its work is done primarily through licensing.

"The relation of the Bureau to the rest of the Treasury Department is largely confined to cooperation with the Customs Bureau in administering the prohibitive features of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act at the ports. Its other major relations are with the Federal Security Agency and the State Department.

"The police work of the Bureau involves much of the same kind of relationship with State and local police authorities as is maintained by the Department of Justice for other types of Federal law enforcement. Duplication could be eliminated and economy achieved by consolidating the work of the Bureau of Narcotics with that of the law enforcement work of the Department of Justice. The same working relations would of necessity be maintained with the Customs Bureau.

"At the same time crime detection within the country would be facilitated by a single channel of contact with State and local authorities in the apprehension of violators who generally form a part of the criminal element shifting or combining their activities with other lawless acts." (Treasury Department, a report to the Congress by the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (first Hoover Commission), March 1949, H. Doc. 115, 81st Cong., 1st sess., pp. 8–9.)

Section 102. Powers of Bureau of Narcotics: This section would give agents of the Bureau of Narcotics power to carry firearms, execute and serve warrants, serve subpenas, and make arrests without warrants for narcotic law violations. This would give narcotics agents powers similar to those of FBI agents.

Sections 103–105. Division of Narcotic Clinics: These sections would create within the Public Health Service a Division of Narcotic Clinics to establish and operate hospitals, farms, and other institutions for the treatment of narcotic addicts and to foster and aid States and reputable private groups working in this field.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sections 201–204. Public Health Service Act Amendments: These sections would authorize the care and treatment by the Public Health Service of narcotic addicts committed by State courts and the United States District

Court for the District of Columbia with the States and District of Columbia paying the cost of such care and treatment.

Sections 205–206. Penalties for narcotic violations: These sections would amend the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act and the Internal Revenue Code to increase penalties for regular narcotic violations as follows:

First offense: Present provision, $2,000 and "not less than 2 or more than 5 years." Proposed provision, $3,000 and not less than 5 or more than 10 years.

Second offense: Present provision, $2,000 and "not less than 5 or more than 10 years." Proposed provision, $5,000 and not less than 10 or more than 20 years.

Third or subsequent offense: Present provision, $2,000 and "not less than 10 or more than 20 years." Proposed provision, imprisonment for life.

Section 207. Penalties for sale or furnishing of narcotics to minors: This section would increase penalties for sale or furnishing of narcotics and marihuana to persons under 21 years of age as follows:

Offense	Present provision for both narcotics and marihuana	Proposed provision for narcotics	Proposed provision for marihuana
1st	$2,000 and "not less than 2 or more than 5 years."	20 years	10 years.
2d and subsequent	$2,000 and "not less than 5 or more than 10 years."	Death unless jury qualifies verdict to read "without capital punishment," then imprisonment for life.	20 years.

Sections 208–209. Educational activities: Section 208 would authorize grants to educational institutions preparing individuals to teach in elementary and secondary schools to help defray the cost of courses in the causes and effects of narcotic addiction. Section 209 would authorize research and studies in narcotic addiction and its prevention.

Section 210. Effective date: Effective date to be the 1st day of 2d month beginning after enactment.

[From the New Leader of December 20, 1954]

THE STORY BEHIND RED CHINA'S DOPE PEDDLERS

(By Irwin Ross)

The case of the camphorwood chests broke in an odd way. On December 17, 1953, Ernest Gentry, head of the San Francisco office of the Bureau of Narcotics, received an anonymous phone call from a man who spoke with a Chinese accent. If Mr. Gentry would go to a certain address, he would find two very interesting camphorwood clothes chests which had just arrived from Hong Kong. Before the day was out, Gentry had taken possession of the chests, together with 2 pounds of heroin ingeniously imbedded in the wood, and 2 Chinese seamen who had transported the contraband.

One of them, Wing Dee Joe, was head cook of the steamship *President Cleveland* and a highly accomplished smuggler. On previous trips from Hong Kong he had brought in 16 pounds of heroin, worth at least $1 million on the retail market.

Gentry is still puzzled as to who his helper was. There is no mystery, however, about the origin of the heroin. For it was light tan in color, rough in texture, and almost pure. To the experienced eye of the Bureau of Narcotics, this meant one thing—it had come from Red China.

Since their rise to power, the Chinese Communists have been engaged in the massive and profitable export of narcotics to southeast Asia, Japan, and the United States. For the free world, the situation is alarming. Before the war, the worldwide drug traffic was declining. Now it is booming—largely due to the efforts of the Chinese Communist Government.

With its foreign trade at a low ebb, the regime desperately needs hard currency—to buy imports and to finance Communist activities throughout Asia. Moreover, under its 1950 agreement with Soviet Russia, Red China must pay for part of its Soviet war supplies in gold or United States dollars, so it has turned to dope peddling to get the cash. And the Communists are not averse to softening up the enemy by spreading addiction. "We are not dealing with a petty adversary," says United States Commissioner of Narcotics Harry J. Anslinger, "but rather with a formidable and far-reaching plot to gain foreign exchange and * * * demoralize the people of the free world."

Facts support these words. Before World War II, the Chinese Nationalists had achieved a measure of success in curbing the opium trade. The death penalty for narcotics traffickers was enacted. By 1939, Chinese opium production was down to 1,200 tons a year. Today, it stands at an estimated 6,000 tons, of which 2,000 is exported, either as smoking opium, as heroin or as morphine. Those 2,000 tons are more than double all other illicit narcotics production in the world.

In his report to the U. N. Commission on Narcotic Drugs, Anslinger has provided abundant proof that this flood of dope comes from Red China. Much of the heroin seized in the Far East during the last 5 years bore Chinese addresses or brand names—such as the well-known Red Lion and Lions Globe brands. Moreover, this heroin had rough granular texture, a tan color, and a purity content as high as 90 or 95 percent. Thus, when heroin of similar characteristics—minus the labeling—has shown up in the Far East or the United States, it has been easy to identify its origin. Heroin coming from Europe is white, smooth in texture and of a low purity—generally 10 or 15 percent. Mexican heroin is around 35 percent pure.

There is one other way to trace the origin of narcotics—from the statements of captured traffickers. These confessions have led the Japanese, Thai, Burmese, and Malayan Governments to report to the United Nations that Red China was the source of vast quantities of drugs entering their countries.

During the last war, however, traffickers in Japan have become too frightened to talk. For the Communist ringleaders have begun to take fierce vengeance on those who do: a simple matter of cutting off an ear or two. "This method proved effective," Commissioner Anslinger noted dryly in one of his reports.

From underground sources in China and American agents in the Far East, Anslinger has collected a mass of data on the methods and organizations of the China drug trade. The Communists' interest in opium goes back to the late 1930's, when they were only a guerrilla army controlling sections of the northwest hinterland. In Shensi Province, vast quantities of heroin were manufactured and parceled out to Red agents, who received instruction in distributing it in areas controlled by the Nationalists. The embattled Communists were hard up; drugs brought easy money to swell the party's coffers. In their own areas, however, the comrades sought to curb opium smoking.

Po I-po, an enterprising "youth leader," was one of the leading operatives. After his party come to power in 1949, Po was elevated to the post of Minister of Finance. He immediately began to step up the export of narcotics; by 1954, the Communist regime was grossing an estimated $150 million a year from what is euphemistically called special trade.

Today, Government officials supervise both drug manufacture and export. In the western province of Szechuan, for example, the Governor controls opium production and also operates a heroin factory. In southwestern Yunnan, the business is run by the Deputy Governor and the chief of the secret police. In Kwangtung Province, poppy planting has trebled since 1951.

The foreign sale of narcotics is supervised by the National Trading Co., of Peking, a state agency. Ostensibly private trading companies—in China and in foreign cities—are used as fronts to handle the merchandise and collect the receipts.

The drugs leave China by several routes. Armed caravans travel south from Yunnan through the jungle to Burma, whence the stuff finds its way to Thailand, Malaya, and Indochina. From Canton, it is but a short voyage by rail or ship to British Hong Kong or Portuguese Macao; and, from these points, heroin is sent by plane and ship all over the world. Another route is by small smuggling boats from Korea and north China to Japan. These craft carry narcotics on the outboard trip and bring back tires, ball bearings, small machine tools, and other strategic materials purchased on the black market.

Japan has perhaps been victimized more than any other country in Asia. "Right after the war," Commissioner Anslinger has said, "I do not think you could have found one heroin addict in Japan. Today, on a per capita basis, they have more than we have."

The first definite proof that Japanese Communist officials were actively engaged in the heroin traffic came to light in October 1950. Undercover agents in Tokyo arranged to make a purchase from three prosperous Japanese citizens, one of whom ran an automobile agency. After the heroin was delivered, in a restaurant in downtown Tokyo, the agents arrested the trio. Two of the men, it turned out, were officials of the Tokyo Communist Party. In the jacket of one of them was found the business card of Hitoshi Yamamoto, chief of the Communist Party for the island of Kyushu—a high post, for it covered seven perfectures.

One of the Communist traffickers confessed that Yamamoto had furnished them with the drug. He was arrested and eventually revealed that his source of supply was a North Korean Communist. The clandestine operation had proceeded for many months, with the profits going to the support of the Communist Party.

The situation in South Korea has been equally serious. A long land border with the Communists facilitated smuggling; and, in the disorganized conditions of an invaded nation, effective law enforcement has been difficult. The heroin that flooded the country has come from both China and North Korea, where there was a large factory in Pyongyang. Its existence was not open to dispute: MacArthur's troops captured it when they took the town.

In one 12-month period, shortly before the armistice, 2,400 North Korean Communists, usually posing as refugees, were seized by police in possession of heroin. Among them were many girls, 18 to 23, who had taken jobs as housemaids or brothel inmates and peddled heroin on the side. Most of them had attended a 6-month training course at a North Korean school, where they had been instructed in Communist ideology and underground operations.

One of the most disturbing aspects of the drug traffic in Korea and Japan has been the spread of addiction among American troops. In January 1953, Cardinal Spellman created something of a sensation when he

returned from a trip to the Korean front to declare that a frightfully high percentage of American GI's were using narcotics. The Cardinal gave no figures, but his words of alarm focused attention on the problem.

From 1952 through the first quarter of 1954 a total of 1,613 troops were under investigation "for engaging in narcotics traffic." Some were suspected of peddling, but most of using drugs. Figures on court-martial convictions are naturally lower. They show that, from 1951 through August 1953, 899 men were convicted. Any police operation reaches only a proportion of offenders. Thus, it is a fair inference that many more than 899 guilty individuals escaped detection.

By 1949 the Bureau of Narcotics realized that the Communist smuggling operation had reached these shores. During the last 3 years the influx of Communist heroin has reached alarming proportions. It now accounts for an unprecedented amount of the heroin sold here.

Narcotics agents have made dozens of seizures on the west coast, but recently the east coast has also been invaded. Last February, for example, the SS. *President Arthur* docked in Jersey City after coming halfway around the world. Most of the crew had gone ashore when two port patrol officers decided to frisk a seaman whom they saw sauntering down a gangplank. A cursory frisking produced nothing suspicious; then they noticed a few flecks of powder on one of his shoes. What was this? He explained that he was a steward and must have spilt some flour in the pantry.

The customs men had him remove his foot gear and found a rubber tube containing a light tan powder in each of his outside shoes. One of the tubes had sprung a leak. At this point the steward was stripped to the skin. Seventeen containers were found around his middle, the bulge being disguised under two layers of underwear. All told, the tubes contained 20 ounces of heroin—and back in the pantry another 31 ounces were found. The steward explained that he had bought his supply for $1,800 from a taxi driver in Singapore. Its Chinese origin, however, was unmistakable from its appearance and chemical composition.

The first big United States case involving Communist heroin came in January 1952. At the Rincin post office in San Francisco, customs verifier, Myron Kahn, became curious about a stack of 20 old American magazines, each separately wrapped, which had arrived from Hong Kong. He had been struck by the fact that the sender had overpaid postage on each magazine, affixing airmail stamps costing $10.50 (Hong Kong) or $1.50 (United States). So Kahn took a close look and discovered that in each magazine some 25 pages had been hollowed out to provide space for a glazed paper envelope. And in each envelope were 3 ounces of heroin.

Customs rewrapped the 20 magazines, and in due course an agent, disguised as a postman, delivered them to a gray-haired, stoop-shouldered man at the St. Clair Hotel. When he accepted the bundles, he was placed under arrest. His name was James Carroll, an old narcotics offender who had once served time in McNeil Island Federal Penitentiary. In the past year, he had received several shipments of magazines, sent him, he later confessed, by one Judah I. Ezra of Hong Kong, like Carroll an old alumnus of McNeil's.

Carroll had first begun getting similar magazines in 1951; all told, he had received 16¼ pounds of heroin. Carroll was only paid $5 per magazine. His function was limited to turning over the copies to an undisclosed Chinese, whom he would meet on a street corner or in a bar.

Carroll was by no means the only mail drop. Five months after he was knocked off, an alert postal clerk in Penryn, Calif., discovered another cache of heroin in magazines sent from Hong Kong to one Fong Wing Suey, alias Tommy Gee. He and a friend had an elaborate mail operation underway, with three post-office boxes in different localities in Placer County.

Ezra was involved in even bigger operations. For a year, up to the spring of 1954, he was recruiting seamen to carry heroin from Hong Kong to a large group of customers in San Francisco. They were wholesale dealers who resold the merchandise in pound lots to retailers.

Among their steady customers was a quick-witted Chinese who talked like a veteran of the narcotics underworld—as indeed he was, being an agent of the Bureau of Narcotics. From October 1953 to January 1954, he purchased 5 pounds of heroin from several dealers, spending $27,000 of the Government's money.

The wholesale ring centered around two respectable Chinatown establishments—the Fragrant Flower Shop and the China Emporium. Pon Wai, the flower merchant, delivered his heroin neatly stacked away in boxes of flowers. When the Bureau of Narcotics swooped down on the culprits one quiet April Sunday, they cracked one of the biggest drug rings ever to operate on the Pacific coast. Eight men were arrested, and Judah Ezra, in Hong Kong, was put out of business—at least for the time being.

These intermittent victories do not make Commissioner Anslinger complacent. As long as the Chinese Communists keep dumping huge quantities of drugs on the underworld markets, no police effort is going to keep the stuff entirely out of the United States. Anslinger pins his hope on pitiless publicity, pointing out that in the distant past the League of Nations cleaned up deplorable situations in France, Switzerland, and Turkey by endlessly calling attention to the facts. But is Red China likely to prove at all responsive to world opinion? Its recent performance gives little ground for hope.

Living Death: The Truth About Drug Addiction

All men and women will benefit if they learn how to protect themselves and their friends from one of the worst dangers of all time—drug addiction.

The best protection is to know the plain truth about what it does to the human body.

Here are the facts, gathered from medical experts:

WHAT IS A DRUG ADDICT?

Teen-age drug addiction in its inception and in its continuance is generally due to vice, vicious environment, and criminal associations, but it cannot be too strongly emphasized that the smoking of the marihuana cigarette is a dangerous first step on the road which usually leads to enslavement by heroin.

A drug addict is a person who continues to use habit-forming drugs—chiefly morphine or heroin (which is derived from morphine). By taking one of these drugs frequently for a short time a person can become an addict.

He gets such an abnormal desire for the drug that he feels he cannot get along without it. When he cannot get the drug he suffers horribly. He feels that his muscles are being torn from his arms and legs. He has violent pains in his stomach. He vomits and has diarrhea, often of a bloody type. He becomes depressed and wants to kill himself.

The idea that an addict takes "dope" just to feel good is a mistake. He takes it to head off for a little while the horrible effects he feels when he doesn't have the drug.

WHAT DRUG ADDICTION DOES TO THE MOUTH, STOMACH, AND INTESTINES

First, let's consider the mouth, stomach, and intestines. The vital secretions of the body are decreased through steady use of narcotics. The mouth should not be acid, but repeated taking of narcotics makes it so. The teeth rot and fall out.

This isn't a pretty picture but it is something every person needs to know for his own safety and for that of friends he may help by pointing out the truth.

With secretions decreased in the stomach and intestines, a person loses his natural appetite and becomes sluggish and haggard. Also, movement of muscles in the stomach and intestines is reduced, resulting in constipation. The gallbladder is involved—often becoming inflamed. Victims suffer from jaundice, which causes loss of energy and makes the eyes and skin turn an ugly yellow.

EFFECTS ON THE NOSE AND LUNGS

Some drug addicts take narcotics through the nose by sniffing. Here is what happens to them. From sniffing dope, the membrane lining the nose becomes inflamed and red. Ulcers appear. They get deep and a hole is likely to form in the partition between the nostrils. Breathing is badly affected. Ordinarily, one breathes in and out about 17 times a minute. The addict's breathing is slowed down to as little as four times a minute as a result of the poisonous action of overdosages of morphine.

The addict's inability to breathe normally cuts down the supply of oxygen he needs for his blood. Over a period, the addict is easy prey not only to bronchitis but also to such dread diseases as tuberculosis.

DAMAGE TO THE NERVOUS SYSTEM

Perhaps some persons who become narcotic addicts are none too bright before they start. But the drug habit can fasten its terrible hold just as easily on the "smart" individual who thinks he knows it all and won't listen to sound medical advice.

The more anyone gets sunk into addiction, the more the weak traits he started with are exaggerated and his good traits disappear. Any strength of character the addict may have had originally is greatly weakened.

A young person who gets into addiction is sleepy most of the time. He becomes poor in his studies and athletics. He is cross, tells stupid lies, or refuses to talk at all.

When a dose of narcotics wears off, every nerve from the top of the adict's head to the tips of his toes tortures him. His nose runs and he starts to twitch. He has imaginary and fantastic fears.

Continuing to take habit-forming drugs in many cases results in complete insanity or a career of crime. It wrecks major functions of the body, including the nervous system. It destroys judgment and will power. It is a living hell—mentally, physically, and emotionally.

OTHER DAMAGE

Morphine and the opiates are thrown off by the body through the kidneys and the intestines. A body poison is formed in this process.

This has a very bad effect on the sex organs. Men addicts, if they wish to marry and raise a family, may not be able to become fathers. Women addicts, if they can have children, pass the poison along to their babies.

As one symptom of addiction, the veins gradually collapse, leaving purple marks on the skin. The addict suffers severe pain. Boils and abscesses plague him as a result of the injuries he has inflicted on his skin. He wakens after a tortured night with his pillow soaked with perspiration.

The sparkle of a pleasing personality is lost. He is too sleepy and unreliable to hold a good job, although he needs an enormous amount of money to keep up his drug habit.

He loses interest in everyone around him and is careless about his person. His interest narrows down to concern about only one thing—getting another dose of the drug. He ceases to be a real human being or a regular fellow.

ADDICTS DIE YOUNG

On the average, persons who are drug addicts live 20 to 25 years less than they would if they were not addicts. And, for the poor addict, you can hardly call "life" more than a living death.

A prominent authority has made a study of how death rates of narcotic addicts compare with those of the general population. His study shows that:

Opium addicts die of tuberculosis at the rate of 4 to 1, compared to nonaddicts; more than 2 to 1, of pneumonia; more than 5 to 1, of premature old age; 4 to 1, of bronchitis; 3 to 1, of brain hemorrhage; 3 to 1, of cancer and other malignant tumors, and more than 2 to 1, of a wide variety of other diseases.

This, indeed, is clear evidence of the vast and dreadful power of habit-forming drugs, repeatedly used, to weaken a person's natural resistance to diseases that result in death.

HOW NOT TO START

The only way to avoid ending up as a drug addict is to use plain common sense and not to start. You don't learn to keep away from addiction by experimenting with it. If you do experiment, it will surely get a stranglehold on you.

Usually, a person is tempted first with marihuana cigarettes. He may not even know they are dope. Then, some dope peddler or his stooge makes it easy to try some heroin, just to enslave a new and steady customer—knowing that later on he can exact frightfully high prices from a hopeless addict. Most teen-age addicts started by smoking marihuana cigarettes.

Some young persons who are being trapped are dared to try the stuff. Some think that they are exceptions and can handle anything. But they are wrong. They can't fool with narcotics. Nobody can.

When a person realizes that peddlers or their agents are trying to snare him, he should realize that he is having a terrifying look, face to face, at what probably is the foulest racket in existence. It must be squelched through the vigilance of everyone, the full power of the law, and the aid of every enlightened man and woman.

Avoid a drug addict the same as you would a "Typhoid Mary" [1] because his plague is just as contagious.

What we have been talking about is the criminal misuse of habit-forming drugs. Incidentally, it is as much against the law to buy illegal drugs as it is to sell them. Drug violations by teen-agers particularly are soon detected, and are subject to severe punishment under Federal law: 2 years for the first offense; 5 years for the second; and 10 years for the third. In many places, addiction itself is an offense for which the addict must undergo compulsory imprisonment in an institution until cured.

Narcotics have many valuable uses in the field of medicine. Such legal uses are carefully controlled and should only originate through your doctor. The United States Treasury Department's Bureau of Narcotics, physicians, and pharmacists all cooperate to make these controls effective and to protect you. The question is: Will you protect yourself?

There are many angles to dope addiction and everyone of them is bad. But nothing is worse than what addiction does to the human body and mind. Everyone should help to wipe out this curse of mankind.

Don't flirt with a living death.

[1] A typhoid carrier.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of December 5, 1954]

THE NATION'S NARCOTIC PROBLEM—TRAGEDY OF ADDICTION CENTERS ON ADOLESCENTS; ITS PREVENTION IS HAMPERED BY DISAGREEMENTS

(This is the first of five articles on narcotics and the efforts of city, State, and Federal agencies to combat the drug habit.)

(By Milton Lewis)

President Eisenhower's recent order for an all-out war against illegal sale and harmful use of narcotics is a national challenge to the most vicious racket confronting the world.

This tragedy of narcotics is focused on the adolescent drug addict who takes "the monkey on his back" out of fear, and who travels a fast cycle from a "square" to a "junkie" in a few weeks.

The prevention of this tragedy is a problem for the adult community, whose intelligence is baffled by endless contradictions, and whose best efforts are harassed by the monstrous viciousness of drug racketeers.

At the heart of the problem is "the stuff"—heroin, the arch-criminal of the narcotics world. Heroin is the beginning and the end of the drug traffic in the United States, the locus of the vicious circle that entices and then enslaves its addicts.

It is "the stuff" that demands $5 to $50 a day from confirmed users, and returns enormous profits to its "pushers." Injected into healthy veins, "the stuff" lays waste the real world, ultimately to destroy the user. But once injected, the addict must live in dread of the day when he may not rustle his daily ration of "horse." Deprived of heroin, the addict suffers unbearable torment, and to avoid it, he will steal, mug, murder, or sell his wretched soul to buy drugs. Thus the circle turns.

Today, the drug traffic is concentrated on heroin. A century ago it was morphine. Before that it was opium itself. All of them are derived from the same source, the gentle poppy blossom, cultivated for opium seven centuries before the birth of Christ.

Morphine, an alkaloid stronger than opium, was isolated about 1805. It was found to be more stable than opium, more concentrated, more transportable. The wonder drug of the 19th century, it came fully into its own with the invention of the hypodermic syringe in 1845.

Immediately following the Civil War, addiction was known throughout the land as the Army disease. Thousands of soldiers were conditioned to morphine administered by Army surgeons and they brought their addiction home as war souvenirs. Their kinfolk were quite familiar with it, since morphine was the No. 1 drug of the 1800's.

MORPHINE WAS FASHIONABLE

It was prematurely reported to cure many ills, such as cancer, asthma, tuberculosis, and heart disease, and doctors gave syringes to their patients indiscriminately. In the eighties, from the royal courts of Europe to New York's Fifth Avenue, solid gold and silver hypodermic syringes set with jewels and diamonds were flashed. Morphine was fashionable.

By the end of the century, addiction was an acute problem. The discovery of heroin in 1898 worsened matters. Heroin, a chemical produced from morphine, serves practically the same purposes as morphine, but is more powerful and more dangerous.

Outlawed in the United States since 1925, heroin is a powerful alkaloid made by heating morphine with acetyl anhydride. The result is a dull white powder with no odor and a slightly bitter taste. It is easily made in a small laboratory. It is of little bulk, and thus it can be diluted without destroying its effect. Processing is simple, and a substantial quantity of heroin can easily be secreted. All of these are essential factors to an illicit drug market.

Doctors prematurely hailed heroin as a cure for morphinism. When this proved not to be so, they gradually withdrew the hypos from circulation.

FOOD ACT FOLLOWED

Thereupon, the patent-medicine business took over. The patent wine tonics and pain killers were generously laced with laudanum (another opium derivative), heroin and cocaine. It is conceivable that thousands were unwitting addicts. A well-known beverage advertised, "The more you drink the more you want."

Thus was born the Pure Food and Drug Act, which curtailed the narcotic content of patent medicines and beverages by legislation in 1909.

From this point on, statistics are of little practical value. Admittedly, there were thousands of drug users who bought their supply openly at the corner pharmacy for a few pennies. There was no social stigma attached to addiction. They took their morphine in moderation, like a cocktail or two before dinner.

What happened to them with the passage of the Harrison Act in 1914 is anybody's guess. Those who were hopelessly addicted got their drugs one way or another. Unquestionably, hundreds of doctors continued to supply their old patients with heroin, winking at the law.

WAR TIMES COMPARED

When World War I came around, the United States Public Health Service estimated there was 1 addict in every 1,500 of the population. World War II figures showed 1 addict in every 10,000.

These figures were based on known users. With the changes in statistical methods, and with differing opinions, no one knows where the situation stands today. The Federal Government estimates there were from 50,000 to 60,000 addicts in the United States in 1951.

Yet, in New York, the mayor's committee on drug addiction found in the same year that there were between 45,000 and 90,000 drug slaves in the city alone; one for every 88 to 177 of the population, infants included.

Today, the sad facts of narcotics and the fight against them are these: We don't know how much heroin there is around. We don't know how many addicts we have. We don't even know how to cure them so they'll stay cured.

A VARIETY OF IDEAS

In all the confusion and contradiction, each expert has his own ideas on cause and cure, and all admit there is much for them to learn. There are as many statistics as there are statisticians.

"Drug addiction is on the downgrade." Harry J. Anslinger, the United States Commissioner of Narcotics, says so, and William Jansen, superintendent of New York City schools, is in accord.

On the other hand: "Addiction is definitely increasing." A psychiatrist at Riverside Hospital, where youthful drug addicts are treated, says so.

"There's plenty of heroin around. I wouldn't guess whether it's being used more or not." That's the opinion of a ranking official of the New York City Police Department.

"ORGANIZED CONFUSION

"All is organized confusion when it comes to statistics," is the opinion of another official.

The experts don't even agree on what makes an addict. Expert No. 1 says: "Addiction is a primary manifestation of a character disorder * * * one element in a neurosis or psychosis * * * emotionally normal individuals seldom ever become addicted."

But expert No. 2 says: "A majority of narcotics addicts are average individuals in their mental and moral fundamentals. Among them are many men and women of high ideals and worthy accomplishments * * * they are normal mentally and morally."

An ominous note in the present wave of addiction is the adolescent user. While this is nothing new (1920 had a wave of adolescent drug users), the alarming aspect is that we don't know where we stand.

To the questions: How are we doing today? Among users under 21, has it gone down, is it up, is it status quo?

NOBODY KNOWS

The answers are: Nobody knows, and everybody disagrees.

The official New York City Police Department figure for narcotics arrests involving persons under 21 for the first 10 months of this year is 641, according to Inspector Peter E. Terranova, head of the narcotics squad, which has recently been ordered increased from 130 to 200 members. The 641 figure compares with the arrest of 775 under 21 for the entire so-called epidemic year of 1951.

The police department asks reasonably, "How do we know whether we're catching 1 in 5 or 1 in 500? You want a figure? Pick your own. There's plenty of the stuff around—that's the only sure part of this thing."

However much they disagree on statistics, on one thing the experts agree. The problem of narcotics is as acute as ever.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of December 6, 1954]

THE NATION'S NARCOTICS PROBLEM—DRUG ADDICTION IN THE CITY'S PUBLIC SCHOOLS APPARENTLY CUT BY HEALTH EDUCATION PROGRAM

(This is the second of five articles on narcotics and the efforts of local, State and Federal agencies to combat the drug habit.)

(By Milton Lewis)

Despite contradictory and dissenting views among educators and narcotics experts, the spread of drug addiction in public schools here has apparently beeen checked in the last 3 years.

In 1951, during public hearings on the subject held by Attorney General Nathaniel L. Goldstein, a witness testified that one student in every 200 in the city's schools used dope.

As a result, New York and the greater part of the country immediately began to find narcotics addicts under every bed.

HARD TO DETECT

This despite the fact that the tell-tale mark of the needle on a drug user—especially a sporadic one—is almost impossible to detect. Occasionally they even slip by the experts. Yet alarmed parents and teachers in hinterland communities began to bombard the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and the United States Public Health Service.

Adolescents with a cold or hay fever, and most epileptics, were suspect. Quite a number of such cases were tracked down by teams of Government investigators. They found no dope—but they did unearth a fair-sized epidemic of adult hysteria.

Drug addiction is where the money is, and the money is in the big cities. Rural communities seldom encounter the drug-addiction problem.

What is the score on narcotics in our city's schools today?

JANSEN'S REPORT

William Jansen, superintendent of schools, says that while there were 154 drug users in the New York schools in 1951, only 27 were discovered in a survey completed this year.

This was contrary to the opinion of Attorney General Goldstein, who said: "I'll bet that if I went into 10 schools I could come up with at least 27 narcotic users in each."

The question was put to Dr. Harold Jacobziner, in charge of child health for the department of health, who said: "It is a safe guess that there are five times the amount Mr. Jansen says. Mr. Goldstein's figure is too high."

Well, then, Dr. Jacobziner was asked, does he feel that the number of youthful users, most of whom are on "horse," or heroin, is going down?

"Unquestionably. School education on the problem has helped considerably."

Why did he say, then, that the true figure is about 5 times 27?

"We figure at the department of health that the teacher, not being a medical person, catches 1 of the 5 narcotic users."

In 1951, when Mr. Goldstein conducted his narcotic hearings, Acting Lt. Bernard M. Boylan, in charge of the New York City Police Department's narcotics squad, gave the testimony that shocked the city and the Nation.

The officer, since retired, estimated that there were 6,000 drug users under the age of 21 in the city, and that 1,500 of them were in the schools.

ONE IN EVERY TWO HUNDRED

That broke down to 1 in every 200 in the schools, a phenomenally high ratio, since it was estimated that the ratio for the entire United States population at the time was only 1 in 3,000.

Police department figures show that during the first 10 months of this year 641 persons under the age of 21 were arrested on narcotics charges. This compares with 556 for all of 1953, 552 for 1952, and 775 for 1951.

Whatever the figures, the board of education is constantly on the alert for narcotics users in the schools. Police, dressed as custodians and sometimes passing off as students, have gone into school buildings in hopes of catching and breaking up the narcotics traffic.

"They found nothing," Dr. Jansen says.

Inspector Peter E. Terranova, head of the narcotics squad, was asked if any dope users or pushers are found in or near schools these days.

MOST QUIT SCHOOL

"We find," he said, "that once a boy or girl goes on dope, they almost always drop out of school. That's why it is almost impossible to get an exact figure on how many drug users there are in the schools."

There is very little evidence to support the theory that the public school is a lab of narcotics addiction. Thousands of case histories point, rather, to small parties in homes as the scene of the first tentative experiment with drugs. The student who "takes the monkey on his back" inevitably quits school.

The adolescent may view acceptance of drugs as symbolizing sociability, solidarity with the group, defiance of adult authority. The youngster who refuses narcotics, but moves in drug-using circles, will be ridiculed for his nonconformity as a "square," "chicken," or "yellow."

EDUCATION IMPORTANT

There is, therefore, no underestimating the importance of a drug-education program in the schools. The Department of Health says so.

While the authorities may differ widely on the current number of users in the teen-age group, they are more or less agreed that there has been no perceptible rise in addiction since 1951.

In that year a hygiene program teaching the nature and effects of narcotics was instituted for use in grades 7 to 12 in those localities where it seemed advisable. Taking that on the least optimistic level, usage among adolescents has been checked.

OBJECT TO TEACHING

Yet on this as on every other level of the drug addition problem, there is dissension. Harry J. Anslinger, United States Commissioner of Narcotics, and James C. Ryan, in charge of the New York district, have expressed grave objections on narcotic education in schools.

Supported by a number of powerful women's groups, Mr. Anslinger has said: "Many young persons, once their curiosity is aroused, will ignore the warning and will experiment upon themselves with disastrous results."

To which Dr. James Toolan, clinical instructor in psychiatry, New York University-Bellevue Medical Center, has replied:

"There is no indication that one single youngster has become addicted just because of the educational processes. I think the educational program has helped these youngsters.

"We should look upon this in the same way we look upon venereal disease education. The same hullabaloo was raised 25 years ago. You read reports in the literature which indicated that if you talked about venereal disease and gave sex education, every youngster in the country would go out to have sexual intercourse."

STRESSES HOW, NOT WHAT

"I think venereal disease education is an accepted procedure. * * * It is not what is taught, but how."

So far as New York is concerned, educational steps have been taken. "We are on the alert for drug users," Dr. Jansen says. "When a student is suspected, the health officer is notified immediately. We have instituted a health education program. The situation today is reasonably under control in the schools.

"But even with the reduction in known cases, there are too many in my point of view."

[From the New York Herald Tribune of December 7, 1954]

THE NATION'S NARCOTICS PROBLEM—RIVERSIDE HOSPITAL, OPENED IN 1952 FOR YOUNG ADDICTS, HAS HAD QUALITATIVE SUCCESS AS PIONEER FACILITY

(This is the third of five articles on narcotics and the efforts of local, State, and Federal agencies to combat the drug habit.)

(By Milton Lewis)

"This small island is a playland, as they say in the newspaper, is a fine place. In my opinion, we do not appreciate it enough. The nurses and doctors take the place of our mothers and fathers. Yes, we miss our homes, but you should be aware of this: We are lucky to be here rather than in an institution of another type where the hospitality is different in many ways."

Those were the written observations of Helen, 18, one of the boys and girls being treated for drug addiction at Riverside Hospital on North Brother Island in the East River, off 138th Street, the Bronx.

The hospital, which has facilities for 110 patients, was opened in July 1952 as the Nation's only treatment and research center exclusively for drug addicts under 21 years of age. It was started in response to the widely publicized need in 1951 for such an institution, created by a startling increase in the use of narcotics by teen-agers.

A TYPICAL PATIENT

A typical patient is Jim, a tall, strapping youth of 20. He is from East Harlem, where his father is a bartender. His mother is a cook. One of six children whose ages are between 5 and 21, his homelife was a constant emotional turmoil.

Jim quit vocational high school in the second term in 1950 when he was 16 because "I just didn't like school." But he started

to use heroin before he left school. He remembers the exact date—December 23, 1949, 2 days before Christmas—when he and other boys and girls decided to have a little party.

"I felt kind of dizzy," Jim says of the first experience, which occurred in the home of one of the boys. "I got no particular enjoyment out of it. But since my friends were all using it, I kept using it, too. It gave me no worries after a while. In fact, when you're on horse, you ain't worrying about nothing—your mind is clear."

FORTY DOLLARS A DAY FOR HEROIN

He soon found himself spending $40 a day for the drug and his only income was from helping his father at the bar. This did not come to anything like $40 a day, so he supplemented what little he did make in the tavern by becoming a "pusher" of heroin.

"It got so," he recalls, "that guys came to me from all over the city for the stuff. I'd pay $45 for half an ounce of 2½ percent pure and sell it to them for $70."

But there were lean days—when he couldn't raise enough cash to buy enough for a single shot for himself.

"Three times I mugged guys," he recalls dispassionately. "I got $87 from the first, $42 from the second, and $28 from the third."

He decided in 1953—after being addicted for 4 years—that he wanted to be cured. He says he was in a terrible rundown condition. He was voluntarily committed to the United States Public Health Service Hospital at Lexington, Ky., where he remained for 135 days, he says.

"I DIDN'T LIKE IT"

"They had me there thrown in with regular prisoners of all ages," Jim says. "I didn't like it. After 135 days they said I was cured. I didn't think I was. They said I was. I came back to Harlem. Within 3 days I was using drugs again."

He was committed to Riverside at his request last July 23.

"I like it very much better here," he says. "The doctors work with you here. They show you why you use drugs and explain why it's bad. I even like going to school here. I'm taking English and math and ceramics. I ain't got no complaints. I'm willing to stay on as long as they want me to."

"You think you got this licked yet?"

"Not yet. If I go out today, I'll take some dope. I still want the stuff. The longer I stay here the more time I got to think and know more about myself. I think I can beat it."

So much for a single case. How is Riverside, more than 2 years old, working out?

QUALITATIVE SUCCESS

The Department of Hospitals, of which Riverside is a part, says it is too early to reach definite conclusions.

But Dr. Rafael R. Gamso, Riverside's medical superintendent since August 1953, has this to say:

"I think we have achieved a great degree of success—in qualitative rather than in quantitative terms."

Dr. Gamso says that a study covering the first 18 months of operations, shows that 19.3 percent of the patients treated at Riverside did not revert to drugs, 22.7 percent became readdicated or were readmitted because they were on the verge of turning to drugs again. The hospital has no information on the rest.

Many experts in the narcotics field believe that a 19.3 percent cure is unusually high and reflects credit on Riverside.

SIX HUNDRED AND THIRTY-TWO TREATED

A total of 632 youngsters have been admitted since July 1952, and of that number about 200 have been admitted more than once—and some two, three, and four times, pointing up what is considered the most difficult psychiatric problem.

Half the patients are self-committed—that is, by the courts through their parents—half are sent there directly by the courts after they got into trouble with the law. Of the 97 patients there as of yesterday, 82 were boys and 15 girls.

It doesn't follow that because a youth is addicted to drugs he is automatically accepted at Riverside. A screening staff will not admit a severe incorrigible, the troublemaker who can wreck the carefully planned program for other patients.

Once they are accepted, there is nothing compulsory about their staying. As Dr. Gamso says, "This is not a custodial place, not a security place. It is an open facility."

STUDIED FOR 21 DAYS

Upon admission, patients receive a physical examination and are placed in the withdrawal ward for study for 21 days.

If withdrawal symptoms appear, patients are treated by the gradual withdrawal method, with diminishing doses of a substitute drug—methadon. All patients are completely off narcotics in a few days.

After those 21 days, there is a diagnostic conference among the staff of 60 psychiatrists, psychologists, nurses, and social workers.

"The great majority of patients ask to leave after those first 21 days," Dr. Gamso says. "They say they have learned their lesson, that they are off drugs now and ask, 'Why should I stay here?'

"This and other things are evaluated. We do not take what he says at face value. If, however, he is sufficiently antagonistic, we discharge him and tell him to come back if he feels he needs help. There is no black mark for the patient who leaves."

AVERAGE OF 5 MONTHS

The length of stay for those who remain beyond 21 days varies considerably with the individual, with 5 months being the average. Some have stayed as long as 15 months and bounced right back as heroin users.

Occupational therapy is stressed and there is Public School 619 on the island, setup specifically for the patients. The school, operated by the board of education under the direction of the division of child welfare, is an important part of the rehabilitation program.

Most patients, upon discharge after treatment at Riverside, are seen at an after-care clinic as often as necessary. By holding evening sessions, employment is possible for the patient, while at the same time reintegration into community life can be evaluated and any problem he meets are discussed freely.

Here is where the entire program meets its stiffest test. Has it conditioned the patient to the extent where he can go back to a squalid area—where he is constantly rubbing elbows with other drug addicts—and not be tempted all over again?

[From the New York Herald Tribune of December 8, 1954]

THE NATION'S NARCOTICS PROBLEM—ADDICT'S RENEWAL OF HABIT IS MAJOR DIFFICULTY; RETURN TO ENVIRONMENT COMPLICATES TREATMENT

(This is the fourth of five articles on narcotics and the efforts of local, State, and Federal agencies to combat the drug habit.)

(By Milton Lewis)

The major difficulty in the treatment of drug addition is recidivism, or the swift relapse to the narcotics habit. Thousands of victims "kick" their habit every year. But only a handful are able to stay away from "the stuff" for good. Why?

One factor is the environment which gave the addict the solace of drugs in the first place, and to which he usually returns after his "cure." In a place like New York City's experimental Riverside Hospital, doctors tangle directly with the problem of environment.

Practically every patient at Riverside was reared in slum areas and left school at an early age. The staff tries to explain to the patient why he began using drugs in the first place. Dr. Jerome L. Leon, Riverside's first medical superintendent, says:

"Not one of these boys has a normal emotional background. They are severely disturbed. They have family problems, work problems, sex problems. For them, drug addiction is a chemical retreat from a repugnant reality. * * *"

ACHIEVE GOALS IN DREAMS

"Born and reared in the slums, with no mature goal in keeping with their training, with no good education, they can, under the influence of heroin or morphine, become lawyers, doctors, baseball stars in their opiate dreams."

What they must have is a sense of achievement—even if it comes only from drugs.

A psychiatrist with the United States Public Health Service put it this way:

"It's not easy to cure in a few mont'is what has been building up for a lifetime."

Some experts feel that returning the cured patient to the same environment is like embarking on a long journey via a merry-go-round.

Other experts, whose patients have had some psychiatric rehabilitation and still go back to the habit, don't honestly know.

The fact is that no more than 1 in every 5 addicts take the cure once and are subsequently able to stay away from narcotics permanently.

UNBEARABLE TORMENT

Even those addicts who successfully pass through the nightmare torments of withdrawal treatment frequently revert to drugs as soon as they are given the chance.

When confirmed addicts are completely deprived of heroin, physical torment is almost unbearable. Thev suffer convulsions, diarrhea, and intense pain in the abdomen and back. There is nausea and vomiting, muscle twitching, clammy perspiration, and fever.

And to these torments is added sleeplessness. The skin is cold and covered with gooseflesh. It resembles that of a plucked turkey; hence the slang expression to denote complete and abrupt withdrawal from opium drugs—cold turkey.

There is a project under consideration which is held by its proponents to be a realistic approach to the problem of recidivism. Under a controlled medical-care program, addicts would continue to get as much dope as they need—from physicians—while undergoing a rehabilitation program.

If rehabilitation failed and the addict continued to be a heavy user of drugs he would still be supplied with narcotics, at a cost in pennies. The point is, according to its adherents, it would keep the addict from going to the underworld, and thus strangle the illicit drug traffic.

Dr. Hubert Shattuck Howe, a member of the New York City Welfare and Health Council's Committee on the Use of Narcotics Among Teen-Age Youth, is strongly in favor of such a project.

He feels the narcotics user is a sick person and not a criminal, and resorts to criminal practices only to maintain a habit which has become vital to his physical requirements. The person addicted to opiates is not a sex maniac. Opiate narcotics produce impotence and a complete lack of desire.

"We would endeavor," Dr. Howe says of the project he favors, "to prevent a relapse by keeping the patient under the care of a physician during the critical period when he is becoming adjusted to his resurgent sexual and other emotions which have been dulled

or warped by the drug, and now emerge with a vigor for which the addict is usually unprepared."

Chief Magistrate John M. Murtagh, who is in sympathy with such a project, feels it would be worth a try. He thinks it might make a dent in the muggings, burglary, prostitution, etc., ascribed to drug addicts.

But practically every other law enforcement official views the plan with abhorrence. They say it is similar—which its proponents say it is not—to a clinic plan which was tried and failed in New York and other cities in 1920.

A former official of the New York City Police Department says of Dr. Howe's idea:

"Drug addicts are pigs. They're never satisfied. The more you give them the more they want. They'd never cut it out if it was available—psychiatrists or no. Such a plan was tried in 1920. It failed. It's a fairy tale and would never work."

Harry J. Anslinger, United States Commissioner of Narcotics, puts it even more succinctly:

"If a plan like that advanced by Dr. Howe is given any serious consideration at all, then a State and Federal building should be constructed. On the first floor there should be a bar for alcoholics, on the second floor a narcotic dispensary for all addicts, and on the top floor a brothel for sex deviates."

[From the New York Herald Tribune of December 9, 1954]

THE NATION'S NARCOTICS PROBLEM—DRYING UP SOURCE ONLY WAY TO HALT ILLICIT TRAFFIC, BUT RED CHINA, THE MAIN SUPPLIER, WON'T COOPERATE

(This is the fifth and last article in a series on narcotics and the efforts of local, State, and Federal agencies to combat the drug habit.)

(By Milton Lewis)

The youth who mugs so he can buy his capsule of heroin, the girl who sells herself to continue mainlining the drug into her scarred veins, may never be cured. But others may be spared a similar depraved state only if the world production of opium is controlled.

International cooperation—that is the one and only possible solution to the suppression of the vicious traffic in drugs.

The tale is told of the representative of one of the big opium-producing countries who was asked, "Why doesn't your country stop the traffic in drugs by controlling the growth of poppy?"

The diplomat eyed his questioner blandly. "If you can suggest another commodity which would bring in a comparable revenue, we would gladly do it."

MUST DRY UP SOURCE

Other than drying up the source, there is no effective means of stopping the illicit traffic. There are many sections of New York City where heroin can be purchased as easily as powdered sugar, which it resembles.

Additional methods are being tried and even strengthened. As a prime example, Congress this year passed Public Law 500, which gives the Government power through the Coast Guard to revoke or deny licenses of merchant marine seamen who are addicted to drugs or convicted of violations of the narcotics laws. Since merchant ships are frequently the pipe lines for opium smugglers, the Coast Guard regards this law as a major weapon in the drug war. But so long as the dope exists, the traffic probably cannot be stopped.

The reason is obvious. One kilo (35 ounces) of heroin costing about $3,000 in Italy could eventually bring $3 million in this country. There's enough money in this monstrous business for everyone—down to the lowliest pusher in the neighborhood.

The profits on heroin mount daily. A few years ago, 1 ounce of the pure yielded about 8,000 capsules (sold from $1 up a cap). Today the drug is cut so heavily that profits are virtually incalculable.

How much heroin is around today? Up to September 1, some 35 kilos were seized this year. If 35 kilos were intercepted, how much slipped through undetected?

SMALL FRACTION DETECTED

At least 10 times more got through, one Federal official estimated.

"How do you arrive at that?" he was asked.

"I don't know. Maybe we're catching only 1 percent instead of 10 percent. The honest answer is, I don't know."

For 45 years the United States, one of the principal targets of this scourge, has been striving to limit the production of opium to the world's medical and scientific requirements. It has met with little success, and has walked out in disgust from several international conferences.

Currently, the United Nations is trying to do something about it. It has drawn up a protocol—known as the international opium protocol—which aims at reducing the licit annual production of opium from 2,000 tons to 500 tons, which represents the medical and scientific needs of the world.

Where has the excess of 1,500 tons been going? To illegal channels and toward the enslavement of millions throughout the world.

NO CRIME MORE EVIL

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, chairman of the Subcommittee on International Opium Control and a member of the crime investigating committee which was headed by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, says:

"Of all the vicious crimes which had been studied by our crime committee—international gambling, the numbers racket, political corruption, and other crimes—there was none more evil, none more depraving, none which has done graver damage to individuals, particularly young people, than dope."

The opium protocol has been signed by 36 nations, but ratified to date by only 8. Thanks to Senator WILEY's leadership, the Senate in August ratified the protocol. Before it can go into effect, it must be ratified by at least 25 nations, including 3 which produce opium, from which heroin is derived.

RED CHINA MAIN PROBLEM

Under the protocol, only seven countries would be permitted to export raw opium—Turkey, Iran, India, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Greece, and Russia. None of these has yet ratified the protocol.

Of the seven, the principal overproduction has been taking place in Turkey, Iran, and India, according to Harry J. Anslinger, United States Commissioner of Narcotics and since 1946 a member of the U. N. Narcotics Commission.

But by far the major source of illicit traffic for the entire world is Red China, Mr. Anslinger says.

Even if Turkey, Iran, and India—which harvest most of the 2,000 tons annually—were to reduce their production by 75 percent, there still remains the problem of Red China, Mr. Anslinger notes.

THE WORST OFFENDER

"I do not believe," he says, "they (Red China) have any place in the U. N. Commission on Narcotic Drugs, because certainly they are the worst offender. Red China represents the major source of illicit traffic for the entire world, and there appears to be no intention to carry out the obligations which the Nationalist Government undertook.

"The Nationalist government was doing a splendid job in reducing opium production. There was very little heroin that came out of China while they were in power and every year the Nationalist government executed about 1,000 drug peddlers. I have not heard of any executions under the present regime. If anything, the trade is encouraged.

"Southeast Asia is flooded with opium from Yunnan. Japan today is suffering from the greatest flood of heroin in her history. * * * A lot of it from Red China is reaching the United States. A lot of it is coming into California."

REDS SPREAD POISON

"* * * The amount of heroin that is flowing out of China is used for several purposes; to obtain foreign exchange (it is a very good means of obtaining foreign exchange, since they cannot export other commodities) and also the demoralization of people who use this deadly drug in many countries. That is certainly one of the objectives—you cannot get away from that—a poison being spread from Red China.

"We have brought this matter up before the Commission on Narcotics Drugs in the United Nations repeatedly. We have had one note from the Communist government which was submitted through the Soviet delegation. Their only answer to many, many charges, well documented, was that they prohibited the production of opium.

"That is about as far as they answered, except to say that it was just slanderous to make those assertions. However, in the United Nations documents submitted by most of the governments who suffer from this terrible scourge, especially Burma, Malaya, Indochina, Indonesia and Thailand, these governments openly state the source of this heroin is the Chinese mainland."

NO LEAKAGE FROM THE SOVIETS

Has there been any cooperation by the Kremlin to stop this nefarious business?

"Not insofar as the Chinese mainland is concerned," Mr. Anslinger says. "The Soviet orbit, that is, Russia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia, do carry out their obligations. We do not find any leakage from the Soviet orbit. It is all from the Chinese mainland, and there is evidently no effort whatever to stop this traffic."

It is Mr. Anslinger's view that if the three large countries where opium production is legal—Turkey, Iran, and India—would agree to reduce their production as a result of this protocol we would be that much better off and then we can devote most of our efforts to this smuggling from the Far East.

MANY NONSIGNATORIES

Specifically, the protocol would require countries to provide estimates of their needs and statistics covering their trade in opium. Its effectiveness, of course, will depend on the good faith of the nations of the world.

"Numerous nations," Senator WILEY notes, "are not signatories at all to the protocol, although there is machinery available in the protocol to help assure compliance by those nonparticipating states.

"Each of those nations must recognize that they must answer before the world if they fail to abide by the international opium effort."

Red China, Senator WILEY believes, will continue openly to flout, as it has been flouting, the conscience of mankind by its vicious opium peddling.

As to the protocol itself, Senator WILEY says:

"If nations refuse to honor their formal or informal obligations; if they refuse to make accurate, complete, and prompt reports regarding narcotics within their area; if they fail to crack down upon narcotics offenders in their midst; if they in any way prove the weak link in the world-wide enforcement chain against criminals, then the chain will snap."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am proud to join with the distinguished

junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] in the introduction today of the narcotics control bill.

As one who has worked in the field of criminal law administration, I think there can be no doubt about the fact that the narcotics problem in the United States is one of the causes of serious juvenile delinquency. I think that Congress, at this session, has a clear public duty to proceed to enact legislation along the lines of the bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Maine, so that we can bring under more effective control the traffic in narcotics in the United States.

FAMILY-FARM BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to state explicitly the long-standing national policy to preserve and strengthen the family-farm pattern of American agriculture, and to set forth some guideposts toward achieving that policy. Because some other Senators have expressed interest in the same objectives, I ask that the joint resolution lie over for 1 legislative day, for the benefit of any other Senators who may care to join as cosponsors.

Since the earliest days of the Republic, the family-farm pattern of American agriculture has been considered as essential to a strong democracy, and the policy of the Nation has been to favor the establishment and preservation of family-owned and family-operated farms.

In this period of reexamination of farm programs and farm legislation, it should be useful to look first at the objectives we intend to serve, and to establish some policy guideposts against which all proposed farm legislation can be appraised for its usefulness in achieving our national objectives.

Ample precedent for establishing goals in the national interest as policy guides, and then reviewing our progress toward them, has been established in the Employment Act of 1946, a measure to encourage an expanding economy assuring full employment.

A desirable pattern of sound and prospering agriculture is closely related to the objective of a sound national economy, and is necessary to maintain full employment.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

Mr. President, because some other Senators have expressed interest in the same objectives, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be held at the desk until the next legislative day, in order to provide other Senators an opportunity to join in sponsoring the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to state explicitly the long-standing national policy to preserve and strengthen the family-farm pattern of American agriculture, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. MURRAY), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

[The joint resolution will appear hereafter in the RECORD.]

JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, because of the very nature of the Central Intelligence Agency I think it is imperative that a joint congressional committee be established for the purpose of making continued studies of the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency and problems related to the gathering of intelligence affecting the national security. I feel that there should be a joint congressional committee authorized, and that the CIA should, as a matter of law, keep that committee fully and currently informed with respect to its activities.

The need for the Central Intelligence Agency is seldom questioned any longer and I certainly am not challenging it now. What I am concerned with, however, is CIA's position of responsibility to none but the National Security Council. I believe this should be changed. It is true that intelligence services of other major countries operate without direct control of the legislatures. This is understandable in a totalitarian government, such as the Soviet Union. It is even understandable in a parliamentary democracy, such as Great Britain where the entire administration is a part of and is responsible to Parliament. Our form of government, however, is based on a system of checks and balances. If this system becomes seriously out of balance at any point the whole system is jeopardized and the way is opened for the growth of tyranny.

There has been almost no congressional inspection of the Central Intelligence Agency since its establishment in 1947. It is conceivable that as the need for an intelligence service had been evident in 1946, the Congressional Reorganization Act of that year would have made provisions for congressional participation in the committee structure of Congress. As it is now, however, CIA is freed from practically every ordinary form of congressional check. Control of its expenditures is exempted from the provisions of law which prevent financial abuses in other Government agencies. Each year only a handful of Members in each House see the appropriation figures. There is no regular, methodical review of this Agency, other than a briefing which is supplied to a few Members of selected subcommittees.

I agree that in order to be effective an intelligence agency must maintain complete secrecy. If clandestine sources of information were inadvertently revealed, they would quickly dry up. Not only would the flow of information be cut off, but the lives of many would be seriously endangered. In addition, much of the value of the intelligence product would be lost if it were known that we possessed it. Secrecy for these purposes is obviously necessary.

However, there is a profound difference between an essential degree of secrecy to achieve a specific purpose and secrecy for the mere sake of secrecy. Once secrecy becomes sacrosant, it invites abuse. If we accept the idea of secrecy for secrecy's sake we will have no way of knowing whether we have a fine intelligence service or a very poor one.

If a joint committee is set up as proposed in the concurrent resolution I am about to submit, all bills, resolutions, and other matters in the Senate or in the House of Representatives relating primarily to the CIA, would be referred to the joint committee; and the joint committee would, from time to time, make whatever reports are necessary to the Congress concerning its relationship with the CIA.

This resolution would establish a joint committee, composed of 6 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate and 6 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In each instance, not more than 4 Members would be of the same political party.

The joint committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof would be authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and make such expenditures as it might deem advisable. The committee, in addition, would be empowered to appoint its staff; and would be authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government.

Mr. President, in my opinion, the CIA is in somewhat the same category as the Atomic Energy Commission; and just as a special committee, with well defined authority and powers has been created on a joint congressional basis to oversee and supervise the interests of the AEC, so I believe should a joint congressional committee be created for the same purpose in connection with the CIA. I realize full well, because of the very nature of the duties of the CIA, that there has been no public scrutiny of its activities. This may be necessary in this day and age, but I believe that a joint congressional committee should be created for the purpose of seeing that good management is maintained in the CIA and also to keep a constant check on its intelligence policies. It is well, too, that this joint committee should be in a posi-

tion to criticize any mistakes which the CIA may make.

Until a committee of the kind I am proposing is established, there will be no way of knowing what serious flaws in the Central Intelligency Agency may be covered by the curtain of secrecy by which it is shrouded. In 1949 the Hoover Commission examined the CIA. A task force stated that—

> The Central Intelligence Agency has not yet achieved the desired degree of proficiency and dependability in its estimates. Without it, the National Security Council cannot succeed in assessing and appraising the objectives, commitments, and risks of the United States in relation to our * * * military power, with sufficient continuity or definiteness to constitute a practical guide to the Military Establishment as to the size of our military needs.

It recommended that vigorous steps be taken to improve the Central Intelligence Agency and its work.

The purpose of the joint congressional committee would be in a sense to safeguard as well as to supervise the policies of the CIA. In my opinion the Congress should, because of the very nature of the work of the CIA, do everything in its power to protect its activities, to make it impossible for the CIA, as an organization, to lose its effectiveness, and to enable it to continue its extremely important work in such a manner as to warrant the necessary amount of freedom of activity and the necessary security to perform the duties allocated to it under the law.

Mr. President, if a joint committee is established, CIA officials will no longer be defenseless against criticism because their lips are sealed. They will have a congressional channel to turn to. The joint committee, in turn, could maintain the confidence of Congress and the public, without loss of security.

To this end, Mr. President, I submit, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], a concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee on Central Intelligence, and ask for its appropriate reference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2), submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and other Senators) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence to be composed of 6 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 6 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Of the 6 members to be appointed from the Senate, 3 shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and 3 shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee in Armed Services of the Senate. Of the 6 members to be appointed from the House of Representatives, 3 shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and 3 shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives. Not more than 4 members appointed from either the Senate or the House of Representatives shall be from the same political party.

SEC. 2. (a) The joint committee shall make continuing studies of the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency and of problems relating to the gathering of intelligence affecting the national security and of its coordination and utilization by the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government. The Central Intelligence Agency shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to its activities. All bills, resolutions, and other matters in the Senate or the House of Representatives relating primarily to the Central Intelligence Agency shall be referred to the joint committee.

(b) The members of the joint committee who are Members of the Senate shall from time to time report to the Senate, and the members of the joint committee who are Members of the House of Representatives shall from time to time report to the House, by bill or otherwise, their recommendations with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of their respective Houses which are (1) referred to the joint committee, or (2) otherwise within the jurisdiction of the joint committee.

SEC. 3. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 4. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report public hearings shall not be in excess of the amounts prescribed by law for reporting the hearings of standing committees of the Senate. The cost of such services to report executive hearing shall be fixed at an equitable rate by the joint committee.

SEC. 5. The joint committee is empowered to appoint such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government.

SEC. 6. The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $ per year, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

CODE OF FAIR PROCEDURE FOR SENATE INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], I submit for appropriate reference a resolution embodying a code of fair procedures for Senate investigations. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me pertaining to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 22), submitted by Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL) was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by deleting the title "Standing Committees" and inserting in lieu thereof "Senate Committees", and by inserting at the end of such rule the following:

"5. The following shall be the rules of the standing, select, and special committees of the Senate (except the majority and minority policy committees) and subcommittees thereof, and the term 'committee' as used in this subsection (except in paragraphs (a) (7) and (b) (1)) means any such committee or subcommittee:

"(a) (1) Committees may adopt additional rules not inconsistent with the rules of the Senate.

"(2) Unless otherwise provided, committee action shall be by vote of a majority of a quorum.

"(3) No committee hearing shall be held in any place outside the District of Columbia unless authorized by the committee.

"(4) All hearings conducted by committees shall be open to the public, except executive sessions for marking up bills or for voting or where the committee orders an executive session.

"(5) No measure, finding, or recommendation shall be reported from any committee unless a majority of the committee were actually present.

"(6) No testimony taken or material presented in an executive session shall be made public, either in whole or in part or by way

of summary, unless authorized by the committee.

"(7) A subcommittee of any standing, select, or special committee may be authorized only by a majority vote of the members of such committee.

"(8) Authority to issue subpenas may be delegated to the chairman or any member by the committee at a meeting called for such purpose.

"(9) A majority of the members of a committee may call a special meeting of such committee by filing a notice thereof with the committee clerk, who shall notify each member.

"(10) The professional and clerical staff personnel of each committee shall be appointed, and services of such staff personnel terminated, by majority vote of the members of the committee.

"(b) (1) No committee or subcommittee investigation shall be initiated unless specifically authorized by the Senate or by the standing, select, or special committee having jurisdiction.

"(2) The chairman of each committee shall from time to time and at the earliest date practicable, report to the Senate the general nature of inquiries or investigations the committee proposes to undertake, or, in any case in which he deems the national security might be endangered by such report, he shall in writing advise the President of the Senate of that fact.

"(3) The chairman or one of the members of a committee shall when practicable consult with appropriate Federal law-enforcement agencies with respect to any phase of an investigation which may result in evidence exposing the commission of Federal crimes, and the results of such consultation shall be reported to the committee before witnesses are called to testify therein.

"(4) In any investigation in which witnesses have been subpenaed, requests to subpena additional witnesses shall be received and considered by the chairman of the committee, except that in any investigation where the provisions of paragraphs (d) or (e) apply, any such request from a witness or other person exposed to defamation, degradation, or incrimination in such investigation shall be considered and acted upon by the committee at the earliest date practicable.

"(5) Each committee conducting investigations shall make available to interested persons copies of the rules applicable therein.

"(c) (1) No subpenaed witness shall be required to testify before a committee with less than 2 members present, unless the committee decides that 1 member may hold the hearing, or the witness waives any objection to testifying before 1 member.

"(2) The interrogation of witnesses at committee hearings shall be conducted, on behalf of the committee, by members and authorized staff personnel only.

"(3) No witness shall be televised, filmed, or photographed during a hearing if he objects on the ground of distraction, harassment, or physical handicap.

"(4) Witnesses shall be permitted to be advised by counsel of their legal rights while giving testimony, and, unless the presiding member of the committee otherwise directs, to be accompanied by counsel at the stand. A witness may be deemed to have waived this right if, after receiving timely notice of his appearance, he fails to provide himself with counsel.

"(5) Witnesses, counsel, and other persons present at committee hearings shall maintain proper order and decorum. Counsel shall observe the standards of ethics and deportment generally required of attorneys at law.

"(6) Witnesses at committee hearings shall be required, so far as practicable, to submit written statements of their proposed testimony in advance of the hearing at which they testify.

"(d) Whenever a committee determines that evidence relating to a question under investigation may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate persons called as witnesses therein, the committee shall observe the additional procedures prescribed by this paragraph, so far as may be practicable, to insure fair treatment of such persons:

"(1) Preliminary staff inquiries in such investigation may be directed by the chairman, but no witnesses shall be called to testify until approved by the committee.

"(2) All testimony, whether given under subpena or voluntarily, shall be given under oath.

"(3) Counsel for a witness may be permitted, in the discretion of the presiding member at any hearing and as justice may require, to be heard briefly on points of right and procedure, to examine his client briefly for purposes of amplification and clarification, and to address pertinent questions by written interrogatory to other witnesses whose testimony pertains to his client.

"(4) Testimony shall be heard in executive session when necessary to shield a witness or other person about whom he may testify.

"(5) The secrecy of executive sessions and of all matters and material not expressly released by the committee shall be rigorously enforced.

"(6) Witnesses shall be permitted brief explanations of affirmative or negative responses, and may submit concise, pertinent, oral, or written statements relating to their testimony for inclusion in the record at the opening or close of such testimony.

"(7) An accurate verbatim transcript shall be made of all testimony, and no alterations other than to correct clerical errors shall be permitted therein.

"(8) Each witness may obtain transcript copies of his testimony given publicly by paying the cost thereof. Copies of his testimony given in executive session shall be furnished a witness at cost if the testimony has been released or publicly disclosed, or if the chairman of the committee so orders.

"(9) No testimony given in executive session shall be publicly disclosed in part only, except when the committee decides that deletions from the transcript are required by considerations of national security.

"(e) Whenever a committee determines that any testimony, statement, release, or other evidence or utterance relating to a question under investigation tends to defame, degrade, or incriminate persons who are not witnesses, the committee shall observe the additional procedures prescribed by this paragraph, so far as may be practicable and necessary, to insure fair treatment of such persons:

"(1) Persons so exposed to defamation, degradation, or incrimination shall be afforded an opportunity to appear as witnesses, promptly and if possible at the same time such evidence or utterance is given, and under subpena if they so elect. Testimony relating to such adverse evidence or utterance shall be subject to the applicable provisions of paragraph (d) of this subsection. Any such person may, in lieu of appearing as a witness, submit a concise, pertinent sworn statement which shall be incorporated in the record of the hearing at which the adverse evidence or utterance was submitted.

"(f) Vouchers covering investigating expenditures of any committee shall be accompanied by a statement signed by the chairman of such committee that the investigation was duly authorized and conducted under the provisions of this subsection.

"6. In any case in which a controversy arises between committees as to the jurisdiction of any committee of the Senate to make any inquiry or investigation, the question of jurisdiction shall be decided by the Presiding Officer of the Senate, without debate, but such decision shall be subject to an appeal. Such decision finally arrived at, with or without appeal, shall not operate to invalidate proceedings of the committee prior thereto."

The statement presented by Mr. BUSH is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUSH

I am submitting for appropriate reference a resolution embodying a code of fair procedures for Senate investigations. I am pleased to have the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] join me in sponsorship.

The problem of providing fair treatment for witnesses and other persons affected by Senate investigations without crippling the Senate's essential power to investigate has been under intensive study for many months.

Since May 24, 1954, when I introduced my first draft of a code of fair procedures, as Senate Resolution 253, many recommendations for additions to the Senate rules have been made.

Most recent of these were the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Rules of the 83d Congress, introduced in the present session as Senate Resolution 17, and based on hearings at which all points of view were thoroughly explored.

In examining the report of the Subcommittee on Rules, it has seemed to me that its recommendations give too few rights to witnesses and other persons who may be exposed to defamation, degradation, and incrimination during the course of Senate investigations.

It is possible to go too far in the other direction, as some have proposed, and have a set of rules which would entangle committees in crippling legalisms and redtape which would seriously interfere with, if not stultify, the work of investigating committees.

The resolution introduced by myself and the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] seeks a sound course between the two extremes. Drawn upon suggestions originally contained in Senate Resolution 253 and upon the recommendations of the select committee in the 83d Congress headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and those of the Subcommittee on Rules, we have attempted to draft a comprehensive code which will preserve the Senate's essential power to investigate and at the same time give to witnesses and others affected the basic protections demanded by the American sense of justice and fair play.

We must maintain and strengthen the weapons of the Senate to ferret out subversives, while respecting the rights of decent citizens who appear before investigating committees.

During the past session many Senators expressed their support, in principle, for fair investigating procedures. The time has now come for action. I hope that the Senate will proceed promptly to set its house in order.

Mr. KUCHEL subsequently said: Mr. President, first of all I ask unanimous consent that my remarks appear in the RECORD following those of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] who earlier today submitted a resolution proposing new Senate rules of procedure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity of joining my colleague from Connecticut in submitting this resolution, which will provide a specific and long-overdue set of rules of procedure for Senate committees.

These rules, which embody suggestions from a wide range of sources, will safeguard the rights and prerogatives of the Senate, and at the same time will protect the rights and interests of citizens who may appear before our committees.

The need for such a code has long been apparent. During the 2 years I have been a Member of this body, I have on occasions been horrified at the lack of such rules and at the abuses which have occurred as a consequence. I have seen committed against individuals, and also against the committees of the Senate offenses which would be definitely discouraged and in many situations punishable if such rules were in effect.

The power of investigations by both branches of Congress is essential to good government. However, we should exercise this power with a sense of justice and decency. Our responsibilities in this regard have multiplied tremendously in recent years. With our present complex civilization and the ramifications of government, Congress looks into actions and problems affecting nearly every segment of American life.

Our committees should have all the necessary authority to carry out effectively and relentlessly the necessary inquiries and investigations.

At the same time, they must not degenerate into witch hunts or inquisitions. On the other hand, our committees should not be turned into forums for character assassins, for paying off grudges, and for obtaining self-serving publicity.

During the past 2 years I was deeply distressed at some spectacles which characterized the operations of some of our committees. I cannot condone the maligning of distinguished citizens by axe-grinding individuals—one instance of which occurred before my own eyes—who obtain the use of Senate bodies as sounding boards. Nor can I shrug off the "leaking" of confidential information and secret testimony, in a manner which gives the public wrong impressions and incomplete pictures of conditions.

There are many valuable and constructive features of the proposed code of procedure. I wish to point to a few which seem to me to be extremely desirable.

The restrictions on one-man subcommittees and the requirements that various actions must be by majority vote are imperative to preserving the dignity of this body, assuring well-balanced inquiries, and avoiding unfair treatment of citizens. The right of injured persons, particularly third parties, to defend themselves is in thorough accord with traditional American concepts of fair play. The details of the proposed rule on committee hearings will elevate the character of our operations, prevent obstructionism such as tried the patience of Judge Medina in the important Communist case, and assure the integrity of executive proceedings.

I am convinced of the need for such rules. Whether they are called reforms or remedies is immaterial to me. They will set forth positively our right to demand and to get facts, but will make sure that both our committees and persons appearing before them, either voluntarily or under compulsion, will conduct themselves in the cherished American way.

Our proposal admittedly will not cover every situation which conceivably could arise. Perhaps other points which should be covered will be suggested. This resolution is easily susceptible of amendment. At the least, Mr. President, it proposes a concrete step toward achieving a goal which, to my mind, the Senate should make every effort to reach with the least delay.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS RELATING TO ECONOMIC STABILIZATION AND MOBILIZATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 23), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That the limitation of expenditures under Senate Resolution 289, 83d Congress, relating to holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and pursuant to its jurisdiction under rule XXV (1) (d) 4 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, agreed to August 11, 1954, is hereby increased by $33,000, and such sum, together with any unexpended balance of the sums previously authorized to be expended under such resolution, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee and covering obligations incurred under such resolution on or before January 31, 1956.

MARKING WITH COLORED STRIPES OF TAX FORMS MAILED TO TAXPAYERS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], I submit for appropriate reference the following resolution:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the marking of tax forms being mailed to taxpayers with colored stripes to designate the amount of the taxpayers' liability is a violation of the intent of section 7213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and that the Secretary of the Treasury and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall be so notified.

There has been much concern expressed that the Treasury Department has adopted the policy of marking tax forms being sent through the mail in a prominent manner which would give information as to the amount of the taxpayer's liability of the previous year.

These tax forms, so prominently marked on the outside and distributed through the mails, can readily be observed and understood not only by the postal clerks but also by any neighbor or visitor in the home or office at the time the mail is delivered.

I can think of no possible justification for this wholesale disclosure of the tax liability of the American citizens by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and I shall urge the Senate Finance Committee to give prompt consideration to this resolution.

I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a letter from Commissioner Andrews explaining the position of the Internal Revenue Service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 24) was received and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The letter presented by Mr. WILLIAMS is as follows:

UNITED STATES TREASURY
DEPARTMENT,
Washington, November 19, 1954.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This matter of distinctive marking of tax packages, to which you referred in your letter of November 1, 1954, has been considerably distorted in some of the newspaper and other reports. Too, no doubt, the subject seems to have gotten kicked around for a few days in the dying days of the recent political campaign when there was some competition among candidates for quotable headlines.

If others could put it down, as I am doing as this is being written, and look at the packages of last year's forms as compared with this year's, they would see how grossly out of focus this whole matter has become in a few quarters. In this year's group we have four packages of the same size with no descriptive information appearing on the outside except a uniformly placed and printed index of contents and the colored stripe which indicates the broadest categories of tax returns. On the other hand, we had 5 separate packages last year printed on 4 different types of paper with 3 different colors of ink being used and 3 different colors of paper being used. Moreover, there were 3 different colors of seals being used to close the packages and last year's packages themselves contained statements, on the front and in bold type as large as 72 point, as to their contents and purposes.

We have received in the national office approximately 90 letters of comment from taxpayers concerning distinctive markings and there is quoted below the entire text of the letter we are using in reply to these communications:

"The Internal Revenue Service has for a number of years followed the practice of marking its tax packages in a distinctive manner as an aid in the economical and efficient handling of tax forms. Since we must print, segregate by tax categories, address and mail in excess of 50 million of these tax packages each year, it is necessary for us to use every means available to us to accomplish this task as rapidly and as cheaply as possible.

"The distinctive marking has been achieved in the past through the use of different sizes and colors of paper, by specially designed symbols, and in other ways. This year we are using a colored stripe across the package to distinguish the forms to be sent to farmers, businessmen, other taxpayers likely under the law to be required to file declarations of estimated tax, and taxpayers not likely to file such declarations. Declarations of estimated tax are required, under the law, not only from taxpayers with income in excess of $10,000, but also certain other taxpayers who are single, file separately from husbands or wives, have investment income, or have income in excess of $100 not subject to the withholding provisions of the tax law. Therefore, the most practical

course open to us was to send packages containing the declaration forms to all businessmen and farmers, regardless of income and to others with incomes above $10,000, and the identification markings were necessary in order to assure mailing the right kinds of packages to all taxpayers.

"All of us here in the Internal Revenue Service are anxious to guard the privacy of tax returns, and take every reasonable step to that end. At the same time, it must be recognized that the mailing of blank returns of any kind is in itself some indication of tax status. For example, in the past the separate mailing of the blank forms for declaration of estimated income tax indicated the previous year's tax status of the taxpayer. On the other hand, it is absolutely necessary that taxpayers be furnished the blank return forms which they need.

"Thank you for your recent communication on this subject and for your interest in the Internal Revenue Service."

While the matter of 52 million tax packages no doubt makes good copy from the newsman's viewpoint there is actually very little likelihood that any close approximation of an individual's income can be gained from observation of this year's tax package. Moreover, the fact that we have received so few communications may be indicative of the general reaction to the wide publicity given this matter.

Sincerely yours,

T. COLEMAN ANDREWS,
Commissioner.

ADDITIONAL CLERICAL ASSISTANT TO COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 25), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized, from January 31, 1955, through January 31, 1956, to employ one additional clerical assistant to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

SEVERANCE OF DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH RUSSIA—INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE TO COMBAT COMMUNISM

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution favoring severance of diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia and satellites and the calling of an international conference to combat communism. I ask unanimous consent that a statement made by me in the Senate on May 13, 1954, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 26) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That (1) whereas it is morally wrong for the Government of the United States to maintain diplomatic relations with the band of Kremlin international outlaws who, by stealth and ruthless power, have enslaved one-third of the people of the world; and whereas the outposts and advance positions of this outlaw band, received and tolerated under the guise of diplomatic missions, in the United States and other countries of the free world are in fact nests of espionage, seditious propaganda, and sabotage: Therefore, it is the sense of the Senate that the Government of the United States should sever diplomatic relations with the alleged Government of Soviet Russia and with the alleged governments of the countries which have been enslaved by the alleged Government of Soviet Russia.

(2) Whereas the tentacles of international communism are everreaching for new areas of conquest, and this spreading menace can be effectively combated only by concerted action of the free nations: Therefore, it is the sense of the Senate that the Government of the United States should convoke an international conference of the free nations of the world for the purpose of agreeing upon united action (a) to destroy the Communist fifth column, and (b) to resist further aggression by international communism.

The statement presented by Mr. JENNER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JENNER

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCarran], I submit for appropriate reference a resolution relating to severance of diplomatic relations with Russia, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement pertaining to the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 247) was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

"*Resolved,* That—

"(1) Whereas it is morally wrong for the Government of the United States to maintain diplomatic relations with the band of Kremlin international outlaws who, by stealth and ruthless power, have enslaved one-third of the people of the world; and whereas, the outposts and advance positions of this outlaw band, received and tolerated under the guise of diplomatic missions, in the United States and other countries of the free world are in fact nests of espionage, seditious propaganda, and sabotage; therefore, it is the sense of the Senate that the Government of the United States should sever diplomatic relations with the alleged Government of Soviet Russia and with the alleged governments of the countries which have been enslaved by the alleged Government of Soviet Russia.

"(2) Whereas the tentacles of international communism are ever reaching for new areas of conquest, and this spreading menace can be effectively combated only by concerted action of the free nations; therefore, it is the sense of the Senate that the Government of the United States should convoke an international conference of the free nations of the world for the purpose of agreeing upon united action (a) to destroy the Communist fifth column, and (b) to resist further aggression by international communism."

The statement presented by Mr. JENNER is as follows:

"STATEMENT BY SENATOR JENNER

"In an official note to the then President of the United States on November 16, 1933, as a prelude to the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Maxim Litvinoff, who was People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, pledged the Soviet Government:

" '1. To respect scrupulously the indisputable right of the United States to order its own life within its own jurisdiction in its own way and to refrain from interfering in any manner in the internal affairs of the United States, its Territories, or possessions.

" '2. To refrain, and to restrain all persons in government service and all organizations of the government or under its direct or indirect control, including organizations in receipt of any financial assistance from it, from any act overt or covert liable in any way whatsoever to injure the tranquillity, prosperity, order, or security of the whole or any part of the United States, its Territories or possessions, and, in particular, from any act tending to incite or encourage armed intervention, or any agitation or propaganda having as an aim the violation of the territorial integrity of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the bringing about by force of a change in the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States, its Territories or possessions.

" '3. Not to permit the formation or residence on its territory of any organization or group—and to prevent the activity on its territory of any organization or group, or of representatives or officials of any organization or group—which makes claim to be the government of, or makes attempt upon the territorial integrity of, the United States, its Territories or possessions; not to form, subsidize, support, or permit on its territory military organizations or groups having the aim of armed struggle against the United States, its Territories or possessions, and to prevent any recruiting on behalf of such organizations and groups.

" '4. Not to permit the formation or residence on its territory of any organization or group—and to prevent the activity on its territory of any organization or group, or of representatives or officials of any organization or group—which has as an aim the overthrow or the preparation for the overthrow of, or the bringing about by force of a change in the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States, its Territories or possessions.' "

"On the same day, November 16, 1933, the then President of the United States accepted this pledge of the Soviet Government and diplomatic relations were established between the governments of the two countries.

"Long before that fateful day, the Communist manifesto had announced:

" 'In short, the Communists everywhere support every revolutionary movement against the existing social and political order of things. * * *

" 'The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions.'

"Long before that fateful day, Nicoli Lenin himself had proclaimed:

" 'The existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end. And before that end supervenes, a series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states will be inevitable.'

"In the face of this record of the aims and objectives of the Soviet Union, was the pledge given to our Government on November 16, 1933, to be believed and accepted in good faith?

"Let us turn again to the writings of Lenin himself:

" 'We must be able to withstand all this, to agree to all and every sacrifice, and even—if need be—to resort to various strategems, artifices, illegal methods, to evasions and subterfuges.'

"A moment's reflection on the treachery which spawned the infamous, Godless tyranny that was then just beginning to whet its appetite for the enslavement of all humanity should have given pause.

"A glance at the Soviet Union's record as a consistent violator of international commit-

ments and pacts prior to November 1933, should have prompted hesitation.

"In spite of these grim warnings, our Government not only established diplomatic relations with the dictators of the Kremlin but, since then, has fed their conspiratorial apparatus with billions of our wealth, with concessions, and appeasements ad nauseam.

"Did the Soviet Union keep its pledge to the Government of the United States? Here are the words of William Z. Foster, national chairman of the Communist Party in the United States:

" 'When a Communist heads the Government of the United States—and that day will come just as surely as the sun rises—the government will not be a capitalist government but a Soviet Government and behind this government will stand the Red army to enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat.'

"On September 30, 1950, the Congress, after years of investigation, inquiry, and direct observation, legislatively declared:

" 'There exists a world Communist movement which, in its origins, its development, and its present practice, is a worldwide revolutionary movement whose purpose it is * * * to establish a Communist totalitarian dictatorship in the countries throughout the world through the medium of a worldwide Communist organization.

" 'The Communist organization in the United States, pursuing its stated objectives, the recent successes of Communist methods in other countries, and the nature and control of the world Communist movement itself, presents a clear and present danger to the security of the United States and to the existence of free American institutions.'

"Today, we read the gruesome record of this monster which is written in the blood of its victims and we are appalled by its insatiable appetite. It has devoured untold millions of human souls. It grips millions more who are wasting to an angonizing death in slave-labor camps.

"Today, there are some 20 million agents of this conspiracy against humanity itself spread out in a deadly fifth column encompassing the globe.

"Today, there are legions of worldwide interlocking nerve centers for espionage, sabotage, and subversion, masquerading as diplomatic establishments, under the discipline of the masters of the Kremlin.

"Today, the awful truth is that the tentacles of this Red octopus embrace one-third of the world's population and one-fourth of the world's land surface, and these tentacles are reaching to encompass the globe.

"The Senate resolution calls for the severance of diplomatic relations with the Kremlin and with these governments which are satellites of the Kremlin.

"The conscious of the world demands that this Nation, as the last great bastion of freedom, take the lead in expelling from the family of nations the tyrants of Moscow. This course of action would give notice to the enslaved peoples of the world, and those who are threatened with enslavement, that we will no longer welcome their vile oppressors at the council tables of the world to spew forth their venom in mockery of men of good will.

"We can no longer blind ourselves to the fact that there can be no binding agreement or solemn pact with men who know no morality and whose only god is naked, brute force.

"This course of action is likewise impelled by the grim necessity to protect ourselves against the penetration of this country by the master plotters, in the guise of diplomats.

"The Senate resolution also calls for the convoking of an international conference of the free nations of the world for the purpose of agreeing upon united action (a) to destroy the Communist fifth column, and (b) to resist further aggression by international communism.

"Although the Communist world is welded in a unity of steel, division and disunity characterize the nations which have not succumbed to the aggression of the Kremlin. A startling fact is that the Moscow trade offensive has penetrated deep into the economic life of the free world with the result that there are currently being drawn into the Communist orbit the economic systems of the free nations. This means not only a transfusion of the strength of the free world into the Iron Curtain countries but eventual economic strangulation of the West.

"Those nations which are yet free must, before it is too late, choose up sides and declare themselves for united action to quarantine the marauding fanatics who threaten to destroy civilization itself.

"It is hoped that the Senate resolution will have wide circulation and discussion. It offers a vehicle for the formulation of one overall policy to strengthen ourselves and the free world against the deadly impending peril."

STUDY OF LEASING OF SPACE OR BUILDINGS FOR GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference, a resolution which I ask to be referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ask unanimous consent that the statement attached thereto may be printed in full in the RECORD. It simply relates to the matter of various Government agencies, bureaus, and commissions renting a great deal of office space in towns where, as a matter of fact, there are Federal buildings available to house Government projects. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me regarding the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 27) was received and referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study of the leasing of space or buildings by agencies, bureaus, departments, and commissions of the United States Government. In the conduct of such investigation special attention shall be given to (1) determining the extent to which space or buildings have been leased at exorbitant rates, (2) determining the extent to which political connections have figured in the leasing of space or buildings, (3) determining the extent to which space or buildings not fireproof have been leased when comparable space in fireproof buildings could have been leased at equal or lower rates, (4) determining the extent to which attempts have been made to locate various agencies, bureaus, and commissions in one building for administrative convenience and for the convenience of the public, and (5) determining the extent to which buildings already owned by the Government have been utilized before space or buildings were leased on a rental basis.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest date practicable but not later than March 1, 1956.

The statement presented by Mr. LANGER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER

Allegations have been made to me which suggest that inefficiency and unwarranted favoritism have been displayed in the securing of quarters for agencies and bureaus of the Federal Government. Such allegations have come from what I consider credible sources and I cannot therefore perfunctorily dismiss them as I might some uncorroborated rumor. In submitting this resolution calling for a thorough study and exposé of the truth or falsity of these allegations, I do not seek to impugn anyone. I am interested only in securing the facts, whatever they might be, which will either set these allegations to rest or result in the establishment of efficiency and impartiality in this large Federal program.

In addition, the resolution also provides a means by which the Congress may obtain information concerning the method, practice, and procedure by which space is obtained for Government agencies. It is certainly important to know whether the convenience of the public is being served on a businesslike basis in this program as it should be in all others.

In my judgment, the committee best equipped for this task is the Committee on Government Operations and I have therefore phrased this resolution accordingly.

Mr. President, I submit the resolution and ask that it be appropriately referred.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS RELATING TO ECONOMIC STABILIZATION AND MOBILIZATION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 23) to investigate problems relating to economic stabilization and mobilization, reported it favorably, without amendment, and submitted a report (No. 5) thereon.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2091) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

TRIBUTE TO ALBERT SCHWEITZER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to say just a brief word with regard to an important anniversary which occurs today. It is the 80th birthday of one of the world's greatest men. I refer to the noted philospher, musician, missionary, physician, spiritual leader—Dr. Albert Schweitzer.

Throughout the world, men and women of all creeds, of all nationalities, of all colors, have been thrilled by his selfless dedication to the cause of humanity. He makes us all humble before his magnificent demonstration in the heart of Africa of the brotherhood of man.

I believe, therefore, that it is altogether appropriate that, from the floor of the Senate to Lambarene, French Equatorial Africa, I send to him greetings and best wishes, which I know are shared by my colleagues and by the American people as a whole.

I send now to the desk the text of a brief article which appears in the current issue of the Saturday Review. It consists of a few inspiring excerpts from a book being issued today by Harper's entitled "The World of Albert Schweitzer," with photographs by Erica Anderson and text and captions by Eugene Exman.

I understand that this book has been described by the editor of the Saturday Review, Mr. Norman Cousins, as the most intimate and most knowledgeable personal portrait yet to appear of the man who is widely regarded as the greatest nonpolitical figure of our age.

Other splendid books have been published by the MacMillan Co., Beacon Press, and other sources, regarding this great individual.

I ask unanimous consent that the excerpts from the Saturday Review be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WORLD OF ALBERT SCHWEITZER

"Life here is not so romantic as most people think it is," Dr. Schweitzer once told a visitor. "To be a success in Lambarene you must be a carpenter, a mechanic, a farmer, a boatman, a trader, as well as a physician and surgeon."

Lambarene, of course, is a village in the Gabon Province of French Equatorial Africa. Here, on the banks of the Ogowe River, Dr. Albert Schweitzer came in 1913 to establish a hospital. To this remote hospital the world has since built a well-beaten path.

Albert Schweitzer's fame, however, is not due simply to his having established a hospital in an equatorial jungle. Other doctors have built hospitals—sometimes better equipped—in far countries, yet their work is relatively unknown. Dr. Schweitzer's significance lies in the extent of his exceptional gifts—native endowments, perhaps, but dedication to a common end. He is a doctor of medicine and also a doctor of music, of philosophy, and of theology. He is the author of books in all these fields, translated into many languages. When he was 8 years old he began to play the organ and at 9 he was able to substitute for the regular organist at church services. He prepared for the university at Mulhausen Gymnasium, where he developed a keen interest in history and natural science. But it was to his trinity of interest—musical theory, philosophy, and theology—that he devoted most of his time at Strasbourg University. His philosophical thought has profoundly influenced two generations.

Happiness filled all of Schweitzer's early life. His interest in music, philosophy, and theology may be partially accounted for by inheritance; both of his grandfathers were organists and one was also a schoolmaster, and his father was a leading Alsatian pastor. But for the young Schweitzer happiness was the twin of shared pain. As he says, "Whoever is spared personal pain must feel himself called to help in diminishing the pain of others. We must all carry our share of the misery which lies upon the world."

In 1896, when he was 21, he determined that he should live for science and art until he was 30, and after that give his talents to the direct service of humanity. When this time came he was already one of the finest organists in Europe, and principal of the Theological College of St. Thomas, Strasbourg; famous friends like the organist, Widor, his teacher, and writer, Romain Rolland, protested that he would take his great gifts to the wilderness of Equatorial Africa. His will was firm, however, and he plunged into medicine. By 1913 he was ready to go.

Since he has been in Lambarene his work has been impeded many times by wars and insufficient funds. And the medical needs of Africa are bottomless. Several times Dr. Schweitzer has had to return to Europe, to write books, lecture, or perform in concert in order to earn the funds necessary to keep his hospital out of the arms of the encircling jungles. He himself has endured sickness, ulcerated feet, and the unpredictable rains and exasperating folkways of primeval Africa. One may imagine that such a sensitive and disciplined man has had many moments of doubt; however this may be, he has never ceased to work, in the most practical ways, for the health and understanding of his beloved Africans, in that continent which is now his second home.

In Schweitzer's own words:

"I wanted to be a doctor that I might be able to work without having to talk. For years I had been giving myself out in words * * * this new form of activity I could not represent to myself as talking about the religion of love, but only as an actual putting it into practice.

"Only at quite rare moments have I felt really glad to be alive. I could not but feel with a sympathy full of regret all the pain that I saw around me, not only that of men but that of the whole creation. From this community of suffering I have never tried to withdraw myself. It seemed to me a matter of course that we should all take our share of the burden of pain which lies upon the world.

"It was quite incomprehensible to me—this was before I began going to school—why in my evening prayers I should pray for human beings only. So when my mother had prayed with me and had kissed me goodnight I used to add silently a prayer that I had composed myself for all living creatures. It ran thus: 'O, Heavenly Father, protect and bless all things that have breath; guard them from all evil and let them sleep in peace.'

"Truth has no special time of its own. Its hour is now—always.

"People say I understand something about music, but the sweetest sound I have ever heard came from a room one night when from the change in a baby's crying I knew that the crisis had passed, and that he would be well again.

"Those who have learned by experience what physical pain and bodily anguish mean belong together all the world over; they are united by a secret bond. One and all, they know the horrors of suffering to which man can be exposed, and one and all they know the longing to be free from pain.

"He speaks to us the same word: 'Follow thou me!' and sets us to the tasks which He has to fulfill for our time. He commands. And to those who obey Him, whether they be wise or simple, He will reveal Himself in the toils, the conflicts, the sufferings which they shall pass through in His fellowship, and, as an ineffable mystery, they shall learn in their own experience who He is.

"An organ is like a cow; one does not look at its horns so much as at its milk.

"Joy, sorrow, tears, lamentation, laughter—to all these music gives voice, but in such a way that we are transported from the world of unrest to a world of peace, and see reality in a new way, as if we were sitting by a mountain lake and contemplating hills and woods and clouds in the tranquil and fathomless water."

ALBERT SCHWEITZER'S CAREERS

Music: Eugene Munch, 1857–98, a biography of his friend and first organ teacher. J. S. Bach, a huge, two-volume biography of the giant Baroque composed. Many organ recordings, some made in Europe in order to buy medicaments for the Lambarene hospital. Also a book on organs and organ building, and an edition of Bach's organ works (with Widor). Dr. Schweitzer still practices regularly on a special, termite-proof organ donated by European friends.

Theology: The Quest of the Historical Jesus (1906), which sums up the work of 200 years of Biblical higher criticism, and provides an original interpretation of many textual problems in Scripture, has been called the most influential book of theology published in this century. He has also written two books on Paul, a psychiatric study of Jesus (written for his doctor-of-medicine thesis), and Christianity and the Religions of the World. Dr. Schweitzer is himself a preacher; during World War I he preached in Strasbourg, and he preaches regularly to his staff and patients in Africa.

Philosophy: His autobiographical works include Out of My Life and Thought, On the Edge of the Primeval Forest, and Memoirs of Childhood and Youth. He has also written, partly from lectures given over Europe, the two-volume Philosophy of Civilization. He has won innumerable medals, prizes, and honors from all over the earth, and the Nobel Peace Prize for 1952.

Medicine: The hospital plant at Lambarene has had to be moved physically and rebuilt several times. In addition to common conditions, Schweitzer must treat tropical scourges like epidemics of amebic and bacillary dysentery, malaria (almost all his patients have this), strangulated hernia, elephantiasis, leprosy, etc. Many Africans also suffer from severe nutritional deficiencies which may be responsible for the prevalence of (uncancerous) tumor.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THOUGHT

Rational thought is important for its own sake and as it leads to a higher form which Schweitzer calls mystical thought. Pure reason can carry us only so far; to penetrate further we must quiet the mind and await the insight for which reason has prepared us.

This higher thought may contradict the expectations of logical, rational thought. Perhaps that is why men have often distrusted it. Actually the new insight may be a premise, in support of which rational thought must build a new structure. Moreover, intuitive insight may include a larger whole than sense data can immediately verify, just as complete knowledge of H_2O must include awareness of ice and steam even though water be its present form recognized by the senses. Water when it boils does not cease to be H_2O. So rational thought does not cease to be thought when it boils over into mystical, or integral, thought. Schweitzer recognizes that mystical thought may lead to a denial of knowledge based upon reason, and seek an experience apart from life itself. But this is a growth to be pruned. He says that mysticism is not the flower on the plant of thought.

It is but the stalk; ethics is the flower. What he calls ethical mysticism, therefore, "admits how absolutely mysterious and unfathomable are the world and life. It is knowledge insofar as it does know the one thing which we can and must know in the sphere of this mystery, namely, that all being is life, and that in loving self-devotion to other life we realize our spiritual union with Infinite Being."

Ordinary commonsense knowledge tells us that we must watch after ourselves and our interests first. But that knowledge is superseded when, through the experience of love, we see that another's life is as important as our own. Schweitzer, like Gandhi, would have us go one step further and see all others as objects of love. This step reason cannot take for us; nor can emotional attachment to another person. The step is made for us when we determine to look beyond the temporal to the eternal, to seek communion with the ground of all being.

But, insists le grand docteur, we cannot break through the ultimate mystery. Beyond us is the unfathomable deep. While we may measure time, we cannot measure eternity, and our time is bounded on all sides by the eternal. It is an awesome prospect to view and as we watch it we see all living creatures mirrored there. All creatures as one.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Address delivered by him at second annual international student exchange dinner, Houston, Tex., Thursday, January 13, 1955,

By Mr. McNAMARA:

Statement prepared by him in reference to centennial of land-grant colleges.

By Mr. STENNIS (on behalf of Mr. ERVIN):

Defense Mobilization Order IV-3, establishing an Advisory Committee on the Watch Industry, and a press release in connection therewith.

By Mr. DANIEL:

Statement prepared by him on 22d anniversary of the Lone Ranger.

CONTINUATION OF THE INVESTIGATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if Senators will indulge me, after conferring with the minority leader, I understand that several Senators are planning to be absent from the Chamber later in the day to attend a funeral. Several Senators also plan to be absent from the Chamber next week.

Therefore, in order that there may be a yea-and-nay vote on Senate Resolution 18, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution, with the understanding that the yeas and nays will be ordered on the resolution, and that immediately after the resolution is disposed of, the Senate will return to the consideration of morning business, so that Senators may continue to make insertions in the RECORD and to transact other routine business.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The majority leader spoke to me about the proposed procedure. I know of no opposition on this side of the aisle to Senate Resolution 18. It was indicated to me, however, that a yea-and-nay vote was desired. I understand that several Senators on both sides of the aisle are planning to attend a funeral this afternoon, and also that several Senators on both sides of the aisle wish to attend the inauguration of their Governors next week. Therefore, it is desirable to have a yea-and-nay vote on the resolution at this time. If that course is followed, all Members of the Senate will be able to meet their commitments. Following the vote on the resolution, it is my understanding that the Senate will resume the transaction of routine business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 18) was read as follows:

Resolved, That the Communist Party of the United States is recognized to be a part of the international Communist conspiracy against the United States and all democratic forms of government. It is the sense of the Senate that its appropriate committees should continue diligently and vigorously to investigate, expose, and combat this conspiracy and all subversive elements and persons connected therewith, including the completion of all pending and unfinished investigations of such nature.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Texas desire to have an immediate vote on the resolution?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If there is no objection, the yeas and nays having been ordered, I would suggest that the Senate is ready to vote on the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent because of illness in his family.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is absent by leave of the Senate, and that, if present he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 84, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—84

Aiken	Beall	Bridges
Allott	Bender	Bush
Anderson	Bennett	Butler
Barkley	Bible	Byrd
Barrett	Bricker	Capehart
Carlson	Hruska	Mundt
Case, N. J.	Humphrey	Murray
Clements	Ives	Neely
Cotton	Jackson	Neuberger
Curtis	Jenner	Payne
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Potter
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Purtell
Douglas	Kefauver	Robertson
Duff	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Dworshak	Knowland	Schoeppel
Eastland	Kuchel	Scott
Ellender	Langer	Smith, Maine
Flanders	Long	Smith, N. J.
Frear	Magnuson	Sparkman
Fulbright	Malone	Stennis
George	Mansfield	Symington
Goldwater	Martin, Iowa	Thurmond
Gore	Martin, Pa.	Thye
Hayden	McCarthy	Watkins
Hennings	McClellan	Welker
Hickenlooper	McNamara	Wiley
Hill	Millikin	Williams
Holland	Morse	Young

NOT VOTING—12

Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Kerr	Pastore
Ervin	Lehman	Russell
Green	Monroney	Smathers

So the resolution (S. Res. 18) was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In accordance with the understanding previously had, the Senate will resume morning business, strictly under the 2-minute rule.

AUTHORIZATION TO REPORT THE URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL DURING THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate following today's session I may report, from the Committee on Appropriations, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, H. R. 2091, which has passed the House of Representatives, so that it may be considered by the Senate next Tuesday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in connection with the request just made by the distinguished Senator from Arizona for permission to report the urgent deficiency appropriation bill during the recess of the Senate, it is the plan, following a conference between the distinguished minority leader and myself, to call up the urgent deficiency bill in the Senate next Tuesday. I simply desired Senators to have advance notice of this intention.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MILITARY SECURITY THROUGH ADEQUATE AIRPOWER

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the best presentation I have read in some time as to why adequate airpower, Army, Navy, and the Air Force, is not a matter that can be handled as normal American production problems in hard-line items are handled is contained in a thoughtful article by an able and experienced newspaperman in this field, Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 12, 1955.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD directly following these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 12, 1955]

FOURTEEN BILLION FIVE HUNDRED MILLION DOLLAR AIR FORCE BUDGET NOT FOR EXPANSION BUT FOR BUYING REVOLUTIONARY NEW TYPE PLANES—REPLACEMENTS FOR PRESENT CRAFT MUST BE CAPABLE OF SPEEDS OF THOUSANDS OF MILES PER HOUR AND VERTICAL TAKEOFFS—RAPID OBSOLESCENCE POSES DILEMMA

(By Brig. Gen. Thomas H. Phillips, U. S. Army (retired), military analyst of the Post-Dispatch)

WASHINGTON, January 12.—The Air Force budget for fiscal year 1956, which is to be about $14,500,000,000 out of a total defense budget of about $34,500,000,000, will not provide funds for any expansion. The money to purchase aircraft to build from the current strength of 121 wings to the planned goal of 137 wings has already been provided in previous appropriations.

The aircraft to be purchased from the 1956 appropriation will be for replacement of existing aircraft.

It is essential that the replacement aircraft should represent long steps forward in performance. This means that the barely supersonic F–100, which is replacing the Sabrejet F–86, should be replaced by a fighter capable of speeds of a thousand miles an hour, or more, powered possibly by ram-jet or rocket engines.

It means that the replacement bombers being designed to take over from the B–52, which is not yet in formations, and the B–47, the real work horse of American airpower, should be supersonic.

It may mean that all new aircraft for which requirements are being placed with manufacturers and designers should be capable of vertical takeoff.

REVOLUTIONARY CHANGE

These steps ahead are as great a change as the shift from piston to jet engines, from speeds of 300 miles an hour to 700 miles an hour.

The business and budget emphasis in the administration and the Pentagon may very well delay the development of the new aircraft so long that when they are delivered in 1962 it will be like buying a new 1955 automobile at that time. The new aircraft are likely to be obsolete before they get into production.

There is a very serious dilemma in the production of new military aircraft between the need to get them into production as early as possible, and before they are obsolescent, and the cost of change and modification if production is undertaken without adequate testing.

The history of the B–47 six-jet bomber is an example. The requirements for this advanced medium bomber were established in 1946. Production did not start until more than 5 years later.

After the first B–47's were manufactured it was found that the tail gun was ineffective and would have to be completely redesigned. No crew members who tried to parachute from a disabled early model escaped with their lives. It was necessary to provide ejection seats which could be shot out of the plane, another big conversion job.

The bombsight was not in pressurized space. It was found that it required a great deal of maintenance and it was necessary to provide pressurization and access to it.

SEVEN HUNDRED AND THIRTY-ONE PLANES MODIFIED

As a result, the first 88 B–47's had to be extensively modified at a cost of well over $1 million each. The next 145 had almost equally extensive changes. Altogether it was not until B–47 No. 732 came off the production line that the changes found by experience to be necessary had been incorporated.

The cost of modifying the first 731 B–47 bombers amounted to more than $300 million.

This tale has been kept hidden in the Pentagon and there is no reason why it should be. It is just what is bound to happen when an almost wholly new instrument of incredible complexity is produced under urgent conditions.

It would have been possible to save half or two-thirds of the modification cost if the first few aircraft had been produced by hand and 2 or 3 years had been spent in development, modification, and getting out the bugs.

But had that been done the United States would not now have more than 1,000 B–47's ready to go when needed. Production was not stopped even though it was known that the aircraft coming off the assembly line would almost immediately have to go to a center for modification at great expense.

The business approach in the Pentagon considers this wasteful and extravagant. Air Force officials agree that it is costly, but ask: How else can you get a new aircraft into production before it is obsolete?

They point to the B–47 and ask if it is not worth the cost to have this finest jet bomber in the world in large numbers, almost certainly able to penetrate the defenses of the Soviet Union with negligible losses, instead of just getting it into production.

COMPROMISE WORKED OUT

A sort of compromise has been worked out between the need for speed in development of new aircraft and the cost of modification. Under this scheme only 12 or 13 airplanes would be produced in the first 18 months of production, for test and modification. This could be stretched out.

But even under this scheme, if quantity production is to be started in 18 months, the jigs and dies, orders for components and parts must be placed after 7 months. The result is that modifications found to be necessary by testing after the first 7 months cannot be put into the assembly line immediately, but will have to be made in a modification center.

Even under this scheme, the Air Force feels that to get the maximum potential out of any new airplane it will be necessary to cycle them all back through a modification center for modernizing after a certain amount of use.

NOT BUSINESSLIKE

All this breaks the heart of the defense comptroller, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Secretary of the Treasury. It does not seem businesslike to them and, of course, it is not. It is just another of the awful wastes of the armaments race.

The eight-jet B–52 intercontinental bombers is a case in point right now. A few prototypes have been built. If we were to wait for another year or 2 years of testing, it would be impossible to meet the Air Force equipping schedule to replace the obsolescent B–36.

At the present time the business approach is predominant in the Pentagon. However, there are knowledgeable people in the Congress who are going to explore just such problems as these.

INVESTIGATION BY THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTACK ON COSTA RICA

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a few days ago the Republic of Costa Rica filed a formal complaint with the Organization of American States that several of its cities had been attacked by airplanes from a foreign source, and that a force had landed inside Costa Rica and was attempting to overthrow the Government of that country.

I am very happy that our State Department apparently took immediate action in the matter and was at least partly successful in getting the Organization of American States to send a mission with airplanes to Costa Rica, which were reinforced, I believe, with planes of our own.

The mission, as I understand, has made a tentative finding, as of this morning, that the planes which attacked the Costa Rican cities came from a foreign source; and a former President of Costa Rica, according to press dispatches just received, has stated that his son is in command of the forces inside Costa Rica.

While the State Department, at times, is severely criticized, and while I reserve the right in the future to criticize it when I think it is wrong, I believe that in this matter it has acted with speed to isolate aggression and to throw the moral influence of the United States against the aggression. I hope that it will continue to proceed along this course, because if we permit the democratic government of Costa Rica to be overthrown by a revolutionary movement or by aggression from outside, it will have a most unfortunate effect throughout Latin America.

WINDFALL PROFITS FROM GOVERNMENT LOANS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, an article appeared in today's Wall Street Journal entitled "Four Builders Have Agreed Tentatively To Return Over $1 Million in Windfall Profits."

I think the present officials of the FHA should be commended for establishing a policy which might well mean the return of millions of dollars to the Federal Treasury.

Some question has been raised that perhaps the distribution of these unwarranted or so-called windfall profits was not actually a violation of any law, but no question has been raised that they were morally wrong.

As an enforcement measure, the Government can and should refuse to recognize any of these individuals or groups having received such windfall profits from future consideration of Government loans or Government-guaranteed mortgages in future building operations until such time as that builder or builders has restored to the Government all of their ill-begotten gains.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article published in today's Wall Street Journal, together with my letter of December 8, 1954, to Mr. Norman Mason and his reply thereto under date of December 15.

There being no objection, the article and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of January 14, 1955]

Four builders have agreed tentatively to return over $1 million in windfall profits.

So disclosed Frank Meistrell, General Counsel of the Federal Housing Administra-

tion, in testimony before the House Appropriations Committee. Names of the builders were not revealed.

Meistrell said there are very good grounds for recovering a further substantial amount of the hundreds of millions of dollars involved. He also reported evidence of possible fraud and corruption in the program.

Builders and promoters got windfall profits when they obtained Government-insured loans greater than their actual costs and pocketed the difference.

DECEMBER 8, 1954.

MR. NORMAN P. MASON,
Commissioner, Federal Housing Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MASON: I was very much concerned to read in last night's paper the announcement that you had cleared about 25 builders who had made windfall profits as eligible for new FHA-insured loans on the basis that their windfalls had not been too substantial. I do note, however, in this morning's paper that upon the request of the Department of Justice you have canceled this order.

It is my opinion that any blanket forgiveness of such practices that were condoned under the previous administration cannot be justified. I would suggest a better policy would be to publicly announce that any builder who had received such windfall profits in prior years, even though no criminal prosecution is involved, would still be required to pay back either direct to the Government or to the corporation against which the Government holds liens, all funds siphoned out of the company as windfall profits, and that the further requirements be made that no distribution of windfall profits be made until after the mortgagor to the Federal Government has been fully paid. To adopt any other policy would have the appearance of condoning that which we have all condemned up to this time.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington D. C., December 15, 1954.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I wish to acknowledge and thank you for your letter of December 8, 1954, regarding the efforts being made to recover windfall profits and to find some satisfactory basis upon which certain building firms and individuals on the so-called windfall list may be permitted to again have access to the benefits of FHA insurance.

It is gratifying to me that your views in this matter seem so nearly identical with my own views. Our procedure is to carefully review each case and to discuss with the particular firm or individual the actions which must be taken for the protection of the Government's interest. This may include the payment back to the corporation of any windfall profits which have been distributed. Our objective is, of course, to effect savings in rent for the occupants of these rental projects if possible, while at the same time effecting the maximum possible recovery through reduction of the Government's risk.

As you know, there are a very large number of firms and individuals involved, and a few of them have indicated their desire to approach the entire matter with a cooperative attitude. It is only in such instances where infractions are remedied that resumption of business relations will be permitted.

I certainly agree with you that any offenders who refuse to work with the FHA in its efforts to reduce the Government's risk should be refused the benefits of participation in the FHA program, and I am pleased that you wrote to me as you did.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN P. MASON,
Commissioner.

END OF BULK-MAIL EXPERIMENT

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I congratulate Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield for ordering an end to the bulk-mail experiment for unaddressed letters and advertisements.

For many months several of us in the Congress have objected to the unaddressed-mail system which General Summerfield inaugurated on August 21, 1953. We urged that it was a costly and burdensome system—unfair to the post-office patrons whose boxes were stuffed with the mail, and unfair to the post-office employees who bore the brunt of the additional work.

General Summerfield is to be congratulated on recognizing the mistake and the unsatisfactory result of this order. It is commendable that he has discontinued the practice, and I only wish that his order could be amended to become effective at a date earlier than March 31, 1955, the date now planned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, entitled "Mail Nuisance Ended," and the Post Office Department release of December 30, 1954, announcing this change, be printed at the end of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial and the release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat]

MAIL NUISANCE ENDED

The Post Office Department's 15-month-old junk-mail delivery experiment should have been called off long ago.

But at last, under pressure of irate Congressmen needled by overburdened constituents, Postmaster General Summerfield has decreed it is to end next March 31. Presumably the unhappily distant deadline was set in order to give users of the unaddressed mailing system ample opportunity to compile specific address lists.

This scatter-shot plan for the cost-benefit of a relatively few large direct-mail advertisers was an unfair burden on the mail carriers, on householders, and on the Post Office Department's financial plight.

There is reasonable question, too, whether the advertisers' loss in public goodwill did not cancel out the saving in expense of individual addressing.

Also, as a matter of ethics does a junk mailer have a moral right to use a distribution system designed to serve individuals, to invade a house whose tenant he has not gone to the trouble even to identify? Especially when the recipient cannot stop it except by ordering all mail stopped?

The junk-mail nuisance is well rid of; sooner than March 31 if possible.

[Post Office Department Release]

Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield today announced that city and village delivery of simplified address mail, established on an experimental basis 15 months ago, will be discontinued effective midnight March 31, 1955.

The extension of simplified address mail to city and village delivery was started by the Post Office Department on August 21, 1953, in an effort to reduce the huge losses incurred in handling third-class mail and to provide an additional service to the public. The results have not satisfactorily met these objectives and the only possible solution is increased postage rates, which will be sought in the next session of the Congress.

City and village delivery of simplified address mail which is to be discontinued on next March 31 gave mailers the privilege of omitting names and street addresses from circulars and other mail matter and using the designations "Householder," "Patron," or "Box Holder" as addresses.

This elimination of simplified address mail from city and village delivery service does not affect the delivery of simplified address mail on rural routes or to boxholders at post offices where no city or village delivery service is available. This service has been in effect since October 1934.

Neither does the decision announced today by the Postmaster General affect the delivery on city or village routes of "Occupant" mail bearing no name but using a proper street address, which was inaugurated on October 12, 1934.

The Postmaster General's order discontinuing city and village delivery of simplified address mail, appearing in the next issue of the Postal Bulletin on January 4, 1955, will read as follows:

"City and village delivery of simplified address mail, which was established on an experimental basis on August 21, 1953, is discontinued, effective midnight March 31, 1955.

"Section 123.4 of the Postal Manual is amended to read as follows as of that date:

" '41. Style of address: Third-class mail intended for delivery to all patrons on a route or to all boxholders at a post office, not having city or village letter carrier service, may be addressed in one of the following styles on each piece: a. Rural or Star Route Boxholder, b. Post Office Boxholder.' "

HELLS CANYON DAM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, each day evidence accumulates to support construction of a high multipurpose Federal dam in Hells Canyon, on the Oregon-Idaho border.

For the past year the administration has been trying to distract attention from Hells Canyon by promoting projects which rely upon Canadian water sources or the use of Canadian soil.

Totally ignored by the administration has been the fact that Canada is one of the world's fastest-growing nations, needing all its own resources for legitimate expansion and development.

The Canadian resources department has now indicated that it might tap the flow of the upper Columbia in order to add to the power potentialities of the Fraser River, which is entirely within British Columbia. Such a step actually would diminish the power resources this administration often cites as a possible alternative to Hells Canyon. Let me point out, however, that it could have no effect on the Snake River system, where is located Hells Canyon, and which is free of reliance on Canadian headwaters.

Furthermore, the national government of Canada at Ottawa has introduced legislation to prevent the use of Canadian water to generate power for factories in the United States, according to the New York Times of January 11, 1955.

Mr. President, I urge the Interior Department to abandon its ill-considered opposition to approval of a Federal dam in Hells Canyon. Such a dam has been recommended by the famous 308 Report of the Corps of Engineers, which is the

master plan for development of the Columbia Basin.

It is becoming increasingly apparent that western Canada will not encourage the diversion to the United States of its hydroelectric resources. Why, then, should the administration continue to promote Canadian projects as possible substitutes for Hells Canyon, which is within our own borders and available to us immediately, if only we authorize the project for Federal construction?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks a thoughtful editorial from the Oregonian, of Portland, of January 10, 1955, a news dispatch from the New York Times of January 11, 1955, and an Associated Press item from the Seattle Daily Times of December 20, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of January 10, 1955]

DESIGNS ON THE COLUMBIA

The Columbia River is a mighty valuable property, about half of which belongs to Canada and half to the United States. The Northwest States have been regarding with a fishy eye recurrent proposals that Columbia waters be diverted at the mouth or elsewhere, via a plastic tube or a big ditch, to thirsty California. But it comes as somewhat of a shock that the Dominion of Canada may also have designs on Columbia waters which normally would feed the powerplants and irrigated croplands of Oregon and Washington.

The far-ranging Christian Science Monitor reports that the Government at Ottawa has announced it will study the feasibility of diverting surplus water from the Columbia River to the Thompson River, which comes within 7 miles of the Columbia west of Revelstoke, British Columbia. The Thompson is a lusty tributary of the mighty Fraser. The linking of the Columbia and the Fraser, to divert floodwaters westward through British Columbia instead of storing them on the Columbia for hydroelectric use downstream in low-water periods, would be a project staggering in its effects.

While we have been guarding against a water raid from the south, our Canadian friends upstream have been thinking of cutting us down at the source.

The Monitor suggests that the Canadian Government may not be willing to approve any of the Columbia River projects now being proposed in Canada until the engineers have given them the data on Columbia diversion to the Fraser. These include the United States Federal project at Libby, on the Kootenai, a tributary of the Columbia, which would back water into Canada and requires approval of the International Joint Commission; Henry Kaiser's proposal to dam lower Arrow Lake, to increase production of United States dams downstream; and the gigantic Mica Creek project above Arrow Lakes which would provide both at-site power and downstream benefits.

There is a United States-Canada treaty of 1909 on regulation of the Columbia River. But it seems to be the presumption of the Ottawa Government that it would not hinder the diversion of excess or flood waters to the Fraser. Such diversion would, of course, result in less complete use of the Columbia than long-range planners in this country have envisaged. A project of this nature might also put a severe strain on the amicable relations which have existed between the two countries, and which have been encouraged by the British Columbia government which, unlike Ottawa, is not opposed to export of power.

British Columbia officials have beer. urging project clearance, financial aid from the United States, and early starts on upper Columbia projects in the Province. They are not worried about exporting power or water. Not so the Canadian Government. In an address before the Pacific Northwest Trade Association at Spokane in November 1953, Gen. A. G. L. McNaughton, chairman of the Canadian section of the International Joint Commission, concluded some remarks on Canadian-United States disagreements over Libby and other dams with this comment: "Please do not think * * * there is going to be power in Canada which will be surplus and to spare. This is certainly not the case, for the most carefully made predictions show that only a comparatively short time remains until we may expect that all our economically available hydro power will be in use."

The Canadian study of feasibility of diverting Columbia waters to strengthen the Fraser as a power producer should not, of course, send the United States into a frantic hunt for means to retaliate by diverting the Pend Oreille and Kootenai Rivers, which cross into Canada, mostly to our benefit. Nor should it bring relaxation of Federal efforts to get agreement on Libby or other projects. It should, however, put additional emphasis on the need for a quick formula for construction of John Day Dam as the immediate next step in Columbia hydropower use. Dams in Canada for United States benefit, including Libby, may not be realized soon, if ever.

[From the New York Times of January 11, 1955]

CANADA OPPOSES DAM—BILL WOULD BAR USE OF HER WATER FOR POWER IN UNITED STATES PLANTS

OTTAWA, January 10.—The Canadian Government introduced legislation today to prevent the use of Canadian water to generate power for factories in the United States. The bill specifies that a Federal lease is necessary for any construction affecting the natural flow of an international river.

What provoked the Government's action was a proposal before the Provincial Government of British Columbia to dam the Arrow Lakes section of the Columbia River. The dam was to be constructed in Canada to provide power for an aluminum smelter in the United States.

Similar proposals have been made for damming the waters of rivers in the northwest territories for smelters in Alaska.

The Federal Government is becoming more and more conscious of its natural resources and is determined to protect them.

[From the Seattle Times of December 20, 1954]

DIVERSION FROM COLUMBIA MAY BOOST FRASER

OTTAWA, December 20.—The Canadian Resources Department will conduct an investigation next summer into the economic feasibility of diverting flood water for hydroelectric power from the Columbia River into the Fraser River system in British Columbia.

Resources Minister Jean Lesage, announcing the investigation today, said it will complement studies being made by the International Joint Commission on the Power Potentialities of the Columbia River Basin of Canada and the United States.

EXTRA POWER POSSIBLE

It has been estimated, Lesage said, that several billion kilowatt hours of additional power could be produced annually by a diversion from the Columbia to the Fraser.

The diversion would be made at the Columbia's "big bend," where the northwest-flowing river turns south toward the United States border. Seven miles from the bend is Summit Lake, the origin of the Eagle and South Thompson Rivers. Water diverted to the lake would flow down them and into the Fraser.

STORAGE FACILITIES LACKING

"Owing to the lack of complete storage and control facilities," the minister said, "a large amount of the flood water of the Columbia cannot now be used for power or other purposes.

"If a dam were constructed below the big bend of the Columbia, with control facilities in the vicinity of Revelstoke, it might be possible to use the waters thus stored for the production of power on the adjoining Fraser River."

DOCTORING OF TRANSCRIPT OF NEWS CONFERENCE

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in today's Washington Daily News there appears as a lead story an interesting article written by an enterprising, industrious, and reliable reporter, Morris Cunningham, under the headline "Admiral Strauss Doctored Transcript." News of such alteration of the official record appeared in the Memphis Commercial Appeal on January 8, 1955. Thereafter there appeared an editorial in the Memphis Commercial Appeal entitled "Chicanery in High Places."

I ask unanimous consent that the article appearing in the Washington Daily News of today, and the editorial appearing in the Memphis Commercial Appeal of January 10, 1955, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of January 14, 1955]

ADMIRAL STRAUSS DOCTORED TRANSCRIPT

(By Morris Cunningham)

By doctoring the transcript of a recent news conference the Atomic Energy Commission under Chairman Lewis L. Strauss has gone into the business of rewriting history.

The conference was held by Admiral Strauss December 17 in which he said the Army Corps of Engineers had approved the site of the Dixon-Yates plant.

The statement was not true and the Engineers Corps protested.

It's surprising that a man in such close communion with the Dixon-Yates deal as Admiral Strauss would offer the assertion to a roomful of newsmen as a statement of fact.

But the surprises did not end there.

The morning after Admiral Strauss' news conference, Maj. Gen. Bernard L. Robinson, Acting Chief of the Engineers Corps phoned this writer a categorical denial that Army engineers had approved the site.

Had Admiral Strauss been quoted accurately?

CHECKED TRANSCRIPT

Morse Salisbury, AEC Information Chief, allowed this writer and another reporter to inspect a carbon copy of a transcript of the admiral's news conference.

The transcript revealed this statement by Admiral Strauss:

"There has been some discussion of whether it was wise to have put the plant there in the first place. The Corps of Engineers and engineers retained by the sponsoring companies have examined some 16 sites on the river and have selected this as the preferable one.

"This elevation here [pointing to a chart] shows the maximum flood record in the river, the 1937 flood. I understand that records have been made since 1880, or thereabouts, some 74 years of record, and the plant has

been located at what the Corps of Engineers feel is a safe place."

Last week—almost a month later—the AEC quietly distributed printed copies of what purports to be an accurate stenographic transcript of the conference.

On page 10 there is this version of what Admiral Strauss is purported to have said about the approval of the site:

"There has been some discussion of whether it was wise to have put the plant there in the first place. Engineers retained by the sponsoring companies have examined some 16 sites on the river and have selected this as the preferable one.

"This elevation here shows the maximum flood record in the river, the 1937 flood, I understand that records have been made since 1880 or thereabouts, some 74 years of record, and the plant has been located at what our AEC engineers, after discussions with the Memphis District Office Corps of Engineers, and review of the date, feel is the best place."

The revised version eliminates Admiral Strauss' statement that the site was approved by the Corps of Engineers.

NO FOOTNOTES

The changes were made in the printed version without any footnotes or other indications of revision.

The fact is that the Army Corps of Engineers not only has not approved the site, but in fact did not even receive an application for construction of the plant until last week.

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal of January 10, 1955]

CHICANERY IN HIGH PLACES

On December 11 newspapermen heard Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, say Army engineers have approved location of proposed Dixon-Yates powerplant.

K. D. Nichols was present and kept silent as Mr. Strauss spoke. Mr. Nichols, now AEC manager, has been an Army engineer general. He must have known how extraordinary it would have been if the Army engineers had advised Dixon-Yates to build anything anywhere.

As a matter of plain fact, the Army engineers had neither approved nor been asked to approve the site. The first connection of the Corps of Engineers with Dixon-Yates came nearly a month after the Strauss incident, when approval was asked for a part of the plans involving only the coal unloading and cooling water structures in the river.

Highest officials of the Engineer Corps protested strongly when they learned what Mr. Strauss had said.

A stenographic transcript made by the AEC showed that Mr. Strauss had said the Corps of Engineers took part in selecting the site as the best of 16 examined. He went further, according to the stenographic record, to say that after looking at flood records the Corps of Engineers considered the site to be safe.

But the AEC has now published its record of what was said and the Corps of Engineers has strangely disappeared from the remarks about examining 16 sites and choosing the West Memphis location.

The record has been doctored.

Who did the doctoring?

PRODUCTION OF WAR MATERIALS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Malone Report Proves United States Is a 'Have' Nation," published in the Tampa (Fla.) Daily Times of Monday, January 10, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Tampa Daily Times of January 10, 1955]

MALONE REPORT PROVES UNITED STATES IS A "HAVE" NATION

A little publicized report by Senator GEORGE W. MALONE's Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels reveals that the Western Hemisphere can be turned into a powerful fortress, containing all the necessary raw materials to feed a war machine.

This important finding destroys a long-held concept that the United States is a "have-not" Nation. Here is what Senator MALONE has to say about the significance of his subcommittee's study:

"For nearly a score of years our domestic and foreign policy has been based on the assumption that we are a 'have-not' Nation, dependent on the Old World for almost all our critical minerals and materials. This report completely shatters that theory. It proves conclusively that there is no remote possibility that this Nation, together with the Western Hemisphere, will or can exhaust its resources of critical materials at any time in the foreseeable future."

Thus, the United States and its friends in the Western Hemisphere are independent and can exist without counting on the Old World for a single critical item.

This finding supports an argument frequently offered in the Times editorial columns for greater emphasis on our ties with Latin America and less concern with the wavering, unpredictable, and often stagnant European countries.

The Malone subcommittee has accomplished a tremendous and tedious task in digesting 10 volumes of published testimony and summing it up in less than 390 pages. It is to be congratulated for developing the facts which prove the New World is in itself self-sufficient and destroying the old myth that overseas ties must be maintained at all costs.

Some of the subcommittee recommendations suggest:

1. Close cooperation between all nations of the Western Hemisphere, the only dependable source of necessary critical war materials.

2. Elimination of the Nation's present dependency upon remote and possibly unfriendly or neutral areas of the world for critical materials.

3. Stimulation of production by increased depletion allowances.

The subcommittee report goes on to outline a positive program of action to insure a wealth of critical materials in the event the Western Hemisphere must become a fortress.

One of the key findings of the report is stated simply and directly:

"Since the testimony of competent witnesses indicates that the Western Hemisphere will be the only dependable source of critical war materials in the event of an all-out war, it is imperative to the security of this Nation and to the nations of the Western Hemisphere that we and they foster the greatest measure of self-sufficiency in the production of such materials and continually study all possible devices that will encourage the hemispheric production in this vital field."

This means a closer working agreement with the Latin American countries and greater development of our own resources and less dependence upon those of overseas producers.

It is vitally important that the findings and recommendations of the Malone subcommittee be recognized early and applied as speedily as possible.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, Senate Report No. 1627 published on July 9, 1954, was the result of Senate Resolution 143, first session of the 83d Congress directing the committee to determine the accessibility of critical materials in time of war, for our expanding economy and for our security.

The committee determined that the Western Hemisphere can be defended and that it can be made self-sufficient in the production of the necessary critical materials to fight a war or live in peace.

HENRY W. TEMPLE

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I have the sad duty of announcing to the Senate the passing of Henry W. Temple, a distinguished Pennsylvanian who served for 20 years as a Representative in Congress.

Dr. Temple was, for many years, my good friend and neighbor in my home town of Washington, Pa. He died Tuesday morning, January 11, in his 91st year.

In his long and honorable career Dr. Temple gained distinction in varied activities.

As a clergyman he was a spiritual leader of strength and power. As an educator he gave many generations of students a clear insight into the science of government, and inspired them with patriotic devotion to the principles of Americanism. As a public servant he gave the Nation the benefit of his wise statesmanship and his scholarly attainments as a foremost authority on international affairs.

He served in the National Guard of Pennsylvania as chaplain of the old 10th Pennsylvania Infantry, my old regiment, in which I began my own military career.

Dr. Temple was a kindly man, always ready with wise counsel and advice for those who sought his guidance. He was held in the highest esteem by his fellow citizens, who looked upon him with love and affection as the grand old man of Washington, Pa.

Dr. Temple was born in Ohio, and came into Pennsylvania as a young man to attend Geneva College at Beaver Falls. Upon his graduation he studied for the ministry at the Covenanter Theological Seminary. For a number of years he served as pastor of churches at Baxter, Leechburg, and Washington.

He had long been interested in the study of history and government, and in 1898 he joined the faculty of Washington and Jefferson College as professor of political science.

In 1912 he was prevailed upon to be a candidate for Congress on the Progressive-Republican, or Bull Moose, ticket and was elected to the 63d Congress. He was unsuccessful as a candidate to succeed himself, but was elected to the 64th Congress to fill a vacancy. He was reelected as a Republican to the 65th Congress, and to seven succeeding Congresses.

During his service in Congress Dr. Temple rose to the chairmanship of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, where his comprehensive knowledge of foreign

affairs and his untiring devotion to duty made him one of the strong leaders of Congress.

Upon his retirement to private life in 1933, he rejoined the faculty of Washington and Jefferson College, continuing his association with world affairs as Professor of International Relations.

Pennsylvania honors Dr. Temple as one who devoted a lifetime to the service of his fellowman. He exemplified in full measure the highest qualities of Christian character and statesmanship.

Pennsylvania mourns his passing as a great loss to the State and the Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial published in the Washington Reporter of January 11, 1955, and an editorial published in the Washington Observer of recent date.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (Pa.) Reporter of January 11, 1955]

DR. HENRY W. TEMPLE

Dr. Henry W. Temple, minister of the Gospel, educator, statesman, first citizen of Washington, and a friendly man, is dead.

When death closed his eyes early this morning in his home in Locust Avenue it brought to an end a career that spanned many decades of challenging and exhilarating progress in the life of this Nation and the world, a program in which Dr. Temple played no mean part.

Born while the North and the South were locked in bitter combat, Dr. Temple watched with observant eyes and a receptive mind the rapid growth of the Nation—which was yet trying to find its place in the sun—and his part in helping shape that growth, congeal the thinking of the people by sincerely and authoritatively giving of the best of his knowledge to young men, in and out of college, as they mapped the start of their own careers, is beyond price.

Dr. Temple was a man of sincere and deep Christian beliefs and he approached and overcame all problems with which he and the Nation were faced in that attitude. He was a whole man in all respects, a friendly man, a man who believed in and practiced the Christian concept of the dignity and worth of the individual, and he did not allow his perspective to become clouded. In short, associating and knowing the great of the Nation and of Europe he was the same man who climbed the steps to the pulpit, stood before his college classes, or gave wise counsel to the many who sought his advice.

As a minister and an educator he left an impression on this community and on Washington and Jefferson College in particular which will live long after him. Because of him and his influence Washington is a better place in which to live and those who sat in his congregation and those who studied under him, scattered as they are today, carry with them some portion of the innate goodness and kindliness of the man.

Dr. Temple loved the simple things of life and he was thrilled by the magnificence of nature. He was a man who enjoyed good talk and one of his passions was the exchange of ideas with his fellow men, particularly on current events and as they affected life and the living of it throughout the world.

An acknowledged authority on international affairs, he saw the people of other nations as potentially neighbors and friends, struggling to attain the finer things of life, and it was in that attitude that he approached the many problems which were his and his colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House.

In Dr. Temple was combined to an amazing extent those qualities which we look for and expect in our leaders and with it all he was a man of the people, interested in and closely attuned to his home, his family and friends who never talked with him but that they left with a lift to their spirits and renewed courage for the tasks with which they were faced.

Humble and forthright in his dealings with his fellow men the stamp of greatness was about him and could be and was felt by all who were privileged to know him and rejoice in that association.

A man who kept his feet always on a solid foundation composed of the eternal truths, he was progressive in his thinking, realized that life does move on, that each generation builds on the past. He approved of progress and lent it his assistance, but above all, he urged retention of the simple things which guided men in the right direction.

One of the activities in which he played a leading role and in which he exhibited a humble pride was acquisition of vast stretches of scenic land which today are known as the Shenandoah and Great Smokies Parks. He was but true to himself when he led this campaign because he was doing something for his fellow man and in that he exhibited his inherent greatness.

Another loved face has left us, but his memory and the effect of his good works will be ours to enrich our lives.

A man died this morning.

[From the Washington (Pa.) Observer]

LEADING CITIZEN OF COMMUNITY DIES

Washington's leading citizen is dead.

For more than 60 years Dr. Henry W. Temple stood foremost among the religious, political, educational, and civic leaders of the entire country.

He came to Washington as minister of one of the town's largest churches.

That job was not big enough for a man of his caliber, and in a few years he moved up—to a college classroom, where his character and pronounced ability as an educator made a profound influence on a generation of students at Washington and Jefferson.

Then he moved up again. This time he was called by the God he had served as minister and educator to become one of the Nation's foremost legislators. He was elected to a seat in the National House of Representatives, and be it said to the credit of his humility, no one was more surprised at his election than was he.

In Congress he soon became known as the Nation's foremost authority on foreign and international affairs. The history he had been teaching to his students had educated him, and had given him a knowledge of what was going on in the world that was unmatched. And for a score of years he was one of the most respected men in Congress, both because of his outstanding character and integrity and because of his knowledge and leadership in legislative matters.

Not since the death of Dr. Temple's close friend, Dr. James David Moffatt, who also served the college and the community for many years, has Washington had another man whose entire life has exerted such an influence for good and for intellectual and spiritual advance.

Dr. Temple will be missed. Even in the evening years of his life, when he was more or less invalid, he exerted an influence on the life of this city which was good. That influence has been exerted through churches, college classes, and through individual contacts.

CENTENNIAL OF YWCA

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in New York, on Tuesday, January 11, 1955, at the YWCA centennial inaugural luncheon at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, our Secretary of State, Hon. John Foster Dulles, made a memorable address. Because of the importance of the address, and because of world tensions, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PEACE WE SEEK

(Address by the Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, at the YWCA centennial inaugural luncheon, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel; New York, N. Y., Tuesday, January 11, 1955)

I should like to talk with you about peace. "Peace" is one of the most beautiful and honored words of our language. However, the word has been so tarnished and besmirched by Soviet Communist propaganda that today, in their mouths, it is scarcely recognizable.

It is time that we rescue this great word from that undeserved fate and proclaim true peace throughout the lands.

Peace is a word which is rich in its meaning. It implies an absence of violence and warfare. But there is much more to it than that. It also implies the inner tranquillity which comes to those who are enabled to pursue happiness and develop their God-given possibilities of body, mind, and soul.

To the orthodox Communists, on the other hand, peace is a negative, barren concept. It means a state of enforced conformity where all men think alike, believe alike, and act in accordance with a pattern imposed by their rulers, who constitute what they call a dictatorship of the proletariat.

If that system of conformity can be made worldwide, then, they argue, there will be an end to war. Thus, in the name of peace they seek to extend their power throughout the world.

One thing is clear about this kind of peace: the international Communists cannot establish it without first resorting to war. This they admit. Of course, they use propaganda, subversion, and menaces to soften up others in the hope that they will give in without resistance. That is their peace offensive. But they foresee that many will never peacefully accept their rule. So Lenin taught, and Stalin agreed, that a series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states will be inevitable.

The fanatical Communists believe that the end result—a world of total conformity—justifies these frightful means. And rulers who are moved by a primitive lust for power find it convenient to cloak their ambitions in such a doctrinal garb.

When we hear talk of peace from the Communist camp, we must always look behind this talk to the nature of the Communist system. It is not a peace system but a force system, for only force can suppress the aspirations of men's souls. Individuals yearn to do what will satisfy them, not their masters. They want themselves to implement the protective love which binds together the family unit. They want to commune with that higher Power whom throughout the ages men have revered as God, and to feel that they do His bidding. Only under coercion do they accept a system which repudiates love of family, love of country, love of God, and which treats men as bits of matter. That is not peace. Yet this is the false concept of peace with

which the Communists load their heaviest propaganda guns.

The God-fearing peoples want peace. But they seek it by using, not suppressing, men's finest qualities. They know that society needs rules of conduct which promote harmony. But they find that the source of those rules is primarily moral or natural law, which is not manmade, and that the sanction for those rules is primarily a voluntary subjection to moral law, and not the arbitrary imposition of a police state.

It is, of course, immensely difficult to preserve both peace and freedom. Nevertheless, we need not feel hopeless. Every year bears its harvest of events which show that the goal we seek is not beyond human capacity to attain.

During the past year there have been many acts of peace. One was the settlement between Great Britain and Egypt of the Suez Base controversy. Two years ago I was in that area. Warfare was close to breaking out. Indeed, both sides were planning for that contingency. Nevertheless, counsels of moderation prevailed. The method of patient negotiation was followed, and finally a solution was found. It involved concessions by both of the parties. But today there is peace in the true sense, and we can hope that that example will extend its benign influence throughout that distraught near-eastern area.

A similar peace was made between Italy and Yugoslavia with relation to Trieste. Here again deep national feelings seemed to conflict to a degree which permitted of no peaceful solution. A point was reached where both sides were moving troops toward the danger zone. But again the processes of negotiation and diplomacy were invoked. Each side exercised moderation and made concessions, with the result that a true peace has been achieved. We are entitled to hope that this peace, too, will spread its influence, so that the south European area will gain unity and strength to replace divisive weakness.

The Manila Conference of last September drew together colonial and anticolonial nations. Yet out of that conference emerged the Pacific Charter, in which the nations of the West joined with the nations of the East to proclaim in ringing terms the basic right of all peoples to self-government and independence.

Also, during the past year a new start was made in Western Europe toward ending the national differences which for generations have led to recurrent wars. These wars have steadily grown in scope and intensity. They have so depleted Europe's human, material, and moral strength that for the first time western civilization can be seriously challenged by an atheistic system.

It is indeed a shocking thing that Western Europe, which has long been the cradle of Christian civilization, should also for so long have been the principal cockpit of war.

To end that situation, the European Defense Community was conceived. It would have integrated permanently those forces which, in separation, have been hostile. When that failed of adoption, this same purpose was transferred to the present plan for Western European union.

There are some who treat this project as merely a device to rearm the Germans. That is belittling almost to the point of absurdity. Of course, Germans, like all self-respecting people, have the right and duty to contribute to international peace and security. That, however, is but a byproduct of the great conception of bringing the countries of Western Europe into a relationship so close and so permanent that it is inconceivable that they again should fight each other. The real issue is: Shall the peoples of Europe be content to go on living in a political structure which has been the world's worst fire hazard or will they build something better?

The new arrangements naturally encounter resistance. That is always the case when great deeds are done. The project for Federal union in this country encountered opposition and in several States the margin of approval was meager and precarious. So it will be in Europe. But we can have good hope that this great act of peace will be consummated through the indispensable contribution, by French and Germans, of tolerance, self-restraint, and vision.

The United Nations during this past year played a notable part in serving, as its charter prescribes, as a center for harmonizing the actions of nations. We eagerly await the return from China of its Secretary General and his report on the outcome of a United Nations mission which critically involves issues of humanity and justice. Our own Nation makes its contribution to the peaceful settlement of these issues by heeding the Biblical injunction to be slow to anger.

I could go on to multiply the proofs of man's capacity to build true peace. Last year was enriched by them. A cataloging is, however, unnecessary. You know, as I know, that peace in the lofty sense of that word is in fact within man's reach. The limiting factor is not impossibility but the lack of well-directed effort and sacrifice which could turn the possible into the actual.

The hard fact is that while throughout the ages men have longed for peace, they have seldom worked for it in a serious, intelligent, and sustained way. It is indeed shocking to contrast what men do in time of war to win victory and what they do in time of peace to prevent new war.

When we are at war, the Nation unites and every mature citizen stands ready to respond to the call of duty. No sacrifice, even that of life itself, seems too great. Yet, when there is peace, men often think that it is sufficient to turn the task over to a few professionals and to hope, and perhaps to pray, that they will succeed. I do not minimize the value of those hopes and particularly of those prayers. They powerfully sustain those who carry heavy burdens. But in every country there is desperate need for greater willingness to make the national sacrifices which may be required for peace.

There will never be permanent peace so long as men and nations reserve for war their greatest effort, their most sacrificial endeavor.

In this country there is a vast urge for peace. We ended the fighting in Korea. We are helping, in partnership with others, to develop collective security throughout the free world. We shall, I hope, follow enlightened economic policies such as those President Eisenhower recommended yesterday. We extend good offices to promote acts of peace elsewhere, such as those I have mentioned and many others.

Perhaps never before has any nation done so much for peace. Our record is good, as judged by the past. But the past provides no proper standard. There is still too much complacency. Winning peace is a desperate struggle against an enemy—the war system—which so far has never been permanently defeated. Today that system is in fact sponsored by greater military power than has ever before existed.

This struggle for peace cannot be won by pacifism or by neutralism or by weakness. These methods have been tried and they have failed. Aggression is deterred only by an evident will and capacity to fight for rights more precious than is a debasing peace.

But also, peace cannot be won by truculence or by intolerance, without or within. Peace has to be planned as a campaign in which many factors are weighed. It is a campaign in which it may be necessary to strive even when success may be improbable, and to accept occasional reverses. Indeed, to deter war and to save peace we may have to be ready to fight, if need be, and to have the resources and the allies to assure that an aggressor would surely be defeated.

In all of this the nations which truly want peace should be able to enlist the individual and collective support of their people.

To achieve true peace is, I know, a deep concern of the Young Women's Christian Association. You have grown in strength and vigor for now 100 years. But the tasks before you remain great and ever more imperative.

Therefore, I am grateful for this opportunity to bring to you this message—a message of hope, but also a message of deep urgency.

THE FEDERAL BUDGET

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I recently made regarding the balancing of the budget.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

I regard Secretary Humphrey as one of the ablest men who has ever guided the Treasury, but I am very much disappointed in his statement that there is no prospect of balancing the budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1955.

This means that we will then start the 23d deficit year in the past 26. It is time that the administration and the Congress face up to the reality of our fiscal situation. Since the deficit spending began we have increased the Federal debt from $16 billion to approximately $280 billion.

No prospect is now held out that the budget will be brought into balance this year or next. We are enjoying the greatest prosperity in our history. We are not engaged in war. If we cannot balance the budget now, I ask when can we balance it? Are we on a chronic deficit basis?

During the period of this deficit spending we have accumulated astronomical debt. Our children and future generations must pay the interest, and some day they will have to pay the principal. Meanwhile, deficit spending has been the main factor in reducing the purchase power of the American dollar from 100 cents in 1942 to 52 cents today.

The foremost plank in President Eisenhower's campaign was the promise of a balanced budget. A reduction of 7 percent in Government spending this year would place our financial affairs on a pay-as-you-go basis without increasing taxes. In the third year of his administration it is time that he fulfilled his campaign pledge.

We have given away $40 billion to foreign nations, all of which has been added to the public debt. The first thing we should do is to eliminate economic aid to other countries, all of which have smaller debts than ours. Few will deny that there is opportunity for retrenchment by the elimination of waste and extravagance in every single activity of the Government.

If we continue to play Santa Claus to our people at home and half of the world abroad, we can expect nothing but collapse of our currency with all of its terrible consequences.

The private-enterprise system is based upon the principle that the people support the Government and not the Government the people.

APPOINTMENT OF SENATORS TO FILL VACANCIES ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to make some announcements.

By request of the Vice President and upon the recommendation and nomination of the majority leader, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is appointed to the vacancy existing on the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

By request of the Vice President and upon the recommendation and nomination of the majority leader, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is appointed to the vacancy existing on the Select Committee on Small Business.

By request of the Vice President and upon the recommendation and nomination of the majority leader, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is appointed to the vacancy existing on the Select Committee on Small Business.

By request of the Vice President and upon the recommendation and nomination of the majority leader, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] is appointed to the vacancy existing on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

FIRST REPORT OF ACTIVITIES UNDER AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on Monday the President of the United States transmitted a report of activities under Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. Public Law 480, authorized by the last Congress, with full bipartisan support, provided for the sale of $700 million worth of surplus farm products for foreign currencies, and for gifts of $300 million worth of farm products over a 3-year period.

The sale of farm products for foreign currencies, as provided in the act, was a new and unchartered course. Therefore, we provided in the law that the President should report to the Congress at least once each 6 months, and at such other times as seemed appropriate. The report—House Document No. 62—transmitted to us on Monday was the first of these reports. It deserves close consideration.

The finding of constructive uses for the accumulation of farm surpluses was a challenge to the 83d Congress. The Congress met that challenge by the bipartisan enactment of Public Law 480. The President's report on activities under Public Law 480 for the first 6 months suggests to me that, with some rather minor changes, we can use for constructive purposes, and in a dignified and businesslike manner, through Public Law 480, a limited amount of surpluses.

I was a cosponsor of this important enactment, and I have followed very closely the operations under it. I wish to comment briefly on the President's report and the operations, to date, under Public Law 480, as I see them.

SALES OF FARM PRODUCTS

The President's report revealed that sales of $453 million worth of farm products, including shipping costs, have already been negotiated or are in the process of being negotiated. Of this amount, it is estimated that 43 percent will be used for grains, principally wheat; and 28 percent for cotton. This would increase wheat exports by one-third over those of last year.

The allocation of the funds among commodities seems reasonable, except that I view with great disappointment, as I am sure you do, Mr. President, the fact that such a paltry amount is to be used for dairy products. United States prices on dairy products should be very attractive to foreign buyers when payment can be made in their own currencies. I think this body should determine the specific reasons why dairy products are not being sold under this program. It is regrettable that certain nonbasic farm products which are in a serious position were not even made eligible for sale under this program. I am sure I state the intent of this body when I say that Public Law 480 was intended to alleviate serious surplus problems, regardless of whether the products were actually owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation. It may be well for us to give some attention to a clearer definition of the commodities which should be made available for sale under Public Law 480.

Because of the uncertainties when the act was written, it authorized the sale of $700 million worth of farm products over a 3-year period. There was no limitation on the amount which could be used during the first year. Arbitrarily a ceiling of $453 million was set for the first year, and that amount was committed during the first 4 months of operation. The $453 million worth of sales represents Commodity Credit Corporation investments. The market values represented in the sales, therefore, will amount to only approximately $350 million.

We drafted the bill in such a way that we assumed the $700 million would be committed as rapidly as possible within the safeguards provided. We hoped to avoid the past paternal practice of arbitrarily doling out allocations of the funds by countries. We hoped funds would be available to all friendly countries, who could thereby increase their total imports of farm products in exchange for an equivalent value to the United States.

I understand that offers to buy, from countries with whom agreements have been made, have been reduced; and I further understand that offers from other countries, which might otherwise qualify, have been denied, in order to keep within this arbitrary ceiling. Now that some experience has been accumulated, we may suggest that the authority be increased and the intent clarified.

USE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES

One of the most important aspects of the implementation of the law is the use made by our Government of the foreign currencies which accrue from the sale of farm products. It is too early to give a statistical summary on the use of the foreign currencies which under this program accrue to the United States. However, it may be well to reemphasize that "the agricultural trade development" in the title of the act was to apply to title I, and it should be implemented in that sense. It has seemed to me that in Government quarters there is a strong tendency to use these currencies to supplement foreign-aid programs which were not authorized by the Congress.

Furthermore, if I understand the matter correctly, the National Advisory Council on Monetary and Advisory Problems decided that the foreign currencies should not be used for loans to promote multilateral trade, as the act provides. The funds are therefore used to promote nationalism and national self-sufficiency, which deaden trade. I hope this body will not be called upon to appropriate new funds for purposes which otherwise might have been provided for through the use of foreign currencies.

I believe it should be made clear that these foreign currencies, which cannot be used to buy or contract for materials for stockpiling or for the payment of United States obligations abroad, should be used as a revolving fund for making short-term loans to expand international trade and to promote economic development until they can be used for these purposes. Their use should emphasize expanding the total trade and production for trade of all free nations. I do understand that a rather large proportion of the currencies are being loaned to the governments for constructive purposes, on terms which protect the interest of the United States to the limits which could be reasonably expected, and that the currencies received by the United States in repayment of these loans may be used for any of the purposes provided in the act. This makes sense.

The actual mechanics for making sales under Public Law 480 have disturbed me somewhat. The negotiations for the sales are made by a committee representing many Government agencies. The businesslike sales aspects of the transactions become enmeshed with various elements of foreign aid and international political problems quite unrelated to marketing farm products. Private trade plays a subordinate role. It was the intent of the act to remove only the dollar shortage limitations on sales of surplus farm products abroad.

Mr. President, it was hoped that within the broad framework of negotiations covering the safeguards and uses of currencies provided in the act, such sales would be negotiated and consummated by private traders. This does not seem to be the case. I understand that each program must go through all the governmental machinery, largely dominated by the Department of State, and the private traders are engaged as little more than forwarders to deliver the products after the governments work out the details. It even goes beyond this. Before each sale can be made under the act, prior clearance must be obtained from each competing exporting nation. This clearance involves the consent of each

other exporting nation to the sale we propose to make and a statement that they do not wish to make the sale.

Almost every major competitor in the production of every major crop that I know of operates a government or quasi-government monopoly, and deals in various nonorthodox practices of trade and currency manipulations. The procedure for making "prior clearances" with competing exporting nations would be acceptable if it were reciprocal among competing exporters. That is, it would not be so bad if these competing exporters who indulge in government export monopolies, currency manipulations, and the acceptance of foreign currencies, asked for similar prior clearance from the United States.

Such reciprocity is certainly not in prospect, and it would be rather awkward in procedure. For the prior clearance on sales to apply only to the United States is humiliating and must certainly impair the prestige of the United States in the eyes of foreigners.

In our consideration of means for improvement in the operation of Public Law 480 it may be well for the Congress to consider the advisability of separating the administration of title I, the sales program, and title II, the giveaway program.

One approach to consider is that the sales program be handled largely through the Export-Import Bank of Washington. I should think that it would be possible to work out procedures with adequate safeguards to protect our markets and world prices through the Export-Import Bank of Washington. The bank might be authorized to make a special type of short-term loan, for the purpose of expanding imports of agricultural products to be repayable in foreign currency. It could be authorized that these currencies be made available for the purchase of basic materials for the United States stockpiles, or for payment of United States obligations abroad. If there were no materials available to purchase or contract for and no United States obligations, the bank could then use these currencies as a revolving fund for short-term loans to expand trade and to increase production for trade until the funds could be repatriated to the United States either directly or through other countries in materials or payment of United States foreign obligations. I hope this possibility will be carefully examined.

Title II of the act, dealing with giveaway, should be administered separately with adequate safeguards to protect agricultural markets. Reports have come to my attention which have alerted me to the dangers to the markets from indiscriminate giveaways. I believe we can all agree that it is not the place of the State Department to deal in business transactions. As I view it, it is beneath the dignity of the Department to do so; yet in the implementation of Public Law 480, the State Department has become embroiled in the minutest details of individual transactions. This matter should be looked into.

Mr. President, about $25 million of CCC capital will be spent this year under Public Law 480 to pay ocean freight in dollars, which might otherwise be paid in foreign currency, because of cargo preference for American-flag vessels. Let me make it clear that I do not oppose a subsidy to our merchant marine. The cargo-preference act has two important and adverse effects on agriculture.

First. It increases the delivered price of United States farm products sold under Public Law 480, or financed by the Export-Import Bank, by from $2 to $8 a ton. This is from 5 cents to 20 cents a bushel. This gives United States farm products a competitive handicap of that amount.

Second. It charges CCC, and therefore the farm program, with a subsidy to the merchant marine.

If the merchant marine needs a subsidy, I am in favor of it, but it should be a direct subsidy, not a subsidy at the expense of United States farm or industrial products, whose competitive position in world markets is handicapped by that subsidy. I feel certain that when we acted on the cargo-preference bill we did not realize the burden thereby imposed was to be borne so heavily by our agriculture. We may wish to reconsider and modify the act.

In summary, the President's first semiannual report on activities under Public Law 480 is gratifying to the sponsors. Its operation has had a stabilizing, rather than a disrupting, effect on world prices, because it revealed that the United States was to pursue an orderly program for liquidating surplus farm products. The President should be commended for getting the program off to such a fine start on this unchartered course. The shortcomings of the program that have come to light can be easily corrected. The farmers who expected Congress to use the surpluses for constructive purposes can be assured that it can be done, and we should assure them that it will be done.

I should like to present to the Senate detailed recommendations for making the necessary improvements and expanding the authorization after I have studied the operations further.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. When people become a little aggravated because the Government has not disposed of all surplus farm commodities within a short time, they should remember that the Schoeppel Act did not go into effect until the latter part of last summer; that it usually takes from 60 to 90 days to set up such a program; that certain problems had to be ironed out between the departments handling the program; and that perhaps there was an inherent desire on the part of one department or another department to look at the situation from the viewpoint of foreign countries as much as from the viewpoint of our own country.

However, I believe that the progress which has been made during the last 2 months under the Schoeppel Act, to promote international trade in farm commodities, has been little short of marvelous.

I believe, furthermore, that when we passed the legislation, most Senators, including myself, underestimated the potentialities of such a program.

According to newspaper reports this morning, attacks are being made on the Commodity Credit Corporation and on the Department of Agriculture because they have not moved huge quantities of the surplus commodities and have not put all of them on the market at once. It should be remembered that such a procedure would certainly break the world market price.

Furthermore, Mr. President, some of the people who are accusing the administration of dragging its feet in connection with this program know perfectly well that to follow the procedure I have indicated would not only break the world market price, but would break the domestic cotton price and the prices of other commodities, and would certainly hurt our own farmers and the producers in the rest of the world.

I believe that the Secretary of Agriculture and his assistants have approached the program in a very reasonable fashion, and that a year from now we will realize the full value of the program authorized under the Schoeppel Act, and that we will probably find that the authorization in terms of dollars is too small.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Vermont, the former chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

As I said in my remarks, I believe that, with some modifications, some of the dislocations can be worked out satisfactorily.

I genuinely and sincerely feel that progress has been made under the act. Much more can be accomplished. Certainly it has surprised many of the critics of the position we took in trying to dispose of farm surpluses abroad.

I feel that within the next 6 months, with reports coming forward, and with modifications of the act, we can make tremendous strides in reducing our surpluses, and at the same time encourage goodwill toward this country around the world.

Mr. AIKEN. Apropos of what the Senator from Kansas has said, the remarkable progress which has already been made under the program authorized by the Schoeppel-Harrison Act, not only has surprised our critics, but perhaps has disconcerted them as well.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

COMMUNISTS IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, this morning the Senate unanimously adopted Senate Resolution 18, which provides for a continuation of the investigation of Communists in Government. I should like to preface my remarks by complimenting the very able junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] for having submitted the resolution. I know that

in submitting it he was completely sincere and completely honest, and that if it were to be implemented now by intelligent, hard-hitting investigations by the Democrats, it would be a great thing for this country.

However, I am not too hopeful, Mr. President, that this will be done. Originally, when I looked at the resolution and when I saw the names of so many of my Democrat friends subscribed to the resolution, I was extremely happy and I also signed it as a sponsor. I thought it meant, perhaps, an about-face, a backtracking, if you please, and that perhaps we had ended the dreary 20 years of the Harry Dexter White type of treason. As I have said, I was hopeful. Yet in fact it is just a pious resolution; it does not dig out a single Communist; but I felt that perhaps it represented a change of heart on the part of the leaders of the Democratic Party.

Last night, however, I picked up the newspaper—and I call this particularly to the attention of the junior Senator from Texas—and read of another great Texan, MARTIN DIES, who had pioneered the task of digging Communists out of Government, who was the chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities until he was hounded out of public life by those who piously claimed they were against communism but did not like the way Mr. DIES was doing his work. He is again a Member of the House of Representatives as a Representative at Large from Texas, having been elected by a tremendous vote. He is an outstanding American. He requested that he be made a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, in the lowliest spot on that committee, if you please. But the leadership of the Democrat Party said, "No; we shall not put you on that committee," because they knew that MARTIN DIES would continue his fight against communism; they knew his reputation, and his record for digging out Communists.

For that reason, Mr. President, I say to my good friend from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] that, while I know he is completely honest and sincere and completely anti-Communist, yet when I read the story about the continued attempt to break MARTIN DIES, I realize that, even though there are some excellent Senators and Representatives in the Democrat Party, it is still in the control of those who for 20 years coddled, covered up, and promoted the Harry Dexter White type of treason.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech which I made on March 19, 1954, documenting 20 instances of treason.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF SENATOR JOE MCCARTHY MARCH 19, 1954, PLANKINTON HOTEL, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Thank you, Young Republicans, for the opportunity to be with you at this dinner commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Republican Party. I feel that this gathering of young Republicans is an especially appropriate place to answer the attacks made upon the Republican Party and me by Adlai.

I would like to thank WGN-WISN and the great number of independent radio stations which are making it possible for me to bring this message to such a large audience. As you know, two major networks, NBC and CBS, carried Stevenson's attack upon the Republican administration and me from coast to coast free of charge as what they called a public service. As you know, they refused to allow me the time to answer his attacks. A sizable number of independent stations, apparently recognizing the dangerous precedent of giving nationwide time for the attack but none for the answer, have given me tonight completely free of charge time on their radio stations for this answer to Adlai, even though there was no obligation to do so on their part.

Now let's move on to Adlai. First let me quote a passage to you and see if you recognize its origin:

"The struggle against McCarthyism is objectively a struggle against the policies of the Republican administration.

"The McCarthyites run interference for the Republican administration on unpopular issues, undertaking to build mass support for new moves to the right. MCCARTHY'S position today becomes Eisenhower's position tomorrow. Precisely because it plays this role, McCarthyism is nurtured and encouraged by the Republican administration."

Does that sound familiar? Did you hear it over the air the other night from the Democrat rally which was addressed by Adlai in Florida. No, you are wrong, you did not. While the meaning is the same this is not the exact language used by Adlai. This is a verbatim quote from a report delivered at the national conference of the Communist Party of the United States and published in 1953. Now let me quote one of the three main objectives as set forth to the national conference of the Communist Party. I quote from page 82:

"To elect an anti-McCarthy Congress by defeating every McCarthyite-McCarranite candidate, especially singling out for defeat those who are incumbents, and by electing a powerful bloc of conscious and determined fighters against McCarthyism."

Just one more quote from the Communist rule book. On page 32 we find mapped out the method of attacking MCCARTHY:

"1. Make it a struggle against witch-hunting investigations.

"2. Defend the victims of McCarthyism such as Lattimore.

"3. Make direct attacks on MCCARTHY himself such as the ADA's demand for investigation of MCCARTHY."

A short paraphrase from page 15 of the Communist orders: We must intervene actively and aggressively in all differences between Eisenhower and MCCARTHY directing the sharpest fire against MCCARTHY but don't support Ike either.

Does that sound a bit familiar? I repeat, this is not a quote from Adlai's Miami speech. While the meaning is the same the language is taken from the main report delivered at the National Conference of the Communist Party, U. S. A., and published in 1953 by the Communist Party, as orders to its members.

Two weeks ago Adlai, acting as spokesman and defense lawyer for the Democrat Party, used the officially approved and published Communist method of attacking MCCARTHY and the Republican Party. He complained that I referred to 20 years of treason. Tonight I shall place before the greatest of all juries, the American people, an indictment of 20 counts, picked at random, which added together at best constitute gross stupidity—or at worst, treason. This does not make up the entire picture, but just 20 counts in the indictment picked at random.

As I read this indictment you decide what the cost was in dollars and in blood and death and grief. There is scarcely one of you who hear me but has had some personal tragedy linked to these acts of infamy.

Twenty years of treason—20 deeds of betrayal.

Count No. 1 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: Let us call as a witness that greatest of all Americans, Gen. Douglas MacArthur. He testified before the Russell committee that when the Chinese Communists were pouring across the Yalu River bridges, he immediately ordered the bombing of those bridges to keep the Reds from pouring across the river to kill, cripple, capture, and then torture to death the sons of American mothers as they did. MacArthur testified: "But that order was countermanded from Washington." How many Americans died because that order was countermanded no one will ever know; that many died because of it, no one can question.

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 2 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: In 1943, Adlai was given the task of formulating America's postwar policy for Italy. That policy according to the sworn testimony of Gen. Bedell Smith was to connive to bring Communists into the Italian Government and to bring the Communist leader, Togliatti, back from Moscow. Why did Adlai want the Communist leader brought back from Moscow to Italy where he has since done so much damage?

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 3 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: Dropping back 20 years to November 1933, one of the first acts of the Democrat administration was to recognize Soviet Russia. This recognition of Russia, says Whittaker Chambers, laid the United States open to foreign espionage. And it may not be without significance that according to a speech made on the Senate floor on May 16, 1933, Dean Acheson had for awhile been the Washington lawyer for Communist Russia.

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 4 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: May 19, 1942, with Adlai as special assistant in the Navy Department, the White House ruled that members of the Communist conspiracy were to be allowed to act as radio operators on either commercial or naval vessels.

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 5 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: October 12, 1942, Lauchlin Currie, who has been named under oath as a Red spy and who was executive assistant to the President, arranged for Earl Browder, head of the Communist Party in the United States, to confer with the State Department so that he might guide the betrayal of China.

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 6 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: The deliberate betrayal of our fighting ally, the militantly anti-Communist Mihailovitch, in Yugoslavia, in favor of Communist Tito. The result: A Communist Yugoslavia.

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 7 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: The secret Army directive which authorized the granting of commissions in the United States Army to members of the Communist conspiracy.

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 8 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: The order to destroy the files on military personnel where the files showed that he was a Communist. Proof of this order is contained in this letter from Senator STYLES BRIDGES, who kept the order from being fully carried out.

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 9 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: We gave Russia our currency plates with no control over the amount of American-backed currency which they could print. The cost to American taxpayers: Over $250 million. The perpetrators: The Communist espionage agent, Harry Dexter White, who was then Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and V. Frank Coe. Recently before our committee he refused on the grounds of self-incrimination to tell whether or not he was engaged in running guns to the Communists. Incidentally, here is a letter in which Coe recommended Adlai to an important assignment.

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 10 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: Yalta. There millions of free men, women, and children were sold into Communist slavery. As our Ambassador to Poland said at the time: "As I looked over the [Yalta] agreement I could not believe my eyes. Every line spoke a complete surrender to the Communists." One of those helped draft the agreement—Alger Hiss—who years before that had been identified in FBI reports as a Communist spy. As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 11 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: In the sell-out to the Communist conspiracy; the loan of $90 million of American money to the Communist-controlled government in Poland while the battle between the Communists and the anti-Communists in Poland was still touch and go. Your 90 million bought the guns, the ammunition, the whips, and the black snakes which beat a free people into reluctant, bloody submission. And who granted the loan—Dean Gooderham Acheson. And whose firm represented the Communist—the law firm of the same Dean Gooderham Acheson.

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 12 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: In 1945 our friends in China desperately needed guns and ammunition to fight off the Communists. At the same time we had in our possession mountains of captured guns and ammunition which our China allies so badly needed. General Eisenhower and his advisers ordered a vast amount of that material sent to our friends in China. Then what happened? There came an order written on White House stationery signed by Lauchlin Currie ordering that none of that material go to our friends in China—Lauchlin Currie who has been repeatedly named under oath as a member of the Communist spy ring, was the former President's assistant with an office in the White House.

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 13 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: Just a few months ago the man who had been acting chairman of the loyalty program of the Government Printing Office testified under oath that the head of Truman's loyalty program ordered them not to discharge any of their employees merely because they were Communists. This was the order of Truman's loyalty chief, even though certain workers in the Government Printing Office had access to the topmost secret material from almost every agency in government—Army, Navy, Air Corps, Atomic Energy, hydrogen bomb information, etc., secret material which if in enemy hands might well decree the death of this Nation. This policy of "don't take Communists away from the Nation's secrets—let them hold a razor poised over the arteries carrying the lifeblood of the Nation"—applied not merely to the Printing Office, but to every Federal agency because the order came from Seth Richardson who was Truman's top dog in the entire loyalty program. Unbelievable you say—yes. Impossible you say—yes, but all a matter of cold record. As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai, guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 14 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: A Federal grand jury presentment released on December 2, 1952, in discussing Communists in the United Nations had this to say:

"Almost without exception these same subversive employees with the United Nations were formerly employed in various departments of our own Federal Government. They were transferred from one Federal department to another, finally ending up in key positions in the United Nations. The evidence shows this is not coincidental but part of a definite, planned pattern. It appears to result from the contrivance of certain highly placed officials who have surrounded themselves in each Government agency, and then in the United Nations, with personnel who share their disloyal convictions."

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 15 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: While the Republic of China, which had fought side by side with us during the entire war, was in a life and death struggle with the Russian supported Chinese Communists we embargoed the shipment of even one ounce of gunpowder to that ally of ours.

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 16 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: While conducting an airtight embargo on the shipment of any of the weapons of war to the Republic of China we were forcing the opening of Kalgan mountain pass into Manchuria with the result that the Chinese Communists could be and were fully armed by the Russians.

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 17 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: Immediately following the outbreak of the Korean war the United States Seventh Fleet was ordered to patrol the waters along the Communist coast of China. Their orders:

1. Sink any ship which attempts to go from Formosa to help those who are fighting the Communists in China, but do not molest or in any way interfere with ships helping the Communists.

2. Do not let the Chinese Navy on Formosa sink any Communist shipping. As Ambassador Bullitt testified:

"Our Government has given orders to our fleet to prevent it [the navy of the anti-Communist Chinese] from stopping the Communist supply ships going up to Korea. They sail right by Formosa, loaded with Soviet munitions put in the Polish Communist ships in Gydnia. They come all the way around and go right by Formosa and sail past there, taking weapons up to be used to kill American soldiers in Korea, and by order of our Government the Chinese Navy is flatly forbidden to stop them on their way up there."

As President Eisenhower pointed out, "This has meant, in effect, that the United States Navy was required to serve as a defensive arm of Communist China. * * * This permitted those Communists, with greater impunity, to kill our soldiers."

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 18 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: Starting in 1939, official reports gave the State Department information showing that Alger Hiss was a member of the Communist conspiracy. Despite this, or perhaps because of it, he rose rapidly up the ladder until he was head of the Policy and Planning Division of the State Department and finally was made the Secretary General for the organization of the United Nations at San Francisco. Hiss' file showed he was a Red spy at the time he was picked for this job.

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 18 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: In the sellout to the Communist conspiracy. During the Korean war, President Truman sent his personal friend, General Lowe, to act as his eyes and ears in Korea. In fairness to Truman, it should be made clear that General Lowe's reports were intercepted either in the Pentagon or somewhere else in Washington and never reached Truman. When Lowe returned to the United States, here is what he had to say:

"General MacArthur was right in Korea, and if he'd been left alone he long since would have won in Korea. What we face now is a disgraceful stalemate, the writing off of tens of thousands of needless American casualties, the loss of face throughout the entire oriental world and a pointless, undefined position for ourselves. MacArthur was hamstrung and finally brought down by the interference of the State Department."

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 20 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: On March 10, 1953, General Van Fleet, who had been the Commanding General of our Armies in Korea appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee. He was being questioned by Senator BYRD:

Question by Senator BYRD: "You were quoted, I think, General, in the newspapers as saying on two occasions that you could have gained a military victory in Korea; is that correct?"

Answer by General Van Fleet: "In June of 1951, we had the Communist armies on the run: They were hurting badly, out of supplies, completely out of hand or control; they were in a panic, and were doing their best to fall as far back as possible, and we stopped by order, did not pursue to finish the enemy."

Question by Senator BYRD: "Did you recommend that the attack be continued?"

Answer by General Van Fleet: "Oh, yes. I was crying to have them turn us loose."

Question by Senator BYRD: "If you had had the authority to go ahead and pursue the enemy as far as you could, what would have been the results?"

Answer by General Van Fleet: "I believe we would have gotten all his heavy equipment and perhaps two or three hundred thousand prisoners."

Ask yourselves, my friends, who in Washington refused to let the general in the field win the victory when he reported to them, "We had the Communist armies on the run, they were hurting badly, out of supplies, completely out of hand or control; they were in a panic." How many American boys died because this great general was instructed not to win. How many will die in the future, no man knows.

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

If these 20 counts picked at random from the record of the two decades between March 4, 1933, and January 20, 1953, do not add up to treason, then I ask you, my friends, what is treason?

These, ladies and gentlemen, are the facts—every one backed by proof and official reports. You be the judge. Is it treason? If not what is it?

Those who would defend that record dare not do so directly. They condemn investigations and techniques. Anyone can be a hero of this left-wing gang if he shouts about liberty and freedom and coercion. The lower the hypocrite the more general the terms, and the greater the condemnation and the louder the clash of cymbals by those who call themselves righteous. If the cries came from the Communists alone, no one

would listen. But cleverly—oh so cleverly—they add the voices of the fellow-travelers, of the ill-informed and of the egg-headed liberals. Many, far too many, of those who scream are but politicians seeking temporary glory, unmindful of the truth of the past, careless of the future, unworried about the destiny of our Nation.

Adlai turned some fine phrases at Miami. A great number of high sounding general statements, but safely devoid of facts except in one instance in which case the statement of fact was false. Apparently Adlai would rather turn a clever phrase than to be truthful. His one statement of fact was that the Republicans had gotten rid of only one Communist. And, of course, the audience applauded. I am not going to try to give you the names tonight of every Communist removed since the American people got rid of Adlai's friends, Truman and Acheson. I will, however, give you the names of 20 of the many fifth-amendment Communists who appeared before our committee and were then removed from Government or defense work. The 20 whose names I shall give you were all working either in the Government or in defense plants which handled secret material for the military at the time our committee called them. Their names: Doris W. Powell, Robert Goodwin, Edward Rothschild, Nathaniel Mills, Henry C. Archdeacon, Donald H. Morrill, Witulad Piekarski, Ruth Levin, Alexander Gregory, Theodore Pappas, Victor Bolys, Irving Peress, Sidney Friedlander, Robert P. Northrop, Arthur L. Owens, Joseph A. Gebhardt, Emanual Fernandez, Gordon Belgrave, Dewey F. Brashear, and Leo Kantrowitz.

I assume I shall read in tomorrow's paper that McCarthy said only 20 fifth-amendment Communists were removed from Government. Let me make it clear I picked at random only 20 of those who appeared before our investigating committee, refused to tell whether they were Communists on the ground the truth might send them to jail, and then were removed from Government or from defense plants which handled secret work.

But Adlai says: "Isn't this McCarthyism a nasty thing to dare expose all those innocent fifth-amendment Communists." Fortunately, the American people, with their sure instinct for what is right, voted against this man and his party. For only Republican leadership could have torn aside the curtain of silence and concealment to reveal the depths to which our Nation had fallen. And the louder the agonized cries from the leftwing, the faster and harder we shall work. We will not rest until every Communist is brought to light and to justice. Yes, Adlai, a single disloyal, dangerous employee is one too many.

Adlai shed crocodile tears because I demanded the names of those in the Pentagon who knew that Communists were active in the military.

He cleverly tried to make this look as though I were attacking that great patriotic group of Americans all the way from privates to generals who have done so much for our Nation.

Adlai knew that our investigating committe has been digging out the few rotten apples in the barrel. Especially am I interested in finding those who knew of the rotten apples, the Communists, and promoted, coddled, and failed to remove them.

Yesterday Defense Secretary Wilson confirmed what I have so often said, namely, that someone in the Pentagon knew about each and every Communist we exposed before we exposed them. Unfortunately, they were not removed until brought before our committee. No matter how great the wailing of Adlai—no matter how cleverly the Pentagon politicians (carryovers from the Truman regime) use honest innocents like Bob Stevens who are lost in the maze of Washington confusion—no matter how hard they try to divert the exposure of Communists into a personal fight between the administration and me, all of the facts will finally be dug out and given to you, the American people.

The enemy's ranks are closing. They are going all out to rally support—from their stalwarts, from the bleeding hearts, from the well-meaning liberals, and from chameleon politicians of both parties. They strive to hamstring our investigations.

In an effort to tie our hands, they will ask for different rules for committees investigating Communists—as if Communists were less dangerous than waste or stupidity. They will demand that there be 2 or 3 or 4 Senators at all hearings: an obvious impossibility for me to order Senators to appear. Anyone who has had any experience with Congress will tell you that there would be no quicker way to stall investigations, for Senators must serve on a great number of committees.

There will be other tactics to slow our progress. Can anyone in this audience think of any reason why rules and procedures which have been good enough for committees investigating graft and corruption should not be good enough to rout out traitors and subversives.

During these days when the abuse and imprecations reach a new crescendo I very greatly miss the moral support which I so long received from that tower of integrity and strength in the Republican Party who no longer is with us—Senator Robert A. Taft—no chameleon was he.

Don't let them fool you, America. If those of us who are exposing the Communists are stopped here and now, the Communists can win. Their crafty conspirators can lie in wait until their friends and protectors take over. They are trained to wait; they have orders to wait—orders from Moscow. Now is the time to redouble our efforts—and with all the energy of mind and body which God gave me, I pledge you that I shall continue no matter how high or low are the Democrats or the Republicans who scream their maledictions at me, and shout that I am not gentle enough in trying to drag the truth from traitors and their protectors. To relax the search now would be to admit defeat. This we shall never do. The truth we shall get; the truth the American people shall have.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I may say, in conclusion, that I hope I am wrong about what is happening. I hope the Democrat Party is ready to make an about-face. I hope it is ready to follow the resolution submitted by the junior Senator from Texas. If it is, it will be a great thing for this country.

Mr. President, I read the names of the Senators who cosponsored the resolution and those who voted for it, and I could not help thinking of the man who continually made excellent speeches against the evils of liquor, and then went out and got drunk every night after his speeches.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for his remarks concerning the sincerity of the junior Senator from Texas in submitting Senate Resolution 18, which has just been passed by a unanimous vote. I am more hopeful than is the Senator from Wisconsin in this matter. I join in his hope that he is wrong in his lack of hope.

Mr. President, I have regretted on several occasions hearing the Senator from Wisconsin, who has been such an outspoken foe of the Communist conspiracy, referring to the Democratic Party as a party of treason——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Texas will yield at that point.

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have been misquoted on that subject so often that I should like to set the record straight. I have always said that the millions of loyal Americans who have disliked communism and voted the Democrat ticket have loved America just as much as have the Republicans. I have also said that there were Senators on the Democrat side of the aisle who were just as anti-Communist as are those on the Republican side.

But I also have pointed out that there were 20 years of treason, the Harry Dexter White type of treason. I think the Senator from Texas will agree with me that the handling of that case involved treason on the part of someone—certainly treason on the part of Harry Dexter White, who was a top official in the Democrat administration. But I have tried to make it clear that I have never labeled all Democrat officeholders as being even remotely treasonable. The Truman-Acheson branch of the Democrat Party certainly has coddled, covered up, and nurtured treason. We cannot get away from that fact. That is just as clear as is the fact that we both stand here today.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I wish the Senator from Wisconsin always would narrow his comment so as to indicate exactly what Democrats he refers to, rather than speaking about the entire Democratic Party in this matter. There are those of us in the Democratic Party, and, I would say, a good majority, who regretted deeply the handling of the Harry Dexter White case and many other cases. I think if we would particularize the cases, and not overstate them, and pinpoint the exact facts and circumstances and the responsible people, we could, in both parties, unite against such instances and happenings.

I entertained the hope that after the adoption of the resolution today, we would have a united front in the Senate, and I still believe we will. The Senator from Wisconsin has said nothing that would prevent that. I sincerely hope we shall have a united front against the Communist conspiracy, and that we shall be united in the support of our committees in carrying on their investigations of subversion in this country. I have complete confidence that the committee of which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] is chairman, and of which the Senator from Wisconsin is a member, will complete the unfinished and pending cases with dispatch, and that the Senate during this session will be just as vigorous and diligent against the Communist conspiracy as it has ever been in its history. The controversy recently disposed of may be partially responsible for restoring unity to this body in the fight against our common foe, the Communist conspiracy.

I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin that Representative Martin Dies is a great foe of the Communist conspiracy. He did wonderful work on his origi-

nal Un-American Activities Committee. I wish it had been possible for him to be restored to membership on that committee. However, I do not know the situation at the other end of the Capitol. It is possible that the matter of senioriy or other valid considerations prevented his being restored to that committee. I am sure the action was not due to any sympathy for communism on the part of the House leadership or the new appointee on the House committee. They are as much opposed to the Communist conspiracy as are we.

We have no responsibility for the House committees. Our resolution refers only to the Senate and its committees. The Senate today has expressed itself as united in its determination to continue diligently and vigorously to fight the Communist conspiracy.

Carrying out the terms of Senate Resolution 18 would not be an about-face on the part of the majority of the members of the Democratic Party. It is a work in which the majority of the members of my party are as interested as are the Senator from Wisconsin and the members of his party.

If all of us will try our best to support the committee, which will now be headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and on which the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin will sit and contribute greatly, as well as our other appropriate committees, I believe we can accomplish something against the common foe.

It was in that spirit that I offered the resolution. Further, I want to make it clear that the fact that some of us criticized the actions of the junior Senator from Wisconsin with reference to his relations and attitude toward certain committees did not mean that we were going soft on Communists or that we were against the work and the objective in which the Senator has always stated he was interested, namely, digging out and rooting from the Government any Communists and others who were following the Communist line.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in order that the RECORD may be absolutely clear, so far as I am concerned, if the Democrat Party were controlled by persons like the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] or the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], I am certain that the Senator from Texas would not have to follow through on the resolution which he submitted and which was voted on today.

At this point, however, I am firmly convinced—and it is an unhappy thought—that there are not enough men like the Senator from Texas in the Democrat Party. The control still is held by the same group of persons who were responsible for the 20 long, dreary years of the Harry Dexter Whites and the Alger Hisses.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator from Wisconsin speak of the Democratic control on this side of the aisle?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am speaking of the Democrat Party.

Mr. DANIEL. Yes, but the investigation of Communists by Senate committees will be controlled by the Democratic membership, Senators on this side of the aisle.

Mr. McCARTHY. I hope it will be. The discipline of the Senator's party is much greater than that of my party. I saw a typical example of that not too long ago when I observed Senators vote on a certain matter and then heard them say later that they held their noses while they voted.

I doubt very much that the policy of the Democrat Party will be ignored by Democrat Senators.

Mr. DANIEL. I have not felt the whip of discipline on this side of the aisle. Neither have I observed its application to other Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle.

The Senator from Wisconsin will remember that I was independent in my vote in the last general election. I voted for President Eisenhower. But members of the Democratic caucus here in the Senate certainly did not discipline me, but treated me well.

I wish the junior Senator from Wisconsin could leave the Chamber today convinced of the fact that Senate Democrats are not controlled by what might be thought up or planned in the Democratic National Committee or in the minds of those outside the Senate Chamber to whom the Senator from Wisconsin has referred.

Since participating in the activities of the party on this side of the aisle for 2 years I have observed no discipline or control over the Senate Democratic leadership by outside political leaders or Democratic National Committee officials. The Senator from Wisconsin might feel much better about the matter if he would simply believe these facts which I know to be true.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have been active in the work of fighting Communists for a long time—a rather bloody long time. Day after day I have seen politicians on the stump waving their arms, saying they were against communism, but always speaking in only the most general terms. But when it came down to the specific task, the dirty job—and it is a very dirty job—of digging out individual Communists in Government, they just did not like anyone who exposed or dug out Communists.

That is what confronts us today. We have now adopted a resolution which, in general terms, states that we are against communism. Such a resolution is meaningless except as a political gesture. I think some of those who sponsored the resolution were trying to get some dirt off their hands. I am not referring to the junior Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. I regret that the Senator from Wisconsin would make such a statement about other sponsors of the resolution.

Let us assume that all other Senators had the same good intention in the wording of the resolution the junior Senator from Wisconsin and I have.

Mr. McCARTHY. I cannot assume that when I look at the names of Senators who have voted to put up the fight they did against anyone who has dug out Communists.

When I find a Senator who has voted for this pious resolution, and I then check his record and find that he is against anyone who tries to implement this type of resolution, I cannot give him credit for being sincere.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). The Chair is compelled to call the junior Senator from Wisconsin to order. His remarks are contrary to the Senate rules, and he must take his seat.

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not understand the statement of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The statement of the junior Senator from Wisconsin was that other Senators were insincere. In making that statement, the Senator from Wisconsin spoke contrary to the rules of the Senate.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask that the junior Senator from Wisconsin may proceed in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin may not speak.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I move that the junior Senator from Wisconsin be allowed to proceed in order.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I think I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Idaho.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield, that I may finish my statement?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I certainly appreciate having the Chair follow the rules so closely. I observed the present Presiding Officer, when he was seated on his side of the aisle within the last 2 or 3 months while every rule of the Senate was violated, and he never once opened his mouth.

I was being criticized and accused of everything but murdering my great-great grandmother, but the junior Senator from Louisiana, who now occupies the chair, sat in his seat on his side of the aisle like a bump on a log. He was not worried then about the Senate rules.

When I started calling the attention of the Senate and the country to the truth of these facts, the Chair suddenly remembered the Senate rules. I am glad to observe that the Chair remembers the rules now; I hope he will remember them in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair desires to make a statement. As a Senator, he has been called to order on the floor for saying far less than that other Members of the Senate were trying to remove dirt from their hands or that other Members of this body were insincere.

Mr. DANIEL. May we not end the discussion with the hope that the junior Senator from Wisconsin expressed in his original remarks, namely, that the junior Senator from Wisconsin is wrong, and that the junior Senator from Texas is right, about the intention of the Senate committees and the leadership of the Senate in investigating and fighting the Communist conspiracy?

Would the junior Senator from Wisconsin agree that we might end on that note of hope for ultimate unity, at least?

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator from Texas agree with me that our hopes were badly dashed when the Democrat leadership decreed that MARTIN DIES, the greatest Communist hunter of all, and the first chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, could not now have even the lowest position on that committee? The Democrat leadership was afraid to have him on that committee. That being the case, I am not too hopeful about what the Democrat leadership will do in trying to guide the Senate in its fight against communism.

Mr. DANIEL. I regret, with the junior Senator from Wisconsin, that MARTIN DIES was not named to membership on the House Committee on Un-American Activities. But my hopes are not dashed at all, because I have no reason to believe that the Democratic leadership in the House is afraid to have MARTIN DIES on the committee. I believe we shall see the fight continued, and that the pending, uncompleted cases now before the Senate committees will be investigated with dispatch. I have faith in the committee. Certainly I hope that will be done.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I am delighted to learn that my friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana, has refreshed his memory with respect to rule XIX, section 2, which I observed was so willfully and grossly violated on the floor of the Senate, not once, but dozens of times, during the terrible tragedy which we had in the Senate a couple of months ago.

I assure the distinguished occupant of the chair, the junior Senator from Louisiana, that he has also refreshed my memory, and that we are going to play the game according to the rules. From this time forward, three strikes will be "out."

To the able and distinguished junior Senator from Texas, I may say that I was happy and honored to be permitted to be a cosponsor of his resolution. Like the junior Senator from Wisconsin, I pray that it will succeed in accomplishing its purpose. I pray that all the shooting at one another in the Senate will stop. We have had enough bickering in this body. The Senate of the United States has suffered, regardless of who won the debate a few months ago. The American people are the sole judges.

I beg of my distinguished friend from Texas that he use his potent influence on some of his colleagues and some of his partisans, who have been shooting daily at the Vice President of the United States, calling him a smear artist, and accusing him of calling the loyal Democratic Party a party of treason. I have not heard such statements from him, and I crossed campaign trails with him many times.

It is time for us to get back to work on the Communist conspiracy. It was my pleasure to have served on the committee with the great former chairman of the committee, the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], who has been succeeded by a great Democrat, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

I know that our committee will act without one iota of partisanship, just as it has in the past under the distinguished Senator from Indiana. It will fight to save the United States from the Harry Dexter Whites, the Alger Hisses, and other such persons, who have been all too prevalent in our Government.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that I recall that not so many years ago the then President of the United States, President Truman, said that the Republican Party was giving aid and comfort to the Communist conspiracy. I did not hear all this crying and weeping and wailing then. But whenever the junior Senator from Wisconsin says one word, it seems to me that opens up the shotguns aimed in his direction. Let us get back to business. I join with the Senator from Texas. He will never find me playing in left field unless I have a glove on.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Idaho will agree that no one has opened up a shotgun from across the aisle today, will he not? Let us open up our shotguns against the common foe and not at each other.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President——

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. The fight against communism is not a simple matter. All of our problems of government stem primarily from the issue of communism. Our unbalanced budgets, deficit spending, military costs, costs of defense, foreign policy, aid programs, high taxes—all of the problems that are paramount in this country stem from the threat of communism, not only to this Nation, but to the entire world. During the past 2 years I was honored to head the Internal Security Subcommittee, and I certainly wish to pay tribute to the Democrats who were on that subcommittee. The subcommittee was founded by a great Democrat, Senator McCarran. That subcommittee has never dealt in partisanship. I think every report the committee submitted has been a unanimous report.

I remember that at the end of the last session, in the heat and passion of the consideration of the proposed McCarthy censureship, a resolution similar to that of the Senator from Texas was submitted as an amendment. I objected. I objected primarily because I thought it was injecting politics into the issue of communism, where it has no place. I did not think that was the time to bring up a resolution of that type, at the end of the heated debate, probably the most heated debate that has ever been held in this Chamber.

I join now with the coauthor of the resolution. From what I have learned in talking with the coauthor, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], it is a comprehensive resolution. The resolution covers all phases of the Communist conspiracy, not only Communists in government, because it reads:

It is the sense of the Senate that its appropriate committees should continue diligently and vigorously to investigate, expose, and combat this conspiracy and all subversive elements and persons connected therewith.

In other words, the author assures me, and I am sure it was so understood when we voted unanimously to agree to the resolution, that we were not going to confine the investigation to any one phase, or to any organization directly connected with the Communist conspiracy, because that is hard to prove. For example, Harold Glasser was taken out of the American Communist apparatus and put directly under the Soviet Embassy's control. Thereafter, Harold Glasser could easily say, "I have no connection with the Communist conspiracy in America—," and he did not have, because his orders came directly from Moscow, through the Soviet Embassy, and he was no longer an American Communist in the American Government.

The resolution is an all-encompassing one. I hope, with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the issue will not become a partisan one, and that now, when the Democratic Party is in control, we shall go forward with this all-important investigation.

We may talk until we are blue in the face, but the written record and our actions will speak louder than words. So time alone will tell, I say to the Senator.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. JENNER. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin for a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. I merely wish to say that a year from today I intend to rise and review the progress of the Democrat Party's investigation.

Mr. JENNER. Only time will tell. Actions will speak louder than words.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President——

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. First of all, I want to recall to the Senate the manner in which the junior Senator from California cast his vote on the several rollcall votes which were taken in November. I think the manner in which I cast my vote on that occasion gives me a particular and a special right to give my sincere congratulations to the able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], who is now in the Chair. Because I happen to be a Member of the United States Senate, I want the debate to be as vigorous and decisive and keen as it ought to be, but I want it to be conducted courteously, and upon a plane which is commensurate with the dignity which all my life I have associated with this highest parliamentary body in the Government of the United States.

So to my friend from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], who is presently presiding, I give my congratulations and my friendship for enforcing, as I would want him to enforce them, the rules of conduct of the Senate of our country, and I aline myself with him completely——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to say that, so far as I am concerned, in the future every Member of the Senate—I repeat, every Member of the Senate—ought to take upon himself the responsibility of measuring his own words as he debates issues in this Chamber, and of seeing to

it that he and the other 95 Senators conduct themselves courteously and with dignity as the rules provide.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I certainly appreciate this outburst of self-righteousness today on the part of the Senator from California——

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask that the junior Senator from Wisconsin be made to take his seat, under rule XIX.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has yielded for a question.

Mr. KUCHEL. I rise to a point of order that the remark of the Senator from Wisconsin is not a proper question.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes, I yield for a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. May I ask the Senator if he was present in the Senate Chamber during the debate in November? Did he hear the rules of the Senate violated, not once, not a dozen times, but a hundred times——

Mr. KUCHEL. I will say——

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me finish my question, please. Was the Senator aware of the fact that I requested all of my friends not to call anyone to order? I said, "Let them get it off their chests. Let them say what they want to say." I did not ask the Senator from California to call for order. Did the junior Senator from California at any time attempt to call those Senators to order? Before the Senator answers me, I say to the Senator, that, so far as I am concerned, I intend to call a spade a spade at all times.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has yielded for a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. May I say this——

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. Several questions have been asked. I shall try to answer.

Mr. McCARTHY. Very well.

Mr. KUCHEL. First of all, I wish to say that in the 2 years I have sat in the Senate, I have heard Members of the Senate repeatedly and on many occasions break rules. I have listened to some comments, I may say to the junior Senator from Wisconsin, upon the part of Senators on both sides of the aisle that to my mind were not in keeping with the manner in which debate in what is sometimes called the Upper House of Congress should be conducted; and I take my share of responsibility for failing to invoke the rule which was invoked just a short while ago. The junior Senator from Wisconsin may speak frankly, as I know he will, but I think the time has come when we ought not to indulge in personal animadversions on the floor of the Senate, no matter what the discussions may concern. That is my answer to the question.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator agree with me that there is no halo that surrounds anyone on these thrones? Will the Senator agree with me that if Senator X knew that Senator Y had done something improper, had done something wrong, and had not properly represented his people, Senator X would have a duty to stand on the floor of the Senate and tell the Senate and the country about the improper conduct on the part of Senator Y? May I say that——

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin has asked a question. I want to answer——

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me finish the question.

Mr. KUCHEL. Very well.

Mr. McCARTHY. Go ahead and answer that part of the question.

Mr. KUCHEL. Of course, I agree that a Senator has the responsibility of disclosing any information which he has which would be of assistance to the people of the United States in arriving at sound conclusions, and if the facts should reflect upon the Senate, obviously it would nevertheless be a Senator's responsibility and duty to take such action. I am talking about a rule of the United States Senate which provides for the manner of speaking. I suggest to the Senator that even the vilest types of conduct can be described without resorting to offensive language.

Mr. President, I had not intended to rise and get into a long colloquy. I had intended to rise for one point. I think I had a special right to emphasize it because of the manner in which I cast my vote in November.

I rose for the sole purpose of informing the present occupant of the chair, the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], that, as a Republican, I congratulate my friend, a Democrat, for the manner in which he has conducted himself while acting as the Presiding Officer of the Senate.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield just once, before he takes his seat?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me say that I know this incident will be labeled an argument or a fight between the Senator from California and myself.

Mr. KUCHEL. It is not.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wish to make it very clear that it is not a fight or an argument, but is a disagreement.

Let me say I think the rules should apply alike to all Senators.

Mr. KUCHEL. I quite agree with the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Last November, during the special session, I took the position that if any Senator knew of any improper conduct on the part of myself, such Senator should rise and should freely speak his mind. I took the position then that any rule which provides for immunity of a Senator from criticism should not apply, and that there is no halo surrounding our sessions. Apparently the entire Senate agreed with me, for, as I recall, not once was a Senator required to take his seat, although day after day I heard the foulest type of vituperation heaped upon my head—although later it was proved to be completely false.

If the rule then was that if a Senator knew of some improper conduct on the part of another Senator, he should discuss it, why is it suddenly proposed, today, that the rule be changed or shifted when I start to point out improper conduct on the part of other Senators?

Mr. KUCHEL. I shall answer the question of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I ask the Senator from California to permit me to finish my question. I now say to the Senator from California that he or any other Senator can have me compelled to take my seat, if he wishes to do so; that can be done under rule XIX. But after looking at this list and after listening to the vote, I am utterly convinced that there are those who signed that pious resolution who are opposed to digging out Communists and will oppose anyone who digs out Communists, and who are attempting, as I said, to remove the stench from their hands and the mud from their skirts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Wisconsin will take his seat.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I will say that so far as I am concerned, the comments any Senator makes in the future ought to be made having in mind the thought that there is some responsibility that the comments made here be those of gentlemen and of Members of the United States Senate, and that there are rules which guide us.

Mr. President, it is true that during the entire time I have been a Member of the Senate, many times rule XIX has not been invoked. But in the future it is going to be invoked, and it should be. I am glad it has been invoked today, because I am completely and sincerely devoted to the maintenance of the prestige, and the reputation of the Senate and the manner in which the business of the Senate ought to be conducted; and I intend to do my part in seeing to it that the debate is conducted in accordance with the rules of decency.

Mr. LONG subsequently said: Mr. President, I am certain that what transpired on the floor of the Senate a few moments ago needs no explanation from me.

However, I should like to make clear on the RECORD the basis on which I felt it necessary to call another Senator to order.

Rule XIX provides, in subsection 2, as follows:

> 2. No Senator in debate shall, directly or indirectly, by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

Subsection 4 of Senate rule XIX provides as follows:

> 4. If any Senator, in speaking or otherwise, transgress the rules of the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall, or any Senator may, call him to order; and when a Senator shall be called to order he shall sit down, and not proceed without leave of the Senate, which, if granted, shall be upon motion that he be allowed to proceed in order, which motion shall be determined without debate.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Louisiana has had that rule invoked against him by motion of other Senators, never on the initiative of the Chair.

However, the junior Senator from Louisiana interprets rule XIX to mean that it is the right of any Senator to require another Senator to take his seat

when that Senator transgresses the rule, but that it is the duty of the Chair to do so, and that it should not be necessary for a Senator on the floor to exercise that right, because it is the duty of the Chair to see to it that the rules of the Senate are not violated.

The junior Senator from Louisiana has many times felt that the Chair was not as scrupulous in enforcing the rule as the junior Senator from Louisiana would have been if he had been presiding.

I say that, Mr. President, without any reflection on any presiding officer, either in the past or at the present time. It is a matter of opinion of the presiding officer to state when a rule has been violated. There have been instances when the junior Senator from Louisiana has felt that if he were presiding he would consider it to be his duty to invoke the rule.

Mr. President, I agree that there were things said concerning Members of this body in the debate on the resolution of censure which certainly reflected unfavorably upon a Member of this body. But that was in debate on a motion to censure. To say that a Senator could not speak unfavorably of another Senator in debate on a motion to censure would be to say that we could not debate a motion to censure.

Section 5 of article I of the Constitution provides that each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, and punish its Members for disorderly behavior.

The Constitution of the United States cannot be set aside by the Senate rules. In debating a resolution to censure, it is completely within the rules of the Senate, by virtue of the Constitution of the United States, to debate matters germane to that subject.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I am pleased to see the Senator from Wisconsin is on the floor, and I wish him to know that I bear him no ill will whatever.

Mr. McCARTHY. I know that.

Mr. LONG. He undertook a very vigorous fight on the Communist issue.

I wish him to know that it is my opinion that it is the duty of the Presiding Officer to enforce the rules when they are violated; that a Senator should not be required to invoke the rule, because it is the duty of the Chair to see to it that the rules are obeyed.

I now yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I am glad to hear the Senator from Louisiana say that he does not bear me any ill will; but the Senator from Louisiana voted that it was censurable to discuss a Senator off the Senate floor. I am becoming more and more disturbed by the idea that some type of halo surrounds the throne of a Senator, that if he is guilty of wrongdoing, it cannot be discussed, or that if he is guilty of graft or corruption or anything else that is improper, it cannot be discussed.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the effect of what I said in the only remarks I made on this subject—and I know the Senator from Wisconsin was present and heard the statement when I made it—was that my feeling on the censure resolution was that if a Senator speaks disparagingly of another Senator and in a way which reflects great discredit upon him, and the matter is brought in issue on the floor of the Senate and no effort is made to prove the charge, the Senator who made the charge must stand condemned by his colleagues because he cannot prove what he said about another Senator. If one Senator accuses another of being unpatriotic, and there is no effort made to prove the charge, it seems to me he stands condemned.

I am not accusing any Senator of any improper conduct. I am simply stating that except when a motion to censure or a motion to punish is being debated, it is the duty of the Presiding Officer to enforce rule XIX.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further?

Mr. LONG. I yield for a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the Senator has pointed up a very important subject, and we could discuss it from now on. We are operating under the rule that one Senator cannot expose the wrongdoing of another Senator even off the Senate floor. In other words, there is a new type of immunity.

The Senator from Louisiana voted for that. He may not have read the resolution; I do not know. If not, I hope he will read it in the near future, because it is a rather fantastic document for which he voted. I am not concerned about how it affects me, but it is of importance insofar as the future of the Senate is concerned. I am only suggesting it in view of the position taken by the Democrats, who voted unanimously, whereas the Republicans did not vote unanimously. Can a Senator criticize another Senator on the floor, or any other place; in the future, can the Senator from Louisiana expose wrongdoing on the part of a Senator, if that rule is followed?

Mr. LONG. It is my understanding and feeling that if a Senator makes charges against another Senator as being guilty of dishonest, unpatriotic, or traitorous conduct, and if the question is brought before the Senate by way of a resolution to censure the Senator making the charge, if the Senator making the charge does not proceed to support it or to prove it, then it seems to me he is liable to be condemned just as he should be liable in a court of law if a slander suit were filed against him. If a Member of this body is accused by a fellow-Member of this body of being a traitor, he is not limited entirely to taking the matter before a court in a slander suit; he can bring it before this body if he cares to do so.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further?

Mr. LONG. For a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe we may agree that no one has accused any Senator of being a traitor or of being dishonest.

Mr. LONG. The resolution of censure did relate to members of a committee being accused of dishonesty.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator says that evidence must be brought before the Senate. Let us assume that the Senator from Louisiana knows that Senator X has two Communists working in his office who are dedicated to the destruction of this Government. Let us assume he has 10 witnesses. How does he present the witnesses to the Senate?

Mr. LONG. If I knew that another Senator had two Communists working in his office, and I wanted to bring the matter before the Senate, I would offer a resolution of censure or a resolution that the Senator be expelled; I would bring the facts before an appropriate committee, and if the case could be proved, I believe the Senate would proceed either to censure the Senator or to expel him if his conduct was not worthy of a Senator of the United States.

Inasmuch as the Senator from Wisconsin is here, and I have not made it clear to him, let me say that it is a matter of record that the Democratic Policy Committee considered the resolution of censure and recommended that Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle should all vote their individual consciences. I was one of the last Senators in making up my mind how I would vote on the subject. It may be of interest to the Senator to know that I actually prepared a speech against the resolution of censure less than 1 week before the vote finally occurred. I discussed it and carefully considered it. I was reminded by one of the leaders that I should vote my own conscience and that the party did not have any preference as to how I should vote. I would not want to call the name of the Senator who told me that, but he was one of the responsible leaders on this side of the aisle.

I believe the Senator from Wisconsin knows that I would not have voted to censure him because a committee may have wanted me to vote one way or the other. I think it was a matter which each Senator should have decided for himself.

But I wish to make it a matter of record at this moment that members of the Democratic Policy Committee told me in private conversation that I should not regard it as being a party matter. That was as late as 2 days before the vote occurred. Those of us who voted for the resolution did not vote for it because we disagreed with the Senator's objectives.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has stated something which reminds me of what I should have said to the Senator from Wisconsin when he asked me earlier about the matter of party discipline.

What the Senator from Louisiana said is correct with reference to me also. Not one Member of the Senate on the Democratic side of the aisle asked me to vote for or against the McCarthy censure resolution.

As a matter of fact, I made it clear early in the debate that I would not vote for count 2, the Zwicker count, and not once did any Member of the Senate ask

me to change my opinion on that matter or try to influence my vote.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to return to the all-important issue for 1 or 2 minutes.

Will the Senator from Louisiana agree with me that if a person has been hindering the fight against Communists by covering up or coddling Communists, the only way for him to attempt to get a clean bill of health before the American people is to vote for a pious resolution saying, "I am against communism generally"? Will the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. LONG. There are many ways by which a person could do an insincere act, but I have never felt that one should accuse others of being insincere unless he has the proof to back up the accusation.

I do not think that Senators on this side of the aisle felt any necessity to cover up or to gain some pardon with regard to the vote of censure, on which they were required to vote.

So far as many Senators were concerned, they had no intention of offering such a resolution; but there was a feeling on the part of some Senators that it should be made clear that they wanted the investigation and the prosecution of anyone connected with the Communist conspiracy to continue. It seems to me it is a compliment to the junior Senator from Wisconsin that such a resolution was submitted.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am very happy that the resolution contains the word "continue." I consider it a compliment, and I appreciate it very much.

I may say to the Senator from Louisiana, as a final comment, that I am very deeply disturbed by what is happening at this time. I think the Senator will agree with me that while he is as anti-Communist as anyone in the Senate, as is also the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the raw, harsh, unpleasant fact remains that the Democrat Party—I should not say "the Democrat Party"; I should say the Truman party, because there certainly are two branches of the party—over the past 20 years has countenanced the Harry Dexter White type of person, to cite one case. It can be multiplied by hundreds, and the Senator can then get the picture.

The Senator from Louisiana and I know that the Communists are clever. They assign their best men and women to infiltrate our Government. The Senator and I know that some of those persons are still in the Government. They were not all removed last night or the night before.

If the resolution which was adopted today means what it says, then this is a really great day for the United States. But I am not too hopeful that its purpose can be accomplished. I am not too hopeful that those who are in control of the Democrat Party—and I do not believe the Daniels and the Longs are in control of the Democrat Party—will allow Senators to dig out from underneath the dark recesses the persons who have been nurtured and encouraged for 20 years. I rise today only to point out that the resolution is meaningless unless something shall be done about those persons.

As I said earlier today—and the Chair can call me to order again, if he desires to do so—it is my opinion that many Senators who sponsored the resolution and voted for it will raise every obstacle they possibly can when an attempt is made to dig out individual Communists. They will be satisfied if we dig up well-known Communists, such as the Earl Browders and the Fosters, and others who are well known in the Communist Party, and parade them before a committee. They will not scream about that. But when an attempt is made to get down beneath the planks and pull out Communists who have been in the Government for years and years, I fear we shall hear shouting and screaming on the part of Senators who voted for the resolution. I hope I am wrong.

Mr. LONG. These questions become matters of opinion, as to which each person is entitled to hold his own opinion.

So far as the opinion of the junior Senator from Louisiana is concerned, I do not believe there has ever been a President of the United States who was not a patriotic citizen, who did not act as God gave him the ability to act, so far as he could to preserve the Nation. I believe history will bear out the statement that without exception there has not been a single President who was not a great American patriot, devoted to the welfare and interest of the country. I make that statement without regard to parties or individuals.

While there have been mistakes, I am confident that, so far as the security of the Nation is concerned, the mistakes which have been made have been mistakes of judgment or mistakes resulting from not knowing all the facts. I do not believe they were mistakes of intention, so far as our leaders were concerned.

INCREASED COTTON-ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall address the Senate quite briefly on a matter of the most serious consequence to thousands of cotton farmers throughout the cotton-producing area, and more particularly to the so-called family-size cotton farmer, the small landowner. My remarks will center around the several measures which have been introduced and sponsored jointly by various of my distinguished colleagues, particularly my colleague the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. Those bills were introduced in the Senate on January 10. They are similar in nature, in that they call for increasing the cotton acreage for 1955 from the present 18.1 million acres, as originally announced by the Secretary of Agriculture, to 19½ million acres. The bills are also similar in regard to the distribution to the States of the national acreage.

I hasten to point out that we have made every possible effort to stay close to the basic formula in the present law, and therefore to enable the States to maintain their present relationship to the basic formula of a 5-year average.

We are proposing an increase of only 1,400,000 acres, which is designed to take care of inequities, with particular attention to the family-size farm.

The present law, as amended in 1954, provides two basic methods for apportioning county allotments to farmers. The 1954 amendments gave the county committee authority to apportion farm allotments on the basis of the crop-land factor, or on the basis of the 3-year history of planting on individual farms. If the crop-land factor is used, the county committee is required to use the minimum small-farm provision in the present law, which provides that each farm shall be allocated, so far as possible, the smaller of 5 acres or the highest planted cotton acreage in 1952, 1953, or 1954.

If the history base is used, the county committee has permissive authority either to use or to ignore the small-farm provision I have just described. I understand that the Department of Agriculture has estimated that 92 percent of the counties selected and used the history base as a method of apportionment and with only a few exceptions have not used the small-farm provision. It is my understanding that only 85 out of 984 counties used the small-farm provision, and 50 of those counties were in Oklahoma. This formula, while having desirable features from the standpoint of flexibility, has in many cases caused serious reduction in acreage to the family-size farmer, and is so drastic in many instances that it actually put him out of business.

Mr. President, if I may have the especial attention of the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry who are present in the Chamber at this time, I should like to refer to a specific example of the operation of the present apportionment in my home State and my home county, where I know the people, where I know the land, and where I know the history of the families who occupy the land. I went on some of those farms during the Christmas holidays, and I found there small cotton farmers whose people have lived on that land for more than 100 years. However, as a result of the operation of these provisions, those farmers have actually been reduced to the point where each of them has less than 1 acre of cotton which he is permitted to plant for the year 1955. There are many cases of that sort. In many instances, the farmers are permitted to plant less than 2 acres or less than 3 acres. I think such a situation is comparable to that of a factory worker who might be permitted to work only 1 hour a day, and whose family would be expected to receive their sustenance from so limited an income.

Actually, Mr. President, in that county there are 1,584 cotton farmers; and more

than 700 of them have such small cotton-acreage allotments under the present law that they would be affected by the enactment of these bills. However, the bills, if enacted, will require the allotment of only 1,200 acres in the county in order to take care of the deficiency and to bring the individual allotments up to the point where those farmers would have what heretofore has been considered the least possible acreage required in order to enable a cotton farmer to keep body and soul together, in the case of both himself and his family.

Mr. President, I am not referring to an imaginary situation. On the contrary, I am referring to what has actually occurred. Over 50 percent of the farmers in that county would be affected by the proposed allowance of 1,200 additional acres. Other provisions of the bills would bring about a modification of the present small-farm provision, and would require that the 1,200 additional acres, to which I have just referred, be apportioned to farmers on a basis similar to that under which they received their original allotments.

Mr. President, even though the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry do not agree with this provision of the bills, I am encouraged by the fact that, as they understand conditions at the present time, they are entirely willing to have thorough hearings held on this situation, particularly in regard to the drastic reductions in acreage allotments. Let me say that I sincerely appreciate the attitude of the members of the committee, and I trust that they will speedily go into this matter, because if additional acres are to be planted in cotton, they must be planted soon, or else it will be too late.

The bills which we have introduced are designed to bring back a normal relationship to these family-size units; and they direct that the increased acreage be apportioned, to the extent such acreage is available, to increase each farm allotment heretofore established to the smaller of 5 acres or the highest planted in the 3 previous years. This is the same provision contained in section 344 (f) (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, but makes it mandatory that the increase be used for this purpose.

Mr. President, let me point out that all that is proposed by means of these bills is that Congress shall take action to restore, for 1955, the minimum requirement which always heretofore has been considered essential and necessary for the small farm operators if they are to sustain themselves and keep body and soul together. Of course, in some counties the proposed additional acres would not be used for the purpose provided by the bills, but would be distributed to other farms where the need is the greatest. A few counties in Mississippi had sufficient allotments to meet the requirements of the small-farm operators to whom I have referred, and thus they have been taken care of. But the great majority of the counties throughout the entire cotton-producing belt are in great need of the relief I mention.

Other proposals would provide for a modification of the present small-farm provision by providing for the smaller of 4 acres or the highest planted in the 3 previous years, and still another proposal would provide for the smaller of 4 acres or 75 percent of the highest planted in the 3 previous years. While the bills vary in method of apportionment of State acreage to county and farm, they are all identical in distribution of allotments to States, and preserve the formula in the present law. This provision is designed to insure the small operator the barest minimum for basic, essential needs of life.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table listing the cotton States, with their present allotments and the proposed increases under the bills that have been introduced. Although the figures are believed to be accurate, it is possible that they may be at some variance with the absolutely correct figures.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Cotton allotments by States—Actual allotments, 1954–55, and proposed increases for 1955

State	Actual allotment for 1954, 21,379,358 acres	Actual allotment for 1955, 18,113,208 acres	Proposed increase over actual allotment for 1955 if national allotment is increased to 19.5 million acres
Alabama	1,346,401	1,101,804	84,382
Arizona	413,820	333,933	25,575
Arkansas	1,847,036	1,529,704	117,153
California	936,408	778,686	59,636
Florida	44,116	36,283	2,779
Georgia	1,188,894	950,818	72,819
Illinois	4,000	3,056	None
Kansas	80	35	None
Kentucky	10,799	8,374	641
Louisiana	750,436	648,442	49,661
Mississippi	2,079,833	1,750,852	134,090
Missouri	462,617	399,627	30,605
Nevada	2,289	2,324	None
New Mexico	218,942	182,194	13,953
North Carolina	624,831	515,714	39,496
Oklahoma	1,098,283	872,532	66,823
South Carolina	929,030	773,945	59,273
Tennessee	680,683	593,868	45,482
Texas	8,719,178	7,612,779	583,027
Virginia	21,682	18,238	1,397
United States	21,379,358	18,113,208	1,386,792

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I should like to emphasize the fact that I am mindful of the present supplies of cotton and the obligation which the cotton farmer has to bring supplies in line with the demand. This very fact has caused me to be very cautious and to study this entire problem before seeking legislation to increase the 1955 acreage allotment. However, after a visit to my home State and having a first-hand look at the severe hardships facing the family-size farmer, I am fully convinced that there are many grave and drastic hardships which demand adjustment.

The economic situation facing most cotton farmers makes it extremely difficult to stand another downward adjustment in cotton acreage. In addition to finding themselves in a price-cost squeeze of paying more for what they buy and receiving less for the things which they sell, the farmers have not recovered from the severe financial setback resulting from a drought last year. This is particularly true of the small farmer who has completely exhausted his credit availability and finds it almost impossible to shift to new crops which are costly and in which he has had little or no experience.

In that connection, I should like to point out that it is necessary for a great many of the small operators I am talking about to borrow money in order to finance the making of a crop. A man with an allotment which is as low as many of these allotments are cannot go to a bank and obtain any kind of financial support for the making of that crop.

I have before me a letter from one of the leading bankers in my State, Mr. W. C. Neill. He is a down-to-earth type of man and knows the problems of the farmers in the making of a crop. The letter reads:

LEFLORE BANK & TRUST CO.,
Greenwood, Miss., December 20, 1954.
Senator JOHN C. STENNIS,
DeKalb, Miss.

DEAR SENATOR STENNIS: The cotton allotments proposed for 1955 are at levels which will induce lending agencies to be extremely critical in making production furnish advances on 1955 crops. In several instances that have come to my attention, allotments are insufficient to provide means for repayment of nominal advances.

If these critical cases cannot be remedied by a decent increase in cotton acreage, there will be no alternative other than to direct loan applicants in such brackets to Federal agencies for assistance—or subsistence.

With best regards, I am,
Yours very truly,

W. C. NEILL.

Mr. President, Mr. Neill very tersely states the situation confronting the small cotton farmers.

I do not contend that the proposed small increase in acreage provides a lasting solution to our cotton problem, but it does provide an emergency measure for the small farmers who depend on cotton acreage for their livelihood.

I feel that this situation emphasizes the need for developing a long-range program which will enable cotton farmers and other farmers to reduce the cost of production and improve the quality of their products in a program designed to meet competition, to expand markets, and to reduce surpluses. I firmly believe that research and education will help provide the long-range solution to this and other agricultural problems, and I hope to have a chance to present my full views on that subject at a later date.

I emphasize the fact that research or any other activity will not meet the situation for this year.

The small operator, against whom this acreage plan works so drastically, has always voted in favor of a cotton acreage controls program, and he did so in 1954 after his acreage was so drastically reduced. But he so voted in the firm belief that the inequities of the situation would be remedied. It is grossly unfair to fail to hear his plea now.

Mr. President, I cannot overemphasize that fact. These men, against whom the acreage plan works so drastically, and

whose acreage has been reduced below the minimum, were completely confident that the inequities of the situation would be adjusted, and with that confidence they voted in favor of acreage controls. They are not the kind of people who write letters. They do not send letters in great volume. They depend upon their elected representatives in Congress to do something about the situation.

I see no sound reason why the administration cannot support some proposal of this nature. In doing so they would not abandon or compromise their position in a sliding scale support program, nor the acreage control program, which goes with it. This is merely remedial legislation to cover hardship cases which may occur under any formula which may be adopted by the distribution of acreage. Many of these hardship cases involve small farmers, and the acres necessary to bring them relief will add very little to the total annual production.

It is significant to note that if the bills are passed the surpluses will still be reduced considerably, according to all present calculations. It should be remembered that the farmer who has built up the surpluses is not the one I have been talking about, who has been drastically affected by the reduction. If relief is given to the small operator under a putting together of the main features of the bills that have been introduced, the relatively small amount he will produce over and above what he is allotted now will not seriously affect our surplus situation.

I appeal to the Department of Agriculture to actively take the lead in meeting this grave situation. The Department has the far-reaching operating machinery to put into effect this program that extends over 1,000 counties of the Nation. It can speedily bring the full facts before Congress and its recommendations will carry tremendous weight in obtaining favorable action by Congress.

Approximately 10 days ago I wrote to the Secretary of Agriculture, requesting that the information be obtained. Orders have been sent to the various counties throughout the Cotton Belt to assemble this information. That is being done now. It is anticipated that the major part of the information will be in the hands of the Department during the first few days of next week.

Mr. President, soon it will be too late. The small operator—be he landowner or tenant—is having to stand by amidst his uncertainty while the deadline for planting cotton daily draws nearer. He does not know what his acreage will be. He does not know how he will be financed. The tenant does not know where he will live in 1955. There is nothing he can do about it until Congress acts.

Therefore, Mr. President, again with complete confidence in our Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I call on the committee to fully study the problem.

The farmers are faced with a critical situation, and I hope the committee will speedily approve one of the bills and report it to the Senate at a very early date.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DANIEL. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Mississippi on the remarks he has made.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator stated that the farmers who are the hardship cases are not organized letterwriters. I agree. On the other hand, the great bulk of my mail since returning to Washington has come from farmers who come under the category of hardship cases.

It is not an organized letterwriting campaign, but one in which many individuals express the same hardship in their own separate ways. They are letters from individual citizens telling their representatives in Washington the hardships that are being forced upon them by the present cotton-allotment program.

I join the distinguished Senator from Mississippi in expressing the hope that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the President, and the Secretary of Agriculture will do something about the situation, so that we may stop the movement away from the small farms and the discouragement of the young men who would like to go into farming. We need some kind of legislation or some change in the program along the line suggested by the Senator from Mississippi.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial on this subject, written by Mr. Walter Malec, and published in the Hallettsville (Tex.) Tribune of January 7, 1955, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW MANY MORE?

Our small farmers are victims of policies which are one-sided and unwise because unjust, to say the least. There is also no doubt as to their effect.

The high tariff is forcing our farmers to plant less and less cotton, while other countries produce more and more, as the result of our tariff policy. Mexico just had a record crop, also not without the help of our own capital.

The parity is paid in the price with a full knowledge that it will act as a serious handicap to our cotton in the world market.

Our allotment policy cut those at the bottom the same as those at the top, contrary to our income-tax policy. If this tax would be levied the same way, it would make it impossible for the small people to make a living, just as this allotment policy does to the small farmers.

Under this policy, the cotton acreage is taken from our old cotton counties and given to the new ones. While our small farmers must plant less, the large producers can plant more in the new cotton counties.

The cotton allotment is in acreage, the same for those producing two bales or more per acre as for the others averaging a half bale or less.

Can anything else be expected than the farm families by the thousands being driven into the cities?

For instance, this congressional district lost some 8,000 farm families, about 25 percent, as did the State and the rest of the South.

Certainly never before were so many family farmers wiped out as since 1940—with all it means to the country. There is already a talk of a farm depression spreading also into the cities.

Senator OLIN JOHNSTON sees the farm depression already on—yet almost utterly ignored, much less understood.

Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY believes the answer is in a higher farm income—of little help to small farmers unless they can produce and sell more cotton.

From independent farmers are being made people dependent only on jobs.

Instead of helping more people to settle on the farms, we are losing them wholesale.

And instead of dividing the large estates into small farms to make more independent people, we are wiping out the small ones and making bigger farms, the same as the Communists do. The same results, only a different method. Nothing else can be expected—but are those policies inevitable?

Must our small farmers be sacrificed to our tariff policy?

Must our parity be used as a price handicap?

And must those at the bottom be cut the same as those at the top?

And should not the allotment be in lint instead of acreage, in justice to all?

Also, must the cotton acreage be taken from the old and given to the new counties?

And must we force our farmers to plant less while we encourage other countries to produce more cotton?

That the mechanized farming is responsible for this trend is only a sinister fallacy—which has nothing to do at all with the above policies.

So much has happened to our farmers, yet so little is known, much less understood.

How much more must happen?

How many more farmers must be sacrificed?

How much more must our very foundation be weakened by those blind and stupid policies?

Only Congress, now in session, can give this answer.

THE GOVERNMENT OF FRANCE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, when Premier Mendes-France addressed the Senate a few weeks ago, I am certain that all of us were impressed with the sincerity and courage of the man. Therefore, it is disturbing to learn that during recent weeks, even since the adjournment of the French Assembly, rumors and reports have been circulating throughout Europe to the effect that the Government of the United States and our top officials have written off France as a country which is unable to govern itself, and have made rather discouraging and disparaging remarks about that great country.

Under date of January 13, there was syndicated in the United States a dispatch from Paris entitled "What France Resents," written by Seymour Freidin and William M. Richardson, which bears out the statement I have made that such reports are being circulated throughout Europe, especially in France, at the present time.

I do not have the original dispatch, but I hold in my hand the text of an article which was printed in the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 14, 1955, in the form of an advertisement presented as a public service by International Latex Corporation.

In the dispatch it will be noted that the reports circulating throughout

Europe actually imply that Secretary Dulles himself is beginning to believe that the French have lost the capacity to govern themselves. Some of us have frequently been briefed by Secretary Dulles during the past year; and I, for one, wish to say that, to the best of my knowledge, he has never implied, in any way, that the French people have lost the ability to govern themselves.

It seems to me that France, which was ravaged and weakened by two wars within a generation, is making a gallant and successful effort to become stronger.

Although we cannot control the thoughts or the language of everyone in the United States any more than can be done in any other country, I believe that confidence in France and the French people is increasing, not only among our Government officials, but also among the people of the country as a whole. We have not lost our faith in the ability of France to maintain her place among the great nations of the world, and I think we should tell them so and should do what we can to overcome the baseless rumors which undoubtedly are being circulated by those who mean no good either to France or the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the dispatch referred to printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT FRANCE RESENTS

PARIS, January 13.—France is profoundly disturbed over reports from Washington that this country is being "written off" as unstable and unreliable, despite recent ratification of the London and Paris agreements in the French National Assembly.

These reports have been given wide circulation throughout Europe during the past fortnight. The BBC has featured them on its main news programs and they have been given wide—and doubtless gratifying—circulation in Germany.

The reports began with Washington dispatches in American newspapers shortly before Christmas which said that Secretary Dulles was beginning to believe that the French had lost the capacity to govern themselves.

Such sentiments were echoed in other dispatches which said Defense Department officials were known to feel that France was no longer a good risk, at least as an anchor of Western defense. The implication was that they would seek other and more reliable real estate on which to build further bulwarks for defense.

Dulles' statement about French incapacity to govern themselves was made before Premier Mendes-France, fighting one of the great parliamentary battles of all time, finally rammed the Paris and London agreements through the National Assembly. But what disturbs France even more is that the echoes of this same sentiment, attributed to the Defense Department, were made after France's Assembly had given the green light to German sovereignty and rearmament.

The French are asking: Are these doubts quite fair, or even justified, within a week of the historic and successful Assembly debate? If American confidence was so completely shaken, why choose this of all moments to give it expression?

For the politicians and people of this country were under the impression that, if they did not ratify German rearmament, then their prestige would be finished in America. But they were certainly not under the impression that when their Assembly ratified that the name of France would be mud at any rate.

The Dulles threat of an agonizing reappraisal, they believed, held good only so long as France procrastinated on these issues, not when it took firm and forceful action.

To many Frenchmen this new defeatist attitude in the Defense Department—if it was correctly reported—comes as a shock since (1) they have ratified German rearmament in the lower house, (2) France has a leader in Mendes-France who shows signs of pulling the nation out of the polite semianarchy which existed for years, and (3) the Premier is preparing next month to push through his far-reaching economic reform program designed to harden most of the soft spots so long criticized by American economists.

The reports already have created resentment and some French observers believe this Washington attitude will play directly into the hands of the neutralists, the supernationalists, and the Communists. Already, all three of these groups have been arguing along these lines:

"You see, we always told you the Americans are, first and foremost, pro-German. And now that we have voted to give Germany arms and sovereignty, the Americans are no longer interested in us. Only a few weeks ago, when we held the future of the Western Alliance in the hands of our Parliament, the French were noble people who would surely make the noble decision. Now, America is looking elsewhere for her 'bulwark' and where else but Germany?"

Such arguments may be false; at best, gross oversimplification, but they have a powerful emotional appeal.

The French official who risked his constituency in the next general election to vote last week for German rearmament and Western stability will not take lightly to having his political courage put down to instability. In that vote, the United States obtained potential new friends outside the tight little ranks of the fretful MRP and rightwing, some of whose most powerful members voted against or abstained on the rearmament issue.

Many strictly neutral observers here believe that now is the time for the propaganda-and-policy battalions of our State Department here to start cultivating these new pro-Western men of courage—who risked all to vote for Western solidarity—and drop those former leaders of France who procrastinated on the question for 4 long years and then voted against it.

For, if France is to shake the malaise which has gripped her since the Popular Front, then her future lies in the honesty and courage of such men and not in the bitterness of the bad losers which it had been American policy to support, both in the present and the previous administration. (By Seymour Freidin and William M. Richardson in the New York Post.)

(Presented as a public service by International Latex Corp., Playtex Park, Dover, Del.)

URGENT NEEDS OF THE AMERICAN SHIPPING INDUSTRY

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in the conviction that the Congress and the people of the United States would give more favorable consideration to the urgent needs of American shipping if they understood more clearly the importance of that great industry to the economy and security of our country, I invite attention to an advertisement which was published recently by the Gibbs Corp., of Jacksonville, Fla.

Under the heading, "Keep Her Flying," this splendidly phrased advertisement puts in most succinct fashion some basic facts pertaining to the American merchant marine that merit the attention of every citizen, and every Member of Congress.

The Gibbs Corp. is to be congratulated heartily upon this most timely and most convincing presentation of the plus side of the shipping question. As the members of the public relations panel of the Propeller Club of the United States were reminded at the recent Miami convention of that important national organization, by one of the country's leading authorities on maritime matters, Miss Helen Delich, shipping editor of the Baltimore Sun, the industry must let the people know what a job it is doing for the country; must sell its services to our people, shippers and passengers alike. This the Gibbs advertisement does most persuasively.

I ask unanimous consent that the advertisement be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEEP HER FLYING

The tankers, freighters and passenger ships of the United States merchant marine are an investment in peacetime prosperity and wartime security. From the operation of these privately owned ships in peaceful commerce comes a chain reaction of economic benefit to industry and commerce, to labor and agriculture, to every State and every part of the population.

In the Nation's defenses, these same ships are as essential as planes, tanks, and battleships; they are the logistical key to any global emergency. Yet this vital weapon of war earns its keep and pays its own way in peacetime, both directly and in the enormous contribution of the merchant marine to the national economy.

But mothballed ships carry no cargoes, create no jobs, and train no men. Only a great merchant fleet, carrying on this Nation's share of the world's maritime commerce, can bring these benefits. Even as a reserve, a merchant fleet in mothballs will be useless unless there are trained officers, seamen and engineering personnel to man them when needed—and only an active merchant fleet will provide the necessary backlog of men with deep-sea training.

Few Americans outside the maritime industries know the facts or understand the urgency of this question. It is up to us who do know to pass the word—to keep our Representatives in Government informed and alert, to speak up at every opportunity in behalf of the merchant marine, to take an active part in the clubs and organizations working to keep the Stars and Stripes flying on the maritime trade routes of the world.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS AND ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, before moving an adjournment, I desire to make a brief announcement.

As stated earlier in the day, in accordance with a request made by the chair-

man of the Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], for leave to file a report when the Senate is not in session, it is the plan of the leadership, after having conferred with the minority leader, to call up on Tuesday next the urgent deficiency appropriation bill. I desire that all Senators have adequate notice that the consideration of that bill will be the business before the Senate on Tuesday.

I now move that the Senate adjourn until Tuesday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, January 18, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 14, 1955:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

James A. McConnell, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, vice Ross Rizley, resigned.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

James A. McConnell, of New York, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation, vice Ross Rizley, resigned.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Kenneth H. Tuggle, of Kentucky, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1961. (Reappointment.)

Everett Hutchinson, of Texas, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1958, vice Charles D. Mahaffie.

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION

Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, United States Army, retired, to be a member of the National Security Training Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 19, 1956.

SUPREME COURT, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Philip L. Rice, of Hawaii, to be associate justice of the Supreme Court, Territory of Hawaii, vice Louis LeBaron whose term has expired.

BOARD OF PAROLE

George Glenn Killinger, of Virginia, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1960. Dr. Killinger is now serving in this post under an appointment which expired September 30, 1954.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be commissioned lieutenants

William R. Kachel, effective January 1, 1955.

Hal P. Demuth, effective January 5, 1955.

Pentti A. Stark, effective January 18, 1955.

Merlyn E. Natto, effective February 25, 1955.

To be commissioned lieutenants (junior grade)

Robert C. Munson, effective January 9, 1955.

Gerard E. Haraden, effective January 10, 1955.

To be commissioned ensigns

David E. Livingston

Kelly E. Taggart

James D. Slayden

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Bartholomew W. Hogan, Medical Corps, United States Navy, to be Surgeon General and Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Brig. Gen. Raymond A. Anderson, United States Marine Corps, to be Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps, with the rank of major general, for a period of 2 years from February 1, 1955.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Centennial of Land-Grant Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 14, 1955

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I am informed that the Post Office Department is about to issue a special postage stamp commemorative of the centennial of the founding of land-grant colleges. It happens that Michigan State College was the first land-grant college, and I ask unanimous consent that some remarks of mine upon the subject be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MCNAMARA

The Post Office Department is about to issue a stamp commemorating the establishment 100 years ago of the first 2 land grant colleges in the United States—Michigan State College and Pennsylvania State University. This centennial anniversary is a source of real pride to the people of Michigan; and I am particularly proud of the fact that the first of the two colleges to be established was Michigan State College, which is thus the oldest of the land-grant colleges in America.

Michigan State College was actually established before the Federal Land Grant Act, the Morrill Act, was adopted by Congress. It was established with money appropriated by the State legislature in compliance with a requirement in the new State constitution. While Michigan did not wait for Federal money to establish its college, the State was grateful for the aid received when Congress did adopt the Morrill Act in 1862 and made possible an increase of 100 percent in the service rendered to Michigan by the college.

This centennial celebration invites us to take another look at the history of Federal aid to education in this country and to contrast that history with the situation today.

The history shows that the first piece of major legislation in support of public education was adopted by our Federal Government as far back as 1785, even before the adoption of our Federal Constitution. This was the famous Northwest Ordinance, which initiated the policy of setting aside Federal land and Federal moneys to aid education. Since then more than 160 acts have been passed by the Congress to help the States support schools.

A list of the major acts is as follows:

Seventeen hundred and eighty-five: Ordinance of 1785.

Seventeen hundred and eighty-seven: Ordinance of 1787.

Seventeen hundred and ninety-six: Ohio Salt-Land Grant Act.

Eighteen hundred and two: Ohio Enabling Act.

Eighteen hundred and three: Ohio Enabling Act amendment.

Eighteen hundred and thirty-three: United States Deposit Fund Act.

Eighteen hundred and thirty-six: Surplus Revenue Loan Act.

Eighteen hundred and forty-one: Internal Improvement Act.

Eighteen hundred and fifty: Swamp-Land Grant Act.

Eighteen hundred and sixty-two: Morrill Act.

Eighteen hundred and sixty-seven: Department of Education Act.

Eighteen hundred and eighty-seven: Hatch Act.

Eighteen hundred and ninety: Second Morrill Act.

Nineteen hundred and six: Adams Act.

Nineteen hundred and seven: Nelson amendment to Morrill Act.

Nineteen hundred and eight: Federal Forest Reserve Fund Act.

Nineteen hundred and eleven: State Marine School Act.

Nineteen hundred and fourteen: Smith-Lever Act.

Nineteen hundred and seventeen: Smith-Hughes Act.

Nineteen hundred and twenty: Federal Mineral Royalty Act.

Nineteen hundred and twenty: Civilian Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

Nineteen hundred and twenty-five: Purnell Act.

Nineteen hundred and twenty-seven: Federal School Land Act.

Nineteen hundred and twenty-eight: Capper-Ketcham Act.

Nineteen hundred and twenty-nine: George-Reed Act.

Nineteen hundred and thirty-four: George-Ellzey Act.

Nineteen hundred and thirty-five: Bankhead-Jones Act.

Nineteen hundred and thirty-six: George-Deen Act.

Nineteen hundred and forty: Vocational education for national defense.

Nineteen hundred and forty-four: GI bill of rights.

Nineteen hundred and forty-five: Amendment to the Bankhead-Jones Act.

History reminds us that the States have not sat on their hands waiting for the Federal Government to do it all. As Michigan did in the case of its State college, the States have taxed themselves for their schools, only turning to the Federal Government for help over and above what they themselves were able to do. History shows also that even when Federal aid was generously given, it was given without any requirement that the States give up control over their school systems. This thing that some people claim to fear today—the loss of local control over education—just has not happened in the past. It need not happen today.

Today, surveys of school needs have made clear the fact that our children need more than $10 billion worth of school construction. The facts have been presented over and again. The States are laboring to do their share to meet these needs. But the Federal Government, unlike some periods in the past, is sitting on the sidelines, waiting for the matter to be hashed over at 49 conferences before it decides how to act, if at all.

As one of those who has joined with the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama, Senator LISTER HILL, in sponsoring a bill to provide at least part of the needed aid now, I hope that this Congress will take both heart and instruction from the history of Federal aid to education, and begin immediately to meet our responsibilities in this crucial area of our lives.

Address by Hon. William F. Knowland, of California, at Second International Student Exchange Dinner, Houston, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 14, 1955

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a speech I delivered last night at the second annual international student exchange dinner in Houston, Tex.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF A SPEECH OF UNITED STATES SENATOR WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND BEFORE THE SECOND ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL STUDENT EXCHANGE DINNER, JANUARY 13, 1955, HOUSTON, TEX.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Mayor, ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased to be here in Houston at the second annual international student exchange dinner and to be in the home State of my two able Senate colleagues, LYNDON JOHNSON and PRICE DANIEL.

In the year 1919 the founders of the Institute of International Education set forth the objectives of the organization. They are as applicable today as they were 36 years ago: "To enable our people to secure a better understanding of foreign nations, and to enable foreign nations to obtain accurate knowledge of the United States, its people, its institutions, and its culture."

Never was it more important that this aim be implemented by Government officials and leaders in education, business, agriculture, and labor, and by the average citizen who travels abroad and is in a sense an ambassador of our country.

Our press, radio, and television industry also has an important mission in reflecting a true cross-section of our country abroad. For the most part they carry out their function with responsibility.

During my last visit to India I had an opportunity to get up into the Punjab territory. This, as you know, is the home of the Sikhs. While visiting some of the projects that had received technical help from the United States, I met a young exchange farmer from Minnesota. His name was Peterson, and he had a Scandinavian background. He had done a fine job of public relations and fitting into the agricultural life of the area. When he came out to meet us he was well tanned and wearing a turban, with a reddish imitation of a Sikh beard, and the farmers in the neighborhood had renamed him Peter Singh.

Both as a member of the Senate and as a newspaperman I have had the opportunity to see some of the other exchange work being done in various parts of the world. As has been the case with a considerable number of American newspapers, we have had men from overseas come and work in our office at the Oakland Tribune for a period of time, and have had some of our people go abroad.

There have also been a considerable number of delegations, of educators, students, newspapermen, and public officials who have had the opportunity of coming to this country and seeing a cross-section of America.

Too often when our people visit abroad or when others come here they only see the capital city and perhaps the chief metropolitan areas. Visiting only Washington and New York certainly does not give a visitor a rounded picture of America and what has made it a leading world power.

All of our citizens desire to live in peace and to devote their efforts to the building of America so that we may leave it as a better land than we ourselves found. This has been the hope and aspiration of Americans ever since we became a Nation.

We recognize that where other nations believe in human freedom and the establishment of international law and order for the preservation of peace in the world for ourselves and our children, we can maintain close and cordial relations with them.

An example is our 3,000 mile frontier with our neighbor of Canada to the North, where for a long period of our history there has not been a single military fortification of any type or character along that whole frontier. We have also developed a comparable friendly relationship with our neighbor Mexico to the South.

However, the American people must be realistic enough to recognize that all nations are not as civilized or peace loving as are our neighbors, Canada and Mexico. Hence it becomes important that we remain as prudent as the early pioneers, who continued to hope and pray for peace but kept their powder dry.

This organization is to be complimented on the constructive work it does. The exchange of students is, of course, of great importance in the building of a better world. These young men and women will carry heavy responsibilities in the years ahead, and it is essential that they have accurate information regarding world affairs.

Even though the Iron Curtain exists between the free world and that of Communist tyranny, we should not consider all the people behind that curtain as being enemies of the free way of life.

As a matter of fact the people of Russia were the first victims of Communist tyranny from which we may hope they will some day be free. The enslaved people of the satellite states of Eastern Europe, of Asia and even of Russia may turn out to be among our stanchest allies in the event of Communist aggression.

Foreign and defense policies are and need to be the people's business. The decisions that are made in the months ahead may well determine whether we are to have a free world of free men.

The wise men who drafted our Constitution knew well the history of the world up to their time.

They knew that where people had lost their freedom it was because of the concentration of power in one agency of the government.

Not only did they set up three great coequal branches of the Federal Government as checks and balances one against the other but they made the Federal Government one of limited and specified powers, reserving to the several States or the people thereof all other powers.

Though a Republican, in each of the almost 10 years I have been in the Senate I have become more firmly convinced of the importance of preserving our States rights as a vital part of maintaining our way of life.

Some, though not all, of our present problems vis-a-vis the Communist world stem from the secret agreements of Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam.

Without the knowledge or consent of either the American people or their elected Representatives in Congress commitments were made for the postwar period which enabled the Communist conspiracy to gain control of Eastern Europe, China, and North Korea.

Since the year 1945 which saw the end of World War II in Europe and Asia, international communism has made great strides.

In January of that year there were less than 200 million people behind the Communist Iron Curtain. Today, just 10 years later, there are over 800 million. The world's balance of power has been upset.

Thirty years ago Lenin said "the road to Paris is through Peking." What he meant was that China was the key to all of Asia with its billion and a half people. Once consolidated with the manpower and resources of Asia communism could turn with overwhelming power against the West.

Peace with honor is and should be the policy of the American people. This is certainly far different from a policy of "peace at any price." Unless this is thoroughly understood, we could be lured into a sense of false security by the words of the men in the Kremlin which do not conform to their actions or their policies.

We must never lose sight of the fact that communism is the most brutal, godless tyranny the world has ever known. As a temporary expedient they may change their day-to-day tactics, but their long-term strategy remains the same under Malenkov as it was under Lenin and Stalin.

Some time between 1913 and 1915 Lenin studied the works of Karl Von Clausewitz who is rated as one of the outstanding theoreticians of war. Clausewitz's statement that the conqueror always pretends to be peace loving because he would like to attain his objectives in a bloodless fashion (as indeed does the bank robber who kills only when resisted or distured in carrying out his mission) and that, therefore aggression must be presented as a defensive reaction of the attacking nation was considered by Lenin to be a good idea. This idea is still at the bottom of Communist pacifist propaganda—peaceful coexistence.

The Kremlin's basic strategy is that communism will dominate the world, and free institutions and enterprise as we know them will be destroyed. Neither as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee nor as a party leader in the Senate has the slightest reliable evidence been presented to me which would demonstrate that the Communist leopard has changed its spots.

We and the free world must not allow ourselves to be paralyzed while nation after nation in Asia and in Europe is brought behind the Communist Iron Curtain. In such an event we might ultimately find ourselves as an isolated island of freedom in an otherwise totalitarian world.

Under such conditions, though the difficulties would be great, we might exist as sort of a continental Dien Bien Phu. However, we would not be able to maintain the same political or economic system which has enabled this country of ours to grow from a small colony of 3 million on the Atlantic seaboard to a world power of 162 million, the most productive industrially and agriculturally the world has ever known.

The doctrine of peaceful coexistence is being advanced by the men in the Kremlin, by the neutralist nations which do not desire to take sides as between freedom and slavery, and by some of our people who have not necessarily followed the full implications of what the Communists mean by peaceful coexistence.

Among some of our associates abroad, and in some unofficial quarters in our own country, the term peaceful coexistence is becoming synonymous with peace at any price. Should such a condition become general, either here or abroad, it would be a fatal policy. It would almost assure the Commu-

nist conquest of all the peripheral countries.

There are some individuals who believe that if and when the condition of atomic stalemate is reached, this in itself will assure a period of peace. In dealing with the ruthless, Godless men of the Kremlin I believe that this is a naive approach. Two individuals may be placed in a room—each having a Colt .45. If one is a law abiding citizen who, because of his training and religion, values human life, and the other is a gangster, killer at heart, who places no value on human life, the equality of weapons does not assure that both will come out of the room alive.

Their basic policy is and has been that they would permit a nation to peacefully coexist for such a time as suited the Kremlin's convenience and until they could either be subverted by communism from within or taken over by Communist aggression from without. They have in mind for us the peaceful coexistence the Thanksgiving turkey has (well fed and housed) until the axe falls.

Whatever their station in political, economic, or academic circles those who lose sight of this basic fact endanger the freedom of this Republic and the hope of gaining or preserving a free world of free men. You could, of course, always buy temporary respite by a policy of appeasement, but the world should have learned at the time of Munich that the road to appeasement is not the road to peace. It is only surrender on the installment plan.

Proposals almost certain to be made if and when a Big Four Conference is held:

1. Recognition and approval of the present borders of the Iron Curtain.

2. Communist China in the United Nations.

This would mean the perpetual slavery of hundreds of millions of people without hope of ultimate freedom.

On November 15 in the Senate of the United States, in discussing coexistence, I raised a number of questions. They were:

"Are 'coexistence' and 'atomic stalemate' synonymous terms? If they are not, just what is the difference? Is the former merely an inevitable prelude to the latter? And what of our foreign policy and our defense policy when such an atomic stalemate takes place? Does not atomic stalemate mean inevitable Communist nibbling aggression, rather than peace in our time? How many years remain when we still have some initiative left? These are some of the basic questions before the Government and the people of the United States."

The United Nations has passed a resolution giving support to the American position relative to the 15 American airmen being illegally held by the Chinese Communists.

Both the resolution and the overwhelming majority by which it was adopted is most welcome.

However, the American people will judge the effectiveness of this resolution and the journey of the Secretary General to Peiping by whether or not these men are promptly released.

Since they have acknowledged that they hold these 15 men in uniform, there is reasonable grounds for belief that they may be holding other unaccounted for Americans missing. During the Korean war there were 931 unaccounted for Americans in uniform who had fallen into Communist hands and were held as prisoners of war. Neither alive nor dead have they been returned to us in the exchanges made pursuant to the armistice. We also know that they have 28 American civilian citizens still in Communist jails, many of them having served there for 3 or 4 years. Some have been held in chains without any type of what civilized people would call a trial.

All of us will hope that the efforts of the Secretary-General may be successful. This Nation will want to know what additional steps the United Nations will promptly take to secure the release of the uniformed personnel without paying ransom or tribute. The fact that the bandit returns the loot does not entitle him to an award of the Legion of Merit.

Are they prepared to apply against the Chinese Communist regime economic sanctions as well as moral condemnation by resolution? If these are not successful, are they prepared to support a tight naval and air blockade upon the China coast?

The religions and cultural background of the free people of China made them "slow to anger." Their nation is today behind the Iron Curtain and millions have been liquidated, including teachers, small merchants, businessmen, and non-Communist workers and farmers. The free people of Czechoslovakia were "slow to anger," and are today behind the Communist Iron Curtain—though in the preceding election less than 20 percent of their people had voted the Communist ticket.

I cannot help but review some of our own history. What a great difference it would have been had the people of Texas, instead of rallying behind the cry "Remember the Alamo," followed the doctrine "after all, they have been liquidated and we shouldn't make much ado about it."

Some of our associates abroad apparently want to brain wash us of some of the history that has made America great.

We did not change from a small colony of 3 million on the Atlantic seaboard to the great nation of 165 million because we had the most people in the world. There have been a good many other nations that have had larger populations.

We did not reach our present place because we had the most resources in the world, for there are other nations which undoubtedly have greater material resources.

I believe that we came to our present position of leadership because the founders of this Republic gave us a heritage of courage and a written constitution that, better than any other document drafted by man, has given to our people the freedom—political and economic—without which this great progress could not have been made.

In this free atmosphere the American spirit had free reign. We were guaranteed the right to worship God, each according to his beliefs. To be sure, we have demonstrated time and time again that as a nation and as a people we are indeed "slow to anger."

But, there comes a time, as my old New England grandmother used to say, when we reach a point of righteous indignation, and out of this has come—cherished to each American generation, one succeeding the other—such terms as:

"Remember the Alamo."

"Give me liberty or give me death."

"Don't give up the ship."

"Damn the torpedoes; full speed ahead." And "Praise the Lord and pass the ammunition."

Despite the fact that in many instances we were faced with what appeared to be overwhelming odds, we have never found it necessary to sacrifice our national honor when a vital principle was at stake.

Nor must we ever permit any cabal or international organization to so dilute or undermine our spirit so that Gulliver becomes chained by the Lilliputians and we are unable to even protect our own.

In the final analysis, neither the American Government nor the Congress can escape the responsibility for taking whatever effective steps are necessary to secure the release of these men wearing the uniform of this country.

United Nations record in Korea. It was not effective security in action. The United States furnished 90 percent of the manpower. Only 17 out of 60 members supplied any manpower at all.

Soviet chairmanship of Security Council at intervals during Korean war was like asking town arsonist to head the fire department. The Soviet Union admitted supplying arms, ammunition, and moral support to the aggressor. With this prima facie case before it, the Soviet Union should have been expelled as a violator of the Charter they had pledged to uphold.

While it is perfectly proper to seek the moral and effective support of our associates in the Korean war, if they fail to take effective steps, our obligation is not discharged. By this time next week we shall know the success or failure of the Hammarskjold mission.

What is the test? The immediate release of all prisoners of war desiring to return home without any political or monetary price being paid.

It is my belief that there are conditions being brought back. An attempt will be made to jockey us into another Panmunjom-type negotiation. Days will pass into weeks and months while American uniformed personnel remain in Communist cells.

It is the American Congress under the Constitution which is responsible for raising and supporting our Armed Forces and passes the selective service and other laws under which our armed service personnel is secured. It is the Government of the United States that ordered these men to Korea to participate in a collective security action against aggression. These men are Americans. I shall not remain silent while a single one of them remains in Communist hands.

If we will only show the same courage and commonsense that motivated the men who sat in Philadelphia and under divine inspiration gave us first the Declaration of Independence and then the Constitution of the United States, there are none of our domestic problems we cannot solve and there is no foreign foe we need ever fear.

Twenty-second Anniversary of the Lone Ranger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRICE DANIEL

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 14, 1955

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement relative to the 22d anniversary in radio of the program The Lone Ranger.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWENTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE LONE RANGER

(Statement by Senator DANIEL)

On January 30, 1955, The Lone Ranger, oldest continuous half-hour program in radio, will observe its 22d anniversary.

I extend my congratulations to Mr. Jack Wrather, of Dallas and Los Angeles, who now owns this program. The Lone Ranger has long been, and will continue to be under Mr. Wrather's direction, an aggressive force for good, a fine example for the young men and women of America, and an excellent specimen of the kind of entertainment our American airways have to offer youth and adults alike.

This program has served as a vital factor in keeping alive in the minds of people, both

in the United States and abroad, the traditions and ideals of the Texas Ranger organization and its work in maintaining law and order. As a radio and television program, it has received many national awards and citations from responsible organizations for its good work in fostering youth betterment and combating juvenile delinquency.

The Lone Ranger, hero of this program, teaches the principles of good citizenship. He fosters honesty, patriotism, fair play, tolerance, and a sympathetic understanding of human beings. Some 90,000,000 people throughout the world weekly feel his impact in one form or another of entertainment.

Although The Lone Ranger is classified as a children's program in radio and television circles, it is interesting to note that adults make up more than 55 percent of its listening and viewing audience. To this audience the program serves as a constant reminder of the American tradition as it was laid down by our forefathers—the tradition for which we fight today and which we strive on all fronts to preserve and defend.

Defense Mobilization Order Establishing Advisory Committee on Watch Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 14, 1955

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I was happy to note the announcement, today, that the Office of Defense Mobilization has established an Advisory Committee on the Watch Industry, which will recommend any necessary steps to keep the domestic watch industry in a healthy condition, and to preserve its essential skills for our national security, particularly as it pertains to essential skills for our national security. This action will help put into effect the unanimous findings and recommendations on this subject, as made last July by the special subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, which was headed by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF]. It was my privilege to serve on that subcommittee. From that experience, I know the fine interest of the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], who today is unavoidably absent from the Senate Chamber. On his behalf, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a press release by the Director of Defense Mobilization, as well as an order of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

There being no objection, the release and order were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D. C.

Arthur S. Flemming, Director of Defense Mobilization, today issued Defense Mobilization Order IV–3 establishing an Advisory Committee on the Watch Industry. Its function will be to recommend to him any measures which should be taken to maintain the domestic watch industry in a healthy condition over a long period and to assure the preservation of essential skills of the industry at a level sufficient to provide for the Nation's mobilization base requirements.

The committee will consist of the Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in charge of customs matters, the Assistant Secretary of Defense (supply and logistics), the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for domestic affairs, the Assistant Secretary of Labor for employment and manpower, and the ODM Assistant Director for manpower (chairman).

Noting that the industry would be essential in the event of full mobilization, Mr. Flemming said national security requires that the facilities and skills of the industry be maintained at a level from which a quick and effective expansion of production can be made in the event of national emergency.

In announcing the establishment of the new committee, Mr. Flemming called attention to a study which had been made of the jeweled-watch segment of the industry by an Interdepartmental Committee. Principal findings of that committee, whose study was issued last year, were (a) that preservation of the skills of the American jeweled-watch industry is essential to the national security and (b) that the levels of production and employment in jeweled-watch manufacturing were then below the levels necessary to preserve those skills sufficiently for the industry to expand quickly and effectively to meet the requirements of full mobilization.

DEFENSE MOBILIZATION ORDER IV–3

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
January 12, 1955.

Subject: Establishment of an Advisory Committee on the Watch Industry.

By vitrue of the authority vested in me by Executive Order 10480 of August 15, 1953, and Reorganization Plan No. 3 of June 12, 1953, and in order to obtain advice which will facilitate the development of long-range policies and programs to further the preservation of the skills of the domestic watch-manufacturing industry which are required in the interest of national security, it is hereby ordered:

1. There is established in the Office of Defense Mobilization an Advisory Committee on the Watch Industry. The committee shall consist of the Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in charge of customs matters, the Assistant Secretary of Defense (supply and logistics), the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Domestic Affairs, the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Employment and Manpower, and the Assistant Director for Manpower, Office of Defense Mobilization, who shall serve as chairman.

2. The Advisory Committee on the Watch Industry shall make recommendations to the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization with regard to any measures which should be taken to maintain the domestic watch industry in a healthy and vigorous condition on a long-term basis to the extent necessary to assure preservation of the essential skills of the industry at a level commensurate with mobilization requirements.

3. This order shall take effect on January 12, 1955.

OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
ARTHUR S. FLEMMING, *Director.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 17, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and ever-blessed God, who art the wisest of all counselors and the dearest of all companions, Thou knowest how greatly we need Thee as we daily encounter difficult tasks and heavy responsibilities.

We humbly confess that our fallible and finite minds are frequently confused and confounded by problems and questions for which we have no adequate solution and no satisfactory answer.

Inspire us with a vivid sense of Thy guiding intelligence and Thy sustaining power whenever we are tempted to surrender to moods of fear and defeatism.

Make us more receptive and responsive to the overtures of Thy grace and fortify us against those tensions and frustrations which deplete our strength and disturb our peace.

Hear us in the name of the all-conquering Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 13, 1955, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

AMENDMENT TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2369) to amend section 7237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 7237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended by striking out "subpart C of part I," and inserting in lieu thereof "part I." Subsection (b) of such section is hereby amended by striking out "subpart C of."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], the ranking minority member of the committee, who is present, is in full agreement with this request. The purpose here is simply to correct an inadvertent error made in the Internal Revenue Code enacted last year. This is unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO THURSDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AUTHORITY TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SIGN BILLS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Thursday, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENTAL OPERATIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 4) to provide for the continuation in office of certain members of the Commission on Governmental Operations.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act for the establishment of a Commission on Governmental Operations," approved July 10, 1953 (67 Stat. 143), is amended, effective December 31, 1954, by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Continuation of membership upon change of status: Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), a person appointed to the Commission in the status of a Member of Congress or in the status of a person in the executive branch of the Government, but who thereafter ceases to have such status, shall nevertheless continue as a member of the Commission. If such person returns to private life (except for his membership on the Commission), he shall, from and after such change of status, receive the same compensation as a person originally appointed to the Commission from private life."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. PATMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is a joint resolution to allow a Member of Congress to continue on the Commission until the expiration of the current investigation, notwithstanding the fact that he is no longer a Member. The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] pointed out the other day that it involves a Republican Member of another body, and that even if he did not continue on the Commission another Republican would be appointed to take his place, which is of course all right.

The distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has pointed out to me, too, that we did the same thing in 1949 when we had a Democratic Member who was a member of the first Hoover Commission, who was defeated in 1948. That case was very persuasive to me. At the same time, I do not want these two to be a precedent. I am not agreeing to this one with the idea that we are going to continue to do it. It is with the undetrstanding as far as I am concerned that it is not a precedent and will not be tolerated or permitted in the future on this Commission or any other commission or committee under similar and like circumstances. I do not expect to object to the consideration of this joint resolution for the reason stated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE WILLIS W. BRADLEY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I inform this body of the death of a former Member, the Honorable Willis W. Bradley, captain, United States Navy, retired, who served California's 18th District with outstanding ability and distinction during the great 80th Congress.

Captain Bradley was one of the few Members of this body who held the Congressional Medal of Honor. It was awarded him for heroism beyond all call of duty during World War I.

The Honorable Willis W. Bradley was a man with a remarkable devotion to his country. After a long and honorable career as a naval officer in peace and in war, he entered public life and civic affairs in Long Beach, Calif., where he had established his home in 1931. This was in California's 18th Congressional District, which at that time comprised the cities of Long Beach, Signal Hill, Lakewood, Compton, Paramount, Lynwood, South Gate, Norwalk, Bellflower, and Artesia.

Captain Bradley's public service did not cease with his membership in the 80th Congress, his long years of service in the United States Navy, nor his numerous local civic capacities. Seeking to give more of himself to his community, State, and Nation, he sought and won further public service by election to the Legislature of the State of California for the term 1952–53, as a representative from California's 70th assembly district, comprising the Long Beach-Lakewood-Signal Hill area.

It was while attending the legislative committee meeting in Santa Barbara, Calif., that on August 27, 1954, Captain Bradley suffered a heart attack which caused his death within a matter of hours. I attended his funeral services in Long Beach where hundreds of civic leaders, public officials, members of the armed services, active and retired, and citizen friends paid tribute to his memory. He was buried with full military honors in Fort Rosecrans National Cemetery at San Diego, Calif.

Born in Ransomville, Niagara County, N. Y., on June 28, 1884, Captain Bradley as a youngster moved with his parents to Milnor, N. Dak., and later to Forman, N. Dak., in 1891. He attended public schools and Hamlin University in St. Paul, Minn. During 1902 and 1903 he gave his first public service as deputy registrant of deeds of Sargent County, N. Dak.

The Honorable Willis W. Bradley graduated from the United States Naval Academy with distinction in 1906. His first naval duty as an officer was aboard the U. S. S. *Virginia*, then attached to the United States Atlantic Fleet. During the First World War he served as gunnery officer aboard the U. S. S. *Pittsburgh*. It was during this service that the signal act of heroism occurred for which he was awarded the coveted Congressional Medal of Honor. Later during World War I he served as Chief of the Explosives Section, Bureau of Ordnance in the Navy Department.

During 1929 to 1931, because of his outstanding administrative competence, he was assigned by the Navy Department to the sensitive position of Governor of Guam.

From 1931 to 1933 Captain Bradley commanded the U. S. S. *Bridge* and from 1933 to 1935 was commanding officer in the United States Navy Yard at Pearl Harbor, T. H.

Subsequent naval service included command of the cruiser U. S. S. *Portland* from 1935 to 1937; commander of Destroyer Squadron 31 and of the Carribbean patrol in 1939 and 1940, and membership on the Board of Inspection and Survey, Pacific Coast Section 1940 to 1946.

After 43 years naval service, Captain Bradley in 1946 retired from active United States naval service because of physical incapacity incurred in line of duty.

In addition to the Congressional Medal of Honor, Captain Bradley was awarded a silver medal from Pope Pius XI and the silver medal of the Italian Red Cross for unique and extraordinary service during the terrible Messina earthquake.

In addition to public service subsequent to his retirement from the United States Navy, Captain Bradley served as assistant to the president of the Pacific Coast Steamship Co. from January 1949 until his election to the California State Legislature.

The Honorable Willis W. Bradley, captain, United States Navy, retired, was a man of remarkable devotion to public service. His entry into political life, after a long and honorable career as a naval officer, was marked with the same zeal that characterized his military service.

Captain Bradley was blunt spoken but kindly. He was aggressively devoted to the causes he espoused but tolerant of the opinions of others.

He was devoted to his family, faithful to his friends, and intensely loyal to his country. He was a good American and left his mark upon the affairs of his community, his State, and his country. This was because he gave unstinted loyal effort to the almost innumerable public and civic responsibilities he accepted. His was a life well lived and well fought. His was a career turbulent, filled with action and responsibilities. His life should be an inspiration to those who seek to be recognized as good citizens.

He leaves surviving him his beloved widow, Mrs. Sue Bradley; four daughters, Mrs. John J. Earle, Monrovia,

Calif.; Mrs. Wallace H. Brucker, of Arlington, Va.; Mrs. Guy O. De Young, of San Juan, P. R.; and Mrs. Bruce McCandless, of Long Beach, wife of another Congressional Medal of Honor winner.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, it was with great regret that I learned of the death of my former colleague, the Honorable Willis Bradley. He and I came to Congress at the same time and were both assigned to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. We worked together closely during the entire period of his service. I learned to know of his great ability in the field with which he was concerned. Particularly in the field of legislation and information concerning the Panama Canal was he recognized as an outstanding authority in the United States.

It was a pleasure to work with him. It was equally a pleasure for Mrs. Allen and me to enjoy the company of Captain Bradley and his wife on the many occasions during which we were together. I extend my sincere sympathy to Mrs. Bradley. The country and particularly the district which Captain Bradley served has lost a very fine American.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. CANNON asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, immediately following the reading of the message from the President of the United States.

Mr. TABER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes, immediately following the remarks by Mr. CANNON.

THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I pick up the papers quite frequently, as I assume other Members do, and occasionally one reads a news item or a column about the two branches of the Congress where they refer to the Senate as the upper branch. That has never particularly disturbed me, although they are wrong and they ought to correct it in the future; but when I pick up the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and find a distinguished Member of the other body refer to the Senate as the upper House of Congress, then I naturally feel that the distinguished Member of the other body ought to be corrected and that he might well study the Constitution of the United States and he would realize that both branches of the Congress are coequal. He might go back to the early days of the country when the Congress sat in Philadelphia when the Senate met on the floor above the House, and they referred to one body because of their location in that particular building as the upper branch and they referred to the other body as the lower branch.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALTER. I wonder if the gentleman's attention has been called to the statement made by a certain Member of what he is talking about—that body—which impugns the patriotism and loyalty of Members of the House insofar as their interest in curbing subversive activities is concerned. I think it might be well to point out that they have no monopoly in that body on patriotism.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is absolutely correct, but on this occasion I am confining my remarks to this question of upper and lower bodies. I think it is well at the outset of the Congress that these remarks be made because statements of that kind are liable to be contagious. I might also state for the benefit of the world that I think the national House of Representatives of which we are all Members is second to no legislative body in the world in the collective ability of its Members and is second to no other legislative body I know of on the basis of its collective stability.

RULE OF COMITY IN THE CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make this statement at the beginning of this session with reference to something that has been maintained by every Speaker of the House since the present occupant of the Chair has been a Member of this body, and that is that the House of Representatives, regardless of what any other body or any other individual does, has maintained strictly those rules and regulations which protect and perpetuate the comity between the two Houses. And when any Member of this House rises to make remarks about what has happened in another body or about any individual in that body, the present occupant of the Chair will certainly see that the rules of the House and the rules of comity between the two Houses are enforced.

THE BUDGET—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NOS. 16 AND 17)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed:

PART A

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting to you today the Budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year 1956, which begins July 1, 1955.

The first part of this budget message summarizes the budget totals and highlights our policies and plans for next year, particularly as related to the fiscal situation. The second part presents summary tables and also contains my budget recommendations for each major Government activity.

The fiscal and budget story during this past year centers around the fact that we successfully made the adjustment from a wartime to a peacetime type of economy, a truly significant achievement. Aided by a proper fiscal policy, the inevitable dislocations of this adjustment, while difficult for some, have not been serious on the whole. Our present growing prosperity has solid foundations, free from the artificial stimulations of war or inflation. However, the peace in which we live is an insecure peace. We must be constantly on the alert. Along with the other free nations of the world we must continue to strengthen our defenses. At the same time to remain strong for what will apparently be a long period of uncertainty ahead, we must also progressively increase our prosperity and enhance our welfare.

The 1956 budget is based on this outlook. Total expenditures will be reduced. However, I am recommending somewhat increased expenditures in particular areas important to human well-being. Budget expenditures for the fiscal year 1956 are now estimated at 62.4 billion dollars, 1.1 billion dollars less than for the current year. All parts of the administration will continue to work toward further reductions during the year by eliminating nonessentials and by doing necessary things more efficiently.

We must maintain expenditures at the high level needed to guard our national security. Our economy is strong and prosperous but we should not dissipate our economic strength through inflationary deficits. I have therefore recommended to the Congress extension for 1 year of present excise and corporate income tax rates which are scheduled for reduction on April 1, 1955, under present law. If this is done, and employment and production increase as currently anticipated, we can expect budget receipts to rise 1 billion dollars over 1955, to a total of 60 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1956.

On the basis of these estimates of expenditures and receipts, the deficit will be reduced from the presently estimated 4.5 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1955 to an estimated 2.4 billion dollars in 1956. Thus we continue to progress toward a balanced budget.

BUDGET POLICIES

Three broad considerations of national policy have guided me in framing the budget for the fiscal year 1956.

First, we must defend our priceless heritage of political liberty and personal freedom against attack from without and undermining from within. Our efforts to date have helped bring about encouraging results—cessation of fighting, new and stronger alliances, and some lessening of tensions. The growing strength of the United States and its friends is a key factor in the improved outlook for peace. We must continue to build this strength. We must at the same time preserve our liberty at home by fostering the traditional initiative of the American people. We will increase the scope of private activity by continuing to take Government out of those things which the people can do better for themselves, and by undertaking on a partnership basis, wherever possible,

those things for which Government action is necessary. Thus, people will be able to keep more of their earnings to use as they wish.

Second, the Government must do its part to advance human welfare and encourage economic growth with constructive actions, but only where our people cannot take the necessary actions for themselves. As far as possible, these steps should be taken in partnership with State and local government and private enterprise. We must do our part to provide the environment for our free enterprise system to keep employment high, to create new jobs, and to raise the standard of living. We must broaden the opportunity for individuals to contribute to the growth of our economy and enjoy the fruits of its productivity.

Third, we must maintain financial strength. Preserving the value of the dollar is a matter of vital concern to each of us. Surely no one would advocate a special tax on the widows and orphans, pensioners, and working people with fixed incomes. Yet inflation acts like a tax which hits these groups hardest. This administration has made a stable dollar and economy in Government operations positive policies from the top down. Expenditure reductions, together with a judicious tax program, effective monetary policy, and careful management of the public debt, will help to assure a stable cost-of-living—continuing our achievement of the past 2 years.

A liberal attitude toward the welfare of people and a conservative approach to the use of their money have shaped this budget. Our determination to keep working toward a balanced budget provides the discipline essential for wise and efficient management of the public business.

NEW AUTHORITY TO INCUR OBLIGATIONS

My recommendation for appropriations and other new authority to incur obligations for the fiscal year 1956 is 1.3 billion dollars more than the amount for the fiscal year 1955, primarily because of new requirements for our military services. However, it represents a reduction of 32.8 billion dollars from 1952, 21.7 billion dollars from 1953, and 4.2 billion dollars from 1954.

	New authority to incur obligations (in billions)
1952	$91.4
1953	80.3
1954: As estimated, Jan. 9, 1953	72.2
Actual	62.8
1955 estimated	57.3
1956 recommended	58.6

The new authority to incur obligations which I am recommending for our major national security programs is 2.4 billion dollars greater than in the fiscal year 1955. I am proposing a reduction in the total new authority for all other Government programs, although within this total, I am recommending selective increases.

Part of the reduction in 1955 of new authority for our major national security programs below the amount enacted for 1954 was possible because the military services improved their supply procedures, which resulted in larger use of existing stocks and reduction of the large backlog of unexpended balances. The accumulated unexpended balances of funds appropriated to all Government agencies in prior years are now on their way down to more reasonable levels and the continued downtrend in total unexpended balances will be less rapid in the future than in the fiscal year 1955.

Recommended new authority for 1956 is less than both the anticipated revenues and the estimated expenditures for that year. By holding the level of new authority lower than anticipated revenues, we can continue making progress toward balancing the budget. Likewise, as long as the amount of new authority is less than expenditures, we are continuing on the way toward lower levels of Government spending.

BUDGET EXPENDITURES

In the fiscal year 1956, net budget expenditures are estimated to be 11.9 billion dollars below actual spending in the fiscal year 1953. The record shows that this administration cut Government spending in 1954 by 6.5 billion dollars below 1953, and 10.1 billion dollars below the level estimated for 1954 on January 9, 1953. For 1955, an additional reduction of 4.3 billion dollars is now estimated and still another reduction in spending of 1.1 billion dollars is the present estimate for 1956. The fiscal year 1955 is only half completed and the beginning of 1956 is still 5½ months away. We shall continue working to improve efficiency and to reduce still further the totals now estimated for these years.

Fiscal year:	*Expenditures (in billions)*
1952	$65.4
1953	74.3
1954: As estimated, January 9, 1953	77.9
Actual	67.8
1955 estimated	63.5
1956 estimated	62.4

The stern requirements of our national defense dictate the largest part of our budget, and it is chiefly these requirements which prevent us from decreasing budget expenditures faster at this time. Further progress in reducing expenditures must result in large part from increasing efficiency and from finding better ways of doing the things that must be done. Future savings will be more difficult than those already accomplished. However, we expect to continue reducing the cost of Government.

Major national security: Expenditures for major national security programs in the fiscal year 1956 are estimated at 40.5 billion dollars, 65 percent of total budget expenditures. This amount includes the cost of new legislation. I am proposing to establish an effective military reserve system and strengthen the career service. This budget provides for more expenditures by the Department of Defense for air power than ever before in peacetime history. New weapons for defensive and retaliatory action are being developed and produced in increasing quantities. High priority is being given to strengthening our continental defense system. Since military supplies are not being consumed in combat, the bulk of the military materiel being produced by our factories is adding to our capacity to defend ourselves. Our defense expenditures are now bringing about a steadily growing strength. Never in our peacetime history have we been as well prepared to defend ourselves as we are now.

We will deliver about the same amount of military equipment to friendly nations as in 1954 and 1955. New atomic energy plants will be placed in operation and more than in any previous year will be spent for peaceful applications of atomic energy. The dollar value of our stockpile of strategic materials is expected to reach 78 percent of the minimum objective, compared with 58 percent in 1954.

International affairs and finance: Our international programs are closely related to national security. The conduct of our foreign affairs is crucial in preserving peace. We have materially contributed to the strengthening of friendly nations through the economic aspects of the mutual security program. Continuation of such assistance is urgently needed for some countries. Net expenditures for international affairs and finance are estimated to be 1.3 billion dollars, 88 million dollars lower than in the fiscal year 1955.

Keeping our own defenses strong and cooperating with our allies to increase their defenses will deter outside attacks on our freedom. We must at the same time look to the abiding sources of our internal strength—our faith in the power of free men, our individual initiative, and our competitive enterprise.

Commerce and manpower: We are moving ahead in taking the Government out of business wherever this can properly be done. In addition to selling the Inland Waterways Corporation and liquidating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, we have already sold or shut down a number of Department of Defense plants for processing scrap and manufacturing paint, clothing, and chlorine. Private industry is performing an increasing share, which has reached almost half, of major equipment overhauls for the Air Force. Most of the synthetic rubber plants have been sold to private purchasers, subject only to congressional approval. These actions not only serve to strengthen our system of private enterprise, but also in many cases reduce Government expenditures and increase tax receipts for cities, counties, and States as well as the Federal Government.

During the past year, legislation was enacted permitting private lenders to make mortgage money available on more liberal terms so that more people can buy their own homes. Local public agencies aided by private investors, are being encouraged to start comprehensive urban renewal programs. Provision has been made for extension of unemployment insurance to 4 million more workers.

For the coming year, I am recommending that we start a 10-year program to modernize the interstate highway system in cooperation with State and local governments. I am also proposing that we step up aeronautical research, expand air navigation facilities, and help industry build more ships.

These activities are important for our national security as well as for our growing economy. I firmly believe that as large a proportion as possible of the expenditures of the Government should be borne by those directly benefiting therefrom. The user charge principle should be further extended. I have recommended to the Congress that postal rates be increased to make the postal system self-supporting in the near future. With the enactment of this legislation, total net expenditures for commerce and manpower in the fiscal year 1956 are expected to be 2.2 billion dollars, 364 million dollars below 1955.

Natural resources: An important policy of this Government is to encourage an increased sharing by State and local governments of our long-range development projects. For example, the State of New York and the Province of Ontario are now jointly developing the power resources of the St. Lawrence River without cost to the Federal Government. Under legislation passed last year the Markham Ferry project in Oklahoma and the Priest Rapids project in the State of Washington, both with large power developments, will be built by State or local units, with modest Federal contributions only for those purposes such as flood control which involve national responsibilities. This budget proposes the start of several new construction projects under such partnership arrangements. Thus, we are continuing to develop our natural resources at less cost to the Federal Government. Net budget expenditures of 953 million dollars in 1956 are estimated for natural resources, 180 million dollars less than in 1955.

Agriculture: Greater freedom from Government direction and control of farming operations will be made possible in future years as a result of the new farm legislation enacted last summer. The flexible supports provided for therein will stimulate the consumption of farm products at home and abroad and will reduce Government expenditures for buying and storing surplus commodities. Greater private participation in the financing of loans to farmers has also been brought about by legislation enacted last year. By increased use of fully insured private loans, the need for direct Federal loans for farm ownership and for soil and water conservation has been reduced. A sound basis has also been provided through the new watershed protection legislation for greater cooperation between the Federal Government and States and local groups in the upstream flood prevention program. In addition, through strengthened agriculture research and educational work, farmers can better work out solutions for their own problems. These steps reduce the dependence of farmers on the Government, encourage farmers to take the initiative in adjusting production to demand, and provide the conditions under which farmers can maintain their incomes with less interference by the Government. The flexible support legislation will not greatly affect expenditures for the fiscal year 1956. Estimated net expenditures for agricultural programs in 1956 will be 2.3 billion dollars, 871 million dollars less than in 1955. This reduction is principally due to the anticipated smaller outlays for farm price supports resulting from acreage restrictions and increased sales.

Welfare, health, and education: Our policy of partnership with State and local governments and with private enterprise is also enabling us to make significant contributions to human welfare. Our broadened programs of assistance for vocational rehabilitation and for construction of nonprofit hospitals and health centers will encourage greater State, local, and private activity in these fields. The extension of old-age and survivors insurance to 10 million more persons and the increased contribution and benefit rates enacted last year are in keeping with our tradition of self-reliance and will diminish dependence on charity. This budget includes appropriations for the health improvement program which I shall outline in a special message. Increases in some programs, principally for public health and vocational rehabilitation, will be offset by some reductions in other programs. Total expenditures for welfare, health, and education are estimated at 2.3 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1956, about the same as in 1955.

Veterans' services and benefits: Expenditures for veterans' benefits continue to increase as a result of the growing number of veterans, now estimated at 21 million in civil life, becoming eligible for benefits. Legislation enacted last year raised compensation and pension benefits to our ex-servicemen and women. I have recently issued a proclamation ending the time period for acquiring further rights to readjustment benefits intended for veterans of the Korean conflict. Estimated net expenditures for veterans' programs will be 4.6 billion dollars, about 200 million dollars more than in 1955.

Interest and general government: Expenditures for interest are estimated to amount to 6.4 billion dollars, 180 million dollars less than in 1955. In the field of general government, I recommend that we increase our expenditures for tax collection and management of Government property as further steps toward efficiency. I also recommend strengthening our law-enforcement agencies, particularly the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Finally, the Government should resume its payments as employer to the civil service retirement fund. As a result of these recommendations and anticipated increases in payments of certified claims, expenditures for general government purposes are expected to rise 344 million dollars to 1.6 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1956.

Special classification of expenditures: The budget expenditures discussed above may be divided into four large groupings to show the ends for which we pay taxes and also the items which make our budgets big. These groupings are (1) the cost of civil operations and administration, (2) interest, (3) civil benefits to various parts of our society, and (4) the major cost of protection against war.

Special classification of net budget expenditures

[Fiscal years. In billions]

	1951 actual	1952 actual	1953 actual	1954 actual	1955 estimated	1956 estimated	
						Amount	Percent
Current expenses for civil operations and administration	$1.9	$2.2	$2.3	$1.9	$1.9	$2.3	4
Interest	5.7	5.9	6.6	6.5	6.6	6.4	10
Civil benefits	11.5	12.2	13.4	11.6	13.3	12.0	19
Protection	25.6	46.0	52.0	47.9	41.7	41.5	67
Undistributed (reserves and adjustments)	−.7	−.9			.1	.3	
Total	44.1	65.4	74.3	67.8	63.5	62.4	100

The expenditures for civil operations and administration of the Government have been obscured for many years by the large expenditures for defense and by the variety and complexity of the domestic and international programs. The cost of keeping the civil functions of the Government running for the fiscal year 1956 is estimated to be 2.3 billion dollars or about 4 percent of the net budget expenditures. This includes most of the expenditures classified as general government plus the expenditures for repair, maintenance, and operation of Government civilian facilities, and for regulatory activities.

The fluctuation shown in the cost of civil operations arises primarily from the contribution made by the Federal Government, as employer, to the civil service retirement fund. This contribution was 321 million dollars in the fiscal year 1953 and 216 million dollars is proposed for 1956. No contributions were made during 1954 or 1955 pending a detailed review of all Federal retirement systems by a special commission. Increased funds are also provided for several departmental operations where there has been a longstanding backlog of work.

Decreasing interest rates during the past 12 months, together with a change in the timing of interest payments, have made possible a forecast for lower expenditures for interest in the fiscal year 1956.

The various civil benefit programs of the Government are estimated to amount to 12 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1956. Expenditures for veterans' benefits represent 38 percent of all civil benefits in that year. The variations in expenditures for farm price supports and mortgage purchases account for part of the changes in total benefit expenditures between the fiscal years 1953 and 1956.

The expenditures for protection, which account for two-thirds of total expenditures, include continental defense at home and mutual defense abroad. The

total amount in the fiscal year 1956 consists of the 40.5 billion dollars for major national security programs and 1 billion dollars for economic and technical assistance under the mutual security program. In addition, many items of smaller size scattered through other parts of the budget, not included in this category, are related in varying degrees to protection. Examples are the Coast Guard and the Selective Service System.

TAX POLICY

Last year we made great progress in reducing tax burdens and improving the tax structure. Total tax reductions of 7.4 billion dollars became effective. This was the largest tax reduction in any single year in tne country's history. It was made possible only by large cuts in Government expenditures. The basic tax law was revised to relieve hardships for millions of individuals and to reduce tax barriers to economic growth.

The budget would have been balanced for the current fiscal year if there had been no tax cuts. However, it was desirable to share the benefits from the large expenditure reductions. This enabled the people to have the extra money to spend for themselves which they retained because of the reduction in their taxes.

In view of the prospective deficit, we cannot afford to have any further loss of revenue this year through reductions in taxes. The corporate tax rate would be automatically reduced under existing legislation from 52 to 47 percent on April 1 with a revenue loss of about 2 billion dollars for a full year unless extended. Under existing law, the excise taxes on liquor, tobacco, gasoline, and automobiles would also be automatically reduced on April 1, with a revenue loss of 1 billion dollars unless appropriate legislation is enacted by the Congress extending them.

In the fiscal year 1956, there will be an automatic revenue reduction (as compared with 1955) of almost 2 billion dollars under existing law, wholly apart from any changes in tax rates. The principal reason is the completion of the plan adopted 5 years ago under which payments of corporate taxes have been moved forward into earlier fiscal years. Fortunately, this reduction in 1956 will be more than offset by increases in revenue due to the economic growth of the country.

Because we must keep our existing revenues intact, I have already recommended to the Congress in my state of the Union message that existing rates on both excises and corporate incomes be extended for 1 year. Any other course of action would result in either (1) inadequate expenditures for national security, or (2) inflationary borrowing.

During the past year the Treasury Department has continued to examine possible changes in the tax laws concerning which no recommendations were made in the revision of the tax laws last year. As final conclusions are reached by the Department they will be sent to the Congress.

I have also directed the Secretary of the Treasury promptly to make recommendations for any other changes in the laws which may be found necessary to prevent anyone from avoiding his fair share of the tax burden.

The present tax take of nearly one-fourth of our national income is a serious obstacle to the long-term dynamic growth of the economy which is so necessary for the future. There must be the means for providing more and better jobs not only for those who are working today but also for the millions of young people who will come of working age in future years. The stimulus of further tax reductions is necessary just as soon as they can properly be made.

We must always make adequate provision for our security and other essential services, and further tax reductions can only be made as savings in governmental expenditures or increased revenues resulting from growth in our economy are in sight.

However, further tax reduction remains a firm goal of this administration, and our policy is directed to achieving both the savings in expenditures and the economic growth that will make such reductions possible.

I hope that tax reductions will be so justified next year. If so, I shall recommend a reduction in taxes to spread the relief fairly among all taxpayers in a way which will be the most effective to relieve individual tax burdens and to increase incentive for effort and investment.

DEBT MANAGEMENT

Debt management policy during the past year was keyed to Federal Reserve monetary policy to help assure the ready availability of money and credit needed to sustain a high level of business activity. The Treasury refrained under the special circumstances of 1954 from issuing long-term securities which would compete for long-term money available for the construction of new homes, for business expansion, or for new schools, highways, and hospitals at the State and local government level. At the same time, progress was made in improving the structure of the public debt by some extension of maturities through issuing more intermediate-term bonds. In each major Treasury financing during 1954, except for borrowing through tax anticipation securities, investors had the opportunity to buy securities longer than 1-year certificates. The result was a substantial reduction in the short-term debt.

On December 31, 1954, the public debt subject to the statutory limit was 278.3 billion dollars. We expect to be able to operate this fiscal year within the temporary debt limit of 281 billion dollars voted by the Congress last August. The increase beyond 275 billion dollars provided by this legislation is, however, temporary. The statutory limit will go back to 275 billion dollars on June 30, 1955. We anticipate that the heavy tax receipts during the remainder of this fiscal year will enable us to reduce the debt to within that figure by June 30, 1955.

At the start of the new fiscal year in July 1955 the debt will already be pressing against the legal limit. With the present seasonal pattern of tax collections, expenditures will exceed receipts in the first 6 months of the fiscal year 1956 by about 8 billion dollars. Thus, it will not be possible to pay the Government's bills in that period without exceeding the 275 billion dollar limit.

We recognize that the statutory debt limit is valuable as an expression of firm intent to maintain fiscal soundness. With present requirements for national security we have not yet been able to achieve a balanced budget, even though we have made substantial progress toward it. Therefore, I have no alternative but to ask the Congress to again increase the debt limit.

During the past 2 years, we have proved that a free, democratic system can make the adjustment from war to peace without serious economic disturbances. A major factor in this achievement has been the confidence of the people in the ability of the Government to bring its financial affairs under control and to conduct them in a responsible manner.

Our objective of being provident in financial matters has paid and is still paying dividends in general well-being. We have reduced expenditures and eased the crushing load of taxation. We have improved the structure of the public debt and provided a favorable environment for sound monetary policy. We have encouraged private initiative by starting to take the Government out of competition with private enterprise. We have made progress in housing and in protection against personal catastrophe. We are developing our natural resources in partnership with the State and local governments and with private initiative. These steps are designed to assure high and rising employment, a growing prosperity, and a stable dollar.

This administration will continue to exercise the utmost care in the manner in which it uses the taxpayers' money. It will continue to purchase what we must have for our security, well-being, and prosperity with the fewest possible number of dollars. And it will continue to administer the huge Government organization more efficiently. It will put first things first and restrain spending to items of high priority. Our success thus far in reducing taxes, expenditures, and the deficit is the best evidence of the earnestness of our efforts.

With an indestructible faith in the destiny of this country, a faith equal to that of the founders who held that all men are Divinely endowed with inalienable rights; with full confidence that in the intelligent cooperation of free men is to be found the most effective way of solving group and national problems; with unshaken dedication to the pursuit of peace and justice at home and in the world, we shall continue to sustain our liberties and we shall meet and far surpass the objectives we now set for ourselves in promoting human welfare, happiness, and prosperity.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

JANUARY 17, 1955.

PART B

This second part of the budget message starts with three summary tables. Follow-

ing these tables is an introduction containing (1) general analyses of budget expenditures from two different viewpoints, (2) a summary of transactions of major trust funds, and (3) a summary of receipts from and payments to the public.

The remainder of the message discusses the nine major groups of Government programs.

Summary of new obligational authority

BY FUNCTION AND AGENCIES

Based on existing and proposed legislation

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Description	1954 enacted	1955 estimated			1956 estimated		
		Enacted	Proposed for later transmission	Total	Recommended in this document	Proposed for later transmission	Total
BY FUNCTION							
Major national security	$39,471	$34,386		$34,386	$33,229	$3,513	$36,742
International affairs and finance	1,268	1,582	$2	1,585	341	1,535	1,876
Veterans' services and benefits	4,272	3,937	349	4,285	4,615		4,615
Welfare, health, and education	2,190	1,981	328	2,310	2,217	72	2,289
Agriculture and agricultural resources	4,010	2,630		2,630	1,288		1,288
Natural resources	1,196	957	10	967	901	28	929
Commerce and manpower	2,846	3,181	200	3,381	2,738	108	2,846
General government	1,041	1,031	25	1,056	1,087	218	1,305
Interest	6,470	6,558		6,558	6,378		6,378
Reserves for proposed legislation and contingencies:							
Net cost of classified pay increase						$125	$125
Other			$150	$150		250	250
Total new obligational authority	62,765	56,244	1,064	57,308	52,794	5,848	58,642
BY AGENCY							
Legislative branch	84	69		69	72		72
The Judiciary	29	30	1	31	33		33
Executive Office of the President	9	9		9	9		9
Funds appropriated to the President	4,730	2,796	2	2,797	27	3,530	3,557
Independent offices:							
Atomic Energy Commission	1,118	1,284		1,284	1,292		1,292
Veterans' Administration	4,276	3,934	349	4,283	4,453	100	4,553
Other	766	1,033	16	1,048	469	284	752
General Services Administration	163	535		535	692		692
Housing and Home Finance Agency	433	585	105	690	114	200	314
Department of Agriculture	4,283	2,802		2,802	1,516		1,516
Department of Commerce	996	1,377	80	1,457	1,458		1,458
Department of Defense:							
Military functions	34,590	30,783		30,783	31,416	1,483	32,899
Civil functions	529	482	(a)	482	536	17	553
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	1,916	1,704	327	2,031	1,959	72	2,031
Department of the Interior	596	492	9	502	473	17	490
Department of Justice	180	181	5	186	201		201
Department of Labor	352	436	20	456	515	5	519
Post Office Department	420	312		312	295	[b] 270	25
Department of State	144	129	1	130	148	1	150
Treasury Department	7,134	7,240		7,240	7,086	35	7,121
District of Columbia (general fund)	16	30		30	32		32
Reserves for proposed legislation and contingencies			150	150		375	375
Total new obligational authority	62,765	56,244	1,064	57,308	52,794	5,848	58,642

[a] Less than one-half million dollars.
[b] Deduct, includes proposed postal rate increase of 400 million dollars.

Summary of budget expenditures

BY FUNCTION AND AGENCY

Based on existing and proposed legislation

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Description	1954 actual	1955 estimated			1956 estimated		
		Under authorizations already enacted	Proposed for later transmission	Total	Under authorizations enacted or recommended in this document	Proposed for later transmission	Total
BY FUNCTION							
Major national security	$46,523	$40,644		$40,644	$39,068	$1,390	$40,458
International affairs and finance	2,166	1,798	$1	1,800	1,504	336	1,841
Veterans' services and benefits	4,289	4,119	349	4,468	4,684		4,684
Welfare, health, and education	2,248	2,057	259	2,316	2,217	95	2,312
Agriculture and agricultural resources	7,497	8,934		8,934	7,647		7,647
Natural resources	1,391	1,356	2	1,358	1,180	29	1,209
Commerce and manpower	7,355	7,698	192	7,890	7,037	[a] 130	6,908
General government	1,212	1,201	24	1,225	1,350	219	1,569
Interest	6,470	6,558		6,558	6,378		6,378
Reserves for proposed legislation and contingencies:							
Net cost of classified pay increase						125	125
Other			100	100		200	200
Total budget expenditures (gross)	79,151	74,276	927	75,203	71,067	2,265	73,332
Deduct applicable receipts [1]	11,379	11,699		11,699	10,923		10,923
Net budget expenditures	67,772	62,577	927	63,504	60,144	2,265	62,408

See footnotes at end of table.

Summary of budget expenditures—Continued

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Description	1954 actual	1955 estimated			1956 estimated		
		Under authorizations already enacted	Proposed for later transmission	Total	Under authorizations enacted or recommended in this document	Proposed for later transmission	Total
BY AGENCY							
Legislative branch	$59	$71		$71	$83		$83
The Judiciary	28	30	(b)	31	33	(b)	33
Executive Office of the President	9	9		9	9		9
Funds appropriated to the President	5,477	5,069	$1	5,070	4,743	$613	5,356
Independent offices:							
Atomic Energy Commission	1,895	2,050		2,050	1,910	90	2,000
Veterans' Administration	4,316	4,148	349	4,497	4,615	90	4,705
Other	3,739	3,098	2	3,101	2,994	248	3,242
General Services Administration	808	1,174		1,174	969		969
Housing and Home Finance Agency	1,440	1,662	5	1,667	1,264		1,264
Department of Agriculture	5,963	7,365		7,365	6,013		6,013
Department of Commerce	1,083	995	185	1,180	1,223	(b)	1,223
Department of Defense:							
Military functions	40,336	34,375		34,375	33,000	1,000	34,000
Civil functions	708	624	(b)	624	618	14	632
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	1,983	1,784	258	2,042	1,960	95	2,055
Department of the Interior	571	592	2	594	572	19	591
Department of Justice	183	181	4	185	201	1	202
Department of Labor	357	413	20	433	512	4	515
Post Office Department	2,686	2,741		2,741	2,811	[d] 270	2,541
Department of State	156	138	(b)	138	148	2	150
Treasury Department	7,339	7,732		7,732	7,356	35	7,391
District of Columbia (general fund)	13	25		25	34		34
Reserves for proposed legislation and contingencies			100	100		325	325
Total budget expenditures (gross)	79,151	74,276	927	75,203	71,067	2,265	73,332
Deduct applicable receipts [1]	11,379	11,699		11,699	10,923		10,923
Net budget expenditures	67,772	62,577	927	63,504	60,144	2,265	62,408

[1] Receipts of public enterprise funds (Government-owned corporations, the postal service, and other revolving funds, the receipts of which come primarily from outside the Government).

[b] Less than one-half million dollars.

[d] Deduct, includes proposed postal rate increase of $400,000,000.

Summary of budget receipts

BASED ON EXISTING AND PROPOSED LEGISLATION

By Source

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Description	1954 actual	1955 estimated			1956 estimated		
		Under existing laws	Under proposed legislation	Total	Under existing laws	Under proposed legislation	Total
Individual income taxes	$32,383	$30,700		$30,700	$32,500		$32,500
Corporation income taxes	21,523	18,466		18,466	15,984	$1,050	17,034
Excise taxes:							
Alcohol taxes	2,798	2,669	$64	2,733	2,622	210	2,832
Tobacco taxes	1,581	1,541	49	1,590	1,443	179	1,622
Stamp taxes	90	97		97	97		97
Manufacturers' excise taxes	2,692	2,765	76	2,841	2,300	627	2,927
Retailers' excise taxes	438	307		307	319		319
Miscellaneous excise taxes	[1] 2,416	1,504	1	1,505	1,547	6	1,553
Employment taxes:							
Federal Insurance Contributions Act	4,537	5,190		5,190	6,175		6,175
Federal Unemployment Tax Act	285	290		290	295		295
Railroad Retirement Tax Act	603	600		600	625		625
Estate and gift taxes	945	930		930	970		970
Customs	562	570		570	570		570
Miscellaneous receipts:							
Miscellaneous taxes, seignorage, and coinage	77	49		49	39		39
Permits, fines, forfeitures, and gifts	59	57		57	58		58
Interest, dividends, and other earnings	819	664		664	659		659
Rents, royalties, sale of products, and services	391	573		573	554		554
Sale of property	221	268		268	225		225
Realization upon loans and investments	236	254		254	273		273
Recoveries and refunds	507	438		438	678		678
Other	[2] 9						
Total receipts	73,173	67,931	190	68,121	67,933	2,072	70,005
Deduct—							
Transfer to Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund	4,537	5,190		5,190	6,175		6,175
Transfer to railroad retirement trust fund	603	600		600	625		625
Refunds of receipts	3,377	3,331		3,331	3,396	−191	3,205
Budget receipts	64,655	58,810	190	59,000	57,737	2,263	60,000

[1] Includes 479 million dollars of unclassified depositary receipts.

[2] Internal revenue not otherwise classified.

To the Congress of the United States:

This second part of my message contains further details regarding budget expenditures and new appropriations and my legislative recommendations. Major trust fund transactions are summarized. Expenditures are analyzed from two different points of view.

Purposes of expenditures: From one point of view, budget expenditures serve four broad purposes. These were summarized on page M12. Four percent goes

for keeping the civil functions of Government running. Another 10 percent is necessary to pay the interest charges on the Government debt. A somewhat larger proportion, 19 percent, is devoted to the cost of various programs combined under the heading of civil benefits. Some of these benefit particular groups or localities. Others are in the nature of more general benefits. Another 67 percent is for the major programs for protection against possible war.

That part of the expenditures of various agencies which is for current expenses of civil operations and administration is shown by agency in the following table:

Current expenses for civil operations and administration

[Fiscal years. In millions]

	1951 actual	1952 actual	1953 actual	1954 actual	1955 estimated	1956 estimated
Legislative branch	$57	$58	$53	$55	$64	$65
The Judiciary	25	27	27	28	30	33
Executive branch:						
Department of Agriculture	101	89	96	139	138	139
Department of Commerce	105	145	112	50	84	82
Department of Defense—Civil functions	56	58	81	52	59	60
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	7	8	8	8	9	10
Department of the Interior	111	119	127	125	150	150
Department of Justice	150	194	169	181	184	200
Department of Labor	38	48	53	51	86	96
Post Office Department	74	70	35	[1] 6	-----	-----
Department of State	193	211	221	144	131	141
Treasury Department:						
Claims and judgments	98	76	137	213	163	250
Other	434	471	478	488	480	495
Civil Service Commission	324	332	346	50	48	235
Economic Stabilization Agency	-----	91	64	2	-----	-----
General Services Administration	96	163	162	147	148	153
Other	43	13	130	135	143	144
Total	1,911	2,174	2,299	1,872	1,916	2,251

[1] Since August 15, 1953, the cost of Government mail has been paid by the various agencies.

Expenditures for civil benefits are shown in the following table. These expenditures are partly for the acquisition of assets, which have varying degrees of recoverable value or permanency. Other expenditures are for long-range development, and for current aids and services to various groups.

The largest amount of benefits goes to veterans for compensation and pension payments, hospital and medical care, and readjustment benefits, including vocational training. The next largest current expense for benefits is for public assistance grants to States. Current expenses for agriculture consist of losses realized in disposition of commodities acquired under price support programs, payment for the removal of surplus commodities, administrative expenses of loan programs and other aids to farmers.

Expenditures for civil benefits

[Fiscal years. In millions]

	1951 actual	1952 actual	1953 actual	1954 actual	1955 estimated	1956 estimated
Federal assets (loans, construction, major equipment, and additions to commodity inventories)	$1,771	$2,905	$4,672	$2,840	$3,323	$2,013
Long-range development:						
State, local, and private assets (roads, airports, schools, and soil conservation)	961	1,023	1,124	1,022	1,131	1,302
Expenditures for education, training, health, and research and development	1,178	566	602	586	667	754
Current expenses for aids and services:						
Agriculture	905	463	305	540	995	750
Business:						
Post Office	521	670	624	307	267	[1] 15
Other	288	371	310	341	483	522
Labor	203	209	215	216	272	348
Home owners and tenants	−160	−129	−123	−116	−92	−48
Veterans	4,515	4,710	4,178	4,185	4,347	4,536
Public assistance	1,186	1,178	1,330	1,438	1,445	1,420
Other aids	141	186	176	209	420	371
Total	11,509	12,153	13,413	11,570	13,259	11,984

[1] Based on proposed increases in postal rates and postal pay.

Most of the postal deficit for 1954 and 1955 has been included among benefits to private business since the Post Office Department's analysis shows that it arises principally from inadequate second- and third-class mail rates. The proposed rate increase will practically absorb the postal deficit in 1956.

Expenditures for protection, as shown in the next table, likewise include the acquisition of Federal assets, of varying degrees of permanent value, from airbases to aircraft, tanks, trucks, and bombs. Such expenditures also include long-range development, and current expenses. The last mentioned is primarily the cost of military pay and operations. Protection also includes a substantial amount of military equipment and economic and technical assistance furnished under the mutual security program, of which a significant amount goes to Korea and other Far Eastern countries.

Expenditures for protection

[Fiscal years. In millions]

	1951 actual	1952 actual	1953 actual	1954 actual	1955 estimated	1956 estimated
Federal assets (construction, plant and major equipment, and stockpiling)	$6,099	$15,059	$21,438	$19,914	$16,762	$16,934
Long-range development (research and development)	915	1,285	1,617	1,616	1,546	1,649
Current expenses (military pay, operations, maintenance, administration, and military aid abroad)	15,293	27,505	27,219	24,994	22,336	23,625
Current expenses of economic assistance abroad	3,320	2,154	1,705	1,339	1,029	1,017
Unallocated reduction in estimates (Department of Defense)	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	−1,750
Total	25,626	46,002	51,979	47,863	41,673	41,475

Further details on this classification of net budget expenditures are shown in special analysis D, page 1153.

Controllability of expenditures: The preceding analysis has indicated the broad purposes of expenditures. It is important that we also consider our budget from another point of view. About one-fourth of the total expenditures can be classified as permitting little or no administrative discretion through the budget process. The level of these expenditures depends upon the provisions of the legislation which authorized the programs and on other factors independent of Executive control.

For example, interest depends upon the size of the public debt and the interest rates. Expenditures for veterans' benefits depend upon the benefit rates and the number of eligible veterans. Expenditures for agricultural price supports are affected by such factors as the weather, the level of world prices, and the ability of foreign purchasers to pay dollars. Grants to States are made under formulas fixed in legislation and vary with State participation and general economic conditions. Expenditures for relatively uncontrollable programs will be 14.8 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1956. This will be 498 million dollars less than in 1955. Increases for grants under the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954, veterans' benefits, payment of claims, and resumption of the Government's contribution to the civil service retirement and disability fund are more than offset by the decreases expected for agricultural price supports and interest on the public debt.

Summary of net budget expenditures indicating controllability

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Description	1953 actual	1954 actual	1955 estimated	1956 estimated
Major national security programs	$50,274	$46,522	$40,644	$40,458
Major programs not readily subject to administrative discretion through the budget process:				
Veterans' compensation, pensions, and selected benefit programs	3,383	3,297	3,512	3,680
Veterans' unemployment compensation	26	82	131	150

Summary of net budget expenditures indicating controllability—Con.

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Description	1953 actual	1954 actual	1955 estimated	1956 estimated
Major programs not readily subject to administrative discretion through the budget process—continued				
Grants to States for public assistance	$1,330	$1,438	$1,445	$1,420
Payment to railroad retirement fund for military service credits	33	35	-------	-------
Agricultural price support (Commodity Credit Corporation)	1,943	1,526	2,159	[1] 1,142
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities	82	178	113	180
Conservation of agricultural land resources	273	171	190	212
Federal-aid highway grants	509	531	600	680
Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration	202	203	195	245
Payment to the unemployment trust fund	-------	-------	64	87
Claims and relief acts	129	213	163	250
Payments to Federal employees' retirement funds	321	31	30	217
Unemployment compensation for Federal employees	-------	-------	33	40
Legislative and the Judiciary	88	87	102	116
Interest	6,583	6,470	6,558	6,378
Total	14,902	14,262	15,295	14,797
All other	9,098	6,988	7,565	7,153
Total budget expenditures	74,274	67,772	63,504	62,408

[1] For comparability with prior years, includes expenditures (127 million dollars) from appropriations to reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation.

Expenditures for major national security programs will decline 186 million dollars in the fiscal year 1956. All other Government expenditures are estimated to decline 412 million dollars. Although these latter expenditures are only 11 percent of the total, they include the great majority of the individual appropriation items in the budget. Between the fiscal years 1953 and 1956, these expenditures are estimated to be reduced by 1.9 billion dollars. Included in this total are expenditures for international affairs and finance, and for most of the regular operations of the Government such as enforcing laws, collecting taxes, promoting health, postal service, and civil public works.

Major trust funds: The budget receipts and expenditures which I have so far discussd reflect only transactions of funds which belong to the Federal Government. In addition, the Federal Government engages in extensive transactions with funds which it does not own but holds in trust for others. The following table summarizes the receipts, expenditures, and balances for the major trust funds. These include the trust funds for veterans' life insurance, old-age and survivors' insurance, railroad retirement, Federal employees retirement, and unemployment compensation. The total receipts and expenditures of the many smaller trust funds which are not included in the table have amounted to about one-half billion dollars annually in recent years.

Summary of receipts, expenditures, and balances of major trust funds

[Fiscal years. In millions]

	1954 actual	1955 estimated	1956 estimated
Balance in funds at start of year	$43,057	$44,924	$46,449
Receipts	8,698	9,343	10,882
Expenditures	6,832	7,819	8,245
Balance in funds at close of year	44,924	46,449	49,087

The accumulated balances of these funds will increase substantially from 43.1 billion dollars at the beginning of the fiscal year 1954 to an estimated 49.1 billion dollars at the close of 1956. Most of these balances are invested in special issues of United States Government securities. Receipts of these trust funds include interest on such investments, payroll taxes paid by employers and employees, and premiums paid by veterans for life insurance. Expenditures are primarily for the payment of benefits. Additional information on these funds can be found in part III of the budget document.

Receipts from and payments to the public: Transactions of trust funds and Federal funds are consolidated to show the total of the Federal Government's receipts from and payments to the public. This statement shows the total flow of funds for the year and is one measure of the inflationary or deflationary impact of Federal fiscal transactions on the national economy; it is not a substitute for the regular budget statements. Details on receipts from and payments to the public are given in special analysis A, on page 1131.

Receipts from and payments to the public, excluding borrowing

[Fiscal years. In millions]

	1954 actual	1955 estimated	1956 estimated
Cash receipts from the public	$71,636	$66,649	$68,793
Cash payments to the public	71,868	69,026	68,235
Excess of cash receipts	-------	-------	558
Excess of cash payments	232	2,377	-------

MAJOR NATIONAL SECURITY

The major national security category of the budget includes not only the military functions of the Department of Defense, but also the development of atomic energy, the stockpiling of strategic and critical materials, and the portions of the mutual security program which consist of military assistance and direct forces support to other free nations. These four major programs are the basic elements of our national security. Other programs with smaller totals and relating to activities which are not so exclusively defense are included under other classifications of the budget. For example, the commerce and manpower section includes the Coast Guard, merchant marine, the Selective Service System, civil defense, aeronautical research, and promotion of defense production.

Expenditures for major national security programs in the fiscal year 1956 are estimated at 40.5 billion dollars. This total is 186 million dollars below that for 1955, and 6.1 billion dollars below the actual 1954 amount. Recommended new authority to incur obligations is greater than for 1955 but less than for 1954. After the cessation of combat operations in Korea, we were able to reduce our 1955 military appropriations because the unobligated balances available were greater than required and the large stocks of supplies on hand permitted the military services to "live off the shelf" to a large degree without replacing the items consumed.

Recommendations in this budget for our major national security programs are based on the same philosophy which I recommended and the Congress adopted for the fiscal years 1954 and 1955. I then proposed that we should plan and finance our national security program on a long-term basis that would maintain essential military strength over an indefinite period of time without impairing the basic soundness of the United States economy. This budget continues the concept of no assumed fixed date of maximum danger. Any other concept would lead to an inevitable let-down in strength and produce peaks and valleys in our defense spending and production.

It is essential that we, together with other nations of the free world, maintain a level of military strength which will effectively discourage any would-be aggressor from attacking. We cannot accept less. The effectiveness of our power to deter rests principally upon our capability to retaliate swiftly and decisively and upon our ability to defend ourselves against attack. The advent of nuclear weapons has profoundly affected our concepts of military strategy and tactics as well as our national security policies. Such weapons multiply many fold the striking power of any military force. This budget, therefore, continues the emphasis on the development and maintenance of effective nuclear-air retaliatory power of the Air Force and Naval aviation as the principal deterrent to military aggression. Such power is being supplemented by other military forces of great strength, flexibility, and mobility and by the forces of our allies.

In order to safeguard our striking power and resources, we are giving continued high priority to the accelerated development of continental defense programs.

Priority is also being given to the development and introduction into operating units of new weapons and techniques adapted to the radically changed conditions imposed by the potential of nuclear warfare. This budget also provides for continued improvement in mobilization reserve stocks and for the cost of expanding and strengthening our military manpower reserves as outlined in my special message on this subject.

The complexity of modern military equipment and the revolution in military concepts in this atomic age put an extra

premium upon military leadership, skill, and training. Unfortunately, much of our investment in developing trained manpower is being lost, as too many servicemen are rejecting a military career for the attractions they expect from civilian life. My legislative proposals to meet these problems were set forth in my special message on military pay and incentives, and funds for them are provided in this budget.

Department of Defense: To maintain a strong military posture and assure that our national security policy will adequately support our foreign policy, our military planning must be kept flexible and dynamic. The structure of our military forces must be subjected to continuing review and adjusted to reflect the rapid technological advances of this nuclear and electronic age. A year ago, I approved a long-range plan for our military forces upon which the fiscal year 1955 budget was based. Recent reviews of our plans and policies have resulted in reaffirmation of most of the elements of this long-range plan, but with some changes in timing. Our current military plans, in turn, will be subjected to continuing review so that they—as well as our military equipment—will be kept up-to-date. It is important that we do not attempt to fix our minds or plans upon any particular set of numbers, for today's technological changes may make yesterday's numbers and concepts obsolete.

Major national security

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Item	Budget expenditures (net)				
	1950 actual	1953 actual	1954 actual	1955 estimated	1956 estimated
Direction and coordination of defense	$10	$15	$12	$12	$12
Other central defense activities	199	394	452	488	588
Army defense activities	3,983	16,242	12,910	8,900	8,850
Navy defense activities	4,100	11,874	11,293	9,775	9,700
Air Force defense activities	3,600	15,085	15,668	15,200	15,600
Proposed legislation	------	------	------	------	1,000
Unallocated reduction in estimates	------	------	------	------	−1,750
Subtotal, Department of Defense	11,892	43,610	40,336	34,375	34,000
Development and control of atomic energy, present program	550	1,791	1,895	2,050	1,910
Proposed legislation	------	------	------	------	90
Strategic and critical materials	438	919	651	994	783
Mutual security (military):					
Military assistance, present program	130	3,954	3,629	2,675	2,875
Proposed legislation	------	------	------	------	200
Direct forces support, present program	------	------	12	550	500
Proposed legislation	------	------	------	------	100
Subtotal, military assistance and support	130	3,954	3,641	3,225	3,675
Total budget expenditures	13,010	50,274	46,522	40,644	40,458

Major national security—Continued

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Item	New obligational authority				
	1950 actual	1953 actual	1954 actual	1955 estimated	1956 recommended
Direction and coordination of defense	$11	$15	$13	$13	$13
Other central defense activities	180	540	778	645	627
Army defense activities	4,392	15,221	12,777	7,788	7,303
Navy defense activities	4,359	12,689	9,612	10,272	8,937
Air Force defense activities	5,428	20,451	11,411	12,065	14,536
Proposed legislation	------	------	------	------	2,933
Reduction through transfers of prior year appropriations	------	------	------	------	−1,500
Subtotal, Department of Defense	14,370	48,916	34,590	30,783	32,899
Development and control of atomic energy	839	4,152	1,118	1,284	1,292
Strategic and critical materials	425	134	------	380	522
Mutual security (military):					
Military assistance, present program	1,359	4,096	3,192	1,144	------
Proposed legislation	------	------	------	------	1,400
Direct forces support, present program	------	------	570	795	------
Proposed legislation	------	------	------	------	630
Subtotal, military assistance and support	1,359	4,096	3,763	1,939	2,030
Total new obligational authority	16,993	57,298	39,471	34,386	36,742

In my judgment, the military forces and programs upon which this budget is based are accurately adjusted to the national needs.

Under our current plans, the number of military personnel is scheduled to be reduced from the present level of approximately 3.2 million to about 3 million by June 30, 1955, and to something over 2.8 million by June 30, 1956, for an average of approximately 2.9 million personnel during the fiscal year 1956, compared with an average of 3.2 million during the fiscal year 1955. Within this figure, however, the Air Force personnel strength will be somewhat increased.

The cessation of hostilities and the buildup of the Republic of Korea forces have permitted us to withdraw five United States ground divisions from the Far East. We have thus increased the number of divisions in a central reserve of forces which can be deployed where and when needed. In addition, 1⅓ Marine divisions will be withdrawn from the Far East in the near future, so that their capability as a highly trained, combat-ready, amphibious force may be available as part of the central reserve. United States military forces will be maintained at appropriate levels in the Far East, with emphasis on highly mobile naval and air units of unparalleled striking power.

The Army has devoted considerable effort to assessing the changes in Army organization and doctrine required to meet the conditions of the atomic battlefield. These studies are continuing, and it appears that the Army of the future will be organized into smaller, but more mobile and self-contained, units with greater fire power. The Navy will operate approximately 1,000 active ships—including 400 warships. The number of carrier air groups is to be increased from the present 16 to 17, and an additional attack carrier equipped with modern aircraft will be added to the fleet. The Navy will continue to maintain 15 antisubmarine warfare squadrons. The Marine Corps will maintain 3 combat-ready divisions and 3 air wings. The current level of approximately 10,000 Naval and Marine operating aircraft will be maintained. The Air Force is continuing its buildup toward a goal of 137 wings, and expects to have 130 wings in being by June 30, 1956—119 of which will be combat wings. The major units of all services will be supplemented by appropriate combat support units. All the services will continue their efforts to increase the proportion of military personnel assigned to combat units.

About two-thirds of the projected Department of Defense expenditures in the fiscal year 1956 will be devoted to air power and related programs—both offensive and defensive. Expenditures for these programs will be the largest in our peacetime history. The active aircraft inventory in combat and supporting units of the Air Force, Navy, and Marine air forces will increase from over 34,000 on June 30, 1954, to 36,000 on June 30, 1956, and will continue to increase in succeeding years toward the present objective of close to 40,000 aircraft. In addition, the Army will maintain 3,600 active aircraft, with more than a 20 percent increase during the next 2 years in the number of helicopters. The growth in our effective air power is far greater than these numbers indicate, for our aircraft continue to increase in size, speed, range, and striking power.

By the end of the fiscal year 1956, the total number of aircraft in combat units of the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps will be approximately one-fourth greater than at the beginning of the current fiscal year. The number of jet aircraft in such units will increase by more than one-third during the same period. The increasing modernization of our air power is shown by the fact that by June 30, 1956, the Air Force combat units will be almost 100 percent jet equipped. The proportion of jets in the combat units of the Marines and Navy will increase by approximately 15 percent over the beginning of the current fiscal year.

During the past year, continuing improvements have been made in the management and operations of the Department of Defense. The stock-fund principle, which has been applied in the Navy over a period of years, is now being broadly adopted by the Army and is being initiated in the Air Force. Stock funds have been extended to include 9.3 billion dollars in inventories. Major savings—particularly in the Army—are resulting from the extension of such property accounting and other business-like management techniques. The Army

is now beginning to account for its supplies in terms of dollar value, and is relating its needs and purchases to its inventories. Largely as a result of the Army's more efficient administration of the supplies and financial assets in its stock fund account, operating stocks are being reduced to lower but better-balanced levels. In addition, military installations with 1.6 billion dollars of annual transactions have been put on a businesslike basis through the use of industrial funds.

Military functions of the Department of Defense will require 32.9 billion dollars of new authority to incur obligations in the fiscal year 1956, including proposed legislation. The gross requirements to finance proposed legislation total 3 billion dollars, but I am recommending that 1.5 billion dollars of this be met with currently available funds which can be transferred as a result of actual and prospective savings and adjustments by the Department of Defense.

Total expenditures for military functions of the Department of Defense will be greater than the new obligational authority required. Expenditures have been estimated at 34 billion dollars despite the fact that the present estimates for the many individual Department of Defense programs add to a total of 35.75 billion dollars. The success of the Secretary of Defense to date in introducing improvements in planning and increased efficiency in operation leads him to believe that he will find more opportunities for savings and economies. It is not feasible for the Secretary to predict at this time what the possible savings, slippages, and program adjustments will be in each category of military expenditures but he expects that total expenditures will not exceed 34 billion dollars. Consequently, the anticipated savings and adjustments are shown as an unallocated reduction of 1.75 billion dollars, about 5 percent of the total estimated expenditures of the Department of Defense.

The estimated 34 billion dollars of expenditures for the fiscal year 1956 includes 1 billion dollars for proposed legislation. The total estimate is 375 million dollars lower than the current estimate of expenditures for the fiscal year 1955 and 6.3 billion dollars below expenditures in the fiscal year 1954.

Department of Defense costs by major categories

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Cost category	Budget expenditures				Recommended new obligational authority for 1956
	1953 actual	1954 actual	1955 estimated	1956 estimated	
Military personnel	$11,556	$10,961	$10,245	$10,205	$10,612
Operation and maintenance	10,379	9,356	7,869	8,576	9,184
Major procurement and production	(17,123)	(15,958)	(12,627)	(12,718)	(9,524)
Aircraft	7,416	8,334	7,557	7,550	6,064
Ships	1,191	1,090	888	999	1,317
Other	8,516	6,534	4,182	4,169	2,143
Military public works	1,913	1,706	1,418	1,749	1,914
Reserve components	522	584	705	927	1,037
Research and development	1,412	1,385	1,307	1,369	1,370
Establishment-wide activities	759	771	719	793	758
Working capital (revolving) funds	−54	−384	−515	−677	
Unallocated reduction in estimates				−1,750	
Reduction through transfers of prior year appropriations					−1,500
Total	43,610	40,336	34,375	34,000	32,899

Military personnel costs, which include the compensation of military personnel, family allowances, subsistence, clothing, and permanent-change-of-station transportation, will be approximately the same in 1956 as during the current fiscal year but about 6 percent below the fiscal year 1954. Although the number of military personnel is scheduled to decrease during the fiscal year 1956, the resulting decrease in expenditures will be more than offset by the added costs of the pay increase and other benefits proposed in my special message. I am again recommending legislation to provide medical care for dependents of members of our Armed Forces in both military and civilian medical facilities. Funds are included in this budget for this proposal. I will also recommend an extension of the Dependents Assistance Act and funds are included in this budget to cover these costs.

Continuing improvements in organization and management of the Department of Defense have resulted in significant savings in the costs of operating and maintaining posts, stations, airbases, aircraft, ships, and other military equipment during the past 2 years. The planned reduction in numbers of military personnel will permit further savings through appropriate reductions in the number of supporting establishments. Nevertheless, total expenditures for operation and maintenance will be greater in the coming fiscal year than during the fiscal year 1955, since the cost reductions will be more than offset by the increasing costs of operating and maintaining the modern equipment being provided for our forces, and for operating our expanding system of continental defense in which all services participate.

Major strides have been made during the past year in expanding the system for defense of continental United States against possible enemy attack. Nike guided-missile battalions are rapidly being installed for the defense of key potential targets. A separate Continental Air Defense Command, reporting directly to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has been established. It has operational control over continental defense forces, including (1) Air Force fighter interceptors and aircraft control and warning networks, (2) Army anti-aircraft and guided missile battalions, (3) Navy radar picket ships and air units in the contiguous radar system, and (4) additional forces from other Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air National Guard fighter and radar units when made available for air defense. Our radar screen is being expanded and existing gaps in coverage are being filled. Our Air Defense forces, as well as the Strategic Air Command and Naval air power, are being kept on an alert basis. A surprise enemy attack would find us with increasing readiness to resist attack and retaliate with devastating effect. These measures inevitably lead to increased operating costs for continental defense, which are now higher than ever before in our history and are still rising.

Expenditures for procurement and production of major items of equipment will continue at approximately the same level as during the current fiscal year and will constitute more than one-third of the total projected expenditures of the Department of Defense. Procurement of aircraft and guided missiles will continue at the same level as during the current year and will account for two-thirds of total major procurement expenditures. Shipbuilding expenditures will increase over the current fiscal year. This budget provides for an increased number of new shipbuilding starts. This continues the program I recommended in the 1955 budget to cope with the problem of "block obsolescence" of the fleet, which was largely built during World War II. Included in the proposed shipbuilding program for the fiscal year 1956 is a fifth carrier of the *Forrestal* class.

Appropriations enacted in prior years have permitted us to build our mobilization stocks of key military items to greater levels than ever before accumulated except in time of war. My recommendations in this budget will permit us to continue the accumulation of reserves of selected types of materiel. They also provide for our operating needs for newer weapons and equipment. As has been the policy of this administration in the past, maximum feasible reliance will also be placed upon keeping military production facilities in operation rather than on accumulating even larger reserve stocks of end-items.

Military construction expenditures during the fiscal year 1956 are expected to increase substantially over the 1955 level, reflecting progress in all Services on construction of bases. A substantial portion of the military public works projects proposed to be undertaken during the fiscal year 1956 are related to the continental defense program. In addition, this budget provides for essential increments to overseas construction programs now nearing completion and for rounding out the facilities needed for the approved military force levels. The program includes a portion of the family housing greatly needed at military installations. Limited provision is also made for replacing a small portion of substandard World War II construction which has passed the point of economical maintenance and operation.

In my special message I recommended urgently needed legislation to create a more effective military reserve. Expenditures for the reserve components are expected to increase markedly during the fiscal year 1956 as a result of this legislation. Reservists in drill pay status are estimated to increase from 697,000 as of June 30, 1954, to about 857,000 at the end of the current fiscal year and a little over 1,000,000 at the end of the fiscal year 1956. In addition, under the terms of the proposed new program, there will be approximately 50,000 reservists in drill pay status who will have completed 6 months' active duty training by the end of the fiscal year 1956.

This budget also provides for continuation of the present high level of research and development in the Department of Defense. Major emphasis is being placed on developments which will more effectively utilize nuclear energy in military operations. New equipment and techniques are being developed to provide the mobility needed to meet the changed requirements of nuclear warfare. We shall continue to concentrate on those programs which show the greatest promise of providing reliable new weapons and significant improvements in both our offensive and defensive capabilities under the conditions of modern warfare. It is my belief that increased returns in military research and development can best come from maintaining a stable high level program. Although this level of program utilizes, either through direct employment or on a contractual basis, about one-half the research scientists and engineers in the United States, it also permits a high level of nonmilitary research and development essential to an expanding economy.

Civil defense: Civil defense is also an integral part of the overall program for defense of the continental United States against enemy attack. Although the major part of continental defense is in the military budget, expenditures by the Federal Civil Defense Administration are classified in the commerce and manpower section together with those for dealing with peacetime disasters.

The concept of civil defense adopted last year takes account of the destructive threat of modern weapons and places emphasis on improved warning of impending attack, to allow time for evacuation of potential target cities. Since this policy was announced, the Federal Civil Defense Administration has developed its plans more fully and individual cities have tested mass evacuation. I cannot stress too much that civil defense will succeed or fail in proportion to the willingness of American communities to meet the peril. The Federal Government is developing cooperative methods with State governors, mayors, and voluntary citizen groups, as well as among Federal agencies, in building the civil defense organization. In accordance with the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, the primary responsibility for civil defense rests with the States and their political subdivisions.

Development and control of atomic energy: It is our purpose, working in concert with other nations, to banish the threat of atomic warfare which now confronts the world. Progress is being made toward establishing an international agency for cooperation in developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy, as I proposed to the United Nations on December 8, 1953. The budget of the Atomic Energy Commission for the fiscal year 1956 provides for greater expenditures than ever before on projects to develop peaceful applications of atomic energy. We shall continue unabated our efforts to assure that this great force will be used, not for war, but for the well-being of all mankind. Until such assurance can be achieved, however, we have no alternative but to strengthen further our most effective deterrent to armed aggression—the power of our nuclear weapons stockpile.

Despite a growing program, I am recommending for 1956 only a slight increase over 1955 in new authority to incur obligations because of the availability of large unobligated balances, due partly to savings in construction costs. Total expenditures in the fiscal year 1956 are estimated at 2 billion dollars, 50 million dollars less than in 1955.

Operating expenditures will rise in the fiscal year 1956 to the highest rate yet attained. They will increase from 1.2 billion dollars in 1955 to 1.5 billion dollars in 1956 principally because of an expected higher level of procurement of raw uranium ores and concentrates and because of greater production at the Commission's plants as new facilities are completed and placed in operation. The estimates assume continuing reductions in unit production costs.

Capital expenditures in the fiscal year 1956 will drop considerably as the large new production plants authorized in prior years approach completion. Recommended new construction will include: (1) plant improvements and other facilities to increase the efficiency and capacity of the production complex, (2) certain weapons research facilities, (3) a medical research center, (4) an international training school in reactor technology, and (5) developmental atomic reactor projects.

The national effort to develop industrial atomic power for peacetime uses will go forward with increased vigor. The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 makes possible substantial private activity and investment in the constructive applications of atomic energy. Construction of one large atomic powerplant jointly financed by the Goverment and industry is already underway. As I stated in my message of February 17, 1954, to the Congress, "It is essential that this program so proceed that this new industry will develop self-reliance and self-sufficiency." Accordingly, it is expected that industry will finance an increasingly larger share of the total national effort in developing power reactor technology. However, to speed progress in getting the new technology established, the Atomic Energy Commission in 1956 will expand substantially its program to develop industrial power reactors. Construction of several experimental reactors will be started in 1955 and 1956. Of these, one of the most significant is a power breeder, designed to produce more fissionable material than it consumes. Nearly 15 million dollars is included in the budget for this project.

Effective progress in military propulsion reactors will continue. The launching in 1954 of the first atomic submarine, the U. S. S. *Nautilus*, will be followed by the launching in 1955 of the U. S. S. *Sea Wolf*, an atomic submarine of different design. In addition, two atomic-powered attack type submarines have been financed by Department of Defense appropriations in the fiscal year 1955. My recommendations for the Department for 1956 include additional submarines of this type. In 1956, development work will proceed on improved types of submarine reactors, and on a reactor to power larger naval vessels. The Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense will expand and accelerate research on atomic-powered aircraft, and will continue development work on small transportable power reactors for military use.

The basic—as distinct from applied—research which is fundamental to progress in all aspects of nuclear energy will be pursued energetically and will entail somewhat higher expenditures in 1956, both in the Commission's own laboratories and through support of research in universities and other institutions.

I again recommend that the Congress approve legislation to allow the residents of Oak Ridge, Tennessee, and Richland, Washington, to purchase their homes and establish self-government, thus taking the Federal Government out of the business of owning and governing these communities.

Stockpiling of strategic and critical materials: A new long-term stockpile level has been established to provide an additional measure of security over and above the minimum goals. Procurement of the additional minerals will generally be limited to instances where purchases at favorable prices will serve both to meet the long-term stockpile objectives and to maintain essential domestic production, as in the case of lead and zinc in the past 6 months.

Preliminary reviews of 50 minerals indicate that the new policy may eventually increase the inventories of materials by 3.3 billion dollars above the 6.5 billion dollars of minimum objectives. By the end of the fiscal year 1956, about 5.1 billion dollars of materials within the minimum objectives, and an additional 1.2 billion dollars toward the long-term objectives will be in inventory, compared with June 1954 levels of 3.8 billion dollars and 700 million dollars, respectively. In considerable measure, this progress is made possible under the Defense Production Act, discussed in the commerce and manpower section of this message.

Mutual security program: Military assistance and direct forces support help other free nations to train and equip the modern armed forces which are necessary for our security as well as their own. Such assistance is an integral part of our own national security program for it helps to create, in crucial areas of the

free world, essential military strength which bolsters our own forces. Because our allies generally provide the major portion of the costs of maintaining the forces, this strength is being created at a relatively low cost to the United States taxpayer.

Mutual security program, military and economic

[Fiscal years. In millions]

	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1956
	1954 actual	1955 estimated	1956 estimated	
Military:				
Military assistance:				
Present programs	$3,629	$2,675	$2,875	
Proposed legislation			200	$1,400
Direct forces support:				
Present programs	12	550	500	
Proposed legislation			100	630
Nonmilitary:				
Present programs	1,241	1,075	725	
Proposed legislation			300	1,500
Total:				
Present programs	4,882	4,300	4,100	
Proposed legislation			600	[1] 3,530

[1] Compares with new obligational authority of 4,725 million dollars in 1954 and 2,781 million dollars in 1955.

The military assistance and direct forces support programs are two parts of an integrated mutual security program which in its entirety is designed to provide other nations with the margin of outside assistance which they need to develop and maintain their political, military, and economic strength, which is in our interest. Other parts of this program are discussed in the international affairs and finance section of this message. I shall submit to the Congress proposals for necessary changes in the Mutual Security Act. These will include my specific requests for authorization of appropriations for the fiscal year 1956. Total expenditures for mutual security are estimated at 4.7 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1956, including the provisions for a program in Asia. Recommended new authority to incur obligations is 3.5 billion dollars.

Organization for mutual security operations: The organizational arrangements to carry on the mutual security program beyond the present fiscal year are now under careful study and I shall in the near future present to the Congress my recommendations regarding them.

Military assistance: The mutual military assistance proposed for the fiscal year 1956 will further help our allies to complete equipping and training the equivalent of more than 180 divisions, 551 combat vessels, 278 air squadrons, and related supporting units. Our assistance goes only for forces determined to be essential by our Joint Chiefs of Staff. It provides only the critical margin of training and equipment which the countries cannot provide for themselves. During the past 5 years we have delivered over 6,000 airplanes, almost 900 naval vessels of all types, 36,000 tanks and combat vehicles, nearly 200,000 transport vehicles, billions of rounds of ammunition, and many other items. Furthermore, specialized training courses have been conducted for officers and technicians from 32 countries.

Expenditures for military assistance in the fiscal year 1956 are estimated at 3.1 billion dollars as compared with 3.6 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1954, and an estimated 2.7 billion dollars in 1955. The decline in estimated expenditures from 1954 to 1955, and the subsequent increase projected for 1956, do not accurately reflect the probable rates of delivery of equipment to our allies during 1956. Actual deliveries are expected to continue in the fiscal years 1955 and 1956 at around the 3-billion dollar level which was attained in the fiscal year 1954. The fluctuations in expenditure estimates are due to a change in the method of financing wherein the Department of Defense finances the production of common type materiel, pending delivery to the mutual security program and subsequent reimbursement of Department of Defense appropriations.

Much of our mutual military assistance continues to strengthen our allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and I hope that we may soon begin furnishing certain items of military equipment which will be needed by the new German forces. To the extent that this materiel cannot be financed by the Federal Republic of Germany from its own resources, it will be financed from appropriations made for the mutual security program. The continuing growth of economic strength in Europe and completion of the financing of much of the capital equipment which was required for the initial rapid military buildup will make it possible to reduce military assistance for this area in the immediate future below the level of the last few years.

The military assistance program proposed for the fiscal year 1956 will include aid to Korea which, in previous years, was financed from regular Department of Defense appropriations. We are also proposing the continuation of assistance designed to strengthen further the defenses of Formosa, Japan, and certain other countries in Asia which are presently receiving military assistance.

Expenditures in the fiscal year 1956 will be largely from appropriations made in previous years. At the same time, however, new authority of 1.4 billion dollars, which I am recommending, is needed to incur obligations in the fiscal year 1956 to finance in advance certain new requirements such as the Korean program.

Direct forces support: The present Mutual Security Act distinguishes between military equipment and those supporting items which are necessary to make the soldiers and weapons effective. These supporting items, commonly referred to as direct forces support, include gasoline, tires, uniforms, medicines, rations, and similar items which all military forces consume every day.

For the fiscal year 1956 I propose that direct forces support be provided to only a few selected countries. These countries, primarily in Asia, are ones where our mutual security requires the maintenance of active forces larger than those which these countries could support from their own resources. In the fiscal year 1956 direct forces support for the armed forces of the Republic of Korea, which was formerly provided for in the Department of Defense budget, will be covered for the first time by the mutual security program.

Direct forces support will continue to be a significant part of the mutual security program for so long as the security of the free world requires that large military forces be maintained in Asia and the Near East. I recommend 630 million dollars of new obligational authority under proposed legislation for this purpose. Expenditures for this program from existing appropriations and from the proposed legislation are estimated at 600 million dollars in the fiscal year 1956, as compared with 550 million dollars in the fiscal year 1955.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND FINANCE

During the past year the free world, despite some setbacks, has made heartening progress in building the strength and unity which are so important to our security. In this hemisphere, in Europe, Asia, and Africa, the free nations acted together to strengthen their defenses against international communism, to widen economic cooperation, and to settle long standing disputes which have undermined free world unity. In these developments the United States has played a vital role.

My program for the coming year is designed to consolidate these gains and to make further progress. Particular emphasis will be laid on further strengthening the foreign service organization of the Department of State which carries the burden of foreign policy leadership and negotiations. We are likewise placing emphasis on revision of our several international programs to give appropriate attention to the important trouble spots around the world today.

My budget recommendations for international affairs and finance reflect a coordinated plan for the conduct of foreign affairs, for the expansion of trade and investment, for mutual security economic assistance, and for foreign information. Total net budget expenditures for the fiscal year 1956 are estimated at 1.3 billion dollars, as compared with 1.4 billion dollars for the current year.

International affairs and finance

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1956
	1954 actual	1955 estimated	1956 estimated	
Gross expenditures:				
Economic and technical development:				
International investment activities:				
International Finance Corporation (proposed legislation)			$35	$35
Export-Import Bank (including Reconstruction Finance Corporation liquidation)	$534	$334	335	
Investment guaranties	4	6	7	

International affairs and finance—Con.

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1956
	1954 actual	1955 estimated	1956 estimated	
Gross expenditures—Con.				
Economic and technical development—Continued.				
Mutual security program (nonmilitary):				
Defense support and development assistance, Technical cooperation	1,241	1,075	725	-------
Refugee and other aid (contributions to international agencies)				
Proposed legislation	-------	-------	300	1,500
Civil assistance programs, Department of Defense	87	30	6	3
Emergency commodity assistance, Department of Agriculture	74	124	177	[1] 79
Other assistance	3	6	9	9
Other refugee activities (Department of State)	1	9	15	16
Foreign information and exchange activities:				
United States Information Agency	71	77	86	88
Department of State	20	18	21	22
Emergency fund for international affairs	-------	4	1	-------
Conduct of foreign affairs (Department of State and other)	130	116	124	123
Total	2,166	1,800	1,841	[2] 1,876
Deduct applicable receipts:				
Export-Import Bank	434	376	425	-------
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	9	-------	-------	-------
Investment guaranties	2	4	4	-------
Commodity Credit Corporation	-------	-------	79	-------
Net budget expenditures	1,720	1,420	1,332	-------

[1] Appropriation to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for commodity assistance provided in previous years.

[2] Compares with new obligational authority of $1,268 million in 1954 and $1,585 million in 1955.

Recommended new authority to incur obligations in the fiscal year 1956 amounts to 1.9 billion dollars, 291 million dollars more than for 1955. Major items of this increase in new obligational authority result from increased emphasis on defense support and development assistance in Asia and reimbursement of the Commodity Credit Corporation for emergency assistance in the form of commodities furnished in previous years.

International investment activities: In my recent special message on foreign economic policy, I made recommendations which will enable us to expand foreign trade and investment. As a further step in providing capital to underdeveloped areas through stimulating private investment, the United States is participating with other members of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development in working out proposals for an International Finance Corporation. Such a corporation, although it could not purchase stock, could provide venture capital by making special types of loans without government guaranties to private enterprises in less developed countries. This budget includes 35 million dollars as the United States' share of the corporation's capital of 100 million dollars.

Moreover, in keeping with legislation approved last year, the Export-Import Bank estimates an increase in direct loans and guaranties of private loans from 460 million dollars in the fiscal year 1955 to 665 million dollars in 1956. It is expected that a significant part of this increase will consist of guaranties of private loans which are not included in gross budget expenditures. New direct loans are expected to be authorized in the amount of 403 million dollars. The collections on old loans, including lend-lease and postwar reconstruction credits in Europe, will exceed disbursements against new direct loans, so that a net receipt of 90 million dollars to the Treasury is estimated in 1956.

Defense support and development assistance: We anticipate that the trade and investment policies outlined above, and the marked advance in economic strength of many foreign countries over the past 2 years, will increasingly enable us to confine direct Government assistance for defense support and economic development abroad generally to two types of situations, both of which are related intimately to our own future security.

In the first place, we will find it necessary for some time to provide defense support to certain countries which have undertaken a military effort beyond the capacity of their own economies to support. This defense support includes consumption goods and capital equipment to support the general economy, as contrasted with direct forces support which provides assistance to the military forces of the country. In the second place, our national interest will require direct assistance to certain less developed countries where a rate of economic progress which would be impossible without such assistance is essential to their becoming and remaining strong and healthy members of the community of free nations capable of resisting Communist penetration and subversion.

Employment, production, and foreign exchange reserves in free European countries are generally increasing. Most of these countries can now strengthen their military establishments and at the same time improve their living standards without further United States defense support. In the fiscal year 1955, defense support has been limited to very few countries, and a similar situation is expected to prevail in 1956.

Latin America, an area with which we have well-established trade and investment relations, has a great need for capital for economic development. Nevertheless, if Latin American countries follow a policy of encouraging private investment, domestic and foreign, they should be able to continue to raise the capital needed for further economic growth. In those cases in which private or International Bank resources are not available or not appropriate for financing sound projects, the Export-Import Bank will welcome applications for loans. The new International Finance Corporation, when organized, can also help provide capital. Grants in Latin America have been necessary only in special situations such as in Bolivia and Guatemala.

In Asia, active warfare has only recently ceased and the free countries of this continent continue to face the threat of Communist subversion and external aggression. We therefore have been furnishing and propose to continue to furnish defense support to several countries including Korea, Formosa, Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. Some assistance in economic development has been extended to India.

Unless such support is provided, we may expect economic deterioration and dangerous reductions in the military defenses of the free world. Moreover, without such assistance, these countries, most of which border on Russia and Communist China, will not achieve the economic progress which is necessary to meet the threat of Communist subversion. The loss of northern Vietnam makes this support more imperative than ever.

In the Middle East and Africa, we have provided some grant and loan assistance to promote economic development and political stability, and will request funds to continue this type of assistance in the fiscal year 1956. This assistance has gone to Iran, Israel, Lebanon, Jordan, Egypt, and Libya.

My budget proposals for the mutual security program were developed on the assumption that all requirements for that program will be met from appropriations made for that purpose. Therefore if it becomes desirable to utilize foreign currencies accruing from sales of surplus agricultural commodities made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act for mutual security purposes, mutual security appropriations will be used to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for currencies so utilized.

Technical cooperation: Over recent years, technical cooperation has become a continuing part of United States policy toward the rest of the world. American experts help the people in foreign countries, and foreign technicians come to the United States to observe our methods. As a result, millions of people are learning how to produce more food, to improve health and educational standards, and to operate modern industries more effectively. Agreements for technical cooperation are in effect in 68 countries and territories in Latin America, Asia, the Near East, and Africa.

In addition to these bilateral efforts, we have contributed to meeting the total cost of the United Nations technical assistance program, for which experts and

financial contributions come from many nations. I am proposing new obligational authority to cover the total proposed contributions of the United States to this program for both calendar years 1955 and 1956.

Refugee and other foreign relief: The 1953 Refugee Relief Act provides for the admission of 214,000 people beyond regular immigration quotas before December 31, 1956. Approximately 17,000 visas have been granted to date. Sufficient progress has been made on concluding agreements with other countries, organizing staff abroad, and completing arrangements with voluntary agencies in the United States to justify the expectation that the program can be completed in accordance with the provisions of the act. To accomplish this, I recommend an increase for the Department of State appropriation for the fiscal year 1956, and a supplemental appropriation for 1955.

I am also recommending continued United States support of those programs and international agencies through which funds have been made available for relief, rehabilitation, and resettlement of escapees, refugees, and other special groups. These agencies include the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, and the United Nations agencies for Palestine refugees, and for emergency aid to children. In addition, this budget makes provision for a small contribution to help the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees take refugees out of camps and make them part of the local communities.

Foreign information and exchange activities: The United States Information Agency has done a capable job of redirecting its work and is increasingly effective. It is carrying out its mission in 79 countries through local radio, press, films, and information centers. Its worldwide radio broadcasting is increasingly directed to the countries beyond the Iron Curtain. But the Soviet efforts to divide the United States from other nations of the free world by twisting our motives, as well as its efforts to sow fear and distrust, are mounting in tempo in many areas of the world. I believe it is of the highest importance that our program for telling the truth to peoples of other nations be stepped up to meet the needs of our foreign policy.

The Department of State's educational exchange program is primarily directed toward the exchange of educators, newsmen, labor and management officials, students and others who influence the formation of public opinion abroad. The sharing of ideas strengthens the community of interest so vital to our relations with other people. I recommend that these exchanges be increased, particularly with underdeveloped areas.

Conduct of foreign affairs: A prerequisite to the achievement of all our international affairs and finance programs is dynamic, positive, and dedicated leadership by the Department of State.

This budget recognizes the essentiality of a stronger and better trained career corps of foreign service officers. We should also provide more adequate facilities for carrying out statutory consular functions. Finally, more comprehensive commercial labor, and other economic data are necessary to assist American businessmen to increase their foreign investment and trade.

As a result of the recommendations of the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives and a committee of distinguished citizens, we are starting a series of improvements in the foreign service. The foreign service will be expanded to cover departmental positions; officers will be rotated more regularly between United States and foreign posts; and training will be improved. Appropriations to initiate these reforms are recommended.

VETERANS' SERVICES AND BENEFITS

Expenditures for veterans' programs are now rising—reversing the decline from the peak in 1947 as World War II veterans completed their readjustment to civilian life. In the fiscal year 1956, the Federal Government will spend an estimated 4.6 billion dollars for a wide variety of aids to veterans, an increase of 9 percent over the actual outlays in 1954 and 5 percent over 1955. This increase will occur notwithstanding the savings made through improved management of the Veterans' Administration, and the long-run outlook under present laws is continued large increases in payments to veterans.

Three main factors account for this outlook. First, World War II, the Korean conflict, and large defense requirements have increased the present and potential veteran population tremendously. Twenty-one million veterans are now in civilian life, 5 times the number before World War II. An additional 3 million men and women now in the Armed Forces have acquired rights to wartime veterans' benefits by serving during the Korean emergency.

Second, the 3 million veterans of World War I are reaching age 65 and are qualifying for pensions in large numbers. A service-incurred disability is not required for these benefits.

Third, benefits for veterans who served during wartime or an emergency have been increased in scope and liberality. Last year, laws were enacted which will add more than 170 million dollars in estimated expenditures for veterans' benefits for the fiscal year 1956, principally for increased pension and compensation payments.

These facts require sober consideration. Our Government has a responsibility to provide generous assistance to those who have special needs arising from service in the Armed Forces, particularly war service. We must make sure that benefits which are provided to veterans and their survivors are timely and reach those who need them most. At the same time, we must bear in mind that Government policies designed to assist in the maintenance of a prosperous economy and to support social security, health, and other humanitarian programs are all of value to veterans as well as to other people. Since more than two-fifths of all adult males are entitled to veterans' benefits, expenditures for veterans are a budgetary problem of major interest to the whole population.

Our veterans' pension and compensation laws, in particular, are in need of constructive reconsideration. The nonservice-connected pension system dates back to the Revolutionary War, and its principles require reexamination in the light of recent developments, including the nearly universal coverage of the old-age and survivors insurance system. The overall system of statutes and regulations governing eligibility and payment rates for service-connected compensation has not had a fundamental review for many years. It also needs to be reappraised in the light of the great improvement in medical and rehabilitation techniques and the actual economic situation of the many beneficiaries.

I am therefore appointing a Commission on Veterans' Pensions to study the entire structure, scope, and philosophy of our veterans' pension and compensation laws in relation to each other and to other Government programs. This budget includes 300,000 dollars for the continuation of the work of this Commission in the fiscal year 1956.

An especially complex and difficult problem exists in the field of survivor benefits for military personnel and veterans, where 4 different agencies now provide 5 major benefits. This problem has received extensive attention within the executive branch and from the Select Committee on Survivor Benefits of the House of Representatives. I hope that our mutual efforts will result in enactment of adequate and improved programs which will include full coverage for military personnel under our basic old-age and survivors insurance program and will properly relate benefits provided military personnel to those for veterans.

I have recently issued a proclamation terminating accrual of eligibility after January 31, 1955, for various benefits authorized for veterans who served during the Korean conflict. Few of those discharged during the fiscal year 1956 will be materially affected by this action. Studies will be undertaken to determine the need for measures to ease the readjustment to civilian life of men required to enter the Armed Forces for 2 years of service.

Readjustment benefits: The Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 authorizes education and training, loan guaranty, and unemployment compensation benefits for veterans who served during the Korean conflict. Many World War II veterans are still eligible for loan guaranty benefits and some are still completing their education and training under the original "GI bill." In addition, special vocational rehabilitation aid is provided under other laws for veterans of both conflicts who were disabled in service.

Veterans' services and benefits

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1956
	1954 actual	1955 estimated	1956 estimated	
Gross expenditures:				
Readjustment benefits:				
Education and training	$546	$602	$587	$587
Loan guaranty and other benefits (Veterans Administration)	76	38	40	40
Unemployment compensation (Department of Labor)	82	131	150	150
Compensation and pensions	2,482	2,679	2,800	2,800
Insurance and servicemen's indemnities	104	72	135	127
Hospital and medical care:				
Current expenses	724	688	710	716
Hospital construction	59	48	60	20
Other services and administration (Veterans Administration and other)	217	211	202	173
Total	4,289	4,468	4,684	[1] 4,615
Deduct applicable receipts:				
Insurance programs (Veterans Administration)	4	9	16	
Other services and administration (Veterans Administration, primarily canteen services)	29	28	29	
Net budget expenditures	4,256	4,431	4,640	

[1] Compares with new obligational authority of 4,272 million dollars in 1954 and 4,285 million dollars in 1955

The total estimated expenditures of 777 million dollars for all readjustment benefits in the fiscal year 1956 will be at about the same level as in the current year, and 10 percent higher than in 1954. The proportion of total readjustment benefits going to veterans of the Korean conflict has been increasing, and is expected to exceed 90 percent in the fiscal year 1956.

An average of 516,000 trainees is expected in the school, job, and farm training courses during the fiscal year 1956. One out of each 4 of the 4.7 million veterans eligible for these Korean conflict benefits will have participated in education or training by the end of the fiscal year 1956. The reservoir of potential enrollees is still large, considering that 1 out of each 2 World War II veterans received such benefits.

Budget expenditures under the loan guaranty program have declined sharply since the fiscal year 1954 because payments for the first year of interest on mortgages have ceased. It is expected that 467,000 loans totaling 5 billion dollars will be insured or guaranteed during the fiscal year 1956. Almost all of these loans will be for housing. The estimated 40 million dollars of expenditures in this category for 1956 includes 25 million dollars for acquisition of properties and losses on defaulted guaranteed loans. The other 15 million dollars is for tuition and supplies in the vocational rehabilitation program and grants of up to 10,000 dollars each for special housing for certain severely disabled veterans. Expenditures for the Veterans Administration direct housing loan program under present law and its proposed extension are included among aids for private housing in the commerce and manpower section of this message.

Federal unemployment compensation benefits of 26 dollars a week for a maximum of 26 weeks are payable through State agencies to veterans of the Korean conflict. Where the veteran who is insured under a State unemployment compensation system receives lower benefits from that system, the United States Department of Labor supplements the State benefit. Expenditures for this purpose are increasing as the number of eligible veterans rises. In the fiscal year 1956 an estimated weekly average of 138,000 veterans will receive unemployment benefits, wholly or partly financed by the Federal Government.

These unemployment benefits were intended to assist veterans of the Korean conflict during their transitional period immediately following separation from military service. Possibly by inadvertence, the present provisions were so written that a veteran of the Korean conflict may apply for these benefits at any time up to January 31, 1960, no matter how many years have passed since his discharge. I recommend that the law be amended to limit the time for filing claims to 3 years after separation or enactment of the amendment, whichever is later.

Compensation and pensions: The upward trend in total expenditures for veterans results mainly from the rise in compensation and pensions. Expenditures for this purpose are estimated to increase more than 300 million dollars from the fiscal year 1954 to 1956, to a total of 2.8 billion dollars. They will equal more than half of all payments from the old-age and survivors insurance system. On the basis of present laws and veteran population, the present annual rate of expenditures for veterans' pensions and compensation is expected to double in 3 or 4 decades.

The estimated expenditures of 2.8 billion dollars include 1.9 billion dollars in payments to nearly 2,486,000 families and veterans for death or disability resulting from service, and 859 million dollars for pension payments in 1,046,000 cases where death or disability was not connected with military service. During the fiscal year 1954, an average of 2,412,000 cases received about 1.7 billion dollars in death and disability compensation benefits, and 716 million dollars in pensions were paid in 902,000 cases. The expenditures for 1956 also include 17 million dollars for 110,000 burial awards and 26 million dollars in subsistence payments to disabled veterans during their vocational rehabilitation.

Insurance and servicemen's indemnities: Payments for insurance and indemnity benefits go to families of personnel who die in military service. The increase in expenditures in the fiscal year 1956 reflects (1) a steady increase in indemnity benefits, and (2) an unusual increase in insurance expenditures resulting from recently declared deaths of servicemen who were previously reported missing during the hostilities in Korea.

Indemnity benefits of $92.90 a month are paid for 120 months to the family of each serviceman who dies while on active military service or within 120 days after separation. The benefits are reduced proportionately if the serviceman has any Veterans' Administration insurance. Payments of 42 million dollars estimated for the fiscal year 1956 are 79 percent higher than in 1954.

While no new national service life insurance or United States Government life insurance has been issued since 1951, previously issued policies continue in force. Where deaths are caused by the hazards of war, or occur during military service while premiums have been waived, the Government reimburses the insurance trust funds for losses. The Government also pays benefits directly to certain policyholders. Budget expenditures for insurance losses are estimated at 93 million dollars in the fiscal year 1956, somewhat more than in 1954 and more than double the amount in 1955.

Hospital and medical care: A rising patient load in the veterans' hospital and medical program will result in an increase in current expenses for the fiscal year 1956. The average number of patients in Veterans Administration and contract hospitals is expected to rise 4 percent above the 1955 level to 114,500. While the proportion of service-connected cases is slowly increasing as more veterans of the Korean conflict are treated, it is estimated that more than two-thirds of the expenditures in 1956 will still be for patients hospitalized or treated for ailments not connected with military service. The number of persons in Veterans Administration and State homes is estimated to be 25,700 in the fiscal year 1956. The workload for outpatient care to service-incurred dental and medical cases is expected to be about 14 percent below that in 1954, with a total of 2,340,000 examinations and treatments in 1956. About four-fifths of the estimated average employment of 171,000 in the Veterans Administration during the fiscal year 1956 will be in the hospital and medical programs.

The budget includes recommended new authority to incur obligations of 20 million dollars for construction and improvements at Veterans Administration facilities. Most of this is for modernization of existing structures. Expenditures for construction and improvements in the fiscal year 1956 are estimated at 60 million dollars, approximately the same amount as in 1954 and somewhat higher than in 1955. Expenditures will be greater than the recommended new appropriations because funds for three large new hospitals to be built in 1956 were appropriated in previous years.

Other services and administration: The general operating expenses of the Veterans Administration are estimated

to decline further in the fiscal year 1956, reflecting declining workloads in some parts of this agency, especially in the insurance programs, and better organization and management throughout the agency. Average employment in nonmedical activities in 1956 is estimated at 34,500, or 13 percent below the 1954 level.

Trust funds: Nearly 6 million national service life insurance and United States Government life insurance policies, which provide more than 40 billion dollars of protection, continue in force. About 1 million of these policies are held by personnel still in the Armed Forces, largely on a waiver-of-premium basis. The remainder are held by veterans who pay premiums. As the special dividend payments to the policyholders declared in 1954 and earlier years are completed, the receipts of the insurance trust accounts begin to exceed their disbursements. The transactions in these, as well as other, trust funds are not included in the budget totals.

Veterans' life-insurance funds

(Trust funds)

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Item	1954 actual	1955 estimated	1956 estimated
Balance in funds at start of year	$6,613	$6,541	$6,574
Receipts:			
Transfers from general and special accounts	72	31	81
Interest on investments	200	208	209
Premiums and other	426	414	406
Total	697	652	696
Expenditures:			
Dividends to policyholders	267	174	169
Benefits and other	503	446	444
Total	769	620	604
Net accumulation (+) or withdrawal (−)	−72	+33	+92
Balance in funds at close of year	6,541	6,574	6,665

WELFARE, HEALTH, AND EDUCATION

Major advances have been made in the past year in the fields of social security, health, and education, pursuant to recommendations which I made to the Congress. We have demonstrated that the well-being of our people can be strengthened without yielding to the dangers of centralized power in the Federal Government, and we shall continue firmly to resist any project which would seem to us to involve such dangers. We have found ways to provide greater human security and social opportunity, while restricting the Federal Government's role to that of assisting private action and State and local responsibility with research and technical assistance, social insurance, and grants-in-aid. We believe that these gains can be continued through cooperative action among all levels of American government together with private participation.

In the last Congress, old-age and survivors insurance was extended to 10 million more persons and benefits were improved. Vocational rehabilitation grants to the States have been stepped up toward the objective for 1959 of helping 200,000 people a year to rehabilitate themselves. We have undertaken to aid the construction of medical diagnostic and treatment centers, rehabilitation facilities, nursing homes, and chronic disease hospitals, as well as general hospitals.

To assist in the search for solution of the Nation's serious school problems, the White House Conference on Education was authorized. The Office of Education has been strengthened. Assistance to schools especially affected by Federal activities was extended.

In this budget, I recommend increased appropriations for certain activities, including health research and the training of health personnel, and basic scientific research. I am also proposing new legislation to help fill gaps in present programs for health care, public assistance, and old-age and survivors insurance, and to obtain better coordination among them. Estimates for new legislation include 3 million dollars for grants-in-aid to enable State, local, and private agencies to deal more effectively with juvenile delinquency. I am recommending the enactment of legislation to establish an Advisory Commission on Fine Arts within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to provide recognition of the importance of the further development of our cultural heritage.

Welfare, health, and education

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Budget expenditures (net)			Recommended new obligational authority for 1956
	1954 actual	1955 estimated	1956 estimated	
Promotion of public health:				
Present programs	$288	$292	$321	$335
Proposed legislation			17	52
Public assistance:				
Present program	1,439	1,447	1,402	1,402
Proposed legislation			20	20
Other welfare aids and services:				
School lunch program	84	84	68	68
Vocational rehabilitation	24	29	43	43
Indian health, education, and welfare	49	59	76	80
Other	106	77	80	83
Promotion of education:				
Assistance for schools in federally affected areas	184	224	173	89
Vocational education	25	31	31	31
Other educational aids	25	30	33	30
General-purpose research:				
National Science Foundation	6	10	21	31
Department of Commerce	17	35	27	27
Total	2,248	2,316	2,312	[1] 2,289

[1] Compares with new obligational authority of 2,190 million dollars in 1954 and 2,310 million dollars in 1955.

Budget expenditures for welfare, health, and education, including proposed legislation, are estimated at 2.3 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1956, a decrease of 4 million dollars from 1955. These figures do not include expenditures for health, education, and research which are classified among veterans' benefits or in the military, atomic energy, and other programs in other sections of the budget.

Promotion of public health: This budget includes funds necessary to assist an expansion of existing services and initiate appropriate new measures which will carry out the objectives of a coordinated health program which I shall outline shortly in a special message to the Congress.

Under existing legislation, budget expenditures for public health are estimated at 321 million dollars in the fiscal year 1956. The principal expenditures are for grants to States for construction of hospitals and other health facilities, public health services, maternal and child health, and the control of various diseases; for research programs, including grants to universities and medical schools; and for operation of Public Health Service hospitals.

Significant items in the 29-million-dollar increase of expenditures over 1955 are for expansion of the research and training activities of the National Institutes of Health, including special emphasis on mental health; construction of more health facilities; an intensified attack on problems of air and water pollution; and strengthened enforcement of the food and drug laws.

I am recommending elsewhere in this message that the Atomic Energy Commission be authorized to build a new medical research center containing a nuclear reactor designed specifically for medical research and therapy. This will be a significant addition to the Nation's facilities for basic research in the field of health.

The new health legislation which I shall recommend will require budget expenditures of approximately 37 million dollars in the fiscal year 1956.

This legislation includes health reinsurance—the best method yet proposed for encouraging adequate health insurance coverage for our people. It includes also the part-year cost of a program of grants-in-aid for medical care for public assistance recipients, shown in the table under proposed legislation for public assistance. Other measures in the health program are designed to foster construction of more adequate medical facilities, training of nurses and other necessary medical personnel, and general improvement of key services in the States and local communities.

Public assistance: The recent expansion of old-age and survivors insurance should gradually reduce the need for public assistance, with a consequent saving to all levels of Government in budget outlays for this purpose.

Further savings will result over the long run from amendments to public assistance legislation which I am recommending. The present grant-in-aid formula requires the Federal Government to pay each State 20 dollars of the first 25 dollars of average monthly old-age assistance benefits, and half of the next 30 dollars for any recipient. One of the proposed amendments would modify the public assistance law so that Federal grants can be adjusted downward to reflect gradually, by application to new cases, the number of old-age and survivor insurance beneficiaries who also

need supplementary old-age assistance. By limiting to 50 percent the Federal share of old-age assistance for these future recipients of both types of benefits, this amendment would result in a more equitable sharing of costs between the State and Federal Governments. The other amendment would encourage States to help needy individuals to become self-supporting or to care for themselves at home.

Other welfare aids and services: Expenditures of 84 million dollars from the school lunch appropriation in the fiscal years 1954 and 1955 include about 67 million dollars for cash payments to States and nearly all of the rest is for commodities. The appropriation recommended for 1956 covers only the cash payments to the States and the costs of administration. In addition, contributions of surplus commodities, financed mainly from a permanent appropriation to the Department of Agriculture for this purpose, are expected to continue at a high level, so that the combined total of Federal cash payments and food donations will remain approximately the same in 1956 as in 1955. Moreover, the new school milk program authorized by the Agricultural Act of 1954 provides 50 million dollars a year in the fiscal years 1955 and 1956 to encourage increased consumption of milk by schoolchildren. Taken together, these various aids will make Federal support of the overall school lunch program the largest in our history. The expenditures for surplus commodities and school milk are classified under agriculture and agricultural resources.

This budget fully supports the enlarged vocational rehabilitation program enacted last year and will make possible the rehabilitation of 95,000 people in the fiscal year 1956.

The Congress last year provided for the transfer of Indian health services from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, where they can be administered with other health programs. The appropriations recommended for the fiscal year 1956 will provide improved medical care for our Indian population.

Social insurance and retirement trust funds: The Federal Government acts as trustee of three large, publicly sponsored retirement and insurance programs—old-age and survivors insurance, railroad retirement, and Federal employees' retirement. Contributions under these programs, including Federal payments, are collected in the respective trust funds and maintained separately from the budget accounts of the Government.

In connection with old-age and survivors insurance, I am recommending two legislative measures. One is the coordination of income and old-age insurance tax collection procedures to make reporting easier for wage earners and employers and at the same time to reduce Government costs for collecting taxes and paying benefits. The second is extension of this insurance to military personnel and to those Federal civilian personnel not now covered, as the basic part of improved systems of survivorship, disability, and retirement protection, with existing staff retirement systems retained as independent and separate entities. The military retirement pay system should remain unchanged. Certain adjustments in the present civilian personnel retirement systems will be needed.

Social insurance and retirement funds

(Trust funds)

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Fund and item	1954 actual	1955 estimated	1956 estimated
Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund:			
Balance in fund at start of year	$18,363	$20,040	$21,356
Receipts:			
Appropriation from general receipts	4,537	5,190	6,175
Deposits by States	92	120	130
Interest and other	451	464	494
Payments of benefits, construction and administrative expenses, and tax refunds	−3,405	−4,459	−4,968
Net accumulation	1,675	1,315	1,831
Balance in fund at close of year	20,040	21,356	23,187
Railroad retirement fund:			
Balance in fund at start of year	3,183	3,418	3,538
Receipts:			
Appropriation from general receipts	638	600	625
Interest on investments	99	102	106
Payments of benefits, salaries, and expenses	−502	−581	−590
Net accumulation	235	121	141
Balance in fund at close of year	3,418	3,538	3,679
Federal employees' retirement funds (Civil Service and Foreign Service):			
Balance in funds at start of year	5,652	5,932	6,196
Receipts:			
Employee contributions	430	444	502
Interest	226	234	222
Transfer from budget accounts and other:			
Present law	35	34	5
Proposed legislation			216
Payments of annuities and refunds, and expenses	−411	−447	−489
Net accumulation	280	265	456
Balance in funds at close of year	5,932	6,196	6,652

Promotion of education: We are all aware that our schools are passing through a period of extraordinary stress. School-age population is increasing faster than classroom space has been enlarged and qualified teachers recruited. In some communities, the available fiscal resources have been strained severely by efforts to meet these needs; in too many States and school districts, the financial support given to schools has not kept pace with recent increases in taxable resources.

The national problem is to find means of overcoming these difficulties within the present framework of responsibilities. In our system of government, the States and their subdivisions have the privilege and the responsibility of providing free public education. The role of the Federal Government has wisely been confined to encouragement and special assistance. I am confident that the overwhelming majority of our people agree that there should be no dilution of that State and local responsibility.

I have called a White House conference this fall of representatives from all the States. Some local and State conferences of citizens and professional educators have already been held in preparation for this national assembly. Others will meet this spring and summer. These meetings will highlight possible long-range solutions to the problems and will place in better perspective the obligations and opportunities of the respective levels of government.

Concurrently, without impairment in any way of State, local, community, and family responsibility, the Federal Government should serve as an effective catalyst in dealing with the problem of classroom shortages. I shall send to the Congress, in February, a special message presenting an affirmative program.

The major Federal expenditure for promotion of education consists of grants to aid school construction and operation in districts where enrollment has grown significantly because of Federal operations. Last year, the Congress extended the temporary program of aid for construction for 2 years. To finance this extension, I am recommending an appropriation of an additional 70 million dollars for the current fiscal year and 24 million dollars for 1956.

The Congress also delayed a requirement that these school districts absorb a greater proportion of the operating costs resulting from increased enrollments. Primarily for this reason, a supplemental appropriation of 19 million dollars will be needed this year. In the fiscal year 1956, greater absorption of the increased enrollments by the local districts will reduce the assistance payments for operations 6 million dollars below 1955, to a total now estimated at 70 million dollars.

The budget recommendations provide for continuing the increase in vocational education grants which was enacted for 1955, and will permit the Office of Education to initiate a program of cooperative research as authorized by the last Congress.

General-purpose research: Despite our tremendous technological strides in recent years, our national interest requires that we support a strong program of basic research and that we train a greater number of highly qualified scientists and engineers. Accordingly, this budget recommends increased National Science Foundation grants for basic research and for training more graduate students, college instructors, and high school science teachers. It includes also the remaining necessary financial support for United States participation in the International Geophysical Year, a worldwide scientific undertaking which will yield great long-range benefits to this country.

The budget estimates for the Department of Commerce include substantial expansion in the general scientific and technological work of the National Bureau of Standards as recommended by a committee of outstanding scientists.

Another aspect of general-purpose research is the statistical work of the Census Bureau. We do not have all the statistical information required in our dynamic economy. I am therefore recommending a governmentwide effort to improve statistics in those areas where our work has been most handicapped by incomplete information. Increases in appropriations are recommended for the Census Bureau for statistics on the labor force and for an intercensal survey on housing. At the same time, in other parts of the budget, increases are recommended for statistics on agriculture, production, construction, employment, and finance. Details on statistical programs are shown in special analysis I.

AGRICULTURE AND AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

The basic agricultural legislation which I recommended and which the Congress enacted last year will help to promote a stable, prosperous, and free agriculture. By helping farmers solve many of their own problems we shall make possible reduced reliance on Government intervention such as production controls, and on Government spending for support of farm income. The Agricultural Act of 1954 and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act will facilitate readjustment of farm production, expansion of agricultural exports, and stimulation of domestic consumption of farm products. The Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954 provides a sound basis for Federal partnership with States and local groups in upstream flood prevention and soil and water conservation. The Farmers' Home Administration was given expanded authority to make loans for soil and water conservation, and a basis was provided for greater participation of private lenders in the financing of this and other loan programs.

My recommendations for agricultural programs in this budget will carry forward the broad objectives reflected in this new legislation. They will also continue the steps taken last year to place greater emphasis on research and educational activities. I have confidence in the ability and willingness of farmers to deal with many of their economic problems if given help through expanded agricultural research and advice in making use of the research results.

Gross expenditures for agriculture and agricultural resources in the fiscal year 1956 are estimated at 7.6 billion dollars. Receipts, estimated at about 5.4 billion dollars, consist mainly of collections on loans and sales of commodities. Net budget expenditures are estimated at 2.3 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1956, which is 871 million dollars less than estimated for 1955 and 298 million dollars less than in 1954. The reduction in net budget expenditures for 1956 is primarily due to anticipated smaller outlays for farm price supports.

New authority to incur obligations recommended for the fiscal year 1956 is 1.3 billion dollars, as compared with 2.6 billion dollars in 1955 and 4 billion dollars in 1954. The reduction in 1956 is accounted for almost entirely by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Corporation's present borrowing authority, which was increased from 6.75 billion dollars to 10 billion dollars during the fiscal years 1954 and 1955, is now expected to be adequate to finance price support activities in the fiscal year 1956.

Agriculture and agricultural resources

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Gross expenditures			Net expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1956
	1954 actual	1955 estimated	1956 estimated	1954 actual	1955 estimated	1956 estimated	
Stabilization of farm prices and farm income:							
Price support, supply, and purchase programs (CCC)	$4,220	$5,705	$4,176	$1,333	$1,934	$968	$2
International Wheat Agreement	59	106	142	59	106	84	57
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities	178	113	180	178	113	180	165
Sugar Act	66	61	61	66	61	61	62
Federal crop insurance	39	36	34	11	12	3	6
Agricultural adjustment programs	41	41	39	41	41	39	39
Financing farm ownership and operation:							
Farm Credit Administration	1,817	1,885	1,988	−74	22	37	28
Farmers' Home Administration [1]	191	178	172	191	178	172	172
Disaster loans and emergency feed	255	101	88	139	16	−39	42
Financing rural electrification and rural telephones [1]	217	217	233	217	217	233	238
Agricultural land and water resources:							
Agricultural conservation program	201	233	255	183	173	246	216
Soil Conservation Service, flood prevention and other	61	76	74	61	76	74	75
Research and other agricultural services	150	180	206	150	180	200	186
Total	7,497	8,934	7,647	2,557	3,130	2,259	[2] 1,288

[1] Net expenditures for the Farmers' Home Administration and for rural electrification and telephone loans do not reflect loan collections, since these collections go directly into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. In 1956, these collections are estimated at 152 million dollars and 112 million dollars, respectively.

[2] Compares with new obligational authority of 4,010 million dollars in 1954 and 2,630 million dollars in 1955.

Stabilization of farm prices and farm income: Establishment of the principle of flexible supports and provision for a gradual shift to modernized parity for the basic agricultural commodities in the legislation enacted last year will encourage farmers to adjust their production to realistic market prices in keeping with the current needs of the economy. Since the transition to the new basis for price supports will be gradual, the benefits for the agricultural economy and for the Nation will not be fully realized for several years.

Based on the best information now available, gross price support expenditures in the fiscal year 1956 are estimated at 4.2 billion dollars, 1.5 billion dollars less than the amount estimated for 1955. These gross expenditures do not represent losses; rather they are outlays for loans and commodities to be acquired during the year, and for redemption of certificates of interest in commodity loans previously sold to private lenders. A substantial part of these outlays will be recovered from collections on loans and sales of commodities in later periods. Receipts from commodity sales and collections on loans in 1956 are estimated at 3.2 billion dollars, resulting in net budget expenditures of 968 million dollars.

The decline in net price support expenditures anticipated in the budget will be brought about by two major factors. First, continuation of acreage restrictions, particularly on 1955 crop year cotton and wheat, and lower support levels on some commodities are expected to result in a lower volume of price support loans. Second, receipts from sales of such commodities as cotton, corn, and wool are expected to increase as our efforts to find new and expanded markets for agricultural products begin to show results. These factors will be offset in part by increased Commodity Credit Corporation expenditures to retire certificates of interest in prior-year crop loans sold to banks and private lenders, because a substantially smaller volume of new commodity loans will be available in 1956 than in 1955 to serve as a basis for certificates of interest. Also, funds of the Corporation will be used to provide for increased milk consumption by schoolchildren and members of the Armed Forces during 1955 and 1956 when supplies of dairy products are expected to be plentiful.

Expenditures in 1956 under the International Wheat Agreement are estimated to be lower than in 1955, but higher than in 1954. In the fiscal year 1954 a total of 119 million bushels of wheat was exported under this program. The average amount paid by the Government to cover the difference between the domestic price and the Wheat Agreement price was 48 cents per bushel. Larger exports under this program are expected in both 1955 and 1956.

In addition to exports under the Wheat Agreement, the Commodity Credit Corporation has offered to sell wheat in limited quantities for export at competitive world prices. Net costs to the Corporation of these additional exports in 1954 were 26 million dollars and are estimated at 59 million dollars in each of the fiscal years 1935 and 1939.

The Corporation may also sell surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act. The law provides for a 3-year program with total cost to the Corporation to be

reimbursed by appropriations limited to 700 million dollars. With due regard to the impact on world markets, we are moving ahead in an orderly manner in the negotiation of agreements, and it is expected that transactions completed during the fiscal year 1955 will account for a substantial part of the costs under this Act. Except for expenditures under the International Wheat Agreement, these expenditures for export programs are included in the total shown for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The trade development act is helpful in marketing commodity surpluses and tends to reduce current outlays under the regular price support program. However, it is unwise to rely upon this means as a final solution to our surplus problem. We must continue our efforts to restore a sound position for agriculture in world markets.

Financing farm ownership and operation: The agricultural credit institutions supervised by the Farm Credit Administration make standard risk loans to farmers and their cooperatives on both a short- and long-term basis. Some of these loans are made with funds obtained through the federally owned intermediate credit banks. New loans of the Federal intermediate credit banks are estimated to be nearly 2 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1956, and will exceed loan collections by 40 million dollars. Receipts from other operations will reduce the total net budget expenditures of the Farm Credit Administration to 37 million dollars.

The Farmers' Home Administration makes direct loans to farmers to supplement the credit services provided by private and cooperative credit agencies, and also insures loans by private lenders. By greater reliance on insured loans, the services of the Farmers' Home Administration can be increased without increasing budget expenditures. Under legislation enacted last year the interest rate on insured loans for farm ownership, farm housing, and other improvements has been set at a level that will attract a larger volume of funds from private lenders. Insured loans will also be used to finance an increase in soil and water conservation loans, which the new legislation has made available in all States. In addition, the Farmers' Home Administration can now take second mortgages as security for direct loans. This will permit private lenders to continue as first mortgage holders in the financing of farm ownership and development, thereby increasing the number of borrowers that can be served under that program.

Financing rural electrification and rural telephones: The programs of the Rural Electrification Administration have brought about great advances for rural America, and this administration will continue to make loans available to meet all legitimate needs for rural electrification and telephones.

The need for electrification loans to provide initial connections of farm homes with central station service is much less than in earlier years. But this is more than offset by larger requirements for improvements of existing systems and for power generation. My budget recommendations, therefore, provide for a higher level of new electrification loans in 1956 than in the current fiscal year.

The rural telephone program is still in an early stage of development. Progress is being made in resolving the various problems involved in achieving adequate telephone service in rural areas. This budget makes provision for new loan authority sufficient to raise the level of telephone loans in 1956 to 80 million dollars, which is 5 million dollars higher than in 1955.

Agricultural land and water resources: My recommendations for agricultural land and water resources for the fiscal year 1956 recognize the great importance to the Nation of soil and water conservation activities. The new watershed protection legislation enacted last year is a vital part of our conservation program. It provides a practical basis for partnership between the Federal Government and State and local groups in the planning and carrying out of a coordinated program for upstream flood prevention and soil and water conservation. This budget recommends an increase of 4 million dollars for 1956 to provide for the necessary Federal participation in watershed protection projects.

Under the forward authorization for the 1955 crop year agricultural conservation program, contained in the 1955 appropriation act, larger expenditures will be required for payments to farmers in the fiscal year 1956 than in 1955. This program assists farmers in applying sound soil conservation practices and in putting to proper use farm land diverted from its previous use through acreage allotments. Because the problems created by diverted acreage are expected to become progressively less pressing, I am recommending a forward authorization of 175 million dollars for the 1956 crop year as compared with the 250 million dollars provided for the current crop year.

Research and other agricultural services: Additional research and educational work on problems of agricultural production, soil and water conservation, and marketing of farm products, can make important contributions to a more efficient and stable agriculture capable of meeting the needs of a growing population. These activities not only contribute directly to the solution of immediate problems of farmers, but also benefit consumers of farm products by more efficient production and marketing. The 1956 budget provides for an increase of 9 million dollars in expenditures for research and an increase of 6 million dollars for extension work. These additional amounts are needed to expand the Federal-State cooperative research and extension programs and to strengthen the basic agricultural research program carried on by the Federal Government.

As part of the coordinated plan to improve economic statistics of the Government, this budget includes added funds to strengthen the work of the Department of Agriculture in developing adequate farm income and production statistics. Expenditures for other agricultural services also include 10 million dollars in 1955 and 15 million dollars in 1956 for eradication of brucellosis in cattle. The necessary funds are to be made available by transfer from the Commodity Credit Corporation. This program is designed both to assist in stabilizing the dairy industry and to give added protection to the health of our citizens.

NATURAL RESOURCES

This administration believes that achievement of the resource development basic to the economic progress and security of the Nation requires encouragement of local public and private initiative and, where Federal participation is necessary, emphasis on the partnership aspects of essential cooperative arrangements with State and local governments or with private enterprise. To the greatest extent possible, the responsibility for resource development, and its cost, should be borne by those who receive the benefits. In many instances private interests or State and local governments can best carry on the needed programs. In other instances Federal participation or initiative may be necessary to safeguard the public interest or to accomplish broad national objectives, where projects because of size or complexity are beyond the means or the needs of local public or private enterprise. The Federal Government must be willing and ready to bear the cost of improvements made for national purposes; but in all cases where the partnership principle logically applies there is automatically acquired a concern for economy and efficiency that is often lacking when no local contribution is required.

As a result of this partnership policy and the willingness of State, local, and private interests to undertake or cooperate in the development of our natural resources, it has been possible to reduce Federal expenditures for these programs since the fiscal year 1954. At the same time, we have strengthened our resource development programs.

The conservation and development of our natural resources will require estimated net Federal expenditures of 953 million dollars in the fiscal year 1956, as compared with 1.1 billion dollars in 1955 and 1.2 billion dollars in 1954. About two-thirds of the net expenditures in 1956 will be for flood control, irrigation, power and multiple-purpose river basin development. The other one-third will be largely for the management and development of the national forests, parks, and public lands, and for our fish and wildlife and mineral resources programs. Federal expenditures for natural resources, if wisely made in proper relation to local public and private efforts, are investments for the benefit of the Nation; in many cases they also result in receipts to the Treasury, thus often providing reimbursement in later years for part of the costs incurred.

Natural resources

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Gross expenditures			Net expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1956
	1954 actual	1955 estimated	1956 estimated	1954 actual	1955 estimated	1956 estimated	
Land and water resources:							
Corps o. Engineers: Flood control and multiple-purpose projects:							
Present programs	$416	$366	$363	$416	$366	$363	$371
Proposed legislation:							
Passamaquoddy Bay survey			1			1	1
Partnership projects			10			10	10
Department of the Interior:							
Bureau of Reclamation: Irrigation and multiple-purpose projects:							
Present programs	199	168	177	196	165	174	180
Proposed legislation:							
Federal projects			5			5	7
Partnership projects			10			10	10
Power transmission agencies	53	48	41	53	48	41	25
Indian lands resources	33	37	41	32	36	40	24
Bureau of Land Management and other	15	17	18	15	17	18	17
Tennessee Valley Authority	409	431	250	238	214	2	28
Department of State	7	5	4	7	5	4	2
Federal Power Commission	4	4	5	4	4	5	5
Forest resources	117	121	115	117	121	115	116
Mineral resources:							
Present programs	41	47	46	37	43	42	40
Proposed legislation: Aid for anthracite mine drainage		2	3		2	3	
Fish and wildlife resources	38	46	43	38	46	43	41
Recreational use of resources	33	39	50	33	39	50	25
General resource surveys and other	27	26	26	27	26	26	26
Total	1,391	1,358	1,209	1,213	1,133	953	[1] 929

[1] Compares with new obligational authority of 1,196 million dollars in 1954 and 967 million dollars in 1955.

Land and water resources: Under the recommendations for the fiscal year 1956, the Federal Government will spend 673 million dollars for the development of land and water resources. A large share of this total—430 million dollars—is for continuation of work on 152 river-basin development projects and units under construction by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers. Much of this work is multiple-purpose development for irrigation, flood control, navigation, and hydroelectric power. Construction on 37 of these projects will be virtually completed in 1956. Funds recommended for work underway in 1956 will maintain power generation schedules and continue nonpower projects at economical rates. Maintenance and operation activities will be at a level which will provide reasonable protection of the Federal investment.

My recommendations are intended to encourage States and local public and private groups to take the initiative in developing our valuable water resources with Federal cooperation where national interests are involved. This budget includes 20 million dollars under proposed legislation to enable the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers to participate, in 1956, in partnership water developments. Five million dollars of this amount is proposed for three multiple-purpose projects with power facilities in the Pacific Northwest. It is expected that local interests will install and operate the power facilities of the Cougar and Green Peter-White Bridge projects in Oregon and that the Corps of Engineers will build the flood control and other facilities in which there is a national interest. Non-Federal interests are also expected to build the Rocky Reach project in Washington, and the Corps of Engineers will assist in financing the nonpower facilities having national benefits. Assistance will be given to other partnership projects as specific proposals are developed. In addition, provision will be made for cooperation in authorized partnership projects, such as Priest Rapids in Washington and Markham Ferry in Oklahoma, when satisfactory arrangements have been completed.

I also recommend enactment of legislation authorizing the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake construction of two comprehensive river-basin improvements which are beyond the capacity of local initiative, public or private, but which are needed for irrigation, power, flood control and municipal and industrial water supply. These are the Upper Colorado River Basin development in the States of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, and New Mexico, and the Fryingpan-Arkansas development in Colorado. The Colorado River development will enable the Upper Basin States to conserve flood waters and to assure the availability of water and power necessary for the economic growth of the region. The total cost of these major developments is estimated at 1.1 billion dollars, with first-year expenditures of 5 million dollars. Sale of power generated at these developments will repay the power investment within 50 years and will make a contribution toward repayment of other investments.

In furtherance of the policy to move forward with needed water use and control projects, the 1956 budget provides for the starting of a number of new authorized Federal projects. For each authorized project recommended, planning has advanced to the stage where the project could be placed under construction early in 1956. Most of the projects are small or intermediate-sized developments, having a high degree of financial participation by local interests or a reasonable excess of benefits over costs. Some of them are essential to permit full functioning of Federal works already completed or under construction.

This budget makes provision for the Bureau of Reclamation to start construction on 5 new irrigation and water supply projects, and for the Corps of Engineers to begin work on 10 local flood protection projects, 2 flood control projects of broader scope, 8 projects for beach erosion control, and 14 navigation projects. It also provides for resumption of work which was suspended a few years ago on 1 local flood protection project and 1 navigation project. These add up to 39 new projects and 2 resumptions. In addition, 2 million dollars is recommended for the construction of a number of small projects to be selected by the Secretary of the Army, none of which may cost more than 150,000 dollars. The total cost of all this new work is estimated at 347 million dollars, of which expenditures of 23 million dollars are contemplated for the fiscal year 1956. The navigation projects included in the above construction starts, at an estimated cost of 198 million dollars, are discussed in the commerce and manpower section of this message.

In the selection of reclamation projects, consideration has been given to (1) more efficient use of present water supply and correction of adverse water supply conditions, and (2) the proportion of the irrigation investment which will be repaid by the water users. The new local flood protection works will provide benefits primarily in highly urban and industrialized areas. The new flood control projects are the Eagle Gorge Reservoir in Washington, on which there will be substantial local contributions in related work and cash, and the Old River Control project in Louisiana. The latter project is essential to prevent the diversion of the Mississippi River to the Atchafalaya River channel, with resultant disruption to the economy of the lower Mississippi River area.

Adequate collection and evaluation of basic data on topography, minerals, soils, and water and weather conditions are essential to provide a sound basis for water resources projects. Current progress in collection of basic data will be continued. It is also essential to prepare adequate project designs prior to construction to assure efficient construction and to safeguard the public investment. I am recommending increased funds for general investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation to assure a proper basis for project authorization. Advance planning of authorized projects by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation will proceed at a rate which will permit early initiation of construction on projects in accordance with needs and budget policy. This budget also provides 1 million dollars under proposed legislation for a survey to determine whether hydroelectric power can be economically developed from the tremendous tides at Passamaquoddy Bay.

Expenditures of the Bonneville, Southeastern and Southwestern Power Administrations in the fiscal year of 1956 are in line with the partnership policy whereby State, local, and private interests participate in power development and transmission. The expenditure estimates also reflect the approaching completion of transmission systems for marketing power from Federal projects now under construction.

In order to establish equity between the Federal Government and other interests, I recommended in my 1955 budget message enactment of legislation to provide that the Federal Government make payments to non-Federal owners of water resources projects when Federal hydroelectric power developments benefit from these projects. Payments are now required from other licensees deriving such benefits and I see no reason why the Federal Government should be exempted. I hope the Congress will amend the Federal Power Act during this session to require such Federal payments.

The Tennessee Valley Authority, in the fiscal years 1955 and 1956, will continue installation of steam electric and hydroelectric generation units started in prior years. With construction on some of the facilities nearing completion, gross expenditures of the Authority are estimated to show a very substantial decrease from 431 million dollars in 1955 to 250 million dollars in 1956. Receipts from operations, largely from the sale of power, are expected to increase from 217 million dollars to 248 million dollars. Thus, an approximate balance between expenditures and receipts is estimated for 1956, with net budget expenditures of 2 million dollars.

No appropriations have been recommended for new power generation units in the fiscal years 1955 or 1956 for the Tennessee Valley Authority. After 600,000 kilowatts contracted for by the Atomic Energy Commission with the Mississippi Valley Generating Company become available for replacing power furnished the AEC by TVA, the scheduled capacity of the TVA system will provide for a substantial increase in loads through the calendar year 1958. The Tennessee Valley Authority is giving immediate attention to the possibilities of financing further expansion of its power system by means other than Federal appropriations. The Authority has been requested to complete its studies in time to permit consideration by the Congress at this session of any legislation that may be necessary. It is expected that the power needs for the system will be reexamined after the Congress has had an opportunity to consider legislation to provide for future financing.

Legislation will also be presented to the Congress to provide that an adequate rate of interest be paid to the Treasury on appropriated funds invested in power facilities of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

National forest and other public lands: Forest and range lands managed by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management provide valuable timber, range, and mineral resources. Receipts from these lands are estimated at 165 million dollars in 1956. Part of these receipts are appropriated for payments to the States and counties in which the lands are located. Increased expenditures are recommended in 1956 for construction of forest roads and trails, supervision of timber sales, and soil and moisture conservation work. As a result of Federal cooperative assistance in the past, States are now assuming greater responsibility for forest fire control on non-Federal lands and some reduction in Federal payments is proposed for 1956. Expenditures on Indian lands and resources will provide for management of forest and range lands at the current level, but some increases are recommended for soil and moisture conservation, maintenance of buildings and utilities, and construction of roads.

In the fiscal year 1955, the submerged lands of the Outer Continental Shelf were first offered for drilling for oil and gas under Federal leases. Receipts from these leases, deposited in the Treasury, are estimated at 147 million dollars in 1955 and 100 million dollars in 1956. Leasing of these lands will continue to provide substantial receipts in later years.

Urgent needs for maintenance and for improved services to the increasing number of visitors will require some increase in expenditures for our national parks, monuments, and historic sites. Employment of additional personnel to collect admission fees, together with the increase in fees put into effect during the current year, will result in increased receipts to the Treasury. Parkways, roads, and trails will be extended in 1956, pursuant to authority provided in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1954.

Mineral resources: During the past year, the Cabinet Committee on Minerals Policy has recommended, and I have approved, general guidelines for developing mineral resources in accordance with our national security needs. Case by case studies of individual mineral industries will be made to determine within the framework of our overall domestic and foreign economic policies the proper level of efficient domestic production necessary for our mobilization base. Where necessary, the various means available to the Government will be used to support essential parts of the mobilization base. The factfinding and research activities of the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines will contribute to this end.

I recommend legislation and a supplemental appropriation in the fiscal year 1955 to enable the Federal Government to cooperate with the State of Pennsylvania in providing facilities for surface water drainage in the anthracite coal region. This will afford protection against the flooding of valuable resources and the decrease in employment which would result if additional mines were closed.

COMMERCE AND MANPOWER

The basic principle underlying budget recommendations for programs in the field of transportation, housing, and business is that the national interest is best served by privately owned and operated industry, which is assisted by a minimum of Federal funds and Federal basic facilities operated at the lowest feasible cost and financed, where possible, by charges levied on the users of the services. Budget recommendations for manpower programs are designed to help the Nation's productive system function smoothly and efficiently, by providing economic safeguards for workers, by helping bring together jobseekers and jobs, and by fostering orderly labor relations and the amicable settlement of disputes.

In the past 2 years, in furtherance of these principles, we have strengthened our major commerce and manpower programs by placing increased reliance on expansion of private investment, by encouraging greater participation of State and local governments, and by providing for the extension of coverage of unemployment insurance. Wherever possible, Federal programs are being placed on a self-supporting basis. As a result, a large share of the Government's operations in these areas is being financed from program receipts, rather than from tax revenues.

After 30 years of discussion, the United States is joining with Canada in constructing the Saint Lawrence Seaway. A joint program is underway with industry to modernize our merchant fleet. Federal aids to States for highway construction have been increased. Positive steps have been taken to promote an economically sound system of air transportation with reduced reliance on Federal subsidies. The Post Office Department has made major improvements in service and substantially reduced its operating deficit. Limited attacks on urban blight through slum clearance have been expanded into a comprehensive urban renewal program. More private investment in housing is being encouraged by more liberal mortgage insurance, by the voluntary home mortgage credit program, and by permitting private investors to retire gradually the Government's investment in the secondary mortgage market. Meanwhile, other housing loans and Government-owned housing are being liquidated as rapidly as feasible. Our production capacity has been expanded to make possible speedier mobilization in case of future emergencies. Provision has been made for extension of coverage of the Federal-State unemployment compensation system to 4 million more workers.

The appropriations recommended in this budget will permit even greater progress in the fiscal year 1956 and later. In addition I am recommending legislation (1) to bring the interstate highway system up to modern standards in the next decade; (2) to make the postal system self-supporting; (3) to increase authority for mortgage insurance and urban renewal grants and to authorize contracts for additional public housing units; (4) to extend the Defense Production Act, the Small Business Act, and the veterans' housing loan program beyond

their present expiration dates of June 30, 1955; and (5) to raise the minimum wage now provided under the Fair Labor Standards Act and modernize Federal workmen's compensation and other labor laws.

Commerce and manpower

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Gross expenditures			Net expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1956
	1954 actual	1955 estimated	1956 estimated	1954 actual	1955 estimated	1956 estimated	
Provision of highways	$586	$659	$725	$586	$659	$725	$919
Merchant marine	236	228	198	153	209	192	235
Navigation aids and facilities	403	409	441	313	325	353	330
Promotion of aviation	275	274	283	275	274	283	284
Postal service:							
Present program	2,686	2,741	2,811	312	268	294	295
Proposed pay and rate increases			−270			−270	−270
Other transportation and communication programs	62	58	60	−28	36	42	37
Urban development and redevelopment:							
Present programs	37	86	145	22	56	94	4
Proposed legislation							200
Aids to private housing:							
Federal Housing Administration	125	143	130	−28	−42	−67	
Federal National Mortgage Association	563	813	338	−221	243	−193	
Veterans' Administration:							
Present programs	118	170	92	85	118	39	
Proposed legislation			90			90	100
Other	31	5	5	−16	−29	−29	
Public housing programs	658	570	604	−401	−85	34	96
Other housing and community facilities	93	83	52	53	54	44	19
Civil defense and disaster relief	103	80	76	61	72	70	71
Promotion of defense production:							
Present programs	936	1,061	626	216	76	104	6
Proposed legislation			12			12	
Business loans and guaranties:							
Present programs	131	50	11	−100	−38	−106	
Proposed legislation			28			28	67
Other promotion or regulation of business	33	37	37	17	21	36	36
Unemployment compensation and placement:							
Administration	211	204	254	209	203	253	257
Payment to Unemployment Trust Fund		64	87		64	87	87
Other labor and manpower programs:							
Present programs	67	65	66	67	65	66	66
Proposed legislation			4			4	5
Total	7,355	7,800	6,908	1,577	2,550	2,186	[1] 2,846

[1] Compares with new obligational authority of 2,846 million dollars in 1954 and 3,381 million dollars in 1955.

Gross expenditures for commerce and manpower, including proposed legislation, will be reduced from an estimated 7.8 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1955 to 6.9 billion dollars in 1956, primarily because of reduced purchases of mortgages by the Federal National Mortgage Association and lower spending for defense production activities. Assuming enactment of the recommended increase in postal rates, net budget expenditures for 1956 are estimated at less than 2.2 billion dollars, 364 million dollars below 1955.

Highways: In the past decade and a half we have not kept pace with the rapidly growing needs for highways adequate for economic development and national security. I plan to send a special message to the Congress in the near future recommending a program of coordinated action by Federal, State, and local governments, to overcome major highway deficiencies. The additional budget expenditures, if any, required in the fiscal year 1956 would be relatively minor.

Budget expenditures for highways under present programs will continue to increase as a result of the enlarged program already provided in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1954. Grants to States (including Federal administrative expenses) will amount to 680 million dollars, with an additional 45 million dollars of expenditures for highways in Federal forests, on public lands, and in Alaska.

Merchant marine: To continue our program of helping to bring the merchant fleet up to date, I am recommending for the fiscal year 1956 new obligational authority for ship construction of 103 million dollars. These funds will: (1) continue the trade-in-and-build tanker program begun this year; (2) start orderly replacement of cargo ships built during or before World War II; (3) finance construction of two cargo ships and one tanker as prototypes for mass production in an emergency; (4) provide for the construction or conversion of four passenger-cargo ships; and (5) continue essential research and development work on ship design. The appropriation of 103 million dollars will be more than matched by private funds, resulting in total investment of about 225 million dollars in new ship construction. Together with the joint 400-million-dollar program now underway and with expanded naval construction in private yards, it should maintain a substantial nucleus of peacetime shipyard employment.

Payment of subsidies to American ship operators to offset lower operating costs of foreign ships will require appropriations estimated at 115 million dollars in 1956. The rapid rise recently in expenditures for this purpose and the possibility of continued increases make it important to provide more effective budgetary control over the level of subsidized operations. I am, therefore, proposing in this budget to establish a limitation on new long-term contracts to pay operating-differential subsidies. Such a limitation will permit annual review by the President and the Congress of the extent of our future subsidy commitments.

Navigation aids and facilities: In accordance with legislation enacted last May, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation has been established to construct, operate, and maintain that part of the new Seaway located in United States territory. Construction is being pushed at maximum speed because of the seaway's importance to economic development and national security. Almost one-quarter of the work is scheduled for completion by the end of the fiscal year 1956.

The Corps of Engineers program for rivers and harbors gives primary emphasis to inland waterways and to those navigation projects needed to provide reliable access to important ports or to relieve serious congestion for important established deep draft traffic. The increase in expenditures from 108 million dollars in 1955 to 135 million dollars in 1956 reflects mainly the normal rate of progress on construction of projects started in 1955 and the resumption of urgently needed maintenance of shallow draft channels.

In addition, 14 new navigation projects and the resumption of one project previously suspended are recommended in the fiscal year 1956. These are projects which promise to yield benefits relatively high in comparison to the construction costs involved or which have substantial local participation. With 2 exceptions, these are relatively small or intermediate-sized projects. Dredging of the Delaware River channel between Philadelphia and Trenton is proposed, but specific recommendations will be sent to the Congress only on the basis that provision be made for adequate cost-sharing in some form. Appropriations are recommended to widen the Calumet-Sag Waterway in Illinois to make this vital channel adequate to handle present and steadily increasing traffic needs.

Although expenditures of the Coast Guard will continue to decline from 205 million dollars in 1955 to 193 million dollars in 1956, the basic aids provided for air and water commerce will be maintained at their current strength. In addition, the Coast Guard will again operate the ocean weather-station network for the Department of Defense.

Promotion of aviation: We have made shifts in Federal aviation programs during the past 2 years in order to reduce assistance no longer required and to concentrate on those Federal aids which are indispensable to the continued rapid progress of aviation.

Since October 1953, when responsibility for subsidy payments to commercial air carriers was placed in the Civil

Aeronautics Board, substantial progress has been made in decreasing the level of subsidies. Expenditures by the Civil Aeronautics Board for this purpose in 1955 are now estimated at 70 million dollars compared to 80 million dollars estimated a year ago; a further decline to 63 million dollars is anticipated for 1956. This trend is consistent with the recommendations made by the Air Coordinating Committee after a comprehensive study made at my request of our basic civil aviation policies. In addition, wherever possible, military mail is being carried by commercial airlines, thus not only eliminating Government competition with private business, but also helping to reduce subsidies to the private carriers.

The continuing growth of civil and military air traffic has increased congestion on the airways system—at times restricting aircraft operations in areas of heavy traffic. As a step to maintain high standards of safety and increase the regularity of flights, I am recommending increased appropriations for the Civil Aeronautics Administration for expansion and improvement of air navigation facilities and for more radar traffic control equipment.

With the increasing maturity of civil aviation, the Federal Government soon should be able to reduce substantially its safety promotion and enforcement activities without affecting the present high level of safety. I have requested the early preparation of a plan, in cooperation with industry, to achieve this objective.

I again recommend incorporation of Washington National Airport to provide the administrative flexibility needed for efficient operation of this business-type enterprise.

The work of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is of key significance in strengthening our military aircraft and guided missiles programs and in supporting our continued progress in the air. During recent years we have achieved spectacular success in flying at speeds well beyond the speed of sound. However, we have not yet overcome all problems of structural failure, engine malfunctioning, and lack of stability and control at high speeds. A more intensive effort in these fields is needed in order that the great improvements in performance now known to be possible can be realized in the actual production of military aircraft, engines, and missiles, which represent such an important and costly part of our defense program. For these reasons, I am recommending additional appropriations for both 1955 and 1956 to increase the Committee's research effort in fields of critical military importance.

Postal service: Considerable progress is being made in providing better postal service to the American people at lower cost to the taxpayer. Movement of first-class mail has been expedited. Substantial investments have been made in capital improvements and in skilled personnel which are just beginning to pay dividends. Long-term leases are being negotiated which will permit acquisition of needed modern postal facilities. Promising experiments in new equipment are underway which, if successful, will revolutionize mail-handling techniques.

Largely because of these savings, the net expenditures of the Post Office under existing laws have been reduced to the lowest level in the last 8 years. The increased postal rates which I recommended in my special message to the Congress would add 400 million dollars to postal revenues. This would be enough to cover the recommended pay adjustments of 130 million dollars and reduce net expenditures to 24 million dollars in the fiscal year 1956. These steps, together with further major economies now in process, should cause the postal system to become self-supporting in the near future. As a long-run solution, an independent commission should be created to review future rate changes proposed by the Postmaster General in accordance with a basic formula laid down by the Congress.

Urban development and redevelopment: Under the new urban renewal program authorized by the Housing Act of 1954, local public agencies, jointly with forward-looking private investors, are developing and executing plans to rebuild our major cities and prevent the decay which is making large urban areas unfit for sound economic investment or family life. The act strengthens the previous slum clearance program by (a) requiring localities as a condition of Federal aid to have a workable plan to eliminate substandard housing and neighborhood decay; (b) providing Federal grants and loans for neighborhood rehabilitation, as well as redevelopment projects; and (c) authorizing the Federal Housing Administration to insure mortgages on homes in blighted areas and to help finance new homes for families displaced by slum clearance.

By the end of the fiscal year 1956, an estimated 22 slum clearance projects will be completed, and 364 other slum clearance and urban renewal projects will be underway. Net expenditures will increase from 56 million dollars in 1955 to 94 million dollars in 1956, largely for capital grants to pay the Federal share of project costs. On the basis of experience thus far, private investment and local government expenditures for slum clearance and urban renewal projects will be about four to five times as great as the Federal capital grants.

Before the end of the current fiscal year, the present 500 million dollars in contract authority for capital grants will be committed. Accordingly, to permit the program to go forward without delay, I am recommending legislation to provide an additional 100 million dollars in capital grant authority in the fiscal year 1955, and 200 million dollars in each of the two subsequent fiscal years.

Federal Housing Administration: The Federal Housing Administration is now authorized to insure larger loans with longer maturities, as well as loans to support the urban renewal program and to help servicemen buy homes. Thus, more of our people can buy their own homes. Because of the more liberal terms provided and the increased availability of mortgage credit, applications for mortgage insurance have risen substantially in recent months. On the basis of the present outlook, construction or purchase of almost 800,000 homes and improvement or repair of 1,500,000 other homes will be financed during the fiscal year 1956 by private lenders backed by Government insurance commitments.

The total private investment in both new and existing homes by homeowners and builders, underwritten by the Federal Housing Administration, in the fiscal year 1956 will amount to an estimated 8.3 billion dollars. To meet the expanding needs for mortgage insurance for the remainder of the fiscal year 1955 and through 1956, approximately 5 billion dollars in additional insurance authority will be required.

In recent months both legislative and administrative measures have been taken to eliminate abuses in insurance programs. The budget also includes additional funds to assure more adequate supervision. The increase in premium collections and other income will, however, more than offset the increased supervisory expenditures, and receipts are estimated to exceed expenditures by 67 million dollars in the fiscal year 1956, compared with 42 million dollars in 1955.

Federal National Mortgage Association: Under the Housing Act of 1954, the Federal National Mortgage Association was reconstituted to comprise financially separate activities for the secondary market, special assistance, and management and liquidating functions. Except for the initial transfer of the Government capital investment of 92 million dollars from the earlier association, the secondary market activity will be financed entirely from private funds and its operations are, therefore, not reflected in this budget. The purpose of this activity is to make sure that mortgage funds are available to meet normal needs in all parts of the Nation at market rates of interest. Private capital will be gradually substituted for the Government investment until the Government funds are fully repaid and the private owners take over responsibility for the program.

Expenditures and receipts for the other two activities are included in the budget totals. Under the special assistance program, the President can authorize limited purchases of mortgages (a) to meet acute housing needs of groups or areas unable to obtain private financing, or (b) to prevent a decline in housing activity. In the fiscal years 1955 and 1956, the Association expects to support the financing of about 90,000 housing units, primarily for the urban renewal program. This support will be mainly through commitments to purchase participations in private mortgages. Under the management and liquidating function, the Association will administer the 3.1 billion dollars of mortgages and undisbursed commitments outstanding at the beginning of the fiscal year 1955.

Primarily because of large purchases under previous commitments, expenditures by the Association will exceed receipts by 243 million dollars in the fiscal year 1955. In 1956, however, net receipts of 193 million dollars are anticipated.

Veterans' housing loans: The Veterans Administration program of direct hous-

ing loans expires on June 30, 1955. These loans are made only where guaranteed private mortgages are not available or cannot be secured through the voluntary home mortgage credit program. I recommend legislation continuing this program until expiration of the veterans' loan guaranty program for World War II veterans on July 25, 1957. If permission is granted to use receipts from repayments, as well as from sales, new obligational authority of 100 million dollars should be adequate for the fiscal year 1956.

Public housing: The aids contained in the Housing Act of 1954, and especially the aids to low-cost housing, will provide the opportunity for the private housing industry to satisfy, eventually, the housing requirements of families of all income groups. In the meantime, it is essential to continue a minimum amount of low-rent public housing construction to meet the critical needs of the lowest income families and to help provide a new place to live for families displaced by urban renewal and slum clearance operations. I recommend a 2-year authorization for contracts with local housing authorities to pay contributions for an additional 35,000 low-rent units each year. Funds necessary for this purpose have been included in this budget.

Liquidation of the emergency World War II public housing program is accelerating. By June 30, 1956, two-thirds of the 195,000 units owned by the Government at the end of 1954 will have been sold, transferred, or demolished. Meanwhile expenditures for the defense housing program started during the Korean emergency will be almost completed.

Gross expenditures for public housing programs, chiefly temporary construction loans to local authorities and annual contributions for completed projects, are estimated at 604 million dollars in 1956. Receipts, mostly from private refinancing of these Federal loans and rental and sale of emergency housing, will total an estimated 570 million dollars, leaving net expenditures of 34 million dollars.

Other housing and community facilities: By the end of 1956, the Housing and Home Finance Agency will have approved 297 loans to finance construction of dormitory rooms for about 63,800 students and homes for 1,500 faculty and student families at colleges and universities throughout the Nation. In the past 2 years the Agency has helped to develop a private market for long-term dormitory revenue bonds, formerly rarely bought by private investors. The increasing success in attracting private funds is a major reason for the decline in net expenditures from 41 million dollars to 28 million dollars.

Civil defense and disaster relief: Expenditures for civil defense are classified with expenditures for dealing with peacetime disasters in the commerce and manpower section, but the program is discussed in the major national security section of this message in view of its close relation to continental defense.

Promotion of defense production: Gross expenditures for promotion of defense production are expected to decline from 1,061 million dollars in 1955 to 638 million dollars in 1956. Most of this reduction is in the synthetic rubber and tin programs. In accordance with the terms of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act, the estimates assume that these plants will be sold or leased before June 30, 1955. Most of these facilities have already been sold, subject to congressional approval. Moreover, since purchases of tin for the national stockpile have now been completed and world supplies are ample to meet current needs, no provision is made for continued operation of the Government tin smelter.

Gross expenditures under the Defense Production Act will continue at relatively high levels, primarily to meet previous commitments made to provide guaranteed markets, loans, or grants to producers of critical defense materials. Net expenditures will amount to only a fraction of gross disbursements, since most of the materials purchased are being sold to the stockpile of strategic and critical materials to meet its objectives, and to industry. The stockpile program is discussed in the major national security section of this message.

Under present law, the Defense Production Act expires on June 30, 1955. Since important gaps in our mobilization preparedness require continued Government encouragement, I recommend extension of the act with modifications for 2 years. No increase in the present borrowing authority of 2.1 billion dollars is anticipated at this time.

Business loans and guaranties: Liquidation of business loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is well advanced. During the 3-year period from June 30, 1953, to June 30, 1956, business loans and commitments will have been reduced from 458 million dollars to about 53 million dollars through repayments, refinancing, and sales to private financial institutions.

Loans to small businesses by the Small Business Administration have been expanding substantially during the last year. Loans are made only if private credit on reasonable terms is not available, and more than two-thirds of the loans so far extended have been made jointly with private banks. The present authority expires on June 30, 1955, and I recommend its extension. Assuming continuance of the 1955 level of operations, about 1,200 new loans would be authorized in the fiscal year 1956, and additional appropriations of 67 million dollars would be required.

Labor placement and unemployment compensation administration: Budget expenditures under existing law for administering the joint Federal-State program of employment services and unemployment insurance are estimated at 253 million dollars for the fiscal year 1956, 50 million dollars higher than in the current year. About 29 million dollars of this increase is nonrecurring and results from a change in the timing of funds advanced to the States; this does not affect the level of operations. The rest is largely for State-approved increases in salaries paid to the State employees who administer the program, and for improvements in the placement service.

Legislation enacted last year provides for transferring annually to the unemployment trust fund the excess of receipts from the Federal unemployment tax over operating costs of the program. The excess received during 1955, to be transferred in the fiscal year 1956, is estimated at 87 million dollars, an increase of 23 million dollars over the amount transferred this year. These funds are to be used to set up a reserve of 200 million dollars from which loans can be made to those States which deplete their own reserves for benefit payments.

The present law authorizing the recruiting of qualified workers from Mexico for seasonal farm employment in the United States expires December 31, 1955. However, the need for this service will continue and I shall recommend its extension. Accordingly, my budget recommendations, including proposed legislation, provide funds for the entire fiscal year 1956.

Other labor and manpower programs: Industrial injuries have been significantly reduced through the efforts of both labor and management, but these injuries still cost us 40 million man-days every year. This is a heavy tax on our economic progress, as well as on the individual employees and employers. Workmen's compensation programs—an important facet of the industrial safety problem—have lagged behind other social insurance programs in recent years. Although workmen's compensation is predominantly a State program, the Federal Government can and should stimulate improvement—especially through studies and clearing house activities. The budget for the fiscal year 1956 provides for studies which will enable the Department of Labor to promote more effective safety programs and assist States in improving their workmen's compensation standards. In addition, I shall recommend legislation which, over the next few years, should aid the States in further developing industrial safety programs. Two million dollars are included for this purpose in 1956.

At present all workmen's compensation payments to Federal employees are provided from a single appropriation. To encourage better safety practices, I shall recommend legislation to shift the financing of some of these benefit payments to the employing Federal agency. Legislation will also be recommended to liberalize workmen's compensation benefits paid to longshoremen and harbor workers under laws administered by the Federal Government.

The apprentice training program of the Department of Labor has contributed to improvement of the skill and versatility of thousands of workers. As our economy continues to expand, many more skilled workers are needed. Accordingly, the budget proposals provide for redirecting and improving Federal participation in these training activities.

As part of a governmentwide program to improve our economic statistics, this budget includes 1.5 million dollars for additional work during the fiscal year 1956 in the labor and manpower field, covering primarily statistics on employment and unemployment, and for basic data for mobilization and civil defense.

Unemployment trust fund: The following table shows receipts and expenditures of the unemployment trust fund.

Unemployment trust fund

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Item	1954 actual	1955 estimated	1956 estimated
Balance in fund at start of year	$9,246	$8,993	$8,785
Receipts:			
Deposits by States and railroad unemployment taxes	1,268	1,219	1,421
Interest	224	220	204
Transfer from general fund		64	87
Payments: State and railroad withdrawals for benefits	−1,745	−1,712	−1,594
Net accumulation (+) or withdrawal (−)	−253	−209	+118
Balance in fund at close of the year	8,993	8,785	8,903

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Net expenditures for general government activities are estimated at 1.6 billion dollars for the fiscal year 1956, an increase of 344 million dollars from the fiscal year 1955. The higher level of expenditures in 1956 reflects primarily (a) the proposed resumption of payments to the Civil Service Retirement Fund for the Government's share of the cost of current benefits for retired Federal civilian personnel and (b) substantially higher payments arising from claims against the Government. Other expenditures for general government cover in the main the costs of such basic Government services as making and enforcing laws, collecting taxes and customs, managing the public debt, and safeguarding and maintaining public buildings and records.

Special allowances are made in the reserves for proposed legislation of this budget for adjustments in the pay and benefits of civilian employees of the Government which I recommended recently in a special message to the Congress. The proposed benefits include a new system of contributory hospitalization and health insurance.

Legislative functions: Expenditures for legislative activities are estimated to increase from 51 million dollars in 1955 to 63 million dollars in 1956, primarily because of construction of the new Senate Office Building.

General government

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1956
	1954 actual	1955 estimated	1956 estimated	
Legislative functions	$45	$51	$63	$50
Judicial functions	29	33	34	33
Executive direction	11	13	11	11
Federal financial management:				
Tax collection	277	273	285	286
Customs collection, debt management and other	171	164	165	164

General government—Continued

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1956
	1954 actual	1955 estimated	1956 estimated	
Other central services:				
Central property and records management	$152	$156	$162	$164
Civil Service Commission	16	15	17	17
Other	16	21	21	24
Retirement for Federal civilian employees:				
Present programs	34	32	2	2
Proposed legislation	-------	-------	216	216
Unemployment compensation for Federal civilian employees	-------	33	40	40
Protective services and alien control:				
Federal Bureau of Investigation	75	79	91	88
Immigration and Naturalization Service	40	44	45	45
Other	31	23	25	24
Territories, possessions, and District of Columbia:				
District of Columbia	13	25	34	32
Territories, possessions, and other	43	49	48	45
Other general government:				
Payment of claims and relief acts	213	163	250	-------
Weather Bureau	26	25	29	33
Other	20	23	32	30
Total	1,212	1,225	1,569	[1] 1,305
Deduct applicable receipts	4	3	3	-------
Net budget expenditures	1,209	1,222	1,566	-------

[1] Compares with new obligational authority of 1,041 million dollars in 1954 and 1,056 million dollars in 1955.

Federal financial management: To enable the Internal Revenue Service to make still more progress in equitable and effective enforcement of the revenue laws, I am recommending increased appropriations of 12 million dollars to extend the audit of tax returns. The improved enforcement should result in increased tax receipts from those who have not been paying their fair share. In addition, I am recommending legislation to reduce the frequency of information returns submitted by employers withholding income and social security taxes and to strengthen enforcement of these taxes. These amendments will not only cut down the reporting burden on private business, but will also increase budget receipts, especially in later years. Total expenditures for collection of taxes and customs, for administration of the public debt and for other Federal financial management are estimated at 450 million dollars for the fiscal year 1956.

Central property and records management: The General Services Administration is making substantial and continuing economies in the governmentwide management of property and records. Central motor pools are planned for 15 cities, with important savings anticipated. Substantial reductions in office and warehouse space are continuing. As a result of examination of Government real property holdings, the sales program of surplus real property will be accelerated, with the desirable result of returning this property to local tax rolls and increasing budget receipts.

In this budget, I recommend added funds for more adequate repair and improvement of public buildings to protect the Government's investment. Estimated expenditures for central property and records management will therefore rise from 156 million dollars in 1955 to 162 million dollars in 1956.

To help meet the most critical needs for office space, construction of several general-purpose buildings has already been approved under the long-term lease-purchase contract authority provided by the Eighty-third Congress, and additional buildings will be considered as quickly as determinations of need and cost can be made. These buildings will be purchased through annual appropriations for rental payments.

Civil Service Commission: Under the recent revisions of the Federal civil service rules, a substantially higher proportion of civilian employees will be on a competitive basis. The transition to this system will require additional funds for the Civil Service Commission for administering the necessary examining program, both in the continental United States and overseas.

Retirement for Federal civilian employees: The civil service retirement and disability system should be financed on a more satisfactory basis. Employees now contribute 6 percent of pay, covering about one-half the currently accruing cost, and the Government is responsible for the rest of the cost. In the past the Government's share of payments to this fund has not been provided on a consistent basis and in the last 2 years appropriations have been deferred pending the report of the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel. The Committee's report to the Eighty-third Congress establishes the necessity for a sound and lasting financial basis for the civil service retirement system.

Financing of the civil service system is a problem requiring careful consideration because of its importance to the Federal career service. For 1956 I am recommending a Government contribution of 216 million dollars which is estimated to be the difference in that year between the Government's share of current benefit disbursements and the interest earned on its part of the fund. This will serve to maintain at its present level the equity the Government already has built up in the fund through its past contributions.

Other budget expenditures for retired Federal civilian employees are estimated to decline from 32 million dollars in the fiscal year 1955 to 2 million dollars in 1956 because payments for cost-of-living increases under the act of July 16, 1952, will be made from the trust fund.

Unemployment compensation for Federal civilian employees: Legislation enacted by the last Congress provides for the payment of unemployment compensation benefits to Federal civilian workers. These payments are similar to those available to most workers in private industry and are being paid through existing State unemployment compensation

agencies. Payments reimbursing the States for the cost of this program for the fiscal year 1955 are estimated at 33 million dollars, requiring a supplemental appropriation of 20 million dollars. Expenditures are estimated to rise in 1956 to 40 million dollars because for the first time the plan will be in operation for a full fiscal year.

Protective services and alien control: Increased expenditures for protective services and alien control are recommended to strengthen the border patrol operations of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and to maintain the Federal Bureau of Investigation at its present effectiveness in the fiscal year 1956. The Bureau's work has been increased by added responsibilities for internal security. At the same time, its costs have risen because of recently enacted legislation providing premium pay for FBI agents for overtime and holiday work.

District of Columbia: Under the new public works program authorized by the Congress last spring, Federal expenditures for the District of Columbia will increase to 34 million dollars in the fiscal year 1956. Of this amount, 22 million dollars represents the Federal Government's share in the costs of District government and public services; loans of 12 million dollars will be made to the District for construction of highways, sewers, and waterworks.

Weather Bureau: To increase the effectiveness of the weather service, I am recommending replacement of certain obsolete facilities with modern observational equipment. This budget provides for the Weather Bureau to take over operation of 25 upper-air stations and perform certain other activities basic to civilian weather service which are now carried on by the Department of Defense. These proposals will carry out recommendations made by an advisory committee of eminent meteorologists. With the improved program, the expenditures of the Weather Bureau for the fiscal year 1956 are estimated at 29 million dollars, an increase of 4 million dollars over 1955.

Claims and relief acts: Payments for claims and relief acts are estimated at 250 million dollars for the fiscal year 1956, an increase of 87 million dollars over the 1955 estimate. The increase consists entirely of higher payments for certified claims, which represent, in the main, bills presented for payment after the appropriation involved has lapsed. In the fiscal year 1955 certified claims are expected to be lower than in 1956 because claims which would otherwise have been paid from this account are being paid from certain Department of Defense appropriations which were extended by the Congress for 1 year.

INTEREST

The large interest payments by the Federal Government arise primarily from the tremendous increase in the public debt during World War II. In the fiscal year 1956 they account for about 10 percent of total budget expenditures. The size of the public debt and interest rates on the debt determine the general level of interest expenditures; variations may also occur from year to year from changes in interest payment provisions of specific securities.

Interest

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Item	Budget expenditures (net)			Recommended new obligational authority for 1956
	1954 actual	1955 estimated	1956 estimated	
Interest on public debt	$6,382	$6,475	$6,300	$6,300
Interest on refunds of receipts	83	78	73	73
Interest on uninvested trust deposits	5	5	5	5
Total	6,470	6,558	6,378	[1] 6,378

[1] Compares with new obligational authority of 6,470 million dollars in 1954 and 6,558 million dollars in 1955.

Interest on the public debt: Interest payments on the public debt in the fiscal year 1956 are estimated at 6.3 billion dollars. Although the debt has increased, interest payments are estimated to be 175 million dollars less than in the current year. This decrease reflects primarily the reduction in the calendar year 1954 in interest rates on the outstanding debt. Another reason for the decrease is the unusual concentration in 1955 of interest payments on part of the public debt refunded this year. As an example of both reasons, in the fall of 1954, 7.5 billion dollars of 2⅝ percent certificates were refunded into a 1⅛ percent certificate and a 2⅛ percent bond. A full year's interest was paid in the fiscal year 1955 on the maturing 2⅝ percent certificates; in addition, the first interest payment on the new 2⅛ percent bond will be due in 1955. For these reasons interest payments in 1955 on this 7.5 billion dollar segment of the debt will be about 130 million dollars more than in 1956.

We have made progress in improving the structure of the public debt by lengthening the average maturity. Nevertheless, the average interest rate on the debt has declined from 2.41 percent to 2.29 percent during the last 12 months.

In this message, we have stated our objectives and our proposals for the coming year.

In preparing this budget we have weighed the requirements of each element of our strength in order that we may allocate our resources according to the requirements of the whole. To each is apportioned the full measure required by relative need and permitted by available means. At the same time our awareness of the necessity for efficient, economical, and moral Government and the development of partnerships with State and local governments and with private enterprise permit reductions in total expenditures. A growing prosperity will result in increasing revenues and should make possible both a balanced budget and lower tax rates in the near future.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

JANUARY 17, 1955.

Résumé of the Budget

[Fiscal years. In billions

	1953 actual	1954		1955 estimate	1956 estimate
		Budget document estimate [1]	Actual		
New obligational authority:					
Under existing legislation	$80.3	$72.2	$62.8	$57.2	$53.1
Under proposed legislation				.1	5.5
Total new obligational authority	80.3	72.2	62.8	57.3	58.6
Budget receipts:					
Under existing legislation	64.8	68.0	64.7	58.8	57.7
Under proposed legislation				.2	2.3
Total budget receipts	64.8	68.0	64.7	59.0	60.0
Net budget expenditures:					
Under existing legislation	74.3	75.6	67.8	63.5	60.5
Under proposed legislation		2.3			1.9
Net budget expenditures	74.3	77.9	67.8	63.5	62.4
Budget deficit	9.4	9.9	3.1	4.5	2.4
Public debt at end of year	266.1	269.8	271.3	274.3	276.0
Balances of appropriations carried forward at end of year	78.4	67.4	68.0	53.9	49.6

[1] These estimates refer to the 1954 budget as presented to the Congress on Jan. 9, 1953.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET MESSAGE FOR 1956

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARDY). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I must confess to a feeling of deep disappointment which I have no doubt is shared by many who have had an opportunity to analyze the budget before us.

The proposed budget is replete with all manner of increases when the tightest possible estimates were expected.

It applies to the third fiscal year of the administration and not only forecasts a substantial deficit for the fiscal year but it offers no definite hope of balancing the budget in the following year. It gives every intimation of intention to continue during the remainder of this administration the debt ceiling, increased from $275 billion to $281 billion at the last session of Congress as a purely temporary measure.

And there is no arresting reference or mention whatever either in message or budget of the national debt or any air or plan to bring about a reduction in the debt, or even hold it at its present level,

although that was one of the assurances given in the campaign of 1952.

But, Mr. Speaker, our disappointment is not only with the provisions of the budget but with the method by which it is presented. The statement is made at the close of the first page of the message:

Thus we continue to progress toward a balanced budget.

Even a cursory analysis of the budget would seem to indicate that we are getting further away from a balanced budget.

For example, the deficit for 1954 was $3.1 billion. It was originally estimated at $2.9 billion for 1955, but when Congress completed action on tax and appropriation measures last year, the revised deficit forecast for 1955 was put at $4.7 billion. Now we have an estimate to the effect that it will be $4.5 billion for 1955 and only $2.4 billion in 1956.

But the latter figure is arrived at by a unique method. The individual appropriation estimates of expenditure for the Defense Department are set out at page 509 of the budget for 1956 at $35,750,000,000. That figure is offset by a single line called "unallocated reduction in estimates" of $1,750,000,000 with the apparent purpose of bringing the net total down to an even $34 billion.

[In billions]

	Receipts	Expenditures	Deficit
Current fiscal year 1955:			
Original 1955 budget (January 1954)	$62.7	$65.6	$2.9
Revised executive estimates after action by Congress (September 1954)	59.3	64.0	4.7
Current estimates (January 1955)	59.0	63.5	4.5
Fiscal year 1956: Budget message (January 1955)	60.0	[1] 62.4	2.4

[1] Detailed estimates add up to $1¾ billion more than this, but are offset by an item of that amount entitled "Unallocated reductions in estimates." See p. 505; also p. 509 of the budget.

NOTE.—Actual deficit 1954 was $3.1 billion.

Just the one line. "Unallocated reduction." That is all there is. It is not adequately explained. It is not itemized. It is not broken down. It is one of the most remarkable items ever presented in any budget—"unallocated reduction." It is one of the most deceptive, misleading, beguiling budget items ever submitted to the American Congress.

Incidentally, the question naturally arises as to whether some of the individual requests for appropriations for 1956 are overstated since they are coordinated with the $35,750,000,000 expenditure total rather than the lower figure of $34 billion.

Let us note another remarkable feature.

Nowhere in this budget is there a simple, understandable tabulation of what Congress customarily knows and understands as appropriations. The tables on funds available and the President's message itself are cast in terms of new obligational authority which is a hodge-podge of several kinds of authorizations. And for 1956 there is a material distortion of figures when comparing 1956 requests with 1955.

The résumé of the budget refers to new obligational authority of $57.3 billion—estimated—for 1955; $58.6 billion—estimated—for 1956; an apparent increase of only $1.3 billion. Analysis discloses this increase to be understated in the amount of $1 billion, although perhaps shown technically correct, representing decreases in reappropriations as between the 2 years. The decrease is attributed almost entirely to nonrecurring transfers, in 1955, from 1954 and prior unexpended defense funds for additional capital for stock and industrial revolving funds in defense. Such transfers will be used to buy supplies and furnish services for which the military departments will have to pay from new obligational authority to be obtained in the future.

The reduction in the public debt receipt item includes $1.5 billion CCC borrowing authority provided in 1955 which is not required to be repeated in 1956.

The right-hand column of the table here more clearly reflects the comparisons of 1956 requests with those of 1955.

Appropriations and estimates

(A rearrangement of budget table 4)

[NOTE.—Figures in millions]

	1955		1956		Change	
	Enacted	Total proposed	Recommended in this budget	Total proposed	Enacted versus recommended	Total
1. Appropriations:						
Annual	$44,761	$45,830	$45,429	$50,943	+$668	+$5,113
Permanent	6,942	6,942	6,773	6,773	−169	−169
Total	51,703	52,772	52,202	57,716	+499	+4,944
2. Authority to expend public debt receipts	3,019	3,019	403	538	−2,616	−2,481
3. Contract authorizations	932	1,032	909	1,109	−23	+77
4. Reappropriations	1,220	1,220	171	171	−1,049	−1,049
Total, all forms of authority	56,874	58,043	53,685	59,534	−3,189	+1,491
5. Less amounts to liquidate prior contract authority	−631	−736	−892	−892	−261	−156
Net new obligation authority	56,243	57,307	52,793	58,642	−3,450	+1,335

Mr. Speaker, immediately on the close of World War II the huge amounts of unobligated funds were reviewed by the Committee on Appropriations and, in consequences of its recommendations, vast sums were rescinded.

Large amounts well in excess of immediate expenditure needs were provided following the outbreak of hostilities in Korea. Today there remain on the books—table 6, pages A12–A13—large amounts available for obligation in addition to the amounts we are called on to appropriate. Much of such amounts can no doubt be justified but certainly they should be carefully scrutinized by the subcommittees having jurisdiction. We may find it practicable to rescind an appreciable amount in the aggregate.

In Defense, here are the unobligated balances of appropriations at the start of the years indicated:

[In billions]

	As per 1956 budget	Shown in budget a year ago
Fiscal 1955	$15.5	$8.5
Fiscal 1956	11.7	3.4
Fiscal 1957	6.5	

The $6.5 billion carryover from 1956 into 1957 includes significant items of $3.350 billion in Air Force plane procurement, for which $6.1 billion new funds are requested in 1956, and $1.658 billion in Army Procurement and Production of which the Budget proposes, under the heading "proposed legislation," to transfer $800 million in 1956 to help finance new legislation.

Existence of such large balances not required in 1956 encourages close scrutiny to ascertain whether new amounts requested for 1956 are fully justified.

On this side, we expect to cooperate with the administration in processing this budget, but let it not be said in the campaign of 1956 that we were a party to the failure of this administration to balance the budget.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The distinguished gentleman is the chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations. Will he at this time venture a guess as to whether or not, when his committee gets through with the spending part of the budget with which they will have to deal, that the overall amount appropriated will be less or more than the figure recommended by the President?

Mr. CANNON. I have never yet seen a budget which was not a compromise. Invariably, it is the result of conferences in the departments and in the Budget Bureau. There is always a lower figure that has been suggested, and which may be more practicable than the figure carried by the budget, and we expect and hope to collaborate with the gentleman from Indiana in getting as close to that figure as possible.

Mr. HALLECK. I will hazard the guess that but for very substantial Republican support here in the House of Representatives, which the gentleman will need if this budget is to be cut further, it would not be cut at all—on the contrary, will be greatly increased.

Mr. CANNON. Then I will ask the gentleman how does he account for an arbitrary and summary reduction with-

out rhyme or reason or Democratic support of $1¾ billion here by simply calling it an unallocated reduction. Where will that reduction be made and in what items will it be made—what sums and in what items?

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, this is a rather lengthy budget message, and I have not had a chance to go through it as the gentleman from Missouri apparently has or to study the technical matters involved. I take it that the overall figures here presented are substantiated in this 83-page document and will be further substantiated by the people downtown who have made the recommendations. I might make this observation to the gentleman: Of course, I appreciate his solicitude for a balanced budget. On occasion in the past I have wondered just how we came out because the Republican 80th Congress for the first time balanced the budget and provided the tax money to apply on the national debt. That was done for the first time in 16 years.

Mr. CANNON. If I may interrupt the gentleman, I want to point out to him that his party did not balance the budget, either then or at any other time.

When his party took over control of the Congress in January 1947, the budget they received from President Truman was not only in balance, but it was in balance for the first time since it went into the red during the Hoover administration. If anyone here on the floor, or elsewhere, entertains the slightest doubt about the accuracy of that statement, or if there is any claim that our Republican friends are entitled to any credit for balancing the budget for either the fiscal year of 1948 or 1949, it is only necessary to examine the figures set forth in table 5, on page A–10 of the budget submitted to the Congress in January 1948.

The last fiscal year in which we were at war was the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946. Only 6 months and 3 days following the close of that fiscal year President Truman presented a balanced budget for the fiscal year 1948. And that is the year Republican apologists would have the country believe they balanced the budget. Such claims are manifestly absurd. You can be certain the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], who probably knows as much about the fiscal affairs of the Nation as any man alive, has never made any such ridiculous claims as that.

The Government was in the red when they turned it over to us in 1933. We received it in the red and we turned it back to them in the black. And in the budget just submitted to the Congress they turn it back to us again still in the red.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a certain table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARDY). Under special order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the budget has been presented to us. The figures for new obligational authority are larger than the figures that were appropriated last year. However, there is involved in this the question of what is going to be provided for the new activities of the Defense Department, including the so-called UMT. There is also involved whatever might be provided for in the way of salary and pay increases. I do not know what they are going to be or whether there are going to be any. Frankly, I do not want to see a wage increase that will start another round of inflation, and the folks who are the recipients of the increased pay and wages, worse off at the end of the year because of rising prices, than they were at the beginning.

Last year there were some very substantial cuts made in the estimates. The amount asked for, including the request for new obligational authority, is just about the same as the request a year ago. Frankly, I expect to see the Appropriations Committee go into the situation very carefully. If there is an unallocated saving to be made, we will find out where that unallocated saving is to be. Undoubtedly, the Appropriations Committee will take out whatever is not needed. That is the way we have always proceeded in the past. It is a good thing that that is shown here, because it puts us on the trail of the place where savings may be made.

I know there is going to be a great lot of agitation for an increase in some of these items. For instance, there has been talk about agitation for an increase in the Air Force. There has been talk about increase in some of these other items, but I am glad to see that a great many of the items do not carry increases.

The atomic energy picture seems to be down.

The Air Force is up $400 million. Whether that is needed, I do not know; certainly, I do not believe anybody will know until we get to the point where we are able to have our hearings and bring things in. It shows at the bottom of the very first page in the document that has been distributed that the carry-over in appropriations is estimated at $49.6 billion, a reduction of $4.3 billion from last year. Last year there was a reduction of $14 billion below the 1954 figure.

It shows on top of that, that the budget expenditures without new legislation are down to $60 billion, which is just about the estimate of the receipts.

The deficit estimated for 1956 is $2.4 billion after adding proposed new legislative expenditures of $1.9 billion. Frankly, I believe, the present year's deficit will not be larger than last year's deficit of $3.1 billion; and the picture next year if we have good business this year and the withholding tax continues to increase on incomes, and the corporation tax is carried forward next year on the same basis that it has been this year so far, I believe that next year we will be able to come very close to balancing the budget. I think we must fight just as hard as possible to cut out everything that is not needed and that is not showing results.

I believe that when we get to the military picture—and I have run into a lot of it—that there are a tremendous number of civilian employees in that picture who are not needed. Whenever they get to the point where they replace military personnel with civilian personnel, if they will put to work those civilians who are on the payroll and who are not working the way they should, we will be able to make a very substantial saving in the general picture.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks and months we have heard quite a bit of talk about untimely statements, smears, and false accusations. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who is chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations, if I heard him correctly, characterized this budget message of the President of the United States as deceitful and deceptive, and I take it from that, calculated to deceive the Congress of the United States.

As I said a moment ago, I have not had a chance to go through this carefully, as I shall shortly; but to my mind, the use of any such words as those at this stage of the proceedings certainly could not be considered in the best taste, to say the least. As far as I am concerned personally, I resent them, because I do not believe there has been any intention on the part of the President of the United States in this message to the Congress, signed by him, to deceive the Congress of the United States, because I do not believe he operates that way.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. I at no time made any reference to the President of the United States. I have said that anyone reading this budget would get an entirely erroneous understanding as to how much money is proposed to be spent in this budget and as to how much the deficit will be at the end of the fiscal year; and that is true. When I asked the gentleman how he accounted for a discrepancy of $1.75 billion, he merely replied that he did not know anything about the subject, he had not had an opportunity to read the message. The gentleman should know whereof he speaks before he attributes to me statements that I did not make.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, may I say that this budget and the President's statement are as near to what the facts are as we can find out at this time. I believe he has made a straightforward statement to us as to what he expects.

At this time I would be lacking in my duty if I did not call attention to the fact that every year the estimates of the administration from the budget and the Treasury for expenditures are made upon a calculated basis and they are made on too liberal a basis. We have come through every fiscal year with a lower expenditure than the estimates

made the first of the year have indicated. That has applied to every year except the war years. I think we ought to bear that in mind as we approach the problem and we ought to try to keep the deficit down just as low as possible and come just as near to balancing the budget as we can.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 74)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 507, 81st Congress, I transmit herewith the fourth annual report of the National Science Foundation for the year ending June 30, 1954.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1955.*

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE IN RE FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 70)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State, showing the condition of the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1953 and 1954, in accordance with section 862, Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724), 79th Congress.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1955.*

(Enclosure: Report concerning retirement and disability fund, Foreign Service.)

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 71)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 10 of Public Law 358, 83d Congress, I transmit herewith for the information and consideration of the Congress the report of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1955.*

CORREGIDOR BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 72)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 193, 83d Congress, 1st session, I hereby transmit to the Congress of the United States a report of the activities of the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1955.*

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 73)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 13, Public Law 806, 80th Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1955.*

PANAMA CANAL COMPANY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the second annual reports of the Panama Canal Company and the Canal Zone Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1955.*

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JANUARY 14, 1955.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to authority granted by section 8002 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, the Committee on Ways and Means did on January 14, 1955, elect the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, of Arkansas, to be a member of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, to serve with the following other House Members who have previously been duly elected by the Committee on Ways and Means as members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation: JERE COOPER of Tennessee; JOHN D. DINGELL of Michigan; DANIEL A. REED of New York; and THOMAS A. JENKINS of Ohio.

Respectfully yours,

JERE COOPER,
Chairman.

RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committee:

JANUARY 13, 1955.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I, herewith, tender my resignation from the Committee on House Administration, to which I was elected by House Resolution 8, on January 5, 1955.

Sincerely,

EDWARD A. GARMATZ.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committee:

JANUARY 13, 1955.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I respectfully tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on House Administration to which I was elected under House Resolution 8.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES B. DEANE.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committee:

JANUARY 13, 1955.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives. United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Administration of the House of Representatives.

Due to my assignment to other committee jobs, I will be unable to serve on the House Administration Committee.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. MOSS, Jr.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committee:

JANUARY 13, 1955.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on House Administration, to which I was elected pursuant to House Resolution 8, effective this date.

Sincerely,

J. W. TRIMBLE.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my special order may take precedence over the special order granted to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CAPITOL POLICE FORCE

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I shall introduce this week for appropriate reference a bill designed to improve the efficiency of the Capitol Police Force, those who attend the doors, and to establish a personnel merit system under the direct control of a joint Senate and House committee.

As one who suffered some injury in the unfortunate occurrence in this Chamber on March 1 last, which startled us, I feel that the time has come when we should pay as much attention to our membership and to the visitors to our deliberations as the people back home expect. I must say that in the busy days in which we find ourselves we soon forgot that experience, but not so, however, with those we have the honor to represent.

With propriety, no mention of the incident was made in my own campaign to return to this office, but hardly a day passed while I was at home but that some friend asked what we had done to improve the security in the House Chamber. In all truthfulness I had to reply that little if anything had been done.

When a lady was permitted to enter this room, make her way to the Speaker's chair, and request an opportunity to speak to this body, I was shocked beyond all understanding. Had this misguided and misdirected woman been mentally ill or emotionally upset, she could have well taken the life of our beloved Speaker. The country and the world would have lost one of its most distinguished, one of its most effective, and certainly one of its most useful citizens.

The time has come when we must forget petty patronage on matters of security. There are many good men presently on the police force. Under my bill, they may remain if they meet minimum qualifications of education, physical well-being, and possess high character. They will be required to successfully pass the instruction afforded either in the District of Columbia police training school or satisfactorily complete a course of study which I feel reasonably sure could be arranged under the direction of the finest law-enforcement officer in the world, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. If requested, I am certain that he would deem the matter important enough to arrange the course of study and supply the instructors in keeping with established police training procedures.

I shall include in my bill improved features covering the care of the galleries and the doors leading to the Chamber itself. Later I shall more explicitly explain the purposes, features, and some of the details of my proposed bill which will provide supervision, incentive, and guarantee adequate pay.

We should act now before other legislation finds itself in order.

TRANSITION TO A PEACETIME TYPE OF ECONOMY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, there will be no bitterness and I think very little partisanship in what I shall have to say. I have had the opportunity to read only three paragraphs of the President's budget message. I think the third paragraph will be misleading to some of the Members of Congress who do not closely follow Government spending. I do not mean to say that the paragraphs are meant to be misleading. I am just saying that they may be misleading. I read:

> The fiscal and budget story during this past year centers around the fact that we successfully made the adjustment from a wartime to a peacetime type of economy, a truly significant achievement. Aided by a proper fiscal policy, the inevitable dislocations of this adjustment, while difficult for some, have not been serious on the whole. Our present growing prosperity has solid foundations, free from the artificial stimulations of war on inflation.

I would hesitate to say that we have made a transition from wartime spending to peacetime spending. It is true that we are not actively engaged in a hot war. But, insofar as making the transition from a high level to a low level of Government spending for defense or otherwise is concerned, we have not made that transition.

It has been said in former years, for example, in 1951 and 1952, that the prosperity which this country enjoyed was enjoyed by reason of vast Government expenditures, particularly for national defense. It was eloquently maintained that the huge shot in the arm which Government was giving business was responsible for our prosperity.

I do not think the proper implication of the language of the budget message here should be, "Well, we have at last found out how to have full employment and a growing and expanding industry without any assist from the Government through defense spending and otherwise." I well recognize that the object of defense spending is not to give industry a shot in the arm, but to give protection to our country and to the free world. But the point I am making is that industry is getting that shot in the arm, and we have not made the transition.

In order to make clear what I am trying to say, I want to recite to you some of the official figures which I have here in my hand.

At the end of World War II, we drastically and quickly reduced Government spending. We went from a very high level, which in the fiscal year 1945 was $80 billion, to a much lower figure. Spending was cut almost 50 percent the first year, and in 1947 national-defense spending was reduced to 14.4 billion; whereas it is proposed in 1956 defense spending shall be $40.5 billion. Do you see what I am trying to say? In 1948 defense spending was $11.8 billion. I think it was a mistake to get to that low level of defense spending at that time; the reduction in our defense after World War II was too fast. History attests to that. But what I am trying to do is to point out that we have not made a transition to low national-defense spending or to low Government spending generally. We still have the impact on our economy of a terrific shot in the arm from defense and other Government spending, and we will probably continue for quite some time heavy defense spending. I am not so much complaining about that as I am trying to make the point that we have not made the transition which we hope some day may somehow be made. As long as industry gets a $40.5 billion shot in the arm from the defense budget in the next fiscal year, we cannot very well say that we have made the transition to a prosperous and expanding economy—a prosperity not considerably based on Government spending.

Let us look at the figures. During the first year of the Korean war, what was defense spending? The war was on, and it was a hot war. The spending was $22.2 billion. You cannot say that we made a transition from high defense spending of wartime to low defense spending of peacetime when for the first full year of the Korean war defense spending was $22.3 billions and defense spending next year will be $40.5 billion and defense spending this year is $40.6 billions. I hope you get the point I am trying to make. Do not let anybody say without challenge that everything is free now from Government stimulation and shots in the arm when the Government is spending Government dollars at such a tremendous rate.

For the second year of the hot war in Korea defense spending was $43.8 billion, about $2 billion more than for this year. It was said sometime ago that the reason we had prosperity was the Government spending for defense. If that were true then, is it in all fairness not more than true now? That is the point I make.

For the third year of the Korean war, and there was very little fighting during the third year, the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, defense spending was $50.3 billion as compared to $40-plus billion this year and next year, and it was $46.5 billion for the year ending June 30, 1954.

I thought it might be helpful to bring those figures out, and in extending my remarks I shall insert other figures in the RECORD.

I shall now insert at this point in the RECORD some figures which I have prepared from Treasury statements and from page 1207 of the President's budget

message which was submitted to us within the hour. In connection with the table, I would like to point out that the column entitled "Defense Department, Military Functions," includes, generally speaking, the Department of Defense except for civil functions under the Army engineers, such as flood control, and so forth. It includes the Army, Navy, and the Air Force, the Marines and, generally speaking, all the spending of the Department of Defense with the one exception which I pointed out.

The second column of figures is entitled "Major National Defense Programs." In this column, spending of the Department of Defense, as set forth in column 1, is included. In addition to Department of Defense spending in column No. 2, I included spending for such things as atomic energy, stockpiling of strategic and critical materials, and portions of mutual-security programs which consist of military assistance and direct forces support. In the previous sentence I am quoting language from page 26 of the budget message which has been read to us today:

Expenditures for national security

[In billions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Defense Department, military functions	Major national security programs (includes Department of Defense)
1945 (peak year for World War II)	$79.2	
1946	42.0	
1947	13.8	$14.4
1948	11.1	11.8
1949	12.0	12.9
1950	11.9	13.0
1951 (1st year, Korean war)	19.8	22.3
1952	39.0	43.8
1953	43.7	50.3
1954	40.3	46.5
1955 (estimated)	34.4	40.6
1956 (estimated)	34.0	40.5

I am not up here preaching against proper defense spending. I am all for it.

I would like to make this further reference to this budget situation. During the political campaigns it was said that if you changed political parties—and I have no quarrel with the people whenever they want to change political parties, the budget would be balanced and you would not have to depend upon defense contracts and defense spending for prosperity, and we would have a real, solid, non-defense-spending basis for our economic structure.

Some of my friends now say: "We did not mean that we would balance the budget in 1 year." I think myself that it would have been a little unreasonable to have expected such quick action. I think probably most taxpayers fondly hoped that a new administration would balance the budget in its first year. A few doubting Thomases probably thought that it might take the new administration 2 years to balance the budget. Certainly, no one would have argued that it would not be balanced during the third year. But it now appears that no balanced budget, by the utmost stretch of the imagination, is anticipated by the end of the third year of the new administration.

Had I been in charge of the fiscal picture and had I had the responsibility of the administration, I am not in any way saying I could have balanced the budget. I am not saying that. I think the budget should have been balanced by not reducing taxes as much as we did, or by a more drastic reduction of non-defense programs. The point I am making is that here again we are subjected to a budget which is not balanced, and moreover, we do not have the prosperity based on non-war, non-Government spending which some might imply we have as a result of what they may hurriedly read in the press or in official pronouncements.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. Is it not a fact that had we not given a tax reduction of $7.4 billions we would have been able to balance the budget? Is it not further a fact that in trying to make a transition from a war policy to a peacetime policy the administration acted wisely in beating off a depression by allowing people to have $7.4 billions more to spend? Does not the gentleman feel that the administration has rendered a great service in beating off this depression by reducing the taxes instead of balancing the budget?

Mr. MAHON. It may be that the administration has beat off a depression by a continuation of a high level of Government spending. I have pointed out the figures. For the fiscal year ending July 1 of this year, it will be $40-plus billion for defense. It would seem to me that if Government defense spending beats off a depression, then the administration has done a good job in beating off a depression by that method. As to the question of whether it was wise to reduce the taxes and to give the people that money to spend, I think the question is well taken, but it was not explained in 1952 that while the budget may not be balanced there would be some reduction in taxes. There was no such proviso left open along that line, as the gentleman well knows. I dare say the gentleman from Illinois is shocked, surprised, and disappointed, as we all are, that it has not been possible for the new administration to balance the budget, in view of the policies of the administration. I am not saying by any means that all of the policies are unsound.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to make this observation in reply to what the gentleman from Illinois has said about the claim of the administration reducing taxes $7¼ billion. That statement has been badgered around, and it is completely incorrect. The facts, the historical facts, show that it is an incorrect statement. The fact is that it was the Congress that reduced the 11-percent temporary increase in individual taxes. Congress provided for the termination date. It was a Democratic Congress that put it into the tax bill, and it was a Democratic Congress that provided for the termination date on December 31, 1953. The Congress also terminated the excess-profits tax. So it was not the administration that did it. It was the Congress of the United States who did it.

Mr. MAHON. I, myself, have heard that statement made so many times that the present administration reduced taxes by this terrific amount that I find myself not taking issue with the gentleman from Illinois when he does make what I consider an incorrect statement. The gentleman from Massachusetts is entirely correct that during a previous administration, a previous Congress of a different complexion—of rather the same complexion as the present Congress, these reductions were provided for.

But, Mr. Speaker, I did not rise to engage in any bitterness or partisanship, but merely, if I can, to encourage the people who do not work with military and other Government spending as closely as some of the rest of us do, to take a better look at this thing and not by any means to consider that we have made the transition to a prosperity not based on heavy Government spending. I hope we can make the transition some day. I do not know when it can be made, but we have not made that transition which we would like to make to an economy prosperous and expanding and not in a very material sense based upon Government spending.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I notice that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is giving credit to the administration for beating off a depression. It seems to me, if my memory is correct, everybody recognized the fact that we were heading into a recession and maybe we would get into a depression, and such people were accused of spreading fear. Now the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] himself admits that we were heading toward a depression and is taking credit for beating off the depression. He admits now that we were heading toward a depression.

Mr. MAHON. There were some people who thought there was some depression in certain areas last year, and the farmers who were so badly socked in the pocketbook by the drastic reduction in their incomes still think there was some kind of a depression.

Speaking of beating off the depression, I am reminded of reading in the papers last fall of a group of Government contracts which were let in certain strategic areas to stimulate business in such areas prior to the first Tuesday in November. It appeared that an effort was being made to encourage the people to believe that the administration should be supported. Of this I am not complaining; I just merely recall the effort that was made prior to last November to stimulate business in areas where a recession was underway.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. If there are any of my colleagues present today who think there is not a depression, I invite them to come over and visit West Virginia.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has expired.

The next order of business is the remarks of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY]. Is it the desire of the gentleman to proceed now, before we take requests for extension of remarks, and 1-minute speeches?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, it is the farthest thing from my thoughts to interfere with the routine business of the House and insist upon my position. It is perfectly all right with the gentleman from West Virginia for the Speaker to recognize Members for 1-minute speeches and extension of remarks.

I would like to ask, however, that a few remain until I make my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The present occupant of the chair will be here.

THE TARIFF QUESTION

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, today's tariffs are the lowest in our history. Yet the President is now asking Congress to permit him to cut these tariffs even lower.

Low tariffs have made, or contributed to the making of more than 50,000 unemployed in my home State of West Virginia.

Babies are going without milk in thousands of homes in West Virginia because of the free-trade policy.

Industry after industry has decayed away as foreign imports have taken over what were once markets for American-made products.

There is only one way that the glass factories, the clothespin factories, and the coal mines of West Virginia could possibly meet this foreign competition—that is by cutting weekly wages to $5 or $10, by slicing the hourly rate to 15 cents or 20 cents an hour.

Is that what the people of America want? Do they want us to match the slave wages of Europe and Asia with slave wages for American workers?

I do not think so. And I know for my part, I will never give any help, directly or indirectly, to reducing the hourly wage rate. Slave wages have been outlawed and will never, I pray, return to grind the American worker into the dirt.

What other solution is there, then, for the thousands of workers in my State of West Virginia who are being forced to stand in breadlines because their factories have been closed by foreign competition?

There is one solution and only one solution, if the tide of free trade cannot be halted. I would like to offer it for the consideration of the Members of Congress.

One of the arguments made in favor of free trade is that it will help foreign nations get back on their economic feet.

We are told, "We have helped these nations with Marshall plan aid. Now that we have built up their industries, we must buy the products of those industries, otherwise we have wasted our Marshall plan money."

Let us reverse this policy.

Let us have a Marshall plan for the American workers of West Virginia.

They are unemployed not because they were incompetent workmen. They are unemployed not because their plants were mismanaged. They are unemployed not because their finished products were not salable.

Ladies and gentlemen, they are unemployed solely because their own Government, the Government of the United States, has seen fit to take away from them the fair and just protection of a tariff. During the more than 160 years history of this country a tariff has provided help for the American workman. It has helped him achieve a living standard unmatched by the workers of any other nation in the world.

Who has stripped the workers of West Virginia of this protection?

Who has decreed that the workers of West Virginia shall be thrown on a human scrap pile?

Who has forced the coal operators and the factory owners of West Virginia into bankruptcy?

I will tell you:

It is the people of New York, the people of California, and dozens of other States who by the vote of their Representatives and Senators have unmercifully stripped the men and women of West Virginia of their livelihood.

It is, therefore, the moral obligation of these people and of the Federal Government which espouses this policy of unemployment for American workers to do something for the workers of West Virginia.

I propose, then, a Marshall aid plan for any worker in West Virginia who is unemployed due, either directly or indirectly, to the national tariff policy.

This aid shall constitute $75 million to be used as interest-free loans of not more than $2,500 per family.

I propose that another $100 million be provided, to be administered by the Department of Commerce, to provide for an industrial survey of the State of West Virginia and that a portion of this money be used for interest-free loans in helping factories relocate in the State to take up the unemployment resulting from the present free-trade policy.

Perhaps I am selfish in talking only about my own State of West Virginia. Perhaps this Marshall plan for America should be expanded to take care of certain areas of Ohio, where, for example, the earthenware industry has been hard hit by cheap slave-labor imports. Perhaps some areas of New England should be provided for as well.

But the time has come for some action on the part of those who have thought more of the workers behind the Iron Curtain and in other foreign countries than they have of their own fellow Americans.

The time has come to take care of our own jobless. A Marshall plan for America is the only answer.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. EDMONDSON asked and was given permission to address the House on Thursday next, January 20, for 30 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

TARIFF ON TEXTILES

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am including testimony delivered by Mr. Henry C. Ball, executive vice president of the Tufted Textile Manufacturers Association, before the United States Tariff Commission and the Committee for Reciprocity Information relative to the proposal to enter into a multilateral trade agreement with Japan and other countries for the lowering of the tariff on textiles.

May I call attention to the fact that just at the time when a proposal is made to lower the tariff on cotton goods, to be imported from Japan, the proposal is made to raise the minimum wage to 90 cents or $1 an hour. I certainly favor the lifting of the minimum wage but at the same time to lower the tariff on the importation of cotton goods from Japan and other countries with their notoriously low wage scales would crush the textile industry, which is just now beginning to recover somewhat from a rather serious decline in activity.

It is my hope that the peril-point provision in our Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will adequately protect the textile and other threatened industries. I have given approval in the past to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act because I believed that the peril-point provision and the escape clause would adequately protect our industries from destruction. If this proves not to be the case, then, of course, I cannot continue to support the reciprocal trade agreements program. I certainly was not elected to Congress to stand by at the liquidation or the orientalization of our textile industry.

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE TUFTED TEXTILE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION REPRESENTING THE TUFTED TEXTILE INDUSTRY IN RELATION TO PROPOSED LOWERING OF TARIFF ON TEXTILE ITEMS AS LISTED IN THE NOVEMBER 1954 PUBLICATION NOTICE OF UNITED STATES INTENTION TO NEGOTIATE LIST OF PRODUCTS TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE UNDER THE TRADE AGREEMENT ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED AND EXTENDED—WE REFER TO SCHEDULE 9, PARAGRAPHS 911 (A), 919, 921, AND 923

(Respectfully submitted by Henry C. Ball, executive vice president of the Tufted Textile Manufacturers Association)

To the United States Tariff Commission, Washington, D. C.:

This statement is submitted by the Tufted Textile Manufacturers Association, a nonprofit trade association, incorporated in the State of Georgia.

The control of the organization is vested in the delegate membership composed of persons designated by its membership.

Plans, statements, and programs of the organization are adopted on approval of the majority of the delegate membership. The Tufted Textile Manufacturers Association represents 80 percent of the production of tufted carpets and rugs, schedule 9, paragraph 921; 90 percent of the production of tufted bedspreads, schedule 9, paragraph 911 (a); and 98 percent of the production of tufted robes, schedule 9, paragraph 919, in the United States.

Tufted textiles originated in the north Georgia area. Tufted textile products have been made by machine for about 20 years. There now are approximately 250 factories, large and small, some integrated in part. There are factories established now in 18 States of the Union and in 11 foreign countries, to our knowledge. Hundreds of requests are coming in from foreign countries for more and more information on tufting machines for making tufted products in foreign countries.

Modern ideas and ingenuity of the north Georgia machinists developed these tufting machines, which have a marked advantage over weaving. The machines are only partly patented (or only certain parts of the tufted machines are patented), and there is no protection of these patents in foreign markets. Some foreign countries are building these machines today.

The last year's complete statistics on the tufted textile industry as reported by the Bureau of the Census revealed the industry used 135,060,000 pounds of cotton yarns and gray goods in 1952, and other types of fiber in the amount of 4,734,000 pounds. Accurate figures for the first half of 1953, quoted by the Bureau of the Census, plus preliminary figures given by the Bureau of the Census for the last half of 1953, reveal the industry used approximately 152,942,000 pounds of cotton yarns and gray goods last year. This is 319,963 (478-pound net weight) bales of cotton. To produce the lint, estimated by the National Cotton Council of America at 275 pounds per acre, 556,153 acres were required.

There has been a large increase in the use of synthetic fibers and jute backing for carpets and rugs in this industry; however, we do not have these figures at this time. The Bureau of the Census is now securing these statistics for the period July 1, 1953, through June 30, 1954, and has been authorized to secure the figures for the last 6 months of 1954, which figures are not available at this time.

Tufting machines are capable of tufting certain types of bedspreads at the ratio of 10 to 1 over weaving, or tufting lineal yardage 40 to 54 inches wide for robes at a ratio of 25 yards to 1 over weaving, and tufted carpeting 12 to 15 feet wide at a ratio of from 10 to 15 to 1 over weaving, depending on grade of product.

There are 25,000 production employees working in the tufting factories and tufted finishing plants in the United States. It takes approximately 25,000 more production employees to supply the industry with yarn, gray goods, machinery, chemicals, and other vital materials necessary for manufacturing tufted products.

The average hourly wage earnings in the textile industry is $1.30. In the carpet and rug industry, Government figures for average hourly earnings are $1.73. We compare these wage earnings in the United States to foreign countries' wage earnings in the textile world: Japan, 13.6 cents; India, 9.5 cents; England, 40 cents; Germany, 31.7 cents per hour.

Tufting machines made in America are being exported to foreign countries in increasing numbers. The production potential of these machines, plus that of tufting machines manufactured in foreign countries, pose a serious threat to American industries if the products of these machines turned out by low-paid foreign workers are allowed to enter into our domestic market and compete with products produced in the United States. We would emphasize that the tufting machine was invented and perfected in the United States; that its value in producing certain consumer textile goods is recognized throughout the world; and that the sharing of American production knowledge and export of American tufting machines have been of great value to foreign countries.

The tufted-textile industry is principally that of a converter. Cotton is the principal fiber used in the industry—cotton raised in the United States and spun by cotton mills in the United States. When you disturb, by low tariffs the economic condition of this industry, you affect the cotton mills and the cotton growers, as well as all others in this country who supply the industry.

The net profits on sales in the industry have already reached a peril point. To quote Dun & Bradstreet's publication, Behind the Scenes of Business, 1952 edition, "The 5-year average, 1947–51: Net profits on net sales for cotton goods converters, nonfactored, was 2.37 percent."

Tufted products produced in foreign countries up to the present time are inferior in quality to American products. If introduced into the American market, they would tend to establish a low price base, which would have an insidious effect upon the industry's entire price structure and would seriously affect our domestic tufted industry.

When the basic price structure of retail merchandising of given products in the country is undermined, or there are depressed prices, it is then felt in the wage structure of an industry. There is then a lowering of basic standards in the industry to the point where the affected products in many cases are discontinued in the retail merchants' stores.

The tufted-textile industry is now a large link in the economic structure of this country and a most vital segment in the overall textile industry. Tufted-textile products rank fourth in the use of cotton. In addition, it has played a major role in lifting the living standard in the American homes of all means.

Tufted-textile products, principal market is the United States. The small amount of export which is done is principally to Canada. At one time the industry enjoyed a fair amount of export business. However, with foreign countries now establishing tufting machinery in their factories and their patronizing of their home factories, and because of import restrictions by most foreign countries, there is practically no exporting of tufted products from this country, even though our standards for tufted products are far superior to those found in foreign tufting plants.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE MATTERS

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in the 83d Congress, together with my colleague the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] and several other of my colleagues, I sponsored a resolution providing for the creation of a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters. The number of that measure was House Concurrent Resolution 169. It provided that the committee be composed of 9 Members of the Senate and 9 Members of the House, the Members to be selected by the presiding officers of the two houses, and to be representative of both political parties. That measure was intended to bring the various intelligence activities of the executive branch under coordinated congressional scrutiny.

Today I am reintroducing that resolution together with several distinguished Members of this House. It is our hope that other Members will shortly join us in cosponsoring this measure.

Mr. Speaker, the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency and of related intelligence services have been handled from a congressional standpoint in a piece-meal fashion. The importance of these activities to the national security demands at this time the creation of a joint committee, which will keep the Congress informed and bring these activities under coordinated, responsible congressional scrutiny. The proposed committee would operate in a manner which has been successfully adopted by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Intelligence has developed as an activity of utmost importance since World War II. The agencies in this field are entitled to a continuous, consistent and stable relationship with the Congress. The membership of the Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters, which would be presumably drawn from those charged with responsibility for military and foreign policy matters, would supply this important link in this crucial area.

In recent years it has become apparent that the intelligence agencies activities of the executive branch have been and may in the future be subjected to undue interference by free-wheeling, congressional investigating committees, which consider themselves called upon to inquire into their operations. The proposed Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters would obviate the need for such separate uncoordinated investigations.

It is my sincere hope that the concurrent resolution, the text of which I shall now read into the RECORD, will receive prompt and favorable consideration from this House:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters to be composed of 9 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 9 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In each instance not more than 5 Members shall be members of the same political party.

SEC. 2. The joint committee shall make continuing studies of the intelligence activities and problems relating to the gathering of intelligence affecting the national security and of its coordination and utilization by the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government. The Central Intelligence Agency and related intelligence services shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to their activities. All bills, resolutions, and other matters in the Senate or the House of Representatives relating primarily to the Central Intelligency Agency and related intelligence services shall be referred to the joint committee. The members of the joint committee who are Mem-

bers of the Senate shall from time to time report to the Senate, and the members of the joint committee who are Members of the House of Representatives shall from time to time report to the House, by bill or otherwise, their recommendations with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of their respective Houses which are (1) referred to the joint committee or (2) otherwise within the jurisdiction of the joint committee.

SEC. 3. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 4. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

SEC. 5. The joint committee is empowered to appoint such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government.

SEC. 6. The expenses of the point committee, which shall not exceed $ per year, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursement so made.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on July 20, 1953, with my distinguished colleagues [Mr. ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin, and Mr. JUDD, of Minnesota] I introduced a House concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee of Congress to supervise all intelligence activities. I have reintroduced this measure today and I understand several of my colleagues are also submitting it.

I was interested to note that a resolution similar to mine was introduced in the Senate in 1954, and a slightly modified version of it is receiving extensive sponsorship in this Congress. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, this points up the importance of this measure and gives rise to the hope that it will be enacted in this session.

In 1947, the Central Intelligence Agency was created. It is responsible to the National Security Council only and is not subject to supervision by the legislative branch of the Government. It is absolutely free from any check by the Congress even to the control of its expenditures. The need for secrecy in our intelligence agencies is obvious, yet I feel that much of the abuse of the Central Intelligence Agency can be avoided by the creation of a joint committee of Congress to supervise all intelligence activities along the lines of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The resolution I have introduced today would establish a joint committee composed of 9 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 9 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House. In each instance, no more than 5 members shall be members of the same political party. The resolution further provides that the committee shall make continuing studies of the intelligence activities and problems relating to the gathering of intelligence affecting the national security and of its coordination and utilization by the various departments and agencies of the Government.

The House and the Senate measures differ only in the proposed composition of the committee to be established. In the House resolution the membership of the committee comprises 18 members while in the Senate resolution only 12 would be appointed. The Senate resolution further specifies that the members be selected from the Appropriations and the Armed Services Committees of the House and the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I feel this resolution should receive a high priority for consideration in this session. During the past year, President Eisenhower found it necessary to create the Intelligence Activities Task Force headed by Gen. Mark Clark and a personal study conducted by Gen. James Doolittle, to investigate the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency. The findings of both groups are secret. It is highly important that the Congress have a continuing check on this Agency and necessary changes in it should be promptly written into legislation.

PROTECTION OF THE MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks already made by my good friend and former fellow casualty the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] regarding the question of security in this House, or the absolute lack of it so far as I am concerned.

As you might know, I normally expect when I go back to my State and district to be asked, as I was last year several times, what security measures have been taken since the episode of last March 1st. I am asked if professional police have been employed at the Capitol or just what has been done to protect the membership.

I am forced to inform them that the only additional protection furnished since that time has been temporary inclusion in the Capitol Police Force of 10 detectives on loan from the Metropolitan Police of the District of Columbia, which has cost the District about $30,000, and which has not been repaid.

I have to tell my constituents back home when I am asked the question as to what has been done since last March that about the only changes we can see in the House are that some of the bullet holes have been patched up in the ceiling, they have patched up the holes in the walls, and repaired some of the furniture that was splintered; they have made various changes like that, but so far as improvement of security is concerned I have been unable to find any of it.

I helped support last year, Mr. Speaker, a bill which passed this body, H. R. 9413, to establish a professional police force, a bill which unfortunately did not pass the other body. I sincerely hope that legislation such as this, or that about which my colleague from Tennessee has spoken, will be introduced in this session of Congress and will pass both Houses as quickly as possible.

The next strange lady who walks down the aisle and asks for recognition from the Chair may have some other intention in her mind than simply making a speech.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard statements today about the propriety of remarks made by Members of one body of this Congress relating to Members of the other body. While the rules protect against character assassination and character assassins, yet we do not have any protection against any other kind of assassination as far as this House is concerned.

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 15, 1955]

CAPITOL INSECURITY

The ease with which the woman in red reached the rostrum of the House directs attention anew to the inadequacy of the present guard system at the Capitol. The woman told reporters later that only a page boy questioned her as she sought to enter the Chamber. "I don't think they could keep anybody out of there," she commented.

It may be that the incident would have occurred even if the House had been protected by a trained police force. But the fact is that the lax security system still in effect at the Capitol, despite last year's shooting affray, makes it relatively easy for unauthorized persons to violate floor or gallery rules. After the Puerto Rican attack on House Members last March there were vociferous demands on both sides of the Capitol for a reorganization of the police force, starting with the elimination of political patronage. But legislation to effect this urgent reform died with the past session.

In the meantime the new Congress has asked the Metropolitan Police Department to detail 10 picked detectives daily to assist in protecting the Capitol. Chief Murray can ill afford to lose the services of these men. A similar special assignment cost the department nearly $30,000 last year, for which no repayment has been made to date. This makeshift arrangement is unsatisfactory from every standpoint. Congress ought to forget patronage and reorganize the Capitol Police Force on an efficient, merit-system basis. Until that is done the legislators will have no one but themselves to blame for lax security.

[From the Washington Sunday Star of January 16, 1955]

CAPITOL FORCE STILL PATRONAGE PLUM

(By Hector McLean)

Of Congress it might be said: "Experience is a great teacher—but not for long."

Less than a year ago, on March 1, 1954, a band of Puerto Rican terrorists stood up in the House visitors' gallery and turned it into a shooting gallery.

They sprayed the House Chamber with automatic gunfire that cut down 5 Members of Congress and drove others cringing to the floor during a crowded moment of voting.

Then it was over. The memory lingered on, however, at least for those lawmakers who literally stood under the guns that day.

Out of the dreadful moment sprang some painfully honest thinking on keeping such a thing from ever happening again. Ideas ranged from putting up bulletproof glass in front of the galleries to plans for installing metal-detecting electric eyes which would help inspect all visitors to the Capitol Building.

All these, however, quickly boiled down to one single idea which seemed practical—keeping the Capitol staffed with trained, experienced policemen on the alert to prevent questionable visitors from ever getting into the legislative Chambers.

PATRONAGE MACHINE

Although Congress has its own police force—156 jobs strong—its members are neither trained nor experienced, except for occasional accidents of hiring which bring in veterans of police duty elsewhere.

Actually, the Capitol Police Force is a patronage machine. A third or more of its strength is usually made up of deserving young constituents to whom the force is a sideline for financing themselves through college here.

So, when the terrorist demonstration subsided, Congress staffed its halls with trained, experienced policemen by borrowing them from the Metropolitan Police Force of the District of Columbia, about 90 percent of which is paid for by the taxpayers and residents of the Federal City.

Then, however, the lawmakers started writing legislation to turn their own force into a corps of trained, experienced policemen who could and would make a career of the service.

CAREER FORCE SOUGHT

The bill was drafted and redrafted to create a carrier force much on the pattern of the Metropolitan Police, whose training school was to be used to process rookies for the Capitol Police Force.

Then the House of Representatives, with memories still vivid of the 1st of March, passed the bill and sent it to the Senate.

There, in the Rules Committee, it languished and died. The Senate, which had no memories of gunfire and bloodshed, never acted on the measure. And, as the 83d Congress expired, so did the bill for a permanent career police force on Capitol Hill.

Once again the patronage machine is starting to roll. Capitol Police Capt. William J. Broderick says, "We are starting to let a few men go now. They're trying to put older men on and, while we have nothing against older men, we have to educate the Members (of Congress) to understand that this is no job for men of 70."

A DEAD ISSUE

Of the career police bill, which he openly espoused, Captain Broderick says, "It looks like it's a dead issue now."

Recalling opposition to the bill by members of the Capitol Police Force who feared they could not meet the stringent physical and mental standards it would have set up, Captain Broderick noted that many expect to lose their jobs anyway—and that sentiment generally is now in favor of the measure.

During the maneuvering to get the career police bill approved, Congress had Chief Robert V. Murray, of the Metropolitan Police, keep varying numbers of police on the Hill for 10,144 man-hours at a cost of $29,992 to the District.

Although the city was urged to bill Congress and did, the debt was never paid, and now we're off again, with another 10-man detail of detectives taken from their work in and around the city for service on Capitol Hill.

And patronage goes on.

RESTRICTION ON IMPORTATION OF RESIDUAL OIL

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, our Republican Party rose to its greatness on two major political precepts:

First. Preservation of the Union at all costs; and

Second. Protection of American workers and American capital at the competitive gateway of all cheap importations of foreign-made goods.

While I am confident we have never departed from that first precept, yet I am now alarmed lest I visualize our Republican elephant waving his tail in an unseemly departure from that second precept heretofore based upon a very militant protection for all our American wage earners and our domestic industry through consistent and legal restriction on importation of cheap-made products of many foreign lands.

Now it appears that American imports of foreign oil only recently broke all daily records, the average daily imports for the week ending December 31, 1954, being 1,443,700 barrels, including 569,000 daily barrels of residual oil to be used in direct competition with American coal miners in my own district and in other parts of the country. That much competitive oil is calculated to displace 136,549 tons of coal per day and idle 22,758 coal miners at the rate of every miner producing 6 tons of coal per day per man.

In that wisest of all books, the Bible, we find the injunction that a man should first provide for his own household. Otherwise, he is characterized as worse than an infidel. It seems to me that if we do not now provide for a reasonable economic protection for our own American wage earners and our domestic industry, then we too could well be considered worse than infidels.

I recall that as a boy I used to stand in the long dark corridors of coal mines down in Kentucky, and out of the darkness and silence some happy coal miner would invariably emerge way off in the far distance wearing a light on his cap and maybe singing a song from his heart. Well the light and the song would just about dispel all the gloom and lift up your depressed spirits as the dark void thus began to yield up a happy, busy workman of the coal mines. To me it would now seem both wise and wonderful if this Congress exercised its legislative wisdom and enacted my own bill, H. R. 2031, or some similar bill to properly restrict importation of foreign residual oil. This would, in my opinion, truly put lights on the headgear and songs in the hearts of 22,758 American miners as they might thereby emerge from present dark corridors of residual oil displacement and once more become happy producers in that great segment of our American economy known as the coal industry. To me this would be a most sensible form of expression of true Americanism.

TELEVISION-TRANSMITTER TOWERS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a joint resolution designed to limit the height of television-transmitter towers to 1,000 feet.

A serious problem is developing affecting two great industries, that merits the consideration of the Congress. I refer to the competition between the television industry and the aviation industry for use of this Nation's airspace.

Both of these important industries require airspace to exist. Television, the finest device yet known for mass dissemination of information and entertainment, requires very tall towers for signal propagation. Aviation has need for the same airspace now being penetrated by taller and taller towers.

To date the growth of the television industry has been concentrated in the large urban centers of population. To reach this market, towers of heights not in excess of 700 feet are generally used. As this industry seeks to expand its coverage to less densely populated areas, towers on the order of 2,000 feet in height are now being proposed. Already, 2 towers over 1,500 feet in height are in existence in the Southwest.

While this is a tribute to the engineering and construction genius of this country, it should be pointed out that these steel spires are practically invisible hazards, under many conditions, to air navigation. Extending upwards into navigable airspace, as they do, they are also supported by guy wires extending out hundreds of feet, thereby compounding the danger. To date no suitable means of marking or lighting these structures has been devised that would afford warning to aircraft when in close proximity to these towers.

Both industries have worked closely to compromise their differences in the past. This has been possible so far principally because most of the towers erected have extended less than 1,000 feet above ground, and are located within or close to urban areas. Now, towers of 1,500 to 2,000 feet in height are being proposed for location away from urban

centers and in areas of the country where the terrain is flat. These are the areas where the training of our airmen, crop dusting and agricultural flying, and private flying take place. Moreover, the general use of so-called omnirange electronic has enabled the Federal Government to establish many new airways—airways badly needed to handle the constantly increasing volume of air traffic. Towers of 1,500 to 2,000 feet located in, or in the vicinity of, these airways will block out the lower flight altitudes badly needed for the adequate flow and safe operation of this traffic.

The fullest growth and development of both television and aviation are vital to our national defense and national economy. However, each should grow and develop without penalizing the other. Each should make the widest use of our navigable air space—one of our vanishing national resources. The Congress must take whatever steps are necessary to insure the establishment of a Federal policy designed to minimize the hazards to air navigation, and the possibility of damage to radio and television towers, resulting from the increased use and occupancy of the air space by these two great industries. To that end I am introducing a joint resolution directing the Federal Communications Commission to permit the construction of radio or television towers extending over 1,000 feet above the ground only in those cases where, after due consideration of the recommendations of the Government agencies concerned and of interested parties, it is able to make a special finding that such towers are not hazards to air navigation.

POSTAL PAY RAISE AND POSTAL RATES

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I have studied the President's message on postal pay raise and postal rates with a great deal of interest, but no surprise.

The President, to my mind, is carrying on his program announced last year, namely, to try to make the Department as self-supporting as possible, to give a much-needed raise to the employees, and to make sure that the old horse and buggy classification in the Department is modernized and brought up to date. This has been done in all private industry, and there is no reason why the Government of the United States should lag behind. The President again recommends the establishment of a board, within the Post Office Department, to regulate rates. This, I believe, is necessary and long overdue. I have introduced legislation to make possible the establishment of such a board.

The President has once again put into practice his fine maxim of being conservative with the Nation's resources and liberal in his programs for our citizens.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

LIVING CONDITIONS IN NEW ENGLAND

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand an article that appeared in yesterday's Lowell Sunday Sun dated Moscow, January 16:

> Pravda, the Communist Party newspaper, declared today in a special article that American officials are trying to keep all tourists and especially foreign correspondents out of New England so they could not see poverty and starvation among the people of the six States.
>
> The article, written by Correspondent N. Karev, made no mention of the United States State Department's recent order closing much of New England as well as large areas elsewhere in the United States to Soviet citizens.

Needless to say, the article appearing in this Russian Communist propaganda sheet, known as Pravda, is false. It is an outrageous lie. Its purpose is to degrade America in the eyes of the Russian people and to increase the tension now existing between Communist Russia and the United States of America.

The article sent to Pravda by so-called Correspondent N. Karev, who in my opinion appears to act more as a spy than as a correspondent, devoted its whole content to the effect that the people of my home city of Lowell and the Merrimack Valley cities of Massachusetts are starving.

This article appearing in Pravda, the Communist Party newspaper of Russia, declaring the people of Lowell, my home city, are starving represents the most barefaced lie that has come to my attention in all of my experience. The publishing of such a ridiculous lie by Pravda illustrates quite clearly that Pravda is not a newspaper but a rank propaganda Communist yellow sheet. It proves beyond doubt that this Russian Communinst Party propaganda sheet is not interested in the truth, not interested in discovering real facts, but only concerned in spreading lies, and lies for the purpose of increasing the tension between Russia and the United States. This yellow sheet is not worthy of the name of newspaper because it does not print news, it prints fantastic yarns in order to hoodwink the Russian people.

The endorsement by the Communist Party, the Russian official government, of this menace known as Pravda, proves without question that the Russian Government is not interested in truth and is not interested in fact.

This ridiculous, scandalous, fantastic reporting, if it may be called reporting, on the part of a Russian so-called correspondent, but actually a Russian spy, shows clearly that the United States must completely exclude these Russian spy agents from our borders.

Recently, there have been statements on the part of officials in our Government and nonofficial writers in our country relating to the proposition of American coexistence with Russian communism. Coexistence must not and cannot be sold to the American people.

The publication of this fantastic falsehood about my home city of Lowell, Mass., one of the fine old cities of America, clearly points up the fact that coexistence between Russia and America is impossible. The time has come for the statesmen in the United States shouldered with the responsibility of our foreign policy to face the facts and reach some decisions as to what is to be gained by this present policy of coexistence.

This horrible lie printed in the Communist propaganda sheet known as Pravda illustrates that there is no such thing as honor among the leaders of the Russian dictatorship. It is impossible to make any kind of an agreement with these Russian dictators who have built their whole government and their entire methods upon lies and untruths.

This fantastic article shows beyond a doubt that the purpose of the Russian Government is to resort to every dishonorable means possible to increase the tension between the United States of America and Communist Russia. It is their intention to try to wear down America and to eventually force it into being a second-rate power.

Make no mistake about this fact, it is the purpose of Communist Russia to defeat America and force this great land of freedom into the orbit of Communist world rule. American statesmen should recognize this fact. No agreement can be made under any circumstances with men or governments lacking honor. This entire theory of coexistence is nothing more than a diplomatic medium promoted by Communist Russia for the purpose of lulling to sleep American statesmanship.

Here in the United States in New York City we have given a home to the United Nations. The United Nations was formed upon a great ideal and upon respectability, principle, and honor. By its constant recourse to falsehood, Communist Russia has illustrated time and time again that there is no place in the honorable society of nations for the dictatorship known throughout the world as Communist Russia.

The time has come when the member nations of the United Nations should seriously consider the kind of a country Communist Russia is, what its intentions are, the lack of respect for other nations, and the dishonor of its leadership, and recommend its expulsion from the United Nations. The American people must recognize the fact before it is too late that Communist Russia and the United States of America cannot coexist together.

Any government such as Communist Russia, any representative of that government, such as the writer who sent the article to the Communist propaganda sheet known as Pravda about my home

city of Lowell, should not have any access whatsoever to the freedom of America or to the land that is America. If we are to remain the great land of freedom we are now, and if we are to keep American free, we must completely expel from America all of those people who are determined to destroy America. I can see no further reason why the United States of America should maintain diplomatic relations with the Communist Government of Russia. I shall not request an apology for this outrageous lie about my home city for I could not honor it even if one should be tendered.

THE LATE GEN. JOHN K. CANNON

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, last Friday afternoon a large formation of jet planes flew over the Arlington Cemetery during the graveside military services of Gen. John K. Cannon. The planes were in perfect formation, except for the fact that the one next to the leader was missing. The vacant spot symbolized the great loss to our country through the death of General Cannon.

He conducted the highly successful Berlin airlift. He was one of the few four-star air generals and the only Utahan ever to receive this honor. At the time of his retirement last March General Cannon was the ranking general in the United States Air Force. His decorations included distinguished medals from his own country and from Great Britain, France, Italy, Poland, Yugoslavia, Morocco, and Brazil. He was beloved by his men in the Air Force and idealized by the young manhood of America.

I join my colleagues in the House of Representatives and his many friends in paying him respect and extend heartfelt sympathy to his wife and family.

I extend my remarks by placing in the RECORD a short message of respect from the trustees, faculty, and students of the Utah State Agricultural College, General Cannon's alma mater; a message from the John K. Cannon Squadron, Arnold Air Society; Utah State Agricultural College ROTC; an editorial from the Salt Lake Tribune, January 14, 1955; and the Salt Lake Deseret News, January 13, 1955:

LOGAN, UTAH, *January 13, 1955.*

The FAMILY OF GEN. JOHN K. CANNON,
Care Hon. H. A. Dixon,
Representative From Utah,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The passing of Gen. John K. Cannon saddens Utah State Agricultural College. The institution has always been proud of this graduate, not only for his distinguished contributions in aviation and in military leadership for the defense of the United States, but for his high character. His influence upon many thousands of persons, young and old, has been most constructive and inspiring. The board of trustees, faculty, and Students' Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and alumni of the college all join in paying grateful tribute to this leader who devoted his life to serving our country and served with equal devotion his God and his fellow men. It is with deepest compassion that we send our condolences.

UTAH STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE,
DARYL CHASE, *President.*

JANUARY 13, 1955.

The Honorable HENRY ALDOUS DIXON,
Representative from the State of Utah,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

We'd appreciate appropriate delivery. Thanks.

PRESIDENT.

We of the John K. Cannon Squadron, Arnold Air Society, wish to express our condolences to the family and loved ones of our esteemed namesake.

JOHN K. CANNON SQUADRON, ARNOLD AIR SOCIETY, USAC ROTC, UTAH STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune of January 14, 1955]

GENERAL CANNON

The death of Gen. John K. Cannon in Arcadia, Calif., comes as a great shock to the many Utahans who have followed with pride the distinguished career of this native Salt Laker.

General Cannon and military aviation practically grew up together. A 1914 graduate of the Utah State Agricultural College, he later was a missionary in Europe for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Then, when the United States entered World War I, he joined the Army as a second lieutenant and served overseas with the Infantry. With the coming of peace, however, his days on the ground were soon over. In 1922 he received his wings in the old Army Air Corps and entered a field of service in which he was to win both fame and glory.

World War II brought General Cannon to public attention, but long before then he was making a name for himself in military aviation. After Pearl Harbor he played an increasingly important role in the air war against the Axis in Europe.

General Cannon's achievements were many and remarkable. He became known as one of the world's foremost specialists in tactical aviation and took part in many campaigns, among them the invasion of southern France during which he was responsible for air operations. By the time the war ended he was commander of United States Air Forces in Europe. He then served briefly as head of the Air Force training in this country, and when the Russians blockaded Berlin in 1948, was sent back to Europe to direct the highly successful airlift.

Many nations, including his own, honored General Cannon. He received American and foreign decorations. He became one of the few four-star air generals, and the only Utahan to attain that rank. Yet he was a publicity-shy man. His voice was never raised in bitter interservice rivalries, he didn't write for the magazines, and the public knew of him for what he did and not for what he said. It is significant, however, that the men who served under him called him Uncle Joe. Such a nickname tells much of the affection in which he was held.

General Cannon was a relatively young man—62—when he died and it is cause of regret that he enjoyed such a few months of private life since he retired last March. Obviously, he wore himself out in the service of his country. To his widow and family the Tribune extends deepest sympathy. General Cannon was an officer, a gentleman, and a hero.

[From the Deseret News and Telegram of January 13, 1955]

GEN. JOHN K. CANNON

Utah and the Nation were saddened Wednesday by the death of retired Gen. John K. Cannon, native Utahan and one of America's most loved and respected tactical aviation experts.

General Cannon, who had retired from active service only last March 31, was just 62 years old at the time of his unexpected death from a heart attack in Arcadia, Calif. But into those 62 years he had packed a tremendous amount of experience and achievement.

At the time of his retirement, this son of a famous Utah family was a four-star general and senior officer in the United States Air Force. Yet he started his military career as an infantryman and a non-Academy man—two factors which might have been expected to keep him from rising to the top in military aviation.

Of his many world-famous exploits, General Cannon was perhaps best known for his direction of the Berlin airlift in 1948–49, one of the most dramatic—and technically complicated—operations in post-war times. Before the airlift, he made his name in history secure by the masterful way he directed the air operations in the invasion of southern France and air support operations in the earlier north African invasion. The men who served under him loved him no less than they respected him, as witness the affectionate nickname of Uncle Joe which they bestowed on him.

The demands of the service had taken General Cannon to all parts of the world and he saw comparatively little of his native State during the last 30 years of his life, but he continued to consider himself a Utahan and many of his close relatives are still living in the State. In addition, the General had a host of friends and admirers here—many of them dating from his days as an ROTC instructor at East High School in the early 1920's.

All of them join with us in mourning and sympathizing with the family of this man who held the highest military rank ever achieved by a Utahan. His great abilities will be sorely missed.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to my colleague from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from Utah.

Gen. John K. Cannon richly deserved the honors which during his long and distinguished career were awarded him by grateful nations the world over.

Born in Salt Lake City, Utah, a member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, General Cannon entered the Army during the First World War and a distinguished career was begun. The Nation and the world lost a champion and a hero with his death last week at the age of 62.

In assessing his outstanding contribution to this Nation's strength, one is most impressed with the vision of General Cannon. Back in 1922, when the airplane was the toy of the few and the plaything of the reckless, General—then Captain—Cannon received his wings in the Army Air Corps.

He never lost his grasp of the importance of air strength and it was due to the vision of such men as General Cannon that this Nation's air arm became

supreme and contributed so heavily to the victory in World War II.

That he was known throughout the service as Uncle Joe is adequate testimonial to the affection in which he was held by the men who served with him and under him. May this Nation ever have in its armed services men of the vision, stature, and capabilities of Gen. John K. Cannon.

MORAL REARMAMENT

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, because most Members of this body are somewhat informed about the great moral rearmament movement, and because 11 of our Members discussed the matter on the floor of this House the other day, I believe it is important that the statement of a group of Asian and African leaders of this movement become a part of the RECORD. These Asian and African leaders, who were among the 1,200 delegates from 51 countries attending the World Assembly for Moral Rearmament here in Washington, have issued this joint statement as the result of the announcement of the coming Asian-African conference in Indonesia.

Behind the statement lie two recent events. In 1952–53, at the invitation of representative Asian leaders, an MRA force of 200 from 25 countries, led by Dr. Frank Buchman, carried out a tour of the major cities of India, Pakistan, and Ceylon. Others were in action in Thailand, Australia, and New Zealand.

One hundred and seventy-four thousand people saw the MRA plays during their 7-month journey. Ten Indian national newspapers published special MRA supplements. The Bombay Chronicle said:

> For the first time millions in Asia became aware of a positive alternative to communism.

In 1953–54 similar international forces moved through the Continent of Africa from Egypt, Tunisia, and Morocco in the north to the Cape Province in the south. In Johannesburg, Pretoria, Cape Town, Lusaka, Salisbury, and other areas the color bar was broken for the first time at MRA meetings acclaimed by the press as introducing a new dimension of racial unity.

In Kenya it is largely the work of MRA-trained men and women which has caused over 500 Mau Mau detainees to renounce their oath.

The Prime Minister of eastern Nigeria, Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe, has said:

> If it were not for moral rearmament, there would be Mau Mau in Nigeria today.

Most of us have felt the moral rearmament movement to be good, but many of us did not dare hope that it could become so far reaching. Its impact is now being felt on six continents. Teeming millions in this world are craving an idealism. If all they are offered is the ideology of the Communists, that is what they will take. If, on the other hand, we can offer them a better ideology, a positive ideology, to fill that vacuum, it would be the strongest attack on a wrong and unsound ideology. Moral rearmament has become a tremendous force, and that force is for the good of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I insert this joint statement in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF ASIAN AND AFRICAN DELEGATES ATTENDING THE MORAL REARMAMENT WORLD ASSEMBLY IN WASHINGTON, D. C.

As Asian and African delegates attending the Moral Rearmament World Assembly in Washington, we wish to state our united conviction that in the global advance of this moral ideology we see humanity's best hope for a permanent peace signed in the hearts of men and not just on paper.

Many people ask, "Which way Asia?" "Which way Africa?" We as Asians and Africans feel that the answer to these questions depends largely on the answer to the question, "Which way America?" When America lives and gives to other nations the ideology of moral rearmament, millions in Africa and Asia will stand at her side. As a result of this world assembly in Washington, we have met changed Americans, men and women who have won our trust. Multiplied, men and women like these can be America's most effective ambassadors abroad.

Many people are also concerned about the forthcoming Asia-Africa conference in Indonesia. We believe that moral rearmament points the way for millions in Asia and Africa to achieve a constructive cooperation which none need fear and which can benefit all mankind.

RESULTS OF MRA IN AFRICA AND ASIA

We presented to this assembly concrete evidence that moral rearmament is:

1. Creating unity between black and white, between east and west, and presenting an alternative to racial supremacy and bloody revolution in South Africa.

2. Providing the cure for the causes of Mau Mau and winning hundreds of Mau Mau to its support.

3. Producing the new moral life in west Africa which is essential in the march toward self-government.

4. Providing the moral factor making negotiations possible between the Tunisian nationalists and the French Government.

5. Giving millions in India a positive alternative to communism and all the isms for the first time.

6. Bringing unity within and between such Asian nations as Japan, Australia, Korea, and the Philippines by eliminating their wartime residue of bitterness and mistrust.

NATO LEADER'S CONVICTION

A distinguished European statesman, Ole Bjorn Kraft, leader of the Danish Conservative Party and former foreign minister and chairman of NATO, voiced our own convictions when he said at the assembly, "moral rearmament has the answer to the burning needs of today. There cannot be found in the world a stronger unifying force. It is a miracle that decades ago Dr. Frank Buchman, initiator of MRA, foresaw what has since become our most urgent need, and now can offer us a trained and disciplined international force with a quarter century's experience in ideological combat."

It is an interesting fact that as a result of Dr. Buchman's work there are now 26 casts, supported by teams of full-time ideological workers, who are simultaneously producing MRA dramas in all five continents. During the Washington assembly invitations came to Dr. Buchman to send further task forces to Brazil, the Philippines, Japan, West Africa, and the Middle East.

NEW ATTITUDE TO AMERICA

We are grateful for all that America has given us in aid and help. In the last resort, however, it is ideas that will decide the future of our continents. At the MRA assembly we heard convictions from Americans in government, business, and from the Negro race that changed our ideas about her and made us want to trust her.

We were, for example, grateful to see our parliamentary representatives introduced on the floor of the United States Senate, along with other parliamentarians attending the MRA assembly. We appreciated the welcome given them by Senators WILEY, GEORGE, SMITH, CASE, and WATKINS.

Most of us have been suspicious of Wall Street, but we were impressed and encouraged to see a Wall Street banker, William C. Wilkes, standing together with Max Bladeck, who was for 26 years a German Communist leader. Mr. Wilkes said: "America does not fully see the connection between moral defeat and ideological disaster. I want to commit the rest of my life with this force of moral rearmament to bring this answer to America and the world. Remaking the world comes first for me from now on." Mr. Bladeck added: "Our unity on this platform is only possible through change in both of us. My dialectical training shows me that, far from betraying my revolutionary longings, in moral rearmament I am fighting for a superior ideology which answers all our problems and is the synthesis for our age."

ROLE OF COLORED PEOPLES

Millions of our fellow countrymen have criticized America for her treatment of her colored peoples. Large numbers of distinguished American Negroes taking part in this assembly saw in MRA the answer.

Mrs. Mary McLeod Bethune, internationally known Negro leader and educator, stated: "There are 16 million people like me in America who have been dreaming, praying, working, toiling, sacrificing, forgiving for an hour like this. Only a basic change of heart in men and women of all races can handle the present integration program in the United States. Laws and law enforcement alone can never do it. This task of morally rearming the Nation is the greatest job to which any of us can apply our energies and talents. To be a part of this great uniting force of our age is the crowning experience of my life."

We were moved to see such reconciliations as occurred between Mrs. Bethune and Mrs. W. P. Wood, of Virginia, whose parents were slave owners. Apologizing for her previous racial prejudice, Mrs. Wood said to Mrs. Bethune, "I am glad to take this opportunity to shake hands publicly with someone of your race, because I helped build racial bitterness. I have decided to commit the rest of my life to building bridges between the two races."

We listened with respect to Joseph Scott, one of the leading Catholic laymen in America, when he said, "The outlook in the world is blacker than it has been in my long years. We can build an atom bomb but never have I seen so much skepticism, so much cynicism, so much bitterness, so much despair and such inadequate preparation for the future. I think the reason is people are losing their faith. Remember it was an American boy who flew over Nagasaki and Hiroshima in a ship made by American boys. The only adequate answer to the hate in the world today is Frank Buchman's philosophy of moral rearmament."

Millions of the East fear the horror and destruction of uncontrolled atomic energy. Therefore we responded to the nuclear physicist from the University of Chicago, Prof. Robert Moon, who pointed out the only basis

on which the dawn of the atomic age can be a blessing to mankind. "We can reap the benefits of atomic energy," he said, "only when we give birth to the new age based on absolute moral standards that moral rearmament is heralding. It is an age essentially of the Holy Spirit first and the intellect second, an age when we first ask God what we should do and then turn our talents, our time and our material strength into doing that."

COMMUNISM OR MORAL REARMAMENT

Millions in our continents are emerging out of colonialism into nationhood. It is a far-reaching revolution. But nationalism is not a big enough motive to build a new world. Our present ways of thinking and living cannot stand indefinitely before the onrush of the tremendous ideological forces aflame in the hearts of millions across the world—the forces which demand change. Change is coming to the nations by either one of two forces—by the Communist revolution or by the renaissance of moral rearmament.

The greatest challenge facing us is not the unity and the passion of the Communist world but the lack of unity and the lack of passion of the free world. Which nation will live inspired democracy so compellingly that Russia and China and all nations will change?

Some of us have led revolutions in our countries. We have fought for freedom, often with bitterness and hatred. We have been at each other's throats as races, believing a bloody revolution alone would change the structure of society.

But we fought the wrong way. We believe the ultimate tragedy for mankind would be if the world were to divide on color lines.

Moral rearmament has brought us a unity born of change starting with ourselves and compelling enough to bridge every barrier. It is the new statesmanship, the ideological perspective which alone is adequate for 1955. It is a new light of hope for Asia and Africa—and America too. For MRA is doing for Africa and many of our countries what Abraham Lincoln did for the United States. It is binding up the nations' wounds and setting the people free.

Our vision is of a mighty force of committed men and women in every land who will make moral rearmament the policy of their nations. To this task we pledge our lives.

SIGNATORIES

P. N. Rajabhoj, Member of Parliament, India; one of the representatives of the 60 million in the scheduled castes and secretary of the All-India Scheduled Castes Federation.

R. T. Lim, member, House of Representatives, the Philippines.

Brij Mohan Thapar, director, Karamchand Thapar & Bros., Ltd., Calcutta, India.

George Fernandes, union official, Bombay Dock Workers Union, India.

Devar Surya Sena, OBE, son of the first Ceylonese to preside over the Legislative Assembly of Ceylon; distinguished musician recently decorated by Queen Elizabeth II of England.

Daw Nyein Tha, educator, Burma.

Dr. Katie Woo So Tsing, MBE, JP, educator, Hong Kong.

Senator Takeshi Togano, member of the Executive, Rightwing Socialist Party, Japan.

Takasumi Mitsui, chairman, the Mitsui Foundation, Japan.

Dr. William Nkomo, founder and first president, African National Congress Youth League, South Africa.

Michael Ogon, MP, Under Secretary, Ministry of Lands, Eastern Nigeria.

The Tolon Na, Yakubu Tali, Member of Parliament, president, Northern Territories Council, Gold Coast, representing 1½ million people.

Miss Mary Waruhiu, daughter of the late Kikuyu Senior Chief Waruhiu, murdered by the Mau Mau, and sister of David Waruhiu, pioneer of Mau Mau rehabilitation in Kenya.

Godfrey Agbim, general secretary, Nigerian Students of Great Britain and Ireland.

Fred McEwen, president, Lagos City College, Nigeria.

Prof. Abolfazl Hazeghi, three times member of Iranian Parliament; personal representative of H. I. M. the Shah of Iran.

Maj. Gen. M. H. Farrag, formerly commanding northern area, Egypt, who accompanied Prime Minister Nasser's personal representative to the Assembly.

THE ANTHRACITE COAL INDUSTRY

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the present and past administrations have been derelict in appreciation of the desperate problem confronting the anthracite coal industry of this Nation, located in northeastern Pennsylvania and centered in Luzerne County. For all practical purposes, within a six-county area, there exists one of America's greatest and most basic fuel potentials. The deadly enemy of the anthracite coal industry is water. To strike at the heart of this enemy, I have today introduced a bill "to provide for temporary measures of flood control and anthracite mine drainage, and for other purposes." The President in his budget message to the House today indicates an awareness of this problem in asking for $8,500,000 to institute a program. I am satisfied that the Congress now recognizes that the presence of large volumes of water in anthracite coal formations involves serious wastages of the fuel resources of the Nation, and constitutes a menace to health, safety, and national security. I am confident it will be the policy of the 84th Congress, as provided for in my bill, to provide for the control and drainage of water in the underground anthracite coal formations and thereby conserve natural resources, promote national security, prevent injuries and loss of life, and preserve public and private property.

My bill provides that the total amount of contribution through the United States Government by the Secretary of the Interior shall not exceed $8,500,000. This amount to be matched by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to have full responsibility for installing, operating, and maintaining the drainage projects, satisfying the United States Government that it will enforce effective installation, operation, and maintenance safeguards.

The success of this project will be the greatest shot in the arm to the sick anthracite coal industry in many years.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, it will be my purpose in the 30 minutes allotted me to once again alert my colleagues in the House to the dangers and the pitfalls contained in this latest attempt of the internationalist group in the Congress to ram down the throat of the American public a 3-year extension of our Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, with added authority vested in the President to further reduce the present import duty rates on foreign products by 15 percent below rates as are contained in the present act.

The latest move to make every American industry "a pawn in the game of international politics," with our State Department sitting in for us at the poker table in Geneva, is to be found in H. R. 1, already introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], who, as a member of the Randall Commission, is merely a front for our State Department and a group of investors and international bankers whose prime objective is to make it more profitable for American capital to invest abroad than to spend their money in the development of our own country.

Any neophyte Member of the Congress knows that the gentleman from Tennessee never wrote the provisions of H. R. 1.

If the Randall Commission report is the panacea for all our economic ills, then the gentleman from Tennessee, who is chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, is merely engaging in some artistic window dressing when he goes through the formality of committee hearings which I am advised opened today.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order, more perhaps for enlightenment than in the expectation of any action, but it seems to me that what the gentleman has just said is a reflection upon the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BAILEY. Of course I did not intend it as such.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know the gentleman did not intend it that way. All right—let it go.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman from Tennessee goes quite far afield when he proposed to write a blanket of legitimacy over the General Agreements on Tariff and Trade, which was conceived out of wedlock at Geneva, Switzerland, in 1945, and which is today functioning as an illegitimate offspring of some "fair haired" boys in our State Department.

In this connection, I want to call attention to subsection I, section A, of the Cooper bill which reads as follows:

> The President * * * is authorized from time to time—
>
> (A) To enter into foreign trade agreements with foreign governments or instrumentalities thereof containing provisions with respect to international trade, including provisions relating to tariffs, to most-favored-nation standards and other standards of nondiscriminatory treatment affecting such trade, to quantitative import and export restrictions, to customs formalities, and to other matters relating to such trade designed to promote the purpose of this sec-

tion similar to any of the foregoing: *Provided*, That, except as authorized by subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, no such provision shall be given effect in the United States in a manner inconsistent with existing legislation of the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes; if the gentleman will make it brief.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will. If I understand the gentleman correctly, then, he does not charge nor intimate that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, in introducing that bill, is insincere. He does not charge that the gentleman from Tennessee does not believe in the principles enunciated therein?

Mr. BAILEY. I certainly do not. I just charge that he is not the author of it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BAILEY. Now, let us scan this section more carefully and read between the lines.

It says the President is authorized to enter into trade agreements, including provisions relating to tariffs, to the most favored nations standards, to quantitative import and export restrictions.

If you, my colleagues, fall suckers for this pot of international porridge, I suggest you see your family doctor about the possibility of having your head bored. There is the possibility that it might prove to be empty.

The Congress, when it initiated our reciprocal trade policy in 1934 and later in a major revision of the act in 1945, never surrendered its constitutional authority to control tariffs. All it did was to set up the United States Tariff Commission as an adjunct to the Congress for the purpose of holding hearings and making recommendations for upping or lowering existing rates. He was given only limited powers by Congress; does not come into the picture as a tariff-rate adjuster until and unless the Tariff Commission fails to reach a majority decision in cases coming up under a peril point or an escape clause action.

The Congress never delegated any authority to our State Department. On the slight pretext that, when a trade agreement has been negotiated by the President, they arrogantly assumed they were the sole administrators of our tariff policies. This bold assumption has led us into the morass of international intrigue. I need only mention the Otis incident some 3 years ago when the Congress ordered the cancelation of the trade agreement with Czechoslovakia. You recall there was a delay of several months, because we found it was necessary to convene representatives of all the signatory nations to the Geneva convention and get their consent to nullify our treaty with the Czechs.

Now the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] proposes to nullify the authority of our Tariff Commission and transfer this power to Geneva where there will be 1 American delegate to 33 foreigners sitting on a board to deal with such purely domestic American affairs as our agriculture and industrial welfare. Facetiously, may I, at this point, say shades of Wendell Willkie's one world.

If the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] succeeds in giving the President power to change quantitative restrictions, as indicated in section A of his bill, it would permit nullification of the provisions of our Agriculture Act that provides restrictions on a percentage basis of shipments of foreign cotton into this country. It would destroy the present quota limit on shipments of Puerto Rican and Cuban sugar into this country and endanger the quota restrictions set up for most agricultural products.

May I ask my colleagues who are members of the cotton bloc, the sugar bloc, or the wheat bloc—how you would like to have your producers go to Geneva for a redress of their grievances instead of coming to Washington in the good old American way to see the Congress or the Tariff Commission?

The illegitimate setup at Geneva has never been submitted to the other body of the Congress for approval or for disapproval. The Committee for Reciprocity Information, orginated by the State Department, has no legal authorization and the International Trade Organization has been rejected by the Congress.

Does the gentleman from Tennessee presume to think the other body will lend its approval to legalizing the outlaw group at Geneva that assumes to obligate the United States without congressional approval?

It might be well for me to call the gentleman's attention to the statement of disapproval written into the legislation by the other body, renewing and extending the Trade Agreements Act by the 82d Congress in 1951.

Here is the exact wording that makes it plain that the other body wants no part of the responsibility. I quote from Public Law 50, 82d Congress, section 10:

> The enactment of this act shall not be construed to determine or indicate the approval or disapproval by the Congress of the Executive agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

In view of the seriousness of the steps about to be taken in the proposed agreement, it is highly urgent that certain general considerations and factors of wide application be given attention. The proposed agreement, because of the probable serious economic repercussions that may be expected to result from it, highlights in sharper outline than ever before certain features of the trade agreements procedures and practices. This is particularly true because the proposed conference in Geneva in February follows what has gone on before. The most startling aspect of the proposal is that the present procedures are along the same lines as those that have been vigorously protested in the past by those who have been injured. Dissatisfaction has been widespread. Expressions of disagreement have been numerous and vehement. These expressions have come from highly responsible sources throughout the country. And they have been ignored, callously brushed aside and treated with what amounts to contempt.

Presumably the stiff-necked attitude of those responsible for the procedures can be ascribed most accurately to the arrogance of power. Sometimes officialdom falls to the temptation that to listen is unnecessary; that those who speak may be given a few moments of attention before a panel and then, the formalities over, thoroughly forgotten.

It is not the nature of the American people or any general segment of them spread throughout the country to relish treatment of this character. We have long been and continue to be very jealous of adherence to the rules of the game and to the same degree we long have been and continue to be sensitive to unfair play and attempted distortions of basic lines of authority and responsibility. We do not like to be bamboozled or hornswoggled, at least not in serial fashion.

There exists a deep-seated feeling, born of repeated experience, that a hearing before the Committee for Reciprocity Information is window dressing. It is regarded as a sham designed to satisfy in form but not in substance the demands of our general conscience that hearings be accorded to those who will be greatly affected by what officialdom proposes to do.

It should be said that this impression persists as a result of previous hearings; and hope is about gone that the hearings recently held on the proposed Japanese Treaty will be any different. The arrogance of power rapidly habituates itself to certain forms and rarely changes of its own accord.

In recent years the status of the Committee for Reciprocity Information has taken on a new aspect. When the peril point procedure was written into law in 1948 and again, after repeal, in 1951, the United States Tariff Commission was designated by Congress as the hearing agency preparatory to any future trade agreement. The Committee for Reciprocity Information was not given any such function.

The question naturally arises why hearings should be held by that committee at all. Do these duplicate hearings imply that the Tariff Commission is incompetent? Does it mean that the executive departments do not trust an agency of Congress to do a fair and honest piece of work?

We find it hard to believe that the actions of the Committee for Reciprocity Information are motivated by such considerations. We are convinced, after considering other possibilities, that the real purpose of these duplicate hearings is to supply the President with an escape from the peril point and escape clause findings of the Tariff Commission. If that is not the proper explanation we implore the committee to correct our impression.

If our interpretation is correct we have the spectacle of the executive department busying itself seeking ways and means of nullifying the work of an agency of Congress. In broad daylight this should have the appearance of a sinister absurdity. Actually it is a living symbol of the executive struggle to possess itself of final authority over tariff administration. As such it is also a

living example of an attempted alienation of constitutional rights in the name of a delegation of power.

Those whose interests are at stake in the fields of industry, agriculture, and labor are called before an executive group to show cause why certain of their economic assets should not be exposed to impairment or deprivation through an international agreement about to be entered into and executed by the executive power. Obviously, the steps proposed to be taken consist of the regulation of foreign commerce.

Keeping in mind where the Constitution lodges responsibility for the regulation of our foreign commerce, namely in Congress, the present procedural arrangement is obviously far afield. The voice of Congress is lost in the distance. There is no longer any connection between congressional elections and the making of trade agreements. The responsiveness of Congress to the electorate has been drowned in the official propaganda that has for 20 years identified the State Department as the agency of authority in the field of tariffs and trade. Schoolchildren and college students have been so inculcated with this distorted concept that it is only with amazement that they learn that it is the function of Congress to regulate our foreign trade.

Yet Congress has the undoubted responsibility to regulate foreign commerce and to establish and adjust tariff rates. It is a perversion of this responsibility to pass such authority to another branch of the Government to do with it as it sees fit.

The Congress is responsive to the electorate and it was intended that it should be thus responsive. In Congress differences of opinion are voiced and recorded by vote. In the executive departments opinions in the field of tariffs and trade represent a monotony of sameness as a result of appointments made with that end in view. They are not reflective of the opinion of the electorate as is the case in Congress.

That is why under our system of government it is constitutionally wrong to substitute the Executive voice for the legislative in carrying out the responsibilities of Congress.

There is yet a further objection.

Under the trade agreements program certain commitments are entered into to bind certain tariff rates or absence of a tariff, as in the case of free-list items. The Executive is, of course, totally devoid of authority to bind Congress to anything upon which it has a right and responsibility to legislate. To say otherwise would be to go counter to the basic concept of checks and balances in our system of government.

Any Congress has the right to repeal or amend any previous legislation, including legislation relating to tariff rates. No Executive can properly bargain away or curtail or abridge this right. To do so would be to deprive any newly elected Congress from legislating according to what might be the will of the people. This will is subject to change. The change of opinion is not unusual. It represents the play of intelligence and human sensibilities and interests on the concurrence or sequence of events. The impact of previous legislation is measured, even if only dimly in the minds of the voters, and at election time the changes are recorded. Usually this means some overturn in congressional representation.

Now why go through the travail and commotion of elections if the new Congress is to have no voice in matters of great and vital interest to the voters? If the legislative grounds are posted by the Executive against trespass by the Congress, what has become of our system of government?

House bill 1, the Cooper bill, gives the President the right to lower existing tariff rates by 15 percent over the next 3 years. It also gives the President authority to lower ad valorem rates fixed in the Smoot-Hawley Act of 1930, if that rate is presently above one half of the rate set forth in the basic law.

The impact that is sure to come, as the result of these reductions, will complete the ruin of more than a score of the Nation's industries now operating without profits or on a marginal basis. It will place in economic jeopardy more than a hundred other industries that are not mass producing and are not engaged in the export trade.

The adoption of this policy means we will soon cease to be a nation of producers and become a nation of importers. The only exception will be a closed-shop monopoly by a select group of mass producing industries such as steel, automobiles, and heavy equipment.

There are added pitfalls for the American producer in the proposed new Japanese trade agreement. We are told it is necessary that we consider Japan as a most favored nation in trade matters in order to keep the Japanese from going communistic. The irony of this is the fact now they think they have us hog-tied. The newly elected Premier of Japan has already opened negotiations for trade agreements with both Red China and Russia.

Is Japan to become a clearinghouse for the entry into our country of slave-labor products coming from behind the Bamboo Curtain? If this is the major idea back of the talk of coexistence, then some folks here at home had better be prepared to take up a notch or two in their belts.

What little is left of West Virginia's glassware and pottery industry will be completely wiped out by imports from Japan, where the wage scale is from 9 to 19 cents per hour compared to $1.72 in our West Virginia plants.

As an illustration of what will happen, let me call attention to a news article in a Parkersburg, W. Va., paper announcing the decision of seven of the Nation's leading marble producers located in West Virginia and Illinois to close all of their plants should the trade agreements with added tariff cuts be approved by Congress.

I believe I should leave a word of caution to my colleagues in New England and in the South, where textiles is a flourishing industry. They, too, will have to meet the impact of imports made under subnormal working conditions and lower wages.

A glance at the list of industries protesting the new Japanese Treaty should be a warning to the proponents of this legislation that American industry and American labor are aroused over this effort to put our Nation on a free-trade basis.

It was approximately 1 year ago that I, along with several other of my colleagues, stood here in the well of the House and literally "took apart" the Randall Commission report. We did it so effectively that the administration's forces backed away from the idea of a 3-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act and offered a compromise 1-year extension, which was granted.

The Congress was then controlled by the Republicans. It is now in control of the Democrats. If this fantastic idea, of having the Congress surrender its tariff-making authority and vest this power in a tribunal setup at Geneva and controlled by foreigners is carried out, then my party must accept full responsibility for the economic desolation that will hit widespread areas throughout the Nation.

Are you, my Democratic friends, on the right of the center aisle, willing to take on this responsibility? You already know of the loss of jobs, the want, and hunger that exists in many areas of the Nation due to our unfair trade policies. Your first duty is to the people of your district and the State you represent. You must insist, as I insist, that any trade agreements adopted by this Congress must provide for equality of treatment to all American producers. Our economy, to be healthy and lasting, must be a nationwide economy.

Already the Russian press is alerting the free peoples of the world to the sad plight, the hunger, and starvation that exists in the New England textile areas and in the coal fields of West Virginia, and other mining States. Shall we, by act of Congress, unwittingly set up other situations that will subject us to further criticism?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. Certainly, no one in this House is more consistent in his position on these matters so far as this side is concerned than the gentleman from West Virginia who has serious tariff problems affecting industries in his district. I take it for granted that the gentleman will comment upon those great destructive forces not only against the hard-coal industry but against the soft-coal industry as a result of the implication of residual fuel oil.

Mr. BAILEY. I can assure the gentleman from Pennsylvania that he and the other Members of the House will be hearing from me quite often, and that I will deal with his Pennsylvania coal situation.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. I may say to the gentleman from West Virginia that I am deeply concerned about the effort to write into the treaty with Japan an agreement for lowering the tariff on textile products. I am wondering if the gentleman would discuss the question as

to whether or not the present provisions in our Trade Agreements Act to the effect that when the peril point to any industry is reached, such industry may make a showing and be protected from further lowering of the tariff.

How is that administered and is it effective in protecting the textile industry?

Mr. BAILEY. May I say to the gentleman that the situation is bad enough under the provisions of the present Trade Agreements Act, but if he will read subsections 1 and 2 of section (a) of the proposal made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] he will find new language that never was included in previous agreements. It is under that section where you textile folks from the South are going to get hurt provided we give the President what he asks that he be given in the way of authority under that section.

Mr. LANHAM. Has the peril-point provision been effective?

Mr. BAILEY. It has not. That was only in existence for approximately 2 years and taken out. It was put in by the 80th Congress and taken out by the 81st. The Tariff Commission does use the peril-point provision as a basis for making its determinations. The gentleman was in the 81st Congress when I succeeded in writing the escape clause into the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act by the assistance of some of my good friends over in the Senate; but, let me say the way they have administered the escape clause under the provisions of our present act has practically nullified the intent of the Congress in trying to bring relief to more than 100 American industries that are today facing bankruptcy. Those industries are making no profits for themselves and they are forced to discharge their employees because they cannot meet this competition.

Mr. LANHAM. Was an attempt made before your industries reached that point to put into effect the peril-point provision rather than wait until treaties had been entered into?

Mr. BAILEY. May I say to the gentleman from Georgia that I appeared as a witness before the Tariff Commission considering the upping of the rates on the importation of clothespins. I have one of the largest clothespin plants in the world in my district. I not only advised them as to what I thought was the intent of the Congress in passing that escape-clause provision but I proved to them by correspondence from the American Embassy in Copenhagen that one of the big importers of clothespins from Denmark did not even have a plant. They were buying clothespins made in the prisons of Denmark and bringing them in here under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; yet, the Tariff Commission delivered one of its 3–3 decisions. It went to the President. What happened? He turned it down despite what was going on, making a farce out of the hearings had before the Tariff Commission. Unless you know the conditions under which the items were produced that are coming in here you cannot make a decision. You do not know whether they are made by free labor, slave labor, or under what conditions they are made.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I wish to compliment the gentleman on the concise and vigorous language that he has used in analyzing H. R. 1. I agree with him entirely in his criticism of that language and in his vigorous protest against it. He has laid an excellent foundation for the few remarks I am going to make on this floor on Thursday of this week.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from Illinois and may I advise him that I am not through with this so-called Cooper bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I agree with the gentleman in his statement of the great damage that is being done to our textile and some other industries in the United States, particularly to those in my own district. I would like to say at this point that what the Russians said about the people of New England starving, of course, was untrue. But may I quote one thing here?

Mr. BAILEY. The gentlewoman may, but may I say before you read that, we should not permit conditions to exist that would offer them an excuse to use that kind of propaganda.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. As I said before, if we help other countries but consign the people of our own districts to poverty, that is the surest way to bring about communism in this country. But, the Russian article is very false. Let me quote just briefly:

> In these cities, he said, "Their streets are empty; chimneys of large textile and shoe factories give forth no smoke."

New England has done very well in selling shoes this year, I will say. The Russian article goes on to say:

> In shops there is no meat or butter or even margarine. You find here only vegetables, potatoes, beans, and green peas.

That is not true in Lowell, where I live. Lowell is one of the cities mentioned in the article. We have a great many textile workers now out of jobs, but we have new electronics plants there now as well as other new industries that are somewhat taking up the slack.

Mr. BAILEY. Will not the gentlewoman from Massachusetts agree with me that we should not do something here that will create added areas of unemployment like the ones she is talking about?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

THE NEW ENGLAND TEXTILE INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] that I appeared before the Tariff Commission on the 14th of December, and also that same afternoon before the Committee for Reciprocity Information and made what I thought was a vigorous protest. I am going to keep on making that protest as the gentleman knows. Japan has sent, I think, 1,500 percent more textiles into this country than a year ago. I think India has increased her textile output to this country by some 1,200 percent. I think Italy is sending in a good deal of textiles. Woolens are being sent in also from Japan. As you know, Japan is making more and more woolens and, of course, we cannot possibly compete with Japanese woolen cloth manufactured under vastly lower standards than those in America.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me compliment the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for her foresight and judgment.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman will remember the fight we made against Japanese competition before. Prior to World War II it was said that Japan would feel friendly to us if we traded with her. Well, she did not feel friendly toward us when we were struck at Pearl Harbor. As I said then and I say it again now the opening of the American market to uncontrolled foreign importations can have only one effect and that is to lower the standard of living of the workers in America. It will not raise the standard of living in foreign countries and it will not cause the governments of these countries to follow policies favored by America. To think these countries will go along with us is pure daydreaming.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WALTER and to include an address he delivered Saturday night and an article appearing in the paper on yesterday.

Mr. ZABLOCKI.

Mr. ENGLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS and include remarks he made to the 29th Women's Patriotic Conference.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. PATTERSON.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN).

Mr. WESTLAND.

Mr. WOLVERTON and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.), under

its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, January 20, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

250. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report of approval of the emergency undertaking by the Virgin Islands Corporation of certain activities of a type authorized, pursuant to section 7 (a) of the Virgin Islands Corporation Act (48 U. S. C. 1407f (a)); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

251. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report of operations, expenditures, and obligations under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, pursuant to the act of June 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 329) and a report of the on-farm assistance through direct aid to rehabilitate farm land damaged by disastrous floods, pursuant to the act of June 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 329); to the Committee on Agriculture.

252. A letter from the Director, Legislative Programs, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

253. A letter from the Director, Legislative Programs, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide medical care for dependents of members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

254. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a quarterly report showing the number of officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of the Government at the end of the second quarter as of December 31, 1954, pursuant to section 201 (c) of the Air Force Organization Act of 1951, Public Law 150, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

255. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report showing the number of officers above the rank of lieutenant commander in the Navy receiving the average monthly flight pay during the 6-month period preceding January 1, 1955, pursuant to Public Law 301, approved February 18, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

256. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the administration of the Ryukyu Islands, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

257. A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities and the acquisition of land by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

258. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to extend the period of authorization of appropriations for the hospital center and facilities in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

259. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to repeal a service charge of 10 cents per sheet of 100 words, for making out and authenticating copies of records in the Department of State"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

260. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the provisions of law added to the United States Code by the act of August 15, 1953 (Public Law 280, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 588); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

261. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with Dr. James E. Feldmayer, which will, when executed by the Superintendent on behalf of the Government, authorize him to provide medical and hospital services in Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks, Calif., for a period of 1 year from January 1, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

262. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with R. D. Shaw and A. B. Phillips which, when executed, will authorize them to sell soft drinks and other refreshments, tobacco products, souvenirs, and related items, at Shiloh National Military Park, Tenn., during a 5-year period beginning January 1, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

263. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract with W. A. Leimback, which, when executed on behalf of the Government, will authorize him to operate the Staircase Resort in Olympic National Park for a 5-year period from January 1, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

264. A letter from the Attorney General, relative to the awarding of Young American Medals for the calendar year 1953, to Marilyn Baker Haar, Savannah, Ga., Gerald Ray Bergeman, Menan, Idaho, and James Thomas Welch, Jr., Rochester, N. Y., pursuant to the act of August 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 397–398); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

265. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to increase the penalties applicable to seditious conspiracy, advocating overthrow of the Government, and conspiracy to advocate overthrow of the Government"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

266. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Robert Burns DeWitt"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

267. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Rodolfo C. Delgado, Jesus M. Lagua, and Vicente D. Reynante"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 2369. A bill to amend section 7237, of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 2370. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish policies and programs for the use of acreage diverted from production by the establishment of acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 2371. A bill declaring Good Friday in each year to be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASS of Tennessee:

H. R. 2372. A bill to provide for the establishment of a post office at Erin, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2373. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2374. A bill to provide for price supports for dairy products at not less than 90 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 2375. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 65 to 60 the age at which benefits may become payable to widows thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 2376. A bill to provide for cancellation of certain feed and seed loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 2377. A bill to provide a vitalized and equitable Reserve program for the Armed Forces; to provide for the operation of the National Security Training Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 2378. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 2379. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 2380. A bill to relieve the Lane S. Anderson Post, No. 297, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of South Charleston, W. Va., of the obligation to pay for a certain tract of land; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2381. A bill to authorize the issuance of commemorative medals to certain societies of which Benjamin Franklin was a member in observance of the 250th anniversary of his birth; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 2382. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons contracting to deliver certain strategic or critical minerals or metals in cases of failure to recover reasonable costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER:

H. R. 2383. A bill to authorize the establishment of an Inventive Contributions Awards Board within the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 2384. A bill to amend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to provide insured aged persons and their dependents, and survivors of deceased insured persons, with insurance against the cost of hospitalization; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 2385. A bill to indemnify drivers of motor vehicles of the postal service against liability for damages arising out of the operation of such vehicles in the performance of official duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 2386. A bill to provide assistance to communities, industries, business enter-

prises, and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2387. A bill to amend section 4061 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the excise tax on automotive windshields, side windows, and rear windows be imposed on a square-foot basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 2388. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of a hydroelectric project on the Tuolumne River, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 2389. A bill to extend certain benefits to persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in Mexico or on its borders during the period beginning May 9, 1916, and ending April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 2390. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that those monthly insurance benefits which under present law are not payable until age 65 shall hereafter be payable at age 60 in the case of men and at age 55 in the case of women; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 2391. A bill to provide for temporary measures of flood control and anthracite mine drainage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 2392. A bill to provide a deduction, for income-tax purposes, of losses and certain other expenses caused by abnormally high water levels in the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2393. A bill to assist the enforcement of State laws licensing insurance companies, by prohibiting the use of the mails to evade such laws; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2394. A bill to allow a deduction for income-tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, of expenses for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 2395. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 2396. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the late Philip Murray; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. R. 2397. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 65 to 60 the age at which old-age and other monthly insurance benefits may become payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. R. 2398. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to reduce from 65 to 60 years the age at which women may qualify for old-age and survivors insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 2399. A bill to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act to direct the Interstate Commerce Commission to make regulations requiring that freight and other unlighted cars be so equipped that they can be readily seen at night; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2400. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain widows and widowers of retired employees and certain widows of employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2401. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949, so as to provide for import controls and modify the provisions relating to export controls for the protection of American agriculture, labor, and industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2402. A bill to amend the Veterans Regulations in order to eliminate the provision requiring that a payment from a burial association shall be deducted from the burial allowance to a veteran; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. R. 2403. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to change the gross income limitation on the allowance of exemptions for dependents to an adjusted gross income limitation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 2404. A bill relating to the tax treatment to be afforded under section 117 (j) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code in certain cases involving the sale, exchange, or conversion of land with unharvested crops thereon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 2405. A bill to provide that a greater percentage of loans made by veterans for the purpose of refinancing certain types of indebtedness on their homes will be guaranteed by the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2406. A bill to amend subsection (e) of title 47, section 1601, of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, 1951 edition; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2407. A bill to extend service pension benefits to certain persons who served honorably as commissioned officers in the Philippine constabulary; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2408. A bill establishing a general policy with respect to payments to State and local governments on account of Federal real property and tangible personal property by providing for the taxation of certain Federal property and for payments in connection with certain other Federal property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2409. A bill to provide for stockpiling an adequate national safety reserve of food and fiber; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2410. A bill to amend the act of August 28, 1937, as amended, to provide additional credit facilities for farm enlargement and development and to assist beginning farmers to become farm owners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2411. A bill to provide for price supports for whole milk, butterfat, and the products of such commodities at 100 percent of parity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H. R. 2412. A bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which prohibits payments under the agricultural conservation program in certain cases; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 2413. A bill to amend section 25 (b) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, relating to the definition of dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 2414. A bill to provide for refund of the Federal tax paid on gasoline where the gasoline is destroyed by fire, flood, or other casualty while in transit or held for resale; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. R. 2415. A bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 2416. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe regulations relating to the qualifications of persons who assist taxpayers in the determination of their Federal tax liability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 2417. A bill to amend chapter 1, subchapter C, of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 2418. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct tuition expenses paid by him for the education of his children through the 12th grade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 2419. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 2420. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish policies and programs for the use of acreage diverted from production by the establishment of acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 2421. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the centennial celebration of the incorporation of the city of Dover, N. H.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 2422. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 2423. A bill for the relief of the city of Sandpoint, Idaho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 2424. A bill to amend section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to provide for administration of farm programs by democratically elected farmer committeemen; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 2425. A bill to increase efficiency and economy in the Federal Government by providing for training of Federal civilian officers and employees in the performance of official duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 2426. A bill to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2427. A bill to create an Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2428. A bill providing for the rank of certain officers in the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2429. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to furnish headstones to mark the actual or honorary burial places of deceased members or former members of the military and naval forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2430. A bill to release certain restrictions on certain real property heretofore granted to the city of Charleston, S. C., by the United States of America; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2431. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that a net operating loss for a taxable year shall be a net operating loss carryback for the 5 preceding taxable years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2432. A bill to provide that any Federal employee who refuses to answer a question of a committee of the Congress with respect to Communist, Communist-front, or subversive affiliations, shall be removed immediately from the position or office held by him; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2433. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for those civilian employees engaged in hazardous occupations in any branch of the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2434. A bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship by voting in a political election or plebiscite held in Greece on March 5, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2435. A bill to amend the Army Organization Act of 1950 to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2436. A bill to provide hospitalization and medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 2437. A bill to authorize the issuance of commemorative medals to certain societies of which Benjamin Franklin was a member, founder, or sponsor in observance of the 250th anniversary of his birth; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. R. 2438. A bill to amend the cotton marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2439. A bill to authorize an improved entrance and channel for Pensacola Bay, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 2440. A bill to provide that pensions for non-service-connected death shall be extended to the widows and children of deceased World War II and Korean veterans under the same conditions as apply to the widows and children of deceased World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 2441. A bill to amend section 2 (a) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of futures trading in coffee; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 2442. A bill to provide additional pay at the rate of $100 per month for certain scientists serving on active duty with the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2443. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to permit an annuitant to receive his annuity even though he renders compensated service for the outside employer by whom he was last employed before his annuity began to accrue; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2444. A bill to provide for temporary measures of flood control and anthracite mine drainage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H. R. 2445. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the payment of child's insurance benefits to certain individuals who are over the age of 18 but who are incapable of self-support by reason of physical or mental disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 2446. A bill creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 2447. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the 200th anniversary of the expulsion of the Acadians from Nova Scotia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2448. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the migration of the Acadians from Nova Scotia to Louisiana; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2449. A bill to provide for an ad valorem duty on the importation of shrimp; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2450. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness) from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 2451. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to complete the survey of the Kickapoo flood area, and to appropriate $25,000 for such purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2452. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2453. A bill to extend certain benefits to persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in Mexico or on its borders during the period beginning May 9, 1916, and ending April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 2454. A bill to permit the sale of gold within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, including Alaska, and for for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 2455. A bill to authorize the expenditure of public funds for the assistance of State, municipal, and other nonprofit youth projects; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. J. Res. 137. Joint resolution designating the Saturday before Palm Sunday in each year as Crippled Children's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. J. Res. 138. Joint resolution limiting the height of certain radio and television antenna towers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution limiting the height of certain radio and television antenna towers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution providing that the United States shall withhold from representatives of foreign nations privileges which such nations withhold from representatives of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. J. Res. 141. Joint resolution providing for a more effective control of narcotic drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. J. Res. 142. Joint resolution for the establishment of a commission to study the need for simplification, modernization, and consolidation of the public-land laws, to make appropriate recommendations for an effective public-land-law system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BECKER:

H. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. BUCHANAN:

H. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. Con. Res. 32. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. Con. Res. 34. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SHEEHAN:

H. Con. Res. 40. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. Con. Res. 42. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. Res. 88. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 89. Resolution providing funds for the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to House Resolution 88; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. Res. 90. Resolution providing compensation for the services of one minority clerk, Office of the Postmaster; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. Res. 91. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct thorough studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 92. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 91; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in favor of the passage of legislation reducing the age at which persons shall be eligible to receive social-security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take cognizance of the acute problems attending the recent devastation resulting from tidal floods in the Narragansett Bay area, and requesting appropriate action to have the situation surveyed; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to make available to the United States Department of Agriculture, Forestry Service, funds necessary to insure that growing timber in the Sumter National Forest can best be utilized; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. R. 2456. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Diana P. Kittrell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 2457. A bill to authorize the appointment of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur to the grade of General of the Armies of the United States, such appointment to take effect as of his 75th birthday; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 2458. A bill for the relief of Edward Gordon, Morton Gordon, John J. Dahill, Esteban Melendez, Jean Garcia, Marie Flynn, Carmen Rodriquez, and 62 Lenox Avenue, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2459. A bill for the relief of John H. Orth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2460. A bill for the relief of Andreas Boulamandis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2461. A bill for the relief of Lydia Sarrka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 2462. A bill for the relief of Meiko Shikibu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 2463. A bill for the relief of Vito Pupo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 2464. A bill for the relief of Aroussian Agopian and Tacor Agopian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. R. 2465. A bill for the relief of Bernard L. Denn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 2466. A bill for the relief of Marino and Giselda Proni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2467. A bill for the relief of Ivo and Elia Monari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALEY (by request):

H. R. 2468. A bill for the relief of Henry Hauri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 2469. A bill for the relief of Cornelis Zyderveld; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2470. A bill for the relief of T. C. Elliott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2471. A bill for the relief of Finn Bache; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2472. A bill for the relief of the estate of Grady Ward; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2473. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Bingham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 2474. A bill for the relief Philip J. Denton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 2475. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria J. McPherson; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 2476. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josephine Braun Rice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 2477. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Semiramis Hurkus (nee Post); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2478. A bill for the relief of Cosimo Damiano Campanelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 2479. A bill for the relief of Jose Leal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2480. A bill for the relief of Dr. Klaus Schwarz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 2481. A bill for the relief of Giacomo Aiello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2482. A bill for the relief of Myra Wishnetzky Dromi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2483. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Zoltan Goldstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2484. A bill for the relief of Federico Giraldi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2485. A bill for the relief of Hyman Drayer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2486. A bill for the relief of Gronislav Vydaevich and Leonid Zankowsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2487. A bill for the relief of Zeynep Hesna Turkkan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2488. A bill for the relief of Stephania Hnatiw and Maria Hnatiw; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2489. A bill for the relief of Aldo Alvarez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. R. 2490. A bill for the relief of Christel Margaret Meyer (nee Klein); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2491. A bill for the relief of Brunhilde Walburga Golomb Hartsworm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 2492. A bill for the relief of Jahangir Afkhami and Fatima Afkhami Mohajer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2493. A bill for the relief of Henry, Elizabeth, James, and Vivian Jorgensen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

H. R. 2494. A bill for the relief of Maria del Pilar Valcarcel Calderon Armistead; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 2495. A bill for the relief of Antoni Rajkowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2496. A bill for the relief of Mary Mouskalis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2497. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Korkodilos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2498. A bill for the relief of Sister Antonina Zattolo and Sister Antonina Cali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2499. A bill for the relief of Miroslav Yelovitch, identical with Miroslav Jelovcic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 2500. A bill for the relief of Lillian Cummings; to the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H. R. 2501. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Legere; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2502. A bill for the relief of Yoshiko (Clara) Oe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H. R. 2503. A bill for the relief of Samuel Fox Stapleton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 2504. A bill for the relief of Antonio Silva Neves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 2505. A bill for the relief of Dimitrious Antonellos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RADWAN (by request):

H. R. 2506. A bill for the relief of Samson Scholom and Ruth Scholom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 2507. A bill for the relief of Adolph J. Matthews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 2508. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe F. Ravalico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 2509. A bill to authorize John E. Gross to accept the award of the Royal Order of Saint Olav, grade of commander with star, tendered by the Government of Norway; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 2510. A bill for the relief of certain nationals of Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H. R. 2511. A bill for the relief of Rosa Ehrlich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT (by request):

H. R. 2512. A bill for the relief of Masanori Ikebe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2513. A bill for the relief of Riley S. King; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 2514. A bill for the relief of Ibrahim Hilmi Voskay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2515. A bill for the relief of Mohamad Ali Sadri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2516. A bill for the relief of Hyeng Pok Sunoo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2517. A bill for the relief of Lynton John Band; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2518. A bill for the relief of Riong Bong Song and In Sook Song; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2519. A bill for the relief of Ernest Ludwig Bamford and Mrs. Nadine Bamford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2520. A bill for the relief of Grace Cheng and Philip Cheng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 2521. A bill for the relief of Ernest Singer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 2522. A bill for the relief of Isabelle S. Gorrell, Donald E. Gorrell, Mary Owen Gorrell, and Kathryn G. Wright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2523. A bill for the relief of Alton B. York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 2524. A bill for the relief of Oather S. Hall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 2525. A bill for the relief of Madiros Kebabjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 2526. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ante Pavkovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 2527. A bill to authorize the appointment of Nathaniel M. Havenick as a permanent major in the Regular Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 2528. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josette L. St. Marie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2529. A bill for the relief of Albert Vincent, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 2530. A bill for the relief of Joseph Ritchie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Res. 93. Resolution providing that the bill H. R. 1485 and all accompanying papers shall be referred to the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

54. By Mr. DONDERO: Petition of the Michigan Sanatorium Association and Michigan Health Officers Association protesting the transferring of service-connected tuberculosis patients to veterans' hospitals irrespective of distance from the families' homes, resulting in hardships to the patients, and requesting the Veterans' Administration to modify its policy and allow service-connected tuberculosis veterans to be hospitalized at the Veterans' Administration expense in approved local tuberculosis hospitals of their choice, unless there is a veterans' tuberculosis hospital in the same community; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

55. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of 370 residents of Marshall County, Iowa, urging that legislation be enacted to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in newspapers, periodicals, and on radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Must Congressmen Have Additional Pay?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I hope I never get to the point where I think I know it all. I have been opposed to an increase in congressional salaries, because I was of the opinion that Members were getting enough to pay their way on a standard of living that would be commensurate with the dignity of the office. So many Congressmen were telling me that it was impossible for them to live as they should on the present pay. This concerned me, and I was anxious to know just how they lived.

I was told that the dignity of the office demanded that I go to parties, give parties, and dress for occasions befitting our station. It seems that clothes make the man here in congressional estimation. I determined to try out this course of dignity for 2 weeks and see for myself what money was needed. Fortunately, I was invited to many functions and fortunately had friends whom I wanted to entertain.

The first requisite was a formal suit and a hat of the established makeup approved by the President. My cow hat would hardly do, although it cost more than one of these muley Homburg hats. I inquired of a tailor about dress suits. He reported that $175 was about as cheap as he could furnish one, but said, "Don't worry, I will rent you a suit for $10." "Lord," I responded, "you don't mean to say that these august Members of Congress go to parties in rented clothes, do you?" "Why, yes," he responded, "a large percentage of the Members do that very thing." This was an eye opener for me to realize that these splendid mannish figures I had seen floating across the society surface of this Capitol were just ordinary men in rented suits. I thought what a sham and a pity this was, and determined right there if I were going to do any buzzing around in society, by the Eternal, I would at least own the outfit.

Well, I rigged up, and while I looked like a cranberry merchant in the little Homburg hat, I felt at ease because I knew the society in which I was about to enter, approved.

I had more trouble with this spike-tail suit. When I tried it on, it seemed too tight and I did not dare to bend over. I complained to the tailor, and he said it was made that way so I would be stiff and formal in my appearance. It seems these tailors are used to building trousers for "cathammed" diplomats but not for he-men. I tried it on in the office and a lady came in. I graciously bowed as I supposed I should learn the Sir Walter Raleigh act, and to my astonishment I heard a good ripping noise under my coattail and quickly erected myself. When the lady went out I made a check-up of my outfit and found the trousers had split right down from the waist to the end of the seam. But my confusion ended, for the spiketail took care of all embarrassment. I then learned what this spike-tail was for. It will cover up a multitude of errors.

I went out to parties and gave them. I was quite stiff and starchy and unnaturally erect—on account of this trouser trouble—and my everyday friends thought I was getting "uppish" in long service in Congress. We took in nice places with nice people, and I remember the first party I entertained. There were eight people, the men all dressed lightly and the ladies much more so. I thought when I started to that dinner that $50 would do, but when the waiter began figuring, I lost heart—I knew I was stuck. The steaks were $32, the drinks $15, and the tips $3, plus taxi fares and tips again. These tip receivers do not have any mercy on a poor man under these circumstances, and the guests seem to pry into your affairs and find out just how much you tipped. They probably want to know right from the beginning whether you are traveling under the orthodox requirements of a Member of Congress, or whether you are in fact a tightwad. Well, when I got the bill the $50 did not do, and I reached in my coat pocket—there was not room in my trousers for a billfold—and pulled out a $100 bill. I felt like impressing this party that I never carried any change less than that.

I kept up the rounds for a week, just to see what it cost a Congressman to live in proper style while performing his duties to the people. My invitations increased when that $100 was exhibited. I met many nice people I had not met before, I kept up the appearance of being very stiff and formal—I had to on account of my pants—and in all, I think I made the desired impression and convinced these people that I was a regular hard-working Member of Congress and of whom his friends were proud.

When the week ended I found I had spent $500, and it just occurred to me that I would have to abruptly end this profligate system of expense, or I could not live here in that fashion on $12,500 annually. I am back now on my standard of living, but feel that this experiment was worth all it cost. I would like to keep up that program, but I cannot do it on the salary I am getting. Probably $25,000 as the President demands for Members of Congress would not do the job either, because you know most of this $25,000 will be taken by the Government for taxes, especially when you have any other income to which this salary is attached for tax purposes.

I did not like to exclude myself from this gorgeous round of pleasure, but I finally asked myself this question: "What are you in Washington for, to work for the Nation and North Dakota, or to entertain?" I finally—I was compelled to—concluded that I had better go on just as I had done for many years, doing what I was elected to do and deny myself this grand and glorious society life. I am back now on ham and eggs and liver sausage, and at least feel at home. I will not continue this experiment for the second week—I would have had to borrow money if I did.

Please do not misunderstand me, I favor this social life. I would like to keep it up. When we are bawled out by the people if we do and do not on certain legislation a Member begins to feel like a worm, but this wormy feeling all disappears when you get into one of those formal affairs. The only time I have felt important since coming to Washington was when I wore one of these make-ups and was dishing out the money to everyone who came along. I am perfectly willing to try to do my work and do some society flitting, but I must have more pay to do it. If the people of North Dakota have no objection I will take this $25,000 or as much more as I can get to carry out the orthodox way of congressional living.

Danger of Lowering Tariffs on Japanese Crabs and Oysters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1955

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, an international tariff-negotiation conference will be held in Geneva, Switzerland, in February under the sponsorship of the countries associated in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The Committee for Reciprocity Information has announced that it will consider granting reductions in the present tariffs on imported fresh, frozen, and canned crab and on imported oysters packed in airtight containers. It is my opinion that any reduction in these present tariff schedules would have a disastrous effect upon the American crabbing and oyster industries.

At the present time there is a 22½ percent ad valorem tariff on imported canned crab and a 15 percent ad valorem duty on fresh and frozen crab. In spite of these tariffs, of the canned crab sold in the United States in 1954, Japan supplied about 60 percent while American producers supplied only about 40 percent. The situation has been growing steadily worse. For example, in 1950 crab imports from Japan were 1,761,000 pounds while in 1953 the figure had increased to 3,860,880 pounds—a more than 100 percent increase. Contrast this with the American canned crab pack which declined during these same years from 137,490 cases to 114,886 cases—a more than 20 percent decrease.

Japan was able so to invade the American crab market not because of a superior product but simply because an average worker in the American crabbing industry is paid about as much in 1 hour as the average Japanese crab worker receives in 1 day. In order to maintain the high wages and standards of the American crab industry—which I believe must be done—the American crab industry must have the protection of the present tariff. Failure to provide adequate protection would take American crab—including the world famous Dungeness crab—off the market.

There is another great danger which would certainly come from the lowering of the present tariffs on crab. If additional markets were to be opened in the United States by lower tariffs on crab, Japan undoubtedly would seek to supply these markets. Crabbing waters which Japan had owned, controlled, and fished prior to World War II were given to Russia under the Yalta agreement. In order to increase her crab production, Japan undoubtedly would make a deal with Russia either to purchase Russian crab for sale on the American market or to obtain fishing rights from the Russians in Russian waters. Whatever course of action was followed would be to the financial benefit of the Soviet Union. I believe there is a great unanimity of opinion in this country that we should do nothing to aid or strengthen Russia. A further lowering of the tariff on crab might well have such an effect.

The American oyster industry also would be in grave danger were present tariffs on oysters in airtight containers reduced. At the present time, imported oyster products from Japan are selling for 25 percent under the prices of American producers on steamed canned oysters and up to 40 percent under American producers on smoked oysters, canned or in glass.

Again, in the oyster industry a great difference exists between the wages paid the American and Japanese oyster worker. Whereas in the Pacific coast oyster industry the lowest hourly wage is $1.55 per hour, in Japan the daily wage is 90 cents or less.

Furthermore, the American oyster grower is required to meet numerous State and Federal sanitary regulations in order to protect the American consumer fully. The added cost of complying with such regulations must be reflected in the final costs of the products. By contrast, Japanese oyster products are inspected and regulated only at time of entry. They are not required to meet the United States sanitary regulations at the point of production, and this in itself gives the Japanese oyster producers a very definite and unfair price advantage.

Actually, it would be to the disadvantage of Japan to have the American oyster industry destroyed, as the oyster industry in this country is a substantial purchaser of seed from Japan. If American oyster producers have to shut down, the Japanese seed-oyster industry most certainly will suffer.

Those who are engaged in the crab and oyster industries recognize the need for helping industries in other countries. But it seems foolhardy to give such help at the cost of survival of our American industries. The very livelihood of many of the residents of our small towns on the Pacific coast would be in jeopardy if the tariffs on Japanese crab and oysters were lowered. Fair play demands that these people not have their existence imperiled by actions taken by the United States Government.

Hetch Hetchy Bill Beneficial to Both San Francisco and Mountain Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1955

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I have again introduced legislation which authorizes the Tuolumne County Water District No. 2 to develop the power potential of the Tuolumne River near the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir of the city of San Francisco.

The development would be partly on lands in the public domain, and the stretch of the river proposed to be developed is in the area covered by a license granted to the city of San Francisco in 1913 under the so-called Raker Act; thus development by the district requires action by the Congress.

The legislation I have introduced provides that the profits from this power development can be used only for assisting and expanding agricultural development and municipal water development in Tuolumne County. The legislation provides further that the electric energy from the development can be sold only to public agencies of the State of California and that the rights granted for the development cannot be sold, assigned or transferred to any private person or corporation.

This valuable power drop has been sitting idle for 40 years despite the great demand for electric energy that has existed in the area. It seems only right and appropriate that the local area, which furnishes the water, shares in the benefits from the development of its resources. Expansion of agriculture and the furnishing of low-cost electric energy to the power consumers through public agencies benefits not only the local area but our whole national economy.

When I introduced this legislation in the last Congress there was opposition from the city of San Francisco. I want to cooperate with San Francisco and have so stated to its officials. This legislation takes nothing away from the city—not a bucket full of water. As a matter of fact, the water available to the city would be increased as seepage and evaporation losses would be reduced to some extent. Financially, this proposal would benefit San Francisco as it would be paid for benefits from regulation of Hetch Hetchy Reservoir. Both San Francisco and Tuolumne County would benefit under this legislation.

San Francisco's development on the Tuolumne River has been a virtual gold mine to the city for over 40 years. The local area does not begrudge the city the benefits it has received. However, we do believe it is high time the local area look to its own future and therefore this Tuolumne County water district is requesting an opportunity to share in development of its own remaining resources.

Under the provisions of the Raker Act, San Francisco cannot develop this power potential itself but some officials have taken the view that no one else should be allowed to develop it. San Francisco has had 40 years to fully develop and operate the Hetch Hetchy project. It has failed to do this.

Congress in passing the so-called Raker Act of 1913 made clear its intention to limit the city and county of San Francisco in its use of the Tuolumne area to the requested purpose—water supply, and such incidental power as might thereby be developed; provisions were inserted requiring timely development by the city of as much power as was needed for municipal uses. The Hetch Hetchy project thus came into being, as a permissive use of Federal properties under tightly drawn restrictions, with limitations clearly specified. In other words, Congress passed the Raker Act to assist the city in meeting its water needs and the power development was

incidental to the development of a water supply. Congress consented to the inclusion of power in the project only on the condition that it would be operated without private profit for the benefit of the power consumers of San Francisco and the power would not be sold or transferred to any private individual or corporation for the purpose of resale at a profit. Also, it was the intention of Congress that the people of San Francisco should be furnished low-cost electric energy, not that the city should use the project as a means of reducing its tax assessment. There is little possibility the Congress will amend the Raker Act to permit exploitation of the resources belonging to all the people.

I am confident that hearings on this bill will help determine, first, whether San Francisco, which is generating power under a Federal permissive use of Federal property, should be permitted, in perpetuity, to bottle up this power potential, at present undeveloped and being wasted and surplus to any foreseeable power needs of the city; second, whether city officials have complied with the restrictions and limitations of the Raker Act with respect to the development and disposal of power from the Hetch Hetchy project; and third, whether Congress, in the Federal and public interest and entirely in keeping with the restrictions and limitations of the 40-year-old Raker Act, should not reexamine that act with the view toward amending it to permit the people in the immediate watershed area to obtain benefits public in nature which will permit local agricultural and community development in Tuolumne County in the same manner in which the earlier Federal legislation involving the same area was intended to bring public, and I emphasize, public benefits to the city and county of San Francisco.

The Dredging of the Housatonic River Must Be Completed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1955

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of satisfaction that the budget presented to the Congress today contains a recommendation for an appropriation of $750,000 to complete the dredging of the channel to Culver's Bar in the Housatonic River.

This recommendation, if passed by Congress, means the end of a mission designed to bring reduced utility costs to individuals and manufacturers in Connecticut. The last budget submitted to Congress contained an item of $500,000 for this project. Subsequent action by the Congress reduced this amount to $400,000. Today's figure of $750,000 represents the Army Corps of Engineers' estimate of the amount needed to finish the work.

During last year's hearing on this project before the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, testimony was presented by an official of the Connecticut Light & Power Co. that plans call for the expansion of the company's largest steam-electric generating plant located at Devon, Conn., 4 miles from the mouth of the Housatonic River. It was estimated that by 1960, the Devon plant will consume a total of 1 million tons of coal a year, compared with 640,015 tons in 1953. The improvement in the channel will permit the delivery of coal to the Devon plant by larger barges and it is estimated that a saving in the delivered price of coal of 50 cents per ton will be achieved.

The project as authorized in House Document 449 of the 70th Congress provides for local contributions in the amount of $150,000 on the part of the Connecticut Light & Power Co. and the amount of $50,000 on the part of the adjoining towns in lieu of providing suitable bulkheaded areas for the deposit of dredged material.

Any savings in transportation costs to the power company are directly passed on to its consumers throughout the State of Connecticut by means of a fuel adjustment clause included in the rates of the company. Therefore, by the completion of this project, the taxpayers of Connecticut stand to gain as much as $500,000 a year by 1960 in reduced power costs. It is my sincere hope that this recommendation will be passed by Congress with no reduction in amount.

A Bill Designed To Encourage Private Insurance Organizations To Experiment in Providing Broader Voluntary Health Insurance to More People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1955

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a health bill, H. R. 2533, entitled "A bill to improve the public health by encouraging more extensive use of the voluntary prepayment method in the provision of personal health services." This bill is substantially identical to H. R. 8356, 83d Congress, in the form in which that bill was reported favorably on July 9, 1954, by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—House Report No. 2106.

H. R. 400, which I introduced on January 5 and which has the same title as this bill, is substantially identical with H. R. 8356, 83d Congress, as originally introduced by me in the form in which that bill was recommended by President Eisenhower.

The present bill, H. R. 2533, provides for the establishment of a health reinsurance program in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It creates a reinsurance fund and authorizes an appropriation of not to exceed $25 million to provide advances of working capital for the fund. The fund would be built up over a period of time from reinsurance premiums and from earnings of the fund. Reinsurance would be available on a voluntary basis and upon payment of a reinsurance premium, to private insurance companies, voluntary nonprofit health associations, such as Blue Cross and other organizations offering prepayment health insurance plans. The proposal is designed to encourage private insurance organizations to experiment in providing broader voluntary health insurance to more people.

The bill also provides for technical and advisory information services to health service prepayment plans.

The bill H. R. 2533 differs from H. R. 400 in that H. R. 2533 incorporates certain provisions, which were adopted by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in reporting favorably H. R. 8356, 83d Congress, to meet questions raised by various witness in the course of the committee hearings held during the 83d Congress. The most important of such questions was based on the fear that the bill could be interpreted to permit some degree of Federal regulation of the health-insurance industry. The bill, H. R. 2533, seeks to remove any and all fear in that respect.

The central philosophy of the bill is one of building on our existing system of voluntary insurance and of providing supporting services and a financial backstop for private effort toward the expansion of prepayment protection. The bill, if enacted, would not of itself directly provide insurance coverage for individuals. Its goal is the removal of obstacles to the extension of coverage for broader ranges of benefits and to additional groups of people.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1955

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, this week the people of Ukrainian ancestry all over the world are observing the anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence which will take place on January 22, 1955.

It would seem to me that this anniversary observance presents us with a splendid opportunity for the reaffirmation of our strong faith in the eventual freedom of all of the peoples who are presently enslaved and subject to totalitarian domination.

The principle of self-determination of all peoples has played an important role in the conception and history of our own Nation. We have always maintained and continue to believe that the nations of the world have the right to work out

their own destinies, in accordance with the expressed desires of their people.

On this occasion of the anniversary of Ukrainian independence, let us reaffirm our stanch adherence to that principle. May those nations who are presently deprived of representation and the right of self-determination find hope and encouragement in this reaffirmation of our principles.

Let's Save America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1955

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in answer to a substantial number of requests, I submit for printing in the RECORD a copy of the remarks which I made to the 29th Women's Patriotic Conference at its sessions in Washington, D. C., last week.

These remarks follow:

LET'S SAVE AMERICA

Mrs. Good, delegates to this 29th Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, and distinguished guests, I appreciate the invitation to participate in your discussions here today.

You, and the organizations you represent, deserve the praise of all America for your efforts to defend our Constitution and the American way of life.

The task to which you have set yourselves is a difficult one, as all of you are well aware. But let me assure you that those of us in Congress who still believe the sovereignty of the Nation deserves first consideration are grateful for your work. I pray that more Americans will become alert to the dangers which threaten to take from us the liberties which our forefathers fought to secure and will join in your crusade.

Our first President, George Washington, warned that we must remain independent and steer a clear and sure course away from Europe's intrigues and quarrels. The great vision of Washington, as well as Jefferson, led to the American policy of nonintervention and the greatest free government on earth. On no other basis than the avoidance of foreign entanglements could this Republic have endured and on no other basis will it be sustained.

What everyone must understand, then, is that the end product of our foreign policy must be the protection and advancement of our national interests, not the least of which is the perpetuation of our individual rights and freedoms. In judging the results of the interventionist policy which we now pursue, those who advocate this course must therefore rest their case on what it has accomplished.

In less than 40 years, and the fighting of three gory wars, we look across the Pacific to a hostile Far East where once we had earned the respect of hundreds of millions of people. We look across the Atlantic—to the Continent of Europe—and are hard-pressed to find a single country of any substantial area or population which is willing to make the sacrifices necessary to defend itself much less join in an international movement to suppress aggression.

Meantime, our young men grow up in the shadow of the draft, serving longer periods in active service and reserves than almost anywhere else in the world; our Federal debt alone far exceeds the combined debts of all the governments of the world, while our total debt, public and private, has rocketed to more than $600 billion. In this climate, savings and investments are constantly threatened by inflation, and we are burdened by a tremendous load of taxation, unprecedented in time of peace and legally unlimited.

By what stretch of the imagination can the one-worlders, Atlantic unioneers and international do-gooders claim that our national security and well-being has been enhanced by the foreign policy we continue to pursue?

FOREIGN GIVEAWAYS

Let us review briefly a few of the many foreign giveaway schemes which have drained from the pockets of American taxpayers some $150 billion in the last 15 years. Incidentally, it may be argued that some of that huge amount of money represents loans to foreign governments. May I remind you that our so-called foreign friends still owe us more than $17 billion as a result of loans during World War I. If our so-called allies haven't seen fit to repay this money in 38 years, is anyone naive enough to believe that any of them will make more than gestures toward paying their debts arising out of World War II and the postwar period?

In the last 15 years we have seen the fantastic spectacle of Americans providing scores of countries with funds for one purpose or another. No corner of the earth has been neglected in our mad scramble to finance the world.

We have made possible the building of air-conditioned, luxury apartments in the jungles of the Belgian Congo.

We financed the building of a railroad station in Rome that for sheer splendor makes Grand Central or Pennsylvania stations in New York look like tank-town facilities on a branch line railroad.

We sent an expert to Italy to show the Italians how to husk corn; we sent a Pennsylvania track coach to India to teach the Indians how to run, although their chief mode of transportation is their legs, and we recently sent a delegation of eight handpicked American women to an assortment of foreign countries to pick a bevy of foreign women to visit this country. American taxpayers, of course, pick up the checks both ways for these international tourists. It's all part of the tub-thumping propaganda by the State Department, Foreign Operations Administration and United Nations to keep the multibillion dollar giveaway show on the road.

COFFEE "EXPERTS"

We send experts to Brazil to tell the Brazilians how to raise coffee but we do nothing about the speculation in coffee that has gouged millions of dollars out of the budgets of American housewives.

We underwrite a super highway in Thailand and commercial aviation in Pakistan and Turkey. We build air bases in Great Britain under terms whereby the British can cancel American rights to the bases at any time, and with no provision whereby we can recover any part of our investment.

We build hydroelectric power dams in France and Italy, and we build power projects in Iran which authorities say are economically unjustifiable and when Iranian money is available for the work.

Besides the money that has been handed over to individual countries, we have given to such organizations as the European Payments Union, the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees, International Refugee Organization, Organization of American States, United Nations Rehabilitation Relief, and a score of others. And more frosting goes on the cake in the form of miscellaneous, overlapping programs.

Henry Wallace, in a flight of fancy during World War II, said the United States must make sure everybody in the world has the opportunity of drinking a quart of milk a day. His successors, if they have their way, will throw in a deep freeze for every Eskimo and a power mower with leaf-chopping attachment for every Hottentot.

Few Government agencies have been omitted in this dishing out of the taxpayers money to foreigners. The Defense, Commerce, Agriculture, State, and Treasury Departments have all been involved. Of course, Harold Stassen's Foreign Operations Administration, and its predecessor agencies, all bearing perfumed titles, have played the leading role.

And not only have the American people been called upon to financially support a good share of the world, but they are called upon to defend it as well.

UTTERLY FANTASTIC

Altogether, some 50 nations with a combined population of more than a billion people look to the United States to come to their defense militarily and fight their battles.

The spectacle of a nation with only a fraction of the land area and population of the world attempting to finance and defend peoples in every corner of the earth is utterly fantastic.

This policy is the handiwork of a small group in this country who either have spent a considerable part of their lives in England and France or who have business interests abroad. This group apparently finds it fruitful to support the decadent and tottering Empires of Great Britain and France, countries which are unwilling to join wholeheartedly with us in meeting the Communist world conspiracy. These internationalists, wealthy and influential politically, their influence stemming from interlocking directorates and vast control over business and industry, do not represent the American people. They have shown little concern over high costs of living or taxes as long as this country spends billions to subsidize their favorite foreign nations and stands ready to defend those nations when they won't defend themselves. It is these people or their hired hands who keep alive scores of organizations, each with a propaganda mill, to perpetuate the cruel fantasy that the American people have it within their capacity to solve all the ills and evils that exist in the world.

UNITED NATIONS

Let me now, and briefly, discuss the United Nations. I would remind you first of all that Alger Hiss, who recently completed a penitentiary sentence for lying about his Communist activities, was one of the chief architects of the United Nations Charter. I would also remind you that Harry Dexter White, who died suddenly and mysteriously while under investigation for his alleged Communist connections, was another of those who had a hand in drafting the United Nations Charter and in piloting it through the San Francisco Conference. Is there, then, anything strange or coincidental about the fact that Soviet Russia has three votes to our one in the United Nations General Assembly; that every possibility and every move to make this organization an effective instrumentality for security and peace is subject to a Communist veto?

If there was any virtue in the Korean war—and God knows the killing of more than 35,000 American boys plus the wounding of 100,000 more can be nothing but stark tragedy—it was the complete proof of dismal failure on the part of the United Nations. Not only did it fail to punish aggression for the aggressors still stand and thumb their noses from the ame vantage points they did in June 1950, but it demonstrated that collective action under the United Nations is a sham and a farce.

The proof of this is that Americans, despite all the eloquent phraseology of the U. N. Charter, did 95 percent of the fighting and dying and 100 percent of the financing of the war in Korea. I am speaking of U. N. participation. Please remember that South Korea was not and is not a member of the United Nations. The cold, bloody record of that war is that 45 member nations of the United Nations with combined populations of more than a billion persons, contributed not a single combat soldier. When the showdown came in the United Nations, there was then as now no real sense of moral obligation or responsibility.

PROFITS AS USUAL

On the contrary and at the height of the Korean war—while Americans were being slaughtered on the battlefields and suffering the agonies of Red Chinese prison camps—it was profits as usual for most of our alleged free-world friends. The British Supreme Court at Hong Kong, for instance, fined the President Steamship Lines more than $60,000 for refusing to deliver a consignment of medical supplies, including wonder drugs, to the Red Chinese. American officials of the President Lines rightly held that these medical supplies were contraband and would be used to patch up Chinese Communist soldiers so they could be returned to the front and kill more Americans.

Does anyone in this room recall a single word of protest even from the United Nations or our State Department concerning this outrageous fine levied by the British upon an American firm which, unlike the British, refused to stab American soldiers in the back?

Only recently we witnessed another shocking defeat in the United Nations when $180,000 in back salaries and damages were approved for 11 American employees of the U. N. who were fired for refusing to answer either to a grand jury or the Senate Internal Security Committee as to whether they were Communists or engaged in Communist activities. The case of these 11 fifth amendment Americans was carried to the administrative tribunal of the United Nations and to the so-called International Court of Justice, both of which upheld the payments.

Henry Cabot Lodge, chief United States representative to the United Nations, described the huge awards as unjust and outrageous but he capitulated to the decision that the payment be made.

TOO MUCH RESPECT

Another representative to the United Nations was the first to capitulate and with the public assertion that he had too much respect for the International Court to oppose its decision. This statement despite the sordid fact that three Communist judges sit on the bench of the International Court and thus were in a position to pass judgment on 11 persons suspected of being part and parcel of the Communist subversive movement.

I wonder if this individual would have the same respect for an appeals court in this country on which sit felons, charged with passing judgment on American citizens?

In the closing days of the last session of Congress, the House and Senate passed a resolution stating in clear language that no funds appropriated then or thereafter from the United States Treasury could be used to pay the award of $180,000 to these 11 characters who sought refuge behind the 5th amendment. Then, you ask, how will payment be made?

We now discover payments will be made by the simple and shabby device, approved by the weak-spined United States representatives to the U. N., of levying an assessment upon the salaries of United Nations employees. This simply means that honest, loyal American employees of the U. N. are now to be taxed on their salaries to compensate 11 persons who were fired from their midst for alleged disloyalty to the United States. This is unbelievable.

Incidentally, Mr. Lodge will pay no part of the assessment. He informs me that his salary is paid by the State Department. I might add that it is considerably more substantial than the salary paid to a stenographer or some other underling at United Nations headquarters. Of course, there will be no deduction from the salaries of congressional representatives to the U. N.

SOVEREIGNTY UNDERMINED

There are many more examples of how our sovereignty is being undermined in the United Nations. I shall mention only 1 or 2.

In 1952, the Government refused to issue visas permitting two foreigners to enter this country to attend a United Nations conference. In refusing, our Government presented to the U. N. a congressional reservation, which reserved the power of the United States to issue visas to aliens seeking to enter this country to attend meetings. What happened? The U. N. decreed that the congressional reservation had never been approved by the U. N. General Assembly. Then, dictating to the State Department of the United States, the U. N. demanded and obtained, entry permits for the two unwanted foreigners.

Another example is to be found in the recently published United Nations handbook on standards of conduct in the International Civil Service. This handbook states that the conduct of the international civil servant must clearly reflect his obligation to the international organization, and any appearance of disloyalty to that organization must be considered incompatible with his status. Under the circumstances, is it any wonder that disloyal Americans have been uncovered in the employment of the United Nations and its subsidiary organizations? Still another example is the World Health Organization decision last year which assessed the United States for $350,000 more than Congress had appropriated for this agency. The United States representatives protested but were of course outvoted. Here is an example of the ability of foreigners to levy taxes upon Americans.

In this brief discussion of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, the U. N. Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization also deserves mention for it is through this agency that the internationalists and one-worlders attempt to influence the people of America, especially our youth.

UNESCO PROPAGANDA

Typical UNESCO propaganda goes something like this, and I quote from a UNESCO publication: "Our children should be educated to prepare themselves for citizenship in a world society. As long as the child breathes the poisoned air of nationalism, education in world mindedness can produce only precarious results. It is frequently the family that infects the child with extreme nationalism. The school should therefore combat family attitudes that favor jingoism." Such propaganda has but one aim: To poison the youth of this nation against America and to prepare them for a role in the internationalists, one world.

What these propagandists find most difficult to overcome is the fact that in terms of culture, civilization, and consciousness this is not one world in which we live. And to try to make it one, against all the realities of life and nature, is far more likely to awaken the spirit of rebellion than the spirit of harmony. And when those in the United States work for world government on the premise that it will solve all the problems of the people of other lands, they refuse to recognize history which teaches that nations are rarely if ever benefited by what they do not do for themselves.

Probably no more flagrant instrumentality for the destruction of the constitutional rights of Americans is to be found than that which is embodied in the so-called Status of Forces Treaty.

Under this treaty, American servicemen stationed in certain foreign countries, who have taken an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States, are subject to trial in foreign civil courts by foreign judges and incarceration in foreign prisons.

JAPANESE SENTENCE AMERICANS

Since this treaty became effective, it is reported that many American boys were brought to trial in foreign courts and some are now serving in filthy foreign prisons for various offenses, some of them minor, and effectively stripped of their constitutional rights as American citizens.

Let us take the case of France where there are thousands of American troops and where communism is rampant. There is nothing to prevent a Communist cell from framing or bringing trumped-up charges against one or more American boys. In that case they would likely be arrested by American military police who would be compelled under the Status of Forces Treaty to turn the alleged offender or offenders over to a civil court for trial.

In Turkey, France, and other European countries American servicemen have been tried by the courts of those countries under procedures that are totally foreign to them. It may well be pointed out here that in certain countries of the Middle East the penalty for petty larceny may be the lopping off of a hand.

It should also be pointed out that as the result of another agreement entered into with Japan in 1953, at least 26 American servicemen are now serving terms ranging up to 15 years in Japanese prisons after being convicted in the civil courts of a country whose nationals only a little more than 10 years ago were practicing barbarity in almost every form upon American soldiers.

Perhaps these individuals were guilty. If so, there are American military and civil courts before which trial could be had. The point is that the Constitution of the United States either has meaning or those who are responsible for setting it aside, without benefit of amendment, ought to be decent enough to make sure that every American conscripted for military service and sent to duty in a NATO treaty country, is properly advised that he no longer has the protection of the Constitution which he has sworn to uphold and defend with his life, if necessary.

DECEPTION

Yes, the American people in the last two decades have been the vicitims of much deception and have lost more in the way of sovereignty than many of us can comprehend.

The hour is late, but there is still time to save America if we will but return to policies that are first of all in the best interests of this country and its people.

In advocating such a return to reason and sanity, one is quickly branded by the internationalists as an isolationist. I asked these internationalists: Were Washington and Jefferson isolationists?

Our Founding Fathers were not isolationists, but rather vigorous advocates of international intercourse based upon reason and understanding, and I am sure all of us here today advocate the same course in our dealings throughout the world.

In this connection, permit me to quote a passage from a speech made in 1852 by Henry Clay. He said:

"By following the policy we have adhered to since the days of Washington, we have prospered beyond precedent; we have done more for the cause of liberty in the world than arms could effect; we have shown to other nations the way to greatness and happiness.

"But if we should involve ourselves in the web of European politics, in a war which could effect nothing, where, then, would be the last hope for the friends of freedom throughout the world? Far better it is that, adhering to our wise Pacific system, and avoiding the distant wars of Europe, we should keep our own lamp burning brightly on this western shore as a light to all nations, than to hazard its utter extinction amidst the ruins of fallen or falling republics in Europe."

These words as spoken by Henry Clay more than 100 years ago are as full of meaning and wisdom today as they were then.

CENTRALIZATION OF POWER

We have many important issues and problems in this country that desperately need consideration and solution but transcending all of them is what position we take and what we do as a matter of foreign policy. No other single issue has the impact of foreign policy upon every home and the lives of every man, woman, and child. Our forefathers understood this and wisely guided the young nation from the pitfalls that today confront us.

We must immediately adopt a foreign policy that is within the ability of the American people to honor and support. We cannot go on indefinitely financing and policing the world, piling up burdens which the children of tomorrow cannot possibly carry or endure.

No less important is the fact that the course upon which we are presently embarked means steadily increasing centralization of power in Washington. The great and free institutions under this form of government—economic, political, educational, religious, and cultural—all depend for their perpetuation upon a diffusion of power.

Another step that must be taken immediately is to revise the charter of the United Nations and make it an effective instrumentality for collective security or abandon it to those who are now using it as a lethal boobytrap.

It is distressing to note that even some who have seen the error of our ways in the last two decades now sadly say it is too late for us to turn back; that we have become so enmeshed in the affairs of nations all over the world that our course can't be altered.

The hour is late, but there is still time to trim the wick of our lamp and make it burn more brightly on our own shores and the shores of the Western Hemisphere. We not only can but we must turn back if we are to save this great constitutional Republic as we know it and as we cherish it.

Should Legislative Hearings Be Televised?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I delivered over WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Saturday, November 20, 1954:

SHOULD LEGISLATIVE HEARINGS BE TELEVISED?

Congressional investigating committees are an essential part of the United States Government to serve as a check on the growing power of the executive department.

Even as I speak, this subject of investigating committees—their activities and conduct—is the real background for an unusual session of the United States Senate.

The development of television makes it possible for most American homes to watch the proceedings firsthand.

It also creates problems in turn.

The issue at present is concentrated on personalities and is highly charged with emotion.

In the larger sense we shall have to decide whether or not legislative hearings should be televised and, if so, under what conditions.

Perhaps most people want televised hearings.

On the other hand, the American Bar Association, the Federal Bar Association, and the New York State Bar Association are in opposition to them. An article by Church and Wasilewski throws much light upon the subject. It quotes John W. Davis, of the American Bar Association, as saying in the report of his committee: "The television camera is a force the power of which is only beginning to be appreciated. Granted that it greatly enhances the public interest in current events, it can also circulate with great speed baseless accusations which may be to the irreparable injury of the person accused. It may often, perhaps usually, be the case that this public view of any proceedings is only intermittent. The result may well be a distorted impression of the facts and a consequent prejudgment of the witness by the viewers, without regard to the legal presumption of innocence to which the witness is entitled."

"Your committee is well aware that newspaper reports may also by their necessary brevity give a distorted impression of the facts, but this regrettable circumstance affords no justification for further distortion incident to the use of television and broadcasting.

"Your committee is not prepared to say televising or broadcasting of an unwilling witness is such an infraction of his right of privacy as to be unlawful; yet even where the consent of the witness is invoked there would seem to be an element of unfairness in putting upon him the burden of consent or protest. His very unwillingness to consent might be treated in certain quarters as an unfavorable symptom. These unfavorable aspects become all the more true where the television or broadcasting is concentrated only on selected witnesses or incidents not calculated or intended to represent the proceedings as a whole."

That is the very careful and conscientious opinion of the legal fraternity.

However, public opinion has a different view.

There is no concern that people are misled by political campaign speeches with their exaggerations and their attacks upon the character of rival candidates. People seem to do pretty well in arriving at the truth regarding candidates and issues.

It does not seem logical that they should now be considered immature to witness the investigative functions of Government on the TV screen.

Such hearings are fact-finding proceedings. Their purpose is to show whether or not legislation is needed in a certain field or to expose such dangers to the security of the Nation as subversion or corruption.

The full publicity given to televised statements before congressional committees makes it impossible for a witness to lie, or blunder. Someone in the huge audience is sure to spot the contradiction and come forward with the true facts.

Representative government is not merely a schedule of free elections with no thought as to what happens in between. The people have a right and a duty to participate in government, and there is no better way than through the media of mass communications, which gives them a front seat to observe how public business is conducted.

We must never forget our constitutional guaranties of a public trial and a free press.

As the Messrs. Church and Wasilewski well state: "Members of congressional committees are elected. In televised hearings they appear before their constituents and make their records. It can be a record of fairness or of partiality, of courtesy or of abuse, but it is a personal record for which they must one day stand up and be counted."

It is too early to determine the effect of television appearances upon the political careers of investigatory committee members. Television, however, has led to a move for reform of legislative hearing procedures. Congressional committees, historically, have made their own rules. Witnesses have been treated with dignity, with frivolity, or with abuse, as the committee saw fit. Prior to the advent of television, the public and the bar showed little concern over such procedure. The presentation to the public, by television, of a relatively few hearings, seems to be the principal spur for demands that reform of congressional hearing procedures be undertaken. This has served to reawaken interest in government. It is an accepted fact that an informed and alert electorate is essential to the survival of a republic; yet, as government becomes centralized, vast, and complicated, personal participation dwindles. Television, by recreating in citizens a town-meeting sense of immediacy, can help reverse this trend. Communications media capable of stimulating such interest should not be curtailed.

It will come as a surprise to many people who regard the televising of hearings as something bizarre to learn that religious services have been televised from St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York, and from the Cathederal of St. Peter and St. Paul in Washington, without any loss of dignity or reverence. Furthermore, the proceedings of the United Nations are telecast regularly, through camera equipment set up in an entirely separate room.

The argument is put forth that television cameras invade the witness' right of privacy.

This is nothing new.

Whenever a person becomes a part of a newsworthy event he is no longer anonymous. Newspapers have been reporting such matters and the persons involved in them for many generations.

Another criticism is that participants are encouraged to put on an act. Committee members are accused of badgering witnesses for the sake of impressing the folks back home. But it seems to me that this wide audience is the best protection for the witness. If unjustly treated that fact is given the widest publicity exactly as it happens. The American people have a genuine sense of fair play, and they can be counted on to react strongly against fakery or injustice.

Out in Oklahoma, they have had successful results in the telecasting of State legislative sessions and even of a murder trial.

In commenting on the latter, Trial Judge Van Meter stated, "The coverage was handled in such a manner as not to hamper or influence the trial in any manner. The attention of the attorneys, the jurors, the witnesses, and the court, was not distracted in any appreciable manner. So long as the court is informed of what is to be done and has control of the situation there should be no objection to this new means of informing the people. In my opinion, if television is used in an educational and factual manner as it was in this case, without any of the spectacular portrayal, it should be very helpful. There is no question in my mind but what there is a need for people generally to know more of their courts in action. Many people rarely have any contact with the courts. Too often what is said or shown

about courts is not a true portrayal. If television can present courts as they actually function, this should be a real public service."

As to the legislature, one of the members noted a sudden improvement in behavior. "Not that the Oklahoma Legislature had any lack of it," he said, with tongue-in-cheek loyalty to his colleagues, "but the customary reading of newspapers while in session, feet on desks, small caucuses held in the aisles, etc., were nonexistent while the camera's red light was on."

Even today in committee hearing rooms of the Congress, apart from the few executive sessions, there are seats for the public and complete recognition of the right of as many people as possible to attend an open hearing as physical limitations of the room will allow.

It is hard to understand why there is so much to-do about extending the audience via television. The machine itself is not prejudiced, even though the human beings whose actions it transmits are not always so objective.

The fact that television's first reports have revealed some problems in legislative procedure should inspire us to correct them. So TV shall become, as it will soon, the most effective instrument in conjunction with press and radio for taking people into full partnership with their representative government.

Through the Peacetime Benefits of Atomic Energy We Have a Relatively Simple and Inexpensive Way of Adding Tremendously to the Numbers of Our Friends Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following address titled "Atomic Energy in Peace and War" was delivered by me before the 29th annual Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., January 14, 1955:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE 29TH ANNUAL WOMEN'S PATRIOTIC CONFERENCE ON NATIONAL DEFENSE, STATLER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 14, 1955

It is an honor to be invited to address the 29th Annual Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense.

For many years, I have followed your activities and have admired the courageous and unfaltering position you have maintained on many vital and controversial issues.

In my estimation, your activities in the field of true Americanism, national defense, and the preservation of the American form of government are entitled to public acclaim.

May I digress at this point to pay a well-deserved tribute to the chairman of your conference, Mrs. David Daniel Good, of Osceola Mills, Pa., who I am proud to number among my constitutents.

Mrs. Good's legion of friends in Pennsylvania are mighty proud of her for she is an ardent exponent of your principles of red-blooded Americanism.

When I tentatively accepted your chairman's invitation to address this conference, I first thought of selecting the topic—"Is the United States a Constitutional Republic or a Democracy?"

I had in mind at that time of discussing the highlights of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787 when this budding Nation was constantly referred to as a Republic and not a Democracy.

The word "democracy" is not found in either the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution.

In fact, Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the Democratic Party always spoke of "the Republic" of "our republican form of government."

History tells us that when Benjamin Franklin was asked what kind of a government the Constitutional Convention had set up, he replied: "A Republic—if you can keep it."

In these trying days, as we fight to preserve our Republic, I would like to discuss atomic energy in peace and war, a subject that has occupied the attention of world leaders since that morning of July 16, 1945, when the first atomic weapon in the world was exploded at the Alamogordo, N. Mex., test grounds.

Since that eventful morning of July 16, 1945, almost a decade has now passed during which the free world has depended for its security primarily on atomic weapons.

Government leaders and private citizens alike throughout the world are well aware of the growing strength in the United States stockpile of atomic and hydrogen weapons.

Here in the United States we have taken great pride in the accomplishment of scientific and industrial miracles, for these accomplishments definitely have prevented world war III and have caused the men in the Kremlin to hold their ambitions in check.

At the same time, however, it is common knowledge that the Soviet stockpile of atomic and hydrogen weapons is ever-increasing; yet this fact seems to escape too many people.

When the Soviets had one weapon and we had many, there was good reason to believe that if they should attack our chances of being able to prevent any sizable amount of destruction to our own cities and military and industrial plants was good.

In addition we had confidence in our own ability to retaliate with heavy atomic attack against the Soviet aggressor.

As the Soviet stockpile increased, it is no longer a secret that Russia's ability to wage an atomic war is now a definite reality.

Confronted with this threat of an atomic attack, neither an increase in our own stockpile of atomic weapons nor an increase in our own ability to insure massive retaliation can offset Russia's ability to engage in atomic warfare.

We are faced today with an absolute fact.

If atomic war should come, many Americans would die in their homes and at their places of work.

I take little consolation in the continued assurance that we would be able to retaliate many times over.

That would be small comfort if New York, Chicago, San Francisco, and Washington were smoldering ruins.

What needs to be done is not so much a matter of simple patriotism as it is preparation for survival.

If we are to remain a free and vigorous Nation, we must take the maximum steps to insure that we can minimize the effects of massive Soviet atomic attacks against the United States.

We must make certain that we can maintain our social, economic, political, and administrative structure in spite of such attacks and continue on as a free Republic.

The American people in general have been lax in responding to the appeal of Federal Civil Defense Administrator Val Peterson to become civil-defense minded by realizing the devastating results of a Russian atomic-hydrogen attack.

It is my earnest hope that within the next few months Congress will appropriate the necessary funds so that Civil Defense Administrator Peterson will be able to improve and expand the present civil-defense program.

In my opinion, such a program must provide greater public education, for only if every American understands the threat with which he is confronted can we expect the support for a civil-defense program so essential to its success.

So far I have been talking about what might happen if the bombs should start to fall.

Frankly, it is a terrifying prospect and one we cannot ignore.

Yet falling bombs is only one small aspect of the total problem of living in an atomic age.

Therefore, we should not devote our attention to it and exclude the many other things which can be done.

One of the best ways to protect ourselves and our Nation against atomic attack is to see to it that war never comes.

I think there are two steps which must be taken simultaneously if we are to do all within our power to prevent an atomic war.

First, we must be prepared to absorb the worst an enemy can deliver and still strike back with terrible vengeance.

If we do that there will be no profit for the enemy in starting the attack at all.

Secondly, we must speed the development and application of peacetime atomic benefits.

By so doing, the standards of living and of health throughout the world will rise so rapidly that peace will be more attractive than war as a means of achieving the humanitarian ends men desire everywhere.

As a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy and the House Armed Services Committee, I have long had an active interest in both these necessary steps.

During the last 2 months I have devoted a great deal of time in pursuit of the second point, namely, the development and application of peacetime atomic benefits.

With other members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I visited 12 countries in November and December.

Most of these are backward countries where the people barely exist.

They never have enough to eat.

They never have enough to keep them warm and they have little hope for their own future or for their children.

The purpose of the trip was to see at first hand what we here in the United States might be able to do through atomic energy in order to raise the economic and health standards in these areas.

Our visit to these foreign nations was an aggressive and coordinated part of the "Atoms-for-Peace" plan launched by President Eisenhower over a year ago.

We intentionally went to countries which, for the most part, do not have a reputation for being in the forefront of modern scientific development.

Yet everywhere we went, we found large numbers of competent, well-trained scientists and technicians who were in close touch with their Government leaders.

We found that they have concrete ideas of what could be done through atomic energy for the betterment of their own people as well as the advancement of science.

In New Zealand we found that they had already used radioisotopes to study the growth of pasture land grasses.

As a result of their experiments they have made radical improvements in the number of sheep they can graze per acre.

As many of you know, a radioisotope is a chemical element charged in an atomic re-

actor and is easily traceable, whether in the human body, plant life, soil, or metals.

We saw New Zealand hills which we were told were brown 5 years ago because of the lack of certain vital trace elements in their soil.

Today they are lush and green as a result of atomic experiments which have proved exactly which elements needed to be added to the soil.

But the New Zealand program is seriously handicapped because the nearest sources of radioisotopes are in the United States and in England.

In New Zealand there is a real need for radioisotopes which will permit experiments to be conducted with radioactive elements.

In Australia we found a broad and vigorous atomic program manned by well-trained scientists, engineers, and administrators.

The problems confronting the Australians in the field of atomic energy are more nearly parallel to those of the highly industrialized countries of Europe.

This was in marked contrast with most of the countries we visited.

Throughout the countries of southeast Asia and the Middle East, we repeatedly observed an urgent need for agricultural experimental stations using radioisotopes to improve crop yields and to improve the crops themselves.

We studied the health statistics with the public health officers in these southeast Asian and Middle Eastern countries and saw for ourselves what the principal diseases are.

We recognized, from our own knowledge of the work here in the United States, how modern medicine using the tools of atomic energy could bring early relief to the people of these countries.

Malaria, tuberculosis, cancer, cholera, these are but a few.

And in every country we found men and women ready, willing, and able to do the job.

They need some equipment.

They need some guidance.

They need some assistance.

But the investment which needs to be made can be measured in a few thousand dollars in most cases, and the benefits which they stand to gain are scarcely measurable by any known standard.

The 83d Congress passed a revised Atomic Energy Act, which those of us on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy worked many months to prepare.

This new law authorizes agreements for cooperation on peacetime atomic development with friendly nations.

I know that everyone of us on the trip came back with renewed enthusiasm for pursuing an international atomic cooperation program.

All of us acquired a better understanding of what needs to be done and when it should be done.

Frankly, small sums spent now in the proper places and in the proper ways will be far more beneficial both to the people to whom they are given and in the improvements in American relations abroad, than will vast sums given too late and with too broad a sweep of the hand.

Therefore, the time for a foreign atomic program is now.

It need not be a multimillion dollar foreign giveaway.

What is needed is a few dollars wisely and discreetly spent.

I was particularly impressed on this trip by the fact that the United States and atomic weapons are frequently spoken of as almost synonomous in Asia.

This is primarily the result of Soviet propaganda but it can be counteracted.

We need to strengthen our bonds of friendship throughout the world.

In this atomic-hydrogen age we cannot stand alone.

Through the peacetime benefits of atomic energy we have a relatively simple and inexpensive way of adding tremendously to the numbers of our friends abroad.

It is an indisputable fact that patriotism is the keystone of a strong nation.

But patriotism to be effective must be intelligent.

Blind sacrifice of time, even of life itself, is not enough.

As patriotic Americans we must stand ready to expend our energies, our resources, even our lives, in such a way as to prove most beneficial to our country.

It is not sufficient to confine our acts of patriotism to buying savings bonds and engaging in the building of an adequate national defense.

We as a nation need to implement our efforts by developing friendly relationship with other countries so that should the horror of a third world war be visited upon us we will have stanch allies.

I should like to conclude my discussion by quoting former Atomic Energy Commissioner Thomas E. Murray, who recently said:

"I consider it the sober truth to say that atomic energy has resulted in the greatest change in man's relations with nature since the fateful day in the Garden of Eden.

"Man has within his grasp an unlimited force, the very source of all energy in nature—atomic energy.

"The difficulty is that this force is a potential equally for death as for life.

"The misuse of atomic energy means death on a scale that staggers the imagination."

Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1955

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me at the annual dinner of the Association of Immigration and Nationality Lawyers, Hotel St. Regis, New York City:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, this occasion on which you have so generously given me the opportunity to address you, affords me a most welcome chance to say some candid and informal words on the subject in which we are all vitally interested—immigration. I am grateful to you as well as greatly honored.

I can probably skip introducing myself. You know that together with the late distinguished Senator from Nevada, my dear friend, Pat McCarran, I am the coauthor of the much maligned piece of legislation sometimes called the McCarran-Walter Act and sometimes more scurrilous names—some of them not fit to be mentioned in this distinguished and, what is very important, mixed company.

Immigration is a vast part of the field of human relations, in which law can do as much harm as good. Immigration means people. Immigration affects human fate and human destiny. The law can help, but the law can hurt terribly. The law can inflict great hardship and on occasions it can hurt beyond possibility of remedy.

Men writing legislation in the field of immigration have to be more cautious than men writing laws that affect taxes, tariffs, shipping, banking, etc.

In the first half of the current century, a few words in a certain section of the immigration law of the United States meant the difference between life and death for many people escaping totalitarian brutalities. Conversely, mistakes in the enforcing of the law can mean untold human tragedies and suffering. An immigrant inspector on the New York waterfront is just as much a protector of our and our children's security as any soldier who, while on active duty, is in charge of protecting a vital military establishment. The same immigrant inspector may be guilty of causing harm to a human being—often, harm and damage beyond repair.

I could dwell long on the subject of immigration. This evening, however, is to be devoted to much more pleasant things than my speech, and I shall therefore ask your indulgence in permitting me to talk about but few aspects of the problem which have recently been brought to my attention.

Since its enactment in June of 1952, the Immigration and Nationality Act has been savagely attacked by various organized groups—in my opinion—almost invariably for wrong reasons and on false grounds. We all know that the only sane purpose of any immigration law is to regulate the admission of immigrants and to keep out aliens who may harm or weaken our country. Of course, carried to its logical extreme, such a policy could be inhumanly harsh. It would keep out all nonproducing foreigners—as they are kept out by many countries—even to the point that means separation of families.

As you know, we do not preach that policy and we do not practice it. The old, the infirm or the unskilled still find entrance to the United States along with their younger, more energetic and better trained relatives. More than that, we specifically accord preferential treatment to relatives of United States citizens and residents of the United States, regardless of age. In that respect, our immigration laws are certainly superior to those of many countries which are much less critically looked upon in discussions held in the world's press.

I would like to remind you that even enemies of our form of government are not necessarily forever barred from entering into our midst. You know well, that reformed totalitarians, including reformed Communists, can settle among us permanently and that active members of organizations which we hate and abhor can enter temporarily if they can show that their enmity toward our way of life does not carry immediate danger to our country.

Surely, that much of self-protection on our part is about the simplest minimum demonstration of common sense. But it is precisely on this point that baseless criticism is being leveled at the Immigration and Nationality Act.

One of the most brilliant minds of our era, that of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, has recently produced, over television, a new set of totally confused ideas. Appearing on Mr. Ed Murrow's program, Dr. Oppenheimer has ventured a few opinions regarding the purport and effect of our immigration laws. I had some correspondence with Dr. Oppenheimer since his excursion into the field of law, and I hope that I was able to explain to him how entirely wrong he was in what he said. Unfortunately, the false impression has been created in the public's mind, and I am, of course, unable to correct it, since I am unable to diffuse my mind as effectively as Mr. Murrow helped Dr. Oppenheimer to do it.

However, I would like to use tonight's fine forum for the purpose of suggesting to Mr. Murrow that he might want to have me on his show and ask me some questions regarding atomic energy. I would certainly be as qualified to answer them as Dr. Oppenheimer is qualified to answer the legal questions propounded by Mr. Murrow. The viewers and the audience would be equally edified, I assure you.

Dr. Oppenheimer's chief concern was the alleged exclusion of scientists and the impossibility of calling scientific meetings in the United States. Let me tell you without

delay that I am just as eager as Dr. Oppenheimer to have all possible scientific meetings held in the United States, and I see no reason why they cannot be held here. It is a matter of record that not only persons who have allegedly associated with Communist organizations, but actual members of the Communist Party, have been admitted to the United States temporarily under one section that this audience is certainly well familiar with, namely, section 212 (d) (3) of the act. It is also a matter of record that a chess team representing officially the Soviet Union, accompanied by, shall we say, trainers or masseurs—obviously they were secret policemen—were admitted to New York to participate in a tournament.

You also know about the group of clergymen from behind the Iron Curtain who were admitted to the Evanston, Ill., meeting last August and permitted to offer their totalitarian and heathen preferences to a Christian gathering.

There are hundreds and hundreds of less publicized cases of admissions of similar people. I am informed by the Department of State that most of our institutions of learning have established, very successfully, permanent contacts with the Department which permit them to overcome difficulties and avoid delays in the admission under the provisions made for specially learned academicians.

I believe that it is time for those of us who are honestly concerned with matters of immigration, international migration, and the security of our country to take factual stock of existing immigration law without reference to personal bias or emotions fed on narrow, egotistic interests.

Another favorite target for criticism is the quota provisions of the present law. The trick in this is to make a sweeping statement that only so and so many immigrants entered in the preceding year, whereas in former years—unnamed—twice or thrice or more could and did enter, the blame, of course, being put on the iniquitous McCarran-Walter Act.

Now, there is dishonesty in this statement, perhaps an innocent dishonesty on the part of many who repeat the story.

The number of entries in 1954—both for permanent and temporary residence—show in overall numbers and by specific categories that our present immigration law has not curtailed the flow of aliens into the United States.

In the fiscal year 1954—that is, July 1, 1953, to June 30, 1954—208,177 aliens were admitted to the United States for permanent residence, which was 22 percent more than came in the preceding year. That figure includes the 821 persons who trickled in under the very strange provisions of the so-called Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

Half a million (566,613) entered as nonimmigrants, 25,000 of them as students, 61,000 of them on business, and over 400,000 for various other reasons, including tourist travel, visiting, etc.

Do those figures justify the cry that we have closed the doors to this country?

Sweeping or frivolous abuse heaped upon a carefully considered law is, in my view, unethical to the point of betrayal of our whole judicial and legislative system. It is treacherous because it seeks not to amend and perfect, but to destroy, and to destroy for dubious reasons, and often in promotion of self-interest. We have a duty to those who honorably seek shelter and opportunity within our borders, but we should not ignore our equal obligation to our fellow citizens who have built, developed, and defended this haven from tyranny.

I do not mean, of course, that every immigration law passed by the Congress is perfect and so, above rightful criticism. Not at all. As a dismal example of sloppy legislation, we have the so-called Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

Last week, when the 84th Congress convened, I introduced a bill to amend that abortive measure in the hope of actually getting help for some people.

I have never made a secret of the fact that I consider the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 a fraud and a phony. For political reasons, the majority party in the 83d Congress rushed through the House and the Senate an ill-conceived and half-baked proposal which was designed to please everybody without achieving any practical results. In spite of my public warnings and in spite of my vigorous opposition on the floor, that unworkable law was enacted to the accompaniment of political drum beating.

The only thing that I was able to do last session in order to correct that deficient law was to insert a few amendments, permitting to reunite families and to permit close relatives of American citizens to join them in this country.

My new bill goes further in that direction in trying to make certain that people who need resettlement in the United States and are deserving of that privilege would get it.

I aim to:

Equalize the requirements in relative cases under the act with the requirements of the Immigration and Nationality Act so that the same evidence is needed to satisfy consular officers that relatives will not become public charges if admitted into the United States;

Eliminate the requirement that sponsors of immigrants keep suitable housing at a specific address open and available for the entire period of time that the intending immigrant goes through the screening and processing machinery;

Prevent the extended separation of families in cases where all members of the family are not present to accompany the principal applicant to the United States from the place where the visa is issued;

Revise the requirement as to documentation which must be produced by an applicant in order to harmonize the requirements of the act with those of the Immigration and Nationality Act in this respect.

I hope that the enactment of my amendment will correct the ridiculous situation in which out of a total number of 209,000 immigrants authorized to come to the United States under the 1953 law, thus far 13,056 have come up to December 31, 1954, or during one-half of the law's entire lifetime.

Well, I hope that I have made my point clear. I have tried to tell you that I am for honest legislation, for honest administration of law, and for honest criticism of both.

A Cute Magazine Cover Horrified the Red Bishops

(By Eugene Gonda)

Four Hungarian Protestant bishops took the lead recently in a new kind of Red propaganda aimed at the United States.

The four—2 Lutherans and 2 Calvinists—were members of a Hungarian delegation which attended the assembly of the World Council of Churches at Evanston, Ill., last August. The Lutherans were Laszlo Dezsery and Lajos Veto; the Calvinists, Albert Bereczky and Janos Peter.

Bishop Bereczky gave well-publicized lectures about his sad American experiences. Bishops Peter, Dezsery, and Veto wrote articles about the horrors of American life and the successes of Iron Curtain churches at the Evanston assembly.

The bishops agreed that the fingerprinting and other preliminaries to obtaining their United States visas were the most mortifying experience of their lives. "Humiliating treatment reserved only for gangsters," they described it.

Bishop Bereczky reported indignantly that New York customs officers even examined his shaving brush and squeezed a tube of toothpaste in their search for Communist propaganda in the bishops' luggage.

"In Hungary," Bishop Dezsery commented, "foreigners can go where they wish without being bothered by authorities."

Bishop Veto found fault with American food and food service.

"America cafeterias recalled production lines in factories," he said. "One of the slanders by the Western reactionary press about Communist countries is that there people wait in line for food in collective restaurants. The truth is that America is the country of waiting in line in cafeterias.

"You can get only canned food in the United States," he went on. "It is not possible to buy beer in bottles there; even this is delivered in canned form. Milk is sold in square paper boxes. American food is tasteless and is permeated with all kinds of unpleasant odors of fish, melted butter, and food oil."

The bishops deplored the savagery of the American press, which they said is full of stories of murder, vice and flying saucers and of war propaganda. And they all cited the same horrible example in support of this charge.

Each of them described in his own way a picture on the cover of an unnamed American publication: "A father with two loaded guns terrorizing his young son in a sickbed and thus forcing him to take a bitter medicine."

The writer succeeded in identifying the picture which so horrified the Hungarian bishops. It was on the cover of American Weekly, and it showed a smiling young father kneeling at the bedside of his little boy, who was grimacing over a spoonful of castor oil. The father wore toy holsters and a toy sheriff's hat, and he was terrorizing the youngster with two cap pistols.

Bishop Bereczky was particularly upset over the ill-treatment of American children. He told of seeing a newsreel of babies forced to compete in a crawling contest, and he cited as typical the case of the Florida swimming instructor convicted of manslaughter in the death of his 5-year-old daughter for forcing her to dive from dangerous heights.

Bishop Bereczky was also shocked by the inscription on an Evanston war memorial which read: "1916–1919" and "1941– ." He protested: "Is it possible to proclaim with such ostentation chiseled in marble that World War II is not yet ended?"

Bishop Peter devoted an entire article published in many Hungarian newspapers to the Evanston memorial, and concluded that the United States was suffering from war hysteria.

(George Tomlinson, head of the citizens' committee which raised funds for the Evanston monument, explained last week that no terminal date had been added because there still had been no official ending of the war with Germany. Moreover, he said, the shaft was in memory of men who had fallen in all conflicts since the Civil War, and the names of some 25 men killed in Korea had still to be added.)

Bishop Peter was convinced that the bad attitude of the American press toward the Hungarian delegates at Evanston was directed by the State Department, and Bishop Dezsery was even more outspoken in his indictment of the Secretary of State.

"Secretary Dulles inadvertently blabbed out his hope of seeing the Evanston conference dominated by American propaganda," said Dezsery. "Therefore he tried to exclude the Eastern churches from the assembly. He mobilized against us the American Legion, that Fascist organization of war veterans, and all kinds of European exiles. But he did not succeed."

Dezsery said that an American minister told him that his sermons were censored by police, and that an American engineer complained that he was always being bothered by FBI interrogators. "But all this could not prevent American sympathies toward

us," the bishop added. "Many people came to see us secretly and shook our hands warmly in the absolute privacy of hotel elevators."

Bishop Dezsery described the plight of the United States in the words of one of his American friends, a Protestant minister who now lives and works in Geneva, Switzerland. Dezsery quoted the anonymous clergyman thus:

"The country before your eyes is no more that of Lincoln, but that of McCARTHY. America is dominated by a hysteria of fear. No European country would live in such fear. The country is a total political and diplomatic failure. Nobody knows what to do.

"The American people normally are very dynamic, but now they are in a state of wavering and great perplexity. President Eisenhower was elected on a program of peace and social progress. This has proved to be an empty illusion.

"Believe me, the American people have lost their faith in everybody; they are only anxious for their future. While reading a newspaper, the average American can do nothing but turn the chewing gum in his mouth."

The number of automobiles astonished Bishop Dezsery, but he had an explanation for the phenomenon. "Americans sweat all their lives to pay for their cars and the mortgages on their homes," he said.

He also explained the use of parking meters: "Cops are paid by corporations owning parking meters for fining those who refuse to pay for their parking."

This instance of collaborationist clergymen preaching Red propaganda is not unique since the death of Stalin, and it coincides with the frequent mention of religious topics on Red broadcasts, with the astonishing authorization to celebrate Christmas and with rumors of the liberation of Cardinal Mindszenty. Stalin's heirs seem to be following the almost forgotten pattern of the czars, who based their despotism on a close alliance between sword and aspergillum (a brush used to sprinkle holy water).

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 18, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, far above us and yet deep within us, in communion with Thee we find peace for our spirits and power for our tasks. In a desperate day of disappointment, disillusionment, and despair, of disruption and confusion, we bow in gratitude for the mercies beyond our deserving which hallow our lot—the sacrament of friendship, the opportunities for service, the joys and privileges of a free life.

We crave Thy wisdom in all the affairs that face us, lest we and all the peoples of the earth drift to disaster. Thou knowest that we supremely care for our schools and our homes, our churches and our communities. We lift up our intercession for the Nation and pray for a day of international neighborhood. O God, put courage into our hearts, understanding into our minds, strength into our arms. Give us a long look and a deep faith in the kingdom of God that shall yet come on the earth. And send us forth, we beseech Thee, with the baptism of Thy spirit, so to live and work that we shall help to leave behind us a fairer world in which Thou canst rear Thy human family. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 14, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to authority granted by section 8002 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House had elected Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS, of Arkansas, to be a member of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

The message announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 4) to provide for the continuation in office of certain members of the Commission on Governmental Operations.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2369) to amend section 7237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of January 14, 1955,

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported on January 17, 1955, the bill (H. R. 2091) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 6) thereon.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senate Resolution 58, adopted on February 20, 1950, in part provides that—

> There is hereby created a select committee to be known as the Committee on Small Business and to consist of 13 Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate as soon as practicable after the date of adoption of this resolution and at the commencement of each Congress.

On January 14, 1955, the President pro tempore, acting on behalf of the Vice President, appointed the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to fill two of the existing vacancies on the committee. The full membership was not named.

On January 29, 1951, at the beginning of the 82d Congress, and again on February 6, 1953, at the beginning of the 83d Congress, the Vice President appointed the full membership.

The Chair today announces the reappointment of the other 10 members of the committee for the 84th Congress.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations may sit while the Senate is in session today. It is not likely that the meeting will take more than an hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 16)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to the budget for the year 1956, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

(For message of the President, see House proceedings of January 17, 1954, pp. 386–411, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment following today's session the President of the Senate and the President pro tempore be authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions passed by the two Houses, and found to be truly enrolled.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and other routine business, and I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes, in accordance with the usual practice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE RULE OF COMITY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a brief announcement I should like to make. Yesterday in the House of Representatives the beloved and respected Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN, made an announcement of interest, and I think of tremendous importance, to this body. The Speaker advised that it would be his practice during this Congress to enforce strictly the rule of comity between the Houses when Members of that body arose to make derogatory remarks about either the Senate or any Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, I should like at this time to announce that, as majority leader, I, too, will follow the long-standing precedents of this body during the coming Congress in the enforcement of this rule of comity. Good relations between

the House and the Senate and its Members are of the utmost importance in these critical times. I think it is equally important that the standards of Senate rule XIX which apply in the Senate should, under the precedents of comity between the Houses, be vigorously applied if the occasion arises.

It will be my intention to see that that rule is followed in the Senate while I am sitting in this chair as majority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to associate myself with the distinguished majority leader in his remarks. I think the orderly processes of the 2 Houses will be better served if the precedents of comity as between the 2 Houses are followed, and I am sure the public business will be expedited if the Senate observes those precedents and adheres to the rule.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am delighted to have the minority leader associate himself with the statement I have made. It is quite in keeping with the course of conduct he has always followed.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS (S. DOC. No. 6)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation in the sum of $160,000 for the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, for the fiscal year 1955 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, for the year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ADMINISTRATION OF RYUKYU ISLANDS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the administration of the Ryukyu Islands, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEDICAL CARE FOR DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Director, Legislative Programs, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide medical care for dependents of members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROVISIONS OF INCENTIVES FOR MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES BY INCREASING CERTAIN PAY AND ALLOWANCES

A letter from the Director, Legislative Programs, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

ACQUISITION OF LAND FOR CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

A letter from the executive secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities and the acquisition of land by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXTENSION OF PERIOD OF AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR HOSPITAL CENTER IN THE DISTRICT

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the period of authorization of appropriations for the hospital center and facilities in the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF COUNCIL ON LAW ENFORCEMENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the chairman, Council on Law Enforcement in the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that council for the period February 1 to December 31, 1954 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPEAL OF SERVICE CHARGE FOR AUTHENTICATING DEPARTMENT OF STATE RECORDS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal a service charge of 10 cents per sheet of 100 words, for making out and authenticating copies of records in the Department of State (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROPOSED AWARDS OF CERTAIN CONCESSION CONTRACTS

Two letters from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, awards of proposed concession contracts in Olympic National Park and Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks, Calif. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN INDIAN AREAS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the provisions of law added to the United States Code by the act of August 15, 1953 (Public Law 280, 83d Cong. 67 Stat. 588) (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN BOULDER CITY AREA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the disposal of certain Federal property in the Boulder City area, to provide assistance in the establishment of a municipality incorporated under the laws of Nevada, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

APPOINTMENT OF MAJ. GEN. FRANK H. PARTRIDGE, UNITED STATES ARMY, RETIRED, TO CIVILIAN POSITION IN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPOINTMENT OF BRIG. GEN. EDWIN B. HOWARD, UNITED STATES ARMY, RETIRED, TO CIVILIAN POSITION IN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INCREASED PENALTIES FOR SEDITIOUS CONSPIRACY

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to increase the penalties applicable to seditious conspiracy, advocating overthrow of Government, and conspiracy to advocate overthrow of Government (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RODOLFO C. DELGADO, JESUS M. LAGUA, AND VINCENTE D. REYNANTE

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief fo Rodolfo C. Delgado, Jesus M. Lagua, and Vincente D. Reynante (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING THE STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Concurrent Resolution 2—Proposed amendments to constitution of State of Mississippi

"A concurrent resolution submitting an amendment to article 8 of the constitution of the State of Mississippi so as to add an additional section thereto, to be numbered 'section 213–B,' authorizing the legislature by two-thirds vote of those present and voting in each house to abolish public schools and authorize the counties and school districts to abolish public schools, sell and dispose of school buildings, lands, and other property, and make appropriation of public funds, and do such other acts and things deemed necessary to aid and assist educable children of this State to secure an education

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi (the Senate concurring therein):

"SECTION 1. That there be and is hereby submitted to the qualified electors of the State of Mississippi for their approval or re-

jection, in an election to be held in accordance with section 273 of the constitution of this State, on Tuesday, the 21st day of December 1954, the following amendment to article 8 of the constitution of the State of Mississippi, to be numbered and inserted therein and added thereto as 'section 213–B' thereof, to wit:

"'SEC. 213–B. (a) Regardless of any provision of article 3, or any other provisions of this constitution to the contrary, the legislature may authorize the establishment, support, maitnenance, and operation of public schools.

"'(b) Regardless of any provision of article 8, or any other provisions of this constitution to the contrary, the legislature shall be and is hereby authorized and empowered, by a two-thirds vote of those present and voting in each house, to abolish the public schools in this State and enact suitable legislation to effect the same.

"'(c) Regardless of any provision of article 8, or any other provisions of this constitution to the contrary, the legislature shall be and is hereby authorized and empowered, by a majority vote of those present and voting in each House, to authorize the counties and school districts to abolish their public schools and enact suitable legislation to effect the same.

"'(d) In the event the legislature shall abolish, or authorize the abolition of the public schools in this State, then the legislature shall be and is hereby authorized and empowered to enact suitable legislation to dispose of school buildings, land, and other school property by lease, sale, or otherwise.

"'(e) The legislature may appropriate State funds and authorize counties, municipalities, and other governmental subdivisions and districts to appropriate funds, including poll tax and sixteenth section funds, to aid educable children of this State to secure an education.

"'(f) The legislature may do any and all acts and things necessary for the purposes of this section, and this section is declared to be, and is, supplemental to all other provisions of this constitution, and legislation enacted under authority hereof shall prevail, whether in conflict with other sections or not.'

"SEC. 2. Said election for the submission of the aforesaid amendment shall be held in every election precinct of this State on said Tuesday, the 21st day of December 1954. Notice of said election shall be given as required by the constitution and same shall be held agreeably to the general election laws of this State, and said amendment submitted therein in the same manner as amendments to the constitution are submitted in regular general elections held in this State.

"Adopted by the house of representatives September 10, 1954.

"Adopted by the senate September 16, 1954."

Special election held in the State of Mississippi, Tuesday, Dec. 21, 1954—Proposed amendment to the constitution of the State of Mississippi—H. Con. Res. No. 2: Adopted, House of Representatives, Sept. 10, 1954; adopted, Senate, Sept. 16, 1954

Counties	For	Against
Adams	1,822	559
Alcorn	642	700
Amite	1,389	133
Attala	1,522	189
Benton	175	381
Bolivar	2,552	256
Calhoun	595	431
Carroll	894	28
Chickasaw	852	131
Choctaw	675	190
Claiborne	547	38
Clarke	1,451	212
Clay	956	83

Special election held in the State of Mississippi, Tuesday, Dec. 21, 1954—Proposed amendment to the constitution of the State of Mississippi—H. Con. Res. No. 2: Adopted, House of Representatives, Sept. 10, 1954; adopted, Senate, Sept. 16, 1954— Continued

Counties	For	Against
Coahoma	1,909	288
Copiah	1,861	134
Covington	542	447
DeSoto	531	302
Forrest	2,352	2,057
Franklin	797	86
George	342	595
Greene	556	177
Grenada	1,490	48
Hancock	525	560
Harrison	5,631	6,064
Hinds	6,999	3,524
Holmes	2,088	70
Humphreys	1,131	32
Issaquena	209	13
Itawamba	228	1,248
Jackson	689	2,872
Jasper	1,135	265
Jefferson	659	60
Jefferson Davis	926	278
Jones	3,108	1,308
Kemper	1,101	137
Lafayette	1,248	690
Lamar	608	447
Lauderdale	3,410	1,634
Lawrence	867	131
Leake	1,687	286
Lee	647	2,332
Leflore	2,663	127
Lincoln	2,187	206
Lowndes	1,413	196
Madison	1,514	131
Marion	1,140	263
Marshall	781	105
Monroe	960	838
Montgomery	1,830	172
Neshoba	1,859	331
Newton	1,666	254
Noxubee	948	52
Oktibbeha	1,521	271
Panola	1,175	170
Pearl River	673	957
Perry	476	232
Pike	1,756	793
Pontotoc	339	1,371
Prentiss	438	1,084
Quitman	733	73
Rankin	1,916	209
Scott	1,590	238
Sharkey	582	92
Simpson	1,479	323
Smith	1,230	342
Stone	312	846
Sunflower	2,465	78
Tallahatchie	2,231	43
Tate	921	55
Tippah	202	1,733
Tishomingo	131	1,618
Tunica	584	12
Union	439	1,434
Walthall	1,037	59
Warren	1,584	462
Washington	2,242	623
Wayne	819	255
Webster	872	189
Wilkinson	598	73
Winston	1,197	187
Yalobusha	952	94
Yazoo	1,945	92
Total	106,748	46,099

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI,
New Capitol Building,
Jackson, Miss.

I, Heber Ladner, secretary of state of the State of Mississippi, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a copy of the official tabulation of the votes cast in the special election held on the 21st day of December 1954.

I further certify that 152,847 votes were cast in said election, according to the returns received from the county election commissioners of the 82 counties of the State of Mississippi, and, that 106,748 votes were for the amendment, and 46,099 votes against the amendment.

Witness my signature this the 31st day of December 1954.

HEBER LADNER,
Secretary of State of the State of Mississippi.

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Resolution 10

"Resolution directing the clerk of the house of representatives to mail, after the December 21, 1954, special election, certified copies of the election returns to the three branches of the Federal Government, namely: the President of the United States, Congress, and the United States Supreme Court

"Be it resolved by the house of representatives, That upon receipt of the official election returns in the office of the secretary of state after the assembling of the people of the State of Mississippi, for the purpose of voting in the December 21, 1954, special election, to be held for the purpose of determining whether or not the constitution of Mississippi, shall be amended, the Clerk of the house of representatives is hereby directed to mail certified copies of the election returns, together with copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, to be transmitted to the next Congress, and to the Clerk of the United States Supreme Court. The same shall be mailed by United States mail, postage prepaid, with request of return receipts, signed by the receivers thereof. Said receipts, when returned to the clerk, shall be filed in the office of the clerk, in the Mississippi House of Representatives. The herein-contained direction to the clerk of the house of representatives, shall only be put into effect in the event the majority of the voters of the State of Mississippi vote in said election for the proposed constitutional amendment to the Mississippi constitution.

"The intention of this resolution and the direction to the clerk to carry out the matters herein set out, are being put into effect because of the rights given to the people of the United States, under article 1 of the amendments to the United States Constitution, which is:

"'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances'; be it further

"Resolved, That the members of the house of representatives, do herein and by the passage of this resolution, feel that we, the people of the South and the State of Mississippi, have been placed in a state of great grievance, because of the United States Supreme Court's decision which declared that there could be no separation of the races.

"Some of our grievances are herein set out, to wit:

"(1) It will bring about grief, heartaches, and no doubt, bloodshed and hatred between the races, who have heretofore been of one accord.

"(2) It leaves the road open for our foes in enemy countries to capitalize upon our differences.

"(3) It will bring about, inevitably, the mixing of the blood of the two races, the Caucasian and the Negro, and thereby destroy the heritage of both races.

"(4) It has engrossed upon our belief that economically there can be equality of the races, but in a different locale. The decision has not destroyed our belief, but has halted our attempt to this end.

"(5) The decision has cost the taxpayers large sums of money in our efforts to right the wrong and injustice which has been perpetuated on our people.

"(6) It will tremendously affect the lives of both races in every way.

"(7) It has impaired and hampered our respect for racial separation as set up by

the Creator of the races. This is true in the localities, principally in the South, where the Negro race predominates in number.

"The above are only a few of the grievances caused by the decision, the probable numbers are too numerous to mention.

"We, the members of the Mississippi House of Representatives, the people of Mississippi, and of the segregated States, resolve that we believe in the majority rule, and submit that this should be the slogan of our national leaders. The majority, we feel, will be reflected in our December 21, 1954, special election.

"We petition the Congress and the President that they use their vote and influence to pass the proposed amendment to our Federal Constitution, involving the race question, which has been introduced by our senior United States Senator from Mississippi; be it further

"Resolved, That we petition the enactment of the necessary constitutional amendments and laws necessary to right the great wrong committed against the people of the United States, and we hereby submit that we should have redress for our grievances."

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take cognizance of the acute problems attending the recent devastation resulting from tidal floods in the Narragansett Bay area, and to lend support for appropriate action in having the situation surveyed, and to make available funds to aid the State of Rhode Island and the cities and towns to finance the protective works recommended

"Whereas hurricanes have devastated much of Rhode Island's shoreline in 1938, again in 1944, and again in 1954, causing hundreds of deaths and hundreds of millions of dollars in property damage; and

"Whereas over $100 million worth of inventory and property damage, most of it uninsured, was caused by hurricane tides and flooding in the port of Providence, and adjacent communities facing on Narragansett Bay; and

"Whereas the Providence metropolitan area, the 19th largest metropolitan area in the United States, is a defense production center containing vital manufacturing facilities as well as important naval installations; and

"Whereas the port of Providence is the market center for almost one million people, a distribution center for petroleum and petroleum products for southern New England, and a hub of communications; and

"Whereas hurricane tides periodically cripple the Providence metropolitan area and the cities and towns fronting on Narragansett Bay for days at a time, a loss which, in time of war or national emergency, might jeopardize the Nation's security; and

"Whereas the Providence area and the State of Rhode Island cannot sustain the full costs of protection from hurricane tides; and

"Whereas preliminary investigation of methods of protecting the port of Providence and communities fronting on Narragansett Bay indicates that a tidal dam and other flood control measures would furnish protection to downtown Providence and adjacent areas; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has provided protection against hurricane tides and river flooding to cities on the Gulf Coast and on inland waterways: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to take cognizance of the acute problems presented by a situation peculiar to Rhode Island, and to lend its support to secure appropriate action on the part of the Secretary of the Army to include in the civil works program of the Corps of Engineers:

"1. A full investigation of the problem of protecting the port of Providence and the cities and towns on Narragansett Bay which have also suffered from recurrent flooding, taking into consideration the engineering reports that have already been prepared;

"2. A review of all information on this problem now in the possession of the Rhode Island Development Council, the same to be turned over to the Corps of Engineers to assist that agency in preparing its report;

"3. A full public hearing to be held under the auspices of the Corps of Engineers upon the conclusion of the report; and

"4. Authorization to construct, operate, and maintain such flood control dams and other protective devices that the Chief of Engineers may recommend and the State of Rhode Island and municipalities bordering on Narragansett Bay shall approve and accept and to enter into agreements with the State of Rhode Island and municipalities of interest to share the cost and upkeep of such protective works; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be, and they hereby are, respectfully requested to urge upon Congress the passage of such legislation as may be needed to make funds available to aid the State and the cities and towns in the Narragansett Bay area, to finance the protective works and other flood control measures recommended in the report of the Corps of Engineers; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Army, and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress."

A letter in the nature of a petition from the American Association of Port Authorities, Washington, D. C., signed by Lewis I. Bourgeois, chairman, committee on foreign commerce, praying for the enactment of House bill 1, relating to reciprocal trade agreements (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States in favor of the passage of legislation reducing the age at which persons shall be eligible to receive social-security benefits

"Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States a bill sponsored by Congressman THOMAS J. LANE, of Lawrence, Mass., to reduce from 65 to 60 the age at which persons shall be eligible to receive social-security benefits; and

"Whereas many persons who have reached the age of 60 years either have difficulty or cannot receive employment even though they are in good health; and

"Whereas in many cases persons between the ages of 60 and 65 by reason of the lack of social-security benefits either become dependent upon relations or welfare agencies because of inability to secure employment: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration and enact into law the bill reducing the age at which persons shall be eligible to receive social-security benefits; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to each of the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

A petition signed by Florence Burke, and sundry other citizens of the State of New York, favoring the enactment of the Bricker amendment to the Constitution relating to treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ALLOTMENT OF FAS FUNDS TO COUNTIES—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Cook County Board of Commissioners at a meeting held at Grand Marais, Minn., with regard to FAS allotment to counties be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred. I have received similar resolutions from a great many other counties in my State.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution No. 55–4

"Whereas the FAS program as it now stands, is 50-percent participation by the Federal Government and 50-percent participation by the counties; and

"Whereas the FAS funds allotted to the counties were meant for and intended to be used by said counties for the improvement of rural highways or farm-to-market roads; and

"Whereas it is becoming more difficult for an increasing number of counties to match the present FAS fund allotment.

"Now, therefore, the Cook County Board of Commissioners do hereby respectfully request the Commissioner of Highways, United States Senators, and United States Congressmen to work together toward effecting legislation changing the present Federal law to read 75-percent participation by the Federal Government and 25-percent participation by the county."

The foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the Cook County Board of Commisioners at a regular meeting held at Grand Marais, Minn., on this 4th day of January 1955.

Attest:

ALFRED H. RINDAHL,
Auditor, Cook County.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. Res. 13. Resolution to investigate certain problems relating to interstate and foreign commerce, with an amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO HOLD HEARINGS AND INVESTIGATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report an original resolution extending the authority of the Committee on Armed Services for hearings and investigations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received; and, under the rule, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The resolution (S. Res. 28), reported by Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Armed Services, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 185, 83d Congress, agreed to January 26, 1954, is amended by striking out January 31, 1955, wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof March 31, 1955.

ADDITIONAL CLERICAL ASSISTANTS FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations I report an original resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 29) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Foreign Relations, under Senate Resolution 146, 82d Congress, agreed to August 6, 1951; Senate Resolution 249, 82d Congress, agreed to January 15, 1952; Senate Resolution 33, 83d Congress, agreed to January 30, 1953; and Senate Resolution 179, 83d Congress, agreed to January 26, 1954, authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to employ two additional clerical assistants is hereby continued from February 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution. I may state that it was offered in the full committee by both the former chairman, the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and myself. It merely continues two clerical assistants to the committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, speaking as the minority leader, I have no objection to the resolution. It was offered in the Committee on Foreign Relations, was unanimously approved by the committee, and merely provides for a continuation of the present situation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, reference of the resolution to the Committee on Rules and Administration will be waived.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

CITATION OF DIANTHA D. HOAG FOR CONTEMPT OF SENATE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations, I report an original resolution (S. Res. 31) citing Diantha D. Hoag for contempt of the Senate, and I submit a report (No. 7) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 31) reported by Mr. McCARTHY, from the Committee on Government Operations, was placed on the calendar as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on Government Operations of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Diantha D. Hoag to answer questions before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, said refusal to answer being pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Diantha D. Hoag may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

William R. Kachel and sundry other persons, for permanent appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Robert C. Hendrickson, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to New Zealand; and

John Lodge, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Spain.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably a group of 1,510 routine nominations in the Air Force, in the grades of lieutenant colonel and below. Since this list has already appeared in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar of this large number of names, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 481. A bill for the relief of Gerard Lucien Dandurand; and

S. 482. A bill for the relief of Capt. Cassius H. Styles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUFF (for himself and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania):

S. 483. A bill to provide for temporary measures of flood control and anthracite mine drainage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. DUFF when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 484. A bill for the relief of Michael Aristides Tseperkas;

S. 485. A bill for the relief of Gerasimos Athanase Haberis; and

S. 486. A bill for the relief of Mohammad Hamad Faris (Fares); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 487. A bill to amend chapter 19, title 5, of the United States Code, entitled, "Administrative Procedure," so as to prohibit the employment by any person of any member, official, attorney, or employee of a Government agency except under certain conditions;

S. 488. A bill to improve the administration of justice by the creation of an Administrative Court of the United States;

S. 489. A bill to provide general rules of practice and procedure before Federal agencies;

S. 490. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act, and eliminate certain exemptions therefrom; and

S. 491. A bill to provide for attorneys' liens in proceedings before the courts or other departments and agencies of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 492. A bill for the relief of Eva Perro Pobre Reilly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 493. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to relieve innocent purchasers of fungible goods converted by warehousemen from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation; and

S. 494. A bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 495. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Rock City as a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 496. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MALONE (for himself and Mr. BIBLE):

S. 497. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washoe reclamation project, Nevada and California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 498. A bill for the relief of Maria Gabriella Byron (Maria Gabriella Michon); and

S. 499. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Airo-Farulla and Joseph Antoine Airo-Farulla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and Mr. WATKINS):

S. 500. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 501. A bill for the relief of Ki Young Kwan;

S. 502. A bill for the relief of Elsa Lederer;

S. 503. A bill for the relief of Cirino Lanzafame;

S. 504. A bill for the relief of Priska Anne Kary;

S. 505. A bill for the relief of Angelo Spiros Phillippas (George A. Phillips) and Loula Spiros Phillippas (Lola Phillips);

S. 506. A bill for the relief of Emery Nussbaum and Eleanor Nussbaum; and

S. 507. A bill for the relief of Anna Marie Hitzelberger Scheidt, and her minor child, Rosanne Hitzelberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 508. A bill for the relief of Victoriana Areitio Berincua;

S. 509. A bill for the relief of Dolores Maria Seijo; and

S. 510. A bill for the relief of Mary A. Mouskalis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

S. 511. A bill to authorize John E. Gross to accept the award of the Royal Order of St. Olav, grade of Commander with Star, tendered by the Government of Norway; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 512. A bill providing for the denial of certain Federal grants to States and tax credits to employers in States which fail to make ineligible for unemployment compensation benefits individuals who have claimed the constitutional privilege against self-incrimination when questioned with regard to Communist Party membership or other

subversive affiliations or activities; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 513. A bill to provide for the construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal reclamation projects by irrigation districts and other public agencies; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MALONE (for himself and Mr. BIBLE):

S. 514. A bill to provide for the disposal of certain Federal property in the Boulder City area, to provide assistance in the establishment of a municipality incorporated under the laws of Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 515. A bill to authorize private transactions involving the sale, acquisition, or holding of gold within the United States, its Territories and possessions, including Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 516. A bill to amend the act of July 3, 1952, relating to research in the development and utilization of saline waters; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 517. A bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 which penalizes other soil-conservation practices when acreage allotments are exceeded; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 518. A bill for the relief of Elsa Alwine Larsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES (for himself, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. CASE of New Jersey):

S. 519. A bill to make certain changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. IVES when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 520. A bill for the relief of Bernard L. Denn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself, Mr. MORSE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HILL, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 521. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to reduce from 65 to 60 years the age at which women may qualify for old-age and survivors insurance benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 522. A bill to authorize Federal payments to the States to assist in constructing schools; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 523. A bill to establish a basic administrative workweek and pay periods of two administrative workweeks for postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 524. A bill to authorize and direct a full investigation of the problem of protecting Narragansett Bay and the southern shores of New England from hurricane tidal floods; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. GREEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCNAMARA:

S. 525. A bill for the relief of Sergio I. Veira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 526. A bill for the relief of Paul Peter Fracchione; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON):

S. 527. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to provide that nothing therein shall invalidate the provisions of State laws prohibiting strikes in public utilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 528. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rainy River at or near Baudette, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 529. A bill to incorporate the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 530. A bill for the relief of the Sacred Heart Hospital; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS (for himself and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 531. A bill to require public hearings prior to withdrawals of public lands, to limit temporary withdrawals to 5 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. WATKINS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 532. A bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 533. A bill to increase the education and training allowances under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. LANGER):

S. 534. A bill to designate the reservoir above the Heart-Butte Dam in North Dakota as Lake Tschida;

S. 535. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of North Dakota, for use as a State historic site, of the land where Chief Sitting Bull was originally buried; and

S. 536. A bill to provide for the return to the former owners of certain lands acquired in connection with the Garrison Dam project of mineral interests in such lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 537. A bill to permit a portion of Federal funds made available to the States for construction or reconstruction of secondary highways to be used by local governmental units for construction or reconstruction of county and township roads; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 538. A bill to prohibit certain reservations of mineral interests by Federal land banks, the Land Bank Commissioner, and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, and to provide for disposition of certain mineral interests heretofore reserved by them; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 539. A bill to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GEORGE (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES):

S. 540. A bill to increase the salaries of judges of the United States courts, and to provide that Members of Congress shall receive salary comparable to that of judges of the United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 541. A bill for the relief of Martin Aloysius Madden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. DANIEL):

S. 542. A bill for the relief of the Trust Association of H. Kempner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 543. A bill to establish the finality of contracts between the Government and common carriers of passengers and freight subject to the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRICKER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 544. A bill to amend section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to provide for administration of farm programs by democratically elected farmer committeemen; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 545. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Sho-Tse Tsiang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 546. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to relieve innocent purchasers of fungible goods converted by warehousemen from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 547. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to increase the penalties applicable to seditious conspiracy, advocating overthrow of Government, and conspiracy to advocate overthrow of Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. KNOWLAND):

S. 548. A bill to provide financial assistance to the Oakdale and South San Joaquin Irrigation Districts, California, in the construction of the Tri-Dam project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. KUCHEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. STENNIS):

S. J. Res. 21. Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Government Security; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

TEMPORARY MEASURES OF FLOOD CONTROL AND ANTHRACITE MINE DRAINAGE

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for temporary measures of flood control and anthracite mine drainage. This is in line with the recommendation of the President in his budget message.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 483) to provide for temporary measures of flood control and anthracite mine drainage, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DUFF (for himself and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF McCARRAN-WALTER IMMIGRATION LAW

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would amend the McCarran-Walter immigration law. A similar bill was introduced in the 83d Congress in both the Senate and the House of Representatives.

This bill contains three titles. The first title is designed to eliminate certain serious injustices which were specifically pointed out by the President of the United States in a letter to the then chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], dated December 6, 1953. Among the injustices eliminated are the unrestricted authority given consuls to give or deny visas with virtually no standards for guidance, the discrimination against naturalized citizens, and the future mortgaging of immigration quotas by many countries.

The second title deals with procedural inequities and injustices which have appeared in the administration of the law.

The third title modernizes the quota system by establishing the 1950 instead of the 1920 census figures as the basis for determining national quotas. This would substantially alleviate a serious inequity that exists with respect to nationalities from southern and southeastern Europe, from which immigration is practically impossible today. Finally, it insures that all unused quotas will be used by providing for a redistribution of such quotas from any year to the succeeding year.

This bill goes far toward curing the most serious inequities contained in our present immigration law and should do much to enhance the prestige of the United States in parts of the world where the menace of international communism is greatest.

I ask unanimous consent that an analysis of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 519) to make certain changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act, introduced by Mr. IVES (for himself, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. CASE of New Jersey) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The analysis presented by Mr. IVES is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF BILL AMENDING IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALTY ACT (McCARRAN-WALTER IMMIGRATION ACT, PUBLIC LAW 414, 82D CONG.)

SHORT TITLE, "IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1955"

Title I

This title follows recommendations of President Eisenhower as contained in his April 6, 1953, letter to Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS proposing a Senate inquiry into the operations of the McCarran-Walter Act.

Section 101: Amends sections 212 (a) (15) and 241 (a) (8) of Public Law 414 with respect to standards for determining whether aliens are or are likely to become public charges. The provision which gives controlling effect to the opinion of the consul or of immigration officials, without adequate supporting evidence, is eliminated.

Section 102: Amends subsections (27) and (29) of section 212 (a) of Public Law 414 with respect to standards for determining whether immigrants would engage in subversive activities. The consul and immigration officials would no longer be vested with the authority, without restraint, to determine by their own mental processes the probability of future prescribed conduct.

Section 103: Amends section 287 (a) (1) of Public Law 414 with respect to power of officers and employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to interrogate without warrant persons believed to be aliens as to their right to be or remain in this country. Strengthens the term "believed" by requiring "with probable cause," thus preventing improper interrogation of citizens.

Section 104: Repeals sections 352, 353 and 354 of Public Law 414, which provide for loss of nationality by naturalized citizens because of residence abroad. This amendment thus eliminates the stigma of second-class citizenship. Section 104 of the bill also repeals sections 350 and 355 of Public Law 414 which provide for loss of citizenship by native-born citizens because of residence abroad. The principle that native-born citizens will lose their American nationality by residence abroad was introduced to our nationality laws for the first time by Public Law 414. To permit that principle to remain in our law, while repealing the corresponding provision as to naturalized citizens, would discriminate against the native-born citizen.

Section 105: Amends sections 101 (2) (37), 212 (a) (28) (D), 241 (a) (6) (D) and 313 (a) (3) of Public Law 414 by broadening restrictions contained in that act with respect to persons who have advocated a totalitarian dictatorship or have belonged to totalitarian organizations. Nazis and Fascists would, as a result, be barred from the United States without the necessity of proving, as Public Law 414 now requires, that they have advocated, or belonged to organizations which advocated, the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in the United States. This closes the loophole in Public Law 414 that now permits the Nazis and Fascists to enter the United States and to become naturalized.

Section 106: By amending section 244 (a) (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) of Public Law 414 eliminates the standards of "exceptional and extremely unusual hardship" in granting suspension of deportation, substituting the term "serious hardship."

Sections 107 and 108: By repealing section 3 (c) of the Displaced Persons Act and amending section 201 (e) of Public Law 414 eliminates provision requiring future mortgaging of quotas.

Section 109: By amending sections 202 (a) (5) and 202 (e) and repealing section 202 (b), (c), and (d) of Public Law 414, eliminates quota provisions in the present act which discriminate against Asiatic and colonial peoples. The amendment will restore the law as it existed prior to Public Law 414, by which colonial peoples came under the quota of their mother country. Public Law 414 establishes a quota determined by race for Asiatic peoples no matter in what country of the world they are born, while the quota for non-Asiatics is determined simply by birth within quota areas. The amendment extends the latter provision to persons of an Asiatic race and thus removes the stigma of racial discrimination.

Title II

This title corrects certain administrative deficiencies that have become generally apparent since the beginning of enforcement of Public Law 414.

Section 201: By amending section 101 (a) (6) of Public Law 414, restores preexamination (an administrative procedure adopted in 1935 which permitted an alien in the United States to become a permanent resident by obtaining his immigration visa in Canada instead of being required to make the long and expensive journey to his country of origin for that purpose.)

Section 202: By amending section 212 (9) and (10) permits entry of an alien who has received a pardon for a crime.

Section 203: Amends section 212 (c) of Public Law 414 to restore the law as it existed, and operated satisfactorily, from 1917 to 1952. The result would be to give the Attorney General discretionary power to admit an alien who is returning to an unrelinquished American residence of at least 7 years, with no requirement that the alien was originally admitted to this country for permanent residence.

Section 204. Repeals section 235 (c) of Public Law 414, which permits exclusion without a hearing.

Section 205: Repeals section 241 (d) of Public Law 414, the retroactive provision which makes an alien deportable for conduct prior to December 24, 1952, even though that conduct was not a ground of deportation before Public Law 414 came into effect.

Section 206: Amends section 245 of Public Law 414 which permits the Attorney General to adjust the status of an alien temporarily here to that of an alien admitted for permanent residence. The amendment softens the unnecessarily rigorous requirements which an alien must now meet.

Section 207: (a) Permits judicial review in exclusion and deportation cases.

(b) Establishes a statute of limitations whereby no alien may be deported by reason of conduct occurring more than 10 years prior to the institution of deportation proceedings.

Section 208: Repeals section 360 (a) of Public Law 414 and substitutes a provision granting judicial review for a person claiming American citizenship who has been denied such right.

Section 209: Amends section 360 (c) of Public Law 414 by broadening provision for judicial review of final determination by Attorney General in refusing entry to persons issued certificate of identity as claimants of American citizenship under section 360 (b).

Section 210: Establishes a Board of Visa Appeals in State Department to review questions involving the denying of visas and the application or meaning of State Department regulations applying to immigration.

Title III

Section 301: Provides for the pooling of unused quotas and their allocation the next succeeding fiscal year to those on waiting lists of quotas 7,000 and under (includes Italian, Greek, Dutch, Austrian, and eastern European quotas). Quotas are to be determined on the basis of the 1950 census instead of the 1920 census as is now the practice.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT RELATING TO REDUCTION OF AGE LIMIT FOR WOMEN FOR BENEFITS OF OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, my first bill since becoming a Member of the Senate. It is introduced on behalf of myself, my colleague the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator

from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA].

At the same time, Mrs. EDITH GREEN, Representative in Congress from the Third Oregon District, is introducing a companion bill in the House.

The bill would lower the social-security qualifying age for women from 65 years of age to 60.

This, in my opinion, is a matter of simple fairness and equity. Wives are usually a few years younger than their husbands. If the husband dies at age 65, his widow, unable to receive benefits because she is a few years younger, must prove her poverty and seek public assistance to carry her to age 65. It should be noted that this turning to public assistance increases the burden on general taxation, instead of allowing the widow to draw from funds to which she and/or her husband contributed directly for this purpose.

Requiring a wife to be 65 before the benefits can be received means that only about one-fifth of the married men in America who retire at 65 have wives immediately eligible for wife's benefits. We are all aware that insurance benefits—the husband may possibly be drawing as much as $660 a year—do not cover the cost of even the most modest living for an elderly couple.

Many families must, therefore, live on inadequate benefits for several years before the wife becomes eligible. They may be forced to prove poverty and turn to old-age assistance. If women could qualify at the age of 60, about three-fifths of the families would draw benefits for both husband and wife immediately when the husband reached the age of 65 and retirement.

I believe that women who are working should also be eligible for social-security benefits at the age of 60. It is difficult for women between 60 and 65 to hold jobs, or to find new ones. Older women do only half as well as men in holding onto jobs once they are past the age of 60. This fact should be recognized by giving them the protection they cannot otherwise obtain.

It is well to consider thoroughly the fears of some who are opposed to lowering the age of eligibility to 60 for women workers. They contend that if 60 is the age of eligibility, so, too, will it be the age of dismissal. When that event does occur, it is as a result of company pension plans, not social security. The remedy against that hardship lies in revising inequities in company pension plans, rather than in leaving inequities in the social-security structure.

On the matter of costs, I have obtained informal estimates which indicate that the cost of the benefits—for working women, wives, and widows at 60 instead of 65—would total 1 percent of the payroll. Employees would contribute one-half and the employers would contribute the other half. It might be mentioned that both of our largest labor organizations have declared that their members are ready and willing to assume that cost.

There are other features of social security which should be expanded, Mr. President, but this gain for women is the most imperative at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 521) to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to reduce from 65 to 60 years the age at which women may qualify for old-age and survivors insurance benefits, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and other Senators) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce a bill for appropriate reference, and I should like to be indulged for about 30 seconds to say that it deals with school construction. I have often heard it said that there are only two absolutes, namely, death and taxes. I think I can add one other absolute, which is the increase in population; and still another is the increase in the school population. Education, Mr. President, will not wait. So I introduce a bill providing for school construction.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 522) to authorize Federal payments to the States to assist in constructing schools was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROTECTION OF CERTAIN SHORES OF NEW ENGLAND FROM HURRICANE TIDAL FLOODS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], a bill to authorize and direct a full investigation of the problem of protecting Narragansett Bay and the southern shores of New England from hurricane tidal floods.

In support of this measure I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Bernard M. Shanley, special counsel to President Eisenhower, dated September 24, 1954, addressed to His Excellency, Dennis J. Roberts, Governor of the State of Rhode Island. This letter indicates that the present national administration will be sympathetic to the approach to the problem proposed in this bill.

I also present for the RECORD, a copy of a letter addressed to me by Hon. Thomas S. Gates, Jr., Acting Secretary of the Navy dated December 16, 1954. This letter indicates the interest of the Navy in a study being made by the Army engineers as provided for in this bill.

Also, for the RECORD, I present a certified copy of a resolution adopted by the Rhode Island General Assembly on January 14, 1955, memorializing the Congress of the United States and recommending an immediate survey of the Narragansett Bay area by the United States Army engineers.

Mr. President, the adjoining States of Massachusetts and Connecticut are also concerned with this effort, as are many industries, civic and public groups throughout southern New England. In this respect, my colleague and I wish to take this occasion to express our appreciation to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], who on Friday, January 14, introduced a measure relating to this same problem.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters and resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 524) to authorize and direct a full investigation of the problem of protecting Narragansett Bay and the southern shores of New England from hurricane tidal floods, introduced by Mr. GREEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The letters and resolution presented by Mr. GREEN are as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., September 24, 1954.

The Honorable DENNIS J. ROBERTS,
Governor of Rhode Island,
Providence, R. I.

DEAR GOVERNOR ROBERTS: The President has asked me to write you concerning your recent letter in regard to utilizing the Corps of Engineers to conduct a prompt preliminary survey of the construction and other means needed to protect Rhode Island shore areas, especially downtown Providence, from tidal waves.

As you know, on September 2, the President found that the recent hurricane had caused damage of sufficient severity and magnitude to certain areas in the State of Rhode Island to warrant Federal assistance to supplement State and local efforts. Accordingly, he issued instructions to the Federal Civil Defense Administrator designating these areas as a major disaster area and subsequently allotted $1,500,000 to provide the necessary Federal assistance. The regional director of the Federal Civil Defense Administration called upon the Corps of Engineers to assist in developing damage surveys of the disaster area, including the coastal sections.

The Corps of Engineers, in accordance with the authority contained in the Flood Control Act of 1950, together with other interested Federal agencies, is currently engaged in a comprehensive survey of the water resources of the New York-New England area. In connection with this survey the Corps of Engineers has initiated a preliminary investigation of the areas damaged by floods aggravated by extreme winds and high tides. These investigations embrace the city of Providence and other areas in Rhode Island but they are expected to develop only a general concept of the protection measures required.

I note in your letter that you are asking your congressional delegation to secure necessary authorization to undertake a thorough study for the development of definitive plans. I can assure you that this administration is sympathetic to this approach to the problem. In the meantime, in order that your rehabilitation program may move ahead as rapidly as possible, the Federal Civil Defense Administration and the Corps of Engineers have been directed to make available to you all pertinent information obtained during the course of the investigation now under way. I am certain that measures can be devised which can be incorporated into the State's rehabilitation plans which would re-

duce in the future such tragic losses as have recently been experienced in Rhode Island and other areas in New England.

The President is deeply concerned with the suffering caused the people of Rhode Island by these devastating hurricanes.

Sincerely,

BERNARD M. SHANLEY,
Special Counsel to the President.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, December 16, 1954.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GREEN: This is in further reference to your letter of December 1, 1954, concerning the construction of breakwaters to protect portions of the State of Rhode Island from hurricanes.

The plan as presented in the Providence Journal appears to have merit. However, prior to the determination of a firm Navy position, further development of the project with a view to providing concrete data on the following factors is necessary:

Velocity of waterflow through the narrow (500 feet) openings in the breakwaters at various tidal ranges.

Possible sizes of openings and the effect of the various openings on the maximum tides to be generated upstream.

Effect of the alteration of the tidal prism on adjacent shorelines. At various locations extensive property damage has occurred due to scouring and new deposits in undesired locations because of manmade changes in the normal-flow channel.

The manner in which ship traffic would be routed and controlled while passing through or approaching the restricted openings.

The above information could best be obtained through extensive model studies conducted by the Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers. However, such studies would probably require congressional authorization and funding.

I trust that the information supplied above will satisfy your requirements. If it does not, please do not hesitate to call on me and I will have this matter further investigated.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS S. GATES, Jr.,
Acting Secretary of the Navy.

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take cognizance of the acute problems attending the recent devastation resulting from tidal floods in the Narragansett Bay area, and to lend support for appropriate action in having the situation surveyed, and to make available funds to aid the State of Rhode Island and the cities and towns to finance the protective works recommended

Whereas hurricanes have devastated much of Rhode Island's shoreline in 1938, again in 1944, and again in 1954, causing hundreds of deaths and hundreds of millions of dollars in property damage; and

Whereas over $100 million worth of inventory and property damage, most of it uninsured, was caused by hurricane tides and flooding in the port of Providence and adjacent communities facing on Narragansett Bay; and

Whereas the Providence metropolitan area, the 19th largest metropolitan area in the United States, is a defense production center containing vital manufacturing facilities as well as important naval installations; and

Whereas the port of Providence is the market center for almost 1 million people, a distribution center for petroleum and petroleum products for southern New England, and a hub of communications; and

Whereas hurricane tides periodically cripple the Providence metropolitan area and the cities and towns fronting on Narragansett Bay for days at a time, a loss which, in time of war or national emergency, might jeopardize the Nation's security; and

Whereas the Providence area and the State of Rhode Island cannot sustain the full costs of protection from hurricane tides; and

Whereas preliminary investigation of methods of protecting the port of Providence and communities fronting on Narragansett Bay indicates that a tidal dam and other flood control meaures would furnish protection to downtown Providence and adjacent areas; and

Whereas the Federal Government has provided protection against hurricane tides and river flooding to cities on the Gulf Coast and on inland waterways: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to take cognizance of the acute problems presented by a situation peculiar to Rhode Island, and to lend its support to secure appropriate action on the part of the Secretary of the Army to include in the civil works program of the Corps of Engineers:

1. A full investigation of the problem of protecting the port of Providence and the cities and towns on Narragansett Bay which have also suffered from recurrent flooding, taking into consideration the engineering reports that have already been prepared;

2. A review of all information on this problem now in the possession of the Rhode Island Development Council, the same to be turned over to the Corps of Engineers to assist that agency in preparing its report;

3. A full public hearing to be held under the auspices of the Corps of Engineers upon the conclusion of the report, and

4. Authorization to construct, operate, and maintain such flood control dams and other protective devices that the Chief of Engineers may recommend and the State of Rhode Island and municipalities bordering on Narragansett Bay shall approve and accept and to enter into agreements with the State of Rhode Island and municipalities of interest to share the cost and upkeep of such protective works; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be, and they hereby are, respectfully requested to urge upon Congress the passage of such legislation as may be needed to make funds available to aid the State and the cities and towns in the Narragansett Bay area, to finance the protective works and other flood control measures recommended in the report of the Corps of Engineers; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby directed, to transmit copies of this resolution to the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Army, and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress.

WITHDRAWALS OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in response to a formal resolution approved by the Western States Land Commissioners Association, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for public hearings and a 5-year limitation on future withdrawals of public lands by Executive order.

On June 30, 1952, the Secretary of the Interior reported that a grand total of 68,474,285 acres, or roughly one-sixth of the public domain, exclusive of the Alaskan Territory, was in a reserved or withdrawn status.

This withdrawn acreage included 46,151,091 acres of mineral withdrawals; 2,541,832 acres of temporary withdrawals for national parks, monuments, forests, wildlife preserves, and recreation areas; 16,273,180 acres for military and other defense purposes, and 3,508,182 for other Federal purposes.

These withdrawals have been effected largely by executive decree. In many cases, the withdrawal privilege has been woefully abused by executive agencies, resulting in orders blanketing in tremendous areas when the practical needs could have been met with relatively small withdrawals. In other cases, the actual need for any withdrawal at all appeared highly questionable to residents of the area affected.

In the withdrawal heyday, withdrawal was placed upon withdrawal, to the extent that thousands of dollars will have to be spent in studies of public records, merely to effect an accounting of the land now subject to these multiple withdrawal orders.

This confusion in our public land stewardship interferes with the proper use and disposition of our public lands, because, in most cases, entries for other uses, such as mineral leasing or homesteading, are prohibited until the withdrawal order is formally revoked.

The legal barrier of withdrawal also prevents transfer to some States of literally hundreds of sections of the public domain granted by Congress in statehood enabling acts for support of the common schools. The attorney general of my State, for example, came to Washington a year ago to protest further inclusion of approximately 200,000 acres of assigned Utah school lands in a naval oil shale reservation of 2 million acres in Utah. Those 200,000 acres, I might add, were awarded by Congress in 1896 for support of the Utah public schools, but they remain under Federal domination to this day, even though the area has been surveyed and Federal oil and gas leasing is permitted on the acreage.

Fortunately, the pace of the withdrawal program has abated in recent years. In fiscal year 1953, for example, only 1,207,219 acres were subjected to Federal withdrawals. During that year, the Federal Government revoked 227,004 acres that had been under a withdrawal status, leaving a net contribution to the total withdrawn acreage of about 1 million acres.

My bill does not prevent the executive branch of the Government from ordering withdrawal or reservation of public lands. It merely prescribes that no public lands shall be withdrawn from settlement, entry, location, or sale, except after full public hearings held with the State or States in which the subject lands are situated.

It also fixes a 5-year limit upon so-called temporary withdrawals, which, in the past, have been, in effect, permanent withdrawals in spite of their temporary designation.

The bill further directs the Secretary of the Interior to periodically review the need for continued withdrawal of any public lands under a withdrawn or reserved status, and to hold public hearings and take necessary remedial action when a Governor of a State requests a review of the status of lands believed subject to official release of withdrawal.

The provisions of the act shall not apply to withdrawals specifically authorized by an act of Congress.

For the information of my colleagues, I request unanimous consent to have appended to my remarks the text of resolution 6, as approved at the 1954 convention of the Western States Land Commissioners Association.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 531) to require public hearings prior to withdrawals of the public lands, to limit temporary withdrawals to 5 years, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WATKINS (for himself and Mr. BENNETT) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The resolution presented by Mr. WATKINS is as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 6

Whereas under the several acts of Congress of the United States providing for the survey of public lands, certain sections were granted to the public land States for the benefit of common schools; and

Whereas the Bureau of Land Management Statistical Appendixes for the year 1952 shows that there are in the Western States 116 million acres of unsurveyed lands; and

Whereas because of the failure on the part of the United States to complete the survey of the public lands in said Western States, said States are denied the benefit of the lands granted for the benefit of common schools; and

Whereas the present rate of original surveys indicates that less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the unsurveyed lands are being surveyed annually; and

Whereas the recent tendency of the Federal Government to withdraw vast areas of unsurveyed lands for Federal purposes precludes the States from receiving "in place" the school sections on lands which are not now and probably never will be surveyed; and

Whereas because of the many withdrawals by numerous Federal departments and agencies, satisfaction of the school land grants through indemnity selections is greatly curtailed for the reason that practically all of the remaining public domain is of very low value: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Western States Land Commissioners Association assembled in San Francisco, Calif., this 16th day of June 1954—

1. That this association urgently seek passage by the 84th Congress of the United States of legislation providing that before land withdrawals can be made by the Federal Government or branches thereof adequate public notice must be given and an opportunity afforded for a public hearing in the State or States affected.

2. That a time limit of 5 years be placed on all temporary withdrawals, and that all withdrawals, past or present, be made subject to review upon the request of the State in which the withdrawn lands are located, and if upon such request the United States or any department or agency thereof does not see fit to revoke or amend the withdrawal, then and in that event, the request for review by the respective States shall be subject to a public hearing, at which all interested parties will be permitted to present reasons for such requested revocation or amendment.

3. That the secretary of this association is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to each Senator and Representative of the States comprising this association, to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate, and to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, and to the Governor of each of the States comprising this association.

FINALITY OF CERTAIN CONTRACTS BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT AND COMMON CARRIERS

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish the finality of contracts between the Government and common carriers of passengers and freight subject to the Interstate Commerce Act.

This is a bill which was passed by the last Congress, but was vetoed by the President. The veto message has been complied with in this bill, and I believe the bill will meet with the approval of the Congress.

The purpose of this bill is to prevent the Government, by complaint to the Commission, from assailing the rates established. Accordingly, it is proposed that after the quotation or contract has been accepted or agreed to by the Secretary of Defense or the Administrator of the General Services Administration, or by any official or employee of the United States to whom they may delegate such authority, the rate so established shall be conclusively presumed to be just, reasonable, and otherwise lawful and shall not be subject to attack, or reparation, after the date of such acceptance or agreement upon any grounds whatsoever except for actual fraud or deceit or clerical mistake.

The bill would also prevent consideration of the reduced rates as evidence of unreasonableness of other rates. It also provides that its passage shall not affect transactions other than those carried out under its terms.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 543) to establish the finality of contracts between the Government and common carriers of passengers and freight subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, introduced by Mr. BRICKER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT RELATING TO FARMER-COMMITTEE SYSTEM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 8 (f) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to provide for administration of farm programs by democratically elected farmer committeemen.

I am sure that many other Senators have had my experience of receiving vigorous protests from farmers on the restrictions placed upon them when deciding whom they shall have represent them as farmer committeemen under the ACP program, formerly the PMA program. Last year Congress intended to correct the situation.

However, after Congress adjourned, the Secretary of Agriculture interpreted the action of Congress as applying only to county committees, not to local committees.

It is the purpose of the bill I am introducing today to make it crystal clear that it is the will and wish of Congress that all committeemen, whether they are on the township, community, county, or State level, be chosen freely by the farmers, without any limitations or restrictions being placed on the farmers in making their selections.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared on the bill be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 544) to amend section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to provide for administration of farm programs by democratically elected farmer committeemen, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The statement presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

I am introducing today a bill to amend section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to provide for administration of farm programs by democratically elected farmer committeemen.

I am sure many of my colleagues have had as I have vigorous protests from farmers to restrictions upon whom they could elect to represent them as farmer-committeemen under the ASC program, the former PMA.

Last year, this Congress accepted my amendment to the Agricultural Act intended to correct this situation and assure farmers the right to elect whomever they might choose to represent them under this committee system.

However, after Congress adjourned, the Secretary of Agriculture interpreted the amendment as applying only to county committees, and not to local committees. Regardless of the legal interpretation, I believe it was the intent of the Congress to give farmers the right to choose any of their neighbors in free and democratic elections, at either township or county levels, without restrictions on the number of terms a farmer might serve. I recall comments on this floor that Senators would not take kindly to a limitation on their tenure, by administrative edict.

Under the farmer committee system, farmers elect township committees from among their neighbors. Chairmen of these township committees meet in county convention, in turn, to select county committees. Under the present departmental interpretation and regulation, tenure of township committees can be limited but not of county committees.

The intention of my bill is to specifically protect the right of farmers to elect whomever they desire, for as many terms as they desire, at either township or county level.

The bill is further designed to correct another administrative restriction on these farmers committees that has brought widespread protest from farmers in the Midwest.

Historically, the farmers serving on these committees in the Midwest have actually administered the programs for which they are responsible. Other farmers have favored this, because they can deal with fellow farmers who understand their local problems.

In other areas of the country, I understand these committees have worked through local county managers, as paid employees of county offices.

Secretary Benson has ordered all county committees in the country to adopt the county-manager plan, making the elected committees more advisory than administrative. While that may work in some areas, it has not been accepted as satisfactory in others. It has led to low-paid clerks with little background or capability trying to administer farm-acreage allotments and the agricultural-conservation program, instead of experienced farm people.

My bill would not prevent use of such county managers where it is desired and has been worked out satisfactorily. However, it does leave it to the discretion of the elected local committees whether they want to perform these administrative functions themselves, or delegate them to a county manager. I believe the change would be in keeping with the spirit of the farmer committee system, to provide as great a local voice as possible in operation of our farm program.

STRENGTHENING OF PENALTY FOR SEDITIOUS CONSPIRACY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill recommended by the Attorney General of the United States to increase the penalties applicable to seditious conspiracy advocating overthrow of our Government, and conspiracy to advocate overthrow of our Government.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill and a letter from the Department of Justice to the Vice President, be printed in the body of the RECORD, and thereafter appropriately referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 547) to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to increase the penalties applicable to seditious conspiracy, advocating overthrow of Government, and conspiracy to advocate overthrow of Government, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2384 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out "$5,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$20,000" and by striking out "six years" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty years."

SEC. 2. Section 2385 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out "$10,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$20,000" and by striking out "ten years" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty years," and by adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"If two or more persons conspire to commit any offense named in this section, each shall be fined not more than $20,000 or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both, and shall be ineligible for employment by the United States or any department or agency thereof, for the 5 years next following his conviction."

SEC. 3. The foregoing amendments shall apply only with respect to offenses committed on and after the date of the enactment of this act.

The letter presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: There is attached for your consideration and appropriate action a legislative proposal, "To amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to increase the penalties applicable to seditious conspiracy, advocating overthrow of Government, and conspiracy to advocate overthrow of Government."

The Department of Justice recommends an increase in the penalties provided under existing law with respect to the offenses of seditious conspiracy and advocating overthrow of Government. It is also recommended that a conspiracy provision with increased penalties be added to existing law relating to the offense of advocating overthrow of Government.

With respect to the offense of seditious conspiracy, existing law provides a maximum fine of $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 6 years, or both (18 U. S. C. 2384). The maximum penalty under existing law for advocating overthrow of Government is a fine of $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or both (18 U. S. C. 2385). The maximum penalty under existing law for conspiracy to commit offenses relating to advocating overthrow of Government is a fine of $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both. This Department recommends that the penalty provisions for each of the foregoing offenses be increased so that as to each offense the penalty shall be a fine of not more than $20,000 or not more than 20 years' imprisonment, or both.

The need for the increase in penalties for the offenses mentioned above is readily apparent if consideration is given to the fact that approximately one-third of the sentence may never be served if a prisoner conducts himself properly in the penitentiary. A little more than 3 years' imprisonment is entirely inadequate as a deterrent for those who would conspire to teach and advocate the violent overthrow of our Government. This reasoning likewise applies with respect to the offense of seditious conspiracy. It was shown in the recent trial in New York against members of the Nationalist Party for seditious conspiracy that the conspiracy culminated in a shooting in the House of Representatives and the wounding of 5 Congressmen. In addition the co-conspirators participated in acts of violence both in the United States and in Puerto Rico. The 6 years' imprisonment or $5,000 fine, or both, which may be imposed at present appears totally inadequate for offenses of this nature.

In view of these considerations the Department of Justice urges favorable action on the attached proposal which not only would increase but would make uniform the penalties applicable to the offenses in question.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation.

Sincerely,

_____,
Attorney General.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF TRI-DAM PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide financial assistance to the Oakdale and South San Joaquin Irrigation Districts, California, in the construction of the Tri-Dam project, California.

The utilization of natural resources for the benefit of the greatest number of people and on the soundest basis possible is an objective of all political parties and all sections of our society. There have been many historic conflicts about the way to achieve this objective. There is not, however, any disagreement that the Federal Government wisely has followed where indicated, a policy of encouraging and assisting groups of our people who formulate and develop plans to improve the economy, the agriculture, and the living conditions of an area through putting to beneficial use the waters of this Nation.

I introduce at this time a bill providing for Federal support of what is to me a commendable example of local initiative in an effort to derive the maximum benefit from unused natural resources. I am delighted to have my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], as a coauthor. This measure would provide Federal assistance for local groups which desire to build the so-called Tri-Dam project on the Stanislaus River in California.

This project is a carefully-planned application of the partnership concept of this administration. It does not require Federal assistance in the usual sense. On the contrary, this bill would place prime responsibility on the people through local public agencies who would enjoy the benefits of the project and who ultimately would pay nearly the entire cost of the development.

The proposed legislation would authorize a Federal loan and grant to two public agencies of the State of California, the Oakdale and the South San Joaquin Irrigation districts, to assist in financing a comprehensive $50 million irrigation and hydroelectric project. The amount of Federal financial aid, which is urgently needed because of circumstances beyond control of the two districts, would not exceed $10,370,000. The money would be advanced, for the period before revenues begin coming in from the works, only to bridge the gap between the amount needed to build the project and the amount which can be obtained through the sale of revenue bonds.

The Federal Government has a dual obligation to assist these districts. In the first place, changes in Federal policies since financing plans were made by the districts and approved by the approximately 30,000 members have affected the money market. Beyond that, the project will have definite flood-control features, which historically are an obligation of the Federal Government.

The bill, which was revised and approved at the last session by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, presents a fine opportunity to carry forward the policy of maximum local participation in such development while recognizing the Federal responsibility to extend a helping hand.

The Tri-Dam project, which involves 3 dams and 3 powerplants, will add 230,000 acre-feet of stored water and provide 81,500 kilowatts of hydroelectric energy. It will serve some 121,000 acres with approximately 30,000 people. The proposed legislation which will help make

this project possible contains safeguards to protect the Federal Treasury and the National Government's taxpayers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 548) to provide financial assistance to the Oakdale and South San Joaquin Irrigation Districts, California, in the construction of the Tri-Dam project, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. KNOWLAND) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TEMPORARY PERMISSION FOR PARKING ON SQUARE 723 OF CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the Architect of the Capitol should permit the parking, under the control of the Sergeant at Arms of the United States Senate, of passenger motor vehicles on that part of the United States Capitol Grounds described as square 723, until such time as the Sergeant at Arms determines that such square is no longer needed for parking purposes.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUSH, and Mr. STENNIS) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 32), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That rule XXXIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended—

(a) by inserting "1." before the first paragraph;

(b) by striking out "The officers and employees of the Senate in the discharge of their official duties." and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The officers and employees of the Senate when in the discharge of their official duties and, in the case of appointed officers and employees, upon exhibiting a credential card issued under subsection 2 of this rule.";

(c) by striking out the last paragraph of such rule and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Members of the staffs of Senate committees and members of the office staffs of Senators when in the discharge of their official duties and upon exhibiting a credential card issued under subsection 2 of this rule."; and

(d) by adding at the end of such rule the following new subsection:

"2. (a) No officer or employee of the Senate (other than an officer or employee elected by the Senate) and no member of the staff of a Senate committee or member of the office staff of a Senator shall be admitted to the floor of the Senate while the Senate is in session, unless he exhibits to the doorkeeper at the time he seeks admission a credential card issued by the Secretary of the Senate pursuant to this subsection.

"(b) Each appointing officer of the Senate shall certify to the Secretary the name of each officer or employee whom he has appointed and whose official duties require his admission to the floor of the Senate while the Senate is in session. The Secretary shall issue to each such officer or employee a credential card in such form as he deems advisable for the use of such officer or employee under this rule.

"(c) The chairman and ranking minority member, acting jointly, of each Senate committee shall, at the beginning of each Congress and at such times during each Congress as may be necessary, certify to the Secretary the names of the members of the staff of the committee whose official duties require their admission to the floor of the Senate while the Senate is in session. The Secretary shall issue two transferable credential cards, in such form as he deems advisable, for the use of such staff members under this rule, one of which shall be used under the direction of the chairman of the committee and one under the direction of the ranking minority member of the committee. Only one staff member shall be admitted to the floor at any time by authority of each credential card, unless the chairman or ranking minority member of the committee makes a request in writing to the Presiding Officer, in each instance, for the admission of more than one staff member. Members of committee staffs, to be admitted to the floor, must be regularly appointed and borne on the rolls of the Secretary as such.

"(d) Each Senator shall, at the beginning of his term and at such times thereafter during his term as may be necessary, certify to the Secretary the names of the members of his office staff whose official duties require their admission to the floor of the Senate while the Senate is in session. The Secretary shall issue two transferable credential cards, in such form as he deems advisable, for the use of such staff members under this rule. Only one staff member shall be admitted to the floor at any time by authority of each credential card. Members of the office staffs of Senators, to be admitted to the floor, must be regularly appointed and borne upon the rolls of the Secretary as such.

"(e) The Secretary shall maintain a current list of all officers and employees of the Senate, members of the staffs of Senate committees, and members of the office staffs of Senators with respect to whom credential cards have been issued under this subsection. A copy of such list shall be kept at the desk of the Presiding Officer at all times when the Senate is in session."

SEC. 2. Rule XXXIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is further amended by inserting after "Members of National Legislatures of foreign countries" the following: ", upon presenting proper credentials and when accompanied by or presented to the doorkeeper by the President of the Senate or a Member of the Senate."

STANDING COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], I submit a resolution creating a standing Committee on Small Business, and I ask that the resolution be appropriately referred. The Senate has before it already a resolution, which I submitted, giving permanent status to the Select Committee on Small Business. Such a step, of course, would be a forward-looking one, but in my judgment, if we are to fulfill our responsibilities to the small-business communities of our Nation, it is essential to give such a committee legislative status.

The resolution (S. Res. 30), submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. LONG), was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That section 1 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(p) (1) Committee on Small Business, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the problems of American small business enterprises.

"(2) It shall be the duty of such committee to study and survey by means of research and investigation all the problems of American small business enterprises, and to obtain all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest, but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation, and to report to the Senate from time to time the results of such studies and surveys."

SEC. 2. The Select Committee on Small Business established by Senate Resolution 58, 81st Congress, agreed to February 20, 1950, is hereby abolished. The employees, records, and property of the Select Committee on Small Business on the effective date of this section shall thereupon become the employees, records, and property, respectively, of the standing committee established by this resolution.

SEC. 3. Section 4 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended, effective on the date of beginning of the second regular session of the 84th Congress and for the remainder of such Congress, to read as follows:

"4. (a) Each Senator shall serve on 2 standing committees and no more; except that not to exceed 23 Senators of the majority party, and not to exceed 11 Senators of the minority party, who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Small Business, or the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may serve on 3 standing committees and no more.

"(b) In the event that during the 84th Congress members of 1 party in the Senate are replaced by members of the other party, the 34 third-committee assignments shall in such event be distributed in accordance with the following table:

"Senate seats

Majority	Minority
48	48
49	47
50	46
51	45

"Third committee assignments

Majority	Minority
25	9
23	11
21	13
19	15"

SEC. 4. Section 4 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended, effective on and after the date of beginning of the 85th Congress, to read as follows:

"4. Each Senator shall serve on 2 standing committees and no more; except that not to exceed 21 Senators of the majority party, and not to exceed 9 Senators of the minority party, who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Small Business, or the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may serve on 3 standing committees and no more."

SEC. 5. The first 3 sections of this resolution shall be effective on and after the date of beginning of the second regular session of the 84th Congress.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF DONALD R. HEATH, OF KANSAS, TO BE AMBASSADOR TO REPUBLIC OF LEBANON

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I give notice that the nomination of Donald R. Heath, of Kansas, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Lebanon, will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule.

REPORT OF ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am pleased to present the initial report of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation describing its efforts since its formation on July 2 of last year.

The report briefly sets forth the splendid progress which has been made during this period in implementing the Wiley law, Public Law 358, 83d Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATUS AND PROGRESS OF THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation began to function July 2, 1954. After a selection of key personnel and an advisory board, the United States Army Corps of Engineers was directed, as agent for the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, to blueprint the designs of the navigation project authorized on the St. Lawrence River under Public Law 358, 83d Congress.

Several meetings with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada, and members of the Canadian Cabinet representatives, were held in Ottawa during July and August. The United States delegation was, on each occasion, headed by Deputy Secretary of Defense, Robert B. Anderson.

An exchange of notes between the two governments followed these meetings. These notes were a declaration of intention and a confirmation of desire to work cooperatively and in close collaboration so as to concurrently complete the navigation facilities by the fall of 1958.

The mechanics of financing the United States project have been satisfactorily discussed with the United States Treasury Department. The Corporation has adopted a seal. Several meetings of the advisory board have been held. A branch office has been established at Buffalo, N. Y., and a resident engineering staff has been located at Massena, N. Y.

On November 27, 1954, we advertised for bids from private contractors on our first contract. These bids were opened on December 16, 1954, and the lowest bid, which was exceedingly favorable, will be awarded early in January 1955. The entire project will be under contract by September 1955.

The Corporation is meeting from time to time with the engineering staff of the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada, as well as the engineers of the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Canada and the Power Authority of the State of New York.

We have enjoyed considerable cooperation from many departments of our Government, namely, the Department of Defense, State Department, Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Budget, United States Army Signal Corps and Corps of Engineers, Attorney General's Office, General Services Administration, General Accounting Office, and the Maritime Administration.

Members of our staff have made frequent public appearances to explain to interested audiences the nature of our project which lies ahead. The imagination of the American people has been greatly stimulated since the passage of this legislation which authorizes an historic engineering venture. The keenest interest has been evidenced in so many quarters.

Nearly every port on the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River is actively planning for the future in the development of adequate facilities to meet the demands which will result from increased shipping and import and export trade.

Ground-breaking ceremonies are being discussed by both the Canadian and United States seaway units.

There are still some problems of design facilities and engineering recommendations to be considered by the Canadian Seaway Authority and the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation. However, we expect these discussions to result in ultimate approval and an atmosphere of mutual understanding.

It is anticipated that the determination of toll rates and their application will be concluded long prior to the completion of the navigation project. Present projection of final cost of the United States portion of the seaway indicates that we will come well within our authorization of $105 million.

Cargo tonnage estimates give reasonable assurance that revenue from tolls will retire our debt to the Treasury Department well within the 50-year term specified in Public Law 358, 83d Congress.

Respectfully submitted.

LEWIS G. CASTLE,
Administrator, St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Address delivered by him on January 17, 1955, at Chicago, Ill., before the Newspaper Advertising Executives Association.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Address delivered by him on January 18, 1955, before the National Agriculture Limestone Institute, in Washington, D. C.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address delivered by him on the subject of the United States foreign policy, at the Jewish Community Center, Harrisburg, Pa., on January 16, 1955, and a press release dealing with the subject of his address.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by him at the New York Democratic State Committee victory dinner held on Friday, January 14, 1955.

By Mr. BYRD:

Statement prepared by him in regard to the national highway program.

Statement by Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, in connection with an article entitled "How Admiral Strauss Doctored History," which was published in the Washington Daily News.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Statement prepared by him in respect to the President's budget message of January 17, 1955.

By Mr. BENNETT:

Address entitled "Progress in Dairying," delivered by Secretary of Agriculture Benson during the 53d annual Farm and Home Week on the campus of the University of Minnesota.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, yesterday was the anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin. Each year the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and myself have made brief remarks concerning Franklin.

Once again we have the honor and privilege of celebrating the anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin, one of the most illustrious of all Americans. Franklin is a son of both Boston and Philadelphia, for although he was born in Boston on January 17, 1706, the greater part of his life was spent in the City of Brotherly Love. Both Massachusetts and Pennsylvania, therefore, proudly claim him.

In these difficult days it is particularly encouraging and inspiring to us to think back to the times in which Franklin served so well. His autobiography and the many books which have been written about him since his day reveal very clearly that the problems which faced Americans in that time seemed fully as great as those which face us today. They met them squarely, however, and solved them with courage, with commonsense, and with enduring faith in the future of this land.

Franklin devoted his life to service to his fellow man, to the building up of the new democracy that had come into being in the New World. Few men served more effectively or energetically in freedom's name than did he.

It is our continuing hope that now, as we move ahead together in freedom's defense, we may demonstrate day by day the same optimism, the same courage, and the same faith in freedom that characterized Benjamin Franklin throughout every one of his 84 illustrious years.

SECURITY CLEARANCE OF CERTAIN STATE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "State Department Clears 80 Accused by McCARTHY in 1950," published in the Washington Evening Star of January 17, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE DEPARTMENT CLEARS 80 ACCUSED BY McCARTHY IN 1950

(By L. Edgar Prina)

The State Department has informed Senator JOHNSTON (Democrat), of South Carolina, that none of the 80 persons investigated in 1950 by the Tydings subcommittee, following charges by Senator McCARTHY, has been found to be a Communist or disloyal.

Senator JOHNSTON, who is chairman of the Senate Civil Service Committee, said the finding by "this present Republican administration" * * * should "clear up this matter for all time."

Former Senator Tydings (Democrat), of Maryland, was chairman of the foreign relations subcommittee which investigated Senator McCarthy's charges of Communists in the State Department.

CLEARED BY TYDINGS

The Democratic majority of the Tydings group reported the charges were false and accused the Wisconsin Republican of engaging in a hoax. Senator McCarthy called the report a "whitewash." He helped Senator Butler in his campaign to unseat Senator Tydings in 1950.

Senator Johnston, whose committee is planning a broad inquiry into the Eisenhower administration's employee security program, said he asked the State Department to check their records on the 80 individuals. The Department's reply was signed by Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations and a former Congressman.

According to Senator Johnston, Mr. Morton informed him that 12 of the employees accused by Senator McCarthy were still working in the State Department and that 10 others had transferred to other Government agencies where they were now employed. He added:

"The State Department * * * further verifies the findings of the Tydings committee by stating that, of the eighty-odd names given to the Tydings committee by the Wisconsin Senator as persons then employed, only 40 were in fact employed in the State Department in 1950; 33 had resigned or left the State Department prior to that year and 7 * * * had never been employed by the State Department."

The Senator said that 3 of the persons accused by Senator McCarthy had resigned or been dropped from the Government rolls, "but that none of these 3 was found to be Communists or disloyal to our Government."

The State Department letter to the South Carolinian was not released, but it is understood the three persons referred to above were the diplomats John Paton Davies, Jr., John Carter Vincent, and John Stewart Service.

Mr. Vincent was ousted in 1953 after Secretary of State Dulles found that his work had been below standard, and Mr. Davies was released last November on grounds that he lacked judgment, discretion, and reliability.

START AT BEGINNING

Senator Johnston said he went back to the original McCarthy charges because "in order to proceed in an orderly manner, I thought it desirable to start at the very beginning."

He said he sent the names of the 80 individuals to the State Department for a check last month.

Senator McCarthy said he will not comment until he has read the text of the State Department's report.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in the same connection, I ask that there be printed in the Record a copy of a letter from the State Department to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], which completely contradicts the story which appeared in the Star.

I am not remotely accusing the Star of falsifying the facts. It did not have the letter at the time this article was written. It merely had an account of the interview with the Senator from South Carolina. If the Senator from South Carolina is correctly quoted, the Star was justified in placing at the head of the article the headline "State Department Clears 80 Accused by McCarthy in 1950."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

JANUARY 10, 1955.

The Honorable Olin D. Johnston,
United States Senate.

Dear Senator Johnston: In response to your letter of November 24, 1954, requesting information with respect to certain previous or present employees of the Department of State, which was acknowledged on December 1, 1954, the following information is transmitted.

Question No. 1: Were these 10 persons publicly accused employees of the State Department?

Of the 10 persons referred to, 8 were or had been employees of the Department of State and 6 of these 8 were on the rolls of the Department of State during February 1950. With respect to the remaining 2 of the 10 in question, they were never on the rolls of the Department of State.

Question No. 2: Who, if any, among these 10 have been proved to be (a) Communists, or (b) disloyal to our Government?

You ask if any among these 10 have been proved to be (a) Communists or (b) disloyal to our Government.

As indicated above, 2 of the 10 charged were never on the rolls of the Department of State.

Of the remaining 8, 2 resigned; 1 transferred to another Government agency; the employment of 2 was terminated at the completion of their assignments; 1 was removed from the Department under the provisions of Public Law 733 of the Eighty-first Congress (5 U. S. C. 22-1); 1 was removed after proceedings pursuant to the provisions of Executive Order 9835, as amended by Executive Order 10241, and under authority of Section 103 of the Department of State Appropriations Act of 1952 (65 Stat. 575, 581); and 1 was retired under the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (60 Stat. 999, 1016), when it was found that he did not meet the standards for continued employment in the Foreign Service.

You will note that only 2 were discharged, 1 under the provisions of Public Law 733 of the 81st Congress, and 1 by the Secretary in the exercise of his judgment under section 103 of the 1952 Appropriations Act and solely as the result of a finding by the Loyalty Review Board pursuant to Executive Order 9835, as amended, that there was reasonable doubt as to the loyalty of the employee and as a result of his review of the opinion of that Board.

It should be noted that neither Executive Order 9835, as amended, nor Section 103 of the 1952 Appropriations Act, nor Public Law 733 of the 81st Congress requires that it be proved that a person is a Communist before he may be discharged, and no findings to this effect were made in either of the two cases, the findings being made as above noted.

Question No. 1: Who, if any, among these 80 names were employees of the State Department on February 9, 1950? (See tab A and the attached list.)

Question No. 2: Who, if any, among these 80 names were not employees of the Department on February 9, 1950? (See tab A and the attached list.)

Question No. 3: Who, if any, among these 80 names were never employed by the Department on or before February 9, 1950? (See tab A and the attached list.)

Question No. 5: How many of these 80 named persons were working in the State Department on June 1, 1954? (See tab A and the attached list.)

Question No. 6: Who, if any, among these 80 named persons are still working in the State Department? (See tab A and the attached list.)

The list which you obtained from the files of the Senate investigating committee which was attached to your letter, sent to the Secretary by messenger on November 24, 1954, is returned to you with notations which answer questions 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6. The attached reference sheet (tab A) explains the symbols used to answer these questions.

Question No. 4: Who, if any, among these 80 named persons have been proved to be (a) Communists or (b) disloyal to the Government of the United States?

In general, the answer to this question is the same as that contained in paragraph 2 of page 2, except for the additional provisions of Executive Order 10450. Under the provisions of Executive Order 10450, the Department has the responsibility of separating from the rolls of the Department those persons whose continued employment is deemed to be not clearly consistent with the interests of the national security.

In an effort to be specific, the following information relative to the 80 individuals listed is furnished for your information:

Removed under Public Law 733—2.
Removed for suitability reasons under personnel regulations—1.
Resigned during proceedings instituted against them under the provisions of Executive Order 9835—2.
Resigned during proceedings instituted against them under the provisions of Executive Order 10450—1.
Resigned (other persons)—32.
Transferred to other agencies—10.
Termination of limited appointments—4.
Separated by reduction in force—8.
Retired—1.
Died—1.
Never employed—7.

Question No. 7: Please also advise whether any employees or former employees in the State Department have been indicted and found guilty under the above law (Sec. 1209 of Public Law 759, 64 Stat. 595, 765); and if so, who are they?

I am sure that you know the Department has no responsibility with respect to the enforcement of this law. According to the records of the Department, no present or former employee has been indicted and found guilty under the provisions of Public Law 759, 81st Congress, 2d session, approved September 6, 1950.

I have attempted to make this reply as responsive as possible to the questions you have raised. If the Department can be of any further service to you and the committee with respect to this matter, we shall be pleased at the opportunity.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

(Enclosures: 1. Reference sheet (tab A). 2. Original list returned.)

Mr. McCARTHY. I invite the attention of Senators to the ninth paragraph in the letter from the State Department to the Senator from South Carolina, in which the State Department tells him that it has no function to clear people of communism or to declare that they are Communists.

I read the paragraph:

It should be noted that neither Executive Order 9835, as amended, nor section 103 of the 1952 Appropriations Act, nor Public Law 733 of the 81st Congress requires that it be proved that a person is a Communist before he may be discharged, and no findings to this effect were made in either of the two cases, the findings being made as above noted.

Therefore, the State Department points out that no findings were made on the question of communism.

I invite the attention of Senators to the figures given by the State Depart-

ment. They show that of the 80 named by me, 69 are no longer with the State Department. Two were removed under Public Law 733;

Removed for suitability reasons under personnel regulations—1.
Resigned during proceedings instituted against them under the provisions of Executive Order 9835—2.
Resigned during proceedings instituted against them under the provisions of Executive Order 10450—1.

These are all orders and laws having to do with Communist activities.

Resigned—32.

The letter does not so state, but I have checked, and find that the 32 were all under investigation at the time they resigned. They were not cleared. They resigned; and when they resigned, the investigations were dropped.

Transferred to other agencies—10.
Termination of limited appointments—4.
Separated by reduction-in-force—8.
Retired—1.
Died—1.
Never employed—7.

This letter is a complete contradiction of the story that they were all cleared. None of those who resigned were cleared by any agency in the State Department. That is made evident by the letter.

With respect to the item "Never employed, 7," that includes men like Owen Lattimore, who was not on the State Department payroll, but who, according to the McCarran committee, was a principal adviser in shaping State Department foreign policy, and, as stated by the committee, "a conscious, articulate agent of the Communist conspiracy." It includes men like William Remington, who was not on the State Department payroll, but on the payroll of the Department of Commerce. He was working closely with the State Department.

I think this letter should be printed in the RECORD along with the story from the Star, so that anyone reading the RECORD will know how far the story strays from the facts. I do not know whether the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] was misquoted or not. I hope it was a case of misquotation, because his statements as quoted are completely untrue.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in reply to the junior Senator from Wisconsin, I ask unanimous consent that the letter which I wrote to the State Department also be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 24, 1954.

Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As the ranking member of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I desire to assemble accurate data as to employees of the State Department who have been proved to be (a) Communists, or (b) disloyal to our Government.

It was on February 9, 1950, that Senator MCCARTHY made his first charge that many State Department employees were members of the Communist Party. Pursuant to Senator MCCARTHY's charges, a Senate investigation was made to ascertain whether or not there were "employees in the State Department disloyal to the United States." In the course of that investigation Senator MCCARTHY publicly accused 10 alleged employees of the State Department as being within one or the other of the categories mentioned.

Question 1: Were these 10 persons publicly accused employees of the State Department?

Question 2: Who, if any, among these 10 have been proved to be (a) Communists, or (b) disloyal to our Government?

In addition to the 10 persons publicly accused by Senator MCCARTHY, he accused 80 other alleged employees whom he stated were then (February 9, 1950) employees of the State Department. In accusing them, he used numbers for each person instead of their names. Later he gave to the Senate committee 80 names to correspond with each number he had used.

I have obtained this identical list from the files of the Senate investigating committee, which I herewith attach and send to you by messenger.

Question 1: Who, if any, among these 80 names were employees of the State Department on February 9, 1950?

Question 2: Who, if any, among these 80 names were not employees of the State Department on February 9, 1950?

Question 3: Who, if any, among these 80 names were never employed by the State Department on or before February 9, 1950?

Question 4: Who, if any, among these 80 named persons have been proved to be (a) Communists, or (b) disloyal to the Government of the United States?

Question 5: How many of these 80 named persons were working in the State Department on June 1, 1954?

Question 6: Who, if any, among these 80 named persons are still working in the State Department?

I desire also to point out that Public Law 759 (year 1950) provides the following: That any person "who is a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence and accepts employment, the salary or wages of which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this or any other act, shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both."

Question 7: Please also advise whether any employees or former employees in the State Department have been indicted and found guilty, under the above law, and, if so, who they are?

I have attempted to present these questions in precise and clear form and I trust I may have definite and concise answers thereto.

Very respectfully yours,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
United States Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I believe that the letter from the State Department, together with my letter, will show that of the 80 persons named by the junior Senator from Wisconsin at that time, about 40 were not even working with the State Department.

I think it will also be found that a great many of those named are still working for the Government. It will be found that not one of them has been convicted during the intervening years.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he resumes his seat?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I invite the Senator's attention to page 3 of the letter which he received from the State Department, of which I also received a copy. It is shown that 61 have left the State Department. All of them were either under investigation, or formal charges had been filed against them. Thirty-two of them were under investigation, with no formal charges filed. The remainder had charges against them, except 10, who were transferred.

The Senator knows also, when he says that they were cleared, that on page 2 of the letter the State Department told him very specifically and honestly that under the Executive orders, and under the law in effect, the State Department did not have the function of determining whether or not those persons were Communists. So when the Senator states, in an interview—if he was properly quoted—that they were all cleared, that is in complete contradiction of this letter. I think the average is fairly good, when we find that 69 out of 80 have disappeared from the State Department.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. A great many of them have gone into other departments of the Government.

Mr. DIRKSEN subsequently said: Mr. President, I listened a few moments ago to the discussion when certain matters were inserted in the RECORD by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. I confess my own confusion when I hear these things, because, unless I know the names of the persons and their circumstances, there is no way of making a proper evaluation of the action taken. Would it not be a good idea—and I address this question to my friend from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]—to ascertain whether the 80 persons named in the RECORD actually did work for the State Department? If they did not, we should know it. If they have been transferred to other agencies of the Government, I should like to know that. But, merely to take a general figure without knowing what the circumstances are, it is impossible for me, and I am confident that it is impossible for the country, to come to a conclusion on the matters which have been in controversy since February of 1945. I should like to see the issue resolved with some finality, and I should like to know who the persons are.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have 80 names in my possession. I sent the list of 80 names to the State Department. The State Department broke down the list originally named by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. About 5 years ago they were sent to the committee, first, by numbers. Later, the committee was given the names in confidence. Everything is in confidence. The State Department, in breaking down the list of names, stated that certain persons named never worked for the State Department and certain others were transferred to other departments. They have been analyzed, and I ask unanimous consent that the information may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REFERENCE SHEET

(Explanation of symbols)

1. Employed on February 9, 1950.
2. Not employed on February 9, 1950.
3. Never employed by the Department of State.
4. Employed on June 1, 1954.
5. Presently employed.

SENATOR M'CARTHY, LIST OF 81

1. Name deleted, 1, 4, 5.
2. Name deleted, 1.
3. Name deleted, 2.
4. Name deleted, 2.
5. Name deleted, 2.
6. Name deleted, 1, 4, 5.
7. Name deleted, 1.
8. Name deleted, 2.
9. Name deleted, 2.
10. Name deleted, 2.
11. Name deleted, 2.
12. Name deleted, 2.
13. Name deleted, 2.
14. Name deleted, 2.
15. Name deleted, 1.
16. Name deleted, 2.
17. Name deleted, 2.
18. Name deleted, 2.
19. Name deleted, 3.
20. Name deleted, 3.
21. Name deleted, 1.
22. Name deleted, 1.
23. Name deleted, 1.
24. Name deleted, 1.
25. Name deleted, 1.
26. Name deleted, 1.
27. Name deleted, 2.
28. Name deleted, 3.
29. Name deleted, 3.
30. Name deleted, 2.
31. Name deleted, 1.
32. Name deleted, 1.
33. Name deleted, 1.
34. Name deleted, 1.
35. Name deleted, 2.
36. Name deleted, 1.
37. Name deleted, 1.
38. Name deleted, 1.
39. Name deleted, 2.
40. Name deleted, 1, 4.
41. Name deleted, 1, 4, 5.
42. Name deleted, 2.
43. Name deleted, 1, 4, 5.
44. Name deleted, 2.
45. Name deleted, 2.
46. Name deleted, 1.
47. Name deleted, 1.
48. Name deleted, 1, 4, 5.
49. Name deleted, 1, 4 5.
50. Name deleted, 1.
51. Name deleted, 1.
52. Name deleted, 1, 4, 5.
53. Name deleted, 2.
54. Name deleted, 1.
55. Name deleted, 1, 4, 5.
56. Name deleted, 1, 4.
57. Name deleted, 2.
58. Name deleted, 1, 4, 5.
59. Name deleted, 1.
60. Name deleted, 1.
61. Name deleted, 2.
62. Name deleted, 2.
63. Name deleted, 1, 4, 5.
64. Name deleted, 1.
65. Name deleted, 1.
66. Name deleted, 2.
67. Name deleted, 2.
68. Name deleted, 1.
69. Name deleted, 2.
70. Name deleted, 1.
71. Name deleted, 2.
72. No name given.
73. Name deleted, 2.
74. Name deleted, 2.
75. Name deleted, 2.
76. Name deleted, 3.
77. Name deleted, 1.
78. Name deleted, 3.
79. Name deleted, 1, 4, 5.
80. Name deleted, 3.
81. Name deleted, 2.

Names have been deleted in order to protect the individuals involved.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. My letter to the State Department asked certain questions concerning the matter. Does the Senator from Illinois wish to bring before the public and have published in all the newspapers the names of 80 persons, against very few of whom there is scarcely a scratch? Does the Senator say that the names of all those 80 persons should be made public?

Mr. DIRKSEN. My answer is that if my name were on the list and my integrity and loyalty were impeached time and time again, I should be the first to ask an appropriate agency of the Government to get the file and to submit it to any committee or individual that might have a right to examine it, so that the whole record could be cleared.

It has always seemed phenomenally strange to me that information of this type should be bandied about while people complain either publicly or privately. If they have faith in the integrity of their own case, they should be the first to come to a Member of the Senate or to an appropriate committee and to say, "Put the information where all the world can see it."

Elective officers live in a goldfish bowl. Their lives are open books. Should a double standard, a different standard, be applied to those who work for the Government? That would seem strange to me.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from Illinois will find, when he reads the RECORD, the letter which I wrote to the State Department. If that does not give all those persons a clear record, so far as the Government is concerned, I do not know what would. Not 1 of those 80 persons has been tried and convicted in a period of 5 years. Why have they not been convicted? We have written into the statutory law of the Nation a provision that anyone who draws a salary from the Federal Government and at the same time is a Communist can be tried, and if convicted, can be sent to a Federal prison for a term of 1 year, and fined $1,000. Yet not one person named on the list has been tried.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I may be trespassing on the 2-minute limitation on speeches, but I wish to conclude by saying that all the material which has been placed in the RECORD today can be nothing more than a general allegation that persons numbered 1, 16, 48, or 79, have something wrong in their files. Nothing will be proved to the Senate or to the country until we can get down to specific cases. It seems to me that we are still tilting at windmills.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If the Senator from Illinois will kindly call the State Department or the President of the United States he will be told that those names cannot be made public. If he can get the President to clear them, they can be made public; otherwise they cannot.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I need only add that I did not raise the issue. However, documents will appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as of tomorrow morning for the edification and gaiety of the country, and I thought the information ought to be precise and explicit enough to convey some facts which would ultimately resolve the age-old issue.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The only thing I did not want to have happen was to have the name of some innocent person read and to have that person's character besmirched when he is as innocent as a new-born babe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if I may have 10 seconds more, I should say that if these persons are clean and undefiled, then, of course, they could not be besmirched if their names were printed in the RECORD.

INEQUITIES IN LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to serve notice that I shall, in the immediate future, introduce an appropriate bill designed to remove many existing inequities in labor legislation involving the compensation and the hours of work of laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors with the United States, any Territory, or the District of Columbia. In a great many instances mechanics and laborers are being worked on Government projects far in excess of 40 hours a week, often without any overtime whatsoever, and often at a great deal less per hour than the going union rate in particular localities. So long as such practices are allowed to continue, not only union members in the construction trade, but far-sighted employers who believe in collective bargaining and in contracts with unions, are being severely penalized.

The bill which I intend to introduce, Mr. President, would amend the 8-hour law so as to provide:

First. An 8-hour day and a 40-hour week.

Second. The 40-hour week to be worked on 5 consecutive days, Monday to Friday inclusive.

Third. Overtime at not less than 1½ times the rate paid during the regular working hours for all time worked in excess of 8 hours per day, 40 hours per week, and for all labor performed on Saturday, Sunday, or holidays.

Fourth. That the Secretary of Labor shall predetermine rates of pay for the regular working hours of employees of contractors and subcontractors, as set forth in section 1 of Public Law 403 of the 74th Congress, as amended.

Fifth. That the Secretary of Labor shall enforce all provisions of this act.

Sixth. That any contractor, subcontractor, or Federal official who intentionally violates this act shall be punished, upon conviction, by a fine of $5,000 for each and every violation or by imprisonment for 6 months, or both, for each offense.

Seventh. For the repeal of any portion of any law in conflict with this act.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert at this point in my remarks a document setting forth some examples of existing legislation which involves construction work and which will be affected by my bill, together with some of the violations of our national policy with respect to wages and hours which have occurred on Government contracts.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXISTING LEGISLATION INVOLVED

Davis-Bacon Act: Applies to all construction, alteration or repair, including painting and decorating, where the Government enters into a construction contract in an amount of $2,000 or more. Some of the agencies which engage in this type of work include the Department of Defense, Department of Agriculture, Department of the Interior, and General Services Administration. The work covered varies and is of many types, ranging from airbases, Army and Navy installations, post offices, Federal buildings, dredging of rivers, and other types of construction.

National Housing Act: This is the law under which the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) insures mortgages on single family homes and multifamily apartments. The law's prevailing wage provisions are applicable only to multifamily apartments. Single family homes are not covered, with the exception of individual homes built by cooperatives and insured by FHA. Under the Wherry Act amendment, rental housing facilities for military personnel built on or near Government military installations are also covered by the law's prevailing wage provisions. Housing for military personnel built directly by an agency of the Government, such as the Army, is covered by the Davis-Bacon Act.

Housing Act of 1949: The prevailing wage provisions of this law cover slum clearances by local authorities assisted by loans or grants from the Federal Government. The provisions also apply to construction of low-rent public housing. This type of multifamily apartment housing is generally constructed under the sponsorship of a local housing authority pursuant to a loan made by the Public Housing Administration.

Federal Airport Act: This law covers grants-in-aid to States and municipalities or other subdivisions of the State such as counties for the building and repair of airports. The act is administered by the Civil Aeronautics Administration of the Department of Commerce and requires observance on covered airport construction of minimum wage rates established by the Secretary of Labor.

Hospital Survey and Construction Act: This law covers the construction of hospitals, medical centers by States, counties, cities, and even by private organizations where the Federal Government makes a grant toward such construction. It requires the payment of prevailing rates as determined by the Secretary of Labor.

School Survey and Construction Act: This law applies to the erection of schools and other facilities in defense areas or other areas where the impact of Federal operations requires Federal contribution toward the construction of additional school facilities. It also requires payment of prevailing rates as determined by the Secretary.

Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951: This law covers the construction of housing for defense workers or military personnel and such community facilities as sewers, waterlines, streets, and the like in defense areas. Payment of prevailing rates as determined by the Secretary is required. The Public Housing Administration which administers the public low rent housing program has by regulation required an overtime premium for hours in excess of eight per day, similar to that required under the 8-hour law.

Mr. MURRAY. Violations on Government contracts include—

First. The schedule of wage rates approved by the Secretary has not been posted in a prominent place at the construction site for all craftsmen to see.

Second. Craftsmen are paid an hourly wage scale less than the Secretary's approved minimum rate for their particular job.

Third. Journeymen craftsmen are classified and paid an apprentice's rate when, in fact, they work with journeymen's tools and perform journeymen's work.

Fourth. Workers are employed and classified as apprentices when, in fact, such employees are not duly registered apprentices as required by the Secretary's regulations.

Fifth. Craftsmen are improperly classified and are paid the approved hourly wage rate for the wrong classification. For example, an employee may be shown on the payroll records as a laborer and paid the laborer's approved rate when, in fact, he is doing the work of a plumber, bricklayer, painter, or carpenter and using the tools of the skilled craft.

Sixth. Craftsmen agree to perform for a lump-sum price certain work, such as the painting of a specified number of dwellings, or the installation of a specified amount of electrical wiring, the materials being furnished by the contractor. In such instances, the craftsman is termed a subcontractor for whom no payrolls are kept. His pay when computed on an hourly basis, is less than the Secretary's approved rate for his particular craft.

Seventh. Craftsmen often work for a contractor who is performing both Federal and private construction. It is not unusual in such cases for the craftsmen to be paid a rate lower than the approved rate. In some instances, it has been found that craftsmen are not shown on the payrolls as working on the Federal project.

Eighth. Craftsmen employed on a piece-rate basis often do not receive the approved hourly rate.

Ninth. Craftsmen do not receive the proper overtime pay. In overtime violations, payrolls have been found to show only weekly earnings when they should show the daily and weekly hours worked.

THE FIGHT AGAINST PARALYTIC POLIO

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, the year before us will be a climatic one in our long war against the ravages of paralytic polio.

In the years since 1938, when Americans, under the banner of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, first banded together to fight this disease, giant steps have been taken toward the eradication of polio.

Last year scientists, supported by the National Foundation, mounted a massive offensive that produced a polio vaccine worthy of mass testing on humans.

Results of these tests are now being evaluated in what is unquestionably one of the most complex scientific projects ever undertaken.

Some time during the coming spring we should have an answer to the vital question: Does this vaccine work?

In the meantime, the job ahead in the polio fight is bigger because we must care for polio patients at the same time we are trying to prevent the disease.

The March of Dimes, now in progress, provides the best way we and other Americans can help get that job done.

The 1955 March of Dimes must raise $64 million to carry on the fight.

Every American should know these facts about the polio fight, and should give as much as he can to the March of Dimes.

In my own State of Delaware, there was a total of 88 polio cases during 1954 compared with only 32 cases for 1953.

This sharp increase in the number of individuals afflicted by infantile paralysis demonstrates the striking power of polio.

Let us hope that at long last we are nearing the end of the struggle to prevent a continuation of the toll which polio extracts annually.

With this goal in mind, I join in the hope that the collective efforts of the American people—together with the untiring labors of medical science—will write the final and glorious chapter in the battle against infantile paralysis.

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION AGAINST UNITED STATES NAVY PERSONNEL AT CAPETOWN, SOUTH AFRICA

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Saturday, January 15, the U. S. S. carrier *Midway*, a great ship with a great war record, docked at Capetown, South Africa. While there, the crew of the *Midway* was given shore leave. It was announced in the press before the *Midway* dropped anchor off Capetown that the 400 nonwhite members of the crew—American citizens, of course, and wearing the great colors of the United States Navy—would, while in Capetown, be treated as colored under the laws of South Africa. In other words, they would be treated in a manner quite different from other American sailors from the *Midway*. They would be barred from access to certain parts of Capetown and from certain public facilities in Capetown.

When news reports of this visit were printed in American newspapers, and when I saw these reports, I was shocked and disturbed. I sent a telegram to the Secretary of the Navy. The Secretary of the Navy replied with a telegram to me. Under the circumstances, I recognize that no action could have been taken by the Secretary of the Navy following the receipt of my telegram. There was insufficient time. Yet I cannot help but retain the sense of shock I felt at American citizens being so treated in a foreign country, under the terms of an agreement with the government of

that country. I do not think we should have entered into any such agreement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a news story in the New York Times of January 14, my telegram to the Secretary of the Navy, his reply to me, and an editorial which appeared in the Monday, January 17, issue of the New York Times, commenting on the whole incident, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of January 14, 1955]

SOUTH AFRICA TO RESTRICT NEGROES ON UNITED STATES CARRIER

CAPETOWN, SOUTH AFRICA, January 13.—Apartheid, South Africa's system of race discrimination will apply to 400 Negro members of the United States aircraft carrier *Midway* when she anchors at Capetown Saturday.

When ashore the United States Negroes will carry special permits enabling them to consume liquor in mixed blood (colored) bars only. They must drink liquor on the premises and cannot take any away in bottles.

European bars, white hotels, motion picture theaters and bathing beaches also will be out of bounds for them. All United States Negroes will go ashore in uniform, thus making it easy for barkeepers to distinguish them from South African Negroes, who are not allowed to take European liquor.

The Licensed Victuallers and Hotelkeepers Association issued these instructions to its members following consultations with the Government.

JANUARY 14, 1955.

Hon. CHARLES S. THOMAS,
Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.:

I am deeply disturbed over story in New York Times today that United States Aircraft Carrier *Midway* is to dock tomorrow, Saturday, January 15, at Capetown, South Africa. The story suggests that United States Navy has an agreement with the Union of South Africa that Negro crewmembers are to be treated differently from their fellow crewmembers while on shoreleave. If the facts are as stated it seems to me to constitute official acquiescence and willingness to submit our own citizens to the infamous Apartheid laws of the Union of South Africa in a contradiction of the United States Navy's announced policy of nondiscrimination and integration.

It is my hope that time remains to reverse the planned arrangements for this potentially unfortunate and most embarrassing incident.

Respectfully,

HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senator.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 15, 1955.*

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Referring to your telegram of yesterday's date concerning the U. S. S. *Midway* I wish to advise the ship is already in port. The Navy is investigating report of unequal treatment being given to some of our citizens and will promptly present the matter to our Government for handling through established diplomatic channels if the situation warrants it. The Navy as you know does not deal directly with any foreign government nor does the Navy's compliance with the laws of any foreign government while within its jurisdiction indicate the approval or disapproval thereof. We appreciate your interest and your support of the Navy's express policy of nondiscrimination and integration.

JAMES H. SMITH, Jr.,
Acting Secretary of the Navy.

[From the New York Times of January 17, 1955]

THE MIDWAY AT CAPE TOWN

The rule that American personnel of the armed services shall conform to the laws of the country in which they happen to be stationed or which they visit may be sound enough in principle. But there are exceptions. The visit of the United States carrier *Midway* to Cape Town is one of them. In this case someone has slipped and in our judgment slipped badly. Either South Africa should have agreed to waive its segregation practices in respect to the American sailors or the *Midway* should have been kept out of Cape Town.

In the *Midway's* crew there are some 400 American Negroes, Filipinos, and Americans of Japanese descent. Under South African law they may not enter "white" restaurants, hotels, or bars while ashore. We believe that this law is an affront to human decency and that its enforcement against our sailors in Cape Town is an affront to the United States Navy. The Navy seems to have taken it lying down, and that is not in Navy tradition.

Furthermore, we are convinced that if the other crew members of the *Midway* had been allowed to express themselves they would have gladly forfeited their own shore-leave privilege rather than see this insult to their comrades in arms. If the *Midway* actually had to put into Cape Town—and the Navy says it did—the men could have stayed aboard ship, and we think they would have been glad to do so on moral grounds.

We realize that South Africa's race problem is a complex one. We have deplored the "apartheid" policy but do not presume to dictate to others how they will approach and try to solve domestic problems. But we are also trying to solve a segregation problem and have made a most significant advance in the armed services. There is no reason why we should sacrifice that advance, even for 1 or 2 days, to the prejudice of the South Africans.

Our Negro and Filipino and Japanese-descended sailors are good enough to die for their country. If they are not good enough to go ashore in Cape Town, on equal terms, then the Navy should stay out of Cape Town. South African law is one thing, but essential morality is another.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 7237 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, at the desk is a bill, H. R. 2369, which has passed the House. The bill corrects an inadvertent omission in the narcotic tax penalties. It is imperative that the bill be enacted today.

As chairman of the Committee on Finance, and with the approval of the full membership of the committee, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be not referred to the committee, but that it be taken up now for action on the floor of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H. R. 2369) to amend section 7237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance spoke to me this morning about the bill and stated that it had the unanimous approval of the Committee on Finance. As I understand, the purpose of the bill is to correct an inadvertent error in the revenue bill, in which a penalty was omitted. Is that an accurate statement?

Mr. BYRD. The statement of the Senator from California is entirely accurate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have no objection. I think it is a very essential bill and should be passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The bill was passed unanimously by the House of Representatives. Is not that correct?

Mr. BYRD. That is true.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2369) to amend section 7237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief explanation of the bill.

Section 7237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 provides penalties for certain narcotic law offenses. In the codification of the narcotic penalties contained in this provision of the 1954 code, the penalties were inadvertently made inapplicable to certain offenses described in part I of subchapter A of chapter 39. While penalties contained elsewhere than in the Internal Revenue Code remained unaffected, the section 7237 penalties were applicable to these offenses under the 1939 code, and there was no intention to make any change in prior law penalties for these offenses, involving traffic in opium, and isonipecaine, opiates, and coca leaves. The bill will simply correct these inadvertencies which occurred in the codification of the 1934 code by making the penalty provisions for all the offenses described in part I of subchapter A of chapter 39, the same as they were before the passage of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

This measure has the approval of the members of the Senate Finance Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 2369) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill H. R. 2091, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair). The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2091) making appropriations for the

fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2091) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the committee amendments will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Chapter I—Legislative Branch," on page 2, after line 2, to insert:

SENATE

For payment to Harriet McCarran, widow of Pat McCarran, late a Senator from the State of Nevada, $12,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 6, to insert:

For payment to Mary R. P. Maybank, widow of Burnet R. Maybank, late a Senator from the State of South Carolina, $12,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 9, to insert:

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

The appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1955, is made available for the employment of additional clerical assistants for each Senator from the State of Kentucky, so that the allowance for administrative and clerical assistants for such Senators will be equal to that allowed other Senators from States having a population of more than 3 million but less than 5 million, the population of said State having exceeded 3 million inhabitants.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 19, to insert:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Office of the Secretary: For an additional amount for the Office of the Secretary, $4,845: *Provided*, That effective February 1, 1955, the basic amount available for clerical assistance and readjustment of salaries in the disbursing office is increased by $6,600 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 3, to insert:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

Senate policy committees: For an additional amount for the Senate policy committees, for agency contribution for Federal employees group life insurance, as authorized by Public Law 598, 83d Congress, $220 for each such committee; in all, $440.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 6, to insert:

Joint Committee on Printing: For an additional amount for the Joint Committee on Printing, for agency contribution for Federal Employees Group Life Insurance, as authorized by Public Law 598, 83d Congress, $115.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 10, to insert:

Inquiries and investigations: For an additional amount for expenses of inquiries and investigations, $795,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 12, to insert:

Stationery: For an additional amount for stationery, $3,550, and the amount available for stationery for committees and officers of the Senate is hereby increased to $13,550.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter III—Independent Offices," on page 4, after line 15, to insert:

COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," $140,000: *Provided*, That said appropriation shall remain available until May 31, 1955: *Provided further*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of H. R. 2010, 84th Congress.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall not offer an amendment to restore the amount which was requested by the agency affected by this amendment, but I think I should point out that the agency was created by a joint resolution which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations. As I recall, the late Senator Taft offered such a resolution, as I believe the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] also did. I know such a resolution was introduced by former Senator Ferguson. I know that Senator Taft was long interested in the matter.

At long last we have had established a commission to investigate the relations between the States and Federal Government, and other pertinent relations. Such a commission was urged by the Governors of many States. The Commission has compiled a great deal of data and information. That information is ready. The Commission has a staff. It will take a while to complete the data. As a result of such information, the Commission will make recommendations to Congress.

It is a field that is highly controversial. It is a field that engages Representatives and Senators in discussion almost every day. It relates not only to the fiscal field, but to fields involving highways, gasoline, and other taxes, and other related subjects. It seems to me that after the work has been done and data have been assembled, and the agency is now asking for $160,000 to complete its work, we should not exercise the fine art of cheese paring and take off $20,000. The denial of such funds may conceivably stop the work of the agency. It would look as if, after the apples are ripe on the tree, we were not appropriating the money to harvest the fruit.

At the time the full committee considered the matter it was my notion that the entire $160,000 should be allowed.

I wanted to acquaint the Senate with these facts so that if someone, out of the generosity and graciousness of his heart, wanted to move that the Senate restore the amount which was cut, the Senate would have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. I should like to inform the Senator that the reduction was made at the suggestion of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who has inherited from his New England ancestors a sense of thrift, and who does not like to see dollars go out of the Treasury any sooner than necessary. The amount of $18,000 out of the $20,000 was cut below the budget estimate because of a doubt about the need for terminal leave payments. It was stated that many of the employees of the Commission had accrued leave pay due them when transferred from the agency of the Government in which they were formerly employed. It was believed that if such employees went back to their former employment, the additional earned leave benefits could be transferred along with them to their former agencies. In any event, such money would not be due until June or July. The reduction of the fund was not a complete denial of the Commission's request. Funds amounting to about $2,000 were also requested for the purchase of equipment which the committee believed could be obtained from the General Services Administration. I do not think the Commission is going to suffer from the cut. I should also like to bring to the attention of the Senate that the date set forth in the amendment is May 31, 1953. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], who are two Senators who are on the Commission, have asked if it would not be possible to make the date June 30, for the reason that there is so much work to be done in a comparatively short time. The Senators say that the Commission is going to do its very best to bring in a final report on time, and we have a definite commitment that the Commission will submit interim reports. As the Commission finishes one study it will report its recommendations to the Congress. If no report is made until the entire work of the Commission is completed, there might not be an opportunity to consider any of its recommendations during the present session of Congress, whereas if the Commission had made up its mind in any particular field, its recommendation in that field could be referred to the appropriate committees of the House and Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think I can concede everything the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has said. However, there may be some employees of the Commission who did not come from another agency, so that the jurisdiction over terminal leave would not repose in the other agency. That may or may not be the case, but, as I look at the matter, it is important to make sure that the staff of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations is not dissipated. If someone on the staff should say, "This is the end of it; it appears that Congress is going to be a little niggardly in providing funds to enable us to assemble and get these data together," we may

see defections among the staff of the Commission. For the sake of $20,000, I would not want to undertake the hazard of the agency's not doing a good job. The staff has been at its work a long time. The work will have cost about three-quarters of a million dollars. At the shank of the work, I would not want to be in the position of cutting off $20,000 after the agency has stated to the Budget Bureau, to the President, and to the appropriate committees that, in its judgment, it needed $20,000 to complete its work.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have in my hand a letter from the Representative from the Fifth Congressional District of Arkansas, Mr. BROOKS HAYS, the sponsor of H. R. 2010. He writes me as follows:

DEAR HUBERT: I regret very much that I made a mistake in the extension date in H. R. 2010 for the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. As you know, it should have been June 30 and not June 1 as the printed bill carries it. I am taking steps to substitute the correct date as fixed by the Commission in its formal request for an extension, and I trust that this error on my part will not embarrass you in getting the necessary funds to enable the Commission to complete its work. I am convinced that the full 4 months is needed.

As to the amount, it seems to me that the committee might well grant the full amount requested since both chairman and staff have been conservative, and I am sure they will be interested in holding expenses down to a minimum. Since the Commission does not have continuing life, it would be an extreme handicap to the staff in winding up its work to run out of money.

With high regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

BROOKS HAYS.

I may say to the Senator from Illinois that the position he has taken is the position which the Commission itself took, in formal resolution, after careful consideration of the needs of the Commission, and with its program finally arrived at. I might say that Mr. Kestnbaum, the chairman of this Commission appointed by the President, is doing an outstanding job.

He is working tirelessly, and he has an able staff which is doing a creditable and very detailed piece of work. So I feel very much as does the Senator from Illinois, namely, that we have almost arrived at the finish line, so to speak. We have gotten over some rather difficult political terrain. As we know, there was a change in the chairmanship, the President had to appoint a new chairman, following the resignation of Mr. Manion. We had a slow start, but we are making progress.

So, as the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has pointed out, I hope the date "June 30" may be provided in the supplemental appropriation bill on which we are working.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, does the Senator from Minnesota offer an amendment to that effect?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall do so, if the Senator from Illinois will yield to me for that purpose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I offer the following amendment to the committee amendment: In the committee amendment on page 4, in line 20, strike out "May 31", and insert in lieu thereof "June 30", so that the date will be June 30, 1955.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota to the committee amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, inasmuch as the bill will probably have to go to conference, I shall not object to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to the committee amendment on page 4, in line 20.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, under the circumstances, and in order to crystallize the matter, I offer the following amendment to the committee amendment on page 4, beginning in line 16: In line 19, strike out "$140,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$160,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment on page 4, in line 19.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed to the committee amendment on page 4, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Foreign Claims Settlement Commission—Administrative Expenses," on page 5, line 20, after ("Public Law 744)", to strike out "$90,000" and insert "$130,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 2091) was passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on page 3 of the bill appears a committee amendment appropriating an additional amount of $795,000 for inquiries and investigations. I have asked the financial clerk of the Senate to prepare a table indicating the total expenditures for current inquiries and investigations by committees of the Senate, and a further breakdown showing what was spent in the present fiscal year. He has not quite completed those figures at this time. However, for the information of the Senate—because the question of the cost of investigating committees is a live one, and before very long will be before the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration—I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the tabulations to which I have referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the tabulations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Contingent expenses, Senate, expenses of inquiries and investigations, fiscal year 1955, as of Dec. 31, 1954

Appropriated	$1,224,120.00
Committee on Appropriations, S. Res. 193 (investigations division)	400,000.00
Joint Committee on Defense Productions	25,000.00
	425,000.00
Available for other expenses of inquiries and investigations	799,120.00
Expenditures for inquiries and investigations for the period July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954, as follows:	
Subcommittees:	
Agriculture and Forestry (S. Res. 304) (importation of wheat)	1,512.92
Armed Services (S. Res. 185) (investigations subcommittee)	43,144.53
Banking and Currency (S. Res. 182) (Federal Reserve matters, etc.)	18,431.83
Banking and Currency (S. Res. 183) (expansion of international trade)	23,829.13
Banking and Currency (S. Res. 289) (FHA housing)	165,854.62
Foreign Relations (S. Res. 214) (technical assistance programs)	845.57
Foreign Relations (S. Res. 193) (International Peace and Security Organization)	11,809.71
Government Operations (S. Res. 189) (Permanent Investigating Subcommittee)	89,932.06
Interior and Insular Affairs (S. Res. 233) (fuel reserves of United States)	1,710.03
Interior and Insular Affairs (S. Res. 271) (critical raw materials)	13,092.01
Interstate and Foreign Commerce (S. Res. 173) (communications, transportation, etc.)	34,810.29
Judiciary (S. Res. 188) (western European refugees)	11,285.62
Judiciary (S. Res. 172) (Internal Security)	96,244.94
Judiciary (S. Res. 181) (investigations subcommittee)	39,594.44

Contingent expenses, Senate, expenses of inquiries and investigations, fiscal year 1955, as of Dec. 31, 1954—Continued

Subcommittees—Continued	
Judiciary (S. Res. 190) (juvenile delinquency)	$88,845.29
Judiciary (S. Res. 62 and 187) (national penitentiaries)	1,123.22
Judiciary (S. Res. 227) (Trading With the Enemy Act)	7,003.70
Labor and Public Welfare (S. Res. 270) (welfare and pension funds)	61,292.43
Rules and Administration (S. Res. 137 and 237) (privileges and elections)	8,928.60
Small Business (S. Res. 115)	671.47
Select Committee to Consider S. Res. 301, 83d Cong	14,630.63
Standing Committees:	
Agriculture and Forestry	190.06
Appropriations	11,120.25
Armed Services	3,615.01
Banking and Currency	1,879.14
District of Columbia	835.27
Finance	989.85
Foreign Relations	4,866.43
Government Operations	478.42
Interior and Insular Affairs	7,064.13
Interstate and Foreign Commerce	1,252.60
Judiciary	7,509.13
Labor and Public Welfare	590.87
Post Office and Civil Service	1,407.65
Public Works	1,804.25
Rules and Administration	3,056.76
Small Business	1,270.62
Total	782,523.48
Paid from 1953 and 1954 appropriations	60,485.02
Total paid from 1955 appropriation	722,038.46
Balance, Dec. 31, 1954	[1] 77,081.54

[1] Of which amount, $42,058.30 held in reserve for advances to committee chairmen.

EXPENSES OF INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS—SUBCOMMITTEE ALLOTMENTS, EXPENSES, AND BALANCES, DECEMBER 31, 1954

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry (making a study of the importation of wheat) under authority of Senate Resolution 127, agreed to July 10, 1953, Senate Resolution 218, agreed to March 10, 1954, and Senate Resolution 304, agreed to August 11, 1954.

Limitation, January 31, 1955 (S. Res. 218).

Amounts authorized:

By S. Res. 127	$15,000.00
By S. Res. 304	12,000.00
Total	27,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	11,766.72
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	15,233.28

Committee on Appropriations (subcommittee for the purpose of obtaining factual data) under authority of Senate Resolution 193, agreed to October 14, 1943, and Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for 1955.

Limitation, fiscal year 1955.

Amount appropriated: Legislative Branch Appropriation Act	$400,000,00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	53,583.79
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	346,416.21

Committee on Appropriations (subcommittee investigating any matter within the jurisdiction of the committee) under authority of Senate Resolution 129, agreed to June 26, 1947.

No limitation.

Amount authorized	$50,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	25,848.51
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	24,151.49

Committee on Armed Services (Preparedness Subcommittee) under authority of Senate Resolution 185, agreed to January 26, 1954.

Limitation, February 1, 1954, to January 31, 1955.

Amount authorized	$150,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	80,945.83
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	69,054.17

Committee on Banking and Currency (subcommittee investigating Federal Reserve matters; Export-Import Bank, and defense housing) under authority of Senate Resolution 64, agreed to February 19, 1951, Senate Resolution 248, agreed to January 24, 1952, Senate Resolution 42, agreed to January 30, 1953, and Senate Resolution 182, agreed to January 26, 1954.

Limitation, January 31, 1955 (S. Res. 182).

Amounts authorized:

By S. Res. 64	$50,000.00
By S. Res. 248	28,000.00
By S. Res. 42	23,000.00
By S. Res. 182	16,000.00
Total	117,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	96,241.78
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	20,758.22

Committee on Banking and Currency (subcommittee investigating international trade) under authority of Senate Resolution 25, agreed to June 8, 1953, and Senate Resolution 183, agreed to January 26, 1954.

Limitation, January 31, 1955 (S. Res. 183).

Amounts authorized:

By S. Res. 25	$67,000.00
By S. Res. 183	83,000.00
Total	150,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	73,898.38
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	76,101.62

Committee on Banking and Currency (subcommittee investigating the FHA) under authority of Senate Resolution 229, agreed to April 23, 1954, and Senate Resolution 289, agreed to August 11, 1954.

Limitation, January 31, 1955 (S. Res. 229).

Amounts authorized:

By S. Res. 229	$150,000.00
By S. Res. 289	75,000.00
Total	225,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	172,549.15
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	52,450.85

Committee on Finance (subcommittee investigating the social-security programs) under authority of Senate Resolution 300, agreed to June 20, 1950.

No limitation.

Amount authorized	$25,000

No expenditures to December 31, 1954.

Committee on Foreign Relations (subcommittee making a study of foreign technical assistance programs) under authority of Senate Resolution 214, agreed to July 6, 1954.

Limitation, January 31, 1955.

Amount authorized	$40,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	15,845.57
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	24,154.43

Committee on Foreign Relations (subcommittee studying revision of the United Nations Charter) under authority of Senate Resolution 126, agreed to July 28, 1953, and Senate Resolution 193, agreed to January 26, 1954.

Limitation, January 31, 1955 (S. Res. 193).

Amounts authorized:

By S. Res. 126	$35,000.00
By S. Res. 193	40,000.00
Total	75,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	46,073.35
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	28,926.65

Committee on Government Operations (investigations subcommittee) under authority of Senate Resolution 156, agreed to June 14, 1951; Senate Resolution 251, agreed to January 24, 1952; Senate Resolution 40, agreed to January 30, 1953; Senate Resolution 206, agreed to January 28, 1954; and Senate Resolution 189, agreed to February 2, 1954.

Limitation, January 31, 1955 (S. Res. 189).

Amounts authorized:

Balance May 1, 1951	$77,315.18
By S. Res. 156	15,000.00
By S. Res. 251	89,000.00
By S. Res. 40	189,000.00
By S. Res. 189	207,273.00
Total	577,588.18
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	556,199.53
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	21,388.65

Committee on Government Operations (subcommittee investigating the reorganization of the legislative and executive branches of the Government) under authority of Senate Resolution 54, agreed to February 1, 1951; Senate Resolution 252, agreed to January 24, 1952; Senate Resolution 56, agreed to February 20, 1953; and Senate Resolution 184, agreed to January 26, 1954.

Limitation, January 31, 1955 (S. Res. 184).

Amount authorized:

By S. Res. 54	$19,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	9,162.16
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	9,837.84

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs (subcommittee investigating the available fuel reserves of the United States) under authority of Senate Resolution 239, agreed to August 15, 1950; Senate Resolution 374, agreed to December 31, 1950; Senate Resolution 33, agreed to January 29, 1951; Senate Resolution 153, agreed to June 29, 1951; Senate Resolution 242, agreed to January 24, 1952; Senate Resolution 45, agreed to February 20, 1953; and Senate Resolution 233, agreed to April 28, 1954.

Limitation, January 31, 1955 (S. Res. 233).

Amounts authorized:

By S. Res. 239	$20,000.00
By S. Res. 45	10,000.00
Total	30,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	27,828.56
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	2,171.44

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs (subcommittee investigating the accessibility and availability of critical raw materials) under authority of Senate Resolution 143, agreed to July 28, 1953; Senate Resolution 171, agreed to January 26, 1954; Senate Resolution 235, agreed to April 28, 1954; and Senate Resolution 271, agreed to July 17, 1954.

Limitation, January 31, 1955 (S. Res. 271).

Amounts authorized:

By S. Res. 143	$37,500.00
By S. Res. 171	12,500.00
By S. Res. 271	34,000.00
Total	84,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	52,280.29
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	31,719.71

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce (subcommittee investigating communications, civil aeronautics, domestic transportation, maritime matters, and wildlife conservation) under authority of Senate Resolution 173, agreed to January 26, 1954.

Limitation, February 1, 1954, to January 31, 1955:

Amount authorized	$115,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	54,435.58
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	60,564.42

Joint Committee on Defense Production, under authority of Public Law 774, approved September 8, 1950 (Defense Production Act of 1950), as amended by Public Law 95, approved June 30, 1953.

Limitation, fiscal year 1955, $25,000.

No expenditures to December 31, 1954.

NOTE.—Funds to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, of which amount, one-half to be reimbursed by the Senate.

Committee on the Judiciary (subcommittee investigating the flow of escapees and refugees to the Western European nations) under authority of Senate Resolution 326, agreed to June 21, 1952; Senate Resolution 68, agreed to April 22, 1953; and Senate Resolution 188, agreed to January 26, 1954.

Limitation, January 31, 1955 (S. Res. 188).

Amount authorized:	
By S. Res. 326	$65,000.00
By S. Res. 68 (allotment reduced)	−18,500.00
By S. Res. 188	10,000.00
Total	56,500.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	40,414.07
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	16,085.93

Committee on the Judiciary (subcommittee investigating the administration, etc., of the Internal Security Act of 1950) under authority of Senate Resolution 366, agreed to December 21, 1950; Senate Resolution 7, agreed to January 29, 1951; Senate Resolution 198, agreed to September 27, 1951; Senate Resolution 314, agreed to May 29, 1952; Senate Resolution 46, agreed to January 30, 1953; and Senate Resolution 172, agreed to January 27, 1954.

Limitation, January 31, 1955 (S. Res. 172).

Amounts authorized:	
By S. Res. 366	$10,000.00
By S. Res. 7	75,000.00
By S. Res. 198	117,000.00
By S. Res. 314	163,800.00
By S. Res. 46	150,000.00
By S. Res. 172	170,000.00
Total	685,800.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	637,325.99
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	48,474.01

Committee on the Judiciary (investigations subcommittee), under authority of Senate Resolution 181, agreed to January 26, 1954.

Limitation, February 1, 1954, to January 31, 1955.

Amount authorized	$87,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	72,914.90
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	14,085.10

Committee on the Judiciary (subcommittee studying juvenile delinquency), under authority of Senate Resolution 89, agreed to June 1, 1953, and Senate Resolution 190, agreed to January 27, 1954.

Limitation, January 31, 1955, or date of final report (earlier).

Amounts authorized:	
By S. Res. 89	$44,000.00
By S. Res. 190	175,000.00
Total	219,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	194,682.39
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	24,317.61

Committee on the Judiciary (Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries), under authority of Senate Resolution 187, agreed to January 26, 1954.

Limitation, February 1, 1954, to January 31, 1955.

Amount authorized	$5,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	1,261.68
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	3,738.32

Committee on the Judiciary (making an examination and review of the Trading With the Enemy Act), under authority of Senate Resolution 245, agreed to March 24, 1952; Senate Resolution 47, agreed to January 30, 1953; Senate Resolution 120, agreed to June 24, 1953; and Senate Resolution 227, agreed to April 28, 1954.

Limitations, January 31, 1955 (S. Res. 227).

Amounts authorized:	
By S. Res. 245	$100,000.00
By S. Res. 47	50,000.00
By S. Res. 227	10,000.00
Total	160,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	130,610.23
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	29,389.77

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (investigation of employee welfare and pension funds), under authority of Senate Resolution 225, agreed to April 28, 1954, and Senate Resolution 270, agreed to July 17, 1954.

Limitation, January 31, 1955.

Amounts authorized:	
By S. Res. 225	$75,000.00
By S. Res. 270	50,150.00
Total	125,150.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	72,495.64
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	52,654.36

Committee on Rules and Administration (Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections), under authority of Senate Resolution 234, agreed to May 20, 1954.

Limitation, none (from May 1, 1954).

Amount authorized	$50,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	10,023.58
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	39,976.42

Committee on Rules and Administration (Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections), under authority of Senate Resolution 250, agreed to April 13, 1950; Senate Resolution 311, agreed to July 27, 1950; Senate Resolution 209, agreed to September 13, 1951; Senate Resolution 262, agreed to January 24, 1952; Senate Resolution 333, agreed to June 12, 1952; Senate Resolution 106, agreed to June 8, 1953; and Senate Resolution 137, agreed to August 3, 1953.

Limitation, none.

Amounts authorized:	
By S. Res. 250	$50,000.00
By S. Res. 311	25,000.00
By S. Res. 209	10,000.00
By S. Res. 252	75,000.00
By S. Res. 333	100,000.00
By S. Res. 106	75,000.00
By S. Res. 137	37,500.00
Total	372,500.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	372,277.62
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	222.38

Amounts authorized and expenditures by standing committees under authority of sec. 134A of Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, 83d Cong.

	Total authorized	Expended to Dec. 31, 1954	Balance Jan. 1, 1955
Standing committees:			
Agriculture and Forestry	$10,000.00	$8,691.11	$1,308.89
Appropriations	60,000.00	44,978.95	15,021.05
Armed Services	20,000.00	14,159.58	5,840.42
Banking and Currency	20,000.00	16,382.01	3,617.99
District of Columbia	10,000.00	6,448.62	3,551.38
Finance	10,000.00	7,088.02	2,911.98
Foreign Relations	59,000.00	21,556.98	37,443.02
Government Operations	10,000.00	5,952.34	4,047.66
Interior and Insular Affairs	30,000.00	27,777.08	2,222.92
Interstate and Foreign Commerce	20,000.00	11,034.92	8,965.08
Judiciary	40,000.00	27,556.67	12,443.33
Labor and Public Welfare	15,000.00	10,022.35	4,977.65
Post Office and Civil Service	10,000.00	5,540.31	4,459.69
Public Works	35,000.00	8,259.01	26,740.99
Rules and Administration	10,000.00	5,985.77	4,014.23
Total, standing committees (83d Cong)	359,000.00	221,433.72	137,566.28
Total, investigating committees	3,870,538.18	2,808,665.30	1,061,872.88
Overall total, subcommittees and standing committees	4,229,538.18	3,030,099.02	1,199,439.16

SPECIAL COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT SECURITY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to create a special Commission on Government Security; and I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the full text of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 21) to establish a Commission on Government Security, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, for himself and Mr. STENNIS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc.—

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is vital to the welfare and safety of the United States that there be adequate protection of the national security, including the safeguarding of all national defense secrets and public and private defense installations, against loss or compromise arising from espionage, sabotage,

disloyalty, subversive activities, or unauthorized disclosures.

It is, therefore, the policy of the Congress that there shall exist a sound Government program—

(a) establishing procedures for security investigation, evaluation, clearance, and, where necessary, adjudication of Government employees, and also appropriate security requirements with respect to persons privately employed or occupied on work requiring access to national defense secrets or work affording significant opportunity for injury to the national security;

(b) for vigorous enforcement of effective and realistic security laws and regulations; and

(c) for a careful, consistent, and efficient administration of this policy in a manner which will protect the national security and preserve basic American rights.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT SECURITY

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the policy set forth in the first section of this joint resolution, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Government Security (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of 12 members, as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, two from the executive branch of the Government and two from private life;

(2) Four appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate and two from private life; and

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives and two from private life.

(c) Of the members appointed to the Commission not more than two shall be appointed by the President of the United States or the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the same political party.

(d) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(e) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

(f) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(g) Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) Members of the Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) The members of the Commission from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) (1) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(2) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

(b) All employees of the Commission shall be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation as to character, associations, and loyalty and a report of each such investigation shall be furnished to the Commission.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. The Commission shall study and investigate the entire Government security program, including the various statutes, Presidential orders, and administrative regulations and directives under which the Government seeks to protect the national security, national defense secrets, and public and private defense installations, against loss or injury arising from espionage, disloyalty, subversive activity, sabotage, or unauthorized disclosures, together with the actual manner in which such statutes, Presidential orders, administrative regulations, and directives have been and are being administered and implemented, with a view to determining whether existing requirements, practices, and procedures are in accordance with the policies set forth in the first section of this joint resolution, and to recommending such changes as it may determine are necessary or desirable. The Commission shall also consider and submit reports and recommendations on the adequacy or deficiencies of existing statutes, Presidential orders, administrative regulations, and directives, and the administration of such statutes, orders, regulations, and directives, from the standpoints of internal consistency of the overall security program and effective protection and maintenance of the national security.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192–194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purposes of this joint resolution, and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

INTERFERENCE WITH CRIMINAL PROSECUTIONS AND INTELLIGENCE FUNCTIONS

SEC. 8. Nothing contained in this joint resolution shall be construed to require any agency of the United States to release any information possessed by it when, in the opinion of the President, the premature disclosure of such information would jeopardize or interfere with a pending or prospective criminal prosecution, or with the carrying out of the intelligence responsibilities of such agency.

REPORTS

SEC. 9. The Commission shall submit interim reports to the Congress and the President at such time or times as it deems advisable, and shall submit its final report to the Congress and the President not later than January 15, 1956. The final report of the Commission may propose such legislative enactments and administrative actions as in its judgment are necessary to carry out its recommendations. The Commission shall cease to exist 90 days after submission of its final report.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that it be noted that the joint resolution is cosponsored by the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. We have joined together on this measure; and for the next few minutes I shall discuss why we believe it is an important proposal.

The joint resolution is carefully drawn, and is the reflection of intensive discussions that I have had with Members on both sides of the aisle. It is a matter of sincere satisfaction to me that, following my original announcement of interest in connection with a commission, significant bipartisan support has come to me both in and out of Congress.

There is a grave realization, Mr. President, that our security laws, regulations, and practices need a new look, a careful look, a nonpolitical look. This can be accomplished through a commission along the lines of the one called for by the joint resolution now at the desk.

The real problem facing us is to assure that we shall have an overall Government security program which will realistically and effectively meet the requirements of the national security in this time of peril and at the same time will be consistent with our great national tradition. We must be sure not only that our legitimate security measures are as effective as possible, but also that they are realistic and worthwhile from the standpoint of the total national interest.

Our present total Government mechanism for assuring security does not inspire confidence. Not since 1917, when the Espionage Act was under consideration by the Congress, has there been full-dress consideration by the Congress of the problems of protecting national secrets, and national defense generally,

against subversive penetration. Nor is there any indication that the executive branch has ever devoted inself to consideration of the total security problem. In the past, such action as has been taken in the name of security has been more a random, sporadic response to peril, rather than a carefully considered plan for defense against peril.

With specific regard to the question of employee security, for example, the central investigating agencies are the FBI and Civil Service Commission. It is my understanding that, ordinarily, investigations are conducted by Civil Service Commission unless an agency has its own facilities, as in the case of the Defense, State, Treasury, Justice, Post Office, and Agriculture Departments.

Mr. President, I note here that immediately we see again the variations in pattern. We see two central investigating agencies, namely, the FBI and the Civil Service Commission; and then, off on the side, we see separate Departments which have their own investigatory facilities, totally removed from the civil-service procedures and criteria. Of course, it is always true and apparent that if serious, derogatory information is developed, the case is then referred to the FBI; and, of course, the FBI may also make original investigation, when required by law.

On the basis of information available to me, I am persuaded that the Civil Service Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation have maintained high standards of selection for their investigators. The best that can be said for the other agencies, however, is that their standards are variable.

Security investigator is a new profession in Government. Where the Civil Service and FBI are concerned, these investigators are not subject to administrative direction from individually interested agencies; but as to the investigators of other Departments, there is always the danger they will be subject to administrative guidance and suggestions.

The FBI has long maintained the practice of not evaluating its own findings. It is a factfinding and reporting agency, and leaves their evaluation to others. Undoubtedly, this has contributed to its prestige and strength—prestige and strength which are justly deserved, Mr. President, on the basis of the record and the performance. Yet it appears that in other agencies the factfinders are also the evaluators. This means that on occasion, security investigators make recommendations on the facts filed by them.

These points raise bothersome questions. Does the Congress intend to have the security investigator serve as policeman, prosecutor, and judge, all in one?

It is to help find the answers to these questions and to these problems and to many more that I do not have the time—nor do I take the time—to raise, that the Commission which is provided for in the joint resolution we are introducing today is necessary.

We have done many things in the name of security during the past decade; indeed, as a practical matter, our present security system is a phenomenon of only the past decade. We have enacted espionage laws and tightened existing laws; we have required investigation and clearance of millions of our citizens; we have classified information and locked it in safes behind locked doors, in locked and guarded buildings, within fenced and heavily guarded reservations. But each of these actions has been taken sporadically and independently and not as part of a rational overall master plan for security.

It is my feeling that the time is long overdue for us to really take a look at what we have created, to evaluate it, to analyze it, and then to assign an appropriate, adequate plan of security which meets all the tests of the protection of our national safety and welfare.

We have not paused in our necessary, though frantic, quest for security to ask ourselves:

What are we trying to protect, and against what?

What can we effectively protect?

What specific measures will give us the degree of protection we want or need?

What price are we willing to pay for security?

Lest I be misunderstood, I realize that individually, as we have discussed these typical questions in our deliberations in the Congress, we have asked ourselves these questions and have come up with immediate answers. The point I am trying to make is that we have never really had placed before us all the laws, rules, regulations, Executive orders, and directives which make up what we call our security system, to see whether there is overlapping and duplication, whether there are loopholes, and areas not properly covered, and to learn whether or not we are creating a program which has a uniformity of application, or whether it runs hot and cold, depending upon the particular attitudes of individual administration officials.

A consequence of our failure to come to grips with the hard realities of the security problem, to understand it, and to bring it under rational control, is that we have in 1955 a complex of Government security statutes, regulations, and procedures which on its face seem contradictory. I do not know whether or not our national secrets and national security generally are being adequately protected under the existing system. I do not think anybody knows or can know—even those men in our Government responsible for security—because the Government's present over-all security mechanism defies understanding, let alone analysis, on the basis of a quick look.

Let us look at the record.

To the extent Congress has legislated at all in this area, it has been primarily concerned with the problems of espionage and unauthorized disclosure of national defense secrets. The basic statute is the Espionage Act of 1917. We have amended this statute a number of times to tighten it in the light of current needs, but we have never really studied it to make sure that a statute written in 1917 to reflect the political, military, and technological problems of that era is adequate in the era of hydrogen bombs, radar, and guided missiles, and the world's most infamous conspiracy, the international Communist conspiracy, which surely is not comparable in its ramifications, its subtleties, and its treachery, to some of the old tyrannies of years gone by.

What we have done, despite the fact that the language of the Espionage Act covers all national defense secrets without limitation, is to enact new self-contained espionage laws applicable to special areas of information.

Thus, in 1946, we enacted a complete self-contained espionage law, included in the Atomic Energy Act, applicable only to atomic energy secrets. In 1951, we enacted a complete, self-contained espionage law applicable to cryptographic data. Each of these new laws closely parallels the original Espionage Act. In some respects the new laws are broader and more stringent; in other respects they are narrower and more lenient. In any event, the original Espionage Act apparently is intended to and does remain applicable to atomic energy and cryptographic information, notwithstanding the enactment of the new laws.

I cannot understand why we need three separate espionage laws. Is it more desirable to have three such laws rather than a single espionage law covering all espionage offenses? I merely ask these questions, without any valid judgment.

The existence of three separate espionage laws creates grave legal problems of reconciling the applicability of these laws in specific prosecutions. This was dramatically demonstrated in the closing phases of the well-known Rosenberg case, when the Rosenbergs were able to seize upon a technicality afforded by the variance in the penalty provisions of the Atomic Energy Act and the Espionage Act. Undoubtedly other such technicalities exist. The existence of three statutes of this kind may well constitute a serious built-in loophole in our security laws.

In this connection, I should point out that a Library of Congress analysis of the Adequacy of United States Laws With Respect to Offenses Against National Security, prepared in 1953 at the request of the distinguished former Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. WILEY] and published as a Senate document, thoroughly documents the inadequacies, inconsistencies, loopholes, and anomalies in the status quo.

It is a very revealing document, and I hope it has been carefully read by Members of the Senate who have concentrated so much of their time and attention upon matters of security.

But the espionage laws are not alone in the state of ambiguity. As the security system grew up, it was every agency for itself. Prior to 1951 when President Truman commenced to bring some order out of chaos by promulgation of Executive Order 10290 establishing uniform minimum standards for classification and safeguarding of national-defense secrets, numerous agencies of the Government had adopted their own regula-

tions for classifying and handling information. Each agency had its own rules; there was no coordination, and very little consistency among them. Every once in a while Congress would make its contribution by superimposing upon this chaos a special requirement for classification of information by a specific agency, as was done in the case of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, and the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950.

President Truman's Executive order, and the more recent one by President Eisenhower, bring considerable coordination and order out of the preexisting confusion, but there remains much that must be done before we can be sure our system makes sense and is truly effective. We still have multiple standards, some purely administrative and some statutory. I think a heavy burden of proof must rest upon those who would tell us that a single, uniform standard would not better serve the cause of security.

I wish to emphasize that the variable standards which are now applicable in the several agencies and departments of the Government defy the mind of man when it comes to bringing about any conformity, any uniformity, or any reasonable degree of fair application in a particular security case as it may go from one department to another.

Equal difficulty prevails with respect to security investigations, and clearance. I am not talking now about the kind of case symbolized in the last few weeks in the Ladejinsky case. However, this is a classic example of what may well be termed confusion compounded in the security system of this Government. It is such a classic example that it has those in high office baffled as to how to justify what has happened.

I refer, rather, to the difficulty prevailing in the very foundations of the personnel security clearance programs, as in the case of the ground rules for classification of information, requirements for investigation and clearance developed independently and without coordination in numerous separate agencies of the Government. Again, Congress helped. Commencing with the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, Congress has since enacted more than a dozen individual laws requiring investigation and clearance for personnel of certain Government agencies. The degree of variation among these statutes in the precise standards and criteria for investigation and clearance is remarkable. The security program established by President Eisenhower is necessarily built upon this uncoordinated statutory foundation, and the statutory foundation imposes definite limitations upon the degree of coordination and consistency which can be achieved under the present security program.

But there is still more to be said about personnel security. We have gone to great lengths to provide special security protection for atomic-energy secrets. Until enactment of last year's Atomic Energy Act there was an inflexible statutory requirement for a full investigation and AEC clearance of all individuals requiring access to classified atomic energy data. We required by law a more stringent investigation and clearance for atomic energy data of only marginal sensitivity than we did in the case of the Military Establishment, which is subject to no statutory security requirements—I emphasize that fact, Mr. President—for access to the most sensitive war plans or scientific data. Conversely, the law prohibited the AEC's giving even high-ranking officers of the Military Establishment, who presumably had been investigated and cleared under military security procedures and who had constant and intimate contact with our greatest national secrets, access even to marginally classified atomic energy data, unless they met the peculiar investigative and clearance requirements of the Atomic Energy Act. All of this has demonstrably impeded the national defense effort.

Fortunately the 1954 Atomic Energy Act remedies this situation to some extent, but much of the anomaly remains. Although there now exists a basis for flexibility of investigation, and for interchange of AEC and Department of Defense clearances, personnel of other Government agencies, including such important ones as the CIA and the State Department, may not be able to have access to AEC information on the strength of their own agency investigations and clearances, but must undergo the specific treatment prescribed in the Atomic Energy Act. Again I think a heavy burden of proof rests upon those who would argue that such ambiguities, complexities, and contradictions are justifiable.

Much of our present fabric of security is built upon the assumption that atomic energy data of any degree of security sensitivity is per se more sensitive and warrants more elaborate protection than any other kind of information.

I should like to hear this assumption defended, because it seems to me that certainly there are many secrets involving war plans, radar, missiles, and the like, which are just as crucial and important as are our atomic energy secrets. Certainly many of our fine research programs are just as crucial and important to our national defense as are our atomic energy secrets. They all need protection. However, the interesting part about this special treatment of atomic energy data is that, in many respects, the actual protection afforded it falls far short of statutory protection afforded other areas of the national security interest.

Thus, the Department of Defense has authority to prevent photographing of its installations, facilities, and equipment, and to control ingress to, egress from, and activities within its property and installations. However, AEC has no such authority, as it found to its embarrassment 4 years ago when its armed security guards apprehended a Chicago radio commentator who had climbed over the fence into the Argonne National Laboratory exclusion area. A plausible legal basis for prosecution could not be found. If the same photographer had walked into a military reservation with his camera, he would have been subject to very severe penalties. Certainly he would have been subject to immediate prosecution.

However, despite all the restrictions which have been imposed on personnel clearance for the Atomic Energy Commission, similar precautions have not been written into law for the benefit of the military authorities. Conversely, we find that the military authorities have statutory requirements in terms of ingress and egress and control over persons on military reservations, but that the Atomic Energy Commission does not have such statutory requirements. Such a situation does not make for a very sensible pattern of security regulation.

All of this demonstrates the presently uneven and inconsistent scheme of security. It may be that despite all these anomalies, inconsistencies, loopholes, and duplications, the security system is working adequately, well, and economically; but I should like to find out by having the Commission proposed under this joint resolution lay the security system as a whole on the table and take a critical look at it. I mean critical in the sense of trying to improve the situation and to develop it fully. This has never been done, to the best of my knowledge. It is imperative that it be done now.

The conclusions derived from such a critical scrutiny will enable us to place the personnel security problem in proper perspective and to consider the problem in terms of meaningful values. It seems to me that we cannot properly cope with the personnel security problem until we understand how the personnel security program fits into the overall program, what it is intended to acomplish, and what it can effectively, justly, and economically accomplish. If we find, for example, that the personnel security program's main purpose is to preserve the security of national defense secrets, we will be able to consider personnel security in relation to the other techniques for accomplishing the same result.

We may find that we have areas of effective choice, and that we can or should relax personnel security standards and tighten the espionage laws and administrative control devices; or that we cannot really have effective security unless we vigorously weed out all persons about whom there is any doubt. I think we should become aware of what choices or alternatives do exist, and the price tag on each.

There are other questions in finding the answers to which Congress needs help. Are we to continue to have each agency make its own final determination without the right of further appeal, or should we establish an independent commission, which will be the final court of judgment in security cases? If such a final court of judgment is desirable, should its service be binding on all departments and agencies?

We must find the answer. Today, there is in existence no court of appeal. In the Ladejinsky case, to which public attention has been focused recently, and in other cases, a man has been shifted from one agency to another. Two agencies have given him clearance, and one agency has not given him clearance. No agency or tribunal exists at the present time where an adjudication of such a

situation can be had, particularly when an obvious division of opinion and attitude exists with reference to an employee's security record.

It is an injustice to the individual, and it may very well be cruel and inhuman treatment of such an individual. However, it is an injustice also to what one might call the effectiveness of orderly government. Surely, an answer must be provided to that question. At least we should provide the means of arriving at an answer.

What should we do with regard to investigations? Should they be centralized under the Civil Service Commission with the assistance of the FBI in special cases? Should we make clear that there is a separation between the investigatory and evaluation functions?

What should we do about uniform criteria? I remind the Senate that we have enacted legislation to provide that administrative agencies which function in a quasi-judicial capacity shall not also act as policemen, investigators, prosecutors, and judges and jury. That subject has been an important item of discussion throughout the past, and Congress has always endeavored to make certain that too much power shall not reside in any one man or in any one group or agency. Therefore I ask: What should we do about uniform criteria? Should we make provisions for a bill of specific particulars against suspected employees in order to help them prepare an adequate defense? What about applicants for Government employment? That is one of the tragedies in the present security system. Should applicants have an opportunity of appealing an adverse decision with regard to security claims?

Under present law, a man may never know why he was not given a Government job. Yet there may be a file in existence containing charges against him, which can be used to blackball him. Such a man can now have no opportunity to make answer, because he does not know the nature of the charges on file against him. That situation may well apply to hundreds of thousands and perhaps even millions of people. Such files may exist in many agencies. A man may seek employment in one agency after another, in all of which such a file may exist, without his having any knowledge of the existence of such a file, and without an opportunity of refuting such charges or criticisms. Yet he is blacklisted and blackballed from holding any Government job. He may be confronted with such a situation not only in trying to obtain a job with the Government, but also in obtaining a job in the defense industry, which provides so much employment in our country.

Furthermore, what about the heavy financial cost each Government employee faces on occasion when they must defend themselves and are then cleared? Does the Government have any responsibility to provide them with counsel?

I am not prepared, Mr. President, to answer these questions, but they are in our minds and in the minds of the American people. We should provide the facts and the intelligence upon which to base an adequate judgment. The American people are wondering whether we can have an effective security system on the one hand and, on the other, still be able to preserve the basic American rights which we know so well under our legal and constitutional systems. We should provide the facts and the intelligence upon which to base an adequate judgment as to all these questions under the system which now operates.

Mr. President, in order to accomplish this objective it would be necessary and wise for the Congress to create a Commission on Government Security. The commission which we propose would have 12 members: four appointed by the President of the United States, 2 from the executive branch of the Government and 2 from private life; 4 appointed by the President of the Senate, 2 from the Senate and 2 from private life; and 4 appointed by the Speaker of the House, 2 from the House of Representatives and 2 from private life. I would say this would be a blue-ribbon commission, composed of men selected strictly on the basis of competence, ability, and the highest standards of morality and character.

These appointments would be equally divided on a so-called partisan basis, so that the work of the commission would be out of the area of partisan political conflict and would be on the high plane of competent analysis and study for the good of the country and the safety of the Republic.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of a remarkable address by one of our former distinguished colleagues, who sat on the other side of the aisle, former Senator Harry P. Cain, member of the Federal Subversive Activities Control Board. The address was delivered at a meeting on January 15. Senator Cain's address emphasizes the strictly bipartisan nature of his agency. He is to be commended for speaking out so plainly. He has spoken his own ideas and his own views. I am not saying whether his views and ideas will be acceptable to many, any, or all of us, but I am saying that, at least, there is deep concern in high places in the Government and throughout the Nation as to an effective security program and its appropriate administrative operation.

Senator Cain calls attention to the necessity for a careful reappraisal of our entire security program and the way in which it is operated, a reappraisal taken out of the realm of political controversy and placed in the hands of a high-level bipartisan commission in which the American public can have full confidence.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN FREEDOM LIVE WITH INTERNAL SECURITY?

(By Hon. Harry P. Cain)

Mr. Chairman, through what I am about to say, I shall endeavor to adequately express the keenness of my appreciation for your invitation and the joy I am receiving from being in your company. This is no small undertaking for it has been more than 2 years since last I was among you.

Robert Paine suggested that you might be interested in what I have been doing in these last 2 years and how I think the Nation and the Republican Party are doing.

I can satisfy a portion of the suggestions in a single sentence. For the better part of 2 years I have been sitting, listening, and thinking.

In this period, I have been a member of a board of inquiry, referred to by the somber title, the Subversive Activities Control Board, which is a basic part of your Nation's developing internal-security system. In this work, my four colleagues and myself endeavor to determine whether the Attorney General of the United States is absolutely correct in his allegations that listed organizations in our country are dominated, controlled, and directed by the Communist Party, United States of America, or by foreign powers which seek the overthrow and ultimate destruction of the United States.

You read and hear very little about the labors of the Subversive Control Board for reasons which are clear and understandable. The Board itself makes every effort to be free of controversy and the Board looks to our high courts for statements of explanation when Board orders, requiring public registration by Communists and fellow travelers, are made final.

It is encouraging that Communist leaders have repeatedly testified that the Communist Party, United States of America, will be required to commit suicide should the Supreme Court finalize the Board's registration order against that organization.

A fuller discussion about the Board's procedures and substantial legislative authority can be provided in some future opportunity but not tonight. I ought, however, to make an observation. This segment of our internal security system does not suffer, aside from some complicated constitutional questions which are now before the courts, from public criticism or misunderstanding because the methods it employs are in support of the spirit of the Constitution and they provide equal fairness, objectivity, and due process to both parties in any case which is offered to us for adjudication. As a member of the Board, I speak for it in saying that we take nothing for granted nor do we assume that any individual or organization is guilty as charged until that result has been established to our own satisfaction on the public record.

I have a reasonable doubt that anyone ever more enjoyed his service in the United States Senate than I did. Its only conceivable drawback was an exaggerated emphasis on work of every possible kind rather than on an output of thought. I readily confess that I attempted to accomplish too much for too many people in too many directions all at once. In attempting all of this, I lost sight of some fundamentals which have returned to focus during the past 2 years.

Before reflecting on these fundamentals, I want to establish this attitude to be true. In my remarks there will not be, if I can help it, a single unreasonable, unsupportable, or destructive political reference. I am here as a proud Republican but I am speaking as one who feels that his basic allegiance is to his Nation rather than to the political party of his deliberate and considered choice. I labor as a Republican from a hope to be of some small service to our Republic.

No one among us denies that the present is an age of peril. Were we in disagreement about this, we could reach agreement about nothing.

Most of those in authority in each political party refer to the present and the years of our immediate future to be an intended period of peaceful coexistence with our enemies. It makes me much more alert and less gullible to think of these years as being coexistence with conflict. Call these years what you will, they will be demanding of a national preparedness and readiness in the armed services, which will long continue the draft or some counterpart—on the farm and

throughout industry—sufficient to call for hard sacrifices and participation by all of us.

This knowledge doesn't bother or perplex me. I accept it willingly. Like you, I am not living in the past or in the future. We must contribute in some real measure to the age in which we live.

As between our material strength and that of the Soviet Union, I see no particular hazards or defeat in store for the United States. I can only believe as I do that our present leaders and those to come will pursue every intelligent avenue for reconciling our differences with the leaders of international communism short of war. I must remain convinced, as I am, that we shall prevail and survive through any war which may be forced on civilization. In this sense and as a citizen, I have no fear of the Soviet Union whatsoever.

My only major concern is with what we are to be when international communism's ambition for world domination has been defeated in one way or another. Will we or those who follow us be able to say after the conflict has run its course that through its years, even though they be a hundred, we Americans and our Government have maintained and left untarnished our self-respect?

Will we then be able to reassure the rest of the world that America remains a place in which the individual is free because his Government and those in authority in every walk of life have been just?

As for myself, justice or equity and freedom or liberty are the two evidences of human progress and hope which distinguish representative governments and their peoples from those directed by tyrants, dictators, and despots. Other differences are only skin deep and hardly worth mentioning.

I want no victory over the godless forces of oppression which does not include the preservation of these assets without which a free people die and wither away.

Here we are confronted with the greatest challenge of our time. Now is when we must inquire about and make certain that in working to become victorious across the seas, we are permitting no domestic enemies or any acts of cowardice, shortsightedness, arrogance, or stupidity to assault or cripple our bastions of freedom here at home.

How often do you hear it said that because of our overwhelming fear of communism, we are blindly or blithely destroying the Constitution and the Bill of Rights? How often do you hear it said that muddle-headed if well-intentioned dreamers are so enamored of liberty in the abstract that we are doing too little or nothing meaningful in opposing the conspiracy which seeks to drive freedom from the earth?

I listen each day to those who frantically espouse each of these premises. In my judgment, neither contention is even remotely correct but there are far too many citizens who believe one or the other of these contradictory courses to be true.

In our struggle to survive as free men and women, we must keep three elements in balance. They are justice, security, and freedom. It seems apparent to me that none of these elements can stand alone and that no two can operate successfully without the other.

In the years of our past, we have lived by the dictates of freedom and justice. We have known what they were and we have long taken their blessings for granted. We can't say as much about internal security. We have had only the most limited experience with it and that experience has seldom touched the majority among our citizens as individuals.

In terms of time it is reasonable to say that our Nation didn't recognize the pressing need for an internal security system prior to 1947, a mere 8 years ago.

Until the very recent past, there was an understandable reluctance to acknowledge or believe that some Americans, perhaps in considerable numbers, were seeking ways through which to overthrow our Government and destroy our free institutions. Many hardheaded patriots, as well as softheaded ones, couldn't bring themselves to comprehend that some of our citizens were giving their allegiance to a foreign conspiracy which seeks to enslave us. This is America, they said, and such things couldn't happen here. I don't know anyone who now refuses to admit that such evil things haven't happened here. The public record is replete with sad and damaging instances.

During the life of the 80th Congress, our Nation began to grapple with the realities of the postwar era. We were forced to agree that the Kremlin was our enemy because our extended hand of friendship had been cast aside times without number. We were required to admit that the masters of the Kremlin intended to carry out the preachments of Nicolas Lenin exactly as Adolph Hitler attempted to satisfy every intention set forth in Mein Kampf. In both cases the visualized result was to be the same, a return to the Dark Ages.

I do not believe that this current and general understanding prevailed throughout the United States before you sent me to the Senate in late 1946. There were then as many or more who disbelieved it, or did not bother to think about it, as believed this evaluation to be true.

In any event, it was along about 1947 when citizens everywhere began to appreciate that a lasting freedom for the individual was somehow inseparably connected with our national security. From that time on, we have made haste, not always wisely, to perfect and operate a system of internal security which would enable us to remain free as individuals. There could be no other possible reason for such a system in a republic.

I think it a great pity that it took us so long to recognize the intentions and determinations of communism for what they are, but I can serve no good purpose by blaming administrations of the past for their failures to specialize on contemporary history or to admit that evil-minded termites were boring from within or to agree that the Federal establishment included those who were traitors as well as the majority who were and are solidly patriotic. The legitimate purpose of this reference is to indicate the national status of our unawareness, unpreparedness, and inexperience when we began to fashion and tailor a system of internal security for the United States.

Before 1947, the Nation's number one domestic security sentinel was the Federal Bureau of Investigation. But this extremely conscientious and splendid agency, which takes pride in being referred to as Uncle Sam's watchdog, expresses no opinions, grants no clearances, and makes no recommendations. The FBI gathers facts and information, that's all, and leaves an evaluation of these matters, a really difficult undertaking, and the action to be taken on them, if any, up to others.

What too often happened before 1947 was that many in authority perceived too little from the files of substance laid before them by the FBI. It goes without saying that if you can perceive too little, you can also perceive too much, and I want to explore this side of the question before I am through.

To those of you who have thought that your Government has been soft on communism, I would urge a consideration of the following developments:

In March of 1947, our Nation departed from the more tranquil life and times of the past. A Government program was established to examine into the loyalty of those many individuals who serve the Federal establishment as employees.

This was followed by the Internal Security Act of 1950, which created the Subversive Activities Control Board and other domestic security activities. Then came the adoption of the Federal Employees Security Program in April of 1953. As its predecessor loyalty program did, this program requires that every civilian employee or applicant for employment in the executive branch of the Government submit to an investigation for loyalty but it goes much further than loyalty and considers a number of other factors like excess drinking, sex perversion, and bad company which affect the Nations' security. In addition to these farreaching measures, the last, or 83d Congress, stiffened up most of the statutes dealing with espionage, counter-espionage, and sabotage. You may now, for example, be executed as a spy in peacetime.

When you add all of this to the Foreign Agents Registration Act, the Smith Act, various rulings by various Attorney Generals, the continuing and vigilant activities of congressional investigative committees, and the investigative processes of the Civil Service Commission, you have in absolute fact today an internal security system of practically all-inclusive dimensions. With the exception of wire-tapping authority, would you establish much more were you an autocratic ruler in our land?

To those of you who have thought that your Government is so bewildered and frightened about communism as to annihilate the Bill of Rights and the Declaration of Independence at one fell swoop, I can offer these reassurances from our Nation's Chief Executive:

More than a year ago, when our present security system was but several months of age, the President said:

"In this country if someone accuses you, he must confront you; he cannot assassinate you or your character from behind without suffering the penalties an outraged citizenry will impose."

In his state of the Union message last week, Dwight Eisenhower said what I believe he means literally:

"We shall," he said, "ferret out Communist subversion while carefully preserving our traditions and the basic rights of our citizens."

To this point my effort has been to convince you that (a) the United States presently possesses an internal security system which is as devastating and powerful in potential as any other such system to be found anywhere, and that (b) the authoritative declarations which constitute the foundation on which this system has been constructed are in support of our constitutional concepts and traditions. Please permit me to press each of these contentions just a little further.

On the pages of history we see at a glance that the manner in which a government handles the problem of internal security is a significant measuring rod for the freedom that its people hold.

Under the internal security system imposed by the Soviet Union, freedom as we understand it is denied to the average Russian citizen. He lives in dread of the absolute surveillance and the unrelenting control of his conduct. That system is not for us, we say, but the system under which we operate shares a common purpose with the other. Both are designed to protect, to give stability to the form of government in each nation. I know that either system can be employed to serve the same ends—to keep citizens free or to put them in chains.

What I must restate is that we have constructed, because of an imperative need which is recognized by all, a system which can, unless we make it operate in accordance with the assurances offered publicly by the President of our Republic, snuff out the lights of learning while making cowards and mental robots out of free men and women.

These assurances that justice will determine security decisions represent the only

foundation strong enough to support a domestic security system for the United States. In no other fashion can we build a system we can trust or live with and any other system will shortly become identical with what we so rebel against in the Soviet Union and fought so hard against and vanquished so completely in Hitler's Germany.

Let us never forget that in an effort to keep our Nation secure at home, we have constructed an apparatus which can destroy us if we don't watch out.

When Dwight Eisenhower referred to an "outraged citizenry," he was encouraging each one among you to cry out in indignation whenever you encounter or uncover an act of injustice to your fellowman.

The President has told all of us how the internal security machine is expected to work, but he must largely delegate to us, in and out of the Government, the energy, vigilance, courage, and determination to make it work.

Since April of 1953, the Nation has been living with Executive Order 10450, which looks into the loyalty and security reliability of millions of our citizens who are employed by or seek now and in the future to be employed by the Federal establishment. The cornerstone or guide within this order is that no individual shall be employed by or work for the Government unless his or her retention is clearly consistent with the national interest.

What have we learned out of this unique and new experience?

The most encouraging lesson is an admission by many responsible persons in executive and legislative authority that we suffer most from a lack of experience with the security program we have created. I know but few who think the administration of the system has been adequate to the reasonable requirements of freedom. I know but few who believe the system is an adequate answer to the reasonable demands of internal security.

One takes heart from appreciating that changes are under study and improvements in prospect.

We know that the system is under serious attack from many quarters. How much of this is generated by partisan politics or by the Communist inciters of trouble and confusion, I do not know. I was impressed on Wednesday of this week when the District of Columbia Bar Association publicly announced that a special and continuing committee of its leading members has been established to provide legal representation for Government employees who become involved in security cases. This service will be provided without any cost whatsoever to those employees who are unable to obtain counsel of their own choosing or who are without funds to retain an attorney. I need not say that this bar association is strongly opposed to subversion and communism or that a majority of its hundreds of members probably are registered Republicans. It should be noted that the special committee was established with strong encouragement from the president of the American Bar Association and from many high officers within the administration of the Government.

To be impressed by this development is not sufficient. Never before in our history has it been thought necessary to provide protection from the outside free of charge, for the individual against possible and unwarranted abuse and condemnation by his Government. If any steps will cause us to stop and think, this is it.

The only thing of which I am certain is that thoughtful citizens throughout the country are sorely troubled by a lack of information concerning what is going on. I hope the day soon comes when their doubts can be resolved. I hope that Republican leaders will begin to acknowledge the criticisms more rapidly and move more swiftly in correcting mistakes in judgment or procedure when they occur.

My own considered view is that our security system has worked well and fairly on the average but that conspicuous and inexcusable examples to the contrary have occurred much too often. It isn't persuasive that we should be complimented because we seldom err. Our Nation can't long tolerate a system which doesn't soon eliminate the possibility for errors which are disastrous to anyone like you or me when they arise. As I see it, some changes in both attitudes and procedures must be agreed to or the system will never work as the President intends that it shall operate.

Before listing some specific recommendations which I believe might add to the strength and resourcefulness of our beloved country, I want you to think about three instances in which our internal security apparatus has failed completely in one respect or another in its mission of balancing the requirements of freedom with the demands of security.

The first: The case of Wolf Ladejinsky has the more recently been in the public's eye. In reflecting on this sad matter, I speak as a part of that "outraged citizenry" to which Dwight Eisenhower made proper and pointed reference.

I am mindful that some in positions of governmental authority much higher than my own do not share my anxiety over the consequences I expect from the Ladejinsky question. My earnest hope is that they will not think me disrespectful and that they will consider a responsible citizen's point of view.

The Ladejinsky case points up practically every weakness which we can find or trace in our prevailing security system. It includes evidences of the shortsightedness, ruthlessness, smugness, and brutality of bureaucracy at their worst.

Wolf Ladejinsky was naturalized a citizen in 1928. He became a public servant for the Government in 1935 and has been on the Federal payroll ever since. During these 20 years, his written record of service has been noted for its reliability and competence and for his intelligent contributions to our Nation's fight against international communism. Ladejinsky was a powerful fighter in the forces against oppression and slavery long before many among us were conscious of the problem. In his years of service, no supportable question against Ladejinsky's loyalty was ever raised.

Not many months ago, the Foreign Operations Administration sought to secure the services of Ladejinsky who was then under the Agricultural Department's control in Japan. This request was denied because the Agricultural Department stated that Ladejinsky was too invaluable to be replaced.

Subsequently, several new security officers were given assignments by the Agricultural Department. One assumed his duties in early December of last year. They discovered, what everybody knew, that Ladejinsky had worked for Amtorg, a Russian trading concern, through parts of 1929 and 1930 and that he had three sisters who assumedly remain alive today in Russia. Ladejinsky had so stated years ago when he first applied for Government service.

In years and months gone by these matters had been scrutinized carefully by the very strict security division of the State Department when Ladejinsky was on that payroll. This examination took into thoughtful consideration Ladejinsky's faithful years of employment.

The Agriculture Department was unimpressed by the State Department's voluminous file in the matter. Ladejinsky was declared by the Agriculture Department to be a security risk and its security officer announced that the three sisters whom he assumed were alive in Russia was cause sufficient to so stigmatize Mr. Ladejinsky. The brother of these Ladejinsky sisters doesn't know whether they are dead or alive. He has had no word from them or about them in over 8 years.

You have read that the FOA has announced its intention of sending Ladejinsky to the very same assignment for which his services were recently denied because he was said to be indispensable in Japan.

So far as I know, Wolf Ladejinsky has never been faced by any accuser nor has he been confronted with any charges. He became unwillingly a cause celebre because some eager beavers and Johnny-come-latelys in our necessary effort to keep America strong couldn't take the time to talk with him or to relate the points in question to 20 years of a man's private and public life. By such indifference and impetuousness can the good reputation of a good citizen be demolished.

Ladejinsky was saved, if that be the proper way to put it, but his Nation's reputation for the exercise of sound judgment and fair play suffered a real blow, not just here at home but all around the world in those quarters where we seek to merchandise our finest exportable product which is labeled justice.

Ladejinsky was saved because he had friends in high places who have known him intimately through the years, and because nameless, outraged citizens cried aloud in their indignation.

It isn't everyone who can call on a Douglas MacArthur, a WALTER JUDD, and members of both parties in both Houses of the Congress. Men and women of smaller reputations might only consider themselves caught in a trap without knowing where to turn for help or an opportunity to state their case.

I shed bitter tears for a political reason as well. The case of Wolf Ladejinsky hasn't been solved with finality. There has been no retraction or apology over his being labeled a security risk. Great agencies of our great Government proclaim the man's loyalty and need for his splendid services. Another equally great department is silent and seemingly content to let a cloud on a citizen's priceless reputation hang on.

You will hear more about Wolf Ladejinsky. Your political opponents will demand, with justification I can't deny, that a full explanation of the circumstances and details be spread on the public record. This was our job to undertake. We were the ones who blundered. It was for us to explain the manner in which the injustice and contradiction occurred in order that you citizens would be reassured that no similar injustice would happen again. The measure of our collective and individual character is always determined by the way in which we admit our weaknesses and by the steps we take to correct them.

My own prayer is that the examination by the opposition will concern itself solely with facts and not with politics. In this case, we can be further and needlessly hurt regardless of the approach employed.

The second: Victor Havris, of Detroit, was a master sergeant stationed in Europe in 1953. At the age of 32, he had 14 years of loyal service behind him. It was thought by someone that the young man's father had been a Communist. It was developed through a hearing conducted by an Air Force security board that Victor Havris, at the age of 12, had been taken by his father, now dead, to some Communist Party meetings. There was no evidence or charge that young Havris was a Communist or a fellow traveler or that he had ever attended any

Communist gathering since he was 12 years old.

Because of the disclosure that young Havris had been led by the hand of his father to a Communist meeting, he was declared to be a security risk and faced dismissal from the Air Force.

This recommendation was overruled by a special board which was appointed to reexamine the case. A Democratic Congressman from Michigan was the one who prevailed upon the Air Force to delay and reexamine its dismissal decision.

This Congressman, whom I do not know, was an outraged citizen. He understood that the first intention of the Air Force was too much in keeping with the corruption-of-blood practice which the third article of our Constitution denies and which we so deplore in the Soviet Union. In this country, the crimes of the father are not to be visited on the children. A citizen must be judged on his own conduct and performance.

The third: Milo J. Radulovich was a first lieutenant in the Air Force who was not on active duty when questions about his being a security risk were raised in 1953. No doubt about his loyalty was intimated publicly. The case against Radulovich, who was a physics student at the University of Michigan under the GI bill of rights, was based on accusations that his father, John Radulovich, had read pro-Communist publications and that his sister, Mrs. Margaret Fishman, had marched as a picket in pro-Communist demonstrations.

For these reasons, ouster proceedings were initiated against Milo Radulovich. This intended action was concurred in by the board of three colonels who first heard the case and by every staff level until the question was laid before the Air Force Secretary.

Here the Air Force Secretary announced his faith in the American way by reversing the ouster decision, by removing the security risk stigma, and by his declaration that we do not impose retribution on the family as is done so destructively in slave states everywhere. In the case of Radulovich, there was a general assumption, short of the Air Force Secretary, that a person tempted, because of family ties, must inevitably succumb to temptation; that any person subjected to pressure must inevitably weaken even if it requires him to betray his country.

Justice was slow in coming to Milo Radulovich and it remained for one man to grant it. My concern about Radulovich was the attitude of mind which gave birth to the ouster proceedings.

When Milo Radulovich, age 26, heard that his reputation had been restored by the Air Force Secretary, he said: "It's just like having your future handed back to you. Just to say thanks isn't enough. I never expected it; I'm kind of bowled over."

It's time that we begin to worry when a young American, age 26, expresses surprise that he was dealt with justly by his Government.

I now offer to you some recommendations and suggestions which perhaps are durable and lasting in their value. In any event, they represent what I have been thinking about and puzzling over since last we met.

(a) There is a pressing need for the adoption of some method which will guarantee that important or unreconcilable differences between heads of departments in the loyalty and/or internal security fields will be referred for decision to a higher authority.

No internal security system can become effective, understandable, or reasonable unless its standards and the procedures for implementing them are national standards, not departmental or bureau standards.

In the Ladejinsky affair, one standard was advanced by the State Department and the Foreign Operations Administration while a fundamentally contradictory standard was supported by the Agriculture Department. This incredible result bewildered employees throughout the Government and confused people within our country and all around the world.

Probably all of the harm to our Nation's pride, judgment, and reputation for fairness could have been avoided if the difference between the departments had been resolved by a higher authority before any public announcement had been made.

If there isn't one national policy which is advocated and supported from the very top, there can't be any system or understanding or order at all.

The higher authority in question could be the Chief Executive or some high-ranking official to whom such a task is assigned or to a commission which certainly would include within it private citizens for whom the Nation has the fullest measure of respect and confidence in their characters and judgment. I dislike thinking that another burden should be imposed on the President but thought should be given to the need.

(b) We must employ a more meticulous care in the selection of security officers. Because of the scope and newness of the problem, some are assigned to judge others who are simply not qualified for these most difficult of all assignments.

Above all else, the Nation's need is for security personnel who can tell the difference between disloyalty and nonconformity; between treason and heresy.

Every Government worker must be loyal and reliable but there is no reason why they must be rigidly orthodox in their thinking. There is every reason to encourage the iconoclast as well as the conformist to serve the Republic on the public payroll you taxpayers support.

Whether in or out of government, the orthodox mind, because of its strength and singleness of purpose, maintains and preserves progress, but the dreamer and the nonconformist make progress. The opportunity to be different, while being strictly loyal, is a climate we ought to take pains to develop.

I consider the security officer to be the cornerstone in our fight to remain strong and free. Any misfits or second-raters among them are more dangerous to our future than the subversives they endeavor to catch. These are the people who indict the innocent without reason and overlook the guilty for lack of knowledge, training, and experience.

Were I appointing a security officer, I would select no one whose background didn't include a sound and wide knowledge of the theoretical advance and practice of communism since the times of Karl Marx and this same individual would be required to have an equal knowledge and understanding of our Constitution, its Bill of Rights, the movements which produced the Declaration of Independence, and the history of the United States.

(c) Under Executive Order 10450, the function of a security hearing board is to conduct hearings on security cases and offer their decisions to the head of a given agency for him to accept or reject as he thinks best.

The members of these hearing boards are generally chosen from the top level of the administrative working force. The rather large number whom I know personally are conscientious, competent, and desirous of being fair.

Their liabilities are few, but important. They have no tenure of office and they lack a feeling of independence because they are subordinates and subject to the directions of superiors. Another sizable fault is that a majority of them have had no previous experience with hearings and the kind of testimony with which these hearings deal.

These security hearing board members lay no claim to being professionals. They started as rank amateurs and it will take time for some to learn their new business and longer for others. I can only recognize their inexperience to be a perplexing problem. I constantly wonder whether professional hearing examiners could better keep the balance we seek between security and justice.

(d) It might be advantageous to separate the personnel function from the function of internal security. It often happens that the job-suitability interviewer or the processor of personnel forms is called upon to make at least a preliminary judgment on questions of loyalty and security.

As often as not, these persons are trained only in the semiscience of relating an individual's qualifications to a given job which needs to be filled.

Why shouldn't the interviewer or processor pigeonhole an application which indicates that the applicant has been a member of organizations alleged to be subversive? These organizations may not be subversive or perhaps they weren't before they went out of business years ago. No one is likely to encounter any future trouble by shelving a troublesome-looking application. Many a personnel officer will react to security questions as he would to poison. He wants none of either.

Too much has been said about Government employment being a privilege and not a right. Of course, it's a privilege. Why labor the obvious? All an applicant is entitled to is a fair and impartial break. He or she does have that right to be judged competitively and fairly on their job qualifications. Their security status could be judged subsequently by one who is an authority in that field.

We must be alert always to avoid procedures, forms, and attitudes which stimulate the advancement of mediocrity in any way within the Federal structure.

(e) We must increasingly learn to tailor security to the job. An individual may be unsuited for the strictness of security demanded by a particularly sensitive assignment. This does not necessarily imply that the individual couldn't fill many other important assignments with credit to himself and the Government. Our operations and the living in the past never called for such an exercise of good judgment as does the present. If this were Russia, we wouldn't bother much about this exercise. Because we live in America, we must be bothered constantly.

(f) The basic criterion in Executive Order 10450 ought, I think, to be reexamined in the light of every development in the last 20 months.

This criterion, that an accused applicant or employee must meet the test that his employment is "clearly consistent with the interest of the United States" would and does, where literally applied, constitute a burden which can hardly be borne by anyone. It almost makes the employee affirmatively prove that the national interest requires the retention or continuation of his services. Who among us could do that?

I believe that the phrase "clearly consistent" has been the source of much of our trouble and that the cases previously referred to, and others like them, were instigated by it.

"Clearly consistent" can easily be construed to mean without doubts, real or fancied, of any kind. It can be read to mean that pure hearsay or malicious gossip or unsupported allegations constitute doubts to be resolved in favor of the Government. To my knowledge it has been so read.

Such an interpretation implies that a domestic system of absolute security is both

desirable and possible. In point of logic and commonsense, it cannot be either possible or desirable.

Any system through which men and women are judged must provide the judges with room for judgment and discretion.

Instead of the rigidity of "clearly consistent" we might better work toward the latitudes included in language like this:

"No person should be dismissed or denied employment from the Federal service as a security risk unless it is affirmatively found that his retention or employment is reasonably inconsistent with the national interest."

I am not suggesting that an established doubt should not be resolved in favor of the Government. It should be so resolved. What I am suggesting, and what our Nation ought to demand, is that the doubt about an individual be first established before it is resolved against him.

Let the Government judges assume their rightful responsibility for establishing their doubts about any individual to be valid and most of the fear and skepticism concerning our security system would disappear overnight.

In expressing this conviction, I am thinking about you and what you are entitled to should you endeavor to join or remain within the Federal establishment.

(g) The general public has a tendency to consider loyalty and security as being one and the same thing. That doesn't follow. A loyal person can be a security risk and a security risk can be truly loyal. Obviously, a disloyal person is a risk.

We should, I believe, be more specific in our use of the term "security risk."

Drunkards, perverts, drug users, gossipers, and those who insist on keeping bad company may well be security risks while being loyal. We ought to make this distinction clear. When a person is fired as a risk, the reason for their being so considered ought to be stated.

A person who drinks too much can often recover from that indiscretion and build a new life—if given a chance. The risk dismissed for being disloyal will remain disgraced for life.

Here again we should be trying to strengthen our Federal structure without unnecessarily destroying individuals in the process.

Espionage agents will be found among the disloyal. These are the ones we ought to try the hardest to discover. When we do, we ought to execute them. Risks who are otherwise loyal will not often be found in this category. We ought to treat them accordingly—without needless embarrassment or harassment.

You've been most indulgent to permit me to speak so long. There is yet more that could be constructively said but I thought tonight I could say no less. One further observation and I'm through.

The days of the present aren't easy or uncomplicated, yet several simple ideals and principles can't be misunderstood.

A whole clique of spies could hardly do as much damage to us as could our failure as a government to have confidence in our people. Any government, to deserve to survive, must deserve the respect of its citizenry. A government is under no compulsion to be less than severe in punishing crimes against the state, but that government is under every compulsion to extend consideration and just treatment to every citizen. He or she must be treated as what they actually are—the fiber and substance from which a free nation derives its strength and purpose.

Some wise man in the early days of our beginning, perhaps it was Franklin, said: "I give you a Republic if you can keep it."

That's what I've tried to talk about, as a citizen, tonight—How to keep it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I conclude with this thought: The formula for the Commission which has been suggested is not new. It is one which has been applied in the case of the Hoover Commission and other commissions. I am not nearly so much concerned about the numbers on the Commission or the formula for the establishment of such a Commission as I am about the necessity for proceeding with this very important and difficult task.

I think it would be well for every Member of the Senate to remember that we are now talking about the safety of the United States of America, its government and its institutions. We are also, Mr. President, in establishing a security system, trying to find a way by which we can maintain security on the one hand and freedom on the other. This is the greatest challenge to a free people that could possibly be placed before us. We do not, I am sure, want to sacrifice that which distinguishes us as a people and as a Nation from others, particularly from the totalitarians, in our effort to gain what we term security in critical days. I do not believe the problems are irreconcilable. I happen to believe it is possible, and not only possible, but desirable, to have an effective, well-administered, carefully thought-out, consistent security program which will protect the safety and the welfare of the United States of America on the one hand, and, at the same time, fulfill all the requirements of what we call the democratic way of life and the principles upon which our democracy is founded.

As we search for the final solution I suggest we call upon the best our country has to offer. I suggest that we view the problem as one which is apart from the normal apparatus of political institutions and political life. Let us call upon the President and upon those in responsible authority to set the house in order, to make the home of freedom not only secure but orderly.

It is in that spirit and with that thought that I have, along with the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], advanced this program. I wish to commend all those who have been working thus far in this field, and to assure my colleagues that there is no conflict of interest between this proposed Commission and the normal and effective functions of the committees of the Congress. We can supplement one another and be of great assistance in arriving at the objective of the protection of the national security and the fulfillment of individual liberty.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CBS TELEVISION PROGRAM CONCERNING THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier I had discussed with the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. GEORGE] an announcement I wished to have made on the part of that committee, and particularly the chairman of it.

Mr. Edward R. Murrow is presenting 2 one-half hour programs on See It Now, CBS-TV, January 18 and January 25, from 10:30 to 11 o'clock p. m., eastern standard time, covering the work of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The program will feature interviews and actual scenes taken at a committee session this year.

Mr. President, as I said previously, I am making this announcement in behalf of the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and I wish to say that I think CBS is to be highly complimented for its keen educational interest in the work of the committee. I think the program will be quite a treat for our colleagues, and I hope it will be of benefit and of educational value to the citizenry of the United States.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if no other Senator wishes the floor, I move that the Senate now adjourn until Friday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, January 21, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 18, 1955:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Donald R. Heath, of Kansas, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Lebanon.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Russell B. Wine, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the western district of Texas, vice Charles F. Herring, resigned.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named licensed officer of the United States Merchant Marine to the grade indicated in the United States Coast Guard:

To be a lieutenant (junior grade)

John Robert O'Connor

The following-named persons to the grades indicated in the United States Coast Guard effective December 10, 1954, to which they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

To be lieutenants in the United States Coast Guard

Charles B. Williams
Jay A. Small, Jr.
Alexander D. Holman, Jr.

To be lieutenants (junior grade) in the United States Coast Guard

Walter F. Condon
Rudolph V. Cassani

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The President's Budget Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 18, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief statement prepared by me regarding the President's budget message with reference to natural resources.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR NEUBERGER

This is a budget which spells economic hardship and adversity for the Pacific Northwest.

Despite the urgent need for deepening the Columbia River bar to a depth of at least 48 feet, no funds are included for initiating this urgent project. The commerce and trade of Portland, Oregon's major port, are being choked by the shallow and dangerous shoals at the mouth of the Columbia.

The pledge of Federal assistance for new hydroelectric development is tied specifically to the discredited "partnership" scheme, under which private power companies would monopolize the bulk of revenues at the dams. This is a shotgun promise, telling the people of the region they must accept "partnership" or reconcile themselves to virtually no new projects at all.

In spite of the extravagant campaign promises made to the voters of southern Oregon by nearly every Republican candidate in the election of 1954, the Talent irrigation and power project in Jackson County receives not one cent in construction funds. Both Senator MORSE and I urged Secretary McKay to honor his party's campaign promises to southern Oregon, but our plea has gone ignored.

The Bonneville Power Administration, which has been the lifeline of Northwest hydroelectric production, is to receive in the coming fiscal year only 66 percent of last year's budget. This symbolizes the gradual decline of Bonneville under the present administration, which hopes to see the great Federal agency superseded by private power companies.

Furthermore, the $500,000 for advance engineering, which may go to John Day, does not even represent a full year's work under a normal program. I regret that the Governor of Oregon, who made many references to Congress in his inaugural message, never once recognized the fact that the budget is prepared wholly by the administration. Why was not the Oregon Legislature asked to urge upon the administration a budget which would do justice to Oregon?

It is alarming that the total sum to be spent on natural resources, which are the lifeblood of the Nation, is the lowest since 1950, amounting to $953 million, as contrasted with $1,358,000,000 in the 1953 fiscal year, for example.

Senator MORSE and I will try to add to this budget some funds for such urgent Oregon undertakings as Columbia River deepening, the Talent project, an accelerated John Day Dam, and authorization and eventually construction of Hells Canyon.

The total disregard of the desperate need to deepen the Columbia bar to 48 feet is an indication of the budget's inadequacy. For at least another year—unless we can amend this budget as it goes through Congress—Portland and Astoria will suffer in their competition with Puget Sound and California seaports.

Foreign and Defense Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 18, 1955

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD the text of the speech I made yesterday in Chicago, Ill., before the Newspaper Advertising Executives Association.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, OF CALIFORNIA

Foreign and defense policies are and need to be the people's business. The decisions that are made in the months ahead may well determine whether we are to have a free world of free men.

The wise men who drafted our Constitution knew well the history of the world up to their time.

They knew that where people had lost their freedom it was because of the concentration of power in one agency of the Government.

Not only did they set up three great coequal branches of the Federal Government as checks and balances one against the other but they made the Federal Government one of limited and specified powers, reserving to the several States or the people thereof all other powers.

It was Thomas Jefferson who said, "I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

The times call for frankness and where there is an honest difference of opinion the American people should be presented the alternatives confronting them.

At the United Nations headquarters in New York a massive propaganda buildup is taking place to silence those who would analyze the facts of the recent visit of the Secretary General to Peiping. The same arguments for voluntary censorship will be used later when the ultimate price of ransom is paid—lest we offend the killers in Peiping.

The Chinese Communist regime is the same one which committed the aggression in Korea; was responsible for inflicting 140,000 casualties upon us, including 35,000 dead. That regime also killed in cold blood hundreds of Americans, with hands tied behind their backs, who were their prisoners.

It is the same regime which has consistently violated the Korean armistice and has prevented the neutral nations investigative teams from being anything but paralyzed, impotent examples of the free world's naive trust in a system which prides itself in treachery, assassination, and dishonor as legitimate weapons in the ultimate communization of the world.

Lest there be some who think I am not being slow to anger I will quote Lenin who said, "We must be ready to employ trickery, deceit, lawbreaking, withholding and concealing truth."

Communism is a global menace. It cannot be stopped in Europe if allowed free reign in Asia. Lenin stated the basic concept when he said, "The road to Paris is through Peking."

In this age of the airplane and atomic power this Nation could no more return to isolation than an adult could return to childhood.

We need and want stout allies but an alliance must be a two-way affair. A nation cannot buy friends any more than can an individual.

The mission of Secretary General Hammarskjold was not a success and, in my judgment, no service is done the American people or those of the free world by pretending that it was.

Mr. Hammarskjold has returned without either the release of the prisoners of war held in violation of the armistice agreement or any prospective date in the future when they will be freed. He personally favors the admission of Communist China into the United Nations and his government has recognized that regime. In China he did not go to see our men and the conditions under which they are imprisoned. His mission was a failure by any fair standard or yardstick that Americans can use.

This is attempted to be glossed over by the statement that "When tensions are eased the members of our Armed Forces may be released." We already know the standards which the Communist Government has set for the easing of tensions. They are:

1. The admission of Communist China into the United Nations.

2. Reopening of trade, including that of strategic materials with Communist China.

3. The reversal of the American policy which holds that it is not in our national interest or that of the free world to have the island of Formosa, with its 9½ million free Chinese, pass into Communist hands.

4. A reversal of our determination and of the free world to draw a line in the Pacific so that additional nations and their people will not pass behind the Communist Iron Curtain.

These surrenders will not be apparent all at once and for the most part, if accomplished, would be done despite the negative vote of the United States.

But first there will come the concessions which like paying other types of blackmail will be constantly enlarged:

1. Assurances to the Chinese Communists relating to limitations and restrictions upon our pending treaty with the Republic of China, now on Formosa, and other offshore islands.

This, I would point out to Mr. Hammarskjold, is a dangerous game. The Chinese and North Korean Communists had understood from Mr. Acheson that the Republic of Korea was outside of our defense perimeter.

2. Assurances that while public opinion in the United States would not presently support Chinese Communist admission into the United Nations the Communist bloc and the neutrals would soon reward the Peiping regime for their generosity in releasing a fraction of our citizens held provided the American voice at home and abroad was throttled from telling the truth regarding the tyranny spreading its cancerous growth in Asia, Europe, and anywhere else they can subvert free nations.

Mr. Hammarskjold knows as well as does any other observer of the world scene that

in Communist eyes there will be no lessening of tensions until the Communists are appeased in that manner.

What a vast difference the history books would record today if the men who gave us our Nation had not been prepared to take some risks. We would never have become or remained an independent free America.

How long can such a policy be followed without ending in disaster for ourselves as well as the other member states of the United Nations?

Our power was so diluted by the United Nations during the Korean action that the recommendations of our responsible military commanders were constantly vetoed or ignored and our joint venture prevented the winning of the Korean conflict.

The United Nations record in Korea was not effective security in action. The United States furnished 90 percent of the manpower. Only 17 out of 60 members supplied any manpower at all. We supplied 450,000 in armed forces to 45,000 supplied by all other United Nations members.

Soviet chairmanship of the Security Council at intervals during the Korean war was like having the town arsonist to head the fire department. The Soviet Union admitted supplying arms, ammunition and moral support to the aggressor.

Will the same joint venture prevent us from securing the release of our own men in the uniform of the American Armed Forces without paying tribute to the Chinese Communist regime?

Before Mr. Hammarskjold and his associates at New York or their home governments commit themselves to appeasement in conformity with the current Communist line let them understand: Any such appeasement will be subjected not only to the most searching scrutiny by the American Congress but by a far more potent solemn referendum of the American people in 1956.

The time may be coming in the not too distant future when the people of the United States may have to insist upon a second Declaration of Independence.

We did not change from a small colony of 3 million on the Atlantic seaboard to the great Nation of 165 million because we had the most people in the world. There have been a good many other nations that have had larger populations.

We did not reach our present place because we had the most resources in the world, for there are other nations which have greater material resources.

I believe that we came to our present position of leadership because the founders of this Republic gave us a heritage of courage and a written Constitution that, better than any other document drafted by man, has given to our people the freedom—political and economic—without which this great progress could not have been made.

In this atmosphere the American spirit had free reign. We were guaranteed the right to worship God, each according to his beliefs.

To be sure, we have demonstrated time and time again that as a nation and as a people we are indeed slow to anger.

The religion and cultural background of the free people of China made them slow to anger. Their nation is today behind the Iron Curtain and millions have been liquidated, including men of religion, teachers, small merchants, businessmen, and non-Communist workers and farmers. The free people of Czechoslovakia were slow to anger, and are today behind the Communist Iron Curtain—though in the preceding election less than 20 percent of their people had voted the Communist ticket.

Some of our associates abroad apparently want to brainwash us of some of the history that has made America great.

But, there comes a time, as my old New England grandmother used to say, when we reach a point of righteous indignation, and out of this has come—cherished to each American generation, one succeeding the other—such terms as: "Give me liberty or give me death," "Don't give up the ship," "Remember the Alamo," "Damn the torpedoes; full speed ahead," "Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead."

Despite the fact that in many instances we were faced with what appeared to be overwhelming odds, we have never found it necessary to sacrifice our national honor when a vital principle was at stake.

Nor must we ever permit any international organization to so dilute or undermine our spirit to the extent that Gulliver becomes chained by the Lilliputians and we are unable to even protect our own.

The United Nations overwhelmingly passed a resolution giving support to the American position relative to the 15 American airmen being illegally held by the Chinese Communists.

While the Communists have acknowledged that they hold these 15 men in uniform, there are strong grounds for belief that they may be holding other unaccounted for Americans. During the Korean war there were more than 800 unaccounted for Americans in uniform who had fallen into Communist hands. We also know that they have 28 American civilian citizens still in Communist jails, many of them having served there for 3 or 4 years. We know some of these have been in leg and arm chains for months at a time.

This Nation will want to know what additional steps the United Nations will promptly take to secure the release of the uniformed personnel? How long are we expected to be patient while our men are in Communist cells?

Are they prepared to apply against the Chinese Communist regime economic sanctions as well as moral condemnation by resolution? If these are not successful, are they prepared to support a tight naval and air blockade upon the China coast?

Or is the plan to silence Members of Congress, have a form of censorship over our press, radio, and television, lull our people into a sense of false security lest it offend the Communist leader at Peiping who as successor to the emperors of the old middle kingdom expects the representatives of the free world to kow tow and bring tribute to his august presence?

Since when did it become sound policy to reward the gangster with the Legion of Merit because he returns a part of his loot?

In the final analysis, however, neither the American Government nor the Congress can escape the responsibility for taking whatever effective steps are necessary to secure the release of these men wearing the uniform of this country. They do not wear the uniform of the United Nations though they did serve in the United Nations operation in Korea. As long as a single American is held in a Communist prison I shall not remain silent.

Some, though not all, of our present problems vis-a-vis the Communist world stem from the secret agreements of Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam.

We should not consider all the people behind the Iron Curtain as being enemies of the free way of life.

At a matter of fact the people of Russia were the first victims of Communist tyranny from which we may hope they will some day be free.

Without the knowledge or consent of either the American people or their elected representatives in the Congress commitments were made for the postwar period which enabled the Communist conspiracy to gain control of Eastern Europe, China, and North Korea.

Since the year 1945, which saw the end of World War II in Europe and Asia, international communism has made great strides.

In January of that year there were less than 200 million people behind the Communist Iron Curtain. Today, just 10 years later, there are over 800 million. The world's balance of power has been upset.

When 30 years ago Lenin said "The road to Paris is through Peking," he meant that China was the key to all of Asia with its billion and a half people. Once consolidated with the manpower and resources of Asia communism could turn with overwhelming power against the West.

Peace with honor is, and should be, the policy of the American people. This is certainly far different from a policy of peace at any price. Unless this is thoroughly understood, we could be lured into a sense of false security by the words of the men in the Kremlin which do not conform to their actions or their policies.

We must never lose sight of the fact that communism is the most brutal, Godless tyranny the world has ever known. As a temporary expedient they may change their day-to-day tactics, but their long-term strategy remains the same under Malenkov as it was under Lenin and Stalin.

Some time between 1913 and 1915 Lenin studied the works of Karl von Clausewitz, who is rated as one of the outstanding theoreticians of war. Clausewitz' statement that the conqueror always pretends to be peace loving because he would like to attain his objectives in a bloodless fashion (as, indeed, does the bank robber who kills only when resisted or disturbed in carrying out his mission) and that, therefore, aggression must be presented as a defensive reaction of the attacking nation was considered by Lenin to be a good idea. This idea is still at the bottom of Communist pacifist propaganda—peaceful coexistence.

The Kremlin's basic strategy is that communism will dominate the world, and free institutions and enterprise as we know them will be destroyed. Neither as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee nor as a party leader in the Senate has the slightest reliable evidence been presented to me which would demonstrate that the Communist leopard has changed its spots.

We and the free world must not allow ourselves to be paralyzed while nation after nation in Asia and in Europe is brought behind the Communist Iron Curtain. In such an event we might ultimately find ourselves as an isolated island of freedom in an otherwise totalitarian world.

Under such conditions, though the difficulties would be great, we might exist as sort of a continental Dien Bien Phu. However, we would not be able to maintain the same political or economic system which has enabled this country of ours to grow from a small colony of 3 million on the Atlantic seaboard to a world power of 165 million, the most productive industrially and agriculturally the world has ever known.

The doctrine of peaceful coexistence is being advanced by the men in the Kremlin, by the neutralist nations which do not desire to take sides as between freedom and slavery and by some of our people who have not necessarily understood the full implications of what the Communists mean by peaceful coexistence.

Their basic policy is and has been that they would permit a nation to peacefully coexist for such a time as suited the Kremlin's convenience and until they could either be subverted by communism from within or taken over by Communist aggression from without. They have in mind for us the peaceful coexistence the Thanksgiving turkey has (well fed and housed) until the axe falls.

Whatever their station in political economic or academic circles, those who lose sight of this basic fact endanger the freedom of this Republic and the hope of gaining or preserving a free world of free men. You could, of course, always buy temporary

respite by a policy of appeasement, but the world should have learned at the time of Munich that "the road to appeasement is not the road to peace." It is only surrender on the installment plan.

Proposals almost certain to be made if and when a big four conference is held:

1. Recognition and approval of the present borders of the Iron Curtain.

2. Communist China in the United Nations.

This would mean the perpetual slavery of hundreds of millions of people without hope of ultimate freedom. It would mean a complete repudiation of the doctrine of liberation.

On November 15 in the Senate of the United States, in discussing coexistence, I raised a number of questions. They were:

"Are 'coexistence' and 'atomic stalemate' synonymous terms? If they are not, just what is the difference? Is the former merely an inevitable prelude to the latter? And what of our foreign policy and our defense policy when such an atomic stalemate takes place? Does not atomic stalemate mean inevitable Communist nibbling aggression, rather than peace in our time? How many years remain when we still have some initiative left? These are some of the basic questions before the Government and the people of the United States."

These questions have not as yet been fully explored. They will be during the present session of the 84th Congress. Without partisanship or factionalism we must face up to the facts and the challenges of our generation.

If we will only show the same courage and common sense that motivated the men who sat in Philadelphia and, under divine inspiration, gave us first the Declaration of Independence and then the Constitution of the United States, there are none of our domestic problems we cannot solve and there is no foreign foe we need ever fear.

The National Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 18, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by me in regard to the national highway program as submitted by the National Advisory Committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. HARRY F. BYRD, OF VIRGINIA, RELATIVE TO THE CLAY COMMISSION HIGHWAY REPORT

I shall discuss the proposed new road plan at length in the Senate when the President submits it to Congress January 27. In this statement I am commenting briefly on the recommendations to the President by the National Advisory Committee for a national highway program.

The Committee's recommendations fall generally in two parts: (1) Continuation of the regular Federal aid to highways at the rate of $623 million a year, and (2) expenditure during the next 10 years of an additional $25 billion for the so-called interstate highway system. Federal expenditures on the 2 programs in 10 years would total $31 billion. Including the interest, the expenditure will be $42.5 billion.

The Committee estimates the $25 billion would construct 40,000 road-miles designated by the Federal Government as interstate highway. This would be little more than 1 percent of all public-road mileage. The average would be about 800 miles per State. For this the Committee recommends borrowing $20 billion at 3 percent interest and collection of $5 billion in fees from filling stations, motels, etc., operating on the rights-of-way.

If the 30-year taxable bonds recommended by the Committee can be sold at 3 percent interest, and if they are paid off on schedule—the last maturing in 1987—the interest would cost more than $11.5 billion. At this rate every dollar borrowed would cost taxpayers $1.55.

Based on all recent Federal experience, I submit it is a violent assumption to predict these bonds will be paid off at maturity. In effect, we have not paid off a single dollar of Federal debt in 25 years. Continuing increase in the Federal debt is in prospect for an indefinite period.

It may be expected that even before the 40,000 miles are constructed, the program will be expanded in mileage, scope, and amount. It is certain that the system will be thousands of miles greater than contemplated in the Committee report.

As we grow, population shifts, and the impact on specific roads changes, and therefore our road needs shift and change. There is no such thing as a permanent road because no one can predict years in advance what specific roads will carry the most traffic.

Actually the Committee recommends that the Federal Government assume virtually the complete obligation for the so-called interstate highway system (abolishing the 60–40 Federal-State matching requirement in this program) and that it be financed by methods which are unique so far as I know, and thoroughly unsound.

The Committee recommended to the President that the program be financed through a Federal corporation which, without either assets or income, would borrow $20 billion from the public. The Treasury, under a contract with the corporation, would guarantee the corporation's bonds, but the debt would not be included in the record of obligations guaranteed by the United States. Annual appropriations to meet principal and interest payments would be requested, but the request could not be refused or reduced by subsequent Congresses, for 30 years, if the faith and credit of the Government are to be honored. If financial difficulty should develop at any time, the corporation with no further authorization could make mandatory calls upon the Treasury for amounts up to $5 billion outstanding at any one time.

Such procedures violate financing principles, defy budgetary control, and evade Federal debt law.

If the Federal Government can properly borrow money for roads in this fashion, without regarding it as debt, and spend it without budgetary control, it may be expected that similar proposals will be made for financing endless outlays which may be desirable for education, hospitals, public health, etc. In fact I am informed that such a plan is now under consideration for school construction.

This would mean operating the Government on two sets of books: One set for activities financed by borrowing outside the debt and expenditures outside budgetary control, and the other set for activities financed by borrowing on the record and expenditures under budget control.

Count it as you will, as we spend more than our income we add to our debt. The least the Government can do, in fairness to taxpayers, is to keep books and accounts in a manner reflecting the true state of our fiscal affairs.

When the Government contracts a bona fide debt, but arbitrarily removes it from classification as public indebtedness, it creates fiscal confusion and disorder, and destroys confidence in Government credit.

You cannot avoid financial responsibility by legerdemain, and you cannot evade debt by definition. The obligations of the Federal Government and all its citizens will still remain.

There is another grave objection to this Federal road plan, of importance equal to those I have mentioned.

GROWTH OF FEDERAL GRANTS TO STATES

Since 1934, Federal grants to States have enormously expanded in cost and functions. Every Federal grant elevates the control of the Federal Government and subordinates the authority of the States. Nothing is truer than the rule that power follows the purse. When the Federal Government makes a grant it directs the exact manner in which the fund is expended, even though the expenditure is partly contributed by the States. Time and time again I have seen the iron hand of the Federal bureaucracy compel the States to do things that they did not desire to do, because of grants made by the Federal Government.

The growth in Federal grants is indicated by the fact that in 1934, 21 years ago, the total of such grants was $126 million, for 18 grants-in-aid programs. Now the total of Federal grants is $3 billion for 50 programs. This is an increase of 300 percent in programs and 2,300 percent in cost. Federal grants to States never end. They continue to expand.

The Committee's proposal contemplates the greatest increase in Federal grants suggested. A Federal agency will determine the location of the interstate road system, will fix the number and location of access roads, which may be considerable distances apart, will fix the fees for the activities such as filling stations, motels, restaurants, etc., that are located along the rights-of-way and will control construction standards, etc.

No one recognizes more fully than I the need of road improvement to meet the constantly increasing impact of modern-day traffic. A great deal of my public career has been devoted to the problems of a road construction in Virginia. As a substitute for the Committee's recommendations I propose:

1. That the 2-cent gasoline tax now being collected by the Federal Government be repealed, thus permitting the States to reimpose it.

2. Present Federal aid to primary, secondary, and urban road systems which, for many years has been integrated with State highway systems, be continued on the long-standing match basis. This amounts to $535 million.

3. That the lubricating oil tax now collected by the Federal Government be continued.

4. A ½ cent per gallon Federal gasoline tax. Revenue from this tax plus the Federal lubricating oil tax, according to estimates of increasing use, shortly will be sufficient to compensate the Federal Treasury for this Federal aid.

Under such a plan States would retain as much control over their roads as they have had in the past; $11.5 billion interest would be saved for additional road construction; and road revenue would be evenly distributed over future years to keep highways modernized to meet changing conditions.

Under the Committee plan principal and interest payments on the $20 billion bond issue would dry up gasoline tax revenue for 20 years, from 1966 to 1987, with the exception of about $600 million which is committed to matching funds of States for their primary, secondary, and urban systems.

In the next few days I will present on a yearly basis figures showing the plan I propose will result in more road development

than can be accomplished under the Committee's plan; that it will avoid increasing the public debt, and that it will serve to preserve the soundness of the Federal budgetary system.

Conservation of Soil: Our Greatest Resource

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 18, 1955

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address I delivered at the National Agriculture Limestone Institute in Washington at noon today.

On this occasion, I spoke on the subject Conservation of Soil: Our Greatest Resource. If we are to preserve our productive capacity we must conserve our soil. We should ever remember the lesson of China, where neglect of natural resources contributed to impoverishment of its people, political instability, and social discontent. Such an example should teach us we cannot continually mine our resources without replenishment, that to do so would invite national disaster. We should remember that it can happen to us.

President Eisenhower, in his recent message to Congress on the state of the Union, said we must direct greater attention to the needs of low-income farm families. Many of these farmers are being strangled slowly by intense competition in the farm markets today. They constitute the group leaving the farm today, causing a reduction in family-size farms.

A properly financed, continuously adequate soil-conservation program, with prominent roles for lime and fertilizer, would enable these farmers to produce better quality crops in greater quantity, and permit them to compete more effectively with lower cost producers.

A betterment of his economic position would make farming more attractive to the low-income farmers and help keep them down on the farm. Further, the farmer's welfare is integrally bound to the Nation's welfare. He is a big buyer of finished steel products, oil, and chemical supplies. If we are to maintain a balance between agriculture and industry we should bend every effort to make farming a healthy, attractive, and thriving business.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. FRANK CARLSON, OF KANSAS, AT NATIONAL AGRICULTURE LIMESTONE INSTITUTE, STATLER HOTEL, TUESDAY, JANUARY 18, 1955

Mr. Chairman, it is a genuine privilege and a real honor to speak to the delegates and members of the National Agriculture Limestone Institute at its annual meeting. Your organization is representative of an industry that means much to the national welfare and the well-being of the American farmers.

It is most appropriate that I discuss with you the subject Conservation of Soil: Our Greatest Resource.

Your interests are not confined to soil conservation, but you have a direct and personal interest in the international and economic problems of the Nation.

I trust you will pardon me if I refer back to the Old Testament and use a verse of scripture as a text:

"And there saw we the giants, the sons of Anak, which come of the giants: and we were as grasshoppers in our own sight, and so we were in their sight." (Numbers 13: 33.)

These giants stand out as symbols of great difficulties—great obstacles. They are in every field of our activities. We meet them in our international problems—we meet them in our domestic problems—certainly we meet them in the field of agriculture. We must overcome them or they will overcome us.

Fortunately, our Nation has been blessed with men and women who had vision, great courage and an overcoming faith.

Two giants or obstacles in agriculture have been and are agriculture surpluses and production restrictions.

The stress of reduced demand during the depression years and the necessity for downward readjustments in agricultural output at the end of World War II have forced us to think a great deal about these two problems.

But as a long-run solution, acreage control of production of food, raw fibers, and the other products of our agricultural industry is as distasteful to the American mind as the restriction of output by an industrial monopolist would be.

Our greatest hope for the permanent solution of both the surplus and restriction problems thus lies in the direction of expanded consumption at home and abroad. Given sufficient time and a realistic approach to the problem of existing surpluses and the need for acreage diversions to prevent their continued accumulation, we can grow up to our present capacity.

It is entirely possible that within the not-too-distant future, instead of worrying about curtailment, we may be having to think and plan for increasing agricultural production even in peacetimes, just as we have had to do several times during war periods in the past.

When one considers the prospects of our working out of these surpluses and the surplus productive capacity from which they come, four points come to mind:

1. We are faced with a tremendous growth in demand resulting from an unprecedented increase in population.

2. We can hope and expect a continually rising standard of living for all these people.

3. With modern technology and research at work for us, there is almost no limit to the possible new uses and hence new demands for agricultural products which may be discovered.

4. Even though the export market for agricultural commodities has declined in recent years, there are still millions of underfed, underclothed peoples of the world who are anxious and willing to buy our products if they can find or be helped to find ways to pay for them.

Population growth, if we look far enough ahead, will alone have a tremendous impact upon the surplus problem. Population which today is 163 million is estimated at 190 million in 1965.

Within the next decade we shall thus be faced with substantially the situation which an excellent Department of Agriculture report, issued only a few years ago, entitled "The Fifth Plate," foresaw for 1975.

For every four people sitting down to a meal and consuming the products of agriculture today there will be another person, a fifth mouth, to be fed at the dinner table 10 and 15 years from now. While the figures on the rate of population increase have been variously presented, each time new estimates are made the earlier estimates seem to appear more and more conservative.

If all of us are to eat as well of pork products a decade hence as we have been doing, agriculture will have not only to produce as it did in 1950, but an additional amount equal to all of the pigs produced in Iowa and Nebraska in 1950.

If we are to do no more than maintain our per capita beef consumption, we will have to add to our national production an amount equivalent to the entire 1950 production of the great producing States of Texas, Oklahoma, and Minnesota combined.

With no increase whatever in lamb consumption per capita, we will need somehow to increase production by an amount greater than that of the combined production of Montana, Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada.

On this population count alone, it looks like our surplus problem may, in due time, give way to one of trying to make every 5 of our present acres produce as much as 6 acres do today. That will call for larger and larger dosages of capital in the form of lime, fertilizers, better seeds and machinery, together with improved farming practices generally.

Incidentally, the report already referred to notes that we can build up acres by using lime and that the tons spread during the agricultural conservation program in the single year 1949 resulted in 20 million tons more hay and pasture forage which, if converted to beef, would equal 1½ billion pounds live weight.

In our great concern for the problems of this agricultural surplus era there is a danger that we may overlook other important phases of our agricultural policies and programs. We should be careful in our thinking not to deemphasize the agricultural conservation programs. We must be ever aware of our duty to preserve the Nation's soils for future generations in a sound and adequate manner even during this period of temporary surpluses.

Only a few years ago we exerted every effort to increase production of practically all crops to meet demand. Who can say the same situation won't face us again a few years from now? Our conservation efforts must remain on a level consistent with the needs of our soil today and in the years to come if we are to faithfully discharge our obligation to the welfare of our farmers and city dwellers today and to those yet unborn.

In addition to the growth in population, we all look forward to a continually rising standard of living for those who make up that population. And a rising standard of living means in part improved diets for those at every income level.

While Americans today are on the average the best-fed people in the world, we cannot be content with present standards. The whole trend in income distribution is certain to be such that those who must now live on restricted or inadequate diets will be enabled to raise their standards and partake of more and more healthful foods.

As costs of producing various crops are realined, the grains which in the short run present embarrassing surpluses may well be applied to greater uses as animal feed. Our increased population and our rising standard of living will call for increased consumption of meats which is one sure way of cutting into our recent cereal surpluses.

The third outlook which we may expect to help minimize our surplus problem over the years ahead lies in the development of new uses and new demands for agricultural products. New and better uses for our crops present several aspects all moving forward simultaneously.

By lowering the costs of production and distribution of established crops through technology, new markets are constantly being tapped. The discovery of wholly new products and wholly new uses for established

farm crops is another way in which demand for the products of our farms can be increased.

Still another front lies in the development of new crops, thereby facilitating the acreage shifts necessary to reduce production in some of the older crops, such as wheat and cotton, which are currently in surplus.

The constant trend toward lower agricultural costs by improved strains and the utilization of wastes makes it increasingly possible to sell agricultural raw materials in competition with other materials in their fields.

It is not necessary to illustrate each of these types. It is only necessary to recall the shifts in acreage made possible by the expanding industrial uses for soybean oil.

Back in 1924 American farmers harvested just under 5 million bushels of soybeans. In 1954 our soybean production was a record-breaking 343 million bushels, with a market value of nearly $1 billion. Thus in the short space of three decades we have seen the development of a new major crop in this country and with it a new major industry.

We need only recall the expanded demand for products resulting from development of freezing and dehydrating processes, and such things as the spectacular use of hulls from rolled oats to produce furfural as a selective solvent used in the petroleum industry and as a raw material in the manufacture of chemical intermediates.

Who shall say what the future limitations may be upon our national development? In agriculture, what new crops will tomorrow bring? What new uses for old crops? In a world just now entering the atomic age, some of the most exciting laboratories ever known to man may be right on our farms.

While corn is not one of our surplus problems, the possibilities of readjustment are demonstrated in the shift from corn to new resistant combine grain sorghums in the southern great plains States and in central and western Kansas.

As an outgrowth of experiments conducted at the Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station in cooperation with the Kansas Industrial Commission, new types of hulling and milling equipment now permit the manufacture of flour and livestock feeds from grain sorghum, the flour being widely used in making gypsum lath or wallboard.

Varieties and suitabilities of grain sorghum have meanwhile been improved by research, giving further impetus to the search for new uses of products and byproducts.

It was reported a few years ago that new industrial uses for grain sorghum had already provided added outlets for the crop from 2 million acres. The expansion would doubtless be even more dramatic if we had the later figures.

Last but not least among the ways which promise to help us work out from under agricultural surpluses is increased agricultural exports.

Export markets have long been vital to our farm population. These export markets have unfortunately suffered in recent years and would certainly have fallen off considerably more had it not been for our foreign aid programs.

As the President observed in his January 10, 1955, message on foreign economic policy, "no single group in America has a greater stake in a healthy and expanding foreign trade than the farmers."

During the recent year there has been some improvement in the export of farm crops, but during the past few years, agriculture has suffered a serious decline in the loss of foreign markets for farm products.

During the years 1951 to 1953, we lost the export markets for farm crops produced on 20 million acres of our farmland. The crops that suffered most from this loss of export markets were wheat and cotton.

The value of the farm crops exported for the years 1952 and 1953 declined from over $4 billion to $2,800,000,000, or a decline of 31 percent.

The average value of farm exports during the past 5 years has been $3,500,000,000.

The last session of Congress provided for a program of disposal of farm products under Public Law 480. This law authorized by the last Congress, provides for the disposal of $1 billion worth of farm surpluses during a period of 3 years.

It is estimated that during the fiscal year ending next June 30, we will have sold or given away abroad under this program $578 million worth of surplus farm products.

This program is functioning well and much credit must be given to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, for the zeal with which he is pursuing it.

The long-run potentialities of foreign markets may be illustrated by the case of cotton, one of the products which in recent years has tended to be in surplus.

With a rapidly growing world population, there is no question that a need exists abroad for all of the cotton that can be produced in the United States, as well as in the countries which have lately become our competitors in this field of agricultural production. Per capita consumption of cotton in 1948 was, for example, 3.3 pounds in Asia, 6.2 pounds in Latin America, and 7.5 pounds in Europe, compared to 28 pounds in the United States.

Granting all that may be said about the increasing role of synthetic substitutes, it is still true that if per capita consumption of other parts of the world were brought up anywhere near levels prevailing in the United States, surpluses such as that of cotton might well give way to shortages.

The key to future exportation of more agricultural products is, of course, essentially a matter of imports. We ought not to hope to solve our agricultural problems permanently by aid programs, dumping, or giving away excesses.

The potential foreign buyers must be permitted to earn the wherewithal to pay for the grains and fibers which they need and would buy.

The problem of international trade and the making of reciprocal trade agreements is one that requires the most diligent study—keeping in mind the interests of agriculture, industry, and labor.

The President has submitted a program calling for an extension of the Executive authority to negotiate tariff reductions, the easing of customs administrative burdens, and steps to encourage United States investment abroad, as measures that should contribute to an expanded trade with foreign countries.

Action will be taken on this program in this session of Congress and as a member of the Finance Committee of the United States Senate, I hope to be helpful in writing a program that will give agriculture its proportionate share of the agricultural export market. The farmers are asking no more, and they are entitled to no less.

All of the ways I have discussed for increasing demand for our farm products will be reduced to empty talk if the soils of our country are not maintained in a condition which will help us produce to meet demand in years to come.

I am as concerned as anyone else over our surplus problem but for one additional and all-important reason—that our preoccupation with it will obscure the ever-present necessity to constantly maintain and increase our soil-conservation efforts.

We must step back from the individual trees and look at the entire forest—we must view the problems and values of soil conservation in proper perspective.

In discussing a conservation program we should not think of it so much as benefiting this or that class of farmers or that only certain groups of farmers deserve to participate. We are dealing here with a program in which the entire Nation—every man, woman, and child—has a stake. For the soil of our Nation is a large part of our real wealth—our strength in a day and time sorely in need of such strength.

Our soil has contributed immeasurably to our country's prosperity, to the health of its people, to the creation of the economic giant we are in the world today and to the universal prestige we hold because of our economic power. We believe our way of life represents a force for good in this world; the productive power of our soil and our industrial might have elevated us to world leadership and have given us an opportunity to influence, by our position, the rest of the world to a way of life which would mean peace and progress.

Considering soil conservation within this frame, who can say an appropriation of $200 million or $500 million or more is enough to accomplish an objective so interwoven with the welfare of this Nation?

It is disheartening to me to find so much emphasis being placed on the saving of dollars in connection with our soil-conservation program. Mere saving of dollars is false economy if this practice becomes a habit and our soil deteriorates to the point where it threatens our productive capacity and ultimately far greater expense becomes necessary in order to rebuild the fertility level.

Economy is important but in soil conservation, as perhaps in national defense, there are other values to consider. It is easy to say that so many billions of dollars can be trimmed from the defense budget. On the other hand, can anyone say positively that twice the expenditure isn't needed in view of the fast-changing race for the latest weapons of destruction?

Today we hear about the imminent possibility of intercontinental missiles which can destroy cities in a matter of minutes. When this becomes a reality the sums we are spending for defense today may be paltry in comparison with the outlays we may have to make.

The same may be said for soil conservation. The consequences of continually chipping away at appropriations for this vital program could be ghastly to behold in years to come.

If we could only visualize the specter of ruin which would face our farm communities and the resultant threat to our economy as a whole following in the wake of neglected and inadequately financed soil conservation practices we would not be so anxious to save dollars alone. We should conserve the real wealth of the Nation—the soil—and not so much the dollars that merely measure value.

In a sense the surplus era upon us gives us an opportunity to produce better quality crops. With fewer acres in production we can concentrate on greater and more intelligent applications of lime and fertilizer, producing higher quality crops in substantial quantity and at a reduced real cost.

There is another area in which an adequate soil conservation effort can be helpful in the maintenance of a strong agriculture. For many years farm population has been steadily declining. In 1800 about 75 percent of our total population tilled the soil; today less than 20 percent make a living from the soil.

President Eisenhower, in his recent message to Congress on the state of the Union, said we must direct greater attention to the needs of low-income farm families. Many of these farmers are being strangled slowly by intense competition in the farm markets today. They constitute the group leaving the farm today, causing a reduction in family-size farms.

A properly financed, continuously adequate soil conservation program with prominent roles for lime and fertilizer would enable these farmers to produce better quality crops

in greater quantity and permit them to compete more effectively with lower cost producers.

A betterment of his economic position would make farming more attractive to the low-income farmer and help keep them "down on the farm." Further, the farmer's welfare is integrally bound to the Nation's welfare. He is a big buyer of finished steel products, oil, and chemical supplies. If we are to maintain a balance between agriculture and industry, we should bend every effort to make farming a healthy, attractive, and thriving business.

The condition of the Nation's soil determines the quality of food products grown. Since we are what we eat, the fertility level of our soils has a direct bearing on the state of our health. Of the 4 forces determining the nutritious quality of food plants grown—air, sunshine, water, and soil—only 2, water and soil, are considered variable.

To the extent that we can control our water resources and the chemical components of our soil we will control the nutritive value of crops grown. When our soil becomes deficient in calcium, nitrogen, and other elements the deficiency shows up in crops and livestock.

These mineral-lacking food products give us a poorly balanced diet affecting our health. We cannot afford the chance that our soil would deteriorate to the point of endangering our health. We should remember that a nation is only as strong as the backbone of its people.

If we are to preserve our productive capacity we must conserve our soil. We should ever remember the lesson of China where neglect of natural resources contributed to impoverishment of its people, political instability, and social discontent. Such an example should teach us we cannot continually mine our resources without replenishment—that to do so would invite national disaster. We should remember that it can happen to us.

Address Delivered by Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, at the New York Democratic State Committee Victory Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 18, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of an address which I made at the victory dinner of the New York State Democratic Committee, at the Waldorf Astoria in New York City, last Friday evening, January 14.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

After 12 long years, we have again known victory in New York State. And all present evidence indicates that New Yorkers are pleased with what they did on November 2, and approve of the manner in which the men and women elected and selected for high office have gone about meeting the problems with which New York is faced.

We meet tonight to do honor to the men and women who led us to victory: the candidates and the hundreds and thousands of others at the county, district, and precinct levels—those who are here tonight and those who are not. We salute them all—the leaders and the foot soldiers of the Democratic Party. And let us not forget our friends of the Liberal Party, too, and those independents who belong to no political party, but to the party of good government.

As most of you know, it was my privilege to play an active part in the recent campaign. I had my heart as much set on victory last fall as in any other campaign in which I have taken part, either as a candidate or as an advocate. And I have participated in almost all of them, over the past 30 years. I am proud and glad for any contribution I was able to make to the election of Adrian Burke, Arthur Leavitt, George DeLuca, and Averell Harriman.

I am happy to know that the chair I had the great honor of occupying during 4 terms as Governor of this State is now filled by that distinguished American, that fine Democrat, whom I have long known as an old friend and outstanding public figure, Averell Harriman.

I am confident that he will add luster to the high traditions of the Democratic Governors of New York.

But as we rejoice in our success of last November and at the fact that our party now controls the State administration, let us pause and reflect on some of the implications of the event of 2 months ago.

Political victory is not an end in itself, although sometimes it has a regrettable tendency to become so. At the terminus of political victory is the beginning of responsibility. The test of victory is how we utilize it. It is one thing to command success. It is another to deserve it.

The people, the voters of New York, will sit in final judgment on the manner in which the responsibility now given our party is discharged. From here on our accounting is not within the party, but with the people.

We must account for the manner in which campaign pledges are discharged. We must account for the manner in which day-to-day actions are taken, and day-to-day decisions are made.

We must prove to the people that the pledges made during the campaign, and the platform agreed upon by the party and subscribed to by our candidates were seriously meant and will be redeemed.

If our leaders and officeholders will be guided by these rules of conduct, and I am sure they will be, our party, which is on trial before the people, will be judged worthy of responsibility and deserving of victory, both in the past and in the future.

The challenge we face as a party in New York State has a striking similarity with, and relationship to, the challenge we have taken up as a party in the Nation.

In Washington, we have assumed not executive but legislative responsibility.

But the basic requirement is the same, to discharge that responsibility in a manner which the people will judge worthy of the trust placed in us last November.

In Washington and in the Nation, as in New York State, too, there is within our ranks a strong sense of party unity. And a basic party unity is, of course, greatly to be desired in preparation for the great victory that beckons us in 1956, for in that year win we must and win we shall.

In November 1956 we are going to put an end to the giveaway regime, to the regime of bluster and blunder, of compromise and surrender, of privileges for the few and sacrifices for the many.

We are fortunately rich in leaders who can take us to victory in 1956, although my own preference has been and remains that great and eloquent apostle and leader of liberal democracy, Adlai Stevenson.

Yes, we will have party unity in 1956, and we will win in 1956. But our party unity must be based on principle. Let us beware of making party unity an end in itself, or of decreeing and enforcing it at the expense of basic principle.

The Democratic Party nationwide, as in New York State, is strong enough, and broad enough, to give shelter to differing views and to tolerate minority opinions, from both the right and the left, on even the most critical subjects. From the pull and haul of honest differences within a party comes political scope, development and vitality.

Let us not make a false or fatal confusion between party unity and party responsibility. A political party has an inescapable responsibility to facilitate, by every appropriate means, the practical fulfillment by party officeholders of the pledges and undertakings made by the party and its candidates at election time. A party has the duty to urge and induce its officeholders to abide by party principles and platform commitments and to justify to the public those departures which are made by reason of clearly demonstrated need.

But there is no warrant to throttle or stifle minority views, based on principle, within the party, or to discourage access to the free market place of ideas for the airing of party differences. Differences on public issues within the party can and should be met forthrightly and with forbearance. The final arbiter in such matters will be the people.

I recognize the necessity of being politically practical and realistic. It is important to get things done as well as to talk about getting them done. The encouragement of party unity as a means of making real progress in legislation and administration is clearly desirable. And often, it is better to take one step at a time, rather than none at all, and to walk slowly, when running proves impossible.

But let us never sacrifice, or try to justify the sacrifice, of essential principle on the altar of political expediency, and surely not when the object of the sacrifies is the false god of rigid party unity.

At the end of that road lies corruption of political integrity, and, instead of victory, only disaster and political repudiation.

Let me make clear that I am not attacking a present situation; I am only warning against a danger, a tendency which shows itself today as no more than a cloud the size of a man's hand on the horizon of our recent victory in the congressional elections.

The Democratic Party is the liberal party of the Nation. That is its tradition and its justification for being. The Democratic Party has been victorious in New York State and in the Nation only when it has stood by its traditions, and with outstanding candidates, has offered a clear program of liberalism to the people.

With specific reference to the Democratic Party of New York State, its role in the Nation is clear and unmistakable.

Its function is to cast its full weight—the weight of the 15 million people of this State—on the side of liberalism and progress within the Democratic Party.

Its role is to fight for liberal principles and liberal candidates for submission to the Nation as a whole.

I am confident that the Democratic Party of New York will continue to fulfill this function in the months and years ahead.

We must continue to battle ceaselessly for the principles of humanitarianism, for equal civil and political rights for all, for the development and conservation of our natural resources in the interests of the consumers and of all the people, for special consideration of the needs of the underprivileged, and for the advancement of the economic interests of the consumer, the worker, the farmer, and the small businessman. We must fight unyieldingly for freedom, and the practices of liberty.

These must be our banners, in domestic affairs, and we must irresistibly uphold and advance them.

Surely we will go forward, under these banners, to victory in 1956, and to another and even greater victory, in New York State, in 1958. Just as surely we will fail if we compromise these principles or surrender them, in the name of political expediency.

We have had a fine victory in the State and in the Nation. Now we must redouble our efforts and develop to the utmost our resources of imagination, of courage, and of leadership. With God's help we will succeed in our purposes, to the greater credit of the Democratic Party, to the greater welfare of our people, and to the greater glory of America.

United States Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 18, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Sunday night it was my pleasure to deliver an address on the subject of United States foreign policy.

At that time, I stated my vigorous opposition to any rash attempt on the part of the United States to impose a unilateral military blockade on Red China at this time.

I send to the desk the text of my Harrisburg address, supplemented by additional comments which I made to the press yesterday when this issue came up for further discussion.

I ask unanimous consent that both items be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and press release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEVEN KEYSTONES OF NONPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

(Address by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, ranking Republican, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in Harrisburg, Pa., at Jewish Community Center, at 100th anniversary of the center movement in the United States on Sunday, January 16, 1955)

I welcome this opportunity to survey with you current and future problems of American foreign policy.

It is particularly appropriate to come to the capital of the great Keystone State on so constructive an occasion as this—to consider the strengthening of nonpartisan foreign policy.

I shall refer to seven keystones of a sound international program for the United States—an enlightened modern program in this age of great challenge from international communism; this age of great opportunity; this contracted world of the jet-atomic era.

JUDGING STATESMEN OR DEMAGOGS

It seems to me that our fundamental mission in international relations is to construct keystones of peace and justice and prosperity.

It seems to me that the one great standard by which you or I should judge those who are active in the field of foreign affairs at home and abroad is this:

Have they, like statesmen, built for better relations? Or have they, like demagogs, tried to tear down the edifice of better relations?

Have they planted good will in the hearts of men?—America for her allies, and her allies for America?—good will for us in the more than 1 billion hearts of the uncommitted segment of the world? Or have they planted seeds of discord, poisonous dragons' teeth of hatred?

Have they contributed to a better, more rational, more clear-cut understanding of the difficult, complex problems of our time? Or have they—in the chronic habit of the demagog—served to becloud issues, inflame them with emotional fury, so that problems become more and more difficult to solve?

These are questions by which you or I or anyone else should judge not only the men in public life who work on foreign affairs, but individuals in private life who also participate in this crucial subject.

SECRETARY OF STATE'S NOTABLE SUCCESSES

With that standard, you and I are going to look at all the world's stage.

If time permitted, I would have liked to consider in detail some of the great advances which have been made during the past couple of years.

They represent successes which already assure for our distinguished Secretary of State an enduring mark in history as one of the greatest men who has ever held this high office.

I refer to such notable achievements as the settling of the Italian-Yugoslav dispute over Trieste; the English-Egyptian agreement on the Suez Canal problem; the settlement of the Anglo-Iranian oil dispute; the independent replacement of the Communist-dominated Government of Guatemala by a strong, able government representative of the will of those fine people; the great milestone represented in the Manila Pact; the very encouraging progress toward bringing into being of the new Western European Union; our mutual defense treaty with the Republic of China; and other impressive advances.

OTHER PROMISING FIELDS OF ACTION

I would have liked to discuss with you some of the current phases of our foreign policy program which are particularly promising.

One such program is the President's famous atoms-for-peace plan. It is one of the most promising of all suggestions for helping to resolve East-West tensions and to assure cooperation within the free world as well.

I should have liked to refer to the vital mission of our United States Information Agency which is doing such a fine job in our battle for the minds of men throughout the world—a peaceful battle using instruments of radio, press, motion pictures, and, yes, television.

In that latter connection, may I point out that in the last Congress; steps were taken toward the setting up of an International Telecommunications Commission, one of whose phases would be the development of international television. Action, unfortunately, was not completed by the Congress, although important spadework has been performed by an intra-Cabinet committee. I am hoping that the 84th Congress will flash the green light for international TV through the proposed Commission.

The use of the miracle medium of television throughout the world offers dramatic possibilities, particularly for dispelling lies and misunderstanding, generated by the Soviet Union against the free world.

DANGER SPOTS ON WORLD SCENE

And, too, if time permitted, I would have liked to take a detailed look at some of the specific danger spots in the world, particularly some of the scenes where force of arms is still the order of the day: Like the guerrilla war in Malaya; the border strife in the Holy Land; Mau Mau terrorism in Kenya; the fighting in Costa Rica; the air and sea strikes to and from Formosa and the Chinese mainland.

I would have liked us to consider problems which do not now involve clash of arms, but which represent sources of deep concern to us like the problems in southern Vietnam and elsewhere in southeast Asia; problems along the uneasy border of our devoted ally, the Republic of Korea.

But time does not permit us to look in detail at each of these specific phases, and so I should like to turn to some of the more general principles which do apply throughout the world. They are principles which will serve as guides to us in weighing the future foreign policy of our country.

SEVEN BUILDING BLOCKS FOR PEACE

I should like to refer to 7 keystones—7 building blocks for an effective foreign policy: They are, as I see them: (1) Nonpartisanship, (2) vision, (3) good will, (4) patience, (5) restraint, (6) partnership, and (7) spirituality.

NONPARTISANSHIP ESSENTIAL IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The first keystone is nonpartisanship.

Without this keystone, we cannot possibly speak with one clear, eloquent, firm voice to the world.

But, fortunately, we are going to continue to do so.

And so, I want to pay tribute now to the responsible leaders of both our major political parties who will help assure continuing nonpartisanship, notwithstanding the overall political division between the executive and legislative branches.

The relatively smooth transition of legislative control is, in my judgment a remarkable commentary on the vitality and worth of our two-party system.

Here too, in Harrisburg, next Tuesday you will be inaugurating a new Democratic Governor. Your new legislature will in turn be divided—with each of the parties in control of one Chamber.

You look forward however to responsible two-party government, I am sure.

In Washington, we have already had our legislative transition. Just 3 days ago, at its first meeting the Senate Foreign Relations Committee formally changed hands, as have all the other committees on Capitol Hill.

The particular smoothness with which this transition was made in our own committee was, I believe, an inspiring demonstration of responsible party and individual leadership.

In this crucial field of foreign affairs there is (on both sides of Capitol Hill) going to be basic continuity, I am happy to say. There may, to be sure, be some changes, as the new majority exercises its prerogative of review. But in the broad outline of past and current foreign policy, in the basic attitude of full and wholehearted cooperation with the executive branch, I am delighted that there is going to be sincere and cordial continuity. There is continuity in staff. There is continuity in teamwork.

At our committee helm, a Republican Senator from the Midwest has been replaced by a Democratic Senator from the southland, the esteemed Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia. Your speaker tonight was and is succeeded by this distinguished American, who has served in the Senate—as one of its most universally respected statesmen—who has done so longer than any other present man of that great body and who is now honored by serving as its President pro tempore.

I, in turn, who have been pleased to serve longer than any other current Republican but one—Senator BRIDGES—am honored to serve with Senator GEORGE and with a group of fine men which includes—as a neophyte, as a freshman for this Congress—the beloved Veep, our former Vice President ALBEN BARKLEY.

From men such as these and from our other associates, you can anticipate—with pleasure—the most responsible form of nonpartisan cooperation in foreign affairs.

VISION NEEDED TO BUILD THE PEACE

We turn to the second keystone.

In the Book of Proverbs, we read that "without vision a people perish."

Never has that been truer than in the dangerous world of the atomic-jet age. Without vision, as to the defense needs of our Nation, the economic-political, spiritual needs, this Nation could not survive.

Without such vision, indeed, this Nation could never have been born. But, 170 years ago the Founding Fathers had a vision—of a constitutional Republic, a Nation of checks and balances, of separation of powers. And they had the courage and perseverance to bring that vision into being.

In our own time, far-sighted men had the vision of establishing a United Nations. It was to be an organization which would achieve goals which neither the League of Nations nor any previous similar effort in history had ever attained: the goal of a world of lasting law and order, of enduring peace and justice. And great progress has been made in this noble United Nations organization.

AN ILLUSTRATION OF VISION: UNICEF

And men had other visions as well. They had the vision of a United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund which would tend the innocent little victims of war and of poverty and disease.

UNICEF, founded in 1946, now operates in 80 countries. Its services are estimated to have reached 25 million children in 1954.

UNICEF surveys indicate that 600 million children, two-thirds of all those living, are without adequate food, clothing, shelter, sanitation, or minimum medical protection.

Millions of them will die in childhood or live warped lives for want of ordinary care. And to help meet this need, UNICEF (which is not a hand-out organization) draws contributions from nearly 100 countries and territories. It does so on a matching basis with the governments of the benefiting countries. Thus, it has provided vaccine for the inoculation of 30 million children; penicillin to cure 3 million children of yaws. It has protected more than 13 million against malaria. This work, it seems to me, is one of the most impressive illustrations of international humanitarian effort. Incidentally, it is backed unanimously by every member of the U. N.

In the not too distant future, a UNICEF movie made by the world-famous comedian, Danny Kaye, with the splendid cooperation of Paramount Pictures, will be released. It will afford another opportunity for men of good will everywhere to become better acquainted with this fine organization—this organization founded and administered by men and women of vision.

It was such men who are responsible, too, for the World Health Organization, which has done such outstanding work toward banishing epidemics and disease; the Food and Agricultural Organization, which has helped uplift farm production; the World Bank, which has helped assure credit for sound new enterprises.

And other men have had the vision to bring into being other vital parts of our system of collective security and international justice.

I refer, for example, to the Office for European Economic Cooperation and its 18 member nations—the Council of Europe, the pioneering Coal and Steel Community.

I refer to the builders of our worldwide system of defensive alliances—bilateral and multilateral—which have done so much to help achieve equilibrium in this troubled world.

Without this type of vision, our chances for peace would perish.

GOOD-WILL EMISSARIES NEEDED

I turn now to the third keystone—good will.

Here we need men and women who will build friendship, who will build warm understanding, who will combat the termites of racialism, chauvinism, provincialism.

We need men and women who will unite free men, irrespective of barriers of race and religion and nationality.

Fortunately, we have witnessed many fine examples of messengers of good will.

I am thinking now, for example, of the outstanding good-will trip which was made by the very competent brother of the Chief Executive of our country, Dr. Milton Eisenhower. It was a trip which inspired the people of Latin America. That trip was later successfully followed up by the work of Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, Henry Holland, and by the efforts of Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey and Under Secretary of State Herbert Hoover, and others at the Inter-American Conference at Patropolis.

I am thinking, too, of the able work performed particularly in the Far East by the Vice President of the United States when he and his charming wife visited 19 countries and 2 Crown colonies in one of the most successful and fruitful such visits ever made by a high-ranking officer of our Nation.

I am confident that DICK NIXON'S forthcoming trip to Central America, beginning on February 6, will be similarly productive of good will.

But harmony and good will are spread by private citizens as well. Hundreds of thousands of American tourists and servicemen traveling or living abroad, embodying courtesy, tact, and fellowship toward foreign peoples, contribute to this process.

Every American, too, who sends a CARE package to relieve foreign need, every American who writes a constructive letter to a friend or relative or business acquaintance beyond the seas, every American who attends a constructive international conference, such as the recent meeting in Vienna of the World Veterans Federation, or such as international church gatherings, fraternal, scientific, or other groups, dedicated to the cause of peace and freedom, can also serve to engender good will.

Likewise, I refer to every artist who serves to cement relations between our two peoples. I am thinking now, for example, of the spectacular success of the traveling troupe which has been presenting the folk opera, Porgy and Bess. This outstanding group of Negro artists has probably done more to dispel falsehoods about racial relations in the United States than an almost infinite amount of words on the part of diplomats.

I am thinking, too, of the great job which has been done by individual artists like the great Marian Anderson—in helping to establish a framework of good will for us throughout the world.

WE NEED PATIENCE, NOT ARBITRARY ACTION, TO RELEASE AIRMEN

The fourth building block is patience. This is one of the most difficult of all to achieve. It is often hard to be patient before injustice, before resisting international crime.

Such a crime has been committed in the imprisonment of 11 American airmen. There is no patriotic American who does not feel a burning moral indignation against this outrage.

And, yet, if we are to be true to the needs of these airmen; if we are to be true to the needs of our Nation and of the world, we must continue to explore every reasonable diplomatic channel through the United Nations for the orderly release of these men.

Naturally, we all regret that immediate release was not effected through the recent trip by the U. N. Secretary General. But the fact that it was not an immediate and complete success does not for one moment detract from the fact that it did effect progress toward our objective.

In any event, we must not rush into hasty ill-considered, impulsive action. I, for one, definitely and absolutely oppose at this time any arbitrary steps involving the use of force—such as a military blockade—to effect the release of these men. I particularly oppose any unilateral forceful action on our part at this time. Talks with Peiping are going to consume more time. But remember that the problem of these imprisoned airmen is related to the problem of other Americans—civilian and uniformed—whom we have very strong reason to believe are still unjustly imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain.

I say, there is too much of a tendency for some of us to become so aroused by a single incident that we forget the overall picture, that we forget that hasty ill-considered action could start a chain reaction leading to diplomatic-military complications of the direst sort.

Nothing that is very good in this world is accomplished overnight.

Rome was not built in a day, nor was this American Republic.

The United Nations is today less than 10 years old. It has been learning, evolving, experimenting the hard way as has every similar institution.

Look back to our own history and consider the difficult conditions which prevailed in this land when we, as a nation, were but 10 years old. Remember that more than a half-century after we were established as a nation, not only had we not succeeded in solving our problems, but we were engaged in a long and bloody War Between the States.

Why, then, should we be so impatient when we are dealing not only with the Reds but with other men who do not speak the same language nor share the same geographic area as ourselves, diverse men and 60 diverse nations throughout the world—nations which are at different strata of development, nations which have different cultural, historical, religious, and political outlooks?

Let us indeed, as President Eisenhower has so eloquently suggested, have the courage of patience.

THE COROLLARY OF RESTRAINT

Hand in hand with the building block of patience is the building block of restraint. We are the world's greatest power, but if we are to be the world's wisest power, we must play our role with restraint. The world will all the more respect us if we use our position with discretion and judgment.

Perhaps the best recent illustration of intelligent restraint came during the recent dangerous days when our ally France was debating the Western European Union in her National Assembly. That occasion afforded a remarkable illustration of United States self-restraint and Communist wildness.

On the one hand, our United States officials scrupulously refrained from either any word or deed which might in any way have been misconstrued as affecting the right of the French nation to decide its own course. On the other hand, the Kremlin ordered all sorts of threats, demonstrations, all sorts of propaganda, to try to stampede the French National Assembly into rejection of the pacts. But the Kremlin's efforts backfired, and France rose to the occasion and the Assembly ratified the WEU.

There will be other occasions when we must be similarly patient, similarly self-restrained.

One such occasion remains, of course, right now in connection with the problem of our imprisoned airmen.

The situation remains delicate. We will not be contributing to its solution if we fail to keep check on our emotions.

That does not imply weakness on our part. Actually, restraint is an act of strength. It does not mean timidity; restraint is an act of courage.

It does not mean softness toward communism. Anybody can easily hurl well-deserved epithets and denunciations at the Reds—in Peiping and Moscow. But it takes a man of character and judgment to work quietly for his objective, against the Reds, but through the appropriate means at the appropriate time.

WE WILL NOT APPEASE RED CHINA

Let there be no mistake.

We are not going to appease Red China or the U. S. S. R. We are not going to surrender to blackmail. We are not going to allow Red China to shoot her way or blackmail her way into the United Nations. We are not going to appease.

You may recall that when Neville Chamberlain flew to Germany in September 1938, that great prophet, Winston Churchill, remarked, "England has been offered a choice between war and shame. She has chosen shame, and she will get war."

We will never choose the course of shame. But neither will we choose a course of war if war can possibly be avoided, as we know it can.

Peace is our goal. Peace is our nature. Peace we will attain—with strength, with preparedness, but with restraint.

We approach now the two final keystones, as I see them, in the arch of peace.

TRUE PARTNERSHIP WITH EQUALS

The sixth keystone is genuine partnership.

We Americans must make up our minds that we are in this international picture as partners and, contrary to a few persons' ideas, not as commanders. As a matter of fact, we have never as a nation sought to order any nation around. We have sought to lead by inspiration, by the soundness of our position, by our willingness to sacrifice and respectfully to ask others to do likewise.

We are not going to arrogate unto ourselves all wisdom.

We are not going to try Atlaslike to hold up all the rest of the world. Every other free nation and group of nations must and will do its part.

One of the soundest features of the activity of our Secretary of State has been his clear recognition of the great contributions which foreign statesmen like Premier Mohammed Ali, of Pakistan, or President Magsaysay, of the Philippines, can make, have made, and will continue to make toward world peace and justice; the contributions which the statesmen of Europe similarly make.

At times, they will differ with us. But, as good partners, we will work with them and we will present the facts to them as we see them.

We will never try to order or boss them or anyone else around. It would not work, even if some people were so rash or blind as to recommend it to us. Some few Americans do unfortunately continue to seem to think we ought to adopt an "ordering" approach. But, they are wrong, they are in a very small minority; and they are completely unrepresentative of the sound thinking of the United States Government and of the American people as a whole.

I point out that the great neutral, uncommitted area of the world is especially not going to take orders from anyone. It is coming into its own. It is feeling its new strength. It has a right to have its position understood and to be given consideration. That we will do, and we in turn will ask that it join in its own enlightened self-interest in our partnership, in our team as sovereign equals.

SPIRITUALITY: THE GREATEST SOURCE OF POWER

And lastly, my friends, is the keystone of our spiritual strength. I need not elaborate on the fact that our greatest power is spiritual power—the rightness of our cause under God.

This power should never be underestimated, for it is the strongest power in the world.

CONCLUSION

It has been a pleasure to be with you this evening.

In this list of 7 keystones, I have not, of course, attempted to cover all of the necessary ingredients for a world of peace and justice and prosperity.

But I think that if we can develop these particular keystones, just as you have built this center, then our children and our children's children will say after us that "they did well of their responsibilities in their time."

SENATOR WILEY URGES SUPPORT OF EISENHOWER POSITION

(Statement by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, ranking Republican, Senate Foreign Relations Committee)

I want to emphasize that I remain 100 percent in favor of the patient position recommended by President Eisenhower and by Secretary of State Dulles who rightly oppose any rash unilateral action at this time to free our United States airmen.

I am convinced that the American people as a whole support the President's commonsense, restrained judgment and oppose any impulsive action such as a unilateral military blockade.

The chances are that for us to try to impose such a blockade at this time all by ourselves might (a) result in the immediate death of the airmen themselves; (b) cause neutral countries to unite against us and against the blockade; (c) cause a wide open split among our allies; (d) overcommit our available naval resources; (e) worst of all, possibly precipitate us into a war with Red China, which is probably just what the Kremlin desires.

Instead we must continue to explore every diplomatic channel available through the United Nations for the peaceful release of these men.

We must not allow our emotions to run away with us in our well-justified concern for our airmen. We must not let the Reds provoke us into an action which we might have deep cause to regret because of its possible backfiring against us.

Progress in Dairying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 18, 1955

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on January 13 the Secretary of Agriculture delivered an address on the campus of the University of Minnesota, during the 53d annual Farm and Home Week. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRESS IN DAIRYING

(Address by Secretary of Agriculture Benson)

It is a genuine pleasure to participate in this 53d annual Farm and Home Week here on the campus of the University of Minnesota. I am deeply impressed by the important contribution that meetings such as this are making toward better understanding of our agricultural problems.

This occasion exemplifies the leadership which our educational institutions are taking in promoting group discussions and exchanges of ideas and information. I have long believed that research, education, and improved marketing practices offer the surest approach to our goal of a prosperous, stable, and free agriculture. It is encouraging to see that all of these steps are emphasized in your Farm and Home Week program.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this forum. For some time I have wished to talk frankly on several matters which are of major importance to Minnesota farmers. Your kind invitation to appear was doubly welcome for that reason.

Minnesota is fortunate in having the soils and climate which permit highly diversified farming operations. Only about 7½ percent of the cash receipts of farmers in this State come from the basic commodities which seem to get most of the attention in farm-policy discussions. Dairying, hogs, and cattle—in that order—provide the major sources of farm income here. The feeding of hogs and cattle has been relatively profitable during the past year. The dairy industry has undergone some serious readjustments. For that reason, I should like to talk primarily about this problem.

Sometimes it is necessary for us to look back to see how far we have come. Today I would ask you to look back for a moment—to the situation which faced the dairy industry of this Nation just 1 year ago.

Your Government was getting into the dairy business at an unprecedented rate. Milk production was booming toward new seasonal highs. Consumption was not only failing to keep pace but was trending dangerously downward, particularly in the case of butter. Surplus dairy products were piling up in Government storage at an alarming rate. The industry was being out-promoted by its competitors at every turn. Despite price supports at 90 percent of parity, net income of dairy farmers had declined by more than $200 million from 1952 to 1953. The dairy industry was sick. There were ominous rumblings that Government might be forced to invoke production controls.

All in all, it was not a very pretty picture. But this was, nevertheless, the situation which faced us just one short year ago.

Confronted by these facts and a law which specifically directed me to fix dairy price supports at a level which would assure an adequate supply, I announced a reduction from 90 to 75 percent of parity for the marketing year beginning last April 1. This decision was not lightly made. It was reached only after long and careful consideration. I had no illusions as to its immediate popularity with many dairymen. Yet I believed then in all conscience, as I do today, that this adjustment—painful though it might be—was in the best, long-term interests of the Nation's dairymen.

May I say now that I received plenty of advice on this matter. Much of it was sound and most of it was well meant. I gave full thought to all suggestions but one. I ignored the warning that the action constituted political suicide.

Now, as we begin this new year, the time has arrived to take stock—to strike a sort of balance sheet—of the dairy situation since price-support levels were adjusted 9 months ago.

The first, and most impressive fact, is that milk production shows definite signs of leveling off. In December 1954, milk production was 1 percent below December of a year ago. Meanwhile, per capita consumption of dairy products is on the upturn. This is of vital importance to every dairyman in America. It means that the day is approaching when supply and demand will be brought into balance—not through a distasteful and uneconomic program of production controls but rather through increased use of the healthful dairy products which our people need.

Milk production during 1954 reached an estimated 124 billion pounds—a record total. The leveling-off process of recent months suggests that it will be about the same this year. At the same time, per capita consumption of butter increased by about 5 percent in 1954—a sharp reversal of the long-time downward trend. The average American also ate a fraction of a pound more cheese and drank a little more milk in 1954.

When we add to this the fact that our population growth provides about 2.7 million additional consumers each year, it becomes evident that we are rapidly bridging the gap between dairy supplies and demand. Even without any increase in per capita consumption of dairy products, this population growth alone provides a market for nearly 2 billion pounds of milk each year.

During 1954, milk consumption in all forms totaled about 118.5 billion pounds. If production during 1955 remains at the 1954 level—as we anticipate it will—our surplus of dairy products will be smaller than in either of the two preceding years. If the stepped-up promotional and merchandising campaigns of the dairy industry, which are beginning to show real results, meet our most optimistic expectations, we may well see an approximate balance between production and consumption by the latter part of this year.

When that happens—as it inevitably will if all of us are determined to see that it happens—prices of manufactured dairy products will move above the support level. The support price will no longer be the ceiling price, as has been the case too long.

I am convinced that every dairyman in the Nation would prefer that to a system which makes the Government the market and ties the future of the industry to a mere formula. I am convinced further that this day will dawn for dairymen much sooner because the dairy industry and this administration elected to face the facts and refused to bow to political expediency.

Allow me to cite a few figures which support the conclusion that we are headed in the right direction now:

In December—last month—the Government bought not a single pound of butter. This was the first full month in 2 years in which no purchases were made. During December of 1953 we bought more than 11 million pounds of butter and the heavy flow was just beginning.

During the final 3 months of 1954, butter purchases totaled only half a million pounds, as compared with 15 million a year earlier.

Government buying of cheese and nonfat dry milk has also declined sharply in recent months. Last month cheese purchases totaled about 1¼ million pounds, compared with nearly 7 million for December of 1953. This was the smallest amount we had bought in any month for 2 years. We purchased 11.2 million pounds of dry milk in December 1954—less than one-third the amount of a year earlier—and the second smallest total acquired in any single month over a 2-year period. Only purchases for November were lower.

Normally I prefer not to incorporate many statistics in a speech. But figures sometimes tell an interesting story. With your indulgence, I should like to cite a few more because they represent good news for every segment of the dairy industry, for the Government itself, and for the public.

Less than 6 months ago, Commodity Credit Corporation had 466 million pounds of butter on hand. At the beginning of January this enormous hoard had been reduced to 266 million pounds. It is growing smaller by the day. This butter is moving into channels or consumption in the United States and abroad.

While it is true that most of these dispositions have been made at substantial losses, it is important that the butter is being used. It is also worth noting that nearly 20 million pounds of butter were resold into commercial-trade channels by CCC at prices which exceeded acquisition costs. Most of these sales were negotiated during the last 2 months. For the entire year of 1953, commercial-butter sales by CCC amounted to about 4 million pounds.

At the end of September 1954, CCC owned 435 million pounds of cheese. This inventory had been reduced by 100 million pounds by the year's end. Government sales of cheese in commercial-trade channels exceeded 116 million pounds in 1954, as compared with a bit more than 5 million pounds during the preceding year.

CCC had on hand 92 million pounds of dry milk at the beginning of this year. Eight months earlier the Government inventory stood at 600 million pounds.

Despite record-breaking purchases of dairy products during the early months of 1954, we bought less butter for the entire year than we did in 1953. Cheese and dry milk buying were up somewhat for the year but the trend during the final months of 1954 was sharply down.

Altogether, CCC disposed of approximately 1.5 billion pounds of dairy products last year, as compared with 352 million pounds in 1953; more than 4 times as much. About two-thirds of the butter and one-half of the cheese was moved after August 1, when Congress gave us broadened authority to deal with the entire surplus problem. Most of the dry milk was sold at substantial discount for use in mixed poultry and livestock feed.

Surplus butter holdings were distributed principally as domestic and foreign donations through school-lunch programs, church and welfare organizations, and charitable institutions. Millions of needy persons here and abroad shared in these donations. Some direct sales were made at reduced prices to foreign governments and United Nations agencies. Further distribution was made through Foreign Operations Administration activities. These various outlets absorbed 264 million pounds of butter in 1954, as against about 100 million pounds for the preceding year.

In addition, the Department of the Army obtained more than 28 million pounds of butter from CCC stocks in 1954, nearly double the amount for 1953. We sold butter for use as a cocoa butter extender and for liquid milk recombining abroad. Butter was also made available to the Veterans' Administration. None of these outlets was employed during the preceding year.

School-lunch donations and welfare distribution at home and abroad accounted for the movement of 161 million pounds of cheese in 1954, approximately 5 times the total of a year earlier. At the same time 400 million pounds of dry milk, more than double the amount for 1953, went into these programs last year.

The effect of these overall disposal efforts, combined with the increased commercial demand for dairy products, is reflected in improved milk prices during recent months. For the final quarter of 1954 wholesale prices received by farmers for all milk averaged 86 percent of parity, the same as in March of 1954, when price supports were still at 90 percent of parity. Seasonal factors, as well as our improved supply position, are partly responsible for this strength. If we can come this far in the space of a few months, there is every reason to be optimistic about the future of the dairy industry.

In fact, I find that optimism shared by many dairymen with whom I have talked and by representatives of other segments of the industry. They believe, as I do, that we have yet to see the full effects of the aggressive merchandising and promotional campaigns which have been steadily building up for several months. They know they have the finest food product in the world to sell—and at a bargain price. They know that there is a vast untapped market for this most nearly perfect food right here in America and they are determined to reach it.

The story of milk is being told today far better than it has in the past—through every conceivable advertising medium. The dairy industry is successfully employing many of the promotional tactics of its competitors. Its leaders have also recognized that there are two important steps in merchandising. First, to create a desire for the product, and second, to make it readily available everywhere.

It's rather sad, but nevertheless true, that it's far easier for many Americans to buy a bottle of pop or even an alcoholic beverage than just a plain drink of milk. In my travels over the country—waiting in airports and railway stations—I find that I can purchase candy, chewing gum, a variety of carbonated beverages—I can even insure my life or test my skill on a pinball machine—all by simply inserting a coin in a slot. But I can't buy milk with the same ease.

Why until a few months ago—even in the Department of Agriculture, where lights burned late as we sweated over the dairy problem—you couldn't buy a drink of milk except in the cafeterias at certain hours. You can now. You can also buy milk in thousands of other places where it wasn't available until the dairy industry got its promotional campaign in gear.

We have had a magnificent response—here in Minnesota and elsewhere—to the new program approved by Congress which makes an additional $50 million available this year and next for an expanded school lunch milk program. The armed services are cooperating in a move to increase the use of milk and other dairy products. These efforts represent more than a current contribution to the better health of our young people. They create the milk-drinking habit. They build markets for tomorrow as well as for today.

I have sought here to summarize what I regard as definite advances on the dairy front during this marketing year. The various facts and figures which I have detailed represent an impressive total on the credit side of the ledger. They indicate clearly that we are on the right road.

At the same time, I would not create the impression that all of our problems are behind us. As our continuing, though greatly reduced, purchases of cheese and dry milk indicate, production is still outrunning demand. The flush season is ahead of us. It will be little short of a miracle if the Government is not called upon to increase its dairy support purchase program over the next few months. Yet I am confident that what buying we are forced to do will be on a much smaller scale than it was during this period in 1954. That situation, as it develops, will be further important evidence of the fact that we are clearly emerging from the serious crisis which gripped the industry such a short time ago.

I am not unmindful that dairy producers are caught in a perplexing price-cost squeeze. While final figures are not yet available, it is expected that they will show net income of dairy producers in 1954 was down some $180 million to $200 million from the preceding year, a decline of about 4 percent. Disturbing as this must be to all of us, it might be pointed out that dairy income declined even more between 1952 and 1953, despite supports at 90 percent of parity. To me this strongly suggests that the continuation of high level supports was not the answer, as some people have argued. If it were, the problem would never have developed.

I would rather think of the loss in dairy income as the industry's share of the cost of getting back on a sound foundation. The Government's share of that cost has been even greater. I do not regard either the industry's or the Government's contribution as an outright loss, however. Rather it is an

investment in the future of dairying—an investment which will be returned many times in the years ahead if we have the courage and the determination to see this crisis through.

However much some individual dairymen may be pinched by the decline in income, they might well consider what their plight could have been had 90 percent supports been continued. Producers of the basic commodities who have been receiving price supports at that level have also been forced to take drastic production controls. In neighboring North Dakota, for example, 1954 wheat acreage was cut 20 percent below 1953. It will be reduced again in 1955.

I am sure Minnesota dairy producers are thankful they are not faced with that kind of a production slash. High level price supports inevitably breed production controls. We have them this year on every one of the six basic commodities. To argue that dairying could somehow have escaped a similar fate—had maximum supports been continued—is to deny the very plain evidence to the contrary. As one who was engaged in dairying for many years, I might add my conviction that farmers would be no happier under milk production controls than I would be in administering them.

As every dairyman knows, his business is particularly sensitive to the factor of volume. His constant objective is increased production at reduced cost. He knows through hard, practical experience that a drop in production can hurt him just as much as a drop in price. Virtually every advance in dairying efficiency, on the farm and in the plant, is geared to large production. The careful upgrading of the dairyman's herd, the improvements in his feeding and milking operations, the better techniques in handling and transporting his milk are all primarily directed toward large volume marketing.

Farmers in our principal dairying regions might well consider another effect of production controls upon their operations. Any attempt to impose such restrictions by law would almost certainly be accompanied by a move to exempt small producers—just as they are exempted from the control provisions of some basic crop programs. The backyard producer—the 1 and 2 cow owner—would be permitted to operate as before, because of the tremendous obstacles involved in the enforcement of milk production controls.

Nearly 29 percent of all farms producing milk have only 1 cow. Seventeen percent have only two cows. Sixteen percent have either 3 or 4 cows. Thus, it would seem to be a fair guess that perhaps half of the farms producing milk would be exempt from production controls. The full burden would fall upon the larger and more efficient producers. Productionwise, if only 1- and 2-cow farms were outside the program, about 11 percent of the milk produced in this country would be completely unaffected by controls.

There is nothing startling about the fact that the dairy industry is adjusting to new conditions and situations. Such adjustments are constantly taking place—and, to a considerable extent, independently of prevailing milk prices.

For example, between 1944 and 1949—when prices of milk and butterfat averaged above 100 percent of parity—the number of farms producing dairy products for the market in this country declined by 19 percent. Yet the change in total milk production was less than 1 percent. The sharpest drop occurred on farms with less than 10 cows. In Pennsylvania, 25 years ago, 47 percent of the total production came from herds of 9 cows or less. Today, in that State, only 18 percent of the milk comes from herds of that size.

There is a wide variation in dairy production costs in different areas of this broad Nation. There are even notable spreads among farms in the same area. One recent study in Pennsylvania revealed milk production costs ranging from $3.50 per hundred to as much as $9.50. I believe we need to ask ourselves whether we want an economic system that permits a producer with such almost unbelievable costs to provide our milk.

As all dairymen know, labor represents a large element of cost. Through the years the great emphasis has been upon obtaining increased production per cow and, with this, greater labor efficiency. To be more efficient, the dairyman need not necessarily work harder, faster, and longer. Rather the goal is to accomplish more, with less back-bending effort in a short time through planning, know-how, and laborsaving devices.

A survey by the Agricultural Experiment Station at Michigan State College pointed out opportunities for reducing milk-production costs by 45 percent, through the use of all available techniques and adjustments. This was done without increasing either the number of workers or the farm acreage. Gains were made primarily through the use of better-producing cows and improved practices.

Now, of course, not every dairyman can achieve such an increase in efficiency. Many producers are already using most of the techniques employed in this test. But even they may increase operating efficiency and profits by using all of the available know-how—the better breeds, feeds, and seeds and improved production practices. The dairyman who achieves only a part of the increased efficiency attained in the Michigan State test can offset the adjustment in price supports. It is still true in dairying, as in other segments of agriculture, that the individual farmer can do more for himself than Government can ever do for him.

Many would-be political leaders have been using high, fixed price supports as a smokescreen to cover up one indisputable fact—the fact that it was the unprecedended demands of war, together with inflation, that kept farm prices high during the 10 years following Pearl Harbor. The parity ratio averaged between 100 and 115 during those years. Actually, it was ceilings fixed by law at the top—not the 90-percent floor below—which set farm prices. Every farmer knows he would have received even more for his products during this period had there been neither ceilings nor price supports.

It has been apparent for some time that high, rigid, emergency supports were not the solution to our peacetime agricultural problems. These current problems have all developed under high, rigid price supports which remain in effect until the 1955 harvest. If farmers have experienced reduced prices and incomes, these reductions occurred under the old law which was supposed to prevent them.

There is nothing new or revolutionary about flexible price supports. They have been a part of our agricultural programs for nearly two decades. They have been endorsed at one time or another by every Secretary of Agriculture for 20 years, by the former occupant of the White House, and by both major parties.

The financial pangs which go with readjustment to a peacetime economy are not new to agriculture. We have suffered them following every war in our history. Just as farm commodity prices go up faster than the general price level under the stimulus of war and inflation, they also drop further and faster than most nonfarm prices while the economy is readjusting to more nearly normal conditions. We are making the transition this time with fewer and less severe dislocations in agriculture and other segments of our economy than ever before.

The depression which was so freely predicted a year ago failed to materialize. From an economic point of view, 1954 proved to be the best peacetime year in history, although agriculture did not fully share in this prosperity. The changeover has hurt and is hurting most of our farm people.

Yet I believe all of the evidence indicates we have seen the worst. I am convinced that for agriculture the road ahead will be smoother than the one we have been traveling.

For several months now, most farm prices have been relatively stable. For the last 2 years, in fact, the parity ratio has averaged about 90, fluctuating narrowly between 94 and 86. It will be recalled that there was a 19 point plunge in the parity ratio during the 2 years preceding January 1953, when the new administration was installed.

We must not be content with mere stability of farm prices at current levels. But the price decline had to be halted before it could be reversed. The first half of that objective is being attained. The job at hand now is to get farm prices back into better balance with the general price level. This, I am confident, can be done under the Agricultural Act of 1954 which has as its goal a prosperous, stable and free agriculture.

Today I pledge anew to you and to all of our farm people that I will never knowingly sponsor or support any policy or program which I believe is not in the best interests of our farmers and all of our people, regardless of political pressure.

As the President pointed out in his state of the Union message: "Agricultural programs have been redirected toward better balance, greater stability and sustained prosperity. We are headed in the right direction. I urgently recommend to Congress that we continue resolutely on this road."

Now if I may leave one final thought with you, it is this: The future of American agriculture is bright—as bright as all of us have the will to make it. A kind Providence has blessed this choice land with vast natural resources—with soils and climate which, with American ingenuity, courage and freedom, have provided a standard of living unmatched elsewhere. May God guide us in the wise use of our abundance.

Statement by Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 18, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

This is in connection with the heading of an article which appeared in the Washington Daily News of Friday, January 14, 1955, entitled "How Admiral Strauss Doctored History."

This headline was withdrawn from later editions.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., January 17, 1955.

Hon. HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
The United States Senate,
Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: Following our telephone conversation on Friday, January 14,

concerning the speech by Senator GORE, I promised to send you a factual account of the incident to which he referred.

The Washington Daily News on Friday published an article which was advertised by a front page headline in its early issue "How Admiral Strauss Doctored History." This article, in disregard of the facts, alleged that I caused the transcript of a news conference which I held on December 17 to be falsified for some improper reason. I am informed the headline was withdrawn in later editions.

The news conference was called for the purpose of explaining, in an orderly, detailed, comprehensive manner, the origin and provisions of the Mississippi Valley Generating Co. contract in order to put into proper perspective the misunderstandings which have been current concerning it. Each reporter who entered the conference room was given a formal, written statement of 36 pages, bearing my name; also reproductions of the charts, graphs, and tabulations dealing with the subject which were exhibited during the conference.

In my formal statement, pages 10 and 11, I discussed the manner in which the site at West Memphis, Ark., was selected and stated:

"The Corps of Engineers has reviewed the plot plan showing the proposed construction and made certain suggestions, all of which we are assured will be complied with in the final plans and specifications. They also have stated that the proposed construction appears to be acceptable to the Mississippi River Commission from the standpoint of navigation and flood control. The site also has been investigated by AEC engineers, has been discussed by them with representatives of the Corps of Engineers' office, Memphis district. They concluded, after reviewing all available data, that the site selected by MVGC is adequately protected from Mississippi River floods by the Corps of Engineers project levee."

The precise and factual account of the role of the Corps of Engineers was given to the reporters not only in my formal statement but also in two of the supplemental documents which accompanied the statement: (1) a reproduction of a drawing of the site which carried an inserted legend of explanation, and (2) a statement as to the manner in which the site was selected, including discussions which were held among AEC engineers, engineers of the sponsoring companies, and the Corps of Engineers.

After the 56 reporters attending the conference had received my formal statement, I turned to a large reproduction of the site drawing which had been affixed to the wall and mentioned again how the site had been chosen but this was only a passing reference, ad lib, since the subject had been covered thoroughly in the formal statement.

The ad lib quotation was as follows:

"The Corps of Engineers and the engineers retained by sponsoring companies have examined some 16 sites on the river and have selected this as the preferable one. This elevation here shows the maximum flood record in the river, the 1937 flood. I understand that records have been made since 1880 or thereabouts, some 74 years of record, and the plant has been located at what the Corps of Engineers feel is a safe place."

In this quotation, an obvious slip of the tongue was recognized as such by all except one or two of the fifty-six reporters present since in reporting the news conference they naturally relied on the prepared statement.

I left town following the news conference but in my absence the Public Information Division of the Commission corrected the stenographic transcript for grammatical errors, et cetera, and in the course of this process the transcript was conformed to the text of the formal statement. This was done in order to eliminate anything that might appear to be a contradiction. Any person speaking ad libitum, whether he be a Member of Congress, a witness before a committee, or a person conducting a news conference, is entitled to the assurance that the intent of his statements will be clearly reflected in a simultaneously presented written record.

These facts as I have stated them were ignored in the newspaper article and which purported to show that I had "doctored history," presumably for some insidious reasons. There was no word in the article about my formal 36-page statement, which is factually accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.

I may be unduly sensitive but it seems to me that this whole incident has very little to do with the merits of the controversy over the contract.

Faithfully yours,

LEWIS L. STRAUSS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 20, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Archbishop John Theodorovich, metropolitan of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the United States, offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, let us pray.

Almighty God, Thou art father of all nations, the source of the mighty stream of life in which the forward flow is humanity. Thou gavest to our Nation to become a mighty wave in the stream of humanity. Grant us, our Father, to remember we are a hope for many engulfed with the waves of oppression. There are the enslavers of the nations hiding the shame of slavery in our time behind the iron curtains.

Have mercy, O Lord, on these victims of mass execution, exile, slave camps, starvation. Have mercy on Thy ministers, tortured and killed for Thy name's sake. Grant the nations crushed under the tyrant's heel the blessings of liberty, independence, and national statehood.

Give our great Nation the strength and courage to keep bright the beacon of liberty and justice. Give us the wisdom to help our brothers in Ukraine and all the other suppressed nations striving for freedom and national independence.

May the day come, O God, when all nations and peoples shall live in a true state of coexistence devoid of iron curtains and tyrants and slavery. And grant that all men may live in their own lands in liberty and independence under their own governments in Thy ways and according to Thy will.

May Thy kingdom come. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 17, 1955, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communications from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

JANUARY 20, 1955.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on January 17, 1955, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate on January 19, 1955, the following messages:

That the Senate has passed with amendments the bill H. R. 2091, entitled "An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes"; and

That the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill H. R. 2091 and requests a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. SALTONSTALL, conferees on the part of the Senate.

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

JANUARY 18, 1955.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on January 17, 1955, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate on January 18, 1955, the following message:

That the Senate has passed without amendment the bill H. R. 2369, entitled "An act to amend section 7237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954."

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2369. An act to amend section 7237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Monday, January 17, 1955, he did on January 18, 1955, sign the following enrolled bill of the House:

H. R. 2369. An act to amend section 7237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

And the following enrolled joint resolution of the Senate:

S. J. Res. 4. Joint resolution to provide for the continuation in office of certain members of the Commission on Governmental Operations.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 15, section 1024, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report the following members on the part of the House: Mr. PATMAN of Texas, Mr. BOLLING of Missouri, Mr. MILLS of Arkansas, Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WOLCOTT of Michigan, Mr. TALLE of Iowa, and Mr. CURTIS of Missouri.

ECONOMIC REPORT — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 31)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am herewith presenting my economic report, as required by section 3 (a) of the Employment Act of 1946.

In preparing this report, I have had the assistance and advice of the Council of Economic Advisers. I have also had the advice of the heads of executive departments and independent agencies.

I present below, largely in the words of the report itself, what I regard as its highlights.

SOURCES OF ECONOMIC PROGRESS

With production and employment now increasing on a broad front, the events of the past year have borne out the major conclusions of the Economic Report of January 1954 concerning the state of our economy and the policies needed to promote sound economic growth.

Economic well-being sustains our whole national life. A high and rising standard of living brings to more of our people the opportunity for continued intellectual and spiritual growth.

The main sources of our Nation's economic strength are its free institutions and the qualities of its people—their ambition, skill, enterprise, and willingness to make great efforts in their own behalf and in behalf of their families and communities.

The need of our times is for economic policies that, in the first place, recognize the proven sources of sustained economic growth and betterment, and in the second place, respect the need of people for a sense of security as well as opportunity in our complex, industrialized society.

A free economy has great capacity to generate jobs and incomes if a feeling of confidence in the economic future is widely shared by investors, workers, businessmen, farmers, and consumers.

Many factors favor a continuation of our vigorous economic growth. The population is increasing rapidly, educational levels are rising, work skills are improving, incomes are widely distributed, consumers are eager to better their living standards, businessmen are starting new enterprises and expanding old ones, the tools of industry are multiplying and improving, research and technology are opening up new opportunities, and our public policies generally encourage enterprise and innovation.

With wise management of the national household, our country can within a decade increase its production from the current annual level of about 360 billion dollars to 500 billion, or more, expressed in dollars of the same buying power.

In the future as in the past, increases in productivity and in useful employment opportunities will be the core of economic expansion.

The role of the Federal Government in the achievement of these goals is to create an atmosphere favorable to economic activity by encouraging private initiative, curbing monopolistic tendencies, avoiding encroachment on the private sector of the economy, and carrying out as much of its own work as is practicable through private enterprise. It should take its full part at the side of State and local governments in providing appropriate public facilities. It should restrain tendencies toward recession or inflation. It should widen opportunities for less fortunate citizens, and help individuals to cope with the hazards of unemployment, illness, old age, and blighted neighborhoods.

Last year the Government took many steps, both legislative and administrative, to encourage economic expansion. Fiscal and monetary measures fostered an expectation of improving economic conditions and encouraged people to maintain a high rate of expenditure. The opportunities of competitive enterprise were enlarged; economic ties with other countries were improved; the floor of personal and family security was strengthened; and additions were made to our public assets.

THE ECONOMY TODAY

The year 1954 was one of transition from contraction to recovery. The contraction reflected the efforts of businessmen to reduce inventories, and was aggravated by a large reduction in military expenditures.

The contraction was relatively mild and brief, because of a variety of timely public and private actions.

The Government cut taxes, the Federal Reserve System eased credit conditions, and the Treasury arranged its financing so as not to compete with mortgages and other long-term issues. A comprehensive program for encouraging private enterprise was submitted to the Congress. Apart from this, the decline in private incomes was automatically cushioned by increased payments of unemployment insurance and other benefits and by sharp cuts in taxes due the Government on the reduced incomes.

Consumers maintained a high rate of spending, businessmen kept capital expenditures at a high rate, builders stepped up their activities, trade unions conducted their affairs with a sense of responsibility, farmers recognized the dangers of piling up ever larger surpluses, private lenders made ample supplies of credit available on liberal terms, States and localities carried out large construction programs, and export demand remained strong.

Although manufacturing production fluctuated, total output was fairly stable, and disposable personal income reached record levels. But some industries and localities suffered from serious unemployment. The fortunes of most of them turned for the better when recovery got under way in the early autumn, and they will benefit from further general economic expansion.

Instead of expanding Federal enterprises or initiating new spending programs, the basic policy of the Government in dealing with the contraction was to take actions that created confidence in the future and stimulated business firms, consumers, and States and localities to increase their expenditures.

The vigor of the recent recovery, which has already made up half of the preceding decline in industrial production, suggests that economic expansion will probably continue during coming months. It holds out the promise that we shall achieve a high and satisfactory level of employment and production within the current year.

A further expansion of consumer spending may reasonably be expected; we are soon likely to experience some rebuilding of inventories; the decline of Federal spending next year will be less rapid than during the last 2 years; State and local expenditure will probably continue to expand; the outlook for housing and commercial construction continues to be good; there is a prospect that plant and equipment expenditures may turn upward, as the general economic advance proceeds; the outlook for export demand is brightened by the economic resurgence of an ever-widening area of the free world.

It is essential to keep a close watch on financial developments; continued economic recovery must not be jeopardized by overemphasis of speculative activity.

TOWARD SUSTAINED ECONOMIC GROWTH

The wise course for Government in 1955 is to direct its program principally toward fostering long-term economic growth rather than toward imparting an immediate upward thrust to economic activity.

Further efforts to reduce Federal expenditures, together with increasing revenues from a tax base growing as the economy expands, should make possible some additional general tax reductions next year. Progress could then also be made in further lowering tax barriers to the free flow of funds into risk-taking and job-creating investments.

Government should persist in its efforts to maintain easy entry into trade and industry, to check monopoly, and to preserve a competitive environment. Continued encouragement should be given to small and new businesses.

Scientific research and development activities in all their phases should continue to have the earnest support of the Federal Government.

Measures by ourselves and other nations to reduce existing barriers to international trade, payments, and investment will make the free world stronger and aid our own economic growth.

Measures should be considered to extend personal security against the hazard of unemployment, to strengthen minimum wage legislation, to protect savings in credit unions, and to increase the President's discretionary authority to vary the terms of insured mortgage loans in the interest of economic stability.

A great 10-year program to modernize the interstate highway system should be authorized.

Our partnership policies of water resource development should be further implemented by appropriate congressional and local action.

Action should be taken this year to help meet our nationwide needs for school construction. I shall shortly send to the Congress a special message that will deal with methods by which the Federal Government can appropriately assist in this vital field.

Support should be provided for an Office of Coordinator of Public Works Planning in the Executive Office of the President, and for a revolving fund for advances to the States and municipalities for public works planning.

CONCLUSION

Our Nation's recent history teaches that a foresighted Government can do much to help keep the economy stable, but experience affords no good basis for a belief that the Government can entirely prevent fluctuations.

We should harness the idealism as well as the intelligence of our generation to the practical end of facilitating the growth of private enterprise and of increasing the stability of our economy.

The Government will shoulder its full responsibility to help realize that goal.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 20, 1955.*

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. BLATNIK appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

SWEARING IN OF RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office as Resident Commissioner for Puerto Rico.

COMPOSITION OF COMMITTEES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 94) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That during the 84th Congress the Committee on Agriculture shall be composed of 34 members;

The Committee on Armed Services shall be composed of 37 members;

The Committee on Banking and Currency shall be composed of 30 members;

The Committee on Education and Labor shall be composed of 30 members;

The Committee on Foreign Affairs shall be composed of 32 members;

The Committee on Government Operations shall be composed of 30 members;

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall be composed of 29 members;

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be composed of 31 members;

The Committee on the Judiciary shall be composed of 32 members;

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall be composed of 29 members; and

The Committee on Public Works shall be composed of 30 members.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MINORITY COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 95) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Agriculture: Clifford R. Hope, Kansas; August H. Andresen, Minnesota; William S. Hill, Colorado; Charles B. Hoeven, Iowa; Sid Simpson, Illinois; Paul B. Dague, Pennsylvania; Ralph Harvey, Indiana; Harold O. Lovre, South Dakota; Page Belcher, Oklahoma; Clifford G. McIntire, Maine; William R. Williams, New York; Karl C. King, Pennsylvania; Robert D. Harrison, Nebraska; Melvin R. Laird, Wisconsin; Henry A. Dixon, Utah; Mrs. Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

Committee on Armed Services: Dewey Short, Missouri; Leslie C. Arends, Illinois; W. Sterling Cole, New York; Leroy Johnson, California; Leon H. Gavin, Pennsylvania; Walter Norblad, Oregon; James E. Van Zandt, Pennsylvania; James T. Patterson, Connecticut; Paul Cunningham, Iowa; William H. Bates, Massachusetts; William E. Hess, Ohio; Charles P. Nelson, Maine; James P. S. Devereux, Maryland; Alvin E. O'Konski, Wisconsin; William G. Bray, Indiana; Robert C. Wilson, California; Frank C. Osmers, Jr., New Jersey; Mrs. Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

Committee on Banking and Currency: Jesse P. Wolcott, Michigan; Ralph A. Gamble, New York; Henry O. Talle, Iowa; Clarence E. Kilburn, New York; Gordon L. McDonough, California; William B. Widnall, New Jersey; Jackson E. Betts, Ohio; Walter M. Mumma, Pennsylvania; William E. McVey, Illinois; Edgar W. Hiestand, California; Donald W. Nicholson, Massachusetts; Oliver P. Bolton, Ohio; Perkins Bass, New Hampshire.

Committee on the District of Columbia: Sid Simpson, Illinois; Joseph P. O'Hara, Minnesota; Henry O. Talle, Iowa; A. L. Miller, Nebraska; James C. Auchincloss, New Jersey; John J. Allen, Jr., California; Carroll D. Kearns, Pennsylvania; James T. Patterson, Connecticut; Charles S. Gubser, California; Joel T. Broyhill, Virginia; DeWitt S. Hyde, Maryland.

Committee on Education and Labor: Samuel K. McConnell, Jr., Pennsylvania; Ralph W. Gwinn, New York; Wint Smith, Kansas; Carroll D. Kearns, Pennsylvania; Harold H. Velde, Illinois; Clare E. Hoffman, Michigan; Albert H. Bosch, New York; Joseph F. Holt, California; John J. Rhodes, Arizona; Stuyvesant Wainwright 2d, New York; Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr., New Jersey; Sam Coon, Oregon; Orvin B. Fjare, Montana.

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Robert B. Chiperfield, Illinois; John M. Vorys, Ohio; Frances P. Bolton, Ohio; Lawrence H. Smith, Wisconsin; Chester E. Merrow, New Hampshire; Walter H. Judd, Minnesota; James G. Fulton, Pennsylvania; Donald L. Jackson, California; Karl M. LeCompte, Iowa; Edmund P. Radwan, New York; Albert P. Morano, Connecticut; Marguerite Stitt Church, Illinois; E. Ross Adair, Indiana; Winston L. Prouty, Vermont; Alvin M. Bentley, Michigan.

Committee on Government Operations: Clare E. Hoffman, Michigan; R. Walter Riehlman, New York; Cecil M. Harden, Indiana; Charles B. Brownson, Indiana; George Meader, Michigan; Clarence J. Brown, Ohio; Glenard P. Lipscomb, California; B. Carroll Reece, Tennessee; J. Arthur Younger, California; Victor Knox, Michigan; Otto Krueger, North Dakota; Charles Raper Jonas, North Carolina; William E. Minshall, Ohio.

Committee on House Administration: Charles A. Halleck, Indiana.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: A. L. Miller, Nebraska; John P. Saylor, Pennsylvania; J. Ernest Wharton, New York; E. Y. Berry, South Dakota; William A. Dawson, Utah; Jack Westland, Washington; John R. Pillion, New York; Clifton (Cliff) Young, Nevada; Craig Hosmer, California; John J. Rhodes, Arizona; Hamer H. Budge, Idaho; J. Edgar Chenoweth, Colorado; James B. Utt, California; Mrs. Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Charles A. Wolverton, New Jersey; Carl Hinshaw, California; Joseph P. O'Hara, Minnesota; Robert Hale, Maine; James I. Dolliver, Iowa; John W. Heselton, Massachusetts; John B. Bennett, Michigan; Richard W. Hoffman, Illinois; John V. Beamer, Indiana; William L. Springer, Illinois; Alvin R. Bush, Pennsylvania; Paul F. Schenck, Ohio; Joseph L. Carrigg, Pennsylvania; Steven B. Derounian, New York.

Committee on the Judiciary: Chauncey W. Reed, Illinois; Kenneth B. Keating, New York; William M. McCulloch, Ohio; Ruth Thompson, Michigan; Patrick J. Hillings, California; Shephard J. Crumpacker, Jr., Indiana; William E. Miller, New York; Dean P. Taylor, New York; Usher L. Burdick, North Dakota; Laurence Curtis, Massachusetts; John M. Robsion, Jr., Kentucky; DeWitt S. Hyde, Maryland; Richard H. Poff, Virginia; Hugh D. Scott, Jr., Pennsylvania.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Thor C. Tollefson, Washington; John J. Allen, Jr., California; Horace Seely-Brown, Jr., Connecticut; Timothy P. Sheehan, Illinois; William K. Van Pelt, Wisconsin; John H. Ray, New York; William S. Mailliard, California; Francis E. Dorn, New York; Alvin R. Bush, Pennsylvania; Thomas M. Pelly, Washington; Elford A. Cederberg, Michigan; A. D. Baumhart, Jr., Ohio; Jackson B. Chase, Nebraska.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Edward H. Rees, Kansas; Robert J. Corbett, Pennsylvania; Katharine St. George, New York; H. R. Gross, Iowa; Cecil M. Hardin, Indiana; Albert W. Cretella, Connecticut; Charles S. Gubser, California; Joel T. Broyhill, Virginia; Elford A. Cederberg, Michigan; John E. Henderson, Ohio; August E. Johansen, Michigan.

Committee on Public Works: George A. Dondero, Michigan; J. Harry McGregor, Ohio; James C. Auchincloss, New Jersey; Russell V. Mack, Washington; Hubert B. Scudder, California; Myron V. George, Kansas; Frank J. Becker, New York; Gordon H. Scherer, Ohio; Gardner R. Withrow, Wisconsin; William C. Cramer, Florida; John F. Baldwin, California; Fred Schwengel, Iowa; Bruce Alger, Texas.

Committee on Rules: Leo E. Allen, Illinois; Clarence J. Brown, Ohio; Harris Ellsworth, Oregon; Henry J. Latham, New York.

Committee on Un-American Activities: Harold H. Velde, Illinois; Bernard W. (Pat) Kearney, New York; Donald L. Jackson, California; Gordon H. Scherer, Ohio.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Edith Nourse Rogers, Massachusetts; Bernard W. (Pat) Kearney, New York; William H. Ayres, Ohio; E. Ross Adair, Indiana; Paul A. Fino, New York; Phil Weaver, Nebraska; William H. Avery, Kansas; E. Keith Thomson, Wyoming; Eugene Siler, Kentucky; Charles M. Teague, California.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1955

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2091) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 3, insert "Senate."

Page 2, line 4, insert "For payment to Harriet McCarran, widow of Pat McCarran, late a Senator from the State of Nevada, $12,500."

Page 2, line 7, insert "For payment to Mary R. P. Maybank, widow of Burnet R. Maybank, late a Senator from the State of South Carolina, $12,500."

Page 2, line 10, insert:

"SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

"The appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1955, is made available for the employment of additional clerical assistants for each Senator from the State of Kentucky, so that the allowance for administrative and clerical assistants for such Senators will be equal to that allowed other Senators from States having a population of more than 3 million but less than 5 million, the population of said State having exceeded 3 million inhabitants."

Page 2, line 20, insert:

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"Office of the Secretary: For an additional amount for the Office of the Secretary, $4,845: *Provided*, That effective February 1, 1955, the basic amount available for clerical assistance and readjustment of salaries in the disbursing office is increased by $6,600 per annum."

Page 3, line 1, insert: "CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE"

Page 3, line 2, insert:

"Senate policy committees: For an additional amount for the Senate policy committees, for agency contribution for Federal Employees Group Life Insurance, as authorized by Public Law 598, 83d Congress, $220 for each such committee; in all, $440."

Page 3, line 7, insert:

"Joint Committee on Printing: For an additional amount for the Joint Committee on Printing, for agency contribution for Federal Employees Group Life Insurance, as authorized by Public Law 598, 83d Congress, $115."

Page 3, line 11, insert:

"Inquiries and investigations: For an additional amount for expenses of inquiries and investigations, $795,000."

Page 3, line 13, insert:

"Stationery: For an additional amount for stationery, $3,550, and the amount available for stationery for committees and officers of the Senate is hereby increased to $13,550."

Page 4, line 16, insert:

"COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' $160,000: *Provided*, That said appropriation shall remain available until June 30, 1955: *Provided further*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of H. R. 2010, 84th Congress."

Page 5, line 20, strike out "$90,000" and insert "$130,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next the clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the special select Committee on Communist Aggression, authorized by the 83d Congress, completed its final summary report on December 31, 1954. This week the printed copies of the summary report are off the press and ready for distribution among the Members of the Congress.

Our former colleague, Charles Kersten, chairman of the select committee and the committee staff, have temporary offices at Georgetown University and are engaged in the work of distributing copies of the summary report and also the special reports for each of the Communist captive countries to the Members of Congress and other organizations who desire to read the same. No doubt a number of Members of Congress will desire extra copies of this report for organizations, libraries, and others in your district. The same can be secured by writing the Committee on Communist Aggression at Georgetown University or telephoning Mr. Kersten, Committee Counsel Jim McTigue, or Staff Director Mr. Edward O'Connor at ADams 2–7000, extensions 433 and 434.

The Committee on Communist Aggression held numerous hearings both in this country and abroad, exposing the true facts on the methods and blueprints used by the leaders of the Communist conspiracy in capturing neighbor nations during the last 15 years. The testimony and facts recorded from over 300 witnesses is a revelation of truth about communism which should be brought to the minds of millions of people living in the free countries throughout the world as well as informing the millions behind the Iron Curtain who are unwilling captives of the Communist conspiracy.

I am hereby submitting for the consideration of the Members of Congress, the committee's basic findings, conclusions, and recommendations which are set out in our summary report:

BASIC FINDINGS

Based upon the testimony, documents, individual sworn depositions, and other evidence presented to the committee, the following basic findings are made:

1. That the objective of Communist aggression is to destroy civilization as we know it and to replace it with a planned existence from which will emerge the new Soviet man completely responsive to the masters of the universal superstate.

2. That no pretext is too insignificant, if the Soviet Union is convinced the proper time has arrived, to serve as an excuse for an action of armed aggression.

3. That no nation, including the Russian Federated Soviet Socialist Republic, has ever voluntarily adopted communism. Communism takes over by force of arms or threat of force by the Red army, controlled as it is by Communist political commissars and the MVD.

4. That treaties of mutual assistance, nonaggression pacts, and protestations favoring peaceful coexistence are continuously dangled as bait before the free nations by the U. S. S. R. to distract them from its unalterable purposes of aggression. Once the bait is taken such fraudulent instruments become the means for Communist penetration and final takeover.

5. That leaders of native Communist elements assisting the Soviet Union to assume control of a victim state are inevitably purged, liquidated, or forced to flee after the successful coup and are replaced by Soviet nationals, usually Russian Communists.

6. That no national culture, aspirations, religion, or independence are permitted to freely exist for more than a relatively short time after communism assumes control of a victim state.

7. That irrespective of constitution, local law, treaties or agreements in force when the Communists take over in the victim state every phase of life is dictated by the Kremlin.

8. That there is no limit to the terror, oppressive tactics, barbarity, perfidy, and inhuman corruption which the Soviet Union will employ to enforce or to secure its demands and desires in a victim state.

9. That every effort at forming a political coalition between Communist and non-Communist groups for the establishment of a government can end in only one result: liquidation of the non-Communist groups.

10. That no election carried out in a Communist-controlled state can be considered a free election. In every case Communists control the election machinery, lists of candidates, ballots, ballot counting, and accompany this control with terrorization of the voters.

11. That communism is the avowed enemy of all religions: Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Orthodox, or Moslem. It tolerates only those religious leaders who lend themselves to Communist propaganda.

12. That the principal purpose of education under Communist rule is to propagate communism and to eliminate the distinctive culture of the victim state. Teachers and students are placed in an intellectual straitjacket.

13. That under Communist rule, labor is organized by the state to serve only the state, the worker is a helpless pawn in a system where ruthless exploitation and drudgery is the reward for all save the Communist elite.

14. That among the false claims which Communist propaganda is promoting in the free world is the idea of Communist nondiscrimination against racial minorities. The hypocrisy of this has been strikingly demonstrated, among other examples, in the persecution and extermination of the Jews in the U. S. S. R., and in the nations of central

Europe more recently occupied by communism.

15. That slave labor and its planned utilization are integral parts of the economic and political system of the Soviet Union, and without them the empire of communism cannot exist. This situation poses a serious threat to the preservation of the hard-earned gains of free labor in the United States and to the economic system of the entire free world.

16. That destruction of the basic unit of civilization—the family—is mandatory and inevitable under communism.

17. That in all the nations occupied by communism two extreme class differences are created and nurtured; there are only the very rich elite who live a life of luxury and the workers who struggle to exist.

18. That the primary targets of Communist agents in the potential victim states of the free world are the police system, press and communications, and the transportation system. Once these targets are taken over the Communists then proceed to use them as the instruments to secure total power.

CONCLUSIONS

Because of the foregoing basic findings, which are based upon testimony sworn to before the committee, we conclude:

1. That communism is a criminal conspiracy purposely designed for and deliberately directed at the enslavement of all mankind and the establishment of a world colonial empire.

2. That this conspiracy which in the course of 37 years has occupied almost one-third of the earth's surface and enslaved over 800 million people is now engaged in the process of consolidating its empire and preparing for the final showdown with the still free nations.

3. That the vast majority of the people living under Red rule know firsthand the antihuman nature of communism and thus constitute a great potential force against communism.

4. That any trade by the nations of the free world with the Communist empire, whether it be in war materials or consumer commodities, will assist the Kremlin in consolidating its empire and will strike a demoralizing blow at millions behind the Iron Curtain who resist and await the day when they can overthrow the Communist tyrants. Moreover, the products of the world of slave labor if put into competition with American production will undermine and destroy the hard earned, high standards of free labor in the United States.

5. That whenever there is a period of weakness or indecision among the nations of the non-Communist world the Soviet Union capitalizes on these conditions and advances its ends by propaganda, subversion, internal disorder, and aggression without resorting to the alternative of general war.

6. That the Kremlin is now engaged in an all-out propaganda offensive as the advocates of "peaceful coexistence" between the Communist empire and the free world in order to gain time, delude the free world as to its real intentions, divide and destroy the free-world alliances and thus prepare the way for world war III.

7. That there has been a dangerous oversimplification of the courses of action open to us in the present world crisis; either preventive war or peaceful coexistence. The committee rejects both these courses of action as alien to the national interest.

8. That the theory which holds that if the United States takes positive and overt action against the Communist conspiracy a new world war would result has tended to paralyze action and destroy the creative initiative of freemen. The committee rejects this theory and concludes the overwhelming evidence points to the opposite conclusion.

9. That truth is the strongest weapon in the arsenal of democracy, faith and hope are the strongest assets of the enslaved people in the Communist empire. Therefore, our major task is to bring the full force of truth concerning communism to the people of the free world and at the same time let the people of the enslaved nations know that the security of our future goes hand in hand with the restoration of their freedom and independence.

10. That the United States Information Agency (Voice of America) and the Committee for Free Europe (Radio Free Europe) are effective in the fight against communism. They reach the peoples behind the Iron Curtain with the truth concerning the policies and actions of the free world, and also reveal the lies, distortions, and treachery put forth by the Communists.

11. That in the struggle of freedom versus slavery our broadcasting media and information programs, including the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe and such others as may originate in the United States, are deserving of much wider support from the public, the foundations, and from Congress.

12. That when morality and adherence to international law are excluded from all relations among nations the rule of the jungle takes over, tyranny and war then become inescapable. The moral and political principles expressed in the American Declaration of Independence should serve as a guide to American policy toward the nations and peoples enslaved by communism.

13. That the continued occupation of the captive nations by Soviet Communist power is the basic cause of the growing menace of war and stands as a threat to the security of the United States. This threat is increased in direct proportion to the time and opportunity afforded the Communists to digest and consolidate their gains, and to use these gains as bases for further and greater aggressions. This threat is diminished in direct proportion as the Communist hold on the captive nations is weakened by a positive policy that promotes the forces of national independence behind the Iron Curtain.

14. That the United States is richly endowed with the natural heritage of a substantial part of its loyal population having strong bonds with the enslaved peoples. This asset has not been fully recognized and utilized in the struggle against the tyranny that enslaves the nations of their ancestry.

15. That it is incumbent upon the present generation of Americans to solve the imminent Communist threat so that the Communists shall not have the time and opportunity to launch their intended full-scale attack on the free world and in order that the coming generation of America may not be confronted with a new and vastly increased Sovietized generation, fully indoctrinated with a fanatic hatred for the non-Communist world.

16. That the time was never more opportune or the world situation more demanding for a bold, positive political offensive by the United States and the entire free world; this is the only course which gives reasonable hope for avoiding all-out war.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee rejects the current Communist propaganda campaign of "peaceful coexistence" between the nations of the free world and the Red regimes of the Communist empire as the only alternative to preventive war. It recommends rather that the Government of the United States immediately launch a positive, bipartisan, political offensive against the international Communist conspiracy and in behalf of the enslaved nations, and that the following steps be undertaken as a part of such a program:

1. The committee again recommends that the President of the United States take the initiative in convening an international conference of all free non-Communist nations for the following purposes:

(a) To express formal recognition of the fact that the Communist governments, which now control over 800 million human beings, are not representative of the will of the people.

(b) To seek agreement whereby the free non-Communist nations acting in concert will withdraw diplomatic recognition from all Moscow-controlled Communist governments.

(c) To reaffirm the friendship and solidarity of the people of the free world with the people and nations enslaved by communism.

(d) To develop a program for the rapid and complete termination of all commercial treaties and trade with Communist governments and the initiation of a program of trade among all non-Communist nations which will strengthen the security of the free world.

(e) To develop an overall, dynamic program for the defeat of the international Communist conspiracy.

2. That Congress establish a joint committee on all United States overseas information programs in order that maximum results may be assured in bringing the full force of truth to all the people of the free world and increased hope to the millions of people enslaved by communism.

3. That Congress by appropriate action reiterate and make clear that the eventual liberation of all the nations enslaved within the Communist empire, together with unqualified support for the principle of national self-determination through free elections and the secret ballot, are firm and unchanging parts of our national policy.

4. That in the advancement of the American program for world peace and freedom all efforts therein be measured against the criteria of whether they assist the captive peoples to hasten the day when they may achieve their liberation, and that all acts or omissions which tend to confirm their enslavement be rejected.

5. That the spirit of resistance to Communist tyranny behind the Iron Curtain be encouraged and supported through the judicious use of funds already authorized by Congress for such purpose.

6. That the appropriate agencies of the Government concerned with the threat of world communism give maximum opportunity to those private American organizations, groups, and individuals that have a natural bond with the enslaved nations and people, to play a major role in the restoration of freedom in the lands of their ancestry.

7. That, as a demonstration of our genuine sympathy for the enslaved nations and peoples, and to weaken the will of the armies under Communist rule to fight and support the Kremlin's plan for world conquest, the President immediately direct the establishment of the national military units formed from escapees from the enslaved nations as authorized by section 101 (a) (1) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, thus providing a concrete symbol of a genuine coexistence and unity between the nations and peoples on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

8. That Congress at the next session enact H. R. 8000, known as the Political Asylum Act of 1954, to provide for the rapid and effective reestablishment of selected escapees from communism and to encourage the defection and escape of others.

9. That the Congress give the United States Information Agency full support not only by way of an increase in funds but also by strengthening its role in our Government's political offensive. Similarly foundations, private organizations, and individual citizens are urged to continue and increase their support to the Committee for Free Europe (Radio Free Europe).

10. That an international juridical commission be established within the framework of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization so that Communist crimes perpetrated against humanity may be fully recorded and officially noted for prosecution.

11. That the Department of State transmit copies of this report, together with all other reports of the committee to each member nation of the United Nations.

12. That the Department of State formulate a resolution based upon the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of this report, branding the U. S. S. R. as an aggressor against all the nations enslaved by communism and that the United States delegation to the United Nations be instructed to take immediate steps to place this resolution on the agenda of the General Assembly for early action.

13. That the work of this committee be continued in order to complete the investigation of all phases and techniques of Communist aggression in areas of the world not already covered by the committee, together with further inquiry into conditions of life within the Communist empire; a program that lack of time has thus far prevented.

INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a joint resolution, the purpose of which is to give the consent of the Congress to the extension and renewal for a period of 4 years of the Interstate Compact To Conserve Oil and Gas, which was entered into originally in 1935 by 6 States and now by 22. Since 1935 the compact has been renewed and extended six times with the consent of the Congress, and, unless renewed, will expire on September 1, 1955.

When the compact was originally consented to by the Congress in 1935, it was hoped that the several oil-producing States, acting together under the compact, would be able to effect conservation of this important natural resource, prevent its waste, and give aid to the petroleum industry in its effort to achieve a relatively stable situation. During the nearly 20 years that this compact has been in force, that hope has been fulfilled in substantial and ever-increasing degree.

I think that the continuing need and desirability of the compact can best be described in the words of former Congressman William Cole, who headed a committee study of the petroleum industry that still is a landmark, as he reported the initial bill giving first consent to the compact:

> The compact bespeaks an effort on the part of a number of States to meet a great problem which is peculiarly a State one, and yet the magnitude of which flows over into every State of the Union, thereby making it one of real national interest. The right of the States to handle and control the production end of this industry is one that the committee recognized and wants to encourage. The problem is not too big for the States if they sincerely want to solve it, at the same time it is not one which will tolerate abandonment or trifling by the States. The country as a whole has a right to demand that petroleum, a great God-given resource belonging as a whole to no State or individual, but a natural national resource, must be conserved and must not be wasted. Petroleum has admittedly become an integral, indispensable part of almost every activity of our country, both private and public. It presents a problem which the committee recognizes as belonging in large measure to the States for solution, but in order for the States to succeed in such an effort they must have the cooperative help of the Federal Government."

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BAILEY (at the request of Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi) was given permission to address the House on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders previously entered.

PREFERENTIAL PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARIES

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a number of Senators and House Members are joining today in introducing a bill to encourage the States to hold preferential primary elections for the nomination of candidates for the office of President. Leading this effort in the Senate is Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, one of the outstanding humanitarians of our time. House Members who are joining with me in sponsoring this bill include Congresswoman ELIZABETH KEE, and Congressmen CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, USHER L. BURDICK, JOHN W. HESELTON, R. L. F. SIKES, and GARDNER R. WITHROW. A number of other Members have expressed an interest in this legislation, and there will doubtless be many others who will cosponsor this bill in the House.

This is a moderate proposal. It would not abolish conventions. It would only make them more responsive to the will of the American people. Each State would be free to decide whether it should participate in a group of State primaries coordinated by a bipartisan presidential primaries commission, which the bill would establish. This proposal would encourage States to adopt presidential primaries by providing Federal grants to assist in defraying the costs of holding such primaries. States would qualify for such assistance by meeting minimum requirements designed to insure that the primaries would be open to all voters with registered party affiliations, and that convention delegates would be bound to a reasonable extent by primary results.

During the growth and progress of our country, there have been a number of changes which have made our Government more democratic. I cannot feel that any of these events were mistakes; and few Americans, if any, would feel that the changes should be undone. Slavery was abolished. Senators ceased to be chosen by legislatures and are now elected by direct vote of the people. Women vote. In many States there are provisions for referendums and recalls. Unreasonable property restrictions among the qualifications for voting have been removed. Almost from the beginning of our country, the electoral college has merely reflected the popular vote of the electorate.

However, little has been done to make nomination of presidential candidates more democratic. Such candidates are chosen by conventions, which are not necessarily representative of the desires of party members. In practice, they are usually more nearly representative of the big politicians, officeholders or not. Some States are represented by delegates chosen by the party central committee. About half of the delegates are chosen through State conventions. Even in the 16 or so States where the voters choose the delegates through State primaries, there is imperfect control by the people; for in most of these States, the delegates may desert, at will, the candidate chosen by the voters. Moreover, uncoordinated State primaries have often failed to represent popular will because presidential candidates are free to enter the States where they can make the best showing and abstain from the others. Favorite son candidates can be used to keep the delegates of a State uncommitted as between major candidates. Is it any wonder that President Truman in surverying these uncoordinated primaries in 1952 called them "so much hogwash"?

If the bill which we have introduced is enacted, I feel sure that the wishes of the voters will be more and more influential each time presidential candidates are nominated. By coordinating State primaries on a voluntary basis, the Federal Government will be carrying out a function which is necessary if these primaries are to have maximum meaning for and effect on convention delegates.

This proposal can be and, we hope, will be adopted in time for the 1956 nominations. If ever we needed to be certain that the President we elect will have the confidence of the people, it is now. With this confidence, he can mobilize the incomparable spiritual and material strength of our people to lead the world into an era of peace.

But even if our proposal is not adopted in time for use next year, its enactment would remove for the future a serious defect in our political system. Surely there will never be a time when our country can afford to do other than use the best possible system to choose its principal leader. I have confidence in the American people and I believe that coordinated State presidential primaries will help them to select through the years, the best persons available to be our President.

CALUMET-SAG PROJECT

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of satisfaction to me, with all other Members from Cook County in Illinois, both Democrats and Republicans, that included in the budget of President Eisenhower is money to start construction on the Calumet-Sag project. No investment of the Federal funds could bring richer return.

My distinguished predecessors from the Second Illinois District, the Honorable Raymond D. McKeough and the Honorable William Rowan, were pioneers in urging upon the Congress and getting authorization for this greatest of all inland waterway developments. In the 81st Congress I took up the fight begun by them and offered from the floor of the House an amendment providing for the necessary appropriation.

In the 83d Congress I continued the effort, taking advantage of every occasion to bring to the attention of my colleagues the vital importance to our country, and especially to the great Middle West, of this project. On 10 or 12 occasions I spoke from the well of this House on the subject and extended my remarks in the Appendix. Calumet-Sag was high on the program of constructive measures that I had presented to the electorate of the district from which I come and upon which I had been elected.

During the 2d session of the 83d Congress I joined with all Members from our area in the introduction of a bill of appropriation for this purpose. It was strictly a bipartisan undertaking. Every Democrat and every Republican from the metropolitan Chicago area joined up with equal measure of earnest sincerity and driving enthusiasm.

The Honorable JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, the only Chicago member of the Committee on Public Works and possessed of great and detailed knowledge on the subject matter, joined with the then majority whip of the House [Mr. ARENDS] and the Representatives from the Second, Third, and Fourth Illinois Districts, those closest to the project, in visiting the Director of the Budget and later President Eisenhower. The composition of the delegation that waited upon the President and the Director of the Budget emphasized the strictly bipartisan nature of the support of this measure.

That our joint efforts ended as we had hoped in the inclusion of the Calumet-Sag project in the President's budget is a cause of great rejoicing among the people of Chicago, who long have realized that development of Calumet-Sag held the key to the industrial future of our city and of the States of the Middle West. With the enactment of the St. Lawrence Waterway Act construction of Calumet-Sag became an immediate must.

From the Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee, Inc., I have received the following letter, signed by Henry E. Seyfarth, chairman:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Our committee is indeed delighted with the President's budget in which is included $4 million for the start of construction on the Calumet-Sag project.

On behalf of our directors, committee, and staff, I would like to take this opportunity of expressing our deepest appreciation to you for joining with the other members of the Illinois delegation in supporting the petition which was presented to President Eisenhower and the Bureau of the Budget that made this possible.

Reflecting the sentiment of public and press, the Chicago Tribune of today, January 20, 1955, says editorially:

WIDENING THE SAG CHANNEL

President Eisenhower included in the Federal budget an appropriation of $4 million to start the widening of the Sag Channel, the longest of the links connecting Lake Michigan in the south Chicago area, with the Illinois Waterway.

This work was authorized 10 years ago by Congress, but the only appropriation so far has been $300,000 for rebuilding the approach to one of the many railroad bridges that cross the channel. The $4 million appropriation is only a small part of the whole cost, now estimated at $98 million. The budget recommendation is an earnest plea that further funds will be available as fast as construction progresses.

The Sag Channel, in spite of handicaps, floats some 4 million tons of freight annually. The principal improvements proposed are widening the channel from 60 to 225 feet and raising and adapting the many highway and railroad bridges that cross it The present channel is so narrow that the heavy tows that come up the Illinois River must be broken up in order to get them to Chicago's center of heavy industry in the Calumet area.

This is by no means wholly a local benefit. It has been called the most important element in the entire Mississippi River system. The Milwaukee Port Authority, in its recent annual report, announced that arrangements had been made and Interstate Commerce Commission sanction obtained for barge service up the Mississippi River and on Lake Michigan to Milwaukee. Our sister city to the north, frequently a bitter foe of Chicago on such navigation issues as lake diversion, ought, in its own interest, to be plugging for the Sag appropriation.

IMPROVING OUR CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, it was not until a recent tragic incident was brought to my attention that I fully realized the urgent need for revising and improving our Civil Service Retirement Act.

Last September 6, 1954, one Frank Patrick McSweeney died at the age of 39. Who was McSweeney? Another hardworking public servant in our Government service. He first came into the Federal Government in 1941 as a deputy collector of Internal Revenue, was later promoted to the fraud squad, and in 13 years became one of our ace special agents. McSweeney, who died of a heart attack, left a wife and 5 children ranging from 2 years to 10 years.

Pat McSweeney worked hard at his job—maybe a little too hard. He was fearless and honest. He was beyond reproach. He could not and would not be bribed. Pat was assigned to the waterfront and narcotic investigations. While in the course of his investigations and shortly before his death, he was approached and offered a $5,000 bribe, part of which was passed to him. Immediately, this bribe attempt was brought to the attention of his supervisor, Chief Agent Lloyd Flanery. The culprit was arrested. Threats were made to Pat; the safety of his family was of great concern to him. While the case was pending, awaiting trial, Pat dropped dead. Chief Agent Flanery testified in Pat's place, which resulted in the conviction and sentence of the briber to 8 years in a Federal penitentiary. This was the work of a conscientious public servant. As the result of the tireless and courageous efforts of Pat, Chief Agent Flanery, and men like them, 54 waterfront characters were indicted. All this a credit to George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury Department, and T. Coleman Andrews, Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service, for having men of fighting courage and indisputable honesty in their departments.

Mr. Speaker, when Pat died suddenly of a heart attack last September, besides leaving a young widow and five children, he left a house with a heavy mortgage and debts. What was our Government's reward to his widow and family?—a paltry pension of $117 per month, to feed and clothe herself and five youngsters.

The family doctor who had examined Pat about a month before his death said Pat's heart was normal—regular and no murmurs. When asked what could have caused this young man's death, the doctor said, "It is very possible that aggravation and worry of his occupation were underlying etiological factors in the production of the heart attack that led to his demise."

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Federal Government should be paying Pat's widow and children a more substantial pension. However, under our present laws, death of a heart attack caused by aggravation and worry of occupation does not come within the scope permitting payment of increased annuity to survivors. Are not the results of overwork, worries, and aggravations attributable to, and in line of duty? Is not death by heart attack from overwork, aggravation, and worry just as shocking and disastrous to a man's widow and family as it would be if he should be killed by a bullet in the course of his duties?

This tragic occurrence brings me to the point I wish to make. I am thoroughly convinced that the facts of our time and considerations of humanity call for a revision of our antiquated civil-service retirement laws. I am introducing a bill which will bring justice and protection to the family in the type of case I have just described. My bill will provide added benefits and afford additional protection to a widow whose husband dies on the job, if medical evidence shows that the cause of death was the direct result of circumstances arising out of and in the course of his Federal employment. My legislation will provide payment to a widow with no children of 75 percent of the full annuity the Federal employee would have received had he lived to be 60 years of age and retired after 30 years of service. A widow with one or more children will receive

100 percent, the same amount the deceased would have received had he lived to retire on a full annuity. The amounts provided for children of the deceased under the Civil Service Retirement Act have been increased.

Mr. Speaker, as you well know, a Federal employee is a human being who, by reason of work, can be subjected to illness and death for which there is no adequate protection in our laws. My bill will give all Federal employees added protection and thereby not only improve our civil-service system but also raise the morale of our Government workers. It is our duty as legislators to protect the families of our conscientious, deserving, and hard-working Federal employees from the fears of insecurity and improper protection.

ORDER LIMITING PHOTOGRAPHY BY AND MOVEMENT OF RUSSIANS IN THIS COUNTRY

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, "tit for tat" is an old, old saying that is quite expressive.

The recent orders limiting photography by, and the movement of, Russians in this country was good, as far as it went.

Everyone knows the exacting limitations under which visitors move in Iron Curtain countries. The few United States citizens that can be admitted to their countries are restricted in movement and action.

For a long, long time this country has placed few restrictions on alien nationals, on their movements, conduct or numbers. They came and went at their will and pleasure, saw what they wished, talked to whom they pleased, read whatever they desired, commented freely, picked up whatever papers and public documents they wished.

Such courteous treatment is not reciprocated by many nations.

Red newsmen can attend White House press conferences sit in the House and Senate galleries and attend congressional committtee meetings.

Hence I have, today, introduced a bill—a "tit for tat" bill—calling for this country to accord visiting alien nationals—in the same number as we have citizens in the corresponding country—the same treatment our citizens are there accorded.

For example, if at any given time, some other country only permits 50 Americans there, we permit only 50 of their nationals here.

If the movements of our citizens are free there, movements of their nationals will be free here.

If Americans must report at intervals—get clearance to move, and so forth, nationals of that requiring country must do likewise while they are in the United States of America.

Another way of expressing this is in another old saying: "What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander."

Mr. Speaker, if visitors from foreign lands are given complete freedom here, then it is only fair that we should expect similar freedom there. Why should we aid, abet and assist our enemies by our liberality, cordiality and courtesy? Why should we make freely available to any of them the public documents and patents which so often relate so closely to our own national welfare?

Mr. Speaker, it is high time we start being realistic; friendly, but firm; courteous, but cautious; and cordial, but careful.

UNITED STATES JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, January 21, marks the 35th anniversary of the founding of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce.

I had intended saying something on the floor tomorrow with reference to this remarkable organization, but in view of the fact that the House will adjourn over until Monday I have asked for this time today.

From a small beginning in 1920, the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce has grown until it now has a membership of over 200,000, who belong to more than 2,000 chapters in 48 States and Territories. Active membership is confined to men between the ages of 21 and 35.

I would like to read you the creed of this organization, which so well expresses its spirit and objectives. It is as follows:

We believe: That faith in God gives meaning and purpose to human life; that the brotherhood of man transcends the sovereignty of nations; that economic justice can best be won by freemen through free enterprise; that government should be of laws rather than of men; that earth's great treasure lies in human personality; and that service to humanity is the best work of life.

This creed is a great statement of purpose, but like any creed it has little value unless it is translated into action. The Jaycees, as members of the organization are commonly called, are men of action. They possess the vigor, vision, and idealism of youth. They are looking ahead and not behind. They believe in this creed and they have taken practical steps to put it into effect. The organization's officers and members have a sense of dedication in their willingness and eagerness to contribute their time, energy, and ability to carrying out the objectives of their organization. It is no wonder that this great civic group has become the fastest growing young men's organization in the world.

The great overall achievement of the junior chamber of commerce has been to develop leadership in the broad fields of good citizenship and civic improvement. Men thus trained in their younger years continue and expand their activities as they pass from active membership as Jaycees. And, although the organization is still young its former active members are found in positions of great responsibility in every field of human endeavor. Its work begins at the grassroots, but many of its projects deal with matters of national importance. Some idea of the scope of its activities can be obtained in reviewing its programs in many fields.

For instance, there is the National Teen-Age Road-E-O, a community program to promote safer driving among the Nation's teen-agers. In the field of public safety the organization has sponsored a wide variety of projects.

Realizing the value of sports and recreational activity, the organization sponsors three major competitions among the youth of America: The international junior golf tournament, the national junior tennis tournament, and the national rookie league baseball tournament. These national projects are supplemented by hundreds of projects carried out by local Jaycee groups. In many places community recreational programs are an important activity.

In the field of citizenship the organization sponsors the Voice of Democracy contest, a script-writing and speaking competition which annually gives more than a million young Americans an opportunity to examine seriously, and speak in behalf of, the virtues of living under a democratic system of government. Also in this field are its get-out-the-vote campaign and Americanism week.

Working with conservation organizations and publications, educational programs to advance conservation are carried out in hundreds of communities.

Christmas projects have become one of the best-known of Jaycee activities. These embrace everything which will bring about a broadening of the observance of Christmas, and especially those programs which make a happier Christmas for underprivileged children.

In an effort to emphasize the importance of religion, the Jaycees conduct two national programs of importance during the month of May. One is the come-to-church campaign and the other is a special day of prayer for the Nation's leaders in their efforts to bring about world peace. Locally Jaycees sponsor and foster hundreds of religious programs of various kinds in their communities.

Its youth programs to recognize youth's accomplishments, to counsel and guide youth, and to help those who have gone astray have been outstanding.

Its contributions to local educational activities are well known.

Let me refer to one instance where a local Jaycee organization in my own district took an active part in initiating a great national Jaycee project in the field of better government. This is in connection with the Hoover Commission report of a few years ago. After the report came out the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Pratt, Kans., held an open-house meeting and discussion on this report at which they urged all of those

in attendance to write to Senators and Representatives with regard to the matter. Soon the Kansas Junior Chamber of Commerce took the matter up as a State project and then the national organization made the study and consideration of this report a part of its program. I am informed that Mr. Hoover has given this organization much credit for the part it played in presenting this matter to the public and to Congress.

But I am sure it is not necessary for me to tell Members of Congress, in detail, of the activities of this great civic organization because each of us has had the opportunity to see these groups in action in our own districts and communities and many Members of Congress are, or have been, members of them.

While what I have said refers to the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, I want to point out that under its leadership there has grown up an International Junior Chamber of Commerce with membership in 65 of the free countries of the world.

Who knows what will finally be accomplished by this great international organization of young men in creating a spirit of international good will and a better understanding between the people of all free nations?

Two years ago, in addressing the 33d national Jaycee convention, President Eisenhower said:

> Yours is one of our Nation's most distinguished and enterprising organizations. You are young and responsible people, with impressive careers and achievements already recorded to your credit.
>
> * * * Because you are both young and responsible, you know what is your greatest responsibility of all, tomorrow, the whole future of freedom.

I think all of us who know something of the Jaycee movement can testify that the members of this great organization are, indeed, meeting their responsibilities.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET MESSAGE

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an analysis of the budget message.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of my colleagues and the public to a new feature which is included in the budget of the President.

For the first time in our history the budget contains significant recommendations for expanding and coordinating our Federal statistical programs.

This new feature is noteworthy and it grew out of a recommendation made last year by the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, of which I was chairman. This subcommittee was established by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report following extensive hearings held last February, when it became evident that there was need for improvement in the Nation's statistical information.

Serving with me on this subcommittee were the Honorable FRANK CARLSON, Senator from Kansas, and the Honorable RICHARD BOLLING, Representative from Missouri.

The subcommittee held carefully planned hearings last July at which expert testimony was given by specialists in important economic fields such as agriculture, industry, labor, trade, finance, and government.

The subcommittee in its report on August 5, 1954—House Report 2628, 83d Congress, 2d session—recommended that—

> A section on economic statistics should be included in the President's annual budget and more consideration given to an adequate economic statistics program in the President's economic report. The various statistical programs of the executive agencies and their costs should be brought together and discussed. Proposed changes in these programs and their relation to the overall Federal statistical system should be pointed out.
>
> The program presented next January (1955) should be prepared after careful appraisal of suggestions received by this subcommittee and incorporated in the published hearings. The subcommittee hopes that the various statistical advisory committees to Federal agencies will be asked to review these hearings and that the President's program submitted next January (1955) will represent a big step forward in the development of a realistic and adequate economic statistical system.

The new feature bears the heading "Special Analysis I, Federal Economic Statistical Programs," and appears on pages 1203 and 1204 of the Budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, which was transmitted to the Congress by the President on Monday, January 17, 1955.

The subcommittee commends the President and the Bureau of the Budget for making this recommendation a reality. It is now hoped that the Congress will take favorable action and provide the funds needed for developing an improved economic statistical system.

Special analysis I, Federal economic statistical programs, as presented in the budget is as follows:

SPECIAL ANALYSIS I. FEDERAL ECONOMIC STATISTICAL PROGRAMS

This analysis presents the current and recommended levels of the major economic statistical programs of the Federal Government. It is intended to facilitate evaluation of the overall system of Government statistics by specific subject-matter areas and to show the proposed changes in the budget recommendations for the fiscal year 1956 for statistics of employment and unemployment, construction and housing, and other important areas of economic conditions or activities.

A sound and balanced statistical system is a necessary basis for sound administrative policies. The needs of business, agriculture, labor, and Government for accurate and prompt knowledge of the ebbs and flows in all major areas of our economic life require improvement and strengthening of our basic system of statistical intelligence.

CURRENT PROGRAMS

For a number of years the current programs of the statistical agencies have operated at a nearly fixed level, despite increases in operating costs. There have been no major expansions in these programs to keep pace with the demands for improved measures of changing economic conditions, although the major economic censuses, which are essential as benchmarks, were initiated in the fiscal year 1955. To meet the demands for better current measures, for the fiscal year 1956 the budget provides increases amounting to $4.8 million, as shown in the following summary:

Direct obligations for major current statistical programs, by broad subject areas

[In millions]

Program	1954 actual	1955 estimate	1956 estimate
Employment and unemployment, wages, industrial injuries	$4.9	$4.9	$6.8
Prices and price indexes	1.6	1.7	2.0
Construction and housing	4.5	.5	1.5
Production and distribution	14.5	15.7	16.6
Population and vital statistics	1.5	1.5	1.6
National income and analysis of business trends: State and local governments	3.2	3.1	3.5
Electronic equipment development	------	------	.2
Total, major current programs	26.2	27.4	32.2

This table does not include all the current statistical programs of the Government. Many of the Government's statistical activities, including some which contribute to our overall system of economic information, are closely tied to and frequently part of administrative operations—for example, reporting activities which arise from the unemployment insurance operations of the Bureau of Employment Security. The agencies whose programs are included, in whole or in part, in this subject-matter summary are shown in the table at the end of this special analysis.

Employment and unemployment, wages, industrial injuries: The number of persons employed, their hours of work and wages, and the number of those looking for work are of concern to the Government in formulating policy and to businessmen, labor groups, and the general public as a guide in making many day-to-day economic decisions. Information on labor turnover (industrial hires, layoffs, and quits) throws additional light on the current economic situation.

One of the problems of most concern in recent months has been the nature of the impact of unemployment during the period of adjustment from an unusually high level of defense spending. The need for greater detail on the labor force, further improvement of statistics on the extent and incidence of unemployment, and more information on the employment situation and outlook in specific areas has been made apparent during the transition period. Increases are recommended for the fiscal year 1956 to enable the Bureau of the Census and the Bureau of Labor Statistics to strengthen their respective programs in this vital area.

Provision is also made for some extension in the fiscal year 1956 of the industry and community wage surveys conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and for expansion of the BLS statistics on industrial accidents to increase their usefulness in promoting safety.

Prices and price indexes: The collection of price data and the computation of indexes of prices and the cost of living are a basic element in our system of economic intelligence. The statistical series currently maintained in this area by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Department of Agriculture are of strategic importance in many different connections—notably, for example, use of the BLS consumer price index as a factor in setting wage rates for millions of workers, and use of agricultural price indexes in determining parity ratios.

Postwar revisions have been completed of the BLS consumer price index and wholesale price index. For the fiscal year 1956 the budget includes a major survey by the Agricultural Marketing Service to obtain the present pattern of farmers' expenditures to determine if there is need for revising or

reweighting the index of prices paid by farmers. This survey will also supply information needed, for analysis of many farm problems.

Construction and housing: Construction is a major economic activity, carried on by thousands of small builders scattered throughout the Nation. Because of its sensitivity to economic conditions and the dependence placed upon it by so many related activities, adequate information on construction is of key significance in appraising economic trends. Estimates now available are limited to the number of new nonfarm dwelling units started and the dollar volume of all new construction activity. The latter series is based on scattered data and can be relied on to reflect only long-term trends or substantial changes in the activity.

For the fiscal year 1956 the budget includes a major increase for the construction statistics program of the Business and Defense Services Administration, to improve the soundness and reliability of the new-construction activity series and to permit compilation of data on expenditures for alterations and repairs and on residential vacancies. Provision is also made for the Bureau of Labor Statistics to obtain statistics on characteristics of new housing being built and on the organization and structure of the home-building industry, and to initiate studies of materials and labor requirements for construction.

In addition to the increase for this area included under current programs, the budget for the fiscal year 1956 provides for an intercensal housing survey, as noted below under periodic census programs.

Production and distribution: The broad area of production and distribution includes work of the Department of Agriculture on farm economics, market research, crop and livestock estimates, and related subjects, and work of other agencies—primarily the Bureau of the Census—on current business and industrial statistics, foreign trade and shipping, and related matters.

Farm production costs and farming methods have drastically changed under the impact of new technology, and the survey of present patterns of farmers' expenditures proposed for 1956 will aid in analysis of farm income and farm practices. Provision is also made in the Agricultural Marketing Service for further market research and improvements in the accuracy of the estimates and forecasts of crop and livestock production. In the Agricultural Research Service, the budget provides for further work in the fiscal year 1956 on the economics of production, designed to develop information to help improve farm practices.

The 1956 budget also provides for annual sample surveys of retail trade and manufacturing activity by the Bureau of the Census.

Population and vital statistics: The only increase provided in this area for the fiscal year 1956 is recommended to enable the National Office of Vital Statistics to reduce the time lag in publishing reports of vital statistics. The increase in the number of certificates of births and other vital events to be processed and tabulated has resulted in excessive time lags in the publication of these reports.

National income and analysis of business trends; State and local governments: The Office of Business Economics in the Department of Commerce is responsible for making estimates of the national income and gross national product and other national accounts. A small increase is included in the budget for the fiscal year 1956 for the work of this office on analysis of national economic trends, primarily to provide for use in the national income-product accounts of the results of the business censuses being taken this year.

The quarterly financial reports program, which collects income statements and balance sheets from manufacturing corporations, is one of the important analytic tools for determining present and prospective levels of economic activity. This program is conducted jointly by the Federal Trade Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission. For the fiscal year 1956 the budget provides for increasing the usefulness of this program by enlarging its scope to include mining and trade corporations.

Tabulations of income-tax returns by the Internal Revenue Service are used as benchmarks for most current series on the financial condition of business and for major components of the national income and product accounts.

State and local governments in toto represent an important segment of the national economy, spending over $30 billion a year. For the fiscal year 1956 the budget provides for filling a gap in our information in this area by including funds for the Bureau of the Census to develop annual State-by-State estimates of expenditures, receipts, and changes in debt of State and local governments.

Electronic equipment development: Efforts in the fiscal year 1956 directed toward developing specialized electronic equipment for use in the censuses of business, manufactures, and mineral industries scheduled for 1958 and the censuses of population, housing, and agriculture scheduled for 1960 will result in significant reductions in the costs of these censuses and in the time required between enumeration and publication of many of the basic tabulations. Funds for development of this equipment are included in the regular 1956 budget for the Bureau of the Census.

PERIODIC CENSUS PROGRAMS

Censuses of agriculture, business (wholesale and retail trade and the service trades), manufactures, and mineral industries are scheduled at 5-year intervals. These periodic canvasses of all establishments and farms are important to business and agriculture and serve as benchmarks by means of which the accuracy of many Government and private statistical series is maintained, and the trends shown by current series are evaluated. The major costs of the present censuses, which cover the calendar year 1954, were provided for in the appropriations enacted for the fiscal year 1955. The budget for the fiscal year 1956 includes funds for the completion of these censuses.

An intercensal housing survey to be made by the Bureau of the Census is also included in the budget for the fiscal year 1956. This survey will obtain needed information on the number and characteristics of the Nation's housing units, and on changes in the amount of housing since the 1950 decennial census of housing.

Direct obligations for major economic statistical programs, by agency

[In millions]

Agency	1954 actual	1955 estimate	1956 estimate
CURRENT PROGRAMS			
Department of Agriculture:			
Agricultural Marketing Service: Marketing research and agricultural estimates	$8.4	$10.2	$11.0
Agricultural Research Service: Economics of production, included under farm and land management research	1.3	1.4	1.5
Department of Commerce:			
Bureau of the Census	6.8	6.2	7.4
Business and Defense Services Administration: Construction statistics, included under industry divisions	.1	.1	.9
Office of Business Economics	.9	.9	1.0
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Public Health Service: National Office of Vital Statistics	1.3	1.3	1.4
Department of Labor: Bureau of Labor Statistics	$5.5	$5.4	$5.8
Department of the Treasury: Internal Revenue Service: Statistical reporting	1.6	1.7	1.7
Federal Trade Commission: Financial reports, included under economic and financial reports	.1	.1	.3
Securities and Exchange Commission:			
Preparation of operational and business statistics	.2	.1	.2
Total, current programs	26.2	27.4	32.2
PERIODIC CENSUS PROGRAMS			
Department of Commerce: Bureau of the Census:			
Census of agriculture	------	16.0	6.0
Censuses of business, manufactures, and mineral industries	------	8.4	4.7
Intercensal housing survey	------	------	.5
Spot checks of business, manufactures, and agriculture	1.5	------	------
Total, periodic census programs	1.5	24.4	11.2
Total, major economic statistical programs	27.7	51.8	43.4

Direct obligations for major economic statistical programs, by agency—Con.

[In millions]

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. WRIGHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

AN INVITATION TO THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES TO ADDRESS CONGRESS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the Federal courts and their problems have not received the degree of attention from Members of Congress which their importance deserves. As a result, who has been injured? Primarily, it has been the litigants, large and small, thousands of whom each year bring their problems and controversies to the courts to be resolved.

One method of improving this situation, albeit a controversial one, is to extend an invitation to the Chief Justice of the United States to address both Houses of Congress each year, regarding the problems and needs of the courts and judicial officers, and any legislation relating thereto.

I am convinced that, on balance, such a move would be constructive and would yield rich dividends. It would strengthen rather than weaken the judiciary. It would alert the Members of Congress and the country to the importance of the judicial branch of government.

Beginning with Lafayette, the Congress has heard scores of representatives of foreign countries. Certainly the

highest judicial officer of our own country is equally entitled to the careful attention of the legislative branch.

The judicial conference, made up of the Chief Justice and the chief judges of the courts of appeal, is now required by law to make an annual report to the Congress. To that extent, this suggestion to hear the Chief Justice is no innovation. The difficulty with the present plan is that the report of the Judicial Conference is received and filed and probably never read by any Member of Congress. An address by the Chief Justice obviously would not receive that kind of a brushoff.

It is my hope that this suggestion will meet with wide bipartisan support. It is not a matter into which politics should in any way be injected. I am happy that many Democratic Members of Congress have already expressed their approval of such a move.

Under leave granted, I include a splendid editorial from the Washington Star supporting the proposal to extend this invitation to the Chief Justice:

SPOKESMAN AND AUDIENCE

An annual address to a joint session of Congress by the Chief Justice, reporting to the people on the Federal judiciary, would be an appropriate capstone of other helpful reforms made possible by Congress to strengthen independence of the judiciary.

One of these was creation in 1922 of the Conference of Senior Circuit Judges, a step toward vesting the courts with management of their own business affairs. The Conference was made responsible for annually surveying conditions within the courts and determining what courts were in need of the help that the courts themselves could supply, principally in the exchange of judges between circuits and districts to supply additional manpower to those that were overburdened.

This step, however, pointed up an anomalous condition: Whereas responsibility of maintaining efficiency within the courts lay with the courts themselves, the authority of management lay with the Department of Justice, a part of the executive branch, which prepared and submitted to Congress the court budget. To remove that anomaly Congress, in 1939, created the Judicial Conference of the United States and the Administrative Office of United States Courts. With this machinery, the courts were given authority to prepare their own budget, subject to review but not change by the Budget Bureau, and to supervise appropriated expenditures. The Chief Justice was obligated to submit to Congress an annual report of the proceedings of the Conference, and its recommendations for legislation.

Both steps have strengthened the principle of the separate and equal branches of our Government. The logical next step, lending even greater dignity and additional significance to that principle, would be appearance of the Chief Justice before a joint session of Congress to report in person on conditions within the judiciary. It is gratifying that the idea is receiving the support of distinguished men inside and out of Congress, and that expressed objections will be studied and discussed.

Some of the objections seem more cynical than realistic. The thought that appearance of the Chief Justice before Congress would inject political considerations into this relationship is difficult to comprehend. The safeguard against that possibility lies in the character of our public servants, not in the method chosen for formal communication between the judicial and legislative branches. The spokesman for the courts is the Chief Justice, and in reporting on conditions within the courts, he should speak to the people through their representatives in the Congress. The courts need such a spokesman, to address such an audience.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which would authorize the armed services to recognize the professional status of men who are registered nurses, by giving them Reserve commissions.

This legislation has been called equal rights for men, in that it gives status to men which only women now enjoy in the armed services. It is in a sense a reversal of the normal problem of discrimination between men and women in the occupations.

Today, only women can receive commissions as nurses. This has relegated many men with full nurse training to tasks as corpsmen, wardmen, and litterbearers, and they receive only enlisted men's ratings. It is a sad waste of vital manpower, for there are some nursing jobs for which men are best fitted, as in such wards as psychiatry and on combat assignments.

This was illustrated most recently during the fighting in Indochina last year. A gallant French woman nurse was trapped in the fortress of Dien Bien Phu and she was subsequently taken prisoner. A military commander, knowing of the tremendous risks involved, would never have intentionally placed a woman's life in such jeopardy. Nevertheless, fighting men need trained graduate nurses at the front. If these nurses were men they could be assigned to combat areas alongside their fighting comrades.

In all health fields, both military and civilian, we need all the nurses we can get, male and female. Giving the male nurse Reserve commissions would grant proper recognition to these men and would strongly influence more well-qualified men to enroll in schools of nursing. It would also free many women nurses to remain in civilian hospitals.

I shall hope for favorable action in the near future.

AMENDMENT OF THE McCARRAN-WALTER IMMIGRATION LAW

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am today filing a bill to amend the immigration law. The same bill has been filed in the Senate. The President of the United States in his state of the Union message stated that there were inequities in the present law, and urged that they be corrected.

Bills to amend this law were filed in the last Congress, but were not acted upon. Prompt action should now be taken to eradicate from the law provisions which have worked great hardship on citizens of friendly countries who want to come to America. I refer particularly to the present quota system, which makes it virtually impossible for persons of certain nationalities to obtain visas to the United States.

In approaching this subject, we should bear in mind that we are not dealing with statistics. We are dealing with flesh and blood humans, many of whom have relatives in this country. To have their entry snarled up by procedural difficulties is not only unfair but a real tragedy for countless thousands of individuals who have already known their share of suffering.

This bill, among other things, provides that quotas are to be determined on the basis of the 1950 census instead of on the 1920 census as is now the procedure. It provides for certain pooling of unused quotas, and their allocation in the next succeeding fiscal year. It corrects administrative deficiencies, permits no exclusion without a hearing, and provides for judicial review in exclusion and deportation cases.

The need for amendment of the present law is pointed up by the number of private bills acted on by the House Committee on the Judiciary. These bills are passed to relieve injustices caused by the present law. The number favorably acted on by the last 5 Congresses were 14, 80, 81, 729, 753.

GEN. DOUGLAS MacARTHUR

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include a copy of a bill introduced by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, on January 26, 1955, a great American will celebrate his 75th birthday. General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, who served as supreme commander in Pacific areas during World War II and in Japan in the years following the war, will be honored at a civic dinner in Los Angeles, Calif., on that date.

It is my thought, Mr. Speaker, that a grateful nation should take additional action to commend him for his years of service. To further that purpose, I am introducing a bill today to revive the office of General of the Armies of the United States. This is the rank which was conferred upon the late General Pershing following World War I. In such a position, the Nation had the benefit of his experience and advice in the years following his active service, including the period of World War II. To date, no such promotion has been given to any of the World War II officers, although a number of them hold the rank of General of the Army, the five-star rank which was created during World War II.

I urge that the Congress and its appropriate committees take prompt action to pass this bill with the hope that General MacArthur could be appointed to such rank on his 75th birthday.

My bill contains a limitation in that the rank would be conferred upon only one officer who served on foreign soil during World War II.

It is interesting to refer to the precedents which exist. In 1866 U. S. Grant was promoted to the rank of general as a reward for his service in the Civil War. Previously, in 1799, Congress passed an act authorizing the appointment of a general of the armies of the United States which would have allowed the promotion of George Washington to such rank but his name was never sent to the Senate. It would appear that General Pershing was the only Army officer appointed to the rank of General of the Armies. In view of the precedent of honoring our military commanders, I urge enactment of my bill.

The text of the bill follows:

A bill to revive the office of general of the armies of the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That the office of general of the armies of the United States is hereby revived, and the President is hereby authorized, in his discretion and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint to said office a general officer of the Army who, on foreign soil and during World War II, has been especially distinguished in the higher command of military forces of the United States; and the officer appointed under the foregoing authorization shall receive pay in the sum of $ per year and such allowances as the President shall deem appropriate; and any provision of existing law that would enable any other officer of the Army to take rank and precedence over said officer shall not be effective: *Provided*, That no more than one appointment to office shall be made under the terms of this act.

YALTA AND POTSDAM CONFERENCES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOSCH] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, on January 16, 1953, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 22, the subject matter of which calls for the full disclosure and reexamination of the secret agreements arrived at in 1945 at the Yalta and Potsdam conferences. Unfortunately, this resolution failed of action by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Recently much has been reported about the State Department release on the Yalta agreement. However, to date the publication of this agreement has not been forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to avoid the pitfalls of the past and destroy, before it is too late, the laying of the keel of world war III, which will surely result unless the inequities which these agreements have sown are corrected, I believe that the House concurrent resolution which I am today reintroducing should be passed.

It is a known fact that at the Yalta Conference, Russia was given the Japanese Kurile Islands which flank the Great Circle Route to Japan and the southern half of Sakhalin Island, in addition to domination of Manchuria and recognition of Outer Mongolia as a Red dependency. By this agreement Russia was given control of Manchuria's ports and railways and thereby permitted to loot $2 billion worth of equipment from factories in Manchuria. At the time of this conference this action was justified as concessions to enlist Soviet aid in the war against Japan. Subsequent recorded history indicates that in the opinion of military experts her participation in the war was unnecessary since the Japanese surrendered within a few days of Soviet Russia's entry into said war. This conference was also responsible for the infamous partition of Poland and the promise of free elections in Poland, Albania, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Czechoslovakia, all of which resulted in their becoming Russian satellites. Agreements were allegedly reached that Germans of East Central Europe should not be deprived of their homes and lands. The abrogation of these agreements have definitely created the tremendous expellee and displaced persons problems which today have caused such anxiety and concern.

The Potsdam agreement set down certain provisions for the purported purpose of establishing a firm foundation for the future peace discussions and treaties. It provided for certain matters to be left for future consideration, such as the final establishment of German-Polish frontier. It is a matter of record that Russia has repeatedly maintained that the Oder-Neisse line constitutes the definite German-Polish frontier and has approved the incorporation of territory east of this line into Poland. There are similar instances which may be cited with respect to Austria, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania. However, in the interest of time and to avoid repetition of material facts with which I am sure the membership is fully familiar, I will not further discuss the inequities which have arisen. No one will dispute that Russia has willfully and consistently disregarded the provisions of these agreements whenever and wherever it has found it convenient to do so.

I should like to point out, the Senate resolution of March 1952, which, in recommending ratification of the Japanese Peace Treaty, specifically repudiated any American recognition of any Soviet rights in former Japanese territories or in Manchuria, and the notes sent to Moscow in September 1952 in a joint action by the Truman administration and the governments of Britain and France, repudiating in effect the Potsdam agreement as valid only for the initial control period and invalid under the radically altered conditions of today. I might say too, that I am aware that Great Britain has expressed her intention of abiding by the Yalta agreement. That may well be her position, but I say in like spirit that the United States should do what is best for her own interest in adhering to the principles of the Atlantic Charter and to preserve and to strengthen the well-being of her own citizens and to guard the precious heritage of our forefathers.

GENERAL OF THE ARMY DOUGLAS MacARTHUR

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced in the House of Representatives a joint resolution which would authorize the President of the United States to designate General of the Army Douglas MacArthur as General of the Armies of the United States.

This great soldier, scholar, diplomat, and patriot will celebrate his 75th birthday on January 26 of this year.

It is my hope that the Congress will extend this honor on this birthday anniversary. He is truly one of our most deserving sons, whose life span has encompassed many of the most stirring moments in our history.

As a Nation we can be thankful that the talents of our great soldiers surge beyond the boundaries of the battlefield, that in peace as well as in war the shield of their ability and bravery continues to glow with the brightness of great deeds.

Our debt to Gen. Douglas MacArthur will not be paid by this honor—this recognition—for we as a Nation owe him much. The United States demanded much of General MacArthur, and he has been unfailing in his devotion to duty, regardless of the weight of the burden we placed upon him.

Twice in global wars, he has borne the shock of enemy shell. Twice he has carried the burden of freedom on his shoulders in the face of overwhelming odds.

His exploits in World War I may be dim in the memory of many of us. But his valiant record on Europe's battlefields is written in history. The whole world knows of his feats in the Pacific in World War II. The daring, the courage, and the genius of MacArthur planned and guided the way for the magnificent comeback victory. His great Pacific campaign will make Hollandia, New Guinea, Leyte, Lingayen Gulf, and the Battle of the Philippines live forever in the memory of all Americans.

History can never dim the accomplishments of this man, for there will always be imbedded for him alongside the words freedom, honor, and country, the enduring tribute, "He was there."

In designating Douglas MacArthur General of the Armies of the United States, our Government will be demonstrating some measure of the affection, esteem, and appreciation in which the people hold him.

Let us honor this man for the great American that he truly is.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MEADER asked and was given permission to address the House for 20

minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

TELEVISING PRESS CONFERENCES

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President for the first time in history had a televised press conference.

Today I have introduced a resolution to amend the rules of the House, one of the outstanding features of which would be to permit committees in their discretion to telecast and broadcast their committee hearings.

I think it was a fine thing that the President did have his press conference televised. The American people are entitled to know about what goes on in Washington not only in the executive branch of the Government but also in the legislative branch of the Government.

I have continually stressed the importance of strengthening the Congress and restoring its prestige as the policymaking agency of our Government.

One of the most effective ways of enhancing the public acceptance of the Congress is to do everything possible to make the public familiar with the activities of the Congress. I think the American people generally are unaware of the importance of committees in the legislative process and are not sufficiently familiar with the manner in which committees operate. Telecasting and broadcasting the hearings of committees will do more than any other single thing to bring the work of the Congress closer to the people. At the same time, through the wider and more effective dissemination of information on the problems dealt with by committees, the electorate will become better informed.

If activities of the executive branch of the Government are widely publicized while those in the legislative branch are hidden in relative obscurity, the gravitation of political power toward the executive and away from the legislative branch will be intensified, rather than minimized, as it should be.

Let me say that this situation is particularly applicable to the House of Representatives. In the 82d Congress, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 1, pages 1334–1335, our present Speaker, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, who was the Speaker at that time, in response to a parliamentary inquiry by Minority Leader MARTIN, expressed the opinion that broadcasting and telecasting committee hearings was not permissible under the rules of the House.

As we all know, the other body has no such practice and Senate committee hearings have been widely broadcast and telecast.

The problem did not arise in the House in the 83d Congress since the Speaker, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., indicated informally that he would be inclined to rule that House committees had the power to telecast or broadcast their hearings if they so elected, and many committee hearings were broadcast and telecast.

Now that Speaker RAYBURN again will interpret and apply the rules of the House in the 84th Congress, this problem again becomes acute. Although I know of no expression of opinion on his part, I assume that his interpretation of the rules in the absence of express action by the House itself will be the same as it was in February of 1952.

Let us contemplate what will happen if the activities of the executive branch of the Government and the Senate are widely publicized while news of House committee activities reaches the public only through newspapers, periodicals, and radio and television commentators.

If House committees are denied the very powerful media of communication of live or recorded broadcasting and telecasting, as well as newsreel moving pictures, the public will come to know less and less of the activities of the House and its committees as compared with the activities of the Senate and its committees and the activities of the executive branch of the Government.

I should very much dislike to see the House of Representatives lose its relative position in the public mind through failure to utilize these new and powerful instruments of communication—television and radio—to bridge the gap between the citizenry of the country and its lawmakers.

I sincerely hope that the Committee on Rules and the leadership of the House will give serious thought to the amendment of the rules I have proposed so as to strengthen committees, to facilitate their functioning, and to publicize their activities.

The text of House Resolution 99 is as follows:

House Resolution 99

Resolved, That rule XI 25 (a) of the Rules of the House of Representatives is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) The rules of the House are hereby made the rules of its committees so far as applicable, with the following exceptions:

"(1) A motion to recess from day to day is hereby made a motion of high privilege in such committees.

"(2) Each committee is authorized to create subcommittees, with such powers and duties and subject to such limitations as it deems advisable.

"(3) Each committee is authorized to adopt rules in addition to, but not inconsistent with, the rules of the House.

"(4) Each committee is authorized to fix a lesser number than a majority of its entire membership, but not less than two members, which shall constitute a quorum thereof for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

"(5) Each committee is authorized, in its discretion, upon such terms and conditions as it deems advisable, to permit the broadcasting and telecasting of its proceedings by radio and television, and the dissemination of news of such proceedings by other methods and media of communication."

SEC. 2. Rule XI 25 (c) of the Rules of the House of Representatives is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) All committee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the Member serving as chairman of the committee; and such records shall be the property of the House. Each committee is authorized to have printed and bound testimony and other date presented at hearings held by the committee. No evidence received in executive hearings, or material received by the committee upon a confidential basis, shall be published, released, or divulged except by order of the committee."

SEC. 3. Rule XI 25 (e) of the Rules of the House of Representatives is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "Until so reported, no findings, conclusions, or recommendations of the committee shall be published, released, or divulged except by order of the committee."

THE CONGRESSIONAL INTERN PROGRAM

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in two instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues may be interested to learn more about the congressional intern program sponsored by the American Political Science Association.

Last year 6 young men and women served internships in congressional offices. This year there are 10, including 1 on my own staff. The program will be continued next year, with 10 newspaper, radio, television, and political science people from 25 to 30 years old participating.

Through a grant from the Edgar B. Stern family fund of New Orleans, La., the American Political Science Association is able to make available free of charge the services of these interns. They do a variety of jobs, including research, writing, handling constituent inquiries, and preparing legislation.

This is a program which will help increase the understanding of Congress by people in communities throughout the Nation. It is a grassroots program, which envisions that these young men and women will spend 9 months of practical work on Capitol Hill. Then, when they return to their university campuses, newspapers, or radio and television stations, they will be better informed about Congress and able to help interpret the legislative process.

I hope that my colleagues will encourage capable young people whom they know, to apply for next year's program before the deadline for applications on February 1. Applicants who are political scientists are required to have graduate training or experience in public affairs; journalists applying must have a bachelor of arts degree and at least 2 years of professional experience. Preference is given to applicants between 25 and 30 years old. Application forms can be obtained from the American Political Science Association, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C.

This congressional intern program attempts to give these young people a variety of experience in both the House and the Senate. After the group arrives on November 1, it spends a month in

the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. On December 1 the interns begin tours of duty in the offices of their choice, working on the staffs of Members of both Houses and of committees.

This year's interns, and their current assignments, are:

Clifford D. Coover, night editor of the Bozeman (Mont.) Chronicle, working with Senator BARRY GOLDWATER.

John T. Dempsey, instructor in political science at the University of Detroit, working with Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

Louis B. Fleming, reporter with the Pasadena (Calif.) Star-News, working in my office.

William C. Gibbons, of Harrisonburg, Va., a graduate student at Princeton University, working with Representative SIDNEY R. YATES.

Marvin A. Harder, instructor in political science at the University of Wichita, working with Senator WALTER F. GEORGE.

Daniel B. Jacobs, of the Lowell Institute Cooperative Broadcasting Council, working with Representative THOMAS L. ASHLEY.

William A. Kirk, instructor in political science at Huston-Tillotson College, Austin, Tex., working with Senator PAUL DOUGLAS.

Richard T. Mittauer, of radio and television stations WOW in Omaha, Nebr., working with Senator ROMAN HRUSKA.

Eli Rapaich, of Lewiston, Idaho, who holds a master of laws degree from Yale University, working with the Senate Antimonopoly Subcommittee.

William L. Rivers, instructor in journalism at Louisiana State University and reporter for the Baton Rouge (La.) State-Times, working with Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT.

INTERNAL SECURITY

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues a bill which I introduced today to establish a 12-man bipartisan Commission on Internal Security. The President is authorized to appoint four members to this Commission as is also the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House. No more than 2 of the 4 members appointed by any 1 of the appointing officers shall be from the same political party. Six members must be appointed from private life.

This Commission on Internal Security would be authorized to make a thorough and objective survey of our Government's loyalty and security programs. It would evaluate the program's effectiveness up to this time, and make recommendations regarding improvements in the present program. In preparing its studies, evaluations, and recommendations the Commission is directed to give special attention to the problem of insuring Government security, and at the same time protecting the rights and privileges of individual governmental employees.

This survey might answer many questions in which the Congress has a legitimate and continuing interest:

First. Has the loyalty-security proven effective in preventing the employment of unsuitable individuals and in removing them?

Second. Has this program unduly impaired any of the traditional rights of all American citizens?

Third. Could these rights be better protected by additional judicial procedures without impairing the effectiveness of the program?

Fourth. Should the Government provide legal assistance to those employees who are financially unable to provide their own legal counsel?

Fifth. Should a governmentwide appeals board be established for these cases?

Sixth. Should the security-risk program be handled separately from the question of loyalty risks?

In closing, I should like to point out that I have previously urged that the President appoint an independent commission to examine this whole problem. I have today introduced this bill so that the Congress may express its own views on the importance of instituting a responsible, nonpartisan review of our overall program.

A BILL TO PROVIDE MARKETING QUOTAS IN TERMS OF QUANTITY RATHER THAN ACREAGE

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, no one who went through the depression of 1932–34 and saw the results on all business because of a bankrupt agriculture wants that to happen again. Some form of price support at this time is inevitable and the job for Congress to do is to figure out the best way of doing it.

A lot has been said about the plan of an ever-normal granary—that is to always have enough left over from one crop year to the next so that, should crops fail in some areas, the old grain would take care of the shortage. But Congress has not worked out this ever-normal granary at all.

It goes against commonsense to try to work a plan that prevents farmers from producing. When farmers have the soil and the season is favorable for crops, does it not seem a little odd to have the Secretary of Agriculture say to the farmers, "Nope, you can put in only 40 acres on your 320-acre farm, because I am afraid you will raise too much, and I don't know how to get rid of the surplus?" He further says, "That is the only way to get a fair price—make the commodity scarce." That is the same old imbecilic plan carried out by F. D. R. and Henry Wallace. If you had 6 houses to rent and were not getting rent enough you are directed to burn down 3 of them and make houses scarce, then the rents would go up. That is the scarcity doctrine and it is wrong, and such a plan can never settle the farm problem. At least it has not settled it in 24 years.

If I know anything at all, I know something about farming and the problems of the farmer. When I came to Congress 20 years ago I thought I would like to obtain a place on the Agriculture Committee—at that time I thought men were placed on committees because of merit. My name was presented and it went before the committee on committees. The chairman said, "What is this fellow like, will he follow our leadership? I do not want some wild western insurgent on any committee." Well, that argument worked, and a druggist was named on the Agriculture Committee instead of myself. I, however, received a place on two minor committees, and the first time I bolted the Republican leaders and voted my convictions, I was summarily removed from all committees. I speak of this situation to indicate that if I ever did know anything about what should be done to solve the farm problem, I have never had a chance to do it through a committee. The question is becoming more tangled each day, and I have decided to race in where angels fear to tread and present a plan that I am confident will work if honestly tried.

There are two main objects sought to be attained in H. R. 748.

First. There should be no limit placed on production.

Second. The present method of handling the farm problem has resulted in a movement which will, intentionally or unwittingly, result in the elimination of the small farm, or family-type farm. I feel that when this is done the cornerstone of our whole institution of government will collapse.

Discussing these two objects of the bill, let us turn to No. 1, namely that there should be no limit placed on production. When the season is right and a farmer has the ambition to produce foodstuffs, is it morally right for Congress, through the Secretary of Agriculture, to step in and say to this farmer, "Hold on there, mister, You have 80 acres of land or 160 acres of land or 320 acres of land, but you are commanded, under penalties, to not plant to wheat 12 acres on your 80-acre farm in the eastern section of the United States, or 28 acres on your 160-acre farm in the Middle West, or 63 acres on your 320-acre farm out in the western arid belt." The farmer does not plant any more than he is told to plant or he will be yanked out of his overalls by some court procedure. He raises a good crop on his small acreage that year, but the next year he has a failure, due to no act of his own. In that situation he is down and out, and will have to get a Government seed loan if he is going to put in the same acreage next year.

The terms of the bill I have introduced provide that when a farmer has the land and he thinks the season is favorable, he puts in all the crops he wants to. There will be no acreage allotment; no army of surveyors ravaging the countryside, walking over crops and drawing Government salary and expenses, to determine if some smart farmer has planted 1⅞ acres too much. This bill gets rid of this army.

At the beginning of a crop season, the Secretary determines about how much wheat will be required to meet the needs of the people in this country, and an individual farmer is given a ticket that he may market, under a protected price of 100 percent of parity, say 2,000

bushels. The farmer gets busy and sows his wheat. The season is favorable and he has raised a good crop, in fact, he has raised 3,000 bushels. He knows he can sell 2,000 bushels at a protected price, but what is to become of this surplus?

He may dispose of it in the following manner:

First, he may store this surplus on his farm at his own expense. In case the following season is unfavorable and through no fault of his own he produced only 1,000 bushels the next year—and this situation frequently happens in the arid West—then he can use his stored grain of 1,000 bushels to replace his shortage of the following year.

If he raises more than 3,000 bushels in that good year, say 5,000 bushels, he has 2,000 bushels more than needed to make up his quota.

He can feed this surplus, or eat it, seed it, but he cannot sell it on the market.

He can negotiate with the Government where the Government is giving away wheat to foreign countries, which is much more sane than to give away dollars, and the price the Government allows him for this wheat is 50 percent of the market price. We have given away and spent on our foreign crusade about $800 million. If we had seen fit to use a little judgment and given them wheat instead of dollars, the United States could have saved several billion dollars and there would be no surplus.

On the second purpose of the bill, namely to protect the family-type farm and not let it drop out of sight and depopulate the farm belt, and dry up all business in that area, the bill provides that there shall be no restraint at all on small farms of 80 acres east of the 93d principal meridian, 160 acres east of the 99th principal meridian, and 320 acres west of that meridian, or the arid belt of the United States. On these farms the Government is commanded to keep hands off. The army of measuring experts from Columbia and Harvard have disappeared and the farmer's trips to court have ended, and he proceeds to live on his land and rear his family. The businessmen in the small towns have customers, vacant schoolhouses are reopened, the tax base increases, and the counties can pay their officers, schoolteachers, and build roads. Compare this picture with some counties in my own State of North Dakota today: Schoolhouses deserted, no money for roads, and the county officers and schoolteachers underpaid.

The United States cannot last if the population of the farm belt is destroyed. That is exactly what will happen if this acreage cutting continues. The large operators can stand it, but the small ones cannot. The large operator has one home, in many cases outside of the State entirely, no people on his broad acres except the operators of tractors. The people who raise our children, educate them, the merchants who serviced these farms, all have disappeared.

This bill will provide an ever-normal granary. This bill restocks the farm belt with people. Schoolhouses and church buildings, now vacant, standing as sentinels of a once proud agricultural community, will be opened. Stores will be opened, roads will be built, and it is not hard to visualize that a happy community will take the place of endless lines of tractors. It is comparatively easy to conquer a country with nothing in it but power machinery, but when people are fighting for their homes, the defense of the United States is secure.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ROOSEVELT asked and was given permission to address the House on Monday next for 20 minutes, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

STOCKPILING ANTHRACITE

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Defense now announces a program to exchange butter for Russian manganese. In March 1954 the President declared the creation of a very important commission for a long-range program for the stockpiling of strategic material. Of the findings of that commission we have not as yet been advised completely. I presume the Secretary thinks we can understand the difference between butter and manganese as not too involved for our immature minds and not as complicated as the more delicate problems of international relations.

I would like to point out the same Department has consistently opposed my bill to stockpile anthracite coal, the basic fuel potential for defense in America in case of the outbreak of war, when oil and gas will be limited for such consumption and prohibited for domestic heating and non-defense uses. Certainly at this time to now trade butter for manganese would suggest the next step of the distinguished Secretary will be to trade butter for anthracite coal, a distressed industry in this Nation, when manganese and coal are mined in Russia by slave labor, and it may be by many American prisoners of war. Mr. Secretary, there will be no use to send my people butter for our coal because we do not have the bread to put it on, since the same leadership wants to import residual fuel oil without reasonable restraint from Venezuela—a sea lane which submarines will stop in case of war—and residual fuel oil is a deadly enemy of the coal industry.

If Acheson or Truman had ever made this suggestion made yesterday by Wilson, the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle would be screaming for their impeachment.

Anthracite coal in spite of what the Department of Defense thinks is a most vital and strategic material and Secretary Wilson should be the first to support my bill to stockpile such coal—butter or no butter.

If the Secretary of Defense wants to be a butter-and-egg man, then let him look to the defense potential of the Pennsylvania coal fields about 200 miles from his office door, with coal dug by American miners, not slave laborers, who when they can earn a dollar pay their share to the United States Treasury in taxes, which provide the subsidy to stockpile butter to trade for Russian manganese for another Alice in Wonderland operation.

Let it be noted that the Russians need the butter much worse than we need the manganese—the Reds are in bad shape for food and commodities, and this move of the Secretary of Defense plays right into the Soviet hands and stomach.

MEMBERS OF OBJECTORS' COMMITTEES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce to the House the appointment of the official Democratic objectors on the Consent Calendar as follows:

The distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. DEANE, chairman of the committee on Consent Calendar objectors; the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. ASPINALL; and the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. BOLAND.

On the Private Calendar objectors on the Democrats side: Chairman, Mr. ROBERTS, of Alabama; Mr. JARMAN, of Oklahoma; and Mr. BOLAND, of Massachusetts.

COST OF PRODUCTION OF FARM COMMODITIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to authorize a nationwide survey of the costs of production of major farm commodities.

The purpose of this bill is to make it possible to obtain scientific information on what it costs the farmer to produce a bushel of wheat, a pound of cotton, or a bushel of corn.

We have heard a great deal of talk in recent years about a fair price to the farmer. But we have had no scientific facts on which to base our conclusions.

It is time for us to obtain a yardstick on which to legislate. That is my reason for introducing this measure.

The bill directs the Secretary of Agriculture to have a survey made in each State to determine the unit cost of production on family farms of the principal commodities, including wheat, cotton, corn, tobacco, rice, peanuts, beef cattle and calves, milk and butterfat, lambs,

chickens, hogs, eggs, fruit, rye, oats, and many others.

The survey is to be conducted in several areas of each State so as to insure coverage of a sufficient number of family farms to be representative. The Secretary is to use land-grant colleges to make the surveys, wherever that is practicable.

Labor performed by the farm operator and his family is to be taken into account in determining the unit cost of production.

The Secretary is directed to report the progress and results of his findings to the Congress and the President at least once during each year. A final report is to be made by the Secretary when the surveys in all States have been completed.

ASSIGNMENTS TO COMMITTEES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 96) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That E. L. BARTLETT, the Delegate from Alaska, is hereby elected an additional member of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives: Committee on Agriculture, Committee on Armed Services, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; and that ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN, the Resident Commissioner to the United States from Puerto Rico, is hereby elected an additional member of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives: Committee on Agriculture, Committee on Armed Services, and Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PRIORITY FOR TRADE

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is again approaching the consideration of a foreign trade policy for the United States. The President has submitted his recommendations to the Congress. This year's message—by and large—constitutes a reaffirmation of the recommendations the President made last year and upon which the Congress failed to take constructive action. It is my belief that our failure to take positive action in liberalizing our trade policy has had in the past 2 years and is continuing to have a serious detrimental effect upon the United States position as a leader of the free world alliance. In addition, it is clear that expanding trade is vital to continue our dynamic and expanding economy at home. It is, therefore, reassuring not only to the country but to the world to note that the Democratic leadership of this Congress has indicated top priority for this legislation.

UNITED STATES TRADE DECISION VITAL

The doctrinal arguments for free trade and for protection are well known to the Congress. They have been stated and restated for many years. However, I believe a doctrinal approach to this vital question obscures rather than clarifies the real issue. The issue is not between free trade and protection; rather the issue is whether we will recognize that our foreign trade policy is an integral part of our foreign policy. In this global conflict our trade policy can be a vital instrument in cementing free world relationships. Contrariwise, a restrictive trade policy can do much to discourage free world unity. Our decision this year will not be a decision for an American trade policy alone. In reality it will be a decision for world trade policy and of free world economic cooperation. Since American trade constitutes about 20 percent of world trade and, in turn, influences much of the remaining 80 percent, our decision will vitally affect the trade and economies of the entire world. Therefore, I think we must recognize that what we do here this year will to a very large degree affect the trade patterns of the world. What we do here this year will be largely irrevocable. As trade patterns jell as the result of our decision, the market relationships will not be easily altered.

THE RUSSIAN TRADE OFFENSIVE

As we approach this decision, I think we should soberly consider the fact that for 2 long years the Soviet Union has been utilizing the tactics of trade agreements as a means of attempting to split the free world. That they have had success in negotiating trade agreements is undeniable. While we have stumbled, faltered, and indicated to the world our lack of ability to make up our collective minds, the Communist countries have negotiated a series of trade pacts. We need go no further than the October 1952 Congress of the U. S. S. R. to find that this is in fact a technique to divide the free world. Therefore, I am sure we can agree that a decision indicating some stability in American trade policy is not only needed but imperative at the earliest possible date.

We have heard a great deal in recent years about the urgent need to meet the Communist threat in the world both externally and internally. We hear many people scream and beat their breasts about how anti-Communist they are—but yet they apparently fail to see that the Soviet use of trade is a weapon in the international sphere. Not only is the Soviet trade offensive a part of their pattern to conquer the world, but, more discouraging, for 2 years they have been relatively successful in their use of this technique. One of the reasons they have been successful is our own lack of capacity to come to a decision on this question. Our allies in Europe and the Far East must trade in order to remain strong and to continue to grow economically. For example, if Japan does not gain entrance to markets in the West, she must turn again toward China and the Soviet Union.

TRADE DECISION NECESSARY FOR FREE WORLD ALLIANCE

The closer our economic relations with our allies, the more stable our political and military relations will be; the weaker our economic relations, the less effective will be the vital imperatives of political and military alliances against the Soviet Union. If we do not offer the markets, it is clear the Soviets will. They hope to split the free world this way. If through our failure and the failure of our allies to develop a trade policy designed to expand the trade of the free world, our allies will be left with inadequate markets and seriously reduced living standards. Already trade agreements have been negotiated between Russia and her satellites and the free world. Since our trade constitutes approximately 20 percent of world trade, our decision is the dominant decision on this issue. This, it seems to me, is the primary, overriding reason for a trade policy permitting expanding trade in the free-world alliance. We must build expanded trade with our allies—offering as well as receiving markets—or, as the President said last year, "we may fail in all."

UNITED STATES INDUSTRIES DEPENDENT ON TRADE

Turning to the domestic side of this question, I would like to briefly outline the oft-repeated arguments for expanded trade in terms of our domestic economy. Such industries as automotive, textiles, machinery, machine tools, diesel engines, trucks, tractors, oilfield machinery, agricultural implements, and many others, depend very heavily upon export. As indicated in the staff papers of the Randall Commission report for example, sewing machines exports 22 percent of its product, motortrucks 15 percent, rolling-mill machinery, 34 percent, and so on. In agriculture the percentage is even higher in many instances; for example, rice 42 percent, cotton 39 percent, wheat 33 percent, and so forth.

Exports of selected commodities as a percentage of United States production

	Percent
Agricultural commodities [1] (1949–51 average):	
Rice	42.6
Cotton	39.0
Wheat	33.5
Inedible tallow	33.3
Grain sorghum	29.5
Soybeans	25.1
Tobacco	25.1
Lard	22.0
Nonagricultural commodities [2] (1951):	
Rolling-mill machinery and parts	34.9
Tractors	22.6
Textile machinery	21.6
Printing machinery and equipment	17.5
Oilfield machinery, tools, and parts	17.3
Office appliances	16.3
Motor trucks and coaches	15.6
Agricultural machinery (except tractors)	11.7

[1] From testimony before the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy by Mr. Alan Kline, Oct. 28, 1953.

[2] Foreign Commerce Weekly, July 27, 1953.

According to the estimates made for the Randall Commission by the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, a total of 4½ million employed persons in this country are dependent upon foreign trade for their livelihood.

Private employment of wage earners and salaried workers attributable to exports from the United States, 1947 (excluding construction industries)

Industry	50 industry I—O codes[1]	Number of employees in nonagricultural industries (in thousands)				Percentage of employees in nonagricultural establishments dependent upon exports	
		Total	Dependent upon exports				
			Total	Directly	Indirectly	Total	Directly
Total	------	37,413.4	[2]2,526.6	1,322.4	1,204.2	6.8	3.5
Food and kindred products	2	1,583.9	95.0	64.9	30.1	6.0	4.1
Tobacco manufacturers	3	104.0	12.6	8.5	4.1	12.1	8.2
Textile-mill products	4	1,050.8	153.8	100.8	53.0	14.5	9.5
Apparel	5	1,396.0	44.7	32.1	12.6	3.2	2.3
Lumber and wood products	6	838.3	57.8	23.4	34.4	6.9	2.8
Furniture and fixtures	7	340.0	8.5	4.1	4.4	2.5	1.2
Paper and allied products	8	464.8	44.6	9.3	35.3	9.6	2.0
Printing and publishing	9	747.2	44.8	8.2	36.6	6.0	1.1
Chemicals	10	694.6	91.0	40.3	50.7	13.1	5.8
Products of petroleum and coal	11	397.1	52.8	19.8	33.0	13.3	5.0
Rubber products	12	270.4	31.9	16.2	15.7	11.8	6.0
Leather and leather products	13	408.5	18.0	9.0	9.0	4.4	2.2
Stone, clay, and glass products	14	598.8	55.1	25.2	29.9	9.2	4.2
Iron and steel	15	964.5	160.1	47.2	112.9	16.6	4.9
Nonferrous metals	16	338.0	47.0	9.1	37.9	13.9	2.7
Plumbing and heating supplies	17	171.1	6.7	4.1	2.6	3.9	2.4
Fabricated structural metal products	18	205.6	10.5	6.0	4.5	5.1	2.9
Other fabricated metal products	19	616.9	70.9	26.5	44.4	11.5	4.3
Agricultural, mining, and construction machinery	20	293.6	57.5	50.5	7.0	19.6	17.2
Metalworking machinery	21	248.3	41.0	27.8	13.2	16.5	11.2
Other machinery except electrical	22	1,019.2	140.6	97.8	42.8	13.8	9.6
Motors and generators	23	128.9	21.1	10.0	11.1	16.4	7.8
Radios	24	201.0	18.9	13.5	5.4	9.4	6.7
Other electrical machinery	25	598.7	52.1	25.7	26.4	8.7	4.3
Motor vehicles	26	776.2	90.0	55.9	34.1	11.6	7.2
Other transportation equipment	27	489.8	57.3	39.7	17.6	11.7	8.1
Professional and scientific equipment	28	264.9	32.1	23.6	8.5	12.1	8.9
Miscellaneous manufacturing	29	460.6	32.7	18.9	13.8	7.1	4.1
Coal, gas, and electric power	30	916.1	87.9	35.7	52.2	9.6	3.9
Railroad transportation	31	1,530.1	172.9	90.3	82.6	11.3	5.9
Ocean transportation	32	220.9	148.2	129.2	19.0	67.1	58.5
Other transportation	33	1,201.9	88.9	38.4	50.5	7.4	3.2
Trade	34	6,984.8	265.4	167.6	97.8	3.8	2.4
Communications	35	619.8	26.0	7.4	18.6	4.2	1.2
Other nonmanufacturing industries	36–44	10,258.1	188.2	35.7	152.5	1.8	.3

[1] The industry classifications indicated in this table do not necessarily coincide with those for which BLS employment data are regularly published.

[2] The total of nonagricultural employment presented in this table differs from the published total owing primarily to the exclusion of construction and Federal and State and local government. A minor difference also results from the use of revised data not as yet reflected in the published BLS total of nonfarm employment for 1947.

Source: U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Division of Interindustry Economics, Nov. 5, 1952.

It is obvious that unless our trade policy permits exporting countries abroad to earn the necessary dollars they will be unable to buy the products of our export industries and the jobs of these people will be in jeopardy.

PROGRESSIVE TRADE POLICY ADVANTAGEOUS TO THE UNITED STATES

What is even more significant is that, on balance, American competitive ingenuity easily competes in the world market in many fields. It is clearly to our advantage to have expanded foreign trade since it will redound to the overall economic advantage of the United States. This may sound like having your cake and eating it too but it seems to me that the arguments for a progressive trade policy lead to that conclusion. It is clearly to our national interest in terms of the political situation in the world today to be the leader in trade policy as well as in political and military policy. It seems equally obvious to me that we stand to gain more by a wide margin than we stand to lose with a progressive trade policy. As with England in the 19th century a liberal trade policy will clearly aid in the growth of the American economy to a very significant degree.

Turning to the other side of the coin there are those people and industries who would be affected by any lowering of tariffs. The most accurate statistics available in the staff papers of the Randall Commission illustrate that the number of workers dependent on tariff protection is much smaller than those workers who depend upon exports. Based on the hypothesis that all tariffs would be temporarily suspended, the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated that approximately 200,000 persons would be adversely affected. This is on the assumption that all tariffs would be suspended which, of course, is a drastic position which is being advocated by no one.

Number of workers producing goods equivalent to increases in annual imports after temporary tariff suspension

[Based on estimated increases in imports in event of tariff suspension, by Howard S. Piquet in Aid, Trade and the Tariff]

Types of import increases in case of tariff suspension and area of employment	Number of workers producing goods equivalent to—					
	Estimated minimum import increases			Estimated maximum import increases		
	Total	Employed in—		Total	Employed in—	
		Nonagricultural industries	Agricultural industries[1]		Nonagricultural industries	Agricultural industries[1]
A. All commodities	189,090	57,360	131,730	404,990	135,040	269,950
1. Direct employment	109,040	40,060	68,980	237,820	97,540	140,280
2. Indirect employment[2]	80,050	17,300	62,750	167,170	37,500	129,670
B. Commodities in "area of maximum import competition"	121,210	36,770	84,440	255,550	85,210	170,340
1. Direct employment	69,900	25,680	44,220	150,070	61,550	88,520
2. Indirect employment	51,310	11,090	40,220	105,480	23,660	81,820
C. Commodities which would be likely to cause some displacement of domestic goods	96,240	23,870	72,370	202,650	57,640	145,010
1. Direct employment	59,660	18,280	41,380	127,730	44,960	82,770
2. Indirect employment	36,580	5,590	30,990	74,920	12,680	62,240

[1] Agricultural employment figures are based upon Bureau of Agricultural Economics data.

[2] Includes estimates of offsetting employment in ocean transportation and insurance arising from assumed import increases.

Source: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Branch of Interindustry Economics.

It is therefore obvious that a gradual program of liberalizing trade barriers would have an adverse effect on a very small number of people in the United States, while at the same time benefiting a great many more people. However, the problem of adjustment would affect a selected number of industries and the workers in them.

GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE NECESSARY FOR READJUSTMENT

Thus, it appears to me that in justice—since this is a decision of the Federal Government—the Federal Government should be concerned that the people and the industries rapidly readjust to more competitive lines. Certainly, the benefiting industries would pick up much of the slack. However, we do recognize that people have gone into the protected industries in good faith based upon the assumption that continued tariff protection would be afforded them. Therefore, if we are to arrive at a national policy which benefits the vast majority but which will have some temporary adverse effects on a small minority, the Federal Government has a responsibility to assure readjustment of the select minority.

With this in mind, I have introduced a trade-adjustment bill. This bill would aid industries presently affected by our tariff policy, as well as those which might be affected in the future. It seems to me that even those who disagree with the proposition I have asserted regarding gradual liberalization of trade barriers will agree that this bill, in itself, is neutral on the trade question. Regardless of what we do on the tariff issue, we all can support this trade-adjustment bill to aid those presently affected by our trade policy.

This bill is not in any sense of the word a compensation bill. It would not authorize compensation to either capital or labor for losses incurred because of import competition. What it seeks to accomplish is facilitation of the necessary adjustments that increased imports in a few cases have made or might in the future make necessary. Such adjustments are, and would be, negligible in comparison with the economy as a whole, and, in the aggregate, would cost very little.

WHAT THE BILL WOULD DO

The bill introduced by Senator KENNEDY and myself would not provide for the establishment of any new Government bureau or agency. It would establish an ad hoc Adjustment Assistance Board consisting of representatives of interested Government departments. The new Board would not duplicate the functions of the Tariff Commission or any other Government body. It would assume responsibility only after the President found it necessary, in the national interest, not to accept findings of injury by the Tariff Commission but to continue the duties in question in effect. Furthermore, the Board would be authorized to invoke the provisions of the act only after the President directed it to do so. If the President thought it best, he could decide not to invoke it and allow the industry and the workers concerned to make whatever adjustments are necessary without Government assistance. He could, of course, choose to follow the recommendations of the Tariff Commission and increase the rate of duty or impose a quota in order to prevent injury, as existing law provides.

Once the President made his decision, the Adjustment Assistance Board would, in those cases where the President so directed, be charged with the responsibility of determining eligibility for the benefits provided for in the bill. The only change this represents is that, at present, the President can and very frequently does refuse to accept Tariff Commission recommendations despite findings of injury. Under this legislation, when he does so, he could invoke the provisions of the act to aid affected industries if he feels that such aid is needed.

The Adjustment Assistance Board would keep in close touch with the situation and whenever in its opinion the benefits provided are no longer necessary, it would order their termination. The intention of the legislation is not to create a new set of vested interests but to facilitate adjustment for affected industries which in all likelihood would occur eventually even in the absence of such assistance. It is neither compensation nor subsidy legislation. It would make easier the adjustments that would occur in the absence of Government assistance. At present, the same decisions by the President leave affected industries completely on their own.

The bill would provide for technical assistance to companies and communities needing it. Such assistance would be directed toward the diversification of output into products less vulnerable to import competition than those that they have been producing. Federal funds would be used to provide consulting engineers, market researchers, and other technicians whose services might prove helpful. This responsibility would be assigned to the Department of Commerce.

The same sort of assistance would be made available to communities. Export industries might be encouraged to establish branch plants in communities that are particularly vulnerable to import competition. In the case of communities, one objective would be to encourage the broadening of the economic base in order to provide as wide a variety of jobs as possible for the population.

In some cases supplementary financing might be necessary. In a number of States privately financed industrial development corporations have been established, and these could be helpful in this connection. One function of the Adjustment Assistance Board would be to facilitate the establishment and functioning of such corporations or similar private bodies. In cases where financing by such means is not forthcoming, the Small Business Administration Act would be amended to permit larger loans for this purpose, if necessary.

Companies found eligible for assistance would also have the privilege of accelerated tax amortization on new plant and equipment for the purpose of introducing new products or expanding production in lines other than those affected by tariff changes.

These proposals follow, in many respects, the recommendations made by Mr. David MacDonald in his statement regarding adjustment to increased imports in the report of the Randall Commission. Mr. MacDonald, president of the United Steel Workers of America, was labor's representative on the Randall Commission. Even though the majority of the Commission did not choose to go along with him in these recommendations, they did think sufficiently well of the recommendations to give them great prominence in the final report of the Commission.

With regard to community adjustment, Mr. MacDonald said:

> Large sectors of expanding American industry have a substantial interest in promoting export trade and, consequently, in lowering barriers to increased imports. Most of these manufacturers are in fast-growing industries and have long-term plans for expanding their plant and equipment. If a number of such firms would undertake to place a relatively small proportion of their branch plant expansion in areas with present or prospective labor surpluses resulting from import competition, selecting from their expansion plans such operations as could economically be located in these areas and still meet their own production and marketing requirements, the problem of unemployment from import competition would be largely solved.
>
> Carrying out a program of this kind under private auspices might be done through an industrial development corporation, fashioned after the community and State industrial development corporations but operating on a national scale. The more that private industry can utilize the skills of these displaced workers through other means the smaller the task left to the Government.

Employees of industries and companies found eligible for assistance under the program outlined in this bill would be made eligible for extended unemployment compensation assistance. Such assistance would be administered through our present Federal-State machinery, but the added assistance would be financed by Federal funds. The bill provides that benefits in cases where adjustment to increased imports is involved should be extended from the present maximum of 26 weeks to a maximum of 52 weeks.

Counseling and placement and special training allowances would also be provided for, together with special moving allowances. Older workers who are unemployable would become eligible for retirement at age 60 rather than at age 65, as at present, without prejudice to their rights at the regular retirement age.

Statements made by other members of the Randall Commission regarding the proposals of Mr. MacDonald indicate that there is keen interest in this approach to the problem. Some members indicated that, although they are in favor of the general idea, they did not see how it could be applied with regard to adjustments made necessary by increased imports while not being available also to assist in making adjustments necessitated by other actions of Government.

I can see some reason for such hesitancy. But does it follow that because there are other cases than those caused by increased imports that are in need of assistance that we should not concentrate at this time upon the one currently before us? It seems to me that rather than holding ourselves back from doing anything, in the absence of a fully rounded program, we should take care of the present problem. That is what this proposed legislation is all about.

IS THIS SOCIALISM?

There may be some who will call the program outlined in this bill socialism. Nothing could be more incorrect. There is nothing compulsory about the assistance provided for in this bill. Nothing in it would give to the State, or any of its representatives, any power to push people around or to force them to shift from one line of activity to another. Instead, it would, in quite democratic fashion, lend a helping hand to those who happen to be situated in uneconomic endeavors. It is not central planning. On the contrary, it would facilitate the adjustments that would occur in the natural course of events in the absence of Government interference. Instead of allowing the natural forces to work themselves out slowly, it would speed them up.

This is the precise opposition of socialism. It would not substitute decisions of the State for decisions by individuals, but would, rather make the decisions of individuals meaningful.

This legislation would, in my opinion, make the individual enterprise system even stronger than it now is, relative to totalitarian systems. It would go a long way toward dissipating unreasoning fear and, at the same time, would strengthen our own economy by bringing the economies of the other countries of the free world closer to ours. Unity here means economic strength. Economic strength makes spiritual courage and determination easier, and, together with the military preparedness that is already underway, such strength can go a long way toward the creation of a truly strong free world.

OUR SO-CALLED RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENT PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. DEANE]. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I want to take the time assigned to me to present the other side of the picture that the gentleman has just presented.

Mr. Speaker, today the United States has the lowest tariff walls in our entire history—almost the lowest tariff walls in the world—with an average tariff rate of 5.1 percent. This is a lower average tariff rate than any one of our principal trade competitors, with the exception of Japan. Today we stand eighth from the bottom of all the nations of the world on tariff rates, while Great Britain, our chief competitor, stands fourth from the top with an average tariff rate of 25.6 percent, exactly 5 times as high as our average tariff rate. We have traveled a long way—a very long way—in the last 60 years, from the position of being one of the highest tariff countries in the world to that of being one of the lowest. Dare we lower our tariff rates still further?

Mr. Speaker, our Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has been in effect exactly 21 years. It has reached its majority. What has it accomplished? It was enacted in order to advance world peace, world prosperity, and amity among nations. Has it done so?

First, Mr. Speaker, has world peace been advanced? During the 21 years the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has been on the books we have had World War II. We have had the Korean incident. We have had the so-called Spanish civil war. We have had 8 years of war in Indochina. We have had trouble between England and Egypt, between India and Pakistan. We have had Communist Russia extending her Iron Curtain beyond her borders until she now has control and domination over 900 million people instead of the 300 million Russians she had domination over at the close of World War II. Can anyone truthfully say world peace has been advanced?

Second, Mr. Speaker, what about world prosperity? Are we any nearer world prosperity today than we were in 1934? To try to bring about world prosperity we have given away over $100 billion in the last 15 years—$60 billion lend-lease during the war and $50 billion since the war—to say nothing of the $200 billion we have spent for national defense in the cold war. Has world prosperity been advanced by the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act? Certainly, our own prosperity has not been advanced, because we are in debt today to the tune of over $300 billion, which is more than all the other nations of the world owe, all put together; and more than twice as much as all the nations of Europe owe, all put together.

Third, Mr. Speaker, what about amity among nations? Is good will or amity among nations any nearer today than it was before 1934? Let us be specific: Has the relationship between France and Germany improved since 1934? Between Pakistan and India? Between Palestine and Arabia? Between Italy and Yugoslavia?—to say nothing about the conditions in the Far East.

What about internal dissensions and strife? Italy with her 36 percent Communist vote in the last election; France with 25 percent of her national legislature composed of Communist members? What about Nationalist China and Communist China? What about England, torn between her Socialist Labor Party and her conservative Churchill Party? Has good will among men and amity among nations been advanced by the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act?

I say, "Not so that anyone can notice it."

Finally, Mr. Speaker, have world-trade barriers been reduced? Do we have a freer flow of goods today across national borders than we had in 1934? Dr. Clair Wilcox, one of the best posted men in America on problems of foreign trade, formerly director of international trade for the State Department, stated in a recent speech:

> The trade of the world today is more tightly regimented than it ever has been before in history, in time of peace.

True, tariff walls have been lowered until today world tariff walls are only about half as high as they were in 1934. But while world tariff walls have been lowered, other obstacles or barriers more effective than tariffs have been erected in their place, such as import and export licenses, trade preferences, currency manipulations, multiple currencies, quotas, subsidies, state trading, and so forth. So, in the face of these facts I ask, what is the use of lowering tariff barriers if the nations of the world erect other and more effective barriers in the place of those that have been lowered? It is a fact, and we must face it, that under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, practically every foreign country that has lowered its tariff duties has erected other barriers against United States imports, thereby nullifying the effect of their tariff concessions or reductions.

Mr. Speaker, the following are some of the general effects of tariff reductions upon our American industries:

First. The American jeweled watch industry has been practically closed out as a result of our tariff reductions since 1934. We formerly had 20 jeweled watch companies in the United States; now we have 3—the Waltham Watch Co., the Elgin Watch Co., and the Hamilton Watch Co. Eighty percent of the American market for jeweled watches has been taken over by Swiss watch manufacturers.

Second. Lowered tariffs in the fresh and frozen fish industry have resulted in such large fish imports at such cheap rates that American fishermen are unable to compete. Some of our largest fish processing plants have moved to other countries where wage rates are lower.

Third. Widespread unemployment is now prevalent in our industries that make chinaware, pottery, glassware, and kitchen articles. All industries classified as handcrafts are affected, industries that depend largely upon hand skills. This is the direct result of tariff reductions and the greatly increased imports of those articles.

Fourth. Thousands of lead and zinc miners are today out of work and on relief because of greatly increased imports of both lead and zinc. Recently our zinc factories have been reducing their working forces or going on a part-time basis because of the importation of processed zinc.

Fifth. An excellent example of the way import licenses work is the American motorcycle. American producers formerly enjoyed a substantial market for motorcycles in Great Britain, in Australia, and in other British areas. The British duty on motorcycles was reduced under the reciprocal trade agreements, but under the British import license system American motorcycles have been absolutely shut out of British markets. No amount of persuasion by would-be American exporters has been able to alter this situation; so today we ship no motorcycles to England or to Australia, but they ship their motorcycles and their bicycles into our ports and have taken over a considerable portion of our American market.

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few samples of the direct result of our reciprocal trade agreements program, and the results are only beginning to become evident. In the face of these facts—and they are cold hard facts—can anyone say that our reciprocal trade agreements program has been a success? Should the program be continued? Should the President be given the power to lower our tariffs still further?

These three questions must be met and answered by the Congress and by the people of the United States. Upon the correct answers to these questions depend the future welfare of this Nation, its economic welfare, its financial welfare, yes, its social and spiritual welfare as well.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial taken from the Richmond Times-

Dispatch of Friday, January 14, 1955—one of the best newspapers in the United States, a dyed-in-the-wool Jeffersonian Democratic newspaper—expresses my position and feelings so well in regard to world tariff problems, that I feel I must include it as a part of my remarks in order to reinforce my position on the tariff question:

President Eisenhower said in his recent message to Congress concerning foreign economic policy: "We and our friends abroad must together undertake the lowering of unjustifiable barriers to trade and investment, and we must do it on a mutual basis so that the benefits may be shared by all."

So far, so good, but the President did not indicate the extent of the discrimination against our goods overseas, and neither do most other American advocates of lowered tariff walls.

It should be noted that many governments are much more socialistic than ours, and hence are in a position to exercise far more control over exports and imports than we do. Great Britain is an example.

The picture there may have changed slightly in the past 18 months, but a summary of the situation in the summer of 1953 appeared in U. S. News & World Report, as follows:

"In Britain, the United States merchant cannot sell autos, radios, or TV sets. He can sell only token amounts of washing machines, refrigerators, vacuum cleaners, dresses, cosmetics, and other nonessentials. He finds the Government regulating trade in cotton, tobacco, machine tools, and other necessities. His customers are bound by quotas and licenses, which tell how much can be bought from the United States and by whom. They need permits for dollars to pay."

Not only is the foregoing true of the country which is perhaps our best friend on the international scene, but Britain has been treating other European countries better than it treats us—Germany, to take one example. Germany is permitted to export automobiles to Britain, for instance, whereas we are forbidden to do so.

It should be pointed out that this latter type of discrimination was put into effect throughout western Europe with the consent of our own authorities, who were seeking to build up European industries so as to get them off the backs of the American taxpayer. Now that those industries have been built up, it seems highly desirable that this type of discrimination be terminated.

Various other devices for keeping out American goods should also be terminated. It would be absurd for us to lower our barriers substantially, while Europe, Japan, and other countries kept theirs virtually stationary, or raised them.

Nor is there any point in minimizing the tremendous obstacles inherent in the socialistic, planned economies of many countries. Controls and economic planning usually go hand in hand.

Mr. Eisenhower's emphasis on mutual concessions is precisely right, but let's never lose sight of the fact that barriers to a free flow of trade are even higher abroad than they are at home. As such, they will have to be brought down proportionately with ours, if any effective and meaningful lowering of these barriers on an international scale is to be had.

THE NATION'S DROUGHT CATASTROPHE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, in the latest issue of the magazine Newsweek a distinguished former colleague of ours who is now Ambassador to Italy is quoted as calling the Democrats troubadours of trouble and crooners of catastrophe.

I have no ambition to be classified by Ambassador Luce or anyone else as a blues singer, but I cannot evade the duty of reporting to the Congress some very alarming facts about our Nation's drought catastrophe.

Most Democrats are aware of the fact that catastrophes are not confined to Wall Street, and economic trouble can appear in other zones of national life besides the stock market. Most Democrats also feel it their duty to bring economic problems of the American people to the attention of Congress, as often and as forcefully as necessary, where our national interest is involved.

I prefer to believe that most Republicans in this House share this breadth of view, and share likewise the Democratic philosophy that any national disaster which is too big for local and State handling is worthy of immediate attention and aggressive action by our Government.

No one can deny the national scope of our drought disaster. At present, 944 counties in 18 States are recognized by the Department of Agriculture as drought emergency areas. The drought area extends from North Carolina westward to Utah and Wyoming, and includes in addition the great States of Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Georgia, Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia.

Farmers home disaster loans have been made available in 8 of these 18 States—Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, New Mexico, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas.

We have had the attention of our National Government, all right, and to a limited extent we have had Federal action.

On the basis of considerable mail as well as first hand observation in the drought areas of Oklahoma, I cannot avoid this conclusion regarding our Federal drought program: Relief has not only been too little and too late, but all too often the relief has been given in the wrong place.

There is strong and mounting evidence that the small farmer and cattleman with limited resources and most urgent need for drought assistance is not receiving substantial help from the present program.

The Department of Agriculture can show some handsome figures on feed assistance and FHA loans, but those of us in hard-hit drought areas can cite far too many instances of wholesale herd liquidations, farm sell-outs and food relief cases.

In my own State, 115,000 people are reported on direct food relief, and the total is expected to reach 125,000 by March 1 of 1955. Farm officials tell me that more than one-half of these people are farmers and their families.

I know the farm people of Oklahoma, and I know they would not seek food relief at the courthouse, except in real emergency.

There are hungry people in Oklahoma today, and they number in the thousands.

I call it catastrophe. I call it real trouble.

I will continue to speak of it, with all the vigor and force I can muster, until the problem is met as this Congress is capable of meeting it.

Let me give you several additional pieces of evidence concerning the gravity of our problem.

On January 4, 1955, the Tulsa World reported that—

Oklahoma and four other southern Great Plains States may experience dust storms this year worse than any since the thirties.

An estimated 1,112,000 acres of parched land in western Oklahoma are in a "condition to blow" this winter or spring, the Soil Conservation Service has revealed.

The SCS, in a report circulated at the Agriculture Department, said the five-State outlook on soil conditions is more than twice as bad as it was at this time last year. Other southern Great Plains States are Texas, Kansas, New Mexico, and Colorado.

SCS specialists reported that more damage was done last year than in any single year of the thirties.

September, October, and November of 1954 were generally dry or below average in precipitation, according to the report.

"Soil-moisture reserves have not been replenished to carry the wheat through the winter and next spring, except in a few localities," the SCS said.

Drought conditions over the past several years have not produced cover for the land and much land does not have crop residues or structure or surface roughness.

This basic condition of the soil is the reason why rains and snow which have been falling during the current month—while very helpful and greatly appreciated—are not likely to avert a continuation of drought conditions in 1955.

On the contrary, Oklahoma A. and M. climate experts have officially predicted another dry year in 1955.

On January 18, Gov. Raymond Gary, of Oklahoma, wired me that—

Only small areas in Oklahoma have had any moisture and prospects for production of hay this coming spring and summer are not good. Two years of normal rainfall needed to bring native pastures back to normal. Long-range forecast indicates below normal rainfall for next 12 months.

From the Pawhuska Journal of December 12, 1954, comes this confirming evidence of the drought's severity:

Oklahoma's worst drought year since 1910 is rapidly drawing to a close with profound effects on the State's agricultural economy, an Associated Press survey showed Saturday.

The resulting hardships are multiplied because the entire State has already been staggered by a dry cycle which has had agriculture on the skids for some years now.

More than 100,000 persons are receiving food and other relief directly from the State Emergency Relief Board exclusive of the general welfare aid in a revival of the program used in the depression.

More Oklahomans were looking for work December 1 than any comparable time since 1946.

Farmers and ranchers have just completed a poor crop and livestock year, and the continuing drought has placed a dark cloud over their prospects for next year.

In the same article are these bleak figures on crop yields in 1954:

This drought year saw the cotton yield decline one-third from the 467,000 bales in 1953.

Wheat, the State's big money crop, is not even up to a stand in many areas, and this year's crop was below average at around 70 million bushels.

Corn, once a major crop, climaxed several years of near failures with the worst yield in history—3,258,000 bushels, about one-eighth of what the State once harvested.

Confronted with a shortage of hay and grain feeds, farmers are having to spend more than ever for feed with the knowledge they may not break even. Federal aid in the form of cheaper feed, loans, and lower hay freight rates has helped, but fell far short of solving the problem.

The cattleman is the major victim of the drought, in the opinion of Harley Custer, manager of the National Livestock Commission Co.

Custer, a keen observer of the livestock situation who has appraised herds all over the State, says the rancher today is definitely not making any money.

"He can't get enough for a calf to pay keeping the cow all year and still pay his overhead," he said. "The cow that used to bring a $150 calf now brings a $75 calf. The cost of keeping her is still at least $40. Virtually all the profit is absorbed, and only a big operator with a good quality herd can survive for long."

It is a tribute to the toughness and courage of the Oklahoma farmer and rancher, in addition to the relief measures which have been undertaken thus far, that so many have been able to survive as long as they have.

The figures on farm income for 1954 are further evidence of the national character of the problem we face.

The December 16, 1954, release by the Department of Agriculture on the farm income situation illustrates the plight of all farmers. According to this report, cash receipts from farm marketings for the first 10 months of 1954 were more than a billion dollars below those for the same period of 1953. Although farm marketings for the first 11 months averaged 4 percent less than in the same period of 1953, marketings in October were 9 percent below October of 1953.

In Oklahoma, one of the two States in which all counties have been declared eligible for drought-emergency assistance, cash receipts from crops marketed in October 1954 were more than $14 million below October 1953, a drop of almost 34 percent. In the other State of 100-percent drought damage, South Carolina, crop receipts were down almost $27 million or almost 50 percent.

Total crop receipts in October 1954 were about $241 million below October 1953. In only 11 States among those listed in the drought-emergency category, crop receipts were down $286 million in the same month. Crop receipts in Mississippi, a State hard hit by drought, were down more than $70 million in October, a drop of about 50 percent.

The income outlook for most of our farmers is a dark one indeed. Farm prices are down and it appears to be the purpose of the Department of Agriculture's present leadership to drive them still lower. According to the chamber of commerce, farm equities dropped almost $3½ billion in 1954. Agriculture is the only segment of our economy showing no gain in 1954, and it is the only one anticipating nothing but reductions in 1955.

The national figures on farm income and farm equities, when added to the regional catastrophe of drought, are additional cause for genuine alarm over the announced budget plans in the field of agriculture.

The figures offer small promise of additional strengthening of our declining farm income—and certainly are a danger signal for all who are interested in seeing a realistic and helpful drought program.

A frontline fighting force in the battle against drought damage is the Soil Conservation Service, which the presidential budget proposes to cut from $59,085,671 in fiscal year 1955 to $55,696,200 in fiscal 1956.

Loan authority for the Farmers' Home Administration, chief source of disaster loans, has been reduced from $166 million in 1954 to $153 million in 1955, and $147 million in 1956.

The agricultural conservation program, in charge of soil-building and water-conserving practices, has its new money cut from a $226 million actual expenditure in 1954 to a recommended $175 million in fiscal 1956. Although $15 million was appropriated for emergency wind damage control in 1954, absolutely nothing is recommended for this worthwhile purpose in the new budget.

Further darkening the picture of funds recommended to meet the farmers' needs, we read in the budget of a $15 million cut in funds for commodity procurement for the school-lunch program.

The announced intention of continuing to provide surplus foods for this program, while commendable, does little to meet the problem of declining farmer income.

Like most Americans from our country's drought areas, I was cheered by these words in President Eisenhower's state of the Union message on January 6:

Because drought also remains a serious agricultural problem, I shall recommend legislation to strengthen Federal disaster assistance programs.

I awaited the budget message with the earnest hope that it would include money recommendations which would make possible the needed liberalization of existing drought disaster programs, including expansion of soil conservation and ACP activities, greater lending authority for FHA, money for needed refinancing loans on a long-term basis and at low interest rates.

We urgently need a truly long-term approach to the problem of drought, which is just as devastating and cruel in its human and property damage as the menace of floods.

In my opinion, the time has come for a national drought-control program—a program as well planned, organized, and financed as our flood-control program.

Everyone recognizes the national and enduring character of the problem of flood—of a surplus of water at a given time and point—and the Congress should also recognize, on a permanent basis, the national and enduring character of the problem of drought, which is nothing but critical shortage of water at a given time and point.

I am hopeful the President's forthcoming recommendations for drought legislation, promised us on January 6, will recognize this need for a permanent national program. I am hopeful it will remedy the financial shortcomings of the budget message in this field with an urgent request for additional funds to finance the battle on drought.

In the hope of lending some small assistance in the legislative field, I plan to follow this brief talk in a few days with a detailed report on the subject of a drought program.

Because the first step in improvement is to locate and understand mistakes in what we now have, the first portion of this report will deal with some of the shortcomings of the present disaster program. Like most Members from the drought areas, I have had many letters and telephone calls on this subject.

The charges against our present program include the general complaint of inadequacy, many specific complaints of discrimination against the small and lightly financed farmer and rancher, and the serious charge that bigtime feed and seed dealers, speculating and profiteering in many cases with Government surplus commodities, have been the chief beneficiaries of our drought relief program.

To some extent, at least, my forthcoming report will document these charges.

I also have in preparation several pieces of proposed legislation, designed to repair at once some of the weaknesses in our present disaster program, and to provide the framework for a permanent and constructive approach to drought control.

I am sure the Members of the 84th Congress, in large part, share my earnest belief that we cannot hope for a prosperous America without a prosperous farm economy.

Unless we defeat the grim menace of drought damage, there is little hope for nationwide farm prosperity in the next few years.

The people of Oklahoma are grateful for the national recognition already extended to the drought emergency which they share with other States. As one of their Representatives in this great deliberative body, I respectfully urge that this Congress lose no time in translating that recognition into constructive and adequate action.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I want to congratulate my colleague upon the very informative, well worked out and splendid statement he has made to the House. I want also to compliment him for the work he has done on behalf of the drought-stricken people of Oklahoma. He has given more attention to this subject than any Member of this House.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman. He is certainly one of our

State's great legislative leaders and one who has done and is doing more for the farmers than any other Member of Congress from Oklahoma.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I want to compliment the gentleman on his very splendid presentation of the problem involving the drought-stricken rancher and farmer. My section of Louisiana is in that disaster area and has been designated so by the President of the United States. The program has been placed in effect in that area.

In line with what the gentleman has said I want to comment briefly, if the gentleman will permit me in his time, on the obligation which is placed by the Farmers' Home Administration upon any rancher or small farmer who draws assistance under the emergency hay program. I have here in my hand form FHA 937, revised August 3, 1954. This is required to be signed by every applicant for help under the emergency feed program. The feed program, as the gentleman has said, merely permits the farmer to get feed without the payment of the full freight charges; yet under the terms of this requirement the farmer is forced to sign this application which states:

> Without the assistance applied for under the emergency program I will be unable to maintain my basic foundation herd and to continue in the livestock operation which I have been conducting.

That is from the form which is required. In other words, if you are serious minded and you construe that as it is clearly stated, it requires the rancher in effect to say, practically, that he is penniless. If he has any money and can continue without the aid, then he is not entitled to any assistance under the terms of this application.

I do not think it was the intent of Congress that a man within the drought area, a farmer or rancher, should be required to go on record by asserting that he is penniless before he gets any assistance under that program. I think the regulations are much too strict, much too drastic, and should be, as the gentleman has well said, revised and liberalized for the benefit of the small rancher and the small farmer.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman. I recognize that he has a very good point with regard to the certification that accompanies these applications.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I want to thank the gentleman as well as commend him for his excellent presentation today. My district is in the industrial East. My district is mostly an industrial and residential area, and I am far from the area of devastation that the gentleman described today. But, it will help me, as we move ahead now and try to meet this problem which is a national problem, to have the information that the gentleman has presented.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate his breadth of vision and his interest on this point, because if we do not have a prosperous farm economy, it is not possible for our farmers to buy the products of the industrial East and North and other sections of our country.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ASHMORE.

Mr. GENTRY.

Mr. BARTLETT and to include an editorial.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. RODINO) in two instances.

Mr. GATHINGS and to include an article.

Mr. LANKFORD and to include a radio address.

Mr. MILLER of California and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VURSELL.

Mr. PELLY in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENTLEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOSMER (at the request of Mr. BENTLEY) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACK of Washington (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REED of New York in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. LANE (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REES of Kansas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WESTLAND.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 24, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

> "I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by each of the following Members and Delegates of the 84th Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948:

ALABAMA

1. Frank W. Boykin.
2. George M. Grant.
3. George W. Andrews.
4. Kenneth A. Roberts.
5. Albert Rains.
6. Armistead I. Selden, Jr.
7. Carl Elliott.
8. Robert E. Jones, Jr.
9. George Huddleston, Jr.

ARIZONA

1. John J. Rhodes.
2. Stewart L. Udall.

ARKANSAS

1. E. C. Gathings.
2. Wilbur D. Mills.
3. James W. Trimble.
4. Oren Harris.
5. Brooks Hays.
6. W. F. Norrell.

CALIFORNIA

1. Hubert B. Scudder.
2. Clair Engle.
3. John E. Moss, Jr.
4. William S. Mailliard.
5. John F. Shelley.
6. John F. Baldwin, Jr.
7. John J. Allen, Jr.
8. George P. Miller.
9. J. Arthur Younger.
10. Charles S. Gubser.
11. Leroy Johnson.
12. B. F. Sisk.
13. Charles M. Teague.
14. Harlan Hagen.
15. Gordon L. McDonough.
16. Donald L. Jackson.
17. Cecil R. King.
18. Craig Hosmer.
19. Chet Holifield.
20. Carl Hinshaw.
21. Edgar W. Hiestand.
22. Joe Holt.
23. Clyde Doyle.
24. Glenard P. Lipscomb.
25. Patrick J. Hillings.
26. James Roosevelt.
27. Harry R. Sheppard.
28. James B. Utt.
29. John Phillips.
30. Robert C. (Bob) Wilson.

COLORADO

1. Byron G. Rogers.
2. William S. Hill.
3. J. Edgar Chenoweth.
4. Wayne N. Aspinall.

CONNECTICUT

1. Thomas J. Dodd.
2. Horace Seely-Brown, Jr.
3. Albert W. Cretella.
4. Albert P. Morano.
5. James T. Patterson.

At large

Antoni N. Sadlak.

DELAWARE

At large

Harris B. McDowell, Jr.

FLORIDA

1. William C. Cramer.
2. Charles E. Bennett.
3. Robert L. F. Sikes.
4. Dante B. Fascell.
5. A. S. (Syd) Herlong, Jr.
6. Paul G. Rogers.
7. James A. Haley.
8. D. R. (Billy) Matthews.

GEORGIA

1. Prince H. Preston.
2. J. L. Pilcher.
3. E. L. (Tic) Forrester.
4. John J. Flynt, Jr.
5. James C. Davis.
6. Carl Vinson.
7. Henderson Lanham.
8. Iris Faircloth Blitch.
9. Phil M. Landrum.
10. Paul Brown.

IDAHO

1. Gracie Pfost.
2. Hamer H. Budge.

ILLINOIS

1. William L. Dawson.
2. Barratt O'Hara.
3. James C. Murray.
4. William E. McVey.
5. John C. Kluczynski.
6. Thomas J. O'Brien.
7. James B. Bowler.
8. Thomas S. Gordon.
9. Sidney R. Yates.
10. Richard W. Hoffman.
11. Timothy P. Sheehan.
12. Charles A. Boyle.
13. Marguerite Stitt Church.
14. Chauncey W. Reed.
15. Noah M. Mason.
16. Leo E. Allen.
17. Leslie C. Arends.
18. Harold H. Velde.
19. Robert B. Chiperfield.
20. Sid Simpson.
21. Peter F. Mack, Jr.
22. William L. Springer.
23. Charles W. Vursell.
24. Melvin Price.
25. Kenneth J. Gray.

INDIANA

1. Ray J. Madden.
2. Charles A. Halleck.
3. Shepard J. Crumpacker, Jr.
4. E. Ross Adair.
5. John V. Beamer.
6. Cecil M. Harden.
7. William G. Bray.
8. Winfield K. Denton.
9. Earl Wilson.
10. Ralph Harvey.
11. Charles B. Brownson.

IOWA

1. Fred Schwengel.
2. Henry O. Talle.
3. H. R. Gross.
4. Karl M. LeCompte.
5. Paul Cunningham.
6. James I. Dolliver.
7. Ben F. Jensen.
8. Charles B. Hoeven.

KANSAS

1. William H. Avery.
2. Errett P. Scrivner.
3. Myron V. George.
4. Edward H. Rees.
5. Clifford R. Hope.
6. Wint Smith.

KENTUCKY

1. Noble J. Gregory.
2. William H. Natcher.
3. John M. Robsion, Jr.
4. Frank Chelf.
5. Brent Spence.
6. John C. Watts.
7. Carl D. Perkins.
8. Eugene Siler.

LOUISIANA

1. F. Edward Hébert.
2. Hale Boggs.
3. Edwin E. Willis.
4. Overton Brooks.
5. Otto E. Passman.
6. James H. Morrison.
7. T. A. Thompson.
8. George S. Long.

MAINE

1. Robert Hale.
2. Charles P. Nelson.
3. Clifford G. McIntire.

MARYLAND

1. Edward T. Miller.
2. James P. S. Devereux.
3. Edward A. Garmatz.
4. George H. Fallon.
5. Richard E. Lankford.
6. DeWitt S. Hyde.
7. Samuel N. Friedel.

MASSACHUSETTS

1. John W. Heselton.
2. Edward P. Boland.
3. Philip J. Philbin.
4. Harold D. Donohue.
5. Edith Nourse Rogers.
6. William H. Bates.
7. Thomas J. Lane.
8. Torbert H. Macdonald.
9. Donald W. Nicholson.
10. Laurence Curtis.
11. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.
12. John W. McCormack.
13. Richard B. Wigglesworth.
14. Joseph W. Martin, Jr.

MICHIGAN

1. Thaddeus M. Machrowicz.
2. George Meader.
3. August E. Johansen.
4. Clare E. Hoffman.
5. Gerald R. Ford, Jr.
6. Don Hayworth.
7. Jesse P. Wolcott.
8. Alvin M. Bentley.
9. Ruth Thompson.
10. Elford A. Cederberg.
11. Victor A. Knox.
12. John B. Bennett.
13. Charles C. Diggs, Jr.
14. Louis C. Rabaut.
15. John D. Dingell.
16. John Lesinski, Jr.
17. Martha W. Griffiths.
18. George A. Dondero.

MINNESOTA

1. August H. Andresen.
2. Joseph P. O'Hara.
3. Roy W. Wier.
4. Eugene J. McCarthy.
5. Walter H. Judd.
6. Fred Marshall.
7. H. Carl Andersen.
8. John A. Blatnik.
9. Coya Knutson.

MISSISSIPPI

1. Thomas G. Abernethy.
2. Jamie L. Whitten.
3. Frank E. Smith.
4. John Bell Williams.
5. Arthur Winstead.
6. William M. Colmer.

MISSOURI

1. Frank M. Karsten.
2. Thomas B. Curtis.
3. Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.) Sullivan.
4. George H. Christopher.
5. Richard Bolling.
6. W. R. Hull, Jr.
7. Dewey Short.
8. A. S. J. Carnahan.
9. Clarence Cannon.
10. Paul C. Jones.
11. Morgan M. Moulder.

MONTANA

1. Lee Metcalf.
2. Orvin B. Fjare.

NEBRASKA

1. Phil Weaver.
2. Jackson B. Chase.
3. Robert D. Harrison.
4. A. L. Miller.

NEVADA

At large

Clifton (Cliff) Young.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

1. Chester E. Merrow.
2. Perkins Bass.

NEW JERSEY

1. Charles A. Wolverton.
2. T. Millet Hand.
3. James C. Auchincloss.
4. Frank Thompson, Jr.
5. Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr.
6. Harrison A. Williams, Jr.
7. William B. Widnall.
8. Gordon Canfield.
9. Frank C. Osmers, Jr.
10. Peter W. Rodino, Jr.
11. Hugh J. Addonizio.
12. Robert W. Kean.
13. Alfred D. Sieminski.
14. T. James Tumulty.

NEW MEXICO

At large

Antonio M. Fernandez.
John J. Dempsey.

NEW YORK

1. Stuyvesant Wainwright.
2. Steven B. Derounian.
3. Frank J. Becker.
4. Henry J. Latham.
5. Albert H. Bosch.
6. Lester Holtzman.
7. James J. Delaney.
8. Victor L. Anfuso.
9. Eugene J. Keogh.
10. Edna F. Kelly.
11. Emanuel Celler.
12. Francis E. Dorn.
13. Abraham J. Multer.
14. John J. Rooney.
15. John H. Ray.
16. Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.
17. Frederic R. Coudert, Jr.
18. James G. Donovan.
19. Arthur G. Klein.

20. Irwin D. Davidson.
21. Herbert Zelenko.
22. Sidney A. Fine.
23. Isidore Dollinger.
24. Charles A. Buckley.
25. Paul A. Fino.
26. Ralph A. Gamble.
27. Ralph W. Gwinn.
28. Katharine St. George.
29. J. Ernest Wharton.
30. Leo W. O'Brien.
31. Dean P. Taylor.
32. Bernard W. Kearney.
33. Clarence E. Kilburn.
34. William R. Williams.
35. R. Walter Richman.
36. John Taber.
37. W. Sterling Cole.
38. Kenneth B Keating.
39. Harold C. Ostertag.
40. William E. Miller.
41. Edmund P. Radwan.
42. John R. Pillion.
43. Daniel A. Reed.

NORTH CAROLINA

1. Herbert C. Bonner.
2. L. H. Fountain.
3. Graham A. Barden.
4. Harold D. Cooley.
5. Thurmond Chatham.
6. Carl T. Durham.
7. F. Ertel Carlyle.
8. Charles B. Deane.
9. Hugh Q. Alexander.
10. Charles Raper Jonas.
11. Woodrow W. Jones.
12. George A. Shuford.

NORTH DAKOTA

At large

Usher L. Burdick.
Otto Krueger.

OHIO

1. Gordon H. Scherer.
2. William E. Hess.
3. Paul F. Schenck.
4. William M. McCulloch.
5. Cliff Clevenger.
6. James G. Polk.
7. Clarence J. Brown.
8. Jackson E. Betts.
9. Thomas L. Ashley.
10. Thomas A. Jenkins.
11. Oliver P. Bolton.
12. John M. Vorys.
13. A. D. Baumhart, Jr.
14. William H. Ayres.
15. John E. Henderson.
16. Frank T. Bow.
17. J. Harry McGregor.
18. Wayne L. Hays.
19. Michael J. Kirwan.
20. Michael A. Feighan.
21. Charles A. Vanik.
22. Frances P. Bolton.
23. William E. Minshall.

OKLAHOMA

1. Page Belcher.
2. Ed Edmondson.
3. Carl Albert.
4. Tom Steed.
5. John Jarman.
6. Victor Wickersham.

OREGON

1. Walter Norblad.
2. Sam Coon.
3. Edith Green.
4. Harris Ellsworth.

PENNSYLVANIA

1. William A. Barrett.
2. William T. Granahan.
3. James A. Byrne.
4. Earl Chudoff.
5. William J. Green, Jr.
6. Hugh Scott
7. Benjamin F. James.
8. Karl C. King.
9. Paul B. Dague.
10. Joseph L. Carrigg.
11. Daniel J. Flood.
12. Ivor D. Fenton.
13. Samuel K. McConnell, Jr.
14. George M. Rhodes.
15. Francis E. Walter.
16. Walter M. Mumma.
17. Alvin R. Bush.
18. Richard M. Simpson.
19. James M. Quigley.
20. James E. Van Zandt.
21. Augustine B. Kelley.
22. John P. Saylor.
23. Leon H. Gavin.
24. Carroll D. Kearns.
25. Frank M. Clark.
26. Thomas E. Morgan.
27. James G. Fulton.
28. Herman P. Eberharter.
29. Robert J. Corbett.
30. Vera Buchanan.

RHODE ISLAND

1. Aime J. Forand.
2. John E. Fogarty.

SOUTH CAROLINA

1. L. Mendel Rivers.
2. John J. Riley.
3. W. J. Bryan Dorn.
4. Robert T. Ashmore.
5. James P. Richards.
6. John L. McMillan.

SOUTH DAKOTA

1. Harold O. Lovre.
2. E. Y. Berry.

TENNESSEE

1. B. Carroll Reece.
2. Howard H. Baker.
3. James B. Frazier, Jr.
4. Joe L. Evins.
5. J. Percy Priest.
6. Ross Bass.
7. Tom Murray.
8. Jere Cooper.
9. Clifford Davis.

TEXAS

1. Wright Patman.
2. Jack B. Brooks.
3. Brady Gentry.
4. Sam Rayburn.
5. Bruce Alger.
6. Olin E. Teague.
7. John Dowdy.
8. Albert Thomas.
9. Clark W. Thompson.
10. Homer Thornberry.
11. W. R. Poage.
12. Jim Wright.
13. Frank Ikard.
14. John J. Bell.
15. Joe M. Kilgore.
16. J. T. Rutherford.
17. Omar Burleson.
18. Walter Rogers.
19. George Mahon.
20. Paul J. Kilday.
21. O. C. Fisher.

At Large

Martin Dies.

UTAH

1. Henry Aldous Dixon.
2. William A. Dawson.

VERMONT

At Large

Winston L. Prouty.

VIRGINIA

1. Edward J. Robeson, Jr.
2. Porter Hardy, Jr.
3. J. Vaughan Gary.
4. Watkins M. Abbitt.
5. William M. Tuck.
6. Richard H. Poff.
7. Burr P. Harrison.
8. Howard W. Smith.
9. W. Pat Jennings.
10. Joel T. Broyhill.

WASHINGTON

1. Thomas M. Pelly.
2. Jack Westland.
3. Russell V. Mack.
4. Hal Holmes.
5. Walt Horan.
6. Thor C. Tollefson.

At large

Don Magnuson.

WEST VIRGINIA

1. Robert H. Mollohan.
2. Harley O. Staggers.
3. Cleveland M. Bailey.
4. M. G. (Burnie) Burnside.
5. Elizabeth Kee.
6. Robert C. Byrd.

WISCONSIN

1. Lawrence H. Smith.
2. Glenn R. Davis.
3. Gardner R. Withrow.
4. Clement J. Zablocki.
5. Henry S. Reuss.
6. William K. Van Pelt.
7. Melvin R. Laird.
8. John W. Byrnes.
9. Lester R. Johnson.
10. Alvin E. O'Konski.

WYOMING

At large

E. Keith Thomson.

ALASKA

Delegate

E. L. (Bob) Bartlett.

HAWAII

Delegate

Mrs. Joseph R. Farrington.

PUERTO RICO

Resident Commissioner

Antonio Fernós-Isern.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

268. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 10 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (49 Stat. 1363); to the Committee on Agriculture.

269. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for 1954, pursuant to the requirement of the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

270. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

271. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

272. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to further amend the act of September 9, 1950, by extending until July 1, 1957, the authority to require the special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

273. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Panama Canal Company, transmitting a report on foreign excess property disposed of during 1954, pursuant to section 404 (d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, Public Law 152, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

274. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of Indians and Indian communities in the southern part of Minnesota, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

275. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the management and disposition of certain public domain lands in the State of Oklahoma"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

276. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to repeal the so-called timber and stone law"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

277. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the disposal of certain Federal property in the Boulder City area, to provide assistance in the establishment of a municipality incorporated under the laws of Nevada, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

278. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of an order canceling certain charges existing as debts due the United States by individual Indians and tribes of Indians, pursuant to the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

279. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to require the recordation of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

280. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to require the recordation of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

281. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to improve the administration of the public airports in the Territory of Alaska"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

282. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide rewards for information concerning the illegal introduction into the United States, or the illegal manufacture or acquisition in the United States, of special nuclear material and atomic weapons"; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

283. A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the court's opinion in re: *Gay Street Corporation of Baltimore, Maryland, v. The United States* (Congressional No. 3–52), pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and House Resolution 566, 82d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

284. A letter from the Administrative Assistant, Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Ernest W. Berry, Alaska native service schoolteacher"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

285. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation and a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, approved July 1, 1948, amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

286. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (5)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

287. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

288. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

289. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on the circumstances surrounding the overobligation of an allotment, which does not, however, involve the overobligation of the appropriation or the quarterly apportionment thereof, pursuant to section 3679, Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

290. A letter from the Sergeant at Arms, House of Representatives, transmitting a report showing the several sums drawn by him pursuant to sections 78 and 80 of title 2, United States Code, the application and disbursement of the same, and the balance, if any, remaining in his hands, pursuant to title 2, United States Code, section 84; to the Committee on House Administration.

291. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

292. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

293. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the Seventh Annual Report of claims paid by the Department of State during the calendar year 1954, pursuant to section 404 of the Federal Tort Claims Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

294. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, deceased, former Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

295. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend Title 18, United States Code, section 871 to provide penalties for threats against the President-elect and the Vice President"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

296. A letter from the administrative assistant, Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Mary J. McDougall"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

297. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer certain property to the Panama Canal Company, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

298. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 4482 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U. S. C. 475), relating to life preservers for river steamers"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

299. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 4421 of the Revised Statutes, in order to remove the requirement as to verifying under oath certain certificates of inspection, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

300. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 2531. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 2532. A bill to encourage the States to hold preferential primary elections for the nomination of candidates for the office of President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 2533. A bill to improve the public health by encouraging more extensive use of the voluntary prepayment method in the provision of personal health services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 2534. A bill to increase the penalties for sedition and seditious conspiracy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 2535. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii and Alaska each to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 2536. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii and Alaska each to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 2537. A bill to provide for public accountability by tax-exempt organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2538. A bill to provide for public accountability by tax-exempt organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 2539. A bill to authorize a nationwide survey of costs of production for major farm-produced commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2540. A bill to amend section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, so as to permit the making of payments under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to producers who harvest wheat in excess of acreage allotments but not in excess of amounts permitted to be marketed without payment of marketing penalties; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 2541. A bill to provide for standards to be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture governing imported agricultural food products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2542. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to review reports on Mississippi River (Frontenac), Minn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 2543. A bill to establish a Bureau of Crime Prevention in the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AVERY:

H. R. 2544. A bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2545. A bill to amend the first section of the act of October 19, 1949 (15 U. S. C., sec. 375), in order to assist Alaska, Hawaii, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in collecting certain taxes on cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2546. A bill to consolidate, revise, and reenact the townsite laws applicable in Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 2547. A bill to allow members of Reserve components of the Armed Forces to serve brief periods of active duty for training while enrolled in certain courses under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, as amended, without such period of time being charged as absences in computing their educational and training allowances; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 2548. A bill to authorize Federal payments to the States to assist in constructing schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 2549. A bill to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits, and to liberalize the provisions under which such earnings are charged for purposes of such deductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 2550. A bill prohibiting lithographing or engraving on envelopes sold by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2551. A bill to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover officers and employees of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 2552. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 2553. A bill to amend section 502 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, as amended by section 223 of the Revenue Act of 1950, relating to the use of corporation property by a shareholder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2554. A bill granting increases in the annuities of certain former civilian officials and employees engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 2555. A bill to provide that the judges of the Court of Military Appeals shall hold office during good behavior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2556. A bill to provide dispensary treatment and hospitalization in Army and Navy hospitals for retired enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2557. A bill to authorize construction of the Mississippi River-gulf outlet; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 2558. A bill to make certain changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. R. 2559. A bill to authorize male nurses and medical specialists to be appointed as Reserve officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 2560. A bill to define service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps as active military service under certain conditions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2561. A bill to provide that Regular enlisted personnel serving under temporary appointment as commissioned officers in the Navy or Marine Corps shall be considered officers of the Regular Navy or Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2562. A bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to provide that receipt of mustering-out payments shall not bar receipt of unemployment compensation payments made under that act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 2563. A bill to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1957; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 2564. A bill to incorporate the Foundation for Community Aid to Mental Patients; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 2565. A bill to state explicitly the longstanding national policy to preserve and strengthen the family-farm pattern of American agriculture, and to provide means of implementing that policy more effectively; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2566. A bill to foster the cooperative agriculture education work of the extension services; to free the extension services from the performance of nongovernmental functions and political activity; and to promote economy in agricultural extension work; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 2567. A bill to amend paragraph 1513 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to toy marbles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 2568. A bill to extend the period within which veterans of service on or after June 27, 1950, may accrue eligibility for wartime benefits to January 31, 1957, or in the case of persons in the service on January 31, 1957, to the expiration of their period of service subsequent to January 31, 1957; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 2569. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the income-tax exemption allowed a taxpayer for a dependent, and $1,800 for a dependent child (until said child reaches 21 years of age) while attending any business school, college, or university; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2570. A bill to amend section 1073, title 18, United States Code, with respect to indecent molestation or sexual abuse of a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 2571. A bill to establish biweekly pay periods for postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2572. A bill to provide for promotion by merit of employees in the postal service and to establish uniform procedures for examination and appointment of candidates for promotion to supervisory positions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 2573. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2574. A bill to make certain changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 2575. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for widows of certain former Federal employees who had rendered 30 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. R. 2576. A bill to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1958; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 2577. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies and for other purposes" to strengthen the protection which it affords to independent business in prohibiting price discriminations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 2578. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the eastern district of Michigan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2579. A bill to repeal the 3 cents per pound processing tax on coconut oil, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2580. A bill to grant additional income-tax exemptions and deductions to taxpayers who are permanently disabled, and to allow additional income-tax exemptions to taxpayers supporting dependents who are permanently disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 2581. A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities and the acquisition of land by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 2582. A bill to require public hearings prior to withdrawals of the public lands, to limit temporary withdrawals to 5 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2583. A bill to provide Federal assistance for construction and reconstruction of

a highway from the Nevada State line across the Sierra Nevada Mountains into the San Francisco Bay area; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 2584. A bill to amend the first section of the act of October 19, 1949 (15 U. S. C., sec. 375), in order to assist Alaska, Hawaii, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in collecting certain taxes on cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 2585. A bill to provide for emergency Federal financial assistance to the States and Territories in the construction of urgently needed public elementary and secondary school facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 2586. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to increase under certain conditions the annuities payable to the widow and the children of an officer or employee who dies in the service of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 2587. A bill to authorize and direct a full investigation of the problem of protecting Narragansett Bay and the southern shores of New England from hurricane tidal floods; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 2588. A bill to authorize and direct a full investigation of the problem of protecting Narragansett Bay and the southern shores of New England from hurricane tidal floods; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 2589. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 2590. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Internal Security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. R. 2591. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act to provide that the annuity of the widow of a deceased employee shall not be reduced on account of certain benefits to which she may be entitled under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 2592. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by individuals, to promote thrift, and to stimulate expansion of employment through investment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 2593. A bill to provide for the conveyance of Jackson Barracks, La., to the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2594. A bill to authorize construction of the Mississippi River-gulf outlet; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 2595. A bill to revive the office of general of the armies of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 2596. A bill to prevent discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2597. A bill to extend the statute of limitations applicable to certain offenses involving fraud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 2598. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, to establish a two-price plan for wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 2599. A bill to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2600. A bill to increase the funds available annually for the schoolchildren's milk program under section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and to continue this program until June 30, 1957; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 2601. A bill to provide for the payment of compensation to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, the White House Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, for duty performed on their days off when such days off are suspended during an emergency; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2602. A bill to increase to $3 per diem the witness fee in cases in the criminal division of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2603. A bill to increase the area within which officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia may reside; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2604. A bill to provide for granting to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and the White House and United States Park Police force additional compensation for working on part holidays; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 2605. A bill to encourage the States to hold preferential primary elections for the nomination of candidates for the office of President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 2606. A bill to provide that United States commissioners shall be paid an annual salary to be fixed by the Judicial Conference of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 2607. A bill to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 2608. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for totally disabled individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2609. A bill to provide that merchant seamen who were captured or interned by the German or Japanese Governments during World War II shall be entitled to preference in Federal employment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. R. 2610. A bill to amend section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended by the Agricultural Act of 1954; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 2611. A bill—

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE AND POLICY

To reaffirm the national public policy and the purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, commonly designated "antitrust" laws, which among other things prohibit price discriminations; to aid in intelligent, fair, and effective administration and enforcement thereof; and to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Anti-Price Discrimination Act and the protection which it affords to independent business, the Congress hereby reaffirms that the purpose of the antitrust laws in prohibiting price discriminations is to secure equality of opportunity of all persons to compete in trade or business and to preserve competition where it exists, to restore it where it is destroyed, and to permit it to spring up in new fields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2612. A bill to authorize Federal payments to the States to assist in constructing schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2613. A bill to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to employees who are involuntarily separated after having rendered 20 years of service but prior to attainment of age 55; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2614. A bill to amend section 1 (d) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2615. A bill to grant civil-service employees retirement after 35 years' service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2616. A bill to grant longevity pay-step increases to Federal employees on an equal basis upon the completion by them of 10, 13, and 16 years of service, respectively; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2617. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for additional personnel engaged in hazardous occupations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2618. A bill to include all types of compensation paid to officers and employees of the Federal Government by the Federal Government within the scope of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2619. A bill to amend section 345 of the Revenue Act of 1951; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 2620. A bill to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 2621. A bill to provide for the orderly termination and liquidation of the Postal Savings System established by the Act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 814), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 2622. A bill to promote the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for compensation for the disability or death of workers from silicosis or other dust diseases, by providing for cooperation with the several States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2623. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans to eligible veterans for the purchase, repair, alteration, construction, or improvement of farm property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2624. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to confer jurisdiction on the States of California, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, and Wisconsin, with respect to criminal offenses and civil causes of action committed or arising on Indian reservations within such States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2625. A bill to establish a program of grants to States for the development of fine arts programs and projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2626. A bill to amend section 502 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, so as to increase the maximum amount in which farm realty loans may be guaranteed

thereunder; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2627. A bill to provide for stockpiling 500 million bushels of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2628. A bill to amend section 502 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, so as to increase the maximum amount in which farm realty loans may be guaranteed thereunder; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2629. A bill to amend sections 315b and 315o-1 of 43 United States Code, chapter 8A, commonly known as the Taylor Grazing Act, in order to provide for the maximum beneficial use of the public lands by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to appoint more representative district advisory boards and permitting the Secretary of the Interior to exercise his discretion and authority in order to improve the administration of the public lands involved in the above-enumerated statutes by operation and utilization of such lands and range resources under a multiple-use program that will adequately protect both the private values and public interest in such lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2630. A bill to increase the amount of guaranty by the Veterans' Administration on certain home loans made pursuant to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2631. A bill to extend the time for filing claims on behalf of certain claimants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 2632. A bill to authorize Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of privately owned real property as well as the shores of publicly owned real property; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2633. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by individuals, to promote thrift, and to stimulate expansion of employment through investment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. R. 2634. A bill to provide equal pension or compensation benefits to all veterans disabled in the military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2635. A bill to extend to the veterans of the Mexican border service of 1916 and 1917 and their widows and minor children all the provisions, privileges, rights, and benefits of laws enacted for the benefit of veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2636. A bill to amend section 402 (a) of the National Housing Act to change the name of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2637. A bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2638. A bill to assist cooperative and other nonprofit corporations in the production of housing for moderate-income families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2639. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize longevity step increases for officers and employees in grades above grade 15 of the general schedule; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2640. A bill to permit aliens registered on former quota waiting lists maintained prior to January 1, 1944, to be placed on the appropriate quota waiting lists maintained under authority of the Immigration and Nationality Act without loss of priority of their original registration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2641. A bill to provide that securities, loans, and obligations shall be sold by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at not less than face value, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2642. A bill to promote certain prisoners of war in Korea upon their discharge from the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 2643. A bill to direct the Comptroller General to audit the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Open Market Committee, and the Federal Reserve banks; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 2644. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 65 to 60 the age at which benefits may become payable thereunder to certain widows and certain disabled veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2645. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 65 to 60 the age at which benefits may become payable thereunder to certain disabled veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 2646. A bill to establish a conservation-acreage reserve, to promote conservation and improvement of agricultural soil and water resources, to stabilize farmers' income, to adjust total agricultural production to consumer and export needs, to maintain an abundant and even flow of farm commodities in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2647. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 2648. A bill to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 2649. A bill to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 2650. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain widows and widowers of retired employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2651. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to prohibit or regulate the use of Government property under his custody and control for the parking or storage of vehicles; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2652. A bill to provide for the payment of annuities to certain former employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 2653. A bill providing loans for the cost of improving the distribution system of the Salt River reclamation project, Arizona, for the purpose of conserving water resources and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2654. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to confer jurisdiction on the States of California, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, and Wisconsin, with respect to criminal offenses and civil causes of action committed or arising on Indian reservations within such States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2655. A bill to amend section 8c (6) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 2656. A bill to provide for the incorporation of the National Woman's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic, organized 1883, 72 years old; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2657. A bill to provide that each veteran of World War II shall be entitled to receive from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs a lump sum equal to the readjustment allowances which he could have received, less the amounts which he actually received; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 2658. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2659. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Patriots' Day, with a likeness of Paul Revere on such stamp; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 2660. A bill to amend section 14 (b) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to protect the rights of employees and employers, in industries affecting commerce, to enter into union-shop agreements; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2661. A bill to exempt the retirement income and pensions of members of the Armed Forces who are under the age of 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 2662. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the excise tax on automotive windshields, side windows, and rear windows be imposed on a square-foot basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 2663. A bill to regulate the conduct of aliens visiting in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 2664. A bill to extend the gratuitous insurance benefits granted by subsection 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to parents of certain deceased members of the Armed Forces without regard to the dependency of such parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2665. A bill to provide more equitably for the medical care of dependents of personnel of the Coast Guard under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2666. A bill to encourage the States to hold preferential primary elections for the nomination of candidates for the office of President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2667. A bill to amend section 208 (b) of the Technical Changes Act of 1953 (Public Law 287, 83d Cong.); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2668. A bill to provide benefits under the Social Security Act for the survivors of certain individuals who died prior to 1940; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2669. A bill to amend section 4233 (a) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the case of admissions to privately operated swimming pools, skating rinks, and other places providing facilities for physical exercise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2670. A bill to provide for public accountability by tax-exempt organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SISK:

H. R. 2671. A bill to provide that individuals serving in the Armed Forces on December 31, 1954, may continue to accrue entitlement to educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, or become eligible for vocational rehabilitation, during their service subsequent to January 31, 1955; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2672. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain as additions to the Central Valley project, California, the Trinity River division and the San Luis unit of the West San Joaquin division; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2673. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to provide that feed grains acquired through price-support operations shall be sold to dairy farmers at prices equivalent to 75 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 2674. A bill to provide for the control and regulation of bank holding companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 2675. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the migration of the Acadians from Nova Scotia to Louisiana; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2676. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the 200th anniversary of the migration of the Acadians from Nova Scotia to Louisiana; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 2677. A bill creating a Federal commission to study the copyright laws and to make recommendations for their revision; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 2678. A bill to provide for granting to the several States the minerals and mineral rights subject to disposition under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 on the condition that the income from such minerals and mineral rights be used for public-school purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 2679. A bill to amend the act to protect scenic values along Oak Creek Canyon and certain tributaries thereof within the Coconino National Forest, Ariz.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2680. A bill to promote the rehabilitation of the Papago Tribe of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Papago Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2681. A bill providing for the leasing by Indian owners of restricted Indian lands in the State of Arizona for certain purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2682. A bill relative to the exploration, location, and entry of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2683. A bill to provide a vitalized and equitable Reserve program for the Armed Forces; to provide for the operation of the National Security Training Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2684. A bill to provide for the administration of the Ryukyu Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2685. A bill to provide medical care for dependents of members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 2686. A bill to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce; to stabilize prices of milk and dairy products; to impose a stabilization fee on the marketing of milk and butterfat; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 2687. A bill to establish a Missouri Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Missouri River, its tributaries and watershed, to prevent floods, reclaim and irrigate lands, encourage agriculture, stimulate industrial expansion, develop low-cost hydroelectric power, promote navigation, increase recreational possibilities, protect wildlife, strengthen the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 2688. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain contracts, agreements, or franchises to enable manufacturers of automobiles and trucks, and their franchise dealers, to protect their goodwill in the business of manufacturing and distributing automobiles and trucks, made or sold by them, by restricting franchise dealers from reselling to certain unauthorized persons; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. R. 2689. A bill to incorporate the Legion of Guardsmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2690. A bill—

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE AND POLICY

To reaffirm the national public policy and the purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraint and monopolies, commonly designated "antitrust" laws, which among other things prohibit price discriminations; to aid in intelligent, fair, and effective administration and enforcement thereof; and to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Anti-Price Discrimination Act and the protection which it affords to independent business, the Congress hereby reaffirms that the purpose of the antitrust laws in prohibiting price discriminations is to secure equality of opportunity of all persons to compete in trade or business and to preserve competition where it exists, to restore it where it is destroyed, and to permit it to spring up in new fields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 2691. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide certain benefits for the widows of employees who died prior to February 28, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 2692. A bill to amend the Seniority Act for Rural Mail Carriers to provide a method for the promotion of substitute rural carriers to the position of regular rural carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. J. Res. 143. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BASS of Tennessee:

H. J. Res. 145. Joint resolution relating to tobacco allotments and marketing quotas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. J. Res. 146. Joint resolution for the preservation for posterity of the archives establishing the fundamental history of America made by the heroic men and women who emigrated from foreign lands to establish the plantation and colonies of America; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution providing for a more effective control of narcotic drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. J. Res. 148. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. J. Res. 149. Joint resolution providing for a more effective control of narcotic drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution inviting the Chief Justice of the United States to address a joint session of Congress annually; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 151. Joint resolution placing individuals who served in the temporary forces of the United States Navy during the Spanish-American War in the same status as those individuals who served in the Army for equal periods of time during that war and who were given furloughs or leaves upon being mustered out of the service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. J. Res. 152. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1955, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 153. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim April 19 of each year Patriot's Day for the commemoration of the events that took place on April 19, 1775; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. J. Res. 154. Joint resolution establishing a Commission on Government Security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H. J. Res. 155. Joint resolution providing for a more effective control of narcotic drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution designating Korean veterans as war veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 157. Joint resolution establishing a Commission on Government Security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution calling for the publication and reexamination of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. Con. Res. 45. Concurrent resolution providing that any identifiable group of American Indians shall be given the opportunity to participate in the drafting of any proposed legislation which concerns them; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Con. Res. 47. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 200th anniversary of

the migration of the Acadians from Nova Scotia to Louisiana and other areas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. Con. Res. 50. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 200th anniversary of the migration of the Acadians from Nova Scotia to Louisiana and other areas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. Res. 97. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the causes of crime committed in violation of the laws of the United States, and of other crimes affecting the national health, welfare, and morals, and of methods of preventing such crimes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 98. Resolution providing funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MEADER:

H. Res. 99. Resolution amending certain provisions of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Res. 100. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Consumer Interests; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing the Congress of the United States to take cognizance of the acute problems attending the recent devastation resulting from tidal floods in the Narragansett Bay area, and to lend support for appropriate action in having the situation surveyed, and to make available funds to aid the State of Rhode Island and the cities and towns to finance the protective works recommended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the House of Representatives, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States in favor of the passage of legislation reducing the age at which persons shall be eligible to receive social-security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 2693. A bill for the relief of Cesare Di Lollo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2694. A bill for the relief of Sarah Lowinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BETTS:

H. R. 2695. A bill for the relief of Ludmilla Maria Anderwald and her minor child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2696. A bill for the relief of Marguerita Willer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 2697. A bill for the relief of Eric L. Reid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2698. A bill for the relief of Joseph Felix Adrien Dionne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2699. A bill for the relief of Wilbraham Academy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2700. A bill for the relief of Astor Cole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND (by request):

H. R. 2701. A bill for the relief of Pantaleone Capuano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2702. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jeannette Pelletier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2703. A bill for the relief of Ettore Penna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON:

H. R. 2704. A bill for the relief of Kazuko Iwata Rausch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 2705. A bill to provide for payment of the adjusted service certificate of Loving J. Collins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARRIGG (by request):

H. R. 2706. A bill for the relief of Incencio Nunez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 2707. A bill for the relief of Terry L. Hatchett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2708. A bill for the relief of Thomas Kunhyuk Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 2709. A bill for the relief of the estate of Rene Weil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 2710. A bill for the relief of Eduardo Orefice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER:

H. R. 2711. A bill for the relief of Fortunato Portilla Delgado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON (by request):

H. R. 2712. A bill for the relief of Emanuel Mathes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 2713. A bill for the relief of Hugo Skala, Maria Skala (Skalova) his wife, and Paul Skala, his son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVEREUX:

H. R. 2714. A bill for the relief of Vasilios Demetriou Kretsos and his wife, Chryssa Thomaidou Kretsos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVEREUX (by request):

H. R. 2715. A bill for the relief of Panagiotes Roumeliotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 2716. A bill for the relief of Margarita Exposito Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2717. A bill for the relief of Giles P. Fredell and wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 2718. A bill for the relief of Fernanda Milani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2719. A bill for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 2720. A bill for the relief of Maria Ruggieri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2721. A bill for the relief of Mihai Indig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2722. A bill for the relief of Dominick Lechich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2723. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ingeborg Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2724. A bill for the relief of Miss Elvira Bortolin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2725. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Reda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2726. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Governali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2727. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hermina Vidor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2728. A bill for the relief of Dr. Frederic S. Schleger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2729. A bill for the relief of William Badinelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 2730. A bill for the relief of Maria Ansuini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 2731. A bill for the relief of Sing Fong York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. R. 2732. A bill for the relief of Fred C. Gallander; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2733. A bill for the relief of Wladyslaw Krajck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 2734. A bill for the relief of Capt. Charles M. Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2735. A bill for the relief of Inako Yokoo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2736. A bill for the relief of Roy M. Butcher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2737. A bill for the relief of Matilde T. Bariao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2738. A bill for the relief of Teresa Jurjevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2739. A bill for the relief of Irma Fontanini Citti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2740. A bill for the relief of Kate Fiorovic and Pave Fiorovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2741. A bill for the relief of Aavo Lohuaru; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2742. A bill for the relief of George Car; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALLECK:

H. R. 2743. A bill for the relief of Robert Wong and Faith Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 2744. A bill for the relief of Aristides Kritikas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois:

H. R. 2745. A bill for the relief of Casimir Ramsauskas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 2746. A bill for the relief of the First National Bank of Birmingham, Ala.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 2747. A bill for the relief of Col. McFarland Cockrill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2748. A bill providing for the extension of patent No. 119,187; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 2749. A bill for the relief of George Risto Divitkos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2750. A bill for the relief of William S. Lin, Jean C. Lin, Annie Lin, Fu Ming Lin (also known as Dina Lin), and Cheng Lie Lin (also known as Richard Lin); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2751. A bill for the relief of Peter Berth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 2752. A bill for the relief of Lupe M. Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2753. A bill for the relief of Geraldine Gean Hunt and Linda Marie Hunt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2754. A bill for the relief of John S. Barreiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2755. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 2756. A bill for the relief of Frank Scriver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 2757. A bill for the relief of Gershon, Szyna, and Herz Brook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2758. A bill for the relief of Schmerla, Rifka, and Kalman Blady; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2759. A bill for the relief of the Yahya Aryeh family; Malekjahan, Moussa, Nouriel, Gabriel, Emanuel, Parvin, Ouriel, Ouziel, Eliahou, and Samuel Aryeh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2760. A bill for the relief of the estate of William B. Rice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2761. A bill for the relief of Maria (Henriette) Zagrabowicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2762. A bill for the relief of Bent Petersen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2763. A bill for the relief of Aurelio Guidi, Andreina Guidi, and Giorgio Guidi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2764. A bill for the relief of Victor and Irene-Wanda Goldstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2765. A bill for the relief of Joseph, Brocha, and Jehoushija Genger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 2766. A bill for the relief of Jose Maria Lopes Ramos and his wife and minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 2767. A bill for the relief of Edward Mixson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2768. A bill for the relief of Charles R. Law, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2769. A bill for the relief of Tennessee C. Batts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 2770. A bill for the relief of Elly S. (Angelides) Christofilos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 2771. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Soledad Tejera Suarez Herreros and her son, Rafael; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2772. A bill for the relief of Jamil Masri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2773. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of personal property damage sustained by the Security Feed and Seed Co. of Johnson City, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 2774. A bill to authorize the acceptance on behalf of the United States of the conveyance and release by the Aztec Land and Cattle Co., Ltd., of its right, title, and interest in lands within the Coconino and Sitgreaves National Forests, in the State of Arizona, and the payment to said company of the value of such lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 2775. A bill for the relief of Chrisavge Christodoulopoulou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2776. A bill for the relief of Lillian Sorensen Howell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2777. A bill for the relief of George L. Goetz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 2778. A bill for the relief of Jacob Grynberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2779. A bill for the relief of Mikie Sato and Haruhiro Sato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H. R. 2780. A bill for the relief of Dr. Byung Hack Youn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 2781. A bill for the relief of Anna G. Pruczinski Wood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 2782. A bill for the relief of Josefa Martinez Infante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 2783. A bill for the relief of Andrew Wing-Huen Tsang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHUFORD:

H. R. 2784. A bill for the relief of Dixie Novelty Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 2785. A bill for the relief of Anesti N. Baicousheff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 2786. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jean Barbara Laing Vance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 2787. A bill to authorize the acceptance on behalf of the United States of the conveyance and release by the Aztec Land & Cattle Co., Ltd., of its right, title, and interest in lands within the Coconino and Sitgreaves National Forests, in the State of Arizona, and the payment to said company of the value of such lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 2788. A bill for the relief of Miguel Sandoval-Michel (also known as Arturo Rodriguez-Gomez); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2789. A bill for the relief of Andrija Artukovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2790. A bill for the relief of Ana Maria Artukovic, Visnja M. Artukovic, Zorica D. Artukovic, and Radoslav Artukovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 2791. A bill for the relief of Ofelia Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 2792. A bill for the relief of Glen Miner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2793. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment on any and all claims in law or equity, which Maquinna Jongie Claplanhoo, of Neah Bay, Wash., may have against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND (by request):

H. R. 2794. A bill for the relief of Bjorne Norman deBough; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 2795. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a Medal of Honor to Joseph Oklahombi; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. R. 2796. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Khatoun Malkey Samuel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. R. 2797. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Seyre Odichou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 2798. A bill for the relief of Alfred Johann Hoinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2799. A bill for the relief of Milan P. Vojvodic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution authorizing the appointment of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur as general of the armies of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

56. By Mr. CANFIELD: Petition of the New Jersey State League of Municipalities opposing any proposal by Congress to tax the income of municipal and other public agency bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

57. Also, petition of the New Jersey State League of Municipalities supporting the actions of the American Municipal Association in urging Congress to provide payments to municipalities in lieu of taxes on federally owned property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

58. By Mr. JENNINGS: Petition of the Smyth County Farmers Union urging that legislation be enacted to permit the Korean war veterans to receive the same benefits as those of World War II in regard to institutional on-farm training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

59. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Wisconsin, in a meeting held at Kenosha, Wis., in December 1954 "that the time has come for the United States to defend its citizens by delivering an ultimatum to Red China to set free all prisoners, both military and civilian, who are being unjustly confined; further that in the event of a refusal by Red China to comply with such request, that the United States take such positive action as is deemed necessary to accomplish the purpose of this resolution"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

60. Also, resolution of the Rock County, Wis., Bar Association unanimously adopted on December 16, 1954, in protest against the increasing complexity of Federal income tax laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Set Net Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1955

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under Federal law, regulations governing the Alaska fishery are made and enforced by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior. By custom and, it must be assumed, because conservation would best be served thereby, set nets, a form of gear for the taking of salmon, have been spaced at different distances in different sections of Alaska. Last summer a Federal judge of the district court for Alaska held that set nets are fixed gear within the meaning of the organic act concerning the Alaska fishery. The Fish and Wildlife Service immediately announced that as a consequence of this ruling 1955 regulations would require these nets to be not less than 1,800 feet distant one from another or a much greater distance than has been the case in most areas of Alaska.

It is generally agreed that this would create chaos, no less. Therefore bills have been introduced in the Congress seeking legislative cure. It is my understanding that in principle they are en-

dorsed by the Fish and Wildlife Service, by the fishing industry, and by the fishermen who, to date, have made their views known. Thus we have what might properly be described an unparalleled situation in which all elements are in harmony as to what should be done, in what had the possibility of being a highly controversial Alaska fishery issue.

Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of Washington, and I have introduced identical bills on this subject. The requirement now is for speedy action so that the law may be changed before the 1955 fishing regulations become applicable.

Only this morning I received from Clarks Point on Bristol Bay in Alaska a radiogram signed by a good many residents of Clarks Point and Ekok whose livelihood is directly concerned with the operation of set nets. The body of the message reads:

> We, the undersigned, urge that the House of Representatives and Senate approve legislation now before you to reduce distances between set nets from 1,800 feet to those distances that were in effect during the 1954 fishing season.

The message is signed by Joe Bermanon, Clara Clark, Joseph Clark, Nancy Wilson, Mary E. Shade, M. E. George, Aurora George, Rose Garcia, Matrona Javier, Verner Wilson, John W. Anderson, Annie Anderson, Ingvar D. Johansen, Peter Hamilton, Jr., Aliek Evon, Annie Evon, John Gardiner, Louise Gardiner, Annie Ramondos, Charles E. Wolfe, John R. Andersen, Peggy Andersen, Emil E. Endel, Messa Egeand, Andrew Roberts, Martha Hamilton, Steven Wassily, Mark M. Hiratsuka, Mary Hiratsuka, Dick Lopez, Victor Tumutak, Andres Javier, Matrona Debano, Peter Traust, Harry Barnes, Daisy Barnes, Domingo Sloresta, Mary Floresta, Mrs. Anita Lopez, Pete Debenno, Jack D. Howard, Lilla M. Howard, Henry A. Shade, Nick Nankon, Mary Echuck, Jacinto A. Blancaslor, Peter Heyano, Rosa Heyano, Gene F. Pillian, Charlotte Pillian, Jack Savo, Tikano Savo, Sakalie Talogan, Nick Hansen, Annie Hansen, Tarrey Nolly, Sophie Nolly, Susie Muneyasu, James Muneyasu, and Henry E. Shade.

The United States Junior Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1955

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 35th anniversary of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, I would like to make the following remarks:

Tomorrow will mark the 35th anniversary of the founding of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce. This organization, made up of young men aged 21 to 35, have made an outstanding contribution to the communities of the Nation. This organization's success in arousing the civic consciousness of our young men and the excellence of their leadership training program is widely recognized.

The citizens of Michigan are proud of the fact that we have 105 active jaycee chapters with a membership totaling over 5,000 members. Their record of accomplishment in many fields of civic endeavor is one to be proud of. We are especially proud of the fact that one of the most outstanding national presidents was Prof. Paul Bagwell, of Michigan State College. Knowing the record of our Michigan Jaycees, it is a pleasure for me to congratulate the national organization on the occasion of its 35th anniversary.

The President's Budget Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, when we heard the President's budget message somewhat of a political stir arose over its contents. The Democrats seem to think the President made some misleading statements in the message. I examined it carefully, as I do all of his messages, and I failed to see where it was misleading. I think the President stated the matter as plainly as possible with what information he had. When the matter is considered by the Appropriations Committee defects will be detected, and, no doubt, many of the items will be reduced. JOHN TABER, on the Republican side, took about this position: That every request would be carefully scrutinized when the committee gets the message before it.

Probably some of the conclusions reached by the President were subject to debate. For example, on page 1, he stated:

> Thus, we continue to progress toward a balanced budget.

On page 15 he made this statement:

> Therefore, I have no alternative but to ask Congress for an increase in the public debt.

Of course, it is difficult to harmonize these two statements. Personally, I do not think it will be necessary to raise the debt limit. The old debt limit was $275 billion, and last session we increased it to $285 billion. On December 31 the debt was $278 billion, thus leaving a leeway of $7 billion, and this in the face of a big tax reduction. Unless we appropriate, and have to borrow, too much money for foreign aid, I do not see where we shall have to worry about raising the debt limit. I do not dispute the President's statement that the limit will have to be raised, but on the surface it would seem not to be necessary.

Sixty-five percent of the budget estimate of $62,400,000,000 will go for national security, and in this I have no complaint. We should spend all that is necessary for our own defense. This amount may have to be increased, because our security depends upon how well we ourselves are prepared to defend this country. In my judgment, we have neglected ourselves too much, because we are just waking up to the fact that in the final analysis we shall have to do our own defending. In his message the President did not take up the subject of cutting down the size of the Army. I am sure objection will be raised to this when the time comes.

We are not on a peacetime economy, even though there is no war. We are still supplying billions to factories to to turn out war material. In other words, war or the fear of war, is still present, and we have no definite way of determining what our national condition would be if we were actually on a peacetime economy.

I will do as I have always done—strenuously object to handing over billions to foreign countries—but will support every move to prepare a full and adequate defense for ourselves.

Under present conditions I think the President said about all that could be said, and, as time passes, any mistakes in recommendations can be ironed out. These corrections are made to every budget, and have been ever since I have been a Member. What a department asks for is not necessarily what they will get.

Crime: A National Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I have long been aware of the fact that organized crime is a cancerous growth upon our society and our way of life. In recent years, since the end of World War II, this situation is assuming alarming proportions in all parts of the country. The most deplorable manifestation of this problem is the growth of juvenile delinquency, the rise in the number of youthful criminals, and the serious offenses committed by them, which makes it a problem of grave national concern.

For many years I have studied the question of juvenile delinquency and the great menace it means for our youth. Coupled with that, I have given a good deal of thought to the means of effective crime prevention. In fact, back in 1936 I founded a crime prevention institution in New York, which is still in existence and is doing a noble job in my home city.

We all know that crime is not confined to any particular race, or nationality, or religious group. It is a social disease which results from many causes, such as poverty, slum housing, poor environment, neglect by parents, lack of family discipline, breakup of the family unit, and emotional disturbances. Juvenile delinquency, youthful criminals, teenage drug addicts, and the like are the

outward manifestations of this social disease.

We should seek to know the social conditions which breed and encourage this situation to grow. I have felt for a long time that society is to blame for the large crime rate, and I am also of the opinion that our Government has been derelict in dealing with this problem from a preventative standpoint. What is wrong with our educational system that it is helpless in eradicating this evil when our children are still in an impressionable age? What is wrong with the neighborhoods and the communities in which we live that our young people are influenced by evil forces? What is wrong with our home life, our discipline, our associations? Where have we fallen down on the job of raising the young generation to be law-abiding, responsible, and dignified citizens?

These and many other questions are perturbing our serious-minded citizenry. There are many among us who raise this question: We are spending many hundreds of millions of dollars to fight crime and criminals by means of large prosecuting staffs, huge police forces, the courts and penal institutions, but what are we doing to prevent crime and to curb juvenile delinquency? True, we have had some investigations, we have had some well-meaning conferences, but the crime rate has not fallen off. The problem goes far deeper than that.

Police protection is not enough. Arrests and court warnings are not enough. Even jail sentences are not enough to curb this evil. This is a long-range problem which must be dealt with from a long-range point of view, if we seriously aim to protect our youth and to eradicate the evil of crime from our midst. It must be given nationwide attention through all media of information, the press, radio, television, the movies, also through our churches, schools, organizations, unions, and various public and private agencies and institutions. The American public must be aroused to this menace which is threatening our youth and is affecting us all.

I believe that Congress should give leadership and guidance to our people in dealing with the problem of crime. An aroused congressional interest in an anticrime campaign would be a valuable resource for all agencies and groups, for parents and teachers, for church leaders and Government officials, who are interested in checking the growth of crime and reducing it to a minimum. Congress has a responsibility to the people to do all within its power to seek a solution of this problem.

Mr. Speaker, in order to get to the roots of this problem, I am introducing two pieces of legislation. The first is a resolution calling for the creation of a fact-finding committee of five members of the House of Representatives to conduct, without regard to politics, a full and complete investigation and study of the causes of crimes committed in violation of the laws of the United States and of other crimes affecting the national health, welfare, and morals, and the methods of preventing such crimes. This investigation should include examinations of criminal records, a study of Federal and State penal institutions for the purpose of recommending new legislation to the Congress, an analysis of the relationship of local neighborhoods and schools with the causes of juvenile delinquency, and other factors which the committee may deem appropriate.

The other piece of legislation is a bill which is designed as supplementary to the resolution. The bill calls for the creation of a Bureau of Crime Prevention in the Department of Justice as a permanent agency to conduct a continuous study and investigation to seek methods for the prevention of crime and curbing juvenile delinquency. It requires the Bureau to establish an office in each State and to cooperate with State and Federal agencies in initiating crime-prevention programs.

I am convinced that the future of our country depends on how well we raise our youth and prepare them for the responsibilities of citizenship. We live in a time of great stress and tension at home and abroad. It is imperative that we imbue our youth with an appreciation of our way of life, our communities, our institutions, and everything that is positive and constructive. We must make it crystal clear to them that crimes committed against society will affect their own future lives and undermine all their opportunities to become useful members of society. We must make them understand that they themselves will be the greatest victims of their criminal acts and that they stand to lose most.

The dollars we spend today for seeking ways to prevent crimes may be paid back a hundredfold not only in saving money which goes into fighting crime, but even more so in helping our youth become better citizens tomorrow. I urge the Congress to approve these measures as soon as possible so that immediate action can be started to deal with this problem.

Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, as in the past, this body will be dealing with the problem of health insurance and reinsurance. While governmental and legislative machinery have been grinding inconclusively on the subject, professional men and citizens in my home community of Long Beach, Calif., have acted on their own initiative.

After 2 years of planning by a group of Long Beach physicians and their lay advisers, the Nation's first "full payment" health insurance plan allowing patients a choice of doctors and hospitals is now in effect for 600 employees of the Independent Press-Telegram Publishing Co. and their dependents. More than 1,300 persons, representing 95 percent of the newspaper's employees and their families are covered by the Long Beach plan which attracted national attention in the medical and health field when it was announced recently.

The plan's backers claim it is one of the most complete medical-surgical-hospital insurance programs ever devised, and describe it as "private medicine's answer to the critical problem of rising health care costs."

Underwritten by California Physicians Service—the familiar Blue Shield Plan—the new program guarantees beneficiaries that more than 1,000 participating physicians in the Long Beach area will accept the plan's fee schedule as full payment for all surgical and medical services in the contract.

Cost of the program for Independent, Press-Telegram employees is shared equally by management and participating employees. Beneficiaries of the plan may use any hospital or any physician although the "full payment" guaranty applies only to participating physicians. Both medical and osteopathic physicians and surgeons have cooperated in the plan.

The unique program was developed and is directed by a nine-man board of local physicians elected by 300 participating Long Beach doctors. Dr. Orville Cole heads the Board and serving with him are Drs. Gordon Bateman, Ben Parks, Robert Helms, Arthur Buell, Sam Woolington, Maurice Rosenbaum, William Burns and John Cottrell.

Dr. Cole believes the plan will serve as a pilot plan for other medical units across the country. He states that for the present it will be offered to employee groups of 25 or more, but that a similar program for individuals may be offered later.

Technical problems in initiating the program were handled by Jake E. Hanstein of the Don Berry Insurance Agency.

Modern Supercarriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 19, 1955, the Washington Post and Times Herald carried an article by John W. Finney, of the United Press, quoting the distinguished Democratic chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Missouri, as recommending the scuttling of the new so-called supercarrier.

The gentleman from Missouri is quoted as saying he "does not approve of expenditures of enormous sums on aircraft carriers when authorities say that no one carrier will be afloat for more than 10 hours after war is declared."

Who the authorities referred to are, I do not know, of course, but I am sure they do not include any GI's, those American authorities who thanked God for the

overhead protection of carrier-based naval planes in the recent uphappy Korean police action. Nor could they include former General of the Army Omar N. Bradley, because shortly after his retirement as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, he wrote an article in the August 29, 1953, issue of the Saturday Evening Post in which he said:

One of the enemy's first major efforts, in case of war, might be to destroy our retaliatory power by knocking out the air bases from which our atomic planes can take off. The location of most of these bases is well known. Carriers are also vulnerable, but their location, as they range the seas is hard to keep track of. They can be here today and 800 miles away tomorrow. The knowledge that planes from such carriers can join in the atomic attack must be a powerful additional deterrent to any totalitarian leaders who are thinking of starting a world war.

General Bradley referred to the primary Navy mission keeping sealanes open.

But he added:

In my opinion, the primary mission of the big carriers is shifting toward strategic air attack.

Mr. Speaker, I just wonder what authority would dare to recommend the risk of scuttling the aircraft carrier—just what authorities would jeopardize our military strength by such a policy. If no one carrier would be afloat 10 hours after war is declared, just what would have happened in the meantime to our nonmobile land airbases. The location and dispersal of carriers over the oceans would not be known to the enemy and it is conceivable that the carriers might be the only means of landing aircraft left to us 10 hours after war was declared.

Aircraft carriers, as I understand it, form the backbone of our strategic sea defense and attack force. Modern carriers are capable of delivering the most powerful atomic bombs on long-range missions at faster than 700 miles-an-hour speed. The Navy's supersonic planes combat ceiling is higher than 40,000 feet; they can carry all the latest type of weapons, bombs, and air-launched missiles. The carrier force is mobile, flexible, and supportable and can operate on 70 percent of the globe.

Maybe the H-bomb will be used in the next war; maybe it will not. In either case, the carrier is our best hope of being able to transport land troops and support the world system of land airbases we have established throughout the world.

Thus far in history, it has been command of the sea which preserved national freedom; now it may be command of the air over land and sea and maybe under the latter.

Peace in Southeast Asia or peace throughout the world cannot be preserved by guided missiles alone nor by capacity for mass destruction abroad. Localized warfare of slow, sinister expansion and infiltration requires mobility and manpower. For example, a revolution in Central or South America or a remote part of the world could not be met by B–47 bombers. One aircraft carrier or a "killer unit" dispatched to a trouble spot with a few marines may put out a fire before it gets started.

God help this great Nation of ours if we discard our basic strategic offensive and defensive weapons, the aircraft carriers, and decide the next war, of necessity, will be an H-bomb air war with the destruction of all civilization and no land or sea forces needed.

President Eisenhower on the advice I am sure of our best military minds has recommended continuation of the program of constructing modern aircraft carriers capable of handling larger, heavier and faster planes. If you scuttle this carrier program, you scuttle the Navy. Moscow and Peiping would like that. Those are the only authorities I know of who want our aircraft carriers scuttled.

Now I do not question the sincere desire of the gentleman from Missouri to curtail Federal appropriations. The gentleman, moreover, is entitled to his views as to the type of offense and defense this country can afford. But I hope the gentleman will not close his mind to recommendations of our best military brains, including the President. The Appropriations Committee and this Congress realize I hope on the aircraft carrier "humanity with all its fears, with all its hopes of future years, is hanging breathless on thy fate."

After Us, the Deluge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRADY GENTRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1955

Mr. GENTRY. Mr. Speaker, in his 1952 campaign, the President delivered numerous telling blows against great public debt, deficit spending, and irresponsible fiscal policy.

Then in his first state of the Union message 2 years ago, following his election, the President repeatedly expressed his great concern regarding the financial condition of our Government. Early in that message he stated:

Our immediate task is to chart a fiscal and economic policy that can reduce the planned deficits and balance the budget.

A few paragraphs later in the same message, the President stated:

The first order of business is the elimination of the annual deficit.

Later, in the same message, the President, still sorely troubled by the financial condition of our country, said:

A balanced budget is an essential first measure in checking further depreciation in the buying power of the dollar.

The President could not get this burdensome problem off his mind. Only a few paragraphs later, in the same message, he said:

If the budget is balanced, the tax burden that today stifles initiative can and must be eased.

The President, in that first message 2 years ago, still had not concluded with the problem which he then must have felt was the most important confronting him and our country. Again he said:

The national debt is now more than $265 billion. In addition, the accumulated obligational authority of the Federal Government for future payments totals over $80 billion. Even this amount is exclusive of large contingent liabilities so numerous and extensive as to be almost beyond description. * * * The present authorized Government debt limit is $275 billion. The forecast presented by the outgoing administration with the fiscal year 1954 budget indicates that before the end of the fiscal year and at the beginning of demand for payments during that year the total Government debt may approach and even exceed that limit. Unless budget deficits are checked, the momentum of past programs will force an increase in the statutory debt limit.

The President neither exaggerated nor unduly emphasized the true condition of the Federal Treasury. Every Member of Congress knows—in fact, all the people of our country know—that there were compelling reasons for the great concern expressed by him. The banks of our Nation then had, and still have at the present time, Government I O U's in their listed assets equal to four and one-half times their combined capital stocks, surpluses, and undivided profits. The insurance companies of our country held in their portfolios at that time, and still do, twice as much in Government I O U's as the amount of the combined capital stocks of all the insurance companies of our Nation. Government I O U's then comprised, and still do today, a great portion of the life savings of a large percentage of our citizens.

Did the Government have the money to pay these debts 2 years ago? No. Does the Government have the money to pay our astronomical national debt, or even any part of it, today? No. All the Government has is the authority to levy taxes against the people of our country and require the people to take up their own I O U's with any savings they still may happen to have. Taxes, high as they are, still do not come close to paying even our current yearly expenses, much less anything on our debt. Meanwhile, more and more of the savings of our people and our institutions are being taken by the Government and our debt continues to grow because of actions by the Chief Executive and the Congress.

So, the situation today is just as urgent, in fact it is more urgent, than it was during the 1952 campaign and at the time the President delivered his ringing denunciation of deficit financing and unwieldy public debt in his first state-of-the-Union message. It is more urgent because we owe more money than we did then. It is more urgent because we are now increasing this debt at a time when the President himself says we are at peace. At the time the President was repeatedly stressing his great worries about our financial status and saying it must be corrected, we were in the midst of a costly war and the opportunity to make the correction was not as great as it is today. Even though we have not been engaged in a fighting war for almost 2 years now and the time would seem to be ripe to put our financial house in order, the President's fears of yesterday,

the expressed pledges of his platform of 1952, and even the record of the first 2 years of his administration seem to have been forgotten.

It is sad to relate, therefore, that we still have deficit financing, the national debt continues to soar, the savings of more and more people and institutions are being expended and given away throughout the world, and the idea that the Government can do everything for a citizen better than he can do it for himself is to have even greater emphasis.

On the 6th of this month, the President delivered another state-of-the-Union address to the new 84th Congress. I heard it in person and I have since read it three times. On each successive reading I became more amazed. You will not find in this message even a bare mention of our overpowering public debt. It is as silent as the tomb regarding it. Can you imagine a President devoting almost an hour to the exposition of the state of our Nation and making no mention whatever of the deplorable fact that $280 billion of the savings of our people is represented solely by I O U's which the Government cannot pay because it does not have the funds, a debt that even now, in a period proclaimed by the President himself in his message to be one of peace and prosperity, is being allowed to increase every single day? It would seem that, by all odds, some of the most salient passages in a message to the Congress on the state of the Union should concern its financial condition.

And, what does this recent state of the Union message say about balancing the budget, that nightmare which concerned the President so greatly in the campaign of 1952 and in his state-of-the-Union address 2 years ago? Here is the one small mention:

> Government efficiency and economy remain essential to steady progress toward a balanced budget.

You may search this message high and low but this one light touch will be found to be the only fleeting reference to the deplorable fact that this Nation of ours still is not able to live within its income.

The President's address, couched in lofty phrases as all such messages are, shows why our financial situation was not even discussed. After enunciating very fine principles of Government, it becomes a promise of something for everybody, a vast grab-bag designed to kill everybody with kindness. It recommends more and greater Federal activities. It makes it certain that more deficit financing and more debt will be the order of the day and that more and more layers of government will be placed on the backs of an already tax-burdened people. It will add to a Federal bureaucracy already so vast that just its civilian employees' salaries now amount to $10 billion annually, an item that alone devours more than $200 in taxes yearly from each American family. This one item now costs the taxpayers 14 times as much as it cost to operate the entire Government of this Nation, including the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, as late as the year 1916.

What recommendations are contained in this message which make more deficit financing, more debt and more fiscal irresponsibility a certainty? Among many other things, it recommends reinsurance of health insurance and public housing, both of which are pure, unadulterated socialism. If these adornments of the welfare state are to become permanent, full-grown cancers on our body politic, we can forever say goodbye to responsible fiscal management and embrace deficit financing and overpowering public debt as permanent fixtures of our economic life. A survey already made shows that it would cost the Government more than $100 billion in additional taxes on our people to give public housing to those who are claimed to be entitled to it. No one knows how much in additional, onerous taxes the Congress would finally have to take from the taxpayers if reinsurance of health insurance also becomes a malignant appendage of our Government.

This message clearly indicates that we are to have an entirely new injection of the opiate of paternalism in the educational field. Where are we to get this money? The Treasury is completely bare. Are we to take more of the people's savings and issue them more Government certificates of credit in order that Washington will get credit for being a benefactor of education? What is to happen to the oft-repeated pronouncements of the last 2 years that invasion of States rights was at an end? We cannot make this appropriation today without making it yearly hereafter because, once given, it will be repeated because of public clamor. Certainly the States should not submit to this malign approach and be cooingly seduced while surrendering their inherent rights. The offer of Federal funds for education on a large scale would be a deception because the Federal Government actually cannot give anything to the States which it does not first get from the States. When the Federal Government starts giving the States bouquets, you can be assured that they were first plucked from the States' own gardens. It is worthy of note, however, that a large part of the plucking is used by the Federal Government in costly bureaucratic administration, the States getting back only a residue. Would not the Government now do well to put its own financial house in order and cease its prostitution of the rights and authority of the States through the subterfuge that it is giving them something?

The state of the Union message did not set out the details regarding what was desired in foreign aid. But the budget message this week stated that it should be the same as last year, approximately $5 billion. You will recall that more than $50 billion of American taxpayers' money has been lavished on foreign nations throughout the world during the last few years, especially in Europe. Europe is prosperous today. Her production is almost twice as great as it was when World War II commenced. Both her unemployment and public debt are much less than our own. While we have 3 million unemployed and are increasing our debt, there is no unemployment in Great Britain and France and Britain's budget is balanced. There is more than $10 billion of our aid today in the pipeline for foreign nations, including Great Britain and France, which they have not yet been able to spend because of the vastness of our extreme generosity. While we are still being requested to give even more to Europeans, we are to concentrate on massive aid for the hundreds of millions of Asiatics in order to demonstrate our bigness of heart and our great regard for their well-being. This will, of course, require billions more of our taxpayers' money and, even worse, billions in additional debt for future generations to try to pay. This proposal seems to make a piker of Henry Wallace who made the suggestion several years ago that we should try to furnish milk to the Asiatics, a suggestion for which he was generally ridiculed.

The President's state of the Union address advised us that the National Advisory Committee on Highways had recently reported to him, advising what should be done with reference to highways. The President will transmit his recommendation to Congress on this subject on January 27. Since the Committee appointed by the President has had meetings with various groups in support of its plan, it is indicated that the President approves it and will recommend it.

There are approximately 720,000 miles of highways in our country which have been accepted by the Federal Government as worthy of Federal aid under the constitutional provision making roads a Federal responsibility. Thirty-eight thousand miles of these highways constitute what is usually known as the strategic or interstate system. These 38,000 miles are our main highways and carry approximately one-seventh of the total traffic. Because of the great sum the President probably will recommend to be spent on these 38,000 miles, it is worthy of note that in the period of 1916 to 1955—the entire life of the Federal Bureau of Public Roads and of organized highway construction in our country—there has been expended by the Federal Government on the full 720,000 miles of the Federal aid system the sum of slightly more than $7 billion. Of this amount, less than $2 billion was expended on the strategic system of 38,000 miles. It is obvious that the President is correct when he says that the past and present rate of contribution by the Government will never result in good highways for that part of our highway system which, by its very nature, is of greatest concern to the Federal Government.

The plan of the Advisory Highway Committee provides for the establishment by Congress of a new Federal corporation which, without income or assets, would issue $25 billion in 30-year bonds. Regardless, the United States Treasury would be obligated to pay the bonds, with interest. Interest would approximate $12 billion. If the bonds are actually liquidated in the 30-year period, a very unlikely possibility, the $25 billion expended on roads would therefore cost the taxpayers $37 billion. It is unlikely, however, that $25 billion in highway value would be real-

ized. Since the $25 billion is to be put under contract in the short period of 10 years, it is most likely that contract prices would soar. The Government will be fortunate to receive as much, say, as $23 billion in road value for the $37 billion they will cost.

The absolute necessity for still another Federal agency with reference to this program is not entirely clear. It may be felt by some that this method makes it appear that the national debt is not being raised by the amount of the bonds. It is unmistakable that this plan will increase the national debt $25 billion, and, with other deficits proposed by the President in the budget, will carry our great debt to well beyond $300 billion. The Government and its citizens cannot escape any of its full responsibility under this proposal even though it is possibly open to the charge that it would make it easy to have your cake and eat it, too. No financial gimmick has ever been devised which will do that. Financial legerdemain will not eliminate the stark reality that the adoption of this proposal places an additional $25 billion mortgage on the taxpayers of our country.

If the Congress is to adopt the proposed method in building highways, it is certain that its action would open the floodgates of pressure for it to utilize the same method in doing all manner of things, a proposal already advanced with respect to educational support in a leading article last week in the Christian Science Monitor. It could mean that financial irresponsibility would run riot, as some may think has already happened.

The Committee's plan is astronomical in cost and a radical and dangerous departure from normal governmental practices in problems of such great magnitude. In any event, Congress should give critical appraisal to all its aspects before adopting it. We could secure $12 billion more in road value by spreading the construction over 30 years, rather than by doing it through the use of bonds over a 10-year period. We would also avoid raising our enormous debt by $25 billion at one fell swoop. The saving of this $12 billion, at the loss of some time, would seem to be worthy of serious consideration because the need for more and better highways in our country is almost without limit.

It is easy to see that we do not have to go on forever incurring deficits, raising taxes, and increasing burdens on our people each year. There admittedly is much attraction in spending vast sums of money in doing something for a lot of people regardless of the desperate measures necessary to get the money. But there are times when sound judgment dictates that Congress should not further extend the credit of our Government. Has that time not arrived? Is it not here right now? If we are willing to forego foreign aid for just 1 year, the budget can be balanced. If we will also reject reinsurance of health insurance, public housing, school construction, and cultural appreciation as proper fields for Federal Government activities while in our present straitened financial circumstances, we can soon reduce taxes.

We do not have one dime in the Treasury with which to comply with the President's many requests for additional Federal activities requiring additional expenditures. We can only do these things by further threatening the solvency of our Nation. With a Government debt today of $7,000 against each and every American family, with our Treasury already drowning in red ink, with a current budget amounting to more than $1,400 in yearly taxes for each family in our Nation, these are extremely dangerous things to do. If we will resolve not to support so great a concentration of bureaucratic power, we will begin living on our income and the people will take heart that we are to have responsible fiscal policy. Even though it might not be considered dynamic, it would be a constructive thing for our country and its people. If given a fair trial, it might even be found to have some political attraction, the native intelligence and commonsense of our people being what it is.

In our service here in behalf of the people, would it not be well to remember the words of eternal wisdom uttered by a great statesman and President, Woodrow Wilson, when he said:

A concentration of governmental power always precedes the death of human freedom.

The Dairyman's Self-Help Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1955

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced for appropriate reference a bill to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of dairy products in domestic and foreign commerce; to stabilize prices of milk and dairy products; to impose a stabilization fee on the marketing of milk and butterfat; and for other purposes. Favorable action on this bill, which contains proposals for a dairyman's self-help plan, would, I believe, be definitely in the public interest. Enactment of this program would mean, among other things:

First. Relieving the taxpayers of the burden of the price-support program for dairy products.

Second. Getting the Government out of the dairy business and permitting the dairy farmers to operate their own program of price stabilization, surplus proposal, and production stabilization.

ITS BENEFITS TO CONSUMERS; TO PRODUCERS

For the consumers it would accomplish the aims of present laws—the maintenance of a stabilized continuous and adequate supply of milk and dairy products at fair prices. More than that, it would protect the consumers from unduly high prices caused by either, first, a shrinking of present dairy supplies, or, second, arbitrary overpricing of milk or dairy products.

For the producers, it would mean stabilized prices at levels to provide a fair return commensurate with the cost of production, and the investment and risk involved in the dairy-farmer operation.

ITS ADVANTAGES OVER THE PRESENT PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM

Under the existing Government price-support program dairy products are supported at percentage-of-parity figures determined within certain limits by the Secretary of Agriculture. The support prices are maintained through the purchase, by the Commodity Credit Corporation, of dairy production which is in excess of that required by current trade outlets. Surplus stocks acquired by the Government are disposed of in various domestic and foreign channels, mostly in giveaway welfare programs or at loss figures.

Under the proposed self-help program dairy product prices would also be supported—but not at Government expense. Compare the results under the two programs under conditions in 1954.

First. Under the present Government price-support program, support prices in 1954 were set at 75 percent of parity. Prices to farmers dropped. As a result dairy farmers, by and large, have increased or intend to increase their production to compensate for lower returns. Milk production in 1954 was an unprecedented nearly 124 billion pounds. Estimates for 1955 indicate continued production at this high level.

Second. Under the self-help program price supports conceivably would have remained at 90 percent of parity. At these price levels there would not have been the incentive to compensate for lower returns by higher production. Farmers' prices would have been higher by 60 cents a hundredweight. The cost of this program would have been borne by the producers. It would have cost them about 23 cents per hundredweight if all of the surplus production had been a total loss. But they would have had a net gain of 37 cents per hundredweight under their own program.

Under the self-help plan the trend toward greater production would have been minimized; the cost to the taxpayers would have been nil; the cost to the producer would have been much more than offset by higher net returns.

MECHANICS OF THE SELF-HELP PLAN

The self-help program would be financed by the collection of a stabilization fee—somewhat in the nature of a license fee—from each producer on his volume of milk or butterfat.

The size of the stabilization fee would be specifically limited to the proportionate amount required to run the program each year. In times of excessive surplus production, the fee would be high and would serve as a means of production control. When production became in line with demand, the amount of the fee would be very small. By relating the amount of the fee directly to the cost of the program farmers will each year pay their proper share of the cost of maintaining an improved market for that year. This has many advantages. It is flexible, it is in line with the general principle of cooperative marketing, and it very promptly and directly reflects in the farmers check the extent of surplus

production and the degree of his cooperation in getting supplies in line with demand.

The program would be operated by a Federal Dairy Stabilization Board consisting of 15 members appointed by the President from nominees selected by milk producers. The Board would be authorized to borrow up to $500 million from the Commodity Credit Corporation to get started. All sums actually borrowed would be repaid with interest. It is not contemplated that any Government funds will be used after the board gets established, but the borrowing power would remain in effect as a backlog which could be used in an emergency.

Appointment of a Federal Dairy Advisory Committee of 12 would be authorized. In selecting this committee the Secretary of Agriculture would give equal recognition to representatives of, first, manufacturers, processors, handlers, and distributors of milk and dairy products; second, consumers; third, other agricultural commodities or programs that may be affected by the dairy stabilization program; fourth, foreign nations that may be affected by the policies and operations relating to imports and exports of milk and dairy products; and, fifth, other interests which the Secretary determines are directly concerned with the operation of the act.

PROGRAM SAFEGUARDED AGAINST ABUSE

The self-help program is designed to be self-policing as to abuses in its administration. Furthermore, supervision by the Secretary of Agriculture would be provided by a section similar to section 2 of the Capper-Volstead law under which the Secretary would be empowered to intervene should the operations result in undue enhancement of prices.

As for the self-policing features, and as far as the consumer is concerned, the success of the program must depend largely on the effective merchandising of milk and dairy products. Prices would have to be kept in balance with the prices of other foods to maintain sales volume. There simply is no possibility of the board maintaining prices which are too high in relation to the prices for other foods.

The program is equally self-policing from the producer viewpoint. Producer prices would have to be reasonably related to returns from other agricultural commodities. If the board should attempt to set producer prices too high, a shift to increased production would occur. The increased cost of disposing of the surplus would be charged to the dairy farmers. The fact that the same farmers producing the surplus would have to pay the costs of its disposal would make it impractical for the board to maintain producer prices at an unreasonably high level.

The proposals and objectives of the self-help plan are such that Congress should carefully consider the proposed legislation. The dairy farmer represents the largest single segment of farming and 20 percent of the total farm income. This bill represents a move on the part of this group to obtain, finance, and direct its own price support and production stabilization program. This, I believe, is an objective within the American concept of free enterprise and individual determination of economic welfare.

Interstate Compact To Conserve Oil and Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1955

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a joint resolution which, if passed by the House and Senate, will extend and renew for a period of 4 years, from September 1, 1955, the Interstate Compact To Conserve Oil and Gas. The language of this resolution, in substance, is identical with a like resolution which was passed 4 years ago, and which has been renewed by the Congress in past sessions covering a period of about 20 years.

The purpose of this resolution is to give the States the authority to more fully cooperate and to enter into a compact, the purpose of which is to conserve oil and gas by prevention of physical waste thereof from any cause.

For the past 20 years under the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, which was formed in 1935 and dedicated to the conservation of oil and gas in the United States, the States have cooperated in a manner that they have not only preserved the fundamental rights of local self-government, but have greatly contributed to the conservation and proper use of the vast natural resources of oil and gas, to the end that the work of the commission has contributed most materially to the development of one of our great industries, one that is most vital not only to the economy of our Nation but to national defense.

From the beginning of this organization in 1935, it has extended to the point where the governors of 22 States have become members of the compact commission.

Gov. William G. Stratton, of Illinois, at the annual meeting in the latter part of 1954, was elected chairman of the Interstate Compact Commission.

The Interstate Oil Compact Commission under the Interstate Compact To Conserve Oil and Gas is the administrative agency organized to follow out the functions of the compact. The commission consists of one representative from each member State. Under most of the State statutes, the governor is named official representative with authority to appoint a substitute or assistant representative.

The success and accomplishments of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission clearly demonstrates the practicability of voluntary cooperation between the States in the solution of mutual problems.

Formed and existing for the sole purpose of conserving and protecting irreplaceable natural resources, the compact has grown and expanded without precedent in the Nation's history.

Now in its 20th year, this cooperative advisory body is without power of compulsion. Yet it has been aptly called a bulwark against Federal control and pointed out as an example in self-rule. The expression of its objective—"the purpose of this compact is to conserve oil and gas by the prevention of physical waste thereof, from any cause"—has been referred to as "the most powerful 21 words in American industrial life today" and as "words which have changed the course of an industry."

The interstate compact to conserve oil and gas provides a forum for interstate cooperation to prevent avoidable waste of oil and gas, to further efficient practices in oil and gas production and to preserve to the States fundamental rights of local self-government.

I feel sure the Members of the House will want to help continue the great work and the vast benefits the Interstate Oil Compact Commission has brought to the economy of our Nation by giving this resolution their unanimous support.

The Need for Standby Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remind this House that we have a great need for legislation authorizing standby controls. Today the newspapers and the news broadcasts are stressing coexistence. There is general agreement that the danger of war is less than it was a few years ago. For this less warlike atmosphere we all are genuinely thankful.

Without in any way minimizing these peaceful developments, I want today to call your attention to the terrible situation we would find ourselves in if all this should suddenly change. Our economy is operating at top speed. We are turning out all kinds of civilian goods and substantial quantities of military supplies. A sudden outbreak of war would not catch us entirely unprepared. In the military field we would be better prepared than in any earlier peacetime period. In the civilian field, however, we would be far from ready for such an emergency.

One has only to look back to the Korean situation to realize what may result from the lack of standby controls. After inflation set in and supply shortages developed, a system of controls was adopted. These controls were adopted too late, however, to prevent a general price rise of 20 percent and many dislocations in civilian supplies. It should be obvious to anyone that our civilian economy is becoming more intricate and more complex with each passing year. It also should be evident that dislocations in the civilian economy surely will be

greater than ever before if we have another outbreak of war.

It is with these things in mind that I call your attention again to the fact that we do not have standby controls which would automatically go into effect if an emergency occurred. Are we going to continue to drift—then, if an emergency occurs, enact legislation after much of the damage has been done to our civilian economy?

You are all aware, I am sure, that there are still many tensions in the world. The Formosa situation is a most dangerous one. The program to rearm Germany has its dangers. Unrest continues in the Middle East and in Africa. In view of all these tensions it seems to me it would be the course of wisdom to provide now for any emergency by enacting legislation which authorizes standby economic and supply controls for our civilian economy.

The United States Junior Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1955

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, 35 years ago tomorrow the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce was organized at a meeting in St. Louis, Mo. Prior to this date, a number of local junior chambers of commerce had been in existence in the Midwest, but no successful effort had been made to form the group into a national organization, until Henry Giessenbier, of St. Louis, called a meeting of delegates from the several local chapters for the purpose of creating a national organization. At this meeting, Henry Giessenbier was elected president and later a constitution and bylaws were adopted.

From the beginning, membership in the junior chamber of commerce was limited to young men under 36 years of age. The fundamental principles adopted by the organization were so basically sound that the movement has spread to more than 2,750 communities in the United States with a membership of more than 200,000 young men. Today, it is international in scope with more than 3,500 chapters in 52 countries and an overall membership of approximately 300,000. There are chapters in every State of the Union, including Washington, D. C., Alaska, and Hawaii, with a national headquarters building in Tulsa, Okla., worth $350,000, employing a full-time staff of 50 people. Before World War II, it was said that the junior chamber of commerce had spread to the four corners of the world and, like the British Empire, the sun never sets on it. Now, the membership is larger than ever before, notwithstanding the fact that all clubs behind the Iron Curtain are no longer in operation.

I am convinced that one of the primary reasons for the phenomenal growth of this wonderful service organization is the fact that it is composed of only young men. Due to the youth of its membership, many worthwhile projects have been undertaken, and accomplished, that other service clubs would not have attempted. It is a medium of expression for the ideas and ideals of young manhood, and through it young men are given an opportunity to serve their communities unselfishly, and at the same time gain experience in civic affairs and general leadership.

Another reason for the great success of the Jaycees is the fact that the organization was founded and promoted entirely through volunteer efforts. National headquarters has never had a paid organizer. All extension work has been carried out by the various local chapters. The spirit and enthusiasm of a Jaycee chapter in one city almost invariably spreads to a nearby community, and in this way, the movement has become worldwide.

The official definition of the organization is, "A junior chamber of commerce is a constructive action organization of young men who devote a portion of their time to community service in the public interest, developing young men as leaders in their community."

By helping their fellowman, Jaycees help themselves. Through service as young men, they become better equipped to render even greater service in the future.

Today, I salute all Jaycees—the finest organization exclusively for young men in the world.

Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marks the anniversary of Ukrainian independence. After the Czarist Russian Empire collapsed in 1917, the Ukrainians set up a separate national republic in their country which for centuries had been under Russian domination. The first meeting of the Ukrainian Constituent Assembly met in January 1918, and on the 22d of that month a proclamation on the independence of the Ukraine was issued.

Unfortunately, the Ukrainian Republic was shortlived. By 1921 the country was overrun by the Russian Communists and the Ukraine again became a subjugated nation. It was one of the first and earliest victims of Soviet imperialism and has paid a tremendous toll in suffering and destruction. The Ukraine's national churches were destroyed, the country suffered terrible famines, mass murders, purges, and deportations. Nevertheless, the spiritual and moral resources of the Ukrainian people have not been exterminated, nor has its indomitable desire for national freedom been extinguished after all these years of enslavement and suffering.

The Ukrainian nation numbers some 40 million people and constitutes the largest non-Russian group behind the Iron Curtain in Europe. In the struggle of the free world against communism, the Ukrainians are a most important and potential ally of the Western democracies. They have never stopped their struggle for the liberation of their country from the Communist yoke.

The American people are following with great sympathy the plight which has befallen the Ukrainian people. Their cause is a righteous one. They deserve our support and encouragement.

On the occasion of the anniversary of their independence, we share in the aspirations of Ukrainians everywhere for the early liberation of their country. We extend our greetings and renew our wishes to all Americans of Ukrainian descent that their country of origin, the Ukraine, will soon regain its independence from the forces of evil and tyranny which are in control of it today.

Junior Chamber of Commerce Organized 35 Years Ago This Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received numerous communications from the junior chamber of commerce national headquarters about the working activities of this group of your businessmen of America. The letters I have received reflect the activities of an aggressive, alert, vigilant organization which is furnishing young leadership to a rapidly growing industrial nation.

Thirty-five years ago, this month, the junior chamber of commerce was organized. It was intended that this body of the newly organized association be composed of young men interested in business, government, and civic affairs who would have an opportunity to prepare themselves for leadership in business and community activities. The original organizational efforts were started in 1915 but were interrupted for 4 years by the intense national effort during World War I. Members of this group were from 21 to 36 years of age and as the depression of 1929 lowered a shadow casting its gloom over the entire business economy of the United States, this organization of youth matured quickly and cast its efforts in the direction of relieving some of the suffering and hardship, and financial distress so keenly felt throughout the country during that unhappy period of our economic growth.

In my home town of Shreveport, La., the junior chamber of commerce is most active. In other cities and towns

throughout Louisiana, 25 junior chamber of commerce chapters carry on the traditions of their organization implanted in its charter 35 years ago. As a matter of fact, the State of Louisiana boasts of over 2,500 junior chamber of commerce members. These junior chambers, composed of young, aggressive men, furnish leadership to business and industry in our State, rapidly coming into full industrial manhood.

The junior chamber of commerce creed is well set forth by a belief—

That faith in God gives meaning and purpose to human life;

That the brotherhood of man transcends the sovereignty of nations;

That economic justice can best be won by free men through free enterprise;

That government should be of laws rather than of men;

That earth's great treasure lies in human personality;

And that service to humanity is the best work of life.

Those of us who are vitally interested in the future of America want to see organizations dedicated to worthy civic enterprise and proper human activity prosper and develop. With this in mind, I express the hope that this organization may continue to be active, aggressive, and alert in our civic and community affairs for many years to come.

Income Tax on Dividends Coming From Foreign Investments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday my good friend, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], in the course of some very interesting remarks on the pending extension of the reciprocal trade agreements authority, made a statement which I believe needs clarification.

He stated, and I quote:

Only in the last session of the 83d Congress, we approved a tax bill which reduced the income tax on dividends coming from foreign investments. By that act alone, you set up a 14 percentage point advantage for American capital to go abroad and establish factories to exploit cheap labor abroad in order to make these products to be brought to America under our trade treaty to take the jobs away from your American workers.

Mr. Speaker, there was a provision in the tax bill as it passed the House similar to that which the gentleman referred. However, it was not in the bill as finally enacted and is, therefore, not a part of our present tax law. I might also point out that the House provision denied the 14-point tax reduction where more than 25 percent of the gross income from the foreign branch or subsidiary would be derived from the manufacture of goods intended for sale or use in the United States.

The Legislative Organization and the Processes and Procedures of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, as a comparatively new Member of this great body I have gained a growing admiration for the legislative organization and the processes and procedures of Congress. I think all Members will agree, however, that in certain respects, due to the vast area of legislative jurisdiction and the complicated structure of our Government, there has developed on the one hand some duplication of committee effort, and on the other hand, preemption by some committees of the functions and responsibilities of others.

It was gratifying recently to learn of the new policy of more clearly defining the investigative powers of committees to avoid duplication. It seems to me it would be appropriate also to give attention to transgression in committee jurisdiction. I have in mind the experience in this body of attempts, some of them successful, to legislate by appropriation.

Let me cite a case which points up this inherent weakness whereby the Appropriations Committee could indirectly influence the entire policy of our vital defense program. Obviously the Armed Services Committee is continuously studying our defense needs. In all frankness, the members of the Armed Services are the only Members of this body, on the basis of their studies and information, particularly in closed hearings, to competently deal with certain vital matters of policy as they apply to national security. Much information is given the Armed Services Committee which cannot be repeated in the public debates in the House. In military affairs the rest of us have to pretty well go by their recommendations.

Recently the chairman of the Appropriations Committee was quoted by the press as having said he was against the aircraft carrier construction program. The danger I see is that the views of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, sincere as I have no doubt they are, might result in legislation of defense policy through an appropriation bill.

In other words, the opinion of the very informed and respected chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia, and members of his committee, on a subject like this certainly is the one we should follow.

Let me just quote four paragraphs from the testimony of the Secretary of Defense before the House Armed Services Committee on January 26, 1955:

I would now like to discuss our retaliatory capabilities. We have provided in our military program very powerful retaliatory forces in the Strategic Air Command of the Air Force. In addition, a great retaliatory capability exists in the carrier striking forces of the Navy, and in the tactical air units of the Air Force and the Marine Corps. Our policy calls for flexibility and versatility in the employment of existing forces. We are prepared to use our total resources in the most effective manner appropriate to the particular situation.

The buildup of the Strategic Air Command of the Air Force is continuing. This part of our retaliatory force will increase in numbers, but more importantly in quality as the remaining reciprocating engine bombers are replaced by modern jet aircraft. The B–36, long the mainstay of the long-range strategic forces, will be replaced by the B–52, the new long-range jet bomber. The long-range strategic fighter units in the Strategic Air Command forces are scheduled to be re-equipped with supersonic fighters possessing a nuclear capability. These forces are being maintained in a high degree of readiness. Some of these forces are capable of operating directly from the continental United States; all are capable of operating from bases scattered around the globe. Local air defense for bases in areas outside the continental air defense system is being improved.

The carrier striking forces will be augmented by 1 additional carrier and 1 carrier air group this year. More importantly, both the carriers and the aircraft are being rapidly modernized, the carriers both through the conversion of existing carriers and the construction of new carriers, and the aircraft through the replacement of old models with the new aircraft now in production.

I am sure you are all familiar with the new *Forrestal* class carriers, the first of which was launched about a month ago. These new carriers, as well as other carriers that are being modernized, will be equipped with newly developed aircraft with improved nuclear capabilities, such as the A3D and A4D, and very high speed fighters such as F9F9, FJ4, and F3H. Our carrier-based airpower increases the flexibility and dispersion of our retaliatory power.

The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee was quoted in the press recently as charging that the Navy's proposed new superaircraft carrier is outmoded and as urging Congress to scuttle it.

On the other hand, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, following the testimony of the Secretary of Defense before it, commented:

I am glad that you have noted that our carrier striking forces will be augmented by 1 additional carrier and 1 carrier air group this year. And in that connection I want to say that I am glad to note that the budget contains funds for the construction of a new carrier capable of carrying modern aircraft that can deliver our most modern weapons.

So we find a divergent viewpoint between two committee chairmen. In the course of events, I think it is safe to predict that the full Armed Services Committee will sustain the President and the Defense Department recommendation. Just for the sake of argument, assume for the moment that the Appropriations Committee follows its chairman and takes a different view. Therein, it seems to me, would be a case of legislation on national policy by failure to appropriate.

The House could, and I am sure would, in an instance like this, resolve the argument in favor of the proper committee—the Committee on Armed Services. But the danger lies in the natural tendency of Members of the House to support a committee on any measure reported by it.

In other words, unwittingly we might scuttle our aircraft carrier program and our national defense policy. I am sure we will not; but we might. All of which

points up a possible weakness in our jurisdictional organization to which Members of Congress, it seems to me, should be ever alert.

The Good People of Alameda Are Extremely Proud of the Great Naval Air Station in Their City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1955

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, for the second consecutive year the military and civilian personnel at the Naval Air Station, Alameda, have offered overwhelming proof that their loyalty, devotion, and pride in the service of their country is equaled only by their sense of community interest and responsibility.

This fact was clearly evidenced when the generous sum of $107,400 was contributed by personnel of the Naval Air Station at the close of the 1954 United Crusade campaign in December. This figure represented a joint United Crusade-Navy relief effort, with $93,000 going to the United Crusade fund and $14,400 to the Navy Relief Society.

Mammoth facsimile checks for the colossal amounts were presented by Capt. Louis E. French, commanding officer of the air station, and head of the military department of the 1954 East Bay United Crusade, to representatives of the two charities in a colorful ceremony. Selmer H. Berg, Crusade campaign chairman, received the United Crusade donation, and Lt. Comdr. Earl D. Payne, NAS special services officer, and NAS chairman for Navy Relief, accepted the Navy Relief donation.

The grand total of $107,400 exceeded last year's record of $100,000. Civilian personnel as a group, gave 8 percent more this year to reach a new high of $9.29 per capital.

The $93,000 raised for the United Crusade fund is considered especially meritorious because it was attained despite a loss of 2,500 personnel since the 1953 campaign.

As head of the military department of the 1954 East Bay United Crusade, Captain French directed and coordinated the Crusade efforts of more than a dozen Army, Navy, Marine, and Air Force activities in the Oakland area and adjacent communities. His representative in the extremely successful campaign aboard the Naval Air Station was Comdr. Robert F. Farrington, NAS executive officer, who served as chairman of the NAS Crusade drive.

Once again NAS Alameda has proved it is a real member of this community and a good neighbor indeed—

Said Captain French.

It's a pleasure to report that 97 percent of our personnel participated in the campaign. These people of good will, who reside in various cities and towns throughout the bay area believe in the crusade slogan, "Give where you work and benefit where you live"—

Added Captain French.

All hands at NAS, Alameda, deserve the Navy's traditional "well done" for a wonderful job—

Commander Farrington said.

And the reason the station personnel gave more than ever before is that they realized the increased needs of the community and gave accordingly—

Commander Farrington added.

The inspired leadership of Captain French and Commander Farrington in the NAS Crusade drive was complemented by the capable and tireless efforts of a host of military personnel and civilian employees who comprised the various committees for the NAS United Crusade campaign. Notable among those who gave unstintingly of their time and effort were: Comdr. G. N. Eisenhart, assistant overhaul and repair officer; Comdr. H. D. Schultz, commander Fleet Air, Alameda staff; J. Griffith, overhaul and repair, industrial management office; C. Brunton, overhaul and repair, cost control office; W. MacDonald, industrial management office; H. V. La Juenesse, industrial relations officer; Lt. Comdr. M. E. Darchuck, NAS-Fleet Air, Alameda, public information officer; Lt. R. T. Janiec, overhaul and repair inspection group; Lt. E. J. Ryan, overhaul and repair administrative services officer; H. Stewart, NAS comptroller's office; S. Lacopoulos, chief boatswain's mate; V. Baum, chief aviation structural mechanic; F. Johnson, chief electrician's mate; and F. B. Grosso, journalist, first class.

Others active in the Crusade campaign on the unit, departmental, and divisional level included: Comdr. H. C. Rand, representing commander fleet logistics air wing, Pacific; R. Faulkner, overhaul and repair department, representing Naval Aircraft Lodge No. 739, I. A. of M.; Joseph Hanfre, overhaul and repair department, representing the Naval Air Station Association; Harry Burbach, overhaul and repair department, representing the American Federation of Government Employees, Local 1471.

S. C. Anderson, Supply Department, representing the National Federation of Federal Employees, local 712; D. Heddell, Public Works Department, representing the Masters and Foremen Association; C. D. Luders, Overhaul and Repair Department, representing the Association of Supervisors, local 17; H. H. Teilh, Overhaul and Repair Department, representing the Planners, Estimators, and Progressman Association; O. Zeisz, Overhaul and Repair Department, representing post 9919 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

J. Leonard, Overhaul and Repair Department, representing the Apprentice and Alumni Association; J. R. McDonald, Overhaul and Repair Department, representing the shop planners; W. Terry, Security Department, representing the Federal Naval Firefighters; Lt. Comdr. E. D. Payne, special services officer, representing the East Bay Chapter, Navy Relief Society; Lt. Comdr. H. T. Johnson, FasRon–116, representing Fleet Aircraft Service Squadron 116 and supported multi-engine squadrons; Lt. I. Cushman, VR–2, representing Air Transport Squadron 2.

J. H. Cook, aviation structural mechanic, first class, VP–9, representing the Fleet Reserve Association, Branch 87; W. S. Meyers, aviation machinist's mate, third-class, NAS Special Services, representing Naval Air-Fleet Air Alameda Enlisted Recreation Council; Lt. Comdr. T. Pearce, FasRon–8, representing Fleet Aircraft Squadron 8 and supported squadrons; and Ruth Barnes, Supply Department, representing the Naval Air Station, Alameda, women employees.

Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to make the following statements on the subject of natural gas.

A matter of grave concern to the State of Louisiana, and the Nation as well, is the recent Supreme Court decision in *Phillips Petroleum Co.* v. *Wisconsin et al.* (347 U. S. 672).

As a result of that decision, the Federal Power Commission, under the Natural Gas Act, is now exercising price-fixing controls over gas producers who sell their gas into interstate commerce. This involves a basic concept of government. Under our form of government, the business of producing commodities or manufacturing products has been left to free competition in the market place. Heretofore, except as a war measure, the producers' and manufacturers' prices have not been regulated. If at any time there is a lack of competition our antitrust laws stand as a guardian over the consuming public.

Yet, under this court decision and the actions of the Federal Power Commission in implementing the decision, this basic principle of government is cast aside. As a result, today there is chaos and confusion throughout the gas-producing industry. The consumer of gas, as well as the producers, have a primary interest and should be alert to the existing situation and the consequences that are sure to come.

If permitted to continue, this situation will retard the exploration and development of gas. The producer is confronted with the uncertainties and burdens of suddenly being treated as a public utility although his activities are in no way like that of a public utility. His efforts to find and produce gas are disrupted. He is waiting to see what is going to happen. This will mean less gas for the consumer.

There are three phases to the natural-gas business: First, production; second,

interstate transmission; and, third, local distribution.

Historically, local distribution of gas has been regulated as a public utility by legislative enactment because of the inherent monopolistic aspect of the business. The distributor operates under a franchise which limits or prevents competition.

The interstate transmission of gas has similar characteristics. As a result the Congress passed the Natural Gas Act in 1938 and delegated to the Federal Power Commission the authority to regulate this activity. These interstate pipelines operate under certificates issued by the Commission which restrict competition and stabilize their business by providing assured market outlets.

To the contrary, the production of natural gas has none of these public utility characteristics. The Congress recognized this distinction when it passed the Natural Gas Act in 1938. It was intended that the act should not apply in any way to the local activity of producing and gathering gas. The law so states in clear and unmistakable language. For 16 years it was so interpreted. The Federal Power Commission itself recognized it had no authority over production.

The Supreme Court has reversed all this. The Federal Power Commission is now applying public utility regulation to the production of gas—inappropriate and disrupting as it is.

This is a matter of national concern. There are about 20 million natural-gas customers. Natural gas now accounts for almost one-fourth of the mineral energy consumed in the United States. Our State of Louisiana is vitally interested, as it is the second largest gas-producing State and supplies about 15 percent of the United States total.

The Nation's peacetime economy and welfare are involved. More important, the national security would be adversely affected if restrictive regulations are permitted to hamper the development of the Nation's natural-gas resources.

I am hopeful that the Congress will give this matter its early attention and take action that will amend the Natural Gas Act so as to make absolutely clear that the Federal Power Commission has no authority over the production and gathering of gas.

I intend to lend my efforts to that end.

Suspension of the Copper Import Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a bill, H. R. 3202, I have introduced today extends until June 30, 1958, the suspension of the present import tax on copper. The present suspension will expire on June 30 of this year.

The bill provides for a 3-year extension rather than a 2-year extension. Otherwise, it is identical with the bill which I introduced last year. It is confined strictly to copper and should not be confused with the import tax on lead or zinc or any other mineral or metal. It is confined strictly to copper because the copper situation in this country is in a class by itself, with problems peculiar to that industry.

This bill, in continuing the law which expires on June 30, also provides the same appropriate safeguards to our domestic producers by requiring the termination of the suspension in the event the price of copper should fall below 24 cents per pound and remain at that level for a period of 1 month.

Last year I said:

> America's high standard of living is, in part, dependent upon an adequate supply of copper. Similarly, our national security demands that copper be available for the manufacture of the implements which help to guarantee that security. Employment of millions of industrial workers is bound up with copper. More than half of the free world's supply of copper is consumed in the United States. Our strategic metals stockpiling program also depends upon an adequate supply of copper.

There is not only no reason for modifying these observations, but, if anything, the world situation today emphasizes the validity of my remarks. Despite the fact that efforts are continually being made to expand domestic production, the additional tonnage being achieved will still leave a wide gap between domestic mine output and our requirements. The simple fact is that the domestic supply deficit—the difference between domestic crude production and deliveries—has been continuous since 1940 and averages one-third of our copper requirements. This deficit must be compensated for by imports, 85 percent of which come from the Western Hemisphere. If anything, the supply of copper is tighter today than when we last acted on similar legislation.

I have reason to believe that the continuation of the suspension has the support of the administration and of the overwhelming majority of the industry.

Some Industries Do Need Tariff Protection Against Competing Products of Low Wage Foreign Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1955

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, we want to increase the flow of international trade to promote international economic strength and well-being of all nations including our own. Tariff reductions in some cases may contribute to that end. In some industries, such as the automotive, where products are made largely by machines, American industry can out-produce at lower costs any foreign competitor despite the low wages that prevail in many foreign nations.

All industries, however, are not in this fortunate and favorable economic position. Where American goods are the product largely of man-hours of labor and not of machines, American goods cannot compete with the low wages paid labor in foreign nations.

The Committee for Economic Development reports that the annual wages and social benefits paid by British industry to each employee in 1951 averaged only about 32 percent of what American industry paid. The Belgium figure was 37 percent; in West Germany and France, 29 percent; in Italy, 17 percent; in Japan, 10 percent.

The oyster, the crab, and the edible nut industries are examples of domestic industries which cannot compete with foreign low wages. The harvesting and processing of canned oysters and crab is done mostly by hand labor and machine processes play but a minor part in the production of the finished product. The canned crab and oysters come mostly from Japan. Thus, in selling price it is largely a case of oriental labor versus American labor and with oriental labor paid only 10 percent what American labor receives, it is obvious that the American crabbing and oyster industries cannot survive without tariffs or quota limitations to protect them.

The same is largely true of the edible-nut industry, where 6 to 7 years of cultivation and care are required before a nut tree begins to bear and where the harvesting of the nuts eventually must be done not with machines but by hand labor.

Another danger in encouraging increased crab imports is that Russia now, due to the Yalta treaty, owns and controls some of the best crabbing waters. Russia cannot ship her crab into the United States directly. She should get it into the United States via Japan by the process of selling fresh crab to the Japanese and letting them can it or by selling Japan crab-fishing rights in Russian waters.

On the danger of Russia getting her crab into the American market, if tariffs on crab are reduced, the Seattle Times, one of the largest metropolitan dailies in Washington State, recently said:

> IT MIGHT HELP RUSSIA
>
> Among issues due to be discussed next month in Washington, D. C., in proposed revisions of United States customs duties on imports from various countries, is a slashing of the tariff rate on imports of canned crabmeat from Japan. The Pacific Coast crab-canning industry is particularly concerned over one aspect of this proposal.
>
> The Japanese now are sending this country virtually all of their crab pack. As a result of the war, Japan lost much of its former crab-fishing area to Russia. Imports of crabmeat from Russia in the United States are barred. But a reduction of the present duty, in the opinion of men in the trade, could have the effect of starting a backdoor deal, under which Russian crabmeat, denied direct entry, would reach this country by way of Japanese canneries.
>
> Members of the Washington congressional delegation, Republicans and Democrats alike, appear to be well informed as to this issue and have presented their views to the Tariff Commission. If there is indeed a serious

likelihood that Russia would be the real beneficiary, this factor assuredly should be considered by our negotiators.

CANNERY UNION PROTESTS

Cannery workers of whom thousands are employed in the American crabbing industry of the Pacific, the Atlantic, and Gulf States and Alaska are fearful of losing their livelihood if tariffs on canned crab are reduced at the coming Geneva Trade Conference.

Mrs. Esther C. Cooper, president of the United Packinghouse Workers of America, CIO, Local 553, of the seacoast communities of Grays Harbor, Wash., under date of January 15 wrote me as follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MACK: Our jobs as workers in the crab industry are most certainly threatened by this latest plan to remove the tariff on Japanese canned crab which enters our United States markets.

The canneries of the Grays and Willapa Harbor areas, as well as Puget Sound, and for that matter the entire State of Washington have not been working at peak production. We who earn our living in this industry will definitely be injured if we are permitted less working hours through a further tightening of market conditions, and a really disastrous condition if the tariff is reduced or removed.

Our field analysis reveals that the American crab industry now gives direct employment to an estimated 34,000 people not including brokers, salesmen, and employees in industries supplying cans, cartons, equipment, and materials of all kinds. When you consider that each worker represents 2.5 persons in the family unit the impact affects a great many persons. Most of us who work in this industry are directly employed in small coastal towns where fisheries are the only means of livelihood. With conditions such as they are at the present moment and danger of a further letdown in the market for American processed crabmeat we see a closedown for not less than three major packing companies in our own immediate district.

May we urge that you assist us in every way possible with the Secretary of State and the President in protecting our jobs and families. This matter is due to be considered at the foreign trade-agreement negotiations to be held in Geneva, Switzerland, and immediate action will be needed before the representatives leave for that meeting. We are depending upon you to speak for us since we, ourselves, cannot be present. We trust you will give us your best efforts as you always do.

Yours very truly,

ESTHER C. COOPER,
President, United Packinghouse Workers of America, CIO, Local 553.

H. R. 1601, Regulating Practice of Lawyers and Others Before Internal Revenue Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced in the present Congress a bill which I first offered last summer to clarify and extend the authority of the Treasury Department to regulate the practice of lawyers, certified public accountants, and others who assist the public in the determination of Federal tax liabilities, preparation of tax returns, and in the settlement of cases in dispute with the Internal Revenue Service. The new bill is H. R. 1601. The need for it was explained in my statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 4, 1954.

Apparently there has been some misunderstanding about the nature and purpose of this bill. It would not change anything. It would merely clarify and reaffirm what is actually going on, and has been going on for 40 years, in the field of Federal tax practice. Such clarification and reaffirmation are necessary only because local courts have attempted to change the established practice by holding that certain phases of Federal income-tax practice, which have normally been handled by accountants, should now become the exclusive property of lawyers.

The principal purpose of my bill is to affirm the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to regulate Federal tax practice. The bill would also reaffirm the intent of Congress, as expressed in the Revenue Act of 1942, that Federal tax practice should not be restricted to the members of any single calling or profession. This policy is as sound today as it was 13 years ago.

The proposed legislation would not grant to anyone any rights or privileges he does not have today. But its enactment should help to clarify a situation which has become needlessly confused in recent years.

As More Foreign Textiles Come In More American Jobs Go Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I delivered over WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Saturday, January 15, 1955.

The address follows:

One of the first objectives of the administration at Washington is to convince Congress that the Trade Agreements Act should be extended. This sounds harmless. Most people agree that two-way trade is the best way to promote all-around economic progress and thus lessen international tensions, assuming, of course, that we are dealing with civilized nations. The Communist nations fail to qualify, because they cannot be trusted. Neither trade nor aid nor anything else will satisfy them—only conquest.

In our efforts to help our allies and to strengthen the free world, we have embarked on a program called reciprocal trade, which the President wants to extend.

When that program, however, strikes at those few American industries that are suffering from a depression it becomes altogether too generous. When it makes dangerous concessions that worsen the position of the fishermen, watchmakers, and textile operatives, all basic to the economy of Massachusetts, we must oppose it. Too many of the people employed by these industries are out of work.

We cannot, therefore, support a policy that would not only prevent them from getting their jobs back again, but might even increase unemployment in the affected industries.

Take the textile industry, for example. That makes one of the three basic necessities of life, cloth for clothing. For generations New England was the undisputed home of that industry. In recent years a number of mills have closed down or have moved away. Employment has declined by 268,000 jobs. In New England alone, there has been a 48-percent drop in this type of employment since 1951.

The textile industry is not only one of the large employers of American labor, but employs a higher percentage of the workers in the areas where it is centered. Hundreds of mills are located in small towns, forming typical one-industry communities. In many cases they are the sole or principal source of income. Textiles provide 1 out of 6 manufacturing jobs in New England. In Massachusetts, 1 out of 7. In Rhode Island, 3 out of 10. Workers who are displaced by domestic or foreign competition either remain unemployed or are forced to take lower-paying jobs. For the middle-aged and older people the chances of getting other employment in or near their hometowns become remote. The Bureau of Business and Economic Research of Northeastern University recently completed a study of 1,705 displaced New England textile workers. Less than half were able to find other jobs, and of this number two-thirds were earning less pay. It was hoped that new and so-called growth industries would absorb them, but the study concludes that, and I quote, "workers displaced are not being absorbed in large numbers by the industries which have been expanding in this area."

Wage and compensation differentials, varying from 20 to 30 percent, have enabled the Southern States to siphon much textile business out of New England, leaving us with the problem of chronic unemployment. This has meant hardship to workers, communities, and stockholders.

In view of this, it is difficult to understand why the administration should favor opening the door to an invasion by foreign textiles manufactured at low wages with which we could not possibly compete.

A comparison of our wages with those of other major textile-producing countries shows how completely the American industry would be ruined by these differentials.

Gross hourly earnings of the textile industry in France are 39.3 cents per hour. In Great Britain, 45.4 cents. In Italy, 24 cents. In Japan, 11.9 cents.

The textile-wage level in the whole of the United States exceeds that of Japan by 976 percent.

In the Northern States, principally New England, the rate is 1,085 percent higher than that of Japan.

Low-priced foreign goods, even though imported only in small quantities at the start, would so cut sales and depress prices as to put many more mills out of business. This would deliver a crushing blow to an industry that has been struggling to survive a serious depression. It would, under these circumstances, contradict the very arguments put forth by the administration to justify its so-called free-trade policy.

To encourage Japanese and other-nation imports would encourage production in low-wage areas. This would retard improvement in technology and productivity and would freeze low standards of living. A worldwide competitive struggle based on lower wages

and lower standards of living in textile industries will pull down the strength of the United States and the free world.

One wonders if the unrealistic planners at Washington are considering the final sacrificial offering—that of opening our domestic market to the slave-labor products of the Communist empire under the illusion that this coexistence would bring peace. It could only bring disaster to the United States. As the New York Herald Tribune commented in part, on January 3, 1955, and I quote: "The depression in textiles in the early part of 1954 was one of the worst the industry has experienced. One of the big factors worrying the textile industry as the new year opens is what the Government intends to do about reducing tariffs on textiles and wearing apparel. The Government aim of making tariff concessions, particularly on textile products, in order to aid the economy of Japan, has thrown a real scare into all sections of the textile industry.

"Textile leaders point out that competition from the Japanese textile industry is beginning to hurt, and the threat of sharply stepped-up competition through lower tariffs at a time when the industry is just beginning to emerge from a prolonged depression could have disastrous effects. Just prior to World War II, they point out, Japan was dominating the world textile market and was pushing not only the United States but England onto the ropes.

"Textile leaders admit the necessity of stabilizing Japan's economy to prevent that country from falling under the influence of Soviet Russia, but they point out that the United States textile industry is not an 'expendable' industry. All sections of the industry have filed strong protests with Washington against any tariff action which would harm the American textile industry."

Time and again New England Representatives in Congress have asked for some relief, some assistance for our hard-pressed textile industry.

No one disputed the facts concerning empty mills or mills operating at a loss or chronic unemployment in textile communities.

Yet Washington remained strangely indifferent to our problems.

Now the administration proposes further sacrifices by our weakened textile industry instead of constructive help.

Some American industries, in order to secure foreign markets for their products, would sell out the domestic market in the United States for American textiles to foreign competitors.

How did this economic treason develop?

Article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States delegated to the Congress the regulation of foreign trade through adjustment of the duties, imports, or excises, commonly called tariffs.

This constitutional power was held by Congress until June 12, 1934, when the President prevailed upon Congress to amend the Tariff Act, thereby surrendering that power to the executive branch of the Government.

"Emergency" was the reason given to justify this transfer without benefit of constitutional amendment.

As emergency after emergency was used to secure extensions of this power grant to the President, a dangerous precedent was established.

The American watch industry was almost smothered by concessions made to Swiss watchmakers. Other defenseless American industries were placed on the auction block of reciprocal trade.

At the same time we were giving billions of dollars taken in taxes from American workers to modernize the production plants and labor skills of other nations that now demand the right to undersell American products in our own home market.

There is, of course, some justification for strengthening the economies of our allies, but there is also a limit to such giveaway programs.

It was never intended by the American people that they should be required to give up their own jobs just to provide export markets for foreign goods in the United States.

Or to sell out an important segment of the New England economy, just to provide foreign markets for certain other favored American industries.

Or to enable big business, which has gone international, to maintain production plants abroad, taking advantage of low-cost foreign labor to produce goods which are then shipped back for sale in our domestic market, undercutting American manufacturers and American workers.

Unfair competition is no solution for our own problems or those of our allies.

How would the automobile industry react if we proposed the following trade swap?

That certain foreign nations be permitted to manufacture, export, and sell American-model cars in the United States for $2,000 and less in exchange for an American monopoly in the manufacture and sale of planes, radios, TV sets, and household appliances in those countries.

No; this is not the way.

Neither is the contemplated sell-out of the American textile industry or any other industry.

Reciprocal trade is justified only to the extent that it is constructive and not destructive.

New England must rally to oppose extension of the Trade Agreements Act, to save our textile industry from extinction.

The Constitution of the United States and the textile communities of New England are not up for surrender.

We urge the executive department and the Congress to reject economic appeasement that betrays our own people.

Tariff on Swiss Watches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1955

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I delivered over station WRC, Washington, D. C., January 18, 1955:

RECENT ACTIONS WITH RESPECT TO TARIFFS ON SWISS WATCHES

Tonight I would like to discuss with you a matter which is vitally essential to the well-being of the Nation as a whole and my own Fifth District of Maryland in particular.

I am referring to a healthy and expanding system of world trade, without which the United States cannot maintain a share of world markets essential to our economic growth and rising standard of living. Foreign markets are indispensible not only for agriculture, but also for our mass production industries.

Other countries cannot be expected to open their markets wide for American-made goods when protective tariffs prevent them from earning enough United States dollars with which to pay for purchases of United States goods. As the world's principal trading nation, it is up to the United States to take the lead in a movement for mutual reduction of trade barriers.

I was heartened by the President's liberalized proposals in the field of foreign trade and tariffs as outlined in his trade message to the Congress last week. I was particularly pleased that the President recognized tobacco as one of the agriculture products dependent upon foreign markets for high levels of income. For most of the $10 million worth of tobacco exported annually is grown in southern Maryland.

However, I was dismayed to read in the press a few days later that the Treasury Department had issued an order establishing further restrictive regulations on Swiss watch imports, contradictory to the stated objectives of the President's liberal foreign-trade program.

My concern over this action is readily understood when it is realized that the Swiss are the largest purchasers of high-grade Maryland export tobacco. And if the Swiss cannot sell their watches in the United States then they will not have the money with which to purchase Maryland tobacco, as well as cotton and textile products, machinery and vehicles, food products, and the many other items we sell them. Swiss purchases of United States products total approximately $85 million a year.

You know, someone has said that if you make a statement often enough even if it be not true, or only partly true, in time it will come to be believed by great numbers of people. This matter of tariffs on Swiss watch imports, it seems to me, falls into that category. So, let's start at the beginning and get the whole story.

In 1936, as part of the reciprocal-trade program, the United States negotiated an agreement with the Swiss Government which, on its part, made certain trade concessions so that American-made goods could be more readily sold in Switzerland.

As a result, trade between the United States and Switzerland flourished. Since 1936, the United States has sold to the people of Switzerland one-half billion dollars more of our products than we have purchased of Swiss products. Anyone can see at a glance how beneficial this arrangement has been for the farmers, workers, and industries of the United States. It has been particularly beneficial to southern Maryland which depends upon tobacco as a cash crop and the fine Swiss market these tobacco farmers have enjoyed has made a good price on the whole for all Maryland tobacco.

In addition, our trade with Switzerland has resulted in excellent friendly relations with that country and has become a world symbol of the advantages of reciprocal-trade arrangements with the United States.

The adverse effects of the administration's action to increase barriers against the import of Swiss watch movement are too obvious to recount. American farmers, industry, and prestige have and will suffer substantial damage while the domestic watch industry will profit little, if anything from this action. Trade with the Swiss is under a reciprocal agreement. It stands to reason that this action will result in a reciprocal removal of concessions granted on our own exports by the Swiss.

Now let's examine the claim by domestic watchmakers that they have suffered serious injury from increased Swiss watch imports. The Tariff Commission looked into this matter last year but failed to come to a unanimous agreement. Only 4 of the 6 Commissioners agreed that the United States watch industry was being damaged. The two dissenters said there was no evidence that Swiss watch movements are being imported in such increased quantities, actual or relative, as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industries producing like or directly competitive products.

It is remarkable to note that every domestic watchmaker except one imports movements and markets them under his own

trade name. Therefore, it is somewhat ironical that the domestic watch industry should claim injury from an increase in imports for which they themselves are primarily responsible. It should also be noted that the increase in duties affects a class of watch imports that is not competitive with domestic watch production.

The claim of injury is not supported by the financial condition of domestic watch manufacturers. The industry is thriving and enjoyed in 1953 its biggest financial year.

The Treasury Department weighs heavily on the defense aspects in raising new trade barriers against imported Swiss watches. It rationalizes that the move is necessary because the domestic watch industry is vitally essential to national defense. If a nation cannot achieve an adequate national defense without a productive watch industry, as is claimed by United States watchmakers, why then are we so apprehensive of the military might of Russia? Everyone knows that Russia had no watchmaking industries. Yet we recognize Russia as a potentially powerful military foe. However, we do have a healthy watch industry. The American total sales of this industry averaged in excess of $90 million between 1946 and 1950 and rose to a record high of over $150 million in 1953. This increased production certainly isn't losing essential jobs for the watch industry that are necessary to meet defense needs. But the domestic watch industry isn't the only source of skilled precision workers. An attempt has been made to give the impression that only the watchmaking industry has the skills which can manufacure time fuses and other precision devices used in the manufacture of weapons for our Armed Forces.

There are four domestic watchmaking companies in the United States. However, data assembled by the Senate Armed Services Committee shows that there are a whole host of other companies not engaged in the manufacture of watches capable of producing time fuses. In fact, the figures show that the companies not engaged in watchmaking have produced substantially more time-fuse devices than the domestic watch industry. I do not mean to say by this that a healthy watch industry is not a good thing. We have always had it and still have such an industry. Indeed, during the 18 years the reciprocal trade agreement between Switzerland and this country has been in effect our domestic watch industry has grown, expanded its plant, increased its capital worth, paid dividends, and enjoyed unparalleled success in the domestic watch market. It has made valuable contributions to and occupies an important position in our national defense.

Increasing trade barriers on Swiss watches constitutes a serious blow to our position of leadership in the free world. The accelerated trade offensive by the Russians, with the trade blandishments that have been offered our allies, has proved alarmingly successful. A considerable number of trade agreements have been signed between the East and the countries of Western Europe. It is noteworthy that the Communist press in Western Europe has recently begun a propaganda campaign directed at the Swiss watch industry. This propaganda has stressed the unreliability of the United States market and the desirability of trading with the Soviet bloc. The fact that Russia does not have a watchmaking industry emphasizes the strategic implications of the Soviet trade offensive.

I hope that I have been able to give you the other side of this matter in a manner which will dispel what I believe to be created misunderstanding of the facts.

This is a most serious matter. It affects our leadership in the free world. It affects the economic well-being of a large segment of our population. It should be given careful consideration by the administration.

On March 15 the Tariff Commission is scheduled to report to the Congress as to the proper and orderly way to handle the problem of revision of customs classifications. The Office of Defense Mobilization has established an interdepartmental committee to recommend ways in which the skills of precision workers necessary to national defense could be secured. No action should be taken until these reports are available.

The President's policy on foreign trade has been clearly defined. We can only hope that all the branches of his administration will act consistently to bring about its accomplishment.

Irrigation Takes Some Risk Out of Farming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I believe that Members of the Congress will be most interested in the ground working of Public Law 597, enacted by the 83d Congress, which was passed by the Congress to enable greater productivity and provide greater water facilities programs throughout the Nation.

At the time the law was adopted—and I am pleased to say that the measure was one of those I worked hard to get passed—it was my thought that the legislation would have a profound effect on the future of our Nation. In addition to the great importance in promoting conservation work, the program would assist also in facilitating long-needed land-use adjustments. I believed that the law would aid in bringing about desirable uses of acres diverted from the production of surplus crops, as well as relieve the danger of drought conditions.

The law has been most beneficial, although the long-range program still needs much work. On the 400 million acres of cropland, surveys of the Soil Conservation Service indicate that erosion is still proceeding at a serious rate on about 200 million acres—about one-half of the total. Most of the grasslands are producing only about half of their potential capacities.

The soil, water, range, and forest resources of the United States are the foundation blocks in the structure of the national economy. From this base comes food, clothing, paper, and other fiber. How well these resources are protected and improved in the years ahead shall determine the standards of living of our Nation's citizens in the towns and the cities as well as our rural businessmen.

With this intention, the Congress enacted Public Law 597. I think that a recent article published in the December issue of the Progressive Farmer and written by Mississippi County Agriculture Agent Keith Bilbry will be of especial interest to those Members who sponsored this law, as well as all the other Members.

I might add that Mr. Bilbry has been a leading agronomist in the State of Arkansas for a number of years, having given 17 years to the study of agriculture and its problems. Mr. Bilbry is also an authority on the adoption of irrigation programs, and his article illustrates the advantages as well as some of the problems our farm citizens have encountered in moving their lands under systems of irrigation and water-control programs.

Mr. Bilbry, in the article, tells the story of the growth of irrigation in Mississippi County. As statistical information background, I might state that in north Mississippi County in 1951 there was very little irrigation practice. As of August 1, 1954, more than 7,000 acres had been placed under irrigation.

Mr. Bilbry's article identifies these practices specifically:

[From the Manila Sentinel of December 24, 1954]

KEITH BILBRY ARTICLE ON IRRIGATION

How did your crops turn out this dry year? It may be a sin to tell you this, but north Mississippi County farmers who irrigated this year harvested bumper crops.

For instance, Earl Wildy cut 34.4 tons of silage per acre and gathered 94 bushels of corn per acre. He irrigated twice.

E. M. Regenold watered some Fox cotton 3 times and expected to harvest between 800 and 900 pounds of lint per acre.

M. J. Koehler harvested about 90 bushels of rice per acre from his first rice crop.

Earl Magers and Mr. Wildy had beautiful Sudan-grass supplemental pastures for their Hereford cattle when farmers without irrigation couldn't even get Sudan to sprout.

Ora Hueter netted $800 per acre from strawberries that had been irrigated.

Irrigated soybeans show promise of profitable increase on Jack Lewis' farm, as well as on Mr. Magers' farm. Mr. Regenold expects a pretty good soybean yield following wheat due to irrigation.

Mr. Wildy carried more than one animal unit per acre all summer on irrigated fescue and clover and Sudan pastures. This is his third year to have such good pastures by irrigation.

We took 325 farmers on a six-stop county-wide irrigation tour this summer. Because of the interest, I think this was the best single-phase educational job I have had the privilege of doing in 17 years of extension-service teaching.

In addition to the fine crops, farmers saw sprinkling and furrow irrigation, use of siphon tubes, gated pipe, and different-size sprinklers from No. 20's to the big No. 90's.

They saw water sources—lakes, streams, ponds, and wells.

They saw 16-inch wells, 12-inch wells, 4-inch wells, and even a series of four 2-inch wells which had been tied together.

They saw power units—14-horsepower gas engines, tractors, and pumps, 135-horsepower motors, engines removed from self-propelled combines, as well as 60-horsepower electric motors.

Should another dry year come, then north Mississippi County farmers may spend more than $4 million on irrigation equipment. They are fed up with 3 years of near crop failures on $22 up to $500 per acre land.

H. C. Knappenberger, a Green Brier Ridge farmer, was the first to irrigate in north Mississippi County—1950 and 1951. This was more or less experimental. The operative furnished part of sprinkling equipment.

In May 1952 James L. Gattis, extension service agricultural engineer, and I held an

irrigation demonstration and school on the Earl Wildy farm. Five farmers bought necessary systems and irrigated 215 acres that year.

Ten more farmers irrigated a total of 900 extra acres in 1953.

Thirty-nine more farmers were watering 6,500 more acres by August 1 of this year.

Fifty-four systems were in use August 1 on 7,600 acres of land. In September new systems were going in each week, even though the main irrigating season was over.

All of Mississippi County in Arkansas is delta land with a high water table. Water rises in wells to from 6 to 10 feet of the surface. Most wells are about 110 feet deep, none more than 135 feet. The 2-inch and 3-inch driven wells are 24 to 28 feet deep. There are also several year-round streams or drainage ditches.

At present, 25 farmers are pumping from ditches, 3 from lakes, 5 from big 12-inch to 16-inch wells, 7 from 4-inch to 6-inch wells, 7 from four 2-inch pump points, tied together, and 7 have small systems operating from 2-inch and 3-inch wells.

Investment costs for those having ditch or lake water seem to range between $38 and $45 per acre. When wells are dug, the total cost rises to the $55 to $85 per acre range.

At present, 92 percent of our irrigation is by sprinkler system, 6 percent by flooding, and 2 percent by furrow.

As farmers learn of the relatively new gated pipe, more about land leveling, and to use consulting engineers in planning a system, there will be more furrow irrigation used.

J. W. Rayder is boring a 16-inch well while I am writing this article. It is too late for this year's cotton, corn, and soybeans. I asked him, "Why not wait until next year?"

Mr. Rayder said, "I spent $1,200 on vetch seed last fall and never got a cent's worth of benefit. I am going to get vetch up this fall. I've got 50 head of cattle and no pasture. They are going to have small grain pasture this winter."

E. M. Regenold, president of the First National Bank, in Blytheville, told more than 325 farmers on tour of his farm, "I'm afraid we are going to be forced to irrigate some. I'm trying it on rice, cotton, and soybeans this year, as you will see."

Mr. Regenold showed a field of highly fertilized, well matured Fox cotton that had been watered twice. It really "took their eye."

He demonstrated the use of gated pipe in furrow irrigation. The crowd was told that irrigation by gated pipe, where possible, was about half as expensive as sprinker irrigation. Mr. Regenold explained that he spent about $50 per acre leveling this land so furlow irrigation would be possible.

Most farmers know that fall-seeded alfalfa and pastures are preferred over spring seeding, but it has just not worked in recent years, due to extremely dry weather. Some of these systems will be used this fall to insure fall-seeded pastures, alfalfa, winter cover crops, and small grains.

The recent new Federal law making it possible to borrow money from the Government to install irrigation, and repay over a long period of years, has increased interest by many times.

Norman Speck keeps asking, "When can I apply for the loan? I want to be one of the first on the list. Three years straight without water is enough for me."

Fant Windham said, "You know I have been talking to you about irrigation for years. Maybe this loan will help me do what I've wanted to do for a long time."

Irrigation is no picnic. It will not solve all your problems. It might not even be profitable for you. To increase yields is one thing, but to increase net income or profit is another. An investment this size demands your serious study and planning. It is hard work to irrigate, to move pipes around in the mud in 100-degree weather.

Earl Wildy told us on tour, "As near as I can tell, it's costing me $3 in labor and fuel to put 2 inches of water on an acre." This is his third year to water cotton, corn, alfalfa, pasture, and Atlas sorgo.

Mr. Wildy and Mr. Regenold both found they could cut fuel cost on their 95-horsepower engines by shifting gasoline to propane.

Jack Lewis and his father watered 220 acres with $8,200 worth of sprinkler equipment ($37.25 per acre). Mr. Lewis said, "It's costing me $3.50 in fuel and labor to put out 2 inches of water per acre."

D. C. Wright said, "I watered 90 acres of cotton twice, 2 inches each application. The 4 inches of extra water has cost me $5.50 in labor and fuel."

Advantages of supplemental irrigation may include: (1) higher yields; (2) likely higher net profits; (3) stand insurance in spring; (4) feed insurance for livestock; (5) better returns from fertilizers; (6) stand insurance on fall-seeded crops; (7) more work per year for labor.

Irrigation's disadvantages may be: (1) much higher capital needs; (2) really hard labor; (3) increased insects, disease, and boll rot; (4) delayed harvest and lower grades; (5) reduced mechanical picker efficiency; (6) good drainage, a first and absolute requirement, increases cost; (7) some years it may not be needed or used.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this article illustrated in a graphic manner the growing value of the law we adopted and we can be pleased with the manner in which our farm businessmen are using their efforts to improve their land productivity and building a better agricultural economy.

Progress in Soil and Water Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1955

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, on November 4 a distinguished Member of the House, my colleague from Kansas, the Honorable CLIFFORD R. HOPE, delivered an interesting and informative address at Sioux City, Iowa, on the subject of progress in soil and water conservation. This address was delivered at the annual soil-conservation banquet of the Sioux City Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. HOPE has given soil and water conservation a great deal of study and is regarded as an authority on this subject matter. I am pleased to include his statement at this point in the RECORD. I am sure Members of Congress, as well as others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, will be interested in Mr. HOPE'S views on this subject matter.

It is indeed an honor to be invited to speak at the annual soil conservation banquet of the Sioux City Chamber of Commerce.

This is not my first visit to your thriving city, which is the center of one of the greatest agricultural regions in the world. My previous visits have been so pleasant and your hospitality so generous that I am always delighted to return.

I am pleased also to have the opportunity to speak again in the home district of my distinguished friend, CHARLES B. HOEVEN, who not only ably represents all of the people of this district in the House of Representatives but who is known throughout the length and breadth of the land as an authority on agriculture and a sincere friend of the farmers of this country.

I want to congratulate the Sioux City Chamber of Commerce and that fine newspaper, the Sioux City Journal, for their interest in agriculture and in the conservation of our soil and water resources which has led them to collaborate in this fine program to encourage soil and water conservation within the trade area.

And may I extend my heartiest congratulations to the winners of the contests sponsored by the chamber of commerce in 52 counties in this 4-State area.

To my way of thinking, the greatest and most constructive thing which men and women living on the land can do is to leave that land better than they found it.

And I know that is the ambition of every good farmer, because good farmers love the land and get real satisfaction and pleasure in enriching and improving it. You are good farmers and good neighbors and good citizens, or you would not be here.

I want to talk to you tonight about the land, about soil and water, about what we are doing and what we need to do if we are going to conserve these great natural resources.

In recent years all of us in America have been giving much attention to the conservation of our soil and water resources. We have been taking stock, we have stopped to think deeply of the relationship between the people and the resources of the earth.

And in spite of the fact that Thomas Jefferson and others of our Founding Fathers expressed concern over the loss of the soil and its fertility in their day and that Patrick Henry is reputed to have said "He is the greatest patriot who stops the most gulleys," it is only comparatively recently that we have adopted national policies to save our soil and water.

For many years, we as a nation acted as if we had a virtually limitless and inexhaustible supply of soil, more than we could ever really need. So we treated this land with its timber, pasture, and water resources with careless abandon. We gave it away to encourage settlement. We stripped the forests from the earth and when they were gone, moved our sawmills to stands of virgin timber.

We sapped the land of its goodness by continual cropping or grazing and then turned our plows to what appeared to be a limitless expanse of new and fertile lands, moving always steadily to the westward.

Then suddenly about 1920 we realized that this vast expanse of land was not limitless, that we had in fact crossed our last frontier and that even much of the land which lay behind that frontier was worthless for agricultural purposes. We began to realize, too, that in our profligate and careless use of the soil and the timber and the water we had not only permitted, but sometimes even encouraged, the deterioration and destruction of those resources which are basic to survival.

It was not easy for the Nation to change its thinking and its policies from resource exploitation to resource conservation, and the process is still going on. There is still more to be done than we have yet accomplished. But the record is clear that once the American people see the need for conservation action, they are quick to respond.

The words soils conservation and the practices and programs which make up soil conservation are so familiar to us today that it is difficult for us to remember that it was not until 1928 that the country was sufficiently aware of the need for soil conserva-

tion to sponsor Federal legislation on the subject. The first recognition of national responsibility in this matter was a small item in the 1928 appropriation bill for research into soil erosion.

Everything that we as a Nation have accomplished in this field has occurred since that time. In other words, nationally organized, promoted, and encouraged soil conservation in the United States has all taken place during the last 25 years. Much has been done during that time, but much still remains to be done.

The continuing losses of productive soil on lands not yet protected by conservation practices are shown in studies made by the Soil Conservation Service. The latest study in 1953 showed that of 478 million acres used for crops in the United States, 121 million acres was deteriorating at a critical rate and an additional 128 million was deteriorating at a serious rate.

Although use of conservation measures on farmlands has brought a proportionate reduction in the amount of soil loss, it is estimated that this loss is stil running in the neighborhood of 500,000 acres a year. In addition, up to 100 million acres once cultivated but never entirely suitable for cultivation have been so severely affected that they are no longer in cultivation.

So we find ourselves today not with a limitless expanse of land which can be brought into cultivation as our old farmland fails us, but with a definitely limited land area—some of it excellent, some of it worthless for agricultural purposes—and with very little additional land that can be brought into agricultural production.

Furthermore the normal expansion of our cities, the widening of highways, building of airports, and other nonfarm uses are every year taking out of cultivation thousands of acres of really good farmland.

However it is encouraging to know that the Nation is now making healthy progress in its fight against soil erosion and depletion. This is reflected in the increased public concern over the matter and in the actual conservation accomplishments which we can see going on. More than four-fifths of the country's farmland (82 percent) and approximately 90 percent of our farms and ranches now are within the boundaries of 2,618 farmer-organized, farmer-managed soil conservation districts. Seventy-one new districts were organized during the last fiscal year with a net increase in district acreage of nearly 37 million acres, including expansion of existing districts.

Conservation practices have been applied or are being applied to some 34 percent of the country's privately owned agricultural land and the rate of farm conservation treatment continues at an accelerated pace year after year.

But the big end of the job still remains to be completed, on individual farms and in the watersheds of this country.

The challenge is great. It must be met. It will be met.

The brightest promise for the future of America is in the great and growing dedication of our people—farmers and city dwellers alike—to the conservation and improvement of the Nation's greatest and indispensable resources—soil and water.

Our basic national soil-conservation policies are embraced in the Soil Conservation Act of 1935. It is under that great piece of legislation, and the laws enacted in our States to complement and supplement it, that our national soil-conservation program has been carried out.

Along about the same time Congress passed the Flood Control Act of 1936 and later the Flood Control Act of 1944. These acts dealt in the main with flood-control work on our larger streams and the flood plains thereof.

Thus, we have had two national programs in operation for almost 20 years—one dealing with the control of water after it gets in the channels of our main streams; the other dealing with work on the land itself to hold the water where it falls.

But I think all who have followed these programs agree that there has been a missing link between them. That missing link is work on the small watersheds, the creeks, and the smaller tributaries of our major streams. This field has not been neglected entirely through oversight, because the authority to deal with small watersheds is contained in the Soil Conservation Act itself, and the Flood Control Act of 1936 authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out water-conservation programs on the tributaries of our larger streams after the specific projects had been approved by the Congress.

Under the authority contained in these two acts, the Department of Agriculture has made numerous examinations, surveys, and reports. In addition, the 1944 Flood Control Act authorized 11 watershed projects. One of these is the Little Sioux project in this area and known to all of you.

However, no other projects have been authorized by Congress under the authority of the 1936 act, and the annual appropriations for these 11 projects have been so small in comparison with the work to be done that at the present rate it will be 30 or 40 years before some of the projects will be entirely completed.

Aside from these 11 projects, nothing further was done toward actually carrying out watershed projects until action was taken by the 83d Congress, to which I shall refer later.

In the meantime, this Nation has become water conscious as it has never been before. This year and last the specter of drought has been stalking the land. In large areas of our country rainfall has been more deficient than even during the drought period of the early 1930's. The Weather Bureau, while admitting its inability to make accurate predictions, doesn't hold out much hope that this year will see the end of this drought period, since such weather phenomena usually run in cycles.

But aside from the drought itself, it is being brought to our attention more and more that water is the primary limiting factor in the development of cities, industry, and agriculture, not only throughout the West but in all parts of the country. The difficulties now faced by many cities which depend upon surface runoff for their water supplies are well known. Even cities and industrial establishments which get most or all of their water from underground sources are having their difficulties.

This is not only because of the rapid increase in water consumption by municipalities and industries as well as irrigation, but because of waste, not only in conserving our water supplies in the first place but in the use of them as well.

Thus, it is becoming more evident every day that our future progress as a Nation will, to a considerable extent, lie in the way we develop, handle, conserve, utilize, and control our water supplies.

And although drought and short water supplies are the problems today, it has not been very long ago that the Nation was suffering terrific losses from flood damage, much of which could have been prevented by sound conservation programs on the land itself and on the small watersheds which feed our main streams.

We must remember that the essential difference between the pure, clear water which flows from our springs and wells and the brown, yellow or red torrent of silt and debris that periodically lays waste to our river valleys is that the clear and usable water stayed for a time where it fell. The other did not.

Thus the watershed programs which are receiving so much consideration in all parts of our country today are based upon a realization that the way we can get good and adequate water supplies and at the same time reduce flood destruction and damage is to get the rain and melting snow into the ground near where it falls. The earth is our greatest and most wonderful reservoir.

I do not mean to say that it will be possible under all conditions to hold all of our water near the place where it falls. That would not be possible or even desirable under all conditions.

What I do want to say and to emphasize in the strongest possible terms is that every drop of water which can be retained in the area in which it falls, either in the earth or in small retarding structures, is one drop subtracted from a potential flood and one drop added to our useful water supply.

This is the basic philosophy behind the watershed legislation which has aroused so much interest and which has been given so much consideration throughout the country in recent years.

I think as a matter of fact that the people of this country have been ahead of the Congress on the question of watershed legislation. However the House Committee on Agriculture has been giving the question consideration for some time past, and as a matter of fact in the 82d Congress it reported a bill which contains many of the salient features of the legislation passed in the last Congress. However that legislation was blocked in the Rules Committee, due in the main to opposition from other Government agencies.

In the interval between the 1st and 2d sessions of the 82d Congress, a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture held hearings on watershed programs in several States.

I think it can be said, however, that the 83d Congress has pretty well caught up with the public on the question of soil and water conservation. Certainly it can be said fairly that this Congress has enacted more important legislation relating to soil and water conservation than any other Congress except the 74th which enacted the Soil Conservation Act itself under the inspiration and leadership of that great conservationist and great American, Hugh H. Bennett.

The Small Watershed and Flood Prevention Act is only one of several important conservation enactments by the 83d Congress. Before discussing this measure, I want to refer briefly to three other proposals, all of which tie in directly with the Small Watershed Act.

First, there was the item in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1954, which set up the pilot plant projects. This occurred during the 1st session of the 83d Congress and enabled us to get a small watershed program under way a year ahead of time. These projects, 62 in number, are widely scattered. They deal with all sorts of conditions and will serve as demonstration projects, the progress of which will be closely studied by geologists, experts in hydrology and all students of watershed programs.

The second matter I want to mention is the extension of the Water Facilities Act. This not only extends the provisions of the Water Facilities Act to every State in the Union, but it is of interest from the standpoint of conservation in that it provides for both direct and insured loans for conservation purposes through the Farmers Home Administration.

The language of the law provides that these loans may be made "for the purpose of financing the improvement of farmland by soil or water conserving or drainage

facilities, structures or practices, improvement of soil fertility, establishment of improved permament pasture, sustained yield afforestation or reforestation, or other erosion preventatives, and such other related measures as may be determined from time to time by the Secretary."

The fact that this loan provides for the insuring of loans advanced by private lenders is one of its outstanding features. Not only will this make it easier for private capital to assist farmers, but it also lessens the demands upon the Federal Treasury.

This legislation will, in my opinion, prove very effective in supplementing operations under the Watershed Act in that the loan provision will make it more likely that all farmers in a watershed area will be able to finance the work which they must do upon the land itself in connection with any area watershed program.

A third important conservation enactment is the provision in the tax bill which permits farmers to treat expenditures for a number of soil-conserving practices as current annual expenses which may be deducted from farm income in computing income taxes, thus giving real financial encouragement to the use of conservation practices. This is a provision which many leaders in the field of conservation have been urging for years.

Now let me take a little time to outline some of the provisions of the Watershed Protection and Flood Control Act. Before doing so, let me point out that the purpose of the legislation is to fill in the gap which I mentioned earlier as existing between programs for conservation practices on the land and flood control on our main streams.

The legislation was developed after it became apparent that the provisions of existing law were not meeting the constantly increasing need for watershed protection.

What the new act does is to set up the machinery and procedure whereby local watershed districts or soil-conservation districts or similar organizations may cooperate with the Federal Government in working out the engineering and financial problems connected with such enterprises. Both the work and the costs are to be shared in an equitable way between individuals, local districts, States, and the Federal Government.

In general it is expected that the cost borne by the Federal Government will average around 50 percent, depending upon the nature of the project and the extent of the national interest involved.

The initiative for the work must come from the local people. Applications to come under the program must be submitted for consideration by the Governor of the State or a State agency set up for that purpose. This is to prevent conflict with other State development plans.

If the application is not disapproved by the State, the Soil Conservation Service will assign technicians and other personnel to work with the local organization in conducting investigations and surveys, making such other studies as may be necessary, and working out detailed plans for the project. At the same time it is assumed that work will be going forward in the locality on the other requirements which are conditions of Federal assistance.

These requirements are set out in section 4 of the act. They include the following: (1) Acquisition by the local organization of all land, easements, or rights-of-way necessary for the project; (2) evidence that the local organization is willing and able to assume its proportionate share of the cost and to maintain and operate the improvements after they have been installed; (3) provide assurances that landowners have acquired necessary water rights; and (4) obtain agreements from owners of at least 50 percent of the land above each retention reservoir to carry out recommended soil-conservation measures and proper farm plans on their land.

Unless the project is one of the relatively few in which there will be a dam providing more than 2,500 acre-feet of detention capacity, no formal approval by Congress is necessary before the project can be started. If the plan includes a structure impounding more than 2,500 acre-feet of water, money cannot be appropriated for it until the Committee on Agriculture in the House and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate have adopted resolutions authorizing the project.

No dam can be constructed under the authority of the act which provides for more than 5,000 acre-feet of detention capacity, no watershed embracing more than 250,000 acres may be included in a project, but several projects of 250,000 acres or less might be carried out jointly and as a part of an over-all plan.

I have not attempted to set out all the provisions and requirements which must be met in connection with projects of this kind, but the Committee on Agriculture has published a public document covering this matter in detail, which will be sent to anyone who will write to the Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

I wish I could at this time give public credit to all those whose help and support made possible the enactment of this legislation. This is impossible, however, because I suppose there is no important piece of legislation in recent years which has had such wide support. First and foremost must come the conservation organizations. All of them did so much that it would be unfair to single out anyone more than the other.

Strong support came from the farm organizations.

The National Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors helped tremendously.

The list of Members in both Houses who worked hard for the legislation is too long to be repeated here. The bill was reported unanimously by the House Committee on Agriculture and passed the House unanimously. It passed the Senate unanimously, although the opposition there succeeded in including a number of crippling amendments which had to be taken out in conference.

The special message of President Eisenhower endorsing the bill and making it an administration measure was of the utmost importance in that it stopped the open opposition from other Government agencies, which was the most serious threat to the passage of the bill.

The Bureau of the Budget exercised much skill and patience in ironing out difficulties with other Government agencies.

The unanimity of support for this bill coming from the country is shown by the fact that it was backed by both the National Chamber of Commerce and the CIO—one of the few measures, and perhaps the only one, on which these two organizations ever got together.

Well, the law is now on the books. How important it becomes depends upon the people who live in the watersheds. Upon them rests the responsibility of setting up local organizations, of initiating the projects, of raising funds, securing the land and easements, and assuming the responsibility for operation and maintenance.

To a lesser extent it depends upon the willingness of Congress to appropriate funds, but in this Congress will undoubtedly follow the sentiment of the country, keeping in mind the availability of funds and economic conditions.

Only through continued popular interest and support can this program realize its full potentialities. It costs money, yes; but to me every dollar we spend for purposes of this kind is an investment in the future of America—an investment which will be returned many times.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 21, 1955

Very Reverend Nicholas M. Kohut, O. S. B. M., provincial superior of the Order of St. Basil the Great in the United States, offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

We thank Thee, O God, for America, the haven for young oppressed people.

Grant, O God, the Members of this august body, the Members of the House of Representatives, and all our leaders vision and fortitude in their endeavors, so that this great Nation may continue to give courage to the rest of the world so that nations may know that freedom, peace, and justice is Thy will.

Grant, O God, to our unfortunate brethren behind the Iron Curtain courage to withstand the tyranny of communism. With them we humbly pray:

O great God, Omnipotent Creator,
Look down upon our native lands.
We were always faithful to Thy will,
Hear our prayers this day.

Our brethren are in chains, our countries in ruin,

Our enemies will not even permit us to pray.

O great God, give Ukraine and the other enslaved nations

Strength, glory, freedom, power.

We ask Thy divine guidance to the end that the once free and independent Ukraine and other nations oppressed by the tyrants may again take their rightful places in the community of free nations.

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 18, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of title 15, section 1024, United States Code, the Speaker had appointed Mr. PATMAN, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. MILLS, Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. TALLE, and

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri on the part of the House to serve as members of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2091) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 2091) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of January 18, 1955,

The VICE PRESIDENT, on January 18, 1955, signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H. R. 2369. An act to amend section 7237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; and

S. J. Res. 4. Joint resolution to provide for the continuation in office of certain members of the Commission on Governmental Operations.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on January 18, 1955, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 4) for the continuation in office of certain members of the Commission on Governmental Operations.

THE ECONOMIC REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 31)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States relating to the Economic Report, which was referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

(For the President's message, see House proceedings of January 20, 1955, pp. 483–484, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on January 20, 1955, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 4) to provide for the continuation in office of certain members of the Commission on Governmental Operations.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. GEORGE, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet from 2:30 p. m. on during the remainder of the session today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and other routine business, and I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes, in accordance with the usual practice.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938 RELATING TO WHEAT MARKETING QUOTAS

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATION OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of an appropriation for the Alaska Experiment Station, Palmer, Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXTENSION OF REQUIREMENT FOR SPECIAL REGISTRATION, CLASSIFICATION, AND INDUCTION OF CERTAIN SPECIALIST CATEGORIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend the act of September 9, 1950, by extending until July 1, 1957, the authority to require the special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

A letter from the Director, Legislative Programs, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending the authority to induct certain individuals, and to extend the benefits under the Dependents Assistance Act to July 1, 1959 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES UNDER THE EXPORT CONTROL ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Twenty-ninth Quarterly Report required under the Export Control Act of 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

IMPORTATION OF GIFTS FROM MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

TERMINATION OF FEDERAL SUPERVISION OVER PROPERTY OF INDIANS IN SOUTHERN MINNESOTA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of Indians and Indian communities in the southern part of Minnesota, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED AWARD OF CERTAIN CONCESSION PERMITS

Two letters from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting pursuant to law, proposed awards of concession permits in Grand Teton National Park, Wyo., and Shiloh National Military Park, Tenn. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MANAGEMENT AND DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS IN OKLAHOMA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the management and disposition of certain public-domain lands in the State of Oklahoma (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPEAL OF SO-CALLED TIMBER AND STONE LAW

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal the so-called timber and stone law (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CANCELLATION OF CERTAIN INDIAN DEBTS DUE THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an order canceling certain charges existing as debts due the United States by individual Indians and tribes of Indians (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REQUIREMENT OF RECORDATION OF SCRIP, LIEU SELECTION, AND SIMILAR RIGHTS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to require the recordation of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES IN FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of November 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

IMPROVEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC AIRPORTS IN ALASKA

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to improve the administration of the public airports in the Territory of Alaska (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REWARDS FOR INFORMATION CONCERNING ILLEGAL IMPORTATION AND MANUFACTURE OF SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIALS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide rewards for information concerning the illegal introduction into the United States, or the illegal manufacture or acquisition in the United States, of special nuclear material and atomic weapons (with an accompanying paper); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

REPRESENTATION OF INDIGENT DEFENDANTS IN CRIMINAL CASES IN DISTRICT COURTS OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district court of the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INCREASE OF MAXIMUM FINE FOR VIOLATION OF SHERMAN ANTITRUST ACT

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase criminal penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF CLAYTON ACT, RELATING TO CERTAIN RIGHTS OF ACTION

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MARY J. MCDOUGALL

A letter from the administrative assistant, Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Mary J. McDougall (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ERNEST W. BERRY

A letter from the administrative assistant, Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Ernest W. Berry, Alaska Native Service schoolteacher (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence for various subjects (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF TORT CLAIMS PAID BY STATE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Secretary of State, reporting, pursuant to law, on claims paid by the Department of State during the calendar year 1954; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PLIGHT OF THE SUGAR-BEET INDUSTRY IN THE WEST—JOINT MEMORIAL OF IDAHO LEGISLATURE

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I submit Senate Joint Memorial No. 1 of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which calls to the attention of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States the plight existing in the sugar-beet industry, not only in the State of Idaho, but also in the States of Utah, Oregon, Colorado, Minnesota, South Dakota, and other sugar-beet-producing areas, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Memorial 1

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, as assembled in its 33d session, do respectfully represent that—

Whereas the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, provides for an inflexible limitation upon the quantity of sugar which may be marketed in the United States in any one year by the Domestic Beet, Mainland Cane, Hawaiian, Puerto Rican, Virgin Islands, and Philippine sugar industries; and

Whereas since the establishment of these rigid marketing quotas the population of the United States has increased from approximately 150 million to more than 163 million persons, and the consumption of sugar by this expanding population has at the same time increased from approximately 7,500,000 tons in 1948 to 8,250,000 tons in 1954; and

Whereas sugar consumption in the United States may be expected to continue to increase at the rate of more than 100,000 tons per year; and

Whereas under provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, every ton of this increase in consumption is reserved to Cuban and other foreign producers of sugar, and not 1 ton of this expanding market may be supplied by our domestic sugar industry; and

Whereas an equitable share of this expanding market is essential to the continued stability and vigor of the domestic sugar industry; and

Whereas the beet sugar industry is prepared to meet the challenge of an expanding market, because it has achieved major gains in productivity per acre and new acreages for the production of sugar beets continue to be developed in the State of Idaho; and

Whereas the welfare of our State and our Nation requires the existence of a strong and vigorous domestic sugar industry, especially during periods of war and national emergency; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Idaho, To urge all Members of the Congress of the United States to enact legislation amending the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, in such manner as to enable the domestic sugar industry of the United States to have a fair and equitable share in our Nation's growth; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of senate forward copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and Members of the Congress of the United States and the United States Senators and Representatives from the State of Idaho.

BURNET RHETT MAYBANK—RESOLUTION

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the American Cotton Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., paying tribute to my distinguished predecessor, the late Senator Burnet R. Maybank.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BURNET RHETT MAYBANK: AN AMERICAN STATESMAN

When Burnet Rhett Maybank died on September 1, 1954, the Nation lost one of its outstanding statesmen. Senator Maybank was a man of deep loyalty and devotion to friends and country. He had a keen awareness of the worth of the individual and an understanding of the need to provide a sound structure of Government within which the individual might develop to the limit of his capabilities.

Born in Charleston, S. C., March 7, 1899, Senator Maybank was the descendant of five former governors of his native State. He was first elected an alderman of the city of Charleston, and later its mayor. At the age of 38 he followed in the footsteps of his forebears to become Governor of the State. He was elected to succeed James F. Byrnes as Senator from South Carolina in 1941, and served in that position until the date of his death. During his tenure in the Senate one of his most important assignments was chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, from which position he distinguished himself for the clarity of his reasoning and the soundness of his judgment.

While Senator Maybank's death brought sorrow to countless thousands who had known him and who had labored with him, it brought particular sadness to those connected with the American cotton trade and industry. Having worked as a cotton broker, Senator Maybank understood the problems of the cotton industry and was quick to champion the cause of cotton whenever consistent with the best interests of the Nation. With the death of Senator Maybank there passed from the American scene a brilliant statesman, an outstanding citizen, and a beloved friend.

In recognition of the value of the life of this great American, the board of directors of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., assembled in regular meeting at Charlotte, N. C., on September 22, 1954, directed that the president of the institute appoint a special committee composed of those members of the board residing in South Carolina; that this special committee transmit to Mrs. Burnet Rhett Maybank and family these expressions of sympathy of the members of this organization and of the members of its board of directors; and that a copy of these expressions be sent to the senior Senator from South Carolina with the request that they be incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc.: Walter S. Montgomery, Chairman, Special Committee; James A. Chapman; R. G. Emery; F. E. Grier, C. B. Hayes; Ellison S. McKissick; J. C. Self, Jr.; William A. L. Sibley; Elliott Springs, Earle R. Stall; Fred W. Symmes.

RESOLUTIONS OF LINN COUNTY (OREG.) FARMERS UNION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three resolutions unanimously adopted by the Linn County Farmers Union, of the State of Oregon Farmers Union, sent me by W. W. Abraham, president.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That we reaffirm our former resolution that we favor the construction of the high Hells Canyon Dam by the Federal Government in accord with the survey and recommendation of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Army Engineers; and, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent the State Farmers Union convention and that copies be sent to our representative in the State legislature and in Congress.

LINN COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
W. W. ABRAHAM, *President.*

Unanimously passed January 8, 1955.

Resolved, That we favor using the Federal income, derived from offshore oil, for education in accord with the bill introduced by Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the State convention of the Farmers Union and to our Representatives in Congress.

LINN COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
W. W. ABRAHAM, *President.*

Unanimously passed January 8, 1955.

Whereas there is a movement by the private power utilities to promote the formation of the Columbia Interstate Compact Commission, including the States of Oregon, Washington, Wyoming, Montana, and Utah, for the purpose of controlling or allocating the electric power in the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas it is feared this commission would be largely in control of the private utilities: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Linn County Farmers Union is unalterably opposed to the formation of the so-called Columbia Interstate Compact Commission and that copies of this resolution be sent to the Oregon Farmers Union State convention and to our representatives in the State legislature and in Congress.

LINN COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
W. W. ABRAHAM, *President*.

Unanimously passed January 8, 1955.

FEDERAL AID TO HIGHWAYS—RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present a resolution which I have received from Mr. Matthew A. Popp, county clerk for Forest County, Wis. This resolution was adopted by the county board on the important subject of strengthening the highway system in counties with relatively modest property valuation.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred to the Senate Public Works Committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Board of Supervisors of Forest County, Wis., That—

Whereas the Federal Government does not now turn over to counties any Federal aid for highways unless such funds are matched dollar for dollar equally by county funds; and

Whereas in counties of low property valuation such counties are now raising the maximum allowed by law for regular county operating expenses and in consequence do not qualify for any Federal aid and are not able to keep up their highways to a minimum standard: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the county board of Forest County in regular session assembled request that the Congress of the United States reduce the requirements for matching Federal funds so that instead of matching dollar for dollar of Federal funds the requirement be lowered so that in counties of less than $25 million valuation, the Federal Government pay 75 percent and counties pay 25 percent of the Federal funds allotted; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Hon. Alexander Wiley and Hon. Joseph McCarthy, our United States Senators from Wisconsin; Hon. John W. Byrnes, our Congressman; the State Highway Department of the State of Wisconsin; and to A. J. Thelen, executive secretary of the County Boards Association.

Dated this 27th day of December 1954.

REDUCTION OF ELIGIBILITY AGE FOR SOCIAL-SECURITY BENEFITS—RESOLUTION OF MASSACHUSETTS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. KENNEDY] and myself, I send to the desk a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the Massachusetts Legislature and ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States in favor of the passage of legislation reducing the age at which persons shall be eligible to receive social-security benefits

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States a bill sponsored by Congressman THOMAS J. LANE, of Lawrence, to reduce from 65 to 60 the age at which persons shall be eligible to receive social-security benefits; and

Whereas many persons who have reached the age of 60 years either have difficulty or cannot receive employment even though they are in good health; and

Whereas in many cases persons between the ages of 60 and 65 by reason of the lack of social-security benefits either become dependent upon relations or welfare agencies because of inability to secure employment: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the house of representatives respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration and enact into law the bill reducing the age at which persons shall be eligible to receive social-security benefits; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Office of each branch of Congress, and to each of the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. YOUNG, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 145. A bill to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 9).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. Res. 20. Resolution authorizing the employment of additional personnel by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and appropriating funds therefor; with an amendment (Rept. No. 10); and under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration; and

S. Res. 25. Resolution authorizing the employment of an additional clerical assistant by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 11); and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

TEMPORARY PERMISSION FOR PARKING ON SQUARE 723 OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Concurrent Resolution 3, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the concurrent resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3) favoring temporary permission for parking on square 723 of the Capitol Grounds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3) which had been reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, in line 6 after the numerals "723" to strike out "until" and insert "for"; in line 7, after the word "the" to strike out "Sergeant at Arms" and insert "Architect", and in line 8, after the word "is", to strike out "no longer needed", so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the Architect of the Capitol should permit the parking, under the control of the Sergeant at Arms of the United States Senate, of passenger motor vehicles on that part of the United States Capitol Grounds described as square 723, for such time as the Architect determines that such square is needed for parking purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the purpose of the resolution is to provide parking spaces for the automobiles of our secretaries and other employees during the construction of the new Senate Office Building. The site of the new Senate Office Building is now being used as a parking place for those cars, and it is necessary to find a new parking space for them during the construction of the building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3) was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR STUDY OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS BY COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I report an original resolution authorizing continuation of the special studies and investigations which the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has been conducting on the accessibility to the United States of supplies of critical raw materials essential to our security.

The distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], who served so ably as chairman of the subcommittee which conducted the investigations in the 83d Congress, has joined me in this resolution. Its submission was authorized by the unanimous vote of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs yesterday.

The committee is firmly convinced that the studies and investigations which have been initiated are essential to our national security and should be continued.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The resolution (S. Res. 37) reported by Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the limitation of expenditures under Senate Resolution 143, 83d Congress, relating to strategic and critical materials, agreed to July 28, 1953, is hereby increased by $40,000, and such sum together

with any unexpended balances of sums previously authorized to be expended under such resolution and Senate Resolution 171, 83d Congress, agreed to January 26, 1954, and Senate Resolution 271, 83d Congress, agreed to July 17, 1954, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee and covering obligations incurred under such resolutions on or before January 31, 1956.

ADDITIONAL TIME FOR REPORT ON A REVISION OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 38) on the extension of time for a report by the Committee on Foreign Relations on a revision of the international peace and security organizations, and submitted a report (No. 12) thereon. Under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That (a) section 2 of Senate Resolution 126, 83d Congress, 1st session, agreed to on July 28, 1953, as amended by Senate Resolution 193, 83d Congress, 2d session (authorizing a complete study of proposals to amend or otherwise modify existing international peace and security organizations, including the United Nations), is further amended by striking out the date "February 1, 1955" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "February 1, 1956."

(b) Section 3 of said resolution, as amended, is further amended by striking out the date "January 31, 1955" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "January 31, 1956."

TEMPORARY ADDITIONAL ASSISTANTS FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, from the Commitee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I report for reference to the Rules Committee a resolution to authorize the committee to engage additional professional, technical, and clerical assistants. This resolution was authorized by the unanimous vote of the full committee at its meeting yesterday.

Mr. President, while the Rules Committee will, of course, give detailed consideration to the resolution, I would like to make the general observation that no committee of the Senate has responsibilities which are more diversified and in greater variety than those of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The committee was formed under the Reorganization Act by a combination of five separate and independent standing committees of the Senate. They were the Committees on Public Lands, Mines and Mining, Irrigation and Reclamation, Indian Affairs, and Territories.

It is no exaggeration to say that literally the sun never sets on the responsibilities of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, since under our jurisdiction come the Virgin Islands, far out in the Atlantic to the east, and Guam and the trust territory, near the Asiatic Continent, to the west. Of course, territories are only a part of the committee's activities. Our major concern necessarily must be conservation and development of our natural resources—minerals, lands, and forests—which form the basis of our national security, prosperity, and greatness as a nation. All Senators are aware of the many highly complex and technical problems of a legal, economic, and engineering nature connected with irrigation and reclamation, for example.

Clearly the committee has need of additional professional, technical, and clerical assistants.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The resolution (S. Res. 39) reported by Mr. MURRAY from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the period beginning February 1, 1955, and ending January 31, 1956, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $60,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY CLERICAL ASSISTANTS FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 34), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized, from February 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, to employ 4 additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR STUDY ON TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report an original resolution to extend the time for the Committee on Foreign Relations to make a study of technical assistance and related programs, and I submit a report (No. 8) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received; and, under the rule, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The resolution (S. Res. 36) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the time within which the Committee on Foreign Relations may complete the study of technical assistance and related programs authorized by Senate Resolution 214, 83d Congress, agreed to July 6, 1954, is hereby extended to January 31, 1956.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit an additional report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the months of October and November 1954, and, in accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I request that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, together with a statement prepared by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, NOVEMBER AND OCTOBER 1954, AND PAY, OCTOBER AND SEPTEMBER 1954

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for November 1954 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In November numbered	In October numbered	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In October was—	In September was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	2,343,707	2,322,997	+20,710	$753,513	$780,632	−$27,119
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,204,230	1,182,026	+22,204	393,424	404,493	−11,069
Department of Defense	1,139,477	1,140,971	−1,494	360,089	376,139	−16,050
Inside continental United States	2,156,530	2,133,551	+22,979			
Outside continental United States	187,177	189,446	−2,269			
Industrial employment	708,638	708,873	−235			
Foreign nationals	381,279	375,532	+5,747	25,506	25,183	+323

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside continental United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside continental United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in table I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1954, and comparison with October 1954, and pay for October 1954, and comparison with September 1954*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands of dollars)			
	November	October	Increase	Decrease	October	September	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	72,202	72,102	100		23,193	24,134		941
Commerce [1]	74,483	55,762	18,721		16,432	16,827		395
Health, Education, and Welfare	36,446	35,983	463		12,653	13,110		457
Interior	51,250	51,845		595	18,831	20,283		1,452
Justice	30,502	30,643		141	12,459	13,130		671
Labor	4,957	5,034		77	2,103	2,197		94
Post Office	508,519	504,152	4,367		163,965	164,643		678
State	21,074	21,028	46		6,901	6,899	$2	
Treasury	79,463	79,769		306	30,070	31,706		1,636
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	265	267		2	136	135	1	
Bureau of the Budget	425	425			247	256		9
Council of Economic Advisers	34	34			22	24		2
Executive Mansion and Grounds	67	97		30	20	20		
National Security Council [2]	26	25	1		15	17		2
Office of Defense Mobilization	291	298		7	147	163		16
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	5	6		1	3	4		1
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Committee on Weather Control	11	13		2	3	8		5
American Battle Monuments Commission	836	[3] 809	27		101	102		1
Atomic Energy Commission	6,016	5,999	17		2,745	2,909		164
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	569	566	3		245	258		13
Civil Aeronautics Board	535	534	1		262	284		22
Civil Service Commission	4,120	4,145		25	1,651	1,733		82
Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	70	61	9		25	30		5
Defense Transport Administration	20	20			11	11		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	131	131			65	72		7
Farm Credit Administration	1,096	1,103		7	486	513		27
Federal Civil Defense Administration	679	627	52		329	357		28
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	8	8			4	4		
Federal Communications Commission	1,091	1,099		8	517	553		36
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,091	1,085	6		460	474		14
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	354	358		4	215	225		10
Federal Power Commission	639	642		3	308	324		16
Federal Trade Commission	595	591	4		303	313		10
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	233	237		4	89	94		5
Foreign Operations Administration	6,039	[3] 6,045		6	2,564	2,551	13	
General Accounting Office	5,829	5,832		3	2,315	2,430		115
General Services Administration	25,897	25,867	30		7,938	8,380		442
Government Contract Committee	14	9	5		4	5		1
Government Printing Office	6,843	6,817	26		2,605	2,721		116
Housing and Home Finance Agency	10,437	10,558		121	4,361	4,596		235
Indian Claims Commission	13	14		1	9	9		
Interstate Commerce Commission	1,847	1,856		9	834	871		37
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,141	7,141			3,004	3,142		138
National Capital Housing Authority	287	286	1		98	96	2	
National Capital Planning Commission	18	18			9	10		1
National Gallery of Art	315	313	2		91	97		6
National Labor Relations Board	1,167	1,170		3	476	606		130
National Mediation Board	110	107	3		64	59	5	
National Science Foundation	227	181	46		86	83	3	
National Security Training Commission	6	7		1	3	3		
Panama Canal	15,751	15,891		140	3,944	3,393	551	
Railroad Retirement Board	2,397	2,425		28	830	874		44
Renegotiation Board	620	619	1		338	364		26
Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission	23	23			13	12	1	
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation [4]	19		19					
Securities and Exchange Commission	700	698	2		365	373		8
Selective Service System	7,195	7,244		49	1,588	1,649		61
Small Business Administration	746	729	17		371	377		6
Smithsonian Institution	501	505		4	176	186		10
Soldiers' Home	929	936		7	179	193		14
Subversive Activities Control Board	35	32	3		19	20		1
Tariff Commission	195	197		2	101	105		4
Tax Court of the United States	142	142			72	74		2
Tennessee Valley Authority	23,107	23,547		440	10,357	10,637		280
United States Information Agency	9,526	9,541		15	2,301	2,442		141
Veterans Administration	178,051	177,778	273		53,293	56,323		3,030
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,204,230	1,182,026	24,245	2,041	393,424	404,493	578	11,647
Net change, excluding Department of Defense			22,204				11,069	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,889	1,914		25	961	964		3
Department of the Army [5]	422,682	426,933		4,251	121,493	127,169		5,676
Department of the Navy	408,969	408,962	7		141,452	148,510		7,058
Department of the Air Force [5]	305,937	303,162	2,775		96,183	99,496		3,313
Total, Department of Defense	1,139,477	1,140,971	2,782	4,276	360,089	376,139		16,050
Net decrease, Department of Defense			1,494				16,050	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,343,707	2,322,997	27,027	6,317	753,513	780,632	578	27,697
Net change, including Department of Defense			20,710				27,119	

[1] November figure includes 543 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.

[2] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.

[3] Revised on basis of later information.

[4] New agency created pursuant to Public Law 358, 83d Cong.

[5] On the basis of current information, figures have been adjusted to—

(*a*) Exclude foreign nationals under contractual agreement in—

	Army		Air Force	
	November	October	November	October
Austria			181	183
England			6,880	6,618
France	15,797	11,623	6,054	5,821

The services of these foreign nationals is provided by contractual agreement between the Government of the United States and the governments of the respective countries. Reporting of these foreign nationals is now shown in table V of the report. Payroll figures for Air Force have also been adjusted. (Figures for Army are subject to revision.)

(*b*) Include foreign nationals employed by the United States in—

	Army		Air Force	
	November	October	November	October
Korea			7,323	7,516
Ryukyus	11,435	11,202	4,545	4,630

These foreign nationals have heretofore been shown in table V of the report. Payroll figures for Air Force have also been adjusted. (Figures for Army are subject to revision.)

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during November 1954, and comparison with October 1954*

Department or agency	November	October	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	70,950	70,956		6
Commerce [1]	71,536	52,809	18,727	
Health, Education, and Welfare	35,934	35,486	448	
Interior	45,299	45,704		405
Justice	29,994	30,138		144
Labor	4,845	4,875		30
Post Office	506,175	501,808	4,367	
State	5,844	5,785	59	
Treasury	78,470	78,778		308
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	265	267		2
Bureau of the Budget	425	425		
Council of Economic Advisers	34	34		
Executive Mansion and Grounds	67	97		30
National Security Council [2]	26	25	1	
Office of Defense Mobilization	291	298		7
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	5	6		1
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Committee on Weather Control	11	13		2
American Battle Monuments Commission	17	16	1	
Atomic Energy Commission	6,001	5,982	19	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	569	566	3	
Civil Aeronautics Board	531	530	1	
Civil Service Commission	4,110	4,135		25
Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	70	61	9	
Defense Transport Administration	20	20		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	131	131		
Farm Credit Administration	1,084	1,092		8
Federal Civil Defense Administration	679	627	52	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	8	8		
Federal Communications Commission	1,064	1,072		8
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,090	1,084	6	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	354	358		4
Federal Power Commission	639	642		3
Federal Trade Commission	595	591	4	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	229	233		4
Foreign Operations Administration	1,637	1,628	9	
General Accounting Office	5,780	5,783		3
General Services Administration	25,782	25,749	33	
Government Contract Committee	14	9	5	
Government Printing Office	6,843	6,817	26	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	10,313	10,433		120
Indian Claims Commission	13	14		1
Interstate Commerce Commission	1,847	1,856		9
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,141	7,141		
National Capital Housing Authority	287	286	1	
National Capital Planning Commission	18	18		
National Gallery of Art	315	313	2	
National Labor Relations Board	1,146	1,149		3
National Mediation Board	110	107	3	
National Science Foundation	227	181	46	
National Security Training Commission	6	7		1
Panama Canal	541	556		15
Railroad Retirement Board	2,397	2,425		28
Renegotiation Board	620	619	1	
Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission	23	23		
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation [3]	19		19	
Securities and Exchange Commission	700	698	2	
Selective Service System	6,994	7,042		48
Small Business Administration	746	729	17	
Smithsonian Institution	499	503		4
Soldiers' Home	929	936		7
Subversive Activities Control Board	35	32	3	
Tariff Commission	195	197		2
Tax Court of the United States	142	142		
Tennessee Valley Authority	23,107	23,547		440
United States Information Agency	2,175	2,190		15
Veterans Administration	176,797	176,529	268	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,144,760	1,122,311	24,132	1,683
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			22,449	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,833	1,854		21
Department of the Army	373,343	374,707		1,364
Department of the Navy	377,894	378,335		441
Department of the Air Force	258,700	256,344	2,356	
Total, Department of Defense	1,011,770	1,011,240	2,356	1,826
Net increase, Department of Defense			530	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,156,530	2,133,551	26,488	3,509
Net increase, including Department of Defense			22,979	

[1] November figure includes 543 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.
[2] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[3] New agency created pursuant to Public Law 358, 83d Cong.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1954, and comparison with October 1954*

Department or agency	November	October	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,252	1,146	106	
Commerce	2,947	2,953		6
Health, Education, and Welfare	512	497	15	
Interior	5,951	6,141		190
Justice	508	505	3	
Labor	112	159		47
Post Office	2,344	2,344		
State	15,230	15,243		13
Treasury	993	991	2	
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	819	[1] 793	26	
Atomic Energy Commission	15	17		2
Civil Aeronautics Board	4	4		
Civil Service Commission	10	10		
Farm Credit Administration	12	11	1	
Federal Communications Commission	27	27		
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1	1		
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	4	4		
Foreign Operations Administration	4,402	[1] 4,417		15
General Accounting Office	49	49		
General Services Administration	115	118		3
Housing and Home Finance Agency	124	125		1
National Labor Relations Board	21	21		
Panama Canal	15,210	15,335		125
Selective Service System	201	202		1
Smithsonian Institution	2	2		
U. S. Information Agency	7,351	7,351		
Veterans Administration	1,254	1,249	5	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	59,470	59,715	158	403
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			245	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	56	60		4
Department of the Army [2]	49,339	52,226		2,887
Department of the Navy	31,075	30,627	448	
Department of the Air Force [2]	47,237	46,818	419	
Total, Department of Defense	127,707	129,731	867	2,891
Net decrease, Department of Defense			2,024	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	187,177	189,446	1,025	3,294
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			2,269	

[1] Revised on basis of later information.
[2] On the basis of current information, figures have been adjusted to—

(*a*) Exclude foreign nationals under contractual agreement in—

	Army		Air Force	
	November	October	November	October
Austria			181	183
England			6,880	6,618
France	15,797	11,623	6,054	5,821

The services of these foreign nationals is provided by contractual agreement between the Government of the United States and the governments of the respective countries. Reporting of these foreign nationals is now shown in table V of the report. (Figures for Army are subject to revision.)

(*b*) Include foreign nationals employed by the United States in—

	Army		Air Force	
	November	October	November	October
Korea			7,323	7,516
Ryukyus	11,435	11,202	4,545	4,630

These foreign nationals have heretofore been shown in table V of the report. (Figures for Army are subject to revision.)

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during November 1954 and comparison with October 1954*

Department or agency	November	October	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	2,805	2,768	37	
Commerce	2,111	2,057	54	
Interior	8,037	8,279		242
Treasury	6,543	6,552		9
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	130	129	1	
Federal Communications Commission	14	14		
General Services Administration	862	839	23	
Government Printing Office	6,843	6,817	26	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,141	7,141		
Panama Canal	7,702	7,815		113
Tennessee Valley Authority	19,866	20,286		420
Total, excluding Department of Defense	62,054	62,697	141	784
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			643	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside continental United States	[2] 207,500	[1] 207,636		136
Outside continental United States	[2] 26,800	[1] 26,252	548	
Department of the Navy:				
Inside continental United States	236,914	238,032		1,118
Outside continental United States	6,957	6,880	77	
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside continental United States	153,172	152,475	697	
Outside continental United States	15,241	14,901	340	
Total, Department of Defense	646,584	646,176	1,662	1,254
Net increase, Department of Defense			408	
Grand total including Department of Defense	708,638	708,873	1,803	2,038
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			235	

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

[2] Subject to revision.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under United States agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of November 1954 and comparison with October 1954*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	November	October	November	October	November	October	November	October
Austria	181	183					181	183
England	6,880	6,618					6,880	6,618
France	21,851	17,444	[1] 15,797	11,623			6,054	5,821
Germany	123,858	122,984	101,307	[2] 100,468	1,961	1,953	20,590	20,563
Japan	160,628	160,491	98,768	[2] 98,768	18,490	18,686	43,370	43,037
Korea	66,377	66,316	[3] 66,377	[3] 66,316				
Lybia	200	199					200	199
Ryukyus	209	218			209	218		
Saudi Arabia	442	442					442	442
Trinidad	653	637			653	637		
Total	381,279	375,532	282,249	277,175	21,313	21,494	77,717	76,863

[1] Estimated.
[2] Revised on basis of later information.
[3] Includes 27,891 members of the Korean Service Corps in November as compared with 29,583 in October.

NOTE.—The Germans are paid from funds provided by German Governments. The French, English, and Austrians reported by the Army and Air Force are paid from funds appropriated for personal service. All others are paid from funds appropriated for other contractual services.

NOTE.—For adjustment of figures in this table see footnote 5, table I.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported regular civilian employment in the month of November totaling 2,343,707. This was a net increase of 20,710 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of October.

This was the third monthly increase in 28 months since July 1952. The other monthly increases were in June and October 1954. The net increase in November was due largely to temporary employment by the Bureau of the Census in the Department of Commerce.

This November 1954 employment was 23,623 less than employment in November a year ago.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1955, which began July 1, 1954, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July	2,332,200		1,694
August	2,331,508		692
September	2,317,565		13,943
October	2,322,997	5,432	
November	2,343,707	20,710	

Total employment in civilian agencies during the month of November was 1,204,230, an increase of 22,204 over the October total of 1,182,026. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in November was 1,139,477. This was a net decrease of 1,494 as compared with 1,140,971 in October.

Civilian agencies reporting the larger increases were the Department of Commerce with an increase of 18,721, the Post Office Department with an increase of 4,367, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with an increase of 463. Decreases were reported by the Interior Department with a decrease of 595, the Tennessee Valley Authority with a decrease of 440, and the Treasury Department with a decrease of 306.

While the Air Force reported an increase of 2,775 in civilian employment during November, the Army reported a decrease of 4,251, and the Navy reported an increase of 7.

Inside continental United States civilian employment increased 22,979, and outside continental United States civilian employment decreased 2,269.

Industrial employment by Federal agencies in November totaled 708,638, a decrease of 235 as compared with October.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies, as compiled today by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,343,707 civilian employees certified to the committee by executive agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports included some foreign nationals employed in United States Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 381,279 foreign nationals working for United States military agencies overseas during the month of November who were not counted in the usual personnel report. The number in October was 375,532. A breakdown of this employment for November follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Austria	181			181
England	6,880			6,880
France	21,851	15,797		6,054
Germany	123,858	101,307	1,961	20,590
Japan	160,628	98,768	18,490	43,370
Korea	66,377	66,377		
Lybia	200			200
Ryukyus	209		209	
Saudi Arabia	442			442
Trinidad	653		653	
Total	381,279	282,249	21,313	77,717

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, the following reports were received by the Secretary of the Senate:

JANUARY 13, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December

31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Harker T. Stanton, counsel	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Edward P. Guinane, investigator	11,646.00	5,823.00
James M. Kendall, chief clerk	8,824.17	4,412.04
Cotys M. Mouser, assistant chief clerk	8,735.34	4,367.64
Therese R. Lepine, secretary to the chairman	4,091.85	2,045.88
Betty M. Mason, clerical assistant	3,996.26	1,998.12
Frances I. Edwards (to July 31, 1954), clerical assistant	4,283.04	356.92
Blanche M. O'Berg (from Nov. 1, 1954), secretary to the chairman	6,003.71	1,000.60
Helen E. Scott (from July 20, 1954 to Aug. 22, 1954)	3,996.26	366.31

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount available, July 1, 1954	1,498.95
Amount expended July 1, 1954, to Dec. 31, 1954	190.06
Balance unexpended Dec. 31, 1954	1,308.89

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 13, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

(Making investigations under S. Res. 127, agreed to July 10, 1953; S. Res. 218, agreed to March 10, 1954; and S. Res. 304, agreed to August 10, 1954.)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Additional funds authorized by S. Res. 304, 83d Cong., 2d sess. agreed to Aug. 11, 1954	$12,000.00
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure 83d Cong	15,000.00
Amount available, July 1, 1954	4,746.20
Amount expended July 1, 1954, to Dec. 31, 1954	1,512.92
Balance unexpended Dec. 31, 1954	15,233.28

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 1, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report on miscellaneous expenses for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

Unexpended balance of amount authorized by S. Res. 129, June 26, 1947, as of June 30, 1954	$24,151.49
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954	0
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1954	24,151.49
Unexpended balance of amount authorized by Reorganization Act and S. Res. 121, 153, and 243 as of June 30, 1954	16,141.30

MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES—continued

Additional authorization by S. Res. 279	$10,000.00
Total available for expenditure	26,141.30
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954	11,120.25
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1954	15,021.05
Unexpended balance of amount authorized by Legislative Appropriation Act, 1954 as of June 30, 1954	288,372.61
Repayment of statutory advance	1,000.00
Total available for expenditure	289,372.61
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954	791.00
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1954	288,531.61
Amount authorized by Legislative Appropriation Act, 1955	400,000.00
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954	53,583.79
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1954	346,416.21

CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 1, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES		
Paul E. Kamerick, staff director	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Gardner C. Turner, counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Leonard E. Edwards, agent	10,068.45	5,034.18
Alan J. Kraft, agent	9,073.03	4,536.48
Leo C. Nulty, agent	10,068.45	5,034.18
William V. Sinnott, agent	10,732.07	5,365.98
Paul J. Tierney, agent	10,068.45	5,034.18
Paul A. Toussaint, agent	9,073.03	4,536.48
Bernard S. Van Rensselaer, agent (to Sept. 6)	10,068.45	1,845.86
Gabriel R. Vogliotti, agent (to July 15)	10,068.45	419.51
Alice S. Dearborn, clerical assistant	3,996.26	1,998.12
Dolores M. Kiermas, clerical assistant (July 15 to Oct. 11)	4,091.85	988.83
Brock Lewis, clerical assistant (to Aug. 31)	3,613.89	602.30
Evelyn M. Nigh, clerical assistant (July 6 to Nov. 23)	4,283.04	1,641.82
Angelo M. Novello, clerical assistant (from Dec. 7)	4,378.64	291.90
Dorothy L. Sankey, clerical assistant	4,569.81	2,284.86
REGULAR EMPLOYEES		
Everard H. Smith, chief clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Thomas J. Scott, assistant chief clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Francis S. Hewitt, assistant clerk	10,732.07	5,365.98
Edmund T. King, assistant clerk	10,732.07	5,365.98
Jarlath M. Slattery, director, professional staff	11,646.00	5,823.00
Raymond K. Perkins, counsel (to Aug. 31)	11,644.54	1,940.74
Kenneth J. Bosquet, professional staff member	10,649.11	5,324.52
Earl W. Cooper, professional staff member	10,732.07	5,365.98
Herman E. Downey, professional staff member	$10,732.07	$5,365.98
Richard W. Eddy, professional staff member	10,068.45	5,034.18
John J. Gaines, professional staff member	10,068.45	5,034.18
G. E. Johnson, professional staff member	8,990.07	4,495.02
H. Maurice Joyce, professional staff member	10,068.45	5,034.18
William J. Kennedy, Jr., professional staff member	10,068.45	5,034.18
Cecil C. McDaniel, professional staff member	10,068.45	5,034.18
Joseph T. McDonnell, professional staff member (to Oct. 15)	10,068.45	2,936.60
Harold E. Merrick, professional staff member	10,732.07	5,365.98
Gordon A. Nease, professional staff member	10,068.45	5,034.18
Stanley L. Sommer, professional staff member	11,644.54	5,822.22
Lawrence H. Wendrich, professional staff member	10,732.07	5,365.98
William W. Woodruff, professional staff member	10,068.45	5,034.18
Gloria S. Butland, clerical assistant	4,569.81	2,284.86
Pauline T. Connell, clerical assistant	4,569.81	2,268.93
Leon DeVille, clerical assistant	4,378.64	2,189.28
Elva Glaser, clerical assistant	4,569.81	2,284.86
Lois A. Glines, clerical assistant	4,569.81	2,284.86
Laura A. Hawley, clerical assistant	4,569.81	2,260.96
Carolyn Macy, clerical assistant (to Aug. 31)	4,569.81	761.62
E. Marea Marshall, clerical assistant	4,569.81	2,260.96
Mary T. Savage, clerical assistant	4,569.81	2,284.86

CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 31, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Allen, Philip K., chief clerk [1]	$11,646.00	$4,052.57
Atkinson, Herbert S., assistant chief clerk	7,819.96	3,909.98
Braswell, T. Edward, Jr., professional staff member	10,897.97	5,448.98
Dantzic, Maurine E., clerical assistant	4,665.41	2,332.70
Darden, William H., professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Earle, Georgia P., clerical assistant [2]	5,334.57	1,373.34
Johnson, Edna E., clerical assistant [3]	4,569.81	187.80
Mudge, Verne D., professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Schweigert, Esther N., clerical assistant	4,378.64	2,189.32
Welker, Mary M., clerical assistant	4,091.85	2,045.92

[1] Leave of absence without pay Sept. 7 to Nov. 3, 1954.
[2] Services terminated Oct. 2, 1954.
[3] As of Dec. 15, 1954.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$10,000.00
Amount authorized by S. Res. 255	10,000.00
Total authorization	20,000.00
Amount expended Jan. 1, 1953, to June 30, 1954	10,544.57
Balance unexpended	9,455.43
Amount expended July 1, 1954, to Dec. 31, 1954	3,615.01
Balance unexpended	5,840.42

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 31, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

PREPAREDNESS INVESTIGATION STAFF

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Anton, James, special counsel	$9,404.83	$4,702.38
Canaday, Alyce D., clerical assistant [1]	4,378.64	1,824.40
Cooper, Genevieve, secretary	4,665.41	2,332.68
Engle, Wallace L., investigator	6,003.71	3,001.80
Freese, Mary C., stenographer [2]	4,856.61	1,863.32
Gilleas, Benjamin J., attorney	7,819.96	3,909.96
Linton, Therese W., clerical assistant [3]	4,378.64	364.88
McGillicuddy, Daniel F., Jr., attorney	7,819.96	3,909.96
Miller, Mary M., clerk-typist [4]	4,378.64	1,094.64
Morse, Frank B., assistant chief counsel	10,151.40	5,075.70
Rhodes, Fred B., chief counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Sircom, Edith M., stenographer	4,187.45	2,093.70
Waldron, Glenn S., investigator	6,672.85	3,336.42

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, under S. Res. 185 agreed to Jan. 26, 1954	$150,000.00
Amount expended to Dec. 31, 1954	81,044.33
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1954	68,955.67

[1] As of Aug. 1, 1954.
[2] Services terminated Dec. 2, 1954.
[3] Services terminated Aug. 1, 1954.
[4] Services terminated Oct. 1, 1954.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Chairman.

JANUARY 10, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(S. Res. 183, study of Export-Import Bank and International Bank)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Raymonde A. Clarke, staff assistant (to July 15)	$7,533.19	$313.88
Dorothy H. Devine, clerical assistant	4,856.61	2,428.26
Donald L. Rogers, staff assistant	8,644.09	4,147.32
David B. Hickenlooper, staff assistant (July 14 to Aug. 22)	4,761.00	515.77
Robert J. Fink, assistant counsel (July 26 to Aug. 31)	8,644.09	840.39
William W. Oberlin, staff assistant (July 22 to July 29)	8,644.09	192.09
Betty Jo Morgan, clerical assistant (from Aug. 1)	4,283.04	1,784.60
Henry F. Holthusen, general counsel (per diem)	32.35	5,273.05
Ezra Solomon, economic specialist (per diem)	32.35	3,008.55
William Simon, counsel (per diem)	32.35	485.25
Dorothy L. McCaffrey, clerical assistant	4,665.41	2,332.68

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong., 2d sess	$126,113.96
Amount expended Jan. 1, 1954 through Dec. 31, 1954	51,868.53
Balance unexpended	74,245.43

HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Chairman.

JANUARY 10, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(S. Res. 182, investigating problems relating to economic stabilization and mobilization)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
John L. Douglas, staff assistant	$8,644.09	$4,322.05
Carl H. Wilken, staff assistant (from Nov. 15)	8,644.09	1,104.52
John R. Hancock, staff assistant (July 16 to Aug. 31)	8,644.09	1,080.51
Harry K. Cuthbertson, Jr., staff assistant (July 16 to Oct. 9)	8,644.09	2,016.95
John H. Yingling, counsel (from Sept. 7)	11,646.00	3,687.90
Barbara H. Spencer, clerican assistant (from Sept. 3)	4,474.23	1,466.54
Charlie W. Jones, staff assistant (from Nov. 2)	8,644.09	1,416.66
Walter H. Moorman, counsel (per diem)	32.35	2,393.90

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong., 2d sess	$52,091.61
Amount expended Jan 1 through Dec. 31, 1954	31,656.91
Balance unexpended	20,434.70

HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Chairman.

JANUARY 10, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Ira Dixon, chief clerk (to Aug. 31)	$11,646.00	$1,941.00
Ray S. Donaldson, staff director	11,646.00	5,823.00
A. Lee Parsons, assistant clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Joseph P. McMurray, economic consultant (to Aug. 31)	11,646.00	1,941.00
William F. McKenna, counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Norman W. Stevenson, counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Florence Barr, clerical assistant	5,908.12	2,954.06
Pauline C. Beam, clerical assistant	5,334.57	2,667.29
Henrietta S. Chase, clerical assistant	5,908.12	2,954.06
Caro M. Pugh, clerical assistant	5,334.57	2,667.29
John R. Hancock, chief clerk (from Sept. 1)	11,646.00	3,882.00
Paul Cyr, counsel (from Sept. 1)	11,646.00	3,882.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong.	$20,000.00
Amount expended, Jan. 1, 1953, through Dec. 31, 1954	16,613.16
Balance unexpended	3,386.84

HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Chairman.

JANUARY 10, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(S. Res. 229 and S. Res. 289, Investigation of the Federal Housing Administration)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
William Simon, general counsel (to Oct. 9)	$11,646.00	$3,202.65
Thomas T. Kenney, assistant counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Harry K. Cuthbertson, Jr., staff assistant (to July 15)	8,644.09	360.17
John R. Hancock, staff assistant (to July 15)	8,644.09	360.17
Joseph B. Kyle, investigator (to Oct. 15)	8,644.09	2,521.18
Edward F. Lyons, investigator (to Dec. 15)	7,150.81	3,277.44
James H. Walter, staff assistant	6,003.71	3,001.80
Helen M. Naylon, clerical assistant	4,283.04	2,141.52
Idell S. Courtaway, clerical assistant (to Oct. 31)	4,283.04	1,427.68
Lenore V. Beckington, clerical assistant (to Oct. 8)	4,283.04	1,165.93
Margaret McCormack, clerical assistant (to Aug. 23)	4,283.04	630.55
Carole S. Keyser, clerical assistant (to Oct. 15)	4,283.04	1,249.21
Marilyn Willmore, clerical assistant (to Oct. 15)	3,613.89	1,054.02
Clarence M. Dinkins, assistant counsel	8,644.09	4,322.04
William H. Cook, staff assistant (to Oct. 15)	6,003.71	1,607.67
Anthony Zabiegalski, Jr., staff assistant (to Oct. 15)	6,003.71	1,751.05
Richard J. Carr, assistant counsel (to Oct. 15)	10,400.26	3,033.38
Richard W. Hogue, Jr., assistant counsel (July 8 to Oct. 1)	11,646.00	2,717.40
Ray C. Norvell, investigator (July 16 to Oct. 15)	6,003.71	1,536.23
Nettie C. Bishop, clerical assistant (July 12 to July 23)	4,283.04	142.76
Byron D. Hedges, staff assistant (July 14 to Sept. 30)	7,246.41	1,549.91
Edna G. Cook, clerical assistant (July 23 to Oct. 15)	4,283.04	987.46
George O. Hill, assistant counsel (July 23 to Sept. 30)	8,644.09	1,632.77
Morris W. Bush, staff assistant (from July 26)	8,644.09	3,721.75
Janet D. Wiebler, clerical assistant (from July 28)	4,283.04	1,820.29
Marion Lalios, clerical assistant Aug. 6 to 31)	4,569.81	317.34
Dean F. Cromer, investigator (from Aug. 4)	8,644.09	3,529.66
Harold H. McConnell, investigator (Aug. 4 to Dec. 15)	8,644.09	3,169.48
Doris I. Thomas, clerical assistant (from Aug. 4)	4,283.04	1,748.90
Alfred S. Baer, staff assistant (Aug. 11 to Dec. 15)	8,644.09	2,905.35
Arthur J. Wilson, staff assistant (from Aug. 11)	8,644.09	3,361.58
Margaret F. Anderson, clerical assistant (Aug. 19 to Dec. 15)	4,283.04	1,391.97
Robert P. Patterson, Jr., counsel (Aug. 24 to Oct. 15)	9,073.03	1,310.53
Angelo F. Addona, investigator (Aug. 23 to Dec. 19)	6,003.71	1,951.17
Leafy E. Breedlove, clerical assistant (Sept. 9 to Oct. 17)	4,283.04	463.99

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong., 2d sess	$225,000.00
Amount expended Apr. 23 through Dec. 31, 1954	177,546.58
Balance unexpended	47,453.42

HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Chairman.

JANUARY 10, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Leland D. Case, chief clerk (from Oct. 4, 1954)	$11,646	$2,814.45
Robert C. Albrook, chief clerk (to Oct. 3, 1954)	11,646	3,008.55
Jesse D. Coon, professional staff member (Sept. 29, 1954)	11,646	2,879.15
William P. Gulledge, professional staff member	11,646	5,815.35
Arlene B. Williams, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,208.92
Ruth W. Bryant, clerical assistant	6,386.08	3,161.15

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong	$10,000.00
Amount available, July 1, 1954	4,386.65
Amount expended, 83d Cong., July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954	835.27
Balance unexpended, Dec. 31, 1954	3,551.38

FRANCIS CASE,
Chairman.

JANUARY 3, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Elizabeth B. Springer, chief clerk	$10,649.11	$5,324.52
Betty Mae Tapy, clerical assistant	6,003.71	3,001.80
Evelyn R. Thompson, clerical assistant	4,952.20	2,476.08
Janice E. Graybeal, clerical assistant (to Aug. 6)	4,952.20	495.21
Helen Sheflett, clerical assistant (to July 23)	3,805.08	243.10
Jesse R. Nichols, clerical assistant	4,856.61	2,428.26
Serge N. Benson, professional staff	11,646.00	5,823.00
Fedele F. Fauri, professional staff (to Sept. 16)	11,646.00	2,458.60

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended Jan. 1, 1953, through June 30, 1954	4,107.57
Amount expended July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1954	2,356.50
	6,464.07
Balance unexpended	3,535.93

E. D. MILLIKIN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 10, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Francis O. Wilcox, professional staff member	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Carl M. Marcy, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Juluis N. Cahn, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Alwyn V. Freeman, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
C. C. O'Day, chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Pat M. Holt, assistant chief clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Emmett M. O'Grady, clerical assistant	5,908.12	2,954.04
Morella R. Hansen, clerical assistant	6,194.89	3,097.44
June C. Pitts, clerical assistant	5,525.75	2,762.82
Mary A. Sames, clerical assistant	4,761.00	2,380.50
Doris B. Covington, clerical assistant	5,047.77	[1]2,523.84
Robert C. Dolan, clerical assistant	4,856.61	[1]2,428.26
Total		51,084.90

[1] Under authority of S. Res. 179, agreed to Jan. 26, 1954.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong	$59,000.00
Amount available, July 1, 1954	43,959.45
Amount expended, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954, 83d Cong	6,516.43
Balance unexpended, Dec. 31, 1954	37,443.02

ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 10, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

(Subcommittee on Review of the United Nations Charter, under authority of S. Res. 126, agreed to July 28, 1953, and S. Res. 193, agreed to January 26, 1954)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Russell D. L. Wirth, Jr., assistant clerk (to Dec. 31, 1954)	$5,525.75	$2,762.82

The detail of certain personnel of the Library of Congress on a reimbursable basis was authorized by the Committee on Rules and Administration for services rendered the subcommittee.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong	$75,000.00
Amount available July 1, 1954	40,736.36
Amount expended, July 1, to Dec. 31, 1954, 83d Cong	11,809.71
Balance unexpended Dec. 31, 1954	28,926.65

ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 10, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

(Subcommittee Making a Full and Complete Study of Foreign Technical Assistance Programs, under authority of S. Res. 214, agreed to July 6, 1954)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Emily J. Butler, assistant clerk (from Oct. 11, 1954)	$3,805.08	$845.57

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong	$40,000.00
Amount expended, July 6 to Dec. 31, 1954 83d Cong	845.57
Balance unexpended, Dec. 31, 1954	39,154.43

ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 14, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Walter L. Reynolds, chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Richard J. O'Melia, general counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Glenn K. Shriver, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,662.80
Eli E. Nobleman, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Donald F. O'Donnell, professional staff member (from Oct. 1 to Dec. 15, 1954)	11,646.00	2,426.25
Ann M. Grickis, assistant chief clerk	6,864.04	3,432.00
Emily I. Tennyson (Mrs.), clerical assistant	5,430.16	2,531.27
Ray Barnett, clerical assistant	5,334.57	2,483.51
Maxine Buffalohide (Mrs.), clerical assistant (from Oct. 16 to Dec. 15, 1954)	4,378.64	729.76
Margaret W. Duckett (Mrs.), clerical assistant (from Oct. 16 to Dec. 15, 1954)	4,091.85	681.96

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong	$10,000.00
Amount available July 1, 1954	4,526.08
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954, 83d Cong	478.42
Balance unexpended Dec. 31, 1954	4,047.66

JOE MCCARTHY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 14, 1955.

SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Ernest P. Abelson, clerk, from July 15 to Aug. 31	$3,709.49	$473.98
C. George Anastos, assistant counsel	8,552.84	4,093.90
Edith H. Anderson, staff editor	6,003.71	2,723.00
Karl H. W. Baarslag, research director to Sept. 30; from Nov. 3 to 17	10,068.45	2,936.09
John W. Beck, messenger to Aug. 15	2,432.13	304.00
Mary W. Bolt, clerical assistant to Aug. 15	2,432.13	304.00
Daniel G. Buckley, assistant counsel	8,096.60	3,733.86
Maxine B. Buffalohide, assistant clerk to Oct. 15	4,378.64	1,277.08
Maxine B. Buffalohide, assistant clerk from Dec. 16	4,856.61	202.35
Francis P. Carr, Jr., executive director to Oct. 31	11,646.00	3,882.00
Roy M. Cohn, chief counsel to Aug. 13	11,646.00	1,391.05
Margaret W. Duckett, assistant clerk to Oct. 15	4,091.85	1,193.43

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Margaret W. Duckett, assistant clerk from Dec. 16	$4,569.81	$190.40
Lavern J. Duffy, investigator	6,099.30	3,049.62
Rosemary Engel, assistant clerk	4,474.23	2,105.64
Herbert S. Hawkins, investigator to Nov. 15	8,279.10	3,104.64
Ray H. Jenkins, special chief counsel to July 31	11,646.00	970.50
James N. Juliana, acting executive director	11,646.00	5,449.35
Robert F. Kennedy, chief counsel to minority	11,646.00	5,823.00
Thomas W. LaVenia, assistant counsel	10,151.40	5,075.70
Pauline S. Larrimore, assistant clerk to Sept. 30	4,283.04	1,070.76
Charles A. Maner, secretary to July 31	11,646.00	970.50
Robert J. McElroy, investigator	6,864.04	3,193.00
Frances P. Mims, assistant clerk	6,003.71	3,001.80
Mary E. Morrill, assistant clerk to Nov. 15	4,474.23	1,677.82
Mary K. Nelson, clerical assistant to Aug. 15	2,432.13	304.00
Donald F. O'Donnell, assistant counsel to Sept. 30	10,151.40	2,537.85
Donald F. O'Donnell, assistant counsel from Dec. 16	11,646.00	485.25
Regina R. Roman, research assistant from July 15	5,047.77	1,906.90
Donald A. Surine, assistant counsel to July 19	11,646.00	614.65
Nina W. Sutton, assistant clerk	5,334.57	2,667.24
Charles A. Tracy, investigator	7,533.19	3,256.72
Ruth Young Watt, chief clerk	7,246.41	3,491.71

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$114,598.87
Amount expended	90,917.49
Balance unexpended	23,681.38

JOE MCCARTHY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 14, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON REORGANIZATION

(S. RES. 184)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

No funds expended for subcommittee personnel, and no expense incurred. Work performed by staff of Committee on Government Operations.

Funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditure under S. Res. 184	$9,837.84
Amount expended	
Balance unexpended	9,837.84

MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Subcommittee Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1955.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE FUELS RESERVES OF THE UNITED STATES

(Under authority of S. Res. 233, agreed to April 28, 1954)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Kirkley S. Coulter, chief clerk to Nov. 30	$11,646.00	$4,852.50
Nellie D. McSherry, assistant chief clerk	9,238.93	4,619.46
Albert A. Grorud, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Elmer K. Nelson, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Stewart French, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
George B. Holderer, professional staff member	9,902.55	5,262.31
Marie Mathew, clerical assistant	5,238.97	2,619.48
Rosemary Donnelly, clerical assistant	5,047.77	2,523.84
Thelma C. Leach, clerical assistant	5,047.77	2,201.35
Dorothy A. Davis, clerical assistant	5,047.77	2,523.84
Jerome S. Adlerman, assistant counsel	$9,902.55	$825.21
Cecelia A. Hoban, clerical assistant	4,761.00	396.75
Adele R. O'Connor, clerical assistant	3,805.08	317.09

Amount available July 1, 1954	$3,881.47
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954	1,710.03
Balance unexpended	2,171.44

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1955.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE AVAILABILITY AND ACCESSIBILITY OF CRITICAL RAW MATERIALS

(Under authority of S. Res. 271, agreed to July 17, 1954)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Jerome S. Adlerman, professional staff member	$10,649.11	$4,437.10
Cecelia A. Hoban, clerical assistant	4,952.20	2,063.40
Adele R. O'Connor, clerical assistant	4,378.64	1,824.40

Total funds authorized or appropriated during 83d Cong. for committee expenditure	$84,000.00
Amount available July 1, 1954	12,511.72
Additional allotment agreed to July 17, 1954	34,000.00
Total amount available	46,511.72
Expenditures July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954	14,792.01
Balance unexpended	31,719.71

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Bourbon, August J., staff member	$9,238.93	$4,619.46
Butz, John R., clerical assistant	6,003.71	3,001.85
Fadely, Catherine E., clerical assistant	4,569.81	2,284.90
Jones, Robert F., staff member (from Sept. 1)	11,646.00	3,882.00
Murphy, Margaret M., clerical assistant	4,187.45	2,093.72
Plotkin, Harry M., staff member (from Sept. 20)	11,646.00	3,267.35
Rogers, Kathryn B., clerical assistant	4,474.23	2,237.11
Thompson, Helen A., clerical assistant	5,334.57	2,667.28
Webster, Donald D., special counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00

Funds authorized or appropriated during 83d Cong. for committee expenditure	$30,000.00
Amount available July 1, 1954	9,287.05
Amount expended July 1, 1954, to Dec. 31, 1954	7,064.13
Balance unexpended	2,222.92

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 4, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(Subcommittee, pursuant to S. Res. 173, agreed to January 26, 1954, to investigate certain problems relating to interstate and foreign commerce)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Bourbon, August J., staff member	$9,238.93	$4,619.46
Butz, John R., clerical assistant	6,003.71	3,001.85
Fadely, Catherine E., clerical assistant	4,569.81	2,284.90
Jones, Robert F., staff member (from Sept. 1)	11,646.00	3,882.00
Murphy, Margaret M., clerical assistant	4,187.45	2,093.72
Plotkin, Harry M., staff member (from Sept. 20)	11,646.00	3,267.35
Rogers, Kathryn B., clerical assistant	4,474.23	2,237.11
Thompson, Helen A., clerical assistant	5,334.57	2,667.28
Webster, Donald D., special counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, balance June 30	$95,374.71
Amount expended	34,810.29
Balance unexpended	60,564.42

JOHN W. BRICKER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 4, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Cecelia M. Cook, clerical assistant	$5,716.93	$2,858.46
Harriet S. Gray, clerical assistant	5,716.93	2,858.46
Edward S. Jarrett, assistant chief clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Edward R. Jelsma, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Robert D. L'Heureux, chief counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Vera B. Rudolph, clerical assistant	6,290.49	3,145.24
Martha P. Shaffer, clerical assistant	5,716.93	2,858.46
Edward C. Sweeney, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Bertram O. Wissman, chief clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Nicholas Zapple, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00

Balance, June 30	$217.68
Additional amount authorized	10,000.00
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	10,217.68
Amount expended	1,252.60
Balance unexpended	8,965.08

JOHN W. BRICKER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
J. G. Sourwine, counsel	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Joseph A. Davis, chief clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
J. Carlisle Ruddy, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Wayne H. Smithey, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
George S. Green, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Thomas B. Collins, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
James L. Miller, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Mary I. Rogers, assistant chief clerk	7,533.19	3,766.56
Mildred E. Canon, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78
Miriam O. Fox, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78
Carrie Lee Conner, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78
Naomi Hankins, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,162.45
Richard F. Wambach, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,068.45
Costas D. Chrissos, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78
Katharine M. Ellis, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure $19,063.78
Amount expended 8,118.02

Balance unexpended 10,945.76

HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman.

JANUARY 8, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION, OPERATION, AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT OF 1950

(Under authority of S. Res. 172, agreed to January 27, 1954)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Baker, Dorothy C., clerk	$6,481.67	$3,240.78
Beaird, Peggy S., clerk	4,091.85	2,045.88
Brown, James M., consultant	8,644.09	4,322.04
Cardiello, James A., legal investigator	3,709.49	1,854.72
Carpenter, Alva C., chief counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Colombo, Louis R., investigator (from Aug. 16, 1954)	7,055.23	2,645.68
Duffy, Edward R., investigator	8,907.12	4,453.56
Fischer, Herman E., clerk (part time)	3,422.72	1,711.32
Fluegel, Edna R., staff member	9,570.74	4,184.14
Franks, George W., clerk (part time)	3,709.49	1,854.72
Grimes, Charles P., chief counsel (to July 7, 1954)	11,646.00	226.45
Haaser, Stephen G., research assistant	8,279.10	4,139.52
Humphreys, Robert C., Jr., clerk (to July 15, 1954; from Aug. 16 to Sept. 15, 1954)	2,515.29 3,422.72	390.02
Keefer, James A., clerk (from July 6 to Sept. 15, 1954)	3,422.72	665.51
Lowell, William E., editorial director	11,646.00	5,823.00
MacDevitt, Mary J., clerk	$5,525.75	$2,762.82
Malaney, Elinor L., clerk	6,481.67	3,001.80
Malaney, Ethel A., clerk (from Aug. 1, 1954)	5,525.75	2,302.35
Mandel, Benjamin, research director	11,646.00	5,823.00
McDonnell, Vyonne G., clerk	5,525.75	2,762.82
McManus, Mary B., research specialist (from Oct. 12, 1954, when actually employed—54 days)	9,073.03	1,360.94
McManus, Robert C., staff member	11,395.68	5,697.84
Mercer, Doris L., clerk	5,525.75	2,762.82
Mitchell, Jonathan, consultant, temporary (from July 12, 1954, when actually employed—125 days)	11,646.00	4,043.75
Richards, Ann E., clerk (from Aug. 1, 1954)	5,525.75	2,302.35
Roberts, Marilyn H., clerk	5,525.75	2,681.03
Somes, Naomi W., clerk	5,334.57	2,667.24
Stavropulos, Mary, clerical assistant	4,856.61	2,428.26

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure $149,523.12
Amount expended 98,492.40

Balance unexpended 51,030.72

HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman.

JANUARY 10, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

(S. Res. 181, agreed to January 26, 1954)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Arens, Richard, staff director	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Arens, William H., staff member	8,990.07	4,495.02
Ashcraft, Ann, clerk	3,805.08	1,902.54
Blair, Drury H., staff member	9,570.74	4,785.36
Burton, Robert R., staff member	9,902.55	4,951.26
Cameron, Betty C., clerk	4,569.81	2,284.86
DeGooyer, Franzetta R., clerk	4,569.81	2,284.86
McCloskey, Mary J., clerk	5,525.75	2,762.82
Mesmer, Fred M., staff member	9,404.83	4,702.38
Schroeder, Frank W., investigator	9,902.55	4,951.26
Theurer, Gary L., clerk, to Aug. 12	2,827.14	329.82
Total		39,273.18

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures $53,618.85
Amount expended 39,533.75

Balance unexpended 14,085.10

HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman.

JANUARY 7, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE UNITED STATES

(Under authority of S. Res. 190, agreed to January 27, 1954)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Beaser, Herbert W., chief counsel	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Bobo, James H., assistant counsel	10,566.16	5,283.06
Chumbris, Peter N., assistant counsel-investigator	8,552.84	4,276.38
Clendenen, Richard, executive director	11,646.00	5,823.00
Gibbons, Richard M., file clerk-liaison	4,665.41	2,292.85
Goff, Donald H., consultant	2,515.29	1,257.60
Hart, Edward, consultant to Dec. 15	4,856.61	2,225.90
Holloway, Mary F., clerical assistant	5,143.38	2,571.66
Jensen, Floyd A., investigator	6,864.04	3,432.00
McArthur, Ina W., clerical assistant to July 23	4,665.41	298.06
Mayes, Martin, consultant from Aug. 23	7,055.23	2,508.50
Morris, Charles V., administrative assistant	7,533.19	3,766.56
Mowery, Edward J., public relations consultant to Dec. 15	10,566.16	4,842.80
Perian, Carl L., investigator	5,238.97	2,619.48
Schonberger, Claude M., investigator	6,386.08	3,054.94
Sears, Lillian F., clerical assistant	4,856.61	2,428.26
Shawn, E. Luise, administrative secretary	6,864.04	3,432.00
Strong, Harold F., social services consultant from Aug. 23	10,068.45	3,579.86
Sullivan, Thomas S., investigator to Oct. 15	6,003.71	1,751.05
Tompson, Mary E., clerical assistant	4,665.41	2,332.68
Sears, Wendell E., investigator (Oct. 20 to 28)	5,430.16	135.75

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure $112,229.99
Amount expended 91,029.63

Balance unexpended 21,200.36

HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman.

JANUARY 14, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH EMIGRATION OF REFUGEES FROM WESTERN EUROPEAN NATIONS

(Under authority of S. Res. 188, agreed to January 26, 1954)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Guthridge, Eleanor C., research assistant and attorney	$10,068.45	$5,034.18
Beaton, Adele V., clerical assistant	4,856.61	2,428.26
Marhoefer, Louis, special representative (from Dec. 21)	750.45	20.84

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure $33,354.85
Amount expended 17,268.92

Balance unexpended 16,085.93

HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

(Under authority of S. Res. 227, agreed to April 28, 1954)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees

for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Day, Nannette H., clerk-secretary (to Sept. 30)	$2,674.68	$668.67
Stevens, William A., clerk	5,238.97	2,619.48

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$36,393.47
Amount expended	7,003.70
Balance unexpended	29,389.77

HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES

(Under authority of S. Res. 187, agreed to Jan. 26, 1954)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$4,739.22
Amount expended	1,066.43
Balance unexpended	3,672.79

HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman.

JANUARY 6, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Roy E. James, chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Richard L. Callaghan, assistant chief clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Crawford C. Heerlein, clerical assistant	6,290.49	3,145.20
Thelma W. Blankenship, clerical assistant	5,812.53	2,906.22
Paul Sample, clerical assistant	5,812.53	2,906.22
Loretta Hogan Gawenda, clerical assistant	4,952.20	2,476.08
Alice H. Price, clerical assistant	4,952.20	2,476.08
Helyn Eagle, clerical assistant	4,952.20	2,444.21
Helen H. Papps, clerical assistant	4,952.20	2,476.08
Marjorie M. Whittaker, clerical assistant	4,952.20	2,476.08
Melvin W. Sneed, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Michael J. Bernstein, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
John D. Stringer, professional staff member	9,073.03	4,493.13
William G. Reidy, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$15,000.00
Amount expended	10,022.35
Balance unexpended	4,977.65

H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
Chairman.

JANUARY 6, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WELFARE AND PENSION FUNDS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Carey, Marjorie L., clerk-stenographer	$3,900.68	$650.10
Christofferson, Alice R., stenographer	4,091.85	2,045.88
Coburn, William H., assistant chief counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Cordes, S. Whitman, chief investigator	11,646.00	2,426.25
Curran, Marguerite, clerical assistant [1]	3,805.08	232.52
Gilmore, Scally, clerk-stenographer	4,856.61	2,428.26
Holzman, Bernice M., clerical assistant [2]	3,805.08	211.38
Homer, Marilyn T., clerical assistant [1]	3,805.08	232.52
Juliano, Mary H., clerical assistant [2]	3,805.08	211.38
Kearney, Rita M., stenographer [3]	4,378.64	790.57
Kirksey, Mary P., clerical assistant [1]	3,805.08	232.52
Knight, Mabelle H., clerical assistant [1]	3,805.08	232.52
Kuhl, Arthur M., chief clerk	5,430.16	2,715.06
Leece, William A., chief counsel and staff director	11,646.00	5,823.00
MacIntyre, Duncan M., investigator	9,073.03	4,536.48
Miller, William J., investigator	9,653.69	3,164.25
Montier, Gladys E., secretary	4,952.20	2,476.08
Murphy, Ann J., clerical assistant [1]	3,805.08	158.53
Plant, Francis X., investigator	9,073.03	2,192.63
Smith, Pearl E., clerk-stenographer	4,761.00	1,481.20
Sornson, Betty D., stenographer	4,856.61	148.39
Sornson, Louis W., investigator	9,073.03	4,536.48
Suss, Frederic T., investigator	9,073.03	2,091.82
Toudic, Agnes, stenographer [3]	4,856.61	1,241.10
Turner, Blake E., investigator	9,073.03	3,049.52
Wenstrup, J. James, investigator	9,073.03	2,016.22

[1] Terminated on Dec. 13, 1954.
[2] Terminated on Dec. 11, 1954.
[3] Terminated on Dec. 17, 1954.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$125,150.00
Amount expended	72,495.64
Balance unexpended	52,654.36

H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
Chairman.

JANUARY 10, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Paschal, Frank A., chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Johnson, R. W., professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Brawley, H. W., professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Irwin, Mary, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Bobo, Virginia, assistant chief clerk	5,716.93	2,858.46
Homan, Colette E., clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78
Lanigan, Alice Y., clerical assistant [1]	$4,856.61	$2,428.26
McElroy, Marty, clerical assistant	5,143.38	2,571.66
Paramore, Mary Anne, clerical assistant	5,334.57	2,667.24
Sutherland, Mary H., clerical assistant	4,856.61	2,428.26

[1] Under authority of S. Res. 221, agreed to Apr. 7, 1954.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong.	$10,000.00
Amount available, July 1, 1954	5,867.34
Amount expended, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954	1,407.65
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1954	4,459.69

FRANK CARLSON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 1, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to January 1, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Bassett, Ellsworth W., professional staff	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Fox, Thomas F., clerical staff	6,003.71	3,001.85
Kapnic, Charles N., chief clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Luschyk, Mary, clerical staff	4,569.81	2,284.90
Martinez, John L., clerical staff	6,481.67	3,240.83
Ortiz, Frances, professional staff	11,646.00	5,823.00
Porter, Eloise, assistant clerk	7,437.59	3,718.79
Sneed, Theo W., professional staff	11,646.00	5,823.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$35,000.00
Amount expended	8,077.31
Balance unexpended	26,922.69

EDWARD MARTIN,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 31, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Bookwalter, William F., chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
St. Clair, Darrell, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
McLachlan, Ann E., clerical assistant	6,003.71	3,001.80
Jackson, Elaine H., clerical assistant	6,003.71	3,001.80
Gavin, B. Floy, clerical assistant	6,003.71	3,001.80
Greene, Eleanor L., clerical assistant	4,474.23	2,237.10
Berkovitch, Boris S., professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Troiano, Thelma M., assistant chief clerk	4,665.41	2,332.68
Total		31,044.18

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong	$10,000.00
Amount available, July 1, 1954	7,859.46
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954	3,845.23
Balance unexpended Dec. 31, 1954	4,014.23

WILLIAM E. JENNER,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 31, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Kemp, L. Stanley, chief investigator	$8,990.07	$4,495.02
Strain, Mary L., clerk	5,716.93	2,858.46
Total		7,353.48

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, S. Res. 234, May 21, 1954	$50,000.00
Amount available, July 1, 1954	46,578.47
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954	6,602.05
Balance unexpended, Dec. 31, 1954	39,976.42

WILLIAM E. JENNER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 5, 1955.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Amis, William D., professional staff member	$10,068.45	$5,034.18
Byrne, Elizabeth A., clerical assistant	5,908.12	2,954.04
Forsythe, Robert A., professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Humphrey, Katherine J., clerical assistant	4,665.41	2,332.68
Jehle, Philip F., assistant chief clerk	8,552.84	4,276.38
Lasky, Sara Betty, clerical assistant	4,569.81	2,284.86
Novak, Gertrude C., clerical assistant	4,569.81	2,284.86
O'Connor, Blake, professional staff member	10,068.45	5,034.18
Ruppert, Minna L., chief clerk	9,653.69	4,826.82
Stults, Walter B., professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, July 1, 1954	$10,000.00
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954	1,695.62
Balance unexpended Dec. 31, 1954	8,304.38

EDWARD J. THYE,
Chairman.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for Mr. MCNAMARA):

S. 549. A bill for the relief of Arthur Joseph La Fleur (also known as Arthur J. Sakoffs); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for Mr. JACKSON):

S. 550. A bill for the relief of John Axel Arvidson; and

S. 551. A bill for the relief of Anthony Agustino Scrivanich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 552. A bill for the relief of Arch Robertson; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for Mr. CHAVEZ):

S. 553. A bill for the relief of Estalia G. Stathis and Ariadni Vassiliki G. Stathis;

S. 554. A bill for the relief of Nedjet Irfan Evin;

S. 555. A bill for the relief of Jose Cipriano Arias Gonzalez;

S. 556. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vincenta Rojas Gomez;

S. 557. A bill for the relief of John A. Lynn;

S. 558. A bill for the relief of Irene Montoya;

S. 559. A bill for the relief of Michael Miakos;

S. 560. A bill for the relief of Louis Rachid Habib;

S. 561. A bill for the relief of Feliciano C. Mendoza;

S. 562. A bill for the relief of Charles F. Garriz; and

S. 563. A bill for the relief of Estalia G. Stathis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 564. A bill for the relief of Caroline M. Newmark and Melville Moritz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 565. A bill for the relief of Edgar Arved Polberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 566. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the establishment of the Fort Leavenworth, Kans., military post;

S. 567. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the Young Women's Christian Association;

S. 568. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of those leaders who pioneered in the field of mental health; and

S. 569. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special stamp in commemoration of the memory of Christopher "Kit" Carson; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 570. A bill for the relief of James Ji-Tsung Woo, Margie Wanchung Woo, Daniel Du-Ning Woo, and Robert Du-An Woo;

S. 571. A bill for the relief of Marguarete Emelianoff;

S. 572. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Delio A. Loo Murgas;

S. 573. A bill for the relief of Julius Firt; and

S. 574. A bill for the relief of Martin P. Pavlov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 575. A bill relating to the issuance of a patent-in-fee to Lorraine Dennis Crawford Woods; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 576. A bill for the relief of Panayiotis Mickel Mavroyiannis;

S. 577. A bill for the relief of Wilton J. Parker; and

S. 578. A bill for the relief of Edmund Lowe and Richard Lowe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 579. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Scalia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 580. A bill to preserve the wheat acreage history of farms voluntarily underplanting their allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 581. A bill for the relief of Nadeem M. Muna; and

S. 582. A bill for the relief of Aloisia Schlotter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE (for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 583. A bill to modify the comprehensive plans for the improvement of the Cumberland River and tributaries to provide for the inclusion in such plans for the payment of specific amounts to certain cities for the construction of additional water system facilities necessitated by the raising of the water level of the Cumberland River as a result of the construction of the Old Hickory lock and dam project; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 584. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, relating to the Customs Court;

S. 585. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chang Ho Cho;

S. 586. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Laddomada, Antonietta Laddomada, and children, Concetta and Paolo Laddomada;

S. 587. A bill for the relief of Hildegarde Hiller;

S. 588. A bill for the relief of Col. David W. Stonecliffe; and

S. 589. A bill for the relief of Lt. P. B. Sampson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE (for himself, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. NEELY):

S. 590. A bill relating to the rendition of musical compositions on coin-operated machines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KILGORE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 591. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to reduce to 60 years the age at which women may qualify for old-age and survivors insurance benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 592. A bill for the relief of Chia-Yi Jen (also known as Charles Jen); and

S. 593. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of Chester H. Tuck, Mary Elizabeth Fisher, James Thomas Harper, and Mrs. T. W. Bennett" by placing a 10 percent limitation on agent or attorney fees in lieu of a complete prohibition thereon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 594. A bill to amend section 6 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide increased benefits in cases of disabling injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 595. A bill to amend section 621 (a) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to increase the period of time within which persons discharged from active service shall be eligible to apply for insurance under such act; and

S. 596. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for the preservation of records; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 597. A bill for the relief of Frieda M. Schwabe and minor child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 598. A bill to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Albeni Falls Reservoir project, Idaho, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 599. A bill to prohibit the transportation of obscene matters in interstate or foreign commerce; and

S. 600. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the mailing of obscene matter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 601. A bill for the relief of Beryl Roberts Irrer;

S. 602. A bill for the relief of Gordon Thompson Brown;

S. 603. A bill for the relief of Edward and Lily Elsie White;

S. 604. A bill for the relief of Alick Bhark;

S. 605. A bill for the relief of Myung Sik Hong;

S. 606. A bill for the relief of Gisela Hofmeier; and

S. 607. A bill for the relief of Hildegard Kropfitsch Pelloski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself and Mr. MARTIN of Iowa):

S. 608. A bill for the relief of Catherine Samouris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself and Mr. ANDERSON):

S. 609. A bill to provide rewards for information concerning the illegal introduction into the United States, or the illegal manufacture or acquisition in the United States, of special nuclear material and atomic weapons; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

(See the remarks of Mr. HICKENLOOPER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 610. A bill for the relief of Mary Ishii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. MALONE, and Mr. BIBLE):

S. 611. A bill to provide Federal assistance for construction and reconstruction of a highway from the Nevada State line across the Sierra Nevada Mountains into the San Francisco Bay area; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. KUCHEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PAYNE:

S. 612. A bill to enable the States to provide for the increased financial needs of persons receiving assistance under the public-assistance plans established pursuant to the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. PAYNE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 613. A bill to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1957; and

S. 614. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to donate certain property to the American National Red Cross; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 615. A bill for the relief of Dr. T. H. Oddie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill.)

By Mr. GORE (for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 616. A bill for the relief of the cities of Lebanon and Gallatin, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 617. A bill for the relief of Mary S. Shaw; and

S. 618. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the town of Lancaster, Mass., for the loss of taxes on certain property in such town acquired by the United States for use for military purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 619. A bill for the relief of Kerson Huang; and

S. 620. A bill for the relief of Louis Bostiga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 621. A bill to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases; and

S. 622. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Blackfeet Indian Tribe of Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KILGORE (for himself and Mr. NEELY):

S. 623. A bill to limit the procurement of fuels of foreign origin by the armed services for use within the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KERR:

S. 624. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to protect innocent purchasers of fungible goods converted by warehousemen from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation;

S. 625. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, so as to require that prices of certain agricultural commodities be supported at 100 percent of parity, and for other purposes; and

S. 626. A bill to authorize the conduct of a nationwide farm cost of production study for major farm-produced commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. KERR (for himself, Mr. FREAR, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. LANGER, Mr. HILL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. WILEY, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. LONG, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. STENNIS):

S. 627. A bill to provide supplementary benefits for recipients of public assistance and benefits for others who are in need through the issuance of certificates to be used in the acquisition of surplus agricultural food products; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. KERR (for himself, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. DANIEL):

S. 628. A bill to authorize construction of a highway crossing over Lake Texoma, Red River, Texas and Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 629. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to carry on certain experimentation work in drought management; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 630. A bill to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

S. 631. A bill to amend certain provisions of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended, relating to educational exchange and other cultural programs under such act; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WELKER:

S. 632. A bill for the relief of Jan R. Cwiklinski; and

S. 633. A bill for the relief of certain alien sheepherders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 634. A bill to authorize loans to owners of farm housing accommodations on farms for the purpose of assisting in the acquisition of adequate facilities for providing and using water in such accommodations; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HENNINGS (by request):

S. 635. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons contracting to deliver certain strategic or critical minerals or metals in cases of failure to recover reasonable costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HENNINGS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HENNINGS (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. GORE):

S. 636. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. HENNINGS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER):

S. 637. A bill to provide for the conveyance of Camp Livingston, Camp Beauregard, and Esler Field, La., to the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 638. A bill for the relief of Jorge Ventura;

S. 639. A bill for the relief of Rosa Fenzl Cassity;

S. 640. A bill for the relief of Roger Ouellette; and

S. 641. A bill for the relief of Joseph H. Lym, doing business as Lym Engineering Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 642. A bill for the relief of Shigeko Nakamura;

S. 643. A bill for the relief of Perla Funes Ovadia;

S. 644. A bill for the relief of Sandy Michael John Philp;

S. 645. A bill for the relief of Donald R. Dyson and Kenneth M. Dyson;

S. 646. A bill for the relief of Vartan M. Benjanian;

S. 647. A bill for the relief of Teresa Monterola Monsanto;

S. 648. A bill for the relief of John Soudas;

S. 649. A bill for the relief of Zelda Baumzveiger; and

S. 650. A bill for the relief of Antonios Vasillos Zarkadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 651. A bill to amend section 401 (e) (2) of the Civil Aeronautics Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. MORSE, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 652. A bill to encourage the States to hold preferential primary elections for the nomination of candidates for the office of President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER):

S. 653. A bill to provide for the conveyance of Jackson Barracks, La., to the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. FULBRIGHT):

S. 654. A bill to extend the direct loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to correspond to the expiration dates provided for guaranteed loans under such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 655. A bill to amend the act to require the Postmaster General to reimburse postmasters of discontinued post offices for equipment owned by the postmaster; and

S. 656. A bill to permit involuntarily separated postmasters, when post offices are discontinued, to acquire classified civil-service status through noncompetitive civil-service examinations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. IVES (for himself, Mr. BUTLER, and Mr. CASE of New Jersey):

S. 657. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. IVES when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. IVES:

S. 658. A bill to establish a Commission on Programs for the Aging; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. IVES when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 659. A bill for the relief of Mary Rose and Mrs. Alcie Rose Spittler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. LANGER):

S. 660. A bill to amend sections 2311, 2312, and 2313 of title 18, United States Code, so as to extend the punishment for the transportation of stolen motor vehicles in interstate or foreign commerce to tractors, commercial truck trailers and truck semitrailers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for himself, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. DUFF, Mr. NEELY, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. HILL, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and Mr. DIRKSEN):

S. 661. A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLEMENTS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. GREEN, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 662. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution placing certain individuals who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, and in the islands of Leyte and Samar after July 4, 1902, and their survivors, in the same status as those who served in the Armed Forces during the Philippine Insurrection and their survivors; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. J. Res. 23. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. J. Res. 24. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to designate October 31 of each year as Youth Honor Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH (for himself Mr. PURTELL, and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. J. Res. 25. Joint resolution authorizing the President to designate 1 week in June of each year as National Amateur Radio Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUSH when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WELKER (for himself, Mr. DANIEL, and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. J. Res. 26. Joint resolution to authorize the appointment of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur as General of the Armies of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. J. Res. 27. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President by primary elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RENDITION OF MUSICAL COMPOSITIONS ON COIN-OPERATED MACHINES

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and my colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Copyright Act of 1909. The bill would repeal that section of the Copyright Act which permits operators of coin-operated music machines to perform copyrighted musical compositions for profit without payment to the copyright owner and without the owner's consent.

As now written, the Copyright Act provides that playing recordings in coin-operated music machines at public places where no admission fee is charged is not deemed a public performance for profit. The practical effect of this provision has been to deny composers and authors of the musical works performed on jukeboxes a just share in the profits which their works earn by being so performed.

All other commercial users of music—without exception—are required to compensate the copyright owners for commercial use of their music. Under the provisions of the Copyright Act, radio and television networks and stations, hotels, restaurants, nightclubs, dancehalls, skating rinks, and all other media of commercial entertainment may not perform a copyrighted musical composition—whether by means of phonograph records or otherwise—without the permission of the copyright owner. The only exception is the jukebox, which benefits today from a special exemption accorded in 1909 to the type of music machine then in use in penny arcades.

When during the era of the penny arcade the Congress granted this special exemption to coin-operated music machines, it could not possibly foresee that these relatively few and primitive devices would grow into today's gigantic jukebox industry. Whereas in 1909 the intake of coin-operated music machines was comparatively nominal, and today the jukebox industry is a multimillion dollar enterprise, in which more than 500,000 machines pile up a gross annual revenue of over $500 million.

The outmoded 1909 exemption has become discriminatory not only to the composers and authors who must watch without recourse as jukebox operators pile up profits from the free use of their music—it is discriminatory also to all other commercial users, who must compensate the composer. This discrimination against the composer and against other commercial users is compounded by the fact that the jukebox operators, not content with enjoying the benefits of an outmoded provision of the 1909 act, are in 1955 very generally doubling their rates, charging 10 cents instead of 5 cents for each playing of a record.

I can call to mind no other group—whether in agriculture, mining, commerce or industry—which is legally permitted to take away a citizen's property without his consent and to make money from that property without compensating the owner. Yet this is exactly what is happening to composers and authors under the archaic provision of the Copyright Act which my cosponsors and I are seeking to eliminate.

Many responsible national and local organizations have urged the repeal of this inequitable exemption.

These organizations include American Bar Association; State and local bar associations; General Federation of Women's Clubs; National Federation of Music Clubs; National Music Council; American Patent Law Association; Authors' League of America; Songwriters' Protective Association; Sweet Adelines, Inc.; Music Publishers' Protective Association; American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers; Broadcast Music, Inc., as well as the vast majority of

the Nation's composers, authors, and publishers, and the agencies of the United States Government which are charged with examining into such matters: Department of State, the Library of Congress, and the Register of Copyrights.

I hope that the Congress will move promptly to correct this manifest injustice to America's composers and authors and their publishers. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 590) relating to the rendition of musical compositions on coin-operated machines, submitted by Mr. KILGORE (for himself and other Senators) was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 (e) of title 17, United States Code (act of Mar. 4, 1909, Public Law 349, 60th Cong., 2d sess., as amended), is amended by striking out the following: "The reproduction or rendition of a musical composition by or upon coin-operated machines shall not be deemed a public performance for profit unless a fee is charged for admission to the place where such reproduction or rendition occurs."

This act shall take effect as of July 1, 1955.

REDUCTION OF AGE LIMIT FOR WOMEN TO RECEIVE OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE BENEFITS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to reduce to 60 years the age at which women may qualify for old-age and survivors insurance benefits.

This bill is designed to correct a current inequity, in that a great many women must eke out a bare existence while waiting to reach their eligibility age of 65.

Recent experience has shown that the wives of only 2 out of every 5 of the married men qualifying for old-age and survivors insurance benefits are also immediately eligible for benefits. On the other hand, if we reduce the wives' eligibility age to 60, this will make it possible for 7 out of every 10 women to receive retirement benefits simultaneously with their husbands.

Right now, however, if the husband retires at or just after reaching 65, the couple has only his benefit until the wife reaches age 65. Wives who have never worked or who have had no recent employment often find it difficult to get a job in their sixties to supplement their husband's retirement benefit.

Moreover, widows at or near the age of 60 and who have not had recent work experience, also find it difficult to obtain jobs.

I believe that this bill is eminently sound, and I earnestly hope that the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee will find it possible to take early action thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 591) to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to reduce to 60 years the age at which women may qualify for old-age and survivors insurance benefits, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT RELATING TO INCREASED BENEFITS IN CASES OF DISABLING INJURIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], and the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], I introduce, for reference to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, a bill to bring disability benefits under the Longshoremen and Harbor Workers Compensation Act up to date. Since 1948 there has been no increase in the disability compensation benefits for working people covered by this act.

Present benefits range from a minimum of $12 to a maximum of $35 a week. Existing law provides that no benefits are to be paid for the first 7 days of disability but that if the disability continues for 49 days, benefits are allowable from the day of injury.

The proposed bill would amend the present law in four respects:

First. Increase minimum weekly benefits to $20.

Second. Increase maximum weekly benefits to $50.

Third. Reduce the qualifying period to 3 days.

Fourth. Reduce the period for obtaining full compensation from the date of injury to 14 days.

In recognition of increases in the cost of living, Congress has liberalized benefits under the Social Security Act and raised the minimum wage.

In the last Congress this bill received favorable departmental reports.

This measure appears to be in line with congressional policy. I urge its early consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the body of the RECORD following the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 594) to amend section 6 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide increased benefits in cases of disabling injuries, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 33, sec. 906), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. (a) No compensation shall be allowed for the first 3 days of the disability, except the benefits provided for in section 7: *Provided, however*, That in case the injury results in disability of more than 14 days the compensation shall be allowed from the date of disability.

"(b) Compensation for disability shall not exceed $50 per week and compensation for total disability shall not be less than $20 per week: *Provided, however*, That if the employee's average weekly wages, as computed under section 10, are less than $20 per week he shall receive as compensation for total disability his average weekly wages."

REWARDS FOR CERTAIN INFORMATION RELATING TO SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIAL

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and myself, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill, which is identical with a bill which was introduced during the previous session, to provide rewards for information concerning the illegal introduction into the United States or the illegal manufacture or acquisition in the United States of special nuclear material and atomic weapons.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 609) to provide rewards for information concerning the illegal introduction into the United States, or the illegal manufacture or acquisition in the United States, of special nuclear material and atomic weapons, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

CONSTRUCTION OF THE ALL-YEAR HIGHWAY OVER SIERRA MOUNTAINS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the defense and safety of our Nation is very greatly dependent on the mobility of our armed forces and the adequacy of a strategic transportation system.

One vital segment of the defense highway network has been recognized for many years as entirely inadequate to meet the demands which certainly would be placed upon it in event of attack upon the Western United States or outbreak of hostilities in the Pacific in which this country might regrettably become involved. This is the portion crossing the Sierra Nevada Mountain.

In view of unusual circumstances which have caused growing concern, I introduce on behalf of myself and three of my colleagues, the senior Senator

from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the two Senators from Nevada [Mr. MALONE and Mr. BIBLE], a bill authorizing Federal participation with the State of California in replacing a dangerous, limited-capacity road over the high Sierras with a dependable, carefully-engineered, all-year highway. A companion bill is being introduced in the House by Representative ENGLE, of California.

The urgent need for a cross-mountain road of much greater capacity than now exists for both national defense and normal transportation purposes warrants enactment of such legislation.

This measure, providing for reconstruction of approximately 100 miles of Route 40 is entitled to special consideration because of the inadequacy of present mountain crossings, the existence of a great number of key defense installations in the region which would be served, the undeniable importance of a highway link between the interior of the country and the essential ports on San Francisco Bay, and the peculiar engineering and construction problems which must be solved.

Any doubt that such a project is imperative to national defense was demonstrated last summer by a simulated attack on the Oakland-San Francisco section of California. As a result of observations during Operation Alert, military and civil defense authorities agreed that prompt steps should be taken to construct additional highway connections across the mountain. The critical need was emphasized by the fact that the existing highway was blocked for 4 hours as a result of traffic jams during what was only a practice.

The importance of a 4-lane highway also was driven home to military authorities in 2 recent winters. Heavy snowfalls closed the present two-lane road for considerable lengths of time. In normal situations, even during the winter an average of 400 trucks cross the summit of the mountains on this route daily. The dire consequences of complete interruption of traffic in an emergency may be easily imagined.

The California Legislature voted almost unanimously in 1953 to share the cost of reconstructing the mountain segment of this highway. The State of California already has expended large sums in transforming portions of the route into a multilane expressway. Joint action is essential to completing the task of providing a road of the sort which is vital to national safety.

I hope that this bill will receive early consideration, so that work can be scheduled in the very near future.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 611) to provide Federal assistance for construction and reconstruction of a highway from the Nevada stateline across the Sierra Nevada Mountains into the San Francisco Bay area, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

INCREASED FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN PERSONS RECEIVING OLD-AGE BENEFITS

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would increase the maximum limitation for those of our citizens receiving old-age assistance as well as others covered under our public assistance plans.

The bill, as it applies to the aged, the blind, and the permanently and totally disabled, would authorize a maximum of $75 a month. The present maximum is $55 a month.

These senior citizens are those who do not come under the regular social security retirement provisions. They were too old or otherwise ineligible to be covered by the bill when it was first passed. Since then, their number has been steadily decreasing as more and more retired persons are covered by the regular retirement provisions of the social security system.

The bill, which is cited as the Public Assistance Act of 1955, would also increase from four-fifths to six-sevenths the Federal share of the initial allotment, which would be raised in this bill from $25 to $35 a month. The Federal Government would continue to pay half of all aid above this figure up to a maximum of $75.

Federal payments to dependent children are increased in the same proportion.

There is no change under this bill in payments to the States for the administration of their plans or in Federal payments to eligible residents of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

It is only proper that in keeping with the spirit of the Social Security Act, payments to the aged and the handicapped should increase to meet the higher cost of living they face today. We all know how heavy the burden on our senior citizens has become since the end of World War II. Throughout the years there has been a very slight increase in the standards previously established, and this bill is simply a well-deserved recognition of an existing need.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 612) to enable the States to provide for the increased financial needs of persons receiving assistance under the public-assistance plans established pursuant to the Social Security Act, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXTENSION OF REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend the Reorganization Act of 1949, which will expire on April 1 of this year. In view of the work and the anticipated reports of the Hoover Commission, or the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, I think it is imperative that this act be extended.

If the bill is referred to the Committee on Government Operations, we shall undertake to process it immediately. I make that announcement so that if any Senator contemplates opposing it, he may so indicate to the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 613) to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1957, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Government Operations.

REPRESENTATION OF INDIGENT DEFENDANTS IN CRIMINAL CASES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce a bill providing for the representation of indigent defenders in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States. This bill has been strongly recommended by Attorney General Herbert Brownell.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that following it there be printed the text of a letter sent by the Attorney General to the Vice President recommending passage of this proposed legislation.

I earnestly hope that the Senate Judiciary Committee will find it possible to report on this measure at the earliest possible date.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 630) to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title 18 of the United States Code, section 3006, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"§ 3006. Public defenders; representation of indigent defendants

"(a) Each district court of the United States may appoint a public defender. In any district where terms of court are held in two or more places, the court may appoint a public defender at each such place. Whenever a district court is satisfied that the number of cases assigned to a public defender is greater than can be conveniently conducted by him, the court may appoint one or more assistant public defenders to render aid to the public defender. The public defender with the approval of the court may appoint a clerk or clerks as may be necessary in such number as may be approved by the Director of the Administrative Officer of the United States Courts. Public defenders or assistant public defenders appointed under this section may be full-time or part-time officers as the volume of work in the judgment of the court may require. Whenever it appears to the satisfaction of a court in which there is a public defender that any person charged in said court with a felony or misdemeanor (other than a petty offense, as defined by section 1 of this title) is unable to employ counsel, the court shall assign the public defender to act as counsel for such person with respect

to such charge: *Provided*, That if in any case there are indigent defendants with such conflicting interests that they cannot all be properly represented by the same counsel, the court may appoint counsel separate from the public defender for one or more of them and provide for the compensation and reimbursement of expenses of such counsel in the same manner as is provided for counsel appointed under subsection (c) of this section. It shall be the duty of the public defender to act as counsel for each defendant to whom he is assigned at every stage of the prosecution, unless after the assignment the court is satisfied that the defendant is able to employ other counsel. Each district court by which a public defender is appointed may adopt appropriate rules governing his conduct subject to general regulations on the subject, which may be adopted by the Judicial Conference of the United States.

"(b) Each public defender and assistant public defender shall be paid a salary based upon the service to be performed in no case exceeding $10,000 per annum, to be fixed by the Judicial Conference of the United States. He shall also be reimbursed for expenses necessarily incurred by him in the performance of his duties when approved by the district court.

"(c) In any district not having a city of more than 500,000 population, in which the district court considers that the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases brought in the court can be provided for more economically by the appointment of counsel in particular cases in which such representation may be deemed requisite than by the appointment of a public defender, and no public defender is appointed or in any district having a city of over 500,000 population if the district court so considers, the judicial counsel of the circuit approves, and no public defender is appointed, the court may appoint counsel for indigent defendants in particular cases. Counsel so appointed may in the discretion of the court be compensated in amounts to be determined by the court upon the conclusion of the service, at a rate not in excess of $35 a day for time necessarily and properly expended in preparation and trial of the case, and may be reimbursed for expenses reasonably incurred in the representation and approved by the court: *Provided*, That the aggregate amount expended for compensation and reimbursement of such counsel in any district shall not exceed $5,000 in any fiscal year.

"(d) In any criminal cases in which an indigent defendant is represented in the district court by a public defender or by counsel appointed by the court in the particular case, the public defender or such counsel, as the case may be, shall also represent him in the event of appeal in the appeal proceedings if either the district court or the court having jurisdiction of the appeal shall consider that there is reasonable ground for appeal and shall so direct. Services of the nature specified in this subsection if rendered by a public defender shall be part of his duties and performed without other compensation than his salary. If such services are rendered by counsel appointed in the particular case, such counsel may be compensated in the measure specified in subsection (c) for counsel appointed to represent indigent defendants in criminal cases and be reimbursed for their expenses. Any sums so paid for compensation and expenses of services on appeal shall be included in the maximum limit of $5,000 in any fiscal year imposed by subsection (c) upon the aggregate expenditures for the defense of indigent defendants in the respective districts from which the appeals are taken.

"(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the United States courts, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. The salaries and expenses of public defenders and assistant public defenders and compensation and expenses of attorneys appointed by the courts to represent defendant in particular cases, above provided for, shall be paid out of appropriations available therefor under the supervision of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

"(f) The term 'district court of the United States' as used in this section shall include the District Court for the District of Alaska, the District Court of the Virgin Islands, the District Court of Guam, and the district courts of the United States created by chapter 5 of title 28, United States Code."

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 201 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out item 3006 and inserting in its place the following item:

"3006. Public defenders; representation of indigent defendants."

The letter presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I should like to recommend the introduction and enactment of legislation to provide for the adequate representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States.

Although the sixth amendment of the Constitution of the United States provides that in all criminal prosecutions an accused shall "have the assistance of counsel for his defense," the existing system of assigning counsel to represent indigent defendants does not seem adequately to comply with the spirit of the amendment.

As I stated to a legislative subcommittee in the last Congress, the collaboration of the bar with the bench by voluntary acceptance of assignments as defense counsel, without compensation, is much like the use of the volunteer fire system in modern society. Both seem to be outmoded. It is neither adequate nor fair that the burden of defending persons who are unable to afford counsel when charged with the commission of crime should fall upon a tiny percentage of the whole bar, to be performed upon a gratuitous catch-as-catch-can basis. There is a community responsibility, consonant with a constitutional proscription, to provide full-time paid counsel, trained in the techniques of the criminal law, to represent the poor who are charged with crime. It is the business of all of us who are charged with maintaining our form of government within the framework of the Constitution to provide an adequate means of assuring every person of the "assistance of counsel for his defense" without regard to whether he has the means to pay for such counsel.

Accordingly, I am submitting a measure which will provide for the appointment of public defenders by the district courts of the United States either as full-time or part-time officers, as the volume of the work may require. The measure also provides that in any districts which do not contain a city of over 500,000 people and in which a regular public defender has not been appointed, the district court may, when deemed more economical than to provide a regular public defender, appoint counsel in particular cases and determine the compensation to be paid therefor. Thus the Federal courts will, it is believed, be able to make use of the best features of both the public defender and assigned counsel systems.

I respectfully request the prompt consideration of this legislative proposal and its early introduction in the 84th Congress.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation.

Sincerely,

———— ————,
Attorney General.

AMENDMENT OF CONTRACT SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1944

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 635) to amend the contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons contracting to deliver certain strategic or critical minerals or metals in cases of failure to recover reasonable costs, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HENNINGS (by request) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REVISION OF FEDERAL ELECTION LAWS

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, at this time I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to revise the Federal election laws and to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes. The bill is introduced by me on behalf of myself and the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, in connection with the introduction of the bill, a statement I have prepared in explanation of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 636) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The statement presented by Mr. HENNINGS is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENNINGS

The Congress of the United States has been confronted for many years by a most serious problem—the inadequacy of our existing Federal election laws. This is a problem which we must face, and a problem which we must solve. On frequent occasions, Congress has attempted to solve this problem, but, unfortunately, all such attempts have ended in dismal failure.

All true Americans are genuinely desirous of making certain that persons selected for elective office are individuals of highest character and integrity. The survival of our democracy requires that such be the case. And we must realize that it is difficult for a defective election system to produce good government. The fact that we have been blessed with such capable leaders throughout most of our history is not the result of our election laws, but has occurred in spite

of such laws. But surely we are tempting fate if we allow this scandalous system to endure.

It is essential that we reform our Federal election laws, and this is the time to act. If we delay, we shall find ourselves caught up in the politics of another election year, and action will be impossible. This is the year which must witness a transformation of our election laws, so that our elections will become inherently honest, rather than merely superficially so.

At the present time, elections to Federal offices are governed principally by two antiquated and obsolete laws, the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 and the Hatch Political Activities Act of 1939. These laws are shockingly inadequate and are riddled with loopholes, and invite, encourage, and frequently seem to demand evasion by even the most well-intentioned candidate for elective political office. They are indeed laws which were framed for a different era.

The United States in 1925, was a relatively simple and almost primitive country, when compared with the dynamic, active, and energetic Nation of 1955. And laws framed to regulate election activities in that less complex society cannot possibly be effective in midcentury America. Most of us have realized this fact for more than a decade. But still Congress has not acted.

Proposals have been advanced in almost every session of the Congress for the past 30 years to amend, revise, and perfect our Federal election laws. And each in turn has failed. But the problem has become ever more urgent, ever more compelling, until today we can say sincerely that these laws do not regulate, they do not control, indeed, they scarcely begin to touch, the subjects which they were intended to cover.

As a long-standing member of the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, I have considered myself to be especially obligated to take any action within my power to correct this grievous situation. I have introduced proposals for this purpose in this body in past sessions. In submitting another such proposal today, I am happy to have as cosponsors three distinguished and eminently able Members of this body—the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona, Senator HAYDEN; the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, Senator GREEN, and my distinguished and able colleague, the junior Senator from Tennessee, Senator GORE. I would like to explain the provisions of this proposal as briefly and as adequately as time will permit.

The deficiencies in the existing laws are depressingly numerous, and our bill contains provisions intended to correct all such deficiencies that we have been able to uncover. Of all the glaring weaknesses in the existing laws, there are three defects which, in my judgment, are major, and most of the other defects stem from them.

First, these laws do not cover primary elections, conventions, or caucuses, and thus do not touch a major part of the operating election machinery. Second, they do not require most of the political committees working in behalf of a candidate to report campaign contributions or expenditures, and they fail to give a candidate any control over the actions of committees who may support him against his will. Third, while they are to be enforced by the executive agencies of the Government, they contain no provision which insures their enforcement; and in view of their inadequacies, it is difficult to ascertain the extent to which they are enforced.

Our bill would remedy each of these weaknesses. First, it specifically would cover primaries, conventions, and caucuses. Second, it would apply to all committees supporting a candidate for Federal elective office, and would permit a candidate to authorize or decline to authorize the activities in his behalf by particular political committees. Third, it would require the appropriate committees or subcommittees in each House of Congress to supervise the administration and enforcement of the Federal election laws, and would insure that violators of these laws received adequate punishment.

Our bill is intended to cover many other most serious deficiencies in present legislation. A few of these should be touched upon at this time.

Federal election legislation today permits a candidate for the office of Senator to spend money in his campaign up to a maximum of $25,000 in some cases, and $10,000 in others. Candidates for the House of Representatives are limited to either $2,500 or, in some cases, $5,000. These provisions truly are ridiculous. The Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections discovered in 1950 that more than $1 million was spent in the Ohio campaign for Senator. Candidates for the House of Representatives frequently expend more than the legal limit, through the operation of political committees which support their candidacy. It is no discredit to any candidate to discuss this situation. For one of the healthiest derivatives of a political campaign is the educating and informing of the voters on the major issues of the day, which candidates and committees accomplish, and such a program necessitates substantial expense. Our bill would correct this situation by establishing realistic limits on contributions and expenditures, and by assuring the effective operation of such limits.

National political committees are limited to $3 million in any 1 calendar year. This is a wretched limit. Our bill would establish a ceiling determined by multiplying the total vote cast for President in a recent election by the sum of 20 cents, thereby raising the present-day limit to over $12 million, and allowing an elastic upgrading or reduction in this ceiling, should the conditions in our country materially change.

Another important weakness of existing legislation is that it provides no means whereby the people are assured true disclosure of campaign expenses. Reports are filed by candidates, and by some committees, but these reports are left to languish in solitude in the office of the file clerk of the House or the Secretary of the Senate, save for the occasions when they are perused by some energetic representative of the press, or by some scholar bent on research. Our bill would require that regular reports and summaries be issued, so that the people may know what is transpiring in the political world.

I believe that our bill would reduce the number of election complaints lodged with the responsible committees of the House and Senate. And this would be a happy circumstance. In the past 8 years, the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections alone has spent more than three-quarters of a million dollars, a substantial portion of which was devoted to investigations and contested elections. In one contest of recent date, more than $200,000 was so expended. The House of Representatives has undoubtedly spent money for similar purposes.

Frequently, these investigations and complaints have arisen, at least partially, because of a claim that candidates in an election have been guilty of corrupt practices. In view of the miserable laws regulating such practices, extensive investigation is required to establish the truth or falsity of such allegations. Realistic and adequate legislation would afford clear evidence of such matters and would tend to reduce the number of contests and complaints.

The American people are entitled to more adequate laws. They are entitled to know the true facts concerning election expenses. If unreasonable amounts are to be spent, the people have a right to know this fact.

I urge the Senate of the United States to put an end to this long-continuing failure to act. I urge the Senate to adopt legislation which will prevent future corruption in these matters. We offer a proposal which will correct such abuses, and I ask the Senate to examine seriously our bill. Continued delay will embitter our citizens even further, and will perpetuate the many abuses which we have seen in the past. We have an obligation to the American people, and now is a propitious occasion to face up to that obligation.

PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARIES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and 11 other Senators, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to encourage States to provide for presidential preferential primaries. Representative CHARLES E. BENNETT, of Florida, and a number of other Representatives are introducing an identical bill in the House of Representatives.

The purpose of the bill is to bring about a greater direct participation by the people in the nomination of candidates for President.

The Constitution of the United States begins, Mr. President, with the historic words, "We the people of the United States." Ever since the establishment of our governmental system under that great document, there has been a steady trend toward a greater participation by the people in nominating and electing public officers. Our proposal is in keeping with that historic trend.

The object of our bill is to enable the voters to take a greater part in nominating presidential candidates, and to do this by providing for Federal-State cooperation. The Federal Government would cooperate with States desiring to conduct presidential preferential primaries by providing grants to help meet the cost of holding such primaries. States would qualify for such assistance by meeting minimum requirements to provide that the primaries would be open to all voters with registered party affiliations, and that convention delegates would then be bound to a reasonable extent by primary results.

Our proposal does not require a constitutional amendment. It does not set up a national primary. States are still to have direct control over the primaries. The bill, however, does encourage States to pass laws which will help to give the people a greater share in the choice of candidates for the most important office in the world.

Our proposal will, therefore, avoid some of the difficulties which are attached to the method of constitutional amendment.

Most of the State legislatures will meet this year. Prompt enactment of our bill

by Congress will enable those States which do not have presidential preferential primary laws, or whose laws do not meet the minimum requirements of our bill, to take legislative action in that direction this year if they so desire.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an analysis of our bill which I have prepared for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement of analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 652) to encourage the States to hold preferential primary elections for the nomination of candidates for the office of President, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The analysis presented by Mr. DOUGLAS is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARIES ACT

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Section 2: The act recognizes and declares the right of the people to participate directly in the selection of Presidential candidates of political parties. The purpose of the act is to provide a method of achieving such participation through the cooperation of the States with the Federal Government in conducting Presidential preferential primary elections.

PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARIES COMMISSION

Section 3: (a) The act would establish a bipartisan Presidential Primaries Commission.

(b) The Commission would be composed of five Commissioners appointed from private life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each Commissioner would be required to be a member of a political party which polled not less than 10 million votes in the Presidential election immediately preceding his appointment. Not more than three Commissioners would be of the same political party.

(c) The Commission would select a Chairman from among its members. Three Commissioners would constitute a quorum.

(d) The term of office of each Commissioner would be 5 years, except that the terms of the 5 Commissioners first appointed to office would expire 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 years after the next presidential election. Any Commissioner appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed would be appointed for the remainder of such term. Upon the expiration of his term of office a Commissioner would continue to serve until his successor is appointed and has qualified.

(e) The Commission would have an official seal which would be judicially noticed.

(f) The commissioners would serve without compensation, but would be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

Section 4: (a) The Commission would be authorized to appoint, without regard to the Civil Service laws, an administrative officer and to fix his compensation, without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, at a rate of not to exceed $12,000 per annum.

(b) The Commission would be authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such other personnel as it deemed advisable, in accordance with the Civil Service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

CERTIFICATION TO STATES OF NAMES OF CANDIDATES

Section 5: (a) Subject to subsection (b), the Commission would certify to each State which qualified for assistance under section 7 the name of each prospective candidate for President with respect to whom it had received, not later than March 1 of a presidential election year, a petition which (1) requested such certification; (2) was signed (A) by at least 1,000 persons in each State, the primary election laws of which conformed to the requirements of section 7 of the act, if the number of such States were less than 4, or (B) by at least 1,000 persons in each of not less than 75 per centum of the States qualifying under the requirements of section 7 of the act, if the number of States were 4 or more; and (3) specified a political party on the ballot of which it was desired to place the name of such candidate. Persons signing any such petition in a State would be required to have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the legislature of such State. Certification of the name of a candidate with respect to whom a qualifying petition is filed with the Commission would be made not later than March 25 of a presidential election year. The name of a candidate would not be certified for inclusion on the ballots of more than one political party.

(b) Whenever the Commission received a petition which appeared to qualify the name of a prospective candidate for President, it would be required to notify the candidate forthwith. Unless the candidate requested not later than March 20 that his name not be used, his name would be certified to the States as provided in subsection (a) for inclusion on the ballots of the political party specified in the petition which are to be used in presidential preferential primary elections to be held in all the participating States.

(c) The Commission would have authority to determine the authenticity and validity of petitions and signatures thereto. Before making a determination it would provide a reasonable opportunity for all interested parties to be heard. The determination of the Commission would be final.

PAYMENTS TO STATES

Section 6: (a) The Commission would be required, not later than November 1 of each presidential election year, to pay to each State which qualified for assistance under section 7 the expenses incurred by such State in conducting primary elections to determine the preference of the registered voters of political parties in such State with respect to candidates for President.

(b) No such payment—

(1) would exceed the rate of 20 cents for each vote cast in any such primary election;

(2) would be made in the case of any primary election of a political party which polled less than 10 million votes in the last preceding presidential election; and

(3) would be made to a State until the secretary of state or other appropriate officer of such State had submitted to the Commission a complete and detailed account of all expenses incurred by such State in conducting such primary elections.

STATE PRIMARY ELECTION LAWS

Section 7: Payment under section 6 would be made only to a State which had in effect on January 1 of a year in which a presidential election occurs legislation which—

(1) provides for the holding of primary elections to determine the preference of the registered voters of political parties in the State with respect to candidates for President;

(2) provides that such primary elections are not to be held earlier than the 1st day of April, or later than the 31st day of July, of each presidential election year;

(3) provides for the inclusion on the ballot of a political party in such primary elections of only the names of candidates for President certified to the State by the Commission, as provided in section 5;

(4) prescribe that in such primary elections voters must have the same qualifications as those required for voting for the largest branch of the State legislature;

(5) provides that each qualified voter be allowed to vote only in the presidential preferential primary election of the political party of his registered affiliation;

(6) provides that delegates and alternate delegates to national conventions be pledged to vote for the person who received the greatest number of votes in the presidential preferential primaries of such State, or the districts thereof in which they were elected;

(7) provides that delegates and alternate delegates to national conventions may be released from the pledge required in paragraph (6) only if (A) they are released by the candidate, or (B) the candidate receives less than 10 percent of the total votes cast, or less than 20 percent on the third ballot, or less than 30 percent on the fifth ballot.

PREFERENTIAL PRIMARY ELECTIONS IN CERTAIN AREAS UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Section 8: The Commission may, in its discretion, conduct primary elections to determine the preference of the people with respect to candidates for President in areas under the jurisdiction of the United States which are not States.

DEFINITIONS

Section 9: (1) The term "States" includes the several States, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and Puerto Rico; (2) the term "Commission" means the Presidential Primaries Commission established under section 3 of the act.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 10: Such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the act are authorized to be appropriated.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Section 11: The act would take effect on January 1 of the year following the year in which it is enacted.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS TO MAKE CERTAIN LOANS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to extend the direct loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to correspond to the expiration dates provided for guaranteed loans under such title, and for other purposes.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief statement which I have prepared.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 654) to extend the direct loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to correspond to the expiration dates provided for guaranteed loans under such title, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its

title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. SPARKMAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SPARKMAN

The bill that I have introduced for myself and Senator FULBRIGHT will make the direct loan program of the Veterans' Administration coextensive with the loan-guaranty program established initially in the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

It was my pleasure to introduce the original legislation which first set up the direct-loan program in 1950. It had become clear that many veterans living in small towns and semirural communities were not sharing in the GI-loan guaranty benefits because private lenders were unable or unwilling to make GI loans. The small country banks usually had sufficient capital only to meet local needs for short-term credit, principally for commercial and farming purposes, and they had very limited amounts available for long-term mortgage loans. These factors prompted me to introduce the original legislation.

I have been extremely gratified with the support given this program on both sides of the aisle and in both Houses of the Congress. The extensions of the program and the many improvements that have been made in it have received the overwhelming support of Congress.

Originally, the sum of $150 million was made available to the VA for the making of direct loans. In September 1951, Congress extended the program and authorized the establishment of a revolving fund so that the VA could make new loans as outstanding loans were repaid or sold to private investors. In April 1952, the direct-loan program was extended and an additional $125 million was made available in quarterly installments.

In the following year, 1953, a 1-year extension of the program was authorized with an additional authorization of $25 million per quarter. Last year, the Congress extended the program through June 30, 1955, and increased the quarterly allotment to $37½ million. Under the existing law the final $37½ million allocation will be made available on April 1 and statutory authority for making such loans will expire on June 30.

While mortgage money for guaranteed loans is in fairly good supply in most urban areas of the country, veterans in rural and semirural areas still are unable to have their mortgage needs satisfied through the VA guaranty loan program. Historically, mortgage money has not flowed into these remote areas even during periods when investment funds generally were in adequate supply.

It now seems clear that there always will be certain of such areas and the only hope of veterans living there for obtaining the benefits of the GI loan will be through the direct loan program. I certainly would not want to see these veterans deprived of their opportunity to share in this benefit, and the past actions of the Congress make it clear that the other Members view the problem in a similar light.

You will note that this bill would authorize quarterly installments of $50 million each during the remaining life of the program. Also, the present pattern would be preserved by having the quarterly allotments reduced by the amount of sales of loans to private investors made by VA in the preceding quarter. The reason I propose to increase the quarterly allocation is simply because the $37½ million allocation has fallen considerably short of satisfying the needs of World War II and Korean veterans in our smaller towns and rural areas. There are still many thousands of veterans on VA's waiting lists hoping to get GI loans. The increase to $50 million quarterly would reduce waiting lists substantially and assist in more effectively meeting future demands.

It is important to bear in mind also that this program is not costing the Government any money. While it is true that as an initial step the Treasury is called upon to disburse funds, the Government is in return receiving a very valuable asset. Just how good these loans are is demonstrated by the fact that out of the 56,600 direct loans made to date, only 125—or about one-fifth of 1 percent—have resulted in defaults to the extent that the Veterans' Administration had to take over the property.

In my home State of Alabama, out of the more than 2,000 direct loans which have been made in the smaller towns and rural areas there have been only 6 properties which the VA has had to acquire.

We should remember too that the Government is receiving a substantial net income from these loans. While the Veterans' Administration has paid the Treasury about 2 percent for its direct-loan funds, the loans presently being made bear a 4½ percent interest rate. This "spread" is more than enough to take care of the administrative costs of the program as well as to set up reserves against future losses. In addition, it is probable that it will result in a substantial profit.

As I mentioned above, about 56,600 veterans of World War II and Korea have shared in this benefit. It is extremely doubtful that these veterans would have been able to start on the road toward debt-free home ownership without the beneficial terms afforded by GI financing. I am extremely hopeful that we will continue making it possible for other veterans and their families to enjoy a similar benefit. I ask that this bill be given the same wholehearted support that has been given in the past in order that the program will be continued.

RELIEF AGAINST CERTAIN FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION IN INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to provide relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation. This legislation is designed to assure to all interstate travelers the full and equal enjoyment of accommodations, advantages and privileges of any public conveyances operated by a common carrier engaged in interstate commerce and all the facilities furnished or connected therewith, regardless of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Although it is assumed that discrimination and segregation on public conveyances operated by common carriers is unlawful, this assumption is based upon a number of recent decisions of the Federal courts which, unfortunately, have not dealt explicitly with every phase of this problem. Moreover, studies indicate that some discrimination and segregation continues to exist against colored passengers, particularly with respect to buses, railroad coaches and such other accommodations as waiting rooms of certain interstate common carriers.

The provisions of the bill are in accordance with the general policy established by the Federal courts and contained in several statutes adopted by the Congress against discrimination with respect to travel on common carriers operating in interstate commerce. Specifically, it would make explicit the traveler's right to sue for damages resulting from such discrimination and travel on common carriers in interstate commerce and would also provide uniform penalties against common carriers or their officers, agents, or employees, or any other person who aids or assists any such officers, agents, or employees in denying or attempting to deny the traveler his right to nondiscriminatory and nonsegregated travel. I believe this bill would assure an effective method of eliminating the remaining vestiges of discrimination and segregation in interstate travel.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the body of the RECORD following these remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 657) providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all persons traveling within the jurisdiction of the United States shall be entitled to the full and equal enjoyment of the accommodations, advantages, and privileges of any public conveyance operated by a common carrier engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, and all the facilities furnished or connected therewith, subject only to conditions and limitations applicable alike to all persons, without discrimination or segregation based on race, color, religion, or national origin.

SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for any common carrier engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, or any officer, agent, or employee thereof, to segregate, or attempt to segregate, or otherwise discriminate against, or for any other person to aid or assist any such officer, agent, or employee in segregating, attempting to segregate, or otherwise discriminating against, passengers using any public conveyance or facility of such carrier engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, on account of the race, color, religion, or national origin of such passengers. Any such carrier or officer, agent, or employee thereof who segregates or attempts to segregate such passengers or otherwise discriminate against them on account of race, color, religion, or national origin, or any such other person who aids or assists any such officer, agent, or employee in segregating or attempting to segregate such passengers or in discriminating against them on such account, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, upon conviction, be subject to a fine of not to exceed $1,000 for each offense, and shall also be subject to suit by the injured person in an action of law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for damages or preventive or declaratory or other relief. Such suit or proceeding may be brought in any district court of the United States as constituted by chapter 5 of title 28, United States Code (28 U. S. C. 81 and the following), or the United States court of any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, without regard to the sum or value of the matter in controversy, or in any State or Territorial court of competent jurisdiction.

COMMISSION ON PROGRAMS FOR THE AGING

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to estab-

lish a Commission on Programs for the Aging. This bill, which would establish a commission to study and investigate the serious problems stemming from the increased proportion of aging persons in the Nation's population, is similar to the one introduced in the second session of the last Congress by Representative FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., and myself. Although the heavy legislative schedule during the final stages of the 83d Congress did not permit the scheduling of hearings on this proposed legislation, I am looking forward to early consideration by the present Congress in view of the favorable response the bill has received.

The Congress, our States and localities have not been unmindful of the particular needs of the aging. In recent years we have made much progress in seeking out solutions to these special problems, particularly in such areas as health, housing, and job opportunities. However, with an ever-increasing proportion of aging persons in the Nation's population, the development of cooperative efforts to assure the well-being of the older members of our society is imperative.

The Commission, which would be established by this bill, would be required to submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress its findings and recommendations for legislative action based upon its study and investigation of the efforts now being made through various programs to resolve the problems of aging persons. The Commission would be required to submit its final report to the President not later than July 1, 1956.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the body of the RECORD following these remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 658) to establish a Commission on Programs for the Aging, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECLARATION OF FINDINGS

SECTION 1. The Congress hereby finds that one of the Nation's great domestic problems is that of its rapidly growing aging population. The increasing proportion of aging people in the population has overtaxed facilities and resources, adequate when created, but now outmoded. Because of arbitrary retirement ages in industry many able-bodied men and women are thrown suddenly upon their own financial and mental resources which too often prove to be insufficient for their needs in daily life. A large segment of the population consists of persons subject to rapid physical and mental deterioration, feelings of loneliness, uselessness, frustration, and detachment from community life. There is overcrowding of institutions, clinics, and general and mental hospitals. There is an ever-increasing number of persons seeking care in such facilities.

The Nation's aging are entitled not only to support and care in their declining years but to a well rounded and satisfying life as members of their communities. The mere increase in custodial facilities is not a final solution, except for those of the aged who, by reason of chronic physical or mental infirmity, require institutional care. A more practical as well as a more constructive approach to the problems of the aging requires the creation of expansion of facilities for their care and supervision outside of institutions and, as far as possible, in a normal community environment designed to encourage their continued interest and participation in the life of the community. Such programs are required to replace outmoded custodial methods of caring for the elderly. Such programs would include provision for medical and nursing care in the home, foster family home facilities, and recreation centers, with institutional facilities reserved for those who are or become chronically ill. In view of the rapidly mounting costs of institutional care, such home care and recreational programs would also afford a means of providing more appropriate and more desirable care at lower cost.

There is need for a coordinated study of the problems of the aging to the end that these problems may be clearly defined and suitable programs developed.

COMMISSION ON PROGRAMS FOR THE AGING

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Programs for the Aging, hereinafter referred to as the "Commission."

(b) The Commission shall be composed of 25 members, as follows:

(1) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, or his designee;

(2) Fourteen members appointed by the President of the United States, from among whom the President shall designate the Chairman and the Vice Chairman of the Commission: *Provided*, That not more than eight of the members appointed by the President shall be members of the same political party;

(3) Five members appointed by the President of the Senate, 3 from the majority party, and 2 from the minority party; and

(4) Five members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, 3 from the majority party, and 2 from the minority party.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) Thirteen members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may conduct hearings.

(e) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) In view of the findings expressed in section 1 of this act the Commission shall study and investigate problems stemming from the increasing proportion of aging persons in the Nation's population, and remedial measures including but not restricted to care and services in the home, use of foster home facilities, recreation centers, and provision of institutional facilities for the chronically ill.

(b) The Commission, not later than July 1, 1956, shall submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress its final report, including recommendations for legislative action; and the Commission may also from time to time make to the President such earlier reports as the President may request or as the Commission deems appropriate.

HEARINGS; OBTAINING INFORMATION

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any persons designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes, (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192–194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure from any department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this act; and each such department, agency, and instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or by the Vice Chairman when acting as Chairman.

APPROPRIATIONS, EXPENSES, AND PERSONNEL

SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the use of the Commission such sums, not to exceed $250,000 as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(b) Each member of the Commission shall receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, except that no compensation shall be paid by the United States, by reason of service as a member, to any member who is receiving other compensation from the Federal Government, or to any member who is receiving compensation from any State or local government.

(c) Each member of the Commission shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of duties vested in the Commission.

(d) The Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of such employees as it deems advisable without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(e) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

(f) Without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, the Commission may appoint and fix the compensation at not to exceed $15,000 per annum of a Director, who shall perform such duties as the Commission shall prescribe.

TERMINATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. Six months after the transmittal to the Congress of the final report provided for in section 3 of this act, the Commission shall cease to exist.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION TO PROCESS CERTAIN FOOD COMMODITIES

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN and Mr. DUFF], the Senators from West Virginia

[Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY], the Senators from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS and Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senators from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. DIRKSEN], I introduce a bill to amend section 407 and section 416 of the Agriculture Act of 1949 so as to provide the Secretary of Agriculture full authority to make available from the Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, wheat, and corn in processed and packaged form as flour or cornmeal as well as other edible commodities, for distribution to unemployed persons and their families, institutions, the school-lunch program, and welfare agencies.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared relating to the bill be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 661) to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The statement presented by Mr. CLEMENTS is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CLEMENTS

The impetus behind the introduction of this bill is two-fold. One, the continued severe unemployment in many States, and secondly, the large stocks of wheat and corn presently in Commodity Credit Corporation inventory available and needed for distribution to the unemployed and other needy, if milled and packaged in usable quantities.

Unemployment in Kentucky has long since reached alarming proportion with no visible and ready solution. To vividly demonstrate the deplorable situation existing, I would like to point out that in January 1953 there were no group IV, or substantial labor surplus areas as defined by the Secretary of Labor, in the State of Kentucky. Today, I regret to say, there are 30 counties in the State out of a total of 120 which have been certified by the Secretary of Labor as group IV areas. Similar situations are prevalent in a great many States.

As a result of continued unemployment, thousands of persons have been without jobs for many months, their unemployment compensation payments have been exhausted, and at the present time over 200,000 persons in Kentucky alone are dependent upon Federal, State, and county welfare for absolute necessities in the form of food. For some time, the Department of Agriculture Food Distribution Division, in cooperation with State agencies, has been distributing food purchased with section 32 funds and from CCC inventory to these unfortunate people. In the past this has included canned meats and gravy, poultry, butter, cheese, dried milk, shortening, and dried beans. However, the most staple food of all, bread, whose ingredients are held in large quantities by CCC in the form of wheat and corn, has not been made available for distribution.

As late as this past Friday, January 14, I attended a meeting with officials of the Department of Agriculture, along with my distinguished colleague, Senator BARKLEY, and Representative CARL PERKINS, of the Seventh District of Kentucky, representing the area of greatest unemployment in the State, and officials from the Commonwealth of Kentucky, at which time we urged that wheat and corn be made available in processed form for distribution in distressed labor areas. Department officials insist existing legislation does not grant authority to the Department of Agriculture to take such action but could be accomplished through amendment to the pertinent sections of the Agriculture Act of 1949. It was also pointed out, as had been stated in letters to the various Members of the House and Senate vitally interested in seeing such distribution, the Department does not favor such action in view of the number of difficult and administrative problems involved and the limited impact that such distribution would have in respect to the surplus-disposal program.

I do not believe Congress or the people of these United States primarily are interested in administrative problems or the lack of impact such distribution would have on surplus-disposal programs. I am confident they are far more interested in seeing that our surplus-held food commodities are used to implement the inadequate diet of our needy to the extent such foods are available. The generosity of the American people is recognized worldwide; surely, it should be best demonstrated at home toward these thousands of fine citizens, now destitute due to no cause of their own.

Certainly, the techniques and know-hows acquired by the Army, Navy, and Air Force along with such agencies as CARE and the Red Cross, during wartimes can be utilized to overcome any immediate obstacles administrativewise.

To remove any fears such a program might be used for purposes other than advocated by this statement, the amendment offered has been carefully drawn to confine such processing to food commodities suitable for home or institutional use, and is confined to food commodities distributed in the United States.

I know of no more pressing problem in Kentucky than the need for a solution to our unemployment problems. However, until a solution can be reached it is the responsibility of those of us in a more fortunate position to see that every means possible is taken to maintain the health and morale of those less fortunate. I urgently request the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to provide early action on this measure, in order that it may be brought to the floor of the Senate for approval with the least possible delay.

MINIMUM HOURLY WAGE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], and the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill to raise the minimum wage from 75 cents to $1.25 per hour and to add approximately 9 million additional workers to those now covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act. I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared on this measure plus a section-by-section analysis of it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 662) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN

I am pleased to sponsor, on behalf of myself and Senators GREEN, KILGORE, NEELY, MCNAMARA, and PASTORE, a bill to raise the minimum wage from 75 cents to $1.25 per hour, and to add approximately 9 million additional workers to those now covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Many Members of Congress and other citizens have registered keen disappointment with the recommendation by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message that the minimum wage be increased to only 90 cents per hour. I feel that this small increase recommended by the President is entirely inadequate to the needs of millions of American workers and their families and to the national economy.

Moreover, the increase, as proposed in my bill, to $1.25 per hour, is fully justified by the ever-increasing cost of living, and by the increase in American productivity. From June 1938, when the Fair Labor Standards Act was enacted, until last year, the cost of living rose by more than 120 percent for lower income groups. The rise in worker productivity alone would amply justify the proposed minimum wage increase, since productivity has risen at a rate of 3.25 to 3.5 percent per man-hour annually.

Under the terms of the proposed bill, a total of 33 million American workers would be covered by the minimum wage statute as compared with the present total of 24 million. Of the 9 million proposed to be newly covered under the bill being introduced today, 6 million are individuals whose occupations were specifically exempted by the minimum wage amendments adopted by Congress in 1949, plus a large number who were exempted as a result of administrative interpretations narrowing the scope of interstate commerce as applied to minimum wage coverage.

Under the terms of the proposed new bill, the groups which were excluded from coverage by the 1949 amendments, including certain workers in lumbering and food processing, would be restored to coverage. The groups who have been excluded from coverage under administrative interpretations of "interstate commerce" and who would be restored to coverage under the terms of the proposed bill, would include employees of certain independent telephone companies and of some wholesale establishments.

Those who would be newly covered under the terms of the proposed bill—whose occupations have never been covered before—number about 3 million, and include such groups as employees of large retail chain establishments.

The proposed bill also reestablishes machinery for the creation of tripartite industry committees empowered to recommend a minimum wage higher than $1.25 per hour for industries in which such a higher minimum is found to be justified. In addition the bill contains a number of technical but important revisions of the act to improve administration and equity of treatment for both employers and workers.

The analysis presented by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF A BILL TO AMEND THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938 TO ESTABLISH A $1.25 MINIMUM HOURLY WAGE AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Section 1: Enacting clause and short title.

Section 2: Broadens the findings in the original act to make them applicable to industries affecting commerce in addition to

industries engaged in commerce and in the production of goods for commerce as now provided.

DEFINITIONS

Section 3 (a): Clarifies section 3 (j) by restoring original language of the act so as to include in the definition of "produced" employees employed in "any process or occupation necessary to the production."

Section 3 (b): "Wage" is redefined by adding a proviso excluding from wages the cost of board, lodging, or other facilities paid to an employee if the furnishing of such facilities is an incident of and necessary to his employment and such facilities are practically available only from the employer.

Section 3 (c): The definition of "resale" is deleted.

Section 3 (d): A new subsection is added defining the term "activity affecting commerce."

INDUSTRY COMMITTEES

Section 4: Restores the original requirement under the act that the Secretary appoint an industry committee for each industry to recommend minimum rates of wages. Authority is continued for the appointment of special industry committees for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

MINIMUM WAGES

Section 5: Extends minimum-wage provisions to employees of employers engaged in any activity affecting commerce and increases the minimum wage from 75 cents to $1.25. This section also provides for higher rates if prescribed by the Secretary upon recommendation of industry committees. The provisions affecting Puerto Rico are amended to provide fixed minima beginning with 80 cents and increasing 5 cents each year until the minimum wage reaches $1.05, and to provide also that a higher rate not in excess of $1.25 may be prescribed as a result of industry committee recommendations. Piece-rate practices in Puerto Rico are continued without change.

A new paragraph is added to provide that a seaman must receive no less than a wage equal to compensation at the minimum hourly rate for all hours excluding off-duty periods.

MAXIMUM HOURS

Section 6 (a): Extends application of the overtime provisions of the act to employees of employers whose activities affect commerce.

Section 6 (b): Continues the overtime exemption for guaranteed-wage agreements but makes the exemption apply only to agreements for 52 consecutive weeks. A new condition requires that employees receive compensation at a rate of no less than time and one-half for hours over 10 daily and 48 weekly.

There is also added a proviso to make the operation of the exemption more flexible by providing that if the guaranty is exceeded the employee must be paid time and one-half for hours in excess of 8 daily and 40 weekly.

The exemption for seasonal industries (7 (c)) is deleted.

Section 6 (c): The overtime exemption now contained in section 7 (c) for certain processing of agricultural, dairy, and livestock products is deleted.

Section 6 (d): The overtime exemption contained in section (d) (3) relative to talent fees paid to performers is continued, and the overtime exemption relating to bonuses is deleted.

Section 6 (e): The overtime exemption for employees subject to "Belo" contracts is deleted.

Section 6 (f): The provision permitting time and one-half to be computed on an agreed basic rate as authorized by regulations of the Secretary is deleted.

WAGE ORDERS

Section 7: New subsection. Provides that it is the policy of this act to reach as rapidly as economically feasible the objective of a universal minimum wage of $1.50 an hour by means of wage orders issued by the Secretary upon recommendation of industry committees. Rates for employees in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, by proviso, are required to conform to section 6 (a) (2) of the act which establishes a wage order ceiling of $1.25 for such employees.

CHILD LABOR

Section 8: Amends section 12 (e) to extend coverage to include a prohibition against employment of oppressive child labor, by an employer engaged in any activity affecting commerce, in or about an establishment where he is so engaged.

EXEMPTIONS

Section 9: Deletes from section 13 (a) the following exemptions now contained in the act:

Section 13 (a) (4): Processing goods in retail establishments.

Section 13 (a) (8): Newspapers.

Section 13 (a) (9): Street railways.

Section 13 (a) (10): Processing and handling of agricultural and dairy products.

Section 13 (a) (11): Switchboard operators.

Section 13 (a) (12): Taxicab operators.

Section 13 (a) (13): Telegraph offices in retail establishments.

Section 13 (a) (14): Seamen on American vessels.

Section 13 (a) (15): Lumbering and forestry.

The remaining paragraphs of 13 (a) are redesignated and amended to provide as follows:

Section 13 (a) (1) is amended to provide that employees in an executive, administrative, or professional capacity must be paid at a rate of $6,000 per annum or more to qualify for exemption under definitions issued by the Secretary.

Section 13 (a) (2) is amended to limit the retail, service exemption to employees in an establishment of an employer having four or less establishments which have a total annual volume of sales or servicing or not more than $500,000.

Section 13 (a) (3) is amended to limit the exemption in laundering, cleaning, or repairing establishments to employees of employers having four or less establishments which have a total annual volume of sales or servicing of not more than $500,000.

Section 13 (a) (4) amends exemption for fishing (now 13 (a) (5)) to eliminate packing, marketing, storing, freezing, or distributing of fish and related products.

Section 13 (a) (5) exempts seamen who are not employed on American vessels.

Section 13 (a) (6) amends present exemption for employees in agriculture by excluding employees on industrial farms.

Section 13 (a) (7) reenacts without change the exemption for learners and others who are subject to lower minimum wages in accordance with regulations of the Secretary under section 14 of the act.

Section 13 (b) is amended to provide that the overtime provisions of section 7 will not apply to carriers and other specified employers subject to part I of the Interstate Commerce Act or to employees of air carriers, or to any seaman on an American vessel. Eliminated from the present section is the overtime exemption for employees of motor carriers, employees of pipelines, employees canning fish, and outside buyers of poultry, eggs, milk, and cream.

Section 13 (c) is amended to provide that children who are not exempt as employees in agriculture under 13 (a) (6) may not be exempt even when employed outside of school hours.

Section 13 (d) which exempts newsboys is deleted.

LEARNERS, APPRENTICES, AND HANDICAPPED WORKERS

Section 10: Deletes "messengers" from the categories of employees who are subject, through regulation under section 14, to rates lower than the statutory minimum.

PENALTIES

Section 11 (a): Amends section 16 (a) to permit imprisonment for first offenses of persons who willfully violate the act, and retains provisions for a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for 6 months or both.

Section 11 (b): Amends section 16 (c) to permit the Secretary, where authorized in writing, to sue on behalf of an employee to recover back wages and an additional equal amount as liquidated damages. The amendment also eliminates the vague provision which places a limitation on jurisdiction of cases which involve an issue of law not finally settled by the courts. It also deletes the 2-year statute of limitations.

INJUNCTION PROCEEDINGS

Section 12: Amends section 17 by deleting the proviso which prohibits courts, in suits brought by the Secretary to restrain violations, from ordering the payment of back wages and liquidated damages.

STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

Section 13: New section. Provides for a 6-year statute of limitations applicable to all actions arising under the act and repeals the 2-year limitation in such suits as contained in the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Section 14: Provides that the amendments shall take effect 30 days from the date of enactment.

THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT LIMITING CONGRESSIONAL POWER TO TAX INCOMES, INHERITANCES, AND GIFTS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in January 1953 the Honorable CHAUNCEY W. REED, of Illinois, introduced in the House and I introduced in the Senate a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the power of Congress to tax incomes, inheritances, and gifts—House Joint Resolution 103 and Senate Joint Resolution 23.

This amendment would limit income taxes to a maximum rate of 25 percent, but would permit Congress by a vote of three-fourths of the Members of each House to exceed that rate at any time without limit. Where the top rate exceeded 25 percent, however, it could be no more than 15 percentage points above the bottom rate. For example, if the bottom rate were 15 percent, the top rate could not exceed 30 percent. If the bottom rate were 20 percent, the top rate could not exceed 35 percent. If the top rate did not exceed 25 percent, however, there would be no restriction at all on the bottom rate. It could, for example, be 1 percent, or one-half of 1 percent.

This amendment would also deprive Congress of the power to impose death and gifts taxes, and would leave these means of raising revenue exclusively to the States, where they belong, and competition among the States would tend to keep the rates within reasonable bounds.

Representative REED and I are introducing this joint resolution again this year.

The proposed amendment has met with wide approval. Important national organizations have endorsed it, including the American Bar Association, the American Legion, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Western Tax Council, the Committee for Constitutional Government, the Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, the National Economic Council, and the National Small Business Men's Association.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of this amendment. Its objective is to save our American incentive system, commonly spoken of as the private-enterprise system, on which our very form of government depends.

Our present system of taxation, with its heavy progressive income and inheritance taxes, will eventually destroy this system and result in the substitution of some form of socialism.

Karl Marx, in his Communist Manifesto of 100 years ago, fully recognized the importance of these taxes as a means of destroying the private-enterprise system by including in the 10 planks in his platform the following:

First. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.

Second. Abolition of all right of inheritance.

For the past two decades the Federal Government has been following the course prescribed by Marx by imposing a heavy progressive or graduated income tax, and while not abolishing the right of inheritance, the Federal Government has been increasing the rates of the death tax until the top rate is now 77 percent.

The progression in income tax rates from the beginning rate of 20 percent on incomes of $2,000 and under to 91 percent on incomes of more than $200,000 is progression of a most extreme character. It not only confiscates the larger incomes, but it bears most heavily on the middle incomes, the group at which Marx particularly aimed in his advocacy of heavy graduated income taxes.

Reason and the experience of other nations, and most recently that of England, demonstrate beyond all question that unless our policy of taxation is changed, the system of society under which this country has prospered and grown great will come to an end and some form of socialism or communism will supplant it.

How, one may ask, will the proposed amendment keep the rates down? The answer is this. The amendment would make it in the interest of every taxpayer, first to keep the top rate down to 25 percent—as compared with the present rate of 91 percent; and, second, to keep the bottom rate no higher than 10 percent—as compared with the present rate of 20 percent. It is expected that the beginning rate will ultimately be much less than 10 percent.

The proposed amendment is just as important for the small taxpayer as for the large. This united self-interest of all taxpayers is relied on as a force that would keep the tax rates within reasonable bounds. There are 66 million individual income-tax payers in the United States. Most of them vote.

It should be noted that the proposed amendment merely limits the degree of tax-rate progression. It does not prescribe the top rate that Congress may impose. Hence, it cannot be argued that the amendment impairs the Government's power to raise needed revenue during either war or peace.

The proposed amendment will reduce the burden of taxation on those with the smaller incomes. A fact not generally realized is that the great bulk of the revenue from the individual income tax comes not from the taxpayers with large incomes, but from those with small incomes. That is so simply because the small incomes, in the aggregate, constitute the bulk of the national income. For example, only 3 percent—about $2 billion—of the total estimated Federal revenue of about $60 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, is produced by the individual income-tax rates above 34 percent, which is 14 percentage points above the present beginning rate of 20 percent.

Contrast these figures with the effect of an increase of only $100 in the present $600 personal exemption and credit for dependents. Such an increase would result in a reduction of 7 million in the number of income-tax payers and a revenue loss of $2.5 billion. This is one-half billion dollars more than the total revenue received from the individual income-tax rates above 34 percent.

Accordingly, if we are to have enormous expenditures and correspondingly large revenue, the great bulk of the revenue must come from persons of small and moderate means.

The only possible way to give relief to the small taxpayers is either (1) by reducing the need for revenue through cutting expenditures, or (2) by increasing revenue through a drastic reduction of the present confiscatory higher bracket rates so as to increase incentive and investment in productive enterprise. This would increase the national income, which constitutes the tax base, and thereby increase the revenue.

Any immediate loss in revenue through the elimination of the higher individual rates would undoubtedly be only temporary. Eventually, the lower rates would produce greater revenue than the higher rates now in force.

That the present confiscatory rates of the individual income tax are not approved by a large majority of the American people is shown by Gallup polls. The vote of those having an opinion was 2 to 1 in favor of a 25 percent top limit in the September 1951 poll, and 3 to 1 in the July 1952 poll.

As I have already stated, the proposed amendment also deprives Congress of the power to impose death and gift taxes and leaves these means of raising revenue exclusively to the States, where they belong, and where competition among the States would tend to keep the rates within reasonable bounds. Under existing laws the tax on the estates of decedents runs to a high of 77 percent, and the tax on gifts to 57.75 percent. These rates are manifestly confiscatory, and they have very harmful economic effects. They not only seriously impair the incentive to work, save, and invest in productive enterprise, but they are extremely destructive of capital and, in the long run, will destroy the accumulations of capital that are so necessary for industrial activity and expansion, with the resulting beneficial effects on our economy.

Moreover, the heavy taxation of large estates compels the rich to seek comparatively safe liquid investments in order to provide for the heavy taxes that will be imposed upon their estates at death, thus further reducing the capital available for risky business ventures.

The harm done to the economy by the present high rates of death and gift taxes is out of all proportion to the revenue produced, and cannot be justified by any argument based on fiscal needs. Even with the very high rates now in force, the revenue from these taxes is comparatively trivial. In 1953 it was $891 million from the two sources. This was a little over 1 percent of the total budget of $74 billion—enough to pay the Government's expenses for about 4 days. The gift tax is merely auxiliary to the estate tax, and both should be dealt with alike.

Of particular concern is the destructive effect of the heavy estate taxes on small businesses. The conclusions of the Select Committee on Small Business of the United States Senate in its report published in June 1953 was that "estate taxes often lead to the disappearance of small or medium-sized independent businesses or their merger with the dominant segment of an industry."

Let me add that this statement represents not only my own views but those of Representative REED, who joins me in making the statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 23) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL AMATEUR RADIO WEEK

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, radio amateurs in the United States have made invaluable contributions toward the advancement of radio. In times of emergency, local and national, they have performed essential services to the public by providing a network of communications linking agencies dealing with disasters.

Connecticut is especially conscious of the contribution to the general good made by these men and women, affectionately known as "hams," because the American Radio Relay League, their official organization, has its headquarters in our State, at West Hartford.

In recognition of the services of these radio amateurs, I am introducing in the Senate today, for myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], a joint resolution authorizing the President to

designate 1 week in June of each year as National Amateur Radio Week.

The month of June was selected because during that month each year is held the American Radio Relay League's annual field day in which more than 7,000 amateurs throughout the country set up portable and emergency-powered radio communications in remote areas and man the gear in shifts for 24-hour periods. The purpose is to demonstrate the skill of volunteer amateur radiomen in providing emergency communications service in the event of disaster—military, civil, or natural.

The week of this event would be a most appropriate one for designation as National Amateur Radio Week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 25) authorizing the President to designate one week in June of each year as National Amateur Radio Week, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SEVENTY-FIFTH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF GENERAL MACARTHUR

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, on January 26 of this year one of our great military leaders of all time, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, will celebrate, in Los Angeles, Calif., his 75th birthday. As all of us know, he is a great soldier, scholar, diplomat, and truly one of our Nation's most respected, honored, and deserving sons.

If my memory serves me correctly, Mr. President, this great man has, in behalf of his country, fought against every foe that has attacked the United States during his lifetime. He bears upon his body scars from wounds inflicted by the enemy, from which wounds he has never fully recovered.

This Nation can do little to pay tribute to this man, who has so well succeeded in the profession of arms, but his work, his bravery, his memory will forever remain enshrined in the hearts and minds of free people all over the face of the globe. I beg that the Senate of the United States act promptly upon the joint resolution which I shall send to the desk, which is cosponsored by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. I should like to invite other Senators to join with me in sponsoring the joint resolution, or if any senior Member of this body who has served with the general would care to do so, he may introduce the resolution and I will step down and appear as a cosponsor with him. In any event, I think that the honor proposed by the joint resolution should be bestowed upon the general on the occasion of his 75th birthday or as soon thereafter as is possible.

Mr. President, I could speak at length with respect to General MacArthur, who has dedicated his life to the cause of making freedom live, but I only say in conclusion that the heroic deeds, the skill and bravery of General MacArthur as one of the great leaders of military science and tactics on numerous fields of bloody combat, and his statesmanship and exemplary life—all dedicated to the saving of his country—will be emblazoned on the pages of the history of this Nation and their memory will live forever in the hearts and minds of his countrymen, who will say, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Mr. President, I now introduce the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 26) to authorize the appointment of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur as General of the Armies of the United States, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That in recognition of the great services to his country rendered by General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, the President is hereby authorized to appoint General of the Army Douglas MacArthur to the office of General of the Armies of the United States (which office is hereby revived for this purpose), such appointment to take effect as of the 75th anniversary of his birth, January 26, 1955. No change in compensation or allowances shall occur by reason of the appointment authorized by this joint resolution.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey subsequently said: Mr. President, I am advised that while I was absent from the room my distinguished colleague from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] introduced a joint resolution in commemoration of the birthday of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to cosponsor the joint resolution with the Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the name of the Senator from New Jersey will be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution.

Mr. BUTLER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to join as a cosponsor of the joint resolution offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the name of the Senator from Maryland will be added as a cosponsor.

PROPOSED ANNUAL ADDRESS BY THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES ON THE STATE OF THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BUTLER submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 4), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That upon the beginning of each regular session of the Congress the Chief Justice of the United States shall be invited to address the Congress with respect to the state of the judicial branch of the Government, and upon his acceptance of the invitation a joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives shall be convened to hear his address as soon as may be practicable after the delivery by the President of his state of the Union address to the Congress.

Mr. KILGORE (for himself and Mr. WILEY) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 5), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That as soon as practicable after the beginning of each regular session of the Congress, the Chief Justice of the United States shall be invited to address the Congress with respect to the state of the judiciary and related matters. Upon his acceptance of the invitation, a joint session of the Senate and of the House of Representatives shall be convened to hear his address at a suitable time after the delivery by the President of his state of the Union message to the Congress.

BICENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF MIGRATION OF ACADIANS FROM NOVA SCOTIA TO LOUISIANA

Mr. LONG (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Whereas this year marks the 200th anniversary of the migration of the Acadians from Nova Scotia and their journey to find refuge and haven in Louisiana and other areas; and

Whereas this exodus, immortalized in Longfellow's poem Evangeline parallels the landing of the Pilgrims in America and their quest for freedom, independence, and the pusuit of happiness; and

Whereas the original Acadian settlers vigorously participated in the early development of Louisiana, and they and their descendants have contributed in full measure to the history, culture, character, and way of life of the people of that great State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States joins the people of Louisiana in commemorating the bicentennial anniversary of the migration of the Acadians from Nova Scotia to Louisiana and other areas, and pays tribute to their spirit of courage, perseverance, and loyalty that has inspired the Nation.

SEC. 2. A copy of this resolution, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, shall be transmitted to the Acadian Bicentennial Celebration Association.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 33), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the administration of the civil-service system by the Civil Service Commission and other agencies of the Government, and to report to the Senate not later than January 31, 1956, the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized until January 31, 1956, to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution,

which shall not exceed $75,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF MERCHANT MARINE TRAINING AND EDUCATION

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, the United States merchant marine has frequently been referred to as the fourth arm of our Defense Establishment. Its importance to our Nation cannot be overestimated. In peacetime it transports our exports overseas and brings back raw materials and imports. In wartime it carries men and supplies to far-off theaters of operation.

When we think of the merchant marine we first think of ships and only too frequently forget the crews which man those ships. Without trained and experienced crews the most modern merchant fleet would be useless.

Since 1911 the Federal Government has given financial assistance to the States which maintain maritime training academies. At the present time the States of Maine, Massachusetts, New York, and California are operating maritime training academies in addition to the Federal academy at Kings Point, N. Y.

In the budget recommendations for fiscal year 1956 Federal assistance to the State academies has been entirely eliminated. Funds for Kings Point have been increased. The budget refers to an "extended study of Federal, State, and industry responsibilities for maritime training" which has supposedly been made but which has not been released. Because of the importance to our Nation of an adequate merchant marine training program, it is believed that a thorough study should be made by Congress itself of our whole maritime training program to determine what the future manpower needs of the merchant marine are going to be and what the best method is for meeting those needs. There is a real question as to whether or not the Federal Government should itself train personnel for what is essentially a private industry. There is considerable indication that the training at the State academies is as good as the training at the Federal academy and that the cost is much less at the State academies. The maritime unions have long maintained that an adequate number of officers can be obtained from the ranks and all the training programs eliminated.

The policy questions involved in this issue are too important to the commerce and defense of our Nation to allow them to be decided without thorough congressional review. I shall join with other interested parties in supporting continuation of funds for the State maritime academies until Congress has had an opportunity to study this matter very carefully. In order to provide for an adequate study, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution to authorize the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make a full and complete study and investigation of merchant marine training and education in the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 35) was received and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of merchant marine training and education in the United States, including the status, cost, and training at the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., and at the State-operated merchant marine academies, the training of merchant seamen, and the future personnel needs of the merchant marine as it relates to the national defense.

The committee shall determine the scope of such study and investigation. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable, to the Senate not later than January 31, 1956.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the 84th Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such experts, consultants, and other employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties, and is authorized with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government of the United States. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SPECIAL REPORT OF FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BOARD (S. DOC. NO. 7)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a special report of the Federal Farm Credit Board to the Congress, pursuant to section 2 of the Farm Credit Act of 1953, printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CONTROL OF NARCOTIC DRUGS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, on January 14, 1955, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 19, a joint resolution to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs. At that time 42 other Senators joined me as cosponsors of the proposed legislation. The Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] have since joined the list of cosponsors.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that when Senate Joint Resolution 19 is next printed the names of the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Statement made by him in an address before the Alexandria (Va.) Kiwanis Club on January 20, 1955, on the subject of the complex situation in the East.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATIONS TO THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, January 24, 1955, at 10 a. m., in room 301, Senate Office Building, upon the following nominations: Glen E. Edgerton, of the District of Columbia, to be President of the Export-Import Bank; Lynn U. Stambaugh, of North Dakota, to be First Vice President of the Export-Import Bank; Hawthorne Arey, of Nebraska, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank; George A. Blowers, of Florida, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank; and Vance Brand, of Ohio, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank.

At the time and place all persons interested in the nominations may make such representations as may be pertinent.

NOTICE OF HEARING BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY ON SUNDRY NOMINATIONS

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

John Marshall Harlan, of New York, to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, Vice Robert H. Jackson, deceased.

Edward J. Devitt, of Minnesota, to be United States district judge for the district of Minnesota—recess appointment.

William E. Miller, of Tennessee, to be United States district judge for the middle district of Tennessee, to fill a new position.

M. Frank Reid, of South Carolina, to be United States marshal for the western district of South Carolina—recess appointment.

Philip L. Rice, of Hawaii, to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, Territory of Hawaii, Vice Louis Le Baron, whose term has expired.

George Glenn Killinger, of Virginia, to be a member of the board of parole for the term expiring September 30, 1960. Dr. Killinger is now serving in this

post under an appointment which expired September 30, 1954.

Russell B. Wine, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the western district of Texas, vice Charles F. Herring, resigned.

Notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee on or before Friday, January 28, 1955, any representations or objections in writing they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled later.

Following the receipt of such representations or objections the committee will consider such, and at its next meeting scheduled for Monday, January 31, 1955, determine and have published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the date, or dates, on which hearings on any of these nominations will be held.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO INCREASE SALARIES OF UNITED STATES JUDGES, JUSTICES, AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 25, 1955, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on S. 165, S. 462, and S. 540, designed to increase the salaries of United States judges, Justices, and Members of Congress. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the proposed legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER].

Mr. President, I have just placed in the RECORD a notice of hearing by a special subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary on legislation relating to increase in salary of justices and judges of the United States courts, and Members of Congress. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and myself, chairman; and the hearing has been scheduled for 10 a. m. Tuesday, January 25, 1955, in room 424, Senate Office Building. The bills which are to be the subject of this hearing are S. 462, introduced by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]; S. 540, introduced by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]; and S. 165, which I introduced.

The subcommittee has notified interested parties, so that their presence or views may be submitted for study by the subcommittee.

As Senators know, the late Senator McCarran introduced S. 1663 in the 83d Congress to accomplish salary increases. That proposed legislation was reported favorably to the Senate on May 12, 1953, but no action was taken thereon.

Pursuant to Public Law 220, 83d Congress, 1st session (S. 2417), which was introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], a commission on judicial and congressional salaries was authorized to hold hearings on this subject. Such hearings were held, and the recommendations of that commission are contained in House Document No. 300, 83d Congress, 2d session.

The subject of salary increases has been under extensive study during the past Congress, and it is hoped that these hearings will resolve the matter so that the Committee on the Judiciary may, if justified, present to the Senate proposed legislation which is in accord with all of the known facts on the subject.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a few moments ago we heard the opening prayer in which we were led by our guest chaplain, Father Kohut. This was a signal and appropriate recognition of the fact that tomorrow is Ukrainian Independence Day.

I have prepared a statement in commemoration of this most significant occasion. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

Tomorrow, January 22, the anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian Independence in 1918, will be observed, in the traditional manner, in many cities and towns throughout the United States. This year's theme for this observance is the reaffirmation of the goal of eventual liberation for all the peoples in the enslaved nations behind the Iron Curtain.

From Kiev southward and westward, throughout the reach and extent of the rich lands of the Ukraine, the 40 million Ukrainian people have valiantly endured the Soviet tyranny, awaiting the day of their liberation.

The people of the Ukraine, and all the peoples of Europe who have been engulfed by the surging tide of Soviet imperialism, must be liberated not by destruction, but by construction—by the construction of a free world order which will rend the Iron Curtain by the sheer and irresistible power of the forces of freedom.

True and lasting liberation cannot be accomplished by atom or hydrogen bombs. Liberation, in the true sense of the word, must be achieved by general peace. Peace, not war, is the true ally of freedom.

War in the modern sense cannot result in good for any nation or any people. It may in the end prove inevitable and we must be constantly prepared for any eventuality. But no nation, in this day and age, can truly benefit by it.

In this day and age, when the gathered force of public opinion, and of world opinion, exerts so powerful an influence on the course of history, no iron curtain, however strong, no slave state, however high its gates, and however powerful its masters, will be able to survive the persistent onslaught of the world's will for freedom.

Just as the walls of Jericho crumbled at the sound of Joshua's trumpets 5,000 years ago, just as surely will the iron curtain fall under the rays of freedom's piercing light. It cannot be otherwise. It will not be otherwise. This is our faith and our creed.

The Ukrainian people have, I know, lived through many a long night of savage oppression in the course of their troubled history. They have felt as many centuries of pain and enslavement as any people on earth.

It is my conviction that such tyranny will not be able to endure in a peaceful world. The chains of slavery will bend and break like clay, once they are exposed to the irresistible strains of peace.

On this Ukrainian independence day we Americans of all national origins, but of one creed, the creed of freedom, salute the people of the Ukraine and especially salute those of Ukrainian birth and descent in this country. Today we prayerfully rededicate ourselves to the cause of peace and freedom. We are aware today as never before that we ourselves are not truly free as long as any peoples remain enslaved.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, it is most appropriate that the Very Reverend Nicholas Kohut should pronounce the invocation today.

On this occasion of the observance of the independence of Ukraine, I extend warm greetings to my fellow citizens of Ukrainian descent.

Over many years it has been my privilege to become intimately acquainted with the great contributions to freedom being made by Ukrainian organizations throughout our country. By rallying the anti-Communist forces here and abroad, they are keeping alive the fervent hope for freedom in the enslaved lands of Central and Eastern Europe. The peoples of the Soviet Union, who have borne the yoke of tyranny for many decades, must eventually regain their independence and join the free nations of the world.

It is most essential that efforts to bring about the freedom of the people of Ukraine be pressed ceaselessly and unrelentingly.

THE "OIL FOR EDUCATION" BILL

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the American people were told by Secretary McKay this week that at least $6 billion would accrue to the Federal Treasury from the sale of offshore oil leases and from royalties.

Secretary McKay has finally conceded the enormous amounts of the oil revenues, which belong to all the people of the United States. However, he has consistently failed to propose or support any constructive plan for putting these revenues to work for the welfare of all the American people.

I sincerely hope that the administration will now come around to support the proposal to earmark those oil revenues for the benefit of the school children of our Nation. During the past 2 years we have waited in vain for action pointing to the solution of the crisis in our schools—the dire shortage of school facilities and of teachers.

The President spoke in his state of the Union speech of moving to meet this crisis, but the budget message does not reflect any real intention to channel Federal funds to aid our distressed elementary and secondary schools.

The sum of 6 billion dollars, which Secretary McKay predicted would come into the Federal Treasury from the oil lands in the Outer Continental Shelf over the next several years, would go

only a part of the way toward providing the facilities necessary for an adequate education for our children. But it would be a meaningful indication of the concern our Government should have for our school system.

The American people remember all too clearly the giveaway of the oil and gas deposits within the so-called Inner Continental Shelf. Certainly the administration could atone in part for its record by supporting the "oil for education" bill introduced by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], our distinguished colleague, and a number of other Senators, including, I am proud to say, myself.

It is my hope that Congress will approve the "oil for education" proposal during this session.

Mr. President, I desire now to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York has the floor.

CEASE-FIRE PROPOSAL IN THE FORMOSAN STRAITS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I was very much interested in the statement by President Eisenhower on Wednesday night indicating his support for a cease-fire move in the Formosan Straits by the United Nations. It is interesting to note that the American Association for the United Nations made this same proposal in a statement presented to the United States delegation to the General Assembly as far back as September 19, 1954. It is also noteworthy that the Honorable Benjamin V. Cohen, former counselor of the State Department, advanced this same idea in a speech delivered before the Washington Ethical Society on October 24, 1954.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that pertinent excerpts from these two documents be printed in the body of the RECORD. I also ask, Mr. President, that a very cogent and absorbing memorandum on this whole subject prepared by Mr. Cohen, who is one of the most noted experts on international affairs and international law in our country, be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM U. N. DAY SPEECH BY HON. BENJAMIN V. COHEN BEFORE WASHINGTON ETHICAL SOCIETY, OCTOBER 24, 1954.

There has been fighting in the straits of Formosa. That fighting threatens our peace and the peace of the world. That fighting which in fact threatens a major international war cannot be passed by as a matter of essentially domestic concern. It is a matter of vital concern to the peace of the world and to the United Nations. But we cannot expect the United Nations to act if we ourselves bypass the United Nations and discourage its use. No nation which is unwilling to use the processes of the United Nations has a right to attribute its own failure to use those processes to any alleged ineffectiveness or alleged impotence of the United Nations.

Possibly the Security Council may be unable to act because of the lack of unanimity among its permanent members. But there is no veto in the General Assembly. If we have the courage to put to the test our faith in the United Nations, we should ask the United Nations to demand a cease-fire in the Straits of Formosa. We should be prepared to join in sponsoring a proposal that the United Nations, without regard to the question of recognition, as to which its members are divided, should at once call upon the authorities now in control of the government on the mainland of China and the authorities now in control of the government on Formosa to cease the use of armed force against each other in this area in the interest of world peace.

Then it would become the responsibility of the United Nations to recommend a peaceful settlement of the Formosan question in accordance with the principle of the charter, that is the principles of world peace and security, justice, and the self-determination of peoples. Formosa is today in fact independent of the mainland of China and its future status should be determined by the United Nations having regard to the wishes and interests of the people of Formosa in a manner which will advance and not endanger world peace and security.

There can be no peace in the Straits of Formosa as long as Mao Tse-tung asserts the right to use force to unite Formosa with the mainland or Chiang Kai-shek asserts the right to use Formosa as a base for armed operations against the mainland. The use of force in either case is contrary to the spirit if not the letter of the charter. The only hope for and the only way to peace in the Far East is through the United Nations which alone has the authority and standing to call for a cease-fire. If we continue to bypass the United Nations, we incur the risks of war with grave and unforeseeable consequences and under circumstances which will deprive us of the aid of our best friends and allies in the free world. Formosa is the test not only of our faith in the United Nations but our faith in the ideals which have made us a leader or, as President Eisenhower would have us say, a good partner in the concert of free nations.

We are living through one of the most critical periods in all history. The fission and fusion of the atom gives warning that civilization must rise above war or it will be overwhelmed and destroyed by war. Civilization's hope for survival depends upon the United Nations. With God's help let us reverently and humbly renew our faith in the United Nations and determine, before it is too late, to justify our faith by our works.

EXCERPT FROM STATEMENT PRESENTED TO THE UNITED STATES DELEGATION TO THE UNITED NATIONS BY THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS, SEPTEMBER 19, 1954

IX. FIGHTING IN THE STRAITS OF FORMOSA

There is fighting in the Straits of Formosa. World peace and security are thereby threatened and endangered. It is unquestionably the function of the United Nations to deal with such threats to the peace. It is imperative that this situation be brought at once to the attention of the United Nations. If there is delay as in the case of Indochina, it may be too late for the United Nations to avert conflict and catastrophe.

The Security Council should be asked to act to restore peace and security in this area, and if the Council cannot act, the matter should be brought promptly before the General Assembly. The United States should join in sponsoring or supporting a proposal that the United Nations, without regard to the question of recognition, as to which its members are presently divided, should at once call upon both the authorities now in control of the government on Formosa and the authorities now in control of the government on the mainland of China to cease the use of armed force against each other in this area in the interest of world peace, and further, to accept the proposition that Formosa and the mainland of China shall not be united by force nor without the free consent of the people of Formosa and under conditions approved by the United Nations as consistent with world peace, security, and justice.

MEMORANDUM ON THE PROPOSED MUTUAL DEFENSE TREATY WITH THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

(Prepared by Benjamin V. Cohen)

1. This memorandum raises some questions concerning the desirability of the ratification of the recently negotiated mutual defense treaty with the Republic of China.

It should be stated at the outset that this memorandum does not question (1) the vital importance to the United States of having Formosa and the Pescadores remain in friendly hands, or (2) the policy of defending these islands from unprovoked armed attack. The purpose of the memorandum is to consider whether the proposed mutual defense treaty on balance will aid or embarrass the United States in protecting its vital interests in Formosa and the Pescadores, in deterring any armed attack on these islands, and in opposing such attack if it occurs.

2. The proposed mutual defense treaty, if ratified, would for the first time constitute a formal recognition of Formosa and the Pescadores as territories of the Republic of China. Heretofore, the United States has been careful to avoid any formal recognition of the transfer of these islands to China and to reserve a high degree of freedom in regard to its position on the future status of these islands. Under the Japanese Peace Treaty Japan gave up all claim to these islands but no attempt was made to define their present or future status.

It is true that the Cairo declaration, which was reaffirmed in the Potsdam proclamation, asserted the purpose of the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, and Nationalist China to restore Formosa and the Pescadores to the Republic of China. But such purpose has not yet been carried out by any duly ratified peace treaty, and much has happened in the meanwhile. The situation has been so altered on the mainland of China as to raise grave doubt whether that purpose can now be carried out, as it was assumed it could be, with due regard to the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the Charter of the United Nations. The mainland of China has become involved in civil war and revolution, and the involvement of Formosa and the Pescadores in that civil war and revolution was neither foreseen nor contemplated at the time of the Cairo declaration. Such enforced involvement without regard to the wishes and interests of the people of these islands could not be reconciled with the principles of self-determination.

3. The formal recognition of Formosa and the Pescadores as territories of the Republic of China would give substance to the claim of the Chinese Communists that an armed attack on these islands is not international aggression on their part but civil war in which the right and purpose of other nations forcibly to intervene would be open to serious doubt and question. Formosa and the Pescadores are in fact at present separate and independent of the mainland of China. It would seem to be very definitely not only in the interest of the United States but in the interest of peace to keep them separate and independent and not to enmesh them inextricably with the rights and claims of the mainland of China. It has been stated in the press that Chiang Kai-shek has given assurances that he would not engage in provocative attacks on the mainland, but such assurances are not found in the text of the treaty. Indeed it would be very awkward by treaty to impose restraints on the exercise of sovereign rights

in China proper by any government claiming to be the lawful government of all China. Assurances outside the text of the treaty will be subject to debate, shifting executive interpretations and waivers. A China whose rights to Formosa and the Pescadores are recognized, cannot be expected to forswear its rights to the mainland of China. But what is more important, a China which controls the mainland will most assuredly assert its rights to Formosa and the Pescadores if those islands are formally recognized as territories of China. What we recognize as territories of Chiang's China, other countries including our allies which recognize Mao's China, may feel compelled to recognize as territories of Mao's China.

4. The formal recognition of Formosa and the Pescadores as territories of the Republic of China will gravely embarrass if not preclude efforts by the United States and by the United Nations to consider in the future any status for Formosa and the Pescadores other than as territories of the Republic of China. But it would seem very unwise for the United States at this time, with the mainland of China under Communist control, to tie its hands so that it would not be free to consider an independent status or possibly even a United Nations trusteeship for these islands if such alternatives should prove feasible and advantageous. Since Communist control of the mainland of China is not likely to be broken for some time, it would seem to be in the interest of the United States to favor and work for the separation of Formosa and the Pescadores from the mainland at least for the time being. Any treaty which inseparably ties these islands to the mainland would seem to be detrimental to the interests of the United States in this area.

5. Most of our friends and allies want to have peace not war in the straits of Formosa. It would probably be possible to evoke wide support in the United Nations and throughout the free world for the calling of a cease-fire by the United Nations in the straits of Formosa. Many nations, including nations which have recognized Red China, probably could be induced to support a cease fire which would preclude the uniting of Formosa and the Pescadores with the mainland by force. It would therefore seem to be in the interest of the United States to separate Formosa and the Pescadores from the power struggle for control of the mainland of China and to base our position on the United Nations Charter which forbids the use of force in international relations and calls for peaceful settlement of international disputes and the right of self-determination of peoples. This would seem to be the best if not the only way of harmonizing our positions and that of our friends and allies and of avoiding grave risks of becoming involved in war without their support and assistance. This would not involve the dispossession of Chiang from Formosa unless the people of Formosa insisted on it. It would seem that Chiang would have a better chance to retain the favor of the people of Formosa if he did not involve them in war with the mainland.

6. In his statements in support of the proposed mutual-defense treaty with the Republic of China (Department of State, press release No. 686, December 1, 1954), Mr. Dulles contends that this treaty is similar to the defense treaties made with the Republic of Korea, Japan, the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand, and he particularly stresses the similarity between the Korean Treaty and the proposed treaty. But there are vital differences in the situations with which the two treaties deal.

Our recognition of the Republic of Korea on January 1, 1949, was based on the United Nations General Assembly resolution of December 12, 1948, which declared "that there has been established a lawful government (the government of the Republic of Korea) having effective control and jurisdiction over that part of Korea where the temporary Commission was able to observe and consult and in which great majority of the people of all Korea reside; that this government is based on elections which were a valid expression of the free will of the electorate of that part of Korea and which was observed by the temporary Commission; and that this is the only such government in Korea."

Mr. Dulles does not mention the practical limitations which we have placed on our recognition of the Republic of Korea when he states that "we recognize the Republic of China as the only lawful government of China, just as we recognize, and the United Nations recognizes, the government of the Republic of Korea as the only lawful government in Korea." We and the United Nations have never recognized the right of the Republic of Korea to extend its effective control and jurisdiction by force to other parts of Korea, and it is clear therefore that any attempt on the part of the Republic of Korea to do so by force would be contrary to article 1 of the mutual defense treaty which forbids the use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

It is not at all clear that any attempt by the Republic of China to extend its effective control and jurisdiction from Formosa to the mainland of China would be contrary to article 1 of the mutual defense treaty with the Republic of China.

Asked whether the treaty recognized on our behalf the claim of the Republic of China to sovereignty over the mainland, Mr. Dulles replied that "it does not deal specifically with that matter one way or another." Asked whether there is any understanding in connection with this treaty that the Chinese nationalists before attacking the mainland must consult with us and act only by agreement with us, Mr. Dulles replied that "we expect that there will be worked out practical arrangements so that neither will take action in this area which would jeopardize the other and that we would generally act in an agreed pattern of conduct. Having undertaken to defend the islands, we would not expect, nor would the Chinese Nationalists expect to act rashly in a way to jeopardize the islands. We anticipate that under the operation clause of the treaty there will be a good deal of consultation and agreement as to just how the situation is to be handled.

Mr. Dulles' remarks in no way suggest that an attack on the mainland by the Chinese Nationalists from Formosa would be contrary to article I of the treaty. Mr. Dulles' remarks in no way suggest that the policy announced in the state of the Union message of 1953 regarding noninterference by the Seventh Fleet with attacks on the mainland by the Chinese Nationalists from Formosa has in principle been abandoned.

To make the proposed treaty at all comparable with the Korean treaty it would have to be amended, or subjected to reservations, to make clear that the Republic of China in Formosa and the Pescadores would not attempt to extend its effective control and jurisdiction by the use of force from areas now thereunder to areas not now thereunder, and that any such attempt would be regarded as contrary to article I of the treaty.

7. While there may be countervailing arguments, the above considerations would seem to suggest that the proposed mutual defence treaty with the Republic of China, in its present form, would on balance embarrass rather than aid the United States in protecting its vital interests in Formosa and the Pescadores and in avoiding war in that area. It would seem that the treaty as presented would be more of an obstacle than a help in working for a peaceful settlement in the Formosan Straits in the interests of the United States, the United Nations, the inhabitants of the islands, and world peace. It would seem highly desirable before attempting to agree on any mutual defense treaty for this disturbed area to seek through the United Nations to obtain a cessation of armed hostilities in the waters between the mainland of China and Formosa and the Pescadores so that it will be clear that we are seeking peace and not trying to shield Formosa and the Pescadores while attacks on the mainland are in course of preparation there.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR AN ADEQUATE OVERSEAS INFORMATION PROGRAM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last Tuesday, it was my pleasure to serve as cohost with my distinguished colleague the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] at a luncheon at which Members of the Senate met with the National Committee for an Adequate Overseas Program.

Earlier in the day, this fine group of distinguished private citizens had met with President Eisenhower. He had reemphasized his own keen interest in strengthening the vital program of American information abroad, via radio, press, motion pictures, books, pamphlets, and television media.

Later, at our luncheon meeting, we heard a very heart-warming discussion of the splendid job which is now being performed under the United States Information Agency by Ted Streibert and his able staff. They had incidentally met with the members of this private committee to relate first hand what is being done by the Voice of America and other units.

I commend these private citizens for their interest in taking time out from their busy careers in order to inform themselves and inform others on this vital program.

I send to the desk the text of a statement which I conveyed to the press following the meeting, and a list of the individuals who were present at the luncheon.

I ask unanimous consent that these materials be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as well as other Members of the Senate met this noontime with several distinguished individuals representing the National Committees for an Adequate Overseas United States Information Program.

I believe that this private committee has a most important mission. I welcome its contribution to American thinking on this very important subject.

For too long, official information work has tended to be a "whipping boy," its splendid achievements have not been sufficiently appreciative; its limitations have often been grossly exaggerated. Time and again it has been pulled up by the roots to be "examined."

I feel that the American people must be adequately informed of the need for strengthening not weakening this program. They must be informed of what has been done, and what must be done, in order to help with the battle for the minds of the world in opposing the international Communist conspiracy.

The United States Information Agency is, of course, not in a position to do more than present the essential facts, as requested, regarding its work to the Congress and the people.

However, on this committee, the private individuals, each of whom has an expert background in this field, is in a position—voluntarily—individually and collectively—to help acquaint the American people with the facts and to contribute otherwise to the program.

Moreover, this private committee is in a position to help further encourage the making available of talent from private American industry to the United States Information Program.

Success in our worldwide information effort is dependent upon our continuing to have available the best talent in the American advertising profession, from among America's newspapers, magazines, radio, television, motion pictures, books, and from the public relations profession.

Already, USIA has many such outstanding recruits from private industry.

I want to say, too, that our friends overseas will be glad to know that not only is our United States Government continually engaged in this fine effort for disseminating the truth, but that public-spirited Americans in private life are taking time out from their busy careers—in order to contribute to the effectiveness of this effort. These Americans are doing so, not only in the enlightened interest of America, but because they recognize that we have an obligation and a mission to get across the facts to the free peoples of the world and thus help increase the chances of enduring peace, freedom, and prosperity.

In the U. S. S. R., there could be no such thing as a Private Committee for Overseas Information Programs, because there is no such thing as a private committee, because the people have no share whatsoever in shaping what the government does and because the Government's stock in trade is not truth but lies.

In the United States, however, in a valid government of, by, and for the people, private citizens join voluntarily with their Government—as a team—in helping to achieve the noble objectives of truth, world understanding, and the furtherance of peace.

ATTENDANCE LIST—MEETING WITH NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON OVERSEAS INFORMATION PROGRAM

(Vandenberg room, Senate wing, United States Capitol, January 18, 1955)

MEMBERS OF SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Cohosts: Alexander Wiley (Republican of Wisconsin); Theodore Francis Green, (Democrat of Rhode Island).

Walter George (Democrat of Georgia), chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

H. Alexander Smith (Republican of New Jersey).

Mike Mansfield (Democrat of Montana).

Homer Capehart (Republican of Indiana).

George D. Aiken (Republican of Vermont).

John E. Horne (administrative assistant to Senator Sparkman, of Alabama).

OTHER MEMBERS OF SENATE

Irving Ives (Republican of New York).

Ralph E. Flanders (Republican of Vermont).

Leverett Saltonstall (Republican of Massachusetts).

W. E. O'Brien (administrative assistant to Senator Mundt).

G. E. Lush (administrative assistant to Senator Duff) and David Fuss.

OTHER PUBLIC OFFICIALS

Theodore Streibert, Director, USIA, State Department.

Abbott Washburn, Deputy Director, USIA.

Robert Macy, Chief, International Division, Bureau of Budget.

MEMBERS, NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR ADEQUATE OVERSEAS U. S. INFORMATION PROGRAM

Edward L. Bernays, counsel on public relations. Member, United States Committee on Public Information, WWI, and subsequently with committee at the Paris Peace Conference.

Edward W. Barrett, Former Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs; former editorial director, Newsweek magazine, 1946–50.

S. R. Bernstein, editor, Advertising Age, since 1939.

Leo M. Cherne, executive secretary, the Research Institute of America; since 1939, chairman, International Rescue Committee.

Mrs. Fleur Fenton Cowles, associate editor, Look magazine.

Kate L. Crabtree, director of public relations, General Mills, Inc.; assistant to the publisher, Minneapolis Star, 1934–37.

C. B. Larrabee, chairman of the board, Printers' Ink; and associated with that publication since 1920.

Louis M. Lyons, curator, Rieman Fellowships, Harvard University since 1939.

Charles F. Moore, Jr., director public relations, Ford Motor Co. since 1952.

O. W. Riegel, director, Lee Memorial Journalism Foundation of Washington and Lee University; consultant for State Department on public opinion research and training in Western Germany, 1950.

Paul C. Smith, president of the Crowell-Collier Publishing Co. and editor in chief, Crowell Publications, former editor of San Francisco Chronicle.

Edmund N. Whitman, director of Public Relations, United Fruit Co., director of Pan-American Society of the United States.

Harlan Logan, director, public relations, Corning Glass Works; vice president and general manager, editor, Look, Inc., 1940–46.

MEMBERS OF FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE STAFF

Francis O. Wilcox, chief of staff.

Julius N. Cahn, counsel.

OFFER OF PRIVILEGE OF VISITATION TO AMERICANS IN CHINESE COMMUNIST PRISONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the news dispatches today carry the word that Chou En-lai, the Communist Premier of China, had apparently made an offer, through Mr. Hammarskjöld, that the families of those who had been sentenced to prison might be allowed to visit them.

It is my feeling that this is a part of the normal Communist propaganda effort. It seems to me that if Chou En-lai and the Communist regime of China had any intention of either immediately releasing or releasing in the very near future the American airmen who have been sentenced to prison, both the airmen themselves and their wives, mothers, parents, and families in this country would much prefer that the welcome be in the hometowns of America rather than have members of their families go halfway around the world to visit them in Communist prison cells.

Under those circumstances, I hope that Mr. Hammarskjöld will use his good offices to expedite their release, so that they may be welcomed in their home communities in America.

IMPRISONMENT OF AMERICAN FLIERS IN RED CHINA

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, Secretary Dulles has released a statement that U. N. Secretary-General Hammarskjöld needs more time to win release of the American fliers held by Red China, in violation of the laws of war.

President Eisenhower says Hammarskjöld's efforts are not a failure so long as negotiations are going on.

Our Government is trying to be conciliatory, but our people are not.

The Communists would like nothing better than to carry on their familiar game of negotiating indefinitely in another Panmunjom. They may fool the State Department, but the American people will not be fooled.

The Red Chinese are going to release our fliers, and for only one reason—the American people are angry and determined. The only thing the Communists fear is the wrath of the American people. That wrath will not be appeased by any notes or conferences or pilgrimages to Peiping, whatever our Government may say.

The American people do not want war. They want justice. They will not be put off with talk of their being warmongers. They will not be put off without justice. The Communists know it.

Hammarskjöld cannot get our men freed. The U. N. cannot get our men freed. The notes of our State Department will not get our men freed. They are powerless, and the Communists recognize only power.

The righteous wrath of the American people will free our men because it is a kind of power the Chinese Communists understand.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an editorial entitled "Another Communist Victory," published in the Indianapolis Star of recent date.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANOTHER COMMUNIST VICTORY

Perhaps from a strictly military view the seizure of Yikiangshan Island by the Chinese Communists is not important as Secretary of State Dulles described it. But from the viewpoint of political and diplomatic strategy it is another defeat for the United States and another victory for the Communists. They have, in the eyes of their Asiatic neighbors, defied the might of the United States and gotten away with it.

This Communist victory is the direct result of American policy recently announced by Secretary Dulles. He deliberately left this and the adjacent Tachen Islands out of the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores. Thus he indicated to the Reds that they could take it without opposition from us. What's next, Quemoy? The Tachens? Then what?

Dulles has also announced that he would not object if the U. N. tried to arrange a "cease-fire" between the Chinese Communists and Nationalists. May we be pardoned for the comparison, but we remember that General Marshall tried to arrange just such a cease-fire in 1948. He succeeded so well that the Communists won control of the entire mainland. Any cease-fire arranged by the U. N., many of whose members are openly in favor of admitting Red China and neutralizing Formosa, would only end in the

destruction of Formosa, and with it all hopes of a successful counter-revolution or liberation in China.

Well, what should the United States do? Should we go to war for Yikiangshan? That is neither necessary nor sensible. But there are plenty of things we could have done and could still do to stop Communist aggressions in Asia and elsewhere. They can be done, however, only when the concept of American foreign policy is changed from containment or peaceful coexistence to one of liberation. We must first make it clear that we intend to take the political and diplomatic offensive against communism by openly announcing our aim to help, by every peaceful means, all enslaved people free themselves from communism.

Thus to reorient our policy in Asia and everywhere else, we should first end diplomatic relations with all Communist countries. We should embargo all trade with all Communist countries. We should require those to whom we give financial aid to do the same. We should make it clear that we will resist further Communist aggressions. And we should never tell them the places we will not defend.

In this particular instance, we could announce that if the Red Chinese do not withdraw from Yikiangshan, we will simply sink the island with an atomic bomb. That would certainly prove our intentions. But this sort of thing would not be necessary if we, by other peaceful actions, made it clear to the Communists that we recognize their intention to destroy our civilization and that we are just as determined to aid in the destruction of communism as they are to plot the destruction of freedom.

Right now we are seeing a clear test by the Communists of American intentions. Here the Communists intend to make us abandon the previously announced policy of "liberation" by abandoning in gradual steps the largest major force in existence that might carry out a "liberation" program.

No nation can win any war, cold, hot, or lukewarm, by the continuous strategy of retreat. That has been our strategy so far. And that is why we are still losing.

TRADE WITH THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a statement which I issued on January 19, 1955, on the subject of trade with the Soviet Union.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JENNER

NO TRADE DEALS WITH COMMUNISTS

Secretary of Defense Wilson has testified in approval of the plan to trade American surplus butter and other foods to the Soviet Union in exchange for strategic goods, such as manganese.

This is of course the policy of the State Department and the Foreign Operations Administration. Secretary Wilson and Secretary Humphrey are only window-dressing, to impress Congress.

Trade with Soviet lands has long been the policy of former Secretary Acheson as it has been one of the most important objectives of Moscow since 1945.

The reasons against this policy are overwhelming. The Subcommittee on Internal Security has collected volumes of testimony all pointing to the unquestioned fact that Soviet trade offensives are only one branch of their world political offensive. Much of the most dangerous Communist penetration in the United States was started by Amtorg which had branches reaching into our industry and finance.

Soviet technical and industrial missions in this country during the war were all agents for industrial espionage. Maj. Racey Jordan, among others, has described the quantities of documents they sent back to the Soviet Union by way of Great Falls, Mont.

I can see no gains from this trade to anyone except the Communist rulers.

The people under Soviet rule are starving, cold and bitter. The boasted gains of the Soviet economic system just are not there. Communism has failed again and again at so basic an economic task as maintaining its animal herds. Famine recurs with deadly regularity.

I see no reason why our surplus butter should be sold to the Soviet Union at a discount, until our housewives and their children have all the butter and milk solids they want.

Every kind of trade is a boost for the Soviet political system and its military machine. Every bit of trade helps preserve the only government in the world which seeks to destroy us. Why should we build up their totalitarian power?

During the cold war with Nazi Germany, the British did not permit the smallest item of goods to reach the Nazis, because they knew every smallest item fed the Nazi war machine. We closed the door to every form of Nazi trade by way of South America and Asia.

I have no wish to starve the people of the Soviet Empire, but if their own government starves them, I will not take food from American children to make up the deficit. This is our time to be firm, not soft. The Russian revolution of 1917 was started by women who were furious at standing day after day in queues for food, and not getting any food. If the women start another revolution because they cannot get food, their rebellion will mean less, not more suffering for the people under the Soviet heel.

Supporting all these reasons of policy is the simple fact that we have on our statute books a law prohibiting the importation into the United States of goods produced by forced labor. Senator MALONE and other investigators have pointed out the danger of Soviet sources for strategic materials.

This proposal is bad political policy, bad economic policy, bad military policy, and a specific violation of the law. It is part of the Soviet grand strategy for the cold war. What more do we need to stop this plan?

No marshalling of more or less reluctant Cabinet officers, to testify for trade with the Soviet Union, can alter the fact that this policy is designed, cut, and tailored to help the Soviet leaders weather the bitter discontent at home, while they seduce our business and political leaders to adopt a soft policy toward Soviet attempts to destroy us.

STRENGTHENING OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, concluding his address at the annual convention of the American Federation of Labor, which met in Los Angeles last fall, President Luis Muñoz-Marín, of Puerto Rico, made a most simple but eloquent plea for the continuation and strengthening of technical assistance programs in underdeveloped countries of the world, and for strengthening our war against hunger and want.

This Congress will consider appropriations for the technical assistance programs. It will consider proposals to accelerate our aid programs, as well as proposals to cut them back on a false plea of economy.

I shall shortly offer a Senate resolution requesting the administration to negotiate, in cooperation with the United Nations, the Food and Agricultural Organization, and similar international agencies, a world food and raw materials reserve.

Because the remarks ably and eloquently express the thoughts of peoples, not just on his little island alone, but in underdeveloped nations around the world, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the record, President Marín's closing statement to the American Federation of Labor meeting.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET A LITTLE ISLAND LEAVE THIS THOUGHT

(By Hon. Luis Muñoz-Marín, President of Puerto Rico)

I have presented statistics, and they no doubt have some significance. But you know, as I do, that the deeper meaning of the Puerto Rico story relates to how a vision and a purpose can turn a hopeless people into a dynamic one, and how the dream of abolishing want from among the fated sorrows of humanity can be a very powerful one. Doesn't it seem to be the duty of civilization to unfold the vistas of this dream before the eyes of all the peoples in the underdeveloped areas of the world? In this connection let me express my belief that for us in the Western Hemisphere, a paramount aspect of this duty is to put into high gear the purpose of abolishing want, destitution and ignorance within this generation in the whole American Continent, north and south.

Not only in the American Hemisphere.

But all peoples are living in the terrible shadow of atomic destruction by attack and retaliation. It very likely can be total destruction of civilized life, or life itself. The West is now trying to ward off destruction for itself, and its enemies, by three means: Preparation for atomic defense and retaliation; readiness to meet aggression in a long costly series of little wars; technical and economic aid to many peoples. The one to which the lesser attention is given seems to be the last, and still I believe it to be by far the most important.

Of these, economic organization for an all-out fight against want, not half-heartedly or meagerly, but in a manner to engage deeply the imagination, the hearts and the intelligence of men and women everywhere, is perhaps the only remaining true answer. We might conceivably persuade the Russian people to cooperate in disarmament so as to augment to its true merited proportions the fight against want, but we can hardly hope to persuade the Soviets of this. Shall they then have a veto over this also, over the hope of peoples all over the world to burst the shackles of poverty, and thereby travel the road to permanent peace?

By strengthening the weapons of the economic war against this ancient enemy of man—hunger—want—while maintaining the strongest military defense against his upstart enemy, communism, the greatest threat of all times may be finally averted. Certainly, it will not be more likely to be averted by not doing it. Only it would cost money. It would cost everyone, in and out of the United States, a lot of money in any one of a number of fiscal years. In terms of a fiscal generation, however, instead of a number of fiscal years, it may even save money, besides saving civilization, besides saving the soul of man by his having, in the cruelest dilemma of his life on earth, answered the challenge of God with creativeness instead of destructiveness, while vigilantly on guard against those that would try to destroy him. But whatever the cost, whatever the burden, we should not insist too much or too long in getting survival at cut-rate in a bargain

counter. The survival of civilized mankind is a bargain at any price.

My friends, a little island which is the home of a good and courageous people, leaves this thought with you.

COMMENTS ON THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE RELATING TO FARM PROBLEMS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the New Republic magazine for January 17 carries an article by Dr. C. Clyde Mitchell, head of the agricultural economics department at the University of Nebraska, commenting on the President's message in regard to farm problems.

Dr. Mitchell points out the complete inconsistency of the administration claim that it has eased the forces depressing farm prices while reducing Government purchase of surpluses. In reality, the administration is using deliberate price deflation in the hope that farmers will produce less and thereby reduce surpluses. By continuing to force low prices the administration is certainly reducing farm income and, unfortunately, failing to accomplish reductions in production it predicted.

A year ago we were told that low dairy price supports would straighten out the dairy situation. But the Department of Agriculture went to the House Appropriations Committee the other day for a big increase in the current fiscal year's administrative fund for the Commodity Credit Corporation. It justified the increase from $18 million to $25 million on the basis of increased volume of commodities flowing in and out of the Corporation.

In the case of milk, it revealed that it has revised its estimates of milk products purchases from 650 million pounds during fiscal 1955 up to 1,216 million pounds. Instead of declining, milk production has increased. There are 500,000 more cows being milked than the Department estimated to us a year ago, and production of milk will be 124 billion pounds instead of the 118 billion pounds they estimated.

Except where acreage controls have been put into effect, production has risen and there is no evidence that the administration's crusade to break farm prices has helped reduce production one iota.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article by Dr. Mitchell, which concludes that we must expand farm markets to really solve the farm problem.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPROMISE WON'T WORK

(By C. Clyde Mitchell)

To many listeners, the President's remarks on agriculture gave the impression that American farmers are doing fairly well: "A most significant element in our growing economy is an agriculture that is stable, prosperous, and free." A look at the facts, however, shows that such an impression is incorrect. American agriculture is now neither stable nor prosperous, nor are farmers gaining in freedom. Their earnings for supplying food and fiber to America are down 14 percent since 1951, from $14.5 to $12.5 billion, with a further drop to $12 billion predicted for 1955.

The President stated that the administration's agricultural program has eased the forces depressing farm prices while reducing Government purchases of surpluses and lessening Federal control over farmers. Actually, the reduced price supports authorized by the last Congress will further depress farm incomes. Since these price reductions are the major force the administration is depending upon to reduce surpluses and make production controls less necessary, the President's anticipations are not consistent.

The only way to raise farm income above its present depressed level and at the same time to reduce the surplus is to expand consumption programs at home and abroad. Some of these programs could be self-financing, but most of them would for a time at least require subsidy. They would include an expansion of school-lunch programs threefold, in order to benefit all American students, together with food distribution schemes to maintain at a decent nutritional level the diet of our low-income families, pensioners, unemployed, and the institutionalized. Internationally, they would include export of our wheat and cotton, to help feed and clothe students in schools set up with our help in the rural areas where education is presently unavailable.

The President did mention one depressing factor in the state of our Union—the 28 percent of our farm families who make less than $1,000 per year. The President promises legislation to alleviate "their most pressing concerns." These concerns have by now been studied intensively for two decades. The best answer so far has proved to be a combination of agricultural credit at low interest rates, plus educational supervision to enable low-income farmers to intensify their farm operations and earn a decent living.

Contrary to the President's basic assumption the lower support prices voted last year are not inducing farmers to reduce their production to any significant degree. Hence, production controls cannot be relaxed. On the contrary, relatively few farmers are able to respond to lower prices by reducing production. Although farmers do increase production when prices look good, they cannot decrease when prices head downward; their investments, both in specialized equipment and in skills, are frozen at the higher level.

President Eisenhower will shortly discover that the Government's surplus headaches will, given normal weather, become more serious, and that production controls will have to be made more onerous. Our two major surpluses always threaten to affect other crops not yet surplus, as lands taken out of wheat and cotton are planted to other crops. Twice this administration has backed rigid cross-compliance. It has required, that is, that land taken out of wheat be left idle or planted in crops not threatened with surplus. Both times the administration has backtracked, postponing cross-compliance. The second postponement, made in October, apparently has enabled the President to say, "We * * * look forward * * * to less Federal intrusion into the lives and plans of our farm people." But there is still a great deal of intrusion in the form of production controls, and if the administration persists in trying to force farmers to adjust production downward to present demand, there will be no more. We need to face the fact that American agriculture cannot adjust downward to any significant degree. The only workable course, in both an economic and political sense, is to adjust demand upward as our capacity to produce increases.

THE SANTA MARIA PROJECT IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, during the last Congress I opposed the passage of a bill exempting the Santa Maria project in California from the 160-acre limitation on benefits from the public water supply. At the time I was advised that there was opposition to the measure within the State of California. Regardless, I feel very strongly that the benefits of our public development projects should be widely distributed and not monopolized by a few big landholders or a few big interests of any type.

I recently learned that there has been organized a California Water & Power Users Association, and that included in its membership are the major labor organizations, the California Grange, water-users associations, church groups, and individuals.

This association, meeting in Sacramento on December 20, 1954, adopted a resolution strongly opposing weakening of the 160-acre limitation. Furthermore, it opposed the proposal that California buy the Central Valley project from the Federal Government.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the leading article from the California Grange News of January 5, 1955, which reports the California Water & Power Users Association meeting.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATER USERS ASSOCIATION FLAYS MOVE TO KILL 160-ACRE CLAUSE

Vigorous opposition to any move to destroy the 160-acre clause in the Federal reclamation law was expressed by officers and executive committeemen of the California Water & Power Users Association at a special meeting in Sacramento December 20.

The group empowered its president, State Master George Sehlmeyer, to draw up a resolution stating their grave concern over efforts to change the limitation rule and to include a clause protesting any move by the Interior Department to sell Pine Flat Dam on the Kings River near Fresno.

A resolution which had been prepared by the Reverend James L. Vizzard of the Santa Clara diocese of the Catholic Church for the National Catholic Rural Life Conference was endorsed by the association. It read in part:

"We condemn any ill-conceived administrative interpretation contrary to the clear intent of the law, which, if allowed to stand, would establish a precedent destructive to the well-established tradition of widespread distribution of the benefits of reclamation projects."

A second resolution which the association authorized to be drawn up would put the California Water & Power Users Association on record as opposed to the purchase of the Central Valleys project by the State.

This resolution will urge the legislature to abandon the idea of purchasing Central Valleys project, pointing out that unless such action is taken it will result in blocking any appropriations by the Federal Government for Federal funds in developing water and power resources in the Central Valleys.

Between now and its next meeting in January, the committee plans to begin preparing extensive plans for its 1955 program, including a vigorous membership drive.

In the meantime, a steering committee has been named to serve until then consisting of Sehlmeyer; Ernest McMillan, of the railroad brotherhoods; Charles F. Lambert, of Williams; John Thorne, president of the Santa Clara County Water Users Association; and Father James L. Vizzard of the Santa Clara diocese of the Catholic Church.

The committee requested Lambert and former Senator H. E. Dillinger, of Eldorado County, to represent the organization during the forthcoming session of the legislature.

Charles Lambert, who was recently elected a member of the executive committee, was seated during the session.

CONCLUSION OF HOSTILITIES BETWEEN NICARAGUA AND COSTA RICA

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I am sure it has afforded all of us a great deal of satisfaction to learn that the recent hostilities in Costa Rica apparently have been ended, and that this threat to peace and prosperity in our hemisphere has been successfully met. From all reports, bloodshed was held to a minimum in this Central American fracas, for which we are all thankful.

There are grounds for apprehension about this or any other small war. We know that as a small brush fire can spread very quickly and almost without warning become a conflagration, so a small war may spread until it involves the whole world. It was such a small and seemingly insignificant clash which started World War I.

In Central America the outbreak of hostilities seemed to stem entirely from a personality clash between two individuals. We have known for some time of the personal antagonism between General Somoza, the head of the Government of Nicaragua, and President Figueres, of Costa Rica.

This little war should never have been allowed to get underway in the first place, and now that it is ended, we can see that not only has nothing been accomplished, but that there was never even any hope or thought of accomplishment. What it has done is to set back by years the earnest efforts of all those who have sought to translate into reality the noble theory of the good-neighbor policy.

It was a setback to the development of warm friendship and genuine understanding which so many conferences have engendered; it has negated assurances of stability and security with which our hemisphere leaders have sought to encourage investors in a sound development program. What we have done is slip on a Central American banana and slide back down the hill which now we must essay to climb again.

There is one encouraging aspect, however, to the favorable outcome of these hostilities, and that is the demonstration that our Western Hemisphere counterpart of the U. N., the Organization of the American States, can and will intervene promptly and effectively when a threat to peace in our part of the world occurs.

It appears likely that the success of the OAS in halting the fighting the Costa Rica-Nicaragua dispute was due largely to the fact that this Organization was able to serve and did serve as a police force going into action to quell a public disturbance. It was a hastily contrived Organization which went into action, but it seems to have been effective largely because it had behind it the force of hemisphere opinion as well as the force of arms.

In my opinion, this situation points up the need for the creation in the future of a standby and ready Western Hemisphere policy force available to go wherever the alarm sounds, to put down hostilities and to force in this hemisphere the settlement of disputes by peaceful means and in the forums provided by civilized people, whose intelligence and vision are ever increasing, and not on battlefields by bloodshed in the manner of barbarians.

In my judgment, we have every reason to be proud of the OAS for its clear vision and sound thinking, and the logical and orderly manner in which it forthrightly approached this problem. We have proof of the soundness of the idea of collective security among friendly nations such as the good neighbors—the United States and the other nations of the Americas—in the Western Hemisphere. In my opinion, the OAS has rendered a great service and has given genuine encouragement and inspiration to those who believe that from our viewpoint the future of western civilization is secure in the hands of the Republics of North and South America.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair announced he would recognize the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] after the completion of the morning business, if there is no further morning business, the Chair will recognize the Senator from Utah, with the request that he permit the Senate to hold a short executive session, if that is agreeable to him.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I hope the Senate may now have an executive session for the consideration of the Executive Calendar. There are Members present in the Chamber this morning who are interested in nominations on the Executive Calendar, and who have deadlines to meet in a very short time.

So, Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance:

David W. Kendall, of Michigan, to be General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury; and

Walter B. Heisel, of Alaska, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 31, with headquarters at Juneau, Alaska.

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Joseph F. Finnegan, of New York, to be Federal Mediation and Conciliation Director.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

George V. Allen, of North Carolina, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

John L. Tappin, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the United Kingdom of Libya;

Henry A. Byroade, of Indiana, now as Assistant Secretary of State, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Egypt;

James C. H. Bonbright, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Portugal, vice M. Robert Guggenheim, resigned;

James Clement Dunn, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Brazil;

Loy W. Henderson, of Colorado, to be Assistant Secretary of State; and

Belton O'Neal Bryan, of South Carolina, and sundry other persons for appointment in the diplomatic service.

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Ervin L. Peterson, of Oregon, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture;

James A. McConnell, of New York, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation, vice Ross Rizley, resigned;

Ervin L. Peterson, of Oregon, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation; and

James A. McConnell, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, vice Ross Rizley, resigned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the executive calendar will be stated.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE—ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert C. Hendrickson, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to New Zealand.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is with a great feeling of gratification and pleasure that I rise in support of this important nomination. For the past 6 years, until the 3d of January, there served in the Senate one of our most distinguished Senators. He has, as we all know, represented my State of New Jersey. The distinguished former Senator, Robert C. Hendrickson, has now been nominated to be Ambassador to New Zealand.

I know of no man better qualified by his life's work, his integrity, his vision, and his devoted sense of public service, to represent the United States in what is today one of the most important and dangerous spots in the world. And, I am happy to record also our deep affection and admiration for his charming wife, who will be his greatest asset in his new responsibilities.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] knows, as well as I do, that the Far East today is in great turmoil and trouble. We all realize, especially those of us who are members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which committee reported the nomination with enthusiasm, that we need men of integrity and vision, and men who will have a deep sense of responsibility in trying to hold together in the Far East those nations,

of which New Zealand is one, that believe in our form of freedom, and have banded together in the interest of combating world communism.

So, Mr. President, with a deep sense of public responsibility, I rise to endorse the nomination. Because of personal friendship with Bob and Olga Hendrickson over many years, including the past 6 years when he was a Senator, I am delighted to see him nominated to this important post. I know there will be no question about his confirmation, but I desire the RECORD to show that, in addition to the wonderful tributes paid to Senator Hendrickson in the last session of Congress for his fine service in the Senate, we are now acting together to confirm his nomination to an important diplomatic position, and to wish him Godspeed in the duties that will lie ahead of him.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is with great pride, as a citizen of New Jersey, and with deep personal satisfaction, that I rise to speak briefly, following the remarks of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], in behalf of confirmation of the nomination of Robert C. Hendrickson as Ambassador of the United States to New Zealand.

Few of his colleagues need any word from me as to his qualifications, his experience, or the great abilities which he brings to this new task.

Therefore, as a representative of my State, and in seconding what my distinguished senior colleague has said, I wish to say that we are very proud that we are able to offer to the service of the Nation one who has so long and so very well served in public office. The good wishes of all residents of New Jersey will go with him and with his lovely wife, as they undertake the new job which I know both of them will perform with great distinction and to the honor and benefit of everyone.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, during the past 6 years I developed a very deep affection and high regard for the distinguished former Senator from New Jersey, Robert C. Hendrickson, now a nominee for the post of Ambassador. He has a very gracious, most devoted, and very lovely wife. I have not the least doubt that if he and his wife shall be sent to New Zealand, they will represent the United States admirably. However, once more, as I did at the time when Mr. Hendrickson appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations, I must object and vote against his nomination.

Once again I want to bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that, under the Constitution of the United States, each State, including the smaller States of the Union, has two Senators to represent its interests. From the State of New Jersey many, many Ambassadors have been appointed, and many Ambassadors have been appointed from numerous other States. But during all the time the State of Idaho has been in the Union, which has been for more than 60 years, it has never had one of its distinguished citizens appointed to the post of Ambassador.

Most certainly all Senators representing the smaller States know, and anyone who read the debates at the time the Constitution was formed knows, that the theory was the smaller States would have two Senators in order that they might be protected. I call attention again, as I have time and time again on this floor, to the fact that the State of Florida, after being in the Union for 100 years, has never had one of its citizens appointed to the Cabinet or the Supreme Court. Nor has the State of Nevada. Nor has the State of Arizona. Nor has the State of North Dakota. Nor has the State of South Dakota. Nor has the State of Montana. Nor has the State of Idaho.

For example, in the northwest there are located the great bread baskets of North and South Dakota, Montana, and Idaho. They have now, as they have had in the past, citizens of the highest type who would have made good Secretaries of the Interior or Agriculture. Yet no man and woman from any of those States have ever been so recognized, nor have those States themselves been so recognized.

Mr. President, I simply wish to say that so long as I am a Member of this body, until a citizen from the State of Idaho is appointed to an Ambassadorship, I shall vote against the nomination of a citizen from any other State, no matter how well qualified he may be. I have been in Idaho. I know what good citizens there are in that State. I have been acquainted with many of them, some eminent men who certainly would have made good Ambassadors.

Therefore, Mr. President, I certainly shall vote against the nomination of a citizen from any other State, no matter how much I may love or respect him, as I do Mr. Hendrickson, or Mr. Lodge who comes from the State of Connecticut. I know Mr. Lodge quite well. He will make a good Ambassador. I shall vote against the nomination of Mr. Hendrickson and against the nomination of Mr. Lodge. I think it is the duty of a Senator to see that smaller States are recognized by the Executive of the country. Therefore I shall cast my vote against the nominations of the two nominees before the Senate today.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as one who several years ago had enjoyed the pleasure of visiting with members of the Parliament of New Zealand, and also of being the guest of our Minister in Wellington, I had some opportunity, though a brief one, to see the type of people living there, to realize the kind of place where the former Senator from New Jersey is going, and so to judge whether or not he is qualified to occupy the post for which he has been chosen.

From a public point of view, I am confident former Senator Hendrickson will make an excellent Ambassador. He is the type of man who will get along with the people of New Zealand and represent our country in a most admirable way.

From a personal point of view, I am very happy to see former Senator Hendrickson appointed, because our families have been very closely associated here in Washington. I know that both former Senator and Mrs. Hendrickson will be very happy to undertake this new responsibility in behalf of their country.

Mr. President, I wish also to take a moment to say that the former Governor of Connecticut, Mr. Lodge, is in many ways a son of Massachusetts; and I have known him both as a governor and otherwise. I am confident that both he and his wife will make excellent emissaries of our country when he goes to Spain as our Ambassador.

So, Mr. President, I am very happy about both appointments. Let me say that neither Mr. Hendrickson nor Mr. Lodge come from Massachusetts, but I shall vote for the confirmation of both nominations.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as a Member on this side of the aisle who has served with former Senator Hendrickson on the Armed Services Committee, I desire to express my very great satisfaction at his selection and appointment for this very important and strategic post. He is a fine lawyer, is very well trained in every way, and has an extremely high sense of patriotism, loyalty, and devotion to his country.

I feel that we are extremely well represented by having him serve in the capacity to which he has been nominated; and I predict for him a most illustrious career as the representative of our great Government to the most important Government to which he is to be sent, that of New Zealand.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask my distinguished friend the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] whether he intends to oppose confirmation of the nomination of former Senator Hendrickson. Let me ask whether the Senator from North Dakota is going to vote against confirmation of that nomination.

Mr. LANGER. In reply let me say that I am going to vote against confirmation of the nomination. I may say to my distinguished friend from Illinois that if former Senator Hendrickson came from the State of Idaho I would vote for the confirmation of his nomination. I may say the same in the case of Mr. Lodge; I would vote in favor of confirmation of his nomination if he came from Idaho.

Simply as a matter of principle, I believe that the States which have the smaller populations are entitled to recognition by having at least one person from those States, a person who is able and is eminently qualified, appointed to some such position. Certainly there should be such an appointment during the period of 60 years.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then I am sure my distinguished friend the senior Senator from North Dakota wishes to have it made abundantly clear for the RECORD that he is not opposing confirmation of the nomination on the ground of any lack of capacity, but only on the ground that scholarly achievement and diplomatic attainment have not yet been suitably recognized in the case of Idaho and North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Only in the case of Idaho; I am not talking now about North Dakota. North Dakota has a delightful Ambassador, and one of the best Ambassadors who is serving America; I refer

to Tom Whelan, our Ambassador to Nicaragua; and let me say that I am delighted that my distinguished friend the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] voted for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Whelan.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very well. However, let me point out that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which will contain our remarks, will be sent practically everywhere. Thus, I wish it made distinctly clear that on the question of confirmation of the nomination of the former Senator from New Jersey, Mr. Robert C. Hendrickson, there will not be any vote in opposition because of any lack of scholarship or diplomatic ability or skill, qualifying him to represent this Government with great distinction and with great credit to both himself, his State, and his country.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to say that both Mr. Hendrickson and Mrs. Hendrickson will make distinguished representatives of this country, I am certain.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, since my State of Florida happens to be one of those which was mentioned by the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I wish the RECORD to show that the senior Senator from Florida supports confirmation of the nomination of Robert C. Hendrickson, who formerly served with great distinction as a Senator from New Jersey. I support very strongly, indeed, confirmation of his nomination to fill the post of United States Ambassador to New Zealand. I believe he will fill that post with distinction. I believe he will make a splendid representative of our Nation, while serving in that post. I think that his record as a great soldier in two wars speaks more eloquently for his patriotism than the words of any Senator can do. I believe that his special experience as a very successful officer in military government and as an efficient State official in the government of the State of New Jersey and as a great Member of the United States Senate, shows his eminent qualifications. Furthermore, I think he has a peculiarly genial nature, in addition to his experience and his training and his great capacity; and I believe that he and his very lovely wife not only will be successful representatives of our Nation, but will be so capable in their service in New Zealand that we shall be very proud of them. Furthermore, I predict that the people of the great State of North Dakota will join the people of the great State of Florida—which, by the way, is not a small State, but is now the 15th of the States in population—in feeling great pride at the type of representation they will have from Ambassador Hendrickson and Mrs. Hendrickson.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, inasmuch as the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] alluded to my State as one of the States which has not had recognition in respect to the appointment of its citizens to diplomatic positions, I should like to remind him that Arizona has provided the United States with two very illustrious men in the field of foreign policy. The first one was George W. P. Hunt, who served for seven terms as Governor of Arizona, and later was United States Minister to Siam. The last one—and certainly one of the most distinguished men who has ever served this country—is Lewis Douglas, who served as Ambassador to the Court of St. James.

As did the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], in the case of the State of Florida, I should like to remind the Senator from North Dakota and the people of his State that Arizona is not a small State; instead, it is the fifth largest in the Nation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, let me say that I understand perfectly the position of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the position of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. I realize that many of our ambassadors have been residents of Florida. In the case of Arizona, it happens that Mr. Lewis Douglas is one of my warm personal friends.

On the other hand, neither Florida nor Arizona has ever had one of its residents serve in the Cabinet of the President of the United States or upon the Supreme Court of the United States.

I wish to say that I intend to oppose and fight against confirmation of the nomination of John Harlan for membership on the Supreme Court of the United States until Florida, which has been in this Union for more than 100 years, is properly recognized by having a resident of Florida nominated to membership on the Supreme Court.

I believe it to be the duty of every Senator to see to it that residents of the States which are the smaller ones in population who are able and competent and qualified to hold positions in the Cabinet and on the Supreme Court of the United States should be properly recognized by being nominated to serve in those positions.

Let me say, Mr. President, that not only should we give attention to that situation, in the case of the States which are the smaller ones from the point of view of population; but under the miserable system which prevails in connection with nominating Presidents of the United States and in connection with the nominating conventions, the delegates are chiefly concerned with what the States of New York, California, Pennsylvania, and Illinois will do. The delegates to the conventions never worry about the States with small populations, States which have only 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, or 9 delegates. As a matter of fact, my experience demonstrates that sometimes deals are made in smoke-filled rooms, and sometimes the size of the contributions literally given to some of the political parties may have an influence in the case of selecting some of the ambassadors and some of the members of the Supreme Court or some of the members of the Cabinet. I am not casting any reflection at all upon the present nominee; but I remember that I stood upon this floor and protested when, during the administration of President Roosevelt, at one time there served in the Cabinet of the President of the United States six persons who came from the State of New York.

As long as I am a Member of this body I intend to protest when situations of this kind arise.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As a matter of fact, I have always manifested a deep concern about North Dakota and about what happens to North Dakota politically. So I went to the State of my esteemed friend and did my best in behalf of the Party. I became so concerned about Florida that I made any number of addresses and sojourns in that State, in order that conversion, light, and political edification might be brought to the State of Florida.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator did a good job. One Republican Member of Congress has been elected from that State.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator ought to return to that State and deliver several more addresses.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank my friend from North Dakota. I wanted to be sure that he understood that there was always grave concern about the electoral vote and the popular vote of every State. To say that there is concern only about New York, Pennsylvania, or California, with the largest electoral votes, is a slight deviation from the fact, because an electoral vote is an electoral vote, whether it be cast in the great sovereign State of North Dakota, in the great Commonwealth of Florida, or in the Empire State of New York.

Mr. LANGER. Perhaps there is no better politician in the Senate than the distinguished Senator from Illinois, who for several years has been chairman of the senatorial campaign committee. I think he will agree with me that when the delegates go to the Chicago convention, whether it be a Democratic convention or a Republican convention, they are most concerned with the large block of votes from New York—"What is Dewey going to do with New York's 94 votes?"

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was so concerned about the great State of North Dakota, that I went there to keynote the convention, and then sought to follow up from that point on.

Mr. LANGER. Let me ask my distinguished friend, if his memory serves him, if he can name the chairman of the North Dakota delegation to Chicago?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Offhand, I am afraid I cannot.

Mr. LANGER. Yet everyone knows about Tom Dewey and New York's 94 votes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, of course this entire discussion is in good humor. I think that we all understand the attitude of our distinguished friend, the senior Senator from North Dakota.

However, in order that the RECORD may be entirely clear in this connection, I should like to have the Senator from North Dakota, as well as other Senators, know that when it comes to the recognition of Florida, attorneys of the United States in general, who are certainly well

qualified to express their approval or disapproval of their fellows, have, 3 times within recent years, elevated Florida attorneys to the very high position of president of the American Bar Association, in the persons of Hon. William A. Blount; Hon. Scott M. Loftin, who I am sure the Senator from North Dakota well remembers, because he later served in the United States Senate; and, only 2 years ago, Hon. Cody Fowler. So I think it must be rather apparent that, so far as concerns the recognition which counts most, namely, recognition from their fellows, attorneys of the State of Florida have not lacked recognition.

Perhaps—and I do not know that this would apply to the State of North Dakota—the eminent attorneys of Florida would prefer to continue to live in our salubrious climate, and prefer to remain in service in such distinguished capacities as president of the American Bar Association, rather than to come to Washington and limit their activities, as they would have to do if they were to become members of the Supreme Court.

The Senator from North Dakota is correct in stating that Florida has supplied many Ambassadors. It is likewise the case that a great many Cabinet members and Ambassadors have, by their own act, chosen to move to Florida and spend their declining years there, in recognition of the fact that, after they have received honors as Cabinet members and in other capacities, they have discovered a more delightful place in which to spend their declining years.

In closing, let me say that at least one Cabinet member was appointed from Florida, a Cabinet member who still is very much loved in the South. I refer to the Honorable Stephen R. Mallory, formerly a Member of the Senate, and later Secretary of the Navy of the Confederate States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. BUSH. What nomination, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Robert C. Hendrickson to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to New Zealand? This nomination is No. 1 on the Executive Calendar, covered by message No. 30.

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

JOHN LODGE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nomination on the calendar.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Lodge to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I listened attentively to the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. I was very glad to hear him remark that in his judgment John Lodge, former Governor of the State of Connecticut, would be a good Ambassador.

I had the privilege of being the guest of the Committee on Foreign Relations at the time Governor Lodge appeared to be questioned by the committee. I am happy to say that everyone present at that meeting agreed that it was a good appointment, and that John Lodge is well qualified to be an Ambassador.

I made a statement before the committee at some length outlining what I think are his excellent qualities for this post. I should also like to point out for the RECORD that Governor Lodge has devoted most of the past 15 years exclusively to the public service. He made a very distinguished record in the Navy during the war. Upon his return, in 1946, he was elected to the House, where he served for 4 years. While a Member of the House, he was literally drafted by the Republican Party to run for Governor of Connecticut in 1950, which he did. He was elected, and served with distinction as Governor of our Great State.

The people of Connecticut are very happy about the great honor which has come to our State and to our Governor. I am delighted that the nomination has met with such unanimous approval in the Senate, so far as the Governor's qualifications are concerned.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I regret that I missed the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota. On behalf of the people of the State of Idaho, whom I have the honor to represent in part, I profoundly appreciate his remarks and his interest in my State. I say thanks to you, Senator LANGER.

I have listened to the learned discourse by my friend the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], with respect to the qualifications of the gentlemen whose nominations are before us. I shall not quarrel or quibble about these men being able and well qualified; I am sure they are; but I must say, as I have heretofore said, that the eastern seaboard and the larger States do not have a monopoly on brilliance or political ability, because, after all, educated men read out of the same books, whether they live in Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York, Idaho, Wyoming, Arizona, Florida, or any other State. I think we should stop and look, and see whether or not it is possible, at some time, to recognize the smaller States, which for years have been overlooked. They have been flown over at a high elevation. Yes, Mr. President, the State of Idaho has never been honored with a Cabinet post or an Ambassadorship.

I know that within my State there are great men, learned men, and skilled men. I think perhaps there is need for a little western blood in the diplomatic service.

In conclusion, let me say that it is not easy for the Senator from North Dakota, or anyone else, to object to the nominations of men who are close and devoted friends of ours. We have served on committees with some of them. However, as I have previously stated, whether we be Democrats or Republicans, we have a union of 48 States. Let us see if we cannot recognize all 48 States, instead of overlooking some of them.

Speaking purely from the political standpoint, Idaho has been a strong Republican State, but leaving politics aside, certainly we will encourage public service by the smaller States being recognized.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. WELKER. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague from Maine.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine should like to ask the very distinguished Senator from Idaho if he considers Maine an east-coast State?

Mr. WELKER. I am happy to do so. As I stated earlier, I am sorry that I missed some of the debate on this subject.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. The Senator from Maine also asks the Senator from Idaho if he has looked at the record of appointments as they refer to the State of Maine. If he were to do so, he would find that Maine has no monopoly on appointments.

Mr. WELKER. If I have offended my distinguished friend from Maine by saying that the east-coast States had a monopoly on such appointments, I am sorry. However, as I study the nominations that come to the Senate, it is apparent to me that most of the appointments are given to persons who come from the larger States. I do not believe that is the way it should be.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. The Senator from Maine is merely trying to point out that Maine is an east-coast State, but is in the same position in which Idaho finds itself with respect to appointments.

Mr. WELKER. I may say to my distinguished friend from Maine that I am truly sorry to hear that. I know that Maine has some of the best, most learned, most devout, and finest people in the country, who could very ably represent our Nation abroad, or in the Cabinet or in any capacity, as could many of the residents of my great State of Idaho.

I do not believe it is necessary that all our diplomatic representatives should be appointed from the large metropolitan areas. After all, when votes are needed in the Senate of the United States, the votes of Senators from the small States count just as much as the votes of Senators from the larger States, such as New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, or any of the other large States.

I do not have one word to say against the honesty or integrity or ability of the persons whose nominations are before us today. However, I hope and pray that those who are responsible will stop and consider the availability of some of the fine people in the smaller States who have been ignored for many years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of John Lodge to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nomination.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the confirmation of the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the routine nominations in the Air Force, lying on the desk, and which have not been printed on the calendar, be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the confirmation of the nominations in the Regular Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be so notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, 35 years ago today, a small group of able young men established an organization devoted to high ideals of public service and committed to a program that would help them prepare for leadership in business and community affairs.

These organizational efforts were started in 1915 and interrupted for 4 years by World War I. A decade later, its members were learning the perils of business leadership in the world's worst depression. Members of the organization were of the right age—21 to 36—to participate extensively in American defense activities during the international conflicts and cold wars that have marked the past decade and a half. Today this organization of youth, matured quickly by the sobering events of the past 3½ decades, is commemorating its 35th anniversary in a world that has never seen a greater need for leadership and service.

The group to which I refer, of course, is the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce. Now an organization of established reputation, the junior chamber conducts its domestic affairs from an impressive headquarters building at Tulsa, Okla., and participates in an expanding program of worldwide activities through an international association of such groups in 65 countries. Here in America, the organization has an active membership of 200,000 young business and civic leaders in 2,750 communities.

Many alumni of the organization—their "old men" are required to retire at the age of 36—are now Members of the Congress and hold other positions of high responsibility in public and private affairs.

Three of my associates—the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER]—have been members, as well as our Presiding Officer, Vice President NIXON, who also was a winner of one of the organization's ten outstanding young men awards. There may be other Senators who share the distinction of membership in the junior chamber of commerce. There may be other Members of this body who have belonged to the junior chambers of commerce, and there may be others than the Vice President who have won honors in that organization. I am not acquainted with all the records, so I cannot state these here today.

In view of the fact that this great organization is active in nearly every community of any size throughout the country, I feel that it is fitting for the Senate to take a few minutes in this legislative day to pay an anniversary tribute to the Jaycees, as the organization's members are known everywhere.

I wish now to read, as a part of my remarks, letters of congratulation from the President of the United States extending anniversary greetings to the junior chamber of commerce, and from the Vice President of the United States. The letter from the Vice President reads as follows:

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, January 21, 1955.

Mr. E. LAMAR BUCKNER,
President, United States Junior Chamber of Commerce.

DEAR MR. BUCKNER: It is a pleasure to extend my warm greetings to all the members of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce as they observe their 35th anniversary.

Your organization realizes the necessity of acceptance of civic responsibility as it continues to strive toward community betterment on a nationwide scale. These young men who devote their time and energy toward benefiting their fellow citizens are being trained to assume leadership in many fields today. Never have we had greater need of young men of high caliber to participate actively and intelligently in public affairs.

My heartiest congratulations on this occasion for the outstanding job you are doing and my best wishes for continuing success in your most worthwhile endeavors.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

The letter from the President of the United States reads as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 19, 1955.

Mr. E. LAMAR BUCKNER,
President, United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, Tulsa, Okla.

DEAR MR. BUCKNER: My greetings and congratulations go to all members of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce on the occasion of its 35th anniversary.

Communities everywhere have been stimulated by your organization's programs to train leaders through civic betterment. Thousands of young men are thereby more adequately equipped in knowledge and spirit to meet successfully the challenge of competitive business and to further the welfare of their fellow citizens.

Our Nation's future promises rich economic opportunities for those with training and enterprise. It also imposes on businessmen clear responsibilities to help make better their neighborhoods, their communities, and their Nation. I know they will respond to this future with vigor and ability and idealism.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Most of the Members of this body are familiar with the large number and variety of civic service projects promoted by the junior chamber in their home communities. One of these culminates here in Washington, D. C. It is the national teen-age "road-e-o," a community program to encourage safer driving among the Nation's teen-agers. State finalists in these safe driving contests are flown to the Nation's Capital in late summer to compete for valuable scholarships.

Jaycees also promote a variety of other projects, such as their Voice of Democracy speaking and writing competition, enthusiastic "get-out-the-vote" campaigns, conservation activities like the "keep America green" project, Christmas lighting and service projects, a "come to church" campaign, "Junior Citizenship" awards, better schools workshops, clean-up weeks, and many others.

In his address at the junior chamber's 33d national convention, President Eisenhower made this observation, effectively summarizing the reputation this group has achieved throughout the country:

Yours is one of our Nation's most distinguished and enterprising organizations, he said. You are young and responsible people, with impressive careers and achievements already recorded to your credit. * * * Because you are both young and responsible, you know what is your greatest responsibility of all—tomorrow—the whole future of freedom.

The organization's feeling of responsibility for what tomorrow will bring to their generation and those who follow them is adequately expressed in the Jaycee creed, which I would like to read for you:

THE JAYCEE CREED

We believe:

That faith in God gives meaning and purpose to human life;

That the brotherhood of man transcends the sovereignty of nations;

That economic justice can best be won by freemen through free enterprise;

That government should be of laws rather than of men;

That earth's great treasure lies in human personality; and

That service to humanity is the best work of life.

As a representative of the State of Utah, I wish to pay tribute to the junior chamber of commerce for setting forth such a high organizational code and to its members who try so enthusiastically and assiduously to attain those goals. We appreciate greatly the extensive service efforts of the Utah chapters and feel honored that a Utah member, Mr. E. LaMar Buckner, of Ogden, was chosen by the 1954 convention to serve as the national president of the organization.

In these days of atomic warfare, international tensions, and conspiracies, it is reassuring to ponder that 200,000 of the Nation's outstanding young business and civic leaders subscribe to a code of fundamental values that closely parallel those laid down by an outstanding young Galilean in their same general use bracket some 2,000 years ago. If ages older generations running the affairs of nations can come to recognize that adherence to such a code of conduct is the one sure means of preventing the world from plunging into Armageddon, then we can hope for a more peaceful, stable world environment for a younger generation that has seen more than its share of strife and stress.

May the junior chamber of commerce grow in membership and influence, and persevere in its ideals in the years to come.

Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], who had to leave on official business, has authorized me to say that he fully approves of what I have said, and he joins in complimenting this great organization upon its remarkable achievements and sees great possibilities for it in the future.

I have here, Mr. President, a statement prepared by the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

I desire to associate myself with the remarks that have been made here today congratulating the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce on its 35th anniversary.

Virginia was one of the earlier States to join this movement to organize young men for service to their communities and for development as civic as well as business leaders and the 30th anniversary of the junior chamber of commerce in Virginia will be celebrated at Norfolk next month.

Through my acquaintance with Tom Baldridge, of Winchester, the first president of the Virginia organization, I was made aware of its activities from the start and over the years I have watched with satisfaction the fine youth work and other projects undertaken by groups in cities throughout my State. I know the Jaycees have made Virginia a better place to live in the past, and I am confident they will continue to do so in the years ahead.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I promised to yield to the senior Senator from Maine, and I now yield to her.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my good friend from Utah, the senior Senator of that great State, in acclaiming the 35th anniversary of the junior chamber of commerce and in paying tribute to that very fine organization. In a lesser degree, I am in a position similar to that of the senior Senator from Utah with respect to the Jaycees. The national president of the junior chamber of commerce comes from Ogden, Utah. The Maine State president, Fred McDonald, comes from my hometown of Skowhegan.

Now let me admit my possible prejudice for the Jaycees inasmuch as I am an honorary member of the Skowhegan Junior Chamber of Commerce—something of which I am very proud.

Maine has one of the youngest Jaycee chapters in the Nation, it being only 11 years old. However, in that short space of time tremendous growth has been recorded, until Maine now has nearly 40 chapters, despite the fact that there are only 50 cities and towns in the State with populations of more than 2,500.

Last May they set as a goal, 50 chapters in Maine. That will afford 50 Maine communities the valuable experience of having an active group of young men between the ages of 21 and 36 working for a better town, State, and Nation.

Thus far this year 50 percent of that goal has been achieved and the goal of 50 will most definitely be reached before the end of the club year, May 31. There are chapters in Washburn, Fort Fairfield, Limestone, Caribou, Van Buren, Presque Isle, Madawaska, Fort Kent, Houlton, Mars Hill, Bridgewater, Sherman Mills, Dexter, Guilford, Dover-Foxcroft, Bangor, Old Town, Orono, Madison, Waterville, Skowhegan, Augusta-Hallowell, Kingfield, Winthrop, Gardiner, Belfast, Rockland, Ellsworth, Bar Harbor, Machias, Brunswick, Portland, Westbrook, Lewiston, Rumford-Mexico, Norway, and Biddeford.

Their chief project for the year is Boost Maine. Their State chairman is Burton Kominick, 80 Oakhurst Road, Cape Elizabeth. At the New England States meeting they stole the show with an industrial exhibit of Maine and various promotional gimmicks during the 3-day affair.

They are setting up a State speaker's bureau to offer leading men and women who are available an opportunity to speak on our State's many advantages. They are compiling a list of the various opportunities and facilities available in each section of the State.

Maine was the only State in the country to have 100-percent participation in the United States teen-age "road-e-o" driver safety program last summer with 33 locals participating. Maine Jaycees conducted statewide voice of democracy and junior golf campaigns. The Governor's safety highway council entrusted to them the important task of setting up local town and city safety councils. They have a statewide youth-activities program in which each local is pledged to sponsor at least five youth-activity projects during the year. On the average Maine chapters each sponsored more than 30 civic-betterment projects during the past year.

In closing, Mr. President, let me say that so long as our country is blessed with organizations like the junior chamber of commerce, we can have full confidence in the future of our country and our people.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, first, I should like to invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from Utah to the fact that our able colleague, the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] also was an active member of the junior chamber of commerce at the time of his election to the Senate.

While I am on my feet I wish to say also that I fully approve of the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Utah in complimenting that very fine organization, the junior chamber of commerce. It has done splendid work.

Insofar as the organization in my own State of Florida is concerned, it is true that not only my present junior colleague [Mr. SMATHERS] was an active member of that organization when he was elected to the Senate, but that also two of our Governors, the late Governor Dan McCarty, and ex-Governor Fuller Warren, were active members of the organization.

Furthermore, four of my other colleagues, present Representatives in Congress, were active members at the time of their election. They are Representative CHARLES BENNETT, Representative DANTE FASCELL, Representative BILL CRAMER, and our most recently elected Representative, who was sworn in a few days ago, Representative PAUL ROGERS.

I likewise ask the indulgence, Mr. President, of being permitted to insert in the RECORD a list of the outstanding accomplishments of the Junior Chamber of Commerce in my State. It is a small list compared with the full record of our Florida Jaycees, but it is one which gives some indication of the vigorous and effective activity of that group of fine young men who comprise the Junior Chambers of Commerce in one of our most progressive States in leading toward the accomplishment of distinctive and worthy public and civic objectives, which should be recognized.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I shall be glad if the Senator from Florida will have the list printed in the RECORD.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Florida Jaycees have—

1. Sponsored legislation setting up Florida highway patrol, highway fencing law, and motor vehicle insurance financial responsibility law.

2. Sponsored: Teen-age drivers' road-e-o, junior golf and junior tennis tournaments, Future Farmer awards, State safety seminar, and so forth.

3. Many clubs including those in Fort Lauderdale and West Palm Beach have established teen-age recreation centers.

Jacksonville Jaycees have sponsored the $10,000 PGA golf tournaments.

5. Miami Jaycees annually sponsor a full-scale regatta and Orlando Jaycees put on the National Orange Picking Contest each year.

6. Practically every club in Florida sponsored Christmas activities for the underprivileged with Tampa putting on the great Christmas card lane.

7. Most clubs in Florida take an active part in local government and have representatives at each city meeting.

8. The Titusville Jaycees sponsor the Breward County Fair, and Sarasota Jaycees put on a gala festival each year.

9. St. Petersburg annually sponsors the $10,000 Tarpon Round-Up.

10. Speakers of the Florida House, Farris Bryant, Ted David, and David Conner are Jaycees, and over 50 percent of the Florida Legislature is composed of Jaycees.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I cannot let this occasion pass without joining with the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] in congratulating the junior chamber of commerce, and particularly the junior chamber of my own State of Missouri, on this 35th anniversary. I take particular pride in doing so because it was in Missouri—at a meeting held in St. Louis on January 21 and 22, 1920—that the junior chamber of commerce was founded.

Since that time the organization has grown in strength and membership, and has compiled a noteworthy record of achievement in thousands of communities throughout the country. In Missouri, we now have 5,000 members in 67 local organizations. The junior chamber of commerce in Missouri has devoted itself to many worthwhile community activities. Among other programs, it has sponsored projects for encouraging outdoor decorations during the Christmas season, and has supported civic and recreational programs for young people; and not the least of its activities was the recent successsful effort to bring a second major-league baseball team to Missouri.

I take pleasure in extending hearty congratulations to this dynamic organization, and in wishing the junior chamber of commerce continued success and achievement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, a statement relating to the junior chamber of commerce and its members.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACT SHEET, UNITED STATES JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

The United States Junior Chamber of Commerce was formed at a meeting held on January 21-22, 1920, in St. Louis, Mo., where Henry Giessenbier (credited with founding the organization) was elected the first president of the organization.

Jaycee chapters were in existence before this date, but the January 21-22 meeting was the actual first caucus of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce.

The organization today consists of 200,000 young men in more than 2,750 communities.

The international organization, Junior Chamber International (which is 10 years old) has almost 3,500 chapters in 52 countries, with a membership of approximately 300,000 (this figure includes the United States).

We have State organizations in every State of the Union, including Washington, D. C., Alaska, and Hawaii, plus a national headquarters building in Tulsa, Okla., worth $350,000, employing a full-time staff of 50 people.

The growth of this organization has been entirely through volunteer efforts inasmuch as no paid organizers have ever been employed, with all extension efforts being maintained by the local organizations.

The official definition of the organization is: "A junior chamber of commerce is a constructive action organization of young men who devote a portion of their time to community service in the public interest, developing young men as leaders in their community."

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I wish to associate myself completely with the very fine remarks which have been made by the able senior Senator from Utah and the distinguished senior Senator from Maine.

I feel, as they do, that the junior chamber of commerce organization is a great credit to the United States. In my own State of Connecticut, I have observed that they are an exceptionally fine organization. They always seem to associate themselves with worthy projects, which are for the benefit of our State and our communities.

It is my pleasure to have among them a number of friends, including Dave Oscarson, the present president of our State chamber; Joe Goldberg, of Norwich, vice president; and Eddie May, the most recent past president. I mention them as being merely a few of the men I know personally who, to me, represent the very best qualities of young leadership in our State.

I had the pleasure, too, of attending their annual convention in 1954 and of delivering an address on that occasion.

One could hardly be in their company without appreciating the high quality of those young men, their high ideals, and the splendid influence which they have upon the citizenship of our State.

So I join most heartily with the distinguished Senators from Utah and Maine, and with other Senators, as well, in paying my tribute today to this great organization upon its 35th anniversary.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Utah.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Utah and other Senators who are paying tribute to this fine organization. It has been my good fortune to have been a member of the junior chamber of commerce. Last night I had the honor of speaking to the junior chamber of commerce in Dayton, Ohio, in conjunction with their annual bosses night.

To my mind, nothing could give one a greater feeling of optimism for the future than a meeting with the members of the junior chamber of commerce, who are justly acclaimed for their vim, vigor, vitality, and fine ideals. They are a great credit to America, and because of them we have little cause to worry about the future.

There are many active junior chamber of commerce groups within the State of Michigan; and as a result of their civic activity, Michigan is a better place in which to live.

One of the chief projects being sponsored this year by the junior chamber of commerce is an educational program to inform the public of the advantages of a strong United States Air Force, a project which will, I am certain, pay off well for our national defense program.

I again wish to associate myself with the remarks which have already been made by other Senators.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. As my able colleague, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], has pointed out, the National United States Junior Chamber of Commerce this month is celebrating its 35th anniversary.

The junior chamber of commerce in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is a most active organization and is doing work of great good.

Our State organization was founded in 1936 and the first chapter was chartered in Lancaster.

It has expanded since that time until there are now 133 chapters throughout the Commonwealth with a membership of approximately 10,000 young men between the ages of 21 and 35.

The worthy community activities in which the junior chamber of commerce has taken a leadership role are too numerous to mention. Suffice to say that when these energetic young men undertake to do a job, they always accomplish their mission.

It makes me most happy to speak these few words of tribute to the junior chamber of commerce, and more particularly to its splendid membership in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. First, I wish to express my appreciation for the splendid review of the junior chamber of commerce which has been given the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. It seems to me that in the words they have expressed here today they have said of the total work of the junior chamber of commerce what we all would like to say.

In the parade of the States, as we seek to establish for the RECORD the distinguishing features and the particular contributions which the junior chambers of commerce have made in our own States, I should like to mention three things for which I think the junior chambers of commerce of South Dakota are especially to be complimented.

First, in South Dakota we claim the greatest number of chapters, per capita, of junior chambers of commerce. South Dakota is not a large or a populous State,

but it has 28 local chapters, which I understand is the largest per capita representation in the Union. These 28 local chapters have a total of 2,150 members.

The second thing for which I think the junior chambers of commerce in South Dakota are to be praised is that they initiated the recognition of farmers and ranchers in their membership and in their projects. Among the proposals which the junior chambers of commerce have advanced in South Dakota are those for the betterment of rural life, including rural electrification and conservation of soil and water resources.

The third thing for which I think the junior chambers of commerce of South Dakota are to be complimented, and for which they can justly be proud, is that the present Governor of South Dakota, the Honorable Joe Foss, is a product of the junior chambers of commerce. Joe Foss, of course, does not need any particular eulogy from me at this time; but I recall to the minds of Senators that he was the first ace of World War II. As the leader of a Marine Corps squadron, he was the first flier to achieve that recognition in World War II. His exploits in the field of aviation, first with the Marine Corps, and later as the commander of the Air National Guard of South Dakota, and as a member of the junior chamber of commerce in his home city of Sioux Falls, are well known.

In South Dakota we feel that the junior chambers of commerce have well exemplified the ideals of service, enthusiasm, and initiative which have been mentioned by the distinguished senior Senator from Utah in his remarks, and we, too, join in the appreciation which is being expressed by so many Senators today for the contribution which the junior chambers of commerce are making to a growing America.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I promised I would yield to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the RECORD a statement of mine on the junior chambers of commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement of Mr. CURTIS is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CURTIS

I am happy to join in tribute to our 200,000 Jaycees on this day, their 35th anniversary.

It has been my great pleasure, during my membership in Congress, to know our Jaycees in Nebraska and to work with them on many worthy accomplishments.

Nebraska's first chapter of the junior chamber of commerce was organized in 1927.

This year's State president, Charles Thone, is an assistant United States attorney for the district of Nebraska.

We now have Jaycee organizations in 51 Nebraska cities with a membership of 5,000. The many fine programs of our Nebraska Jaycees promote some of the finest civic accomplishments, each year, in Nebraska.

We know, of course, that there is no better training for civic responsibility or, for that matter, for the American way of life than is afforded by active membership in junior chambers of commerce. These young men who, voluntarily, devote much time and hard work to so many fine objectives will, deservedly, become the leaders of their generation.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I, too, join in all the fine sentiments which have been expressed on behalf of this great organization. As I recall, in Illinois there are 136 chapters, with a membership of 8,500.

Perhaps one of the things that has impressed me most about the junior chambers of commerce is the vigorous way in which they have alerted the electorate to its responsibilities. It is a sad commentary on the electorate of the United States that of the 77,940,000 citizens registered and eligible to vote in the recent election only 41,900,000 voted. That means that in 1954, 36 million citizens of the United States, qualified, registered, and ready to vote, somehow found an excuse not to go to the polls. That is one of the most tragic commentaries on a free America of which I can think, because it represents a tremendous apathy and disinterest in voter responsibility, which is one of the means by which the citizenry participates in government. So may the efforts of the junior chambers never wither as they undertake to alert our electorate and give it a new sense of responsibility in keeping with the tradition of America.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, does the Senator wish to make a statement about the junior chamber of commerce?

Mr. THYE. I was going to ask that I might join in some of the tributes.

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have been greatly impressed by the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the distinguished senior Senator from maine [Mrs. SMITH], and other Senators in their commendatory remarks regarding the accomplishments of the junior chambers of commerce throughout the United States.

It has been my observation in my own State of Minnesota that the splendid work of the junior chambers of commerce in the various towns and cities of our State has greatly aided in continuing to keep alive in the United States those virtues which the Founding Fathers endeavored to inculcate into our citizenry, as evidenced by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights which they wrote with the intent and purpose that the United States should be a nation of free men.

As I observed their activities in Minnesota, the junior chambers of commerce, in their civic undertakings, have endeavored to continue to keep alive the virtues and qualities which have made this Nation great.

The senior Senator from Utah is to be commended, as is the distinguished Senator from Maine, for calling to our attention the valuable aid rendered by the junior chambers of commerce to all worth-while civic undertakings.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I had some additional remarks I wished to make. If the Senator desires me to yield so he may join in the remarks which have been made, I shall yield for that purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join with the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] in congratulating the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce on its 35th anniversary. This national organization of young men has an outstanding record of community service in the public interest. The Junior Chamber of Commerce is a very productive source of outstanding young leaders in more than 2,750 communities in our Nation.

The Jaycees in Montana have an enviable record of accomplishments in the State. In my State they have a long list of charitable, recreational, and safety projects to their credit, which have contributed greatly to the betterment of the communities. Again I wish to salute these young men who have given so unselfishly of their free time in promoting community welfare.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a fact sheet of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACT SHEET, UNITED STATES JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

1. The United States Junior Chamber of Commerce was formed at a meeting held on January 21–22, 1920, in St. Louis, Mo., where Henry Giessenbier was elected the first president of the organization. (Giessenbier is credited with founding the organization.)

2. Jaycee chapters were in existence before this date, but the January 21 meeting was the actual first caucus of the United States Jaycees.

3. The organization today consists of 200,000 young men in more than 2,750 communities.

4. The official definition of the organization is "A junior chamber of commerce is a constructive action organization of young men who devote a portion of their time to community service in the public interest, developing young men as leaders in their community."

5. The Jaycee creed:

"We believe—

"That faith in God gives meaning and purpose to human life;

"That the brotherhood of man transcends the sovereignty of nations;

"That economic justice can best be won by free men through free enterprise;

"That government should be of laws rather than of men;

"That earth's great treasure lies in human personality;

"And that service to humanity is the best work of life."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask further unanimous consent, if the Senator from Utah will yield, that a statement by the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] may be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for that purpose.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JACKSON

The United States Junior Chamber of Commerce is good citizenship at its very best. Without fanfare or pretention, the 200,000 members of this organization throughout the country are engaged in simple, effective programs to promote the well-being and progress of their local communities.

In Washington State the Jaycees have promoted programs of youth activities, safe driving practices, public health, and public safety. They have sponsored an annual public-speaking contest to stimulate student thinking on the positive attributes of democracy. Over 4,000 students from 125 high schools participated last year. They have also sponsored a State soil-conservation recognition program to support and encourage the work of our farmers in preserving natural resources.

This brief summary reflects a record of notable achievement. Not only has the program contributed to the life and outlook of many communities, it has also played a significant role in developing the leadership potential of the young men who have made it work. Through the Jaycee organization, many of its members are well on their way to positions of high responsibility in the business, cultural, and political life of their country.

It is a real pleasure for me to join in congratulating the junior chamber of commerce on its 35th anniversary. I am sure it will continue to grow in size and influence as the years pass. On the basis of its first 35 years, this growth will be all to the good for the thousands of communities it now serves.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the senior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to join in the sentiments expressed by my good friend the Senator from Utah, and to concur in all he has said. We have in Louisiana a quite vigorous junior chamber of commerce organization. As a matter of fact, my State boasts over 2,000 members of the Junior Chamber of Commerce, located in 25 communities. These chapters, composed of civic-minded young businessmen, have supplied several nationally prominent Jaycees. Two of these have gained particularly widespread prominence. Last year, prior to the election of national Jaycee president, Louisiana offered the national organization as a presidential nominee Mr. Jack Howard, of Monroe, La. Mr. Howard failed of election to the presidency of this great organization by only 1 vote.

Among our other nationally known Jaycees is Mr. Hamilton Richardson, of Baton Rouge, La. Mr. Richardson—better known as "Ham" to the sports-minded—is an outstanding tennis star, and was recently named as one of our Nation's 10 outstanding Jaycee's. I am proud to say, that, in addition that Mr. Richardson was selected as a Rhodes scholar last year. I am told that he is now in England, attending school.

I wish to thank the Senator from Utah for yielding to me. I merely wished to emphasize his observations, and to make known to our Nation the fact that Louisiana's energetic junior chambers of commerce yield first place to none in their efforts to achieve their announced ideals. I only desired to pay brief tribute to these young men of action, whose blue-chip community projects have brought them and my State national recognition.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President——

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to join in the tribute being paid to the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce on the occasion of its 35th anniversary.

I have had close association with its organization in Virginia for many years. In fact, Tom Baldridge, of Winchester, my home city, was the first president of the Virginia State organization of junior chambers of commerce.

We have in Virginia some 70 organizations of the Jaycees, with Sumpter T. Priddy, Jr., of Waverly, Va., as its president, and I have observed the constructive work of these organizations throughout the State, as well as the country, for many years.

I may mention in passing that the Virginia organization will observe its 30th anniversary in Norfolk next month.

I am pleased to join other Members of the United States Senate in congratulating these fine young men on the magnificent work they are doing in the achievement of the constructive objectives of their organization.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the junior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, at one time the junior Senator from Louisiana had the pleasure of being one of the organizers of a chapter of the junior chamber of commerce at Baton Rouge, La. That chapter and other chapters in my State have worked to better their communities and citizenship in their State.

I am happy to join with other Senators in congratulating the junior chamber of commerce for its very fine record throughout the Nation.

In Louisiana our junior chambers are presently engaged in a six-phase program, which they call the blue-chip program, to better citizenship, and they have more than 2,000 members engaged in activities to better their communities and their State.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, it is a distinct pleasure to me to join the senior Senator from Utah and other Senators in paying deserved tribute to the junior chambers of commerce of the United States. Over the years this outstanding body of young men has made many substantial contributions to the progress of our country.

In my own State of Iowa, I am proud to say, the junior chambers are established in 70 of our largest communities. They have a membership of more than 7,500, a membership which is increasingly taking a leading part in civic and community affairs.

For example, the Fort Dodge chapter provided new playground equipment recently for the local park and set it up themselves. The local park board was without the necessary funds. In Dubuque the safety committee of the local Jaycee chapter is doing a fine job pledging students in the local schools to drive carefully and seeing to it that the pledges are honored.

Wherever they are established, in Iowa and elsewhere, these junior chamber members work hard and effectively for their communities and for the good of our Nation. They deserve all the honor and commendation which is being accorded to them on their 35th anniversary.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I desire to join with the distinguished senior Senator from Utah and my other colleagues who have paid their profound respects and regards to the junior chamber of commerce, on its anniversary.

Let me say, briefly, Mr. President, that I could not add anything to the fine remarks which have been made by my colleagues, other than to state that in my State of Idaho, the junior chamber of commerce has, among other things, sponsored two very meritorious projects, the first being "Keep Idaho green." That means they are educating our people to the importance of preserving from the devastation of fire our vast forests and fields. The junior chamber of commerce educates the people of Idaho to be very careful with respect to the prevention of forest fires.

As has heretofore been stated, the next major project in my State is "Get out the vote." On that project they have done an outstanding service. So long as we have young America at work in the way the junior chamber of commerce is functioning, and in the way which has been so well exemplified over the years, there is very little for us to worry about for the well-being and future of our country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER in the chair). Without objection, the present occupant of the chair would like to associate himself with the remarks of the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and other Senators. The Chair wishes to say that he has had some very close experience with the membership of the junior chamber of commerce, in that the Chair's very able administrative assistant, Edwin Murray Hood, is a past president of the Baltimore Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, before the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] takes his seat, I wish to add a word to those which have been spoken today by other Members of the Senate, in paying tribute to the junior chamber of commerce, both as a national organization and as an organization in the several States and the various counties and communities. I have had close association with many of the members and many of the leaders of the junior chamber of commerce, particularly in my own State; and I know something of the worthwhile program they have had year after year.

Fortunately, in my home State one of the finest junior chambers of commerce exists, and I have had ample opportunity to observe the work of the individual organization in one locality. I know of no organization which has done a finer job. I am sure that is true throughout tne entire country.

I am glad the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] brought this matter to the attention of the Senate, and I express my appreciation of the opportunity to add a word to what he has said.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me at this time?

Mr. WATKINS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I am highly honored to have been a member of the junior chamber of commerce in my younger days; and I look back with great pride on the accomplishments to that organization in the State of Arizona.

I desire to associate myself with the remarks which the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and other Senators have made today, in extending congratulations to the junior chamber of commerce, on the occasion of the anniversary of its founding. I am very happy that various Senators have taken this occasion to recognize the contributions the organization has made in their States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL subsequently said: Mr. President, more than 2,000 Jaycees, or junior chambers of commerce in 39 Massachusetts cities and towns join me in these 35th anniversary congratulations. I firmly believe that the spirit of enthusiasm for Massachusetts as a good place to work and live is strengthened by each Jaycee Massachusetts chapter. Marblehead, Salem, Winchendon, Great Barrington, and Holden are healthier communities because Jaycee chapters have been started there in the last 4 months. In the next 4 months, I look forward to knowing that Wilmington, Norwood, Greenfield, Orange, Athol, Danvers, Bridgewater, Clinton, Northampton, Palmer, Ware, Southbridge, Middleborough, and Falmouth will become even more vigorous communities because of new Jaycee chapters. We are fortunate to have a United States Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. CARLSON subsequently said: Mr. President, today is the 35th anniversary of the junior chamber of commerce of the United States.

The junior chamber of commerce is a constructive action organization of young men who devote a portion of their time to community service in the public interest, thereby developing young men as leaders in their communities.

The growth of this organization has been entirely through volunteer efforts inasmuch as no paid organizers have ever been employed, with all extension efforts being maintained by the local organizations.

The junior chamber of commerce has State organizations in every State in the Union and in Washington, D. C., Alaska, and Hawaii, plus a national headquarters in Tulsa, Okla.

Recently I was privileged to attend a breakfast given in honor of the new national president of the junior chamber of commerce, Lamar Buckner, of Utah.

In Kansas, Dr. E. F. Giannangelo is president of the Kansas Junior Chamber of Commerce. He has surrounded himself with an outstanding board of directors. We have many local organizations of the junior chamber of commerce who take an active part in the affairs of the State and the local communities. It has always been a pleasure to cooperate with them, and I wish to state to the Senate that I know of a no more unselfish group of young men than the membership of this organization.

Personally, I am indebted to them for their splendid support during my service as Governor of the State of Kansas and continued support during my service in the United States Senate.

Mr. DANIEL subsequently said: Mr. President, on behalf of my distinguished colleague [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] and myself, I congratulate the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce as that organization observes its 35th anniversary.

We are well aware of the work of this great body of young Americans due to our familiarity with the accomplishments of the Texas Junior Chamber of Commerce.

The Texas Jaycees this year will observe their 28th anniversary. The organization consists of approximately 15,000 young men in 163 communities of our State.

In Texas, one of the outstanding accomplishments of the Jaycees was the organization's successful effort to bring about the adoption of the O. B. Ellis plan in the State penal system. This resulted in raising the rating of the system from 48 in the Nation to a place among the top 10.

Throughout Texas, local Jaycees are constantly striving to make their communities better places in which to live through carrying out a wide variety of civic, safety, and religious projects. Every year they wage vigorous get-out-the-vote campaigns.

The Texas Junior Chamber annually honors five outstanding young Texans. The group most recently chosen for this honor includes Howard E. Butt, Jr., of Corpus Christi; Ben Carpenter, of Dallas; Dr. Denton A. Cooley and George F. Pierce, Jr., both of Houston; and Jack W. Gray, of Denton.

Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and myself, I congratulate these five outstanding young Texans. Also, I extend our congratulations to Rocky Ford, State president of the Jaycees, and to all members of the Texas Junior Chamber of Commerce. They are a potent factor in the life of our State.

Mr. KERR subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that today is the 35th anniversary of the founding of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce. This event has a special significance to the State of Oklahoma, inasmuch as the national junior chamber of commerce and the junior chamber international both have their headquarters in Tulsa, Okla. They occupy a very beautiful office building in one of the most picturesque locations in the city of Tulsa.

This organization of young businessmen has grown until it now consists of 200,000 members between the ages of 21 and 35. They have organizations in 2,750 communities throughout the Nation, as well as chapters in 52 countries of the world. Oklahoma is fortunate in having 45 chapters over the State, with approximately 4,000 members.

We all know that since its inception this young and vigorous organization has made itself felt in the commercial activities of the United States, and I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate them on their forthright interest in the business activities of our great country.

I have great confidence in the young men and women of the United States, and I predict that the developments which will occur under their leadership will far surpass anything we or our fathers have ever dreamed of.

Mr. McCLELLAN subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished senior Senator from Utah and other Members of the Senate in extending formal congratulations to the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce on this the occasion of its 35th anniversary.

It has been said that an idea well timed is one of the greatest forces in the world. The gentleman, Mr. Henry Giessenbier, who is credited with founding the organization, certainly had such an idea. I am sure he and the others who joined him in the organizational meeting in St. Louis have been very agreeably surprised at the rapid growth and expansion of junior chambers of commerce, not only in every State of the United States, but into 52 other countries.

But on reflection should it be too much of a surprise? Is it not the normal enthusiastic response of our young men to the challenge of our times? I believe it is, and imbued with the spirit of the definition of their organization, "a constructive action organization of young men who devote a portion of their time to community service in the public interest, developing young men as leaders in their community," I predict for this splendid organization greater growth and even more effective community service.

I am particularly proud of the work of the Arkansas Junior Chamber of Commerce in such service in its contribution to the efforts on the part of several civic organizations in my State in arousing community responsibility. This program has been very effective and has prompted editorial commendation from leading newspapers and magazines. In fact, it has been so noteworthy that I understand similar programs are in progress or are contemplated in other States. The Arkansas Jaycees are to be congratulated for their cooperation and effective work in this program in our State.

The Arkansas Jaycees are to be commended for their services and contributions to the United States Chamber. These have been notable. In 1942–43 the Arkansas Jaycees gave the United States Jaycees their national president in the person of William M. Shepherd of Little Rock.

Also at the last national convention of the United States Chamber the Arkansas Jaycees started a movement which has resulted in the building of a Jaycee "white house" in Tulsa as a permanent home for the national president. This home will be built and completely furnished from donations of material and furnishings from Jaycee clubs all over the United States and will probably have some things in it from every State.

And I suspect a custom commenced by the Arkansas Jaycees in connection with the national conventions is appreciated by more members than any of its services or contributions. Each year the State delegation from Arkansas feeds the entire convention some of the finest fried chicken in the world. Of course, the fowl used came from northwest Arkansas. These Arkansas annual chicken parties have, I am told, become a tradition throughout the Jaycee world, and if the fried chicken served to them is as good as I have eaten in all sections of the State, I can heartily recommend it.

Mr. President, I am pleased to announce that Mr. Robert F. Kennedy, who will likely be chief counsel for the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee, and who has served for the past several months as chief counsel for the minority members of said committee, has been selected by the junior chamber of commerce as 1 of the 10 outstanding young men in the United States for the year 1954. A citation will be awarded to him for this honor tomorrow night, January 22, at Louisville, Ky.

I am sure Members of this body are gratified to know that young Kennedy has received this honor and that he is now and will continue to be on the staff of one of the Senate's permanent committees.

Mr. BARRETT subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to join with the distinguished Senator from Utah in his commendation of the junior chamber of commerce. I should like to say that we in the West were very happy when a fine young man from Utah was elected president of the organization. At the same time, a very outstanding young man of my State was elected vice president of the organization—Mr. John Hendrickson, of Casper. He has served with President Buckner in the past year. I was very much pleased about a month ago when Mr. Hendrickson agreed to join my staff and become my secretary in Washington. I can say to the Senator from Utah that the young business people of Wyoming have taken a very prominent part in civic and business affairs in my State. We are very much pleased that they have taken their rightful place as leaders of tomorrow.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I am very happy indeed because of the statements made by the various Senators who have participated in these tributes and have spoken in connection with the anniversary of the founding of the junior chamber of commerce.

I may say that all of us recognize the great service this organization is performing and the wonderful opportunities it will have for future service. It is really one of our great organizations, even though it is only 35 years of age.

In behalf of my fellow citizen from Utah, Mr. Buckner, the president of the junior chamber of commerce, I desire to express gratitude and sincere appreciation for the very splendid compliments and remarks which have been made in the Senate today, with respect to that organization.

TERMINATION OF POLITICAL CHARACTER ASSASSINATION

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, some weeks ago I attended a banquet given by the Women's Press Club at the Statler Hotel. On that occasion I heard the address delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], in which he pleaded with those in politics to end character assassination.

On the following day, when speaking on the floor of the Senate, I took occasion to commend the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] for his remarks, saying that throughout my association with politics I had hoped to see the day when vituperation and so-called character assassination might disappear; but I also expressed some doubt as to whether that would be accomplished.

I recall that at times, in the days of my youth, I traveled around my native State with my uncle, who was a politician of some renown in that area; and I recall that the candidates of both parties—both the Republican candidates and the Democratic candidates—would travel together and would be in the same railroad car or, in the earlier days, in the same buggy; and they would stay at the same hotel, would eat at the same table, and would partake from the same bottle; and then would stand on the same stump, and would give each other the particular devil. But they got along.

Mr. President, because of long interest in this subject, I have made a study into so-called character assassination, both past and present; and I have come to the conclusion that people who live in glass houses should not throw rocks.

Mr. President, vituperation has been a feature of political life in the United States since the founding of the Republic.

Let us examine a few instances of this. Early in 1796 President Washington delivered a message to Congress in person.

Here is the way the message was received by the Philadelphia Aurora, a newspaper zealous in support of Thomas Jefferson.

> If ever a nation was debauched by a man, the American Nation has been debauched by Washington. If ever a nation has been deceived by a man, the American Nation has been deceived by Washington.[1]

Here is another sample. This is John Randolph of Virginia, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, referring to Edward Livingston:

> Fellow citizens, he is a man of splendid abilities; but utterly corrupt. Like rotten mackerel by moonlight, he shines and stinks.[2]

Democrats have excelled in political mudslinging. We may recall that in the campaign of 1860, when Lincoln ran for the first time, he was referred to as a descendant of "an African gorilla."[3]

Again, in 1864, Harper's magazine made a collection of some of the epithets flung at Lincoln by the Democrats. Here is a handful: Filthy storyteller, despot, liar, thief, buffoon, perjurer, and butcher.[4]

Of course, when Democrats attack Democrats in politics, then indeed vituperation can rise—or, if you prefer, sink—to either extraordinary heights or depths.

The distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] will no doubt recall a famous instance of this which occurred when the Senator was 18 or so. At that time State Senator William Goebel was one of the most powerful Democratic politicians in Kentucky. He was a resident of Covington. Likewise there lived in Covington an influential politician named Col. John Sanford. Goebel and Sanford had been bitter enemies for many years. Goebel had bought control of the Covington Ledger, a weekly newspaper. In this paper Goebel ran a piece referring to "Col. John Gonorrhea Sanford, who claims to carry the legislative vote of the county of Kenton in his pocket."

It was quite a spirited article in which these references to "Gonorrhea John" were repeated so that it would be hard, indeed, for Colonel Sanford to escape the idea that "gonorrhea" was precisely the word that Goebel intended to use. One day in April 1895—shortly after the article had appeared in print—the two men chanced to meet on the street in Covington. Colonel Sanford asked Goebel if he was responsible for the article. Senator Goebel said that he was. Both men reached for their guns. Goebel's aim was better than Sanford's. Sanford pitched over dead with a bullet in his head. Goebel escaped with a bullet hole through his coat. Goebel surrendered at once to the police. A brief examining trial was held, the judge dismissed all charges and Goebel was at liberty. Such are the vicissitudes of Democratic politics.[5]

I may add that the first election for sheriff in my county of Maricopa was decided by pistol, but the winner was not allowed to take office.

Later President Theodore Roosevelt had the pleasure of being referred to as a "policeman turned bandit. In the name

[1] Aurora, March 23, 1796.

[2] Randolph of Roanoke, by Gerald W. Johnson. N. Y. Minton Balch & Co., 1929. P. 16.

[3] Abraham Lincoln, the Prairie Years, by Carl Sandburg. N. Y. Harcourt Brace, 1926, vol. II, p. 355.

[4] Abraham Lincoln, the War Years, by Carl Sandburg. N. Y. Harcourt Brace, 1939, pp. 389–390.

[5] The Goebel-Sanford shooting is reviewed at some length in Famous Kentucky Tragedies and Trials, by L. F. Johnson, 1933. Banks-Baldwin Law Publishing Co., Cleveland, Ohio. P. 272 ff.

of equity and under the guise of friendship, he smote the innocent and plundered the defenseless."[6]

John Nance Garner, who was the Democratic Speaker of the House during the last 2 years of Hoover's Presidency admitted that—

I fought President Hoover with everything I had, under Marquis of Queensberry, London prize ring and catch-as-catch-can rule.[7]

And of Henry T. Rainey, who was then the Democratic House floor leader, it was said that "no smear was too filthy for him to use."

I could go on giving historical examples from political campaigns, early and late, in which rival candidates threw dead cats, mud, and anything else they could lay their hands upon, at their opponents.

I wish now to refer to a few examples of rather recent vintage.

In speaking about the Republican Party, during an address to the Democratic National Committee meeting, on March 5, 1931, when he was a Senator from Tennessee, Cordell Hull said:

The Republican Party is hopelessly chained to the chariot wheels of aggravated special privilege. It is being led, and has been led for 10 years, by persons who are both blind and asleep, and without vision, and today we are experiencing the culmination of its financial leadership and economic leadership of the past 10 years (p. 425).

The Republican administration has suffered a complete breakdown, not only politically but morally and economically, and intellectually as well (p. 426). (Speech by Cordell Hull (then Senator from Tennessee) to the Democratic National Committee meeting, March 5, 1931, official proceedings of the Democratic National Convention, 1932.)

I quote a few remarks by Paul V. McNutt. I quote from a speech made by Mr. McNutt when he seconded President Roosevelt's nomination in 1936:

Who opposes that leader? The Socialists, the Communists, the Fascists, the reactionary Republicans, and that last infirmity of political minds, the Liberty League, taken together an unholy alliance of Bourbons and Bolsheviki, oppose him. That is one reason so many real Americans are for him (p. 228). (Speech by Paul V. McNutt, of Indiana, seconding Roosevelt's nomination; official proceedings of the Democratic National Convention, June 26, 1936.)

When I read some of the statements made by Vice President NIXON, about which bitter complaint is made, I wonder how the conscience of a party can complain, with this kind of smear on its record.

Paul McNutt said later:

Two weeks ago what is left of the Republican Party held a convention. In the dull, lifeless, futile Cleveland meeting, the delegates staged a few mechanical demonstrations, gave the salute to the dead, to one Herbert Clark Hoover, who abandoned his role as chief peeker-around-corners to become the Nation's scarecrow, adopted a platform and selected a ticket, both of which can be described by a couplet "Back on the rocks with Landon and Knox" (p. 230). (Speech by Paul V. McNutt, of Indiana, seconding Roosevelt's nomination; official proceedings of the Democratic National Convention, June 26, 1936.)

James A. Farley, a man who was thought by the public to stand for the highest ideals in politics, once made this remark:

Greedy, selfish interests which dominated the Government from the time that Woodrow Wilson left the White House to the day Franklin D. Roosevelt took the wheel.

Moreover, you must realize that the assault on the Roosevelt administration will be financed with the largest slush fund on record, contributed for the most part by those who have neither public conscience nor private scruple. They are men who are interested only in getting back the inordinate privileges which have enabled them to exploit the people in the past and who will hit below the belt, or do anything else that they think may give them hope of regaining their pirate ascendancy. In the ranks of our foes you will find not only the financial gangsters whose extortions were so largely responsible for bringing on the Hoover panic, but others, who for one reason or another hate Franklin D. Roosevelt, or who are accessories of the exploiters (p. 358). (Address of James A. Farley, chairman, Democrat National Committee, official proceedings of the Democratic National Convention, June 26, 1936.)

We now come to a period in the history of American politics which I think has no equal for dirt, for character assassination, for the slinging of mud, or for anything else one wishes to ascribe to a campaign which is particularly dirty. I refer to the era between 1932—it started, really, before 1932—and the present time.

I refer to the campaign of vilification which was carried on against that great American, Herbert Hoover. I wish to make a few remarks on that subject, and also insert a few remarks on that particular score.

What were the relations between President Hoover and the Congress? What happened to the President's legislative program? That is not of particular interest at the present time, because we in this Nation are again confronted with a President of one party and a Congress in control of another party. We await eagerly to see what will happen. Let us see what happened in the program of vilification to which I have referred.

Shortly after the 1928 election, John J. Raskob, the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, "essayed the rehabilitation of the Democratic Party" as Charles Michelson described it, by setting up a press bureau in Washington. Michelson, an adroit and experienced newspaperman, was put in charge of this bureau.

What Michelson did is described—pages 249–251—by Eugene Lyons in Our Unknown Ex-President:

A unique factory was opened up in Washington about 3 months after the inauguration of President Hoover. An understanding of the administration and of Hoover's personal ordeal is impossible without awareness of this strange enterprise. And the date of its organization is significant. It was not, as some people later pretended, a reaction to the slump or an answer to the President's "fumbling" of depression problems, for these things were still in the future.

The factory might be called Michelson's Mills, although technically it figured as the press division of the Democratic National Committee. Its products were smear stuff, rumors, verbal tar and feathers, and high-grade literary ectoplasm manufactured by Charlie Michelson and his associated ghosts. The plant occupied nearly a whole floor of the National Press Building and it specialized in processing every word and act of the President—including words he never uttered and acts he never committed—into proofs of his ineptitude, callousness, and confusion.

It mattered little what went into the Michelson Mills at one end. The genius of its presiding chemists transmuted it to evil-smelling stuffs at the other end. Hoover's pessimism in seeking to restrain speculative forces served as well as his optimism in envisioning recovery after the October smash-up. His refusal to roll out the pork barrel was parsimony; his budget for public works and economic rescue agencies was extravagance. Many of the very agencies and procedures which this factory later dressed up as proofs of New Deal genius were mocked and mauled here when Hoover first proposed them.

No President, not even Washington and certainly not Lincoln, escaped vilification while in office and after. But in Hoover's case the process was put on an organized, systematic, and scientific basis. The techniques of smearing, after all, had been amazingly improved since Lincoln's time. Every accusation against Hoover was endlessly multiplied, as in repeating mirrors, through press syndication, canned speeches, quickie books, bushels of cartoons, miles of radio broadcasts—all of it on a mass-production basis. * * *

This time the opposition organized for continuous attack before they had the faintest knowledge what they would be called upon to attack. * * *

The Democratic National Committee raised nearly $3 million for the undertaking. Part of this went to cover campaign deficits. The rest, estimated at no less than $2 million, went to oil the wheels of the smear mills. * * *

Two other novel features need to be mentioned. The first is that this great effort was not directed especially against the Republican Party but specifically against one man, Herbert Hoover. The theory, and a mighty smart one for all its indecency, was that some Republicans, too, could be incensed against their standard bearer who was certain to run for reelection. The second is that the systematic process of character assassination was not soft pedaled after its victim had been ousted from the White House; on the contrary, it was even stepped up and infinitely refined, until Hoover was turned into a synonym for all the sins and fears and angers of a troubled time.

It should be recalled that the crisis in national economy and morale during the Hoover administration was as serious as war itself. It demanded some measure of national unity, some relaxation of the partisan spirit, at least a moratorium on the more egregious varieties of mudthrowing. No President in peacetime had ever made more earnest and self-effacing proffers of bipartisan action to find solutions for problems threatening the very survival of American civilization. No President had ever been so completely and insultingly rebuffed.

* * * The Shouse-Michelson offensive, far from easing off when catastrophes such as market crashes, economic collapse, floods, drought, struck the country, went into high gear. The factory thrived on disaster and therefore hailed the approach of every new one with whoops of joy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of my prepared statement on this subject be printed in the RECORD.

[6] Roosevelt Fact and Fable, by Mrs. A. R. Hale. N. Y. Broadway Publishing Co., 1908, p. 85.

[7] My White House Years, by Herbert Hoover. Collier's Magazine, May 17, 1952.

There being no objection, the remainder of Mr. GOLDWATER'S statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By 1931, not long before the 72d Congress assembled, the press attacks had gone far beyond the initial efforts of Michelson. In that year, for example, the anonymous Washington Merry-Go-Round (for a considerable time it was not known that the authors were Drew Pearson and Robert Allen) was telling the world (p. 55) that Hoover's "whole record throughout the great national disaster is unbelievable for its abysmal incompetence, do-nothingness, and reactionary stultification."

A REPUBLICAN PRESIDENT WITH A DEMOCRATIC HOUSE

In December 1931 the new Congress convened; this was the situation: In the Senate were 48 Republicans, 47 Democrats, and 1 Farmer-Labor Member. There was no sure control due to the frequent defections of the so-called insurgent Republican Senators (Norris, Borah, Nye, La Follette, etc.). In the House, 220 Republicans had been elected in 1930 as against 214 Democrats and 1 Farmer-Labor Member. However, by the time the 72d Congress first convened the Republican delegation had been reduced to 214 through the death of Members; and the Democrats, through the displacement in special elections of these deceased Republican Members had acquired a total of 218. (The remaining two vacancies were subsequently filled by Democrats.)

In effect, Hoover had a Democratic Congress. One result may be seen in the action taken by the Senate on civilian nominations, submitted by the President during the session beginning December 5, 1932, and ending March 4, 1933 (see record of civilian nominations for that session of Congress in the office of the executive clerk of the Senate):

	Number nominated	Number confirmed
Postmasters	1,667	None
Coast Guard officers	35	35
Public Health Service	35	35
Other civilian offices	61	1
Total	1,798	71

That is to say, during this session of the Congress—leaving aside the Coast Guard and Public Health Service positions— there was a single confirmation of an executive nomination. The exception: Roy D. Chapin, to be Secretary of Commerce.

HOOVER'S ACCOUNT OF THE DEADLOCK

The situation which President Hoover faced with the 72d Congress is described by Hoover in various parts of his series in Collier's, as follows:

"I was faced with a Democratic majority in Congress, whose partisan action no man could measure or conciliate. The skirmishing for the 1932 campaign had begun. Out of power for three administrations, the Democrats at last saw a chance for victory. They were hot with partisanship, and would not regret it if demoralization extended through the election" (May 10, 1952, p. 75).

"Reforms which would have been possible, depression notwithstanding, met another obstacle in the shape of an opposition Congress during the second half of my term. That being the last session before the 1932 election, it brought out all that is worst in the democratic process. I felt deeply that the independence of the legislative arm must be respected. I had little taste for forcing congressional action or engaging in battles of criticism, although that could not be avoided with a Democratic Congress bent on administration ruin" (Apr. 26, 1952, p. 26).

"The fourth period of the depression began early in December 1931. It lasted 11 months and saw our descent to the bottom of the depression pit in July 1932. It was in this period that a Democratic Congress, bent on political destruction of the Republican administration, added to the impacts of Europe and of our own weak banking system" (May 3, 1952, p. 41).

"The congressional election in November 1930 went against us, with a Democratic majority in the House and an effective opposition coalition in the Senate. That Democratic-controlled Congress was not to come into session until a year later in December 1931, but prices of commodities and securities fell sharply with the election. I tried to patch up this threat to public morale by making an agreement to 'cooperate' with the Democratic leaders. They soon demonstrated, however, that they were entirely satisfied, and even anxious, to see the depression prolonged to the presidential election of 1932" (May 3, 1952, p. 45).

"When I conferred with them (Democratic leaders in Congress) before introducing my program to Congress, I added that if the Democrats had a constructive program prepared, I would go the full length to support it. I asked for their program. They replied that it was my responsibility to propose a program and theirs to criticize it. The fact is that they had no program except to embarrass me and assure the country that if I were thrown out they could save the Nation. They were very skillful at camouflaging their actions with loud oratory on human suffering."

In a letter to Mr. Hoover, Republican Congressman Hawley wrote:

"Mr. Rainey stated that he would not sponsor the legislation as proposed by you nor would he urge the committees having jurisdiction of such legislation to consider and favorably report thereon. * * * He gave as the reason for his refusal, 'We intend to beat him, Hoover' " (May 17, 1952, pp. 23, 36).

"There was a choice of two courses: To join battle with the Democratic-controlled Congress, or to do one's best to cooperate, consult, explain, and implore. * * * I proposed measures to meet the situation so far as we could see it at the time. * * * But the Democratic leaders now at once attacked my proposals and denounced me as responsible for the depression. The nature of their future tactics immediately appeared: To sabotage and delay—up to the full extent that would not arouse the public against them. * * * In the half year before Congress was to adjourn, virtually every proposal I made meant a battle. * * * In all, our running battle with a Democratic-controlled Congress bent on delaying recovery until it would come too late to affect the impending presidential election lasted 8 months. * * * The stalling and sabotage began immediately with the opening of Congress in December 1931 and lasted until the end of June or early July 1932. * * * The Democratic Congress had dug the depression deeper than would have been necessary if we had had a cooperative Capitol Hill during the emergency—even deeper, in fact, than was necessary to win an election" (May 17, 1952, pp. 36, 44, 45).

President Hoover said in a speech in St. Louis in November 1932: "Instead of a constructive program the Democratic leaders passed a number of bills through the Democratic House of Representatives designed to appeal to discontent and sectional cupidity and indeed of the type that would have destroyed the very foundations of our American system. Its threats to confidence set recovery backward."

In a Salt Lake City speech Hoover said: "We were delayed * * * by the destructive attitude of the Democratic House of Representatives which proposed day-by-day measures which pandered to sectional and group interest in preparation for this political campaign. These obstructive actions themselves destroyed public confidence" (pp. 197 and 149, Campaign Speeches of 1932, by President Hoover and ex-President Coolidge; Doubleday, Doran & Co., 1933).

CONGRESSIONAL OBSTRUCTION TO HOOVER PROGRAM

Ray Lyman Wilbur and Arthur M. Hyde, in their book, The Hoover Policies (pp. 478–480), state:

"No clear exposition of the policies of the Hoover administration is possible without realization of the character of the Congress of 1931–33. * * * The congressional elections of 1930 had produced a House that was in majority Democratic. The Senate was in majority Democratic and radical Republican. In the face of the great crises which culminated with the British collapse in October 1931, President Hoover called movingly for national unity and cooperation outside of politics. He took council with Democratic leaders equally with Republicans. Some Democratic Members did cooperate and genuine tributes were paid to their patriotism by the President. But aside from those exceptions and some lip service, it was obvious that the Democratic control was resolved to sabotage the President's program and to delay recovery itself with the hope of winning the election a year later. This can be made evident if we review the fate of the President's urgent emergency program during the session of 1931–32.

"1. On December 8, 1931, the President proposed the creation of the RFC with widespread powers to support the financial and industrial fabric. The act was passed 46 days later with reduced resources and more limited scope. The balance of the powers vital to employment and agriculture asked for were not enacted for 221 days. (See RFC, p. 427.)

"2. The President on December 8 proposed an increase in the land bank capital and an entire revision of the land banks to enable them to handle farm mortgage emergencies. The increase of capital was given 44 days later and the revision was not passed until a year later. In the RFC proposals were provisions which would have allowed the establishment of a system of agricultural production and livestock loan banks. This provision was enacted 221 days after its proposal. (See Agricultural Credit, p. 442.)

"3. The President, on December 8, proposed the creation of a system of home loan banks to relieve pressure on homeowners and to stimulate home building. The act in attenuated form was passed 220 days later. Foreclosures on thousands of homes would have been saved by reasonable promptness. (See Home Loan Banks, p. 436.)

"4. On December 8 the President proposed an extension of 'eligibility' paper in the Federal Reserve System. The purpose was to allow immediate expansion of credit to meet the contraction due to foreign withdrawals of gold. It was not until the situation became so acute as to threaten the gold standard and to force the country to the edge of panic that this action was taken by Congress 80 days late. (See Protecting the Gold Standard, p. 470, and Expansion of Federal Reserve Credit, p. 449.)

"5. On February 29, 1932, the President proposed his great reform of the bankruptcy laws to bring about an adjustment of overwhelming debt to farmers, homeowners, railways, and business. This law was not passed until a year later, just prior to the Roosevelt inauguration. (See Adjustment of Debt, p. 486.)

"6. On December 3, 1929 (and often before), the President proposed a drastic reform of the whole banking system so as to make deposits safe. Nothing was done but talk till 1933 and then only an attenuated bill passed by the Senate in 1933. (See Banking Reform, p. 332.)

"7. On December 8, 1931, the President proposed that loans should be made on the assets of closed banks to enable distributions to depositors and to conserve the assets for their benefit. It was not passed until the Roosevelt administration.

"8. On December 8, 1931 (and before), the President urged a revision of railway regulation so as to strengthen railway service and finance. It has never been adequately done. (See Reform of Railway Regulation, p. 320.)

"9. Beginning in December 1929, repeatedly, the President urged the regulation of electrical power companies. The Federal Power Commission was created but the full authorities recommended by Hoover were not accepted. (See Electrical Power Regulation, p. 314.)

"10. On December 8, 1931, the President urged the absolute necessity of balancing the Federal budget. On December 9, he presented an executive budget with a cut of over $350 million in the ordinary Federal expenditures. The Congress refused all but about $150 million. In February the President proposed additional reductions of ordinary Federal expenditures of $300 million which required legislative action. It finally passed on June 30 as $130 million savings. (See Balancing the Budget, p. 450.)

"11. On February 17, 1932, the President presented a plan of reorganization of Federal bureaus that would make great savings. In June a make-believe authority was passed that meant nothing. (See Reorganization of Federal departments, p. 561.)

"12. On December 9, 1931, the President proposed an increase of over a billion in taxes in order to balance the budget. It was not until 90 days later that a revenue bill was reported out of committee. With its large membership, for years it had been the practice of the House to consider its revenue legislation under a special rule, limiting the number of hours that the bill could be considered under general debate. The Democratic House leaders refused such a rule in considering this particular bill. The bill was debated for 15 days. In the face of a national emergency it was talked to death. The President was angry but held his tongue to soft words and conciliation, for it was the Democrats who had to legislate if the country was to be saved from panic, and a few decent Democrats had supported the President.

"From February to May no progress had been made on the President's program. By the month of May it became clear to the country that this sabotage of recovery was in progress and alarm became general."

CONCLUSION

It is interesting to note that several of the measures in President Hoover's program were subsequently passed under the Roosevelt administration which followed.

These included (p. 5, Legislative Program of President Hoover, Research Division, Republican National Committee, July 1952):

1. Reform of the bankruptcy laws (requested February 28, 1932; enacted March 3, 1933).

2. Reform of the banking system (proposed December 3, 1929; no congressional action) to permit statewide branch banking by national banks and the guaranty of bank deposits (the latter carried out under President Roosevelt).

3. Revision of railroad regulation (proposed December 8, 1931, but never enacted).

4. Regulation of power companies (proposed 1929, but not enacted during his administration).

5. Reorganization of Federal executive departments (proposed for economy and greater efficiency, but never enacted under his administration).

In recalling his efforts to deal with what seemed like an endless series of economic disasters, Mr. Hoover has told how the Democrats either blocked his proposals or strove to saddle them with crippling amendments or, on their own account, worked up inflationary measures.

Two examples:

1. Hoover's proposal for the RFC (sent to Congress December 8, 1931) was given the Garner treatment in the shape of an amendment "to furnish a huge porkbarrel to increase nonreproductive public works; and to direct the RFC to go on an orgy of loans to private individuals and local governments for almost everything. * * * A Senate investigation in 1951 disclosed every evil I had predicted." (Colliers, May 17, 1952, p. 36.)

2. After seeing the veterans' bonus passed over his veto in 1931, in the spring of 1932, Hoover "was compelled to stop a Democratic veterans' bonus for $2.4 billion, payable in fiat money." (Colliers, April 26, 1952, p. 61.)

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. POTTER. I am sure the Senator from Arizona recalls that during the administration of former President Herbert Hoover and for 20 years thereafter the Democratic Party referred to the worldwide depression as the Hoover Depression, and referred to the Republican Party as the Depression Party.

I am convinced that if any of our three more recent wars, the First World War, the Second World War, and the Korean conflict, had occurred during a Republican administration, the Democratic Party would have accused the Republican Party of being a war party, and that they would have labeled such a war with the name of the Republican President.

Heaven forbid that it should happen, but if we should within the next few years become engaged in a third world war, I am of the opinion, judging from past experience, that the war would be labeled the Eisenhower war.

All Americans abhor any politician who stoops to a smear campaign. The distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], in his recent speech, not on the floor of the Senate, made reference to smear activities by hinting that the Vice President—although he did not mention the Vice President by name—was conducting a smear campaign.

The research I have made on the subject shows that the Vice President, in the speech to which the Senator from Oregon objected, had referred to the Senator from Oregon as a leftwinger.

Mr. President, how sensitive can politics be? I am sure the distinguished Senator from Arizona has been called a reactionary Republican by some groups, and a radical Republican by other groups. Perhaps the word "Republican" has been left off at times in making reference to him, and he has been labeled a radical. Such terms are commonly used. We often hear used the terms "leftwinger" and "rightwinger." I suspect that possibly our friends on the other side have become extremely sensitive.

When it comes to political philosophy, I agree that it is difficult to use one term with which to characterize a political philosophy. However, the situation works both ways. We have had to suffer many times quite unjustly, and I am rather fearful that our opposition has become extremely sensitive in this area.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Michigan. I stated that for 20 long years the Democratic Party has told lies about Herbert Hoover. All that we have been trying to do is to tell the truth about Harry Truman.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to yield further.

Mr. POTTER. I am sure the Senator from Arizona remembers the presidential campaign of not so long ago when former President Harry Truman was campaigning in what I believe was referred to as a "Give 'em hell campaign."

As I recall the various statements which were made during that campaign, the Republicans in Congress were called not only reactionaries, but it was charged that they were being paid by various special interests, and that they were mossbacks. Certainly that is not the kindest language that could be used. I am sure the Senator will agree with me in that regard.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I would say that the Senator from Michigan has only touched on the more polite terms that were used.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. POTTER. I am fearful that if I were to repeat some of the words that have been used by former President Truman, I might be ruled to be not in order in the Senate.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator. I am sure he is correct, and, I might add, in concluding my comments on his remarks, that if by some unhappy circumstance—and all of us pray that it will not happen—our country should become embroiled in another war, this time under a Republican administration, if I am not mistaken in my recollection of history it would be the first war in which this country ever became involved in war under a Republican administration.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Arizona has referred to the speech made by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. Did the Senator from Arizona hear anything in that speech of the Senator from Oregon which directly impugned the motives or conduct of any individual?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I believe the Senator from Louisiana was not in the Chamber when I began my remarks. I merely referred to the remarks of the junior Senator from Oregon as a key with which to unlock this door of my remarks.

It was the Senator from Oregon who suggested the character assassination end. However, it is the Democratic Party which continues to vilify the Vice President. I merely used the remarks of

the Senator from Oregon as what in golf is called a tee, from which to tee off.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to yield further.

Mr. LONG. Speaking for myself, I do not recall anything the Vice President said during the campaign which went beyond the point that is often reached during campaigns, and sometimes in Congress, when a speaker sometimes engages in partisanship. At times, in attempting to be partial to one's own party, a person sometimes stretches a point. That is not an unusual development in a campaign.

It seems to me that everyone at the dinner at which the junior Senator from Oregon spoke should have applauded the Senator's speech. There was nothing in the speech of the Senator from Oregon at which offense could be taken.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am not criticizing the speech of the junior Senator from Oregon. In fact, I complimented him on the floor of the Senate for that speech.

What I am doing—and I am getting into this subject now—is defending the Vice President of the United States against past, present, and future attacks which I believe are entirely uncalled for.

I am very happy to hear the Senator from Louisiana say that he has never heard the Vice President in a campaign say anything that the Senator from Louisiana felt was untoward.

I can honestly and truthfully say that in the research I have done I could not find anything that a Member of the Senate has said that I would particularly take offense at. Perhaps the trouble lies in the management end of the Democratic Party, namely, in the downtown office of the party.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for an observation?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. WELKER. I did not attend the banquet where the junior Senator from Oregon was alleged to have said something derogatory about or to have impugned the motives and the conduct of the Vice President. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] apparently were present. But I do read occasionally, Mr. President, and I have read editorials by famous writers who condemned the junior Senator from Oregon for his statements and conduct. Perhaps I may be in error. I was not present when the speech was delivered. I am glad, however, to find that the junior Senator from Louisiana, who is sometimes called "the Judge" by me in the cloakrooms, has now seen fit to glide over statements made by one of his colleagues, and yet, a few days ago, when he was presiding in this august body, he directed a colleague to take his seat for a statement wherein no Senator's name was mentioned, but which merely said that in the Senator's opinion some of the coauthors of a certain resolution were not sincere.

We are getting down to brass tacks. I hope the Senator from Louisiana will continue as he has been proceeding, but apparently either a number of editorial writers missed the point, or the Senator from Louisiana missed it, either on the floor of the Senate or at the meeting to which reference has been made.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I would only refer my distinguished colleague to the RECORD, where I think he will find that in regard to the speech made by the Senator from Oregon there was no reference made to any individual. I do not believe the Senator accused anyone of any character assassination. I believe that if the same speech were made on the floor of the Senate, there would be no reason for anyone to feel that he was being criticized by that speech.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, once again I should like to put the mind of the Senator from Louisiana at ease. I am not condemning the speech of the junior Senator from Oregon. I complimented him on certain phases of it.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I came into the Chamber at about the time the Senator from Arizona was discussing some war which he said might be classified as an Eisenhower war.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That was the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Did the Senator from Arizona make any reference to it at all?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No. I made a a statement, which I am sure the Senator from Kentucky heard, in answer to the remarks of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], which I will repeat to the best of my ability, that the Republicans referred to the past three wars as Democratic wars, and the Democratic Party would certainly refer to any future war which might take place under a Republican administration as a Republican war.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. As I recall my remarks, I stated that the Democratic Party had referred to the depression of 1929 as the Hoover depression, and to the Republican Party as the depression party. I said I assumed they would carry out that same practice, and that if we should become engaged in a war under a Republican administration, they would use the same format they have used in the past, and that the Democratic Party would refer to it as an Eisenhower war.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, did I correctly understand the Senator from Arizona to say that if there should be a war it would be the first war under a Republican President?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I made the statement that to the best of my recollection it would be the first war under a Republican administration.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. As one who does not believe that there has ever been a war involving this country which has been caused by any political party, and that there has been no war ever fought by this country except in defense of the principles for which this Nation has stood, I do not think there has ever been a war which should be called a Wilson war, a Roosevelt war, a Truman war, a McKinley war, or an Eisenhower war. Certainly, the Spanish-American War had its inception while a Republican President was guiding the destinies of this country. I do not think there is any more patriotism in the breast of a member of one party than there is in the breast of a member of the other party.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I fully agree with the Senator. War is a national calamity. We do not like depressions, either, or some other things which have occurred in the normal course of our lives. I am happy to note that the Senator from Kentucky thinks we should not attach party names to such disasters. I mention again the fact that the depression of 1929 was referred to and is still referred to as the Hoover depression.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am glad to know that the only reference made to the Hoover depression has been on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think we have probably waited too long to speak of it and of the source of the language used in the campaign. It bears out what the Senator from Kentucky has said, that we should not attach party names to such situations; but it has been done.

Since the election Democratic Party spokesmen have been talking very bitterly about the speeches made by Vice President NIXON during the campaign last fall.

These intermittent blasts gradually assumed the appearance of a well-planned and coordinated attack. On the 12th of January Democratic National Chairman Butler invited Republican Chairman Hall to inspect a "chamber of smears" which the Democrats had assembled. This "chamber of smears" prominently displayed excerpts from these Nixon campaign addresses given in the West.

With this formal baptism, the New Deal mouthpieces, the leftwing columnists and commentators, swung into action. Now we have in full blast a campaign intended to damn the Vice President outright.

Why this attack on NIXON. The people conducting it claim he made statements during his campaign-speaking trips which were untrue, especially the statements on the issue of communism. He smeared the whole Democratic Party, they contend. The real reason behind this attempt to make NIXON out a liar and a smearer of the whole Democratic Party is that what the Vice President said was true and it was effective. Because it was true and effective, it hurt. Also, the Democratic spokesmen hesitate, as yet anyway, to try to tear down President Eisenhower. So they are making NIXON their target, and are aiming their fire at him with the 1956 campaign in mind.

Just what did the Vice President say in these so-called smear speeches? Here are some examples:

1. Two days ago I made some very serious charges against Mr. Truman, Mr. Stevenson, Mr. Mitchell, and other leaders of the ADA leftwing clique of the Democratic Party who are asking for the election of an anti-Eisenhower Congress. I stated that the Truman administration deliberately refused to heed the warnings of the FBI and in instance after instance promoted rather than fired individuals whose FBI reports indicated participation in Communist activities.[1]

Let us examine this passage. In the first place, Mr. Stevenson was the Democratic candidate in 1952. Mr. Stevenson was a member of the ADA and one of his most prominent brain trusters in the campaign was Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., who, right now, is national cochairman of the ADA.

The ADA has favored the admission of Communist China to the United Nations.[2]

The ADA's opposition to the admission of Spain to the United Nations will be recalled. So will its demand for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, its opposition to the Mundt-Nixon bill, and other similar measures.

Certainly, in the light of its history, the ADA can be reasonably identified as a leftwing outfit.

In all candor, it seems to me that the Senate should consider the definitions of the various wings we now accuse each party of having, because I think we are making a lot out of something which is considered, in the countries which have already tried it, as the road down which the Republican Party has traveled too long.

People object to being called leftwingers. I suspect that some persons object to being called rightwingers. I suspect that other persons object to being called middle-of-the-roaders or conservatives or liberals. But let us see if there is a reason for their objection. Let me compare what is going on in Congress today with the political philosophy of the Nation.

There is a group of people who believe that a big Federal Government is better than a small Federal Government. Certainly the accepted concepts of Jeffersonian Democrats would call for a small Federal Government. Yet there are persons in the Democratic Party who advocate a bigger Federal Government. Are they to the left of the party line, or are they to the right? I should say that, in the accepted usage of the word, they are to the left.

There are those in Congress who believe in Federal supremacy over States' rights. Here, again, we are confronted with one of the ancient concepts of the Democratic Party. Are we to say that a man who believes in Federal supremacy over States' rights is a Jeffersonian Democrat? Is he to the right? Does he believe in the concepts of that party? Or is he to the left? If he does not believe in States' rights, according to the accepted doctrines of the party, then I should say he is to the left, and should gladly assume that mantle.

We have in Congress persons who believe that Government control of business is preferable to the free-enterprise system. In both parties we have believed almost religiously, during the nearly 200 years of the life of the Republic, that free enterprise was the answer to expanding the economy of the country, with a minimum of Federal Government control. But there are persons in Congress, in both parties, who believe that the Federal Government can control business and produce a better economy than can the free-enterprise system. That, certainly, is to the left of accepted thinking.

On the other hand, there is in Congress a group of persons who believe halfway in the measures I have mentioned—and I could name others. They believe that a little of one thing is good, and a little of something else is good. We call such persons "middle of the roaders."

I cannot understand why a person who believes to the left of his party line should object to being called a leftwinger. That is the basis of most of the complaints about Vice President NIXON's remarks in the West. I think that the sooner both parties separate leftwingers from rightwingers, the better off the country will be; and we shall then stop the practice of having persons riding into power or office on the accepted political philosophy, when their own philosophy does not agree with it in any particular.

As I have said, Mr. Stevenson, the Democratic Presidential candidate, was an ADA member.

We may likewise recall that Mr. Stevenson appeared as a character witness for Alger Hiss and never thereafter gave any forthright public repudiation of Hiss.

Let us recall another incident. Was it not Adlai Stevenson who, as Assistant to the Secretary of the Navy, carried the orders that overruled the Navy board which had ordered the discharge of Communist radio operators from American vessels? Yes; it was. It was Adlai Stevenson also who transmitted the orders forbidding the chairman of this Navy board to testify before a House committee.[3]

This charge against Mr. Stevenson has been made before, but never, to my knowledge, has he made any forthright public statement about that either.

It may be said that anything done in 1941 is forgivable, that desolate mistakes were made in dealing with the Communists, but that, after all, we did not know then how sinister and threatening the Communists would turn out to be.

All I can say to that is that some persons knew in 1941 that Communists were sinister; and others, who did not, have had the guts since then to admit their mistake. But Mr. Stevenson has never admitted anything.

If past administrations were so zealous about Communist infiltration, how do we explain the fact that, as Assistant Secretary of State Berle testified, warnings about Alger Hiss were given to the State Department as far back as 1939? How can it be explained that it took a Republican House Committee on Un-American Activities 9 years later to force the facts about Hiss into the open and precipitate his indictment, trial, and conviction?[4]

The Vice President has bitter reason to speak hard on this point, for, at the last, when the going got rockier and rockier, when every form of obstruction was thrown in the committee's way, it was NIXON who persisted in the efforts that finally broke the case.

Let us go a little further in our examination of the Vice President's Rock Island speech. He said that the Truman administration had refused to heed FBI warnings and had promoted individuals involved in Communist activity.

If this is not the case, just exactly how would one describe Truman's handling of Harry Dexter White? White was assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury in 1946. J. Edgar Hoover testified, under oath, before the Senate Judiciary Committee on November 17, 1953, that warnings on White had been sent to the White House on November 8 and December 4, 1945. In the face of these warnings Truman promoted White to be Executive Director for the United States in the International Monetary Fund. He not only promoted him. Truman wrote White:

I am confident that in your new position you will add distinction to your already distinguished career with the Treasury.

When ex-President Truman was caught flatfooted by the first revelations about White, he stated that as soon as the White House learned that "White was wrong we fired him." This proved not to be the fact. White did not resign until March 31, 1946.

The public uproar continued. Finally, on November 16, 1953, Truman made a national broadcast. He said that the White promotion to the International Monetary Fund was done intentionally because "the course we took protected the public interest and, at the same time, permitted the intensive FBI investigation then in progress to go forward. No other course could have served both these purposes."

When FBI Director Hoover, during his testimony, was asked about this, he said:

I must point out that while he (White) was a member of the Monetary Commission, the premises of that Commission are extraterritorial and the FBI does not have any right to follow any employee or any person onto the property of the Commission.[5]

---

[1] Nixon speech at Rock Island, Ill., October 21, 1954.

[2] The New York Times, September 25, 1950.

[3] Testimony of Admiral Staton before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, 83d Congress, 2d session, March 2, 1954, pp. 1315 ff.

[4] Hearings before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, August 30, 1948.

[5] See the New York Times for November 7, 10, 17, and 18, 1953, for the verbatim texts of Attorney General Brownell's Chicago speech, former Secretary of State Byrnes' statement, Mr. Truman's Kansas City broadcast, and the testimony of the Attorney General and FBI Director Hoover before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee.

What does all this show? It shows that the Vice President's charge at Rock Island was true, and the truth on this issue is exactly what the New Deal ADA leftwing Democrats cannot stand.

I might say that during the campaign I made similar statements many times. They were not directed at the great bulk of Democrats, who are just as loyal to their country as are Members of the Republican Party; they were uttered honestly, in the hope that my feeble remarks might awaken the great Democratic Party to the fact that they were being wormed into by a group who not only do not believe in the Jeffersonian principles, but who I doubt seriously, have ever heard of those principles.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the text of numerous newspaper articles published throughout the country, quoting Vice President NIXON during the period of the campaign.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of October 20, 1954]

NIXON DENOUNCES TRUMAN, ACHESON

PHILADELPHIA, October 19.—Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON took the gloves off here tonight and charged former President Truman and Dean Acheson, former Secretary of State, with indifference to the campaign issue of communism at home.

As he carried his campaign for a Republican Congress into Pennsylvania, Mr. NIXON swung away from his earlier campaigning on the peace-prosperity-progress theme. Tonight, he placed the emphasis on his charge of Democratic failure to deal with Communists in the Federal Government.

Without using names, he cited what he said were seven typical cases of Communists in government who, he said, had been retained by the Truman-Acheson regime. By contrast he said the Eisenhower administration had "succeeded magnificently in cleaning up the mess they left."

For his 7 examples, Mr. NIXON listed 1 employee active in the Communist Party all through the late 1940's; a second who recruited Communist military forces for Eastern Europe; a third who attended Communist party meetings regularly from 1934 to 1938 and associated with Soviet Government representatives; and a fourth who contributed to Communist-front organizations and was close to officials of a Soviet satellite.

The fifth, he said, had been active in the Communist Party and its fronts in 1949, and had been arrested for distributing Communist literature. The sixth, active in Communist Party affairs, was chosen in 1949 to attend a Communist leadership school, redeclared. The seventh he added, was an official of a Communist Party club in 1950 and was a member of the party as late as 1952.

[From the New York Times of October 23, 1954]

NIXON WARNS FOES OF REDS IN PARTY—TELLS MONTANA RALLY THAT COMMUNISTS ARE SEEKING TO INFILTRATE DEMOCRATS

(By William R. Conklin)

BUTTE, MONT., October 22.—Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON charged here tonight that the Communist Party was determined to infiltrate the Democratic Party.

Winding up a day of "propeller stop" campaigning in Montana, Mr. NIXON quoted Communist Party documents tonight to prove that the Communist strategy of infiltrating the Democratic Party was succeeding. He told an audience in the Rialto theater that the Republican Party was opposed by the Communists and never would accept their support. He left the inference that the Democrats welcomed Communist assistance.

"The Communist Party is right when it says the 1954 elections are crucial in determining the path America will take," Mr. NIXON said. "It has determined to conduct its program within the Democratic Party. There is no question but that millions of loyal Democrats throughout the United States bitterly resent and will oppose this effort on the part of the Communists to infiltrate the Democratic Party and to make its policies the policies of the Democratic Party.

"As far as the Republican Party is concerned it never has had the support of the Communist Party, it does not have its support now and it will never accept it or have it in the future. We welcome the opposition of the Communist Party in this campaign.

"The previous administration's lack of understanding of the Communist danger and its failure to deal with it firmly abroad and effectively at home has led to our major difficulties today. The previous administration unfortunately adopted policies which were soft, vacillating, and inconsistent in dealing with the Communist threat.

"Abroad this type of policy contributed to the loss of 600 million people to the Communists in 7 years. It contributed to the loss of China and if China had not gone Communist there would have been no war in Korea."

Earlier Mr. NIXON declared he had taken a strong hand in the revocation of security clearance for Dr. Edward U. Condon, former Director of the National Bureau of Standards.

Mr. NIXON said he felt all the facts in the Condon case were not known. For that reason, he said, no routine security clearance should be given to Dr. Condon, whose clearance again was revoked yesterday by the Navy.

The Vice President said Dr. Condon's file should be reviewed by a special board, which could pass upon the full record. Mr. NIXON said he had supported Dr. Condon in 1951, when the official resigned his Federal post. Since then, he added, Dr. Condon has written a letter in support of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, nuclear scientist, also involved in a security controversy. Mr. NIXON asserted that the full record should be reviewed before any clearance was given.

Dr. Condon now is director of research and development for the Corning (N. Y.) Glass Co. He left the Government in 1951.

Yesterday, Charles S. Thomas, Secretary of the Navy, again suspended, for unannounced reasons, Dr. Condon's limited security clearance pending a complete review of the case. The Corning company announced only a few days ago that the scientist had been cleared by the Eastern Industrial Review Board for access to classified information.

The clearance had been granted in July, but it was not brought to light until the company made the announcement. Once before, in 1953, Dr. Condon's security clearance had been lifted.

[From the New York Times of October 24, 1954]

NIXON LINKS REDS TO LEFT-WING FOES—CHARGES COMMUNIST ALLIANCE WITH CLIQUE OF ADA—LISTS POLICY AGEEMENTS

(By William R. Conklin)

CHEYENNE, WYO., October 23.—Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON blasted away tonight at what he called the alliance between the Communist Party and left-wing Democrats to defeat Republican candidates for Congress.

His views were expressed in the text of what was intended to be a major speech here. The text was released from Bozeman, Mont., where Mr. NIXON and his party were blocked by snow. It was the first time since he began his 33-State campaign for GOP nominees that he was weatherbound.

In his speech he enunciated four major points on which, he said, "Communist Party members and left-wing clique of Americans for Democratic Action have joined forces."

Mr. NIXON and his party of 18 were scheduled to leave Butte by air at 10:05 o'clock this morning, New York time. Two inches of snow had fallen during the night. By morning the ceiling at Butte Airport was 700 feet and icing conditions prevailed. Between 7 and 10 a. m. the ground temperature remained at 2 degrees below freezing.

After waiting more than 4 hours to take off from Butte, the Vice President decided to drive 250 miles to Billings, where the airport was then open. The party of 13 drove to Bozeman through snow and rain over Pipestone Pass in the Continental Divide, but the airport was closed in by the time they arrived.

The Vice President, fretting over his interrupted schedule, released his Cheyenne speech as a statement. He planned to resume his trip by air to Salt Lake City, Utah, if weather precluded his speaking in Cheyenne tonight.

CRITICIZES SENATOR MURRAY

Before leaving Butte, Mr. NIXON criticized Democratic Senator JAMES E. MURRAY for using a photograph of himself and President Eisenhower in his campaign. "No Member of the Senate," Mr. NIXON said, "had a worse record in opposing the President than the senior Senator from Montana."

The NIXON forces made no secret of their desire to start a fight with the Democrats over the communism-in-Government issue. Mr. NIXON bore down hard on this theme in his Butte speech last night when he charged that Communists were determined to infiltrate the Democratic Party to control its policies. He amplified the attack today.

"It is time to talk bluntly and frankly about the most sinister development of this campaign to date," Mr. NIXON said.

"The Communist Party has agreed enthusiastically with Americans for Democratic Action in the latter's position on four major points. These are:

"1. Calling for the recognition of Communist China just before the Korean war.

"2. Attacking the Eisenhower security program.

"3. Calling for the abolition of the committee which brought out the evidence which convicted Alger Hiss. [This was the House Committee on Un-American Activities, of which Mr. NIXON was a member in 1949.]

"4. Constant sniping at J. Edgar Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

The Vice President said the majority of Democrats and Republicans were loyal Americans. He centered his attack on the Democrats associated with the ADA, and said other members of the Democratic Party should repudiate this group. Continuing his attack, he declared:

"The Communists know that the Democratic National chairman, Stephen A. Mitchell, has told the American people that a Democratic 84th Congress would go back to the Truman policies. These are the policies which meant:

"1. The Acheson foreign policy, so weak and inconsistent that it led to the loss of 600 million persons to the Communists in 7 years, and to the Korean war.

"2. The Truman 'red herring' attitude under which the previous administration tried unsuccessfully to shield Alger Hiss and to cover up the treachery of Harry Dexter White.

"3. The Truman so-called 'loyalty order,' under which individuals with clear Communist records in their files were retained in Government jobs and promoted rather than being fired.

"4. The Truman administration's policy of refusing to cooperate with J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI, and in consistently pigeonholing and failing to act on FBI reports on Communists, and other security risks.

[From the New York Times of October 25, 1954]

NIXON CRITICIZES CONDON'S RECORD—CALLS ON CALIFORNIA LEGISLATOR TO CLEAR HIMSELF ON RED CHARGES OR QUIT RACE

(By William R. Conklin)

LAS VEGAS, NEV., October 24.—Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON today called upon Representative Robert L. Condon, Democratic nominee for Congress from California's sixth district, to clear himself of security charges or to resign as a candidate.

Mr. NIXON, a Californian, made his demand in Salt Lake City, Utah, en route here from Bozeman, Mont. Low ceilings lifted sufficiently this morning to permit continuation of the Nixon campaign trip after an all-night grounding in Bozeman.

The Vice President went to church twice today. In Bozeman he attended the 8 a. m. mass in Holy Rosary Roman Catholic Church. At Salt Lake City he visited the 10,000-seat Mormon Tabernacle with Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture and 1 of the 12 apostles of the Mormon Church, where he heard Mr. Benson's 20-year-old daughter Barbara sing a 10-minute hymn. His party then left in a rainstorm for Las Vegas.

During this no campaigning Sunday, the Vice President found time to work for the reelection of Representative WILLIAM A. DAWSON, Republican, in Utah's Second Congressional District and Dr. H. A. Dixon, first district candidate who replaced Representative Douglas R. Stringfellow last Monday. Representative Stringfellow resigned after confessing that his tale of war heroism was a hoax.

Mr. NIXON also criticized Adlai E. Stevenson, 1952 Democratic Presidential nominee, for dismissing serious charges against the Democrats with quips; predicted the election of CLIFFORD P. CASE as a Republican Senator from New Jersey, expressed his backing for the upper Colorado River power and irrigation project; defended the United Nations against critics and praised the recent western defense agreement as the best news for the United States since World War II.

He extended his campaign trip to add a stop at Cheyenne, Wyo., at noon on Monday, Nov. 1. He had been scheduled to speak at two other places in Wyoming yesterday, but bad flying weather washed out these engagements.

Mr. NIXON plans to fly to Cheyenne from Seattle, with the possibility of a Monday night speech in Sioux City, Iowa.

CONDON BANNING CITED

In his statement on Representative Condon, Mr. NIXON said:

"Mr. Condon's participation in Communist activities has been so extensive that he was banned by the Atomic Energy Commission from witnessing secret atomic tests. He is the only member of Congress against whom such action was taken. His record was so bad that even the Democratic National Chairman, Stephen A Mitchell, called unsuccessfully for his defeat in the Democratic primaries last spring.

"Though Mr. Condon has not cleared his record since the charges were made, all the California State Democratic organizations are solidly supporting him and the Democratic National Committee is not seeking his defeat. Mr. Condon should either clear himself of these charges or resign from the ticket.

"If he does not resign, Mr. Mitchell and the California State Democratic Committee should force his resignation * * *."

Turning his fire on Mr. Stevenson, Mr. NIXON objected to the Stevenson characterization of the Vice President as "MCCARTHY with a white collar." Mr. Stevenson made that statement in Milwaukee Friday night.

"I resent his typically snide and snobbish innuendo toward the millions of Americans who work in our shops and factories," Mr. NIXON said. "The working people have a much keener and clearer understanding of the threat of communism at home than Mr. Stevenson has displayed during his public career."

"Mr. Stevenson not only testified for Alger Hiss, but he has never made a forthright statement deploring the terrible damage that Hiss and others like him did to America because of the protection and comfort they received from the Truman Administration and its predecessor."

In Nevada, at a Las Vegas press conference, Mr. NIXON urged the election of Ernest Brown, Republican Senate nominee, and of Clifton Young, nominee for Representative at Large.

The Vice President's campaign this week takes him to Arizona, Idaho, Oregon, Washington, Wyoming, and possibly Iowa.

[From the New York Times of October 26, 1954]

NIXON CONNECTS FIVE IN WEST TO LEFT—VICE PRESIDENT, PRESSING RED ISSUE, ATTACKS DEMOCRATS RUNNING FOR SENATE

(By William R. Conklin)

POCATELLO, IDAHO, October 25.—Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON slashed directly today at the issue of communism in Government by naming five Democratic candidates for the Senate in Western States as members of the left wing of their party.

As he opened the final week of his national drive to elect Republicans to both Houses, Mr. NIXON stressed this issue as paramount in the 1954 campaign.

The decision to hammer at it between now and November 2 was made despite some belief in the Republican high command that communism at home should be soft pedaled. Proponents of this view contended that employment and other domestic matters should be emphasized instead.

In a breakfast-through-dinner day of campaigning, the Vice President emphasized the administration's opposition to communism. He began with a breakfast talk to 400 in the Silver Slipper Cafe at Las Vegas, Nev. At a theater in Phoenix he bore down on this once more, with direct attacks on Stephen A. Mitchell, Democratic national chairman; Adlai E. Stevenson, 1952 presidential candidate, and former President Truman. A crowd estimated at 2,100 heard the attacks.

Mr. Nixon named John Carroll in Colorado, Richard L. Neuberger in Oregon, Joseph C. O'Mahoney in Wyoming, former Senator Glen H. Taylor in Idaho, and Samuel W. Yorty in California as all from the left wing of their party.

ANSWERS JOHNSON CHARGE

In a speech tonight at the Pocatello High School, Mr. NIXON answered statements by Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, Senate minority leader, that conservatives would shape United States policy if the Republicans won. The rally was attended by an estimated 2,200.

"Let us get down to actual names and cases on just what kind of a Congress an 84th anti-Eisenhower Congress would be," the Vice President said.

"Any gains the Democrats might make must inevitably come from their Americans for Democratic Action left wing, and not from those who represent more moderate views. If the Democrats win control of Congress, it will give a tremendous boost to the left-wing elements.

"Those who are calling for an anti-Eisenhower Congress are not moderates, but men like Mr. Truman, Mr. Stevenson and Mr. Mitchell, recognized leaders of the ADA left wing of the party. Mr. Mitchell has admitted that a Democratic 84th Congress would go back to the repudiated policies of the Truman administration.

"In five Western States we can see the national picture in capsule form. In Colorado, Oregon, Wyoming, Idaho and California, the Democrats are hoping to elect new men to the Senate. Their candidates, Messrs. Carroll, Neuberger, O'Mahoney, Taylor, and Yorty are all from the left wing of their party.

"These men are typical of the Democratic candidates in States where the Democrats must pick up seats to control the Congress. A Democratic victory will mean a sharp turn to the left, back down the road to socialism."

The 5 western Democratic candidates for the Senate share 3 factors, the Vice President said. He listed these as follows:

1. They have the enthusiastic support of the ADA left wing elements.

2. In varying degrees, they all are sincerely but enthusiastically dedicated to the Socialist left wing policies of the ADA and the Truman administration.

3. Their political and economic philosophy is poles apart from that of President Eisenhower and they inevitably will oppose major parts of his program.

"There is no State in the Union in which the choice is more clear-cut than here in Idaho, Mr. NIXON said.

In Phoenix, Ariz., at noon, Mr. NIXON said the Truman Democrats were doing everything they could to "hamper, hamstring and kill" the Eisenhower security program.

[From the New York Times of October 27, 1954]

NIXON IN OREGON HEARS GOP GAINS—SPEAKS FIVE TIMES FOR CORDON—SCORES TAYLOR IN IDAHO FOR STRINGFELLOW ATTACK

(By William R. Conklin)

PORTLAND, OREG., October 26.—Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON today made five speeches in this State for Senator Guy Cordon and the Republican candidates for Congress.

Jess J. Gard, Republican national committeeman from Oregon, told the Vice President that Senator Cordon now was showing a slight gain over RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat-Liberal supported by both the CIO and AFL here.

Mr. NIXON faced his largest audience in this swing when 10,500 gathered to hear him at noon in the Oregon State College Coliseum. Republicans came from 100 and 150 miles away, and afternoon classes were dismissed for the college students. The college crowd, a whistling, applauding audience, included about 80 percent of the 5,400 in the student body and 1,500 faculty members. The college band in orange and black uniforms played California Here I Come as Mr. NIXON entered.

The crowd remained standing and applauding for several minutes before he spoke.

AIMS ATTACK AT TAYLOR

In Portland tonight the Vice President drew 1,200 in the Masonic Temple. Smaller gatherings heard him at the Legion hall at Corvallis, Congregation Beth Israel and the Swedish Society of Portland. Extensive local radio and television coverage accompanied his campaigning.

Before leaving Idaho this morning, Mr. NIXON delivered a parting slap to ex-Senator Glen H. Taylor, Democrat, opposing Senator HENRY DWORSHAK.

The Vice President said Mr. Taylor had made a vicious attack on Representative Douglas R. Stringfellow, of Utah, who resigned last week after confessing a hoax on his war record.

"It does not sound well from a man with no service record to criticize a man paralyzed for life from war service," the Vice President said, referring to Mr. Stringfellow's having been wounded in actual combat.

"Since Mr. Taylor has gone outside his own State to make this attack," Mr. NIXON went on, "I challenge him to say whether Representative Robert Condon should get off the Democratic ticket for Congress in California's Sixth District. * * * Mr. Taylor is dedicated to a political philosophy directly opposite to that of the people of Idaho, who voted 2 to 1 for Ike in 1952."

Mr. NIXON based his attack on Representative Condon on a report dated March 13, 1953, which was sent to all naval commandants by Adm. Carl Espe, Director of Naval Intelligence.

At a Portland press conference Mr. NIXON called on Stephen A. Mitchell, Democratic national chairman, to disavow Representative Condon as a Democratic candidate for Congress.

NIXON CITES FBI REPORT

In an airport interview here tonight Mr. NIXON followed up his statements on Mr. Condon with these comments:

"Representative Condon has been barred both by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Navy from access to classified information. The ban is still in existence and he is the only Member of the House and Senate against whom such action has been taken.

"The Navy Department and the AEC were acting on similar information. Mr. Condon has not requested a security clearance from the Navy. This clearance has not been given and will not be given."

"A report of the Federal Bureau of Investigation was the information on which both agencies acted."

Mr. Condon, he said, had a long record of participation in 20 Communist-front organizations. Mr. NIXON added that his information indicated that Mr. Condon had been a Communist Party member.

"Also," Mr. NIXON declared, "and I mention this because of the security angle, his criminal record includes seven arrests for intoxication. The Navy Department has more installations in California than in any other area of the United States.

"These include the Mare Island Navy Yard and other installations. As a Member of Congress, Mr. Condon has close relations with Navy personnel in his area. Before he entered Congress he was a member of the California House of Representatives.

"This is the same information on which Mr. Mitchell called for Mr. Condon's defeat in the California primary. Now all Democratic organizations in that State are supporting Condon."

Discussing international communism, Mr. NIXON told his Masonic Temple audience that a vote for a pro-Eisenhower Congress was a vote for peace. A vote for an anti-Eisenhower Congress, he added, "will be a vote to return to the Truman-Acheson policies which did such terrible damage to America in the 7 years after World War II.

"The test of success of a nation's foreign policy is whether it results in war or peace," he contended. "The Truman-Acheson policies result in war and the Eisenhower-Dulles policy has resulted in peace."

Mr. NIXON plans to arrive at San Francisco tomorrow and to campaign in California 2 days.

[From the New York Times of October 28, 1954]

NIXON ASKS RIVALS REPUDIATE CONDON—HAMMERS AT REPRESENTATIVE AS SECURITY RISK IN HIS CAMPAIGN IN CALIFORNIA

(By William R. Conklin)

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., October 27.—Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON stepped up his dubious security risk campaign against Representative Richard L. Condon, California Democrat, today as he began 3 days of campaigning in his native State.

In stressing his doubts about Mr. Condon's security status, Mr. NIXON said he expected Stephen A. Mitchell, Democratic National Chairman, to repudiate the Democratic Representative as a candidate. As another effect he expects to force Representative Samuel W. Yorty, Democratic senatorial nominee, to take a definite stand on the Condon issue. Both moves, he feels, will help elect Republicans in California's 30-Member House delegation, which now has 19 Republicans and 11 Democrats.

In San Diego tonight before the Navy League Mr. NIXON stressed national defense and security. His third issue of the day was domestic employment, which he said was improving consistently. He stressed an expanding economy before more than 6,000 who gathered on a sun-drenched field at noon in Long Beach.

On Mr. Condon, the Vice President said he was not using any report of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. He said the derogatory information on pro-Communist activity by Mr. Condon was the basis on which the Atomic Energy Commission and the Navy Department had barred the Californian from access to classified data. He said he assumed this information was known to the FBI, adding that much of it had previously been published.

DENIES USING FBI DATA

At stops throughout the day, Mr. NIXON was questioned whether he was using FBI reports in a political campaign.

"I cannot say that I have any FBI files in my possession," he said. "When I listed 12 security cases last week without using names, I used no FBI files. I disclosed general information about these cases.

"I have never used an FBI file since I have been in Congress, and that goes back to 1946. I do not see the files. I have no opportunity to read them.

"I do state categorically that Mr. Condon has been barred from classified data both by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Navy Department. This is the only case in history where such action was taken against a Member of the House or Senate. I know the ban still stands, because I checked it with both agencies within the last two days."

CITES MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

"The barring is done by both agencies on the basis of FBI files, which contain information concerning Condon's participation in Communist activities, a participation so extensive that he is considered a security risk."

On Mr. Condon as a security risk, Mr. NIXON said in part:

"This is important from the standpoint of his own district, because there is perhaps no district in the country in which there are more military installations than his. It means that clearly apart from any ideological questions, he simply cannot adequately represent his district because of his past record.

"But the issue is much bigger than his own district. This has become a State and national issue. It is incredible that a great political party would lend its support to a man who is designated a security risk by two agencies of the Government on the basis of FBI reports. This is the same blindness and ignorance we saw in the old Truman red herring days.

"Failure to repudiate Mr. Condon will be an indication of what the American people can expect if the kind of Congress demanded by the left wing ADA—that's Americans for Democratic Action—elements of the Democratic Party is elected."

[From the New York Times of October 29, 1954]

STEVENSON TARGET OF NIXON ON REDS—VICE PRESIDENT ASSERTS RIVAL IS UNCONSCIOUSLY SPREADING COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA

(By William R. Conklin)

PASADENA, CALIF., October 28—Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON today charged Adlai E. Stevenson with unconsciously spreading Communist propaganda.

In a noon speech to 500 persons at the Beverly Hills City Hall, Mr. NIXON said:

"Mr. Stevenson, skipping and quipping his way around the country has said 'all around the world American prestige has suffered and the initiative is in Communist hands. Our situation since the war has never been more precarious or our influence lower.'

"Just yesterday he said that the Eisenhower administration has shown 'mismanagement amounting to genius,' in foreign policy. And there was 'no peace in Korea.'

"In addition, Mr. Stevenson has been guilty, probably without being aware that he was doing so, of spreading pro-Communist propaganda as he has attacked with violent fury the economic system of the United States and has praised the Soviet economy.

STEVENSON IS QUOTED

"He said recently: 'While the American economy has been shrinking, the Soviet economy has been growing fast, which is one of the most important facts in the world situation. In the long view it is probably a more important fact than the development of Soviet military power.'

"Whatever Mr. Stevenson's purpose may be, such statements of praise for the Soviet economy do the cause of the free world great damage. His dislike for our own economic system is his own business, but when he links such criticism with praise of the rapid growth of the Soviet economy he is performing a grave disservice to us and to the rest of the free world."

Earlier Mr. NIXON insisted that Republicans would win both Houses of Congress on November 2.

In a speech tonight in the South Pasadena High School auditorium Mr. NIXON said Democrats were swinging behind President Eisenhower's appeal for a Republican-controlled Congress.

Through a long day of campaigning in the Los Angeles area, Mr. NIXON spoke at two breakfast meetings in the Hotel Ambassador here.

THE BASIC ISSUE

To both groups, Mr. NIXON emphasized that the basic issue in 1954 was the 1952 issue of the Eisenhower administration against the Truman-Stevenson socialistic policies.

In his statement on major trends in the congressional elections Mr. NIXON said: "I have noted with interest the reports concerning the poll taken by Newsweek Magazine of 50 leading Washington columnists and political reporters who have been covering the campaign in the field.

"Memories are short, but in 1952 a majority of this same group of writers predicted that Mr. Stevenson would beat Mr. Eisenhower, and that the Democrats would win the House and the Democrats would win the Senate. They were wrong on all three counts in 1952."

The Vice President told his audience here that his tour of 6 Western States in the last 2 weeks had convinced him that "ever-increasing numbers of Democrats are deciding to support President Eisenhower by voting for a Congress controlled by members of his own party."

The Vice President will campaign tomorrow in the Los Angeles area, and will remain overnight in San Mateo, Calif.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, to show how far the smear campaign against Vice President NIXON has gone, I read in many of the newspapers of the country last week, varying statements as to the backing of the Vice President by the President of the United States.

It was surprising to see the unanimous opinion of the United States press that

Eisenhower backed NIXON. I read from the New York Herald Tribune:

Eisenhower speaks up for NIXON.

I read from the Baltimore Sun:

Eisenhower backs NIXON campaigning.

I read from the Washington Post and Times Herald, which is not a paper particularly friendly to several of us:

Eisenhower defends actions of NIXON, under fire for alleged smear tactics.

I read from the Chicago Tribune:

NIXON smear charges denied by Eisenhower.

I have commentaries from the leading columnists of the country, which bear out the wire version of what the President said; but the New York Times, one of the great influential papers of this country, published this:

President backs NIXON and critics. The President declined to take either Mr. NIXON'S side or the side of those Democrats who had been denouncing the Vice President.

Mr. President, it was not in my fiber to remain silent in the face of that obvious discrepancy by a great newspaper. Therefore, I addressed a letter to the editor on January 14, 1955. I had high hope the letter might appear in the Letters to the Editor column. I have not read today's New York Times. It might be in today's issue, but it was not in the issues of yesterday, the day before, or the day before that.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, my letter to the New York Times, together with photostatic copies of headlines in other newspapers, lead articles of other newspapers, a photostatic copy of the United Press tape of the meeting referred to and several newspaper headlines.

There being no objection, the letter and other documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 14, 1955.

The EDITOR,
New York Times, Times Building,
New York City.

DEAR SIR: Flying back from Omaha, Nebr., yesterday, I read the page 1 New York Times account by William S. White of President Eisenhower's remarks at his press conference on the day before (Wednesday, January 12). I was startled at the headline, which declared "President Backs NIXON and Critics," but even more startled at the content of the story.

"The President declined to take either Mr. NIXON'S side or the side of those Democrats who * * * had been denouncing the Vice President," the Times story by William S. White read. "In expressing confidence in the honor of both Mr. NIXON and his Democratic detractors," etc.

Knowing Mr. White to be an honorable and usually accurate reporter, I immediately turned to page 14 to read the transcript of the President's press conference.

I was astounded to discover, upon careful reading, that the New York Times story seemed to go far afield from the import of what the President said in the transcript, in fact, it was at complete odds with what he said.

To me, it was perfectly clear that the President was wholeheartedly supporting Vice President NIXON, pointing out that while "the Vice President had talked about certain individual cases and the way they had been handled administratively," Mr. NIXON had only questioned some Democrats' "good judgment but never loyalty." The President added that he admired Mr. NIXON.

I could find nothing in the transcript which indicated that he admired Mr. NIXON'S detractors, neither could I discover where the President had discussed the "honor" of Mr. NIXON'S detractors, yet the front page Times story attributed this to him."

What the President did do was make clear that neither he nor NIXON were impugning anyone's loyalty.

To me, loyalty and honor are two different things. A man may be perfectly loyal to his country but dishonorable in other ways.

Inasmuch as Mr William S. White was at the conference and I wasn't, I purchased some other newspapers upon my return to Washington.

Knowing that the New York Times takes both the Associated Press and the United Press, and their accounts were available to your editors, I first sought to discover what their reporters had written.

Associated Press: "President Eisenhower defended Vice President NIXON today against Democrat criticism of NIXON'S campaign tactics, with the suggestion that words taken out of context lie back of the complaints * * *."

United Press: "President Eisenhower strongly defended Vice President NIXON today * * * He fired back at the questioner a stern-voiced inquiry as to whether the reporter was basing his question on actual reading of NIXON'S campaign speeches."

Next, I turned to the byline stories of the correspondents for several major newspapers. Here is what I found.:

New York Herald Tribune (by Robert J. Donovan): "President Eisenhower today defended Vice President RICHARD NIXON."

Baltimore Sun (by Gerald Griffin): "President Eisenhower warmly defended Vice President NIXON today".

Washington Post and Times Herald (by Edward T. Folliard): "President Eisenhower yesterday championed Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON."

Chicago Tribune (by Walter Trohan): "President Eisenhower today strongly defended Vice President NIXON."

Chicago Sun-Times (by Carleton Kent): "He warmly defended Vice President NIXON against Democratic complaints."

The political complexion of the above newspapers is about 50–50 as far as support of either political party is concerned and the correspondents who wrote the stories are all reputable newspapermen. Yet we find them all at complete variance with the New York Times account. Such phrases as "warmly defended," "strongly defended," "championed," "firing back," and "stern-voiced" are in complete contradiction to the Times story that the "President declined to take Mr. NIXON'S side or the side of his detractors."

Knowing your correspondent, Bill White, as I do, it is difficult for me to believe that he heard the President correctly, or, failing that, had access to the transcript which the New York Times itself printed. Inasmuch as the editors of the New York Times did not see fit to correct the conflict between the story on page 1 and the transcript on page 14, could it be that New York Times "editorial" policy dictated the nature of the front page account?

I would appreciate it greatly if you would print my letter in full and provide your answer at the end.

Sincerely,

BARRY GOLDWATER,
Member, United States Senate,
from Arizona.

Press coverage of Eisenhower's NIXON statement:

1. New York Times—"President Backs NIXON and Critics" (by Bill White): "The President declined to take either Mr. NIXON'S side or the side of those Democrats who * * * had been denouncing the Vice President * * *. In expressing confidence in the honor of both Mr. NIXON and his Democratic detractors, the President fended off all questions about * * * 1956."

(Actually, the President defended the loyalty and patriotism of both.)

2. New York Herald Tribune—"Eisenhower Speaks Up for NIXON—Defends Him On 'Smear' Charge" (by Bob Donovan): President Eisenhower today defended Vice President NIXON. * * * The President said * * * that he admired Mr. NIXON, that he found him loyal and patriotic * * * His defense of the Vice President came as four members of the Republican National Committee * * * issued a statement * * * praising Mr. NIXON."

3. Baltimore Sun—"Eisenhower backs NIXON Campaigning—Denies Vice President Slandered Democratic Party" (by Gerald Griffin): "President Eisenhower warmly defended Vice President NIXON today * * * The President's defense * * * dealt with the question of whether NIXON * * * 'smeared' the Demoncratic Party. * * * The President declared his support of NIXON.

4. Washington Post and Times Herald.—"Admires Vice President—Eisenhower defends actions of NIXON, under fire for alleged smear tactics" (by Ed Folliard): "President Eisenhower yesterday championed Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON. * * * When a reporter asked * * * about * * * NIXON (the President) showed a flash of annoyance. * * * He said he admired NIXON."

5. Chicago Tribune.—"NIXON 'smear' charges denied by Eisenhower" (by Walter Trohan): "President Eisenhower today strongly defended Vice President NIXON. * * * The President said that NIXON is loyal and patriotic. Mr. Eisenhower added that he admires NIXON * * * The President praised NIXON for his role in the campaign."

7. Washington Evening Star.—"Eisenhower defends NIXON—says Democrats are patriotic" (no byline): "President Eisenhower today defended Vice President NIXON and Mr. NIXON'S campaign. * * * He said he believed in the loyalty and patriotism of the Vice President.

8. United Press.—"President Eisenhower strongly defended Vice President NIXON today. * * * Mr. Eisenhower said NIXON is loyal and patriotic and that he admires him * * * (and that) he was sure NIXON had never challenged the loyalty of the entire Democratic Party. * * * He fired back at the questioner (Merriman Smith) a stern-voiced inquiry as to whether the reporter was basing his question on actual reading of NIXON'S campaign speeches."

9. Associated Press: "President Eisenhower defended Vice President NIXON today against Democrat criticism of NIXON'S campaign tactics, with the suggestion that words taken out of context lie back of the complaints."

10. International News Service: "The President also made these points: (1) Stanchly defended Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON against Democrat charges that he used smear tactics. * * * He declared emphatically that he certainly believes in the loyalty and patriotism of NIXON and added that he admires the Vice President."

11. Chicago Sun-Times (by Carlston Kent): "There were these other highlights. * * * (1) He warmly defended Vice President NIXON against Democratic complaints. * * * Mr. Eisenhower said he had confidence in NIXON'S loyalty and patriotism, and admired him."

COMMENTARY

1. David Lawrence: "The President answered firmly and courageously. * * * The President asked one of the reporters if he was inquiring about Mr. NIXON'S speeches on the supposition that the Vice President had said what his critics claimed or on the basis of what Mr. NIXON really did say. * * * Mr. Eisenhower thereupon said he

would give a few facts himself. * * * The President said no such sweeping condemnation of any major party had been made by Mr. NIXON. * * * Mr. NIXON, the President said, had questioned good judgment and never loyalty. * * * By coming out flatly and demanding that the accusers of Mr. NIXON give chapter and verse to support their criticism, the President is well advised. * * * The President is acting more like the leader of his party, and it is a healthy sign."

2. Fletcher Knebel: "Ike defends Vice President NIXON'S campaign tactics. But Democrats will never let up on NIXON—not until they get up the courage to take on Eisenhower."

3. Tom Stokes: "It was a straddling, middle-of-the-road gesture typical of the President. * * * He expressed his confidence in his Vice President's loyalty and patriotism, and at the same time gave a similar vote of confidence to the Democratic Party's loyalty and patriotism."

4. Charles Lucey: "The President yesterday refused to buckle on his support of the Californian. * * * He said he believed in the loyalty and patriotism of DICK NIXON and admires him."

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, as I said at the outset, my research into this question has convinced me that we have the strange situation of the pot trying to call the kettle black, and there are people who live in glass houses throwing stones with the hope that they will not shatter their own windows.

I think one of the most pertinent writings that has been published on this question appeared in the Washington Star of recent date. I do not happen to have the date, but it was a few days ago. Before I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial included as a part of my remarks, I wish to read from it, because I think the man who wrote the editorial has caught the whole import of this smear campaign.

I now read a portion of the editorial:

It is not enough, however, to be able to recognize a political smear when it emanates from Mr. NIXON. It is also desirable to be able to recognize political comments which do not come within the definition of a smear. And perhaps a good way to do this is to list a few of them.

Thus, it was not a smear when Harry Truman charged in the 1952 campaign that Mr. NIXON had paid with his votes in Congress for the $18,000 expense account he accepted from California supporters.

It was not a smear when, on the eve of the 1952 election, the Democrat, official organ of the party, falsely and by innuendo attacked the integrity of Mr. NIXON'S mother, father, and brother. And since this was not a smear, no responsible Democratic leader can be linked to the attack merely because no one of them saw fit to repudiate it.

It was not a smear when Mr. Butler's predecessor, Stephen Mitchell, accused President Eisenhower in March of 1954 of having made "an unholy political alliance with Senator MCCARTHY for the purpose of the next election."

And, of course, it was not a smear when Mr. Mitchell, in one of his blasts at the Dixon-Yates contract, implied that the President was trying to steer some easy money toward his golfing friend, Bobby Jones.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"CHAMBER OF SMEARS"

The Democrats, with an impressive show of righteous indignation, have put together what National Chairman Paul Butler calls a "chamber of smears." The purpose is to prove that Vice President NIXON, despite his disclaimers, really did smear the Democrats during the recent campaign, and that the President, by praising Mr. NIXON'S efforts, has become a party to these smear tactics.

One might just as well concede, at the outset, that some of Mr. NIXON'S comments, as reported by the Democrats, have many of the distinguishing characteristics of the political smear. Only a truly rugged Republican individualist like Mr. NIXON would contend to the contrary.

It is not enough, however, to be able to recognize a political smear when it emanates from Mr. NIXON. It is also desirable to be able to recognize political comments which do not come within the definition of a smear. And perhaps a good way to do this is to list a few of them.

Thus, it was not a smear when Harry Truman charged in the 1952 campaign that Mr. NIXON had paid with his votes in Congress for the $18,000 expense account he accepted from California supporters.

It was not a smear when, on the eve of the 1952 election, the Democrat, official organ of the party, falsely and by innuendo attacked the integrity of Mr. NIXON'S mother, father, and brother. And since this was not a smear, no responsible Democratic leader can be linked to the attack merely because no one of them saw fit to repudiate it.

It was not a smear when Mr. Butler's predecessor, Stephen Mitchell, accused President Eisenhower in March of 1954 of having made "an unholy political alliance with Senator MCCARTHY for the purpose of the next election."

And, of course, it was not a smear when Mr. Mitchell, in one of his blasts at the Dixon-Yates contract, implied that the President was trying to steer some easy money toward his golfing friend, Bobby Jones.

Why do not these observations and others like them come within the definition of a political smear? The answer is obvious: A political remark becomes a political smear only when expressed by a prominent member of the opposing political party; never when expressed by a prominent member of one's own political party.

Perhaps there are those who will not be satisfied with this explanation. If so, one can only suggest that they should receive Mr. Butler's current lamentations with the proverbial grain of salt.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Chair and to the attention of Senators who are present the fact that the writer of the editorial has caught the whole import of the question. It all depends on who is doing the smearing. If the Democrats are smearing the Republicans, what they say is the truth.

Mr. POTTER. That is liberalism.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is liberalism. That is a good word for it. In the absence of a good definition, I accept the definition of the Senator from Michigan. When the Republican Party makes statements against the Democratic Party in a campaign, the downtown office of the Democratic Party sees fit to tear out with its red fire engine and all the other engines, and try to vilify the President of the United States; and it will stop at nothing.

Let us see how righteous and holy and pious the Democratic campaign was. By the way, this was not the last campaign; it was the one in 1950. This was a very common approach. It was used over and over again:

Ten out of thirteen. It is common editorial knowledge that Congressman Marcantonio is believed to be Russia's voice in our present Congress. Do you know that on bills for Korean aid, military assistance, and economic cooperation, your present Congressman voted exactly like Marcantonio 10 times in 13?

This advertisement was run by the party which does not like Vice President NIXON to use the terms "leftwingers," "Socialists," "liberals"—all truthful definitions and descriptions.

It goes on:

It's time for a change. Vote for Blackmore for Congress in the 13th District. For proper representation in Congress, get more with Blackmore.

Such campaign tactics were used against Representative Weichel, of the 13th District in Ohio. That kind of campaign tactic was used by the party which now cries from the housetops that its honor is besmirched. Its honor is not besmirched. I think the Democratic Party still has a chance to worm its leadership away from the ADA and the leftwing, and restore itself to the rightful dignity of a major party of this country, when it may act unanimously on basic political concepts which once ruled that party.

I wish to read from the remarks of Representative HOSMER which were printed in the RECORD several days ago, January 10:

They [the Democratic Party] could apologize for Harry Truman's charge that the Republican 80th Congress aided the power lobby in "crudely and wickedly cheating" the people; or for his charge that the House Un-American Activities Committee was "more un-American than the activities it is investigating"; or that "powerful forces" like those that created European fascism were "working through the Republican Party" to "undermine" American democracy; or for his comparison of "all this Republican talk about communism" with the anti-Catholic "whispering campaign" of 1928.

I read that from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 10, 1955.

I think I have dwelt sufficiently long on this subject, and I now wish to get back to my opening remarks, which the Senator from Louisiana misunderstood at first, but which I am sure he now understands, because he is very knowledgeable. I refer to the remarks of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] when he stated that he hoped character assassination in political campaigns could end. Yes, I think we all hope that now. I imagine politicians from Washington on down had hoped they could go out to the people and not have their names besmirched, and not be referred to as persons who represent this class or that class, or persons who have an interest in certain foreign countries, or persons who are ruled by forces other than those motivated by a desire to do their best for their country.

Mr. President, it is difficult to conceive that the American people would elect to

office persons who were not patriotically dedicated to their work in any legislative body, whether it be the lowest or the highest; but if we are going to have this era of political companionship, this era of friendliness in our political arguments and campaigns, when both parties, so to speak, get in the same bed and agree never to fight each other again, then I think the Democratic Party may well start following the preachings of the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, to complete the record, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD several documents which I have prepared, including some newspaper criticism of Abraham Lincoln, selected favorable and unfavorable criticisms of George Washington, selected examples of criticisms of President Theodore Roosevelt and President U. S. Grant—selected examples of adverse criticism.

There being no objection, the documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME NEWSPAPER CRITICISM OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

(NOTE.—Headlines such as we know today, which summarize the main point in the news story, were almost unknown in Lincoln's time.)

"SPIRIT OF THE EVENING PRESS—THE NOMINATIONS

"When the Ethiopian can change his skin, and leopard his spots, then will the administration of Mr. Lincoln receive the support of the Nation. Thousands may support him for reasons good and bad, profitable and personal, general and special—but that a majority of the American people, respect the administration or its chief, we do not believe." (Source: New York Evening Express, June 4, 1864, p. 4, col. 4.)

"VIOLATIONS OF THE CONSTITUTION—SOME OF THE REBELLIOUS ACTS OF LINCOLN'S ADMINISTRATION AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES

"The Times, which defends the President through thick and thin, is invited to answer, if it can, these stubborn facts:

"First. The issue of paper money.

"Second. The appointment of Congressmen to commands in the Army, at the same time retaining for them their seats in Congress.

"Third. The division of the State of Virginia.

"Fourth. The arbitrary arrests and imprisonment of American citizens.

"Fifth. The proclamation that one-tenth of the voters of any State can legally elect its officers and make its laws.

"Sixth. The suppression of the press by force of arms.

"Seventh. The interference with the ballot box, intimidating the people, and carrying elections by armed men.

"Eighth. The substitution of commissions for the courts at law.

"The following also may be put down as violations of the principles of the United States Government, as established by an active policy of over 80 years duration, by the Lincoln administration:

"First. Offering to abandon the right of privateering.

"Second. Declaring that confiscation [sic] of property shall extend beyond the life of the person attainted of treason, thus making treason work corruption of blood.

"Third. Its disposition to form entangling alliances with European powers, as shown in its intercourse with Russia, a nation of serfs; while, at the same time, it denounces any union with slaveholders, and carries on a war of extermination against its own countrymen and brothers.

"Fourth. The total abandonment, in practice, of the Monroe Doctrine.

"Fifth. The delivery to the inquisitorial government of Spain of a refugee; without law, and in violation of the long cherished and defended right of asylum."(Source: New York Evening Express, June 6, 1864, p. 1, col. 5.)

[From Baltimore]

"THE BALTIMORE CONVENTION—WHAT WILL BE DONE?

"(Correspondence of the New York Express)

"BALTIMORE, June 5.—The Lincoln men, that is the men in the Lincoln green, begin to assemble—but all in the livery are not at heart Lincoln men. * * *

"In all probability, however, Mr. Lincoln will be put through by Wednesday. He brings an enormity of power there for a renomination—such as no Roman emperor even, ever had before—because no Roman, emperor like, ever devised the art of printing paper and of turning it into gold." (Source: New York Evening Express. June 6, 1864, p. 2, col. 7.)

"SPIRIT OF THE EVENING PRESS—THE PRESIDENT SOFT-HEARTED

"According to the Post (see the article copied into the Express from the Tribune on the President's use of the pardoning power): 'It is not easy to believe such charges true, for if they were, the President would have committed, in our opinion, a most serious offense against the public morals and the general welfare. The President is known to be a soft-hearted man; and when he pardoned an unlucky soldier who had fallen asleep on his post or exceeded his leave of absence or committed some other indiscretion of this kind, though men might differ in opinion as to the judiciousness of the President's interference, no one thought him seriously wrong, but if this softness of heart is extended to thieves and swindlers, convicted of violating solemn trusts and robbing the Government, then it becomes a serious matter, and Mr. Lincoln must expect not only severe public censure, but a strict congressional inquiry.'

"This is very mildly put, but the charges of the Tribune remain. We ask that they be read, and then the act of the President can be better understood. They are after all but specimen bricks in the great temple of swindlers from which the Nation is now suffering." (Source: New York Evening Express, June 6, 1864, p. 4, col. 4.)

"THE BALTIMORE CONVENTION

"Our correspondent brings down the proceedings of this body, by telegraph, to the latest moment. Thus far, there is no indication of anything like a serious difference of opinion or sentiment among the delegates, who, as everybody can see, are mere puppets, come together, to go through certain performances arranged, if not paid for, by the wire-pullers at Washington. The whole thing, so far as it claims to be a faithful exponent of bona fide public sentiment, is a hollow farce. It represents nothing and nobody, but Abraham Lincoln and his office-holders and officeseekers." (Source: New York Evening Express, June 8, 1864, p. 1, col. 1.)

"SPIRIT OF THE PRESS—WHAT IS SAID OF THE BALTIMORE NOMINATIONS

"* * * Our own views of Mr. Lincoln's fitness and qualities are unchanged. Of all the men who have filled the President's office, he is the least capable, manly, practical, or consistent; and just when the highest qualities of statesmanship are required, his friends from a pure party and selfish standpoint, have put him before the people for reelection. We know not what great calamity God has in store for this tired and suffering Nation, but we pray most fervently that this new cup of sorrow may pass from it. Surely there must be thousands of men who support the administration because it is the administration, who do not endorse Mr. Lincoln's conduct and capacity." (Source: New York Evening Express, June 9, 1864, p. 2, cols. 5, 6.)

"SPIRIT OF THE PRESS

"Morgan's bold, and as yet unobstructed, raid into and through eastern Kentucky arrests attention. His troopers appear to be something more formidable than a mere guerrilla band. They are, in fact, a little army; and unless that army is soon checked, we fear it will gather strength as it goes. The administration 'policy' in Kentucky just now seems to be such as absolutely to give 'aid and comfort' to the enemy rather than to deal him damaging blows." (Source: New York Evening Express, June 10, 1864, p. 2, col. 5.)

"WHAT OLD ABE SAYS HE WOULD LIKE TO DIE OF

(From the Times)

"Old Abe's choice: A gentleman in conversation remarked to President Lincoln on Friday that nothing could defeat him but Grant's capture of Richmond, to be followed by his nomination at Chicago and acceptance. 'Well,' said the President, 'I feel very much like the man who said he didn't want to die particular, but if he had got to die that was precisely the disease he would like to die of.'

"Very well said, but who believes Mr. Lincoln meant what he said? We remember what he said in his inaugural, both of his want of power under the Constitution and of his own want of purpose, to do certain things. We remember, too, what he said of the 'Pope's bull against the comet.' It is easy to talk, and Old Abe, as the Times calls him, understands the trick of humbug well." (Source: New York Evening Express, June 13, 1864, p. 2, col. 6.)

"SPIRIT OF THE PRESS—STATES CANNOT BE ABOLISHED

"* * * It is impossible for conservative men, who honor the Constitution, who love the Union, who respect the rights of the States and of citizens of the States, to support the administration in its daily innovations upon constitutional and personal liberty. The States still live. The States have committed no treason against the Federal Government. Individuals have, and they must suffer. Mr. Lincoln, by his proclamations, has effected nothing good for white men or black men, and still less has he produced any good by his general policy touching slavery, confiscation, or any other radical measures. Let not Mr. Lincoln's friends complain that the administration is opposed. They compel all who are for the Union, for the Constitution—which is the rock on which the Union rests—for State's rights, for civil law against military interference, to resist the usurpations of the Executive. Hence it is that the Republican Party is cut in twain. Hence it is also that so many conservative men oppose the administration." (Source: New York Evening Express, June 15, 1864, p. 2, cols. 5, 6.)

"SPIRIT OF THE PRESS—HOW THE WAR EFFECTS [SIC] COMMERCE

[After presenting some statistics:]

"We take no pleasure in these records of administration imbecility. We regret them deeply on account of the damage done to the country, to the Army and Navy, to the prestige of the country on sea and land, and to the disgrace and injury they bring upon us from other powers. Just as United States commerce declines, foreign commerce prospers. Surely nothing but bad management in Washington is responsible for most of this." (Source: New York Evening Express, June 21, 1864, p. 2, col. 5.)

SELECTED FAVORABLE AND UNFAVORABLE CRITICISM OF GEORGE WASHINGTON

(NOTE.—Published criticism of George Washington is preponderantly favorable. Upon request, however, this compilation (including manuscript and photostat) is prepared with emphasis on unfavorable criticism.)

SELECTED FAVORABLE AND UNFAVORABLE CRITICISM

1. General

(1) "A citizen, first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen." (Col. Henry (Light Horse Harry) Lee, Resolutions Adopted by the Congress on the Death of Washington, December 19, 1799. These were the concluding words of the resolution, which were written by Lee and introduced in the House of Representatives by John Marshall. They are often wrongly ascribed to Marshall because he read them and moved their adoption (Journal of the House of Representatives, 6th Cong., 1st sess., p. 45; Annals of Congress, 6th Cong., 1st sess., col. 204). Marshall in his Life of Washington (vol. 5, p. 765) quotes the resolutions, perhaps from memory, and erroneously gives the last clause as "first in the hearts of his fellow citizens." He states in a footnote that the resolutions were prepared by Lee. Burton Stevenson, The Home Book of Quotations, 1937, p. 2122.)

(2) "Washington is the clear upper sky." (Daniel Webster, Eulogy on Adams and Jefferson, Fanueil Hall, Boston, Aug. 2, 1826. John Bartlett, Familiar Quotations, 1937, p. 340.)

(3) "Both his enemies and his friends bore evidence to his honesty. Jefferson said, 'his integrity was most pure, his justice the most inflexible I have ever known, no motives of interest or consanguinity of friendship or hatred being able to bias his decision. He was indeed in every sense of the word, a wise, a good, and a great man.' Pickering wrote that 'to the excellency of his virtues I am not disposed to set any limits. All his views were upright, all his actions just.' Hamilton asserted that 'the general is a very honest man,' and Tilghman spoke of him as 'the honestest man that I believe ever adorned human nature.'" (Paul Leicester Ford, George Washington, 1896, p. 310.)

(4) "A hero who cannot stand up under the clear light of truth without false props deserves to fall. But the truth makes Washington real and lovable as well as admirable." (Rupert Hughes, George Washington, 1926, p. 489.)

(5) "The character of Washington may want some of those poetical elements which dazzle and delight the multitude, but it possessed fewer inequalities, and a rarer union of virtues than perhaps ever fell to the lot of one man. Prudence, firmness, sagacity, moderation, an overruling judgment, an immovable justice, courage that never faltered, patience that never wearied, truth that disdained all artifice, magnanimity without alloy. It seems as if Providence had endowed him in a preeminent degree with the qualities requisite to fit him for the high destiny he was called upon to fulfill, to conduct a momentous revolution which was to form an era in the history of the world, and to inaugurate a new and untried government, which, to use his own words, was to lay the foundation 'for the enjoyment of much purer civil liberty, and greater public happiness, than have hitherto been the portion of mankind.'

"The fame of Washington stands apart from every other in history; shining with a truer luster and a more benignant glory. With us his memory remains a national property, where all sympathies throughout our widely extended and diversified empire meet in unison. Under all dissensions and amid all the storms of party, his precepts and example speak to us from the grave with a paternal appeal; and his name, by all revered, forms a universal tie of brotherhood, a watchword of our Union.

"'It will be the duty of the historian and the sage of all nations,' writes an eminent British statesman (Lord Brougham), 'to let no occasion pass of commemorating this illustrious man, and until time shall be no more, will a test of the progress which our race has made in wisdom and virtue, be derived from the veneration paid to the immortal name of Washington.'" (Washington Irving, Life of George Washington, 1857, vol. 8, pp. 124–125.)

(6) "George Washington stands in the history of our Republic as the great leader who made its founding possible through his military generalship in the Revolutionary War. He stands in our history as a great leader, who after independence has been won, helped shape our present form of government as a member of the constitutional convention. He stands in our history as a great leader who, at the call of the people of the young Nation, became our first President and as such gave meaning and direction to our form of government." (Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN, address delivered on February 22, 1941. Extension of remarks of Hon. Charles W. Tobey in the Senate of the United States, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 87, pt. 10, p. A801.)

(7) "I think I knew General Washington intimately and thoroughly; and were I called on to delineate his character, it should be in terms like these:

"His mind was great and powerful, without being of the very first order his penetration strong, though not so acute as that of a Newton, Bacon, or Locke; and as far as he saw, no judgment was ever sounder. It was slow in operation, being little aided by invention or imagination, but sure in conclusion. Hence the common remark of his officers, of the advantage he derived from councils of war, where hearing all suggestions, he selected whatever was best; and certainly no general ever planned his battles more judiciously. But if deranged during the course of the action, if any member of his plan was dislocated by sudden circumstances, he was slow in readjustment. The consequence was that he often failed in the field, and rarely against an enemy in station, as at Boston and York. He was incapable of fear, meeting personal dangers with the calmest unconcern.

"Perhaps the strongest feature in his character was prudence, never acting until every circumstance, every consideration, was maturely weighed; refraining if he saw a doubt, but, when once decided, going through with his purpose, whatever obstacles opposed. His integrity was most pure, his justice the most inflexible I have ever known, no motives of interest or consaguinity, of friendship or hatred, being able to bias his decision. He was, in every sense of the words, a wise, a good, and a great man. His temper was naturally high toned; but reflection and resolution had obtained a firm and habitual ascendency over it. If ever, however, it broke its bonds, he was most tremendous in his wrath.

"In his expenses he was honorable, but exact; liberal in contributions to whatever promised utility; but frowning and unyielding on all visionary projects and all unworthy calls on his charity. His heart was not warm in its affections; but he exactly calculated every man's value, and gave him a solid esteem proportioned to it. His person, you know, was fine, his stature exactly what one would wish, his deportment easy, erect and noble; the best horseman of his age, and the most graceful figure that could be seen on horseback.

"Although in the circle of his friends, where he might be unreserved with safety, he took a free share in conversation, his colloquial talents were not above mediocrity, possessing neither copiousness of ideas, nor fluency of words. In public, when called on for a sudden opinion, he was unready, short, and embarrassed. Yet he wrote readily, rather diffusely, in an easy and correct style. This he had acquired by conversation with the world, for his education was merely reading, writing, and common arithmetic, to which he added surveying at a later day. His time was employed in action chiefly, reading little, and that only in agriculture and English history. His correspondence became necessarily extensive, and, with journalizing his agricultural proceedings, occupied most of his leisure hours within doors.

"On the whole his character, was in its mass, perfect, in nothing bad, in few points indifferent; and it may truly be said, that never did nature and fortune combine more perfectly to make a man great, and to place him in the same constellation with whatever worthies have merited from man an everlasting remembrance. For his was the singular destiny and merit, of leading the armies of his country successfully through an arduous war, for the establishment of its independence, of conducting its councils through the birth of a government, new in its forms and principles, until it had settled down into a quiet and orderly train; and of scrupulously obeying the laws through the whole of his career, civil, and military, of which the history of the world furnishes no other example." (Thomas Jefferson, letter dated at Monticello, January 2, 1814, and written to Dr. Walter Jones, New York Times Magazine, Feb. 19, 1932, p. 5.)

II. Relative to private life

(1) "It has been said of George Washington, 'God left him childless that he might be father of his country.' The homelife of this extraordinary man, like so many other phases of his distinguished career, stands out with glowing radiance across the decades as an example to the Nation he inaugurated and started on its way to greatness.

"'Washington's homelife,' says one historian, 'shows him as a lover of the fireside, a domestic-minded householder, a man careful of his property, but generous with his servants; a devoted husband, a father whose loving kindness was no less that the relationship was not of blood, a man who loved the outdoors, the earth, the growing grain, the wild game; a hospitable man who offered the best he had in happiness that there were many who enjoyed breaking bread with him, a man to whom church and divine worship were a part of life. His home was refuge and a haven of peace and joy. He left it with regret, he returned to it as to a heaven on earth." (H. L. Rogers, Washington as Home Lover and Host, Washington Star Bicentennial Magazine, Feb. 21, 1932, p. 22.)

(2) "His affections overflowed toward his own and his wife's relatives; toward the members of his military family in camp and the Mount Vernon household in times of peace.

"Washington had weaknesses; but they were not of a kind to subtract from his character. None of the tales whispered about him has any foundation in fact; and the facts of his life are patent. From the days of the Revolution spurious letters purporting to have been written by him have been published; but the fraud has been exposed quickly. He has suffered from the implied reproach of having been thrifty in money matters. So he was, else he could not have given his services freely to the Nation. His friends and admirers never were called upon to extricate him from harassing debt. Yet no needy person was ever turned from his door either by himself or by his agents." (Charles Moore, the Family Life of George Washington, 1926, preface, p. v–vi.)

III. Relative to military leadership

(1) "Had he [Washington] died at the close of the Revolution, with his military achievements standing alone in bold relief, he would today be honored as one of the

world's greatest captains, as he is honored as one of the world's statesmen. He was bolder than Alexander, more crafty than Hannibal, wiser than Caesar, more prudent than Gustavus Adolphus, more resourceful than Frederick, more sagacious than Napoleon, and more successful than Scipio, and his star will not pale by the side of theirs." (Col. Samuel C. Vestal, United States Army; quoted by William A. Millen in George Washington as a Soldier, Washington Star Bicentennial Magazine, February 21, 1932, p. 20.)

(2) "During the Revolution George Washington showed great and unusual aptitude as a strategist—one who utilizes his military forces and resources so as to secure from a successful combat the greatest possible results and to make a defeat or a repulse render the least effective return to the enemy. But strategic judgment alone would not have secured ultimate success with an army so untrained of united action without his organizing gifts and his capacity for overcoming practical difficulties, his engineers' capacity for measuring physical obstacles, and completely thinking out each job before beginning it." (Lt. Col. U. S. Grant 3d, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, quoted by William A. Millen in George Washington as a Soldier, Washington Star Bicentennial Magazine, Feb. 21, 1932, p. 20.)

(3) "As commander in chief of the Continental Army, he took a ragged, ill-equipped force and made an army of it, and as a military tactician won the praise of Frederick the Great, Napoleon Bonaparte, and the Duke of Wellington. His military campaigns compare favorably with those of the greatest leaders in history.

* * * * *

"By his victories and the spirit which they infused into the despairing people Washington saved the Revolution in its darkest hour. There were still many anxious days before the final triumph, but the tide of American disasters had passed its lowest ebb. Von Moltke, the great modern German strategist, says, 'No finer movement was ever executed than the retreat across the Jerseys, the return across the Delaware a first time, and then a second, so as to draw out the enemy in a long, thin line.' Horace Walpole pronounced Washington's march through the British lines 'a prodigy of generalship.' In London the youthful Lafayette heard of Trenton and Princeton and hastened his preparations to sail for America.

"As a leader of men, Washington is without parallel in the history of our country." (Hon. Harry S. Truman, radio address relating to General Washington. Extension of remarks of Hon. Tom Connally, of Texas, in the Senate of the United States, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 87, pt. 10, p. A800.)

IV. Relative to Presidency

(1) "The prevailing weakness of most public men is to slop over. * * * G. Washington never slopt over." (Artemus Ward, Fourth of July oration; Burton Stevenson, the Home Book of Quotations, 1937, p. 2123.)

(2) "Pickering, who placed a low estimate on his military ability, said that, 'upon the whole, I have no hesitation in saying that General Washington's talents were much better adapted to the Presidency of the United States than to the command of their armies,' and this is probably true. The diplomatist Thronton said of the President, that if his 'circumspection is accompanied by discernment and penetration, as I am informed it is, and as I should be inclined to believe from the judicious choice he has generally made of persons to fill public stations, he possesses the two great requisites of a statesman, the faculty of concealing his own sentiments and of discovering those of other men'." (Paul Leicester Ford, George Washington, 1896, p. 303.)

(3) "In a spirit of unity, under the leadership of Washington, the new Government was put in operation, and the legislative and executive branches of the Government were launched under the Constitution with efficient cooperation. The statesmanship and profound knowledge and wisdom manifest in the framing of the Constitution was carried into the inauguration of the various functions of the new Government. No other man could have brought to this tremendous task the judgment that was required, with greater effect than Washington. It is not without justice that Washington throughout our history has been referred to as the Father of his Country." (Hon. Joseph Rosier, address to the Sons of the Revolution, extension of remarks in the Senate of the United States, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 8, p. A830.)

(4) "During his 8 years as President, he was alternately the idol and the abomination of the people; from being a man above party he was forced into partisanship, and with the wrong party. From being a rebel he became a conservative, an old-school aristocrat in a Republican Nation pushing on toward heights of democracy that were beyond him.

"This is not to be imputed to his discredit, for he had done more than could be expected of any man. Only a tidal wave can push all the way up the beach, and then with destruction." (Rupert Hughes. George Washington, 1926, p. 493.)

B. UNFAVORABLE

1. General

(1) "John Adams, in one of his recurrent moods of bitterness and jealousy toward Washington, demanded, 'Would Washington have ever been Commander of the Revolutionary Army or President of the United States if he had not married the rich widow of Mr. Custis?' To ask such a question is to overlook the fact that Washington's colonial military fame was entirely achieved before his marriage." (Paul Leicester Ford, George Washington, 1896, p. 94.)

(2) "With his London agent there was a little difficulty in 1771, and Washington objected to a letter received 'because there is one paragraph in particular in it * * * which appears to me to contain an implication of my having deviated from the truth.' A more general charge was Charles Lee's: 'I aver that His Excellencies' letter was from beginning to the end a most abominable lie.' " (Ibid., p. 308.)

(3) "Ideas had only a small part in his life. He did not consider them important, nor does the average American. He respected ideas only when they had the force of authority, or of money, or of a political party. * * *

"He was thoroughly undemocratic * * * and this, too, is typically American, for our country is the most undemocratic of all the great free nations. * * *

"He was vain, fond of adulation and power, and greatly disturbed by criticism, but he was—so I think—a little ashamed of his vanity, and concealed it under an appearance of great modesty." (W. E. Woodward, George Washington, 1926, p. 454.)

2. Relative to private life

(1) "A more gorgeous dandy never rode than the Colonel Washington of 1756. * * * He spent his 24th birthday in Philadelphia and reached New York February 15. * * * Though his business was in Boston, and the Indians were scalping and burning everywhere along the diminishing frontier of Virginia, Washington found reason to tarry in New York. The reason was Mary Philipse of Yonkers." (Rupert Hughes, George Washington, 1926, p. 294.)

(2) "Many worshipers of Washington find it impossible to imagine that he could have loved his friend's wife. But it is still more impossible (if possible) to doubt Washington's own frantic protestations.

"There is nothing to do but marvel at the contrast between the strangled agonies of Washington's letter to Sally Fairfax and the letter he wrote to his betrothed, Martha Custis, during this same absence at the war" (ibid., p. 418).

3. Relative to military leadership

(1) "These are high times when a British general is to take counsel of a Virginia buckskin." Gen. Edward Braddock, in rejecting George Washington's advice, 1775. (C. F. Hoffman, Winter in the Far West, i, 67; Burton Stevenson, The Home Book of Quotations, 1937, p. 2121.)

(2) "A very minor but most malignant enemy was Dr. Benjamin Rush. In 1774 Washington dined with him in Philadelphia, which implied friendship. Very early in the war, however, an attempt was made to remove the director-general of hospitals, in which, so John Armstrong claimed, 'Morgan was the ostensible—Rush the real prosecutor of Shippen—the former acting from revenge * * * the latter from a desire to obtain the directorship. In approving the sentence of the court, Washington stigmatized the prosecution as one originating in bad motives, which made Rush his enemy and defamer as long as he lived.' Certain it is he wrote savage letters of criticism about his commander in chief, of which the following extract is a sample:

" 'I have heard several officers who have served under General Gates compare his army to a well-regulated family. The same gentlemen have compared General Washington's imitation of an army to an unformed mob. Look at the characters of both. The one on the pinnacle of military glory—exulting in the success of schemes planned with wisdom, and executed with vigor and bravery—and, above all, see a country saved by his exertions. See the other outgeneraled and twice beaten—obliged to witness the march of a body of men only half their number through 140 miles of a thick settled country—forced to give up a city, the capital of a State, and after all outwitted by the same army in a retreat.' " (Paul Leicester Ford, George Washington, 1896, pp. 251–252.)

(3) "Undoubtedly the most serious Army antagonist [of Washington] was Gen. Charles Lee, and, but for what seem almost fatalistic chances, he would have been a dangerous rival. He was second in command very early in the war, and at this time he asserted that 'no man loves, respects, and reverences another more than I do General Washington.' But 4 months later he was lamenting Washington's fatal indecision, and by inference was calling him a blunderer. In another month he wrote, 'entre nous a certain man is most damnably deficient.' At this point, fortunately, Lee was captured by the British, so that his influence for the time being was destroyed" (ibid., p. 253).

(4) "John Adams declared himself sick of the Fabian systems, and in writing of the thanksgiving for the Saratoga convention, he said that 'one cause of it ought to be that the glory of turning the tide of arms is not immediately due to the Commander in Chief. * * * If it had, idolatry and adulation would have been unbounded.' James Lovell asserted that 'Our affairs are Fabiused into a very disagreeable posture,' and wrote that 'depend upon it for every 10 soldiers placed under the command of our Fabius, 5 recruits will be wanted annually during the war.' William Williams agreed with Jonathan Trumbull that the time had come when 'a much exalted character should make way for a general' and suggested if this was not done voluntarily, those to whom the public looked should see to it. Abraham Clark thought, 'we may talk of the enemy's cruelty as we will, but we have no greater cruelty to complain of than the management of our Army.' Jonathan D. Sargent asserted that 'we want a general—thousands of lives and millions of property are yearly sacrificed to the insufficiency of our Commander in Chief—two battles he has lost for us by two such blunders as might have disgraced a soldier of 3 months standing, and yet we are

so attached to this man that I fear we shall rather sink with him than throw him off our shoulders. And sink we must under his management. Such feebleness, and want of authority, such confusion and want of discipline, such waste, such destruction would exhaust the wealth of both the Indies and annihilate the armies of all Europe and Asia.' Richard Henry Lee agreed with Mifflin that Gates was needed to procure the indispensable changes in our Army" (ibid., p. 256–257).

(5) "The historians who make so much of Braddock's failure because he declined Washington's advice—though he failed in spite of accepting it—are strangely mute about the indisputable fact that when the blundering English actually did refuse his advice, they succeeded completely." (Rupert Hughes, George Washington, 1926, p. 362.)

4. Relative to Presidency

(1) "In April 1787, Thomas Paine gathered his goods and sailed for England. There he produced the Rights of Man, fled to France, was made a citizen, and chosen to a seat in the national convention. From the convention he was expelled by the influence of Robespierre, was thrown into the Luxembourg prison, was in time reclaimed by Monroe, and had, under the roof of the American Minister, found shelter and food. While there the farewell address of the President fell in his way, and he made all haste to answer it in a pamphlet letter. The character which Mr. Washington had attempted to act in the world was, in the opinion of Paine, 'a sort of nondescribable, chameleon-colored thing called prudence.' Prudence was in many cases a substitute for principle. It was so nearly allied to hypocrisy that it easily slid into it. Once in the Presidential office, the natural ingratitude of his character appeared. He assumed the merit of everything to himself; swallowed the grossest adulation; traveled America from end to end to put himself in the way of receiving it; had in his chest as many addresses as James II, and had supported monopolies of every kind from the moment his administration began. But the gist of the whole letter was given in one short sentence: 'And as for you, sir, treacherous in private friendship (for so you have been to me, and that in the day of danger), and a hypocrite in public life, the world will be puzzled to decide whether you are an apostate or an impostor; whether you have abandoned good principles or whether you ever had any.' Washington had not exerted himself to have Paine set free.

"When Congress met, a new affront was given the President. In accordance with his custom, he went down to the House of Representatives and, from the Speaker's chair, delivered his speech. The Representatives bade a committee bring in a reply. The committee threw the burden on Fisher Ames, and Ames framed an answer that was little to the liking of the Republicans in the House. Since James Jackson, of Georgia, ceased to be a Congressman, the most factious Member on the floor was William Giles, of Virginia. For 3 years he had been steadily opposing the foreign policy of the administration. He could not, therefore, suffer this last chance of insulting the President to pass by unused. The whole answer seemed to him so objectionable that he would have it recommitted. Something was said about America being the freest and most prosperous of nations. This should be left out. It was unbecoming to tell nations involved in calamity that we were happier than they. Something had been said about the President's firm, wise, and patriotic administration. This, too, should be left out. Though he stood alone in the opinion, he would declare that he did not believe the conduct of the administration had been firm and wise. Had it been, the present crisis would surely have been averted. Some regret had been expressed at Washington's retirement. This, also, he could not agree to. He felt no regret. He hoped the President would retire, and enjoy all the happiness that awaited him. Though the voice of all America should declare it a calamity, yet would he not join in the declaration.

"And now other Members rose one by one to speak against the answer. The motion to commit was lost. A motion to amend was destroyed by the previous question. The answer then passed, but, when the ayes and nays were taken, 12 Members answered 'No.'

"In the press the President was yet more cruelly treated. 'If ever a nation,' wrote one Republican scribbler, 'if ever a nation was debauched by a man, the American Nation has been debauched by Washington. If ever a nation was deceived by a man, the American Nation has been deceived by Washington. Let his conduct, then, be an example to future ages; let it serve to be a warning that no man may be an idol; let the history of the Federal Government instruct mankind that the mask of patriotism may be worn to conceal the foulest designs against the liberties of the people.'

"If, wrote another, any additional proof of the hostility of the Government to France were wanting, it could be found in the President's speech. Since the last meeting of Congress 50 of our vessels have been seized by the English to 1 taken by the French. Our ships have been boarded; our seamen have been pressed, fettered, exposed to contagious diseases and the sword, nay, even the masters of our vessels have been ignominiously whipped by officers in British pay. Yet not one word is said about these things in the address. All self-respect, all recollection of what is due the character of our Government, is forgotten when Great Britain is concerned. It is with their conquerors only, with the French, that we dare to talk of dignity and respect. 'Fifty to one,' exclaimed a Federalist. The British have not taken 50 ships since the treaty was framed; nor have they condemned 10. There are now anchored in one French port in the West Indies more American ships than the English have seized in 2 years. Yet another Republican demanded an examination of the conduct of the Executive. It was right that the people should know how far he had deserved the censure of their great and good allies, the French. One, who wrote in the name of the people, assured the President that they highly respected him as a private man. He was in that capacity an ornament to the land; but of his political career this could not be said. Should he fail to bring back that state of peace which the loss of the friendship of the French Republic had so suddenly broken, he would surely go down to his grave with a character stained and blackened forever. When at last he did quit public life a shout of exultation went up from the Republican press. 'Lord,' exclaimed one in the words of Simeon, 'now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy words, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation.' Now should the people rejoice exceedingly, and let their hearts be glad, for now is the source of all misfortunes brought down to the level of his fellow men; now will political iniquity cease to be legalized by a name. After bringing the country to the very brink of ruin, Washington had fled from the gathering storm. Having run the ship between rocks and shoals, he had abandoned the helm and left the vessel to her fate. When a grateful people raised him to the exalted post of President, America was, indeed, a happy land; now by his means she has become most miserable. Then every Frenchman was her friend; now every Frenchman is her foe.

"The Executive, whose conduct was so bitterly denounced, had now reached the end of his Presidential term." (John Bach McMaster, A History of the People of the United States, 1885, vol. II, pp. 303–306.)

SELECTED EXAMPLES OF CRITICISMS OF PRESIDENT THEODORE ROOSEVELT

"Speaking allegorically, the actual condition at the White House has been for many, many months that of a quack doctor who has certain pills which he wishes to prescribe for the public. The newspapers have been the spoon, Mr. Loeb has been the apothecary, and Roosevelt's pills on Panama, Roosevelt's pills on Roosevelt, Roosevelt's pills on railway-rate legislation, Roosevelt's pills on everything pertaining to public affairs are administered in this way; and because the newspapers have resented this interference with their ancient rights and privileges, have seen fit in recent months to lose some of that attitude of fulsome adulation, of lending themselves to this process of becoming a funnel through which this quack physic was to be sent abroad, because they have presumed, some of them, to deny certain official statements from the White House, there is great wrath in the Executive Mansion." (Senator Benjamin R. Tillman (South Carolina) in the Senate, Jan. 17, 1906, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 40: 1181.)

"The growing unpopularity of President Roosevelt would have been impossible if he had carried out the reforms which he has put only in his speeches. * * *

"But Mr. Roosevelt chose to undo with his left hand what he proclaimed with his right. In the midst of the growing deprecation he has not a solitary reform measure that goes straight to the life of the people to hold a brief for him in the day of his trial, after 6 years of opportunity." (George Lewellyn Rees, Roosevelt as a Reactionist in the Arena, March 1908, p. 289.)

"Mr. Roosevelt has everywhere further intrenched the State bosses by appointing them to political offices. The society of the future will look back upon this conscienceless policy of giving office to the boss as a landmark of former low-political morals" (id., p. 291).

* * * * * *

"Examine Mr. Roosevelt's speeches and there is scarcely a sentence that is intended to be committal that is not capable of two meanings, that does not trail a rider, with clauses that go together like two horses, so that he can jump to the one when the other is lamed—ever preaching against the rich and the poor in the same sentence, yet never throwing his weight on the most unequal side (id., pp. 297–298).

"Yet the Hay-Herran instrument itself provided that 'The convention, when signed by the contracting parties, shall be ratified in conformity with the laws of the respective countries.' Assuredly. Else the mere Executive, the mere administration, would have full and final authority in matters involving the Nation's vital interests—to a fatal ursurpation of the power of the Congress. The Senate of the United States has again and again amended, and rejected, treaties which had been duly negotiated by the administration. Still, the Washington administration peremptorily forbade Colombia's Senate either to amend or reject.

"Was this attempted coercion 'not only technically justifiable, but demanded by every ethical consideration national and international'? Was it 'as free from scandal as the public acts of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln'? In utmost soberness of inquiry, did any civilized representative of superior power ever indulge in browbeating so pitiable and so pitiless? Can such cowardly disrespect be matched in the annals of treatymaking nations? And that, on the part of the executive of a great republic which professed to do justice and to love mercy, and against a nation helpless, yet standing in a relation of acknowledged equality of sovereignty and independence. A nation at whose hands we had confessedly received important 'advantages and favors.' A nation to which we were bound by an inviolable treaty of 'peace and amity,' of

'friendship and good understanding,' a treaty whose stipulations were to be 'religiously observed.' That nation cooly informed that if, in the exercise of her indisputable prerogative, she followed what might be her patriotic judgment, she should suffer a retribution whereat the ears of them that heard should tingle.

"What must be the character and culture of the President who proudly affirms that such was his highest conception of what was 'demanded by every ethical consideration,' and should be 'a matter of pride to every honest American'?" (Leander T. Chamberlain, A Chapter of National Dishonor, North American Review, February 1912, pp. 155–156.)

"When the President of the United States issued the 50-mile order of November 2, 1903, he virtually declared war against the very nation * * * to which the United States was united by obligations admittedly paramount. He bound Colombia hand and foot and delivered her over to her domestic foes" (id., p. 161).

"The President's search for justifying precedents was foredoomed to failure. There was a vast improbability that the history of the United States would furnish any analogy of such despotism. The President should have known beforehand—doubtless he did know—that the outrage was wholly novel, conspicuous in its infamous isolation. An unoffending ally fettered and gyved, in forecast of her instinctive movement for self-preservation. The President's act was truly monumental. It was altogether and characteristically his own" (id., pp. 162–163).

"The verdict of history reads, 'The policeman himself turned bandit. In the name of equity and under the guise of friendship, he smote the innocent and plundered the defenceless' " (id., p. 172.).

"So long as people are willing to accept words for deeds; so long as they are content with profession instead of performance, and exempt from honest criticism those in high official position; just so long will artists of the Rooseveltian genus flourish in this world of 'mortals' discovered by Puck." (Hale, Mrs. Annie Riley, Rooseveltian Fact and Fable, New York, Broadway Publishing Co., 1908, p. 85.)

"The subjects calling for big stick regulation range from the highest to the most trivial affairs of the Nation. But whether it is delivering an ultimatum and timely warning to a foreign power—little ones, that is, like the Latin-American Republics—or causing the arrest and suspension of a steamboat pilot for the daring impertinence of running his boat in such a manner as to outdistance the one carrying the Presidential person, there is the same complacent intimation of the divine right of this Rooseveltian scepter" (id., pp. 170–171).

"Sympathy has always gone to the United States Senator who, when accused of complicity in 'the rich men's conspiracy' to defeat the only policies of the only T. R., stoutly protested his innocence, and urged in defense, that he was an ardent admirer of Mr. Roosevelt, and that he had always voted for the 'policies,' whenever he could find out what they were" (id., p. 172).

PRESIDENT U. S. GRANT: SELECTED EXAMPLES OF ADVERSE CRITICISM

Hon. Charles Sumner of Massachusetts in a speech delivered in the Senate of the United States, May 31, 1872, said among other things:

" 'On what meat doth this our Caesar feed' that he should assume so much? No honor for victory in war can justify disobedience to the Constitution and to law; nor can it afford the least apology for any personal immunity, privilege, or license in the Presidential Office. A President must turn into a king before it can be said of him that he can do no wrong. He is responsible always. As President he is foremost servant of the law, bound to obey its slightest mandate. As the elect of the people he owes not only the example of willing obedience, but also of fidelity and industry in the discharge of his conspicuous office with an absolute abnegation of all self-seeking. Nothing for self but all for country. And now, as we regard the career of this candidate, we find to our amazement how little it accords with this simple requirement. Bring it to the touchstone and it fails.

"Not only are Constitution and law disregarded, but the Presidential office itself is treated as little more than a plaything and a perquisite—when not the former then the latter. Here the details are ample, showing how from the beginning this exalted trust has dropped to be a personal indulgence, where palace cars, fast horses, and seaside loiterings figure more than duties; how personal aims and objects have been more prominent than the public interests; how the Presidential office has been used to advance his own family on a scale of nepotism dwarfing everything of the kind in our history, and hardly equaled in the corrupt governments where this abuse has most prevailed; how in the same spirit office has been conferred upon those from whom he had received gifts or benefits, thus making the country repay his personal obligations; how personal devotion to himself rather than public or party service has been made the standard of favor; how the vast appointing power conferred by the Constitution for the general welfare has been employed at his will to promote his schemes, to reward his friends, to punish his opponents, and to advance his election to a second term; how all these assumptions have matured in a personal government, semi-military in character and breathing the military spirit, being a species of Caesarism or personalism, abhorrent to republican institutions, where subservience to the President is the supreme law; how in maintaining this subservience he has operated by a system of combinations, military, political, and even senatorial, having their orbits about him, so that, like the planet Saturn, he is surrounded by rings; nor does the similitude end here, for his rings, like those of the planet, are held in position by satellites; how this utterly unrepublican Caesarism has mastered the Republican Party and dictated the Presidential will, stalking into the Senate Chamber itself, while a vindictive spirit visits good Republicans who cannot submit; how the President himself, unconscious that a President has no right to quarrel with anybody, insists upon quarreling until he has become the great Presidential quarreler, with more quarrels than all other Presidents together, and all begun and continued by himself; how his personal followers back him in quarrels, insult those he insults, and then, not departing from his spirit, cry out with Shakespeare, "We will have rings and things and fine array"; and finally, how the chosen head of the Republic is known chiefly for Presidential pretentions, utterly indefensible in character, derogatory to the country and of evil influence, making personal objects a primary pursuit, so that instead of a beneficent presence he is a bad example through whom Republican institutions suffer and the people learn to do wrong.

"Would that these things could be forgotten, but since through officious friends the President insists upon a second term they must be considered and publicly discussed. When understood nobody will vindicate them. It is easy to see that Caesarism even in Europe is at a discount; that personal government has been beaten on that ancient field, and that Caesar with a senate at his heels is not the fit model for our Republic. King George III of England, so peculiar for narrowness and obstinacy, had retainers in Parliament who went under the name of 'The King's Friends.' Nothing can be allowed here to justify the inquiry, "Have we a King George among us?' or that other question, 'Have we a party in the Senate of the King's friends?' " (Source: A reprint of the speech Republicanism against Grantism, New York, the Tribune Association, 1872.)

A statement by the New York Liberal Republican State Committee, John Cochrane, chairman, published in May 1872, said in part:

"The present administration, although failing to fulfill the just expectations of the American people, is nevertheless attempting, through its officeholders, to prolong its power for the next 4 years.

"A large portion of the President's original supporters, and the entire remainder of his fellow countrymen, without distinction of party, survey the attempt with indignation and alarm.

"The history of the administration is a shadowy record of discreditable (sometime disgraceful) acts—many of them blunders; others, crimes. Ever since the day after the President's inauguration, when, as his first official step, he sought to abrogate one of the oldest statutes of the Republic in order to put a personal friend into office, he has repeatedly shown himself on the one hand ignorant of the laws, and on the other defiant of them.

"He has transcended the limitations of the Constitution, and done violence to its free spirit by usurping for himself functions which that instrument reserves to the States and their citizens.

"He has tyrannously invaded the political assemblies of our own and other free commonwealths, mischievously intruding the Federal influence into local affairs.

"He has alternately proposed and defeated civil service reform, until, notwithstanding his professions in its favor, he has proved himself the chief obstacle to its success.

"He has, in multitudes of cases, made tenure of office to depend, not on good behavior or personal fitness, but on mere subserviency to his partisan schemes.

"He has put crafty and ambitious parasites at the receipt of customs, where they still continue to fatten their private purses on the public funds.

"He said to a Nation weary with war, 'Let us have peace,' but has kept the word of promise to the ear to break it to the hope—fostering in the North toward the South a temper of bitterness and resentment, instead of fraternity and good will.

"He has connived at and sustained a number of alien and rotten governments in the Southern States, some of whose officers have perpetuated frauds equaled in magnitude only by those of the Tammany ring.

"He has habitually stifled investigation even into the gravest charges brought against his own official household.

"He has committed acts of nepotism more numerous than are recorded against the entire line of his presidential predecessors from George Washington to Andrew Johnson.

"He has accepted gifts from flatterers, for which he has rendered dishonorable equivalents by bestowing public emoluments on the obsequious givers.

"In short, he has administered his high office, not as a trust devolved upon him by the whole people, but as an estate or property owned by himself alone in fee simple." (Source: New York Daily Tribune, May 16, 1872, p. 4, col. 6.)

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, this completes for today the record I have prepared, which I hope will serve both parties as the history of the thing we call character assassination. If they are sincere, then let us stop this campaign against a wonderful Vice President and let us get down to the issues which face the country.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I spent 1 day with the Vice President when he came into Massachusetts during the campaign. I estimate that he spoke to approximately 5,000 persons, at 4 different meetings. One was a college meeting. One was a meeting in an open square, in a town which was equally divided between Republicans and Democrats. One was at what might be called a partisan meeting. And one was at a large dinner, in the evening. He made four different speeches. They were forceful speeches; but, Mr. President, to the best of my knowledge and memory, there was no personal reference in any of them.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. The distinguished Vice President, Mr. NIXON, spent a day in Minnesota, and I was with him during the day he was there. He spoke in the southwestern part of Minnesota; then he flew to Duluth and spoke there. At no time did the Vice President speak either about individuals or in a manner unbecoming a Vice President on a political platform.

For that reason, I wish to commend the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] for the very able way in which he has pointed out the issues and what some are endeavoring to do to this young man, the Vice President of the Nation, in their political attacks upon him, in their attempt to make it appear as if he had been engaged in political conduct and activity wholly unbecoming one holding the high office of Vice President of the United States.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to yield to the able Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. When the Vice President appeared in Michigan in the recent campaign, he spoke in both Negaunee and Lansing. I recall that at the time, none of the newspaper accounts nor any of the Democratic opponents in the State charged that any unethical statement had been made by the Vice President. As a matter of fact, this issue never arose, so far as the newspaper accounts in our State were concerned, until the recent campaign initiated by the Democratic National Committee, here in Washington, D. C.

As I recall, the Vice President made a hard-hitting speech, as any good leader of his party should do. But, as I recall, in his reference to the Democratic Party he was very specific in stating that loyalty is not a party proposition; that the vast majority of the Democrats, as well as the Republicans, are good, loyal American citizens; but he did have to state the fact that during the previous administration, some members of that administration were at least naive as to the danger of communism. He did not accuse them of being Communists; he did not accuse them of being Communist sympathizers. But the records bear out—with the history of Harry Dexter White and Alger Hiss—that certainly there was a certain naiveness on the part of some of those leaders.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

DISTRESS AMONG COTTON FARMERS

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, application of the reduction in cotton acreage allotments in many areas of the Nation is about to result in one of the greatest social and economic setbacks ever faced by cotton farmers and their families.

It is true that a general reduction has been approved by the cotton farmers of the Nation; and in order to maintain a reasonable price for their product, the total acreage allotment should not be greatly increased. However, within the total national allotment, some administrative or legislative adjustment must be made to prevent untold hardships from occurring.

If additional allotments cannot be provided in hardship cases within the present overall allotment, then some reasonable additional national allotment should be made, in order to take care of these cases.

Mr. President, the situation is serious. There are thousands of farmers on family-size farms in Texas who will have their cash crop reduced this year far below what it is necessary for them to receive in order to earn a living and to encourage them and their children to continue in the business of farming.

I do not profess to be an expert on the subject or to possess the answer as to what must be done. All I know is that some type of relief on cotton allotments for hardship cases must be devised by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Congress, and possibly by both, if we are to prevent suffering and further exodus from the family-size farms of the country.

With this in mind, earlier this week, I joined my distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the distinguished Senators from Mississippi, South Carolina, and Arkansas [Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. JOHNSTON, and Mr. FULBRIGHT] in presenting this problem to officials of the Department of Agriculture and in requesting them to advise Members of the Congress what type of relief would be feasible and agreeable to this administration.

Mr. President, the purpose of these remarks is to urge the Secretary of Agriculture and his staff to recommend an appropriate solution of this problem and to advise the Congress what legislation this administration will support in order to alleviate the hardships which now are apparent.

Time is of the essence. Any effective relief must come within the next few weeks, in order that the farmers may know what they can plant. That is why it is essential that the support of this administration be given wholeheartedly to whatever action Congress might take. There is no need for Congress to attempt to solve the problem in the short time remaining, unless it is assured that its legislation will be signed by the President.

Mr. President, in east Texas and south Texas and other parts of our State and in the other cotton-producing States, there are literally hundreds of farmers who have had their cotton-acreage allotments cut for the first time below 5 acres. Many of their allotments have been cut to less than 2 acres.

A delegation visited me on this subject just before I left for Washington. The delegation was composed of the editor of one of the outstanding weekly newspapers in the cotton-producing area, the Lavaca County Tribune, Mr. Walter Malec; also Dr. Harvey Ranger; State Senator Gus Strauss; Mayor M. I. Bozka, a Lavaca banker; and Mr. Glade Welhausen, a Shiner banker. They presented the situation in Lavaca County, which, it seems to me, is only an example of what is happening in some of the other upland-farming counties of our State. They represented to me that Lavaca County has lost some 1,000 farmers since 1940; and they also represented to me that their congressional district has lost about 8,000 farm families since 1940; and the State of Texas, according to their figures, has 100,000 less farm families than it had in 1940.

They convinced me that it is impossible, under the present allotment program, to interest boys or young men in staying on the farm or in entering farming for the first time—at least, insofar as concerns the farming of cotton, because they cannot get sufficient allotment.

They presented a suggestion which appeals very much to me, that we have been thinking too much about the land and the crop, and too little about the people involved, too little about trying to see to it that our cotton-allotment program is so designed that it will keep the people on the small farms, the family-size farms, and, especially the young people, interested in farming in the future.

I have received several letters from bankers who say that the situation is becoming quite serious, and will become worse if some relief is not granted in hardship cases in the cotton-allotment program.

For example, Mr. Glade Welhausen, of Shiner, Tex., cashier of the First National Bank there, says:

> Our renewals of notes and unpaid balances were exceptionally heavy this year. The majority of our farmers could not liquidate their indebtedness.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Drought contributed to our present problem, and prospects are discouraging for this year, due to a serious lack of winter rains and subsoil moisture. If there is no way to adjust present allotments under existing laws, I certainly feel that our farmers should be granted substantial increases in allotments under an emergency condition.

From the chamber of commerce of Moulton, Tex., I have received a letter, signed by W. H. Pundt, acting secretary-manager; Mr. Edwin Darilek, president of the Moulton Chamber of Commerce;

and Mr. John E. Janacek, a member of the board of directors of the South Texas Chamber of Commerce, in which they say:

Hereto attached is a brief memorandum as adopted by the Moulton Chamber of Commerce pertaining to the small family farms which are steadily disappearing not only in our area but over the South. The organization feels that there is more at stake than the mere absorption of the small farms into larger ones.

* * * * *

Perhaps needless to say, but directly the loss of the rural people has meant for our town a drop in business volume, drop in bank deposits, over a half million dollars less in gross cotton income for our farmers alone, the continual loss of youth to large cities, etc. We, then, fail to see how our Nation is booming, and see that the growth of many industrial areas are at the expense of the small towns who furnish the manpower.

This exodus from the farms, especially of young people, has been going on for quite a number of years. It seems to me that in thinking about the overall cotton allotment program, something must be done not only to take care of hardship cases, but to make it possible for young men to become interested in staying on the farm or in following agricultural pursuits in the future.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks excerpts from various other letters and telegrams on this subject. They are merely examples of what I have been receiving from Texas on this subject. I should like to have these excerpts placed in the RECORD in order that Members of the Senate may know the seriousness of this problem.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTERS ON COTTON ALLOTMENTS

Mr. R. E. Brown, Jr., of Lockhart, Tex., president of the Caldwell County Farm Bureau, writes:

"We need your help in a most crucial crisis facing the cotton farmers of Caldwell County. Caldwell County feels that their farmers have been a victim of circumstances in the recently announced cotton allotment. When the Government asked farmers to divert cotton acreage to other crops and voluntarily retire acres of cotton, they did. They did this with the understanding that future cotton allotments would take into consideration these conservation practices.

"Now we find a county that had an adjusted allotment of 28,206 acres in 1954 cut to 21,550 in 1955. Not taking into consideration the extra 5,000 acres allotted in 1954, our county would have had 23,000 acres in 1954. Now we find they have been cut some 2,000 acres over this. We look to a neighboring county that has over a 100,000-acre allotment and they were cut only 1,700 acres. Do you think it is right for a county that has 5 times as much cotton as Caldwell County to be cut less than a small county that is dependent on at least a 15,000-bale crop to maintain an economic stability? We need an additional 5,000 acres or more this year; probably more than we will ever need again. During this year, 1954, only about 9 inches of rain has fallen. Many farmers have been forced to sell their livestock and if cotton allotments are not adjusted so the farmer who has tried to cooperate in a conservation program can maintain some income, economic despair is certainly in prospect. Especially hard hit are farmers with tenant families. Many of these Mexican families are being forced to move."

A similar letter was received from Mr. P. W. Griffith, chairman, farm and ranch committee, Lockhart Chamber of Commerce, who adds:

"We feel that it is not the small farmer nor the conservation farmer who have caused the cotton surplus; but under the present law, these two types of farmers are getting hurt most while the man who has contributed most to the cotton surplus is getting the least reduction in acreage."

Mr. Ralph Mather, chairman, and members of the agricultural committee of the Crockett and Houston County Chamber of Commerce, write:

"Cotton alone accounts for 24 percent of our total yearly income. Our average cotton production is over 16,000 bales and in 1954 we produced less than 10,000 bales because of the drought and consequently the outstanding debts owed by farmers are at a longtime high running as high as 60 percent unpaid accounts with one lending agency. There are 2,240 cotton farmers operating 1,741 farms not to mention the thousands of others these farmers supply with work; and there are no industrial jobs for these people to turn to as total nonagricultural workers number only 990."

Mr. J. Perrin Willis, of Rusk, Tex., writes:

"Cotton as you know is our main cash crop, or I should say was. Year after year our acreage is being cut, until today, though there is supposed to be a minimum of 5 acres per farm, often many of our farmers do not get more than six-tenths of an acre. This has put many of our farmers out of business and is the one reason our east Texas counties are losing in population."

Mr. T. L. Roberts, of Canton, Tex., president of the Van Zandt County Farm Bureau, writes as follows:

"We, in this county, through the past have been urged by every USDA agency to plant more soil-conserving crops and less cotton, and have been led to believe that these crops would not count against us in allotment years. Those who have been working best with those agencies are the ones who are hurt the most by this program.

"Due to last year's drought a part of our cotton acreage was never planted. Some of this county's allotments were so small that the individual farmer would neither plant them nor turn them back for reallocation. We understand this acreage will be taken away from our county. If this is true, it is not only unfair to us but will not ease the cotton surplus."

Mr. H. A. Krueger, Brenham, Tex., owns a farm along the river in Washington County, Tex. He advises that an average of 54 acres per year has been planted to cotton on this farm for a number of years prior to the acreage reduction of 1954, but his allotment for 1955 will be 29.8 acres. His letter continues:

"Two tenants are cultivating the land—one family consists of 8 persons, while the other consists of 4, making a total of 12 persons who must make a living on this farm. * * * With this drastic acreage reduction of 44.8 percent, it will be impossible for my tenants to take care of their family needs, besides meeting payments on a tractor (which one of my tenants purchased during 1953), and as a result he would be forced to give up his tractor and lose the money he has paid on it and his family would be forced on relief. If our Senators could only realize the conditions that will be confronting us this coming year, there is no doubt in my mind that an increase would be granted, especially in hardship cases."

Taylor County is one of those hit the worst by the drought. Mr. W. O. Higgins, of Abilene, Tex., secretary of the Taylor County Farm Bureau, has written that:

"In a recent farm bureau meeting the cotton allotment for our county, 36,000 acres was discussed. Also, we tried to figure out some way we could live and pay our past debts due to the continued drought.

"The small cotton allotments look bad. We think we need more cotton as cotton is our principal cash crop. We don't feel that we have had much to do with the surplus cotton, due to the drought."

A good many individual farmers have also told me of the difficulties which they face. Mr. R. L. Michie, of Josephine, in Collin County, expressed it this way:

"Mr. Daniel, I do not believe that these gross inequities were the intent of Congress. We are faced with economic disaster. We do not seek special favors or extra considerations. We merely ask that we receive a fair cotton allotment as compared to other primary cotton producing regions."

Bankers in the drought areas have become acutely aware of the serious consequences unless some relief is given. A typical letter indicating the existing hardships comes from Mr. J. H. Harrison, executive vice president of the First National Bank of Childress, Tex. His area has suffered severe drought conditions for 3 consecutive years and he writes as follows:

"A majority of our farmers have incurred heavy indebtedness during the 3-year period making it necessary for practically all of such farmers to secure operating loans from the Farmers Home Administration during 1954 and to some extent in 1953. * * * These same farmers are now faced with this big debt with high operating cost and their only means to pay the debt is from production.

"In this extreme critical area would it not be possible to give them a 15- to 25-percent acreage increase in order for them to recoup some part of their losses in these dry years. Personally I do not see how they are ever going to pay their debts where the acreage is being continually reduced. In fact if they were to make a normal crop many of them could not make it."

This same thought was expressed by Mr. Millard A. Webb, of Dimmitt, Tex., chairman of Castro County Growers:

"We do not believe that it was the intention of the law to inflict such hardship on us when a 15-percent national cut was desired. We believe that national legislation to relieve hardships imposed by drought and extreme grower trends, such as now exists in Castro County, should be enacted."

I have received numerous letters and telegrams from Fayette County, including telegrams from Mr. George Bridges, president of the Flatonia Rotary Club; Mr. F. W. Janssen, chairman La Grange Local Farm Bureau; and Mr. Arthur Citzler, chairman, Fayette County Farm Bureau. Representative of these messages is the following from Mr. Citzler:

"Small cotton farmer of this county is in sad plight of which we have 500 with 5 acres or less; 980 with between 5 and 10 acres and 620 with between 10 and 15 acres. His condition severely aggravated by drought. Must have relief. Please give your wholehearted support to the bill of HOMER THORNBERRY under which this county's allotments would be restored to 1954 revised allotment of 34,024 acres. Being one of the drought-stricken counties in central Texas, have bill passed immediately so local farmers can take advantage of it. Last year increased acreage passed too late for our farmers to plant."

LOYAL AND EFFECTIVE PUBLIC SERVICE BY VETERAN EMPLOYEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, with the opening of the 1st session of this 84th Congress, it has occurred to me to comment upon a factor which helps to make possible the smooth transition from one Congress to another

and from operation under one party to operation under another. It is that public servants who seldom are headlined contribute much to the stability and continuity of our Government.

Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a growing tradition in America of loyal and effective public service. It is a tradition far more venerable than many of us realize.

To dramatize this fact, I call attention to seven employees on the Senate side who typify the self-effacement and the high ability of women and men who are making lifetime careers in Government service. Each of these seven started on the Hill more than 50 years ago. Add up their tenures, as we start this first session of a new Congress, and we have the astounding total of almost 400 years.

So, Mr. President, I salute these seven veterans. The dates of their respective appointments are as follows:

Charles L. Watkins, Chief Senate Parliamentarian, 1904; Paul C. Johnson, Senate Restaurant headwaiter, 1900; Arthur E. "Gus" Cook, Assistant Capitol Architect, 1897; Charles E. Alden, Assistant Superintendent, Senate Office Building, 1900; Lillian M. Taylor, Capitol Architect clerk, 1901; James D. Preston, Senate registration clerk, 1897; and James W. Murphy, Chief Senate Reporter, 1896.

CHARLES L. WATKINS

Charles L. Watkins is, in service, the youngest of the group. He came to Washington December 1, 1904. Fresh from law school, he was brought by Senator James P. Clarke, of Arkansas, as a stenographer at $75 per month. But pothooks did not hold him long. After several steps up the ladder, he assumed the duties of Parliamentarian in 1923, though the position was not created by name till 1935.

To say that his command of parliamentary procedure is profound is to utter the obvious. Once his mind clasps a point, it sets like a vise. He is as a seeing-eye dog to guide the newcomers through parliamentary mazes and a rod and a staff to those who preside. Mr. President, it might be said he sits only a little lower than the angels and dispenses wisdom like an oracle.

How does he do it?

Unlike the House, the Senate did not adopt Jefferson's Manual, although Thomas Jefferson wrote the first version while Vice President. The House has its 8 volumes of Hinds' and Cannon's Precedents with 3-volume indexes. But in the Senate we have no printed guide.

Instead, Charley has compiled in semipermanent form our precedents from 1883 to 1940 and maintains in looseleaf notebooks those from 1925 to the present. These and our celebrated "40 rules" are the corpus of Senate procedure—these and Charley Watkins' encyclopedic and tenacious memory.

Seldom does he need to consult his records. Usually a whispered word to the Presiding Officer settles the most baffling question. An important appeal from a decision of the Chair, as some Senators present will recall, occurred in 1949. Under the old rule on motion of 16 Senators debate could be closed on a pending measure. Vice President BARKLEY had ruled that this applied to a motion to take up a motion. But in a history-making vote, the Senate overruled this decision of the Chair and sustained a differing opinion of the Parliamentarian.

Charley Watkins' respect for precedent is, however, humanized by sentiment. In his personal archives is a list of visiting personages who have been officially received by the Senate, beginning with General Lafayette on January 1, 1824. The roster is studded with such names as Louis Kossuth, the King of the Hawaiian Islands, Marshal Joffre, General Pershing, Orville Wright, Charles A. Lindbergh, King George VI, Winston Churchill, and General MacArthur.

Charley Watkins believes traditions are precious. He sees the tiny cannisters on each Senator's desk as a link between the unhurried era when our predecessors blotted quill-spread ink with sand and these tense days of self-drying ballpoint pens. The Senate's snuffboxes have not been regularly used for 25 years—not since Senator Lee S. Overman, of North Carolina, took his daily sniff—but Charley Watkins wants them retained and regularly filled with the American Indian's favorite medicinal herb.

He is proud to have been present November 17 last when an ivory gavel, presented by India's Vice President, the Honorable Sarvapelli Radhakrishnan, replaced the one traditionally in use since 1789. He approved heartily that day when Vice President NIXON announced that the old gavel would repose in a special box on the rostrum during all Senate sessions; and Senators will note that it so rests today.

"It started a new old tradition," he says, "Another one to give color and texture and durability to our republican institutions."

PAUL C. JOHNSON

Paul Johnson personalizes a chapter in American history, for two of his grandparents were born into slavery. Despite a humble start in life 75 years ago at Culpeper, Va., Paul has won the respect and affection of senatorial generations extending back to 1900. That was the year he started in the Senate Restaurant—as a busboy.

Perhaps the reason for his long success as the maitre de of our restaurant is best expressed in a recent remark.

"No matter how expensively a man is dressed," he said, "he is not well dressed if he doesn't wear a smile."

Paul's quiet smile of welcome has made an indelible impression on the minds of uncounted men and women who have served in the Senate, as well as members of their families and guests. Moreover, Paul, who now is 75 years old, is gifted with a memory that photographs faces and names. When Senators who served 20 or 30, even 40 or 50 years ago, return to these memoried halls, he greets them with a smile and speaks their names.

Quietly genial and never hurried, he welcomes opportunities to chat about personalities he has known and about the rich symbolism of the Brumidi decorations on the dining room ceiling and walls. I hope that some day his book of observations and reflections will be published.

He should let us know how and why every day since 1907 bean soup has been on our menu.

THREE FROM ARCHITECT'S OFFICE

Arthur E. "Gus" Cook is a rarity—an 82-year-old native Washingtonian. In 1894 he served briefly as a page, but in 1897 he started his continuous career in the office of the Capitol Architect. He is now chief assistant, concerned with operation and maintenance of Government buildings "on the hill."

Gus sees to it that the 124 elevators are checked each morning before 9 o'clock; that the 2 subway cars are inspected weekly and overhauled each summer; and that the buildings are patrolled day and night.

He is in charge of security police. When Puerto Rican desperadoes went berserk in the House last year, he happened to be on the floor. "Someone shouted, 'Revolver shot. Duck.' " recalls Gus, adding with candor, "and I ducked." But he is proud of the record of Capt. Carl Schamp, of his detective force, who, a few seconds later, had disarmed the would-be assassin.

Gus—no one knows him as "Arthur Cook"—epitomizes the tradition of friendliness and efficiency characteristic of the corps responsible for the services and the physical appearance of the Capitol and associated buildings. But the Architect's office's half-century club has two other members.

Charles E. Alden, now 83, is oldest son of the oldest son nine generations removed from John Alden who bequeathed our most romantic tale of old New England.

Alden started service here in 1900, coming from Indiana. For some 25 years he was secretary to various Senators and from 1929 to 1933 was Chief Custodian of the Senate Office Building, of which he is now Assistant Superintendent.

His daily journal, however, records more than workaday events. For he lives a full life with chamber and orchestral music and friends as hobbies. Those who have been favored with his confidence, know of the richness of his alert personality.

Miss Lillian M. Taylor is Virginia born and started as a stenographer in the Architect's office in 1901. For many years she has been doing Martha's work there as clerk in charge of filing.

Gifted with imagination, she finds pleasure in maintaining in order many thousands of blueprints, letters, contracts, and documents.

Currently her duties relate to maintenance, but many files under her care are jammed with paperwork on the offices and other structures and installations dating from 1901.

JAMES D. PRESTON

Jim Preston was born in 1876, the centennial of our Republic. Historians also remind us—and I am delighted to make reference to this point because of my personal interest in the section of the country in which that historic event took

place—it was the historic year when resentment of the Sioux and allied tribes against incursions of gold miners in the Black Hills of South Dakota reached its climax on the Little Big Horn in Montana. There perished Gen. George A. Custer and his immediate command.

Jim Preston was to see much news made. Son of a newspaperman, he at age 20 was employed in 1896 by the Washington bureau of the Boston Journal.

In that era of social unrest, "General" Jacob Sechler Coxey recruited malcontents throughout the Nation in a march on Washington. Led by his nose for news, young Preston walked 4 miles to their camp at Brightwood, in the city's outskirts, to get the news firsthand.

As a reporter, he marched with the army through Washington to the Hill where mounted police dispersed it on the Capitol Grounds. Fortunately he escaped injury. But his accurate report of the unhappy incident was relayed through his chief, E. B. Wight, to the Nation and contributed to the base of fact from which came later reforms.

In 1897 Jim's enterprise was recognized by appointment as messenger in charge of the Senate Press Gallery at an annual salary of $1,440. To him, Government is far more than something that has provided him with employment.

Personally I cherish a memento that evidences his affection and respect for the institutions and traditions that grow up around the functions of Government within the Capitol. It is in the form of a miniature chair which he carved and fashioned from one of the white-pine planks upon which stood President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON at the inaugural, January 20, 1953.

JAMES W. MURPHY

Mr. President, I wish to conclude this review with certainly one of the most interesting men in the entire group, James W. Murphy.

Mr. President, Jim Preston is a revered reminder of the continuity of our legislative processes. But for a personality linking our generation through public service with far earlier American history, we have our official reporter, dean of all Senate employees, Mr. James W. Murphy. He is now in his 59th year with us, but the Murphy family started to record debates of this body 107 years ago in 1848.

That year the Senate decided to keep a word-by-word account of its debates and proceedings and called upon a Philadelphia shorthand teacher to supply a stenographer. His choice was a 14-year-old prodigy named Dennis F. Murphy, uncle of our James W.

When Senator John C. Calhoun saw has frail body, he remarked that he "would be better off outdoors, on a farm." But he underestimated the staying power of the body. Dennis F. Murphy served the Senate 48 years. And perhaps unparalleled in the annals of stenography is his single-handed coverage of the bitter and protracted debate of 1877 when the Electoral Commission awarded the Presidency not to Samuel J. Tilden but to Rutherford B. Hayes.

Dennis F. Murphy brought two brothers to the Senate as reporters: James J. who came in 1854, and Edward V., father of our James W., who began a 59-year term of service in 1860.

That was a pivotal year. Many statesmen were wrestling with their consciences whether to suport the Union and Abraham Lincoln or to cast their lot with the Confederacy and Jefferson Davis. Among memories of the reporting Murphys, is the farewell speech by Senator James A. McDougall, of California, who blended it with tragic belligerency in the pronouncement: "I, Mr. President, favor wine, women, and war."

Perhaps the invitation to alliteration got the best of the Senator's judgment. However, my opinion is rendered many years after the fact, and I may be wrong.

James W. Murphy, latest of this stenographic dynasty, started work in these Halls on December 7, 1896, at the beginning of the second session of the 54th Congress as amanuensis.

Mr. President, when I prepared these remarks I did not intend to make any comment on this point, but I cannot refrain from saying that December 7, 1896, the date when James W. Murphy started his service in the Senate of the United States, was only 2 days removed from my own birthday. The beginning of his service as an employee of the Senate of the United States antedates my birth by 2 days.

Edison's gramophone was not yet in use. Reporters dictated successive paragraphs from their notes to alternating amanuenses, who hurriedly tapped them out on a new-fangled device known as a typewriter. In a short time Murph was reporting the debates on the Senate floor.

Murph's hand has been in all of the four-hundred-and-fifty-odd volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD issued since 1896. In those published since May 1933, in the course of his work of arranging and preparing the copy for the printers, he has read millions of words. It is daily routine for him to heal split infinitives, rescue dangling participles, and ease tortured syntax.

Innumerable times have his deft pencil and agile mind saved Senators from slips which spring from heat and excitement common in extempore debate. When, for example, one agitated Member of this Chamber referred to himself as "the distinguished and able Senator from" his home State. Murph's friendly editing deleted the inadvertence.

Perhaps it is fortunate for us all that he has foresworn memoirs. But if ever he were to relent that decision, I am sure his book would be tempered by his innate kindliness and his saving grace of humor. Certain to be included, however, would be an amusing error of one of Murph's colleagues, who worshipped at the pugilistic shrine of John L. Sullivan. A Senator had correctly quoted a scriptural reference to Solomon and the lilies of the field, but when the copy came to Murph's desk it read:

Sullivan in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these.

His choicest example of repartee recalls the "noughty nought" era when President McKinley's Philippine policy was vigorously defended by Senator Chauncey M. Depew.

After Depew had spoken what he thought was the final word on the subject, up rose Senator Edward Carmack, of Tennessee, who later was to climax his reputation as a firebrand by being killed in a duel. Carmack read a New York Times report of a speech of years before wherein Depew had taken a diametrically opposite stand. But the New York Senator had ready reply.

Mr. President—

Depew said—

I have an admission. My forebears were Democrats, my early inclinations were Democratic, and as a young man I was a Democrat. Even at this late date in moments of aberration I sometimes take the Democratic and, therefore, the wrong line.

Carmack was immediately on his feet.

Yes—

He declared with disarming suavity—

and when Satan trod the burning marl of hell, he, too, boasted that once he had been an angel of light.

Quick as Murph is to enjoy humor in the day's debate, he also has the eye of a man who loves and caresses words put into combinations that signify more than they say. He laments pressures that preclude Senators from preparing orations such as graced the RECORD in the heyday of men like Beveridge, of Indiana; Dolliver, of Iowa, Bailey, of Texas; Ashurst, of Arizona; Borah, of Idaho; Hiram Johnson, of California; Daniel, of Virginia, and Blackburn, of Kentucky. Yet, often in the day's overburden of verbiage, he will discover and take pride in passages that glow with logic and sparkle with apt phrases. And many a man who has sat in this Chamber since 1896 has fondly remembered both compliment and encouragement from this maestro of the reporters' rooms.

A speech delivered in the Senate in 1950 represents what Murph jokingly refers to as a real flight of oratory, for it flew all the way to Ohio by airplane. It was an important speech by Senator Taft, and, contrary to his usual custom, he asked to have the transcript sent to him for revision. He put it in his briefcase and took it with him on the 6 o'clock plane for Cleveland. About 9 o'clock, in making up the copy for the RECORD, Murph discovered that the speech was missing, and no one could find it. Later in the evening Jack Martin, Senator Taft's assistant, reached the Senator by long-distance telephone, and was advised that the speech still reposed in the briefcase and had been entirely forgotten, but it was necessary that it be in the RECORD. In the meantime, it had been redictated by the reporters and retranscribed, and so it was printed in the RECORD of that day, to Senator Taft's entire satisfaction.

Around-the-clock sessions impose inhuman strain on the men who transcribe and edit our debates, but they accept exigencies as a part of their day's work.

During discussions of atomic-energy control in the 2d session of the 83d Congress, last August, the task was enormous. In one 4-day period, our 76-year-old Murph snatched naps totaling a scant 16 hours out of the 96. Each morning, however, the RECORD came out as if produced entirely by machines.

In passing, it may be noted that Murph has a degree of master of laws and has been a member of the District of Columbia bar for 50 years. He considers this accomplishment to have been an invaluable aid in performing the work with which he has been charged.

And so it is, Mr. President, that I rise to express admiration and appreciation for the tradition and devotion to service that exceeds the call of duty exemplified by the seven I have named: Charles L. Watkins, Paul C. Johnson, Arthur E. "Gus" Cook, Charles E. Alden, Lillian M. Taylor, James D. Preston, and James W. Murphy.

Mr. President, I have been obliged, of course, to limit myself to a few. I have taken those who have served over 50 years with the Senate of the United States, but the loyalty which they have exhibited, the help which they have given to those of us who are Members of the Senate are invaluable. They have been invaluable not merely to the Members of the Senate who represent the several States, but they have made a real contribution to the esprit de corps of all the employees of the Senate. Although I have limited my speech to only a few, having chosen those whose service has exceeded 50 years, I could go on and name other persons who have contributed. All of them have personalized something of incalculable value to our Republic.

STATEMENT CONCERNING THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I should like to inform the Senate that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, in executive session, on January 19, 1955, duly elected the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] as chairman for the 84th Congress succeeding Representative STERLING COLE, of New York. Representative CARL T. DURHAM, of North Carolina, was duly elected vice chairman, succeeding the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

It will be recalled that the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (section 202) requires that the chairmanship and vice chairmanship of the joint committee rotate between the two Chambers with each Congress. The law, therefore, required that in the 84th Congress the chairman be a Senator elected by the Senate section of the committee and the vice chairman be from the other body, elected by the members of the joint committee from that body. In the 85th Congress the chairman will be from the other body and the vice chairman from the Senate.

Following the election of officers for the 84th Congress, the committee, as its first matter of business adopted a resolution commending the services of Representative COLE and the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] as chairman and vice chairman, respectively, during the 83d Congress. I should like to read at this point in my remarks the text of the resolution:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was created pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, and was further authorized by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to act on behalf of Congress in atomic energy matters; and

Whereas the joint committee has great responsibility in gathering and studying all information concerning the atomic energy program; and

Whereas the joint committee has the further very great responsibility of helping to mold the long-range policies of the atomic energy program; and

Whereas Representative W. STERLING COLE, of New York, has been chairman of the joint committee, and Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, has been vice chairman from April 1, 1953, until January 19, 1955; and

Whereas during this period the joint committee undertook the complete revision of the basic Atomic Energy Act; and

Whereas in all matters the chairman and vice chairman have served faithfully and well, and by their devoted service and the exercise of sound judgment have brought credit to the joint committee and to the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy commends Representative W. STERLING COLE and Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER for the excellent manner in which they discharged their duties; and be it further

Resolved, That the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy expresses its appreciation to Representative W. STERLING COLE and Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER for their devotion to their duties; and be it further

Resolved, That the chairman of the joint committee is instructed to have this resolution suitably engraved and presented to each with the best wishes and deep regard of their colleagues.

Mr. President, in order to have available to the Members of the Senate in one place full information on the membership and organization of the joint committee, I should also at this point like to insert a full list of the members of the joint committee, as follows:

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, chairman; Representative CARL T. DURHAM, vice chairman; Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL; Senator JOHN O. PASTORE; Senator ALBERT GORE; Senator HENRY M. JACKSON; Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER; Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN; Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND; Senator JOHN W. BRICKER; Representative CHET HOLIFIELD; Representative MELVIN PRICE; Representative PAUL J. KILDAY; Representative JOHN J. DEMPSEY; Representative W. STERLING COLE; Representative CARL HINSHAW; Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT; Representative JAMES T. PATTERSON.

Mr. President, because of the importance of the exchange of information and cooperation with other nations in the atomic field, both in peacetime applications and in certain limited military areas under proper security safeguards, it was felt prudent to appoint a new subcommittee on agreements for cooperation to deal with all matters relating to these activities.

In addition, the joint committee, under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, was given the responsibility of recommending authorizing legislation to Congress for all Atomic Energy Commission acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility, and matters relating to AEC plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion. A subcommittee on authorizing legislation has therefore been established.

I should like to insert in the RECORD at this point a list of the joint committee's six subcommittees with their chairmen and membership, as follows:

Subcommittee on research and development: Representative MELVIN PRICE, chairman; Representative CARL T. DURHAM; Representative CARL HINSHAW; Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT; Senator JOHN O. PASTORE; Senator ALBERT GORE; Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER.

Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation: Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, chairman; Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON; Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER; Senator JOHN W. BRICKER; Representative CARL T. DURHAM; Representative MELVIN PRICE; and Representative STERLING COLE.

Subcommittee on Authorizing Legislation: Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman; Representative CARL T. DURHAM; Representative PAUL J. KILDAY; Representative STERLING COLE; Senator ALBERT GORE; Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER; and Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN.

Subcommittee on Military Applications: Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, chairman; Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON; Senator JOHN O. PASTORE; Senator JOHN W. BRICKER; Representative CHET HOLIFIELD; Representative STERLING COLE; Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT.

Subcommittee on Security: Representative PAUL J. KILDAY, chairman; Representative JOHN J. DEMPSEY; Representative CARL HINSHAW; Representative JAMES T. PATTERSON; Senator JOHN O. PASTORE; Senator HENRY M. JACKSON; Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

Subcommittee on Raw Materials: Senator ALBERT GORE, chairman; Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON; Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER; Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN; Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND; Representative CHET HOLIFIELD; Representative JOHN J. DEMPSEY; Representative JAMES T. PATTERSON.

GRANTING OF PERMANENT CERTIFICATES TO SO-CALLED LOCAL OR FEEDER AIRLINES

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, at the request of the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by him on the local service airlines bill be printed at this point in the RECORD, and also that certain telegrams relating thereto may be printed as a part of his statement.

There being no objection, the statement and telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. MAGNUSON ON LOCAL SERVICE AIRLINES BILL

I am introducing today a bill to grant permanent certificates to the so-called local or feeder airlines. There are 14 such carriers operating in the United States today. They service 42 States and over 400 cities. They are an important part of our domestic air-transportation system. Without them many cities in this air age would not have air transportation. I introduce the bill, at the request of a number of local service carriers. I would like inserted as a part of my remarks

the wires I have received on this subject. I point out to the Senate that all 14 local service airlines are on record in favor of this legislation.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *January 19, 1955.*
The Honorable WARREN MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Urgently request you introduce separate Senate bill providing for issuance of permanent certificates to local service air carriers similar to House bill introduced this session by Congressman HINSHAW, of California.

Best regards,

EDMUND CONVERSE,
President, Bonanza Airlines Inc.

SEATTLE, WASH., *January 19, 1955.*
Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Would appreciate your sponsoring local airlines permanent certification along same lines as introduced in House last session. I believe this will be in the best interests of the traveling public and the airlines industry.

WEST COAST AIRLINES,
NICK BEZ.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *January 19, 1955.*
Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Washington, D. C.:

We are very much interested in H. R. 526, introduced by Hon. CARL HINSHAW in House of Representatives on January 5, 1955. We respectfully urge your consideration and introduction of a companion bill in the Senate.

LADDIE HAMILTON,
President, Ozark Airlines, Inc.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 24, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 21, 1955:

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Leverett Edwards, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1958. (Reappointment.)

FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BOARD

The following-named persons to be members of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for the terms indicated and until their successors have been appointed and qualified:

Harlan Bruce Munger, of New York, for a term of 6 years from December 1, 1954. (Reappointment.)

George P. Daley, of Minnesota, for a term of 6 years from December 1, 1954, vice Clark L. Brody, term expired.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Gilbert H. Jertberg, of California, to be United States district judge for the southern district of California, vice Campbell E. Beaumont, deceased.

IN THE ARMY

The officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (Public Law 476, 82d Cong.), to date from December 8, 1954:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. LeRoy Hagen Anderson, O239452.
Brig. Gen. Claude Thomas Bowers, O183291.
Brig. Gen. James Francis Cantwell, O396657.
Brig. Gen. Clyde Emerson Dougherty, O190855.
Brig. Gen. Charles Lyn Fox, O154765.
Brig. Gen. Roy Albert Green, O226513.
Brig. Gen. John David Higgins, O152349.
Brig. Gen. Hugh Stanford McLeod, O143285.
Brig. Gen. John Williams Morgan, O140899.
Brig. Gen. Ralph Albert Palladino, O232912.
Brig. Gen. Russell Archibald Ramsey, O215598.
Brig. Gen. Isidor Schwaner Ravdin, O399712.
Brig. Gen. Herbert Norman Schwarzkopf, O190484.
Brig. Gen. Albert Hummel Stackpole, O103158.
Brig. Gen. William Miles Stokes, Jr., O166391.
Brig. Gen. Carl Thomas Sutherland, O258676.
Brig. Gen. Lamar Tooze, O107927.
Brig. Gen. Frederick Marshall Warren, O266247.
Brig. Gen. Warren Claypool Wood, O295588.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Otwa Tilden Autry, O332367, Artillery, National Guard of the United States.
Col. Ernest Oscar Black, O293790, Artillery, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Aloysius Maximius Brumbaugh, O225777, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Louis Henry Charbonneau, O142965, Infantry, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Harold Richard Duffie, O126221, Transportation Corps, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Robert Ernest Frankland, O277098, Artillery, National Guard of the United States.
Col. Thomas Fuller, O248411, Transportation Corps, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Robert Morgan Jones, O270821, Infantry, United States Army Reserve.
Col. John Harry LaBrum, O909644, Signal Corps, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Frank Lawrence Lazarus, O242867, Artillery, United States Army Reserve.
Col. James Bryant Mason, O219601, Medical Corps, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Charles Sumner McCormick, Jr., O332054, Transportation Corps, United States Army Reserve.
Col. John Adair McEwan, O280352, Artillery, United States Army Reserve.
Col. George Augustus Morris, O266651, Corps of Engineers, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Henry George Nulton, O205635, Infantry, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Charles William O'Bryant, O328896, Infantry, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Almerin Cartwright O'Hara, O328935, Infantry, National Guard of the United States.
Col. Charles Adam Ott, Jr., O428375, Artillery, National Guard of the United States.
Col. Maston Samuel Parham, O299244, Infantry, National Guard of the United States.
Col. Don Archibold Parkhurst, O284478, Corps of Engineers, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Manfred Ullman Prescott, O224176, Medical Corps, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Philip George Rettig, O903151, Corps of Engineers, United States Army Reserve.
Col. William Thomas Rice, O320906, Transportation Corps, United States Army Reserve.
Col. William Edwards Roberts, O233906, Artillery, National Guard of the United States.
Col. Forrest Lee Roe, O226907, Artillery, National Guard of the United States.
Col. James Earl Rudder, O294916, Infantry, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Clifford LeRoy Sayre, O201040, Chemical Corps, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Carlton Kimball Smith, O231996, Infantry, National Guard of the United States.
Col. Alden Earl Stilson, O320041, Corps of Engineers, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Louis Frank William Stuebe, O170245, Artillery, United States Army Reserve.
Col. James Strom Thurmond, O191221, Staff Specialist, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Morgan Montrose Wallace, O275387, Artillery, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Clyde Jefferson Watts, O269820, Artillery, United States Army Reserve.

Gen. William Morris Hoge, O4437, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Maj. Gen. Withers Alexander Burress, O4812, United States Army, retired, to be advanced on the retired list to the grade of lieutenant general under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Maj. Gen. William Benjamin Kean, O12470, United States Army, retired, to be advanced on the retired list to the grade of lieutenant general under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The following-named officers for appointment to the position indicated and for appointment as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

*Maj. Gen. John Wilson O'Daniel, O7342, United States Army, to be Chief, Military Assistance Advisory Group, Indochina, with the rank of lieutenant general.

*Maj. Gen. Hobart Raymand Gay, O7323, United States Army, to be commanding general, Fifth Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

*Maj. Gen. Stanley Raymond Mickelsen, O7042, United States Army, to be commanding general, Army Antiaircraft Command, with the rank of lieutenant general.

*Maj. Gen. Thomas Wade Herren, O7430, United States Army, to be commanding general, First Army, and senior United States Army member, Military Staff Committee, United Nations, with the rank of lieutenant general.

*Maj. Gen. Claude Birkett Ferenbaugh, O12479, United States Army, to be deputy commanding general, Army Forces, Far East, with the rank of lieutenant general.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

*Maj. Gen. Laurin Lyman Williams, O8425, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

*Maj. Gen. Samuel Tankersley Williams, O8472, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

*Maj. Gen. Boniface Campbell, O9788, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

*Maj. Gen. Leslie Dillon Carter, O10663, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

*Maj. Gen. Philip Edward Gallagher, O11249, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

*Maj. Gen. David Ayres Depue Ogden, O12051, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

*Brig. Gen. John Hamilton Hinds, O12106, United States Army.

*Brig. Gen. Robert Alwin Schow, O12180, United States Army.

To be brigadier generals

*Maj. Gen. Gilman Clifford Mudgett, O14966, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

*Brig. Gen. Douglas Valentine Johnson, O15072, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).
*Maj. Gen. Robert Parker Hollis, O15079, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).
*Brig. Gen. Kenner Fisher Hertford, O15120, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).
*Brig. Gen. Einar Bernard Gjelsteen, O15143, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).
*Brig. Gen. John Joseph Binns, O15207, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).
*Brig. Gen. Charles Vinson Bromley, Jr., O15239, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).
*Brig. Gen. John William Harmony, O15240, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).
*Maj. Gen. Earl Shuman Gruver, O15259, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).
*Brig. Gen. Robert Ward Berry, O15554, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).
*Brig. Gen. William Thaddeus Sexton, O15777, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier general, Dental Corps

*Brig. Gen. James Melvin Epperly, O16288, Army of the United States (colonel, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

To be major generals

*Brig. Gen. John Hamilton Hinds, O12106, United States Army.
*Brig. Gen. Robert Alwin Schow, O12180, United States Army.
*Brig. Gen. George Bateman Peploe, O16246, United States Army.
*Brig. Gen. Victor Allen Conrad, O15546, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).
*Brig. Gen. Rinaldo Van Brunt, O16225, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).
*Brig. Gen. Herbert Butler Powell, O16684, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).
*Brig. Gen. Frank Otto Bowman, O12090, United States Army.
*Brig. Gen. Louis Watkins Prentiss, O14672, United States Army.
*Brig. Gen. Kenner Fisher Hertford, O15120, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

*Col. Dale Bowlby Ridgely, O17797, Dental Corps, United States Army.
*Col. Miles Merrill Dawson, O16079, United States Army.
*Col. Claude Franklin Burbach, O16184, United States Army.
*Col. Marcel Gustave Crombez, O16198, United States Army.
*Col. Harry Wells Crandall, O16238, United States Army.
*Col. William Livingston Bayer, O16372, United States Army.
*Col. William Edward House, O16406, United States Army.
*Col. Rothwell Hutton Brown, O16604, United States Army.
*Col. Walter Byron Larew, O16647, United States Army.
*Col. Charles Albert Sheldon, O16662, United States Army.
*Col. James Harold Banville, O28921, United States Army.
*Col. William Perry Pence, O16779, United States Army.
*Col. Raymond Wiley Curtis, O16784, United States Army.
*Col. Charles Richard Hutchison, O16796, United States Army.
*Col. William Jordan Verbeck, O16852, United States Army.
*Col. Theodore Scott Riggs, O17076, United States Army.
*Col. Thomas Fraley Van Natta, O17086, United States Army.
*Col. Mercer Christie Walter, O17151, United States Army.
*Col. Paul Amos Gavan, O17169, United States Army.
*Col. Samuel Leslie Myers, O17180, United States Army.
*Col. Wilhelm Paul Johnson, O17229, United States Army.
*Col. Evan McLaren Houseman, O17307, United States Army.
*Col. Robert Henry Wienecke, O41569, United States Army.
*Col. Aaron William Beeman, O29063, United States Army.
*Col. James Dreyfus, O29117, United States Army.
*Col. Joseph Horridge, O17555, United States Army.
*Col. Joseph Milton Colby, O17562, United States Army.
*Col. Edmund Chauncey Rockefeller Lasher, O17624, United States Army.
*Col. Joseph Reisner Ranck, O17647, United States Army.
*Col. William Kerr Ghormley, O17674, United States Army.
*Col. Bruce Easley, Jr., O17735, United States Army.
*Col. Stanley Walker Jones, O17747, Judge Advocate General's Corps, United States Army.
*Col. Herbert Allen Hall, O41631, United States Army.
*Col. Francis Frederick Uhrhane, O18071, United States Army.
*Col. William Henry Harris, O18155, United States Army.
*Col. Herbert Lucian Scofield, O29462, United States Army.
*Col. William Edwin Barksdale, O29478, United States Army.
*Col. Albert Frederick Cassevant, O18456, United States Army.
*Col. Rush Blodget Lincoln, Jr., O18656, United States Army.
*Col. Horace Freeman Bigelow, O18775, United States Army.
*Col. Bogardus Snowden Cairns, O18798, United States Army.
*Col. John William Bowen, O18904, United States Army.
*Col. Richard Joseph Werner, O29107, United States Army.
*Col. Norman Hayden Vissering, O41603, United States Army.
*Col. Edgar Thomas Conley, Jr., O17665, United States Army.
*Col. William Richard Frederick, Jr., O29388, United States Army.
*Col. Briard Poland Johnson, O29393, United States Army.
*Col. Andrew Thomas McAnsh, O38667, United States Army.
*Col. Philip Campbell Wehle, O18067, United States Army.
*Col. Isaac Sewell Morris, O18806, United States Army.

NOTE.—The officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (*) were appointed during the recess of the Senate.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of sections 502 and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be colonels, Judge Advocate General's Corps

*Anderson, George N., O51379.
*Ayars, Benjamin M., O42173.
*Baron, Edwin W., O42012.
*Bisant, Oscar M., Jr., O51387.
*Clarke, Franklin W., O29792.
*Crook, Gerard B., O39713.
*Dougherty, George R., O51055.
*Eger, Arnold G., O29842.
Engel, Harry J., O39840.
*Hembree, Tom B., O29789.
×Henderson, Thomas J., O42203.
*Johnson, Edward T., O29856.
×Johnson, Ralph K., O42213.
*Johnson, William H., Jr., O29908.
*Lawrence, Charles W., Jr., O41613.
*Levie, Howard S., O38735.
*Lougee, Laurence W., O41933.
*Lundberg, Floyd M., O42136.
*Murphy, Edward J., Jr., O42061.
*Nolan, James L., O38689.
*O'Brien, John G., O42171.
*Pike, Robert P., O42023.
*Rasco, Delphine D., O41973.
*Sams, Gerald A., O41931.
*Steele, Roy H., O41847.
*Todd, Alan B., O42088.
*Weisler, Julian E., O42028.
West, Charles P., O29964.
*Williams, Curtis L., O30082.
*Wolf, Samuel S., O38674.
*Woods, Cameron F., O42089.
*Wurfel, Seymour W., O29835.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be lieutenant colonels, Judge Advocate General's Corps

*Allen, Meredith E., O21408.
*Arn, Lauren A., O43290.
*Barkin, Albert, O51809.
×*Baughn, Wilmot T., O40155.
*Belser, William G., Jr., O42897.
*Blackmarr, William H., O42836.
*Brack, Joseph L., O51746.
*Bragdon, Kerlin J., O42766.
*Buldain, Frank J., O43495.
*Cameron, Thomas J., O42804.
*Carmody, John J., O51659.
×*Cherubin, Stanley J., O20700.
*Conley, William H., O30823.
*Cordes, Clifford F., Jr., O20186.
×*Drissel, Virgil H., O40010.
×*Easton, William G., O20656.
*Fernandez, Claude E., O30454.
*Fitch, Richard W., Jr., O52064.
×*Gaynor, James K., O43354.
*Grogan, John F., O42637.
*Gross, Charles A., O30528.
×*Hargus, Lowell U., O30315.
×*Healey, James P., Jr., O42906.
*Henderson, Allen R., O51708.
*Hogan, Samuel M., O21094.
*Holbrook, John, O51646.
*Horstmann, John W., O42566.
*Hummel, John F., O42712.
*Hunter, Robert C., O40045.
*Ireland, Arthur P., O51543.
*Kent, Edward F., O20909.
*Lough, Frederick C., O21118.
*Mickel, George E., O38793.
*Moberley, Kirk B., O51758.
*Newton, Thomas J., O42563.
*O'Connell, Edward M., O19563.
*Philips, Burton K., O40048.
*Reynolds, Robert W., O42638.
*Ryan, Thomas A., O51795.
*Scheid, Arthur M., O42812.
×*Scott, James M., O30822.
*Shull, Lewis F., O43277.
*Solf, Waldemar A., O40145.
×*Stafford, John P., Jr., O30827.
*Thorpe, George M., O40031.
*Tibbs, Richard B., O30688.
*West, Bland, O31378.

To be majors, Judge Advocate General's Corps

*Abbott, Lysle I., O34559.
*Baker, John, O24704.

*Crawford, Kenneth C., O35784.
*Fairbanks, Russell N., O40747.
*Freeland, Sumner, O47401.
*Freeman, Wilson, O24234.
*Hamilton, Frank O., O24532.
*Johnson, Robert P., O23926.
*Keogh, William T., O33742.
*Kooken, John J. DeW., O34743.
*Parker, Harold E., O34951.
*Woodruff, Owen E., Jr., O36172.

To be captains, Judge Advocate General's Corps

*Bookout, Hal H., O68179.
*Booth, Dale R., O70078.
*Branting, Leland R., O70167.
*Braun, Walter D., O69865.
*Clausen, Hugh J., O70302.
*Coggins, Bruce T., O68335.
*Crouchet, Jack H., O69893.
*Cunningham, Harold D., Jr., O65973.
*Dickson, Ervin W., Jr., O69479.
*Flake, Glade F., O69921.
*Fulton, William S., Jr., O70137.
*Hardage, John M., O69500.
×*Hopper, Edward L., O70382.
*Howard, Kenneth A., O67581.
*Oliver, Wiley E., Jr., O70005.
*Simon, James E., O70150.
*Tobin, Paul G., O68804.
×*Williamson, Wade H., O70128.
×*Wilson, Melville C., Jr., O66646.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be first lieutenants

*Carter, William G., O70297.
*Garner, Kermit C., O70340.
*Graham, William R., O70190.
*Harty, William Q., O70193.
*Hemmer, James B., O70370.
*Hunter, Thomas C., Jr., O71524.
*Johns, Harvey B., Jr., O70391.
*Maxfield, Norman R., O70423.
*Oliver, Billie L., O70460.
*Pearson, Paul F., O70469.
*Rademacher, Leon E., O70482.
*Ramirez, Willard A., O70483.
*Rorabaugh, William P., O71594.
*Stonecipher, Robert G., O71608.
*Tecco, Robert, O70525.
*Tousley, Horace W., O70533.
*Twitchell, Lowell DeV., O70539.
*Walker, William O., O71620.
*Welch, James S., O70555.
*Whisler, Harold H., O70560.
*Winn, Arthur C., O70568.
*Young, Robert S., O71633.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

*Field, Gordon, O70335.
*Foegen, George J., O71494.
*Kelly, Charles L., O70399.
*Newson, Harold D., O70451.
*Spencer, Lloyd E., O70511.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended by section 3, Public Law 514, 81st Congress, approved May 16, 1950:

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

*Robinson, Doris M., N2624.
*Vance, Vivian J., N2658.

The following-named person for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade specified, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title IV, Career Compensation Act of 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.):

To be colonel

Maulsby, William E., Jr., O17718.

To be majors

Alexander, Douglas G., O32927.
Wagner, Jacob F., O30475.

To be captain

Kennedy, Robert W., O60729.

The following-named officer for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States, without specification of branch, arm, or service, in the grade specified:

To be lieutenant colonel

Hogan, Samuel M., O21094.

The following-named officer for appointment, by transfer, in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade specified:

To be major

*Ivey, Robert H., O24849.

To be captains

Adair, Don W., O28491.
*Chase, David M., O26212.
Persons, Wilton B., Jr., O27975.
Porter, Frank W., Jr., O28503.

To be first lieutenant

Jones, Richard L., O63745.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.); title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), Public Law 759, 80th Congress; Public Law 36, 80th Congress as amended by Public Law 37, 83d Congress, and Public Law 625, 80th Congress:

To be majors

Hannum, William Y. C., MC, O1734809.
McClatchie, Samuel, MC, O990991.
*Moyar, John B., MC, O1775949.
*Owens, Ross, MC, O263873.
Parnell, Homer S., Jr., MC, O336724.

To be captains

*Burham, William A., MC, O2097376.
*Farmer, Garland R., VC, O938989.
Howard, August A., MC, O2041351.
*McCabe, Marshall E., MC, O1718628.
*Mehnert, Erich C., VC, O1718887.
Moran, Guy G., VC, O1775239.
Ruhe, Joseph G., MC, O972657.
Shadish, William R., MC, O976688.
*Sweigart, Thomas T., DC, O980803.
Truscott, Basil L., MC, O4043172.
Wilkinson, John C., MC, O2027880.
*Williamson, Walter S., MC, O991873.

To be first lieutenants

*Abagis, Kenneth M., JAGC, O999617.
*Adams, Harriet M., ANC, N794653.
*Bauer, Betty L., ANC, N768102.
*Benson, John H., VC, O1916526.
*Boyers, Robert C., DC, O4034149.
Buckley, Francis R., JAGC, O2269162.
Campbell, Mayme V., ANC, N792247.
*Carberry, Barbara G., ANC, N900418.
*Carroll, Helene D., ANC, N804876.
Connolly, John R., MC, O2103459.
Cook, Hugh H., Jr., MC, O1878516.
*Cook, Margaret, ANC, N762945.
*Crippen, James G., VC, O2104913.
*Daniels, Mary J., ANC, N774094.
DeFiori, Victor A., JAGC, O2264614.
*Dolan, Gertrude A., ANC, N804112.
Edman, Winifred L., ANC, N792883.
Embry, Nora E., ANC, N804138.
*Evans, Kathleen E., ANC, N805208.
Fillmore, Helen E., ANC, N799573.
Foote, Maud S., ANC, N804537.
Gausling, Anita L., ANC, N769161.
*Glidden, Dorothy I., WMSC, M2511.
*Haegele, Ida L., ANC, N770160.
Harris, Lilliam L., ANC, N779184.
*Hays, William L., VC, O970114.
Hedlund, James L., MSC, O996699.
*Hill, Helen M., ANC, N792649.
Houseknecht, Edith M., ANC, N768621.
*Isham, Ruth M., WAC, L1020589.
*King, Thomas J., DC, O1917258.
Knox, Gaylord S., MC, O1915316.
Knox, Grace E., ANC, N797287.
*Koenig, Jane L., ANC, N805015.
*Koontz, Ruth L., ANC, N795036.
Kuttas, George, DC, O1872656.
*Link, Lillian G., ANC, N723362.
*Mathews, Peggie M., ANC, N805214.
McCarthy, Margaret M., WAC, L1010235.
McCarty, James E., MC, O1887887.
McSwain, Earl C., Jr., MSC, O1919998.
*Mobley, Ruth Z., ANC, N805146.
*Moore, Daisy E., ANC., N764784.
Morrison, Euleta O., ANC, N805187.
*Moseley, Leanora M. W., ANC, N805143.
*Murphy, Donald B., MSC, O996700.
*Neirby, Gladys O., ANC, N733074.
*Nichols, Barbara J., ANC, N792485.
*Pak, Regina, ANC, N804654.
Patch, Charles E., Jr., MSC, O996752.
Patterson, Ruth E., ANC, N794057.
*Pelton, Ella M., ANC, N799429.
Quinn, Mary C., ANC, N804993.
*Riggs, Lucille M., ANC, N785751.
*Roberts, Alma M., WMSC, M2918.
Scott, Betty E., WAC, L1010209.
Shaw, Eugene D., MSC, O1915578.
Shields, Marian C., ANC, N769637.
*Smetters, George W., MC, O1934437.
Smith, Marion L., ANC, N804382.
Stallard, Sally M., ANC, N805401.
*Swab, Wealthy E., ANC, N796907.
Tague, Lena M., ANC, N725558.
Thompson, Carol E., ANC, N900540.
Trahan, Robert G., MSC, O955396.
*Travers, Veronica R., ANC, N804280.
Watson, Elinor M., ANC, N900195.
Watson, Henry, Jr., JAGC, O1019493.
*Weeks, Nelda L., ANC, N792991.
Wever, Robert C., MC, O1889598.
Whitcomb, David T., MC.
Williams, George D., Jr., MSC, O958973.

To be second lieutenants

Bloxham, Carolyn A., ANC, N901584.
Burn, Margaret T., WAC, L1010545.
*Craig, Betty J., WAC, L1010548.
*Davenport, Chloe A., ANC, N900230.
*Davis, Betty L., ANC, N900260.
Engelhardt, Dorothy M., ANC, N901358.
*Evans, Mary L., ANC, N900387.
*Foegen, George J., MSC, O2103349.
Haines, Marian H., ANC, N901627.
Henschen, Retha M., ANC, N901391.
Johnstone, Annie L., ANC, N900295.
*Kilby, Edgar G., MSC, O1882334.
Light, Lucile M., ANC, N901699.
McFadyen, Ross M., MSC, O2264437.
McHugh, Mary C., ANC, N901429.
Osborne, Rose M., ANC, N901709.
Pursley, Robert J., MSC, O1881426.
*Rodgers, Marie L., ANC, N900592.
*Russell, Marilyn J., WAC, L1010701.
*Singletary, Winfield S., Jr., MSC, O4006499.
Stauber, Ruby R., WAC, L1010574.
Thompson, John H., Jr., MSC, O1893760.
*Tomlinson, Wanda J., ANC, N900372.
*Vance, Vivian J., ANC, N900249.
Williams, Vern M., Jr., MSC, O998998.
Zeiss, Warren W., Jr., MSC, O1893963.

The following-named persons for appointment as chaplains of the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

To be captain

Day, Clayton E., O973848.

To be first lieutenants

Calter, John T., O995934.
Farrow, Alpha A., O2264147.
Harris, Thomas A., O1549728.
Justice, Willard M., O931576.
Killinger, Joseph G., O997352.
LeBlanc, Paul J., O996203.
Stewart, Duncan C., O994779.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first

lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to completion of internship:

*Chamblin, Stuart A., Jr., O4016542.
Conrad, Marcel E., Jr., O4002565.
Ferguson, John S., Jr., O4024740.
*Guenter, Kenneth E., O4013824.
Jefferson, Samuel C., O2268964.
Johnson, Waine C., O1940137.
Kent, Alfred H., O4013272.
Kortis, Howard I., O2268953.
Longfellow, Don W., O4002266.
Lukasik, John.
MacNair, Donald S., O4020390.
McFadden, Archibald W., O2269136.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

To be first lieutenants

Alford, John C., Jr., O968233.
Anderson, William A., O2020996.
*Atkinson, Larry R., O1335098.
Bailey, Broadus, Jr., O2041702.
Barringer, Fred A., O2019410.
*Bauer, Charles J., O2028372.
*Bishop, James M., O996483.
*Black, Roscoe, O969055.
*Boyle, Garrison J., O1560405.
Bretz, Robert D., O2004133.
*Brooks, Edwin E., O2021103.
Christian, Charles F., O968540.
Colebank, Albert E., O2033799.
*Coyle, Marcus W., O1342053.
Craun, Noel E., Jr., O961202.
Cunningham, Carl L., O1923517.
Deadwyler, Earnest W., O960726.
*Denny, Lawrence E., O985675.
Dudney, Charles L., O1924553.
*Dyer, Robert A. J., Jr., O830433.
Emrick, George E., O1924926.
Goad, Maury F., O1872367.
Goodson, Allen M., O2205233.
*Grammer, William C., O2206026.
Guelker, Clarence W., O1019629.
Hale, Charles L., O2028342.
*Hammer, Hoyt M., Jr., O1873771.
Hanby, John B., Jr., O2030486.
Hauser, Ferdinand H., O2203341.
Hayden, Robert T., O2030439.
*Hill, James G., O2208105.
Hirsch, Peter J., O1339003.
*Hollis, Richard C., O1330924.
Hoey, Matthew W., O1688516.
Huestis, John L., O956497.
Jeo, Calvin C., O2211975.
*Johnston, Walter L., O2028384.
*Kingston, Robert C., O1913235.
*Klingelhoefer, John W., O1924933.
Larsen, John W., O974871.
Martin, Irl R., O980548.
McCormick, Joseph C., Jr., O1341231.
Merrill, William K., O1924661.
Metz, Richard P., O2104001.
*Meyer, Keith, O2021094.
Miller, Robert N., O948976.
*Morris, James F., Jr., O963873.
Morse, Gerald E., O2201762.
*Mullett, Edwin, Jr., O994612.
*Naegele, Eugene L., O972696.
*Nicewander, Dennis R., O2014529.
Norris, Awbrey G., O995634.
Olson, Roger J., O1339746.
Patterson, Robert W., O1341696.
Peel, Wesley E., O966392.
*Price, Robert E., O994924.
Puccio, Dominick V., O1913476.
Quattrocchi, Frank S., O992354.
Regan, Norman E., O970594.
Romano, Frank, Jr., O1333539.
Shay, Charles J., O2028520.
*Sherman, Lee M., O962624.
*Sidney, Wilbur A., O1913208.
Slocum, John M., Jr., O1020512.
*Smarr, Albert W., Jr., O984035.
Smith, Charles L., O1915123.
*Snowden, Charles S., Jr., O972949.
Stough, Richard B., O1913236.
Taylor, Julius C., Jr., O1917812.
*Thralls, Rodney E., O2028369.
*Vaughn, Clifford H., O2021085.
Vincent, James A., O1913212.
Walker, Samuel S., O2206110.
Warthen, Brice L., O1924515.
*Wilder, Bliss W., O982827.
Williams, Davant T., O954022.
Williamson, Lyndall C., O2208474.
Wilson, James R., O2212020.
Wright, Clarence D., O2203913.
*Zeller, Norman C., O985083.
*Zilian, Carl M., O2007081.

To be second lieutenants

Allan, James P., O2021692.
Ambrose, Thomas J., O1926956.
*Amundson, Donald M., O2263638.
Anderson, Richard V., O2262966.
Bacey, Algirdas S., O1702298.
*Baughman, Larry J., O1935321.
Baynard, Richard A., O1937076.
Belcher, Eugene R., O4006893.
*Berkey, Ronald R., O4007169.
Berry, Ray W., O2265306.
Bickerstaff, Hugh J., Jr., O1882149.
Bing, Tom L., O973368.
*Blanton, Clay E., O1937155.
Brown, Gerald W., O1919384.
Brown, Robert E., O1926471.
Burdick, Leonard R., O2207918.
Campbell, William E., O1875145.
*Cate, William F., Jr., O2096505.
*Caughron, Walter E., Jr., O2266249.
*Chavez, Joseph D., O988249.
Churchill, Jack B., O1931604.
Clausen, Erling W., O1933711.
*Coffey, Vernon C., Jr., O4005173.
*Comer, James L., O4013362.
Corley, Robert J., O1886549.
Craig, Robert B., O1932368.
Cunningham, Alfred J., O1880166.
Curtiss, Lester R., O1935930.
Dagon, Ronald R., O1935333.
*Davis, Edwin G., O4005180.
Dawson, Wallace H., III, O2028678.
Doran, Fred R., O1877164.
Dunham, Gerald L., O1883204.
*Eckhart, John W., III, O4009249.
Evanchick, John, O1889713.
*Finter, George A., O2265387.
*Forrest, Ernest E., Jr., O1695179.
Foster, Andrew J., Jr., O1894172.
Frost, Theodore N., O1926988.
*Gaspard, George W., Jr., O1882042.
Gaumond, Robert J., O2021807.
Gavis, Jerome.
Glidden, Harry R., O2263791.
*Graves, Charles E., O2266318.
Hall, Daniel D., O2004506.
*Hasty, Gerald R., O948763.
Heath, Harry A., O1926273.
*Heinlein, Willard H., O1861254.
Henry, James H., O1933498.
Higgins, James W., O4009152.
Hilborn, James R., O1881549.
*Hill, Lloyd H., O1935778.
*Hippler, Richard A., O969801.
Hodgson, Lowell F., O1894151.
Hungerford, Franklin M., O4009166.
*Hunter, Thomas C., Jr., O1873360.
*Hurd, Philip S., O4009159.
Hyde, James L., O2004076.
Jackson, James M., O1702277.
Jackson, John H., O1894128.
Jacobitz, John P., Jr., O4009618.
*Johnson, Gerald K., O1877023.
Jolley, Alvin L., O4011134.
Jones, Bernel, O1935562.
Kampschror, Darrell B., O4009566.
Kastner, Joseph H., O1936126.
Kinne, Milton J., Jr., O4009367.
*Kitts, James R., Jr., O1925086.
Klopp, Charles A., O1935079.
*Koontz, William E., O4013542.
*LaFrance, Raymond J., O1931561.
*Landry, Robert L., O1914645.
LaNoue, Carol L., O1933346.
*Lawrance, Marvin D., O4012113.
*Lawrance, Paul S., O1925195.
LeBlang, Alfred S., O1920293.
Leyh, Robert J., O1881933.
Long, Johnny B., O1935791.
*Lutz, Bradley T., O1881509.
Lynch, Thomas P., O1919249.
Mallet, Henri-Gerard, O1881936.
Malone, Dandridge M., O4006272.
McBride, Thomas F., Jr., O1885218.
McClelland, Thomas M., O1937692.
McClusky, James D., O4009712.
McCrone, Clarence L., Jr., O1877760.
McGinnis, William A., O1931147.
*McSorley, Lester F., O4005587.
Meese, John R., O4006593.
*Mennona, Edward, O2265907.
Metzner, Edward P., O2041481.
Mitchell, George W., O2028392.
*Morris, Hubert, O1931324.
*Munsel, Harold M., O2265732.
*Neely, Albert D., O1882369.
O'Dea, Thomas F., Jr., O984815.
O'Keefe, Neil L., O2211646.
Oksa, Reino O., O1885460.
*Paquette, Dean R., O1886333.
Person, David E., O4006373.
Pettit, Lewis W.
*Pfanzelter, Max R., O1932252.
*Piotrzkowski, Joseph L., O992672.
*Ponder, Arno L., Jr., O4005141.
Ranney, Frederick J., O1862175.
*Rorabaugh, William P., O1872474.
Sandel, Derrell W., O1882110.
Sasseen, Jack A., O1889874.
Schoening, George W., O4011167.
Seay, Jefferson, III, O4009585.
Sheppard, Irving T., O1936805.
Sherman, William G., O1695192.
Simonds, Richard A., O1883161.
Smith, Douglas S., O4006471.
Smith, James D., 1841764.
Smith, William B., O1925238.
Stanberry, Billy M., O4005943.
Stephens, James E., O4009647.
*Stern, Jack M., O1889777.
Stipo, Vito D., O1891709.
*Stonecipher, Robert G., O2028527.
Terry, Bennett E., O2004580.
*Thomas, William E., O1885477.
Thompson, Allan D., O1690992.
Thompson, Harry J., Jr., O1926571.
Thompson, Richard W., O4007160.
Thurmond, Herbert K., O1935701.
*Tower, John B., O4005273.
Van Winkle, Parker C., O1881408.
*Walker, William O., O1915636.
Wallace, Festus E., O1931674.
Walther, Harry J.
Ward, Floyd J., Jr., O4006748.
Warren, James R., O1938078.
Wilson, Gene F., O4011099.
Wittbecker, Richard A., O2097036.
*Wootten, James P., O1894211.
*Wyatt, James E., O4012131.
Young, Edward R., O1934990.
*Young, Robert S., O990360.
Yunker, Sylvester J., O4005869.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

*Conselman, Charles B., O4030121.
Whisiker, Stephen S.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

*Albert, Yvan J., O4057205.
*Anderson, Cecil M., O4023879.
*Anderson, Henry A., Jr., O4033757.
*Archibald, Robert J., Jr., O4032694.
Atherton, Frederick W., O4033532.
Austin, Clinton W., O4028663.

*Baker, Frank H., O4018237.
Barcelona, Charles B., O4004887.
Bennett, Joseph D.
Bernard, Paul H., O1891814.
Berning, Robert J., O4025369.
Bethke, Robert L.
*Blanke, Gerald F., O4018580.
Blasingame, Josiah, Jr., O4044564.
Bone, Terrell F., O4033652.
Bowman, Ronald N., O4037914.
*Boyd, Bobby K., O4024413.
Bradley, Gregory A.
*Bramblet, William B., O4029905.
Breedlove, Smedley D., O4044565.
*Bryan, Robert L., O4033572.
*Burke, Paul J., Jr., O1940768.
*Butterworth, Louis S., O4024025.
Campbell, William W., Jr.
Carr, Robert F., O4028326.
*Chambers, Andrew P., O4032948.
Ching, Edmund K. S., O4031869.
*Christensen, John E., O4017503.
Clark, Robert H., O4044568.
*Cleveland, William L., Jr., O4029190.
*Collins, Harold E., O4004756.
Congleton, Roy E., O4028329.
*Convard, Frank L., Jr.
*Cooper, Joe L., O1940925.
Cose, LeRoy E., O4019180.
*Costen, Richard O., O4004230.
Crabtree, Sidney J., O4026982.
*Craig, Michael F., O4004233.
*Crall, Ralph L., O1941186.
*Creel, Tilford C., O4031752.
Crosby, John S., O4042245.
Cullison, James S., II.
*Davis, Bobby J., O1941191.
*Davis, Vernon K., O1939764.
*Dick, Bruce R., O4037437.
*Dickey, Robert R., O4030473.
*Douglass, Elmo T., O4031753.
*Dowdell, Joseph O.
Dreger, Wilson T., III.
*Dulin, Ralph W.
Dunn, Earl C., Jr.
Durbin, James J., O4040304.
*Eberle, John S., O4015865.
*Erdal, Rasmus A.
*Evans, Bobby G., O1941055.
*Federovitch, Frank J., O4032224.
*Fernandes, Vincent R., O4042510.
*Focht, Charles W., O1941159.
Fulp, Charles A., O4028778.
*Gerkey, George E., III, O1941265.
*Ginn, Charles J.
*Goebel, James R., O4030458.
Gordon, James C., Jr., O4029145.
*Goss, Gerald D., O4004141.
*Greenberg, William M., O4037129.
Grove, Glenn M., O4032802.
Hammel, Robert L., O4017464.
*Harmon, Leonard J., II, O4033977.
Harrison, Benjamin F., III, O4028207.
Hartzog, Arthur W., O4042266.
*Herndon, George W., O4032702.
*Herrmann, Klaus J., O4300460.
*Hess, Donald L., O4040604.
*Hill, Mickey E., O4024900.
*Hines, Thomas G.
*Hissong, Fred, Jr.
*Hoffert, Charles E., O4004235.
Hoffmann, Joseph H., O4004263.
*Holland, Evan F.
*Horlitz, Alfred E., O4020804.
Hostler, Howard K.
Houts, Francis C., O4042272.
*Hunter, Kelvin H., Jr., O4027836.
*Hutton, William E.
*Johnson, Moses G. H., O4004281.
*Justiss, Robert E., O1941132.
*Kelley, Paul B., O4012926.
*Kirby, James W., O4000292.
Kleis, C. Frederick, O4031831.
Kowalczyk, Chester A.
*Kunkel, Frank J.
Kuykendall, Robert W., O1941214.
*Labourdette, Albert H., Jr., O1939985.
*LaCour, Hugh, Jr., O4025058.
Lamb, Luke F., O4025311.
*Leach, Robert A., O4032705.
Lohre, John O.
*Longanacre, Louis E., O4000610.
*Longhofer, Melvin L., O4024726.
Lowery, George B.
*Ludwig, Donald J., O4020799.
*Lybert, Elmer J., O4037824.
*Lyles, Jesse D., O1941071.
*Mait, Martin B.
Marrett, Magnus C.
*Marshall, Raymond E., O4018878.
Matthews, James E., O4024215.
*McCord, Thomas B., O4023731.
*McGee, Bernard A., Jr., O4004436.
McKee, Richard W., O4018206.
*McNeil, Frank H., O1872502.
*Meaders, Barney R., III, O4024324.
*Miller, Darwin C., O4024146.
Mitchell, Don B., O4024701.
*Mitchell, Frederick H., O4024396.
Montgomery, James J., O4037943.
*Moody, Herbert E., O1940901.
*Morgan, Jerry T., O4032762.
*Morrow, Robert D., O4004565.
Mosco, Richard A.
Mueller, Frederick W., Jr.
*Muldrow, Robert, IV, O1939774.
*Mullen, Gordon R., O4037101.
*Nanopoulos, Constantine T.
*Neroni, Frederick J., O4037893.
Owings, William M.
*Paoletti, Karl P.
*Parry, Raphael P., Jr., O1880999.
*Peerenboom, Maurice A., Jr., O4032640.
*Pierce, James R., O4044579.
*Pinder, Richard S., O4029168.
Poydasheff, Robert S.
*Presley, James N., Jr., O4040394.
Rhyne, William Q.
Riddle, Miles M., O4017752.
Robinson, Jerry L., O4027817.
*Rolph, Paul R., Jr., O4031656.
Rooker, James A., O4040641.
Rosser, John C., Jr., O4027212.
Sachs, Arthur, O4020288.
*Sanders, Drexel E., O1879579.
*Scott, Richard L.
Senay, David C.
*Shreeve, Caleb A., Jr., O4027832.
Simmons, Ralph T., O4024334.
*Simmons, Ronald F., O4013712.
Slocombe, Donald K., O1940569.
*Smith, Ivan F., O4028753.
Smith, John J., O4037901.
Smith, Nelson H., O4025348.
*Sontag, Paul D., O1941173.
Strang, Charles W., Jr., O4034021.
Surmiak, Edward P.
Tawoda, Robert J., O4032165.
*Thomas, Nelson H., Jr., O2206379.
*Thorp, Lee L., O1941242.
*Tinsley, Philip, Jr., O4015093.
*Toner, Francis J.
*Traver, Thomas G.
*Traxler, Grady M., O1940057.
Treadwell, Millard L., Jr.
Tuten, Jeff M., O4029502.
Van Camp, James P.
*Walker, Robert L., O4033422.
*Wallace, Alvin J., O1941152.
Wallenfeldt, Evert C., O4018500.
Ward, Chester L.
Warf, Elmer R., O4023717.
*Warren, Carl W., O4032771.
Weaver, John L., O4027750.
*White, Chad B., O4027760.
*Whiteley, Frank G., O4001103.
*Whitmore, Wesley C., O4033145.
*Williams, David J.
*Wise, David L., O4017080.
*Wisenteiner, Herman N., O1941049.
Worthen, Kay F., O4027830.
Yasko, Alfred E.
*Zoldak, Andrew B., O4033000.
*Zulli, Andrew W., Jr.

NOTE.—The officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (*) were appointed or promoted during the recess of the Senate.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major general:

Reginald H. Ridgely, Jr.
Joseph C. Burger
Verne J. McCaul
Homer L. Litzenberg
Edward W. Snedeker
Robert E. Hogaboom
Thomas A. Wornham

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Russell N. Jordahl
Jack P. Juhan
John C. Munn
Frank H. Wirsig
Robert B. Luckey
Arthur F. Binney
Thomas G. Ennis
Frank C. Croft
Edward C. Dyer

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Harold D. Hansen
Randall M. Victory
Carson A. Roberts
James P. Berkeley

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Edward W. Snedeker
Arthur H. Butler
Thomas A. Wornham
Roy M. Gulick

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 21, 1955.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Robert C. Hendrickson, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to New Zealand.

John Lodge, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, subject to qualifications provided by law:

To be commissioned lieutenants, from the dates indicated

William R. Kachel, effective January 1, 1955.
Hal P. Demuth, effective January 5, 1955.
Pentti A. Stark, effective January 18, 1955.
Merlyn E. Natto, effective February 25, 1955.

To be commissioned lieutenants (junior grade)

Robert C. Munson, effective January 9, 1955.
Gerard E. Haraden, effective January 10, 1955.

To be commissioned ensigns

David E. Livingston
Kelly E. Taggart
James D. Slayden

REGULAR AIR FORCE

The nominations of Frank Browne Leggette and 1,509 other officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, section 306 of the Woman's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948, and section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended, which were confirmed this day, were received by the Senate on January 10, 1955, and may be found in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Frank Browne Leggette, which is shown on page 185, and ending with the name of Olive Justine Potter, which is shown on page 190.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Complete Situation in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 21, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I made yesterday in an address to the Alexandria Kiwanis Club, in Alexandria, Va., in relation to the serious and complicated situation in the East.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY BEFORE ALEXANDRIA KIWANIS CLUB, GEORGE MASON HOTEL, THURSDAY, JANUARY 20, 1955

SENATOR WILEY SAYS ASIA SITUATION SERIOUS, COMPLEX—URGES PATIENCE, RESTRAINT

The diplomatic situation which has arisen in the Straits of Formosa is both serious and complex.

This morning, I participated in a meeting at the White House with Democratic and Republican leaders which explored various problems in that connection.

I do not propose at the present time to comment in detail on this subject, but I do want to say that the administration is working hard to protect our own national interest and the cause of freedom, peace, and justice in Asia. Let's give the President and the Secretary of State a chance to work this problem out—in close consultation with the Congress.

Let's think, before any of us, inside the Congress or outside, rushes into print with off-the-cuff solutions to an exceedingly difficult situation.

I should like now to present a few general observations with regard to ways and means by which we may help assure a just and lasting peace in Asia, and for that matter, elsewhere in the world:

1. We can do so only by maintaining the strong western alliance, a dynamic unity among the free nations, including our proven friends in Asia.

This requires careful and continuous consultation among all of them. It requires careful consideration of the viewpoint of each.

We must not ignore the views of others and proceed impulsively and emotionally like a bull in a china shop. We must weigh the interrelated military, economic, diplomatic, psychological factors, including basically United States strategic considerations in the Far East.

2. The second basic principle is that we must and will remain loyal to our allies. I refer, in particular, to the Republic of China. The government of Chiang Kai-shek has been our proven friend. We will, therefore, remain true to our commitments. We will not abandon the Nationalist government.

We definitely do not believe that the people of China should be represented in the United Nations by the Red government at Peiping which has violated practically every international law.

3. A third principle is that we must try to win to our cause the great neutral, uncommitted bloc of Asia.

I do not believe that there is any good reason why there should be a lasting or growing barrier between ourselves and the Governments say, of India, Ceylon, or Burma.

On the contrary, we share the same common aspiration for the sovereignty of peoples for a better way of life for them. We have the same belief in the spiritual worth of the human being.

On the other hand, Red China shares none of these concepts.

We must make sure, that we do not, by arbitrary, impulsive action push the neutral countries into Red China's orbit. This could have come about, or still could, if the United States were to go halfcocked and to try all by ourselves a military blockade of Red China at this time. Some of the gravest questions of international law would arise in the event such a unilateral blockade were to be attempted.

I previously have stated on several occasions my vigorous opposition to such a blockade at the present time.

I have stated that a blockade might result in the immediate death of our own 11 imprisoned airmen. It might cause a wide-open split with our allies. It might overcommit our present naval resources. It might cause the bitterest of differences with the neutral countries. But, worst of all, it might precipitate us into a war with Red China, which is probably something the Kremlin would dearly like.

4. We must continue to work through the U. N., both for the release of our imprisoned airmen and for the furtherance of peace, stability, and freedom in the Far East.

I believe that it is unfair and unwise to characterize the mission of the United Nations Secretary-General to Peking as a failure. On the contrary, I believe that it contributed to progress toward the goal of peace.

We must remember that diplomatic negotiation, particularly with the cagey Communist adversary, often takes a long, long time. We cannot expect miracles overnight. An impulsive blockade could bring chaos overnight, but diplomacy cannot bring order and justice overnight.

5. The next basic principle is that we must contribute further to the inner security and strength of the free nations in Asia; for example, among such splendid friends as the Philippines, Thailand, and Pakistan.

We must help enable them to assure security inside their own borders and at their outer borders. This means prompt ratification of SEATO—prompt ratification which must and will come.

At the same time, we must remember that these various countries require greatly expanded programs of technical assistance if they are to assure an ever-higher standard of living for their people.

Guns alone will not save free Asia. In a war of ideas, a war of hungry stomachs, right ideas and full stomachs count far more than weapons.

There must be guns for defense, but there must be ideas for the mind; there must be food, shelter; honest, efficient government; decent sanitation; opportunity for a higher standard of living as a whole.

I conclude with this thought:

Your President—a great President—is acting with care, with discretion, with judgment. He is consulting carefully on a bipartisan basis with the Congress.

Let's give him our faith and confidence. Let's give him the benefit of any doubt; he is entitled to our admiration and esteem. His record of statesmanship, and that of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, proves that we are in good, capable hands. Let's work with them as a team.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 24, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, in changing and troubled days we pray for quiet hearts and conceptions big enough and spirits strong enough to match the awesome time in which we live and serve. We confess the things in our own dear land of liberty which weaken and betray the faith we profess. We acknowledge the selfishness which dominates groups caring only for their own interests; the partisanship which sees clearly the next election while ignoring the next generation; the narrow nationalism which is oblivious to the fact that exploitation and injustice anywhere poison the arterial blood of the race; the excesses which are gnawing at the very vitals of our national life. O, America, America, God mend thine every flaw and fit thee to be the channel of His redeeming grace for all the earth.

Create in us clean hearts and right spirits as we face foes which have not Thee in awe, fanatical foes to whom human life is nothing because their gaze is no higher than the earth; whose pledged word is worthless because expediency is their only god; who, for their own ends, callously traffic in normal human affections and family ties. To protect this earth which could be so fair, our God, bless America as she throws her might across the path of so godless a pestilence. May our strength, moral and material, be a factor through Thy will in bringing to pass a just peace in our time, O Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 21, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and other routine business, and I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes, in accordance with the usual practice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY IN ASIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 76)

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, in view of the importance of the message the President has sent to the Senate today, I ask unanimous consent that the morning hour be postponed, and that priority be given to the reading of the President's message.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The President's message being a privileged matter, it may be laid before the Senate at any time, and the Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, before the message is read, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Flanders	McNamara
Allott	Frear	Millikin
Anderson	Fulbright	Morse
Barkley	George	Murray
Barrett	Green	Neely
Beall	Hayden	Neuberger
Bender	Hennings	O'Mahoney
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Bible	Hill	Payne
Bricker	Holland	Potter
Bridges	Hruska	Purtell
Bush	Humphrey	Robertson
Butler	Ives	Russell
Byrd	Jackson	Saltonstall
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case, N. J.	Kerr	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Kilgore	Smathers
Chavez	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Clements	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Cotton	Langer	Sparkman
Curtis	Lehman	Stennis
Daniel	Long	Thurmond
Dirksen	Magnuson	Thye
Douglas	Malone	Watkins
Duff	Mansfield	Welker
Dworshak	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Eastland	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Ellender	McCarthy	Young
Ervin	McClellan	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The message from the President of the United States will now be read.

The message was read by the legislative clerk, and referred jointly to the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

The most important objective of our Nation's foreign policy is to safeguard the security of the United States by establishing and preserving a just and honorable peace. In the western Pacific, a situation is developing in the Formosa Straits, that seriously imperils the peace and our security.

Since the end of Japanese hostilities in 1945, Formosa and the Pescadores have been in the friendly hands of our loyal ally, the Republic of China. We have recognized that it was important that these islands should remain in friendly hands. In unfriendly hands, Formosa and the Pescadores would seriously dislocate the existing, even if unstable, balance of moral, economic, and military forces upon which the peace of the Pacific depends. It would create a breach in the island chain of the western Pacific that constitutes, for the United States and for other free nations, the geographical backbone of their security structure in that ocean. In addition, this breach would interrupt north-south communications between other important elements of that barrier, and damage the economic life of countries friendly to us.

The United States and the friendly Government of the Republic of China, and indeed all the free nations, have a common interest that Formosa and the Pescadores should not fall into the control of aggressive Communist forces.

Influenced by such considerations, our Government was prompt, when the Communists committed armed aggression in Korea in June 1950, to direct our 7th Fleet to defend Formosa from possible invasion from the Communist mainland.

These considerations are still valid. The 7th Fleet continues under Presidential directive to carry out that defensive mission. We also provide military and economic support to the Chinese Nationalist Government and we cooperate in every proper and feasible way with that Government in order to promote its security and stability. All of these military and related activities will be continued.

In addition, there was signed last December a mutual defense treaty between this Government and the Republic of China covering Formosa and the neighboring Pescadores. It is a treaty of purely defensive character. That treaty is now before the Senate of the United States.

Meanwhile Communist China has pursued a series of provocative political and military actions, establishing a pattern of aggressive purpose. That purpose, they proclaim, is the conquest of Formosa.

In September 1954 the Chinese Communists opened up heavy artillery fire upon Quemoy Island, one of the natural approaches to Formosa, which had for several years been under the uncontested control of the Republic of China. Then came air attacks of mounting intensity against other free China islands, notably those in the vicinity of the Tachen group to the north of Formosa. One small island—Ichiang—was seized last week by air and amphibious operations after a gallant few fought bravely for days against overwhelming odds. There have been recent heavy air attacks and artillery fire against the main Tachen Islands themselves.

The Chinese Communists themselves assert that these attacks are a prelude to the conquest of Formosa. For example, after the fall of Ichiang, the Peiping radio said that it showed a "determined will to fight for the liberation of Taiwan [Formosa]. Our people will use all their strength to fulfill that task."

Clearly, this existing and developing situation poses a serious danger to the security of our country and of the entire Pacific area and indeed to the peace of the world. We believe that the situation is one for appropriate action of the United Nations under its charter, for the purpose of ending the present hostilities in that area. We would welcome assumption of such jurisdiction by that body.

Meanwhile, the situation has become sufficiently critical to impel me, without awaiting action by the United Nations, to ask the Congress to participate now, by specific resolution, in measures designed to improve the prospects for peace. These measures would contemplate the use of the Armed Forces of the United States if necessary to assure the security of Formosa and the Pescadores.

The actions that the United States must be ready to undertake are of various kinds. For example, we must be ready to assist the Republic of China to redeploy and consolidate its forces if it should so desire. Some of these forces are scattered throughout the smaller offshore islands as a result of historical rather than military reasons directly related to defending Formosa. Because of the air situation in the area, withdrawals for the purpose of redeployment of Chinese Nationalist forces would be impractical without assistance of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Moreover, we must be alert to any concentration or employment of Chinese Communist forces obviously undertaken to facilitate attack upon Formosa, and be prepared to take appropriate military action.

I do not suggest that the United States enlarge its defensive obligations beyond Formosa and the Pescadores as provided by the treaty now awaiting ratification. But unhappily, the danger of armed attack directed against that area compels us to take into account closely related localities and actions which, under current conditions, might determine the failure or the success of such an attack. The authority that may be accorded by the Congress would be used only in situations which are recognizable as parts of, or definite preliminaries to, an attack against the main positions of Formosa and the Pescadores.

Authority for some of the actions which might be required would be inherent in the authority of the Commander in Chief. Until Congress can act I would not hesitate, so far as my constitutional powers extend, to take whatever emergency action might be forced upon us in order to protect the rights and security of the United States.

However, a suitable congressional resolution would clearly and publicly establish the authority of the President as Commander in Chief to employ the Armed Forces of this Nation promptly and effectively for the purposes indicated if in his judgment it became necessary. It would make clear the unified and serious intentions of our Government, our Congress and our people. Thus it will reduce the possibility that the Chinese Communists, misjudging our firm purpose and national unity, might be disposed to challenge the position of the United States, and precipitate a major crisis which even they would neither anticipate nor desire.

In the interest of peace, therefore, the United States must remove any doubt regarding our readiness to fight, if necessary, to preserve the vital stake of the free world in a free Formosa, and to engage in whatever operations may be required to carry out that purpose.

To make this plain requires not only Presidential action but also congressional action. In a situation such as now confronts us, and under modern conditions of warfare, it would not be prudent to await the emergency before coming to the Congress. Then it might be too late. Already the warning signals are flying.

I believe that the threatening aspects of the present situation, if resolutely faced, may be temporary in character. Consequently, I recommend that the resolution expire as soon as the President is able to report to the Congress that the peace and security of the area are reasonably assured by international conditions, resulting from United Nations action or otherwise.

Again I say that we would welcome action by the United Nations which might, in fact, bring an end to the active hostilities in the area. This critical situation has been created by the choice of the Chinese Communists, not by us. Their offensive military intent has been flaunted to the whole world by words and by deeds. Just as they created the situation, so they can end it if they so choose.

What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy. Consequently, my recommendations do not call for an increase in the Armed Forces of the United States or any acceleration in military procurement or levels of defense production. If any unforeseen emergency arises requiring any change, I will communicate with the Congress. I hope, however, that the effect of an appropriate congressional resolution will be to calm the situation rather than to create further conflict.

One final point. The action I request is, of course, no substitute for the treaty with the Republic of China which we have signed and which I have transmitted to the Senate. Indeed, present circumstances make it more than ever important that this basic agreement should be promptly brought into force, as a solemn evidence of our determination to stand fast in the agreed treaty area and to thwart all attacks directed against it. If delay should make us appear indecisive in this basic respect, the pressures and dangers would surely mount.

Our purpose is peace. That cause will be served if, with your help, we demonstrate our unity and our determination. In all that we do we shall remain faithful to our obligations as a member of the United Nations to be ready to settle our international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

For the reasons outlined in this message, I respectfully request that the Congress take appropriate action to carry out the recommendations contained herein.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
January 24, 1955.

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF ARMED FORCES TO PROTECT SECURITY OF FORMOSA—JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and myself, I introduce a joint resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the joint resolution will be read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 28) authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area, introduced by Mr. GEORGE for himself and other Senators, was received, read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Whereas the primary purpose of the United States, in its relations with all other nations, is to develop and sustain a just and enduring peace for all; and

Whereas certain territories in the west Pacific under the jurisdiction of the Republic of China are now under armed attack, and threats and declarations have been and are being made by the Chinese Communists that such armed attack is in aid of and in preparation for armed attack on Formosa and the Pescadores; and

Whereas such armed attack if continued would gravely endanger the peace and security of the west Pacific area and particularly of Formosa and the Pescadores; and

Whereas the secure possession by friendly governments of the western Pacific island chain, of which Formosa is a part, is essential to the vital interests of the United States and all friendly nations in or bordering upon the Pacific Ocean; and

Whereas the President of the United States on January 6, 1955, submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification a mutual defense treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of China, which recognizes that an armed attack in the west Pacific area directed against territories therein described in the region of Formosa and the Pescadores, would be dangerous to the peace and safety of the parties to the treaty: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States be and he hereby is authorized to employ the armed forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack, this authority to include the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands and the taking of such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions, created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, and shall so report to the Congress.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without such action being established as a precedent, the message received today from the President of the United States on the Nation's foreign policy, and the joint resolution which I have introduced today on behalf of myself and other Senators, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services for joint consideration and study, including the holding of hearings if deemed advisable; and that those committees, acting through the chairman of one of such committees, shall, at the earliest practicable time, by bill or otherwise, submit their recommendations to the Senate.

Mr. President, I point out that a similar resolution was introduced on July 28, 1949, when unanimous consent was given and an order was entered providing for joint consideration of the resolution by the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services. I am now making a similar request.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am glad to join with the distinguished Senator from Georgia in making this request for a unanimous-consent agreement. I believe there have been a number of occasions upon which measures have been referred for joint consideration to the two committees mentioned, which have primary responsibility in this field. I think it would be entirely fitting and proper for those two committees jointly to consider a matter of this importance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare [Mr. HILL], which is at present occupying the old Supreme Court room on this floor of the Capitol, will undertake to procure the consent of his committee that the hearings to which I have referred may be held in the old Supreme Court room. Inasmuch as there

is to be a joint hearing before the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, it is necessary to provide a somewhat larger room than the regular committee room of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I give notice that if consent is given by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for the use of the room, the hearings will begin this afternoon at 2:45.

In that connection, I ask unanimous consent that, should the Senate remain in session later than 2:45 p. m. today, the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered?

Morning business is now in order.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORTS ON OVEROBLIGATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, 36 reports relating to the overobligations of appropriations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON PROFESSIONAL AND SCIENTIFIC POSITIONS IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on professional and scientific positions in the Department of Defense, for the calendar year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

STRENGTHENING OF THE RESERVE FORCES

A letter from the Director, Legislative Programs, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for strengthening of the Reserve Forces, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS UNDER SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the operations of that System dated June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ACQUISITION OF FACILITIES FOR ATOMIC ENERGY PROGRAM

A letter from the Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for plant and equipment, including acquisition or condemnation of real property or facilities, and plant or facility acquisitions, construction, or expansion, for the atomic energy program (with an accompanying paper); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT, RELATING TO DEBT CLAIMS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act relating to debt claims (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relating to an amendment of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, in such manner as to enable the domestic sugar industry of the United States to have a fair and equitable share in the Nation's growth; to the Committee on Finance.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. WELKER, on January 21, 1955, p. 530, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Joint Resolution 2

"Whereas the modern Army and Navy Hospital at Hot Springs National Park, Ark., was constructed at the cost of millions of dollars to all of the people of the United States; and

"Whereas during World War II it was expanded to include as its annex the great Eastman Hotel in Hot Springs; and

"Whereas this hospital is probably better located and situated to better serve as a hospital service center for our Army and Navy in time of atomic warfare than any other Government hospital in the United States; and

"Whereas in this hospital the patient members of our Armed Forces have the advantage of treatment with thermal hot waters, the benefits of which are unexcelled by any other similar treatment in the world; and

"Whereas the closing of this hospital by the Defense Department would be the zenith of extravagance and waste on the part of the Government and would be a calamity to the great national health resort of Hot Springs National Park, Ark.: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of Arkansas, That the Secretary of Defense be and is hereby respectfully requested and implored to rescind his order that such hospital be closed; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to President Eisenhower, to Vice President Nixon, to Speaker Sam Rayburn, and to each Member of the Arkansas delegation in the United States Congress.

"Q. BYRUM HURST.

"I, Jim Snoddy, secretary of the senate, do hereby certify that this is a true copy of senate joint resolution No. 2 as adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Sixtieth General Assembly of the State of Arkansas.

"JIM SNODDY,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from Dr. Harold S. Jenneman, of Stanley, Wis., relating to the treatymaking power (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from the American Dental Association, Chicago, Ill., signed by Harold Hillenbrand, secretary, embodying a resolution adopted by that association, relating to support of the program of the World Health Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of James McElwain, and sundry other citizens of the State of New York, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of H. Joseph Mahoney, of Brooklyn, N. Y., relating to the treatymaking power (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STENNIS:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Concurrent Resolution 5

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to give its favorable consideration to legislation providing for an increase of cotton acreage to 19,500,000 acres

"Whereas the State of Mississippi is primarily dependent upon the health of its agricultural economy for the prosperity of its citizens and for making its contribution to the Nation's welfare; and

"Whereas the 1955 cotton crop, bulwark of Mississippi agriculture, has been seriously curtailed by a drastic reduction in acreage; and

"Whereas there are many small farmers in this State, a large number of whom have been dealt a mortal blow by the cotton acreage cut, and there now being an immediate economic emergency forced upon them by such reduction in cotton acreage; and

"Whereas legislation has been introduced in the Congress of the United States seeking to increase the cotton acreage allotment to 19,500,000 acres, which increase could do much toward alleviating hardship among cotton farmers, and particularly among those with small cotton acreage allotments; and

"Whereas it is the view of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi that this matter is of vital and pressing concern to the people of this State and to the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi (the senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, memorialized to give its most earnest and favorable consideration to the legislation now pending therein providing for a cotton acreage increase to 19,500,000 acres; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to members, both Senate and House, of the Mississippi delegation in Congress, and that a copy of this resolution be released to the press.

"Adopted by the house of representatives January 12, 1955.

"WALTER SILLERS,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Adopted by the senate January 17, 1955.

"CARROLL GARTIN,
"President of the Senate."

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

Three resolutions of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation increasing the personal income tax exemptions

"Whereas it is estimated that approximately 80 percent of Rhode Island's industrial workers are engaged in either directly producing goods for the consumer market, or producing materials or parts for consumer goods; and

"Whereas Rhode Island's goods are sold in a national market, and therefore the prosperity of Rhode Island business and industry and high levels of earnings and employment depend on a sustained and rising level of consumer purchasing power throughout the Nation; and

"Whereas extensive unemployment has resulted from the fact that the Nation's productive capacity exceeds present levels of consumption; and

"Whereas it is essential to a more prosperous Rhode Island and a more prosperous Nation that national purchasing power be increased; and

"Whereas such an increase in purchasing power would be most effective and beneficial to the lower income groups who must spend the highest proportion of their income: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation increasing the personal income-tax exemptions; and be it further

"Resolved, That attention of the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States is respectfully called to these facts and that each is requested to use his best efforts in this behalf; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he is hereby authorized and directed to transmit to the respective presiding officers of both branches of Congress and to the Senators and Representatives from the State of Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, duly certified copies of this resolution."

"Resolution urging Congress to enact legislation to incorporate the principle of reinsurance as a means of enabling the Federal Government to assume its responsibilities in financing the employment security program and thereby equalizing the tax burden among the States

"Whereas, Rhode Island has few natural resources and is dependent on light manufacturing industries; and

"Whereas the economy of Rhode Island and that of other industrialized States depends largely upon a demand for our manufactured products which is far beyond a State's border to contain and far beyond a State's power to control; and

"Whereas these and most causes of unemployment are national in scope; and

"Whereas the effects of unemployment fall unevenly upon the highly industralized States, of which Rhode Island is one; and

"Whereas this results in a severe drain on the Rhode Island employment security fund, placing this State in an unfavorable competitive position with other States not so severely affected: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations hereby urges the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, legislation which would incorporate the principle of reinsurance as a means of enabling the Federal Government to assume its responsibility in financing in part the employment security program and thereby equalizing the tax burden among the States; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of state to the President of the United States and to each of the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, earnestly requesting the latter to use their efforts to be certain that legislation is enacted which would carry out the purposes of this resolution."

"Resolution urging the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, and the Tariff Commission to enact and maintain tariff rates on textiles, including lace, jewelry, and rubber goods imports

"Whereas textile, jewelry, and rubber goods manufacturing are three of Rhode Island's major industries employing over 54 percent of Rhode Island's manufacturing workers; and

"Whereas manufacturing is the foundation of the Rhode Island economy whereby over one-half of the entire State's population is directly or indirectly dependent upon such industries; and

"Whereas in all of these industries labor and labor costs are vital factors representing about 60 percent of the value of the manufactured product; and

"Whereas such products can be and are manufactured today in many parts of the world, often with the aid of the latest types of American equipment; and

"Whereas the consequent threat of price competition from low-wage countries abroad is very real; and

"Whereas recent studies by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics indicate the large wage differentials which place American manufacturers at a decided competitive disadvantage; and

"Whereas the Rhode Island textile industry, including lace goods, represents about 30 percent of all manufacturing employment and a total investment of $300 million; and

"Whereas the jewelry industry employs about 19 percent of Rhode Island manufacturing workers; and

"Whereas the manufacture of rubber products represents a substantial portion of industry in this State; and

"Whereas this tremendous percentage of Rhode Island industrial workers would be forced into the ranks of the unemployed upon the closing of the mills and factories of this State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the President of the United States insist on increasing and maintaining proper tariffs on the imports of textiles, including lace, jewelry, and rubber goods imports; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State of the United States enter into no agreements and make no concessions to any foreign nation which would affect adversely the manufacture and sale of textiles, including lace, jewelry, and rubber goods imports; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States and more particularly the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives take every legislative precaution in enacting proper legislation to insure the creation and maintenance of proper tariff rates on textiles, including lace, jewelry, and rubber goods imports; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Tariff Commission of the United States, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance and to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States earnestly requesting that each use his best efforts to bring about the enactment and maintenance of proper tariff rates on textiles, including lace, jewelry, and rubber goods imports, to the end that the manufacture and sale of such goods in the United States are not jeopardized."

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Resolution urging the President of the United States, the Congress, and the Secretary of Defense of the United States to reappraise Manpower Policy No. 4 to the end that Rhode Island may receive its fair share of defense contracts, so-called

"Whereas there has been a sharp reduction of Federal defense contracts, so-called, in Rhode Island over the past 2 years; and

"Whereas such reduction can be considered directly responsible for a decline in Rhode Island manufacturing employment of over 11,000 workers which represent 40 percent of Rhode Island's current unemployment in manufacturing; and

"Whereas it is evident that Federal Manpower Policy No. 4 aimed at channeling defense contracts into labor surplus areas has had little effect on Rhode Island in the past year: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That, if defense contracts are to be used successfully to combat unemployment in distressed areas, the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island urges the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and the Secretary of Defense of the United States to reappraise Federal Manpower Policy No. 4 and to overhaul and better coordinate the general procurement policy of the Federal Government to the end that Rhode Island may receive its fair share of defense contracts, so-called; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of Defense of the United States, earnestly requesting that each use his efforts to see that proper action is taken which would carry out the purposes of this resolution."

DEEPENING OF GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS — RESOLUTIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, from all over Wisconsin I have received welcome resolutions from various civic groups urging early action to deepen the connecting channels of the upper Great Lakes.

This project is the subject of a bill which I have already introduced, (S. 171) to authorize the modification of the existing projects for the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie, for this purpose.

I present two such representative resolutions, which I heartily endorse. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Whereas the United States Army Corps of Engineers has filed its report on the cost of the proposed deepening and improving of the connecting channels of the Great Lakes, with particular reference to the Detroit River, Lake St. Clair, the St. Marys River and some shoal spots in the Straits of Mackinac; and

"Whereas the completion of said channel deepening and improvement project will permit large ships to enter the Great Lakes ports upon the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway when operating at maximum draft; and

"Whereas said channel deepening and improvement project will be beneficial to the city of Racine and to all of the other Great Lakes port cities, as well as the neighboring communities: Be it

"Resolved, That the mayor and the Common Council of the City of Racine do hereby urge Senators ALEXANDER WILEY and JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY and Congressman LAWRENCE H. SMITH to support any legislation, the purpose of which is to institute and complete

the above referred to channel deepening and improving projects; be it further

"Resolved, That the city clerk be and hereby is authorized and directed to transmit certified copies of this resolution to the above referred to congressional representatives forthwith."

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
County of Racine, ss:

I, Frank J. Becker, city clerk of the city of Racine, Racine County, Wis., do hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Common Council of the City of Racine, Wis., at a meeting held January 18, 1955.

Dated this 20th day of January 1955.

FRANK J. BECKER,
City Clerk.

"Whereas the benefits to our country of the long-awaited St. Lawrence Seaway will be fully realized only if the connecting channels of the Great Lakes are deepened so as to permit deep-draft vessels to reach all of the lake ports in the Midwest; and

"Whereas it is expected that legislation will shortly be presented to the Congress authorizing the deepening of these channels and appropriating the funds determined to be necessary by the Corps of Engineers: Be it

"Resolved by the Council of the City of Kenosha, That this council favors the passage of such legislation to the end that the great seaway project may most fully serve its intended purpose; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to our congressional Representatives.

"Dated this 17th day of January 1955.

"R. MERRILL RHEY,
"President of Council."

I, J. R. Sawicki, city clerk, hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of resolution No. 5484 passed by the Council of the City of Kenosha, Wis., on the 17th day of January 1955.

J. R. SAWICKI, *City Clerk.*

ANTIMONOPOLY INVESTIGATION—RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present a resolution which I have received from C. F. Baldwin, manager of the Richland Cooperative Electric Association, of Richland Center, Wis. This resolution urges the allocation of sufficient funds to continue the investigation of monopoly by the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee.

I believe that this investigation should indeed be carried on, and should have sufficient appropriations to enable it to do its job in a fair, effective, thorough way.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred to the Senate Rules Committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RICHLAND COOPERATIVE ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION,
Richland Center, Wis., January 21, 1955.

Senator ALEXANDER P. WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The following resolution was adopted by the board of directors at their meeting of January 17, 1955:

"Whereas the Senate Judiciary Committee has been conducting a limited investigation of monopolies and restricted trade programs aimed at farm rural electrification programs; and

"Whereas insufficient funds have been appropriated for such investigations during the last session of Congress: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we urge Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin member of the Judiciary Committee, and other Members of the United States Senate to vote sufficient funds to complete the investigations of monopoly which have been started by the Judiciary Subcommittee."

It has been the opinion of this cooperative that Senator LANGER has been doing an excellent job with the limited resources he has had to work with. However, we believe that he could do a more thorough job if he had adequate funds to work with, and that his findings would prevent some repetition of economic catastrophes our country has experienced in the past. Is this in agreement with your opinion?

Respectfully yours,

C. F. BALDWIN, *Manager.*

CONSTRUCTION OF THE UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the San Juan County Reclamation Association of Farmington, N. Mex., and the chamber of commerce of that fine community, have requested that I present to the Senate resolutions adopted by them endorsing the construction of the upper Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and specifically the Navaho Indian project. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas legislation is now before the Congress of the United States to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the upper Colorado River storage project and participating projects; and

Whereas included in said legislation is the Navaho project in New Mexico which will utilize San Juan River waters, mainly to irrigate and rehabilitate a large section of land on the Navaho Indian Reservation; and

Whereas such rehabilitation, under the Navaho Indian project, will eventually be of great assistance to the Navaho Tribe in their struggle for survival, which assistance has heretofore been denied the Navaho Indians through the Nation's failure to comply with the Treaty of 1868; and

Whereas the citizens of San Juan Basin of New Mexico are fully cognizant of the plight of this minority group and urge full support be given to that end: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Farmington Chamber of Commerce of Farmington, N. Mex., expressing the wishes of the people of Farmington, N. Mex., enthusiastically endorses and fully supports congressional action to authorize the upper Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and specifically the Navaho project.

FARMINGTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
FARMINGTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
By ERNEST H. BRUSS, *President.*
A. J. ZIMMERMAN, *Secretary.*

Whereas legislation is now before the Congress of the United States to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the upper Colorado River storage project and participating projects; and

Whereas included in said legislation is the Navaho project in New Mexico which will utilize San Juan River waters; and

Whereas the Navaho project is mainly a Navaho Indian project which will ultimately result in great assistance to the tribe in solving a most serious economic problem, aside from rectifying some of this Nation's failures in compliance with the treaty of 1868; and

Whereas it is the desire and wish of all citizens of the San Juan Basin area of New Mexico that full support be expended toward the end of seeking congressional authorization of the Navaho project: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the San Juan Reclamation Association of Farmington, N. Mex., expressing the wishes of the people of San Juan Basin in New Mexico, enthusiastically endorses and fully supports congressional action to authorize the upper Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and specifically the Navaho project.

SAN JUAN RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION,
By ED H. FOSTER, *President.*
Attest:
A. J. ZIMMERMAN, *Secretary.*

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THYE:

S. 663. A bill for the relief of William T. Collins (Vasilios T. Buzunis); and

S. 664. A bill for the relief of Mecys Jauniskis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 665. A bill to revive section 3 of the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act;

S. 666. A bill to extend the period of authorization of appropriations for the hospital center and facilities in the District of Columbia;

S. 667. A bill to exempt meetings of associations of professional hairdressers or cosmetologists from certain provisions of the acts of June 7, 1938 (52 Stat. 611), and July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 622), as amended; and

S. 668. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947 as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NEELY (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. THYE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. WATKINS):

S. 669. A bill to provide an elected mayor, city council, school board, and nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DANIEL:

S. 670. A bill to increase the penalties prescribed for violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act and the antitrust provisions of the Wilson Tariff Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DANIEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 671. A bill for the relief of Charalambos Anastasios Papaspiratos; and

S. 672. A bill for the relief of Richard T. Harvey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 673. A bill to provide for a Veterans' Administration neuropsychiatric hospital of

1,000 beds at Gainesville, Fla.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 674. A bill to amend section 14 (b) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to protect the rights of employees and employers, in industries affecting commerce, to enter into union-shop agreements; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 675. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Romalda Stase Plachowa Manley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 676. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Borromeo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 677. A bill for the relief of Susanne Fellner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 678. A bill for the relief of Abbas Mohammad Awad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

S. 679. A bill for the relief of Shalom Fred Ron; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 680. A bill to provide for granting to the several States the minerals and mineral rights subject to disposition under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 on the condition that the income from such minerals and mineral rights be used for certain public purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 681. A bill to authorize the Federal Government to guard strategic defense facilities against individuals believed to be disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion;

S. 682. A bill to accelerate consideration by the courts of criminal proceedings involving treason, espionage, sabotage, sedition, and subversive activities, and to increase to 15 years the statute of limitations applicable to such offenses;

S. 683. A bill for the relief of Ashley G. Ogden; and

S. 684. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Oscar Ems de Huy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 685. A bill for the relief of Yen-Yu Huang and his minor daughters, Li-An Huang (also known as Lillian Huang and Lillian Kan), and Chi-An Huang (also known as Jean Huang and Jean Kan); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. GORE, Mr. KERR, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. McNAMARA, and Mr. NEELY):

S. 686. A bill to provide for Federal financial assistance to the States in the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 687. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to protect the timber and other surface values of lands within the national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 688. A bill to authorize and direct the Civil Service Commission to make a study of the Classification of, and rates of basic compensation payable with respect to technical, scientific, and engineering positions in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 689. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 690. A bill to amend section 35 of the Oil Lands Leasing Act of 1920, relating to the disposition of the proceeds of sales, bonuses, royalties, and rentals under such act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DANIEL (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas):

S. 691. A bill to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of Plancor No. 877 at Baytown, Tex.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. DANIEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 692. A bill to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. POTTER (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BENDER, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. THYE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WELKER, Mr. WILEY, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 693. A bill for the establishment of the United States Commission on the Aging and Aged; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. POTTER when he introduced the above bill which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 694. A bill for the relief of Jacob Fraim Zubli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 695. A bill for the relief of Cirilo Jose;

S. 696. A bill for the relief of Mellton T. Tapawan;

S. 697. A bill for the relief of Mateo Parilla;

S. 698. A bill for the relief of Alvaro A. Jose;

S. 699. A bill for the relief of Alfredo A. Sevilla; and

S. 700. A bill for the relief of Mariano J. Uy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE (for himself, Mr. WILEY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. J. Res. 28. Joint resolution authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area; to the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, jointly.

(See the remarks of Mr. GEORGE when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

INCREASED PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION OF SHERMAN ANTITRUST AND WILSON TARIFF ACTS

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would increase from $5,000 to $50,000 the maximum penalty for violation of the laws prohibiting trusts and monopolies.

This proposal is in line with the recommendation made by the President in his Economic Report, page 50, which reads as follows:

> The Government has a responsibility to maintain easy entry into trade and industry, to check monopoly, and to preserve a competitive environment. All efficiently managed businesses benefit from such policies—new and small firms most of all. Recognizing this fact, the Attorney General appointed a national committee to study the antitrust laws, composed of distinguished citizens and legal experts, to recommend improvements in the substance and administration of our Federal laws to promote competition and prevent monopoly. Even prior to the submission of the report of this committee, it would be well to strengthen the deterrent to violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act by raising substantially the maximum fine that may be imposed under the act.

The increase in penalty was further recommended by the Attorney General in a message to the Vice President dated January 21, 1955, a copy of which has been placed in the RECORD.

As a former prosecutor of antitrust and monopoly cases in the State of Texas, I wholeheartedly agree that the maximum penalty contained in the present law is entirely too low. Practically every State in the Union has higher maximum fines for violation of State antitrust and monopoly laws.

Texas, for instance, which has one of the oldest and strongest antitrust laws in the Nation, permits penalties as high as $1,500 a day for each day that the violation continues. During my 6 years as attorney general of Texas, the record shows that our State prosecuted and brought to judgment more antitrust suits than any other State in the Nation. These included suits against monopolies, price-fixing and restraint of trade among oil and gas companies, milk distributors, bread companies, butane gas companies, typewriter manufacturers, construction companies, building and trade councils, ginners, and many appliance companies, all of whom were injuring the consuming public of our State.

In all of these lawsuits involving more than 125 persons and corporations, with only 2 exceptions, our penalties were more than $5,000, which is the present maximum penalty for violation of the Federal antitrust laws. Actually, $5,000 would be more realistic as a minimum fine rather than a maximum if we are to use this as a real deterrent to violation of our antitrust and monopoly laws.

Stiffer penalties and proper enforcement of both State and Federal laws against trusts and monopolies are essential to the preservation of free enterprise and the protection of the public welfare. We cannot have free enterprise without free competition. Trusts and monopolies strangle competition and reap a heavy toll of exorbitant profits from the consuming public.

The fight against trusts and monopolies is a continuing battle. Congress should do everything within its power to assist in this essential responsibility of government. It is believed that the proposed increase in penalties will constitute an effective additional weapon in this conflict.

Mr. President, in addition to the amendment to the Sherman Antitrust Act, recommended by the Attorney General, the bill which I am introducing would likewise amend the antitrust provision of the Wilson Tariff Act so as to increase the penalty imposed on any importers who violate the provisions of that law against trusts and monopolies.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 670) to increase the penalties prescribed for violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act and the antitrust provisions of the Wilson Tariff Act, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL FACILITIES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], my colleague the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for Federal financial assistance to the States in the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities, and for other purposes.

With only minor and clarifying changes, this is the same as the bill I introduced last year during the 83d Congress on behalf of myself and some 24 cosponsors. It, together with others, was the subject of extensive hearings before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, from May 11 to June 9, 1954.

While no action was taken last year on any of these several bills, including the one I introduced with 24 cosponsors, the hearings on them did arouse a nationwide interest in the problem growing out of the alarming shortage of elementary and secondary school facilities.

This interest has prompted the introduction of several bills in the Senate and in the House since this Congress convened, all directed to the solution of this problem. Included among them is one (S. 5) introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare [Mr. HILL], in which a number of Senators joined as cosponsors.

Specific mention is made of that bill in view of its sponsorship and because it is an emergency measure providing for a 2-year program of assistance of $500 million a year. On the other hand, the bill I am introducing provides for a continuing program of Federal assistance because it will be a continuing problem for some years to come. And while there is no limit in the amount of assistance that may be extended, this can be determined from year to year depending upon economic and budgetary factors.

The bill last year was introduced after advising with the cosponsors, a number of representatives of educational associations and outstanding leaders in the field of education. It was the consensus of those with whom I conferred that there was little hope for the enactment of general Federal Aid for Education legislation.

We all recall the futile efforts which have been made in recent years to enact such legislation. During my 12 years of service the Senate has passed two bills to provide general Federal Aid for Education to the several States. One was passed by a vote of 58 to 22 on April 1, 1948, and the second on May 15, 1949, by even a larger vote—58 to 15. However, in each of those instances the House failed to act. The record of efforts to enact such general legislation goes beyond those years, as the Senate will recall. In fact in 1943—October 20 to be exact—such a bill was recommitted after lengthy debate on the Senate floor.

The opposition to proposals to provide general Federal aid for education stemmed from a fear that Federal aid would open the door for Federal control and supervision of the public school systems of the several States.

In view of this history, it was obvious that Federal participation in any kind of nationwide educational program should be limited. This has been done in this bill. A working arrangement between the Federal Government and the several States is proposed in financing the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities. It is patterned in principle after the Hill-Burton Act, which provides Federal aid for the construction of hospitals and mental institutions, and also after the law providing for Federal aid for highways. Those laws have been in operation for a number of years and the administration of them has thoroughly demonstrated that we can have Federal aid without Federal interference or control. The Federal Government exercises no control, supervision, or authority over the operation of hospitals which have been constructed with Federal assistance under the Hill-Burton Act.

As a further safeguard, the bill provides that when any of the funds allocated to a State are paid into the State Treasury they become funds of the State to which it was paid. It further provides:

> Except as specifically provided by this act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or prescribe any requirements with respect to any State agency, school agency, or school to which any funds have been or may be paid under this act.

So, Mr. President, there cannot be, and there will not be, any Federal authority, control, or supervision of our public school systems under the proposed legislation.

Under the provisions of this bill not one dollar appropriated by the Congress under the authorization proposed in it can be used to pay any part of the operating expenses of any school that would be or might hereafter become eligible for the assistance this measure would provide. It is limited solely to Federal financial assistance to the several States for the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities.

But its enactment would operate to free local revenues of many school districts from a part of the future debt service obligations which they would have to incur for the construction of buildings. The funds thus released would be available for general administrative expenses and for increases in the pay of teachers. In effect, this would be of direct general assistance to school districts in this indirect way without permitting any supervision or control over the affairs of their schools by the Federal Government.

Under the terms of the bill each State desiring to participate in the proposed program would, among other things, be required to submit a State plan for carrying out the purposes of this act within such State, setting forth on the basis of a statewide inventory existing school facilities and a survey of the need for additional school facilities within such State. The State plan would also have to provide means whereby each school agency within the State shall have reasonable notice of the provisions of this act and opportunity to apply for a project grant or grants, and to be heard in support of such application, before the State plan is approved by the State agency for submission to the Commissioner of Education of the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Such plan would further prescribe the principles adopted for determining the relative priority of projects and allotment of Federal and State funds to projects included in such plans, taking into account (a) the relative urgency of the need within the different areas of the State for additional school facilities and (b) the relative financial resources of the several school agencies within the State.

It, therefore, is the intent of this proposed legislation to channel the Federal funds, or the major portion thereof, into States where the greatest need for assistance exists and also down into the areas, localities, and particular school districts

where additional school facilities are needed the most and where the local school revenues are presently inadequate to provide such facilities and at the same time to pay the operating costs necessary to maintain a reasonable minimum standard for elementary and secondary schools.

To carry out that intent, the bill sets forth a formula for the allocation of Federal appropriations to the several States. This formula is based on the number of school students and the per capita income of the State as compared to the average per capita income of the Nation.

This formula, or one very similar to it, must be used in any Federal aid for education program if we are to move effectively toward the much-desired objective of providing equal educational opportunities for all our children.

Possibly no formula yet suggested is perfect, but the one used in this bill is workable and is substantially fair and equitable. It surely will operate to channel such Federal assistance as the Congress may be willing to authorize into those areas and districts where school facilities are inadequate or are deemed unsatisfactory.

During the hearings on a similar bill last year I said on several occasions, and I repeat with emphasis now, that it is the solution of the problem in which I am interested rather than quibbling over the merits of formulas.

The several formulas used in the bills introduced last year were thoroughly analyzed and discussed by experts who appeared as witnesses before the Subcommittee on Education during its hearings on those bills. Extensive general hearings on the subject of Federal Aid for School Construction were conducted also by a special subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor on October 6, 7, and 8, 1954, pursuant to House Resolution 115. I refer Members of the Senate to the testimony as contained in the record of both of those hearings for a complete analysis and explanation of the theories underlying the several formulas studied, and as to how they would work out in practice in the distribution of appropriated funds among the several States. At pages 299 and 300 of the record of the hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on Education there is a table which I inserted in the record and which was prepared at my request by the staff of the Commissioner of Education. This table shows how, under the formula used in this bill, a stated amount of money—$95 million in this instance—would be distributed to the several States.

Many Members of the Senate as well as the House, representatives of a number of education associations, outstanding educators, and prominent citizens deeply concerned about the problem appeared during those hearings or submitted statements for the record. It was the unequivocal opinion of most of those witnesses that the Federal Government should recognize its responsibility in this national crisis of school-facility shortage, and urged immediate action on this bill or a similar one as a logical and sound Federal-State cooperative approach to its solution.

What is this crisis?

The following quotation from the statement of Dr. Samuel M. Brownell, Commissioner of Education, submitted to the Senate Subcommittee on Education and included in the record of its hearings of last year at pages 318 et seq., gives some startling figures with respect to the status of our elementary and secondary school facilities:

> You have heard many witnesses reinforce evidence of the need for school construction. There is no question as to the need for construction of additional school facilities. The first phase of the recently completed school facilities survey, conducted under title 1 of Public Law 815, indicated a shortage in 1952 of 312,000 instructional rooms of public elementary and secondary schools. The 1954 shortage is estimated to be approximately 340,000.
>
> These figures do not include the buildings needed for higher education. Neither do they provide for the increased enrollment ahead. The situation of classroom shortage has not suddenly occurred. It has been developing over a considerable number of years. If we are to meet current needs, we must build 117,000 new classrooms annually. We built in each of the years of 1951, 1952, and 1953, approximately 50,000. We are thus falling behind at the rate of 67,000 classrooms annually. Assuming merely a continuation of the 1953 rate of construction and obsolescence, the backlog for 1960 would be 507,000 classrooms. To construct the approximately 340,000 classrooms needed now, without regard to the increased enrollments ahead, would cost roughly $10 billion to $12 billion.
>
> When we look at these figures in relation to the enrollment forecasts of the Nation it becomes apparent that the school-construction problem is a very big one and one that will continue over many years.

The figures included in this quotation from Dr. Brownell's statement were taken from the Report of the Status Phase of the School Facilities Survey, authorized by title I, Public Law 815, 81st Congress, published in December 1953, and reflect the status and condition of our elementary and secondary school facilities in 43 States as of the commencement of the school year 1952–53. This survey, as we know, was conducted by the educational agencies of the respective States in cooperation with and coordinated by the School Housing Section of the Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. While the survey covers only 43 States, data for the 5 States not included in it are available, and some if not most of the statistical information contained in the report has been revised by individuals and associations to reflect the facts with respect to the status and condition of these school facilities in all 48 States as of September 1954.

I invite the attention of the Senate to this report because it gives a graphic description of the status and condition of our elementary and secondary school facilities. The facts disclosed by the 43 charts in the report, supported by the statistical data contained in the 43 tables that make up the appendix of it, give a picture of the status and condition of such facilities that is startling and deplorable.

As an example, 35.1 percent of our school plants are rated as unsatisfactory. In this category are rented quarters and other facilities not suitable or adaptable to school purposes; barracks buildings or similar structures not designed for school use, and makeshift quarters in buildings redesigned for classrooms. This means that approximately 22.9 percent of our school population are housed in unsatisfactory plants, and approximately 22.8 percent are attending school in buildings not meeting fire-safety conditions—a polite definition for firetraps.

Inasmuch as the statistics in that report are not revised to date, it should be borne in mind that, based on the present rate of construction and obsolescence and taking into consideration the rate of increase in our school population, 70,000 classrooms are being added annually to the present 340,000 backlog of shortage mentioned in the quoted excerpts from Commissioner Brownell's statement submitted to the Subcommittee on Education last year.

On December 2, 1954, the Special Committee on Federal Aid for School Construction submitted its unanimous report to the House of Representatives. This report is based upon extensive hearings conducted by that committee in October of last year. Here is what that report has to say about the problem:

> There is no question that more classrooms are urgently needed. This need has been repeatedly demonstrated by school facilities surveys, by reports from State governors, and by testimony during extensive subcommittee hearings. It will cost from ten to twelve billion dollars to provide adequate classrooms for children now enrolled, and enrollment will increase markedly in the next few years. The hearings held by the subcommittee have demonstrated that the national interest requires that the Federal Government join with State and local governments in solving this pressing problem. Adequate education for our children is essential to the preservation of a free and strong Nation. Their education must not be impaired by the serious classroom shortages which exist in every State.

In fact, the problem created by our school facilities shortage is so great and pressing that it is recognized as a crisis not only by education associations, educators, and others charged with administrative responsibilties in connection with our public schools, but by parents of school-age children and casual observers throughout the country. The shortage is growing steadily and rapidly, and it is and will continue to be one of our most urgent national problems.

The problem was so acute more than 2 years ago that General Eisenhower, then a candidate for President, recognizing the urgency of the problem and the need for Federal assistance in school facility construction, said in his speech in Los Angeles on October 2, 1952:

> Another part of the task ahead concerns the conservation of our greatest asset: Our Nation's children. Part of this responsibility belongs to our schools.
>
> American education is a living testimonial to the devotion, the intelligence, the deep concern, and sacrificial service for America's future on the part of tens of thousands of school teachers and school officials. Also

laymen and women in thousands of communities have served and are serving the cause of education.

But here, again, we must honestly face the fact that in too many places we are not adequately meeting the school needs of America's children. More than 10 percent of all our public school classrooms are now seriously overcrowded. By 1958 it is estimated that our school system will have a shortage of 600,000 classrooms. This year 1,700,000 American boys and girls were without any school facilities.

The American answer is to do—in this field—what we have been doing for a long time in other fields.

We have helped the States build highways and local farm-to-market roads. We have provided Federal funds to help the States build hospitals and mental institutions.

Then, as President, General Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message to the Congress on January 7, 1954, stated:

Youth—our greatest resource—is being seriously neglected in a vital respect. The Nation as a whole is not preparing teachers or building schools fast enough to keep up with the increase in our population. The preparation of teachers as, indeed, the control and direction of public education policy, is a State and local responsibility. However, the Federal Government should stand ready to assist States which demonstrably cannot provide sufficient school buildings.

And again in his recent state of the Union message delivered to the joint session of the Congress on January 6, 1955, the President reiterated his recognition of the urgency of the problem in these words:

It is the right of every American, from childhood on, to have access to knowledge. In our form of society this right of the individual takes on a special meaning, for the education of all our citizens is therefore imperative to the maintenance and invigoration of America's free institutions.

Today we face grave educational problems. Up-to-date analyses of these problems and their solutions are being carried forward through the individual State conferences, and the White House conferences to be completed this year.

However, such factors as population growth, additional responsibilities of schools, and increased and longer school attendance have produced an unprecedented classroom shortage. This shortage is of immediate concern to all our people. Affirmative action must be taken now.

Without impairing in any way the responsibilities of our States, our localities, communities, or families, the Federal Government should serve as an effective agent in dealing with this problem. I shall forward a special message to the Congress on February 15, presenting a program dealing with this shortage.

All of us who are deeply concerned about this problem anxiously await the President's recommendations as may be contained in his special message to the Congress on February 15.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 686) to provide for Federal financial assistance to the States in the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

REOPENING OF BIDS AND NEGOTIATIONS ON SYNTHETIC RUBBER PLANT, BAYTOWN, TEX.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to reopen bidding and negotiations on the synthetic rubber plant in Baytown, Tex. An identical bill has been introduced in the House today by Representative ALBERT THOMAS. I ask unanimous consent that following the printing of the bill a statement prepared by me may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 691) to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of Plancor No. 877 at Baytown, Tex., was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. DANIEL is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DANIEL

By an unfortunate combination of circumstances the Baytown synthetic rubber plant, which has been operated since the beginning of the synthetic rubber industry in America by the General Tire & Rubber Co., did not receive a suitable bid during the negotiations of the Rubber Disposal Commission. In the opinion of all the experts, both technical and economic, the Baytown plant is an excellent facility, can compete readily in a private synthetic rubber industry, and in the national interest should be included in the recommendations for the disposition of Government synthetic rubber plants.

This bill would provide authority for the Rubber Disposal Commission to reopen bidding for a period of 30 days and negotiations for an additional 30-day period on this rubber plant.

In order to avoid any delay in the congressional consideration of the overall disposal program, expeditious action is necessary in the consideration of this bill. I urge in behalf of myself and my colleague that the appropriate committee and the Senate take early action on this bill.

EXTENSION OF EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS UNDER VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1952—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I had an agreement with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] to be a cosponsor with him, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], of a bill to extend benefits to GI's now in the service. However, through an inadvertence, the names of the junior Senator from Massachusetts and myself were omitted. I now ask unanimous consent that we be listed from this point on as cosponsors of the bill (S. 306) to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes, and that any future printing of the bill shall show the names of the junior Senator from Massachusetts and the junior Senator from Florida.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF REPORT OF UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION AS A SENATE DOCUMENT (S. DOC. NO. 8)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a report on the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, transmitted to the Senate by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission on January 6, 1955, be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER:

Statement by him on January 22, 1955, commemorating the anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence.

INVITATION TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO ATTEND SPRING SERIES OF ATOMIC TESTS AT THE NEVADA TEST SITE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Representative CARL DURHAM and I have today mailed to each Member of Congress a letter inviting them to attend the spring series of atomic tests to be conducted at the Nevada test site.

I sincerely hope that every Member who possibly can will arrange to attend one of these test operations. Atomic weapons are the keystone of our defenses against militant communism, and the better-informed Members of Congress are concerning this vital weapon the better we all will be equipped to deal effectively with the problems of defense and foreign relations which now press so urgently upon us.

The trip will require approximately 5 days. This may seem like a rather long period to be absent from Washington. However, the requirements of public safety, which are a paramount concern of the Atomic Energy Commission, require that weather conditions be ideal for a test before a shot can be fired. I am sure that every Members of Congress will wholeheartedly support this prudent approach on the part of the Atomic Energy Commission. Since one cannot predict ahead of time the precise day on which a test can be fired, the Commission has suggested that the Members plan a 5-day visit. I can assure them that the 5 days will not be wasted. In addition to observing a test shot, the Members will be given a nontechnical briefing concerning the test program

and the method of conducting tests, and will be given an opportunity to observe the results of previous tests. If conditions permit, the Members will also have an opportunity to see firsthand the results of the test which they observe.

The Members will be transported to and from the test site in pressurized-cabin aircraft of the Military Air Transport Command, a service whose record for safe and comfortable flying is second to none in the world. I should like to assure the distinguished lady from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] that adequate facilities will be provided for any Congresswomen who would like to go. Several attended the tests in 1953 and have reported that they found the trip to be exceedingly worthwhile in carrying out their official responsibilities as Members of Congress, and that in addition the trip was a most pleasant and enjoyable one.

In closing I should like to recall the old Chinese proverb: "One look is worth a thousand words." This proverb is particularly apt as regards atomic weapons, for atomic weapons are a force that is so new and so different that they must be seen to be fully comprehended. I therefore again urge every Member of Congress who can possibly do so to take this opportunity personally to observe an atomic test.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD I be permitted to insert the text of the letter which has been sent to the Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY,
January 21, 1955.

DEAR FRIEND: The Members of Congress who observed the atomic test series in Nevada in the spring of 1953 found the experience to be so worthwhile that on behalf of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and in cooperation with the Atomic Energy Commission we would like to invite you to witness one of the atomic tests in the 1955 series in Nevada.

The AEC has informed me that tests are planned for the weeks of February 20, February 27, and April 3. Transportation will be provided by MATS four-engined, pressurized cabin aircraft. The Members of Congress will be quartered at the Air Force Base at Indian Springs, Nev. Adequate facilities will be available for any Congresswoman desiring to make the trip. Planes are scheduled to depart from the MATS terminal at Washington National Airport Sunday mornings, February 20, 27, and April 3, and fly direct to Indian Springs. Test shots may be fired on any day that weather conditions are satisfactory. The planes will return to Washington the evening following the shot but in no event later than Friday of the same week. The party will have an opportunity to tour the test site and visit a shot area after a test if conditions permit. A nontechnical briefing concerning the shot is also planned.

If you are interested, would you kindly fill out the attached form at your early convenience, indicating the particular week when you wish to attend. Because of logistic problems involved in handling a large party at the test site, it will be necessary for Members planning to make a trip to notify the committee office no later than 4 days before scheduled departure. We have asked Ed Heller of the committee staff to serve as liaison officer for the test series. He will be available to answer any questions you may have concerning the trip.

The safety of citizens living in areas adjacent to the test site is a paramount concern of the AEC in conducting these tests. It is therefore necessary that weather conditions be ideal for the test before a shot can be fired. There is, therefore, the possibility that weather conditions may prevent the firing of any test detonation before the scheduled plane return Friday.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman.
CARL T. DURHAM,
Vice Chairman.

GROUND-BREAKING EXERCISES FOR THE NEW SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, on behalf of the New Senate Office Building Commission, I am happy to announce that at 11 a. m. on Wednesday, January 26, ground-breaking ceremonies for the New Senate Office Building will be held at the site, First Street between B and C Streets NE. The Senate Office Building Commission extends a cordial invitation to the membership and officers of the Senate to join with us at this ceremony.

I remind Senators that the ceremonies will be held on next Wednesday, January 26, and I hope that all Senators will be able to be there.

GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on February 21 an international tariff-negotiating conference will convene in Geneva, Switzerland, under the sponsorship of the countries associated in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT. The purpose of this conference will be tariff negotiations looking to Japan's full accession to the general agreement, thus enlarging her trade possibilities with other countries as well as with the United States.

The forthcoming conference, like the President's recommendations for additional authority to negotiate tariff reductions on a gradual, selective and reciprocal basis, involves matters of the highest importance.

Much is at stake for America and for the people of Connecticut. An increase in trade among the nations of the free world will add to the security of the United States. As loyal, patriotic Americans we of Connecticut, of course, want our country to be in a position of maximum strength in the struggle against international communism in which we have been so long engaged.

However, in any tariff negotiations entered by the United States, care must be exercised to observe faithfully the principles of gradualness, selectivity, and reciprocity enunciated by President Eisenhower. As citizens of a highly industrialized State, we of Connecticut want our economy maintained at a high level, with expanding opportunities for employment. Our Connecticut economy, like others in the Nation, could be injured, with serious effects upon employment, if tariffs were cut on an indiscriminate and injudicious basis.

In a recent letter to Samuel C. Waugh, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, I urged that our negotiators at the Geneva conference keep uppermost in their minds what I have called the paycheck peril point.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared on these matters be included in the body of the RECORD at the close of my remarks, together with excerpts from an interview by Mr. William A. Garrett, Washington correspondent of the Hartford (Conn.) Times in which I expressed my views on the President's foreign economic policy.

There being no objection, the statement and the excerpts from the interview were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUSH

In a letter to Samuel C. Waugh, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, I have strongly called attention to the "paycheck peril point" which should be an ever-present danger signal to our negotiators at the Geneva Conference on tariffs.

Through Mr. Waugh, who is in charge of the trade-agreements program, I have urged the Department of State to keep constantly in mind the serious threat to Connecticut employment which might result from indiscriminate tariff reductions on products produced domestically and in foreign countries where an extremely low-wage level prevails.

A number of Connecticut industries may be vulnerable to unfair competition of foreign industries paying substandard wages. Among examples which come readily to mind are the rubber footwear industry, in the Naugatuck Valley, the hat industry in Danbury, vacuum bottles in Norwich and New Britain, flashlights in Bridgeport and New Haven, the bicycle industry in Torrington, the lace industry and our clock and watch industry.

Connecticut workers in these industries receive wages which are far higher than those paid by their foreign competitors. A startling example of the wage differential is furnished by the rubber footwear industry. Cheap canvas and waterproof footwear, made in Hong Kong by coolies getting starvation wages, already is being offered for sale in this country. I am informed that male packers in Hong Kong rubber footwear plants receive the pitifully small sum of 8 cents an hour, in comparison with the $2.05 earned by packers in our Naugatuck plants.

In some cases, the lower wage rates paid abroad may be offset by the greater skill and productivity of American workers, and by the superiority of our production methods. It is impossible to believe, however, that such factors can close a gap so great as that between the starvation levels prevailing in Hong Kong and the wage standards which our Connecticut workers earn and deserve.

American industries and the skilled workingmen and women who man their machines have nothing to fear from fair competition. But the peoples' representatives in Washington, whether in Congress or the executive branch, must remain on the alert to nip in the bud unfair methods of competing. And some foreign producers are not reluctant to resort to unfair methods. An example was the use of a thin leather insert in rubber-soled footwear to get a leather shoe classification and thus evade the intent of Congress in establishing the duty on such products. This evasion was halted last year by the Bush-Sadlak bill adopted by the 83d Congress.

In carrying on negotiations at Geneva, our representatives will have the guidance of "peril-point" determinations made by the

United States Tariff Commission. I am confident that in so establishing the levels below which tariffs may not be safely reduced, members of the Tariff Commission were keenly aware of the problem created by wage differentials.

In writing to Mr. Waugh, I sought to make certain that this "paycheck peril point" is equally impressed upon the minds of those who will negotiate for the United States.

President Eisenhower's recommendations for authority to negotiate moderate tariff reductions on a gradual, selective, and reciprocal basis are sound, and have my support. But, in implementing the trade-agreements program, extreme care must be taken to avoid undermining the American standard of living. In the negotiations at Geneva, emphasis must be placed on selectivity and reciprocity.

In the whole wide range of products produced by American industry in partnership with labor, there are those on which tariffs may be safely reduced. Others are more vulnerable, and may need the protection they now have. Still others, indeed, may need more. Thus, the need for selectivity is apparent.

In a speech on the Senate floor on February 23, 1954, I urged that our trade agreement negotiators always keep uppermost in mind the wage differential problem. I also referred to a letter I had written to the Secretary of State informing him of the widespread feeling that there has been too little reciprocity in the so-called reciprocal trade-agreements program. Many believe we have received too little from foreign nations in return for the large concessions we have already made.

If both selectivity and reciprocity are insisted upon, as I have reminded the Department of State, trade agreements can be negotiated which will benefit our whole economy and create new opportunities for jobs. If those principles are flouted, serious consequences might result.

EXCERPTS FROM AN INTERVIEW OF SENATOR BUSH BY WILLIAM A. GARRETT, WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENT OF THE HARTFORD (CONN.) TIMES, BROADCAST FRIDAY, JANUARY 21, AND SATURDAY, JANUARY 22, 1955, BY CONNECTICUT RADIO STATION

Mr. GARRETT. Senator, it's probable that tariff legislation will be among the hottest issues of this session. What did you think of the President's recommendations for cutting the tariff?

Senator BUSH. They were just about what I expected, Bill. They followed very closely the recommendations of the Randall Commission, of which I was a member, and whose report I signed. Let me point out to you and to our friends in Connecticut some key words in the President's message on this subject. The President said this:

"I request a 3-year extension of Presidential authority to negotiate tariff reductions with other nations on a gradual, selective, and reciprocal basis."

The key words are gradual, selective, and reciprocal. Those words, as well as other protections in the law, are very important to us in Connecticut.

Mr. GARRETT. You referred to other protections, Senator. Were you thinking of the peril point and escape clause provisions of the tariff act?

Senator BUSH. That's right, Bill, especially the so-called peril point. That provision is crucially important to us in Connecticut at the present time, and has been for some years. Before the President can enter into any trade agreement negotiations the law requires the Commission to fix the peril point below which tariffs cannot be reduced without causing serious injury to a domestic industry. So that's a safeguard against tariff cuts which might have a harmful effect. Of course, the President has recommended that the peril point must be found before any reductions can be made.

Mr. GARRETT. Then you feel, Senator, that the President's program could be adopted without any harmful effects in Connecticut?

Senator BUSH. Yes, Bill; that's right. I've been close to this tariff situation for the past 2 years and since then. As a United States Senator representing Connecticut, I feel a particular responsibility to the thousands of working men and women in industries which might possibly be affected by tariff cuts.

As you know, we have many of our Connecticut industries which have grown up behind tariff protection. The men and women who work in those industries have their roots in our communities—in Bridgeport, Hartford, New Haven, Norwich, the Naugatuck Valley, and so on.

Very sudden and drastic cuts in the tariff would or could cause distress to those people—unemployment, the loss of jobs—and dislocate the economy of their communities. If anything like that were proposed, I would certainly fight against it. But the President's program doesn't propose that kind of thing at all. It is a very moderate program, carefully thought out and surrounded with safeguards. Far from harming Connecticut, therefore, it will have very beneficial results. In my judgment, it will create increased employment, and more jobs. By increasing the importation of goods that we need here—like copper, fuel oil, raw materials used by our factories—it will make possible increased opportunity for Connecticut exports. And approximately 10 percent of our employment depends on exports.

Mr. GARRETT. We have a stake, too, in the foreign policy aspects of the President's program. Is that a fair statement?

Senator BUSH. Of course, that's right, Bill. Our foreign economic policy—and that includes tariff policy—is an essential part of our program to check the spread of communism. It's a hard-headed, practical way of fighting communism. If we improve our own living standards, and help our allies among the free nations to raise their living standards, we'll be hitting the Communists where it hurts. They depend on poverty and human suffering to provide fertile grounds for their propaganda. If we can improve living standards in the free nations, it will hurt the Communists. There is no doubt about that.

But in helping other nations we mustn't forget this fact: The defense of the free world, now and for many years to come, will depend primarily upon the military strength of the United States. And a strong domestic industrial economy is the backbone of our military strength. In whatever we do we must keep that in mind. Knowing the President's views on this question, I am confident that his foreign economic policy was drafted with that thought constantly in mind.

POLICY STATEMENT ADOPTED BY THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive from Mr. Gwynn Garnett, director for the American Farm Bureau Federation of its section on international trade development, a series of excerpts from an important policy statement adopted for this great federation by the official voting delegates of the member State organizations at the 36th annual convention.

I believe that the Farm Bureau's position will be welcomed by Members of Congress as an immensely significant statement.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Garnett's letter be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., January 20, 1955.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We thought you would appreciate receiving the enclosed copy of the policies adopted by the voting delegates of American Farm Bureau Federation for 1955 on international affairs. There was an unusually broad membership participation in the formulation of these policies. They reflect some important changes from earlier Farm Bureau policies and from existing policies of the Government.

Some of the policies applicable to the work of the Foreign Relations Committee are extracted below:

Foreign investment: "The United States Government should make clear that primary reliance must be placed on private investment to assist economic development abroad. It should be made clear that United States resources for public loans are limited and inadequate in relation to total needs, and that public lending is a poor substitute for private investment."

Technical assistance: "We favor the continuation and improvement of the technical-assistance program as an important part of our foreign policy."

Foreign aid: "We believe that economic aid on a grant basis seldom accomplishes its intended purpose, but instead tends to weaken our economy as well as that of the recipient, and often diminishes United States prestige abroad. Except in disasters, we recommend that monetary grants be replaced by loans which assure the opportunity to repay the United States in goods or services. These loans should be made through banking institutions on a sound basis with provisions to repay in goods which complement our economy, or in goods or services which would otherwise require United States dollar appropriations."

Sales for foreign currency: "The Secretary of Agriculture should authorize the sale and export of farm products through private trade channels, under limitations determined by him, in exchange for foreign currencies. These foreign currencies should not be used to supplement foreign-aid programs in ways not authorized by Congress. The use of currencies should emphasize the building of continuous foreign markets on a sound basis.

"We believe that a substantial part of the frozen assets of CCC can be coverted into working assets needed to increase the ability of foreign countries to earn foreign exchange. We recommend that the authority to sell surpluses for foreign currency be expanded, so long as the currencies can be used for constructive purposes."

Stockpiling strategic materials: "High United States standards of living and military security both require increasing quantities of basic materials such as manganese and chromium. The United States is increasingly dependent on imports for these critical supplies. Many of the underdeveloped countries have vast reserves of these materials.

"The United States should enter into long-term agreements to purchase basic materials to greatly expand our national security reserves. These security stockpiles should be isolated from normal domestic requirements and used only in case of a national emergency.

"Such a program would not only contribute to the economic and political stability and purchasing power of friendly countries, but it would also further the security and economic welfare of the United States and contribute to expanding trade."

Foreign military aid: "Foreign military aid should assist our allies to build up their own defense resources rather than to supply military goods produced in the United States. The dispersion of the vast expenditures for defense among cooperating nations will not only provide purchasing power in the hands of other nations but will also avoid undue concentration of defense production in the United States, which tends to unbalance our own economy and encourages allies to let us carry an increasing burden for the common defense."

United Nations: "The United Nations is a force for world peace. Though it has failed to solve some problems, it has succeeded in solving others. Where there is discussion, there is hope.

"We favor continued financial support of the United Nations and its specialized agencies. However, we insist that these funds be allocated to the specialized agencies in a manner similar to that now being used and that the funds and program be administered on a decentralized basis. We oppose centralizing the use and administration of funds for specialized agencies in the United Nations. We believe that the charter of the United Nations should be reviewed."

We think that these policies are particularly applicable to the proposed program for the economic development of South and Southeast Asia. We shall be glad to discuss these policies with you in detail at your convenience.

Respectfully yours,

GWYNN GARNETT,
Director, International Trade Development.

THE SHORTAGE OF CLASSROOMS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, along with my colleagues, I was pleased to hear today from Mrs. Newton P. Leonard, president of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, writing on the urgent subject of a Federal program to meet the pressing problem of the deplorable shortage of classrooms in our Nation.

It is obvious that strong steps must be taken in order to enable the States to be adequate to the educational needs of the youngsters who are, after all, the future citizens of America.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mrs. Leonard's letter be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS,
January 21, 1955.

To: Members of the 84th Congress.

From: Mrs. Newton P. Leonard, president, National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

The National Congress of Parents and Teachers, with its nearly 9 million memberships in 39,000 PTA's, takes great hope from the state of the Union message recently delivered to Congress by the President of the United States. His reference to the "grave educational problems" and his declaration that "such factors as population growth, additional responsibilities of schools, and increased and longer school attendance have produced an unprecedented classroom shortage" show that he is cognizant of the needs that are demanding attention. We agree most emphatically with his statement, "This shortage is of immediate concern to all of our people. Affirmative action must be taken now."

The members of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers have been convinced—their convictions based on many surveys made in various parts of the country—that the classroom shortage is critical in nature and national in scope. We have, as an organization, testified before the subcommittees of both the Senate and the House, urging the Congress to pass an emergency construction bill.

During these early days of the 84th Congress many bills on school construction have been introduced into both houses and referred to their respective committees. The President of the United States has said that he will "forward a special message to the Congress on February 15, presenting a program dealing with this shortage." From the bills that have been introduced and the message from the President, we have hope of positive action. The members of the two committees, all of whom have evidenced great statesmanship in expressing themselves as sympathetic to emergency aid to school construction, will, we trust, quickly select the best from all suggestions and present such legislation as can readily be passed by the 84th Congress and signed by the President. The situation has gone far beyond meager measures. We need a realistic program that can, and will, aid the critical situation facing the country as a whole.

The needs of children cannot wait. Children cannot be placed in a storehouse with the caption, "Do Not Grow Until We Have Classrooms Ready For You. Then We'll Give a Signal To Grow." No. Growth is daily, and children are this country's most precious resource. We must not fail them now. We, the parents and teachers of the land, and you, the legislators whom we helped to elect, must join forces and together act immediately for these our children.

We have confidence in you. We trust your integrity and your leadership. We also assure you that you can trust us to do our share to speed this necessary legislation. The PTA membership of this country is alerted to the need. The membership will act.

VACANCY IN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE STATE OF OREGON

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, for nearly 9 months there has been a vacancy in the United States District Court for the State of Oregon. This situation has imposed a severe strain on the judicial process in my State. Both my senior colleague [Mr. MORSE] and I have tried to cooperate to the fullest extent to see that the vacancy is filled. We have given clearance and would not interpose any objection to the names mentioned by various Republican Party groups in the State. Accordingly, I have sent to the Attorney General today a letter suggesting the appointment of Hon. Edward C. Kelly, of Medford, Oreg., for the position, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 24, 1955.

The Honorable the ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: For nearly 9 months a seat on the United States District Court for the State of Oregon has been vacant. In order to maintain a reasonable pace with the caseload, the assignment of visiting judges to this court has been necessary. Furthermore, the strain of the additional work on the other judges has endangered their health.

Both Senator MORSE, my senior colleague, and I have tried to cooperate to the fullest in order to encourage an early filling of the vacancy. We both have stated publicly our intention not to invoke the objection of "personally obxnoxious" against the candidates mentioned by various Republican Party groups in the State. In my own case, I even have declared that I would not voice this objection against ex-Senator Cordon, were he to be named to the seat, in spite of the recent bitter campaign between him and me in Oregon.

Yet, the court vacancy still has not been filled, to the detriment of orderly judicial proceedings in our State.

While I have assumed this was an appointment to be made on the basis of Republican Party recommendations, I think the time has come for Democrats to make a definite recommendation if the Republicans are unable to do so.

Accordingly, I should like to propose to you for the seat on the district court in Oregon the name of Hon. Edward C. Kelly, of Medford, Oreg. Mr. Kelly is an outstanding member of the bar, a descendant of a distinguished pioneer Oregon family, a war veteran, a father of three law students, and a man of great integrity, ability, and capacity for public service. I feel sure that any investigation of Mr. Kelly's qualifications made by your office would confirm these facts.

I trust you will give this recommendation serious and careful consideration.

Respectfully yours,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, a measure to enable the strategic American Territories of Alaska and Hawaii to become States of the United States is under active consideration by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The Members of the Senate will recall that during the 83d Congress we were unable to obtain any reports on the Alaska measure from the appropriate executive agencies, although two Republican chairman of the committee, the late Senator Hugh Butler of Nebraska and the Senator from Oregon, the Honorable Guy Cordon, both sought such reports.

At its initial meeting in the 84th Congress, the committee, by unanimous action, authorized me, as its chairman, once again to seek the views of the appropriate agencies of the executive branch of the Government on statehood for Alaska. Accordingly, on behalf of the committee I have directed specific inquiry to the Secretary of Defense, requesting a clear statement as to what effect, if any, admission of Alaska and Hawaii would have upon our national security. Because the matter is one of grave importance to all of us, I ask that my letter to Secretary Wilson be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point. When a reply is received from the Defense Department, I shall request that it appear in the body of the RECORD also, so that all Members of Congress may be fully informed on the matter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 21, 1955.

Hon. CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary, Department of Defense, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY WILSON: The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, at

its initial meeting of the 84th Congress on January 20, 1955, instructed me, as chairman, to submit to the Department of Defense the bill S. 49, enabling Alaska and Hawaii to become States of the United States, and urgently to request the Department's views and comments on the proposed legislation.

The committee is especially desirous of obtaining from the Defense Department a clear statement of the effect, if any, the admission of these two strategic American Territories as States would have upon our national security. If the Department is of the opinion that their admission would not be in the best interests of national security, the Senators on the committee are strongly of the opinion that they and the American people, and especially our loyal and brave citizens in those Territories, are entitled to a full and frank statement of the facts and the reasoning upon which such a conclusion is based.

In this connection, your attention is respectfully called to President Eisenhower's unequivocal support of immediate statehood for Hawaii and his endorsement of the principle of statehood for Alaska in his state of the Union message on January 6 of this year. Reference also is made to the several previous reports of the Department of Defense unequivocably supporting statehood as furthering our national security.

S. 49, 84th Congress, is identical in all major respects to the statehood measures that were thoroughly debated in the Senate last year and which passed the Senate by a very substantial majority. The bills which passed the Senate last year, S. 49 and S. 50, 83d Congress, as a combined measure, were both submitted to the Department of Defense well over a year before their passage in the Senate, but no report was received on the Alaska measure.

In view of the fact that the Department is thoroughly familiar with both the policy question, which has been before the American people for many, many years, and the detailed provisions of the proposed legislation, the committee further directed me to request a prompt reply to this request.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should state that I have sent a similar letter to the Secretary of State requesting his views as to what effect, if any, the admission of Alaska and Hawaii as States would have upon our foreign relations, and also whether the asserted boundaries for the proposed States were consistent with our recognized sovereignty in international law.

I have directed still another inquiry to the Secretary of the Interior, requesting his views on the administrative feasibility of the provisions of S. 49.

It is greatly in the interests of the people of the United States as well as the loyal and brave American citizens of those two American Territories that these questions be answered fully and frankly.

In connection with the question of statehood for Alaska, I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter I have received from the Cordova Chamber of Commerce, of Cordova, Alaska. This letter supports statehood, but outlines some of the problems the Territory is facing.

I firmly believe, Mr. President, that if S. 49, the statehood measure now before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, were to become law the people of Alaska themselves could take action that would go a long way toward solving the problems outlined in the letter of the Cordova Chamber of Commerce. I know that many Members of the Senate concur in my conviction in this respect.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORDOVA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Cordova, Alaska, January 13, 1955.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: I wish to congratulate you for your stand on statehood for Alaska. We of Alaska realize, if given a chance, we can and will show the doubting Members that we can succeed as a state, and will become one to be proud of. Our natural resources, if exploited, will soon class us as one of the richest States in the Union. Our tax revenues alone will become a great factor in the support of our country, making the good old United States of America that much stronger.

We realize we are, in the minds of many residents of the United States, a long way from home. However, it is only 6 hours by air from our largest city, Anchorage, to Seattle. A few years ago that same trip took 6 full days by passenger boat, but time has changed all that. Last February I left home—Cordova, Alaska—on a Friday morning at 9 o'clock and enjoyed lunch in Washington, D. C. The next day—less time than it used to take to travel by train from one end of California to the other.

We in Alaska are rich in many ways, very poor in others. Our greatest need is highways. Roads bring settlers and make it possible to market our products close to home. Today many communities must depend on steamer or air freight—steamer freight at 90 cents a cubic foot (and already 10 days old when it arrives in Cordova), or 20 cents a pound by air freight. Can you imagine a head of lettuce, costing 20 cents in Seattle, being enjoyed by us with the additional 10 to 20 cents for freight? With roads connecting us to the farming areas of Alaska, we could enjoy the same head of lettuce for very little more than the Seattle price.

Fish processed and canned in Alaska journeys to Seattle and back again via steamer, drastically increasing the cost, while by truck our small packers could market their product directly to interior Alaska, quickly and cheaply.

Yet with these conditions prevalent and our population growing by leaps and bounds, Congress has seen fit to cut our road appropriations over 100 percent from the 1952–53 total. We ask—Why? For example, the 1952–53 road appropriation was to start a $12 million highway program—the Copper River Highway from Cordova to Chitna—to be constructed in 4 years. We were assigned $650,000 with which to begin construction. During the 1954–55 session, one Member pointed out that by taking advantage of already existing, abandoned steel railroad bridges Congress could, by granting $2,400,000, reconstruct miles of these before they collapsed, thereby saving millions of dollars on this roadbuilding program.

I would like to stop for a moment and thank the Senate of that year for raising the House appropriation from $12 million to $14,850,000, making it possible for the above conferee committeeman to earmark this $2,400,000 for the Copper River Highway. That same man assigned $700,000 more in the 1954–55 session to complete the crossing of the Copper River Delta, out of the total $9 million road appropriation for that year.

We understand that this year only $8 million is being asked for highways in Alaska, none of which is earmarked for the Copper River Highway. Does not the expenditure of $4 million on this highway justify further funds this year to keep the road under construction? It is true that it will take this year to finish this section, but with no additional funds, we will lose next year's construction season. We must have allocated funds ahead.

I understand that it is not too late to influence the Budget Committee to vote additional funds for this project. The question of our gas tax has been raised in the committee, leaving them reluctant to give us added road moneys. The old adage, "Help yourselves, and we will help you," seems to be the prevailing attitude. However, we have been assured by our own legislators that our gas tax will be doubled—from 2 cents to 4 cents—this February. Go along with us? Use your influence to persuade the Bureau of the Budget to allot $15 million instead of only $8 million. If our legislature does not come across with the promised tax increase, you will still be able to cut the appropriation. Allot $5 million, at least, for the Copper River Highway project. We will then be able to construct the road from both ends. Next year's appropriation could finish the job.

Help us to help Alaska become the State all America can be proud of. The Copper River Highway will traverse the richest mineral area and the most scenic section of all Alaska, bar none. The old railroad bed of the Copper River Northwestern Railway, which we are converting to a highway, poured $257 million worth of mineral wealth through Cordova during its 25 years of operation. Today's value would be treble that amount.

The railroad was built in 1910, 1911, and 1912 at an expense of over $20 million. It would cost, conservatively, $60 million today, yet a highway taking advantage of the many steel bridges and the roadbed will cost not over $15 million. Is this not conservation? Has it not earned its way already by the returns of this wealth already poured indirectly into the coffers of Uncle Sam?

We are confident of your support in this worthy cause. Please let me hear from you soon.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN LEFEVRE,
Chairman, Road Committee,
Cordova Chamber of Commerce.

ECONOMIC CONDITION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, preparatory to holding hearings on President Eisenhower's Economic Report by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, I believe it well to review the accomplishments of 1954. Indeed, as the President indicated in his State of the Union message of last Thursday:

> The past year—1954—was one of the most prosperous years in our history. Business activity now surges with new strength. Production is rising. Employment is high. Personal income after taxes is at a record level. So is consumer spending.

The year 1954 was far different from the year of gloom and doom which some politicians tried to characterize it last October and November.

Based upon the excellent record of the economy in 1954, which saw a decrease in Federal spending of nearly $6 billion, the predictions are for greater economic progress in 1955. The outlook for this year is well summarized in an article entitled "Business Roundup," which appeared in Fortune magazine for January 1955. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DANIEL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, that the economy is as prosperous as it is today, is a real tribute to the efforts of the Republican 83d Congress to strengthen the free enterprise system. This it did by passing legislation with four general purposes in mind: First, getting the Federal Government out of business; second, encouraging private enterprise to expand its production facilities; third, ending regulatory controls and other interferences with private business operations; and fourth, cutting Government spending.

In a few words, this action of the Republican 83d Congress has again permitted the profit motive of our free enterprise system to perform its vital functions. It is the anticipation of profits that provides the incentive to the undertaking of investment in an economy which is characterized by risk. Profits and losses are motivating forces which bring about readjustments in the allocation of resources—of land, labor, and capital to different industries.

It is this private profit system which has given to us Americans the highest levels of living in the world. It is the same motivative factor which has enabled the economy to make the basic readjustments it did in 1953 and 1954 and which makes the prospect for continued economic progress so bright in 1955.

Because the profit motive has been subject to abuse from many sources, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have an editorial entitled Profits and Progress, written by Mr. Herschel D. Newsom, grand master of the National Grange, and appearing in the National Grange Monthly for November, 1954, printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROFITS AND PROGRESS

(By Herschel D. Newsom, master, National Grange)

Let there be no doubt about it, the Grange believes in the American system of capitalism. Farmers are capitalists, and proud of it. They believe in the free enterprise system. This organization has long felt that the profit motive is a primary stimulus for incentive and progress. A tax system, or any set of governmental regulations or institutions, that destroys the possibility of making reasonable profits is deadly. It is the beginning of the end of our enviable level of living.

This editorial is prompted by current vicious attacks, both direct and implied, against profits. Numerous individuals and groups of individuals are conducting an insidious campaign of misrepresentation aimed at undermining confidence in American business and the profit it must make to continue. These attacks imply that profits are sinful and against public interest—something of which we should be ashamed. Is it a coincidence that these attacks follow the Moscow line which, to my way of thinking, is a clever, intriguing avenue of sabotage?

How can a farmer, or any other businessman, expand and provide additional goods, jobs, and services without reasonable profits?

PROFITS—LIFEBLOOD OF BUSINESS

Progress without profits is impossible. Private research is financed out of profits. Capital built out of profits has financed the development of new inventions that have added to our standard of living. Farms cannot be mechanized and improved except through reinvestment of profits. New and expanding factories, to give more employment, are the result of profits converted into capital. Without profits, capital would quickly die of starvation.

Many of us are sick and tired of seeing these insidious, slurring, uninformed barrages of antiprofit and antibusiness propaganda that are born of ignorance, selfishness, malicious intent, or as a result of a conscious or unconscious following of the Kremlin doctrine.

So there shall be no misunderstanding, we are referring to reasonable profits; as in so many things, there is involved here an element of degree. We speak for moderation. We oppose excesses in anything.

Let there be no doubt about it, furthermore, that the Grange believes in regulation of business and profits where adequate competition for one reason or another does not adequately fulfill its purpose. This regulation must be carefully developed in order to safeguard against destruction of the values that the profit motive carries with it. So far, we have done a pretty good job of recognizing the delicacy of this process. That is why it is nauseating to see group after group seek legislative and other mechanisms to eliminate or materially reduce competition in their particular field. True, we need a few devices to prevent the dog-eat-dog type of competition that enables the "big" to swallow the "small." This, however, does not embrace a planned economy.

Many groups, either consciously or unconsciously, reason that competition is fine and desirable for everyone else, but not for them. They want competition to guarantee for them supplies of quality products at fair prices, and with satisfactory service. Yet they can find a thousand reasons for monopolistic devices for themselves.

The Grange, meanwhile, was largely responsible for the first antimonopoly laws. It fights against exhorbitant profits, but it does not countenance attacks on the profit system itself. Nor does the Grange sanction the practice of taking a hasty look at some company's balance sheet and then carelessly quote or misquote—or yell "profiteering"—until that balance sheet is understood in terms of percentages or relativity of profits to volume, risks, investment, and so forth.

The ingredients for America's phenomenal success, in terms of progress and the good life, begin with a combination of our structure of government, plus the opportunity for business, industry, and the professions, including agriculture, to develop along lines prompted by the profit motive. Richness of a wide array of natural resources, an ingenious, energetc people with the proper attitude toward work, and the general lack of internal trade barriers have played an important part in this process. Without the profit motive the spark plug would be missing.

WARNING—POISON

Consequently, if any large bloc of our people swallow or take seriously the avalanche of poisonous, antiprofit charges now running rampant in the propaganda of several groups, I fear for the future. Ours is a system of enlightened self-interest. Some call it a peculiarly successful, slightly, but intelligently regulated free enterprise system. Whatever you call it, it has been phenomenally successful and it is dependent upon profits and the profit motive. This motive must continue to live as a desirable force in the minds and in the future of all Americans; otherwise our bountiful level of living will fall into jeopardy and the visions, aspirations, and toil of our forefathers and our present generation will have been short lived.

EXHIBIT 1

BUSINESS ROUNDUP—A MONTHLY REPORT ON THE ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

BEST YEAR EVER

The year 1955 will be the best in United States business history. (Barring war.) By the end of 1954 the business upturn had burgeoned into a full-fledged recovery. Roundup's forecast now is that business will continue to improve at least through the second quarter of 1956. The Nation's output of goods and services should rise another $24 billion by mid-1956—i. e., the annual rate of gross national production should increase from $360 billion in the fourth quarter of last year to $384 billion in mid-1956 (in 1953 dollars), or a trifle more than 1 percent per quarter. About $15 billion of the projected $24 billion rise in the annual rate of gross national production should take place in the next 12 months. Although the upswing will be slower than in 1949–51, and slower, too, than the upsurge during the past 3 months, it will suffice to make 1955 the best business year ever.

Total output in 1955 will be 4 percent higher than in 1954 and 1 percent higher than in the previous peak year, 1953. Industrial production should also be up 4 percent from 1954, but that will still leave it 3 percent below 1953, and postpone a new record for industrial production until 1956. The chief reason for the difference between the prospects for gross national production and industrial production: the steady growth in spending for services—housing, utilities, education, medical care, retail distribution, etc.

In coming months and quarters business activity may run slightly ahead of or behind Roundup's projections. Last year, for example, production at first dipped a bit faster, and recently has turned up more sharply than Roundup forecast a year ago. Yet for 1954, as a whole, industrial output was off 7 percent from 1953, as compared with the 6-percent decline forecast by Roundup in January 1954, and gross national production was down precisely the 3 percent predicted. A good many economists thought Roundup was overoptimistic when it suggested, last April, that the recession had reached bottom, and again, last July, when it predicted a $10 billion upturn in gross national production between mid-1954 and mid-1955. Roundup was right in April, not quite optimistic enough in July.

Right now, the business upturn is running ahead of schedule, and it has been doing so since last September. At that time the FRB index of industrial production was still perched at the 124 level where it had been almost all year. But in October it rose to 126, in November to 129, and in December it probably reached 130. This rapid climb has outstripped even the "sharp rise" (to 127–128 at year-end) that Roundup forecast 2 months ago. If the FRB index continued to rise at this rate of 2 points a month, output would soon reach a new peak of 145. Such a boom, however, might well be followed by a 1956 "bust."

But the production rise will slow down, and the FRB index, instead of climbing 2 points a month, may rise only 2 points in the next 6 months. Most of the impetus for the pickup in production in the fourth quarter of 1954 came from the shift in business inventory policy—stocks that were being cut at a rate of $5 billion a year in the third quarter of 1954 are about back to a normal replacement basis today. Production gains as sharp as those of the past 3 months are not likely to be sustained by the more gradual growth of consumption—or by a continuing acceleration of inventory accumulation. More than half the recent rise in

output was caused by a doubling of new-car assemblies (up from less than 300,000 units in September to more than 600,000 in December), and a 33 percent jump in steel operations (which rose from 60 percent to over 80 percent of capacity). Auto manufactures are already building up dealer stocks by more than 100,000 cars a month, however, and assembly rates therefore should level out soon and decline by midyear. Steel output, too, is already running 5 percent above the probable 1955 demand level and may drop this summer before expanding again in the autumn.

With the FRB index at 130, industrial production is now close to the level Roundup projected for mid-1955. So production may stabilize from now through midyear. If it does, what will produce the renewed upswing later in the year and into 1956? The answer is that there will be steady, all-over growth in the economy, strongly encouraged by three governmental programs—for more roads, bigger exports, and lower taxes.

These programs should start exerting a major influence on the economy in 1956, and should add about $4 billion, and perhaps twice that much, to effective economic demand. That amount by itself will lift gross national production only 1 or 2 percent, but the corollary economic activity it generates will reinforce all the growth trends in consumer expenditures, capital outlays, inventories, etc.

As always, of course, there are a few potential weak spots in the economic outlook. If residential construction, for example, should hammer along at the November rate of 1,400,000 starts annually, it may prove difficult to prevent a homebuilding letdown in 1956. Car sales, too, may sag toward the end of 1955, particularly if Detroit pushes the sale of new models aggressively this spring and fails to come up with substantially different 1956 models next autumn. And there is always the chance that business may go on a buying spree—as the buildup in stocks of cars and steel suggests—and overload itself with inventories this year. None of these possibilities is very likely, however, and even if one of them materialized that would not upset the basic uptrend of the economy. The only serious danger, a combination of all three of these boom-and-bust situations, is virtually out of the question. Undoubtedly Washington would bring credit and fiscal weapons into counterplay if they seemed to be developing simultaneously. Nevertheless there is some possibility of a renewal of mild inflationary pressures in 12 months or so.

The course of the business upswing in coming months may not be altogether smooth; much depends on business inventory policies and Federal fiscal policies. Yet as Fortune declared 2 years ago (see Business After the Defense Boom, December 1952) there is "no weakness in the economy of 1955 that cannot be forfended by wisdom and cooperation on the part of government and confidence and resolution on the part of business." This is still true today, even though 1954, not 1955, has proved to be what Fortune 2 years ago was calling "195X"—the year defense spending would level off at around $40 billion. (In constant dollars (1953) the gross national production rate of $360 billion in the fourth quarter of 1954 was remarkably close to the $355-billion level Fortune projected for 195X.)

Defense: Outlays for defense declined by $8 billion during 1954 instead of the $5 billion anticipated. Spending has dropped from an annual rate of $52 billion in mid-1953 to $40 billion, and Secretary of Defense Wilson recently declared that approximately the present volume of expenditures must be maintained for the duration of the cold war. At best, the prospect is for a very slight dip in outlays—perhaps to a $38-billion spending rate by mid-1956. Several contemplated increases in defense costs—i. e., raising servicemen's pay, the new reserve training program, more air defense—may well absorb all the savings realized from trimming personnel, foreign miiltary aid, etc. Any worldwide reduction of armaments, leading to a substantial cut in United States defense outlays, hardly seems probable within the next 2 years.

The budget: There will be a deficit of some $3 billion in the cash budget this fiscal year (about a $6-billion deficit in the administrative budget) as compared with the $4-billion cash deficit roundup forecast a year ago. In fiscal 1956, however, the cash budget will be in approximate balance if Congress defers the tax cuts scheduled for April 1, as President Eisenhower has recommended. And a surplus of $5 billion or more could be realized in fiscal 1957. The chief reason: business activity will be rising steadily, and each $4-billion rise in gross national production produces nearly $1 billion of additional tax revenues. But with presidential elections coming up, taxes will probably be cut again in 1956 in preference to running a cash surplus in 1957. On the spending side, some net reduction in farm support outlays and a slight cut in defense should trim total Federal cash expenditures very slightly in fiscal 1956 and again in fiscal 1957, to around $65 billion. Meanwhile, State and local spending will continue to increase $2 billion a year—for schools, hospitals, and other services and public works. On balance, therefore, Government spending at all levels should rise from $99 billion in fiscal 1955 to over $100 billion in fiscal 1957.

Capital outlays: Business spending for plant and equipment has stopped declining. The total cutback in 1954, in fact, was milder than expected (at $36.3 billion, spending was off only 4 percent from 1953 instead of 6 percent). This year capital outlays will total about the same as last year, according to Fortune's surveys of business plans. The rate of spending (now below the 1954 average) will begin to turn up early in 1955 and by mid-1956 may be rising as much as $2 billion annually.

Inventories: Business cut its stocks by $4 billion during 1954, a decline of 5 percent, while end purchases of goods dipped only half that much. Thus most of the excess stocks built up during 1953 were disposed of last year. Business has already slowed its inventory trimming markedly, and as gross national product and final sales rise by 4 or 5 percent a year, inventory building should increase gradually to an annual rate of $3 billion by the end of 1955, and to $4 billion or so in the spring of 1956.

Business, of course, may rebuild its stocks even faster than that, just as it cut them unexpectedly quickly in 1954. Steel consumers and new-car dealers are already replenishing their depleted stocks rapidly. But while the output of steel and cars may slow down a bit soon, production for inventory may accelerate in other lines—textiles, building materials, etc. If business in general rebuilds its stocks too rapidly in 1955—by $5 billion or more—the economy might well develop another case of inventory indigestion in 1956. However, business is becoming increasingly orderly in its long-term inventory policies, and total amount of inventory accumulation in 1955 will probably run between $2 billion and, at most, $4 billion.

Construction: The building boom provided the strongest antidote to the 1953–54 recession, and construction activity should contribute substantially to the 1955–56 economic expansion. Home building began picking up last fall from the 1 million unit rate to which it declined as a result of the 1953 hard-money pinch. Mortgage funds became plentiful during 1954, of course, and credit terms for VA and FHA mortgages were progressively liberalized. Consequently, as the builders themselves forecast last spring (April Roundup), housing starts rose to 1,200,000 last year. The seasonally adjusted home-building rate reached 1,250,000 in October and in November soared to 1,400,000, reflecting excellent building weather for an off-season month. But this rate can hardly be maintained, much less increased further. For such a rate would imply too fast a tapping of the replacement market for housing. (See the Insatiable Market for Housing, February 1954.) Moreover, there may not be enough mortgage money readily available at current terms and interest rates for that much building. (See Credit below.) Consequently, home building cannot be expected to rise much above 1,300,000 in 1955. Nevertheless the dollar volume of building will probably rise slightly this year since builders are putting up larger houses and homeowners are spending heavily for expansion and modernization.

Public-works construction increased by nearly $1 billion in 1954—to $8.5 billion—and the spending rate will probably rise another $1 billion this year, and by an additional $2 billion each in 1956 and 1957. One reason: With the Eisenhower administration's full backing a committee headed by General Clay has projected a $25-billion, 10-year addition to the previously planned volume of interstate highway construction. The Clay proposals will be presented to the new Congress for enabling legislation. Meanwhile, spending for construction of schools, hospitals, and other public works may also be speeded up by Federal and State Government action in 1955.

Prices and wages: In 1955, for the third year running, prices and wages will change only slightly. Last year both industrial prices and living costs fluctuated within a range of less than one-half of 1 percent. Farm prices eased 2 percent, while wages rose about 2 percent. But the wage rise was more than matched by the recovery of man-hour productivity from a slump in late 1953.

Productivity this year will rise at least enough to offset the pay increases of 5 cents an hour—3.3 percent—that will probably be granted. Thus the easing pressure of costs on industrial prices will offset the upward pressure of strong demand. Farm prices will not change much this year if the weather is normal. On balance, the cost of living will again be remarkably stable.

A mild uptrend in prices may develop by the spring of 1956. That possibility, however, is contingent on a number of factors that cannot be forecast with precision— e. g., how wage increases compare with the rise in productivity, how the dip in farm output matches up against the rise in farm exports, how closely the economy approaches full employment, etc. Although it is unlikely, a combination of factors sufficient to produce a slight price rise could even take shape toward the end of 1955.

Income and savings: Last year both personal incomes and savings held within $500 million of the peak 1953 levels. This partly reflects the influence of the economy's various built-in stabilizers, and these stabilizers will also tend to moderate the improvement in consumer spending from now on. A dip in unemployment benefits, for example, will offset part of the rise in payrolls; some of the additional payroll income, moreover, will go into taxes. During the "recession," personal incomes nearly held their own while the gross national production dropped $14 billion; similarly, incomes will rise less sharply than gross national production in the 1955–56 upswing—$15 billion against $24 billion. The savings rate, which rose through 1953, declined during 1954 largely because installment debt repayments (which count as savings) eased last year. Repayments will increase gradually in 1955 and especially in 1956, however. So the savings rate, now slightly below the recent norm of 8 percent of consumer income, should rise a trifle. But the rise in savings will probably not occur until personal taxes are cut again sometime

in 1956. That cut may add as much to consumer disposable income as the $3 billion contributed by the tax reduction on January 1, 1954, part of which went into saving and part into spending.

Consumer spending: Outlays by consumers increased $6 billion during the "recession" year 1954 (from an annual rate $229 billion in the fourth quarter of 1953 to $235 billion in the last 1954 quarter). They should rise $8 billion in 1955, and another $5 billion in the first half of 1956. The rise in spending, moreover, will be well rounded, as suggested by Fortune's analysis of the Changing American Market. Approximately one-third of all consumer dollars will continue to be spent for services—better housing, more household utilities, medical care, car repair, etc. The rise in outlay for food, which slowed in 1954, should resume at a rate of 3 percent a year to meet population growth and satisfy the demand for more and more "built-in" services in food—precooking, prepacking, etc.

Consumer spending for goods last year was off a bit from 1953 in dollars, up a bit in physical volume of goods, buying rose 5 percent from late 1953 to late 1954, and it should rise another 5 percent by mid-1956. Nondurables will account for the bulk of the rise; apparel sales have already recovered from the warm-weather slump a year ago, and should continue to gain. Gas and oil sales are rising rapidly, and sales of most other nondurables (except tobacco) are rising steadily. As for durables, home-goods sales, led by TV, have been on the rise (despite a bad summer for air-conditioner sales). And with so much home building, appliances and furniture producers now look for bigger volume.

In 1954 Detroit sold 5,250,000 cars. That was a half million fewer cars than in 1953, but about as many as industry spokesmen had forecast, and a quarter-million more than Detroit's economists or Roundup predicted. A major reason, of course, was the early introduction of 1955 models with eye-catching innovations. Auto men now foresee still higher sales for 1955—most are predicting about 5,600,000 cars, although some project sales as high as six million. The current rise in incomes would suggest some rise in 1955 car sales; on the other hand, the industry can't look for as much sales gain from an earlier introduction of the new models—last year they were brought out almost as early as they can be. New-car sales, all in all, should about match this year's volume.

Credit: Money was plentiful and cheap in 1954 but will tighten up a little this year. Although 1955 corporate tax payments will be lower, and profits and depreciation reserves higher, the demand for bank loans to business will probably expand, instead of contracting as in 1954, because business will be increasing its inventories again. This demand for credit will probably curtail the commercial banks' ability to supply long-term funds to the capital market, although individual savings should hold up well. Meanwhile the demand for long-term funds will be heavy. Corporations may again finance a large share of their capital outlays internally but the rising trend of home construction and public works will produce a strong demand for mortgage money and necessitate more State and local bond issues.

The credit outlook, of course, depends importantly on action by the Federal Reserve, which pursued a policy of active ease in money in 1954, and now may shift gradually toward a policy of just ease. Right now there is pressure for the Federal Reserve to avoid interfering with the business recovery, but other pressures may mount for the FRB to suppress inflationary tendencies in the stock market, in inventory buying, building activity, etc. However, since the present outlook is for something less than full employment in 1955 and in 1956 (mainly because of rising productivity) the Federal Reserve is apt to be more restrained in its overall credit control than in 1953.

All in all, interest rates will firm up. The yield on short-term obligations—Treasury bills and commercial paper—has declined more than 1 full percentage point since the hard-money pinch of 1953 (to just over 1 percent) and long-term-bond yields have dropped more than half a percentage point (to just under 3 percent). Interest rates may rise enough to make up about half these declines over the next 18 months. Relatively, however, money will remain fairly plentiful and cheap.

Exports: United States sales of civilian goods abroad rose from $12.3 billion in 1953 to $12.5 billion in 1954. They may rise another $2 billion over the next 2 years, with most of the growth coming in 1956. Economic and financial recovery abroad is not only increasing the demand for United States goods, but also enabling foreign countries to relax their trade restraints against them. Meanwhile, the United States will be swelling the outflow of dollars. United States imports will increase this year and next as American industry chews up more foreign raw materials. More important, the Eisenhower administration plans a substantial increase in aid to underdeveloped countries, particularly in Asia. Only a part of this aid will be direct Government grants; the rest will come from various forms of private investment with Government collaboration—e. g., export credits, World Bank loans, Federal tax incentives or guaranties to overseas investors, etc.

Thus, whereas in recent years the United States has been buying more abroad than it sold (apart from Government gifts), an export surplus of at least $1 billion is likely by mid-1956. United States heavy-goods exports have recently had heavy going in world markets, but with Western European industry now working at capacity, United States exports of heavy goods should increase substantially. Farm exports began to pick up in 1954, and should rise further, since Congress has authorized the disposal of $1 billion of United States agricultural surpluses abroad to be paid for in local currencies.

THIRTY-SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the American demand for freedom has been not for ourselves alone but for all people. Americans know that those who threaten the freedom and independence of any people are a threat to our freedom, too. We know that those who fight for freedom anywhere are fighting for our freedom as well.

This is why it gives me real pleasure, on behalf of the people of Michigan, to join in the salute to the Ukrainian people in their fight for freedom and independence.

On this 36th anniversary of the Ukrainian Declaration of Independence we recall our own dedication to human liberty and greet those who, as do the Ukrainian people, stand beside us in the fight to win it for all people everywhere. The kinship that brings us together at this time will grow even stronger as we continue the fight until independence and dignity become secure for all.

SUGGESTED POSTPONEMENT OF SALARY INCREASES

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, the rising Red menace in the far Pacific now threatens us with the terrible possibilities of armed conflict after a short period of uneasy peace and shaky prosperity. With the United States Seventh Fleet steaming into the troubled waters of Formosa, and with the situation so grave that the President has sent to Congress a special message on this new crisis, I feel that we must reassess our budgetary situation in the light of the rapidly shifting world events.

Inflation is rearing its ugly head with all its sinister influences and implications for our economic structure. This is a time for cautious planning; it is no time for heedless spending or unwarranted tax reductions.

All Americans are vitally concerned with these related problems. They are willing to forego additional tax reductions and make necessary sacrifices to prevent further depreciation of the dollar.

Under such circumstances, it seems to me that this is no time to set a dangerous inflationary pattern by unduly increasing salaries of civilian and military personnel. We are all Americans dedicated to preserving our way of life. This preservation, however, is contingent upon stopping the inflationary spiral which will result from adding billions of dollars to our Federal budget and to the deficit. If such spending is provided, there will be economic repercussions along the line, with devastating and extremely harmful effects upon our economic system, and our national defense.

Therefore, I appeal to the President and the executive department, to Federal employees' organizations, and to my colleagues of the 84th Congress, as well, to exemplify the highest patriotic motives by postponing temporarily action on extreme demands for increased salary and wage schedules, including congressional salaries. A hastily enacted pay increase measure will be ultimately regretted by all.

It is our sworn duty and responsibility to set an example for Americans everywhere. Higher living costs have been reversed downward. This administration and the Congress should challenge the Nation to hold the economic line, not break it, at this crucial point in our history.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DANIEL in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Charles C. Finucane, of Spokane, Wash., to be Under Secretary of the Army, vice John Slezak, resigned, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James Clement Dunn, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Brazil.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry A. Byroade, of Indiana, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Egypt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John L. Tappin, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Kingdom of Libya.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James C. H. Bonbright, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George V. Allen, of North Carolina, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Loy W. Henderson, of Colorado, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of David W. Kendall, of Michigan, to be General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ervin L. Peterson, of Oregon, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James A. McConnell, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James A. McConnell, of New York, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ervin L. Peterson, of Oregon, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. NEUBERGER subsequently said: Mr. President, a few moments ago the Senate confirmed the appointment of Mr. Ervin L. Peterson, of Oregon, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. A number of complaints were received by me from farm people in the State of Oregon regarding Mr. Peterson's views on farm parity and farm-price supports. I happen to share their disagreement with Mr. Peterson's views in this respect, and I do not believe that he is on the right track in his attitude toward farm legislation. However, I did not consider the objections to be sufficiently strong to justify any attempt to deny to the President of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture the right to fill this important post with a man of their choice.

I have voted for the confirmation of Mr. Ervin L. Peterson to be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and I wish him success in his new office. Mr. Peterson is a longtime resident of my State of Oregon.

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION DIRECTOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph F. Finnegan, of New York, to be Federal Mediation and Conciliation Director.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ROUTINE DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Routine Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Routine Diplomatic and Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Routine Diplomatic and Foreign Service are confirmed en bloc.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Walter B. Heisel, of Alaska, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 31, with headquarters at Juneau, Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

SOUTHEAST ASIA COLLECTIVE DEFENSE TREATY

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations voted on Friday, January 21, to report the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty to the Senate. Because of the Formosan situation, which has been the subject of much discussion and consideration during recent days, it has not been possible to have the report completed for submission at this time. I therefore ask unanimous consent for permission to file the committee report on this treaty at a time when the Senate may not be in session.

I am confident that we shall be able to file the report sometime during the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

COMMISSION TO STUDY THE PROBLEMS OF THE AGING AND AGED—INTRODUCTION OF BILL

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, at the conclusion of my remarks, I should like to introduce a bill in which I am joined by more than 50 of my colleagues, calling for the establishment of a United States Commission on the Aging and Aged to explore the problems, economic and social, of this increasing number of our people.

The problems to which I shall refer are not only those with which we are presently faced, but the same problems greatly accentuated with the passing of time and the continued growth of our economy.

Since I first came to Congress, the problems of the handicapped and the disabled have interested me and have taken much of my time, and the most rewarding part of my legislative work has been the part of it which has dealt with rehabilitation.

Most of us are aware of the great waste of human resources which attends insufficient knowledge of this broad subject. Lately it has come to my attention that many studies have been carried on by numerous private and public agencies, many working independently, and others in a coordinated and united effort, to reach solutions which will be of benefit to our complex society.

Some great strides have been made as a result of this abundance of attention to the needs of the handicapped and incapacitated. Few communities in the United States have not been made aware of the need for organized responsibility in this field.

In the past year in the largest city of my State, Mr. President, certain tragic events have turned my thinking to another element of our society. That element is not composed of the chronically sick or the disabled. I have in mind the unfortunate citizens who were forced into idleness because their employers were unable to continue in business. In many instances, these individuals had spent the better part of their adult years with reasonable expectation of paid retirement, had their employers been able to continue. The plight of these individ-

uals is a sad one because they are of an age group whose productive energy is regarded as having been slackened.

There are, too, the folks who, because periodically they have sought improved opportunities, have passed up the security benefits accruing to the steadily employed. The search of these individuals for advancement and greater emolument finds them in middle life not included in the modern blueprint containing pensions. Their reemployment under current trends becomes less probable, and then only when pension arrangements are not involved. In not so ancient times this type of person was thought of as the trailblazer and the chancetaker whose courage was regarded as a virtue.

The natural inclination is for employers to hire younger men. This is true, not only because of the greater vigor of youth, but because present widespread arrangements involving insurance and pensions sometimes make it impracticable for the employer to give consideration to the older person. The latter condition could not have been avoided when these plans and formulas were established, nor can any manmade law in a free society assure the continuance in business of a private enterprise which is no longer solvent or capable of producing a return on investment.

At this point, Mr. President, I am referring only to the fiscal aspect of the situation. When dealing with problems of youth, where earning power is not at all involved, we think of many other things. Every community has its playgrounds, vocational training and education, and youth guidance centers, all thought of as preparatory. We raise and equip our children for careers as useful citizens. We overlook circumstances which may reduce one's years of useful adulthood or may result in an adulthood where a continuous place in the economy of the Nation is not properly judged as essential.

In our Nation we have, too, an ever-increasing group of citizens whose lives, because of improvement in medicine, have been prolonged. It is ironic that this improvement, which has brought about better physical health and longer lives, has created one of our most vexing problems. On every hand, we see the miracles of improved industrial and commercial methods. When these factors collide, they tend to cause new questions to arise.

It is not difficult to perceive the confusion which may result from a disorganized approach to the problem. Some of our best minds have been devoted to research on these subjects, and frequently I have heard the warning that the very large group of our troubled citizens whose anxieties are created thusly, will become prey to false prophets who may attempt to convert their fears into activities prejudicial to themselves and harmful to the Nation.

Proposals to care for the aged and to help the aging to find the means of providing for themselves must be given every encouragement. Otherwise, this movement will be taken advantage of by those whose prime concern may be the advancement of single groups able to muster voice and pressure greater than the volume which will come from less articulate elements.

No part of our society, Mr. President, is not profoundly affected by this growing problem. To me, it is unthinkable that a Nation which boasts the best system of free enterprise in the world will stand aside while that very free enterprise is jeopardized by its inventiveness, because an important part of the system is neglected.

Steps are being taken to increase the number of our citizens entitled to old-age and survivors insurance. These are steps in the proper direction, but much more remains to be done.

In the matter of human resources, I am daily reminded of the enormous cost in knowledge and experience when our older people are shelved because they have attained an arbitrary point in life where certain actuarial agreements force total retirement from the scene. This produces a greater number of persons in the lower income bracket, and puts a drain on the national economy.

At my request, Dr. Wilma Donahue, of the University of Michigan, has gathered for me some impressive data which will be of widespread interest. Dr. Donahue is research psychologist and chairman of the division of gerontology, Institute for Human Adjustment, and lecturer in psychology at the university. She is the author of many papers on the subject, and she has collaborated in many studies which have been printed in book form. Dr. Donahue is recognized as one of the foremost authorities on this challenging economic and social problem. She has taken part in explorations into the issues involved in many States and in many nations.

Since 1900, Mr. President, the population of the United States has doubled; but the number of older people has quadrupled.

During the decade between 1940–50, the group over 65 increased by 37 percent, while the group under 65 increased by only 13 percent.

There are now more than 14 million persons 65 years of age and over in the population, or more than 8 percent; by 1970 this group will have increased to 21 million, and will include more than 12 percent of the population.

All demographic studies indicate that the growth in the older segment of the population will continue at an accelerated rate for another half century.

Every day, approximately 3,000 more people become 65 years old; but about 2,000 in the older age group die, thus making a net gain of approximately 1,000 a day, or nearly 400,000 per annum in the older age group.

In the past 13 years alone, the number of persons age 75 and over has increased almost 50 percent. Almost 4 million are now in this advanced age group. In fact, during the past decade the second fastest growing segment of the United States population has been that composed of persons 65 years of age and over.

Life expectancy at birth is steadily increasing. At the present time it is 68.4 years, a gain of 21 years since 1900.

Life expectancy of those in their later years is also increasing; at the present time the average expectancy for men at 65 is 12½ more years; and for women, 14½ more years.

The longer life span of women is creating a disproportionate number of them in the older age brackets. There are 10 women to every 9 men in the 65-and-over age group.

The median age at which wives enter widowhood is 57 years of age. In the United States, there are at present 7,500,000 widows of all ages, and at least half of these are 65 years old and over. At age 65, approximately half of the women are widows; by age 75, 72 percent of the older women have lost their husbands.

With the increasing number of older people, there is in our Nation a growing proportion of low-income families. Five million families are headed by persons 65 years of age and over. Of these, 43 percent have yearly cash incomes of less than $1,500; 30 percent have incomes of under $1,000; 15 percent have incomes of less than $500.

The plight of the 2,500,000 older persons who live alone is even worse financially. Of these, 76.5 percent have incomes of less than $1,000; nearly 40 percent have incomes of less than $500.

Such incomes fail entirely to meet the needs of elderly people for living even at exceedingly modest levels. Official budget estimates in 1950 indicated that an elderly couple required from $1,602 (New Orleans) to $1,908 (Milwaukee) a year to maintain a modest, but adequate, level of living.

In spite of the improvements in social-security legislation during the last decade, and the extension of private pension plans, the financial circumstances of the older age group are still exceedingly unsatisfactory. Considerable pressure is being exerted upon employers to increase the number of employment opportunities for older people in order that they may supplement their incomes with earnings and also in order that they may have something useful to do. However, the introduction of industrial automation and the poor health of older people cast doubt upon employment as an effective solution, even if employers were to abandon present compulsory retirement and age discriminatory hiring practices.

In a recent survey, it was found that 42 percent of all men 65 and older were still in the labor force, but that of those who were not in the labor force only 6 percent felt well enough to want part-time or full-time jobs. The great majority of older men who were not in the labor force reported that they were not well enough to work. It was concluded that these findings represent the hard core of the economic problem of the aged and that—

> The various devices which have been suggested for persuading employers to retain older workers do not * * * touch the heart of the problem. The problem is not one of a great reservoir of wasted resources but of men whose working lives are in a very real sense over.

The implications are clear. The physical and financial limitations of large

numbers of older people make it impossible for them to meet their needs without the assistance of national, State, and local government and voluntary groups. Special services and facilities are needed to increase financial resources, to provide more healthful living circumstances, and to create useful roles for the aging. Medical care, housing, income maintenance, employment, and effective use of leisure time are special areas needing consideration and action.

There is still great need for expansion of medical care facilities. Chronic illness is 5 times more prevalent at age 65 and over than at younger ages. It should be our goal to offer a constellation of services integrated to provide each individual the type of care he needs at a cost within his means to pay and embodying the best practices of medicine and rehabilitation. The acts of the last Congress providing funds and enabling legislation to help communities establish hospitals, clinics, nursing homes, and rehabilitation centers and services should go far in providing urgently needed facilities.

In addition to increased health facilities, Mr. President, there is need for an extension of health insurance for the older age group. Not more than 26 percent of persons 65 years and over, and only 15 percent aged 75 and above, have hospitalization insurance; even smaller percentages carry medical and surgical insurance. Most of the aged do not have health insurance because (a) they cannot afford to pay the premiums, (b) they are largely unemployed and most low cost insurance has been issued to employed groups, and (c) they are excluded from coverage by many companies or are entitled only to limited benefits.

In a 1950 survey, it was shown that 1 out of 7 couples receiving old-age and survivors insurance had 1 or more members hospitalized during the year; of these 65 percent incurred medical expenses of $200 or more, an amount which depleted family savings in more than half the cases.

Inability to maintain health insurance causes many old people to neglect chronic illness; some obtain medical care only by sacrificing other essentials to healthful living; others resort to care whose cost is borne by younger and middle-aged groups, either as family members or taxpayers at large. It would be cheaper for communities to help provide health insurance than to pay for expensive medical care for old people prone to long-term illnesses.

Ancillary services needed to promote the health of older people include housekeeping, bedside nursing, hot meals, visiting and shopping, home-care medical programs for convalescents, clinics for adults who are well, activities and crafts centers, special employment programs for disabled and frail old people wishing to work, market outlets for crafted goods, and recreational programs.

Mr. President, housing is one of the most pressing needs of the older group. of the 65-and-over group, 69 percent live in households maintained by themselves, 26 percent live in households of other persons, and 6 percent live in institutions, hotels, or large rooming houses.

Home ownership is high. Approximately two-thirds of all families whose heads are 65 and over own their homes. On an average, however, older people are overhoused and occupy low value structures which are dilapidated and substandard in heating, cooking, lighting, and plumbing facilities. For these poor accommodations, renters often pay a disproportionate amount of their incomes for rent. Twenty-six percent of older families who live in rental units pay 30 percent or more of their incomes for rent. Homeowners find that their property continually depreciates and that they are not able to keep it in repair because of physical and financial reasons.

Older people need low-rental housing especially designed to meet their special limitations and needs. Federally financed public housing has not been generally available to them because the law states that such housing may be used only for family occupancy. Administrators, knowing that one member of an older couple may die soon, have been unwilling to accept older families. State financed public housing in New York has set aside 5 percent of all new housing for individuals 65 years and over, without reference to their family status. Boston, Chicago, and Cleveland have special housing projects designed for older people. Efforts of these kinds are so limited, however, that they do not begin to meet the need.

Massachusetts recently established a loan fund of $15,000,000, which is available to local housing authorities to build low-rental housing for the low-income group aged 65 and over. Already 23 communities have provided plans and have applied for these funds.

Extension of State programs and assistance at the Federal level are much needed. Private enterprise does not find it profitable to build for a group able to pay only a very low rental fee. Lending agencies will not extend credit to older people even when they can offer reasonable security. Furthermore, lending agencies are unwilling to loan money to nonprofit organizations on a long-term amortization basis. FHA financing has been limited to individuals less than 65 years of age, thus making it impossible for older people to build retirement homes for themselves.

Canada has enacted legislation to make it possible for local communities with 10 percent of the cost of a housing project on hand to receive an outright gift from the Government of one-third of the cost, and to borrow the remainder from the Government Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

In England and the Scandinavian countries government and local communities furnish the necessary financial assistance to provide housing for most of the low-income elderly group.

All communities and countries have found that when old people are housed in safe, decent, sanitary, comfortable, specially designed housing their health has improved and they are much happier. It has also been found that it is much cheaper to provide housing than to care for the old people in hospitals, sanitariums, or other institutions.

Although the improvements in social-security legislation enacted during the past session of Congress will include many more people in the program and will increase the benefits being received, most old people will still have only very limited incomes from this source. As of October 1954, the average OASI payment was $58.87; the recent changes in the law will increase average monthly payments from $5 to $13.

Likewise, individuals dependent upon old-age assistance are forced to live at bare subsistence levels. The average monthly payment for OAA recipients as of October 1954 was only $51.53 a month.

In old age, nonearned income, including pension benefits, savings, insurance, and so forth, usually becomes the only—and it is inadequate—source of support. For example, in a recent survey, it was shown that almost half, 47.2 percent, of males and 81 percent of females aged 65 and over having nonearned income earned nothing in addition. The median nonearned income for older men was only $1,008, and for older women it was $536.

Consideration should be given to the further extension of social-security coverage, to the maximum increase of benefits compatible with sound economic planning, and to an increase in the amount permitted to be earned while receiving benefits. Vigorous programs of saving including home ownership, insurance, pensions, investment, and so forth, should be advocated in order to increase the average amount of nonearned income in the later years.

It has already been noted, Mr. President, that employment cannot be expected to solve the financial problems of large numbers of older people. However, every effort should be made to enable and encourage those able and wanting to work to find jobs.

Federal subsidization to communities interested in establishing special employment projects for the elderly might be investigated. These projects can be worked out in cooperation with management and unions, and thus cause no conflict with existing policies. Examples are already available. In Boston a group of businessmen established Sunset Industries to employ retired men and women. In Holly Hill, Fla., a retired businessman established a factory to reproduce early American furniture, which employs only retired men. In Hempstead and Schenectady, N. Y., older people have formed groups to sell their own and each other's services to established firms. The number of these projects is far too small. Moreover, they are not likely to be duplicated to any extent until funds are made available on a grant-in-aid basis to communities wishing to develop these and similar projects.

Current practices in the hiring and retiring of older workers need considerable more study and evaluation. Likewise, the reasons which are usually given as a basis for current practices, including increased health-insurance costs, difficulties encountered in fitting an older worker into a retirement program, and so forth, should be thoroughly investigated.

It has been apparent from the figures and facts already presented that the United States has a rapidly growing population of the aging who are largely unemployable and who have unlimited amounts of leisure time. What lies ahead for these older people is one of the most important questions facing American society at the present time.

Current trends show that colonies of old people are beginning to form in the more benign climates of Florida, California, and the Southwest. For example, in 1 Florida community there are 3,000 retired families in an isolated area. This community of retirees provides no facilities for socialization or for service activities in the town; the only organized group is a garden club. In many retirement towns in Florida, almost one-fourth of the homes have for-sale signs on them. Students of this phenomenon indicate that it reflects boredom and dissatisfaction which come from having nothing to do. Aggregations of people who are dissatisfied and who at the same time are having to live in minimum circumstances constitute potential trouble spots in our society; and, sooner or later, organizations may form which operate only for the vested interests of the old-age group.

Until these facts are dealt with as an entity, putting all the bases together in an overall pattern, our efforts in human engineering will be less than skillful.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield for a question?

Mr. POTTER. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. The able Senator from Michigan mentioned Florida, and referred to the many retired people who live in that State. I am very happy to be a cosponsor of the bill to make a study of the question, and I support in every way the remarks the Senator from Michigan is making.

It is true that many retired people live in Florida, and it is also true there is every indication that the number will increase. Obviously, people like to come to Florida to live when they qualify under the various retirement programs in their home States. We are grateful that these people can take advantage of such programs, and that many of them who reach retirement age move to Florida.

However, it is necessary to make a further study of the problem in an effort to find the solution. In my State 15 percent of the total population is 65 years of age and over. Furthermore, we have the problem of employment, because many of the retired people would like to supplement their retirement income through employment. It is very difficult for them to obtain employment in many cases, because industry, unfortunately, does not wish to employ any person who is over 65 years of age. That is a mistaken policy in many ways.

I believe the Senator from Michigan is making a most commendable approach to an important subject, and we in Florida appreciate the efforts he is making to solve this difficult problem. I am certainly very happy to be associated with him and with the bill which I understand he is about to introduce.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida for his kind comments. It is probably true that problems connected with the aged are coming to the fore in Florida more than in any other State. I know that in my own State of Michigan many of our people, in later life, when they reach retirement age, seek the climate of Florida, and possibly also of California and the Southwest, because cold weather is not the most pleasant climate for aging people.

At the same time, many problems arise. The studies I have mentioned, as the distinguished Senator from Florida well knows, are directed toward the solution of those problems. Some communities in Florida are inhabited by elderly people of practically about the same age. That fact itself brings about certain abnormal situations. The purpose of establishing the commission is to study the various problems with which aged people are confronted, and with which the communities in which they live are also confronted. I believe what we advocate is a step in the right direction. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida for being a cosponsor of the bill. I sincerely hope that we will be able to get early action on the proposed legislation.

The Government of the United States, Mr. President, must delay no longer in giving its sanction and support for the collection of all available evidence. Even the term aged needs a redfinition, so that we may better apply ourselves to the task. It is one of the most important problems we face as a Nation. It should command the use of every facility for advancement, to the end that we may help in providing the remedies concurrently with our other improvements.

Let us explore this social phenomenon and try to learn how it will manifest itself in the years to come. One of the principal riddles of the subject is how it will affect the economy of the Nation. The project I urge should be able to draw from our private industries and those concerned with their survival some of the clues which may very well avert cumulative destructive trends.

Interest has manifested itself in many places and will increase. I share the concern of those who have devoted long hours of study to the subject that the very diffusion of these efforts may fail to achieve full application unless that which is already known is more broadly applied.

Much can be accomplished if a central collection point or repository is established. Several agencies of the Government have already amassed much information and have given leadership to the many matters related to this subject. It may very well be that such an approach as that which I propose can correlate these efforts.

I am sure that there is an obligation on the part of our Government to address itself to all characteristics of this social and economic phenomenon. In whatever we discover to be needed, I am sure that it will be the objective of all of us to avoid paternalism so that the dignity of the individual shall be maintained in any future pattern. We cannot, in good conscience, ignore these trends, nor can we pretend they do not exist. Our civilization was brought about by courageous men and women willing to recognize the duties of community living and eager to make it possible for all to have a chance for happiness to the end of their days.

Mr. President, from our institutions of higher learning, our industries, our trade and professional associations, our labor organizations, our learned societies and from any and all groups sharing the common burden of shaping the future of our country, we should recruit assistance. I propose that the Congress establish a commission to tackle this job.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the junior Senator from

Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill proposing establishment of a United States Commission on the Aging and Aged. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this measure be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

Mr. President, I wish to thank the many colleagues who have joined with me in the introduction of this bill. They have joined without reservation, with the exception of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who had a question regarding one provision of the bill concerning the powers of the Commission with reference to calling witnesses. I might state for the benefit of my colleagues that the bill is patterned after the bill which created the so-called Hoover Commission. I have no particular pride in any of the sections, but I assume that the committee which will have jurisdiction of the proposed legislation will give consideration to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 693) for the establishment of the United States Commission on the Aging and Aged, introduced by Mr. POTTER (for himself and other Senators) was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. The Congress recognizes that an increasingly large proportion of our population consists of persons past middle age. It is the sense of the Congress that the implications of this fact require further study and investigation from the standpoint of the national economy and the general welfare. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress, in recognition of this fact, to assist in defining the problems of the aging and aged segment of the population, and in finding solutions therefor, by providing for an immediate study leading to recommendations for integrated action particularly with respect to:

(a) Employment and employability,
(b) Income maintenance,
(c) Health and physical care,
(d) Housing, living arrangements, and family relationship, and
(e) Effective use of leisure time.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON THE AGING AND AGED

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the policy set forth in section 1 of this act, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the United States Commission on the Aging and Aged (in this act referred to as the "Commission").

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18, of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) Number and appointment: The Commission shall be composed of 10 members as follows:

(1) Six appointed by the President of the United States, 3 from the executive branch of the Government and 3 from private life;

(2) Two appointed by the President of the Senate from the Senate; and

(3) Two appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the House of Representatives.

(b) Vacancies: Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. The Commission shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 5. Six members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) Members of Congress: Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members from the executive branch: The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) Members from private life: The members from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. (a) Investigation: The Commission shall study, investigate, analyze, and assess existing knowledge and programs related to the problems of the aging and the aged in this country, in accordance with the policy set forth in section 1 of this act, with a view to determining what steps can be taken to provide a better integration of this group in the social and economic life of the Nation. In carrying out its functions, the Commission shall solicit the cooperation and help of the various professional, business, and labor groups, as well as all other groups which are concerned with the problem, for the purpose of obtaining their views, experience, and assistance in providing direction for future planning and such legislative action as may be necessary. The Commission shall further make full use of the information, studies, and experience of the various agencies of the Government which have considered various aspects of the problem.

(b) Report: The Commission shall submit an interim report of its activities and the results of its studies to the Congress not later than December 31, 1955, and the Commission may submit such earlier interim reports as it deems advisable. The final report of the Commission may propose such legislative and administrative actions as in its judgment are necessary to carry out its recommendations. The Commission shall submit its final report not later than May 31, 1956. The Commission shall cease to exist 30 days after the submission of its final report.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) Hearings and sessions: The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192–194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) Obtaining official data: The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

(c) Other data: The Commission shall cooperate with State and local bodies, and other public and private bodies, to obtain information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act.

THE FORMOSA SITUATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it goes without saying that this body will cooperate unreservedly with the President in any matter vital to the security and welfare of the Nation. Perhaps that is what is involved in the joint resolution which has been introduced today by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] for himself and other Senators. If so, then the President can rest assured that he shall have the full support of the Senate.

I must say, however, that at this point I am concerned by the manner in which this matter has been presented to the

Senate. At the beginning of a new week, after a series of hurried conferences, leaks, and rumors, the Senate is confronted with a highly unusual resolution, with the implication that immediate action is essential.

If there is an impending crisis, why did not the President come in person to present the facts to the Congress? Why was the Senate not advised sooner? Crises in foreign relations are not like typhoons in the Formosan Straits. They do not arise overnight. They give full warning, or should give it, through the numerous channels of information available to the executive branch—provided, of course, that those channels are functioning properly.

The situation in the vicinity of Formosa is not one which lends itself to improvisation. We have slipped into a difficult position there. It will grow more difficult unless this Government acts with a high degree of responsibility.

This resolution comes to us on the heels of the proposed treaty of mutual defense with the Republic of China. Since early in January, the Foreign Relations Committee has had that treaty under consideration. As the Senate knows, both the treaty and the resolution cover substantially the same ground. Both deal with the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores in roughly comparable terms.

I do not understand, therefore, precisely why the President has seen fit to seek passage by Congress of the joint resolution which has been introduced today. If it were purely a matter of urgency, he could have asked the Senate to handle the treaty in that fashion. The fact is that members of the Foreign Relations Committee were advised by the executive branch to deal with the treaty in the normal order of business.

I stated at the outset my belief that the Senate would never deny cooperation to the President in any matter affecting the vital interests of the Nation. That belief applies in this case as in any other involving foreign relations.

As a coequal branch of the Government of the United States, however, Congress has a sworn obligation to examine this resolution, as it would any similar resolution, in an independent light. We cannot abdicate our constitutional responsibilites any more than the President can assign his to us.

Before we begin the examination, it seems to me to be of the utmost importance that we bear in mind the historical circumstances surrounding the Formosa situation. Sound policy must be based on these circumstances as seen from the perspective of the vital interests of this Nation.

Prior to World War II, Formosa was a part of the Japanese Empire. That status was generally accepted by the nations of the world, including the United States. Many Chinese, however, continued to regard the island as a part of China which, under duress, their country had been forced to cede to Japan towards the close of the 19th century. China's claim is based on the contention that Formosa had been under the nominal control of Peking for centuries, and on the fact that in the present day most of the inhabitants are of Chinese origin.

It was from Formosa that the Japanese militarists launched some of the most devastating naval and air attacks against our forces in the Pacific during World War II. Our vital interest in Formosa then was obvious; it was to deny the island, insofar as it was in our power to do so, to any group or nation which would use it for aggressive purposes in the western Pacific. That vital interest explains the American signature to the Cairo Declaration of 1943. Under the terms of the agreement, the return of Formosa and the Pescadores to the Republic of China was pledged by the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of Great Britain and the Generalissimo of China. The Cairo Declaration was a pledge, not a treaty. It did not, under international law, transfer title of the islands to China. They remained technically under the sovereignty of Japan, at least until the end of World War II.

We did not have at the time of the Cairo Declaration any interest in the acquisition of Formosa for ourselves. As a matter of fact, once American sea and air power had made possible the occupation of the island by the Chinese Nationalist Government at the end of World War II, we immediately reduced our military commitment in that area. In the hands of the Republic of China, Formosa no longer constituted a threat of aggression to us from the Far East. Our vital interest was secured, pending a peace treaty with Japan.

I shall not review at this time the tragic events which completely unhinged the postwar situation in the Far East. It is sufficient to point out only that China was torn asunder by revolution and by the intrusion of aggressive communism from northern Asia. In the incredible chaos that accompanied those developments, the only alternative to throwing ourselves into the flames of war on the Asian mainland was to await a clarification of the situation.

The status of Formosa and our policies with respect to it did not change until international communism moved out of its Russian and Chinese orbit in Asia and fired the conflict in Korea. Largely as a result of our initiative, the United States was immediately designated by the United Nations to command a collective military action to turn back the Communist aggression.

As a corollary of that United Nations action and the responsibilities which we assumed in connection with it, our commitment in Formosa deepened. The President, the Secretary of State, and the President's military commanders found it necessary to neutralize the situation in the vicinity of Formosa if the conflict in Korea was not to flare into a general war in the Far East. Our interest in Formosa, however, remained the same. We had no interest in acquiring Formosa for ourselves but only in preventing it from falling into the hands of the Communist aggressors. We supplied the Chinese Nationalist Government on Formosa with military and economic aid, while the 7th Fleet was ordered to patrol the straits. They prevented an attack on the island, and brought to an end the sporadic and futile air raids against the Chinese coastal cities.

We had to proceed in these circumstances to negotiate a peace treaty with Japan. By the terms of that treaty, Japan renounced all claims to Formosa. We and the other nations involved insisted on that renunciation as a safeguard against renewal of aggression from that source. The treaty, however, left indeterminate the legal status of the island, pending a clarification of the situation in the Far East. In actuality, Formosa remained under the control of the Nationalist Government of China.

The decision to neutralize the Formosan Straits in 1950 involved great risks. President Truman accepted those risks courageously as a part of the responsibility of his office. As events subsequently showed, he had made the proper decision. Not a single American was lost in combat in the Formosan area. Yet, the island was kept out of the hands of the Communists. The position of the Nationalist Government of China grew stronger, not weaker, as a result of it. The interests of this country, the United Nations, and world peace were served by the decision. When the Chinese people are free to understand the facts, I believe they will also realize that it served their long-range interests as well.

There may yet be a way to avoid the drift toward the abyss in the Far East. We will not avoid it, however, unless the futility and the danger to this country of loud words and little actions is now fully understood. We will not avoid it unless we keep before us the nature of our real national interests in the Formosan region.

Armed Forces of the United States are in that region for one purpose. They are there, or should be there, only to prevent Formosa and the Pescadores from falling into the hands of forces of Communist aggression which might ultimately be aimed at this country. It is essential that that purpose be understood and adhered to by every combatant, from private to general, and from seaman to admiral, who is involved in any way in the operation. Within that general scope of policy, it may be necessary to make dangerous operational decisions; but only the executive branch has the innumerable facts on which to base those decisions. Hundreds of its employees are engaged in no other function than in collecting and analyzing such facts. The Senate does not have the facts. The House of Representatives does not have them. The American people certainly do not have them. The responsibility for the day-to-day decisions rests with the President and his branch of the Government. Resolutions to the contrary, he cannot share it.

Our national policies with respect to Korea have an international corollary, and it is time to take it into consideration. The depth of our involvement in Formosa has developed in part out of the international action in Korea. It is time to make clear to the Chinese Communists and to other nations with interests in Asia that the Korean and the Formosan problems are inextricably tied together.

If there is to be hope for a stable peace in the Far East, it is essential that there must first be a termination of the incipient threat of large-scale hostilities between the Chinese forces on Formosa and those on the mainland. What is needed in the Formosan vicinity is what has already been achieved in Korea—a cease-fire arranged under the United Nations—and one which I am happy to report was included in the President's message today.

It seems to me urgent, therefore, that the President consider taking the Formosan question immediately to the Security Council. If that body cannot act because some nation may choose to block peace by the exercise of the veto, then the issue perhaps may be carried to the General Assembly. It is not unreasonable to expect that the nations which supported the action against aggression in Korea will recognize the relationship between the Korean and Formosan situations. Nor is it unreasonable to expect that any nation which sincerely desires peace will be unwilling to share the responsibility for maintaining it in the Far East.

If a firm cease-fire can be achieved in the vicinity of Formosa, it might serve as the prelude to a general political solution of the many problems which for a decade have plagued the peoples of Asia and this country with conflict, and the threat of still greater conflict. From our point of view, such a settlement must be based on the following principles, which are, for the most part, traditional and well-tried principles, and can provide the basis for firm and effective action for peace:

First. We make no territorial claims to Formosa, the Pescadores or any adjacent islands currently in dispute.

Second. We affirm the terms of the Japanese Peace Treaty, under which Japan has relinquished all claims to Formosa.

Third. We have one overriding interest with respect to any settlement affecting Formosa: that the island does not become a springboard for aggression in the Western Pacific.

Fourth. The final legal status of Formosa and the Pescadores should be in accord with the freely expressed desires of the inhabitants of the islands.

Mr. President, if I may return to the joint resolution for a moment before concluding my remarks, I wish to say only that I do not believe the Senate should act in haste in this matter. The full implications of the resolution, to say the least, are not clear. Certainly, it ought not to be considered except in conjunction with the pending treaty between this country and the Republic of China.

I am sure that it is not the intent of the President, by his message, to ask Congress to give him in advance our constitutional power to declare war. Yet, such an inference might easily be drawn from it. By the same token, I can hardly believe that he is asking Congress to assume the powers of his office to conduct the foreign relations of this country and to command the Armed Forces.

The Constitution wisely provides for the separate responsibilities of the various branches. Each has the facilities and composition which make possible the discharge of those responsibilities.

As Executive, the President, and the President alone, is equipped to make the operating decisions relative to our foreign relations and our Armed Forces. Conversely, the President cannot declare war. War cannot be delared without inviting the destruction of the Nation until it is evident through Congress that the will of the people of this country is fully mobilized.

I know that the Foreign Relations Committee, under the chairmanship of the distinguished President pro tempore [Mr. GEORGE], will explore fully the constitutional questions, along with other implications in the joint resolution, before the Senate is asked to deal with it. I am also glad to note that the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. RUSSELL] will likewise join in and give us the benefit of his wisdom.

Mr. President, I am looking forward to the meeting of the two committees this afternoon, and I hope that the words which I have spoken today will be given some consideration, because it is my firm belief that we are taking a step which is fraught with grave consequences, that we should know where we are going, and that we should take our time in discussing the joint resolution, and be absolutely sure of the facts before we finally act.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was very pleased to hear the Senator from Montana say that he saw no need for immediate action. Is it not the Senator's understanding that the President, under his constitutional powers, already has the power to meet any emergency or to resist any sudden attack which might constitute an emergency?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is my understanding. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, and I think most, if not all, constitutional authorities would so hold.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am happy to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not trying to leave the implication that the joint resolution may not be justified. That is for the Senate to determine, after consideration, and I think the President is motivated by a desire to have consultation and to preserve the usual comity. However, the point I make is that there is no need for immediate action. Under the circumstances, it seems to me, there is plenty of reason for the Senate to take its time and for giving the country time to understand the significance of the problem, before we vote on the question.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct. All the implications should be considered. I do not think the joint resolution should be rushed to passage today, and I am delighted that there will be consideration of the measure by the two committees acting jointly. However, there can be read into the message many things that are not so limited as they seem to be. I have no doubt that the President's intent is honorable, and that he is determined to achieve a reasonable, sound, and honorable peace; but I think we owe it to ourselves, as representatives of the people, to go into the joint resolution and the message as thoroughly as possible, before we take action.

If I may continue for a moment, I think it is in the national interest to defend and protect Formosa and the Pescadores, and the present Nationalist Government thereof. No nation has title to the Pescadores and Formosa at the present time, because there has been no conveyance of title to that land since the end of the Second World War, at which time the Japanese renounced their claim to that particular territory. So we have as much right now to declare what the future of these islands shall be as do our allies. In our hands collectively lies the final authority to determine what shall be the final disposition of the Pescadores and Formosa; and I think those two areas are interdependent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Montana for his fine remarks, and I think they clarify the situation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I understand that the reason the Senator from Montana says there is no need for immediate action is that the President already has a right to act if he deems it necessary to do so. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The President does have such authority under the Constitution, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the Nation. Furthermore, we have had before us, as the President points out in his message of today, a treaty of mutual security between the United States and the Republic of China. We have been informed there is no hurry to have the treaty ratified. So, Mr. President, if there is no hurry to have action taken on the treaty, why is there such a hurry to have action taken on the joint resolution, which in effect covers somewhat the same areas?

However, it occurs to me that those who read the message will have raised in their minds some questions as to exactly what is meant; and I believe we should explore this matter fully, and should know what we are doing.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am satisfied that the Senator from Montana agrees with me that it is nice of the President to keep us informed concerning these matters and, if possible, to let us know about similar matters in the future. Certainly we should know all the facts, when we pass upon a question of this kind.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. In my opinion, the President is to be congratulated and thanked for taking us into his trust in the case of this particular matter, and I say that very seriously. On the other hand, I believe we must also keep in mind that there is a separation of authority as between the execu-

tive and the legislative branches of our Government, and that under the Constitution there are certain elements of responsibility which are his, first of all, because he is President; and, second, because, as President, he is Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I think the action of the President of the United States, in sending to the Congress the message to which reference has been made—and I hold the message in my hand, and I also have before me a copy of the joint resolution regarding the Formosa matter, which is to be considered by the Congress—is the most encouraging thing which has happened in my approximately 11 years in the United States Senate. I compliment and congratulate the President of the United States. He is doing exactly what many of us have been urging for many, many years that a President do, namely, share the responsibility for wars with the Congress, which, under the Constitution, has the right to declare war. I think it is a splendid thing. I congratulate the President, and I hope this action on his part will establish a pattern which all future Presidents will follow.

The President has reached the conclusion that the situation in the Formosan area is serious. Having reached that conclusion, he has now requested the Congress for its advice and consent, if you please, under the authority reposed in Congress by the Constitution.

However, I think the Congress should take sufficient time—and I do not mean that any delaying tactics should be engaged in—to check into the entire matter. That should be done by both the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and both branches of the Congress. Certainly it is important that they take a reasonable length of time to do so.

I believe we are entitled to have before us the facts upon which the President based his decision to send the message to Congress. I do not believe we should be hurried into taking action on this matter. I hasten to state that I do not mean there should be a delay of a week, 10 days, or 2 weeks. Instead, I am thinking in terms of a few days. It seems to me it is important that we be given a few days to acquaint ourselves with the situation and to see whether we can absorb as many of the facts regarding the circumstances and conditions as the President did in arriving at the decision to send the message to the Congress, because he based his decision upon certain facts and circumstances, and we should be given sufficient time to do the same thing.

We ought not to delay. We ought to make this subject the first order of business, but we ought to obtain the facts. I am certain that the President of the United States and the Secretary of State are most desirous that we obtain all the facts. I am sure that they will give to the Congress all the facts and all the information they have. I am confident that they are just as eager as we are that sufficient time be taken to reach a wise decision on this question.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The Senator from Indiana has expressed the hope that this subject will be gone into thoroughly by the joint action of the two committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services. I express to him the belief that, inasmuch as he is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which, with the Committee on Armed Services, will consider this subject jointly this afternoon, and at such other times as may be necessary in order to obtain all the facts, he will insist upon all the facts being obtained, so that when we come to take action on the resolution, or any comparable proposal which may be before the Congress, we will be in possession of the necessary information.

I am glad to hear the Senator make the observation which he has made. I have confidence that he, as one of the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, will endeavor to obtain the necessary information for other Members of the Senate.

Mr. CAPEHART. I feel that our case would be much stronger, and there would be a greater degree of unity and cooperation as between the Congress and the American people if we were to take a reasonable length of time to obtain the facts. Then we should be acting upon the basis of facts, rather than merely because the President of the United States sent a message to Congress upon which we acted within an hour or two. If we take the time to obtain the facts, then we can say, "Mr. President, this is what we want you to do." The world and the American people ought to be 100-percent satisfied that we are doing the right thing, and the thing which is necessary. If we take the time to obtain the facts, our action will then be based upon facts, and not merely upon 2 or 3 hours of hearings before the 2 committees acting jointly, followed by brief debate in the Senate. If we obtain the facts, we can say to the world, "The President considered this subject carefully. The Secretary of State considered it carefully, and the Congress of the United States did not act within 2 or 3 hours, but considered the subject for several days and obtained all the facts. Upon the basis of the facts the Congress came to the same conclusion as did the President and the Secretary of State."

Mr. CLEMENTS. My observation is made only for the purpose of commending my friend from Indiana and expressing confidence that he will obtain the facts.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am sure that the President of the United States is just as eager to furnish the facts as we are to obtain them. I congratulate the President of the United States for sharing the responsibility with the Congress. If the Congress takes a reasonably sufficient time to study and assimilate the facts, we shall then have inaugurated a new era in United States foreign policy.

I rose to congratulate the President for the way in which he has handled this subject. I hope the Congress will consider it with due deliberation, with a view to obtaining all the facts. I do not advocate any delaying tactics. I ask only for a reasonable length of time in which to obtain and consider the facts. Then when we reach a decision, our decision will be worth something, because it will be based upon facts and not hysteria. We shall not be doing something on the spur of the moment.

OPPOSITION TO CLOSING OF UNITED STATES POST OFFICES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on January 6, the second day of Congress, I submitted Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, which sets forth that it is the sense of the Congress that the Postmaster General should not discontinue any United States post office until the expiration of 60 days after he shall have reported to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and House of Representatives on the necessity and advisability of such action.

I, like many other Senators and Representatives, have been deluged with complaints about the Post Office Department's action in closing many small post offices throughout the country.

On January 14 I sent to the Postmaster General a telegram strongly urging that he postpone action to close a fourth-class post office at White Rock, S. C. This is only one of many complaints I have registered with the Postmaster General about this action. More than 200 citizens in the area of White Rock, S. C., sent to the Postmaster General a petition requesting that this office not be closed. Mr. President, up to now I have been unsuccessful in receiving any consideration from the Post Office Department concerning these complaints.

A few moments ago, in glancing at the news ticker, I read the following statement:

WASHINGTON.—The Post Office Department changed its mind today and decided to keep the Peoli, Ohio, post office open as a favor to Denton "Cy" Young, one of baseball's all-time pitching greats.

Originally the Department was going to shut down the tiny post office as a money-losing proposition and establish a star route. About 11 families and Young get their mail there.

Young is the 87-year-old ex-Cleveland, Boston, and St. Louis pitcher whose record of 511 major league victories in 23 years still stands. He was understood through friends to be complaining about the closing.

So W. R. Fudge, the Post Office's regional operations manager in Cincinnati, wrote to Representative Bow, Republican, of Ohio, Young's Congressman: "In view of your interest and in view of the large amount of mail that Mr. Cy Young receives through the post office, no further action will be taken at this time."

Commented Bow: "This is the kind of thing that makes America great."

Peoli, with a population of 30, is in Tuscarawas County, in the middle belt of Ohio on the eastern side.

Mr. President, I certainly have no argument over the fact that "Cy" Young was a great baseball player. I have no argument over the fact that the Post Office Department has decided not to close this office, but to keep it as a monument to the great "Cy" Young. But, Mr. President, the Postmaster General has

said heretofore that he had to close these offices in order to save money, because most of them were losing money. I hope this announcement means a change of mind by the Post Office Department, and that hereafter the Postmaster General will give serious consideration to my requests that he not close offices in my State.

We have many great people in South Carolina, but I am not here requesting that the Government establish monuments to greatness in my State. Rather, my request is that serious consideration be given to maintaining the present offices because of necessity.

To name only a few, I have reference to Wateree, White Rock, Ballantine, and Lykesland, S. C.; and in my State there are many others in connection with which the Postmaster General is already aware of my interest and the interest of the people of South Carolina.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS AND COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO SUBMIT REPORT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two committees which were authorized to meet jointly this afternoon during the session of the Senate, namely, the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, be authorized to file a joint report at any time the Senate is in recess or in adjournment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. CLEMENTS. I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, January 26, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate January 24, 1955:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Charles C. Finucane, of the State of Washington, to be Under Secretary of the Army, vice John Slezak, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, January 24, 1955:

DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

James Clement Dunn, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Brazil.

Henry A. Byroade, of Indiana, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Egypt.

John L. Tappin, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United Kingdom of Libya.

James C. H. Bonbright, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

George V. Allen, of North Carolina, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

Loy W. Henderson, of Colorado, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

David W. Kendall, of Michigan, to be General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Ervin L. Peterson, of Oregon, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

James A. McConnell, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons for appointment to the titles indicated:

To be Foreign Service officers of class 2, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Belton O'Neal Bryan, of South Carolina.
J. Robert Fluker, of Kansas.
Harold G. Kissick, of Maryland.
Leonard H. Price, of Virginia.
Louis F. Thompson, of Indiana.

To be Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

James S. Beddie, of Maryland.
William L. Hamilton, Jr., of Maryland.
Charles N. Manning, of Virginia.
Norman M. Pearson, of Maryland.
Charles F. Pick, Jr., of Virginia.
George M. Pollard, of Virginia.
Joseph Rosa, of Wisconsin.
Ancel N. Taylor, of Idaho.

To be Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

William E. Beauchamp, Jr., of California.
Robert L. Brown, of New Jersey.
Darwin J. DeGolia, of Maryland.
Paul W. Deibel, of Ohio.
Miss Selma G. Freedman, of the District of Columbia.
John K. Havemeyer, of Illinois.
T. Greig Henderson, of the District of Columbia.
John J. Janke, of Ohio.
Miss Elizabeth Jorzick, of the District of Columbia.
Northrop H. Kirk, of California.
Duncan A. D. Mackay, of New Jersey.
John B. Penfold, of Missouri.
Richard B. Peters, of Oklahoma.
Hilding A. Peterson, of Minnesota.
James A. Ramsey, of Massachusetts.
Robert L. Redding, of Florida.
Miss Genevieve F. Rifley, of Nebraska.
Melvin E. Sinn, of Virginia.
Horace L. Talley, of Virginia.
Niemann A. Terry, Jr., of South Carolina.
John C. Thornburg, of Maryland.
Christopher Van Hollen, of the District of Columbia.
Miss A. Dorothea Wool, of Maryland.

To be Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Miss Alma M. Armstrong, of Maine.
Howard J. Ashford, Jr., of Colorado.
James H. Ashida, of Washington.
Herbert Corkran, Jr., of Virginia.
Miss Mary G. Crain, of Maryland.
Miss Lois M. Day, of Ohio.
Miss Hazel C. Dougherty, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Eleanor Ebert, of Pennsylvania.
Arne T. Fliflet, of South Carolina.
Miss Helen F. Foose, of California.
Miss Anna G. Foster, of Texas.
Joseph R. Jacyno, of Massachusetts.
Lawrence J. Kennon, of California.
Mrs. Elvira P. Martin, of Connecticut.
Miss Annee W. Meriam, of Massachusetts.
George C. Mitchell, of Nebraska.
Miss Charlotte M. Morehouse, of Virginia.
Peter J. Raineri, of New York.
Clyde F. Roberts, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Miss Harriet C. Thurgood, of Florida.

To be Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Richard W. Boehm, of New York.
Richard J. Brynildsen, of California.
Miss Pamela F. Craig, of Pennsylvania.
Daniel H. Daniels, of Virginia.
John R. Davis, Jr., of California.
Donald B. Easum, of Wisconsin.
Louis P. Goelz III, of Pennsylvania.
Lewis D. Junior, of Missouri.
Richard G. Long, of Illinois.
Charles N. Rassias, of Massachusetts.
William F. Ryan, of New York.
Miss Frances A. Usenik, of Minnesota.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

James A. McConnell, of New York, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Ervin L. Peterson, of Oregon, to be a member of the board of directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION DIRECTOR

Joseph F. Finnegan, of New York, to be Federal Mediation and Conciliation Director.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Walter B. Heisel, of Alaska, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 31, with headquarters at Juneau, Alaska.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 24, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee for this new day, affording and challenging us with many opportunities to serve our generation and minister to the needs of humanity.

Grant that we may not be recreant to any duty or afraid to raise our voices and take our stand on the side of those programs of legislation which are just and righteous.

Show us how we may have a large and vital part in helping our beloved country to be true to its highest potential and its God-ordained destiny.

We beseech Thee that in our hopes and longings to build the way of amity and comity among all mankind, we may see how imperative it is to remove the roadblocks of pride and prejudice of selfishness and personal aggrandizement.

Inspire us with a greater loyalty to the principle of reverence for the sanctity and worth of human personality and human dignity.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 20, 1955, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 3. Concurrent resolution favoring temporary permission for parking on square 723 of the Capitol grounds.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on tomorrow to consider a report from the Committee on Rules as provided in clause 21, rule XI, except that the provision requiring a two-thirds vote to consider said reports is hereby waived.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may sit while the House is in session today, and that we may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

SAFEGUARDING THE SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 76)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The most important objective of our Nation's foreign policy is to safeguard the security of the United States by establishing and preserving a just and honorable peace. In the Western Pacific, a situation is developing in the Formosa Straits that seriously imperils the peace and our security.

Since the end of Japanese hostilities in 1945, Formosa and the Pescadores have been in the friendly hands of our loyal ally, the Republic of China. We have recognized that it was important that these islands should remain in friendly hands. In unfriendly hands Formosa and the Pescadores would seriously dislocate the existing, even if unstable, balance of morale, economic, and military forces upon which the peace of the Pacific depends. It would create a breach in the island chain of the western Pacific that constitutes, for the United States and other free nations, the geographical backbone of their security structure in that ocean. In addition, this breach would interrupt north-south communications between other important elements of that barrier, and damage the economic life of countries friendly to us.

The United States and the friendly government of the Republic of China, and indeed all the free nations, have a common interest that Formosa and the Pescadores should not fall into the control of aggressive Communist forces.

Influenced by such considerations, our Government was prompt, when the Communists committed armed aggression in Korea in June 1950, to direct our 7th Fleet to defend Formosa from possible invasion from the Communist mainland.

These considerations are still valid. The 7th Fleet continues under Presidential directive to carry out that defensive mission. We also provide military and economic support to the Chinese Nationalist Government and we cooperate in every proper and feasible way with that Government in order to promote its security and stability. All of these military and related activities will be continued.

In addition, there was signed last December a mutual defense treaty between this Government and the Republic of China covering Formosa and the neighboring Pescadores. It is a treaty of purely defensive character. That treaty is now before the Senate of the United States.

Meanwhile Communist China has pursued a series of provocative political and military actions, establishing a pattern of aggressive purpose. That purpose, they proclaim, is the conquest of Formosa.

In September 1954 the Chinese Communists opened up heavy artillery fire upon Quemoy Island, one of the natural approaches to Formosa, which had for several years been under the uncontested control of the Republic of China. Then came air attacks of mounting intensity against other Free China islands, notably those in the vicinity of the Tachen group to the north of Formosa. One small island (Ichiang) was seized last week by air and amphibious operations after a gallant few fought bravely for days against overwhelming odds. There have been recent heavy air attacks and artillery fire against the main Tachen Islands themselves.

The Chinese Communists themselves assert that these attacks are a prelude to the conquest of Formosa. For example, after the fall of Ichiang, the Peiping radio said that it showed a "determined will to fight for the liberation of Taiwan [Formosa]. Our people will use all their strength to fulfill that task."

Clearly, this existing and developing situation poses a serious danger to the security of our country and of the entire Pacific area and, indeed, to the peace of the world. We believe that the situation is one for appropriate action of the United Nations under its charter, for the purpose of ending the present hostilities in that area. We would welcome assumption of such jurisdiction by that body.

Meanwhile, the situation has become sufficiently critical to impel me, without awaiting action by the United Nations, to ask the Congress to participate now, by specific resolution, in measures designed to improve the prospects for peace. These measures would contemplate the use of the Armed Forces of the United States if necessary to assure the security of Formosa and the Pescadores.

The actions that the United States must be ready to undertake are of various kinds. For example, we must be ready to assist the Republic of China to redeploy and consolidate its forces if it should so desire. Some of these forces are scattered throughout the smaller offshore islands as a result of historical rather than military reasons directly related to defending Formosa. Because of the air situation in the area, withdrawals for the purpose of redeployment of Chinese Nationalist forces would be impractical without assistance of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Moreover, we must be alert to any concentration or employment of Chinese Communist forces obviously undertaken to facilitate attack upon Formosa, and be prepared to take appropriate military action.

I do not suggest that the United States enlarge its defensive obligations beyond Formosa and the Pescadores as provided by the treaty now awaiting ratification. But unhappily, the danger of armed attack directed against that area compels us to take into account closely related localities and actions which, under current conditions, might determine the failure or the success of such an attack. The authority that may be accorded by the Congress would be used only in situations which are recognizable as parts of, or definite preliminaries to, an attack against the main positions of Formosa and the Pescadores.

Authority for some of the actions which might be required would be inherent in the authority of the Commander in Chief. Until Congress can act I would not hesitate, so far as my constitutional powers extend, to take whatever emergency action might be forced upon us in order to protect the rights and security of the United States.

However, a suitable congressional resolution would clearly and publicly establish the authority of the President as Commander in Chief to employ the Armed Forces of this Nation promptly and effectively for the purposes indicated if in his judgment it became necessary. It would make clear the unified and serious intentions of our Government, our Congress, and our people. Thus it will reduce the possibility that the Chinese Communists, misjudging our firm purpose and national unity, might be disposed to challenge the position of the United States, and precipitate a major crisis which even they would neither anticipate nor desire.

In the interest of peace, therefore, the United States must remove any doubt regarding our readiness to fight, if necessary, to preserve the vital stake of the free world in a free Formosa, and to engage in whatever operations may be required to carry out that purpose.

To make this plain requires not only Presidential action but also congressional action. In a situation such as now confronts us, and under modern conditions of warfare, it would not be prudent to await the emergency before coming to the Congress. Then it might be too

late. Already the warning signals are flying.

I believe that the threatening aspects of the present situation, if resolutely faced, may be temporary in character. Consequently, I recommend that the resolution expire as soon as the President is able to report to the Congress that the peace and security of the area are reasonably assured by international conditions, resulting from United Nations action or otherwise.

Again I say that we would welcome action by the United Nations which might, in fact, bring an end to the active hostilities in the area. This critical situation has been created by the choice of the Chinese Communists, not by us. Their offensive military intent has been flaunted to the whole world by words and by deeds. Just as they created the situation, so they can end it if they so choose.

What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy. Consequently, my recommendations do not call for an increase in the Armed Forces of the United States or any acceleration in military procurement or levels of defense production. If any unforeseen emergency arises requiring any change, I will communicate with the Congress. I hope, however, that the effect of an appropriate congressional resolution will be to calm the situation rather than to create further conflict.

One final point. The action I request is, of course, no substitute for the treaty with the Republic of China which we have signed and which I have transmitted to the Senate. Indeed, present circumstances make it more than ever important that this basic agreement should be promptly brought into force, as a solemn evidence of our determination to stand fast in the agreed treaty area and to thwart all attacks directed against it. If delay should make us appear indecisive in this basic report, the pressures and dangers would surely mount.

Our purpose is peace. That cause will be served if, with your help, we demonstrate our unity and our determination. In all that we do we shall remain faithful to our obligations as a member of the United Nations to be ready to settle our international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

For the reasons outlined in this message, I respectfully request that the Congress take appropriate action to carry out the recommendations contained herein.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 24, 1955.*

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2091. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that, pursuant to the authority granted him on Thursday, January 20, 1955, he did on January 21, 1955, sign the following enrolled bill of the House:

H. R. 2091. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

GROUND-BREAKING CEREMONIES FOR NEW SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., January 24, 1955.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: At 11 a. m. on Wednesday, January 26, ground-breaking ceremonies for the New Senate Office Building will be held at the site, First Street between B and C Streets NE. The Senate Office Building Commission extends to you and the membership and officials of the House of Representatives a cordial invitation to join with us and the membership of the United States Senate at this ceremony.

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. PURTELL,
Chairman,
Senate Office Building Commision.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next, following the regular business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 45 minutes tomorrow, following the regular business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. BURLESON asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next, following any special orders heretofore granted.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield back the time granted me under a special order for today and that I may address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next, following any special orders heretofore entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

THIRTY-SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on this, the 37th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence, it is my privilege to bring to the minds of my colleagues here in the House of Representatives and to the American people the struggle and the suffering of this brave group of people. For some years past even to the present time, they have been captive souls of the totalitarian hordes of the Soviet Union, a fate not chosen but forced upon them by the brute will of the masters of the Kremlin.

The complete story of what the Ukrainians have been subjected to is not likely ever to be known. Purges, famines, and Siberian exile orders for the past 35 years have taken their toll. Yet, by the very fact that the Soviets have resorted to such measures, we are convinced that the love of freedom and of justice burns in the hearts of these people and sparks their actions and their attitudes. They are our allies, in spirit if not in fact, and we, who now hold high the torch of liberty, must stop at nothing in our efforts to see that the Ukraine regains its place among the free nations of the world.

To those who say that the Ukraine holds a seat in the United Nations and allies itself with the U. S. S. R. in every test of strength, it is necessary to point out that the Soviet Union pressured the United Nations into admitting the Ukraine as an independent state, although the bare facts of history blatantly show that the Ukraine has been a puppet state of the Soviet Union since 1920, and is one of the "republics" of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, all of which are directly under the thumb of Moscow. The Ukrainian representatives in the United Nations are lesser ambassadors of Malenkov and no more represent the people of the Ukraine than they do the people of the United States.

Our Ukrainian friends bitterly resent and have persistently fought the domination to which they have been subjected. Their valiant resistance to their oppressors is well known and serves as a symbol to us of the necessity for continuing our own resistance to the Communist menace and for furthering the cause of the liberation of all the nations behind the Iron Curtain.

UNITED STATES GOAL—LIBERATION OF ALL CAPTIVE PEOPLES

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, peaceful coexistence with communism is impossible until Red imperialism purges itself of the aggressions it has committed against humanity and liberates all the enslaved nations within the Communist empire.

As the leader of the free world, and as the one last hope of oppressed peoples everywhere, the United States must reaffirm its stand on this anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day.

On January 22, 1918, in line with the principle of self-determination, the Ukrainian people proclaimed their independence.

In 1920, after fierce resistance, they were physically conquered by the Communist invaders.

The Ukrainians, who are not Russians, have never surrendered their legitimate claims for independence.

The very fact that the Moscow Communists demanded and secured membership in the United Nations for the sovereign Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, theoretically separate from Russia itself, was an implied admission of Ukrainia's case for recognition, even though Moscow did not so intend it.

Recent moves on the world's diplomatic front have aroused concern that the United States is beginning to shift its position, and conceal its gradual abandonment of moral principle in favor of expediency, to hush-hush its original support of captive peoples, and slide over toward a so-called practical program of coexistence with communism.

Similar to the way in which it apparently wrote off 140,000 American casualties in Korea, and is apparently passing the buck on the fate of hundreds of Americans still held captive by Russian and Chinese Communists to a United Nations which seems only capable of making concessions in the name of an illusory peace.

Ukrainian Independence Day reminds Americans, if not some architects of their foreign policy, that the moral values of courage and honor are indispensable if we are to maintain faith in ourselves and in those who look to the United States for help in winning their independence.

LIBRARY SERVICES BILL

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, today 21 Members of the House, representing both sides of the aisle, are introducing identical bills to remedy the current serious deficiencies in public library service to our rural areas.

For my part, I am sponsoring this bill because I feel that it is essential to the educational program of the Nation. Public libraries have been long recognized as a necessary part of our educational facilities, but they have lagged far below their potentialities despite the efforts of States and local communities.

Education does not stop with formal schooling. It must meet the rapidly changing needs of the times, in business, in industry, and in cultural developments. The public library, an agency serving all ages, all classes, and all creeds, is particularly fitted to perform this function.

Unfortunately, according to an article by Benjamin Fine which appeared in the New York Times on June 18, 1953, and I quote:

> The public libraries of the United States are in a deplorable condition. Most of the 7,500 separate library systems of the country are substandard with insufficient reading material and inadequate staff the general rule. More than 53 million people do not have easy access to books, while 24 million have no public library service of any kind.

The preceding figure is actually much larger because the New York Times study covered only 40 of the 48 States.

The legislation which is being proposed today will stimulate the States to take the steps necessary in attaining the goal of adequate public library services needed to insure that our Nation has the maximum number of educated citizens capable of making sound judgments and taking wise actions on the problems facing the United States and the world today.

The library services bill authorizes an appropriation of $7,500,000 a year for a 5-year period on a matching basis. Each State would receive an original allotment of $40,000, plus additional funds based on the ratio of its rural population to the total rural population of the United States. The State library agency has control over the formulation and operation of the plan under which these funds would be used. There are no Federal controls except the routine ones necessary for safeguarding Federal money.

Eighteen national organizations representing education, farm, labor, civic, and veteran groups are supporting this legislation. These organizations believe that library facilities aid people to do a better job, to learn new skills, and to understand current problems.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, how wise it is to come to the Congress, in accordance with the Constitution, for the support the President needs, to keep the peace.

How different from the action of the Truman administration which sent us to war first and told the Congress about it some hours later.

As President Eisenhower said:

> It would not be prudent to await the emergency before coming to the Congress. Then it might be too late.

We have behind us the lesson of Truman-Acheson failure to face up to the threatening aspects of the North Korean-Chinese situation until arrogant invasion forced decision upon our temporizing leaders in the middle of the night.

When the startling news of our unexpected injection into the Korean war was gently broken to a nearly empty House Chamber—having been held until most Members were at lunch—I said to the Member who broke the sudden news: "I just hope you are not moving in with too little, too late." History shows we were utterly unprepared, that our initial entry with too little led to the tragic casualty lists which were the price of diplomatic misjudgment.

History will also record that we acted too late to prevent that war and with too little to end it during those early critical months when our commanders waited for the support and for the orders which never came.

Had the kind of warning to the Communists which Eisenhower issued been given by Truman to the Communists in 1949 and 1950, we probably could have avoided the tragedy of the Korean war.

Today's message gives us a better chance to avoid war—and equally to avoid being caught unprepared—in the Asian area. Also, the best way to unite the American people in their own defense is to take them and their Congress into the administration's confidence—and not to spring things on them in the middle of the night.

PAYMENT OF TRAVELING COSTS TO VISIT PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to authorize payment of the travel costs incurred by relatives of the men who are prisoners of the Chinese Communists, if it really works out that the Communists are serious and that visits will be permitted. To my surprise, this proposal has been misunderstood and even the subject of some controversy. A brief clarifying statement seems to be in order.

In the first place, it would be entirely inappropriate for any of us here in Congress to urge these unfortunate men and women to decide one way or the other, whether they go or stay. That was not my intention.

In the second place, it would be highly inappropriate for us to interfere with whatever negotiations or policy determinations the executive branch may ultimately undertake. I had no thought of forcing the hand of the President or his advisers.

But, Mr. Speaker, this small matter of defraying the expense, if and when such travel is undertaken, does fall squarely within our province as the appropriating authority for our Government. I felt—and I still feel with all my heart—that we should hasten to remove any question of expense from the other and broader considerations that confront us.

One of these men, unjustly imprisoned in a hostile foreign land as a result of strategy and policy that he had no hand in formulating, would simply be unable to understand even a suggestion that his Government might deprive him of an opportunity—if it turns out to be that—to receive a visit from his family and loved ones. We must not forget we are dealing with individual human beings, loyal and devoted citizens whose service to our country has put them in a terrible position.

I cannot conceive of trifling with their feelings and the possibility, remote though it may be, of improving their situation before we win their ultimate release. That alone would be enough to merit swift action in their behalf.

But beyond there is something more important. This is an obvious propaganda device, cleverly pitched at us by Chou En Lai. The world is watching our reaction. And if the United States is to turn the offer down, let it be done in

the considered terms of great policy and not in any sense through niggling quibbles over details.

It is my hope that we will take this offer calmly in our stride, demonstrating that we are absolutely sure of ourselves and sure of our ground all the way through. If, as is conceivable, the Chinese Reds are really indulging a cruel and heartless bit of trickery at the expense of the feelings of these unfortunate people, let the consequences rest squarely on their heads—and not on ours because we held back in apprehension. Least of all, can we afford further talk, such as has been reported in the press, that the wives and mothers who are suddenly faced with this surprising suggestion must turn it aside because they have no funds to make the trip. What could be more damning and a more entirely wrong picture of our good, rich, and warmhearted Nation?

ATOMIC TESTS AT THE NEVADA TEST SITE

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, Senator ANDERSON, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and I have today mailed to each Member of Congress a letter inviting them to attend the spring series of atomic tests to be conducted at the Nevada test site.

I sincerely hope that every Member who possibly can, will arrange to attend one of these test operations. Atomic weapons are the keystone of our defense against militant communism, and the better informed Members of Congress are, concerning this vital weapon, the better we all will be equipped to deal effectively with the problems of defense and foreign relations which now press so urgently upon us.

The trip will require approximately 5 days. This may seem like a rather long period to be absent from Washington. However, the requirements of public safety, which are a paramount concern of the Atomic Energy Commission, require that weather conditions be ideal for a test before a shot can be fired. I am sure that every Member of Congress will wholeheartedly support this prudent approach on the part of the Atomic Energy Commission. Since one cannot predict ahead of time the precise day on which a test can be fired the Commission has suggested that the Members plan a 5-day visit. I can assure you that the 5 days will not be wasted. In addition to observing a test shot the Members will be given a nontechnical briefing concerning the test program and the method of conducting tests, and will be given an opportunity to observe the results of previous tests. If conditions permit, the Members will also have an opportunity to see firsthand the results of the test which they observe.

The Members will be transported to and from the test site in pressurized-cabin aircraft of the Military Air Transport Command, a service whose record for safe and comfortable flying is second to none in the world. Adequate facilities will be provided for any ladies in the House who would like to go. Several Congresswomen attended the tests in 1953 and they have all reported to me that they found the trip to be tremendously worthwhile in carrying out their official responsibilities as Members of Congress, and that, in addition, the trip was a most pleasant and enjoyable one.

In closing I should like to recall the old Chinese proverb, "One look is worth a thousand words." This proverb is particularly apt as regards atomic weapons for atomic weapons are a force that is so new and so different that they must be seen to be fully comprehended. I, therefore, again urge every Member of Congress who can possibly do so to take this opportunity to personally observe an atomic test.

MRS. HARRIET McCARRAN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a letter received from Mrs. Harriet McCarran, widow of the late Senator Pat McCarran, expressing the thanks of herself and family for recent action taken by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 22, 1955.*

Mr. RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROBERTS: The family of the late Honorable Pat McCarran deeply appreciate the respect shown to his memory on the part of the Members of the House of Representatives. We, the family, will cherish the resolution which the Members of this august body offered in his memory. To each and every person in the House of Representatives we send our sincere thanks and deep appreciation. The resolution will be framed and placed with the many historical documents in the Nevada State Museum, where the other testimonial letters to our beloved husband and father will be preserved.

Sincerely yours,
MRS. HARRIET MCCARRAN AND FAMILY.

TELEVISING AND BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan rise?

Mr. MEADER. I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MEADER. With the 84th Congress now organizing its committees, it seems to me important to have a clear ruling on the authority of committees to disseminate or permit the dissemination of news of their hearings and proceedings.

By way of background, I might say that this question was raised by the present minority leader in the 82d Congress on the 25th of February 1952. At that time the Speaker expressed the opinion that the rules of the House did not now authorize committees to permit radio and television coverage of their public hearings. I should like to propound that same inquiry but ask for a little greater clarification as to just what news coverage is permissible under the rules of the House of committee public hearings; whether news reporters are permitted to be present; whether photographers taking still pictures are permitted to be present; whether motion picture cameras for newsreel purposes with sound are permitted to be present; whether live radio broadcasting or telecasting or recorded radio broadcasting are permissible.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule and also make a statement. Something along the same line was propounded to the present occupant of the chair by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] February 25, 1952.

Rule XI of the House provides that the rules of the House of Representatives shall be the rules of the committees of the House of Representatives so far as applicable. The Chair does not think anyone would contend that the House of Representatives is authorized to televise its proceedings or put them on the radio. The Chair held at that time that this was outside of the rules and also held in response to another inquiry that a committee sitting outside of Washington was under the same rules as a committee inside of Washington, and the Chair held that it was controlled by the same rules.

There is nothing new with reference to this, because the same rules are in effect now in the House of Representatives as they were on February 25, 1952, and until the rules are changed, which would have to come from a resolution reported by the Committee on Rules and adopted by the House changing the rules of the House, the Chair still thinks that it is not in accordance with the rules of the House of Representatives or its committees to televise or broadcast hearings or actions before any committee of the House, and so holds and will hold unless and until the rules of the House are amended.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Perhaps due to my lack of understanding, does the Chair then hold that a regular standing committee of the House cannot authorize broadcasting either by radio or television of its hearings?

The SPEAKER. That is what the Chair held in 1952 and that is what the Chair holds in 1955.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MEADER. Will newsreel cameras be permitted to be present in the committee room during public hearings?

The SPEAKER. The reply is the same. It is the same as television.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SCOTT. Would the Speaker also hold that in the absence of any rule of

the House on this subject committees should be required to prohibit the taking of photographs before, during, or after any committee hearing if the Speaker so directed?

The SPEAKER. That is a question to be decided by the committee. The present occupant of the chair was chairman of a committee at one time. When the photographers came in, the Chair always told them they could take pictures of the committee or anyone in the room they wanted to until the proceedings of the committee began. Then they were asked to retire, and they always did retire.

Mr. SCOTT. Is it a correct statement, then, that the matter of photographs before, during, or after committee hearings is in the discretion of the committee chairman or the duly designated presiding officer?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would hold the photographs could be taken before and after the proceedings, but not during them.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Chair.

"ORDER IS HEAVEN'S FIRST LAW"

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 20 minutes.

May the Chair say that the gentleman from Michigan has upon occasion made reference to the rules of the House and their application and the Chair thinks he intends to do that again now. The Chair thinks his statement will be interesting and very helpful to the Members if they will heed it.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman from Michigan has in times past called the attention of the Members of the House to the decorum and the comity that should exist between the Members of this House when on the floor and he has done it in a very effective and delightful way. I do feel that perhaps the Members present would like to listen to what the gentleman from Michigan says. Because of that I ask that particular attention be given to the gentleman from Michigan at the present time.

Mr. DONDERO. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, nearly two centuries ago a noted author declared that order is heaven's first law. The truth of that statement applies to our own day and generation with ever-increasing force and validity.

When your constituents and mine come to Washington, it is almost certain that they will visit this Capitol Building. Their presence may be observed daily when they occupy the galleries of the House and especially when Congress is in session.

Members who have served here any length of time have heard with chagrin and embarrassment the harsh criticism from the visitors directed at, what appears to them, a lack of reverence, dignity, and respect for this historic Chamber.

Information from officials of the House indicates that hardly a week passes without complaints regarding our habits and our conduct on the floor.

Here in the House of Representatives the people speak and here their voice is heard. This is their forum, established by our forefathers. From them come the noble and distinct character of American institutions.

The very walls of this Chamber echo with the voices of our great and our past. It is rich in the traditions of our Nation. Many whose names adorn the pages of history labored in this room to serve the cause of freedom and self-government. They were the torchbearers of humanity's forward march.

May God help us to preserve their influence and labors by reverence for this notable place and forbid that we should ever be irreverent toward it and the memory of those who made our day possible.

Our position as Members of Congress is one of great responsibility. If a proper attitude and proper conduct toward the position to which we have been elevated is wanting, we deface and impoverish our position in the eyes of those who pass this way.

Infraction of the rules in the game of life brings punishment and penalty. The penalty we pay individually and collectively is the loss of respect, the loss of prestige, the loss of faith and confidence, and a gradual breaking down of self-government by a free people.

This House of Representatives is governed by rules, some as old as the Government itself. They were designed to govern the conduct of Members on this floor and the orderly procedure of our legislative work.

Not one of us here is entirely blameless for breaking the rules of the House. In a thoughtless moment, and unconsciously, many of us have broken the written and long-established code of conduct for this floor. Many of the older Members, knowingly, and many of the newer Members, unknowingly, because of unfamiliarity with the rules, have allowed certain habits to violate the proprieties of this body.

For the benefit of new Members and to remind many of the older Members, including myself, the observations I am about to make are confined solely to the rules governing our conduct on this floor. My remarks are not intended as a scolding of any Member individually or of the House collectively.

I now come to the rules violated daily in this forum. How should a Member address our Presiding Officer? At public gatherings throughout the country it is customary and in good taste to say, "Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen," and so forth. In this Hall such a salutation is improper and a distinct breach of the rule.

In recent years, almost daily, Members, both old and new, have taken their place here in the well of the House and commenced their remarks with "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen." The rule requires a Member to address himself to "Mr. Speaker" or, if the House is in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, to "Mr. Chairman." To add more is a slight upon the Speaker, who represents the House in its organization. When we address the Chair, we address the entire membership of the House.

It is a violation of precedent, and bad form, to conclude an address by adding the words, "I thank you." There is no necessity for any Member to thank anyone. We speak as a matter of right.

Express provision is made for the manner in which a Member may address the House. Rule XIV, clause 1, reads:

> When any Member desires to speak or deliver any matter to the House, he shall rise and respectfully address himself to "Mr. Speaker," and, on being recognized, may address the House from any place on the floor, or from the Clerk's desk.

Committees of the House should not be designated as "The Rules Committee," "the Appropriations Committee," and so forth. The proper way to designate any committee of the House is to say, "The Committee on Rules," "the Committee on Appropriations," "the Committee on Un-American Activities," and so forth.

Another rule violated daily is rule XIV, clause 7, which provides:

> While the Speaker is putting a question or addressing the House no Member shall walk out of or across the hall, nor, when a Member is speaking, pass between him and the Chair.

It has become a custom for Members to walk in front of a Member while he is addressing the House from the lecterns here in the well of the House. Such practices are a violation of a long-established rule of this body and are a contributing cause to the confusion and distraction evidenced on this floor from day to day. To walk in front of a Member who is speaking is objectionable and discourteous.

Another part of clause 7, rule XIV, grossly violated by many Members, reads as follows:

> During the session of the House no Member * * * shall smoke upon the floor of the House; and the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper are charged with the strict enforcement of this clause. Neither shall any person be allowed to smoke upon the floor of the House at any time.

What constitutes the floor of the House? The space behind the rail is the floor of the House as much as the space in front of the Speaker's rostrum. Smoking behind the rail is smoking on the floor of the House and equally an infraction of the rule; it is most obnoxious to our visitors in the galleries. Walking into the Chamber with a cigar or pipe held in the mouth, whether lighted or not, is an invitation for caustic criticism and disparaging remarks on the part of the public who come to visit our sessions.

A practice as defenseless as it is objectionable is the habit of placing one's feet against or on top of the seat in front of one. This habit, a clear and distinct breach of the rules of decorum of this House, is most noticeable from the galleries and draws the sharpest criticism and adverse comment from those who come to visit this legislative body in action.

Reading newspapers on this floor when the House is in session may not fall within the text of any definite rule, but such a habit conveys to the public, and to the Members of the House, an impression of the want of interest, indifference to legislative duty, and failure of attention to the matter under discussion on the floor.

A practice that has grown to be a habit is that of referring to a Member in the second person as "you" or "your." Some distinguished Members, with long service here, have designated their colleagues by their given names, such as "John" and "Jim." We all know better. These are plain violations of ordinary parliamentary procedure. Each of us can make his contribution in preserving dignity and orderly conduct during our sessions by observing and obeying the rules of the House. The proper way to address a colleague is "the gentleman or gentlewoman from Maine," or whichever State the Member represents.

Dignity and decorum commensurate with the greatness of this body, and the power we possess, should prevail at all times in the discharge of our duty to the Nation. These matters may seem small, unimportant, and of no serious consequence in themselves, but upon the whole they are destructive of the respect and confidence of the people.

The rules of the House provide that the Speaker "shall preserve order and decorum"—rule I, clause 2. Let every Member constitute himself a committee of one to assist the Speaker in the discharge of his duty by seeing to it that the rules are respected and obeyed.

By reason of our membership here, each Member is clothed with tremendous power over the lives and destiny of a mighty people. With that power goes a corresponding responsibility to discharge the trust reposed in us by the people. Every word we speak, every decision we render, is weighted with the position we hold. The confidence and faith of the people in the legislative branch of their Government must be preserved if the Republic of the United States is to survive.

The lamps of freedom have been going out all over this world. Representative government has been and is under attack by a totalitarian philosophy of government. May we be worthy of the high honor conferred upon us as Members of Congress by discharging our responsibility to the Nation with that dignity and decorum which the people have a right to expect from us.

May the visitor to these galleries observe in us a genuine respect for this House of Representatives of the American people, and leave with greater love for our Republic and greater pride in American citizenship.

Let us all remember that "Order is heaven's first law."

THE LATE HONORABLE ERLAND H. HEDRICK

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad responsibility to inform the House of the passing of a distinguished former Member from the Sixth District of West Virginia, Erland Harold Hedrick. Dr. Hedrick, as he was affectionately called by his many friends, died on September 20, 1954, shortly after the adjournment of the 83d Congress.

Erland Harold Hedrick was born in Mercer County, W. Va., on August 9, 1894. He attended the grammar schools of Beckley where his parents moved when he was about 10 years of age. After attending Beckley Institute, he was graduated from the University of Maryland with an M. D. degree in June of 1917. Following his graduation, he served in the United States Army Medical Corps as a first lieutenant for 18 months. Upon his discharge from the service after the close of World War I, he returned to Beckley and began a very successful medical practice. He had served as examiner for the Veterans' Administration since 1919, and he served as city health officer and county health officer at various times. He was interested in the banking business for many years, and he became vice president and director of the Raleigh County Bank in Beckley. He was coowner of an ice-cream business, a theater business, and a coal company. Dr. Hedrick served as president of the Raleigh County Medical Society in 1932, and he was a member of the West Virginia State Medical Association and the American Medical Association, being made a life member in all three in 1954, after a membership of more than 34 years. He was a member of the American Legion, the Loyal Order of Moose, and a charter member of the Beckley Kiwanis Club. Dr. Hedrick was general superintendent of Pinecrest Tuberculosis Sanitarium in 1933 and 1934, a position which he held in conjunction with his private medical practice. He resigned as general superintendent to run for the House of Representatives from West Virginia's sixth district. He was elected in 1944 to the 79th Congress of the United States. His majority was approximately 24,000, and he served in the succeeding 80th, 81st, and 82d Congresses, in each instance being reelected by a large majority. He was a member of the Public Lands Committee and the House Appropriations Committee. In 1952 he ran for Governor of West Virginia and received a tremendous vote.

Dr. Hedrick married Miss Myrtle Adelle Wade of Nashville, Tenn., on June 23, 1943, and they made their home at 713 Woodlawn Avenue in Beckley. In February of last year, he became ill with virus pneumonia and was found to be suffering with a heart condition. Retiring from his office on that date, he continued ill until his death in September. He was buried in Sunset Memorial Park in Beckley. Only his widow and companion survives, a companion who helped him fight his political battles and who was active in the Congressional Woman's Democrat Club, the United Daughters of the Confederacy, and the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Mr. Speaker, it is said that "a man that hath friends must show himself friendly." Dr. Hedrick showed himself friendly, and he left behind a host of friends. He was gentle in his disposition, charming in his personality, captivating and ingratiating in his manner. He was a faithful servant, a good citizen, and a fine American. His county, his State, and his people have suffered from his loss.

Mr. Speaker, since the voice of Abel cried unto its Creator from the ground, death has been in the world; and the spoiler, among the works of the Almighty. Someone has spoken of death as a pleasant journey; another has said it is a state of rest; another, that it is a mystery; and still another, that it is a beautiful adventure. But it never fails to leave behind it a trail of sorrow and of tears. The piercing cry of King David at the loss of Absalom, and the soft weeping of Jesus at the tomb of Lazarus have echoed and reechoed a thousand billion times in the hearts of men throughout the centuries. All that are born must die. We know not where or how the silent messenger will bid us come.

We know when moons shall wane,
And summer birds from far shall cross the sea;
When autumn hues shall tinge the golden grain,
But, death, oh who shall tell us when to look for thee?

Leaves have their time to fall,
And flowers to wither at the north wind's breath,
And stars to set—but all
Thou hast all seasons for thine own, oh death.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Hedrick has gone on into the valley of the shadows. His voice and pleasant smile will be heard and seen no more in these chambers. Yet, in the night of death, hope sees a star. Joyous is the belief that we can be rejoined in a greater forum and in a lovelier world, in a city "that hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God."

To his widow, his relatives, and his friends I extend my heartfelt sympathy. May they find comfort in the words of One who, 15 centuries after Job, came saying:

Be thou faithful until death, and I shall give thee a crown of life.

Let Fate do her worst, there are relics of joy,
Bright dreams of the past that she cannot destroy;
Which come in the nighttime of sorrow and care,
And bring back the features that joy used to wear.

Long, long be my heart with such memories filled!
Like the vase in which roses have once been distilled—
You may break, you may shatter the vase, if you will,
But the scent of the roses will hang 'round it still.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to this beautiful and deserved tribute to our former colleague. It was my privilege to be closely associated with Dr. Hedrick here in the Congress. We served on the Appropriations Committee together.

I know Dr. Hedrick intimately and knew of his work in the Congress. He

was a hard worker and a very able and conscientious Member of this body. He served his district, his State, and the Nation well.

Dr. Hedrick was also a frequent visitor to my district. His brother resides in Henrico County, Va., which is in my district. The family is outstanding in the community. They have served the county and my district as Dr. Hedrick served in West Virginia.

His nephew is chief of police of the county. He has made an excellent record as the chief law-enforcement officer and enjoys the confidence and respect of the people.

It is a great privilege to me to join in this tribute to one of our colleagues for whom I had great love and affection.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Hedrick and I came to the 79th Congress together. We served on the old Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. We were thrown together as freshman Congressmen, and I came to know and admire him and I came to know and admire his very charming wife. I was shocked when I heard of his death, and I want to join in paying a well-earned tribute to a man who has fulfilled his obligations to his State, to his Nation, and to his God.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the glowing and well-deserved tribute that my colleague the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has paid to the late Dr. Hedrick, his predecessor in the House from the Sixth West Virginia District. I think I can say without fear of contradiction that Dr. Hedrick had the facility and took advantage of his opportunity to become acquainted with a greater number of Members of this House than probably any other Member serving in the sessions of the Congress in which he honored the Sixth District of West Virginia. We will all miss Dr. Hedrick, not only the West Virginia delegation but his many intimate friends that he acquired over the years that he served with outstanding ability in the Congress of the United States. I want to join the gentleman in expressing my deepest feelings of condolence to the widow of the late Dr. Hedrick. I am sure that the doctor will live long in the memories of the Members of the House in which he became so well acquainted for his friendly and kindly attitude to everyone with whom he came in contact.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my voice to those rendering eulogies to Dr. Hedrick. I served with him in the House for 8 years. During that time we had many intimate and close conversations. Partly because both he and I were physicians, we had an opportunity to exchange ideas. During the 8 years Dr. Hedrick and I served together as members of the Committee on Public Lands, we took a trip out through the great Northwest, traveling a great deal of the way by automobile. When you travel with a man, you learn something about him. For 2 years we served together on a special committee investigating chemicals in foods and cosmetics. During my association with Dr. Hedrick, I learned to know him as a man of integrity, of honesty, a man of great patriotism, truly a fine man, and it was with regret that I learned of his passing. Dr. Hedrick was, after all, a man that should be in the prime of life. He did a good job here in the Congress of the United States. I knew that he was a good physician and well respected and loved by those at home. I will miss Dr. Hedrick because of the numerous times that we sat down together and talked about the little and the big things of life. I join with the gentleman and the others in extending sympathies to his wife and to his friends.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH].

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in expressing my appreciation of Dr. Hedrick. I also served on a special committee with him. I enjoyed his association, and I am sure that those of us who served with him will miss him because of his alert understanding of all legislation that was under consideration by the House. I became intimately acquainted with both him and his wife, and I want to express my sincere sympathies and condolences to Mrs. Hedrick and the people of the district and to the State of West Virginia who have lost a patriotic and a devoted public servant in the passing of Dr. Hedrick.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my colleague the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] for bringing to the attention of the Congress the sad tidings of the recent death of Dr. Erland H. Hedrick, who ably represented the 6th District of West Virginia in the House in the 79th, 80th, 81st, and 82d Congresses before voluntarily withdrawing. I want to associate myself with the excellent statement which the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has made about his predecessor.

The Sixth District adjoins the district which I have the honor to represent. Our districts have many problems in common. During Dr. Hedrick's term of office here, he always worked closely with my late husband, John Kee, and later with me on those issues of mutual concern to our congressional districts and our State. Consequently, we came to know him well as colleague as well as friend, and to admire the hard work and effective effort which he put into the work of representing his district.

A man of many talents and of a really remarkable range of interests, Dr. Hedrick was a physician, banker, political leader, and businessman. As a businessman he was interested in and active in a variety of enterprises, including coal, ice cream, real estate, and theaters. Thus, he was, indeed, familiar with the issues and the problems and the technical details of legislation involving the business community as well as other aspects of our society.

Those of us who served with him, Mr. Speaker, were always uplifted by his pleasant manner, his vast knowledge, and his friendliness. In company with the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] I want to extend my sympathy to Dr. Hedrick's widow, other members of his family, and to his many friends.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting and proper that this solemn and dignified ceremony take place in this great forum of democracy as a tribute from this body to the life and memory of one of West Virginia's most distinguished sons.

Not only do I extend my heartfelt sympathy to the people of the congression district represented for so many years, and so ably, by Dr. Hedrick, but I extend that expression of sympathy to the entire Nation. For while it is true, his home town, his constituency and his State lost a good neighbor, a firm friend, and outstanding public servant, the United States lost a great American.

As many of my colleagues know, Mr. Speaker, in this distinguished body some Members become more close friends than others. I shall always be proud to declare that Dr. Hedrick was one of my close and personal friends. I often wondered why Congressman Hedrick, a learned practitioner of the ancient and noble calling of medicine, entered the rough and tumble arena of politics. By knowing the good doctor as I did, and as long and as well as I did, I know from his great heart and from his practice of medicine and from his knowledge and love of his fellow men, there sprang this desire to bring his understanding and feelings to public service.

In performance of our duties in our great Committee on Appropriations of the House, year after year, in moments of great stress of soul searching in matters dealing with the lives and fortunes of America, and therefore, the world, I saw Dr. Hedrick stand firm in his belief in his God and country to always do the right thing.

I have had occasion, in the performance of our official duties, to visit various countries of Western Europe in company with the distinguished Dr. Hedrick. His charm and great sense of humor and deep appreciation of other people and other problems, gave us an ambassador of good will to these other people at a time that they and we needed understanding more than any other thing.

I enjoyed the visits made by me to the home of the good doctor and his gracious wife. Accompanied by my wife, who I am pleased to say is a dear and close friend of Mrs. Hedrick, both in Washington during our years there and since,

the warmth and pleasantness of hospitality for which West Virginia is famous, was another cause for increasing endearment of our friendship.

And so today, with this solemnity in the fullness of my heart, Mr. Speaker, I can look toward the heaven and say to my good friend Congressman Hedrick in the words of the poet, which so well typifies your service to the people and your country:

So live, that when thy summons comes to leave that shore, which never yet has seen the image of a homeward sail, may perfect peace be yours, and where you lie dreaming know that you have not lived and have not died in vain.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Masscahusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, just as the hearts of many are filled with sadness today, so is mine. In the passing of Erland Harold Hedrick, I lost a personal friend, the State of West Virginia lost a great son, and the Nation lost one of its most distinguished citizens.

Dr. Hedrick was a man who had many friends, irrespective of political party, and irrespective of station in life. No words but kind words were ever spoken by him or of him. He was a fine public servant devoted to the interests of his people. We will all miss him, but the memory of him will live unblemished, untarnished, and unstained.

Mrs. McCormack and I wish to join with the gentleman from West Virginia who has so eloquently spoken in extending regrets to Mrs. Hedrick and the family.

THE ROSE STILL GROWS BEYOND THE WALL

Near a shady wall a rose once grew,
Budded and blossomed in God's free light,
Watered and fed by morning dew,
Shedding its sweetness day and night.

As it grew and blossomed fair and tall,
Slowly rising to loftier height,
It came to a crevice in the wall,
Through which there shone a beam of light.

Onward it crept with added strength,
With never a thought of fear or pride,
It followed the light through the crevice's length
And unfolded itself on the other side.

The light, the dew, the broadening view
Were found the same as they were before;
And it lost itself in beauties new,
Breathing its fragrance more and more.

Shall claim of death cause us to grieve,
And make our courage faint or fail?
Nay! Let us faith and hope receive:
The rose still grows beyond the wall.

Scattering fragrance far and wide,
Just as it did in the days of yore,
Just as it did on the other side,
Just as it will for evermore.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, may I add my voice to my colleagues' who have preceded me in praise of the late Dr. Erland Harold Hedrick. My experience with Dr. Hedrick in the 81st and 82d Congresses has always been a source of pleasure. I had known Dr. Hedrick for a great many years and had always admired him. When I came here as a freshman in 1948, his advice and counsel were invaluable to me. He was an excellent politician, a skillful legislator, and a sincere, kind man. He knew how to take first things first, but always seemed to have time for those things which seemed unimportant except to the individual who asked help.

Dr. Hedrick's experiences were varied. He was a physician, a soldier, a city and county executive, a banker, and a businessman. To this vast amount of experience he coupled a deep devotion to the people of his State and a sound philosophy of life to produce that which we all strive to be, a good representative. He represented excellently a district of greatly diversified interests with skill and devotion. His methods were always straightforward and his motives always honorable.

The men assembled here in this Chamber who knew him have lost a friend. The men here who were not fortunate enough to know the man will never realize their loss.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, once again I find it necessary to alert my colleagues of the House to the dangers and the pitfalls contained in the proposal found in H. R. 1, to liberalize and to extend for a 3-year period our present Trade Agreements Act.

May I remind my colleagues of the House that the basic tariff law of the Nation is known as the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, passed in 1930. I should like to explain particularly to the new Members of Congress who happen to be present on the floor today that our so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act is superimposed upon section 350 of the basic tariff law. This new act, which was largely the idea of Cordell Hull, of Tennessee, who was at that time Secretary of State, was conceived in the light of the situation that existed throughout the free world in those days. That, if you will remember, was the beginning of our depression period, and it was a depression period throughout the rest of the world. He conceived the idea that we should enlarge trade activities. He talked about American sailing vessels sailing on all of the seven seas.

The idea was fine at that time, I call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the Congress in writing its policy statement on the new idea of trade relations stated that it was for the purpose of enlarging trade and reducing unemployment. If you will recall back in 1933 and in 1934 when the Congress took action on this trade treaty we were still in the midst of our so-called great depression. The object of the Congress was to increase employment.

I submit to you that it has worked in the directly opposite manner. I challenge any Member of this House who happens to be a proponent of this legislation to show and to prove to this House that our trade policies have increased jobs for the American people more than they have lost jobs for the American people.

Let us keep in mind what the word "reciprocity" means. It means that the United States agrees to lower our import duties on foreign-made goods in return for other nations' lowering their import duties on American goods that we wish to send into such countries. That is the idea of reciprocity.

May I say to my colleagues of the House that out of 22 articles made in my State of West Virginia on which concessions are made, so far as I have been able to find out at the present time only one single article receives concessions on that side of the reciprocal trade agreement, and I refer to West Virginia apples.

This agreement is no longer entitled to be called a reciprocal trade agreement. Reciprocity has disappeared. We, the American people, have been giving away further reductions in our import duties and our tariff rates until today the American tariff rates are among the lowest of all the 34 nations which are signatory members of the Geneva agreement on trade and treaties. Yet, we are being asked in House Resolution 1, introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, that we further reduce our tariffs a total of 15 percent in the next 3 years, and that we enlarge the authority given the President to deal with trade matters, which is solely the business of the Congress. In that I see trouble ahead. Some of the suggestions are dangerous. For instance, the resolution goes so far as to attempt to write a blanket of legality over what has been taking place at Geneva since 1945, and I am speaking now of the present outlaw organization known as our Treaty on Trades and Tariffs, which is functioning as an international agreement without the consent of the American Congress. The proposals and the practices advocated by the Geneva Convention have never been submitted to the Congress of the United States or particularly to the other body for approval.

There are two divergent views on what the President is asking for in this 3-year extension of our trade policies with added authority. One of those viewpoints, that comes from the proponents of the legislation, is to the effect that since we intend to give away some of our wealth anyway to foreign nations, we had better do it on an economic basis rather than on an eleemosynary basis of just giving it away outright. That is the argument of the proponents of this legislation who are talking about more trade and less aid.

The other viewpoint, and that is the viewpoint held by the opponents of the renewal and extension of our trade policies, is that if you give the President what he is asking for in this legislation, you are sure to drive out of business completely more than 100 of our basic, small American producers who cannot possibly meet the competition they are being asked to meet from Europe and Japan on imports. Now, why can they not meet that competition? Congress is partly to blame for this situation. Only in the last session of the 83d Congress, we approved a tax bill which reduced the income tax on dividends coming

from foreign investments. By that act alone, you set up a 14 percentage point advantage for American capital to go abroad and establish factories to exploit cheap labor abroad in order to make these products to be brought to America under our trade treaty to take the jobs away from your American workmen. So I say to you, the Congress itself sometimes does strange things, and I submit to you that this is one of the strangest. Why we would today, after the last session of the Congress, oppose a tax bill as many on my side of the aisle, the Democratic side of the House, did, which contains a provision of that kind and now come along and swallow the same kind of proposition in the proposed broadening of our Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, is beyond me.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I call the attention of the House to the fact that Secretary of State Dulles on Monday, a week ago, testified that there were $14 billion of reserves in Europe today, the highest dollar reserve in the entire history of the world, and yet we hear so much about this dollar scarcity to buy American goods.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from Illinois. I would like to call attention to the fact that the history of the tariff in the United States in the past has principally been a story of conflict between manufactured goods and farm products, and the industrial East and North and the agricultural South and West. Today, in 1955, the situation is changed. That is not the conflict today. The difference today is in the view between great units of mass production; big business, if you please; and the so-called small-business man, small manufacturer.

Big business is world conscious. It not only hopes to sell universally but it manufactures universally by establishing plants in many other countries. Its capital is not only locally invested, but it is invested in foreign countries where it is manufacturing products. This is not true of the small manufacturer. He makes goods for the local market, whether that market is in the United States or any particular section of the United States. He may not produce a superior product to one made elsewhere, but let me remind you that he employs American labor. He pays taxes to the Federal Government as well as to the local government, and his price is geared to the American standard of living.

If our small manufacturers are driven out of business, as you propose to do by this legislation, by a faulty economic policy, the social damage will be enormous.

Those who talk about a free market do make the point that the American manufacturer who cannot compete ought to go out of business, as an admission of his inefficiency. This position would have some virtue if he were permitted to compete on a basis of equality. There is where the actions of the Congress come in, in giving advantages, from the standpoint of Federal income taxes, by saying to him that if his investment was abroad he could have better treatment as a taxpayer. What you are doing is making it more profitable and more enticing for American capital to be invested abroad than to be invested in the development of the resources of your own country. A free market is only possible if there are no subsidies, no rebates, and no economic tricks.

What are some of the economic tricks?

Let us go back just briefly to this question of reciprocity. I said to you that it was no longer a trade compact involving reciprocity. The American people have set up only 2 or 3 restrictions that I can recall at this time. One of those restrictions you will find in the general Agricultural Adjustment Act, which limits the import of cotton to this country. Another might be a similar provision that limits the amount of Canadian wheat that may be imported. I can remember another restriction when the trade treaty was written, in order to protect the infant sugarcane and beet-sugar industries in this country. There was a provision written in the Sugar Act that set up a 25-percent import quota on shipments of Cuban and Puerto Rican sugar to the United States. This may be considered restrictive. The only overall restriction that I can recall now was the peril point which was adopted by the 80th Congress and killed by the 81st Congress; and, a little later on, a proposal of my own, called the escape clause.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act is also a safety valve on agricultural products.

We now have in the case of the six basic commodities restrictions on production on the part of our own farmers; in other words, if a person farms peanuts, tobacco, or cotton he cannot grow any more than his allotted acreage. This is done to keep the price up. Is there any danger of weakening that structure? Because if we bring in unrestricted production from abroad while our own farmers are being restricted we are going to create some sort of condition that is going to destroy the farm program. I would like to know what would be the effect of the new bill on the escape clause and on section 22.

Mr. BAILEY. I am pleased that the gentleman from Oklahoma has raised this question. If you will look at subsections (a) and (b) of section A of the pending legislation, that is the Cooper bill, that is something altogether new from what has already been done in reciprocal trade treaty legislation in the past. We give the President added power to reduce rates 15 percent over the next 3 years. We are allowing him to take a product that is on the trade list on which the ad valorem duty is above 50 percent and not only reduce that down to 50 percent of the basic rate set by the Smoot-Hawley Act of 1920, but we are going further and give him authority to cut it down further. We give added authority over the favored-nations clause, that is, the policy that those nations which are signatories along with the United States in our trade agreements, are all treated alike; in other words, if you make a concession to one you have to make it to all. Now we go ahead and say that we are giving him authority over the control of quantitative restrictions. That is exactly what the gentleman from Oklahoma is talking about now. In the general agricultural act under that quantitative restriction provision the Congress wrote in an alternative. In the matter of cotton it specified that only 35,000 bales of foreign cotton could be shipped into this country with the exception of special types of cotton that we do not grow in this country.

Another restriction that the gentleman from Oklahoma had in mind was the restriction written on the importation of wheat. Wheat from Canada is now held to 800,000 bushels a year. Now we are going to give the President authority—and that authority will be delegated to the State Department, to people who sit around a table over in Geneva and bargain for new agreements when the Canadian people come along with the proposition that they have some things they would like to buy from United States they add to it the condition: "We want to know if you are going to be a little more liberal in your policy of imports on Canadian wheat." They could make that 80 million bushels instead of 800,000 bushels of Canadian wheat. We are just opening up an opportunity for that tribunal over at Geneva to bargain and to barter with the other countries on these reciprocal-trade agreements, to throw down the restrictions that are set up, the quantitative restrictions that are set up on wheat, cotton, peanuts, and on sugar, because it will affect all of those. Congress has set a precedent there, and I question the advisability of our changing it. There is exactly what I meant when I said it had dangerous provisions in it; I had reference to the new language contained in the proposal introduced by the gentleman which is the Randall Commission's report and the State Department's idea.

I believe Mr. Dulles acknowledged on cross-examination when he was a witness before the Ways and Means Committee that it was written by the State Department and the experts of the Randall Commission.

I question the wisdom of it. I am afraid that it is going to vest in some tribunal out from under the control of this Congress power to thwart the will of Congress.

In the speech I made on Monday last I asked: "How would you like to have your producers required to go to Geneva for redress of their grievances instead of coming to the Congress in Washington or to the Tariff Commission?" That is exactly what I had in mind.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The entire reciprocal trade-agreements program must be approached not in an across-the-board fashion but item by item. On the Pacific coast we have a

salmon-fishing industry that does a business in excess of $100 million a year and employs more than 60,000 people. The Japanese just announced through their Ministry on Fisheries that they are expanding their fisheries operation from 7 cannery ships to 11 cannery ships, an increase of more than 50 percent. They are putting out to sea in the North Pacific and in the Atlantic a total of 284 fishing ships as compared with 160 fishing ships last year, an increase of 75 percent. The Japanese wage rate in the fishing industry is 19 cents an hour for men and 8 cents an hour for women. American workers simply cannot compete with those low wages. Unless the American fishing industry, which depends mostly on hand labor, is given as much or more protection than it has now, it is going to be destroyed by this increase in Japanese imports.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman for his observation and may I ask if he has the American wage rate that is being paid in the American fishing industry? How many American ships have been put out of the fishing business? Just what is the situation in the California fisheries?

OUR FISHING INDUSTRY NEEDS PROTECTION

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the American crab- and salmon-fishing industries will be confronted in 1955 with stiffer competition from the Japanese fishing industry than American fishermen and cannery workers ever have experienced heretofore.

I say this because the chief of the Japanese Government fishing agency recently announced that Japan is increasing her fishery activities in the North Pacific and Arctic Oceans by more than 50 percent and expects in 1955 to double her 1954 fish take from these waters.

A recent dispatch from Japan quotes the chief of the Government fishing agency as saying that Japan which in 1954 had 7 floating canneries operating in Pacific and Arctic waters will have 11 of these ships in 1955. The same dispatch says that instead of the 160 fishing boats operating from these mother canneries the Japanese in 1955 will have 284 of these boats, an increase of more than 75 percent.

The chief of the Japanese Government fishing agency predicted in that dispatch that Japanese fishermen will catch 40 million fish in 1955 or just about double her 1954 take.

The announcement of plans of the Japanese to expand her fishery activities makes it imperative that our State Department refrain from reducing tariffs on fishery products during the International Trade Conference which opens in Geneva in February. Workers in the fisheries of Japan receive wages of 8 cents an hour for women and less than 20 cents an hour for men. American fishermen and cannery workers cannot and should not be expected to compete with such low wage rates.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, February 1, following the legislative program in order for that day and any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour. I make this request, Mr. Speaker, at the suggestion of the majority leader, recalling that January 30 is the birthday of the immortal Franklin D. Roosevelt, but that there will be exercises on Monday in memory of our martyred President, William McKinley, and that, therefore, Tuesday be set aside to observe the birthday of that great American, that immortal, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM OF FEDERAL LOANS TO ASSIST STATES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES IN BUILDING SCHOOLS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I submit for your attention a bill that I have just introduced. The purpose of this bill is to provide a program of Federal loans to assist States and local communities in building schools.

At the outset I wish to emphasize that partisanship has no place in our approach to the serious classroom shortage prevalent today in our elementary and secondary public schools. Many of the Members of Congress have introduced bills that would, if enacted, provide for emergency Federal financial assistance to our States and Territories in the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities. Everyone appears to be in agreement that this problem is urgent, that we can no longer delay in taking some form of action, and that there should be full and efficient use of State and local resources in meeting school-construction requirements.

The vigorous and sustained efforts of the States and local communities to provide classrooms needed for free public education has not been sufficient to meet the number of classrooms needed. I am first and foremost for adequate appropriations through a Federal grant-in-aid program for school construction. That is why I have introduced a bill similar to that introduced by Congressmen CLEVELAND BAILEY and CARROLL KEARNS, H. R. 2612.

The bill that I am introducing today, if enacted, is not intended as a substitute for any Federal program of grants-in-aid to the States for school construction but as an additional and supplementary means of enabling the States and local communities to carry out school-construction programs which might not otherwise be possible in meeting their school capital outlay requirements. The program under my bill would be administered in conjunction with other programs of Federal assistance to States seeking to meet their school-construction needs.

If adequate funds are not made available under a grant-in-aid act for school-construction purposes, then, I believe, my supplemental Federal-loan proposal can be of very definite value.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FLYNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

SOIL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I realize that this Congress has many pressing problems and that a first-term Member will be well advised to do a great deal more listening than talking.

For that reason I have voluntarily limited my request this afternoon to address the House for only 15 minutes.

I do believe, however, that in our understandable preoccupation with the difficult decisions of world affairs, some of which were placed in our hands a few minutes ago by our President, we run the risk of overlooking certain dangerous developments if they are not called to our attention.

One of the finest activities of our entire Government, Mr. Speaker, and one which I am convinced is absolutely essential to our ultimate survival as a Nation, is in jeopardy of being destroyed.

A subcommittee of the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has officially recommended that the field activities of our Federal soil conservation program be discontinued.

The panel proposes that the responsibility for sending these trained field technicians out to the grassroots, at the forks of the creek, where they can actually help the American farmer save our soil, be simply turned over to the various States to accept or ignore as they may individually see fit.

I find it difficult to conceive of a more costly or a more disastrous move. My purpose in bringing it to the attention of the Congress at this time, Mr. Speaker, is in the hope that we may be forewarned and alerted in time to stop it.

It is my understanding that, under the provisions of the Executive Reorganization Act, the whole Commission, if it approves this monstrous mistake, could simply submit it to the Congress and it would automatically become law unless we should pass a resolution of express disapproval within 60 days.

Now, concerning the proposal itself, Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss three points as briefly as I can.

First of all, I would like to demonstrate that this Federal soil-conservation program is a rightful national responsibility and one that we simply dare not ignore or shunt off to some other unit of government.

Secondly, I am convinced that turning it over lock, stock, and barrel to the 48 States would be to turn back the clock

and immeasurably weaken this vital program.

Finally, I would like to say that the work of our Soil Conservation Service is yielding us the very best return on our tax dollar of just about any activity in our entire Federal Government.

I

Protecting the soil of our country can be nothing less than a national responsibility. Our Nation's potential productive might depends upon it.

The two most indispensable natural resources of ours or any civilization are the most ordinary and the most necessary—the cheapest and the most priceless commodities of all—the water that falls from the skies and the soil that lies under our feet.

Each year, the rivers of our country carry to the sea more than a million foot-acres of this good, rich soil which is the lifeblood of our people—a treasure of greater intrinsic worth than all the gold that is stored at Fort Knox, Ky.

Man can never replace it, and the best he can do is to install practices designed to hold what is left and arrest its untimely flight.

This the farmers of our land have been striving to accomplish, aided by the invaluable scientific know-how of the field technicians of our Federal Soil Conservation Service.

Yet theirs is a fight against time. We are losing our irreplaceable topsoil to erosion at the rate of one-sixteenth inch each year.

For 20 years, we have been making progress. It has been a slow and agonizing task, to be sure. The present rate of applying soil-conservation practices to the land amounts to only about 3 percent of the Nation's croplands annually. At least, we have been moving in the right direction.

The exigencies of our time demand that the program be speeded up, not slowed down.

Ours is a rapidly growing population with no great land frontiers remaining. The food and fiber needs of our people require more and ever more productive acres of land.

Every evening when the American people sit down to dinner, there are 6,200 more of us needing to be served than on the day before.

By 1975, according to a publication issued last year by our House Committee on Agriculture, we shall need the production equivalent of an additional 115 million acres of cropland to keep pace with the national demand.

Even to approach this goal, the per acre yield of our land shall have to be very substantially increased. This cannot be done with a weakened soil-conservation program.

It is a well-established medical fact that foodstuffs grown on eroded land lack the vitamins and nutrients necessary to physical health and growth. Impoverished land produces impoverished people.

This is a matter of pressing concern not only to the farmer but to every city dweller in the land whose children seek nourishment in the products of our American farms.

Our modern genius for transportation and marketing make this an unavoidable Federal responsibility, when most of the food consumed from American tables was produced in other States.

What happens to the soil of Idaho is important to Texas, and what happens to the Texas grazing lands has a very vital effect for the people of New England.

The problem cannot be divided into 48 compartments, and neither can the solution.

II

Secondly, I think it is obvious that shifting these responsibilities to the States would mean a long step backward in the work we have so painstakingly begun.

It is not a question of whether the States should assume a greater responsibility in saving our land. It is a question of whether we in the Federal Government should abdicate our responsibility.

It is, further, a question of just what some States can do and what others will do.

The record speaks for itself. This problem has been with us for many years, and there has been an almost unlimited field of work for the States to undertake.

Yet, while a few enlightened States have made significant contributions to the effort, 13 States still appropriate nothing whatever for assistance to their soil-conservation districts at the grassroots.

I am wholly in sympathy with the idea that many functions of government can best be performed at the local and State levels to reduce, insofar as possible, the people's dependence upon Federal authority.

But to speed up the impoverishment of the earth from which our whole economy must be sustained would inevitably and unavoidably reduce the people to an even greater reliance upon the Federal Government.

In many things decentralization is a worthy aim. But the soil-conservation program is today the most thoroughly decentralized activity of our Government. It is actually run by the farmers themselves in local districts of their own creation, and the Federal technical staff serves them at their call.

The result of dismantling the service would be not decentralization, but disintegration.

In a day when we speak of $100 billion for highways, all the 48 States combined provided only a bit over $2 million last year to save our soil for future generations.

Indeed, the States should be encouraged to apply more of their financial resources to this significant program. But such increased interest should be in addition to, rather than in place of, the pittance our National Government is providing.

III

Finally, I want to stress that any temporary saving which might result from the proposed abandonment of our Federal grass-roots program would be the height of false economy.

In cold dollars and cents, it would be infinitely more costly to us in the long run.

The present worth of the farm lands of our Nation is estimated at $85 billion—2,361 times what we are spending to save those lands.

The market value of the produce raised last year, even with a searing drought, was 700 times the trifle we invest in holding the land where it is. One-seventh of 1 percent is the cheapest rate of interest I can imagine.

The total tax cost of the present Federal program to the average citizen is only 35 cents a year, or less than 3 cents a month.

Surely if economy is our aim, there are far better places to cut. For our Nation expends no money more wisely than this trifle it invests in soil conservation.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I want to commend the gentleman for his position on this matter, and say to him that we consider the topsoil on the American farms today the second greatest national asset we have, second only to the resources of our boys and girls.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman and quite agree with him.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I want to commend the gentleman from Texas on his speech because I think he has touched on a subject that should be in the minds of all of us as we start this session, and that we should give consideration to the very things he has pointed out so clearly and so forcefully. I think he has rendered a real service to the House and to the country in bringing this matter to our attention at this time.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am grateful for those remarks.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to join my good friend from Texas in his views and join the gentleman from West Virginia in commending the gentleman from Texas on his eloquent speech in behalf of the soil-conservation program. As has been stated, I think he has rendered a great service to the Nation, because when you serve the farmers and conserve the soil of our country you do indeed serve the country well. I join in the commendation of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to point out in closing, if I may, that after 20 long years of intense activity on the present budget, only 22 percent of our farms have been planned for soil and water conservation.

In testimony before the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee of the House, the spokesman for the service gave the following statement:

> This is a 33-year program. Farmers have indicated their desire to speed up the program. Their interest is high; their cooperation is increasing; and they are now ready to go ahead with the needed jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the national welfare demands that this work be speeded up, not slowed down.

It took nature a million years to build a single inch of topsoil. We are depleting it at the rate of one-sixteenth inch each year. Thus, in a meager 16 years, we are denuding the earth of a million years of nature's labor.

This land of ours is a good heritage. Yet one cannot help wondering, more practically than philosophically, how long we can continue so rapaciously exploiting and so rapidly exhausting this basic gift of God.

I sometimes think a timely message for our people was written some 3,400 years ago. It appears in the eighth chapter of the Book of Deuteronomy:

> For the Lord thy God bringeth thee into a good land, a land of brooks of water, of fountains and depths that spring out of valleys and hills; a land wherein thou shalt eat bread without scarceness . . . whose stones are iron and out of whose hills thou mayest dig brass. When thou hast eaten and art full, then thou shalt bless the Lord thy God for the good land which He hath given thee.
>
> And it shall be, if thou do at all forget . . . I testify against you this day that ye shall surely perish. As the nations which the Lord destroyeth before your face, so shall ye perish.

May ours be the wisdom not to despoil this heritage in our time, but to pass it on enriched and improved to the future.

TELEVISING COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss today the increasingly important question of televising public hearings of the committees of the House of Representatives.

Last Thursday I introduced in the House, House Resolution 99, to amend the rules of the House with respect to committee proceedings. That resolution included a provision which will clearly give committees, at their discretion, the right to permit live or recorded telecasts and broadcasts of their public proceedings.

That question is important and timely. Just last week we completed the assignment of Members to committees. Presumably in the next few days those committees will meet and arrange their internal organization, including the creation of subcommittees and the adoption of procedural rules. Whether committees will be permitted to broadcast or televise their committee hearings must be settled at the beginning of this Congress.

From statements made in response to parliamentary inquiry, it appears to be the opinion of the Speaker that the Rules of the House do not authorize televising or broadcasting of committee hearings. My review of the House rules and precedents would lead me to an opposite conclusion. Apparently the minority leader, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., likewise is of the opinion that committees presently have the power to authorize telecasts of their proceedings since it was permitted during the 83d Congress.

My interpretation of the rules is of little consequence since for all practical purposes the Speaker's interpretation is the final word unless the House itself acts in one way or another.

Because House rules nowhere expressly prohibit telecasts and broadcasts of committee proceedings, and this issue seems to be, in the words of former Speaker MARTIN, "in the twilight zone," I suggest that the House and its Rules Committee give consideration to this question early in the session and resolve the issue once and for all, clearly and expressly, by amending the Rules of the House. Those who are interested in all that appears in the precedents of the House can find it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 1, pages 1334–1335.

I should add at this point that earlier in the session today I propounded a parliamentary inquiry, and of course there will be further comments on this question in the RECORD of today.

Although I disagree with it, I do not think any useful purpose would be served on this occasion in analyzing and discussing the conclusion of the Speaker. In announcing his opinion in February of 1952 that the rules of the House do not now permit committees to televise and broadcast their proceedings, the Speaker said:

> If the House adopts a rule, the Chair will abide by and enforce it as he does all the rules of the House of Representatives.

On that same occasion Minority Leader MARTIN, Speaker of the House in the 83d Congress, said:

> Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that this is a twilight zone which has not been clearly defined as to just what authority the Speaker might have, and I think we should at the earliest possible moment have some definite rule established.

Later Mr. MARTIN also said:

> I think television and broadcasting is here to stay and will probably increase in popularity as the days go by. For that reason, we should have revision of the rules to define authority.

Mr. Speaker, this subject is not new in interest to me. I first offered a resolution providing for the telecasting of committee hearings on February 27, 1952. That resolution was House Resolution 540 in the 82d Congress. I discussed the subject at some length on the floor of the House of Representatives in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 2, pages 1567–1571.

In the 83d Congress on May 17, 1954, I introduced House Resolution 550, to amend the rules of the House, which is identical with House Resolution 99, which I introduced in the 84th Congress last week. In the discussion of House Resolution 550, I incorporated references to previous remarks made and testimony given before congressional committees. These appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 5, pages 6779–6780.

Mr. Speaker, I now desire to turn to considerations of public policy, which, in my judgment, ought to impel the Rules Committee and the House to give express authorization to committees to permit telecasting and broadcasting of their public proceedings.

I will first state certain general propositions on which I think there should be no disagreement. I will then argue that those propositions lead logically to the reform in the rules which I advocate.

First, television and radio broadcasting, although new, have already established themselves as effective means for the transmission of news.

Second, self-government by citizens through elected representatives can work successfully in modern, complex society only if, first, the electorate is well and accurately informed about the public business; and second, the performance of their elected representatives is well known to the voters.

Third, under our Constitution, the policymaking or legislative authority of the Government is vested primarily in the Congress.

Fourth, the executive branch of the Government, under the Constitution, has a part in policy formulation through recommending measures and through the power of veto. As a practical matter, however, the bureaus and departments have a far greater influence on the character of legislation than the American public realizes. That influence is exerted through the drafting of technical provisions in bills, through reporting on measures customarily referred to them by legislative committees for comment and through pressures on committees and individual legislators of one kind and another.

Fifth, in the contest between the executive and the legislative branches of the Government over the relative influence of the one or the other in the formulation of national policy the sympathies and the support of voting citizens is controlling. To preserve the constitutional power and prerogatives of the Congress in policymaking, the respect, the understanding, and the support of the public is necessary.

Sixth, familiarity with the problems of the House of Representatives, the manner in which they are met, the functioning of committees in the process of enacting laws, plus acquaintance with the individual members of the House, all will lead to the sympathetic knowledge and understanding on the part of the American public, so necessary in upholding the legislative prerogatives of the House.

Seventh, of all the media for the transmission of news, first-hand observance through live or recorded television and radio broadcasting is the most powerful and effective. Through them the functioning of the House of Representatives and its committees can be brought into the homes of the American people in a way never possible before. Through television and radio, government can be brought closer to the people.

Eighth, if we deny the American people the opportunity to witness the Congress in action firsthand, if we draw, as it were, a translucent curtain between the people and the conduct of public affairs, we will do two things: First, we will prevent the electorate from becom-

ing as well informed on public matters as it would be if it could observe them through television and radio broadcasting. Second, the House of Representatives will suffer in public notice and consequently in public esteem. Any product or service which is not brought to the attention of the public is soon forgotten. With the executive branch of the Government and other legislative bodies continually in the limelight, the House, if it excludes itself from the public gaze, will be relegated to a position of inferior importance in the public regard.

Mr. Speaker, it has been argued that telecasting and broadcasting committee hearings will lead to demagoguery and showmanship on the part of Members seeking the spotlight. I am not one who would argue that Representatives are free from such human frailities. But I venture to suggest that any tendencies in that direction will be no different than they are now in the absence of television and radio at committee hearings. I do not believe that telecasting or broadcasting committee hearings can convert a statesman into a demogogue. I also venture to suggest that the public will be quick to sense and resent cheap tactics on the part of a Member of Congress; that the reaction on the guilty Member would be unfavorable to him.

I predict also that instead of encouraging demagoguery, superficiality and showmanship the knowledge that he was under the eyes of many American citizens in all walks of life would have a tendency to sober anyone having such tendencies. Actually, radio and television can only improve the quality of legislative performance. That will be particularly true as the American public, through the use of television and radio, becomes more and more familiar with the operations of the House of Representatives and the public problems with which it deals.

Mr. Speaker, overriding any of the considerations I have mentioned is the right of the American people to be informed fully about their business. I, for one, shall not stand in the way of more complete and more accurate knowledge on the part of an electorate which, after all, is the ultimate sovereign in our system of Government.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TUMULTY. I wish to inquire a little as to the operation of the gentleman's resolution. Are we to understand that the sessions of the House of Representatives will be televised, as for example, the session today?

Mr. MEADER. Let me say in reply to the gentleman's question that my resolution, House Resolution 99, does not refer to the House of Representatives; it has reference only to committees. The language is to be found on page 2 of the resolution and reads as follows:

> Each committee is authorized, in its discretion, upon such terms and conditions as it deems advisable, to permit the broadcasting and telecasting of its proceedings by radio and television, and the dissemination of news of such proceedings by other methods and media of communication.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. TUMULTY. Will the gentleman tell the House whether or not there is any reason in fact or philosophical approach as to why the gentleman in his resolution includes only the televising of committee hearings and apparently excludes the television of sessions of the House of Representatives?

Mr. MEADER. In answer to the gentleman's question, the reason that I have related this only to committee hearings is because the entire resolution deals with procedural rules of committees. I have not sought in this resolution to deal with conduct in the Chamber of the House of Representatives itself. I know that in a previous Congress the gentleman from New York, Mr. Javits, who has left us to become attorney general of the State of New York, strongly advocated the telecasting of proceedings in the House of Representatives.

My own understanding of the rules with respect to the Chamber itself is that the question of televising House proceedings is largely under the control of the Speaker of the House. We presently do have telecasts and radio broadcasts of joint sessions of the Congress to hear Presidential messages, and we also have had live radio and television broadcasts of joint meetings of the House and Senate where we have heard the address of some representative of a foreign government. I understand that telecasting is done by permission of the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BROWNSON. Carrying the thought further, then, as a projected plan of operation of the gentleman's resolution, would it not ultimately result in the committee itself within its own committee rules providing specific authorization necessary for that particular committee or its subcommittees to negotiate in order that radio or television coverage might be possible?

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman is correct. As the gentleman knows, since we both serve on the Government Operations Committee of the House of Representatives, in connection with the rules of that committee in the 83d Congress, there was considerable discussion over the terms upon which committees and subcommittees could compel a witness to testify if the proceedings were being broadcast or telecast. I envision this problem would be dealt with by the committee as the occasion might arise. It would be difficult to come each time to the House to get a ruling, or to the Speaker to get a ruling, particularly when the question might arise in the midst of a committee hearing.

Mr. BROWNSON. May I suggest that the gentleman from Michigan has prepared what in my opinion is a very fine analysis of this particular situation. May I say further that he has had unusual experience as a staff member of committees and as staff counsel of an important committee, as well as a member of at least two important committees of the House of Representatives during his tenure of service here. To me he has approached the whole situation very orderly; it is very logical and it merits my own detailed consideration.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman.

May I say further that this question obviously is one that needs to be settled clearly by the House itself. The present Speaker in this Congress today and in the 82d Congress in February 1952 unequivocally and clearly stated that committees did not presently have the authority to disseminate news of their proceedings by either radio or television.

In the 83d Congress, without any express ruling, Speaker MARTIN took the position that the committees presently had that authority, and that it would be within the jurisdiction of the various committees to permit or not to permit the taking of pictures, the presence of news reporters, the presence of television apparatus, or the presence of moving-picture newsreel cameras. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] has told me that he took that position although no formal ruling was requested by parliamentary inquiry.

Now, since two Speakers about the same time have different interpretations about the rules of the House, it seems to me that there must be enough question about the meaning of the rules so that it could be clarified clearly and a policy established once and for all by the Committee on Rules and the House of Representatives.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Could I just ask one question in relation to this bill? Would this imply that the committee would have the authority to pick and choose that part of the committee hearings that should be released for publication? For instance, I notice that today the press conferences of the President of the United States are released on television but they are released only after they are edited by the President's staff. Would the committee have the same right under this bill?

Mr. MEADER. My answer to the gentleman is, yes. I would not want television and radio reporting to be authorized beyond the power of the committee to police it, because the committee should continually have control of its proceedings and should not permit distortion. I personally would be opposed to any commercial tinge upon a telecast or broadcasting of a committee hearing, and I think the committee should retain editorial control over its proceedings and its record.

FEDERAL AND POSTAL EMPLOYEES PAY INCREASE

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a ranking member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I informed my colleagues of the House of Representatives that I intended to take whatever action was necessary to avert any delay in the prompt consideration of pay increases for Federal and postal employees.

I do not intend to stand idly by and permit dilatory practices similar to those used in connection with our last year's hearings to again use up so much time that Congress will not have sufficient time in which to consider and enact a fair and equitable pay raise which our Federal and postal workers sorely need and justly deserve. I might add, also, that my idea of a fair pay raise is not one of 5 percent but rather one of 10 percent. The Federal and postal employees of my district in Detroit, and many throughout the United States know the stand I have taken in their behalf, and I want to reassure them at this time that I shall continue to fight for their rights, because I believe that they, as part of our great general public, are more entitled to consideration by this administration than General Motors.

I have noted with interest that certain Republican Members, who last year voted against even a niggardly 5-percent pay raise, have now come out for a 10-percent pay increase. I have further been informed that their motive for so doing is that they realize that we Democrats will see that our Federal friends are given fair treatment, despite whatever course of action the Republican leadership may choose to take. Therefore they want to climb on the bandwagon and share part of the credit for finally enacting a pay raise that could have easily been passed last year, but for their Republican leadership, who arbitrarily tacked on a postage rate increase bill and took the unreasonable stand that one should not become law without the other. No doubt this unreasonable, unyielding position is one important reason why we once again find a Democratic majority in both the House of Representatives and the Senate.

I was pleased to learn that a great number of the Democratic Members of the other body have likewise indicated that prompt consideration will be given to this all-important pay-increase legislation. These statements were undoubtedly motivated by the same reasons as mine is—to make certain that we can give proper consideration to and pass into law an equitable pay raise for our deserving Federal and postal workers irrespective of whatever adverse action might be taken by the administration.

I intend to push for prompt action on pay legislation just as soon as the routine internal business of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee is dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend my remarks, was granted to:

Mr. TABER.

Mr. BOGGS and include a minority report signed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN] and himself.

Mr. DODD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SELDEN.

Mr. JOHNSON of California and include a magazine article.

Mr. LANE in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. FRIEDEL) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCOTT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MORANO and to include an address by the distinguished Assistant Secretary of State, Henry F. Holland.

Mr. PATTERSON and to include a magazine article.

Mr. FORD.

Mr. MCVEY.

Mr. HILLINGS and to include extraneous matter .

Mr. MAILLIARD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHORT and to include the ceremonies held in connection with the christening of the U. S. S. *Forrestal.*

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include a speech he made yesterday.

Mr. REES of Kansas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIEMINSKI in two instances.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. PFOST (at the request of Mr. METCALF), on account of death in immediate family.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), today, in order to attend a funeral.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 3. Concurrent resolution favoring temporary permission for parking on square 723 of the Capitol Grounds; to the Committee on Public Works.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On January 18, 1955:

H. R. 2369. An act to amend section 7237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

On January 21, 1955:

H. R. 2091. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 25, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

301. A letter from the adjutant general, national headquarters, United Spanish War Veterans, transmitting the proceedings of the 56th National Encampment, United Spanish War Veterans, held in San Antonio, Tex., September 19 to 23, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 77); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

302. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the wheat-marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

303. A letter from the Director, Legislative Programs, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to further amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending the authority to induct certain individuals, and to extend the benefits under the Dependents Assistance Act to July 1, 1959"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

304. A letter from the Director, Legislative Programs, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for strengthening of the Reserve forces, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

305. A letter from the Director, National Headquarters, Selective Service System, transmitting the fourth report of the operations of the Selective Service System for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 10 (g) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

306. A letter from the Chairman, Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission, transmitting Report No. 8 prepared by Federal Facilities Corporation, the operating agency, with respect to its expenditures for repairs, replacements, additions, improvements, or maintenance of the Government-owned rubber-producing facilities during the 5-month period for fiscal 1955 ending November 30, 1954, pursuant to section 15 of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 408); to the Committee on Armed Services.

307. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 29th Quarterly Report required under the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

308. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

309. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and

for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

310. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on House Administration.

311. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the Fourth Annual Report on the Operations of Civil Aeronautics, pursuant to Public Law 867, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

312. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of November 30, 1954, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act, as amended July 16, 1952 (Public Law 554); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

313. A letter from the Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations for plant and equipment, including acquisition or condemnation of real property or facilities, and plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, for the atomic energy program"; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

314. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, "A bill to increase criminal penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

315. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by various subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

316. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting 36 separate reports received from the Departments of the Army and Air Force covering 45 specific violations of section 3679, Revised Statutes, and Department of Defense Directive 7200.1 entitled "Administrative Control of Appropriations Within the Department of Defense," pursuant to section 3679 (i) (2), Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

317. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report covering the professional and scientific positions established in the Department of Defense for the calendar year ending December 31, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 313, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 758, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

318. A letter from the Attorney General, transmiting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act relating to debt claims"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

319. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to readjust postal rates; establish a Commission on Postal Rates; and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

320. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

321. A letter from the Chairman, Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission, transmitting a recommended program for disposal of the Government-owned synthetic rubber facilities and related equipment, pursuant to section 9 (a) of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 (Public Law 205, 83d Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 159. Joint resolution authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area; without amendment (Rept. No. 4). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2800. A bill providing for the conveyance of the Old Colony project to the Boston Housing Authority; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 2801. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2802. A bill to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 2803. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 2804. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 2805. A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2806. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2807. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to provide a permanent procedure for adjustment of tariff rates on a selective basis, to regulate the flow of imported articles on a basis of fair competition with domestic articles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2808. A bill to encourage the States to hold preferential primary elections for the nomination of candidates for the office of President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 2809. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2810. A bill to permit payment of certain cost-of-living allowances outside the continental United States at rates in excess of 25 percent of the rate of basic compensation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BASS of Tennessee:

H. R. 2811. A bill for the relief of the city of Gallatin, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2812. A bill to modify the comprehensive plans for the improvement of the Cumberland River and tributaries to provide for the inclusion in such plans for the payment of $37,740 to the city of Gallatin, Tenn., for the cost to such city of the construction of additional water system facilities necessitated by the raising of the water level of the Cumberland River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 2813. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2814. A bill to amend section 1073 of title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the punishment of any individual who travels in interstate or foreign commerce to avoid prosecution or punishment for indecent molestation of a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 2815. A bill to encourage equity investments through tax incentives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2816. A bill to amend subsection 216 (c), part II, of the Interstate Commerce Act to require the establishment by motor carriers of reasonable through routes and joint rates, charges, and classifications; to the Committee an Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. R. 2817. A bill to promote the further development of public-library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 2818. A bill to establish a Council on Juvenile Delinquency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 2819. A bill to authorize purchase of a portion of the bonds issued by the Brazos River Authority, an agency of the State of Texas, to finance the early development by it of the water resources of the Brazos River Basin, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2820. A bill to amend section 4521 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to prevent a contraction of the tax base from which Federal revenues are derived; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2821. A bill to amend section 13 (c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to the exemption from the child-labor provisions of such act of certain employees employed in agriculture; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2822. A bill to amend section 2 (a) (7) of the Social Security Act to provide that, in determining the need of an individual for old-age assistance under a State plan, the first $50 per month of such individual's earned income shall be disregarded; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 2823. A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 2824. A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 2825. A bill to establish a Commission on Programs for the Aging; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 2826. A bill to increase the rates and amounts of compensation which may be

earned by retired commissioned officers when employed by the United States, and to provide that such rates and amounts shall increase or decrease as the level of prices increases or decreases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2827. A bill to provide an equitable adjustment for retirement pay of naval and Marine Corps officers commissioned from the enlisted ranks; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 2828. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 and the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951 to provide for lump-sum payments to certain beneficiaries under those acts; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2829. A bill to authorize the sale of certain property of the United States to the Georgia Institute of Technology; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 2830. A bill for the relief of the cities of Lebanon and Gallatin, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. R. 2831. A bill to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 2832. A bill to provide for the sale by the Secretary of the Army of land allocated for cottage-site development in reservoir areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 2833. A bill to amend the provisions of law added to the United States Code by the act of August 15, 1953 (Public Law 280, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 588); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 2834. A bill to modify the comprehensive plan for the improvement of the Cumberland River and tributaries to provide for the inclusion in such plans for the payment of specific amounts to certain cities for the construction of additional water-system facilities necessitated by the raising of the water level of the Cumberland River as a result of the construction of the Old Hickory lock and dam project; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2835. A bill to amend the veterans regulations to provide for the review of claims for compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 2836. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 2837. A bill to provide for a pay increase for postmasters, officers, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 2838. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain tuition payments be treated as charitable contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 2839. A bill to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. R. 2840. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor

H. R. 2841. A bill to amend section 6 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide increased benefits in cases of disabling injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 2842. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 2843. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to indemnify farmers for damages to fruit trees caused by hurricanes in 1954; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAYWORTH:

H. R. 2844. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the payment of old-age insurance benefits to certain disabled individuals who are under 65 years of age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 2845. A bill to amend the veterans regulations to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-incurred disability of loss or loss of use of both buttocks; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 2846. A bill for the establishment of a commission on organization of the Federal judiciary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 2847. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide for the discharge and continuing deferment of certain persons of exceptional scientific, technical, and engineering ability or aptitude; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 2848. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to furnish memorial markers commemorating certain deceased members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 2849. A bill to grant to certain State agencies control over the allocation and expenditure of certain Federal appropriations made to carry out the Federal Airport Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 2850. A bill—

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE AND POLICY

To reaffirm the national public policy and the purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, commonly designated "antitrust" laws, which among other things prohibit price discriminations; to aid in intelligent, fair, and effective administration and enforcement thereof; and to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Anti-Price Discrimination Act and the protection which it affords to independent business, the Congress hereby reaffirms that the purpose of the antitrust laws in prohibiting price discriminations is to secure equality of opportunity of all persons to compete in trade or business and to preserve competition where it exists, to restore it where it is destroyed, and to permit it to spring up in new fields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 2851. A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 2852. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 2853. A bill to defray traveling expenses of relatives of United States nationals held as prisoners of war by foreign powers, in connection with visits to places of such imprisonment; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 2854. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to increase the penalties applicable to seditious conspiracy, advocating overthrow of government, and conspiracy to advocate overthrow of government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 2855. A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2856. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 2857. A bill to provide for a program of Federal loans to assist States and local communities in building schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 2858. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 2859. A bill to provide that the fluid-milk program for schools established by section 201c of the Agricultural Act of 1949 shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of the National School Lunch Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 2860. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 2861. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2862. A bill to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 2863. A bill to provide that pensions for non-service-connected death shall be extended to the widows and children of deceased World War II and Korean veterans under the same conditions as apply to the widows and children of deceased World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H. R. 2864. A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2865. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 2866. A bill to declare the waterway (a section of the Acushnet River) north of the Coggeshall Street Bridge in Massachusetts a nonnavigable stream; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 2867. A bill to increase the monthly rates of pension payable to widows and former widows of deceased veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 2868. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2869. A bill to provide that veterans may continue to accrue the benefits provided by the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, until individuals may no longer be inducted for training and service in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2870. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2871. A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. R. 2872. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act to relieve innocent purchasers of certain fungible goods from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 2873. A bill to authorize purchase of a portion of the bonds issued by the Brazos River Authority, an agency of the State of Texas, to finance the early development by it of the water resources of the Brazos River Basin, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 2874. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to reduce from 65 to 60 years the age at which persons may qualify for old-age and survivors insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2875. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide certain benefits for the widows of employees who died prior to February 28, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2876. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 2877. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 2878. A bill to authorize the Public Housing Commissioner to enter into agreements with local public housing authorities for the admission of single persons, in hardship cases, to federally assisted low-rent housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2879. A bill to provide for tax refunds in certain cases where it has been determinded that an unlawful collection has been made; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2880. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the Racine County Rifle Range, Wis., to the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 2881. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 2882. A bill to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of Plancor No. 877 at Baytown, Tex.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Miss THOMPSON of Michigan:

H. R. 2883. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2884. A bill to amend section 901 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 2885. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2886. A bill to further amend the act of September 9, 1950, by extending until July 1, 1957, the authority to require the special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 2887. A bill to exempt the retirement income and pensions of members of the Armed Forces who are under the age of 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. R. 2888. A bill to provide for intensified research into the causes, hazards, and effects of air pollution, and the methods for its prevention and control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 2889. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land in Necedah, Wis., to the village of Necedah; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 2890. A bill to provide for the disposal of certain Federal property in the Boulder City area, to provide assistance in the establishment of a municipality incorporated under the laws of Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2891. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to amend section 84 (a) (2) of title 28 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. J. Res. 161. Joint resolution to establish a commission on utilization of manpower in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. J. Res. 162. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Information, Intelligence, and Security; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. J. Res. 163. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1955, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H. J. Res. 164. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating October 31 of each year as Youth Honor Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. J. Res. 165. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army to confer with certain municipal officials and others to work out a method of preventing certain lake levels from dropping excessively because of the use of hydroelectric generators; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution establishing a joint committee to make a study of the organization and operation of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. Con. Res. 52. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of juvenile delinquency in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. Res. 101. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to investigate and study the desirability and feasibility of establishing an island prison for the confinement of persons convicted of crimes involving disloyalty; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Res. 102. Resolution to authorize the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. Res. 103. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of juvenile delinquency in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BEAMER: Resolution of the Senate of the Indiana General Assembly urging the location and establishment of a harbor and port along the shore of Lake Michigan in the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to prevent the closing of the Murphy General Hospital in Waltham, Mass.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly urging the President of the United States, the Congress, and the Secretary of Defense of the United States to reappraise manpower policy No. 4 to the end that Rhode Island may receive its fair share of defense contracts so-called; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly urging the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, and the Tariff Commission to enact and maintain tariff rates on textiles, including lace, jewelry, and rubber goods imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolution of the House of Representatives, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to prevent the closing of the Murphy General Hospital in Waltham, Mass.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to House Concurrent Resolution 5, requesting that the Secretary of Defense rescind his order that the Army and Navy Hospital at Hot Springs, Ark., be closed; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Senate Joint Resolution 2, requesting that the Secretary of Defense rescind his order that the Army and Navy

Hospital at Hot Springs, Ark., be closed; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting the enactment of legislation increasing the personal income-tax exemptions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to a concurrent resolution approved by the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico, entitled "Concurrent resolution to condemn the aggression which is being inflicted to democracy in Costa Rica, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 2892. A bill for the relief of Marcelino C. Hortizuela; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 2893. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Graphic Arts Corporation of Ohio, of Toledo, Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 2894. A bill for the relief of Angelo John Maroulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 2895. A bill for the relief of Ahti Johannes Ruuskanen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2896. A bill for the relief of Elisabetta Marie Cocco, Riccardo Cocco, and Laura Cocco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2897. A bill for the relief of Chung Poik Cha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 2898. A bill for the relief of F. Delizia Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 2899. A bill for the relief of Eugenio (also known as Eugene) Cataldi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2900. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Gallagher, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 2901. A bill for the relief of Elmer George Reitmeyer and Johanna Mary Reitmeyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2902. A bill for the relief of Andrew Trittner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD (by request):

H. R. 2903. A bill for the relief of Olindo Balboni, Mrs. Gisella Balboni, and Piero Balboni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2904. A bill for the relief of Maj. Orin A. Fayle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2905. A bill for the relief of Sydney Eric Barnett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 2906. A bill for the relief of Luigi Orlando; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2907. A bill for the relief of Thomas F. Harney, Jr., doing business as the Harney Engineering Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 2908. A bill for the relief of Col. Benjamin Axelroad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2909. A bill to amend Private Law 498, 83d Congress, so as to allow payment of agent's or attorney's fees out of the amounts appropriated thereunder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 2910. A bill for the relief of Osman Demir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2911. A bill for the relief of Max Steinsapir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 2912. A bill for the relief of Mori Blustein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2913. A bill for the relief of Piotr Kowalczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2914. A bill for the relief of Juan Pedro Garay-Muro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 2915. A bill to authorize the President to appoint General of the Army Douglas MacArthur to the grade of General of the Armies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 2916. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elfrieda Schoeppe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLT (by request):

H. R. 2917. A bill for the relief of Alexander D. Ramati and Gerda Ramati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2918. A bill for the relief of Fa Hsiang Wu, George Kuosing Wu, Chin Chung Yu, Lan Sing Wu, and Fu Sing Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2919. A bill for the relief of Anton and Rosanda (Rosana) Jugo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2920. A bill for the relief of Vera Suhrawardy and Oleg-Jerry Calder and Gleb Zahid Suhrawardy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2921. A bill for the relief of Rosy Juin Tseng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2922. A bill for the relief of Barry Maurice Clines and Margaret Linsley Clines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2923. A bill for the relief of Edward Abbey Kornitz; to the Committee of the Judiciary.

H. R. 2924. A bill for the relief of David J. Daze; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2925. A bill for the relief of Carmelo Rodriguez Perez, also known as Carmelo Rodriguez Fenald; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2926. A bill for the relief of George Huppert and Marta Huppert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2927. A bill for the relief of Mary Keane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2928. A bill for the relief of Robert C. Bentley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2929. A bill for the relief of Lazara Camargo Bernoudy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2930. A bill for the relief of June Beatrice Simmons Hightower Darling (nee Arron), alias Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 2931. A bill for the relief of Gina Bellagamba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2932. A bill for the relief of John H. Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2933. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Berta Mansergh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2934. A bill for the relief of Maria Pizzarello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 2935. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josephine Ray; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H. R. 2936. A bill for the relief of Clifford Oesterlei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 2937. A bill for the relief of Karel Aloys Kase; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 2938. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Javier (formerly Maria Alvarado Sala); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 2939. A bill for the relief of Isabel Tre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 2940. A bill for the relief of H. O. Schundler and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 2941. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Majka Grifasi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2942. A bill for the relief of Umberto Randaccio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 2943. A bill for the relief of Ami and Malka Hadary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 2944. A bill for the relief of Franziska Lindauer Ball; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2945. A bill for the relief of Joan Frances Feeley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. R. 2946. A bill for the relief of Eugene Dus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2947. A bill for the relief of Emelda Ann Schallmo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2948. A bill for the relief of William Joseph Perella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 2949. A bill for the relief of Jose Armando Quaresma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 2950. A bill for the relief of Maximo C. Angeles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2951. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emma Hankel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 2952. A bill for the relief of John H. Parker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 2953. A bill for the relief of Judy Anne Marie Burton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VELDE:

H. R. 2954. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Irene Emma Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2955. A bill to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2956. A bill to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 2957. A bill for the relief of Elli Anna Maria Cirillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 2958. A bill for the relief of Victoriana Areitio Berincua; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2959. A bill for the relief of Dieter Wolfgang Kaisenberg (also known as William Prieb); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 2960. A bill for the relief of Amadea Avanzado and Gil Avanzado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 2961. A bill for the relief of Fuh Yu Yang (John F. Y. Yang); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. J. Res. 166. Joint resolution to authorize the appointment of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur as General of the Armies of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

61. By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts: Petition of Boston, Mass., City Council, opposing the closing of the Murphy General Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

62. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution adopted by the common council of the city of Racine, Wis., to urge its elected Representatives to support any legislation the purpose of which is to institute and complete the deepening and improving of the connecting channels of the Great Lakes, with particular reference to the Detroit River, Lake St. Clair, the St. Marys River, and some shoal spots in the Straits of Mackinac; to the Committee on Public Works.

63. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Harold Hillenbrand, D. D. S., secretary, American Dental Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the association's interest in providing additional resources in support of the program of the World Health Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

64. Also, petition of Charles Telfian, Raiford, Fla., relative to the case of *Charles Telfian* v. *The United States of America*, relating to a redress of grievance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Minority Report on Investigation by Special Campaigns Committee in Ninth Congressional District of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 439, 2d session, 83d Congress, created a special Committee To Investigate the Election of the Members to the House of Representatives of the 84th Congress. By the terms of the resolution the committee expired with the end of the 83d Congress.

The majority report of the committee was filed on January 1, 1955. At that time I was in my home district of Louisiana and did not have an opportunity to examine the report prior to its being filed.

The report was not signed by myself or by Representative FRANK KARSTEN of Missouri. We were the minority members of the committee. The committee having expired, there is no procedure whereby a minority report may be attached to the majority report. Representative KARSTEN and I are using this means of publishing the report which we would have filed. It follows in full:

MINORITY REPORT ON INVESTIGATION BY SPECIAL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE IN NINTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

Ordinarily we would not issue a minority report concerning the procedure followed by the Campaign Expenditures Committee in its investigations and hearings. But we are particularly concerned with the report issued relative to the investigation conducted in the Ninth Congressional District of North Carolina. This report, plus various and sundry press releases, issued in the name of the committee has, in our opinion, created in the minds of the voters of that district widespread misconceptions and we think the record should be set straight.

In our opinion neither the hearings nor the investigations were warranted.

The hearings demonstrated the soundness of the rule previously adopted by this committee that only complaints filed under oath in writing by either the victorious or the defeated candidate for Congress would be considered. This rule was neither adopted nor followed in the 83d Congress. The soundness of such a requirement is obvious. Without it complaints, by crackpots and others, could undoubtedly be filed in all of the congressional districts of our country.

In the Ninth Congressional District of North Carolina the committee never had a complaint in writing from either the winner or the loser in the congressional race. The only complaint was that filed by the Republican organization of North Carolina. At the time that complaint was filed we took the position that it involved the election laws of the State of North Carolina. (We are not authorities on the election laws of North Carolina, although we did learn a few things about them while there.) At the most it seemed to us that what was indicated was action by the Legislature of the State of North Carolina, amending, if necessary, the North Carolina absentee ballot laws, but in no instance was Federal legislation or Federal election laws involved. Throughout the existence of our Republic the States have zealously guarded their rights to determine election procedures.

We most certainly condemn the violation of any election laws. The privilege of voting is the greatest heritage that the American people enjoy. A man who stultifies that right or seeks to buy or sell a vote or stuff the ballot box is a criminal. Nevertheless the net effect of 3 days of hearings in North Carolina simply confirm our original conviction that the election laws of North Carolina must be determined by the representatives of that State acting in their own legislature. The investigative rights of Congress ought never to be used as a weapon to accomplish the desires of a political party in any locality because that party at the moment happens to be the majority party in the Congress of the United States.

It appears to us that one of the main objectives of the Republican Party in North Carolina was to create doubt in the minds of the voters on the soundness of the North Carolina election laws, particularly those sections dealing with absentee voting in that State. These laws may very well need changing. We are not prepared to say yes or no. We do feel, however, that it is not the function of this committee to dictate to the Legislature of North Carolina.

In its effort to justify its expedition into the Ninth District, reckless and greatly exaggerated statements were made by members of the staff of the committee during and after the hearings. Cases were presented to the committee without adequate preparation, some of which had no bearing whatsoever on the congressional election. Frequently only one side of a case was presented to the committee. Several cases were presented as illegal which were not so. The alleged irregularities were magnified by the staff of the committee. A careful check of all of the irregularities has been made. On the basis of the testimony before the committee it is doubtful that more than a dozen or two votes would have been changed had there been a complete recount in the district. That could hardly be called gross irregularities in a district which casts from 70,000 to as many as 130,000 votes. In the November 2, 1954, election, approximately 100,000 votes were cast.

In order to clarify the above conclusions we deem it necessary that we here review in brief the evidence in the record county by county.

Alexander: Evidence was presented to the committee that 14 absentee ballots were voted prior to the date of issuance of the ballots with further evidence that the office of the chairman of the board of elections erroneously failed to enter the dates when the applications were received and when the ballots were sent out. There was some controversy about challenges by Republicans and some misunderstanding of the law of North Carolina relating thereto on the part of the election officials. There was some evidence that an invalid woman received $7 for voting. This was denied by her sister who was there. In another matter brought before the committee there was hearsay testimony that someone voted an absentee ballot for a lady without her knowledge. From the evidence there was a misunderstanding between the Democratic and Republican members of the board of elections as to just who could see the election records with evidence that the Republican member at one time had illegal possession of part of the records. There was no showing that any candidate was prejudiced by what transpired.

Alleghany: Three cases were erroneously brought before the committee, all of which concerned residence qualifications under the North Carolina law. Had counsel for the committee prepared his cases adequately and had he checked the North Carolina law, he would have found that each of the voters were duly qualified under the law and that there was no irregularity from this county.

Ashe: There was evidence with affidavits and counteraffidavits that an invalid man 80 years old, who was forgetful, stated he didn't vote his own absentee ballot. Yet there was evidence that his son accompanied the notary public at the time the father voted the ballot.

There was evidence presented that the ballots for one precinct were not properly guarded. In one case a newspaper reporter and others offered conflicting evidence as to whether or not 2 or 3 aged invalid ladies, who did not appear before the committee when subpenaed, had not received their ballots by mail. No prejudice was shown from this county to any candidate.

Cabarrus: Evidence that one registrar left books in custody of clerk with instructions to contact him if anyone desired to present

any challenges and that this was not done on that day but the next day the registrar heard the challenges.

Caldwell: Nothing was presented to the committee concerning this county.

Rowan: Nothing was presented to the committee concerning this county.

Stanley: Evidence given by a 45-year-old son, who couldn't read or write, that "X" mark on absentee ballots of father, who couldn't read or write, and who died on night of election was not the "X" of the father.

Watauga: Evidence was offered that the chairman of board of elections failed at one time to let the Republican member of board see election records. Evidence was presented by a Republican watcher who kept a record of people who voted that more votes were turned in in one precinct than had actually voted, but no more for congressional candidates than she had written in her book. No prejudice to any candidate was shown from this county.

Finally, we would like to emphasize that at no time during the hearings were there any indications of any nature that either candidate for Congress participated in any fashion in any of the alleged irregularities. Our own conclusions are that the Legislature of North Carolina should make a thorough study of the election laws of that State and take whatever action is deemed necessary in the premises. We reiterate the inadvisability of congressional committees concerning themselves with matters which should be left to the respective States.

HALE BOGGS.
FRANK KARSTEN.

Anniversary of the Proclamation of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my statement of January 22, 1955, commemorating the anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, OF MARYLAND, COMMEMORATING THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE PROCLAMATION OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

January 22 is the day set aside for the traditional observance of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence. Since 1918 this memorable day in the history of man's struggle against oppression has been a reminder to us, both of the atheistic dictatorial forces at large in our world and equally as important, the unbounded zeal of the Ukrainian people to attain the freedom and liberty for which they have so long aspired.

We, in America, together with the other free peoples of the world, are the present keepers of the flame of freedom—man's undying will to live in peace and friendship with his fellowman in accordance with the principles of God. As we enjoy these blessings, we cannot and we will not forget the freedom-loving people of the world who are not free, those who cherish liberty, but who must live without it, and those whose offer of a faith and charity to their neighbors is scorned by godless dictators whose thoughts and ambitions are of world domination and slavery for mankind rather than the protection of the inalienable rights of the individual.

No people have been more heroic, nor fought more bravely against countless odds for liberty and freedom than the Ukrainian people. We in America are not unmindful of their present plight nor of our solemn obligation to them. On this anniversary, we hail the free spirit of Ukrainia and renew our pledges of the past to continue to seek the means by which they can throw off the oppressor's yoke and walk with us as a free people.

Increase in Cotton Acreage Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced a measure—H. R. 2438—which, if enacted into law, will increase the national acreage allotment for the 1955 crop of cotton to 19,500,000 acres.

The Secretary of Agriculture, under existing legislation, has set the 1955 allotment at 18,113,208 acres which compares with the 1953 acreage of 25,151,400 and a 1954 acreage allotment of 21,379,358.

I have introduced this legislation, and urge its early passage, because many of the cotton farmers of my district and State are already in very bad financial circumstances due to last year's crop failure caused by a disastrous drought.

The cotton farmers of America have demonstrated time and time again their willingness to cooperate in a nationwide program which enables them to keep production in line with reasonable consumer demands. They know, as I do, that if we are to have a price-support program, we must also have acreage quotas. Yet, I believe that under certain conditions it may be unwise to reduce surpluses in certain years as drastically as they have been in others. I believe that 1955 is a year, certainly in the district I represent, in which our national acreage allotment should not be reduced by as much as 3 million acres.

Our national acreage allotment in 1954 was almost 4 million acres less than the 1953 acreage. In addition, my section of the country as well as other areas suffered the most disastrous drought that can be remembered. Another cut in cotton acreage for 1955 amounting to more than 3 million acres can only mean bankruptcy for some of the cotton farmers in my State and district. I am certain it would be better at this time to spread out our acreage reduction over a longer period of time rather than throw thousands of cotton farmers out of work by another drastic acreage cut this year.

I therefore urge the members of the Agricultural Committee and the Congress to give careful and early consideration to my bill and to other measures that propose an increase in the cotton-acreage allotment for 1955.

To delay consideration of such legislation could mean that any increase the Congress adopts might be too late for the planting season.

Modesto, Calif.: All-American City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in Look magazine on February 8, 1955, will appear an article in which the magazine and the National Municipal League, assisted by a group of distinguished civic leaders, selected 11 cities as all-American cities.

In this group is the city of Modesto, Calif. It is the county seat of Stanislaus and the second largest city within the 11th Congressional District of California, which I have the honor to represent in the House of Representatives.

I congratulate the mayor, Harry Marks, the city manager, and the City Council of Modesto, and Lawrence Robinson, Jr., chairman of the citizen's committee, on receiving this honor. But I must confess that I was not surprised. Many years ago when I was a municipal official in California, and a director in the League of California Cities, I organized the Central Valley division of the league. This included Modesto and from that time on I have had knowledge of the city government of Modesto. It has always been a well-governed city. Over Highway 99, the major through highway in the city, is a huge sign with this inscription: "Water, wealth, contentment, health."

Modesto is in the center of one of the richest agricultural areas in the United States. In Stanislaus County are the two most fabulous irrigation districts in California. They are the Modesto Irrigation District and the Turlock Irrigation District. They are operated jointly. Last year they had paid off their bond issues. They furnish the water to the fertile land that raises the fruits, nuts, row crops, alfalfa, and so forth, which make the county so rich and its county seat, Modesto, so prosperous.

Modesto, like most California cities, was afflicted with "growingitis." So many from outside of California came into the area that contiguous to Modesto's boundaries was a population much larger than the city's population. So the people began to agitate and later they organized to provide money, through a bond issue, to make various improvements that would attract the outside area. It did. Then came annexation to the city of many of these areas. The schools were improved to the tune of $4.3 millions by the sale of bonds approved by the voters for necessary expansion and improved teaching techniques. Incidentally, the superintendent, James H. Corson, was an Olympic games star in Amsterdam in 1928. He

was a world champion discus thrower for a short time, being outdistanced by another American 15 minutes after he had broken the world's record.

Good municipal government in California is partly due to the nonpartisan elections which California adopted over 40 years ago. Partisan party politics are out in our city elections. The elective officers of our cities are selected by the voters who vote for those they think best able to conduct the affairs of the city government.

Under leave to extend my remarks I am including a portion of the article from Look magazine about Modesto, Calif. It follows:

(By Jack Star)

Despite the traditional cynicism of politics, an American community—if it becomes indignant enough and determined enough—can stem graft, choke creeping blight, root out bumbling inefficiency, make streets safe for women and children.

As proof, the National Municipal League and Look again point to 11 communities where energetic, purposeful, and intelligent citizen action has accomplished such ends—and more. The league, which for 60 years has provided tools and inspiration for better local government, and Look have named these communities the All-American Cities of 1954.

The winners include the second largest city in the land and one of the smallest hamlets. None is necessarily a model town, but all, because of citizen action, are better places in which to live.

In the words of Dr. George H. Gallup, league president and director of the American Institute of Public Opinion, the awards are given not for good government, efficient municipal administration, or a specific improvement, as such, but rather for citizen effort.

This year, a record 225 communities were nominated for awards. The 22 finalists presented their cases before a distinguished jury of civil leaders at the annual national conference on government in Kansas City, Mo.

The winning communities are Chicago, Ill.; Decatur, Ark.; Maricopa County, Ariz.; Mexico, Mo.; Modesto, Calif.; Newark, N. J.; Pueblo, Colo.; Richfield, Minn.; Rock Island, Ill.; Rockville, Md.; and Warren, Ohio.

These are their stories:

Modesto, Calif.: Late in the 1940's, Modesto discovered that while its own population (17,000) had remained unaffected by the postwar California boom, the area outside its city limits had blossomed into an industrial section of 34,000. This huge fringe population posed a crushing problem: The suburbanites used Modesto's facilities and paid few taxes. Modesto, with no place to dump its sewage, found itself girdled by 10,000 cesspools.

The solution was annexation—make all problems common and solve them for the common good. But outside industry feared higher taxes and stricter regulation. In 1953, the voters adopted city-manager government (which had once been ruled illegal) and began wooing the suburbanites.

"Some outside industries began boycotting our merchants," recalls Mayor Harry Marks. "So we decided to make them want to come in, to offer them a city they would beg to become a part of."

A committee of 21 swelled into a committee of 1,000 and began a campaign of doorbell ringing to publicize a $2.5 million sewer-improvement bond issue. It carried 8 to 1. An improved fire department meant lower insurance rates for industry.

The annexations began. By the end of 1954, so many areas had been annexed that Modesto's population had more than doubled and more areas were waiting their turn. The voters approved spending $4.3 million for schools; a youth center that stood unfinished for 3 years was completed in weeks with donated labor and materials. Many more improvements are on the way.

Commission on Organization of the Federal Judiciary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, much has been said over the past years concerning the sad conditions which exist in the Federal judiciary. Everyone agrees that something should be done and various suggestions arise from time to time, but nothing ever happens. I believe that now is the time to stop piecemeal measures and inquire into the problems of the judiciary in the broadest manner possible.

We hear about crowded calendars, insufficient number of judges, inadequate physical facilities for holding court, lack of sufficient courts, and lack of funds. These are subjects which are not charged with emotion and not too many people think about them until they themselves become litigants and victims of the inadequate system.

It is our duty as legislators to see that American citizens are not denied justice for want of an adequate, well-working court system. After all, the Bill of Rights and other constitutional guaranties mean nothing if our people do not have the instrumentalities to put them into effect.

I do not pretend to offer all the answers to the problems raised. As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, I merely desire to call them to the attention of the Congress and offer a plan of attack.

I have prepared legislation and will introduce it today to establish a Commission on Organization of the Federal Judiciary. The idea is not novel and involves no departure from precedent. This plan is frankly patterned after the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, popularly known as the Hoover Commission. We know of the outstanding work performed by the Hoover Commission in past years, and at the present time we are awaiting the reports of the new Hoover Commission as authorized by the 83d Congress.

The Commission contemplated by my bill would be composed of 16 members. The President of the United States, the Chief Justice of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives would be authorized to appoint four members each. Half of those appointed by the President would be selected from persons in the executive branch of the Government. Half of those appointed by the Chief Justice would be from the Federal judiciary. The two congressional leaders would make half of their appointments from Members of their respective bodies, and all other selections would be made from individuals in private life. All appointees to the Commission should be lawyers in good standing. This suggestion is made because of the technical nature of the subject and specialized knowledge required.

The Commission would be given a broad mandate to inquire into every phase of the Federal court system. A few of the subjects of inquiry might be:

First. The volume of litigation, delays incident thereto and suggested remedies.

Second. Recommendations should be made concerning the advisability of consolidating courts of special jurisdiction such as the Tax Court and others, with district courts.

Third. The necessity of realinement of judicial districts, geographical areas, and places of holding court as dictated by modern-day conditions, shifts in population, and other factors.

Fourth. The adequacy of buildings, courtrooms, libraries, and other physical facilities necessary for efficient administration of justice.

Fifth. Recommendations for liberalizing retirement laws in order to encourage retirement of judges whose efficiency is impaired due to age, infirmity, or other reasons.

Sixth. Recommendations concerning advisability of delegating jurisdiction to State courts in certain cases.

Seventh. Recommendations concerning court aids such as clerks, marshals, and others.

Eighth. Recommendations for improvement of appellate procedures.

Ninth. Other recommendations that the commission may deem appropriate.

I have not raised the question of the pay of judges inasmuch as that subject has been considered by another commission and recommendations have been made.

The proposed commission would have the usual power to appoint a staff, hold hearings, and obtain necessary data for proper discharge of its duties. It would be required to report to Congress 1 year after the commission is established.

If the Congress sees fit to authorize the establishment of a Commission on Organization of the Federal Judiciary, an opportunity will be given for the first time to the lawyers, judges, and other citizens of the United States, to submit their suggestions to one forum which is considering the individual problems and how they affect the whole judicial system. It would be expected that the bar associations and other groups concerned with the improvement of the administration of justice would take an active part in supplying necessary data, members of task forces, and rendering other valuable assistance. The advice and counsel of Members of Congress and Federal judges would also be sought. It should be kept in mind that the final duty for securing adequate justice to the American people rests with Congress. Our duties do not end with the appointment of a commission. It is incumbent

upon us to rise to the challenge and follow through with the necessary legislation once we have the recommendations. The commission would gather the facts for us on a nonpartisan basis, free from political considerations and unfettered by the myriad of details which are incidental to service in the Congress.

Anniversary of the Proclamation of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the traditional observance of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence, January 22, 1918, presents an opportunity for American citizens to assure to all escapees from tyranny scattered throughout the world their sympathy, and their determination to continue the struggle for the freedom of all people.

This America believes: "That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." This applies to men both behind and outside the Iron Curtain.

We hear much of peaceful coexistence today. Every one of us wants peace. To be realistic we must recognize that we do exist in a world divided into two great idealogical camps. And we can hardly demand that every people and every nation adopt our form of Government or our way of life. Yet, we must strive in every legitimate way to assist those who would bring freedom to nations enslaved, or to peoples oppressed.

There are those who say that the internal rule of the Communists is none of our concern. To a displaced person this must have a strange sound. Furthermore, that attitude cannot be defended if we understand the fundamental philosophies of democracy and communism. If democracy means anything, it means a firm faith in the inherent infinite worth of the individual, in the innate dignity of the human being. If we honestly believe this, we will not be satisfied until the worth and dignity of every human being in the world is recognized, and that human being is permitted to live and act freely.

This is not to advocate preventive war nor rash and unintelligent action, but it is to warn all despots that we will continue to strive for justice and decency for all mankind.

There are good and noble people in my district who dream of the day when their captive homelands will be free again. They are working and preparing for that day. Such men were Tomàš Masaryk, of Czechoslovakia, and Syngman Rhee, of Korea. To these good people and all like them we pledge our help and our cooperation in securing a body of free nations in a free world.

Italy's Complaint on United States Subsidy of American Citrus Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, because of the administration of our laws on the high policymaking level, a conflict has developed between our foreign policy as expressed in GATT—General Agreement on Trades and Tariffs—and our statutory law as expressed in the Agricultural Act of 1935.

As a participating nation in GATT, the United States is committed to a policy of limiting subsidies where it would seriously prejudice the interests of other participating nations. Under section 32 of the Agricultural Act, however, the Secretary of Agriculture has a mandate to encourage the exportation of agricultural commodities through the use of subsidies in order to help increase America's competitive position in foreign markets. The subsidy provisions of the Agricultural Act, however—and this is an important distinction to remember—are not mandatory but permissive and give the Secretary a wide discretion in both the granting or withholding of subsidy benefits, and in the selection of the commodities to be subsidized.

The present export program of agriculture grants heavy subsidies on citrus fruits which compete directly with Italian, Israeli, North African, and Spanish citrus products in the European markets. As a result, Italian oranges, for example, are being crowded out of Italy's traditional orange markets, not because Italy's oranges are inferior, but because of United States financing of American citrus fruits. While it is presently asserted that subsidy assistance is to help American exporters to maintain their foreign markets, the fact is that the Department, through subsidies, is seeking to expand America's competitive position in foreign markets and is in fact lengthening the time period of America's so-called summer citrus market in Europe.

The United States is committed to a foreign program of helping war-ravaged and poor countries rehabilitate themselves, so that by raising their economic levels, these countries may, one day, help themselves. With the termination of direct United States economic aid, countries like Italy more than ever need their traditional foreign markets and, in fact, Italy must expand hers in order to take up the slack caused by the ending of direct United States assistance. Because it is lacking in many natural resources and cannot compete in the industrial field, Italy must rely most heavily on her agricultural export trade. The United States citrus industry, on the other hand, is enjoying an all-time high and has access to other foreign markets such as Canada without having to invade the European market on an unfair United States subsidized competitive basis, at least not at the present time. Furthermore, if we are to follow the principle of "trade not aid" then these subsidies must be rarely if ever used. If we drive Italy and other countries similarly situated too hard and they have markets for their citrus fruits that are narrowing more and more, we force her to sell wherever she can—behind the Iron Curtain if need be.

SUGGESTED ACTION

The above statement may be an oversimplification of the problem which is indeed a complicated one with many facets. Yet, in the final analysis, it is clear that there must be greater coordination between our executive agencies, in order that conflicts, brought about by the administration of our laws, may be avoided. Negotiations under GATT have reached an impasse. The GATT agreement, unfortunately, has no true enforcement provisions, and its success depends upon the willingness and consent of the countries concerned. Since the policies set forth therein represent our latest thinking on the subject, the Department of Agriculture should revise its policy so as to eliminate those aspects which are harmful to countries like Italy, Israel, Greece, and Turkey. United States is presently subsidizing dried raisins and apricots, to the detriment of Greece and Turkey; and oranges, to the detriment of Italy, Israel, Spain, and North Africa. Without seriously prejudicing United States citrus producers, subsidy payments could be suspended on American citrus exports which are shipped to the traditional European markets of these countries, at least during their market season, which is from November through April.

Strike Averted Following Intervention of Governor Ribicoff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, today I am calling to the attention of the membership a significant occurrence in the State of Connecticut last week.

A statewide strike of some 2,200 employees of the Connecticut Co., the Connecticut Light & Power Co., which would have paralyzed a large portion of the transportation system of Connecticut, was called off after Gov. Abraham Ribicoff intervened and succeeded in bringing both sides together.

Many of my colleagues will remember Governor Ribicoff as my distinguished predecessor, the Representative from the First Congressional District of Connecticut.

Governor Ribicoff believes that the welfare and prosperity of this country to a very large extent depends upon a harmonious and cooperative effort between employees and employer. Several times in the course of his public career he has publicly voiced this philosophy.

In the bus strike he applied this philosophy with great effectiveness. As a result of his efforts, this strike which would have been disastrous in many respects, was completely avoided.

For his successful efforts, the bus drivers' union and officials of the Connecticut Co. have both expressed their thanks to the Governor. The people of Connecticut join in this expression of gratitude.

I have taken this time to bring this matter to the attention of the House, not only to pay tribute to a great Governor who was a former Member of this body, but as well to point out that this is the kind of leadership in Government which will produce a more stable society in the United States of America.

The Memory of Agnes G. Shankle: Fighter for Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following in memory of the late Agnes G. Shankle.

The older people of the United States have lost one of their very best friends, in the passing of Agnes G. Shankle, who was secretary-treasurer of the National Pension Federation, Inc., Washington, D. C., and editor of the National Pension Guide.

Adequate universal pension coverage for all our senior citizens 65 years of age and older without any ifs, buts, or ands, this was the goal to which she devoted herself unsparingly.

Not for personal gain or glory, but out of the fullness of her heart, finding fulfillment in helping others.

Before congressional committees she argued cogently and convincingly on the need of a national pension, and she provided inspiring leadership for the millions of aged to whom she was the symbol of hope.

The facts and figures she presented to prove that a national pension is not only necessary but inevitable were illuminated by her own earnestness and sincerity.

Into the arena of economics and politics, she brought the saving grace of humanity and the spirit that is eternal.

When the day surely comes that her vision becomes reality, every older person in this Nation can thank the pioneering efforts of Mrs. Shankle for the security they will enjoy during the closing years of their lives.

Our grief is comforted by the knowledge that she is safely home in the kingdom of the blessed.

As she would wish, we shall continue the good work to which she dedicated her life until a national pension becomes a beneficent law of this land and a living memorial to Agnes G. Shankle.

Anniversary of the Proclamation of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marked the 37th anniversary of the Ukrainian people. This anniversary symbolizes the love for freedom by all the peoples enslaved by Communist domination. Their indefatigable spirt of opposition to Communist oppression commands the admiration and the support of the entire American people. When their unity of purpose and resistance forced the regimes in Hungary and Czechoslovakia to retreat and make concessions, what better proof could we have that the captive people entrapped behind the Iron Curtain are our stanchest allies; brothers in arms who man the outpost in the never-ceasing struggle against Communist imperialism.

Such friends will never be forgotten, for their suffering and their sacrifices serve the cause of freedom of men everywhere. Their aspirations of national independence, human rights, and dignity are the same cornerstones on which our Republic was founded and maintained. How could we fail to support, wholeheartedly, these aspirations which are the essence of democracy in which we believe, and for which thousands of Americans gave their lives on the battlefields of Europe and Asia.

The American people will not be fooled by Communist slogans of coexistence which means enslavement for millions of our brothers. We shall continue to strive for the just aspirations of the captive nations, as we have done in the past. That the Congress of the United States, and thus the people who elect their representatives, continuously study means and ways to support the enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain is manifested in the work of the House Committee on Communist Aggression and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The House committee recommended to the Government a specific course of action, specifically designed to help the now captive nations attain their goal of self-determination, while the Senate's studies on tensions in Eastern Europe again demonstrated to the American people that the Communist regimes in that area only derive their power from inhuman terror and atrocities. The American people are fully aware of these conditions, and true to their tradition have formed organizations to combat them. Such private organizations as the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., and the Free Europe Committee, are truly representative of the feeling of American sentiment. More important still, they prove by their action, be it by radio or leaflets dropped by balloons, that the voice of the once free nations can never be silenced as long as the American people stand side by side with their freedom-loving brothers behind the Iron Curtain.

Anniversary of Proclamation of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian National Republic issued a proclamation of Ukrainian independence. Last Saturday was the anniversary of this proclamation of Independence. Since that time the Ukrainian people have suffered greatly and they are now among the enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

The centuries-old struggle for freedom and independence on the part of the Ukrainian nation constitutes an impressive chapter in the annals of human history. This indomitable will for national freedom clearly crystallized itself in the old Ukrainian Kievan state from the 9th to the 14th century, in the Ukrainian Kozak state from 1648 to 1783, and more recently in the Ukrainian National Republic from 1917 to 1920. As one of the first victims of Soviet imperialism, Ukraine, since the very inception of alien Bolshevik tyranny, has proved to be the Achilles Heel of the Soviet Union. The destruction of its national churches, the horrible man-made famine of 1932–33, the mass murder at Vinnitsia in 1937–39, and the vast purges and deportations decreed by Moscow have failed to exterminate the spiritual and moral resources for national freedom in Ukraine. The historic capital of Kiev, with centuries of rich tradition and culture conserved in its vaults, still symbolizes today the indestructible hope and passion of a nation destined to be sovereign, free, and independent.

During the Second World War millions of Ukrainian patriots seized the short-lived opportunity of the German invasion to realize once again this hope, only to be frustrated in their valiant efforts by the scourge of another imperialism. But this unbending will continues to be strong and powerful in the epic struggle of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) against the evil forces of Soviet imperialism, and in the resistance of the Ukrainian people.

As a nation of over 40 million people—the largest non-Russian nation behind the European iron curtain—Ukraine stands as one of our most important and natural allies in the eventual defeat of Soviet imperialism. Its historic claim to national freedom and independence cannot be ignored. Its place as a sovereign and equal partner in the mutual construction of the free Europe of tomorrow must be assured, if the foundation of permanent peace among freedom-loving nations is to be impregnable.

Protest Against Contemplated Merger of Chase National Bank and Bank of Manhattan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have written to the Honorable William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, urging him to do all in his power to prevent the merger of the Chase National Bank and the Bank of Manhattan Co. In addition, I have asked that the Federal Reserve Board withhold its approval of any application for the establishment of branch banks which may be made as a result of this union.

In the light of the excessive accumulation of capital in the control of the parties to this merger, it is highly questionable whether the resulting banking corporation can avoid conflict with the laws and policies of our Federal Government involving monopolies and/or undue restriction of competition. Inasmuch as the merger concerns two of our largest banking institutions which are daily engaged in intensified competition with each other, there can be no doubt that the union of the two will be in defiance of and will directly flout the whole spirit and policy of our antitrust laws. I secured the passage of the Celler Antimerger Act which prohibits the merger of corporations where such consolidations tend to substantially lessen competition in any section of the country. The merger of these two banking institutions is clearly at odds with the whole intent and policy of that law as well as with the antimonopoly policies established under the Clayton Act and the Sherman Antitrust Act.

Together, these 2 banks presently have over 80 branches concentrated in a 50-mile area in the city of New York and are daily vying with each other for the business of the people in New York. In addition, the Bank of Manhattan Co. is also set to acquire the Bronx County Trust Co. The danger is therefore evident that the merger will unduly lessen the competition which large competing banks provide and may tend to create a monopoly to the disadvantage of the people of New York and to the country generally. The businessman and merchant will find it increasingly difficult to establish credit facilities and they will be at the mercy of a financial colossus which, because of the lack of competition, will be able to set the standards providing for the bank's best interests, to the detriment of small-businessmen and other customers.

There have been 14 bank mergers in New York City in the past 7 years. Unless some brake is placed on this trend, serious consequences will befall that section of the country. If the present merger is approved, an all-powerful oligopoly, made up of the National City Bank, the Manufacturers Trust—both the results of mergers—and the new Chase-Manhattan Bank, will have a stranglehold on New York banking facilities. Under these circumstances, the Attorney General has the clear duty, under the Sherman Act, to investigate and prevent this merger.

In addition, I have asked the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on my present bill, H. R. 2115, which is a measure designed to subject all bank mergers and consolidations to the scrutiny and written approval of Federal banking authorities. The bill, in substance, would require that before any bank merger can be effectuated, the approving Federal official would determine whether or not the merger or consolidation would lessen competition unduly or tend unduly to create a monopoly contrary to the policy of Congress hereby declared in favor of local ownership and control of banks and competition in the field of banking.

I advise Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve System, Attorney General Brownell, and Governor Harriman, Superintendent of Banks in New York State, and the Comptroller of Currency, that, in the event this merger goes through, it is my intention to have a full and complete investigation by the House Judiciary Committee of which I am chairman.

Also, because of the unwarranted rise in the stocks of these banks, there are strong indications of stock jobbing and sale manipulations. The records of brokers, traders, directors and officers of the banks in question should be closely scrutinized by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

I have in addition, introduced a bill designed to subject all bank mergers and consolidations to the scrutiny of Federal banking officials. The bill, in substance, would require that before any bank merger could be effectuated, it would be necessary to obtain the written consent of appropriate Federal banking authorities as follows:

First. If acquiring bank is insured national or District of Columbia bank, approving agency is Comptroller of the Currency.

Second. If acquiring bank is insured State member bank, approving agency is Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Third. If acquiring bank is insured nonmember bank, approving agency is Federal Deposit Insurance Corp.

Fourth. If acquiring bank is noninsured bank, approving agency is Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

In determining whether or not to approve the merger, officials, under the terms of the bill, would be required to determine if the effect of the merger or consolidation "may be to lessen competition unduly or * * * tend unduly to create a monopoly contrary to the policy of Congress hereby declared in favor of local ownership and control of banks and competition in the field of banking."

The bill would enlarge upon existing statutory provisions in several important respects. As provided by the Federal Deposit Insurance Act of 1950, Federal banking officials must approve mergers between insured banks only where the capital stock or surplus of the resulting bank will be less than the aggregate capital stock or surplus of the two institutions combined. Under existing law, the Comptroller of the Currency also must grant his approval before the merger of two national banks or a national bank and a State bank can occur; and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation must lend its sanction to mergers between insured and noninsured banks. In none of these instances, however, is the competitive impact of the merger a necessary element to be considered in granting or withholding approval of Federal officials.

The bill I have introduced would extend the merger provisions of existing statutes to include all insured banks regardless of the capitalization of the financial institution resulting from the merger and to require approval of mergers and consolidations of all noninsured banks as well. It would also make it necessary for Federal officials, in adjudging the merits of proposed mergers, to inquire as to the effect of the consolidation upon competition and monopoly power in the field of banking.

In introducing the proposed legislation, I wish to emphasize that no impartial observer viewing the financial structure of the Nation can feel other than alarm over the constant and unremitting decline in the number of banks serving depositors and borrowers in the country. This is a trend which began well before the great depression and has continued even into the most prosperous periods of our history. In 1951, more than 80 banks were lost through consolidation or absorption into other institutions. In the first half of 1952 alone, 52 banks went by way of merger.

Many of these consolidations result principally in strengthening the already powerful position of large banking institutions. Manufacturers Trust Co., for example, has risen to the position of the fifth largest bank in the United States principally by virtue of the efforts of the many fine banking institutions which it has absorbed, such as Brooklyn Trust Co., Equitable Trust Co., of New York, Flatbush National Bank, of Brooklyn, and others. Mellon National Bank & Trust Co., 11th ranking bank in the United States, has in recent years embarked upon a program which has resulted in the acquisition of many small suburban banks in the residential communities surrounding Pittsburgh. We see in the Bankers Trust Co., as another example, this surge toward financial concentration. Bankers Trust Co., since 1950, has absorbed such independent banking institutions as Title Guarantee & Trust Co., Lawyers Trust Co., Flushing National Bank, Commercial National Bank & Trust Co., and the Bayside National Bank, of New York. At the present moment there is a contemplated merger between the Chase National Bank and the Bank of Manhattan Co.

Something must be done to put a halt to this continued decrease in our bank population. Access to capital for all

types of businesses, small as well as large, must be safeguarded. Concentration of financial power in a comparatively small number of banks must be discouraged. These are not partisan objectives—on the contrary, they are the aims of all those interested in preserving free and independent enterprise.

Present laws relating to bank mergers are completely inadequate. This is confirmed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, whose Chairman wrote me some time ago, as follows:

It is apparent, therefore, that present statutory provisions with respect to bank mergers and consolidations do not provide effective means for the prevention of mergers and consolidations which may result in a lessening of competition or a tendency to monopoly. Even in those cases in which consent is necessary, the law does not specifically require the Comptroller of the Currency, the FDIC, or the Board, in determining whether to grant or withhold consent, to consider whether the proposed merger or consolidation will lessen competition or tend to a monopoly or to consider any other specific standards or guides.

The objective of this bill is consonant with that of the Congress in recently enacting the Celler Antimerger Act amending section 7 of the Clayton Act extending the merger provisions of that statute to acquisition of corporate assets as well as stock by those concerns subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission. It is now time to close another loophole in our salutary laws against mergers, and I believe this is the kind of legislation to which Members of both parties can freely lend their support.

Thirty-seventh Anniversary of the Ukrainian Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in rendering tribute to the 37th anniversary of the founding of the free and independent Ukrainian Republic, which was celebrated on January 22, 1955. Thousands of Americans of Ukrainian descent on that day reaffirmed their active faith in the eventual liberation of all the enslaved nations in the Communist empire.

As a nation of over 40 million people—the largest non-Russian nation behind the European Iron Curtain—Ukraine stands as one of our most important and natural allies in the eventual defeat of Soviet imperialism. We should not ignore its historic claim to national freedom and independence. Its place as a sovereign and equal partner in the building of a free Europe of tomorrow must be assured if the foundation of permanent peace among freedom-loving nations is to be unconquerable.

For two or more nations to coexist there must be a common ground of understanding, based on responsibility, confidence, and respect. Above all, there must be a respect for each other's sovereignty. When sovereignty is respected responsibility and confidence will follow. A Communist dictatorship to hold its people must create havoc between themselves and other nations, such as cold wars, little hot wars and big wars, blaming and pointing to the rest of the world as warmongers and aggressors against them. Ukrainian principles are an abomination to Communists, who would destroy every principle of life that is religious and good, since it is their aim to bend everyone to the atheistic precepts of Marxism.

Americanism Activities of Kings County (N. Y.) Jewish War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, this country can be proud of the services rendered by the people of the Jewish faith since the time of the Revolutionary War. The Jewish people have actively participated, with glory and distinction, in all the wars in which our great country was engaged.

In 1896, men of the Jewish faith organized the Jewish War Veterans of the United States. During the many years of its existence, this organization has been concerned with a twofold purpose: protection of the war veteran and his rights under the law, and a program of Americanism.

The Kings County—Brooklyn—Jewish War Veterans deserve recognition for the outstanding work which they have accomplished in both of these fields, with particular emphasis on their Americanism program. It is readily understandable that men, who have offered their lives in the service of their country during wartime, should logically be concerned with the welfare of our Nation in peacetime. It was in the fulfillment of this program that the Kings County Council of Jewish War Veterans instituted a program several years ago to help awaken the people of this country to the menace of communism.

By way of constructive action, a boycott was instituted at the time to inform the community of the goods produced by Russia and its satellites. Posters were printed and distributed in all stores listing these countries and the goods which originated from there. All large department stores were contacted and advised of this program. Cooperation was obtained from them and a campaign of public relations was undertaken to advise the public not to purchase goods made behind the Iron Curtain.

Side by side with the menace of communism exists also the menace of fascism, and there, too, the Jewish War Veterans of Brooklyn have been diligent and alert. Since the fall of nazism in Germany, the Jewish veterans' organization of Kings County has been alert to any incidents which might arise in our country in an effort to prevent a resurgence of these un-American activities.

While in past years there have been isolated instances of such activities, it was not until 1950 that a concentrated effort appeared on the New York scene. A group of individuals formed an organization called the National Renaissance Party. At that time, Ted Brooks, the JWV Kings County commander, appointed Jerry Cohen to head a committee to investigate and assemble facts about the National Renaissance Party. The committee included several officers of the veterans' organization: Emanuel Greenberg, Benjamin H. Chasin, Lester Sacks, Marshall G. Kaplan, and the executive director of veterans' group, Henry R. Shields.

Under the leadership of Jerry Cohen, secretary to Municipal Court Justice Harold J. McLaughlin, of Brooklyn, the committee was assigned specific duties in Yorkville, a section of the borough of Manhattan, where the followers of this party were concentrated.

The National Renaissance Party was headed by a young fanatic, James H. Madole, who with 20 or 30 followers began to sing the praises of Hitler in vituperation against the Jewish people at a series of street-corner meetings on 88th Street in Yorkville. These men appeared wearing the uniform similar to the Nazi bund, with brassards on which was a lightning-bolt insignia replacing the swastika. Their program and propaganda was practically a word-for-word "steal" from the Nazi dictators. For example, their program advocated the establishment of a Fascist corporate economy, the preservation of the white Aryan race by gradual deportation of Puerto Ricans, Negroes, and Jews, and the denial of citizenship, and professional and political posts to Jewish people.

In addition to Madole, John M. Lundoff, Kurt Mertig, Hans Schmidt, James R. White, and Keith H. Tompson, Jr., continued to disseminate this type of vicious propaganda at street-corner meetings and to extoll the virtues of Hitler through publications.

It was disturbing to find that in a city like New York, comprised of over 8 million people of heterogeneous groups, who had been living side by side in harmony and peace and in understanding and respect for each other's religious beliefs and feelings, people should now be subjected to an indoctrination of the principles of nazism. This was an insult to every decent American. It was also a challenge.

The Kings County Council Jewish War Veterans was among the first to accept this challenge. Here was an organization which recognized this menace. For it was only a short time ago, in 1933, when Hitler came into power in Germany, that the Jewish War Veterans of Kings County had helped to awaken our great country and had initiated an economic boycott against Germany. Now, more than 20 years later, we find the

same evil seeking to gain a foothold in America. It had to be stopped in time, and the Kings County Jewish War Veterans accepted the challenge.

Night after night the members of the JWV committee spent in Yorkville in an effort to obtain the necessary information to prove that the leaders and the followers of the National Renaissance Party were un-American and against our way of democratic life. They visited stores, meeting halls and places of public assembly, where little groups had gathered to discuss this new party. They attended their secret meetings, knowing all the time that if they were discovered they were subjecting themselves to either a beating or perhaps their very lives would be endangered.

When information was received that the National Renaissance Party had a definite schedule of outdoor meetings, the Kings County Jewish War Veterans, in order to counteract the venom and hate which was disseminated at these meetings, obtained permission to hold Americanism rallies on the opposite street corner at the same time. The Jewish War Veterans rallies were orderly and well conducted; their purpose was not only to tell the true story of the American people, but to enlighten the people of Yorkville about the threat represented by the National Renaissance Party if it is permitted to grow and gain a foothold in America.

At one time, it was necessary to call upon the Jewish War Veterans from Brooklyn and from the entire city of New York to come to Yorkville to counteract a very large rally that the National Renaissance Party had planned. In addition, the leadership of the American Legion and the Catholic War Veterans were notified of this activity and they, too, joined with the Jewish War Veterans.

The press of New York was solicited for its help. Radio Commentator Barry Gray is to be commended for the efforts which he exerted through the media at his disposal, informing the public of what was taking place under their noses. Feature stories and articles were also published in the New York press.

It is interesting to note that the very same people whom James Madole hoped to influence by appealing to their "nationalism" were the ones who repudiated him, heckled him, and told him, in no uncertain terms, that they want no part of him and his followers.

The Kings County Jewish War Veterans, after obtaining all the facts and publications distributed by this group, forwarded them to the Federal Bureau of Investigation in Washington. The FBI was requested to undertake an official investigation and, after the facts had been substantiated, to place the National Renaissance Party on the Attorney General's subversive list.

All of this has borne fruit. On December 14, 1954, the Attorney General of the United States, Herbert Brownell, Jr., issued a formal call for the opening of grand-jury proceedings against the National Renaissance Party. The House Committee on Un-American Activities, likewise, is to be commended for its efforts in exposing James H. Madole, the man who has labeled members of the House committee as "cowards" and has brazenly demanded that President Dwight D. Eisenhower be investigated.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the American people owe a debt of gratitude to the Kings County Jewish War Veterans for their activities in the field of Americanism. Under the leadership of Kings County commander of the Jewish War Veterans, Milton I. Weintraub, and his Americanism committee headed by Eli Goldstein, I am certain they will continue to be alert of any group which proposes to change our way of life, be they to the far left as communism and to the far right as nazism.

ORT in North Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, in my tour through French Morocco, Tunisia, and Algeria, I made a special attempt to visit the ORT schools and facilities, and I willingly testify to the dynamic and realistic approach made by them. I know of nothing more useful in raising the standard of living of our unfortunate Jews in the Mellah than to afford the young men and women the opportunity to become skilled workers. ORT provides a great ray of hope to thousands of these people. It is really and truly the Organization for Rehabilitation and Training.

I saw ORT installations in schools in Algeria and Casablanca. I am sorry, indeed, I was not privileged to see many of the other schools which ORT has established.

I wish to draw particular attention to some 50,000 Jews, sometimes called Berber Jews, who live in the Atlas Mountains region of Morocco. They have for centuries been small craftsmen and tradesmen, who sold their wares to the Berber Moors. With the impetus of the coming of industry to Morocco, a change has occurred bringing with it new problems. Machine-made goods are replacing handmade goods and the Berber Moors are coveting the cheaper machine-made goods. This tendency is displacing some of the Jews and taking them out of the economic market. It is essential that many of these Jews be trained by ORT; for example, in the use of machines for making shoes, clothes, radios, auto supplies, and so forth.

Up until a decade ago, Jews in Morocco had a monopoly on trading in the southern part of Morocco. Now the Berber Moors are competing with them, and the Berber Moors are given the preference. The Moors only buy from the Jews when they cannot buy from the Berbers. It is to the great advantage of the Jews, therefore, to learn all they can about electronics, about the work of beauticians, and other trades in which the Moors themselves are untrained. ORT can help the Jews get ready for industrial jobs through its training program.

I know of no better service to which money can be put than in contributions to the activities of ORT. The knowledge that we, the more fortunate, cannot take for granted that poverty, ignorance, and disease must always be with us—that help can and must be extended to the individual to aid him in finding a place for himself in this ever increasingly complicated society. ORT has shown the way, and to ORT every support and contribution should be given.

As I have been thinking of the development of ORT and the necessary statistics that must accompany its history, I was forcibly struck by an amazing parallel. I repeat what I said once before, that the point 4 program of the United States Government is exactly the drama of the work that ORT has been carrying on for more than 70 years. When President Truman announced the point 4 program, it was hailed—and rightfully so—as a dynamic concept of far-reaching significance in the training of the individual for the realization of a productive society. A new emphasis was placed on the individual, on his training, on his rehabilitation, teaching the use of tools first for his own benefit and for the benefit of the society in which he lives. It was a departure from mass thinking. It focussed attention on the needs of the individual, on the dignity of the individual, and how he as an individual contributes to the common good. It struck me then how ORT quietly, persistently, and even doggedly had inaugurated just such a program many years ago.

In 23 countries of the world ORT is training people in new uses of the hands and the eyes and the mind, lifting from them the weight of their uselessness and with such training bringing an understanding of new standards, of pride which will some day reflect itself in their children yet to be born.

A fact to be noted and remarked is the realization that ORT follows the line of history. The camps in Germany, Austria, and Italy are now closed. Most of the DP's are gone. ORT has turned its gaze eastward and to Africa, as has the rest of the world. The Near, Middle, and Far East, as well as North Africa, have by the pressure of events forced the western nations, not only to acknowledge their existence, but to begin to understand for perhaps the first time that these regions of the world must relate themselves to each other. So with ORT. While retaining and maintaining its ties with the western civilization, it has brought its greatest intensity to bear upon these areas.

One cannot feel kinship with Jews in one part of the world and choose to forget about Jews in another. Sooner or later the facts will creep through to your consciousness. One cannot escape. One has to recognize the chain that links all people together regardless of geography. In Iran, in Moslem North Africa, in French Morocco, in Tunisia and Algeria, Jews have huddled in the ghettos of those forgotten worlds, feeding for

centuries only on the strength of Judaism. They are no longer forgotten. ORT will not let us forget. ORT is bringing new values to live by, a new dimension to life itself, to these people whom civilization has bypassed. This is not the age of despair.

In these turbulent years one fact has emerged—that it is not a natural law for some to be born and to die in helplessness, in futility and in hopelessness. I do not exaggerate when I say that in the realization of this concept, ORT has shown us how to open the doors and windows to let the sun come in, cleansing and reviving. ORT has been on that road a little before anybody else.

The Command Management School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal recently about our new military look which has been designed to give the taxpayer more defense for the dollar. Members of this body will be glad to know, I am sure, that our Army is leaving no stone unturned in its efforts to improve the efficiency of its operations and to increase the effectiveness of its combat elements.

Last week, at the invitation of my good friend, Col. John Roosma, deputy post commander, Fort Jay, N. Y., I visited a most unique and progressive establishment in the Army at nearby Fort Belvoir, Va. The Army calls it the command management school. What I saw was a gigantic step forward in the improvement of military management.

As we all know so well, two-thirds of our mammoth budget is spent for national defense. It is our duty to see that these funds are spent wisely and well. I am convinced that this school will do more to accomplish this end than anything I have yet seen, and I think I might say that I am not without some military experience.

We know that the military has installed, in recent years, many new tools and systems in the management of their installations all over the world. Most of these have been borrowed from our industrial enterprises, which are justly world famous for their managerial efficiency. The Army has recognized, however, that a tool in any system is no better than the executives who administer it. In the command management school the Army has accordingly set out to educate its key officers, largely the installation commanders, in how to use these tools and how to apply them to the business of managing an installation.

The Harvard Business School's advanced management program has been well known for years in the industrial world for its ability to train mature, experienced, business executives and to improve their management skills. The Army's command management school has been amazingly successful in adopting the methods applied by this and similar institutions and in converting these methods to their own use in the training of post commanders and principal staff officers.

Under the direction of the Army Comptroller, Lt. Gen. G. B. Decker, and his chief management assistant, Maj. Gen. L. R. Dewey, the school assembles 50 senior Army installation commanders, staff officers, and key civilian employees, each 4 weeks and puts them through an intensive, round-the-clock course in the efficient management of men, money, and materials. A hand-picked and well-trained faculty of senior Army officers is headed by Col. Frank Kowalski, of Meriden, Conn., the school's commandant. He is ably assisted by a civilian management engineer, Mr. Gilbert C. Jacobus, of my own State of New Jersey. The permanent teaching staff is liberally supplemented by outstanding speakers in the management field from industry, from Government, and from the educational world as well as from the military.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that these men, the generals and colonels who command the Army's installations, are the individuals who, in the final analysis, manage the Nation's resources which have been entrusted to them by Congress for our defense. Having seen these officers attacking the Army's management problems at the command management school, I know that each one will do his job in a far better and more efficient manner as a result of this training.

The school is indeed a new approach to military education. All of our armed services have been justly praised by every professional educator who has examined their systems of schools, but these, until now, have been limited to the purely military fields of tactics, strategy, and logistics. The Army has now recognized the need for the schooling of its senior officers in the field of nontactical commands, of the management of resources: Men, money, and materials.

This school for managers is more than just a classroom. It is in effect, a meeting-place, where the officers participating live; they eat, sleep, and breathe management on a 24-hour basis. Needless to say, the assembly of 50 officers, each with 20 or so years of service, represents a vast quantity of experience; experience that can be utilized by colleagues and is shared among all. The commandant told me that this is really the secret of the success of the school. The discussion of down-to-earth, concrete problems and the exchange of ideas on how best to solve them, not only in the classroom, but anywhere and everywhere, goes on literally around the clock. Throughout these discussions the school constantly emphasizes the need for accomplishing assigned missions effectively with fewer dollars. The payoff here is dollars saved. One of the students, a brigadier general who commands a large military post here in the East, told me that he dreams management nearly every night. I might add that he, like all of the other students, is delighted with the course and feels that he really is learning how to improve his post. This is the real proof of the pudding, and I am convinced that the school will stand the test of time.

In my enthusiasm for the school I do not want to give the Members of this body the impression that the Army has become so management minded that it has forgotten the primary reason for its existence. So I hasten to assure you that the school, the faculty, and the officers who attend the course are all keenly aware that the Army exists to accomplish the mission assigned to it, to protect the security of our people around the world. On the other hand, every dollar saved, every wasteful practice eliminated, means just that much more effort can be channeled to increase the combat effectiveness of our Army. This is the purpose of command management, and this is the purpose of the school that I visited.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every Member of this body would be impressed, as I was impressed, with this example of progress and forward thinking by our Army. I strongly recommend that as many as possible visit Fort Belvoir and see the school in operation for themselves. On every battlefield since the days of Valley Forge, our Army has shown its ability to win wars; it is now showing its efficiency in helping to win the peace which, God willing, we can and will attain.

Thirty-fifth Anniversary of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of the House the 35th anniversary of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce observed January 21, 1955.

I have had a personal interest in the work of this fine organization for almost a decade, having been an active member, committee chairman, and member of the board of directors of the San Francisco Junior Chamber of Commerce.

The Jaycees have grown to where they now command the well-established position of one of America's most dynamic groups. I understand that nationally there are over 2,750 local chapters and 200,000 individual members. In addition, the junior chamber is worldwide in scope; it exists in 58 countries and has a foreign membership of over 100,000 young men practicing the same democratic principles that we practice here.

I am particularly proud of the fine work our California Junior Chamber has done. Their slogan, "California Jaycees Get the Job Done," indicates the attitude with which this organization operates. In addition to participation in civic improvement and public affairs, the California organization encourages

and emphasizes youth development and leadership training in young men.

I wish to extend my sincere congratulations to the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce for its work in the past and best wishes for continued success in the future.

Events in Costa Rica

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, on January 12 of this year I sent a telegram to our able Secretary of State, Hon. John Foster Dulles, urging immediate and vigorous action by the United States under Mr. Dulles' personal direction and within the framework of the Organization of American States to bring about a cessation of hostilities and of needless bloodshed in Costa Rica. I am pleased to report that the Organization of American States has moved swiftly and it now would appear that a serious menace to the Panama Canal and to the entire Western Hemisphere has been averted. All of us can be proud of the Organization of American States and of the vigorous leadership taken by the United States within that organization's framework.

As the membership of the House well knows, the headquarters of the Organization is in Washington, located several blocks from the White House and the Department of State. I urge as many Members of this House as possible to become better acquainted with the Organization of American States by observing at first hand the many useful activities pursued at its headquarters.

There follows the text of an address delivered in Houston, Tex., on January 20 by the Honorable Henry F. Holland, our able, courageous, and very effective Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, covering the events which have been transpiring in Costa Rica:

During the past 10 days much of our attention has been centered on the conflict in the Central American Republic of Costa Rica. Through the newspaper, television, and radio you have followed events there. I would like to discuss with you their significance as regards the inter-American system, and the policies of our own Government.

The dimensions of the conflict itself may be small—some 10,000 Government forces, only 4,000 of them well armed, pitted against six to eight hundred revolutionaries; nevertheless, the principles and issues involved in the conflict are basic and of lasting importance to the peace and order of our hemisphere.

What has been taking place in that small Central American country is in the first place a matter of humanitarian concern to all of us because human lives and welfare are affected. If, and to the extent that, this is a domestic upheaval, it is regrettable, and would not be an occasion for United States or OAS political action. But, the nature and apparent origin of the conflict suggest intervention from abroad and thus have presented problems of deep preoccupation to the American family of nations. At stake have been the principle of nonintervention and collective action to maintain international peace which are cornerstones of the relationship among the American States—a relationship which is unique in the divided world of today. In the balance stood the expressed intention of the American nations to come to the assistance of a sister republic when the integrity of its territory or sovereignty or political independence was threatened, thereby demonstrating the effectiveness of the inter-American regional security system. Beyond this, what is taking place in Costa Rica and the response of the Organization of American States, in my opinion, carried serious implications for the fabric of collective security which binds the nations of the free world. Happily, in this case there was no evidence that international communism had gained control of the political institutions of Costa Rica. If that had been the case, the Caracas declaration would have applied and the Communist-dominated government would have been deemed a common danger to all of the American Republics.

I am pleased to say that the challenge has been met by the OAS, and in a rapid, effective, and resourceful manner.

Before taking up the course of events in the Costa Rican crisis and their significance, I believe I should very briefly describe the inter-American machinery to which that country appealed for any of you who might not be familiar with it. The Organization of American States, or OAS as we generally refer to it, is a regional organization within the United Nations. All 21 American republics are members. Its affairs are normally directed by a council comprised of representatives of each member state and which under emergency conditions such as those in the existing situation is accorded certain unusual and extensive powers such as those it has exercised during recent days.

Among the organization's basic purposes as expressed in its charter are the following:

1. "To strengthen the peace and security of the continent."

2. "To prevent possible causes of difficulties and to insure the pacific settlement of disputes that may arise among the member states."

3. "To provide for common action on the part of those states in the event of aggression."

A fundamental principle vouchsafed in the charter is that:

"If the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any American state should be affected by an armed attack or by an act of aggression that is not an armed attack, or by an extra-continental conflict, or by a conflict between two or more American states, or by any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America, the American states, in furtherance of the principles of continental solidarity or collective self-defense, shall apply the measures and procedures established in the special treaties on the subject" (art. 25).

The principal treaty referred to in this article is the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, known as the Rio Treaty. It is under this treaty that Costa Rica on January 8 appealed to the Council of the Organization for assistance, considering itself to be in imminent danger of invasion.

The Costa Rican call for OAS action brought to a head issues and difficulties which have hovered in the background for some time. Last spring, after frustration of an attempt to assassinate him, the President of Nicaragua asserted that the President of Costa Rica, from whose territory certain of the conspirators had come, was implicated. Thereafter the Costa Rican Government from time to time asserted that a revolutionary movement was being prepared against it from outside its territory, with the toleration, if not assistance, of other governments.

During this period of tension in the area those of us dealing principally with Latin American affairs in Washington were informed of these developments. Not infrequently we were called upon to lend our assistance in an effort to ease the difficulties. At times, both before and after the recent outbreak, we have been asked to provide more direct assistance ourselves.

In response to such appeals, the policy of the Government of the United States has been to take such informal and friendly steps as we believed would be proper and helpful to bring about a more cordial atmosphere between the governments concerned. We also encouraged them to make every effort to resolve their difficulties by direct negotiations. All members of the Organization of American States clearly have a responsibility to strive for such settlement under the charter of that body, the Rio Treaty, and the U. N. Charter. However, we have firmly and consistently insisted that governments which found themselves unable to resolve their difficulties by direct negotiations should utilize the abundant and effective machinery of the Organization of American States in achieving that peaceful solution which is enjoined upon all members of the inter-American community. Specifically, we have repeatedly advised that a government which had reason to believe that its sovereignty or political independence were endangered from outside its territory should place its complaint before the Organization of American States. We believe that procedures which are readily available in the OAS can be effective, and that the degree to which they achieve good results depends in no small measure upon the degree to which the American States resort to them, and thus demonstrate their confidence in them. No machinery for the maintenance of peace and security can demonstrate its effectiveness unless it is used by the governments that created it.

Now let me review briefly the order of events in connection with Costa Rica's appeal to the OAS. That will permit a clear understanding of the role played by the United States and the other members of the OAS.

On Saturday, January 8, the Costa Rican representative notified the Council of the Organization of American States that his government believed an invasion of its territory was imminent and that the movement was being supported in violation of the obligations of the governments under inter-American treaties. These prohibit any American state from resorting to force in a dispute with another and require each state to take effective measures to prevent its territory from being used to further an armed attack on any other state. Costa Rica asked that the provisions of the Rio Treaty applicable to such emergencies be invoked.

The Chairman of the Council immediately called a meeting of that body for the following day. Subsequently, the meeting was postponed 24 hours, with the concurrence of the representative of Costa Rica, because of the absence of the Nicaraguan representative from Washington.

The Council met on the afternoon of Monday, January 10, and heard Costa Rica present its case and Nicaragua's denial of the allegations of its complicity in any revolutionary movement. No act of violence having taken place, and considering it desirable for the representatives to consult their governments on the matter, the Council scheduled a further meeting for Wednesday, calling upon the Governments of Costa Rica and Nicaragua to take the necessary measures

to prevent any acts which might aggravate the situation.

The situation changed drastically the following morning, Tuesday, January 11. Rebel forces attacked and occupied the Costa Rican town of Villa Quesada, some 60 miles within Costa Rica, north of its capital, San José. At the request of Costa Rica, the Council of the OAS met immediately that day. In view of the new circumstances, it did not hesitate to apply the Rio Treaty, and as a first step to send an Investigating Committee without delay to the scene to ascertain the facts. The United States was privileged to be designated as a member of the Committee, together with Mexico, Brazil, Paraguay, and Ecuador. The Committee was named at 9 o'clock in the evening. At 6 the following morning the group was on its way in a plane which, in view of the urgency of the matter, was furnished by the United States. The Council had acted with vigor and dispatch.

While the Investigating Committee was en route on Wednesday, a new element entered the picture: Costa Rica reported that during the day several towns, including the capital, had been bombed and strafed by aircraft coming from the north. Costa Rica pointed out that, having no air force of its own, this development posed a new and serious danger to its security. Not only was the danger increased, but it appeared that such elements could only have come from outside Costa Rica.

In response the Council called urgently upon all American governments to take the measures necessary to prevent the use of their territories for any military action against another government. But it also made what I think is an historic decision in the inter-American system; the establishment for the first time of an international aerial patrol under the supervision of an OAS body for the purpose of making peaceful observations over the region affected by the situation. To accomplish this, the member governments in a position to do so were requested to place at the disposal of the Investigating Committee aircraft which would fly in its name and under its supervision. Within 2 hours after this decision was unanimously taken by the Council, our Government announced that it was making planes available. Ecuador, Uruguay, and Mexico have taken the same step.

The use of peaceful observation flights under the supervision of the Investigating Committee is a new development in inter-American peace machinery. Multiplying the eyes and expanding the vision of the five-man committee, this procedure doubtless also served as a deterrent to any international transit of men and arms in violation of treaty obligations.

Recognizing the need for a finding of facts, the Council requested the Investigating Committee to send immediately a preliminary report on the situation. This is the Committee did with noteworthy speed.

This report received late Thursday indicated that aircraft originating from outside Costa Rica had machine gunned and bombed several places in the country, and that there existed grave presumption that arms entering Costa Rica were continuing to arrive across its northern frontier. On Friday the Council, on the basis of this information, condemned the acts of intervention against Costa Rica; it called on all American governments, especially Nicaragua to the north, to redouble their efforts to prevent their territories from being used for military action. It also directed its Investigating Committee immediately to send observers to all airports and other places in the region which might be used to transport military elements into Costa Rica. Meanwhile, constant aerial surveillance under the supervision of the Investigating Committee continued, as did the other activities of the Committee.

At midnight on Saturday, January 15, the Committee reported that its reconnaissance indicated that the air force of the revolutionary group operating in Costa Rica had been increased by the addition of one P–47 which had come from outside Costa Rica. This plane had been used in strafing operations. The Costa Rican Government had no combat aircraft with which to meet this new threat.

At 2 o'clock in the morning on Sunday the Council of the OAS met to consider what should be done in the light of this latest development. The Council was informed that Costa Rica had asked that the United States sell it four P–51's. Since the problem was being dealt with by the OAS, we would not send such war material into the area except at the request of the Council. We told the delegates that we could, under our laws, make a sale of the four planes to Costa Rica, and that, if the Council requested that such aircraft be made available to the Costa Rican Government, we would do so. Five hours later, at 7 in the morning last Sunday, the Council unanimously approved a resolution which made known its desire that these aircraft be sold to Costa Rica. At 3 that afternoon the 4 P–51's were on their way to Costa Rica. They arrived on Monday, January 17, and have been turned over to the Costa Rican Government.

There has been speculation in the press as to the price of the planes which have been transferred to Costa Rica. United States law requires that the price of military equipment sold to other friendly governments be fixed at its fair value, which is determined according to standards specified in the Mutual Security Act of 1954. In past sales of similar equipment that price has been far less than the original cost of the planes. The price in this case is now being determined by the Department of Defense and will be fixed on the basis of the type of plane and equipment, spare parts and services made available with them. I might add that if because of price or any other reason Costa Rica would now prefer not to have the planes, we would be satisfied to have them returned. They were withdrawn from National Guard units here in Texas, where they are useful.

After its night session the Council reconvened at 4 o'clock Sunday afternoon to consider what further measures might be taken to insure against treaty violations. It had before it petitions from both Costa Rica and Nicaragua that effective surveillance of their frontier be established under the OAS for the purpose of keeping watch on border crossings by revolutionary forces or supplies. The Council approved this request, directing its investigating committee to plan and maintain effective vigilance of the border through its military advisers.

Aerial reconnaissance revealed that the rebel forces had 4 planes—2 AT–6 trainers, a DC–3 cargo plane, and the F–47, which I have mentioned. The DC–3 crashed last Sunday. On Monday the air patrol reported that the three remaining planes had left the rebel airstrip in Costa Rica. Later the two trainers were observed to land in Rivas, Nicaragua, where the pilots surrendered to Nicaraguan authorities who report that the Government has interned the aircraft and crews. The whereabouts of the fighter plane has not been determined.

This account of the action taken by the OAS speaks well of the forceful and expeditious manner in which the 21 American republics, operating through their regional organization have been able to act. Not only has its action saved lives and property which would undoubtedly have been destroyed had the fighting become more widespread, it has also shown to the world that effective machinery exists and is being used in this hemisphere for the prevention of international conflicts. This success will strengthen the Organization of American States by giving a concrete demonstration of its power as a deterrent to warfare in this hemisphere. The United States as a member of the OAS may be justly proud of its contribution to this joint undertaking.

A question often asked me in the last several days is, "Who is responsible for this armed conflict in Costa Rica? Are the accusations made by the Governments of Costa Rica and Nicaragua against each other true?" This is not a question for any one member of the American community to decide, and we shall not engage in speculation. The determination of facts and the assessing of guilt, if any, is the function of the OAS. If we want to preserve the dignity and integrity of our regional organization we must not prejudge issues which it is studying preparatory to rendering a decision upon them. Nor must we expect hasty decisions from it. The Investigating Committee is still in the field. It has just spent time in Nicaragua where at the invitation of that Government it has been assembling information. Until all of the facts are in, it would not be proper to render any judgment, as the voicing of unfounded or unsupported accusations by an official spokesman of any of the American governments would only tend to worsen the situation.

The importance of the OAS action thus far lies chiefly in the prompt and resourceful way in which it acted to protect the sovereignty, integrity, and inviolability of the territory of one of the member states. Despite the small size of the military engagement which is involved, the issues presented were the kind that could in the future arise in connection with any member of the group. The measures applied were unique. Never before has the Organization requested the establishment of pacific observation flights or requested the sale of military equipment to a beleaguered member. Under these circumstances one cannot exaggerate the significance of the fact that all decisions not only of the Council but of the Investigating Committee have been taken unanimously. Americans throughout our 21 republics can be grateful that the peaceful solution of our problems has been entrusted to this regional organization to which the Soviet veto cannot extend.

The OAS has acted with speed and efficiency which deserves the applause of all the members of the inter-American system. In less than 4 days actions were taken which put an investigating group into the affected area and gave it the means for carrying out peaceful observations of the widest possible scope. I doubt that in any similar situation an international investigating body has discharged its duties with greater diligence, greater speed, or greater resourcefulness.

Furthermore, as a result of the OAS action, aircraft were made available which enable Costa Rica to defend itself against marauding planes introduced from outside its territory. The basis has been established for a system of effective frontier vigilance. These are remarkable achievements for any international organization.

Let me summarize the policy which the United States Government has pursued and will continue to pursue in this matter. First, we support vigorously all appropriate steps determined by the Organization of American States to protect the obligations and guaranties of the treaties upon which our inter-American system is founded, and we make every effort to insure that these steps are taken on the basis of facts rather than charges or rumors. Finally, we are committed to a policy of strengthening the OAS as an effective international organization within the United Nations to which members of the American family should in the first instance refer such problems as this for peaceful solution.

Restoration of the Rights and Liberties of the Ukrainian People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, Communist Russia has enslaved the people of the Ukraine, and they no longer have the liberties which they formerly enjoyed, nor do they have an opportunity to better themselves.

I know many people who came from the Ukraine, and they make good citizens, and are entitled to recognition in the Republic of the United States of America.

The restoration of the rights and liberties of the Ukrainian people is one of the things that should be sought after by the free world just as soon as the opportunity presents itself.

Administration Should Fill Judgeship Vacancies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, efforts have been made to ask the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States to address a joint session of Congress, in order that the problems of the Court, with particular reference to its clogged calendars, be made known. In that connection, permit me to submit a list of vacancies in judgeships in the Federal court, other than the Supreme Courts, which includes the time the vacancies have existed, as of January 11, 1955:

Location	Origin of vacancy	Date vacancy occurred
Circuit judgeships:		
2d circuit	Retirement of Judge Chase	Sept. 1, 1954
5th circuit	Retirement of Judge Holmes	Nov. 30, 1954
Do	Death of Judge Strum	July 26, 1954
District judgeships:		
California, southern	Death of Judge Beaumont	Nov. 19, 1954
Do	New position	[1] Feb. 10, 1954
Delaware	do	Do.[1]
New Jersey	do	Do.[1]
New York, southern	Retirement of Judge Conger	Oct. 20, 1954
North Dakota	Elevation of Judge Vogel	Aug. 20, 1954
Do	New position	[1] Feb. 10, 1954
Oregon	Elevation of Judge Fee	Apr. 30, 1954
Pennsylvania, eastern	Resignation of Judge Bard	[2] July 16, 1952
Do	New position	[1] Feb. 10, 1954
Pennsylvania, western	do	Do.[1]
Do	do	Do.[1]
South Dakota	do	Do.[1]
Texas, northern	Retirement of Judge Atwell	Dec. 31, 1954
Wisconsin, eastern	New position	[1] Feb. 10, 1954
Judgeship in U. S. Customs Court:		
Customs Court	Retirement of Judge Cline	Mar. 1, 1953

[1] Date of approval of Public Law 294, 83d Cong., 2d sess.
[2] Nomination made Mar. 29, 1954, but not confirmed.

Is it not high time that the administration filled these judgeships, instead of shouting from the housetops that it needs no less a person than Chief Justice Warren to demonstrate the needs of the court. Let the President and the administration act, and act quickly to fill these vacancies.

GI Educational Benefits Should Be Extended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I made this morning before the House Committee on Veterans Affairs in support of H. R. 587, to permit persons now in the armed services or who will be in service on January 31 of this year to continue to accrue rights of educational benefits despite the termination of the war emergency on that date. My statement follows:

I strongly urge that this legislation be given prompt and favorable action.

President Eisenhower has given his support to this legislation. His press secretary stated on January 13, 1955:

"We would be very much in favor of it. The President believes that it would be unfair to take those rights (school accrual rights) away from men already in service. We could not include that in the Executive order (terminating the war emergency) because it required approval of Congress and legislation was necessary. We are in favor of such legislation."

I have received a number of letters from parents of young men now in service asking that justice be done in the cases of those who had voluntarily joined the armed services on the understanding that GI educational benefits would continue. It is only fair that these men who entered the service with this understanding, and whose education is being interrupted, be given a chance to complete their education when they are released from active duty.

The educational benefits program has been one of the most valuable and successful projects for veterans. To cut off their rights of accruing benefits as of January 31 would be an unfair hardship; and their loss of educational opportunities would also be a loss to the public.

Its Treachery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio broadcast I delivered over WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Saturday, September 18, 1954.

The address follows:

EYEWITNESS REPORTS ON COMMUNISM AND ITS TREACHERY

Communism mocks divine precepts and human virtues.

Honor, truth, justice, kindness—these have no meaning for the Reds except as bait with which to trap humanity and imprison it in slavery.

There is no wider gulf in the world than the distance and the difference between Communist promises and Communist practices.

To expose this cruel deceit, the Committee on Communist Aggression of the United States House of Representatives conducted hearings in Chicago, New York, London, Munich, and Berlin. Out of these came first-hand reports from those who had escaped the Red terror, ripping the mask from Communist propaganda, and destroying forever the illusion that the free world can coexist with this menace to all human freedoms.

I want to bring to you some of the findings of that report.

The cross section of witnesses included members of former ruling royal houses as well as ordinary workers and peasants; internationally known generals, political leaders, and soldiers; members of the formerly free parliaments and governments; clergymen of all denominations; labor leaders, seamen, and housewives, intellectuals, and even children. They were people who escaped from their Communist-controlled homelands just a few months ago, as well as those who escaped during and after World War II.

As the report says: "Barbed wires, mined fields, machineguns, savage dogs, and ruthless frontier guards, have not been able to shut the door of freedom to those who chose escape to the West."

It is proof that communism with all its power can never conquer the human yearning for freedom.

All who testified had one thing in common: they were eyewitnesses. They saw. They experienced. They were there. Most of them suffered the tortures of communism. They came separately from the different nations enslaved by communism, but with fundamentally the same story: the antihuman nature of real life under communism. The basic conclusions from their total testimony, under oath, cannot be questioned. It was a tragic parade of witnesses—people from another world, a dreadful world of mass murders and anonymous graves, of concentration camps, torture prisons, slave-labor camps, the ever-present secret police, and hatred, hatred beyond the comprehension of us Americans.

For years the world has been bombarded with propaganda that communism was both a system and a method to establish a utopia, a workers' paradise. Under it there would be no injustices and inequities which Marx had charged up against both capitalism and Christianity. Communism would establish a classless society. The state would no longer exist. So communism preached.

But how did actual conditions measure up to these rosyhued promises?

The Select Committee on Communist Aggression was authorized by Congress to investigate and find out the truth.

What they found was shocking, to say the least.

Testimony revealed that communism was able to fix its rule upon the people of captive nations only when it was supported by the Red army, preceded by subdivision which was politically, technically, and financially engineered by the Kremlin. As soon as the Communist-controlled Red army, infiltrated and dominated as it was by political commissars and elements of the NKVD, entered any area, terror, robbery, and violations of women and children became the order of the day. The people learned through bitter experience that the Communists would do whatever they wanted to do without regard for any laws, ethics, or moral codes. The people also learned that any opposition to whatever action the so-called Communist liberators took, meant certain imprisonment or death.

Then came Kremlin agents working with local traitors.

They set up governmental bodies which they tried to clothe with the appearances of legality and respectability to mislead the world and confuse local public opinion.

King Michael of Rumania testified that at the time he was the constitutional head of the country, on March 6, 1945, he stated to Mr. Vishinsky, the then Soviet foreign minister: "I am doing things in our manner and according to the interests of my country, and besides, the conference at Yalta says that every country is free to choose its own form of government."

To which Vishinsky bluntly replied: "In this case I am Yalta, and I tell you what to do."

A recent escapee from Hungary put it this way: "Before the war I had the right to vote, and elections were held in an orderly manner. Everyone could vote for the party of his choosing. After the Communists took over completely in 1948, when the elections were held, we received the ballot and couldn't even look at it. We didn't even know who the people on the ballot were. We simply placed the list in an envelope, sealed it, and dropped it in the box. At the same time the Communists transported truckloads of Communist soldiers all over the district who voted many times. That was all. It was a farce."

To destroy non-Communist political forces, the Reds resort to mass arrests and deportations. Testimony was taken by our congressional committee from many who were themselves deported. They told how men, women, and children were awakened in the darkness of night, given 1 hour to pack their modest belongings, were locked in cattle cars for transportation to Siberia. For days they had no food, water, heat, or sanitary facilities. They died like flies.

To break resistance they practice man-made famines.

In the Ukraine during 1932 and 1933, when the harvest was above average, it is estimated that from 6 to 7 million people starved to death.

Armed guards were placed around the churches and other buildings used for storing grain and the grain was allowed to spoil while people begged for something to eat. Mrs. Anna Kravchenko testified that about one-half of the people in the village where she lived died from starvation, and that special brigades of Communists were sent from Moscow to search out all food and to confiscate it.

Another witness, who requested that his true identity not be disclosed because a large number of his relatives still live in the Ukraine, gave vivid testimony of the way in which the Communists covered up the millions of deaths caused by their planned famine. He told how a famous French statesman visited the Ukraine during the time of the famine, and was taken on a conducted tour by the Communists. Every minute of his visit, every home he saw, every person he talked to, every route he followed was carefully prearranged without his knowledge. He saw the fronts of houses newly painted, while directly in back of them people were living like animals in holes dug in the ground. He saw in the windows of the country shops along his prepared route, stocks of loaves of bread, and people who appeared to be freely buying them. What he was not allowed to see was that behind these shops and newly painted houses the police had closed off all roads to the famine-stricken population.

Other witnesses testified to instances of cannibalism, of how parents tried to save their children by turning them over to the State children's homes, how the militia would punish them if they were caught leaving their children anywhere near those homes, of how quotas were set each day for collecting corpses for burial in the fields.

We can imagine that Clement Atlee, former Prime Minister of Great Britain, and other Laborites were given the same false front tour when they recently visited Russia and China.

As to life under the Communist tyranny, Jan Jasinski testified, and I quote: "They arrested me about 3 a. m. and took me to Kilce. When they saw that they were not getting much out of me, they began to torture and beat me. They poured salt water down my nose and pinched my fingers in a door joint. They used what looked like a twisted copper cable to beat the soles and heels of my feet, cutting the flesh so badly that I couldn't walk except on my hands and knees for 6 weeks. After 6 years in prison I escaped with a friend to the Czechoslovakia-German border. I got across, but my friend was killed."

Multiply that testimony by millions of other cases and you begin to get the picture of the cruelty and the terror that communism tries to palm off as paradise.

The committee is in possession of documentary material relating to the violent persecution of all forms of religion.

Eyewitness testimony concerning Cardinal Mindszenty's ordeal and his show trial was received by the committee. The cardinal appeared with his face gaunt and emaciated covered by a pink makeup to create an impression of health. He used Communist jargon as if it was his usual way of speaking. Saliva was trickling down his chin. He was unable to control his voice. The fraudulent nature of his trial and the false confession forced upon him by his tormenters, were exposed.

The select Committee on Communist Aggression of the United States House of Representatives, after considering a mountain of evidence detailing Communist crimes, came to the conclusion that peaceful coexistence is a Communist myth which can be attained only through the complete surrender of our free way of life for one of slavery under Moscow-controlled communism.

Knowing the fate that awaits us should we fail should make all of us more vigilant.

Peace and freedom will be in mortal danger as long as the thing called communism reaches out to enslave the world.

H. R. 587

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members to H. R. 587, a bill to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter which I have written to the chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 24, 1955.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of January 20 inviting me to testify during the hearings on your bill, H. R. 587, to permit individuals in service on or before January 31, 1955, to continue to earn educational benefits. I regret that another committee meeting precludes my testifying, and therefore I would appreciate it if you would include this letter as part of the record.

I would like to urge the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to act favorably and promptly on H. R. 587. I am convinced this bill should be enacted if we are to prevent injustice to service personnel who volunteered for terms of service of greater length than would have been required under the selective-service law in the belief that they would thereby accrue additional educational benefits. Many of them have made their plans at considerable sacrifice in order to obtain these educational benefits.

As a former member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, may I commend you on your prompt introduction of this desirable legislation.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD,
Member of Congress.

Twosome in the China Tangle?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, history might well record our times as those of twosome and the big split. We divide our world into east and west, north and south, old and new.

Will a twosome emerge in the China tangle?

Will it be east China and west China? Or will it be old China and new China, with Formosa forming the new China of the west to pace the old China of the east?

To us, there is a familiar ring in old and new, north and south, east and west. We have the Eastern Hemisphere and the Western Hemisphere, the old world and the new, North America, South America; Mexico, New Mexico; North Dakota, South Dakota; North Carolina, South Carolina; Virginia, West Virginia; England, New England; London, New London; York, New York; Jersey, New Jersey; North Pole, South Pole.

Like the winds, our names seem to blow away inherited hatreds.

One wonders whether the names east China and west China would do the same for the China tangle? Or would old

China and new China do better, with the name Formosa gone with the wind? All Chinese dislike it anyway.

They call Formosa Taiwan—Tie-Wan—gem of the Pacific.

I Believe in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include in my extension, remarks that I made on a radio program, I Believe in Massachusetts, on January 23, 1955, over station WALE, operated by the Narragansett Broadcasting Co., of Fall River, Mass.:

Thank you very much. I am glad to make my contribution to your radio audience on the subject, I Believe in Massachusetts.

If my discussion seems to reflect a Washington viewpoint, it perhaps may have value because we can evaluate the position of Massachusetts in its relationship with the other 47 States and view our position as part of the national picture.

It seems to me quite unnecessary that we should raise the question of belief in Massachusetts because all of us have a strong faith in the future of our Commonwealth and all of its people, a conviction that we need never question.

In my opinion, the future of Massachusetts is very bright. Look in every direction and you will find clear indications of a better future, which gives conviction to my belief that we are probably entering the greatest period of economic success and expansion that we have ever seen in our State. There are many signs that point in this direction.

Most of our citizens depend upon industry in our State for their livelihood. We have, I believe, been passing through a period of industrial change. Today we can now see, new signs of stabilization and growth that should be encouraging to everyone.

May I point out that change in industrial life is occurring in every State in our country, brought about chiefly by technological advances and the development of thousands of new products, that are making fundamental changes in our economy, replacing older modes of living and opening up new opportunities in increasing numbers to our citizens who are alert to these advances and will grasp the opportunities.

We should never entertain the thought that Massachusetts is declining or losing our predominant position. We are only changing and change is merely another expression of life.

We have many outstanding advantages in Massachusetts to offer the world. We have the most skilled supply of industrial labor in the United States and we have the best industrial labor record in the United States. This is recognized everywhere in the industrial world.

People in the Fall River and New Bedford as well as the Lawrence areas have witnessed the gradual loss of their textile industry. While part of this loss is represented by companies that moved away, there were a considerable number that permanently went out of business.

You also probably know that the causes for this loss in textiles were largely a world-wide over-productive capacity and a world-wide growth in substitutes for cotton and woolen products. New uses for cotton and woolen products should be discovered. Intelligent research will enable such discoveries. The best brains of Massachusetts should be addressed to solving this problem.

May I point out to you that when an industry moves from a northern industrial center it only takes its capital, its management, and its machinery and it leaves behind its industrial plants, its highly skilled labor, the industrial facilities that they have built into the community together with many servicing organizations that do business with industry.

If utilized, these are tremendous assets of great advantage to other industrial companies. The difficulty lies in the fact that normally industry is slow in making up its mind to change and the problem is to hold all of these assets together until they can be grasped by new companies.

It is my considered opinion that the textile industry in New England is now at its lowest position and that from now on it will experience a new growth, a new life that spells opportunity for our textile industry centers that is if we have intelligent management leadership. We have the intelligent leadership in the ranks of labor.

At the same time, I am firmly convinced that new, other types of industry will quickly develop or move to these textile centers and in the end our textile communities will be healthier because of wider diversification of manufacture.

Today there are probably 150,000 business concerns in Massachusetts, of which about 12,500 are manufacturing establishments.

Back of all of these industrial concerns lays the greatest concentration of research institutions and technical engineering concerns to be found anywhere in the world. We are today recognized as the greatest center of technical education. It is inevitable that from the explorations and discoveries of these engineers and scientists will come many new products of inestimable value to Massachusetts and to the world. For example, 18 percent of all doctorates in engineering and 14 percent of all doctorates in physics in the country are awarded in educational institutions within 50 miles of Boston. Another instance is that Massachusetts Institute of Technology awards more than 25 percent of all doctorates in metallurgy in the United States.

In the fields of electrical manufacturing and plastics we are probably the fastest growing State in the country. Within the last month employment in the electrical machinery industry has become the largest employer of industrial labor in our State.

It is estimated that today Massachusetts industry is growing at the rate of one new manufacturing company or important plant expansion every working day. While most of these are small, it is from small starting and steady growth that large industries develop.

Boston is the greatest medical center in the United States. This is a well-known and self-evident fact. For illustration, the American Heart Association is allotting more funds for heart research to Massachusetts institutions than to any other State in the country.

We still lead the country in many of the major products, including shoe production which this year in Massachusetts is 9 percent higher in production than last year. It can be considerably improved upon. In spite of the concentration of certain industries, like textiles and shoes, Massachusetts is the third most diversified industrial State in the country.

We have become a great military research center. Witness the recent opening of the Consolidated Quartermaster Research Laboratory at Natick and the new and rapidly expanding Air Force Research Center at Bedford, which are encouraging and stimulating new industrial growth. I introduced the bill which brought this great research laboratory to Massachusetts.

Occasionally we hear of an industrial company closing down or going away but we rarely ever hear of the many large companies that are either moving to Massachusetts or establishing plants here. Massachusetts is a natural for the establishing of large plants here. We have the market and we have the skilled labor.

Let me repeat the advice of our beloved late Gen. George Patton, which was "Never take counsel in your fears."

The idea that better opportunities lay in other sections of the country is either completely false or wholly temporary—so my message to the people of Massachusetts and especially our workmen is that retaining any faith in ourselves they will probably never find better opportunity than is facing us today in our grand old Commonwealth.

Gallup Poll Opinion on First-Class Postage Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under consent approved by the House, I am including herewith a statement entitled "Gallup Poll Opinion on First-Class Postage Increase."

Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield has called attention to a report by George Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion, indicating the views of the people contacted in respect to increases in first-class mail rates.

The statement follows:

For the first time in the 6 years since an increase in postage rates was first advocated to cut down the operating deficit of the United States Post Office Department, majority opinion today favors raising the rate on first-class mail from 3 to 4 cents.

By an even greater margin, the public would approve increasing the airmail rate from 6 to 7 cents.

These facts come to light in the latest coast-to-coast survey by the American Institute of Public Opinion in which a representative cross section of the Nation's voters was asked:

"To help put the United States Post Office Department on a paying basis, would you favor or oppose increasing the rate of first-class mail from 3 cents to 4 cents?"

The vote nationwide and by men and women:

	National	Men	Women
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Favor	51	55	46
Oppose	45	42	49
No opinion	4	3	5

An increase in postal rates was first advocated in 1949 to help erase the mounting post-office deficit which since World War II has exceeded $4 billion.

At that time an institute survey found 59 percent opposed, 33 percent in favor, while 8 percent expressed no opinion on increasing first-class postage.

The 1949 survey did find a majority would approve raising the rate on the penny post-

card to 2 cents. That increase was approved by Congress in 1952.

Each voter in today's survey also was asked:

"Would you favor or oppose raising the rate on airmail from 6 cents to 7 cents?"

The vote:

	National	Men	Women
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Favor	54	59	48
Oppose	40	35	45
No opinion	6	6	7

Six years ago, the vote was 51 percent in favor, 40 percent opposed, and 9 percent no opinion.

Today's survey finds that the greatest opposition to boosting first-class postal rates would come from the Nation's farmers, from southern voters and from residents of small towns and rural areas.

Rank-and-file Democrats are more opposed than are GOP voters.

In the fiscal year 1954, the Post Office had a deficit of more than $399 million.

Last August, the President vetoed a general pay rise for the postal service's 500,000 employees, partly on the ground that the bill passed by Congress contained no provision for improving postal revenues.

U. S. S. "Forrestal"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, December 11, 1954, it was my privilege and pleasure, with thousands of my fellow Americans, to attend the launching of the U. S. S. *Forrestal* at Newport News, Va.

This will forever remain a significant date in our military history, for it signals a great milestone if not the beginning of a new era in the advance of naval and air warfare.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the complete, interesting, informing, and impressive program at the launching of our first great supercarrier, the largest and mightiest ship ever built:

PROGRAM

Air salute: Carrier group 6 from United State Naval Air Station, Oceana, Va.

National Anthem: United States Navy Band.

Introduction of William S. Blewett, Jr., president of the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co.

Address: William E. Blewett, Jr.

Introduction of Adm. Robert B. Carney, United States Navy, Chief of Naval Operations.

Address: Adm. Robert B. Carney, United States Navy.

Introduction of the Honorable Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense.

Address: The Honorable Charles E. Wilson.

Introduction of the Honorable Charles S. Thomas, Secretary of the Navy.

Address: The Honorable Charles S. Thomas.

Introduction of Rear Adm. Edward B. Harp, Jr., United States Navy, Chief of United States Navy Chaplains.

Invocation: Rear Adm. Edward B. Harp, Jr., United States Navy.

Introduction of sponsor: Mrs. James V. Forrestal.

Christening of the *Forrestal:* Mrs. James V. Forrestal.

Flight demonstration: Blue Angels, United States Navy Flight Team.

ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM E. BLEWETT, JR., PRESIDENT OF THE NEWPORT NEWS SHIPBUILDING & DRYDOCK CO., AT THE LAUNCHING OF THE U. S. S. "FORRESTAL," NEWPORT NEWS, VA., DECEMBER 11, 1954

Mrs. Forrestal, Secretary Wilson, Secretary Thomas, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. is delighted to have you with us today for the christening of the aircraft carrier U. S. S. *Forrestal.*

For the past 7 hours this vessel, the largest ever to be constructed, has been waterborne in the submerged shipway before us. This gigantic carrier is as trim and modern as technical know-how, looking into the future, can make her. The only conceivable bit of futurama that she lacks is to be driven by atomic power.

Her size and potency are matchless. She is a mobile base which can be located in any navigable portion of the oceans as the needs of defense or freedom of the seas may demand. From her flight deck, equipped with steam-driven catapults, she can launch the heavier planes of longer range and higher speed which are capable of delivering the latest developments in explosive power against possible enemy targets.

This mighty aircraft carrier which dwarfs any other engineering product is the greatest single instrument conceived to protect this hemisphere. Today one cannot speak in terms of countries because transportation and communication have made the world so small. While our physical world has contracted, our thinking must be expanded and translated into new and appropriate means for self-protection. The *Forrestal* is a striking example that Navy planners concern themselves with a realistic vision of the future.

The building of the *Forrestal* is a milestone for Newport News. Our workmen, many of them of a third generation, have been brought up in the creed that "we shall build good ships here * * *," and they are building into the *Forrestal* not only designed might but also their cumulative skills in shipbuilding and pride of workmanship.

The Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. is proud of its accomplishments and the privilege accorded us by the Navy in building this carrier.

Aircraft carriers have traditionally been named in honor of famous battles in our naval history or for former vessels with illustrious careers. Today, for only the second time that a capital ship has been named for an individual, this vessel will be named for the late Honorable James V. Forrestal, our first Secretary of Defense. This mighty ship will carry a mighty name which speaks to all the world of our desire for peace.

ADDRESS BY ADM. ROBERT B. CARNEY, UNITED STATES NAVY, CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

After VJ-day, the Navy looked at the future. Some of its aspects were visible and apparent; others were obscured behind time's horizon. The informed students of the strategic meaning of the oceans were convinced of one thing: Control of those oceans must never be relinquished to an enemy.

Amid the welter of new ideas and inventions, some notion of the required tools of the future began to come into focus. One of the necessary tools of United States sea-air power continued to be the aircraft carrier. National thinking in those early post-war days was somewhat beclouded by a passionate desire to return to a peacetime economy, and this was reflected in drastic military cuts. The aircraft carrier was a sufferer from the economic complexities of those days.

Nevertheless, the Navy went patiently ahead with its studies and evolved an aircraft carrier design which would fulfill an inevitable need in the scheme of our national security. The thinking which went into the carrier design effort kept abreast of the times with respect to development of all types of aircraft, weapons, and equipments. Difficulties were encountered throughout these development years, but the compelling logic was not to be denied; and gradually the American people came to understand the value and power of this unique weapons system. During the intervening years, the Navy had modernized some of our carriers of World War II vintage, and they are performing a worthwhile service.

This ship, from the keel up, is built for the future, dedicated to the support of our national policies and the preservation for all time of the things that we hold dear. Today, she is afloat. When she joins the fleet, she will be the mightiest warship of the oceans—versatile and durable. She, and her sisters to follow, will be our future ships of the line, and, as such, will possess an ever-expanding usefulness. They will constitute a powerful diplomatic instrument during peaceful years both by reason of their own quiet but imposing strength and also as symbols of the great national strength which alone could give them birth. They will retain their predecessors' World War II capabilities, of course, but they will also have a vastly increased firepower deliverable at greater distances, together with defenses capable of dealing with modern threats.

Offensively, this ship will be able to play her vital role by smashing at the sources of any enemy's naval power and by assisting our sister services and allied forces in carrying the fight to the foe. Wherever attack must be launched from the sea, this mighty ship and her planes will have the capability of delivering crushing blows against her assigned targets. The versatility of her aircraft and weapons will permit her to engage targets on the sea, above it, and below it, and on land where threats to our control of the sea is to be found. By her mobility, she will be able to bring airpower to parts of the world where no comparable friendly force can be found or maintained. The carrier task force takes on new and formidable significance with the advent of this new class of ship.

This carrier of the future will also have the inherent protection provided to naval vessels by the vastness of the ocean areas where their location cannot be predetermined and thus zeroed in for destruction. The aircraft carrier, by her very nature, becomes an obscure target for enemy detection and effective attack. Even if her whereabouts become known, she, with guided missile-carrying companions will offer a formidable defense against any weapons now on the drawing boards or even on the horizon. As she goes about her assault tasks, she will be protected by her own fighters, guided missiles, mighty depth bombs, and curtains of electronic energy pulsating both beneath the waves and above them to detect and herald the enemy's approach.

As awe-inspiring as are the dimensions of this leviathan, the ship, herself, is but a symbol of the vastly greater power from which she springs—the unstoppable power of a great free society, blessed with generous resources, spurred on by the incentives of freedom, ready to share with those struggling for freedom as we originally and fiercely struggled, determined not to lose any part of the heritage we have won by struggle. That is the true significance of this great ship and I give the Navy's pledge that the U. S. S. *Forrestal* will discharge her duty to her country in defense of those things for which her country stands.

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES E. WILSON, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Nearly 2½ years ago a similar group gathered here to lay the keel of the aircraft carrier U. S. S. *Forrestal*. Today, as we launch this vessel, we mark another milestone in the progress we are making to modernize and improve the readiness of our armed services.

The building of this ship is a tribute to the men of the Navy who are dedicated to maintaining the freedom of the seas in the defense of our country. It is also a tribute to the skill of the loyal and capable workers of the shipbuilding industry of this country, and in particular to those of the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. We are sure that they have planned well and have built well and that this ship, when commissioned, will fulfill our every expectation.

During this period of 2½ years the Navy has proceeded with the other plans and work necessary to provide the aircraft which will fly from the *Forrestal* decks and with the training of the officers and men who will man her when she joins the fleet.

The same careful planning and integration of new weapons and new technology is proceeding in all of the armed services as we continue our efforts to provide this country with the best and most modern defenses in our history. In so doing we are providing what we believe to be a real deterrent to the outbreak of another world war.

I am particularly proud that this ship bears the name of the first Secretary of Defense who did so much to build our modern Navy and whose efforts contributed so much to our national defense.

I knew Jim Forrestal well and had many contacts with him when he was Under Secretary of the Navy with Frank Knox; when he guided the Navy through the difficult war years as its Secretary; and later when he was the first Secretary of Defense. I always admired and respected him for his self-sacrificing devotion to his country.

At the keel-laying ceremony, the then Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. William C. Foster, spoke these words:

"And now let us in our hearts echo the prayer that from these beginnings an historic ship may rise successfully;

"That she will render service to the Nation consonant with that rendered by the man whose name she bears;

"And that she will carry to the far ends of the earth our championship of peace."

I would like for all of us to reiterate that prayer here today.

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES S. THOMAS, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE MOVING SEA BASE

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a historic moment for all Americans as we launch today the newest, most modern, and most powerful naval weapon in history.

It is a particularly proud moment for me personally, here in the presence of Mrs. Forrestal, Mr. Forrestal's two sons, and his brother, to pay tribute to that wonderful and dedicated American and friend whom I had the privilege of knowing and working with during World War II and who did so much to alert us to the danger of communism. His imprint is still visible and his influence is still felt throughout the Navy and in Washington.

Today you are witnessing not merely the launching of a ship, but the launching of our country's most versatile and most dispersable weapon in our nuclear arsenal.

The aircraft carrier, such as the *Forrestal*, is not only a weapon of great potency and utility today, but for the future, it is one of a family of sea weapons with even greater possibilities and potential.

For the foreseeable future, nothing is in prospect which will diminish our need for continued control of the seas—the surface of the seas by ships, the underseas by submarines, the air over the seas by naval airpower. As a matter of fact, the advent of the atom, the jet, and the missile have increased, not decreased, the importance of sea power.

So in this atomic age, when the weapons and the nature of war are changing, the mission of our Navy has not changed. The oceans continue to be our cushions of defense, the bonds uniting us with our friends and allies, and our lifelines to overseas sources of raw materials which are so vital to our defense and peacetime production. Our continued dependence on overseas bases for many years to come, be they Navy, Army, or Air Force, will demand that we control the seas to operate and supply them.

Even more important, if war should be forced upon us, the seas are and can become increasingly vital as the mobile platforms of swift and devastating retaliation.

If we are attacked, our Nation's survival will depend on how well our system of airbases survives the initial blitz. For it is from these airbases that our counterattack will be launched. Not all of our continental airbases are certain to be invulnerable to destruction. Not all of our airbases on foreign soil are certain either to be available or usable.

Therefore the security of our airbase system is of utmost concern in our defense planning. Today, dispersal has one of our Nation's top priorities—dispersal of industry, of communications, and particularly of our retaliation system. Our airbase system must therefore not only be strongly defended, but it must be widely dispersed and as secure as possible if it is to guarantee that our retaliatory attack is launched.

Since the United States has rejected preventive war on moral grounds, our determent and our defense against a nuclear attack must be based on a well advertised ability and intention to counterattack with overwhelming force.

To be certain that we have the maximum defense against a surprise attack, a part of the United States counterattack has been decentralized and dispersed on unpredictable moving sea bases. These unpredictable moving sea bases complement our fixed base system and together, the two insure a balanced base system which an enemy cannot neutralize.

The *Forrestal* is one such mobile sea base—the missile carrying atomic submarine and seaplane are others. Each one of these can use the entire oceans as mobile platforms and 10,000-mile runways. The *Forrestal's* airplanes will be able to take off and land simultaneously from her deck. This mobile base has a top speed of about 40 miles an hour; it can move rapidly to any part of the world's oceans. It is an outstanding example of dispersion. An aggressor can never be sure of its location. To find it and attack it will force him to divert a proportion of his offensive air strength which might otherwise be used to attack our homeland. The moving sea base's mobility, speed and striking power will also require that the enemy scatter, dilute and expand his defensive air power, which might otherwise be devoted to offensive roles. The *Forrestal's* ability to haunt an enemy's shoreline carrying a lethal load is a threat he cannot ignore.

Any target can, of course, be hit under the right conditions. But a moving sea base, particularly one which can maneuver and travel at 40 miles an hour, is obviously very difficult to locate or destroy.

The *Forrestal* with its speed, its greatly reinforced armament, its improved radar vision, its heavy antiaircraft defenses, its guided missiles, and its new jet interceptor aircraft will indeed be a phantom target for any enemy.

And the modern, streamlined carrier task force surrounding the *Forrestal* will operate under a new tactical doctrine emphasizing dispersion making it impossible to damage or destroy more than a small part, if any.

Moving sea bases, such as the *Forrestal*, also have great versatility and usefulness. They can be used in conjunction with massive retaliation. They can be used to maintain control of the seas. As we learned in Korea, they are ideal for localized wars requiring the use of conventional weapons, or in places where our fixed airbases are limited.

Because of these abilities, and particularly because of their atomic striking power, the *Forrestal* and her sister ships will be a deterrent force against aggression, and an insurance policy for peace.

The recognition of the importance of and the need for naval power is best exemplified by the Russians. The Russian Navy is the only service of any major military power that has increased in both personnel and equipment over what it was during World War II. Since that time, the Russian Navy has risen from the seventh largest navy in the world to second only to that of the United States. This growth is eloquent evidence of their fear of our transoceanic seapower, particularly of such a weapon as the *Forrestal*.

In this atomic age, if we did not have this type of mobile sea base we would be forced to invent one. Fortunately, we have it and in just a few moments you will see it launched. The *Forrestal's* ability to carry a powerful atomic punch, its ability to take the fight right into the enemy's front yard, its ability to sustain itself at sea for long periods of time, its ability to strike a naval target a thousand miles from her deck, gives our Nation a powerful weapon for preserving a peaceful world.

Our seapower, as represented by the *Forrestal*, is therefore a great deterrent to war. We are determined to keep that seapower modern, alert, and adequate.

The launching of this great ship should elevate our confidence that peace can be achieved. We have a righteous cause, freedom and peace. We have strong friends. We have superior productive capacity. We have superior naval power to control the seas on the surface, below the surface, and in the air above.

With all of these, and above all, with God's help, we are confident of success.

INVOCATION BY REAR ADMIRAL EDWARD B. HARP, JR., UNITED STATES NAVY, CHIEF OF UNITED STATES NAVY CHAPLAINS

Almighty and Eternal God, who art the fountain of all wisdom and power, we come to invoke Thy blessing upon this ship. We praise Thee for this memorable and climatic moment of human achievement. We rejoice that under the dispensation of Thy providence, in this particular moment of history, Thou hast made it possible for the ingenuity, skill and labor of free men to bring this ship into being. May there come now, to those who have wrought as good workmen in its planning and construction, the inner satisfaction of having done their tasks worthily and well.

As we christen the U. S. S. *Forrestal*, we commend her to Thy guidance and care. Grant that her services may be used in the preservation of peace, and for war only when the defense of freedom and honor shall so dictate.

To this petition we add also our supplications for the President of the United States and all others in authority. We ask Thy blessing, too, upon all who serve in the Armed Forces of our Nation, particularly those who are making the greater sacrifices in the troubled areas of the world. Be pleased to protect and uphold them with Thy love and care.

Finally, O God, unite us all in an eternal purpose, to preserve and bear aloft the torch of freedom and peace among nations who love Thee and keep Thy commandments. To Thy honor and glory we offer this prayer. Amen.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 25, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace and goodness, of all wisdom and power, Thou art our refuge in the stillness of the night and our strength in the struggles of each new day.

We humbly and penitently implore Thee that we may be blessed with insight and inspiration, with indomitable courage and confidence to meet aright the serious and critical decision which now confronts us.

Grant that our President, our Speaker, the Members of Congress, and all the citizens of our Republic may be endowed with calmness of spirit, clarity of judgment, and a glorious faith in the invincibility of Thy divine strength and love which is ever round about us.

May we face the future with a larger and more daring faith, a faith that puts iron into our blood and hope into our hearts, a faith that fears man so little because it fears God so much, a faith that always avails itself of the inexhaustible resources of divine love, a faith that daily prays and labors for peace on earth and good will among men.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

AUTHORIZING THE PRESIDENT TO EMPLOY ARMED FORCES OF UNITED STATES TO DEFEND FORMOSA, ETC.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 104, Rept. No. 5), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 159, authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores and related positions and territories of that area. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the joint resolution shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said joint resolution except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 104 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]; and at this time I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 159, with which, I take it, the Members are all familiar, and which authorizes the President to take such measures as may be necessary for the defense of Formosa.

I do not think any of us should minimize the significance and importance of this joint resolution. It is probably one of the most far-reaching steps in foreign policy that will be taken by this Congress. I think this joint resolution should be understood as notice to the world, and should be so regarded, as a definite and definitive policy with respect to the defense of Formosa.

There has been much discussion about what has happened in China. The time has passed to quarrel with any past policies or to quarrel over the question of whether any of the steps taken in the past were proper. The time has come now for us to join together as a united America behind our Commander in Chief, in whom I am sure the whole Congress and the country have complete confidence. This joint resolution merely gives firm and positive notice to the world of the policy that this country has adopted and upon which we stand united.

I do not care to discuss the resolution or the wording of it. You will understand from the reading of this rule that this is a closed rule. The administration has not insisted upon a closed rule and neither has the leadership on either side insisted on it. They thought it wise, and the committee agreed with that policy.

Here is the proposition. All that is before this Congress is that you are going to support the President's policy, or you are not going to do it. We did not think it ought to be cluttered up with proposed amendments that might reach far beyond the purposes of this resolution, in which it is the desire of all parties to make simple and clear to the whole world just what this country proposes to do and where we stand and where we propose to stand from now on out. That is what this resolution proposes to do. For that reason the committee thought it wise that there should be no amendments offered to it and that we vote it either up or down. I may say that it is the earnest hope of the Democratic leadership that when this resolution comes to a vote at least on the Democratic side there shall not be a dissenting voice heard.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, while the general feeling is that the President has the power inherent in the authority of the Commander in Chief to issue the necessary orders to take such action as may follow the passage of the pending joint resolution, it is evidently the opinion of the President, as stated in his message, that—

It would make clear the unified and serious intentions of our Government, our Congress, and our people.

I agree with this statement. To me, this is the most effective argument for congressional action at this time in a field within the authority of the President as Commander in Chief. I assume from the message of the President that if there is delay on the part of the Congress, and action is immediately necessary on our part to carry out the policy, the President will exercise his authority as Commander in Chief and act.

In June of 1950 the situation was so acute in Korea that President Truman acted. Time then was of the essence.

It is fair to assume that President Eisenhower feels that while the present situation is acute, it is not so immediate in terms of hours—if not a few days—but what he can seek action on the part of the Congress to show the unity of our Government and of our people in the present crisis. However, I assume from his message that the President is prepared to act, if necessary, before congressional action is obtained—and I emphasize the words "if necessary." If it is necessary, the President should exercise his authority as Commander in Chief when he feels the security of the United States is involved.

I hope the pending resolution will be overwhelmingly, if not unanimously, adopted. It should be. Such action will convey to the world and particularly to the Communist leaders, whether in the Kremlin or Red China or elsewhere, the unity of our Government and of our people. It will show them that in politics we may be Democrats or Republicans or Independents, but where the national interest and security of our country is involved, we are Americans. It will convey to them with firmness and strength that a Republican administration with a Democratic Congress does not mean a divided Nation, but rather it means unity of thought, unity of spirit and determination, and, if necessary, unity of action.

This is not the time, Mr. Speaker, to draw thin or technical lines of demarcation or of differentiation. This is not the time to equivocate or to try to place the blame, if any, for the present situation. To those who may want to do that, there is another day—but not today—in the face of the immediate aggression and danger which exists. Today is the time for unity of thought and unity of action.

We may have to face other trying questions in the years that lie ahead, but we must decide in our own national interest the question which confronts us today. This is our immediate problem.

There is no question but that there are calculated risks involved in the proposed action, but on the other hand, in my opinion, there are greater calculated risks involved if we fail to take action. As I see it, the calculated risks of action are much less than the calculated risks involved in inaction. For action on our part may deter further aggression. Inaction may mean capitulation, further appeasement and further aggression on the part of the Communists in the near future, and at a time when our position may be much less favorable than it is today. Projecting our minds ahead as we have to do, looking into the future and relying on our judgment and our

conscience, having in mind the national interest of our country, the passage of the pending resolution is the best course we can take. As a simple human being charged with a responsibility, as I am, I think under the circumstances the course of action proposed is the only one that we can take and that I can take, and accordingly I am supporting the resolution.

It represents affirmative action. It represents firmness and strength. The President says that our purpose is peace. In saying that he speaks for all of us. Our purpose is peace, and we hope and trust that the President will exercise his powers soberly, and use force no further than is absolutely necessary to do so.

To those of us who have sat in this Chamber for years, we have undergone many trying experiences. I can remember the days before World War II when in this Chamber there were many dramatic fights, battles in the legislative field, the outcome of which one way or the other might be of inestimable value or harm to our country. Over and above every consideration in your minds, as well as my mind, in days of crisis or emergency, is the national interest of the United States, of our beloved country. You and I are elected by our constituents to this body, the greatest legislative body in the world. As those of us before Pearl Harbor had to meet trying questions in those days, I know my colleagues of today will meet this particular trying problem. Let us do so with clear vision, with objectivity and with courage.

I hope that this resolution will receive a unanimous vote, but in any event, an overwhelming vote, that will convey not only to the Communist leaders but to the peoples of the still free countries of the world the fact that America, acting through the Members of its Congress, are united, not acting as members of a political party, but acting as Americans.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution which the rule makes in order has been favorably reported unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, provides the Members of this Congress an opportunity for the exercise of bipartisanship in a matter which concerns the entire American people. The pursuit of peace is a cause that is bound up with the hopes and aspirations of every citizen of this Nation, whether he be a Wisconsin dairy farmer, a steelworker, a New England textile worker, or an industrialist. This resolution concerns the peace and security of the one remaining area of the world where active hostilities are now in progress, an area which has been determined to be important to the defense and security of the United States itself.

Our bipartisan support for this resolution is not being sought for any purpose or in any manner inconsistent with the assurance of peace through action by the United Nations or other peaceful means. Neither will it require the initiation of any new policy. On June 27, 1950, the then President of the United States declared that—

> The occupation of Formosa by Communist forces would be a direct threat to the security of the Pacific area and to United States forces performing their lawful and necessary functions in that area.

He stated that he had ordered the 7th Fleet to prevent any attack on Formosa, and to see that the Government of the Republic of China ceased its attacks on the mainland. In an address to a joint session of Congress on February 2, 1953, President Eisenhower reaffirmed the order that the 7th Fleet defend Formosa against attack. However, in view of the Chinese Communist armed intervention in the Korean conflict, he canceled that part of the order directing the 7th Fleet to see that attacks on the mainland were stopped.

By our united and strong support for this resolution, we will hope to demonstrate to the world and on behalf of a united American people the firmness of our conviction in maintaining what two successive administrations have affirmed, "That the defense of Formosa is vital to the security of the Pacific area and to our own safety. We will be stating in the most unmistakable terms that if action is called for to defend Formosa and the Pescadores, it will be taken with all the strength and determination of a united nation. Such a demonstration and such a statement are, unfortunately, necessary. The Chinese Communists have repeatedly stated in the most violent of language the determination of their regime to seize Formosa and the Pescadores. In recent months they have launched savage attacks of ever-increasing intensity against the coastal islands held by forces of the Government of the Republic of China, and they have openly declared that these attacks herald an eventual assault on Formosa. We must take account of the appalling possibility that the Communist Chinese dictatorship has fallen prey to the weakness which has proved fatal to other dictatorships in the past. They may have miscalculated the strength and the determination of the democratic nations. It is for us, through our united support for this resolution, to eliminate the danger—to us and to the Chinese Communists themselves—of any such miscalculation.

The mutual defense treaty with the Republic of China, now before the Senate, will, upon ratification, go far to remove any doubt from the minds of the Communists as to our determination to defend Formosa and the Pescadores. The treaty tells the Communists plainly that we will consider any armed attack directed against Formosa and the Pescadores as dangerous to our own peace and safety, and that we will react to any such attack. By this resolution, we take a further important step and make clear to the Communists what the character of our reaction would be. This resolution authorizes the President to employ armed force against the attacking forces, allowing them no safer havens or stepping stones, and without waiting until their convoys are approaching Formosan beaches. Our bipartisan support of this resolution serves notice on the Communists that our vigorous and prompt action would be pursued by the executive branch with the steadfastness of purpose that comes from the support of a united people and Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the unanimous adoption of this resolution as a measure of vital importance for the preservation of peace from the miscalculations of aggressors. Let us all show by our votes that we are a united people—determined to preserve a free world.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower delivered an historic message to Congress January 24 on the subject of Formosa, and it was the kind of message the American people have been waiting for. The matter of first importance was that he put the question up to the Congress of the United States to approve or reject his views. Whatever is done, finally, the President will be fortified by the representatives of the people, and has put this country right back under the Constitution.

The second significant thing about the President's message is found in the following language:

> Meantime the situation has become sufficiently critical to impel me, without waiting action by the United Nations, to ask the Congress to participate now.

I have always forecast just this situation so far as the United Nations is concerned. I knew that in any eventuality, if we waited for the United Nations to act, no action would ever be taken. Our destiny cannot be hitched to the whims of this debating society. The President has the picture clearly in mind and it encourages Americans to know that in the matter of self-defense of this great Nation, we chart our own course and propose to back it up with a united people.

On the merits of the Formosa question, there can be no doubt that the President is eternally right. That island, not a part of China when World War II began, is a part of the western perimeter of defense of the United States. It is not this great island we want as this Nation covets no territory. To secure peace and prevent mad aggressive leaders from creeping up on all peaceful nations, we must be able to stop this aggression before it acquires momentum. The Republic of China on Formosa, the Philippine Islands, and Japan constitute the western barrier to this aggression, because we have seen from experience that forces from this eastern Asian coast, reached out into the waters of the Pacific and blew up our ships within sight of the shores of the United States. We must not let this happen again.

These aggressors ought to know, and probably do now, that this country seeks peace and not territory. Our example in the Phillipine Islands, in Cuba and elsewhere is conclusive of our intentions.

The President, I predict, will have 100 percent approval of Congress in this grave matter. We have finally taken a stand, and with what force and power

I possess will go to the President in this grave and important situation.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks on this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, one consideration in the adoption of the rule governing the procedure for House Joint Resolution 159 has not been touched upon during the debate on the rule. In that connection, I think it advisable to place in the RECORD a statement appearing on page 4 of the report from the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the resolution:

> The committee considered the relation of the authority granted by the resolution and the powers assigned to the President by the Constitution. Its conclusion was that the resolution in this form, while making it clear that the people of the United States stand behind the President, does not enter the field of controversy as to the respective limitations of power in the executive and the legislative branches. Acting together, there can be no doubt that all the constitutional powers necessary to meet the situation are present.

The language above, although not included in the resolution, must be considered in connection with the resolution, since the resolution is accompanied by the report. From the reading of that language, it appears clear that the committee in its consideration and likewise the House of Representatives in acting upon the rule are stating that by the adoption of House Joint Resolution 159 they are in no sense abrogating to the executive the legislative power and duty under the Constitution to declare war.

I am confident that it is not the desire of either the executive or the Congress for any such abrogation, and for that reason I have quoted from the committee report accompanying House Joint Resolution 159.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, there is little doubt in my mind but that the rule under consideration will be passed, I hope unanimously. The resolution—House Joint Resolution 159—which we are asked to pass to support the President in his efforts to stop Communist aggression in the Formosa area is timely.

Thank God we are at long last taking affirmative steps to halt the advance of Communist aggression in Asia by the rulers of Communist China.

Our failure to defeat them in Korea is what really stimulated their aggression. Every high ranking United States officer has publicly stated that we had our chance to destroy them and destroying their warehouses, railheads, airfields, communications system had our planes and men been permitted to cross the Yalu River. Here are the men who made these representations: Lt. Gen. George Stratemeyer, Far Eastern Air Command; Gen. James Van Fleet, Commanding General Eighth Army; General MacArthur; the Chief of the Marines in the Far East and the head of the carrier task force in the Korean waters. I merely mention this to indicate that when we failed to take advantage of our situation to crush or neutralize the aggressive tactics of the Chinese Communists they simply stepped up their aggression. We cannot, of course, solve our present problem by discussing errors that may have been made in the past.

I am glad and thankful that we have as the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee JAMES P. RICHARDS. His objective mind and his courage are an inspiration. Also, I feel proud of the committee that by a unanimous vote decided that Chinese Communist aggression must stop and gave 100-percent support to the President.

I have visited this area and know what a sensitive place it is. This step may be the beginning of the decrease in Chinese Communist agression. I do not believe that the steps that the President may take will lead to war. To me it is a step in the direction of peace. Our passage of this resolution by an overwhelming vote will give encouragement and hope to millions of people in Southeast Asia who are now living in fear of Communist aggression. They dare not take a positive stand against Communist intrusion. The decision today may strengthen the position of those people so they will become aggressive in their opposition to the Communists and the spread of their doctrine.

We are the leader of the free world. Communism proposes to liquidate the free world. With our ingenuity, our progress in science, our industrial potential, our resources of goods and skills, and our capacity to make popular government work successfully, we cannot fail to halt communism if we maintain a strong military posture and aggressively resist further advances of Communist aggression.

We have a leader in President Eisenhower who can furnish the kind of leadership that can properly protect the free world so democratic processes may flourish and expand.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote "aye" when the roll is called on House Joint Resolution 159. The President's special message to this great legislative body of yesterday, made it crystal clear in the very first paragraph thereof, that the paramount objective of our foreign policy is not only to guard the security of our great Nation, but that it can be preserved and safeguarded by taking reasonable steps for the establishing and preserving of a just and honorable peace. He pointed out to us that the situation in the western Pacific Ocean is immediately developing so seriously that it imperils not only the peace but our national security. As he is Commander in Chief of all our Armed Forces by virtue of his constitutional authority and responsibility and has sent us this message, I believe it to be my duty as Representative in this House of more than one-half million people in Los Angeles County, to at this time comply with the request of our Commander in Chief and of the President of the United States to enact House Joint Resolution 159.

I am pleased that the President identifies the United Nations as a source to which this Formosa-Red China problem can well be referred. However, I am also pleased, that he and our responsible military officials realize we may not be able to await the functioning of the United Nations in the premises. While all of the President's message to us, dated January 24, is of vital and paramount importance to us, his paragraph wherein he said, "In the interest of peace, therefore, the United States must remove any doubt regarding our readiness to fight, if necessary, to preserve the vital stake of the free world in a free Formosa, and to engage in whatever operations may be required to carry out that purpose," seems to me to set the tone, the possibilities, the dangers, and the significance of what may lie ahead for us. It is not pleasant to contemplate. But I wish to say again that I am pleased that the President has kept on emphasizing that what he has notified us he feels is necessary to do is in the interest of world peace.

It has seemed to me for a long time, that as I have seen more and more of world conditions in my official travels over a part of it as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, that enduring peace under present world conditions will only stem from strength and from the ability to use force successfully and in abundance enough to deter and stop the aggressive military Communist conspiracy. I, of course, concur with my distinguished colleagues who have pointedly analyzed that the adoption of this resolution is not in any sense a necessary incident or move by Congress to authorize the President of the United States to employ the Armed Forces of our great Nation. For, Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States is the only Commander in Chief of the military forces of the United States. He alone is it; under our United States Constitution. He cannot place any responsibility on the Congress of the United States which would take any responsibility from his shoulders. Nor can we, as the legislative branch, take any of his constitutional authority away from him. I am sure that he is not asking us to. Likewise, I am sure that our distinguished Foreign Affairs Committee did not intend to imply or infer by the text of the resolution before us that we could or intended to enter into the field of responsibility for the acts of the Commander of our military forces. The distinguished chairman of our Foreign Affairs Committee and other members thereof have satisfactorily explained it on the floor of the House in the last couple of hours and I am ready to vote "aye." In doing so, I hold my heart and mind and soul in reverent prayer to God Almighty himself that neither this present incident nor any other shall lead us into another shooting war. God forbid.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, persistent aggressions by the Red rulers of Communist China left no other course to the President but to ask for the passage of this resolution. The cruel conduct of these Chinese rulers has left the Congress nothing else to do but to pass this resolution—quickly and unanimously, I hope.

Risks most certainly are involved in actions such as that under consideration. However, the risks are not so great as will exist if we do nothing and allow the Communists to continue their aggressions.

I expect and hope, as I am sure we all do, that in approving this resolution we will help bring a long era of peace to the Pacific. If, however, conflict comes we may be sure that conflict, sooner or later, would have come anyway.

Our American Government wants peace. We hope the Chinese Government does also.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, authority by Congress for use of our Armed Forces to protect the security of Formosa would never be granted, I am sure, nor the inherent power of the President undertaken, if it were not considered that the United States had the military power to carry out its intention and successfully protect Formosa and the Pescadores from all-out Communist attack.

Moreover, it would seem that the reliance of our Armed Forces in their ability to secure and defend this far-off territory and keep it in friendly hands lies not in our supply of H-bombs nor in the Strategic Air Command's ability to destroy and wipe out great masses of mankind and industrialized civilization. Rather we are counting on our Navy with its modern mobile airplane carriers carrying jet fighter planes to cover and protect other deadly surface units.

The Democratic chairman of the House Appropriations Committee has suggested the scuttling of our aircraft carrier construction program.

If it were not for the modern carriers of our Navy, it seems to me we would be foolish to declare our intention of protecting Formosa, for there carriers are our best means of successfully carrying out our declared objective. Indeed, it may well be that our carrier force will be the "big stick" which will deter further Communist attack.

In any event, this is no time to talk about the scuttling of the aircraft-carrier construction program. Consideration of the joint resolution on Formosa should forcefully bring that home to the Members of Congress.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this resolution but with serious reservations. It is strange that at this time the President is asking Congress to give him carte blanche authority that already exists in the executive branch. I, indeed, hope that it is the security of the world and not political security which is involved.

I recognize it is vital to our own interests to work out some settlement in the Far East and to see that Formosa does not fall under Communist control, but it seems to me that we should work in the direction of turning the whole problem over to the United Nations. Placing Formosa under the jurisdiction of the United Nations for a period of several years would be far preferable to a course of action which bolsters the repudiated regime of Chiang Kai-shek and which could very likely lead to war.

However, because of the seriousness of the present situation which poses a real threat to the peace of the world, and in order that the Chinese Communists may not misjudge our national unity, I reluctantly join the other Members of this body in support of this resolution. It is my hope and prayer that the effect of this resolution will serve to calm the situation rather than to create further conflict. And I further hope that this Congress shows its determination to remain faithful—as the President said—"to our obligations as a member of the United Nations to be ready to settle our international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice are not endangered."

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I fervently hope President Eisenhower will not find it necessary to make use of the authority here made available to him.

I expect to support this resolution but I regret that it is accompanied by a closed rule for I have grave misgivings concerning the language involved in the last paragraph. For the purpose of emphasis, let me read it again:

> This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, and shall so report to Congress.

I realize that the words "or otherwise" provide a measure of qualification, but on the basis of the record of dismal failure of the United Nations in Korea and its further failure to take any concrete action to date in the perilous situation that now confronts us, I am opposed to any recognition of the United Nations in this measure.

This resolution is designed specifically to implement the mutual defense treaty between the United States and the Republic of China, which was signed in Washington on December 2, 1954. In his letter of transmittal to the President, Secretary of State Dulles pointedly described it as a bilateral treaty. Neither the treaty nor this resolution is multilateral in fact or in responsibility and any attempt to read the United Nations into either document is window dressing. Citizens of this country ought to be spared any pretense in a situation fraught with the danger that now confronts us.

To those of you who would uphold the United Nations in this hour, I ask: What is this organization prepared to contribute now, today, to halting the march of communism in the far Pacific? Repeatedly, since the war in Korea, the Chinese Communists have warned that they would take whatever steps are necessary to gain control of Formosa. The Republic of China is a member of the United Nations. Is there any doubt that acts of aggression are being committed? Is there doubt as to the identity of the aggressor? If there be these doubts then this resolution is improperly before us. If no such doubt exists, then where is the vaunted collective action of the United Nations? Where are the warships and planes of the United Nations and the men to man them?

Or is this situation to be viewed by our so-called free world friends in the nature of another Korea, where the United States poured the blood of its sons and its resources into the breach while the United Nations leaned on the weak crutch of token forces and gestures. Yet it had the political power to manipulate us into a stalemate and dictated the terms of a dismal truce that set the stage for the critical situation with which we are faced here today.

In the name of commonsense, how can we at this hour say in any language or words that the effectiveness of this resolution and the action it contemplates may be ended by the United Nations?

To do so is to open the door to another Panmunjom; another sordid exhibition of a world organization which is either too comfortable or lacks the moral courage to enforce the terms of a truce, even to the release of prisoners of war.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, we are preparing to enter into a solemn covenant with the Republic of China and with no other nation, and no amount of flowery language written by Secretary Dulles into the Mutual Defense Treaty with the Republic of China and no inclusion in this resolution can hide the fact that the United Nations, as an instrumentality for peace, through collective action, is an unmitigated failure.

Let us be done with this sham and pretense. Here and now we are confronted with the cold, brutal facts of life and these facts tell us indisputably that of the 48 other member nations of the United Nations there is little or no sense of urgency to join in the mission upon which we have embarked.

As of this day and hour, and henceforth, let us cast our lot with those nations, large or small, which demonstrate the moral fibre and will to sacrifice, within their capacity, to meet the threat of the Communist aggressors.

Mr. Speaker, the concluding paragraph of the resolution before us should read:

"This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably secured, and shall so report to Congress."

Let the United Nations first demonstrate that it has the qualities that entitle it to recognition. Until it does, let there be no further deception of the American people.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and, therefore, reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 159, now under consideration, is before the Congress in response to the special message of the President, asking authorization to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores islands, and related positions and territories of that area.

This matter was before the Rules Committee this morning after having been acted upon favorably by the House For-

eign Affairs Committee yesterday afternoon. It was admitted by members of the Foreign Affairs Committee before the Rules Committee this morning that the President, as Commander in Chief, has already the powers and authority which he is requesting in this resolution. Of course, I hope the Members of Congress will unanimously pass this resolution and cooperate in every way with our Commander in Chief, and the leaders of our Armed Forces, in assisting in every way to carry out what in their experienced knowledge of the Formosan situation is for the best interests of the free nations and the curtailment of communism.

Unfortunately the resolution is indefinite in that it sets out "Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area." It includes other areas besides Formosa and the Pescadores which places Members of Congress in the position of voting for a resolution that might cover islands, territories, and areas adjacent to the whole Chinese coastland. Unless our Commander in Chief and the military leaders use the greatest precaution, we may be in danger of flirting with an all-out war along the Chinese mainland. I am satisfied that the vast majority of the Members of Congress, including myself, would not vote for a resolution which would call for the sending of American boys over to fight on the Chinese mainland or the hundreds of islands adjacent thereto. We are all unanimous in the protection of Formosa and the closely located Pescadores. It was from Formosa that the Japanese militarists launched some of the most devastating naval and air attacks against our forces in the Pacific in World War II. Formosa is a vital interest to our defenses in the Pacific in order to stop a Communist menace from spreading to Japan, the Philippines, Australia, and other South Pacific islands. The decision to neutralize the Formosan Straits in 1950 involved great risks and President Truman accepted those risks courageously as part of his responsibility as Commander in Chief. His decision at that time was proper and not a single American was lost by combat in the Formosan area, yet the island was kept out of the hands of the Communists.

The situation concerning Formosa did not arise in the last few days, it has been pending and smouldering for months. President Eisenhower, the State Department, in carrying on their duties as leaders of our Foreign Affairs should have kept the Members of Congress informed as to the critical situation which has been pending for such a long time and not request action on the part of Congress so important as this resolution to be rushed through in 24 hours' time. It is very readily apparent that if the actions of the military in the Formosan area are a success, the executive department will take all credit for keen foresight in assuming constitutional responsibility in curbing Communist aggression in this area. If the reverse occurs, the Members of Congress who acted upon and supported this resolution, the contents and limits of which are so uncertain in its present context, Congress will be held responsible for the actions they are taking today, based on total lack of factual information on the military risks involved.

At the rules committee meeting this morning, the gentleman from Illinois, LEO ALLEN, made a statement which I endorse highly. That statement was that political consideration or interpretations of any kind should be eliminated on matters involving critical international problems such as the Asiatic situation. I not only agree with my good friend, Congressman ALLEN, but I would extend the banning of politics concerning all our international problems past, present, and future that has to do with our fight against the terrible scourge of communism. It is indeed unfortunate that the leaders of the Republican Party during the last campaign and for several years, have thrown our Asiatic troubles wholeheartedly into the realms of politics and political campaigns. It is my firm belief that as time passes and millions of people in the free nations of the world become more acquainted with the true facts of communism, our country will have more effective and cooperative allies in combating this tyranny. In the meantime, our Nation must continue to assume the leadership on behalf of millions throughout the world who are helpless to effectively curb the Soviet tyrants. We in the Congress and the executive department must present a solid front in this fight until victory is won.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] to close the debate.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, first I want to express my approval and appreciation, for whatever they are worth, of the splendid spirit of unanimity with which this very grave and important matter has been considered up to this time. Particularly I want to commend the Speaker of the House, the minority leader, the majority leader, the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, on the lack of partisanship demonstrated in this grave hour of the Republic.

Mr. Speaker, history will record today as a day of decision. For what action we take here on this occasion will color the stream of civilization and be responsible for the continuation of the opportunity for men to remain free on the one hand or for further appeasement of totalitarian communism with all of its implications.

The decision made here today will reverberate around the world. That decision can only be a firm one. It should be a unanimous one. We must either give the President the authority which he seeks or we must get out of the Western Pacific. There is no choice. Mr. Speaker, the only criticism to be made of the President's request for authority, seems to me, is that it has been so long coming. As one who for the past 10 years has been advocating a firm policy in dealing with the Communist masters, I welcome the first opportunity I have had in those long 10 years of appeasement to go on record for an affirmative foreign policy. Too long we have followed a Chamberlainlike appeasement of the Kremlin masters and their stooges. Too long have we, the richest and most powerful Nation in the world, suffered the grossest type of indignities in an effort to appease the Communist leaders. Our ships have been circumscribed in their sailings on the high seas. Our vehicles have been stopped and searched on the international highways. Our aircraft have been shot down from the free airways. Our soldiers and citizens have been seized and incarcerated in the vilest dungeons while undergoing mental torture worse than the Spanish Inquisition and held for ransom.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, these and many other crimes have been perpetrated against us. These indignities this proud Nation has borne in an effort to maintain the peace and on the assumption that we must do nothing to provoke Russia into starting a war. I repeat here today what I have said on many occasions on this floor during the past 10 years. Namely, that Russia wants war no more than we want war. The Russian masters have set out deliberately on a system of divide and conquer. The Russian policy of requiring the United States to spend itself into bankruptcy has not changed since Lenin first prescribed that formula for the liquidation of the United States. The present happenings in Asia are just as much a part of that pattern as was the trouble in Germany, in Korea, in Iran, in Indochina and as it will no doubt be in many other places in the world in the future as long as the present regime is in control of the Russian and Chinese peoples.

The American people have no quarrel with the masses of the people of China. On the contrary, our benevolence and efforts to assist them in times of famine and war have been demonstrated time and time again over a period of more than 100 years. We do not propose here to make war upon those people. We are not dealing with the downtrodden peoples of China any more than we are dealing with the similarly oppressed people of Russia. We are forced to deal with their warlords who in reality are but the puppets of the Kremlin. It is not proposed here nor is it the thought of any responsible Government leaders that we will have an all-out war with the Chinese people. But, we do propose here to keep our commitments to the free peoples of Nationalist China and defend their land of Formosa. Moreover, we also propose thereby to protect further aggression in the direction of Japan and the Philippines as well as our own homeland.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the lack of partisanship manifested in getting this issue to the floor of the House. To my mind this is a splendid exhibition of patriotism. Partisanship in times of peril to our common country has no place and in the debate that will follow, I am confident that both Democrats and Republicans will follow the example set by the leadership on both sides of the aisle and see to it that the common interest of the country is placed above political preference. As a matter of fact, the fortunes

of the Democratic and Republican Parties are relatively unimportant. Our true objective in this matter is to prevent both of them from being replaced by the totalitarian Communist Party. What a splendid picture will be presented to the peoples of the world if the debate can be devoid of political disunity and the vote unanimous in a democracy whose Chief Executive, the President, is of one Party and the Congress controlled by the other. In my humble and feeble way, I implore you to cooperate in presenting that picture here today.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 159) authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 159, with Mr. BOGGS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I have served in this body for more than 20 years. From that long experience, I can say that no measure upon which I have had to vote, except a declaration of war, was more important for the future of our country than the resolution now before this House. I do not want to overdramatize the serious content of this resolution, but I would not feel that I was being honest with my colleagues if I dismissed it lightly. It simply reflects the serious times in which we live. We are peaceful people. We are a patient people—willing to explore every reasonable means to maintain the peace. What, then, is the course of events that suddenly makes legislative expression desirable, if not imperative? Is it simply the insatiable appetite of the Communists who have been talking "peace" and "truce" and "cease fire" while they nibble away at the non-Communist world? Since 1949, when the Chinese Communists seized the mainland of China, they have engaged in aggression in Korea and Vietnam and elsewhere. The Chinese Communist authorities no later than yesterday announced their next goal is the conquest of Formosa. If they are successful in seizing that island, they will have cut our defensive lifeline from the Aleutians to the north to the Philippines to the south, and thus endanger the United States. It may take more than an expression of congressional support of the President's policies to stop the Communist advance. I do not know, and I am sure that you do not know. I hope the Communist leaders will correctly interpret the endorsement of the President's policy which we are giving in this resolution. If they do not, they ought to know that we are, in this resolution, as representatives of 160 million Americans, authorizing the President to choose the time and place and nature of defensive action that he may have to talk to halt their continued advance. There is confidence in the President's judgment. Last fall, along with my friend the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], I visited many of the countries rimming the China mainland.

One of the strongest impressions I brought back was the uncertainty among the peoples of those countries that we would fight to stop further aggression. If we, with all our power, and removed by distance, waver, if we talk further about settlements and truces with the Communists, we cannot expect the small nations living in the long shadow of the vile Communist octopus to stand up to them. The firm and uncompromising position we take today will do much to renew their faith in what we stand for.

The issue involved in this resolution is rather simple. I am sure that it is already well understood by the Members of the House and by the people of the United States. The basic issue is simply this: Has the time come to take a firm stand and give notice to the leaders of Red China and their Moscow masters of that stand? Will the choice for us or the issues before us be any clearer in 6 months or in 12 months or in 2 years? I think we have reached the dividing line where doubt must end and decision must begin.

If the issue is as important as I think it is, then speed is an essential part of our responsibility. We cannot dillydally while the welfare of our country is at stake.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs has acted quickly but has not acted in haste. We voted out this resolution by a vote of 28 to nothing. There are only 32 members of that committee, and I understand that 3 of the other 4 were ill and could not be here.

I want to make it as clear as I can that this is not a declaration of war. Unless I miss my guess, Moscow and its Chinese Communist puppets will call this a warmongering move. If it should turn out that way, it will be because they have misinterpreted it. But their respect for us would be even less if we abjectly retreated before each of their blasts and threats against us.

All we are doing is stating clearly and firmly the policy of our Government. We are giving endorsement to the President to take such measures as he may think necessary in this area in our own defense, and to maintain the peace of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to string out what I say here today. Everyone here understands the issues involved. Those who were here with me in the dark days before World War II know that I fought as strongly as I could to prevent our involvement in that war. Why? First, we were not ready. Second, it was not the policy to become involved in that war. Third, I thought we could stay out. Fourth, we had made no commitments abroad. Fifth, because I hate war as such. But today the situation is entirely different. We have said from the housetops that we are not going to let this ungodly Communist movement conquer this world; we accepted the challenge when they made it, that there was not enough room in this world for both the international Communist superstate and the democratic form of government; and we do not intend to surrender.

Since the threat of world communism arose, I have consistently taken the position that we must be ready for anything, war if necessary. We must get this country ready for the showdown that must inevitably come. Mr. Chairman, do not mistake it, if the showdown does not come today it will come tomorrow or the next day, or the next day; it may come on less favorable ground. We have formed alliances all around this world; we have the Atlantic Pact which guarantees the protection of Europe, passed by the Senate with hardly a dissenting vote. We have additional treaties in the Pacific, already made or in the making. Mr. Chairman, we must carry out the obligations of those treaties if we want the world situation to improve.

Mr. Chairman, in the life of every man and woman, in the life of every State, there is a moment of decision, to go this way or to go that way to success or failure, happiness or sorrow. "He either doubts his fate too much or his desserts are small, who dares not put it to the touch to win or lose it all."

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I have listened with careful attention to what the gentleman has said. I, likewise, think we have got to show firmness in a critical situation like this.

I have read the resolution carefully. I wish to ask the gentleman: Is there anything in this resolution now that restricts at all the use of nuclear energy, the atom bomb, or the hydrogen bomb?

Mr. RICHARDS. It does not restrict anything, but there are other laws governing the use of those weapons.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. There is nothing in this resolution to restrict the President in the use of the hydrogen or atom bomb?

Mr. RICHARDS. There is nothing in this resolution that either restricts it or authorizes it.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. At least there is no restriction to it; he is able to use it if he needs it.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I strongly favor the passage of House Joint Resolution 159 as I believe it is designed to safeguard the security and the defense of the United States.

I find myself in entire agreement with the statement of President Eisenhower to the Congress on this important subject. I believe it is for the best interests of our country that we have this expression of the Congress establishing the authority of the President as Commander in Chief, to employ the Armed Forces promptly and effectively in the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores

and in such related localities which might determine the failure or success of an attack upon them. In so doing it makes clear to the world the serious intentions of our Government, our Congress, and our people.

While the Committee on Foreign Affairs considered this resolution expeditiously, it did go into all phases of it most carefully. We heard extended testimony from Mr. Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, and Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I believe it was wise that we passed this resolution in the form presented. While it is true there is a difference of opinion as to powers assigned to the President by the Constitution, and as to the constitutional powers of the Congress, I believe the resolution was presented in a form which makes it clear that the people of the United States stand behind the President, and it is unnecessary to go into any controversial matters as to the respective limitations of power in the executive and legislative branches.

While ordinarily I would prefer an open rule but, for reasons I have just recited, I believe the Rules Committee was wise in bringing this resolution before us under a closed rule.

There is a difference of opinion as to whether or not it was desirable in this resolution to establish specific geographical limits but after considered judgment it was felt that to do so would give our potential aggressors notice that we would not resist them beyond those geographical limits. It was felt best by Admiral Radford and Secretary Dulles not to delineate in terms of latitude and longitude the areas that are to be defended. The committee concurred in these views that precise definitions tended to tie the hands of the United States to an undesirable extent.

While I feel that we would all welcome action by the United Nations to bring about peace in this area, I do not feel we could wait for such possible action, but had to take this step immediately.

We all recognize there are risks involved, I believe by making our position absolutely clear we will increase our chances for peace.

I hope this House will follow the example of the Foreign Affairs Committee, which voted 28 to 0 in favor of the passage of this resolution, and that there will not be a dissenting vote on the floor this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]. The gentleman from Minnesota was chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs dealing with the Far East during the last Congress.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this resolution is to try to prevent war in the Far East with Communist China. It is based on the conviction, supported by our practical experience in the past, that whenever and wherever the United States has taken and maintained a constant, consistent, dependable position of firmness and strength in harmony with our historic principles, it has not led to war, and our legitimate interests have been protected.

On the contrary, whenever our policy has been soft and weak, or half-hearted, or even hesitant; whenever we have allowed our desire for peace to lead us into vacillation and concessions and then additional concessions to aggressors, we have regularly lost ground, the dangers have increased, and expanded hostilities have resulted.

Our situation in Asia today is similar to that in Europe 8 years ago when President Truman came before the 80th Congress and said in substance, "The time has come when we have got to stop further expansion of this Communist menace in Europe, specifically in Greece and Turkey. The United States must assist free countries in their efforts to resist subjugation from without or subversion from within by aggressive Communist forces."

That Congress was Republican controlled. It gave him full support and the Congress passed, first, the bill to give military and economic aid to Greece and Turkey, later the Marshall plan, and then legislation laying the foundation of NATO. We did so because we knew it would be too dangerous to the security of the United States to have the opposite shores of the Atlantic in the hands of mortal enemies of the United States instead of in the hands of friends of the United States. Our action did not lead to war as many feared. It prevented war.

When our Government took a firm stand on the Communist blockade of Berlin, and backed up our words with firm deeds, the airlift, the Kremlin breathed fire and brimstone, but it did not start a war.

When the Communists attacked South Korea President Truman again took a strong stand and again we prevailed, with much of the free world responding to our leadership. Unfortunately, in 1951, just when victory was in sight, a victory that could have demolished Red China's military power and prevented both Indochina and the present threats against Formosa, some of our allies and some timid souls among ourselves decided that it was more dangerous to win than to accept the truce proposed by the Reds. They assumed that the military defeat of Communist forces meant also their political defeat, and the end of the threat. Many in America thought that to push on to victory in Korea would lead to extension of the war, when in reality that was the only way to end it.

When a strong, firm, policy had succeeded to the point that Malik suggested a truce, many in our Government accepted the proposal at face value and returned to a policy of softness and weakness. They assumed that when Communists propose a truce, they want what we want, namely, peace. But to Communists a truce proposal is a military maneuver, not a move to bring real peace. Years ago the present Communist Prime Minister Chou En-lai who is so belligerent today, said, "A truce is the military equivalent of the political tactic of coalition."

That is, if in politics, they do not have enough support to win an election, they say to the dominant elements in a country, Let us have a coalition government, take in all the parties, including the Communists, of course. Let us form a "democratic front," or a "united front."

Then they bore from within to take over the coalition.

In war, when they cannot win, they say, Let us have a cease-fire and negotiate.

But let us not forget that to them a cease-fire is the "military equivalent of the political tactic of coalition." It is not a move to end a war, but only a trick to end a losing phase of it—such as Korea—in order to shift to an operation—such as Indochina—which they believe will be more profitable.

When we see a prizefighter along about the 10th round become very affectionate with his opponent, embracing him ardently, we do not misunderstand that maneuver. We do not imagine it is because he has decided to give up and not try to win the fight. We know it is the reverse: he wants to hang on and rest, if he can, until the end of the round, in the hope he can knock the guy out in the next round.

When Communists suddenly propose a truce, it is only a skilled boxer's clinch. It means they are in trouble and trying to get out of it. The purpose is not to end the war, but to win it.

Our sincere desire to have peace at almost any cost caused us to make repeated concessions in Asia despite Communist duplicity and violations of agreements. Of course, Communist aggressiveness grew.

When General Eisenhower became President 2 years ago, his first official act in the field of foreign policy was one of firmness. He withdrew President Truman's order under which our fleet was protecting Red China against any possible attacks from Formosa. The purpose of that order had been to avoid "provoking" the Communists, to keep them out of the Korean war by showing them that we had no designs against them, that we were not going to attack them or let Free China harass them. But it did not keep them out. Rather, our softness encouraged them to intervene in Korea and take thousands of American lives. So, it made no sense to continue that order; it had failed of its objective.

That firm act by the new President got prompt results. The Communists reversed their adamant position on prisoners of war, and asked for peace negotiations. It was, of course, only another clinch.

Unfortunately, once more we followed our hearts instead of our heads, and permitted them to get out of the hole they were in in Korea, and resume the offensive elsewhere. I opposed our abandonment of the strong, firm policy, which was working, to return to the soft, weak policy which never has worked. As expected, the result was not to limit the war, but to extend it—to Indochina, and now to the Formosan Straits.

Surely it is plain that whenever we have been consistently firm and strong, we have succeeded. Western Europe and the Mediterranean today are free.

Wherever, as in Asia, we have not had a similarly firm and strong policy, under either administration, we have uniformly failed and steadily lost ground.

Our desire to avoid trouble in Asia, because to some it seemed less essential to our security, plus the policy that we must not get involved in China, has now led to greater involvement. It has forced us, as it was bound to, toward one or the other of the two courses we wanted most to avoid, namely, either withdraw step by step from Asia in disastrous defeat, or "expand the sanctions," that is, stop the Reds by force. Those are the two things we did not and do not want; and almost 10 years of weakness and indecision, or at least half-heartedness, in that part of the world have led inevitably to one or the other. We cannot delay a decision any longer. Perhaps by firmness now we may still prevent having to do either. That is the reason for this resolution.

Some may ask, Why not let the Communists take Formosa? Because the stakes are too great for ourselves. The issue in this part of the world is not Chiang Kai-shek, it is not Syngman Rhee, it is not this, that, or the other controversial figure as some have suggested in the past. It is the security of the island chain from the Aleutians to Australia. It is the freedom of the remaining 800 million free people in Asia. It is the security of the United States.

The Communists have understood that clearly. Right after the end of the last war, 3 months after VJ-Day to be exact, the Communists published their instructions to their faithful followers in this country. I discussed them here at some length in 1950, right after the Korean war started. This was their central instruction: "The war in China is the key to all problems on the international front."

We said that Germany was the key; we said the North Atlantic was the key; some said the Mediterranean was the key; some said Japan was the key. But the Kremlin, in its hard-headed realism, said, "The war in China is the key to all problems on the international front."

The war in China was the one we did not want to bother with, but they were determined to win. Why? Look for a moment at the geography of Asia. It is like a giant hand. China is the palm of that hand, the hub of the Asia wheel, just as Germany is the hub of the wheel in Europe. Out of the palm that is China go 12 fingers—12 countries consisting of island groups or peninsulas. On China's east are Korea, Japan, Formosa, the Philippines. Down in southeast Asia are Indochina, Thailand, Malaya, Indonesia. Then there are four more across the south—Burma, India, Pakistan, and Afghanistan.

In those 12 fingers live one-third of all the people of the world. The Communists saw that if they got the palm, China, and were able to consolidate their position there and develop China's vast manpower and raw materials, they could gradually take over the fingers, one by one—unless the free world fought back.

So the stake is not just Formosa and some island outposts; it is a third of the people in the world, with vast resources and strategically located bases. Once on the Indian Ocean, Africa lies ahead—almost totally unprotected on its east.

Well, the Communists have China, for the present. The next goal is the fingers. To change to another figure, China is first base. Their next objective, of course, is second base, the 12 countries lying like a giant crescent around China from Korea and Japan to Iran. If they are permitted to get second base they will outnumber the free world 2 to 1. Europe will be cut off from many of her raw materials and markets. Does anybody think Western Europe can long support herself isolated from two-thirds of the world? Or that we can support her indefinitely? The Communists then can get Europe—third base.

But a man does not go to third base to stop; he goes to third base to get home. And who is home base? We are, of course.

The Communists turned to Asia in 1928 as the surest and safest way to get Europe and America. Their real objective in Asia—in China, Korea, Indochina, and now Formosa—was and is to isolate and ultimately destroy the United States, because we are all that stands between them and total control of the world.

How can they best get second base? If you look at the two chief portions of the crescent around China you see that one is the island chain in the western Pacific and the other is south and southeast Asia. Formosa is a key to both.

This island chain is our western Pacific defense line. It arches from the Aleutians through Japan, Okinawa, Formosa, the Philippines, down to Australia and New Zealand. The key to that arch happens to be Formosa.

It flanks the Philippines on the north. You remember the Philippines were attacked and taken by the Japanese from Formosa.

It semiflanks Japan on the south. On Japan's north, the Russians are already in the Kurile Islands, which unfortunately were given to them at Yalta in an effort to get peace and good relations. How is anybody going to make a "bastion" out of a Japan flanked on the south by Formosa and on the north by the Kurile Islands?

Look now at the other part of the crescent around China—the countries to its south. The riches of Asia are not in China. They are down in southeast Asia—tin, rubber, oil, rice surpluses. Now, if you were a Communist general, would you move down into Burma or Thailand or Malaya or India as long as on your flank lay this unsinkable aircraft carrier, Formosa, with some 60 airfields originally built by the Japanese, some of which have been enlarged to take jets? There are not too many jets there now, but we could get them there very quickly from Okinawa, Japan, and elsewhere. It is the existence of a free Formosa on the flank of Red China which makes the Communists say so emphatically that they are determined to capture Formosa. They dare not try to take south Asia without first securing Formosa, or perhaps getting it neutralized.

The reason why they say they must have Formosa is the reason why we are saying they must not be allowed to have it. Where could they be stopped then? Mr. Nehru, for example, has said he has no means of saving India if the Chinese Communists move against his country. Formosa is a major deterrent to Communist aggression against the vitally rich prizes of the south, including the Malay Peninsula and the vast country of Indonesia. Australia, right next door, understands this, but our people as a whole have not understood it.

We hope we will never have to use Formosa for such purposes, but the very existence of it there in friendly hands on Red China's flank is perhaps the best guaranty against further Communist expansion, which would force us into war—unless we are to let all Asia go and retreat to our west coast.

So this resolution is not just to save one island and some outposts, but to help keep free over one-third of the human beings in the world and keep the world balance of power from being turned overwhelmingly against us. The free world now has one-third, the Communists have one-third. Which way is the other third to go—with us or with the enemy? That is what we are talking about today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Is Formosa an international territory today, or does it belong to the Republic of China?

Mr. JUDD. The juridical position of Formosa has been in dispute. Some say one thing, some another. Events are probably going to have to determine it. China ceded it to Japan after the war of 1895. Japan relinquished all right to it in its treaty with the Republic of China after World War II. Both the Nationalist Chinese and the Communists insist that it is Chinese territory. It is the one thing on which they agree. But, the international status of Formosa from a juridical standpoint, I think, has not been finally determined, and therefore I do not think that we need to go into that today.

The main issue today is whether that key strategic area is to be taken over by the Communists and the defenses of ourselves and the free world in the western Pacific go down.

Quite as important as the geographical considerations involved are the morale factors. Should we retreat once more in the mistaken notion that would appease the Communists, the already shaken morale of other countries in the area, and their confidence in us, are bound to deteriorate rapidly. Are we, then, to abandon the Philippines and Japan also as soon as Red China is ready to threaten them? The Japanese prime minister has recently been defeated, in part because he put all his chips on the United States and its strength, and the people out there are not now certain we can be depended on.

Mr. Chairman, I came home a year ago from a study trip through all these "fingers" with about four main impressions:

First, the people there are awakening to the nature of communism and its threat to them.

Second, they are afraid of it, especially of Communist China, because they know it will destroy their newly won national independence. When people like Mr. Nehru extol the Chinese Communist regime or agree with it on almost everything, it is not because they are pro-Communist; they are afraid. Why should they not be?

A high official in one of these countries said to us that if we strong nations in the West did not have the courage to stand up against Communist China, how could the new and weaker governments of Asia be expected to? He said, "Some of your allies in Europe, 6,000 miles away from China, not right across its border, are insisting that you accept Communist China into the United Nations. If you are to embrace Communist China, how can we resist her?" I did not have a good answer. Only such a resolution as this expressing the united will of this Nation to back down no further and to surrender no more strategic bases and no more millions of free people to Communist conquest, can give an answer they will believe.

Third, they want to be on the side of the United States and the free world, because that is their best hope of retaining their dearly bought freedom from alien control; but

Fourth, they are not certain we will stay on our side, the side of human freedom. They are afraid we will make a deal with the Red tyrants at their expense, in our desire to get peace for ourselves, however illusory and transient it will be. I hate to admit it, but just as the question mark in Europe is France, so, in the minds of the people of East Asia and Southeast Asia, the great question mark is the United States. If they do take a firm stand on our side, how can they be sure that we will not let them down?

It is the vital importance of Formosa from the standpoint of these geographical factors plus the morale factors which has brought us to this showdown today.

The showdown for Europe and the Mediterranean came over Greece and Turkey almost 8 years ago. The President and Congress then took a firm stand and it did not lead to war.

The showdown for Asia is over Formosa, and it is here now. I only hope it is not too late to convince these men of violence in Peking that our repeated concessions in the past, our attempts to get peace at almost any price, our long suffering and patience, are not synonymous with weakness. The Communists always proclaim to Asia that America is a "paper tiger," and they may have come to believe it. Chou En-lai bellowed his threats yesterday in an attempt to intimidate the American people, trying to beguile us once more into believing that it is not their aggression, but our resistance to it, that threatens war. Naturally he hopes that we will once more give in and back down.

Mr. Chairman, our appearance of weakness and softness in the past has encouraged the present Communist arrogance and aggressiveness. Firmness now may cause them to pause. Weakness now would be certain to increase their truculence and to extend, not limit, hostilities.

For communism is exactly like a cancer. It lives by lawless encroachments on neighboring tissues or peoples. We are presented here today with the same problem a surgeon has when a lady comes in with a cancer. We tell her it must be removed. Her husband asks, "But may not the operation lead to her death?" And we reply, "Yes, it may. But what is going to happen if we do not operate? She is certain to die. You had better ask the question this way, May it still prevent her death?"

Likewise there is risk of war if the United States takes and firmly adheres to the stand proclaimed in this resolution. But there is greater danger of war if we do not take this action. We had better put the question this way, "May it still prevent war?" Certainly there will be war later if the malignant Communist growth is permitted to continue its course—and under far more difficult circumstances.

There is risk of war if we act—but there is also hope of peace. There is greater risk if we do not act—and no hope.

So this proposed action is a belated effort to prevent war, not to make it. However great the dangers involved in taking this step, the risks assumed in not taking it are greater. I have no difficulty in deciding to take the course of lesser risk.

For I am sure that we will have a world war if we return to a weak and vacillating posture. And it will come at a time when, God help us, the odds will be against the United States. I cannot choose that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, House Joint Resolution 159, authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area, was approved by our Foreign Affairs Committee by the overwhelming and unanimous vote of 28 to 0. In this vote there is expressed the bipartisan support which is essential to the proper carrying out of the foreign policy of our Nation. The fundamental objective of the resolution is to safeguard the security of the United States. It is imperative that the strategic islands of Formosa and the Pescadores be protected against attack by the Red Chinese. The aggressive Communist forces have a lust for power and expansion which will not stop if we sit idly by. On the contrary, if our Nation stands united behind our President there is an excellent possibility that the Communists will be impressed with our determination to use our resources in our security and that of the free world.

It is because this resolution offers us the best hope for making that possibility a reality that I support this resolution.

I have been very much impressed with the testimony of Secretary of State Dulles and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Radford. They were subjected to very careful and thorough questioning by the members of our committee. There was within the committee a keen awareness of the emergency involved and the necessity for taking quick action.

I know that none of us likes to take any action that may involve hostilities, but I shudder at the thought that if we do not act, the entire Far East area may fall, and inevitably Europe. If that should come to pass, it would mean the end of freedom and the beginning of enslavement for the American people.

The President in his message stated that he believed that the threatening aspects of the present situation, if resolutely faced, may be temporary in character. He further stated that the recommendations contained in his message do not call for an increase in the Armed Forces of the United States and that if any unforeseen emergency arises requiring any change, he will communicate with the Congress.

I commend the President for this forthright statement and for his words of hope for peace which he has conveyed in his message to the Congress. If we remain united, firm and courageous and faithful to our principles, we will succeed with God's help.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and my colleagues in urging favorable consideration of the resolution pending before us.

The President has asked Congress to authorize the use of our Armed Forces to protect Formosa and related positions against possible Chinese Communist attack. I personally believe that our Chief Executive, as the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, already possesses adequate powers to deploy military forces as necessary to safeguard the security and the interests of our Nation. Nevertheless, if the President feels that he needs the special encouragement of a congressional resolution to exercise such powers, I feel that this body ought to go along and comply with his request, I hope unanimously.

There is another, more important reason for my action in urging speedy and favorable action on the resolution before us. The resolution, if approved by this body, would signify our determination to stand fast on our principles and commitments to prevent Communist expansion and enslavement of free peoples. As such, the passage of this measure would serve notice on Red China that we will not stand idly by and allow them to go through with their openly announced plans for the armed capture of Formosa and other areas in the Far East.

I firmly believe that, after the two recent partition settlements in the Far East, it is necessary for us to reassert

our determination that at least the policy of containment, inaugurated by the past administration, will be continued by our present Government. In the interests of our national security, we must not allow any further extension of the Communist domain—either by partisan settlements or by outright military conquests. If we wait until Red-dominated territories invade our defense perimeter, it may be too late to take a stand on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, in the years before the inauguration of the present administration, our Government had taken some courageous steps to prevent Communist expansion into new territories. Through firm announcements of policy and decisive actions we stopped Red advances in Greece, in Turkey, in Iran, in Berlin, and in Korea. I believe that we must be equally decisive now. We do not want war and we earnestly hope that the current crisis between Red China and Formosa can be resolved through the U. N. by peaceful methods. Yet we must serve notice on all aggressors, and would-be aggressors, that we shall not condescend to any clandestine or overt invasion of other people's land. We cannot cower and hesitate anytime the Red masters decide to announce that they intend to invade a new territory.

Several years ago, during the crisis in Greece, former President Truman asked the Congress to take a stand on the issue whether or not we were willing to aid the people of Greece in preserving their liberty and the right of self-determination. While the circumstances in that instance were different from those which we encounter today, the principle applies to the resolution before us. It is my hope that the measure will receive unanimous approbation of this body.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW].

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, I strongly favor the passage of House Joint Resolution 159 authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area. I hope this measure is unanimously adopted by the House. This resolution clearly states the position of the United States in the area and gives the President the authority to use the Armed Forces of the United States for the purpose of protecting Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions. In this resolution we are taking a firm, definite, and realistic stand. The adoption of the resolution will, in my opinion, constitute a major step in insuring the peace of the world.

The President sent to Congress on Monday a clear, forthright message. I applaud the President's action in this crisis and am glad that he came to the Congress requesting legislation to implement his proposals for action in the Far East.

I am supporting this resolution wholeheartedly. I have for years advocated taking a firm, realistic stand in this worldwide struggle. The President has shown courageous and inspired leadership, and I will continue to support him to the limit in the effort to halt Red aggression.

In connection with the action we are taking today I call attention to a suggested platform on foreign policy which I included in the RECORD on June 23, 1947. In it I used these words:

> Our interests circle the globe and when there is encroachment on strategic areas, the integrity of which is necessary to our security, we must be ready to offer immediate, continued, and unrelenting resistance.

I further stated:

> A strong policy, a resolute foreign policy, a firm foreign policy will lead to a peaceful world, a world in which nations can live without fear of aggression, slavery, and ultimate annihilation.

The passage of House Joint Resolution 159 clearly defines our policy and our determination to take the requisite action in "assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores." This resolution constitutes a firm stand in the Pacific areas. It is necessary that we take this action in the interest of preserving peace. This is a historic occasion and I am sure that the firm stand we take today will be recorded as an outstanding action of this decade in preserving and insuring the peace of the world.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the resolution now before the House for consideration is one of tremendous importance. It contains implications that are far reaching and can mean war or peace according to the effect given to it by Red China.

It is highly commendable that in a situation such as this, even though he may not have been required to do so, that the President should request Congress to approve his standby resolution rather than for the President on his own initiative to have taken action precipitously as was done in the Korean situation.

President Eisenhower, in his message to Congress, has used plain and understandable language. It cannot be misunderstood as to the intent or purpose with which it was written. No speech on the floor of this House can improve upon or strengthen the reasoning it contains to justify the course of action it recommends. It justifies the adoption of the resolution now before us.

The adoption of the pending resolution—House Joint Resolution 159—is appropriate not only from the standpoint of making a clear denunciation of the conduct of Red China, but, also that the world may know, both friend and foe, where this country stands with respect to Communist aggression, and, its purpose to oppose such whenever and wherever it is necessary to do so in order to maintain our own security and preserve the rights of free nations.

Furthermore, the adoption of this resolution without party division will be of inestimable value in demonstrating to the world, that regardless of any division that may exist along party lines with respect to domestic issues, there is no such division in our intention as a nation to oppose communistic aggression and uphold the principles of justice and freedom when challenged. In unity there is strength. Our action today in supporting this resolution, regardless of differing political affiliations, gives evidence of our unity and the strength it engenders. The unity here displayed will strengthen the cause of ultimate peace throughout the world.

I think we will all agree that President Eisenhower would not have made the strong and uncompromising recommendations that we resist any attempt of Red China to expand its aggression, had he not had information that left no doubt of the necessity to take such action. In addition to this we would not be justified in overlooking the fact that our President is the outstanding military leader of the world. He knows better than anyone, less informed, when it is time to speak and the military necessity to do so together with the appropriate steps to be taken.

The President has pointed out that Communist China has pursued a series of provocative political and military actions, establishing a pattern, as he so properly says, of aggressive purpose. That purpose, he further says, they proclaim is the conquest of Formosa.

In detailing the indictment against Red China as to its aggressive intent, and, the reasons that impel the necessity of resistance, the President in his message said:

> In September 1954, the Chinese Communists opened up heavy artillery fire upon Quemoy Island, one of the natural approaches to Formosa, which had for several years been under the uncontested control of the Republic of China. Then came air attacks of mounting intensity against other free China islands, notably those in the vicinity of the Tachen group to the north of Formosa. One small island (Ichiang) was seized last week by air and amphibious operations after a gallant few fought bravely for days against overwhelming odds. There have been recent heavy air attacks and artillery fire against the main Tachen Islands themselves.
>
> The Chinese Communists themselves assert that these attacks are a prelude to the conquest of Formosa. For example, after the fall of Ichiang, the Peiping radio said that it showed a "determined will to fight for the liberation of Taiwan (Formosa). Our people will use all their strength to fulfill that task."
>
> Clearly, this existing and developing situation poses a serious danger to the security of our country and of the entire Pacific area and indeed to the peace of the world. We believe that the situation is one for appropriate action of the United Nations under its charter, for the purpose of ending the present hostilities in that area. We would welcome assumption of such jurisdiction by that body.
>
> Meanwhile, the situation has become sufficiently critical to impel me, without awaiting action by the United Nations, to ask the Congress to participate now, by specific resolution, in measures designed to improve the prospects for peace. These measures would contemplate the use of the Armed Forces of the United States if necessary to assure the security of Formosa and the Pescadores.

The course of action outlined by the President, in the event of a concerted attack by Communist China, can mean either war or peace. However, I am strongly of the opinion that unless Red China has already, and heretofore, decided on war, the words of President

Eisenhower would not provoke it to starting a war, but, if such an intention had already been formed, then the words of warning by the President were spoken none too soon. Certainly if not spoken by him and with the positiveness with which they were spoken, then we could easily expect that Red China would have pursued its aggression, and war would have been the result. It is my opinion that the firmness displayed by the President will be more likely to promote peace than would softness. Therefore, it seems quite likely—and I hope it so develops—that the warning issued by President Eisenhower will cause the Communist leaders in China to think twice before acting, and that peace, not war will be the result.

The desire for peace is the dominating desire of America. It is the very heart and soul of America. The President appropriately concluded his message to Congress by stating:

Our purpose is peace. That cause will be served if, with your help, we demonstrate our unity and our determination.

Mr. Chairman, the resolution, as introduced, clearly and forcibly sets forth the reasons that make necessary the passage of the resolution as now before us. It reads as follows:

House Joint Resolution 159

Joint resolution authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area

Whereas the primary purpose of the United States, in its relations with all other nations, is to develop and sustain a just and enduring peace for all; and

Whereas certain territories in the West Pacific under the jurisdiction of the Republic of China are now under armed attack, and threats and declarations have been and are being made by the Chinese Communists that such armed attack is in aid of and in preparation for armed attack on Formosa and the Pescadores,

Whereas such armed attack if continued would gravely endanger the peace and security of the West Pacific area and particularly of Formosa and the Pescadores; and

Whereas the secure possession by friendly governments of the Western Pacific island chain, of which Formosa is a part, is essential to the vital interests of the United States and all friendly nations in or bordering upon the Pacific Ocean; and

Whereas the President of the United States on January 6, 1955, submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification a Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of China, which recognizes that an armed attack in the West Pacific area directed against territories, therein described, in the region of Formosa and the Pescadores, would be dangerous to the peace and safety of the parties to the treaty: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States be and he hereby is authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack, this authority to include the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands and the taking of such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, and shall so report to the Congress.

I trust the resolution will receive the unanimous approval of the House.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I favor the resolution. I believe that had this kind of action been taken in time before the Korean war we might not have had such a war. Then the Communists took a chance that we would do nothing. The then Secretary of State reassured the Communists on that point in January 1950. This time the Communists know exactly where we stand. It is a much better way.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, since the conclusion of hostilities in World War II, our generations have seen the rise and the full forward surge of a great aggression directed against the lands and the liberties of all mankind. During this period the map of the world and the political and economic character of many nations have undergone a series of significant changes. These developments have not augured well for the remaining free peoples of the earth who determined to prevent, if at all possible, the tragedy of a third and cataclysmic world conflict, have time and again retreated from positions, the continued occupancy of which might have proven to be a torch to a powder train of full-scale hostilities.

Indecisiveness, timidity, and wavering diplomatic and political measures in our own and many lands, have been in constant attendance upon the efforts of this Nation to preserve peace and strengthen the hands of others who might bring to the battle for human freedom a willingness to defend it, and a determination to resist the aggressor. We have seen nation after nation, and people after people, join the tragic and silent parade of witnesses to the immutable truth that only in union is there strength, and that he who hesitates in the face of almost certain disaster receives neither plaudits for his caution nor acclaim for his forbearance.

The United States, together with others of its allies, has retreated from the realities of the world situation as it has developed in the Far East. It is true that determined, if indecisive stands, were made in Korea and more recently in Indochina. But since that time other tentacles of Red aggression have been probing and searching for other soft spots in the free world's defenses in the Far East.

The pattern for the future is now clear, made so by the frank declarations of the rulers of Peiping. While the goals and the determinations have, to this time, been made clear only with respect to Formosa, the Pescadores, and other islands over which sovereignty is presently exercised by the Nationalist Chinese Government on Formosa, who can be so naive as to believe that the subjugation of these island outposts would so pacify and mollify the Communist masters of China as to constitute the foundation of a just and lasting peace. Beyond the dots on the map which preoccupy the attention of the Members of this body today, lie the greater targets of Communist aggression. The Philippines, Japan, and the whole of the western Pacific are projected on the screen of aggressive Communist design.

This is no hour to belabor the past, nor to debate at length here the pros and cons of past errors of commission or omission. What could and should have been said relative to the past has long since been read into the record. This resolution is far too important a milestone on a tortuous path to be bandied about for partisan effect or political considerations. It has been said that we can lose tomorrow by debating yesterday today, and we can truly lose the future hope of the free world today by belaboring the past.

The President of the United States has requested a joint declaration by the legislative branch. I applaud his action in so doing and the manner in which the request has been made. There should be no center aisle in our contemplation of this resolution, and in that connection it should be made abundantly clear again that the Committee on Foreign Affairs acted with expedition and complete unanimity on reporting the resolution to the floor. It now remains for the membership of this great body to work its will upon the measure and make its final decision. I am confident that the passage of the resolution will meet with universal approval among the American people. Far from being a declaration of war, the resolution states succinctly and with determined purpose the future course of action to be pursued by the United States in our efforts to defend the vital line of communications extending from Alaska southward through the western Pacific. In the proposed course of action we have the support of powerful ground forces in being upon the scene. This fact should obviate the necessity for the commitment of United States ground forces in any action which might grow out of the passage of this resolution.

There is certainly a grave calculated risk involved in the passage of the resolution. If, during the course of operations necessary to evacuation of Nationalist ground forces from threatened island positions, the Red Chinese launch attacks in force, it is certain that our air and naval forces will defend themselves by taking whatever actions are indicated. This the Congress and the American people would demand that they do. However, it should be clear at this time that if the Chinese Communists are determined upon a course of hostilities with this Nation, the passage of this resolution will have little or no effect upon that decision. If the die has been cast in Peiping, and the destiny of the world is to be plunged again into the holocaust of war, the issues should be joined and the determination made, not at the convenience of those whose aggressions have already subjugated millions of human beings and a good part of the earth's surface, but at a time and place where

the free nations will not fight with their backs to the wall.

The result of the vote upon House Joint Resolution 159 will today be broadcast to the world. Our allies in the Philippines, Japan, Formosa, in Australia and New Zealand, will know that we intend no further retreat in the Orient. Let us pass House Joint Resolution 159, not in the heat of passion, nor in a vindictive spirit, but with the certain knowledge that it is the right thing to be done. Let friend and foe alike understand that in taking this important step we are seeking, not to speed war but to insure peace. Our strength to wage war and to achieve ultimate victory has been demonstrated time and time again. It remains to be seen whether or not our vast resources can be mobilized for the maintenance of world order.

When the word of our action here today sifts through to the prison cells where our airmen and other Americans sit disconsolate and in a state of near hopelessness, I am confident that this determined voice of their own people will strike a chord in their own hearts and bring to each of them the certain knowledge that he is neither abandoned nor forgotten. As a people we are slow to anger, and the sometimes unwieldly machinery of the Republic seems to grind to no avail, but somehow, and at times almost miraculously, the purposes which are the blood stream of the Republic make themselves seen and felt. And it is at moments such as this that the greatest pages of a brilliant and fateful national history have been written here in this very Chamber.

The question of war or peace is not for us to determine. A handful of men a half a world away hold the key to that grave question. We should be greater than gods if we could insure a just and lasting peace among men and, by the same token, we would be less than men if we failed to meet this clear challenge in this fateful hour.

America has a unique opportunity to sound a keynote of courage, hope, and determination today. Our people are waiting for that expression, not fearfully, as some might imagine, but impatiently. I am confident that they will not shrink from the action, but will join with the President and the Congress in laying down a line beyond which aggression can trespass only at great peril. There will be 10,000 echoes to every affirmative vote cast here today, as America and Americans meet the responsibility of a great nation of free men and women.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, in a world topheavy with troubled areas; in a world that now possesses for the first time in history the power of complete destruction; in a world in which the principles of Christianity, the Magna Carta, and the Bill of Rights are seriously threatened; in a world divided between two diametrically opposed philosophies, I have, and will continue to support, any measure that enhances the security of our Nation and bolsters the prestige and dignity of freedom.

For that reason, I will support the resolution requested by the President in his message on Formosa on Monday, January 24, 1955.

The message could be far reaching in its effects. Certainly, this constitutes a calculated risk, but in my opinion there is a far greater risk in refusing to take positive action. In every instance in the past where we have made our position definitely clear as we have done in such places as Turkey, Greece, Iran, and Germany, we have been able to avoid war. This Nation cannot stand idly by and watch its outer defense perimeter slowly and insidiously deteriorate.

The message states clearly that we will defend Formosa and the Pescadores. For tactical and strategical reasons, it apparently refrains from mentioning, by name, other islands which are part of the defense perimeter of Formosa and the Pescadores. The President has said that the danger of armed attack directed against the area of Formosa and the Pescadores "compels us to take into account closely related localities and actions which, under current conditions, might determine the failure or the success of such an attack." We are, therefore, asked to accord to the President the approval of the Congress in using our Armed Forces in any portion of the Formosan area which might be interpreted as necessary to defend the security of Formosa. This, too, could be far-reaching. Undoubtedly, the President, as Commander in Chief, possesses the power to move our Armed Forces in any area that he chooses, but Congress still possesses the power to declare war. In effect, then, the President's message asks the Congress to concur, in advance, in any move which he directs which might later require the outright declaration of war. This is something new in the history of the United States. Nevertheless, I will support the resolution, for I am convinced that the defense of Formosa is absolutely necessary if Communist aggression is to be stopped.

I believe, however, that the Nation is being exposed to some mental gymnastics that are rather difficult to comprehend. On the one hand, we are asked to support appropriations which in effect reduce the size of our Army, Marine Corps, and Navy, forces which might well be the keystone of a Western Pacific defenses, and at the same time we are asked to support a resolution which could involve us in an all-out war in the Pacific.

As far as I am concerned, I will support the resolution proposed by the President, but I will need considerable reassurance concerning the reduction in our Armed Forces at a time when a sudden expansion may be just around the corner.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this resolution.

I think it is the best thing that has happened in our foreign relations since I have been privileged to be a Member of this body, but I hope it is all that we understand it to be.

I hope it is the end of weakness and the beginning of strength.

I hope that it means that our policy will now be as constant and steady as our colleague, Dr. JUDD, suggested that it should be.

If it is so, if it is something more than a temporary politico-military maneuver, then I think we all have reason to take heart and to be greatly encouraged.

I believe that it is.

However, I think it will not be sufficient for us to pass this resolution with great unanimity and with considerable pleasure today.

We must do more than this. We must coordinate all of our policy to conform with this expressed attitude of the American people.

This means we must be done with the mistakes and errors and the weaknesses of the past.

I have no desire to rake over the dead ashes of the past, or to sound a harsh or discordant note at this hour. But I think it is well to admit that we have made a lot of mistakes and that neither the Republican Party nor the Democratic Party has had any monopoly on them.

We must once and for all abandon the illusion of somehow compromising basic principles that cannot be compromised.

We must abandon the nonsense about recognition of Red China.

We must put out of our minds and out of our planning consideration with respect to the admission of Red China to the United Nations.

We must act as a people who recognize that we are faced with an implacable enemy who will be satisfied with nothing less than the subjugation of the world.

There will be great temptations to return to weakness. There will be great inducements to abandon strength. This policy will call for courage, confidence, and strong character as a people. It will mean sacrifices.

This is a hard doctrine but I believe it is realistic and I believe it is our duty to state it clearly as we debate the adoption of this resolution. For if it does not mean all of these things, then it is only another empty gesture.

Mr. Chairman, I wish this step had been taken long ago, and had it been taken, I believe that we would have saved ourselves great trouble and at the same time, we would have preserved for the free world vast areas and millions of people who have fallen under the domination of the Communist tyrants.

As I understand the import of this resolution, it means that from this point forward the United States is done with appeasement and that it is willing to face up to the issue of freedom versus slavery. This resolution will encourage our friends all over the world and give them confidence in our leadership.

Good leadership, based on firm policy, frank and truthful with the people of the United States and the free world will get the support and the confidence that the times require.

By passing this resolution today we will make ourselves more secure. The world will be more safe and the foundation for real peace will have been laid.

I hope that this resolution passes without a dissenting vote.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this resolution. I join in support of this resolution because I have long believed that the only way free men can meet the challenge of Communist aggression is by intelligent, positive, and resolute action. The truth of this belief has been well demonstrated in the years just past. When we have stood firm and have met the challenge of Communist aggression, the cause of freedom has been lifted up and advanced. Whenever we have shown the slightest weakness, for example, when we have attempted to negotiate or cooperate with the Communists, the cause of human freedom has been placed in severe peril.

The purpose of this resolution before us, as I understand it, is to serve notice on the Chinese Communist conspirators that we have the will to fight and that we propose to support our loyal allies in the defense of their native lands. It also serves notice on the Russian elite, who are the string pullers behind the bloody trail of Communist aggression, that we propose to take whatever action is necessary to protect our national interests. I am sure every thinking American would agree that we must serve notice on the international Communist conspiracy that the state of world affairs created by them has reached a point of extreme peril and that they must take the full responsibility for this situation.

We all hope and pray that the Russian autocrats who now sit in the Kremlin will fully understand the meaning of this resolution and will accordingly withdraw their loud talking puppet, Chou En-lai.

This morning's newspapers announced that Chou En-lai only yesterday had declared he will not stop his warfare against the Chinese people and that his immediate goal remains the enslavement of Formosa and the adjoining islands. In this announcement he also makes the false claim that we Americans are occupying Formosa. Every rational person knows that Formosa is in the hands of the free and loyal Chinese who intend to defend this Chinese territory against the puppets of Moscow.

Does it not seem strange that Chou En-lai, who himself is a Soviet citizen, should be talking about the foreign occupation of China. It is all the more strange when we recall that a great many of the leading Communists in control of China are Soviet citizens. They may have Chinese names, but they profess and practice a complete loyalty to Moscow. Moreover, the Chinese puppets who now hold the Chinese people in chains for their Russian masters, have nothing in common with any of the people of Asia. Most of them have spent long years in Moscow and are more Russian than they are anything else. It is about time that we stopped doing business with the parrots and puppets of Moscow and initiated a positive political action program calculated to advance the cause of human freedom and dignity throughout the world.

This resolution is a start in the right direction. It is, however, only a start.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORANO].

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to compliment my colleague from the State of Connecticut [Mr. DODD], who is likewise my colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee, for the very fine statement he has made. I endorse it wholeheartedly.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this resolution represents a serious resolve on the part of a united United States to hold up its hand to the Red Chinese and say: "No; you don't."

We as a people have constantly demonstrated our ready willingness to cooperate wholeheartedly with other nations toward the attainment of a just peace. We have shed our blood and poured forth our money and materiel out of the sinews of our resources running into the billions and billions of dollars in the interest of peace and security. Those qualities which have made us great are again being tested; we are faced with an imminent danger of a direct attack upon our strategic areas in the Pacific. The Red Chinese have publicly and boastfully announced that they plan on seizing Formosa, which is a vital link in a free world chain of our strategic bases.

Since September of 1954 the Chinese Communists have intensified their attack upon the island approaches to Formosa. Chou En-lai is already counting his islands before they are his. But he miscalculates the spirit of our people; and he miscalculates the devastating power of an American President, an American Congress, an American Nation, and American resources all welded into one mighty force. That is the message of this resolution. It is a message which will be heard all over this good earth which the good Lord has given to mankind.

As to how the United States forces are to be employed, when and precisely where in that area, these matters are left to the Commander in Chief, the President. The President has assured us in his message that—

> The authority that may be accorded by the Congress would be used only in situations which are recognizable as parts of, or definite preliminaries to, an attack against the main positions of Formosa and the Pescadores.

Mr. Chairman, this resolution and its implementation offer us the best hope for a peaceful solution of the vexatious problems in the Far East. The President's message is a message of hope and not of despair.

I urge the unanimous approval of the resolution. Our action will point a firm and resolute finger at the Communist Chinese and say, "We are united; we are ready."

May the good Lord grant that this resolve and readiness in the interest of a just defense will pave the way for peace and not for war.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORANO. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate my colleague on the very fine statement he has made. I know he is a great student and a great observer and student of the psychological effect of the resolutions that emanate from his committee. Does the gentleman foresee in this resolution a possibility of hope also being given to all of those people now residing behind the Iron Curtain who look to the United States for help?

Mr. MORANO. I most assuredly do. This resolution will give hope to those who reside behind the Iron Curtain. It will demonstrate that we have a policy of firmness and strength and not of appeasement. This resolution offers the hope to the enslaved peoples of the world that some day they, too, will join the freedom-loving nations of the world.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 159. While I feel that the President has the constitutional power necessary to take any emergency action contemplated under the scope of this resolution, I also feel that since the President has asked for congressional approval of his actions, it is imperative that we act affirmatively and promptly. This is not the time to argue the legal questions which might be raised. This is the time, however, to show positively and clearly that both the executive and legislative branches of the Government stand united in the defense of decency and freedom for ourselves and for free people everywhere.

The question has been raised here today whether or not this action will establish a precedent which might tend to limit the powers of the President to take prompt action to meet emergencies which may arise. In my opinion, the passage of this resolution does not set such a precedent. The President said in his message asking for this action by the Congress:

> Until Congress can act I would not hesitate, so far as my constitutional powers extend, to take whatever emergency action might be forced upon us in order to protect the rights and security of the United States.

Both the President and the Congress, I am sure, will continue to recognize and respect the constitutional power of the President.

The conflict which we must correctly and promptly meet at this time is not reconciliation of slightly differing constitutional interpretations. The problem we are facing is a most serious threat to our own security. Freedom and democracy are being challenged by a godless Communist dictatorship. This conflict between democracy and communism is a mortal duel. Surely we must by now realize that there is no room for both in a peaceful world.

By the passage of this resolution we are declaring in unmistakable language that we intend to survive. We need make no apology to anyone for our stand. We intend to defend the concepts of freedom, we intend to perpetuate the strength of democracy, we intend to firmly establish the realities of peace.

I hope that the resolution will be unanimously passed by the Congress.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I support the pending resolution and I endorse the action of the leadership and of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in bringing it before us so promptly. I have absolute confidence in the patriotism and in the capacity of President Eisenhower to carry out whatever he desires to do in the Formosa area.

I am fearful of the establishment here of a precedent which I believe would be contrary to the best interests of the United States and I want to make at least my position clear in connection with the matter.

In whatever action the President shall take I will regard it as having been taken under his practically plenary powers as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States. The fact that the President does have such power is firmly established under our system of Government. I know of no authority which has questioned it. I know of many excellent authorities which have sustained it.

No less an authority than the late President William Howard Taft, after he was President and before he became Chief Justice of the United States, delivered a series of lectures at Yale University. One of these was on the powers of the President as the Commander in Chief. In the lecture—and I would recommend it for the consideration of all Members in these trying times—the former President came to the conclusion that while only the Congress could declare war, the President as Commander in Chief had it within his power, in the deployment of the Armed Forces, to create a situation in which the Congress had no alternative other than to recognize a condition already in existence.

I know of no action which has transpired since that time that could be construed to the contrary unless this resolution should be so unfortunately construed. The President has requested that we pass the resolution and I hope it will be done unanimously and without delay.

The thing that troubles me is that no longer can we regard the two oceans to our east and west as barriers for our protection. A great segment, if not the principal segment, of our national defense is based upon the concept of instant retaliation. So that should this be considered as a precedent that future action by the Commander in Chief must be first referred to the Congress, a great segment of our national defense system would be impaired. We should not cause other nations, friendly to us, to feel that before the President can deploy our Armed Forces the Congress shall be required to act, nor should any potential enemy be encouraged to believe that because the Congress has not taken such action the President will not do whatever may be best for the welfare and the safety of the United States.

This is the atomic age. In 1946, when we came to write the Atomic Energy Act, there were many who feared that the military should not have possession and control of atomic weapons. And we wrote into that act that the President alone should have the power to direct that any atomic weapons be delivered to the military and that the President alone should have the power to direct the manner in which those atomic weapons should be used. So, I say we must maintain, and maintain inviolately, the power of the President as the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States to deploy our Armed Forces as he sees fit and that we do nothing that could be regarded as being an impingement upon the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as confirmed in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, that the President, and the President alone, shall have that power. In construing the President's message, and in construing the resolution which has been formulated in accordance with the message, I believe that those constructions are proper within the message and within the resolution, and I shall support it, and I trust that it is passed unanimously.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. I would like to make this statement, that the observations being made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] I think are very profound. I agree with that premise. There are other lawyers better than I who disagree. I agree with the gentleman from Texas. But, nevertheless, the President says he wants this additional power or authorization or support in this resolution, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs has agreed to give it to him.

Mr. KILDAY. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly. I hope I have made myself clear that the President has requested that this be done. I feel it should not only be done but done now without any delay. I congratulate the committee for having brought it in so promptly. But, what I am fearful of, because a request has been brought here once, that in another situation when perhaps there will not be time or a situation in which it would not be to the welfare of our country to disclose information which the President has, that he could not act immediately and without the consent of Congress. So, I want to have it clear for myself, at least, that this is my view of the matter.

Mr Chairman, I hesitated to speak on this matter over a long period of time. I finally came to the conclusion, after having spent about 16 years as a Member of this House on the former Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services, having given the question some consideration, and having very definite and positive views of the plenary powers of the Commander in Chief, in supporting this resolution I also want to make my views in that regard a matter of record.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman. The only qualm I had in the consideration of this resolution was not that it might expand or increase the power of the President, but that it might be construed as setting a precedent limiting the power that I think he has under the Constitution. That is, I do not think it is necessary for the President to come to the Congress for this authority; but I think it is better for him to do so, because it makes our national position stronger before those who threaten war and before the world. It thereby is more likely to prevent war.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman may be correct, and I trust that he is. That is the way in which I shall construe it. But should President Eisenhower, in whom I have absolute confidence in dealing with a matter of this kind, hereafter see fit to take action without sending it to this House for consideration, I trust that we will not hear from either side of this aisle a complaint that on this occasion the President submitted a request for power and in the next, in his judgment feeling that it should not be done, that he did not do it. I do not want this to be considered in any way a limitation upon his power.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. I am very glad that my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] in the powerful way in which he has presented his views, has done so. I do not think that anyone who has ever studied our Constitution or the makeup of our Government denies that the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, has this power. I quite agree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] that this should not be taken as a precedent that the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, under any and all circumstances, should feel it his duty to come before the Congress and ask for a resolution such as this; because, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] expressed it so well, there will come times when 12 hours will be too long a time for the President to have to wait to act.

If the President had done what is proposed here without consulting with the Congress, he would have had no criticism from me. But I fear, if this is taken as a precedent, and followed absolutely to the letter, we may find ourselves in very embarrassing and dangerous conditions.

Mr. KILDAY. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, it does seem to me apropos the point raised by the gentleman that the President has made it amply clear in his message that he would not hesitate to act. If you will examine the report, at page 2, next to the last paragraph, the President in his message says:

> Authority for some of the actions which might be required would be inherent in the authority of the Commander in Chief. Until Congress can act I would not hesitate, so far as my constitutional powers extend, to take whatever emergency action might be forced

upon us in order to protect the rights and security of the United States.

To my mind, that is clear evidence that he would not hesitate under circumstances that might arise to take action that might be deemed necessary. At the same time, I think that this, coming up as it has, has been a fine thing; that is, for the Chief Executive to work with, to cooperate with, the legislative branch of the Government in making this very important policy determination.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I have no fear that the President will not take every action he believes to be proper. I do not want Members of this House or of the other body or anyone else hereafter to raise the question, however, should the President act without having previously submitted a request to the Congress for specific authority in that instance. I want to preserve his constitutional powers as written and preserve them inviolate.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 159, which carries out the request of President Eisenhower in accordance with his letter addressed to the Congress under date of January 24, 1955, to extend powers granted to him by the Constitution to protect the interests of our country and the interest of countries who by agreement are our allies, to the end that we may be able to stop encroachment of the Chinese Communist government in the West Pacific area, and particularly of Formosa and the Pescadores. The loss of Formosa would flank our allies in the Far East and would be a springboard for invasion of the Philippines, Japan, Australia, and other Far Eastern countries.

The action taken by Congress today in the adoption of this resolution will stop their aggression and will serve notice to those countries and, in fact, the peoples of the world, particularly those behind the Iron Curtain, and all other liberty-loving people, that the United States is not going to stand for Communist aggression.

It will permit the President to prosecute instant retaliation of the aggressive encroachment of peaceful people throughout the world, many of whom are our recognized allies. Even though great authority is granted the President, he needs this additional power now in order to show the Communists that we mean business in not permitting their ruthless exploitation of small nations on the perimeter of their present expansion.

I trust that this resolution passes by a unanimous vote of the House which will be assurance to all the people of the world that this country is united behind the President in his program to stop Communist expansion.

This resolution cannot be construed as a limitation of the powers of the President. The National Chinese Government has been one of our valued allies for years, and particularly so during World War II. I believe that our action today is in the interest of peace, and is necessary in assuring that any Presidential move will be that of a united country. It will put us in a position where we can tell them to stop, and we will not have to fight at their convenience if war is inevitable.

It is my candid opinion that had we had affirmative action and the will to stop the Communists at the time our forces reached the Yalu River during the Korean war, we might have been able to wipe out their base of supply and reinforcement, and have culminated that so-called police action in a victory for the peace-loving peoples of the world.

I again express my hope that this resolution receives the unanimous support of the Congress.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I am no constitutional lawyer and could not, if I wanted to, argue the point of whether the President should or should not, or need or need not, come to this Congress for the authority authorized by this resolution.

To me it is a refreshing and a wholesome sign that at a time like this, when the future of the world is at stake, a President does come to the Congress in truly democratic process, and forces upon us the decision of what action we, as a united people, must take. I think it is wholesome. I think that it will have a wholesome effect upon the world situation that not only the President deems it right to take action, if necessary, but the Congress says that he should.

I think action on this resolution, Mr. Chairman, should be unanimous; and without oratory, I should like to tell you why I think such unanimity is justified. I should like to explain to some of my friends why, in the committee, the action was unanimous, because there are some of us on the committee in the past who have not hesitated, when our judgment differed, to vote against the majority. Action yesterday on this resolution, I point out, brought a completely unanimous decision.

I happen to be one of those who have repeatedly stood here, particularly when the Mutual Security Acts were up for consideration, and pleaded for a decisive policy decisively announced and firmly adhered to.

I confess, Mr. Chairman, when this action came to me it was almost too decisive, it was almost too pronounced, it was almost too fearsome. Yet I realized this: The President is right in forcing upon the representatives of the American people the choice and the responsibility.

I do not often quote Elmer Davis, but I do want to repeat a statement that he once made: "This Nation was not constructed by cowards. It will not be saved by cowards."

The Committee on Foreign Affairs accepted the responsibility and has asked the Congress to accept the responsibility.

I should like to tell you why I voted to make action unanimous yesterday, even though I believe that there is no person on the committee who was more fearful of the implications.

I have lived through three major wars. I want no more war. I have practically stated that only over my dead body and my lost hopes would I ever vote for war. I voted therefore to make this action unanimous only because I became convinced after 5 hours of careful testimony and discussion—the main tragedy being that we cannot tell you all of the facts in the case, ever—that this resolution was a measure not for war but to prevent war. Only for that reason did I find the courage to take a step that I know is so momentous.

I would urge the Congress, particularly those who may have some fears as to where we are going, to look upon this matter with equal earnestness and accept, as I have had to accept, the words of those whom I trust, the facts which I cannot refute, the indications of a future course that may be much more dangerous without this action now. I urge you to vote for the resolution, I repeat, not as a measure which will take us into conflict; but, indeed, as a measure without which such conflict, I have been assured, will be much more inevitable, and as a measure which possibly may bring to us and to a very troubled world, and to the troubled hearts of human beings all over that world, a greater hope for peace.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, in June 1950, when the free nation of South Korea, set up under the auspices of the United Nations, was threatened by the armed aggression of Red Chinese so-called volunteers, President Truman acted promptly and courageously and ordered armed resistance by United States military forces. A resolution was passed almost unanimously by the Congress the following day giving its approval to his action. The President ordered the matter laid before the United Nations and sought their approval. This approval was granted and the first united action by a world organization against armed aggression began. Sixteen of the fifty-odd nations actually participated with contributions of manpower and military resources.

Notwithstanding the overwhelming approval of both Houses of Congress, notwithstanding the formal approval of the United Nations—this courageous action became a football of partisan politics in the long years of the struggle. Most of the Republican candidates for national office thereafter referred to it as Truman's war. This despicable appeal to the emotions of the American people no doubt had the political effect intended—the Democratic Party was defeated in 1952. The blame for the Korean war was no doubt the primary cause.

Nor did this planned program of political attack, dragging the banners of the fight for freedom in the political gutters cease when the Republican Party was elected in the fall of 1952.

I sat in the Chamber of the House of Representatives on February 2, 1953, and listened with amazement and indignation at the brazen partisan political statement

by the President of the United States "that the United States Navy was required to serve as a defensive arm of Communist China."

He stated further:

There is no longer any logic or sense in a condition that required the United States to assume defensive responsibilities on behalf of the Chinese Communists.

The President then said:

I am, therefore, issuing instructions that the 7th Fleet no longer be employed to shield Communist China.

The full excerpt of his statement on this point as given in his state of the Union message appears herewith:

In June 1950, following the aggressive attack on the Republic of Korea, the United States 7th Fleet was instructed both to prevent attack upon Formosa and also to insure that Formosa should not be used as a base of operations against the Chinese Communist mainland.

This has meant, in effect, that the United States Navy was required to serve as a defensive arm of Communist China. Regardless of the situation in 1950, since the date of that order the Chinese Communists have invaded Korea to attack the United Nations forces there. They have consistently rejected the proposals of the United Nations command for an armistice. They recently joined with Soviet Russia in rejecting the armistice proposal sponsored in the United Nations by the Government of India. This proposal had been accepted by the United States and 53 other nations.

Consequently, there is no longer any logic or sense in a condition that required the United States Navy to assume defensive responsibilities on behalf of the Chinese Communists. This permitted those Communists, with greater impunity, to kill our soldiers and those of our United Nations allies, in Korea.

I am, therefore, issuing instructions that the 7th Fleet no longer be employed to shield Communist China. Permit me to make crystal clear, this order implies no aggressive intent on our part. But we certainly have no obligation to protect a nation fighting us in Korea.

The President's partisan statement was received with generous applause on the Republican side of the aisle.

It was received by the Democrats with deep resentment—because we knew as the President knew that the statement was untrue. The President has admitted its untruth by his statement of January 24, 1955, to the Congress. I print the pertinent part on this point herewith in order that the reader may be the judge:

The United States and the friendly Government of the Republic of China, and indeed all the free nations, have a common interest that Formosa and the Pescadores should not fall into the control of aggressive Communist forces.

Influenced by such considerations, our Government was prompt, when the Communists committed armed aggression in Korea in June 1950, to direct our 7th Fleet to defend Formosa from possible invasion from the Communist mainland.

These considerations are still valid. The 7th Fleet continues under Presidential directive to carry out that defensive mission. We also provide military and economic support to the Chinese Nationalist Government and we cooperate in every proper and feasible way with that Government in order to promote its security and stability. All of these military and related activities will be continued.

Thus we see by the President's two messages—by his own words—the duplicity of his messages.

These are not slips of the tongue. These statements were carefully drawn. They were both coolly calculated to achieve a result. Had the first message on February 2, 1953, been a mistake on domestic matters it could have been understood and forgiven because of the universal knowledge that the speaker's background on domestic problems was thin, to say the least. But this statement was on a military situation and, with a lifetime experience in military affairs, how could the most generous person find grounds to excuse his words? The wheel has now turned, and the President in his message of yesterday—January 24, 1955—refutes his logic, refutes his words, and retreats from his false position.

He comes now to the Democrats he villified with soft words, with words of appeasement, yes, with words which must be embarrassing to him.

Now as to the merits of his request and the reasons for making such a request.

What does the President say regarding his power as Commander in Chief?

He said:

Authority for some of the actions which might be required would be inherent in the authority of the Commander in Chief. Until Congress can act I would not hesitate, so far as my constitutional powers extend, to take whatever emergency action might be forced upon us in order to protect the rights and security of the United States.

The President admits that pending congressional action—and complete action by both Houses may well be delayed, as the other body apparently is not taking such hasty action—he "would not hesitate, so far as my constitutional powers extend, to take whatever emergency action to protect the rights and security of the United States."

What is the scope of emergency action? It obviously includes military action. Therefore, what additional action could be authorized, short of a formal declaration of war?

What is the scope of the extension of his constitutional power in emergency action to protect the United States and its citizens?

We all admit it is very wide. We and the President know that this is either a propaganda gesture, or it is what I would call a contingency declaration of war.

Why should the Congress be placed in this position, then?

The Congress alone can declare war, under the Constitution. Can we authorize the President, by this type of resolution, to take steps beyond his power as Commander in Chief?

Are we doing the wise thing today in passing what may amount to a contingency declaration of war?

Are we giving the President a blank check to act on the individual recommendation of Admiral Radford, as the congressional leaders were asked to do last year during the siege of Dien Bien Phu?

As I recall, the Chief of Staff at that time advocated a position opposite to the rest of the joint chiefs. If his individual advice had been taken, carrier planes would have been used. The congressional leaders turned down Mr. Dulles and Admiral Radford then. Are you giving the same two advisers a blank check today?

These are questions I hope will be answered satisfactorily today. If not, I hope the other legislative body will take the time and deliberation which apparently is not going to be taken by the House.

The Congress is placed in an unnecessary position today.

The President is, in my opinion, putting the Congress in a position of either giving him a "contingency declaration of war," or presenting a divided front before the Communist world.

We should not be put in the first position, and for the sake of presenting a united front to the Communist world, we cannot afford to do other than go along.

We are setting a dangerous precedent, I fear.

The gentleman from Texas, [Mr. KILDAY] has made probably the most important contribution to this debate. I wish to identify myself as approving his remarks. I share with him his deep concern that this resolution might be looked upon as a precedent which might bind a future President. In my opinion the resolution neither adds to nor detracts from the present constitutionally controlled powers of the President.

Although I shall vote for the resolution, I resent the fact that Congress has been put in the position of having to vote on this Presidential request.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Chairman, does the joint resolution presently under consideration bring us closer to war? Does it mean that we are more likely to become involved in a conflict in the Far East? Does it suggest the inevitability of world war III?

Certainly these questions were uppermost in the minds of all of us on the Committee on Foreign Affairs when we were briefed yesterday on the Formosa crisis by Secretary Dulles and Admiral Radford. Each of these gentlemen discussed the situation at length and with complete frankness and candor. Neither attempted to minimize the potential danger. Both recognized that the possibility of war is very real. But they also expressed the conviction that unless the Chinese Communists are irrevocably committed to continued aggressive action, a firm declaration of policy by the United States may well diminish the likelihood of war—now and in the future.

But if, unhappily, the Chinese Communists are bent on sowing the seeds of war, neither this resolution nor any declaration of policy by our Government will serve any purpose other than to inform the world that this country fervently desires peace, but not a peace at any price which indubitably would lead to the piecemeal destruction of the free world, including our own country.

In the President's message to the Congress yesterday he emphasized this country's peaceful intentions. At least

twice he expressed the hope that world public opinion would be mobilized to preserve the peace and that the United Nations would find a means of bringing about a cease-fire agreement between the Nationalist Government on Formosa and the Chinese Communists.

Reportedly Chou En-lai, the Communist premier, told the Secretary General of the United Nations during his recent visit to that country that his government feared an invasion of the mainland by the Nationalists. Certainly, if Chou En-lai is as realistic as he is reputed to be, he must know that such an invasion would have little hope of success unless supported by the United States or some other major power, and repeated assurances have been given by our Government that we have no design whatsoever other than to maintain the status quo.

It has been made unmistakably clear that United States Armed Forces will not be utilized for any purpose except to resist an attempted invasion of Formosa or an obvious preparation for an invasion of Formosa or of such other islands as may be essential to its defense. The very fact that consideration has at least been given to the possible evacuation of Nationalist troops and equipment from some of the coastwise islands in the area should indicate beyond doubt that this country has no thought of aggressive action unless forced into it.

Obviously, the most dangerous and uncertain element in this whole situation is the attitude of Soviet Russia. If the Chinese Communists attempt to carry out their threat to invade Formosa will Russia use her treaty of friendship with the Reds as an excuse for active participation? Obviously, this is a hypothetical question which only the future can answer. But should such prove to be the case we can then be certain, I think that all our efforts to preserve the peace were foredoomed to failure because of a relentless and undeviating determination on the part of Soviet Russia to conquer the world.

I believe that Russia can dissuade the Chinese Communists from any ill-conceived venture which might plunge the world into general war if she desires to do so.

If the leaders in the Kremlin do take action to restrain the Chinese Communists, we shall have reason to hope that the present leadership in Russia desires to resolve some of the problems which threaten the future of humanity.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I am not so naive or so vain as to think that I can change anybody's opinion, just like that. I am getting out of the woods, just as you are. Get that straight right now.

Here are my reasons for supporting this resolution: I know it is going to pass unanimously, because you do not choose to make your differences with the Eisenhower administration today on this resolution. In the words of our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], I believe while this thing is fraught with danger, it is far more dangerous to be guilty of inaction than to be guilty of action, I believe in action. In the words of our distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], I believe fervently that each of you, including RIVERS, has already been committed to death; to death, not today or tomorrow, but that you and I have been committed to death by the Chinese Communists, the Russian Communists, and the rest of the Communists, when they are good and ready. Make no mistake about that. I agree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], when he said what he did about the powers of the President. I think his observations were absolutely right. I am not voting to minimize his powers or to restrict them. I think he has the power. In the words of our distinguished majority leader, I think the President is to be congratulated for taking us into his confidence.

Here is my point: If the President of the United States—I do not claim he knows a great deal about diplomacy, but he does know something about the military. He gained the greatest military victory in the history of the world, and we lost it somewhere else. If he has one reservation when this thing shall have passed today about the deadly business of doing business with the Communists, he had better not ask our backing of this resolution, which will be unanimous. If he is not willing to draw the line and say, "When you pass this, hell is going to break loose," he is not getting my support, because I am voting today to give him authority to use whatever is necessary, including nuclear weapons, which he has marked for the Chinese Communists, and I hope he will start at Peking and work right down. If he has any reservations about proceeding within the framework of the United Nations, he is not getting my vote as such, or my authority as such. I want him to proceed as America's interests dictate. We have treaties with Formosa. We have treaties with Korea. We have treaties with Australia. And we have treaties which sacredly bind us to a course of action. I hope he exercises them. I know something about the military; I have been on that committee and its predecessor for 14 years.

No nation on the face of the earth has a navy to compare with ours, or an air force to compare with ours. Eisenhower knows that. We can roam the skies of China and of Russia at will. I do not care what they say; we have the planes in being and not on the drawing board. We have a Navy that no nation on earth can stop. As the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] has said, when they gobble up Formosa, their flank is free, they can go wherever they please: the Philippines, Japan, or any place.

I am voting today to give him the power to act. The day of weakness, I hope, is past, and I hope the President will act and act forthwith, with everything in the book, because, Mr. Chairman, this resolution is not going to stop those Chinese; they do not scare easily; just remember that. And if he is not willing to act, my vote may not be construed as such, and this paper is not worth the ink with which it is written. If he is not willing to act our Nation will again become the laughingstock of the world, a condition to which they were reduced by the United Nations bungling in Korea. Whatever may be said about Harry Truman, and I have said some mean things about him, when the time came to act he was decisive; he would fight the world if he had to fight it alone. It was not his fault that the United Nations let him down; but it will not be Eisenhower's fault if he does not get mixed up with that outfit.

I want the President to act even if alone. I do not believe in going it alone; I know that our friends are going to be with us, and we have friends in the world. Old Chiang Kai-shek—he has got no place to go, he has got to be with us; and Syngman Rhee, we all know he is ready to go right now; he will be with us. And old Curtis LeMay, just untie his hands and he will level them. We can stop this with firmness; anything else is cowardly.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, today we are considering the adoption of House Joint Resolution 159, which would authorize the President of the United States to employ the Armed Forces of this country for the specific purpose of securing and protecting the islands of Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack. Authority in this resolution would permit the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that geographical area which are now in friendly hands and would, in addition, permit the President to take such other measures as, in his judgment, would be required or appropriate to assure the defense of these islands. The resolution is to expire when it has been determined by the President that the peace and security of this area has been reasonably assured by international conditions which may have been created by action of the United Nations or otherwise. The President is to report to the Congress at such a time.

It is a well-known fact that, from the military standpoint, the islands of Formosa and the Pescadores form a vital link in our Western Pacific defense chain which stretches from the Aleutians to New Zealand. The loss of any link of this chain to an unfriendly power, such as Communist China, would in all probability result in the eventual destruction of the entire chain with the result that our first line of defense would fall back several thousand miles closer to our own shores. Such a result would be hastened by our failure to defend Formosa and the Pescadores, which would be evidence to our allies in that part of the world of our uncertainty and weakness with regard to a future policy against further Communist aggression and expansion.

For that reason it clearly becomes a vital part of our national security to do all in our power to prevent the islands of Formosa and the Pescadores from falling into Communist hands. To properly effect this defense, it is necessary that our Armed Forces be empowered also to maintain the control of such other positions and territories whose capture

would be a necessary prerequisite to the actual invasion of Formosa itself. Likewise, our Armed Forces should be empowered to take such additional action as might be necessary to prevent even the initiation of invasion of these islands which are so necessary to our own defense. House Joint Resolution 159 confers the necessary authority for such action.

In this respect, it should be noted that the resolution under consideration, as well as the message which we received yesterday from the President, does not specifically state these additional areas which should be maintained under our control. It would be imprudent in light of possible future developments in the military picture, to do so. The commanders of our Armed Forces, both in the field and in Washington, should have full authority to take such steps as they may deem necessary to meet any situation which may arise at a given moment. This might include the redeployment of the available forces in that area which are under the control of both ourselves and our allies. The prime need at this time is to assure the defense of Formosa and other considerations of a political nature must be secondary.

It is hoped that such a clear-cut warning to the Chinese Communists of our own intentions with respect to this area may serve as an effective deterrent to future aggressions on their part. It does not require a long memory to recall other occasions when such warnings might have been effective in preventing aggression in the past. If, in spite of such notice on our part, the Communists persist in their aggressive attempts, there is nothing which we could do to forestall them further. We hope that this announcement of our intentions will bring peace to this area but, if it does not, it will not be because we have not tried to do all in our power to maintain peace.

It is hoped that the United Nations will give prompt consideration to efforts to achieve some sort of stable conditions in this part of the western Pacific. Only yesterday the Chinese Communist Foreign Minister, Chou En-lai, announced that his Government believed the United Nations had no jurisdiction in this matter. Although this sounds a discouraging note from the standpoint of hoping for success in any U. N. venture, we should not, therefore, cease our support of the U. N. in whatever attempts it may make to bring about a condition of peace and stability. This is a proper function of the organization and should deserve our support. Until those conditions, however long they may be in coming, are achieved, however, the circumstances of our own national security require this defensive posture on our own part.

There may be those who question the necessity for this resolution and who would maintain that the President already has the constitutional authority to take such steps as are hereby outlined. This appears to me to be a moot question at this time. Regardless of the constitutional aspects of the matter, I find it a very heartening sign that the President has requested the support of the Congress for such an important step. If more important developments in this regard should ensue, no one can say that the executive branch of our Government has taken action without the full backing of the American people through their elected representatives here in Washington. Again, one does not have to go far into the past to recall other occasions when such congressional support might have been thoroughly desirable.

Mr. Chairman, we are facing grave and troublous times. Not even our highest officials can safely predict what the Communist reaction may be. But, I sincerely believe that the element of doubt fades to almost nothing by comparison with what the Communists could do if we did not take such a step. As I said earlier, we may not be able to prevent a war in the Pacific. But to me the chances of war are much greater if we fail to maintain this defensive stand at this time. I trust that House Joint Resolution 159 will receive overwhelming support in this body from both sides of the aisle and will thereby serve notice to the Communist aggressors throughout the world that the Government of the United States, as leaders of the free world, has taken a stand from which there can be, and must be, no retreat. I urge the adoption of the resolution under consideration.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, that we face a grave situation in the Far East is obvious to all. On yesterday afternoon the Committee on Foreign Affairs was briefed at length on the magnitude and gravity of the situation in the Pacific. In the relatively short time that I have been privileged to be a Member of this body I think one of the most magnificent things I have seen was the way this committee, under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, saw the gravity of the situation and met it swiftly and decisively and unanimously reported this resolution to you.

Mr. Chairman, under the United Nations Charter we are committed to the proposition of defending against aggression wherever it may occur in the world. This proposition is predicated upon the assumption—which appears to me to be brutally true—that clear defense against aggression is the only sure way to prevent power-hungry nations from achieving their illegitimate goals.

We are asked here this afternoon whether we, the Congress of the United States, will adopt the policy in clear and unmistakable terms—to support the President in indicating to the world that we mean what we say in terms of firmness of preventing aggression or, on the other hand, whether we will submit to a policy of piecemeal appeasement.

To quote Adlai Stevenson in a speech made in New York City on October 21, 1952:

> We must meet force when we are challenged by force. For freedom is worth defending, not for a day or a year or for a limited time; but for as long as it is necessary.

To yield one step at a time to Communist aggression is to forget the entire lesson of the 1930's. Neville Chamberlain said that the Sudetenland was the end of Hitler's ambitions. The awful consequences of this fallacious judgment are today clear to all in terribly brutal terms. In the face of totalitarian aggression, whether it be Fascist or Communist, it is clear that weakness begets further encroachment, as strength and firmness of purpose are the principal deterrents to aggression and the best assurance of peace.

The President of the United States in 1950 made a decision to resist aggression in the Far East which, at the time, was supported on both sides of the asile in the Congress. That we paid an awful price for this decision is painfully obvious. But that it accomplished the purpose of dissuading the Communists from quickly again assuming weakness on our part is also self-evident. Now we are again faced with a similar decision. If we, as the President has recommended, state in bold terms that the American people are united behind the proposition that aggression will not be tolerated by the United States, under our commitment to the United Nations Charter, we will strike a major blow in deterring the awful consequences of a war in the Pacific.

No one, of course, can assure that favorable or even unanimous action on our part on the joint resolution before us will assure peace. But certainly we can say from the lessons of history that such an action would be our best contribution towards assuring peace.

In 1950, when President Truman took his bold action to prevent aggression in Korea, Gen. Douglas MacArthur said of the President's action that it had "lighted into a flame a lamp of hope thoughout Asia that was burning dimly toward extinction. It marked," he said, "for the Far East the focal and turning point in this area of struggle for freedom."

We are again asked today to rekindle the hope of freedom in the Far East. Failure on our part to take the action requested by the President would extinguish the hope for freedom in the Pacific. Indeed, it would do more. It could well constitute the beginning of a chain reaction which would ultimately extinguish the hope of freedom in the world.

This, in my view, is the magnitude and the scope of the decision we face today. It is not only important that this resolution before us pass by a majority in the House; it is imperative that it pass with such an overwhelming vote—if not a unanimous vote—to indicate to the world that there is no hesitancy of purpose on the part of the United States, the strongest partner of the free world, to face up to its commitment to the United Nations, indeed, its historic commitment to the tradition of defending freedom wherever it is under attack.

Now some have said and some will say that this resolution commits us to the defense of a political regime which is not totally in accord with the ideas of freedom that we so dearly hold. This, it seems to me, is not the most important consideration before us. The most important consideration is that an area of the world is under attack by a regime

which is committed to the aggressive designs of subjugating peoples to their will. Once we submit to such attacks, regardless of the political regime in power in the area under attack, then we face the proposition of determining whether any specific area is sufficiently beholden to the proposition of freedom by our standards to warrant defense on our part. This is totally beyond the bounds of legal judgment under the United Nations Charter.

Under the joint resolution before us and from the President's message yesterday, I take it that, in passing this resolution, the Congress would hold to these propositions: First, a commitment to the United Nations on our part to lead again in the defense against aggression from whatever source; and, second, that the ultimate defense against aggression rests with the concerted actions of the partners who are joined in the United Nations; and, third, that the United States is not committed to any particular political regime in any country but that we are committed to the prevention of changing such regimes by the means of force from without, under the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations; and, fourth, that by such action the United States, in cooperation with other free nations, can best promote the cause of peace and freedom throughout the world.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, in view of my past efforts to obtain legislation to reinforce congressional control of the warmaking power and President Eisenhower's past assurances that he would not commit American forces to combat without appropriate congressional authorization, I cannot permit this occasion to pass without expressing my gratification that the President has now by deed confirmed his sound views as to constitutional responsibilities and limitations. I hope that he may himself at some time suggest legislation to make more difficult action by any future President in derogation of the constitutional authority of the Congress in the deadly business of making war.

As to the merits of the pending resolution, the inescapable logic of events leaves, in my judgment, no alternative but the vote for the resolution. My vote will be actuated primarily by the conviction that we cannot now abandon the friendly Chinese on Formosa, who for 5 years have been led to believe that they could rely upon our military support in the event of attack from the mainland.

My affirmative vote is not to be understood, however, as necessarily meaning approval of the course of American-China policy during the past 10 years—a course which has now led us to the grim alternatives of complete surrender or the real risk of another American tragedy of futile sacrifice in the Far East.

Nor does a yes vote necessarily mean approval of an indefinite or permanent commitment by the United States on its sole responsibility to the defense of Formosa.

I share the President's hope that the Formosa problem may be solved soon and peaceably by United Nations' action or otherwise. I trust that every effort will be made to expedite such solution to the end that the United States may ultimately be disengaged from any commitment to defend Formosa on a substantially go-it-alone basis.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for this resolution for there seems to be no other course to take at this time if we are to stand united as a people against aggression.

I would rather see such action initiated by the United Nations, for this is a contest between Communist tyranny and the entire free world. We have common interests with the other free nations in opposing aggression and we should act in unison on matters of such great importance. If out of the action we take today war is to follow, it is important not only that we be united in America but that all free people in all nations stand together.

Any effort to bypass the United Nations would be a grave error. We need the minds and hearts and the strength of freemen everywhere if the fight for world freedom is to be successful.

I would be reluctant to vote for this resolution if it meant the sending of ground forces to the mainland of China in a war in which we had no friends and allies.

The request by the President to the Congress for the authority to act is not necessary. In making the request the President asks Congress to share the responsibility.

We should, and no doubt will, vote to share that responsibility, but I trust that Congress will be kept informed and given the opportunity to act before any steps are taken in the future which separate us from the rest of the free world in this great crisis.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this resolution but I do not construe it in any way as releasing the President from his obligation as the Commander in Chief to invoke a defensive action for the security of this Nation should it be necessary. Customs, usages, and traditions of the Constitution tell us as much.

The question is, will Peiping and Moscow jeopardize the strategic position for peace that each now holds for itself in the Pacific? It is the first time in more than 50 years, it appears that an effective buffer separates Russia and mainland China from Japan, the traditional foe of both.

Is it in the best interests of Russia or mainland China to disturb the power bloc in Korea and on Formosa that keeps mainland China, Russia, and Japan from being too close to each other's throats, as they were in the past when Japan occupied Korea and controlled Formosa?

Does mainland China want Japan on Formosa? Does Russia want Japan in Korea?

That is the issue both face. It seems to me that memories of the past should remind Peiping and Moscow that they have never had it so good in the Pacific. Heaven help them if they move against us.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN].

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, President Eisenhower has certainly shown his consideration of Congress and his deep adherence to the principles of constitutional government in asking the Congress to act with him in this very critical situation. The President's warning to Congress and the American people is quite plain in his words—

> Meanwhile, Communist China has pursued a series of provocative political and military actions, establishing a pattern of aggresive purpose. That purpose, they proclaim, is the conquest of Formosa.

I certainly am in agreement with the general principle which lies behind the President's request for congressional action. However, I honestly feel that even with this type of action, we fail to face the facts of life. It seems to me that in the President's message and in his request for passage of the general resolution on the Far East crisis, when we designate the Pescadores Islands and Formosa as the so-called line of demarcation, we have not gone far enough. In the President's message, he appears to limit this line of demarcation to Chinese Communist forces when he says:

> Moreover, we must be alert to any concentration of employment of Chinese Communist forces obviously undertaken to facilitate attack upon Formosa, and be prepared to take appropriate military action.

If memory serves me—since 1940, and even prior to that, we in America have constantly closed our eyes and looked the other way. We have consistently failed to recognize and designate Communist-controlled Russia as our enemy. I firmly believe the plight in which the world now finds itself today is due to the philosophy behind the rulers of atheistic communism in Russia. It is my belief that the real roots of world unrest are traceable directly to Moscow, and the moves of the satellite nations in Korea, French Indochina, and now of the Chinese Communists are all formulated and directed by these Communist rulers in Moscow.

It seems to me that if we are to be realistic and face the world as it really is, we should draw the line of demarcation against Communist Russia and actively declare that any warlike movements on the part of her satellites will cause us to retaliate against Moscow and the rest of Russia.

The Korean police action proved without a shadow of doubt that to engage in warlike actions against satellite nations will only sap our strength and spread us thin. Korea also proved the ineffectiveness and inconclusiveness of wars against Russian satellites. Communist-dominated China, in my opinion, reflects the views and policies of the men in the

Kremlin, and if we are to face the issues squarely, we should let the Russian rulers know that we consider them our enemy and that we will retaliate against the roots of the cancer. It is my opinion that the bulk of Chinese war supplies are being and will continue to be furnished by Russia. A war at the present time can be prevented only if Russia will not supply her satellites with the materials of war. We should hold to the long-accepted legal theory that a principal is responsible for the acts of its agent, and in this case Communist China, as an agent for Russia, should be held only secondarily responsible; and we should proclaim to the world that it is Russia who is seeking the downfall of religion and capitalism throughout the world and the satellite wars are but part and parcel of the Russian plan of world domination.

As Mr. Eisenhower said:

> Our purpose is peace. That cause will be served if, with your help, we demonstrate our unity and our determination.

We can show our unity and our determination by pointing a finger at Russia and declaring openly to the world the fact that we will hold her responsible for any actions of Communist-dominated China.

We must also be practical and face the realization that if we engage Communist China in a limited or all-out war, we still have to face the problem of what to do with her nearly 600 million people when we conquer her or bring her to terms. Another point to bear in mind is that we still would not have attacked the cancerous growth of communism emanating from Moscow, and we would be in the same predicament as we were in the Korean war, when we fought the wrong enemy at the wrong time and in the wrong place.

Therefore, I am not in favor of the resolution in its present form because it fails to face reality and should be so drawn so as to designate Russia as our principal enemy and with a line of demarcation drawn in the resolution to take into account settlement with Communist Russia.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, the adoption of House Joint Resolution 159, now before the House for consideration, is a firm declaration by the people of the United States through its elected officials that we will no longer tolerate the continuous sporadic and irritating type of nibbling warfare that has been carried on by Red China under the direction and support of Soviet Russia in the Far East.

This resolution, coming to us at the request of President Eisenhower, is a further indication that the President meant what he said when he declared that he had no intention of committing this Nation to war without consulting and taking the Congress into his confidence.

I regret that the United Nations have not assumed their responsibilities in this situation, which, in my opinion, is their proper duty. This lack of responsibility by the United Nations was also deplored by President Eisenhower in his recent message to the Congress when he said:

> We believe that the situation is one for appropriate action by the United Nations under its charter for the purpose of ending the present hostilities in that area. We would welcome assumption of such jurisdiction by that body.

Since the U. N. has not taken action, we cannot sit idly by and allow Red China to continually threaten the free world, including the United States. Consequently, this declaration of policy by us is necessary.

I do not fully agree with the last paragraph of this resolution, which practically gives the United Nations the credit for establishing peace in the area covered by this resolution, when the United States has found it necessary to assume the burden of taking the first step to notify Red China that we will fight to preserve peace in the Far East as a single nation, if necessary, without the assurance from the other members of the United Nations that they will support our action.

I am supporting this resolution, believing that it will prevent rather than promote war, and in the further belief that we must not appease Red China or Soviet Russia in their mad rush to control and dominate the free world.

I urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I hope this historic resolution receives prompt and overwhelming support today. Speed does not involve hasty or ill-considered action. This is the culmination of years of study, discussion, and debate in our country, in Congress and out, on developments in the Far East. The implications and consequences of this action have been weighed by the President, the National Security Council, the Joint Chiefs, and reviewed by our committee. While certain information is secret, I think every Member, and the public in general, understand what is involved.

Mr. Chairman, I rejoice that we are dealing with this matter today in a bipartisan spirit. For 8 years there has been in the House of Representatives a dependable bipartisan majority constantly supporting Nationalist China against Communist China.

I would not wish by my silence to give consent to all that has been said this afternoon praising the Far Eastern policies of previous administrations. I would not want my vote on this to be considered a vote of confidence in all that has been done and left undone by the past administrations. However, I rejoice that always in this House we have been united, regardless of party, in support of Nationalist China as opposed to Red China. We have joined at least 17 times in the last 8 years in such votes, with or without administration support. Beginning in the 80th Congress, when we included China in the Interim Aid Act in 1947 and wrote the China Aid Act of 1948, we had 6 such votes in the 81st Congress; 5 such votes in the 82d Congress, including 3 resolutions urging the United Nations General Assembly to embargo shipments to Red China, to declare them aggressors, and opposing their membership in the United Nations; in the 84th Congress there were 4 such votes. This House, as a body, is not second guessing today on its record on China policy.

Last November, in the course of a survey mission with my friend and colleague, our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], we went to Japan, Korea, Formosa, the Philippines, Hong Kong, and Vietnam. We learned something, firsthand, of the pressures, the threats from Red China, the progressive chipping away that goes on, the need for us to stem this erosion by a firm stand.

We were in the building near the entrance to Kaohsiung, a harbor in the south of Formosa, where Tojo signed the orders launching the Japanese attack on Clark Field near Manila. We saw how Formosa flanks Japan and the Philippines.

While we were in Formosa the papers there carried a box each day called The War Today. The day before we arrived there the Red Chinese had sunk a destroyer escort vessel which the United States had furnished to the Nationalists. The title of this resolution we are considering today is "Authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area." We are contemplating in the action we take today intervention in a war that is going on now.

Thus the constitutional question involved today—I believe this resolution calls for war powers that require the cooperation of Congress with the Executive. There are two views about this among lawyers and Congressmen. We have spent much time debating this issue in the past. The Committee on Foreign Affairs acted on this resolution in the way the President requested. Our committee report says:

> The resolution in this form, while making it clear that the people of the United States stand behind the President, does not enter the field of controversy as to the respective limitations of power in the executive and the legislative branches. Acting together, there can be no doubt that all the constitutional powers necessary to meet the situation are present.

But, on this matter of whether it is wise or necessary for the Congress to participate, as to whether this limits the President or creates a precedent, I think certain things are clear.

First, the Congress cannot, by its action today or at any other time, limit the powers of the President granted in the Constitution. Congress cannot pass an unconstitutional law that is at the same time valid and effective. So there is no danger of a limitation here. Second, as to creating a precedent, the precedent that we are creating is to give the President the powers he says he needs when he asks for them and we think he needs them in the interests of national

security. I think that is a rather good precedent to establish, if it has not been established in the past.

But while we must solemnly realize that we are, as is stated by the title of this resolution, "authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States." This is a measure in the interest of peace. Here is the way the President puts it, "in the interest of peace we must remove any doubt regarding our readiness to fight, if necessary, to preserve the vital stake of the free world in a free Formosa." Then I call your attention to what the President says following this. He says, "to make this plain requires not only Presidential action, but also congressional action." I am willing to rely on the President when he says that in the interest of peace, we must remove any doubt concerning our readiness to fight under certain circumstances, and that to do this it is not merely convenient or nice to have congressional support, but it requires congressional action in addition to Presidential action.

On the matter of drawing a line, it has been suggested, and we discussed in committee the idea of drawing a line by metes and bounds from island to island, or from one place to another, and saying in substance that anyone who steps over that line is in a war with the United States. Here is the difficulty about that. When you draw a line out in the open by congressional act, who do you help? You accommodate your enemies. You tell them just how far they can go. The line idea was tried on the 38th parallel. I saw this year the zigzag line, the demilitarized zone we settled on in Korea, and our enemies go right up to the other side of that line with impunity. It would certainly be disastrous if we, by law, created a privileged sanctuary on the mainland of China, as we did beyond the Yalu, if the Reds decided to defy our resolution to defend the Pescadores and Formosa. So that we are taking the right course here, I think, in showing clearly that we intend to defend the Pescadores and Formosa, and that we intend to defend the places that are necessary for that defense, and to let our enemies guess about where that line is, while the Chinese Nationalist forces know all about it. In 1940, after France had fallen, a resolution was considered in the House redeclaring the Monroe Doctrine, and affirming that we would not recognize any transfer of territory in this hemisphere to any European power. This was aimed at the rumored attempt of Vichy France to transfer the island of Martinique to Germany. The other body passed it, describing the territory involved as "the Western Hemisphere." After great debate, we decided in our committee to use the words James Monroe did. He said, "This hemisphere." We found that to attempt to define the boundaries of the Western Hemisphere involved about 57 geographic theories and plans, and it would be an accommodation only to our enemies. So we said, "This hemisphere," and after some delay the august other body agreed with us. So in the same way, in order to avoid telegraphing our punches and giving any privileged sanctuary anywhere, we are not telling prospective enemies where the President is authorized to use this power which we give him today.

This resolution refers to possible peace measures through the United Nations. It seems to me, in view of the announced attitude of both the Chinese Reds and the National Government of China, that there is very little hope for that. But we have the obligation to report such matters to the United Nations. As has been stated today, we also have an obligation under the United Nations Charter to do our part in preventing aggression until the United Nations can act. That is what I think will happen in this case.

It has been mentioned that there should be an expiration date on this resolution. The only expiration date expressed is that it runs out when, at last, peace and security of the area is reasonably assured. That may be some time. We have two opposing forces, the Chinese Reds and the National Government of China, which are agreed only on one thing, that Formosa should belong to China, and each claims the mainland of China. To secure a cease-fire there by agreement would be difficult. There is the opportunity that by action under this resolution a cease-fire may be maintained if the Reds realize that from now on they are engaged with us, but that will be a cease-fire by force and not by agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has expired.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. VORYS. In this solemn and important and fateful action we are taking today, of course we are seeking the best high road to peace. We are seeking to wage peace. Let us face this. We can have peace any time by agreeing to everything the Communists want. But it will be a cruel, wicked peace of world-wide Communist domination. We can win a just and lasting and secure peace only by stopping Soviet expansion from now on. So that the time to support waging that kind of peace is now. The action we take today, perhaps with different ideas of the past but united in looking resolutely toward the future, is in that sense a step toward peace among men of good will, which is the goal of our country.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I am very much disturbed about the resolution now being considered by the House. In my judgment it is most unfortunate that the Congress should be called upon to act so precipitately upon a matter of such vital importance.

It has been stated that the reason for bringing the matter up at this time is the heavy deployment of arms and troops by the Chinese Communists at invasion ports and the need for our making a declaration of our line of defense in the Far East: That is, of advising the Chinese Communists and the world where we take our stand positively and leaving to the Communists the choice of peace or war.

This bold step would have support in logic and in historical precedent. But all that we have been told today is that we are continuing the policy previously established by President Truman and subscribed to by President Eisenhower of defending the Pescadores and Formosa from invasion by the Chinese Communists. There has been no doubt that such an objective is within the power of the Chief Executive to take necessary military action for its achievement. Where, then, is any new line being drawn? Wherein have we declared to the enemy, "You shall cross this line at your peril"? What new proposal requires our approval?

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has stated that we do not want to telegraph our punches or let the enemy know the limits within which he may proceed without fear of reprisal. If this be true, our new policy seeks to contain the enemy completely, because presumably, if he makes any move at all, he does so at the risk of having crossed the line which is deemed vital to the defense of the free world. The President last week declared the Tachen Islands to be outside of our defensive zone. Ichiang was permitted to be overrun by the Chinese Reds. It is apparent that even with the passage of this resolution, there will be a vagueness and uncertainty in our Far East policy which may result in the flare-up of a conflict at any time.

I have listened to the very eloquent statement by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH]. She said that much information was given to the Foreign Affairs Committee which cannot be revealed on the floor, information which caused her to vote for the resolution. We do not have such information. Without it, we are asked to back up the President by voting for this resolution under a closed rule which permits no amendments, in establishing a new policy the purpose of which has not been clearly explained. Complicating the matter even further is the very cogent argument made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] a few moments ago when he referred to the constitutional powers of the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces to take action in deploying our Armed Forces without congressional approval, and his hope and expectation that the President's action in submitting this resolution to the Congress for its consideration should in no respect be taken as a precedent for the future. For these reasons, because I wonder why the administration wants us to act in this matter, I would like to ask the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee several questions: First. Does the gentleman from South Carolina construe this resolution as a declaration of war, either actual or contingent against the Chinese Communists or against any other nation?

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not consider it that, but I realize that the action we are taking may lead to war.

Mr. YATES. But he does not construe this as a declaration of war?

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not consider it as a declaration of war. I feel personally that if events transpired that made the President feel a declaration of war was necessary that he would have to come to Congress to get it.

Mr. YATES. I direct another question to the chairman of the committee: On page 2, lines 9 to 11, of the resolution, this statement appears:

> And the taking of such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

In the opinion of the chairman, does that language authorize the President of the United States to invade the mainland of China even for the purpose of defending the Pescadores and Formosa?

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not so construe it. It would authorize the President to take physical possession of the islands in friendly hands, which we would say would be islands in the hands of the Nationalist Chinese. It would not authorize him to take possession of anything of the ground on the mainland, but would authorize him, I think, to attack the mainland if he deemed it necessary in support of the defenses of Formosa.

Mr. YATES. Another question, if the gentleman please: At a recent session of the United Nations, Great Britain's Minister of State, Anthony Nutting, in response to a question stated:

> A Chinese Communist attack on Formosa is an attack upon a member of the United Nations and would no doubt call for collective action by the United Nations in which we, of course, would be involved as a member.

I ask the chairman whether he construes this resolution to be a resolution which would require the Government of the United States to go it alone, or whether it is the intention of the Congress that we continue to cooperate with other members of the United Nations in defending the Pescadores and Formosa?

Mr. RICHARDS. I construe the resolution not as requiring the Government of the United States to go it alone if action is not taken by the United Nations, but permitting it to go it alone.

I would like to state that it is my understanding—and I believe it is the understanding of the executive department of the Government—that we are going to handle this situation whether the United Nations does get into it or not.

Mr. YATES. But it is my hope that we will continue to cooperate closely with our allies, as well as with possible efforts at easing tension made through the United Nations. It would be indeed unfortunate for the United States to isolate itself, through inadequate consultation and arbitrary unilateral action, from the rest of the free world. It would be equally unfortunate to impede, by precipitous and belligerent judgments or acts, those peaceful remedies which the structure of the United Nations makes possible.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. A moment ago the gentleman from Illinois stated in substance that in view of the remarks made by me that he would like to ask the chairman whether this resolution constituted a declaration of war. I trust that the gentleman did not hear me say anything to the effect that it constituted a declaration of war.

Mr. YATES. No; I did not. It was my own interpretation of the gentleman's remarks, namely, that the gentleman expected that the President of the United States would not consider that by submitting this resolution to the Congress he would thereby be relieving himself of his constitutional responsibility as Commander in Chief.

Mr. KILDAY. No; the gentleman surely misunderstood me. What I said was not that the President would relieve himself of anything, but that others do not construe his action in submitting this question to Congress as an incident or a precedent that hereafter he would have to submit any question involving the deployment of the Armed Forces to the Congress, but that he has plenary power, that this resolution neither adds to nor subtracts from his constitutional power.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for his statement, and I want to associate myself with the viewpoint he expressed. It seemed to me that this being true, the purpose for submitting this resolution should be ascertained. Hence my question to the chairman as to whether or not this resolution can be construed as a possible declaration of war, inasmuch as the President already possesses the authority to act in the manner set out in the resolution.

Approval of the treaty between Nationalist China and the United States is still awaiting action by the Senate. It seems to me that it would have been much more appropriate to have waited until the Senate had considered and acted upon that treaty before submitting this resolution to the Congress. After all, it was indicated to the Senate that approval of the treaty was not a matter of extreme urgency. Yet, inasmuch as many of the same issues are embraced in that document as are contained in this resolution, had action been deferred, it is possible that this resolution need never have been brought to the floor. Further, why should not the Members of Congress have been given the benefit of the deliberations of the other body? And what happens if the Senate disapproves the treaty?

For these reasons I believe our consideration of this resolution is premature. There is still much uncertainty with respect to the import of this resolution, and many questions that should be answered before the Congress should be expected to take decisive action. However, on the basis of the presentation made by members of the committee today, and in view of the statements made by the chairman in response to my questions, it seems to me that all that can be said for this resolution is that the President wants moral support at this time from the Congress. Inasmuch as I favor defending Formosa and the Pescadores from Chinese Communist aggression, which to my mind is not the equivalent of undertaking a preventive war, I shall vote to give him such moral support.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I also yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the joint resolution is considered as having been read for amendment. No amendments are in order to the joint resolution except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Are there any committee amendments?

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, there are no committee amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOGGS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 159) authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area, pursuant to House Resolution 104, he reported the joint resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the House joint resolution.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the House joint resolution.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 410, nays 3, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 3]

YEAS—410

Abbitt	Bolton, Frances P.	Cooley
Abernethy	Bolton, Oliver P.	Coon
Adair	Bonner	Cooper
Addonizio	Bosch	Corbett
Albert	Bow	Coudert
Alexander	Bowler	Cramer
Alger	Boykin	Cretella
Allen, Calif.	Boyle	Crumpacker
Allen, Ill.	Bray	Cunningham
Andersen, H. Carl	Brooks, La.	Curtis, Mass.
Andresen, August H.	Brooks, Tex.	Curtis, Mo.
Andrews	Brown, Ga.	Dague
Anfuso	Brown, Ohio	Davidson
Arends	Brownson	Davis, Ga.
Ashley	Broyhill	Davis, Wis.
Ashmore	Buchanan	Dawson, Ill.
Aspinall	Buckley	Dawson, Utah
Auchincloss	Budge	Deane
Avery	Burdick	Delaney
Ayres	Burleson	Dempsey
Bailey	Burnside	Denton
Baker	Bush	Derounian
Baldwin	Byrd	Devereux
Barrett	Byrne, Pa.	Dies
Bass, N. H.	Byrnes, Wis.	Diggs
Bass, Tenn.	Canfield	Dingell
Bates	Cannon	Dixon
Baumhart	Carlyle	Dodd
Beamer	Carnahan	Dollinger
Becker	Carrigg	Dolliver
Belcher	Cederberg	Donohue
Bell	Celler	Donovan
Bennett, Fla.	Chatham	Dorn, N. Y.
Bentley	Chelf	Dorn, S. C.
Berry	Chenoweth	Dowdy
Betts	Chiperfield	Doyle
Blatnik	Chudoff	Durham
Blitch	Church	Eberharter
Boggs	Clark	Edmondson
Boland	Cole	Elliott
Bolling	Colmer	Ellsworth
		Engle
		Evins

Fallon	Kilgore	Richards
Fascell	King, Calif.	Riehlman
Feighan	Kirwan	Riley
Fenton	Klein	Rivers
Fernandez	Kluczynski	Roberts
Fine	Knutson	Robeson, Va.
Fino	Krueger	Robsion, Ky.
Fisher	Laird	Rodino
Fjare	Landrum	Rogers, Colo.
Flood	Lane	Rogers, Fla.
Flynt	Lanham	Rogers, Mass.
Fogarty	Lankford	Rogers, Tex.
Forand	Latham	Rooney
Ford	LeCompte	Roosevelt
Forrester	Lesinski	Rutherford
Fountain	Lipscomb	Sadlak
Frazier	Long	St. George
Frelinghuysen	Lovre	Saylor
Friedel	McCarthy	Schenck
Fulton	McConnell	Scherer
Gamble	McCormack	Schwengel
Garmatz	McCulloch	Scott
Gary	McDonough	Scrivner
Gathings	McDowell	Scudder
Gavin	McIntire	Seely-Brown
Gentry	McMillan	Selden
George	McVey	Shelley
Gordon	Macdonald	Sheppard
Granahan	Machrowicz	Short
Grant	Mack, Ill.	Shuford
Gray	Mack, Wash.	Sieminski
Green, Oreg.	Madden	Sikes
Green, Pa.	Magnuson	Simpson, Pa.
Gregory	Mahon	Sisk
Griffiths	Mailliard	Smith, Kans.
Gross	Marshall	Smith, Miss.
Gubser	Martin	Smith, Va.
Gwinn	Mason	Spence
Hagen	Matthews	Springer
Hale	Meader	Staggers
Haley	Merrow	Steed
Halleck	Metcalf	Sullivan
Harden	Miller, Calif.	Taber
Hardy	Miller, Md.	Talle
Harris	Miller, Nebr.	Taylor
Harrison, Nebr.	Mills	Teague, Calif.
Harrison, Va.	Minshall	Teague, Tex.
Harvey	Mollohan	Thomas
Hays, Ark.	Morano	Thompson, La.
Hays, Ohio	Morgan	Thompson, Mich.
Hayworth	Morrison	Thompson, N. J.
Hébert	Moss	Thompson, Tex.
Henderson	Moulder	Thomson, Wyo.
Herlong	Multer	Thornberry
Heselton	Mumma	Tollefson
Hess	Murray, Ill.	Trimble
Hiestand	Murray, Tenn.	Tumulty
Hill	Natcher	Udall
Hillings	Nelson	Utt
Hinshaw	Nicholson	Vanik
Hoeven	Norblad	Van Pelt
Hoffman, Ill.	Norrell	Van Zandt
Holifield	O'Brien, Ill.	Velde
Holmes	O'Brien, N. Y.	Vinson
Holt	O'Hara, Ill.	Vorys
Holtzman	O'Hara, Minn.	Vursell
Horan	O'Neill	Wainwright
Hosmer	Osmers	Walter
Huddleston	Ostertag	Watts
Hull	Passman	Weaver
Hyde	Patman	Westland
Ikard	Patterson	Wharton
Jackson	Pelly	Whitten
James	Perkins	Wickersham
Jarman	Philbin	Widnall
Jenkins	Phillips	Wier
Jennings	Pilcher	Wigglesworth
Jensen	Pillion	Williams, Miss.
Johansen	Poage	Williams, N. J.
Johnson, Calif.	Poff	Williams, N. Y.
Johnson, Wis.	Polk	Willis
Jonas	Powell	Wilson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.	Preston	Wilson, Ind.
Jones, Mo.	Price	Winstead
Jones, N. C.	Priest	Withrow
Judd	Prouty	Wolcott
Karsten	Quigley	Wolverton
Kearney	Rains	Wright
Kearns	Ray	Yates
Keating	Reece, Tenn.	Young
Kee	Reed, Ill.	Younger
Kelley, Pa.	Reed, N. Y.	Zablocki
Kelly, N. Y.	Rees, Kans.	Zelenko
Keogh	Reuss	
Kilburn	Rhodes, Ariz.	
Kilday	Rhodes, Pa.	

NAYS—3

Barden	Sheehan	Siler

NOT VOTING—21

Bennett, Mich.	Davis, Tenn.	Hope
Chase	Dondero	Kean
Christopher	Hand	King, Pa.
Clevenger	Hoffman, Mich.	Knox
McGregor	Pfost	Simpson, Ill.
Miller, N. Y.	Rabaut	Smith, Wis.
O'Konski	Radwan	Tuck

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD; and, secondly, that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the joint resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, with this request for a resolution from the Congress, President Eisenhower has again demonstrated his devotion to the Constitution of the United States.

The President's request that the Congress support his policy with respect to the conduct of our foreign affairs in the Far East is in the time-honored traditions of our Nation.

It confirms his declaration that except for an attack on Americans serving where they have a right to serve, he will not commit the American flag without participation by the Congress in such a decision.

During the past 2 years under President Eisenhower's leadership, we have seen encouraging progress toward the establishment of lasting world peace.

The substantial gains made have been detailed in the President's State of the Union message.

The easing of tensions in many trouble spots throughout the world has given us renewed hope that an honorable and lasting peace is nearer than ever before.

It is not necessary for me, at this time, to elaborate on this point.

In spite of the solid gains we have made, however, realism demands that we recognize present dangers to the security of the free world posed by the aggressive actions of Soviet Russia's satellite, Communist China.

Recognition of this threat, together with appropriate counteraction, is consistent with our efforts to achieve a just and honorable world peace.

President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message, offered as the first purpose of our Federal Government "to maintain justice and freedom among ourselves, and to champion them for others so that we may work effectively for enduring peace."

To achieve this goal, the President has time and again made clear his desire to work with the Congress on a bipartisan basis.

I have no doubt the Congress will respond.

It is vital to the cause of world peace that the nations of the world understand—both those who count us as friends and those who may seek to destroy our way of life—that regardless of any political differences we may have on the home front we stand firmly united in the face of peril from without.

That unity has been our great tradition.

Let no one doubt we stand united today.

By our actions here we will give comfort to our allies and fair warning to those who seek further encroachment on the free world, that we are united in our determination to preserve the security of ourselves and our friends.

America is a nation of peace-loving people.

We are patient and we are tolerant.

But we are dedicated to preserving the rights of man.

This, the Congress of the United States, is known as the greatest deliberative body in the world.

But let no man underestimate the extent of our capacity for defending liberty.

When freedom is at stake, we are of one mind.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to make clear my position on House Joint Resolution 159, as proposed by the President of the United States.

I am voting for this resolution not because the President needs any authority to take whatever steps are necessary to protect the interests and citizens of the United States from danger. Nor do I view this resolution as a limitation on the powers of the President, granted him under the Constitution and by accepted historical precedent down through the years.

I am voting for this resolution because the President, with the superior sources of information available to him, says the United States, its citizens and interests, are in danger. Under such circumstances a positive vote of the Congress serves as a warning to the world that we stand as one to protect ourselves at all times anywhere in the world.

But it is essential to make clear that this resolution is a needless one from the point of view of constitutional authority. As Commander in Chief, under the Constitution, the President has the power and the obligation to move with utmost dispatch to protect the interests and citizens of the United States.

That he feels he has this power the President has amply demonstrated in the many orders he has already issued directing the 7th Fleet without first resorting to a resolution of Congress for authority.

In other days other Presidents have clearly seen their duty and have acted to protect the United States. And in the proper way the Congress has seen fit to support such actions as the emergencies require.

Members of Congress do not have the full information available to the President.

This fact notwithstanding, we act because the President has said there is clear and present danger to American citizens and interests.

The world, particularly the Communist leaders, must know that American citizens will never shrink from protection of their security.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, approval of the pending resolution is

consistent with our obligations under the United Nations charter. The President in his message requesting this action said:

> We believe that the situation is one for appropriate action of the United Nations, under its charter, for the purpose of ending the present hostilities in that area. We would welcome assumption of such jurisdiction by that body.

The authority conveyed upon the Executive in this resolution is designed to meet existing dangers, and the powers requested should be granted without awaiting the assumption of jurisdiction by the United Nations. At the time the United Nations acted to secure release of American fliers held in violation of the Korean armistice agreement, President Eisenhower said:

> Truth and right are on our side. We must have faith in the community of nations and the tremendous influence of world opinion.

Mr. Speaker, I make this reference only to record my own feelings that we are proceeding with admirable consistency and that we seek the support of world opinion in these policies.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to make clear my position on House Joint Resolution 159, as proposed by the President.

This is a time of national crisis which demands unity. The issues transcend partisan considerations. The country must unite behind the President in supporting the national policy, and show clearly to the world that despite political differences on the home front we stand united when the national security is threatened.

Our first objective is to do everything consistent with national security and honor to avoid war and promote peace.

To let the world know what we deem to be our vital security interests is a constructive step in that direction. The danger and futility of not doing so has been proved by past experience. The President's message must be regarded as a step toward peace, not toward war.

We believe in the principle of united action by freedom loving peoples to repel aggression and to prevent war. In accord with that principle the President stated in his message that this country "would welcome action by the United Nations which might in fact bring an end to the active hostilities in the area." The action which we take in passing the President's resolution will strengthen the efforts of the United Nations to find a peaceful solution to the problems in the western Pacific area.

The President's message is noteworthy in indicating his desire that Congress should share in the making of this vital foreign policy decision. This is democracy at its best. It is no renunciation of the President's constitutional power to take military action on his own authority as Commander in Chief in the face of attack or defense necessity. The President recognized that he had such authority. Consultation with Congress in the present circumstances is a wise and statesmanlike step. It strengthens our national position before the world, and particularly before those who threaten aggression.

In supporting the President we take a firm and honorable course. We are true to our traditions so nobly expressed by a great President: To strive on "with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right."

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted to all Members of the House to extend their remarks concerning House Joint Resolution 159, I want to take this opportunity of expressing my extreme reluctance in casting an affirmative vote on this resolution.

I would particularly like to associate myself with the forceful and pertinent remarks made by my able colleague from California, the Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD, as well as the clear and, I believe, the most important matters of principle stated to the House by the distinguished and beloved Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, as well as those of my respected colleague, the Honorable PAUL J. KILDAY.

My reluctance in voting for this resolution was heightened by the answer given by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs when, in answer to a question, he stated that he believed this resolution gave to the President direct authority to bomb the coast of China if, in the opinion of the Commander in Chief, such action was necessary to assure the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores. This answer highlights the extremely broad courses of action which this resolution, by implication, assures the President that we, in this House, have approved. In other words, the Congress—for the first time that I know of—is giving prior approval of actions which the President may take, as Commander in Chief—now unknown perhaps even to him—and certainly to us, and which, as was so well emphasized in the debate—and in the President's own message—are actions which he alone, under our Constitution, has the power to take.

This resolution and the rule under which it was adopted also, I am sure, prevented many of my colleagues from clearing up points which are of importance to them. For instance I, for one, do not want my vote in any way to indicate approval of any aims which the present so-called Government of the Republic of China has to restore itself to power on the mainland of China. This also does not imply that I approve of the present Communist Chinese Government. I do not. That such a rule was necessary does not detract from its unfortunate effects.

There were two main and prevailing reasons for my affirmative vote:

First, I have great respect and confidence in the leadership of the majority of this House of Representatives, and when that leadership—as in this case—was unanimous in believing that it was in the national interest to adopt such a resolution, it meant and did carry great weight with me.

Secondly, the message of the President carried one most significant sentence, and I quote:

> Thus it will reduce the possibility that the Chinese Communists, misjudging our firm purpose and national unity, might be disposed to challenge the position of the United States, and precipitate a major crisis which even they would neither anticipate nor desire.

To this the President also added, and I quote:

> I hope, however, that the effect of an appropriate congressional resolution will be to calm the situation rather than to create further conflict.

These are expressions of opinion from the one man who has the direct responsibility and who is in a position to have the most complete facts concerning this situation. In brief, this is a step the President asks for to further the cause of peace. Therefore, I reluctantly concluded that it was the duty of the Congress to support a direct request from the President for an action which he believed would contribute to peace as well as safeguard our national defense.

I can only pray—as I am sure that the vast majority of our fellow citizens are also doing—that the President may have divine guidance in his judgment. I pray, also, that he may realize that the passage of this resolution has placed upon him an even greater responsibility—that such additional power or influence as this resolution may give him shall never be used for any aggressive action of any kind.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the world witnessed a remarkable display of American unity this past week.

It crystallized suddenly in support of a bold stroke in foreign policy that had heretofore been weakened by confusion, indecision, and appeasement.

It was the true spirit of America speaking up for what is right and just.

Serving a clear warning to the Chinese Communists that if they persist in disturbing the peace by seeking to conquer Formosa and the Pescadores, they will be treated as outlaws against the world community, and will suffer a disastrous defeat.

Although there may be some difference of opinion concerning our right to prevent the Communists from taking over the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu, there is none whatever concerning Formosa and the Pescadores to which the Reds have no claim whatsoever.

Both international law and strategic necessity justify our defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

This stand will hearten anti-Communist forces throughout Asia; will restore the prestige of the United States; and will place justice above expediency in the settlement of international disputes.

We are pleased that the President sought the endorsement of Congress.

It demonstrated our unity to the world, and it will give a psychological boost to every human being who longs for peace, and security against aggressors.

The Communists have suffered a serious setback.

Proving that whenever the United States is true to its fundamental conscience and its courage it wins the support of freedom-loving people everywhere and raises the hopes of Chinese

and Russians who long for the day when they will be liberated from the Communist yoke.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with keen attention to the words of our wise and beloved Speaker the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], and with equal deference to the opinions of our level-headed and experienced colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] as he, too, expounded his views regarding the requested authority by President Eisenhower in connection with the Formosa threat. I agree heartily with all they said. Their deductions are patriotic, sound, and unimpeachable, but I am not going to quibble about the President's interpretations to the contrary. I am going to vote as the President requests, to prove to the world that there is unity among us on the point of presenting a solid front, and to disregard minor differences where security and peace are the chief concern.

I agree, too, with my good friend the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] whose analytical mind and brilliance are equaled by his patriotism and aggressiveness, so valuable to our beloved country. I not only listened to his brief remarks here on the floor, but also read and agree with his statement which is to be printed in the RECORD and which was released to the press. I believe the President owes it to the people to make some explanations about the employment of the 7th Fleet. What he, the President, said to Congress on February 2, 1953, does not square with what was said as he backtracked on the same subject in his address to the Congress on January 24, 1955. I shall circulate the released Holifield statement in my district should I deem it necessary to do so for the edification of the people who are interested in unimpeachable facts.

JOINT MEETING TO RECEIVE HIS EXCELLENCY PAUL E. MAGLOIRE, PRESIDENT OF HAITI

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Thursday, January 27, 1955, for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting the President of the Republic of Haiti, His Excellency Paul E. Magloire.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING PARKING ON CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3) favoring temporary permission for parking on square 723 of the Capitol Grounds.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Massachusetts explain the resolution?

Mr. McCORMACK. The purpose of the concurrent resolution is to provide a parking space for Members of the Senate and their staffs.

Mr. Speaker, the present parking space, as I understand it, is on the site of the new Senate Office Building, which is about to be constructed. Ground is being broken there tomorrow. Arrangements have been made for a new parking space on land bounded by First and Second Streets and Massachusetts Avenue NE., opposite Union Station. This is senatorial action, and unless we pass this concurrent resolution today they will have no place to park.

Mr. MARTIN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know whether there will be any change in the regulations with respect to parking in the Senate garage for this session. Can the gentleman inform me on that?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to answer the gentleman. Of course this has nothing to do with the resolution before us. The gentleman is asking me something that frankly is foreign, so far as my knowledge is concerned, to this resolution. This has nothing to do with the resolution, I assure the gentleman.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that there have been some changes in the practices which have existed heretofore with respect to parking in the Senate garage by Members of the House. I feel an explanation should be made of that at this time, because this is a general parking problem for all Members of the House. If I cannot have that information at this time, Mr. Speaker, I will have to object.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say to the gentleman that this is a matter which concerns the Senate. If we had a matter concerning the House and it was in the other body and some Member objected to consideration of it, having in mind that today is the deadline, I would feel considerably disturbed, and I know the gentleman has such profund respect for comity between the two branches that he will make his inquiry on the other matter independently, and permit this resolution to be passed. If the gentleman will send me a letter and make specific inquiry on the matter that he has in mind, I will be very glad to personally look into the matter.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not ask that the gentleman be especially kind to me, but this is a matter that affects the parking facilities of the Members of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree to that.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am bringing the matter up now.

Mr. McCORMACK. But it is separate and distinct from this.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Well, I think this matter of parking should be a matter of concern to Members of this House as well as to Members of the Senate.

Mr. McCORMACK. This particular matter does not in any way concern Members of the House. I ask the gentleman to let this resolution pass.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. McCORMACK. No, Mr. Speaker, not at this time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The House is not in order. I would like to know who has the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has the floor. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] has reserved the right to object, which gives him half of it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that every Member of the House is concerned with this new practice that has evidently developed since the 5th of January of this year, but in deference to his request, and because of my admiration for the majority leader, I will be glad to withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the Architect of the Capitol should permit the parking, under the control of the Sergeant at Arms of the United States Senate, of passenger motor vehicles on that part of the United States Capitol Grounds described as square 723, for such time as the said Architect determines that such square is needed for parking purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Senate concurrent resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AMENDING REORGANIZATION ACT

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 109, Rept. No. 7) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the

Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2576) to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1958. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF WEEK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the majority leader what will be the program for the balance of the week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules this afternoon reported out a rule on the bill (H. R. 2576) to extend the reorganization powers of the President in connection with the executive branch of the Government. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate. It will be called up tomorrow.

The Committee on Rules will sit tomorrow to consider whether they will vote out a rule on the bill H. R. 587, permitting men in the service as of January 31 to complete their entitlement to educational benefits, and so forth. The bill is out of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. If the Committee on Rules reports a rule on it tomorrow it is the intention of the leadership to bring that bill up on Thursday.

These are the only two bills for the rest of the week. Anything else will be by unanimous consent.

Mr. MARTIN. Is there to be a joint meeting of the Congress on Thursday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. It is the intention to bring that bill up after the joint meeting.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I have for today may be transferred to Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered, and to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

RUSSIA'S IRON GRASP SUBJUGATES THE UKRAINE

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, 37 years ago Saturday the people of the Ukraine seized the opportunity to proclaim their independence once again from their Russian captors, but their independence was short lived. And so, since 1921, the Ukraine has been under a tyranny as severe as any people have ever known, and the rich resources of this area have been exploited by the Soviet Union to bolster communism's drive for world conquest.

It is therefore fitting, I believe, that we in what is today the oldest continuous Republic in the world, with the oldest written Constitution, should mark the anniversary of Ukrainian independence and keep the memory of that date alive until the Ukrainian people themselves are free and independent and at liberty to reestablish their own national way of life.

Therefore, on behalf of the good American citizens of Ukrainian descent in Westmoreland County of Pennsylvania and elsewhere throughout the country, and on behalf of freedom-loving people everywhere who believe in keeping alive the flames of hoped-for freedom which rage behind the Iron Curtain, I want to take advantage of this opportunity in the Congress of the United States to mark the anniversary and join in the hope that the Ukraine may soon see freedom and decency prevail.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed a leave of absence for 4 days, from January 31 to and including February 4, to attend to official duty in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

THE NATIONAL SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA OF WASHINGTON

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, this is an important week for the city of Washington. This is campaign week for the National Symphony Orchestra.

This great orchestra is the only cultural institution in Washington that must go to the public for funds. The museums, art galleries, parks, and monuments are maintained through private endowment or Federal funds. The National Symphony Orchestra is the core of the cultural life of the city. It brings great music to the people of Washington, young and old.

This year the orchestra needs $300,000 from the people of this city. In return, the orchestra will continue next season with its more than 100 concerts: 20 Wednesday nights in Constitution Hall, 4 Thursday afternoons in Lisner Auditorium, 4 Thursday nights at the University of Maryland, 6 young people's subscription concerts in Constitution Hall and district schools; 9 suburban young people's concerts, 4 tiny-tots concerts in the District and nearby counties, 4 Saturday night pops concerts, and 7 special concerts in the District.

More than 85,000 schoolchildren each year hear the music of the great composers through the National Symphony Orchestra. The National Symphony is an important part of life in Washington and must be maintained at all cost. All the people of Washington should, and I am sure will, do their part.

VETERANS' BENEFITS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day I introduced a bill which would provide that so long as the draft is in effect the men in the services may receive the full benefits they now receive. In view of the resolution passed today giving the President war powers, in effect, in view of the seriousness of the situation and the fact that for quite a number of months our men have been killed and injured in other countries by enemies, I feel very anxious to have this bill passed.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs this morning extended the time for Korean veterans to receive educational benefits under the GI Training Act. I believe that all benefits should be continued. I have requested a hearing on my bill. The chairman will hold hearings on bills of that type, I understand, in the near future.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

THE COMMON ENEMY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, some apparently "thin-skinned" individuals seem not only indignant but outraged because they assume that the political party to which they owe allegiance has been unjustly accused of being sympathetic toward communism.

So far as I have been able to learn, no responsible individual has ever accused the Democratic Party or any of its spokesmen of having ever knowingly furthered the purpose of the Communist Party.

It would not only be untrue, but an absurdity for anyone to charge that the Democratic Party or its members were less patriotic, less opposed to communism, than the Republican Party or its members.

It is equally absurd for anyone to charge that either the Vice President of the United States, RICHARD M. NIXON, or the gentleman from Wisconsin, against whom the Communists have directed their attacks, ever accused the Democratic Party or its members of being, as a party or as individuals, supporters of communism or the communistic doctrine.

Leaving out of consideration for the moment the Democratic Party and its spokesmen, and not making reference to them, permit me to add that, evidently thinking they have the gentleman from Wisconsin out of the picture, some individuals are now attempting to establish the thought in the minds of the voters that the Vice President, who has long been an active and effective foe of communism when he was a Member of the House, during the last campaign carried on a smear campaign. The record does not bear out that charge.

It is in the record that during the Roosevelt administration communism not being then the issue which it subsequently became and now is, that administration did—undoubtedly without knowledge of what was happening—by its actions, to a certain degree, protect Communists, some of whom held positions in the Federal Government.

It has been pointed out that the Truman administration likewise did not fully realize the progress which the Communists had made in this country in promoting their theory of government.

As the years go by and as we gather additional knowledge of what has happened, of what is happening, undoubtedly the attitude of the people toward various political philosophies change.

What was acceptable in the 1930's and the 1940's is now unacceptable. While in the Roosevelt administrations, Communists were entertained at the White House, a change in world conditions and in our own thinking makes their acceptance there today as guests, absolutely impossible.

Beyond question, the Communists will continue their efforts to overthrow this Government either by force or by causing us to accept their way of life, and the time has long passed when opposition to them should cease to be a party issue.

It is indeed fortunate and encouraging that as of today no political party dares openly to support communism.

We have today been forced into a position, through our own negligence, through our adoption and continued acceptance of what to me has been an unsound foreign policy, where another world war is just over the horizon.

Before I vote for a declaration of war, I must know the ultimate objective. We should know whether it is our purpose, when the next war is over, to continue to entangle ourselves in the affairs of other nations, to continue to tell them what they shall believe, think, and how they shall live—whether we intend to continue to maintain what some term defensive positions throughout the world, the cost of which, in dollars and perhaps in lives, will ultimately render us unable to defend ourselves from foreign aggression.

The adoption of a resolution which will be construed by China and Russia as a declaration of war and which gives no assurance that after that war has been won we will not continue the unsound, futile foreign policies of the past will give no assurance of a better, more peaceful future.

Turning now to the policy which I think we should follow here at home with respect to aggression by the Communist Party, I read from a Saturday Evening Post editorial of January 22, which clearly expresses the thought to which I have heretofore, many times, both in speeches and in letters, given utterance.

The editorial reads as follows:

The people of the United States and their political leaders are about to be subjected to tests of their courage, tenacity, and powers of discernment as severe as any they have undergone for many generations. It is difficult to remain "at the ready" when the Nation is being challenged, bullyragged, and kicked in the teeth by a contemptuous enemy. To keep up the guard under the more persuasive attack described as peaceful coexistence may prove almost impossible. We are offered the outward and visible sign of something all of us want: peace. Few dare even to appear to reject so desirable a boon. And, as time passes, fewer and fewer critics arise to mention the probability that the Kremlin's idea of peaceful coexistence is that we should exist peacefully in the Red orbit. The Communist dove of peace is a decoy, wired to blow up in our faces.

Simultaneously with the peaceful coexistence symphony from abroad, the leftwingers in our midst plan another campaign equally insidious. Relying on the general distaste for McCarthyism, they hope not only to discredit the results of past congressional investigations but to amend the rules governing such committees drastically enough to make it impossible to probe deeply into the operation of the Red conspiracy. If we can be led to believe that there never was an Alger Hiss, that Harry Dexter White was a victim of a climate of fear, and that thought control has been established in America, then the movement to render Congress impotent to expose Communist penetration may well succeed.

On another sector of the battle, leftwingers attack the security system governing the hiring and firing of Federal jobholders. The gimmick here is that a man accused of being a security risk or a loyalty risk should have the right to confront his accusers. In one case that found its way to the Supreme Court, 4 Justices voted that a suspected employee should have this right, although it has been often pointed out that, when the FBI is the informant, the identification of the agent supplying the information would end the usefulness of the FBI in this field. This, of course, is a blow which the Communists and their fellow-traveling allies could endure without great pain. The proper response to the "right to confront accuser" argument is that a Federal job is not a right. Nor do admitted past injustices in security matters constitute a valid argument for making it impossible to remove a dubious employee without going through proceedings as loud, protracted, and frustrating as the trial of New York's 11 Communists 5 years ago.

The answer to the question: "How far will this softening-up process get in Congress?" lies with the Democratic leaders. It will be tempting to some to treat the subject as a party matter. Many Democrats feel that their whole party membership stands accused of virtual treason by certain GOP campaign orators, and it is natural that this should rankle. However, no responsible Republican leader has made any such charge, although many have rightly pointed out that, during the 20 years of Roosevelt and Truman, it was frequently difficult to move against the Red conspirators.

Either Mr. Roosevelt or Mr. Truman could have prevented communism from becoming a party matter by the simple device of saying to the congressional investigators: "Nobody wants to throw out these scum, if there are any in the Government, any more earnestly than we do. Come in and get 'em." Instead, Roosevelt sent word to Whittaker Chambers that he could "jump in the lake" (inexact quotation), and Mr. Truman mumbled sourly that the whole thing was a "red herring." Adlai Stevenson seemed unable to untrack himself from this generally unhelpful attitude, and that is one reason why Mr. Eisenhower is now President.

Anyway, all recrimination to one side, the Democrats in Congress have an opportunity to take the Red issue away from the Republicans and hand it to all patriotic Americans. They can do this simply by refusing to weaken the investigating apparatus of Congress and by continuing it with improvements, especially now that the public is in serious danger of being lulled to sleep by the peaceful-coexistence myth. Senator MCCLELLAN, who succeeds Senator MCCARTHY as chairman of the Permanent Investigations Committee, has already given assurance that the probes into communism will continue. There is no reason why the security and existence of the United States should ever have been a party issue at all.

I have never been able to accept the doctrine that any individual has an absolute right to a Federal position.

Those who wrote the Constitution sought to protect future generations by laying down the rule that periodically we should elect a President, Members of the Senate, and Members of the House. Neither the President nor the Members of Congress have any right to a Federal office, nor is there more reason why any individual should have a right to a Federal job.

I have the utmost faith in the individual integrity, in the patriotism, of the gentleman who is now chairman of the Senate Committee on Government Operations. In my judgment he will pursue the same objectives as did the former chairman of that committee, and it is my hope that he will not suffer from the same unjust criticism which so grievously hindered the efforts of his predecessor.

Let us not in the future be deceived or misled by false complaints emanating from the friends of the Communists or from those who have no faith in, who

doubt the principles laid down in, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey and to include an editorial.

Mr. LONG in two instances.

Mr. REUSS in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. QUIGLEY.

Mr. CLARK.

Mr. RODINO in two instances, in each to includes extraneous matter.

Mr. ROBERTS and to include a statement he made before the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Mr. CRETELLA.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN (at the request of Mr. CRETELLA).

Mr. HOSMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri in two instances.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON in reference to the nursing shortage and to include copy of a bill she has introduced.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS and to include a letter.

Mr. CRAMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GWINN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROONEY and to include an editorial and extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include a statement made by him on January 24, 1955.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. O'KONSKI (at the request of Mr. WITHROW), for 1 day, January 25, 1955, on account of official business.

Mr. DONDERO (at the request of Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan), for January 25, 1955, on account of illness.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin), for January 25, 1955, on account of illness.

Mr. MCGREGOR (at the request of Mr. MCCULLOCH), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

Mr. CLEVENGER (at the request of Mr. MCCULLOCH), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 26, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

322. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 5221 of the Revised Statutes, relating to voluntary liquidation of national banks"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

323. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

324. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to prohibit the transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce by communication facilities"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia; Committee on Rules. House Resolution 104. Resolution providing for consideration of House Joint Resolution 159, joint resolution authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area; without amendment (Rept. No. 5). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 2576. A bill to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1958; without amendment (Rept. No. 6). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 109. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 2576, a bill to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1958; without amendment (Rept. No. 7). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 587. A bill to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 8). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 2962. A bill to provide that persons who serve in the active military, naval, or air service of the United States during the period beginning February 1, 1955, and ending on the date the induction of individuals into the Armed Forces ends shall be extended, with limitations, certain benefits presently available to wartime veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 2963. A bill to amend the Trade Agreements Extension Act of July 1, 1954, so as to assure the availability of materials essential to national security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 2964. A bill relating to the income-tax treatment of corporations which shift manufacturing operations from the continental United States to Puerto Rico to avoid Federal income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2965. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 2966. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to assist small business by increasing the amount which is exempt from the surtax on corporate taxable income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 2967. A bill to provide for strengthening of the Reserve forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 2968. A bill to establish a commission to prepare a plan for the removal of temporary Government buildings in the District of Columbia, for the accommodation in other buildings of the personnel employed in such temporary buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 2969. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 2970. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 65 to 60 the age at which women may become entitled to benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 2971. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 2972. A bill to require the recordation of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H. R. 2973. A bill to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain tract of land in Macon County, Ga., to the Georgia State Board of Education; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 2974. A bill to provide for the appointment by the Postmaster General, subject to the civil-service laws and rules and regulations, of postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 2975. A bill to require approval by Congress of executive agreements with respect to the reduction of tariff rates before the same become effective; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 2976. A bill to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on musical instruments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 2977. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the northern and southern districts of Iowa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 2978. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 2979. A bill to amend the Trade Agreements Extension Act of July 1, 1954, so as to assure the availability of materials essential to national security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 2980. A bill to authorize Federal payments to the States to assist in constructing schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 2981. A bill to amend the law granting education and training benefits to veterans of service on or after June 27, 1950, to extend the period during which such benefits may be offered; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2982. A bill to amend the Trade Agreements Extension Act of July 1, 1954, so as to assure the availability of materials essential to national security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2983. A bill to provide that, notwithstanding the termination by Presidential proclamation of the period within which veterans of service subsequent to June 27, 1950, may accrue eligibility for wartime benefits, such period shall not terminate while individuals may be inducted for training and service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.R. 2984. A bill authorizing E. B. Reyna, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Los Ebanos, Tex.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 2985. A bill to provide that the rates of duty on certain goods manufactured from wool shall not be reduced below the rates applicable to such goods on January 1, 1955; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 2986. A bill to adjust the salaries of judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia and the salaries of the judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 2987. A bill to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2988. A bill to readjust postal rates; establish a Commission on Postal Rates; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 2989. A bill to adjust the salaries of judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia and the salaries of the judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 2990. A bill to establish a self-sustaining national pension system that will benefit retired citizens 60 years of age and over; to stabilize the economic structure of the Nation; and to induce a more equitable distribution of wealth through monetary circulation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 2991. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the town of Lancaster, Mass., for the loss of taxes on certain property in such town acquired by the United States for use for military purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 2992. A bill to provide a means whereby domestic producers who are injured by increased imports resulting from trade agreement concessions may obtain preferences in bidding for Government contracts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 2993. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce retirement age for women from 65 to 60, to eliminate remarriage as a bar to widow's and parent's benefits, and to provide that widows with minor children may in certain cases become entitled to widow's benefits before attaining retirement age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2994. A bill to amend the provisions of the Social Security Act relating to old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled, so as to provide for increased payments to needy individuals thereunder and for the removal of certain restrictions on their eligibility for such payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 2995. A bill to provide that certain service rendered by disabled retired members of the uniformed services shall be computed as double time for retired pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2996. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the northern district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2997. A bill relating to the naturalization of certain merchant seamen who later serve in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2998. A bill to extend pension benefits to persons who served on certain vessels operated by the Army during the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2999. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, with respect to the computation of disability payments in the case of certain seamen and other persons; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 3000. A bill to regulate commerce among the several States, with and among the Territories and possessions of the United States, and with foreign countries; to protect the welfare of consumers of tung oil and of those engaged in the domestic tung nut and tung oil producing industry; to promote the export trade of the United States; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 3001. A bill making the 17th day of September in each year a legal holiday to be known as Constitution Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3002. A bill to extend rural mail-delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3003. A bill to exempt certain nonprofit organizations from the tax imposed on bowling alleys and billiard and pool tables; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 3004. A bill to promote the further development of public-library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 3005. A bill to further amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending the authority to induct certain individuals, and to extend the benefits under the Dependents Assistance Act to July 1, 1959; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 3006. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which may be received by an individual while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. R. 3007. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901, so as to provide for a divorce from the bond of marriage for permanent and incurable unsoundness of mind; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BOW:

H. R. 3008. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to provide that feed grains acquired through price-support operations shall be sold to dairy farmers at prices equivalent to the percentage of parity at which dairy products are being supported; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 3009. A bill to provide medical care for dependents of members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 3010. A bill to provide for the sale by the Secretary of the Army of land allocated for cottage site development in the Fort Gibson Dam and Reservoir project and the Tenkiller Dam and Reservoir project, in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3011. A bill to provide for the sale by the Secretary of the Army of land allocated for cottage site development in reservoir areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 3012. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 3013. A bill to allow for construction of distribution systems by irrigation districts in the Central Valley project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 3014. A bill to authorize personnel of the Armed Forces to train for, attend, and participate in the second Pan-American games, the seventh Olympic winter games, games of the XVI Olympiad, future Pan-American games and Olympic games, and certain other international amateur sports competitions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 3015. A bill to establish workmen's compensation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 3016. A bill making May 17 in each year a legal holiday to be known as Anti-Segregation Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 3017. A bill to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3018. A bill to readjust postal rates; establish a Commission on Postal Rates; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 3019. A bill to amend the Trade Agreements Extension Act of July 1, 1954, so as to assure the availability of materials essential to national security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Internal Security; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. J. Res. 168. Joint resolution to aid in preventing the acquisition and use of narcotic drugs by minors by closing the Mexican border to any minor who is not accompanied by his parent or guardian unless he can demonstrate that he is leaving the United States for a legitimate purpose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. J. Res. 169. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday in June of each year as Shut-In's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the International Oil Exposition, to be held at Houston, Tex., May 3 through May 8, 1955; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. J. Res. 171. Joint resolution for the establishment of a Commission on Nursing Services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. J. Res. 172. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. J. Res. 173. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:

H. Con. Res. 55. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the celebration of holidays on Mondays; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the private agreements concluded in 1945 at Yalta and Potsdam should be forthwith repudiated by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. Res. 105. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct investigations and studies with respect to matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 106. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Foreign Affairs to investigate and study the participation of the United States in the International Materials Conference; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 107. Resolution opposing all plans, programs, and proposals tending toward the development of any form of world government, which would limit the rights, privileges, or immunities of citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Res. 108. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the report of the Library of Congress entitled "Foreign Trade and Milwaukee"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. Res. 110. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: Memorial of the Indiana State Senate asking the cooperation of the Federal Government in the location and establishment of a new port on the Indiana shore of Lake Michigan; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly urging Congress to enact legislation to incorporate the principle of reinsurance as a means of enabling the Federal Government to assume its responsibilities in financing the employment security program and thereby equalizing the tax burden among the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing Congress to enact legislation increasing the personal income tax exemptions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts to prevent the closing of the Murphy General Hospital in Waltham, Mass.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts in favor of the passage of legislation reducing the age at which persons shall be eligible to receive social-security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memoralizing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation amending the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, so as to enable the domestic sugar industry of the United States to have a fair and equitable share of the Nation's growth; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to an interstate civil defense and disaster compact between the State of South Dakota and the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 3020. A bill for the relief of Buonaventura Giannone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 3021. A bill for the relief of Juan Nestor Vinbela-Medina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 3022. A bill for the relief of Frank Michael Whalen, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:

H. R. 3023. A bill for the relief of Mohammed Moinuddin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW (by request):

H. R. 3024. A bill for the relief of Margaret Mary Hammond; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWNSON:

H. R. 3025. A bill for the relief of Simone Sakey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 3026. A bill for the relief of William R. Fleetwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H. R. 3027. A bill for the relief of Leo E. Verhaeghe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 3028. A bill for the relief of Ines Lenzi Erickson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3029. A bill for the relief of Regina Chan Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON (by request):

H. R. 3030. A bill for the relief of Shelmo Hakim and Parvin Hakim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 3031. A bill for the relief of Paul Nelson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3032. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alberta S. Rozanski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3033. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elvira Bonvini Simoncelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3034. A bill for the relief of Venanzio Girardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3035. A bill for the relief of Spyridon Saintoufis and Mrs. Efrossini Saintoufis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3036. A bill for the relief of George P. Provencal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 3037. A bill for the relief of Jakob Hass, Roza Hass, and Mala Hass; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 3038. A bill for the relief of Argyrios G. Georgandopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 3039. A bill for the relief of Zofia Nowosad (Mazurek); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 3040. A bill for the relief of Ruth Lieslotte Ludascher Clark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 3041. A bill for the relief of Demetrios George Florakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3042. A bill for the relief of Jerzy Hadrosek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 3043. A bill for the relief of Edward M. Thompson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 3044. A bill for the relief of Edith Skeete; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H. R. 3045. A bill for the relief of George L. F. Allen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 3046. A bill for the relief of Yvonne Yip; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 3047. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth G. B. Hohn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York (by request):

H. R. 3048. A bill for the relief of Assuntino Del Gobbo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 3049. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bertha Mansour; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3050. A bill for the relief of Noel Kaiser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 3051. A bill for the relief of Dr. Abdullah Cem Bayar and Mrs. Sermin Okyanus Bayar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H. R. 3052. A bill for the relief of Elsa Wahl Enlow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 3053. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Smanda (Laavola) Salo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 3054. A bill for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN (by request):

H. R. 3055. A bill for the relief of Gray Television & Research, Inc., of Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 3056. A bill for the relief of Anni Marjatta Makela and son, Markku Paivio Makela; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3057. A bill for the relief of Dr. Bienvenido L. Balingit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3058. A bill for the relief of Rev. Canon John Malinowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 3059. A bill for the relief of Thomas Lampaces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 3060. A bill for the relief of Paul Samuel Abella, his wife, Georgette, and their children, Elizabeth Aimee and Bernard (Haritchelhar); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 3061. A bill for the relief of Irene Schaetzel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 3062. A bill for the relief of Paul H. Sarvis, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 3063. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Bartlett Springs Co., and certain others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 3064. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lina Gemora Ray; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3065. A bill for the relief of Jeanne May Sasaki, Pamela Joyce Suzuki, and Dorothea Grace Itoh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3066. A bill for the relief of Robert V. Blednyh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3067. A bill for the relief of Thomas C. Cox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3068. A bill for the relief of Knut Peterson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3069. A bill for the relief of Eufronio D. Espina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3070. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lee Tai Hung Quan and Quan Ah Sang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3071. A bill for the relief of Eleanor Ramos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3072. A bill for the relief of Mr. Michael Nemoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3073. A bill for the relief of Sigfried Olsen Shipping Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3074. A bill for the relief of Jean-Marie Newell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3075. A bill for the relief of Virgil Won (also known as Virgilio Jackson); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3076. A bill for the relief of Jose Esteban Romero-Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3077. A bill for the relief of Enrique R. Godinez, Enriqueta P. Godinez, and Lydia M. Godinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3078. A bill for the relief of John Napoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY (by request):

H. R. 3079. A bill for the relief of George K. Jue (also known as Jew Ten); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3080. A bill for the relief of Ko Wai Sing and Go You Gin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 3081. A bill for the relief of Leonard Appleton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. J. Res. 174. Joint resolution to authorize the appointment of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur as General of the Armies of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

65. By Mr. SILER: Petition of Harlan Woman's Club Harlan, Ky., by Mrs. J. A. Dickinson and others favoring constitutional amendment whereby treaties and agreements can only be adopted by Senate when a quorum is present and by rollcall vote, and opposing the admission of Red China on Security Council of United Nations to replace Nationalist China; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

66. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Council of the City of Kenosha, Wis., favoring legislation authorizing the deepening of connecting channels of the Great Lakes and appropriating the funds determined to be necessary by the Corps of Engineers to the end that the St. Lawrence Seaway project may most fully serve its intended purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

National Shut-In's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to invite the attention of the House to a highly commendable organization known as the Shut-In's Day Association.

The objective of the association, which everyone must readily recognize as being most benevolent and humanitarian, is to encourage remembrance of the sick and disabled shut-in whether the individual be a civilian or war veteran. The general therapeutic value of the activities of this association to the less fortunate members of our society who must be confined indoors for long or permanent periods of time is widely acknowledged. The welfare of all mankind will be significantly advanced. It is a well-known fact that there are some long-continuing illnesses which can be at least partially alleviated by the bringing of encouragement and cheer and through the proper display of kindness and affection on the part of those who are entirely well. That the organization's manifold activities are intended to be universally appealing and effective is apparent since it has consciously striven to be nonsectarian, nonpolitical, nonracial, and nonprofit-making.

I consider it a distinct privilege to be able to encourage the national observation of Shut-In's Day by introducing a bill to have Congress designate the first Sunday in June of each year as Shut-In's Day and to authorize and request the President of the United States to issue annually a proclamation calling for appropriate recognition and celebration of the day.

A developing interest on both a national and international scale is being demonstrated with reference to the desirability of having a day of remembrance set aside for the many unfortunate people who are forced by illness and disability to remain in their homes, hospitals, or sanitaria. An increasing number of the shut-ins are war veterans who, because of their sacrifices for all of us, are particularly deserving of the attention and consideration of those who are in good health. Many of the hospitalized veterans remain cheerfully patient, awaiting the day of recovery or improvement, even though they realize inwardly that they may never enjoy the open sunshine again. Their chief contentment must be derived only from the thoughtfulness of those who visit them and send them books, magazines, flowers, and other tokens of warm and kind friendship.

Precisely when such an excellent program as the present one originated, or by whom it was first conceived, is not known, but the determination of the date is not essential to the continued success of the program. It has been established, however, that an annual day of remembrance for those unfortunate souls who must be confined to their homes, hospitals, and other institutions was in the mind of man perhaps centuries ago. English and Canadian soldiers stationed in India many years ago brought back reports concerning one of the Indian religious sects whose members visited soldiers confined in hospitals or their homes on a certain day of each year. The sick or wounded were presented with gifts such as flowers and food delicacies.

In the early thirties in the United States and Canada many shut-ins exchanged cards or letters of greeting observing Shut-In's Day. The honor and credit for making Shut-In's Day an organized observance belongs to Ernest Barker, a young Canadian shut-in, who with the help of a few friends founded the Shut-In's Day Association, International, in 1942. Since that time a great deal of desirable, well-warranted publicity has been accorded the idea of an annual Shut-In's Day. Ministers, governors, mayors, representatives of the press, radio, television, and civic clubs, and the general public have all made impressive contributions to furthering the project. Twenty of our State governors issued proclamations in recognition of Shut-In's Day in 1953.

Surely so noble a movement—already so widely supported—deserves the fullest national recognition. In terms of cost—whether we consider costs in time, energy, or money—adequate observance of the day entails very little by way of sacrifice on the part of society. But no

sacrifice is too great if through it we may bring to the permanently afflicted—the shut-ins—some measure of comfort by the demonstration of the friendly concern of their more fortunate fellow citizens.

The Administration Discovers Culture 2 Years Late

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower is trying to get Congress interested in the fine arts. This is a field, he thinks, where Russia is outdistancing the United States, and he proposes that something be done about it. As a beginning, he proposes that Congress set up a Federal Advisory Commission on the Fine Arts.

This story is told in the January 28, 1955, issue of U. S. News & World Report. The story fails to mention the bills sponsored by 10 Members of the House and 6 Senators in the 83d Congress on which hearings were held by the House Education and Labor Committee.

In the majority report on those bills the Republican members of the House Education and Labor Subcommittee said:

> In view of our analysis of the proposed legislation, and our study of this hearing record, we recommend that none of the bills referred to in this report be passed.

It may be that, as in the case of other legislation developed by Democratic Members of the Congress which was at first rejected by the Republican Members and then presented later as administration proposals without any reference being made to those who had labored hard in its development, it largely depends upon who is presenting the legislation.

For the record then, the gentleman from New York, EMANUEL CELLER; the gentleman from Montana, LEE METCALF; the gentleman from Louisiana, JAMES H. MORRISON; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, GEORGE M. RHODES; and the gentleman from Minnesota, ROY W. WIER, have joined with me in introducing bills "creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center."

A second bill "to establish a program of grants to States for the development of fine arts programs and projects, and for other purposes," has been introduced by the gentleman from New York, EMANUEL CELLER; the gentleman from Montana, LEE METCALF; and myself.

These bills have been endorsed in principle by many national organizations and by outstanding leaders in our country in all walks of life—see hearing record and the report on the fine arts bills considered by the 83d Congress.

The total cost to each 1 of the 53 million taxpayers of our country for the program which these bills would establish would be, on the average, just about 11 cents per year. It may be noted, for purposes of comparison, that Americans spent $5,310 milion for tobacco in 1953. This is an average expenditure per taxpayer of $100.07. They also spent $8,865 million for alcoholic beverages that same year, for an average expenditure of $167.05 per taxpayer.

In view of these facts, it seems reasonable to assume it unlikely that the legislation which was rejected by the Republicans in the 83d Congress, and which has been introduced again this year with some minor revisions, would contribute to the impoverishment of the richest nation in the world, as feared by the Republican majority of the House Education and Labor Subcommittee in the 83d Congress.

A third measure in the cultural field which I have introduced in the 84th Congress would create a Federal Commission to study the copyright laws and make recommendations for their revision—see daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 20, 1955, pages A256–A258, and A262–A263. A fourth measure would establish a program of financial aid to students in higher education in order to help us cope with the Russians in this cold-war period—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 13, 1955, pages 307–308.

The article from U. S. News & World Report follows:

IKE LIKES THE ARTS, SO UNITED STATES MAY EXPORT CULTURE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The arts, all of a sudden, are getting official attention. White House is concerned, thinks United States needs to show the world its finer side, as Russia does. Many in Congress agree. Idea is to promote music, painting, sculpture, dramatics, the dance, other artistic pursuits. For now, the President asks only a study. Out of that could come a system of subsidies.)

President Eisenhower is trying to get Congress interested in the arts.

This is a field, he thinks, where Russia is getting ahead of the United States, and he wants to do something about it.

As a start, he proposes that Congress set up a Federal Advisory Commission on the Fine Arts. Its chief job will be to size up the art situation and recommend a program.

The President has not yet laid down a plan for subsidies or other heavy spending. That might develop later.

Reports from United States officials overseas have stirred the President, as well as many Congressmen. The Russians are sending singers, dancers, musicians, actors, and art exhibitions to places all over Europe and Latin America. The Soviet Government foots the bill.

The Russian artists are reported to be making a deep impression. And American prestige, the reports add, suffers in proportion. The Russians picture Americans as gum-chewing barbarians. They spread the idea that the United States might excel in science and industry, but it has no art worth showing.

PROBLEM FOR EISENHOWER

The truth is that the United States does very little to show foreign countries its artistic work. The President has been pondering this, close associates recall, since he was president of Columbia University. He is a painter himself, and that other noted amateur, Sir Winston Churchill, has talked to him about it as well.

Nelson Rockefeller, a new special assistant at the White House, is credited with getting the President actually to launch an art program. Mr. Eisenhower is reported also to have been impressed recently by an eloquent radio talk on the subject by the actress, Lillian Gish.

The President made a small start on an overseas art project last summer. At that time, he got Congress to appropriate about $2.5 million to be spent by the United States Information Agency on cultural programs. With that fund, USIA subsidized some of the overseas performances of Porgy and Bess, which has been a smash hit in places that hardly ever saw an American production before.

UNITED STATES AS ART PATRON

Porgy and Bess played to full houses everywhere, but lost money in such countries as Yugoslavia, where the average admission price was 35 cents. USIA is underwriting the show's appearances in such places as Israel, Egypt, Greece, Spain, and North Africa.

José Limon and his modern American dance group made a tour of Latin America, with expenses underwritten by USIA. Icelanders heard Isaac Stern, American violinist, with similar help from the USIA funds.

American paintings are seldom seen outside the United States. Only 8 or 10 exhibitions have been sent abroad by USIA since 1953. Between 1947 and 1953, no traveling shows went over. That was because some Congressmen in 1947 denounced exhibitions then on tour. Too much abstract art, they said, and too many "reds" and "pinks" among the artists whose works were displayed.

WHAT'S WANTED FOR THE ARTS

The President is seeking to install a top-flight commission of leaders in the art world, which will help him make a start on a more ambitious Government art program. The only task he has announced for it, specifically, is arranging for Government awards of merit. In his state of the Union message he proposed that awards go to Americans "who make great contributions to the advancement of our civilization." Apparently, scientists, engineers, and others will be honored, along with artists.

Here are some ideas a commission will be expected to consider:

Subsidies for art schools, orchestras, operas, theaters, art galleries—all such subsidies to be administered by the States.

Scholarships for artists, writers, and liberal-arts students.

An art center in Washington, to be a show place for the Nation and visible evidence to foreign visitors of America's interest in the arts. It would comprise an opera house or theater, a presidential inaugural auditorium, an art gallery and studios for the study and teaching of art.

Projects of this type are being discussed widely in art circles. Bills to put them into effect have been introduced in Congress. If Congress does not approve the President's proposal for a commission, it still can grab the ball from Mr. Eisenhower and start some of these projects on its own.

Art lovers for a century and a half have tried without success to have a high-level fine-arts agency created in the Government. Bills to create some kind of fine-arts unit within the Government have been introduced in nearly every session of Congress since 1877. The existing Commission of Fine Arts merely advises the Government on the acquisition of art works for Federal parks and buildings.

FINE-ARTS PRICE TAG

No big spending has yet been suggested. The subsidy proposal before Congress would involve about $5 million—called "leverage money," to start private funds flowing. A

scholarship program, however—now being drawn up within the United States Office of Education—could cost from $20 to $25 million a year.

No public works-of-art project, such as the New Deal ran in the 1930's, is talked of. Artists themselves oppose any such venture at this time. Some art organizations oppose even subsidies, fearing Government domination.

Art activities in the United States receive almost no Federal aid and little help from cities or States. Artists in most foreign countries depend heavily on subsidies.

Berlin spends $1 million a year, and Milan, Italy, spends $3 million, mostly on opera. The Italian Government spends $3 million. Great Britain spends $1.4 million a year. Denmark spends $800,000 for the Royal Theater in Copenhagen, with its dramatic school. France, Germany, the Netherlands, and many Latin American countries provide sizable subsidies.

Subsidies, nevertheless, are to be only one of the problems of the new commission, if it is created. Its primary job will be to tell the President what can be done to capture the imagination of the people of the older, art-loving nations of the world.

Government for the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE S. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1955

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, there comes a time in the history of every democracy when the people seem to fall asleep at the switch and allow the big corporate interests to take over control of their government. It has happened in national government many times before; it has happened in state government; and I am sure unless we keep our eyes on the signs of the times that it will happen again. I am thankful to Almighty God that such periods of apathy and indifference on the part of the masses of our citizens are not usually long-lived. The common people soon reassert themselves and show their good horsesense and throw the rascals out. This is not only true of national government but, Mr. Speaker, we have seen the same process work out in state governments.

In the year 1924 my brother, Huey P. Long—who, may I say with pardonable pride, was a man of great intellectual force and the champion of the masses of people—first appeared on the political scene as a candidate for railroad commissioner. Next, he sought the governorship of our State. He was fought tooth and nail, hammer and tongs, at every turn in the road by the big corporate interests and their lawyers and newspapers. These selfish interests had ruled Louisiana for some years prior to Huey's interest in politics.

On election day a heavy, cold rain fell all over Louisiana and the rural vote could not get out. Although he pulled a tremendous vote, he fell short of election. Again in 1928 he sought the governorship. He was elected. After his election, in spite of the persistent opposition of the specially privileged classes and their major metropolitan newspapers, he inaugurated and carried out a program for the people of Louisiana heretofore unheard of in any State.

He took his people out of the mud and built our first good roads—6,000 miles of concrete roads; abolished all toll roads and bridges and made every road and bridge free to all of the people.

Now, my friends, we are again faced with the proposition of having toll roads in my State. I say that if a man would be governor of the people; he should state without any hesitancy that he is opposed to toll roads and toll bridges in Louisiana. We would certainly be playing into the hands of the large corporations and selfish interests should we turn our highway system over to toll roads and toll bridges.

Further, Huey Long gave our people free hospitals and free ambulance service in all parts of the State. He gave us homestead exemptions, provided free schoolbooks for all the schoolchildren. He did so many fine and constructive things for the masses of Louisiana's people that it would take a great deal of time and many reams of paper to set them all out before you. The philosophy of government instituted and carried on by my late brother has been in the main preserved since his untimely death in 1935.

But, Mr. Speaker, in the year 1952 a so-called reformed government caught our people napping and we find at the helm of our State government today a handful of selfish people dominated and controlled by the giant corporations and their newspapers. They have, as they invariably do in State as well as in national affairs, sought to control and restrict the gains made by and for our people.

Fortunately for us all, the tide at home has turned and is presently surging toward the type of government which has accomplished so much for our people, both State and national.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think a lesson should be learned from the ebbing and flowing of these tides of public sentiment and the resultant change from one philosophy of government to another. Just as these gigantic corporate interests and their mouthpieces and henchmen during their brief moments of control of our government have sought to chip off the gains and advantages made by the friends and champions of the masses of people, we who believe in and fight for the kind of government which brings about these gains and advantages should implement, strengthen, and add to them during the times when we are in the pilothouse of the ship of state.

Louisiana's next governor will be elected in January 1956, 1 year from now. It is not known at this time just who the candidates for governor will be. Several good men have already been mentioned as potential candidates; I, myself, have been urged by many fine men and women in our State to become a candidate. I feel highly honored at the compliment.

Mr. Speaker, whoever it is that makes the race as the Democratic Party's candidate for President of the United States or as the people's candidate for Governor of Louisiana, he should far in advance of either election state publicly, as plainly as words may be written or spoken, just where he stands on every important question. He should declare what he intends to do to protect and expand the gains made in the past for the plain, average people of his State or of the United States.

I cannot speak for the next President of the United States, but I can and will say what I think should be assured the people of my State, in this respect, by any candidate for governor who hopes to be elected in 1956. May I suggest the following platform for a candidate for governor? It would be short and simple:

Include first a solemn pledge to the people that every gain and advantage made for them by our friends over the years, such as homestead exemptions, free school books, good roads and bridges, old-age pensions, hospitals, and ambulance service, will be preserved and protected to the utmost.

Increase the old-age pensions to $80 per month and this without raising taxes one cent.

Increase the homestead exemption from two to five thousand dollars so as to bring it back within the true spirit of the exemption and cover the present-day muchly increased cost of living. At the present, $2,000 means very little to any taxpayer.

Provide a college education free of charge to every boy and girl who desires to have such an education. The amount of education that a boy or girl receives should not be limited by his family's pocketbook, but by his ability to absorb and profit by further training.

Push the completion of the Louisiana River bridge at New Orleans, but kick out the rascals who have designed to make it a toll bridge and make it by law a free bridge like every other bridge in our State.

Strict enforcement of Louisiana's game laws but eliminate the persecution of our fishermen and hunters who suffer a standard $25 fine for very minor violations under the present administration.

Eliminate altogether the annual State hunting and fishing licenses heretofore required of our people. The revenues derived from the State from this source are negligible and can be replaced by funds from other sources.

Mr. Speaker, there are many, many things that remain to be done nationally and within our States in the interest of the plain, average men and women of our land. Their lot should be made easier and happier. Just as an example of the kind of thinking and planning which should be done by those who feel as I do, permit me to cite one instance of planning to help those who wish to obtain homes.

Black River Swamp contains thousands of acres of good, rich, fertile soil. Some of this land belongs to our State. A levee built through that land would make it ideal for farming. It is my thought that a project of this nature should and could be worked out using State-owned machinery. Bulldozers could go into this swamp and the Kisatchie National Forest and clean off the

underbrush. Then the State could finish off lots of about 40 acres, building houses on them and selling to those who want a home in the country. Give them tax exemptions for 5 years and for a period of 5 years no payment would be due the State.

We have a law in Louisiana at present which exempts some corporations from taxation for as much as 10 years. Exemptions for some of these corporations run into hundreds of millions of dollars. I am not opposed to encouraging business in this manner, but I also believe the little man should be encouraged to build and develop farms and homes, too. The timber from the land could be sawed up for use in construction of homes. An investment for this purpose would not have to be a large one. The Federal Government, I am sure, could be encouraged to come in and help such a program. They, too, are interested in creating homes for our citizens.

A question often put to me is, What are they going to do with all the land in the Kisatchie National Forest? Will it remain a place where 'possums and 'coons and other animals live or will human beings be permitted to live on it? The answer is obvious. The plan I am offering would permit many parents to rear their children in the country in a wholesome atmosphere, where they can grow their own vegetables and own their own milk cow. In short, where a living is much cheaper, much easier than it is now. Much of this land is near enough to the city of Alexandria and other towns that the people could live on it and work in town. I do not mean to destroy the forest. It is my thought that by cutting roads into it and permitting people to live on the part of the land that is suitable for homes and cultivation, fires would be prevented and more timber could be grown on this land so made available. Also, to an extent, the Government would be taken out of the timber business and it would be returned to private industry.

I would like to add one more example before I close. It is in reference to the good-roads program. For more than 35 years I have been going about this country making speeches advocating a superhighway system—a 4-lane highway system—to be constructed from the North to the South, from the East to the West. I am happy to say that the President of the United States is planning such a program now. Let us join in with the Government and get some good roads for all the States of our Nation. As you know, the Government is planning to spend billions of dollars on roads. Large sums will be given to the States on some kind of a matching basis. Heretofore, we in Louisiana have been content with a 20-year bond issue. It is my thought to construct roads that will last for 100 years or more. The bonds would be divided up to run up to 100 years, so that the first man who drives on the road will pay the same as the last man who rides on it. The idea is to extend the present road program, and instead of building 100 miles of road with the money, stretch it out 5 times and build 500 miles of road. Instead of covering 20 years it would cover 100 years. Of course, 100 years from now people will need roads as badly as we do now. This is a real pay-as-you-go program. The man who drives over the road pays for it at that time, and the last man pays just as much as does the first man. The only reason that such a program is not in use now is that the selfish financial interests prefer the principle now used in order to make big money. However, I have been told by some good financiers that such a program will work.

We all know it requires money for any government to operate, and those necessary funds are derived principally from taxation. We cannot escape the fact that we must have taxes for our government to operate, but those taxes should be based on sound and just principles and work as an investment for the taxpayer. Anyone who aspires to the governorship should give assurance that our tax structure will be under constant and careful scrutiny and that a continuous effort will be made to keep taxes as low as consistent with the program of benefits and cost of operation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me repeat, the friends of democratic government in its highest and finest sense should, during the time they are in office, do such things as these I have been discussing. They should secure and expand locally the maximum blessings and benefits which the plain, average, everyday people of America have gained under the most enlightened and democratic administrations. I know of no better time in which to do so than the present, on both local and national levels of government. The tide ebbs and flows. Today it is in the direction of advancement and benefit for the masses. Let us take advantage of it. We, the plain average people of all America, should resolve that we will not doze or fall asleep again where our Government affairs are concerned. We should resolve and see to it that America will always be a land where there shall be no beggars or slaves; a land where our aged, our helpless, and our blind will not be cast aside or neglected but will always receive our sympathy and care; a land where the dignity of labor and the integrity of capital shall both receive recognition and respect at the hands of those who govern; a land of equal opportunity and justice; an America where a proud and happy and prosperous care-free people shall live; a land where every man is king but no man wears the crown.

The Meaning of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, for Ukrainians one of the most compelling and cohesive forces of unity is the desire for national independence. This desire is a force that brings together all Ukrainians into a common understanding and endows them with a common ideal. Achievement of this ideal is indeed fundamental for any people; for to be free from foreign domination, to establish a way of life in accordance with one's own unique political, economic, cultural, and religious concepts, and to be independent and self-reliant are basic human impulses.

Thirty-seven years ago the Ukrainians had realized, after centuries of subjection to foreign powers, their long-sought aim of national independence. Disintegration of the Russian Empire and later the Austro-Hungarian Empire made it possible, for at least a short time, to gather the formerly subject peoples of the western and eastern Ukraine into one homogeneous national republic. The Ukrainian dream had at last come true.

But the Ukraine was caught in the struggle between the Red Russians and White Russians for control over the former Russian Empire. Both forces were inimical to the national interest of Ukrainians; for an objective of each was to reassert Russian domination, whether Red or White, over the Ukrainian people.

A country exhausted after years of war and German occupation, the Ukraine could not resist successfully the overwhelming Russian forces from the north and south and defend the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic. And thus, before Bolshevik might, which had defeated the White Russian armies, the forces of Ukrainian liberation were compelled to recoil, until at last the Eastern Ukraine was again conquered by Russia. Large sections of the western Ukraine thereafter fell under Polish, Rumanian, and Czechoslovak control; but at the close of the recent World War, even those areas were united with the Soviet Ukraine and brought within the Soviet Empire.

On this January 22, the anniversary of Ukrainian independence, it is a fitting tribute to Ukrainians everywhere that this historic occasion be acclaimed. To the Ukrainian people beyond their native land, may their age-long dream again come true: That the yoke of the foreign tyrant will one day be thrown off, and that the Ukraine will again be free.

The President's Economic Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower voiced great optimism in his economic message last week. He spoke of the current recovery from the mild-business recession. His message contained fine words.

What the President said about recovery may be somewhat of a surprise to many people in the 19th Congressional District of Pennsylvania. This may be particularly true of industrial workers

in York County. More than 2,800 fewer people were working in York County in December 1954, than were working at the same time a year earlier, according to a report entitled "York Labor Market Letter," a monthly review prepared and published by the York office of the bureau of employment security of the Pennsylvania State employment service.

This report shows that both initial and continued claims for unemployment benefits have been rising steadily in York since mid-October. While estimates of total unemployment were not available for December, current employment was 2,850 below the year ago level. The data compiled covered only manufacturing employment. Of 12 industries involved, 8 of them showed declines in employment.

Of great significance, the report shows that each of the men and women employed during December was working a shorter workweek, and earning less money.

Many of us were disappointed in the President's message, which failed to carry out the intent of the Full Employment Act of 1946, which is the law which requires an economic report to the Congress. This law provides that the President's economic report contain recommendations to maintain full employment. Despite the nice words and phrases, the message made no recommendations designed to promote full employment.

Mr. Speaker, I owe it to those citizens of the 19th Congressional District who want to work but for whom no work is available, to urge the Congress to take up the slack in the President's program and enact measures which will create the climate for full employment. I firmly believe each of us owes it to the people we represent, as well as to the welfare of the Nation, to take action which will promote and maintain full employment.

Despite the failure of the President and his administration leaders to recognize the necessity for full employment, the Congress has a mandate from the people, expressed last November, to take up the slack.

Flood-Control Action Needed in Butler Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1955

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to point out the critical need for Federal action to relieve the serious flood situation in my district.

If ever there was a practical demonstration of the truth of the adage that to be pennywise can sometimes be pound foolish, it is the recurring flood damage in and near the city of Butler, Pa., in my congressional district.

Year after year in the city of Butler alone, damage from floodwaters of the Connoquenessing Creek runs from $100,000 to $2 million. In the flood this past fall, damage in Butler was estimated at more than $1,500,000. Many families were made destitute and homes were rendered uninhabitable, all because of an unconscionable delay in putting into operation the machinery already available to the Federal Government to correct the cause of the floods.

The entire cost of cutting a ditch or channel less than 2,000 feet long to get at the cause of the trouble would be less than $150,000. A section of the existing flood-control law permits the Corps of Engineers to allot not in excess of $150,000 to any single locality to correct a situation such as this, with the provision that local cooperation be forthcoming.

The council of Butler has taken the initiative in providing this required cooperation. It has demonstrated a sincere desire to cooperate in furnishing the relief these people need, and which they need now. The victims of these annual floods are neither all Democrats nor all Republicans. They are good, loyal American citizens who have every right to expect the protection which available law was intended to give them. I trust the Corps of Engineers will lose no more time in providing that protection.

Extension of Educational Benefits for Members of the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1955

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I presented to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs today in support of H. R. 587, to permit persons now in the armed services or who will be in service on January 31 of this year to continue to accrue rights of educational benefits despite the termination of the war emergency on that date. My statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I wish to express my appreciation for this opportunity to submit the following statement to you in behalf of H. R. 587, a bill "to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952."

The 82d Congress enacted Public Law 550, "to provide vocational readjustment and to restore lost educational opportunities to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be fixed by the President or the Congress. * * *" The President on January 1, issued a proclamation establishing January 31, 1955, as the termination of the Korean emergency period. In accordance with Public Law 550, the termination of the emergency period will also end the accrual of educational benefits. The enactment of H. R. 587 would assure those individuals in service on or before January 31, 1955, the privilege of continuing to accrue educational benefits until their discharge and would eliminate any possibility of an injustice, with respect to this act, occurring to any individual serving in the Armed Forces prior to the issuance of the President's proclamation.

I am happy to say I supported the enactment of Public Law 550 in the 82d Congress, and I wish to support the enactment of H. R. 587 in an effort to avoid any misunderstanding or misinterpretation of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I would also like to commend the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, which I feel has done such excellent work in both honoring and protecting the veterans of America. The original GI bill of rights was indeed a bill of remarkable vision, a supreme concept, and, in my opinion, extremely rewarding to both the individual and the entire Nation. It was a generous act upon the part of the taxpayers who so wholeheartedly supported this program, as one sign of their token of esteem for the sacrifice the young men of America made in service to their country during World War II. There was similar public demand and approval that an educational rights bill be enacted for those men serving in the Korean war. It is a credit to this committee that its members carefully studied the operation and history of the original GI bill of rights and in drafting Public Law 550, drew up legislation which eliminated any of the abuses that had developed under the original bill. In this way the committee protected the veteran, retained his educational benefits for him, and at the same time protected the taxpayers.

The GI bill of rights legislation has helped and is helping the veteran help himself. It is one way in which our Government can help a young man regain through education the time and normal advancement he has lost while on military duty. It helps the individual veteran obtain a higher standard of living which, in turn, increases the level of the Nation's prosperity. It is, indeed, of greater benefit to both the veteran and the country to give the veteran a better life through advancing his education than to reward him with a small bonus, quickly spent. The young men of the United States have shown their fine heritage in the sacrifices they have so willingly made for their country, and they deserve to be respected, honored, and rewarded in a like manner. This all the citizens, taxpayers, and Congress have tried to do in supporting educational benefits legislation.

In my opinion, H. R. 587 is a perfecting amendment to Public Law 550, 82d Congress, which would facilitate the implementation of this law and would assure any deserving veteran the educational rights which Congress intended that he have. I hope H. R. 587 will be enacted without delay.

Thirty-seventh Anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence of the Ukrainian People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1955

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday was the 37th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian people. We in the United States, together with all the free peoples throughout the world, are aware of

the great courage displayed by the brave Ukrainians in their opposition to Communist oppression and have great admiration for their consistent zeal in their efforts to attain liberty and freedom.

We have an obligation to continue to aid them in every way we can in regaining the liberty and permanent peace among freedom-loving nations which they so justly deserve.

The Reciprocal Trade Casualties Act of 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I have today introduced a bill which, if enacted, would be entitled "The Reciprocal Trade Casualties Act of 1955." It is designed to cushion the shock that will be felt if this Congress decides, as I hope it will, to renew and expand our reciprocal trade agreements program.

This country, I believe, needs expanding world trade. Our export industries can survive in the long run only if we let other countries earn the dollars with which to buy our exports. At the same time, lowered tariffs help the American consumer.

But if imports to this country are to increase, and thus give these benefits to the country generally, someone is going to get hurt in the process. Beyond a certain point, imports can be increased only at the expense of domestic industry. If you are in such an industry, it is small comfort to be told, as your company goes bankrupt or you lose your job, that everything is for the best in the best of all possible worlds.

Now, our trade-agreements legislation has had for some years the escape-clause provision, whereby if sufficient injury is shown, the President is authorized to raise tariffs. Possibly because this escape clause could negate the entire trade program, it is no secret that the President has been very loathe to invoke it. If he does not invoke it, domestic producers suffer. If he does invoke it, where is your trade liberalization then?

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] recently introduced bills which would provide assistance to individuals, communities, and industries jeopardized by the lowering of trade barriers. I believe that these bills are entitled to the sympathetic consideration of this House. The bill I have introduced, the Reciprocal Trade Casualties Act of 1955, is designed to serve the same purpose as these bills and to supplement them. Like them, it tries to answer the question: How can we lower trade barriers and yet mitigate the hardship that such action causes by helping producers to adjust to a higher level of world trade?

The bill, in brief, provides that any domestic producer found by the Tariff Commission to be in danger by foreign imports, may receive a certificate entitling it to a percentage advantage—up to 25 percent—in its bids for Government contracts. The idea is to provide an oxygen tent so that a company may keep busy and solvent while it finds new products which can sustain it in the long pull. The certificate would be good only for a limited period, while the company energetically sought to develop new products which could withstand competition. With the Government purchasing many billion dollars a year worth of materials, a percentage advantage of this type could be of real significance in tiding a hard-pressed producer over a transition period.

Certainly, we cannot sit idly by and see economic distress and misery caused by our trade policies. An individual plant and its workers cannot just be wished out of existence. Into such a plant, ownership has put its savings and management and skill. Tied to it are hundreds of workers, by reason of seniority, pension plans, or simply by a very understandable wish not to be uprooted from their home, their church, their community.

This bill attempts to keep such a business organization in being. If the company does succeed in making a better mousetrap, we will all be better off for it.

But, as an addition to the cost of certain procurement contracts, the proposal will cost money. So, I suppose, does our practice of giving veterans a percentage advantage in their civil-service examinations. We consider veterans worthy of such protection since they are casualties of our national policy of resisting aggression. Should we not equally recognize as deserving of a percentage break certain industries which are casualties of a trade policy designed to produce a peaceful world? In doing so, we take the costs of a liberalized trade policy off the shoulders of a few isolated industries, and instead spread that cost over the entire Nation, as it should be.

The administrative machinery utilized by the bill is the Tariff Commission, which has already considerable experience in making determinations whether a given industry is being hurt by foreign imports.

The bill is applicable to all producers, and particularly to a number of industries now in tariff jeopardy, which are well equipped to bid on Government contracts. These include such diverse industries as bicycles, cutlery, optical instruments, watches, and motorcycles.

As a specific example, take the motorcycle industry, of which the Harley-Davidson Co., of Milwaukee, is now the sole American producer. Because our tariff on motorcycles has been bound at 10 percent under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, Harley-Davidson has been severely affected by foreign competition, largely from Great Britain. Employment at Harley-Davidson has declined from close to 3,000 in 1949 to less than 900 today. It has lost more than half its domestic market to foreign competition. It is currently operating, I am informed, very close to the red.

If Harley-Davidson is considered a protectionist company, this is so despite itself. Harley-Davidson longs for liberalized trade and the day when once again it can sell its motorcycles throughout the world market, instead of being kept out by the rigid quota system enforced in the sterling bloc and elsewhere today. It sees the point that foreign countries must earn dollars. I believe it would accept with Christian resignation the loss of part of its domestic motorcycle market to foreign competition if it could somehow see a hope of survival on the horizon. The company is engaged in an imaginative and resourceful search for new products which costs it many thousands of dollars monthly. It hopes that in a year or 2 or 3 it will light upon such a product, and then be able to diversify its line so that it can keep its head above water and keep jobs for its workers. Meanwhile, it is bidding, and bidding hard, on a great variety of Government contracts. It has run into the same experience as many another medium-sized company—it finds that General Motors or Chrysler can underbid it by a few dollars on an important contract.

Let us put the Reciprocal Trade Casualities Act on the books. Let us give Harley-Davidson, and companies similarly situated, the opportunity to prove before the Tariff Commission what is perfectly obvious: That it is suffering, and suffering badly, from foreign competition. Let it be armed, then, with a certificate entitling it to a percentage break on its Government work. Let this added business keep its working capital and working force intact over the next few years. And, hopefully, let the company then fashion a better mousetrap which will set the free world beating a path to its door.

If we can do that, we can move closer to our goal of trade without tears.

Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1955

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., has requested Members of Congress to make a brief statement in the RECORD for distribution abroad and behind the Iron Curtain. The occasion is the observance of the proclamation of Ukrainian Independence on January 22, 1918.

The Nation of Ukrainia, numbering 40 million people, has been under the yoke of tyrants for centuries. The latest plunderers of Ukraine independence and culture are the cruel Soviet imperialists, who have committed mass murders, manufactured famines, and destroyed

churches as the highlights of their reign of terror.

In my home district of New Haven, Conn., the Ukrainian flag of blue and gold flew at city hall alongside the American flag last week in memory of the Ukrainian proclamation of independence. I take great pride in pointing out that New Haven is the first city in the United States to recognize Ukrainian Independence Day. It is my hope that many other towns and cities will follow this example of tribute to a nation which cherishes freedom above all else and will never cease to fight for it.

Torch of Freedom Burns in the Ukraine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1955

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, there is no better occasion than the 37th anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence from the Russian Empire of the Czar and from the Soviet Government which followed it, to remind the people of the United States that the torch of freedom burns brightly behind the Iron Curtain, and nowhere more brightly than in the breasts of some 40 million Ukrainians who are de facto a part of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

In my district of eastern Connecticut, we have thousands of American citizens who have ties of blood and culture with their homeland in the Ukraine. They are loved and respected by their neighbors. They take seriously their responsibilities and privileges as American citizens, while retaining, in their churches and patriotic and fraternal societies, observance of their traditional customs, such as the one just recently observed, as it is every year, of the Ukrainian Christmas on January 7, based upon the Julian calendar. Not only in Colchester, where at St. Mary's Ukrainian Catholic Church elaborate preparations for this festival were made and carried out, but also in Norwich, Hebron, Salem, and Lebanon, all towns in my district, where other hundreds of families dwell, where there was similar observance, the people combined with the prayers at their Christmas services prayers to speed the day when the aspirations for real and lasting freedom in the homeland will be fulfilled.

In the Ukraine, although conquered by Soviet imperialism and brigaded in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, like so many other peoples who were free once and who prepare for the day when they can be again, the people may be frustrated, but they are not despairing.

The people of the Ukraine know, from the experience of hundreds of years, that there can be no such thing as peaceful coexistence with a tyrant. As one of the first victims of Soviet imperialism, Ukraine has been particularly subjected to the murder, corruption, and pillaging of the invader, and endures as a captive state only with determination to find and to provide the opportunity to break the shackles.

It is significant that Soviet Russia recognizes the Ukraine as a nation, by asking for and obtaining the admittance to the United Nations, when it was formed, of the Ukraine Soviet Republic as a member of the United Nations. The day must come when the Ukraine will be a totally independent nation in its own right, and not a vest-pocket member to swell the voting strength of the Soviet bloc.

The anniversary of the proclamation of Ukraine independence by the people of that nation in 1918 should be, at this time, an inspiration to the American people as we continue to strive forward to extend the boundaries of the free world. We shall give, as people dedicated to preserving and restoring human freedom everywhere, every possible assistance and encouragement to the efforts which are being made, and will continue to be made, by the people now behind the Iron Curtain, to attain that freedom.

The Committee on Ways and Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means, on which I have the honor to serve, has recently begun public hearings on the administration's foreign trade program. These hearings are expected to last a minimum of 3 weeks and then, of course, extensive consideration in executive session will be required.

In certain quarters, criticism is being leveled at the committee for its failure to undertake this important task during the last Congress. The following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Monday, January 17, 1955, is a case in point:

IN LESS THAN A WEEK

How to get down to business in Congress promptly has been demonstrated by the House Ways and Means Committee under the chairmanship of Democratic Representative JERE COOPER, of Tennessee.

Chairman COOPER has already started public hearings on President Eisenhower's foreign trade program. Not only that, he has called as the first witness no less an official than Secretary of State Dulles. This would suggest that instead of a long-drawn-out procedure with a lot of time-consuming minor witnesses first, the committee will be ready to take action on proposed reciprocal trade legislation early in the session on the basis of top-level testimony.

President Eisenhower sent his foreign trade message to Congress only a week ago, and it is even less than a week since the Senate and House completed organization of their committees. Yet hearings are already started on perhaps the one most important part of Mr. Eisenhower's program—the part designed to loosen the bonds that restrict world trade.

Contrast this with the way things went on the Ways and Means Committee in the last two sessions when the committee had a Republican majority and high-ranking Republican Representative DANIEL A. REED, of New York, for its chairman.

On this vital issue at least, the White House ought to say a prayer of thanksgiving that it "lost" the election last November.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means has a reputation for hard work which is recognized by every Member of this House. Its record of legislative accomplishment in the last Congress is unsurpassed. It may well be without parallel in our entire history. If the committee was, in fact, dilatory in taking up the trade question, then it deserves criticism. On the other hand, if the committee was not dilatory, and I shall demonstrate that it was not, then this charge must be labeled as irresponsible, political, and unworthy of a great newspaper.

On April 7, 1953, during the 1st session of the 83d Congress, the President requested a 1-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. At the same time he referred to the need for a thorough reexamination of our whole foreign economic policy. Accordingly, on May 1, 1953, the President transmitted a message recommending creation of a commission to make this review. These two Presidential recommendations were carried out promptly. On June 9, 1953, the Committee on Ways and Means favorably reported the bill to provide for a 1-year's extension of the trade agreements authority and to establish the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy. It was provided therein that the report of the Commission was to be submitted within 60 days after the commencement of the second session in 1954. Obviously, it was not intended that the Congress take up the question until after the report had been transmitted.

Let us look for a moment at some of the work the Committee on Ways and Means did during that 1st session of the 83d Congress, when we are informed that it was wasting time. It reported some 34 bills of which 18 became law during that session. In addition to the trade agreements bill described above, it provided for extension of the excess-profits tax on corporations; it provided the Technical Changes Act of 1953, containing a number of technical changes in the tax law; it provided the Customs Simplification Act of 1953, the first major overhaul of customs legislation in many years; the Employment Security Administrative Act which became law in 1954; it provided a judicial retirement system for the tax court, a long-needed reform; it provided for the extension of the renegotiation Act; and many other lesser items of legislation. Perhaps most important, the committee began public hearings June 16, 1953, on general revenue revision. In the course of these hearings, the committee heard testimony from over 500 witnesses. It conducted hearings on 25 days and 10 nights. The full committee remained in session for 2 weeks after adjournment to complete the hearings. These exhaustive hearings made it possbile for the committee to start writing a new tax law in

executive session immediately upon convening of the second session. No further public hearings were necessary.

Let us turn now to the 2d session of the 83d Congress and see how the Ways and Means Committee wasted its time. Presumably, it was during that second session that critics of the committee believe it should have considered the trade problem. In this connection, let us not forget that the President's message containing his recommendations on foreign economic policy, based upon the economic report of the Commission, was not transmitted to the Congress until March 30, 1954.

On January 13, 1954, the committee immediately began work in executive session on a complete overhaul of our tax laws, a work which culminated in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. These executive sessions usually occupied both mornings and afternoons. This was our schedule of executive sessions on the tax bill: January 13, 14, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, February 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 25, 26, March 2, 3, 4, and 5. If this schedule appears fairly full, do not forget that the staff upon which the committee must depend for technical assistance, had to do its preparatory work in between the executive sessions, usually late into every night and through every weekend.

On March 10, the committee reported the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1954, carrying out the President's recommendation for extension of certain excises and providing the first significant reduction in excise taxes for many years. The bill was debated and passed by the House the same day. On March 17 and 18, the House debated and passed the mammoth tax revision bill. On March 29 and 30, the excise bill was before the House-Senate conference committee.

Following work on tax revision which the President had called the "cornerstone" of his program, the Ways and Means Committee turned to social-security legislation. Public hearings on the President's social-security recommendations, which had been submitted early in the session, began April 1. The schedule of hearings was as follows: April 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, and 15. The Easter recess began April 15 and lasted until April 26. Following the recess, executive sessions on social security began May 10 and continued on May 11, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, and 28. The bill was debated in the House and passed June 1.

Next the committee took up the unemployment-compensation legislation recommended by the President. Public hearings were held June 8, 9, 10, and 11; executive sessions on June 14 and 15. The bill was not considered by the House until July 8.

On June 10, the committee had reported the bill for a 1-year extension of the trade-agreements authority.

On June 22, 24, 25, and 28, public hearings were had on customs simplification, an important part of the President's foreign economic policy recommendations. Executive sessions on this legislation were held on June 25, 29, and July 1. The bill passed the House July 26.

On July 7, the committee conducted executive sessions on a variety of less important legislative items and on the 8th began the extremely important House-Senate conference on H. R. 8300, the new Internal Revenue Code of 1954. This conference covered the period July 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, and 27.

The House-Senate conference on the vital social-security legislation began August 16 and lasted, without interruption, until August 20.

Mr. Speaker, that is the record of the Ways and Means Committee last session. Our box score for the Congress was 52 bills reported and 41 enacted into law.

During the second session alone, our record was astonishing. The tax-revision bill which, as I have mentioned, the President called the cornerstone of his program was the first major overhaul of the tax system in over 75 years. It has been estimated that some 500,000 man-hours went into its preparation. The social-security bill extended coverage for the first time to about 10 million workers and their families, thus achieving practically universal coverage, a goal sought for many years. The unemployment-insurance bill extended unemployment-compensation protection to millions of workers to whom this coverage had not previously been available. This was the first significant extension of the system since its inception.

It should also be pointed out that on 15 different days during the session the House considered bills reported by the Ways and Means Committee. This is exclusive of debates on conference reports.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when it is apparent that even under Democratic leadership it will take the Ways and Means Committee about 5 weeks to finish its current deliberations on the trade bill, I cannot but wonder how we could have done the job properly last session and have done so sufficiently in advance to permit a similar period of consideration in the Senate. As I pointed out above, it was not until August 20, the very day of adjournment, that work on the social-security bill was completed. In fact, I doubt if ever a committee of this Congress has applied itself so diligently, so tirelessly, and so successfully as did the Ways and Means Committee last session.

When our committee reported the trade-agreements extension bill last June 10, Chairman REED publicly declared:

> This 1-year extension will serve to maintain continuity of our present trade relationships, while, at the same time, permitting the Congress to have thorough public hearings early next year on the recommendations of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy.

That is no more and no less than is being done now.

Mr. Speaker, I do not mind criticism when it is honest and when it is fair. When it is neither, I resent it. I do not believe that even the most partisan Member of this House would charge the Ways and Means Committee with having wasted time last session. However, perhaps I am wrong to expect equal fairness and objectivity from the "independent" newspaper whose editorial I have quoted above.

Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1955

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, the President's request in his message to Congress last week for an increase in the salaries of postal workers provides the Congress with a splendid opportunity to thoroughly review the whole operation of the Postal Department.

Such an audit is urgently required in view of the deficit of over $4 billion that the Department has accumulated since World War II. The interest on this deficit presently amounts to over $100 million annually.

President Eisenhower is to be commended for requesting an increase in postal rates to be coupled with the increase in salaries. Without such an increase in rates, the raise in pay would add an additional one-half billion dollars to the large deficit already accumulated.

I have always opposed Federal deficits, particularly when they occur in agencies conducting proprietary functions of the Government. The Postal Department is a business run by the Federal Government, and as such should pay its own way. That is commonsense and sound economics. The alternative is to subsidize the Department out of general revenues, thereby increasing the already heavy tax burden of the American people.

I support the President's recommendation for the establishment of an independent commission to handle the long-range postage-rate problem. The operation of such a commission will greatly facilitate future equitable adjustment of salaries and rates and enable the Congress to legislate intelligently and effectively. I regret that no such board is now in existence, as expert, unprejudiced opinion at this time would eliminate to a large degree, the necessity for the debate that will surely come on this question.

As I have indicated I support the President's recommendations generally. I disagree, however, as to the desirability of increasing the rates of first-class mail. It traditionally has paid its own way, because of its size and weight, and for the same reason constitutes the lightest burden in the letterman's pouch. It is also true that an increase on this type of mail most directly affects the ordinary citizen. Even a penny increase can become burdensome to the small wage earner when the occasion arises to send out invitations, announcements, and the like. It is my conviction that a rate increase on first-class mail would penalize the ordinary citzen and amount to a subsidy

of the other classes of mail. The classes of mail that cause the deficit should pay the deficit.

I completely endorse rate increases on second- and third-class mail. Second-class mail pays only 22 percent of its allocated cost and in 1954 expenses on this type of mail exceeded revenues by $232 million. Present rates are only 3 percent higher than in 1932, the increases authorized since 1951 having only restored the decreases made in 1934. It is absurd to compel the general taxpayer to subsidize the distribution of magazines, newspapers, periodicals, and similar publications. The distribution costs should be borne by the publisher just as he must pay for his printing, paper, and labor. It is a cost of the business, not a cost of the Government.

All of us are familiar with the advertising circulars and similar printed matter that daily jam our mailboxes. A great deal of this material constitutes a nuisance. Not only do these circulars add greatly to the weight of the letter carrier's pouch, but they also compel him to stop at every mailbox on his route which is ordinarily not necessary. The expense of this type of mail, which is third class, exceeded revenues by $147 million in 1954, which is adding insult to injury.

I agree with the President that increases in pay of postal workers is necessary and long overdue. Obviously rates should also be increased to meet the expenses of the business. The postal workers should support the rate increases on the mail that is most burdensome to the Department, that is, second- and third-class mail. On the principle, the postal workers as citizens and voters, should support and work for rate increases, for neither the Nation nor the Department can continue to operate on a deficit basis. The mounting Federal debt and the crushing tax burden leaves no alternative to a pay-as-you-go method of operation. For the postal employees to recommend any other policy would be selfish and shortsighted. I am sure that they are neither.

Hon. Frances P. Bolton, of Ohio, Proposes Commission on Nursing Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1955

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a joint resolution providing for a Commission on Nursing Services.

For many years my colleagues in the House have known of my deep interest in the overall health needs of the Nation in general, and for nursing services in particular. Since World War II, the public has been told intermittently that there are not sufficient nurses of all kinds to meet the needs of the sick. It is my firm belief that if the public can be fully informed on the problem and significant developments in the nursing profession, the public will be stimulated to action on all levels and will accept with more understanding the increasing costs of nursing care and nursing education.

So today I have asked for this time in order to inform my colleagues why I believe a Commission plan is an imperative step that needs to be taken in order to find a feasible and effective way to solve the problem of adequate care for our sick.

THE PROBLEM

For some time the Nation has been faced with a very real difficulty in securing adequate care of the sick. All across the country there is a shortage of nurses, and this in spite of the fact that there are more nurses on duty today than ever before in our history. Also there are more young women taking nurse training. If we are to believe the studies that have been made—and I can assure you these are authoritative—some 55,000 nurses should be graduated each year to keep up with the ever-increasing demand for trained personnel. Our nursing schools are graduating only about 30,000.

Many things contribute to our present situation, not the least of which is the fact that the public which is now enjoying the highest standard of living in its history is demanding improved nursing services. This same public however, is beginning to recognize the need of making the economic status of the nurse more nearly commensurate with her skills and added responsibilities.

We here in the Congress have added to the problem by providing for more hospitals, rehabilitation facilities, clinics, and nursing homes without doing anything to help staff these health facilities. We all recognize that this construction is necessary, but some way must be found to staff them adequately lest they stand empty as all too many hospital wards already do for lack of nurses. Surely the time has come when we must face up to the problem.

WHAT IS BEING DONE

There is nothing new about all this, for Government at all levels as well as many private institutions, has been grappling with the subject for years.

A recent study showed that the Federal Government this fiscal year is spending some $2 billion annually for its health, medical and related activities, which range from construction of multimillion dollar hospitals to maintenance of clinics. The programs are spread among more than a score of departments and independent agencies. But it is being done without a basic plan to meet the overall needs of the American people.

There have been many segmental studies of health service problems, but none have taken an inclusive national view of the situation. There have been many unilateral studies by separate professional groups in the health field, but none by all the professions, with the public cooperating for the benefit of the patient. It has become apparent that a broader approach is needed.

BOLTON SURVEY, 83D CONGRESS

For several years I have conducted an extensive personal survey of the situation. Nearly 4,000 nurses, doctors, laymen, State governors, Federal and State health authorities, and Members of Congress replied to my letters on this subject. As I told this House last year:

> There is overwhelming accord that there is indeed a nursing shortage. Many opinions are given as to the different causes: financial, psychological, social. The difficulties attendant on securing sufficient new recruits to take nurse training are particularly emphasized, as are low pay, and long and irregular hours. Competition from other fields and within the nursing field itself are emphasized.
>
> Over and above the specific replies there was voiced a deep sense of the need for a large-scale program of informative education to bring about a dramatic realization of the common problem presented by this short supply of trained nursing personnel to all segments of the nursing profession, to all sectors of the health-care field. Today, as the survey dramatically brings out, there are misunderstandings, misconceptions, antagonisms, and areas of disagreement between the various groups involved which must be lessened in the mutual interest of all dedicated to serving the Nation's health.
>
> On such a basis of research and educational information there can be constructed, it seems to me, a sound structure which will ultimately meet not only the needs and desires of the profession, but, even more importantly, the requirements of the ever-increasing population in America as a whole.

WHY A NEW EMPHASIS NEEDED

Up to now efforts to deal with nursing service shortages have been mainly from the standpoint of increasing the number of nurses. The results have been neither effective nor adequate. Perhaps we have been trying to deal with the nursing shortage as an isolated problem, whereas in reality it is interrelated with and inseparable from the changing needs of a modern society. The tremendous advances in the medical sciences have created whole new fields of health workers and have given many new functions to the established health professions. Today, the professional nurse has much more complex a role to play than she had only a few years ago. Many different categories of nurses has developed with many overlapping functions within those categories. We must become aware of the many implications of these changes.

It has become apparent that we should be dealing with the nurse shortage in its true perspective within the entire health field for the benefit of society, that is, the patient. As an example of a few of the areas needing study:

It has become more and more evident that we should be making more effective use of the skills of the limited professional personnel we now have. We should be able to identify the scope of their duties and see that they are adequately prepared to exercise them.

The more exhaustively one studies the whole problem of the needs of patient care, the more one realizes that there is insufficient authoritative knowledge of what the component parts of a nursing staff should be in a general hospital. For example, how many professional nurses, how many practical nurses, how

many auxiliary or volunteer workers could best serve in the various departments of hospitals and of public health associations?

A bringing together of such knowledge as already exists would unquestionably lead to intelligent reorganization of staffs which would improve and safeguard the quality of care given the patient. We need to know something about what the effect upon hospital nursing staffs is of the present trend towards home care of the patient.

Studies have indicated that the time of the professional nurse—time that could better be spent for the more important needs of the patient—is all too frequently used for routine record-keeping, housekeeping, errands for patients, floral arrangements, and so forth. Authoritative knowledge of the value in time and better patient care of methods to relieve the nurse of these would most certainly lead to a wider use by hospitals and nursing homes.

There are many questions that need to be answered, not the least among them: What is the actual economic situation of those who care for the sick? What should be the working hours and the working conditions? Are there no regulations to keep a nurse from lifting more pounds than labor unions permit men to lift? Important matters of this kind.

All such studies and many others should be evaluated and made available to the health field at large so that the patient can receive full benefits of the specialized skills of hospital personnel.

We should know more adequately the areas that could be supplied by less skilled, less highly trained personnel who would, of course, serve under supervision of the professional nurse.

It is quite possible that some part at least of what appears to be a nurse shortage may be due to a failure to adjust educational patterns to the various functional needs of the profession. This, of course, would influence the effectiveness of the use of the professionally trained nurse.

The Commission will be able to evaluate the varying educational and training requirements needed for bedside care, for teaching, for supervisory and administrative positions, for public and community health work.

THE COMMISSION

The proposed legislation seeks to provide a source of authoritative fact and expert opinion about nursing care for the entire field of health service.

It sets up a Commission to be composed of 12 members—4 appointed by the President, 4 by the President of the Senate, and 4 by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Half of each group would be chosen from private life, and include representatives of the nursing and medical professions.

The Commission to be created by this bill is predicated upon comparable bodies which have done successful work, such as the Commission on Reorganization of Government, the Commission on International Trade, and others. The public interest generated through citizens committees studying these problems have brought—indeed, are still bringing—increased understanding of these subjects.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call particular attention to section 1 (b) of the joint resolution, which states:

Nothing in this joint resolution shall be construed as authorizing or intending any interference with the programs of study and improvement of patient care which are being carried forward by the professional nurses' organizations, or by public or private endeavor, but rather this joint resolution shall be construed as an effort to augment such programs through the marshaling of resources for a multidisciplinary approach to the problem.

TYPES OF INFORMATION TO BE GATHERED

Up to now research and writing in the field of nursing have been dependent upon the limited resources of foundations, institutions, professional organizations, or individuals. They have had neither the facilities nor the authority of the National Government behind them, nor have they been able to rally a broad field of specialists representing all of the various groups that impinge on nursing. The Commission's membership will be so organized as to include experts, both men and women, from all the varied services, including representatives from the lay public. Working together as a top-level Commission, these people will:

Evaluate what the changing health needs of the public are.

Appraise the resources in money, manpower, and skills necessary to deal with these health needs.

Study the kind of nurse education and training necessary to meet these needs.

Study the relationship between the economic status of nurses, the professional skills required, and the existing personnel shortage.

Analyze the various techniques and arts of nursing including all successful new methods or devices, and indicate where they may best be applied.

Encourage additions to the body of knowledge of nursing as a discipline and thus permit more of the practice of nursing to be based on scientific principles.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, if the Commission is to serve its purpose, it must not only find the facts, but it should weigh and interpret them. It should draw conclusions and make, first interim reports, and then broad recommendations to the American people. One of the direct results of such reports would be to inform the public of the problems and possible solutions—suggesting concerted public action.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert herewith this joint resolution that the Members may inform themselves at firsthand:

House Joint Resolution —

Joint resolution for the establishment of a Commission on Nursing Services

Whereas it is generally recognized that the demand for nurses is increasing faster than the supply; and

Whereas efforts to deal with the resulting shortage solely by increasing the numbers of nurses have not been successful in meeting the demand; and

Whereas it has become apparent that a solution of the problem must be based upon a broader approach which will take into account all of the factors relating to the more effective utilization of nursing skills in the province of nursing and health care; and

Whereas the relationship between the economic status of nursing, the professional skills required, and the existing personnel shortage needs study; and

Whereas there are many segmental and unilateral studies of health service problems, but none which takes an overall multidisciplinary view of the situation; and

Whereas existing reports, studies, and knowledge could be best coordinated and utilized through the organization of a central task force dealing with the overall health needs of the Nation in general and the need for services of nurses in particular: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc.—

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to promote the health of the American people by aiding the nursing profession in its efforts to achieve greater efficiency and improved nursing services. It is the purpose of this joint resolution to implement that policy by providing for the establishment of a Commission that will gather by scientific methods authoritative data relating to the services rendered by all types of nursing personnel (including professional and practical nurses, nursing aids, and nursing administrators, supervisors, and teachers) and shall make such recommendations with respect thereto as it deems advisable in the interest of improving patient care.

(b) Nothing in this joint resolution shall be construed as authorizing or intending any interference with the programs of study and improvement of patient care which are being carried forward by the professional nurses' organizations, or by public or private endeavor, but rather this joint resolution shall be construed as an effort to augment such programs through the marshaling of resources for a multidisciplinary approach to the problem.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION ON NURSING SERVICES

SEC. 2. (a) To carry out the purpose of this joint resolution there is hereby established a Commission on Nursing Services (hereinafter referred to as the Commission).

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) Number and appointment: The Commission shall be composed of 12 members as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, 2 from the executive branch of the Government and 2 from private life;

(2) Four appointed by the President of the Senate, 2 from the Senate and 2 from private life; and

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, 2 from the House of Representatives and 2 from private life.

(b) Included among the six members of the Commission appointed from private life, there shall be representatives of the nursing and medical professions.

(c) Vacancies: Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 5. Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) Members of Congress: Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members from the executive branch: The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) Members from private life: The members from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. (a) The Commission shall gather by scientific methods authoritative data relating to nursing services of all types, including services performed by professional and practical nurses and nursing aides. In the gathering of such data and the making of such recommendations, the Commission shall give particular attention to the need for considering ways and means to—

(1) clarify further the province of nursing personnel (including professional and practical nurses and nursing aides) with particular reference to the impact upon nursing of the changing functions of the related health professions and the changing health needs and resources of the Nation;

(2) add systematically to the body of knowledge of nursing as a discipline and thus permit more of the practice of nursing to be based on scientific principles;

(3) improve and extend our resources for the education and training of nursing personnel of each type for their appropriate functions; and

(4) encourage more effective organization of nursing personnel and more effective utilization of their skills.

(b) Report: The Commission shall submit to the Congress interim reports at such time or times as the Commission deems necessary and shall submit to the Congress its final report not later than 2 years from the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, at which time the Commission shall cease to exist.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) Hearings and sessions: The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee, or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deemd advisable.

(b) Obtaining official data: The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this joint resolution; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

Extension of Benefits for Members of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1955

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I submit a statement presented by me to the House Committee on Veterans Affairs relative to the extension of educational benefits for members of the Armed Forces beyond the end of the Korean emergency period, which reflects the opinions expressed by many of the veteran organizations and citizens of the First District of Florida as well as my own personal convictions in this matter:

JANUARY 21, 1955.

To: House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, convening January 24, 1955.

Subject: Request to the committee to extend educational benefits for members of the Armed Forces beyond end of Korean emergency period, January 31, 1955.

Under the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 many of those who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States in defense of our Nation and our way of life have, as veterans seeking rehabilitation, received in the form of educational benefits encouragement and some slight compensation for the years that have been taken by military service from the regular pursuits ordinarily required in early life of a good citizen of our country in preparation for home and family. These men who have served have been young men. These men who have been called to the defense of our Nation were taken at a time when great strides would otherwise have been made in their education and growth. It is not fitting that these same benefits for educational opportunity should not accrue to those who are now in service and will be so on the day declared, January 31, 1955, as the end of the Korean emergency period.

I therefore urge that the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs take favorable action on H. R. 587, a bill to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes.

It would be most unfair to discriminate against these men who are now in armed service, having depended, when enlisting, on these and other existing benefits, and with whom at the time of induction the Government of the United States made a moral contract to provide these benefits. To abrogate this contract would place these men at a great disadvantage in our society especially as compared to their predecessors in service and, without these benefits of educational assistance, the morale and rehabilitation ability of a great segment of our citizenry would suffer.

The obligation we have to these men is beyond question and not one that would place an unjust burden upon our Nation. The wise and considered program that has promoted the welfare of our citizens, has contributed to our high standard of living and has, through its basic program of fair education and opportunity to replace the years of loss to our citizens while in service, brought prosperity and the great concept of equal opportunity for all to greater fruition in this land. The educational benefits heretofore provided have shown by the test of time to have been of great advantage to our servicemen—no greater investment can be made than in the education of these youths who have answered the call of their country and, unflinching, stepped forward to face its enemies. Those serving today should not be denied.

I respectfully urge that House Resolution 587 of the 84th Congress be passed by your committee and I shall, upon such passage, support this bill upon the floor of the House.

WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Member of Congress,
First District of Florida.

Reduction in Army Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in view of the acute situation in the Far East, and with its worldwide implications, it seems to me imperative that President Eisenhower should reconsider at once the drastic reduction that he has ordered in the manpower of our Army. At a time when evidence of strength is necessary, weakness in this respect is shown.

The continued reduction in our Army is inconsistent with the strength we must have and show in the face of the Chinese Red aggression in Formosa and elsewhere, and also the insult to our country by the imprisonment of our airmen.

The Democrats in Congress were right in 1953 in opposing the Eisenhower reduction in our Air Force. We are on firm ground now in expressing our deep concern in the sharp reduction in our Armed Forces.

There is no question but what our country is taking a calculated risk in this new and sudden policy. Passage of the resolution should be implemented by evidences of strength. The reduction of our Army is weakness at a time when we need strength.

The only thing the Communists respect is what they fear, and that is military strength and power greater than they possess.

The President should permit military men in active service to express their opinions on this reduction without fear of punishment.

The 1955 Flying Wheels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the 1955 Flying Wheels, all-star wheelchair basketball squad of the Paralyzed Veterans' Association, Long Beach, Calif., Hospital Chapter will arrive in the Nation's Capital this next weekend. They will play the Jersey Wheelers of New York at Bethesda Naval Hospital Sunday night, January 30 at 8 p. m. All Members of Congress are invited to attend and I can personally guarantee an exciting and inspirational evening. Wheelchair basketball always is fully as exciting as the regular game and oftentimes more so.

This marks the ninth annual coast-to-coast nonprofit, noncommercial trip by the Flying Wheels to play the Nation's top-ranking teams and provide inspiration and free entertainment for hospitalized veterans.

All traveling expenses for this tour, and the last 3 years, have been paid by the Los Angeles Evening Herald and Express through the courtesy of David Hearst, publisher, and Vic Dunsmore, business manager. Expenses for the other five coast-to-coast tours were raised by tour director John B. Old, of the sports department of the Herald and Express.

Mr. Old conceived the idea of these tours over 10 years ago and he has directed each one of them. I could not overstate the respect and admiration for Mr. Old held not only by the Flying Wheels, but sportsmen all over the country for his wonderful work over the years on this most worthy of projects.

Paralyzed veterans by definition are fine young Americans who will never walk again. They are paralyzed from the waist down. Most of them are victims of an enemy bullet in the spine; others are victims of polio or tragic accidents. All served their country gallantly.

Many are continuously bedridden. Others find themselves chained to wheelchairs for the rest of their life, compelled to return periodically to VA hospitals for checkups and medical attention.

Their incentive to live is not the same as most people—or so you might reasonably assume. Not so with the courageous members of the Flying Wheels, all-star wheelchair basketball squad of the Long Beach, Calif., Paralyzed Veterans' Association.

They are out to prove to themselves, to their less fortunate bedridden PVA brethren, polio victims everywhere and the world at large that the years to come should not be wasted in self pity or vain regrets sitting on the sidelines of life. They are going to be participants.

The agonies of the soul which all hopelessly crippled young veterans must have suffered can only be imagined. What "gutty guys" like the Flying Wheels are doing today takes more courage, in a way, than they were called on to display against the enemy.

Although their mode of living is limited, they have but one code: "Ability, not disability, counts." Wheelchair basketball is doing much to keep that spirit alive and contagious.

It all started early in World War II at the now discarded Birmingham VA hospital, Van Nuys, Calif. Hunting a way to inspire bed-ridden patients, Bob Rynearson of the recreation department hit upon the idea of wheelchair basketball—played just like able-bodied teams do with only slight variations—such as two pushes on the wheels, while the ball rests on a player's lap, is the equivalent of a dribble.

Occasionally a veteran would wheel down to the gym. On the court self-confidence was bolstered. Returning to his ward, he would brag of his shooting—a direct challenge to ward mates to get out of bed. As the competitive spirit lurks in the heart of every American youth, many accepted. Later more and more. For most of the paraplegics it was their first real inspiration to get out of bed—back into the American competitive way of life if only to beat a bunk mate.

Once on the court they gained physical benefits far and beyond the reach of calisthenics. A new and hopeful mental outlook was born. They bit heavily into the challenge to excel, found they were no longer cognizant of their handicap. Now all wheelchair basketball players love crowds—especially when backward fellows with similar handicaps are watching. Their brilliant court play is inspiring proof positive: Ability, not disability, counts.

Because of its proven value, wheelchair basketball is now played wherever PVA groups assemble. Unfortunately for the southern California group, there is no other VA paraplegic center west of Kansas City. Hence these annual coast-to-coast nonprofit, noncommercial tours. The Flying Wheels want to meet and beat the best wheelchair teams in the country.

During this tour, in addition to the Bethesda game, they have or will play teams at Tulsa, Chattanooga, Richmond, New York City, Chicago, Kansas City, and Amarillo.

In 8 coast-to-coast wheelchair basketball tours, the Flying Wheels have amassed the creditable record of 50 games won, 22 lost, in 72 intersectional engagements. They have averaged 33 points per game—a remarkably high percentage for a free-wheeling outfit.

Their best years were in 1948, 1950, and 1953. In the 1948 campaign they won 12, lost 1, to be named national wheelchair basketball champions by the Melms Athletic Foundation of California. In the 1950 trip, they compiled a 10 won, 1 lost record to regain the national title.

In 1953 they won 9, lost but 1 game, in their annual tour, that one by 2 points. Two months later the Flying Wheels competed in the national championships at New York City. They were eliminated after winning one championship game by Kansas City, who went on to capture the 1953 crown.

An excerpt from Veterans Administration Technical Bulletin TB 10–503, page 36, paragraph 5, reveals:

> The importance of competitive games for physical and psychological rehabilitation of paraplegics must not be forgotten. These games maintain the musculature in good condition, improve coordination and put to severe test the paraplegic's ability to balance as in a fast basketball game conducted from wheelchairs.
>
> The mental goal achieved by such competition is a loss of self-consciousness and a gain of self-reliance.
>
> It is medically desirable that tournaments be regularly arranged between the several paraplegic centers in the Veterans' Administration.

Dr. Ernest Bors, medical chief, paraplegic section, Long Beach Veterans' Hospital, observes:

> Having witnessed the very beginning of the athletic rehabilitation of paraplegic patients, I am impressed with the beneficial effect wheelchair basketball has on the morale and on the physical well-being of the paralyzed veterans.
>
> Sucessful rehabilitation of the severely disabled person is contingent upon the mental approach. It is evident that the self-consciousness of patients, who are bound to use a wheelchair, has been greatly relieved by competitive performances before spectators. Good muscle function, so vital to the patient with a spinal cord injury, is obtained through participation in wheelchair basketball.
>
> The patient's desire to play wheelchair basketball makes his mental and physical rehabilitation a voluntary pleasure.

The Flying Wheels squad roster for 1955 is as follows:

Number	Name	Position	Service	Age
3	Jack Chase	Forward	Army Signal Corps	27
14	Gilbert Ortiz	do	Army	23
13	Al Halverson	Guard	do	29
6	Morris Moorhead	Forward	Sergeant, Marines	27
7	Fritz Krauth	do	Navy Air Force	27
8	Wally Frost	Guard	Army	29
10	Bill Fairbanks	Forward	(Equipment manager)	19
11	Lee Barr	Guard	Army	28
12	Norman Harris	Center	do	27
4	Arthur Jurado	Guard	Lieutenant, Air Force	31
16	Arthur Eakes	Center	Army	27
20	Walter Haley	Forward	Navy	30

The 1955 Flying Wheels able-bodied personnel on the tour are: Coach, Everett Sylwanowicz, Long Beach VA Hospital; physician, Dr. John F. Fahey, Los Angeles; trainer, Dave Flores, Los Angeles Baseball Club; publicity director, Sam Schnitzer, Los Angeles Examiner; tour aid, Jack Disney, Los Angeles Herald-Express; Stewart Air Service pilots, Capt. Ed Stewart and Jim Gregory; tour director, John B. Old, Los Angeles Herald-Express.

The Formosa Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to make clear my position on House Joint Resolution 159.

The President has asked that the Congress join the administration in affirming the readiness of the American people to fight, if necessary, to prevent the invasion of Formosa. Since we have the ability to defend Formosa, and since it is important that Formosa's 10 million human beings and its strategic real estate do not fall into Communist hands, I support the resolution.

But I would be happier if the President, who has moved with admirable speed so far as Congress is concerned, had taken equally speedy steps to invoke the United Nations as the shield behind which the forces of the free world may rally.

The President's message recognized that the security of Formosa is properly a matter for the United Nations, and says, "We would welcome assumption of such jurisdiction by that body." But the administration has so far failed to place the Formosa question before the United Nations.

The President, in yesterday's message, has shown that he knows how to invoke the jurisdiction, such as it is, of the Congress. There is, in fact, a much more precisely established method of invoking the jurisdiction of the United Nations. Under the uniting-for-peace resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on November 3, 1950:

If the Security Council, because of lack of unanimity of the permanent members, fails to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in any case where there appears to be a threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression, the General Assembly shall consider the matter immediately with a view to making appropriate recommendations to members for collective measures, including in the case of a breach of the peace or act of aggression the use of armed force when necessary, to maintain or restore international peace and security. If not in session at the time, the General Assembly may meet in emergency special session within 24 hours of the request therefor. Such emergency special session shall be called if requested by the Security Council on the vote of any seven members, or by a majority of the members of the United Nations.

The prerequisites of General Assembly jurisdiction have been satisfied. That there is a threat to the peace, the President's message abundantly establishes. That the Security Council, because of the U. S. S. R.'s intransigence, is failing to exercise its responsibility to secure Formosa against aggression is equally apparent. Although the General Assembly is not now in session, an emergency special session may be called on 24 hours' notice.

Under the uniting-for-peace procedure of the United Nations, the General Assembly may recommend to members exactly the kind of action designed to resist aggression which the President has asked that he be empowered to undertake on behalf of this country. It may call for a cease-fire, or ask its members to meet aggression with armed resistance.

To fail to take steps to use the uniting-for-peace procedure lays us open to the charge that we are trying to go it alone. So long as we let the uniting-for-peace procedure lie dormant, we are not doing our best to marshal the forces of the free world to our side.

Revere Memorial Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address which I delivered at the eighth annual banquet of Revere Memorial Hospital:

There was a time when we used to think of a hospital as some sort of an elaborate garage for human beings, where they went for overhaul and repairs.

It never occurred to us that we might ever need such care and treatment.

And so the burden of supporting our hospitals was unfairly placed upon the shoulders of a few.

However, a great and necessary change in the attitude of the American people has taken place within the last 20 years.

The depression of the 1930's turned out to be a shock treatment in disguise.

We were jolted out of our indifference to economic problems.

In the quest for material security we also became aware of the need for taking better care of our health.

We came to understand that these were matters of group concern and that the responsibility for solving these problems must be shared.

Churches, schools, and hospitals are basic to the life of any community. They are entitled to the widest possible measure of support from all who live in the community.

Churches are exempt from taxation. Schools are maintained from public revenues or private funds. So are the many types of hospitals. Although Government aids in various ways, it is the people by their own voluntary efforts who maintain these institutions—in the spirit of the Good Samaritan.

We in Massachusetts take great pride in the fact that Metropolitan Boston has developed into one of the world's great medical centers. This could not have happened without public confidence and cooperation.

Six years after the establishment of the first English colony in America, Samuel Puchas noted in 1613 that: "Beyond James Towne * * * they were building a hospital with fourscore lodgings, and beds already sent." A little over a century later in 1718, the public records of Boston show that the selectmen were impowered "to lease out a piece of land * * * for the erecting of a hospital or resthouse there for the reception and entertainment of sick persons coming from beyond the sea, and in order to prevent the spreading of infection."

We are not quite so blunt today in our language. Even though an occasional patient, nurse, or doctor may seem to be somewhat of a pest to others, human nature being what it is, we regard hospitals as temples that are truly devoted to the healing arts.

The use of the word "hospital" in this country, early combined the Latin "host" and "hostel" with the Grecian concept of a community institution. Larger than the more general meaning in England, where the terms "private hospital" and "nursing home" were usually limited to specialized institutions.

Among the most influential founders of American medicine and medical care were two Massachusetts brothers, Joseph and John Warren, who were largely responsible both for the development of our first military hospital in 1775, and for the medical school at Harvard. Joseph Warren, who had pioneered in medical studies, was killed during the battle of Bunker Hill, but his younger brother, John, carried forward his work by arranging for shelters for the wounded at Cambridge. The Army hospital, located in a Boston pasture, served as well to house John Warren's lectures on the cadaver; sessions which were conducted behind locked doors. But this early course in anatomy could not remain hidden and, after having been carried on sub rosa, it moved to Harvard College and formed the beginning for the medical school, with John Warren as the first professor of anatomy and surgery. His son, John Collins Warren, who succeeded to his chair, set the stage for modern surgery by founding the Massachusetts General Hospital (1811) where in 1846, he gave anesthesia its first public demonstration.

Today, hospitals in America rank among the 12 largest American industries, representing an investment of billions of dollars, employing more than half a million people, and operating at a cost of more than a billion dollars a year.

Within the past 10 years the demand for hospital care has increased over half again.

Just look at the record of births in your own city and you will find that most new arrivals now come via the hospital route rather than the home.

Workmen's compensation laws, and the rapid expansion of group-insurance plans, with their tens of millions of members, have both extended the range of hospital care, and have made it simpler for the institutions to obtain prompt payment of bills. The facts that people are living longer, and that diseases of old age are increasing, have further added to the need for more facilities.

Each year we are providing more hospital beds, but the demand continues to outrun the supply.

The day is fast approaching when all Americans will not only be born in hospitals but will have occasion to revisit them as patients several times during the rest of their lives.

It is generally agreed that the average community needs 4½ general beds for every 1,000 inhabitants.

This is not just a simple matter of buying a bed from a supply house. There is the building to pay for and maintain, there is costly equipment to purchase, and there are many skilled people to serve the patient who will occupy that bed.

The United States Public Health Service estimates that the national average cost of a hospital bed is more than $16,000.

Staffing a hospital is a big proposition.

It is generally considered that a community should have 1 general medical practitioner for every 1,200 persons. A mythical town of 70,000 should have at least 58 GP's. It needs specialists, too; 1 surgeon for every 50 beds in the hospital; 1 eye-ear-nose-and-throat man for every 100 beds, plus other experts.

As for nonmedical personnel, the PHS recommends from 140 to 170 employees for every 100 patients. That breaks down to 80 to 105 nurses, 30 X-ray, laboratory, and dietetics people, and about 35 clerks and housekeepers.

So you can see that each bed requires a lot of money to service.

If one thing is certain, it is the fact that your community hospital will not be able to pay its own way completely. Revenue from patients, most sources agree, will only finance 85 to 90 percent of operating costs.

That is why hospitals need your help to keep going.

Nonpatients must carry part of the load.

There are almost as many ways of financing a hospital as there are hospitals. Raising funds through public subscription requires the time and generous effort on the part of many people as you know from your own experience. A combination of private funds and public grants might be the better answer.

Even hospital buildings have a life expectancy of about 50 years and they, too, need oxygen and transfusions, in the form of money, to keep them up to date and functioning.

Not to mention the income of the staff, which must keep step with the rising standard and cost of living, if these dedicated workers are to be truly appreciated.

Many States are assisting communities with their hospital programs. Some match local contributions dollar for dollar. Others make smaller but still sizable grants.

The nationwide need for new hospitals and public health centers was recognized by the Congress in 1946 when the original Hospital Survey and Construction Act was passed. The major purpose of this legislation is to assist the States to provide adequate hospital, clinic, and similar services to all their people.

This is accomplished in two phases; namely, the survey and planning phase, and the construction phase of financial assistance to the States in building hospital and related facilities.

For the construction phase of the program, the Congress has, thus far, appropriated over $682 million. Of this sum, over $625 million, matched by $1¼ billion in State and local funds, have been allotted to 2,300 projects approved for Federal aid.

The American Hospital Association, in its June 1954 Administrators Guide Issue, reports that there are 5,212 short-term general hospitals in the United States, providing 546,000 general hospital beds.

In the New England States alone there are 242 voluntary, nonprofit institutions with 31,000 beds; 17 proprietary, with 523 beds; 31 governmental, with 5,661 beds.

It is apparent that, in our part of the country, the backbone of the system is comprised of the voluntary, nonprofit hospital group.

The summary data on the program in Massachusetts indicates that 64 projects have been approved and are receiving Federal assistance. Of particular interest is the fact that of these projects approved under the program, 52 of these, or 81.2 percent of the total projects were in the voluntary, nonprofit ownership group.

I shall not go into the financial figures of your fund-raising campaign, because I know that mathematics is a dry subject that has some of the effects of anesthesia.

Now if we only had some figures like Marilyn Monroe—or some of your own attractive nurses—to dramatize the problems of our hospitals, I am sure that everybody would take a lively interest in those problems.

As it is, you the workers, and you the donors, have done a fine job in rallying to the support of the Revere Memorial Hospital.

Concerning the future, I think we must have a big and continuing public relations program in order to make everybody hospital conscious.

For the health of the individual and the well-being of the community it is necessary that hospitals should be free from financial worries.

A popular song a few years ago bemoaned the fact that "money is the root of all evil." I believe that the author of those lyrics did not refuse to accept some of the money that came his way as a result of his efforts.

Hard-pressed hospital administrators and trustees know how indispensable money is—to buy and maintain facilities, improve on equipment, and pay for the services of those who attend to the sick.

Without you, the benefactors, a community hospital might not survive.

Even though you do not wear a nurse's uniform, or apply a doctor's stethoscope, or take a blood count in the laboratory, you make all these services available to your fellowmen.

In behalf of the Revere Memorial Hospital—even though, as a Congressmen, I wouldn't be of much use on its staff—permit me to thank you for your neighborly spirit and your generosity.

Kind hearts and gentle people are the unsung heroes on the road of life.

And you, the contributors to your community's hospital, are angels of mercy.

Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the 37th anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence by the people of that country took place on January 22.

The history of the Ukraine contains many chapters on their struggle for freedom and independence which they more recently realized during the years 1917 to 1920.

Today this Nation, composed of 40 million people, is behind the Iron Curtain under Communist domination, but in their hearts and minds these people continue their centuries-old struggle to regain their freedom.

The free people of the world are aware of the great courage which this country has displayed in its opposition to Communist oppression and we in the United States will give every possible assistance to restoring freedom in the Ukraine so that these people may realize a cherished dream—permanent peace.

Commemoration of Second Anniversary of Inauguration of President Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1955

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, the second anniversary of the inauguration of President Eisenhower was commemorated by a reception at the Capitol Hill Club on January 20, 1955. On that occasion the members and their guests listened to a few remarks from that great Republican, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., and a letter was received and read from the President of the United States. This letter is an inspiration to all Americans, and I hope it will be read thoughtfully by many of our citizens.

Mr. MARTIN's remarks and the President's letter follow:

Fellow Republicans—I guess it is safe to say that here—as I look around; and I am happy to come and join in this anniversary celebration. It is a good thing to have a club like this where we can gather occasionally and become better acquainted. We belong to a great party. We belong to a party that not only the destinies of America, but the world are largely dependent upon to guide them safely. We are happy to have this organization where we can meet and organize to carry on that great work.

We are 2 years old, and knowing JIM AUCHINCLOSS as I do, the energy and zeal and the time he puts into this club, I know that before a few years pass, this will be a club that we will all be genuinely proud of. And we want to have it, too, as part of our plans for 1956. We had a little setback last year, but it is only a slight setback. Next year will be another year.

We can win in 1956. I know that. I have been all over the country and sounded out the sentiment. Last fall I spoke in 23 States. There is no discouragement to be found for Republicans when they visit the other States of this Union. The people are all active and loyal. None are discouraged. What they are looking for is for us here in Washington to make a record so they can go out and win this victory in 1956. This is a must. We can do it by meetings like this, as we come here and talk over our plans with each other, and we arrange what we believe is going to be a great victory in 1956.

The program of this administration, in my judgment, will be a sound and forward-looking one. It will appeal to the large majority of our people if we can bring our message to the country. I am happy to join in this celebration, because I know this club can be helpful to the party. This meeting stimulates the interest which must be aroused to win the great victory in 1956.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 18, 1955.

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: Because it would be a great pleasure for both of us, Mrs. Eisenhower and I are disappointed that we cannot be at the

Capitol Hill Club on January 20 for the inaugural anniversary. For me, personally, the occasion would be an opportunity to discuss with my fellow members some thoughts that I feel are of interest to us all. But—at the risk of mixing a message of regret with a dissertation—I venture, in this note, to suggest a few of them.

This Administration is committed to a program of progressive moderation, liberal in its human concerns, conservative in its economic proposals, constructively dynamic and optimistic in its appraisal of the future. This program, I firmly believe, merits the endorsement and support of thinking, confident, forward-looking Americans.

For our country and the world, we seek establishment of international relationships characterized by order and justice, in which reason and truth are respected, under which men can live as neighbors at peace. Within the United Nations and in all our pacts for mutual security, our treaties of alliance, our proposals for trade, that purpose inspires our foreign policy.

For our national economy, we seek a dependable stability in our present assets, a vigorous expansion in our future growth. These can be best achieved, we believe, by giving the private citizen the greatest possible opportunity—consistent with the rights of others—to contribute to the development of the economy and to share in its abundance.

For individual Americans, we seek increase in their opportunity to enjoy good health, good schools, good homes; we seek a lessening in their fear of personal disaster and in the impact of hardships beyond their control. In this endeavor, we reject Federal domination over state and community, for we seek to strengthen—not to weaken—the historic self-reliance of our people.

The principles and purposes, sketchily outlined here, must be, in my judgment, the standard of the Republican Party through the coming months. Committed to them, we can and must work together to advance the legislative program now before the 84th Congress, for this program is their legislative expression.

Thereby we shall serve our Party and the Republic. We shall draw to our ranks men and women of action and wisdom who, in prayerful thought and dedicated effort, strive for an America worthy of their forebears' dream and fit for their children's living. Together—all of us—we shall achieve it.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Liberty Versus License

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio broadcast I delivered over WMEX, Boston, Mass., Saturday, October 16, 1954, 7:30 to 7:45 p. m.:

There is enough trouble and excitement in the world today, without overstimulating our young people via comic strips that have ceased to be funny.

By and large, this industry has much to its credit. A minority who pander to the passions of the young are bringing about a public demand to clean house.

Liberty is no excuse for license.

It means freedom with self-control, the obligation to maintain decent standards, and the responsibility of setting the right example for impressionable youngsters.

Both the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives have thoroughly investigated this problem. While they have clearly and repeatedly emphasized that they are not interested in Government censorship, they are trying to bring about an improvement through self-regulation.

There are three comics published which do not feature crime and horror to one that does, but it is that one-quarter of the output that does the damage.

No less an authority than J. Edgar Hoover, Director, FBI, has warned of the tremendous impact that undesirable literature has on the juvenile mind. He has said in part that "Crime books, comics, and other stories packed with criminal activity and presented in such a way as to glorify crime and the criminal may be dangerous, particularly in the hands of an unstable child.

"A comic book which is replete with the lurid and the macabre; which places the criminal in a unique position by making him a hero; which makes lawlessness attractive; which ridicules decency and honesty; which leaves the impression that graft and corruption are necessary evils in American life; which depicts the life of a criminal as exciting and glamorous may influence the susceptible boy or girl who already possesses definite antisocial tendencies.

"While comic books which are unrealistic in that they tend to produce fantastic pictures of violence, brutality, and torture may have no effect on the emotionally well-balanced boy or girl, nevertheless they may serve as the springboard for the unstable child to commit criminal acts.

"On the other hand, those comic books which are restrained in presentation, which conform to carefully prescribed standards of good taste and authenticity, and which teach a true lesson that crime does not pay, have a real educational value."

So says FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover.

A witness before the House committee asked this question: "Shall we permit a few greedy publishers to exercise control of a harmful nature over the children of the Nation? The comic-book and picture-strip technique is a highly popular one. The enormous volume of trade—some 50 million sold each month—stresses its popularity. Shall this fertile field of instruction, citizenship, and conduct be allowed to spread in cancer fashion throughout the land with lurid, bloody, sadistic, and immoral attitudes? Or shall it be controlled into channels for the betterment as well as the enjoyment of children?"

It is a well-known fact that youngsters are imitative. That is part of the learning process. The schools bring to their attention the product of the best minds of all time. Unfortunately this is offset by other reading, seeing, or hearing in the child's experience outside of school.

Children identify themselves with the characters—good and bad—that they find in the comic strips. They put themselves into the position of the hero, the heroine, or the villain. Since most children have a hard time with reading in their earlier years, picture representation clears the way for them to understand what is going on. The classroom is at a disadvantage with the comic book in this respect. Without going into details I can think offhand of several cases where youngsters injured or killed themselves reenacting violent scenes that have been portrayed for them through visual means of communication.

The committee found that only a small percentage of the so-called comic books dealt with comedy or mirthful subjects. The great majority are about crime, violence, horror, romance, supermen, mystery, adventure, and westerns. They do not teach children to think straight. They glorify crime, make a mockery of democratic living and respect for law and order. They make lawlessness attractive and ridicule decency and honesty. They show children how to make weapons and how to inflict injuries with those weapons. One comic actually printed charts of the human body indicating the exact positions of the points and areas most vulnerable to physical assault, and told just how to attack those points and areas most effectively.

The field of comics is one which perhaps more children and a certain type of adults find reading entertainment and relaxation than in any other. Their astonishing circulation far surpasses that of all books, magazines, and periodicals combined, and is exceeded only by that of daily newspapers.

Several years ago the Kefauver Crime Investigating Committee reported that crime comics are believed to have a corrosive effect on the mind of the child, and that they encourage delinquency.

The New York Joint Legislative Committee To Study the Publication of Comics conducted an exhaustive study and produced a comprehensive report on the comic-book situation in 1951. The committee's recommendations have greater pertinence today as the problem is approaching a showdown—nationwide.

Here, condensed, are some of the finding of that committee:

1. The entire comic-book industry is remiss in its failure to institute effective measures to police and restrain the undesirable minority of stubborn, willful, irresponsible publishers of comics whose brazen disregard for anything but their profits is responsible for the bad reputation of the publishers of all comics.

2. Comics are a most effective medium for the dissemination of ideas, and when such a medium is used to disseminate bad ideas which may leave deep impressions on the keen minds of children, the unrestricted publication and distribution of comics becomes a matter of grave public concern.

3. Comics which depict crime, brutality, horror, and which produce race hatred, impair the ethical development of children, and those which describe how to make weapons and how to inflict injuries with these weapons, and how to commit crimes, have a wide circulation among children.

4. The New York State Joint Legislative Committee states flatly as follows: Crime comics are a contributing factor leading to juvenile delinquency.

5. Instead of reforming, publishers of bad crime comics have banded together, employed resourceful legal and public relations counsel, and so-called educators and experts, in a deliberate effort to continue such harmful practices, and to fight any and every effort to arrest or control such practices.

6. The reading of crime comics stimulates sadistic attitudes, and interferes with the normal development of sexual habits in children, and produces abnormal sexual tendencies in adolescents.

The mutations that have been brought about in the name of "comics" by profit-minded publishers are well illustrated by books classified in the trade under the strange designation "war horror comics."

The entire output of one such promoter was officially banned from distribution among United States Navy personnel because some of the contents were deemed contrary to the best interests of our country. It was charged that their objectionable features might be the work of a genuine pacifist organization, but that they were much more likely the subversive efforts of Communists.

Of late, the Association of Comics Magazine Publishers is trying to clean its own house.

But not all comic-book publishers are members of the association.

The constantly increasing volume of nationwide protest is reflected in many ways, among which is the amount of unsold salacious material returned by dealers to the distributors, in some instances running as high as 40 percent which is believed due, at least in part, to local protests; by communications received from an ever-increasing number of groups from various parts of the United States urging Congress to clean up the newsstands; by protests against the distribution of obscene literature of all kinds; by the activities of religious groups of all denominations; by greater diligence on the part of the police as a result of aroused public opinion; and by the increased activity of all prosecuting agencies, both Federal and State.

Complaints have been received from men in our Armed Forces protesting against the infiltration of pornographic and otherwise objectionable literature there, but lack of time, facilities, and funds, have prevented the investigating committee of the United States House of Representatives from inquiring fully into that situation.

Purveyors of pornographic books, pictures, and the like, frequently attempt to justify their activities by citing the constitutional guaranty of freedom of speech and of the press; but being granted and guaranteed freedom by no means includes license. It is the attempted transformation of liberty into license for profit which is arousing the indignant public.

Publishers of comic books must learn that freedom implies responsibility.

And that innocent children also have the right to be protected from the character-destroying glorification of crime and sex.

Anniversary of the Proclamation of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the observance of the anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence, I am at this time inserting in the RECORD a letter I wrote to the president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., Mr. Lev E. Dobriansky:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 24, 1955.

Mr. LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
President, Ukranian Congress Committee of America, Inc., Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOBRIANSKY: Thank you for your letter of January 18, 1955, suggesting that I put some comments into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in observance of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence which occurred January 22, 1918. I shall be happy to do so. I think you have struck a basic note when you point out that all this talk of coexistence leaves many wondering whether the plight of the enslaved people behind the Iron Curtain is to be forgotten. I am satisfied their plight has not been forgotten by the people of our great country, but I am afraid that sometimes it is necessary to remind the leaders of our people that there still exists in the breasts of our people the burning fire that produced the original immigrations to this country, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, the stirring speeches of Patrick Henry and other great patriots. This warmth in the breasts of the American people goes out to all the enslaved people of the world wherever they may be. Though we may not immediately share this warmth with our brothers, it is important that they realize the fire is there and that the time will soon come when tyranny has run its course and they shall again enjoy freedom.

I for one can never talk in terms of peace as long as injustice exists. In fact, true peace only comes through attaining freedom and justice. May our countrymen never forget the heritage which is theirs and always keep in mind the necessity for assisting at all times any peoples or persons struggling for the freedom and justice which was given to us through the blood of our forebearers.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

Radio Report by Hon. George S. Long to Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1955

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over station KALB, Alexandria, La.:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, this is your Congressman GEORGE S. LONG speaking to you from Washington, D. C., by tape recording.

A great deal of discussion has been had through the newspapers and by various individuals regarding the salary raise just voted to the Congressmen, Senators, and Federal judges. Inasmuch as it concerns me, your Congressman, I shall devote a brief part of this talk to discussing this subject. In the first place, this is the first salary raise that the Congress has had for many, many years. Like all others, the Congressmen's expenses have increased year by year. I have been in Congress now for almost 3 years and on the present salary have not been able to save $1. To the contrary, I have used money derived from other sources to help bolster my expenses in order that I might stay in Congress and represent you.

Briefly, may I say that I have to keep 2 homes—1 in the district and 1 in Washington. While I do not entertain a great deal, I do entertain some of those coming to Washington on business. I felt that a salary raise was due; I voted for it honestly. I have only this to say to my constituents. You have 2 years now in which to watch my work and see if you think I am worth the salary I am receiving.

At the end of 2 years, if you do not feel I am worth the money, then this will afford you the opportunity to select a man who is. May I say with all candor that you do not need a cheap man in Congress. You need one who is worth the salary he will receive and if I am not that man, I shall find no fault with you should you elect someone else to serve in my stead.

On Thursday, February 24, the United States House of Representatives was again considering legislation designed to provide tax relief for our taxpayers. The bill, H. R. 4259, was sponsored by the Democrats and, unlike last year's Republican-sponsored bill which gave relief only to the favored wealthy, this bill will provide, among other things, a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption. It goes right home to the individual taxpayer whether he be wealthy or poor.

I recall that last year I tried to get the tax exemption for each individual raised from the $600 allowed to $1,000. This was blocked, and the figure was lowered to $900. This, too, failed and an exemption of $700 was sought. The Republicans opposed even that small relief for our taxpayers and the bill they forced through Congress bypassed the little man completely.

That bill, H. R. 8300, can be explained this way. In our area in Louisiana we have a lot of people who work with their hands and who earn $3,000 and less. Take a man with a family who earns $3,500 farming. He works with his hands 12 months in the year. His wife works, and all of his children work. They make $3,500 in 12 months—if they are lucky. His tax under this bill approximately is $60. But take the man who uses 12 minutes of his time, instead of 12 months. A man who clips bond coupons in the amount of $3,500—his tax is in the neighborhood of $20. Now have you helped the little man or have you helped the big man? Those are the facts.

Last year's tax bill contained 875 pages. On every page you find help for the big taxpayer. On every page he turns, he finds a golden nugget which takes care of him. But for the little fellow in the low brackets you might just as well send him a Sears Roebuck catalog, which would do him more good than this bill, H. R. 8300, did for him. Republicans say that this $20 tax reduction will not do anyone any good and that it is a phony. A $20 bill, my friends, is never a phony. You will find that one $20 bill will buy just as much food for empty stomachs as another. Twenty dollars is $20 in anybody's language. This is not just $20 to the taxpayer. His wife gets $20 and each of the children get $20. A family of 5 get $100.

The Republicans say this is politics. You bet this is politics. H. R. 8300 was politics. That was Republican politics and it did not help the little man in this Nation. But now this is politics, too—this is Democratic politics that believes in filling the stomachs of the hungry people of America. While I admit that $20 is very small, it goes to every man, woman, and dependent in this great Nation of ours. This will bolster the economy of this country and will put purchasing power in the hands of the people. This is an extra $20 that all of us will have to spend. We do not hesitate to give relief to other nations when they are in need. Then why in all good reason should we not give relief at home? Let me repeat, the only thing wrong with this tax cut, it is not enough.

I was very pleased when this tax-relief bill passed the House on Friday, February 25, despite the opposition of the Republicans. I am pleased because it is a definite step in the right direction. While small, it begins the journey which I hope will lead us to greater tax relief.

In my humble opinion, we must have relief from the burdensome taxes we are now paying. This small cut that we are making now could be easily cared for by just a little of the money being curtailed that we are giving to the foreign-aid program.

Thank you for allowing me the privilege of coming into your home, and may God bless you.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 26, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in a day of tribulation Thou hast called us to dedicate our little lives to vast and vital causes.

In Thy providence it is ours to act our part in momentous days when it can be solemnly said:

"Once to every man and nation
Comes the moment to decide,
In the strife of truth with falsehood,
For the good or evil side."

We thank Thee that in such a day America is privileged to pledge her utmost that government by and for the people shall not be replaced by the shackles of tyrants, who disdain human dignity and whose ruling passion is to seize the reins of power for their own evil designs.

We humbly pray for the assurance that we are on Thy side. To this end keep our motives clean, our appraisals just, our conscience unbetrayed, as together, with fixed purpose of heart and in Thy might unafraid, we march to meet whatever awaits as in the name of the God of truth and freedom we set up our banner. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., January 26, 1955.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. PRICE DANIEL, a Senator from the State of Texas, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. DANIEL thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 24, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 159) authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories in that area, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3) favoring temporary permission for parking on square 723 of the Capitol Grounds.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of January 24, 1955,

Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, and the protocol thereto signed at Manila on September 8, 1954 (Ex. K, 83d Cong., 2d sess.), reported it favorably on January 25, 1955, and submitted a report (Ex. Rept. No. 1) thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for an indefinite period, because of illness.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONVENTION WITH CANADA ON GREAT LAKES FISHERIES—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate Executive B, 84th Congress, 1st session, a convention on Great Lakes fisheries between the United States of America and Canada, signed at Washington on September 10, 1954. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy is removed from the convention, and the convention, together with the President's message, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the message from the President will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a convention on Great Lakes fisheries between the United States of America and Canada, signed at Washington on September 10, 1954.

Upon submission of the present convention to the Senate, I desire to withdraw from the consideration of the Senate the Great Lakes Fisheries Convention signed at Washington on April 2, 1946 and submitted to the Senate on April 22, 1946 (Senate Executive C, 79th Cong., 2d sess.).

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the convention signed on September 10, 1954.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
January 26, 1955.

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries, signed at Washington September 10, 1954.)

BOARD OF VISITORS TO MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I have appointed the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO COAST GUARD ACADEMY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I announce I have reappointed the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and appointed the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be a morning hour, and I ask unanimous consent that any statements made in connection with the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and other routine business, be limited to 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES TOMORROW

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I desire to announce to the Members of the Senate that arrangements have been made for a joint meeting of the two Houses on Thursday, January 27, 1955, at 12:30 p. m., for the purpose of receiving the President of the Republic of Haiti, His Excellency Paul Magloire.

After a quorum call, which will be had about 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, the Senate will proceed in a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AUTHORIZATION FOR FEDERAL LAND BANKS TO PURCHASE CERTAIN REMAINING ASSETS OF FEDERAL FARM MORTGAGE CORPORATION

A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan

Act, as amended, to authorize the Federal land banks to purchase certain remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 5221 OF REVISED STATUTES RELATING TO VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION OF NATIONAL BANKS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 5221 of the Revised Statutes, relating to voluntary liquidation of national banks (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF RUBBER PRODUCING FACILITIES DISPOSAL COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman and members of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, dated January 1955, together with a supplement thereto (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF FEDERAL FACILITIES CORPORATION ON GOVERNMENT-OWNED RUBBER PRODUCING FACILITIES

A letter from the Chairman, Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, Report No. 8, prepared by the Federal Facilities Corporation, with respect to its expenditures for repairs, replacements, additions, improvements, or maintenance of the Government-owned rubber producing facilities during the 5-month period for fiscal year 1955, ended November 30, 1954 (with accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN SERVICE ACT OF 1946, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the third report on the extent and disposition of United States contributions to international organizations, for the fiscal year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDING SECTION 1 OF ACT OF MARCH 12, 1914

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1 of the act of March 12, 1914 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LEASING OF RESTRICTED INDIAN LANDS REQUIRING THE GRANT OF LONG-TERM LEASES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TRANSMISSION OF CERTAIN GAMBLING INFORMATION IN INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE BY COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prohibit the transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce by communication facilities (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REGISTRATION OF CERTAIN PERSONS TRAINED IN ESPIONAGE, COUNTERESPIONAGE, OR SABOTAGE SERVICE OR TACTICS OF A FOREIGN GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to require the registration of certain persons who have knowledge of or have received instruction or assignment in the espionage, counterespionage, or sabotage service or tactics of a foreign government or foreign political party, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RATES OF BASIC SALARIES OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES IN THE POSTAL FIELD SERVICE

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

READJUSTMENT OF POSTAL RATES AND ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION ON POSTAL RATES

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to readjust postal rates; establish a Commission on Postal Rates; and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation increasing the personal income-tax exemptions

"Whereas it is estimated that approximately 80 percent of Rhode Island's industrial workers are engaged in either directly producing goods for the consumer market, or producing materials or parts for consumer goods; and

"Whereas Rhode Island's goods are sold in a national market, and therefor the prosperity of Rhode Island business and industry and high levels of earnings and employment depend on a sustained and rising level of consumer purchasing power throughout the Nation; and

"Whereas extensive unemployment has resulted from the fact that the Nation's productive capacity exceeds present levels of consumption; and

"Whereas it is essential to a more prosperous Rhode Island and a more prosperous Nation that national purchasing power be increased; and

"Whereas such an increase in purchasing power would be most effective and beneficial to the lower-income groups who must spend the highest proportion of their income: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation increasing the personal income-tax exemptions; and be it further

"Resolved, That attention of the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States is respectfully called to these facts and that each is requested to use his best efforts in this behalf; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to transmit to the respective Presiding Officers of both branches of Congress and to the Senators and Representatives from the State of Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States duly certified copies of this resolution."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 5

"Relative to memorializing the President and Congress to have the Mammoth Pass Road in California constructed as a national defense highway.

"Whereas the National Government is maintaining a naval ammunition depot at Hawthorne, Nev., for national defense; and

"Whereas the National Government has assisted in the construction of a national highway from the Mexican border to the Canadian line, known as United States Highway No. 395; and

"Whereas the United States Highway No. 395 connects with various other highways leading to other portions of California; and

"Whereas the central portions of California, namely San Joaquin and Santa Clara Valleys, are without direct defense for a great portion of each year because of snow on the high Sierra Mountains; and

"Whereas, the Mammoth Pass, which is within a few miles of United States Highway No. 395, is much lower and in more open country than the other passes and is not closed with snow for as long a time in the winter months as the other passes; and

"Whereas a portion of said proposed highway has been constructed by the Forestry Department, building from both sides of the mountain range, leaving a distance of approximately 28 miles to connect the United States Highway No. 395 and State Highway Route 125; and

"Whereas the construction of a highway over the said Mammoth Pass which could be kept open during the entire year through the use of modern machinery would be an important link in coast defense, inasmuch as the transportation of munitions from the naval ammunition dump at Hawthorne, Nev., to San Joaquin Valley and coast points would be greatly facilitated thereby; and

"Whereas the proposed highway will connect with United States Highway No. 99 from which several State highways lead across the Coast Range to the Santa Clara Valley on the west side of the said range, and connect with United States Highways Nos. 101 and 466; and

"Whereas the construction of the proposed highway would not only be of importance from the standpoint of national defense, but would be of inestimable advantage from an economic standpoint, in that it would:

"(a) Afford an opportunity for the development of a virgin territory with extensive natural lumber resources amounting to upwards of 2,800,000,000 board feet of a present commercial value and an additional 2 billion board feet of potential pulp timber and substantial deposits of iron, lead and, silver.

"(b) Attract a large number of visitors to view the priceless heritage of forests, mountains, game animals, birds and other scenic beauties of the region which would be open to tourist and other travel;

"(c) Provide a loop trip for those persons traveling from Southern California to the Owens River Valley by the eastern route; and

"(d) Assist in the full power and irrigation storage development of the upper San Joaquin River in order to meet the needs of the Central Valley Project; and

"Whereas, the building of the proposed highway would contribute in great measure to the future and increasing growth and prosperity of the San Joaquin Valley and of other portions of this State; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the President and the Congress of the United States be memorialized to take such steps as may be necessary to have the said Mammoth Pass Road constructed as a national defense highway, to commence at or near Casa Diablo in Mono County, on United States Highway No. 395, and continue over Mammoth Pass at the most feasible location and connect with State Highway Route 125 in Madera County, a distance of approximately 28 miles; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to make a suitable appropriation to construct said highway as soon as possible; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the chief clerk of the assembly to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of War, and to each Senator and Representative from California and from Nevada in the Congress of the United States; and the Senators and Representatives from California and Nevada are hereby respectfully urged to request such action."

A petition signed by John J. Sommer and sundry other citizens of the State of California, relating to the establishment of a national pension of $100 a month; to the Committee on Finance.

A petition signed by Mrs. Carolyn Fox Lawton and sundry other citizens of the States of Connecticut and New York, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to prevent the closing of the Murphy General Hospital in Waltham

"Whereas the proposed closing of the Murphy General Hospital in Waltham would cause great inconvenience to disabled war veterans and would greatly lessen the hospital facilities available for such veterans: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts urgently requests that the Federal Government take such steps as may be necessary to prevent the closing of said hospital; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Army, and to each Member of the Massachusetts delegation in Congress.

"House of representatives, January 17, 1955.

"Adopted.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk.*

"A true copy.

"Attest:

"EDWARD J. CRONIN,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to amend the provisions relative to pardons contained in the Immigration and Nationality Act, commonly called the McCarran-Walter Act

"Whereas the Congress of the United States enacted into law the Immigration and Nationality Act on June 27, 1952, commonly called the McCarran-Walter Act, and identified as Public Law 414, 82d Congress, 2d session, chapter 477 (8 U. S. C., sec. 1101 et seq.); and

"Whereas this law provides only for the granting of a full and unconditional pardon by the President of the United States or by the governor of any of the several States to certain aliens convicted of certain crime or crimes to prevent deportation; and

"Whereas in many deserving cases undue hardship results by reason of the limitations placed upon the power of the governor pertaining to pardons provided for under this law: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Governor and Executive Council of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to amend the provisions of the said Immigration and Nationality Act so as to broaden its scope to prevent deportation of aliens in worthy cases where undue hardship would result to dependent persons, by allowing for the granting of conditional pardons by the President of the United States or by the governor of any of the several States to persons convicted of a crime or crimes to prevent deportation of an alien; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of State to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to each of the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"Adopted in council, January 19, 1955.

"A true copy. Attest:

"EDWARD J. CRONIN,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

A resolution of the senate of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Resolution 5

"Whereas the Charolaise cattle smuggled into Louisiana originated from an area in Mexico in which foot and mouth disease had been prevalent and in which all livestock were exposed to and vaccinated against the disease; and

"Whereas the presence of these smuggled cattle in our State constitutes a threat to the livestock industry of the State and Nation as such exposed and vaccinated animals are considered potential carriers of foot-and-mouth disease for unknown periods of time; and

"Whereas the individuals involved in this case were refused permission for the legal entry of these cattle into the United States on two occasions because of the disease threat but chose to smuggle the cattle into this country, thus jeopardizing the entire livestock industry for their own personal gain; and

"Whereas the effectiveness of our livestock disease control laws that have protected the Nation's livestock from the exotic diseases that plague the world will be virtually destroyed if the smuggled animals are allowed to remain in the United States under any circumstances; and

"Whereas the presence of these potential disease disseminators in Louisiana will seriously curtail the movement of our livestock through normal marketing channels as 16 States, in order to protect their own livestock industries, have threatened to embargo all cloven-footed animals originating from or passing through Louisiana: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Louisiana, That the United States Treasury Department be requested to refuse all further requests for delays in the removal of these animals; and be it further

"Resolved, That all the smuggled Charolaise cattle and their offspring be returned to Mexico immediately; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Members of the Louisiana congressional delegation, Hon. Ezra T. Benson, United States Secretary of Agriculture and Hon. George M. Humphrey, United States Secretary of Treasury.

"C. E. BARHAM,
"Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate."

By Mr. ELLENDER:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Resolution 4

"Whereas the Charolaise cattle smuggled into Louisiana originated from an area in Mexico in which foot-and-mouth disease had been prevalent and in which all livestock were exposed to and vaccinated against the disease; and

"Whereas the presence of these smuggled cattle in our State constitutes a threat to the livestock industry of the State and Nation, as such exposed and vaccinated animals are considered potential carriers of foot-and-mouth disease for unknown periods of time; and

"Whereas the individuals involved in this case were refused permission for the legal entry of these cattle into the United States on two occasions because of the disease threat but chose to smuggle the cattle into this country, thus jeopardizing the entire livestock industry for their own personal gain; and

"Whereas the effectiveness of our livestock disease-control laws that have protected the Nation's livestock from the exotic diseases that plague the world, will be virtually destroyed if the smuggled animals are allowed to remain in the United States under any circumstances; and

"Whereas the presence of these potential disease disseminators in Louisiana will seriously curtail the movement of our livestock through normal marketing channels as 16 States, in order to protect their own livestock industries, have threatened to embargo all cloven-footed animals originating from or passing through Louisiana: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the House of Representatives, State of Louisiana, That the United States Treasury Department be requested to refuse all further requests for delays in the removal of these animals; and be it further

"Resolved, That all the smuggled Charolaise cattle and their offspring be returned to Mexico immediately; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to members of the Louisiana congressional delegation, Hon. Ezra T. Benson, United States Secretary of Agriculture, and Hon. George M. Humphrey, United States Secretary of the Treasury.

"CLARENCE C. AYCOCK,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"A true and correct copy, January 20, 1955.

"W. CLEGG COLE,
"Clerk, House of Representatives."

RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF MOTOR VEHICLE ADMINISTRATORS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive from Commissioner Melvin Larson, of the Wisconsin State Motor Vehicle Department, an important resolution which had been adopted by the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators at a conference which they held in Los Angeles, Calif., on November 19, 1954.

The resolution raises the very important issue of a proposed special low postage rate for the mailing of motor vehicle license plates and certificates of title.

The resolution points out that there is at present a very unfortunate disuniformity in postage charges.

I present this important resolution and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 2

Whereas since the beginning of the practice of registering motor vehicles the United States mail has been one of the chief means of distributing license plates and certificates of title issued by the several States; and

Whereas the postage for such distribution has been paid by the States; and

Whereas motor vehicle registration has grown to such an extent in recent years that the postage for mailing license plates and certificates of title now imposes a tremendous financial burden on the States; and

Whereas all costs of administering motor vehicle registration laws are steadily increasing; and

Whereas it is impracticable to pass these increases on to the motoring public; and

Whereas 51 jurisdictions out of 65 States, Provinces, Territories, and districts have now adopted a standard-size license plate measuring 6 by 18 inches, and it is believed that all other jurisdictions which have not yet adopted such standard-size plate will do so in the near future; and

Whereas certain inequities now exist in the postal rates charged for sending license plates and certificates of title through the mail, an example of which is shown by the fact that in some States the postage on 1 license plate to a point within the first, second, or third zone is 8 cents, while the rate for 2 such plates is 23 cents; and

Whereas Congress has seen fit to permit newspapers, magazines, and other articles to be sent through the mails at special low rates: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators, That Congress be requested to give consideration to the establishment of a special low postage rate for the mailing of motor vehicle license plates and certificates of title; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the administrator in charge of motor-vehicle registration in each State and that each administrator furnish a copy to each Member of Congress from his State.

GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to hear today from Col. F. H. Falkner, resident member, Corps of Engineers, here in Washington, that the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors had approved the regional report on deepening the Great Lakes connecting channels.

This marks an important step forward toward the completion of this great project which will cost around $110 million, but which will repay itself manyfold to our Nation.

These channels are the subject of (S. 171) a bill to authorize the modification of the existing projects for the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie, which I introduced earlier this session.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Rivers and Harbors Board release recommending the deepening of the channels be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and be thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the release was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIVER AND HARBOR BOARD RECOMMENDS DEEPENING OF GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS

JANUARY 21, 1955.

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors at its meeting on January 20 held in Washington, D. C., concurred in general in the recommendations of the Detroit district engineer, United States engineer office, for the deepening of the Great Lakes connecting channels.

The Board's recommended plan of improvement provides for deepening and further improving the channels in St. Marys River, Straits of Mackinac, St. Clair River, Lake St. Clair, and Detroit River generally in accordance with the plans of the district engineer. The Board also recommended that the district engineer's plan be revised to include 1 foot of depth, in addition to that shown in the plan, in South Canal, upper St. Marys River. The recommended improvements would provide not less than a 27-foot depth throughout the connecting channels for 96 percent of the navigation season, applicable to St. Lawrence Seaway traffic. The recommended increased depths are based on the requirements of internal Great Lakes traffic but are so planned as to be fully comparable to depths planned for the St. Lawrence Seaway. The Board estimated the cost to the United States of these improvements at $110,327,000.

The Board's recommendation also provided that a cutoff channel be constructed in Canada at Southeast Bend, St. Clair River, generally in accordance with the alternative plan of the district engineer for that section in lieu of further improvement along the existing alignment, if prior to initiation of construction in this reach accomplishment of the cutoff is found to be feasible; at an estimated additional cost to the United States of $5,491,000.

The Board's report is being processed for submission to the Chief of Engineers. The proposed report of the Chief of Engineers thereon will be furnished to the Governors of the interested States and to interested Federal agencies for their views and comments. These comments will accompany the complete report to Congress with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers.

After the report has been transmitted to Congress further action toward construction of any projects that may be recommended therein will depend upon the authorization of those projects by Congress and the subsequent appropriation of the necessary funds for the work proposed.

MINIMUM HOURLY WAGE—TELEGRAM

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Friday, January 21, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], I introduced the bill (S. 662) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes. There has been a good deal of support forthcoming from groups and individuals in my State and elsewhere for such legislation.

It is certainly not news when groups and individuals representing labor give their strong support to legislation increasing the minimum wage and extending coverage under the Fair Labor Standards Act. However, when an organization representing business goes all out for such legislation, I believe that my colleagues in the Senate and other Americans throughout the country should take notice. Such support for S. 662 has come in the form of a wire from Mr. Rudolf Greeff, general manager of the Greater Clothing Contractors Association, Inc. I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there be printed the telegram which was sent to me on January 21 from Mr. Greeff.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 21, 1955.*

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Greater Clothing Contractors Association, Inc., of 100 Fifth Avenue, New York City, is a trade organization representing over 200 contracting shops in the men's clothing industry which in a city of New York employ approximately 40,000 workers. Our board of directors has unanimously adopted a resolution requesting that Congress support Governor Harriman's proposal to raise the national minimum wage to $1.25 an hour. This must be adopted and put into law if we are to keep our factories and workers employed in the City of New York. Time is of the essence because we are losing ground steadily.

RUDOLF GREEFF,
General Manager, the Greater Clothing Contractors Association, Inc.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, jointly:

S. J. Res. 28. Joint resolution authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area; without amendment (Rept. No. 13).

By Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Government Operations:

S. 539. A bill to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; with amendments (Rept. No. 15).

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for Mr. McCLELLAN), from the Committee on Government Operations:

S. 613. A bill to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1957; without amendment (Rept. No. 16).

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 13. Resolution to investigate certain problems relating to interstate and foreign commerce (Rept. No. 19); and

S. Res. 34. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to employ four additional temporary clerical assistants.

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Res. 25. Resolution authorizing the employment of an additional clerical assistant by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

CONTINUANCE OF AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE EMPLOYEE WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 40), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare under Senate Resolution 225, 83d Congress, agreed to April 28, 1954, as amended (authorizing an investigation of employee welfare and pension plans and funds subject to collective bargaining) and the time for reporting the results of its study and investigation thereto is hereby extended through January 31, 1956.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out its duties under such resolution, the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, the sum of $150,000 in addition to any sums heretofore authorized for such purpose.

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES AND EMPLOYMENT OF TEMPORARY ASSISTANTS BY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], from the Committee on Government Operations, I report an original resolution to provide funds for the investigating subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, and ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received; and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The resolution (S. Res. 41) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (g) (2) (B) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or any other duties imposed upon it, the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 1, 1955, and ending on January 31, 1956, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $190,000 in addition to the amount authorized under Senate Resolution 189, 83d Congress, 2d session, agreed to February 2, 1954, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

REVISION AND PRINTING OF SENATE MANUAL—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 43), which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration be, and it is hereby, directed to prepare a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual for the use of the 84th Congress, that said rules and manual shall be printed as a Senate document, and that 1,500 additional copies shall be printed and bound, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the Senate, 100 copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the remaining 400 copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents and delivered as may be directed by the committee.

MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 44), which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. HAYDEN, of Arizona; Mr. GREEN, of Rhode Island; and Mr. JENNER, of Indiana.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. GREEN, of Rhode Island; Mr. MANSFIELD, of Montana; Mr. GORE, of Tennessee; Mr. BARRETT, of Wyoming; and Mr. McCARTHY, of Wisconsin.

MARY ELIZABETH ELLIS

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 45), which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Mary Elizabeth Ellis, widow of Joseph C. Ellis, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 12 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ZELMA SHEPARD

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 46), which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Zelma Shepard, widow of M. H. Shepard, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

HILDA MILLER COON

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 47), which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Hilda Miller Coon, widow of Jesse D. Coon, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 2 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN PERIOD OF EMPLOYEES OF FORMER SENATOR BOWRING—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original resolution to pay compensation for a certain period to employees of former Senator Eva Bowring, and I submit a report (No. 18) thereon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 48) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator Eva Bowring, who were carried on the Senate payroll on November 7, 1954, salary for services in her office for the period November 8, 1954, through December 7, 1954, or for so much of that time through December 7, 1954, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of November 7, 1954.

EXTENSION OF TIMES FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original resolution to extend the times by which the Committee on the Judiciary may conduct studies and investigations, and I submit a report (No. 17) thereon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 49) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the times in which the Committee on the Judiciary may expend funds under authority of Senate Resolution 172, agreed to January 27, 1954; Senate Resolution 181, agreed to January 26, 1954; Senate Resolution 187, agreed to January 26, 1954; Senate Resolution 188, agreed to January 26, 1954; Senate Resolution 190, agreed to January 27, 1954; and Senate Resolution 227, agreed to April 28, 1954, are hereby extended through February 28, 1955.

COMPENSATION FOR A CERTAIN PERIOD TO EMPLOYEES OF FORMER SENATOR UPTON—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 50), which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator Robert W. Upton, who were carried on the Senate payroll on November 7, 1954, salary for services in his office for the period November 8, 1954, through December 7, 1954, or for so much of that time through December 7, 1954, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of November 7, 1954.

COMPENSATION FOR A CERTAIN PERIOD TO EMPLOYEES OF FORMER SENATOR BROWN—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 51), which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator Ernest S. Brown, who were carried on the Senate payroll on December 1, 1954, salary for services in his office for the period December 2, 1954, through December 31, 1954, or for so much of that time through December 31, 1954, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of December 1, 1954.

COMPENSATION FOR A CERTAIN PERIOD TO EMPLOYEES OF FORMER SENATOR BURKE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 52), which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator Thomas A. Burke, who were carried on the Senate payroll on December 2, 1954, salary for services in his office for the period December 3, 1954, through January 1, 1955, or for so much of that time through January 1, 1955, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of December 2, 1954.

COMPENSATION FOR A CERTAIN PERIOD TO EMPLOYEES OF FORMER SENATOR CRIPPA—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 53), which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator Edward D. Crippa, who were carried on the Senate payroll on November 28, 1954, salary for services in his office for the period November 29, 1954, through December 28, 1954, or for so much of that time through December 28, 1954, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of November 28, 1954.

COMPENSATION FOR A CERTAIN PERIOD TO EMPLOYEES OF FORMER SENATOR LENNON—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 54), which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator Alton Lennon, who were carried on the Senate payroll on November 28, 1954, salary for services in his office for the period November 29, 1954, through December 28, 1954, or for so much of that time through December 28, 1954, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of November 28, 1954.

INTERIM REPORT BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER (S. REPT. NO. 14)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I submit an interim report by the Subcommittee on the United Nations Charter. This subcommittee, created by Senate Resolution 126, 83d Congress, 1st session, has been under my chairmanship for the past 2 years. The Committee on Foreign Relations last Friday authorized me to transmit this report to the Senate. It describes the activities which the subcommittee has carried on and indicates in a general way the main ideas we have received as the result of holding hearings at various places in the United States. Last week the Committee on Foreign Relations agreed to recommend that the Senate extend the life of the subcommittee for 1 more year so that it may make final recommendations helpful to the President in formulating the position of the United States Government in the event a United Nations Charter Review Conference is held next year. By the terms of the resolution, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, Mr. GEORGE, will serve as chairman of the subcommittee.

I should like to express my appreciation to the Honorable Guy Gillette, who conceived the study originally and who served with me during the 83d Congress. I also wish to thank other members of the subcommittee who helped carry on this work, namely, Senators Ferguson, Knowland, Cooper, Holland, Sparkman, and Mansfield.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Kenneth W. Momeyer, Jr., and sundry other candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service; and

Leverett Edwards, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the National Mediation Board.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Philip Alexander Ray, of California, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce;

G. Joseph Minetti, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board;

Kenneth H. Tuggle, of Kentucky, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner; and

John Robert O'Connor, Charles B. Williams, and sundry other persons for appointment in the United States Coast Guard.

By Mr. DANIEL, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Everett Hutchinson, of Texas, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner; and

Ben H. Guill, of Texas, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 701. A bill to release certain restrictions on certain real property heretofore granted to the city of Charleston, S. C., by the United States of America; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 702. A bill for the relief of Tarik S. Kaynor; and

S. 703. A bill for the relief of the MacArthur Mining Co., Inc., in receivership; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 704. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of Indians and Indian communities in the southern part of Minnesota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 705. A bill to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 706. A bill for the relief of Margarete Lewis; and

S. 707. A bill for the relief of Christos Paul Zolotas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 708. A bill for the relief of Dr. James C. S. Lee, his wife, Dora Ting Wei, and their daughter, Vivian Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 709. A bill to authorize the release of the personnel files of Federal officers and employees to congressional committees at the request of such officers and employees; and

S. 710. A bill to establish a postal rate-making procedure in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 711. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for filing of equipment trust agreements and other documents evidencing or relating to the lease, mortgage, conditional sale, or bailment of trucks and trailers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and Mr. DOUGLAS):

S. 712. A bill to amend section 7 (h) of the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 713. A bill for the relief of Romana Michelina Sereni;

S. 714. A bill for the relief of Alfio Ferrara; and

S. 715. A bill for the relief of Toy Lin Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 716. A bill for the relief of Athanassios Theodore Stathopoulos; and

S. 717. A bill for the relief of Hedi Gertrude Spiecker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 718. A bill to provide for the return to the former owners of certain lands acquired in connection with the Fort Randall Dam project, the Oahe Dam project, the Gavins Point Dam project, of mineral, oil, or gas interests in such lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. CASE of South Dakota):

S. 719. A bill to increase, in the case of children who are attending school, from 18 to 21 years the age until which child's insurance benefits may be received under title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 720. A bill for the relief of certain Pakistani aliens; and

S. 721. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Stafford Ordnance Corp., a corporation, against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 722. A bill to authorize certain improvement of the Weber Basin, Utah, for flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. BENNETT when he introduced the above bill, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 723. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide civil liability for violations of such act by common carriers by motor vehicle and freight forwarders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRICKER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 724. A bill to establish a Commission on Mental Health, and to provide for a study of the problems of mental illness and for the development of a national mental-health program; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. PURTELL when he introduced the above bill, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 725. A bill for the relief of John Flanagan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 726. A bill to amend paragraph 1513 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to toy marbles; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 727 (by request). A bill to adjust the salaries of judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia and the salaries of the judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEELY when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. HENNINGS):

S. 728. A bill to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the control of juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 729. A bill relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KERR (for himself, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, and Mr. CARLSON):

S. 730. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Oklahoma to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries as they affect such States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KERR (for himself, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MCCLELLAN, and Mr. FULBRIGHT):

S. 731. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Arkansas and Oklahoma to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries as they affect such States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. LEHMAN):

S. 732. A bill to promote public cooperation in the rehabilitation and preservation of the Nation's important historic properties in the New York City area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 733. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws;

S. 734. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, section 871, to provide penalties for threats against the President-elect and the Vice President; and

S. 735. A bill for the relief of Sarah Kabacznik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KILGORE when he introduced the first two above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. KILGORE (for himself and Mr. NEELY):

S. 736. A bill to provide a transcontinental superhighway with alternate sections; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 737. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Fort Wallace, in Wallace County, Kans., as a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 738. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act (49 Stat. 2036), as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SMATHERS (by request):

S. 739. A bill for the relief of Avak Hagopian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 740. A bill to extend for an additional 5 years the authority to make, guarantee, and insure loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 741. A bill to amend title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to war-risk insurance, in order to repeal the provision which would terminate authority to provide insurance under such title.

S. 742 (by request). A bill to improve the administration of the public airports in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 743. A bill to authorize biennial inspection of the hulls and boilers of cargo vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 744. A bill to authorize the expansion of post-office facilities at Williston, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. LANGER):

S. 745. A bill to encourage durum wheat production through nonrecourse production loans; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 746. A bill to provide for the return to the former owners of certain lands, including Indian tribal lands, acquired in connection with the Garrison Dam project of mineral interests in such lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LONG:

S. 747. A bill to enable the States to provide for the increased financial needs of persons receiving assistance under the public assistance plans established pursuant to the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 748. A bill to prohibit the United States from acquiring mineral interests in lands acquired by it except when necessary to serve the purpose for which such lands are acquired; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LONG (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER):

S. 749. A bill to authorize construction of the Mississippi River-Gulf outlet; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 750. A bill to require the registration of certain persons who have knowledge of or have received instruction or assignment in the espionage, counterespionage, or sabotage service or tactics of a foreign government or foreign political party, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 751. A bill to provide assistance to communities, industries, business enterprises, and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. SCHOEPPEL):

S. 752. A bill to amend section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, so as to eliminate the requirement that privately owned stocks exported thereunder be replaced from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 753. A bill for the relief of George Roland Lavoie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 754. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Fred A. Fletcher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. LONG, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. THURMOND):

S. J. Res. 29. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the qualification of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HOLLAND when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. HILL):

S. J. Res. 30. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIEL (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. WILEY, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. JENNER, Mr. IVES, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. NEELY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. HILL, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. BYRD, and Mr. GORE):

S. J. Res. 31. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DANIEL when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

IMPROVEMENT OF WEBER BASIN, UTAH

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize certain improvement of the Weber Basin, Utah, for flood control. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 722) to authorize certain improvement of the Weber Basin, Utah, for flood control, introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The statement presented by Mr. BENNETT is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENNETT

Even though the State of Utah faces a perpetual water shortage—in common with the rest of the country—we also face the unpredictable threat of floods.

The Corps of Engineers has approved a field report which recommends certain channel improvements on the Weber River between Morgan, Utah, and the mouth of the Ogden River. The corps characterizes these improvements as "essential parts of the flood control plan for the basin." The bill which I am introducing today would embody the corps' plan and would provide estimated average annual flood control benefits of $226,000 for reduction in flood damages and $16,000 for higher land use, a total benefit of $242,000.

Such a bill is necessary to help prevent the annual loss to my State of hundreds of thousands of dollars as a result of spring floods. Ten such floods between 1890 and 1952 have ravaged this area, destroying homes, industrial buildings, transcontinental highways, railroad yards, schools and many acres of farm land that, paradoxically, have thirsted for water within just a few short months thereafter. Similar floods will roar out of our mountains again, Mr. President, unless we can authorize and build such economical improvements as are embodied in this bill.

The estimated cost to the Federal Government for construction of these improvements will be $470,000, with another $100,000 of non-Federal funds. Annual charges will total just $40,000 of which $15,800 would be paid by the Federal Government. When contrasted to the estimated annual benefit of $242,000 and the benefit-cost ratio of 1.45, such investment by the Federal Government is more than warranted.

The flood control program on the Weber River has been developed by the Corps of Engineers in collaboration with the Bureau of Reclamation and with local cooperation, and I hope that the Congress will see fit to approve those phases of it as embodied in this legislation.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT RELATING TO CIVIL LIABILITY OF COMMON CARRIERS AND FREIGHT FORWARDERS

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide civil liability for violations of such act by common carriers by motor vehicle and freight forwarders.

The purpose of this bill is to write into part II of the Interstate Commerce Act a similar provision to that now contained in section 8 of part I and section 308 of part III.

These sections of law were enacted for the purpose of protecting persons who suffer damages resulting from violations of the law under parts I and III. Over the past few years shippers have been seriously injured as a result of violations of part II of the act; therefore, it appears desirable to write language into part II in order to provide civil liability for violations.

It seems eminently fair that the shipping public should be permitted to recover damages sustained as a result of violations of the law, and in this connection they are entitled to the establishment of an orderly system whereby recovery of such damages can be made under provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act. This bill has been designed to accomplish that objective.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 723) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide civil liability for violations of such act by common carriers by motor vehicle and freight forwarders, introduced by Mr. BRICKER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

COMMISSION ON MENTAL HEALTH

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill designed to augment and accelerate our present efforts to solve the difficult, nationwide problems which have long persisted, and which continue to confront us, in our efforts to bring about a more universal understanding of the nature of mental illness and greater improvement in our methods of care, treatment, and rehabilitation of the mentally ill.

I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a brief statement relating to the bill which I estimate will consume approximately 5 minutes and that the text of this bill (S. 724) immediately follow my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Connecticut may proceed.

The bill (S. 724) to establish a commission on mental health, and to provide for a study of the problems of mental illness and for the development of a national mental health program, introduced by Mr. PURTELL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. PURTELL. First, Mr. President, I am convinced that this Nation must step up its efforts to deal more effectively with the general problem of mental illness. From time immemorial the populations of the world have experienced the problems, frustrations, and despair, which, widely attended by ignorance of the nature of mental diseases, have accompanied the incidence of mental illness. Yet we have made progress, so that today we have knowledge of many of the basic aspects of the problem, which, if more widely and properly applied, would help to reduce the number of patients presently in mental hospitals and to prevent the admission of countless others. At the same time, there are many aspects of the problem about which we lack sufficient knowledge to enable us to proceed with any degree of certainty.

To the extent that we can reduce the population in mental hospitals but do not do so, for lack of adequate programs or for other reasons, we are merely continuing to add to the taxpayers' burden, as well as failing to conserve our human resources. It is a fact, Mr. President, that 98 percent of all our mental patients are in State, county, city, or Federal tax-supported hospitals. We are spending over $1 billion a year in public funds alone on costs incident to mental illness. It is also a fact that more than 700,000 patients, or 54 percent of all hospital patients of all kinds, on any given day, are in mental hospitals. I also invite attention to the fact that 38 percent of the 5 million men rejected before induction by selective service during World War II were rejected for neuropsychiatric disorders of one kind or another.

There is no doubt about the need for action, Mr. President. As a result of my experience as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, during the 83d Congress, I have reached the conclusion that the problems incident to improving our attack on mental illness, through improved care, treatment, rehabilitation, and preventive measures rank among the most serious problems with which we are confronted in any

consideration for improving the Nation's health.

Accordingly, it is most gratifying that in his budget message last week President Eisenhower specifically singled out the field of mental health and made positive recommendations thereon. The President has recommended a budget increase of approximately $4½ million for various mental health purposes.

The bill I have introduced would provide for the establishment of a Presidential Commission, made up of experts, to make a thorough inquiry into the whole question, and to develop and recommend to the President and Congress a comprehensive, long-range program of action for dealing with the problem. Such a program, Mr. President, is not to be envisaged as a Federal program, but as a national program, which would clearly seek to achieve progress through the joint efforts of all levels of government and of the numerous nongovernment organizations which are now working in this field. The step that is needed is to arrive at a benchmark, as it were, and to set goals, so that the combined efforts of all agencies may be brought together with common purpose and focused on common goals. Further, the Commission here proposed would not be merely another agency to make a study, and a report, to be filed away and perhaps forgotten. One of the fundamental problems confronting those who are trying to accomplish results in the mental health field is that of bringing about a wider understanding of the true nature of the problems of mental illness and keeping public attention focused on the problem long enough to bring about a lasting improvement in existing circumstances. Accordingly, it is proposed that this Presidential Commission continue in existence after completion of its inquiries in order to follow up, for a reasonable period of time, its review of progress toward solution of the problems of mental illness, and to assist and cooperate with other agencies in informing the public through educational programs in mental hygiene. I believe this sort of approach is absolutely necessary if we are going to do anything to step up our efforts in the field of mental health.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD. There being no objection, the bill (S. 724) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO ESTABLISH A COMMISSION ON MENTAL HEALTH, AND TO PROVIDE FOR A STUDY OF THE PROBLEMS OF MENTAL ILLNESS AND FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A NATIONAL MENTAL HEALTH PROGRAM

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established a commission to be known as the "President's Commission on Mental Health" to be composed of a Chairman and seventeen other members appointed by the President. Members of the Commission shall be eminent representatives of the fields of psychiatry, mental hospital administration, medical education, physical medicine and rehabilitation, and allied mental health fields, and of representatives of the Council of State Governments. Such members shall be appointed for terms of three years except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, six at the end of the first year, six at the end of the second year, and six at the end of the third year, after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2. (a) The Commission is authorized and directed to conduct a thorough inquiry into the problem of mental illness, including the status, progress, and problems incident to (1) the provision of hospital and related facilities necessary to the furnishing of care and treatment for the mentally ill, (2) the improvement of mental health services and treatment both in and outside mental hospitals, (3) the availability and training of psychiatrists and allied mental health personnel, and (4) the development of research into the causes, treatment, and prevention of mental illness.

(b) The Commission is further authorized and directed to develop and recommend a comprehensive national mental health program, including long-range plans for coping with both existing and anticipated problems incident to mental illness, as well as recommendations as to methods of financing the costs of such a program and the proper role of the local, State, and Federal Governments, and of nongovernment organizations and facilities in such a national program.

(c) The Commission shall transmit a report of its findings pursuant to the inquiry authorized under subsection (a), together with its recommendations under subsection (b), to the President and the Congress not later than thirty months following the enactment of this Act. In addition to such report and recommendations, the Commission may transmit from time to time such interim reports as it deems appropriate.

SEC. 3. Upon completion of its inquiry and transmittal of its recommendations in accordance with section 2, it shall be the duty of the Commission to conduct a continuing review and evaluation of the status, progress, and problems incident to the provision of care and treatment for the mentally ill, and to report annually to the President and the Congress the results of its review and evaluation, together with such recommendations as it deems desirable, and from the sums made available therefor for any fiscal year, the Commission is authorized to (1) develop, coordinate, and initiate broad public educational programs in mental hygiene, and (2) develop and participate with State and local mental health authorities and agencies and with nongovernmental mental health organizations, upon request, in the initiation of special demonstration projects, which, in the judgment of the Commission, hold promise of making substantial contributions to the solution of problems incident to the improvement of care and treatment for the mentally ill.

SEC. 4. (a) In connection with its inquiry under the provisions of section 2 (a) the Commission is authorized to sit and act at such times and in such places; to hold such public hearings; and to take such testimony, as it deems advisable.

(b) All executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government are authorized and directed to cooperate with the Commission in its work and to furnish the Commission such information and assistance not inconsistent with law, as it may require in the performance of its functions and duties.

(c) Members of the Commission shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 per diem while serving on business of the Commission, shall be reimbursed for actual and necessary travel expenses, and shall be entitled to an allowance of $10 per diem in lieu of reimbursement for subsistence expenses, while so serving away from their places of residence.

(d) The Commission is authorized to appoint, without regard to the civil-service laws and regulations, and to fix the compensation without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, of an executive secretary and such other employees as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions and duties.

(e) To enable the Commission to carry out its functions and duties, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, the sum of $1,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, the sum of $1,500,000, and for each fiscal year thereafter such sums as Congress may determine to be necessary for the purposes of this Act. The Commission is also authorized to accept (1) funds; (2) the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel (and to provide transportation and subsistence as authorized by section 5 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 73b–2), for persons performing such services); (3) equipment; and (4) facilities, donated for purposes of the Commission, and to use the same in accordance with such purposes.

SEC. 5. The Commission shall cease to exist ten years after the enactment of this Act.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will my colleague from Connecticut yield?

Mr. PURTELL. I am very happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. BUSH. I wish to compliment the Senator upon his splendid address, and upon the bill which he has introduced dealing with this very important subject.

For a number of years I have been director of the Connecticut Society for Mental Health, and I am aware of the very serious problem which confronts us, a problem which exists throughout the United States.

I am very happy that my distinguished colleague has studied this situation so closely, and has introduced proposed legislation which I think will go a considerable distance toward solving this very serious national problem. I heartily compliment the Senator.

Mr. PURTELL. I thank my distinguished colleague.

ADJUSTMENT OF SALARIES OF JUDGES OF MUNICIPAL COURT OF APPEALS AND MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to adjust the salaries of judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia and the salaries of the judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter dated January 26, 1955, addressed to me by Charles B. Murray, president of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia, relative to the subject matter of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 727) to adjust the salaries of judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia and the salaries of the judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. NEELY by request, was received, read twice by its

title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The letter presented by Mr. NEELY is as follows:

BAR ASSOCIATION OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D. C., January 26, 1955.

Hon. MATTHEW M. NEELY,
Chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

SIR: The Bar Association of the District of Columbia requests your assistance in the introduction and enactment of proper legislation to adjust the salaries of the judges of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, to accompany S. 462.

S. 462 is proposed legislation for national Federal judicial salaries, among other things, and is being considered by the Committee on the Judiciary. It is predicated on the Segal Commission report. That report took into consideration all economic factors pertaining to the judiciary, including the judiciary of the District of Columbia, namely, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia circuit and the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

We of the bar association feel that the historical differential between the salaries of judges of the United States court of appeals, the district court, the municipal court of appeals, and the municipal court should be maintained in the same ratio that has been established since the two latter courts were fully organized. The purpose of the proposed legislation, which is transmitted with this letter, is to preserve that ratio.

It is the feeling of the members of the bar association that the same reasons advanced by the Segal Commission report apply equally to the judges of the municipal court of appeals and the municipal court. Were it not for the mechanics of the District of Columbia organization and the organization of Congress, the legislation here proposed would undoubtedly have been included in the Segal report and legislation. The judges of the two courts who are affected by the legislation proposed are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, and the two courts are in fact an integral part of the judicial system of the District of Columbia.

Respectfully,

CHARLES B. MURRAY,
President.

ASSISTANCE TO STATES IN THE CONTROL OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President on behalf of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for assistance to and cooperation with State efforts to control juvenile delinquency.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief explanatory statement and an analysis of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanatory statement and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 728) to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the control of juvenile delinquency, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. KEFAUVER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

On behalf of myself, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I am introducing a bill to provide for a broad and comprehensive attack on the problem of juvenile delinquency. The action which we are proposing is designed to assist States and localities to strengthen and extend their own programs to prevent youthful crime and to provide treatment to rehabilitate those children and youth who have already taken the first misstep on the road to a life of crime.

As members of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, we have, during the past year and a half, heard the testimony of countless witnesses from coast to coast and have heard hundreds of different recommendations as to what can and should be done to win this fight against juvenile delinquency. Out of all this testimony, certain facts are abundantly clear.

It is first of all clear that the problem is one that is growing in size and seriousness. The most recent figures indicate that in the last year alone the number of children in trouble with the police rose by a quarter of a million, from one million to one and one-quarter million. That figure in itself is shocking. But when one realizes that the types of youthful crimes committed are increasing in seriousness, that younger boys and girls are, in greater numbers, committing the more serious types of offenses, then it should be apparent to every thinking American citizen that the time to act is now.

A second fact that is equally clear is that the fight against junvenile delinquency cannot be fought from Washington. It must be fought in the localities where the delinquent child is found and where the delinquent acts are committed.

And the final fact made clear by our investigations is that even though the fight must be fought locally, the Federal Government can and should give assistance to the States in that fight. That assistance should not—it cannot—be such as to supplant the State's own efforts. But much can be done by the Federal Government not only through financial assistance but also through the gathering together and transmission of know-how, to aid the States in their fight to control and treat juvenile delinquency. At this crucial period in the fight the situation calls for nothing less than boldness, determination, and foresight.

This bill is designed to meet the problems on all levels of government. It establishes within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an office for children and youth which will encompass the present Children's Bureau and provides for an added title of Assistant Secretary for Children and Youth. This greatly strengthens the program of the Federal Government in providing leadership in establishing programs for combating juvenile delinquency.

An advisory council on juvenile delinquency to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is also established with membership from leading organizations dealing with the problems of delinquency in such fields as education, legal, social work, psychiatry, and police.

There are two provisions incorporated within the scope of this bill providing grants. One is to aid State governments in developing programs to combat delinquency and coordinate services of these governments, but it does not underwrite even a portion of the present State and local programs. The other is a grant for training personnel limited to a period of 10 years. One of the greatest needs in the field of delinquency, as pointed out in our hearings, has been the extreme shortage of adequately trained personnel to meet the growing delinquency problem.

The analysis presented by Mr. KEFAUVER is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED DELINQUENT CHILDREN'S ACT OF 1955

TITLE I

Establishes an Office for Children and Youth in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This should serve to concentrate work on the problems of children and youth at a departmental level which will command the attention that those problems should have. The Children's Bureau is made a part of this new Office and the Chief of the Children's Bureau is given the responsibility for administering the new Office with the added title of Assistant Secretary for Children and Youth. A new bureau is created in the Office—a Bureau on Juvenile Delinquency.

TITLE II

In an effort to achieve greater coordination of Federal programs dealing with delinquent children and to assure that in planning such programs consideration is given to the viewpoints of the national agencies in this field, this bill would establish a Federal Advisory Council on Juvenile Delinquency—advisory to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TITLE III

This title provides—for a period of 7 years—for grants to States to assist them in achieving coordination of the many services involved in the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency, in determining wherein these services need strengthening, in planing for priorities to stregthen these services, and in strengthening and improving those services. It is not intended that through this title the Federal Government would be underwriting even a portion of the present State and local programs. Rather this is intended as a means of boosting State and local efforts by putting a small amount of money where it will do the most good.

TITLE IV

This title would authorize grants for training personnel. The program is limited to 10 years. One of the greatest needs in the field of juvenile delinquency, as revealed by witness after witness before the subcommittee, is for more and better trained personnel. Present efforts in this area are scant. The bill is drafted so as to give the Secretary the greatest possible flexibility in the manner in which the desired objective—more trained personnel—is achieved.

TITLE V

Title V is a "seed money" or "risk capital" provision. It authorizes grants for special projects and is intended to permit the testing and development of new techniques for the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency. If administered with imagination and foresight, it holds great promise. This program, too, is limited to 7 years.

TITLE VI

This title contains general administrative provisions to be found in the standard grant-in-aid bill, with two exceptions. One is the provision permitting the Secretary for a period of 2 years directly to establish short-term courses for training personnel. This provision has been borrowed from the vocational rehabilitation amendments of 1954 (Public Law 565, 83d Cong.), since the problems faced by both fields seem to be identical. The second special provision is a "variable grant" provision for matching

State expenditures under title III, except for the first thirty thousand spent in the first 2 years.

RECOVERY OF DAMAGES UNDER ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Attorney General recommending the enactment of the proposed legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 733) to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws, introduced by Mr. KILGORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The letter presented by Mr. KILGORE is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., January 20, 1955.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Department of Justice recommends amendment of the Clayton Act so as to grant to the United States a right of action to recover actual damages for violations of the antitrust laws. A draft of a bill designed to carry this recommendation into effect is enclosed for your consideration and appropriate action.

Section 4 of the Clayton Act (15 U. S. C. 15) provides that any person injured in his business or property by reason of anything forbidden in the antitrust laws may sue therefor in the United States district courts and if he prevails shall recover an amount equal to three times the damages which were sustained by him.

In the case of *United States* v. *Cooper Corp.* (312 U. S. 600 (1941)), the United States Supreme Court held that the United States is not a person within the meaning of the statute or within the meaning of section 7 of the Sherman Act, which also authorizes treble-damage recovery for antitrust violations. The legislation here recommended would grant to the United States the right to recover actual damages sustained by it as a result of violations of the antitrust laws.

The United States is the largest single purchaser of goods in this country and may suffer substantial losses from antitrust violations. As shown in the Cooper case, the Government sustained extensive damages as the result of certain bids submitted on motor-vehicle tires and tubes. For the half year ending March 31, 1937, 18 companies submitted identical bids on 82 different sizes of tires and tubes. This identical bidding was repeated in the next half year, but with substantially higher prices than for the preceding period. When bids were submitted for the third half-year period the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department, upon the advice of the Attorney General, rejected the bids and invited new ones. The new bids were the same as those rejected. In the circumstances the Treasury Department negotiated a contract with another supplier for its full requirements.

In its next invitation to submit bids the Government required the bidders to warrant that the prices bid were not the result of an agreement among them. Lower bids followed. A comparison of these bids with the earlier bids showed that the United States had been injured to the extent of $351,158.21 during the 18-month period involved. A treble-damage action against the offending companies was instituted by the Government but was dismissed on the ground that the United States is not a person within the treble-damage provision of the statute.

The legislation recommended does not propose to authorize recovery by the Government of treble damages. The provision for the recovery of such damages by private litigants was enacted as an aid in the enforcement of the antitrust laws, constituting, as it does, a powerful additional deterrent to would-be violators. The Government, however, having primary responsibility for the enforcement of the antitrust laws, does not need a provision for the recovery of treble damages to stimulate its law-enforcement activities. Nevertheless, the taxpayers would seem to be entitled to recovery of actual losses sustained by the Government as the result of antitrust violations. Remaining provisions of the bill are technical amendments rendered necessary by the primary objective of the measure.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation.

Sincerely,

HERBERT BROWNELL, Jr.,
Attorney General.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO PENALTIES FOR THREATS AGAINST THE PRESIDENT-ELECT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, section 871, to provide penalties for threats against the President-elect and the Vice President. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury recommending the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 734) to amend title 18, United States Code, section 871, to provide penalties for threats against the President-elect and the Vice President, introduced by Mr. KILGORE, was received, read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The letter presented by Mr. KILGORE is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 1955.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill "To amend title 18, United States Code, section 871, to provide penalties for threats against the President-elect and the Vice President".

Title 18, United States Code, section 871 makes it a Federal crime willfully and knowingly to make any threat to take the life of or to inflict bodily harm upon the President of the United States, whether such threat is deposited for conveyance in the mail, or is otherwise communicated. The proposed legislation would amend this statute to include, in addition to threats against the President, threats made against the President-elect and the Vice President of the United States.

The United States Secret Service, Treasury Department, is, by law, charged with the protection of the President-elect and Vice President, as well as the protection of the President and his family. It has been the experience of the Secret Service that the present law has been a great aid in the investigation of threats against the President, in that it permits prompt Federal action to be taken in the matter regardless of the manner in which the threats are communicated. Although it has been the past experience of the Secret Service that threats against Presidents-elect or Vice Presidents have been somewhat less numerous than those directed against our Presidents, there have been a sufficient number of cases involving threats against the President-elect and Vice President, investigation or prosecution of which have been hampered because of lack of an applicable Federal statute, to warrant the proposed amendment of title 18, United States Code, section 871. Accordingly, the Treasury Department recommends the enactment of the proposed legislation.

A comparative type showing changes which the proposed legislation would make in existing law is enclosed for convenient reference. The proposed legislation was submitted by the Department to the 83d Congress and introduced as S. 2602 and H. R. 5665. However, no further action was taken prior to adjournment.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Very truly yours,

H. CHAPMAN ROSE,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN LOANS UNDER TITLE III OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend for an additional 5 years the authority to make, guarantee, and insure loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement, prepared by me, explaining why I think it necessary for Congress to act on this matter at this time be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 740) to extend for an additional 5 years the authority to make, guarantee, and insure loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

While I am well aware of the fact that the provisions of existing law for GI loans and loans with which veterans may buy homes do not expire until July 15, 1957, and

for the Korean veterans at a subsequent date, I am also mindful of the fact that many veterans who would like to have availed themselves of the beneficial provisions of these laws have not been able thus far to do so. A goodly number have been and many still are confined in our hospitals in process of becoming rehabilitated. Many have been completing and are still receiving their education. Some are compelled to study on a part time basis. There are others who for economic reasons are just now finding themselves in a position to assume the responsibility of purchasing a home or establishing himself in business. To be able to buy a bare home without being able to furnish it adequately is a problem faced by many of our veterans. To accommodate this practical situation is the primary purpose of the proposed legislation.

The separate dates provided for in the extension of the several acts have for their purpose uniformity of time limitations for the benefits, as originally provided. Many of the veterans of the Korean war are still in school and will not graduate until several years from now, hence the extension of time for them and for others situated in similar circumstances is necessary if we are to meet the practical problems involved. I am sure it is the will of Congress that these problems, varied and complex as they are, deserve and will receive our heartiest consideration. The overriding purposes of all our veterans legislation has been to meet, as time passes and these problems arise, an equitable solution of them. Many of the difficulties could not be anticipated with any degree of certainty when these beneficial laws were first enacted.

PROVISION FOR EXTENSION OF CERTAIN WAR RISK, MARINE AND LIABILITY INSURANCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to extend the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to provide war risk and certain marine and liability insurance for the protection of passengers and crew and vessels and cargoes, when endangered by war conditions or threat of war.

The present law—Public Law 763, 81st Congress—expires on September 7, 1955. In view of the unsettled state of world conditions this legislation should be kept on the statute books so that if conditions require it, the Government will be prepared to issue war-risk insurance when commercial marine insurance companies cannot or will not do so.

I may say, Mr. President, that I was the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee which held hearings on the original bill during the 81st Congress. When I reported that legislation to the floor it contained no expiration date. However, the minority calendar committee objected to such permanent authorization, hence an amendment was added placing a limit of 5 years on the Secretary's authority.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 741) to amend title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to war-risk insurance, in order to repeal the provision which would terminate authority to provide insurance under such title, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REGISTRATION OF CERTAIN PERSONS WHO HAVE RECEIVED INSTRUCTION OR ASSIGNMENT IN ESPIONAGE, COUNTERESPIONAGE OR SABOTAGE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950, relating to the registration of certain persons. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me on this subject, together with a letter from the Attorney General of the United States, be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 750) to require the registration of certain persons who have knowledge of or have received instruction or assignment in the espionage, counterespionage, or sabotage service or tactics of a foreign government or foreign political party, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

I am introducing today a bill recommended by the Department of Justice to repeal and revise certain sections of the Internal Security Act of 1950. These sections, although conceived with the best of intentions, are not, however, working out as originally planned.

The sections pertain to the registration of persons who have knowledge of or who have received instruction in espionage, counterespionage, or sabotage, service or tactics of a foreign government or a foreign political party.

The purpose of this new bill, like the purpose of the present sections in the Internal Security Act, is sound and fundamentally necessary.

The only question before us in the modus vivendi, how to attain a worthy purpose which by our experience is not being attained, imbedded under the present overall internal security statute and its foreign agent registration component.

I believe, and Attorney General Brownell and his associates believe, that we can achieve our goal by setting up a separate and distinct registration statute which will require registration of espionage-trained individuals, irrespective of any technical status or relationship as agent of a foreign principality.

I want to point out that on a great many previous occasions I have commented on the Senate floor regarding the danger of Communist espionage in our country.

In this air-atomic age, a single foreign intelligence agent—like a Richard Sorge, or a single treacherous American like the great numbers who were trained in espionage and related "skills" at the Lenin Institute and other Red schools of subversion—can do incalculable damage to our country.

THE SOVIET UNION—A SUPERSPY STATE

The Soviet Union is a breeding ground of spies. It is a superspy state. There, officials spy on one another, superiors on subordinates, subordinates on superiors, children on parents. It is only natural that this domestic spying spills over into preoccupation with engaging in foreign spying.

For that reason the Soviet Union has turned out wave after wave of crack spies, saboteurs, provocateurs from its training centers. It has graduated innumerable cadres skilled at everything from secret radio transmission—see my CONGRESSIONAL RECORD remarks of June 18, 1954—to assassination by poisoned bullets fired by an electrically operated gun resembling a cigarette case.

Soviet intelligence in particular has long been one of the master weapons in the international Soviet conspiracy.

Again and again, the West has learned to its sorrow that a Soviet spy network in the United States, or in Canada, or in Australia, or in Japan, or in West Germany, or in France, and elsewhere has penetrated what was mistakenly believed to be an impregnable fortress of security.

We must, therefore, take vigorous action against these skilled foreign professional spies who infest the West, just as we must take action against their dupes and accomplices of American nationality.

Fortunately, our ever-alert Federal Bureau of Investigation is on the job, but let us at least give it and the Department as a whole a more effective registration tool than we now have available. We cannot expect miracles under the pending proposal, but at least it will be infinitely superior in effectiveness to the present provisions and it will become another improved weapon in our defensive arsenal.

I append hereto the text of the Attorney General's letter of January 26.

I introduce the bill and present the letter particularly in my capacity as ranking Republican of the Senate Judiciary Committee as well as ranking Republican of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The letter presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

JANUARY 26, 1955.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended by section 20 (a) of the Internal Security Act of 1950, presently includes within the definition "agent of a foreign principal" persons who have knowledge of or who have received assignment in foreign espionage or sabotage systems. However, the remaining provisions of the act make it clear that the registration requirements are applicable only to those persons who are currently acting as agents. Hence, persons with past knowledge or training in the espionage, counterespionage, or sabotage service or tactics of a foreign government or political party are under no obligation to register if they are not acting as agents of foreign principals. The presence of this provision as an integral part of the Foreign Agents Registration Act, which imposes the necessity of establishing an agency relationship or status before registration can be required, seriously impedes achieving the purposes and objective sought in the enactment of this legislation.

Furthermore, in administering the Foreign Agents Registration Act, the Department of Justice has attempted to make it clear that registration under the act in no way places any limitations on the activities which may be engaged in by an agent of a foreign principal and that there is no stigma attached to registration. The tenor and import of the statute are altered, however, by including within the definition of "agent of a foreign principal" persons who have received training or assignment in foreign espionage or sabotage systems.

For these reasons, it is recommended that the Foreign Agents Registration Act be

amended by deleting from it any reference to persons who have received training or assignment in foreign espionage or sabotage systems and to substitute therefor a separate and distinct registration statute which would require the registration of such persons irrespective of any technical agency status or relationship.

There is attached for your consideration a draft of a measure which would effectuate this recommendation. It will be observed that provision is made for the exemption of certain categories of persons from its registration requirements. These exemptions have been concurred in by the Departments of State and Defense.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation.

Sincerely,

HERBERT BROWNELL, Jr.
Attorney General.

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE NATIONAL TRADE POLICY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide assistance to those individuals, companies, and communities suffering serious injury or threatened with serious injury due to increased imports resulting from the national trade policy. This bill is identical to one which the Senator from Massachusetts, who is absent from the Senate because of illness, introduced in the closing weeks of the 83d Congress—S. 3650. Representatives HARRISON WILLIAMS, of New Jersey, HAROLD DONOHUE, of Massachusetts, and others have introduced a similar bill in the House of Representatives in the 84th Congress.

Since the first introduction of this bill in June of last year, administration spokesmen have indicated agreement with the basic thesis of the junior Senator from Massachusetts that consideration must be given to the significant readjustment problems certain to follow from the adoption of any international trade policies which would result in a decrease in tariffs and a corresponding increase in imports directly competitive with the products of so many of our domestic industries.

This idea has recently been expressed publicly by Mr. Clarence B. Randall, the Chairman of the President's Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, and by Samuel W. Anderson, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for International Affairs, in a recent speech before the National Foreign Trade Convention. Mr. Anderson discussed the need for assisting segments of our economy weakened by tariff decisions taken by our Government in the national interest and stated:

> In my judgment, this idea has had insufficient debate and analysis. I am unwilling to accept the hypothesis that a Federal Government would be incapable of administering such an assistance program exclusively on the grounds of helping those unable to help themselves to readjust their affairs because of tariff action in the national interest.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks certain excerpts from the statement the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], made upon the introduction of this bill in the 83d Congress be inserted, along with a brief section-by-section analysis of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the excerpts and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 751) to provide assistance to communities, industries, business enterprises, and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the United States, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The excerpts and analysis presented by Mr. HUMPHREY are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KENNEDY

The difficulties caused by increased competition from imported products which face many businessmen, workers, and communities in this country, including those in the State of Massachusetts, present an increasingly serious problem which must be met by the United States Government. Inasmuch as any tariff, existing or prospective, is a direct result of national policy promulgated by the executive branch under authority delegated by Congress, it is only fitting that those individuals, companies, and communities who suffer serious financial loss or other injury as a result of that national policy be assisted by the Government in their own efforts to meet those problems.

The "escape clause" and "peril point" provisions in our tariff law, aimed at affording protection to domestic industries from foreign competition which is ruinous in nature, have serious shortcomings. Under an "escape clause" proceeding, even when an industry proves to the satisfaction of the Tariff Commission that imports have caused or threatened to cause serious injury, and the Commission has recommended to the President that the tariff be increased to prevent serious injury, the President is free to reject the Tariff Commission's recommendation (although he must provide Congress with an explanation of his action).

Under the "peril point" provision, the Commission, upon receipt from the President of a list of all products imported into the United States which are being considered for possible tariff modifications, specifies for such products the tariff level below which, in the Commission's opinion, excessive imports would cause or threaten to cause serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or competitively similar articles. But this again is merely a recommendation to the President, who is at liberty to reject the recommendation (again with an explanation of his reasons for doing so), and to negotiate a tariff lower than the "peril point" specified by the Commission. Thus in both instances a finding of serious economic injury can be ignored.

Since the "escape clause" principle was first promulgated by Executive order in 1947, it has become painfully clear that the proof of injury or threat of injury does not insure that relief will be forthcoming. Of 43 applications for relief under the escape clause provision upon which action has been completed to date, only 3 have been successful in traveling the tortuous route to relief: the fur-felt hat industry, the hatters fur industry, and the dried-fig industry. In the other 40 applications, 33 were rejected by the Tariff Commission, 5 were rejected by the President and 2 have been postponed by the President pending further study. Thus, although the congressional intent that domestic industries are to be protected against ruinous competition from imports is written in crystal-clear language, no real relief has been forthcoming. Moreover, these discouraging results have had such a dampening effect on industries which are legitimately in need of relief from imports, that those companies are reluctant to go through the time-consuming, expensive procedures of the Tariff Commission to have their cases fairly adjudicated only to learn that—although they are entitled to relief under the criteria established by law—in the final instance such relief must be denied.

I am not suggesting that the President is guided by improper motives in rejecting the recommendations of the Tariff Commission that relief be granted to suffering industries in the form of tariff adjustments. Nor do I suggest that the decision is an easy one for the President. Concededly, it is extremely difficult to reconcile the conflicting national interest, which the President rightfully believes demands a high degree of international trade, with the legitimate needs of the domestic industries to be protected from imports which can be manufactured in foreign countries—with their lower living standards and labor costs—at substantially lower prices than in this country.

But it is our hope in presenting this bill to provide the President with a workable alternative to callous disregard of economic hardship, an alternative whereby the President would call into operation the facilities, programs, and resources of the Federal Government to provide special assistance to local industries, employees, and communities in making those economic readjustments made necessary by the President's decision. Where now the President can either accept or reject the recommendations of the Tariff Commission, this bill would authorize the President to invoke the provisions of the bill in the event he decides to (a) establish tariffs below the peril point or (b) refuse tariff modifications recommended as a result of an escape-clause proceeding. Let me make it perfectly clear that it is not our intention that this bill is to be a substitute for the present escape-clause or peril-point provisions. The President will continue to use his authority under the escape clause, as the national interest permits, to make "such adjustments in the rates of duty, impose such quotas, or make such other modifications as are found and reported by the Commission to be necessary to prevent or remedy serious injury to the respective domestic industry." The President could not use this as a substitute for following the peril-point recommendations of the Commission, in those cases where he would normally decide to follow them. The Trade Adjustment Act recommended by this bill would merely provide the President with an alternative in the event he determines, for reasons of overriding national interest, not to follow the recommendations of the Tariff Commission.

Upon the President's invocation of the provisions of the act those individuals, companies, or communities who regard themselves to be eligible for benefits under the act could apply to a new Trade Adjustment Board, which Board would determine the eligibility of applicants for relief under the act. The Board would issue certificates of eligibility entitling the holders to the assistance measures outlined in the act.

Very generally speaking, the following provisions of assistance are contained in the bill. For an individual who is unemployed as a result of the failure of the President to adhere to the recommendations of the Tariff Commission, the following forms of assistance would be available: (1) Supplemental unemployment compensation benefits in addition to those already available under existing unemployment compensation laws; (2) a lower

social-security retirement age, if he is of advanced age and unable to find further employment; (3) vocational reeducation and training programs; and, (4) in certain cases, financial assistance in his efforts to relocate to a different place in the United States, where appropriate employment is available.

For a company adversely affected, (1) technical information, advice, and consultation would be made available through established governmental agencies; (2) rapid amortization benefits would be made available to encourage modernization and diversification; (3) loans otherwise not commercially available would be made by the Small Business Administration to further aid modernization and diversification.

For communities found to be adversely affected as a result of the national trade policy, there would be available (1) the advice, technical information, and consultation necessary to establish a workable plan for adjusting to the situation created by the tariff action; (2) loans to such communities or industrial development corporations or similar agencies, for the purpose of implementing those adjustment proposals.

This bill is the result of several executive, congressional, and private studies during several years. The first recommendation of the Bell report on a trade and tariff policy in the national interest—signed by the representatives of major business, labor, and farm interests serving on the Mutual Security Public Advisory Board—states that where a decision in the national interest results in hardship to domestic industry, "the industry [must] be helped to make adjustments * * * extension of unemployment insurance, assistance in retraining workers, diversification of production, and conversion to other lines." Attention was given the basic ideas involved here by the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy appointed by the President to inquire into the problems of international trade policy (the Randall Commission). The Commission's study in this field is summarized in chapter 7 of the staff papers of the Commission. In addition, Mr. David J. McDonald, a member of the Randall Commission, formally submitted to the Commission a proposal, similar in many respects to that contained in the bill which we have introduced today.

It is true that most of the assistance measures contained in the bill are found elsewhere in Federal activities; but the bill consolidates in one act all such assistance measures, states clearly the national policy to aid in these hardship cases, and, most important, provides an administrative procedure which will facilitate the securing of adjustment assistance, and contains special provisions or extensions of existing programs not now available to those who are to be assisted by these measures. No superbureaucracy is created. The Board created by this bill would perform carefully limited functions, and existing governmental facilities and activities would be utilized to the extent possible.

Let me also stress that this bill would not subsidize American industries merely to keep them in production; but would aid industries in their own efforts to adjust to changed conditions by modernization of plant and techniques and by diversification of products.

Although American industry has frequently been compelled to readjust to changed conditions resulting from industrial development, shifting customs and tastes, and general economic conditions, any adjustment made necessary by the tariff structure is unquestionably the direct result of national policy. Just as the Government felt compelled to assist the railroads at a time when national policy called for the devolpment of a continental transportation system, just as the Government has felt compelled to assist in personal readjustments made necessary by the participation of our youth in military service, just as the Government met its obligation to assist industry in adjusting to war production and again to return to civilian peacetime production, so there is an obligation on the part of the National Government to render assistance to those who are suffering as a result of the national trade policy, existing or prospective.

We must be realistic. Regardless of personal or sectional attitudes, it is clear that the trend is in the direction of lower tariff barriers and increased international trade. I might add that, even if there were no such trend and we were assured that the current tariff status would remain constant, there is great need for assistance to those who are injured by the existing tariff structure. Instead of merely talking about the need for American industries to adjust to imports, it is time we took some positive steps to assist them in their difficult transition.

In order that the Members of the Congress might better understand the purposes and provisions of this bill, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted into the RECORD at this point in my remarks a brief section-by-section analysis which I have prepared.

SUMMARY OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1955

Section 1 authorizes the act to be cited as "The Trade Adjustment Act of 1955."

Section 2 recognizes the necessity for an international trade program, indicates the practical shortcomings of the existing escape clause and peril point provisions, and recognizes the national obligation to render assistance to those industries, enterprises, communities, and individuals suffering as a result of increased imports encouraged by the international trade policy.

Section 3 authorizes the appointment of a special board made up of five officers and employees of the executive branch of the Government who shall serve without compensation in addition to their normal salaries as Government employees.

Section 4 authorizes the Board to conduct hearings, to secure information from the various agencies of the Government, to subpena witnesses, and to establish appropriate rules and regulations.

Section 5 authorizes the President to invoke the provisions of this act in the event he fails to accept the recommendations of the Tariff Commission under the mechanisms of the escape clause proceeding or in the event he negotiates a tariff lower than that designated by the Tariff Commission as a peril point. After the President invokes the provisions of the act, the Board shall receive applications from communities, industrial development corporations, business enterprises, employees, or organizations representing employees for certificates of eligibility. The Board shall issue such certificates to those parties engaged in the production of articles identical to or competitive with the articles found to need tariff adjustment by the Tariff Commission. In determining eligibility, the Board is directed to consider the extent to which the employees and business enterprise or communities are affected by the injury suffered by the domestic industry. The Board is also directed to consider whether communities, business enterprises, and industrial development corporations have developed satisfactory programs for adjustment.

Section 6 authorizes application to appropriate Federal agencies for technical information, market research, or any other form of information and advice.

Section 7 amends the Small Business Act of 1953 to permit loans for economic adjustment purposes without the usual limitation on the amount which may be loaned. There is the requirement that the loans be not available commercially and that the program be an approved one and the same safeguards of the Small Business Act are made applicable.

Section 8 authorizes the Secretary of Labor to enter into agreement with the individual States whereby supplementary unemployment compensation benefits may be paid by the State to unemployed individuals eligible for the benefits of this act. The States would be reimbursed by the Federal Government for the supplementary payments made by the individual States. The supplementary payments would be such as to make the total payment to the individual equal to 66⅔ of his average weekly earnings and the period for which this amount would be paid the individual would be 52 weeks. It is provided that all the standard unemployment compensation requirements shall be applicable.

Section 9 directs the Secretary of Labor to provide suitable vocational rehabilitation training for unemployed individuals. It directs the Secretary to utilize existing Federal Government facilities, and if necessary by agreement with public or private institutions to provide such additional training facilities as may be necessary. The Secretary is also authorized, under certain circumstances, to assist in the transportation of an unemployed individual and his dependents and household effects to a place in the United States outside of the employee's current labor area if no job opportunity exists within his own labor market area, if there is a job opportunity existing in the new location, if the individual desires to make such move in order to obtain such job, and if such action would be in the best interest of the United States.

Section 10 authorizes the Secretary of Labor to certify older workers to be unemployed as a result of the international trade policy of the United States, and the Social Security Act is amended so that such individuals may retire under the Social Security Act at age 60.

Section 11 would permit eligible business enterprises to take advantage of the accelerated amortization provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

Section 12 amends section 4 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 which is the "peril point" provision. As indicated above, the amendment authorizes the President to invoke the provisions of the act, and to notify the Congress in his message refusing the recommendations of the Tariff Commission to advise whether he has invoked the provisions of the act.

Section 13 amends section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, the "escape clause" provision. This authorizes the President to make the adjustments in tariffs recommended by the Tariff Commission, to invoke the provisions of the act, or to take no action in which case he shall submit a report to the appropriate committees of the Congress.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution so as to abolish the electoral college and divide the electoral vote in proportion to the popular vote in each State.

The joint resolution is introduced on behalf of myself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WIL-

LIAMS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senators from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER].

I request that the resolution lie on the table for 2 days before being printed in order that additional cosponsors may add their names if so desired.

Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, and Representative CHAUNCEY W. REED, of Illinois, are introducing a similar resolution in the House today.

Without a doubt, the electoral college method of selecting the President is the most archaic and undemocratic feature of the United States Constitution. It was one of the few mistakes made by the Founding Fathers—a mistake because they thought the people could not be trusted to select the President and Vice President.

As originally intended, the States were to select well-informed public men as electors, and they were to meet and select a President and Vice President without reference to popular vote or any other method of expression from the people. The original form has been retained in the solemn words of the Constitution, although for more than a century it has had no practical use.

In fact, the electoral college system has never functioned as contemplated by the framers of the Constitution. For many years the electors have been mere figureheads casting their votes for the candidate who received the majority of the popular vote in their respective States. These votes could just as well be reported and counted without the intervention of "dummy" officers known as presidential electors.

All reason for the electoral college has long since disappeared, and the form should be removed from our Constitution before it rises to haunt us by flouting the will of the people in selecting a President. As long as the form remains in the Constitution, it is possible for electors to cast their independent votes contrary to the expressed will of their constituents, and this, in fact, has been done in more than one instance.

The practice which has been substituted for the constitutional form is just as evil and undemocratic. I refer to the custom which is generally understood and followed—that all electoral votes of each State will be cast for the candidate who receives a majority of the popular vote within that State. In effect, this disfranchises millions of American voters. Their votes for a candidate for President are not counted in the electoral vote unless their candidate receives a majority of the popular vote in their State.

For instance, if a candidate receives a 1-vote majority in the State of New York, he now receives 100 percent of the electoral votes of New York, and the candidate receiving only 1 less vote at the polls receives none of the New York electoral vote. Is it any wonder that overemphasis is given to political machines and minority groups which can make the slight difference in the pivotal States?

This proposed amendment would abolish the electoral college and provide for the division of the total electoral vote of each State in the exact ratio with the popular vote. This would mean that every person's vote would be counted as it was cast. It is the nearest possible approach to electing a President by direct popular vote of the people and at the same time retaining and preserving the present proportional strength of each State in the election of a President.

This joint resolution is worded exactly the same as the so-called Gossett-Lodge joint resolution, which was passed by the Senate February 1, 1950, by a vote of 64 to 27—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 1, page 1278. We have chosen this same language because it has been studied thoroughly and approved by the Judiciary Committees of both the House and Senate in previous sessions of Congress. Briefly, the proposed amendment would accomplish the following:

First. Abolish the fictitious electoral college.

Second. Abolish the office of presidential electors.

Third. Provide for direct voting for President and Vice President.

Fourth. Retain the electoral voting strength of each State as at present—one vote for each Member of Congress—but provide that such electoral vote be divided in exact ratio with the popular vote.

Fifth. Provide that the winning candidate must receive at least 40 percent of the electoral vote, failing in which the Congress would select the President from the candidates having the two highest numbers of electoral votes. This was the so-called Lucas amendment adopted in the Senate in 1950 in order to prevent splinter parties.

Mr. President, in due time it is my intention to speak at length concerning the evils of the present electoral college system and the benefits to be obtained from this proposed reform. For the present, I will simply summarize a few of the benefits, as follows:

First. We will cleanse our Constitution of an archaic provision which we have failed to obey or defend for more than a century.

Second. We will have democratic elections, with every person's vote counting for the candidate for whom it is cast.

Third. There will be less opportunity for fraud and pressure-group action.

Fourth. Sectionalism will be largely abated. A vote in every State will be just as important and count just as much as a vote in the present pivotal States. This is not the case now. With certain exceptions in 1952, the emphasis usually is on 8 or 10 pivotal States and the remaining States enjoy very little of the campaign and are usually ignored as source of presidential candidates.

It is my hope that during this year, with the approach of another presidential election, a serious effort will be made on both sides of the Capitol to submit the proposed reform to the States for their approval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President, introduced by Mr. DANIEL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO SPECIAL MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. MUNDT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 42), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Standing Rules of the Senate are amended by adding at the end thereof the following new rule:

"RULE XLI

"SPECIAL MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES

"1. If the chairman of any standing, special, or select committee of the Senate, or of any subcommittee of any such committee, is requested by at least 3 members of the committee or subcommittee (or by 2 members, in the case of a 3-member committee or subcommittee) to call a special meeting thereof and fails or refuses after 3 days' consideration of the request to call such a special meeting within 7 calendar days from the date of the request, then upon the filing with the clerk of the committee or subcommittee of a written signed request by a majority of the members of the committee or subcommittee for a called special meeting thereof, the committee or subcommittee shall meet on the day and hour specified in such written signed request. It shall be the duty of the clerk of the committee or subcommittee to notify in the usual way all members of the committee or subcommittee of such called special meeting.

"2. In the temporary absence of the chairman of any standing, special, or select committee of the Senate, or of any subcommittee of any such committee, the member next in rank in the order named in the election or designation of such committee or subcommittee, and so on, as often as the case shall happen, shall act as chairman."

DEFENSE OF FORMOSA—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to House Joint Resolution 159, authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores and related positions and territories of that area. The resolution was passed yesterday by the House. I think this amendment is a very important one, and should be adopted by the Senate and by the House. The amendment simply provides that we shall discontinue any financial aid to any country (1) which allows its own materials to be shipped to Red China, or (2) allows its flagships to be used to transport goods to Red China.

If legislation of this type had been enacted 2 or 3 years ago, there would be no need today for House Joint Resolution 159. If the amendment is not adopted, we shall again find ourselves in the not too distant future in the tragic position of having American boys killed with materials which we are indirectly shipping to Red China.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. LANGER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 28) authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores and related positions and territories of that area, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. MORSE) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by them to Senate Joint Resolution 28, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. LEHMAN) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 28) authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores and related positions and territories of that area; which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION PLACED ON CALENDAR

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 159) authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores and related positions and territories of that area, was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KILGORE:

Statement prepared by Senator HENNINGS concerning President Eisenhower's message requesting a congressional resolution on the defense of Formosa and adjacent areas.

NOTICE OF FURTHER HEARING ON S. 462 AND S. 540, RELATING TO INCREASES IN SALARY OF JUSTICES AND JUDGES OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS, AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, a special Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary on yesterday, January 25, 1955, held hearings on S. 462 and S. 540, relating to judicial and congressional salary increases. Numerous witnesses were heard, including the Attorney General of the United States. In order that any other persons or organizations interested in this matter may be given an opportunity to testify or present a statement, the subcommittee is again meeting in open session on Friday, January 28, 1955, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building. I herewith present for insertion in the RECORD a notice of the continuation of these hearings on Friday next.

There being no objection, the notice was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On Friday, January 28, 1955, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, there will be a further hearing on S. 462, entitled "A bill to increase the salaries of justices and judges of United States courts, Members of Congress, and for other purposes," and S. 540, entitled "A bill to increase the salaries of judges of the United States courts, and to provide that Members of Congress shall receive salary comparable to that of judges of the United States district courts." This is a continuation of the hearings commenced on Tuesday, January 25, 1955. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the proposed legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], chairman; the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]; the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL]; the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]; and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER].

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATION OF JOSEPH CAMPBELL TO BE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], I wish to announce that the Committee on Government Operations will hold public hearings on the nomination of Joseph Campbell, to be Comptroller General of the United States, on February 2, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EULOGIES OF SENATORS WHO DIED DURING THE 83D CONGRESS

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD eulogies which I have prepared on the life and public service of four Senators who died during the 83d Congress.

There being no objection, the eulogies were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EULOGY OF SENATOR HUGH BUTLER

Mr. President, one of the Senators who welcomed me to Congress in 1946 was a man whom I had come to know and admire as the Republican national committeeman from Nebraska, our departed colleague, Senator Hugh Butler.

My first committee assignment was to Interior and Insular Affairs, where I had the good fortune of serving with Senator Butler until his untimely death in 1954. Few men in the Congress have taken their committee chairmanships as seriously and served so fairly and impartially as this good man from Nebraska.

Senator Butler acquired his fine, charitable, Christian nature through a lifetime of service in religious and public-service organizations. Groups that he served with distinction and devotion, both as an official and a member, included Rotary International, the Omaha Board of Education, and advisory boards of the YMCA, Salvation Army, Community Chest, and the Omaha Chamber of Commerce. In addition, he served as moderator of the Nebraska congregational churches.

His ability to get along with people and to appeal to their better natures served him well in his efforts in the Senate and its committees, and the sound achievements of the 83d Congress in the field of Interior and Insular Affairs stand largely as a monument to his ability as an organizer and to the personal esteem and friendship he had acquired among Members on both sides of the aisle.

His passing is a great loss to his family, his State, and to his many friends in Nebraska and to those of us who served with him in the Congress.

EULOGY OF SENATOR LESTER CALLAWAY HUNT

Mr. President, Senator Hunt had the distinction of being one of the few dentists ever elected to serve in the United States Senate. From the practice of dentistry in his hometown of Lander, Wyo., he first responded to a deep-seated urge for public service by becoming a candidate and being elected to the Wyoming House of Representatives in 1932. From that time to his untimely death in 1954, he was active in public affairs in the State of Wyoming and in the United States Senate, to which he was elected in 1948. He also was highly regarded in his profession, being a Fellow in the American College of Dentists.

Although Senator Hunt was in his first term in the Senate when death occurred, he was well known from the start to most of us from the Western States. He had served as secretary of state for Wyoming from 1934 to 1942, and as Governor of the Cowboy State from 1942 to 1948.

Because our respective States have a common boundary and similar economic problems, I had the pleasure of working with Senator Hunt on many problems of mutual interest. I was always favorably impressed with the competence and sincere devotion to duty displayed by Senator Hunt on those occasions, and I am gratified to recall that our relations here in Congress were always pleasant, even though the political aisle had technically separated us.

My last joint project with Senator Hunt was to provide active support to a bill that he had introduced to provide protection to our domestic coal industry. Because of his wide background in public affairs, he had a rich source of experience to draw upon, and he could always be counted on to be well informed and in support of measures contributing to the developing of the Mountain West.

His passing is deeply regretted by his many friends in the Senate, and his death is a heavy loss to the State of Wyoming.

EULOGY OF SENATOR BURNET RHETT MAYBANK

Mr. President, the past 2 years have been filled with many tragic moments for us Members of Congress as we received notice after notice of the passing of stalwart Members of the legislative Houses. Each of these men who died in the legislative service of his country was immediately missed by us in our labors, and the weight of that loss has increased with each passing day.

Those present at the hearing conducted in the caucus room on September 1, 1954, will remember the deep hush that fell over the room with the announcement of Senator Maybank's death. As we stood in silence, with our heads bowed in respect to our deceased colleague, I could not help reflecting how only days before we had exchanged cheerful greetings in the halls of the Capitol and the corridors of the Senate Office Building. Senator Maybank was a friendly, gracious man who made firm and fast friendships wherever he chanced to be, and his loss was a deeply personal one to those of us who had the good fortune to know him and to be associated with him so closely.

We here in the Senate learned to know and respect this man's exceptional ability

to inject a note of subtle humor when the occasion needed some relaxation, and to be sternly serious when the occasion demanded a steadfast adherence to fact and principle.

A veteran of World War I and a former Governor of the great State of South Carolina, he was a warm, personable man and a devoted public servant who will be missed by his family, his church, and his many friends throughout the Nation. I feel that my own life was enriched by the privilege of knowing and associating with Burnet Maybank.

EULOGY OF SENATOR PATRICK A. MCCARRAN

Mr. President, Senator Patrick A. McCarran served the State of Nevada in the United States Senate from 1933 until his untimely death in 1954. His loss was keenly felt here, where the veteran Senator from the Silver State was known and respected as one of the best informed and individually effective Members of the Congress and a great and powerful friend of the Mountain West.

I enjoyed congressional associations with Senator McCarran since my election in 1946. As a fellow member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I early came to regard the senior Senator from Nevada as a neighbor not only in a geographic sense, but also in his approach and convictions on many legislative and administrative problems. He was a man of strong convictions, and though we differed at times, it was never on personalities. In most of his dealings with other Senators, he chose to deal only with facts and issues, and he came to be widely respected by those with whom he differed.

The magnitude of legislative work turned out by this energetic and conscientious Senator was prodigious. Every session was replete with bills of his authorship and with reports from committees and subcommittees under his chairmanship. Any calendar of bills and of committees to which he was assigned bears liberal evidence of his phenomenal legislative activity.

In the passing of Senator McCarran, or "Pat," as he was called by everyone, not only the State of Nevada but the Nation has lost a true friend, a vigorous advocate, and a legislator distinguished for his ability and effectiveness. It is indeed rare that a small State produces a man of such great stature on the national scene.

Through his two decades of service in the Congress, Senator McCarran amassed a wealth of experience in the legislative processes and of knowledge of domestic and international affairs that has seldom been equalled in the history of American Constitutional Government. In these times of recurring international crises, his sound judgment and sage counsel was invaluable.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S SPECIAL MESSAGE ON FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I wish to make a few observations with respect to President Eisenhower's special message on foreign economic policy, which was communicated to the Congress last Monday, January 10, 1955. I believe it represents, in general, a constructive approach to a very complex problem which has many ramifications.

The President's emphasis upon the need for increasing "the opportunities for the fuller operation of the forces of free enterprise" in general are indeed welcome and desirable. In this regard, I am sure the President will find substantial support for his proposals that, first, stimulating the flow of capital abroad must be done in such a manner that "it results in investment largely by individuals or private enterprise," and that, second, the technical assistance program should be concerned with "know-how rather than large funds."

However, there is another area of our foreign policy to which the President addressed himself which warrants special attention. That is the area of tariff legislation. I think my colleagues will agree with me that an American trade policy must embody those features that will work toward the enlargement of international trade, but in a manner consistent with maintaining a sound domestic economy. In this respect it appears to me that if realistic tariff legislation is enacted, it must necessarily, therefore, recognize the requirements of national defense, the customs and traditions of our people, and the protective legislation which safeguards wages, industry, and agriculture.

The President did indicate that all nations should mutually undertake the lowering of unjustified barriers to trade on "a mutual basis so that the benefits may be shared by all." But the "all" the President referred to must include those domestic industries such as wool, fuels, and nonferrous metals, which face disadvantageous competitive conditions with foreign imports. Not only must they be protected because they involve the economic welfare of a great section of this country, but because they are strategic and essential to our national defense and security.

There is, however, another aspect of tariff policy which is frequently overlooked in all the emotionalism and generalized discussion which frequently surrounds debate on this problem. That is the desirability and need of stability of tariff schedules. Witness after witness who testified at the hearings held last September by the Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Samuel C. Waugh, on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, spoke of this problem.

The central theme of their remarks indicated that the basic requirement for flourishing world trade is not so much a matter of lowering trade barriers generally, but a trade policy that embodies the attributes of predictability, continuity, and stability in tariff schedules. The environment in which trade can flourish, investment can realize a profit, and general world economic progress can continue, is one which is stable long enough to ensure that economic decisions can be made with a reasonable chance for success. Importers and exporters build markets on the basis then of stability in tariffs, quotas, and other barriers.

This problem, Mr. President, is ably discussed by Mr. Walter Lippmann in an article entitled "Economic Disarmament," which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of January 13, 1955. Although I cannot agree with Mr. Lippmann on the question of "escape clause" legislation, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, with respect to escape-clause legislation, I should like to point out that the United States has invoked this clause on 4 occasions out of 55 requests for such action, since the Trade Agreement Extension Act of 1951 became effective. These four occasions were with respect to:

First. Hatters' fur, 1952.

Second. Dried figs, 1952.

Third. Alsike clover seed, 1954.

Fourth. Watches, movements and parts, third investigation, 1954.

That certainly is not a very impressive list. The use of the escape clause by the United States, it is evident, has not made tariff rates unstable and subject to quick and arbitrary change, as Mr. Lippmann indicates is generally the case when escape-clause provisions are included in trade agreements and treaties.

EXHIBIT 1

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

ECONOMIC DISARMAMENT

Reading the President's message on foreign economic policy, one is left with a general impression that American tariff rates are too high and that what he is asking for is authority to lower them a little bit by reciprocal agreements arrived at by international bargaining. I wonder whether this puts the real problem in its proper focus. Perhaps we can reach a clearer definition of that problem by saying that the main trouble today is not the level of the tariff rates. In the United States they are by and large not exorbitantly high any longer.

The real problem is economic warfare. All the governments have armed themselves with legal powers which they use to interfere with the international markets for goods. They use them offensively and they use them defensively to cut down, to cut off, to divert, to penalize, to subsidize buying and selling so that the pattern of transactions is different from what it would be under the free operation of supply and demand.

I think I am right in saying this, that the main trouble is not the level of the tariff rates established by the legislatures. If only the levels are known and are not subject to quick and arbitrary change, the trading community throughout the world can and will adapt itself to the rates. Provided the rate is stable, the question of whether it should be higher or lower is primarily a domestic issue. It is a domestic question whether industries should be protected for reasons of national defense or whether they should be exposed to international competition for reasons of efficiency and for the service of the consumer.

There is no inherent reason why the level of the tariff rates should be determined by reciprocal bargains. The real reason why we in the United States have used the reciprocal method for 20 years is that we have found it easier, as a matter of domestic American politics, to lower a tariff over the protests of a domestic producer if we could confront him with an American exporter who was going to gain access to a foreign market. Tariff reduction by reciprocal bargaining has been essentially a device for neutralizing one vested domestic interest by another.

The fact of the matter is that trade is, that trade has to be, reciprocal and no international agreements are needed to make it reciprocal. It is an optical illusion to believe the contrary. If we lower an American tariff rate and allow some foreign goods to be sold in the United States, the dollars earned by the foreign importers will in the end have to be used to buy goods produced

in America. The notion that the American markets can be flooded with foreign goods all coming one way cannot be true. For what on earth would the foreigner want to do with the dollars he earns? What good are American dollars to a foreigner unless he, or someone to whom he sells his dollars, spends them in the markets where dollars are the currency?

Almost anywhere in the world today, and for all I know perhaps also in the Communist world, an American can pay his bills with dollars. But why should an Italian taxicab driver or a French shopkeeper be glad to be paid in American dollars? Because he believes that he can always exchange the American dollars at a good rate for lire or francs. With whom can he exchange dollars? With someone who intends, or with someone who knows someone else who intends, to buy something in America that can be bought only with American dollars.

If the foreigners who earned American dollars by exporting goods to this country did not get those dollars spent in America, they would not be selling their imports to us. They would be giving them to us.

All of this is to say that, except as a matter of domestic practical American politics, tariff rates do not need to be fixed by reciprocal bargains. The real point of reciprocal bargaining power lies elsewhere. It lies in the field of what we might call the ending of economic warfare and the beginning of economic disarmament. Almost all countries, and we are well in the lead among them, are armed with economic weapons of offense and defense. These weapons include such devices as import quotas, which limit or even prohibit citizens from buying certain commodities, regardless of the price, the quality, the supply and demand. The weapons include exchange restrictions, export subsidies, preferential treatment for public contracts as in the Buy American Act, preferential rates as in the British Commonwealth, the peril-point gadget and the escape clause, which make almost all tariff rates unstable and subject to quick and arbitrary change.

The characteristic of these weapons of economic warfare is that they are not fixed rules and laws of trade but are operated by administrative decisions made, often under political pressure, by bureaucracies.

What we call the liberalization of trade might also, indeed might better, be called the ojective of economic disarmament. The essential condition of economic peace is that trade among friendly nations should not be subject to the arbitrary acts of administrative and political officials, that trade should be subject to laws enacted deliberately and openly and after debate and not changeable except by equally careful deliberation.

DANGERS OF AIR POLLUTION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, from time to time I have made brief comments respecting the problem of air pollution in the State of California, and particularly in the southern area of that State, and the great city of Los Angeles. Occasionally I have had printed in the RECORD comments from newspapers across the land to indicate that air pollution is not a local problem, nor, indeed, a problem for the people of California alone, but, rather, Mr. President, to indicate it has now become a national problem of considerable moment. I hope, therefore, that the 84th Congress will look with favor upon the efforts of communities in the various States to combat this menace, and will provide the means by enacting such legislation as may be necessary to enlist the power and the might of the Federal Government in assisting the American people to solve a growing problem which threatens the health of the Nation.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article which appeared in the Los Angeles Examiner of Friday, January 21. In the article the Medical Society of Los Angeles announces that smog can kill. I commend the article to the reading of my brethren in the Senate because I believe the article brings forcibly and for the first time to the attention of the people the fact that today the pollutants of the air are sufficiently serious and hazardous that they can kill human beings. To my mind, that is one more reason why the Federal Government should enlist its services in respect to arriving expeditiously at a solution of the problem. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDICOS ISSUE WARNING: "SMOG CAN KILL," DOCTORS SAY

(By Magner White)

Smog can cause death. For the first time, the Los Angeles County Medical Association, through its 38-man council, was officially on record yesterday to that effect.

The council adopted nine motions, of which this was the first, all bearing on smog, as recommended by its smog committee, headed by Dr. Francis M. Pottenger, Jr., of Monrovia, the official bulletin disclosed.

"The viewpoint that air pollution can cause death is now official," Dr. Pottenger said yesterday. "It is based on medical literature on air pollution, including reports on the 1948 Donora, Pa., and the 1952 London and other air pollution disasters in which people died."

REAL QUESTION

The real question is, "Have such deaths occurred in Los Angeles? We have no positive proof, but the question has been brought up several times by physicians.

"Dr. John Barrows, former president of our association, was the first to sign a death certificate listing smog as a contributing factor in a death. More doctors have done this in the last 2 years."

Dr. Pottenger said it is yet unsettled how much smog, and what in smog, could kill a human being.

A meeting of all sections of the medical association with his committee has been set for next Monday night to develop an opinion survey on this, Dr. Pottenger said. Results of this survey will be published officially later in the association's monthly bulletin.

NINE POINTS

The request for this meeting was 1 of the 9 points in the smog committee's list of motions establishing the association's views on smog which was adopted by the council.

Others were:

1. That air pollution is a continuing dynamic problem in the Los Angeles area.

2. That biological (effects on living things) as well as chemical (density and duration of smog) indices "must be determined for the safety of human beings."

3. That the smog committee approves in principle establishment of chemical standards of air pollution (the point at which public warnings should be given) as proposed and begun by the board of supervisors.

4. That the smog committee feels that present chemical standards (based mostly on ability of workers in certain industries to withstand effects of gases) "do not alone safeguard the health of the public."

HOW MUCH?

5. That how much of each contaminant in smog human beings can withstand safely, either in sudden large amounts or over longer periods, singly, or in combination, must be determined.

6. That deans of the three medical schools and the California Institute of Technology be asked to report how they would determine these standards of toxicity (poisonousness) of air pollutants, and estimate how much it would cost to do this.

7. That the county supervisors be asked to obtain private, city, State, and Federal aid in financing research on these subjects, using facilities of all local institutions.

On Dr. Pottenger's smog committee, which drafted these propositions, are Drs. Kurt C. Shery, Torrance; James C. Doyle, Beverly Hills; Fordyce Johnson, and Clinton H. Thienes, Pasadena; Charles H. Pettet, Monrovia, and from Los Angeles: Fred E. Bradford, Madeleine Sallon, William K. Hewitt, Jr., J. Safe Ludwig, Walter E. Macpherson, Maurice Nugent, and Reginald H. Smart.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me for a brief comment?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I should like to add to the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from California that in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania we have already had an instance of smog killing several persons.

In addition to what the distinguished Senator from California has mentioned, there is the matter of stream pollution, which relates not only to drinking water, but also to water used for commercial purposes.

The problem the distinguished Senator from California has mentioned is one which I believe should have the very serious attention of Congress.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania very much indeed. In his succinct comments, I think there is additional evidence that this problem is not a local one, but concerns all the States of the Union.

PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SHIPPING, SHIPBUILDING, AND SHIP-REPAIR INDUSTRIES

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in the interest of conserving time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have prepared, regarding the need for continued and vigorous attention to the problems of our shipping, shipbuilding, and ship-repair industries. In making this request, I especially emphasize to my colleagues the comments therein with respect to the funds which are recovered by the Government from the profits of subsidized shipping lines.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

During the 1954 session of the Congress, a good beginning was made toward solution of some of the many problems that plague American shipping and its sister industry, shipbuilding and ship repairing.

Lest there be any misunderstanding on this point, I believe the advances achieved in this respect were important. They will serve to prevent, or at least to defer, the impending collapse of these two strategic components of our peacetime economy and

our national security. However, I repeat and would emphasize strongly, that what has been done is only a beginning.

The 1954 enactments in the maritime field must be followed with legislation to establish a sound, long-range program for rehabilitating and maintaining the American Merchant Marine on the adequate basis envisioned in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. Unless this is done, we shall have accomplished only a transitory and fleeting result.

A recent issue of Nation's Business pictures in realistic fashion the current shipping situation and its unpleasant implications for the future, in an article captioned "Needed: 60 Ships a Year." As a direct result of the ship construction and emergency ship repair authorizations and appropriations passed in the final days of the 83d Congress, the horizon is somewhat brighter today than when this article was written. However, I believe it would be most appropriate to excerpt some of the factual statements and the conclusions of this splendid article for the reason that they are just as pertinent now as when written. For instance, the author lays down this premise as a starter:

"America's shipbuilders and operators are worried about the future of the Nation's merchant marine. Here's why: * * *

"In our pool of 1,028 active and 2,212 inactive vessels are many ships that were built just before or during World War II. They all will become obsolete between 1962 and 1967. Others, notably the war-born Liberties, always have been considered outmoded.

"Cargo offerings have been declining as a result of the end of the fighting in Korea and the recovery of foreign economies formerly dependent on American aid shipments."

Despite the remedies authorized by the 1954 legislation, however, the article continues:

"Still unsolved, however, is the problem of how to put the merchant fleet on a solid long-range footing. To do this, according to Under Secretary of Commerce Robert B. Murray, Jr., a peacetime nucleus of 36,000 shipyard workers should be continuously employed to meet planned mobilization needs. To maintain this force, Mr. Murray estimates, shipyards would have to build 60 ocean-going merchant vessels a year.

"Unlike many United States concerns, the ocean shipping industry is in constant, direct competition with foreign operators. Because most freight rates are fixed by international agreements among United States and foreign steamship companies (to maintain stable rates and prevent wild price slashing on the world market) the average shipper in foreign commerce would find little, if any, difference in the shipping price quoted by domestic and foreign lines.

"But the American shipowner who operates under these uniform rates has much higher cost of operation than his foreign competitor. Wages of United States seamen are more than twice as high as those paid by The Netherlands, second best-paying nation. It requires more capital to build a ship in United States yards than anywhere else—and American lines pay more for repairs, insurance, and food than operators under foreign flags.

"The Government officially recognized the squeeze on United States shipbuilders and operators with the passage of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. This measure provides subsidies for the construction and operation of ships serving trade routes which the Federal Maritime Board deems essential to our commerce and defense. In both cases, the Government pays the difference between certain American and foreign costs.

"But subsidies do not assure profits. They do not even guarantee against losses.

"To obtain an operating subsidy, a steamship line must demonstrate that it is meeting substantial foreign competition on its route; that other United States-flag vessels do not serve the route adequately; that its sailings will be scheduled. Furthermore, it must submit to strict Government supervision of its accounts and operations and maintain its fleet by replacements as ships become obsolete.

"Subsidies are awarded on the basis of long-term contracts—usually 10 years—and are subject to recapture by the Government. If a line's profits during the contract period exceed 10 percent of the capital necessarily employed in the business, 50 percent of the excess must be returned to the Government until the recapture has equaled the entire amount of the subsidy paid.

"In the first 10 years of ship operating subsidy the United States spent $67,222,996.87 and recaptured $28,529,825.39. Thus, in its first decade, the program cost the taxpayers $38 million. Between 1947 and June 30, 1953, subsidy expenditures totaled $100,016,175.43. The amount to be recouped in this period has not yet been determined. The Maritime Administration has estimated that $65,736,000 will be required for operating subsidies in 1954, and approximately $69 million in 1955.

"Sixteen steamship lines currently are receiving subsidy aid. Their ships ply 28 essential trade routes."

Let me interject at this point my conviction that this question of maritime subsidies is the greatest obstacle American shipping has had to surmount in its efforts to win support in the Congress and throughout the country.

To those unfamiliar with the provisions of our basic shipping legislation, maritime subsidies have always represented, I daresay, so many millions of dollars tossed overboard and lost with the various subsidized shipping companies as the sole beneficiaries.

As explained above, however, this is not the case. Over the years a large percentage of these "subsidies" have been recovered directly from the profits of the companies involved, while the indirect recovery from corporation levies and personal income taxes has added greatly to that amount.

"Since 1952 United States flagships have been carrying a progressively smaller percentage of total American imports and exports.

"Latest figures available—covering 1953—show that our import-export trade was averaging 11,813,000 tons a month, with American flagships carrying 29.6 percent.

"Proponents of a strong United States merchant fleet cite this country's growing reliance on raw materials from abroad. The Committee of American Steamship Lines, trade association for the subsidized lines, stresses this theme in a recent study which reveals, among other things, that the jobs of about 1 million persons in Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan depend upon ocean transport of 15 raw materials vital to steel mill operation.

"Fifty-four passenger-carrying vessels are now operating under the United States flag. Thirty-seven are privately owned, 17 are property of the Government. Private owners maintain 758 United States-flag freighters, of which more than 100 are now inactive, and 433 tankers, of which 94 are in layup.

"Total private investment in dry cargo vessels and tankers has been estimated at $1,830 billion. What this figure fails to show is the career investment of some 200,000 men and women whose livelihoods depend upon American ocean ships.

"The urgent requirements of defense underlie the efforts which such groups as the American Merchant Marine Institute are now making to improve our merchant fleet. Government officials have learned that they must equate our defense capabilities with a strong, readily available merchant fleet. World Wars I and II and the Korean conflict demonstrated conclusively that merchant vessels are indispensable to the mass movement of military equipment and personnel and the raw materials needed for war production."

Nevertheless, some, in Congress and elsewhere, seem to be unalterably opposed to payment by Government of any aids to shipping. Forgetting, or perhaps unaware of, the fact that sizeable recoveries from subsidy funds have been and are being made, they take the position that the merchant marine is too great a drain upon Government. Some even go so far as to argue that we could, and should, save money by using foreign ships to carry our foreign trade. Here again they overlook or are unaware of the fact that, on practically all the established trade routes, conference agreements provide that foreign ship rates are the same as those of American-flag vessels, and that the ocean-shipping rates have a tendency to go sky high in emergencies, particularly when American-flag vessels are not available to us. We must not forget the bitter experience of the past when our Nation has sought to use foreign shipping in periods of emergency.

Further, no discussion of maritime subsidies could be considered complete, or conclusive, if it is limited strictly to the amounts paid out by the Government in ship construction and operating differential subsidies, and the portion of such funds recovered from profits of the subsidized lines.

To begin with, American shipping is as much a part of the defense structure of the country as are the fighting ships and auxiliaries of the Navy, the warplanes that operate from bases all over the world, and the land forces, the millions of fighting men, stationed in far-away bases, who must be kept supplied with food, armaments, medical requirements, and a thousand-and-one other products. Without the constant flow of supplies made possible by the vessels of the American merchant marine, and without the services of the thousands of trained officers and men of the merchant marine, this vast military establishment would be absolutely incapable of functioning, it would bog down quickly and completely.

The Nation is spending billions and billions of dollars to develop and maintain a military establishment capable of carrying on war anywhere throughout the world. Isn't it reasonable that we should spend some small percentage of those defense billions, to assure continued functioning of those military forces under the stress and strains of all-out-war? Even if the merchant marine cost the taxpayers hundreds of millions each year—which it never has—the services rendered by American shipping in World War II and the Korean hostilities would clearly demonstrate the wisdom of paying such a price to keep the merchant fleet in being, ready for any emergency calls.

On many counts it is possible to refute the argument that this Nation's shipping is an unbearable, and unjustifiable, deadweight on the taxpayers. Government participation in the maritime field makes it possible for the shipping lines to maintain vessels and shore facilities that furnish thousands of jobs, both directly and indirectly, throughout the country. The same holds true for the shipyards, to which construction differential payments are made.

These two industries pay, in the aggregate, vast amounts of taxes; likewise, their thousands of officials and employees, the latter mostly skilled, well-paid craftsmen, pay many additional millions in personal income taxes. Added to these are the tax payments from the many industries largely or solely dependent upon the continued functioning of American shipping, and their thousands of employees and officials.

The net result, I believe it can safely be said, is that, despite the terrific competition of low-wage foreign shipping, the American

merchant marine actually has been, if not self-supporting, at least so nearly so as to require only a negligible Government aid in the final analysis.

One of the larger subsidized shipping lines recently completed a study of its experience with Government subsidies. It is the first such statement that has come to my attention, and I am not in a position to state, therefore, whether the experience of this particular line is typical of the entire industry, or not. However, in line with the old adage that "the proof of the pudding is in the eating," I think the study deserves the serious consideration of Senators and citizens alike.

Here a word of praise might well be said for those former Members of the Congress who framed the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. They were extremely farsighted when they carefully designed the recapture provision of that act. It is a most unique provision. By virtue of it the Federal Government reserves the right, under specified conditions, to recapture up to the full amount of the operating subsidy paid during the effective recapture accounting period.

In effect, the recapture provision requires the Maritime Board to withhold the actual payment of subsidy accruals to the extent that the profit of the subsidized vessel operator exceeds 10 percent of his capital necessarily employed in the operation. The performance, under this section, of at least this one major subsidized operator would seem to prove a point and, to my mind, is worthy of special comment. The company in question is the owner and operator of one of the larger fleets of freight vessels under the American flag.

Its first subsidy contract was executed in 1937, from which time (excluding the war years, 1943 to 1946 inclusive) through 1953, it performed 2,969 round voyages with privately owned American-flag vessels on five trade routes declared by the Maritime Board to be essential.

As authorized in its contract, the company accrued operating-differential subsidy in the amount of $49,800,000. Its profit for this operation permitted the Government to recapture a total of $33,600,000. Thus, actual payments to the company by the Government in the form of operating subsidy were $16,200,000.

During this same period from 1937 through 1953, this company paid $18,800,000 in Federal income taxes. This was a net return to the Government from its operation of $2,600,000, to say nothing of the Federal and State taxes paid by the company's employees or of the beneficial effect of the company's healthy operation upon our entire national economy.

In addition to the above-referred-to subsidized operation with its own vessels, the company also chartered from the Government quite a large fleet of Government surplus war-built ships, as authorized by the Ship Sales Act of 1946. This bare-boat charter operation, from May 1, 1946, through December 31, 1952, brought to the company an additional profit of $6,400,000, which likewise was made subject to the recapture provisions of its subsidy contract. And the company paid a total charter hire to the Government of $28,600,000 for the temporary use of these vessels.

Thus this operator, during the years following the enactment of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 through the year 1953, has paid to the Government, in the form of subsidy recapture, Federal income taxes and charter hire, some $31 million above and beyond the amount of subsidies received by it from the Government during this period.

It is freely admitted that the steamship business is cyclical, and that the subsidized lines, during certain depressed periods, cannot exist without full payment of subsidy under the parity principle. During the good years, however, the Government shares proportionately in the profits as and when they accrue—a fact which I fear is all too little understood and appreciated.

It does seem to me that the results noted, covering the entire shipping subsidy period, do suggest that the word subsidy is at least challengeable as applied to participation by Government in the operation of this one steamship company.

SUPPORT FOR PROPOSAL FOR ANNUAL ADDRESS TO CONGRESS BY THE CHIEF JUSTICE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 4, which I submitted on January 21, 1955, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two interesting articles which appeared recently in the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 25, 1955]

WHY NOT A HEARING FOR CHIEF JUSTICE?

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

The parade of foreign dignitaries who have addressed Congress over the years is being cited by some of the legislators who want to hear an address by the Chief Justice.

The argument of these legislators: Congress listens to the aspirations and problems of officials of other lands. Shouldn't it give equal attention to the problems of the chief of one of the three branches of its own Government—particularly when these problems affect all the American people?

Since the days of Lafayette, scores of foreign emissaries have addressed one or both branches of Congress. There has also been a sprinkling of American generals and a few cabinet officers.

In one 4-month period in 1917, 9 different representatives of foreign countries addressed 1 or both Houses of Congress.

Between January and July of 1954, Congress assembled in joint meeting four times to hear foreign dignitaries.

Debates in Congress, a flowery predecessor of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, shows the Marquis de Lafayette addressed a joint session of Congress on December 10, 1824. The volume notes that the Speaker addressed the Nation's guest in an "eloquent strain, adorned by those graces of oratory for which he is distinguished." Lafayette's speech, according to this record, was delivered "in a tone in which energy of character and sensibility of feeling were most interestingly blended."

A half century later, a Chief Justice did address a joint session—by default. On December 18, 1874, His Majesty David Kalakaua, King of the Hawaiian Islands, appeared before a joint session but the first reigning sovereign to visit these shores was suffering from a severe cold. So Chief Justice Allen of the Hawaiian Islands read his address.

From then on, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is spotted with names familiar now only to students of foreign affairs. There was, for instance, Count Albert Apponyi, Hungarian Minister of Education, who addressed the House in 1911. And Reni Viviani, Vice Premier of France, who addressed the Senate on May 1, 1917, and came back to address the House 2 days later. And Baron Moncheur, chief of the political bureau of the Belgian Foreign Office, who addressed the Senate on June 22, 1917, and the House 5 days later. And Prof. Boris Bakhmetieff, Ambassador from the Republic of Russia, who addressed the House on June 23, 1917, and the Senate 3 days later. The legislators also paused that busy summer to hear addresses by a member of a Japanese war mission and by the head of the Serbian war mission, among others.

British Prime Ministers have been frequent Capitol Hill speakers. Ramsay MacDonald addressed the Senate in 1929. Winston Churchill addressed an informal joint session in the Senate chamber on December 26, 1941; addressed a joint meeting in the House chamber on May 19, 1943, and another joint meeting on January 17, 1952. Clement Attlee also addressed a joint meeting on November 13, 1945.

Among the countries whose spokesmen have appeared before one or both chambers, separately or in joint meeting, have been France, Hawaii, Hungary, Italy, Belgium, Russia, Japan, Serbia, Great Britain, Union of South Africa, Canada, Nicaragua, Peru, Philippine Islands, Greece, Yugoslavia, the Netherlands. Ecuador, India, Chile, Pakistan, Australia, Turkey, Ethiopia, China, Bolivia, Czechoslovakia, Liberia, Paraguay, Venezuela, Brazil, Mexico, Cuba, and South Korea.

Congress has paused in its business of legislating to hear Americans, too, though less frequently. Cordell Hull, as Secretary of State, addressed a joint meeting of Congress in 1943. Gen. Julius Franklin Howell, as acting commander in chief of the United States Confederate Veterans, addressed the House in 1944.

As supreme allied commander, General Eisenhower addressed a joint meeting in 1945. So did Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz. Gen. Douglas MacArthur made his long-awaited appearance before a joint meeting of Congress in 1951. And Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway addressed a joint meeting in 1952.

Last year, the House and Senate held joint meetings to hear President Celal Bayar of Turkey in January, Governor General Vincent Massey of Canada and Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopa in May and President Syngman Rhee of South Korea in July.

There have been kings and queens, prime ministers and premiers, cabinet officers and generals. Some legislators feel it is now time to hear from another distinguished visitor to the halls of Congress—the Chief Justice of the United States.

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 20, 1955]

STOREY, EX-PRESIDENT OF UNITED STATES BAR, BACKS CHIEF JUSTICE REPORT—JUDICIAL BRANCH NEEDS CONGRESS SPOKESMAN, DALLAS LAWYER SAYS

A former president of the American Bar Association and widely known southern lawyer today endorsed the proposal for an annual address to Congress by the Chief Justice in the interest of prompt and efficient justice.

Robert G. Storey of Dallas, Tex., made this statement to the Star:

"The judicial department of our Government should have a spokesman, just as the executive branch has a spokesman and the legislative branch has spokesmen.

"In my observations as president of the American Bar Association and as a long-time member of the bar, the judges get together at meetings and make recommendations, but they really have no spokesman. No public attention is given to their needs."

NEEDS WOULD BE UNDERSTOOD

"It is entirely proper and fitting that the Chief Justice make a statement to the Congress once a year, reviewing the accomplishments of the judiciary and outlining its needs. Certainly, the Chief Justice is the head of the judicial system and I do not see why he should not be its spokesman.

"I feel that the Congress and the people would support the reasonable needs of the judiciary if they knew the facts. These facts have not been properly disseminated. I think there is a great lack of information on the part of the public and even the Congress of the actual condition of the judiciary. The case loads are far beyond the capacity of the courts in many areas. The facts properly brought to the attention of the Congress

and the public would result in help for the judiciary.

"There is another reason for the Chief Justice to address the Congress. In this world-wide struggle between the Communist way of life and the free world, one of the basic issues is the type of judicial system which will survive—whether one as independent as ours from any outside influence will decide on questions of life, liberty and property or one dominated by the Kremlin."

SAFEGUARD OF LIBERTY

"I don't believe our people as a whole understand the safeguards and guaranties we receive through our independent judiciary system. Our contracts are sacred and enforced. Under the Communist regime, contracts are not sacred. Our independent judiciary system is one of the greatest safeguards of liberty not only for us but for other free nations.

"Long delays in the disposition of cases will affect the standing and integrity of the judicial system and hence tend to weaken it. We should do all we can to assure that justice will be prompt as well as efficient."

AIR CARGO LOGISTICS AND THE FAIRCHILD FLYING BOXCAR

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the Fairchild flying boxcar, truly an aviation workhorse, is one of the special products developed by Maryland hands. Located at Hagerstown, Md., the Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corp. has for a great many years turned out military troop and cargo transports. More than 1,200 of these planes have been produced since VE-day in 1945.

Recently the flying boxcar was made the key item in a planned and scheduled air cargo service operated by the United States Air Force in Europe, under the command of Lt. Gen. William H. Tunner. The development of a regular airlift through careful planning has been receiving increasing attention, and has been the means of providing an astounding increase in combat effectiveness for military planes and crews stationed in various areas of the world. By efficiently utilizing pilots and crews in their required routine training, freight transportation between military bases on a scheduled basis has been effected without additional cost to the Government.

Mr. President, in December 1954 there appeared in the Pegasus, a monthly publication of the Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corp., an article on the subject of the importance of air cargo logistics, the excellence of which prompts me to ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRACKING THE AOCP BARRIER

In an operation lacking the high drama of the Berlin Airlift or the combat urgency of Korea, but with even greater import for the future, Lt. Gen. William H. Tunner has directed the fashioning of an air logistics service that has increased the combat effectiveness of the USAF in Europe by an astounding percentage — astounding but highly classified. And the job has been done with great and measurable savings to the United States.

General Tunner took over command of USAFE—United States Air Forces in Europe—in July 1953. It was a command that had made very major strides in the buildup of air strength on the continent. The Ramstein Complex [Pegasus, November 1953] had been built into business and as the buildup of the Air Force in the United States continued, new units would flow into the command. The slow and frustrating construction of NATO bases in France was a harassing problem and still needs must be nursemaided into effectiveness. As General Tunner took over the details of his command he found the maintenance and supply of his USAF units, and that of the MIDAP commands, tied to traditional ground transport. A few C–47's borrowed and begged from administrative units were being flown on scattered emergency supply missions. By November of 1953 he had established by air logistics service, and its planes that month flew 1,000 tons of cargo.

As of November 1 this year, 12 months after the establishment of the Air Logistics Service as the keystone in a program to increase the combat availability of American aircraft on the continent, approximately 3,600 tons a month are being carried on scheduled cargo flights flown over trunk and feeder routes by Fairchild C–119 flying boxcars. Cargo carried in the 12-month period has gone as high as 4,000 tons in a month. Of these 3,600 tons, 84 percent are critical, high-cost items required to keep fighter aircraft ready to fly—and ready to fight. The remaining 16 percent consists of filler items put aboard to utilize the capacity of the flying boxcars and, at the same time, save this additional cost of ground transport of the items.

About the only way in which an estimate of what this means can be given, without at the same time giving away order of battle information to the Russians, is that $345 million would represent the essential cost of the number of additional wings needed to maintain the higher level of combat readiness now being attained over that available when the program started. At the same time, it is estimated that $500,000 a year is being saved on ground transportation costs alone, not taking into consideration the losses ascribable to damage and pilferage, both of which had been major items of expense in the European logistics system. An additional saving will come with the development of a new pallet and loading system devised in the European theater and now being service-tested. This, it is now estimated, will save 90 percent of loading time when it has been put into general service in the 200-plus C–119's assigned to the USAFE.

The additional cost of flying these 3,600 tons a month? Nothing. The flying boxcars in the Air Logistics Service are programed for 32 flight hours per month. Previously, the programed hours had been entirely utilized in routine training or Army cooperation missions. Today, the Army requirements are being met, while 50 percent of the total capability of the 3 C–119 wings—the veteran 60th and 317th and the more recently arrived 465th—is devoted to the scheduled service. This service in itself is viewed as primary training along the lines of troop carrier realities developed during the Korean war. A rotational squadron, the 776th of the 456th Wing normally based at Charleston, S. C., also contributes planes, crews, and experience to the Air Logistics Service. The 60th Wing is based at the huge Rhein-Main base outside Frankfort, Germany. The 317th is based at Neubiberg, near Munich, and the 465th is in France at Toul-Rosiere, northeast of Paris. The 776th squadron is operating from Rhein-Main.

As Leroy Whitman, editor of the unofficial but authoritative Army-Navy-Air Force Journal, describes the increased combat effectiveness rate directly attributable to the new air logistics system: "The increased strength stems from the vast understanding and experience in airlift on the part of USAFE's commander, Lt. Gen. William T. Tunner, USAF."

But even beyond this basic fact lies an unusual but quickly transmitted enthusiasm built up in the echelons of operations, transportation, supply, packaging, and material-handling units which is reflected in new procedures, new devices, new methods, and new outlooks encouraged by General Tunner, and by Maj. Gen. Mark B. Bradley, Jr., vice commander of USAFE. This enthusiasm has led to slicing of redtape and paperwork, to speeding of the gears at major depots, to the radical new pallet and loading system which has been hand fashioned in its evolution to service-test form by technicians both American and German. People all along the line who had ideas churning through their minds were encouraged to express them and the top-level interest in development of the Air Logistics Service is reflected in the building of an airlift system that resembles only in fundamental concept the great airlifts of the past in Burma, Berlin, and Korea.

Burma was a total airlift, carried out to convey all materiel and many supplies required for the maintenance of a limited force; it had to be organized and flown without regard for cost. Berlin was a one-point airlift, geared to deliver staples required to feed and warm a city under siege; it required a high degree of traffic control and turnaround techniques. Korea was a combat airlift, with heavy accent at times on airdrop in a land with few airports; it was largely one of support of operations of ground units.

USAFE's Air Logistics Service is not a total airlift. It serves many bases scattered from England to Turkey and North Africa. It is designed to improve day-to-day efficiency of an air force—to increase the size of the air force-in-being by cutting maintenance time to an irreducible minimum. To accomplish this, USAFE utilizes many of the techniques of these earlier airlifts, but, at the same time, introduces the elements of economics and air-route scheduling over both trunk and feeder lines. Additionally, it does not wholly absorb the aircraft units used, utilizing only part of their capability.

The Air Logistics Service is controlled by the 322d Air Division (combat cargo), at 12th Air Force headquarters in Ramstein, Germany. The 322d has responsibility for carriage of personnel, cargo, and mail; for supply of aircraft for airborne operations both of the United States Army and NATO allies; aeromedical evacuation and special missions. In addition to the 3 wings and 1 squadron of Fairchild C–119 flying boxcars, the 322d has been assigned C–47 aircraft, requisitioned from administrative service in tactical units, for its passenger service on the continent. These operate under the 716th Special Air Mission Squadron at Rhein-Main and the 7206th Air Base Squadron, at Athens, Greece.

Working with the 322d is the Air Secretariat of US EUCOM Joint Military Transportation Board at USAFE headquarters, which includes members from Air Force and the Army. This board receives requirements and allocates space to units requesting air logistic support.

USAFE headquarters is now situated at Lindsey Air Base, a former German Army establishment on the outskirts of Wiesbaden, Germany. Until this year, USAFE headquarters was scattered through 33 rented buildings in downtown Wiesbaden, and the consolidation is saving $500,000 a year in rentals alone.

The Lindsey establishment was refinished by the German Government to meet the needs of USAFE, and with the move to the new kaserne the command headquarters and the Wiesbaden area command were consolidated. Although termed an air base, the only landing field at the headquarters is a small area for helicopters.

A few figures dramatize the magnitude of the USAFE operation in Europe and the importance of the new airlift concept to the

carrying out of the American mission on the continent. USAFE represents a $3½ billion investment on the part of the United States in aircraft, equipment, and supplies, and real estate facilities. It is manned by 115,483 persons with an annual payroll of $285,340,867. It is spending more than $200 million a year in construction at the present time, with total expenditures on the Continent of more than $375 million, exclusive of United States pay.

The Air Logistics Service operates over routes totaling 16,000 miles. The flying boxcars cover more than 260,000 miles a month on the trunk and feeder routes, operating 58 flights a week in regular service and utilizing up to 18 C–119's a day.

Trunk routes are those between the huge depots at Burtonwood, England; Chateauroux, France, and Erding, near Munich in Germany via Rhein-Main; another trunk operates from Chateauroux to Bordeaux, France, and across Spain to Nouasseur, near Casablanca in French Morocco; another from Nouasseur to Wheelus Field at Tripoli.

The feeder runs are those among the base complex in southern Germany and northern France, serving six bases at the present time, 6 days a week.

The feeder runs are from Erding through Rhein-Main and Landstuhl to Chateauroux; and from Toul through Laon to Chateauroux, returning to Toul through Chaumont; from Rhein-Main through the Hahn and Bitburg bases to Chateauroux. Greece and Turkey are served by an additional trunk MDAP route operation, with five flights weekly being flown between Erding or Chateauroux through Athens to Ekisehir in Turkey. Still other flights, when necessary, serve these countries from Wheelus Field, where cargo for these countries brought from the United States is dropped by the Military Air Transport Service on its service to Dhahran, Saudi Arabia.

Denmark is serviced by one flight each week, but will take over its own supply flights as its C–47 fleet becomes fully operational.

Italy and Belgium also have been worked into the program, operating at least one flight a week into the depot at Chateauroux with their MDAP C–119 flying boxcars.

In addition to the regularly scheduled 58 flights per week, there also exists what is known as the lift of opportunity, by which an effort is made to locate and load cargo on an airplane going on a mission of some other type if the load will not affect the carrying out of the mission assigned.

Served by this airlift, in addition to the important interdepot operation, are 6 USAF fighter-bomber wings, 2 USAF pilotless bomb squadrons, 8 USAF fighter-interceptor squadrons, and 3 USAF C–119 wings themselves, the big strategic bases of north Africa, the MDAP units of the NATO countries, and the Army aviation units in Germany. These latter pick up their supplies from the nearest Air Force base served by the Air Logistics Service.

Before the Air Logistics Service began its operations, the mechanics of requisitioning and receiving routine items from base to depot to base required an average of 45 days. A goal of 23 days was set for the total materiel pipeline—air and ground—system, and at one time during the year this target almost was met. It has recently crept up to 28 days, and, needless to say for the benefit of those who know General Tunner, is being worked upon—rather strenuously, continuously and with almost religious fervor.

Priority items were taking 16 days before ALS. A goal of 6 days was set; the chart lines crossed that point several months ago and are now down to 3½ days.

In Turkey, it had been taking an average of 150 days to obtain parts and supplies. This has been cut to between 15 and 20 days, a matter which is also getting considerable attention to determine why it is even that long a time.

When it is considered that an estimated $1,400,000 inventory is carried for every day of Air Force supply in the European theater, it is obvious that elements other than combat effectiveness are involved, as vital as is the combat posture in a situation in which victory or defeat could be decided in a matter of hours.

The reduction in supply time is not solely a matter of air delivery. It involves innovations in procedures, in paperwork, packaging, and attitudes.

For example, requisitions today are prepared at the bases on a basis of priority lists, separated into priority and routine envelopes, and hand delivered to the crew of the ALS airplane going through, and delivered at the depot directly to the voucher section—bypassing the Adjutant General step—for processing. At the depot a further analysis is given the requisitions, and, even though the item may be ordered as routine, it will be air-shipped if it comes in the high-cost category. This is not necessarily an item on which the cost of purchase alone is high, but rather one in which a number of elements enter: expense of packaging, expense of acquisition, expense of warehousing, expense of exposure to damage and loss, expense of ground transportation, etc.

There is a further analysis of aircraft loads as the requisitions by bases are assembled. First are the priority items, then the high-cost items, and, finally, the filler items to make up the prescribed load, set up by the 322d, which must be carried on each scheduled run. There is then analysis to determine if extra sections will be required to meet commitments. The 3½-day figure for receipt of priority items is proof enough that the system has been thoroughly shaken down.

The C–119 flying boxcars are given a form of combat loading, with the ultimate aim of cutting ground time to a minimum.

Being given service tests in the Air Logistics Service is a new form of pallet-loading, which, it is hoped by its originators, will reduce loading time by 90 percent and permit a leveling out of labor peaks and valleys in the depots. While pallets are not particularly novel, the USAFE system meets that description. It has been evolved by trial and error to a point at which it now appears that it well may be a major development in cargo handling.

The heart of the system is a combination of light tracks and wheeled pallets which permit ready movement of the pallets in a warehouse, aboard trucks and onto aircraft. On the aircraft, they are automatically positioned and held in position by the tracks, which are so arranged that they can be connected to existing tie-down structure, disconnected and folded completely out of the way, or removed completely from the plane if necessary for other missions. It is estimated that the track can be installed or removed in 5 minutes, and when folded, in 2 to 3 minutes, in each instance by 1 man. They fold into an area 2 inches wide and 9 inches high.

The pallets are built with lightweight steel bracing and aluminum, in 2 sizes, 40 by 48 inches and 60 by 84 inches. They weigh approximately 40 pounds, as compared with the 80 pounds of the normal wooden pallet. The entire system weighs in at about 900 pounds.

The development will be tested on the feeder run between Rhein-Main and Chateauroux, at first on 4 C–119 aircraft and eventually on 25 of the flying boxcars.

Unusually high load factors have been maintained by the Air Logistics Service through close control in the operations section of the 322d Air Division. On the trunk lines, a load factor of 75 percent has been attained. Feeder lines are exceeding 65 percent, for an overall efficiency of more than 90 percent. The feeder load factor is compromised by the fact that return loads from air bases served on the feeder system are only about 30 percent. It has been estimated, for a basis of comparison, that commercial freight carriers have been operating with an average load factor of less than 60 percent.

The average load carried by the C–119's in the Air Logistics Service is 11,000 pounds, ranging up to 14,000 pounds on some runs.

Thus far, the Air Logistics Service operates primarily for the Air Force. Small quantities for the limited naval forces in Europe also are carried. Supplies and materiel for the Army are handled through a liaison officer at Chateauroux, and Army supplies are beginning to move through the system as a result of USAFE studies of applications of the system to the Army. Foreseen is a possibility of effective and expanding use for the same type of supplies now hauled for the Air Force. This would cover tank engines and similar equipment, which would permit reduction of time out of service for maintenance and at the same time permit removal of war-risk items to safer areas. This has been done by the USAFE with the depot at Erding, for a long time the principal supply center in Europe but within minutes by air of the Russian zone. War risk items have been transferred to the establishments at Chateauroux and Burtonwood. Erding now being used largely for MDAP items and routine supplies.

USAFE estimates that the tonnage being carried will increase over the next several years as additional units arrive from the States to fill NATO bases being built in France.

THE TALENT IRRIGATION AND POWER PROJECT IN JACKSON COUNTY, OREG.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the failure to include in the 1956 budget any funds for starting construction of the Talent irrigation project constitutes a betrayal of the people of southern Oregon.

During the political campaign of last fall celebrations were staged by the Republican Party heralding the Talent project. The unmistakable impression was given to the voters of Jackson County that the great undertaking was on the threshold of being brought to fruition.

Yet, having used this important project, which has the support of Oregonians of all political persuasions, as a campaign device to drum up Republican votes, the administration has now evidently abandoned interest in the project, as demonstrated by the fact that no funds have been included in the budget for construction of either irrigation works or the powerplant.

Both my distinguished senior colleague from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and I have urged the Interior Department to provide funds in the budget for the Talent project. At this point, Mr. President, I should like to make available for the RECORD the letter which I addressed to the Secretary of the Interior on January 11, 1955, less than a week after I took the oath of office as a Senator, making a formal request for recognition of the urgent need to begin the Talent project.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 11, 1955.

Hon. DOUGLAS MCKAY,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This is a formal request to urge that you include funds for the Talent irrigation project in the budget of the Bureau of Reclamation for the coming fiscal year.

In my opinion, the minimum which should be recommended is $350,00 for restoring the canal systems of the Medford and Rogue River Valley Irrigation Districts. I also believe that at least $2,500,000 should be recommended for the start of construction on the physical engineering works themselves.

It is imperative, I think, that the resources of Oregon be developed in an orderly manner, in the public interest, in order to care for the large population influx which migrated into our State between 1940 and 1953. These people can earn a living at productive work only if we use our resources wisely and well. I feel certain that the Talent irrigation and power project constitutes such use of our resources.

Because the total cost of the project is $22 million, it is obvious that even a recommendation of nearly $3 million in the coming fiscal year budget will still leave a considerable amount of time before the project can be completed.

I hope that you and your associates in the administration can see fit to recommend in the budget the funds necessary to get the Talent project well started.

With good wishes, I am,

Respectfully yours,
RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

Mr. NEUBERGER. During the 1954 campaign my wife, who campaigned vigorously throughout the State, and I warned the people of southern Oregon that the administration might drop all real interest in the Talent project, after having used it as a campaign come-on. We pointed out that an authorization without construction funds was like a man telling his girl friend to go down to Tiffany's jewelry store to buy the best necklace in the house, but never opening his checkbook to pay the bill.

My opponent told the people of southern Oregon that it was merely run of the mill work from here on, so far as the Talent project was concerned. The Governor of Oregon said at a big political rally:

I know that you people will prove to Congress and the President that the Talent project was well considered and a worthwhile project, not only for Jackson County but for the State of Oregon and being good for Oregon, is good for the United States.

The Governor spoke as if the Talent project already were completed; but the cold, hard fact is that the 1956 budget does not provide one penny to finance concrete, excavation, girders, generators or ground clearing on the Talent project.

For political purposes the people of Jackson County were sold a mirage.

I should like to say here and now, for the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and myself, that we will spare no effort to try to redeem the broken promises which the administration made to the people of southern Oregon last year.

The budget should contain $2,500,000 for the start of engineering and construction on the physical engineering works themselves. The whole project will cost approximately $23 million so even this is only a modest beginning.

Plans for the Talent division of the Rogue River Basin call for development of storage facilities to irrigate 17,890 acres of land in Bear Creek Valley, and the construction of a 16,000-kilowatt hydroelectric plant. The Talent division includes 9,250 irrigable acres in the Talent irrigation district which require supplemental water, and also 8,640 irrigable acres of dry lands.

The area critically needs a reliable and permanent supply of water, which can come only with adequate storage. The Talent project will provide this storage.

Oregon is one of the 2 or 3 fastest growing States in the Nation. It needs sound and steady development of its natural resources. Its people should not be subjected to so-called political authorizations of projects, which then are cavalierly abandoned, once the campaign at the polls is over. Either a project is sound or it is not. Why authorize it with bands and fanfare and political speeches, if there is no genuine intention to provide the funds with which the authorization can be turned into steel and concrete and rushing water in canals?

Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a dispatch by Mr. A. Robert Smith in the Medford (Oreg.) Mail-Tribune of January 9, 1955, describing the elimination of the Talent project from the budget; a story in the same paper of January 17, 1955, detailing my letter to Secretary McKay requesting funds for the Talent project; and a report by the Commissioner of Reclamation, dated March 17, 1954, setting forth some of the details of the Talent project in Jackson County, Oreg.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TALENT PROJECT OUT OF FEDERAL BUDGET, CORRESPONENT SAYS—ELECTION RESULTS SAID REASON FOR REMOVAL

(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—The Eisenhower administration has passed over Oregon in preparing the new Federal budget in the field of new reclamation projects for 1955, while approving new starts on added irrigation acreages in neighboring Washington, Idaho, and California.

Oregon was left out because of the outcome of the recent election, in which the voters of the State refused to return Republican Senator Guy Cordon and thereby gave Democrats control of the Senate, according to a highly placed administration official.

The Oregon project which the Bureau of Reclamation and Oregon Members of Congress have been seeking to get started in 1955 is the Talent division of the Rogue River project, a $20,500,000 irrigation proposal near Medford authorized by Congress last summer.

REPORTED TURNED DOWN

But reportedly the project was turned down by the Budget Bureau, which has the last word on how to allocate the President's annual budget requests—that is, which projects go in and which get chopped off. Official word on the matter will not be out until President Eisenhower sends his detailed budget message to Congress January 17.

Only three new reclamation projects are reportedly contained in the new budget—Santa Maria, near Santa Barbara, Calif.; Michaud Flats near American Falls Dam on the Snake River, Idaho; and Foster Creek near Chief Joseph Dam on the Columbia River, Wash.

A high administration official said Senator Cordon had tried before leaving office this past week to get the Budget Bureau to unloosen funds for the Rogue River project.

"WHY HELP CORDON?"

"But the boys in the Bureau feel, 'Why should they help Cordon? He was defeated.' And that's all they need to cut a project out of the budget."

Reminded that Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay is still in office and favors the project, the official declared: "But the Budget Bureau has seen the Oregon election returns, and they know McKay came out on the short end."

In short, it was pointed out the few projects gaining approval were doled out to States that stood by GOP candidates. The California project is a pet of Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, a Republican reelected in November; the Idaho project is a favorite of Senator HENRY DWORSHAK, a victorious Republican in 1954; and the Washington project goes to Representative WALT HORAN, Republican, and Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, a Democrat who will be the top man from the Northwest on the powerful Senate Appropriations Committee in this Congress.

ELLSWORTH SOUGHT APPROVAL

Representative HARRIS ELLSWORTH, Republican, of Oregon, said he vigorously argued for Rogue River project funds but had no word on whether they had been approved or disapproved.

From Democratic circles, it became clear that Senator WAYNE MORSE and Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER will try to add funds to the budget during its review by Congress, and that the slighted Oregon project would be one they would push. The long-haul strategy of Democrats so long as they control Congress and the GOP controls the executive departments, it is expected, will be something like this:

Although Eisenhower does not ask Congress for funds to start many new projects, the Democrats will move to jack up his budgets by adding funds for such resource development. They will initially appropriate the minimum amount of money needed in each State to get construction work started, which would be calculated to force the administration in subsequent years to request additional funds to complete the projects without politically risky and uneconomic interruptions.

NEUBERGER CALLS ON MCKAY TO ADD FUNDS FOR TALENT PROJECT

Oregon Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER has called on Interior Secretary Douglas McKay to include at least $2,850,000 in the budget of the Bureau of Reclamation to be used for the Talent irrigation project.

CANAL RESTORATION

In a letter written to McKay, a copy of which was furnished to the Mail Tribune, NEUBERGER stated: "In my opinion the maximum which should be recommended is $350,000 for restoring the canal systems of the Medford and Rogue River Valley Irrigation Districts. I also believe that at least $2,500,000 should be recommended for the start of construction on the physical engineering works themselves.

"It is imperative, I think, that the resources of Oregon be developed in an orderly manner, in the public interest, in order to care for the large population influx which

migrated into our State between 1940 and 1953. These people can earn a living at productive work only if we use our resources wisely and well. I feel certain that the Talent irrigation and power project constitutes such use of our resources."

TOTAL COST $22 MILLION

"Because the total cost of the project is $22 million, it is obvious that even a recommendation of nearly $3 million in the coming fiscal-year budget will still leave a considerable amount of time before the project can finally be completed.

"I hope that you and your associates in the administration can see fit to recommend in the budget the funds necessary to get the Talent project well started."

PROPOSED REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER OF RECLAMATION

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D. C., March 17, 1954.

The SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

SIR: This is my proposed report on the Talent division, Rogue River Basin project, Oregon. It is based on and includes the accompanying report of the regional director, Boise, Idaho.

The Talent division is located in Jackson County of southwestern Oregon. Project lands lie along the Bear Creek, a tributary to the Rogue River, in the general vicinity of the city of Ashland and the towns of Talent and Phoenix. This multipurpose development is primarily for irrigation but also produces hydroelectric power, flood control, and incidental fish and wildlife, and recreation benefits.

There is substantial need in the project area for supplemental water for presently irrigated lands and the development of new irrigated lands from the water supply that the proposed development would make available. This is a locality with a large percentage of small farms with off-farm income playing an important role in the economy. A full water supply would furnish additional income to farmers on the small tracts and would provide for optimum use of the available water resource which, as a result of population increase, is important to the economy of the region.

Lands developed along Bear Creek for agricultural, industrial, commercial, and residential purposes are subject to flooding almost every winter. This flood damage would be substantially reduced as a result of enlarging the existing Emigrant Reservoir as part of the proposed plan. Hydroelectric power and energy that would be made available would provide a modest but valuable addition to help serve the anticipated power requirements of the area. The inhabitants have recognized the value of this development to their general welfare and there is concerted local agreement for early construction. The construction of this division would be economically justified in that the estimated annual benefits exceed the estimated annual costs by the ratio of 1.3 to 1.

The plan provides for an adequate water supply for 17,890 acres of irrigable land of which 9,250 would receive a supplemental supply and 8,640 would be newly irrigated lands and receive a full supply. In addition, the plan would develop 10,000 kilowatts of nominal prime power by integration of the proposed division powerplant with the Columbia River power system. Studies are now under way to increase this capacity to 16,000 kilowatts and a supplemental report on this will be made available in the near future.

The division plan is primarily an extension to the works of the Talent irrigation district. Existing facilities of this district would be used to as great an extent as possible and enlarged as required. Emigrant Reservoir would be increased in size from 8,300 to 45,000 acre-feet capacity, as would the lengths and capacities of the existing major canals and laterals. Hyatt Prairie Reservoir would be utilized at its present size. Major new water-collection facilities would consist of Howard Prairie Dam and Reservoir, 60,500 acre-feet capacity, a system of collection canals for diverting and conveying water from the Little Butte Creek watershed into Howard Prairie Reservoir, and the Howard Prairie delivery canal and tunnel for conveying the reservoir water and other flows of Beaver and Jenny Creeks, of the upper Klamath River watershed, across the Cascade Divide into Bear Creek. This canal and tunnel would also convey Hyatt Prairie Reservoir water. In dropping from the Cascade Divide to the enlarged Emigrant Reservoir, where it would be reregulated, the water would pass through the proposed Green Springs powerplant.

The proposed plan will require transbasin diversion of water to be successful. Studies indicate that the required supply is available and there would be no apparent conflict with existing rights. The State engineer of Oregon has expressed his approval of the proposed use of water as set forth in this report.

The estimated cost of the development based on January 1953 prices is $19,894,000. Annual operation, maintenance and replacement costs would amount to $150,500, of which $85,900 is allocated to irrigation and $64,600 allocated to power.

The allocations of the $19,894,000 to irrigation, power and flood control are respectively $12,971,000, $6,286,000, and $637,000. The latter amount is nonreimbursable in accordance with law. It is estimated that the amount allocated to power including interest during construction could be repaid from net power revenues in 49 years with interest at 2½ percent. For the water users to pay out the irrigation allocation, 70 years would be required with the aid of net power revenues after the 49th year. It is estimated that the irrigators, in addition to paying annual operation, maintenance, and replacement costs and a bonded debt with interest due on existing works, would be able to repay in the 70-year period approximately $7,870,000 of the capital costs allocated to irrigation. Aid to irrigation from net power revenues would amount to about $5,101,000.

During an interim period, it is proposed to defer development of 2,680 irrigable acres under the Phoenix Canal in the division and to use the water (9,000 acre-feet) on the Medford and Rogue River Valley irrigation districts to supplement their present inadequate supplies until an alternative source of supply can be developed. No new construction would be required to accomplish this temporary arrangement, inasmuch as the water would be released into Bear Creek for use by the district through existing facilities. The charges for the 9,000 acre-feet of water would be on the same basis as if the 2,680 acres of division land were included and would maintain feasibility of the plan.

Present plans include but a very small amount ($10,000) for fish and wildlife facilities. Studies will continue on fish and wildlife resources affected by this development and any reasonable expenditures found necessary by the Secretary for this purpose will, in final analysis, be considered nonreimbursable in accordance with existing law.

The National Park Service concludes that recreational development in the Talent division would not be of national significance. The regional director, therefore, in the absence of commitment by local interests for repayment of recreation costs and in accordance with Bureau of the Budget Circular A–47 omits recreational facilities from the plan of development recommended. However, it is believed that construction of minimum basic recreation facilities necessary to provide access, sanitation, and safety for immediate public use and for protection of the area should be undertaken as part of the project costs on a nonreimbursable basis. Accordingly, the regional director's report is hereby amended in this respect.

Except as modified with regard to fish and wildlife costs and recreational facilities, I concur in and adopt the recommendations of the regional director as set forth in paragraph 41 of his report.

I recommend that you approve and adopt this report as your proposed report on the Talent division and that you authorize me in your behalf to transmit copies to the States of Oregon and California and to the Secretary of the Army, in accordance with requirements of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 887), to the State of Oregon for the views and recommendations of the head of the agency exercising administration over the wildlife resources of that State, in accordance with provisions of the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080), and to the other interested Federal agencies for their comments.

Respectfully,

W. A. DEXHEIMER,
Commissioner.

Approved and adopted: April 1, 1954.

DOUGLAS MCKAY,
Secretary of the Interior.

PROTECTION AGAINST STORM DAMAGE

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, hurricanes Carol and Edna struck Connecticut and other Northeastern States with devastating force during 1954. Fifty-eight lives were lost; thousands of families in coastal areas suffered distress and hardship; property damages were inflicted in staggering amounts.

In an effort to find a constructive solution to the very serious problems of shorefront protection, beach erosion, and tidal flooding created by these terrible storms which have occurred with increasing frequency in recent years, I introduced on January 14 a bill authorizing a survey of the affected areas. The bill, S. 414, would require the Army engineers to determine possible means of preventing damages to property and loss of human lives by hurricane winds and tides.

The distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and his distinguished colleague [Mr. PASTORE], subsequently introduced a somewhat similar bill, although more limited in scope. I refer to S. 524. I should like at this time to express my gratitude for the kind remarks made by the senior Senator from Rhode Island in reference to my bill, and to assure him and his junior colleague that I stand ready to cooperate with them, and with all other Senators interested in constructive action toward meeting this problem.

It is my hope that these bills will be scheduled for early hearing by the Senate Committee on Public Works. I have requested the chairman, the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] to schedule hearings at the earliest practicable date.

Mr. President, many difficult problems have been created by the increasing frequency and severity of hurricane damage in the Northeast. The determination of the extent of Federal participation in meeting them will not be an easy task. But they are problems which need solution, and the leadership of the Congress is essential in exploring all possible

avenues of proper assistance to the States, communities, and people who have borne the brunt of these disasters.

I ask unanimous consent that an exchange of correspondence between the Governor of Connecticut, Hon. Abraham Ribicoff, and myself on this matter be printed at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBERS,
Hartford, January 19, 1955.

Hon. PRESCOTT BUSH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I know that you are vitally interested in the problems of shorefront protection and beach erosion as it affects the State of Connecticut. The serious effects of tidal floods and beach erosion will take the cooperation of the Federal Government, the State, the towns, and the individual property owners.

I have received a letter from Governor Roberts, of Rhode Island, who informs me that the Rhode Island delegation intends to ask for a study by the Army engineers concerning the problems which affect the navigable waters of Narragansett Bay and waters along the southern shores of New England. Furthermore, that Senator GREEN will invite congressional representatives from the three southern New England States to meet for discussion of an act the Rhode Island delegation is introducing in Congress.

In reading the proposed Rhode Island act, it would appear to me that it might be preferable to widen the scope of the survey to cover beach erosion and shorefront protection in general as well as problems of damage due to hurricane tidal floods.

I have written Governor Roberts that I am sure that the Connecticut delegation would be pleased to cooperate with other congressional representatives from adjoining States in joint action for the mutual benefit of southern New England.

It is my intention, at some future date, to call a conference to which will be invited our United States Senators, the Congressmen whose districts adjoin the Connecticut shoreline, and local officials. Before setting such date, I will clear with you to find a day mutually convenient.

If you have any suggestions, I would be pleased to receive them.

Thanking you in advance for your cooperation, I am

Sincerely,

ABE RIBICOFF,
Governor.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
January 22, 1955.

Hon. ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,
Governor of Connecticut,
State Capitol, Hartford, Conn.

DEAR GOVERNOR: Thank you for your letter of January 19. I am delighted that we share interest in the problems of shorefront protection and beach erosion vitally affecting Connecticut. In an effort to contribute toward a solution of these problems, I introduced in the Senate on January 14 a bill to authorize a survey of the New England, New York, and New Jersey coastal and tidal areas for the purpose of determining possible means of preventing damages to property and loss of human lives due to hurricane winds and tides. A copy is enclosed.

The bill was drafted after consultation with the Chief of Army Engineers and contains language broad enough to cover the very serious problems of beach erosion and shore protection in general as well as those arising from tidal flooding.

I had not been aware, at the time the bill was introduced, that Senator GREEN was working on similar legislation. His bill, in which Senator PASTORE joined as a sponsor, was introduced on January 18. I agree that the Rhode Island bill appears to be too limited in scope, and feel that by restricting the proposed survey to southern New England it narrows the support we might expect from other States in the Northeast.

As you know, bills of this nature are referred to the Committee on Public Works, of which I am a member. It is my intention to request that hearings be held at the earliest practicable date. When hearings are scheduled, I think it would be advantageous if you, as Governor of our State, could appear in person or by representative to join me in presenting Connecticut's views.

In the meantime, a conference of Connecticut Members of Congress with shoreline and local officials, such as you suggest, seems a very desirable step, and you can count on my cooperation. I will also be glad to discuss the problem with Senator GREEN when we can arrange a mutually convenient time.

Your interest in this problem, which has been a matter of deep concern to me since I entered the Senate, is fully appreciated. I am confident that by working together we will be able to make progress toward its solution.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

PRESCOTT BUSH,
United States Senator.

Mr. PURTELL subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in today's session my colleague, the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] introduced correspondence between him and the Governor of Connecticut relative to a bill providing for a study to be made relative to preventive measures guarding against hurricane damage along the New England, New York, and New Jersey coasts. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of the remarks of my colleague correspondence which I have had with Hon. Abraham Ribicoff, Governor of Connecticut.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 24, 1955.

Hon. ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,
Governor, State of Connecticut,
Executive Chambers,
Hartford, Conn.

DEAR ABE: Thank you for your letter of January 19, with respect to the communication which you received from Governor Roberts of Rhode Island, informing you of the study which the Rhode Island delegation is asking the Army engineers to conduct concerning the problems affecting the navigable waters of Narragansett Bay and waters along the southern shores of New England. This general area is one which has given me some concern for quite a period, and early last fall I first took up the matter with the office of Army engineers and had drafted for introduction in the Congress a bill which would, "authorize and direct the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, to conduct a detailed study of the coastal areas of the New England States and of New York State for the purpose of determining the feasibility of protective works in such areas against hurricanes and other heavy storms."

However, I found that Senator BUSH had likewise prepared a bill which would serve the same general purposes and, inasmuch as he is a Member of the Senate Public Works Committee, to which committee any request having to deal with public works would be referred, I deferred to him. A copy of his proposal is attached.

As I stated above my interest in this matter continues, and I shall be most pleased to cooperate with you and the other members of the Connecticut delegation as well as the representatives of neighboring States. While one cannot control the elements, I think we would be remiss in our duties if we did not look into the engineering and economic feasibility of hurricane protective works.

I shall be pleased to hear from you as to your plans for a conference and you may be sure I shall try to adapt my calendar to yours.

With every good wish, I am

Sincerely yours,

Bill

WILLIAM A. PURTELL,
United States Senator.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBERS,
Hartford, January 19, 1955.

Hon. WILLIAM A. PURTELL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: I know that you are vitally interested in the problems of shore-front protection and beach erosion as it affects the State of Connecticut. The serious effects of tidal floods and beach erosion will take the cooperation of the Federal Government, the State, the towns, and the individual property owners.

I have received a letter from Governor Roberts, of Rhode Island, who informs me that the Rhode Island delegation intends to ask for a study by the Army engineers concerning the problems which affect the navigable waters of Narragansett Bay and waters along the southern shores of New England; furthermore, that Senator GREEN will invite congressional representatives from the three southern New England States to meet for discussion of an act the Rhode Island delegation is introducing in Congress.

In reading the proposed Rhode Island act, it would appear to me that it might be preferable to widen the scope of the survey to cover beach erosion and shore-front protection in general, as well as problems of damage due to hurricane tidal floods.

I have written Governor Roberts that I am sure that the Connecticut delegation would be pleased to cooperate with other congressional Representatives from adjoining States in joint action for the mutual benefit of southern New England.

It is my intention, at some future date, to call a conference to which will be invited our United States Senators, the Congressmen whose districts adjoin the Connecticut shoreline, and local officials. Before setting such date I will clear with you to find a day mutually convenient.

If you have any suggestions, I would be pleased to receive them.

Thanking you in advance for your cooperation, I am

Sincerely,

ABE, *Governor.*

RELIEF OF TAKASHI SUGIURA

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a few days ago I introduced Senate bill 328, for the relief of Takashi Sugiura, a picture mounter in the Smithsonian Institution.

I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] be permitted to be a cosponsor of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the text of a letter written by the Director of the Smithsonian Institution to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], together with an attached memorandum.

There being no objection, the letter and the memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION,
FREER GALLERY OF ART,
Washington, D. C., January 24, 1955.

Hon. THEODORE F. GREEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GREEN: You no doubt recall meeting our Japanese picture mounter, Mr. Takashi Sugiura. Senator SALTONSTALL has introduced a bill in the Senate for the relief of our man's wife and children. The number of the bill is S. 328, and the enclosed paper will explain the situation. I do hope that you will find it possible to support this bill, which is very important to us.

Sincerely yours,

A. G. WENLEY, *Director.*

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED CONCERNING JAPANESE PICTURE MOUNTER, FREER GALLERY OF ART

Early in 1953 we brought to this country on a first priority immigration visa Mr. Takashi Sugiura, of Tokyo, Japan, to work as an oriental picture mounter in the Freer Gallery of Art. Our understanding with him was that, if both parties liked the arrangement we would bring over his wife and family at the end of a year. Now we find that, although he petitioned for the admission of Mrs. Sugiura and her three children, Motoko, Atsushi, and Kumi Sugiura, and they were placed on the waiting list on October 15, 1953, they are on the No. 3 priority list and there is no hope of getting them over here in the near future in that classification.

This matter is extremely urgent to us because, should we lose Mr. Sugiura, it would be almost impossible to get someone to take his place here. We could get no technician like him in this country, and it is difficult even in Japan to find a really good man. We therefore asked Mr. Fouche of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to draw up a bill for the relief of Mrs. Chii Sugiura, Motoko Sugiura, Atsushi Sugiura, and Kumi Sugiura. This has been introduced in both the Senate and the House of Represntatives as S. 328 on January 11 and H. R. 933 on January 5 of this year. These bills were introduced by Senator SALTONSTALL and Representative CANNON, respectively, and are identical. These two bills are worded as follows:

"*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Chii Sugiura and her three children, Motoko Sugiura, Atsushi Sugiura, and Kumi Sugiura, shall be deemed eligible for the issuance of immigration visas pursuant to section 203 (a) (1) (B) of that act notwithstanding that they are not accompanying Takashi Sugiura to the United States: *Provided,* That they are otherwise admissible to the United States and that applications for such visas are made within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this act."

We feel rather pressed, for it is urgent to the safety and preservation of our great collection of more than 2,000 paintings that Mr. Sugiura remain with us. It is now almost 1 year and 9 months since he has been in this country, and as yet we have been unable to fulfill the agreement that we made in good faith with him. This has placed a physical and financial burden on Mr. Sugiura, for not only has he been separated from his family, but he has also had to maintain two households. He has recently expressed his determination to return to Japan in the near future if nothing can be done to reunite him with his family in the United States.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO BAN THE POLL TAX

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in the last three Congresses a group of southern Senators, of which I have the privilege to be one, has introduced in each Congress a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the effect of which would be to ban the imposition of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in elections in which a President, a Vice President, Members of the United States Senate, or Members of the House of Representatives are being elected.

This has been an extremely serious effort on behalf of this group of Senators. At this time we wish to call attention to the fact that we are again introducing the same joint resolution which was introduced previously. I am honored to be joined in this effort by my colleague, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the two Senators from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. LONG], the two Senators from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN and Mr. FULBRIGHT], the two Senators from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN and Mr. SCOTT], and the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. In addition, at least a half dozen other Senators from Southern States will support the joint resolution, if it is brought to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, it is quite apparent that this matter has been allowed to become largely a poltical issue, and that no party and no Judiciary Committee up to this time has been willing to report such a proposed amendment to the Senate, where it could receive careful consideration by the entire body.

I must say that the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], former chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, was kind enough to conduct hearings on the subject last year. The hearings were completed and the printed hearings were made available. Therefore, it should not take long for the present Judiciary Committee, under the able leadership of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], to complete the consideration of the subject and to report to the Senate an appropriate joint resolution.

For myself and on behalf of the other Senators whom I have named I now introduce a joint resolution proposing the constitutional amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection the joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred. Without objection the text of the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 29) to provide for a constitutional amendment to the Constitution of the United States, introduced by Mr. HOLLAND for himself and other Senators, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax or to meet any property qualification.

"SEC. 2. Nothing in this article shall be construed to invalidate any provision of law denying the right to vote to paupers or persons supported at public expense or by charitable institutions.

"SEC. 3. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to state to the Senator from Florida that I am pleased by his introduction of the joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment with respect to poll taxes. It is my intention very shortly to introduce a bill which will try to accomplish the purpose of the joint resolution which the Senator from Florida has introduced. The bill would accomplish that result by legislative enactment.

I may say, further, that if we should be unable in the Senate and in the House to proceed with success toward the enactment of a statute, which can be held to be constitutional, to eliminate the requirement of a poll tax, I would deem it wise and prudent to undertake an appropriate program looking toward the desired result by way of a constitutional amendment, and to call for prompt action on the proposed amendment by the States.

I believe the time has arrived for us to take some action that will be meaningful and effective. I wish the Senator from Florida to know that, because we always try to treat each other with a sense of integrity and fair play. Therefore I shall try to continue to further the proposal which it is my intention to introduce with the assistance of my colleagues as cosponsors. However, I wish also to say in good faith that if those efforts are not effective and successful, I believe it will be the duty of those of us who believe that the poll-tax requirement should be eliminated to support an effort to bring the desired result about through a constitutional amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota. By way of response I should like to say that many of us disagree entirely with his belief that it would be efficacious or constitutional to bring about the desired result by a Federal statute. I believe such an approach would lead only to a snarl on the floor

of the Senate, which would get us nowhere at all.

I hope the Senator from Minnesota and other Senators will consider seriously supporting our proposal for a constitutional amendment. The senior Senator from Florida and many other Senators from the South have strongly supported such a State constitutional amendment, or statutory action, or both, in their own States, which have resulted in the elimination of the poll tax. For example, I see on the floor today several Senators who in their own States, either as members of their legislatures or as Governors—and some of them in both capacities—from time to time have accomplished that result.

We believe that with the limitations that are proposed in the joint resolution, the constitutional amendment could be submitted quickly to the States and that probably it could be adopted even more quickly than any other amendment has been heretofore adopted.

We have indicated to the members of the Committee on the Judiciary that we would be perfectly willing to have a 2-year limitation or any other reasonable limitation placed upon the measure, because we are confident of its prompt adoption by most of the several States, if they are given an opportunity to act on it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I gladly yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to express the hope that the Committee on the Judiciary will proceed along the lines of the request of the Senator from Florida, and hold hearings on the joint resolution. I should like to say further that, while one always has his own personal convictions as to the best manner in which to approach a very difficult problem, which in this case relates to the election laws of the various States and the right of franchise, I believe the important thing is to get something done.

I believe the Senator from Florida will find that the junior Senator from Minnesota, instead of trying to be an obstructionist in any way, will try to be a supporter of prompt and effective consideration of the joint resolution. At the same time, with all the vigor I have and with the powers of persuasion I have, I shall try to gain majority support for a legislative proposal.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, if I am permitted to do so.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired. The Senate is still operating under the 2-minute order.

Mr. HOLLAND. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed additional time so that I may yield for a question to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from West Virginia may proceed.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is undoubtedly aware of the fact that in days gone by I have advocated that the best way in which to handle the poll-tax situation was by a constitutional amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I recall that with pleasure.

Mr. KILGORE. The effect of a constitutional amendment would be much more far-reaching than would the effect of a bill. For that reason I am glad the Senator from Florida has introduced his joint resolution, and it is my hope that we will get efficacious action on the matter in committee, so that it may be reported to the Senate as soon as possible.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am very much encouraged by the remarks of the Senator from West Virginia.

APPOINTMENT OF GEN. DOUGLAS MacARTHUR TO THE RANK OF GENERAL OF THE ARMIES

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, on January 21, a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 26) was introduced on the floor of the Senate. This resolution authorizes the appointment of Gen. Douglas MacArthur to the rank of General of the Armies. Today, on the 75th birthday of this distinguished American, I should like to speak on behalf of this resolution.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur has marched through history with the alert, giant strides of a man who knows where he is going. This colorful son of a colorful father was born 75 years ago today on an Army post in Arkansas. He was born into the Army. He gave it his life.

The early record of Douglas MacArthur promised the great future he later achieved. He graduated from West Point as the No. 1 man in his class. He achieved the incredible record of 98.14 percent in all his studies. It was no surprise that he was selected as the man most likely to succeed.

His record in the Rainbow Division of World War I was one of courage combined with astute military judgment. When he was appointed Chief of Staff of the United States Army by President Hoover he was only 50 years old. He was the youngest man ever to hold that high position.

The highlight of his career came in the Second World War. Few of us will forget his brilliant and inspired defense of the Philippines. The news was tragically bad from all fronts. The Dutch East Indies and Singapore fell like dominoes before the rush of the Japanese. But General MacArthur conducted a defense of Bataan that was both brilliant and valuable. The Japanese planning for the conquest of the Philippines was thrown completely off schedule. The free world watched and took heart. Handicapped by small forces and by meager resources, he held on to give us the precious time we needed so vitally. Even in adversity this was one of his finest hours.

When victory finally came it was due in no small part to the magnificent leadership of Douglas MacArthur. But he was not yet free of responsibility. After a spectacularly successful period of Japanese reconstruction, MacArthur again assumed the role of military leader with the invasion of South Korea. Again his judgment and vigor led us successfully through a trying time. The brilliance of the master craftsman appeared with the attack on Inchon. The Nation had again called on Douglas MacArthur and again he had responded.

A brilliant military tactician, a sound statesman, a warm human being—this is Gen. Douglas MacArthur. To raise his rank to General of the Armies would be a fitting tribute to a truly great man.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Iowa on his remarks concerning that great American, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and to join with the Senator in the sentiments which he has expressed upon the occasion of the 75th birthday of that very distinguished citizen of our country.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute and in saying "Happy birthday" to that great professional military tactician who is today celebrating his 75the birthday anniversary in the city of Los Angeles, Calif.

I remind the Senate that last week I introduced a joint resolution, which was cosponsored by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and other Senators, which would accord to General MacArthur the distinguished honor of being General of the Armies of the United States. I should like to invite all my colleagues to join in the sponsorship of that resolution.

It has been impossible to call this matter to the attention of the Committee on Armed Services because that committee has been holding hearings on Formosan problems.

I should like to give way to any of my senior colleagues who favor the resolution, and who, because of their superior knowledge of the great work of General MacArthur, might desire to be the author of the resolution which I have heretofore introduced. So again I say to General MacArthur, on behalf of the people of Idaho—yes, on behalf of the people of this Nation—"Happy birthday," and many, many more of them. I thank the Senators for their interest in the matter.

PROTECTION OF THE SECURITY OF FORMOSA

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, which held a joint meeting, I report favorably Senate Joint Resolution 28, authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States to protect the security of Formosa, and for other purposes. I request unanimous consent to file the joint report of the two committees on the resolution sometime during today.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, may I inquire of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations if it is the purpose, to his knowledge, to bring up this matter for consideration immediately, or if the Senate will have a few days in which to study the joint resolution?

Mr. GEORGE. It is not my purpose to move the immediate consideration of the joint resolution, but I expect to move tomorrow morning to proceed with its discussion.

Mr. LONG. Are we to understand that debate on the measure in the Senate is to be undertaken without Senators having had more than simply tomorrow morning in which to study the report of the committees?

Mr. GEORGE. The report of the committees will be filed sometime during this afternoon—as early as possible, I may say to the Senator—and I hope that the Senate will be ready to proceed with the consideration of the joint resolution tomorrow.

Mr. LONG. Can the distinguished Senator from Georgia inform the Senate how much time Senators will have in which to study the report of the committees before the Senate takes up the matter?

Mr. GEORGE. I cannot say. I shall move the consideration of the joint resolution tomorrow, immediately upon the convening of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report, when filed, will be received and placed on the calendar.

In that connection, House Joint Resolution 159, a similar joint resolution, also will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that I have been advised that a joint meeting of the two Houses will be held tomorrow, and that it is likely that the Senate will be convened at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning. Therefore, I shall make the announcement that the joint resolution will not be called up until after the Senate has reconvened, following the joint meeting with the House.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I desire to confirm what the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia has said with reference to the plans for tomorrow. It is my intention to move that at the conclusion of its business today the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning. As the distinguished Senator from Georgia has said, he will not move to take up the joint resolution tomorrow until after the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress, which will be held in the Hall of the House of Representatives.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 28 and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

THE FIGHT AGAINST THE CHICAGO WATER STEAL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I have caused to be prepared relating to the fight against what is known as the Chicago water steal, and also a letter from the municipal port director of the city of Milwaukee.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

WE MUST CONTINUE TO FIGHT AGAINST THE CHICAGO WATER STEAL

For many years it has been my privilege to battle against what is generally known as the Chicago water steal; namely, the efforts by the Chicago Sanitary District to sabotage a United States Supreme Court decision limiting to 1,500 cubic feet a second diversion of water from Lake Michigan through the Chicago Sanitary Canal.

Side by side with me in this effort have been most senatorial and congressional delegations from the Great Lakes States, the Great Lakes Harbors Association, the Lake Carriers Association, and the governments of States bordering the lake. Simultaneously, the United States State Department has vigorously supported our position; namely, that any change in the Supreme Court's decision of 1930 should be effected through judicial process rather than political process; that is, by going back to the Supreme Court for review of the matter rather than by attempting to torpedo this court decision by a political action.

Our good friends to the north in Canada have repeatedly protested through diplomatic channels Chicago's attempts to abstract water from an international basin for the benefit of a single community in one nation.

And so, as Senior Senator from Wisconsin, and as ranking Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I shall continue to oppose with all the force at my command the Chicago water steal. I shall continue to insist that studies which are now being made of the water levels on the Great Lakes by the Corps of Engineers be continued, and that no adjustment of the allowable water diversion be made until the Engineers' reports have been made and very carefully considered.

I am deeply interested in protecting the common interests of the Great Lakes area. That includes, of course, shore property owners along the lakes. But I point out that these property owners would in no way be helped by the Chicago water steal, which is actually contrary to their interests and to the interests of the lakes as a whole.

I append a splendid and hard-hitting memorandum, which was prepared by the distinguished municipal port director of Milwaukee, the Honorable Harry C. Brockel, for the mayor of Milwaukee, the Honorable Frank P. Zeidler. This memorandum discusses the background of this issue clearly, and in a very straightforward fashion.

CITY OF MILWAUKEE,
BOARD OF HARBOR COMMISSIONERS,
Milwaukee, Wis., January 21, 1955.

Hon. FRANK P. ZEIDLER,
Mayor, City of Milwaukee,
City Hall.

DEAR MR. MAYOR: As requested, we are glad to send you herewith a memorandum concerning the legal background of the Chicago water diversion controversy, which apparently will be revived again in this session of Congress, despite Presidential veto last August of H. R. 3300 which, if enacted, would have authorized an additional 1,000 cubic second-feet of diversion from Lake Michigan through the Chicago Sanitary Canal.

The water diversion controversy arose from the circumstance that between the years 1892 and 1900, the city of Chicago and its suburbs carried out a plan to dispose of the sewage of the Chicago metropolitan area by cutting a canal across the low continental divide about 10 miles west of Lake Michigan and discharging the sewage of the entire metropolitan area into the Mississippi watershed by way of the Chicago Sanitary Canal, Des Plaines and Illinois Rivers.

This action precipitated 40 years of controversy and litigation. Ultimately, the other States of the Great Lakes Basin all the way from New York to Minnesota brought an original action in the United States Supreme Court to enjoin Chicago from the continued abstraction of waters from the Great Lakes Basin. The United States Supreme Court appointed Charles Evans Hughes as special master. After years of hearings and investigation, the Supreme Court in 1930 issued a decree based upon the findings of Special Master Hughes, who later became Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court held that the Chicago water diversion had caused a lowering of 6 inches in the levels of the Great Lakes. It held that the lowering of lake levels by approximately 6 inches caused "a substantial and injurious effect upon the carrying capacity of vessels, and deprived navigation and commercial interests of facilities which otherwise they would have enjoyed in commerce on the Great Lakes." The Court also held that the 6-inch lowering of the Great Lakes had caused substantial injury in connection with fishing and hunting grounds, beaches, summer resorts, and public parks.

The Court in its decree of 1930 ordered a gradual reduction in water diversion from the amounts then being taken and ordered Chicago to provide other means of disposing of the sewage of the sanitary district.

Since 1930 Chicago has slowly and reluctantly progressed the building of sewage treatment plants, and it is understood that substantially all of Chicago's sewage is now fully or partially treated.

The Supreme Court ordered that by 1937 diversion from Lake Michigan be reduced to 1,500 cubic feet per second, plus domestic pumpage. The diversion of 1,500 cubic feet per second was considered adequate to provide water circulation in the Sanitary Canal and to maintain navigation levels. No sooner had the diversion reached the level fixed by the Supreme Court in 1937 than Chicago initiated the first of its many attempts to evade the Supreme Court decree. In practically every session of Congress since 1937 bills have been introduced providing for diversion in quantities much greater than allowed by the Supreme Court decree. Numerous other efforts were made by Chicago to circumvent the decree. For example, in 1942 the Chicago Sanitary District attempted to secure from Donald Nelson, War Production Administrator, an order increasing the diversion on the grounds that increased flow of water through the canal would permit increased generation of power at Lockport for war-production purposes. Thanks to vigilant action by Milwaukee public officials and the Great Lakes Harbors Association, this specious plea was denied.

Very shortly thereafter Chicago attempted to hoodwink the United States Public Health Service into issuing an order for increased diversion. Chicago claimed that a great pool of pollution existed in Lake Michigan, in the vicinity of its water intakes, which could be siphoned off by increased velocity of flow from Lake Michigan into the Sanitary Canal. At the same time that the sanitary district claimed that its water supply was in peril Mayor Kelly was campaigning for office and loudly proclaiming that Chicago had "the finest water supply in the world." Dr. E. R. Krumbiegel, Milwaukee health commissioner, was an effective witness in refuting this fallacious claim before the United States Public Health Service and before congressional committees.

Having been frustrated before the War Production Board, the United States Public Health Service, and congressional committees, Chicago then attempted to secure an Executive order from the late President Roosevelt authorizing increased diversion. A barrage of protest came from the Great Lakes region as a result of which the President declined to issue the order.

Chicago thereafter petitioned the Supreme Court to reopen the case on the grounds that Chicago's water supply and public health were in jeopardy. A special master was appointed by the Supreme Court, who conducted lengthy investigations and took much testimony. The special master found the Chicago claims unfounded and the Court declined to modify the decree.

Officials of the sanitary district have gone so far as to claim that increased diversion of lake water is needed for the development of atomic power at the Argonne Laboratory. Neither the State of Illinois nor the Chicago Sanitary District is in any way concerned with the development of atomic power at the Argonne Laboratory. No suggestion has ever been made by the Atomic Energy Commission that increased diversion is necessary for the operation of this atomic plant.

A variety of specious reasons have been advanced by the State of Illinois and the Chicago Sanitary District. These are not the real motives for increased diversion. The real motive is obscured in the sensational claims of the sanitary district. Increased diversion is desired because of the additional income to be derived from the development of hydroelectric power at Lockport, Ill., where the sanitary district maintains an electric powerplant and to decrease the operating expenses of the sanitary district, which becomes possible if untreated or partially treated sewage can be diluted with additional lake water. In the report of Special Master Lemann to the United States Supreme Court in March 1941 it was pointed out that the additional electricity which could be developed by a diversion of 10,000 c. f. s. is worth $1,500 a day to the sanitary district, or $550,000 a year.

The sanitary district has thoroughly confused the entire issue by repeated shifts of position and numerous phoney claims. Among the purposes mentioned by Illinois for requiring increased diversion of Lake Michigan water are navigation, public health, recreation, community use, agriculture, and atomic power. Every one of these claims has been thoroughly disproved. Only two conclusions can be drawn—either the securing of increased diversion has become an obsession and a fixed political objective in the Chicago area, or the sanitary district wants the water for power generation at Lockport to increase the funds available to it from sale of power.

The Great Lakes Harbors Association, the port cities of the Great Lakes, the Lake Carriers' Association, and the governments of the States bordering the Great Lakes have been united in opposition to the demands of Chicago that the waters of Lake Michigan be exploited for the political or financial benefits of the Chicago Sanitary District. The Canadian Government has repeatedly protested through diplomatic channels the attempts to abstract water from an international basin for the benefit of a single community.

For the past 40 years the Milwaukee city government has been a powerful force for the protection of community and regional interests in this matter. Milwaukee should not be diverted from its position by abusive statements emanating from Chicago, which have little or no basis in fact. The allegation that pollution in the Chicago area emanates from Milwaukee is utterly ridiculous. While the writer is no authority in the field of sewage disposal, it is my understanding that it would be physically and financially impossible to build sewage facilities of a capacity adequate to treat sudden deluges of storm water when torrential rains fall. Under these conditions, there is inevitably some mixing of storm and sanitary sewage and a flow develops beyond the capacity of our treatment plant. However, it is my understanding that quantities of sewage bypassed under these conditions are small in volume, short in duration, and so diluted as not to present a health hazard.

Chicago is obviously attempting to weaken the united front of Great Lakes interests against water diversion by endeavoring to make it appear that this is a Chicago-Milwaukee squabble. Nothing could be further from the truth, and Milwaukee's valuable and historic leadership for the protection of its interests and the interests of the entire lake region should not be diminished by these unworthy and unfounded allegations.

It has been the position of many interests on the Great Lakes that if Chicago has a legitimate basis for adjustment of the 1930 decree, it should be back to the Supreme Court and make its petition, which will become the subject of reasonable and thorough investigation. In a word, this important issue, affecting a great watershed, 2 nations, and 8 States, should be decided by the judicial processes and not by political methods.

With another temporary rise in lake levels, it can be anticipated that another hue and cry will emanate from Chicago, for more water. The Chicago Sanitary District and Chicago newspapers have done a clever propaganda job in persuading and alarming owners of shore property in Wisconsin and Michigan that increased diversion of water to the sanitary canal will solve the high water problem on Lake Michigan. The maximum correction which would result in high water in Lake Michigan as a result of H. R. 3300 would be 1 inch in 3 years. One inch of water would obviously not settle the erosion problem when the lakes rise to levels of 3 feet above normal, as they did in 1951 and 1952. On the other hand, removal of 1 inch of water from Lake Michigan as a result of the Chicago water diversion would, at the low lake level cycles, have a disastrous effect upon lake shipping. If the bulk freighter fleet on the Great Lakes has its safe draft reduced by only 1 inch, the annual loss in carrying capacity is approximately 2 million tons of cargo per season for American vessels only, excluding Canadian and ocean shipping. In the contest between erosion and navigation, the Chicago water diversion offers small comfort as an erosion preventative, but presents a very real threat to navigation and shipping on the Great Lakes.

Milwaukee, other port cities, and maritime interests of the Great Lakes region are now pressing for Federal deepening of the Great Lakes connecting channels in preparation for the St. Lawrence Seaway project. It would be most inconsistent to press for such a costly improvement and at the same time consent to other measures which would result in lowering lake levels.

We recommend that Milwaukee continue to support legislation providing for long-range study of water levels of the Great Lakes with a view to the building of control works. Such a study by the Corps of Engineers is now in progress. Its findings should be awaited before lake levels are further tampered with. In the meantime, the writer believes that it would be sound public policy to insist that Congress refrain from adjusting the allowable water diversion until lake level engineering studies are completed. The groups opposing the Chicago water diversion are now in a very powerful position, having the support of a presidential veto which will serve as a deterrent to congressional committees and to both Houses of Congress against hasty enactment of legislation such as H. R. 3300 which slipped through the Senate in the confusion of the closing hours.

Respectfully,

H. C. BROCKEL,
Municipal Port Director.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF WHEAT MARKETING QUOTA PROVISIONS

Mr. LONG obtained the floor.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. LONG. I shall yield to the distinguished acting majority leader, with the reservation that I do not lose my right to the floor, and by that I mean that if the measure the Senator intends to take up should result in relatively lengthy debate, I shall insist on my right to proceed in the regular order.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may reserve that right in yielding to the acting majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate bill 145, amending the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 145) to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments on page 2, line 2, after the word "counties", to insert "which (1) are", and in line 3, after the word "and", to strike out "which" and insert "(2)", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (e) of section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1334 (e)), is amended, beginning with the 1955 crop of wheat, to read as follows:

"(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the Secretary shall increase the farm marketing quotas and acreage allotments for the 1955 crop of wheat for farms located in counties in the States of Minnesota, Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota designated by the Secretary as counties which (1) are capable of producing class II durum wheat and (2) have produced such wheat for commercial food products during 1 or more of the 10 years 1945 through 1954: *Provided*, That the increase in the wheat acreage allotment for any farm shall not exceed the difference between the acreage of cropland on the farm suitable for the production of wheat and the wheat acreage allotment, if any, determined without regard to this subsection, and the increase in allotment shall be conditioned upon the production therein of class II durum wheat. The increase in wheat acreage allotments authorized by this subsection shall be in addition to the national, State, and county wheat acreage allotments, and the acreage of class II durum wheat thereon shall not be considered in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I should like to make a very brief explanation of the bill.

The bill would permit a small increase in the production of durum wheat for a 1-year period. Durum wheat is used in making macaroni and spaghetti. Because of a severe new type of rust damage, the total production of durum wheat has declined from an average of about 35 million bushels to about 5,600,000 bushels this year. Additional acreage is badly needed. The bill is approved by the Department of Agriculture, farm organizations, the Grange, the macaroni industry, the milling industry, and by the committee.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the committee report explaining the bill, and a tabulation showing durum wheat production for the past 10 years.

There being no objection, the report (No. 9) and tabulation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 145) to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass with amendments.

Public Law 290, 83d Congress, added section 334 (e) to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, to provide for increased acreage allotments in 1954 and 1955 for durum wheat producers. However, it is restricted to producers who devote a normal share of their original allotment to durum and who have produced durum in 1 or more of the preceding 3 years. S. 145 would remove these restrictions for 1955; since experience in 1954 shows that durum producers, who have sustained serious losses due to damage from stem rust "race 15b," will not risk planting a large part of their original allotment to durum in order to obtain the additional durum allotment. The critical shortage of durum and the need for this legislation is more fully described in the attached letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture.

The committee amendments are designed to make it perfectly clear that the additional allotments are to be restricted to "counties" which have produced such wheat, rather than "farms" which have produced such wheat.

DEPARTMENTAL VIEWS

JANUARY 20, 1955.

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed for consideration by the Senate is a draft of a proposed amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. We believe it to be of such importance as to require immediate and favorable consideration. It is designed to increase the production of class II durum wheat, the supply of which is extremely short.

It is essential that the bill be given immediate consideration and enacted as soon after the convening of the Congress as possible. If the amendment is to be effective, farmers must be informed of its provisions prior to seeding time, which begins soon after the 1st of March. It is only after enactment of the proposed amendment that we can prepare and promulgate an effective program that will induce farmers to seed increased acreages of durum wheat.

Durum wheat, class II, has a usage substantially different from that for any other class of wheat because it is the source of semolina, from which satisfactory quality macaroni products are manufactured. It is a spring wheat and is grown in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Minnesota. The supply situation with respect to durum wheat is critical, due to damage from stem rust "race 15b." In 1952 the production of durum wheat totaled 22 million bushels, which was only 60 percent of the 10-year 1942–51 average production of 37.4 million bushels. In 1953 the crop was 13.9 million bushels and the estimate for the 1954 crop is only 5.5 million bushels. The normal requirement for domestic use, exports, and carryover is about 35 million bushels per year.

These three successive crop failures have endangered the entire durum wheat industry both on the production and milling sides. The macaroni industry members report it is faced with a shrinking market due almost entirely to the production of an inferior product resulting from the use of classes of wheat not well suited for such products.

An effort was made by the Congress in 1953 to relieve the situation by enacting section 4 of Public Law 290 (68 Stat. 4). Under this statute the 1954 acreage allotments and marketing quotas for wheat producers who had grown durum wheat during 1 or more of the preceding 3 years were increased to permit the growing of increased acreages of durum wheat, class II. Our investigation indicates that the program, under these provisions, has not and will not be effective because (1) the seeding of other spring wheat is limited to the pro rata share of the regular wheat allotment attributable to such spring wheat as a condition of qualifying for the additional allotment for durum wheat, and (2) eligibility for the additional allotment to produce durum is dependent upon the producers having grown durum wheat, class II, in 1 or more of the preceding 3 years. Producers feel that the growing of durum wheat against the hazards of stem rust "race 15b" is too great to expect them to gamble on seeding a substantial part of their farm wheat acreage allotments to such class of wheat.

Under the proposed bill, farmers would be permitted in areas capable of producing durum wheat, class II, from which acceptable semolina may be produced for the production of satisfactory macaroni products, to grow such class of wheat over and above the regular farm wheat acreage allotments without regard to the class of wheat seeded within the allotments. The acreage permitted to be grown would be limited only by the total acreage of cropland on the farm well suited for the production of wheat. Farmers operating in the areas to be selected would be eligible for the increased allotments for durum wheat production regardless of whether they had previously produced such wheat. The increase in allotments under the bill would not be considered in determining future State, county, and farm wheat acreage allotments.

Although considerable increase in the acreage seeded to durum wheat could be expected if the proposed bill is enacted, it is not likely that the production of durum wheat will reach normal levels until adequate supplies of rust-resistant varieties of durum wheat seed are available. Four such varieties of durum wheat, class II, have been developed and further experimentation is being conducted by the North Dakota Agricultural College and Experiment Station. This station is also conducting a seed-reproduction program for such varieties. It is not expected, however, that ample seed of these varieties will become available before 1957.

The proposed bill would apply to the 1955 crop only. Although the problem may continue for 2 to 3 years, it is felt that the situation should be reexamined before continuing this type of legislation beyond 1955.

The proposal would result in a slight increase in administrative costs, which can be absorbed within existing funds.

Representatives of this Department will be available to assist in any way in the consideration by the Congress of the bill.

A similar letter is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that from the standpoint of the program of the President, there is no objection to the submission of this bill.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

SEC. 334. * * *

(e) [Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, if after investigation the Secretary determines with respect to any class or subclass of wheat that a substantial difference exists in the usage or marketing outlets therefor and that the supply of such wheat for the 1953–54 and 1954–55 marketing years with respect to the 1954 crop, and for the 1954–55 and 1955–56 marketing years with respect to the 1955 crop, will be substantially short of indicated market demands and carryover requirements for such wheat for such marketing years, the Secretary shall increase the marketing quotas and acreage allotments for such crop of wheat for farms which produced such wheat in one or more of the preceding 3 years to the extent necessary to make available a supply of such wheat adequate to meet such demands and carryover requirements. The increases in farm marketing quotas and acreage allotments shall be made on the basis of the acreage seeded to such class or subclass of wheat during the period of years considered in establishing farm marketing quotas and acreage allotments for wheat. The additional acreage required by this subsection shall be in addition to the national acreage allotment, and shall not be used to increase the acreage allotment applicable to other wheat produced on farms for which such additional acreage has been allotted, nor shall such acreage be considered in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments.] *Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the Secretary shall increase the farm marketing quotas and acreage allotments for the 1955 crop of wheat for farms located in counties in the States of Minnesota, Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota designated by the Secretary as counties which (1) are capable of producing class II durum wheat and (2) have produced such wheat for commercial food products during 1 or more of the 10 years 1945 through 1954: Provided, That the increase in the wheat acreage allotment for any farm shall not exceed the difference between the acreage of cropland on the farm suitable for the production of wheat and the wheat acreage allotment, if any, determined without regard to this subsection, and the increase in allotment shall be conditioned upon the production thereon of class II durum wheat. The increase in wheat acreage allotments authorized by this subsection shall be in addition to the National, State, and county wheat acreage allotments, and the acreage of class II durum wheat thereon shall not be considered in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments.*

Durum production for the past 10 years

	National	North Dakota
1945	32,800,000	29,900,000
1946	35,800,000	32,400,000
1947	44,300,000	40,500,000
1948	45,100,000	40,500,000
1949	39,100,000	34,300,000
1950	37,200,000	32,400,000
1951	34,800,000	28,600,000
1952	22,500,000	20,000,000
1953	13,000,000	12,100,000
1954	5,600,000	5,000,000

NOTE.—United States figures are for the States including Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota. Figures include red durum, which is generally less than a million bushels per year.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. Do I understand correctly that the bill provides for the increased allotment for a period of only 1 year?

Mr. YOUNG. One year.

Mr. DANIEL. The bill does not propose to restrict the planting of that crop in any other area, and will have no effect whatever except for a period of 1 year. Is that correct?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. I may say to the Senator from North Dakota that I have received inquiries concerning the bill, and certain objections were raised, which I think the Senator from North Dakota has met by the elimination of certain language from his bill.

Mr. YOUNG. I should like to add that the bill would permit the production of durum wheat on undiverted acres in any county in the United States which had a previous history of raising durum wheat. If the county had produced any durum wheat in the past 10 years, the farmers in that area would be permitted to produce additional durum wheat.

Mr. DANIEL. For 1 year?

Mr. YOUNG. For 1 year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF ARMED FORCES TO PROTECT SECURITY OF FORMOSA

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I have been seriously worried about the request for the passage by Congress of a joint resolution authorizing the President to conduct military operations for the defense of Formosa, the Pescadores, and other islands along the China coast. Let me say that as one Member of this body I very much appreciate the fact that the President has undertaken to request of the Congress our advice and consent to military actions that might well lead to world war III. It is an extremely grave decision that Congress is called upon to to make. Its gravity should not be underrated, nor should it be arrived at without thoughtful consideration.

Yesterday the House voted 409 to 3 in favor of the resolution, only 1 day after its introduction, without having the benefit of a single day's hearings. The argument that prevailed on the floor of the House was that we should back the President. I do not agree that that is the basis upon which we should decide this issue. It seems to me that it is our duty to give the President and the Nation the benefit of our best advice after we have fully informed ourselves on the subject.

I do not have the advantage of presently being a member of either the Senate Committee on Armed Services or the Committee on Foreign Relations. Those committees have been conducting hearings for 2 days, and able members of those committees have been developing the problems involved in the commitment which we are asked to make.

It is well that the entire public of the United States should go into this matter with their eyes open. Up to this point, as a former member of the Committee on Armed Services, and as one who served on that committee when President Truman ordered the 7th Fleet to defend the strait between Formosa and the mainland, I have never interpreted that obligation as extending to the small islands within easy artillery range of the Chinese mainland held by the Communists.

I would not attempt to compare my judgment with that of the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Nevertheless, as a veteran of three amphibious landings, I have some practical understanding of the difficulties of an amphibious landing. I say to my colleagues that there is all the difference in the world between committing our fleet to the defense of a strait more than 75 miles wide, defending islands more than 50 miles beyond the horizon, so far as the Communists are concerned, and holding islands a mere stone's throw from the Chinese mainland. To me it is inconceivable that it would be at all difficult for the greatest naval power on the earth to defeat an amphibious landing attempted by a force, totally lacking in modern seapower, against a well-armed island manned by 500,000 troops. Yet, I can envision eventualities that could lead to an all-out war if the President were to take full advantage of the invitation in the resolution as presently worded.

If I understand the situation correctly, it is the feeling of the responsible military authorities of this country that our forces should undertake to attack the Chinese mainland prior to the time that our opponent could launch any amphibious invasion. The mere concentration of Communist Chinese troops at any point along more than 200 miles of shoreland could serve as justification for heavy bombardment of Red Chinese ports. This is far more than our Nation has thus far committed itself to do.

When President Truman committed this Nation to resist aggression, it resulted in severe criticism, as the hardships of such a course became apparent. We owe it to the people of the United States to explore fully and to understand fully the extent of the commitments we are asked to make and the possibilities to which they may lead.

If this resolution is to be regarded as a decision to ask for a showdown with China, and Russia as well, then we should face it as such. We should realize that to become involved in a war with Russia under such circumstances would mean that the many allies, numbering more than 400 million persons committed to our side in the event of Communist aggression, would have no obligation to come to our aid. It would be strictly the type of go-it-alone policy that has previously been advocated by some of our military commanders in the Pacific.

It would be with the utmost regret that I should feel forced to vote against the resolution requested by the President. Nevertheless, I believe in my conscience that I owe it to those whom I have the honor in part to represent to vote my own convictions in this matter after learning the facts, rather than to approve without study the judgment of the President or Admiral Radford.

I am extremely concerned about that fact that we have not made available to the Amrican people the information that has been developed in hearings on this joint resolution. Mr. President, at this point let me say it is my understanding that we shall have no printed hearings on this matter when it comes before this body for consideration. If keeping the public somewhat in the dark is necessary to prevent our enemies from knowing our intentions, then at least Senators should avail themselves of the facts and of our intentions prior to the vote. It is for that reason that I wish to request that we not be in such a wild rush to pass the joint resolution before all Members have had the opportunity to apprise themselves fully as to the effect of their vote.

This joint resolution need not be rushed through today or tomorrow. After all, we have the capabilities of defeating any enemy Communist effort to capture Formosa and the Pescadores. The entire world knows of our intention to do so.

Having seen our great fleet in action, I have not the slightest doubt that it could prevent any major organized landing on Formosa. It could do this without bombing China prior to the initiation of such a landing, if there is the slightest determination or will to fight on behalf of Chiang Kai-shek's troops on Formosa, and I am confident that such a determination exists.

Yet if we pass the joint resolution in its present form, it would be urged by the friends of Chiang Kai-shek that it would be appeasement for our President to permit the Chinese Communists to capture any one of many islands held by the Chinese Nationalists along the China coast. For myself, I fully believe that Chiang Kai-shek and his friends have no more certain purpose than to have the United States fully involved in all-out war with Red China, even if this should mean war with Russia.

Once Congress has given this matter the green light, it would be difficult for the President to resist the urging to extend our protection even closer to the

Chinese mainland, in holding tiny islands that are of little value to the defense of our essential interests. Every person who urged that we should hold back would be accused of being an appeaser. When troops are concentrated opposite small islands along the China coast, the hue and cry would be raised across the land that our forces should bombard the mainland of China.

I do not regard it as a bad thing that we have many able fighting men who believe that war with the Communist powers is inevitable. After all, a good fighter will never be fully prepared unless he believes he is going to fight. However, we should be careful that those of us trusted with the policy decisions do not permit our judgment to be colored too much by those forceful men of action who become impatient with those who attempt to make their action unnecessary.

It is also fair that we give the American people an opportunity to be heard in the making of this decision. So far they have hardly heard it discussed. Although I am not one to decide my vote in such a matter by popular sentiment, I believe it only fair to our people that the question of carrying warfare to the China mainland and the possibility of Chinese counteraction, together with the steps that might be expected from China's powerful ally, Russia, in support of the Chinese Communists, should be made clear. Thus far the American people have not been informed of the implications of this joint resolution. They do not realize that our commitments are being extended far beyond anything any of us have realized prior to this time.

Let us be true to our responsibilities by so carefully studying this joint resolution that we give the President our best advice. Let us arrive at a joint resolution which we can support with the assurance that it offers the best possibility for world peace.

IN OPPOSITION TO PREVENTIVE WAR

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the course of my life I have delivered many speeches; but I have never delivered a more difficult one, or one which carries a greater obligation and responsibility to my conscience and to what I consider to be my patriotic duty, than the speech I am about to make on the floor of the United States Senate.

During the course of this speech I shall not yield, Mr. President, because I wish to have appear in the RECORD a statement of continuity, setting forth the reasons for the vote I cast this morning in the joint meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services in opposition to the resolution authorizing the President in advance to exercise extraordinary powers in the Pacific.

Up to this minute I have refused to give to any member of the press any statement of those reasons, because I think I owe it to my constituents and to my country to set them forth in the first instance on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, as a Senator, there is no question in my mind as to the probable consequences, insofar as I am concerned, of the course of action I am following in this issue. However, I may say I have committed political suicide many times, and probably once more will not make any great difference, even though it may be the final act of its kind in my case. But I have always meant it, Mr. President, when I have said I would never hesitate to sacrifice myself politically for any principle which I believed to be one of right. I shall always try to keep faith with the dictates of my conscience. In my judgment, the implications of this issue called for the vote against the resolution in its present form which I cast this morning in the joint meeting of the two committees, and for the reasons I am about to enunciate.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I will not yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon declines to yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MORSE. I pause, Mr. President—in order to protect my rights to the floor—to inquire whether the Senator from Louisiana wishes me to yield, in order to permit him to submit something which has nothing to do with the Senator from Oregon or the subject matter of the speech I am about to make, but has something to do with the business of the Senate, over and above this matter, and can be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum, if the Senator from Oregon will yield for that purpose, inasmuch as I believe—although I do not know what the Senator from Oregon has in mind—that the speech he is about to make is a rather important one, and I am sure other Senators would like to hear it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy implied in the Senator's suggestion, but I decline to yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon declines to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not think there is any doubt about the fact that the purpose and subject of this speech is very well known throughout the Senate. Furthermore, I am not speaking to the Senate alone; I am speaking to the American people, on an issue which I believe to be of as vital importance to their security as any issue which has come before the Congress since the outbreak of the Korean war.

PRESIDENT HAS EMERGENCY DEFENSE POWER

Mr. President, I desire to have it distinctly understood that it is my judgment that as a matter of constitutional law the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief, has the emergency power at any time to proceed to take whatever defensive action in his wise discretion is necessary to protect the security of the United States. From the standpoint of authorizing the President to exercise that power, the joint resolution pending before the Senate is absolutely unnecessary.

I can understand why a President of the United States, for psychological reasons and in view of the present world situation—and I think as we read the President's message, it becomes very clear that that was one of the motivations of the message—might wish to take up this matter with the Congress, in advance of any exercise of discretion on his part. I wish the President had not done so, Mr. President, not because I have any hesitation in meeting the issues involved, but because he places upon each Member of the Senate, in my judgment, the responsibility of carrying out an independent senatorial duty in regard to the proposals, and the implications of those proposals, found both in the message and in the joint resolution. That makes it necessary, in my judgment, for a full discussion and for the maximum disclosure possible of the serious dangers inherent in the resolution consonant with the obligations of each Member of the Senate to keep secret certain high military secrets of the Government which were discussed in the executive joint meetings of the committees.

SECURITY MAKES DEBATE DIFFICULT, BUT PUBLIC MUST HAVE FACTS

That is very difficult to do, Mr. President, because if the American people are to receive the information they are entitled to receive on this issue, it becomes necessary, in my judgment, to discuss some of the implications and possible eventualities of the course of action suggested in the joint resolution. Such a course of debate is necessary even though some of the information might be considered by some to be of some value to potential enemies. I don't think anything will be said in this debate that will disclose any information that will be helpful to our enemies. However, Mr. President, such a risk must be run under the constitutional processes of our system of political freedom if the Congress is to fulfill its responsibilities to the people of this Nation.

So as we proceed in this debate, it seems to me that we must walk a pretty tight wire as between our obligations to the Commander in Chief on the one hand and our obligations to a free citizenry on the other. But the President raised the issue; I did not. When the President raised the issue and placed upon me as a Senator the responsibility to fulfill what I consider to be my solemn obligations to the people of my State, I became duty bound to discuss the implications of this issue as I honestly believe them to be. Let me make it very clear, however, at the outset of this speech that I do so without the slightest intent of disclosing on the floor of the Senate any information which could possibly be used against the best interests of my Nation.

In decades gone by in the history of the United States Senate, other men have stood in a position somewhat similar to mine at this moment. Other men have stood on the floor of the Senate when great issues of war and peace were involved, and have not represented a majority point of view in the Senate.

It is rather paradoxical for me to find myself in a somewhat similar position today, because in most of the past historical instances I have usually found myself, as a citizen, opposed to the point of view held by those minorities of Senators. I have always respected, however, their sense of duty and their obligation to their constituents to stand here and say what they thought ought to be said in the interest of protecting the welfare of their country. In that spirit I shall discuss the issue of war and peace today.

I have said that in my judgment the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief, has the emergency power which he needs to take whatever defensive course of action is necessary to protect the vital interests of the American people and the United States Government in the Pacific, if the overt acts of an enemy make it necessary for the President immediately to take such action without coming to the Congress of the United States for approval.

The inherent Commander in Chief powers granted to the President of the United States by the Constitution have never been defined by the United States Supreme Court, and in my judgment, they never will be defined in any straitjacket manner, because they defy definition. They defy definition because changing conditions from year to year and from decade to decade make it essential, from the standpoint of national survival, that the President of the United States exercise broad emergency powers as Commander in Chief to protect the security of the Nation in an hour of crisis.

POSITION ON PRESIDENT'S EMERGENCY POWERS NOT NEW

This is not the first time I have enunciated that principle on the floor of the Senate. I have done so during the past 10 years on several occasions. The last time I discussed this point—and I shall be rather brief about it today—was at the time of the Steel case, when the President of the United States, in exercising what he claimed to be his constitutional powers under the facts of the situation then existing, ordered a token seizure of the steel mills. I stood on the floor of the Senate and said then—and I repeat it today—that if the facts were as the President believed them to be, then he had the power to seize the steel mills.

There is not a line in the United States Supreme Court decision in the Steel case, which was written in 6 parts, in 6 special concurring opinions, which denies that premise. What the majority decision in the Steel case found was that the facts in the case did not support the exercise of the power which the President exercised, and therefore, on the basis of the facts which the Court found existed, the power he exercised was an unconstitutional exercise of power. It is surprising that so many lawyers who have criticized me for my position on the Steel case apparently have never taken the time to read the 6 special concurring majority opinions in the case.

I thought the President properly exercised a constitutional power on the basis of the facts of the case, because of the controlling factor set forth in the testimony of the then Secretary of Defense, Mr. Lovett, when he said to the Labor Committee of the Senate—I paraphrase him, but accurately—"If those steel furnaces go cold, we shall pay for it in the loss of life of American boys in uniform."

I said in substance, "If that fact holds up, if it be true that the Korean situation is such that there will be a loss, by reason of these furnaces going cold, of ammunition needed by our military forces, then the President of the United States has the duty to exercise his power as Commander in Chief and raise the American flag in a token seizure over the steel mills, and operate them under the flag, without a single managerial officer being taken from behind his desk, so that there may be continuity of production in the interest of the successful prosecution of the Korean war."

That is why I said on the floor of the Senate—and I paraphrase my speech—that I did not think any of us would live long enough to see the United States Supreme Court deny that power to the President; but I was wrong. I was wrong on a finding of fact so far as the Supreme Court was concerned, because the Supreme Court disagreed with a finding of fact which I made as a Senator when I came to judge what decision I should render in regard to the seizure of the steel plants.

It will be recalled that, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows, the moment the Supreme Court decision was handed down, I walked onto the floor of the Senate and said in effect, "The Court has spoken. Its decision is law, and we must proceed now to see to it that the rights of management are protected in accordance with the Court's findings of fact and law."

PRESIDENT'S EMERGENCY POWER SUBJECT TO CONGRESSIONAL CHECK

The RECORD will also show that when I supported the President's seizure, I pointed out that, although a President has the right to act as President Truman did in the premises, the Congress has the duty to pass judgment upon the act, and proceed either to affirm, modify, or repudiate the President's course of action. If I say nothing else in this speech on the question of constitutional power—and although this is an abstract point, and I recognize that it may be considered by many as academic and professorial—I desire to make plain that the constitutional principle I am talking about now is of vital importance in connection with the course of action we may follow with respect to the resolution dealing with the Formosan area.

Therefore, I wish to stress the point that under its constitutional checking power the Congress has jurisdiction and authority to modify a course of action followed by a President in the exercise of his emergency powers. I emphasize that, Mr. President, because I am surprised to find that some of my colleagues and many citizens seem to think that when the Commander in Chief exercises an emergency power the Congress of the United States is handcuffed and has no authority to act in the premises.

To the contrary, Mr. President, under our system of checks and balances the Executive power is subject to a legislative check; and if a President of the United States, for example, should order troops somewhere in the world where the Congress thought troops should not be sent, the Congress would have the right to pass a resolution checking the President's action.

A study of the history of Congress during the past decades seems to indicate a growing acceptance, it appears to me, or a growing contention, that there is nothing Congress can do when a President exercises emergency power. I deny that premise. When we are called upon to deal with such an issue as that which now confronts us, I say that Congress has the duty of taking affirmative checking action if it believes the President of the United States is exceeding his emergency power, or if the facts in a particular situation do not justify the exercise of his inherent constitutional powers as Commander in Chief.

Therefore, Mr. President, on the very day the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows that I supported President Truman in the steel seizure case, I introduced in the Senate a bill proposing to regularize the seizure, making perfectly clear the limitations of such seizure, and protecting the interests of management, so that the argument could not be supported that the seizure would override the rights of management.

The RECORD shows that I said I thought there were really three types of strikes involved in the steel case. I said one strike was the threatened strike of the workers. Then there was the threatened lockout by the employers which amounted to a strike on the part of management. Lastly there was the strike by the Congress of the United States in not going forward with its constitutional duty of exercising a check upon the President of the United States in the exercise of his powers as Commander in Chief. I argued that Congress had a clear duty to pass some legislation on the steel seizure case.

I have given that little review of my position on the question of emergency power of a President because my position has ever been consistent with respect to it, and it is consistent today.

In my judgment, the President of the United States has the authority to carry out the defensive purposes of the resolution which has been submitted to Congress. I think it is a significant and historic message which the President of the United States has sent to Congress in support of the resolution and of the exercise of his emergency powers.

I shall always support the President of my country when he exercises those powers in his capacity as Commander in Chief, unless a clear showing can be made that the President is following a course of action contrary to the security and welfare of the Nation, in which event a restrictive check should be put upon him by the Congress.

I do not expect, Mr. President, that any such situation will ever develop under Dwight Eisenhower.

Knowing full well that misunderstanding will arise and that in some quarters, the deliberate misrepresentation will be made of my position on this

issue, let me make the RECORD perfectly clear by saying, although I oppose the President of the United States on a great many domestic issues, I have gone down the line with Dwight Eisenhower on all the major issues of foreign policy which have come before the Senate, and I intend to continue to do so in connection with those matters which fall clearly within the field of my legislative responsibility. I doubt if President Eisenhower in the future, any more than in the past, will propose legislation in the field of foreign policy that I shall not support in the main. I shall disagree undoubtedly on some details and support from time to time some amendments to his legislative proposals in the field of foreign policy but I doubt if we will ever be so far apart that I cannot support his main objectives in foreign policy legislation.

RESOLUTION IN PRESENT FORM A BLANK CHECK

However, Mr. President, what confronts us now is not legislation. This is a proposal that, in advance, we give a blank check of approval to the President of the United States to do any and all the things permitted to be done under all the implications of the resolution: We are being asked in effect to underwrite by our approval not only all the words of the resolution, but all the meanings of the resolution to be found between the lines, which are not written physically into the resolution. Those meanings must be read into the resolution from the testimony of Secretary Dulles and Admiral Radford and the other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

In my judgment, that is not appropriate under our system of checks and balances. The Executive has the duty of carrying out executive functions. The Congress is required to exercise its constitutional checks upon the decisions and the actions of the President of the United States.

I wish to say, Mr. President—and the arguments I have heard in support of the resolution prove how sound I am in my judgment—that one of the effects of the resolution will be to seal the lips of the elected representatives of the American people with respect to the course of action the President may take under the resolution.

If the President were to follow a course of action which Congress might think was not in the best interest of the Nation, we would hear it said to us: "You voted for the resolution to give the President the authority and the sanction to carry out that course of action; did you not? Why are you now criticizing him?"

The fact is, what the President is asking for is a predated authorization of anything he may do under the resolution. Perhaps there is a great deal of merit in what one distinguished Member of the Senate said to some of us when we discussed the subject: "It may be a predated declaration of war." It might very well be that.

One of the reasons for my voting in committee against reporting the resolution favorably—and there are many other reasons—was that in my judgment, under our constitutional processes, the resolution should never have been introduced in the first instance. The President should have proceeded to exercise the power he has, without asking Congress for a predated authorization for any particular course of action. In my judgment the Members of Congress will be put in a rather embarrassing position, if subsequently they find themselves not in support of a particular course of action the President may be following.

THE NEED FOR NATIONAL UNITY AND THE NEED FOR NATIONAL DISCUSSION

In these early remarks I wish to make it very clear that no Member of the Senate is more appreciative than I am of the fact that in this hour we need the maximum amount of unity and support of the President of the United States and of the Government of the United States. For me, possessing, as I do, the conviction that we should have the maximum of unity in this hour, Mr. President, it is not pleasant, and it is not easy to stand on the floor of the Senate and set forth objections to a resolution, when I know very well that the very objections themselves are bound to create in some quarters some disunity. But the responsibility for that is not mine; it is the President's. When, at the request of the President this resolution comes to the floor of the Senate, it then becomes the duty of each Member of the Senate who does not think that what it proposes is in the best interest of the United States to make clear the reasons for his objections.

WILL SUPPORT FINAL ACTION OF CONGRESS

But—and mark this—when the Senate acts, whatever its action may be, there is not a Member of the Senate who will stand behind the action more firmly than will the Senator from Oregon. That has always been my position. When the court speaks—and this is the court of last jurisdiction and last resort on this issue—that is the decision, so far as I am concerned. Then I shall abide by it. When the debate is over and the Senate of the United States takes its action—and I think we all know very well what the majority action will be; it will be in favor of the resolution—then I shall support the action, because it will then become a clear public duty to do so, since the Congress is the court of last resort in these premises.

FREE DEBATE REQUIRED

But there is always hope, Mr. President. If the time should ever come when the Members of the Senate of the United States abandoned hope that a majority of this body would follow what they considered the right course on some occasion, then service here would really be unbearable. I still have hope that the Senate will at least propose some modifications of this resolution which will remove some of the dangers which I consider to be in it now. The more serious the threat of war, the greater is the responsibility of the President and the Congress in this particular situation calmly and conscientiously to act only after the most mature deliberation.

Therefore, Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks previously made this afternoon on the floor by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. I think the premises he laid down are sound. Proper consideration of this resolution necessarily calls for full and frank discussion of varying points of view in this body.

It has been necessary for the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the Senate Committee on Armed Services to hold closed-door hearings on the joint resolution introduced at the request of the President. It is assumed that no information available to the President and the Defense Department has been withheld from the joint sessions of those two committees; but, unfortunately, the hearings cannot be made public. I understand, however, and this I stress, Mr. President, that the report of what occurred in those secret hearings can be read by each Member of the Senate in the committee rooms of the two committees. The hearings will be kept under lock and key and guard, but Members of the Senate are privileged to read the record. I urge Members of the Senate to do so.

I say to my colleagues in the Senate, Mr. President, "Disagree as you may with me on any or all the points I make in this speech, you cannot understand my position unless you know the contents of the record of the hearings which we have held in the past 2 days. If you know the contents of the record of the hearings, then, and then only, will you understand one of the major reasons for my opposition to the resolution, to wit, it establishes a precedent in the history of American foreign policy, it marks a departure from our principles and practices."

PRESENT RESOLUTION THREATENS UNITED STATES RECORD OF NONAGGRESSION

A study of the history of American foreign relations will disclose that the most persuasive foreign policy weapon we have ever had, and the most precious foreign policy ideal a free people has ever had, has been the ideal of the free Government of the United States never to commit an act of war, never to commit an act of aggression, and never go to war, until war is made upon us.

Senators may differ with my conclusions, but my conviction is mine, Mr. President, and no one can take it from me. My conscience is mine, and no one can take it from me. My conscience and my convictions shout in my ears a warning that in the course of action proposed now the United States, for the first time in all its history, is moving itself into such a position that the judgment of millions of people will be that we are, at least so far as the resolution in its present form itself is concerned, going so far as to threaten an act of aggression before an act of war has been committed upon us.

I happen to believe it is important——

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I shall not yield at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). The Senator from Oregon declines to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I happen to believe, Mr. President, that in this hour of crisis we had better think of American boys and girls 50 years from today or 100 years

or 200 years from today, because in future international councils of the world they will be judged by what we do in making a record on this issue. We shall weaken our position, Mr. President, one of the strongest positions we have had over decades in the field of foreign relations, if we make any exception to the historic principle that we are a nation of peace, and that the proof of it is found in our actions. The proof of it is that there cannot be pointed out in our history an act of war on the part of the United States prior to an act of war being committed against us.

I know one of the arguments or rationalizations being used by some in justifying following the course of action to which this resolution may lead is that we have to run the calculated risks of war.

THE CALCULATED RISKS OF PEACE

In answer to that, Mr. President, I plead with my Government and with my people also to show a sufficient determination to run the calculated risks of peace. The calculated risks of peace, applied specifically to this factual situation, in my opinion, mean that we must face the calculated risk of the Red Chinese massing forces in China, without striking them unless they actually commit an act of war.

I am greatly disturbed about the extent to which in so many quarters in America, it has become accepted that legal principles of international law no longer are important. The argument is by way of rationalization, I respectfully submit; it is an appeal to fear and not to reason. We cannot stop and pay respect to the principles of international law, goes the argument, because the issue now is an issue of survival. Therefore, it is contended we must run the calculated risks of war, and we must make it very clear to the Communist segment of the world that if they mass air power and troop power on the mainland of China, or naval power in the harbors of China, we are giving them notice by this joint resolution—that we are authorizing the exercise of a value judgment by someone to determine whether we should not strike first.

RESOLUTION IN PRESENT FORM CONTAINS THREAT OF PREVENTIVE MILITARY ACTION

In my opinion, Mr. President, the threat of such an aggressive course of action does violence to the long history of America's international record of nonaggression and peace. Even the threat is bad enough. But another reason I am against the resolution is that, in my judgment, the odds will be against peace if the resolution should be passed in its present form. I do not say that the joint resolution will make war a certainty, but I say that the passage of the joint resolution will step up considerably the possibilities and probabilities of war on the mainland of China.

PROPOSAL IRRECONCILABLE WITH CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLES

Here, again, we deal with a matter of conscience, which a Senator is entitled to have the record show when it is such a driving force as it is to me in the formation of my conviction. I cannot reconcile with my religious principles what I consider to be some issues and questions of morality involved in this proposal. I cannot reconcile them with what I think is the Christian motivating force behind the whole history of American foreign policy, because that policy, in my judgment, can best be defined or described, if a short definition is wanted, by three words: Promotion of peace. That has been the moral principle of American foreign policy, and I cannot reconcile this joint resolution with that principle, because, as I view it, the joint resolution greatly endangers the prospect of peace and steps up the probabilities of a new war.

What is my duty if I see it that way? My duty is to fight as hard as I can in this debate for the protection of the blood of millions of my fellow citizens, because I am certain that if we get into a war on the mainland of China, it will cost us vast reservoirs of American blood, to the number, not of thousands, but of several million Americans.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I have listened, as other Senators have listened, to the arguments about what will happen to us if an enemy should start dropping atomic bombs upon us, thereby involving the danger of the annihilation of whole areas of the United States. I know of that danger. It is a very real danger. Does that danger justify what I consider to be a repudiation of the historic policy of our country, not to commit an act of war upon another nation until an act of war shall have been committed upon us?

I say it is a matter of conscience. I like to think that the words "In God we trust" constitute more than a motto. I like to think that those words express a spiritual way of life for the American people. As I listen to some of the arguments made by the preventive-war group in America, I come to the conclusion that no longer do they fully appreciate the meaning of that motto. Is it something simply to pass lightly between our lips? Or do we have the faith that there is a great Deity who, after all, directs the course of mankind, and before whose throne we shall be adjudged?

I am not in the slightest moved by all the scarecrow and fear arguments relating to the atomic age, when it comes to considering the question whether we shall keep faith with or shall now repudiate a great international policy principle of our Nation from its beginning, namely, that we are a nation of peace, and that we do not make war upon others until war has been made upon us. I have greater faith in a living God than to accept the argument that the threat of possible war justifies our committing an act of war out of fear that we may be attacked. I cannot reconcile such an act with God's law.

It seems to me that great spiritual truths and principles should be lived not only by individuals, but also by a group of individuals who have formed themselves into a political society called a nation. How frequently do we hear it said on the platforms of America, in the discussions of the people of America, from the pulpits of America, and from the offices of the politicians of America that we are a Christian nation? Do we mean it? If we mean it, Mr. President, then here is one Christian whose Christian convictions compel him to say on the floor of the Senate today that he thinks it is immoral to propose that we tell any nation, no matter how much we may fear it and despise it, that "We threaten you with aggression if you follow some course of action on your mainland which we fear may result in your making an attack on us." I say it is immoral. I say it cannot be reconciled with Christian principles. I say it cannot be reconciled with our claim over the decades that we are a peaceable nation.

Other men as Christian as I am, as spiritually devoted to the right as I want to be and try to be, hold a view on this question directly the opposite of mine; and I respect their sincerity, patriotism, and integrity. What I am confessing now on the floor of the Senate is my earnest feeling in regard to this matter because I happen to believe that it is of such serious import to the future of my country that I must say whatever I think needs to be said by way of warning the American people as to the dangerous course of action that is being marked out for them by implication and by the express provisions of the resolution as well.

I have discussed a hypothetical situation in terms of spiritual and moral generalizations. I now wish to discuss the problem from the standpoint of the question of sovereignty in the field of international law.

THE PROBLEM OF NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY

I say most respectfully that one who listens to the discussion of the resolution by some persons might think that all we had to do was to take an eraser and erase and wipe from international law codes that have existed during the history of mankind the doctrine of national sovereignty. That doctrine cannot be erased. It is indelibly written in the chronicles of history for all time. While a nation can violate it, the doctrine cannot be erased.

I respectfully say that one of the implications of the resolution in its present form is that it will lead to the violation of the sacred doctrine of sovereignty, if civil law can be considered sacred, if man-made law can be said to be sacred.

I know one should not entertain feelings of hate, and yet we are human. I hate communism. I despise the Communists. Yet I know that even if one entertains against Communist nations and communism the feelings of hatred that the Senator from Oregon holds, and yet talks about the sovereign rights of a Communist nation, I know what that person lets himself in for. But I shall take the abuse and misunderstanding of my position if it comes, because I am not talking about these nations as nations except in respect to the law and the doctrine of sovereignty. Let us not forget that even dictatorships have rights of sovereignty. Fascist dictatorships, Communist dictatorships, Socialist dictatorships—yes, dictatorships of any hue—have rights of sovereignty, as do democracies.

As I cross-examined the Secretary of State in executive session, and as I cross-examined the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, about the doctrine

of sovereignty—and I speak respectfully—I came to the conclusion that they were willing to put the doctrine of sovereignty in refrigeration for the time being, and proceed with a foreign policy course of action as though the doctrine were nonexistent. But the doctrine does exist. The American boys and girls, to whom I referred a few moments ago, are going to be judged, 50 or 100 or 200 years from now, by the people of other nations of the world, on the issue whether or not we, claiming to respect the sovereign rights of another nation, violated those sovereign rights, or threatened to violate them, under the implications and meaning of the resolution.

Let us consider those sovereign rights. On the map in the back of the Chamber is shown the mainland of China. Does anyone wish to deny that it has sovereign rights? Does the fact that we know it to be a mortal enemy of ours and that we know the Communist segment of the world, if it ever felt strong enough to annihilate us, would endeavor to do so, does such recognition on our part destroy the sovereignty of the Communist nation or the Government which controls the mainland of China? Of course not.

We hope, and I trust others in the Senate pray with the frequency that I pray for the fulfillment of the hope, that the day will soon come when great international problems, such as the one now before the Senate of the United States, will be settled in international judicial tribunals, where the rules of reason will prevail, rather than by military force and atomic weapons threatening the destruction of most of civilization.

The time when reason and justice will prevail in international disputes may be far in the future, but when the day comes when I shall cease to be a Member of the Senate of the United States, I shall be very proud to think that my greatest contribution may be judged, if I shall have made any contribution, worthy of historical note, to be the Morse resolution of 1945, whereby we committed ourselves to the compulsory jurisdiction of a world court in a controversy with any nation that likewise accepts that jurisdiction for settling an international dispute. I hold that up as an ideal in international relations. I hold it up as a goal yet to be reached, but a goal we had better work toward, or there will never be permanent peace on earth. We are not marching toward a goal of international justice, in which a dispute such as the one now before the Senate will be determined by rules of evidence, the weight of the evidence, and the merits of the respective positions of the parties in issue, by threatening to ignore the rights of sovereignty, even of a dictatorship nation.

So I go back to the hypothetical situation. As can be seen on the map, 8 or 10 miles from the mainland, or from the Amoy Harbor, is the island of Quemoy. Suppose as a sovereign nation, Red China, builds a jet airplane field, or another kind of military installation, and Red China masses military forces on that installation. Our military officials, as is their duty, report to the Commander in Chief, as the result of that course of action by that dictatorship, that all does not go well. So we say to that dictatorship, "Disband those military forces or we strike." Can anyone regard that kind of action as respect for the sovereign rights of another nation? I cannot do so, nor can I square it with what I think history shows to have been the record of the United States in regard to respecting the sovereign rights of other nations. It has never been our policy to threaten aggression or commit acts of aggression.

Mr. President, all the children of a Divine Being have some common human frailties, including impetuousness, emotional attributes, impulsiveness, and a tendency to resort to self-help whenever they think they have received from an opponent a great thrust at their personal dignity. That goes for individuals; but history shows it goes for nations, too. And I say it, Mr. President, in expressing a fear of mine that when we are dealing with a nation such as Red China, we are dealing with a nation which has little regard for human values and human life, a nation to whose leaders, in my judgment, human values mean nothing. I think its leaders are so warped and twisted in their political philosophy that they will follow a course of action—if we give them a good excuse for it—of seducing us into a war on the mainland of China, and thereby poisoning our reputation for nonaggression. So, Mr. President, I think it is a great mistake to encompass in a joint resolution, either by word or by implication or by testimony in executive sessions supporting the joint resolution, any proposal which would lead to violation of the sovereign rights of any nation. However, this joint resolution would do that, in the case of the hypothetical I have cited, because the moment we were to strike a blow, carrying out the threat of aggression that is implicit in the joint resolution in its present form, we would have committed an act of war against the mainland of China. Then we would be in it; and if we go into it, Mr. President, we are going into it to win. We must do so. And if we go into such a war, we are not going to end it in a day or in a year, or in ten years. That is so because all the modern weapons, all the atomic bombs and hydrogen bombs will not subjugate the mainland of China. We can pockmark it with all the weapons of atomic destruction, and even though each pockmark on the topography of the mainland of China may extend 20 miles across; we could not subjugate China by atomic action. Mr. President, in the last analysis we could not subjugate China by any means except manpower; and that would mean American manpower, with foot soldiers—American foot soldiers.

Therefore, Mr. President, when I am discussing my fear as to the potentialities of the joint resolution, I am raising my voice today on the floor of the Senate in the interest of what I believe to be the security of millions of American boys who will be called into the military as well as civilians at home. Should a conflict come it will go on long after the bombing is over. We then would be confronted with the job of occupying the vast land mass of China, which no nation to date has ever subjugated, and which I am not sure even some trigger-happy military advisers of our own Nation believe even we could conquer. Years of guerrilla warfare would go along with our occupation of China. It is a great mistake to run the risk of a war that would necessarily send foot soldiers to China.

Mr. President, another word on the question of sovereignty; and then I shall discuss the dangers of the kind of a full-scale war the possibility of which I believe this resolution increases.

GOING IT ALONE

We have no reason to believe that Red China will act alone; we have no reason to believe that Red Russia will pay no heed or will give no consideration to her treaty commitments to Red China. We certainly have the right to believe that Red Russia, like Red China, would like to get us into a position where we would stand alone, or comparatively alone, in a contest with Red China. No one can give a guarantee, as of this hour—and I do not think it will be possible to give such a guarantee for some time in the future, if ever—that we will not stand alone if we become involved, as the result of the threat of aggression which is implied in the joint resolution, in a war on the mainland of China.

RESOLUTION SHOULD BE LIMITED TO FORMOSA AND THE PESCADORES

I believe it is fairly well recognized in our country that the people and many of the leaders of countries who are our allies are very much divided on the military course of action which should be followed in Asia by the United States and our allies. I think there is general recognition that we have the right and, as I happen to believe, the duty of protecting America's vital interests in the Pacific, by seeing to it that the Pescadores and Formosa are protected. I want it thoroughly understood that I will vote for an amendment to the joint resolution, which has become known as the Humphrey amendment, the legal implications of which I shall discuss on a different day, because that calls for a detailed discussion of means of perfecting the joint resolution. I shall vote, as I did in committee this morning, for such an amendment because it draws the line of demarcation which I believe should be drawn in the Straits of Formosa, and serves clear notice, not only on the Communist segment of the world, but also on our allies, that we have no defense policy in this area whatsoever except to protect the Pescadores and Formosa.

I have supported the proposition that that is what we should do. I have supported it from the very beginning of the Formosa issue. Also from the beginning, Mr. President, I have taken the position, and I repeat it today, that the responsibility of protecting Formosa should be placed under the jurisdiction of the United Nations. I completely support the President as to the United Nations reference in both his message and, I think, the meaning, in part, of the joint resolution itself, namely, that the United Nations should be encouraged by

us to take early action over the issue of jurisdictional control of this very hot issue in the Straits of Formosa.

Why do I take that position, Mr. President? I take it because I think we have rights—they are not permanent rights, but I think they are rights which would be recognized in any international court of law—to exercise jurisdiction by way of protecting Formosa and the Pescadores from becoming a threat to the peace in the Pacific. Our rights grow out of World War II and the Japanese treaty.

UNITED STATES RESPONSIBILITY AND RIGHTS CONCERNING FORMOSA

Further I take that position because of this history, which I briefly state: For a long, long time, of course, Formosa was recognized as Chinese territory. Then there came the Japanese occupation. Then there came the Cairo agreement. The Cairo agreement was participated in by Prime Minister Churchill and Franklin Roosevelt, representing their respective countries. They entered into an agreement that Formosa should be returned to China as a territorial settlement of World War II. On what theory? On the theory of dividing the spoils of war? No American or Britisher would ever impute such an unconscionable motive to those two great world statesmen. In my judgment, we cannot study the history of the Cairo agreement, we cannot study what it says and what was said about it at the time of the agreement, and reach any other conclusion than that the Cairo agreement rested upon the sovereign rights of China to Formosa. Those rights are not changed because there has been a change of government in China. The change of government in China in no way changes the sovereign rights of China to Formosa. Those are vested, sovereign rights. They were violated by Japan. They were trespassed upon by Japan, and the Cairo agreement recognized them anew.

Someone may ask, "If that is true, why do we not withdraw from Formosa?" In the process of settling a war, when an area is such that it threatens the peace of the segment of the world in which it is located, it does not follow that a nation which has sovereign interests in the territory is entitled to an automatic reestablishment of physical control of the area because the consequences of a war are not over even with the signing of a peace treaty. There still rests upon the participants in the war, and particularly the victors in the war, if their intentions are peaceful, the duty to follow a course of action which will advance and preserve the cause of peace.

So after the Cairo agreement, with the problem of settling the whole Pacific situation in connection with the Japanese Peace Treaty, which was subsequent thereto, we were confronted with the question of exercising some protective jurisdiction over Formosa so that it would not become a threat to the vital interests of peace in the Pacific—and the vital interests of peace in the Pacific happened to be also the vital interests of the United States.

That is why, in years gone by, I have stood on the floor of the Senate and defended what amounted to a de facto protectorate by the United States over Formosa. But I think the obligation is not yet completely fulfilled. I think we have the right and duty to maintain—and to announce to the world the purpose of maintaining—a protectorate over Formosa, until the United Nations assumes that responsibility. I think it ought to do so, and the sooner the better.

RESOLUTION SHOULD BE STRENGTHENED TO EMPHASIZE U. N. ROLE

There can be no denying the fact that the loss of Formosa at the present time to the Red Chinese would not be in the interest of world peace. It would break the chain of America's defense from the Aleutians down through Australia and New Zealand. But because it is so vital to the preservation of peace in the Pacific I believe we ought to urge, in stronger language, and more specific language than is contained either in the message or the resolution, that the United Nations take early jurisdictions over Formosa, as I have suggested in the past, and suggest again today. I call it a trusteeship. I care not what it is called. It is the accomplishment in which I am interested—a jurisdiction which will place on the United Nations, to which we are a party, the responsibility for maintaining peace in that area of the Pacific so far as Formosa is concerned.

STATUS OF OTHER ISLANDS DIFFERENT FROM STATUS OF FORMOSA

But let us take the other islands—Tachen, Matsu and Quemoy. For decades they have always been within the sovereign jurisdiction of China. Their allegiance to China or Chinese sovereignty is not questioned. They are recognized as Chinese territory. It so happens that as the Nationalist Chinese forces retreated from the mainland of China they occupied those islands. It makes no difference whether they are occupied by National Chinese or Red Chinese, so far as their sovereignty lineage is concerned. It is Chinese. Now they are involved in a civil war, which is the next major point I wish to stress in this argument.

Under the doctrine of sovereignty, those islands are clearly Chinese territory. They have never been under our control. We have never exercised any jurisdiction over them. They were not involved in the Cairo agreement in the respect to the point I am now discussing. They are unquestionably Chinese territory even though they are now the subject of a civil war.

I cannot see any other conclusion than that if we become involved in those islands, we knowingly and intentionally and willfully, as a nation, involve ourselves in a Chinese civil war. That will be the propaganda of the Communists all over China.

CONGRESS MUST CONSIDER ASIAN OPINION

That causes me to say at this point that we must pay some attention to what the millions of people in other parts of Asia think about these matters of sovereignty and the involvement of a western power in Chinese civil wars, or the civil wars of any Asiatic people. I am fearful of some of the consequences of this resolution because, as we look at the map and recognize the sovereign rights of these islands, I do not see how we can escape the fact that they are the subjects of a civil war. Certainly Quemoy, the Matsus, and the Tachens, which have figured so prominently in the discussions, both in public and in our committee in private, are Chinese territories. If we try to maintain Nationalist Chinese forces on those islands with American support, we are involving this Nation in a civil war of China.

The question may be asked: "But why does not that argument apply to Formosa?"

It does not apply to Formosa for the reason that Formosa was occupied by Japan during a period of war, and because it became involved as one of the settlement problems of World War II itself. Furthermore, we took jurisdiction over Formosa, as one of the victorious allies, and in that way we had authority under international law to take action with respect to its protection until peace in the Pacific could be assured. The finality of that action has not yet been reached. I wish to stress that point. There are still many questions of international law which will have to be adjudicated in connection with Formosa, and it will take many years before any finality is reached in respect to the disposal of Formosa.

Our rights in Formosa are not rights of fee simple, I may say, but rights of protection, which we as a nation have in maintaining peace in the Pacific. They grow out of World War II. That argument does not apply to the other islands. We have the right to protect Formosa as a postwar problem as long as its status involves or threatens our vital interests in the Pacific. It is important to get the United Nations to relieve us of a unilateral course of action in respect to Formosa, but until it does we have a clear duty in the interest of world peace to protect Formosa. The world cannot overlook the fact that we owe territorial obligations to Formosa because we took it from the Japanese and controlled it after World War II. Its return to China had not been implemented when it became a threat to our vital interests and to peace in the Pacific.

Mr. President, I fear it will be contended all over Asia that it is one thing for us to defend and protect Formosa, but another thing for us to become involved in supporting a participant in a Chinese civil war in connection with its attempt to hold coastal Chinese islands.

That leads me to make a few comments on one of those participants. I make these comments on the Nationalist Chinese participant by saying, first, that no matter what I may think the shortcomings of the Nationalist regime may be, the Chinese Nationalists are so much less objectionable than the Red Chinese and their program that I am not at all hesitant about our protecting the Nationalist Chinese on Formosa and on the Pescadores. I am not hesitant about it, because that area was involved in the Cairo agreement. It was involved in the settlement following the war, and we still have responsibility in connection

with that settlement. Of course, we have the clear responsibility of maintaining peace and protecting our vital interests in that area. Therefore I support the defense of Formosa.

NATIONALIST CHINA COULD LEAD UNITED STATES INTO WAR ON CHINESE MAINLAND

One of my fears is that if we shall adopt the language of the resolution, including what it covers and what it implies, we will place the American people and the interests of the American people in the Pacific in the hands of the Nationalist Chinese, in that, if they followed a course of action on the coastal islands with our coverage and logistic support which would result in war, we would be in it with the Nationalist Chinese.

Of course, we must speak in terms of possibilities and hypotheses in dealing with the question of Formosa. Therefore, let us assume that the Nationalist Chinese in the Tachens or in the Matsus or in the Quemoy area should follow a course of action which would result in major military operations, and that we would support them—and I believe that under the resolution we would be expected to support them, do we not thereby run a grave risk of being drawn into a war on the mainland of China? I think we would. Suppose the Nationalist Chinese so maneuvered in their military operations in the coastal island areas that it would look very much as though we were being attacked by the Red Chinese. In that event we would be drawn into a war on the mainland of China by the Nationalist Chinese.

As I said, Mr. President, many people do not entertain that fear. I do. I am very much afraid of the consequences of giving the Nationalist Chinese any support in connection with their military operations on the coastal islands. I am very much afraid that it would be very easy for the Nationalist Chinese, under the operations that would ensue from implementing the resolution, to follow a course of action in the Tachens or in the Matsus or in the Quemoy area which would have the effect of dragging us into a war with Red China.

I have an additional fear. I believe that is exactly what the Nationalist Chinese would like to have us do. I happen to share the point of view, which has been expressed by other Senators also, that the Nationalist Chinese believe their only hope of survival in the long run is to get the United States involved in an all-out war on the mainland of China, which would result, they hope, in the final subjugation of the Communist regime and in the restoration of the Nationalist Chinese on the mainland of China.

I do not believe I can say more than that, because I do not feel I can say more on the floor of the Senate by way of documenting that fear without violating what I believe to be security matters.

However, I make the assertion about my fears of the Nationalist Chinese because it explains one of the reasons for my vote this morning against the resolution. I shall not be a party to a resolution which, in my judgment, places what I believe to be an awful power, or the opportunity to exercise an awful power, in the hands of the Nationalist Chinese, with the danger of involving the people of my country in a third world war. I do not believe there is any necessity for running that risk in order to protect and defend Formosa.

The argument is made, of course, that we cannot draw a line in the Straits of Formosa, because if we draw a line, we serve notice on the Red Chinese that we will not defend the Tachens, the Matsus, and Quemoy. However, I say if we do not draw a line, there is a very great danger that we will not only defend the Formosan area but we will also fight on the mainland of China. I shall not vote to sacrifice the life of a single American boy on Quemoy or on the Matsus or on the Tachens in the defense of a participant in a Chinese civil war, as the Nationalist Chinese are.

Can we defend Formosa without threatening to bomb any concentration of military force on the mainland of China? Can we defend Formosa unless we threaten and carry out the threat that we will commit an act of war upon a sovereign nation before that sovereign nation commits an act of war upon us? I should certainly hate to think we could not. I hope I am within the proprieties when I say I have not heard any high American official, civil or military, say we could not. They do say that we run a greater risk, militarily speaking, if we follow that course of action. There is, of course, a greater risk if we wait for the enemy to get its forces concentrated and then let it start to use that concentration. But that is what I, in this speech, have called the calculated risk of peace in contrast with the calculated risk of war, which latter I think is speeded up and greatly increased by the resolution in its present form. I think we had better hold firm to our historic policy, to which there has been no exception of which I know, never to commit an act of war until an act of war has been first committed against us.

THE RESOLUTION IN ITS PRESENT FORM THREATENS PREVENTIVE WAR

On the last point, Mr. President—and I speak respectfully when I make this argument—I think the implication of the joint resolution is that we are going to strike on the mainland of China, when those in charge of our military operations have reached the conclusion that the enemy is about to attack us. This amounts, in fact, to authorizing by this resolution a preventive war. That is another reason why in committee I voted against the resolution this morning.

I have always been opposed to the preventive-war philosophy. I have always felt that the talk of a preventive war does not promote peace, and I have felt, Mr. President, that no matter in what language it may be couched, any proposal for a preventive war means not a little war, not a police action, but a total war.

So, Mr. President, I am opposed to the resolution in its present form because, to all intents and purposes, I consider it to amount to a quasi-legalization of a preventive war. That is not a legally accurate term, but it is descriptive in outlining my point of view.

I think we should continue to assert that we will not be a party to a preventive war, because a preventive war is based upon acts of aggression, and we cannot reconcile a preventive war with America's historic policy of peace which I have outlined.

Much talk is reported in the press, Mr. President, and on the radio, about the near unanimity of the House of Representatives in voting for the resolution. It has been discussed only in terms of protecting Formosa from attack. But there has been a secret debate both inside and outside the committee rooms on the alarming implications of the broad scope of the resolution. That secret debate has been conducted by small groups of Senators, Congressmen, among themselves and with members of the press. The public has had little opportunity to learn and consider the extent of the military action that might result from the approval of the resolution as presented by the President.

The President in his message said:

> In unfriendly hands Formosa and the Pescadores would seriously dislocate the existing, even if unstable, balance of moral, economic and military forces upon which the peace of the Pacific depends. It would create a breach in the island chain of the western Pacific that constitutes for the United States and other free nations, the geographical backbone of their security structure in that ocean. In addition, this breach would interrupt North-South communications between other important elements of that barrier, and damage the economic life of countries friendly to us.

There are some who dispute the military value of Formosa, but I recognize that it has great military value. It has great military value, as I said earlier in this speech, in protecting our defense line from the Aleutians and down the island chain to Australia and New Zealand. But I do not share the point of view, and I am satisfied that many military officials do not share it, that all would be lost in the Pacific if we lost Formosa; that we would be driven back to the California shore if we lost Formosa; that the Philippines, Japan, Okinawa, Australia, and New Zealand would fall. I do not think there is any basis for such military conclusion. It would be much more difficult to defend our vital interests in the Pacific if we lost Formosa. Any war would be much more costly in precious lives and materiel, if we lost Formosa. But I do not believe that the calculated risk of losing Formosa justifies the United States at this time in violating our historic policy of avoiding the commission of an act of war. I have more confidence in the military than to think they cannot hold Formosa—unless we authorize a preventive war. I wish to reemphasize that no one in the hearings—and I think I am free to say this much—testified that we could not hold Formosa even if we did not strike first on the mainland of China in case we thought the situation was such that there was a real danger that a strike was about to be made against us.

HOW FAR SHOULD WE GO?

Assuming the importance of Formosa to Japan, the Philippines, South Asia, Australia, New Zealand and other areas, how much territory should be defended under this resolution? The President and Secretary Dulles urge protection of Formosa and the Pescadores because of the importance their defense to free nations in the Pacific. The resolution in its present form provides for "protection of related possessions and territories." Of course, it is that part of the resolution to which the Humphrey amendment goes; and I shall support on the floor of the Senate, as I did in committee, the Humphrey amendment to eliminate the quoted language.

The Humphrey amendment would have the effect of drawing the line of jurisdiction through the Straits of Formosa, and it would eliminate any obligation or responsibility for defending the coastal islands to which I have already referred, about the sovereignty over which there is no dispute. It is Chinese sovereignty, and whatever government controls China will be the government which eventually will control those islands.

It is very interesting that this subject matter was discussed very brilliantly, in my opinion, in an article written by Stewart Alsop, which appeared in this morning's Washington Post and Times-Herald.

I shall not take the time to read all the article, if I may have unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXHIBIT 1

MATTER OF FACT

(By Stewart Alsop)

IT COULD MEAN WAR

The extraordinary gravity of the decision which President Eisenhower has now taken is not yet fully appreciated in Congress or the country. The decision is, essentially, to bomb the Chinese mainland if this is deemed necessary for the defense of the Nationalist-held islands of Quemoy and Matsu.

Bombing the Chinese mainland means, of course, war with China. It could mean war with China's ally, Russia.

The Presidential decision to risk a major war in the defense of these two islands represents a great victory for Admiral Arthur Radford, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Last October, Radford first proposed that the 7th Fleet should bomb the Chinese mainland, if necessary, to hold Quemoy. That time, Radford suffered a defeat when President Eisenhower ruled against it.

Thereafter, Radford went to the Far East. He returned a couple of weeks ago, surer than ever that he was right. He immediately went to work to convince Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, who had taken a middle position in the October dispute. Radford is a very persuasive man, and Dulles at length fell in with the substance of his views.

It was thus Dulles, rather than Radford, who went to the President to persuade him to reverse his October ruling. In the end, the President decided on a curious compromise—the Tachens would be evacuated, while war would be risked if necessary to defend Quemoy, the most important Nationalist island, and probably Matsu. This time, the Joint Chiefs other than Radford were informed of this Presidential decision after it had already been taken.

Events, of course, helped Radford. Evacuation of all the offshore islands was a possible alternative, but Chiang Kai-shek bitterly resisted this idea. The alternative prospect of letting island after island fall bloodily to the Communists, while the Seventh Fleet stood idly by, seemed more and more unappetizing as time went on.

At the same time, it became more and more obvious that these islands, virtually within spitting distance of the mainland, could not possibly be defended unless bases and supply lines on the mainland were attacked.

Both the President and Dulles undoubtedly hoped that the American decision to intervene if necessary might bring "stability" to the area, in the form of a deal with the Communists to accept an agreed dividing line in the straits of Formosa between the two Chinas. In fact, the Presidential decision was presented to the British on this basis.

Now both the Communists and Chiang have furiously rejected any "two-China" deal, and the hope that it can be made is dying. Simultaneously, the fear that the Chinese Communists, far from being deterred, will accept the American challenge, and invade Quemoy or Matsu, is growing.

Moreover, although the basic decision to attack the mainland if necessary to defend the islands has been made, two vital questions remain unanswered. The first is: Do we use nuclear weapons? Many policymakers, reportedly including Secretary Dulles, say that the use of atomic weapons against China would have fatal political consequences. But there are cogent arguments for using the decisive weapons if the Chinese mainland is to be attacked at all.

The second question is: What do we do if the Communists succeed in taking Quemoy, say, despite our intervention? They may well be capable of doing so. American officers who watched the invasion of Yikiangshan through powerful glasses reported that it was a remarkably efficient little operation. If Quemoy is taken despite American bombing of the mainland, this would be a genuinely disastrous blow to American prestige in Asia. Yet current estimates are that it would require a major amphibious operation, involving at least three crack American divisions, to retake the island if it fell.

But although such vital questions remain unanswered, the great central decision has been made. The decision to bomb the Chinese mainland if necessary may well be—it probably is—the right decision. But the dangers it involves, including the danger of war, should be faced up to boldly, rather than being buried in ambiguities. And if these dangers are faced up to boldly, surely it will appear that this is hardly the right time to begin reducing our investment in defense.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call attention to an observation or two by Stewart Alsop, for whose knowledge of Asiatic problems I have an exceedingly high respect, and in which I have great confidence. He says in the article:

The extraordinary gravity of the decision which President Eisenhower has now taken is not yet fully appreciated in Congress or the country. The decision is, essentially, to bomb the Chinese mainland, if this is deemed necessary for the defense of the Nationalist-held islands of Quemoy and Matsu.

I express, here and now, complete agreement with that observation by Stewart Alsop. I think the American people should recognize that that decision has been made and should take it into account as they come to pass judgment upon what is involved in the course of action upon which we are asked to embark under the joint resolution.

Alsop goes on to say:

Bombing the Chinese mainland means, of course, war with China. It could mean war with China's ally, Russia.

I completely agree with that conclusion. Again, I think that I am within the bounds of propriety—I trust I am—when I say that I heard no official, civil or military, deny that a strike by our forces against the mainland of China would be an act of war. We would be in a war. If we attacked before a strike was committed against us, we would go down in history with the black page written against us that we were the aggressors. I do not want future generations of Americans to be subjected to that judgment of history.

Alsop continues as follows:

The Presidential decision to risk a major war in the defense of these two islands represents a great victory for Adm. Arthur Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Last October, Radford first proposed that the Seventh Fleet should bomb the Chinese mainland, if necessary to hold Quemoy.

Before I go a step further, Mr. President, I wish to modify my request for insertion of Alsop's article in the RECORD, and to reserve the right to strike out any part of the article which may, to the slightest degree, be subject to the interpretation that it violates rule XIX. I do not think it does, but before I release it to be printed in the RECORD, I wish to check it very carefully.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the article goes on to say:

That time, Radford suffered a defeat, when President Eisenhower ruled against it.

Thereafter, Radford went to the Far East. He returned a couple of weeks ago, surer than ever that he was right. He immediately went to work to convince Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, who had taken a middle position in the October dispute. Radford is a very persuasive man, and Dulles at length fell in with the substance of his views.

I digress to say that there is no doubt that Admiral Radford is not only a very persuasive man, but an exceedingly able man, a very forthright man, and a highly intelligent and courageous man.

One cannot listen to him testify, as I have listened to him, and as other members of the committee have listened to him, for the past 2 days, without knowing that he possesses those great qualifications. I happen to be one, however, who believes that he is very wrong in some of the approaches he makes to American-Asiatic relations. I happen to be one who believes that he does not fully appreciate the very great probability that if we become involved in a strike against the mainland of China, we are going to have to put foot soldiers onto the mainland of China. I feel certain that it is within the proprieties to say that Admiral Radford would not deny that to strike against the mainland of China might lead to that result. He does not guarantee that it would not. He

does not share, to the degree that some of us do, the fear that it would be inevitable.

That leads us to a very vital military, strategic problem of the hour. Are we in a position of military defense at the present time, so that if what the resolution called for should lead to a war on the mainland of China, we have the forces in being, either air power or manpower, for the successful prosecution of such a war, without unnecessary and terrific losses to the United States? I happen to be one who believes we are not in that defense posture. I happen to be one who thinks that every Senator owes a duty to himself and to his constituency to read every word of the transcript of the record of the past 2 days, and to reach his own conclusions as to whether, at the present time, we are in the defense position we ought to be in, so as to be able successfully to prosecute, with the minimum possible loss, a war on the mainland of China.

I repeat what I said earlier this afternoon: We shall have to do that with men, in the last analysis, because we are not going to conquer China except with manpower, after we get through bombing out her "guts"—and we can do that, and will do it, and should do it, if we should become involved in a war.

But I am concerned that we shall have a clear, clean record of involvement; and I am concerned that we should have a defense posture so strong at the time we become involved, if we shall become involved, that our involvement will result in minimum losses of American life, both on the battlefields and here at home—and I happen to believe that many civilian lives will be lost at home, as well as the lives of men in uniform.

Alsop proceeds in his article, which I shall not take the time to read to the Senate, to discuss the attitude of the Nationalist Chinese and the clear implications of the adoption of the resolution. I find myself in agreement with his statement of those implications. I urge my colleagues in the Senate to read the article, along with the official transcript of the record of the executive sessions of the committee.

Mr. President, I now refer to an article by Walter Lippmann, which was published in the Washington Post and Times-Herald of last Monday, the 24th. I ask unanimous consent that, following my speech, I may submit for the RECORD whatever edited portions of the Lippmann article I wish to present for inclusion at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXHIBIT 2

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

REAPPRAISAL IN FORMOSA STRAIT

In their press conferences on Tuesday and Wednesday of last week, Mr. Dulles first, and then the President, made known the decision not to defend the Tachens and the other offshore islands which are held by Chiang's Nationalist forces. This marked the turning of a page.

Until then our military commitments in this area had as a matter of policy been left undefined and uncertain. Our policy was to keep everybody guessing. Thus, under the proposed security pact with the Nationalist government, our military commitments are quite specifically limited (article VI) to Taiwan (the Chinese name for Formosa) and the Pescadores. The treaty promises nothing beyond that, nothing, that is to say, about the offshore islands. But notes exchanged by Mr. Dulles and Mr. Yeh, the Nationalist foreign minister, which go with the proposed pact, do say that the United States could by joint agreement act in the other territory, which means the Tachens and the offshore islands. We were not bound to act there. But we had left ourselves the option of acting if we chose.

Some time ago the Peiping government began to test our intentions in this unclarified situation. They took to shelling and bombing offshore islands, and finally by an amphibious operation they conquered one of them last week. It was at this point that the administration abandoned its policy of deliberate uncertainty, and made known the decision not to intervene in the defense of the offshore islands.

This might be described as a sound decision taken under embarrassing conditions that should have been foreseen and avoided. The policy until last week was a bluff that was called, and we have retreated in the face of Red Chinese military action. Since for good reasons we had never meant to fight for the offshore islands, it was a serious error to give the impression that we might fight for them.

Moreover, the President gave a very poor reason for our decision to draw a line between the Formosa-Pescadores territory which we will defend and the offshore islands which we will not defend. He said that the Tachens and the small islands are not "a vital element, as we see it, in the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores." This takes it for granted that we have a unilateral right to intervene in foreign territory for strategic reasons—that the controlling principle of our policy is not law but strategy. This, to give it its true name, is militarism.

We do not need to resort to militarism to protect our interests in this area. There is a radical difference in law between the two sets of islands. Throughout the 20th century Formosa and the Pescadores belonged not to China but to Japan. They were captured from Japan by the United States, not by China. Under the Japanese surrender terms of 1945, which were formally ratified by the 1952 Treaty of Peace (chap. II, art. 2b) "Japan renounces all right, title, and claim to Formosa and the Pescadores." But now let us note this. Though Japan has renounced the title, no one else has acquired it.

In the President's message of January 10, 1952, submitting the Japanese Peace Treaty to the Senate, he put into the RECORD the official statement of Mr. Dulles to the San Francisco Conference. In that statement Mr. Dulles said that "some Allied Powers suggested that article 2 should not merely delimit Japanese sovereignty according to Potsdam, but specify precisely the ultimate disposition of each of the ex-Japanese territories. This, admittedly would have been neater. But it would have raised questions as to which there are now no agreed answers. * * * Clearly, the wise course was to proceed now, so far as Japan is concerned, leaving the future to resolve doubts by invoking international solvents other than this treaty."

None of this applies to the offshore islands. They have always been Chinese. We have a right to be present in Formosa and the Pescadores under the terms of the Japanese surrender and of the Japanese Peace Treaty. We have a right to see that their ultimate disposition is not settled by force but in accord with the interests of the people of Formosa and of the interests of the powers concerned in the Pacific. Our presence for these purposes is not intervention in the Chinese civil war. It is not intervention because Formosa and the Pescadores are not really Chinese territory.

But were we to intervene in the offshore islands, we would be acting on Chinese territory in a Chinese civil war. For these reasons our actual decision not to intervene in the offshore islands would not only look better but would in fact be better if it were based not on the strategical opinions of the White House and the Pentagon but on the law and the right about Formosa and the Pescadores.

Our right to defend Formosa rests on the fact that it is territory ceded by Japan about which the ultimate disposition has not been settled by any treaty. Even though both Chinese governments claim Formosa as Chinese, even though we promised in 1943 at Cairo to restore it to the Republic of China, Formosa is not now, it is not yet, Chinese territory. Because of that, our presence in Formosa is not intervention in the Chinese civil war.

On these grounds we have obligations and rights in the disposition of Formosa, regardless of whether we think Chiang or Mao is the head of the legitimate government of China. Our position in Formosa does not depend upon Chiang. For Chiang has never acquired a legitimate title to Formosa. Our position is the consequence of an international war, and on that ground we can make a case before the opinion of mankind to invoke their collaboration in reaching an international solution.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Lippmann article, I submit, is a very persuasive document in support of the Humphrey amendment. Listen to what Lippmann says; speaking of the conference between the Secretary of State and the Chinese Nationalists:

Until then our military commitments in this area had as a matter of policy been left undefined and uncertain. Our policy was to keep everybody guessing. Thus under the proposed security pact with the Nationalist government our military commitments are quite specifically limited (Article VI) to "Taiwan (the Chinese name for Formosa) and the Pescadores." The treaty promises nothing beyond that, nothing, that is to say, about the offshore islands. But notes exchanged by Mr. Dulles and Mr. Yeh, the Nationalist Foreign Minister, which go with the proposed pact, do say that the United States could by joint agreement act in the other territory—which means the Tachens and the offshore islands. We were not bound to act there. But we had left ourselves the option of acting if we chose.

Sometime ago the Peiping Government began to test our intentions in this unclarified situation. They took to shelling and bombing offshore islands, and finally by an amphibious operation they conquered one of them last week. It was at this point that the administration abandoned its policy of deliberate uncertainty, and made known the decision not to intervene in the defense of the offshore islands.

This might be described as a sound decision taken under embarrassing conditions that should have been foreseen and avoided. The policy until last week was a bluff that was called, and we have retreated in the face of Red Chinese military action. Since for good reasons we had never meant to fight for the offshore islands, it was a serious error to give the impression that we might fight for them.

Moreover, the President gave a very poor reason for our decision to draw a line between the Formosa-Pescadores territory which we will defend and the offshore islands which we will not defend. He said that the Tachens and the small islands are not "a vital element, as we see it, in the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores." This takes it for granted that we have a

unilateral right to intervene in foreign territory for strategic reasons—that the controlling principle of our policy is not law but strategy. This, to give it its true name, is militarism.

Mr. President, I too have a very high regard for this great student of international relations, Walter Lippmann, who writes so penetratingly and with great scholarship. I think this particular column, entitled "Reappraisal in Formosa Strait," and his most recent column, describing the line of demarcation, which really is covered by the Humphrey amendment, represent a point of view to which Members of the Senate should give great weight before they vote for a resolution so broad in the territory it covers as is the resolution now before the Senate.

Mr. President, I have already received permission to have this commentary, when edited, printed in the RECORD.

I think Alsop and Lippmann have performed a great service for the American people by pointing out in their columns the dangers that are likely to flow if—and it is an assumption—it develops that a decision is made to strike on the mainland of China before a strike is committed against us.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement in regard to a second Walter Lippmann article which I did not include, as I had intended to do, when I discussed the first Walter Lippmann article today. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Official Reporter be authorized to insert in the body of the RECORD, at the point where in my speech this afternoon I was discussing the Walter Lippmann article entitled "Reappraisal in Formosa Strait," and quoted therefrom the entire article, as well as the second Lippmann article which I had intended to discuss briefly, which is entitled "The Definition of Formosa."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXHIBIT 3

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

THE DEFINITION OF FORMOSA

The realities of the Formosa question are overlaid with so much propaganda, bluff, and face-saving that it is hard to find one's way around in it. The best clew to a clarified definition of the problem—I am not saying a solution of the problem—is to recognize that there are in fact two lines which mark the limits of what we call "Formosa."

The one line is known to the experts working on the problem as the "jurisdictional line." It is the line laid down in the Japanese surrender terms, the Japanese peace treaty, the proposed mutual security pact with Chiang's government and in the President's message. The line covers Formosa and the Pescadores but not the offshore islands. The other line includes the offshore islands. Though it is sometimes called "the strategic line," that is a misleading name for a line of which some of the islands at least, such as the Tachens now, Quemoy in September, have been declared of no decisive strategic importance. This second line is in fact the western boundary of the legal territory of China that Chiang's Nationalist Government still holds. It is the line where the Nationalist retreat from the mainland ended.

The difference between these two lines, which involve the possession of the offshore islands, is probably the critical issue in the present phase of maneuver and possible negotiation about Formosa. The offshore islands—but not Formosa and the Pescadores—are Chinese territory for which the Chinese civil war is still being fought. They are the last remaining Chinese territories which Chiang actually governs.

That gives these offshore islands considerable symbolic importance. A clean-cut decision by the United States to stand on the jurisdictional line of the treaties would protect Formosa, it would cut off the implied commitment of the United States to support Chiang in a campaign of restoration.

For Peking this would mean acceptance of the fact that they are the de facto government of Chinese territories. It would not recognize that they have title to Formosa. Nobody would have title to Formosa. The Allied Powers who have made the peace treaty with Japan would remain the custodians of the title to Formosa and the Pescadores.

It is evident that if there is to be a cease-fire, there must be a line of demarcation, and that the most reasonable line is the jurisdictional line. East of that line Peking does not have any legal title; armed action would therefore be international aggression. West of the line we have no legal claims, and intervention would be intervention in a civil war. The acceptance by us of the jurisdictional line would put an end conclusively to the notion of a United States intention to intervene. It would, moreover, fix conclusively not only the defense but the custodial character of our presence in Formosa.

There are differences of opinion as to the strategic value of these offshore islands. They would seem in the main to have a nuisance value in that they enable the Nationalists to interfere in some degree with coastal shipping. That may well be one of the reasons why Peking has been showing so much interest in them.

From the point of view of the defense of Formosa, their importance cannot be very great. Last week the President wrote off the Tachens and last September he wrote off Quemoy. It is indeed a question whether these islands, some of them within less than 5 miles of the mainland, are not strategic liabilities if it came to actual fighting. I have heard one eminent soldier, not American but active in our cause, say that an insistence upon defending these offshore islands would be like trying to defend the doormat of a house inhabited by your enemies.

The real significance of these offshore islands is not strategic but legal and political. In forming our policy we cannot expect to find that every consideration is on one side rather than the other. What we shall find is, I believe, that the preponderant weight of the consideration is in favor of our standing on the jurisdictional line.

The objection to doing that is that it means the final abandonment of our support of the Nationalist campaign of restoration, and that this will destroy the morale of the Chinese on Formosa. There can be little doubt that the Formosa Chinese and their supporters in other lands will feel that they have been deprived of the hope of a restoration. But is it not the fact that insofar as they have thought the United States would go to war for a restoration, they have been living on false hopes? I think their sincerest friends in Washington would tell them that American opinion favors the defense of Formosa, but is opposed to a commitment or to taking any risks of war about going back to the mainland.

As against the political disadvantage of the discouragement of non-Communist Chinese, there are probably big advantages on the other side. An American policy based on the jurisdictional line will almost certainly insure the support of our active allies in the Far East. It enables the powers which recognize Mao Tse-tung to recognize also the defense of Formosa. It would probably do much to win respect for our Formosa position among the uncommitted nations of Asia and it would provide a sound legal and political foundation for an eventual attempt by the United Nations to bring about a ceasefire in the Far East.

I use the word eventual because in a matter of such immense complexity, it is not possible to proceed by big and spectacular steps. The world is an elephant crossing a precarious bridge and it must test its footing. It is sometimes possible to obtain assent, to obtain a willingness not to object, without obtaining an express agreement. But in order to progress at all, no matter how slowly and tortuously, it is necessary that we be clear in our minds about where we do and where we do not stand, where we are not going and where we are going.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show, at that point in my speech this afternoon, the following brief comments on the Walter Lippmann article dealing with the subject of the definition of Formosa.

In this very fine article Walter Lippmann discussed the problem of the definition of Formosa, and he used the following language:

The one line is known to the experts working on the problem as the "jurisdictional line." It is the line laid down in the Japanese surrender terms, the Japanese peace treaty, the proposed mutual security pact with Chiang's government and in the President's message. The line covers Formosa and the Pescadores but not the offshore islands. Though it is sometimes called "the strategic line," that is a misleading name for a line of which some of the islands at least, such as the Tachens now, and Quemoy in September, have been declared of no decisive strategic importance.

Mr. President, I think the entire column is a very excellent one, and bears on the entire question of the Humphrey amendment, as to whether we owe a clear duty now, in determining our final policy on this issue, to make clear that we are not going to become involved in any conflict over the Matsu Islands and the Quemoy Islands and the other islands along the Chinese coast, which I do not think anyone can question are Chinese territory and fall within the sovereign rights of China.

The President and Secretary Dulles urge protection of Formosa and the Pescadores because of their importance to the defense of the free nations in the Pacific. The resolution in its present form provides for "protection of * * * related positions and territories."

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE HUMPHREY AMENDMENT

The resolution is so broad as to authorize preventive military action against Communist military build-ups which may threaten "such related positions and territories."

In his message the President said:

I do not suggest that the United States enlarge its defensive obligations beyond Formosa and the Pescadores as provided by the treaty now awaiting ratification. But unhappily, the danger of armed attack directed against that area compels us to take into account closely related localities and

actions which, under current conditions, might determine the failure or the success of such an attack. The authority that may be accorded by the Congress would be used only in situations which are recognizable as parts of, or "definite preliminaries" to, an attack against the main positions of Formosa and the Pescadores. (Quotation marks added.)

I say, most respectfully, that calls for an authorization to take preventive action. When we authorize preventive action, I say we close the books on all the past foreign policy of the United States in respect to our becoming involved in war, and we start a new chapter, whereby we serve notice—and I say we do it in a rather threatening manner, and it will be so interpreted—that we may engage, in accordance with our judgment and discretion, in preventive action.

Mr. President, there is a very delicate point which I think must be considered in the debate, namely, as to who is going to make that decision. Of course, the responsibility for making the decision is the President's, and I am satisfied that President Dwight Eisenhower will review very carefully any recommendation concerning a decision he might make relative to taking military action in the Pacific. But he, too, is human, and he must necessarily rely heavily, it seems to me, upon the recommendations and the urgings of those who are entrusted with military operations in that area of the world.

With no personal reflection whatsoever, but because I have a difference in point of view as to what ought to be our approach to Pacific problems, I think that in all probability the first decision at least, and it will probably be the prevailing decision, will be made by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Radford; and I am satisfied that he is strong for preventive action, and that preventive action will get us, I believe unnecessarily, into the third world war.

Much is being said about the statement issued by the Chinese Red premier's insulting statement, a vicious statement, a typically Communist statement, and I think also it was a blustering and a bluffing statement—but who can be sure?—that the Chinese Communists are going to drive us out of this area of the world, including Formosa. That statement makes us angry, and would make any red-blooded American angry. Of course, our first reaction would be, "Oh, you think you will? Well, we will show you." That is a very normal human reaction. But the Communists have made many such blustering and bluffing statements; and I believe that if we make clear that we are going to defend Formosa, if we serve firm notice that we are going to hold Formosa, and call upon the United Nations to assume jurisdiction over it, and demonstrate, to this dictator of Red China, as we are perfectly able to demonstrate, without preventive action, that any time he starts a strike against Formosa, he will be at war with us, the strike will not start.

Why do I say that? Because I think he knows that we can destroy his military forces, and, for that matter, those of Red Russia. I think the Kremlin, as well as the Red Chinese, know we can do it, if we have to. We can do it with much less loss and more quickly if we have allies. We are not likely to have many allies if we now adopt a preventive war policy in Asia.

But I refuse to believe that we have to put ourselves in the position before the eyes of the world of threatening an aggression in order to protect Formosa or in order to make clear to the Red dictator in China that we mean business. That is why I say, Mr. President, we must run the calculated risk of peace in order that we shall not in any way besmirch the great record of peace which is the record of American foreign policy from the beginning of our Nation.

We hear the argument that, "Of course, we do not have to wait until the first bomb is dropped if we know large numbers of Russian jet planes are coming over Alaska and Canada on their way to drop bombs on the United States." Mr. President, of course, we do not have to wait, because those planes commit an act of war against us the moment they start over our territory or the moment they leave Siberia. No one will have any doubt as to what the purpose of that kind of a trip is, and then the war is on. But in this discussion we are talking, insofar as my hypothetical is concerned, about the situation before an act of war has been committed by a sovereign state against us. I say that we can defend Formosa without providing, by means of this joint resolution, an authorization for preventive action.

Therefore, Mr. President, it is my argument that the joint resolution could involve potential unilateral United States military action in two areas beyond Formosa and the Pescadores, namely, the Quemoy and Matsus island groups, which are within 10 miles of the Chinese mainland.

United States military action on, or in the skies over, or in the water surrounding the island groups in sight of the mainland, or action on the mainland could constitute acts of war. Such acts of war might, under the joint resolution as it is now drawn, be undertaken before any overt Communist military action.

In either of these cases, in view of the questionable right of the United States to protect the Quemoy and Matsu island groups, the United States would find itself at war with Communist China; and I believe we would be in that situation without very many allies. Under the Chinese-Soviet Defense Pact, Russia could enter the war without the NATO countries being under obligation to join with us. Our European bases almost certainly would not be available to us under such a circumstance.

The United States position already does not have the sympathy of the Asian and Pacific countries. Our efforts to bolster anti-Communist forces in Asia which are not now receiving sufficient attention—would get even less.

With the United States embroiled in a war with Communist China, the invitation to Communist attempts to subvert Western European nations would be clear.

It is said that the joint resolution is defensive only. Unfortunately, that is not the case, in my opinion. The language of the joint resolution and the President's message make clear that it would be taken as authority to prevent militarily "situations which are recognizable as parts of, or definite preliminaries to, an attack against the main positions of Formosa and the Pescadores."

Mr. President, I cannot speak for the thoughts in the minds of men in foreign capitals. The information we have received thus far is very scant. But today the ticker shows that Herbert Evatt, head of the Labor Party in Australia—the opposition party to the party now in control there—made the statement that the Formosan stiuation should be put before the United Nations at the earliest possible moment. That is a part of my argument. I think it should, too, Mr. President. I think the joint resolution should be very much strengthened in connection with the United Nations' obligations to act; and I think the Kefauver substitute—which I shall not discuss today, other than to make this passing reference to it—is much to be preferred in respect to its provisions relative to the United Nations. So I shall support the Kefauver substitute as an alternative to the joint resolution now before the Senate.

PROBLEM OF TACHEN EVACUATION

However, Mr. President, I wish to point out that when we start talking about preventive actions involving "definite preliminaries" to an attack by our potential enemy, such action or the use of ships or planes of the 7th Fleet to evacuate some 20,000 Nationalist troops from the Tachens might very well create a situation which would lead to war. To be frank about it, Mr. President, I think the Tachens situation is the most difficult problem for me to handle in connection with my argument. However, I am going to face it. I believe we have a moral obligation—and perhaps a legal obligation, too—to give protection to the Nationalist Chinese who must be evacuated from the Tachens. It seems to me it is pregnant with the possibilities of war, in that there can be created incidents which might unavoidably lead us into war. To use one example, let us suppose we are giving cover to a Nationalist Chinese ship which is taking Nationalist Chinese soldiers off the Tachens; and let us suppose we are giving that coverage because—to state only one of many reasons, and this one is a reason of humanity—we think it is unconscionable to leave those soldiers to a Red-Chinese blood bath, which is what we would do if we did not provide a cover to evacuate them, if the Nationalist Chinese decide upon evacuation. Of course, if they do not so decide, then I think our responsibility to the people on those islands comes to an automatic end. But, Mr. President, if the decision to evacuate is made, we then have, in my opinion, a humanitarian and a moral obligation to give them coverage, in order that they may leave safely. So let us suppose that in that operation the Red Chinese were to sink the troopship to which we were giving cover, and let us suppose that our aircraft were then

in hot pursuit—as I think they should be, under the circumstances—in following an attacking Red Chinese airplane over the mainland of China. That could lead to an incident of war, although I do not think it necessarily would, as a consequence. But, I also think that from the standpoint of international law, the Red Chinese plane in making such an attack would know that in attacking that cover, it was in the first instance making a war strike against us. Of course, that is a different thing from our making a strike in the first instance against the mainland of China in the Quemoy area.

EVACUATION SHOULD BE UNDER AUSPICES OF U. N.

Mr. President, I shall not take the time to go into the further legal distinctions regarding this matter; but I think the broad distinction becomes perfectly clear.

However, I would hope—although I doubt that the time element would permit it, but I wish it could and would—that the evacuation, even though the military force being used for coverage would be ours, would be conducted under the auspices and the jurisdiction and authority of the United Nations. Then, Mr. President, an attack by the Red Chinese would have to be considered as an attack not only on the United States, but also on the United Nations, for which, under those circumstances, we would be acting as the enforcement officer of a program of evacuation.

LIMITING THE RESOLUTION

Mr. President, we must consider whether the joint resolution goes too far. Should it not be limited literally to defensive actions and to the territory of Formosa and the Pescadores? I think so. One of the reasons why I voted against the resolution in committee is that I believe it goes too far. The Humphrey amendment sought to remedy this defect.

THE DESIRE FOR U. N. CONSIDERATION

Many people of the United States, and many people throughout the world, believe that this current threat to world peace should be submitted to the United Nations. We can and should secure Formosa and the Pescadores until the United Nations can act. We should do no more without the most searching consideration.

We must firmly resist Communist aggression. We must also avoid any action which would provide the Chinese Communists with a pretext for aggression, a pretext whose validity in the eyes of Asians would be different from what it is in our eyes.

That leads me—and I am almost through—to comment on the fact that it does us no good to say, "They are going to lie about it anyway." As was said recently, one can turn on the short-wave radio anywhere in Asia and hear almost a constant Red Chinese propaganda bombardment, consisting of vicious misrepresentations of United States policies in Asia. I know that to be true. All I am saying is: Let us not follow a course of action which, in the judgment of history, would afford any foundation for the propaganda which Communists may wage against us.

While I am on that point, let me say that we cannot ignore public opinion abroad or at home. Now that the President has requested the Congress to pass this resolution, I think there is no way of avoiding a considerable amount of international discussion of the implications of the resolution.

I am very much worried about what the final judgment of world public opinion will be. Early indications are that in Asia such public opinion involves a great many reservations about the course of action which is being proposed by the resolution. In our own country there can be no question about it. Already, as Senators, we are receiving a considerable number of communications. I do not know how they run in other offices, but in my office the communications are overwhelmingly against the adoption of the proposed resolution in its present form.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a cross-section of the communications received in my office. I assure Senators that they in no way violate rule XIX.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the communications may be printed, as requested.

(See exhibit 4.)

CONCLUSION

Mr. MORSE. In concluding, Mr. President, for the reasons I have expressed today, and for others which I intend to set forth in greater documentation detail in subsequent speeches, I wish to say that I shall vote against the resolution unless, in the course of the debate, argument is advanced which shows that I am wrong in my present thinking and conclusion on the subject or it is amended by the Humphrey and Kefauver amendments. I have never hesitated to change my opinion on the floor of the Senate in the course of debate when I became convinced that I was mistaken. I shall not hesitate to do so in this instance; but after listening for the past 2 days to the arguments advanced by the top civilian and military officials in the field of military and foreign policy, I have come to the deep conviction that it would be a great mistake for the United States to follow the course of action contemplated or made possible by this resolution.

So, I say that, as was pointed out by witnesses, we must, of course, take the calculated risks of war. But we must also take the calculated risks of peace. I say that we cannot in good conscience flirt with a defensive war. In my judgment this resolution would legalize the position of the proponents of a preventive war, which has been advocated in this country for the past several years.

EXHIBIT 4

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please speak out against hasty action which may plunge America into catastrophic world war.

ALLEN A. SMITH.

HANOVER, N. H., *January 25, 1955.*
The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This appeal is addressed to you because I believe that you have a clearer and more independent mind than most of the other Senators, and, in addition, the ability to see ahead.

It seems to me that Mr. Dulles, for it is he who is apparently propounding the theory of telling China just where to stop, is operating from a wishful thinking starting point. He wants China not to want a major war, but has he any basis for an actual belief, backed up by facts, that China, with Russian promises behind her, is not ready to risk one? Since victory today may well consist in China's keeping us busy in the Orient, with Russia, acting suddenly as an ally, striking our cities with atomic bombs from another direction; can't that possibility encourage, rather than discourage, China from risking such a large-scale, total-push war at the present time?

Furthermore, we actually do not know what fears and emotions are now stirred up in the Chinese people, distorting their thought processes. We should know that they have a deepseated historical hatred of the West as exploiters of the East—which distrust the Communists have had more success in allaying than the British or we have had. I myself am not at all sure that China isn't as ready now as she ever will be for an all-out war. The decisive question for us at present might well be: Can we afford to tip the scales with a Formosa ultimatum and land in an atomic squeeze between Russia and China?

War has changed; and only the country that can strike first and hardest can call the tune. Are we in that position? I think not. Our great danger is arrogance in our political thinking. It could be our undoing.

Thanking you for any consideration you may give these beliefs,

Very sincerely yours,

ALICE POLLARD.
Mrs. Joseph G. Pollard.

DETROIT, MICH., *January 25, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Might I suggest, Senator, a possible solution to the political Formosa situation?

Place Formosa under U. N. trusteeship and then leave the Formosans vote and decide whether they desire to remain under Chiang Kai-shek, join mainland China, return to the jurisdiction of Japan, or establish themselves as an independent country.

The Formosans are not Chinese. The Chinese conquered them in the 16th century. Japan conquered them in 1895, and Franklin D. Roosevelt returned them to China without plebiscite. My recollection is that in 1946 Chiang sent an army to Formosa and killed 50,000 of them in their revolt.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. DAPPER.

SKOKIE, ILL., *January 24, 1955.*

DEAR SENATOR: Now you should speak out against holding Formosa. You have always voted with the people. The people don't want militarists taking us into a futile and a rough war.

Sincerely,

F. H. MARSHALL.

GLOUCESTER, VA.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I see with great alarm that the President is asking for the power to commit warlike acts and even to make war at his own discretion.

Do not, I beg, allow any man such power!

I notice, if we don't look out, that we will be standing up to Red China all alone and

Russia can pick up what's left, win, lose or draw! I don't see any allies rushing to join us.

Are we going to slaughter our young men again for some orientals living half around the world? And why is our destiny and that of Chiang so bound up together? Trade? Trade against blood?

A Pacific war brings prosperity to California as some people know. But it is paid for in blood and tears.

Evidently we are not committed to protect Formosa as I understand that the Senate has never ratified this pact and I hope they never will!

Turn the whole business over to the U. N. They are for this sort of thing. Bring back the Seventh Fleet and let the U. N. take over.

Sincerely,

Mrs. H. B. HOLCOMBE.

EUGENE, OREG., *January 23, 1955.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Isn't there some way the explosive Formosa situation can be turned over to the U. N. and thereby increase the worldwide respect for this Nation and the possibility of further progress toward peace?

We have made a good beginning in sending our food to hungry populations even if their government happens to be our enemy. This mature and Christian action should have all the encouragement you can give it. As I understand the psychology of starvation, meeting the basic physical needs of hungry people is the best—perhaps the only—defense against their falling prey to totalitarian forms of rule.

Now, if ever, we need a show of faith in the future. Our acts, as a nation must be in the direction of a community of all nations for there can be no hope for peace outside of that eventuality.

I hope you will make every effort to see that the Formosan situation is neutralized and that restraint becoming a mature people is exercised in the power struggle now going on.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD E. L. BARTON.

YPSILANTI, MICH., *January 25, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

We know, don't we, that the Soviets want us to exhaust ourselves in peripheral wars. Why then do we fall into the trap of Formosa, the least significant area in which we could possibly engage our strength. Will we win the battle of Formosa, drag on in a war with a China as duped as we are, and be unable to parry the thrust of a completely unexhausted Russia? This is not statesmanship but idiocy.

ANN JONES.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 26, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In heaven's name, please deny President's request for authority to intervene in Chinese civil war. We can see no logical, sane, or moral basis for such an act that could lead to an atomic world war. The U. N. is the only alternative to the frightful implications of President's request.

Dr. and Mrs. Z. GROSS.

SEATTLE, WASH., *January 26, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Depending on you to lead and opposing granting Eisenhower war powers. Using United States forces, atomic weapons, attacking prognosticated attackers "before they leave home," are stupidly and absurd measures for attaining goal professed—peace. There are other alternatives to our futile Asian policy than war.

Mr. and Mrs. RICHARD A. PETERSON.

SANTA CLARA, CALIF.,
January 26, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As one who 10 years ago attended the organizational sessions of the United Nations, I urge you to seek some method for utilizing the machinery established there for a settlement in the Formosa Straits short of armed unilateral action.

GRACE MCDONALD.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
January 25, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Unalterably opposed to the turn to preventive war indicated in reversal of previous China policy. As Nation magazine puts it, recent treaty "is a document giving away an island which doesn't belong to us to a man who has no right to it." Now we encourage Chiang Kai-shek to new provocations by suggesting blank check commitments. Chiang is hated by his own people because his government is a cruel, treacherous, and corrupt dictatorship. Urge you do everything possible to stop administration from lighting matches around this powder keg.

RICHARD LYNDEN.

RALEIGH, N. C.,
January 26, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

All sections of America but especially we of the South have reason to recall how amazingly few outstanding national leaders stood out with wisdom and courage against the tragic drift toward war in the 1850's and 1860. I hope history will not repeat itself in this respect and that you will seriously consider whether we may not invite the world's worst war if we bypass the United Nations or act without the sincere approval both of our professed allies and of the great neutral nations. There will be almost equal danger in a general world war or in a war in which the United States and China might almost destroy each other, leaving Russia itself unharmed.

CLARENCE POE,
Editor and Board Chairman,
The Progressive Farmer Magazine.

MADISON, N. J.,
January 25, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you vote against resolution authorizing use of armed force in Asia and work for peace in Asia and Europe through United Nations.

ALICE HUSSEY BALASSA.

STAYTON, OREG., *January 22, 1955.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is with anticipated pleasure that I await the results of the 84th Congress under the leadership of the Democrats. From your newsletter I can readily see that you have set high and commendable goals to strive for.

The Hells Canyon bill is one that I hope will be looked upon with favor by Congress because it is vital and essential to the development of industry in the Northwest.

My hope is that you will favor any aid in the way of equipment and supplies to Nationalist China, as of late the policy of our Government seems to be one of appeasement to Red China, who has murdered many American citizens. No; I do not favor a blockade of Red China at present, but I feel quite strongly that we should not tie the hands of the Nationalists. After all, Russia is constantly supplying Red China. News dispatches indicate that Red China is using Russian-built equipment. I have heard news commentators say that Nationalist China would be able to successfully invade the mainland if we would supply them with the necessary equipment, much of which we have in mothballs where it is doing no one any good but going to waste. This I believe is an important item to be considered.

Yours truly,

NESTOR VAN HANDEL.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 26, 1955.*

Chiang desperately needs our surplus fighting planes. Let's send them.

Yours hopefully,

VERA J. ELLIS.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 24, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Sincerely hope you will back the President's request on the defense of Formosa.

P. J. LAWLESS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 24, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

HONORABLE SIR: We do want peace but not at the price of appeasement. Patriotic Chinese Nationalists are being murdered by gangsters. They do not have means to defend themselves. Chiang does not ask for manpower, only for defense equipment. How come we can send fighter planes to Latin America and deny this so much greater need? In the name of suffering humanity, let us send Chiang's government what they need, and at once. Our stupidity gave away the mainland. Can we never learn? Please, please act quickly.

Yours hopefully,

VERA J. ELLIS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 26, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Foreign Affairs Committee,
Washington, D. C.:

Resist hysterical stampede. Allow time for people to register opinion. Evacuate Formosa. Save world from inevitable destruction.

LEO GALLAGHER.

ACOMA, WASH., *January 25, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

A synthetic war atmosphere has been built up by the Pentagon, the armament interests, and the China lobby, and it is apparently very thick around Washington. What would we say if Cuba were Communist and the Kremlin decided to maintain that island as part of a Kremlin defense line? That is not one bit more absurd than our policy in Asia, and mark my word, our system of free enterprise is going to collapse along with democracy if we follow the egg-head leadership now insisting on American evacuation of Chinese forces thrown off the mainland as result of revolution. Heaven knows our country needs men of courage and commonsense as never before.

REX ROUDEBUSH.

SOUTH PASADENA, CALIF., *January 24, 1955.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: Now that the President has spoken for broader power to deal with the China situation, and having heard you on a broadcast say that this should never have been handled unilaterally—that I fully agree. We have the United Nations and

that's where the problem belongs. It's a world problem, and if it calls for boys to die, then I say let all the nations take part. We should not sacrifice our young American manhood any further on foreign soil, unless others are willing to do likewise; and I don't mean a token force, either.

As you well know, "Chang" was surrounded on the mainland by a bunch of grafters and crooks; if he hadn't have been, why was it that whole armies of his deserted and went over to the Commies? They didn't trust him or his advisers. I don't think he is any better than the Commies. It's six on one hand and half a dozen on the other. That's why I say, my dear Senator, one American boy's life isn't worth giving for the motley scum, so won't you please do everything in your power to keep us from becoming involved, alone, on an all-out war in China?

Now, I am of middle age. I have no young boys to go, but I have some very dear friends who do, and I feel very close to these kids, and there are millions of other kids whom I don't know but for whom I am writing this letter. May God direct you, for I know you have the courage to fight for what you think is right. I have followed you too long in the Senate for that; you are a great American, and you are one of the best Senators to sit in that august body.

With my best wishes for your success in all your undertaking,

Yours truly,

M. F. YASBOROUGH.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *January 23, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are about the only person on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that it seems worth writing to, although you aren't from my State. In today's Plain Dealer was a big splash about "Warships moving" out of Manila, etc. Then a dispatch out of Washington, D. C., saying the President was going to draw a line between Formosa and the mainland and hold it against Communist aggression—and ask Congress to back him.

I realize that after World War I, we withdrew into our "shell" and let the rest of the world "stew in its own juice". I didn't agree with that kind of diplomacy but I think it is just as wrong morally or bad for the country diplomatically if we go too far the other way.

Just what does this Chiang Kai-shek have or represent that we feel we must back him and stay in his corner?

This Plain Dealer article spoke of the Tachens being an outpost guarding the approaches to Formosa. Then later we were told the islands were 250 miles away to the north—twice as far away as the actual mainland, China.

Why do we insist on holding Formosa, just to give a home for Chiang—our boy? And keep the pot boiling over there? Do you think that Red China could find a better issue to unite their people, to build up militarily over the years than this is? Then we talk about peace—when are we going to be realistic for the long pull ahead? Let's eliminate tensions, not aggravate them—if we desire peace.

Yours truly,

C. ROMEY.

MADISON, WIS., *January 25, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

No further aid to Formosa. Fear atomic bomb war.

LELIA BASCOM.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *January 25, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Oppose any attack on China mainland or coastal waters. Find cease fire outlet for peace.

Mr. and Mrs. ALFRED DAWSON.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *January 25, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

You're only person who can defeat or arrest this sudden recommendation for war with China. If Nationalist China wants cease fire and our protection; yes. Fight her war now.

Respectfully submitted.

OLGA BURROUGHS.

PELLA, IOWA, *January 22, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to you because, I believe, you would rather serve the best interests of the American people than the war party in Congress which tries to get us involved in an Asian war.

America would oppose any foreign power occupying islands along her coast. We wouldn't want China in Puerto Rico, Cuba, or Alaska would we? By the same token let's get out of Formosa and let the Chinese settle their own war.

Wendell Wilkie a long time ago told us that the jig was up for the white man exploiting the colored races. Apparently, we need a war, possibly an atomic war to learn that lesson.

A vote for the Asian alliance or defense means that you support the Chinese lobby and the American privileged few as against the people of the United States.

Please vote against any Asian alliance.

Yours respectfully,

PETER VAN ZANTE, M. D.

SAN RAFAEL, CALIF., *January 25, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Do not feel American people have any vital interest in Formosa nor preservation Chiang's government worth single American life. Hope you will oppose pending resolution.

A. P. SAXTON.

CLAREMONT, CALIF., *January 25, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Under no circumstances allow attack on continental China. Danger of total war too great. Far better lose face and Formosa by refusing President's request than lose civilization. The meek shall inherit the earth. Urge cease-fire through United Nations.

C. S. JOHNSON.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 24, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Beg you to vigorously oppose use of our forces to evacuate islands outside line we will defend.

WILLIAM H. DAVIS.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *January 25, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We're inviting war by our actions on Formosa in defending the corrupt and antidemocratic Chiang regime. In Cincinnati you spoke of keeping faith with conscience. We urge you keep faith by speaking out against this suicidal policy and do all you can to get a peaceful solution.

Mr. and Mrs. BERMAN.

BURLINGAME, CALIF., *January 25, 1955.*

United States Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please don't sell people of the United States out by a vote for our defense of Formosa or other far distant Chinese islands. Suggest to you, our President, and your colleagues a 6-month cooling-off period. We cannot win an aggressive war with the awakened teeming millions of Asia. Don't vote to wipe out the white race. Vote for peace. Yours for a free United States.

J. MONTGOMERY REYNOLDS.

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF., *January 22, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

HONORABLE SIR: Since the President inclines to the military, such as Admiral Radford's setting of foreign policy in the Far East, must the Senate, likewise, bow to this military ursurpation of policymaking? Cannot such rash, dictatorial promoters of hot war be called to account before the Foreign Affairs Committee and the American public in conformity with our longstanding, American constitutional subservience of the military to civilian policymaking authority?

I am against conceding to the President any power to take the "tough, insane" steps towards involving America in the eventual holocaust of hot war anywhere, especially towards supporting the figment of a corrupt Chinese Nationalist Government on Formosa or Tachen Island with American guns and lives.

Respectfully,

SAMUEL J. SPERLING, M. D.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *January 24, 1955.*

The EDITOR, POST-DISPATCH,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR SIR: I was glad to read this statement by Senator MORSE in the Post-Dispatch of January 23:

"Southeast Asia should be brought under the United Nations jurisdiction as rapidly as possible, and * * * American unilateral action, particularly in the Formosa straits, should come to an end. I think of it as a great mistake for the United States to take upon itself the full responsibility of policing the Formosa area."

Bravo to Senator MORSE! One of the saddest ramifications is that this kind of opinion has not been more openly and more confidently expressed in recent years.

Sincerely,

JOY C. GUZÉ.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I don't know whether this letter will be printed or not but my object is to get your words in the much-read Letters to the Editor column since I found them on one of the back pages.

I hope you will follow Senator FLANDERS' example and speak fearlessly for peace and the United Nations.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JOY C. GUZÉ.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 26, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge your influence for rational approach Formosa crisis. Peace too precious to jeopardize by calculated-risk policy administration.

VIRGINIA MALBIN.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 25, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Senator WARREN MAGNUSON is right. This step can well lead to war

and the end of civilization. It should be handled through the United Nations.

Sincerely,

WARREN LOYAL IRWIN.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 25, 1955.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Nation looks to you for leadership in opposing on Formosa program. Vast majority oppose new war moves in Asia, but they need spokesman. Strong Senate minority would give encouragement to peace forces here and abroad. Whole problem should be referred to United Nations.

ARTHUR H. BONE.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 26, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge that you firmly oppose United States military defense of Formosa. The people are not with Eisenhower on this suicidal giveaway of American lives any more than they are for the giveaway of public resources. The problems are similar; the villains identical. Fight for us on this front, too.

JOAN BAKER.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 26, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Dulles policy now bearing its disastrous fruit. Warlike measures and risks cannot be construed as implementing peace. Urge your counsel against: (1) Rash threats of war; (2) consequent damage of our prestige in Asia and worldwide; (3) unfair methods of administration to stampede Congress and Nation.

M. RUSSO.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 25, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are very disturbed by recent statements and actions of our President and Secretary of State in regard to the Formosa question.

It seems to me like a cleverly devised scheme to wrest from Congress the power to declare war.

It was also stated that they would have to take action without the consent of the United Nations. This is another clever scheme to scrap the United Nations.

May we count on your vote against this resolution?

Yours very truly,

W. L. FOWLKS.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 25, 1955.*

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It seems to me that a unilateral United States decision, not only to defend Formosa but also to take whatever steps necessary, including preventative action, might leave us in a shooting war without any allies. I think that the United States should have put up a resolution in the United Nations, in a sense, giving U. N. protection to Formosa. Then if a Chinese Communist invasion came, we would have other armed forces standing by our side.

Now that the President has sent this message to Congress, and it appears obvious that the implementing resolution will pass, I think it is important that an amendment be made on the floor instructing the United States delegation to the U. N. to press for parallel United Nations action. If the United Nations is to mean anything, we should bring our problems to the U. N. first and take our unilateral action only if the U. N. fails to act.

Sincerely,

DON S. WILLNER,
Attorney at Law.

THE DALLES, OREG., *January 26, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Unthinkable you will vote for possible war to save Formosa for discredited, corrupt Chiang.

Mr. and Mrs. FRANK R. STOVALL.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 26, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We sincerely hope that when the matter comes up in the Senate of aiding Formosa—to the extent of bombing the Chinese mainland in advance of aggression—that you will vigorously oppose it.

We hope that you will examine your conscience and see that such a move could only lead to a disastrous war, and we do not want another war.

Sincerely,

MRS. LOIS NEWMAN.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 26, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge every effort be made to keep us out of China war. Hope you will speak out for calm approach to crisis.

Mr. and Mrs. ARTHUR LIND.

MONMOUTH, OREG., *January 24, 1955.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are absolutely opposed to a defensive war in China, such as Eisenhower seems to be suggesting, or any other kind of a war.

We feel that war is outmoded in international affairs and that we should not only initiate negotiations in cases of disagreement, but be prepared to initiate a new series if they break down.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE and MILDRED BURCK.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 22, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

Good work on using the United Nations for the Formosa problem. Keep it up.

Sincerely,

LESLIE C. DAVIS.
CLARA J. DAVIS.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 25, 1955.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please vote against any move by our Armed Forces which might involve United States in Far East war.

Sincerely,

PATRICIA ZAHUMENSKY.

FLORENCE, OREG., *January 26, 1955.*

The Honorable WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

I am against defending Formosa. Believe it will precipitate a full-scale war.

Dr. THOMAS M. HUNT.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 26, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Considering danger of atomic holocaust, strongly urge you oppose Formosa resolution. Let United States not bypass U. N. Road to peace is not via ultimatum and war threats.

Dr. and Mrs. M. MALBIN.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 26, 1955.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We strongly urge that you vote against the Eisenhower resolution for United States defense of Formosa. United States has no jurisdiction over Chinese civil problems and we urge that such problems be referred to the U. N. in the interest of world peace.

MOLLY CAVENAUGH.
LOIS CARTOZIAN.
RUTH NEWMAN.
JOAN BAKER.

ST. ALBAN'S EPISCOPAL CHURCH,
Tillamook, Oreg., January 22, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Foreign Affairs Committee,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Evidence indicates that peaceful coexistence between the eastern and the western alliances can be achieved through the following adaptation of the providential principle of geopolitical hegemonic equity, which will most likely prove acceptable to both East and West:

Providence has composed the world in the form of world islands consisting of continents (and subcontinents) and their adjacent islands and peninsulas. Today, each world island is awakening to its capability of becoming self-sufficient (in all essential resources), prosperous and independent, largely through internal unification. All areas within a world island are economically (that is, in natural resources and productivity) interdependent. Consequently, every world island today is driven (often without full awareness) by a strong natural urge to achieve effectual political unity as the only means to economic integration and consequent prosperity and security; two of the main purposes of government are those of insuring the security and the prosperity of the area governed.

In other words, each continental world island is by nature endowed with its own Monroe Doctrine. This should be easy for the nations to see and agree upon in principle. However, in practice present boundaries would presumably remain; and every maladjusted area which by its present sovereignty, alliance, hostility, and geographical situation menaces the security of the world island of which it is part, would be bound and benefited by treaties of peace, limited armament and economic aid, guaranteed by all concerned, thereby demonstrating mutual good faith (and note that political destiny is generally determined in large measure by apparent economic advantage). Such is the long-sought-after modus vivendi, the condition for peaceful coexistence, the formula for peace—geopolitical hegemonic equity.

If this peace formula is not adopted, war between Russo-Chinese Eurasia and the United States alone may occur, perhaps reducing both powers to exhaustion or atomic rubble and leaving the other nations, until then under jeopardy and relatively helpless, to compete for world dominance.

Of course, this is my personal message to you. (And, of course, you are welcome to read it to Congress if you should so desire.)

With all good wishes,

Sincerely,

The Reverend J. J. HANCOCK,
Vicar.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I had not intended to speak this afternoon, but the remarks of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are so far reaching in their implications that I feel in the interest of national security the RECORD must not be allowed to go unchallenged at this point.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield for that purpose provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HRUSKA. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as I stated at the outset, I had not intended to speak today on the subject of Senate Joint Resolution 28, which has been reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, sitting jointly.

However, after listening to the speech of the senior Senator from Oregon, the implications and deductions he apparantly drew from some testimony given before the committees are so far reaching in their nature that I believe great damage can be done to the national security position of the United States and, indeed, to the security of the 7th Fleet and our other Armed Forces in the far Pacific. Therefore, insofar as something may be said to clarify the RECORD in that regard, I believe it needs to be said here and now, and very properly.

The President of the United States, in his message to Congress of Monday, specifically said:

> Our purpose is peace. That cause will be served, if, with our help, we demonstrate our unity and our determination. In all that we do, we shall remain faithful to our obligations as a member of the United Nations, to be ready to settle our international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered.

I repeat that the President's message, the joint resolution which has been reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services today by a vote of 26 to 2, and the companion joint resolution, which was passed by the House by a vote of 410 to 3, serve the purpose of peace. That is the sole purpose involved.

Of course, men may honestly differ in their interpretation of testimony, but in my judgment there is not a scintilla of evidence before the committees, sitting jointly, which could lead any reasonable person to believe that the purpose of the resolution is to engage in a preventive war, or that its purpose is aggression against the Chinese Communist regime or any other regime on the face of the earth.

The whole text and tenor of the joint resolution and the President's message is to stabilize a difficult situation in the Pacific.

During the last administration it was the judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and during this administration it is the judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, that it was not and is not in the national interest of our own security or in the interest of peace in a free world to permit the island of Formosa to pass into unfriendly hands. Should that island and its adjacent group of islands, the Pescadores, pass into unfriendly hands, it would drive a wedge into the heart of our defense position, which runs from Japan to Korea in the north, through our great airbase on Okinawa, through Formosa to the Philippines, to its anchor in Australia and New Zealand. The breaching of the line would turn the flank of Okinawa in the north, and it would turn the flank of the Philippines in the south.

In addition to that, it would cut the sealanes into southeast Asia, upon which depends the economic life of Korea and Japan, two of our allies, with whom we have mutual-security pacts, and would thus bring about the economic and political collapse of peoples with whom we are associated.

Therefore, there has been no difference of opinion or in judgment between the last administration and the present administration with respect to the importance to the vital interests of this country of maintaining the chain of defense to which I have referred.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would prefer not to yield until I have completed my statement. At the conclusion of my remarks, I shall be glad to yield.

In view of the statements of the senior Senator from Oregon, I hope Members of the Senate, in the exercise of their responsibilities as Senators, will go to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations and ask to read in the committee room the classified documents of the hearings. I make that request because if those records are read in their entirety, no deduction of the kind made by the senior Senator from Oregon can possibly be drawn.

Why do I say that in my considered judgment this has been a great disservice to our country? I say it because on the floor of the Senate, not by a columnist, who did not sit in the hearings, not by a newspaperman, who may have received his information second hand or third hand—accurate as newspapermen may try to be—but by a Member of the Senate, who has just recently been assigned to one of the two great committees concerned with this subject, there has been made a statement today which, if allowed to go unchallenged, might cause the men in the Kremlin or in Peiping to believe that a decision to engage in a preventive war or an act of aggression had been made by the Government and the people of the United States.

If the Communists in Red China and Russia felt that was the case, they might decide to strike before that event could occur, and we might jeopardize the men of the 7th Fleet, we might jeopardize our position at Okinawa, and might jeopardize our entire position in the far Pacific. It is for that reason, Mr. President, that I have felt the deep necessity of rising on the floor today to try to straighten out the record.

Mr. President, already the wire services are carrying comments on this subject. To be sure, the comments were made before the speech, but I can think how Pravda and Tass will blazon forth tomorrow.

What Pravda was saying before the speech was made is indicated by the following on the ticker tape:

> Moscow.—The Soviet newspaper Pravda charged today President Eisenhower's message to Congress on Formosa was "brazen intervention" in Red China's internal affairs and an attempt to prepare an invasion of the mainland.
>
> The official Communist Party newspaper printed its sharpest attack on American policy on Formosa in an article about Mr. Eisenhower's message to Congress Monday. The article was written by V. Borovoski.
>
> "On 24th January," Pravda said, "President Eisenhower sent a special message to Congress demanding powers to use American Armed Forces for insuring the so-called security of Formosa and the Pescadores; in other words, for open armed intervention in the domestic affairs of China.
>
> "Both Houses of Congress are rushing through the consideration of this message. In question is the preparation of direct aggression by the United States Armed Forces against the continental territory of China," the newspaper said.
>
> It added that President Eisenhower's "demand for freedom of action in the area of the Taiwan (Formosa) Strait fully discloses the real meaning and purpose of the reports emanating from the United States that American diplomacy is allegedly seeking a cease-fire in the Taiwan Strait.
>
> "Washington wants such a cease-fire as would prevent the Chinese people from liberating Taiwan and the other islands belonging to them which have been seized by the Chiang Kai-shek clique," Pravda said.
>
> "At the same time Washington itself is making preparations on the pretext of helping Chiang Kai-shek to intervene directly in the hostilities and extend aggression against China."
>
> The article reviewed recent American military actions and plans in the Formosa area, as reported in the American press.
>
> "To all this the Chinese people reply calmly and firmly that they are resolved to liberate Taiwan, which is their territory, and no threats or provocations can prevent the triumph of their just cause," Pravda said.
>
> It said, "The ruling circles of countries allied to the U. S. A. hasten to take a more cautious attitude, stressing that (President) Eisenhower's move is American in nature."

Mr. President, with all the sincerity which I possess, I say I know of no living American who is more devoted to the cause of peace in the world and to the cause of preventing the holocaust of war, and more familiar with the devastation of war and with what war costs in men and material, than is the President of the United States. Time and time again in the face of great provocation of things which in the long course of history would have been considered acts of war, such as the shooting down of American planes in areas where they had every right to be, the illegal holding of men in uniform of our country in violation of the Korean armistice terms, which are certainly acts of war, he has demonstrated his peaceful inclinations. In order to prevent the provoking of hostilities, he has—and I say this as one who has been sometimes critical of things which have been done or which have not

been done—leaned over backward to preserve peace with honor, which is far different from peace at any price.

Mr. President, I again plead with every Member of the Senate to look at the record, to read the record, to go to the committee room this afternoon, or to go there tonight and read it. They have no business which is more important to them than to read the entire record even if they have to cancel every engagement they have made. If that were done, they could not fairly draw the deduction that this resolution was either intended or meant to provide for preventive war, or provide for aggression against the Chinese Communist regime, or against any other nation on the face of the earth.

It is not only the high responsibility of the Senate of the United States, but, according to my view, the high responsibility of the American press, that that fact be made clear to the people of this Nation and to the people of the world, before great damage is done to the security of the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall be glad to yield when I have completed my statement. The Senator from Oregon asked that he be not interrupted during the course of his remarks. There were several times when I would have liked to interrupt him. I think it would have been helpful if we could have carried on a colloquy during his remarks. But he preferred it the other way, and I think he was entirely within his rights.

We are dealing with a serious problem, one which could, to be sure, ultimately lead to peace or to war, but there is a considerable body of opinion on the part of those who are just as much devoted to the cause of peace, just as much interested in the American people, just as much interested in the children and grandchildren of America and the heritage we shall pass on to them as are any other classes of our citizens, who feel that the alternative of doing nothing or of passing an emasculated resolution will more quickly and more directly lead to war than will the action proposed by the President of the United States in order to stabilize the situation in the Pacific.

Mr. President, I believe the time has come when, as responsible men, and Members of this great legislative body, and as citizens of the United States, whether we serve here or elsewhere, we must face up to the fact that the Far East today hangs in the balance. There is responsible judgment in the highest councils of our Nation that if nothing is done, if the Chinese Communists are permitted to go unchallenged from island to island down the coastal island chain, ultimately and inevitably they will launch a massive attack, as is stated not only in the Pravda article and by Chou En-lai, but is repeated time and time again.

If it be true that the last administration believed as does the present administration, that it is not in our national interest to permit this great chain of islands to pass into Communist hands, and that the loss of Formosa can be detrimental to the holding of our position in the Pacific, then we must decide what reasonable and prudent steps should be taken to see that that shall not happen.

If we do nothing, the nations which hang in the balance will say, as they have said heretofore, that the United States of America, as the Chinese put it, is a "paper tiger"; that when we hear one slight roar out of Mao Tse-tung or Chou En-lai, we back down from our position; we dare not uphold our friends in the Pacific; we dare not uphold our own positions in the Pacific; and we will lose the remaining free nations in Asia today. That is the condition which the people of our country, the Congress, and the Government must face up to.

I have said that the President of the United States is devoted to the cause of peace. Every Member of the Senate, everyone in the galleries, everyone throughout the country, knows that to be a fact. There is no person who is more devoted to religious principles than is the President of the United States.

This joint resolution has not come before Congress in any quick, un-thought-out way. It has come only because the President of the United States, having the greatest responsibilities which any nation ever has placed upon any human being in all time, and living in a sort of solitary loneliness, if I may say so, in sleep, work, and in recreation, cannot escape his final responsibility as President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.

The President cannot go on a brief vacation or fulfill a social engagement without having always in the back of his mind that thought that he may at any moment get a message saying that our Armed Forces have been attacked in some area of the world. What a tremendous responsibility for any person to be called upon to bear. The American people have made the office of the Presidency the most burdensome and man-killing job the world has ever known.

Do Senators think that the President lightly prepared his message to Congress suggesting the joint resolution? Everyone knows that that did not happen. The joint resolution comes before Congress not only with the recommendation of the President of the United States, but also of the Secretary of State, who is an experienced diplomat. It comes before Congress with the endorsement of the National Security Council and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in the belief that the outlines presented by the President are in keeping with our vital security interests in the Pacific.

The joint resolution has been endorsed by the unanimous vote of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. It has passed the House of Representatives, I repeat, by a vote of 410 to 3. It has been reported to the Senate by a vote in committee of 26 to 2, with 2 amendments having been offered and having been rejected by a vote of 20 to 8.

Certainly those persons also are concerned about the honor of the United States.

I would not stand here today and make the statements I have made—and I believe my statements would be borne out by other Members who sat in the committee—if I interpreted this measure as did the Senator from Oregon, as having any semblance of being a joint resolution calling for preventive war or aggression.

I submit that the evidence is clear and unmistakable that the President believes that the situation in the Pacific can be stabilized if with the judgment and consent of the sovereign government of the Republic of China on Formosa the Nationalist Chinese can simply redeploy certain of their forces which are located on certain of the islands referred to as the Tachen group and perhaps other islands in that general area. Redeploy them to do what? To defend more effectively the bastion of Formosa which, as a national policy, we have said must not pass into Communist hands.

Why cannot the Government of the Republic of China, which was our ally in two world wars, and which offered to come to our support in the Korean war, but was turned down, themselves defend this group of islands some 200 miles north? Simply because they do not have the air power to provide effective cover. The Chinese Communists have superiority in the air. They can interfere with the resupply and reequipment of the Nationalist Chinese. Unless the Nationalist Chinese were either supported directly by us or we could give them cover support for redeployment, it would mean a Dunkerque in that area of the world, and would result in the loss of a substantial number of Chinese Nationalist troops who could better be used for the support and defense of the island of Formosa.

There have been suggestions of better ways of accomplishing the desired result. I suppose a resolution has never come before the Senate which could not be fly-specked, or in which a word could not be changed here or there. But the pending joint resolution has been given deep consideration by the President, by the National Security Council, by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and by the Secretary of State, having in mind our obligations under the United Nations Charter, our obligations to our allies in Europe, and our obligations to our allies in the Pacific, as well; for, I repeat, we have a mutual defense pact with the Republic of Korea, with Japan, with the Philippines—and also historic ties with the Philippines—and with the Anzus powers, including Australia and New Zealand. There is before the Senate a treaty, not yet acted upon, dealing with southeast Asia, the so-called Manila pact. There will be pending before long a similar mutual defense pact with the Republic of China on Formosa, which is the only gap in that long area of defensive chains.

There have been some who have suggested that the joint resolution should be changed. Changed how? One of the suggestions was that the reference to certain other areas now in friendly hands should be eliminated. Presumably it was thought on the part of the proponents of that amendment that to do so would further limit the action of the United States. The proponents of the amendment had a perfect right to submit their proposal. I am not complaining about

that. Men may honestly differ. No one is infallible. But the proposal was that there should be such a limitation, which would mean, quite frankly, that regardless of what might occur, the United States should not, even if in the judgment of the President it was wise to do so and, of course, no one suggests that one iota of his powers as Commander in Chief, whatever they may be under the Constitution, can be either added to or subtracted from by whatever Congress might provide in a resolution—use our forces on the offshore islands other than Formosa and the Pescadores. So the amendment is a restrictive proposal.

If the intent and the purpose of such an amendment be as I have suggested, what would it accomplish? It would be a green light to the Chinese Communists to proceed to take those islands. We would be saying to them, "You can feel absolutely certain that, with impunity, you send your invading forces, your paratroopers, troops from amphibious craft into that line of islands, regardless of their relationship to the safety of Formosa. Come and get them, and get them now."

There is a school of thought that believes that the proponents of the amendment are mistaken; that actually what the amendment would accomplish would be to impose, in a way, restrictions upon the President, because now he is limited in that particular field, so far as the resolution is concerned, to other areas in friendly hands, which means that only on those islands or areas in friendly hands, which in his judgment, and that of the Security Council and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, are believed to be essential to the protection of Formosa, could our Armed Forces be used. They could not be used under the resolution, on the mainland of China, or even on the islands presently held by other than friendly hands.

But let us look at this picture in its entirety. What is the proposal again? If the Government of the Republic of China believes that it would serve the mutual defense interests to redeploy its forces, we shall do what? We shall be in a position, if the President and his advisers deem it wise, to furnish cover and facilities for deployment of those forces, and save another Dunkerque. We would not be committing an act of aggression. We would merely be trying to stabilize peace in the Pacific. There can be no question about that. There would not be a shot fired by either an American plane or an American ship unless fired upon.

Can anyone suppose that, if the American Air Force or the American Navy were giving cover for that type of humanitarian effort in an effort to evacuate persons from certain islands, if it was determined to do that, and if the Communists sent a wave of MIG planes to attack the carriers which were furnishing the planes to give such protection, and attempted to sink our carriers, our forces would take it and do nothing? Is it desired to draw a line, or to provide a sanctuary, with the understanding that when American planes reached within 3 miles of the Chinese coast, they could go no further, but would have to return to their carriers, wait to be refueled, re-armed, and re-equipped, so that the enemy planes could come again in another wave and attempt to sink the carriers of the 7th Fleet, and other American forces that might happen to be there? I cannot believe that any person who has thought the problem through would want to tie the President's hands to that extent.

I repeat, this is a resolution of peace. It is a resolution of stability. The President of the United States has invited the United Nations to give consideration to the problem in the Pacific. I have stated it, and I repeat that there is not one iota of desire or intent, in the President's message, in the resolution, in the action of the House of Representatives, in the action of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services in the Senate, that the resolution be passed for the purposes of either making possible a preventive war or aggression against the Chinese Communist regime, or any other regime.

I only hope and pray that the misinterpretation or the misconstruction which may have been placed on the resolution has not already done great damage to our national security, and the security of the men in the 7th Fleet who are manning the outposts in the Pacific, for the situation is just that serious. Problems and wars have resulted from less than such statements. There is a big difference between having a columnist or newspaperman make certain statements and having a statement made on the floor of the Senate which may be interpreted as an official American Government policy. Again I say that men may honestly differ, but at least I have given my views as a spokesman for the administration and the President's party in this matter which is not a partisan matter because the resolution was reported in the House by Representative JAMES P. RICHARDS, of South Carolina, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and in the Senate by the able and distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. President, I wish to point out that on April 29, 1954, during the Geneva conference, Mr. Chou En-lai gave a formula for peace in the Pacific which I think we should bear in mind. I read from Mr. C. L. Sulzberger's article on the first page of the New York Times of April 29, 1954, with the dateline Geneva, April 28.

In part, the article reads:

> In his first speech before the Geneva conference and in the Western World, Peiping's Premier and Foreign Minister, Chou En-lai, assumed a role for his country of sharp belligerence. His words were angry, even if they were read in a quiet, indeed monotonous, high-pitched voice.
>
> Mr. Chou asserted that the United States had occupied Formosa in June 1950 and that this was Chinese territory.

Every Member of the Senate knows there is no occupation of Formosa by the United States. We have a relatively small military mission there. The island does contain 9½ million free Chinese, and an armed force of more than 350,000 non-Communist Chinese. The population is larger than that of 30 nations who are members of the United Nations and are sitting in the General Assembly. So it is no small, inconsequential island. It is larger than Denmark, Switzerland, New Zealand, and Ireland. It is the approximate size, in population, of Australia. So let us put the island in its proper perspective.

Let me continue to read from the article of Mr. Sulzberger:

> He proposed that "all foreign military bases in Asia be removed."

Listen to this, Members of the Senate of the United States. He has laid down his formula. He has said:

> If you want to follow this formula, you can get stability, for a brief time, in the Pacific.

Mark my words and listen to the statement that Chou En-lai spoke at the Geneva Conference:

> He proposed "that all foreign military bases in Asia be removed, foreign armed forces stationed in Asian countries be withdrawn."

He stated, in effect, "Be prepared to withdraw from Japan, from Korea, from Okinawa, and your military mission from Formosa, from the Philippines, from southeast Asia, and you can have a temporary settlement in the Pacific."

Mr. Chou went on to say:

> The remilitarization of Japan be prevented, and all economic blockades and restrictions be abolished.
>
> Later a spokesman from the Chinese Communist delegation clarified this implied demand in alleging that the United States had "more than several hundred military bases in Japan."

The formula has been laid out. It was laid out there at the Geneva Conference. It has been repeated time and time again.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a part of the remarks of Mr. Chou which was published in the New York Times of April 29, 1954, and a part of the text which appears on page 4, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement and text were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> In his first speech before the Geneva conference and in the Western World, Peiping's Premier and Foreign Minister, Chou En-lai, assumed a role for his country of sharp belligerence. His words were angry even if they were read in a quiet, indeed monotonous, high-pitched voice.
>
> Mr. Chou asserted that the United States had occupied Formosa in June 1950 and that this was Chinese territory.
>
> He proposed that "all foreign military bases in Asia be removed, foreign armed forces stationed in Asian countries be withdrawn, the remilitarization of Japan be prevented, and all economic blockades and restrictions be abolished."
>
> Later a spokesman from the Chinese Communist delegation clarified this implied demand in alleging that the United States had "more than several hundred military bases in Japan."

STATEMENT BY MR. CHOU

This is the first time that the foreign ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States of America, the United Kingdom, the Republic of France, the People's Republic of China, and other countries concerned have met together, at the same table, to examine and solve the most pressing problems of Asia. Our task is intricate. However, the convening of this conference signifies in itself the growing possibility of settling international disputes by the peaceful means of negotiations. The delegation of the People's Republic of China hopes that all the delegates to this conference will make due efforts to fulfill this task.

The government of the People's Republic of China and the Chinese people consistently work for peace and against war. We have never committed and will never commit aggression against other countries; but we most emphatically shall not tolerate aggression against us by any country. We respect the right of all the nations to choose and preserve their own way of life and their own state system without interference from outside. At the same time we insist that other nations treat us in the same way. We believe if all the nations of the world observe these principles and are motivated by the mutual desire for cooperation, the peaceful coexistence of the countries with different social systems will be secured.

The People's Republic of China has already been recognized by more than 20 countries with an aggregate population of over 1,000 million. However, certain states—the U. S. A., first and foremost—still refuse to recognize the People's Republic of China and endeavor to ignore the right of the Chinese people to choose their own state system. Refusing to reconcile themselves to the defeat suffered by them in China, they are dreaming to impose upon the Chinese people the power of the Kuomintang remnant clique (the Nationalist China government on Formosa), a clique long ago thrown out by the 500 million Chinese people.

Up to now, at various international conferences they are still planting the henchmen of the Kuomintang clique to pose as representatives of the Chinese people. The People's Republic of China has been subjected to illegal discrimination with respect to its international status and rights. The peaceful development and security of China are being constantly threatened. The existence of this state of affairs and its further continuation hinder the peaceful settlement of the urgent international questions especially those of Asia, and aggravate uneasiness and tension in international relations. It is clear that this state of affairs should not prevail any longer. This conference should lay foundations for the change of this situation.

NORTH KOREAN PLAN BACKED

The delegation of the People's Republic of China fully supports the three-point proposals put forward by Foreign Minister Nam Il of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in respect to the restoration of the national unity of Korea and the holding of free, all-Korean elections.

The Korean people, after their liberation from the enslavement under Japanese imperialism, have consistently aspired for the realization of Korea's independence and unity. The unification of Korea should be achieved through the holding of the all-Korean general elections under conditions precluding any foreign intervention and pressure from any terroristic group, thus enabling all the Korean people to freely express their will under peaceful conditions.

Some people do not like this only correct solution, that is, the holding of general elections in Korea to form an all-Korean Government and reunite Korea in a united, independent, and democratic state. The Syngman Rhee government does not like it, according to yesterday's speech made by the delegate of the Republic of Korea. He obviously ignores the national interests of the Korean people, trying to make it appear that without foreign interference in the internal affairs of Korea, the Korean people could not solve their democratic problems, the holding of free all-Korean democratic elections included.

This view was most vividly expressed by the delegate of the Republic of Korea when he spoke of the foreign troops in Korea. He openly called for the staying of American troops in Korea. This fact alone shows how much such claims that the South Korean regime expresses the interests of the people of Korea are worth. But the Chinese people are interested not only in this aspect of the problem, but more so in the fact that the presence of the American troops in Korea directly affects the preservation of peace in Korea and the security of the People's Republic of China.

The peaceful unification of Korea is a matter for the Korean people themselves. Therefore, for the purpose of holding nationwide free elections in Korea without foreign interference, all foreign troops must first of all be withdrawn from Korea.

From the first day of the negotiations on the cessation of hostilities in Korea, we have formally put forward the proposal for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Korea. Now as the armistice in Korea has already been achieved, there is even less excuse for any foreign troops to remain in Korea.

The peaceful unification of Korea has a great bearing on the maintenance of peace and security in the Far East. The successful carrying out of the peaceful unification of Korea depends on the will of the respective states concerned with the maintenance of peace in the Far East to take measures for insuring the free and peaceful development of Korea without allowing foreign interference in the internal affairs of Korea.

From what has been said, we consider that the proposals made by Foreign Minister Nam Il, head of the delegation of the democratic People's Republic of Korea, are entirely fair and reasonable. We hope that all the participants in this conference will seriously consider those proposals which could form a basis for achieving an agreement on the peaceful settlement of the Korean problem.

Since the outbreak of the war in Korea, a territory belonging to China—Taiwan [Formosa]—has been occupied by the United States of America. This question is not yet settled. As is generally known, Taiwan is part of China's territory, and its occupation by anybody can in no case be tolerated. The United States occupation of Taiwan is an act seriously violating the territorial integrity and sovereignty of China. At the present time Taiwan is turned into a base of the United States of America for conducting subversive activities and further aggression against the People's Republic of China. Japanese militarism which had committed aggression against nations in Asia for a long time is now being revived at an accelerated pace. This state of affairs is menacing with increasing seriousness the peace and security of the Far East and Asia.

The Government of the People's Republic of China considers that the countries of Asia should consult among themselves with a view to seeking common measures to safeguard peace and security in Asia, by assuming obligation mutually and respectively.

CONCERNED ABOUT PEACE

The people of China, as all the peoples of Asia, are concerned not only about peace in Asia but also about peace in Europe and other parts of the world. The policy of reviving German militarism and splitting Europe into mutually hostile military blocs now menaces the peace and security in Europe and at the same time affects the situation outside Europe, aggravating tension and uneasiness in Asia. That is why we consider that in order to safeguard world peace it is necessary, through negotiation, first and foremost between the great powers, to put an end to the rearmament of Western Germany and to insure security in Europe on the basis of joint efforts of all the European states, as proposed by the Soviet Union.

We also consider that the interests of peace demand the termination of armaments race, the reduction of armaments and armed forces, the prohibition of atomic, hydrogen, and other weapons of mass extermination.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the peoples of the whole world, especially the peoples of Asia, are following the progress of our conference with great concern. They all expect the conference to achieve positive results. Unfortunately, some Asian states which express concern about peace in Asia, such as India, Indonesia, Burma, etc., are unable to participate in our conference, which in no way can be considered as a positive aspect of this conference.

Allow me to express the hope that the delegates to this conference, guided by the interests of consolidating peace and security in Asia and in the whole world, will make joint efforts to find ways and means for solving the present urgent problems listed on the agenda of this conference.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement which was made by Premier Chou En-lai, and which is dated "Tokyo, Tuesday."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOKYO, Tuesday.—Text of a statement by Chinese Communist Premier Chou as broadcast by the Peiping radio:

"The Government of the Peoples Republic of China has repeatedly and in solemn terms declared to the world: The Chinese people are determined to liberate their own territory of Taiwan (Formosa). Since the recent successful liberation of Yikiangshan by the Chinese people, the United States Government has, on the one hand, stepped up its military operations to make war provocations, and has, on the other hand, been engineering a conspiracy for a so-called cease-fire through the United Nations, to intervene in the Chinese people's liberation of Taiwan.

"Taiwan is an inalienable part of China's territory. The liberation of Taiwan is a matter of China's sovereignty and internal affairs. No outside interference is allowed. Article 2, paragraph 7, of the United Nations Charter also explicitly stipulates: 'Nothing contained in the present charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in the matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State or shall require the members to submit such matter to settlement under the present charter.'

"Therefore, neither the United Nations nor any foreign country has the right to intervene in the Chinese people's liberation of Taiwan. The Government of the People's Republic of China absolutely cannot agree to a so-called cease-fire with the traitorous Chiang Kai-shek clique repudiated by the Chinese people.

"It should be pointed out that the Chinese people's exercise of their own sovereign rights in liberating China's mainland and many coastal islands has never caused tension in the Far East. The present tension in the Taiwan area can only be attributed to the fact that the United States Government has occupied Taiwan, shielded the traitorous Chiang Kai-shek clique, and incessantly directed subversive activities and war threats against the People's Republic of China.

"The so-called mutual security treaty concluded between the United States Government and the traitorous Chiang Kai-shek clique has further heightened this tension and is seriously threatening peace in the Far East.

"It is very obvious that the source of this tension is the United States and not China. This tension will be eliminated as a matter of course, if the United States stops its intervention in China's internal affairs and withdraws all its Armed Forces from Taiwan and the Taiwan Strait.

"The so-called cease-fire between the People's Republic of China and the traitorous Chiang Kai-shek clique, which the United States Government and its followers are trying to engineer, is in actuality intervention in China's internal affairs and alienation of China's territory. They are using war threats and brandishing atomic weapons in an attempt to force the Chinese people into tolerating the occupation of Taiwan by the United States, giving recognition to the United States-Chiang Kai-shek Mutual Security Treaty and permitting the use of Taiwan by the United States as a military base for preparing a new war. The Chinese people absolutely cannot tolerate this. They firmly oppose it.

"To safeguard China's sovereignty and territorial integrity, to safeguard the security of China and peace in the Far East, the Chinese people must liberate Taiwan, and the United States must stop intervening in China's internal affairs and withdraw all its Armed Forces from Taiwan and the Taiwan Strait."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I now read from the statement:

The Government of the People's Republic of China has repeatedly and in solemn terms declared to the world: The Chinese people are determined to liberate their own territory of Taiwan (Formosa). Since the recent successful liberation of Yikiangshan by the Chinese people, the United States Government has, on the one hand, stepped up its military operations to make war provocations, and has, on the other hand, been engineering a conspiracy for a so-called cease-fire through the United Nations, to intervene in the Chinese people's liberation of Taiwan.

Does he want a peaceful settlement? Is that statement by him an indication that he respects international law and order? Is it an indication that he is ready for membership in the United Nations, which presumably was created to help establish an international system of law and order and to assist in preserving the peace of the world for ourselves and our children? Even on that basis, does this statement of his indicate a peaceful intent on his part?

I continue to read:

Taiwan is an inalienable part of China's territory. The liberation of Taiwan is a matter of China's sovereignty and internal affairs. No outside interference is allowed. Article 2, paragraph 7 of the United Nations Charter also explicitly stipulates: "Nothing contained in the present charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in the matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the members to submit such matter to settlement under the present charter."

At that point I might say, parenthetically, that the Government of the Republic of China is recognized by most of the nations of the world. It is still a member of the United Nations organization. What forces we have there for training purposes have been there by invitation of the legal, recognized Government of the Republic of China, one which sits on the Security Council of the United Nations—just as we have sent missions into Greece, to help put down the Communist rebellion there; and just as we have sent missions into Turkey, to help the Turks resist Communist aggression from without.

I continue to read:

Therefore, neither the United Nations nor any foreign country has the right to intervene in the Chinese people's liberation of Taiwan. The Government of the People's Republic of China absolutely cannot agree to a so-called cease-fire with the traitorous Chiang Kai-shek clique repudiated by the Chinese people.

It should be pointed out that the Chinese people's exercise of their own sovereign rights to liberating China's mainland and many coastal islands has never caused tenson in the Far East. The present tension of the Taiwan area can only be attributed to the fact that the United States Government has occupied Taiwan, shielded the traitorous Chiang Kai-shek clique, and incessantly directed subversive activities and war threats against the People's Republic of China.

The so-called Mutual Security Treaty concluded between the United States Government and the traitorous Chiang Kai-shek clique has further heightened this tension and is seriously threatening peace in the Far East.

It is very obvious that the source of this tension is the United States, and not China. This tension will be eliminated as a matter of course—

Listen to this, Mr. President—

if the United States stops its intervention in China's internal affairs and withdraws all its Armed Forces from Taiwan and the Taiwan Strait.

I might say parenthetically at this point that I wonder whether my distinguished friend and colleague from the State of Oregon really believes that Chou En-lai and Mao Tse-tung and the other members of the hierarchy of the Communist regime in China will be a bit interested in the legalistic question as to whether there is a difference between Taiwan and the Pescadores, on the one hand, and Quemoy and the Matsu Islands and, indeed, even the Tachen groups, on the other. After all, they are all a part of China. Taiwan and the Pescadores were promised to the Republic of China by the Cairo agreement. They were promised to be returned to the Republic of China, and that is to whom they have been returned. The legalistic title may not be settled, but certainly the possession is in the hands of the Republic of China. There will be no shooting in that area of the world, in my judgment, unless the United States, in trying to stabilize, in the interests of world peace, the area there is fired upon; and in that case I do not believe the American people would expect our forces there to act as sitting ducks.

I continue to read:

The so-called cease-fire between the People's Republic of China and the traitorous Chiang Kai-shek clique, which the United States Government and its followers are trying to engineer, is in actuality intervention in China's internal affairs and alienation of China's territory.

In his message, Mr. President, the President of the United States himself suggested that we would be glad if the United Nations would use its good offices to obtain a cease fire. But what was done before the ink of the message had hardly had time to dry? In view of the difference in time between the Far East and here, it was probably almost before the message was off the presses in America that Chou En-lai even repudiated a cease fire engineered by the United Nations, as being an intervention in the Chinese war; and I suppose that in that event he would consider the event itself an act of aggression.

I read further:

They are using war threats and brandishing atomic weapons in an attempt to force the Chinese people into tolerating the occupation of Taiwan by the United States, giving recognition to the United States-Chiang Kai-shek Mutual Security Treaty and permitting the use of Taiwan by the United States as a military base for preparing a new war. The Chinese people absolutely cannot tolerate this; they firmly oppose it.

To safeguard China's sovereignty and territorial integrity, to safeguard the security of China and peace in the Far East, the Chinese people must liberate Taiwan, and the United States must stop intervening in China's internal affairs and withdraw all its Armed Forces from Taiwan and the Taiwan Strait.

Mr. President, that statement by Chou En-lai is entirely consistent with the statement he made at Geneva, when he said there can be peace in the Pacific, but the United States must get out of the Pacific and must withdraw to the Pacific coast States of Oregon, Washington, and California. He said that perhaps they would permit the United States to keep Alaska and Hawaii, but that the United States must get out of that area of the Pacific. He asked the other nations to denounce the mutual-security pacts they have at the present time with the United States. Then said Chou En-lai, at Geneva, "Then we shall have Asia for the Asians."

But, Mr. President, the free people of Asia know that is merely Communist semantics, and that it means that Asia will then be for the Communists. Thus there will be full realization of the prediction made 30 years ago by Lenin, when he said, "The road to Paris is through Peking"—meaning that if the Communists can get control of China, they will ultimately have control of all of Asia, with its 1½ billion people and its vast strategic resources; and once the Communists have consolidated their power in Asia, including the manpower and resources of Asia, they will then be prepared to turn with overwhelming power against the West. In that event, neither Paris nor Berlin nor Madrid nor Rome nor London would be likely to stand up against that overwhelming mass of power.

Under those circumstances, with Asia and Europe behind the Iron Curtain, although we might resist as an isolated island of freedom, the result would be sort of a continental Dien Bien Phu, and we would not be able to preserve either the economic or the political systems which have caused this Nation to grow from a small colony of 3 million on the Atlantic seaboard to a great Nation of

165 million, the most productive, agriculturally and industrially, the world has ever known, with the highest standard of living for our people; and a Nation which time and time again, at great sacrifice to itself, has poured forth its resources, in order to help maintain a free world of free men.

Now we have reached the point where we can either back up the President of the United States, and can take a position which is sound in international law, a position which will command the decent respect of the people of Asia, who are not playing "footsie" with the Communists. We will never entirely satisfy them until we completely abdicate, and agree to every demand of the Chinese Communists; and even then they will not be satisfied.

So we now have that choice. We can either draw the line and make it clear that this is in the interest of peace, and make it clear that there is not an aggressive act in the mind of the President or the Government of the United States; or we can back down, in the face of these threats, and can see all in Asia go down the drain, at the vital risk of the security of the United States, as was testified by the responsible members of our Government.

Is this situation one in which the Communists have followed a rather consistent policy? It is. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial published in the Daily Worker for Tuesday, January 25, 1955. The Daily Worker is the spokesman of the Communist Party in this country. The title of the editorial is "For Peace in Asia." It is highly critical of the recommendations of the President of the United States, and suggests that we had better get out of Taiwan if we want peace in the Pacific.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Daily Worker of January 25, 1955]

FOR PEACE IN ASIA

The American people know peace in Asia is vital to the peace of our own country.

That is why they insisted on a truce in Korea. That is why they blocked the demands of the Knowland-Radford-McCarthy crowd for intervention in Indochina.

And that is why they are so concerned now to see an end of fighting in the Formosa Straits.

Does the message which President Eisenhower sent to Congress Monday help bring peace, or does it threaten peace?

The Cairo Declaration, signed on December 1, 1943, by the United States and the other great powers, declared that all the territories that Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores, shall be restored to the Republic of China.

The Chinese islands which Japan stole from China and was forced to return, the Eisenhower administration now proposes to steal in the name of its puppet Chiang Kai-shek.

That is the sum and substance of the President's message which treats the Cairo Declaration as a scrap of paper. That is how the billion people of Asia rightly see it. No hypocritical talk by Eisenhower of peace can cover up its meaning as a threat to peace. No approval by Congress can make it lawful.

Crisis in the Far East? Yes, but it would disappear overnight if our Navy were where it belonged. Chiang Kai-shek himself couldn't last a week on Formosa (Taiwan) without American guns—the Chinese people of Formosa themselves would throw him into the China Sea as he was thrown off the mainland.

Even the proposal to use the 7th Fleet to evacuate Chiang's mercenaries from the Tachen Islands, is highhanded intervention. The administration is trying here to prevent a defeat for Chiang from turning into a rout, and is thereby inviting an incident which could involve the United States directly in the shooting.

Every time the international atmosphere cools down a bit, the Knowland "warhaws" and the Eisenhower administration try to make it boil again. Dag Hammárskjold's trip to China was greeted by millions of Americans as a sign of the easing of tensions. But that is just what the Cadillac Cabinet in Washington can't stand.

The administration does not dare ask even the U. N. to approve this outrageous action. The American people should not support it either, since it is a threat in the first place to the people of our country. Congress should reject Eisenhower's request for war powers. There is only one way to avoid crises and bloodshed in the Pacific, that is through talks for a peaceful settlement of all differences, based on a recognition of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the 600-million-strong People's Republic of China and of its rights to its legal seat in the U. N.

This is what all Americans who want to preserve peace and restore our own country's dignity in the eyes of the world, should tell the President and their Congressmen.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have already spoken longer than I intended to speak. However, I felt that it was important that the RECORD be cleared, at least, insofar as I, as one Member, might clear it.

I wish to make only passing reference to the statement by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] regarding a so-called United Nations trusteeship over Formosa. That suggestion, or a similar suggestion, was made some time ago, officially, by some of the Communist powers, and by India. India is a great nation in population. I regard Mr. Nehru as a very sincere man. I think he hopes he can maintain a sort of balance between the East and the West. He certainly is rather severe on his domestic Communists, although at the United Nations, and in his diplomatic action, he is neutral on the side of the Communist world. Some time ago he suggested the possibility of a trusteeship over Formosa, and at one time over Korea.

How do the people of those two sovereign nations look upon such a suggestion? Mr. President, a trusteeship by the United Nations with respect to either Korea or Formosa would be looked upon by the sovereign people of those two nations as nothing but multiple colonialism. Colonialism in Asia is dead. The people on our side want no part of it. The people who are neutral want no part of it. Even the people who are on the Communist side want no part of it. They are gradually learning the bitter lesson that one type of colonialism has been supplanted by the greatest godless tyranny the world has ever known. So they would reject such a proposal.

I ask the Senator from Oregon, What United Nations mouse would bell the cat with respect to Formosa? Formosa has a population of 9½ million. I have already said that that is a larger population than that of some 30 members of the United Nations who sit in the General Assembly. When the war in Korea broke out and the United Nations called upon its members to come to the aid of the little victim of aggression in Korea—and it will be remembered that the Communists charged that that, too, was a civil war—how many responded? Of 60 members of the United Nations only 16 besides the United States responded, and all 16 of them together supplied only 45,000 troops. The United States alone supplied more than 450,000, and we rotated more than 1 million men through Korea. The little Republic of Korea, which was the victim of aggression, supplied 650,000 troops, and today has the largest standing army in that area of the world. Indeed, it is the fifth largest standing army in the world. They are our allies and our friends. They gave a good account of themselves, but the two of us together, the Republic of Korea and the United States—supplied 95 percent of the manpower and 95 percent of the resources.

How do Senators think those people would react to a trusteeship? How do Senators think the people on Formosa would react to a trusteeship? Inasmuch as all the members of the United Nations together supplied only 45,000 troops in the Korean war, which was the first test of whether or not we could preserve a system of international law and order, are they going to disarm the government and the army of the Nationalist Government on the island of Formosa with 45,000 troops? I think not. It is not a practical suggestion, and in my judgment it will not be accepted, and should not be accepted by any decent, self-respecting sovereign people in that area of the world. Are they expected, then, in order to prevent the liquidation of their families, to place their lives in the hands of an organization which could be paralyzed by a Soviet veto, an organization which, when the chips were down, supplied only 45,000 men? Do Senators expect them to disarm 350,000 of their own troops and place their lives and future at the tender mercy of an organization which would be subject to a Soviet veto? I think not. So let us at least keep this discussion on a practical plane, and realize that we have some obligations to those people.

If it were not a fact that the President of the United States, the Security Council, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff believe that this proposal is in the vital interest of our country, there might be a question involved. But the purpose of this action is not to help the Republic of China as such—although it would help it, of course—any more than our agreement with Japan and the Philippines was solely for the purpose of helping them.

This action is proposed because we do not think it is in the vital interests of this Nation to permit that island chain to go down the drain, and to move back toward the Pacific Coast States, one of which is, in part, represented by the dis-

tinguished Senator from Oregon, and another of which I represent, in part. That would not be in our interest or the interest of the free world.

So, Mr. President, I hope that at least I have been able to afford some clarification on this question. It is the desire and intent of the President and of the Government that the proposed course of action shall be an act of peace and of stabilization in the Pacific. It will be nothing more than that unless the Chinese Communists themselves make it war.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I congratulate the able minority leader on his fine presentation of the essence of this issue. He will recall that beginning in 1949, I believe, he and I visited the Far East a number of times. Our visits were not limited to Formosa, and they were not concerned solely with that issue. They related to Japan, Korea, the Philippines, Indochina, Australia, New Zealand, and the entire Southeast Asia area, including Thailand, Burma, Malaya, and Indonesia. The present message of the President of the United States relates to that entire area and its relation to the other areas of the world.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Will the Senator also bear me out when I suggest that those of us who have been there in person and have studied the areas and talked with the leaders of those countries may perhaps be better qualified to express a global view on this question than those who have not been there? I express the thought that every member of the Foreign Relations Committee and every member of the Armed Services Committee should be familiar with that area before criticizing the President of the United States for what seems to us to be obviously a step which he feels he must take at this time, with the full collaboration of the Secretary of State and the members of his administration in the interests of the security of the United States.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to place myself on record as concurring in the remarks of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND]. He has well stated the issue. I was in the committee room the first day of the hearing on this resolution, when the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, appeared before the committee. At that time I endeavored to acquaint myself with the entire question, as best I could. I was in the Far East a year ago. I believe the President has taken the only sane, sound, and proper course of action in laying before this legislative body, representing the people of the respective States, a resolution which would give him the assurance that we, as a legislative body, stand behind him, in the event that his action may in any sense involve this great Nation in a military role in the Far East.

The Senator from California has stated the case ably, and I wish to commend him for doing so. He has expressed better than I could possibly have expressed my conviction and opinion on this very grave question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to add a few words to those expressed by the senior Senator from California this afternoon, in support of the resolution, which was reported jointly by the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services.

I do so because I join him in wishing to leave no false impression either with the Senate, with the people of our country, or with the peoples of other countries as to the feeling of many of us who have considered and discussed the subject, not only today, but over many years.

Let us never forget the primary purpose of this resolution. Let us keep ever before our eyes the primary purpose of the President. That primary purpose in each case is to maintain the security of our country, with the least possible bloodshed by American boys. We wish to do everything we can to keep peace in the world, to maintain our security in the United States, and to cause as little harm as is possible to those of our boys who must fight for us.

Let us never lose sight of that primary purpose. Let us never forget that that is the primary obligation of the President, as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces and as head of our diplomatic and policy-making establishment, responsible for our foreign relations.

The senior Senator from California has emphasized the fact that the President's only motive is to keep the peace.

I have attended almost every meeting at which this vital subject has been discussed, at which the President has led the discussion. Certainly, as one who has listened to him, I have always heard him state most fervently that his one motive was to keep peace in the world and to obtain a better and more durable peace than exists in the world at the present time. Certainly his intention is not to initiate an act of war.

I have served on the military committees of the Senate since I have been a Member of this body, first on the Naval Affairs Committee, and then on the Committee on Armed Services, over a period of more than 10 years. During that time the committees on which I have served have authorized new aircraft carriers. They have authorized new types of weapons. They have increased the manpower of the Armed Forces, and have considered measures increasing the pay of the members of the Armed Forces.

Those of us who have served on those committees have taken all manner of steps designed to improve the defense of our country, to enable our country to obtain maximum security, and to strengthen the morale and efficiency of our armed services.

We have done that over the past 10 years.

The purpose of the resolution which we shall consider tomorrow, and which was reported jointly by these two committees, after considering it for 2 days, is to make certain that the peace is kept. Its purpose is to insure that the military forces which we have built up, and which we want to make ever more efficient, will be able to act to maintain and protect our security with the least possible bloodshed by those of our boys who would be the first to fight in our behalf.

In all the briefings of the military committees on which I have served, it has been made perfectly clear, as it has been made perfectly clear to the people of the United States by the Secretary of State and by the President and by others, that our first line of defense runs from the Aleutians in the north, through Japan and Okinawa to Formosa and the Philippines, down as far as Australia and New Zealand.

As the senior Senator from California has pointed out, if Formosa is taken out of that line of defense and allowed to fall into unfriendly hands, the airline between Okinawa and the Philippines and the sealanes between Japan and Australia could be cut off. In that way our military forces which we have established and strengthened on Okinawa and Formosa and in the Philippines could be seriously interfered with.

Therefore, as the President has stated, Formosa is important to our security. It is absolutely necessary, therefore, that it remain in friendly hands. The purpose of this resolution is to support the President's effort to do just that—keep Formosa in friendly hands.

Since 1950, the 7th Fleet has been patrolling the sealanes off Formosa in an effort to maintain the defensive attitude of Formosa and to keep it from being invaded from the mainland, which is only a little more than 100 miles away.

In the resolution which the President has requested he asks to be given authority to defend Formosa, the Pescadores, and certain other islands which are in friendly hands, in order to make sure that no enemy will land on Formosa.

I am not disclosing any security information when I say that if we permit hostile Communist troops to board junks in certain island harbors, it will be much easier for the enemy to approach Formosa than otherwise. It would create a grave danger for our boys who may have to defend the area between Formosa and the mainland. If those islands with those harbors are protected and kept in friendly hands, the possibility that junks could use those harbors for the purpose of invasion becomes more remote.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would rather not yield, because I do not desire my trend of my thought to be interrupted.

The purpose of the resolution, as I say, and the purpose of the vote of the committees in jointly reporting the resolution, is to maintain our security with the least possible bloodshed of American boys. Let us never forget that fact.

That is the thought I try to keep everlastingly before me in considering this subject. The distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], in the course of his remarks, to which I listened attentively, and which the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] answered so ably, makes four points, as I understand. The first point is that the constitutional authority of the President permits him to act without any action on the part of Congress.

The second point is that the resolution initiates an act of aggression.

Third, the senior Senator from Oregon states, the passage of the resolution may involve the question of usurping the sovereignty of another nation.

Finally, he brings up the question of the United Nations, and the question of making more use of the United Nations.

So far as the constitutional power of the President is concerned, let me say that if immediate action on his part is required, the President certainly can be relied upon to act. If there is involved a situation which will continue for several weeks or months, even 6 months or a year, as may prove to be the case when it comes to the protection of the Formosan Strait, then certainly he has the privilege of asking the Congress to join with him in assuming responsibility.

As I see it, that is what he is doing in this instance. Congress must appropriate the funds. Congress must build up the manpower of the Nation. Congress becomes intimately involved in any act of this kind. It is not an act of aggression, but an act that will maintain the security of our country with the least possible danger to American boys.

Is this an act of aggression? As the senior Senator from Oregon was speaking, I tried to think of a very simple situation that comes up in everyday life. We know that Chou En-lai has made the most violent statements about Formosa and about our so-called interference with Formosa. When a man is calling us all kinds of names, and is raising his fists, and we know he is a strong man, what are we going to do? Shall we wait until he strikes the first blow? If we wait for the first blow, we may never be able to strike back.

In the world of sport, which we all love, let us consider football, which I used to play badly. A player, let us assume, is about to throw a forward pass. Is the opposing team going to let him throw the forward pass without any effort to defend its goal line, or is it going to stop him? We see that situation in every game of football we watch.

Whatever we may do, when we see the massing of junks or of planes and note what Chou En-lai has said about our acts in Formosa, are we going to stand with our hands at our sides, or are we going to maintain our security with the least possible bloodshed on the part of our Armed Forces?

That, as I see it, is the important question. There is no question of sovereignty of nations involved. We are not going to attack any nation unless our own security is in danger. If our own security is in danger, we must be guided by circumstances as to what will best preserve our security with the least possible loss of the blood of American boys.

Finally, Mr. President, I should like to say something about the United Nations. There is no one who desires to see the United Nations succeed more than I do. I was for the League of Nations in 1920. I voted for the United Nations when that question came before this body in 1945 and 1946. I wanted the United Nations to succeed. But if we load that organization with tasks that it clearly cannot accomplish, it will lose its prestige and its opportunity for doing future good. If we ask the United Nations to bring about a cease-fire now, we are placing a burden on that organization which it will be very difficult for it to bear.

We are even now asking the United Nations to help us to get back some of our prisoners of war. I hope it will succeed. If it does not, we must do something about it. The United Nations can accomplish it only by persuasion, and it cannot be very forceful at this time in attempting to influence men like Chou En-lai.

So the President, in sending his message to the Congress, asks us to join with him in carrying out the great responsibility which is his in the first instance. He is asking us to help him carry it, because he thinks it will offer the best opportunity for maintaining peace in the world and maintaining our security with the least possible loss of blood. Let us not forget that fact for a single minute when we vote on this question tomorrow or the following day.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I should like the Senator to clear up 1 or 2 points with which I am much concerned. The Senator is a member of the Armed Services Committee, and served as chairman of that committee last year. He is familiar with many of these problems. The Senator made the statement that he was in favor of maintaining our security with the least possible loss of lives.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. I should like to ask the Senator which would tend toward the least possible cost in lives, the holding of an island 75 miles away from the shores of an enemy power, when we have the most powerful navy in the world to defend the straits, or the holding of an island right at the entrance of an enemy harbor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The holding of an island at the entrance of an enemy harbor is primarily to be done by the Chinese troops who are on the island today. The furnishing of air cover, our ability to support the troops by airpower, and perhaps from the sea, will provide an additional source of power to those islands and will keep the harbors free.

Mr. LONG. The question I had in mind was, Which would tend to cost us the greatest loss of life, and which would be the most difficult—to hold an island lying against the shoreline at the mouth of an enemy harbor, or to hold an island 75 miles away?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think what we want to do, clearly, is to prevent an invasion of Formosa. If we allow ships to be collected in those harbors to invade Formosa, it makes it much more difficult for us, and it makes it possible for them to land a greater number of troops successfully.

Mr. LONG. The Senator agrees with me, does he not, that Communist China has very few fighting ships, particularly very few modern ones?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator; but it has many, many thousands of junks. It has not much regard for human life; and if a large number of junks start out at night, it is very difficult——

Mr. LONG. The Senator is not concerned about the firepower of a Chinese junk, is he?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; but I am concerned about the number of junks which can do damage at night.

Mr. LONG. I know of no seaworthy craft that could not be picked up by radar. Certainly, we could defend at night as well as in the daytime.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to make it clear to my colleague that I do not think any naval officer will testify that every junk can be stopped.

Mr. LONG. Of course, the Senator agrees with me that there are at least 500,000 well-trained troops on Formosa.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Less than that, but there is a substantial number. The Senator from California mentioned 350,000. I should think he is correct in that figure.

Mr. LONG. We have spent large amounts of money in connection with those troops, and they are well equipped and well trained.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes; and we hope they are being better equipped and trained as time goes on.

Mr. LONG. In order to have our ships in a position to support islands such as Quemoy it would be necessary to bring the ships within range of Communist land-based guns, would it not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would not agree with the Senator's statement in that regard.

Mr. LONG. The Senator would agree that those ships would be in much more hazard, would he not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would agree that they would be closer to the shore, but if the harbors are kept clear, the danger of troops landing in Formosa is that much less.

Mr. LONG. Is there any doubt in the Senator's mind whether Formosa can be held without attacking Communist harbors prior to the time the fleet puts to sea?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would hope that that question can be answered "Yes." I know I cannot answer the question. In other words, I would not agree with the Senator from Louisiana on that point. Do I make myself clear?

Mr. LONG. Yes. Would the Senator agree with me that this resolution accepts in advance the President's judgment as to whether it is desirable and necessary to bomb the Chinese mainland prior to the time a Chinese fleet with a

Chinese troop concentration could be put to sea?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say that the resolution, if passed, would recognize the principle that the Commander in Chief can use his best discretion, his best experience, and his best knowledge in handling the situation for the security of Formosa and the Pescadores and with the least loss of life of American citizens.

Mr. LONG. Does not the resolution, by its terms, state specifically that the President should take such action as in his judgment would hold those islands which he believes should be in friendly hands?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Those are the islands which are in friendly hands today.

Mr. LONG. Therefore, this resolution does accept in advance the judgment of the President as to whether we should bombard or bomb the Chinese mainland?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think that what it does is to place reliance upon the judgment of the Commander in Chief; and this particular Commander in Chief has given his whole life to a comprehensive understanding of military problems.

Mr. LONG. The resolution relies upon his judgment, but it accepts his judgment in advance, in that it instructs him to take such action if, in his judgment, he deems it to be proper.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If he did not come to Congress, but exercised the constitutional authority he has for the direction of our Armed Forces in an emergency, then Congress would have to rely upon his judgment anyway.

Mr. LONG. The point I have in mind is that, once again, the President, not being in the field, would necessarily be forced to accept the judgment of the commander in the field as to whether or not it was necessary and desirable, all facts considered, to undertake to bombard the Chinese mainland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. He could accept the recommendation of the commander in the field, and then exercise final judgment himself, as has been stated in the press. That authority he has used in one or two instances already.

Mr. LONG. Would not the Senator agree with me that even without this resolution, if the President felt that it was essential and necessary to undertake to attack the Chinese mainland prior to the time our own units were attacked, in that event this Nation would expect the President to take such action?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the act of aggression by Chou En-lai were made evident by the concentrations of planes and ships, then the President would, in his discretion, have to do what I have tried to indicate I would do in the circumstances, namely, defend and protect this country by taking appropriate action at that time.

Mr. LONG. Whether or not Congress would support such action would then depend upon the facts of the particular case. Would not that be correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Whatever occasion arose, naturally, Congress would have to determine what action, if any, was necessary afterward. My understanding is that no action would be necessary, except, of course, action on appropriations.

Mr. LONG. In view of that fact, why should it be necessary for Congress to approve in this case the basis upon which the President should undertake to attack the Chinese mainland, without our knowing what the facts are?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I disagree with the Senator's premise. I do not agree that the President necessarily would direct an attack upon the Chinese mainland. I should hope that it would not be necessary. But the President has appropriate constitutional powers. This situation is not going to end overnight. It will continue for a week or 10 days, 6 weeks or 2 months, or perhaps 10 months. Therefore, the President has asked us to join with him, and to have the American people join with him, in undertaking to carry out his responsibility for the security of the country.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator from Massachusetts explain why Congress should approve in advance a decision to attack the Chinese mainland, without our knowing what the facts might be whenever that should occur?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Louisiana continues to refer to an attack on the Chinese mainland. I should hope that it would not be necessary to attack the Chinese mainland. I hope that by the policy we are now considering we will prevent any effort on the part of the Chinese Communists to build up and activate their forces.

Mr. LONG. I believe the Senator from Massachusetts has already agreed with me that the joint resolution would approve of the President using his judgment in undertaking to attack the Chinese mainland, if he thought it necessary to do so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not think the placing of ground troops on the Chinese mainland is at all contemplated. So far as I can foresee in the future, there will be no use for ground troops on any of the islands or, in any event, on the mainland.

Mr. LONG. We are speaking of air bombing and naval fire.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Naval fire and air bombing, at the most.

Mr. LONG. The point I make is, Why approve such action in advance, without knowing the facts upon which action might be based at a particular time?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Because it affords us the greatest opportunity for security with the least possible bloodshed. By letting Chou En-lai know that we are going to stand our ground and are not going to hold back helplessly, we hope that we will prevent any attack. That is the basis for our action, as I see it.

Mr. LONG. How can we be sure in our judgment that the Chinese Reds are actually going to be able to attack Formosa?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is a risk. Of course any positive policy is a risk these days. This is the least possible risk to our security.

Mr. LONG. Would not that be a case of our firing the first shot, in that sense?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I cannot say it would not; I would hope not.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I congratulate the Senator from Massachusetts upon his very clear statement, which is entirely extemporaneous. There is one thing at this time about which I wish to question him, since he is a very distinguished and experienced lawyer.

We have heard a great deal, pro and con, from Members about the question of sovereignty. I submit to the Senator that there is involved no question of sovereignty, in the international sense of the word, in our relationship with the Red forces in China. There is a de facto ability on the part of the Reds in China to exercise force. But sovereignty among nations, as we know it, is a technical situation, in which the recognition of de jure rights is accorded by the nations of the world, and such recognition is generally considered to be binding upon the nations which accord it.

The United States has never recognized the sovereignty, the political integrity, or the right of the Government of Red China to speak for the Chinese people. We have, on the contrary, continued our recognition, official and otherwise, of the sovereignty and jurisdiction of the Republic of China as now exercised by the Nationalist Government, which presently has its seat in Formosa.

Does the Senator from Massachusetts agree, therefore, that the question of sovereignty probably does not apply to the claimed authority of the Red organization in China?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Iowa has expressed the situation much better than I could express it. I agree with him entirely, and I repeat one point I tried to make earlier. I do not ask Senators to agree with me, but it is my feeling that that question would not arise unless our own security were imperiled. If our own security were imperiled, then it would be necessary for the United States Government to take whatever steps were necessary at the time to save the lives of American boys, and not to have our grandchildren or great-grandchildren raise questions at some later time.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In connection with the defense of Quemoy and the Matsus, which are I believe, the other series of islands in the vicinity of Fuchow, is there any question in the Senator's mind that the Chinese Nationalists themselves have ample troops on those islands to defend the islands, and that at present there is no particular indication that they will need additional manpower on those islands, provided they receive adequate logistical support, and that they can defend themselves for an indefinite period against the announced intended attacks on the part of the Red forces of China?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is the information which has been supplied to us. The Senator has correctly stated the situation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Therefore, the defense of those islands by Chinese

Nationalist troops themselves would be, in fact, a defensive action, which would postpone or eliminate the threat of action by the Reds against Formosa, a threat which might, indeed, call for the shedding of American blood.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In other words, if the bastions are now being protected by Nationalist Chinese troops in sufficient numbers, and can probably continue to be protected by Chinese troops in sufficient numbers, provided they receive logistical support, it puts the danger of shedding American blood just that much further away from Formosa and the Pescadores; and therefore, it would be to our interest, in my view, that the islands which would guard the entrances to the harbors where staging operations could be undertaken by the Reds should be as far away from Formosa as possible, and there is already Chinese Nationalist manpower in position to do that job in the foreseeable future.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Iowa has expressed the situation well and clearly. His view is in accordance with the evidence which has been given to us. I believe that is the only purpose the President had in mind in requesting the passage of a joint resolution by Congress at this time.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator. Before I conclude my questions, and without desiring to take any further time from the Senator from California, I wish to say that I think the Senator from California has given one of the most masterful extemporaneous expositions and analyses of this situation, or of any other situation, that I have heard since I have been on the floor of the Senate. I wish to congratulate him for the vigor, clarity, and force with which he has set forth the position of the United States and of President Eisenhower in the effort to preserve the peace of the world, to do everything we can to that end, and to prevent what would otherwise be the certainty of American involvement at some time in the not too distant future, if we do not act now to put out the incipient fire which otherwise might take hold and burn up our whole free civilization.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish first to agree with the last statement made by the Senator from Iowa. I now yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts think there would be more benefit if some of the so-called neutral nations who have been playing "footsie" with the Chinese Communists, both in the United Nations and elsewhere, during the whole Korean struggle, instead of proposing a trusteeship for Formosa, where the people have had free elections, would suggest free elections in Communist China, in order to let the people of Communist China determine by vote, rather than by force of arms, whether they wanted to be a free China or a Communist China? If that were done, and if the same amount of effort were to be exerted for such a proposal, we might find that there might be two Chinas. We might find that the Communist-dominated areas of Manchuria and north China, which now are so closely allied to the Soviet Union that they are almost a part of it, might decide to be Communist China; but south of the Yangtze River, we might find that if the people had an opportunity to express themselves, they would have a free China.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There is much evidence on which to base a belief that there are many persons in the south of China who would like to be under a different regime, and under a free China regime, as the Senator from California has suggested.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of sending to the desk a proposed substitute, which I presented in the committee this morning, which I intend to offer on behalf of myself and a number of other Senators at the appropriate time, when the resolution is under consideration. I ask that the amendment be printed for the information of the Senate, and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed and will lie on the table.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to speak very briefly in explanation of the substitute which I propose to offer at the appropriate time. Later I shall discuss it in more detail.

The question before the Senate presents a very grave issue, which is very likely to result in a war with Communist China, and perhaps a general war. Therefore, I am glad that the Senate is going to take ample time to debate and consider the question.

I am glad the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has made a full explanation of his point of view, with much of which I agree. I wish to compliment him for his address. He has spoken with great sincerity and with much conviction.

Likewise, the distinguished Senator from California has clearly and forcefully stated his point of view. I do not agree with the criticism made by the Senator from California of the Senator from Oregon that the Senator from Oregon was not justified in talking about the possibility of a preventive war. I hope all Senators will read the RECORD, but I wish to say that if there was any doubt about the matter, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], in his colloquy with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], has clearly brought out that possibility as a part of the result which might follow if the joint resolution were enacted.

The Senator from Massachusetts always understates matters. He is a thoughtful and a conservative gentleman. However, not more than 10 minutes ago the Senator from Massachusetts said that the purpose of the resolution was to make it possible, if it looked as if the Communists were "going to throw a pass," for our forces to strike the first lick. I do not know a better definition of preventive war than such a statement.

In the Senator's remarks it was brought out that it would be up to us to decide whether a staging, or concentration, or collection of ships, or shipping, and whatnot, in our judgment, and in the judgment of the political leaders of the islands off the coast of China, would be such a situation as would require, under the resolution, an invasion of the mainland of China, or the dropping of bombs on the mainland of China. So that aspect is perfectly clear. Everyone who reads the RECORD will realize the possibility which is embodied in the resolution of bombings, and of carrying of war to the mainland of China. So I think that the Senate should carefully consider the resolution, because it seems to me probably to be a war resolution.

Mr. President, I think war may come out of the present situation, whether any resolution is passed or not. Our citizens ought to understand that we are considering a question which may lead us into war very soon. The Senate should endeavor to get the resolution in such shape that it will result in the least possible chance of war, and still maintain our honor.

In the second place, if such an unhappy day must come when we go to war, I think we must insure our being in a favorable position in the eyes of the world, in seeking international justice and standing for justifiable rights, so that we will not be all alone, if such a horrible catastrophe should befall us. In other words, we must try to have public opinion, world public opinion, on our side. We must have allies.

I fully agree with the Senator from California that this is a time when we would all like to back up the President, and when we should have national unity. We do want national unity.

I say to the Senator from California that if the terms of the resolution were limited to the defense, by all the forces we have, if necessary, of Formosa and the Pescadores, which the resolution has been advertised to the people of the Nation as encompassing, I do not think there would be one vote against the resolution in the United States Senate. I do not know of any Senator present who would not favor using all of our military forces, pending a fair and equitable final disposition of the island of Formosa, in a defense of that vital island, and the protection of the obligation that we took upon ourselves when our military forces occupied Formosa after the war with Japan. So if it is unity the minority leader is seeking, all that is necessary is to see to it that we are kept from getting involved with Chiang on these little coastal islands.

If what is desired is the protection of the Pescadores and Formosa, there can be absolute unity, in my opinion, as registered by the vote of every Member of the United States Senate.

But, Mr. President, when it comes to the question of the coastal islands, that is another thing, for they are in a different category, as compared with Formosa. The coastal islands have always been Chinese territory. Formosa was ceded to Japan, I believe, in 1895. We

have a moral and a legal obligation to protect Formosa; that is our obligation under the treaty of peace, and in view of our having occupied Formosa, after our forces captured it during the last war. Come what may, no vote in the Senate should be interpreted by anyone as meaning that any Member of the Senate is not willing to vote to have the United States use all its forces for the protection of the Pescadores and Formosa.

Mr. President, I feel very sincerely that agreement to use our forces to defend Quemoy and Matsu and the coastal islands will greatly increase the risk of our becoming involved in a general war. There is no doubt that military people are also of that opinion. Senators who read the record will see that is true.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I believe the Senator from Tennessee feels the same as some of the others of us do, although perhaps we are in the minority. At any rate, some of us feel reluctant to approve the principle of having our Nation strike the first blow because we think the enemy will strike us if we do not. However, it seems that that is a strong possibility, in view of the use in the joint resolution of the language—

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States be and he hereby is authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack, this authority to include the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands and the taking of such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; there is no doubt that that would result in breaching our policy of opposition to fighting preventive war, our policy of opposition to striking the first blow. That is what the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] said a few minutes ago. There is no question about it.

Mr. LONG. Once those harbors were used in an effort to make a landing in an attack against Formosa, if we saw other concentrations of those who were attempting to make such a landing, it would then seem appropriate that those concentrations might be attacked while they were still in the harbors. But to attack them before an effort was actually made to launch an invasion would be to assume that those forces were going to launch such an invasion, whereas an error might be made in making that assumption.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It has been said we would not use our own troops. Of course, it has been said for a long time that Chiang Kai-shek would need only our materials, and would not need our troops, for assistance. But I cannot see how we can even use our air cover or our naval cover, for that would involve shooting down their planes; and, as we know, that would lead to war.

The Senator from California said that such a limitation as has been proposed would be an open invitation to the Communists to take the islands. Of course, no one here wants to interfere with anything Chiang Kai-shek wants to do, for that is his business. If he wants to continue to fight for those islands, as he has been fighting for them, that is his business. We did not put him on those islands, and I do not think it is up to us to help him defend them. That is a matter between himself and the Chinese Communists. If he wants to fight, he has a great deal of our material which he can use. But we are not going to use the Armed Forces of the United States for the purpose of trying to keep Chiang Kai-shek on those islands, so he can mount an invasion of the mainland of China. That is the issue here.

What happens if we are in those islands? We know that in that case we run a grave risk or grave danger, militarily, of getting into war; and we also shall have this difficulty: We shall place our future and what will happen in the future in the hands of a man who passionately wants to get back on the mainland of China, and who apparently would give anything in the world in order to get us involved in a war with Communist China, so he could get back on the mainland of China, by using our troops and our military power. The decisions thus made by his people would involve us. If we are going to take over these coastal islands, I say we should call the signals. His motive is not the same as ours. Our motive is peace. His motive is the reinvasion of the continent of Asia.

I am sure all of us remember seeing, about the first of the year, an item about an Associated Press and, I believe, a United Press press conference at which Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek said he expected a general war to break out within a few weeks; and he said that after having had a 4-hour conference with Admiral Radford. I have the news clipping around somewhere, and I am certain that all Senators remember that incident.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Tennessee has referred to a statement made by the Senator from Massachusetts. Of course, the Senator from Massachusetts left the Chamber briefly, and thereafter was engaged in conversation. I do not wish the record to stand, as I understand it has been made to stand, as showing that the Senator from Massachusetts had either suggested or admitted or advocated that either this policy or this joint resolution was intended to or would be used to bring about or to authorize a preventive war. The Senator from Massachusetts is on the floor at this time, and of course can himself clarify the matter. However, as I understood his remarks——

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator from Massachusetts was here when I made the statement.

Mr. KNOWLAND. He was in and out of the Chamber.

As I understand the situation, and I think the record regarding it is perfectly clear, the Senator from Massachusetts said that if the United States or if the President, in his desire for peace, and the President has made that very clear in his message to the Senate and in the joint resolution, had furnished cover and support for the evacuation of the Tachens, if that is determined upon by the Nationalist Chinese forces that are there, and if our planes were subject to attack by Chinese Communist planes, and if the Chinese Communist planes committed the first open and overt act, and thus if they themselves determined whether there would be war or would not be war, if they had committed that act of aggression, and if thereafter we found they were building up in the harbors of Foochow or Amoy a vast invasion fleet, we were not going to let our forces be sitting ducks.

I think that is an entirely different premise, as compared to the one the Senator from Tennessee has tried to write into the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts, namely, that this would lead to a preventive war.

Mr. KEFAUVER. No; I entirely disagree with the Senator from California; that is not what the Senator from Massachusetts said. He said, in effect, that if you see a fellow about to throw a forward pass, you jump in, first, to break it up.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; but after the football game has started.

Mr. KEFAUVER. No; he did not say anything about waiting until after the football game had started.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. President, I think the record is quite clear, namely, that if we see a concentration of shipping or if we see an airport being built in that area, under the terms of the joint resolution as it is now written, we would be leaving the action to be taken to the judgment of military men who might be trigger-happy, to begin with, whereas we do not know how their decision might be influenced by their frame of mind; or we would be leaving it to the responsibility of Chiang Kai-shek and his people, and we might be leaving it to their decision; and they might decide that in the case of a small activity, in one place or another, it might be a concentration leading to an invasion, and therefore we should bomb it.

I say that is too great a risk for us to take, considering how awful a war would be.

Now I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to say that I was out of the Chamber for a few minutes, having been called to the telephone.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thought the Senator from Massachusetts was present when I referred to his statement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I was told of the statement the Senator from Tennessee made. At that time I was in the lobby.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am sorry.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I say that I agree with President Eisenhower when he says he would never fight a preventive

war. He has made that statement, and I certainly am in support of it. I certainly agree that he would never, in and of himself, as Commander in Chief, recommend or commit an act of aggression. But I say that if it is perfectly obvious that an act of war or an act of aggression is going to be committed, and has been started, either by attacks on our airplanes, when our planes are flying as air cover, or by having planes attack ships we were trying to cover in order to enable them to support an evacuation in a peaceful way, or if there were to be such as an assembling of ships in one of the harbors after such threats have been made and after such acts have been initiated, then we should expect to take action in self-defense.

As the Senator from California, who has played football perhaps, more recently than I, knows, one cannot throw a forward pass until after the game has started. I am confident the Senator from Tennessee feels the same way about it. The situation is similar to that in which a man makes a very hostile remark and puts up his fists, indicating that he is about to hit another man. Is he to let that fist come within an inch of him before hitting back, or must one stand with his arms at his side and let the other man hit him first?

Mr. KEFAUVER. If a man were in his own yard and held up his fist, I would wait until he came out to the street before hitting him. What the Senator is saying is that we should go into his yard and take him on.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Oh, no.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am sorry if I have misunderstood the Senator. His remarks will speak for themselves in the RECORD. I think he has made some qualification, however.

I think it is unfortunate that much, if not most, of the testimony must be confidential and secret. However, I believe one point should be made clear to the American people, and that is that the resolution contemplates bombing shipping concentrations, staging areas, air fields, and any other activity on the mainland which, in the opinion of some Army officer in the area, or perhaps some of Chiang Kai-shek's men who may be acting as advisers, may remotely, or otherwise, in some way be used, not against the Pescadores and Formosa, but the islands which are now in friendly hands. It is clear that that is the situation.

Mr. WELKER and Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I want to see the United States do everything it can to defend Formosa; and we will do so. But it is desired to bomb a ship which someone might think was going to Quemoy, or a train going to Quemoy which might have some supplies, or to bomb a staging area.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, that is not the testimony, if the Senator will yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the Senator know that that is not the testimony at all? It was not stated in any of the hearings that a local commander on the spot would have the responsibility or the power to commit an act such as the Senator describes, which would be an act of aggression. That is not the intent of the resolution, and there is nothing in it which indicates that the local commander would have authority to make the decision.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I accept that modification. That is correct. The President would make the decision. He is spoken of, of course, as the Chief Executive. But I submit—and I think the Senator will agree—that actually decisions must be made by commanders in the field under general orders. I do not think anyone would contemplate that, in connection with bombing a staging area or some other target, the local commanders would actually get in touch with the President and await his reply. He would send his orders down through military channels.

I did not mean that actually the decision would be made by some subordinate officer; but the gathering of the facts upon which the decision would be made, and the recommendations, which are always very influential in such cases, would certainly be done by the commanders and officers in the field, perhaps even after consultation with Chiang Kai-shek's officers.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does the Senator believe that if Admiral Pride, for example, the commander of the Seventh Fleet, were affording covering facilities for the evacuation, and his planes and ships were brought under attack, whether or not the responsible officer had communicated with Washington, he would then be limited to flying 3 miles from the China coast, while the Chinese Communist planes went in for another bomb load to come out and attack United States carriers or planes?

Mr. KEFAUVER. No.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does the Senator believe that a responsible officer like Admiral Pride, who is entrusted with great responsibility in an important mission, should have his hands tied in circumstances in which we might be attacked, and in which war might be made upon United States forces?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Of course, that involves the executive power of the President. The issue which we are discussing is that in one clause of the resolution, a situation which might apply to Formosa and the Pescadores is made to apply also to the offshore islands. That is the issue. It has been said that we want to defend Formosa and the Pescadores. There is no argument on that point. There is absolute unity. It is the coastal islands that are getting us into all this difficulty.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. This Nation having committed itself to support the Chinese Nationalists and help them to hold the coastal islands along the Chinese coast, does it not stand to reason that, when it sends its ships within range of the coastal guns of the Chinese Communists, they are going to fire on our ships?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Of course, they will fire on our ships.

Mr. LONG. If we send our ships in to evacuate Chinese Nationalist troops in positions where they are under fire from land-based Communist guns, is there any reason to believe that those guns will stop shooting merely because our ships come up?

Mr. KEFAUVER. No. I think we must realize that our ships and planes are going to be hit and our men killed.

Mr. LONG. Is there any doubt in the Senator's mind that once the shooting starts, our side will be shooting, too?

Mr. KEFAUVER. There is no doubt in my mind about it. These things spread very rapidly.

Mr. LONG. In short order the fur will fly.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In short order the fur will fly. The unfortunate thing is that when the fur starts flying, we shall be left in a situation in which we are there alone, or with Chiang Kai-shek. If the fur must fly, I want it to be on a high legal basis. I want us to be in a position in which the free nations of the world will have to join with us.

We can do that so long as we confine ourselves to Formosa, where we have a legal obligation to be, and where other nations have just as mucht interest as we have. All the nations which joined with us in the war against Japan are just as much interested as we are. Britain is interested in Hong Kong. France has concessions. The Netherlands, Australia, and all the other nations have interests. But if the fur started to fly, we would be in the fight by ourselves, on our own, without any help, I am afraid, from our friends and allies. I think that would be very unfortunate.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. A few moments ago I heard my distinguished friend and colleague from Tennessee discuss the point that, should the resolution be passed, we would, in effect, be giving control over American boys to some war-mad man who had dedicated his life to recapturing the mainland of China.

Does the Senator want the American people to feel that the Commander in Chief of our forces, the Chief Executive of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, would ask the Congress to pass a resolution calling upon American mothers and fathers to turn over to his command their children, in order that they might go to a foreign land, namely, Formosa, and be shot down at the whim of some alien commander not under the direct control of the President of the United States? Does the Senator want that message spread over America?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say to the Senator that I did not intentionally say what the Senator gives me credit for having said. Whatever may be the case, I have the greatest confidence in the President of the United States. I know the President of the United States does not want to get us into war. I know he wants peace. I have no doubt in the world that the preamble to the joint res-

olution which sets forth that the resolution is for peaceful purposes, is all that is in his mind. There can be no question about it. His whole life and all his acts throughout his life have demonstrated that. I believe that is true in large part of our high military officers and of the civilians in the Defense Department. However, I submit to the distinguished Senator that we must face the realities of what the resolution would do.

After all, in spite of our confidence in the President, all of us have our own responsibilities to the people who send us here. I have such a responsibility to my people.

I quote from the resolution:

> This authority to include the securing and protection of such positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands.

That can mean one and only one thing, namely, that Congress specifically authorizes—it may be considered as a suggestion—the placing of our troops on the island of Quemoy, the Matsu Islands, and the other islands that remain in the hands of Chiang Kai-shek.

I believe the reference to those islands must be eliminated from the resolution, because they are in a different situation. They must be eliminated, because I do not understand how we can operate in those islands without getting into a shooting war. There is shooting going on there.

If the substitute amendment I have offered is adopted, or if the Humphrey amendment is agreed to, and if then the President, after exhausting all other efforts, believes it to be absolutely necessary to take some action in connection with those islands, he would have the constitutional right to do so.

At least the implication in the resolution before us is that we take that burden and responsibility upon ourselves.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Tennessee has stated that if we limit the pending resolution in the form suggested by the Senator from Minnesota, and if then the President believes he must go beyond it, he will have the constitutional power to go beyond it. Assuming that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee were in the White House, would he, after Congress——

Mr. KEFAUVER. Let me say that that is a violent assumption in the first place. I would much sooner assume that the Senator from Massachusetts were in the White House.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am citing a hypothetical case. Suppose the Senator were in the White House as President, and Congress had stricken from the resolution the authority he had requested in the regard mentioned by the Senator from Tennessee, would the Senator from Tennessee, as President, then go forward assuming even greater responsibility, without again coming before Congress, although it might then be too late?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will tell the Senator what I believe a reasonable man would think about it. He would feel that the sense of Congress was that we should not get into war over coastal islands; that we would be glad to have Chiang Kai-shek defend them—and he has a great deal of our material—but we would not want to take the risk—and I think it is almost bound to happen—of getting into a general war over some islands of which Chiang Kai-shek is in possession and which he has great difficulty holding, by sending our airplanes and troops and ships into the islands, where they would be bound to get hit.

When they get hit, we will be in an all-out, general war.

I believe everyone would understand that it was the intention of Congress that Chiang Kai-shek should retain the islands, but that we would not want to get mixed up with him in a war.

In holding Formosa and the Pescadores, with the greatest Navy and Air Force in the world—at least, the greatest Navy—and with about 148 miles between the mainland and Formosa and the Pescadores, it might be a little more difficult to hold those islands without the harbors or ports on the coastal islands, but I think the greater difficulty would be more than offset by the lesser chance of getting us into a war.

If we found that something had to be done with respect to some island, because of the attempted invasion of Formosa, then I think the President would have the constitutional right to do it. However, that would not be a suggestion or an invitation by Congress to do it in the first place.

Mr. President, I have talked too long already. The substitute I offered for the joint resolution has these objections.

First. It avoids reference to the unratified defense treaty and other language which recognizes Formosa and the Pescadores as a part of China.

Second. It avoids the assumption that the present Communist attacks or threatened attacks on the offshore islands are in aid and preparation for armed attacks on Formosa. This is not necessarily true. At least the Congress is not in a position so to aver and thereby to sanction in advance armed retaliation for any armed attack on the offshore islands. We must guard against becoming involved in a large-scale war; not in defense of Formosa and the Pescadores, but in defense of the offshore islands.

Third. It defines and explains United States' responsibility for the peace and security of Formosa as a result of World War II and describes a basis for action by the President in fulfillment of that responsibility pending U. N. action.

Fourth. It makes clear that the purpose of the United States in committing itself to the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores is to keep these areas from being involved in the Chinese conflict.

Fifth. It makes clear that we welcome U. N. intervention and respect our obligations under the charter.

Sixth. The revised language making clear the preexisting responsibility of the United States as a consequence of the war against Japan, for the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores, makes it possible for the Congress to recognize and affirm the authority of the President to act, rather than to purport to authorize the President to act, in a field which is the primary if not exclusive responsibility of the President.

Seventh. Reference in the administration proposal securing related positions and territories as necessary to the defense of Formosa is unwise. This reference implies that the offshore islands are necessary to the defense of Formosa. As already stated, this is not necessarily true; to say so gravely increases the risks of war. If it be true it is a military judgment for which the President and not the Congress, must take the responsibility. If the President decides that intervention in case of attack against an offshore island is necessary for the defense of Formosa, he can so declare and act accordingly. The inclusion of specific language suggests that the Congress thinks such intervention may be necessary and in light of the imminent danger of war from such intervention, Congress should not so suggest. Many things may happen before Red China can prepare an all-out attack against Formosa. But hasty intervention to protect the offshore islands may precipitate war much more quickly than is generally realized, and when we are ill prepared psychologically as well as militarily for it. Moreover we may in time gain free world support for the defense of Formosa but not for defense of the offshore islands. Serving due notice that we will defend Formosa may deter or at least postpone war. Serving due notice that we will defend the offshore islands is more likely to precipitate than to deter or long defer war. If we are bluffing about the offshore islands, we will lose much more face than need be when our bluff is called, as it is likely to be.

If war comes, not from the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores which can be divorced from the Chinese conflict, but from the defense of the offshore islands like Quemoy and Matsu which cannot be divorced from the Chinese conflict, we may be without friends and allies in the free world. The defense of the offshore islands necessarily involving us in China's conflicts is in its nature calculated to precipitate war with China rather than to forestall armed attack on Formosa. We cannot convince the world that the Communist attacks on the offshore islands are primarily designed in preparation for armed attacks on Formosa. The offshore islands are in truth more necessary to the defense of the mainland than they are to the defense of Formosa. Quemoy and Matsu are nearly as difficult to separate from the mainland as Staten Island is from the United States. They are as close to the mainland as Alexandria is to the 14th Street Bridge in Washington.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, we have before us for consideration Senate Joint Resolution 28 authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores and related possessions and territories of that area.

In the passage of this resolution we are facing the most portentous situation since the decision made by President Truman to resist the invasion of South

Korea. The dangers of that action which the resolution supports do not arise from any decision to protect the security of Formosa and the Pescadores. The doubt, the uncertainty, the ambiguity relate to the protecting of "related possessions and territories of that area."

It is the clear assumption that this joint resolution authorizes the defense of the Quemoy and Matsu Islands though those are not named in the resolution. In the public press of this country, in the comment from abroad, this assumption is made and the assumption is supported by the briefings we have had during the past few days.

The dangers of this situation can be expressed in a very few words. If the island of Quemoy, for instance, is to be defended by our armed strength, the commitment is a grave one. Should Communist China make a massive attack upon it, our defense must be correspondingly massive. It surely would be the case in that event that not 11 airmen but 1,100 of our boys and eventually perhaps 11,000 of them would find themselves in Communist prisons. A determined attack by the Communists cannot be kept within narrow limits. It is they who will determine the scope.

The situation is more dangerous than this. We have had intimations from the highest quarters that it would be militarily advisable to prevent the massing of troops and equipment gathered for the purpose of making an assault on the islands. Put in plain English, this is preventive war. And it is seriously proposed as a possible action pursuant to the purposes of this resolution.

We have already lost military face in Asia. We lost this in the summer of 1951 when General Van Fleet had the Communist armies retreating in disorder, out of ammunition and abandoning their equipment. He was told not to pursue them. Militarily we then and there lost face. There is no hope of recovering it by any action contemplated in this present connection.

Had we advanced to the narrow waist of Korea, we could have bargained for peace terms from strength and the whole Asian situation would have been infinitely better than it is today. We could indeed have gained not merely military face but moral face as well, for the opportunity was open to us to propose peace terms which were right for all the people involved in the Korean situation. We could have proposed the unification of that unhappy country, the protection of the interests of Communist China by the establishment of a neutral zone along the Yalu and confided the administration of that neutrality to Asiatic powers, thus giving them a stake and a responsibility in the peace of the Asian continent. We lost military face and threw away the opportunity for moral face.

This happened during the Truman administration. It was still possible at the beginning of this administration to have saved the situation morally and more consideration was given to that possibility than in the months before. Eventually, however, the present administration abandoned the position of moral and spiritual strength and banked its hopes of a peaceful settlement on the weary months of wrangling at Panmunjon.

There is, therefore, no hope of regaining our military reputation through the passage of this resolution and every expectation of losing what moral strength our position in Asia still holds for us. The proposal is a dubious one indeed.

All this may be said while at the same time we recognize that our President and the Secretary of State, by leaving open the questions posed by the situation in the Quemoy and Matsu Islands, nevertheless can employ it as an asset in negotiations of the most difficult, delicate, and dangerous sort, looking ultimately to some sort of arrangement for ending the hostilities between Communist and Nationalist China. It must be admitted that this is a possibility, but it is a possibility which the President and the Secretary of State must carry out alone. It is not fair to ask the Congress with its limited knowledge of the situation to share that responsibility. The Congress must not offer to share it. For that reason I shall vote for the treaty guaranteeing the independence of Formosa and the Pescadores, but without prejudice to negotiations, I shall vote against this resolution.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, we are about to take very grave action that concerns the vital security of every family and every home in our country. The risk in the action is tremendous. But I think that we have no other choice than to give the President, by an overwhelming vote, the power he requests. To do otherwise would be disastrous. It is unthinkable that we would not vote to affirm the power the President requests in this crisis—and make no mistake about it, it is a crisis.

The situation is such that we do not have the luxury of freedom of choice in this matter. There is no choice. The circumstances do not permit us the liberty to differ with the President on this resolution. For if we did, and the resolution were defeated, we would give the impression to the rest of the world that we did not have the will to resist Communist aggression.

Yet, the fact that we do not have a free decision in this matter, the fact that we must overwhelmingly give to the President by resolution the very power which I am convinced he already possesses constitutionally, the fact that there is such great unanimity in Congress on this issue, and the fact that the American people overwhelmingly demand a firm stand against the Communists—all these facts do not relieve us of the responsibility of debating and determining, as far as is humanly possible, what this resolution entails.

The conduct of foreign relations and the formulation of foreign policy traditionally and constitutionally have been the authority of the executive branch of our Republic—the constitutional prerogative of the President and the State Department—except for the provisions for ratification by the United States Senate. But let us recognize, particularly in relation to the matter now before us, that such ratification power and participation by the Senate in the formulation of foreign policy is an "after the fact" power and participation—or perhaps more accurately stated, an "after the decision by the President" power and participation.

The resolution before us presents an unusual situation in at least two respects. First, the resolution calls upon the Senate for a "before the fact" participation in foreign policy formulation, for partnership with the President in a field heretofore reserved for the President. It is not actually a sharing of the authority in foreign policy formulation with the President, simply because under the circumstances we have no free choice in the matter.

What it is, is actually a sharing of the responsibility for the grave decision with the President. That is a responsibility that I am quite willing to accept, even though it is not accompanied by authority. As Representatives of the people, however reluctant we may be to have this awesome responsibility thrust upon us by the President, and regardless of the traditional separation of powers under the Constitution, we have no choice but to accept what the President has thrust upon us.

But in doing so let us be honest about this matter. The first and basic point of honesty to ourselves and our people is the inescapable fact that, with all the paramount considerations of international ramifications in this proposal, at least some of it stems from a consideration of domestic politics.

To put it as frankly and honestly as I know how, the request of President Eisenhower for passage of this unprecedented resolution has the strong recent historical background of the decision of President Truman to involve our country in the Korean war without consulting Congress.

We all know the criticism leveled at him because of that.

This resolution, when passed, will foreclose against any such similar criticism of President Eisenhower, because he will have put Democrats, as well as Republicans, in the same position with him. He will have placed them in the position of having shared the decision with him.

A second point of distinction in this unprecedented resolution is the manner in which it has thrust upon the House of Representatives participation in the formulation of foreign policy. While the Senate has an "after the decision" ratifying power, the House does not even have that power under the Constitution. So in this resolution the House has been presented with a doubly unusual situation.

The nearest similarity that I can think of with respect to participation by the House of Representatives on foreign policy—and I speak with the experience of 9 years' service in the House, most of which was during the war—is the voting by the House, as well as by the Senate, on a declaration of war.

So I ask in all sincerity and seriousness—I ask with the greatest emphasis on remaining calm—I ask in what I consider to be a deep responsibility to the people of our country—"Is this resolution a reserve declaration of war?" Does it amount to giving to the President, in

advance, a ratification by both the House and Senate of a future declaration of war by the President?

I do not know. I do not think the people of America know. I think that they are entitled to know, because I think they are entitled to know as far as possible what this resolution is getting them into. If the answer is "Yes," then I am confident that the American people have such confidence in President Eisenhower that they are willing to give such great power to him in advance.

This leads me to the very core of what troubles me the most about this resolution: the question of what it actually is as contrasted with what it seems to be to the American people. There should be no difference. It should be what it seems to be.

It is my impression that to a majority of the American people it seems to be an ultimatum to the Red Chinese that we will take so much and no more; that we have drawn a line which we have warned the Red Chinese not to cross; that if they do cross that line there will be war. Grave and awesome as that is, I think the American people have come to the conclusion that we must do that—that the Reds have given us no other choice; that we have reached the point where we can tolerate no more; that we have put the Reds on notice not to expect any appeasement, retreat, or withdrawal on our part in the future.

Yes; I think that is what the resolution seems to be to the American people. But is it actually what it so seems to be to the American public?

Certainly that does not seem to be the case with many of the sophisticates in international relations, for there is a widespread interpretation and prediction in Washington, in London, and in other capitals of the world that the resolution is a beginning of a partial withdrawal of the United States from this area of Chinese conflict; that it is the first step toward a goal of two-pronged neutralization: First, to insure the security of Formosa and ultimately to make it a United Nations trusteeship under Chiang Kai-shek; second, to give notice to the Chinese Reds that the United States not only will not help Chiang in any attempt to invade the mainland and regain control of China from the Reds, but that the United States will go further and prevent Chiang from making such an attempt.

This interpretation and prediction, which is being made freely in Washington, London, and other capitals of the world, further forecasts an ultimate and accelerated admission of Red China to the United Nations and the recognition of Red China by the United States.

Who are right in their impression—the American public or the sophisticates in international relations? This is a question to which I believe the American people are entitled to an answer in the debate and discussion of this resolution.

It is a question which I believe the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States have a clear duty to answer to the American people—to tell the American people as much as can be told. The American people must not be misled by what the resolution seems to be if that is not in fact what the resolution actually is.

One of the inherent dangers in a matter of this kind is the tendency of oversimplification. For example, one simple and popular way in which the resolution has been characterized is that it "draws a line and tells the Reds that if they step over that line they face war."

It is not just that simple. It is not that easy of determination. It is not merely a matter of whether the Reds go 1 inch over that line.

For example, suppose that our intelligence forces determine that the Reds have massed forces on the coast of the mainland of China in the first step of an assault on Formosa. Do we wait until those forces have crossed 1 inch over the drawn line? Or do we strike those forces on the mainland before they get that far, since we know they are going to cross the drawn line?

Suppose that the answer is "No," then what do we do if the Red planes take to the air off the coast of the mainland and head for Formosa and the assault ships start cruising in the waters, headed for the assault on Formosa? Do we make a defensive strike at these planes and ships so obviously headed for an assault on Formosa? Do we make a defensive strike in the area between the coast of the mainland and the island of Formosa?

No; it is not as simple as this catchy concept of drawing a line.

The least that we can do for the American people is to give them all the facts we can—to tell them the risks, the problems, what can and cannot be foreseen—to tell them as much as possible about what we are getting into in passing this resolution—to be completely honest with them regardless of partisan considerations—to say that we are drawing a line on Formosa as we drew a line in Korea and a line in Berlin—to say whether the resolution is actually a reinvoking of the Truman policy of neutralizing Formosa and the civil war between the Chinese Reds and the Chinese Nationalists—a reinvocation by President Eisenhower of a Taft-revised Truman policy—in that President Eisenhower has done what the great Senator Robert A. Taft criticized President Truman for not doing—taking the decision of intervention to Congress before final action.

To summarize my position on this matter, Mr. President, I close by saying this:

First. I am going to vote for this resolution because I think we must take a firm stand; and because I think Congress and the President should stand united on this issue, I hope the resolution is passed by a unanimous vote.

Second. I am going to vote for this resolution even though I do not consider it necessary from a constitutional standpoint, for I believe the President already has all the necessary power without this resolution. I am going to vote for it because the President feels that it will strengthen his hand in dealing with the situation.

Third. But before this debate is over, I hope that the President and Congress will have taken the American people into their full confidence and will have told them as much as possible; that the questions I raise will have been answered as much as possible—the questions of:

(a) Is this a reserve declaration of war?

(b) Is it the ultimatum to the Red Chinese that it seems to be to the American people?

(c) Or is it a radical change in our foreign policy—a change that will commit this country to preventing Chiang from invading the mainland of China?

(d) Is it the first in a series of steps designed to end ultimately in admission of Red China to the United Nations and to recognition of Red China by the United States?

(e) Is the concept of "drawing a line" as simple as many Americans might think it to be?

(f) Do we have the necessary military strength to back up our firm talk—enough strength to still make the proposed cuts in the military forces?

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I should like to restate the program for the Senate tomorrow. The Senate will meet at 11 o'clock a. m., and complete its morning business before proceeding in a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives for a joint meeting of the two Houses to hear the President of Haiti. After the joint meeting, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 28.

Mr. President, earlier in the day a number of the Members of the Senate were advised that the Senate would not remain in session after 6 o'clock p. m. There are present two Senators who have short statements they wish to make. I should like to inquire if there are any other Senators on this side of the aisle who have statements they care to make.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Minnesota to offer such proposals as he may desire to present, if I may yield with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send to the desk two amendments to the pending resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 28, and ask that they be printed and lie on the table, and be brought up for consideration tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be printed, and will lie on the table.

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF ARMED FORCES TO PROTECT SECURITY OF FORMOSA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have asked the Senator from Massachusetts to tarry for a moment, because I wish to make a very brief comment on some observations he made concerning some arguments presented by me earlier in the afternoon.

I am sure the Senator from Massachusetts never intends to put words in my mouth; but I respectfully suggest that the record of his remarks will contain a misstatement, which he attributes to me, of my position on the emergency powers of the President. I wish to make

very clear to him that my position on the powers of the President as Commander in Chief is that he has the right, whenever the facts justify, to take the actions necessary to protect the security, safety, and vital interests of the United States, until such time as Congress can act in the premises. Therefore—and I think this is where the Senator from Massachusetts misunderstood or misinterpreted my position—I pointed out there is no necessity for the joint resolution insofar as concerns the right of the President to exercise his power as Commander in Chief to protect the security of the Nation, for that power already exists. The joint resolution goes beyond that. That is why I said I thought it was a mistake for the President to request the passage of the joint resolution. The joint resolution seeks to obtain a blanket authority or authorization from the Congress of the United States to approve in advance a course of action the President may sometime in the future deem it wise for him to follow. That course of action, I respectfully submit, might be one which would involve the President's ordering the military to commit an act which would amount to an act of war on a sovereign power. I respectfully submit that under the Constitution of the United States, the President does not have that power; and, because, under the Constitution, the Congress has the power to check the Executive, Congress would have the power—if the President exercised that kind of authority, which would exceed his emergency and Commander in Chief powers—to revoke his action.

Let me put it in another way: Under the Constitution of the United States, no President has the right to commit an act of war against a sovereign power. That power vests in the Congress of the United States, and nowhere else.

One of the weaknesses of the joint resolution, in my judgment, is that, in effect, a situation may arise in connection with which we may find that we have predated an act of war by the President of the United States against a sovereign power.

Next let me say the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Iowa engaged in a very interesting colloquy on the doctrine of sovereignty. Of course, Red China does not exist in an international vacuum. Red China exists in a world in which our most powerful allies have recognized her; and, as to those allies, they have recognized her as a sovereign nation. What is her relationship to us? It is that of a de facto government which controls the mainland of China. She does it by her reprehensible, police-state methods, whereby the Chinese people either go along or are liquidated; or, as I said on the Ed Murrow television show, last night, a great many of them have found that one of her devices of liquidation, particularly in the Indian corridor, is to make them work on dams, highways, and various other public projects on from 500 to 700 calories of food a day, until finally their starving carcasses drop dead.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I decline to yield at this time.

So, Mr. President, Red China liquidates them in that way. No one can question that she rules and controls the mainland of China by these reprehensible methods; but she is in de facto control there, and we know her to be a de facto government.

The Senator from Massachusetts cannot cite a single instance in history in which a de facto government is without sovereign rights, when it comes to making war upon such a de facto government.

I wish to say that the United States has no right to commit an act of war upon a de facto government without violating the long history of our country, which shows that we have never committed acts of war by way of aggression. That is my position; and everything I have said this afternoon on the doctrine of sovereignty, I reiterate after hearing the Senator from Massachusetts.

Now, Mr. President, let me say something more about preventive war. I am sure the Senator from Massachusetts is going to let the record stand exactly as he made it when he presented his point of view as to the effect of the joint resolution, and I am perfectly willing to let the record speak for itself.

I believe the Senator from Tennessee is completely correct when he points out that the record of the hearings—if the Senate will read it—leaves no doubt about the fact that the joint resolution encompasses the possibility of conducting preventive action on the mainland of China.

Let me now refer to the argument of analogy used by the Senator from Massachusetts. Of course, such arguments are always of dubious value, and very often they get the arguer into difficulty. I refer to the argument about what one would do if a man were to raise a fist against him. Let me tell my colleagues that the law of self-defense does not mean that it can be applied to such a case of before an assault has started. Raising one's fist does not constitute an assault—particularly, to use the analogy employed by the Senator from Massachusetts, if the person raising it is in his own backyard.

If Senators wish to contend with me on the basis of argument of analogy used by the Senator from Massachusetts, I reply that, even though I hate Communists, as I do, with every fiber and cell of my body, nevertheless, the fact remains that Red China exists as a de facto government in relation to us, and as a recognized government in relation to our major allies. As a de facto government, she has the sovereign right on her own mainland to maneuver her military forces as she sees fit; and our right of self-defense does not start, Mr. President—unless we want to take on the historic responsibility of waging war against Red China—until China starts an assault. The legal principle is similar to the case of an assault and battery case. One's right of self-defense does not exist until one is assaulted; and if one proceeds to beat up the other fellow before he begins the assault, the one who proceeds to beat him up cannot invoke the right of self-defense. Every lawyer in this body knows that to be so.

Therefore, I wish to say that I do not think we can escape the fact that under the record which has been made in connection with the joint resolution, the President goes beyond the proposal of merely exercising his existing emergency power on the basis of present facts. This joint resolution implies clearly that we would be authorizing, in advance, preventive action. That would do such violence to the historic policy of my country that I will not be a party to it.

I close by saying to my good friend from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], for whom I have the highest respect, that I do not accept the thesis laid down in her speech, that we do not have freedom of choice in this matter. We not only have freedom of choice, Mr. President, but we have the clear sworn duty, under the oath which we took when we walked up to the Vice President's desk at the time we entered this body, to exercise freedom of choice. No President of the United States can, under any possible exercise of power, take away from a Member of the Senate the duty to exercise freedom of choice.

One of the most unsound arguments I have heard in connection with this subject—an argument which we heard in committee, and an argument which was repeated by the Senator from Maine this afternoon—is that, in the interest of national security, we have no choice but to go along with the President of the United States. That is an argument which might have a place in the forum—to the extent any forum exists—of a dictatorship country, but not in free America. We have the clear constitutional obligation, when we take our oath of office upon entering service in this body, to exercise a freedom of choice in the Senate. If we think the President is making a mistake, we owe a serious patriotic obligation to the man in the White House to express to him our honest differences of opinion with him as to the implications, the effects, and the possible results of this resolution.

I know of no better way of creating great disunity among the people of the United States than for us, the lawmakers, ever to bend our knees to the idea that we have no choice but to go along with the President in the name of national unity. We have a duty in this debate—and it will be a historic debate—to demonstrate to the free nations of the world and the police states of the world what constitutional processes under this Government really mean, what a system of checks and balances, which guarantees us protection from a personal government, really means.

Whenever the argument is made to me that I have no choice but to go along with the President of the United States because he sent a resolution to Congress and announced to the world his program, that argument means that I should accede to a personal government. That I will never do.

I wished to make these points before the session closes tonight, because I think it is only fair to the people of my State. It is fair to me. It is fair to my col-

leagues. It is fair to the minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND], whose sincerity is not the slightest bit less than my sincerity in the premises. Nor is the sincerity of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] or any other Senator in this body less than mine. I understand the position taken by the Senator from California. I simply do not agree with his conclusions.

Of all the things he said, I think the only thing I wish to take the time to comment on tonight is the statement he made with respect to a trusteeship. It is the strangest interpretation of what a United Nations trusteeship is to suggest that it is a multilateral colonialism.

The trusteeship I am talking about is the same kind of trusteeship I urged in 1945, when, on the floor of the Senate, I suggested that the United Nations exercise jurisdiction over Korea, giving immediate life and meaning to the self-determination principle of the San Francisco Charter—until when? Until such time as conditions could be stabilized in Korea and the Korean people could enjoy the freedom of self-government. Would that we had done it, because we followed a different course of action some months later, when we joined with Russia in the partition of Korea along the 38th parallel.

The principle of giving life, meaning, and substance to the self-determination principle is what caused me last spring to urge a United Nations trusteeship over Indochina. In my judgment, had we tried to bring that about, and had we been successful in our effort, we would have thrown the Russian propaganda forces for a complete loss in Indochina, because it would have been a clear demonstration that we were standing for the freedom of all Indochina, not merely a part of it.

I am pleading for a United Nations trusteeship as quickly as we can get it. I do not know whether we can be successful. I have my doubts as to whether we could be successful. But let the record of history show that we tried.

Let me say to the Senator from California that when I am pleading for a United Nations trusteeship I am not proposing that on Formosa the Nationalist Chinese be weakened one iota. I am not proposing that they be disarmed to the extent of a single rifle. I am simply proposing that the United Nations, by a trusteeship order, announce to the world that Formosa has come under the protectorate of the United Nations, and not the United States alone, and that an attack on Formosa under that trusteeship would be an attack on the United Nations. Let us call Russia's bluff on that point.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Let us call Russia's bluff, in the light of all the phony, false peace propaganda she is sending around the world. Let us see if she means it when she implies that she wants peace in the South Pacific. One of the best tests as to whether or not she means it is whether or not she would join with other nations of the United Nations in a plan for a trusteeship-protectorate over Formosa.

That is the position I have taken, in urging in the Senate in years gone by that we take advantage of every opportunity to build up the system of international relations which the great Senator Vandenberg of Michigan used to proclaim so effeectively from his desk on the other side of the aisle, when he was a Member of this body. In those historic speeches he pleaded for support for a system of international justice through law. If one rereads those speeches, as I did during the past summer, he will see that time and again he pointed out that the hope of permanent and lasting peace in the world will never be attained until we use international judicial processes to accomplish it.

I think Russia will not go along for a long time, but I want to keep her in such a position that we can show the rest of the world that when she has an opportunity to support a system of international justice through law, she will not go along. That is why I have urged on more than one occasion that we call her bluff, that we show up the falsity of her hand, so to speak, by asking her to take a dispute to the World Court. We shall not get her before the World Court as of the present. When do I think we will start getting her there? We shall start getting her there whenever we become successful in keeping the free nations of the United Nations united shoulder to shoulder.

Another great lesson Vandenberg taught us was that one of the devices of Russia would be to drive wedges of discontent, discord, and difference of opinion among our allies, and keep us split as allies. Then the old Communist technique of divide and conquer would have a better chance of prevailing.

I urge that we work out a satisfactory form of United Nations trusteeship or mandate or protectorate over Formosa I am not one for labels. I do not care what it is called, if the substance is there. I am in favor of any program that will place the United Nations in a protectorate position over Formosa and will protect the Nationalist Chinese.

Let me tell the Senator from California—and I believe he knows I have stood with him on some phases of this issue many times in the last few years on the floor of the Senate—that he can count on me always to support a program which will not subject the Nationalist Chinese on Formosa to a Red Communist blood bath. We must never do that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say to the Senator it is hardly conceivable in any proposal of a U. N. trusteeship that I have heard discussed that it would not have as a part of it some type of what might be called a U. N. neutral nations' commission. We tried that system in Korea. The so-called neutral nations in the Soviet bloc have used their power to move their representatives around South Korea for espionage purposes. However, the representatives of the neutral nations of Sweden and Switzerland in North Korea are limited to the ports of entry.

I should think that the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa would have to have their heads examined if they ever permitted a similar neutral nations' commission to roam around the fortifications and beach defenses and gun emplacements on Formosa, when the information that such representatives obtained would go to the Security Council of the United Nations, which every 6 or 7 months is headed by a representative of the Soviet Union, and to the Military Applications Commission, of which every 3 or 4 months a Soviet representative shows up as chairman.

From public admissions of representatives of the Soviet Union during the Korean war we know that at the U. N. they not only gave moral support to the aggression in Korea, against the authority of the U. N., but that they supplied the arms and equipment and Mig planes and tanks and ammunition, and practically every other type of equipment, and defied the U. N. to do anything about it.

Under those circumstances, how could any responsible Nationalist Chinese official on Formosa, with any sense of responsibility, sit back and rest the defense of 9½ million people, to whom he has a great responsibility, upon the U. N., which did not produce the force to resist aggression in Korea, particularly when we know that there would be leakages through the Soviet world and its allies back to Communist China, which would endanger the defense of Formosa?

Therefore I think it is a very practical problem that we must face.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator from California is quite right in saying it is a practical problem. He knows me well enough to be certain that I would never underwrite that kind of trusteeship.

I never speak about another man's motives, but on the basis of our colloquy I would infer that the Senator from California thinks it is impossible to develop a trusteeship for Formosa which would be satisfactory and practical.

I say, let us try. By trying we would not in any way weaken the Nationalist Chinese on Formosa, because they would still be under our protection until we were convinced that the U. N. protectorate would protect their interests and until the people on Formosa were convinced that it would protect their interests.

I am not for 1 second advocating the weakening of the protection of the Nationalist Chinese on Formosa. I am saying, however, that we ought to carry this propaganda fight to the Russians, and to that end we should evince a willingness to propose and advocate a United Nations protectorate over Formosa which would avoid the kind of impractical problem the Senator from California and I wish to avoid, and which would advance a system of international justice through law.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Why, under the same circumstances, and with a good

deal of justification, should we not say—and I am saying this in all seriousness—that the United Nations is interested in the peace of the world. Therefore, let us arrange a supervised U. N. election on the mainland of China, as well as on the island of Formosa, so as to give the people of both areas an opportunity to express their views as to what kind of government they would like to have?

Why must we always pick out our friends, one of the free nations of the world, particularly when the Senator has so ably pointed out the ruthless type of tyranny which exists in Communist China, and never be allowed to make a suggestion or proposal that the same question be submitted to the people of China, who are unfortunate enough to be on the mainland, as to whether they wish to live under that type of dictatorship? We could make a little propaganda out of that suggestion going behind the Chinese equivalent of the Iron Curtain, whether it be a bamboo curtain or other kind of curtain.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Oregon advocates doing everything we can possibly do to explore any possibility of developing the kind of protectorate in Formosa that will protect the Nationalist Chinese, and at the same time remove us from what I believe to be the singular position of maintaining a jurisdiction over Formosa at the present time which is not to our best interest.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall take only another minute or two to say that there is a great deal of talk about two Chinas cropping up. It is always Formosa that is stressed.

If there is to be a discussion or any proposal made for a trusteeship with respect to the island of Formosa, where the free Chinese are in possession, I believe that any government, whether it be the Indian Government or the British Government or any other government, has an equal responsibility to suggest the same thing to the Chinese Communists. Let them submit the issue to their people under a UN trusteeship or under a U. N. supervised election.

We suggested such a course in Korea, but it was turned down. Therefore, why apply the force, so to speak, to the Republic of China on the Island of Formosa, but not make a similar suggestion with respect to the Chinese mainland?

The second point I should like to bring out is that perhaps the analogy which has been drawn by the Senator from Oregon and by my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] was a little wrong with relation to this situation.

The Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Oregon during the colloquy spoke of the man in the backyard who shakes his fist at his neighbor. I quite agree that under those circumstances the neighbor would not be justified in going over and knocking off the other man's block, so to speak, even though he had shown an unfriendly attitude.

The Senator from Oregon is the former dean of a law school and an able lawyer, while I am not a lawyer, but a newspaperman. Let me suggest a little closer analogy. Suppose in the Senator's neighborhood there was a person who had killed his brother and perhaps one of his sons, and had recently kidnaped three of his children, and then had publicly and privately stated that at the first opportunity he would shoot the Senator from Oregon; and suppose that when the Senator from Oregon went out into his yard, within view of his neighbor who had killed his brother and son and kidnaped three of his children, and his neighbor pulled out a Colt .45 and started to load it, as well as a sawed-off shotgun, and then proceeded to point it at the Senator from Oregon. I ask the Senator whether under those circumstances he would not be justified in at least assuming that his neighbor was going to kill him at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. MORSE. I say goodnaturedly that I would not run over to my neighbor's yard.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I know that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is about to make a request of me, as acting majority leader, for some time. I wish to serve notice on him that if I yield to him I yield for a very definite purpose, and that I do not wish him to be as extravagant with time as was the Member of the Senate to whom I yielded 5 minutes.

I inquire of the Senator from Minnesota as to the amount of time he may require.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to my good friend from Kentucky that my request for time will be for less than the 5 minutes under the normal clock arrangements which are customary in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield, with the understanding that I shall not lose the floor; but let me urge the Senator to confine his remarks to as many minutes less than 5 as may be possible.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I merely want to announce that the amendment which I introduced, relating to Senate Joint Resolution 28 as it is found on page 2, is cosponsored by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and I ask unanimous consent that we may hold it open for others who have indicated to me that they want to join in cosponsoring the amendment. However, they were not present when I offered it, and I did not feel at liberty to add their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota understands that it would not be printed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did not so understand, Mr. President. Then I shall leave it as it is.

I should like to make this observation in reference to the amendment, so that my colleagues may know its purpose as they read the RECORD tomorrow morning.

What it does is to strike out the language on page 2, after line 11, insert a period after the word "attack" and strike out the remainder of the sentence down through line 11.

The language which would remain would be:

> That the President of the United States be, and hereby is, authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack.

It is that language which will authorize the President to do what he says he wishes to do, namely, to safeguard and protect the vital interests of the United States by the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

I would merely cite, Mr. President, what I read recently in the dispatches in the Senate lobby from the Associated Press and the United Press, to the effect that a foreign minister of the chief ally of the United States of America, that ally being Great Britain, and that Foreign Minister being Anthony Eden, in reply to questions this afternoon, in the House of Commons, stated that he considered the offshore islands which have been referred to so frequently in these debates, particularly Quemoy, to be within the territorial jurisdiction of the Communist government of China. He considered that the island of Formosa is in a separate category, in view of its relationship to World War II and the disposition of that island since that time, and, therefore, its defense and security is obviously the legitimate interest of the nations of the world.

I merely make this observation because, while the Secretary of State has informed many of us that the relationships between our chief ally, Great Britain, and the United States are sound and in accord, it is perfectly obvious that there is a great difference of opinion as to the right of a nation such as ours to interfere in what is considered to be a domestic matter, a civil war, and the right and the obligation of our country to take a stand in defense of Formosa and the Pescadores, which by their peculiar relationship following World War II are outside the jurisdiction of the Communist government of China.

I further add, Mr. President, that when I listened to the comment today that the resolution which is before the Senate is submitted for us to consider before the decision is made, I felt that I should sharply dissent from that attitude and that observation. The truth is, as the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] who made that general observation stated, herself, that we have no choice. The President has already announced what he has constitutional power to do, and he placed before us his desire, his objective, and his purpose by formal resolution. So that the resolution is not one which we are permitted to design; it is one which we are permitted to accept or reject; and to reject it would be to undermine the President's authority completely and totally.

I regret to say that we find ourselves in that particular position. I feel that my amendment, however, will do much to clarify the intent and purpose which have been stated again and again as to our objective in defending Formosa and

the Pescadores and which may very well save us from a debacle second to none if we accept such tenuous and uncertain language as is found in the resolution relating to island territories and possessions if held in unfriendly hands.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 27, 1955, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 26, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Paul R. Abbott, Church of the Advent, Episcopal, Brownsville, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our only governor and king, who hast brought us from many places to serve this country, who hast committed to us, through Thy people, the solemn trust of government, we confess that we are creatures of weakness, that we are often tempted to do the evil we would not, that we are divided and torn between many loyalties, sometimes taking the easy way to avoid criticism and seeking the easy honor of popularity.

Yet Thou hast made us as Thine own children and hast said in Thy holy word that our creation was very good. Thou hast planted us each in a special portion of this land where we have grown into many allegiances to family and friends. Thou hast even sent Thy blessed son to die for us and redeem us.

Therefore, O Lord, we make bold to ask Thy special grace that, despite our weaknesses, and despite our divided commitments, we may, in the deliberations of this body be inspired by Thy wisdom, especially needful in these troublous times; to the end that we may truly serve all the people of this country, seeking the honor and welfare of the state and, above all, the good hope of Thy kingdom where perfect justice, charity, and peace shall reign.

We beseech Thee, O Lord, to bless the labors of this House of Representatives and make its Members good servants both of Thee and Thy people.

Through Jesus Christ, the great giver of law, we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ANNOUNCEMENT CONCERNING CEREMONY TOMORROW

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a statement. After consultation with the majority and the minority leaders of the House and remembering the terrific jam we had upon this floor on previous occasions, with the consent and approval of the floor leaders, the Chair announces that on tomorrow during the ceremony the door immediately opposite the Speaker will be open and the doors on the Speaker's left and right and none other. No one will be allowed upon the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

MANDATORY RADIO CONTACT BY SHIPS AT SEA

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, frequently, on board ship and other places where shipping people gather, I have often discussed with them the problem of whether or not the law requires a ship to report by radio once a day.

In a recent editorial, the New York Times revived this discussion, arising from the loss of the freighter *Mormackite* which capsized in the Atlantic last October with the loss of 37 seamen. It was several days before the few survivors were discovered because, for a week or more, no search had even been started.

In some cases of ship loss at sea there are no survivors and none knows just when the ship went down, or in what area. So it is that I raise once more the question of mandatory radio contact and I agree with the words of the New York Times, as follows:

> As far as we know there is no valid argument against such a rule, and not to have it is simply to ignore an ordinary safety precaution that would be neither difficult nor costly.

It is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that I introduce my bill today, to require certain ships to report by radio their positions every 24 hours.

CONTINUATION OF EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS TO PERSONS SERVING IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. O'NEILL, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 111, Rept. No. 9), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

> *Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 587) to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

THE DEBATE ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 159

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I regretted to note yesterday, during the debate of House Joint Resolution 159, the gentleman from California took advantage of the opportunity to accuse President Eisenhower of duplicity in the message to the Congress of January 24 regarding the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores. I resent this attack upon our President and will endeavor to state the facts in their correct sense.

The gentleman referred to the President's message of February 2, 1953, which revoked the earlier order given by former President Truman in June 1950 that the 7th Fleet was instructed to prevent Formosa from being used as a base of operations against the Chinese mainland. The gentleman terms this statement as "brazen partisan politics" and apparently is under the impression that the President's message of January 24 represents a retreat from this position. He goes even further in stating that President Eisenhower knew that he was speaking an untruth when he made this statement approximately 2 years ago.

I confess myself completely unable to follow the gentleman's logic. In June of 1950, at the time of the Communist invasion of South Korea, former President Truman ordered the 7th Fleet to prevent attack upon Formosa and also to prevent any operations on the part of the Chinese Nationalists against the Communist-held mainland. It is a well-known fact this permitted the Communists to abandon their troop concentrations opposite Formosa and to move them into Manchuria and then into Korea the following November. For 2½ years, therefore, the Communists had no concern for the protection of their long and exposed coastal line from attacks from Formosa. This was, to say the least, an unnecessary advantage to give to a country with whom we were at war for all intents and purposes. President Eisenhower was right in correcting this mistake in his message of February 1953 and in ordering the 7th Fleet to be used solely for the defense of Formosa and not also as a defense of the Chinese Communists. There is certainly no duplicity in his recent message, which continues that protection of Formosa, and there is no inconsistency in the two messages. Finally, former President Truman did order the 7th Fleet to protect the Communist Chinese mainland against attacks from Formosa. This is an incontestable fact, a true statement,

and President Eisenhower was speaking the truth when he said it.

I can only assume, therefore, that the gentleman's remarks of yesterday were undertaken for purely political purposes and with a complete disregard of the logic and the facts in this case. When both sides of the aisle responded so nobly yesterday to the President's appeal for bipartisanship at this crucial time, the gentleman's remarks were completely uncalled for and certainly appear as nothing more or less than an effort to disrupt this splendid bipartisanship. In my opinion, the gentleman from California has reached an all-time low in a smear campaign of personal vilification by terming the President of the United States a liar in public debate on the floor of the House of Representatives. Such action should be equally resented by all good Americans, regardless of their political affiliations.

THE DEBATE ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 159

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and dismayed in examining the RECORD this morning—the record of yesterday's debate in this House—on House Joint Resolution 159, which authorized the President to employ Armed Forces of the United States in defending Formosa.

I was shocked because among the truly patriotic and bipartisan remarks supporting the President in his position regarding Formosa—remarks of men from both sides of the aisle—I noted a speech directly attacking not only the President's position but also his personal integrity.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] charged that in President Eisenhower's state of the Union message in 1953 he made a statement and that "the President knew that the statement was untrue." He further charged that "the President has admitted its untruth by his statement on January 24, 1955, to the Congress," and submitted excerpts from both speeches which intended to prove "the duplicity of his"—the President's—"message."

The real facts were presented today by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY], a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives.

Even careful reading of the quotations themselves disprove the charges.

I am shocked and dismayed that a Member of this House should attempt to make such an obviously partisan, political charge against the President of the United States in this really serious time of decision.

I was dismayed that the same gentleman should, later on in his speech, protest so vigorously accepting responsibility in this matter. The Member from California resented the fact that Congress has been put in the position of having to vote on the President's request.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] has just admirably outlined, in a bipartisan spirit, the constitutional question involving the powers of the President as Commander in Chief. In spite of this, however, the gentleman from California obviously used this occasion to lay the ground for a later political attack.

For my part, I am proud to have a President who, though he recognizes his constitutional powers to act in time of crisis, is, nevertheless, willing to inform and consult with the Members of Congress, and through them the people whom they represent, regarding the international situation and any impending crises.

The people of the United States, Mr. Speaker, will judge. I think they will join me in my shock and dismay at this obvious attempt to make political capital out of this momentous and serious occasion, by a personal attack upon the President of the United States.

PROGRAM FOR REMAINDER OF WEEK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] what the program will be for the rest of the week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very glad my friend from Massachusetts asked me about that.

I understand the Committee on Rules has reported out a rule on the Teague bill, to which I referred yesterday. I said that in the event a rule was reported out on that bill today the bill would be brought up tomorrow. It is important to get it through as quickly as possible.

Mr. MARTIN. That will follow the joint meeting?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. Then the Committee on Rules reported out two resolutions continuing for this session certain powers of the Committee on Armed Services and the Small Business Committee in relation to investigations or surveys. I hope they will be more surveys than investigations. However, the two resolutions were reported out and we will bring them up tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the gentleman.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for the last several centuries Ukrainian independence has been a hope rather than a reality. Ever since the Ukrainian leaders were coerced into a union with the Russians in the middle of the 17th century the Ukrainian people have been unable to enjoy national political independence, except for a short 2-year period from 1918 to 1920.

For more than two and one-half centuries the unhappy Ukrainians lived under the alien regimes of the Russian czars. During that time their overlords did all in their power to obliterate and destroy everything that symbolized the free spirit of the Ukraine, and to suppress ruthlessly all nationalistic ideas. But they could not succeed in their destructive task. The spirit of freedom and independence quietly lived on in the hearts of the brave Ukrainians. Toward the end of World War I they seized upon the favorable opportunity afforded by the political upheavals in Russia and declared their national political independence in January of 1918. This glorious event led to the formation of the Ukrainian Republic. However, events did not permit it the time it needed to grow and mature. The forces of destruction and tyranny once more robbed the Ukraine of its independence. Its unhappy inhabitants fell victims to the Communist forces and they were incorporated into the Soviet state.

Since early 1920 the Soviet regime has ruled over the Ukraine with oppressive cruelty. The once happy country has become virtually a vast prison camp for some 40 million Ukrainians.

Under the conditions prevailing in their homeland today, the Ukrainians, of course, are not permitted to celebrate their national independence day. We in this country, however, gladly celebrate that happy day, the Ukrainian Independence Day, and hope that soon all Ukrainians will be able to enjoy in their beloved homeland those freedoms for which they have so long and courageously struggled.

AMENDING REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 109) providing for the consideration of H. R. 2576, a bill to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1958, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2576) to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1958. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous

question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half hour to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and I now yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for 1 hour of general debate. It is an open rule on the bill, H. R. 2576, which will extend from April 1, 1955, to April 1, 1958, the presently existing Reorganization Act, the act under which the President is empowered to send to Congress certain reorganization plans, and which plans in turn become law unless either House of the Congress by constitutional majority passes a resolution negating those plans. We understand there is relatively little controversy and that the Committee on Government Operations reported out this legislation with certain reservations, with virtual unanimity. I urge the adoption of this rule so that we may proceed to the debate on the legislation itself.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. There is one part about this which disturbs me. It looks as if it is in the direction of minority rule. If you by law establish a policy here that requires a constitutional majority, that means that much fewer than the full membership are here on the average vote, and that, therefore, means that the minority can veto the will of the majority. That point is something which does not seem just right to me. The other point is the question of placing ourselves in a position in advance where we are going to agree to something which we do not know. In other words, we say now that regardless of how objectionable or offensive something might be, we will be powerless to deliberate and consider it and vote on it as we normally do in a legislative body. And we are thereby restricting ourselves to the extent that we have to veto it within a certain time. I wish the gentleman would enlarge on those two particular points. I am not saying I am against it at all, but it just occurs to me that we ought to consider it.

Mr. BOLLING. The points which the gentleman raises are questions, if I remember correctly, which have been raised on each occasion when this particular piece of legislation has been brought up in the past.

At one time the gentleman now speaking served on the Committee on Government Operations and had some opportunity to go rather thoroughly into these matters. Based, perhaps more on history than any other aspect of the question, I came to the conclusion then, which I hold today, that unless we have some such procedure as this reorganization-plan procedure, it is highly unlikely that the reorganization of the Federal Government will be undertaken and consummated in an expeditious fashion. For whatever reason it may be, over the years it has been demonstrated to be a fact that the Congress had great difficulty in initiating and carrying into law reorganization of the Federal establishments of a nature massive enough to achieve the kind of economies that are potential in a Government which has grown over the years to a very substantial degree.

I recognize the force of the gentleman's argument with regard to a constitutional majority, but I think it represents a relatively small infringement on our rights and powers, and the procedure has in the past worked effectively.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the gentleman support this resolution for one reason; that is, that the gentleman is of the opinion that there is altogether too much waste and inefficiency in the executive department? That is one reason?

Mr. BOLLING. The gentleman will remember it has been some years since I served on the great Committee on Government Operations and I am not aware of what its most recent investigations have revealed. But I have had the impression that the reason for the establishment of a new Hoover Commission, and other commissions of a similar nature, was that there was some suspicion on the part of the Congress that there might be a waste of money in the operation of various agencies in the executive branch which could be saved, perhaps by applying more businesslike methods. Therefore, I would say that my answer to the gentleman would be "Yes."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As I understand it, then, the reasons which have been advanced at various times for legislation of this kind is to enable the President to get some greater degree of efficiency and economy in the executive departments. That is one reason. Then, as I understand it, another reason is that the Congress itself has been very lacking in the inclination, or has been a little neglectful in enacting proper legislation to end inefficiency and waste. Is that not about the sum and substance of it?

Mr. BOLLING. The gentleman is welcome to his own opinion, and I think much of what he has said has a great deal of weight.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, this morning Secretary of Defense Wilson appeared before our Committee on Armed Services and presented to us one of the clearest and most informative statements with respect to our national defense policies and programs it has been my privilege to hear since I have been a member of that great committee.

The able chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services [Mr. VINSON] responded with a most penetrating summary of the Secretary's remarks, commending him on his forthright presentation of the situation and assuring him of our concurrence in the objective.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that those remarks be included in the RECORD at this point, although they may exceed the cost allowed. Due to the importance of this testimony before the committee this morning, and that it come to the attention of as many as possible, I ask this unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE CHARLES E. WILSON BEFORE THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE JANUARY 26, 1955

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am glad to have this opportunity to appear before your committee, together with Admiral Radford, and to discuss with you some of the principles which guided us in the Department of Defense in the development of the military programs for fiscal year 1956 and to discuss with you the force levels which we believe the United States should maintain.

I have divided my statement into several parts and would like to take up first some of the legislative programs which we are proposing and the reasons supporting them; second, a brief review of the international situation as it affects our military programs; third, the military policies we have adopted to deal with the situation as we see it; and fourth, the military programs we have developed to carry out these policies.

The fundamental concepts on which our military program is based are set forth in a letter from President Eisenhower dated January 5, 1955, in which he outlined to me his views on the various problems relating to the armed services, particularly in regard to the conservation and proper utilization of manpower. With the committee's permission I would like to place this letter in the record together with my letter to the President of January 3, 1955.

Admiral Radford, as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, is here with me today and is prepared to discuss the military aspects of the international situation and our policies and programs. Where security considerations are involved we will ask the committee's permission to discuss those matters with you in executive session.

THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

The Department of Defense has developed and is recommending to the Congress a coordinated legislative program which we feel will do much to improve our military position and enable us to make more effective use of the funds which the people of the United States through the Congress make available to us, as well as make more effective use of the manpower, both civilian and military working in our Defense Establishment.

On January 13 the President forwarded to the Congress a message outlining the administration's recommendations in regard to the extension of the Selective Service Act for a period of 4 years. He also recommended in that same message the extension of the provision authorizing the registration and induction of doctors and dentists for a period of 2 years and most importantly he recommended the strengthening of our Reserve forces to meet essential mobilization requirements.

The President also in a special message to Congress on January 13 made recommendations in regard to the career incentive program of the Department of Defense to provide for an increase in compensation of military service personnel on a selective basis. In this same message he recommended, also on a selective basis, increases in hazardous duty pay for our military personnel. This same program includes recommendations in regard to a reassignment allowance in connection with a permanent change of station for military personnel with dependents, an

increase in the per diem allowance for temporary duty travel; more housing for service families in areas where present facilities are insufficient; authority for fair rentals where servicemen and their families must live temporarily in substandard housing; the removal of existing inequities in the provision of medical care for our military families; and the equalization of survivor benefits for military personnel.

In his budget message of January 17 the President outlined the military programs of the Department of Defense and his recommendations as to the funds required to support those programs.

The Department of Defense will also shortly recommend to the Congress its program for military public works and military family housing for the next year.

These measures constitute the more important legislation which the Department of Defense will ask your committee, the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committees of both Houses to consider during the current session of the Congress. We believe that these recommendations are vitally important to the welfare of our military people and therefore to the security of our country.

I urge the prompt consideration and early enactment of the measures to which I have referred, and members of the Department of Defense and the military departments will be glad to appear before your committee at any time to give you a full and careful explanation of our recommendations and the reasoning back of them.

In this particular hearing I would like to comment briefly upon two of the legislative programs. The first of these is our recommendations in regard to an improved national Reserve plan. We believe that this plan will do much to correct our present inadequate Reserve situation. In its preparation we have carefully considered the views of many interested groups and of all interested agencies of the Government so that we could present to you the best plans possible in view of the problems that must be met. Specifically, the national Reserve plan provides for the following:

(a) Continuation of present manpower procurement procedures including induction and the minimum 8-year obligation for service in the active and Reserve forces.

(b) Modification of the present Reserve structure to produce a Ready Reserve that is in fact organized and well trained.

(c) Establishment of a new 6-month training program as a means of direct entry into the Reserve, including the National Guard, to meet valid military requirements, to be used to the extent deemed necessary by the President.

(d) Measures which will encourage and require better participation in Reserve training.

(e) Screening processes to insure suitable allocation of skilled manpower to both military and civilian requirements in an emergency.

(f) Authorization of State militia to be used for missions within the State in cases when the National Guard is being employed to meet emergency needs for the Federal Government.

(g) Equity of military obligation to the greatest extent feasible under conditions prevailing at this time.

The second, upon which I would like to comment, is the proposed Military Career Incentive Act. We are keenly aware of the importance of attracting and retaining in the armed services the required numbers of career personnel both in the officer and enlisted grades. Our objective is to maintain a sound Military Establishment ready at any time for whatever is required of it in defense of our vital interests. This readiness is dependent upon the technical skills and military leadership of our military personnel which can only be achieved after long and constant training. The integration into our Military Establishment of an increasing number of newer and more modern weapons is rapidly raising the level of technical skill and experience required of our military personnel. Experience has shown that we cannot maintain on a voluntary basis the total number of military personnel that are required for the foreseeable future. It is most important that we have a high level of long-term personnel within the Military Establishment. We must also have the authority to draft any required additional personnel on a short-term basis. We are not able, at the present time, to retain sufficient numbers of career personnel. This situation makes it mandatory that we bring their compensation and benefits more in line with that which men of equivalent experience, ability, and responsibility receive in civilian life. Many of the things that were once considered additional benefits in the military services have now become common in industry. We feel it is imperative, if we are to attract and retain the type of personnel that we all know is necessary, that our career military personnel receive an appropriate increase in compensation, better housing, better medical care for their dependents, and are free from worry about the reduction of such things as commissary and post-exchange privileges.

THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION AS IT AFFECTS THE MILITARY PROGRAMS

During the past year we have made progress in our efforts to safeguard the peace. As the President pointed out in his state of the Union message, "Free nations of the world are collectively stronger than at any time in recent years." The security of the United States and the security of our allies are, in reality, one and the same. This concept of collective security is reflected in our military arrangements around the world.

In the Far East we are strengthening our bonds with our allies through the pending Manila Pact which supplements our treaties with Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Korea, and Japan. The treaty with the Government of the Republic of China should also help to stabilize the situation in the Far East. Korea, the Republic of China, and Japan have made progress in the past year in developing and improving their military forces and we are continuing to assist them in their efforts. The current situation in the Western Pacific was dealt with by the President in his message to the Congress on January 24.

In the European area the forces of our NATO allies have continued to grow in strength and combat effectiveness, particularly in the case of support forces. While the numerical buildup of ground forces in Europe was substantially completed prior to 1953, and there are still some deficiencies in NATO forces, significant organizational and tactical improvements have been made, permitting greater mobility and increased firepower. In the past 2 years naval strength has increased importantly and available frontline combat aircraft increased almost 50 percent.

With the ratification of the recent Paris agreements, European unity we hope will move forward another step. There is now a real prospect of adding the strength of free Germany to the defense of Western Europe.

In the Near East, Pakistan and Turkey have made arrangements to consult with each other on problems of mutual defense. Other nations in that area are showing a growing interest in similar arrangements. The United States is supporting these collective defense efforts by assisting those countries in equipping and training their military forces.

In this hemisphere, the Caracas and Rio Conferences have demonstrated to the world the unity of the American States in strengthening their economic ties and resisting the inroads of imperialistic communism.

While there are no apparent indications that the Soviet Union intends to take action during the next few years that would deliberately precipitate another world conflict, we must always be alert to the possibility that such a conflict might arise through miscalculation on their part. There is no indication that the Communist leaders have given up their goal to dominate and communize the world, and we do not now believe that their strategy or opposition to our way of life has changed materially.

In the development of our military programs now and in the future we must reckon with the Communist capabilities as well as with their possible intentions. Because their military power has continued to grow and now includes the ability to produce and deliver nuclear weapons, the United States for the first time in its history has reason to be deeply concerned over the serious effects which a sudden attack could conceivably inflict upon us.

At the same time we consider the Soviet capabilities from a military viewpoint we must also consider their capabilities in the fields of subversion, propaganda, and economic warfare. While creeping Communist expansion is a threat to our national security it is not one that can be met by military means alone. We must be prepared to take action against subversion just as we must be prepared to meet the threat of military attack until such time as our efforts to achieve a just and lasting peace are successful. Because of the nature of the threat there is no way to predict a date of maximum danger. We must, therefore, be prepared for an indefinite period of years.

It is the long-term nature of the existing threats to our national security that emphasizes the importance of a vigorous healthy economy. Economic strength is a basic prerequisite of military strength.

MILITARY POLICIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The President, the National Security Council, and the Department of Defense, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the military departments, have given a great deal of earnest consideration and study to the problem of developing sound military policies which will best serve the Nation for the years ahead. As a Nation we reject the concept of preventive war. However, a sudden nuclear attack aimed at our population, industrial, and military centers could be a threat to our survival as a nation. Therefore, our primary objective must be to maintain the capability, first to deter an enemy from such an attack; and second, to blunt any such attack if it comes. Both purposes require a combination of effective retaliatory power and a continental defense system of steadily increasing effectiveness. These two tasks logically demand high priority in our security planning.

There are additional military tasks, essential to ultimate victory, should general war be thrust upon us, which we must be capable of performing. The sea lanes would have to be cleared and protected to enable us to support our forces overseas and those of our allies. We must be in a position to deal with critical land situations as they arise and we recognize that the problem of maintaining order and organization under the conditions that might prevail in the major cities of our country could of itself constitute a major challenge.

To provide for meeting lesser hostile action such as local aggression, we must rely primarily on the collective defenses of the free world now in existence and being strengthened in many areas. However, because indigenous forces do not provide a complete defense in themselves, and because our own vital interests and pledged faith might be involved, the United States should

be ready to provide timely assistance in certain situations to cope with local aggression.

We must also have ready reserve forces, an adequate mobilization base, appropriate reserves of ammunition and other equipment, and stockpiles of critical materials to meet the needs of an all-out war if such a situation should be forced upon us. This is the kind of defense structure that we must build and maintain to deal with the situation we face in the world today. At the same time we must carefully consider the force levels, composition, and the organization of our armed services. The services must be so organized as to permit the maximum utilization of our scientific, technological, and production abilities. In addition to the maximum utilization of modern technology we must plan and organize our forces so as to get maximum combat strength and at the same time minimize the number of men required on full time active duty. To retain excessive numbers of men on active duty not only increases the cost to the country but at the same time it decreases our ability to support the Military Establishment by removing manpower from more productive civil pursuits.

The lack of reasonable stability in our military programs is a most wasteful and expensive practice. We cannot afford to revert to the feast or famine pattern of our past history, not just because of the effect upon our economy but primarily because we cannot take the military risks involved in such a policy. Development of a sound, long-term security requires that we design our forces so as to assure a steadily increasing efficiency, in step with scientific advances, but characterized by a stability that is not materially disturbed by every propaganda effort of unfriendly nation, or wishful thinking on the part of ourselves or our Allies.

We believe that efficiency and economy in the operation and management of the Defense Establishment is essential to the national security. We must have quality as well as quantity and only in this way can we get the maximum defense per dollar spent. A potential source of future savings and increased efficiency, for example, lies in our ability to level off our training costs once we are able to stabilize our forces by attracting and holding the highest type of personnel both in our military and civilian positions.

MILITARY PROGRAMS

These are the military policies which guided the development of the fiscal year 1956 military program. We believe we have planned a well-balanced program of both offensive and defensive forces and one which fits into the overall pattern of collective allied strength. Certain of our forces, however, are specifically designed for continental defense and these are the forces I would first like to discuss.

The United States has been building a continental air defense system for several years. This is a massive undertaking, involving great cost and effort, not only in the far north country but in its seaward extensions.

The major elements of this system are (1) the warning net, on the land, on the sea, and in the air, employing both electronic means such as radar and the eyes and ears of hundreds of thousands of our private citizens in the Ground Observer Corps manning 13,000 posts throughout the country; (2) the weapons systems, including manned interceptor aircraft, antiaircraft artillery, and guided missiles; and (3) the communication and control system, the essential link between the warning net and the weapons systems.

While continental air defense is the primary responsibility of the Air Force, the continental defense system is a joint undertaking of all the services, including the participation of selected elements of the reserve forces of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The Air Force and its reserve components, for example, provide the land warning net, the Texas towers, the close-in airborne early warning aircraft, and the manned interceptor forces. The Army, assisted by the National Guard, provides the antiaircraft artillery and NIKE guided missile units. The Navy furnishes the seaborne early warning facilities, namely the picket ships, the distant airborne early warning aircraft, harbor defense, and submarine surveillance.

In addition, each of the services in time of emergency will contribute such aircraft, radar facilities, and the antiaircraft artillery forces as may be available in its active forces and Reserve components. The Air Force, for example, would provide all available tactical and training aircraft in the continental United States and the bulk of the Air Force reserve forces would be committed to this mission for a period of time. The Army would contribute such National Guard antiaircraft resources and such other antiaircraft units of the active forces as may be available in the continental United States. The Navy and Marine Corps would contribute such aircraft, both land and ship based, as may be available and useful at the time of emergency.

The problem of coordinating this vast aggregrate of forces is indeed a big one. For this reason we have recently established the new Continental Air Defense Command with headquarters at Colorado Springs, which is responsible for the control of the combat elements and coordination of the early warning systems.

The continental air defense program is being pushed with all practical speed. It is important to understand that the kind of equipment needed in this program is subject to rapid obsolescence due to the high rate of technological advance in this field. The improvement of the system is geared to the availability of suitable equipment and to the capacity of our forces to use this equipment.

Considerable progress has been made in the implementation of comprehensive plans for aircraft control and warning and submarine detection, as well as in measures for the destruction of hostile aircraft and submarines. The aircraft control and warning network will encompass (1) the present continental United States permanent radar network, which is undergoing substantial augmentation; (2) the southern Canadian pinetree radar network, which is virtually completed; (3) an early warning line across middle Canada; and (4) the distant early warning line across the most northerly practicable part of North America.

The Canadian Government is making an invaluable contribution to the air defense of the North American Continent. The Canadian forces not only participate in the warning net but also provide a number of interceptor squadrons for this mutual effort. Important agreements in relation to the financing, equipping, and operation of the mid-Canada and the distant early warning lines have recently been negotiated with Canada and we have no important matters remaining to be settled in this regard. They are contributing a full share in the planning, operation, and financing of this important undertaking.

The continental United States radar network is being extended seaward from both coasts by radar-equipped aircraft, radar picket vessels, and large radar in so-called Texas towers being installed on strategically situated shoals off our coasts. The mid-Canada line will be extended seaward by the use of airborne early warning aircraft and radar picket ships. A limited number of aircraft and radar picket ships have already begun operations and construction of the first Texas tower will begin soon. Equipment is being procured to convert the continental defense net to a new semiautomatic system to improve communications, data processing, and weapons control.

Our expanding active Air Force fighter interceptor squadrons are 100 percent equipped with modern jet fighters. Improved firepower in these interceptor forces is being achieved by the introduction of high performance air-to-air rockets and Falcon and Sparrow guided missiles will soon give our interceptors increased kill effectiveness.

Antiaircraft defenses around many of our critical targets are being strengthened by the installation of the Army's NIKE surface-to-air guided missile. We are encouraged by the number of Nike batteries now ready to engage hostile aircraft should the need arise. Improved surface-to-air guided missiles are expected to be available in the future.

A comprehensive and vigorous research and development effort is directed toward the future air defense system which will encompass radars of increased range and height finding capability; high performance long-range, medium-range, and short-range piloted and pilotless interceptors; more versatile surface-to-air guided missiles; improved devices for submarine detection; and nuclear weapons applications to continental defense.

While our air defense system is already formidable, we must devote our efforts to a steadily improving air defense system phased to cope with growing Soviet capabilities and make maximum feasible use of new weapons and techniques as quickly as they are developed. We must recognize that in a very real sense all forces included in our military programs contribute in some measure to continental defense: offensive forces by their deterring effect and overseas-based forces plus our allies by posing both material and psychological obstacles to any potential enemy operations.

I would now like to discuss our retaliatory capabilities. We have provided in our military program very powerful retaliatory forces in the Strategic Air Command of the Air Force. In addition, a great retaliatory capability exists in the carrier striking forces of the Navy, and in the tactical air units of the Air Force and the Marine Corps. Our policy calls for flexibility and versatility in the employment of existing forces. We are prepared to use our total resources in the most effective manner appropriate to the particular situation.

The buildup of the Strategic Air Command of the Air Force is continuing. This part of our retaliatory force will increase in numbers, but more importantly in quality as the remaining reciprocating engine bombers are replaced by modern jet aircraft. The B–36, long the mainstay of the long-range strategic forces, will be replaced by the B–52, the new long-range jet bomber. The long-range strategic fighter units in the Strategic Air Command forces are scheduled to be reequipped with supersonic fighters possessing a nuclear capability. These forces are being maintained in a high degree of readiness. Some of these forces are capable of operating directly from the continental United States; all are capable of operating from bases scattered around the globe. Local air defense for bases in areas outside the continental air defense system is being improved.

The carrier striking forces will be augmented by 1 additional carrier and 1 carrier air group this year. More importantly, both the carriers and the aircraft are being rapidly modernized, the carriers both through the conversion of existing carriers and the construction of new carriers, and the aircraft through the replacement of old models with the new aircraft now in production.

I am sure you are all familiar with the new Forrestal class carriers, the first of which was launched about a month ago. These new carriers, as well as other carriers that are being modernized, will be equipped with newly developed aircraft with improved nuclear capabilities, such as the A3D and A4D,

and very high speed fighters such as F9F9, FJ4 and F3H. Our carrier-based airpower increases the flexibility and dispersion of our retaliatory power.

The Army has also improved its nuclear capabilities. Atomic artillery and Honest John unguided rockets, both capable of delivering atomic warheads, are now included in Army units in the Continental United States and overseas.

The capability of our retaliatory force is dependent upon its quality as well as its size. The tremendous destructive power of nuclear weapons has put a premium on certainty of delivery. A single aircraft may now accomplish what would have required thousands of aircraft during World War II. Consequently, the quality of our retaliatory force is now becoming increasingly more important than its size. We feel fully confident that the retaliatory forces provided in our program are equal to the tasks they must perform.

A portion of our ground forces, amphibious forces, and tactical air forces must be deployed in line with our international commitments and strategic needs. However, from the viewpoint of collective defense of the free world, it is essential to hold these deployed forces to the minimum and to concentrate, principally in the United States, the balance of our forces in a strategic reserve available for use wherever they may be required.

We recognize both the possible needs for timely reinforcement of United States forces overseas as well as the practical considerations limiting the rapid deployment of large military forces from the continental United States immediately on the outbreak of war. Thus, we must achieve a proper balance between the size of our active forces and the size of our Ready Reserve forces. We must develop reserve forces adequate in size and combat effectiveness to sustain and augment the active forces of all services in a timely manner in the event of an all-out war. The new legislation requested by the President earlier this month will provide the foundation for rebuilding, strengthening and improving the readiness of the civilian components of our Armed Forces to meet today's requirements for rapid mobilization.

An essential task during the initial period, in the event of global war, will be to clear and keep open the sea lanes that tie us to our allies. Our military programs provide the forces to deal with potential enemy naval forces; to seize and defend advance naval bases; to conduct antisubmarine warfare and to carry out the minesweeping, minelaying, and harbor defense missions of the Navy.

As we all recognize, global war is not the only threat to our national security. Our forces must also be prepared to cope with lesser hostile actions. Within the framework of collective defense of the free world we must place growing reliance on the forces of the other free nations of the world. We will continue to assist in the equipping and training of these forces. We must recognize, however, that there may be places where local forces cannot by themselves cope with aggression directed against them. We must be prepared, in line with our collective security responsibilities, to come rapidly and effectively to their assistance.

The forces and manning levels which are proposed in the President's budget for fiscal year 1956 are based on the concepts and policies I have just outlined. I would now like to summarize these force objectives in terms of the individual services.

At the end of December the Army had an active duty strength of about 1,300,000 men, and was supporting major combat elements consisting of 19 divisions, 12 regiments, and 117 antiaircraft battalions. Under the budget program for fiscal year 1956, approved by the President, the Army will reduce its active-duty strength to approximately 1,027,000 men by June 30, 1956, and will be supporting 13 mobile divisions, 11 regiments, and 136 antiaircraft battalions. In addition, the Army will have 2 divisions termed "static" divisions, indicating that their mission is fixed and that not all troops will be stationed in 1 area and 3 additional training divisions which will be organized to enable the Army to carry out its divisional rotation program announced by the Army early last year.

The Army is actively studying the changes in organization and doctrine required to gear its force structure, organization, and equipment to present and projected changes in weapons technology. Tests have been going on for some time at Fort Benning and Fort Hood, and more extensive tests on the divisional level will be held to study these new formations and concepts under simulated conditions of atomic war. The force structure beyond June 1956 may begin to reflect the results of these tests. While it is premature to draw definite conclusions at this time, it would appear that in the future the Army may be organized into a larger number of smaller, but more mobile and self-contained units of great firepower.

The Navy program for fiscal year 1956 will provide for the operation of over 1,000 active ships, including 405 warships. Active duty military strength will be gradually reduced from 687,000 at the end of December to approximately 664,000 by June 30, 1956. The number of carrier air groups will be increased from the present 16 to 17, and an additional attack carrier equipped with modern aircraft will be added to the fleet. The program will continue to maintain 15 antisubmarine warfare squadrons.

The Marine Corps will reduce its active duty strength from 221,000 at the end of December to approximately 193,000 by June 30, 1956, but will continue to maintain 3 combat-ready divisions and 3 airwings and essential supporting elements. At the same time certain redeployments of Marine Corps forces now in progress will increase their effectiveness and readiness for emergency employment.

The Navy will continue to maintain an active aircraft inventory of 13,000 planes, of which 10,000 will be operating aircraft in Naval, Marine, and their Air Reserve units. In addition to conversion and modernization of older types, a significant number of new ships will be added to the fleet during the current and succeeding fiscal year. The fiscal year 1956 budget provides over $1.3 billion for the construction of new-type ships and the modernization of older types.

The Air Force will continue its build-up toward the 137-wing goal and the 975,000 manpower target established over a year ago. The objective for June 30, 1956, is now 131 wings—4 more combat wings than the Air Force planned 1 year ago. The Chief of Staff of the Air Force advised me of this most recent change during the preparation of this statement. The active aircraft inventory of the Air Force will increase to over 23,000 by June 30, 1956, and will continue to increase in fiscal year 1957. Continuing modernization of the inventory is being accomplished simultaneously, and by June 30, 1956, the combat units of the Air Force will be almost 100 percent jet equipped. Over $6 billion in new appropriations are requested in the 1956 budget for Air Force aircraft and guided missiles. Another substantial increment of military construction funds will be requested early this spring to push forward the construction of airbases and other military installations required by the expanding Air Force program.

It is apparent from what I have said that science and technology are playing an important role in our military planning. The effectiveness of a military research and development program cannot be measured solely in terms of the number of dollars we expend for this purpose. I am confident that the present level of Department of Defense research and development expenditures is just about right. It is important to maintain stability in the overall level of expenditures in this field in order to facilitate sound planning. Our principal problem is to apportion our efforts in such a way as to produce the greatest possible amount of usable research and development. Our fiscal year 1956 program lays particular stress on the utilization of nuclear energy in military operations. The U. S. S. *Nautilus* put to sea on January 17 and its performance has exceeded expectations. This event is typical of what research and development can do, and opens up an entire new field of propulsion, not only for ships, but eventually for aircraft. Our program also emphasizes new equipment and techniques required to provide the mobility needed to meet the changed requirements of nuclear warfare and the development of operational guided missiles to meet the urgent requirements of our air defense and retaliatory forces.

Long-range studies by the Department of Defense have been made to determine the best balanced and the most effective use and deployment of our Armed Forces. Our analysis of this problem included an examination of (a) strategic concepts and implementing plans, (b) roles and missions of the services, (c) composition and readiness of our forces, (d) development of new weapons and weapons systems and the resulting new advances in military techniques, and (e) our military assistance programs. We are continuing to eliminate any overlapping of operations or administration and at all times have in mind the development of our forces on an economical basis.

At all times we have kept in mind the necessity for providing forces which are adequate for our Nation's security and have attempted to the best of our ability to determine the size of these forces in the light of (1) the need to maintain these forces in a qualitatively improved state of readiness, (2) the importance of assisting our allies in their own military security programs, (3) the necessity for an adequate defense of the continental United States within our integrated military programs, (4) the best utilization of the qualified manpower that can be made available, (5) the need for sustaining an adequate and stable military program over an indefinite number of years and as a consequence the feasible annual expenditures and new appropriations that can be made available for military programs within the framework of a growing economy.

We concluded that in certain areas the United States forces were not deployed to the best advantage of this country and the free world and that for their best utilization in the event of major war or of local aggression certain redeployments were both desirable and necessary. Through this effort we have attempted to develop a force structure which can be maintained, once it is stabilized, in a qualitatively improved State of readiness for an indefinite period of time. We feel that this military program will furnish a sound base for mobilization in the event of a general emergency, enable us to maintain ready forces to perform essential tasks in the initial phases of a general war, and enable the United States promptly to supplement the indigenous forces of our allies in the event of aggression short of general war.

We believe that the United States is approaching such a force and that the program as outlined in the budget for fiscal year 1956 represents the general order of magnitude of the size forces that this country can effectively maintain, can improve on a qualitative basis and that the economy of the country can continue to support.

We recognize that improvements in organization and in weapons may make possible certain small savings and adjustments but that our overall strength in the active forces will need to be held to this general level for the next several years. As our re-

serve structures and organizations improve it may be possible at a future date that their contribution will permit further minor adjustments in the active force levels.

In arriving at the conclusions set forth above the Joint Chiefs of Staff and all of the military services have been consulted at frequent intervals. Their views, while not in all cases unanimous, have been considered by the National Security Council and the President. The total personnel strength of the active forces and the target end strength for each service for June 30, 1956, have resulted from these reviews. I believe that it is fair to add that the Air Force feels that our defense program is a good one. The Navy and the Marine Corps have some minor reservations, and would perhaps like a few additional personnel. The Army from its point of view would still recommend some higher strength for the active forces of the Army. In my own opinion the program we have adopted is a sound one. Admiral Radford is here to give you his opinion in regard to these matters, and I understand that the Secretaries and Chiefs of each Service will also appear before your Committee.

In working out this program we have been fully conscious of the impact that any reductions in our deployments abroad or in the strength of our total military forces might have upon our Allies and have considered our plans carefully with due regard to the improved strength which they themselves are able to maintain, in many cases with our aid. None of the redeployments which we have made, nor the adjustments in our personnel strengths, should be considered as indicating any lessening of our determination to defend those areas vital to the securities interests of this country and the free world.

In connection with the current problem in the Pacific and in particular the Formosa Straits, President Eisenhower said, "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy. Consequently my recommendations do not call for an increase in the Armed Forces of the United States or any acceleration in military procurement or levels of defense production. If any unforeseen emergency arises requiring any change, I will communicate with the Congress. I hope, however, that the effect of an appropriate congressional resolution will be to calm the situation rather than to create further conflict."

The forces envisaged in the long-range program of the Department of Defense constitutes by far the largest Military Establishment that this country has ever undertaken to maintain for an indefinite period of time. With the incorporation into our Military Establishment of the new weapons that we have developed, they constitute a force of tremendous striking power. The maintenance of these forces and their qualitative improvement will require expenditures over an indefinite period of years of many billions of dollars.

I cannot at this time foresee any important reduction in the Military Establishment nor in the total annual military expenditures of the Department of Defense below the present levels, nor do I see any need for any important increases short of war.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, January 3, 1955.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: For nearly 2 years we have discussed the various problems relating to the armed services and in particular the need for the conservation and proper utilization of our manpower, both military and civilian. Just before Christmas you again discussed the question of personnel strengths with me and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I have found so much value in the views underlying your decisions as to the personnel strengths of the armed services that I wonder if you would give me the gist of them in written form. I should like very much to have them available during the next year to guide me in my consideration of those matters and to be able to make them available to all of the interested people who are considering this problem.

With great respect, I am
Faithfully yours,

C. E. WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 5, 1955.

The Honorable CHARLES E. WILSON,
The Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Responding to your request I shall, in this note, briefly summarize the views on our general needs in military strength, including personnel, that I expressed verbally to you and the Joint Chiefs of Staff in December. Needless to say, these convictions on how best to preserve the peace were formed after earnest consideration of the oral and written views of our military advisers.

In approaching this problem, we should keep ever before us the realization that the security of the United States is inextricably bound up with the security of the free world. For this reason, one of our tasks is to do everything possible to promote unity of understanding and action among the free nations so that each may take its full and proper part in the cooperative process of establishing a lasting and effective security.

Certain considerations, applying more specifically to our own country's military preparations, are these:

First, the threat to our security is a continuing and manysided one—there is, so far as we can determine, no single critical danger date and so single form of enemy action to which we could soundly gear all our defense preparations. We will never commit aggression, but we must always be ready to defeat it.

Second, true security for our country must be founded on a strong and expanding economy, readily convertible to the tasks of war.

Third, because scientific progress exerts a constantly increasing influence upon the character and conduct of war, and because America's most precious possession is the lives of her citizens, we should base our security upon military formations which make maximum use of science and technology in order to minimize numbers in men.

Fourth, due to the destructiveness of modern weapons and the increasing efficiency of long-range bombing aircraft, the United States has reason, for the first time in its history, to be deeply concerned over the serious effects which a sudden attack could conceivably inflict upon our country.

Our first objective must therefore be to maintain the capability to deter an enemy from attack and to blunt that attack if it comes—by a combination of effective retaliatory power and a continental defense system of steadily increasing effectiveness. These two tasks logically demand priority in all planning. Thus we will assure that our industrial capacity can continue throughout a war to produce the gigantic amounts of equipment and supplies required.

We can never be defeated so long as our relative superiority in productive capacity is sustained.

Other essential tasks during the initial period following a possible future attack would require the Navy to clear the ocean lanes, and the Army to do its part in meeting critical land situations. Our forces in NATO and elsewhere could be swiftly engaged. To maintain order and organization under the conditions that would prevail in attacked areas of our country would of itself constitute a major challenge. Improved Reserve programs would help greatly—in fact might prove the decisive margin—in these as in other major tasks.

To provide for meeting lesser hostile action—such as local aggression not broadened by the intervention of a major aggressor's forces—growing reliance can be placed upon the forces now being built and strengthened in many areas of the free world. But because this reliance cannot be complete, and because our own vital interests, collective security and pledged faith might well be involved, there remain certain contingencies for which the United States should be ready with mobile forces to help indigenous troops deter local aggression, direct or indirect.

In view of the practical considerations limiting the rapid deployment of large military forces from the continental United States immediately on outbreak of war, the numbers of active troops maintained for this purpose can be correspondingly tailored. For the remainder we may look primarily to our Reserves and our mobilization base, including our stockpile of critical materials.

All these capabilities have a double value—they serve our aim in peacetime of preventing war through their deterrent effect; they form the foundation of effective defense if aggressors should strike.

Both in composition and in strength our security arrangements must have long-term applicability. Lack of reasonable stability is the most wasteful and expensive practice in military activity. We cannot afford intermittent acceleration of preparation and expenditure in response to emotional tension, inevitably followed by cutbacks inspired by wishful thinking. Development of sound, long-term security requires that we design our forces so as to assure a steadily increasing efficiency, in step with scientific advances, but characterized by a stability that is not materially disturbed by every propaganda effort of unfriendly nations.

It is, of course, obvious that defensive forces in America are maintained to defend a way of life. They must be adequate for this purpose but must not become such an intolerable burden as to occasion loss of civilian morale or the individual initiative on which, in a free country, depends the dynamic industrial effort which is the continuing foundation of our Nation's security.

It is at this point that professional military competence and political statesmanship must join to form judgments as to the minimum defensive structure that should be supported by the Nation. To do less than the minimum would expose the Nation to the predatory purposes of potential enemies. On the other hand, to build excessively under the impulse of fear could, in the long run, defeat our purposes by damaging the growth of our economy and eventually forcing it into regimented controls.

It is for the reasons so briefly touched upon above that I have decided to present to the Congress, on behalf of the administration, a program which has been under development during the past 2 years. That program contemplates an active personnel strength of the Armed Forces at June 30, 1955, of approximately 3 million, within which the Air Force will be increased to about 975,000.

Experience will determine to what extent the personnel strengths set for June 1955 can be further reduced. It would not be wise at this time to fix rigid targets for 1956. As a goal, I suggest a strength of the order of 2,850,000, with any further material reductions dependent upon an improved world situation. To reach such figures without injuring our combat strength will require continuing close scrutiny of all defense elements, with particular emphasis on administrative overhead.

Essential to this entire program is economy in operation. If we are to support active and effective forces of the order indicated over a period which may last for decades, we must practice a strict austerity in day-to-day operations. This is an insistent

and constant mission of every responsible official, military and civilian, in the Defense Department.

In this time of rapidly developing technology and frequent changes in the world situation, we should in our efforts for peace and security continuously reshape our programs to changing conditions and avoid fixed or frozen ideas. The threat of modern war calls for constant modernization.

Since your request to me and this reply both deal with matters on which our citizenry ought to be as fully informed as considerations of security permit, I am directing the public release of the two documents.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

REMARKS OF HON. CARL VINSON, OF GEORGIA

Mr. Secretary, I want to commend you on an outstanding statement. I've been here a long time and I have heard many résumés on world situations, and defense needs, but I believe your statement is the most comprehensive and the most forthright one I have ever heard. Your reasoning is sound and your candor is highly commendable. I hope that the American people and the world will take full cognizance of your remarks.

Now I would like to comment more specifically on what you have said. First, I would like to assure you of my complete and early cooperation in the legislative program that you have outlined. I find myself in general accord with everything that you have recommended where legislative action is necessary. I'm confident the full committee is in complete agreement with your objectives.

Now, Mr. Secretary, it is a rare thing for us to adopt a bill just as it is sent over from the Department. We will have a few t's to cross and a few i's to dot, and I wouldn't be surprised if we added a few amendments. In fact, in some cases the similarity between the original bill and the finished product may not be readily apparent, but I can assure you that as far as I am concerned, the ultimate objective will be the same.

It seems to me that our whole problem of national defense is well stated in your comment which I would like to quote:

"While there is no apparent indication that the Soviet Union intends to take action during the next few years that would deliberately precipitate another world conflict, we must always be alert to the possibility that such a conflict might arise through miscalculation on their part. There is no indication that the Communist leaders have given up their goal to dominate and communize the world, and we do not now believe that their strategy or opposition to our way of life has changed materially."

In other words, Mr. Secretary, the goal of communism is world domination; and knowing what the Communist goal is, this Nation has no choice but to maintain a strong armed force that must be able, as you have so clearly stated, to cope with local aggression and to deter the Communists in their objective of complete world control. We know the Communist objective, and therefore we know what our Armed Forces must be capable of doing.

So I want to congratulate you most heartily for your comment and position on a matter that has bothered me for many years. I am referring to the stability of our Armed Forces. In your statement you have said: "The lack of reasonable stability in our military programs is a most wasteful and expensive practice. We cannot afford to revert to the 'feast or famine' pattern of our past history, not just because of the effect upon our economy, but primarily because we cannot take the military risks involved in such a policy. Development of a sound, long-term security requires that we design our forces so as to assure a steadily increasing efficiency, in step with scientific advances, but characterized by a stability that is not materially disturbed by every propaganda effort of unfriendly nations, or wishful thinking on the part of ourselves or our allies."

You have used the expression "feast or famine"; I have often used the expression "peaks and valleys"; but we are in complete accord on this fundamental philosophy of a proper defense structure. You are to be commended, Mr. Secretary, for setting forth as a national policy, stability in our Armed Forces. From what you have said in your statement, and from what you have said about the Communist objective, it is imperative from here on out that the country and the world know that the floor on the size of our Armed Forces will be 2,850,000 men at an annual cost of approximately $34 billion. The security of the Nation will not permit us to go below those figures.

You have said that we have a goal of 137 wings for our Air Force; you have said that our Army will be maintained at a floor of 1,027,000 men; you have said that our Marine Corps will have 3 combat-ready divisions, and 3 combat-ready air wings, in a combined Marine Corps strength of not less than 193,000 men. You have said that our Navy will not go below a strength of 664,000 men, operating over 1,000 ships, including 405 warships.

And you have made the most significant statement of all when you stated that you cannot forecast any important reduction in the Military Establishment, nor in the total military expenditures in the Department of Defense below the present levels; on the other hand, neither can you see any need for any important increase short of war. This is the stability that the Nation must have. This will permit planning, orderly procurement, efficient operation, and will give us, as you have stated, a force sufficient to cope with local aggression; a force capable of rapid expansion in time of war, and a force which will, we hope, deter Communist efforts to dominate the world.

Mr. Secretary, to me the stability of force which you are seeking to bring about is the most important single policy that this Nation can adopt with respect to our Armed Forces. The effect of such a policy will let the world know where we stand, and the world will know that for an indefinite period of time, with world conditions as they are, such a force will be maintained.

Mr. Secretary, there are many other parts of your fine statement which are significant and should be reemphasized. For example, you state that "the security of the United States and the security of our allies are in reality one and the same." I find myself in complete accord with that statement. What you have said is that a military aid program for our allies is an aid program for ourselves.

We cannot look upon a military aid program for our allies as something separate and detached from our own national security.

I am glad you have discussed our retaliatory capabilities. The world should know, as you have stated:

"We are prepared to use our total resources in the most effective manner appropriate to the particular situation."

You have indicated that we must be ready to provide timely assistance in certain situations to cope with aggression. The world today is, of course, fully conscious of the situation now prevailing in the Formosan area; but Formosa is simply one more reason why we must maintain a stable, large, rapidly expandible forces for the indefinite future. The Formosa of today may become another place tomorrow. And we must be able to cope with these situations. And we certainly are not going to let a temporary cessation in the Soviet's insatiable drive for further conquest lull us into a dangerous slumber characterized by reduced expenditures for our Armed Forces and a decrease in the size of our Armed Forces. We are embarked upon the ship of stability, irrespective of the weather.

I am glad that you have noted that our carrier striking forces will be augmented by 1 additional carrier, and 1 carrier air group this year. And in that connection I want to say that I am glad to note that the budget contains funds for the construction of a new carrier capable of carrying modern aircraft that can deliver our most modern weapons.

The committee, Mr. Secretary, appreciates your very forthright discussion on the present size of our Armed Forces, their planned strengths for fiscal 1956, and your determination to stabilize these forces.

I appreciate, too, your comment concerning the military structure of the Army. Congress, of course, should not concern itself with military organization as such, so whether you have combat divisions, or regimental combat teams, is a matter for our military leaders to decide, but I am happy to note that this study is being conducted with a view toward proper defense and utilization of combat forces in the face of nuclear weapons.

I think that the country will be reassured with respect to the active aircraft inventory, and I know will be impressed that by June 30, 1956, the combat units of the Air Force will be almost 100 percent jet equipped.

I want to compliment you on your candid summary of the views of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps with respect to the planned military strength for fiscal 1956. You have indicated that the Air Force is happy; the Navy and Marine Corps would like a little less reduction; and the Army is not content with its reduction from 1,300,000 to 1,027,000 men. However, you have stated that you believe the program to be sound.

I am glad to see in your statement that none of the redeployments which have been made should be considered as indicating any lessening of our determination to defend areas where our combat units have been stationed. Your statement justifies these redeployments on the basis of increased strength of our allies, and I think our allies should be greatly strengthened in their confidence with the knowledge that our Armed Forces will stabilize at not less than 2,850,000 men for the indefinite future. They, along with the American people, should rejoice in the knowledge that the days of valleys and peaks, or feast and famine, are over. Their planning can now be coordinated with ours on the basis of stability.

Again, let me congratulate you for coming before this committee and the American people and presenting to all of us your military program, your assurance of stability, and your sound reasoning. This statement should do much to set aside the fears of many people that we were again headed for an era of false economy which inevitably is the forerunner of trouble and costly expenditures in men and money.

I repeat what I said at the beginning, your statement is the most forthright and comprehensive résumé of defense needs that I have been privileged to hear. The Nation is indeed fortunate that the Department of Defense has at its helm a man of your courage and capability.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may need.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Missouri previously explained, House Resolution 109, from the Committee on Rules, makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 2576, a bill by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] to extend the Reorganization Act for a 3-year period. Debate under the rule is limited to 1 hour.

I had introduced a measure similar to the Dawson bill, the only difference being that my bill would have extended the

power of the President to send reorganization plans to the Congress to April 1, 1957, or for 2 years, whereas the bill before us would extend it for 3 years, or until April 1, 1958.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman from Ohio introduced a resolution and then the gentleman from Illinois introduced a similar resolution, except that there was a difference of 1 year in the length of the extension.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Can the gentleman conceive any reason for the introduction of the second resolution, except to show that the majority was in favor of the legislation introduced by the gentleman from Ohio and were supporting the President?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think, of course, the introduction of the bill by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], not only shows that the majority favors the extension of the Reorganization Act and the granting of the powers to the President to send reorganization plans to Congress, but it also, I think, indicates that it is the view of the gentleman from Illinois that there should be a greater length of time provided in which the President can submit these reorganization plans.

This act has been in effect since 1949. Prior to that time, during the Roosevelt administration, powers were granted to the President to submit reorganization plans for their consideration and rejection. As partially explained a few moments ago, under the reorganization act we are just reversing the usual procedure. Usually, legislation is introduced in Congress to change a Government organizational setup and by affirmative vote of both branches of Congress enacted into law and thereby forces that reorganizational change. However, because of the difficulties had in reorganization matters in the past, the Congress has adopted the procedure of giving the President power to submit to the Congress reorganization plans for the consideration of both branches of the Congress with the understanding that unless one branch or the other, by a constitutional majority, should reject the reorganization plan it goes into effect within 60 days after it is filed; so instead of taking affirmative action, the Congress, under this plan, is required to take a negative action.

As many of you here on the floor of the House know, we have in the past debated rather thoroughly the question as to whether or not it should require a constitutional majority or a bare majority of a quorum to reject one of these reorganization plans. The Congress in its wisdom has established the precedent that in order to reject an organization plan, a constitutional majority would be required. Originally, as some of you may recall, I had rather strong and fixed convictions that it should require only a bare majority of a quorum to reject one of these plans; but inasmuch as the precedent has been established, inasmuch as the Congress has passed on this issue before, and we have operated under the system so long, I expect to support the present plan and the present arrangement whereby a constitutional majority would be required to reject a plan.

I think it is very important that we enact this bill into law as promptly as possible, because Congress established the second so-called Hoover Commission, and its recommendations will be presented to the Congress between now and May 31. The Commission will present a number of recommendations as to reorganization plans and other legislative action to bring about greater economy and efficiency in the Federal Government. The Commission will also submit its report to the President of the United States, and undoubtedly the President will take into consideration the recommendations of the Commission and submit reorganization plans to Congress as his wisdom may dictate. Inasmuch as the Commission's life does not expire until May 31, and many of these recommendations will not be submitted prior to that date, the President will not have a very long period of time in which to consider the recommendations of the Commission, and inasmuch as the Reorganization Act itself would expire on April 1 next it is absolutely necessary that his reorganizational powers be extended through this amendment to the Reorganization Act.

This is a nonpartisan matter. There is no partisanship in it. The bill was unanimously reported by our committee with one Member, I believe, reserving the right to oppose if he so desires on the floor of the House. The resolution from the Rules Committee and the bill itself were reported by the committee unanimously. The measure has the support, insofar as I can ascertain, of the leadership on both sides of the House. It has the support of the President of the United States. I hope that the rule and the bill will be approved by the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman think it wise to apply this negative vote procedure to other legislation coming before the Congress?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No; I do not. As I have said, I had my own convictions on the matter of a majority; however, I do feel strongly it is necessary to get many of these reorganization plans before the House. This has been the best method that has been devised throughout the years to bring these matters up. In most instances, certainly, the reorganizational plans have worked very well. I feel this bill should be passed.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman fearful this precedent that is now established will be used by other departments of the Government?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No. The Congress has complete control. That is why I think that the authority under the Reorganization Act or the life of it should be limited. That is the reason why in the bill I introduced I fixed the period at 2 years rather than 3 years as provided by this measure; however, I have no great objection to the 3-year period. I accept that as coming from the leadership on the other side of the aisle. I would rather have that than to have nothing because I think we have to put into effect some reorganization plans and we have to give to the President the authority to reshuffle, if you please, in an endeavor to get greater economy and efficiency in some of the agencies of his own branch of Government, providing, of course, the Congress has a veto power.

Mr. GROSS. But we do not have to rely upon a most unusual voting procedure in order to do that?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This is not an unusual voting procedure. It has been followed off and on for a great many years. Of course, it is needed at this time because the Congress by its own action has directed a Commission, which is an arm of the Congress, to bring in recommendations as to how the President should reorganize.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. Since the gentleman's measure asked for only a 2-year extension and the measure before us asks for 3 years, is it fair, because of the gentleman's position on the Hoover Commission, to infer that the administration was only asking for 2 years?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. In my discussion with the administration officials and with the White House, the 2-year arrangement was agreed upon, and that was the thought of the Commission, as I recall, and certainly the thought of the President and his advisers.

Mr. MEADER. Is the gentleman able to advise the House as to the time within which the recommendations of the Hoover Commission will be made? My particular interest is whether or not all of the reorganizations can be completed in this session and the next session of the Congress.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Well, I am very hopeful, of course, that the Commission can file with the Congress all of its recommendations and reports by May 31, which is the present expiration date of the life of the Commission.

Now, it is entirely possible that if there is any unseeming delay in the printing of these reports, they might come in a week or so after May 31. These recommendations will be submitted to the President as well as to the Congress. Now the Congress can act directly on these recommendations—and I want you to get this—the Congress can act directly and permanently on these recommendations by passing legislation, or the President can submit reorganization plans based on these recommendations. Either approach can be taken and followed. I doubt very much that either the President or the Congress could give a great deal of attention to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, or this whole matter of reorganization, between the time the Commission files its reports and the time this session, the first session of the 84th Congress, adjourns sometime next summer, which, I

might add, I hope will be early. That means, then, that most of the consideration that will have to be given to these recommendations would come in the second session of the 84th Congress.

Mr. MEADER. Would it be the gentleman's judgment that in the second session of the 84th Congress there would be full and ample opportunity for the Congress and the President to dispose of any recommendations made by the Hoover Commission that were meritorious?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Well, I, of course, cannot foresee the future. I do not know what the President may have on his mind or what problems may confront him in the period to which the gentleman alludes; neither do I know what problems the Congress may have before it or the particular committee which handles the reorganization plans. I feel that if the 2-year period should be voted it would at least give a fair opportunity, and perhaps would speed up the process a bit, to consider the legislation. However, a 2-year period may not be sufficient, and I recall that some of the recommendations of the first Hoover Commission were adopted a year and 2 years and even longer than that after the Commission made its report.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think it is fair to state that the reason for the 3-year extension was that some of us felt that after the 1956 election—projecting our minds ahead; no one can tell what the results will be. Of course, we Democrats are confident that a Democrat will be elected, but nobody can tell. We hope the country will return to normalcy in that respect. But, at any rate, no one can tell—and a new President coming in, if we extend it 2 years it will expire on June 30, 1956, and it was felt that extending it to June 30, 1957, would give an additional year. There was no objection. There was an appreciation of that fact by all members of the committee. With a matter of 5 years or something like that, it may be different, but we felt a 3-year extension would be the proper thing to do under the circumstances. The gentleman remembers that.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I agree fully with the gentleman's statement, and I would like to express my own personal opinion. While I thought the 2-year period was the right length of time in which to extend this act, I would rather have 3 years than 1 as an extension. I would rather err on giving too much time than not giving sufficient time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. Might I also say on the veto power that at one time there was a two-body veto required, you may remember.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. While it was a simple majority, nevertheless it required the veto of two bodies. The gentleman will remember the year the constitutional majority was put into the law that we passed a two-body veto.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I recall that; very much over my objections.

Mr. McCORMACK. When it went to the Senate it had a one-body veto. Out of the conference there came the constitutional majority. The reason for that was that it was appreciated, based on experience, that a one-body simple majority might defeat, with comparative ease, reorganization plans that were submitted. It was felt that on a reorganization plan there ought to be some reasonable assurances that a clear case had to be made before that reorganization plan was vetoed. That is the reason for the constitutional majority provision.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] will recall that in the debate and the discussion at the time to which he alludes, it was pointed out that for the President to overrule or veto an action of the House there was required a two-thirds vote. It was determined finally in the consultations which took place when the bill was in conference, that it would be only fair to give to the President, the Chief Executive, somewhat the same break that we expected from him on measures that we enacted. In other words, we felt that a constitutional majority to overrule a Presidential action in the reorganization of his own department was not too far out of line and was rather a fair procedure.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; the gentleman was a member of that conference, too, as I remember, as I was several years ago, out of which the constitutional majority provision came. But there is a history that justified it and justifies its continuance.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has been very, very helpful throughout the years in connection with the various endeavors to reorganize the Government.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I should like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] a question. I understood him, in his remarks, to say something to the effect—"when a new President came in." I should like to ask him what he means about a new President coming in. The gentleman wants this power to be continued for 3 years even if the present President remains President?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, whoever will be elected in 1956 will start his term in January 1957.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; but it would not necessarily be a new man or a new President. It could be the same President.

Mr. McCORMACK. On this side we confidently expect that it will be a new man. But in any event, it will be a new administration; let me put it that way.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I say that when I took the floor I was very hopeful that politics would not enter into this nonpartisan discussion.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, this is a most pleasant colloquy. The gentleman knows that we are not injecting politics, because if politics were injected, there is no one better able to defend the Republican position than the gentleman who has the floor, my dear friend, Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman very much. I should like to advise both the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] that a little later I shall look into my crystal ball and tell the gentlemen exactly what is going to happen politically in 1956.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I should like to ask the gentleman if he plans to offer an amendment in the committee to change the termination date to 1957.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No, I do not expect to offer that amendment because the committee, of which we are both members, acted on this and unanimously reported the bill. I am going to accept the committee's action.

Mr. JONAS. If the gentleman will yield further, may I just say that it occurs to me that, although it has not been mentioned in the debate here today and it was not alluded to in the discussion in the committee, it is true that we will have not only a presidential election in 1956 but a new Congress will come into being in 1957. By having the termination date 1958 we would, in effect, be taking away from the 85th Congress a right that that Congress ought to have, perhaps, to act on this. Of course, I realize the 85th Congress could repeal the section or change the law, but it occurs to me that there is ample opportunity between January and April 1 of 1957 for the 85th Congress to act on a further extension. It just seems to me it would be more desirable for this Congress to fix the termination date in 1957 instead of 1958.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think the gentleman has made a point. However, if I recall correctly, and I would like to be corrected if I am wrong, at one time we gave the President the right to reorganize for a 5-year period. I have a feeling that regardless of what type of bill is enacted or the length of time fixed, no President is going to abuse this power. I do not believe President Eisenhower, who I certainly hope will be with us not only until 1956 but for a longer period, will abuse it, and I do not think a new President, should one be selected, would take unfair advantage of this legislation.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], the chairman of the Committee on Rules, and ask unanimous consent that he may speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to speak of a recent action of the Committee on Rules with respect to the general policy with regard to the creation of investigating committees and investigatory powers heretofore given to standing committees. I may state in the begin-

ning that the Committee on Rules on this subject has the support of both the Democrat and Republican leadership of the House, and I am authorized so to state.

There are now 80-some resolutions pending before the Committee on Rules asking for various types of investigations, both for select committees and for general investigatory powers on the part of legislative committees.

We think that in times gone by there have been a good many unnecessary investigations, a good many that have not produced worthwhile results or any legislation. It is the hope of the leadership that this situation can be corrected. We hope that we will have the cooperation of the House and the various committees of the House in trying to reduce this matter of investigations as much as reasonably can be done.

With that end in view, the committee does not propose to report any rule for an investigation unless a good case is made for it, unless we know just exactly what the jurisdiction of the committee is going to be and unless they can justify it in hearings before the Committee on Rules. The same rule will apply to standing committees of the House. Heretofore, standing committees have come as a matter of course before the Committee on Rules and have obtained general jurisdiction to investigate anything that might fall within the jurisdiction of that particular committee. In many instances, there has been an overlapping jurisdiction and one committee has been investigating something that another committee thought they had jurisdiction over. We expect to ask the committees, both special and legislative, to specify in the resolution which they offer just exactly what they are going to investigate and have the resolution limit the subject of investigations specifically so that the committee and the Congress will know what jurisdiction the committees have. I think the committee will ask for very specific information when a legislative or a special committee asks for powers to conduct an investigation outside of the continental limits of the United States.

It is the expectation of the committee, and the leadership, with the cooperation of the membership that we may thereby very much reduce the necessity of so many legislative investigating committees. Incidentally, it is the expectation, I might say for the information of the membership, that the Committee on Rules will as soon as possible begin discussions on the question of rules for governing investigating committees, which will relieve some of the criticism that has been made in the past on that score.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. In the absence of our colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] who is the ranking member of the committee, I feel it is my duty and responsibility to say that the minority members of the Committee on Rules agree in full with the statement that has just been made by the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I should have stated, and I will now state, that the Committee on Rules is unanimous upon that policy.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 75th birthday of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. The city and county of Los Angeles and California, today will honor General MacArthur. Mrs. MacArthur will unveil a monument in MacArthur Park. Proper ceremonies will be held and this evening the general will make an inspirational and stimulating speech.

It is seldom that a man crosses the pages of history and leaves such an impact and indelible mark upon the world as Gen. Douglas MacArthur has left. He has given most of a lifetime to the service of his country. He has a magnetic personality. He is a born leader of men. The general has vision and courage and understands human nature. Many of you will recall that he appeared in the House on April 19, 1951, on his return from Korea. The ending of his speech contained these words: "Old soldiers never die—they just fade away." It seemed appropriate at that time, but General MacArthur has not faded away. He is now engaged in a successful business enterprise. The general, on his 75th birthday, still has a keen mind and insight into the affairs of the world. He has been a great soldier, a diplomat, a statesman, and a fine Christian gentleman.

I know that my colleagues in the House and the general's friends all over the United States and the world will join with me in wishing Gen. Douglas MacArthur many, many happy returns of the day.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2576) to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1958.

And pending that, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who speak in Committee may have permission to revise and extend their remarks and include certain extraneous matters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2576, with Mr. HARRIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] will be recognized for 30 minutes; the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is with pardonable pride that I rise at this time to carry out the task conferred upon me by the Committee on Government Operations to present to you for your consideration the bill H. R. 2576, which is to extend the terms of the Reorganization Act of 1949.

The Reorganization Act of 1949 had its inception in the Committee on Government Operations. As I look back to the committee, which in those days passed that act, I am filled with pride because to my mind it was one of the hardest working committees ever set up by the Congress. It was a committee composed of many men who had distinguished themselves in the Congress. We had as a member of that committee the majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]. We had the able and distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. As a member of that committee was the minority whip the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. We had as members of that committee two members of the Hoover Commission, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]. Also, as a member of that committee, was the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], who is now again a member of this committee.

We have been very proud of this legislation, because under this legislation was accomplished more reorganization of executive departments than had been accomplished in all the years of the organization of this Government theretofore.

We are here before you now at the request of the President of the United States, and upon the recommendation of the now existing Hoover Commission, a body appointed by this Congress, asking for an extension.

In compliance with the usual custom of our committee we asked the opinion of the Bureau of the Budget, along with other agencies of Government. From

the Bureau of the Budget I received this answer, from which I quote:

This is in reply to your 2 letters, 1 dated January 21, 1955, requesting reports and comments on H. R. 2576, a bill "to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1958"; and the other dated January 24, 1955, relating to H. R. 2563—

The bill introduced by Mr. BROWN of Ohio—

a bill "to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1957."

The letter then goes on to state matters concerning the Reorganization Act and then refers to the President's message in these words:

The President, in his annual message to the Congress on January 6, recommended extension of this act. He stated:

"Every citizen rightly expects efficient and economical administration of these many Government programs I have outlined today. I strongly recommend extension of the Reorganization Act * * * which expire(s) this spring. Thus, the Congress will assure continuation of the excellent progress recently made in improving Government organization and administration."

He also included a quotation from the existing Hoover Commission report, as follows:

As a result of the unanimous vote at its meeting held on November 15, 1954, the Commission recommends to the Congress that the authority of the President to file reorganization plans, which expires on April 1, 1955, be extended.

In referring to both bills—and I want my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Ohio, to note this—the Bureau of the Budget says:

H. R. 2563 would authorize extension of the act until April 1, 1957; H. R. 2576 would authorize its continuation until April 1, 1958. Enactment of either of these bills would accomplish the President's objective of extending the Reorganization Act. I am authorized to state that he would be satisfied if the extension of the act were for a period of 2 years as provided in H. R. 2563; however, should the Congress enact a measure extending it for a longer period, such as the 3-year extension in H. R. 2576, he would be happy to favor such a measure.

That, I think, takes care of the request for the 2-year extension. You and I can well see how an existing President would not ask for an extension beyond his present term of office, but you and I can also understand how an existing President would extend to whomever was his successor, whether it should be himself or another, a measure which he had found to be a good thing in his administration; he certainly would give to a succeeding President an opportunity to study this inherited executive setup and then to take advantage of studies that had been made by means of this legislation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What the gentleman has just said is overwhelming evidence that the President wants to go along with the majority, is it not?

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. It is overwhelming evidence that the President from his experience has found this Reorganization Act a good thing to help him reorganize our vast executive establishment; and whether he is the next President or not, he is happy to say to us that he favors extending such a measure until 1958.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Was the gentleman of that same mind on this during the last 2 years?

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Is the gentleman referring to the President? Evidently he is.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No. I am referring to reorganization legislation.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. I am stating the wishes of the President. As author of the Reorganization Act of 1949, when I have seen the extent of reorganization that has taken place since then by more than one President, I am happy at this time to join with the President of the United States and with the vast majority of the members of our Government Operations Committee in asking the Congress at this time to extend this to 1958.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My question is whether during the last 2 years the gentleman has been of the opinion that under this legislation we were getting good plans coming up from the President?

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Far be it from me to criticize my President.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am not talking about the President. I am talking about legislation. I know the gentleman is happy about the President.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. I am sure that he who controls the minority, if he has any quarrel or fight with the reorganization plans set up by the President, will, during his own time, find fault therewith. Far be it from me in the use of time allotted to me to find fault with our President.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am asking the gentleman as to what his attitude has been in the last 2 years.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. My attitude and my duty is to carry out the wishes of my committee—to ask the Congress to extend this Reorganization Act until 1958.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I think the present chairman of the committee would have to take the position that most of us do; that is, as each individual reorganization plan is submitted we reserve the right to act on it as we see fit. That is our responsibility. That is what I shall do when the others come up, if this act is extended.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. There has been some question as to whether we should have a constitutional majority or whether we should have a simple majority. They tell me that the best proof of the pie is in the eating of it. We have had this act since 1949. More reorganization plans have been passed under this act than during all of the years theretofore that this country has been free and independent. Consequently, it has worked, it has enabled the Chief Executive to assume a responsibility, and it also gives to the Congress a power to protect itself if it is not satisfied with the President's plan. Any Congressman within 60 days after the submission of a plan may file an objection to that plan. The Congress then must consider that objection and must act thereon. So the Congress is protected.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 13 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing new about this legislation.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. KARSTEN. Then this is not a part of a bold, new, dynamic program?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, I would not call it dynamic. I would call it, rather, destructive of constitutional procedure, that is all.

BILL AUTHORIZING SUBMISSION OF REORGANIZATION PLANS

The bill before us, H. R. 2576, is an amendment to Public Law 109, 81st Congress, which is known and cited as the Reorganization Act of 1949. The sole purpose of the amendment is to extend the provisions of the act—which would expire on April 1, 1955—to April 1, 1958.

Experience has demonstrated that, to promote the welfare of its people, to provide for the national security, those who wrote the Constitution and the Bill of Rights provided the best form of government yet devised.

Our present position among the nations of the world demonstrates the truth of that assertion. But no form of government provides a check to either misinterpretation or maladministration, nor for that matter a safeguard against greed or corruption.

Alexander Hamilton, the first Secretary of the Treasury, as long ago as 1795, declared that the Treasury Department should be reorganized.

In 1888, Senator Francis M. Cockrell and Representative Alexander M. Dockery, both from Missouri, headed special legislative subcommittees whose objective was the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government.

Later, Senator Smoot, of Utah, headed a legislative committee on which served two very able, capable Members of the House—one from the Fifth Congressional District of Michigan, the Honorable Carl Mapes, another from New York, James Wadsworth. The committee made a most exhaustive study of the executive departments.

A former colleague from Missouri, Mr. Cochran, in the debate on the floor—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 84, part 2, page 2305—gave some of the reasons for the enactment of this type of legislation.

The Congress has on several occasions adopted legislation in an attempt to bring about a desirable situation which

we all hope will give us increased efficiency and economy in the Federal Government.

The Reorganization Act of 1932, so-called, was title IV of the Legislative Appropriation Act of 1932, and was adopted on May 3, 1932—Forty-seventh Statutes at Large, page 413, section 407.

Mr. Hoover, then President, sent down various recommendations, but on January 19, 1933, the House voted on a resolution which prevented the adoption of those recommendations from taking effect.

We had a Reorganization Act in 1939—Fifty-third Statutes at Large, page 561, section 5. We had another one in 1945—Fifty-ninth Statutes at Large, page 613. We had still another in 1949—Sixty-third Statutes at Large, page 203. That act was extended on February 11, 1953. It is the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, which is now before us for a further extension of the authority granted the President.

REASON FOR THE LEGISLATION

The reason—or, more accurately, the excuse—given for the attempt to grant this legislative authority to the President is, and so far as I know always has been, the statement—and I think that statement is true—that our Government has grown so large, its activities cover so many fields, that the Congress has never given the people that degree of efficiency and economy to which they are entitled and which prevail in privately owned and operated corporations.

And the reason—or, again, more accurately, the excuse—for that failure is either the lack of ability or determination on the part of the Congress, as well as the failure of the executive branch of the Government, to efficiently perform their respective functions.

What we do in these Reorganization Acts is merely to shift from our own shoulders a part of our duty and obligation to our constituents, to the already overburdened shoulders of the executive departments.

We also by this action open ever wider the door for the executive departments to build up centrally controlled bureaucracy in every department.

NONPOLITICAL

The drive for this legislation should be nonpolitical. There has been a great deal of inconsistency in the attitude of members of both parties when this type of legislation was before the House.[1]

REORGANIZATION LEGISLATION

Among other provisions, section 3 of the act provides:

SEC. 3. Whenever the President, after investigation, finds that—

(1) the transfer of the whole or any part of any agency, or of the whole or any part of the functions thereof, to the jurisdiction and control of any other agency; or

(2) the abolition of all or any part of the functions of any agency; or

(3) the consolidation or coordination of the whole or any part of any agency, or of the whole or any part of the functions thereof, with the whole or any part of any other agency or the functions thereof; or

(4) the consolidation or coordination of any part of any agency or the functions thereof with any other part of the same agency or the functions thereof; or

(5) the authorization of any officer to delegate any of his functions; or

(6) the abolition of the whole or any part of any agency which agency or part does not have, or upon the taking effect of the reorganization plan will not have any functions, is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a), he shall prepare a reorganization plan for the making of the reorganizations as to which he has made findings and which he includes in the plan, and transmit such plan (bearing an identifying number) to the Congress, together with a declaration that, with respect to each reorganization included in the plan, he has found that such reorganization is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a). The delivery to both Houses shall be on the same day and shall be made to each House while it is in session. The President, in his message transmitting a reorganization plan, shall specify with respect to each abolition of a function included in the plan the statutory authority for the exercise of such function, and shall specify the reduction of expenditures (itemized so far as practicable) which it is probable will be brought about by the taking effect of the reorganizations included in the plan.

Inasmuch as we all know that there is a great deal of inefficiency and of waste in the executive departments, and there is much of both in the legislative departments, you may wonder why I am opposed to the enactment of the amendment to this bill.

We are aware that in more recent years there has been a steady and altogether too successful drive to disregard Constitutional provisions.

Freely will I admit that the Constitution does not carry the authority inherent in the Ten Commandments. Freely will I admit that conditions today are far different than those which confronted those who wrote the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Equally true is it that we of today never were forced to endure the abuse and persecution which caused them to forsake the mother country to attempt to establish here a free, independent and enduring Republic.

There are, moreover, certain fundamental laws of nature, certain principles, which despite the passing of the years or even of the centuries do not change.

As just stated, we now have, in spite of our indifference, the best form of government yet devised. Yet there are many among us who thoughtlessly would little by little disregard the principles laid down in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The Constitution leaves no doubt as to the line of demarkation between executive and legislative power.

The continued welfare of our people, the existence and the security of our Nation, rest upon the principle that the judicial, the legislative, and the executive departments of the Government must be kept separate, apart from and independent each of the other.

That those who wrote the Constitution so intended is made clear when we read that document.

The first 15 words of article I, section 1, are these:

Section 1. All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

The manner in which proposals become law is set forth in section 7 of article I. I quote:

Article I, section 7:

Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it become a law, be presented to the President of the United States. If he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his objections to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the objections at large on their Journal, and proceed to reconsider it. If after such reconsideration two-thirds of that House shall agree to pass the bill, it shall be sent, together with the objections, to the other House, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two-thirds of that House, it shall become a law. But in all such cases the votes of both Houses shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against the bill shall be entered on the Journal of each House, respectively. If any bill shall not be returned by the President within 10 days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the same shall be a law, in like manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress by their adjournment prevents its return, in which case it shall not be a law.

Every order, resolution, or vote to which the concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the same shall take effect, shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two-thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to the rules and limitations prescribed in the case of a bill.

A further grant of power is carried in paragraph 14 of section 8 of article I, which gives the Congress the power "to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces."

---

[1] Reorganization Act of 1932, (title IV of Legislative Appropriation Act):

Motion to recommit—yeas 146; nays 250; not voting 35. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 75, pt. 9, pp. 9518–9519, 72d Cong., 1st sess.)

On passage of bill—yeas 316; nays 67; not voting 48 (id., pp. 9519–9520.)

Reorganization Act of 1939:

Adopted by 246 to 153. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 76th Cong., 1st sess., 34 not voting, vol. 84, pt. 3, p. 2504; (mostly Republicans opposing.)

(In 1939, the Sumners amendment provided for the rejection of a plan by one House. The vote was 193 (mostly Republicans) to 209, with 32 not voting (id., p. 2502).

Mr. TABER offered an amendment which provided that a plan should not become effective until the adoption of a joint resolution approving the plan. On that vote, there were 163 affirmative votes (again mostly Republicans), 236 in opposition, with 34 not voting (id., p. 2504).

Reorganization Act of 1945:

On motion to recommit, with instructions to accept amendment which would permit one House to reject reorganization plan—yeas 168; nays 192; not voting 71. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 79th Cong., 1st sess., vol. 91, pt. 7, p. 9453.)

On final passage—yeas 305; nays 56; not voting 70 (id., p. 9454).

Reorganization Act of 1949:

Motion to recommit, lost; no record vote.

Final passage—yeas 358; nays 9; not voting 66. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 81st Cong., 1st sess., vol. 95, pt. 1, p. 923.)

THE PRESIDENT'S FUNCTIONS

The enumeration of the powers of the President and of the executive departments are carried in article II of the Constitution. Nowhere in the enumeration of those powers is there even a hint that the President shall have any authority to initiate or participate in the enactment of legislation except that he may veto proposed legislation. But even his veto may be vetoed or overridden by a two-thirds majority of the Congress.

The above statement is, of course, qualified by section 3 of article II, which, referring to the President, states:

> He shall, from time to time, give to the Congress information of the state of the Union and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall deem necessary and expedient.

He is also given authority on extraordinary occasions to convene the Congress, and, in the event that the two Houses cannot agree as to the time of adjournment, he may adjourn them subject to call.

In my judgment, because this Congress has demonstrated time and again, no later than yesterday, that it has the utmost confidence in the President, I am unable to find any reason why we should now continue a clearly unconstitutional method of legislating.

Is it not certain that the so-called opposition party, which controls the House and the Senate, will quickly enact any sound, recommended legislation which the President or one of the executive departments may send up to us in the form of a bill? Waste and inefficiency in the executive departments can be minimized by executive supervision.

If that, in the judgment of the President, is not sufficient to bring about the desired end, then his suggestion in the form of a bill to be considered by the proper standing committee will, if it has merit, undoubtedly be enacted without undue delay. The proposed procedure which the House has, as has been indicated, adopted on several occasions, is wholly unnecessary.

As stated, under the Constitution, the Congress is charged with enacting legislation and the President is given the power, under certain circumstances to veto that legislation.

This proposed procedure reverses the process and gives to a President legislative authority nowhere found in the Constitution.

It permits the President to enact legislation unless his plan is, within a stated time, vetoed by a majority of the elected Members of either House.

The only effective argument which was used in obtaining the continuation of this legislation in 1953 that I heard was that like power had been given to President Roosevelt and to President Truman, therefore it should not be denied President Eisenhower.

With equal truth might it be said that the existence of this act and its extension is a reflection upon the Congress of the United States because, unless we grant this power to the President, he will not be able to obtain proper legislation.

As the result of the Hoover Commission's recommendations, a representative of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, in 1949 sent up 11 bills, all of which I introduced.

In 1951, it sent up 18 bills, all of which were introduced by me.

The substance of all those which were acceptable to the Congress was enacted into legislation.

I realize that there will be a practically unanimous adoption of this amendment, but I would fail in my duty to my people, did I not again call attention to the fact that, by enacting this bill, the Congress is shirking its duty, laying additional burdens upon the executive departments, and opening the door to unconstitutional legislative procedure.

On January 30, 1953, in a minority report from the Committee on Government Operations, my views were expressed in the following language:

OBJECTIONS TO ENACTMENT OF H. R. 1979, A BILL TO GRANT LEGISLATIVE POWER TO A PRESIDENT

Despite my confidence in the President, the imperative need for economy and efficiency in the executive department, I cannot support this bill because—

1. The bill proposes an unconstitutional grant of legislative power;

2. A grant of legislative power to a President to reorganize executive departments does not insure either economy or efficiency;

3. Conferring legislative power upon a President to reorganize the executive departments is unnecessary: (a) Because a President now has the authority to appoint the heads of the executive departments and to force them to adopt practices which will bring about both economy and efficiency of administrative functions; and (b) because a willing Congress, knowing the urgent need for both economy and efficiency in the operation of the executive departments, will enact any and all necessary constructive legislation which he may send to it by either bill or resolution; (c) because we now have a President who has the administrative ability, the courage, the desire, and the determination to, by Executive order or the approval of bills or recommendations submitted to Congress, "clean up the mess" which was so large a factor in his election.

In the "clean-up task" confronting him, the President deserves the cooperation of Congress and will get it from Republicans and those Democrats who, like Senator BYRD and others, believe that economy and efficiency should be among the first objectives of public officials.

It is my purpose to give the President all help which can properly be given him within the framework of the Constitution.

A considerable portion of the membership of the House opposed the Reorganization Act of 1949 and earlier similar legislation because they believed that the then pending bills were a grant of legislative power to the Executive.

To the extent that our position may have reflected a lack of confidence in past administrations, the position can now properly be changed as an aspect of our cooperation with the new administration and the confidence which we have in it.

But, to the extent that our objection has been based on constitutional grounds, we are still bound by the objection. Certainly, our President would not want us, in our efforts to cooperate with him, to transgress the Constitution.

1. THE BILL PROPOSES AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL GRANT OF LEGISLATIVE POWER

Primarily, the objections to the Reorganization Act of 1949—as to prior acts—were based on its unconstitutionality. In the past few weeks those objections have been very carefully reviewed and considered in the hope that the conclusion that the act is constitutional might be reached.

Unfortunately, the act, in principle, if not in degree, seems to be just as violently in contravention of the basic law as it was in 1949. Having that opinion, I cannot, in conscience, support this bill to extend the Reorganization Act.

Hence, the fair and honest course is to present the reasons why the act seems so clearly unconstitutional, so that an opportunity may be presented to those who feel otherwise to meet the objections, if the objections can be met.

These reasons which have caused many of us to take a recorded position that the Reorganization Act is unconstitutional have been argued before on the floor of the House.

Likewise, the matter has been discussed on the executive side. The last Republican Attorney General of the United States before this administration, Mr. William D. Mitchell, found a similar act to be in contravention of our fundamental law (37 Op. A. G. 56, 63–64). In view of this opinion of the last Republican Attorney General, Senator MCCLELLAN, on February 28, 1949, requested New Deal Attorney General Tom Clark for his opinion. In lieu of an opinion, a memorandum was received from Tom Clark's assistant, which stated in part that Mr. Mitchell's opinion was "based upon an unsound premise."

The duty of Congress to determine constitutionality

The burden of upholding and defending the Constitution rests just as squarely on the Congress as it does on the Supreme Court.

If we, as Members of Congress, reach the conclusion that proposed legislation would transgress the Constitution, we cannot enact that legislation without violating our oaths of office, even though we believe the Supreme Court might hold the legislation to be valid.

We should not, we cannot—in the first instance, at least—avoid that duty by attempting to shift the responsibility to the Supreme Court. Particularly, when the issue is to delegate the legislative power of the Congress, do we have a responsibility at least equal to that of the Supreme Court to first pass on the matter of constitutionality, for otherwise the indispensable system of checks and balances would be in danger. And, in a case such as this, where not only does the constitutional issue relate to the power of Congress but is presented in legislation that, because of its nature, may never be reviewed by the Supreme Court, would, because of a Presidential veto, be difficult to recapture, our duty to inquire into the constitutional issue is sharp, clear, and inescapable.

So far as I have been able to learn, none of those who favor permanent legislation granting the proposed power to the President have given expression to the truth that, once adopted, the power granted cannot be retaken unless with the consent of the President and a majority vote of both Houses. And, should a President oppose the abolition of the power proposed to be granted, it can only be taken from him by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members of both Houses.

So, while the opinions of the Supreme Court on the matter should be accorded great weight and respect in determining whether this legislation is compatible with our basic law, we must, nevertheless, follow our own conclusions.

A comparison of the provisions of the reorganization act with our Constitution

Most schoolchildren know that we get our laws by the concurrent action of the Houses of Congress, followed by the approval of the President or the overriding of the President's veto by a two-thirds vote of each House.

The reorganization act tries to prescribe another method for making laws.

Section 1 of article I of the Constitution of the United States reads: "All legislative power herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

The Reorganization Act vests in the President the power to originate a "reorganization plan" which, unless rejected by a House of Congress, becomes the law of the land.

Section 7 of article I of the Constitution of the United States reads in part:

* * * * *

"Every order, resolution, or vote to which the concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the same shall take effect, shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two-thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to the rules and limitations prescribed in the case of a bill."

The Reorganization Act provides that the plans originated by the President shall be filed with each House of Congress and, unless rejected by the affirmative vote of more than half the authorized membership of either House, shall become law. Under the proposed amendment, a plan would become law if not rejected by a majority of either House.

The constitutional powers of Congress are specified in section 8 of article I. (See also sec. 3 of art. III, secs. 1 and 3 of art. IV, and art. V.) The last clause of section 8 of article I reads: "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

The Reorganization Act attempts to place in the Executive the power and authority not only to abolish agencies, except departments, but even to abolish any function of the Government, except that he must leave each department with one function.

The first sentence of section 1 of article II of the Constitution is "the Executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America."

The Reorganization Act makes it possible for either House of Congress to veto a Presidential reorganization.

The constitutional issue: Having in mind these provisions of our Constitution, Attorney General Mitchell (37 Op. A. G. 56, 63) analyzed the constitutional question presented to him on the basis that, unless the function were Executive, the delegation would be unconstitutional, and if the function were Executive, the setting up of a method whereby one House of Congress could disapprove Executive action violated article II, section 1. With all due respect for the statement of Tom Clark (then Mr. Truman's Attorney General) that Attorney General Mitchell based his opinion on an "unsound premise," Mr. Mitchell's analysis seems determinative to me.

The delegation itself:

The Constitution is violated when Congress attempts to transfer legislative powers to the President (*Schechter Poultry Corp.* v. *U. S.* (295 U. S. 495); *Panama Refining Co.* v. *Ryan* (293 U. S. 388); *Yakus* v. *U. S.* (321 U. S. 414)).

The Supreme Court distinguishes an unconstitutional delegation of legislative power by Congress from "a mere exercise (by the Executive) of administrative discretion under valid legislative authority (*Lichter* v. *U. S.* (334 U. S. 742, 775)).

Generally, Supreme Court cases discuss whether Congress has sufficiently laid down "its policies and standards in order that the administrative authority granted may not be an unconstitutional delegation of its own legislative power," acknowledging that this test is a matter of degree "not capable of precise definition" (id. at 779).

The draftsmen of the Reorganization Act of 1949 made a studious effort to comply superficially with these tests of constitutionality. (See secs. 2 and 3 of the act.) But no amount of careful draftsmanship can conceal the basic difficulty presented by the very scope of the delegation in the Reorganization Act.

The reorganization acts have become broader in scope since 1939. The Reorganization Act of 1939 exempted 21 agencies; that of 1945 exempted 6 agencies; the present act does not exempt any agency, covers the whole Government.

In 1949 when the bill was before the House, it adopted an amendment providing that—

"SEC. 5. (a) No reorganization plan shall provide for and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of—

"(1) abolishing or transferring an executive department or all the functions thereof, establishing any new executive department, designating any agency as 'Department' or its head as 'Secretary,' or consolidating any two or more executive departments or all the functions thereof;"

And it exempted from the operation of the bill four boards: National Military Establishment, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Interstate Commerce Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission, as well as an amendment covering the Railroad Retirement Board, National Mediation Board, and National Railroad Adjustment Board.

However, these amendments were all stricken by the conferees and the bill as written contained no exemptions whatever, except that the final enactment contains limitations to prevent the abolition or consolidation of departments or all the functions of a department.

One serious constitutional objection is met by the committee amendment. The unamended act requires that a majority of the authorized membership of each House is necessary to reject a reorganization plan. The amendment restores the historic constitutional test for effective action of the Houses of Congress.

Those who feel that 218 affirmative votes (a majority of the authorized membership) should be necessary for effective legislative action in the House, or 49 affirmative votes in the Senate, should address themselves to a constitutional amendment.

To call such a requirement a "constitutional majority" is a farce. It is an innovation of the New Deal, repugnant to and designed to frustrate the Constitution.

No such test for legislative action is recognized by the Constitution. None can be imposed by legislation short of an amendment to the Constitution.

Figures which show the number of recommendations of the past two administrations that were turned down are irrelevant. Congress now has faith and confidence in our President. President Eisenhower does not need unconstitutional devices.

The present bill does not carry any exemptions but provides that the President be given authority to write legislation, subject only to a veto by one branch of Congress.

However, it is my understanding that an amendment will be offered either by Mr. SHORT or Mr. VINSON, both of the Committee on Armed Services, reading in substance as follows:

"Subsection (a) of section 5 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(7) abolishing, reassigning, transferring, or consolidating the combatant functions assigned to any of the military services by the National Security Act of 1947, as amended'."

Except for its immediate predecessors, I know of no attempted delegation by Congress in any way comparable in breadth with the authority attempted to be delegated in the Reorganization Act of 1949.

Under that act, any function of any agency can be abolished by the Executive.

All veterans' benefits can be invalidated by a ukase. The FBI could be put out of business.

There is hardly an activity of the Government that the President could not eliminate, except that he must leave the 9 major departments with at least 1 function each.

That act tries to give away the power and duty of Congress to make laws regarding the Government of the United States. It is silly to compare that kind of a delegation with the Renegotiation Act, or any other type of statute.

The standards and limitations set forth in the Reorganization Act would be adequate for a delegation of power to reorganize the Fish and Wildlife Service; possibly they would be adequate for a delegation of power to reorganize or even abolish the Department of Commerce, though that I doubt. But, a delegation of the scope of the Reorganization Act of 1949, cannot be validated by a legislative preface of generalities as to permissible aims. (See *A. L. A. Schechter Poultry Corp.* v. *U. S.*, *supra*, and compare *Fahey* v. *Mallonee* (332 U. S. 245), in which the Court slides over the practical absence of standards because it is dealing with a narrow and customary field of delegation.)

We have confidence in the President of the United States. He now has the power to, and I believe he will, clean up the mess in the executive department. But we have a government of laws. A decision that this act is constitutional cannot rest in the fact, which I proclaim, that we have a good and competent President. And there is nothing else on which it can rest.

Carved into stone over the door of the Supreme Court is the legend "Equal Justice Under Law." That is the foundation upon which our Government rests. Constitutional government is the basic reason we here have a greater degree of freedom, prosperity, and security than in any other country. The constitutional system of checks and balances, which has served us individually and as a Nation so well, will ultimately be destroyed if, little by little, first one constitutional provision and then another is either ignored or overriden. That we are on the way toward dictatorship is shown by the willingness of the Congress to surrender the legislative authority granted to it by the Constitution.

2. A GRANT OF LEGISLATIVE POWER TO A PRESIDENT TO REORGANIZE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS DOES NOT INSURE EITHER ECONOMY OR EFFICIENCY

A brief summary of efforts to reorganize the executive branch of the Government

Because of the very nature of the Government, reorganizations probably date back almost to the time the Government started.

There have been numerous later efforts to bring about some improvement in the organization of the executive department. The Cochrell committee reported its findings on March 8, 1888.[1] The Dockery-Cochrell Commission was established in 1893.[2] Both were legislative creations, but the Keep committee was established by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1905, and functioned until 1909.

In 1910, Congress appropriated $100,000, and in the following 3 years an additional

[1] Report of the select committee of the U. S. Senate, March 8, 1888. 3 vols. in 2 (S. Rept. No. 597 50th Cong., 1st sess.).

[2] References to Laws Organizing Executive Departments and Other Government Establishments at the National Capitol (H. Repts. Nos. 41 and 49, 53d Cong., 1st sess.).

$160,000, which provided for the establishment and operation of the President's Commission on Economy and Efficiency. Although the Commission made numerous recommendations, no legislative action was taken.

The Division of Efficiency, created in 1913, was later given reorganization functions, and the President was authorized to abolish duplications of service which it found to exist.

Vast war reorganization power, during World War I, was given President Wilson by the Overman Act.

After the war, the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 created the Bureau of the Budget and established the General Accounting Office as an independent agency.

In the 66th Congress, in 1919, a Joint Committee on Reorganization of the Administrative Branch of the Government was established.

In 1921 the President was authorized to appoint a representative to cooperate with this committee. Among the recommendations of the committee in 1924 were: (1) the coordination of the Military and Naval Establishments under a single Cabinet officer, as the Department of National Defense—a proposal which was adopted some 25 years later; (2) transfer of all nonmilitary functions from the War and Navy Departments to civilian departments—chiefly Interior and Commerce; (3) elimination of all nonfiscal functions from the Treasury Department; (4) establishment of a new Department of Education and Welfare; (5) change the name of the Post Office Department to Department of Communications; and, (6) the attachment to the several departments of all independent establishments except those which perform quasi-judicial functions or act as service agencies for all departments.

There was some coordination of units of the Veterans' Administration by President Hoover under act of July 3, 1930.

Authority very similar to that contained in the Reorganization Act of 1949, if committee amendments are adopted, but not as complete, was contained in the Legislative Appropriations Act of 1933.

No plans proposed by President Hoover under this authority became law, and Attorney General Mitchell found the act, so far as it attempted to provide for reorganization, to be unconstitutional (37 Op. A. G., 56, 63).

The Treasury and Post Office Appropriations Act for 1934 gave President Roosevelt power to issue Executive orders subject to congressional disapproval within 60 days for the purpose of governmental reorganization. The President submitted six Executive orders during 1933 and 1934 in accordance with this grant of power. All the orders became effective, and are known as the first Roosevelt reorganization plan.

On February 25, 1936, the Senate passed a resolution establishing the Select Committee to Investigate the Executive Agencies of the Government. Composed of five members, headed by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, the committee was appointed by the President of the Senate and drew its funds from the contingent funds of the Senate. The committee was responsible for a series of 14 reports prepared by the Brookings Institution and published as Senate committee prints.

In March 1936, President Roosevelt advised the Congress that he was going to appoint a committee to formulate a plan for the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government and asked the cooperation of the Senate select committee in that project. The President then appointed Louis Brownlow, Charles E. Merriam (who died in January 1953), and Luther Gulick as the President's Committee on Administrative Management. The Committee submitted its report in 1937 with the following main recommendations: (1) expansion of the White House staff; (2) strengthening and developing the managerial agencies of the Government, such as those dealing with the budget and personnel; (3) extension of the merit system; (4) grouping of independent agencies and units in 12 major executive departments; and, (5) establishment of accountability of the Executive to the Congress by providing an independent post audit of all fiscal transactions.

The Reorganization Act of April 3, 1939 (Public Law 19, 76th Cong., 1st sess., 53 Stat. 561), gave President Roosevelt power to reorganize through the device of reorganization plans which were to be submitted to the Congress. Disapproval by both Houses within 60 days was required to defeat plans and a time limit for submission of plans (January 21, 1941) was included. Under the authority given him, the President submitted five extensive plans of reorganization, all of which were approved.

The next major action relative to reorganization came in 1945, although the President had been given wartime powers of great scope. The Reorganization Act of 1945 (Public Law 263, 79th Cong., 1st sess., 59 Stat. 613), gave the President authority again to submit reorganization plans subject to the disapproval of both Houses of Congress. Seven plans were submitted under the authority of this act; two were rejected by both Houses; two were disapproved by one House but went into effect; and three were approved without serious objection.

In July 1947, Congress established the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, better known as the Hoover Commission. After 2 years of extensive study and the expenditure of a little less than $2 million, the Commission in 1949 issued a series of reports on various phases or units of the Federal Government. Nineteen reports were submitted to Congress along with accompanying task force reports and other supporting data. It has been estimated that over half of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission have been adopted. The Congress might well adopt the remaining Hoover Commission's recommendations before it seeks others.

In 1949, Congress passed the present Reorganization Act authorizing the President to submit reorganization plans. This time, however, the disapproval of a constitutional majority of only one House of Congress was sufficient to reject a plan. So far, 41 reorganization plans have been submitted under this authority; 29 have gone into effect; 11 were rejected by Congress; and 1 was superseded by law. The authority granted by the Reorganization Act of 1949 would expire, except for the now-proposed amendment, on April 1, 1953.

If the committee amendments are adopted, in addition to the extension of time, the Reorganization Act of 1949 will be changed in the further respect that a majority of the authorized membership of the House or Senate, as the case may be, will no longer be necessary for effective rejection, but only a majority of those voting.

More recently, the Veterans' Administration employed Booz, Allen & Hamilton, a private organization, at a cost of $605,000, to make a management survey. In April 1952, these results and recommendations of the Booz study were furnished the Administrator. It is a weighty survey, in fact, it weighs 34 pounds in 10 volumes, pages, 8 by 11.

However, in November 1952, the Administrator apparently discarded the plan, announced his own plan for reorganizing the Veterans' Administration. Possibly as a result of eyebrow lifting at the casual treatment he gave the 34-pound, $605,000 Booz reorganization survey and recommendations, the Veterans' Administrator came out 2 weeks ago with an explanation that looks like three volumes of Fortune magazine bound together with a fancy black binder.

There are over 40 beautiful charts in the explanation. The 10-volume, 34-pound, $605,000 Booz reorganization study, together with such diverse proposals as resolutions of conventions and the Hoover Commission, is disposed of in a section titled "Various Suggestions Which Have Been Made Aimed at Improving an Organization." The clear implication is that political pressure was so great that the Booz reorganization could not be adopted.

That section is an eloquent answer to those who contend that the executive department should take over the power of Congress to legislate.

Another Commission on Reorganization

Temple University Survey of Federal Reorganization

Under the personal direction of its president, Robert L. Johnson, former chairman of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, Temple University, is now making a survey.

In November, last, then President-elect Eisenhower wrote Dr. Johnson, as follows:

DEAR DR. JOHNSON: Thank you for your letter of November 14, in which you advise me of the nonpartisan review and study of Government reorganization which has been undertaken by Temple University. It is my understanding that this will integrate and bring up to date existing studies and recommendations, including the report of the Hoover Commission. This undertaking is most timely and should be very helpful to the prospective members of the new administration.

I am appointing a committee composed of Nelson A. Rockefeller, Arthur S. Flemming, and Milton Eisenhower to represent me and work with my assistant, Gov. Sherman Adams, and the Budget Director in connection with this study. In view of the fact that the appointment of the new Cabinet will soon be complete, I would like to make available to the Cabinet designees the experience and findings of the experts who are now conducting the review.

With lasting appreciation of your initiative and selfless devotion in this matter,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

To the average taxpaying citizen who has knowledge of the President's desire to streamline our Government, of his authority, there would seem to be little need for further research. Present conditions are obvious. The cure—Executive action is available. Why spend further time in diagnosis?

Many other studies have been made by experts, reports have been submitted to Congress, and, while some savings may have been made, some greater efficiency obtained, the argument for the adoption of this legislation is still based upon the fact that, notwithstanding the expenditure of millions, if not billions, of dollars, the writing of thousands of words of legislation, in the effort to force greater economy, more efficiency, upon the executive departments of the Government, the present situation is such that it is common knowledge that in the executive departments (and, in my opinion, the legislative departments as well) there is outlandish waste, deplorable lack of efficiency—a situation which, in the 82d Congress, was dramatically emphasized by congressional committees whose activities were directed, whose conclusions were reached, by members of the Democratic Party.

In fact, the situation was so bad that loyalty to party was superseded by devotion to country, and the overall situation was

commonly known and characterized as a "mess." It was condemned November 4, 1952.

(NOTE.—That reorganizations did not bring economy, fewer employees, see exhibit D.)

The Hoover Commission warned: "The Nation is paying heavily for a lack of order, a lack of clear lines of authority and responsibility, and a lack of effective organization in the executive branch."

But Congress has paid more attention to the Hoover Commission, and does more about it, than the past administration did. According to Morris Sayre:

"1. A total of 81 legislative enactments—51 public laws and 30 Presidential reorganization plans—for improvement of the Federal structure are credited to the 81st and 82d Congresses.

"2. Sixty-five percent of the Hoover Commission's recommendations have been adopted and are being, in some measure, applied."

Time and time again we have had a reorganization of the executive department, sometimes on recommendations of the experts, sometimes by Presidential plan. None, nor all, have given us either efficiency or economy. Having been tried and found wanting, why not apply the obvious remedy?

Neither the reorganization plans recommended by experts, the recommendations made by the Hoover Commission and adopted, nor the plans sent down by President Roosevelt or President Truman have ended the inefficiency, the waste.

3. CONFERRING LEGISLATIVE POWER UPON A PRESIDENT TO REORGANIZE THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS IS UNNECESSARY

(a) Because a President now has the authority to appoint the heads of the executive departments and to force them to adopt practices which will bring about both economy and efficiency of administrative functions; and

(b) A willing Congress, knowing the urgent need for both economy and efficiency in the operation of the executive departments, will enact any and all necessary, constructive legislation which he may send to it by either bill or resolution.

(c) Because we now have a President who has the administrative ability the courage, the desire, and the determination to, by Executive order, or the approval of bills or recommendations submitted to Congress, "clean up the mess" which was so large a factor in his election.

Now, it is quite true that obviously, in a business as large and as sprawling as is the Federal Government, there must be overall plans. No one contends that this Government of ours or any one branch of it can be successfully operated without plans and organization.

Equally true is it that no legislation, no organizational setup, will either operate itself or can be made foolproof. Inefficient administration will wreck the most perfect organization.

The President is aware of the danger to our economic structure; he is undoubtedly determined that, in the executive departments, we shall have both efficiency and economy; he is, as the people decided in November, a superlative administrator, a man accustomed to command the obedience of those under him. I can see no reason why our President cannot, why he will not, attain the long-sought objective of an economic, efficient administration in the executive departments.

For myself, I prefer to retain our constitutional government, rely for the needed reforms upon the unquestioned ability, integrity, courage, and determination of our President.

That I am justified in this belief is evidenced by order No. 1 of Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., which demands that the employees under him give the service to which the Government has so long been entitled, to which the people have been looking forward. (See exhibit A.)

There is also proof, in a release by Secretary Benson, that in the Agriculture Department, a similar drive is on. (See exhibit B.)

Just 10 days ago, President Eisenhower took over, and, within that 10-day period, we have not only these 2, but several other orders which, if followed throughout the executive departments, will give us the needed cure.

What more evidence does the most skeptical new dealer want to convince him that we are on the road toward a more economical, a more efficient executive department, a balanced budget, a lower tax rate?

What this country needs is not an unconstitutional grant of legislative power to the executive department, but faith in the Chief Executive, an opportunity given him to, may I state, crack the whip, let the subordinates know that he means business.

If the President finds that he cannot bring about necessary and desirable reforms under the power he now has, or through resolutions sent to a more-than-willing Congress, the Congress can easily and quickly change its procedure to insure immediate consideration of new legislation.

In my judgment, one objecting to a remedy should offer an alternative. For this reason I have attached hereto a proposed amendment to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 which, in my judgment, would answer the purpose without ignoring constitutional provisions. (See exhibit C.)

I cannot vote for this bill because today's grant of unconstitutional power to a liberty-loving President may be tomorrow's weapon in the hands of a now unknown tyrant.

EXHIBIT A

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

ORDER NO. 1

To All Officials and Employees of the Department of Justice:

The business hours of the Department for all offices, including the field, are hereby established as 9 a. m. to 5:30 p. m., Monday through Friday, inclusive. Variations in the established workweek or irregular tours of duty may be fixed to meet the requirements of law or the needs of the service. The hours of duty must be strictly observed.

A schedule for lunch periods will be established in each office on a staggered basis so that someone will be present at all times to answer inquiries or handle routine business. Any abuses of the time allotted for lunch should be corrected by administrative action either as a charge against annual leave or appropriate disciplinary measures.

Unavoidable or necessary absence from duty not in excess of 30 minutes and tardiness may be excused by the supervisor. The time must be made up either by charge against overtime previously worked or subsequent overtime. Habitual tardiness will not be excused and will be charged against annual leave or corrected through disciplinary action. The minimum charge for annual leave regardless of the period of tardiness is 1 hour.

Complete records must be maintained by the time and attendance clerk on all periods of overtime. All paid overtime must be ordered by the head of the division or office and approved in advance by the Deputy Attorney General or the Administrative Assistant Attorney General.

This order becomes effective immediately.

HERBERT BROWNELL, Jr.,
Attorney General.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, January 22, 1953.

SECRETARY BENSON MOVES TO OVERHAUL DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The United States Department of Agriculture, largest of all the Nation's civilian agencies, swollen into a huge bureaucracy of 20 agencies and bureaus in the last 20 years, is getting a major overhauling.

Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary, announced today that he is regrouping the Department's services into four divisions for administrative purposes. Another division, that of the Solicitor's office, will remain as presently constituted.

"This action," stated Benson, "will make possible a closer coordination of related activities. All the regrouped agencies retain their present structure with the exception of the Agricultural Conservation Program. This will be transferred from the Production and Marketing Administration and placed with the Research, Extension, and Land-Use Group.

"What we intend is a gradual streamlining of the Department's services in the interest of economy and greater efficiency. The action is taken after weeks of study and conferences with congressional leaders, the members of the President's Committee on Reorganization, our own Interim Agricultural Advisory Committee, and members of the Hoover Commission."

* * * * *

In a memorandum to agency heads and employees, announcing the new grouping and outlining the new lines of authority in his administration, Secretary Benson had this to say about policy:

"As public servants, we must recognize the duty and responsibility we have to serve the public efficiently and well. The people of this country have a right to expect that everyone of us will give a full day's work for a day's pay. They have a right to expect that we will find more effective and economical ways of doing our job. In these times of unprecedented public debt and continued high Federal expenditures, the public rightfully expects us to put forth even greater effort to effect savings in Government operations and to reduce public expenses. Fulfillment of this responsibility will require the undivided loyalty and support of every agency head and employee in the Department. We must work as a team if we are to meet the problems that lie ahead and render the greatest possible service to the farmers of America, the entire agricultural industry, and to this great and good country we love so much."

EXHIBIT C

A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for the expeditious consideration of bills to reorganize the executive branch of the Government

Resolved, That the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is hereby amended by renumbering title III thereof to be title IV and by renumbering the sections thereof as follows: Section 301 to be section 401, section 302 to be section 402, section 303 to be section 403, section 304 to be section 404, section 305 to be section 405, section 306 to be section 406, section 307 to be section 407, section 308 to be section 408, section 309 to be section 409, section 310 to be section 410, and section 311 to be section 411; by renumbering title IV to be title V and by renumbering the sections thereof as follows: Section 401 to be section 501, section 402 to be section 502, section 403 to be section 503, section 404 to be section 504, section 410 to be section 510, section 411 to be section 511, section 412 to be section 512, section

413 to be section 513, section 420 to be section 520, section 421 to be section 521, section 422 to be section 522, section 423 to be section 523, and section 424 to be section 524; by renumbering title V thereof to be title VI and by renumbering the sections thereof as follows: Section 501 to be section 601, section 502 to be section 602, section 503 to be section 603, section 504 to be section 604, section 505 to be section 605, section 506 to be section 606, section 507 to be section 607, section 508 to be section 608, section 509 to be section 609, section 510 to be section 610, and section 511 to be section 611; by renumbering title VI thereof to be title VII and by renumbering the sections thereof as follows: Section 601 to be section 701, and section 602 to be section 702.

SEC. 2. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is further amended by inserting a new title III therein, as follows:

"TITLE III—REORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

"SEC. 301. Whenever the President shall transmit to the Speaker of the House and to the President of the Senate a proposal in the form of a bill for a statutory change involving the reorganization of departments or agencies of the executive branch of the Government and not involving any other matters, the proposal shall be referred to the Committee on Government Operations, which committee shall conduct hearings and report out a bill with recommendations, within 15 legislative days of the date on which the proposal was referred to the committee.

"SEC. 302. When the committee has reported, or has been discharged from further consideration of a proposal referred to it as set forth in section 301 hereof, it shall at any time thereafter be in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of the bill. Such motion shall be highly privileged and shall not be debatable. No amendments to such motion shall be in order and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

"SEC. 303. (a) All motions to postpone, made with respect to the discharge from committee, or the consideration of, a resolution with respect to a bill of the nature set forth in section 301 hereof, and all motions to proceed to the consideration of other business shall be decided without debate.

"(b) All appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution with respect to a bill of the nature set forth in section 301 hereof shall be decided without debate."

EXHIBIT D

In 1939 it was argued that it was necessary to give the President the power to reorganize the Government in order to do away with useless commissions, bureaus, and agencies, make the executive branch more efficient, effect a reduction in the cost of government. The President was given the needed authority. But, in truth and in fact, we soon found ourselves with more commissions, bureaus, and other Federal agencies than we had at any time in our history.

We all understand that, because of our growth in population and ever-increasing services which are rendered to our people, our municipal organizations, and our States, Federal employees will increase in number. It is matter of common knowledge that the number of Federal employees is excessive, expenditures are wasteful. If this were not true, there would not be the overwhelming public demand for a reformation in administrative policies and practices.

If the reorganization acts produced economy, we should expect the economy to be reflected in a reduction in the number of all civilian Government employees within a reasonable time after action is taken under the acts. There have been no such reductions. This is illustrated by the following table:

Civilian employees as of the end of the year

1933	623,880
1934 [1]	714,657
1935 [2]	830,122
1936 [3]	846,316
1937	808,622
1938	920,979
1939	988,099
1940 [1]	1,183,344
1941 [2]	1,670,922
1942 [3]	2,810,871
1943	3,227,578
1944	3,412,355
1945	2,969,729
1946 [1]	2,277,078
1947 [2]	1,999,431
1948 [3]	2,075,559
1949	1,955,731
1950 [1]	2,181,217
1951 [2]	2,518,137
1952 [3]	2,562,792

[1] 1st year after a reorganization act.
[2] 2nd year after a reorganization act.
[3] 3rd year after a reorganization act.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], a former member of the committee.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of this important committee for giving me this time. I have great respect and admiration for the chairman, the distinguished Member from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON].

I served on the Government Operations Committee in the 1st session of the 83d Congress and I enjoyed my service as a member because I felt then, and I feel now, that it is a great committee of this House.

I introduced a bill in the 83d Congress which provides for partial disapproval of reorganization plans. That bill never came out of the committee.

Throughout my service on the Government Operations Committee during the 83d Congress, my concern about the delegation of power by the Congress was increased.

I believe that we must do more than talk about the preservation of constitutional responsibilities.

In the name of haste, of efficiency, and sometimes of personal presidential popularity, the Congress has been careless about its constitutional powers and responsibilities. This is not good for our country.

I believe we have already gone too far down the road with respect to the delegation of power for the purposes of governmental organization. But I also feel that it is futile now to attempt to reverse that course of conduct. We must make the best of a bad situation.

The proposal which I made in the 83d Congress and which I will reintroduce in this 84th Congress, is, I think, a reasonable compromise on this question of delegation of power for governmental reorganization.

It will retain for the Congress some real practical control with respect to reorganization plans. And yet, it will permit the executive department to have the first responsibility for reorganization procedures. It is not a complete cure. But it will help somewhat.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I now repeat the statement which I made on the floor of this House with respect to my proposal for partial disapproval on July 27, 1953.

I quote, in part, what I said at that time and I delete from my remarks certain statistical information not essential at this time:

Mr. Speaker, I have always been a strong supporter of the principles of reorganization of the executive departments. My interest and support of these principles predate my brief service in the House, because of my membership and later chairmanship of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report in Connecticut for the last several years. I am quite cognizant that efficiency and economy in government must be continually fostered, and thus consider it a privilege and an opportunity to sit as a member of the House Committee on Government Operations, which was designated by the House to favorably or unfavorably review reorganization proposals submitted by the President.

Having served on this committee for 6 months, however, I have become considerably concerned with some of the procedural aspects in the review of the various plans submitted. The Congress saw that the public interest demanded the carrying into effect of the reorganization proposals expeditiously and made approval easier by requiring a majority of the full membership of either House to disapprove a plan and giving the plans high preference in coming to a floor vote.

Because of the highly technical nature of many of a plan's provisions the Congress may not, under the present act, amend a plan but can only approve or disapprove in toto. However, I am alarmed by the direction and scope that some of the reorganization plans are taking. Often sections of a plan go further than to promote efficiency and economy, and, indeed, in certain areas, efficiency and economy are not the highest values of a democratic government. We have seen in the reorganization of the Department of Defense the shaping of policy of a far-reaching nature—policy which falls within the legislative power and function of the Congress. In that case an effective reorganization could have been made without provisions which many of us felt violated the constitutional and traditional concept of civilian control of the military.

In its desire to help a new President assume his responsibilities, in its respect for the arduous undertaking of the Hoover Commission, this Congress has approved every reorganization plan thus far submitted. But reorganization should be a continuing thing and should not be based upon the personal popularity of a Chief Executive at a given moment, nor should the time and money expended by a Hoover Commission task force be lost. The all or nothing idea involved has the effect of approval of a defective plan or total disapproval of a plan with great merit.

Under the present procedure this defect is impossible to cure. The amendment to the Reorganization Act of 1949 which I am introducing today would give either House the power to veto a section of a plan. Such a veto with accompanying suggestions would be a proper expression of legislative disapproval but still allow the President the opportunity to word the changed clause or section to his satisfaction. Other provisions of a plan could take immediate effect and would not need to await the necessary changes as directed by the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I will offer a bill to achieve the objectives which I have pointed out today, and I earnestly ask the Committee on Government Operations to give this proposal careful consideration.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I realize that this legislation in its present form will be adopted. I am a member of the Committee on Government Operations, and have considered extension of the Reorganization Act on two previous occasions as a member of that committee and as a Member of the House.

My remarks defining my position have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD previously. For purposes of reference, statements I made on this subject 2 years ago, in the 83d Congress, appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 1, pages 771–774.

I find myself in general agreement with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], on the basic philosophical approach to this type of legislation in reverse. We have delegated power vested in us in the Constitution, the policy-formulating power of the Government, to the President in the Reorganization Act.

The thing that disturbs me the most is that since the early thirties, with the exception of only a few months during the 80th Congress, this temporary authority to make reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government has existed continually, being renewed from time to time.

Heretofore, the renewals have only been for 2 years, at least in recent times. Now, without paying much attention to it, or anyone raising their voice against it, we are renewing the Reorganization Act for 3 years. I presume in 1958, when it comes up again, regardless of the party in power, it will be offered for extension again. By and by the time will come when the Congress will no longer care that the President, in effect, is making policy in derogation of the prerogatives, the privileges, the dignity and the responsibility of the elected representatives of the people. I think that is a matter of some concern.

This measure comes before us in haste, after no more than the most cursory consideration by the committee. What did we do? A meeting of the Committee on Government Operations was called by telephone at 10:30 on Monday morning, without any notice of what was coming up. The meeting was held at 2 o'clock on Monday afternoon. A motion was made to report out the measure now before us. No witnesses appeared. No showing whatever was made. There are no hearings before us to show why a 3-year extension is necessary at this time. I offered an amendment to strike out November 1, 1958, and insert April 1, 1956.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And at least half of the members of that committee are serving their first term here, any they have no knowledge of what happened before; is that not correct?

Mr. MEADER. I think the gentleman has made a point; that particularly the new Members of the House and of the Committee on Government Operations, and there are many new Members on it, are not sufficiently familiar with the implications of this legislation to pass upon it in such a casual and perfunctory fashion as we are employing in adopting this measure here today. At any rate, here we are on Wednesday with 1 hour of debate to discuss this question which affects our basic constitutional structure and the right of the people through their elected Representatives to determine what their national policies should be.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is the gentleman opposed to this legislation or does he favor it? I mean is the gentleman for or against the basic purposes of this legislation?

Mr. MEADER. I may say to the gentleman that on two previous occasions when this legislation was before us, I voted for it, and I am glad the gentleman, who is a member of the Hoover Commission, asked that question.

As the gentleman said earlier, sometime this spring, perhaps in May, the recommendations of the Hoover Commission will be made. They should be considered both through legislation and through the power of the President to submit reorganization plans. But let me point out, and I asked the gentleman the question for the very purpose of pointing this out, that a 1-year extension to April 1, 1956, should be adequate to take care of those recommendations which come out of the Hoover Commission, which expires in May of this year.

Having reorganized the executive branch of the Government on the basis of the Hoover Commission recommendations, let us be done with it. After April 1, 1956, there will be a Congress and if the situation then calls for a further extension, upon a strong showing—not upon no showing at all such as we had in our committee—but upon a strong showing that the President needs a continuation of this power, the Congress will be here to grant an extension. But, I would treat this sacred power of ours very, very cautiously and I would not grant a long extension on casual and perfunctory consideration.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But the objections of the gentleman from Michigan do not go to the basic bill itself, but only to the length of time for which this would be done, is that it?

Mr. MEADER. May I say to the gentleman, I think there should come a time when this reorganizing job is finished. Then we can proceed to legislate through orderly processes under the Constitution rather than legislating in reverse as is now the case when the bureaus and the departments send up programs involving national policy, mind you, over which we have limited and meager change of repudiation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Of course the gentleman is aware of the fact that there was a long period of time in our history when there was no power to reorganize these Government organizations vested in the President. The only change that could be made was by action of the Congress. And it was during that period of time that this great Government of ours mushroomed and grew so big and so fast that it was impossible to keep track of it, and the Congress finally decided that perhaps it should use as its arm a commission especially established for that purpose, to look into the reorganization of the executive branch, because the Congress itself had failed or had been unable to do it itself.

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman will pardon me. I do not like to disagree with him on the history of this reorganization legislation, but I believe that this reorganization power delegated to the President has existed practically since the inception of the New Deal. The Government was much more economical and much smaller before there was any power in the President to reorganize, and it was while that power existed that the Government has mushroomed.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman may have a point in what he has said. I agree to the mushrooming during World War II. But this grant of power to the President to submit reorganization plans in no way shackles the power of the Congress to go ahead and do all the reorganizing it wants to do. The gentleman can introduce a complete plan of reorganization for every department of our Government through legislation, if he desires; and if the Congress approve, the Congress will then have reorganized the executive branch. But the fact remains that history teaches us that Congress has not done it. Therefore, finally, Congress established a commission as a legislative arm to do the job.

Mr. MEADER. I agree with the gentleman. The Congress does have the power to reorganize the departments, and perhaps it has been lax in exercising that authority intelligently. But let me also point out that unless it runs counter to the will of Congress, expressed in some statute, the President has full power to streamline the executive branch of the Government. It is only when he must contravene a provision of the law passed by Congress that he needs to use the reorganization plan procedure. I might say that I hope the gentleman will agree with me that sometime this urgent, emergency reorganization job can be finished, and we can return to the legislative procedure for whatever reorganizing may be necessary in the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Again I express the hope that the time will come

when the Government does not need reorganization, but it does seem to me, from my experience of about 40 years, that perhaps the Congress and the President create the need for reorganization, or that at least it will be a continuing need and a growing need. We very often find some action will have to be taken by some arm of the Congress to take a look at the Government's structure and see whether or not greater economy and efficiency can be obtained.

Mr. MEADER. May I point out to the gentleman that the committee, on which he and I both serve, does have the responsibility of looking into the efficiency of the Government. If we could properly staff that committee—although, perhaps, we could not do as good a job as the Hoover Commission—we could do a pretty good job, using constitutional legislative processes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And the gentleman of course must either feel that the committee has been lax in its duty or that it has had so much work to do that it could not accomplish the task assigned to it. Which position does the gentleman take?

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman takes the position that the committee has very wide authority and that it has not exercised that authority effectively because it has not built up an adequate staff to do the job. I dare say that the Hoover Commission has a much larger staff than any committee of the House of Representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman the remainder of the time on this side, 7 minutes.

Mr. MEADER. I would like to elaborate my point that the power to submit reorganization plans is policy formulation.

Congress has not equipped itself, in my judgment, adequately through investigative instruments to find the facts concerning a legislative subject, so as to base its policy, in clear and specific terms, on logic and facts. It has been necessary increasingly in past decades to create boards and commissions. The Congress has usually set up general standards or objectives for those commissions and then give them, as it were, legislative power to carry out the objectives and accomplish the will of the Congress.

The Congress has sought, when it has delegated this vast authority over public affairs to a board, to hedge it about with certain checks and restrictions.

I am sure the gentleman from Ohio will recall that Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1951 proposed to abolish the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and substitute a single administrator with no limit on his term.

The Congress, in giving the Reconstruction Finance Corporation vast authority over public funds, particularly the lending of public funds to private organizations, had sought to prevent abuse of that power by certain checks and restrictions.

What were those checks and restrictions? One was that not more than 3 of the 5 members of the Board of Directors should be of the same political party; that not more than one should be from any one Federal Reserve district; that their terms expire at staggered intervals. They could continue to serve thereafter only if renominated and confirmed by the Senate.

Those checks and balances were put in there by Congress as a matter of policy to prevent abuse and the dissipation of public moneys; and I say they were intentionally put there by Congress as a policy-making function of the Congress.

What then, did Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1951, do? It left all the authority that Congress granted to the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, but it removed all the checks and balances and thereby paved the way for a further gravitation of power to the executive branch of the Government.

I say you cannot talk about reorganization plans solely in terms of realigning structures within the departments of the Government. When you take away checks that the people's representatives in their wisdom placed against the abuse of public money or public authority by our public officials, then I say that is policy making; and that is why this matter is so urgent and why we should not permit ourselves as representatives of the people, sworn to uphold and defend the Constitution, to go on constantly and in an unusual fashion to pass our power, our sacred power, over to the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. But when a reorganization plan comes before the Congress which does have policy in it submitted by the executive departments, any Member of Congress, the gentleman himself, could introduce a bill to do the exact opposite of what the President requests be done.

Mr. MEADER. That is exactly what happened last year. A reorganization plan came up here last year abolishing the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank and creating a single Administrator, but somewhere along the line in the months that followed the Congress passed a provision that was slipped into a bill that came out of the Banking and Currency Committee abolishing that part of the reorganization plan, abolishing the administrator and reestablishing the Board of Directors.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman will have to admit that the Congress did reestablish its authority and control, and we did not know much about it.

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman must remember that once a reorganization plan is sent up it requires a constitutional majority vote to stop it. The President has the advantage; he can veto a bill repealing the reorganization plan and it would take a two-thirds vote of both Houses to pass the bill over his objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman realizes then that early last year we did accomplish that which was so difficult and hardly anybody knew about it.

Mr. MEADER. Well, the President went along when it was in the bill.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. I wish to compliment the gentleman for the contribution he is making and to ask him if he does not agree that perhaps partial disapproval of a plan will at least help with respect to this problem that he is pointing out.

Mr. MEADER. I certainly do, and I want to commend the gentleman for introducing that legislation. We have sought to deal with that problem before. Too few Members realize how much our hands are tied under this reorganization-plan procedure. We cannot even make the correction of a typographical error in a Presidential reorganization plan. We can vote it up or down, but it is almost impossible to vote it down because we have to do so by a constitutional majority, meaning 218 Members in the House or 49 Members in the Senate. I think the gentleman by attempting to find some middle ground so that the Congress can, in part, work its will in the field, has made a very constructive suggestion. I shall be glad to study the gentleman's measure and hope to be able to persuade the committee and my genial friend, the chairman, and other members of the committee, to give consideration to the gentleman's bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I ask the gentleman to yield because I would like to agree with him as much as I can. I want to go back far enough in his remarks to agree with him on the statement he has made that the committees of Congress are not properly staffed. That is a matter that has been a problem before us for a very long while; yet I feel that that is a matter in which the Congress rather than the President is at fault. Any understaffing of committees on the Hill is entirely our own fault and we are to blame for that failure. Which brings up the question as to just how much work the individual Member of Congress can do and how much assistance he can assimilate from a staff. There are certain questions of policy that should be passed upon not by staff members, employees of the committee, but by the committee itself.

I would like to speak on one other subject just a second.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to clear up a statement which was made a while ago that is somewhat in error. It has to do with the number of new Members that are on the committee at the present time.

I believe the statement was made that about half the members are first termers. That is not accurate. There is a total of 30 Members on both sides of the aisle on the committee. Of that 30 there are 4 Members of the minority that are serving for the first time and 1 Member on our side, a total of 5 out of the 30. So 25 members of the committee are not new to this subject.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY. I ask the gentleman to yield not to take issue with him; however, I have listened to this debate with a great deal of interest and noted that several statements have been made that no reorganization plan has been effective except by Presidential proposal. I think the gentleman will well remember that in 1949 the General Services Administration was established, which had a very important bearing on the economical phase of our Government. That was brought up by substantive legislation.

Mr. HARDY. I would certainly have to agree with the gentleman, and I think it is a fine idea that we do have substantive legislation. Substantive legislation is still permissible and possible with the Reorganization Act in effect.

Mr. HARVEY. The main point I want to make, and I am sure the gentleman from Virginia will agree, is that not all reorganization legislation has come by Presidential recommendation.

Mr. HARDY. I wish more could come about without having to originate in Presidential plans. May I say that I have a personal interest in the suggestion made by our colleague the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. I shall be interested in studying that legislation at the proper time, but this is not the proper time for it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would like to agree in substance with what the gentleman from Connecticut has suggested. I have been concerned about that same problem.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman will agree with me that the committee should give its attention to it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) of section 5 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 205), as amended by the act of February 11, 1953 (67 Stat. 4), is hereby further amended by striking out "April 1, 1955" and inserting in lieu thereof "April 1, 1958."

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amended offered by Mr. MEADER: On page 1, line 7, after the comma, strike out "1958" and insert "1956."

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe it will be necessary for me to take 5 minutes, since I discussed this subject during general debate.

Let me point out that with respect to any reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government which do not contravene a statute, the President now has and always has had the right to make realinements and structural changes for the purposes of running the Government more efficiently and more economically.

Let me point out also that Congress has the power through legislation to alter any statutes which are thought to be in need of alteration.

And, let me point out with respect to the 1 year extension that the work of the Hoover Commission should be completed in May of this year. It perhaps will not be possible to send up Presidential reorganization plans based on the Hoover Commission studies for this session of the Congress if we adjourn when we all hope we will, but certainly by April 1 of next year, 1956, those recommendations of the Hoover Commission would have had ample opportunity for study by the executive branch of the Government, and any reorganization plans thought desirable could very well be presented to the Congress before the 1st of April, 1956.

Taking the cue from my colleague on the committee the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] let me say that the earlier terminal date may have the effect of speeding up the presentation of these reorganization plans to get them in before the deadline.

Now, I want to point out that in addition we will be in session on April 1 of 1956, and if there is any need at that time for further extension, this Congress can very easily act on it.

I am disturbed that we grant this legislative power through these renewals so casually when it involves the very jurisdiction of this legislative body. I think we should be very cautious and very chary of giving away the power delegated to us by the Constitution which we have sworn to uphold.

A 3 year extension is not necessary. One year will be ample, and I favor extending it so that the advantages of the study of the Hoover Commission can be worked out either through legislation or through the presentation of reorganization plans.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly that I find it necessary to rise in opposition to the amendment of my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER]. Seemingly he approves generally of the Congress granting power to the President of the United States to submit reorganization plans to the Congress, the only difference being that he feels the term or time should be 1 year instead of either 2 years or 3 years.

I want to point out that in my opinion—and I think in the opinion of most students of the question—1 year is not a sufficient length of time under the present circumstances for the submission of reorganization plans. The Hoover Commission itself, which is preparing to make certain recommendations to the Congress and to the President, will not conclude its work until May 31. It may be that it will be a month later before the printed copies of these recommendations can be made available to the Congress. Once they are made available, either the President through reorganization plans or the Congress through legislation can take action based upon the recommendations of the Commission.

However, the President will need some time, as will his advisers, to study the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and come to a conclusion as to the wisdom or lack of wisdom thereof. Certainly the Congress will need time. Personally I am rather hopeful, and I suspect there are others who are equally hopeful, that the Congress may see fit to adjourn sometime next year along about in July or August, perhaps, as the Reorganization Act requires.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. July.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. In July, as the act requires, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has pointed out. Then we will not be here to pass on these reorganization plans as submitted. There are 60 days in which Congress has to act, and if the President submitted a reorganization plan just before Congress adjourned, we would be in the dilemma either of having to continue in session or else there might be charges that the President was engaging in rather sharp practices, in not giving us an opportunity to study his reorganization plan.

The same thing occurs next year. Congress will not meet until perhaps January 3. If reorganization plans are submitted then, the Congress should have at least 60 days in which to act, and we would be having all these problems coming up in one short 3-month period.

So I think either a 2-year extension, as I originally proposed, or a 3-year extension, as proposed in this bill, would be the proper provision. The President, I feel I know, will not be satisfied with a 1-year extension. I feel that he thinks that that would be shackling him, not giving him a fair opportunity to consider the recommendations of this Commission. I think either this bill or the other bill should be adopted.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Lacking the White House connections which my distinguished colleague has, I should like to ask him, does he recall that during the 83d Congress there was bitter complaint many times on the other side of the aisle that we did not have an opportunity to get the facts as to whether the plan submitted was or was not acceptable; and that I was forced in order to have those hearings, to offer a resolution disapproving the plan, which was really contrary to my own position?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and I are both attempting to cooperate with the President in the matter of reorganization legislation. I introduced a measure this

year that I understood was the administration measure. A year ago the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] introduced a bill which we then understood was the administration measure. So in the past we have both supported the President's right to have such legislation considered, and I hope that we will both support the President's position on this particular piece of legislation and adopt either the measure now before us or, if not, that we do not reduce the extension of the act below 2 years.

In other words, I hope that this amendment will be voted down.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to Government reorganization, but I am absolutely opposed to this sort of procedure in putting reorganization plans into effect.

Under existing legislation, which this measure would perpetuate for another 3 years, there is a wholly unjustified delegation of power to the administrative branch of Government. As explained by others, a reorganization plan submitted by the administrative branch must be voted up or down on the House floor without recourse to amendment. Members of the House can change neither a word nor a comma of legislation that may establish or change Government policy. This is incompatible with every democratic process.

Equally as bad as this procedure is the back-door method of voting. Contrary to the disposition of all other legislation, Congress must vote affirmatively and by a majority of the 435 Members of the House to reject one of these plans. In other words, an affirmative vote must be taken on a negative proposition. This is a fantastic proceeding.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that I favor Government reorganization where it is deemed necessary and I certainly recognize the right and the duty of the executive branch of Government to make recommendations. But I am absolutely opposed to this autocratic method of ramming highly important legislation down the collective throat of Congress on a virtual take-it-or-leave-it basis.

For the reasons stated in the foregoing I want the RECORD to show that I cannot support the extension of existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEADER: On page 1, after line 7, insert a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 6 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Except as may be otherwise provided pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, the provisions of the reorganization plan shall take effect upon the expiration of the first period of 60 calendar days, of continuous session of the Congress, following the date on which the plan is transmitted to it; but only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such 60-day period there has not been passed by either of the two Houses a resolution stating in substance that that House does not favor the reorganization plan.'"

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MEADER. I yield for that purpose, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is my understanding that there was another amendment at the desk, the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS]. He should not be foreclosed by the committee's considering this amendment. Can he later offer his amendment with reference to the expiration of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment to the preceding section should be offered in advance of this one.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet but the Chair recognized the gentleman from Michigan. I have sent an amendment to the desk to change the expiration date to 1957.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not observe the gentleman standing, but the gentleman will be protected and his amendment will be considered.

Mr. JONAS. I do not care to debate it, I just want to have a vote on it, and then the gentleman from Michigan can proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONAS: On page 1, line 7, after the comma strike out "1958" and insert "1957."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. It is not because I care anything about this date, but inasmuch as the gentleman from Ohio introduced a bill prior to the introduction of the bill we are now considering and which has carried this date, and in view of the fact that heretofore—and I am referring now to a specific incident—I think this amendment should be adopted, and the gentleman from Ohio receive credit for its introduction.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BROWNSON. Does the gentleman know the attitude of the gentleman from Ohio, who has been presenting the White House viewpoint on this thing, about this amendment today?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Inasmuch as the original bill which he introduced carried this date, the date in the amendment now before us, I assume that he is speaking, as he always does, with knowledge of what has gone before.

Mr. BROWNSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Here is the point I am trying to make clear to the Committee, and the only point. Will it be the policy of the majority party to disregard any bills that are introduced by members of the minority and to substitute for these bills others which will bring about the same results?

I recall very distinctly in years gone by offering amendments when the same party that is in control now was in control, and the amendment would be voted down in the House. Then, when the bill went over to the Senate, the same or a similar amendment would be inserted by a member of the majority party, be accepted there and, later, when it came back, accepted here.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman, for whom I have great affection——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; I appreciate that. I am glad the attitude of the gentleman has changed. I want to bask in the sunshine of that high regard while I may.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman has been so delightful in recent weeks that we must all change.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I hope the gentleman will be consistent now in that and not reverse himself before the first 3 months of the session are over.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. So long as the gentleman continues his delightful attitude toward his colleagues.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is the same attitude that I have always had.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I continue?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; you just did not recognize it, that is all. Yes; I beg your pardon. I was only trying to suggest that, when identical or similar bills are introduced, the Member who first makes the fight for the legislation should, in fairness, receive credit for its adoption if it is adopted.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman is long on assumption, for, of course, he is one of the great assumers of the House. However, he is correct in his assumption today that the bill I introduced was cleared with the White House. In fact, if I might say so, I consulted with the White House, and at that time agreement was made that the bill would provide a 2-year period. However, since that time I understand the Bureau of the Budget, representing the President, has said a 3-year extension is acceptable. Therefore I have gone along with the action of the Committee on Government Operation, of which the gentleman from Michigan and I are both members, by which the committee unanimously reported this bill—the Dawson bill. The gentleman from Michigan, as I recall, reserved the right to oppose the bill on the floor, but approved reporting the measure to the floor of the House for consideration. Feeling as I do, that I am more or less bound by the action of the committee—that the majority still rules—I have not pressed for the substitution of my particular bill or insisted that the measure before us carry the length of time for the extension of the reorganization act that I had written into my measure. Therefore I am supporting the committee's decision which has the unanimous approval of the committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I want to thank the gentleman for transmitting the information from the White House. I hope he will continue to do so, because as a Republican I would like to be advised from time to time as to the admin-

istration's attitude toward specific legislation which may be suggested.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment. May I say to the committee, I do not care to get into an argument about the authorship of the bill. The bill, as it will pass the House, will be the Dawson bill. I know nothing about any competition between Members to get any particular bill before the committee for a decision. My feeling with respect to the termination date is that it would be better to terminate it at the beginning of the term of office of the next President, whoever he may be, and when a new Congress comes into being, which will be January 1957. A President will be inaugurated in January 1957, and he and the new Congress should have the right to decide then whether to ask for a further extension beyond April 1, 1957.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. It is true that the President in his request asked for 2 years, so I am told. We know that in his message to the Congress, he did not specify the time. We submitted to one whom we considered the mouthpiece of the President both of these bills. Certainly, as I stated before, the President would not ask initially for a period beyond the date of his administration. We can all appreciate that, but certainly the present President would want to give to his successor, whether it would be himself or a new man of another party, a period in which to study the executive departments and also in which to study this law and its application.

Mr. Chairman, I have no pride of ownership in this bill as the Dawson bill. I do have pride of ownership in the subject matter and intendment. When the President said he would be happy to favor such a bill, I am sure he meant what he said when he said it. Also, the bill extending the time to 1958 was unanimously voted out by our committee, and I am of the opinion that the House and this Committee ought to follow the unanimous vote of the committee.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have just been advised—I did not quite hear the gentleman because I was engaged in conversation with another colleague that the expression "mouthpiece of the President" was used with reference to me.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. If I have referred to the gentleman wrongly, I apologize.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. In the city of Chicago, if I recall, the word "mouthpiece" has a rather peculiar connotation.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Oh, I did not mean to imply anything peculiar.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I hope that it does not mean that the President of the United States needs any criminal lawyer or defense of any kind.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. He does not, and I would say when I used the word "mouthpiece," I apologize for using it, but I am happy that we have one of our Members whose word we can take when he states a matter as having the approval of the Chief Executive.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman very much, and if the gentleman would just change that to "Ambassador of Good Will" that would be fine.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] having already been read, the gentleman is now recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment is to eliminate the requirement that reorganization plans must be approved by a constitutional majority. The language stricken is by the affirmative vote of a majority of the authorized membership of that House.

In other words, under the present law, it takes 218 votes in the House against a reorganization plan to defeat it. You will appreciate what that signifies, from the results of a study I made of the rollcalls in the 82d Congress. There were 181 rollcalls in that Congress. The highest number of Members ever present in the 82d Congress was 426. The lowest number was 233. The average was about 357. There were only 20 of those 181 rollcalls on which more than 400 Members were present on the floor. There were almost 20 on which less than 300 Members were present. Suppose a reorganization plan came up for consideration when there were only 233 Members on the floor—and there was such a rollcall in the 82d Congress—it would mean then that only 16 Members of the House could defeat the will of 217 Members.

In other words, I am trying to emphasize that this seemingly innocent constitutional majority provision approaches the degree of voting required to override a Presidential veto, with 357 Members present, the average attendance on rollcalls in the 82d Congress. You can see it would be very difficult to get 218 of them to oppose anything recommended by a President. In other words, I say that under the present phraseology, the right of either House of the Congress to reject a reorganization plan is an illusory right.

I wish I had had the time, before making my address in the Committee of the Whole, to have made a complete study of the reorganization plans which have taken effect over the years. I had intended to make this study. But our committee acted so precipitately on this measure I did not have the time. But I venture to say that there are very few reorganization plans which have ever been disapproved by either House of the Congress. That indicates how completely our hands are tied. I think we ought to have the right to pass on these policies in the same way that we act on all other legislative matters; namely, by a majority of those present and voting, a quorum being present.

The House of Representatives in the 82d Congress on March 13, 1951, under Democratic control, adopted the provision of my amendment in debate on the so-called "quickie" emergency reorganization bill by a vote of 158 to 61; about 2½ to 1. See the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 2, page 2333.

I hope the committee will adopt my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARRIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2576) to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1958, pursuant to House Resolution 109, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file privileged reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

LAWS RELATING TO POLITICAL ACTIVITIES, CORRUPT PRACTICES, AND ELECTIONS

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have submitted a bill to make certain corrections in the Federal laws pertaining to political activities, corrupt practices, and elections. The specific section 12 as amended—title 5, United States Code, section 118k—presently forbids the so-called interference with an election by officers or employees of any State or local agency whose principal employment is in connection with any activity which is financed in whole or in part by loans or grants made by the United States or by any Federal agency.

Recently, a disgruntled discharged employee made a complaint to the United States Civil Service Commission about

the political activities of certain employees in the State of Indiana. Apparently, this same condition has arisen in many of the States.

In fact, if the charges that have been preferred are substantiated, then the same principle could be applied to all local groups. For example, Federal highway aid is used on both State and county and municipal highways and streets. Thus, it is conceivable that all workers on county, city, and State thoroughfares would be restricted from a constructive activity in the political party of their choice.

The same unworthy principle could apply to all appointed employees of the State and local departments of agriculture, conservation, hospitals, and all branches of welfare work. A previous Congress exempted employees of educational and research institutions from the provisions of this act. The same principle should apply to all and the Federal Government has encroached too far on State and local jurisdiction.

I would not exclude Federal employees from the provisions of this act. These sentiments are expressed in the following editorial of January 1, 1955, in the Indianapolis Star:

IT'S NONE OF THEIR BUSINESS

The Governor of Indiana has been summarily ordered by the Federal Civil Service Commission to reply in 15 days to charges against 4 employees of our State government. These State employees are charged with violating a Federal law prohibiting Federal employees from engaging in political activity. The Civil Service Commission asserts that they are Federal, not State employees, because the Federal Government grants a piddling $67,000 out of the total State budget of $915,000 for forestry purposes.

If Americans ever needed proof of the dangers of the arrogant assumption of greater and greater power by Federal bureaucrats dispensing Federal aid to the States, this should be proof enough. We are glad that the Commission has chosen Indiana as the whipping boy in its attempt to foist Federal control over our State officials. The people of Indiana have proved before that they are more than equal to such a challenge. We have beaten back one arbitrary attempt to usurp the powers of this State in the field of welfare secrecy. We will prove again to these willful bureaucrats that our people will not lie down like dogs before any threats of reprisal from the Federal Government.

Governor Craig expressed concisely the independent spirit of all Hoosier citizens when he stated, "Indiana welcomes the opportunity of being an historic test case to limit the degree of Federal intervention in the individual States. * * * Carried to its logical extreme, this means that every employee of a State department is subject to Federal control. If any State can be so intimidated, then indeed, we will have seen the destruction of a vital part of the constitutional sovereignty of the separate States."

The individual liberties of our people are also involved. For if Federal aid means Federal control in this instance, why is it not also possible for Federal bureaucrats to prohibit political activity by any individual receiving Federal aid—those on veterans' pensions, on social security, or on welfare?

The charges of the Civil Service Commission involve political activities that are subject only to Indiana law. It is none of the Commission's business how we regulate political activities in Indiana. The Federal Government has no constitutional right whatsoever to interfere with such affairs. It makes no difference at all whether one approves or disapproves of the activities involved. The issue is simply, is Indiana a sovereign State, or isn't it?

Consequently we suggest to Governor Craig that he deliberately ignore the Commission's peremptory demand that he reply in 15 days. We suggest that he offer no cooperation in any investigation the Commission might want to make. Should the Commission rule that the four State employees are guilty and demand that the Governor remove them, he should ignore that demand. And if the Commission persists, let him challenge the Federal Government to remove these people itself and see what happens. No Federal bureaucraft can tell any governor of any State whom he shall hire or fire or when.

The State of Indiana must protect the rights of its citizens to conduct their activities as they chose under their own constitution. When these rights are challenged, we must resist with every resource at our command. For as one Amercan President, Woodrow Wilson, once said, "The history of liberty is a history of resistance. The history of liberty is a history of the limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it."

FARMER COOPERATIVES

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a copy of the policy statements recently adopted by the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, membership in our country's farmer cooperatives is a history of growth. This consideration is brought into perspective when it is realized that—in the short span of 10 years—membership in these institutions has been almost doubled. Today's total membership figure is 7.5 million, this figure representing approximately 3 million individual farmers, some of whom belong to more than one farm cooperative.

And as membership in farmer cooperatives has grown, so has the business transacted by these organizations. In the 1952–54 period, for instance, business transacted by farmer cooperatives—not including that between cooperatives—was $9.5 billion; this reflected a gain of $100 million over the 1951–52 period.

In Chicago, Ill.—during its 26th annual meeting extending from January 5 to January 8, 1955—the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives adopted policy statements pertaining to agriculture.

Because of the sensitive interrelationships existing between our agriculture, our domestic economy, and our foreign interests and relations, Members of Congress and others interested in agriculture would do well to give these policy statements careful and serious study.

The policy statements follow:

POLICY STATEMENTS ADOPTED BY THE DELEGATE BODY, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES, 26TH ANNUAL MEETING, EDGEWATER BEACH HOTEL, CHICAGO, ILL., JANUARY 5–8, 1955.

THE PRICE-COST SQUEEZE

With constant increases in costs of production, distribution, and marketing, farmers have suffered losses in earning power and in economic stability to an extent which is cause for national concern.

Through maximum use of their own cooperatively owned, managed, and financed business organizations, farmers can make significant progress toward alleviating the present cost-price squeeze.

The value of such organizations in providing stability to our farm economy and furnishing farmers a means of establishing a greater stake in our free competitive enterprise system, while making a maximum contribution to the public interest, should be recognized and aided by governmental agencies and other segments of our economy. To that recognition there should be added wholehearted efforts to contribute to the sound development of farmer cooperatives in every fair manner by all such agencies and segments in this country.

COORDINATED PUBLIC RELATIONS

The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives will lend its support to the expansion and execution of sound public relations programs conducted on the part of itself and its affiliated associations. All farmer cooperatives should move quickly and decisively toward improving their public relations.

Cooperatives today need the council's coordinating support in an intensified public relations program, which should include:

1. Advice and leadership in the coordination of public relations activities of its affiliated associations.

2. Continued development and extension of farmer cooperatives' relationships with other organizations;

3. Identification of farmer cooperatives more specifically with rural youth organizations and their activities.

Therefore, the council directs its officers to take such action as is necessary to accomplish these objectives.

FARMER COOPERATIVE MOVIE

Presentation of information and ideas by visual means is recognized as one of the most effective ways of reaching the public and is an integral part of any general public relations program. The advent of television has enhanced the opportunities for visual presentation.

The national council, in conjunction with the American Institute of Cooperation, should avail itself of these opportunities by taking the initiative immediately in production of a film through the joint efforts of various agricultural cooperative agencies. The film should explain in factual and interesting manner the story of farmers' marketing, purchasing, and service cooperatives, and the role they play in our economy.

Bearing in mind the difference in types of cooperatives, the film should be planned so that local or regional information can be economically added.

Further, a committee of five should be appointed to proceed with the planning, financing, production, and distribution of this film.

TAXATION OF PATRONAGE ALLOCATIONS

In view of the extreme complexity of problems surrounding the current tax status of farmer cooperatives, their patrons and members, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives refers the matter of policy determination of this problem to its executive committee with authority to act.

TRIP-LEASING

Two years ago the council urged legislation to sanction the trip-leasing practice as applied to motor vehicles. A bill which would have given effect to such resolution was overwhelmingly passed by the House of Representatives during the 83d Congress.

Notwithstanding that extensive hearings were held before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the bill was not reported to the Senate prior to adjournment.

On the basis of the facts developed in hearings before congressional committees and the Interstate Commerce Commission, and in view of the manner in which this matter has been handled up to the present time by the Interstate Commerce Commission, we believe action by Congress is required.

Therefore, the council directs its officers to seek prompt enactment of appropriate legislation in the 84th Congress to sanction the trip-leasing practice.

RATEMAKING

Numerous proposals are being discussed and advanced which would substantially change the basic ratemaking authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to regulated carriers. We do not oppose changes which would expedite action on proposed rate adjustments. We are opposed to any changes in present law that would divest the Interstate Commerce Commission of any of its authority as to ratemaking essential for the protection of the interests of shippers and the public generally.

PARTICIPATION OF UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE IN PROCEEDINGS BEFORE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION AND OTHER REGULATORY AGENCIES

The council is concerned over the recent efforts of certain nonagricultural business interests and Government officials designed to curtail the participation of the United States Department of Agriculture in proceedings before the Interstate Commerce Commission and other regulatory agencies.

The council believes that the continued exercise of such authority by the United States Department of Agriculture is in the public interest and is essential in order that the facts concerning the transportation of agricultural commodities and farm supplies may be fully and fairly presented.

The council, therefore, directs its officers to oppose any restrictions upon the present authority of the United States Department of Agriculture to participate in such proceedings.

BULK COMMODITY EXEMPTION

We are opposed to any legislation, such as was proposed in S. 3111 in the 83d Congress, to either repeal or restrict the dry bulk commodities exemption applicable to transportation on inland waterways.

OBSTACLES TO ORDERLY MARKETING OF FARM PRODUCTS

An appraisal of current developments affecting the movement of farm products in interstate commerce by motor vehicle prompts a restatement of council policy, as follows:

The movement of truck traffic over State lines is unduly burdened by many different and conflicting State laws and regulations affecting physical limitations upon trucks, their equipment, and cargoes.

Many such laws and regulations constitute bottlenecks which not only unnecessarily increase the cost but seriously inhibit or actually prevent the movement of agricultural commodities by motor vehicle.

All such limitations that result in undue or unwarranted expense in effecting such movement are detrimental, both to producers and consumers.

Therefore, council efforts should be directed toward the elimination of all such detrimental barriers by encouraging and promoting coordinated actions at the State levels, of all interested groups in cooperation with representatives of both State and Federal Governments.

FEDERAL REGULATION OF TRANSPORTATION

The Federal regulation of transportation is one of the most perplexing problems facing the country today. Some regulated carriers are advocating less regulation for themselves while urging more regulation of other modes of transportation. The impact of regulation—its character and extent—upon the net income of farmers is tremendous.

Facilities within the executive and legislative branches of the Government have proved inadequate to develop the facts for Congress to deal effectively with the major national transportation problems on which action has been urged.

The council believes that it is a proper function of the Congress to supervise the assemblage of factual information on a professional, nonpolitical basis on which to make decisions with respect to major national transportation problems.

Without in any way infringing upon the present functions of existing congressional committees, council officers are instructed to explore with other interested agricultural groups ways and means whereby the Congress may obtain on a continuing basis more adequate facts to furnish a proper basis on which to make any needed changes in present national transportation policies.

FOREIGN MARKETING

Under the American system of free enterprise, private industry rather than government, should occupy the position of primary importance in the field of foreign trade. This objective will require greatly expanded efforts on the part of farmer cooperatives and other segments of the economy, as well as maximum efforts on the part of all Government agencies, including our agricultural attachés. The same principles that have governed the expansion of domestic outlets, such as improved quality of product, should be applied to exports in order to assure full value to all concerned.

These fundamentals call for cooperation on the part of appropriate Government agencies, trade associations, cooperative organizations, private firms, and individuals. Farm products owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation when marketed abroad should be sold in an orderly manner and at the best possible advantage. Such commodities should be handled by private trade.

OPPORTUNITY FOR TRADE

Various devices, such as quotas, licenses, seasonal embargos, bonus dollars, and many other restrictions, have become of even greater significance in regulating and restricting international trade than tariffs. As a consequence tariffs have largely become impotent as a bargaining instrument.

The restoration of exports and international trade will come from increased economic strength in foreign countries, currency convertibility, the development of sound conditions which will tend to attract investment of American capital abroad, and the elimination of the many practices which hamper rather than encourage the exchange of commodities. We recommend these principles.

RESEARCH

Research in the field of agriculture generally should be increasingly directed to the problems of marketing and expanded utilization. Marketing research should be designed to anticipate problems of distribution to an ever-increasing extent. Production and utilization research should be governed to a greater degree by the changing and increasing needs of the market.

Further decentralization is needed, accompanied by a high degree of coordination between the various agencies involved. Private research should be steadily encouraged. Appropriations for public research should be planned at a reasonable rate which will make most effective use of available personnel.

With the increased necessity and desirability for expanding foreign markets for agricultural products there has come the realization of the need for greater market research in foreign countries. Such research should be designed to broaden foreign markets and assist private industry to develop effective programs of merchandising in the same manner that such research has aided industry in our domestic markets.

FARMER COOPERATIVE SERVICE

The importance of farmer cooperatives in the Nation's agriculture was recognized in the recent reorganization of the United States Department of Agriculture through the establishment of the Farmer Cooperative Service. This action was designed to strengthen the long conducted work of the Department of Agriculture in the field of agricultural cooperation.

The council believes that placing Farmer Cooperative Service under an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, together with such agencies as the Agricultural Research Service and the Federal Extension Service, provides for the full integration and coordination of Federal and State research, service, and educational work directed toward helping farmers meet many of their important economic problems in marketing their products, purchasing their farm supplies and in performing other important business services by self-help cooperative action.

The effectiveness of the Farmer Cooperative Service in assisting farmers with their cooperative problems requires that it have the necessary personnel and facilities to perform its duties as prescribed by the Congress.

The president of the council is requested to appoint a committee of cooperative representatives to work with the Farmer Cooperative Service and keep the National Council advised of the needs of the service in order that it may render maximum efficient service to the cooperatives.

BANKS FOR COOPERATIVES

The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives endorses and supports the principles and purposes of the banks for cooperatives legislation proposed by the Federal Farm Credit Board.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION CLAIMS

The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives will support legislation that would relieve from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation, innocent purchasers of grain and other fungible goods which were converted by warehousemen.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

The national council again states its belief that the National Labor Relations Act is providing sound basis for the employer-employee relationship. The council urges that the administration of the act continue to follow the intent of Congress and protect the legitimate interests of labor and management without favor.

INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

The council reiterates the need for legislation that will afford injunctive relief to the producers of agricultural commodities in perishable condition whenever labor disputes, to which such producers are not a party, threaten serious loss to the producers of such commodities.

AREA OF PRODUCTION AND FIRST PROCESSING

We emphasize the need for a redefinition of area of production as referred to in the Fair Labor Standards Act and urge council officers to take advantage of any opportunity to seek a congressional definition of area of production similar to the wording adopted by the council at its 1954 annual meeting.

We urge that the term first processing as referred to in the Fair Labor Standards Act be broadened by congressional action to include all those processing operations such as normally would be performed in preparing perishable agricultural products to enter wholesale marketing channels.

SOCIAL SECURITY FOR TRANSIENT AND SEASONAL FARM LABOR

The council officers are authorized and directed to work with other farm and commodity groups to clarify and simplify the

handling of social security for transient and seasonal farm workers to the end that it may be workable.

IN MEMORIAM

The year has taken its toll of our friends and workers in the fields of cooperative agriculture. We are saddened by their passing and we shall miss not only their courageous and loyal leadership but also their friendship and association. While we bow to the inevitable, we shall be inspired by their example as we inscribe their names on the honor roll of time and their memory in our hearts: George E. Farrand, Harold S. Norman, E. N. Puckett, Raymond Sayre, Romeo E. Short, Harrison S. Nolt.

EUGENE L. HENSEL

The legal and tax committee and the accounting and business administration committee of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives learned, with sadness, of the death since their last meeting of Eugene L. Hensel.

Mr. Hensel served as a member of the legal and tax committee from its organization in 1942 until his death, and as its chairman during 1953.

During this entire period he gained the respect and affection of all of his associates on both committees and of the members of the council.

Mr. Hensel, through his devoted service to both committees has made outstanding contributions to the welfare of farmer cooperatives and to lawyers, accountants and executives of such groups, particularly through his compilation of cases enunciating cooperative principles.

Now, therefore, the legal and tax committee and the accounting and business administration committee of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, in annual meeting assembled at Chicago, Ill., hereby record their extreme sorrow over the untimely passing of Eugene L. Hensel, and extend to Mrs. Hensel their deepest sympathy.

This resolution shall be spread upon the permanent records of the council and a copy be transmitted to Mrs. Hensel.

TELEVISING AND BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, early in the afternoon of Monday, January 24, almost immediately after the reading of the President's message on safeguarding the security of the United States, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] announced that he, together with Senator ANDERSON, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, was inviting each Member of Congress to attend the spring series of atomic tests to be conducted at the Nevada test site. After urging the Members to attend these demonstrations, the gentleman from North Carolina said:

In closing, I should like to recall the old Chinese proverb, "One look is worth a thousand words."

Scarcely a moment later, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] propounded a parliamentary inquiry to the distinguished Speaker relative to the televising, photographing and broadcasting of committee hearings. The Speaker's ruling, a reversal of the policies of his predecessor during the Republican 83d Congress, left little doubt that while "One look is worth a thousand words," the American public will be denied action photographs, moving pictures, kinescopes, or live television of the all-important hearings of the House committees as long as the gentleman from Texas' interpretation of the rules prevails.

This side of the Capitol is now behind a "shutter curtain."

In fact, the Speaker went much further in restricting journalistic activity on Monday than he did in his much discussed ruling of February 25, 1952. This time, in answer to a further query, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] announced that photographs could be taken before and after the proceedings, but not during them. This would, in effect, I wish to point out, make posed and stilted photographs of witnesses present at the beginning or close of a hearing available to still photographers, but would not allow any photography of a committee in action—even though the committee sat in open hearing.

In other words, we are telling our constituents that, if they can afford a railroad ticket to Washington and a hotel room while they are here, they have an outside chance of crowding into a committee room to see and hear what their paid Representatives are doing in their name. Those less fortunate will have to stay at home and wonder what really happened before the record was corrected because the House rules do not apparently recognize the 20th century inventions of the motion picture camera, television broadcast equipment, or inconspicuous high speed still photographic equipment.

I hope the taxpayers can follow that devious logic, but even then I doubt if they will long approve of any curtailment of their vital right to know.

Since February 25, 1952, when the present Speaker ruled on this subject previously, television has expanded technically and from a standpoint of effective program coverage. Two great national political conventions has been televised, one under the gavel of today's great Speaker of the House of Representatives. Is it possible that the public which heard the Speaker make statements at that convention which were partisanly political, is not entitled to see how the committees of the House of Representatives of which he is the Speaker face up to the promises made during that Presidential campaign?

Since 1952 a Presidential inauguration, a Cabinet meeting, a Presidential press conference, and committee hearings of tremendous interest have been successfully televised and photographed for reproduction using newly developed fast films, improved strobe-light units, and advanced techniques. Newspapers, wire services, and periodical photographers have quietly and efficiently brought to the taxpayers, our only bosses, every gesture, facial expression, and physical attitude of witnesses and committee members alike, which tell the story of investigation and legislation, the story of committee accomplishment or failure. Is it possible that the cameras have already revealed too much of the corruption and lax security provisions existing under previous administrations?

Our beloved Speaker has undoubtedly read extensively from the writings of President Woodrow Wilson, with whom he came to Washington in 1912. The final sentence of one of President Wilson's most famous essays, The Study of Politics—written while photography and electronics were in their infancy—comes to mind as being worthy of consideration in a discussion of this ban. Wilson said, "In order to know anything about government, you must see it alive"—and he carefully italicized "see it alive" to emphasize his point.

Today, we have the technical means of allowing millions of people to know their Government by seeing it alive. It seems obviously desirable to expand the number of those that can see congressional committees in action from the thousands who can visit Washington to the millions who can view them on television, in the newsreels, and through the press. As their knowledge of their Government increases, their willingness to accept fully the responsibility of citizenship increases.

Under the Republican leadership of Speaker MARTIN and Majority Leader HALLECK in the 83d Congress, hearings of House committees were successfully televised and the privileges of still photographers were respected. A thoughtful Member eager to protect freedom of the press and mindful of the gradual erosion of liberty can well ask, "Why this reversal of an interpretation which worked out well?" Why the additional tightening of previous procedures to curtail the authority of committee chairmen and limit the privileges of press photographers? What is there to hide?

By the thunderous applause from the majority side of the House at the conclusion of the distinguished Speaker's ruling last Monday, one could have drawn a conclusion that whatever is to be hidden is a partisan secret. I am sure that, after thoughtful consideration, this will be shown to be untrue.

I sincerely hope that this urgent blockade will be removed either by a reinterpretation of the Rules of the House or by the passage of legislation such as that of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] amending the rules in the interest of freedom of information. It will be most interesting to watch the vote when such a resolution reaches the floor.

It will give the members of the majority party a chance to show that they really do believe in operating in full view of the public whose money we spend and in whose name we meet.

INDIA AND THE WHITE MAN

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago a distinguished Member of our body, one whom I personally esteem, made a statement over a coast-to-coast hookup in which he said that the country of India was antiwhite. I rise on this day to make a few comments on

that statement. This happens to be India's Fourth of July; her Government is celebrating its fifth year of independence as a republic. I think there are a few things that would help all of us in our thinking that I can say concerning India from my personal acquaintance with the people and with the country.

India is not antiwhite; in fact, in India today the British people, the British whites, are very popular; they are more popular today than they ever have been. They are in business there with hundreds of millions of dollars of investments, and as they walk the streets they are accepted by the people of India as comrades and brothers.

India is not anti-American, either. India, however, along with all of the Far East, including our good ally Pakistan, is anti-American foreign policy.

About 3 or 4 weeks ago the Prime Ministers of Pakistan, India, Ceylon, Burma, and Indonesia drew up plans to convene in April a pan-Asiatic and pan-African conference of 30 nations. Pakistan, along with India, wholeheartedly agreed to not inviting to that conference the countries of Formosa and of Korea. We thought that Pakistan was going to be our counterbalance in the Indian subcontinent, that Pakistan was going to be totally on our side. But we must note that at this conference they agreed with India that Formosa and Korea not be invited.

India is against our foreign policy along with the Far East. Whether their reasons for being against our foreign policy are right or wrong, one thing does stand out, and that is, we cannot force them or club them or any nation, into following our foreign policy. We also know from our experiences in France, Italy, and the rest of Europe that we cannot buy people into following our foreign policy. Dollars are needed in the Far East, dollars are needed in Europe, but with dollars must go a concept of democracy in action so that the peoples of the Far East and the peoples of Africa who we are helping through our foreign-assistance programs will know that we have a democracy that does not say: "Follow us but do not come any farther than the Statue of Liberty; follow our leadership, but do not come to our shores."

A democracy that holds up one hand and says: "Grasp it and follow us," and with the other hand, through the McCarran Act, closes the door to the people of Asia and Africa, is not going to be a program or a policy that will attract the fellowship of the sensible hundreds of millions of the colored peoples of Asia and of Africa.

We today in the United States have a very peculiar position before the peoples of Asia and Africa. We happen to be the only western nation with a very large minority of colored people. No other western nation has the colored population that we have here and when I say "colored" I mean not only the Negro, but also the Mexicans, the oriental people, the people of Puerto Rico—all the colored peoples.

We have been doing very well with our domestic policy in recent years. Through the leadership of Mr. Eisenhower in the White House, and through the Supreme Court we are showing the world that we are beginning to practice at home the democracy that we preach about. What we need is a radical change in our foreign policy. We need to let the peoples of Asia and Africa know that we do not consider them second-class nations.

Therefore, I think it would be very important if when this conference is held in Indonesia in April of the 30 colored nations of the world, led by Pakistan, India, Ceylon, Burma, and Indonesia, that our Department of State send to that conference, not as delegates because we are not invited—it is a pan-Asiatic and pan-African conference—but as observers, not all-white Department of State team, but an all-American Department of State team, a team composed of Negroes and whites, of Jews and Gentiles, and of Protestants and Catholics. We need to let the 2 billion colored peoples on the earth without whom we cannot continue much longer as a first-class power know that America is a democracy of the people, black and white; for the people, Jew and Gentile; and by the people, Protestant and Catholic. We can only do that by sending abroad teams of American people who are visibly representatives of all of the segments of our population.

I would like to close these remarks on this, the 4th of July of India, with a salute to India, saluting it on its fifth anniversary. Let us let India know that we are not going to try to force them to follow us but that we are going to compete with any other way of life. We will compete with the way of communism because we know that there is no idea in the world that can equal the idea of democracy in action. Let us practice democracy not only at home, but practice it in our foreign affairs. If we practice it in our foreign affairs, we will attract the people of Asia and Africa, because this is what they want. They do not want the totalitarianism of communism, nevertheless communism is succeeding in Asia and it is going to succeed in Africa by compulsion unless we Americans make democracy work.

So, on this day, as a Member of this Congress, and I know I am speaking for many more Members, I salute the Republic of India and wish it godspeed and hope that in the years to come, as quickly as possible, together the Far East and America can make this world a free world of security based upon brotherhood and based upon equality and respect for all peoples.

January 26 has a great significance in India's history, for on this day in 1930, in response to the Congress' directive, meetings were held throughout the country demanding complete independence from the British.

Matters were brought to this point by repeated British refusals even to accept the Congress' modest request for dominion status within the British Commonwealth. At the 43d session of the Congress at Calcutta in 1928, the same demand was repeated, and December 31, 1929, was fixed as the last date for the receipt of an affirmative reply from the Government; failing which a civil-disobedience movement was to be launched. No reply came. On December 23, 1929, Mahatma Gandhi and other Congress leaders met the Viceroy, Lord Irwin, and asked an assurance from him that the forthcoming roundtable conference in London between Indian and British representatives would proceed on the basis of dominion status for India. The Viceroy declined to give any assurance to this effect. The Congress leaders then felt that the time of waiting was over.

On January 1, 1930, the Congress President, Pandit Nehru, unfurled the flag of independence. The following day the Congress Working Committee decided upon January 26 as Purna Swaraj—Complete Independence—Day. Meetings were to be held in support of the demand for independence. An extract from the resolution which was read at these meetings follows:

> We believe that it is the inalienable right of the Indian people, as of any other people, to have freedom and to enjoy the fruits of their toil and have necessities of life, so that they may have full opportunities of growth. We believe also that if any government deprives a people of these rights and oppresses them, the people have a further right to alter it or to abolish it.

The pledge was renewed year after year and partly redeemed on August 15, 1947, when the flag of free India waved over the nation's capital, and the Prime Minister, Pandit Nehru, said to a hushed Parliament:

> Long years ago we made a tryst with destiny, and now the time comes when we shall redeem our pledges, not wholly or in full measure but very substantially. At the stroke of the midnight hour, when the world sleeps, India will awake to life and freedom.

The Indian Constituent Assembly first met on December 9, 1946. It passed the new constitution on November 26, 1949, and decided to give effect to it on Independence Day, January 26, 1950.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BYRD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FORRESTER.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOYLE.

Mr. KRUEGER.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONOHUE (at the request of Mr. LANE) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEATING.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania.

Mr. ADDONIZIO (at the request of Mr. O'HARA of Illinois) and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 27, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

325. A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to authorize the Federal land banks to purchase certain remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

326. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to permit national banks to make 20-year real estate loans and 9-month construction loans"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

327. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the Third Annual Report on the United States Contributions to International Organizations for the fiscal year 1954, pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 806, 81st Congress (H. Doc. No. 80); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

328. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

329. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

330. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 1 of the act of March 12, 1914"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

331. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to require the registration of certain persons who have knowledge of or have received instruction or assignment in the espionage, counterespionage, or sabotage service, or tactics of a foreign government or foreign political party, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 111. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 587, a bill to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 9). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 112. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Armed Services to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters relating to procurement by the Department of Defense, personnel of such Department, laws administered by such Department, and scientific research in support of the armed services; without amendment (Rept. No. 10). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 114. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business; without amendment (Rept. No. 11). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 3082. A bill to amend the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 3083. A bill to transfer certain land within United States survey 1474, tract A, of the townsite of Sitka, Alaska, to the city of Sitka, Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BEAMER:

H. R. 3084. A bill to amend certain provisions of the laws relating to the prevention of political activities to make them inapplicable to State officers and employees; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BECKER:

H. R. 3085. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 3086. A bill to provide that the United States shall reimburse the States for that portion of the construction cost of certain schools which is attributable to Negroes and Indians; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3087. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 3088. A bill to amend section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the maintenance of the Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 3089. A bill to provide for voluntary coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system for lawyers engaged in the practice of their profession; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 3090. A bill to authorize a nationwide survey of costs of production for major farm-produced commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3091. A bill to establish a national policy for the production and utilization of food and fiber, so as to make full economic use of the productive capacity of United States farms to improve domestic nutrition and clothing standards and implement the policy, friendship, and cooperation among the free peoples of the world; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3092. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3093. A bill to authorize Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of privately owned real property as well as the shores of publicly owned real property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 3094 A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3095. A bill to grant an additional income-tax exemption to a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is permanently handicapped; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3096. A bill to provide an additional income-tax exemption to certain physically handicapped individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3097. A bill to repeal the Immigration and Nationality Act of June 27, 1952, and to reenact all acts repealed or amended by the Immigration and Nationality Act of June 27, 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3098. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement annuities and pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3099. A bill to provide free postage for first-class letter mail matter sent by or to members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3100. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that those monthly insurance benefits which under present law are not payable until age 65 shall hereafter be payable at age 60 in the case of men and at age 55 in the case of women; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3101. A bill to impose a 5-percent Federal excise tax in the case of parimutuel betting on horse and dog races and other events; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3102. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to increase the deductions for personal exemptions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3103. A bill to provide for voluntary coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system for lawyers engaged in the practice of their profession; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3104. A bill to establish in the Department of Commerce a Consumers' Advisory Bureau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 3105. A bill to provide that certain former members of the Polish armed forces residing in the British Isles may be admitted to the United States under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 without presenting the certificate of readmission required by section 7 (d) of that act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 3106. A bill to aid navigation and protect the fishing industry in the waters adjacent to New York City by prohibiting the dumping of certain materials in such waters; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3107. A bill to aid navigation and protect the fishing industry by prohibiting the dumping of certain materials in the coastal navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 3108. A bill to amend the Trade Agreements Extension Act of July 1, 1954, so as to assure the availability of materials essential to national security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 3109. A bill to provide for voluntary coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system for lawyers engaged in the practice of their profession; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 3110. A bill to establish a Commission to prepare a plan for the removal of temporary Government buildings in the District of Columbia, for the accommodation in other buildings of the personnel employed in such temporary buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3111. A bill to require certain ships to report by radio their positions every 24 hours; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 3112. A bill to authorize, under regulations of the Civil Service Commission, the withholding, upon request, from compensation of Federal employees amounts for the payment of certain life and hospitalization insurance and credit union savings deposits; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 3113. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by individuals, to promote thrift, and to stimulate expansion of employment through investment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3114. A bill to amend section 127 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and other statutes relating to the deduction of war losses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3115. A bill to create the office of Delegate at Large in the House of Representatives for ex-Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 3116. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide medical, surgical, and dental treatment and hospitalization for certain officers and employees of the former Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 3117. A bill to add a new section 274 to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide revenue and eliminate unfair competition by denying a deduction for amounts paid by a private industrial or commercial organization to a State or local government for the use of property acquired or improved by the Government by issuing industrial development bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3118. A bill to amend section 7851 (a) (1) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 3119. A bill to amend section 151 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional exemption for certain individuals who maintain separate households; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3120. A bill to promote public cooperation in the rehabilitation and preservation of the Nation's important historic properties in the New York City area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 3121. A bill to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 3122. A bill to provide for the conveyance of Camp Livingston, Camp Beauregard, and Esler Field, La., to the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 3123. A bill to repeal the provision of the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, which requires recoupment of certain Federal funds spent for school construction; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3124. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 3125. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to exempt operations in the transportation of livestock, fish, and agricultural, floricultural, and horticultural commodities from the act and from regulation by the Civil Aeronautics Board thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 3126. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of manganese-bearing ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. R. 3127. A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3128. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. R. 3129. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide that the Interstate Commerce Commission shall establish regulations requiring certain motor carriers to equip their motor vehicles with front and rear bumpers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3130. A bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which prohibits payments under the agricultural conservation program in certain cases; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 3131. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the deduction from gross income of an allowance for the depreciation of property owned and occupied by the taxpayer as his residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 3132. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 3133. A bill to establish a program of grants to States for the development of fine arts programs and projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 3134. A bill to provide for extension of terms of patents where the use, exploitation, or promotion thereof was prevented, impaired, or delayed by causes due to war, national emergency, or other causes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 3135. A bill to amend section 214 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deduction of expenses for the care of certain dependents); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 3136. A bill to amend the act to promote the education of the blind, approved March 3, 1879, as amended, so as to authorize wider distribution of books and other special instructional material for the blind, to increase the appropriations authorized for this purpose, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 3137. A bill to incorporate the Legion of Guardsmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H. R. 3138. A bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to provide that education and training allowances paid to veterans pursuing institutional on-farm training shall not be reduced for 12 months after they have begun their training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 3139. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 3140. A bill to establish public use of the national forests as a policy of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3141. A bill to promote the education and rehabilitation of the Indians of the United States and its Territories; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3142. A bill to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3143. A bill to increase the national minimum wage to $1 an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 3144. A bill to amend section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, in order to provide for direct distribution of surplus agricultural commodities in distress areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3145. A bill to provide for direct distribution of surplus agricultural commodities and products to relieve acute distress due to unemployment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 3146. A bill to authorize Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of privately owned real property as well as the shores of publicly owned real property; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3147. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 3148. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 175. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 176. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 112. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Armed Services to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters relating to procurement by the Department of Defense, personnel of such Department, laws administered by such Department, use of funds by such Department, and scientific research in support of the armed services; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 113. Resolution to provide for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 112; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 114. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. Res. 115. Resolution favoring the embracing within the Republic of Ireland of all the territory of that country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 116. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of air pollution in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. Res. 117. Resolution to provide funds for the investigations and studies made by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce pursuant to House Resolution 105; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the Executive Council, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to amend the provisions relative to pardons contained in the Immigration and Nationality Act,

commonly called the McCarran-Walter Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the provisions relative to pardons contained in the Immigration and Nationality Act, commonly called the McCarran-Walter Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution 3, which provides that the State department of public welfare shall have the authority to set the maximum payments equal to the maximum upon which Federal funds are earned; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 3149. A bill for the relief of Dr. Demetrios L. Floras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 3150. A bill for the relief of Louis Chen Sun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3151. A bill for the relief of Haim Braun Cohen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H. R. 3152. A bill for the relief of Waymon H. Massey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3153. A bill for the relief of Evoggelos Mpompotsis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 3154. A bill for the relief of Young Bae Kim and Susie H. Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3155. A bill for the relief of Reza Rezazadeh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 3156. A bill for the relief of Chryssoula Fotinatos (Stevens); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3157. A bill for the relief of Milagros Claveria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 3158. A bill for the relief of Shizuko Hamaoka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3159. A bill for the relief of Dwejra Shaffer and daughter, Haya Shaffer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 3160. A bill for the relief of Alick Bhark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 3161. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nadezhda Pojidaeff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3162. A bill for the relief of Joseph Berke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3163. A bill for the relief of George Mechial Mourkakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3164. A bill for the relief of Elvira and Gerardo Barrios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3165. A bill for the relief of Jose Ramos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3166. A bill to adjust the status of a displaced person in the United States who does not meet all the requirements of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3167. A bill for the relief of Kim Suingtuk Jacob, Mrs. Tai Kang Kim, Ruth Sunyung, and Luther Sunil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3168. A bill for the relief of Istvan Racz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3169. A bill for the relief of Tran Dinh Khe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3170. A bill for the relief of Oldrich Bartasek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3171. A bill for the relief of Rebecca Polak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3172. A bill for the relief of George and Maria Bonto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3173. A bill for the relief of Lydia Kunder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3174. A bill for the relief of Imre and Margareta Seykeli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3175. A bill for the relief of Bernt Erland Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3176. A bill for the relief of Albert Lest; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3177. A bill for the relief of Gizella Vajda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 3178. A bill for the relief of Dr. Reuben Rapaport; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 3179. A bill for the relief of Dr. Fred Ciampi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 3180. A bill for the relief of William Frederick Werner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 3181. A bill for the relief of Lilia Ebli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 3182. A bill for the relief of Ely Schapiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3183. A bill for the relief of Thomas Andrew Guckian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3184. A bill for the relief of Frederick J. Roggow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3185. A bill for the relief of Paraskevas George Stamatiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3186. A bill for the relief of Robert Bertram; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3187. A bill for the relief of Ada Carlucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 3188. A bill for the relief of William Lawler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 3189. A bill for the relief of Dorothy Claire Maurice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3190. A bill for the relief of Maria Lanau Buil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3191. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marielise Fallotico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 3192. A bill for the relief of the former shareholders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 3193. A bill for the relief of Evelyn Hardy Waters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 3194. A bill for the relief of B. S. Berney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 3195. A bill for the relief of Rolf Hugo Neuman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 3196. A bill for the relief of Nachman and Estera Rosen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3197. A bill for the relief of Kam-Fai Chan and Lau Chun Kwan Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3198. A bill for the relief of Anastase and Elefteria Haritos and Simone Haritos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3199. A bill for the relief of Ming Yu Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3200. A bill for the relief of George Parissis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3201. A bill for the relief of George Mikroulis, his wife, Dora Mikroulis, and his daughter, Madonna G. Mikroulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution for the relief of certain alien refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER (by request):

H. J. Res. 178. Joint resolution to release and quitclaim to Olin S. Proctor certain submerged lands within the Continental Shelf and beyond the 3-mile boundary line, Long Beach, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Defense of Formosa and Adjacent Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 26, 1955

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an able and important statement by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] concerning President Eisenhower's message requesting a congressional resolution on the defense of Formosa and adjacent areas. This statement was issued by the Senator from Missouri on Monday, January 24, 1955, and I should like to call it to the attention of all Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENNINGS CONCERNING PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S MESSAGE REQUESTING CONGRESSIONAL RESOLUTION ON DEFENSE OF FORMOSA AND ADJACENT AREAS

I had intended to speak today in the United States Senate concerning the constitutional implications of the President's message on the Far Eastern situation. Since, however, the Senate adjourned earlier than usual and will not meet again until Wednesday, at which time the Committee on Foreign Relations most probably will present its report on this matter, and since I feel it is essential that certain factors receive public consideration, I am issuing the following statement:

President Eisenhower has requested that the Congress adopt a resolution that in his words would "clearly and publicly establish the authority of the President as Commander in Chief to employ the Armed Forces of the Nation promptly and effectively" to protect our interest in Formosa and its environs if in his judgment it be-

comes necessary. I believe that the President under the Constitution already has this authority, although others may contend that he does not. In any case, I am certain that if he does not have such authority the Congress cannot constitutionally give it to him except in a declaration of war which, in this case, the President has clearly not requested. On the contrary, he appears to be requesting that Congress delegate to him the authority to conduct military operations at some future time if in his judgment such should be necessary.

I am seriously disturbed by the issues raised by this request. As a lawyer and as a member of the Judiciary Committee, I am most concerned with any matter which touches the keystone of our constitutional distribution of governmental power. And it is in my role, too, as a member of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, that I am apprehensive on this subject.

The public will recall that less than a year ago the Senate discussed at considerable length a proposed amendment to the Constitution that would have effected a revolutionary alteration in the office of the President, and, in my opinion, would have cut down the President's great historic powers in foreign affairs. I refer, of course, to the so-called Bricker amendment. The public will also recall that the debate was arduous and continued, and, in the end, the proposal failed to receive the required vote in this body. Some Senators fought to sustain and protect the President's historic constitutional powers and authority. Our efforts were ultimately successful.

Today the President in his message asked the Congress of the United States to take an action that seems to raise again the issues we decided in the Bricker debate. He has asked the Congress to approve in advance actions which he may take as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States; actions, if you please, which he may take at some indeterminate time in the future in the light of events which have not yet occurred; and the nature of which admittedly cannot be predicted at this time.

I am concerned lest this constitute a tacit acceptance by the President of the principle he opposed at the time of the debate on the Bricker amendment.

If the President's intention is to spell out in detail, for all the world to see, the fact that America is united in opposition to Communist aggression, he is to be commended for such intent. But is this not already known to the world? I believe so. But in choosing this manner of acting to demonstrate our unity, is the President not taking a step which may, in the future, react unfavorably for our country?

The action of the President is heavy with fearful possibilities. For what one President chooses to do, another Chief Executive may be required to do. While the situation today is such that the President has the opportunity to consult with Congress, in future years, indeed, in future months, the President may not have such time. And if President Eisenhower feels he must get the approval of Congress in this instance, will not he and his successors be required to obtain such approval in all instances? I do not know, but I am concerned lest this may prove to be the case. We must remember that we act not merely for today. Our action may well serve as a precedent binding upon future generations.

Therefore, while I will support the adoption of a resolution which would give President Eisenhower the moral support he desires, I think the resolution should be adopted in such a manner that the great historical powers of the Presidency will not be in any way limited for future generations. We who have inherited the blessings of our great constitutional system are at least under the obligation to hand down to our political heirs this constitutional office unimpaired in strength.

Why has the President asked Congress to formally support his contemplated action? I must confess I do not know.

Does the President have the authority to act in this matter in the absence of congressional approval? I believe that he has. And while some will contend that he does not have this authority, I can say with certitude that if he does not have it, Congress cannot give it to him. Under our Constitution, each branch of the Government has certain powers entrusted to it. And just as Congress cannot delegate to the President the authority to declare war, so the President cannot delegate to Congress the powers he possesses as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.

If the President is merely requesting our moral support by means of this proposed resolution, we will gladly give it to him on the basis of our faith in his integrity and purpose and out of respect for his high office. If he wishes us to assume responsibility for any action he may take, I submit that we cannot properly do so because we do not have the information on which such action must be based. We do not have access to the intelligence services of the State Department, the Department of Defense, the National Security Council, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the myriad channels through which information flows to the President. He has all the facts, the Senate virtually none. And since the President has all the facts, the responsibility for action must be his—as it is already his responsibility under the Constitution.

It is, therefore, obvious that if the President desires the Congress to share his heavy responsibility, he must give Congress the necessary information. And if he is not willing, or is not able, for reasons of national security, to give the Congress this information, then can we act intelligently or share his responsibility? I think not. I can speak only for myself as one Senator, and I do so speak. Before the Congress can assume responsibility for a course of action which very well may result in all-out war, I think the Congress has the right, and even the duty, to request all the information on the basis of which action may be contemplated.

I have the highest faith in the President's sincere desire to avoid world conflict. I know he will act in the manner which he believes will be most salutary for our country's future. I am willing and I am desirous of putting myself on record as having such faith. But I do not know if I can go further. If the President feels that the information which Congress would need in order to share his responsibility cannot be made public, then should the Senate not invite him to address us in executive session? And if this matter is so delicate that he cannot risk the leaks which might conceivably come from such a session, then I do not know if we can do anything more than give him our moral support.

I make these remarks with the full awareness that they may be misconstrued as either an attack on the President or a suggestion that we abandon an Asian ally. Such is not my intention. I am concerned lest the President's message be misinterpreted as a confession that the most powerful Nation in the world does not have the ability and the intention of taking immediate and firm action, through the unquestioned constitutional power of the President as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, to protect our interests whenever and wherever these are threatened, until such time as the President and the Congress are able to jointly agree on the details of a course of action. We must make it clear to the aggressive forces of communism that we are ever ready to hasten to the defense of freedom. I shall support the President of the United States as the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces in any action, which he, in that capacity takes for the safety and security of the United States in the fulfillment of our obligations under any treaty including, of course, the United Nations Charter, and in the protection of the interests of the free world anywhere.

City of Lakewood—Modern Day Miracle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a modern-day miracle has occurred in the 18th Congressional District of California, which I have the honor to represent. In just 4 years one of California's now major cities, with a population of 70,000, has risen on 3,375 acres of land that in January of 1951 was an agricultural reserve.

During these 4 years over 14,000 new homes were built on acreage which was part of a grant by the King of Spain to Dan Manuel Nieto in 1784. A $100 million shopping center nears completion. A new and novel city government has been born. And important new economic strength has been added to southern California and the Nation. Such, in summary, is the city of Lakewood.

Although Lakewood's 30 new homes a day pace is slacking off, it is not because it is losing any of its reputation as a pleasant place in which to live. It is simply that residential building sites are nearing the full utilization point. There remains room to add only about 3,500 new residences.

A gigantic 154-acre shopping center containing parking space for 7,632 cars lies at the city's center. Here is to be found Lakewood's modest rented city hall, together with a total of 84 businesses in operation. Construction of nine additional stores is underway and others will be added. The shopping-center area eventually will be rounded off with a medical building and additional parking lots.

The city government of Lakewood, which was incorporated April 18, 1954, has attracted nationwide attention for its unique plan of obtaining practically all its services from special county districts in existence prior to incorporation or through contracts with the county of Los Angeles. Under this system the city has been able to contract for police, fire, sanitation, and most other functions ordinarily carried on by local governments.

Lakewood's economies in capital investment and routine overhead are substantial. Under the contract system, the city has been able to operate with only a 29-cent property tax rate and with a small staff headed by City Administrator Robert T. Andersen.

After only 8 months of corporate existence, at the start of the new year the city of Lakewood had a total unexpended balance of $441,166.98 out of appropriations of $548,203 for the last 6 months of 1954. Thus expenditures for this city of 70,000 amounted to only $170,036.02

during the last 6 months of 1954. Accounts show $15,005.22 spent for personal services; $77,551.59 for contractual services, $5,765 for materials and supplies; $7,636.37 for equipment and $1,177.75 for fixed charges.

Costs in all contracted services ran far below appropriated estimates, according to the city's financial report. Only $269.26 of $2,000 set aside for county jail use was spent but $162.55 of $600 appropriated for health and sanitation. Highest cost was $53,100 of a $130,000 appropriation for lighting maintenance. Business-license enforcement cost but $776.24 against $21,329.69 in business-license revenues.

The extent to which contractual arrangements for services has been carried is illustrated by a current round-robin series of city civil-defense programs being carried on throughout the city. Even these are conducted by Los Angeles County civil-defense officials under a contract from the city of Lakewood.

Much of the success of the sparkling new community rests with its outstanding elected public officials. It is probable that no group of men anywhere in the Nation have given as much of themselves to their community during the past year as have Lakewood's city councilmen. The councilmen, all of whom serve without pay, are: Mayor Angelo M. Iacoboni, attorney; Eugene K. Nebeker, realtor; William J. Burns, newspaper reporter; George Nye, Jr., school teacher; and Robert W. Baker, electrical engineer.

Starting off with a marathon reading of the massive municipal code that started on the day of incorporation and ended at 5 a. m. the next day, by the first of this year the council had enacted 37 ordinances and 150 resolutions covering a great variety of activities ranging from the city's basic legal code to cosponsorship of monthly teen-age dances.

The small group of city employees headed by administrator Andersen consists of: city clerk Nita Birch, deputy clerk-typist Alene Hyatt, and administrative "interne" Henry Goerlick, who is on a part-time basis. Guy Halferty, special assistant to Andersen and city attorney John Todd serve on a retainer basis.

Incorporated Lakewood City is the hub of a yet greater contiguous community of homes some of which are in the corporate boundaries of Long Beach and others are in unincorporated county territory. The area as a whole is known as greater Lakewood. Despite this split political personality, residents of greater Lakewood regard themselves as a single community and there exists a great civic spirit which unites religious, fraternal, veterans' and civic organizations for the benefit of the entire area.

Greater Lakewood has a colorful history. By 1930, through transfers and marriages, the part of the King of Spain's original grant to Don Nieto, which is now Lakewood, had come in the hands of the Montana Land Co. headed by Clark J. Bonner. In that year Bonner filed a plan for subdivision of the area and today is kown as the father of Lakewood.

However, it was not until 1932 that the real beginning of greater Lakewood as a community for modern living began with the construction of Lakewood Country Club by Montana Land Co. In that same year, the company gave 29.84 acres of land to the Long Beach Unified School District for development of Long Beach City College campus. In September 1934 ground was broken adjacent to the campus for the first Lakewood subdivision.

Montana land chose promotion-minded Charles Hopper, developer of Bel-Air and South Gate to promote sales in the subdivision and one of his first steps was to have two-lane Cerritos Avenue renamed Lakewood Boulevard. Today that road's six busy traffic lanes truly entitle it to the name "boulevard."

Greater Lakewood's first business building was opened October 25, 1934, and its first resident, John Davies, moved into his new home in the spring of 1935.

Growth in the area was on a modest, but steady scale until it was given impetus by breaking of ground for the huge Douglas Aircraft Co. plant at Carson and Lakewood Boulevard in November 1940.

Postwar years saw ever increasing development by several subdividers including Griffith & Legg, Walker & Lee, Cunningham & Brittain, and the Aldon Construction Co.

However, it was not until an $8,800,000 transaction in January 1951 transferred Montana land's remaining 3,375 acres to the Lakewood Park Corp. which set out to build 17,500 homes that the incorporated area of Lakewood City got is real impetus.

With its neat rows of well-kept homes, many new schools, beautifully landscaped parkways, convenient shopping sections, model city government, and intense civic pride, Lakewood today is one of the outstanding communities of the United States. Its developers and residents have made it that way.

Every Member of Congress takes pride in the district he represents. In my case, the miracle of the city of Lakewood more than justifies my pride in California's 18th Congressional District.

Salute to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 26, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague from New York [Mr. POWELL] in a salute to the Republic of India on this fifth anniversary of its independence.

I share with him the thought and belief that the Government of India and its people are not antiwhite and that such charges made by leaders in our own country are unwise, unfair, and unjust.

To have India as a friend of the United States and of the free world is of vital importance to the cause of democracy and human freedom. It seems to me that the philosophy and character of the Indian people puts them on the side of freedom and human decency and against totalitarian tyranny in any form.

Not only are hostile public statements offensive to the people of India, but they offend our friends among the dark races of Asia. The Communist cause and not the cause of freedom and democracy is helped by irresponsible public statements against the young republic and the Indian people.

As my distinguished friend from New York has so eloquently pointed out, we can play a more effective role in the fight against totalitarian tyranny when good sense and the practice of democratic principles becomes more evident in both our foreign and domestic policies.

The Closing of Fourth-Class Post Offices in Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. FORRESTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 26, 1955

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, under orders of the Postmaster General the following fourth-class post offices in the Third District of Georgia have been closed:

Sumter post office, a post office which had existed for approximately 90 years and a post office which served 27 families and, also, a school which was dependent upon that service; Dooling post office, an office which had been in existence for many, many years and serving 51 families; Cobb post office, an office serving 31 families and being the office which served the Veterans' State Park where the safety program, inaugurated by the State Highway Patrol of Georgia, is held annually and hundreds of boys attend annually, and where statewide veterans' activities are held on practically a year-round basis; and Plainfield post office, which has existed for more than 40 years and which serves more than 39 families.

Further, the post office at Powersville, an office which has been in existence for many years and which serves at least 175 persons, and which would serve the personnel and civilians at the United States Naval Base, which is now in process of being built and located only 4 miles from Powersville, and where a new State highway is being built to Robins Air Force Base only 12 miles away, will be closed shortly unless the Postmaster General shows a great change of heart.

In fact, every fourth-class post office in the district I represent, which has been considered by the Post Office Department, has been closed with the exception of Powersville, and the Postmaster General has advised that Powersville is to be closed. Additionally, the Postmaster General is now investigating other fourth-class post offices in the dis-

trict I serve, and if the Postmaster General follows past performance those under investigation will be closed, also.

The wholesale closing of fourth-class post offices simply cannot be justified. The post offices I have referred to, which have already been closed, have been the means of holding those fine rural settlements together. The post offices and churches have been the means of keeping these people in their rural communities.

The post office service has been one service these rural people could see and understand, also, a service by their Government from some of the tax money they paid the Government.

Despite the fact that I thought the closing of these post offices was a tragic mistake, I have tried to feel that the fourth-class post offices in our district were sharing the same treatment as other offices over the Nation. I was terribly shocked, however, when I read in the papers last week that the Postmaster General had decided to retain a fourth-class post office in another section of this country which served 12 families, and that his decision to serve that office was based on the fact that a great athlete, in the years gone by, received his mail at that post office. This is not to be construed as a demand that the service of that post office be discontinued, but I do intend that it serve as an example to demonstrate the reckless action on the part of the Postmaster General. In common with every section in this country, prominent and remarkable people live in everyone of the areas of the post offices which have already been closed in our district.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that a review should be made by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of every fourth-class post office which has been closed, and to ascertain the damage inflicted upon the people served by those offices and, also, to ascertain whether any well-defined and fair policy has been adhered to in the closing of these offices, or whether many have been recklessly disposed of and many have been retained for some fanciful, but impractical, reason.

Can the Ukraine Shake Off the Communist Yoke?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO KRUEGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1955

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, the anniversary of the Declaration of Ukrainian Independence, January 22, is another reminder of the tactics and policies of the Soviets against the peoples of the world who love freedom and independence.

It was in 1918 that these 40 million residents of the rich Ukraine moved toward self-government after the collapse of the Russian empire. But the Bolsheviks with a Russian army invaded the new nation, set up their puppet government and the territory went under the control of the Communist dictators.

The familiar story of oppression and pillage followed. The resources of 250,000 square miles of fertile land, the mines and industry were diverted to the upbuilding of Communist power.

Resistance was bitter but costly. Massacre and famine followed. Millions were uprooted, sent to Siberia, to other Asiatic areas to face a bitter existence as slave laborers.

And while we hear this talk of coexistence, let us remember the pattern of conquest, the ruin of peoples and of nations that have come under the Kremlin's fist.

In the United States today we have a group of Ukrainians who escaped the Communists. They have taken a place in their adopted country, are leaders in professions, citizens of the finest type. It is this group, with a full realization of the benefits of liberty, that are the voice of the 40 million behind the Iron Curtain, that help keep us conscious of the dangers of communism in our country.

Personal Attacks on President Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, many of our colleagues must have read with amazement, as I did, an extension and revision of remarks in yesterday's RECORD by our distinguished colleague from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] in connection with the Formosa resolution.

In an address to Congress by President Eisenhower on February 2, 1953, dealing in part with the employment of the United States 7th Fleet by former President Truman both, first, to prevent attack upon Formosa; and, second, to prevent Formosa from attacking the Communist-held China mainland, President Eisenhower said of the Truman order:

> This has meant, in effect, that the United States Navy was required to serve as a defensive arm of Communist China.

Mr. HOLIFIELD characterized this statement by President Eisenhower as a "brazen partisan political statement," and said that "it was received by the Democrats with deep resentment—because we knew, as the President knew, that the statement was untrue."

Elsewhere in the body of today's RECORD our distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] discusses in detail the facts of the 7th Fleet deployment and shows the complete accuracy of President Eisenhower's statements.

It is my real and sincere hope that Mr. HOLIFIELD did not intend from the forum of the House of Representatives to call the President of the United States a liar. I would resent such a personal attack and I know millions of fine Americans would resent such a personal attack.

Nevertheless, and despite general statements from the President's political opponents that they will not oppose just for opposition's sake, I have noted a recurrent emanation from them of what I would consider unfounded and unwarranted personal attacks on the President and those around him. Some persons have even raised a question as to whether or not there exists an organized and planned all-out attack by vilification and innuendo both against President Eisenhower and his program.

It may be that I am oversensitive to these unwarranted and unfounded personal attacks on the President. So that my colleagues may judge for themselves, I set forth some statements made over the past 6 months which I regard as personal attacks against the President of the United States:

Adlai E. Stevenson, August 18, 1954 (United Press): Stevenson charged President Eisenhower with "putting party expediency" ahead of "even his own view of the national interest."

Adlai E. Stevenson, August 18, 1954 (United Press): Stevenson sharply criticized President Eisenhower for offering his good wishes to Joseph T. Meek, 1954 Republican candidate for the Senate in Illinois.

Adlai E. Stevenson, August 18, 1954 (Washington Post and Times-Herald): In a speech on the Republican farm program, Stevenson said: "But even more interesting * * * was the * * * Presidential failure to point out that it was a cynical and total breach of promise, which apparently is no longer a political offense, at least among Republicans."

Stephen A. Mitchell, August 16, 1954 (New York Times): "Let's look * * * at the Dixon-Yates scandal. Here was a deal to grant a subsidy of $140 million to a favored power syndicate, on the President's personal order, over the protest of the Atomic Energy Commission and the TVA, without competitive bidding.

"A director of 1 of the 2 companies in the favored syndicate is one of the President's closest friends (Bobby Jones) with a cottage next to President Eisenhower's at the Augusta golf course.

"Maybe they never even talked about it, I don't know. Maybe it's just a coincidence that some of the bankers in this administration came from banks which underwrite this kind of project; I don't know."

Stephen A. Mitchell, August 18, 1954 (United Press: Democrat Chairman Mitchell charged President Eisenhower with a "multi-billion-dollar giveaway to big business" in the Dixon-Yates power controversy.

Averell Harriman, December 8, 1954 (Associated Press): The Democrat Governor-elect of New York said: "We've got to stop avoiding holding President Eisenhower responsible for the actions of his lieutenants and of the Republican Party." * * *

"When President Eisenhower told the people of this country that there would be a 'partisan cold war' in Washington if the Democrats won control of Congress," Harriman continued, "he was saying something that wasn't true—and that he has admitted wasn't true." * * *

"If that is an example of the responsibility that President Eisenhower feels to the people of this country, then I hope it is also a lesson for us Democrats—and I think it's one we're beginning to learn.

"We've got to quit this business of excluding President Eisenhower from criticism of the unworthy campaign tactics that have been adopted by the Republican Party, and that he has condoned."

Harriman added: "This is not an administration, or a party, without a head—much as it sometimes seems to be."

Paul M. Butler, December 5, 1954 (Baltimore Sun): The present Democrat chairman said: "As the months have passed it has become more and more apparent that a military background is not a full and complete preparation for a Chief Executive.

"It has become more and more apparent month by month that the Eisenhower administration and the Republican Party have a lack of capacity to lead and unite the American people."

Asked by reporters if he meant Eisenhower himself, Butler said: "I certainly did. I think the responsibility is with the President."

Paul M. Butler, December 5, 1954 (Associated Press): "The responsibility is with the President to see that the Nation is united and there is ever-increasing evidence of his lack of capacity to do it."

Paul M. Butler, December 8, 1954 (Washington Post and Times-Herald): President Eisenhower "has not shown the particular qualities that enabled Harry Truman to write such a courageous page in history.

"I only wish that President Eisenhower had the courage to join with moderate Republicans and Democrats in Congress to square away with the Old Guard and extremists in his own party."

Paul M. Butler, December 10, 1954 (New York Times): Amplifying his earlier attacks on President Eisenhower, Butler declared: "It would seem to me that the first step might well be to make some effort to unite and lead his own party. We do not have to look far to see that the Republican Party is not united and is not being led by the President."

Paul M. Butler, December 12, 1954 (Associated Press): "We feel that thus far the President has not displayed the qualities of leadership that he displayed as a military figure."

SAM RAYBURN, December 4, 1954 (New Orleans Item): The Item quoted RAYBURN as saying that he "does not think President Eisenhower knows his job." * * *

The Item further quoted RAYBURN as saying: "The truth is, I don't think he (President Eisenhower) pays enough attention to the work and I don't think he knows what is going on"

SAM RAYBURN, January 4, 1955 (Washington Post and Times-Herald): At the party caucus of Democrat Members of the House on January 4, RAYBURN said, "* * * We Democrats cannot forget some of the tactics employed by the President's own party in the last campaign, the reckless smearing of Democrats as alleged traitors, with which the President saw fit to identify himself." * * *

"In my estimation, that makes Eisenhower a party to these unwarranted attacks on our patriotism."

Democratic Digest, February 1955: The February issue of the Democratic Digest tried to show that in more than a score of instances over the last 2 years, President Eisenhower was "at odds with himself or his party."

The Digest asserted that since the President appeared on the political scene "he has presented so many different faces that no one positive image had emerged."

Walter P. Reuther, December 9, 1954 (New York Times): Reuther accused President Eisenhower of perpetrating a "political fraud" by saying that Labor Secretary Mitchell held equal status with other Cabinet officers.

"The Secretary of Labor is not a member of the Cabinet," Reuther said. "He is just there as convenient window dressing to make the working people believe they have a voice in the policymaking decisions of our Government."

Veterans' Educational Benefits Should Be Extended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include at this time the statement I presented before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee on January 25, at the public hearings being held on H. R. 587.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE, OF MASSACHUSETTS, BEFORE HOUSE VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE ON H. R. 587

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I want to thank the chairman and the committee for the courtesy extended to me and congratulate you upon the expediency with which you are acting to deal with a problem affecting the lives of so many of our military personnel and veterans. Of course, I would expect nothing less from the committee on which I have had the high honor of serving for several years and therefore know so well the industry and competency of its individual members. I have the happiest recollections of my membership here, particularly under the spirited leadership of the acknowledged champion of veterans' welfare, my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, the beloved Mrs. Rogers.

Knowing the arduous schedule of this committee, as well as the multiple personal duties resting heavily upon each member, I have no intention of transgressing long upon your valued time.

I am here to urge you to promptly consider and approve, I hope unanimously, this bill to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952.

I think everyone will substantially agree to the need and the merit of this measure which, to my mind, affords but simple justice to the patriotic men and women who are now in the service, or will be by the end of this month. Any action to suddenly cut off these educational benefits is practically a violation of an unwritten understanding and virtual promise by the Government that persons going into the armed services in this period would have the privilege of pursuing their educational ambitions with Government assistance upon the termination of their enlistments.

Not the least of the aims of this bill is to remove any doubts in the minds of the persons affected and to make the extent of their entitlements quite clear, and unquestionably it will serve to do just that. It will, therefore, lift the morale of these young patriots and assure them the Congress has no intention of summarily taking away any of the benefits to which they understood they had a right. I submit that it is vitally important, more especially in the light of recent unfortunate developments in the Far East, that the morale of our military personnel, their families, and dependents be encouraged to a high level, and this proposal is designed to accomplish that objective.

We all understand that the need of prompt action on this measure by the Congress is great. I shall not, then, attempt to complicate consideration of this bill by introducing any discussion about granting educational benefits to those who enter military service in the future. I think that serious thought should be given to the extended projection of such benefits and I earnestly hope the committee will devote its attention to that subject in the near future. If, by any chance, such provision was included during the coming House action on this bill, I would be inclined to favor it on the basic ground that no one, not even the President, dares try to foretell what will develop from the dangerous venture upon which we are now embarked in the Far East waters and islands. I trust, therefore, we will have an opportunity to implement this legislation before too long, if the majority of the membership feels such action would be essential.

I realize full well that this committee will conscientiously act upon this proposal, and I earnestly trust you will determine to favorably report it to the House without extended delay, because it is most impressively meritorious and just on its face value.

My thanks again to you all for your kindness and courtesy.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1955

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marked an anniversary that tears at the hearts of many loyal Americans of Ukrainian descent—the 37th anniversary of the independence proclamation of the Ukrainian people. They had great hopes and faith when they started anew, in 1918, to carry on their ancient traditions of national independence. But their hopes were shortlived. The Ukraine was the first non-Russian country to fall victim to the wicked imperialism of the Soviet. The churches of the Ukraine were among the first to be leveled in the fanatical atheism of these godless conquerors. Ukrainians were decimated in the famines and purges and the deportations and mass murders to which Moscow resorts when it is challenged by the national spirit of the non-Russians it enslaves.

Yet, through all these trials and tribulations the Ukrainians have never lost their spirit or their hopes. In the brief interlude during World War II, when they were permitted to fight at our sides, the Ukrainians distinguished themselves as a valorous breed apart from their Russian masters. They wait, 40 million strong, for the great opportunity—which history must surely hold for them—to reaffirm their independence and take their places, at last, in the community of free nations and free men and women.

These brave friends of ours behind the Iron Curtain cannot raise their voices so we can hear. But they hear us, through our official efforts to communicate with them, and through all the unofficial channels that always carry words of hope to men of good heart within the tyrants' domain. I am glad to see a number of my colleagues taking note of this anniversary. I am proud to join them, and add my voice to theirs.

Lynwood, Calif., High-School Students Put on Successful Get-Out-the-Vote Campaign in the November 2, 1954, Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

Wednesday, January 26, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent granted me heretofore so to do, I am pleased to herewith set forth information and evidence of the very active, very well-organized, and very successful campaign by the students of the Lynwood, Los Angeles County, Calif., High School, which started October 18, 1954, and continued through election day, November 2, 1954.

The Lynwood Press, a community-conscious newspaper, gave the students deserved and extensive publicity by printing on the very front page thereof on October 28, 1954, the following letter:

OCTOBER 18, 1954.

DEAR STUDENT BODY: We seniors at Lynwood High School are out to prove that we have what it takes to really make democracy live. Seniors in previous years became truly alarmed when they learned that but 67 percent of the qualified voters of Lynwood had shown up at the polls when some truly crucial issues were at stake. The senior problems classes sparked a "Get out the vote" campaign, the results of which were astounding. In the presidential campaign of 1952, 92 percent voted.

We're proud of what these "alums" did, but we're not yet satisfied with the civic participation of our voters. We know more moms and dads should get to the polls. We're wondering how you feel about this situation, and we're thinking maybe you will be interested in knowing what we are doing. Maybe you can give us some ideas, too.

Under the chairmanship of two livewire seniors, we've organized committees that are really on the beam. We've a big sign ready to stretch from walk to walk over our main street. When mom goes to the market she's going to find a right smart handbill stowed away with the groceries. Even car bumpers are reminding Lynwoodites that November 2 is a day to remember. (We're particularly proud of the seniors who designed these signs, and of the printshop boys who did the producing.) One of the very special features of our homecoming parade is going to be the surprise "Get out the vote" senior float.

To be sure that mom gets to the polls, we're sending out crews of specially trained baby sitters; expert chauffeurs will drive her to the polls if she doesn't have her own transportation. We don't care how mom votes, and dad's choice for Senator is his own secret, but we do want to be sure they both get to the polls—our neighbors, too. We want to make the voting percentage of our Lynwood the highest in the good old United States.

Will you go along with us on this project, and make your plans for a get-out-the-vote campaign? May we hear from you?

Footnote: As the November elections draw nearer Lynwood high-school students are working fast and furiously toward a goal which is vastly important to us and to the American way of life.

What we are asking of you, our parents, is not a difficult thing to accomplish. It requires no effort, no money, and very little time. What it does require is thought—thought for your future and for ours—thought for freedom and a way of life surpassed nowhere, by no one. When the November elections roll around, we want you to get out and vote.

We want to keep alive not only the idea of democracy, but the practice of it as well.

Our efforts in this campaign are not entirely unselfish, however. We want to be sure you leave our country in great shape for the time when we take over your privileges and responsibilities—the greatest of which is the right to vote.

If you need transportation or a baby sitter so that you can visit the polls, call NE 1-6153. The candidates will not thank you for your votes nearly as much as we will, the future citizens, who will benefit by them.

We are willing to put forth time and effort to get you to the polls. Are you willing to get out and vote?

NORA GAEDE and JIM DUNN,
Cochairmen of Steering Committee.
FLORENE HERREID, *Secretary.*
SALLY JOHNSON,
Director of Public Relations.
TOM BANCROFT, *Supervisor.*

Other publicity channels carried the same story and the Lynwood High School student paper Castle Courier on October 29, 1954, on the front page of that splendid, sizable 6-page student publication carried in prominent place the following text:

VOTE—STUDENTS IN ALL-OUT CAMPAIGN FOR URGING COMMUNITY TO VOTE

Vote more in 1954. That is the slogan used by the senior class this year in an all-out campaign to get citizens of Lynwood out to vote November 2.

The campaign is under the direction of Mr. Tom Bancroft, faculty advisor, and Nora Gaede and Jim Dunn, student chairmen of the student steering committee. The members of this committee are Florene Herreid, secretary; Jerry Ackley, Dale Costa, Sam Leonard, Diane Olhoeft, Meredith Perkins, Sondra Sanders, Carol Sturtevant, Sally Steele, Mary Cornell, Arlene Watts, Jackie Crammer, and Margie Stone.

The committee has organized various activities that they are undertaking. They have already sent out letters to every school in southern California telling of plans and asking that they might try to do something on the same order to try to increase their voting percentage.

Students have contacted the ministers of Lynwood asking them to remind the people of their churches to vote. Handbills were printed and were distributed throughout the community in the gas stations and in the grocery stores. Speeches were made to the various service clubs and to the schools around Lynwood.

A banner was erected to hang across Long Beach Boulevard in front of the bank. This is a constant reminder to the citizens of Lynwood to vote on November 2.

A float that will long be remembered by everyone in Lynwood was the one entered by the student steering committee, in the homecoming parade.

The senior class has asked that the citizens who vote on November 2 turn on their porch lights. If their porch light is not on it will help the students to find the ones who have not yet voted and they will remind them to do so.

Meredith Perkins, senior class president, says, "We of the senior class are hopeful of a 100 percent turnout this year for Lynwood."

In addition thereto the same Castle Courier, on its editorial page carried the following:

FROM THE EDITOR'S DESK

Vote. Vote. Vote. That is the cry of the senior class. This year they are going all out in a campaign to get 13,000 people out to vote.

How do they propose to do it? Well, they have many activities planned and they are working very hard to carry them out. The senior problems classes elected a representative to represent them on the Student Steering Committee. They are Jerry Ackley, Dale Costa, Mary Cornell, Jackie Crammer, Jim Dunn, Nora Gaede, Florene Herreid, Sam Leonard, Diane Olhoeft, Meredith Perkins, Sondra Sanders, Margie Stone, Lynn Butler, Carole Sturtevant, Sally Steele, and Arlene Watts. They are guided by a very efficient advisor by the name of Mr. Tom Bancroft.

From this committee they appointed two co-chairmen who are Nora Gaede and Jim Dunn. Also a secretary, Florene Herreid.

Among the activities that they have carried out has been the banner stretched across Long Beach Boulevard, reminding the voters to vote on November 2.

The printshop has been busy printing up the handbill which will be passed out throughout the community to the gas stations and grocery stores. They have been busy making speeches to the primary schools, in an effort to get them to tell their parents about the campaign. Also they were given the handbills to take home to their parents and to those who don't have children.

Letters were sent to all the schools in southern California, telling them all about the all-out campaign put on by the senior class, and suggesting that they might do the same.

Speeches were given to the service organizations of Lynwood asking for their support.

Then they had their float in the homecoming parade advertising their campaign. The public address system was used to advertise it all the more.

Election day they will supply free baby-sitters and free transportation for mothers who wish to vote at that time.

These students have put hours upon hours of work on this, and I think we should all take our hats off to them and the whole senior class for the tremendous job that they have done.

Now let's all help them by reminding our parents to vote on November 2.

FLORENE HERREID,
Assistant Editor.

The same Lynwood Press carried the following:

TURN ON YOUR PORCH LIGHT AT 5 P. M. IF YOU HAVE VOTED

Next Tuesday, November 2, is election day in California. Every registered voter is urged to get out and vote for the candidate of his choice by the get-out-the-vote committees of the Lynwood High School, chamber of commerce, Kiwanis Club, realtors, and many other organizations.

The committee at the high school asks that at 5 o'clock, if you have voted, turn on your porch light. Students will call on every home without the porch light on, to remind the residents that it is still not too late. If you need a babysitter call the high school, NE 1–6153, and one will be furnished. If you need transportation the high-school students or any member of the Lynwood-Compton Realty Board will furnish it.

The sample ballots mailed recently tell where to vote.

In addition to all the foregoing vigorous and timely publicity, the Lynwood High School students in their own printshop produced many thousands of handbills on the outside of which were the following words: "For Adults Only," while on the inside thereof was used a graph of a Democratic donkey and a Republican elephant. But in addition thereto the following language in very

readable type: "Get-out-the-vote campaign—sponsored by Lynwood High seniors and Lynwood Chamber of Commerce. For free transportation and baby care call NE 1-6153 until 3:30 p. m." These were distributed throughout the total city population.

Nor was this Lynwood student body in my great 23d Congressional District the only student body which actively put on campaigns to get out the vote. However, so far as has come to my attention, it appears that the Lynwood High School student body was the most active with its punchline and with a large number of students participating and with a very sizable and active community response and cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you and all my distinguished colleagues join with me in extending congratulations to this very large high-school student body which, by the evidence of its activity to get out the vote has become early conscious of this duty of every American entitled to cast his or her ballot.

As you well know, Mr. Speaker, each one of the four terms I have already previously served in this great legislative body I have very strongly emphasized on the floor of this house and in many visible ways my belief that it was the duty of every Member of this great legislative body to do his or her utmost in their respective congressional districts to cooperate with all community groups and organizations to see to it that the maximum number of American citizens exercise their voting franchise and perform their duty at the polls. For instance, on August 4, 1954, on pages 13172 and 13173 of the RECORD, appear my remarks on the subject of "vote on election day."

And now I wish to state emphatically that I think it is not too early for all Members of this great Congress to in every practical way urge and assist every possible community effort in their respective congressional districts to promote and plan that the largest possible number of American voters in their respective congressional districts shall go to the polls and vote. Nor do I confine myself just to elections for Members of Congress and for the President of the United States. I refer to what might be termed local elections, as well as State, county, and national elections.

This voting participation is one of the factors which is clearly certain to help perpetuate democratic processes and, therefore, our American way of life.

Mrs. Ella J. Vaughn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 26, 1955

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is with distinct pride that I have the honor and pleasure of paying a much deserved tribute to one of the great ladies of our Nation. She is not one who has been publicized in the metropolitan newspapers nor one who has appeared on nationwide radio and television broadcasts. She is not one who has sought the limelight of publicity nor undertaken to find praise for the great contributions that she has made to mankind. The lady of whom I speak is truly "Mrs. America." She is Mrs. Ella J. Vaughn, of Silverton, Briscoe County, Tex., who will on Sunday, January 30, celebrate her 103d birthday. She first saw the light of day in Wood County, Tex., on January 30, 1852, when Millard Fillmore was the 13th President of this great country. In fact, her birthplace is only a few short miles from the birthplace of the present occupant of our White House, the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower. Mrs. Vaughn has lived under the administrations of 22 of our 32 Presidents and has witnessed the greatest era in the advancement of civilization and in the development and progress of mankind. Her first recollection of any President was the Honorable James Buchanan. She remembers vividly the assassination of Abraham Lincoln. She is affectionately known as Grandma Vaughn to everyone who enjoys the honor of her acquaintance. Her full enjoyment of life is exemplified by the perpetual smile that greets her children and her countless friends. Certainly, we in the Panhandle of Texas are honored that her long and useful life has been spent in this great area. Her fine character and unselfish devotion to her children and her country exemplify the fine Christian life for which we all so diligently strive. Grandma Vaughn has been, and will always be, a fine example for all in our section of the country. America is indeed proud to extend to you sincere congratulations on the celebration of your 103d birthday and to extend to you best wishes for many more.

The Distressed Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 26, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, an audience of leading statesman, diplomats, and industrialists was in attendance at the Silver Quill Award Dinner in this city a week ago last Saturday.

One of the highlights of this occasion was the novel way in which various spokesmen presented information on their respective industries and governmental activities. This information was elicited through questions such as that asked of L. C. Campbell, president of the National Coal Association, and vice president of Eastern Gas and Fuel Associates, some of whose mining operations are in my district. His response was in answer to this question:

If coal is the sick industry that it is reported to be, will you as the man responsible for the coal development at Eastern Gas and Fuel Associates, as well as president of the National Coal Association, tell us what steps are being taken by producers to bolster the future security of your industry, which is of course tied to the security of the Nation?

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including his answer in the RECORD. I should like also to associate myself with the views herein expressed in respect to prevailing conditions in many of our coal-mining communities. I want to emphasize Mr. Campbell's comment regarding the fact that a single plant which closes down sometimes takes the jobs of as many as 800 miners. On an average, the number of human beings thus directly affected is in the neighborhood of four or five thousand. Yes; besides those 800 men are the women and children who are automatically deprived of many of the actual necessities of life once the breadwinner's income is removed. It is true that, for a short time, unemployment benefit payments provide a part of the food and clothing which every normal family requires, but when those benefits are exhausted these persons must depend entirely upon surplus food commodities for subsistence. Today if you should walk into many of the schools in the mining communities of West Virginia, you would meet numerous children who left their homes this morning without an adequate breakfast. By this time, they will have participated in the free lunch program, but by nightfall they will again sit down to a meal that is sadly lacking in the nourishment necessary for proper growth. Many of those children are improperly clothed, and there is little chance that they will obtain new coats or dresses or suits or shoes so long as current conditions persist.

Mr. Campbell stated very precisely that it is dangerous from a defense standpoint to take for granted that a crippled industry can respond to the demands that would come about in a national emergency. I believe that none among us could ignore coal's place in the national security if only this statement from Mr. Campbell's address were observed and considered:

A ton of coal per ton of steel—a pound of coal per kilowatt-hour of electricity—there you have the lifeblood of America's industrial might today and tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, Congress is empowered with the authority to alleviate at least a portion of the distress that has enveloped coal communities. It can return employment to many thousands of our miners and make it possible for the families of these men to again assume the God-given right to adequate food and clothing if it will enact legislation to provide a 10-percent quota limitation on foreign residual and crude oil shipped into this country. In the last paragraph of the Campbell statement, he mentioned that most of his audience had never seen a coal miner. As a person who was brought up in a coal-miner's home, I would like to assure you that the story of poverty that has come to coal communities is not an exaggeration. I lived in a coal-mining town when foreign residual oil began to trickle into the fuel markets of the east coast. As this inflow increased in intensity, mine after mine was forced to cut back production, and the "no work tomorrow" sign began

to haunt more and more mining families. As the imports reached flood stage, jobs were wiped out completely, and today throughout West Virginia there is ample evidence of the dire consequence of the policies which have permitted these imports to plague the coal industry. I believe that the present predicament of our mining families is the most compelling testimony for need of a quota restriction on oil imports.

Following is the text of Mr. Campbell's statement:

STATEMENT OF MR. L. C. CAMPBELL, BEFORE THE SILVER QUILL BANQUET OF THE NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS, INC., ON JANUARY 29, 1955

Question: If coal is the sick industry that it is reported to be, will you, as the man responsible for the coal development at Eastern Gas and Fuel Associates, as well as president of the National Coal Association, tell us what steps are being taken by producers to bolster the future security of your industry, which is of course tied to the security of the Nation?

Mr. Chairman, may I say that coal is not necessarily a sick industry, but rather that its economic health is seriously impaired. This is evidenced by the fact that whereas 95 percent of the Nation's power and fuel needs at one time were supplied by coal, today coal accounts for about 45 percent, petroleum and natural gas supply 25 percent each, and the balance is supplied by water power.

Production of 630 million tons of coal in 1947 has declined to less than 400 million tons in 1954. Manpower of more than 600,000 has declined to slightly over 200,000 in 1954. One hundred thousand miners went off the payrolls in that year alone. These jobless miners have thus become our displaced persons in the United States. This is a brief sketch of the gradual dismantling of the great basic coal mining industry on which the industrial might of America was built.

There exists a tremendous conflict of the energy supply available from coal, oil, natural gas, and electricity. The attrition of the coal mining industry still goes on. The tragedy of displaced workmen stalks every coal field in the country. Whole communities see their only source of livelihood wiped out. Plant after plant is closed down. The dismantling of a single plant frequently takes the jobs of as many as 800 miners.

Despite factors contributing to the present situation, including competition from domestic as well as imported fuel, coal producers have invested millions on millions of dollars to improve mining methods and the quality of the product. Mechanization and modernization of mining plants and methods have increased the man-day output from 4½ tons per man-day 20 years ago to more than 9 tons per man-day in 1954, and 10 tons per man-day is in sight. This compares with a little over 1 ton per man-day in European mining. The effect has been to lower the price of the product at the mine to an average of $4.82 a ton in 1954, in spite of wage increases which have taken place in all industry over a period of years.

Reliable estimates place the demand for coal in an all-out emergency mobilization at 650 to 700 million tons annually. To reach that figure in a given year the industry must have a minimum year-to-year production of 500 million tons. The 1954 production was more than 100 million tons below the safe level.

American coal producers have never yet failed to meet the challenge for necessary coal in every national emergency. The Nation should not take for granted that a crippled industry can again thus respond unless an adequate going industry, properly manned and equipped, is available for the expansion in this mechanical mining age. The Nation's welfare and security demand that the industry be given proper scrutiny by the Government to the end that appropriate policy changes be effected, so that the coal industry's own efforts to meet the challenge of not only emergency but normal requirements may no longer be impeded by factors beyond its control.

A ton of coal per ton of steel—a pound of coal per kilowatt-hour of electricity—there you have the life-blood of America's industrial might today and tomorrow. The challenge is for all of us to do our part to keep it flowing.

Most of you have never seen a coal miner. I appreciate the opportunity to be here as one who has spent 30 interesting years in the industry and express my appreciation to the business publications which have contributed so much to our American story on industry, and especially to the group who speak for coal.

Tenth Anniversary of Yalta Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 26, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, the approach of the 10th anniversary, on February 7, 1955, of the famous wartime meeting at Yalta of the Big Three, which marked the beginning of a series of retreats of the free world before the forward march of Soviet aggression, serves to forcefully remind us of the continuing tragic fate of Poland.

With the current gravity of governmental indecision in the Republic of France, and the pregnant situation in the Far East, it is becoming increasingly evident that the American people must concentrate upon the vital need for a prompt overall European settlement. It is supremely important that the Government of the United States decide whether any peaceful and lasting world order can be achieved when such international commitments as those written in the Atlantic Charter and the Yalta agreement are so boldly violated.

It is increasingly evident that there is no semblance and no intent whatever of any real democracy being permitted to exist in Poland under Russian dominance.

This country is morally bound to make it clear that in its conscientious judgment what did occur, and is now occurring, in Poland embraces a violation of the third article of the Atlantic Charter, to which every member of the United Nations is committed.

The duty of the American Government to take a decisive stand in Poland's case cannot be forever disregarded. It is a matter of official record that in addition to the pledges set forth in the Yalta agreement, the United States during the war years repeatedly and specifically assured the Polish people, through their representatives, that it would never recognize a government "not representative of Poland."

The United States cannot hope to retain the confidence of the smaller nations, and to exercise a continued influence in world affairs, if it disregards pledges of so solemn a character. The United States must redeem our pledge by calling upon the United Nations to assume the humanitarian responsibility of demanding that the Christian people of Poland, who suffered so much in the Allied cause, shall not become victims of the ruthless pagan imperialism of an oppressive totalitarian government.

The Foreign Agents Registration Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 26, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a news item written by William Galbraith of the United Press, appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 16, 1955, together with a memorandum on possible legal questions raised therein prepared for me by the American Law Division of the Library of Congress:

SOVIET SEEN EVADING UNITED STATES TRAVEL CURBS

(By William Galbraith)

The Soviet Union gets partly around the recently imposed tighter control on Russian travel in the United States by employing Americans, officials said yesterday.

The Americans include eight correspondents here and in New York employed by Tass, the official Russian news agency. A small number also work for Tass in noneditorial capacities.

The United States clamped the new travel controls on Russians January 3 in a tit-for-tat measure against similar restrictions which have long hindered American travel in the Soviet Union.

The order closed about 27 percent of the United States to persons holding Soviet passports.

However, officials said the order has no effect on the Americans working for Tass. If the Soviet Union wants to learn something about an area closed to Russian travelers, Tass can send one of the Americans to the area to make a firsthand report.

State Department officials, who worked out the order with other interested Federal agencies, said they were aware of this loophole when drafting the controls.

However, officials said, if the United States found any open attempt to circumvent the order the State Department could bring the matter up with the Soviet Embassy and presumably take action against such an attempt.

The United States hires some Russians for work on unclassified matters in the American Embassy at Moscow. These Soviet citizens are not subject to travel restrictions on Americans but are affected by many other controls which Russia maintains on all its citizens.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., January 24, 1955.

To: HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK.
From: American Law Division.
Subject: Foreign Agents Registration Act.

Reference is made to your letter of January 16, 1955, in which you requested a brief

on the Foreign Agents Registration Act showing what cases it covers and how it affects Americans employed by Russia or a Russian agency who travel in areas from which Russian nationals are excluded.

The Foreign Agents Registration Act (U. S. C. 22: 611–621) is aimed at foreign agents who carry on propaganda and kindred activities in the United States. On the theory that full disclosure of the facts is the best method of combating such activity, the act requires foreign agents to register with the Department of Justice and give detailed information about themselves, their principals, and their activities. It also requires them to label political propaganda sent through the mails or channels of interstate commerce for disemination among two or more persons. It does not impose travel controls on such agents.

The act applies generally to persons in the United States whether citizens or aliens, who are agents of a foreign principal. However, persons engaged only in legitimate diplomatic, humanitarian, religious, scholastic, academic, artistic, scientific or private commercial activities, or agents of a country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, are exempt from the registration requirements. Officials of foreign governments who are not public relations counsel, publicity agents, information-service employees or citizens of the United States, are also exempt in some circumstances.

The term "foreign principal" includes not only a foreign government or a foreign political party, but also foreign individuals and organizations, domestic organizations subsidized by a foreign principal and individuals affiliated with, or controlled or subsidized by, a foreign government or foreign political party. A person in the United States who acts as public-relations counsel, publicity agent, information-service employee, servant, agent or attorney of, or who collects information for, a foreign principal, or who accepts compensation from, or collects funds, for, such a principal, or acts under its orders, is a foreign agent within the purview of the act. So also is a member of the Armed Forces, an officer or employee of a foreign country, and a person trained in espionage or sabotage by a foreign country or foreign political party. Domestic news agencies and publications engaged solely in bona fide news or journalistic activities are not covered.

Whether particular persons are governed by the act depends on the facts concerning their status and employment. Citizens of the United States who are employed by the Russian News Agency, Tass, may be subject to the registration and propaganda-labeling requirements of the law.

MARY LOUISE RAMSEY,
American Law Division.

JANUARY 24, 1955.

Thirty-seventh Anniversary of the Proclamation of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1955

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, the United Ukrainian Organizations of Newark demonstrated on January 23 on behalf of the 37th anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence and the 36th anniversary of the union of Eastern and Western Ukraine. This traditional observance is a fitting occasion to reaffirm the faith and hope of all freedom-loving people in the eventual liberation of all the nations behind the Iron Curtain. I was happy to send the following message to my good friends of the United Ukrainian Organizations:

JANUARY 20, 1955.

UNITED UKRAINIAN ORGANIZATIONS
OF NEWARK,
Newark, N. J.

DEAR FRIENDS: It is a privilege to send a message of greeting and friendship to your distinguished assembly upon this hallowed occasion.

January 22 of 1918 was a memorable day for all freedom-loving Ukrainians, and especially so for those who, after enduring the severe vicissitudes of World War I, attained their most cherished dream, that of national political independence. This national ideal, which was carefully nursed in the hearts of all patriotic Ukrainians during the long years of their subjection to alien rulers, had become almost a second religion to all devout Ukrainians. Its realization in 1918 looked like a true national resurrection. Unfortunately the newly recreated government could not withstand all the evil forces of tyranny and barbarism which were arrayed against it. In less than 2 years the Ukraine's independence became a victim of these forces.

Today Communist tyranny rules over the Ukraine with an unrelenting, iron hand, but even under the present adverse circumstances, all patriotic and freedom-loving Ukrainians still cherish their national ideal, their political independence. In this celebration you are certainly helping to keep alive that fine sentiment. I extend my cordial greetings to all of you on the occasion of this celebration and wish you every success.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

HUGH J. ADDONIZIO,
Member of Congress.

Protection of Domestic Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert a statement which I made before the House Committee on Ways and Means on January 31, 1955. My statement was made during the hearings on H. R. 1, and I emphasized to the members of the committee the imperative need for protection of domestic industries such as the coal, chemical, glass, and railroad industries. Thousands of our fellow Americans who formerly worked in these industries have lost their jobs, but there are thousands of other workers still employed who will be thrown out of work unless adequate safeguards are provided against foreign competition. Not only should we be concerned about unemployment in these fields, but we also must remember that these industries are our first line of defense. If they suffer, we suffer; and if they perish, we perish. The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN ROBERT C. BYRD BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, JANUARY 31, 1955

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee:

We are again faced with a crisis in world events—a crisis which could plunge us overnight into a world conflict for actual survival. Pray God this does not happen. But if it does, I am seriously disturbed over the grave danger to our country if we fail to recognize and halt the serious disintegration and deterioration of one of our basic and most important resurces.

I refer, of course, to the coal industry.

When World War II broke out, there was an immediate demand for vast new amounts of energy to run our tremendous war production effort. Tanks, guns, planes, and all the other equipment of a modern fighting force had to come rolling out of our converted factories at rates unprecedented in world's history.

Total energy demands, excluding motor fuels, rose 19 percent in 1942 and 32 percent in 1944. Most of this new energy source had to be supplied by coal.

Submarines practically halted the import of petroleum products because the Nazis were in almost undisputed possession of the waters along the entire Atlantic coast during the early months of the war. An official publication of the United States Department of the Interior states: "From the Caribbean to Cape Race, no spot was safe * * * From then on, until the last year of the war, tanker deliveries were an insignificant factor in supplying the oil needs of the east coast."

We have all read accounts of Russia's new, modern submarine force. There can be no question that it is far superior to the one with which Germany was able to almost entirely halt oil deliveries from abroad. Thus, we must accept the fact that foreign petroleum will not be available to us in case of a new war.

It would seem only the part of wisdom and prudence, then, that we look carefully at our domestic resources for fuel and energy, and make certain that they will again be able to meet a new emergency as they did in 1942.

Unfortunately, there is every reason to fear that they will not, unless immediate steps are taken by this Congress.

In recent years of an expanding economy and new levels of prosperity and production for almost every other industry in America, the coal industry has sunk to critical levels of low production and disintegration.

Production of bituminous coal, which is the major industry of my own State of West Virginia, fell from a high of 613 million tons in 1947 to less than 400 million last year.

Employment in the mines has been cut in half, dropping from 400,000 men 6 years ago to no more than 200,000 now. Gentlemen, this state of affairs should be cause for grave concern for every one of us. We cannot afford to sit idly by and watch the destruction of the livelihood of thousands of our fellow Americans, and at the same time the weakening of our productive capacity for national defense to the critical point.

The demand for bituminous coal and lignite rose from 461 million tons in 1940 to 620 million in 1944. I am told by competent authority that the demand to run our expanded industrial machine in case of a new war would be much greater.

Leaders in the coal industry estimate that an annual peacetime production of 500 million tons would be necessary to keep the industry at a level from which it could rapidly expend to meet such war demands. Yet last year, the Bureau of Mines estimates, we produced only 390 million tons.

Throughout the coal fields of my State, and of Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and all the other great producers, are idle tipples, idle railroad cars, deserted shafts, and mine after mine closed down. During the past 3 years, at least 150 commercial mines have closed in the State of West Virginia, idling thousands of miners. Add to these the thousands who depend on coal for a livelihood—railroad workers, storekeepers, service station owners, and a host of others, and we begin to get some picture of a real depression in coal producing areas.

But the best picture, Mr. Chairman, could be gotten by the committee itself were it to delegate a subcommittee to visit these forsaken and miserable people who have long since despaired of a return to full employment in the only occupation they have ever known. In view of the seriousness of the problem as it affects coal producing communities, in the light of depressed conditions in the chemical, glass, pottery, and other industries; and because of the profound controversy which centers around H. R. 1, on-the-spot hearings would seem advisable, desirable, and necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I live in the Beckley area of West Virginia, and in that area alone, the percentage of total employment as represented by mining has declined 43 percent from that of 1 year ago. Practically all of the unemployed are men who are over 45 years of age, with none other than mining experience, a fact which in many instances precludes them from finding employment elsewhere. A recent report shows 3,500 persons a month exhausting their unemployment benefit payments in my State, and many individuals passed this point of exhausted benefits months ago.

On January 1 of this year, 223,847 people in West Virginia were depending upon Government surplus food commodities for survival, and the figure is increasing at the rate of 10,000 each 2 weeks, I have been informed. School lunch programs have been seriously affected in these mining areas, as more and more children of unemployed workers are forced to depend upon free school lunches. Many requests are being received by teachers for clothing to keep children warm. The situation, in many instances, is desperate, to say the least.

Mr. Chairman, throughout many months, I and other Members of Congress have offered evidence of rising unemployment, hunger, and destitution in coal-producing States. Our arguments have gone for naught. If the attitude we have met continues to prevail, I assume that to offer further evidence would be "Love's labor lost." Some may say that the difficulties confronting these people are so provincial as to be excluded from consideration in a program devoted to international-trade policies, but there are other aspects of the damaging impact of foreign residual which cannot be looked upon as sectional problems. Coal mining and railroading are as essential to the conduct of a mobilization program as are aircraft industries, munitions works, and shipbuilding. Coal mines and railroads cannot survive under a system which demands that they operate like a stop-and-go traffic light—on again, off again, on again, gone again. The caution light is now burning and, unless the rail and coal industries are given consideration in the immediate future, the red light may be on when this Nation's security is in jeopardy and these great basic industries are called upon once more to deliver the goods.

Large among the factors which have contributed to the decline of coal sales in the United States is the importation of cheap, residual oil from Venezuela and the Netherlands West Indies. This oil, a residue remaining after crude has been refined and lighter oils, gasoline, and the like taken off, was formerly treated as a waste product and dumped into the ocean. Now, however, it is "dumped" on the east coast of the United States, and is playing a large part in wrecking America's coal industry. Total imports in 1954 were over 131 million barrels, totaling 32 million tons coal equivalent. In addition must be considered some 15 million tons coal equivalent residual refined from foreign crudes, giving a total entry of heavy fuel oil amounting to 47 million tons coal equivalent.

Some may say that about 17 million tons coal equivalent is needed to satisfy the preferred uses of the oil for ship bunkering and other noncompetitive purposes. However, the current domestic-origin residual supply on the East coast is at a rate of 17 million tons coal equivalent, enough to satisfy the preferred uses. The 47-million-ton figure broadly measures the residual oil available from foreign sources after preferred-use demands have been met. This figure is representative, it is believed, of the overall impact of foreign-origin residual fuel oil upon the coal industry.

On the basis of this figure, what has been the effect upon the coal and rail industries?

The loss in sales to coal producers exceeds $225 million, and the loss in freight revenues to the railroads accounts for an additional $180 million—a combined total of over $400 million.

If one considers only the direct residual oil imports annually running to 32 million tons coal equivalent, the figures are still very disturbing. This amount represents a loss in coal industry sales of $153 million annually, a loss in miners' wages of $74 million, a freight revenue loss of $90 million, and a loss of $40 million in wages to railroad employees. Over and above this is a continuing uncertainty facing coal and railroad management in programing of capacity, financing, development of reserves, research, and the like.

Mr. Chairman, too long have we flirted with national disaster by failing to give domestic industries an opportunity to regain some of the vigor needed in a mobilization period. Can we afford to delay longer? The answer is best spoken in the word of Poe's ghastly, grim, and ancient raven—"Nevermore."

Several Members have introduced a measure which would limit the importation of foreign residual to not more than 10 percent of the domestic demand during the corresponding calendar quarter of the preceding year.

This is not a drastic restriction of such imports, but it would provide a real benefit to the American coal and railroad industries and thousands of unemployed workers.

Total domestic demand for residual in 1954 is estimated at about 565 million barrels, while imports of residual totaled approximately 131 million. Under the suggested 10-percent quota, 57 million barrels would be allowed.

This protection would be a major step in restoring the coal industry to a level of production which would enable it to meet the demands of any new war emergency.

We simply cannot dare to let our most basic fuel supply deteriorate. It takes a ton of coal to make every ton of steel we produce for war or peace. It takes almost a pound of coal to produce a kilowatt of electric power. Coal is essential in the production of thousands of vital drugs and chemicals, and for other uses so varied and widespread it would take pages to list them.

Too long have our domestic industries sought relief in vain. The coal industry, the glass and chemical industries, and many others must be protected by placing adequate safeguards, in the form of amendments, in H. R. 1.

Let us prepare while there is yet time, lest, like the five foolish virgins, America be found wanting in her most critical hour.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 27, 1955

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who art the hope of all the ends of the earth and the light of all our seeing, help us who grope in the darkness of earth's dim ways to remember that even the shadows themselves are born of light. May we be saved from despair by hope and faith. Even as we are spurred to fight with all our might against a present evil, may we also be lured by the vision splendid of a coming good. Refresh our souls and restore our faith as in all the bewilderment of the world's fiery strife our burdened hearts seek the quiet sanctuary of Thy healing presence.

Thou only art our strong tower and sure defense amid the flood of mortal ills prevailing. Though a host encamp against us, in this will we be confident, Thou makest the devices of the wicked of none effect. The counsel of the Lord standeth forever, the thoughts of His heart to all generations. We ask only for light enough for the next step, courage enough to face the present crisis, truth enough for today's decisions, as into Thy hands we commit our ways. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 26, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2576) to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1958, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare had scheduled some hearings on

proposed school construction legislation prior to the time it was known that Senate Joint Resolution 28, which will be considered today, would be brought before the Senate. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the committee may sit during the sessions of the Senate while the resolution is being considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (S. DOC. NO. 1)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1915, as amended, establishing the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, I transmit herewith the 40th annual report of the Committee covering the fiscal year 1954.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 26, 1955.*

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be a morning hour, and I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection with the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and other routine business, be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSFER OF U. N. NARCOTICS UNIT TO GENEVA—RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received a resolution which was adopted by a section of the New York Board of Trade opposing removal of antinarcotics work from the United Nations at its headquarters in New York to Geneva, Switzerland.

I very definitely agree with this resolution and have so advised our United States mission to the United Nations.

The United States has long been the center of international antinarcotics efforts. Thanks to our intensive efforts, this work has been progressing, especially in recent years. I believe that we will continue to be called upon for international leadership in this fight, principally through the great work of the Narcotics Bureau and the Treasury Department.

I present the resolution and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Secretary General of the United Nations has decided to transfer the Narcotic Division of the United Nations from New York to Geneva; and

Whereas New York City has a serious narcotic problem which is due entirely to the international illicit flood of heroin that originates primarily in the Far East, particularly in Communist China, in Turkey, Lebanon, France, Italy as well as in Mexico; and

Whereas many international narcotic treaties are being ably administered by the United Nations in New York in a stupendous effort to halt the gigantic and diabolical narcotic smuggling activities into New York City and other points of entry; and

Whereas it is of vital importance to retain the Narcotic Division at the New York headquarters of the United Nations to maintain the closest possible cooperation with the United States, which is the chief victim in this vile traffic; and

Whereas the President of the United States has made known the gravity of the present situation by recently appointing a special interdepartmental committee to study the State, national, and international narcotic problem: Now, therefore, be it therefore

Resolved, That the drug, chemical and allied trades section of the New York Board of Trade vigorously protests the removal of the Narcotic Division of the United Nations from New York City to Geneva, Switzerland, and that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Secretary General of the United Nations, to the United States delegate to the United Nations, to the Members of the United States Senate, and to the mayor of the city of New York.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 755. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain war housing projects to the city of Warwick, Va., and the city of Hampton, Va.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 756. A bill to provide that the United States shall aid the States in wildlife-restoration projects, and for other purposes; and

S. 757. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718), as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 758. A bill for the relief of Marion S. Quirk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 759. A bill for the relief of the First National Steamship Co., the Second National Steamship Co., and the Third National Steamship Co.; and

S. 760. A bill for the relief of Pietro Meduri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 761. A bill for the relief of Arthur Joseph La Fleur (also known as Arthur J. Sakoffs); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 762. A bill for the relief of Vaclav Majer, Irma Majer, and Vaclav Majer, Jr.;

S. 763. A bill for the relief of Chocura Yoshida; and

S. 764. A bill for the relief of Robert Gartenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HRUSKA (for himself and Mr. CURTIS):

S. 765. A bill for the relief of Reuben Nichols and Andrew Nichols; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

S. 766. A bill to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 767. A bill for the relief of Andrew Rosner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

S. 768. A bill for the relief of Jose Armando Quaresma; and

S. 769. A bill for the relief of Clorimondo Mancia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 770. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself, Mr. JENNER, and Mr. POTTER):

S. 771. A bill to amend section 315 (a) of the Communications Act of 1934 to withdraw from individuals convicted of subversive activities and members of certain subversive organizations the right of equal opportunity for the use of broadcasting facilities in political campaigns; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. NEELY, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. WILEY, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. IVES, Mr. FREAR, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 772. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act in order to provide that revenues under the provisions of such act shall be used as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. HILL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON (for himself, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. WELKER, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota):

S. 773. A bill to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes; and

S. 774. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government; to authorize the President to establish the maximum number of positions under section 505 of the Classification Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 775. A bill to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 776. A bill to amend the Census Act of June 18, 1929, so as to prohibit inquiries as to income of individuals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 777. A bill to provide a method for protecting the domestic stem and table glassware, machine and blown, and sheet-glass industry against injury caused by certain imported glass products; and

S. 778. A bill to provide for the waiver of premiums on the national service life in-

surance and United States Government life (converted) insurance issued to certain former servicemen who are disabled; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 779. A bill to amend section 403 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to permit the granting of free or reduced-rate transportation to ministers of religion; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 780. A bill to define the application of the Clayton and Federal Trade Commission Acts to certain pricing practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 781. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Armed Forces Medical Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 782. A bill to prevent citizens of the United States of questionable loyalty to the United States Government from accepting any office or employment in or under the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 783. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the late Senator Robert A. Taft; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. JENNER):

S. 784. A bill to amend certain provisions of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. 785. A bill to prohibit an individual from traveling in interstate or foreign commerce in connection with the abandonment of his dependent child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 786. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the first electrically lighted city in the world, Wabash, Ind.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. THYE, and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 787. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the attainment of the conservation and development of the water resources of the Missouri Basin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. JENNER):

S. J. Res. 32. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1955, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIEL:

S. J. Res. 33. Joint resolution to prohibit transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce by communication facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. DANIEL when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ADMENDMENTS OF 1954

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that an analysis of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 770) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MURRAY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The analysis presented by Mr. MURRAY is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF S. 770

I. MINIMUM WAGE

Section 3 (a) of the proposed bill would amend section 6 (a) of the act to increase the statutory minimum wage from 75 cents to $1.25 an hour.

The present 75-cent minimum wage was inadequate when the Fair Labor Standards Act was amended in 1949 and is completely outmoded today. The inflationary rise in the cost of living since 1950 when the amended Fair Labor Standards Act took effect has placed a particular hardship on low-wage workers.

The minimum wage has failed to keep pace with the general increase in wages. Thus from June, 1938, when the Fair Labor Standards Act was enacted, to December, 1953, average hourly earnings of factory workers increased from $0.62 to $1.79, a rise of $1.17. By contrast, the minimum wage has risen by only 50 cents.

II. MAXIMUM HOURS

Section 4 (a) of the proposed bill would amend section 7 (a) of the act to decrease the maximum workweek from 40 to 37½ hours during the first 2 years after the act takes effect and to 35 hours thereafter.

The gradual reduction of working hours combined with increased real income have contributed greatly to the growth of our national economy. There has been a tremendous increase in the productivity of American industry since World War II. Unless the increased productivity is accompanied by a reduction in the number of hours worked, without reduction in incomes, this technological progress could, instead of enhancing the living standards and welfare of American workers, threaten full employment and continued progress in our economic life. Continuing reduction in the workweek without loss of pay is necessary to assure full employment and an ever-rising standard of living as well as greater opportunities for leisure-time activities for American workers.

III. COVERAGE

A. General application of the law

The proposed bill would extend the application of the Fair Labor Standards Act to cover all "activities affecting commerce."

At the present time, the FLSA applies only to employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce. The coverage of the law is thus far more restrictive than the Labor Management Relations Act. There is no reason why the FLSA should not cover the same categories of workers as the labor management relations law.

B. Large-scale retail and service establishments

Section 7 of the proposed law would extend coverage of the law to employees of large-scale hotels, chain stores, restaurants, and other similar retail and service establishments.

The modern department store, grocery chain, and similar large-scale enterprises have become part of America's big business. These firms where business amounts to many millions of dollars annually, are quite capable of meeting the requirements of the nation's basic labor standards legislation.

The proposed bill would continue to exempt from coverage the small hotel, corner grocery store, and similar small businesses.

C. Industralized agriculture

Sections 2 and 7 of the proposed bill modify the blanket exemption of the present law for employees employed in agriculture. The exemption would be modified so that only workers on large-scale corporate mechanized farms would be covered by the law.

Workers on these farms are hired just as any factory employee might be. They are paid by the hour or, in some cases, by the week or month, and they are discharged, fired, or laid off just as any machine operator might be. The work of hired farm laborers performing similar repetitive operations such as picking fruit or harvesting crops is strikingly similar to the operations performed on a factory assembly line. There is no reason why these workers should not be covered under the law.

D. Agricultural and seafood processing

The present law contains a maze of partial and complete exemptions for various types of agricultural and seafood processing. These exemptions were written into the law through the influence of the special interest groups who have benefited by them. They should be swept away so that workers in these industries, including the seasonal employees, would be given the protection of the law.

E. Transportation

There are a number of special exemptions for transportation employees written into the law. These need to be drastically changed so as to give workers in these industries the full protection of the law.

F. Other industries

A number of other exemptions (weekly and semiweekly newspapers, small telephone exchanges, contract telegraph agencies) which were written into the law at the request of special interest groups are eliminated from the act by the proposed bill. There is no reason why the benefits of wage and hour legislation should not be extended to these groups of workers.

IV. PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Sections 3 (a) and 5 of the proposed bill amend the act to provide for an increase of 50 cents in the minimum wage rates established by the Administrator under the present industry committee procedure for industries in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. It also provides for a 3-year step-up so that the statutory minimum rate of $1.25 will apply to all industries in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands 3 years after the $1.25 statutory minimum wage rate takes effect elsewhere in the United States. During the 3-year interim the minimum wage rate for each industry in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands is to be increased at the end of each year by one-third of the difference between the minimum rate which would take effect with the enactment of the proposed bill and $1.25.

It is essential that the minimum wage in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands be increased to the mainland level as quickly as is feasible in order to raise the standard of living of the population of those territories and to eliminate the competitive advantage of employers in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands over their counterparts on the mainland. As long as workers in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are forced to seek jobs at extremely low wages, employees on the mainland will continue to be threatened by the ever-present possibility that their employers will move their plants in order to take advantage of the extremely low wages prevailing in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

V. LEARNERS, APPRENTICES, AND HANDICAPPED WORKERS

Section 8 of the proposed bill would amend section 14 of the act to provide that

subminimum wages established for learners, apprentices (except indentured apprentices) and handicapped workers be set at not less than $1 an hour.

VI. CHILD LABOR

Section 7 of the proposed bill amends section 13 (c) and (d) of the act to prohibit employment of children under the age of 14 in agriculture. It also bans employment of children less than 18 in so-called street trades except that children 16 years of age or over may be employed in such occupations outside of school hours.

All avaflable evidence indicates that the employment of children under the age of 14 in agriculture is harmful to their health and proper growth.

The moral hazards involved in employment of young children in so-called street trades are so great that children under the age of 16 should not be permitted to be employed in such occupations under any circumstances and children between the ages of 16 and 18 should be permitted to do such work only after school hours.

VII. ADMINISTRATION

Section 9 of the proposed bill would amend section 6 (a) of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947 as well as 16 (c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act to increase the statute of limitations from 2 to 4 years.

Workers ought not to be limited in their opportunity to recover wages to which they are entitled which have been denied them by unlawful acts of their employer.

AMENDMENT OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS ACT RELATING TO USE OF CERTAIN REVENUES FOR GRANTS-IN-AID OF EDUCATION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], my colleague the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act in order to provide that revenues under the provisions of such act shall be used as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education.

I ask unanimous consent that immediately following these remarks a statement prepared by me, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 772) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act in order to provide that revenues under the provisions of such act shall be used as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The statement presented by Mr. HILL is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HILL

On behalf of 35 of my colleagues and myself, I have introduced for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act so as to dedicate the income from the Nation's undersea oil and gas deposits of the outer Continental Shelf for use in promoting the national defense and national security through grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education, including scholarships, fellowships, and training and research grants.

Sponsoring the bill with me are the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. FULBRIGHT; the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DOUGLAS; the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. NEELY; the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. LANGER; the Senator from Oregon, Mr. MORSE; the Senator from Alabama, Mr. SPARKMAN; the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. KEFAUVER; the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. CHAVEZ; the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. HUMPHREY; the Senator from Missouri, Mr. HENNINGS; the Senator from New York, Mr. LEHMAN; the Senator from Montana, Mr. MURRAY; the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. KILGORE; the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. GREEN; the Senator from Washington, Mr. MAGNUSON; the Senator from Washington, Mr. JACKSON; the Senator from Montana, Mr. MANSFIELD; the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. PASTORE; the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY; the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. WILEY; the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. CLEMENTS; the Senator from Missouri, Mr. SYMINGTON; the Senator from South Carolina, Mr. JOHNSTON; the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. MONRONEY; the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. MCCLELLAN; the Senator from Mississippi, Mr. STENNIS; the Senator from New York, Mr. IVES; the Senator from Delaware, Mr. FREAR; the Senator from South Dakota, Mr. CASE; the Senator from Oregon, Mr. NEUBERGER; the Senator from Michigan, Mr. MCNAMARA; the Senator from North Carolina, Mr. SCOTT; the Senator from Maine, Mrs. SMITH; the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. YOUNG; and the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. O'MAHONEY.

The bill embodies the principles of the oil for education amendment which, in the first session of the last Congress, the Senate adopted and made a part of the Senate bill providing for the development of the outer Continental Shelf.

Senators will recall that in the closing days of the session the House conferees rejected the amendment without a vote by the membership of the House.

There is no more urgent or pressing problem confronting the Nation today than the crisis in our schools and colleges. Each day the shortage of classrooms grows more severe and we are finding ourselves with fewer trained teachers. School operating expenses have risen to new heights. The total of the financial demands is so great that despite heroic efforts in community after community, we continue to fall further and further behind as each year brings a new and greater floodtide of children into our elementary and secondary schools.

Today it is estimated that over one-half the classrooms in the Nation are so overcrowded as to make effective teaching almost impossible. Every 15 minutes of every day our tremendous birth rate is bringing 30 more pupils in the population, creating a need for 1 more classroom and 1 more teacher. Within 3 years our shortage of classrooms throughout the Nation will have climbed to 600,000. Day by day we are falling behind with serious damage to our children and to the Nation.

We are likewise facing a critical situation in the field of higher education.

Nearly all our 1,900 institutions of higher learning are in financial trouble, whether they are State institutions, land-grant colleges, the large private universities, or the small colleges. Recent surveys show that 1 out of every 3 of our liberal-arts colleges is operating in the red at a time when the Nation's future strength and security demands the training of more scientific and professional manpower—more scientists, more chemists, more physicists, more engineers, more doctors, more professional and business leaders, more agriculturists, and more skilled workers.

We do not suggest that the oil-for-education proposal will prove a cure-all for every ill and every need that vex our educational institutions, but we do feel that the revenues which will eventuate from the development of these resources can contribute importantly to correcting our educational deficiencies and to raising our stricken school system to new heights of proficiency.

I am sure that Senators read the recent announcement by the Department of the Interior that already $150 million has accrued to the Federal Treasury from the sale of leases on only a fractional portion of the oil-rich lands of the outer Continental Shelf. I call to the attention of Senators the fact that the $150 million has been paid just for drilling rights and does not include 1 cent in royalties from oil production which has not yet started. The Department of the Interior is predicting that the revenues which will eventuate to the Federal Treasury from the development of the outer Continental Shelf oil lands will well exceed $6 billion.

The $150 million that has already come into the Treasury and the revenues that will follow should be put to work to help meet the financial crisis in our schools and colleges.

Here is nontax revenue for relieving the financial straits of our elementary and secondary schools, for providing more and better paid and better trained teachers, and for building desperately needed classrooms.

Here is a bonanza for relieving the agonizing difficulties of our colleges and universities, medical schools, dental schools, nursing schools, scientific and technological schools, and research institutions with scholarships and grants-in-aid for specific training and research projects. The possibilities challenge the imagination.

The use of public-lands resources set us on the road to realizing the dream of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, John Quincy Adams, Abraham Lincoln, and other statesmen of our early history of a great system for the dissemination of knowledge.

The challenge to this generation and to this Congress is that we have the wisdom to use similar resources to give to that system the high standards of quality they envisioned.

Here we have a magnificent opportunity to carry on the great American tradition of providing for the education of our children, of strengthening the wellsprings of our democracy, of following the policy established by the Founding Fathers, of dedicating great natural resources for the development of our precious human resources, the children of the Nation, and of building America strong that we may keep America free.

Among the organizations endorsing and supporting the oil-for-education bill are the National Education Association, the American Council on Education, the American Federation of Teachers, the American Library Association, the American Vocational Association, the National Grange, the National Farmers Union, the Co-Op League of the U. S. A., the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the Oil Workers International Union, the Communications Workers of America, the Textile Workers Union of America, the United Mine Workers, the United Automobile Workers, the Friends Committee on National Legislation, Americans for Democratic Action, Students for Democratic Action, the Consumers Cooperative Association, the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, Switchmen's Union of North America, the Order of Railroad Telegraphers, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, American Train Dispatchers' Association, International Association of Machinists, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, Sheet Metal Workers' International Association, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers, Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, Railroad Yardmasters of America, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, Hotel and Restaurant Employees' and Bartenders' International Union, National Organization Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America, National Marine Engineers' Association, International Longshoremen's Association, the Order of Railway Conductors, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, and the United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. As a cosponsor of the bill, I should like to have it printed in the RECORD. Will the Senator from Alabama make that request?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the bill is very brief and I ask unanimous consent that it also be printed in the RECORD, as suggested by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 772) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act is amended by deleting section 9 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 9. Disposition of revenues: (a) All rentals, royalties, and other sums paid to the Secretary or the Secretary of the Navy under any lease on the outer Continental Shelf for the period from June 5, 1950, to date, and thereafter, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States and held in a special account and, except for the payment of refunds under the provisions of section 10 of this act, such moneys shall be appropriated exclusively for the purpose of promoting the national defense and national security through grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education.

"(b) An Advisory Council on Education for National Security is hereby created to be composed of 12 persons to be appointed by the President of the United States with regard to their experience in the relationship of education to national defense and national security, of whom 6 shall be from the fields of education, and research in the natural and social sciences. It shall be the function of such Council to recommend to the President of the United States for submission to the Congress not later than January 1, 1956, a plan for the allocation of the grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education provided in paragraph (a) of this section in such manner as will contribute most effectively to meeting the immediate and long-range requirements of education as it relates to national defense and national security."

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR POSTAL AND CLASSIFIED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Postmaster General, Mr. Summerfield, and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Young, have sent to the Vice President proposed legislation providing adjustments in the pay of postal workers and officers and employees of the Federal Government under the Classification Act.

The proposed legislation carries out the recommendations of the President in his message to Congress under date of January 11.

As the ranking minority member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I am introducing these bills this morning.

The pay increase recommended for the one-half million Post Office Department employees will total $129 million a year. The pay increase for the employees under the Classification Act will cost about $202 million annually.

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is beginning hearings tomorrow on proposed pay increases for all Federal employees, and the Postmaster General, Mr. Summerfield, and Mr. Philip Young, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, will appear and explain the proposed legislation. Personally, I favor a pay increase for Federal employees, and am confident our committee will, within the very near future, report to the Senate a measure which will meet the approval of Federal employees.

If there are other Senators who care to cosponsor these bills with me, I shall be most pleased to secure their support.

Therefore, Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], I introduce the bills for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. CARLSON (for himself and other Senators), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as follows:

S. 773. A bill to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal-field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes; and

S. 774. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government; to authorize the President to establish the maximum number of positions under section 505 of the Classification Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. BEALL subsequently said: Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] has introduced 2 bills today, 1 to raise the pay of postal employees, and the other to raise the pay of civil-service employees. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to join him as a cosponsor of the two bills.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I, too, may join the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] in the introduction of the bills raising the pay of civil service and postal employees.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROHIBITION OF INTERSTATE TRANSMISSION OF RACEHORSE-GAMBLING INFORMATION

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I am pleased to see that the Attorney General of the United States yesterday recommended legislation which would prohibit interstate transmission of racehorse-gambling information to bookie parlors and gambling houses operated in violation of State laws. As attorney general of Texas I met this problem at first hand and stopped such transmission within our State, but found it difficult without the assistance of Federal laws on the subject.

I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which would assist in solving this problem. It is the measure recommended by the Attorney General. I ask unanimous consent that my statement in favor of this type of legislation made before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on April 21, 1950, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 33) to prohibit transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce by communication facilities, introduced by Mr. DANIEL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. DANIEL is as follows:

STATEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL PRICE DANIEL

"I appreciate your invitation to present my views on the desirability of Federal legislation to prohibit the interstate transmission of gambling information.

"Perhaps my views will be of more value if I give at the outset the experience we have had in the State of Texas in stopping the transmission of racing information by telegraph wires to bookie shops and gambling houses. Early in 1949, through investigations of this office and the department of public safety, it was determined that gambling houses and bookie shops in Texas were receiving their information for gambling purposes from the same out-of-State source over the wires of the Western Union Telegraph Co., leased to a man by the name of A. G. Coggins, who was operating under the assumed name of 'Texas Daily Sports News,' at Houston, Tex.

"Part of this network in Texas was being served out of Indianapolis, Ind., and the balance out of New Orleans, La., but all of the racing information was apparently collected and placed on the wires by the Continental Press or one of its affiliates in Chicago and Indianapolis. Western Union ticker machines were found in most of the cities in which bookie shops were operating. Drops from this wire service were found in Houston, Galveston, Beaumont, Stafford, Corpus Christi, Odessa, and Fort Worth.

"In each instance the contract with Western Union called for the service to be furnished to Texas Daily Sports News, or a local sports publication. In each instance we found that these purported sports publications were mere subterfuges for the purpose of gathering the racing information into the cities and then transmitting it direct to the gambling houses.

"Texas Rangers made simultaneous raids on the "publications offices" in which the ticker machines were located and the bookie shops. In each instance they found that the information was being relayed from the ticker machines to the bookie shops or that the ticker machines were actually located in the same buildings with the bookie shops. Dallas shops were being served by long-distance telephone from the bookie shop.

"Our office filed suit against Western Union Telegraph Co. and A. G. Coggins, doing business as Texas Daily Sports News, on August 22, 1949, to enjoin them from distributing gambling information within the State of Texas.

"Our reply to Western Union's motion to dismiss the suit gives additional allegations and in our opinion shows that Western Union had cause to know and believe that Texas Daily Sports News was a mere subterfuge to cover up the actual use of the racing information for gambling purposes and that Western Union officials and employees had knowledge that some of their machines were actually located in the same buildings with the bookie shops.

"The trial of this case resulted in an injunction against Western Union, Coggins and Texas Daily Sports News on September 7, 1949.

"Western Union removed its machines on the day the suit was filed, and since the filing of this suit there have been no direct wires from any out-of-State network into Texas, according to the best information obtainable through our investigations.

"Prior to that time the information was being transmitted from a Nation-wide network with headquarters at Indianapolis and Chicago. Our investigation revealed that the same network was serving, or had served, gambling houses in California, Maryland, New Jersey, Arkansas, Louisiana, and many other States.

"In each instance the receiving parties were termed "sport news" or other publications. The thing that distinguished this wire service from other news services was that it gathered the information from the tracks in violation of State laws or track rules and sent the information out before, during, and immediately after the races were run.

"The value of the service to bookie shops was that they could in turn announce every phase of the race and results as they occur. Most of the shops had loud-speaker systems which announced the entries, weights, positions, and results just as though the information were being legally obtained from the tracks.

"When this wire service was stopped in Texas it put an end to most of the bookie-shop operations in the State. An elaborate up-to-date bookie shop cannot be run without direct wire services from the tracks. Since the suit, the only gambling information of this nature which we have found entering the State has been by long-distance telephone. The telephone company is quick to disconnect the telephones of establishments which are reported by law-enforcement officials as being used for receipt of gambling information in connection with gambling operations.

"However, you can imagine how difficult it is to put an end to this type of communication under present laws. It is very easy for a private telephone patron in New Orleans to call a private telephone number in Houston and give the racing results over the private telephone connections.

"Many of these have been detected and stopped, but there is a need for legislation which will charge both the telephone and telegraph companies with a greater responsibility to prevent such use of their wires. Such legislation also should make it easier for the companies to detect the use of their wires for unlawful purposes.

"It may be that the legislation now before the committee would accomplish this purpose. At least, from what has been outlined herein as to the former operation of interstate telegraph wires connected with bookie shops in this State, it is evident that Federal legislation would be justified to prevent transmission of gambling information direct from race tracks during or immediately after the races have been run.

"A delay for a certain period of time after the events, as suggested by the Attorney General of the United States, would at least help solve the problem. If there is a nationwide crime syndicate in existence, its lifeblood is in the interstate transmission of gambling information. This leech upon the back of the commerce clause is the core of most of the corruption which we know as organized gambling.

"It therefore stands to reason that to put an end to the interstate means of communication among these law violators will go a long way toward the final solution of our crime problems.

"The laws of the several States are not sufficient to cope with a criminal combine which extends to almost every corner of the Nation. Local law enforcement is highly desirable, but of course, has its limitations. With our vast and complex communications system these days, what will it ultimately avail a county sheriff to raid a particular bookmaker who gets his race results by telegraphic wire, when the bookie down the street gets his results by merely placing a long-distance telephone call to a racing service across the State line?

"I believe that your proposed legislation against interstate transmission of gambling information and against interstate shipment of slot machines will do much toward breaking up what appears to be a nationwide combination of gambling interests and sponsors of organized crime."

Mr. President, after the above statement was made, I found it necessary to file suit also against certain telephone companies and the Maceo gambling syndicate in Galveston to prevent the syndicate from bringing this type of gambling information into their gambling parlors in Galveston through private telephone wires. These suits resulted in permanent injunctions and stopped such unlawful acts.

In recent years both telegraph and telephone companies have shown their desire and willingness to cooperate with law enforcement agencies, but it has been held that they cannot deny their services, even when demanded by peace officers, without the risk of civil damages. This would be remedied by the proposed legislation, and the transmission companies would be protected when they iooperate with law enforcement officials.

JOINT COMMITTEE TO STUDY DROUGHT CONDITIONS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee to study drought conditions in the United States. This is a revision of a concurrent resolution which I submitted in the 83d Congress. Congressmen EDMONDSON and ALBERT, of Oklahoma, have submitted a similar concurrent resolution in the House.

Mr. President, serious drought conditions exist in wide areas of the Southwest and Middle West. In some areas these conditions have existed for more than 2 years. The latest information of the Department of Agriculture indicates that at present 944 counties in 18 States are recognized by the Department as drought emergency areas. These counties extend from North Carolina westward to Utah and Wyoming, and include large portions of the great States of Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Georgia, Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. There are areas in Illinois and Nebraska that have suffered from drought, but not severely enough to meet the Agriculture Department's test of emergency.

The Weekly Weather and Crop Bulletin of the Weather Bureau indicates that the five southern Great Plains States of Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, New Mexico, and Colorado may experience dust storms this year worse than any since the thirties. The Soil Conservation Service, in a report recently made to the Department of Agriculture, points out that the five-State outlook on soil conditions is more than twice as bad as it was at this time last year.

It is obvious, Mr. President, that this drought situation is a matter of national concern. It presents a grave threat to the farm economy of the Nation. Last year there were high losses of farm production due to the drought. Farmers in drought areas have experienced a sharp decline in farm income. I am informed that several hundred thousand people in the drought emergency areas are now on direct food relief.

Mr. President, our resolution would create a joint congressional committee, composed of 5 Senators and 5 Members of the House. At least 3 of the joint committee members from each body would be members of the Senate and House Agriculture Committees. It would be the duty of the joint committee to

make a full and complete study of drought conditions in the United States for the purpose of preparing plans and programs for the alleviation of such conditions. The committee would be required to report to the Senate and House not later than June 15, 1955.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) was received and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas serious conditions of drought exist in wide areas throughout the Nation; and

Whereas Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives have been petitioned for relief and assistance by citizens, banks, farm organizations, and other groups, representing great populations of 18 of our States, which have been declared drought-emergency areas; and

Whereas many cities and towns in such States are suffering from acute water shortages, causing great hardships; and

Whereas drought conditions have been prevalent in this area for 2 or more years; and

Whereas telegraphic and press reports indicate high losses in grains, soybeans, egg production, livestock, poultry, and other farm products due to drought; and

Whereas in some areas farm production has been estimated to have suffered a 75-percent loss; and

Whereas there are literally hundreds of thousands of people on direct food relief in the drought area and long-range weather predictions indicate continued drought in 1955 in many sections; and

Whereas this situation presents a grave threat to the farm economy and represents extreme hardship to hundreds of thousands of farmers: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be composed of 5 Members of the Senate, at least 3 of whom shall be members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 5 Members of the House of Representatives, at least 3 of whom shall be members of the House Committee on Agriculture, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In each instance two of such members appointed shall be members of the minority party. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from its members. A quorum of the joint committee shall consist of six members, except that the joint committee may fix a lesser number as a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

(a) It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of drought conditions in the United States for the purpose of preparing plans and programs for the alleviation of such conditions, and to formulate a long-range plan for the control of drought damage including loan and feed programs, water storage, local lakes, construction of feasible reservoirs and irrigation and flood-control projects, and such other measures as are deemed practicable. In conducting such study and survey the joint committee shall take testimony with respect to such drought conditions and such plans and programs from representative farmers and other individuals residing in drought areas. The joint committee shall, not later than June 15, 1955, report to the Senate and the House of Representatives the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable. Upon the submission of such report the joint committee shall cease to exist and all authority conferred by this resolution shall terminate.

(b) The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the session, recesses, and adjourned periods of the 84th Congress, to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of the amount prescribed by law for reporting of hearings of standing committees of the Senate.

(c) The joint committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and other employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

(d) The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the joint committee. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

HOUSE BILL PLACED ON CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 2576) to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1958, was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:

Address delivered by Senator MARTIN of Iowa before the 1955 National Conference of Ladies Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, at Washington, D. C., on January 26, 1955.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address delivered by him at a meeting of the National Workshop on World Economic and Social Development, at the Woodner Hotel, Washington, D. C., January 27, 1955.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JOHN SHERMAN COOPER TO BE AMBASSADOR TO INDIA AND NEPAL

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Senate received today the nomination of former Senator John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky, to be Ambassador of the United States to India, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador of the United States to Nepal. I give notice that this nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule.

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF ARMED FORCES TO PROTECT THE SECURITY OF FORMOSA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], made a speech about the Senate Joint Resolution 28 which was introduced as a result of the message from the President of the United States of January 24. During his remarks I asked the distinguished Senator to yield, but, because he desired to continue, I did not make a statement at that time. What I wished to say then I should like to say now.

The distinguished minority leader stated that both the previous Democratic administration and the present Republican administration favored the defense of the Pescadores and Formosa. The minority leader also stated that every Member of this body should read the transcript of the hearings which were held in executive meetings.

I should like to join in that request, and urge that every Member of the Senate who has not had an opportunity as yet to read the transcript of the hearings which were held in executive meetings do so, in order that all may see just what the proposition before the Senate is.

I know the decision which is facing all of us will be perhaps the hardest decision we will face in our lives. No matter how Senators may vote, the decision is not going to be easy.

I also should like to say that, to my knowledge, every member of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services was agreed that we had an obligation to defend Formosa and the Pescadores; and in that respect, I repeat, to the best of my knowledge, Mr. President, there is no difference of opinion.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is my purpose this afternoon, when the debate on Senate Joint Resolution 28 is opened, to participate in the debate. However, at this time I should like to offer for the RECORD 1 editorial and 2 news articles. I think they should be printed in the body of the RECORD because they might have a very important bearing on the debate which will take place.

The first is an editorial entitled "The President's Message," published in the New York Times of Tuesday, January 25, 1955.

The second is an article entitled "The Purpose of the Message and Its Form," written by Arthur Krock, and published in the New York Times of Tuesday, January 25, 1955.

The third is an article entitled "When Coordinate Powers Enter the Twilight

Zone," also written by Arthur Krock, and published in the New York Times of Thursday, January 27, 1955.

It seems to me that these clearly worked out statements by Mr. Krock and the editorial to which I first referred will help clarify our thinking in regard to some of the issues involved in the question which is before the Senate. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that the articles and editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of January 25, 1955]

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

In a dramatic move to avert a new crisis in the Far East which could endanger world peace, President Eisenhower has called upon Congress to pass a resolution specifically authorizing him to use the Armed Forces of the United States if necessary to protect Formosa and the Pescadores from Communist aggression and to "take into account" closely related "localities and actions" which might determine the success or failure of such aggression. At the same time, in the formal context of a message to Congress, he has again urged the United Nations to assume jurisdiction over the growing conflict in the Formosa Strait and to take appropriate action to end the present hostilities.

This move has become necessary because of what the President calls the aggressive pattern of provocative Communist political and military actions against the Chinese Nationalists. This pattern began to unfold, after a long period of merely sporadic rival raids, with a massive Communist attack on Quemoy last September. The second phase of this pattern has consisted of the forceful seizure by the Communists of Yikiang Island. As Premier Chou En-lai again broadcasts to the world, the end aim of these actions is the conquest of Formosa.

In this respect the President's message is a definite challenge to Communist pretensions. Once again an American President proclaims that, having turned over Formosa to the friendly hands of the Republic of China, we are determined to keep it there and are ready to fight if necessary to do so. This purpose is also proclaimed in the mutual defense pact with the Nationalist Government, for which Mr. Eisenhower urges prompt Senate approval. But in view of the danger signals in the Far East, and true to his promise to consult Congress in such situations, the President also seeks the support of Congress for three evident purposes—to dramatize our determination and to dispel any Communist misapprehensions regarding our national unity on that score; to obtain advance authorization for any military action that may become necessary and, finally, to clarify the legal status of both our own military steps and the status of the Nationalist Government.

The virtually unanimous congressional approval of the President's action shows that national backing is assured. In fact, the draft resolution introduced in both Houses goes even beyond the cautious phrases of the President's message and authorizes the use of our Armed Forces in the protection not only of Formosa and the Pescadores but also of "related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands." Neither the President's message nor the draft resolution mentions the Chinese offshore islands as such, but it is clear that the authorization granted in the draft resolution could be used for the evacuation of the Tachen Islands in the interest of a new deployment of the Chinese Nationalist forces. It could also be used, if regarded as necessary, to protect areas which President Eisenhower characterizes as "natural approaches to Formosa." In any case, this formulation permits flexibility of action.

But it is important to note that all these military precautions are designed not as steps toward war but as steps away from it—that is, as measures to protect and promote peace against those who would destroy it. That is why the President coupled his call to Congress for military authorizations with an equally valid call to the United Nations to move for a cease-fire which would make military action on our part unnecessary.

Premier Chou En-lai has already declared that he rejects any United Nations interference in what he characterizes as a purely Chinese internal affair and misquotes the charter to back up his stand. He used the same argument regarding United Nations action in the case of the American fliers, but this did not stop him from discussing the case with the United Nations Secretary General. If the stakes are high enough for him to lose, there is a chance that he will change his mind regarding Formosa as well, and the President's action is the best way of demonstrating to him the wisdom of such a course.

[From the New York Times of January 25, 1955]

IN THE NATION—THE PURPOSE OF THE MESSAGE AND ITS FORM

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 24.—The President had two principal reasons for asking Congress, but not in person, for authority he already has as Commander in Chief to defend Formosa and the Pescadores. Since the notice it gives to Communist China is designed to act as a deterrent to the proclaimed intention of Peiping to take the area by force, the President wanted the notice to have the full official and public support of the branch of Government which finances military undertakings and has the sole constitutional power to declare war. Since peace was the design of the message, the President sought to restrain the contrary impression, which the Peiping government is trying to stimulate, by not delivering it in person.

When Presidents in this country have gone to the Capitol in times of military threat to the security of the United States it has been in the atmosphere of impending or actual war, and war itself has quickly followed. Woodrow Wilson knew of the German Foreign Minister's offer to Mexico to join Germany in war against the United States, in consideration of help to regain Texas and other southwestern States, when, February 26, 1917, he asked Congress for approval of his plan to arm American merchant ships. And Germany had already declared total submarine hostilities. On April 2, 1917, and December 8, 1941, Presidents Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt, respectively, went in person to the Capitol to ask Congress for formal declarations of war.

This historical association was deliberately avoided by President Eisenhower today. It was good statesmanship to do so, and it was good strategy in the interest of maintaining his request as a deterrent, and not as a stimulus, of war, or as an implication of belief that war is inevitable. In the highest sense of the word, it was good politics, too. Politics has been well defined as the art of government, and for the President to seek a common front of the Executive and Congress in the circumstances, and a common front of the two major political parties also, were excellent practices of the art of government.

PERSONAL AND POLITICAL PLEDGE

From the standpoint of political integrity the President's resort to Congress was also of national benefit. He was carrying out a pledge he has often made publicly as well as his own concept. But in addition he was redeeming an implied pledge in the platform on which he was nominated.

It was:

"We charge that they [the Truman administration] have plunged us into war with Korea without the consent of our citizens through their authorized representatives in Congress and have carried on that war without will to victory."

In view of the President's decision that the governmental province and responsibilities of Congress entitled it to know in advance what he proposed to do around Formosa, and his request for it to become his partner where the Constitution authorized him to act alone, a comment attributed to Speaker RAYBURN seems strange. According to the United Press, the presiding officer of the popular legislative body, himself second in the presidential line of succession, remarked that General Eisenhower had the unilateral power to do what he proposed, "but he wanted it done this way, so it will be done this way." The reasonable expectation was that the Speaker of the House of Representatives would have applauded this Presidential recognition of Congress, quite aside from the obvious and important fact that by his action the President sought to present to the world a unified Government of the United States in so grave a business.

The contrast to President Truman's procedure with respect to the Communist invasion of South Korea implied, of course, a criticism of this procedure that was not relished politically by Democratic leaders who, if perchance they shared this criticism, anyhow did not voice it and defended what Truman did. Senator Taft contended that the President usurped his powers and breached section 6 of the bill to implement the United Nations Charter by ordering Armed Forces to Korea without consulting Congress or asking for its sanction. Other Republicans attacked him for not even asking for the approval of Congress immediately after the fact, or ever. And now a Republican President has gone to Congress for its approval before the fact, though by common consent he did not require it.

Some Democrats have been saying privately that what the administration really wanted was for the Democratic-controlled Congress to volunteer advance approval of what the President as Commander in Chief might deem it necessary to do to protect Formosa. and the Pescadores. They read this purpose into visits made to committees by administration officials before it became known that the President would initiate the matter by sending a formal request. They suspect that these officials hoped to join the Democratic party more firmly to eventualities in the Formosa Strait through the sponsorship of an advance resolution of approval by committees under Democratic control.

But either this lacks substantial proof or the proof is not procurable. At any rate, the President initiated the move, after his agents tested the political ground and found it firm in both parties.

[From the New York Times of January 27, 1955]

IN THE NATION—WHEN COORDINATE POWERS ENTER THE TWILIGHT ZONE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 26.—The moves leading up to congressional approval of the resolution sought by the President with respect to defending Formosa and the Pescadores are following a familiar path. The House, the popular branch, quickly overcame the misgivings natural in a proposal with such grave potentials and passed the resolution almost unanimously. But in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee vital amendments were offered. And, though these were overwhelm-

ingly rejected, they became inevitable when the President asked the Senate to tell the world it backed in advance whatever he might find it necessary to do as Commander in Chief in protecting these islands.

That was a disadvantage the President had to weigh against the greatly overbalancing world asset of carrying out our Formosa policy with the executive and legislative, the policy activating, arms of the Government in firm and public partnership. Unless the few who supported the proposed Senate committee amendments became a much larger percentage of the whole body than they were of the committee, which is improbable—the disadvantage will be minor in comparison to the vast gain of a unified American Government.

The common section of the KEFAUVER and HUMPHREY proposals was to withhold Senate approval from any military tactic of the Commander in Chief that would engage the Chinese Reds on the Quemoys and the Matsus, islands which lie in the very shadow of the mainland. This reservation, even if adopted by both branches of the Congress, would not enforce this limitation on the Commander in Chief if, in his judgment, the battle had to be joined in these offshore islands to disperse an assembly of amphibious forces that put Formosa and the Pescadores in extra peril. But it would have the effect of breaking the American political line behind our military front. And, if the reservation were approved by the Senate only, and the President found himself obliged to disregard it, the old constitutional quarrel would reappear over the power of the Commander in Chief versus the sentiment of Congress. This quarrel would be more acrimonious because of the fact that the Senate had not volunteered, but had been asked by the President, to express its views.

PERIL OF PERIPHERAL WAR

The large majority in the Senate committee against the reservation was, therefore, the product of these considerations. But some Members who voted for it doubtless decided to do so in the knowledge that conflicts over peripheral areas easily get out of hand when each side bases its policy on a misunderstanding of the fundamental objective of the other. It is possible that this is true of the present situation. The Chinese Reds may actually believe that the real objective of the United States is conquest of the mainland.

In the January number of World Politics, sponsored by the international studies center at Princeton University, the Korean war is cited as an example of the tendency of peripheral conflicts to spread for this reason. "The policy of not implicating the U. S. S. R. directly," says the article, "* * * exaggerated by a * * * desire not to provoke the Politburo into further aggression * * * may have * * * inadvertently undermined the objective of securing an immediate Communist withdrawal in Korea."

The crisis in the Formosa Strait does not furnish a parallel. Nor does the effort to compare President Truman's dispatch of Armed Forces to Korea with President Eisenhower's prior resort to Congress in this instance. The contrast unfavorable to Truman is that he did not immediately ask Congress to approve the action he had taken, necessarily without delay, under his clear powers as Commander in Chief and the United Nations Charter, to which this country adhered. Eisenhower made it plain in his message that, if circumstances required him to act as Commander in Chief before Congress voted on the resolution, he would do so. But he initiated the unity move the moment he decided the threat to Formosa had reached a critical military stage.

RAYBURN AND M'CORMACK

The House rule prevented efforts to amend the resolution; hence no Member had a chance to vote on the Senate committee reservations that are to be reproposed in the floor debate. Instead, the House considered an issue which Speaker RAYBURN said was troubling him. "There will come times," said the Speaker, "when 12 hours will be too long a time for the President to have to wait to act. If the President had done what is proposed here without consulting with the Congress he would have had no criticism from me. But, I fear, if this is taken as a precedent, and followed absolutely to the letter, we may find ourselves in very embarrassing and dangerous conditions."

This was said as if the President in his message had not conceded his unilateral power to act and had not given notice he would use it if necessary before Congress passed on his request. Strangely also, the presiding officer of the popular branch of Congress made no acknowledgment (as Majority Leader MCCORMACK did) of the President's recognition of the inherent right of the legislative branch, an equal in the Federal trinity, to express itself on so grave an executive project.

POSTAL SERVICE AND OTHER FEDERAL EMPLOYEE PAY BILLS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am delighted to note that this morning the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, introduced certain pay bills which have been sent to the desk. I am particularly pleased to note that the committee has called for public hearings beginning Friday of this week, instead of waiting until the latter part of the session. It is very pleasing to me to note that the Senator from Kansas has joined the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] in acting on this matter so promptly, inasmuch as the awarding of proper pay to these employees is long overdue. As a matter of fact, I am satisfied the testimony will show that the take-home pay of the postal employees is much less than it was in 1939.

I could not let this opportunity pass without complimenting the distinguished Senator from Kansas for his very fine leadership as ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to say I appreciate very much indeed the very fine compliment which has been paid me by the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, inasmuch as it appears that no other Member of the Senate has any matter to be submitted during the morning hour, I am about to request that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] be permitted to speak for somewhat in excess of the limitation under the 2-minute rule. I know the Senator from Kansas is consistently desirous of not violating the spirit of the 2-minute rule for the morning hour. However, inasmuch as no other Senator, so it would appear, has anything to submit for the RECORD this morning, during the morning hour, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Kansas may proceed to address the Senate for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

The question now is on agreeing to the request of the Senator from Kentucky. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Senator from Kansas is recognized for 10 minutes.

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF ARMED FORCES TO PROTECT SECURITY OF FORMOSA

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the request of the distinguished acting majority leader, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], that I be permitted to use a small amount of time in excess of the usual 2 minutes' allowance during the morning hour. As a matter of fact, I do not like to see the 2-minute rule violated, and I do not like to violate it myself.

At this time I wish to make a brief statement—not to exceed 5 or 6 minutes, in my opinion—on the pending joint resolution.

Mr. President, last Monday, President Eisenhower sent to the Congress a message on our military situation in Formosa and Red China.

The language in the message was forthright and clear. The President has shown courageous and inspired leadership, and I am supporting the pending joint resolution wholeheartedly and unreservedly. It is my sincere hope that the Senate will give it unanimous endorsement.

In this debate it has been stated that the President had the authority to act without action by Congress. Frankly, I think he had and he has that authority; but how much more impressive must it be to the Communist leaders in Red China and other Red-controlled nations if it can be said that the President, the Congress, and the people of our Nation say, "We are taking a firm and positive stand in the Pacific area."

We take this action in the interest of preserving peace. The desire for peace is the dominating desire of America; it is the very heart and soul of America.

The President appropriately concluded his message to Congress by stating—

> Our purpose is peace. That cause will be served if, with your help, we demonstrate our unity and our determination.

It is my opinion that the firmness displayed by the President will be more likely to promote peace than would softness.

I think we all agree that President Eisenhower would not have made these strong and uncompromising recommendations had he not had information which left no doubt of the necessity of taking such action. We are fortunate in having as our President, during this crisis, a man with great military experience—a President who knows the horrors of war and abhors war. He knows better than one less informed when necessity requires that immediate and appropriate action be taken.

It seems to me that we must give the President the power he seeks or we must

get out of the area covered by the resolution. There is no other choice. I believe that we must give the President this power, and that we should do so immediately.

For several years our Nation has borne the indignities heaped upon us by the Communist leaders, on the assumption that we must do nothing to provoke a war with them. The President has, from time to time, with unlimited patience, urged extreme caution. In fact, he has been criticized for not taking a firm and strong position in dealing with these ruthless and Godless leaders.

The question is, how long shall we permit these leaders to seize our soldiers and citizens, incarcerate them in vile dungeons, and expose them to the greatest of mental torture? How long shall we permit our aircraft to be shot down in the free airways? How long shall we permit our vehicles to be stopped and searched on international highways? How long shall we permit the Communist leaders to circumscribe the sailing of our ships on the high seas?

Mr. President, these and many other indignities have been borne by our Nation during the last few years in an effort to maintain peace. We are at last showing to the world a firmness in dealing with Communist leaders. This firmness is in keeping with the prestige, the power, and the interest of our Nation.

It is my hope that our decision will have a sobering effect on the Red China leaders, and that in the words of the President, "This will be a move for peace."

It is a sobering decision, and one fraught with great danger; but in my opinion it is a decision we cannot postpone.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me the same privilege he requested for the Senator from Kansas? I have to leave the Chamber, in order to make an address to an organization at noon. It will not take me long to make the remarks I have in mind making at this time.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I am glad to yield for that purpose to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. President, there appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of January 25 an editorial entitled "Drawing the Line." The editorial is, to my mind, very reasonable and sane. It begins by stating:

> President Eisenhower's request to Congress to define a policy on Formosa is both reasonable and constructive.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, inasmuch as the editorial constitutes, at least to some extent, the text of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRAWING THE LINE

President Eisenhower's request to Congress to define a policy on Formosa is both reasonable and constructive. It goes far enough without going too far. The determination expressed to help the Nationalist Chinese Government defend Formosa and the Pescadores Islands is in accord with evident public sentiment. It ought to be enough to dissuade the Chinese Communist Government from launching the invasion it has been threatening.

At the same time the President and Secretary of State Dulles have avoided giving provocation to the regime of Mao Tze-tung and Chou En-lai over the small coastal islands held by the Nationalists near the mainland of China.

As to Quemoy, which already has been under artillery fire and which the message describes as "one of the natural approaches to Formosa," some freedom of action is left, depending on the nature of the Communist threat.

"I do not suggest," says President Eisenhower, "that the United States enlarge its defensive obligations beyond Formosa and the Pescadores as provided by the treaty now awaiting ratification." But he points out that the United States must be alert to any concentration of Communist forces obviously for an attack on Formosa and must "take into account closely related localities" which might figure in such an attack.

As to the Tachen Islands the implication is that American vessels, and air cover if necessary, will be used to withdraw Nationalist forces to Formosa if General Chiang Kai-shek consents. This may be capitalized by Communist propaganda as a loss of prestige, but it will result in establishing a more solid moral, economic, and military position to be maintained against any aggressive threat.

By basing its commitment strictly on Formosa and the Pescadores, rather than contemplating the mainland islands as a foothold for Nationalist reconquest, the United States should have firmer allies than heretofore, especially in its proposal for a United Nations cease fire.

This line can be made clear by two affirmative actions in Congress: (1) By authorization to the President for "use of the Armed Forces of the United States if necessary to assure the security of Formosa and the Pescadores"; (2) by ratification of the pending mutual defense treaty between the United States and Nationalist China which embodies the same territorial commitments.

Such action would, as the President said, "make clear the unified and serious intentions of our Government, our Congress, and our people." It ought not only to reduce the danger of an ill-advised and ill-informed move on the part of the Chinese Communists but it should lead to clearer and better understanding of American purposes among non-Communist and so-called neutralist nations of the world.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as one of the cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 28, I rise to give my support to the able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. GEORGE]. In the report submitted by him he has set forth the reasons why the 2 committees sitting jointly recommend that the Senate approve this resolution. My remarks will be brief.

President Eisenhower, who had led this Nation in war and peace, and who we know is devoted to peace, has asked us to support him in a momentous decision. Last Monday, he asked that we make crystal clear to the entire world that Formosa and the Pescadores must not fall into unfriendly hands. That, of course, has been the policy of this Government for many years. It is based upon the fundamental rule of self-preservation. Look at the map and note the location of these islands. All the military authorities say that Formosa and the Pescadores are a part of the great defensive line of America.

The only other question seems to be whether or not, if we know that someone is about to attack that line, and to puncture our defense, and that that someone is 100 miles away, shall we apply the rule of reason and defend our position, or partially lose it and then send to the island to defend it American boys who will be targets for the enemy to shoot at. As it is now, approximately 350,000 able Chinese Nationalist troops are ready.

I listened to the argument yesterday. I think we must apply the rule of reason. As I have said, last Monday President Eisenhower asked that we make it crystal clear to the entire world that Formosa and the Pescadores must not fall into unfriendly hands. He has asked us to do this so there may be no doubt in the mind of anyone as to our intentions.

Mr. Dulles recently remarked:

> If events are likely which will in fact lead us to fight, let us make clear our intention in advance; then we shall probably not have to fight.

Mr. President, I cannot help but think that if we had made our intention clear in Korea, the Chinese themselves, who suffered the loss of 1 million lives, would not have fallen for the line of argument which the Kremlin put up to them. They have not forgotten that incident. One million Chinese lives were sacrificed because they were told they could push us out of Korea.

The action of the President in asking support for this resolution recognizes the facts as they exist. This world has been shrunken by the ingenuity of man. New York is less than 4 hours distant from Los Angeles by airplane. It requires only a little more than 4 hours to travel from Newfoundland to the continent of Europe by airplane.

The potential enemy is 100 miles away. We have been told that he is getting ready and poised to take the island, and to push us away from our line of defense. Are we going to sit idly by? The answer is "No." In my judgment, if we pass the joint resolution, the Chinese Communists will have been served with notice that if they attempt to take the outer defenses they will meet with determined resistance. If they attempt to breach our line of defense, they, not we, will have taken the first step. They, not we, will have made the first threat.

The action of the President in asking support for this resolution recognizes the facts as they exist. Since 1950, the 7th Fleet has had responsibility for protecting Formosa and the Pescadores from Communist assault. Our support of the pending resolution underlines the unity of this Nation in backing up two Presidents—Truman and Eisenhower. But it does something else. It supports the principle of self-defense, self-preservation.

It is important that we make our position perfectly plain not only to the Communists but also to our allies and to the neutrals. If we do not take a firm stand now we will discourage our friends to the degree that we encourage the Commu-

nists. We will give our friends cause to doubt that they can really rely on us. The uncommitted millions of Asia will be given grounds for the belief that they can expect no help from us and that they had better come to terms with the Communists. If we appear weak or indecisive now, the effects throughout Asia will be far-reaching and could be disastrous. We are talking about a great deal more than a few small islands; we are talking about the prestige and influence of the United States, and whether or not our friends are justified in having faith in us.

Mr. President, we must not minimize the consequences which might ensue from this action. We know what the result will surely be if we do not take this action. We have been told by the Communists themselves what would be the result of doing nothing. We are taking risks, but not as great risks as we would take if we were to give the Communists the idea that we are lying down and letting them have their way. They thought so in Korea, and see what happened. We are taking risks, but, Mr. President, no nation is worth its salt if it is not able in time of crisis to make up its mind and let the world know where it stands. Furthermore, the risks involved in this resolution are less than the risks involved in doing nothing. Doing nothing invites action by the Communists.

I have given a great deal of thought to this question. Yesterday I listened with interest to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I always profit from listening to him. He always stimulates my thinking in various directions. After listening to that great speech, and to the great reply by the minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND], and after studying the question during the midnight hours, I have come to the conclusion that the risks involved in this resolution are less than the risks involved in doing nothing. Our history demonstrates that.

If hostilities should result from the action of this Government, it would be only because the Communists precipitated hostilities. By this resolution we draw a clear line over which an aggressor must not step. We intend to hold that line until it is possible for the United Nations to step in and prevent hostilities from endangering international peace. We are affording an opportunity for the international community to exert an influence on Communist forces who are toying with the idea of plunging the world into war.

Now is the time when the people of this Nation must stand together. We must be united and firm. We must be united in spirit, in mind, and soul, in order to preserve the peace. It is my faith—and that is why I have no fear in voting for the pending joint resolution—that the course proposed is the right one to take in the light of all the facts as they exist today.

I know very well that men in the Kremlin would like to spring another trap; they would like to get us into another Korea; but I also know that the Chinese Communists have had their medicine. They know that the Kremlin got them into Korea. They know that the Kremlin furnished the incentive, gave them the arms, and egged them on. That incident cost 1 million Chinese lives.

The Chinese leaders have told us definitely that they are going to take Formosa. We say to them, "If you take certain steps which constitute a threat to our defense line and our lifeline, you will meet with firm resistance."

I trust we will take the kind of action that was taken by the House on this subject.

Now is the time for the people of this Nation to stand together. We must be united and firm in the preservation of areas which are vital to our national defense. I know that our President would never have sought this authority had he not felt it was necessary and in the interest of world peace.

I believe in the Senate and in the House, and I have a firm faith in the direction they will take. I also have great faith in the Constitution, which made the President the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, and gave him the power to spearhead our foreign policy.

I know that through the medium of his intelligence officers and the officers of our Foreign Service, he has facts and information which are the basis for his consultation with us, first, and then his message and the joint resolution.

I know, also, that we have a responsibility, because we are asked to weigh the information we have. However, the facts are open before us.

We know that the world has been shrunk by the ingenuity of man, so that every nation is in every other nation's backyard, so to speak. We know what the Communists have done since the end of the war in Europe. We know their policy. We know what the designs of the Kremlin are. In my opinion, the Chinese Communists also know what they are, and Chinese Communists are not going to be made a "sucker" in this undertaking.

Therefore, Mr. President, I join with those Senators who feel that, in the interest of America, we should vote for the joint resolution. I urge the Senate not only to pass it, but to pass it by an overwhelming and unmistakable vote, without in any way changing the letter or spirit of the joint resolution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, excerpts from the MacArthur hearings of 1951 indicating the importance of Formosa to the vital security interests of the United States.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM MACARTHUR HEARINGS IN 1951 RELATING TO THE IMPORTANCE OF FORMOSA TO THE SECURITY INTERESTS OF THE UNITED STATES

General MACARTHUR. I believe that from our standpoint we practically lose the Pacific Ocean if we give up or lose Formosa. Formosa should not be allowed to fall into Red hands (p. 53).

Secretary of Defense MARSHALL. At the time I became Secretary of Defense last September, the established policy of the United States was to deny Formosa to Communist China to oppose the seating of the Communist Chinese in the United Nations.

There has been no deviation from that policy whatsoever. At no time have I entertained the opinion that there should be any deviation (p. 323).

Senator JOHNSON. General Bradley, speaking from purely a military viewpoint, what is your estimate of the strategic value of Formosa?

General of the Army BRADLEY. I think it [Formosa] has great strategic value in the hands of an enemy. It would seriously affect our line of defenses if it fell into the hands of an unfriendly power, particularly in time of war, because of its naval and air bases which would extend the action of ships and planes a considerable distance along our line of communication between the Philippines, Okinawa, and Japan. So the Joint Chiefs have always felt that it is very important that it not be in the hands of an unfriendly power during war with such power, but that we should not try to occupy it with United States forces (p. 882).

Admiral SHERMAN (Chief of Naval Operations). I felt that Formosa was vitally important.

Senator SMITH. Did you agree with him [General MacArthur] that it would be unfortunate, and probably a threat to us, if Formosa was in hostile hands, for example, Russian hands?

Admiral SHERMAN. I, along with the other Joint Chiefs of Staff, have gone on record repeatedly and consistently that Formosa should not be allowed to fall into unfriendly hands.

I think the Joint Chiefs of Staff have used almost the same language every time that we have given forth any opinion on Formosa; although we have also felt that, in the state of the military establishment, that we couldn't afford to deploy forces in there to attempt to hold it.

When we were capturing Okinawa, Formosa in enemy hands required us to tell off a carrier task force to keep Formosa and Sakishima pounded down.

Certainly, in unfriendly hands, it is in a position which is exceedingly important and particularly in connection with communications between points north of it and points south of it (pp. 1589–1590).

General WEDEMEYER. I have consistently and repeatedly recommended American supervised aid to the Chinese Nationalist Government, presently located in Formosa, in order to stop the advance of communism in the Far East (p. 2297).

Chairman RUSSELL. What is your opinion, Admiral, as to the strategic importance of Formosa to the United States, to the defense of the United States?

Admiral BADGER. * * * I would like to answer your question that I leave the value of Formosa from a military point of view to the up-to-date planners, but I will say that I would certainly support Formosa for every reason, one of which is its very great importance to our moral strength, the moral strength of the United States and of the free world in the Far East (pp. 2741–2742).

General BARR. I think the strategic value of Formosa to the United States is principally in not letting the other fellow have it. So far as we are concerned, I think we could get along very well without it, but an enemy on Formosa would have an advantage (p. 2959).

Senator SMITH. It is our policy now not to let Formosa get into hostile hands. I think you agree that is desirable.

General O'DONNELL. Yes, sir (p. 3093).

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to India, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Nepal, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Philip Alexander Ray to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Leverett Edwards to be a member of the National Mediation Board.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Kenneth H. Tuggle to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Everett Hutchinson to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of G. Joseph Minetti to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ben H. Guill to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Coast Guard.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Coast Guard be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Coast Guard nominations are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Public Health Service nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all nominations confirmed this day.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

RECESS TO 12 O'CLOCK

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 35 minutes a. m.) the Senate took a recess until 12 o'clock meridian the same day.

On the expiration of the recess the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF HAITI

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of enabling it to proceed in a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives, to hear the address to be delivered by the President of Haiti, His Excellency Paul E. Magloire.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, the Senate, preceded by the Secretary (Felton M. Johnston), the Sergeant at Arms (Joseph C. Duke), the Vice President and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of attending the joint meeting to hear the address to be delivered by His Excellency Paul E. Magloire, President of the Republic of Haiti.

(For the address delivered by the President of the Republic of Haiti, see pp. 853–854 of the House proceedings in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The Senate returned to its chamber at 1 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m., and reassembled when called to order by the President pro tempore.

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF ARMED FORCES TO PROTECT SECURITY OF FORMOSA

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the two joint resolutions before the Senate, namely, Senate Joint Resolution 28 and House Joint Resolution 159, as passed by the House, are identical. I move that the Senate immediately proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 159.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 159) authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores and related positions and territories of that area.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 159) authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores and related positions and territories of that area.

RECESS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 2 o'clock p. m. today.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 2 o'clock p. m.

At the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MURRAY in the chair).

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF ARMED FORCES TO PROTECT THE SECURITY OF FORMOSA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 159) authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related possessions and territories of that area.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What is the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. House Joint Resolution 159 is the pending business.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the Senate Committee on Armed Services acted jointly on Senate Joint Resolution 28; but House Joint Resolution 159 is identical with the Senate joint resolution in all respects. The House having passed House Joint Resolution 159 by a very impressive majority, the substitution of the House joint resolution for the Senate joint resolution has been made, and the Senate will proceed to consider House Joint Resolution 159, rather than Senate Joint Resolution 28, which, as I have stated, are precisely the same.

Mr. President, I do not believe the joint resolution needs lengthy discusion. I call attention to one fact, namely, that whatever the value of the joint resolution may be and whatever else it may accomplish, it certainly will have a strong psychological effect if it is acted upon promptly and is not crippled by trifling amendments. But if it is long-delayed, the psychological value of the action taken by the Congress of the United States will be very greatly minimized, if indeed not partially destroyed.

Mr. President, I express now my profound belief that the President was right in coming to the Congress and requesting the passage of this joint resolution. The question is not how much power the President may have had. The question is not how much power he has under the Constitution. But in this juncture of affairs, it is my judgment that the President was right in coming to the American Congress, even if the only reason for so doing was to secure the moral support of the American people. I ask this one question now: If the Congress of the United States is willing to withhold moral support to the President of the United States, under existing conditions, which are not disputed, what is the alternative? Let every Member answer, on his conscience, the question of what is his alternative. Is it a legalistic argument? Is it quibbling over some terms which might be applicable to legislative power and some which might be applicable to executive power under the Constitution?

I am profoundly grateful, Mr. President, that the debate on this grave issue—and it is a grave issue—has not descended to the level of partisan politics. The American people are to be congratulated that that is true, because if a grave issue of this kind were reduced to the level of purely partisan politics, the voice of America would not be heard, Mr. President, very far beyond our own boundaries, and certainly not in the councils of the nations. I say that without regard to whether provocation has existed, or whether it now exists, for the injection of political observations into this consideration. As an American, Mr. President, I believe that to reduce a discussion on this grave issue to the basis of petty political arguments, observations, considerations, innuendoes, and charges, would be belittling to the Senate of the United States. I am happy that that has not happened.

I repeat that I am happy that the President came before the Congress and gave us certain facts in his message, and asked us to consider a joint resolution on this subject.

Suppose we say that the only effect of the joint resolution will be to give to the President, in this grave juncture in world affairs, moral support. To the Senator who denies that that is so, I ask, What is his alternative? I ask him to answer, not my question, but the American people. Such Members will have to answer to the American people.

Mr. President, what are the circumstances? The circumstances are that for a long time military threats have been coming from the mainland of China, directed at the Republic of China and the islands it held, Formosa and the Pescadores Islands, which are contiguous to Formosa. What else? Even since the President submitted his message to Congress, and twice repeated since that hour, the President of Red China has said, "You are talking to no purpose. Our purpose is to take Formosa and the Pescadores Islands."

Not only is that true, Mr. President, but military operations actually commenced; and a small island next to a larger island in the Tachen group, some 200-odd miles north or northwest of Formosa fell into Communist hands even before the President submitted his message. But the threat is twice repeated, and it comes from the responsible head of Communist China—perhaps the ablest single Communist in a commanding position on the earth today, and I do not except the Kremlin. He says, "Say as you please and message as you wish; our purpose is to liberate"—to use his rather pleasant language—"Formosa"—or, as he says, "Taiwan and the citizens of Taiwan and the Pescadores Islands."

Mr. President, we can spend a great deal of time here talking about the Gulf of Amoy and the Amoy Islands, and talking about the question of blocking the gulf. We can spend a great deal of time talking about the Matsu Islands and wondering what we are going to do and what is to happen to them. Chou En-lai is not worried about the offshore islands. That is an issue which the American Senate is supposed to consider, talk about, exploit, and worry about. Chou is not concerned about it. Has he said anything about taking the Tachen Islands? Has he said anything about taking any other small island along the coast of China? Not at all. He has said, "You assert sovereignty over Formosa and the Pescadores Islands, and we propose to liberate those islands."

That is the challenge. What is the alternative? Is it to engage in legalistic talk to the effect that the President already has this power? Suppose he has? For the most part he has this power. I do not think he has the complete power, unsupplemented by congressional action. But the President has asked for congressional action up to a point, and he has indicated what he thinks executive action should comprehend. So he has appealed to all the power in the entire Constitution. Certainly someone has a right to represent the United States of America and the people of the United States.

The President has only today given additional assurance, which, under all the circumstances, I think he was entirely right in giving. Speeches on the floor of the Senate have been disturbing to foreign chancellories. Make no mistake about that. Speeches on the floor of the Senate suggesting that we are about to engage in a preventive war—meaning an aggressive war—play right down the line of Communist propaganda. And, of course, our friends in other parts of the world are a bit disturbed. So today, following a meeting at the White House with important officials of this Government, representatives of the Security Council, of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and others, the statement was made which I shall read. I read from the news-ticker report:

The White House said today President Eisenhower would decide personally whether to use United States forces for purposes other than immediate self-defense in protection of Formosa against the Communists.

Do Senators want anything further? Can they ask anything further? Lest some may not have heard it, let me read the statement again:

The White House said today President Eisenhower would decide personally—

Not through any line officer, not through any commander in some remote part of the world, not through any officer fighting in the Formosa Straits or under the shadow of the islands lying off the China coast, but personally—

whether to use United States forces for purposes other than immediate self-defense in protection of Formosa against the Communists.

Do Senators want anything more? I read further:

Mr. Hagerty, White House press secretary, said in a statement that Eisenhower had made that clear at a conference with top civilian and military defense officials. The statement said that at the White House conference today:

"The President made it clear that these United States forces were designed purely for defensive purposes and that any decision to use United States forces other than in immediate self-defense or in direct defense of Formosa and the Pescadores, would be a decision which he would take and the responsibility for which he has not delegated."

The purpose of the statement, it was learned, is at least twofold:

1. To allay concern expressed by some Senators that the President's fight-for-Formosa resolution carries authorization to launch a preventive war against the Communists.

2. To set at rest concern on the part of some Members of Congress that authority to decide whether to use United States armed forces might be delegated so that control of the situation would not rest with the United States.

What does that statement say? It says that Chiang Kai-shek will not make the decision. A great many Members of the Senate have been disturbed about the possibility of Chiang Kai-shek

breaking loose and starting a war. For 5 years he has wanted to move to the mainland. That is understandable. I am not critical of the President of the Republic of China, but for 5 years and many, many months, when he was wholly unleashed and no one was controlling him, he did not start a war.

But what does this statement mean? For one thing, it means that neither the President of the Republic of China nor any of the officers of that Government will start the war, if one is started. But it means infinitely more than that. It means that no admiral here and no line officer off the coast of China, in the Formosa Straits or elsewhere, will start it. It means, in explicit terms, that the decision will be made here, that it will be a personal decision of the President of the United States, and that he has delegated no authority to anyone else to make that decision.

Mr. President, I believe that President Eisenhower is a prudent man. I believe that he is dedicated to a peaceful world. I believe what he says, and I am willing to act upon it.

There is no question by any Member of Congress, so far as I know, that the United States should protect Formosa and should protect the group of islands called the Pescadores, which lie close to the shores of Formosa. If anyone has a contrary view, I have not heard it expressed.

Certainly the present administration, and certainly the prior Democratic administration, said we should protect them. Certainly every oustanding strategist in the American Armed Forces has said that if we do not protect this island chain of defense in the western Pacific, if we allow the line of communication to be destroyed by permitting Formosa to fall into unfriendly hands, Japan, the Philippines, and perhaps even Okinawa—unless we move back from that base, on which we have spent immense amounts of money—would be endangered.

Mr. President, I am not a military man, I am not a strategist, and technically I know nothing about the subject, except what commonsense teaches, but, more than what I have stated, if Formosa should fall into unfriendly hands, it would be with the greatest difficulty that we could defend, not merely Japan, not merely the Philippines, which lie a relatively short distance from Formosa, and Okinawa, but the whole of Southeast Asia clear down to the end of the great countries that lie under the Equator would be endangered. That is clear. I have heard no responsible military man in America make any contrary statement.

Military authorities might differ as to whether we could retire to Fortress America and make our stand here and maintain it. That is a different problem. However, they all agree that the vital interests of this country lie in the retention in friendly hands of Formosa as a key island in the group, essential to our communications from the far stretches of the Aleutians to Australia. No one questions that fact.

Therefore, Mr. President, it seems to me that there can be no question that we should say to the world that we now propose to make our position clear. We must say that we will not be parties to the placing of Formosa and the Pescadores in unfriendly hands, and that we will defend them against every effort to do so.

We need not speculate about what faces us, when Chou En-lai has repeated at least three times precisely what his program is, to wit, the liberation of Formosa and the Pescadores.

Many people in the United States have been disturbed because the President, in the resolution and in the message to Congress, did not suggest exactly what places within the general area of Formosa he might think it advisable to hold by the use of our Armed Forces. I do not know how to characterize that method of thinking. It is a fine line for columnists and radio commentators to use.

The moment we announce what islands we intend to hold, we offer Chou En-lai the invitation to take any other islands, anywhere off the coast of China. We not only put our enemy on notice, but we actually invite him to come and get some of those islands. In effect, we say to him, "We will not defend those islands. We are not sure what we will defend, but you can know now that we are not going to defend those islands."

That seems to me to be sufficient to say on that point. A great many people seem to want someone to draw a line. I do not. God keep us out of war, but if war must come, let us not draw a line and say that beyond that line is a sanctuary which the enemy may occupy, and beyond which he may retreat. Let us say that wherever the enemy is we will strike. Let us, at least, reserve the flexibility which comes from no preannouncement of our own military programs. Let us act with commonsense.

As I said in the beginning, some of our friends believe that the President has the full authority for which he has asked in the pending resolution. As I have indicated, I question it very much. However, for the most part, he does have the power. But that seems to me to be immaterial in connection with this resolution.

Certainly he has both asked for authority from Congress and has invoked the powers of the executive branch of the Government and in those two departments all these powers must reside. The two together, at least, must possess the power to protect the United States.

I do not know, and I do not believe any other man can know, whether the passage of the resolution will increase the efforts of Chou En-lai and his government to "liberate," as he says, Formosa, or whether the passage of the resolution will intensify the feeling of hostility which unfortunately has grown up between ourselves and a people who for many long years, if not centuries, have been friendly disposed toward America; but I am certain that whether the resolution is passed or whether it is dismissed without passage, the decision of Chou En-lai and whatever allies he has, on whom he is depending, will not be altered.

He does not do business in that way. He makes up his own program, and follows it out.

But certainly when the President of the United States, who perhaps has all the powers he has suggested he would exercise, comes to Congress and asks for our support, we must indeed have a very clear answer of the alternative that we are willing to give to that request, if we deny it, not only to him but to the American people.

When we consider the President's announcement of a few hours ago that he would decide personally whether to use United States forces for purposes other than immediate self-defense, in protection of Formosa against the Communists, one thing is certain, Mr. President, namely, that such a decision is within his power and within his power alone.

Mr. President, I know very well that various arguments can be made. I have heard military men argue for hours concerning what is our best defense, and what is not. All that is beside the point. If we have a right, because of our vital interest in the free world facing the Pacific, east and west, to defend Formosa in order to prevent its falling into the hands of an unfriendly power, we have a right to make an effective defense.

But some of our friends are worried because we may want to hold some islands which the Nationalist Government of China has across the little hundred-mile strait if that be necessary. I say, Mr. President, that when we have the clear right, or when we assume the power of saying that the holding of a given piece of land at sea is vital to the interests of this country, and that we propose to hold it, we have the right to say that we shall undertake to make an effective defense of that island. We would be the laughing stock of mankind if we said we would not interfere until we saw the enemy actually putting his foot on the shore of Formosa. In this modern world, with the new weapons now available, we cannot defend it in that way. That suggestion cannot be seriously advanced anywhere.

If we are going to defend effectively the island of Formosa or the Pescadores, we have to start in time to stop the invasion of those islands. If, as some of our friends contend, the President has a perfect right to do everything he thinks is wise or right to prevent the invasion and "liberation" of Formosa, he can start operations in areas away beyond the islands. He can bomb the concentrations prepared for the attack, though I myself do not concede such a situation to exist. But if that be true, why worry about the islands? The islands would be in between Formosa and the point where a large concentration of air power was taking place ready for an immediate attack on Formosa.

But, Mr. President, I believe the President of the United States, if he has a clear right to take any affirmative action, has a right to make that action effective. I would be the last man ever to bind his hands and say, "You cannot do this and you cannot do that." When he suggests the passage of a resolution and outlines it to us and says. "This is what I want

to do," I am willing to acquiesce. I would never bind his hands.

Mr. President, what are the facts which are beyond dispute? The Sino-Japanese War ended in approximately 1895. As a result of that war and at the end of that war Formosa and the Pescadores Islands were ceded by China to Japan. They remained in the hands of Japan until the end of World War II and the signing of the peace treaty following that war. In the peace treaty Japan said only that she quitclaimed any interest, title, or right of sovereignty which she had over Formosa and the Pescadores.

What about the columnists and commentators on our foreign policy, who refer to a juridical line, and then talk about something else, and heaven only knows what they mean? Where did the right to Formosa and the Pescadores go? It remained in the hands of the United States and her allies. It remains there to this hour. It will remain there, under even a legalistic conception, until some other disposition is made of Formosa and the Pescadores group. That being true, Mr. President, and inasmuch as we have taken the initiative in the far western Pacific, we certainly have the right to be heard about their disposition. Two administrations representing different political parties have said that Formosa and the Pescadores should not fall into unfriendly hands. Does not that mean that we are to defend them? Do we want to be unworthy of the trust and confidence of every small nation on the face of the globe, as we would be if we should repudiate our obligation? Do we? Are we capable of even debating whether we will refuse to defend those islands?

Eliminating all questions of an effective defense, and looking only at the big question here involved, shall we not defend them in the face of a threat, twice repeated within a week, by the powerful leader of Communist Red China, that he intends, despite all our protests, to take Formosa and the Pescadores? It seems to me that the question answers itself. If it does not, I am incapable of answering it.

Looking at the resolution for a moment, Mr. President, by it Congress authorizes the President of the United States "to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack"—and, translating it literally, as it must be construed—"this authority to include the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands and the taking of such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores."

I point out to the Senate—and in this I do not think I can be wrong—that that is a limiting clause. It is an express limitation upon the power of the President. He is not required to use the authority which he is asking Congress to give him. He may have the authority under the Constitution, which is an altogether different question. But he is not asking Congress to give him any authority except the authority to secure and protect such related positions and territories of that area as are now in friendly hands.

What does that mean? It means that the President is asking Congress to say to him, "You cannot take, secure, and hold any area on the mainland of China, because it is not in friendly hands." The authority can refer only to those islands lying not too far off the coast which, in some way or other, the Nationalist Republic of China has been enabled to hold, and which it now holds.

So what the President himself is asking is that we agree, so far as we can agree, to give him support, not to go onto the mainland, and not to take any lands which are held by any people other than those who are friends of ours. He is asking that he be given the right, in this area, to secure and protect those lands that are now in friendly hands. That is what the President has asked for. It is a limitation upon his authority and power, from the point of view of those who believe the President has absolute power to reach as far back as he wishes in order to protect Formosa and the Pescadores. But he is asking for this authority, and I think he is asking it for a good reason and a good purpose.

I can see no reason why Congress should hesitate to grant him that power, which is a probable limitation upon the power which, under the Constitution, he might exercise, but as to which assuredly he feels justified, by implication at least as strong as death, in saying to Congress: "I do not want the authority to go beyond the areas which are now in friendly hands. I want you to give me the authority to secure and protect lands now in friendly hands, and that only."

Whatever amendments may be offered may not be intended to do one important thing, but they will have the unavoidable result of conveying to our enemies all around the globe the idea that we haggle and hesitate and delay when we are asked to give moral support to the President of the United States in this grave matter.

Mr. President, that is all I shall say at this time; and perhaps it is all I shall say on the joint resolution. No person can guarantee the results of any important public act. We cannot. But there is no man who is worth his salt, in this or any other high deliberative body which has any authority in the premises, who is not willing to exercise his best judgment, his honest judgment, in response to the President.

Though unhappily it may turn out that the request of the President was unwise, though unhappily it may turn out that the passage of the joint resolution will result in evil to our country, and bring about a horrible experience, nevertheless, it is one of those things as to which, when we assume high public office, we simply assume the responsibility of passing upon.

I hope no Democrat will be heard to say that because the President of the United States came to Congress, he is thereby subject to criticism. The President chose a courageous course, a course which would be taken only by a prudent, patient man, who knows the pitfalls along the course, and who knows the horrors of war.

For my part, I shall always commend the President for coming to Congress with this request.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION OF OATH AS AMBASSADOR TO FORMER SENATOR HENDRICKSON

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, before I begin my marks on the pending joint resolution I desire to make an announcement of an event which has come to my attention, and which is a matter of great personal interest to me.

I have been advised that our distinguished former colleague, Senator Hendrickson, of New Jersey, will be sworn in as Ambassador to New Zealand at 5 o'clock this afternoon in the office of the Secretary of State.

POSITION OF SENATOR POTTER ON PENDING JOINT RESOLUTION AND STATEMENT OF REASON FOR HIS INABILITY TO VOTE

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield briefly to me?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield a minute to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, the Republic of France will soon commemorate the 10th anniversary of the World War II Battle of Alsace, and has invited representatives of our Government to participate in the ceremonies, which will take place on Saturday and Sunday of this week.

I have been fortunate enough to be selected as one of the members to represent our Government in the ceremony at Colmar, which place is of particular significance to me because it was at Colmar that my combat service came to an end. I shall be leaving this afternoon for France as one of the American delegation. I regret that this duty will prevent my being present to vote on the pending joint resolution. I am fully in favor of the measure introduced by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and if I were present at the time of voting I would support the joint resolution.

I thank the distinguished Senator from New Jersey for yielding to me.

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF ARMED FORCES TO PROTECT SECURITY OF FORMOSA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 159) authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores and related positions and territories of that area.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, as one Member of this body, I wish to express my profound appreciation to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, for one of the finest speeches I have ever heard delivered in the Senate. It would be difficult for anyone at this time to add to what he has said.

But as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, on which I have served for 8 years, I feel that it is my responsibility to reflect here my own thinking and judgment on the question under consideration, and to try to show my colleagues the situation as I see it in the Far East, together with the relation of the pending joint resolution to that whole situation.

Mr. President, as one who has had the privilege, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, of traveling in the Far Eastern Asia area 4 or 5 times in the past 6 years, I should like, as a background for my remarks today on the pending resolution, to try to dramatize Asia as I see it, and to indicate why we are living and shall continue to live in very critical times unless we recognize the significance of Asia as a whole.

I

Let us first consider a line from Korea, down through China, and down through Indochina. We see today three danger spots which might well result in the entire Asiatic world being engulfed in communism, and, if that should happen, the security of the United States and the western free world would be seriously threatened.

Today there is a crisis in Korea, and it is a continuing one. If there should be a breach of the armistice in Korea—and there might well be if we should fail to protect ourselves—the whole Japanese area would be threatened.

If we consider the area farther south, which might be called the underbelly of China, the area reaching out toward Formosa, and toward our islands in the Pacific, we come to another area where an attack might well result in all of Asia succumbing to communism, and consequently threaten our own security to such a degree that the consequences would be almost impossible to imagine.

When we consider the area still farther south, Indochina, where also there exists today an uneasy truce, we again find as in Korea a line dividing the country. That is the third danger point.

So, considering the map of Asia as a whole, there are three points of danger, Korea, mainland China, and Indochina. Unless we maintain and strengthen the defenses and the solidarity of our allies, unless the program of the administration under President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles is carried out, so that the defense of those areas is maintained, we shall face one of the most critical periods in our history.

I admit very frankly that the vote each one of us shall cast on the pending resolution will be one of the most important votes ever cast during the time at least some of us have been in the Senate. Certainly, during the 10 years that I have been a Senator it will be my most critical vote.

I have mentioned three danger spots; but below that area are Malaya and Thailand—one of the allies we must protect against communism—and then beyond there lie Burma and India, all teetering back and forth, uncertain whether Asia will go to the Communists or will be kept on the side of the free nations of the world.

As I said a moment ago, Mr. President, I have been in that area 4 or 5 times. I had the privilege last fall of being a delegate to the United Nations, representing the United States, and I had the opportunity to talk with the leadership in the Middle East and Far East, and especially the leadership in the areas about which I have been speaking. I made a special point of trying to ascertain what the thinking of the leadership in those areas was, and I desire to speak particularly about the Philippines and our other friends in Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, and Pakistan, and those areas which have up to today stayed with us in trying to handle these problems.

As I have said, unless we face the problem as an all-Asian problem, we run the risk of having it said, "This is just a battle to keep Formosa for Chiang Kai-shek. This is all part of a plan to keep Chiang Kai-shek in power." That is a part of the picture, but the overall consideration is the whole Asia problem. At the present moment Formosa happens to be the key spot.

As the Senator from Georgia stated, the security of Formosa is necessary in order to keep up the hope of other peoples of the world for freedom and self-determination. The defense of Formosa would be in line with the whole program of securing freedom and self-determination for peoples who are yearning to have those privileges, and who believe that the United States provides the one great hope that they may become free, and that we shall stand fast in endeavoring to secure that goal.

Mr. President, I am not worried about the public opinion of the world, because, in my judgment, the free world wants us to do what the resolution calls for, and wants to see support of the President of the United States in this time of crisis.

So, my thinking, my study, and my experience bring me to an understanding of the so-called Far Eastern policy of the United States Government today. Our policy, by necessity, has had to be a defensive one in that area. I hope to address the Senate soon on what I believe can be an offensive approach to world peace, without being bound closely by defensive attitudes. That will have to do with our whole program of assisting countries and areas which are looking to us for help in their yearning to be free.

II

I had the privilege of being a delegate for the United States during the signing of the Japanese peace treaty. Since the close of the Japanese war we have seen a series of collective security arrangements entered into. I wish to emphasize how vital they are. They are parts of a pattern.

In Europe we adopted what is called the NATO program, which initials stand for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, for joint action in case of trouble.

In the Far East the situation was more difficult, and we felt that the wisest course would be not immediately to organize all the free nations there into one big collective group, but to join with them individually in their determination to resist Communist aggression.

In line with such a policy, we entered into a collective-security arrangement with Japan, soon after we signed the peace treaty with that country. We have similar arrangements with the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand. The ANZUS Pact was entered into between Australia, New Zealand, and the United States, which comprised an Anglo-Saxon group. Later on we entered into a defense arrangement with Korea, an old friend.

In those agreements we applied what we called the Monroe Doctrine principle, rather than the NATO principle. The NATO principle, according to its own language, was that an attack on one would be an attack on all. We realized that in the farflung areas of the Far East we could not assume the responsibility of stating that an attack on one would be an attack on all. We could not assume the responsibility of going to the assistance of one nation that might be attacked by another nation locally. Therefore, we adopted what was known as the Monroe Doctrine principle, which doctrine had been in effect in this hemisphere for many, many years, namely, that aggression anywhere would be a matter of concern to our own security and the security of the country attacked. In case of such an aggression, we agree to meet with the party concerned and then to decide on what course to take to resist the aggression, if it seems necessary to do so, according to our constitutional processes.

I wish to emphasize the words "constitutional processes," because the President of the United States, in requesting the Congress to pass the pending joint resolution, is thinking in terms of the Constitution and of a joint responsibility. So when we become involved in difficulties with foreign nations and there is a threat of war, although the President is Commander in Chief, he does not ignore but works with the Congress, composed of the representatives of the people of the United States, in taking the steps he has to take.

Then we move from the treaties with these individual countries, to which I have referred, to the next development in this collective-security program. I should like to refer now to southeast Asia, where, last September, I participated with the Secretary of State and the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the colleague of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who now is presiding over the Senate, in the signing of the so-called Southeast Asian Defense Treaty. In that group were the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, and the three important Far Eastern and Asian countries of Pakistan, Thailand, and the Philippines. The offer was left open to other countries in that area to join with that group in collective self-defense, based, as I have said, on the Monroe Doctrine principle.

In addition to that, because we have been close friends with the Nationalist Government of China, and because we have been profoundly interested in For-

mosa as an outpost of strategic value to our own security, and as a protection to our bases in that area, we felt we should bring the Nationalist Chinese Government into the same area of collective self-defense treaties and that we should make with that Government a similar treaty. That treaty is now before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and we shall presently begin hearings on it. It follows the pattern and spirit of the collective-security treaties with countries in the other parts of the Pacific. The pending joint resolution is really, in a sense, an implementation of that treaty with Nationalist China.

I wished to give the whole background, and I hope my colleagues will appreciate its significance. If we limit our thinking to the consideration whether Formosa is worth keeping or not, our vision is not sufficiently broad to enable us to have a realization of what the issue before us today is.

III

At this time let me discuss the arguments which have been made regarding the pending joint resolution and review the matters on which everyone has agreed. The distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] did this very effectively a few minutes ago. However, let me sum up where we are agreed and where the area of controversy seems to lie.

In the first place, while there was some doubt in 1949 and 1950 as to whether Formosa should be included in the island chain which we consider vital to our own security, it has finally been decided, without fear of contradiction, by a succession of governments, Democratic and Republican, that Formosa and the Pescadores are essential parts of our defense chain in that area; and that if that area falls into hostile hands, it will constitute a real threat to the free world and to our own Pacific possessions and responsibilities. So we have reached the conclusion, as the pending joint resolution shows, that Formosa and the Pescadores must be defended.

The distinguished senior Senator from Georgia read carefully, 2 or 3 times, the exact language of the joint resolution. So all I need to do is call attention to the fact that the joint resolution simply authorizes the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the Nation, to use his discretion in dealing with the defense of those islands.

I believe that without a distinct authorization, such as the pending joint resolution will give the President, he would be empowered, as Commander in Chief, to act in case there was a threat to the safety of Formosa, which it is our policy to defend. I think he would have the duty of doing so. But in discussing this matter with me and with others, the President has made it very clear that he wishes to take no steps without having the Congress fully advised. He has conferred with the congressional leaders. He has conferred, of course, with his military staff and with the Security Council. He has decided that the Congress itself should have full debate on this subject and should be told completely about it, so that the people of the United States can know exactly what we are doing. So we have come up with the pending joint resolution, which gives the President authority to take certain steps which he may deem necessary for the protection of Formosa and the Pescadores.

I really believe that the President felt this was necessary, because all of us will recall that when the hostilities broke out in Korea, there was criticism of the then President—even though at the time I felt he was justified in doing as he did—because he did not request of Congress either the passage of a joint resolution beforehand, although there was not time for that, or the passage of a joint resolution of approval, afterward. In either case, it probably would have been wise to obtain the support of Congress, so as to avoid some of the subsequent criticism which developed.

We also remember that in connection with NATO there was considerable debate in Congress on the question of whether the president could send troops to Europe, to back up NATO, without congressional action of approval. It was felt that it certainly was desirable to have action taken by Congress, in order to have public opinion and popular support on the part of the people of the United States behind the President.

So the President felt—and quite wisely so, I think—that even though it risked some debate at this time and some misunderstanding, the proper thing to do was to come directly to the Congress, the representatives of the people, and lay the entire matter before us, right on the table, and ask us to give him authority to carry out the difficult tasks which fall to his lot under his responsibility to protect these island areas.

Mr. President, let me point out that the joint resolution does not either include or exclude certain controversial islands. All of us know from the debate which occurred yesterday and from the debate which has occurred today, and from looking at the map, that there is a string of islands along that coast. Those of us who have been to the Far East have tried to distinguish between the islands which might be vital and those which might not be vital. In any event, we know that Quemoy and Matsu stand out because, in the first place, they are directly across from Formosa; and in each case those islands are at the mouth of a river or a harbor where it might be that the preparations for an attack upon Formosa could be made and the forces could be assembled. Should we or should we not take a stand on defending those islands?

The way the joint resolution now reads, we shall, by passing it, neither include those islands nor exclude them, as I have said. But we let it be known that the Congress has authorized the President, in his discretion, to decide whether it is to the best interests of the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores that those islands be included, or excluded. We thus give him authority to take such action, as Commander in Chief, as in his discretion he may think best.

Mr. President, for the benefit of my colleagues who were not present when the Senator from Georgia was speaking, I shall read again into the RECORD the White House statement which came to us a few hours ago. This should set at rest the fears of some persons that Chiang Kai-shek or someone else might order an attack on some of these islands or, in the defense of the islands, might take some impetuous action.

The White House statement reads:

> The President made it clear that these (United States) forces were designed purely for defensive purposes and that any decision to use United States forces other than in immediate self-defense or in direct defense of Formosa and the Pescadores would be a decision which he would take and the responsibility for which he has not delegated.

That puts at rest, it seems to me, any thought that anyone other than the President of the United States could take the action which has been criticized.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the Senator reread the last sentence?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be very glad to do so. I will reread the entire statement. It is very brief:

> The President made it clear that these (United States) forces were designed purely for defensive purposes and that any decision to use United States forces other than in immediate self-defense or in direct defense of Formosa and the Pescadores would be a decision which he would take and the responsibility for which he has not delegated.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to have the Senator state how he interprets the clause "and that any decision to use United States forces other than in immediate self-defense or in direct defense of Formosa and the Pescadores would be a decision which he would take and the responsibility for which he has not delegated"?

What would be such a use?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think this question arises because of a circumstance which was brought to our attention yesterday by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If there should be an accumulation of boats, war vessels, or equipment in the harbors, facing Quemoy or Matsu, or if there should be an accumulation of swift-flying jet planes at the airports behind those places, obviously aimed at a sudden attack on Formosa, might it not be necessary for the President to decide to take appropriate action in order to avoid the destruction of Formosa? With modern jet planes and bombs, the whole place might be destroyed in one surprise attack. Our military people might be perfectly sure, or, in this case, the President might be perfectly sure, that the accumulation of such forces was beyond doubt aimed at making a swift and sudden attack on Formosa. Before Formosa were destroyed, which, under modern warfare, might easily happen, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] pointed out, the President would have to use his discretion to act to save the entire situation and protect Formosa and the Pescadores. He would not

be taking any land in China. He would not be doing anything except to head off an attack from the other side, which might be totally destructive. He would be acting to prevent any attack at all.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am glad the Senator from New Jersey has again called attention to the statement from the White House. Pursuing the thought a little further, does the Senator understand that steps "in immediate self-defense or in direct defense of Formosa and the Pescadores" might be taken by theater commanders or by local commanders, as the case might be, without referring the question to the President?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I believe that in the immediate defense of Formosa, if it were attacked, the local commanders would go right ahead with ordinary military operations. What we are referring to here are the other possible actions which have been criticized, particularly action which might be taken, say, to destroy a large force which had been accumulated and was in the process of launching an attack which, in my judgment, at that stage would be an aggression by the enemy. I will admit that there is some debate on that question; but that kind of decision, the decision to take appropriate action before Formosa could be destroyed, would be a decision which the President alone would make.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If action away from the immediate vicinity of Formosa or the Pescadores were contemplated, such action would not be taken until the President had personally made the decision?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is my understanding. If Quemoy or Matsu were attacked, I think the President would want to make the decision as to just what to do at that stage.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the Senator think that embraces not merely a response to an attack, or retaliation, but also the possibility of a defensive strike?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Certainly not.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Or of intervention?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I do not think the President has any idea of a preventive strike or of intervention.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is purely retaliation?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. As a military man, the President would not let the enemy so get the jump on us that we would not be able to retaliate. Modern jet planes with modern bombs might destroy everything we had in Formosa, or even Okinawa. We must think of Okinawa, because it is near Formosa. We must think of the Philippines, which are near. We have a responsibility for those areas under the treaties which we have made.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think we do. Under the treaties I think we have made certain commitments. Of course, the treaty with China has not yet been ratified by the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That treaty is before the Foreign Relations Committee now, and hearings will be held within the next day or two.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. We ought not to think of the possible commitments under that treaty as commitments already made. The treaty has not been acted upon by the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Except insofar as we all agree that the treaty with the Republic of China puts into writing in the form of a treaty, as is done in the treaties with other countries in that area, substantially what has been our attitude toward Formosa up to the present time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator is getting into an interpretation of the treaty. I think some errors might be made if we were to proceed upon the basis that the treaty with the Republic of China was in existence. It certainly is not effective yet. It has not been ratified by the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am not assuming that it has. I am taking only the resolution before us. It is my own judgment that the directive for the use of the 7th Fleet is approximately what has been put into the language of that treaty. Of course, we particularly emphasize in the treaty the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores, but that has been our policy right along. It has not heretofore been put in black and white in any treaty.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think we might also fall into the error of indulging in what might be semantics when we attempt to differentiate between a strike in self-defense, when it is the first strike, on the one hand, and intervention, on the other hand.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to continue with my remarks, because I wish to keep them in consecutive order, if I may. I shall be glad to answer further questions when I complete my statement.

The big question is, Should the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, who is charged with the defense of Formosa, have authority—he may have such authority anyway, but should we in the Congress approve his having such authority— to strike before the enemy strikes and destroys Formosa and the Pescadores? If it is perfectly clear to him—and he alone will make the decision—that the massing of troops and planes, and the entire movement and congestion in the area is for the purpose of making a strike, my own judgment is that the President has such authority. The President has certainly clarified that question in the statement issued an hour or two ago, by saying that he alone will make the decision.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. To make a preventive strike?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes; but only in the context in which we have discussed this problem.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I prefer to wait until I have concluded. I shall be glad to yield to Senators as soon as I conclude my remarks. I am very eager to answer any questions I can answer.

Yesterday the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], for whose reasoning I have the greatest respect, and who I think is very sincere in the presentation of his case, seemed to suggest, if I am correct in my interpretation of his approach, that if we were to take action to protect against what were obviously threatening forces, that would constitute aggression on our part. I take sharp issue with that position. I think the very fact of concentration of such overwhelming force would constitute an aggression. The President would have to make the decision as to whether or not such an accumulation was a threat of attack. We could not be charged with aggression if we were to take appropriate defensive measures before we were destroyed.

It seems to me that it would be very unreasonable to accept the responsibility of defending Formosa and the Pescadores if Formosa and the Pescadores must be struck with devastating bombs before we anticipate the strike and take the necessary defensive measures.

We are faced with that situation. That is the big objection that has been raised to the language of the resolution. It is the basis, of course, of the Humphrey amendment, which would strike those words from the resolution. For the sake of clarity, I shall read the words the Senator from Minnesota asks to strike from the resolution. I will first read the whole resolution, so that there will be no question about it. The resolution reads:

> That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack, this authority to include the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands and the taking of such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.
>
> This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, and shall so report to the Congress.

The words in the resolution which is the part the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] seeks to strike out are:

> this authority to include the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands * * * other * * *

All the language embodied in the resolution has to do with one thing, namely, the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

According to the manner in which that language is interpreted by the recent statement of the President, it means that the President needs and desires the authority to deal with the so-called related positions and territories in the area now in friendly hands, which of course refer to the islands. The islands are not included, and they are not excluded. The islands are left in that state in which I believe they should be left, so that the matter can be dealt with properly.

Otherwise, as the Senator from Georgia has stated, if we exclude those islands, they will be immediately seized. If we are not going to do anything about them, the Communist Chinese will take

them over, and in that way we will lose that much advantage in our present position.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the entire resolution is vitally important for the whole Asian picture. It is also vitally important for another reason.

Is there any implication here that there might be an attack made on the mainland? Of course, there is no implication that that might happen.

The Communists might violate the truce in Korea, possibly with Russian help. That would be a threat; more than that, it would be aggression. There might also be a similar attack in Indochina, as we felt last year there might be. The Communists might try to clean up the Vietnam situation, and in that way destroy our program there.

It is to our advantage, by agreement with the Nationalist forces, to be always in a position to strike a blow at the mainland of China, at the underbelly of China, in order to deter the accumulation of forces in Korea or in Indochina for attacks in those areas.

It is a very strong strategic position, and we must maintain it for the security of our own position and in behalf of our obligations under the defense treaties.

Therefore I say that any alternative to the resolution, which has been so carefully drawn and studied, not only by the Joint Chiefs of Staff but by everyone else who has had a hand in the matter, would be critically dangerous to Formosa and would jeopardize our whole island chain of defense and our entire position in the Pacific. Perhaps we could not even move back to Honolulu, because it would be extremely difficult to defend the Hawaiian Islands under those circumstances, and we might even have to move back to the coast of California. I can well realize that the distinguished Senators from California would be concerned very much if California were to be our bastion of defense, if we had to move back in the Pacific area.

I believe the whole policy we have been working on now for 6 or 7 years, I have been going back and forth to Asia discussing this situation during that time, of an effective defense of the Pacific would be jeopardized if we should fail to pass the pending resolution giving the President authority to move in if he sees Formosa and the Pescadores threatened.

Mr. President, the point about the related positions and territories in that area was raised also by my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. He seems to believe that by passing the resolution we would authorize a preventive war. I cannot see how we would be authorizing a preventive war by the passage of the joint resolution. The idea of a preventive war has absolutely nothing to do with giving authority to the President to defend Formosa and the Pescadores Islands, and to defend them effectively.

If the enemy is in a position to strike first, and if we see that danger, as, for example, if we see a great many junks and other boats being loaded with troops who could be used only to attack Formosa, I do not see how it can be said that we are not entitled to take effective measures before the boats arrive at their destination and the troops strike the first blow. I do not see how we could fail to assume that responsibility, if that type of danger was apparent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] also raised a question about the Matsus and the Quemoys. I have already referred to that situation. I believe we are in a much stronger position if those islands are not included or excluded and we let the President determine whether we need to defend those islands as a part of the program of defending Formosa and the Pescadores. We do not want them for their own purposes, but only as a part of our defense program.

The suggestion has been made by various persons, in discussing this subject, that there is a danger that Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek might precipitate some trouble. I wish to speak on that point now. I can speak on it from a somewhat personal standpoint, I believe, because I know the Generalissimo reasonably well. I have been to Formosa and I have talked with him a number of times. The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] also have been there. Those of us who have talked with the Generalissimo are not at all concerned that he would be so foolhardy as to go off half-cocked and try to start something which would involve us. He knows perfectly well that he could not get to first base in such a proceeding, unless he had the backing of the United States.

I had the privilege of being with the Secretary of State last summer when we stopped in Formosa, in September, and we talked with the Generalissimo for 2 or 3 hours.

He explained his desire, which we all have, of some day restoring freedom to China by recovering the mainland, but he said he realized it was an impossibility without the backing and support of the United States. There was no indication anywhere that he would be so foolhardy as to try to recover it by military means without our backing. Furthermore, in the treaty which is now before the Committee on Foreign Relations, it is clearly set forth that unless we collaborate, the Nationalist Chinese will take no steps to make any attack of any sort.

In this morning's New York Herald Tribune I have had pointed out to me an article which states that the United States has been assured that Chiang Kai-shek would have no objection to a reasonable cease-fire proposal in the U. N. Previously, of course, he had been quoted as being opposed to any cease-fire proposal. Now, I understand he will not oppose it. Of course Chou En-lai will oppose it.

In order to make absolutely clear whether Nationalist China might attack if we should ratify the treaty or if we should pass the pending resolution, I should like to read into the RECORD at this point an exchange of letters between the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, and Mr. George K. C. Yeh, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of China. Mr. Yeh has been in this country during the last few months.

Under date of December 10, Secretary Dulles wrote to Mr. Yeh, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 10, 1954.

His Excellency GEORGE K. C. YEH,
Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of China.

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to refer to recent conversations between representatives of our two Governments and to confirm the understandings reached as a result of those conversations, as follows:

The Republic of China effectively controls both the territory described in Article VI of the Treaty of Mutual Defense between the Republic of China and the United States of America signed on December 2, 1954, at Washington and other territory. It possesses with respect to all territory now and hereafter under its control the inherent right of self-defense. In view of the obligations of the two Parties under the said Treaty, and of the fact that the use of force from either of these areas by either of the Parties affects the other, it is agreed that such use of force will be a matter of joint agreement, subject to action of an emergency character which is clearly an exercise of the inherent right of self-defense. Military elements which are a product of joint effort and contribution by the two Parties will not be removed from the territories described in Article VI to a degree which would substantially diminish the defensibility of such territories without mutual agreement.

Accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State of the United States of America.

To the letter of Mr. Dulles, Mr. Yeh replied, as follows:

DECEMBER 10, 1954.

His Excellency JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State of the United States of America.

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of Your Excellency's Note of today's date, which reads as follows:

"I have the honor to refer to recent conversations between representatives of our two Governments and to confirm the understandings reached as a result of those conversations, as follows:

"The Republic of China effectively controls both the territory described in Article VI of the Treaty of Mutual Defense between the Republic of China and the United States of America signed on December 2, 1954, at Washington and other territory. It possesses with respect to all territory now and hereafter under its control the inherent right of self-defense. In view of the obligations of the two Parties under the said Treaty and of the fact that the use of force from either of these areas by either of the Parties affects the other, it is agreed that such use of force will be a matter of joint agreement, subject to action of an emergency character which is clearly an exercise of the inherent right of self-defense. Military elements which are a product of joint effort and contribution by the two Parties will not be removed from the territories described in Article VI to a degree which would substantially diminish the defensibility of such territories without mutual agreement."

I have the honor to conform, on behalf of my Government, the understanding set forth in Your Excellency's Note under reply.

I avail myself of this opportunity to convey to Your Excellency the assurances of my highest consideration.

GEORGE K. C. YEH,
Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of China.

If there should be any decisive movement, as suggested some time ago, in the way of a three-pronged violation in Korea, in China, and in Indochina, if there should be convincing evidence of a war being set in motion along that line, we could, by agreement with the Nationalist Chinese, use forces for any purposes we saw fit, but there would have to be an agreement by us, as we have, so to speak, all the aces in our hands, because we have to furnish the logistics and any support the Nationalist Chinese may need. It seems to me it would be unthinkable that we could be inveigled into any sort of an action of that kind that Chiang Kai-shek might take. I have talked to him, and I can reaffirm that position from the conversations I have had with him.

So, Mr. President, with all the vigor at my command I shall support the pending joint resolution, and support the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations who has so eloquently presented the case for our consideration.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. If Chiang Kai-shek, or those serving under him, should decide to make a preventive strike—I understand the distinguished Senator from New Jersey does not like the term "preventive war"—would that not be definitely an act of aggression, virtually an act of war, against the Chinese?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If who makes the strike?

Mr. LEHMAN. If Chinese Nationalist forces make a preventive strike—not merely a defensive move in direct defense of Formosa, but an attack on the mainland by Chinese Nationalist troops—would that not constitute an act of war against China?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Chiang Kai-shek has no means of transporting troops. Any act of that kind would have to be by joint agreement.

Mr. LEHMAN. We have not yet had the treaty before us, but when it comes before us I certainly shall have much to say regarding it. But suppose that the President, or whoever should be in command of the American forces, should authorize a preventive strike. I am being careful not to use the words "preventive war," because I know the phrase is objectionable in certain quarters. It seems to me that what I have suggested would be an act of war.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. What is the alternative?

Mr. LEHMAN. My alternative is to confine our defense commitment to Formosa and the Pescadores.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. And let the enemy bomb us with jet planes before we move?

Mr. LEHMAN. The President of the United States of course has very broad constitutional powers, but we should not give the President the sanction of Congress to engage in unspecified and undefined acts which might even be beyond his constitutional powers. Such authorization by Congress would constitute, to all intents and purposes, a blank check including a reserved declaration of war, under the predated authority of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I do not admit that the resolution gives the President any authority in the nature of an advance declaration of war.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the whole situation have to be kept in its proper perspective? As a practical matter, the Nationalist forces on Formosa now hold certain coastal islands, including Quemoy, which the Chinese Communists tried to take in 1949. They landed several divisions and lost every one of the invading troops and all their equipment. They received such a bad beating on Quemoy that they have never even tried to return, though they have employed artillery fire. So the fact of the matter is that the Nationalist Chinese hold these islands, and they are going to be a tough nut for the Communists to crack, in any event.

Is it not putting things in the proper perspective to assume that the first thing that would be done, or would be likely to be done, under the resolution, in the event of Senate approval, if redeployment were worked out, would be that the Republic of China would redeploy the Chinese Nationalist division in the Tachen group? It has been made perfectly clear that it would be the intention of the Government of the United States to provide air cover and screening for the fleet. The Chinese Communists have been put on notice to that effect. The islands belong to the Republic of China, and upon them they now have their forces.

As a friendly government, one with which we have been allied in two world wars, and a treaty with which is now pending before the Senate, they have asked us, or will ask us, presumably, in the very near future, to give air cover which they do not now have, and to give fleet protection.

The Chinese Communists are on due notice. We are not going to fire upon the Chinese Communists unless they fire upon us, but I am certain that if our planes or our fleet were fired upon, we would not take the position that they should be like sitting ducks and should let the Communists get away with it without protecting themselves. If the Chinese Communists attack us first and commit an act of war, they are certainly not going to expect to have a sanctuary when they reach the 3-mile limit. That would amount to another Yalu River. But, having first committed an act of aggression in the Tachen area, as the Senator from New York propounds his question to the Senator from New Jersey, it seems to me that the answer is entirely consistent, that they have made war upon us; they have committed an attack upon our forces. But if immediately following that, or in the near future, we or the Republic of China should see a concentration of barges and planes for the obvious purpose of attacking Formosa or the Pescadores, we certainly should have our heads examined, having already been the victim of an attack by the Chinese Communists, if we sat idly back and took no action.

What would the Senator from New York have us do in those circumstances? The distinguished Senator from Georgia has said, in effect, "If a fleet starts moving out from Red China, are we to wait until they have unloaded their landing barges and are on the shores of Formosa before it is to be considered an invasion?" Are we to wait until they lift anchor and are dispersed in the fog of the Formosa Strait?

If we know through intelligence officers of the concentration of their power and that they have committed an act of aggression against us at the Tachens, are we then to wait until they strike again? Under those circumstances, the power is at least there, in the judgment of our responsible military authorities and may finally be exercised by the President of the United States, to take action if necessary for our defense and for the defense of our vital position in the Pacific. Certainly, we are not going to sit with our hands tied.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield, in order that I may reply to the Senator from California?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from California asks what I would do if the Red China troops or ships opened fire on our fleet or took some other step of active aggression.

Of course, my answer would be that if they opened fire on our fleet, we should return the fire immediately with interest, I should hope. But certainly the President of the United States does not require any special authorization from Congress to give him that authority. He has always had that authority. Every President has had that authority. If, in order to repel active aggression, the President did not assert that authority, he, of course, would be derelict in his duties.

What I am questioning is the fact that the President is actually asking for unlimited reserve powers the use of which we cannot foresee but which could lead to an act of war against a power with which, even though we hate it, we are not at war.

I think that what is being forgotten is the distinction between the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores and what might result from the reserve powers which the President of the United States is asking Congress to give him in advance of any known plan or act or policy.

As the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has said, I cannot conceive that any Member of the Senate would be willing to surrender Formosa or the Pescadores, or would fail to provide for the defense of Formosa or the Pescadores. I fully agree with the Senator from Georgia. I think every Member of the Senate has gone on record, as I have, not once, but many times, that we must, on both moral and strategic grounds, defend Formosa and the Pescadores.

I think we are in a very different situation, with respect to the islands of Matsu and Quemoy, about which we have been speaking. Formosa does not

belong to China. It has not belonged to China for generations. Formosa was taken from Japan, and Japan has renounced all claims to Formosa. Formosa was handed over to the Chiang Kai-shek regime by us. We are its protectors. Neither Red China nor the Republic of China, as such, has a valid claim to Formosa recognized by us or by any other free nation. But the islands of Quemoy and Matsu are another matter. They have always belonged to China.

Mr. KNOWLAND. But to which China? They have belonged to the Republic of China, not to Communist China.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is true; but that is only a part of the picture, which is complicated by the fact that other nations recognize Red China as the Republic of China. A step in the direction of a solution would be taken if we urge, as I hope we will, the United Nations to order a cease-fire between the Communists and the Chiang regime. I think it will place us in a weakened position if we draw a defense line in the Far East to include Matsu and Quemoy, or the other islands, nearby the China coast. Those islands—Quemoy and Matsu—are only 4 or 5 miles from the mainland. If we did that, we would be taking sides in a civil war, not in a war to defend Formosa, which clearly does not belong to China, although the Nationalist regime of Chiang Kai-shek, of course, has its headquarters on the island, with our permission and under our authority.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Chinese Nationalists do not look at it in that way. Under the Cairo declaration, it was said that the Island of Formosa would be returned to the Republic of China; and the Republic of China is on Formosa and is in possession of it. Nine and one-half million free Chinese are on Formosa. As I pointed out yesterday, that is a larger population than 30 members of the United Nations have in their countries. So Formosa is not an inconsequential island. On Formosa is an army of more than 350,000 non-Communists, which is not an inconsequential defense force.

They hold certain islands, which at least they believe, and there may be others having military strategic knowledge who believe, that the island of Quemoy bottles up the aggressive use by the Chinese Communists of the harbor of Amoy, which would be a natural place to concentrate a fleet for the invasion of Formosa, and the Matsu group of islands bottles up the harbor of Foochow, which would be another great concentration point of Communist Chinese fleets. Under those circumstances, at this point, should the Government of the United States say, in effect, to the Chinese Communists, no matter what they may do against these strategic islands, even though they should open up harbors for invasion fleets to be used against Formosa and the Pescadores, "come and get them, because we have now served notice in advance that no matter what you do, no matter what type of invasion you launch against them, no matter whether you attack our fleet which may afford a screening operation for the Tachen groups; you will not be bothered by a defense of those islands?" I should think that would be destructive of the morale of the people of the Republic of Korea, or the Republic of China on Formosa, of the Japanese, of the Filipinos, of the Thais, and of everyone else in Asia who wants to be free. They would say that as soon as Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai started to talk business, the great United States became a paper tiger and backed down.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield, so that I may answer the Senator from California?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If Senators desire to continue with their debate, I should be glad to yield the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to answer the Senator from California, if I may.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. There was no need for drawing a line and saying "We are not going to do this, we are not going there, and we are not going to go somewhere else."

That issue has been raised by a clause in Senate Joint Resolution 28. After describing the responsibility of the Armed Forces of the United States to secure and protect Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack, the resolution asks Congress to give the President unlimited and undefined authority. The resolution proceeds as follows:

> This authority to include the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands and the taking of such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If that clause were stricken out, immediately Chou En-lai would interpret it to mean that because of his threats and his huffing and puffing, the Senate of the United States decided to put shackles on the hands of the Commander in Chief, and decided to prevent our Armed Forces from operating in those islands for the defense of the fleet, for the defense of Formosa, or for the defense of our own vital interests; because the clause once having been in the resolution, the clear implication of striking it out would be that at the ultimatum of Chou En-lai and Mao Tse-tung, the Senate marched up the hill, and then marched down again.

Mr. LEHMAN. I agree that is was unfortunate that the President included such a provision in his message and had it included in the joint resolution. Nonetheless, in my opinion—and I hold a very strong conviction about this—that clause should come out. Otherwise, I believe we shall find ourselves in very, very serious difficulties, and under great stress and danger and we may be lighting the fires of another world war.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota has asked me to yield him some time. I shall yield to him; and then I shall be glad to yield the floor, because I believe other Senators desire to continue the debate.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Senator from New Jersey for yielding to me during his discourse on the question of the interpretation of the President's statement.

I do not interpret the statement exactly as the Senator from New Jersey has expressed it. I think there is some difference between the interpretation he expressed and the interpretation suggested by the minority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from California. However, I shall not transgress on the Senator's time further to develop that thought; I merely wished to express a reservation, in the light of the debate which has taken place.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be glad to yield the floor, if other Senators wish to participate in the debate. Did the Senator from Minnesota wish to ask me a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to ask a simple question in relationship to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from California. How does the senior Senator from New Jersey interpret the language in the resolving portion of the joint resolution, "as he deems necessary"?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think that means that the President should have the authority to take such steps as he deems necessary—to do what? To secure and protect Formosa and the Pescadores.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, does that seem to the Senator from New Jersey to mean that if the President deemed it necessary that certain sorties or attacks should be made, he would be able to direct that they be made in defense of Formosa and the Pescadores?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I do not know what the Senator means by forays or attacks.

Mr. HUMPHREY. A sortie or foray means simply an attack.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The only thing we have discussed at all is the possibility of such accumulations of forces, as require appropriate defensive measures in advance of the total destruction of Formosa and the Pescadores. I think the language must be related to the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores all the way through.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate what the Senator says. Does he contend that the broad language, "as he deems necessary," gives the President certain military discretion in terms of tactical operations for the specific and exclusive purpose of the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course. I say to the Senator from California that is the answer to the question. The difference between the language which we have discussed, "as he deems necessary for the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores," and the language which follows, is that the language which follows not only commits us to the protection of the territories and positions held in friendly hands, but, I remind the Senate, of securing those positions. I say that

it is an unwise tactical position, from my point of view, which is, of course, merely one man's point of view. Instead of helping in this situation, it commits us much further in an area where we may find it very undesirable to be.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I do not agree with the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not expect the Senator to agree with me.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] in the matter. I think he is entirely right. The resolution provides for a limitation, and not an extension, of activities.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator not realize that the paper which the President of the United States released today contains exactly the statement we have been discussing? In the statement the President of the United States, in order to allay concern, made it clear that these United States forces were designed purely for defensive purposes and that any decision to use United States forces other than in immediate self-defense or in direct defense of Formosa and the Pescadores would be a decision which he would take and the responsibility for which he has not delegated. Is it not true that that is exactly what the words "as he deems necessary" mean?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So that all that the President has done today by his statement is to take the first part of the resolution before the Senate, which I read:

> That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary * * * against armed attack.

That is what the President has said today, and for that I salute him. He has clarified what was perfectly obvious to the White House, but something which in the resolution was not only indecisive but unfortunate. I think the reason which led the President to make the statement was the debate which took place on the floor of the Senate, a consideration of the hearings before the joint meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee, and the testimony of General Ridgway. I salute the President of the United States for clarifying this, at least to the satisfaction of the junior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not want that implication to stand, because that is not at all the reason for the President's statement. I was with the President of the United States this morning. He feels it would be unwise for the resolution to be amended in the way the Senator has suggested it should be for some of the reasons the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and other Senators have pointed out on the floor of the Senate.

The reason for the President's statement was the misconstruction which had been placed on the resolution and the hearings, as was indicated on the floor of the Senate in the debate yesterday in remarks which went out over the world, that this was an effort on the part of the Government, the people, and the President of the United States to start a preventive war and an aggressive war. The President was trying to make it clear, as the Senator from Georgia indicated today, and as I indicated last night, that that was not the intent of the resolution and was not its purpose. The President also had in mind some of the discussion which took place on the floor, to the effect that perhaps a lieutenant colonel, or captain, or lieutenant commander in the Navy, or even, as was suggested, one of our allies of the Republic of China, might get us involved in a difficult situation.

The President was making it clear that a decision to take action which it might be necessary to take, involving something beyond the immediate defense of our own Air Force and Navy, which might be under attack in that area, in which case those forces could immediately fire back, or an immediate attack on the island of Formosa itself, would not be delegated to any other group, and that the President of the United States himself would assume that obligation personally. But there should not be read into the statement the implication that the President either believes or would approve the suggestion which the Senator has read into the statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield so that I may make a comment?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, would not the Senator from Minnesota rather make the comment in his own time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should be glad to do so, but I think a reply is pertinent to our discussion.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Both the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] have been asking for recognition, and I should like to yield to both of them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to make a comment so that the RECORD will have the proper continuity. I ask the Senator from California, who is an intelligent, able, and devoted public servant, to read the language which I read earlier, and then to read the statement released at the White House following the conference today. I ask the Senator to read those words:

> The President made it clear that these United States forces were designed purely—

That is another word for specifically—

> for defensive purposes and that any decision to use United States forces other than in the immediate self defense or in direct defense of Formosa and the Pescadores would be a decision which he would take and the responsibility for which he has not delegated.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That would not foreclose protecting the islands along the coast if as a defensive measure it was believed to be unwise to have them fall into Communist hands, and open up the harbors of Amoy and Foochow, if it were determined to do so, as a defensive measure for the protection of Formosa and the Pescadores. If the decision was to use air and naval forces to accomplish that end, that would be a decision of the President of the United States, and those islands could be held as part of the defensive position. But I say that to strike out the words, as the Senator has suggested, would be a clear indication to Chou En-lai and Mao Tse-tung that we had written off those islands.

The Senator from Minnesota knows full well that, so far as the constitutional powers of the President as Commander in Chief are concerned, we cannot add or subtract one iota from them. As the Senator from Georgia so ably pointed out, even though the authors of the proposal to strike out certain language might not intend it to be so, actually the language as submitted to the Congress, so far as what we are delegating to the President is concerned, is restrictive, because it applies to islands and areas "in friendly hands." So to that extent whatever delegation of authority Congress may be making to the President is limited to islands and areas "in friendly hands."

Mr. HUMPHREY. I only say in reply to my friend the Senator from California, since I did not have time to continue my statement, that the words "immediate self-defense" are not in the statement because the White House did not know what other words to use. Those words have a direct relationship to the interpretation of the resolution.

I further point out to the distinguished Senator from California that the argument which has been made on the Senate floor in reference to the nature and the application of the resolution was also made in the joint meetings of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services. So it is nothing new.

Furthermore, I point out to the Senator from California that the junior Senator from Minnesota has not described what is proposed as a preventive war measure. I was one who voted for the resolution in the committee, with some trials and tribulations of heart. I felt the language should encompass and embrace the thought the President has now conceded, namely, the "immediate self-defense or in direct defense of Formosa and the Pescadores," for which he would use the Armed Forces of the United States, and then what the junior Senator from Minnesota has talked about, the immediate defense and self-defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

Of course, no one would quarrel with the President as to his right as Commander in Chief to take whatever steps might be necessary to defend our vital interests. No one would wish to quarrel about his right to do that.

I only say that as the Senator from California replied to the Senator from New York, he was a little unkind. I say that in all kindness to the Senator from California. He took an analogy the Senator from New York did not use, and then tried to apply it to the proposition the Senator from New York discussed. But the Senator from New York discussed whether an offensive strike could

be made against inland positions before there were any hostilities. However, the Senator from California interprets that, under the joint resolution, as meaning that it would be possible to make such a strike before there was a grouping of enemy forces.

The Senator from New York, in challenging the Senator from California, asked, "Do you mean that if our ships were fired on, we should not be able to send planes against the enemy on the mainland?"

Of course, Mr. President, if one of our ships were to be fired on, we should send planes against that enemy. If one of our ships were to be fired on, or if any of our manpower were to be the victims of gunfire, we should take whatever action might be necessary. The question is, Who starts it? But I am not engaging in that argument.

I have believed in the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores, and I believe the President can do anything within his constitutional powers to defend them—which may mean putting planes over Quemoy, or may mean evacuating Quemoy, as we are evacuating the Tachens; or may mean putting planes over the coastline of China.

But my point is that when we are taking steps in regard to another piece of real estate, it is unfortunate to use the word "securing"—which apparently is used simply because the authors could not find a better word—since "securing" means "holding." That word should not be used in a congressional joint resolution. We have already staked out Formosa and the Pescadores; and I believe we should be a little careful as to how much more we stake out by means of precise language such as that used in the joint resolution.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Alabama for a comment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, when I first asked the distinguished Senator from New Jersey to yield I wished to participate in the discussion about the islands which has been going on. Of course, a good many things have intervened since that time.

First, I wish to say I am pleased the President has made the clarifying statement he has issued today. I think it is clarifying, and I think it removes a good many things which disturbed many Members of the Senate. We know they certainly did disturb many members of the committee.

But recurring to the island situation, let me say I have been disturbed about the vagueness and uncertainty inherent in the joint resolution, insofar as the islands are concerned. From all the discussion, I think the matter has been narrowed down fairly well to the two groups of islands, namely, the Quemoy Islands and the Matsu Islands. As the Senator from California has so well stated, they lie at strategic points with reference to the two harbors which have been mentioned.

But I believe it would be much better to remove the uncertainty, either by saying we will not defend those islands or by saying we will defend them.

Mr. President, whether those islands are essential to the defense of Formosa is a military question. I believe it to be most unfortunate that our military advisers perhaps cannot agree as to whether they are essential to the defense of Formosa. But so long as we permit the existence of uncertainty as to whether we will defend them, it seems to me it is an open invitation to the Communists to continue their probing attacks.

It will be recalled that a few months ago, when we began talking about the drafting of the Formosan treaty, question arose about the offshore islands; and at that time public statements were made, and it was more or less agreed that with reference to the islands we were going to adopt a keep-them-guessing policy, But I certainly was given to understand that among the Tachens there were islands of strategic value that we would defend. Yet the very first time the Chinese Communists struck, we announced to the world we were not going to defend those islands. I think that simply gave the Chinese Communists greater incentive to continue their attacks; and a part of our trouble today is due to the fact that they thought we were bluffing with reference to those islands.

So I believe we would be much better off if we said either "yea" or "nay" as to the defense of these two particular groups of islands which are left. That would remove the vagueness and uncertainty; and the whole world, including the Chinese Communists, would know we meant what we said, and that we were not going to withdraw from that position, as we did in the case of the Tachens.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE EISENHOWER RESOLUTION—THE MONROE DOCTRINE VERSUS PACTS—WASHINGTON'S ADMONITION

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, there are two approaches to destroy this Nation. One is political and the other is economic.

THE POLITICAL APPROACH

The political approach did not start yesterday. It started in 1933 with the recognition, without any safeguards whatsoever, of Communist Russia. Since that time we have continually built up and improved the Russian position.

THE ECONOMIC APPROACH

The economic approach began in 1934, running tandem with the political approach, with the passage of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, named by its sponsors the Reciprocal Trade Act, to sell free trade to the American people.

AN ENLARGED MONROE DOCTRINE

Mr. President, beginning in 1948, I have continually advocated a return to the Monroe Doctrine, enlarged if necessary setting the boundary in the Pacific and the Atlantic Oceans where the President judges our security would be threatened. Only one point is fixed in the pending joint resolution. However, it is a start.

PRESIDENT SHOULD DESIGNATE ALL THREATENED POINTS AND AREAS

Mr. President, if the situation is such that this body is convinced that our security is threatened to the extent that we must pass a joint resolution granting the President full authority, backed by Congress, to defend this point, then I would say we should not tie the President's hands, but we should urge him to state or to set the complete boundary in the Pacific and in the Atlantic beyond which an enemy must not extend his political, economic, or military control, since it would threaten the security of this Nation.

Mr. President, in 1949 this body adopted the Malone-Wherry-Kem resolution denying any assistance to any nation trading with Communist Russia or the Iron Curtain countries.

NATIONS WE AID TRADE WITH RUSSIA; RED CHINA

Immediately upon the passage of this resolution the Battle Act was introduced in the House of Representatives; and then the propaganda went out over the Nation that the Battle Act must be enacted into law, in order to prevent trading with Russia—although, as a matter of fact, the Battle Act repealed the Malone-Wherry-Kem resolution. It repealed the resolution and left to the Executive the determination of the extent of the trade which could be carried on with Russia by the European nations we were financing. The European nations have continued to trade with Russia without stint, sending the Russians practically everything they needed in order to fight a war with us; and of course that material was furnished to Communist China, during the battle of Korea. These nations are still trading with Russia and the Iron Curtain countries, Mr. President; and at this time they are trading with Communist China, directly. Most of these nations likewise have recognized Communist China.

Another factor in the economic approach to destroy our Nation, the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, has made us dependent upon areas across major oceans for the critical materials without which we could not fight a war or live in peace—materials which would not be available to us within hours after an all-out war commenced.

STRATEGISTS DISAGREE ON WAY TO DEFEND FORMOSA

We also have the spectacle of two great military strategists disagreeing as to what would be the most effective method of defending Formosa, if in fact we are to defend it. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway told Senators, according to a report in the Washington Daily News today, that between 300,000 and 400,000 United States ground troops would be needed to gain a foothold on the Chinese mainland. We had a recent President who tried that method, and he found himself in a perpetual war for perpetual peace, whatever that was.

Admiral Radford, it is argued, does not agree with General Ridgway. Admiral Radford believes that the Navy should do the work. In an all-out

atomic war, with Russian planes going to Red China, both ground and naval forces would be as useless as a Civil War musket.

RED CHINESE AGGRESSORS WERE "AGRARIAN REFORMERS" TO OFFICIALDOM IN 1948

General Chennault is calling for a Chinese war now. I visited General Chennault at Canton, China, in 1948. He had a good plan then to stop the Communists and to prevent the occupation of China; but no one wanted to prevent the occupation of China by the Communists at that time, least of all the State Department. The Communists were then referred to as "agrarian reformers." I suppose they are the same agrarian reformers who are now attacking the coastal islands, in the first step to Formosa. At least, they are under the same command, and are getting from the same source—the Kremlin—the material to fight whoever is in their way.

The joint resolution as now written would grant the Chief Executive authority to wage war in the Far East without a formal declaration of war by the Congress. That is what the joint resolution boils down to. Specifically, it would authorize him to employ the Armed Forces of the United States to protect Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack. Next, it would extend his authority so as to include other related positions and territories in that area.

Lastly, comes the broad power—and it is very broad—to take such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

WOULD MEASURES AUTHORIZED IN RESOLUTION INCLUDE DEFENSE AGAINST COMMUNIST RUSSIA?

It would be of interest to the senior Senator from Nevada to know what other measures might be within the realm of possibility or probability. It would also be interesting to the senior Senator from Nevada if he could be informed, before we relinquish our constitutional right to declare war—if, in fact, it still exists—what points in the Pacific and in the Atlantic, should be fixed beyond which no hostile power could come without being considered a serious threat to the security of the United States.

Would such other measures include, for example, the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores and/or other related areas against direct attack by the real author or instigator of all aggressions on the Continent of Asia, namely, Red Russia? If the other measures contemplated by the joint resolution include such an eventuality, why are they not spelled out?

EXTEND MONROE DOCTRINE TO AREAS WE WOULD PROTECT

Why do we not extend the Monroe Doctrine, as has been suggested by the senior Senator from Nevada for 8 long years on the floor of the Senate, to cover the areas in the Atlantic and the Pacific into which no hostile power may encroach without our considering it a threat to the security of this Nation?

The only potential enemy mentioned in the joint resolution is Red China, or, to quote the joint resolution, "the Chinese Communists."

Everyone knows, or should know, that the Chinese Communists are merely the trained puppets of the Kremlin. As Red outlaws they seized the China mainland, and they now threaten to seize Formosa and the Pescadores from our friends, the Nationalist Government of China. Formosa cannot be defended against a mass attack by the fleet or by foot soldiers. Her defense would have to be conducted by air power—American air power—and not merely by an attack on the attacking force, but by a threat to destroy the industrial areas and supply centers of Red China. Perhaps if we were to say that, if there were an attempt to attack this area, we would do just that, starting with Mukden in Manchuria, we might be required to follow through. We might have to do it one time because we have not made good on anything we have said we would do in Asia for so long that no one believes us. But in the opinion of the senior Senator from Nevada, if we were to hit them just once, that would be the end of it. And should Russia come in, then bomb Russia and its industries.

DON'T SEND OUR SONS OUT TO FACE ANOTHER KOREAN STALEMATE

Let us not send our boys out there to be cut up, running up and down the hillsides, as they did in Korea, or a fleet to be destroyed.

Everyone knows, or should know, that the Chinese Communists are merely the trained puppets of the Kremlin. Nine years ago the Nationalist Government of China held most of the China mainland. The Red Chinese, backed by Russian arms, forced them out. We did not rescue the Chinese Nationalists then, when they governed the Chinese mainland. In fact, the capture of the mainland of China by the Kremlin-trained Red Chinese bandits gave our State Department little or no concern at that time. They were too busy worrying about Europe; and, after all, the Red Chinese were "agrarian reformers," and our policy was to stand idly by and wait for the "dust to settle."

Chiang Kai-shek and his patriots, due largely, I think, to our negligence, had to fall back to the island of Formosa and other small islands off the Chinese coast.

RESOLUTION 9 YEARS LATE PROPOSES TO HANG WRONG OUTLAW

The trouble with this resolution is that it comes 9 years too late, and proposes to hang the wrong outlaw in the event of a raid on Formosa or some other islands, or in the event of a threat to Formosa. We are like the timid sheriff in a western town who is eager to string up the minor cattle thieves, but avoids any harsh words with the boss rustler, who directs the whole thieving operation. Not only do we exempt the top outlaw from any resolutions or recriminations, but we recognize him and exchange diplomatic courtesies with him. The boss outlaw is, of course, Red Russia.

I may say that we not only pass up any idea of calling the turn on the boss outlaw, but we send money and materials to build up European countries, which in turn trade not only with Russia, but with all her satellites, including Red China. The claim is made, of course, that it is all nonstrategic material. If there is any such thing as nonstrategic material when a nation is preparing for war, no one has yet been able to find out what it is.

NINETY-SIX WESTERN TRADE TREATIES AID RUSSIA AND RED CHINA

The senior Senator from Nevada placed in the RECORD, in 1949, 96 trade treaties which 17 Marshall plan countries had made with Russia and other Iron Curtain countries, under which they were selling to the Iron Curtain countries everything they needed in order to get ready for war, including tool steel, ball bearings, engines, and trucks.

This supplies Russia, the boss rustler and top outlaw, the military goods she wishes to pass on to her puppets.

As long as we recognize Russia, we may be sure, she will have a lot of minor thieves and rustlers working for her, and supplying them guns, airplanes, submarines, and ammunition with the expectation of sharing in their loot, meanwhile Russia exchanges diplomatic amenities with their victims.

ACTION NEEDED FOR PEACE AND SECURITY: NOT WORDS

The resolution before us today is, by its language, temporary.

It states that when, in the opinion of the President, peace and security is no longer threatened, the resolution is to expire.

Mr. President, I do not believe the resolution will ever expire in our lifetime, or in the lifetimes of our children, unless we take definite action along the line of determining exactly where in the Pacific and in the Atlantic we are threatened, and, if we are threatened, do something about it.

That does not mean foot soldiers running all over Asia and Europe, or a fleet of ships trying to fight World War I and World War II all over again. It means long-range supersonic-speed planes. It means fighter planes. It means guided missiles. It means nuclear submarines. It means every type of defense that has been developed since World War II.

Mr. President, the joint resolution will never expire so long as we deal only with the little eruptions that break out constantly around the edges of the Communist world and never the origin and seat of the disease which is Red Russia.

RUSSIA SPARED TO DATE FROM LOSS OF FACE OR DROP OF BLOOD

It will never expire so long as the boss outlaw, Russia, has immunity and recognition, and can continue to build up her armaments and supply her satellites without a single loss of face or a drop of blood.

Russia will not care how many Red Chinese are killed as long as some American boys lose their lives defending foreign islands 7,000 miles away.

The only thing that Russia cares about is that no Russian gets hurt, and none has been hurt yet in the fighting either in Korea, Indochina or along the China coast.

RUSSIA PREFERS PUPPETS TO FIGHT HER WARS

Red Russia, in my opinion, does not want any war she has to fight herself, but she likes to stir up other peoples' wars particularly in Asia, where she can market her munitions.

We, of course, do not want to go to war with Russia, and she knows it.

I do not want war with Red Russia or any other nation, and I am sure that none of my distinguished colleagues do either.

But the fact that we do not want war, does not mean that we should accept Russia as a diplomatic equal among the other and more friendly nations of the world, with an elegant embassy in Washington, and spies running footloose over most of the United States, some of them carrying White House and State Department press cards.

RESOLUTION SHOULD CONDEMN REAL OUTLAW—RUSSIA

The resolution now before us has the objective of preserving a just and honorable peace, and it so states.

If it is to achieve that objective, it should include more than Red China in its condemnation and in its warning.

It must include Russia, which is Red China's brain and muscle, and is the true instigator of all of Red China's hostile acts.

How can we condemn Red China while we recognize and extend diplomatic courtesies with the boss outlaw who gives Red China orders on which peaceful citizens they shall raid, shoot, imprison?

Mr. President, the resolve in the resolution before us states:

That the President of the United States be and he hereby is authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack, this authority to include the security and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands and the taking of such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

This could well include anything in the Atlantic Ocean at any point. It could include the Arctic. It could include any area in the Pacific.

That is not what the senior Senator from Nevada is objecting to. He is objecting to the fact that the resolution only specifies one point. Is it possible that it has been only 10 or 11 years since the end of World War II and that we do not yet know at what point our security is threatened in those two oceans?

This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions, created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, and shall so report to the Congress.

SUSPEND RECOGNITION OF RUSSIA SO LONG AS OUR PEACE AND SECURITY IS THREATENED

Mr. President, I propose an amendment to the resolution. I send the amendment to the desk and ask that the clerk read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). The Secretary will read the resolution.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the joint resolution it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. Inasmuch as—

(1) the Government of the U. S. S. R. is the activating agent behind every aggressive move of the Red rulers of China;

(2) the Red regime at Peiping is wholly dependent upon the Government of the U. S. S. R. for the weapons with which to wage aggressive war in the Far East;

(3) the Government of the U. S. S. R. represents brutal tyranny which now holds sway over 800 million human beings and aims ultimately at the enslavement of the entire human race;

(4) hope would be reborn among the captive peoples of Soviet totalitarianism by the assurance that the Government of the United States has no intention of dooming them to perpetual slavery by any act which has the effect of freezing the status quo;

(5) no advantage of any kind accrues to the American people or to the cause of world peace by the presence in the Soviet Union of diplomatic representatives from the United States;

(6) the Government of the U. S. S. R. has continually and flagrantly violated its pledge of noninterference in the internal affairs of the United States; and

(7) it is wholly inconsistent to treat the Red regime of China as an outlaw among civilized governments while according diplomatic recognition to the master gangster-state;

it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that all diplomatic relations between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics be suspended and the consular representatives of this Nation be recalled until such time as the President may determine that the U. S. S. R. no longer constitutes a threat to our peace and security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the desire of the senior Senator from Nevada to have the amendment voted on at this time?

Mr. MALONE. No; I request that the amendment be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT BRANDS RUSSIA AS REAL INSTIGATOR OF AGGRESSIONS IN ASIA

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, this amendment attaches full weight to the fact that Soviet Russia is the true author and instigator of aggression in the Asiatic area, and that it is Red Russia, not Red China or any of the other Communist satellites of Russia, who can determine peace or war in Asia.

If the boss outlaw says to his thieves and rustlers: "Put down your guns, boys," they will be put down.

I do not think there is a possibility in the world that Russia will ever do that until the United States shall determine the point in the two oceans beyond which she cannot go, and we prepare ourselves to enforce the edict, just as President Monroe established the Monroe Doctrine 133 years ago. In 1823, President Monroe said, in effect, that any nation which sought to extend its form of government into the Western Hemisphere would be considered as committing an overt act against the United States of America. That was when the empire-minded nations of Europe were seeking to gain and regain colonial slaves on the Western Hemisphere, as they were doing in the Far East, in Africa, and in other areas. The Monroe Doctrine stopped it, Mr. President, and it was the only thing that would have stopped it.

OUTLAW THE TOP RED OUTLAW—RUSSIA

I have never known a real outlaw in my life who reformed, and I do not expect that from the world's top outlaw—Russia. But Russia being the outlaw that she is, is all the more reason why we should break off diplomatic relations with her now, send her spies and agents packing, and put her American agents in jail where they belong. That would have a more salutary effect on Red China than would all the resolutions we could adopt in the 84th Congress.

Red China could not begin to fight a war without Russian arms and ammunition, and Red China knows it.

In any event we would at least be naming the real outlaw and we would be doing it ourselves without any pussyfooting pacts such as have proved so useless in the past.

WORTHLESS PACTS OF PAST RECALLED

By now this country should have learned its lesson and have had enough of pacts.

I recall the 1922 Pacific Pact in which the United States, England, France, and Japan guaranteed each other's rights in the Pacific and agreed to consult if any of these rights were threatened.

Then there was the 1923 pact guaranteeing the territorial integrity and administrative independence of China—mainland China under the Chinese Nationalist Government that is—and reiterating the open-door policy. That was the nine-power pact or treaty.

Then we had the Kellogg-Briand Pact renouncing war. That was in 1928.

And then, in 1930, there was the London Naval Treaty, a pact between ourselves, Great Britain, and Japan, to limit naval armaments and scrap certain warships. We scrapped warships, Great Britain scrapped blueprints, and Japan went right on building more and bigger battleships than ever before.

JAPAN BUILT BATTLESHIPS WITH SCRAP WE SENT HER—OUR GOODS TODAY HELP ARM RUSSIA

She did it with the scrap which we sent her, out through the Golden Gate, at San Francisco, together with the necessary fuel. We are doing the same thing today, Mr. President—arming Russia.

The only value these pacts had, in my opinion, was to provide free travel and lodgings for a lot of diplomats, and headlines in the newspapers.

After World War II we went back into the pact business and we soon found ourselves in another, an undeclared war in Korea.

We also went into the declaration business and the resolution business.

Many of us on the floor here today will recall the Vandenberg resolution and the debate which took place on the floor while this resolution was pending.

The Vandenberg resolution declared the right of collective self-defense "should any armed attack occur."

The key idea was "collective." When any one of certain nations were attacked all of the others were to collect around

and make material contributions to its defense.

That was in 1948, well before the Korean conflict or world war III.

THIRD WORLD WAR CAME—IN KOREA

I said at that time—it is in the record—that under the Vandenberg resolution military alliances and commitments would be made which "could easily provoke a third world war."

Well, the third world war has come and gone—Korea. We fought it in Korea at a cost of 25,000 American boys killed and 103,000 wounded, and more than 12,000 missing or captured, many of them now dead.

President Truman called it a police action, but I call it a war, and, as I have said previously on the Senate floor, if it was not a war, it will serve as one until another comes along.

It was a war, all right, and one we did not win. We could have won it by following the sound military advice of General MacArthur, General Van Fleet, and others, but the Acheson boys in the State Department said we must not win it, so we did not.

Now we are getting set for world war IV, beginning by way of Red China, and the China coast.

The pending resolution provides easy road directions for world war IV.

IF WORLD WAR IV COMES WE MUST FIGHT TO WIN

If, God forbid, we should be sucked into that war, I hope we will fight to win; and to fight to win we must strike the communications and supply centers that are the vital links between Red China and Red Russia, the lifeline so to speak between the cruel heart that beats in the Kremlin and the greedy fingers reaching out to Red China.

VICTORY IN FUTURE CONFLICTS WILL DEPEND ON AIRPOWER

To do that will require airpower, and I am told we have it.

We could use far more than we have, Mr. President, but, at the moment, in the opinion of many qualified military strategists, we have a greater amount of airpower than has Russia, the long-range kind, not in numbers of planes. We could use more. Instead of sending a fleet to Formosa to be destroyed, or to be made useless in any all-out atomic war, we have planes based at various places in the Pacific. Starting with Mukden, in Manchuria, we could destroy industry and proceed as long as it might be necessary to destroy supply centers and the lines of communications and the Red Communist ports along the mainland.

It is my opinion that if that is done there will be no move in the Pacific by Red China or by any other nation.

The only reason why there may be such a move is because we have not kept our word since World War II. We might have to hit one place, but after that there would be no more move on the part of Red China, because we could destroy every industry in Manchuria. But we will have to make them believe we will do it, and quit pussyfooting around as we have been doing for approximately 10 years.

RED CHINA SPARED FROM AIR ATTACKS IN KOREAN WAR, PERMITTED TO CONTINUE ARMS BUILDUP

We exempted those cities, communication lines, industries, and areas from attack during the Korean war, thus enabling Red China's buildup for that conflict, and also Red China's buildup for the aggressions that now threaten and which will continue to threaten so long as we softly appease her master, Russia.

If Red China persists in her aggressions that threaten our safety and security we should serve warning that we will hit Mukden and the industries of Manchuria, and then, if she still persists, do it.

And if Russia comes in, let us start with her industries, and include Moscow.

Let us build up our airpower by keeping ahead with our production of long-range, sonic-speed planes, including bombers and fighters; by building guided-missile bases and radar installations for information and warning; by building nuclear submarines.

With that policy, as long as we stayed ahead—we could do it and have the resources with which to do it—it would cost 25 to 40 percent less than we are expending and, in my opinion, we would not have a major war.

ALLIES DENIED US VICTORY IN KOREAN WAR BY DECREEING "NO BOMB CHINA"

The reason we lost the Korean war—and I consider that we lost it—was that our so-called allies, under the postwar pacts we entered into so freely, said, "No, no; you must not bomb Red China. We trade with her."

In other words, we were told that to bomb Mukden or Red China's supply lines would interfere with Britain's markets in that Communist-controlled area, and we were bound, under our pact commitments then, to listen to Britain's advice and counsel, and also that of other signatories to the pact.

When the United States signed the Atlantic Pact, we were guaranteeing the integrity of the colonial slavery system throughout the world. Why? Because we were guaranteeing to go to war when the empire-minded nations of Europe—Great Britain, France, the Netherlands, and Belgium—went to war; and we would have no control over how they got into a war. How were they going to get into a war? Simply by defending their colonial slavery systems. Everyone knows that now.

PACTS PREVENT US FROM WINNING WARS OTHER NATIONS GET US INTO

Our pacts with foreign countries, in fact, blocked us from winning a victory in Korea. The difference between the Monroe Doctrine and the pact method is that when we enter into a pact, it is necessary to have an agreement with the nations who would sign the pact with us before we can do anything. Under the Monroe Doctrine, we provide for our own security; and when our own security is threatened, we can take action as we please. When we take a proper action, we have allies.

When we have signed a pact, and our allies are trading with a potential enemy, we are at their mercy.

Had we won a victory in Korea, I do not think Red China would be worrying us now. I doubt that they would even be holding American boys in Red China as prisoners.

PENDING RESOLUTION PROPOSES INDEPENDENT ACTION—NOT A PACT

The principal virtue of the resolution pending before the Senate today, as I see it, is that it is not a pact. It has flaws and faults, but that is not one of them.

DEBATE ON VANDENBERG RESOLUTION RECALLED

On June 11, 1948, during the debate on the Vandenberg resolution, I stated:

It could result in a war move without our consent. It could provoke retaliation by Russia, or that of any other nation. It is an absolutely utter abandonment of traditional American foreign policy. It could easily provoke a third world war.

RUSSIA NAMED AS REAL ENEMY IN 1948

I named Russia as the real enemy of that time, and I do so again today. That was in 1948.

The third world war, incidentally, as I have stated before, has come and gone. That was the war in Korea. Most of the nations of Europe were in that war, but mostly by words. But they were all in the Korean war in some form or other.

I stated further on the floor of the Senate in 1948:

While the initial objective (of the Vandenberg resolution) is to create a European alliance, it may well be that the administration—

The Truman administration, that is—

foresees a Pacific alliance, say with China, India, Australia, and New Zealand.

That alliance is in the works right now, but with India declaring herself out, and if I read the signs aright, siding with the Communists.

RESOLUTION A CONFESSION UNITED NATIONS DOES NOT WORK

I stated further in 1948:

The Vandenberg resolution is a public confession that the peaceful means set forth in the United Nations Charter for the maintenance of peace are hopeless and to be abandoned.

That statement applies with equal force to the resolution we have before us today.

U. N. CANNOT WORK SO LONG AS RUSSIA A PRIVILEGED MEMBER

If the United Nations worked, there would be no need for a resolution such as we have before us now. But the United Nations does not maintain the peace, and it will never maintain the peace so long as Red Russia, with 3 votes, and some of her satellites, with 1 vote each, are members.

The United Nations is a debating society or club, in which the outlaws and bandits have equal privileges with the decent members. That policy has never worked with any club or society in the world.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that the United Nations not only is a debating society, but also is a wonderful sounding board for the Communists of Russia, as

Vishinsky proved when he was at the head of it some 2 years ago?

Mr. MALONE. There is no question about that; and the United Nations is selling our own country short.

Mr. LANGER. In other words, day after day, week after week, from the city of New York, Russia, over the airwaves, has been sounding all the advantages of communism to the people of this country, and has been doing it through the United Nations, which is more than one-third paid for by the taxpayers of the United States.

COST OF U. N. BORNE BY UNITED STATES TAXPAYERS

Mr. MALONE. And the rest of the cost of the United Nations is being paid for by the taxpayers of the United States through handing to the other nations the money before those other nations pay it to the United Nations. So that makes the percentage which the United States pays about 97 percent.

There is only one other city in the United States which even approaches Washington, D. C., as a danger city, and that, of course, is New York City. In Washington, everyone either works for the Government, or works for someone who works for the Government, or works for someone who sells to someone else who works for the Government. So all they can see is more and more money.

New York takes an override on everything. They produce nothing, so they have traded the producing industries of the West for a set of brokers in New York who trade across the ocean, and get the money back from the European nations for the products they want to sell. It is a very simple procedure, so long as Congress appropriates the money in the first instance.

AID STRENGTHENED EUROPE AND RUSSIA WHILE MAKING AMERICA WEAKER

The Vandenberg resolution was approved, and soon we had the Marshall plan and ECA, which were supposed to make everybody happy and peaceful by giving away our goods and money.

It was supposed to make Europe stronger, too, by making ourselves weaker; and we have achieved that, too, with no advantage to ourselves. We made Russia stronger, too, because all the European nations, or practically all of them, are trading continually with Communist Russia and Iron Curtain countries.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LANGER. As a matter of fact, under the Marshall plan and the other plans, the taxpayers of the United States have subsidized Russia to the extent of approximately $12 billion. Is not that true?

Mr. MALONE. It is probably far more than that, because Russia has access to everything we send to Europe through the process of a second sale. Through the first sale, we simply send our products to the European nations.

I noticed in the newspapers recently a statement by Mrs. Luce, our Ambassador to Italy. Mrs. Luce is one of the most attractive, efficient, loyal women it has been my pleasure to know.

She said that the Italians would not understand, now that we have built their industrial plants for them, why we did not buy everything they can produce. We talk about the extension of the free-trade monstrosity, which has been sold to the United States for 22 years. It is called reciprocal trade, although the words "reciprocal trade" do not occur anywhere in the act.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that under our foreign-aid programs we have built up Spain, Portugal, and other foreign countries, so that, whether we consider antimony or mercury, mines containing such products in the United States, including those in the Senator's home State of Nevada, have closed down, while we have been importing those products, some of which are strategic materials, from foreign countries?

FREE-TRADE PROGRAM MAKES US DEPENDENT ON FOREIGN SOURCES

Mr. MALONE. I wish to say to the Senator from North Dakota that the real danger is not in the importation of certain products, and the shutting down of domestic mines in North Dakota, Nevada, West Virginia, and in practically every other State of the Union. The danger is that we are becoming dependent for those major strategic materials on offshore sources of supply, and that in the event of war those sources of supply would not be available to us; and without such strategic materials an enemy would be able to destroy us.

Mr. LANGER. I agree with the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. And now we are talking about an extension for 3 years of the power of the President to reduce tariffs an additional 15 percent in order to make up the difference between the effective wage standards in this country, plus taxes and other costs of doing business, and those in other competitive nations producing similar products; and there are 5,000 such products.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that mercury mines in this country were closed down at one time, and were opened only recently? Is it not also true that antimony mines were closed in this country? Is it not further true that, by executive order, gold mines in Colorado at one time were closed? Former Senator Johnson, of that State, informed us that 2,000 men were thrown out of work. At the same time the price of gold was rising in foreign countries, and we were purchasing gold from them.

HOW BRAIN-TRUSTERS THREW GOLD MINERS OUT OF WORK

Mr. MALONE. There is no doubt about that. It was the plan to do so. The intention was to close those mines during World War II so that gold miners could work in other mines. Such a decision was reached by graduates of Harvard or Columbia, who had never seen a gold mine. Miners who worked in gold mines were not going to go to work in mercury mines. Not 10 men who formerly worked in gold mines went to work in other mines. However, that was the excuse given for closing gold mines and mines producing other metals. It happened that I was a consultant to the Senate Military Affairs with respect to strategic and critical materials. I also sat with the War Production Board and saw these events occurring. Of course that reasoning is silly, but it would be funny if it was not tragic.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that in last night's newspapers there was published an article about manufacturers of glass who met in convention and passed a resolution to the effect that one glass factory after another was being put out of business and closing up because of competition from glass manufactured by machinery which was paid for by the American taxpayers, and which machinery was sent to those competing foreign countries?

INDUSTRIES BEING PROGRESSIVELY DESTROYED ARE CITED

Mr. MALONE. The senior Senator from Nevada expects to have quite a bit to say about that aspect of the problem at the proper time. However, as long as the Senator from North Dakota has brought the question up, I should like to say that pottery production in this country is three-fourths gone.

Glass production is about gone. I do not know what the percentage is at the moment, but it is all going.

Textile production has been cut down.

Mining operations are gone. There is not a mining operation in this country that is not financed in some manner by the Federal Government, either through short amortization periods or guaranteed prices. The representatives of such mines are usually under some obligation of an official in Washington; therefore their mouths are closed.

I am surprised that the glass manufacturers had the guts to get up and say what they did. By the way, most industrialists do not have that courage. They are usually serving in some kind of advisory capacity, and are given certain information, which has been known to some of us for several years. The officials want the advice of such persons, but they never take such advice. However, those industrialists go home with confidential information, and their mouths are closed as far as concerns disclosing what they know is wrong, and what is happening in this country.

Of course, such hand-raised economists and engineers come out of college and are immediately hired by the Government. No miner would hire a man fresh out of college. We used to say that a college graduate would make a good rodman after 2 or 3 years. Yet such graduates are put in the responsible positions of telling experienced men how their business should be run—or not run, which is more likely.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. As long as we are talking about pottery, glass, and that kind of product, I should like to ask the Senator a question about importations of grains from foreign countries. I see that my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], is present. I think we are all familiar with the job he did in connection with oats being imported from foreign countries.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nevada if it is not true that there have been importations of barley, rye, and oats into this country, with result that the prosperity of the farmers of this country was affected.

Mr. MALONE. Yes; as well as wheat and cotton. Somehow or other, we seem to be married to the erroneous theory that we have to divide the wealth of the United States with the nations of the world in order to prevent war. Finally, when we shall have become entirely dependent, or dependent enough, on foreign countries, in the event of war we would not have such products available, without which products we could not carry on a major war.

FREE-TRADE POLICIES HAVE MADE US DEPENDENT ON NEUTRAL INDIA FOR MANGANESE

As a result of the 1934 Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act—it is laughingly called that, because the word "reciprocal" does not occur in the act—we have become dependent on India for 900,000 tons of manganese a year, which is a little less than one-half of our annual consumption of that product. Our manganese plants are shut down. We can get manganese cheaper from India, because very low wages are paid in that country. That is one of the arguments used in urging the purchase of manganese from India. However, we could not get a pound of manganese from India in the event we were engaged in war.

For many months the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economics of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs investigated the accessibility and availability of critical raw materials to the United States in time of war or for an expanding economy.

We determined that delivery of manganese, or any other critical material across a major ocean, would be problematical if not impossible in time of war.

On the other hand, the Western Hemisphere could be made self-sufficient in all the critical materials necessary to fight a war or live in peace, and, moreover, the Western Hemisphere can be defended.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE HOLDS KEY TO NATION'S SECURITY IN WAR

In fact, the Western Hemisphere will be the only dependable source of critical raw materials if another world war is ever forced upon us, and we had better begin giving more interest and concern to that area, protected as it is by the Monroe Doctrine, than to the rest of the world on which we have been spending billions and tens of billions of dollars.

There are immense deposits of manganese in the Western Hemisphere, but we still prefer to acquire it from distant India which would not or could not supply us with a pound of it in the event of an all-out war.

During hearings before the subcommittee one of the witnesses said, "You don't make your steel in Pittsburgh; you make it in India. You don't make jet engines in Cincinnati; you make them in Nigeria and the Belgian Congo, where you get columbium."

Our country pays the same amount for columbium purchased in Nigeria and the Belgian Congo as they do for columbium purchased in Idaho, where wages are $12 or $15 a day. Naturally, the supply in Nigeria is going to cost less, but you could not get a pound of it in the event of a war.

EFFORT TO SHUT DOWN TEXAS TIN SMELTER RECALLED

The silliest thing on earth happened last year. A State Department representative testified before our committee that we should wreck the Texas tin smelter, the only tin smelter in the Western Hemisphere. For many years the better grade of tin has been going to England, in the amount of 15,000 to 20,000 tons a year, to be processed there and brought back to this country. Most of that product crosses the ocean twice. It would not cross the ocean even once if a war started.

ONLY BOLIVIA COULD MEET OUR TIN NEEDS IN EVENT OF WAR

As regards our tin smelter, which has a 35,000- or 40,000-ton capacity, we get half of the tin for that smelter from Indonesia and the Malayan States; but we could not get a pound of it if a war should start. Of course, we could not obtain a pound of it when a war started. So all we would have to do would be to make a deal with Bolivia; and Bolivia wants to deal with us. With my committee, I spent a little time in Bolivia; and we went to the tin mines near the Andes. In the course of that trip we did not go to any tin smelters, because there are no tin smelters there. In the Western Hemisphere there is only one tin smelter, and that is the one in Texas.

The Bolivians want to deal with us. What is the matter with taking the Bolivian ore to the tin smelter in Texas? The testimony is that we use approximately 60,000 tons of tin, annually, in peacetime, and that we would use approximately 40,000 tons of tin, annually, in a war. That is the amount which can be handled by the Texas tin smelter. However, Congress was confronted with the proposal to wreck that tin smelter.

In 1947, there was testimony by representatives of the departments, in appearing before our committee—and it was the same committee, with only a slightly different arrangement—that they wished to have the Government dispose of the synthetic rubber plants. The State Department's representative testified to that effect, in his appearance before our committee; that is a matter of record. I nearly fell off my chair when he testified to that effect. I asked him, "Did I hear you correctly?" He replied, "Yes."

I said, "Please go back and get another story; we cannot use this one."

STATE DEPARTMENT SEEKS TO GIVE FOREIGN COUNTRIES GREATER ACCESS TO OUR JOBS AND MARKETS

I was going to say—and in a moment I shall yield again to the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota—that we have sitting in the State Department and in the other Government departments around Washington men who say, "Oh, yes; with our know-how and our machinery we can beat anyone in the world. We do not need tariffs, and Congress should forget about tariffs"—even though in article I, section 8 of the Constitution, there is the provision that Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imports, and excises, and to regulate commerce with foreign nations.

So, Mr. President, all that has occurred under a simple act of Congress, passed in 1934, and extended in each subsequent period since that time. That act expires at midnight on June 12 of this year; but at this time hearings are being held in the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, for the purpose of extending the act 3 years more, in order to give foreign countries even more access to the markets of the United States.

FALLACY OF STATE DEPARTMENT'S FREE-TRADE THEORIES SHOWN BY FACTS

The so-called experts in various of the Government departments say, "Of course, because of our know-how and our machinery, the United States does not need any duties or tariffs." But, Mr. President, I say to you that I have been in every nation in Asia except Russia; and I have been in every nation in Europe, except the Low Countries; and I have now been in every nation in South America, and in every nation in the Western Hemisphere; and every place I have gone—whether to the Bolivar iron mine, in western Venezuela; or in the oil-production areas at Lake Maracaibo; or to the copper-producing areas of northern Chile, I find that those areas have better-producing plants than any to be found in the United States of America, because those foreign plants can continually be in production, in view of our low tariff or free-trade situation; and at those plants they need pay good wages only to the superintendents and foremen who direct the cheap labor. Under such circumstances, United States plants do not have a Chinaman's chance of competing with the plants in those countries.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield further to me?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I hold in my hand the United Nations Charter. I think the distinguished Senator from Nevada is familiar with the names of all the countries which signed the charter—some 51, I believe. Can the distinguished Senator answer this question: When the Korean war broke out, how much support did the United States receive from our so-called allies?

Mr. MALONE. No one bothered to figure that out, because it was so embarrassing. Of course, the amount of

help the United States received from her so-called allies under the United Nations Charter amounted to virtually nothing.

Mr. LANGER. As I recall, 95 percent of all the expenses incurred by those who opposed the invaders in Korea was borne by the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. MALONE. Not only the expenses, but the losses in men and in blood.

Mr. LANGER. Yes; 95 percent of all the casualties sustained there by the forces who opposed the invaders, were American boys; is that not correct?

Mr. MALONE. Yes. However, the other members of the United Nations insisted on telling the United States when its forces could advance and when they could not advance; and they would not let the United States win that war, and would not let the United States forces return home.

Mr. LANGER. And under the so-called treaty, which we are going to vote on in a day or two, in the case of Asia, if that treaty were to be ratified, the result would be the same, would it not?

CONFIDENCE EXPRESSED IN PRESIDENT'S MILITARY JUDGMENT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I say to the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota that I have more confidence in the President who now is in the White House. He himself is a general. I have every confidence that that President means it when he says that our security will be threatened when certain forces attack Formosa or the Pescadores. That means the forces of Communist China, and it really means Russia.

When the President takes that stand, I will stand with him. Furthermore, not only should our fleet be used, but our planes should be used. If only our fleet is used there, we might just as well send an Indian canoe. If only a token force is sent there by us—of course, that will mean a terrific waste of manpower and material, and a great increase in the national debt. That situation could continue for 5 or 10 years. However, I do not think this President will do that.

NOW IS TIME TO PREPARE FOR NEXT WAR, NOT FOR THE LAST ONE

Certainly, Mr. President, the adoption of my amendment to the joint resolution will help.

I have just received a telegram from Alexander P. De Seversky. I have not yet read the telegram, but at this time I shall read it into the RECORD. I know Major De Seversky. He has the reputation of being a little too forward in emphasizing airpower; but I wish to say now, Mr. President, before reading the telegram, that it is time—just one time—that the United States of America begin to prepare for the next war, not for the last one. Heretofore we have always prepared for the last war.

ALEXANDER P. DE SEVERSKY TELEGRAM READ INTO RECORD

I now read the telegram:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate:

In considering Formosa resolution, following facts must be weighed: No Communist leader to date threatened invasion of Formosa by surface forces, which, in presence of 7th Fleet, is impossible. Communist threats alluded to liberation of Formosa and could be accomplished by aerial destruction of physical assets of Chiang Kai-shek regime and its complete elimination as political factor in world affairs. Threat to Formosa not Chinese army but Chinese air force. President's statement "We must be alert to any concentration or employment of Chinese Communist forces obviously undertaken to facilitate attack upon Formosa, and be prepared to take appropriate military action" would give him power to attack any and all Chinese air force installations on Chinese mainland at any time—in opinion of our military—a concentration of Chinese air force anywhere in China appears to constitute threat to Formosa. Such action by us would mean full-scale atomic global war with China and Russia without participation of our allies. A war for which, in my opinion, we are utterly unprepared. Since we have reached atomic stalemate in which both sides have necessary nuclear weapons and aircraft with which to destroy each other completely, our ability to survive enemy surprise air attack depends primarily on capability of our continental air defense to destroy the invading air force. We were officially informed throughout recent years that Russia was building powerful air force. Yet, our own effort in this direction has been meager. Today we have only 2,000 appropriate aircraft with which to defend continental United States from Alaska to Florida, California to Maine. This means that regardless of superiority of our strategic air force, if Russia's air armada, including even obsolescent propeller bombers, launch atomic attack against us, they could saturate our meager air defenses. Total destruction of United States under such circumstances is possibility. I suggest therefore that continental air defense of United States be given A–1 priority over and above any military expenditures for any other purpose whatsoever.

ALEXANDER P. DE SEVERSKY.

SECURITY FROGRESS BEING MADE UNDER PRESENT CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Mr. President, it should have been done 5 years ago. But I say again that if the present President of the United States means what he says—and I believe he does; if he means that he is starting to set the points in the Pacific, and perhaps will get around, before long, to setting the points in the Atlantic beyond which there will be a danger to our security if any hostile nation were to move, either politically, economically, or militarily—then we have made progress.

Mr. President, when the present President of the United States sets that point as being in the Pescadores, beyond Formosa, I only differ with the surface indications of what he is going to do about it, for I am not the chief of the Armed Forces and I am not a military strategist. I say it must be left to the President of the United States and his advisers. They will learn it the hard way.

Under an atomic attack, the fleet could not defend anything if it were beyond the protection of our own land-based Air Force. It would be found that foot soldiers would be as obsolete as a Civil War musket. The only foot soldiers we would have, if we were smart, would be parachute troops and commandos to defend our own industries against attack. No country in the third or fourth world war—whatever we call it—will have foot soldiers other than those in its own area to repel invasion. It is time we started to prepare for the next war, and not for the one we have just fought.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MALONE. I yield for a question.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from North Dakota does not quite understand what the distinguished Senator means by saying that he will leave it to the President. Under the Constitution I thought it was up to the Congress to declare war.

Mr. MALONE. I am referring to the joint resolution. If we pass the joint resolution, we shall be leaving it up to the President; and if I can have confidence that the President will start setting the points, and if he will use airpower and build airpower, I shall be willing to go along with him. Otherwise I shall not.

PRESIDENT ON RIGHT COURSE AND DESERVES ENCOURAGEMENT

I will say further to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that I feel that if the President does not know the situation he will learn it before long. He will have to learn it. There is no escape. But he is the only President we have. We must be for him. We do not have to pass the joint resolution, but since he has started to set the points, which no other President has ever done, I see reason for encouragement.

I remember that in the approach to World War II someone, after being pressed for many months, said, "Our frontier is on the Rhine," and then continued smoking a cigarette. No one ever told the American people the truth as to just what we are to do and when we are to do it. Therefore we cannot blame a nation which is hungry for land, hungry for food, and for everything else, for taking all it can get, and all it thinks we will allow it to take, even within the Western Hemisphere. I think there is little doubt in the mind of any Senator that, but for the Monroe Doctrine, every nation in South America would be under some European empire-minded nation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MALONE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. What percentage of the American people does the Senator believe realize the import of this joint resolution?

Mr. MALONE. None.

Mr. LANGER. Would the Senator say that even one-half of 1 percent understand it?

Mr. MALONE. No.

Mr. LANGER. Do the boys who would have to do the fighting realize what we are voting upon here?

Mr. MALONE. Almost no one realizes what we are voting upon. I doubt very much if even we do. That is the reason I am on my feet today to offer this amendment.

PACTS AND THE SECRETARY OF STATE

I am discussing the Vandenberg resolution today only to show what these pacts have got us into. We have reached the point where a Secretary of State is never at home. He is always in some foreign country. As I said during the previous session, when he finds two or

more people together, wherever they are, he signs a pact to protect them.

Another individual who runs around all over the world is Mr. Stassen. Every time he finds two or more people together he signs a pact to feed them.

Of course, we cannot keep any of such pacts. Now the President of the United States has set a point beyond which he will not allow an enemy to go.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. We also have the Bureau of Internal Revenue, which collects the money from the taxpayers to raise all the funds to turn over to foreigners. Is not that correct?

Mr. MALONE. That is the law; and we have the best tax collector in the whole world. I am not referring to any particular individual. But we are the ones who raise the money. We pay the bill.

Mr. LANGER. In other words, our boys do the dying in the wars and we raise the money to pay for all these expeditions.

TAXES TO SUPPORT FOREIGN AID HIT LOWEST-PAID AMERICAN WORKERS

Mr. MALONE. That is correct. We have a tax law under which we can reach the lowest-paid man or woman in the United States within a week. All we have to do is to set the taxes and go out and collect them. No other nation on earth does it. Therefore, when money is needed, we must raise it. Then we continue to raise salaries to pay taxes, and finally the money in circulation is all worthless, and there is one continual round of pleasure.

(At this point Mr. MALONE yielded to Mr. CLEMENTS to propound a unanimous-consent request. The discussion relating to this request was ordered to be transposed to a point following the conclusion of Mr. MALONE's speech.)

NAMES OF FOREIGN-AID AGENCIES CHANGED TO KEEP PUBLIC CONFUSED

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, with respect to the Vandenberg resolution of 1948, I had just said that the resolution was approved. Soon we had the Marshall plan, the ECA, which was supposed to make everyone happy and peaceful by giving away our goods and money.

The ECA gave away to another name. We now have the FOA. We change names every so often, in order to keep the people confused, so that they will not be sure exactly where the taxpayers' money is going.

Certainly no Senator or Representative knows exactly where it is going, if, in fact, the man at the head of FOA knows.

As I said, it was supposed to make Europe stronger, too, by making ourselves weaker, and we have achieved that, too, with no advantage to ourselves. We made Russia stronger because these nations traded with Russia. There is no secret about it. I have already explained it. I have explained how it was carried on. The right was given to them to do it. As I said on the Senate floor on March 13, 1949:

> We are arming Russia for a third world war—
>
> I missed the war sequence by one—
>
> through money and supplies furnished the 16 European nations under the ECA, and the recipient nations are shipping everything from locomotives to jet engines to Russia and Russian satellite countries.

BRITAIN SUPPLIED RUSSIA EARLY JET ENGINES

Someone called the Secretary of War at that time, and it was denied that England had shipped jet engines to Russia in 1947 and 1948. Six months later every schoolchild in this country knew that that had been done. The Migs were copied after those engines that were sold to Russia at that time.

It is silly to say that that is not being done.

My comment about the jet engines was denied at first, but it is common knowledge now, as some of the Mig Red warplanes that were shot down in North Korea so dramatically proved. I also stated in that speech:

> The United Nations is being bypassed by a series of administration moves and manipulations, and the world is being swiftly divided into spheres of influence between the United States and Russia.

I was right then, and I see no change in the situation now, except that this resolution on its face proposes some independent American action, although it does suggest also that the United Nations have a hand in our international operations.

UNITED NATIONS UNWORKABLE FROM START

In 1945 the Senate Military Affairs Committee requested me to attend the San Francisco Conference where the United Nations was being formed as an organization. At the time I had been acting as a special consultant on strategic and critical minerals and materials and was making an examination of military establishments. I was requested, as I said, to go to San Francisco. I saw Senators follow Hiss around out there, and setting up something that could not possibly work.

Why do I say that? I say it because we were talking about five major nations. At that time I stated publicly that there were not five major nations in the world. I said at that time that there were not four major nations in the world, and that there were not three major nations in the world. I said there were only two major nations in the world, namely, Russia and the United States of America. I said that they would form spheres of influence.

Why did I say that there were not five major nations? I said it because the other nations, particularly England and France, had lost their colonial slavery nations. They had lost them. Everyone knew it in a little while, and everyone knows it now.

PROFIT FROM COLONIAL SLAVERY ZONE

However, through the North Atlantic Pact we guaranteed the integrity of those nations, even after they were gone.

Mr. President, no nation will ever again make money from a colonial slavery nation. I say that because the people in those nations now have the radio and they have airplanes, and they have information and means of communication.

Out in Indochina—and I was there in 1948—while we were having dinner with our own Ambassador, we could hear the guns in the jungle at night. I flew over a part of Indochina, as far as it was possible to get in those days.

In the recent unpleasantness in Indochina, there was not one Indochinese who favored the French or us. Why? Because we were giving them the choice of going with the Communists or continuing in colonial slavery.

They did not know very much about communism, but they knew all about colonial slavery, and they were just not having any more of it.

That is true of every area on the earth.

EXTENSION OF MONROE DOCTRINE ADVOCATED IN 1948

At the time the Vandenberg resolution was being considered, I stated we should study the effects of the new weapons of offense and defense, that we should fix a point in the Pacific and in the Atlantic, and that we should extend the Monroe Doctrine to cover those points, we should say, without mentioning any nation, that any foreign power which seeks to extend her form of government or her control anywhere inside the line will be committing an overt act against the United States, which will mean war. I said also we should prepare. We should prepare our airplanes. We should prepare our submarines. We should prepare our guided missiles. We should prepare our radar. I said we should not start building battleships or trenches. There will be no battleships for very long in the next war.

SOUTHEAST ASIA TREATY NEXT PACT IN OFFING

Right on the heels of the pending resolution we will have the so-called Southeast Asia collective defense treaty which is simply another pact like the 9-power treaty I referred to earlier and the Kellogg pact.

Passage of this resolution will be construed no doubt as a step toward adoption of the so-called Southeast Asia collective defense treaty or pact.

For almost a century the Monroe Doctrine kept us out of war. Then in 1917, 37 years ago, we were sold two bills of goods to enter the trade wars of Europe. That is what they are, Mr. President. They are trade wars.

Population is the big difficulty in old Europe and in Asia. Every time a baby is born somebody calls off the war.

EUROPE'S TRADE WARS EXTEND OVER CENTURIES

The nations in Europe have had these trade wars for 350 years. Whenever a nation is hungry it starts a war, and they kill people and wipe out the food supply, and then they have an uneasy peace for a while, and then they have another war. Our ancestors left the Old World during the past 300 years because they could not make a living over there. It is still impossible to make a living over there.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE COULD PROVIDE ROOM AND LIVING FOR A BILLION PEOPLE

In the Western Hemisphere we have one-third of the land area of the world. That is the land areas of the nations in the Western Hemisphere. Three hundred and fifty million people live in that

area, and there is room for a billion people, without crowding anyone.

We were told in 1917 that if Germany controlled Europe we would be the next nation to be attacked.

BACK EXTENDED MONROE DOCTRINE WITH WORLD'S GREATEST AIRPOWER

We have destroyed the two nations which we were told were a threat to our security—Germany and Japan. Now a greater nation, Russia, threatens our security. The bill of goods which we were sold was just as phony as a $3 bill. We can defend the Western Hemisphere by setting a point beyond which a foreign power will not be allowed to come, because, if it does, it will be a threat to our safety. Extend the Monroe Doctrine—or call it an Eisenhower doctrine, if you will. We can make it good with the best airpower in the world, and nuclear-powered submarines which we can build and are building.

PACTS HAVE NEVER PREVENTED ANY FOREIGN WARS

However, our State Department and the Foreign Ministries of mendicant nations thriving on our largesse seem to think only in terms of package deals or pacts, none of which have ever prevented any of the wars they were supposed to block.

George Washington in his Farewell Address cautioned the Nation as follows:

> Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake: Since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government.

President Washington also declared in that famous address:

> Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?
>
> 'Tis our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world.

Washington counseled against foreign entanglements, and since 1917 under Democratic administrations we have entangled ourselves with every nation of the world, in Europe, Africa, Asia, and in the islands of the seven seas.

REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENT MUST BE PRESERVED IN AMERICA OR LOST TO WORLD

The cost has been three wars and now new entanglements are proposed that could involve us in world war IV.

Let us get back to Washington's sound counsels and protect republican government in our own America.

If republican government is lost in our own Nation, it is lost everywhere.

WASHINGTON'S FOREIGN POLICY ONLY POLICY IN HISTORY THAT KEPT US OUT OF FOREIGN WARS

George Washington's foreign policy of no entanglements is the only foreign policy in the history of our country that has ever worked to protect the peace and prevent us from involvement in foreign wars.

President Monroe followed that policy in 1823 when he enunciated the Monroe Doctrine.

The Monroe Doctrine was not a pact.

President Monroe and the Government made no pact with anyone when it served notice on all European powers that they were to keep hands off the Western Hemisphere, either through direct aggressive action or by interposition of their political systems.

We were as much concerned then about political systems or ideologies being planted on this hemisphere as we were about the threat of armed invasion, and we stood on our own feet and said so.

MONROE REJECTED PACT WITH BRITAIN TO ENUNCIATE INDEPENDENT DOCTRINE

I may say, Mr. President, that I think it is time we stood on our own feet again and enlarged the Monroe Doctrine to cover the points in the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans at which our military strategists may say that our security is threatened. Prime Minister George Channing of Great Britain tried to get President Monroe to join with him in tying in Great Britain in a joint relation or pact, and President Monroe, heeding Washington, said "No."

England wanted to cut in on the doctrine so it could be said that both the United States and Great Britain guaranteed the integrity of the American Republics, but Monroe would have none of it, and wisely so.

The Monroe Doctrine was a two-way precept: No European intervention in this hemisphere; no American intervention in Europe.

In other words, we simply told Europe, including Britain, to keep its political systems out of the Western Hemisphere, wherever any 1 of the 21 American Republics had set up its own system, and there has not been a foreign war, with one exception, on this hemisphere since that time.

MONROE DOCTRINE CHALLENGED ONCE, BUT NOT FOR LONG

That was when a French opportunist sought to set up a government in Mexico during the War Between the States, and the Mexicans themselves soon disposed of him.

They knew, of course, they would have our backing when we settled our own trouble.

UNITED STATES DETERMINED OWN SECURITY UNDER MONROE DOCTRINE

Mr. President, under the Monroe policy we ourselves decided in each instance whether our ultimate peace and safety were threatened, and so long as we applied that policy, or for nearly 100 years, we kept out of Europe's wars.

In a floor speech on October 19, 1949, I stated:

> I propose an American policy: an extension of the Monroe Doctrine, or an open door policy to include the nations in Europe and Asia whose integrity we consider important to our ultimate peace and safety—thereby putting all empire-minded nations on notice against attempting to extend their system of government into such areas.

I renew that proposal today.

AN AMERICAN POLICY FOR AMERICANS THE NATION'S NEED

I hope the President has now set a point, after council with his strategic analysts and military analysts, beyond which no nation may come, or our security is threatened. I would not mention a particular nation; I would simply lay down the policy.

Call it an American policy, an expanded Monroe Doctrine, or an Eisenhower policy, whatever you wish, just so that America have its own determination of its own peace or safety.

If our peace and safety require the defense of Formosa let us do it under our own initiative and power.

POLICY WOULD STOP FURTHER AGGRESSIONS ON AREAS OF UNITED STATES INTEREST

I would say, further, Mr. President, that every nation whose ambition it is to encroach on our area would be stopped automatically.

I have cited several pacts which were broken like twigs when the time came. It is the interest of these nations that counts when the chips are down.

I do not believe that any official of any sovereign nation has the right to threaten the sovereignty of that nation by signing a pact that it is in war when the other nation is in war, whether at that moment it is threatened or not. If such an official does have that authority under any action by this Congress, it should be withdrawn.

OFFICIALS COME AND GO BUT NATION MUST LIVE ON FOREVER

Mr. President, Presidents come and go, Secretaries of State come and go, Senators come and go, Representatives come and go, but this Nation, I hope, will live on forever.

It has been here for more than 175 years; and for most of that time we did not have a busybody signing pacts with everybody in the world. We managed to stay out of war until we came to the making of pacts.

If we undertake to safeguard our own peace and safety with such an endeavor let us do it under our own initiative, and complete it under our own power. But let us not take the risk of having the job bogged down in the wordy morasses of the United Nations, where Red Russia is a full member. Let us stand on our own feet, as we did during the first century and a half of America's history.

Pacts bind us to fight other nations' wars. The Monroe Doctrine preserved the peace in the American Republics from 1823 until 1917. Then we ignored the doctrine and went into another hemisphere to fight a war.

If, during those 130 years, we had had a number of pacts, instead of the Monroe Doctrine, we would probably have been mixed up in a dozen wars.

MORE POWERFUL ENEMY NOW REPLACES FOES OF WORLD WARS I AND II

Pacts do not prevent wars; they breed them.

Beginning with World War I, we have made all kinds of pacts with nations throughout the world, and none of them have kept us out of war. We had an Atlantic Pact in 1941, and a few months later we were in war with Germany, Japan, and Italy. We destroyed those nations. Now we are threatened with another war with a more powerful enemy.

HOW THREE PRESIDENTS KEPT US OUT OF WAR

For almost as long as I can remember, we have had Presidents keeping us out of war. The first one who kept us out of war was reelected in 1916 because he had kept us out of war. At that time I was 26 years old and a student in the University of Nevada. A few months after the reelection of President Wilson, I, together with 4 million other American citizens, was on the way to war.

In 1940 we had another election, in which we reelected a President for the third or fourth time—I forget how many times he was reelected—because he had kept us out of war. But in about 8 or 10 months another batch of young men were on the way to war all over the world.

Then we had another President, who developed a theory of perpetual war for perpetual peace, whatever that is. We could not win; we could not lose.

I once said, on the Senate floor, that if this keeps up, I am going to be plumb worn out by being kept out of war.

Let us keep our feet on the ground and start talking about the interests of the United States of America and what we have to defend. Let us talk about our own security, and forget the practice we entered into 37 years ago, of preventing some nation from controlling some area which has nothing to do with our own security.

HOW UNITED NATIONS KEPT US OUT OF WAR

We got the United Nations pact or charter shortly after World War II. I listened to that debate in 1945 in San Francisco, as an observer for the former Senate Committee on Military Affairs. The United Nations Charter was designed to keep us out of war. Did it? Soon our men were fighting and dying in Korea.

Let us be finished with pacts throughout the world which bind us to go to war when any nation that is a party to the pact is in trouble. We have no control over that nation's actions or whatever involved them in their troubles, but we are committed to go to war on their side.

PACTS HAVE COST US FRIENDSHIPS THROUGHOUT WORLD

We are now committed to go to war whenever the empire-minded nations shall go to war anywhere in the world, and we are obligated to defend their colonial slavery system. By that very act we have lost much of the Moslem world, and we have lost the friendship of many of the very nations which we need the most.

Pacts entered into with foreign governments by the State Department have transformed our armed services into police forces stationed around the world. Soon, I suspect, we shall have foot soldiers stationed on Formosa to bolster Chiang Kai-shek's aging army.

Mr. President, I have already said in the course of my address that a foot soldier outside this Nation at the time of the next world war will be just as useless as a Civil War musket.

TRUE PURPOSE OF OUR ARMED FORCES—TO DEFEND AMERICA—FORGOTTEN

We now have a mutual defense pact with Nationalist China, which was signed last December and is now before the Senate for ratification. We have a NATO pact to defend Europe, and other pacts to defend other parts of the world.

We have gone a long way toward forgetting the true purpose of America's Armed Forces, which is to defend the United States of America. We have more divisions stationed in Europe today than we have at home. We have other divisions in other parts of the world. Wherever we have troops on foreign soil, protecting countries with whom we have signed pacts, any attack could throw us into war. If another world war, an all-out war, started tomorrow, we could not feed those troops in Europe; we could not get them home. We could not even have a decent Dunkerque.

During the Civil War, Great Britain sympathized with and aided the South. Had Great Britain seen fit to interfere with forces on the islands off the coast of Georgia, the North would have considered it an act of war and would have acted accordingly. Fortunately, the British did not go as far as Senate Joint Resolution No. 28 proposes that the United States should go today in waters off the coast of China and surrounding offshore islands.

CALCULATED RISK TAKEN IN RESOLUTION

It is a step that should not be taken unless we are fully prepared to meet the consequences, whatever they may be; and should Red China consider it an act of war, we still would not be dealing with the top outlaw.

We should not take this step today unless we have confidence in the President of the United States and believe that he knows at what point the security of this Nation is threatened, considering the weapons at our disposal, and that he will only risk a war of defense at those points where the security of this Nation shall be threatened.

MANY OBSTACLES CONFRONT CHIANG KAI-SHEK

As much as we may respect Chiang Kai-shek and his government on Formosa, the same Chiang Kai-shek which a previous administration sold down the river, his military situation is desperate.

Chiang's forces grow older and less battleworthy, while the Red forces on the mainland, headed by the Kremlin, grow stronger.

Chiang has no reservoir of youth from which to draw recruits. Granted that many Chinese youth on the mainland would join him were the opportunity presented, the Red army prevents recruitment and even escape.

The way the joint resolution is worded, it could result in forever preventing Chiang Kai-shek from entering the mainland, which is his ambition today. It could result in a permanent division between the mainland and Formosa.

I have spoken about this before in the Senate, the first time in 1949, when Great Britain, Canada, and the United States held a conference. The Senate was in the progress of debating whether or not to extend, at that time, the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. I said then that it had been agreed in Washington to devalue the British pound, and that the United States had agreed to follow Great Britain in the recognition of Communist China.

PUBLIC PROTEST PREVENTED RECOGNITION OF RED CHINA

So much objection arose to the recognition of Communst China that the United States did not follow Great Britain's action. But I still believe that certain officials sought to commit the United States at that time to do that very thing. Up to now, to my best knowledge, the Secretary of State has never directly stated that he would use the veto in the United Nations to prevent such recognition.

Mr. Lodge, our chief delegate to the United Nations, said we would use the veto; but Mr. Lodge does not happen to be the Secretary of State.

Our own Secretary of State said, if I am correct, that we would be justified in using the veto, but he did not say that we would use it.

I still believe that the American people are being conditioned to the recognition of Communist China.

RED CHINA OFFERS POOR TARGETS FOR AIR STRIKES

As to Nationalist China, obviously Chiang must act now, or his cause will wither. It is, therefore, to his interest for the United States to come to grips with Red China. But what would we do in Red China?

Since all of the war equipment used for Red Chinese comes from Russia, we would find no decisive industrial target on the Chinese mainland. The bombing target would, therefore, be the Chinese Red forces, the sparse lines of communication, and the population centers. To bring Red China to her knees would require terrific slaughter of Chinese civilian populations, themselves slaves of their Communist Soviet-trained and Soviet-directed masters.

All Asia would be turned against us, and the only victor would be Russia.

Remember, Mr. President, most of the Asiatic countries have recognized Communist China. They include Burma and other nations adjacent to China.

KREMLIN WOULD WELCOME UNITED STATES ATTACK ON RED CHINA

A war between the United States and Red China would be manna from heaven for the Kremlin. Its war industry, immune from attack, would supply Red China, as well as continue to expand the Kremlin forces.

The Kremlin would be able to find ready disposal for airplanes and equipment which are approaching obsolescence, and concentrate on new and advanced equipment for herself. The Kremlin would grow stronger while part of our strength was being wasted 7,000 miles away.

From Russia's standpoint, a war between the United States and Red China would be ideal.

Wars are easy to start and difficult to end. A war against Red China might be dragged out for years. During this time our national debt would skyrocket, and the national economy would run wild. When the end finally came in China, Red Russia would be in her prime, her manpower undepleted, her air and arms inventory bulging, her control over her own people more firmly established than ever before, her A-bomb and H-bomb supply built up to maximum proportions. Then, after having other coun-

tries fight her wars for years, she herself might wish to fight, and the showdown war would be underway.

RUSSIA MIGHT PLAY SAME GAME AS AFTER DEFEAT OF GERMANY, JAPAN

Mr. President, the situation might be similar to that in which we brought Germany to her knees, then held her army beyond the Rhine, allowed Russia to go in and take charge, and then divided Germany into four parts; or the situation after Japan was on her knees and wanted to surrender, and we did not accept her surrender until Russia made some kind of showing or attack, and entered the war against Japan.

The same thing could happen, Mr. President, unless we took adequate steps to prevent it. The senior Senator from Nevada considers adequate steps to be the fixing of a line, the announcement of an enlarged Monroe or Eisenhower Doctrine. Let us set the point beyond which no nation, not only Russia, but Red China or any other nation, would be allowed to come in militarily, politically, or otherwise. If they did, we should then use our planes and atomic weapons on industry in Manchuria and Red China. If Russia were brought into the conflict, we should use such weapons on Russian industry. Let us stop pussyfooting around and talking our way into another world war, in which we could easily get whipped.

LET THE PEOPLE DECIDE, NOT THE MILITARY

In other words, the United States has nothing to gain and everything to lose by being sucked into a war with Red China. That is the step being taken today, and which the Congress is being asked to approve.

The intention is that a firm decision might continue the present uneasy peace, but there is also an inevitable risk that the authority the President seeks today will be the initial step toward world war IV, which like world war III would be the "wrong war, at the wrong time, in the wrong place."

Such steps require mature judgment, and our decision should reflect the will of the people, not the will of either the key military or policy-making officials of the administration.

MAIN ISSUE IS COMMUNISM CENTERED IN THE KREMLIN

Again, I say, the proposal before us today merely avoids the main issue, which is communism centered in the Kremlin.

The Chinese Reds are mere tools of the Kremlin dictatorship. What Red China does meets the full approval of Moscow, and every move is directed by strings pulled by the Kremlin.

HOLD KREMLIN RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTS OF RED CHINA; PUT RESPONSIBILITY FOR ASIA STRIFE WHERE IT BELONGS—ON RED RUSSIA

The pending resolution, in effect, serves notice on Red China that it is inviting trouble if it attempts to seize Formosa or the Pescadores.

But the strings that direct Red China are pulled from Moscow, as stated before. Moscow is the architect and the manipulator.

Our Government should serve notice on the Kremlin that we hold it responsible for the acts of Red China.

It was the Kremlin which armed Red China with weapons taken from the Japanese who surrendered in Manchuria back in 1945.

KREMLIN MASTERMINDED KOREAN CONFLICT

It was the Kremlin which trained and equipped the North Koreans, and instigated the attack on South Korea.

It was the Kremlin who supported the North Koreans and the Red Chinese against the United States in the Korean war.

It is now the Kremlin which supplies her principal satellite, Red China, in the present Pacific crisis.

Our Government must serve notice that unless peace comes to the Pacific, unless all arms held by the Chinese Reds are delivered up immediately, we shall break diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union.

In the meantime, we should suspend such relations pending the outcome of the current crisis.

CONTINUED RECOGNITION OF KREMLIN DENIES HOPE TO ASIA'S OPPRESSED MILLIONS

This step, alone, would be the greatest single blow to Communist seizure of all Asia.

The peoples of Asia hate the Kremlin, and they fear their dictators in the Soviet Union and in Red China.

There are two great fears today, the fear of the people for the dictator and the dictator's fear of the people. These fears are held in equilibrium by the bayonet. Whenever the people fear the dictator less than the dictator fears the people, the end of tyranny begins.

In other words, our withdrawal of diplomatic relations with the Kremlin would encourage 800 million oppressed peoples to look to their own welfare, peace, and freedom instead of bowing to the dictators in Moscow.

It would demonstrate to these 800 million oppressed people that the United States would be on their side, ideologically, in their struggle for peace and freedom.

They will never be convinced of that so long as we conduct diplomatic relations with their masters, extend to Russia all of the diplomatic courtesies and amenities that we extend to governments of free peoples, open up and widen our East-West trade with their masters, and even propose to barter butter for Russia's commodities.

BUTTER FOR MANGANESE DEAL DENOUNCED

Mr. President, anyone who knows about the supply of manganese—and it is mentioned in connection with butter going to Russia—knows that the United States of America needs Russian manganese as much as the schools of America, as they now stand, need more pupils. I sent engineers who were employed by the committee to the new manganese mines on the Amazon River. It took them 7 days to get there and back. There is enough manganese in Brazil to supply the demand in this hemisphere for all time in the foreseeable future. There is enough manganese in the United States of America, if we want to get it, to do the same job.

Cuba is unable to sell her manganese. She worked up a production of manganese, but now we are not buying it. Any suggestion that we give food supplies to Russia for manganese or any other critical material would normally prompt me to make comments which would not look very well in the RECORD. However, I refrain from making those comments.

BUTTER UP RUSSIA WHILE THREATENING CHINESE

Mr. President, it is a shocking thing that at the same time we are threatening to employ our Armed Forces against the Red Chinese puppets of the Kremlin, we hear proposals that we ship vast amounts of butter to their Russian masters.

In other words, it is proposed that we pass a joint resolution to block the small-time cattle thief and rustler, while we offer to "butter up" the top outlaw of them all, Red Russia. It does not make sense.

What does make sense is to suspend recognition of the top outlaw, extend the Monroe Doctrine to the areas whose security we feel is imperative to our national security, and stop the constant broadening of our trade with Soviet Russia, which only serves to build up Russia for further aggression.

MALONE-WHERRY-KEM RESOLUTION WOULD HAVE HALTED RED EXPANSION

Mr. President, if we had let the Malone-Wherry-Kem resolution stand—which kept any money from going from the taxpayers of the United States to any European country which traded with Russia or with any Iron Curtain country—the trouble would have been over long since. But we followed the policy of a great nation—or, at least, at one time it was a great nation; today it is not so great any more; I refer to England—which always fed and supplied her enemies, even while she was fighting them, just as we virtually built the Japanese Navy with our own scrap iron, and furnished the Japanese Navy with the fuel needed to run it. We provided that oil from our own oil fields, while we were getting ready to fight the Japanese. Today we are doing the same thing all over again.

Mr. President, a firm stand against the Kremlin might lead to peace in the Pacific; but if the Kremlin refused to use its influence in Red China, the mere fact of withdrawal of our recognition of Russia would be a stunning blow to Russia and would bring new hope to 800 million people now her slaves. It would lead to the easing of world tension, and might be the first step to self-liberation of the peoples of Asia.

PRESIDENT SHOULD SET UP MORE BARRIERS TO COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

Mr. President, in closing, I wish to say that I hope this first point the President of the United States has set in the Pacific, beyond which our potential enemies cannot come, because to do so would threaten the security of this Nation, is only the beginning.

LET US SAY WHAT WE WILL DO AND MEAN WHAT WE SAY

I hope that he will set similar points elsewhere in the Pacific and also in the Atlantic, and will conduct negotiations to such an extent that our potential enemies will know we mean what we say and that we will do what we say we will do. If we continue to build our Air Force and if we keep ahead of Russia

and any other power on earth with our guided missiles, our airpower, our submarines, and our radar, I believe we shall not have another war in 50 years.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO 11 A. M. TOMORROW

During the delivery of Mr. MALONE'S speech,

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in order that I may propound a unanimous-consent request, with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. MALONE. I have the highest regard in the world for the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, and I would yield for any question or statement he might wish to make.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it take a recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I should like to ask the distinguished acting majority leader a question. When the Senate convenes at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, is it his intention, if possible, to reach a vote on various amendments during the day, with the possibility of voting on the joint resolution tomorrow night? What are the plans of the acting majority leader?

Mr. CLEMENTS. It is the intention of the acting majority leader to proceed as expeditiously as possible with the pending business. As to whether or not a vote will be possible tomorrow, I should rather have the judgment of the Senator from Massachusetts, inasmuch as he has been a Member of the Senate longer than I have.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In other words, we should plan for a long session, running into the early evening tomorrow?

Mr. CLEMENTS. The acting majority leader has no idea whether the Senate will be in session an hour, a day, or a week.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to make one observation, if the distinguished Senator from Kentucky will permit me to do so at this time.

The senior Senator from Nevada considers the pending joint resolution one of the most serious and important measures that has ever come before the Senate, or is ever likely to come before the Senate.

I do not believe that it is in order at this time to discuss the possibility of limiting debate. If consideration of the pending joint resolution should require tomorrow, the next day, and Monday and Tuesday of next week, I think the time would be very well spent. I shall not try to prolong the debate, but it seems a little out of place to start talking about limiting debate on a question the implications of which no one fully understands.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may comment?

Mr. MALONE. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The acting majority leader assures his fine friend from Nevada that there will be no effort on the part of the acting majority leader to rush any Senator who has anything he may wish to say on the joint resolution or any amendment. Even if the acting majority leader desired to do so, under the rules of the Senate his efforts would have little effect.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SUGGESTED SATURDAY SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I wish to answer a question which was propounded by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who now is occupying the chair. He asked whether there was a likelihood that a Saturday session would be held this week. I think only the progress the Senate makes tomorrow can determine whether there will be a Saturday session this week. If there appears to be an opportunity to finish action on the pending joint resolution by holding a session on Saturday, it is my view that a session should be held on Saturday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Nevada permit the Presiding Officer——

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair state to the distinguished acting majority leader, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], that it is the understanding of the Chair that the situation in regard to the military and naval forces is such that it would seem to the Chair that a decision on the part of the acting majority leader possibly to hold a Saturday session would appear to be a wise one.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, that is a decision which will have to be reached tomorrow, not today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In order that any Member of the Senate who may read the RECORD tomorrow morning, in regard to procedural matters, may make his plans accordingly, let the Chair state that it is the Chair's understanding that some votes may be taken tomorrow, and there may be a fairly long session tomorrow, running somewhat into the evening hour, and with the possibility of a session on Saturday, according to the Chair's understanding.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Yes. If there is a possibility of concluding action on the pending measure by tomorrow night, or if it appears that action on the pending measure could be concluded tomorrow night, I believe it would be wise that a night session be held.

As I have stated, if it should appear that action on the pending measure could be finished on Saturday, it would be the intention of the acting majority leader to have the Senate hold a session on Saturday. If there is no apparent chance that action on the pending measure can be finished on Saturday, of course that would be another matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On behalf of the minority leader, the Chair thanks the acting majority leader.

THE WHITE HOUSE STATEMENT ON THE PENDING RESOLUTION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I speak at this late hour for two reasons: First, because a number of my colleagues have expressed the view that I should get into the RECORD, tonight, so that my arguments can be read tomorrow—some of my replies to the President's White House release of today, and some of my replies to the arguments made by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

I also speak at this late hour tonight, Mr. President, as an accommodation to the acting majority leader and to other leaders in the Senate, because I have no desire to prolong the total period of debate in the Senate. I certainly am not going to allow myself to be placed in the position of speaking at great length at times which would result in prolongation of the total period of time in which this matter might otherwise be disposed of.

Therefore I wish to make clear that I am speaking tonight because a good many of my colleagues in the Senate have urged me to make brief remarks by way, shall I say, of rebuttal—and to make them tonight—in answer to some of the things which have been said on the floor of the Senate during the day.

So, Mr. President, I have—as a matter of accommodation and cooperation—agreed to make this speech, knowing full well that most of my colleagues are at a banquet which I had hoped to attend, but which I had notified the sponsors thereof I would not be able to attend because I expected to be speaking tonight in the State of Oregon. I canceled the Oregon trip because of the emergency which has developed in the Senate over the pending joint resolution. Therefore, because I seem to be in the best position of almost any Member of the Senate to use speaking time tonight, while many other Members of the Senate are at the banquet, I have agreed to oblige the leadership by making this speech tonight so that my comments will be in the RECORD for Senators to read who may be interested in my arguments.

Mr. President, with that explanation for my giving of this speech at this late hour, I now wish to make a few comments on the President's White House release of today. In order that there will be continuity in my speech on the White House release I now ask unanimous consent that the White House release of today be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES-CHINA

WASHINGTON.—The White House said today President Eisenhower would decide personally whether to use United States forces for purposes other than immediate self-defense in protection of Formosa against the Communists.

James C. Hagerty, White House press secretary, said in a statement that Eisenhower had made that clear at a conference with top civilian and military defense officials.

The statement said that at the White House conference today:

"The President made it clear that these [United States] forces were designed purely for defensive purposes and that any decision to use United States forces other than in immediate self-defense or in direct defense of Formosa and the Pescadores would be a decision which he would take and the responsibility for which he has not delegated."

The purpose of the statement, it was learned, is at least twofold:

1. To allay concern expressed by some Senators that the President's fight-for-Formosa resolution carries authorization to launch a preventive war against the Communists.

2. To set at rest concern on the part of some Members of Congress that authority to decide whether to use United States Armed Forces might be delegated so that control of the situation would not rest with the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Without taking the time to read all the release, I wish to say that my first reaction to it is that it grants the soundness of one of the major contentions of the group of us who believe that the language of the joint resolution should be modified.

PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT PROVES CONTENTION THAT MORE THAN DEFENSE IS INVOLVED IN RESOLUTION

I do not know whether or not the advisers at the White House fully appreciate the basis of the contention which I made in my major speech yesterday, that the language of the joint resolution in its present form authorizes someone to exercise the discretion and make the decision committing or ordering the commission of a military act by American forces which might very well have the effect of involving a strike on the mainland of China.

In my speech yesterday I referred to it as an authorization for the exercise of power to start a preventive war. I repeat that criticism of the joint resolution. There is not a word in the White House press release today that changes the meaning of the joint resolution in that regard. Listen to the release:

The statement said that at the White House conference today:

"The President made it clear that these (United States) forces were designed purely for defensive purposes and that any decision to use United States forces other than in immediate self-defense or in direct defense of Formosa and the Pescadores would be a decision which he would take and the responsibility for which he has not delegated."

That is my case. That is my charge. I am glad to have the admission of the President of the United States, in his own release, that there is encompassed in this joint resolution the proposal that the Congress of the United States authorize someone in our Government—who the President now says is himself—to use American military forces at his discretion for purposes other "than in immediate self-defense or in direct defense of Formosa and the Pescadores." I repeat it:

The President made it clear that these (United States) forces were designed purely for defensive purposes and that any decision to use United States forces other than in immediate self-defense or in direct defense of Formosa and the Pescadores would be a decision which he would take and the responsibility for which he has not delegated.

I say that the resolution opens wide the door for taking action over and beyond the immediate defense of Formosa and the Pescadores and the President admits as much in his release.

I emphasize that in the release from the White House today there is no assertion by the President of the United States that the testimony of the Secretary of State and of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Radford, has in any way been repudiated by Presidential order. To the contrary, I submit that the President, by clear implication, underwrites that testimony, and that what he is saying in the White House release is that when it comes to any course of military action other than the direct defense of Formosa and the Pescadores, he will pledge to the American people that he himself will make the decision.

I am as much against giving such authority to the President of the United States as to anyone else in the executive branch of the Government. So long as I am in the United States Senate, I do not proposed by preauthorization, by predating, or by commitment in advance without having before me the specific facts involving an incident which might justify the President asking for the exercise of such power, to give blanket approval to the President of the United States to proceed to commit an act of war against another nation. That is the sum and substance of my position.

We do not get away from the language of the joint resolution—and I am coming to that language momentarily—by one single word in the White House release today. To the contrary, I respectfully submit that the White House release simply buttresses the language of the joint resolution. All it says is that the President will exercise the right of decision. What I am protesting is the exercise of such a decision by any American official, be he the President of the United States, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or anyone else, because if we underwrite the joint resolution in its present form, in my judgment, we tie our hands in the future, to protest any course of preventive war action upon which a President of the United States might embark under the terms of the joint resolution.

I emphasize that point, because it is the substance of my argument and my difference with the President of the United States.

Let me say now to the American people from this desk, "You do not get the meaning of what is involved in this situation either by the joint resolution or by the White House release today, unless you have before you the testimony of the Secretary of State and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff."

The President does not in any way reject that testimony in respect to the authorization by this resolution of a preventive war act. I am sure I am within the proprieties when I say that neither the Secretary of State nor the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff ever suggested that either one of them would have the power or would entertain the intention of exercising such a decision. To the contrary, they made it very clear that they would look to the President to make such a decision. So the President has not added a single thing to the operative facts of the record in this case.

It has already been represented to us by the Secretary of State and by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that they would look to the President for the exercise of any decision under this resolution. But what decision? That is what I wish to focus attention upon. I refer to the right to make a decision to go beyond the direct defense of Formosa and the Pescadores, the decision as to whether or not, upon information from American military intelligence to the effect that there was a great concentration of military forces on the mainland of China orders should be issued to strike on the mainland before an act of war was committed against the United States. That is the crux of the great difference in this debate. All the White House really means is that what the President is doing is telling the American people what Dulles and Radford already made clear, namely, that that decision would be made by the President.

Later I shall say something about the dispute on this question within the ranks of some of the American military authorities.

RESOLUTION IN PRESENT FORM DELEGATES CONGRESSIONAL POWER TO DECLARE WAR

Those of us who are objecting to the language of the resolution, which would have the Congress preauthorize the President of the United States to make a decision to order a strike against China, point out to the American people that if we grant the power we say the intention is that the President shall be free to exercise the authority, if he decides to exercise it.

I do not believe any President should have that power. I do not believe Congress should in any way delegate its power to declare war.

Mr. President, we might as well look at the realities. If by this resolution we authorize the President to exercise that power, and if we make the assumption of the minor premise in my syllogism, namely, that the President decides the power shall be exercised, the conclusion is inevitable that the President has declared war, not Congress. All that we could do as Members of Congress would be subsequently to say "amen" to a

course of action we had already authorized the President to take when we passed the resolution.

We would have no other choice. If we pass the resolution with this language in it, particularly in the light of the supporting evidence and the clear notification of the President's intention as to what he would do, we shall have delegated to the President of the United States the power to declare war.

I respectfully submit that we have no right under our oaths of office to delegate that great constitutional obligation of Congress to anyone, not even to the President of the United States. In my judgment, we cannot do it constitutionally. We can do it only in fact, not legally.

Let me say one more word about it. It is the same point, but I state it from a different angle, for the purpose of emphasis. It is important that at least the RECORD be clear that the Senate be put on notice of what the legal effect of the resolution would be, and that the American people be informed as to what it would be.

What we are doing, Mr. President, is for the first time in the history of the United States serving notice on all the nations of the world that we have now decided to abandon the glorious historical and traditional American policy of peace and to adopt the policy of deciding in our judgment whether we ought to make war on another nation because we have become fearful that that nation is about to make war on us. A terrible wrong would be perpetrated if we misjudged the intention of the other nation.

As I warned yesterday, no one can take the position I am taking on this very critical issue without being misrepresented and misinterpreted and abused. I do not intend to reply to statements of irresponsibility. In the course of this debate, I do not intend, no matter how much abuse may be heaped upon me by innuendo and implication, to reply to such irresponsible attacks. Those who know me are aware of the complete sincerity of my opposition to everything communistic. Those who know me also are aware of my devoted dedication to the Constitution of the United States and my deep-seated conviction that we cannot maintain a government by law if we ignore any constitutional responsibility imposed upon us by that organic document.

I shall not be diverted in this great constitutional debate—because it is that more than anything else—by any ad hominem argument which seeks to place me in a position of resorting to legalisms, or by any argument that today we in America have no time to resort to and to hold fast to fundamental constitutional law doctrine.

It is an hour of crisis. Some of the great Justices of the United States Supreme Court have stated in powerful and noteworthy decisions of the Court that particularly in an hour of crisis it is of the utmost importance that we never vary from the constitutional processes of the great basic act of our system of government by law namely, the Constitution itself.

There is a great danger that if the resolution passes in its present form we shall write a chapter of history in American constitutional law of which generations of Americans in the not-too-distant future will be ashamed. I say that because when the period of hysteria which now seems to grip so many people in America passes, the questions will be asked, "How could the Congress do it? How could it delegate such power to any President and thereby establish what amounts to personal government in the United States?"

Mr. President, we have no constitutional right to authorize any President to exercise his discretion in determining whether or not he should commit an act of war against another nation on the basis of his value judgment that the security of America is in danger. I do not believe we can afford, in terms of historical judgment, to have it ever said about our Nation that we walked out on the principle of our foreign policy from which there has been no deviation, namely, never to make war unless and until war is made against us.

I discussed that point at some length yesterday. I make reference to it today only because I believe it needs to be made, in order to answer the White House release, and to answer some points made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

OPEN DEBATE HAS ALREADY AFFECTED ADMINISTRATION

I finish my comment on the White House press release by saying that the very fact the White House felt it necessary to issue any release at all shows the effects of the debate thus far held on this issue. It shows, Mr. President, that the White House has already become aware of the fact that there is great consternation in this country about the possibility of our becoming involved in a war on the mainland of China, or becoming involved in a war as the result of our trying to defend the Nationalist Chinese on the Quemoy Island and Matsu Island, or on other islands, only a few miles off the coast of China.

That leads me to the second main point I wish to make in this speech. Let me quickly add, on the last point, that I am satisfied that when the American people come to consider and understand the meaning of this debate we shall find increasing opposition to this resolution throughout the country.

DECISION SHOULD BE MADE BY AMERICAN PEOPLE ON BASIS OF THE RECORD

I was surprised and a little shocked last night, Mr. President, to hear a prominent journalist tell me that he thought the major objection to my approach to this problem was that the people of the country should not be the ones to judge the course of action which is taken in such a matter as this. I could not believe my ears. He went on to argue that, of course, the people did not want to go to war, but it may be necessary to go to war. I hope we have not reached the point, Mr. President, where the people, and the sons of the people who will be doing so much of the dying in a war, if it should come, cannot determine the peace and war policies of their Government. I am perfectly satisfied that if the people of this Nation had 1 week in which to consider the implications and inevitable consequences of this resolution it would be overwhelmingly rejected by them in its present form.

There are various reasons for wanting an early disposition of this resolution which is before the Senate, but I am not blind to the fact that one of those reasons on the part of some administration leaders is that they would like to get the matter settled before the people learn too much about it.

DELAY NOT INTENDED

Although I shall not allow myself to be placed in the position of prolonging this debate simply for the purpose of prolongation, I wish to make it very clear that before this debate is over I shall make whatever remarks I think should be made by me in order to complete my record on this issue, in light of whatever is said by the opposition between now and the end of the debate.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR GEORGE

Mr. President, I wish now to say a few words about what I understand was one of the major theses of the great chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. GEORGE]. I do not know of any other man in American public life for whose legal ability, intellectual courage, and complete intellectual honesty, I have a higher respect than the very able and distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. Whenever I find myself entertaining a difference of opinion with him on any legal matter I go to the books. Whenever I find myself holding a point of view on a question of law different from that of the Senator from Georgia, I know it is of the utmost importance that I check the sources of legal authority on the subject.

DIFFERENT INTERPRETATIONS PLACED UPON RESOLUTION

Having said that, Mr. President, I wish to make clear that I completely disagree with the Senator from Georgia on an interpretation of legislative construction which he has made in this matter and on the basis of which he bottoms much of his legal argument. What is that argument? It is that the language in the resolution which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] seeks to strike from it is language of limitation, and if stricken it would follow, according to the Senator from Georgia, that the President would have broader powers than he would have if the language remained in the resolution.

Let us see if that is true, Mr. President. This is the section of the resolution containing the language in regard to which the Senator from Georgia will have to sustain his contention. It reads as follows:

> That the President of the United States be and he hereby is authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack, this authority to include the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands and the taking of such other measures as

he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

Language of limitation, Mr. President, did I hear the Senator from Georgia say? As a matter of draftsmanship, can the Senator from Georgia sit down and draw language that will grant greater power in the premises than does the language of the resolution?

What does the Senator from Minnesota propose to strike? The following language:

this authority to include the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands and the taking of such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

That is the language which the Senator from Minnesota is proposing to strike; and the Senator from Georgia says he would be striking language of limitation from the resolution. What the Senator from Minnesota is proposing to strike includes the language "and the taking of such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores."

As I argued yesterday and argue again tonight in reply to the Senator from Georgia, I do not know how we could give the President broader powers than are given by that language. The Senator from Georgia did not even come near to answering my argument; not a word did he say that answers the argument that the language "and the taking of such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate" is a blanket grant of preventive war power to the President of the United States, if he decides to use it. I do not know how we could use language that would make clearer that what we propose to do is to authorize the President to take such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

That is what all this argumentative shooting is about on this issue, Mr. President. What we are saying is that under this resolution the Congress of the United States proposes to authorize the President to take such other measures as he judges to be required in the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores. The Senator from Minnesota proposes to eliminate that language, and we are met with the argument that by removing that broad, sweeping language from the resolution, we broaden it. That is a bit of argumentation that defies all my understanding of logic. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] seems to think that without the language of the resolution which the Humphrey amendment seeks to strike the President would be free to take any action he might want to take anywhere in China and call it action in defense of Formosa. Obviously, with the language "to take such other measures" left in the resolution it is perfectly clear that the President would have the power, most certainly, to order a strike against any point on the mainland of China. There is no limitation expressed or implied in that language as far as the power of the President is concerned. Therefore, the conclusion is inescapable that striking such broad language from the resolution as the Humphrey amendment does cannot possibly result in broadening the resolution.

Further, the Senator from Georgia argues, if I interpret him correctly, that the language "this authority to include the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands" constitutes language of limitation by way of a geographical limitation of a sphere of action in which the power granted in the resolution can be exercised. I respectfully submit that the fact that some territory may now be in the friendly hands of the Nationalist Chinese does not in any way limit the power of the President under this resolution in its present form to take whatever measures he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores. Obviously, those measures need not be limited in any way whatsoever to military acts to be committed in securing and protecting such related positions and territories of the Formosa area now in friendly hands. The words of the resolution referring to "positions and territories of the area now in friendly hands" constitute no limitation whatsoever upon the authorization granted to the President under this resolution to order a military strike anywhere on the mainland of China if in his judgment such a preventive war act would be "required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores."

What the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] seems to overlook in our contention in opposition to his defense of the resolution is that the broad powers authorized under the language which the Humphrey amendment would strike out of the resolution are powers which would permit the President to order a preventive war act against the mainland of China, at any point thereon, without any reference to or relation to the islands and territories a few miles from the coast of China now in friendly hands.

To clarify this point, let me put it this way: The power authorized by the resolution to take "such other measures as the President decides are necessary" clearly permits him to order a preventive war strike against an air base anywhere in China if he decides that a concentration of planes on that base threatens the defense of Formosa, the Pescadores or the "related positions and territories."

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has confused the description set forth in the resolution of the territory to be defended with the unlimited grant of power to take "such other measures as the President judges to be required" to defend that area.

The language of the resolution most certainly does not limit the President to act militarily within the bounds of the specific locations of Formosa, the Pescadores, and positions and territories now in friendly hands. The President could go far beyond the limits of that territory by ordering a military strike against any point on the mainland of China if he judges such action is required to defend the areas named in the resolution.

That is why I say preventive war authorization is granted in this resolution. The mistaken legal construction of the present language of the resolution by the Senator from Georgia does not remove in fact the terrible grant of power to the President by the resolution.

It is a preventive war power no matter how much the Senator from Georgia wants to believe otherwise. The security of our country and the issue of peace or war cannot be escaped by wishful thinking.

All the White House press release means is that the President assures the people of the United States that he will make the decision as to "such other measures" he may take in order to defend Formosa and the Pescadores.

Let me also say to the people on this point today that we have to read that language from the standpoint of the testimony before the joint committee hearings. The President has not rejected that testimony. I am within the proprieties in saying so, because the testimony on this point, as I can show from newspaper discussions, is pretty much a matter of public property. I can discuss this subject within the proprieties by saying that there is no question of a doubt that the record of the hearings will show that high civil and military officials of our Government admitted to the joint committee that a situation might arise in which it might be deemed desirable to make a strike against the mainland of China, without an act of war first having been committed against us. Those officials admitted that if that occurred, it would constitute an act of war by the United States against Red China.

That is it, Mr. President. That is the essence of this dispute. I care not in what language the Senator from Georgia couches the administration's position. I care not what rationalizations are used. I care not how much of an emotional appeal is made about ignoring legalisms in this debate. The fact is that under that language the President is authorized to commit a preventive war act if, in his judgment, it is necessary to defend Formosa and the Pescadores.

Mr. President, it is not possible, in my judgment, to use language that gives broader, more sweeping authority to the President to exercise an arbitrary discretion than the language the Senator from Georgia says is language of limitation.

It is not language of limitation for anctther reason. In the first place—let me recapitulate—it is not language of limitation because, by its very definition, "such other measures" includes any act the President might deem it necessary to take, which, in the light of the testimony before the committee, would encompass a strike against the mainland of China before a strike had been committed against us. That is preventive war.

I am sorry if that phrase is unpleasant to the ears of our opposition in this debate. I am sorry if they would prefer not to hear it. But that is what it means.

This is not language of limitation for a further reason, Mr. President; namely, that it is, in the light of the history of our policy in Asia, of very recent months, an extension of American jurisdiction over the islands of Quemoy and Matsu. As recently as September the White House permitted the impression to go abroad in this land—and if it was a mistaken impression, the White House did not correct it—that the islands of Quemoy and Matsu were not essential to the defense of Formosa. That was the understanding of our Asiatic policy as of that time, which the President of the United States allowed to become established in American public opinion.

ADMINISTRATION NOW EXTENDING AREA TO BE DEFENDED

But no longer. There is now a shift in policy, and this resolution points it up dramatically. Now we take the position that we will defend territories in friendly hands, if that is our discretion and our desire, based upon a viewpoint that, by doing so, it might be easier to defend Formosa and the Pescadores.

Again, all I can say is by way of assertion, because it is highly desirable that the military features of this matter not become a matter of public record, at least not at this time. But I say to the American people and to the Senate that on this point the record of the testimony leaves no room for doubt that, at least for now, we are going to assume the obligation of defending the Nationalist Chinese, who purportedly are defending Quemoy and Matsu.

Look at them on the map, Mr. President. They are 8 to 10 miles from the mainland of China, within gun range of powerful batteries. They are no distance at all from the mainland, militarily speaking, when it comes to opportunities for waging a successful attack on those islands. Who occupies them? The Nationalist Chinese.

Let me say to the President of the United States that here is one Senator who is completely opposed to risking the life of a single American boy, whether he be in the Air Force, the Navy, or the Army, in the defense of Quemoy or Matsu, which are at present under the control of the Nationalist Chinese.

There is a great danger that if a defense of those islands is maintained, we will become involved in military operations and in the possibility of maneuvers which will cause us to become involved in a war on the mainland of China. We can become involved in such a war in several different ways.

Under the language of the joint resolution, there could be military advice to the President, pointing out that the military leaders in that area believe there is great danger of a successful attack upon Quemoy and the Matsus; and the President might reach the conclusion that he thinks he ought to protect them in order to make it easier to protect Formosa, and he might thus order a strike on the mainland. That would be a preventive war move.

Or we might wait until there was some kind of attack made by the Red Chinese upon islands off the China coast held by the Nationalist Chinese, and then we would move in with the Air Force and Navy to protect the Nationalist Chinese. We would then be in the war, no matter which way we got into it.

I know that we have our problems and troubles with Chiang, but I think the time has come when the United States Government should make it very clear to the Nationalist Chinese that we are not going to risk American life in the defense of islands 8 to 10 miles from the mainland of China. We are not going to do it on any pretext or representation that we ought to do it in order to defend Formosa.

I spoke yesterday about the risk of a calculated peace, and I think we ought to pay more attention to the risk of a calculated peace than is being done in our country today.

QUEMOY AND MATSU ISLANDS NOT ESSENTIAL TO DEFENSE OF FORMOSA

Mr. President, the impression is being spread in this country that, from a military standpoint, the defense of the Quemoy Islands and the Matsu Islands is essential to the defense of Formosa. I deny that. I deny that top military officials will testify under oath that our Military Establishment cannot defend Formosa unless we maintain a defense of the Quemoy Islands and the Matsu Islands.

I admit that under some military situations which might develop, it might be somewhat more difficult to defend Formosa; but I say that it will not be impossible to defend Formosa, and that Formosa can be defended by the Military Establishment with less risk—mark you this, Mr. President, with less risk—to our becoming involved in a war on the mainland of China than would be the case if we continued to defend Quemoy and the Matsus.

But let us assume for a moment that in our defense of Quemoy and the Matsus we do become involved in a war on the mainland of China, either as a result of our committing a war act in the first instance or as a result of the Red Chinese committing a war act against the Quemoys, which involved American military airmen or the Navy, and we strike back, as we certainly should under those circumstances. Some persons seems to think that I would not favor going to war against Red China if Red China committed an act of war against us. Let me eliminate that impression from their minds right now, as I attempted to do yesterday in my speech. If Red China should commit an act of war against the United States I would be in favor of prosecuting a war against Red China to a complete and successful end. But I want the people of my country to face and recognize the dangers involved.

So I come back to the point I just made. If we are to become involved in war, then I think the people of the United States are entitled to an answer to the question, "Do we have ground forces in being, or that can be put into being in sufficient time to carry out our military obligations on land, so that war can be prosecuted to a successful conclusion, with a minimum of loss to American Air, Navy, and Army forces?"

When I raise that question, Mr. President, I raise a very delicate one. Had not an article appeared in the newspapers today bearing upon this point, all I would have said now is that there is a division of opinion within the Joint Chiefs of Staff on this point. But let me emphasize that when there is a division of opinion within the Joint Chiefs of Staff on any military point, we had better take a long, long look at the pros and cons involved in that division of opinion before we authorize any particular military course of action such as is contemplated by way of granting the broad, sweeping power to the President of the United States which is provided in the resolution.

Mr. President, there appeared today in the Washington Daily News a story entitled "General Wasn't Consulted—Ridgway Versus Radford at Hush Hearing." In view of the fact that the information is now public, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the story be published at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the news story was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL WASN'T CONSULTED—RIDGWAY VERSUS RADFORD AT HUSH HEARING

Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway told Senators that 300,000 to 400,000 United States ground troops would be needed to win a foothold on the Chinese mainland, it was reported today.

The statement was attributed to the Army Chief of Staff by a Senate informant familiar with Tuesday's closed-door session of the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff appeared at that session for testimony which some Senators interpreted as clear evidence of disagreement between General Ridgway and Adm. Arthur W. Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs.

The conflict was said to have developed when Admiral Radford was asked if the Chiefs were unanimous in support of President Eisenhower's Far Eastern defense plans. Admiral Radford had been quoted previously, in a public announcement from the House Foreign Affairs Committee as saying they were unanimous.

NOT CONSULTED

General Ridgway was reported to have arisen and said in effect, "I was not consulted."

Admiral Radford agreed General Ridgway was out of Washington when the Joint Chiefs considered the Formosa program. General Ridgway told the committees that a deputy, who was present, was not authorized to speak for him.

General Ridgway was said to have given terse answers and to have testified with great reserve because his position seemed to put him in conflict with Mr. Eisenhower.

His apparent disagreement with Admiral Radford involved differing viewpoints about the likelihood of United States ground forces being committed in any American military action against the Chinese mainland or in defense of offshore islands, such as Quemoy.

It was said Admiral Radford did not rule out strikes against the mainland or the defense of Quemoy, but he visualized such action in terms of using air and sea power. General Ridgway feared that any such moves might lead to the commitment of ground forces. He said these already are overextended.

"JUST A RIPPLE"

Meanwhile, House Armed Services Committee Chairman CARL VINSON, (Democrat of Georgia), called for a public airing of

General Ridgway's opposition to scheduled cuts in Army manpower, though the chairman revealed he may go along with the reductions.

But Representative VINSON warned Defense Secretary Charles Wilson to put on the brakes with reductions early this year in view of the Formosa crisis.

Mr. Wilson testified that the Formosa situation was just a ripple as far as its effect on the military program is concerned.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, all I wish to say about the story—and let the administration deny it if it is not true—is that it raises serious doubts as to whether or not we have the necessary ground forces in being to fulfill the necessary military commitments which would have to be met if we became involved in a war on the mainland of China. That is all I am going to say on this point, other than to suggest that it would be a matter of most serious consequences if, in the area under discussion, a course of action should be followed which would cause us to become involved in a war on the mainland of China.

Mr. President, of course we all know that some outstanding military experts point out that if we should become involved in a war with Red China we would very soon thereafter be in a war with Red Russia. Russia might prosecute such a war in a variety of ways. She might decide to prosecute the war against us by making China the battleground. There are many military experts who are of the opinion that if we should get in a war with Red Russia, there is one place we should not try to fight that war, and that is in Red China.

There are those who would point out that if we should get into a war with Red China, and should have to commit great Navy and Army forces to operations in that part of the world, we would weaken our defense position in Europe, and would put our allies in Europe in an exceedingly precarious position.

It is because I think the resolution, which contains very broad language—not language of limitation, but broad language—greatly increases the danger of a war on the mainland of China that I am supporting the Humphrey amendment. That amendment serves notice on the world that we are not going to be held responsible for the defense of the Quemoys and the Matsus, and other islands just offshore the China mainland.

Let me say, in reply to the Senator from Georgia, that I am worried about this matter from another standpoint. Certainly I have confidence in the President of the United States in matters military, but he is not infallible. When he says he is going to make the decision, of course, he is not going to make it in a vacuum. When he makes the decision, he will make it on the basis of having data, representations, and arguments presented to him by his military advisers. I certainly hope we shall never get into a situation in which a President of the United States will not give consideration to the advice and recommendations of his field commanders and of his Joint Chiefs of Staff and of those on the spot. From that premise, I argue—sad as it is to do so, nevertheless it is true—that there are in the Senate those who do not question the great military ability of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, but who are not in sympathy with his record regarding the course of action which should be followed in this area of the world, in respect to a war against China. It simply must be said—even though it is a very blunt statement—that some of us, and I am one of them, believe that for the past 2 or 3 years Admiral Radford has been leaning and inclining very strongly toward the preventive-war theory. Some of us feel, after we hear him, that he entertains the thought that war with Red China is inevitable—and, for that matter, that war with Red Russia is inevitable, too; and we fear that he may hold the opinion that if such a war is to be fought, now is the time to fight it—if not sooner. That is why we have this additional reason for fearing the language of the joint resolution.

Mr. President, I will never be heard to say that Admiral Radford will make the decisions for the President of the United States; but I do not think anyone can deny that the President would be bound to give great weight to Admiral Radford's recommendations; and, because he is not infallible, I would feel much easier about this situation if we did not grant to the President of the United States the broad power encompassed in the pending joint resolution. I repeat that to grant it to him will, in effect, amount, I think, to giving him the power to declare war; and that happens to be the constitutional prerogative of the Congress of the United States.

Another argument of the Senator from Georgia was to the effect that in this situation we must support the President—leaving the impression that those of us who disagree with that conclusion are somehow, in some way, guilty of some kind of a disservice to our country. Mr. President, I will support the President whenever I think he is right. I will never support the President on the basis of the fallacious argument that I should vote for the pending joint resolution because the President wants it to be passed. I did not ask for this joint resolution; the President did. I am not responsible for the discussion of the joint resolution; the President is, because when he sent the joint resolution to Congress, he placed upon each Member of the Senate who takes seriously his constitutional obligations, in accordance with the oath he took, the duty of analyzing the joint resolution, and, if he honestly and sincerely believes its passage would not be in the public interest, the further duty of telling the Senate and the American people why he so believes.

So, Mr. President, any implication or innuendo in the argument of the Senator from Georgia that we simply should vote now in favor of passage of the joint resolution because if we do not vote for it, then, in some way, somehow, we shall give the people of the rest of the world the impression that we in the United States are split with disunity, I think is highly fallacious and is one which, again, could be made in support of some kind of personal government in the United States, instead of a constitutional government.

On the contrary, Mr. President, I think this great constitutional debate in the Senate over the joint resolution is serving as a great object lesson to the other free nations of the world as to the superiority of a parliamentary system of government such as ours, in which the requests of the executive—in this case, the President of the United States—are not considered as dictates to a rubber-stamp Congress.

I was not at all moved or impressed by the argument of the Senator from Georgia that we should vote for the passage of the joint resolution because if we do not do so and if we do not give the President this support now, we shall be put in the light of giving the impression that great disunity exists in the United States.

Mr. President, the survival of the United States is not dependent upon the existence of a "yes, yes" attitude in the Senate. The survival of our country will always be greatly strengthened by full, free, and serious debate in the Senate in regard to the import and impact of any proposal of a President of the United States to have Congress grant to him the authorization to exercise the sweeping powers contemplated by the pending joint resolution.

It is very reassuring that the Senator from Georgia is not concerned about any danger that the President might order a course of action which would result in committing an act of war against another nation. But the Senator from Georgia does not answer the danger of a preventive war act by saying, in effect, "I do not think there is any danger the President would do it." We do not protect the legal rights of the American people, let me say most respectfully, by granting to an official of our Government a broad, discretionary power which could be subject to abuse, inasmuch as there would not be anything we could do about it, once the President exercised the power. The pending proposal, in the form of a joint resolution, amounts to a proposal to have us throw out the window our check upon the President.

I happen to believe that we have the duty of passing a resolution which will check the possibility of abuse. I agree with the Senator from Georgia in one respect. I do not think the President of the United States would ever order a military course of action which he did not believe to be in the best interests of the United States. But let me say to the Senator from Georgia that I do not think we have any right to give blanket authority to the President of the United States to exercise the kind of discretion contemplated in the language "the taking of such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate." When we grant that power, we throw the check and balance system out the window for the duration of the time that he is empowered to exercise that broad, sweeping discretion. That is my answer to the Senator from Georgia on that point.

I say most respectfully to him that the argument constitutes an appeal to esteem for a person. I suggest that we

direct our attention to the legal implications and consequences of the authority which the Senator from Georgia proposes to grant to the President. I repeat what I said early in the argument. As the Supreme Court has said so many times, in the hour of crisis we should hold fast to constitutional guaranties. In the hour of crisis we should not try to delegate our constitutional obligations to an individual and grant him the power of personal government, grant him the discretion to commit an act of war, if he so decides, upon another nation before an act of war has been committed upon us, thereby repudiating the long history of America's record in foreign policy, which has always demonstrated our peaceful intention of never proceeding to war until we first have been warred upon.

There is another thing which disturbs me with respect to the Quemoy and Matsu area, in connection with the Chinese Nationalists. One of the great cooperators, shall I say, or one of the ideological allies or sympathizers in the points of view of the Nationalist Chinese since this Asiatic crisis first arose, has always been General Chennault, who has a great military record, and for whom I have the same high respect that I have for Admiral Radford, but whose points of view in regard to the course of action he thinks the United States ought to follow in connection with the Nationalist Chinese, I completely reject.

Here again we have one who thinks, and has thought for some time, that we should conduct a preventive war against China. He has openly advocated such a war. He is one of the leading and most able and sincere spokesmen of the preventive-war group. In today's press we find an article entitled "It's Better To Fight Things Out—General Chennault Calls for China War Now." I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"IT'S BETTER TO FIGHT THINGS OUT"—GENERAL CHENNAULT CALLS FOR CHINA WAR NOW

(By Earnest Hoberecht)

TAIPEH, January 27.—Maj. Gen. Claire Chennault (retired) said today the "time has come for a showdown with the Chinese Communists."

General Chennault said in an exclusive interview that it will be easier for the United States and her Asian allies to defeat the Red Chinese now than 1 year hence.

"They (the Red Chinese) are not our friends and are not fit for membership in the United Nations," General Chennault said. "They have demonstrated this."

SHOWDOWN NOW

"We had better have a showdown now," the former commander of the Flying Tigers added. "I don't like war, but sometimes it's better to fight things out. The Red Chinese are the only aggressors in Asia. They are doing all the shooting and all the moving forward."

General Chennault defended Nationalist Chinese retaliatory attacks against the Reds.

"The Chinese Nationalists are only trying to return the fire to protect themselves," he said.

General Chennault said he did not believe American ground troops would be needed in a showdown with the Red Chinese.

"We can use troops of friendly Asian nations who are plenty willing to fight if we supply them and provide air and sea assistance," he said. "We can run the Chinese Reds out of China if we will use our Asian allies who want to fight."

COMBINED FORCE

He said the Chinese Nationalists have a greater combined, first-class fighting force than the Red Chinese.

"The Reds strained every muscle to get 1 million men into Korea and many of them were 'human wave' troops rather than first-class soldiers," he said.

He said he believed the Chinese Nationalists and South Koreans could put 2 million or 3 million men on the battlefields if America supplies them. The retired general also said he refused to go along with those who fear the great numbers of Chinese on the mainland.

"Red China's big population is not the deciding factor," he said.

LOGISTICS

"The real factor is what the Communists can equip and supply. Her tanks, guns, planes, and other main war items must come from Russia. This is a big logistic problem. Then, when the supplies get to China, she still has only one railroad to move them from north to south.

"If we let the South Koreans hit the Communists through North Korea and let the Chinese Nationalists hit the Reds in south China, the Chinese Reds will have two fronts and they cannot handle them."

Mr. MORSE. I offer this article only because it will show those who read my speech that there is a basis for the fear many of us in the Senate entertain that we run the grave danger that the Nationalist Chinese will manipulate us into a war with Red China, because the Nationalist Chinese know very well that if they are ever to be reestablished on the mainland of China, it will have to be with American aid; and obviously the best way to get us committed would be through a war.

So we have this difference of opinion within the committee and in the Senate. We have those who think that the word of the Nationalist Chinese can be relied upon. I do not speak for other Members of the Senate. They will have to speak for themselves on that subject. However, let me say that one of the foremost conservatives in the Senate, one of the greatest conservative statesmen living in America today, completely shares my point of view. In fact, he has expressed much more strongly than I have ever expressed, a lack of confidence in the reliability of Chiang. I have no confidence in Chiang, nor has this great conservative. We had better be very careful that we do not become involved in a situation in the Formosa Straits whereby the Nationalist Chinese, by maneuver, manipulation, and intrigue, call the first shots for us, so far as involvement in a war with Red China is concerned.

I do not see how I could be more frank than that. Having said that, I express another reason why I will not vote to give to any President of the United States the broad, sweeping powers granted by the joint resolution, which the Senator from Georgia, in the debate today, has described as words of limitation.

Before I close, I invite attention to an excellent article which appeared in the Washington Post and Times-Herald of this morning. The article was written by Mr. Walter Lippmann. Yesterday I discussed two of his articles on the Formosa issue. They are masterful articles. In his message the President said, "The warning signals are flying." Walter Lippmann has been running up signals of warning to the American people in the brilliant articles he has been writing during the past few days on the Formosan danger, as involved in the pending joint resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Walter Lippmann be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. So far as I know, it may have been offered by some other Senator for publication in the RECORD, but even so, I wish to have it printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks as supporting documentary evidence backing up the arguments I have been making this afternoon.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

THE TROUBLESOME CLAUSE

The chances, such as they are, of arranging a cease-fire in the Formosa Strait would seem in the first instance to depend upon what the administration has in mind about the offshore islands. Certain of these offshore islands are referred to in congressional resolution and are called the related positions and territories of that area.

The administration seems to be saying that though the United States is not going to enlarge its defensive obligation beyond Formosa and the Pescadores as provided by the treaty, the President will probably decide to defend some of the offshore islands as a way of defending Formosa.

Beyond our legal right to defend Formosa and the Pescadores, which cannot be doubted, the administration is asserting that it has also a strategic right to defend Quemoy and other islands if it chooses to do so. In this area where it is asserting a strategical right, the administration has adopted a policy of deliberate ambiguity. Thus there is for the time being no demarcation line at which a cease-fire could be agreed to.

Without a demarcation line there cannot be a cease-fire. In order to have a cease-fire the armed forces of the two sides must know where the fence between them is.

We may ask ourselves whether it was necessary for the President to ask Congress to vote him authority to act beyond the legal line in the off-shore islands. Not, I submit, so long as our defensive obligations do not go beyond the legal line of Formosa and the Pescadores. The President has undoubted legal power to repel aggression against territory over which the United States has legal rights, and this power has always carried with it the right to strike out beyond the geographic line to repel the aggression.

Congress, when it makes a declaration of war, does not specify, as does this resolution, what is to be the strategic plan of the war. No one need doubt that if an invasion force threatening the conquest of Formosa were building up in the Chinese ports, the authority to defend Formosa would carry with it the authority to take preventive measures.

The trouble with this clause is not that it authorizes the President to do certain things that might be necessary if an invasion of Formosa were being mounted. The trouble

with this clause is that for all practical purposes it commits him to defend islands that lie outside the legal area in which the United States has rights. The President would have just as much authority in the military sense and he would have a far freer hand in the diplomatic sense if somebody had not persuaded the President to insert the "related positions and territories" clause.

This clause raises what appear to be serious obstacles to the project of a truce through the U. N. We do not know, of course, if there is any conceivable arrangement acceptable here to which Chou En-lai would agree. But what was possible would have been wide support among our allies in Europe and among the uncommitted nations of Asia for a clear-cut cease-fire proposal at the jurisdictional line. We cannot expect much support for our strategical claims beyond the legal line. Whatever their military importance may be—and the President did not rate them very high last September—they are a political and diplomatic liability today.

The clause raises also new and serious practical difficulties. The position of the administration is that we have a strategical right to defend Quemoy, which is less than 5 miles from the mainland, because we have a legal right to defend Formosa. But it is not we who are in Quemoy. It is Chiang's armed forces. Will they follow the same policy as we, namely a defensive policy? Or will they use the island to raid the mainland and to attack shipping? Unless Chiang is bound to the same defensive policy as we confine ourselves to, we shall be putting the power to make peace or war into his hands. That is a risk against which every precaution should be taken. It is a thousand pities that the administration has involved itself in such unnecessary and dangerous ambiguities.

This dangerous ambiguity suggests a conceivable line of action out of the muddle. It might begin with the reduction of Chiang's military action to strictly defense measures; it might go on from this to some kind of a negotiated arrangement—possibly in the U. N. or in the corridors of the U. N.—for an implicit, perhaps later for an explicit, demilitarization of the related positions and territories.

It cannot, I believe, be said too often or too insistently that if there is hope of a modus vivendi, it lies in some kind of acceptance by Peiping and Washington of the fact that the jurisdictional line is where the fighting has ended. The Senate would serve the vital interests of the United States if it found some way of clarifying the distinction between our genuine rights in this area and our strategical notions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Lippmann says:

The administration seems to be saying that though the United States is not going to enlarge its defensive obligation beyond Formosa and the Pescadores as provided by the treaty, the President will probably decide to defend some of the offshore islands as a way of defending Formosa.

Beyond our legal right to defend Formosa and the Pescadores, which cannot be doubted, the administration is asserting that it has also a strategic right to defend Quemoy and other islands if it chooses to do so. In this area where it is asserting a strategical right, the administration has adopted a policy of deliberate ambiguity. Thus there is for the time being no demarcation line at which a cease-fire could be agreed to.

Without a demarcation line there cannot be a cease-fire. In order to have a cease-fire the Armed Forces of the two sides must know where the fence between them is.

We may ask ourselves whether it was necessary for the President to ask Congress to vote him authority to act beyond the legal line in the offshore islands. Not, I submit, so long as our defensive obligations do not go beyond the legal line of Formosa and the Pescadores. The President has undoubted legal power to repel aggression against territory over which the United States has legal rights, and this power has always carried with it the right to strike out beyond the geographic line to repel the aggression.

Congress, when it makes a declaration of war, does not specify, as does this resolution, what is to be the strategic plan of the war. No one need doubt that if an invasion force threatening the conquest of Formosa were building up in the Chinese ports, the authority to defend Formosa would carry with it the authoritly to take preventive measures.

The trouble with this clause is not that it authorizes the President to do certain things that might be necessary if an invasion of Formosa were being mounted. The trouble with this clause is that for all practical purposes it commits him to defend islands that lie outside the legal area in which the United States has rights. The President would have just as much authority in the military sense and he would have a far freer hand in the diplomatic sense if somebody had not persuaded the President to insert the "related positions and territories" clause.

This clause raises what appear to be serious obstacles to the project of a truce through the U. N. We do not know, of course, if there is any conceivable arrangement acceptable here to which Chou En-lai would agree. But what was possible would have been wide support among our allies in Europe and among the uncommitted nations of Asia for a clear-cut cease-fire proposal at the jurisdictional line.

Mr. President, the article is a pretty strong argument in support of many of the points I have made in the course of this debate. I have a reservation with respect to one observation made by Mr. Lippman, and that relates to the right of the United States to proceed to make a strike within the sovereign territory of another nation, based only upon the assumption that we believe the other nation is about to make war upon us.

However, the point he makes in regard to the handicaps which the resolution will create for the United Nations is a point of vital importance, because I believe if we shall pass the resolution we will make it more difficult for the United Nations to take action by way of assuming jurisdiction over Formosa.

That leads me to comment upon the position taken by Anthony Eden today, as reported in the press. In one part of his statement Mr. Eden gives assurance to the House of Commons that the President's proposed resolution is defensive only. Then he proceeds at once to point out the concern about what may be encompassed in the resolution in respect to the islands of Quemoy and Matsu, and the other islands which are a short distance off the coast of China.

We cannot read Eden's statement, or the reports of the statement made by his opposition in the House of Commons, without reaching the conclusion that the British leaders are very much concerned about the very point I have been stressing in the speech this afternoon, namely, the war dangers which are created by any program on the part of the United States to defend the islands of Quemoy and Matsu, particularly with the military Nationalists occupying them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of my remarks certain representative communications which I have received from people across the country with respect to this issue.

I wish to have them inserted in the RECORD because they are very clear evidence of what the growing public opinion in this country is on the issue before us. They predict what will be the sweeping reaction in the country if time is allowed for the people to react to the resolution. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the communications may be published in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. SALTONSTALL in the chair]. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published at this point in my remarks an excellent editorial which appeared in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald. It is entitled "Clouds Over Quemoy." It is an editorial which expresses some of the very deductions and points I made, both in my argument yesterday and in my argument this afternoon.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLOUDS OVER QUEMOY

It is both proper and desirable for Members of the Senate to explore the obscurities in the President's Formosa message. The tension over Formosa Strait is potentially a great deal more serious than what Secretary Wilson, with more than customary ineptitude, at first termed "just a little ripple" in the larger defense problem. More important than speed in passing the resolution is the need to understand precisely what obligations and risks this country would assume respecting the Quemoy and Matsu Islands.

Offhand the administration plan to defend these islands as temporary bargaining points—with retaliation against the mainland if necessary—represents a reversal of the President's decision of last September that Quemoy was not worth involvement in a major war. The context today, to be sure, has changed. The administration now has clarified its position elsewhere by abandoning the Tachen Islands and by writing off Chiang Kai-shek's pretensions to the mainland.

Nevertheless, the retention of the Quemoys and Matsus represents a gamble, and the question is whether this gamble is worth the clash it might involve. Admiral Radford has been more forthright than some other spokesmen in stating the possible consequences. Strategically, it seems to this newspaper, an exposed position on these islands makes no more sense than it did last September. Presumably the islands would be useful for detecting a Communist buildup and interdicting an invasion of Formosa. But, contrary to the status of Formosa, the legal title to which remains indeterminate, these islands always have been Chinese; and the presence of what the Communists regard as hostile forces at outposts athwart Amoy and Foochow would remain a constant irritant and provocation. It is a little as if someone insisted on holding Ellis Island in New York Harbor as protection against an invasion of Nantucket.

It would be highly unfortunate to permit confusion over Quemoy to overshadow the broader meaning of the President's message and the sensible change of policy it represents. Furthermore, no serious question has been raised about the determination to

defend Formosa. National unity in this determination, as reflected by emphatic approval in Congress, is important. For this reason, especially, the administration would be wise to take note of the criticisms with a view toward amending the resolution to make the American position respecting these two danger points less risky and more specific.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, finally, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "Who Owns Formosa?" published in the Baltimore Sun of this morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO OWNS FORMOSA?

When Mr. Hammarskjöld returned from his trip to China, he reported that many other questions besides that of releasing the captive flyers had been discussed. He then went over his trip privately and at length with Mr. Dulles. We do not know what he told Mr. Dulles. He may have reported that the Communist Chinese proposed an island deal of some sort. He may have reported that the Chinese were intransigent in their declaration of intention to gain Formosa and the other Nationalist-held islands.

What we do know is that the President's latest action in requesting "fight-if-we-must" authority from Congress followed soon thereafter. Whatever Mr. Hammarskjöld told Mr. Dulles, the President's action was taken in full cognizance of it and was hence in part determined by it.

But whatever the precise motivation may be, one consequence of this action is to raise again the question, Who owns Formosa?

There was a time back in 1948 when the question might perhaps have been settled once and for all, for the question of title to Formosa was ambiguous then while also there were excellent reasons for settling it decisively.

Up until 1895, Formosa was owned by China and was treated as a sort of colonial appendage. In 1895 it passed to Japan by treaty and became a Japanese colony. At the Cairo Conference in 1943, in midwar, we declared it our object to return "Manchuria, Formosa and the Pescadores * * * to the Republic of China." Following the Japanese surrender, therefore, representatives of the Chinese Nationalist Government moved back into de facto possession of Formosa. But it was only de facto possession: Final disposition of the island awaited a peace treaty with Japan. Formosa was definitely not to be Japanese, but it was not yet Chinese.

Not long after, two new considerations arose, both affecting the question of Formosa. One was the imminent collapse of the Chinese Nationalist Government. The other, hinging on this collapse, was the strategic importance to the free world of keeping Formosa out of Communist hands.

The collapse of the Nationalists could have been read as a release from the Cairo obligation, since to all intents and purposes the Nationalist Government had ceased to govern effectively and the Chinese Peoples' Republic of the Communists was not, and has not since been, looked upon as its legitimate successor by most nations. The collapse could have been taken as an opportunity, then, to establish Formosa as, say, a trusteeship under the United Nations. This would have neutralized Formosa once and for all, so serving the strategic interest of the free world as well, no doubt, as the interests of the much-exploited Formosans themselves.

This would, to be sure, have left the Nationalist Government without any land to stand on and would have made more difficult the support of the Nationalists, against Chinese Communist claims, as the legitimate government of China. Chiang Kai-shek thereupon established the seat of his government at Taipeh. Within the practical limits set by the Communists, and leaning heavily on the United States, he has continued to exercise the powers of sovereignty.

And yet title of the Chinese Nationalists to Formosa has remained ambiguous. The Japanese Peace Treaty evades the question This country has made no formal declaration on the subject. Though it has been brought up from time to time in the United Nations, determination has been postponed for one reason or another. In view of the decisive step that the President, with the apparent support of Congress, has now taken, postponement seems unlikely to continue much longer.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in closing, I should like to say I know full well that there will be a great many other statements made during the course of this debate in opposition to and by way of rebuttal of my arguments. I do not propose to answer all of them, but only those which I think have merit. I shall do it by way of so-called summary speeches. I shall wait until I have heard a series of speeches in opposition to the position I have taken, and then I shall give a summary of my answers to those arguments.

With respect to the sovereignty argument, I know of nothing in the speech of the Senator from Georgia which to the slightest extent causes me to modify one iota the doctrine of sovereignty which I stated yesterday.

Certainly we cannot justify committing an act of war upon any nation which has any sovereign rights, even though they may be only de facto rights.

We have the right to protect Formosa, but there is no right under the doctrine of sovereignty for us to participate in a civil war on the islands of Quemoy and Matsu, or on any other coastal islands which unquestionably fall within the sovereignty of China, not of the United States.

We do not have the slightest legal right to exercise control over the sovereign territory of another nation. I explained in some detail yesterday why, as a part of our obligations still growing out of World War II, we have the right and the duty to maintain peace in the Formosa area until such time as Formosa can be turned over to the United Nations under some form of a United Nations protectorate.

I hope that the administration will reconsider the language of the resolution. I respectfully suggest to the administration that it follow one of the following two courses of action: Either announce to the leadership of the Senate in charge of this resolution that it will accede to striking from the language of the resolution the broad, sweeping language to which the Humphrey amendment is directed, or accept the Kefauver substitute, which gives an emphasis where I think emphasis belongs, namely, upon the importance of having the United Nations come into the picture quickly by way of official representation on the part of the American Ambassador to the United Nations to both the Security Council and the General Assembly, announcing that pending United Nations action we shall defend Formosa and the Pescadores, and only Formosa and the Pescadores.

I respectfully submit, Mr. President, that unless we follow some such course of action we shall not be giving the heed we should give to the calculated risks of peace, but will be enhancing the probability of the calculated risks of war.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Continue to propose your constructive amendments.

ARTHUR ROSS,
Studio City, Calif.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE:
This is to express our appreciation of your efforts to remove the blank-check aspects of the Formosa resolution. Certainly this is no time for such ambiguity as this resolution contains regarding the coastal islands and possible military action. Every effort should be made to reach a solution to this tense situation through the United Nations rather than through unilateral action.

RAYMOND WILSON,
Friends Committee on National Legislation.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 25, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE:
HONORABLE SENATOR: I am writing in protest to the stand taken on the Formosa trouble. I suggest this matter be taken up before the United Nations before the United States is plunged into a one-nation war.
Then the decision will be a collective one of all nations.
Respectfully,
Mrs. JEWELL L. THOMPSON, Sr.,
Democratic Committeewoman.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE:
Wish to express agreement with your position against preventive war.

LYDIA KERR.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Your television speech was great. We are absolutely opposed to any military involvement near China. Any dispute should be handled by the United Nations.

Mrs. JOHN HARRIS.

OXFORD, OHIO, *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
I agree with President's appraisal of Formosan situation but am aghast this incredible blanket grant of authority to the President. Urge you at least plead for Senate to delay action until can get full debate of constitutional consequences or until it is amended with some limitations. Letter following.

THOMAS HOVET.

WATCH HILL, R. I., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:
We support your stand on President's resolution. While we believe defense of Formosa and Pescadores is right, provisions to attack Chinese mainland is dangerous, almost certainly leading to nuclear war. Please press for U. N. cease fire.

ALICE LOUISE GREER.
MARY RUTH OLIVER

SAN JOSE, CALIF., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
The purpose of this message is to strengthen your voice in opposition to the Formosa resolution. War danger is imminent. Must be avoided. We are now acting alone. We must work through United Nations. Going alone is suicidal.
OTTO VON HERMANN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate Building:
Very impressed with television talk, agree completely, keep on fighting.
Mrs. ANNETTE KARDON.

DETROIT, MICH., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Commend you on courageous stand to protect American lives. No winner when the atom bomb falls.
Mr. and Mrs. AARON KRASNER.

WHITESTONE, N. Y., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: We were heartened by your courageous and independent stand on the crucial issue of Formosa. We are hoping that you can clearly and forcefully carry your argument through the committee in favor of presenting the case to the U. N.
SEYMOUR CUKER.

SYRACUSE, N. Y., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Hearty congratulations on vote against the defend-Formosa resolution in committee. Continue fight in Senate.
HORACE A. EATON.

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF., *January 26, 1955.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
We support your stand for consideration consequences unilateral action in Formosa. Every channel of approach and negotiation should be examined to avert open hostility and to strengthen the bond of world brotherhood. The United States is in unique position to lead in building peace through United Nations.
Mr. and Mrs. STANLEY CANOLES.
RAY CONATSER, Jr.
Rev. and Mrs. HERBERT M. FINK.
Mrs. WM. N. FRAZEE.
WARREN MCELROY.
Mr. and Mrs. CLINTON SHONBERGER.

SAN JOSE, CALIF., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Support you in opposition to Formosa resolution for the following reasons: Gives Eisenhower unlimited war powers, United States will be acting alone, Asiatic countries should be consulted. This is a United Nations problem. Take it there.
DONALD H. CLARK.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We wholeheartedly support you in your fight against the administration's request for unlimited power in defense of Formosa. This issue should be handled through the United Nations. Please try in every way to stop this preventive war policy from being passed in the Senate.
Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT FRANZ.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your brave patriotic stand regarding the Formosa question. We stand behind you in your fight against a preventive war.
B. J. and SARAH SHERMAN.

MONTEBELLO, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Support your stand against authorizing preventive war. Best of luck to you and those who agree with you in debate to come.
ELIZABETH ALLEN.

COMPTON, CALIF., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations for your courageous stand on the Formosa question today. American people will agree if you can get debate on issue.
Mr. and Mrs. J. G. FRYE.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Work as you never have before. The heart and hopes of those who share similar ethical first principles are with you.
THOMAS F. WRIGLEY.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Appreciate your stand against war power resolution. Urge you to filibuster or delay action any possible way so as to give people time to speak to their Senators. When they do this monstrous measure will never pass. Yours for peace and the honor of America.
MALCOLM and LILLIAN CALDWELL.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Earnestly urge you vote no power to President to arbitrarily make war with China. This is invitation to all-out war which would open door to nuclear destruction. World is sick of war; cannot survive devastation of modern warfare.
PAULINE WATKINS.

OAKLAND, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
All support for your fight against the China war resolution. Parents everywhere will be grateful for your courage.
Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT E. TREUHART.

SAN JOSE, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Urge you continue your opposition to Eisenhower resolution on China.
Mr. and Mrs. FRANK FULLER.

BERKELEY, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
This madness to unleash a grim war must be stopped. Millions of Americans support the position you are taking. Please do not waiver.
BARBARA SICULAR.

MONTEREY PARK, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We too are against preventive war. Support your stand. Encourage you to bring out all implications of this action.
ALFRED O. TRUMPLER and
MARJORIE S. TRUMPLER.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
I heartily support your stand on the Formosan resolution. Millions of Americans prefer negotiation to fighting an ill-advised war. Please inform the Nation that the resolution will negative support from our allies and will further lower our prestige among the free peoples of the world.
HENRY R. SEARLE.

SAUSALITO, CALIF., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We thank you for your stand on the Formosa issue.
Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. DOUGLAS ROBERTS.

CUPERTINO, CALIF., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
In the interest of peace I urge that the United Nations be trusted to deal with the Formosa crisis. Also that the Asian countries be consulted to avert a major war.
Sincerely,
MINNIE FISHMAN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We agree President's Formosa plan increases danger of war. War now means holocaust many million American urban residents and therefore constitutes insanity.
VOGEL, KAPLAN, FRANKEL,
Attorneys.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:
Delay war power vote. Public uninformed.
Mr. and Mrs. WALLACE CAYARD.

SHERMAN OAKS, CALIF., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Thanks for sticking for sanity.
EDWARD P. BAILEY.

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your brave stand against war resolution. We beg you insist on continuance debate until people realize what is being done and can protest. God help you carry on for the people, democracy, and peace.
REBECCA SHELLEY.

MODESTO, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE:
Greatly commend your objection to President's war proposal.
CALL B. BENSON, M. D.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE:
Congratulations on Wednesday's preventive-war speech. Warm support for your opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 28.
JOHN DICKINSON.

LINDSBORG, KANS., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Three cheers for you. I am glad someone had the courage to speak up for the American people. This is one of the few times I have agreed with you.
MARGARET S. GREENOUGH.

BURLINGTON, VT., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Please keep on fighting in Congress to keep our boys from fighting in Asia. We depend on Congress and the President to conduct our affairs so that peace is kept. We want no needless, horrible war.
Mrs. GABRIEL LEVIN.

BOSTON, MASS., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE:
We want peace.
Z. PLAUT.

LAFAYETTE, IND., *January 26, 1955.*
WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank you for working against Chinese war. Keep debate going for few more days and even Washington will hear people's prayers for peace.
JOHN SCHUDER.

CICERO, ILL., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Please continue objection to resolution. Refer to Lippmann's definition of Formosa, today's Chicago Sun-Times, for confirming your views. Futility of Chinese war coincides with lecture to teachers given here 15 years ago by noted Chinese writer who said, "Going into China like going into a cloud." Help our boys.
LORAINE DAVIS.

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations. Keep the debate going until the American people can be heard.
LEONARD WENIG.

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulate your stand against Eisenhower resolution which could lead us to war. Such provocation can only alienate your stand against Eisenhower resolution which could lead us to war. Such provocation can only alienate our allies and put our country in bad standing internationally.
Mr. and Mrs. JAMES HUFFORD and
Mr. and Mrs. DONALD RANDSTAD.

DETROIT, MICH., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Encouraged by your TV analysis to believe that some Members of Senate will avoid emotional and blind following of trap set by China lobby. Thank you and more power to you.
BETTY JENNINGS RICHTER.

DETROIT, MICH., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Commend your position on Formosa for the sake of our children. Let's not rush into a war. There is time for open hearings and work through the United Nations.
MARY ANN DOOHA.

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your fight against the danger of a preventive war in the Pacific. Your stand will give us time to urge our Senators to support you.
LEO and ROSALIE BERMAN.

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Your stand in the Senate today made me feel that those who are afraid of unjustified war have a voice in their country's affairs. Thank you.
JOSEPH W. GROSSMAN.

CLAIRTON, PA., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Thanks and congratulations on your courageous stand against United States involvement in world war III. Would there were many more Senators to display similar courage and intelligence. God bless you.
C. J. COY.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Strongly urge opposition to Eisenhower's Formosa proposal, a serious threat to world peace.
Mrs. ROSE SMUKLER.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Be assured that what's left of American progressive tradition supports your position on Formosa. Despite your isolation you must put up a fight. Remember La Follette in 1917. America must base its Asian foreign policy on democratic Burma and India, not on an absurd island ruled by a discredited dictator.
EUGENE F. SUTER.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Continue intelligent opposition to Eisenhower resolution; otherwise we lose Asian and European sympathies.
E. A. NYSTROM, Jr.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Strongly and fervently urge Formosa question be taken to U. N. immediately. President's plan, especially protection of Quemoy and Matsu, certain to involve us in war. This will be the saddest hour in our Nation's history, if we permit ourselves to be sucked into this horrible situation—it will mean all-out war.
MONICA HALLER.
ILYANA BROMBERG.

LAURELTON, N. Y., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations your courageous stand against resolution. Keep up the fight.
SAUL SCHINDLER.

BROOKLINE, MASS., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations. Keep up the good and, we hope, successful fight.
Mr. and Mrs. BEN ALPER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Keep up fight against Formosa resolution and urge support Kefauver amendment United States settlement of Formosa problems.
ALBERT MONROE.
HELEN MONROE.

LOS ALTOS, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate:
We are prayerfully certain that you have the support of the people in your courageous opposition to the Formosa resolutions.
Mr. and Mrs. IRA SANDPERL.

HOT SPRINGS, ARK., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE:
As a Republican voter and campaigner for Eisenhower I hope—certainly with millions of other Americans—that you will not submit to pressure for hysteria because your courage can still save the lives of millions of American men, women, and children.
Dr. K. KAUFMANN-GRINSTEAD.

NEWTON, MASS., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Commend your fight on President's resolution. Urge all possible limitations to minimize danger our involvment in war.
Dr. and Mrs. ROBERT GOLDSTEIN.

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Congratulations on your stand on President's request.
LEONARD B. MEYER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Keep up your fight for peace. Save the lives of the American people. God bless you.
CHARLOTTE PASCAL.
JOSEPH PASCAL.
IRMA PASCAL.

PEDRO VALLEY, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We most strongly approve your stand against Formosa resolution.
JANICE and JOSEPH FULFORD.

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
You are right. Let U. N. work out issue.
GUS and LOUISE NIEHAUS.

MOBILE, ALA., *January 27, 1955.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building:
Heartiest congratulations. Respects to Senator LANGER. Block that pass.
Sincerely,
VAN NESS NOLAN.

DAYTON, OHIO, *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE:
We're with you on Formosa issue.
MR. and MRS. HARRY J. WHALEY.

IOWA CITY, IOWA, *January 26, 1955.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Support your stand opposing Formosa resolution. Please continue efforts to stop this legislation.
WM. DICKEY.

BALTIMORE, MD., *January 27, 1955.*
SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Congratulations on your courage and statesmanship in Formosa debate.
Mr. and Mrs. HERBERT SHUGER.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*
SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Senate of the United States:
We agree with everything you said on television today. Please try to make it clear to the Senate.
Dr. and Mrs. WALTER W. HAMBURGER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We support your opposition to special powers.
DOROTHY and ROBERT KAHAN.

DAYTON, OHIO, *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
On the Formosa issue you are absolutely right.
JOHN KENNEDY.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Bravo, your stand on Presidential resolution. Keep up good work to lessen possibility of war.
Mrs. LEAH CAMPANELLA.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 25, 1955.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE.
DEAR SENATOR: I protest the Formosa stand taken. I suggest the matter be taken up with United Nations, before we are plunged into a war of only one nation, then whatever the results will be a collective decision of all nations.
I am a precinct Democrat commiteeman, No. 438.
J. L. THOMPSON.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I plead with you to oppose any measure which will take the power to declare war from Congress and to hand it to the President and to the military. Do your very best to defeat this measure, or to attach amendments limiting its use.
If Red China were to meddle in our affairs at the very door of America, the United States would declare war immediately.
We dare not risk war. Exert your influence in the cause of humanity.
Sincerely,
KATHERINE J. WARNER.

BERKELEY, CALIF., *January 25, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: I am much concerned by the hasty action taken by this Government in connection with China. I do not believe the public interest of this country is being served when the Congress rushes through such important matters as probable war without giving the people an opportunity to express their disapproval in the public forums.
As a mother of three children who are of school age I am deeply concerned about the present state of this country. I do not want to see another war and I do firmly believe that you can and must, as a public figure, find some more honest and sane way of solving international disputes other than war.
Yours very truly,
ELIZABETH WHITE.

OMAHA, NEBR., *January 25, 1955.*
The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.
MY DEAR SENATOR: We are alarmed at the attempt to set our defense line a few miles off the China coast.
After extricating ourselves from the costly Korean mess, surely Congress will not send American boys again to die so many thousands of miles from their homes under the guise of defense.
If the Joint Chiefs make as many errors in judgment as they did during the Korean fiasco, it could easily cost us our material entity. One mistake will be too many as the next war will be for keeps.
Please use your influence to reconsider action that will be likely to plunge us into atomic war.
Thank you,
I am, sincerely,
MAUDE FARGHER.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate:
Your information to the public clear courageous, convincing. Fight for time to reach all the people. We want no war with China. Want the continued support of our allies on the jurisdictional line. We want the United Nation solution of Formosa problem.
EDITH J. GOODE.

ALBION, MICH., *January 27, 1955.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate:
Congratulations on opposition to President's Formosan policy. Peaceful solution imperative.
ARTHUR W. MUNK.

ARLINGTON, MASS., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
We support your stand opposing resolution granting President Eisenhower full war powers regarding Formosa.
ELAINE and HERBERT SILLS.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *January 27, 1955.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
I believe the President's requests are fraught with deadly peril. I am back of you in your fight against these requests as they now stand.
ELIZABETH B. BOYDEN.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Urge settle Formosa crisis in U. N. We must have peace.
SARA SHILLER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
We add our support to your stand on the offshore island and Formosa.
HARRY PHILLIPS 3D and ESTELLE HABE.

NEWTON, MASS., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Thanks for telling truth about China. Keep fighting.
Mr. and Mrs. ARTHUR KORB.

OAKLAND, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
I am solidly behind you in your decision regarding Formosa situation. You have my deep regard and respect for your courage and honesty.
Sincerely yours,
PATRICIA KING.

BOSTON, MASS., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up magnificent fight to limit President's resolution and avoid war.
Mr. and Mrs. JAMES ALACH.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Wonderful; hold your ground until people speak. Refer resolution to United Nations.
OLGA BURROUGHS.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Clevelanders approve your efforts to prevent what could be hundred-year war with China. You and sympathetic Senators filibuster if you must until sanity prevails in Washington. God bless you.
RITA OCHMANN,
Manager, Cerita Bureau.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Congratulations on your courageous stand.
E. SUTHERLAND KONIGSBERGER.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Formosa resolution should be referred to United Nations to demonstrate our good intentions for peace.
AUBREY HERRINGTON.

PATCHOGUE, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Grateful for your stand against President Eisenhower's resolution. No action should be taken outside United Nations.
BETSY S. VAN PELT.
JOHN V. VAN PELT.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Wish to commend you on your position on the Formosa proposal. Feel that the future of my children is at stake. Continue your excellent patriotic stand.
Mrs. LEONORA S. RIVERS,
A Mother.

RACINE, WIS., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C..
SIR: Let's have some enlightening discussion on the vague Formosa resolution. What's the rush?
NICK CARIELLO.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE:
Continue to resist the Formosan resolution. It should permit a preventive war. Good luck.
CHARLES TALBOT.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate:
Congratulations on your stand. Sober thought needed before Senate action.
NATALIE B. KIMBER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Thank you for your deep concern for peace as evidenced by your position against preventive or other war in current discussions on China.
BENJAMIN SEGAL, M. D.

RICHMOND, IND., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Congratulations on stand against Formosa resolution. Urgent U. N. negotiate cease fire.
THOMAS and PATRICIA BASSETT.
MARGARET KNOLLENBERG.
CARRIE LANE CHARLES.
ELEANOR ZELLIOTT.
EDITH WILDMAN.

BOSTON, MASS., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Keep up good fight against Formosa resolution. It is not committing political suicide.
GUSTA BLAINE NISSEN.

NORWOOD, MASS., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Your remarks on TV program today concerning President's proposed resolution exceptionally clear. I trust Senators will heed your warning and vote for HUMPHREY and KEFAUVER amendments.
E. ROSALIND SCHULTZ.

SHAWANO, WIS., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Admire your views. Let this not be a spineless Senate.
M. E. BLACK.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In accordance with the previous order, the Senate will stand in recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Thereupon, at 7 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m. the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, January 28, 1955, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate January 27, 1955:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Nepal.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 27, 1955:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Philip Alexander Ray, of California, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Leverett Edwards, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1958.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Kenneth H. Tuggle, of Kentucky, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1961.

Everett Hutchinson, of Texas, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1958.

FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD

G. Joseph Minetti, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1958.

Ben H. Guill, of Texas, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1957.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The following-named persons for appointment to the grades indicated:

To be lieutenants effective December 10, 1954

Charles B. Williams
Jay A. Small, Jr.
Alexander D. Holman, Jr.

To be lieutenants (junior grade) effective December 10, 1954

Walter F. Condon
Rudolph V. Cassani

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

John Robert O'Connor

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations, to be effective date of acceptance:

To be senior assistant surgeons

Kenneth W. Momeyer, Jr.
Len H. Andrus

To be assistant surgeons

Allen C. Pirkle
John F. Lee, Jr.

To be surgeons

William L. Ross, Jr.
Roger L. Black

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers

Lawrence C. Gray
Melvin W. Carter
Shinji Soneda

To be scientist

Colvin L. Gibson

To be senior sanitarian

Maurice E. Odoroff

To be veterinarian

Samuel Abramson

To be nurse officer

Marie F. Hansel

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 27, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in this moment of worship and quiet waiting upon Thee, may we seek and sense the guiding presence and sustaining power of Thy divine spirit.

Inspire us with a resolute determination to consider and support fearlessly those policies and actions which we honestly believe are well pleasing unto Thee.

Help us to keep in high visibility the glorious assurance that being girded with the shield of faith and the breastplate of righteousness we shall be able to defend ourselves against all the forces of evil.

Hear us in the name of the Captain of our Salvation. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 145. An act to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 44):

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. HAYDEN, of Arizona; Mr. GREEN, of Rhode Island; and Mr. JENNER, of Indiana.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. GREEN, of Rhode Island; Mr. MANSFIELD, of Montana; Mr. GORE, of Tennessee; Mr. BARRETT, of Wyoming; and Mr. MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin.

The message also announced that the Senator from Maryland, Mr. BUTLER, and the Senator from North Carolina, Mr. ERVIN, be appointed members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

The message also announced that the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. PASTORE, and the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. PURTELL, be appointed members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT PAUL E. MAGLOIRE, OF HAITI

The SPEAKER of the House of Representatives presided.

At 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m. the Doorkeeper announced the Vice Presi-

dent and the Members of the United States Senate.

The Vice President took the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate took the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort His Excellency the President of Haiti into the Chamber, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. McCORMACK, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MARTIN, the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. RICHARDS, and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. CHIPERFIELD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate, the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort, the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. CLEMENTS, the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. SALTONSTALL, the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. GREEN, and the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. WILEY.

The Doorkeeper announced the Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the members of the President's Cabinet, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

At 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m. the Doorkeeper announced His Excellency the President of Haiti.

His Excellency the President of Haiti, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the high privilege and the great honor of presenting to you the President of the Republic of Haiti. [Applause, the Members rising.]

ADDRESS OF HIS EXCELLENCY, PAUL E. MAGLOIRE, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF HAITI

The PRESIDENT of Haiti. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply grateful for the opportunity to visit Washington as a guest of President Eisenhower and for the privilege of addressing the Congress of the United States. It has been an honor for me and for Madame Magloire to come here and we are looking forward to visiting some of the cities and institutions which symbolize the historical, political, and economic traditions of the United States and its people.

As one enters the magnificent harbor of New York toward evening, when the beauty of the American coastline reveals itself in the most fairylike of settings, one is filled with an admiration which no words can express. Overcome by the intensity of emotion aroused by the beauty of the scene, each detail of which is multiplied on every side, creating a panorama of irresistible charm, one is left speechless. The newcomer half closes his eyes, seeking refuge in his thoughts. But a majestic light suddenly blazes forth, dazzling him. Bartholdi's colossal statue, the generous gift of France, stands out against the dark background of the sky, holding the beaconlight that shines, like a great star, above the vast harbor: Liberty, lighting the world. [Applause.]

This is how the United States first appeared to one of our greatest writers and thinkers, Antenor Firmin, who in his remarkable book, Mr. Roosevelt, President of the United States, and the Republic of Haiti, published in 1905, considered it his patriotic duty to make the Americans known to the Haitians and the Haitians to the citizens of your great country. His boundless admiration for all those pioneers who, as your history unfolded, built, stone by stone, the solid structure that was to become in the 20th century the citadel of all free peoples, inspired those immortal pages in which he exalted the heroic virtues that enabled our two nations to become the first independent states in the New World. [Applause.] In that great book Firmin proclaimed his faith in the destiny of an America where all the nations of the hemisphere, united in brotherhood, would work side by side as good friends toward the establishment on this earth of the gospel of universal peace and concord, so beautifully expressed in the Declaration of Independence of 1776, the immortally humane precepts of which, rather than the valiant captains, led the American soldiers to final victory on the battlefields of Saratoga and Yorktown. [Applause.]

These self-evident truths, which established the inalienable rights of all men to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, brought from Savannah to our land by such men as Beauvais, Lambert, Pinchinat, and Henri Christophe, putting weapons into the hands of Bookman, Biassou, and Jean-Francois, produced heroes of the stature of Toussaint L'Ouverture, Jean-Jacques Dessalines, and Alexandre Pétion, who passed the sacred torch on to Francisco Miranda, Simón Bolívar, O'Higgins, and San Martín for the greater glory of mankind. [Applause.]

However, despite the identity of views and thoughts that formed the basis of all the efforts of the men of good will of our hemisphere, it was with a certain reserve that, for more than a century, the eldest of the American nations looked upon its younger sisters. Even the famous declaration of December 2, 1823, better known as the Monroe Doctrine, which was intended to serve as a bulwark to the new South American states and to safeguard their independence, tended to arouse suspicion and did not evoke sentiments of confidence among our various peoples. Notwithstanding the individual manifestations of sympathy on the part of certain American philanthropists toward our great Toussaint L'Ouverture, and the proofs of friendship shown by the Boston and New York merchants toward the young Haiti, we have not always been regarded with the warm feelings of friendship which have been so evident to us here today.

Haiti's struggle for independence was a long and arduous one. During that struggle it was necessary to destroy its entire economy, build the Citadelle La-Ferriere, and affirm by the use of arms its unshakable will to obtain its freedom. Later, the necessity of paying heavy indemnities to France further retarded development. A great step forward was taken when your great President Abraham Lincoln became the first to recognize Haitian independence. Since that time Haiti has continued to stride forward and has endeavored by every means at its disposal to forge political and economic future worthy of its proud people.

Although world leaders such as Charles Sumner, William King, Senator Borah, and many others have shown an active interest in Haiti, it was not until Franklin Delano Roosevelt took office that the relations of cordiality and fraternity, which alone can make our hemisphere strong, really came into being. The good-neighbor policy, put into practice in 1934 by the withdrawal of the Marines from Haiti, inspired great confidence of the Haitians and all peoples of the Americas in the United States. It is this policy, happily continued by President Dwight D. Eisenhower, which enabled the Americas to present a united front against aggression during the last war, a united front which is maintained in the United Nations and at all international conferences for the defense of the free world. [Applause.] In San Francisco and Chapultepec the greatness of soul and altruistic spirit that have always characterized the American people, who have a deep respect for individual liberty, were fully revealed. Haiti takes pride in having been one of the first links in this unbroken chain of the union that now comprises the American states. She placed all the resources of her soil at the disposal of her good friend, substituting for regular crops those urgently needed for the war effort. Haiti will never regret these sacrifices, which it voluntarily undertook in order that there might be more brotherhood, solidarity, and understanding in the relations between the nations. In the face of the threat of international communism, the Republic of Haiti, at the side of your country, has taken active steps to eliminate all traces of communism within its country, because it is firmly convinced that democracy is the only form of government that favors the full expression of the individual. [Applause.]

Since the United States has demonstrated its will to cooperate closely with the American Republics and has taken numerous steps toward that end—establishment of the Export-Import Bank, initiation of the point 4 program, and so forth—a great hope is becoming a reality, and that era is beginning to dawn when all our nations will unite their efforts toward putting into practice the humanitarian principles set forth in the Constitution of the United States. No doubt, from time to time clouds darken

this atmosphere of confidence. We often complain of insufficient aid while distant countries receive considerable benefits. But we believe that our destiny is closely linked to that of the great American democracy for better or for worse. Like various members of the same family living in different cities, we feel the joys and sorrows that come to each of us, and we are obligated to help one another. Therefore, we believe strongly that despite the divergent views expressed at the Rio Conference, the agreements reached there will result in benefits to all the countries of the hemisphere. [Applause.]

Our visit to the United States, which has afforded us the privilege of being welcomed by one of the most brilliant soldiers of the 20th century and at the same time gives us the honor of being the guest of the Senate and the House of Representatives in joint session, is a new proof of the closeness of the relations between our two nations. The people of Haiti, who follow with interest President Eisenhower's personal efforts to eliminate prejudices of all sorts which constitute handicaps to the mutual understanding which is our common objective in this hemisphere, are very optimistic with respect to the future of these relations. In his merciless fight against the nefarious ideology which the forces of evil try by every means to establish on earth, President Eisenhower has shown that he is of the lineage of those eminent Americans, true citizens of the universe, whose acts throughout the history of this marvelous country aimed less at the greatness of the United States than at the triumph of those fundamental truths without which man cannot attain his goals. [Applause.] His efforts to arrive at international control and utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes have already won him the gratitude of all those who are concerned about the future of the human race. The understanding he has found both on the part of Members of Congress and of his fellow citizens and the unreserved approval of his efforts by all free peoples and by all those who aspire to be free, makes him the most authoritative spokesman of a civilization which refuses to fall into the chaos into which a degrading materialism is trying to drag it, which denies to man any rights as an individual.

His past achievements on the field of battle preserved the independence of the great and small nations of Europe, of Asia, and of the Americas. As Chief of State of a Nation which has from the day of its birth been the most perfect example of the value of a democratic government, he seeks to guarantee the right to life of those states whose every existence is threatened today. [Applause.] In this tribute of gratitude which the Americas owe President Eisenhower for his fruitful efforts, I am happy to join my voice to that of all the countries of this hemisphere, particularly the underdeveloped countries in which poverty constitutes a fertile field for the development of the noxious germs of communism. Thanks to the assistance which has been intensified since the beginning of the present administration, these small republics to a certain extent are seeing the handicaps to their evolution in the American community disappear. Such projects as those underway in my country in the Artibonite Valley, which have been made possible by loans from the Export-Import Bank and which will reclaim thousands and thousands of hectares of land and raise the standard of living of the whole population of those regions, represent for us the most efficient weapon for fighting communism. To be sure, we have taken legal measures to prevent not merely the extension but the very manifestation among us of this pernicious doctrine. We believe, however, that only the establishment in Haiti of decent conditions of life for our masses will make them immune to these theories. Since I took office as President, we have undertaken an extensive program for the liberation of the Haitians; we have, with our limited means, constructed schools, clinics, and workers' housing projects. Although the recent hurricane which struck our country has forced us to limit our efforts considerably, we are determined to continue the task, trusting in the great solidarity which the United States demonstrated on that occasion. We are assured of being able to do so, for the competent agencies of your country have already favorably received the steps we have taken to the end that satisfactory solutions might be found for all our vital problems. We are also confident of the favorable disposition of the Members of this Congress, which has always shown much interest in the cause of my country. I hope my presence among you in this memorable session will strengthen the spirit of good will which has existed here for so long. [Applause.]

The numerous expressions of sympathy which have been given us testify to your desire to continue this good-neighbor policy through which the American nations, more and more united, will constitute a living example of the possibility of the establishment throughout the world of that peace which the United States has been seeking for decades.

During the past few months we have seen many evidences of your concern for Haiti's welfare. The dramatic arrival of the aircraft carrier *Saipan* on the day after a disastrous hurricane struck our southern coast was instrumental in relieving the suffering of hundreds of our people. Subsequent aid in the form of food and medical supplies from the American Government, from the Red Cross, and other public and private agencies will long be remembered. It will soon be my pleasure, as a token of Haiti's appreciation, to decorate members of the United States Armed Forces and the aircraft carrier *Saipan* in recognition of their services. [Applause.]

In thanking you, Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, for your special attention, we beg you to accept with all the gratitude of the people and the Government of Haiti our sincere wishes for the ever-increasing greatness of the United States and the triumph of the ideals for which so many of her sons have died. [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 1 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m., His Excellency the President of Haiti, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Chamber.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The Members of the President's Cabinet.

The Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired at 2 o'clock p. m., the House was called to order by the Speaker.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 1)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committees on Armed Services and Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1915, as amended, establishing the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, I transmit herewith the 40th annual report of the Committee covering the fiscal year 1954.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 26, 1955.*

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2010) to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (c) of section 3 of the act of July 10, 1953, entitled "An act to establish a Commission on Intergovernmental Relations," is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) The Commission, not later than June 1, 1955, shall submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress its final report, including recommendations for legislative action; and the Commission may also from time to time make to the President such earlier reports as the President may request or as the Commission deems appropriate."

SEC. 2. Section 6 of such act of July 10, 1953, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"TERMINATION OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 6. The Commission shall cease to exist at the close of business on June 1, 1955."

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "June 1" and insert "June 30."

Page 2, line 7, strike out "June 1" and insert "June 30."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

COMMUNIST EXPOSURE

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have just received unanimous consent to address the House on Monday for 30 minutes, and the purpose will be to speak on a joint resolution which I have introduced today following the resolution of the Pennsylvania Bar Association and of the committee on un-American activities of the American Bar Association. My resolution provides that there be created a commission comprised of Members of the House and of the Senate and of the American Bar Association and of certain learned American societies, with the chairman appointed by the President, for the purpose of making available curricula, textbooks, and other necessary documents and material to be made available to the school system of America, if they see fit to so use it, to expose and teach to the American students just what communism is or is not. This information will in no way entail the interference by this Government with the American school system. Quite the contrary. But I think the time has come when this matter should be brought to the attention of and taught to the future students of this Nation by the responsible and through the responsible American way.

In my speech on Monday I will develop my thinking on this resolution in detail. I point out now, however, that the material to be utilized is to come only from testimony taken under oath before congressional committees or executive agencies so that only factual material will be made use of.

The resolution is entitled "to provide for a commission to make available information as to the basic differences between the theories and practices of the American way of life and the theories and practices of atheistic communism."

GI EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, today the House will have an opportunity to consider a bill to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952. It will be presented by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], who has led so many worthwhile fights for the Nation's veterans. He and his great Committee on Veterans Affairs are due the thanks and commendations of the House for their forthright action in speedily bringing this measure to the floor.

I doubt that there will be opposition to this measure. It is fair and right that it preserves an implied contractual obligation entered into by this Government with the personnel of its Armed Forces for educational and other benefits, which since have been terminated by Presidential directive.

The passage of H. R. 587 will clarify the situation and provide for the orderly termination of some of the wartime benefits now enjoyed by veterans, without denying to those persons already in the Armed Forces their just claim for all existing benefits. Its cost is material, but cost is not consequential when the good name of this Government in its relations with its service personnel and veterans is concerned.

FAILURE TO OFFER AMERICAN FARM COMMODITIES ON WORLD MARKETS AT COMPETITIVE PRICES

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked to extend in the RECORD a copy of the speech which I made to the National Agricultural Limestone Producers Association at its annual meeting this week.

I have asked for this time to point out that this speech and the hearings from which it quotes was made at a time when the members of the Committee on Ways and Means are considering the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act.

It is admitted by the Secretary of Agriculture that American farm commodities are not offered on world markets at competitive prices. It raises a very serious question as to whether the President or the Government should be permitted to lower tariffs and allow foreign articles to come in when that same Government follows a practice and policy of holding back American farm commodities and not even offering them in world trade. I believe this speech will be of interest to many who have not realized the Government has billions of dollars worth of farm commodities only because it will not sell them.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. REED of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House on Monday next for 15 minutes, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 112 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1955, the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters—

(1) relating to the procurement, use, and disposition of materiel, equipment, supplies, and services, and the acquisition, use, and disposition of real property, by or within the Department of Defense;

(2) relating to the military and civilian personnel under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense;

(3) involving the laws, regulations, and directives administered by or within the Department of Defense;

(4) involving the use of appropriated and nonappropriated funds by or within the Department of Defense; and

(5) relating to scientific research and development in support of the armed services.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution to continue the investigative powers of the Committee on Armed Services.

In accordance with the policy announced a few days ago with respect to these investigating committees, the committee has undertaken to define with some more particularity the jurisdiction of the investigations that may be conducted by that committee. I may say that the Committee on Rules considers this one of the most important investigatory powers the Congress has with respect to this particular committee. Members will recall the fine work that has been done by the Committee on Armed Services in keeping check in the years gone by on the vast expenditures of the Armed Services. I know that that committee has saved the Treasury hundreds of millions of dollars in reducing expenditures and has saved, I think, untold millions in the mere fact that we did have a watchdog over the huge expenditures of the various armed services departments.

Therefore, I hope that this resolution may have the unanimous support of the House.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, this resolution will confer necessary investigative powers upon the Armed Services Committee. In this resolution we have spelled out the exact subjects which we need to investigate. We want to define for the information of the House and all concerned the specific fields in which we shall inquire.

The addition of a continuing staff subcommittee, having subpena power, as a part of the House Armed Services Committee was put in effect in the 82d Congress; it was carried through the 83d Congress on the same basis.

We have found it to be an important arm of our committee and indispensable to the proper discharge of our responsibility. Because of the powers which are conferred on us, we will be able to obtain information and to move effectively and promptly to solve the many problems presented to us because of the magnitude of defense expenditures.

I will not recite the results of the investigation subcommittee. But, acting always within bounds prescribed by the chairman, and as they are defined in this resolution, our committee has been able to do a magnificent job for the Congress and for the armed services.

Published reports have often been referred to on the floor of the House: they are available for all to read.

I have only to tell you that in the last Congress an independent examination of our records showed the subcommittee had actually saved in excess of $200 million. We have exposed attempted influence peddling with a salutary effect. There are many other matters of an administrative nature which did not have a monetary value which have been investigated and settled by our Investigating Subcommittee.

In the 82d Congress the investigating power was exercised over a period of 16 months. During that time we presented reports on 27 subjects, resulting in incalculable savings to the Government and improvement in administration.

In the 22 months of investigations in the 83d Congress there were 26 reports on major inquiries and 179 of minor importance produced by the subcommittee.

The continuance of the investigative function is, therefore, of tremendous importance to the successful operation of our committee, and it is of transcendent importance to the taxpayer. I think I can properly say that the exercise of this function, as it has been administered in the 82d and 83d Congresses, has won the admiration and respect of every member of the committee and every person with whom the subcommittee has dealt.

We have always operated under rules of procedure. They have been widely read, approved, and copied. Most of the rules of our investigating subcommittee have been adopted by the Senate in the last few days. We have always had present a majority member and a minority member when any subcommittee action was taken. In the entire time there has never been occasion for the minority to disagree with actions taken or conclusions reached.

I propose in this Congress to continue and operate this investigative function on the same plane with the same effectiveness that it has operated in the 82d and 83d Congresses. We need it to do our work. We need it as an arm of our committee when so much money is involved in defense appropriations.

We fully agree with the policy of the Rules Committee. Our resolution defines exactly what we propose to do. We have sound rules of procedure. Every witness knows them and we follow them to the letter. We have and we will avoid duplications in investigations. We will confine our investigations to the number required to effectively do our job on the Armed Services Committee and we will do it within the budget allotted to us.

This last Congress, notwithstanding the tremendous amount of work done, we were able to turn back $39,245 of the appropriation allotted to us. It is, in my opinion, good management; but I believe it conforms to the spirit and intention of the House in conferring this authority upon us. I believe it is proof that we will merit your continued confidence.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to add to what my chairman has said, and I know of no one in opposition to this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 114 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1955, there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of 11 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, 6 from the majority party and 5 from the minority party, 1 of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of all types of small business, existing, arising, or that may arise, with particular reference to (1) the factors which have impeded or may impede the normal operations, growth, and development of the potentialities of small business; (2) the administration of Federal laws relating specifically to small business to determine whether such laws adequately serve the needs of small business; (3) whether Government agencies adequately serve and give due consideration to the problems of small business; (4) whether priorities and preferences established and allocations made by the Federal Government with respect to scarce materials adequately serve the needs of small business; and (5) methods of solving the special problems of small business arising by reason of the existing national emergency: *Provided*, That the committee shall not invade any subject matter under active investigation by any standing committee of the House.

The committee may from time to time submit to the House such preliminary reports as it deems advisable; and prior to the close of the present Congress shall submit to the House its final report on the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session may be filed with the Clerk of the House.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses

and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any properly designated chairman of a subcommittee thereof, or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half hour to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and I now yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, as appears from the reading of the resolution, it creates and continues a select committee to conduct a study and investigation of problems of small business. It is a study that has been made by this committee over the years, which is very important to the small businessmen throughout the country. I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I know of no one who is opposed to this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARMED FORCES EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 111) providing for the consideration of H. R. 587, a bill to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 587) to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of the House Resolution 111 which will make in order the consideration of the bill (H. R. 587) to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 111 provides for a closed rule with 1 hour of general debate on the bill itself.

H. R. 587 was reported out of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs with an amendment.

As we know, the President's proclamation issued on January 1, 1955, among other things ended the accumulation of any additional education and training time under Public Law 550 of the 82d Congress—Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952.

The law, as limited by the proclamation, provides that a veteran in the service on or after June 27, 1950, shall be entitled to 1½ days of education or training for each day of service prior to February 1, 1955, with a maximum of 36 months of education or training.

H. R. 587 attempts to take care of any inequities that might occur due to the effective date of the lapse in additional education and training time for the veterans. Specifically, the bill would provide that a serviceman may accumulate additional time after January 31, 1955, if he is in the service on that date, ending on the date of his first discharge or release from active service after January 31, 1955. This too would be subject to the maximum entitlement of 36 months education or training.

The Bureau of the Budget has stated that this bill would be in accord with the program of the President.

The estimated cost of the benefits granted under this bill would be about $25 million for fiscal year 1957, $60 million for fiscal year 1958, $90 million for 1959, $90 million for fiscal year 1960, and $70 million for 1961. After this the costs would decrease gradually.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has had the benefit of the views expressed by the Veterans' Administration, the Department of Defense, Selective Service, as well as the views expressed by many Members of the House. I hope that the rule will be adopted so that the House may then proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. What was the compelling reason or reasons for bringing this bill before the House under a closed rule?

Mr. O'NEILL. The reason is, as the gentleman is aware, that there are many, many bills presented before the committee concerning different types of benefits for veterans. This is emergency legislation to take care of the veterans who will enter the service during the month of January, or who entered just previous to the beginning of 1955.

Mr. GROSS. I certainly hope the Committee on Rules will not continue this practice of bringing out closed rules simply because there are other bills before the House on the same subject.

Mr. O'NEILL. As I said, as the gentleman knows, this is emergency legislation.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I know of no one opposed to this rule, and I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 587) to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 587, with Mr. WILLIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, to understand the effect of H. R. 587, I believe that it is desirable that I review the content of the President's proclamation issued on January 1, 1955, terminating the Korean war emergency period so far as it affects veteran benefits.

Wartime veteran benefits were extended to all personnel of the Armed Forces who served after June 27, 1950, and prior to the date determined by the President or the Congress by three laws. Public Law 28, 82d Congress, granted to veterans serving during the Korean emergency period hospital and medical care, pension, compensation, burial allowances, and certain other benefits identical to those provided for World War II service. Public Law 894, 81st Congress, extended the vocational rehabilitation program to persons disabled during the Korean emergency period on the same basis as previously provided World War II veterans. Public Law 550, 82d Congress, extended the readjustment program to veterans with service during the Korean emergency period on a basis similar to those benefits provided World War II veterans. The readjustment programs included education and training, entitlement to a loan, unemployment compensation, mustering out pay, and job placement assistance. Korean veterans were granted wartime benefits identical to those given World War II veterans in a number of other programs not under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, such as housing preferences and preferences to certain

farm loans administered by the Department of Agriculture.

All of the legislation granting benefits to which I have referred provided that the emergency period during which a veteran's service would be considered by wartime service could be terminated either the President or the Congress. The President has now acted and declared January 31, 1955, as the date ending the Korean emergency for the accumulation of war benefits for veterans.

I would like to point out that the President's action in terminating the Korean emergency is quite similar to the pattern set in World War II. Hostilities ended in World War II in August 1945. The emergency period was officially terminated in July 1947, 23 months after hostilities had ceased. Hostilities in Korea ceased in July 1953. The President has now declared the emergency at an end 17 months later. As you can see, the two emergency periods have been handled in a similar manner.

I would like to emphasize that the President was granted authority under the various laws extending wartime veterans benefits to Korean veterans to terminate the emergency. He was given no authority to modify the effect of the laws in any other way. The President's proclamation has created no special problem in the way that any of the programs are terminated with the exception of the education program. All of the other benefits granted on the basis of wartime service will be available to any person who has at least 1 day's service during the emergency period and subsequently serves at least 89 days and receives an honorable discharge. The education and training program is an exception. In that program, a veteran is granted entitlement to education on the basis of 1½ days entitlement to education for each day of service during the emergency period. The maximum entitlement permitted is 36 months; therefore, a veteran with 24 months' service during the emergency period may accumulate the maximum entitlement provided by law. Since the President's proclamation terminated the emergency period effective January 31, 1955, it means that any individual who, on January 31, 1955, has been in the Armed Forces less than 24 months, will cease to accrue entitlement at a point before that individual has accrued the maximum. A serviceman who has 1 year of service on January 31, 1955, will have accrued 18 months educational entitlement on the day that accrual of the benefit ceases. A veteran who went in on January 1 of this year will have 1 month of service during the emergency period and will be entitled to only 45 days educational entitlement, despite the fact that he may remain in the service for at least 23 more months. H. R. 587 amends Public Law 550, 82d Congress, and provides that any individual in active service in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue entitlement to education at the rate specified in the law until his first discharge or until the maximum of 36 months entitlement is accrued. Persons entering the service after January 31, 1955, would not be entitled to educational benefits or any other wartime benefits.

Public Law 550, 82d Congress, provides that a veteran may have 8 years from the end of the emergency period, or 8 years from the date of his discharge, whichever is earlier, in which to complete his educational program. This means that the law as it now stands has an overall delimiting date of January 31, 1963. H. R. 587 amends the law and provides an overall delimiting date of January 31, 1965. This date permits an individual who has entered the service during the last 30 days on a 4-year enlistment to complete his enlistment and have 6 years in which to complete his educational program.

Passage of H. R. 587 does not disturb the President's proclamation ending the Korean emergency. It is necessary to remove the possibility that our young men and women who entered the Armed Forces will be dealt with unfairly. There is no doubt that most persons entering the Armed Forces in the past few months have believed that by doing so they would accumulate full entitlement to all wartime benefits. This was true with the exception of education. I think this misapprehension has been heightened by uninformed recruiters and others who had not bothered to seek a legal interpretation of the law. I have received a number of reports that Armed Forces recruiters went into the high schools last June and urged young men and women to enter the Armed Forces to get their military obligation out of the way and obtain the right to a college education. I have received letters from such young people contending that they have been mislead by their Government. I believe that we can proceed on the assumption that if the education and training program is basically sound that this amendment is desirable to eliminate this area of dissatisfaction and misunderstanding and to assure that those persons who were in service during the emergency period will not feel that they have been dealt with unfairly.

As for those individuals entering the service after January 31, 1955, they will at least know where they stand. And this brings up another question, Mr. Speaker. There has been a great deal of discussion about our obligation to those young men who will be drafted to serve in the Armed Forces on a peacetime basis in the future. There has been some demand that we continue the Korean emergency period indefinitely because a number of men will be drafted on a peacetime basis in the future. I would like to point out that we have drafted persons in the past for peacetime service and have not given them wartime benefits. In the 6-month period just preceding Pearl Harbor, we drafted nearly a million men on a peacetime basis. During the months of December 1948 and January, February, and March 1949, we drafted 40,000 men on a peacetime basis. We have, therefore, drafted persons on a peacetime basis in the past without granting wartime benefits.

The Federal Government has a firm policy established since our creation as a republic of dealing with its veterans on the basis of wartime and peacetime service. We have declared the limits of every major war on the basis of dates. A person serving between the dates established by law as the emergency period has been considered a wartime veteran. For instance, the war emergency period for the Spanish-American War is April 21, 1898, to July 15, 1903. The World War I emergency period is April 6, 1917, to November 12, 1918, or April 2, 1920, if the person served in Russia. In some instances, where the person reenlisted and had wartime service, the date of July 2, 1921, was used. World War II began on December 7, 1941, and was officially termined July 25, 1947. The official emergency period for the Korean emergency has now been established as June 27, 1950, to January 31, 1955.

Since the Revolutionary War we have made a positive distinction so far as veteran benefits go, between wartime and peacetime service. I will not attempt to review the history of benefits for veterans serving during the Revolutionary War or the War of 1812 and the Civil War; however, I would like to point out the marked difference between benefits due veterans with wartime and peacetime service from the Spanish-American War forward. Veterans with peacetime service and their dependents are not eligible for pensions. Veterans with war service are entitled to a non-service-connected pension provided they are found unemployable, disabled, and their income does not exceed certain specified amounts. The surviving dependents of veterans who served during the Spanish War and World War I receive pensions. The surviving dependents of World War II and Korea may receive a pension provided the veteran had a service-connected disability of compensable degree at the time of his death. Veterans of any war receive full compensation for service-connected disabilities; however a veteran with a service-connected disability received in peacetime receives 80 percent of the wartime rate. A veteran with war service may receive hospitalization for either a service-connected or non-service-connected disability. A peacetime veteran is not entitled to hospitalization for a non-service-connected disability. Veterans of World War II and Korea may receive unemployment compensation, mustering out pay, guaranteed loans, burial benefits, vocational rehabilitation, education and training, social-security credits, income-tax deferments, housing preferences, entitlement to automobiles for amputees, and preference in the Federal service. A peacetime veteran is not entitled to any of these benefits. Veteran organizations, such as the American Legion, VFW, DAV, and AMVETS, will not accept for membership an individual who does not have war service. In the past, they have used the dates of the declared emergency as a basis for eligibility for membership in the Legion at their national convention here.

I believe we should be very careful before changing our policy of special benefits for wartime service and I think that a great many war veterans would be justifiably resentful if war benefits are extended over an indefinite period of time to persons with peacetime service. There

is some discussion that continuation of the emergency is necessary bcause of unsettled world conditions. Some seem to believe that we need a standby veterans' program, in the event hostilities resume in some part of the world. Experience does not indicate that this is true. We have created a veterans' program following each wartime emergency period to meet the needs of the group of veterans involved. We did not pass the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 until World War II had run its course. Hostilities began in Korea on June 27, 1950, and it was 10 months later that we passed Public Law 28, 82d Congress, extending war benefits to Korean veterans for pension, compensation, hospitalization and certain other purposes. It was 24 months after hostilities began in Korea that we passed the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act for Korean veterans. Certainly if we have groups of veterans, even small in number, involved in hostilities in the Far East or any other part of the world, these veterans should be entitled to wartime benefits if they are involved in hostile action. We will be in a much better position to contemplate the needs of such a group if our forces do become involved after the incident has occurred and we are able to know its exact nature and extent.

I know that you are interested in the cost of this legislation. If you will refer to page 3 of the report, you will find the estimate of the Veterans' Administration and you will note that it is estimated that this legislation will cost several hundred million dollars over a period of the next 10 years. In considering these costs, it must be borne in mind that this amount grows out of a very limited extension of one single benefit—education and training. If the emergency period is left in full force for the dozen or more veteran benefits which I have already listed which are available to wartime veterans, it will cost us about a half billion dollars for each month that the emergency continues. It will cost us $45 million a month in incurred obligations for the education and training program alone.

There are some who feel that enactment of this bill means that the Congress is ignoring the needs of young men entering the Armed Forces in the future on a compulsory peacetime basis. Of course, this is not true. In his state of the Union message our President made the following statement, indicating that he is cognizant of this special problem:

> Studies will be undertaken to determine the need for measures to ease the readjustment to civilian life of men required to enter the Armed Forces for 2 years of service.

Several bills have been introduced which would provide some sort of readjustment program for men returning from compulsory peacetime service. If it appears that young men will be drafted over an extended period of time, it may be necessary that the Congress look into the needs of this group and establish some sort of program geared to their special needs. This can be done on a more intelligent basis when we know the type of military-manpower program which will be authorized by the Congress. I would be very happy to have the advice of my colleagues on this subject; however, I do wish to emphasize that the prospect of extended peacetime drafts has no bearing on the termination of the emergency by the President and has no particular bearing on this bill, which is intended to create an equitable way of terminating wartime benefits for veterans of the Korean emergency. We should meet these other issues squarely, but we should not confuse them with the one at hand.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman, a former member of the committee.

Mr. EVINS. I should like to commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for his industry in bringing this bill before the House.

Does not the gentleman feel that cutting off benefits at this time, when there is a cold war developing into what may be a hot war, is untimely? I would take it that way, from the statement the gentleman made.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Of course, when the President issued his proclamation, things did not appear to be as serious as they do now. Frankly, I was giving much consideration to a bill to do what the President did. Probably if what has happened in the last few days had happened 2 months ago, the President would not have issued his proclamation.

Mr. EVINS. This bill has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, does it not?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. This bill has the approval of everyone, I think.

Mr. EVINS. And it was unanimously reported by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. It was unanimously reported by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. There were some members of the committee who felt that the bill did not go far enough.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, again I want to commend the gentleman, because he was chairman of a special committee that studied the overall problems of the educational training program relating to the veterans of this Nation, which resulted in bringing forth the GI bill for the Korean veterans. The gentleman has done a great piece of work on this matter, and I should like to join my colleagues in congratulating him on what he has accomplished and to strongly urge passage of this meritorious measure.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I appreciate the kind words of the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman, a member of the committee.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I should like to join our very well-informed and hard-working chairman in support of this worthwhile piece of legislation.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to see how anyone can reasonably oppose H. R. 587, which is simply a means of performance by our Government upon its implied contract with all young men now in our Armed Forces.

Unless this bill is passed an injustice will be done to thousands of American boys who entered service in the belief they would be entitled to certain educational and training benefits at the conclusion of their service. I am sure that no Member of this body would favor such an injustice.

The bill is not intended as any disposition of the very important question of a permanent readjustment program for our peacetime armed services. That is a bridge which remains to be crossed, and to which the Department of Defense as well as the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will be giving serious consideration.

I trust H. R. 587 will be passed by an overwhelming vote of this House.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEATING. I would like to commend the gentleman and his committee on the speed at which they have moved to meet this very important problem. It seems to me that the educational advantages which we have given to these young men and women have represented a very fine method of compensating them for the service that they have rendered.

I would like to ask the gentleman this question, to be sure that the matter is clear in my own mind. Do I understand, correctly, that no legislation whatever would be necessary in order to give to those men and women who are in our Armed Forces on or prior to January 31 any of the other benefits except the educational benefits?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is true. Any person who is in the service on January 31 and who then completes the 90-day requirement and receives an honorable discharge is entitled to every other benefit except education.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SPRINGER. I would like to say that I think the gentleman has done an outstanding job on this piece of legislation. I think I can recall that what is being done here is nothing startling or new, as far as the President's proclamation goes, in this legislation. I think the gentleman will recall that last year in a subcommittee on which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] served, and I did, too, we extended the GI bill with the thought that it would terminate in July of 1955. The President's proclamation came along and cut that date off. So you would have a cutoff date in July of this year, and I do not believe it was

contemplated that we intended to extend it as long as it was in peacetime. Is that correct?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to endorse and vote for the bill introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs continuing the time in which the GI legislation will be in effect. He has worked tirelessly on educational matters for the veterans, as well as other matters, and he deserves a great deal of credit. The other members of the committee deserve a great deal of credit for their prompt action also. It is nice to have some of the fine old members and the new members on our committee active.

This bill will permit veterans serving on and after January 31, 1955, to accrue education time up to their first discharge after that date.

This legislation is made necessary by the President's proclamation of January 1, which brought to an end wartime benefits, and prevents any accrual of education time after that date.

Under the provisions of Public Law 550 of the 82d Congress, education and training time is accrued on the basis of 1½ days for each day of service to a maximum of 36 months.

I am happy to note that the President has endorsed the principle in H. R. 587, and that the Bureau of the Budget has found that the enactment of this legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Hearings have been held, and the measure was unanimously reported by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

As many in the House know, I am sure that this bill does not go far enough. I should like to have the time extended for all benefits to the GI's while they are drafted and I introduced a bill for that purpose the day Congress convened. That is being studied now, I understand, by the White House, the budget, the Veterans' Administration, and others. I have been promised a hearing on my bill by the chairman of the committee and many endorsements of the bill have come to me. I am firmly of the belief we should pass some legislation extending all of the benefits, certainly during this very grave emergency.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY], the very able ranking member on our side of the committee.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I am wholeheartedly in support of this legislation. I, too, add my commendation to the chairman of the committee on the speedy work in reporting out this bill.

To me, it would be unfortunate and unfair for this House to deny benefits to those veterans now in the service and who would be affected by the President's proclamation. As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House, I am very much in favor of early hearings on other bills before the committee for further extension of benefits.

With the present bill before us it is necessary for its speedy passage as an indication of our willingness to give justice to those now in service or who enter before January 31, 1955. It would not be fair to cut off education benefits upon which they have relied. To do so would be a breach of faith.

I earnestly urge my colleagues to support H. R. 587 with a unanimous vote.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has made a very accurate, comprehensive, and most able statement of the issues involved in the legislation which is before us today. Although this is a matter of vast importance to a considerable number of men and women in the service and their families, the issue here is a rather narrow one and should not need a great deal of explanation. The question simply is, Do we permit people in service prior to February 1 of this year who continue in service beyond that, and who have not accumulated all the educational training benefits to which they would otherwise be entitled, to continue to accumulate those benefits?

I think perhaps every one in this House is in favor of the bill because it does a thing which we feel needs to be done. It will be recognized by all that this amends and extends the provisions of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952. There are a considerable number of people in our armed services who without the provisions of an act like this one would not be able to accrue all the educational benefits to which they thought, and many other people likewise thought, they would be entitled.

This makes clear the intent of the Congress that a person whose service has begun shall be permitted to accumulate up to the maximum educational benefits, that is the 36 months accumulated at the rate of 1½ day of benefits for each day of service. It has been pointed out by previous speakers that the cost of this program is not inconsiderable. It is estimated it will run from $300 million to $350 million for the period of time covered by this bill. It will extend likewise to a considerable number of individuals. It is estimated that 1.4 million people will be affected by this bill. Of course, not many of them will be affected to a very considerable extent—only a fairly limited number will be affected seriously, but it will touch in one way or another, according to the estimates before the committee, that many people.

Mention has been made earlier of the fact that perhaps a number of the Members of the House feel that the legislation should be extended and that we should give additional benefits to people who are on and after February 1, 1955, taken into the service. It has been pointed out that by enacting this legislation, we by no means preclude consideration at some future time of these other questions. There are many people in the House and on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs who feel that the question generally of benefits to persons who are taken into the service after February 1, 1955, should be given very careful study. I, for one, feel that the matter should be presented to the committee, that hearings should be held, and that then upon the basis of the information at hand, recommendations be made and, if necessary, legislation be enacted.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to commend the gentleman for his statement. I think that educational benefits in particular ought to be continued until the Selective Service Act is ended. I think they ought to be continued at least until emergency powers are surrendered by the Chief Executive no matter who he may be. In this instance, educational benefits for GI's have been suspended as of January 31, but certain emergency powers have been retained. Educational benefits ought to be extended as long as the draft law is on the books, and as long as we import foreign students into this country to educate them at the expense of the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. ADAIR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Do I understand that vocational rehabilitation training is included in this present bill? For instance, if a boy was inducted early this year and has an accident after February 1, will he be entitled to his full vocational rehabilitation and training?

Mr. ADAIR. It is my understanding, I would say to the gentleman, that vocational rehabilitation and training is not included in this bill. This bill applies only to educational benefits. If something is to be done about the rehabilitation program, it would have to be the subject of subsequent legislation, the kind that I just mentioned.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. In other words, there is no provision for taking care of an individual's training who may not be in a position to have an education, but who needs this in order to go back and have a job and earn his living even though when he was inducted prior to January 31, he felt that he had these benefits coming to him?

Mr. ADAIR. There is no provision for education and rehabilitation training in this bill.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would certainly like to say that I hope the committee will make every effort to rectify that. I think that is unfair to those who have been inducted under those circumstances.

Mr. ADAIR. I would say to the gentleman that if the committee considers other matters with respect to veterans' benefits that would certainly be one which would be given every consideration.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The gentleman recalls that I appeared before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs this week in support of this measure. It is needed and it is a proper measure. However, it was not the President who cut off the

benefits at all. The President did not cut off any of the benefits. The language of the act itself cuts off the benefits. He merely issued the Executive order declaring the end of the emergency. It had to come sometime. It was due to the very language of the bills that brought about this result which we are today remedying, and which we must do because the original Korean bill did not provide for this extension of privilege.

Mr. ADAIR. The gentleman is correct, and I appreciate his comment.

As has been heretofore said, this measure has been approved by everyone who has made a study of it. It is approved by the President. It is approved by the Veterans' Administration. It is approved by the Bureau of the Budget, and by various veteran organizations, as well as by many Members of Congress who appeared before the committee.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I strongly recommend that the House do pass this important legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for H. R. 587 and I hope this bill passes the House unanimously. I wish to congratulate the chairman of our Committee on Veterans' Affairs for making it possible for the House to vote on this bill this early in the session of the 84th Congress. Mr. Chairman, during the hearings on H. R. 587, I was impressed with the unanimity of all who spoke concerning the bill in their favorable comments about the educational benefits that our veterans have received under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and under previous legislation for veterans of World War II.

This week, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Mr. H. V. Higley, appearing before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, spoke of his belief in the educational program which has been made available to our veterans. Mr. Higley told the committee that before he had studied this program that frankly he was somewhat in doubt about its benefits, but that after seeing its operation he was very enthusiatically in favor of this splendid program.

I should like to quote from a release of the Veterans' Administration of June 22, 1954, concerning the educational and training benefits of this so-called GI bill. In that report the Veterans' Administration revealed that more than 7,800,000 World War II veterans, half of all who served during the war, trained under the GI bill over the past 10 years. Of the total, 2,200,000 attended colleges and universities; 3,500,000 went to schools below the college level; 1,400,000 took on-the-job training; and 700,000 enrolled in institutional on-the-farm training, a combination of classroom work and practical experience on the farm. Included in the below college total are 150,000 veterans who were given the chance to learn to read and write in accelerated grade school classes for adults. America's veterans have trained for nearly every occupation at which man earns his living. As a result, the Veterans' Administration said the GI bill has helped fill the Nation's reservoirs of trained manpower, dangerously depleted after World War II. Among the veterans trained were 450,000 engineers, 180,000 doctors and nurses, 113,000 scientists, 243,000 accountants, 107,000 lawyers, 36,000 ministers—representing all major religious faiths—17,000 writers and journalists, 438,000 television and radio repairmen, 711,000 mechanics, 383,000 construction workers, 288,000 metalworkers, 138,000 electricians, 83,000 barbers and beauty culturists, 83,000 policemen and firemen, 45,000 bakers and meatcutters, 61,000 printers and typesetters, 76,000 dressmakers and tailors, and hundreds of thousands of others in many fields.

Various statistical studies have proved that the educational benefits of the GI bill have helped raise not only the educational, but the income levels of the veterans and other citizens of our great Republic. The average male veteran today has completed high school and has gone ahead for some college work, while on the other hand, the average male nonveteran in the same age bracket has been able to finish just a little more than 2 years of high school. I know that one reason for this difference in educational achievement has been, and the Census Bureau has so stated, "The advantages of educational privileges under the GI bill." It has been estimated that those who have had educational training under the GI bill are paying approximately $1 billion more each year in Federal income taxes, or if you want to regard it in another way, within the next 15 years they will have paid for the entire program.

Now, Mr. Chairman, these facts relate to this program as of June 22, 1954. As of today, I think we could mention even additional outstanding accomplishments under this program. You will recall that in the number of professional men and women who have been trained under this program as of June 1954, there were 450,000 engineers. Many of us in Congress are worried about the number of engineers that Russia is training today in comparison with the training of engineers in our own country. In this age of nuclear power, certainly the profession of engineering is vital. I believe that if it were not for the educational benefits of the GI bill that we today would be suffering even more seriously than we are from a shortage of engineers. Without this program we would have fewer doctors, nurses, scientists, lawyers, ministers, and many others in the professional and nonprofessional fields.

Mr. Chairman, my profession is education. Before becoming a Member of Congress, all of my adult life—with the exception of 4 years spent in military service—was spent in the field of education. When I was released from active service in 1946, I returned to my position at the University of Florida, where serving in an administrative capacity as director of the Florida Union, and later as director of alumni affairs, I could observe at first hand hundreds of veterans who were pursuing college careers as a result of the benefits under the GI bill. I was proud of the accomplishments of our veterans. I saw in them a sober, determined group, anxious to get the best education possible. I was proud of the fact that this great Republic of ours was attempting through these educational benefits to compensate our veterans for the loss of time in pursuing their civilian careers, and I saw also in this great program a trend toward what I have always considered a great democratic ideal—namely, giving to every citizen in this Republic the opportunity to rise just as high in life as his or her capacity will permit. It is tragic that many of our young people possessed of superior minds cannot find it possible to pursue higher education because of income limitations. This great program of educational benefits under the GI bill has certainly not been perfect, it has not opened the doors of education to the extent that we would like for it to do, but it has presented a superb opportunity to many. This opportunity has been gladly accepted by millions of our young men and women.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I feel that those who are in the service now, or those who are serving in the Armed Forces as of January 31, 1955, should be permitted to receive their full entitlement under the educational benefits' provisions of the GI bill of rights. This will be accomplished if Congress passes H. R. 587. Many members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs felt that this bill did not go far enough. Several members of the committee stated that since the tragic development of recent days, we will have to reexamine the future of this great program, and make other changes. There will be some who disagree in the particulars of the changes. I cannot see, however, how many of us, realizing the great benefits of this program, and analyzing the fact that the costs will be repaid in greater incomes with their corresponding taxes, and in further recalling that many of our young men and women in the service now have enlisted voluntarily because they have felt that by so doing they would not only be serving their country, but they would receive the educational benefits that have heretofore accrued to veterans of the Korean emergency and World War II, could vote against this bill. I believe that the quick passage of H. R. 587 will be most helpful to the morale of thousands of young men and women who are now in the service, and who are anticipating the opportunity to pursue their education as they had envisioned upon their entry into the service.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I commend the distinguished gentleman, chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the members of that committee, for bringing this legislation so speedily before the House. The adoption of the bill now before us, H. R. 587, is one that should be adopted if we are to do full justice to our servicemen now serving in our military forces.

The report filed by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs states that the necessity for this legislation arises from the fact that the President's proclamation governing eligibility of personnel in the Armed Forces for various wartime benefits issued on January 1, 1955, among other things, ended the accumulation of any additional education and training time under Public Law 550 of the 82d Congress known as Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952.

This law, as limited by the proclamation, provides that a veteran in the service on or after June 27, 1950—commencement of Korean conflict—shall be entitled to 1½ days of education or training for each day of service prior to February 1, 1955, with a maximum of 36 months of education or training. Thus, under the proclamation a veteran serving from October 1, 1954 and until October 1, 1956, would be entitled to only 6 months of education and training, inasmuch as the time he served after January 31, 1955, would not yield him any additional education or training.

The bill reported by the committee provides that a serviceman may accumulate additional time after January 31, 1955, if he is in the service on that date, ending on the date of his first discharge or release from active service after January 31, 1955. The adoption of this bill will result in providing the maximum entitlement of 36 months' education or training, and, thereby preclude any injustice being done to members of our Armed Forces presently serving.

The hearings conducted by the committee left no doubt that many persons entered the service with the expectation that they would have an opportunity to acquire the full education and training benefits provided by law now in effect. To prevent an injustice the bill now before us has been introduced and should be adopted.

There have been many provisions enacted into law that have been very beneficial to our servicemen upon their return to civilian life. The provision that was made to provide means for their education and training after completing military duty is one of the most important. It has enabled many young men to obtain a higher degree of education and training than would have been otherwise possible. In my opinion it constitutes one of the most valuable benefits available to a serviceman. The great number who have availed themselves of it upon leaving military service is clear evidence that it is so recognized by our servicemen. There is a duty upon our part to continue its availability to our servicemen, and I shall so vote. The meritorious character of the bill now before us, that will continue this benefit, entitles it to have unanimous approval.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for acting so expeditiously on the timely legislation, House Resolution 587. It would be unfortunate and very unfair to deny educational benefits to those veterans now in the service as a result of the President's proclamation.

This proclamation was necessary under Public Law 550, 82d Congress, and consequently made it necessary to act quickly to extend veteran educational benefits beyond January 31, 1955 in order to give those eligible for these benefits who are now in the Armed Forces.

The veteran educational benefits has been a great help in building up the economy of the Nation and providing the young men who have served in the Armed Forces with the required education to better their way of life and develop their talents.

President Eisenhower favors the passage of this bill and I am confident that practically all Members of the House also favor it.

Let us be as fair with our Korean veterans as we were with World War II veterans and let us give those who are now in the Armed Forces an equal opportunity to obtain an education. The veteran will be all the better for it.

I urge a favorable vote by all Members of the House on House Resolution 587.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to speak in behalf of such a worthy cause.

H. R. 587, which will provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits was, of course, given a full hearing before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, of which I am a member. I am convinced by the testimony there introduced that passage of this bill is a matter of considerable urgency.

There are several hundred thousand men and women now serving in the Armed Forces who will be directly affected. Many of these young people volunteered for service and interrupted their education partially in reliance on their understanding that, when they had completed their service to their country, they could resume their advanced schooling with help from the Federal Government, which help in some measure would compensate them for contributing several years out of their lives.

I feel that this investment in the education of veterans is money well spent. Many educators have told me that students coming to them under the GI bill of rights have an added seriousness of approach. In this day of critical shortage in the field of technicians of all sorts this is extremely important to our future.

All of these young people were and are ready to serve our country with or without a GI bill of rights. Nevertheless, for men and women now in service it is not fair to cut off these education benefits upon which they have relied. To do so would be to rescind a contract of the United States Government. From the testimony before the committee, it is clear that the President has endorsed the objective of H. R. 587.

I earnestly urge my colleagues in this honorable body to vote to enact this bill into law. To do so is not only to affirm a moral obligation but to make a sound investment in the great future of our country.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, this measure, introduced by your distinguished chairman, deserves the immediate consideration which you are giving it. I certainly commend the speed with which the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has brought this measure before us.

I believe that if H. R. 587 is not promptly enacted, a serious injustice may be worked on members of our Armed Forces who have enlisted or entered service with a view to earning educational benefits after they finish their tours of duty. I know, of course, that nothing could have been further from the President's intention when he proclaimed the end of the Korean emergency. This is a small incidental to the great step of putting our war-weary Nation—at long last—squarely on a peacetime footing. There is not a man in Washington who is more deeply interested in the members of our Armed Forces than the President, and I am sure that he will act as quickly in approving this measure as I hope we shall be able to act in passing it in both Houses of Congress.

We must keep faith with the splendid young men and women who are giving good years of their lives to keep our Nation strong.

But in this case, there is something else as well. I have never missed an opportunity to speak up in wholehearted support of the educational benefit program that was initiated with the first so-called GI bill. I do not think I could say too much in praise of the concept behind that program. After all, when you take these good years, between, say, 18 and 22 or 23, from young people, you are selecting years that are possibly the most important of all to them, in terms of their own development and preparation for later life.

Our country has no choice. Those are the years we need. But there is no way to return them, and there is no way to compensate for taking them merely by the payment of money, the assurance of job status and that kind of thing.

I have always felt that the nearest approach to a valid quid pro quo, the best possible return that we can make, was in the form of extended educational opportunities. The most meaningful thing we can say to a young person leaving military service is, "Here is a helping hand to prepare you for civilian life in the best possible way; we hope you will end up at least as well off as if you had been able to stay in school; we hope, indeed, that you will be better off, better trained, better fitted for citizenship, more able to achieve the goals you seek, because of this program."

Because of this deep feeling on my part, I urge that, under no circumstances, we let the present educational benefit provisions lapse and I think it likely that later in the session I may be back sponsoring or supporting legislation to make

this great program even broader and more widely available to our young people.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to join my colleagues on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in supporting this needed legislation.

This is a simple but yet important bill which deserves the full support of every Member of Congress.

The support of this humane legislation will serve notice on our young men presently in the service of this country that the promise we made to them will not be forgotten.

Unless we act now, the educational benefits of our servicemen will be terminated next Monday. This, to say the least, would be unfair and unjust. Many of these boys interrupted their educations in order to enter the service of our country. They were told that their interrupted educations would be resumed upon discharge or release.

The continued education of these boys is as important to us as it is to them. Let us not at this time renege on our promise. Let us not at this time discourage educational training. Let us support this legislation in the interests of justice and fairness. Let us keep a bright future open to these boys upon discharge or release from active service after Monday.

I am happy to note that President Eisenhower agrees with the purpose and scope of this legislation and is in favor of continuing this humanitarian program.

I trust that this bill will pass unanimously.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I consider this bill, H. R. 587, the most urgent piece of legislation to be made necessary by the recent Presidential proclamation terminating wartime benefits for those who served in the Korean crisis.

As has been explained by other able members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the President's proclamation, among other things, ends next Monday, January 31, the accrual of educational benefits for those soldiers and sailors who are already in the service. Many of these servicemen have gone into the service within the past few months and have therefore been able to earn only a few days of education time, which means little or nothing to them. But the sad part of it is that these same men joined up with the full understanding and promises of recruiting officers for the armed services that they would be able to earn their full educational rights. Under the Korean GI bill of rights, the Congress provided that an individual serving during the Korean emergency could earn 1½ days of education time for each day he spent in the service, or until a maximum of 3 calendar years of education is earned. It takes him 24 months to earn the 3-year maximum accrual.

I am sure that most Members of this body will agree with me that we are surely breaking faith with those boys who have been called to carry on our national defense to withdraw these benefits from those who have already entered the service with the understanding that they would earn these rights.

I supported this bill wholeheartedly in committee when we held 2 days of hearings on it. Incidentally, this is one of the few measures I have seen introduced for veterans which has the support of the President and most of his Government departments.

As I have already stated to the press, I think that the Congress should go even further into the problems brought about by the President's proclamation ending the Korean emergency on January 31. This is only one of them, for this proclamation ended all wartime benefits for those who serve after that date. There is some feeling prevalent that educational rights should continue after that date for all men who are drafted or who serve their country involuntarily. I have not made up my mind entirely on this question, but I would like to see it explored thoroughly, and I believe that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], who heads our Committee on Veterans' Affairs, shares this opinion. However, the bill at hand is the most urgent, for the deadline is upon us and will probably be passed before this bill is enacted into law.

Of less importance insofar as speed is concerned are hospitalization entitlement, housing, pension, mustering-out pay, automobiles for amputees, and other wartime benefits which are affected by the proclamation. I would like to see the entire picture explored and investigated thoroughly to determine the policy of the Government toward a veteran of service in these times, which are not actual times of war, but definitely a state of preparedness, promoting a feeling of instability and insecurity on the part of our young men on whom the Nation must depend for its protection.

As an example of the emergencies we are constantly facing, I point out to you the trouble which is now going on in China and in which this Nation is involved. It is not yet a full state of war, but for all intents and purposes the youth of our Nation is being called upon for defense exactly the same as in wartime.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. WEAVER].

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly endorse and concur in the remarks of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], as well as the other gentlemen who have spoken in behalf of this bill. There has never been a time in the history of our country but that the veteran has stepped forward to help us preserve our way of life. I think it behooves every single one of us as citizens and as Members of this great body to support this bill 100 percent.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER], a former member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for reporting to the floor, H. R. 587. I was a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee during the 81st Congress, which recommended to the House very important legislation for the benefit of our servicemen.

The termination date as contained in the present law would preclude a certain segment of our servicemen from receiving benefits which we provided. The enactment of this bill will have the effect of extending the educational program for 2 years from the present terminal date of January 31, 1963. This would mean that the date for educational training would be extended to January 31, 1965.

I trust that the House today will give its unanimous approval to this measure.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, there are no more requests for time on this side, but I would just like to reiterate that I believe the President today is studying granting further benefits to the veterans. It is obvious from the debate that there are omissions, particularly in view of the emergency and the seriousness of the situation we are in today. We are practically in a war at the moment. The least that we can do is to try in some way to compensate the men that we draft into the service of the country, men who give up their business, their ways of life, their professions, by passing this bill. The President in his proclamation stated that he would study adding further benefits after the cutoff date.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

PROCLAMATION TERMINATING CERTAIN VETERAN BENEFITS

The proclamation of the President issued on January 1, 1955, will have the effect indicated below:

Basic service period: Korean service, by the terms of the proclamation, has been officially set as on or after June 27, 1950, and through January 31, 1955.

Education and training: Public Law 550 of the 82d Congress authorizes 1½ days of education or training for each day of service performed during this basic service period with a maximum of 36 calendar months of entitlement. The proclamation means that no additional eligibility may be accumulated under this law after January 31, 1955, and persons first entering service after such date acquire no eligibility for the benefits. The proclamation also ends eligibility for training under the vocational rehabilitation laws.

Compensation: Today disabled veterans of the Korean conflict are entitled to service-connected disability compensation ranging from $17 per month for a 10-percent disability to $181 per month for total disability. In certain severely disabled cases special rates may go as high as $420 per month. Any veteran who has a service-connected disability as a result of service after January 31, 1955, will be entitled, as a peacetime veteran, to 80 percent of the rates mentioned previously. Certain presumptions of service connection in chronic disease cases will not be available to veterans separated from service after January 31, 1955. After that date eligibility for service-connected death compensation will also be on a peacetime basis, with rates based on 80 percent of the wartime rate.

Pensions: Veterans of World War I, II, and Korea today are entitled under certain conditions to non-service-connected disability pension at rates of $66.16, $78.75, or $135.45, depending upon age, condition, and other factors. Service after the date of January

31, 1955, will be considered peacetime, but any veterans serving, for example, as little as 1 day prior to the delimiting date and 89 additional days continuously thereafter will be eligible for non-service-connected disability pension under the existing laws.

Widows and children of veterans of the Korean conflict period (June 27, 1950, through January 31, 1955) are eligible for pension based upon the non-service-connected death of such veterans. The basic rate for a widow is $50.40 per month. This program will not be available to dependents of persons first entering the service on or after February 1, 1955.

Automobiles: Veterans of exclusive service after January 31, 1955, will not be eligible for the benefits of Public Law 187, 82d Congress, which provides $1,600 toward the purchase of a specially equipped automobile for service-connected veterans who have suffered the loss or loss of the use of one or both hands, or feet, or who are blind as defined.

Hospitalization: No entitlement to VA hospitalization for non-service-connected disabilities where the service of the veteran is solely after January 31, 1955.

Insurance: The proclamation does not affect in any way provisions of Public Law 23 which automatically insures any serviceman in the amount of $10,000 while in active service. It is payable over a 10-year period to beneficiaries defined in the law.

Housing: The issuance of the proclamation means that in order for a veteran to obtain a loan guarantee (maximum $7,500) the loan must be made prior to February 1, 1965. So long as there is service prior to January 31, 1955, additional service to complete the required 90 days may be had after that date, if continuous.

Mustering-out payments: Mustering-out payments in the amount of $100, $200, or $300, depending upon the length and place of service will no longer be available to veterans who serve exclusively after January 31, 1955.

(Other possible results flowing from this proclamation, not within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, are omitted.)

JANUARY 4, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

ACCRUAL OF EDUCATION TIME AFTER JANUARY 31, 1955

H. R. 587

Title: To provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Introduced and referred January 5, 1955.

Analysis: President's proclamation of January 1, 1955, terminating certain wartime benefits, ended the accrual of additional education or training under Public Law 550, 82d Congress, for service performed after January 31, 1955. This bill permits the veteran to continue to accrue education and training time after that date until the date of his first discharge or release from active service. Maximum amount of training is set at 36 months; all training must end by January 31, 1965.

Digest of report (Veterans' Administration):

"It should be noted that the bill would retain the requirement that for purposes of basic eligibility a person must have entered service on or prior to January 31, 1955. The privilege which it would establish of permitting persons in service on that date to accrue additional educational entitlement by reason of service continuing after that date would be subject to the present maximum of 36 months entitlement to education and training. The bill would have an added distinctive feature in that the 8-year period prescribed by section 213 of the act as limiting the time within which education or training may be afforded would be measured from the first discharge or release from active service after January 31, 1955, in these cases and would not be limited by the presently applicable final closing date of January 31, 1963. However, in apparent recognition of the fact that, unless restricted, this would permit long-service career personnel to receive training at a remote time in the future, the bill would specify a final terminal date of January 31, 1967, beyond which no training could be provided for any individual. This would, in effect, result in a 4-year extension of the life of the education and training program.

"Under existing provisions, the governing terminal date, January 31, 1963, applies to all persons discharged less than 8 years prior to that date irrespective of whether they had accrued maximum or merely partial entitlement. Accordingly, the proposed extension of the program to January 31, 1967, may present considerations differing from those involved in the primary objective of permitting accrual of additional entitlement for service continuing after January 31, 1955.

"The committee may wish to weigh the fact that the Veterans' Administration would thus be required to maintain a staff to administer the program for 4 additional years along with the question of whether there will exist any practical need for an extension of time among those for whom the bill is primarily intended, bearing in mind that in virtually all instances they will have 4 or more years in which to take and complete their education or training if the existing terminal date is retained."

(NOTE.—Amendment ends training in 1965.)

"The President's proclamation of January 1, 1955, fixed January 31, 1955, as the terminal date governing eligibility of personnel in the Armed Forces for various veterans' wartime benefits which had been authorized in connection with active service since the onset of the Korean conflict and not merely for educational and vocational assistance. While each of the various laws thus affected had separate provisions authorizing the President, or the Congress, to determine the date which ended their applicability to future servicemen, the President in the exercise of his discretion determined upon January 31, 1955, as the appropriate uniform terminal date.

"It is important to note that the President's authority with regard to the educational and vocational assistance program was strictly limited to discretion in fixing a single terminal date. Once this overall date was determined, the question of any special consideration for persons in the group contemplated by the present bill was beyond the scope of the Executive proclamation and becomes an appropriate subject for legislative consideration.

"In the light of the singular situation which exists as to educational and vocational assistance and the further fact that a large number of the persons who would be relieved by the bill undoubtedly have related their future plans to the expectation of receiving this important readjustment aid, it is my view that enactment of legislation to allow persons in the service on January 31, 1955, to accrue entitlement to education and training prior to their first release or discharge from active service on or after that date is justified. It is believed that this primary objection of H. R. 587 would not depart from the basic principle of the President's proclamation or create a precedent for extension of the other laws numerated therein.

"In view of uncertainty regarding some of the factors involved, such as plans of veterans discharged in the future, future discharge rates, etc., the additional cost which would be attributable to H. R. 587, if enacted, cannot be predicted with precision. Subject to this limitation, it is estimated that there would be no increase in direct benefit costs for fiscal years 1955 or 1956. Thereafter, the additional direct benefit cost would approximate the following amounts: Fiscal year 1957, $25 million; fiscal year 1958, $60 million; fiscal year 1959, $90 million; fiscal year 1960, $90 million; fiscal year 1961, $70 million. The additional annual costs for direct benefits attributable to the proposed legislation could be expected to continue to decrease after fiscal year 1961. Additional administrative costs attributable to enactment of the proposed legislation are expected to be approximately 4 to 5 percent of the additional costs cited above for direct benefits with relative costs for administration increasing as the program draws to a close.

"The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report to the committee. The Bureau also advises that, subject to the committee's consideration of the question raised in the report concerning extension of the overall terminal date, enactment of legislation along the lines of H. R. 587 would be in accord with the program of the President."

Reported: In House, January 25, 1955; House Report 8.

JANUARY 26, 1955.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken may revise and extend their remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, our committee has acted promptly in reporting this bill to you. I wish to compliment our distinguished chairman, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, for his untiring efforts in getting this bill before us today.

We believe that this bill extending educational benefits to our service men and women is right, just, and in the national interest of the United States. I believe that we are under a moral obligation to the men and women who recently entered the Armed Forces. Many of them joined the services with the understanding that they would get the educational benefits. We cannot let them down now. The morale of our Armed Forces is very esseential to the security of our country. We must maintain this high morale. One step in that direction is to pass this bill immediately and overwhelmingly.

Our national income is reaching a new alltime high. To obtain volunteers and to draft men from a more lucrative civilian occupation without guaranteeing to them these benefits would be unwise and most unfair. The men and women serving America today are peace forces. They are rendering just as great a service in preventing war as our young men and young women did in fighting to win World War II and the Korean war. The national emergency grows ever more acute. We must encourage our forces to stand firm and extend to them every privilege possible. This bill will go a

long way toward serving notice to our young men and women all over the world that we are backing them up with every means at our command. Our program of making available to veterans educational benefits in the past has been on the whole a remarkable success.

It is a good investment in the future of America. The income of the Federal Government will grow with the increasing income of veterans promoted by our GI training program. This policy will pay for itself many times over in the years to come. I hope and believe that this House and the other body will pass this bill without any opposition.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for having expedited H. R. 587. The bill is necessary if we are to give the benefits promised to our veterans.

I have introduced H. R. 2962 which provides that persons who serve in the active military, naval, or air service of the United States during the period beginning February 1, 1955, and ending on the date the induction of individuals into the Armed Forces ends shall be extended, with limitations, certain benefits presently available to wartime veterans.

It is my feeling that we must continue certain benefits to peacetime draftees. I feel confident that the able chairman will schedule hearings on this important matter in the near future.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I think it should be made plain again that President Eisenhower has not, with some malicious forethought, arbitrarily canceled all of the Korean veterans' benefits. His January 1, 1955, proclamation was only the terminal action originally contemplated by the organic law which brought this program into being. It merely represents the dividing line between wartime and peacetime service as related to the Korean war.

I was gratified to hear the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs corroborate the merits of the President's courageous action by informing us that he had been considering legislation to effect the same result as the President's proclamation.

In announcing his proclamation, the President had no authority to act selectively with respect to the different types of benefits. His authority extended only to the naked responsibility of selecting the dividing line which would be applicable to all benefits indiscriminately.

Of course, the establishment of this dividing line affected different benefits in different ways according to the differences in the nature of the benefits themselves. Unavoidably, the proclamation affected education and training benefits in an undesirable and inequitable manner. Indeed, it would appear that the total effect was unanticipated and uncomprehended by many people. According to my information, recruitment officers have been encouraging young men to enlist before January 31, 1955, the effective date of the proclamation, in order to be eligible for education and training benefits; whereas, in the absence of positive legislation, such as the bill now under consideration, the right to accumulate entitlement would have ceased after January 31, 1955, regardless of the date of enlistment.

Doubtless, many men and women were encouraged to enlist by these inaccurate representations. Others who graduated from high school last spring, anxious to discharge their military obligation befor entering college or embarking upon a vacation, voluntarily interrupted their careers and enlisted under a promise that, in partial compensation for this sacrifice, the Government would help to finance their education or training for a period up to 36 months under the statutory formula of 1½ days entitlement for every day's service. To repudiate this promise, held out as an inducement to voluntary enlistment, would be to break faith with our service personnel. The bill before the committee will preserve the integrity of that promise and the good faith of our Government. I am pleased to learn that the President has lent his endorsement to the measure.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I support H. R. 587. I do so because I believe the Congress must keep the faith. Thousands upon thousands of men and women have enlisted in the Armed Forces upon the supposition that by so doing they would receive certain educational benefits; benefits which they felt had been promised by the Congress of the United States.

Unless H. R. 587 is passed these thousands of men and women in our armed services will look upon the Congress as a body which reneges. We cannot allow this to happen. The solemn word of the Congress must be kept.

When we vote on this bill, a little later this afternoon, I shall be casting my second vote. My first vote, cast on the so-called Formosa resolution, was cast with many misgivings. I am pleased to vote affirmatively on H. R. 587 without any misgivings.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, I am wholeheartedly in favor of the bill, H. R. 587, which provides that persons serving in our Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to earn educational benefits until their discharge or until they have accrued the maximum of 36 months entitlement.

When the President issued a proclamation designating January 31 of this year as the date of termination of the Korean emergency period, he also decreed the end of educational benefits permissible in this period to the men in our Armed Forces. I consider this an injustice to these young people who have interrupted their careers and their schooling in order to serve in defense of our country and our way of life.

It is my opinion that as long as it is necessary for us to retain the draft as a means of building up our military forces for the security of this Nation, it is also fitting and proper to extend to the men serving in these forces the privilege and the opportunity to receive the educational benefits. These benefits should continue if for no other reason than to serve as a stimulant for the future and a chance to make up for lost opportunities.

It is unjust to discriminate against the men now serving in the Armed Forces. We have an obligation to them and we must fulfill it. We cannot deny them the same rights and privileges and benefits which others in our armed services have enjoyed in the past. The United States is known throughout the world for its generosity in rewarding its young men and women for their sacrifice in service to their country. Let us keep up that good record. It is a boon to these young people, but in the long run the country as a whole gains from their education and experience derived through these benefits.

I therefore urge you to vote in favor of this bill, H. R. 587, and to continue the educational benefits to our men in the Armed Forces.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting H. R. 587 which provides that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952.

Inasmuch as the President's proclamation of January 1, 1955, fixed January 31, 1955, as the terminal date governing eligibility of personnel in the Armed Forces for various veterans' benefits which had been authorized in connection with active service since the beginning of the Korean conflict, I believe it is necessary that we enact legislation to allow persons in the service on January 31, 1955, to accrue entitlement to education and training prior to their first release or discharge from active service after that date.

Undoubtedly, many of our Nation's young men and women have made plans while in the service to use this readjustment aid at the time they leave the service. It is only fair that we keep faith with them and continue to let them accrue education and training benefits as set forth in the Veterans' Readjustment Act of 1952.

H. R. 587 retains the requirement that for purposes of eligibility a person must have entered service prior to January 31, 1955, and the bill further retains the maximum amount of training at 36 months. Terminal date of all training is set at January 31, 1965.

Certainly, the tremendous acceptance that has been accorded our original GI bill of rights and the subsequent Korean conflict bill makes it imperative that we continue this program of education and training for our discharged veterans. The values of this program have been many, both to the individual receiving the training and to the Nation.

I know of no area that has profited more from these laws than the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama. Evidences of the value of the program abound in better methods of farming, farm diversification to include milk, beef, egg, and broiler farming.

The program has opened new doors of opportunity to our veterans. Thousands of them have finished college and have taken their place in the business, professional and commercial life of our area.

As stated above, I am happy to vote for this bill and I hope it will be passed practically without opposition. Mr.

Chairman, I think we should extend the benefits of the bill to all those veterans whose enlistments follow January 31, 1955. We are living in a very unsettled age, as has been so dramatically illustrated by the events of this week. When we call a young person into the service we automatically interrupt his opportunity to educate himself. The men and women of our Armed Forces are playing a great role in the times in which they live. They are entitled to a restoration of their lost educational opportunities.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith submit a statement in support of H. R. 587, to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Act of 1952.

H. R. 587 recognizes the ex post facto nature of the Presidential proclamation of January 1, 1955, which arbitrarily abrogates as of January 31, 1955, the right of men and women now in military service, or about to enter service, to participate in the benefits of the Korean bill of rights.

It hardly need be pointed out that young men and women entering the Armed Forces prior to the President's January 1 proclamation did so, at least in part, on the basis that the benefits promised by our Government were real and concrete. Plans were made on this basis which most assuredly affected the course of tens of thousands of American lives.

I support H. R. 587 because it recognizes that the American people, through their Government, insist upon keeping faith with the men and women upon whom our country depends for its national security.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, there are no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the bill is considered as having been read for amendment. No amendments are in order to the bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 22, strike out "1967" and insert "1965."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WILLIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 587) to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 111, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 366, nays 0, not voting 68, as follows:

[Roll No. 4]

YEAS—366

Abbitt	Crumpacker	Heselton
Abernethy	Cunningham	Hiestand
Adair	Curtis, Mass.	Hill
Addonizio	Curtis, Mo.	Hillings
Albert	Dague	Hinshaw
Alexander	Davidson	Hoeven
Alger	Davis, Ga.	Hoffman, Ill.
Allen, Calif.	Davis, Wis.	Hoffman, Mich.
Allen, Ill.	Dawson, Utah	Holifield
Andersen, H. Carl	Deane	Holmes
	Delaney	Holt
Andresen, August H.	Dempsey	Holtzman
	Devereux	Horan
Andrews	Dies	Hosmer
Ashley	Diggs	Huddleston
Ashmore	Dingell	Hull
Aspinall	Dixon	Hyde
Auchincloss	Dodd	Ikard
Avery	Dollinger	Jackson
Bailey	Dolliver	Jarman
Baker	Dorn, N. Y.	Jenkins
Baldwin	Dorn, S. C.	Jennings
Barden	Dowdy	Johansen
Barrett	Doyle	Johnson, Calif.
Bass, N. H.	Durham	Johnson, Wis.
Bass, Tenn.	Eberharter	Jonas
Bates	Edmondson	Jones, Ala.
Baumhart	Elliott	Jones. Mo.
Beamer	Ellsworth	Jones, N. C.
Becker	Engle	Judd
Belcher	Evins	Karsten
Bell	Fallon	Kean
Bennett, Fla.	Fascell	Kearney
Bennett, Mich.	Feighan	Kearns
Bentley	Fenton	Keating
Berry	Fernandez	Kee
Betts	Fine	Kelley, Pa.
Blatnik	Fino	Keogh
Blitch	Fisher	Kilburn
Boggs	Fjare	Kilday
Boland	Flood	Kilgore
Bolling	Flynt	King, Calif.
Bolton, Frances P.	Fogarty	Kirwan
	Forand	Klein
Bonner	Ford	Kluczynski
Bow	Forrester	Knox
Bowler	Frazier	Knutson
Boykin	Frelinghuysen	Krueger
Boyle	Friedel	Laird
Bray	Garmatz	Landrum
Brooks, La.	Gary	Lane
Brooks, Tex.	Gathings	Lanham
Brown, Ga.	Gavin	Lankford
Brown, Ohio	Gentry	LeCompte
Brownson	George	Lesinski
Broyhill	Gordon	Lipscomb
Buchanan	Granahan	Long
Budge	Grant	Lovre
Burleson	Gray	McCarthy
Burnside	Green, Oreg.	McCormack
Byrd	Green, Pa.	McCulloch
Byrne, Pa.	Gregory	McDonough
Byrnes, Wis.	Gross	McDowell
Canfield	Gubser	McIntire
Cannon	Hagen	McMillan
Carlyle	Hale	McVey
Cederberg	Haley	Macdonald
Chelf	Harden	Machrowicz
Chenoweth	Hardy	Mack, Ill.
Christopher	Harris	Mack, Wash.
Church	Harrison, Nebr.	Magnuson
Cole	Harrison, Va.	Mahon
Colmer	Harvey	Mailliard
Cooley	Hays, Ark.	Marshall
Coon	Hays, Ohio	Martin
Cooper	Hayworth	Mason
Corbett	Hébert	Matthews
Cramer	Henderson	Meader
Cretella	Herlong	Merrow
Metcalf	Reed, Ill.	Thompson, La.
Miller, Calif.	Reed, N. Y.	Thompson, Mich.
Miller, Md.	Reuss	
Mills	Rhodes, Ariz.	Thompson, N. J.
Minshall	Rhodes, Pa.	Thompson, Tex.
Mollohan	Richards	Thornberry
Morano	Riehlman	Tollefson
Morgan	Riley	Trimble
Moss	Rivers	Tuck
Moulder	Roberts	Tumulty
Multer	Robeson, Va.	Utt
Murray, Ill.	Robsion, Ky.	Vanik
Murray, Tenn.	Rodino	Van Pelt
Natcher	Rogers, Colo.	Velde
Nelson	Rogers, Fla.	Vinson
Nicholson	Rogers, Mass.	Vorys
Norblad	Rogers, Tex.	Vursell
O'Brien, Ill.	Roosevelt	Walter
O'Brien, N. Y.	Rutherford	Watts
O'Hara, Ill.	Sadlak	Weaver
O'Hara, Minn.	Schenck	Westland
O'Neill	Scherer	Wharton
Osmers	Scott	Whitten
Ostertag	Scrivner	Wickersham
Passman	Scudder	Widnall
Patman	Seely-Brown	Wier
Patterson	Selden	Wigglesworth
Pelly	Sheppard	Williams, Miss.
Perkins	Short	Williams, N. J.
Philbin	Shuford	Williams, N. Y.
Phillips	Sieminski	Willis
Pilcher	Sikes	Wilson, Calif.
Pillion	Siler	Wilson, Ind.
Poage	Simpson, Pa.	Winstead
Poff	Sisk	Withrow
Polk	Smith, Kans.	Wolcott
Powell	Smith, Miss.	Wolverton
Preston	Smith, Va.	Wright
Price	Spence	Yates
Priest	Springer	Young
Prouty	Sullivan	Younger
Quigley	Talle	Zablocki
Rains	Teague, Calif.	Zelenko
Ray	Teague, Tex.	
Reece, Tenn.	Thomas	

NOT VOTING—68

Anfuso	Dondero	Mumma
Arends	Donohue	Norrell
Ayres	Donovan	O'Konski
Bolton, Oliver P.	Fountain	Pfost
	Fulton	Rabaut
Bosch	Gamble	Radwan
Buckley	Griffiths	Rees, Kans.
Burdick	Gwinn	Rooney
Bush	Halleck	St. George
Carnahan	Hand	Saylor
Carrigg	Hess	Schwengel
Celler	Hope	Sheehan
Chase	James	Shelley
Chatham	Jensen	Simpson, Ill.
Chiperfield	Kelly, N. Y.	Smith, Wis.
Chudoff	King, Pa.	Staggers
Clark	Latham	Steed
Clevenger	McConnell	Taber
Coudert	McGregor	Taylor
Davis, Tenn.	Madden	Thomson, Wyo.
Dawson, Ill.	Miller, Nebr.	Udall
Denton	Miller, N. Y.	Van Zandt
Derounian	Morrison	Wainwright

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Donovan with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Carrigg.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Chase.
Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Sheehan.
Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Van Zandt.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Taber.
Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Derounian.
Mr. Denton with Mr. Hand.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. King of Pennsylvania.
Mrs. Pfost with Mr. McGregor.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Miller of Nebraska.
Mr. Norrell with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Rooney with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Dawson of Illinois with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. McConnell.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Jensen.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Radwan.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Taylor.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JANUARY 26, 1955.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives,

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and trust you will give it immediate consideration.

Very respectfully yours,
ALVIN R. BUSH.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

MEMBERS OF SELECT COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT A STUDY AND INVESTIGATION OF THE PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 114, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Select Committee To Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Problems of Small Business the following Members of the House: Mr. PATMAN, chairman; Mr. EVINS; Mr. MULTER; Mr. YATES; Mr. STEED; Mr. ROOSEVELT; Mr. HILL; Mr. RIEHLMAN; Mr. SEELY-BROWN; Mr. MCCULLOCH; Mr. SHEEHAN.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, due to unavoidable delay on official business in the Pentagon, I was absent during the rollcall on H. R. 587. I arrived in the Chamber 30 seconds after the rollcall, having left a conference with Assistant Secretary of the Air Force David S. Smith. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the veterans' bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SALK ANTIPOLIO VACCINE

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most insidious and the most baffling of diseases which have scourged mankind is infantile paralysis. It attacks especially our little children and leaves them crippled for life.

Now, the people of the country, in a spirit of voluntary neighborliness, so typical of our American culture, are joining in an all-out attack on this dread disease through the March of Dimes.

One front of that attack is the testing of the Salk vaccine which, it is hoped, will prove to be an effective means of immunization against poliomyelitis.

In this test, the University of Michigan is pioneering in the field of medical testing techniques. For the first time in history, modern medical and scientific techniques are being combined with modern business machines and methods on a huge scale to test the efficacy of the Salk vaccine.

The nerve center of this mass-testing program, in which over 2,090,000 children, doctors, nurses, volunteer workers, and technicians in all parts of the country—in 44 of the 48 States—are participating, is located at the University of Michigan, in my home town of Ann Arbor, Mich.

I am sure my colleagues in the Congress and the people of the country are interested in the work of the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan. An excellent account of this work appears in the current issue of the Michigan Alumnus, which, under leave I include at this point in my remarks.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIVE: POLIO'S LAST YEAR?—IN A MODEST BUILDING NEAR UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL THE COMPUTER JOINS FORCES WITH THE HYPODERMIC NEEDLE IN MEDICINE'S DRIVE TO CONQUER POLIO

To people who prefer science wrapped up in slick packages—streaking jet planes and cyclotrons that glow in the dark—the greatest experiment in United States medical history must seem something of a dud.

This was not the case when the description was first applied (last spring, by Life magazine) to the testing of the Jonas Salk vaccine against poliomyelitis. Quite the contrary. There was a thinly disguised air of jubilation in the articles appearing at the time. A preventive for polio had been found; it was all settled but the minor question of whether it was any good.

The process of answering this question has proved to be, at least in the eyes of the press, a distinctly unspectacular enterprise. The handful of visitors who have made pilgrimages to the headquarters of the evaluation program, a former maternity hospital near the Survey Research Center, come away feeling slightly disillusioned. It is a squat, red brick building, with ugly fire-escape chutes sprouting from its upper stories. An unhelpful sign on the door reads: "Special projects research building." No mushroom cloud hovers over the roof.

Inside, the feeling of anticlimax achieves an ultimate deflation. There are rooms full of filing cabinets and clerks. There are batteries of humming IBM machines. There is a staccato clatter of typewriters. But there are no whirling centrifuges, no white-coated laboratory technicians hurrying through the corridors with flasks; nothing at all to suggest a medical experiment. "It looks," said one visitor, "like the head office of a mail order company."

This impression is reinforced by the austere and businesslike anteroom of the director of the vaccine evaluation program, a room dominated by a large wall map of the United States. Studded with brightly colored pushpins, it has the appearance of a sales map; but these pins, instead of marking off sales areas, are keyed to a legend with such items as "Trials Completed, Edited and Coded, and Sent to Punching."

This map is the only visible clue to the size of the center's operations. There are 217 separate areas pinpointed in 44 of the 48 States. In these areas there are more than 14,000 schools which took part in the vaccination program. And scattered among these schools are the more than 1,830,000 children who comprise what the center calls the "study population." If, instead of selecting children from polio-susceptible areas and age groups, the vaccinators had rounded up every man, every woman, and every child in the five States of Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, New Hampshire, and Nevada, they would still fall several hundred thousand short of this total. Any visitor who is unimpressed by these figures is invited to reflect that more than 144 million separate pieces of information are being assembled and digested at the evaluation center—all to be boiled down to answer one question, "How good is the Salk vaccine?"

NO ONE PUSHES HIM

Sitting serenely at the center of this seething mass of tabulation is the director of the vaccine evaluation program, Dr. Thomas Francis, Jr. He looks younger than his 54 years, and is impeccably dressed to the point of making his callers uncomfortably aware of their own relatively rumpled state. He is a man who seems almost phlegmatic on first acquaintance, but in a discussion that interests him, his manner abruptly changes and his conversation fairly crackles with emphasis as he makes his points. He is also, according to an associate, "a man no one can push around. And I mean no one."

Before accepting the director's post at the request of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, Dr. Francis made it generally understood that the money to finance the evaluation program—more than three-quarters of a million dollars—was being paid to the university and not to himself. He also stipulated that the center be the only group receiving all the information and that the only authorized report would be released by it.

The prudence of these precautions has become increasingly evident since last spring. Several newspapers in vaccination areas have taken it upon themselves to pass judgment on the effectiveness of the Salk vaccine. The sources of authority for these statements was usually of the friend-of-the-cousin-of-the-woman-who-cleans-house-for-the-local-public-health-official variety, but the stories tended to make up in sweeping conclusions what they lacked in scientific validity.

Further, at a press conference held shortly after the center was set up, a reporter informed Dr. Francis that some of the people on his paper felt that, since the university was being granted so large a sum for the evaluation, the integrity of the conclusions might be open to question. Dr. Francis replied to the effect that the reporter could go back to his paper and inform those people that the center's integrity was at least the equal of their own.

Under the circumstances, it is not surprising that Dr. Francis has become extremely chary of meetings with the press in recent months. He has, in fact, made himself almost totally inaccessible. Reporters attempting to reach him, whether in person or by telephone, are deftly intercepted by his accomplished secretaries and shunted to the University News Service.

When he does occasionally grant an interview, his manner is friendly, but reserved. He examines each question carefully for possible concealed boobytraps. Asked recently if he would comment on the effect approval of the Salk vaccine might have on the fight against polio, he peered over the top of his spectacles, giving the question the fishy stare it deserved.

"That is precisely the sort of question we will not answer here," he said dryly, "because someone might read into it a hint that we have already made up our minds on the value of the vaccine. There are three alternatives: that the vaccine is effective, that it is ineffective, or that it is partially effective. I think you can figure out the implications of each conclusion for yourself."

But Dr. Francis is more than willing to talk about the experiment itself. The need for so large an experiment, he says, is due to the nature of the disease. If the researchers had been able to obtain a limited number of subjects, all certain to contract polio in the near future, they could have simply inoculated some of them and watched for results. By repeating this experiment with a few additional groups, it would have been relatively easy to evaluate the effectiveness of the vaccine in a short time. But the natural incidence of polio is only about 1 person out of every 1,000, even in epidemic areas; consequently, an enormous study population is required to give meaningful results.

Not all of the 1,830,000 children received the vaccine. Injections were given to 440,000 children, and another 210,000 received the placebo, a substance that looks like the vaccine but has no effect. The remainder of the study population constitutes the control group.

CRISP AND VIGOROUS

In his element here, and on nondangerous ground, Dr. Francis speaks crisply and vigorously, using the question as a springboard to a general discussion. "This is more than an empirical test," he says. "It is a test of an immunological hypothesis. That is, this is not just a matter of someone waking up one morning and saying, 'Hooray! I've got a vaccine. Let's test it.' There is a vast body of previous research behind this test. What is being tested is the immunological hypothsis that killed polio antibodies can prevent the disease."

Although Dr. Francis is more than willing to discuss the evaluation program, the air of reserve sets in once more whenever he is asked to talk about himself, a subject he is notably reluctant to discuss. When he answers, chances are it is not with the requested statement but with a declaration of praise for the staff of the center. Dr. Robert F. Korns (on leave from his post as director of the Bureau of Epidemiology and Communicable Disease Control, New York State Department of Health) is doing a magnificent job as deputy director of the evaluation program, Dr. Francis says. And the men upstairs in charge of statistical operations are wizards when it comes to boiling down a vast mass of data to the elusive essence that would provide the answer. This job is in the hands of Robert B. Voight, assisted by Morton Boisen. Both men are on leave from the United States Bureau of the Census.

WORLDWIDE FAME

While praising these highly trained experts, Dr. Francis manages to convey the impression that he himself had simply wandered into the center one day, found an empty desk in the director's office and proceeded to occupy it—an impression denied by all the facts of his history.

Dr. Francis has a worldwide reputation in the field of epidemiology and has won a list of honors longer than these pages could comfortably hold. He was the first man to discover more than one type of influenza virus. He won the 1947 Lasker award from the American Public Health Association for his development of an influenza vaccine. He was given a large measure of credit for preventing an outbreak of influenza during World War II, like those deadly epidemics among the troops in the First World War.

Dr. Francis explains his involvement with epidemiology by saying, "In order to study certain of the infectious diseases, you've got to go where the disease is. You can't wait for it to come to you." In the course of the last World War, "going where the disease is" entailed going to North Africa and Italy during the campaigns there, visiting the Caribbean bases, and traveling to the Pacific theater of action. For this work he was awarded the Medal of Freedom, an honor bestowed by the Army on civilians who have rendered distinguished service in foreign theaters of operation.

Except for his absence during the war, he has filled the post of chairman of the department of epidemiology since 1941, carrying a teaching burden in addition to his research work (Jonas Salk, the discoverer of the polio vaccine is a former pupil). And 2 years ago he was appointed Henry Russel lecturer, signifying the university's recognition of his having achieved the highest distinction in his chosen field of scholarship.

His present job is a far from easy one, and is made considerably more difficult by the fact the it's-all-over-but-the-shouting attitude toward the vaccine has persisted, leaving the evaluation center to play the role of wet blanket at the celebration of a medical triumph. This feeling was intensified when the National Foundation announced it was gambling $9 million on the vaccine; ordering its preparation but withholding distribution until the vaccine is evaluated by the center.

Thereafter, the reasoning of the impatient ran thus: If the National Foundation is willing to gamble that kind of money, the vaccine must be good. Why doesn't the center come right out and say so?

This glib simplification of the matter ignores the overwhelming complexities of such a study. Even the first step in the process, the diagnosis of a case of polio, is a delicate and time-consuming operation. To be authenticated, a case requires the reports of the attending physician, the physical therapist, and the laboratories, in addition to a clinical-epidemiological record. This takes time but it is nevertheless essential if the conclusions of the evaluation center are to be scientifically valid. And Dr. Francis is determined that when the announcement is made it will be as accurate as the combined efforts of 20,000 physicians, 40,000 registered nurses, 200,000 volunteer workers, 24 laboratories, and the highly trained statistical staff at the center can make it.

Dr. Francis is making no rash promises as to when the report will be released. "Sometime after the first of April" is as close as he will come to pinpointing the date. "To us, the important thing is not just getting done in a hurry, nor is it the mere size of the experiment. The important thing is the complete accuracy and integrity of its conclusions."

RECIPROCAL TRADE

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah.

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which I firmly believe would help solve one of the major questions we are facing today. That question is:

How far can we go toward a free-trade policy without seriously ruining the economy of the United States?

I have been impressed with the testimony of the President and members of his Cabinet on our need for an ever-expanding trade program. We must help keep the economy of friendly, freedom-loving nations strong or be prepared to see them fall to Communists from within or become dependent upon trade with Communists.

But I have also been impressed, shocked, and saddened by the effect of foreign trade on some of our vital, wealth-producing domestic industries. There is misery in the coalfields of West Virginia. Lead and zinc miners in Utah used up their unemployment compensation months ago and the mines now operating must forgo development and exploration in order to meet expenses.

I would like to speak about the situation of the domestic lead and zinc industry, because that is the one I am most familiar with.

Two years ago on the floor of this House, I stated that the trade policies that were being followed were creating boom towns in French Morocco and ghost towns in Utah. When it came time to renew the reciprocal-trade agreement, I testified in behalf of a measure to put a sliding tariff on the importation of lead and zinc.

Members of the President's Cabinet successfully opposed this measure. But, in arguing against a sliding tariff, Secretary Dulles said that there were adequate protections already in the law for domestic industries being injured by trade concessions.

He was referring to the escape-clause provision giving the President the right—upon recommendation of the Tariff Commission—to increase tariffs or impose quotas on imports.

Miners and mine operators took the Secretary of State at his word. Lengthy and expensive hearings were held by the Tariff Commission. Hundreds of pages of expert testimony from both sides went into the record. Government experts on the Commission staff and the able commissioners themselves weighed this record.

They unanimously reported to the President that the domestic lead and zinc industry was being seriously injured by foreign competition and that the provisions of the escape clause should be invoked.

How much of this testimony ever got to the President I have no way of knowing. How many experts the White House has on lead and zinc is also unknown to me. But I doubt that the executive budget could furnish the President with advisers with knowledge of the metal trade situation as extensive as that of the experts who testified before the Tariff Commission.

It occurs to me that there is something wrong with a setup which puts the decision to change a trade agreement in the hands of the same person who made it, when it later turns out the agreement was a mistake or is failing to work.

Many say that Congress has given the President unconstitutional power in even allowing him to negotiate trade agreements. I will not go that far. But to those who believe that statement, the measure I introduced today would encroach very slightly upon that unconstitutional power.

Briefly, the purpose of the bill—which gives the President all the authority he requests to renegotiate reciprocal trade pacts—would be to transfer to Congress the final decision of what is to be done

if—and only if—the Tariff Commission finds a domestic industry is being seriously injured. I desire at this point to submit an explanation of the measure.

WHAT THE NEW BILL DOES

First. Gives the President all the authority he requested to renegotiate trade agreements. Incorporates all of H. R. 1.

Second. Makes no change in the President's authority to impose quotas and embargoes under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Third. Increases to seven the members on the Tariff Commission.

Fourth. Leaves the appointive power on the Tariff Commission in the President with advice of Senate.

Fifth. Retains the same definition of injury now in the existing sections of the law dealing with peril point and escape clause.

Sixth. Gives Congress the advantage of sharing Tariff Commission findings with the President by requiring the Commission to report to Congress the results of its investigations under the peril-point provisions of the Tariff Act.

Seventh. Makes Congress the final authority of what action should be taken when the Tariff Commission after investigation and hearing reports that existing trade agreements are working a serious injury to a domestic industry.

Eighth. Provides the machinery by which Congress can reject the Tariff Commission recommendations for invoking the escape clause.

The new tariff bill gives the President everything he requests in his trade message.

These include:

First. A 3-year extention of the Reciprocal Trade Act.

Second. Authority to negotiate tariff reductions with other nations on a selective and reciprocal basis by not more than 5 percent per year in each of the next 3 years.

Third. Authority to reduce by not more than 50 percent the rates on products which are not now being imported or which are being imported in negligible quantities.

Fourth. Authority to reduce any tariff rates now in excess of 50 percent to 50 percent.

The bill, however, makes substantial changes in the theory and procedures under the peril-point and escape-clause provisions of the Reciprocal Trade Act. These changes are made by the addition of four new sections to H. R. 1—the original legislation embodying the President's trade recommendations.

Section 6 of the bill modifies peril-point and escape-clause investigations and procedures.

Section 7 increases the membership of the Tariff Commission from 6 to 7 and the length of their terms from 6 years to 7 years.

Section 8 sets up the machinery whereby the Tariff Commission reports its findings on peril-point and escape-clause hearings and specifies how these reports are handled after being transmitted to Congress.

Section 9 provides how pending cases now awaiting action by the President shall be handled.

Following is a section by section analysis in more detail of the new matter additional to that in H. R. 1 which this legislation would incorporate into the Reciprocal Trade Act. The present law is given first, followed by an account of how this procedure would be changed and a statement of the reasons for this change.

SECTION 6

This section affects both the peril-point and escape-clause procedures. The explanation of section 6 is divided into two parts dealing separately with its effect on these two procedures.

PERIL POINT

Present law: Under the present law, the President is required to furnish the Tariff Commission with a list of all articles upon which the duties would be changed by a proposed trade agreement. This list must be presented to the Commission before negotiations begin. The Commission is then required to hold public hearings and report back to the President within 120 days on the extent to which the duties can be changed without causing serious injury to domestic industry. The President cannot act until after this 120-day period.

Proposed changes: All of the above provisions of the present peril-point law are retained. The Tariff Commission in addition is required to send a copy of its recommendations to both Houses of Congress. This report is for information purposes only.

Purpose: The purpose of this amendment is to keep Congress informed as to the effect of proposed reciprocal trade agreements before they are entered into by the President. This is only consistent with the delegation to Congress by the Constitution of the power "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises." The present law only requires notification to Congress after an agreement has been entered into.

ESCAPE CLAUSE

Present law: The President, either House of Congress, the Senate Finance Committee, or the House Ways and Means Committee, or an injured party can require the Tariff Commission to make an investigation to determine whether domestic industry is being threatened by trade concessions. This investigation must be made within 9 months. The Tariff Commission's findings then are reported to the President in the form of a recommendation. Within 60 days or sooner if the President takes action on the recommendation, an identical report is sent to the Finance Committee of the Senate and the House Ways and Means Committee. Under the present law, the President is not required to follow the recommendations of the Commission. He may follow them, or not, as he sees fit. If he declines to follow them, however, he must report his reasons to the Senate and House committees within 60 days after receiving the Tariff Commission's report.

Proposed changes: The major change made by the Dawson bill is to require the Tariff Commission to make a definite recommendation to Congress rather than the President. This recommendation must be delivered to both Houses of Congress on the same day, and it must be delivered while the Congress is in session.

The findings must be specific and may include any of the following or a combination of any of the following: First, permanent withdrawal of the trade concession; second, modification of the trade concession; third, suspension of the concession in whole or in part; and, fourth, limitation of the quantity of the product which may be entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption—in other words a quota.

In the event the Tariff Commission finds that any or all of the above actions are necessary to protect a domestic industry, this finding goes into effect—unless vetoed by a majority of the Members of either House—after the first period of 60 calendar days of continuous session of the Congress after the finding is received by both Houses. The act defines "continuous session" as one unbroken by an adjournment sine die. It excludes from the 60-day period any days in which there has been an adjournment of either House for more than 3 days.

Purpose: This section gives to Congress the power to decide what action if any should be taken after the Tariff Commission by a majority vote finds that a trade agreement is injuring domestic industry. Either House has the power reserved to it to overrule the findings of the Tariff Commission by a majority vote of its membership.

One of the major difficulties we now face is that Congress has delegated to the President the power to set tariffs and quotas. This measure does not take away that power. It does, however, take from the President the power of deciding what action, if any should be taken after the Tariff Commission finds that the trade agreement set aside by the President is injurious to domestic industry. In effect, Congress—not the Executive—would be the final judge of whether a trade agreement is a mistake. It puts an end to the present situation whereby inaction on the part of the President nullifies a finding of the Tariff Commission. Since June 1951, the Tariff Commission has completed 51 escape-clause investigations. In 12 of these cases, the Tariff Commission recommended that the trade concession be modified to protect domestic industry from serious injury. In three of the cases, the 6-man Tariff Commission was evenly divided. What was the action of the President in these 15 cases where the Tariff Commission recommended action? He followed their recommendation in only five instances and turned the Commission findings down in 10. If an industry can convince the Tariff Commission that it is being injured by an agreement negotiated by the President, that industry should have the right to have its case finally determined by someone other than the President who is responsible for the situation in the first place. What other body of Government is more qualified to make this final determination than Congress in which the constitutional power to set tariffs rests?

SECTION 7

Present law: The present Tariff Commission has 6 members appointed for 6-year terms by the President by and with the consent of the Senate.

Proposed change: Under the new proposal, the membership would be increased to 7 and the terms lengthened to 7 years. The bill adequately provides for a smooth transfer from the 6- to 7-year term.

Purpose: It is necessary if Congress is to have the final decision on escape-clause recommendations that these recommendations be definite and have the backing of a majority of the Tariff Commission. It would be impossible for either House to act if the Commission divided 3 to 3 as has been the case 3 times in the past. The law still reserves to the President the power of appointment with consent of Senate.

SECTION 8

New section: This section sets up the procedure by which the Tariff Commission's recommendations are handled in Congress. It is a procedure very similar to the method used in the Reorganization Act. It provides that the Commission's findings shall be referred to the Finance Committee in the Senate and the Ways and Means Committee in the House. Provision is made to discharge the recommendation from committee if the committee has not reported the resolution within 10 days after receiving it. Priorities of motion are defined and debate limits set in this section.

Purpose: As in the Reorganization Act, special rules must apply for legislation that becomes effective in the absence of action by Congress. The language in this section is necessary for the law to be constitutional. Amendments to the Tariff Commission's specific report are forbidden because the amendment would require signature of the President and thus the plan would be defeated. The automatic discharge is to insure Members of a chance to reject the Commission recommendation.

SECTION 9

New law: Provides that the new procedure of transferring decision on escape clause from President to Congress shall become effective simultaneous with approval of the act. All pending cases upon which the President has neither made a decision or reported to Congress would be submitted to Congress as provided above.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if the chairman of the Committee on Veterans Affairs, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] did not secure permission to include as a part of his remarks the report on the bill just passed continuing GI training benefits, I ask unanimous consent that I may have that permission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE CHARLES E. WILSON

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that a remark made by Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson before the House Armed Services Committee yesterday has been misinterpreted.

The remark to which I refer was his reference to the Formosa problem as "just a ripple." To one who was present and heard the entire statement there could be no just criticism of that remark; however, when taken out of context it could have a far different meaning than that which was intended. This remark by Secretary Wilson was made in response to a question as to the advisability of changing the general long-term planning for national defense because of recent developments in Formosa. There has been a great demand, and justifiably so, that our country have a sane long-term defense policy capable of meeting our defense needs, yet a policy that would not cripple America's economic system and standard of living which has made us so strong. It is evident that if we change our entire defense policy as the result of every threat or at every change in world conditions, we would be wrecking the long-term defense effort which is so essential to our safety. The threat may be in Formosa today and in another location tomorrow, and Secretary Wilson instead of being criticized should be commended for adhering to a defense policy that does not change every time the Kremlin barks.

NATIONAL OIL POLICY

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklamoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote some information from the text of an article written by Mr. H. B. Fell, of Oklahoma, relative to the natural resources of the United States:

Six years ago the National Petroleum Council outlined a set of principles which it deemed essential to a national oil policy. The National Petroleum Council is an official oil industry body appointed by the Secretary of the Interior for the purpose of advising the Government on petroleum matters. Its membership represents all branches of the petroleum industry and includes the heads of all of the leading importing companies.

With regard to petroleum imports this council unanimously agreed upon the following statement which is quoted from its report dated July 13, 1949, entitled "A National Oil Policy for the United States":

"The availability of petroleum from domestic fields produced under sound conservation practices, together with other pertinent factors, provides the means for determining if imports are necessary and the extent to which imports are desirable to supplement our oil supplies on a basis which will be sound in terms of the national economy and in terms of conservation.

"The implementation of an import policy, therefore, should be flexible so that adjustments may readily be made from time to time.

"Imports in excess of our economic needs, after taking into account domestic production in conformance with good conservation practices and within the limits of maximum efficient rates of production, will retard domestic exploration and development of new oil fields and the technological progress in all branches of the industry which is essential to the Nation's economic welfare and security."

On July 24 the National Petroleum Council further defined its policy on petroleum imports with the following statement:

"Fair and equitable relationships should obtain between total imports of crude oil and its products and total demands for oil in the United States during periods of excess availability of domestic oil for United States consumption."

These statements reflect the oil industry's current policy position on oil imports.

Domestic-oil producers have never been of the opinion that all petroleum imports should be eliminated. They have been of the opinion that some fair and equitable relationship should be maintained between the total volume of oil imported and the demand for petroleum products in this country. During the period 1935–41 total imports supplied 5.5 percent of the domestic market. This percentage declined slightly to 4.8 percent during the World War II years, 1942–45. Following World War II there was a rapid increase in the share of the domestic market supplied by imports and the ratio averaged 10.3 percent in the 1946–51 period. It has gone up even further since that time averaging almost 14 percent in 1953 and 1954.

Volume-wise total imports averaged only 181,000 barrels daily in the 1935–41 period. The war years, 1942–45, were only slightly higher averaging 209,000 barrels daily. In the postwar period, however, imports have increased tremendously, averaging 611,000 barrels daily in the 1946-51 period and going over the million-barrels-per-day level in 1953. Total imports in 1954 will average about 1,065,000 barrels daily.

The most disturbing thing about this whole matter, however, is the outlook for 1955. Just a few days ago the major importing companies filed schedules with the Texas Railroad Commission indicating the amounts which they plan to import during the first 5 months of 1955. Based on these figures, oil imports during these 5 months will average about 1,240,000 barrels daily. This amounts to an increase of more than 150,000 barrels daily or about 15 percent over the same 5 months of 1954. The more optimistic petroleum economists in the United States anticipate about a 5-percent gain in United States consumption next year. I cite these figures to indicate the rapid strides which imports are making in taking over domestic markets and to illustrate the failure of the importing companies to play the game in accordance with the rules which they themselves helped to make and unanimously agreed upon.

To dispel any doubts which may exist as to the ability of the domestic petroleum industry to supply the needs of this country, and to clearly show that imports are now supplanting domestic production, I would like to cite some figures with regard to the domestic industry's productive capacity. A report of The Independent Petroleum Association's Productive Capacity Committee dated May, 1954, estimated the

total productive capacity in the United States of crude oil and natural gas liquids at 8,669,500 barrels daily as of January 1954. The Committee forecast that this capacity would increase to 9,105,000 barrels daily by January, 1955 which would indicate an average capacity in the United States during the year 1954 of 8,888,000 barrels daily. Actual production during 1954 averaged about 7 million barrels daily. This would indicate an average shut-in or idle capacity in the United States during 1954 of almost 2 million barrels daily. I might add that the IPAA forecast for January 1955 is deemed to be rather conservative as many more wells were actually drilled in 1954 than were anticipated at the time the report was made. It is generally agreed within the industry that the shut-in capacity throughout much of 1954 was in the neighborhood of 2 million barrels daily.

To pin-point the effects of these excessive oil imports on individual areas of the country I would like to discuss the situation briefly as it exists in Texas and Oklahoma.

In Texas, for example, in the month of September, oil producers on the average were actually producing at the rate of only 65.5 percent of their maximum efficient rate of production. If the production which is not prorated is eliminated from the figures, those wells which are subject to proration were producing at only 54 percent of their maximum efficient rate. Production in September, however, was drastically curtailed so let's look at the current month of January. Even with the increased rate of production in January the total State will produce at less than 80 percent of its maximum efficient rate and the prorated wells at a little over 70 percent.

In Oklahoma a similar situation exists. In September the State as a whole was producing at only about 70 percent of its maximum efficient rate and the prorated wells at only 51 percent. In January Oklahoma as a whole is producing at only about 75 percent of its maximum efficient rate and the prorated wells at only 62 percent.

The effect of oil imports can readily be seen on the economies of States like Texas and Oklahoma where the State governments, school systems, and general economic well-being are so dependent on the revenues derived from the production of oil and gas.

Domestic oil producers fully recognize the value of our trading with other countries and believe it should be encouraged if it can be done without injury to essential domestic industries.

Trade policy must take into consideration the differences between the various commodities in trade. Strategic materials in trade are of a special character. As a nation, we cannot trade oil as we do butter. An overall national policy must be based on defense needs as well as trade needs.

Reciprocity in trade is also important. The illusion of reciprocity is not enough. In the case of oil, for example, this Nation buys oil from such countries as Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, without any hope of selling them comparably valuable goods.

A completely uninhibited trade policy would result in the ultimate destruction of some of our most essential extractive industries. These industries are controlled by nature, not by the production line and there are practical natural limits past which they cannot expand in order to compete with extractive industries overseas. Assembly-line domestic industries can lower production costs and compete in world trade simply by expanding manpower and machines. Extractive industries are not so fortunate.

You can't simply put on another shift and double your production in the petroleum industry. The search for oil involves countless geological studies and years of preliminary work and analysis before a well is drilled in an unproven area. This preliminary work is time-consuming and involves the expenditure of tremendous sums of money.

There is probably no commodity more vital to our defense than petroleum. Adequate supplies within our own borders are a must if we are to maintain any semblance of real security.

We do not believe that our foreign trade in nonstrategic materials or products should be developed or expanded at the expense of an industry so vital to our national defense and economic well being as is the petroleum industry.

I therefore urge this committee to adopt and support, in the national interest, a recommendation to the United States Chamber of Commerce, which would be consistent with the existing and recorded policy of the oil industry in this country, and would assure the continued existence of a strong domestic oil producing industry which is vital to our Nation's security.

THE DEVASTATION OF OUR NATIONAL FORESTS BY STRIP MINING

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to call to the attention of this House a matter of very great importance. Some time ago the Forest Service acquired surface rights in 47,000 acres of land from the Stearns Coal & Lumber Co. in Stearns, Ky. The traditional method of mining coal, at that time, was by underground or drift mining. A method of strip mining known as rim cutting was subsequently developed, and the Stearns firm recently applied to the forest supervisor of the Cumberland Forest for permission to strip the property, but was refused. The supervisor maintained that the mineral reservations in the deed did not provide for removal of the coal by stripping the surface. The applicant appealed to the Regional Forester and was again refused a permit, with the result that a final appeal has been made by the Stearns Coal & Lumber Co. to the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture.

Pending the rendering of a decision, an advisory group has been selected to study the case, and to submit recommendations upon which the Secretary might base his conclusion. The consultants selected were Mr. R. C. Wilhelm, a businessman with extensive experience in strip mining; Dr. Samuel T. Dana, retired dean of the Michigan University School of Forestry; and Mr. Charles P. Taft, a Cincinnati lawyer. These 3 men are conducting a hearing today in Stearns, Ky., after which they will submit recommendations to the Secretary of Agriculture.

I have written to the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson, requesting that the application by the Stearns Co. be rejected. The matter is of no personal interest to me, but the long-term public interest demands that national forest lands be protected from devastation by stripping. The issue in the Stearns case is not confined to the 47,000 acres in the Cumberland Forest. It involves 750,000 acres in other eastern forests which are purchased forests, paid for by all of the people, and with mineral rights outstanding in many cases. Other owners and operators have asked permission to strip, and they are awaiting the outcome of the instant case. If the Kentucky firm is permitted to strip, the way will be paved for the ultimate destruction of the national forests in Kentucky, Virginia, and West Virginia, and other areas.

The administrative decision rendered by the Secretary of Agriculture will set a precedent. If the decision permits stripping, the results will be of incalculable damage. Watersheds will be endangered, streams will be polluted with chemicals and silt deleterious to fish life, surface erosion will be severe, and unsightly scars will be created to permanently mar the beauties of Nature.

I hope that the decision by the Secretary of Agriculture will be one which will be in the best interests of our national forests and the people of America who own them. I am inserting a copy of my correspondence to Secretary Benson in which I have tried to call his attention to the potentialities involved. I exhort the Members of this House to read it carefully.

JANUARY 25, 1955.

The Honorable EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This correspondence is with reference to the forthcoming administrative decision which will be rendered in the Stearns strip-mining case upon which hearings are scheduled on January 27 at Stearns, Ky. As a Representative of the State of West Virginia, a State containing thousands of acres of national forest land, I urge that the application to strip for coal in the Cumberland National Forest be rejected. I preface my correspondence by taking the position that it is imperative that the application be rejected, and the following paragraphs will set forth the reasoning upon which my position is founded:

By way of developing my subject, perhaps a brief recapitulation of the primary facts in the case should be made. It is my understanding that the Forest Service purchased 47,000 acres in the south end of the Cumberland from the Stearns Coal & Lumber Co. several years ago, surface rights being transferred to the former, and the mineral rights remaining in the latter. At the time the Government acquired the surface rights, the traditional method of mining coal was by underground or drift mining. This method was envisioned as applicable at the time. Subsequently, however, a method of strip mining known as contour mining or rim cutting has been developed and is now employed to remove the outer rim of coal seams. Some time ago, Mr. Stearns applied to the Forest Supervisor of Cumberland Forest for permission to strip the property, but was turned down. The supervisor maintained that the mineral reservations did not carry the right to strip. The applicant appealed to Regional Forester Charles L. Tebbe and was again refused a permit. A final appeal by the Stearns Coal & Lumber Co. has been made to your office, and I am informed that you have requested an advisory group to study the case and to submit recommendations upon which you might base your decision. The consultants selected were Messrs. R. L. Wilhelm, of St. Clairsville, Ohio; Samuel T. Dana, of Ann Arbor, Mich.; and Charles P. Taft, of Cincinnati. I have corresponded

with Mr. Taft requesting to be heard on this matter, and he has very graciously offered to let me appear at the hearing or submit a statement in writing. Inasmuch as I have no information or factual data directly pertaining to the Stearns case, however, I have decided that it is best to appeal to you with a presentation of facts which, in my opinion, are worthy of consideration in the process of arriving at a decision which will be so far-reaching as the one about to be rendered. Mr. Taft, Mr. Wilhelm, and Dr. Dana are being supplied with copies of this communication.

The question raised in the Stearns case is of the most serious consequence, not only to the Cumberland National Forest but also to other eastern forests which are purchased forests with mineral rights outstanding in many cases. These are public lands in Kentucky, Virginia, and West Virginia, bought and paid for by all of the people and administered by a public agency charged with the responsibility for their care and management.

The issue involved in the instant case is very important as it relates to the Monongahela National Forest in my own State. It affects all or portions of three undisturbed watersheds in the Gauley district of the forest; namely, the Williams, the Cranberry, and the North Fork of Cherry Rivers. These are among the few fine pristine streams in West Virginia today and, for that matter, in the East. About 162,000 acres of national forest land and 128 miles of main fishing streams are involved. I mention this area specifically because application to strip mine in these watersheds was made by the Rich-Sewell Coal & Coke Co., and on November 17, 1953, the company was informed, after thorough investigation on the ground, that it would be in the best interests of the people to limit the removal of reserved coal to only those methods set forth in the reservations or exceptions in the deed conveying the surface to the United States which do not include stripping. There are over a quarter million acres in the Monongahela National Forest underlain with reserved coal.

The State of West Virginia came to the same conclusion with regard to strip mining in Kumbrabow State Forest and permanently enjoined the owner of the reserved coal beneath the forest from removing it by this method. One could scarcely do less than take a similar position with respect to the Monongahela National Forest.

There are several points that I would like to lay before you which deal with the issue in Kentucky and West Virginia.

1. Access to the reserved coal is not denied.

2. I am told that, in both instances, the right to remove coal by stripping is not held to be inherent in the reservations in deeds to the United States. Permission to strip, therefore, becomes a matter for administrative determination.

3. The effects of strip mining or rim cutting in mountainous terrain cannot be satisfactorily repaired even at great cost. With multiple coal seams, one above the other, as much as 10 percent of the surface is disturbed and the vertical headwalls run for miles along the mountain sides following the coal outcrops. These with the attendant overburden cast down the slope form scars that are permanent.

4. Siltation of streams has a marked effect upon fish life. The West Virginia Conservation Commission, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the United States Forest Service have collaborated during the past year in studying paired streams to determine the impact of strip mining on the production of fish and fish food organisms. Periodically, throughout a full year, samples were taken from the paired streams which are similar in drainage area, flow, and most other characteristics. The streams, located on or adjacent to the Gauley ranger district, Monongahela National Forest, differed primarily in the fact that one group flowed from undisturbed watersheds while the second group drained watersheds disturbed by rim cutting for coal. A summarization of the data shows:

	Pounds per surface acre
Production in streams from disturbed watersheds:	
Fish food organisms	7.58
Fish	2.29
Production in streams from undisturbed watersheds:	
Fish food organisms	39.02
Fish	17.1

(a) On the Gauley study, the differences shown stem largely from siltation damage. Due to the extremely low sulfur content of the rim-cut Sewell coal in West Virginia, acid pollution was a minor factor. However, in summarizing this work, a pollution report submitted by the Fish and Wildlife Service in November 1954, states: "Addition of silt to streams in the Monongahela National Forest has resulted in decreasing the biological productivity of recipient streams. Any expansion of pollution in this or any other form should not be permitted."

(b) Additional studies on two of the same streams to determine the amount of silt carried from disturbed and undisturbed land shows the following total sediment load for 2 months:

Disturbed: 1,016 tons per square mile drainage area.

Undisturbed: 29 tons per square mile drainage area.

(c) A composite picture reflecting measurements on a total of 4 streams showed the following siltation effects during a 2-month period:

Disturbed: 1,595 tons per square mile drainage area.

Undisturbed: 78 tons per square mile drainage area.

5. No terrain that is so altered can fully serve the purposes for which it was acquired by the people of the United States. The Weeks Act authorized the purchase of such lands for the protection of watersheds at the headwaters of important streams. The effects of strip mining are in opposition to this and to the concomitant values in scenery, recreation, and timber production.

Perhaps it is best that your attention be directed at this time, to the following facts concerning some of the damage which would result from strip mining if permitted in the Monongahela National Forest.

1. Pure waters leaving the Williams, Cranberry, and the North Fork of Cherry Rivers serve to dilute the pollution and siltation from mine wastes which render the Gauley River below the national forest unfit for domestic, municipal, or industrial use without costly plants and treatment.

(a) The water supply of 5,500 people living in Richwood comes from the North Fork of Cherry River. Chlorination is the only treatment given. City officials estimate that, if the North Fork is subjected to extensive strip-mining, water supply improvements costing $250,000 or $45 per capita will be necessary.

(b) The town of Cowen has a water supply coming from Gauley River. Due to mine pollution and siltation, the town is now developing plans to draw water from Williams River for its 1,000 users. If strip-mining follows on Williams River the town will not have greatly improved its water supply.

(c) Webster County 4–H Camp Caesar, which accommodates up to 300 people, drew water for its swimming pool from Gauley River. Following strip-mining operations upstream, the camp constructed filter beds in order to maintain a pool suitable for swimming. This proved inadequate, and the camp explored the Williams River as a source of supply. This in turn was abandoned on account of cost and the probability of again running into mine refuse. The camp is now developing plans to build a water supply reservoir on a small side stream at a cost of between $10,000 and $12,000.

(d) In Nicholas County, the county seat town of Summersville secured water from Muddlety Creek for its 460 users. Contamination from strip-mining forced the town to construct filtration beds at a cost of $30,000, or $65 per capita.

(e) Among the chief water uses are the sport and relaxation furnished by 128 miles of fishing streams; the recreation enjoyment of clear, pure water; and the potential invitation to those seeking pure water for industrial uses. All of these values would be destroyed by the extension of strip-mining as now planned.

(f) The river waters of Williams, Cranberry, and the North Fork of Cherry, comprising nearly 300 miles of yearlong live streams of which 128 miles are fine trout habitat, are an invaluable boon to the people of West Virginia and the country at large. The fact that these watersheds are in public ownership for the enjoyment of all is significant in the light of mounting populations, increased posting of private property, and accelerated public interest in out-of-doors pursuits. Nowhere in the State of West Virginia, and at few places in the East, can be found an area of such size and potentiality for recreational enjoyment, and the use of pure water for domestic and industrial supplies. In these watersheds, good protection and management have been teamed with the recuperative process of nature until restoration from an earlier era of rapid exploitation of timber prior to public ownership is an accomplished fact. It is necessary only to view the mountains, the slopes, and the clear streams, and to know something of past history, to appreciate the strides that have been made. These investments in protection, management, and conservative harvest are beginning to pay off in a variety of public benefits. These center around good watershed management and its corollary of sustained yields of pure water. The upheaval of the earth itself from strip mining in such an area is entirely incompatible with the public interest.

The foregoing facts will explain why I look upon the Stearns case as being of the utmost importance. I summarize by stating and reemphasizing certain points, as follows:

1. Short-term advantages to the local economy may be gained from stripping, but consideration should be given to long-term public interests.

2. Chemical pollution and siltation will be dumped in some of the finest live streams in the East, streams which contribute much to sportsmen and recreationists, to businesses and towns. Siltation by itself, even without chemical pollution, is deleterious to fish life.

3. Watersheds are endangered.

4. In the strip-mining process, the cost of equipment is great, the number of people employed per production unit is small, and they are mostly heavy machine operators. Hence, the extent to which stripping could compensate for reduced deep-mine employment would be quite small and temporary, and small justification for great damage to permanent values.

5. There is no justification for opening the national forests to stripping based upon a need for coal. Coal resources are virtually unlimited, and the coal industry is presently suffering from lack of markets for its product.

6. In strip mining, unlike drift mining, the surface is removed from the coal and not only is the mined area completely destroyed but additional surface is required for spoil and overburden. The average surface destruction (in the general area of the Monongahela National Forest) at the present time is 1.8 acres for each acre of coal removed. Furthermore, interruption of the

water table on high contours decreases the productivity of the land on a much larger area.

7. Soil and surface erosion would naturally be severe since 1.8 times the area mined is laid bare and steeper slopes are created.

8. By destroying the surface on 1.8 times the area mined, unsightly and permanent scars are created.

9. Healthy watersheds, conservation of top soil, pure water, and adequate timber reserves are absolutely necessary to our Nation in peace and in war. In the light of the present tense world situation, and with every indication that such an unsettled and dangerous international situation may continue to exist indefinitely, it is of the greatest necessity that every action be taken to safeguard these elements which are so necessary to our Nation's security.

10. The issue in the Stearns case is not confined to 47,000 acres; in reality, it involves 750,000 acres. Other owners and operators have asked permission to strip, and they are awaiting the outcome in this case. The long-term public interest demands that the application for permission to strip national forest lands be rejected.

I apologize for the length of this letter. Its length can only be justified in the light of the importance of the decision which will emanate from your office in connection with the Stearns case. I have no personal interest in the matter. I speak as a representative of millions of people, not only in my State but also in others, who are not in a position to speak for themselves. The decision you are about to render will set a precedent. I hope and believe that it will be a precedent favoring the welfare of America and future generations.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT C. BYRD,
Member of Congress.

PROPOSED ATOMIC REACTOR FOR HIROSHIMA, JAPAN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to construct in the city of Hiroshima, Japan, through the cooperative efforts of the Governments of the United States and Japan, an atomic power reactor dedicated to the advancement of peace and progress by producing power for industrial purposes. I have done so because I believe it is necessary that we place primary emphasis upon our intention that the atom shall be used in the cause of peace rather than for the destruction which war brings.

We Americans know that our fundamental objective is peace. Ever enshrined in our hearts is the ancient prayer: "Grant us peace, Thy most precious gift, O Lord." We know that we want no aggrandizement, we want no imperialism, we want no colonialism. We want only to be permitted to live out our lives without fear and without aggression, and to cooperate with like-minded peoples everywhere in this quest for mankind's eternal dream.

This is our goal—and yet, earlier this week this House passed a resolution which has been described by the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee as one which, while it is not a declaration of war, might very well lead to it. That resolution is now being debated by the Senate.

One cannot help but remember, Mr. Speaker, the words with which Charles Dickens began The Tale of Two Cities:

It was the best of times, it was the worst of times; it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness; it was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity; it was the season of light, it was the season of darkness; it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair; we had everything before us, we had nothing before us; we were all going direct to heaven, we were all going direct the other way.

Would not one have believed, Mr. Speaker, that this was a description of the period in which we live? Were his comparisons directed to our present age, Dickens might have added that it was a most simple time, it was a most perplexing time; it was a time of potential peace, it was a time of potential war. It was a time when there was a vision of mankind moving toward the loftiest age in the history of civilization through peaceful uses of the atom; it was a time when the shadow of a mushroom-shaped cloud hung heavy over the prospect of extinction of the civilization which man had laboriously wrought for centuries.

The memory of that cloud is important, Mr. Speaker, because this year marks the 10th anniversary, if it can be called that, of the birth of that cloud—of man's use against his fellowman of the destructive capacity of atomic energy, for it was in August of 1945 that the early morning stillness of the large Japanese city of Hiroshima was shattered by the most terrible single explosion in human history. The incredulity with which the pilot of the bomber Enola Gay witnessed the fiery envelopment of a metropolitan center marked the opening scene of what has become the new life and death drama of our age.

The atom brought a speedy termination to World War II, and there began an all too brief period marked by the fervent hope that we were on the verge of witnessing the achievement of a lasting foundation for world peace. We looked to the organization of the United Nations as a body in which all the peoples of the earth would be represented, a body which would be dedicated to the encouragement of individual freedom for all peoples and the elimination of war as a means of settling disputes. We envisioned a world ruled by the orderly processes of law in which disputes between nations would be subject to settlement in the same manner as disputes between individuals.

Today such goals seem much more distant. The fraternal spirit which marked the opening session of the United Nations has been all but shattered in a mounting accumulation of controversies with the Soviet Union, its Eastern European satellites, and Communist China. The beneficence and sympathetic understanding which we believe to be high among our fundamental national traits, and which led us to seek to relieve the economic plight of nations torn by war and to help underdeveloped countries attempt to eliminate poverty, eradicate disease, and achieve the fullest use of their resources, at a cost of billions of dollars to our taxpayers, now seems to have been forgotten by much of the world and we are puzzled and saddened. On the other hand remembered all too well is our policy of national security, which has emphasized primary reliance upon armaments and military bases capable of being used to ward off, if that is possible, the threat of aggression from our inner citadels—and also capable of being used for delivery of the bomb. The warm glow of good will which first greeted our Nation's generosity and friendship has become more and more diffused by the spectre of massive retaliation. Paraphrasing Wordsworth's famous line: "The bomb is too much with us, late and soon." The world does not relish the thought of atomic war. While we believe in and declare our peaceful intent, while we desire and preach that men shall live in harmony with one another, that swords shall be beaten into plowshares and men practice war no more, unfortunately the world seems not to have forgotten Hiroshima.

While we once enjoyed a monopoly in the knowledge and manufacture of atomic weapons, we are no longer its sole possessors. All indications point to a successful thermonuclear blast by the Soviet Union fully 6 months prior to our first test of a fusion-type nuclear device. Although the Soviet Union may be recognized as the aggressor in the pushing and pulling which characterizes contemporary relationships between nations, the world seems to believe that the United States is the nation most to be feared in dealing with this latest instrument of devastation, because of our professions of preeminence in the field of atomic energy and because of the identification of the atom with the bomb. Much of the world knows of no other use of the atom at the present time. The shroud of secrecy which originally was woven to protect the atom's use for military purposes has not been lifted sufficiently to disclose the progress being made in adoption of the atom for peace. We have done much too good a job in selling our atomic might, with unexpected and undesired results.

This picture in people's minds was not softened by the extensive tests of thermonuclear devices conducted by the United States in the Pacific last spring. The first of these, held on March 1, proved to be not only an awesome demonstration; it was an event of special political importance which we cannot fully comprehend, as well. Had it not been for the poor fishing to the north, the *Fukuryu Maru*, a small Japanese vessel, might never have ventured into the vicinity of the testing area. Had not the winds from the explosion blown radioactive ash over that section of the ocean where the crew of the ship were trying to increase their catch of tuna, the March 1 explosion, which was twice its predicted power, would have remained, for years perhaps, a terse announcement by the Atomic Energy Commission that a test had been successfully made. But the fishing was poor to the north, and the winds that day were a bit hazardous.

Suddenly, the sailors were startled by a high ball of flame in the distance and

a deafening noise. Minutes later a peculiar white dust began to sift down upon their craft, their nets, their hands, their hair. One man, following the natural tendency to taste, touched some of it to his tongue; another, thinking it would make a unique souvenir, tucked some of it away in a small bag under his pillow. In several weeks the ship returned to port, and several of the crew, feeling ill, reported to the hospital. Soon the cause and nature of their condition became clear, and all 23 were hospitalized in Tokyo.

Last fall one of these men died. The other 22 are now suffering from various aftereffects, the future results of which are a matter of some controversy. Recently a $2 million settlement of claims, involving the men themselves and various fishing interests which suffered from the drop in the fish market, was made by our State Department with Japan. Perhaps, with this act, the file in the case was marked "closed" in the Department of State. It was not marked "closed" in Japan, where resentment runs deep that the Japanese should once again have become victims of the bomb.

I frequently wonder whether we have not become so susceptible to Soviet saber rattling, that we fall easy prey to Moscow's design that we not be identified as a nation seeking peace. Each Soviet threat brings with it a corresponding and more belligerent response on our part. They have professed peace, as have we—but for some reason, perhaps an overglorification of the bomb, if one can use that phrase—the world takes lightly the magnificent message which President Eisenhower delivered to the United Nations last year, when he said:

It is with the book of history, and not with isolated pages, that the United States will ever wish to be identified. My country wants to be constructive, not destructive. It wants agreements, not wars, among nations. It wants itself to live in freedom, and in the confidence that the people of every other nation enjoy equally the right of choosing their own way of life. * * * So my country's purpose is to help us move out of the dark chamber of horrors into the light, to find a way by which the minds of men, the hopes of men, the souls of men everywhere, can move forward toward peace and happiness and well-being.

The President continued:

The United States seeks more than the mere reduction or elimination of atomic materials for military purposes. It is not enough to take this weapon out of the hands of the soldiers. It must be put into the hands of more who will know how to strip its military casing and adapt it to the arts of peace.

The United States knows that if the fearful trend of an atomic military buildup can be reversed, this greatest of destructive forces can be developed into a great boon, for the benefit of all mankind.

Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, the United States is now in a position to fulfill the promise implicit in the President's statement, and why should we not tell it to the world again and again? The dynamics of peace require as much of us as those of war, and now that we possess a tool with such unbelievable possibilities for good that our greatest expectations in its use can hardly be too broad, why should we not share it for the benefit of mankind?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. I have discussed this matter recently with the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, and I know how deeply he feels on this world-shattering problem. I would like to point out it is particularly opportune in the House today, following the momentous vote of this House on the resolution dealing with the President's powers this week and it is difficult for me to imagine a more timely speech or a more important subject than my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, is favoring us with at this time.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

We can offer to the peoples of the world new hope and new life through tangible evidence of the fact that atomic energy can be a force for good, rather than evil, consecrated to the life of man rather than to his destruction. And in the case of Japan, what more concrete expression can we furnish of our friendship for the peoples of Japan than our desire to help erase the searing scars which the war-born atom brought to them than to make available the miracle of the atom fashioned in peace and designed to help them overcome a harsh disposition of nature's resources?

We are a people of peace. Securing peace involves risk, even the risk of war itself. If our motives to defend the peace through such a resolution be susceptible to misunderstanding, certainly there can be no misgivings in the action proposed in the bill I have filed today. I think it is well that this reactor directed toward the use of atomic energy for peaceful pursuits should be constructed in the place which first felt the destructiveness of the bomb.

Mr. Speaker, I am not the originator of this proposal. I wish I were, but that honor goes to the distinguished and very able Commissioner of the Atomic Energy Commission, Thomas E. Murray, who first broached it in his speech to the international convention of the United Steel Workers of America last September. Mr. Murray said, and I quote:

Conscious as we are of America's right intentions, we should also recognize that the United States must give by action and not by words alone, clear and tangible proof of our determination to channel the energy of the atom, as soon as possible, into peaceful and constructive paths. Time is running out.

Mr. Murray continued:

We know from experience that only with great difficulty can men in severe economic want be made to think of matters other than their own hunger. Our first imperative task then is to use the atom to assist in the elimination of want where it exists and to forestall want where it threatens. It is clear to me that not only can we do this by developing nuclear power but that in so doing we can simultaneously enrich ourselves and the world both materially and spiritually. Many locations come to mind. But if I were to make a choice, my choice would be Japan. Japan was the first and is still the only land which has been engulfed in the white flame of the atom. Now, while the memory of Hiroshima and Nagasaki remains so vivid, construction of such a power plant in a country like Japan would be a dramatic and Christian gesture which could lift all of us far above the recollection of the carnage of those cities. A nuclear reactor in the Land of the Rising Sun, built by Americans and out of American resources, would be a lasting monument to our technology and our good will. One of our reactors in Japan would go a very long way toward nullifying what has been lost at Dien Bien Phu and Geneva. In this way we would be giving substance to the Divine Command that we forgive our enemies, and we would demonstrate to a grim, skeptical, and divided world that our interest in nuclear energy is not confined to weapons.

Subsequent to Commissioner Murray's eloquent plea, Mr. John J. Hopkins, president of the General Dynamics Corp., the firm which constructed the world's first atom powered sub, the *Nautilus*, joined with him in urging the sharing of the secrets of the peacetime uses of the atom with the other nations of the world. This is what Mr. Hopkins said:

We are now dimly beginning to realize that under the impact of the atom the old mathematical standards, the laws of physics which in earlier years we were taught to think immutable, the established concepts of space, time, and dimension, are faulting and folding—and forming again. The atomic revolution is already molding our world, and if we are not fluid enough to pour ourselves into the changing shape of economic things to come we are—as a major economic power, as the world's industrial leader—through, done for, dead. And dead and done for industrially also means dead and done for militarily. * * *

If we do not use industrial atomic energy to increase the living standards of underdeveloped and politically unstable nations, if we fail to recognize that by so doing we can create vast new world markets for our products, if we are slow to accept the economic, social, and political changes the industrial atom is bringing about—we shall have doomed ourselves to an inferior competitive position, very much second to the Soviet Union and even to Communist China with its unlimited cheap labor. * * *

Nations which are poor in natural resources, nations whose resource are poorly distributed with reference to their population centers, nations now emotionally and politically unstable, could become our industrial equals and unfriendly competitors through the use of atomic power reactors donated by Soviet Russia.

Mr. Hopkins continued, and I quote:

The potentials for an already industrialized but power-short nation such as Japan are far more startling. Between 1945 and 1952 we gave Japan $2¼ billion in nonmilitary economic aid and credits. If it had been possible to allocate an equivalent sum for the installation by American industry of industrial atomic reactors, Japan might have now in the neighborhood of 100 large stationary atomic powerplants with an installed capacity of about 10 million kilowatts.

Mr. Speaker, power is the blood of industrial life. Cheap power offers the possibility of providing benefits which will not only raise the standard of living of an impoverished people, but will increase a nation's economic and political stability. Japan, a country about the size of California, has arable land amounting to only 17 percent of its total. It has a population of 87 million people, increasing at the rate of 1 million per year. With available farm land com-

pletely occupied, more people are moving to the cities wherein industry must expand in order to permit them to live. Even an expanded power development based upon present type electrical generation will be inadequate for many years to come to provide necessary fulfillment of Japan's power needs. An atomic reactor, occupying a small area and generating large quantities of power would be a logical answer to this problem.

But more important than these is the message implicit in this gesture to the people of Japan. We would be telling them for the first time in the potent language of the atom, that we in the United States come in peace, not in war.

I am advised by Commissioner Murray, of the AEC, that construction of a nuclear power reactor in Japan would be feasible, practical, and advantageous. Such a project, in the opinion of Mr. Murray, would be started this year and completed within a few years. Its cost would depend upon the type of reactor employed, as well as the power-potential on which the project would be based. While we do not know, before decisions on these and other factors are made, the exact cost of constructing a power reactor in Japan, we do know that a duplicate of the Duquesne reactor now under construction in Shippingport, Pa., producing upwards of 60,000 kilowatts would cost approximately $45 million. It must be recognized, however, that improvements in reactor technology offer hope of considerable future reductions in present cost estimates.

I also have been assured by Mr. Murray and others that the level of technology in Japan is more than adequate for the construction and maintenance of such a project. We need only to be reminded that it is Japan which has produced Dr. Hideki Yukawa, a world-renowned physicist who won a Nobel prize for his work.

The question may be raised by some of the wisdom of providing Japan with a reactor which, should that nation ever be subjected to Communist rule, could be used against the United States. I have discussed this matter with Mr. Murray, as well, and have been assured that the production of fissionable and fusionable materials, both in this country and Britain, and in the U. S. S. R., has reached such a high point that one reactor, no matter what the wattage, could not possibly shift the balance of power one way or the other. Far from creating a military risk, this project would contribute to the military strength of Japan, and hence of all of free Asia. Moreover, it would put to the test the blatant Soviet declarations about the willingness and ability of the U. S. S. R., as Pravda said recently, "to make atomic energy serve man." Atomic energy must indeed serve man, and it only remains for the United States to demonstrate that it is our intention to do everything we can to see that it shall.

We are losing sight of the fact that in this war-threatened world there are other weapons for conquest than those of a purely military nature. There is no doubt that we must keep our weapons primed and our powder dry, as the gravity of the present situation warrants, but we must realize that this in itself is not enough. If we insist on placing undue emphasis on sheer military might, we will be falling into a Communist trap to identify the United States as a Nation which looks to military rule, rather than peaceful persuasion as the basis for international relationships.

I would like to hope, Mr. Speaker, that it might be possible for the reactor to be named the McMahon reactor, after the late great Senator Brien McMahon, of Connecticut, who was one of the pioneers in promoting the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In a speech to the other body on February 2, 1950, Senator McMahon said:

At present, only one-third of the world's 2,200,000,000 people receive enough food to sustain life on a decent basis. The other two-thirds live continuously at a margin of starvation. Mr. President, it is atomic energy that opens up the vision of expanding material decencies until there is enough to go around for all, until every last hungry mouth is filled. Perhaps, through the expenditure of a few extra tens of millions of dollars we can conquer the riddle of photosynthesis and extract from the processes of plant growth a means of multiplying many times the world's food supply. Perhaps through atomic power for industry and agriculture we can transform the deserts of Africa, Asia, and the Americas into blooming crop-producing acres, and the arid hills of the world into gardens. It is almost impossible to overestimate what all-out concentration upon atomic energy for peace might accomplish in terms of remaking and improving the physical environment of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, life goes on even with the threat of war hanging overhead and the efforts to maintain peace must be constant and unremitting. The atom must become identified with kilowatts, not killing; with balms for healing, not bombs for destruction.

Mr. Speaker, I have every hope that the bill I have introduced today will help keep the peace.

ATOMIC ENERGY FOR PEACE

(By Commissioner Thomas E. Murray)

Mr. President, members of the United Steel Workers of America, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, in 1952, on November 1, in the far Pacific, at Eniwetok, I participated in the test of our first thermonuclear explosion. It was the forerunner of our present hydrogen bomb. Up to the time of Mike, which was the code name given to that historic explosion, scientists had been talking and calculating about creating a hydrogen bomb. Many practical, technical questions had to be answered; soundly proposed scientific doubts had to be resolved. It was hoped that Mike would go far in giving direction to scientific thinking in the hydrogen bomb field. Mike by surpassing expectations, hurled us into the hydrogen era. It was that detonation which enabled scientists to estimate how many hydrogen bombs it would take to scatter to the four winds, in a matter of seconds, the civilization it has taken man centuries to put together. Before Mike, scientists discussed the possibility of world destruction through nuclear reactions. After Mike, they knew that the possibility could be triggered into actuality.

Other versions and improvements of Mike have been developed and successfully tested. Scientists now know that the number of Mikes needed for total world catastrophe is less than they calculated in 1952. Only God knows how much smaller this magic number will become in the next few years. Mike and its successors have placed in the hands of man the dreadsome power of world destruction.

Following Mike, I took another trip. This time to Arco in Idaho. Here the Atomic Energy Commission has established a facility to carry on a variety of atomic power experiments. For several years prior to my visit, there had been under design and construction a large nuclear reactor—an atomic power engine. In contrast with Mike, it was not an engine of mass destruction. In many respects it could be likened to a controlled and safe version of Mike. Like Mike it was to play a tremendous role in scientific research. Although designed primarily for military purposes, if successful, it promised a constructive counterpoint to atomic weaponeering. It, too, would usher in a new era of atomic concepts and achievements. It would perhaps point to a solution of the world's atomic dilemma.

Following years of planning, research, and construction, we were now ready for the first trial. I had the privilege of starting that plant—the prototype of the first submarine nuclear power unit. That epochmaking event took place on May 31, 1953. That plant at Arco continues to operate and has met, and in some respects has exceeded, the fondest dreams of its designers.

These two experiences—one in the far Pacific and the other in the Idaho desert—are symbolic of the atomic age. Thus we have on the one side, frustration and world destruction; on the other, creativity and a common ground for peace and cooperation. Between them they indicate the progress that has been made in adapting the atom to each of these two possible ends. For while the atom is far advanced in the weapons field, it is not yet very far down the road to peace. Our most important task should be to correct this evergrowing and dangerous unbalance. All the multitudinous peaceful applications of atomic energy can be made to contribute toward peace. However, the all important key, for the years immediately ahead, is to develop nuclear energy for the generation of electric power.

This requires that we develop that fabulous atomic furnace, the nuclear power reactor; a Vulcan's smithy where the energy locked up in the atom can be released, in a controlled manner, safely, steadily, surely—in quantities measured only by our vision, courage, and leadership.

To understand why the atomic power reactor is so important a key we must remember that there is an ever-growing demand for electric power. This is true not only in our own country, where the demand for power is doubling every 10 years, but throughout the world. There are many regions where the shortage of power is already acute. So much so in fact that the demands for electricity are increasing at a more rapid rate in some parts of the world than in the United States. The national well-being and security—of our Nation and indeed of all mankind—are so closely and increasingly tied up with energy and power, that we cannot afford to leave dormant this new atomic power source. I will not attempt to forecast the number of decades that will pass until a shortage of conventional fuels presents a serious world problem.

Certainly, this country has enough of the standard fuels to dispel sensational and unfounded fears of their impending scarcity. There is no need for anxiety. Widespread obsolescence of conventional powerplants or any serious disruption of labor and industry are not just around the corner. Be that as it may, we must be continually mindful that there do exist areas with a scarcity of conventional fuels. There are nations where

adequate electric power, so necessary for improving standards of living, is now impracticable, technically and financially. For many of these "have-not" nations nuclear power holds great promise, not only for the future but today.

Conscious as we are of America's right intentions, we should also recognize that the United States must give by action and not by words alone, clear and tangible proof of our own determination to channel the energy of the atom, as soon as possible, into peaceful and constructive paths. Time is running out. It is as if there were a delayed time fuse in the ever-mounting stockpiles of Mikes both here and in Soviet Russia. The mechanisms of delay in this fuse cannot be trusted to last indefinitely.

Recently Congress passed a new Atomic Energy Act. In setting forth the fundamental policies of our Government in the atomic field, the Atomic Energy Commission is called upon to develop programs for promoting the general welfare and world peace. And President Eisenhower has pledged our intention to carry out these two objectives. Before the United Nations he solemnly promised that we will take the atom out of the hands of soldiers and adapt it to the arts of peace. I can think of no quicker and more concrete way of fulfilling the mandate of the act, as well as the President's promise, than to embark, now, while we still have time, on a vigorous program to develop atomic electric power.

Again on Labor Day the President reaffirmed our intentions. He called for such things as the formation of an international agency having control of fissionable materials earmarked for peaceful use, the establishment of a nuclear training center for friendly nations, and help in the building of foreign research reactors. This program should have universal support. But unless this program is aggressively implemented, years will pass before significant tangible worldwide results are realized. The implementation needed is a persistent determined effort, backed by our manpower and our dollars to put atomic power plants into operation, both here and abroad.

We have in this country a technology and industrial capability that is unsurpassed. We have a wealth of courageous nuclear scientists so indispensable and always so willing to assist once the need is made clear. Because of the magnitude of the job ahead, we should immediately increase the number of scientists presently engaged in atomic power work. Our failure to go ahead on a broad, vigorous program will be interpreted as a "dog in the manger" policy. It would be like saying, "We could have atomic electric power if we wanted it, but, unlike the rest of the world, we do not need it today. Therefore, its development can wait for economic and financial forces to move it ahead."

That is an attitude which must be resisted. To permit such a policy to prevail because of budgetary or other limitations would be inconsistent with all that this Nation stands for. It would play into the hands of the Soviets. No one familiar with world technology has any doubt that today the Soviets are capable of meeting the atomic electric power challenge. The explosion of a hydrogen device by the Soviets in August 1953, as well as other evidences of their overall nuclear progress, are clear indications of their ability in the atomic field. If the U. S. S. R. should win the industrial power race, the price tag for nuclear power reactors will be high. So high indeed that the purchaser will be forced to relinquish his birthrights and civil liberties in exchange for nuclear electric power. This must not happen. What a tragedy it would be if world leadership in this field fell by default into Soviet hands.

The "have-not" nations are anxious for atomic power. They are not particularly seeking the details of nuclear power technology. Very few of them now have the background to take full advantage of such technology. Many of these countries may never have atomic power if first it will be necessary for them to acquire the technical skills to design reactors and the supporting industries to manufacture them. But with our help they can have atomic power.

Let us now examine where the United States stands today in the field of power reactors. Except for the Arco installation, which I have mentioned, there are no operating power reactors in this country. It is true that we are investigating a number of different reactor types, each potentially capable of making significant nuclear contributions. But in assessing our accomplishments, candor requires that we distinguish between achievement and promise. That is, we must not identify these promising development programs with operating reactors. Certainly our overall accomplishments in the power reactor field do not rank as yet with the other outstanding achievements of American science and industry. Part—but only part—of the reason has been our necessary preoccupation with improving and stockpiling atomic weapons. It must be admitted, however, that we could have done more in spite of Soviet intransigeance.

Indeed, our one operating unit would not be in existence today if it had not offered great military promise. Financial support for this Arco reactor would not have been given except for its possible military importance. In this respect, the unit has fulfilled its promise by giving this country revolutionary advantages in the propulsion of submarines and other vessels. Although developed as a military program the Arco reactor continues to give valuable information for future industrial reactors. In fact, if it had not been for the accomplishments of the naval reactor program, our industrial power effort would still be in the embryo stage. Even our first major step toward industrial nuclear power, the Shippingport 60,000-kilowatt reactor, was only salvaged after much persuasion from an abandoned naval design.

The President broke ground for the Shippingport plant, near Pittsburgh, on Labor Day. By his participation and his remarks on that occasion, he gave impressive evidence of the importance which he attaches to industrial nuclear power. Significant as this event is, however, we must recognize that the fruits of this project will not be realized for several years.

You can appreciate my concern for our atomic power future when I tell you that as the Arco unit went into operation, much of its design was out of date. However, rapid obsolescence is characteristic of all healthy scientific and technological developments. Take for example the aircraft industry. By the time any plane enters wide operational service it is well on the way to being obsolete. It takes about 7 years from the time the design of a large bomber is begun until the plane is in production. It was fortunate that we did not wait 7 years after designing the B–47 before beginning the design of the B–52. We should adopt this same progressive technique in the development of industrial power reactors. Today we are sure that the 60,000 kilowatt Shippingport reactor will work. Tomorrow we should be building a bigger and a better power reactor of the best design now available.

I should like to emphasize the word "build." It is a meaningful word. Because in order to build well, one must discard all impractical schemes and face facts. Where even small difficulties exist, one must overcome them. To neglect them as trivial is to invite failure. Then, too, as a result of building, we add all that vast store of practical knowledge that only comes from putting a thing together and running it.

However, to get on with the building of power reactors we must have a strong program of Government support. I stress this because there is a widespread misconception concerning the speed with which nuclear power will become competitive with conventional power. Many optimistic statements have been made. Most of them are based on the erroneous assumption that the engineering problems have already been solved, and lead to the equally wrong conclusion that nuclear power is cheap and is ours for the asking. The fact is we have only begun to solve the engineering problems. And the ultimate cost of nuclear power will depend very heavily on just how these engineering problems are solved. We just do not have sufficient information today to be able to calculate how much nuclear power will really cost. But this should not cause us to delay. Thomas A. Edison never attempted to calculate the cost of electricity while trying to make a workable electric generator. He and the other pioneers, like my own good father, knew that if they succeeded the cost would take care of itself. Similarly a study of the potentialities of aviation following the Wright brothers' famous Kitty Hawk flight would have proven that the airplane had no economic future. Henry Ford did not rush to the economists before he decided to go into production of automobiles.

Our approach to the overall atomic power problem should benefit from these experiences. We cannot today estimate the cost of atomic electric power from the new Shippingport reactor. There will be no accurate figures until the plant is built and operating. Informed bids for supplying major units of this atomic plant in some cases varied as much as fivefold. How then can one discuss intelligently the cost of atomic power at the present time? And yet reports continue to be published arguing a 20-percent advantage for one design of reactor over another. Again I say we just do not know.

Because the economics of nuclear power are so uncertain, it is unrealistic to expect private industry to undertake, on a purely risk basis, anything like the effort that the world atomic power problem demands. If our goal is electric power from the atom at an early date, the Government must continue to play the major role for the immediate years ahead. Only in this way can we make sure that this potentially giant industry arrives soon enough to be of any assistance in the attainment of peace.

A word of caution is in order. There are two basic types of reactors—one for the primary purpose of producing power; the other for the primary purpose of producing plutonium, and with electric power only as a byproduct. We have to decide on which type of reactor we should concentrate our scientific talent, facilities, and fissionable materials in the immediate future. Naturally certain segments of private industry, in order to reduce their risks, will favor the plutonium plus power or dual-purpose approach. At first glance this so-called compromise reactor seems to represent a reasonable course. But the Government already has in operation and under construction sufficient facilities to supply present military requirements for weapons grade plutonium. Even if military requirements are increased it is highly unlikely that the compromise route could be depended upon to meet firm military requirements for the critical years just ahead. Furthermore, it is not conceivable that we would want to place such reactors, capable of producing weapons grade plutonium, in foreign lands. We cannot allow budgetary considerations, such as possible cheaper weapons materials, nor the lack of risk capital, to cause us to drag our feet in this most important nuclear power race.

We know from experience that only with great difficulty can men in severe economic

want be made to think of matters other than their own hunger. Our first imperative task then is to use the atom to assist in the elimination of want where it exists and to forestall want where it threatens. It is clear to me that not only can we do this by developing nuclear power but that in so doing we can simultaneously enrich ourselves and the world both materially and spiritually. For example, while proceeding to fulfill our understandings with Belgium to assist that country in the building of its power reactor we could also proceed to build power reactors in other foreign lands. Many locations come to mind. But if I were to make a choice, my choice would be Japan. Japan was the first and is still the only land which has been engulfed in the white flame of the atom. Now, while the memory of Hiroshima and Nagasaki remains so vivid, construction of such a powerplant in a country like Japan would be a dramatic and Christian gesture which could lift all of us far above the recollection of the carnage of those cities. A nuclear reactor in the Land of the Rising Sun, built by Americans and out of American resources, would be a lasting monument to our technology and our good will. One of our reactors in Japan would go a very long way toward nullifying what has been lost at Dien Bien Phu and Geneva. In this way we would be giving substance to the divine command that we forgive our enemies, and we would demonstrate to a grim, skeptical, and divided world that our interest in nuclear energy is not confined to weapons.

Let me add a final word of caution. The roots of the so-called atomic dilemma are embedded deeply in 2 mutually antagonistic but basic ideologies; 2 irreconcilable concepts concerning man and his relation to God. Therefore, no matter how bountiful the material benefits derived from the peaceful uses of the atom may prove to be, we cannot expect that they alone will suffice to resolve this dilemma. A solution in the material sphere alone can never be more than a partial or tentative answer. Only in the realm of the spirit is man complete. Man's soul is what distinguishes him from the brute. That is why the divine founder of the Christian faith said: "Not by bread alone does man live." We are here today discussing energy. Prayer puts us in direct contact with the greatest source of energy in the universe. All of us, if we will, can pray to God.

I have posed today's atomic dilemma—on the one hand world destruction—potential annihilation of man and civilization—and on the other peaceful power reactors contributing to man's well being. While the masters of Soviet Russia are stockpiling their "Mikes" of destruction, we must continue to surpass them as indeed we are doing. But my message to you is that we must do the one without neglecting the other.

You, the United Steel Workers of America, are recognized for your intelligent leadership. Your participation in worthwhile programs of relief and reconstruction, looking to the achievement of a workable peace, are well known. Your constructive vision is perhaps nowhere better demonstrated than by your keen interest in nuclear energy and its prospects for man's service. That is why I gladly accepted your President's kind invitation to speak to you today. For my 4½ years of scanning the nuclear panorama I am convinced—and I hope you agree—that the future of civilization and culture, and of humanity itself, depends on our intelligent use of the atom. Now is the time for us to act on this conviction. Now is the time to marshal all the titanic forces of American labor, science, and industry behind a determined effort to channel the power of the atom into the pathways of peace. For only in this way can we justify before God our stewardship of the atom, which can be made the richest of His material blessings.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of September 24, 1954]

MR. MURRAY'S PROPOSAL

(By Roland Sawyer)

WASHINGTON.—This dispatch is written particularly for readers in Japan and in America. Both are involved emotionally, morally, politically, and spiritually by the chain of events which began nearly 10 years ago at Hiroshima. Then it was 77,000 Japanese who were first "engulfed in the white flame of the atom." Now it is a single Japanese, Aikichi Kuboyama, the seaman who has just perished from the effects of radiation caused by the United States hydrogen bomb test at Bikini, March 1.

Judging from reports out of Tokyo, the Japanese are almost as disturbed in time of peace by what has befallen the seaman, who was a radio operator on a Japanese fishing boat, as they were by what happened at Hiroshima in wartime.

At this very moment has come an idea which, if carried out, could do much to ameliorate the harshness of both events. A proposal has been made by Thomas E. Murray, a member of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, that the American people, through their Government, build and present to the people of Japan an atomic reactor to produce electric power. Mr. Murray suggests that the reactor be located in Hiroshima.

This "would be a dramatic and Christian gesture which could lift all of us far above the recollection of the carnage of those cities" (Hiroshima and Nagasaki). "In this way," Mr. Murray went on, "we would be giving substance to the divine command that we forgive our enemies, and we would demonstrate to a grim, skeptical, and divided world that our interest in nuclear energy is not confined to weapons."

This idea seems to have splendor. It ought to be given sufficient prominence in the United States so that some such thing could be done. But it is unlikely that it will be done unless the American people know of the idea and respond, and unless that response is transmitted with some force to the Atomic Energy Commission and the White House. Here seems to be an opportunity to build a lasting monument to the good will in the United States toward the Japanese, which is substantial. All President Eisenhower would need to do, virtually, would be to scratch a note on a pad on his desk and the plan could be put into action.

It is true that the Japanese are not in immediate need of atomic-electric power. But the symbol of the atom returning to Hiroshima in a constructive role would accomplish two things. It would be a reminder to Americans that the need for the United States to give much more priority to atomic-electric power than it has done, up to now, is very great. And it would be a reminder to the Japanese people—and to people everywhere—that there is a body of public opinion in America which is far more enthusiastic about developing the atom for constructive purposes than concentrating everlastingly upon how large bombs can be made.

With the death of Aikichi Kuboyama, Mr. Murray's proposal is especially timely and helpful. He is one of those few people in the United States Government who really understands what the atomic age is all about. While this statement cannot possibly be proved, a reporter sees many indications in Washington that the dimensions and speed of potential destruction which atomic weapons have introduced are still dimly understood by men in the highest echelons of the present as well as the past administration.

But Mr. Murray knows. He has witnessed most of the great tests. He has taken the trouble to go and see for himself, whereas many have not, even when urged to do so. And he understands, too, that being mesmerized by bombs and bigness to the point where power development has been grossly neglected, as he charged in his recent speech, is a shortsighted policy.

The time has come for a real effort to give the world a prospect of someting from the atom besides bombs. The President's plan of last December turned the light in this direction. Chairman Lewis L. Strauss, of the AEC, has pledged to keep the light turned on. And Mr. Murray is generating some heat toward a greater effort than has yet been shown.

His proposal to begin at Hiroshima is a goal the American people should not lose sight of. And the people of Japan, who have suffered most, would be among the first to enjoy the fruits of this greatest material power that man now has, almost at his disposal.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of September 24, 1954]

CAUTION: H-BOMBS

The United States has in the hydrogen bomb a weapon which could backfire disastrously for American and western civilization unless even peacetime tests of its efficacy and variations are skillfully handled. An indication of this is seen in the intense reaction which has swept over Japan following the death of a fishing vessel crewman exposed to radioactive dust from the H-bomb test at Bikini last March. This reaction has been building for months.

The story of Aikichi Kuboyama and 22 other fishermen of the Lucky Dragon is one which has gone around the world. A conjunction of events capped by what happened to this ill-starred fishing vessel 80 miles from the test site caused a barrage of criticism of the United States which, if international relations are important, may have caused America as much damage as if the bomb had fallen on the American continent.

We do not agree with flamboyant declarations that the bomb tests never should have been held. A great deal of hysteria has been built up over the effects, stemming naturally from the searing experiences of Hiroshima and Nagasaki but fanned also, undoubtedly, by Japanese Communists.

The American response to the wave of fear which swept Japan should have been more immediate, more tactful, and more indicative of real concern. To be sure, the weapons being tested were part of the defense of Japan itself as well as of the United States and the West. This point ought to have greater significance to the Japanese since the evident explosion of a hydrogen-type bomb by the Soviet Union in the vicinity of Wrangel Island northeast of Japan.

But American officialdom could and should make it clearer, more emphatic, that the United States regards such an incident as part of the unfortunate cost of the international power struggle, that it is distressed over injury to even one Japanese or Marshall Islander, that it is not only willing to pay compensation to men and their families, but that it is resolved to take measures to safeguard positively against any such misfortunes if further tests of atomic or thermonuclear weapons are required.

An affirmative declaration to that effect from the President or some other authoritative high official would be very much in order in Washington today. The statement would commit the United States to finding an area in which nuclear tests could be made without hazard or arranging for exclusion of human beings from a much larger territory than before, if such tests are to be continued. But this is virtually the obligation imposed already by a decent regard for the safety of others and the opinion of mankind.

Possibly a safe region could be found in northern Alaska or arranged for on the

Greenland ice cap or in Australia, where Britain held its atomic tests. If any further activities of the sort are contemplated in the Pacific it may well be advisable to ask the United Nations to take part in the supervision, since the island areas are held under a U. N. strategic trusteeship.

There is potential value in the recommendation made by Thomas E. Murray, a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, that the United States should sponsor construction in Japan of an atomic reactor to generate electric power for peaceful purposes. This would give important evidence of American interest in constructive as well as destructive uses of atomic fission.

But the United States must also find ways to avoid giving an impression of casualness or callousness in its necessary tests of nuclear weapons. It is ironic that world sentiment accepts Russian tests with much greater calm. America must cultivate an atmosphere in which it will be better appreciated that such tests on its part are for the security of the free world.

A PLAN FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY UNDER THE LEADERSHIP OF AMERICAN INDUSTRY

(By John Jay Hopkins)

American businessmen are, and must be, vitally concerned not only with specific industrial problems of our own economy but also with broad economic problems besetting the entire world. For all men and all nations are now more closely interrelated than ever before.

Electronic communication, supersonic flight, limitless atomic power, and atomic radiation are challenging traditional political concepts, expanding the economies of nations, opening up vast new markets for astounding new products, and so preparing the way for world-wide and revolutionary social, economic, and political change.

These oncoming changes and our consequent urgent need to keep fluid in order to master them impress me constantly with the truth of Spengler's vivid phrase, "rigidity is death."

It is evident that the American industrial economy is the most powerful political factor in the world today. It is the potent source of our military strength, our high standard of living, our physical well-being. But with the advent of the atom many of the basic processes which support and motivate our industrial mechanism are in imminent danger of obsolescence.

IMPACT OF THE ATOM

We are now dimly beginning to realize that under the impact of the atom the old mathematical standards, the laws of physics which in earlier years we were taught to think immutable, the established concepts of space, time, and dimension, are faulting and folding—and forming again. The atomic revolution is already molding our world, and if we are not fluid enough to pour ourselves into the changing shape of economic things to come we are—as a major economic power, as the world's industrial leader—through, done for, dead. And dead and done for industrially also means dead and done for militarily.

It is profoundly disquieting to read that our Soviet rival has already passed us in the industrial application of atomic energy. I hope that such reports are inaccurate, but it is increasingly evident that the Soviet Union intends to use the industrial atom as an instrument of foreign policy along with—and perhaps in preference to—the military atom.

If we do not use industrial atomic energy to increase the living standards of underdeveloped and politically unstable nations, if we fail to recognize that by so doing we can create vast new world markets for our products, if we are slow to accept the economic, social, and political changes the industrial atom is bringing about—we shall have doomed ourselves to an inferior competitive position, very much second to the Soviet Union and even to Communist China with its unlimited cheap labor.

Nations which are poor in natural resources, nations whose resources are poorly distributed with reference to their population centers, nations now emotionally and politically unstable, could become our industrial equals and unfriendly competitors through the use of atomic power reactors donated by Soviet Russia.

The time has come, it seems to me, when American industrialists must coalesce international policies and international programs into international actions.

The energy and ability which has built the American industrial civilization—the American standard of living—must now be turned to those "have-not" nations of today which want so desperately and deserve so thoroughly to become the "will-get" nations of tomorrow.

SEEDS OF INDUSTRIALIZATION

Since the inception of the industrial revolution in Europe and North America and the consequent rise of living standards in the West, the peoples of the Asiatic, African, and South American continents have been exposed in varying degrees to the new society based upon machine technology. At first, their countries were looked upon as sources of raw materials and markets for finished goods by the rapidly expanding and competitive nations of Western Europe and North America. In many instances they were the recipients of European or American capital which brought about partial industrial development, usually in the form of improved transportation, or in the extractive industries such as mining, or the limited processing of raw materials.

This aspect of nineteenth century imperialism, closely linked as it was with world politics and the specious doctrine of the white man's burden, succeeded, among other achievements of dubious value, in generating the profound repugnance and emotional animosity toward the West which is our heritage today. Yet, for all the abuses by the imperialists, and there were many, they were not the prime movers, but only the expediters of the inevitable. Sooner or later, the agrarian cultures of the world would have begun to clamor for the higher living standards so attractively displayed in the show windows of the West. Had there been no imperial interlude, we would be surrounded still by hungry people anxious to emulate our ways, and frustrated perpetually by the extreme pressures of their partially agrarian, partially industrial economies.

To say the best of ourselves, it is probable that the cumulative effects of the brand of enlightened imperialism such as professed and practiced by us in the Philippines—and by the British in later years in India—accomplished a great deal of useful work in planting the seeds of a future industrial economy.

EXPLOSIONS AND IMPLOSIONS

Apart from imperialism, however, certain socio-economic factors are responsible in large part for the desperate shortages of power, food, water, shelter, clothing which now characterize the agrarian nations.

First, exposure to western civilization taught the leading classes in these nations that the cheap power of the industrial city automatically raises living standards over agrarian levels. And over the years there has been diffused to all classes the conviction that a western-type standard of living can be achieved only by a western-type industrialization.

Second, the improved health standards of partial or incomplete industrialization have induced explosive increases in population with stagnant economies basically unaltered in cultural pattern, and without commensurate increases of food supplies.

The result is that in typical underdeveloped countries there is never a sufficient capital or manpower surplus to achieve complete industrialization with its more static population and more dynamic nutritional curves. Not only do many underdeveloped nations lack any but the most primitive forms of mechanical power but—due to poor nutrition—they lack even effective muscle power.

Third, many of the underdeveloped nations possess valuable mineral resources which, because of insufficient capital and untrained and inadequate labor, remain idle while multitudes living above and around these resources are constantly on the edge of starvation.

Finally, World War II, which brought about a general weakening of the great colonial powers such as Britain, France, Belgium, and the Netherlands, permitted a galvanic upsurge of native idealism and nationalism. High-minded native leaders vied with the unscrupulous in seizing the opportunity to exploit the obvious restlessness of the native masses; and often, in the well-worn fashion of totalitarian dictators, blamed the failure of their promises on that now traditional villain—western imperialism. Such situations, surcharged with the heat of emotional nationalism, were well suited to the purposes and methods of the Soviet Union. We have only to consider recent and current events in China, Korea, and Indochina as ample evidence of their success. Yet in those have-not nations which are still independent of the Soviet yoke the same problems remain. Indeed, as each year goes by exterior and interior political and economic pressures are being intensified. I need not tell you that if these pressures are not in some way relieved, there will be explosions—or implosions—of disastrous violence.

A SYMBIOTIC RELATIONSHIP

It may be said that we have no need for Asia's underprivileged millions; that they are an economic liability which we can well do without. Nothing could be more fallacious or so fraught with danger to our security and our way of life. To ignore the needs of these people is not only inhuman but most uneconomic and impolitic. We must not and, indeed, cannot abandon them to become instruments of Soviet Russia's—or Communist China's—aggressive military and economic policies.

The world's economic and political life, like its organic life, the life of the sea, the forest, and the prairie, is fundamentally a symbiotic relationship—a mutual interdependence, a mutuality of benefits as well as responsibilities. The American economy cannot be healthy and secure if the Asiatic, or African, or European, or South American economy is unhealthy and insecure.

Further, the world is uneasily poised between an economically dominant industrial society and a numerically dominant agrarian economy which is striving to become industrialized. If industrial civilization survives the current threat of world destruction, of thermonuclear terracide, agrarian nations with low living standards must aspire to industrialism. Therefore, it becomes a question of whether these peoples, and we ourselves in the long run, will enjoy industrial, economic, and political freedom or whether they and, eventually we, succumb to Soviet industrial, economic, and political tyranny. It is fallacious to assume that a conquering Soviet would keep a billion people in abject poverty. Although world communism is certainly not motivated by moral considerations, it is shrewdly aware that, given cheap power, today's underdeveloped areas and hungry populations could prove to be tomorrow's richest economic and political assets. I present for your contemplation these words

of Mahatma Gandhi: "To the millions who have to go without two meals a day the only acceptable form in which God dare appear is food."

The brilliant American geochemist, Harrison Brown, has written recently, "it seems likely that, given concerted efforts of both the underdeveloped areas and the industrialized regions of the world, the standards of living of the underprivileged two-thirds of humanity could be raised significantly in about 50 years, and standards of living characteristic of the industrialized West of today might be attained in an additional 50 years without resorting to totalitarian methods."

AN ATOMIC MARSHALL PLAN

Thus, I am led to make the following proposal:

I propose that there be initiated forthwith—through concrete proposals by American industry to our Federal Government—a 100-year program for the financing, construction, and implantation of atomic reactors in the power-short, food-short, water-short, life-short areas of the world. And that this be done by American private enterprise and the American Government working together with friendly national governments and their own private enterprise groups.

I propose the implantation now in underdeveloped nations of what might be termed atomic seed reactors—from which ever-widening ripples of agricultural, industrial, physiological, and sociological benefits will spread.

Such seed reactors implanted by American industry and the American Government, working together, would encourage the development in these vastly populated nations of indigenous industrialization—resulting in the creation of a billion-customer market with a deep hunger for an American-type standard of living, and the gradually growing means to attain it.

This seeding of have-not nations with suitable atomic reactor projects could be achieved within the next 25 years by a well-designed program to divert a very substantial part of present international economic aid from what has been an almost sterile, nonself-perpetuating giveaway plan to what would be a breeder-type repayment plan. I believe that atomic reactors implanted in such areas would go to work at once to grow the real wealth out of which their costs could be paid back.

I do not represent to you that my associates and I have been able to much more than begin the study and analysis of basic data. Certain statistics, however, are thrown into significant relief when examined in the light of a humanitarian program of massive atomic creation in contrast to the threat of massive atomic destruction.

THE WAY OUT OF OUR DILEMMA

In the last 6 years, between 1948 and 1954, due to the exigencies of the world situation, the American people, through the Foreign Operations Administration alone, have sent abroad—in the form of manufactured products, food supplies, and financial credits—the sum of $26,298,400,000.

Of this vast sum military assistance accounted for over $10 billion and industrial and financial rehabilitation accounted for over $15 billion. Europe received the lion's share of $22,214,400,000 with roughly the same ratios between military and economic aid. Latin America received but $83,800,000, of which $38 million was for military assistance and nearly $46 million was for economic and financial aid.

I certainly would not quarrel with the policy that has dictated such emergency military expenditures. I cannot cavil at the Marshall plan's dollar grants for economic aid which have been effective in Europe, though only temporarily so, and only partially effective in Asia. We were doing the best we knew how. But then we had only dollars. Now we have atoms.

Yet it is significant that over the 7-year period between 1945 and 1952, not quite $6 billion, including military aid, went to Africa, the Near East, Far East, and Pacific Ocean areas, with Japan and China alone receiving well over half of the benefits. If we stop to consider that this covers the period of the Communist conquest of China and the Korean war, when we were exporting large quantities of military supplies to these areas, it can readily be seen that except for Japan we have not set up any program of economic aid which could stimulate the industrialization of Asiatic have-not nations. And we have just recently heard Mr. Yoshida suggest in Washington an economic aid program of some $4 billion more to save Southeast Asia. Note that he was not requesting direct aid for Japan but aid for the preservation of the Japanese rice bowl on which the life of his country depends.

Our foreign-aid program has been a short range one, dictated by necessity. It has heavily favored Europe over Asia, Africa, and South America, and a sizable percentage of total outlays has been for military supplies. The types of nonmilitary assistance have varied, but it is safe to generalize that most have aimed at propping the existing economy—to largely agrarian countries we sent agricultural machinery, seeds, fertilizers, and the like, in industrial nations we have provided transportation and communications equipment, some heavy industrial components and other manufactured materials of a similar nature.

Most thinking Americans would agree that if the billions spent thus far have purchased even a temporary security for the free world, they were well worth the spending. And in some nations, notably Great Britain, Italy, France, and West Germany, assistance was a dire necessity. But the basic problem of worldwide instability between industrial and agrarian economies remains. Nor can it be solved by conventional "dollar-stuffing," "stop-gap" means which, with the advent of atomic energy, have lost much of any previous effectiveness.

The only way out of the world's political, social, and economic dilemma is to provide the power for agrarian nations to begin to industrialize, and for partially industrialized nations to industrialize completely.

I think we must now face up to the fact that in the atomic age, dollars per se are no longer power. In the atomic revolution now sweeping away the world's conventional military, economic, and political concepts the prime material power is the absolute power of atomic power.

THE ATOMIC KEY TO WORLD STABILITY

With the atom, mankind has finally secured a key to power unlimited, and power is the prime mover of industrialization. The enormous energy value contained in minute quantities of fissionable materials means that at least one formerly very high cost item—a complex power, highway, and rail transportation network—is not an absolute sine qua non to primary economic development. With helicopters, huge flying boats, and the portable atomic reactor we appear now to possess the means readily to reach areas formerly inaccessible and to reverse the historic process of ground transportation necessarily preceding power and communication. Eventually, of course, extensive ground transportation networks might very well be built, but these would be a gradual secondary development.

Radiating in concentric circles from atomic reactor nuclei, the rate of growth of a new industrial economy will be measured by the steady capital accretion which will result as atomic powerplants process valuable raw materials—stimulate local skills—educate classes of technicians and engineers—irrigate arid but potentially fertile agricultural lands—and release valuable manpower from fruitless subsistence farming.

What are the immediate, specific, economic consequences of the international sharing of atomic reactors and reactor technology? Where would be the most feasible places to export atomic technology, fissionable materials and components? How could they benefit American industry? These questions, though difficult, are possible of solution if we will equate calmly and in a positive fashion the factors of geography, economics and mutual security.

Generally speaking, atomic reactors now being planned or built in the United States fall into 4 categories: the research reactors; the somewhat larger package reactor; the propulsion reactor for submarine or ship or aircraft; and the large stationary power reactor. The research reactor, as its name implies, is used primarily for experimental or educational purposes, though it does produce limited quantities of valuable radioisotope byproducts useful in industry, medicine and agriculture. Such a reactor is relatively inexpensive—ranging from several hundred thousand dollars to $3 million or so depending upon design as well as the amount of laboratory and other facilities required—and can be produced in quantity. To those nations which possess modest technical capacities and an ultimate ambition for larger, more complex installation it would be invaluable as a training device, a source of radioisotopes and as the pioneer in paving the way for further nuclear power development.

THE BOON OF INDUSTRIAL ATOMIC ENERGY

Small power reactors which may cost from about $1 million to $3 million could be particularly useful in bringing power to inaccessible sites, where valuable minerals exist, but where costs of bringing in fuel for conventional powerplants would be prohibitive; for setting up mountain top radio, TV, and radar warning networks; or for other military purposes. Small power reactors could also prove economically desirable in semi-industrialized nations which lack sufficient reserves of fossil fuels because they would provide nuclei of power which would further develop industry, and also act as developers of nuclear technology.

Large stationary reactor powerplants with a power potential in the vicinity of 100,000 to 600,000 or more kilowatts are still primitive in respect to design and economics. But we know definitely that these huge powerplants will be of ultimate enormous value for all nations.

The three chief obstacles to constructing large atomic powerplants are cost, feasible locations, and the number of highly skilled technicians and engineers required. A fourth problem to master is the satisfactory development of reactor breeding techniques which is an ultimate goal but not necessarily a vital one for foreign nations at the present time.

It is difficult to specify the exact cost of each reactor in the changing state of today's technology. A cost of roughly $250 per installed kilowatt of production capacity would seem to be a good achievable estimate of costs for a large powerplant. Thus a 100,000-kilowatt reactor would cost roughly $25 million. In addition, costs of like magnitude may be required for fuel reprocessing facilities. Such costs, however, could be substantially modified by a number of complex variables.

Of the principal have-not areas in the world to which nuclear power might bring a new industrial civilization, Asia has the largest population potential, is the most underdeveloped, has the most diversified problems, and is the most explosively nationalistic. Asia is still the world's jewel, but, as the poet John Masefield so prophetically pointed out many years ago, no longer for traditional reasons. The classical emerald-and-ruby

wealth of the Arabian Nights—the "ivory, apes, and peacocks" of the antique world—is of little economic value now.

The real wealth of Asia is locked under deserts, in mountains—and mainly in the billion people who hunger for food, for equality, and for all that is implied in the term "American standard of living." The key that will unlock the treasures of this fabulous continent—for its people and for the world—is atomic energy. Energy that is relatively cheap; energy that is transportable; energy that is constant; atomic energy that will enable this area of the world to leapfrog the conventional fuel systems, the conventional communication systems, the conventional medical practices, the conventional agriculture of the 19th and early 20th centuries. Energy that will propel not only Asia, but Africa, Free Europe, and Latin America into the 21st century.

I believe that we Americans, in our great tradition of free enterprise and democratic government, must grant to those free nations of the world who need it the boon of industrial atomic energy.

FOUR BASIC STEPS TO TAKE

As I see it, there would be four basic steps to be taken in the process of implanting industrial atomic reactors in have-not nations by the American Government and American private enterprise. They are:

1. The atomic research reactor: I label this the "pioneer" reactor, because in a foreign environment it would begin the process of raising industrial technical levels to the point where in 5 or 10 or 15 years the economy of the country would support, or improved technology would make possible, the indigenous development of a large stationary power reactor. In the meantime, the research reactor—through its production of radioisotopes for medical and agricultural research, and for industrial measurement, radiation of plastics and other materials—would develop highly valuable industrial experience as a byproduct.

2. The portable atomic power reactor: The portable or "package" reactor might find its first use in locations where there is now insufficient technical skill or industrial development to support an indigenous atomic power program. The package reactor, through its mobility and freedom from fuel supply lines, could supply the initial seed of an industrial development in a have-not nation with still undeveloped natural resources.

3. The large stationary power reactor: The main objective of any reactor program, of course, would be the eventual development of the large stationary power reactor—perhaps similar to but much larger than the 60,000 kilowatt pressurized water reactor being developed now by Westinghouse for the Duquesne Light Co. I say "perhaps" here since the Atomic Energy Commission, as you may know, has set forth on a very large and very important 5-year plan for the development of a number of different reactor designs, many of which offer great promise.

4. The large-scale breeder reactor: The ultimate step, so far as we can see now, appears to be the large-scale breeder reactor which produces power and radioisotopes and breeds its own replacement fuel as well as fuel for other reactors. The possibilities here are, obviously, infinite but are still so vast, so nebulous that I do not feel qualified to discuss them beyond this mention.

TO HELP NATIONS HELP THEMSELVES

How could such a 100-year program be financed? So bold, and broad and unorthodox a program could not, of course, short of cartelization, be supported wholly by private capital.

It is not merely a matter of money. Atomic energy cannot be equated or compared with any other previous manifestation of the physical world.

What we have here, now, at our hand is a power so vastly benevolent, or so blackly malevolent, that decisions as to its use are the decisions not of persons but of peoples, of nations. We could no more see atomic energy monopolistically controlled than we could believe in the propriety, to say nothing of the possibility, of a monopoly controlling the moon or staking a claim to the sun.

The 100-year atomic-reactor program by which the underdeveloped nations of the world would lift their own living standards, "Operation Bootstrap" if you will, is broadly economic, broadly political, and broadly humanitarian.

It is right, therefore, that such a program of sound economic investment—free of the unfortunate giveaway label so repugnant to the giver and the receiver alike—should seek the participation of Government funds. The dividends, I believe, will more than repay the investment: Dividends in security; dividends in improved standards of living for our neighbors; dividends in new markets; dividends in better and hence more productive human relations. We must doubly underscore the fact that our purpose is to help underpowered nations to help themselves; that we are dedicated to the fostering of that spirit of individual worth and integrity, of mutual forbearance and understanding, without which any international program, however well-intentioned, is bound to fail.

Let me point out for you some of the world markets available through a mutually beneficial plan, under the leadership of American industry, such as I propose.

From July 1, 1951, to May 1, 1954, we sent to India and Pakistan a total of $78,828,000 in economic aid. Allocated and obligated but unspent funds total $91,188,000. I believe that these sums should have been allocated, should have been obligated, and should have been spent.

I do not know what proportion of these funds should still be spent under the existing concept of economic aid. I do suggest that even in terms of American dollars and American construction costs and American wage and salary rates that $170 million today would buy, for India and Pakistan, between 75 and 80 portable atomic power reactors—or 3 large stationary atomic reactors complete with reprocessing plants producing 300,000 kilowatts of electric power, and incalculable quantities of radioisotopes for industrial, agricultural, medical, and biological research. If, under the convention of counterpart funds, India and Pakistan should contribute equal amounts there might be built 6 large stationary atomic power plants of 600,000 kilowatt capacity—or between 150 and 160 portable package atomic reactors.

The potentials for an already industrialized but power-short nation such as Japan are far more startling. Between 1945 and 1952 we gave Japan $2,276 million in nonmilitary economic aid and credits. If it had been possible to allocate an equivalent sum for the installation by American industry of industrial atomic reactors, Japan might have now in the neighborhood of 100 large stationary atomic power plants with an installed capacity of about 10 million kilowatts. It is worth noting that Japan's total installed capacity in 1952 was only 12 million kilowatts. All this without consideration of thousands of millicuries of radioisotopes for industrial, medical, biological, agricultural, chemical, and metallurgical applications.

I cannot now, in these last few minutes, delineate for you the revolutionary possibilities inherent in an atomic Marshall plan or perhaps more accurately an atomic lend-lease program for the Philippines, Malaya, Indonesia, Indochina, Thailand—or for the African continent—or for Israel, Italy, Spain, Portugal, France—or for Latin America. I leave the extrapolation to you.

AN ECONOMIC CHAIN REACTION

These are just some of the more obvious areas which almost immediately could profit from atomic power and where financing the costs of reactors, technology, and fissionable materials to the extent necessary is a justifiable risk. We must view such investments not only as sources of direct profit for American industry, but even more importantly we must consider atomic energy as the last opportunity we possess to create a stable world. We must stake our future on the hope that the atomic reactor will produce an economic chain reaction which, by establishing industry in underprivileged nations, will in turn give employment, permit the creation of surplus capital for reinvestment and eventually raise living standards while decreasing population pressure by natural means.

Without considering the vast new industry which the manufacture of reactors and their powerplant components would create in the United States, the technological and scientific and social benefits which would flow from an international atomic "lend-lease" program of this magnitude would indeed be incalculable.

A LONG PERIOD OF WORLD PEACE

The President of the United States recently asserted the world moral leadership of our Nation with his bold proposal to share our atomic technology and resources with other nations. The General Assembly of the United Nations is playing an important part in fostering the President's farseeing policy. But the Soviet veto power and Soviet harassment preclude the harmonious working together vitally necessary for the practical development and use of industrial atomic energy for underdeveloped nations by this organization. The practical development of international industrial atomic energy can only come through the participation of our private enterprise institutions.

There is now, therefore, it seems to me, an opportunity and an obligation for us to assert in a constructive, creative atomic energy program the world industrial leadership of the United States.

As recently as September 28 of this year, Dr. Lawrence Hafstad, the Director, Division of Reactor Development, United States Atomic Energy Commission, stated before the Atomic Industrial Forum that "today, we should be building atomic power plants. We have passed the time when we can get along with paper studies and economic analyses." Later in the same address, Dr. Hafstad declared: "In the international pool arrangement * * * we can expect the European nations to take an aggressive part. * * * So let us not have any illusions about sitting on a vast store of information and controlling a valve by which it flows to the rest of the world. If the undeveloped nations don't get help from this country, they will get it from Europe."

And I might add, if they don't get it from Europe they will get it from the Soviet Union.

If we succeed in our 100-year international atomic power program, we will have helped to increase the standards of living, health, and education of peoples abroad, and for many succeeding generations yet unborn; we will have earned and made vital and lasting friendships; opportunities and outlets abroad for American enterprises and products will be created; we will have lifted a substantial burden from our treasury; we will have a basis for ever-increasing economic activity; we will have proved and taught the soundness of the American free enterprise system; and what is most important we may well have finally discovered the only effective means of stopping the spread of communism. In short, if we succeed, we can look forward to a long period of world peace.

For these objectives no risk is too great, no price is too big.

I suggest that the leaders of American industry immediately stimulate our Govern-

ment to the practical and effective pursuit of the ideals and objectives set forth by President Eisenhower before the United Nations. In the international scene as in the domestic, the task must not be performed by Government alone. Nor should we industrialists—disciples of free enterprise and sworn antagonists of socialist monopoly control of the future prime source of power—expect, or allow, our Government to attempt alone to meet this great challenge of the atomic age.

Thus far, in respect to the worldwide industrial atom, the voice of American industry has been silent.

I submit that such timidity is not an American characteristic.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 4 today on the bill H. R. 587, I was absent on official business. Had I been here I would have voted for the passage of the bill.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. POWELL asked and was given permission to transfer to Wednesday next the special order he had for today.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS AND OIL IMPORTATIONS

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means is now considering the extension of the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. I assume the measure will reach the floor of this House for debate some time in the very near future. I hope that H. R. 2820, a bill I introduced a few days ago, will be incorporated by the committee as an amendment to section 4521 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Historically, the south and southwest subscribe to the philosophy of free trade as opposed to a protective tariff usually favored by the industrial areas of the north and east. Today, by reason of the peculiar developments in our economy, the situation has somewhat changed and the lines are not as clearly distinguishable as they were in the earlier days of our country.

This may suggest that insofar as the south and southwest are concerned, the shoe may be on the other foot. However, I do not think this particularly true or that one who generally favors the free or relatively unrestricted trade pattern is inconsistent in favoring protection for those industries which not only themselves suffer, but that the economic health of which must be protected for the sake of national defense.

Mr. Speaker, in discussing the plight of the domestic oil industry by reason of excessive oil imports, I shall attempt to make clear that my references are to the independent oil operator as opposed to the major oil companies whose names are well known. It is the thousands of independent oil operators who are suffering and who are threatened with disastrous consequences because of oil imports from abroad. The situation is peculiar, and what may appear an inconsistency is reconcilable by the fact that the importers of crude oil into the United States are a few of the United States major oil companies, and not some foreign governments or citizens of foreign governments. Not only are the major oil companies the importers of oil but they are the owners and producers in foreign countries. The oil import problem must be reviewed in the light of these facts.

The problem of oil imports is dramatically told by the record of year after year increases in imports which has occurred since World War II. Whereas prior to the war imports averaged about 5 percent of domestic demand, today they represent about 15 percent. The record of recent years is as follows:

	Barrels daily	Imports to domestic demand
		Percent
1935–41	181,000	5.5
1942–45	209,000	4.8
1946–51	611,000	10.3
1952	958,000	13.1
1953	1,050,000	13.7
1954	1,063,000	13.7

As of now there are about 1,235,000 daily imports.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we have been losing our export market. Prior to World War II a substantial portion of United States production was sold into the world market. But we are losing out steadily. As a result, whereas formerly we were a large net exporter, today we are a very large net importer. This is a dangerous trend. It will lead inevitably to dependency on foreign sources for peacetime as well as wartime needs.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Texas for the very fine remarks he is making. I know of no one who is better equipped and better informed on the problems that face the petroleum industry. I am one of those who favors strongly the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act and I intend to support that program. But I do not feel that that belief is anywhere in conflict with the purposes that the gentleman speaks about. I know that he will point out in his speech that there is a very critical situation developing in the domestic industry and I am sure that he will probably touch on the fact that the petroleum industry is unique in that it cannot, in many parts of the country, compete freely because some States have decided it is to the public interest to control the production and to control in the public interest the activities of the petroleum industry. So in effect one arm of the Government is saying to them that they cannot produce at capacity or at maximum efficiency and then another arm is letting foreign products come in to compete with them to the point where the domestic industry cannot produce in its most efficient manner on account of those regulations.

I do not want to further trespass on the gentleman's time other than to say again that I think he is performing a real service in bringing this very pertinent and important information to the Members of the House.

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman is entirely correct and I appreciate very much his contribution. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD] is a member of the Ways and Means Committee. He is intensely interested in this problem, I know; he is thoroughly familiar with it. We have some argument among ourselves as to who represents the largest number of independent oil operators in the world. For the benefit of those who might like to know, our districts lie side by side and we have a common problem. It is really a matter of informing the people as to what the problem is. Our domestic wells are capable of producing all the oil that we need and a lot more.

Why are imports increasing? Are we short of oil in this country? Do we need this foreign oil to supplement domestic supplies? The answer to all these questions, Mr. Speaker, is "No." Our domestic wells are capable of producing all the oil we need and a lot more too. During the past year the domestic oil industry has operated at about 75 percent capacity. About 25 percent of our producing capacity is idle. The domestic industry has been cut back until it now has 2 million barrels per day shut in. At the same time, more and more imports come in, absorbing the domestic market. If this is permitted to continue the domestic industry will be permanently weakened and our Nation will become unnecessarily dependent upon uncertain foreign sources of supply.

It is not uncommon to hear someone say that we do well to import crude oil in order to conserve our own reserves. There is total fallacy in such reasoning. In the first place, there must be an extremely active oil economy if new reserves are to be found to replace that which we use each day. What do we mean by this? The unrefutable figures show that the small independent oil operators discover about 80 percent of all oil reserves. The independent oil operator cannot store the oil above ground to any great extent, nor can he allow his well to stand idle. He must produce the well in order to obtain income to drill others. It is as simple as that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we from Texas usually contend that we have the biggest and best of everything. May I say here that we have a lot of little things also. In this instance it is the many people in the oil business who may be termed as "small business". It is not a matter with them of knowing where their next Cadillac is coming from, but rather, it is where they can borrow the next 30 to 50 thousand dollars to punch a hole in the ground in the hope that they will discover oil. This is the problem of oil

business—this is the problem of the independent oil operator.

In Texas, as in most of the oil-producing States, we have a conservation program. Under this program wells are not permitted to be produced inefficiently or wastefully. The amount of oil that each well may produce without waste is determined on an engineering basis. Under the State law, it cannot exceed that amount. In addition, the law provides that in order to avoid unnecessary waste involved in storing oil above ground, production should be related to the market demand for oil. The conservation programs of the oil-producing States are sound, and through the many years that they have been tried and tested we know that a valuable natural resource is being used wisely and in a manner that contributes greatly to the expansion and development of our economy. In contrast, foreign oil is produced without regard to such conservation programs. Foreign oil is permitted to flood the world markets. In the United States imports constitute an uncontrolled and unknown factor, and the State officials who are responsible for administering the State conservation laws are confronted with the impossible task of knowing what imports are going to be. The amount of imports is left entirely to the whims of the few large importing companies. As a result, they constitute a threat to the sound and long-established conservation programs of the oil-producing States.

This gives in brief a part of the picture of uncontrolled imports, insofar as the independent operator is concerned, and the effect on the States, but now let us look at the effects on national defense.

In the first place, we are not short of oil in the United States. It is not necessary that we depend on a foreign supply. And it is not wise for us to become dependent upon a foreign supply in peacetime, because we thereby unavoidably become dependent upon foreign oil in time of war. If we sacrifice the discovery of new reserves in this country by the importation of crude oil from the Middle East and South America, the domestic oil operations will, without a doubt, be reduced to a level that will make it necessary to depend on that same source from abroad to supply a war machine. Now, someone may say that if a national emergency should arise and enemy submarines prevented the importation of foreign oil, we could then turn to our domestic reserves. It would be too late. The problem is not that simple. It requires a going and an experienced organization to produce oil. An oil operator, even a small one, cannot organize himself into activity in a matter of days, weeks, or even months. He cannot do so, even to begin a search for the elusive product deep underground. In addition, he stands the chance of finding a new source of oil only once out of nine attempts, and going broke in the process.

Mr. Speaker, the domestic oil industry will gradually dry up and we as a Nation will become more and more dependent on uncertain foreign sources of oil if the Congress stands idly by and permits oil imports to take over more and more of the domestic market month after month, year after year, as has been taking place. I personally am concerned about the economic well-being of the independent oil producers in my district. I am personally concerned about the adverse effect of excessive oil imports on the economy of my State of Texas and the economy of the Nation as a whole. But the overriding consideration, and the one which is paramount so far as Congress is concerned today, is the effect of imports upon the national security. The Congress of the United States has the responsibility for the national defense. That responsibility can not be relaxed. Yet, as of now, the Congress is leaving this vital matter, insofar as it applies to petroleum, in the hands of a few importing companies. Their natural impulse is geared to the economic welfare of their stockholders. That is not the proper repository for the responsibility of our Nation's security. The time is here when the Congress must recognize its responsibility and take positive action to correct the dangerous course that we are now following.

The President of the United States has recognized this problem. A few months ago he created the Cabinet Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy. One of the matters which has been considered by that committee has been the import problem. The committee has spent several months studying this problem and its findings should be forthcoming soon. It is hoped that this report will contribute to a solution, and an immediate one, of the problem of excessive imports.

I know that many of the Members of the House also recognize this problem. Particularly, I realize that the representatives from the great coal producing States of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Illinois, and the many others are aware of the injury that is being inflicted upon the domestic coal industry by imports of residual fuel oil. The coal industry, like petroleum, is a vital industry to the economic welfare of our country but particularly to the defense of our country.

It is time that we face the grave situation created by excessive oil imports, from the viewpoint of both the domestic oil industry and the domestic coal industry.

Mr. Speaker, the oil industry itself for the last 5 years has attempted to resolve this controversy over excessive oil imports. The independent oil producers have appealed to the major importing companies to follow the established policy of supplementing rather than supplanting the domestic supply. But the only result of these efforts has been more and more imports.

It is not my intention to accuse the major oil companies of bad faith in these efforts. Rather I would prefer to think that it is a difference in viewpoint and that the viewpoints will never be reconciled voluntarily.

It has been the attitude of the oil industry generally, and particularly as I know it from the standpoint of the independent operators as distinguished from the major companies, that they would much prefer to be able to solve this problem without legislation. They have hesitated to appeal to the Federal Government for any type of intervention. I personally wholly share that viewpoint. The less Federal Government intervention in these matters, as in many others, is, in my humble opinion, the more desirable. But the independent oil producers have now reached the point of feeling desperately in need of help. As a last resort, they are now appealing to Congress for relief.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is imperative that some system of limiting oil imports be imposed by Congress in order that we not only have a healthy domestic oil economy, but, of greater importance, that we be secure by having ample supplies of petroleum within our own borders if and when we are again called upon to oil a war machine.

Because of these considerations I have introduced legislation which will limit oil imports to 10 percent of domestic demand. This proposal does not bar all oil imports. On the contrary, it provides a very generous quota. It would permit imports to continue in the large volume of approximately 800,000 barrels daily as compared with the average for the year of 1954 of approximately 1,060,000 barrels daily. This proposal recognizes that there is a place for some oil imports. It recognizes the large investments of our American oil companies in places around the world. It likewise recognizes that the countries where foreign oil is produced need to export their petroleum products and that we are willing to share in trade with them. It would not wreck the economy of our important and good neighbor Venezuela. In fact, it would not affect imports in Venezuela to any substantial degree. I would be hopeful that the entire reduction in imports which would be brought about by my proposal would be through elimination of Middle East oil, permitting Western Hemisphere imports to continue at current rates. In every respect a 10 percent limit on imports is fair and reasonable.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe with the deepest of conviction that the problem of excessive oil imports is one which demands the immediate attention of the Congress. It goes beyond the economic well-being of any one industry or any one segment or region of our economy. It involves the availability of a vital munition of war. It involves the very heart of our national defense. In view of the unsettled world conditions which face us today, the Congress can no longer ignore its responsibility to meet this problem. I earnestly urge every Member of the House to give my proposal their immediate and careful consideration.

MINIMUM-WAGE LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, twice, in recent weeks, the messages of the President of the United States to the Congress have included sections urging the passage of legislation broadening

and amending upward the minimum wage and other provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

In the Economic Report of the President, sent to the Congress on January 20, his recommendation and reasoning are to be found on pages 57, 58 and 59 under the heading "Augmenting Low Incomes." Approaching two score Members of this House have introduced bills toward this purpose.

The desire to eliminate poverty and low incomes certainly belongs to the members of no single political party or group within it. But differences have and will arise on the means, their scope and the speed of their application as solutions to the problem.

It is to these differences that I ask the earnest consideration of my colleagues. For the action of this Congress on minimum-wage legislation will not only affect the lives of those directly and indirectly concerned—amounting to millions of Americans—but will also loom large in the world-wide struggle between the forces of true freedom and those of communistic human slavery.

The President has stated that—

A small and shrinking, but still significant number of American families have cash incomes under $1,000 per family. By current standards, most of them must be considered poverty-stricken. These families are not concentrated in urban centers. They live chiefly on small farms or in rural areas and villages mainly in the Southern States. Raising the incomes of this group should be one of our continuing objectives.

As with all of you, I rejoice that this is one of our continuing objectives.

It may well be that these conditions are widespread in the South, but there must be many of you who realize full well that similar conditions are prevalent in nearly all parts of the United States. For example, in my State of California, the Saturday, January 22, edition of the daily newspaper, the Mirror, of Los Angeles, has this front-page headline: "One Thousand Starving in Fresno Area."

When the Federal Reserve Board reports to me that there are some four to four and one-half million families in our United States with incomes of less than $1,000 a year, I cannot agree that this is a small number. Even allowing for a million single-person families in this group, this means that if the average family size includes 4 human beings, between 13 and 15 million Americans—men, women, and children—are, as the President says, poverty stricken. And we must not forget those additional families who do earn more than $1,000 per year and still do not realize the level of adequacy found to be necessary for a city worker's family budget by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The President urges the Congress to limit its action to an increase to 90 cents an hour in the minimum wage and a gradual approach to the question of bringing substantial numbers of workers, now excluded from the protection of a minimum wage, under its coverage.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have a strong conviction that an excess of caution may produce too little and too late. There is no excuse for radical action but there is every need for bold and adequate action.

This is not the time or occasion to examine the details of the pro and con of proposed legislation on this subject, but I would sincerely ask this House to remember and consider three fundamental considerations.

First, there have always been those who, in varying degrees of intensity, have opposed any wage increases, using the philosophy voiced by the President when he said—and I quote:

A higher minimum might well cause lower production and substantial unemployment in several industries, and—whether directly or indirectly—it would probably bring generally higher prices in its wake. Such effects would make the gains of covered workers illusory, and they would lower the standard of living of uncovered low-wage workers.

As do most of you, I remember and have a file of those who saw only chaos in the wage revolutions of NRA days. Their fears were proven groundless then by the proof of what improvements can be wrought by Americans earning a decent wage.

I believe that a thoroughly convincing case, based on established experience and present conditions, can and will be made for far more effective action than the President proposes. Indeed, some of it can well be found by the facts recited in the Economic Report, where it deals with corporate profits—on page 84—with the rise in hourly earnings—on page 86—and with the stability of prices—on page 95. I hope that moderation will not produce a whisper where a shout is needed.

Secondly, although I have the highest respect for the splendid and sound objectives of the President—as expressed in his report—there is one passage which I believe to be erroneous in concept. I hope this Congress will firmly reject it. On page 58 there is this sentence:

Minimum wage laws do not deal with the fundamental causes of low incomes or poverty.

The President had listed these on page 57 as including "lack of education or skill, poor health, old age, or prolonged unemployment."

The report itself states that 1,300,000 workers would increase their hourly pay by 9 cents if his suggestion of a 90-cent hourly minimum wage limit was accepted plus—to quote again—"some workers now getting 90 cents an hour would probably receive wage increases to preserve customary differentials." Ninety cents an hour for the usual 2,000 working hours in a year is an annual wage of $1,800. Surely this is not an acceptable living wage in the United States of our day.

I would like to place myself beside those who will be grievously disappointed if we fall short of a goal which will add 9 million workers to the 24 million now covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act. I find it hard to believe that there are many who do not realize that lack of education or skill, poor health, and unemployment breed and fester on low wages, lack of purchasing power, and the loss of opportunity which poverty necessitates. If these things are true on the small farms or in rural areas and villages, mainly in the Southern States—see page 57 of the President's Economic Report—then let us join hands with the South, wherever we may come from, and obliterate these sore spots. The farmers were among the chief beneficiaries of an expanding national income in the thirties. I firmly believe they would be so again. But let us do it now.

Third, and lastly, I would draw attention to the fact that these existing conditions are not top secret. They are known, exploited, distorted, and exaggerated by the unrelenting foes of our country. It is this kind of propaganda which has greatest effect in Asia and in all areas where peoples are struggling for self-improvement.

The sincerity and effectiveness of the billions of dollars we, in this Congress, will vote for foreign aid—military and economic—to bolster and win our allies, may be hopelessly lost if our basic determination—as evidenced by acts, not words—can be truthfully attacked. It is not enough against this kind of an enemy that we have achieved a high standard of living for most of our people. We can afford no Achilles heel. Our American family must be proven to include every one of those who live in the enjoyment, and under the protection, of our freedoms.

It is for these reasons that I ask your consideration for the setting of far-higher goals than those given to us by the President in his Economic Report.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TUMULTY. May I presume on the gentleman to compliment him on his splendid address and upon his concern for the underfed and for those who need help. I particularly feel that it is typical of a Roosevelt to become interested in that subject. The gentleman's speech has been one of eloquence and great weight and great persuasion. I understand the program which the gentleman advocates has been studied from the standpoint of practicality; has it not?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It certainly has. I believe it is embodied in legislation which will be considered by the proper committee of this House.

Mr. TUMULTY. I am glad to be a Member of this large audience that is now before the gentleman.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY AND H. R. 1

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WICKERSHAM). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, there is a certain portion of H. R. 1 which could have devastating effects upon the entire economy of the Fourth District of Georgia which sent me to Congress, to the State in which I live, and to the economy of the entire American textile industry. Many citizens of this district and State are justifiably alarmed, and I share their apprehension.

I refer, specifically, to that provision of H. R. 1 which would authorize the President of the United States to reduce by 5 percent per year for 3 years the existing tariffs on foreign-made textile goods, notwithstanding the absence of such a recommendation from the Tariff Commission and even notwithstanding an adverse recommendation. When the economy of the textile industry is so seriously threatened, I cannot in fairness to the men and women engaged in this industry in the Fourth District of Georgia remain silent any longer.

I agree most heartily with the recent testimony of the cotton-textile industry before the Committee for Reciprocity Information in which it was stated that the reciprocal trade program as presently set up in H. R. 1 could very well be an attack not only on the textile industry but even on smaller business generally.

At the outset here, I would like to go on record that while I am basically for the idea of reciprocal trade, I emphatically am not willing to stand idly by and see the wholesale sacrifice of the textile industry or the jobs of textile employees. Unfortunately, as presently set up, the United States foreign-trade program could mean the surrender and devastation of the American textile industry and the jobs of American men and women to foreign countries and alien peoples, and certain testimony heretofore presented before the Ways and Means Committee indicates the belief by some persons that the American textile industry is expendable.

The district which I have the honor to represent is one of the largest textile-producing districts in the Nation, but even if there were not a single cotton mill in the great State of Georgia, I would still oppose any provision which would cripple or destroy any portion of the economic life of our country.

Here is the reason: The American tariff structure is at best a hodgpodge, admittedly, with some resemblance to a typical Rube Goldberg invention. If a reduction in cotton textiles duties brings in more cheap goods from Japan and other countries, the people of the Fourth District of Georgia and other textile producing districts will still have to pay tariffs, some high, some low, on other materials and other items from the rest of the world. And so will all Americans. Thus the people of Georgia and the other States will be caught in the inextricable position of paying high duties from part of the world and having to compete with wage rates which are as much as 10 times lower than in our country.

Some people say Americans do not have to worry about foreign competition because we are so much more efficient. We must remember, however, that competition here at home keeps textile mills at a peak of efficiency. Efficiency cannot be turned on and off at will.

The United States textile industry operates within the American wage-cost structure. Its efficiency is geared to the peculiar requirements and to the vast size and variety of the American market.

However, spinning and weaving are universal processes. Foreign countries can and do use the same machinery that American mills use. In fact, Japan may even be ahead of us in that their machines are newer because Japan's industry has been rebuilt from the ground up with American money. And we loaned them the money to do it; sent them new machinery and showed them how to duplicate ours. Further, the Congress of the United States established a revolving fund of $150 million for them to purchase raw cotton. Thus the industries of competing countries, rebuilt and modernized with American funds, are rapidly matching, if not already exceeding, the technical efficiency of the United States.

We should also keep in mind that we have no advantage over Japan or any other country in our supplies of raw material. Cotton is available to foreign countries at the same prices as are paid by American mills, owing to the low cost of ocean transportation. Therefore, with manufacturing processes the same and the raw material the same, the wage cost factor emerges as the only real area of competition. In the United States textile industry, as contrasted with other major industries, labor costs run high—about 40 percent—in the manufacture of products.

This leaves the wage differential as the only area of competition. And look at the difference—$1.30 in the United States, 13.6 cents in Japan. How long can any small-business type of industrial operation go on against such odds?

As the Griffin Daily News in my home city of Griffin, Ga., editorially said recently:

> The United States has rebuilt Japan. We had to fight and whip the Japanese and we had to pay in lives and money the price of winning the war in the Pacific. Then when the shooting war was over, the American taxpayers have had to keep footing the bill for rebuilding a former foe. We are in complete accord with the policy of doing this. It has been necessary not only from the Christian point of view but also, quite frankly, from the self-interest point, because we sorely need a strong Japan to help us keep communism from making further inroads in Asia, and to help protect our position and interests there. But it would not be fair or right to expect the people whose livelihoods come from the textile industry to sacrifice their jobs or their pay scales for the benefit of a former enemy. A strong America at home is even more important than a strong America abroad.

For example, the list of cotton manufactures to be considered for tariff concessions in forthcoming trade negotiations with Japan and other countries comprises almost the entire production of the American cotton textile industry. It includes the whole output of countable cotton cloth, that is, cloth which can be basically described by the number of threads per inch and by yarn numbers. In addition, the list includes many special cloths and articles. Further, it covers the products of the industry's chief customers, such as finished or unfinished apparel, rugs and so on.

Now, in preparing the public mind for forthcoming tariff reductions the pronouncements of many Government spokesmen, the reports of all official commissions, the propaganda of all private free trade agencies, have combined to persuade the American people that the great mass production industries of the United States were so much more efficient than foreign industries as to be immune to the dangers of unlimited foreign competition. I believe this to be completely false in the case of textiles. Why do exponents of this theory wish us to jam our heads in the sand when refuting evidence clearly points out that in the textile industry Japan obviously can equal, or already has, the advantage over existing production efficiency in this country?

Mr. Speaker, the textile industry of this country is fighting for its life. It has been fighting for its life under the existing low tariffs. To reduce tariffs further, to allow foreign labor to compete with a great American industry which employs more than a million people, yet which last year averaged less than 1 percent profit on sales, can shake the very foundations of the economy of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, we are certain that those who drafted the provisions of H. R. 1 and those who now support it in its present form take the position which they do inspired by the very highest of patriotic motives; but we feel that there may be a pitfall of which the proponents of H. R. 1 may not be fully aware. It is highly possible that under a 3-year extension of existing reciprocal trade agreements, coupled with the power in the excutive branch to drastically lower import duties on textile products to or below the peril point, it is not impossible, indeed not improbable, that the American textile industry as we know it could be utterly destroyed within this 3-year period, and American textile employees in all sections of this country may absolutely lose their means of livelihood and the abundant American way of life which they, together with the vast company of Americans, now enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, I remember well the breadlines and soup kitchens of the early 1930's. I cannot remain silent and fail to voice my opposition to the provisions of pending legislation which could very easily change thriving textile communities and cities into vast centers of unemployment. I cannot sit idly by while legislation is discussed and possibly will be enacted which would render jobless thousands of skilled men and women who are engaged in this industry. It is imperative that we have some definite, specific assurance in the form of a committee amendment to the original draft of H. R. 1, which would guarantee to the textile employees that they are not expendable and that they are not ever to be considered anything but first-class citizens standing on the bases of equality of workmanship and character with any other economic group in this Nation. We cannot for one moment submit to the proposition that the American textile industry is expendable. We are not willing to sacrifice the American textile industry to the preferment and propulsion and acceleration of any other industry or any other economic group in this country.

We ask no special favors. We ask no benefits which are not accorded to other industries and other groups, but we do demand the right to sit at the first table

along with other major industries in this Nation.

The real problem of sick world trade is in trade restrictions, inconvertible currencies, and political embargoes. These constitute the problem. Viewing these component parts, we see the problem is not within the borders of our country, but without.

There is no more reason to permit unrestricted access to Japanese cotton goods into the United States than to permit unrestricted import of raw cotton from Brazil, or dairy products from Denmark and Holland, or wheat and flour from Canada, or nuts and fruits from southern Europe. In each instance, equally, there would be, in effect, the same type of attack on American employment, incomes, investment, and standards of life.

I feel most strongly that Japan should be encouraged in every possible way to restore her trade with her natural and historic markets, and not be forced to unload cheap-wage produced textiles in the United States at the expense of American labor and industry.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. I want to compliment my brilliant friend and colleague upon his outstanding statement on a subject which I feel sure the gentleman is as familiar with as any single Member in this House. The gentleman was born and reared in a section where he is bound to know the textile situation as well as any other man in the United States. And, I am certain that his colleagues from Georgia are deeply indebted to him for the expressions that he has made.

Now, I would like to ask the gentleman this particular question. Is it not true that substantially 100,000 laborers in the State of Georgia are dependent upon the textile industry for their livelihood?

Mr. FLYNT. That statement is substantially true. And, I might add that they are directly employed in the textile industry.

Mr. FORRESTER. I would also like to say to the gentleman that the textile industry in Georgia and those 100,000 laborers are very alarmed over the provisions of H. R. 1, and we sincerely hope that some provision is going to be made to put it where we might be able to support the bill. If the gentleman will yield to me further, I know the gentleman is aware of the agricultural situation and I am afraid that agriculture is expendable, too, unless the committee handling H. R. 1 will give consideration to the great danger that section 22 of the Agricultural Act is going to be abrogated by this proposed legislation. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that if the textile industry and agriculture are considered expendable, then we have lost our lifeblood of America. I want to throw those things in, and I want to say that I share the gentleman's viewpoint and I sincerely hope that the committee will give us legislation taking care of agriculture and, I might add, taking care of the other industries in other sections of the United States which we are not so well acquainted with but who are entitled to protection, so that we can have the privilege of supporting this reciprocal trade bill.

Mr. FLYNT. I thank the gentleman for his comment. I should like to say here—and I think my colleague from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] and most of the Members of this House will agree with me—that I do not believe that any phase of American industry, or any phase of American economic life is expendable to a corresponding group in any other nation on earth.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNT. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. ASHMORE. I want to commend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] who happens to represent the Fourth District of Georgia, while I represent the Fourth District of South Carolina. It so happens that both of those districts are large textile industrial districts. It has been said that my district, the Fourth District of South Carolina, contains more spindles than any other congressional district in the United States. I know that my predecessor used to claim that and no one has ever disputed it.

I know that both the gentleman's section of Georgia and mine have many, many tremendous textile industrial plants. I want to say further that the letters that I am receiving from the people back home are not just from the employers, not just from the capitalist side of this question; I am receiving letters from the man who works in the mill and the woman who works in the mill, the true laborers.

Very little labor in our section is organized. The majority of it is not. But these people depend on these industries for their livelihood and they are vitally interested and are fast becoming alarmed over this situation.

Most of the people in my district, as I do, believe in reciprocal trade. I voted for it in the past, but I also recognize the fact that we can go too far with this thing. We must have some protection for our home industries or else it will be too late to save them from the destruction that will naturally come about if too much of foreign-made goods—that is, cheaply made goods, as the gentleman has so well indicated in his speech this afternoon—if too much of that sort of textile product comes into our country. What then are our home people going to do with the goods that they manufacture?

There will be no market for them simply because, as the gentleman has so clearly pointed out, these goods are made likewise on the best machinery the world produces. We gave a great deal of that machinery to Japan. The point is the differential; the line of demarcation is the wage rate that those people get in comparison with what our people work for, which is a living wage and in accordance with our higher standard of living.

What if we permit this low tariff to come into effect and we permit these imports of foreign-made goods to a point greater than they are now? We will then be doing something that will greatly endanger not only the textile industry—and that does not affect merely the southland, because we have great textile industries in the New England States, as we have in Tennessee and Kentucky and other sections of our country. But it will not only endanger those vital industries, but it will endanger the entire standard of living of our American people. I know that none of us want that to come to pass.

I thank the gentleman for permitting me to make these remarks.

Mr. FLYNT. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. ASHMORE] and I concur in his remarks.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Unlike the Fourth District of Georgia, which the gentleman represents, and the Fourth District of South Carolina, which Mr. ASHMORE represents, the Fourth District of Mississippi, which I represent, is not, relatively speaking, a large textile district. But I can say this, that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] has proven himself to be a very able spokesman for the people he represents.

To me, it is refreshing indeed to hear a speech made on the floor of this House in the interest of an American enterprise and in the interest of the American people—for a change.

In my opinion, we are going to have to face many more of these problems, similar to the one that is being faced in the textile industry, simply because these fifty-odd billions of Marshall plan dollars are beginning to come home to roost.

Not only the textile industry, but all throughout agriculture we find that we have in the past 10 years been subsidizing foreign production of these commodities in competition with American agriculture. In one of them, cotton, as I understand it, we have just finished expending several million dollars in Pakistan to enable the people of Pakistan to grow cotton in competition with the people of the South and the West. To me that just does not make good sense, especially when we have surpluses of cotton piling up on us at home and we are having to support the price of cotton and provide limited production of cotton in the United States. I think it points up the fallacy of attempting to subsidize competition all over the world.

Mr. FLYNT. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNT. I yield to my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I want to compliment the gentleman from Georgia on a very able speech on the subject of reciprocal trade and particularly for his interest in the textile industry.

The gentleman's remarks indicate that he has devoted much time and thought to this most serious problem. This is a serious problem to many people in my district, the Fifth Congressional District of Georgia. While of course all of us realize the need for reciprocal trade, and

we realize that trade is a two-way street, at the same time provision must be made to take care of American industries. Unless provision is made to take care of the textile industry, if there are permitted to be sent into this country floods of foreign textile material, many of our textile mills will be forced to curtail their products and some of them shut down. All of this will mean loss of jobs and curtailment of earnings of American citizens, all of whom in my district need this employment.

So I compliment the gentleman on the thought he has given to this most serious problem, and reiterate what he has said, that provision must be made to take care of the textile industry in dealing with this reciprocal trade subject.

Mr. FLYNT. I thank my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LANE. I, too, wish to join my colleagues on this side of the House in congratulating the gentleman on his very able remarks in reference to reciprocal trade. I feel it is one of those subject matters that will be of most importance to this session of Congress; in fact, I think it will be one of the most important of all of the subject matters we will consider in this Congress.

I am pleased to join with the gentleman in his remarks in reference to reciprocal trade and its effect on the textile industry. I am aware of the fact that ordinarily we from the North are feuding with those in the South that enjoy the textile industry at the present time, but at this particular time I am pleased to join my colleagues from the South in saying that we who represent industries that have enjoyed textiles in the past and hope to keep on enjoying them in the future want to tell the Congress that it is of great importance at this time, more than ever in the history of the United States, that we protect this industry. This is an industry that I suppose gives more work to more people than any one of the other industries.

As the gentleman well knows, coming from a textile industry, and as the previous speakers have well stated, at the present time the textile industry is a sick industry. We are struggling, we are trying to keep our head above water as best we can. If we are going to have any more imports from Japan, Great Britain, Italy, or any other countries it will make it so much harder for us. At the present time many of our factories are idle.

I have the honor to represent a section of the United States that is perhaps hit harder than any other section. We are classified, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in a 4–F classification. That is, our section has more unemployment than all but a few other areas in the United States. So we are in a serious situation, and we will be in a worse situation if we allow these textiles further to come into this country. I dare say the gentleman in his remarks covered the hourly earnings in the textile industry and, as you have well stated, we here in the United States have a high hourly earning in the textile industry. I would like at this point for the RECORD to show what the rates are for November 1954, starting with some of the highest. These are the gross hourly earnings. The figures are as follows:

November 1954:

Connecticut	$1.59
Massachusetts	1.47
New Hampshire	1.41
Rhode Island	1.53
Alabama	1.22
Georgia	1.22
Maryland	1.50
Mississippi	1.24
North Carolina	1.26
South Carolina	1.29
Tennessee	1.23
Virginia	1.34

So that we can in no way cope with the competition of the hourly earnings, let us say in Great Britain where it is 45.4 cents and in Italy 24 cents and in Japan 11.9 cents.

In other words, the Members must readily understand that with our high hourly earning rate in our textile industry here in the United States, we can in no way compete with the low wage that is paid in these other countries. So that if we allow those textiles to come into this country in competition with our textiles, there will be nothing for us to do except to go out of the textile business.

In conclusion, may I reiterate what I said in my opening remarks. I compliment the gentleman in bringing this to our attention again, and I know that so far as the North and South are concerned, on the subject of textiles, we will be united and we hope to do our best to have something done to regain our own domestic textile industry.

Mr. FLYNT. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, the cotton-textile industry has been flat on its back in competitive world markets for a long time. It has struggled bravely and against seemingly insurmountable odds.

Mr. Speaker, the textile industry is very near the breaking point. Congress has it in its power to break it or to preserve it.

It is the duty of the Congress of the United States to protect this basic industry so vital to so many Americans and to the economy of our Nation, and absolutely indispensable in times of national emergency.

Let us harbor the hope that our foreign economic policy may find its guidance in world realities and let us exercise the courage and the political sagacity to carry through to those solutions which are basic and enduring.

If the death knell sounds for the American textile industry or any other American industry, large or small, never send to know for whom the bell tolls—it tolls for thee.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HOLTZMAN.

Mr. GARMATZ.

Mr. ROOSEVELT and to include a proclamation by the Ukrainian Congress Committee.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina.

Mr. EDMONDSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. KEARNEY.

Mr. BENTLEY and to include the text of a speech, notwithstanding that it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $180.

Mr. WHITTEN and to include a speech.

Mr. PHILBIN.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. DURHAM), for today, on account of official business.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 145. An act to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 31, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

332. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the annual report on the administration of functions of the General Services Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

333. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 2680 (j) of title 28 of the United States Code so as to permanently exclude claims arising out of combatant activities or warlike operations"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

334. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of the activities relating to providing war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, covering the period as of December 31, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 763, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

335. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1941, to authorize the waiving of the requirement of performance and payment bonds in connection with certain Coast Guard contracts"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

336. A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government; to authorize the President to establish the maximum number of positions under section 505 of the Classi-

fication Act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

337. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report by the Coast Guard showing the number of officers above the rank of lieutenant commander receiving flight pay for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 301, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

338. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to further amend section 20 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, relating to fees of agents, attorneys, and representatives"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 3202. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1958, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 3203. A bill to authorize construction of a highway crossing over Lake Texoma, Red River, Tex., and Okla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 3204. A bill to provide that one floating ocean station shall be maintained at all times in the Gulf of Mexico to provide storm warnings for States bordering on the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 3205. A bill for the relief of the city of Mobile, Ala.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 3206. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of the New Haven Harbor and Long Island Sound, from the Hammonasset River to the Housatonic River, coastal and tidal areas, for the purpose of determining possible means of preventing damages to property and loss of human lives due to hurricane winds and tides; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DODD:

H. R. 3207. A bill to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, so as to authorize either House of Congress to disapprove specific provisions in reorganization plans transmitted by the President; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 3208. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. R. 3209. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 3210. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test on a 3-year basis the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. R. 3211. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test on a 3-year basis the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 3212. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test on a 3-year basis the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURRAY of Illinois:

H. R. 3213. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test on a 3-year basis the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 3214. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test on a 3-year basis the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H. R. 3215. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test on a 3-year basis the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOWLER:

H. R. 3216. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test on a 3-year basis the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 3217. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test on a 3-year basis the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 3218. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test on a 3-year basis the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois:

H. R. 3219. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test on a 3-year basis the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SHEEHAN:

H. R. 3220. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test on a 3-year basis the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. R. 3221. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test on a 3-year basis the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 3222. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test on a 3-year basis the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 3223. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test on a 3-year basis the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 3224. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test on a 3-year basis the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. R. 3225. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test on a 3-year basis the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. R. 3226. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 3227. A bill to prohibit members of the Armed Forces from bringing certain firearms into the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 3228. A bill providing that there shall be equal pay for equal work for women; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 3229. A bill to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 3230. A bill to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 3231. A bill to amend section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, so as to eliminate the requirement that privately owned stocks reported thereunder be replaced from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H. R. 3232. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 3233. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to make it a criminal offense to move or travel in interstate commerce with intent to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, for arson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 3234. A bill to provide that persons who served overseas during World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict with certain eleemosynary or charitable institutions rendering services to the Armed Forces shall be eligible for burial in national cemeteries; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. R. 3235. A bill to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Demopolis lock and dam, Alabama, by the reconveyance of certain lands

or interests therein to the former owners thereof; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 3236. A bill to amend the Trade Agreements Extension Act of July 1, 1954, so as to assure the availability of materials essential to national security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 3237. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 3238. A bill to extend the time within which claims may be presented to the Indian Claims Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 3239. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of certain colonies of Indians in the State of Nevada and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 3240. A bill to amend section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, so as to permit the making of payments under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to producers who harvest wheat in excess of acreage allotments but not in excess of amounts permitted to be marketed without payment of marketing penalties; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 3241. A bill relating to income-tax refunds for the taxable year 1949; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 3242. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, so as to permit the return under such section of property which an alien acquired, by gift, devise, bequest, or inheritance, from an American citizen; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 3243. A bill to amend the Trade Agreements Extension Act of July 1, 1954, so as to assure the availability of materials essential to national security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3244. A bill to provide for the distribution of certain surplus food commodities to needy persons in the United States, by use of a food-stamp plan; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3245. A bill to provide a method for protecting the domestic sheet glass industry against injury caused by imported sheet glass; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 3246. A bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 3247. A bill to provide for the erection of a suitable monument at the grave of Samuel Chester Reid, a naval hero of the War of 1812 and the designer of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 3248. A bill to amend title 9, United States Code, entitled "Arbitration", so as to provide for correction of defects and omissions in the present law regulating arbitration, for judicial review of questions of law arising in arbitration proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. R. 3249. A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3250. A bill making an appropriation for the prosecution of the Delaware River Channel deepening project, as heretofore authorized by law; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 3251. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 3252. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLT:

H. R. 3253. A bill to amend section 6 of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, so as to provide for the continued operation of certain schools on Marine Corps installations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. R. 3254. A bill for the establishment of the United States Commission on the Aging and Aged; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 3255. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 3256. A bill to amend section 723 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 3257. A bill to amend the Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U. S. C., secs. 669–669i) by providing that the amount of money currently in the Federal aid to wildlife restoration fund shall be available for use during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1955, defining "wildlife restoration project" and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3258. A bill to provide for the designation of substitute rural carriers to act as rural carriers pending appointments of regular rural carriers to fill vacancies in rural routes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 3259. A bill to provide that Mikveh Israel Cemetery, in Philadelphia, Pa., shall be a national shrine; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 3260. A bill to convey by quitclaim deed, certain land to the county of Hill, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 3261. A bill to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Demopolis lock and dam, Alabama, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. J. Res. 179. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make studies to determine what the Federal Government can do to assist the coal industry to develop new markets, and to protect shutdown mines from deterioration; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YATES:

H. J. Res. 180. Joint resolution to provide for the construction of a nuclear power reactor in Japan; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. J. Res. 181. Joint resolution to grant the State of Oklahoma consent to sue the United States in the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. Con. Res. 58. Concurrent resolution creating a joint committee to investigate drought conditions and the drought program; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution creating a joint committee to investigate drought conditions and the drought program; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 60. Concurrent resolution to invite the Chief Justice of the United States to address a joint session of the 84th Congress at each regular session thereof; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. Res. 118. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing Congress to enact legislation for the creation of Federal disaster insurance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing Congress to enact legislation to increase the Federal minimum-wage rate; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to increase the Federal minimum-wage rate; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 3262. A bill for the relief of Rabbi Hersch Low and Mrs. Sara Low (nee Newman); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 3263. A bill for the relief of John G. Duenges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 3264. A bill for the relief of Zelda Szklanka and her son, Eliezer Szklanka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 3265. A bill for the relief of Angela Sfounis and Alkista Sfounis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 3266. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of Roger W. Evans and Jamerson C. McCormack; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON (by request):

H. R. 3267. A bill for the relief of Lorenzo Cesare Caprioglio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 3268. A bill for the relief of Comdr. George B. Greer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. R. 3269. A bill for the relief of Eugenia Gierik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3270. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Arsena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H. R. 3271. A bill for the relief of John Lloyd Smelcer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 3272. A bill for the relief of Edgar Arved Polberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:
H. R. 3273. A bill for the relief of Terence Byrne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. GUBSER:
H. R. 3274. A bill for the relief of Martin Wunderlich Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. HYDE:
H. R. 3275. A bill for the relief of Richard Raffo Hanson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. JENNINGS:
H. R. 3276. A bill for the relief of George E. Bergos (formerly Athanasios Kritselis); to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. KING of California:
H. R. 3277. A bill for the relief of Juan Ysais-Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. KIRWAN:
H. R. 3278. A bill for the relief of Antonio Bianco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. KLEIN:
H. R. 3279. A bill for the relief of Anthony Barbato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3280. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Scarso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. LIPSCOMB:
H. R. 3281. A bill for the relief of Herbert Roscoe Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3282. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Adela Montilla Manibog; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. McCORMACK:
H. R. 3283. A bill for the relief of Joaquim T. Lopes; to the Committee on Judiciary.
By Mr. MACHROWICZ:
H. R. 3284. A bill for the relief of Christos Ioannou, also known as Chris Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3285. A bill for the relief of Frank Morettin or Frank Francesco Morettin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MAGNUSON:
H. R. 3286. A bill for the relief of Alf Andreassen Maberg also known as Alf Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MULTER:
H. R. 3287. A bill for the relief of Olga Rubin Donn Bornes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:
H. R. 3288. A bill for the relief of Szjena Peison and David Peison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. TEAGUE of California:
H. R. 3289. A bill for the relief of Jose Zavala-Rivera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. VORYS:
H. R. 3290. A bill for the relief of Barbara Starrett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. WICKERSHAM:
H. R. 3291. A bill for the relief of Frederick D. Stalford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

67. By Mr. CANFIELD: Petition of the New Jersey State Bar Association that the benefits of the social-security program be extended to include the members of the legal profession on an optional basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

68. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of protest from Hansen Glove Corp., Milwaukee, Wis., that H. R. 1 would have very adverse effect on its industry and in communities in Wisconsin where they have factories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

69. Also, petition of protest from the president of the Amity Leather Products Co. of West Bend and Sturgeon Bay, Wis., that passage of H. R. 1 would be detrimental to interests of 750 employees in State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1955

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein my statement in observance of Ukrainian Independence Day:

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Ukrainians constitute the largest nationality group, with the exception, of course, of the Russians, in the sprawling Soviet empire. It is only under compulsion that these 40 million hardened and sturdy tillers of the soil are subject to the Communist rulers of the Soviet Union. Even with all the harshness of the Red regime, the Ukrainians resist it whenever they can.

The Ukraine is the breadbasket of Russia. Without the Ukraine's abundant harvest, it would be almost impossible to feed the people of the Soviet Union. The leaders of Russia, Czarist as well as Communist, know the agricultural importance of this rich black-soil area. For that reason they robbed the Ukrainians of their national independence, annexed their beloved and richly blessed country, and have since 1920 considered it a Soviet Socialist Republic.

To call the Communist regime in the Ukraine a republic is, as we know so well, a farce. The independence which the Ukraine attained at the end of World War I and unfortunately was forced to lose in 1920, was real, was genuine national independence, whereas the euphonious republic which the Kremlin claims the Ukraine is today, is nothing but a sham. It is a downright falsehood, a gross distortion of the accepted meaning of the word, to call the Ukraine of today, or any country dominated by the Soviet Union, a republic.

It is, of course, most unfortunate that since 1920 there has been not a single gleam of light in the Ukraine indicating there is any genuine independence. The barbarians of the Kremlin see to it that there is no such light.

Fortunately, however, neither the tyrants of Moscow, nor their minions in the Ukraine, can extinguish the spirit of freedom and of independence which all liberty-loving Ukrainians claim as their birthright. As long as that noble spirit is kept alive, as long as the ideal of national freedom is cherished by the Ukrainians, no dictatorships or tyranny can rob the Ukrainians of their real independence—the independence of their souls and hearts. As long as they possess this, they will never give up their resistance to the Red tyrants.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America has done excellent work in keeping alive Ukrainian hopes for the recovery of their freedom. On this Ukrainian Independence Day, I wish you all success in your inspiring endeavors.

What's Wrong With Our Present Drought Program?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1955

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, along with colleagues in both Houses of the Congress, I am today introducing a concurrent resolution calling for a complete study and investigation of drought conditions in the United States for the purpose of preparing plans and programs for their alleviation.

This resolution is offered against a background of increasingly disturbing news concerning the gravity of the drought catastrophe in my own State of Oklahoma and the pitiful failure of our existing drought-relief program to meet adequately the emergency which we face.

It is offered against a background of long-range weather predictions which point to another dry year in 1955.

It is offered against a background of declining farm income throughout the Nation, even as we face an administration farm program which is aimed directly at further depressing of farm prices.

As I pointed out in my speech to the House on January 20, we have 18 States—and 944 counties within their boundaries—which are today classified as drought emergency areas.

Literally hundreds of thousands of farm families are today on direct food relief throughout the Nation, the victims of relentless drought and the tragic failure to provide an adequate drought relief program.

I want to submit to you a summary of the reports which I have been receiving for some time concerning the operation of the Benson drought program.

Most of the ideas and opinions expressed are the ideas and opinions of men who know the drought program best, because they are living with it, in the drought area of Oklahoma.

From letters and messages received in my office, from farmers, ranchers, county agents, and others, I submit this report on our drought program.

I hope there are reasonable explanations and answers for some of the program's failures—but I doubt that there are.

I would prefer that some of the charges are not completely accurate—but I am afraid that they are.

The Congress should act now to create machinery for a careful review of this program, and should act at once to improve it where action is demanded by the plain facts.

REPORT ON THE DROUGHT PROGRAM

The major complaint against the program is plain inadequacy. Concerning the feed relief program, one farmer who is president of a civic association writes as follows:

At the meeting of our organization last night the feed relief program was discussed and found to be inadequate. If this program is not changed at least 60 percent of the farmers who have cattle will be forced to sell their livestock and leave the State seeking employment.

This prediction has already been proved accurate in many counties of the State.

The president of one small town chamber of commerce wrote:

The drought program set up by the Government has been of no help to our farmers in that it is set up to help the big man, but not the small cattleman.

A leading citizen of another eastern Oklahoma town agreed:

Our farmers and livestock growers are in desperate condition for feed with which to winter their livestock. They have made no crops and will have very little money if any to buy feed with and the feed that is available is very costly.

A county agent wrote as follows:

I have lived in Oklahoma for 61 years and believe that I can say without reservation that this is the worst drought that I have ever seen, partly due to the fact that it follows previous drouths of 1952 and 1953. A great many of our little farmers especially are in very bad shape financially. They would like some kind of made-work program so they can earn an honest living, not a giveaway. Also, it seems to be the consensus of all the farmers that I have talked with that this 60 cents per hundred on drouth feeds is entirely inadequate.

After numerous protests, the Agriculture Department finally admitted the truth of this charge and raised the assistance to $1 per hundredweight on feed, but the basic problem of finding a way to make up the cash difference remained to blight the program for the small and hard-hit farmer.

Meanwhile, high prices on feed grains were compounding the problem for the drought-hit farmer and stockman.

In most cases, the fault did not lie with the local feed dealer, who raised local prices very reluctantly, but rather with his sources of supply, who were taking advantage of market conditions and at the same time draining off large Government surpluses at bargain rates.

According to CCC operational reports, more than 193 million bushels of corn were sold between January 1 and October 31, 1954. The average price was $2.52 per hundred.

In Muskogee, Okla., on October 4, 1954, the wholesale price of $3.40 per hundred was being quoted for corn.

The CCC sold 11 million bushels of oats at an average of $2.26 per hundred—and the October 4 wholesale price on oats in Muskogee was $3.00–$3.10.

More than 12 million bushels of barley sold by CCC brought an average price of $2.25 per hundred—while the Muskogee wholesale price was $3.10.

CCC disposed of 1.2 billion pounds of grain sorghums at an overage of $1.77—but in October the Muskogee wholesale price for ground sorghums was $3.10.

Note that these Oklahoma prices are wholesale prices, for truckload lots or more, according to report, and retail prices in lesser amounts would run even higher.

Who was the beneficiary of the Government's feed program, anyway?

A county agent quoted by the farm editor of the Tulsa World made this comment:

Take the case of grains which are covered by this new plan; all it means is that the feed merchant will simply up his price under this program, and the Government's money will be wasted. * * * The feed trade has the ball now. It is just about the same as a year ago under the beef-buying program when the packers and not the cattlemen had the ball.

Members of the Oklahoma delegation, knowing the financial distress of the drought area, appealed on more than one occasion to top agriculture officials for direct distribution of Government grain surpluses, as well as seed for winter cover crops, to the farmer victims of the drought.

The Department elected to peddle surpluses at bargain rates to big feed and seed dealers, and then lend a small measure of financial assistance to the farmer in order to bolster the sizable profit to the feed and seed speculator.

No departmental attempt was made to hold prices down, unless the bargain sale of surplus stocks can be so described.

On the contrary, it is reported that the practice of posting a "fair price" list of dealers guaranteeing reasonable prices was ordered discontinued in ASC committee offices.

The picture on seed surplus disposals and price trends for the farmer is just as disturbing as the feed picture.

In a letter of August 9, 1954, to the President, I offered the following recommendation for emergency drought measures in this field:

2. ASC regulations should be amended to make wheat, oats, and barley available at once as ASC practice for winter pasture and cover. This seed should be made available free if possible in the disaster area, or at least at a reduced cost. As an ASC practice, it would be accompanied by necessary fertilizers, and of course, it would be subject to the provision that the crop would not be harvested for grain but would be used to meet actual pasturing and feed needs on the farm itself. Such an amendment of ASC regulations, which would not require new law, should take place immediately, since the time for planting of winter pasture will soon be upon us in our section. Of course, this practice would require some rain this fall, but it is our best hope to secure a feed supply through the farmers' own efforts in this disaster area.

On August 18, the Department sent me a copy of a press release dated August 16 quoting the Secretary of Agriculture to the effect that "under a recent change in the ACP any farmer or rancher is eligible to apply for cost-sharing for planting cover or green manure crops on cropland which will be shifted from crop production next year. The ACP authorizes payment of up to 50 percent of the cost of seedbed preparation, fertilizer, lime, and seed for establishing cover crops on such land."

This was a good beginning, but it did not go far enough. In the first place, it should be noted that cost-sharing was made available only in connection with "crops on cropland which will be shifted from crop production next year." In recent years, a great physical change has been wrought in much of eastern Oklahoma. As a result of the good work done by the Extension Service, Soil Conservation Service, and other conservation agencies, vast acreages have been taken out of crop production and put into pastures. Obviously, no assistance would be made available on these acres nor to the people and livestock on them.

Secondly, the Department ignored the opportunity to move seed from CCC stocks directly to farmers in furtherance of a program of self-help. In anticipation of developments which subsequently occurred, I called upon the Department to undertake the immediate distribution of winter cover crop seed to farmers in the drought areas. In behalf of my own farmers, I specifically requested the release of CCC stocks of oats for this purpose but was advised that there were no such stocks. In our emergency we would have welcomed any seed that had a good chance of germinating. Since the program did not permit harvesting of any yields, we were not interested in anything but an edible growth.

The Department at that time had tremendous stocks of winter cover crop seeds, such as vetches, crimson clover, peas, and so forth, which were in demand in my State. But our plea for direct action was ignored. As a result of the actions taken by the Department, some startling developments have occurred. To anyone even remotely acquainted with the agricultural situation these developments should not have been unexpected. To anyone closely associated with the Department, and particularly those in policymaking positions, they doubtless were expected.

As the ACP winter cover crop practice got underway, local seed stocks were quickly exhausted. In some States, county ASC committees gave purchase orders to farmers which constituted the bulk of the purchase price for such seed. Great volumes of seed were moved in a short time. The Secretary of Agriculture anticipated this. In his press release of August 16, "Secretary Benson urged farmers to anticipate their needs and order seed early." It was said that "this will facilitate movement of seed from surplus to deficit areas."

By mid-September the Department was reporting sharp increases in grass and legume seeds, although seed grain prices had dropped. Some seed prices had advanced as much as 35 percent since spring. Seed oats and wheat were also in demand and prices reflected this demand.

The September 1954 price on winter seed wheat was $2.86 compared with $2.82 in September 1953 despite the sharp drop in prices in other farm commodities.

With increased demand, other seed prices shot up. At least in my section of this country, these price increases did not represent profiteering on the part of local seed dealers. As a matter of fact, they, too, were caught in the price squeeze as they tried to hold retail prices down. Prices generally maintained their stability until local stocks were exhausted, and then they were forced up by the increases in prices asked by the big seed suppliers in other parts of the country. In some sections, I am told that these price increases virtually wiped out the temporary benefit farmers received from cost-sharing participation on the part of ACP.

Since CCC had a virtual monopoly on many seed stocks, I was interested in learning what disposition had been made of them. According to CCC financial reports, more than 18 million pounds of vetch seed was sold between January 1, 1954, and October 31, at an average price of 5 cents per pound. Much of this was common, selling for about 3.5 cents per pound for export. On September 15, the Department reports showed that Oklahoma farmers were paying 13.5 cents per pound for hairy vetch, the national average retail price was 16.3 cents, and prices in some States ranged as high as 23 cents per pound. Common vetches were selling at a national average of 8.4 cents and as high as 10 cents.

Another example of CCC sales of winter cover crop seeds was crimson clover. In this same period the Department sold almost 5 million pounds of crimson clover seed at an average price of 18 cents per pound. Oklahoma farmers were paying 24 cents per pound, the national average was 23.9, and prices were as high as 30 cents in some States. Almost 6 million pounds of Austrian winter peas were sold by CCC at about 2 cents per pound while Oklahoma farmers were paying 7 cents, with a national average of 6.9 cents.

A great demand has also develcped for alfalfa seed. Although not a winter cover crop, the actions taken in connection with the 40 million pounds of seed held by CCC typifies the seed operations of the Department. Factors influencing the alfalfa seed market were well known to the Department last summer, but the official reaction to impending price increases was surprising indeed. In its press release of June 1, 1954, about 20 million pounds of northern alfalfa seed was offered at $37.50 per hundred pounds, and about 15 million pounds of various certified varieties were offered at $43 per hundred. On July 1, 1954, these prices were reduced to $35 and $40 respectively. From January 1, 1954, through October 31, CCC reported the sale of over 12 million pounds of alfalfa seed at an average of 35 cents per pound. I understand that the CCC stocks of alfalfa seed have either been exhausted since that time or soon will be. In the meantime, alfalfa seed prices in retail stores showed sharp increases between spring and fall. Prices ranged as high as 48 cents a pound and more in some States for improved varieties.

The examples I have cited are illustrative of both the effects of strong demand upon the market and the manner in which the Department of Agriculture reacted. It is quite significant that CCC price decreases and volume sales of seeds were followed almost immediately by considerable price increases at the retail level.

This was not the only action taken by the Department in the interests of the seed speculators. As I mentioned earlier, prior to the announcement of the special drought emergency ACP cover crop practice, the county committees had for several years maintained what was known as fair price lists. Each committee determined fair prices for ACP seed after consultation with local dealers and posted such prices in the county office together with a listing of firms agreeing to offer seed at prices not higher than those listed. With the advent of the drought emergency program and an increased demand for seed—paid for in large measure by the Government—the Department directed the discontinuance of the fair price posting. In other words, the Department directed its field personnel to look the other way while the seed industry took advantage of human misery to increase profit margins on seed. For the first time in modern history, our Government gave the green light to profiteering by a few on the suffering of many.

It is not only proper but highly desirable for the Department of Agriculture, and any other agency of our Government for that matter, to conduct its business wherever possible and practical through normal trade channels. But it is inconceivable for an agency of government to deliberately set up an emergency program to alleviate human suffering and at the same time create conditions for unconscionable profiteering. It will be recaled that when it was found that gamma globulin offered some hope for polio victims the Government stepped in and controlled distribution to prevent inequitable treatment and profiteering on a life-saving medium. Could we expect any less from the same Government in the development of a humanitarian program of assistance for our drought-stricken farmers?

The 83d Congress recognized the need for emergency credit for drought-stricken farmers in the enactment of Public Laws 115—amending Public Law 38, 81st Congress—and 727. Unfortunately, the administration of these and other credit programs has revealed a striking inadequacy.

There has been little or no uniformity in the local application of regulations applying to production emergency loans. In some places, a penalty has been applied to bigness; in others, it was the little farmer or stockman who found the door closed. Refinancing of existing indebtedness was denied, as were loans to compensate applicants for their losses as a result of the drought.

In too many instances the requirement that the proposed borrower be unable to obtain from other lenders the credit required was interpreted to mean that he must be virtually without means or substance. If he met this test, then he failed the requirement that he have reasonable prospects for success with the assistance of a loan.

These were but a few of the obstacles placed between desperate people and a source of credit which would have meant the difference between survival and failure. Where credit is made available for crop production, the terms of the loan require that the debt be paid when the income derived from the sale of the crops produced with the loans is received. At best, this requirement only delays economic death until the end of the crop season.

The principle of self-help through the extension of emergency credit has been defeated by the manner and method of administration. Thousands of farmers who had found new faith and hope in the announced emergency loan program learned to their sorrow that their Government's interest was limited and that in the end they were left to the mercy of the improvident elements.

In summary of the charges made in this report—which admittedly are only a part of the numerous complaints against our present drought program—I can only repeat that the relief extended thus far has apparently been too little and too late, and all too often in the wrong place.

Hundreds of thousands of American farmers are waiting hopefully for action by this Congress to change this picture, and place in action a fair and effective drought-relief program.

Every day of delay means new tragedy on the farm front.

On January 22, the Tulsa Tribune carried the Associated Press item "Farm Population Drop Continues."

Between 1950 and 1954, according to this report, the Nation's farm population fell 12.6 percent, from 25,058,000 in 1950 to 21,890,000 in April of 1954.

This continues a trend in evidence since 1940, when our farm population totaled 30,547,000.

Most heartbreaking aspect of this trend is found in the drought area—the west-south-central region—where the farm population drop in the last 4 years was an alarming 21 percent.

The farmer continue to be the backbone of the Nation and its economy, yet we are permitting the steady weakening of this backbone by our failure to act with full vigor and effectiveness to meet our farm problems.

Make no mistake about it, drought damage is public enemy No. 1 among those problems in many States today.

I hope and pray that the 84th Congress will rise to its responsibility in meeting the drought challenge.

Entry of Firearms Commonly Referred to as "Souvenirs"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1955

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the 83d Congress I introduced H. R. 3842, a measure designed to prohibit members

of the Armed Forces and their dependents from bringing into this country certain firearms commonly referred to as souvenirs. Under the provisions of my bill, the Secretary of Defense would be required to search the effects of returning servicemen and to seize any such weapons.

Statistics show that as many as 50,000 contraband weapons have been brought into the United States of America on 1 ship returning from the European theater. It has also been established that in 1 county of New York City as much as 75 percent of the crimes of violence have been, and are being, committed with these so-called souvenirs.

Too often do we read of tragic accidents resulting in fatality or serious injury as a result of the mere handling of these allegedly harmless guns.

Mr. Speaker, if we mean what we say about combating juvenile delinquency, I can think of no better beginning than by making it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to get these Lugers, P–38's, and Berettas. With few exceptions law-enforcement officials all over the country have agreed that passage of this bill would be a real deterrent to the frightening increase in the crime rate.

I am today reintroducing this bill and urge my colleagues to give it careful consideration.

Correction of Flaws in the Present Federal Statute Regarding Arbitration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1955

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, in the 2d session of the 83d Congress, I introduced H. R. 10010, which had as its purpose the correction of numerous inaccuracies and flaws contained in the present Federal statute regarding arbitration. The bill was introduced on July 22, 1954, but because of the relatively short period remaining before adjournment, it was impossible to pursue efforts to have it enacted into law.

I am again introducing the bill, which has been carefully studied by practitioners in various parts of the country, and it is hoped that it will not be the subject of controversy. Accordingly, I trust it will have the favorable consideration of the general membership of the Congress.

For a long time those familiar with this subject matter have realized the lack of provisions for judicial review in questions of law arising out of arbitration. A large number of standard forms of charter party and other contracts contain clauses requiring that the arbitrators shall be commercial men.

A proposed amendment would clarify and would extend jurisdiction of the District Courts to issue orders requiring arbitration. Another purpose of the proposed legislation is to preclude the enforcement of arbitration in those instances where the dispute has become time-barred.

The bill being introduced would incorporate in the statute the prevailing judicial view that unless the parties expressly agree otherwise, all arbitrators must be impartial persons and their decisions should be limited to evidence submitted to them in a specified manner. Members of the Maritime Law Association of the United States have been actively interested in this legislation and I consider it worthy of the attention of the Congress of the United States.

The Late Burnet R. Maybank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1955

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have never before seen the State of South Carolina so shocked and saddened when they learned of the untimely death of our senior Senator, Burnet R. Maybank. Senator Maybank dedicated his life to the service of the American people. It is true that he represented the State of South Carolina, but his leadership and ability was felt in every State of the American Union and by the entire free world. Senator Maybank was a casualty of overwork and service beyond the call of duty, the same as many of our gallant soldiers in time of war. He worked long and hard on the floor of the Senate and in the committees for the people he loved.

After military service in World War I with the Navy, Senator Maybank began his political career as alderman in South Carolina's chief city, historic old Charleston. He subsequently became one of the youngest and ablest mayors of that great city. While serving as mayor of Charleston he ran for the governorship of the State of South Carolina at the age of 38. He was elected over a host of aspirants for the governorship, several of whom had a strong statewide political following. During Senator Maybank's administration as Governor, the miraculous modern-day progress of South Carolina was inaugurated. His leadership as Governor greatly contributed to that progress. In 1941 he was elected to the United States Senate to succeed his friend, James F. Byrnes, who was appointed to the United States Supreme Court. Burnet Maybank was reelected to the United States Senate in 1942. In 1948 he was elected on the first ballot over four opponents. As one of the candidates in that race, I came in contact with the splendid sportsmanship and fine spirit of our senior Senator. After this experience, I had a higher regard for Senator Maybank than ever before. In 1954 Senator Maybank was elected without opposition. This was the first time in the modern history of South Carolina that a United States Senator had been reelected without any opposition whatever in the primary. Senator Maybank was one of the few men since the War Between the States to be Governor and Senator.

As United States Senator, Burnet Maybank fought, among many other things, for preparedness. He worked untiringly for a great Air Force, Army, and Navy. He believed that the only road to peace was for America to be strong militarily. He ably represented the farmers and the textile industry of the South.

Space will not permit even a mention of his many accomplishments for our country. It would take volumes to cover his career and service to his people. Senator Maybank had a pleasing personality and was liked by people in every walk of life. The people of South Carolina had the utmost confidence in his honesty, integrity, and ability. He will be greatly missed in Washington and in South Carolina as time goes on. We formed a warm personal friendship and I miss him greatly in my work here in Washington. Our friendship began when I served as State representative and State senator while he was governor.

Senator Maybank reared a splendid son and two fine daughters. He was a devoted father and husband. He left his family a great heritage and tradition of service that will inspire them. Senator Maybank told me upon one occasion in the cloakroom of the Senate, "That it matters not whether you won or lost, but how you played the game." This was the philosophy of Senator Burnet Rhett Maybank. My deepest sympathy always to his wonderful wife and loyal family.

Thirty-seventh Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1955

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, the centuries-old struggle for freedom and independence on the part of the Ukrainian nation constitutes an impressive chapter in the annals of human history. This indomitable will for national freedom clearly crystallized itself in the old Ukrainian Kievan state from the 9th to the 14th century, in the Ukrainian Kozak state from 1648 to 1783, and more recently in the Ukrainian National Republic from 1917 to 1920. As one of the first victims of Soviet imperialism, Ukraine, since the very inception of alien Bolshevik tyranny, has proved to be the Achilles heel of the Soviet Union. The destruction of its national churches, the horrible man-made famine of 1932–33, the mass murder at Vinnitsia in 1937–39, and the vast purges and deportations decreed by Moscow have failed to exterminate the spiritual and moral resources for national freedom in Ukraine. The historic capital of Kiev, with centuries of rich tradition and culture conserved in its vaults, still symbolizes today the

indestructible hope and passion of a nation destined to be sovereign, free, and independent.

During the Second World War millions of Ukrainian patriots seized the short-lived opportunity of the German invasion to realize once again this hope, only to be frustrated in their valiant efforts by the scourge of another imperialism. But this unbending will continues to be strong and powerful in the epic struggle of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army—UPA—against the evil forces of Soviet imperialism, and in the resistance of the Ukrainian people.

As a nation of over 40 million people—the largest non-Russian nation behind the European Iron Curtain—Ukraine stands as one of our most important and natural allies in the eventual defeat of Soviet imperialism. Its historic claim to national freedom and independence cannot be ignored. Its place as a sovereign and equal partner in the mutual construction of the free Europe of tomorrow must be assured, if the foundation of permanent peace among freedom-loving nations is to be impregnable.

Anniversary of the Establishment of the Ukrainian National Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1955

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of a speech which I made on Sunday, January 23, on the occasion of the 37th anniversary of the establishment of the Ukrainian National Republic:

SPEECH OF HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY, OF MICHIGAN, IN DETROIT, JANUARY 23, 1955

I am very happy to be here this afternoon and to have the privilege of speaking to the Detroit branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America on the 37th anniversary of the establishment of the Ukrainian National Republic. I know of the many thousand persons of Ukrainian origin and descent who live in the Detroit area, in the State of Michigan and throughout our country and it is a happy opportunity to join them in commemorating this day.

During the work of the House Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression on which I was privileged to serve during the 83d Congress, I came to learn a good deal concerning the essentials of the history of Ukraine and its people, including the period of Communist takeover and occupation of that nation. Given this occasion which has brought us together today, it is not inappropriate to review briefly some of these essentials so that we may have a better understanding of how the present situation was achieved.

It is a well-known fact to Ukrainians and non-Ukrainians alike that today the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, as one of the union republics of the U. S. S. R., is a charter member of the United Nations, but it is not allowed to enter into direct relations with any of the free nations of the world. Not so well known, perhaps, is the fact that, according to the best calculations, which are, of course, approximate, there are about 54 million Ukrainians in the world. This entitles them to rank in Europe next after the Russians and the Germans in point of numbers. It certainly merits careful consideration being given to the present problems and the future of this great people.

It is interesting to note how Ukrainian consciousness fared under pre-Communist foreign dominations. Under the Hapsburgs there was no denial of the Ukrainian national identity. In Russia, however, that is Czarist Russia, the Ukrainian identity was denied and many of the younger Ukrainians were drawn into the Russian revolutionary movement, while no separate Ukrainian political activity was possible.

A study of the rise of the Ukrainian National Republic should properly begin in March 1917, when the old Russian imperial organism collapsed under the strain of World War I. It was at this time that Prof. Mykhaylo Hrushevsky returned home from forced exile in Russia. On April 7 there was a great demonstration in Kiev at which Professor Hrushevsky spoke of the ending of the past, the fight for fundamental national rights, and called on the Ukrainians to be loyal to their native land—Ukraine. It was out of this that the Central Rada developed which issued, on June 23, 1917, its first universal, written by Vynnychenko, and declaring that from this time Ukraine had to live its own life. The general secretariat which was set up by the Rada was in effect the first modern Ukrainian government.

On November 20, the Rada, which had now become the governing body of Ukraine, issued the third universal, which was really a declaration of national independence except that it contained the phrase "not breaking federative bonds with Russia." This important statement provided for the establishment of a democratic republic in the Ukrainian ethnographic boundaries and guaranteed to all citizens those democratic rights that form the basis of a free country.

More important, however, from the standpoint of the Ukrainian people was the statement issued by Nikolai Lenin, on behalf of the Soviet of People's Commissars, on December 17, 1917, which officially recognized Ukraine as a completely sovereign and independent state. However, at the same time this recognition was extended, the Bolsheviks presented an ultimatum, an ultimatum which was rejected by the Ukrainian Government.

The Soviets thereupon declared war and invaded the Ukraine, driving the Ukrainian Government from Kiev to Zhytomyr in February of 1918. Prior to this, however, the Rada decided to proclaim the fourth universal on January 22 and declare the complete independence of a Ukrainian state.

Thanks to the fact that the Central Powers recognized the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic and sent military assistance, the Rada was able to return to Kiev by March 1 and resume its work of constructing a democratic state. On April 29, a constitution was adopted and Hrushevsky was elected president of the Republic. Although a German-inspired countermovement against the Rada was temporarily successful, it collapsed along with the Central Powers and by December 19 the Ukrainian National Republic was again restored. On January 3, 1919, the western Ukrainian National Republic voted to unite with the Ukrainian National Republic and the union was proclaimed at Kiev on January 22. It is the 36th anniversary of this great event which we are celebrating here today.

Even before this time, flagrant Soviet interference had assumed serious proportions. On January 16, the legal Ukrainian Government was forced to cease efforts at peace and to declare war on Soviet Russia. Caught in the midst of the Russian civil war, the Ukrainian Government was forced to leave Kiev by early February even though it returned twice briefly in August and again in May of the following year, both times with Polish assistance. However, the armistice of Riga on October 18, 1920, put an end to hostilities. The Bolshevik-supported Ukrainian Soviet Republic signed this treaty and no mention was made of the Ukrainian National Republic. When the remaining Ukrainian military forces withdrew across the Zbruch in November of 1920, it marked the close of a chapter in an heroic struggle for national independence.

Opposition to communism continued, however, especially among the Ukrainian peasants. Ukrainian national consciousness was also heightened by the fact that for a while Moscow desired to keep the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic as a quasi-independent state for its international value and effect. It must be emphasized that Ukraine proved itself an unwilling victim, albeit a very challenging field for the trying out of experiments on ways of dominating subject countries. That is why Ukraine has been the scene of so many experiments and why it has been an especial victim of the Russian Communist terror.

The Russian leaders of the first invasion of Ukraine were as much interested in plundering the peasants to secure grain as they were in capturing the country. As might have been expected, the peasants resisted. Then in 1921 a famine broke out and several millions of people starved. One result was the adoption by the Soviets of the new economic policy (NEP) which resulted in a slight change in the field of agriculture. Unfortunately, the outside world assumed that the disastrous effects of militant communism had taught the Communists reason and commonsense and that they were returning to sound and civilized policy. Such impressions were strengthened by the measures which the Communists adopted in heavy industry, in coal mining, and the production of iron ore and pig iron. Even the steady diminution of the influence of the Ukrainian S. S. R. on foreign affairs and the development of the idea, in 1922, of the formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics did not serve as sufficient warnings to world leaders.

During this period a lively intellectual life was developing in the Ukraine in connection with the so-called Ukrainization. But the Ukrainian revival came to an end in 1926 when Stalin decided that Ukraine would continue to be an agricultural area and the producer of mineral and metal raw and semi-finished materials which would take their final form in the Russian Republic. The first step in the deliberate destruction of the Ukrainian village was to ruin the peasants and force them to turn over their lands to the collective farms. Then, in 1930, came the order for compulsory collectivization of all the land and the means of production. And then Stalin decided upon a still more drastic device—the starvation of the Ukrainian villages—which resulted in the great famine of 1932–33.

During the hearings of our committee last year, one witness testified that during the period of the famine at least 6 million people died in the Ukraine as a result of it, and about 80 percent of the Ukrainian intelligentsia also perished. The most conservative estimate is that there were about 4,800,000 deaths, although there are many recognized scholars who have placed the number as between five and eight million. In addition, there was the loss to Ukraine of that part of the population which did succeed in getting out of the country and securing work in other sections of the Soviet Union. It should be remembered that, despite all appeals, any international relief was prevented by Stalin and his associates during this period.

At the same time of the collectivization and the famine, a similar attack was directed

on all of the intellectual leaders of the country. A Ukrainian orthodox bishop told our committee that over 3,000 Ukrainian priests were exterminated or sent to prisons in Siberia. He added that about 90 percent of the Ukrainian orthodox churches were either completely destroyed or were turned into other buildings, such as warehouses and barns.

It was also at this time that Professor Hrushevsky, former President of the Ukrainian National Republic and then 64 years of age, was arrested and confined in an obscure village under inhuman conditions. When he was completely broken by this procedure, he was released and moved to a rest home in the Caucasus, where he died in 1934. Along with Mezepa and Petlyura, he had been charged with bourgeois nationalism and accused of trying to destroy the unity of the Russians and Ukrainians and to undo the great work of Marx and Lenin.

The destruction of the Ukrainian cultural renaissance and the crushing of the traditional Ukrainian peasant life were but the first steps in the policy of Stalin and his associates. That dealt with Ukrainian life and thought in the present. It was necessary also to alter the past and the future. Therefore the suggestion was made that the Ukrainian language should be assimilated to Russian by the introduction into it of Russian words wherever the Ukrainian words differed. Even today the Communists are striving to make Ukrainian a dead language incapable of growth or of adaptation to modern conditions in any way other than by the addition of Russian elements.

The outbreak of World War II and the crushing defeat of Poland by the Nazi hordes also saw the Soviet Union invade that part of Ukraine and Byelorussia that had previously been Polish lands. On October 22, 1939, a national assembly (elected by the usual Communist methods) met in Lvov and asked admission to the Ukrainian Soviet Republic. A hand-picked delegation went to Moscow and on November 1, the area was formally incorporated by the Soviet of Commissars in Moscow.

It is undeniable that, when the German-Soviet war broke out in June of 1941, many of the Ukrainians welcomed the invading German forces. However, Hitler's plans did not include the formation of an independent Ukrainian Government. In August 1941 the Germans annexed western Ukraine to the governor generalship and the rest of the Ukraine was formed into the Reichskommissariat Ukraine. Therefore resistance against the new invaders developed early in 1943 with the formation of the Ukrainian insurgent army (UPA) and the next year there was finally formed the Supreme Council of Ukrainian Liberation (UHVR) which coordinated the military and civilian sides of the Ukrainian struggle. This became in a sense a government for the UPA.

One of the members of the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council who testified before our committee told us that the Ukrainian resistance was organized not only on political lines but also in the form of armed resistance and added that all the Ukrainian people fight for the same aims and motives as the Ukrainian insurgent army itself.

When the Soviets returned at the end of the war, they endeavored to soothe the aroused nationalistic feelings in Ukraine and Byelorussia. It was for this reason that they secured the entrance of the Ukrainian and Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republics as charter members of the United Nations and later gave these republics their own flags and provided new national anthems for them. But in spite of this the UPA turned against the Communists and continued to fight the Soviet armies as determinedly as they had fought the Germans.

The success of the UPA encouraged the population and did much to hamper the return and functioning of the Soviet system in the Ukraine. This continued success led to a tripartite agreement of the Soviet Union, Poland, and Czechoslovakia on May 12, 1947, to suppress the UPA, and the armed forces of all three united to suppress a menace that the Communists had denied ever existed. By 1952 open military conflict had pretty much ceased and the chief object of the UPA is now to maintain a constant state of unrest and uneasiness on the part of the more prominent Communist terrorists in the country.

In postwar Ukraine the real church has ceased to exist or has gone underground. The agricultural policy of the Soviet Union has been to revive and reform the collective farms and also to introduce the so-called agrogorod, or farm city, which facilitates the the control of the collective farms by the Communists. The work of restoring the factories has gone slowly since the policy on the part of the Soviets has been to develop the entire union in such a way that Ukrainian industrial production would increase very slowly and the share of Ukraine in the total agricultural and industrial yield of the Soviet Union would definitely diminish.

You may be interested to know that in January of 1953 there was celebrated with all the fanfare possible the 300th anniversary of the Treaty of Pereyoslav which brought Ukraine into alliance with Moscovy. On this occasion the theses of the Communist Party call Kiev the oldest Russian city and Lvov the oldest Ukrainian city because it was founded by the Ukrainians after the division of the language. Of course this postulates an original linguistic, political, and racial union of the two nations. You may also be interested to learn that the Council of Ministers turned over to Ukraine the Crimea from which they had already forcibly deported its native Tartar population. And finally, since Moscow has decided to cultivate more land in Kazakhstan and Siberia, some 800,000 young Ukrainians, young men and women, are to volunteer for the pioneering service. It is another example of the long continued attempt to place the Ukrainians everywhere, except in Ukraine.

These are some of the facts which were brought out by the Select House Committee on Communist Aggression and contained in its special report No. 4 which was published at the end of last year. I have been given a few hundred copies of this Ukrainian report and would be happy to supply you with copies as long as my supply lasts, if you will write me at my Washington office.

As many of you also know I was, during the last Congress, Michigan's only Representative on the House Foreign Affairs Committee. I recall our hearings on July 15, 1953, on the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 58 which would have authorized the establishment of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Republics of Ukraine and Byelorussia and the creation of American representation at Kiev and Minsk. Although I endorsed this legislation publicly during the course of the hearings and supported its passage in committee, the bill itself was never reported out of committee.

In this connection, I would like to clarify a point which may seem confusing to some people. The Select Committee on Communist Aggression, in its final report, recommended steps which would lead to the breaking of diplomatic relations between this Government, on the one hand, and the Soviet Union and its satellites, on the other. Along with every other member of the committee, both Republicans and Democrats, I signed this report and endorsed such steps. Some persons might naturally inquire, therefore, why I endorsed the breaking of relations with the Soviet Union while at the same time I supported attempts to establish diplomatic relations with Ukraine and Byelorussia.

Of course, those of us who supported the latter step had little hope that the Soviet Union would permit this Government to have direct contact with the so-called foreign offices of Ukraine and Byelorussia. But we wished to force the Soviet Union to refuse publicly and thus give the lie to the fiction that these two Soviet republics enjoy autonomy in the conduct of their foreign affairs. Of course, we all know that neither Ukraine nor Byelorussia have the slightest degree of external or internal autonomy, but it is important that the most clear and ample proof of this be displayed to the outside world and we believed that the passage of this concurrent resolution would have placed a valuable weapon in our hands for the cold-war struggle.

I wish now to speak of the captive peoples, not only of Ukraine but everywhere behind the Iron Curtain. Recently there has been much talk in the press of peaceful coexistence between this country and the Soviet Union. Some have interpreted such talk as an indication that we have abandoned the captive peoples to their fate, that we are willing to sit down with the Soviet rulers and divide the world into so-called spheres of influence, that we are prepared to permit the Communists to have Ukraine, let us say, if they will agree to abandon their infiltrative efforts in perhaps Guatemala or Chile or Brazil. I want to answer such interpretations this afternoon.

I can categorically assure all of you here that the policy of this Government toward the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain has not changed one iota, nor will it change under our present administration. Under date of December 16, little more than a month ago, I received the following assurances from the State Department (from which I quote): "This Government is not reconciled to the present fate of those peoples; it will not be a party to any arrangement or treaty confirming or prolonging their subjection to Soviet despotism, and it seeks by peaceful means conditions permitting these enslaved national groups to recover genuine freedom and independence."

You may have heard of or read the recent speech which Secretary of State Dulles made in Chicago in which he stated (and I quote again): "The scope of conferences with the Soviet Government is necessarily limited by our attitude toward the captive peoples, for the Soviets know that we will not make any deal which would condone and perpetuate the captivity of men and nations." And the State Department has personally assured me that our objective remains unchanged, that is, to work in all peaceful ways for the creation of a Europe in which the captive peoples will again enjoy governments as well as social and economic institutions of their own free choice.

I hope that these official statements of policy on the part of our Government will act to reassure the captive peoples that they are not and will not be forgotten and that no so-called deal will be made with the Soviets that would in any sense of the word be an acceptance on our part of their conditions of bondage. Moreover, I will say that I am convinced that the great majority of the American people are desirous and hopeful that the eventual day of liberation will come and that it will come soon.

I wish to make one thing clear about which there has been much misunderstanding. There will be no so-called war of liberation in its literal sense. The American people are not prepared to and do not intend to fight a war solely and simply for the liberation of the captive peoples. The horrors of an atomic and thermonuclear war are too great for us ever to seek war of our own choosing. But if, in spite of all our efforts for peace, war should be thrust upon us, we will not shrink from its horrors, however catastrophic they may be.

All of the peoples of the world ardently desire peace. But we will not pay any price, however unworthy, to buy peace. And I am

convinced that if war with the Soviets should come, albeit not of our choosing, we would not hesitate but would wage it until the power of international communism everywhere was beaten and trampled into the ground.

So I tell you that, while there may be talk of peaceful coexistence, a concept which I personally believe can never be realized, the policy of liberation is still as much a part of our national objective as it ever was. And there are peaceful means and ways in which we can work for this liberation, some of which are already in use while many others remain to be tried.

In working for peaceful liberation, I believe we would in effect be working toward a victory over the Soviet Union in the only way which would avoid either shameful surrender to the Soviets or an all-out atomic war in which there would be neither victor nor vanquished. Therefore you can see that the achievement of liberation by peaceful means would be very much in the interest of our own national security and therefore must of necessity be and remain a part of our Government's international policy toward the Soviets.

One thing more. When one deals with the Soviets, it is necessary to approach them from a standpoint of strength, not weakness. For example, when our citizens are incarcerated in Soviet prisons, it is not only unnecessary but even the height of folly to resort to the payment of ransom and blackmail in order to effect their release. This was done in the case of Oatis from Czechoslovakia, Vogeler from Hungary, and in other instances. Such examples not only set dangerous precedents but are also shameful reflections of the loss of honor and prestige of a great Nation. You here in Detroit have just witnessed a successful attempt, in which I was proud to play a small part, at liberating one of your own fellow townsmen from a Soviet prison. No ransom or blackmail, no shameful concessions, were paid to effect the release of John Noble. He had been in a Russian labor camp for 9 years. But it was not until the State Department stopped writing notes and instructed our Ambassador to take the matter up personally with the Soviets that success was achieved.

I have been privileged to join with you this afternoon in honoring the 36th anniversary of the establishment of the Ukrainian National Republic. I join with all of you in praying for the day when the people of Ukraine will once again be free and able to choose their own form of government in accordance with the cherished principle of self-determination which this country has always espoused. I am happy to come here and tell you that the Eisenhower administration is just as concerned with this question of liberation as any of you and to assure you of my own intention to work for this principle as long as I remain in public service. I commend you for keeping the memory of this day alive and I urge you never to forget what this occasion signifies as best expressed by the title of your historic national anthem, Shche Ne Vmerla Ukraina—Ukraine Will Never Die.

Continuing Struggle for Freedom and Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, during the past week of January 22 the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America has, throughout the United States, observed the anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence which took place on January 22, 1918.

This observance is truly an occasion, as the committee says, and I quote, "for the unending reaffirmation of our faith in the eventual liberation of all the enslaved nations in the Communist empire."

I am happy to include a summary of these stirring feelings in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SUMMARY

The centuries-old struggle for freedom and independence on the part of the Ukrainian nation constitutes an impressive chapter in the annals of human history. This indomitable will for national freedom clearly crystallized itself in the old Ukrainian Kievan state from the 9th to the 14th century, in the Ukrainian Kozak state from 1648 to 1783, and more recently in the Ukrainian National Republic from 1917 to 1920. As one of the first victims of Soviet imperialism, Ukraine, since the very inception of alien Bolshevik tyranny, has proved to be the Achilles heel of the Soviet Union. The destruction of its national churches, the horrible manmade famine of 1932–33, the mass murder at Vinnitsia in 1937–39, and the vast purges and deportations decreed by Moscow have failed to exterminate the spiritual and moral resources for national freedom in Ukraine. The historic capital of Kiev, with centuries of rich tradition and culture conserved in its vaults, still symbolizes today the indestructible hope and passion of a nation destined to be sovereign, free, and independent.

During the Second World War millions of Ukrainian patriots seized the short-lived opportunity of the German invasion to realize once again this hope, only to be frustrated in their valiant efforts by the scourge of another imperialism. But this unbending will continues to be strong and powerful in the epic struggle of the Ukrainian insurgent army (UPA) against the evil forces of Soviet imperialism, and in the resistance of the Ukrainian people.

As a nation of over 40 million people—the largest non-Russian nation behind the European Iron Curtain—Ukraine stands as one of our most important and natural allies in the eventual defeat of Soviet imperialism. Its historic claim to national freedom and independence cannot be ignored. Its place as a sovereign and equal partner in the mutual construction of the free Europe of tomorrow must be assured, if the foundation of permanent peace among freedom-loving nations is to be impregnable.

Speech of Hon. Jamie L. Whitten, of Mississippi, at Annual Meeting of the National Agricultural Limestone Producers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1955

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered at the annual meeting of the National Agricultural Limestone Producers, January 18, 1955, Washington, D. C.:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I welcome this opportunity to speak to your organization and to so many of my colleagues. Many times in the past I have welcomed your active assistance in fights in the Congress for conservation of national resources. I understand that your business interests give you a special interest in the conservation of the Nation's soil. Knowledge of the problems which you gain in your own business gives you a knowledge of land needs, and may I say, gives you an obligation to make available to the committees of the Congress and to the public what you have learned. Not only do you have the right to speak but an obligation, in my opinion.

You know there are many things involved in this complex subject of American agriculture and its place in the Nation. We left agriculture out for many years when industry had advantages written into law and when industrial labor was protected by law. Largely as a result, 80 percent of our timber is gone; 40 percent of our fertile land is gone. Farm life had so few returns from the farm share of the national income dollar that farm homes had few conveniences others had. Work hours were longer. It followed that nearly all who could left the farm. Farm population went down steadily from 84 percent to only 13 percent on the farm.

Today, farming is a commercial operation. Farmers either make costs plus a living, or deplete the land, go broke, and move to town like the rest of us. We had the great depression of the twenties, for which many explanations have been offered. At any rate, a drastic break in farm prices led off in that depression which carried all down with it—labor, agriculture, and capitalist. We cannot stand another. Finally, it was determined by the Congress to put protections for agriculture in the law, where the other two major segments were already. Thus, we have the price support system provided by law. You may say you now have a price support law, though actions last year weakened it; but may I remind you that farm income can be ruined by reductions in acreage and the giving away of our foreign markets.

We no longer have the natural resources to waste, which were wasted when "sale at the market place" under world competitive conditions was all that agriculture got.

I believe in free enterprise, but if you analyze the situation you soon find that our free enterprise has been free only under the laws as written by the Congress and by the States. There has been competition as to how these laws were written. It has been said that all anybody wants is a fair advantage—an advantage which he wants others to agree it is fair for him to have. One way to get such advantages declared fair is to pass a law and have the law declare it fair; with the first Congress the fight was on.

Early in our history, industry got protective tariffs written into law; and a good argument could be made for such protection, especially in the early days. They retain most of them today, and they are not going to be repealed. Only about 22 years ago did agriculture begin to receive somewhat equal treatment in law.

Agriculture today operates in an economy where for all practical purposes those advantages to industry and labor are provided by law, and such laws are not going to be repealed. Only recently the President of the United States asked for a 90 cents an hour minimum wage. Whatever the merits, it can only have the effect of raising farm costs at a time when farm laws are under attack and farm income is going down.

Today farming is a commercial operation. Farming is a business and is no longer merely

a way of life. The expensive farm machinery necessary today makes it that.

Forty years ago 70 percent of the farm investment was land. Today only 45 percent of the investment is land. The balance is expensive farm machinery, equipment, and needed buildings. These things cost money, and they wear out.

Forty years ago it took a farmer almost 10 years to lose his farm if he made nothing. Today, due to heavy outlay of cash, he can lose it in less than 2 years. A real farmer must be a capitalist as well as a laborer today.

There has been some 13 freight-rate increases since World War II, based on operations of other laws, an 85-percent increase in spread between prices received on the farm and prices to the consumer, a 13-percent increase in farm costs in the past 3 years, with a 12-percent decrease in farm income. These conditions, which largely result from laws, many of them enacted by Congress to provide protection to various segments of our economy, make price supports for certain basic agricultural commodities essential to maintaining some degree of balance in our economy. The fact that price supports are necessary to offset American costs does not remove the necessity that our foreign markets be retained to absorb commodities surplus to our domestic needs, if we are to avoid further curtailments in agricultural production and farm income with the resulting unemployment of thousands upon thousands of American farmers.

LARGE INVESTMENT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION COMES BECAUSE OF REFUSAL TO SELL

The large holdings of agricultural commodities in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation in recent years is not the result of our price-support program, but rather is due to the Government's refusal to offer to sell our products, once they are in the hands of CCC, competitively on world markets. Yet each time I have challenged this policy of holding our agricultural commodities back, admitted to be our policy by our Department of Agriculture, I have been faced with the fact that such policy reflected the attitude of our State Department and those handling foreign-aid programs, based on what the State Department claimed were political and national defense considerations. That Department has made its decisions, apparently, without any awareness of the effect on agriculture and business in the United States. I believe such policies ruinous to American agriculture and, in the long run, to the Nation.

ECONOMIC LOSS FROM REFUSAL TO SELL

According to the national advisory committee for CARE, composed of such men as Henry A. Bullis, General Mills' chairman of the board; Roy C. Ingersoll, president of Borg-Warner; Ward Melville, Melville Shoe Corp.; H. J. Heinz, and others equally successful, such policy costs the United States $700,000 a day for storage, deprives American railroads of transportation equal to 100 transcontinental freight trains each day for a year, deprives American shipping of the equivalent of the dispatch of 10 oceangoing freighters every day for a year, not to mention the loss of labor and the effect on agriculture itself, being cut back now to absorb surplus commodities. And all this food and fiber has been held back by the Department's policy, set up by our State Department on the fallacious argument that such a course helps needy peoples of the world.

WE NOW HAVE AUTHORITY TO SELL COMPETITIVELY ON WORLD MARKETS

I would point out that the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in section 5 (f) authorizes the Corporation to export or cause to be exported, or aid in the development of foreign markets for, agricultural commodities. Under the Charter Act these commodities may be commodities acquired under price-support programs or specifically procured for export purposes.

The Charter Act contains no restrictions on the prices at which commodities may be sold by the Corporation. Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, does establish minimum prices at which the Corporation may sell commodities owned or controlled by it, except in the case of sales for certain specified purposes. Sales for export, however, are specifically exempt from the application of this minimum-price restriction.

Yet the United States Department of Agriculture admitted in hearings before my committee last year that the United States has been following a policy of holding our commodities at prevailing prices, letting other countries undersell and have the markets. Many commodities have not been offered even at prevailing prices.

Foreign countries do have the dollars. However, due to our policy of not offering our commodities these countries simply are not spending as much for agricultural commodities, but are buying other things. Agriculture's share of United States sales has dropped from 28 percent in 1934–38 to 19 percent in 1953. We will spend $3,200,000,000 in support of our military in foreign countries this year.

Only last week authority was granted to the Commodity Credit Corporation to use $7,200,000 in additional funds for administrative expenses. Our committee went along with this request because these funds are necessary to handle the quantities of agricultural commodities which the Commodity Credit Corporation owns, but which it has on hand because of faulty Government policy.

The price-support system may have caused the Corporation to buy those commodities, but the Corporation has them because we would not sell them.

This fact is proven in hearings held by our committee last week, when Secretary Benson and Under Secretary Morse were before us.

LARGE HOLDINGS USED TO LOWER PRICE SUPPORTS AND IMPOSE ACREAGE REDUCTIONS

We read about our Secretary of Agriculture and others talking about having invested more the $6 billion in farm commodities, and that is true. We saw the last Congress, where the administration including the Secretary of Agriculture, reduce price-support levels on basic farm commodities from 90 to 82½ percent of parity; the Secretary of Agriculture said "to prevent the holding of such huge supplies of farm commodities."

Dairy support levels were reduced because of the butter CCC owned. Last year drastic reductions were made in acreages in wheat, cotton, and other crops, and decreased production was ordered. This year still further drastic reductions in acreage were ordered, which is working a tremendous hardship and putting lots of people out of business in the area I come from.

Our hearings, and if you haven't read those hearings you should, disclose that, notwithstanding the fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation has had authority to sell these commodities in world markets for dollars, it simply would not do it. We have held our commodities off world markets and thereby helped to increase foreign production. By way of illustration, since 1945 cotton production in Asia has increased by 3½ million bales and in Africa by more than 100 million bales, not to mention Central America and Europe. I tried to get a change in policy last year. Later in the year we got them to offer some commodities in world trade on a competitive basis, and they sold $453 million worth of them, reducing CCC stocks to a minimum.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

On January 10 we heard the speech of our distinguished President of the United States, in which much was made of the administration's efforts to move the CCC-owned agricultural commodities into foreign trade for foreign currency under Public Law 480. What does Public Law 480 provide? A close reading of that speech will show you that 90 percent of that foreign currency we would receive is not even subject to the control of the Congress. By far the greater part of that foreign currency will be used for economic development in those countries. The last 10 percent of it can be given to them if the President just says the word. What was not in the President's speech is the fact that his administration is trying to give these commodities away under Public Law 480 without even offering them for sale for dollars, under the general authority of the law. The administration's approach would continue to hold an umbrella over world prices.

Representatives of the United States Government are going around over the world trying to give away to foreign countries that which they will not offer for sale, commodities which they have the authority to sell but which they will not sell, all to add to foreign aid.

And all the time foreign production increases, and the American farmers gets his production cut more and more. There is ample evidence of the fact that the Corporation could sell to be found in the experience that they have had with those items which we finally got them to offer for sale on a competitive bid basis last year. Let me read to you a list of those commodities which they will not even offer for sale on a competitive basis: cotton, cheeses, corn, rice, seeds, naval stores, tobacco, wool, and butter—our investment, $3,700,000,000.

Secretary Benson says the trade recommended this policy. I know many in the trade do not. In fact, many people in the cotton trade have asked that I determine "who it is who has benefited from increased foreign production, which is protected by the United States umbrella." In many, many cases, I am told, it is American operators who have moved into production and business in foreign countries; and it is charged by some in the cotton business that many of those same people are now in key spots to advise the United States Department of Agriculture to hold American production off world markets. I expect to have a special investigation to find out these facts with regard to the various commodities. I believe such information will be valuable to the Appropriations Committee.

If it be true that it is not foreigners who have increased cotton production in foreign countries, but American business interests which have moved in to take advantage of the United States umbrella they help to raise over their foreign investments, they have what you might call perfect insurance or assurance of profits. Furthermore, do not try to tell me that we must sell these commodities from one government to another government.

THE REMEDY

All we have to do is announce periodically that given quantities of those commodities will be sold on a competitive-bid basis to American exporters for export. By controlling the quantity offered and the spacing of our offerings we can take into account all factors. My suggestion is not dumping, for United States businessmen would buy and sell in the regular way. We would use the private enterprise system.

Foreign countries do have the dollars, but this shortsighted policy of not selling our commodities competitively on world markets, and thus holding an umbrella over world prices, invites the increased production we are getting in nearly every country which produces such commodities. We are making competitors out of our customers. This failure to use the general authority of

law is cutting back the income of our own farmers more and more, so as to leave many of them far below any kind of a reasonable standard of living; and if it is continued it will result in American agriculture being limited to the domestic market. What I charge here is proven by the testimony in the hearings before our committee.

Though actually the President's recommendation for giveaway under Public Law 480 is a form of dumping, contrary to misleading headlines our committee has urged no irresponsible dumping. Our Government has held these commodities so long it has built our holdings up to the extent that we must gradually move back. May I read to you the report of our committee:

COMMITTEE REPORT

"In the opinion of a majority of the members of the committee, actions of the Department to reduce price supports, change parity formulas, and reduce acreage allotments will not cure the problem of the increasing commodity holdings of the Corporation. They believe that this difficulty is due to the failure of the Corporation to discharge its responsibility under its charter to sell its commodities competitively in world markets. Testimony before the committee shows that none of the large stocks of cotton, cheese, corn, rice, seeds, naval stores, tobacco, and wool have been or are being offered for sale on a competitive basis, despite basic authority in law to do so.

"The program for moving commodities under Public Law 480, for which much is claimed, actually is a means of giving commodities away in preference to attempting to sell them through normal trade channels. It involves prior clearance from a committee composed primarily of representatives of nonagricultural interests (State, Commerce Departments, etc.) which is a serious hurdle in getting agricultural commodities exported. Also, under the law, the major portion of the local currencies received for commodities shipped abroad will be used for foreign-aid purposes in the countries from which received.

"The majority of the committee feels that steps should be taken as early as practicable to begin the movement of these commodities into world markets on a competitive bid basis through American exporters. The committee also feels that an immediate announcement of such change in policy should be made to discourage further increases in foreign production to the detriment of American farmers.

"Such an action will eventually make possible reductions in administrative costs of the Corporation. It should also help to correct the present practice of making competitors out of former customers and should benefit foreign consumers who have a real need for products surplus to United States domestic needs.

"Further, and most important, it will enable the American farmer to compete with foreign producers and make additional acreage available to relieve undue hardships existing in many areas of the country under present orders."

THE TRAGIC EFFECT

The tragedy of not selling these commodities—cotton, cheese, corn, rice, etc.—and they could have been sold, is that those same commodities for which there was a market and for which there is authority to sell, were used and counted to cut support levels, to reduce acreage, and restrict American production, to restrict the cotton acreage of American farmers. It was used as an argument to reduce the price-support levels on basic commodities from 92 percent to 82½ percent. It was used to change the parity formula so that it will almost automatically go down to 75 percent within the next several years. All the time the commodities that were used for this purpose could have been sold, and there was authority to sell them. When these fights were up last year, Secretary Benson did not tell the American people he had full authority to sell these commodities, but would not offer them for sale to our traders for use in world trade. The major harm or loss is not the amount of money we have invested in these commodities; it is not the fact that the longer you keep them the more storage we have to pay; but the commodities which we have, which we would not sell, have been used to do these other injuries to the American farmer, leaving thousands of tenants without a means of livelihood in the South and many, many small landowners reduced below the barest minimum essential to a decent living.

VIEWS OF SECRETARY BENSON

The chief difference between the views of the Secretary of Agriculture and myself, on the price support system, is that I believe price supports are necessary to protect the American farmer against high United States costs largely brought about by other American laws.

Apparently the Secretary, judged by his arguments for flexible supports, feels that price supports should be a means to help regulate American production. He would increase supports when he wants more production and lower supports when he wants less.

Where I believe the parity formula should be tied to costs as it was under the old parity formula, the Secretary's modern parity, substituted last year, ties parity primarily to the average price the farmer received for his commodities for the 10 preceding years. Under the Secretary's law, as the farmers' prices go down parity goes down though costs may be going up. Under the old formula, as cost went up parity went up.

However, whether you agree with Mr. Benson or with me, neither system will work unless what the farmers produce above domestic needs is offered in world markets on a competitive basis. I repeat: "According to admissions of Mr. Benson and Under Secretary Morse, before our subcommittee last week, billions of dollars worth of cotton, corn, dairy products, wool and tobacco are not even being offered to the markets of the world for sale on a competitive basis. To prove my point, those commodities we have been able to get the department to offer have been sold for dollars."

QUANTITY OR VOLUME IS AS ESSENTIAL AS PRICE

Price-support levels are only one factor. The other essential is quantity or volume. If you guarantee a cotton farmer 200 percent of parity and limit him to 3 acres of cotton, his gross income would be less than $1,000 per year. Today acreage curtailment in cotton is reducing thousands of small farmers to less than $1,000 gross per year. Tenant farmers, thousands of them, are being let out entirely. This cutback is to help absorb cotton which the Government has and won't offer for sale competitively: and actually, unintentionally I am sure, amounts to forcing our United States farmers to absorb foreign increases in production.

SMALL FARMERS

Our distinguished President, in speaking to the joint session of the Congress, said the administration had to do something for the small farmers.

Acreage reductions in my section are making many more small farmers for the administration "to do something for." Today, the Government is giving them cheese and butter, mighty good products but tiresome if the only food provided.

Incidentally the Government has this cheese and butter because it won't offer it for sale to our exporters on a competitive basis.

We must start moving to prevent further losses in our United States export markets. We must begin offering some quantities on a competitive-bid basis to our own traders for export, or we will be back to the domestic market on a permanent basis.

I repeat: by controlling the size of our offerings and the spacing between offerings our Department of Agriculture can consider all factors. Such a course is not dumping; but giving away what we won't offer for sale competitively under Public Law 480 is dumping, though there are certain safeguards written into the law.

FARMERS' INCOME DETERMINES CONSERVATION

Why do I stress price supports and market to you who are primarily interested in conservation? Because, however strongly you and the farmers believe in conservation, restoring minerals to the soil, the job will be done only as the farmer's income leaves enough over after taxes and cost to put something back into the soil.

Income over and beyond cost of living to the farmer is essential to the effectiveness of our Soil Conservation Service, Extension Service, and yes, will even control the amount of sales of limestone by members of your association.

WHAT IS THE FARM SITUATION TODAY?

The prices of farm products have declined about 25 percent since February 1951. The cost of farming continues to increase. The net farm income in 1954 was down about 30 percent from 1951.

And the outlook is for still further declines in net farm income in 1955 because of the reduction in acreage of controlled crops and the low prices of nearly all farm products.

In December, the parity ratio dropped to 86, the lowest since 1941.

As a result of the decline in prices of farm products and the drastic drop in net farm income, the value of United States agricultural assets dropped from $170.1 billion on January 1, 1952, to $156.5 billion on January 1, 1955, a loss of $13.6 billion, or 8 percent.

During this past 3-year period the value of farm real estate dropped nearly $9 billion, or about 9 percent. The value of livestock declined $8 billion, or more than 40 percent.

The losses sustained in real estate and livestock were partly offset by small gains in the value of farm machinery, crops on farms, and household furnishings.

What has happened in industry during this period? From January 1949 to January 1955, the value of 30 leading industrial stocks skyrocketed from $175 to $412.97 per share. The total value of industrial stocks increased by $53 billion.

The continuing boom in industry and the spiraling prices on the stock market are reflections of the profits of industry and dividend payments by industrial enterprises. How much of the advance is the result of speculation or hope of future gain is itself a question for speculation and meditation. And all this adds to costs to American farmers, but the new parity formula is based on the average price the farmer has been receiving, not on the cost of what he buys.

Mr. Fred J. Hurst, director of information, Farm Credit District of New Orleans, says:

"The farm mortgage debt has almost doubled since 1945. The estimated dollar volume of farm mortgages recorded during the third quarter of 1954 totalled $380,343,000, which was nearly 2½ times the amount recorded in the third quarter of 1940, and the largest dollar volume recorded during the third quarter of any year since the heavy refinancing year of 1934.

"Yet, despite the decline in farm prices and farm income, despite the unfavorable position of agriculture in the national economy, responsible officials continue to lower farm price-support levels. At the same time we hear the official call to the Congress to raise the minimum wage level from 75 cents

to 90 cents an hour. We hear the call for increase in salaries for various groups. We see and hear many things happening that would tend to widen rather than narrow the disparity between agriculture and industry.

"It is disturbing to note that there seems to be little concern about the plight of agriculture except among farmers themselves and their cooperatives and a limited number of sympathetic farm leaders who know the desperate battle farmers are waging to make ends meet, and who realize the danger to the entire national economy unless the decline in farm income cannot only be arrested but reversed and improved.

"Unfortunately, there seems to be a disposition on the part of some agricultural groups, judging by their published statements, to echo the national refrain, to docilely accept the indifferent national attitude toward agriculture, and to consider the farm price situation as something inevitable and permanent. We want to make a plea for a general awakening to the worsening farm situation. We want to sound a warning. Past experience has shown that there is a limit to the beating farmers can take. There is a limit to the depths to which farm income can drop without bankrupting agriculture and without endangering the entire economy. The current 86 percent of parity is a long way from the 100 percent of parity, the fair level goal set for agriculture."

GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIES

You may say the farm program is a subsidy program. Collectively, through Government, we spend as much as $6 million on getting one group of magazines distributed. The Government largely supports the distribution of newspapers. We subsidize the airlines; we held build ships, so our shipping can pay the high wages of the American seamen, protected by bargaining power of labor unions, to haul commodities in competition with foreign shipping; and so it is just about in every direction you look. Through Government we have had many advantages termed fair by being enacted into law. Under those conditions we had better be sure we include agricultural income along with the rest, for food, clothing, and shelter are still basic. Whatever the real cost of the farm program would be, our refusal to sell Commodity Credit stocks on a competitive basis multiplies such costs many times over.

THE YEARS AHEAD

Our population is increasing by 3 million people each year. Twenty years from now, except for new increases in yield, we will need in this country 115 million more acres of land than we now have.

Four out of five people have left the farm in the last 40 years. With the present commercialization of farming, with present high cost of each crop, unless the farmer makes a profit he will first drain his soil of its fertility, as he did with 40 percent of our land; then if price is no better, he too will move to town like the rest of us.

If the consumers demand our food, clothing, and shelter below the cost of production, the United States will go the way of China, whose resources are gone; and instead of 1 farmer feeding 6 city consumers, it will take 6 farmers to feed 1 city consumer.

WE MUST DIRECT OUR ENERGIES TO OUR OWN COUNTRY

A year or two ago the Chief of the National Production Authority, the Federal agency which had the job of planning the increase of the production potential of our country in power, nitrates, aluminum, and all other things needed to meet the Russian threat, told me privately that if he were Joe Stalin and wanted to wreck the economy of the United States he would declare 5 years of peace. With all of us praying then and now for peace, his statement was shocking. He continued:

"If we were to cancel all war contracts with the resulting closed factories and unemployment, if we were to have nearly all of our men in the service back home seeking jobs, if we quit shipping out machinery, equipment, and nearly everything else to our allies, if civilian industry had to cut out its 20 percent of extra production with its labor let off, and if the farmer had no market for 20 percent of his production, it would wreak havoc with our national economy—for with our present debt of more than $260 million we must keep national income high, the dollar cheap, if we hope to handle it."

If we think of it, we have been producing through all our factories about 15 to 20 percent more to meet the needs of war. There has been a sale for practically anything industry produced. If we will dig further we will realize that labor turning out that production has been accustomed to a full workweek, and farmers producing about 20 percent more than our present domestic markets will use were accustomed to selling almost anything we could grow.

If we follow the subject further we will also see that the American people as a whole, except for the farmers this year, have enjoyed material prosperity for the past 12 years to a greater extent than any people ever before in this or any other nation. We have had more cars, more clothes, more and better food, more radios, television, more electrical equipment, more of everything that people need or want.

With all of us sincerely for peace, it is unbelievable that it takes a war and preparation for war to continue such prosperity, even though war and its demands on us seem to have brought about increased production.

In war and preparation for war, a large part of that extra effort is shot up in shells, worn out as military vehicles, planes, equipment, guns, warships, in wear and tear on our railroads, our highways. The extra food and fiber is either given to our allies or else we have given them the money and sold them such commodities for our money back. Our lands have been used to a greater extent, our timber and natural resources have been further depleted.

If that extra effort due to war and the preparedness for war is the basis for our material prosperity, then why not continue to put forth that extra effort, not in a war which leaves us a poorer country but in work that will improve our country? Why can't we put forth that extra effort in reforesting our lands, harnessing our streams for electricity, reclaiming our lands through soil conservation and in those things that make our country richer and better?

Where war and preparedness and all that goes with it leaves us with a poorer country, if our efforts were made as I suggest we would have a better and a richer country I think you will agree with me. But I will tell you the only hitch. It is to be doubted that our people will put forth the same effort in our own country, or let us through the instrument of government attempt to move in that direction.

WHILE THE GOVERNMENT AIDS OTHERS, IT REDUCES EFFORTS AT HOME

While speeches are being made on conservation, funds for soil conservation are being reduced by the President's budget. The conservation job is being pushed back on the individual farmers, when their income is decreasing and their costs are rising. The job is being put back on the States, though those with the greatest problems are least able to pay.

While our President speaks of providing farm commodities to the needy peoples of the world, our own school-lunch program is cut. While we provide money to the world for their economic improvement, the same United States commodities are being held off world markets, to give such markets to operators in foreign countries. While American tenant farmers are being cut back in acreage to the point of being without a means of livelihood and thousands of others are reduced to a gross annual income of less than $1,000, we are promoting the increased production of the same commodities throughout the world—at least 1 million bales per year increase in foreign cotton production—not only by providing an umbrella over world prices, but by grants of American dollars as well.

PROVISION FOR THE FUTURE

It has been said, "The world is never more than 1 year ahead of starvation." In our country we have had great abundance through the years. Now we know we are gaining population at the rate of 3 million a year. We must, in self defense, if we hope to maintain our present high standard of living, see to it that a reasonable part of what is taken out of the land is put back; and that will be done only as income received exceeds cost of production.

Protections for industry and labor are going to continue and since that is true we must see to it that agriculture, the source of all wealth, returns to the head table, too, for the good of the Nation.

The farmer must have price, but he must have volume as well.

Remember, the only source of real wealth is the land. Your income and the future of our Nation, as well, is tied to the farm income.

If we leave to our children and children's children a fertile land, with timber restored, our soil erosion stopped, and our streams harnessed, with our natural resources intact, they will make it fine. On the other hand we could leave them all the money in the world but leave them a worn-out land and they will have nothing on which to build. Remember, the cost of producing food and fiber on the farm is going to be paid—either by those who use the products of the soil or by the land from which it comes. Forty percent of our land has paid that price in the past. Today with an ever-increasing population, we don't have the land to spare. There will likely be no Marshall plan or foreign aid law like our Public Law 480 if our country should ever be worn out as are most of the old countries of Asia we aid today.

New Vistas for International Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 27, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it was my privilege this afternoon to speak before the National Workshop on World Economic and Social Development, at a meeting held in the Woodner Hotel.

I ask unanimous consent that my address on that occasion may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW VISTAS FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

(Speech by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin)

It is a great pleasure to be with you today. International economic development is the

most exciting undertaking of this generation. Of all the great events which we have seen in our lifetimes, none offers a greater challenge, nor a greater opportunity for creation of a world in which peace and prosperity will be accomplished facts instead of wistful dreams.

I think it is not too much to say that whether future generations live in a Communist world or a free world depends on how we, the American people, carry out our part in international development.

The words of Theodore Roosevelt, more than 40 years ago, are more than ever appropriate in this connection.

"The United States of America," he said, "has not the option as to whether it will or will not play a great part in the world. It must play a great part. All that it can decide is whether it will play that part well or badly."

Before this group, there is no need to belabor the set of facts which makes this so. You are all familiar with them. Three facts, however, are worth emphasizing.

The first is the great—and growing—disparity in levels of economic development between the United States and Western Europe, on the one hand, and most of the rest of the world on the other.

The second is the urge to develop which characterizes important segments of the underdeveloped world. These countries have glimpsed better things and are determined to have them.

The third is the increasing effort of the Soviet Union and Communist China to make it appear that communism offers the shortest road to economic development.

Most of the people, and a great many of the resources, of the world are in underdeveloped countries which in their present state are quite incapable by themselves of withstanding determined Communist aggression. If these underdeveloped countries were to go behind the Iron Curtain, the United States' problem of national survival would be greatly increased. Development of these areas is therefore in our interest in order to increase their capacity to defend themselves.

It is also in our interest to provide an irrefutable demonstration to the skeptics in these nations that communism does not offer a short cut to conomic development but that, on the contrary, a free society produces richer rewards economically as well as spiritually.

We might as well recognize that the economic history of the Soviet Union since 1917 is attractive to some people in the underdeveloped countries. While there is considerable doubt that the average Russian has any more of the material things of life than he had under the Czars, the Soviet Union has nonetheless sprouted steel plants and tractor factories at a rate which, though not equal to the United States, is at least sufficient to impress some of those underdeveloped countries which want steel plants and tractor factories themselves.

But it is putting the case for international development on too narrow a base to state it solely in terms of a defensive measure against the threat of Communist aggression. Programs of assistance for international development would be in the self-interest of the United States if the Communist threat did not exist.

Defense is essentially negative, but international development is positive and constructive. It is our best long-term instrument for accomplishing our foreign policy objectives. These objectives, it seems to me, are too frequently stated in negative terms of resisting aggression. That is, of course, one of the fundamentals of our policy, but it is by no means the whole of our policy. It is, indeed, no more than an essential prerequisite to the accomplishment of our broader objective of an expanding economy in a free society. Programs of international development offer an opportunity for imaginative, constructive accomplishment in the highest traditions of enlightened statesmanship.

In the language of the scripture, "Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another." This is a Christian program, and we would not be true to our moral and spiritual heritage if we did nothing to lift up the hopes and minister to the needs of those who are less fortunate than ourselves. United States participation in international development can be justified on these grounds.

But it can also be justified on the basis of dollars and cents.

From the economic point of view, international development is in our interest because poor countries are poor customers and poor suppliers. The underdeveloped part of the world is an increasingly important source of the raw materials which American industry needs. It can also become an increasingly important market for the products of American industry. The bulk of our international trade is carried on with the more highly developed countries. As economic development progresses, trade increases—to the mutual benefit of all concerned.

These various reasons for United States participation in international development—the reasons for defense, of economics, and of morals—are not contradictory; they are complementary. When you put them together, they do not weaken the case for international development; they strengthen it.

We have been much too coy in making plain all our motives for carrying out our programs of economic development and technical assistance. The result of this coyness has been that the people who are receiving our help frequently do not understand why we are giving it. They are skeptical of the explanation that we are doing it in their interest and therefore search for some hidden motive which they believe must exist and must be so bad that we are ashamed of it. The Communists have ready at hand the explanation of imperialism, and this gains credence through our own lack of complete frankness.

The case for United States assistance for international economic development is so strong, on several counts, that we must be as careful not to attempt too much as not to attempt too little. When one considers the state of the underdeveloped parts of the world, and particularly when one considers the Soviet threat, he feels a sense of urgency. And certainly the need is urgent. But this is a situation in which haste can best be made slowly.

What we can do is, of course, limited by our own resources. But it is more severely limited by shortages of skilled technicians and by the capacity of underdeveloped countries to absorb capital.

We can accomplish more by spending $2 billion in 10 years, or even 20, than by spending the same amount in 1 or 2 years. Personally, I would rather see the United States undertake a long-term commitment, on a relatively modest annual basis, than a short-term commitment on a large annual basis.

It takes time for economic-development projects to produce results, and it sometimes requires a high order of faith to persevere in these projects when no immediate results are apparent, but we must think in terms of decades, or even generations, instead of 2 or 3 or 4 years.

Despite the long history of economic development in Western Europe and the United States, the process is as yet imperfectly understood. Indeed, there is a serious question as to the validity of the conclusions which we can draw from studying our own history when we attempt to apply those conclusions to the rest of the world. What effect do cultural attitudes and social organization have on economic development? And what effect does economic development have on cultural attitudes and racial organization? This is a field in which we have much too little information and to which we have given much too little attention.

In the United States, we have what I believe anthropologists call a future-oriented society. We like to try new things, simply because they are new. We adjust to technological change with relative ease. Witness, for example, the smoothness with which, in the space of scarcely more than a generation, we shifted the focus of our family life from the living room to the automobile to the television set.

We have great faith in expertness. If a veterinarian tells us that the cow and the calf will both be healthier—and that the farmer will have more milk—if the calf is weaned at an early age, the farmer may not understand the biological reasons why this is so, but you can bet that he will at least give it a try. Yet when a veterinarian in one of the underdeveloped countries told a group of farmers the same thing, they flatly refused to believe him because everybody knew that it had always been done differently. When the veterianarian gave what he thought was a convincing demonstration, his credibility was not increased at all; the people simply said that although it might work with his cattle, it certainly would not work with theirs.

I could tell you many similar stories; I am sure many of you are familiar with others of the same type. The point is that the receptivity of people to technical knowledge varies greatly, and the more underdeveloped their economies, the more highly resistant they are apt to be to improvement.

We make a great mistake when we do not take this into account. International development is not a program to remake the world in our own image. Humility, patience, tact, and understanding are more important than technical expertness. A paternalistic, do-it-this-way-daddy-knows-best attitude not only foredooms a project to failure, but produces positive harmful results.

Economic development cannot be imposed from without. No matter how much capital investment or how much technical knowledge we may be able and willing to supply, it will not have the desired effects—indeed, it may even have negative effects—unless there exists in the recipient country the urge to develop.

This urge is a great deal more complicated than the simple desire for more food, or better housing, or better schools, or concrete highways, automobiles, and steel plants. If a country wants more food, is it willing to change its traditional, perhaps centuries-old, system of land tenure? If it wants better schools, is it willing to step on the toes of vested interests who may be fearful of the power of an enlightened people? Is it, in other words, willing to break with the past?

This is basically a question of politics in the broadest sense of that word. The drive to independence among former colonial areas of the world is one of the most significant phenomena of the age in which we live, and it is directly related to the problem of international economic development.

An example from one of the newly independent Asian countries will illustrate what I mean. A missionary in this particular country devoted most of his adult life to improving a single village. With the help of the local people, he made it into one of the cleanest, healthiest, most prosperous, and best educated villages in the country. Withal, it was a monument to what could be done with meager resources and tireless, dedicated work. Shortly before World War II, the missionary went home to retire, and within a year after he had left, the village

had reverted to its previous condition of poverty and filth and was indistinguishable from all the other poor, dirty villages in the country. After World War II, this country gained its independence, and within a year thereafter, this particular village was once again a model of village improvement.

In this case, political independence had almost everything to do with the urge to develop. This urge did not exist until the people realized that, at long last, it was their country they were concerned with, that their future was in their own hands.

One cannot be dogmatic about these things, because we are dealing with a field in which our ignorance still exceeds our knowledge, but there is evidence to suggest that economic development flourishes best in an atmosphere of political and social change. Change, of course, does not necessarily imply instability. But when political authority changes hands, old symbols of authority are torn down and the atmosphere is cleared for accompanying changes in social outlook and organization.

One could cite many examples. Certainly, the political changes in India and Pakistan from British rule to national independence have greatly improved the climate for economic development. A different kind of political change, but one with equally favorable results from the development point of view, has occurred in Egypt and also in Bolivia. We find similar evidence in the history of our own country.

I would not want to deny categorically that this sort of change cannot be induced by outside pressures, but certainly in its most favorable form it is self-generating and comes from within. This is why, in addition to the legal reasons, we can carry out development assistance programs only on the invitation of the country we are trying to help.

Much has been said about international development being a self-help program. It is. But I sometimes fear we have fallen into the statistical trap of measuring self-help in terms of the number of dollars, or dollar equivalent, which the recipient government is willing to contribute to joint development projects. This is a useful indicator, but it is no more than an indicator and it may be misleading. Equally important—perhaps more important—is the spirit of the people and the extent to which they are willing to give their labor, their time, and their effort. Contributions of this sort, as well as contributions in goods, are difficult to measure quantitatively, but they are important indices of how badly a people really want economic development.

It seems absurdly elemental to say that how we go about extending international assistance for economic development depends upon the state of development of the recipient country. Yet some of the assistance programs which I hear suggested from time to time lead me to believe that this elemental truth is too often overlooked. During World War II, we became so familiar with the complaint of "too little and too late" that many of us resolved we would never again allow ourselves to be put in that position. Americans are a pretty impatient race, anyhow, not given to waiting happily until next week for something we would like to have tomorrow.

But in this process of economic development, I suggest that the pitfalls of trying to do too much too soon are probably as great as those of once again being too late with too little.

The capacity of any economy—even that of the United States—to absorb capital is limited. The more underdeveloped the economy, the more limited is its absorptive capacity. This poses a dilemma. Development assistance would produce the greatest results in the countries which are in an intermediate stage of development. But, excepting the primitive tribes of Africa and the South Pacific, the countries which can absorb the least amount of assistance are precisely those where the need is greatest and most urgent.

I do not know the answer to this dilemma. I do know one thing which the answer is not.

It is fantasy to think of international assistance for economic development in terms of the European recovery program. When I hear people talk about a Marshall plan for Asia., I wonder if they have really thought about what they are saying. The Marshall plan, as its formal name implies, was a program of economic recovery, which is a great deal different from a program of economic development. The recovery of a highly developed, but war-devastated, economy can come about very quickly; economic development is an infinitely slower process.

There now appears on the horizon, however, a further aid to international development which may provide at least a partial answer to our dilemma. Certainly it has potentialities so vast that we as yet but dimly comprehend them. I refer to peaceful uses of atomic energy.

In the intermediate future, at any rate, this may turn out to be more important to underdeveloped than to highly developed countries. It may be possible for example, to generate electric power from atomic energy at rates which are economically feasible in a country severely short of power before it is possible to do so in a country with well-developed hydroelectric or steam generating facilities.

The prospect of huge quantities of power from atomic generating plants in the underdeveloped parts of the world carries with it the most breathtaking implications. Food production could be greatly increased through the irrigation of vast areas of new lands. A wide variety of new manufacturing industries would become economically feasible for the first time. The whole countryside, as well as the whole lives of the people, could be transformed.

Here is a great new resource—a new tool for economic development—which may do even more for Asia than the invention of the cotton gin did for our own southland. Like the cotton gin and all other new technological developments, it will also carry with it, of course, social implications of the first magnitude.

Peaceful use of atomic energy on an international scale appears to be still some time in the future. Progress has been slow, and much yet remains to be done. But progress has been nonetheless real and encouraging. We have gotten off dead center, largely through the impetus of President Eisenhower's imaginative and statesmanlike address to the United Nations in December 1953. Despite the filibustering of the Soviet Union, the free nations of the world have resolutely pushed ahead. When the Soviets realized that they could not block the project, they came forward with offers of cooperation. It remains to be seen whether these offers are spurious or genuine. We hope they are genuine, but on the basis of bitter experience, we must reserve judgment until they are followed up with concrete actions.

In any event, an international conference on cooperation to promote the peaceful uses of atomic energy is scheduled to be held in Geneva in August. There are good grounds for encouragement that we are now somewhat more quickly approaching the day when the atom will come into its own as an instrument for peace and prosperity.

The atom has a habit of rendering preconceived notions obsolete. It may well render obsolete much that I have said here today. Let us hope it may also render obsolete hunger and poverty, misery and hopelessness.

Address by Hon. Thomas E. Martin, of Iowa, Before Ladies Auxiliary to Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 27, 1955

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on January 26 last my colleague from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] delivered a keynote address at the 1955 National Conference of the Ladies Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, in Washington, D. C. The address dealt, among other things, with the subject of national defense. I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by my colleague be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS E. MARTIN, OF IOWA, AT THE 1955 NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE LADIES AUXILIARY TO THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS AT THE HOTEL STATLER, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 26, 1955.

It is a pleasure to meet with this distinguished group again. With the leaders you have selected and the program they have arranged I'm certain your stay in Washington will meet your every expectation. I know from past experience that your meetings are successful and worthwhile. Your kind invitation to be a part of the panel last year marked one of the high spots of a busy and eventful year for me. I sincerely hope that in the coming years in the Senate I can continue to merit your kind consideration and support.

As members of the Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, you fully realize that these times fill a precarious page of our history. During the lifetime of some of us we've seen our youth march off to three wars. Billions of dollars and thousands of lives have been sacrificed in a battle that is not yet wholly won. Last year the guns of war were silent in the world for the first time in many years. Today, we hear the ominous rumblings of conflict that at any minute may blaze into the red hot fury of active fighting. Formosa and its outlying islands have become a point of severe tension. Just 2 days ago President Eisenhower sent to us in the Congress a message that drew the line of no return in the Pacific. The guns of war are aimed and loaded on several fronts. Whether we like it or not—whether we would change it or not—these are the conditions in the world today. To ignore them could be fatal.

Because of these world tensions the problem of our military manpower assumes an increasingly important role. I have a full awareness of the problem. As some of you know I had the privilege of serving in the Regular Army on the Mexican border and in World War I. I taught military science at the University of Iowa during the 1920's when it was not popular to believe that we should be prepared. Later, I was on the Armed Services Committee in the House of Representatives through the bitter years of the second and worst world war. These are experiences you don't easily forget.

Because of this background I take a special interest in the new military manpower program advanced by President Eisenhower. Certainly it is one of the most important

messages to be sent to Congress from the White House. It attacks a difficult problem. It offers a constructive, affirmative answer. It is a characteristic Eisenhower message.

Before we discuss the important portions of this military suggestion might I take a moment to point up the thorny dilemma that confronts us. As a country we have to walk a delicate tight rope in constructing a defense programs. Russia and her satellites have a total population that exceeds a billion persons. We have 160 million. They have an estimated 4 million men in the their ground forces alone. Today, we have less than a million and a half. The training and maintenance of an active army is costly, almost beyond comprehension. It would be impossible for us to maintain a sufficiently strong standing armed force to be ever ready to oppose any belligerent move by these hordes of communism. To try to match, soldier for soldier, their active army would be to threaten our own economy. Stated bluntly, we can't afford it. We must be constantly alert not to spend ourselves into economic exhaustion. From the Communist point of view a devastated American economy is as important as a crushing American defeat on the battlefield. In the language of my grandchildren, we would be cutting off our noses to spite our faces.

But this undeniable fact remains—we must be prepared. The Reds understand nothing but force. In my first week at the little country school in Iowa where I started my schooling I learned the characteristics of a bully. I learned that he will listen to reason, that he will talk things over—but only if he believes that you have the force to back up your demands. The lesson I learned on the dirt schoolyard in Iowa is equally valuable when applied to world conditions today. When we negotiate with the Reds we must do so from force, not weakness. We must offer no invitation to disaster.

A quick glance at history shows that we have never been prepared when war sought us out. That is a tragic indictment. But it is an accurate one. Think back to the first few months in 1942. Remember the tragedies of Bataan and the Rock. Hark back to July and August and September in 1950. Think of the sorry spectacle of American boys retreating down the Korean peninsula. Remember the stories we heard of our fighting men—grabbing, clawing, striving to hold on—paying in blood and tears the price of inadequate equipment. This is what happened. This is what must not happen again. A 20th century war doesn't give you time to leisurely build up your fighting force. The devastation of war is upon you with the first blast of the first atomic bomb. The moment we forget that we have, by our omission, passed the death sentence on thousands of our sons. Like the bloodspots in Macbeth, it will come back to haunt us.

In the face of this problem of great magnitude President Eisenhower has offered a plan. It is a good plan. It offers, first, a well-trained, active Armed Force of sufficient proportions to act as the shock absorber for the first attack if it comes. It protects us to the maximum extent under the dictates of economic necessity.

Secondly, the Presidential plan contemplates a reserve force sufficiently trained and organized so that it forms an alert backfield for the front line of the standing Armed Forces. This is a vital part of the new program. Its importance cannot be overstressed.

Thirdly, the proposal provides for an unorganized reserve pool that brings with it a fundamental training available for quick mobilization.

My friends, an adequate reserve force is not a luxury that we may forego if we wish. It is as essential to our preparedness as is the whole program to our future as a Nation. We must have an effective National Guard; we must have a competent, modern Army, Air Force, and Navy; we must have an organized group of trained reserves for all branches of the Armed Forces—for the Air Force and Navy as well as the Army. In the Air Force the great need is for a trained reserve of ground force personnel. There must be no time lag between scientific development and military usage. Reserve training must be modernized to keep pace with the giant strides made by industry and science.

We must train ourselves to be trained. We have no alternative other than destruction.

My friends, this is a program that requires the participation and support of all of us. Make no mistake, this is not the easy way out. To ignore the real danger would be far easier. It would also be far more costly in the end. So many times I have visitors who come to Washington and say I have come to see how the Government works. I am always glad to see them, but somehow, I feel they should realize that I am only an elected official and that these people from Iowa—like you people out there—are the government. It is a two-way street. You have a responsibility, just as I have. This new program offers a challenge to you. It must have your active support.

Unless the reserve program is adopted in substantially the same form it was presented to Congress it will be the first real signal for our adversaries. Failure to adopt an adequate reserve program will be notice that we are allowing our waistlines to expand into complacency. It will be more than a sign that we will have no hard hitting reserve force available should an emergency arise. It will be more than a statement that we will not prepare ourselves. It will be the five-star announcement that the proud American eagle is ready to assume the role of the sparrow.

My friends, even this morning we are engaged in battle. This is not the simple alignment of armies—it is a conflict of concepts—of ideologies. As Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway so accurately portrayed it: "The real issue is whether the rule of men who shoot their prisoners, enslave their citizens and deride the dignity of men shall displace the rule of those to whom the individual and his individual rights are sacred; whether we are to survive with God's hands to guide us and lead us, or to perish in the dead existence of a godless world."

It is wishful thinking for us to contemplate living today in a quiet world where quiet decisions are made. These times demand big decisions from big people. That is our role. We must accept it.

The National Legion of Greek American War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on October 1, 1954, I was very much privileged and highly honored to address a meeting of the National Legion of Greek American War Veterans at the 71st Regiment Armory in New York City. I am indebted to this outstanding organization of war veterans of Greek-American descent because at this meeting I was honored with an award of the Cross of Merit of the Greek Legion.

In attendance were the national officers of the Greek Legion, National Commander Denys K. Zongos, Adjutant General Perry Voultsos, and members of Greek Legion Posts 1 and 3 of New York City and Ladies Auxiliary Post 2. Special guests included Col. K. Stefan Pomierski, the Very Rev. Canon John Malinowski, Commander Gust Zapnukayas of Post 1, and Mrs. Elizabeth Contogeorge, commander of Ladies Auxiliary Post 2.

Lt. Col. Perry Voultsos, adjutant general of the National Legion of Greek American War Veterans, made the presentation of the Cross of Merit and under unanimous consent, I include his remarks in the RECORD:

As a fitting reward for your concrete friendship and championship of the Greek cause wherever needed, for your everlasting moral support and undying affection for the Hellenic people, it is my sincere pleasure and proud privilege to present you, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, with the Cross of Merit of the Greek Legion, with the assurance that your name has been hewn in golden letters on the centuries-old granite of Grecian history along with the names of many other American Phil-Hellenes who championed the cause of Hellas, such as Daniel Webster, Howe, and Clay.

Mr. Speaker, I also include in the RECORD the text of my remarks at this memorable meeting of the Greek Legion:

REMARKS IN PART OF HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN, OF MASSACHUSETTS, ACKNOWLEDGING RECEIPT OF AWARD AT CEREMONIES OF GREEK AMERICAN WAR VETERANS, NEW YORK CITY, OCTOBER 1, 1954

Colonel Voultsos, Canon Malinowski, Mr. Pomierski, distinguished guests, and members of this outstanding pro-American organization, it is very difficult for me indeed adequately to express my appreciation for the great honor you have conferred upon me, but I want you Colonel Voultsos, and all your associates and members, to know of my undying gratitude for your kindness, confidence and esteem. You may be sure that I accept this honor with fullest humility and with the recognition that it carries with it not only your approval of my contributions to the veterans and to the Nation and to all your people, but also a very high responsibility to continue to stand loyally and unflinchingly in the Congress for those great causes of government and humanity in which we are mutually interested, and which are of such moment to the cause of free government.

It is not my purpose tonight to burden you with extended speech. But really if I were Demosthenes I could not possibly impress upon you the very deep feelings of appreciation and the renewed sense of dedication which your most distinguished award has prompted within every ounce of my being.

Your organization, and its superb leadership is serving a very high purpose for this Nation. It has grown out of devoted service and unselfish sacrifice. It is based upon a demonstrated loyalty to our beloved country which will ever serve as an inspiration to all our citizens. It aims to serve in peace just as its members have served in war with fullest concern for the well-being, the safety, the security of this Nation and for the establishment of a just and lasting peace.

We live in a time of greatest peril. We are beset by an evil worldwide conspiracy that seeks the destruction of human liberty and aims to impose a thralldom and slavery upon free men and women everywhere. We cannot be too vigilant in ferreting out the active agents of this conspiracy within our

own Nation. We cannot be too determined in standing up bravely, courageously and militantly before the great dangers which this conspiracy has caused throughout the world. It is a time for Americans to recapture something of the fine spirit and noble patriotism and firm resolution which enabled you and your comrades to defeat another great tyranny which was afflicting mankind and visiting our Nation with the threat of destruction.

You of Greek blood have a great and mighty heritage. Americans all, who have stood the acid test of the highest demands of Americanism with courage, valor, and devotion, you are descendants of one of the greatest races of all history, a race, a nation, and a people that has been mighty in arms, mighty in spirit, mighty in learning, mighty in its democratic orientation, mighty in its humane traditions, in its culture, in its immeasurable contributions to civilization. Above all, you spring from a people whose inspiring family life, whose loyalty to spiritual values, whose love of religion and belief in God, which has been practiced for centuries, typify a truly great and truly outstanding nation.

For the Greeks have felt, as civilized Americans have felt and still feel, that worthwhile human progress and belief in God Almighty are inseparable. The doctrine that without faith in the Divine Master no nation can long survive is a basic feature of Greek civilization—a doctrine which must be recognized more fully by all peoples of the earth if communism is to be successfully fought.

The achievements of the Greek people ring down through the ages with clarion sound of glory and grandeur. Pericles and the Golden Age, perhaps one of the few periods in all time when the fine arts, cultural life, and individual development in political and artistic values flowed in such a favorable climate.

The famed Acropolis, an historic monument which symbolizes a great culture, which has profoundly influenced human beings throughout the ages, a place of refuge and the inspirational center of glorious olden Greece, the place where Christianity took new and vigorous root, a place which still inspires the Greek people and the free world.

And Aphrodite, the goddess of beauty, typifying the magnificent art of the Greeks, not only beauty in the physical sense, but beauty of the soul, beauty of ideals, beauty of thought and culture.

And if time permitted, I could go on ad infinitum enumerating the monumental accomplishments of the Greeks, and I think that these glories should be recited frequently not only by your own people but by all true lovers of liberty and culture, because they exemplify so appropriately and beautifully the long successful struggle of man from the cave to the culture and civilization we enjoy at the present moment.

And let me remind you, my friends, that prophecy in the world did not die with the Delphic oracle. Faith in high ideals and undying determination to uphold them did not die when the Golden Age passed into history. We have visible signs, even unto the present hour and in contemporary times, in the heroic fight—an incomparable uphill fight characterized by bitter struggle and bloodshed—the heroic fight of present-day Greece and the present-day Greek people against communism which recently has electrified and inspired the free world. And like the Delphic oracle of the past, the success of that fight is a prophecy and a prediction and an assurance that in the future, just as the Greeks have done, all democratic-minded, liberty-loving, God-fearing peoples in the world following the leadership and example of our own great Nation and joining in a great human brotherhood embracing all those who believe in the true dignity of man and the sanctity of the individual soul will militantly defend and preserve our unequaled, our unparalleled, our incomparable institutions of democracy and justice.

Yes, my friends; I could tell a long story of the glories and the grandeurs of Greece, of the sacrifices and devotion and indomitable spirit of your forebears, the Greek people—a story of war and a story of peace, a story of invincible progress through bloody struggle, a story of peerless culture shaped by statesmen, warriors, orators, sculptors, artists, writers, musicians, the drama, the stage, the harp, and lyre, which sounded in the past a song of hope, strength, and courage—which united the Greeks of ancient times and now sound again, here and elsewhere throughout the world, to defy the unspeakable enemies of freedom and to rally true lovers of liberty to do battle against its enemies, to liberate the enslaved, to give new hope and inspiration to subject peoples struggling and suffering under the pall of persecution and exploitation and abominable discrimination that debases the dignity of man and disgraces modern civilization.

There is another side to Greek culture as it has influenced our own great country and that is its scholarship. The logic, the rhetoric and the aesthetics of Aristotle are as realistic and vital and meaningful today as when first written. The ideals of Plato still beckon to those who are pledged to scholarship and freedom of thought. In fact, if you should subtract Greek culture from civilization, there would be no civilization as we know it today because it is a primary cornerstone of our modern political, social and ethical life.

It is pertinent to note in connection with present trends in our own Nation which so greatly disturb us that the Greeks of old were not materialists. They were profoundly spiritual in their approach. They did not embrace mechanistic, sordid philosophies of the jungle which consign human beings to the status of the beast, of which we hear and see so much today. They were idealists, they had their feet on the ground and their gaze turned towards the heavens and for that reason, despite their many contributions to the material world, their greatest triumphs will be found, not in the world of matter or of substance, but in the world of thought and the world of the spirit.

Realizing these things, my friends, it is easy for any of us, except of course the Maxists Communists with their evil designs on personal liberty, to understand why with unquenchable purpose the modern Greeks against powerful revolutionary subversion have gallantly and successfully potected their free way of life. And we of America, greatest free Nation in history, may well be proud that our culture is enriched, ennobled and perfected by the presence and loyalty of so many devoted industrialists, inspired American citizens of Greek heritage. Most of all our country is fortunate and blessed indeed to have men like you and the members of your organization and stanch Americans of every race, color, and creed who are fired with the patriotism, the loyalty and devotion to stand by our country in time of peril and need. With God's guidance, with wise statesmanship, with renewed dedication to the great principles of America, let us go forward to grapple with the problems of the present without fear, compromise or appeasement, confident that in time through adherence to our ideals and unselfish service to our Nation and interest in the common problems of humanity, loyally united to those of common bonds, we will find a way, not only to protect the security of our own beloved land, but to usher in an era of prosperity, security and peace for ourselves and all mankind.

Colonel Voultsos, I thank you one and all. Keep up the good work for the cause of Greece—a Greece again reunited with historic Cyprus and your invaluable work for America, our own great country and its cherished ideals of freedom, democracy and justice.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 28, 1955

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 27, 1955)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whose keeping are the destinies of men and nations, endue with Thy wisdom our fallible minds. Lead, Kindly Light, amid the encircling gloom!

Thou knowest that we desire nothing for ourselves that we do not crave for all mankind, a chance to be freemen. In the midst of decisions that concern fearful forces which, if not harnessed by mutual good will, may utterly destroy, give us greatness of soul that the keys of new power may be used to open doors of plenty for the whole earth. May we shrink from no sacrifice that will prevent serfdom from dominating the earth. May a constant sense of the eternal save us from spiritual decay, from moral cowardice, and from any betrayal of the highest public good. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 27, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 587. A bill to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2010. A bill to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to sit in executive session during today's session of the Senate.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the customary morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and other routine business, and that any statements made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATION OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the overobligation of the appropriation "Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration, 1954" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON AVERAGE MONTHLY FLIGHT PAY FOR CERTAIN OFFICERS IN THE COAST GUARD

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, the average monthly flight pay for certain officers in the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXAMINATION OF NATIONAL BANKS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AUTHORITY FOR NATIONAL BANKS TO MAKE CERTAIN LOANS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit national banks to make 20-year real-estate loans and 9-month construction loans (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

BALANCE SHEET OF CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a comparative general balance sheet of that company for the year 1954 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the statement of receipts and expenditures of that company, for the year 1954 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS UNDER FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the administration of functions under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON PROVISION OF WAR-RISK, MARINE, AND LIABILITY INSURANCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, as of December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

A letter from the Acting Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board for the fiscal year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

RALPH BENNETT ET AL.

A letter from the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Ralph Bennett and certain other members of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

WAIVING OF REQUIREMENT OF CERTAIN PERFORMANCE AND PAYMENT BONDS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of April 29, 1941, to authorize the waiving of the requirement of performance and payment bonds in connection with certain Coast Guard contracts (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT, RELATING TO CERTAIN FEES

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend section 20 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, relating to fees of agents, attorneys, and representatives (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN CLAIMS

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2680 (j) of title 28 of the United States Code so as to permanently exclude claims arising out of combatant activities or warlike operations (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR CLASSIFIED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, to authorize the President to establish the maximum number of positions under section 505 of the Classification Act, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 3

"Whereas the legislature hereby approves the proposed action of the State department of public welfare in preparing to put into effect the conclusion and intent of the legislature as expressed in Act No. 698 of the regular session of 1954 by amending its plan: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the senate (and the house of representatives concurring), That there should be a readjustment of the budget of persons entitled to old-age assistance to allow one person a minimum need of $85 per month, and to a couple living in the same household, a minimum need of $134 per month; the same representing the absolute minimum amount needed to sustain such persons in reasonable health and decency in the State of Louisiana and providing for the continued consideration of all income and resources available to applicants for old-age assistance in determining their need; and be it further

"Resolved, That the State department of public welfare shall have the authority to set the maximum payments equal to the maximum upon which Federal funds are earned. Accordingly, this legislative body hereby reaffirms the authority of the State department of public welfare to increase such maximum payments as available funds permit, taking into consideration the requirements of all programs administered by the said department; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Louisiana.

"C. E. BARHAM,
"Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate,
"CLARENCE C. AYCOCK,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

A resolution adopted by Kauai Post, No. 2, Department of Hawaii, the American Legion, Lihue, T. H., favoring the confirmation of the nomination of Philip L. Rice to be associate justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. WATKINS):

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 1

"Concurrent resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the 31st Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize the Colorado River storage project, including the Echo Park Dam and participating projects

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein):

"Whereas the waters of the Colorado River and its tributaries have by compact, approved by the legislatures of the States of Arizona, California, Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, Nevada, and Wyoming, been allocated to these several States, and said compact having been approved by the Congress of the United States in 1922; and

"Whereas the upper basin States, consisting of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, through the upper Colorado River Commission and the legislatures of said States and with the approval of Congress, have allocated their proportionate share of the water of said river among themselves; and

"Whereas the conservation and wise use of water of the Colorado River can only be made possible by the construction of strategic storage facilities on said river and its tributaries; and

"Whereas the conservation and wise use of water is of foremost importance to the future agricultural and economic development and the general welfare of the Western United States and of the United States; and

"Whereas the upper Colorado River Commission, working in conjunction with the Federal Bureau of Reclamation, has developed a plan, known as the Colorado River storage project, to permit the conservation and wise use of the waters of the Colorado River in the upper basin States; and

"Whereas said Colorado River storage project has been developed after many years of investigation, planning, and on the ground survey of the storage facilities of the upper Colorado River and its tributaries; and

"Whereas said Colorado River storage project has been determined to be the most economical and feasible method of storing and using said waters for the benefit of both the upper and lower basin States; and

"Whereas the storage of water as proposed in the Colorado River storage project is vital to permit the upper basin States to meet its commitment to the lower basin States under the compact of 1922, and to have available the upper basin States' allotment of water as provided in said compact; and

"Whereas certain opposition has developed to the inclusion of the Echo Park Dam as proposed in the Colorado River storage project upon the alleged ground that it constitutes an invasion of a national monument; and

"Whereas the Echo Park Dam is an integral and necessary part of the upper Colorado River project; and

"Whereas at the time the monument boundaries were extended in 1938 to include the Echo Park Dam site, such extension of the boundaries was made expressly subject to prior power and reclamation withdrawals; and

"Whereas prior to 1938 many reclamation and power withdrawals had been made in this area; and

"Whereas the construction of the Echo Park Dam, as proposed in the Colorado River storage project, will not be an invasion of a national monument; nor, because of the reservations incident to the extension of the boundaries of the Dinosaur National Monument, can construction of such dam constitute a precedent for the invasion of any other national park or monument; and

"Whereas no portion of the area set aside in the original Dinosaur National Monument will be affected by the construction of said dam; and

"Whereas the area in the extended boundaries of the Dinosaur National Monument is inaccessible except to a few who will run the 'white' water of the river; and

"Whereas the construction of the Echo Park Dam will make the beauty of the area available to millions who otherwise would not see it, and will develop a prime recreational playground; and

"Whereas to carry out the intent and purposes of the several compacts approved by the legislatures of the several States concerned, and to carry out the purposes and intent of said compacts as approved by Congresses of the United States, the authorization of the Colorado River storage project by the 84th Congress of the United States is imperative: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the 31st Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein), That the 84th Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby memorialized to promptly, thoroughly, and fairly consider and favorably act upon legislation to authorize the Colorado River storage project, including construction of the Echo Park Dam and participating projects; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, United States Senator Arthur V. Watkins, United States Senator Wallace F. Bennett, Representative William A. Dawson, and Representative Henry Aldous Dixon, to the Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay, to the Commissioner of Reclamation, the upper Colorado River Compact Commission, and to the the Governors and legislatures of the following States: Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Finance:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to continue a tariff that will protect the American cotton textile industry from competition with the importation of foreign textiles

"Whereas our Government is dedicated to the improving of the standards of living of its citizens, especially the living standards of our lowest income groups; and

"Whereas today the threat to the cotton-textile industry of the United States is becoming more critical because of competition not only in the markets of the world but also here in the United States; and

"Whereas the lower tariffs on textiles become, the easier it is for foreign countries to ship their products to this country and with each increase in the textile production of foreign countries a part of the American industry's foreign market is destroyed: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States is memorialized to see to it that American tariffs are adequate to protect the American cotton-textile industry; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the two Members of the United States Senate, and to each of the Members of the House of Representatives from this State."

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Columbia, S. C., January 26, 1955.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the South Carolina house of representatives and concurred in by the senate.

INEZ WATSON,
Clerk of the House.

RESOLUTIONS OF RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, two resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island. The first resolution memorializes the Congress to enact legislation to increase the Federal minimum wage rate, and the second favors the enactment of legislation for the creation of Federal disaster insurance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolutions presented by Mr. PASTORE were received, appropriately referred, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation to increase the Federal minimum wage rate

"Whereas in today's highly competitive struggle for markets, Rhode Island manufacturers are faced with unfair competition from a few States and areas with wage rates far below the national average; and

"Whereas such large differentials present a serious threat to established industry in other parts of the Nation, particularly where labor is an important factor; and

"Whereas the Rhode Island textile industry has been especially hard hit by ruinous price competition based on low wage rates at a time when the industry nationally has been in a serious slump causing severe unemployment and wage cuts; and

"Whereas extremely low wage rates in any part of the Nation are a drag on the entire national economy, reducing employment and income levels at a time when increased consumer purchasing power is essential to national economic health: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the general assembly now respectfully calls these facts to the attention of the Congress of the United States, and urges the immediate enactment of legislation to increase the Federal minimum wage rate; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from the State of Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States are urged to use their best efforts in this behalf; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he is hereby authorized and directed to transmit to the presiding officers of both branches of Congress and to the Senators and Representatives from the State of Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States duly certified copies of this resolution."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation for the creation of Federal disaster insurance

"Whereas the recent hurricanes have brought severe flood and tidal wave damage to large areas of Rhode Island; and

"Whereas insurance coverage for such damage has been inadequate, and where available the premium rates therefor have been prohibitive; and

"Whereas His Excellency, Gov. Dennis J. Roberts, in his inaugural message on January 4, 1955, has stated 'insurance which is beyond the reach of the community is worthless'; and

"Whereas Governor Roberts further stated 'if private insurance companies are unable or unwilling to cover the risk then the matter should be dealt with on a national basis by the creation of Federal disaster insurance'; and

"Whereas the general assembly is cognizant of the urgent need for positive action: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation permitting municipalities and property owners to obtain disaster insurance from the Federal Government or any agency thereof; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in said Congress be, and they hereby are, earnestly requested to use their concerted effort to bring about the enactment of such legislation; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to transmit to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States duly certified copies of this resolution."

TRANSFER OF UNITED NATIONS NARCOTIC DIVISION TO GENEVA—RESOLUTION

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, many of us who are concerned about the increase of traffic in narcotic drugs since the end of World War II have been particularly disturbed by the proposal to transfer the Narcotic Division of the United Nations from New York City to Geneva, Switzerland. I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the drug, chemical, and allied trades section of the New York Board of Trade opposing this proposed move be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Secretary-General of the United Nations has decided to transfer the Narcotic Division of the United Nations from New York to Geneva; and

Whereas New York City has a serious narcotic problem which is due entirely to the international illicit flood of heroin that originates primarily in the Far East, particularly in Communist China, in Turkey, Lebanon, France, Italy, as well as in Mexico; and

Whereas many international narcotic treaties are being ably administered by the United Nations in New York in a stupendous effort to halt the gigantic and diabolical narcotic smuggling activities into New York City and other points of entry; and

Whereas it is of vital importance to retain the Narcotic Division at the New York headquarters of the United Nations to maintain the closest possible cooperation with the United States, which is the chief victim in this vile traffic; and

Whereas the President of the United States has made known the gravity of the present situation by recently appointing a special interdepartmental committee to study the State, national, and international narcotic problem: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the drug, chemical, and allied trades section of the New York Board of Trade vigorously protests the removal of the Narcotic Division of the United Nations from New York City to Geneva, Switzerland, and that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, to the United States delegate to the United Nations, to the Members of the United States Senate, and to the mayor of the city of New York.

ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN TYPES OF COMMERCIAL MAIL MATTER—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a resolution, adopted by the City Council of the City of Virginia, Minn., with regard to the elimination of certain types of commercial postal matter, printed in the body of the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution requesting the President, Postmaster General, our Senators and Congressmen to eliminate and forbid certain types of commercial postal matter

Resolved, by the City Council of the City of Virginia, That—

Whereas the recent change in Federal postal regulations has permitted various concerns to distribute through the mails circulars addressed to "Occupant" in such a manner as to make the Federal postal service a bill-peddling agency for commercial establishments; and

Whereas the great volume of such mail received by the citizens of this city constitutes a nuisance to them and hardships upon the personnel of the postal service responsible for deliveries, and also createss a municipal problem for the city and the disposition of such mail, much of which is spurious; and

Whereas the low charge for the distribution of such advertising matter as well as the low and reasonable charge for other types of commercial mail is such that the continuance of this type of service at less than the cost to the Federal postal service has created a deficit which must be met by raising the rates of legitimate mail service utilized by the ordinary individual: Now, therefore, be it hereby

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Virginia and the citizens of the city of Virginia express its disapproval and dissatisfaction of the continued rendering of this type of service; and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Postmaster General, Senators THYE and HUMPHREY, and Congressman BLATNIK with the specific request that every possible step be taken to eliminate and forbid the continuing distribution of "Occupant" postal delivery and to revise the rates for other types of commercial postal matter so that all classes of mail will bear their equitable share of the cost of the postal service.

Moved by Alderman Virshek, supported by Alderman Glatz, that the above resolution be adopted.

Ayes: Alderman Oklobzija, Vukelich, Luodo, Virshek, Thomas, Glatz, Nelson, Maki, President Stock—9.

Nays: None.

Adopted Janaury 4, 1955.

ARTHUR J. STOCK,
President of the City Council.

Attest:

J. G. MILROY, Jr.,
City Clerk

Presented to the mayor, January 5, 1955.
Returned by the mayor, January 10, 1955.
Approved January 10, 1955:

JOHN VUKELICH,
Mayor.

OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, LAKE COUNTY, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of Lake County, Minn., with regard to old-age assistance.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mrs. John LeClair appeared before the board regarding a plan for the payment of an amount equal to the Federal Government's share of old-age assistance directly to every person of the age of 65 and over, with reservations as to income.

Be it resolved, That this board of county commissioners hereby endorses the plan presented by Mrs. John LeClair; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this plan and this resolution be forwarded to Senator Thye, Senator Humphrey, Congressman Blatnik, and Governor Freeman.

Commissioner Dahlberg moved the adoption of the foregoing resolution and the same was declared adopted upon the following vote. Yeas—Houle, Degerstedt, Dahlberg, Sandstrom, and Wiklund. Total yeas—5; nays—none.

Adopted January 4, 1955.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
County of Lake, ss:

I, Paul W. Nelson, auditor of Lake County, Minn., do hereby certify that I have compared the foregoing resolution with the original filed in my office on the 4th day of January 1955, and that the same is a true and correct copy of the whole thereof.

Witness my hand and seal of office at Two Harbors, Minn., this 14th day of January 1955.

PAUL W. NELSON,
Auditor, Lake County, Minn.

Now the Government gives as much as $35 a month to the States for certain old people. Would it not be fairer to give $35 direct to every old person of 65, who applied for it? Of course, there should be a limit on their other income, but make it so high, at least $200 a month, so as to keep administrative costs to a minimum.

Of course, those who need more would get it from the States, as they do now, but the Federal Government would not pay anything to the States for old-age pensions, except for special services, such as for the blind, for medical care, and to medical institutions.

We know $35 a month is not an adequate pension in itself, but it is rather to supplement other present income. Besides, we would rather have $35 a month now than a larger amount after we're dead.

The applications could be made through the post office, with the applicant paying a small sum, say 50 cents, to the postmaster, as the postmaster should not have to do more for free than he is now.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Res. 23. Resolution to investigate problems relating to economic stabilization and mobilization (Rept. No. 20);

S. Res. 28. Resolution extending the authority of the Committee on Armed Services for hearings and investigations (Rept. No. 21);

S. Res. 36. Resolution extending the time for a study by the Committee on Foreign Relations on technical assistance and related programs (Rept. No. 23);

S. Res. 37. Resolution providing additional funds for the study of strategic and critical materials by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs (Rept. No. 22); and

S. Res. 39. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to employ temporary additional assistants (Rept. No. 24).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Glen E. Edgerton, of the District of Columbia, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington;

Lynn U. Stambaugh, of North Dakota, to be First Vice President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington;

Hawthorne Arey, of Nebraska, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington;

George A. Blowers, of Florida, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington; and

Vance Brand, of Ohio, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 788. A bill to provide for the establishment of a dairy research laboratory; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BENDER, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GORE, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KERR, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. THYE, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 789. A bill to continue authority to make funds available for loans and grants under title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 790. A bill for the relief of Michael Gerdelan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 791. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the 175th anniversary of the arrival of the French Expeditionary Forces in America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 792. A bill for the relief of Spyros Nicholaou Lekatsas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 793. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that a Federal tax lien shall not be valid, as against a holder of a mechanic's lien, until notice of such tax lien has been duly filed; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 794. A bill to reserve to certain State and Territorial agencies and tribunals the authority to exercise jurisdiction over labor disputes involving public utilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) (by request):

S. 795. A bill to amend the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 to provide for additional facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 796. A bill to provide for the relief of certain members of the Armed Forces who were required to pay certain transportation charges covering shipment of their household goods and personal effects upon return from overseas, and for other purposes;

S. 797. A bill to enact certain provisions now included in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act and the Civil Functions Appropriation Act, and for other purposes;

S. 798. A bill to provide for the tonnage composition of the United States Navy with respect to vessels, and for other purposes;

S. 799. A bill to provide that the enlistment contracts or periods of obligated service of members of the Armed Forces shall not terminate by reason of appointment as cadets or midshipmen at the Military, Naval, Air Force, or Coast Guard Academies, or as midshipmen in the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes;

S. 800. A bill to repeal the act of January 19, 1929 (ch. 86, 45 Stat. 1090), entitled "An act to limit the date of filing claims for retainer pay";

S. 801. A bill to provide for the crediting of certain service toward retirement of reserve personnel;

S. 802. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to remove the requirement for a final physical examination for inductees who continue on active duty in another status in the Armed Forces;

S. 803. A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1948 (ch. 511, 62 Stat. 489), relating to the retention in the service of disabled commissioned officers and warrant officers of the Army and Air Force; and

S. 804. A bill to amend section 201 (e) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for advance payments of certain pay and allowances of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. RUSSELL when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 805. A bill to indemnify drivers of motor vehicles of the postal service against liability for damages arising out of the operation of such vehicles in the performance of official duties; and

S. 806. A bill to amend sections 3182 and 3183 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to authorize the use of an information filed by a public prosecuting officer for making demands for fugitives from justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LANGER when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 807. A bill to adjust the rates of annuities for certain employees retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, prior to April 1, 1948;

S. 808. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide certain benefits for the widows of employees who died prior to February 28, 1948, and for other purposes;

S. 809. A bill to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government;

S. 810. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees;

S. 811. A bill to reclassify supervisory employees in the field service of the Post Office Department into step-rate grades comparable with those for other postal employees and employees in other Federal services, and to adjust inequities;

S. 812. A bill to make retroactive section 6 (b) (2) of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), as amended, dealing with the restoration to Government service of persons improperly discharged, suspended, or furloughed without pay under section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, and for other purposes;

S. 813. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Government;

S. 814. A bill to provide for exclusion from the mails of mail violating certain State laws dealing with improper solicitations of contributions by charitable organizations and to forbid the payment of money orders therefor;

(See the remarks of Mr. LANGER when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 815. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to permit the retirement of postal employees who have rendered at least 30 years of service;

S. 816. A bill to grant civil-service employees retirement after 30 years' service; and

S. 817. A bill to provide maternity leave for Government employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 818. A bill for the relief of the North Dakota State Hospital, Jamestown, N. Dak.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 819. A bill for the relief of Irene Guay Salentine; and

S. 820. A bill for the relief of Dorothy Mae Howell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 821. A bill to amend title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937 so as to provide retirement benefits for the office of judge of the District of Columbia Tax Court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 822. A bill to require the armed services to utilize private American shipping services for the overseas transportation of commodities and civilian personnel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 823. A bill for the relief of Taghi Mirsepassi and his wife Heshmatol-Molouk Philsouf Mirsepassi and their child Khadidje S. Mirsepassi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 824. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands erroneously conveyed to the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 825. A bill to authorize the Federal Communications Commission to establish rules and regulations and make orders with respect to networks and their activities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 826. A bill to provide for payments by the Federal Government to States or local taxing units adversely affected by Federal acquisition, ownership, or use of defense production facilities, to provide for the taxation of certain Federal properties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 827. A bill for the relief of Mojsze Hildeshaim and Ita Hildeshaim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 828. A bill to provide that the fluid-milk program for schools established by section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of the National School Lunch Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 829. A bill to authorize personnel of the Armed Forces to train for, attend, and participate in the Second Pan-American Games, the Seventh Olympic Winter Games, Games of the XVI Olympiad, future Pan-American Games and Olympic Games, and certain other international amateur sports competitions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 830. A bill for the relief of Iskar Spas Schumanov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 831. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Horse Shoe Bend National Military Park, in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WELKER:

S. 832. A bill for the relief of Jonas Dercautan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 833. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Esther Chan Lee (Eta Lee); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 834. A bill to amend section 203 (a) of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 835. A bill to amend the Federal Unemployment Tax Act; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 836. A bill for the relief of Wong Nan Ling and Wong Nan Fee;

S. 837. A bill for the relief of Aviva Eliel;

S. 838. A bill for the relief of Frank Deakins;

S. 839. A bill for the relief of Antonio Bottei and Clorimondo Mancia;

S. 840. A bill for the relief of Henry Szymerski (Henryk Szymerski) and Polly Henrietta Saymerski;

S. 841. A bill for the relief of Oren E. Cleveland;

S. 842. A bill for the relief of James E. Savage;

S. 843. A bill for the relief of Gerda Graupner; and

S. 844. A bill for the relief of Zev Cohen (Zev Machtani); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 845. A bill to amend the Seniority Act for Rural Mail Carriers to provide a method for the promotion of substitute rural carriers to the position of regular rural carrier; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 846. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to suspend deportation and admit for permanent residence under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act certain aliens who have served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

DAIRY RESEARCH CENTER, MADISON, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which I caused to be prepared for the purpose of establishing a dairy research center at Madison, Wis. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an article which I wrote for the February 1955 issue of Better Farming magazine, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and article will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 788) to provide for the establishment of a dairy research laboratory, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is hereby authorized and directed to establish a dairy research laboratory to be known and designated as the Dairy Research Laboratory of the Department of Agriculture. The Secretary shall establish such laboratory at Madison, Wis.

SEC. 2. The objectives of the laboratory to be established under this act shall be to conduct and stimulate continuous research into the basic problems of dairying, including but not limited to research relating to the improvement of the quality of, and the development of new and improved methods of, packaging, processing, refrigeration, powdering, condensing, transportation, storing, marketing, distribution, and merchandising of dairy commodities; research relating to the combating of livestock disease, the increasing of dairy productivity, the lowering of dairy costs; research relating to the problems of human nutrition and the nutritive value of dairy products, including gains or losses in nutritive value that may take place at any stage in their production, distribution, processing, and preparation for use by the consumer; research relating to the development of present, new, and extended food and nonfood uses and markets for dairy products and byproducts; research relating to the design, development, improvement, and the more efficient use of dairy machines and equipment; and research relating to any other matters that may contribute to the establishment and maintenance of a more effective dairy industry.

SEC. 3. The Secretary is hereby authorized (a) to provide, by construction or otherwise, the necessary facilities for the housing of the Dairy Research Laboratory established under this act, including any equipment necessary to the operation of such laboratory; (b) to maintain, repair, and alter such facilities; (c) to acquire buildings, property, and rights and interests therein by purchase, lease, gift, transfer, condemnation, or otherwise, necessary to the operation of such laboratory; (d) to incur necessary administrative expenses in the establishment and operation of such laboratory, including personal services; (e) to accept in the name of the United States donations of any buildings, property, real or personal, to such laboratory; and (f) to utilize voluntary or uncompensated services at such laboratory.

SEC. 4. In order to facilitate administration and to increase the effectiveness of all dairy research facilities of the Department of Agriculture, the Secretary is authorized and directed, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to transfer the functions, powers, and duties of any other agency, division, bureau, service, section, or other administrative unit in the Department of Agriculture, which is primarily concerned with research in connection with dairy products, to the Dairy Research Laboratory established under this act.

SEC. 5. In carrying out the provisions of this act the Secretary may cooperate with other agencies of the Government, State agencies, State colleges and universities, private research organizations, purchasing and consuming organizations, chambers of commerce, transportation and storage agencies and organizations, and other persons or corporations engaged in the production, packaging, processing, refrigeration, powdering, condensing, transportation, storing, marketing, distribution, and merchandising of dairy products or byproducts.

SEC. 6. The Secretary shall promulgate such orders, rules, and regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such funds as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The article presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

[From Better Farming of February 1955]

"WE NEED A DAIRY RESEARCH CENTER"

(By ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

You could be dollars ahead in your milk business this year and every year if we would do a better job of organizing our dairy brain power.

The same kind of concentrated study that opened up vast, new production and marketing fields for wood and aluminum can be used to the advantage of dairy products and milk producers. One of the results, I'm convinced, would be an improvement in your milk checks.

It's true that dairying is centuries old and we ought to know most of the answers by now, but the fact is we're just beginning to recognize the modern potentialities in milk. Actually, I think we're on the threshold of a vast and uncharted dairy future with new products, new methods, and new markets still ahead.

We need to open the doors to this future as soon as possible. The key is concentrated research—research of the same intensity that unlocked the secrets of the uranium atom.

Today we need a dairy district project for milk just as we had to have a Manhattan District project during World War II to harness the atom.

No other single force holds more dramatic, far-reaching potentialities for dairymen and American agriculture than a dynamic milk-research project on a national scale.

Research into what? I say into everything related to milk: Processing, packaging, refrigeration, powdering, condensing, and merchandising. Research to combat livestock diseases, increase productivity, lower costs, and improve machinery. Research, too, into human nutritional needs.

A lot of this research is already going on, as you know, in private and public laboratories, in colleges and universities, and on experimental farms. Nowhere, though, is it proceeding with the intensity or coordination equal to the needs of our times.

Most inadequate of all, in my opinion, is our research into new industrial uses to be gained from the chemical masterpiece which is milk. Yet it is in this field, I believe, that we will find our greatest opportunities for expansion.

It is altogether reasonable to expect that nature's first and most nearly perfect food should hold promise for new miracles of chemistry, perhaps surpassing even those derived from the lowly corncob, nuisance sawdust, or from the humble soybean and peanut. Out of these products, research has developed literally hundreds of new uses. Residues which once were regarded as sheer waste have now taken on tremendous economic value.

We can also unlock the secrets of the milk molecule. To get this done I propose establishment of a new dairy research laboratory to serve the Nation. It should be located, I feel, at the heart of the dairy industry, which is Wisconsin—the State we are proud to call America's dairyland.

Such a laboratory can become a fitting companion to the great Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, which over the years has produced a tide of research findings to enrich the entire woodworking industry.

Let me make it perfectly clear that I recognize and appreciate the fine research which has been done thus far by the Department of Agriculture at its four regional research laboratories, one of which has devoted part of its efforts to dairying. Nevertheless, I am convinced we will not tap even 1 percent of the potential discoveries awaiting us until we have a laboratory devoted exclusively to dairy products.

We have hardly touched the hem of the garment of such discoveries so far. We will never touch the full garment until we make an all-out effort.

Suppose, during World War II we had scattered the then infant atomic research into a dozen projects at a dozen locations, uncentralized and uncoordinated. Do you think we could have developed the atomic bomb while the war still raged? Of course not.

Instead, we wisely took a centralized, coordinated approach. We established the Manhattan District Project. We put $2 billion into it. We made available the greatest scientific geniuses of the allied world. Out of this mammoth effort came the discovery

which led to the end of World War II after the explosions at Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

By contrast, a dairy district project would not be devoted to destruction, but to construction of the human body and of America's soil. In a very short time it would be recognized as the worldwide spearhead of dairy research.

The time to begin the laboratory is now.

Toward this end, I shall introduce legislation authorizing funds for the prompt establishment of the laboratory. It will take time, of course, to build it and staff it with men of outstanding qualifications. But meanwhile there is no need to be idle; the project can be set in motion now by utilizing whatever facilities are already available.

Later, when the structure is erected, all the dairy research can be brought together within one building—preferably in Wisconsin, to my way of thinking, but in any event in some appropriate, central location.

From the outset, certain facts should be clearly recognized.

1. Early research has already indicated what can be attained in the future. Casein makes a good illustration. It is now used in the manufacture of coated paper, glues, cold-water paints, adhesives, plastics, cosmetics, ink, and a score of other products.

2. The key problem in milk-residue research is economic. To find profitable, new industrial uses for the components of milk, it must be possible to manufacture and distribute them in competition with other products, some of which begin as raw materials less costly than milk.

Time after time, splendid new uses have been found for milk residues; yet they have not been sufficiently competitive.

A synthetic rubber was developed from milk, for example, that was extraordinarily resistant to the action of hot oil. For a time, it was used extensively in gaskets for automobile automatic transmissions. Then, unfortunately, it became apparent that the raw material could be obtained cheaper and more surely from petroleum. Research in this direction was discontinued.

3. The research I am proposing is by no means the exclusive or even the principal remedy for the total dairy problem. It can be, however, an important factor in the solution.

Meanwhile, we must continue work to expand the consumption of both fluid milk and nonfat milk solids. Today you get the highest price, of course, for whole milk going into the consumer trade. But dairy statistics show something else that is important.

In 1953, according to preliminary USDA figures, 18.3 percent of the milk solids produced went into nonfood uses. This amount—primarily the solids in skim milk, buttermilk, and whey—was either fed to pigs or chickens or used for various commercial purposes.

These solids make excellent animal food. More important, however, they are invaluable nutritious human food. New uses should be developed for these nonfat milk solids for human consumption purposes.

Then, after human consumption is increased, the remainder should be devoted to the expanded industrial consumption mentioned before.

There is no good reason why industrial use of milk components should not become an effective safety valve for milk producers, providing an acceptable outlet for solids in times of unusually heavy production. This is no pipe dream. We have been too ready to assume that just because something hasn't been done, it can't be done. That's negative. We don't have to accept the status quo. In my opinion there are no limits to what research can do or the fields, now undreamed of, that can be opened up. The day may even come, if we give wings to research, when industrial demands will be competing with human consumption needs for the output of our dairy herds.

Right now, though, we don't eat enough of the milk solids and industry doesn't have sufficient uses for them. We urgently need some more pioneering work on both fronts.

The necessity for this research is certain to increase as time passed. By 1975, there could be more than 190 million Americans. In serving this expanding population, however, we may find that our milk surplus has grown rather than diminished. Milk production per cow in 1975 will probably average close to 7,000 pounds of milk a year. Under these circumstances, we must have ready some sound alternative uses for milk components.

Anyone who thinks the task is unsolvable underestimates the genius of American industry and chemistry. Cynics should remember what was accomplished during the war, when the whole powdered milk field was revolutionized almost overnight.

American flexibility operates in our favor. Americans will change their eating habits just as corporations will change their buying habits if we (1) devise new and better products, (2) package better-tasting, more attractive and economical food, or (3) produce less expensive raw materials.

Frozen orange juice is a case in point. A few years ago there was no such thing.

Who can tell what new milk products will be devised or what new forms of powdering, condensing, refrigerating, and packaging will be developed if we concentrate on this research job?

The odds for success are against us, though, unless we make an all-out effort. Only a dairy research laboratory is equal to this effort.

Whatever the cost of the laboratory, it will be worth it.

Our experience is that for every dollar invested in research, we may get back in actual taxpayer wealth from $5 to $100 or more.

We spent $70,000 cooperating with the Florida citrus commission in the development of orange-juice concentrate. But last year Americans paid an estimated $150 million for 43 million gallons of this frozen juice. This is just one of many illustrations of what a small Federal research expenditure can help accomplish.

Think of the good that could be accomplished by intensive research in milk. A dairy research laboratory—working hand-in-hand with the great universities and great corporation laboratories—is a challenge to America. It is a challenge I will offer to the 84th Congress.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for not to exceed 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Wisconsin may proceed.

Mr. WILEY. The Nation's dairy industry is confronted by a great many challenges. One problem is low prices. For example, in 1954, Wisconsin dairymen received only $3.54 per hundredweight of milk—a distressingly inadequate return. Still another of the important challenges is to find ways and means of utilizing the vast amount of surpluses which are at present piling up in America's warehouses. This presents a challenge.

The basic fact of the current situation is that American consumption is far too low in relation to dairy products. If consumption were increased, it would more than absorb the present so-called surplus. We must do everything possible, therefore, to encourage increased consumption. This will require improved processing, merchandising, packaging, retailing, advertising, public relations of dairy products.

At the producing end, we must find new techniques for turning out even better quality, lower cost, better tasting, more appealing dairy products. To do this will take research and it is for this primary purpose that I am proposing the new laboratory today.

At the same time, research of a totally different type is also required. I refer to research into new byproducts of milk.

Within this generation, there have been a series of revolutionary discoveries of new uses of other basic agricultural commodities. I believe that what has been done with respect to the cotton plant, the peanut, the corncob, and other agricultural items, can and should be done with regard to milk. I believe that from the molecule of milk can be extracted secrets for new uses which can be of tremendous significance to the American dairy industry.

I point out that, as I stated in the Better Farming article which is printed in today's RECORD, a great deal of outstanding research is now being performed. For example, at the University of Wisconsin, able research chemists, biologists, physicists, and others are every day attacking many phases of milk uses.

The research center should be the basis for an all-out coordinated mass attack on the whole dairy problem. In Wisconsin there are produced about 17 billion pounds of milk a year. We are talking now about opening up the gates for foreign trade, and yet there are barriers which prevent the shipment of Wisconsin milk into the city of Washington. Of course, the laboratory to which I have referred would not go into that phase of the problem.

Mr. President, if we in this country were to consume the amount of milk we should, of course that would answer the problem to a large extent; but with the advent of atomic energy, we have been delving into new fields of research. We might very well think in terms of utilizing this great natural food in many other directions than that in which it is now being used.

What I am proposing by means of this dairy research center is a type of all-out, coordinated, mass attack on the dairy problem. Such a research center will be capable, within a relatively short period of time, I repeat, of producing discoveries which otherwise might not be forthcoming for a generation.

I should like to make clear that I have very definitely planned that the splendid work of the various State agricultural experiment stations be continued. Obviously all dairy research work cannot be placed under one roof, at one dairy research center. Much can and should be continued on the present Federal-State basis, rather than by having everything transplanted to one location exclusively. At the same time, I believe that savings can be effected by greater coordination within the research center.

Mr. President, I earnestly hope that in accordance with the facts which are

set forth in the article from Better Farming, action can be taken to set up this research laboratory.

Let me say that I believe it is the function of government to reach out for new knowledge and to apply that knowledge to the betterment of its citizens. I feel that through the coordinated avenue I have suggested, if such an institute or research center were established in, let us say, Madison, Wis., we would have there a research center which would lead into undiscovered fields and to the utilization of the vast amount of energy which is to be found in milk; and the result would be the betterment of the race.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR FUNDS FOR CERTAIN LOANS AND GRANTS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], my colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the junior Senator South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to continue authority to make funds available for loans and grants under title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended.

The bill would continue the farm housing program which was established under title V of the Housing Act of 1949. The provisions of this program were originally sponsored by Representative BOB JONES, of the Eighth District of Alabama, and I. Representative JONES is today introducing a bill identical to this one.

In spite of the great good accomplished under this farm housing program during the 5 years of its operation, it was virtually allowed to die last year. This was so even though Congress unanimously voted to continue the authority for it. Unfortunately, the Bureau of the Budget did not submit an estimate, and funds were not appropriated.

Mr. President, many Senators on both sides of the aisle originally supported this Farm Housing Act, and have consistently voted for continuation of the authority. Let me say that when the act was extended last year, a great number of Senators joined in sponsoring the bill.

I have not had an opportunity to invite all Senators who may be interested to join this year in sponsoring this bill. With that in mind, I now request that the bill lie on the table until next Wednesday, before being printed, so that any Senators who may wish to do so may join the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and I as cosponsors of the bill.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared in connection with the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 789) to continue authority to make funds available for loans and grants under title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. FULBRIGHT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. SPARKMAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SPARKMAN

In passing the Housing Act of 1949, Congress said in clear terms that we recognized the need for financial assistance to both farm and city families living in substandard homes if these families were to have an opportunity to obtain decent and adequate housing.

Title V of the act specifically authorized loans to farm owners to enable them to build, modernize or repair their homes and farm service buildings needed to operate their farms profitably. The original act authorized annual appropriations for 4 fiscal years, beginning July 1, 1949. Although the law was amended in 1952 to extend the appropriation authorities for an additional year, no provision for loan appropriations was made beyond the 1954 fiscal year.

Last year Congress extended the authorities of title V of the Housing Act of 1949, but did not appropriate funds to continue the program. The Budget Bureau submitted no estimate.

Originally the act authorized appropriations of $275 million for farm housing purposes. Only about a third of this amount was actually made available. The general curtailment of nondefense Government expenditures associated with the Korean war as well as certain building material shortages that existed in immediate postwar years are the principal reasons why the farm housing program did not reach its anticipated volume.

The amount available for the 1954 fiscal year was $19 million. The demand for these loans was so great that almost all of the funds were committed within 6 months. The Farmers' Home Administration received thousands of applications that went unsatisfied because the farm housing funds were insufficient to fill the needs.

Approximately 19,600 farm families have benefited from the nearly $100 million of farm housing funds that were made available during the years 1950–54 inclusive. With these funds they built or repaired over 16,000 farm homes, approximately 14,000 farm service buildings and over 7,200 water systems. In my home State of Alabama, over 700 families have received farm housing loans to build new and modern homes, and over 200 additional families repaired and modernized their homes. In addition, about 400 farm service buildings and more than 600 water systems have been financed with farm housing funds. In all, about $6 million was loaned to Alabama farmers for these purposes.

This is a mere beginning in solving the problems of substandard housing on our Alabama farms but it does demonstrate the effectiveness of the farm housing loan authorities in meeting a critical need of farm families for construction credit.

That Alabama farmers want better housing is shown by the fact that the demand for these loans was so great during the last year the program was active that 80 percent of the funds allotted to Alabama was obligated within 2 months.

The cost of these new homes has been exceptionally low. To a person accustomed to the price of city homes, it seems almost unbelievable that farm families should be able to build good, substantial homes at an average cash outlay of less than $6,500. While these homes are modest in design, they do meet all the generally accepted requirements of a decent, safe and sanitary living.

Low cash cost when compared with similar urban homes results from a number of reasons. One is the fact that there is no land cost involved. Another is that the borrower and his family ordinarily are able to contribute a substantial amount of labor, and a third is that in many cases borrowers have been able to utilize such materials as timber, sand, gravel, or stone from their own farms or else obtain such materials from local sources at a low cost.

Low cost, however, does not mean low quality. Each of these homes was required to meet the construction standards of the Farmers Home Administration. These standards protect the borrower against faulty construction and the Government against unsound investment. The standards are flexible enough to permit a farmer to use his skills and ingenuity to build at minimum cost the kind of a home of which he and his family are justifiably proud.

In addition to providing financing for farm homes, the farm housing program offers farm families an opportunity to build or improve service buildings needed to put their farms on a paying basis, and to operate them more efficiently.

A fourth of the farm housing funds have been used for purposes such as building dairy barns, general-purpose barns, poultry houses, and for installing water systems. While this has not been the largest field of activity of the housing program it has been a highly significant one. Through it some farmers have been able to put their units on a paying basis; others have been able to make necessary changes in their farm buildings to meet the changing requirements of our present-day agriculture; and others have changed their building facilities so as to use more efficiently their family labor and their land.

The nature of the farming business—one in which the family home and income-producing activities are inseparably joined—makes this authority an important phase of our farm housing program.

The level of living of farm families depends upon the productivity of their farm. When through the addition or modernization of farm service buildings farm families of moderate means, such as the ones to whom farm housing loans are made, are able to increase their income, they are better able to pay the cost of a decent home.

These housing loans to farm families who are unable to obtain their credit from the usual sources are sound investments. During the 4 years that the farm housing program was in operation, borrowers established a commendable repayment record. As of January 31, 1954, less than 5 percent of the borrowers had not paid in full the amounts that had become due on their loans. Approximately one-third had paid more than was due.

I am particularly proud of the repayment record established by the borrowers in Alabama. Of the almost 1,000 farm housing borrowers who had payments due at the end of 1953, less than 1 percent had not paid the full amount due on their loan. These few are the families who did not have sufficient resources to meet the credit requirements of conventional lenders for a construction loan. However, as soon as they make sufficient progress to qualify for a loan from another source they will be required to refinance their Government loans with private or cooperative lending institutions. They only need adequate credit on reasonable terms and an opportunity to prove that they are good credit risks. When the construction work is finished and the loans become seasoned, private credit agencies can and will carry the remaining debt.

The farm housing program is not in competition with private and cooperative credit, but rather it is an integral part of our total credit system that will enable farm families to have homes comparable to those enjoyed by city dwellers. I think we will all agree that a high percentage of our city families are well housed today because they have been aided in their home purchase or improvement through Government-financed, insured, or guaranteed program. We should do no less for the farm families.

Although the inadequacy of farm homes has been less conspicuous and perhaps less publicized than the slums in the cities, a far greater percentage of our farm families are living in substandard houses than is true of urban families. Nationwide, 1 out of every 5 farm families is living in a house that is so dilapidated that it either needs to be replaced or else needs major repairs. In Alabama only 1 farm family out of 12 has the commonly accepted convenience of a private toilet, bath, and hot running water. One out of four families live in homes having less than four rooms. A high percentage of Alabama farm homes are not only inadequate but 1 out of every 3 needs major repairs or needs to be replaced.

The economic and social problems associated with inadequate housing on a fifth of our Nation's farms are too great to be brushed aside. The idea that privation and hardship necessarily are a part of farm life was commonly accepted during the years when our country was being settled, but today farm families want, and I believe they are entitled to, the same conveniences that city people enjoy.

Farm families for one reason or another frequently have deferred home improvements until they had paid for their farms. The idea has prevailed among both farmers and lenders that the house was something to be improved out of savings and that it was not prudent for the farmer to borrow to give his family a decent home. This postponement of home improvements frequently extended beyond the years of greatest family need—the years when the children were at home. Particularly during these years, the household duties of farm wives meant hard labor and drudgery without such commonly accepted conveniences as electricity, running water, and efficiently designed and equipped kitchens.

This postponement of home improvements was largely because of economic necessity and not by choice. All too frequently farm families never did accumulate enough money to build a decent home. The possibilities of obtaining a long-term amortized loan to build a new home were exceedingly rare; consequently, many of these families were forced to patch up and continue to live in run down and inadequate homes.

Today, farm families no longer accept the notion that because they choose farming as a way of life they need to live in homes that are inconvenient and inadequate. To the extent that private and cooperative credit sources can meet the building credit needs of farm families they should be encouraged to do so. Government loan guaranties and insurance have encouraged private capital to finance improved housing for our city families on a substantial scale. When private credit was not available direct Government loans have been provided. What farm families want and need is a like opportunity to finance farm-building improvements.

The farm-housing section of the Housing Act of 1949 gives this opportunity to the farm families who cannot obtain their financing from private or cooperative sources. The limited funds that have been made available under this act have proved its effectiveness in helping farm families of modest means improve their homes.

We need to extend these authorities. They are an essential part of our national housing program which has as its objective the progressive improvements of our housing standards with the eventual realization of a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I introduce for appropriate reference 10 bills relating to the armed services. Each of these bills is requested by the Department of Defense and is accompanied by a letter of transmittal from the appropriate military department. I ask unanimous consent that the letters of transmittal be printed in the RECORD immediately following the listing of the bills introduced.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters of transmittal will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Georgia.

The bills, introduced by Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) (by request) were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

S. 795. To amend the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 to provide for additional facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 795 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., January 6, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to amend the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 to provide for additional facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955, and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to its transmittal to the Congress for consideration. The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

It is the purpose of this proposed legislation to convert the existing temporary program for the acquisition of facilities for the Reserve components to a permanent program by repealing both the time and monetary limitations imposed by the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950.

The National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 829) authorizes the acquisition and utilization of such facilities as may be necessary for the proper development, training, operation, and maintenance of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Section 3 of that act limits the amount authorized to be appropriated to $250 million over a period of the 5 fiscal years following its enactment. Such period will expire with fiscal year 1956, and it is contemplated that the amount of authorization utilized by that time will approach the monetary limitation established in the act.

If section 3 is amended, as proposed, the Secretary of Defense will be authorized to continue such program on a permanent basis within the limits of such amounts as the Congress may, from time to time, appropriate for such purpose. The acquisition, including construction, which would be so authorized, would provide for additional increments of the longer-range requirements of the Reserve components. Additionally, establishment of the program on a permanent basis would permit more effective long-range planning in this area.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of this proposal would result in no increase in the budgetary requirements of the Department of Defense.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

S. 796. To provide for the relief of certain members of the Armed Forces who were required to pay certain transportation charges covering shipment of their household goods and personal effects upon return from overseas, and for other purposes.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 796 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, January 3, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to provide for the relief of certain members of the Armed Forces who were required to pay certain transportation charges covering shipment of their household goods and personal effects upon return from overseas, and for other purposes.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to afford relief for certain military per-

sonnel who, on their return from an overseas or Alaskan tour of duty, were charged with transportation, packing, crating, temporary storage, drayage, and unpacking of household goods and personal effects for poundage in excess of 9,000 pounds net.

Certain provisions of the Joint Travel Regulations covering weight limitations on shipments of household goods, established pursuant to the Career Compensation Act of 1949, were limited by the Appropriation Acts of 1953 and 1954.

Section 632 of Public Law 488, 82d Congress (Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1953), provides that no part of any appropriation contained in that act shall be available to expense of transportation, packing, crating, temporary storage, drayage, and unpacking of household goods and personal effects in excess of an average of 5,000 pounds net, such average to be based on the total number of shipments authorized for permanent change of station during the previous fiscal year but not exceeding 9,000 pounds net in any one shipment.

Section 629 of Public Law 179, 83d Congress (Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1954), while retaining the weight limitations of 5,000 and 9,000 pounds net, differs from section 632 of Public Law 488, 82d Congress, in that the qualification as to average, "such average to be based upon the total number of shipments authorized for permanent change of station during the previous fiscal year," is omitted. Further, the limitations imposed in section 629 are not "applicable in the case of members transferred to or serving in stations outside the continental United States or in Alaska under orders relieving them from a duty station within the United States prior to July 10, 1952, and who are returned to the United States under orders relieving them from a duty station beyond the United States or in Alaska on or after July 1, 1953." In other words, personnel who meet the above-stated requirements will not be affected by the 5,000- or 9,000-pound limitations but are limited by the provisions of the joint travel regulations established in accordance with the Career Compensation Act of 1949.

While section 629, Public Law 179, 83d Congress, offers relief not afforded in section 632, Public Law 488, 82d Congress, certain inequities have arisen from its application. This proposal would remove these inequities. Under section 629 personnel who complete their overseas or Alaskan tour and return to the States under orders relieving them from duty on July 1, 1953, are protected under the saving provision of that section; personnel who were ordered overseas prior to July 10, 1952, but who returned on June 30, 1953, or earlier, are not so protected. In the first case, the transportation, crating, etc. (if within the limiting provisions of the joint travel regulations), are paid for by the Government; in the second case the individual must reimburse the Government for poundage in excess of 9,000 pounds net. The individual required to make such reimbursement had, in good faith, shipped household goods to the overseas or Alaskan theater in accordance with joint travel regulations then in effect. In some cases personnel for whom relief is sought are members of the Reserve who were recalled to active duty, had their household goods shipped at Government expense, were led to believe the return shipment would be at Government expense, and have since been called upon to defray part of the cost of the return shipment when being returned to an inactive duty status. Actions of this nature lend support to the charge that the services are constantly changing the conditions of service from those in effect at the time military personnel came on active duty.

While the military departments have not considered the 9,000-pound limitation to be applicable to intratheater moves of personnel who were not subject to the limitation on their overseas shipment, the proposal does expressly exempt such moves from the limitation.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES

A similar proposal was submitted to the 83d Congress on May 26, 1954, as a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1954, and was introduced as S. 3575, but no further action was taken thereon.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

It is estimated that the enactment of this proposal will result in an increased cost to the Army of $50,000 and to the Navy of $13,000 for fiscal year 1956. These amounts can be absorbed within funds appropriated for such purpose.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD E. TALBOTT.

S. 797. To enact certain provisions now included in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act and the Civil Functions Appropriation Act, and for other purposes.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 797 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, January 23, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to enact certain provisions now included in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act and the Civil Functions Appropriation Act, and for other purposes, and a sectional analysis thereof.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that it has no objection to the submission of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

This proposed legislation would provide legislative authorization for certain activities of the Department of Defense now supported only by provisions contained in the annual appropriation acts. A detailed discussion of each section is contained in the attached sectional analysis.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The enactment of this proposal will cause no aparent increase in the budgetary requirements for the Department of Defense.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD E. TALBOTT.

"SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF A BILL TO ENACT CERTAIN PROVISIONS NOW INCLUDED IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION ACT AND THE CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION ACT, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

"Section 1: (a) This subsection would enact into permanent law the authority contained in the following provisions of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1955 (Public Law 458, 83d Cong.)—

"Military personnel, Army: 'Donations of not to exceed $25 to each prisoner upon each release from confinement in an Army prison (other than a disciplinary barracks) and to each person discharged for fraudulent enlistment.'

"Maintenance and operations, Army: 'Donations of not to exceed $25 to each prisoner upon each release from confinement in a disciplinary barracks'; 'civilian clothing, not to exceed $30 in cost, to be issued each person upon each release from confinement in an Army prison and to each soldier discharged otherwise than honorably, or sentenced by a civil court to confinement in a civil prison, or interned or discharged as an alien enemy.'

"Maintenance and operations, Air Force: 'Civilian clothing and, when necessary, an overcoat, the cost of all not to exceed $30, for each person upon each release from a military prison.'

"Military personnel, Air Force: 'Donations of not to exceed $25 to each civilian prisoner upon each release from a military prison, to each enlisted man discharged otherwise than honorably upon each release from confinement under court-martial sentence, and to each person discharged for fraudulent enlistment.'

"It provides authority for the issuance of civilian outer clothing to prisoners released from military and naval prisons who do not possess personally owned clothing. It also makes possible the furnishing of a small amount of cash to such released prisoners, in order that they may purchase meals and other necessities during the trip to their homes.

"(b) This subsection would repeal the Navy statutes relating to the furnishing of transportation, civilian clothing, and gratuities to prisoners. Those statutes would no longer be necessary because of subsection (a), above, and section 2.

"Section 2: This section would provide permanent authority for the furnishing of subsistence, quarters, and supplies and services required for health and personal necessity, to applicants, accepted applicants and rejected applicants for enlistment, registrants called for induction under the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and rejected registrants, persons in military custody not in a pay status, such as prisoners, and, in emergencies, supernumeraries, including straglers from other military units and shipwrecked mariners. It permits commutation of subsistence to applicants for enlistment and registrants, including those rejected. This section would replace the following provisions of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1955:

"Military personnel, Army: 'Authorized issues of articles to prisoners, other than those in disciplinary barracks'; 'subsistance of * * * selective service registrants called for induction and applicants for enlistment while held under observation, and prisoners (except those at disciplinary barracks)'; 'subsistance of supernumeraries necessitated by emergent military circumstances.'

"Maintenance and operations, Army: 'Subsistence of prisoners at disciplinary barracks'; 'authorized issues of articles for use of applicants for enlistment and persons in military custody.'

"Military personnel (Air Force): 'Rations for applicants for enlistment, * * * and general prisoners'; 'commutation of rations, as authorized by regulations, to applicants for enlistment, and general prisoners, while sick in hospitals; subsistence of supernumeraries necessitated by emergent military circumstances.'

"Section 3: (a) This subsection would amend section 303 (e) of the Career Compensation Act so as to include persons discharged for fraudulent enlistment or for reason of minority among the categories to whom traveling expenses may be paid. Current law authorizes transportation in kind and a $10 donation for persons discharged from the Army and Air Force for fraudulent enlistment, and transportation in kind and subsistence for those similarly discharged from the Navy. This would place all three services on a uniform basis, and permit deletion of appropriation language for the Army and Air Force which raises the amount of the donation to $25. The phrase "or for reason of minority" has been added because the Uniform Standards for Discharge approved by the Secretary of Defense on August 2, 1948, provide that minors who enlist with false representations as to age or without parental consent and who meet applicable standards for discharge are discharged for reason of minority and not for fraudulent enlistment.

"(b) This subsection amends section 501 (a) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to make applicable to officers of the Reserve components the authority to provide rations to personnel on inactive-duty training when the duty period or periods total 8 or more hours in any one calendar day. As originally enacted, section 501 (a) authorized payment of only basic pay to Reserve personnel on inactive-duty training. In some instances, particularly with National Guard units, when the duty period involved is for purposes of firing weapons on a range, it is necessary to arrive at the range area early in the morning and spend the entire day at the location. In such instances, personnel were required to furnish their own meals, and the cost of these took a large part, if not all, of the basic pay the individual received. This problem was solved in part by an amendment to section 501 (a), which was contained in section 244 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, and which authorized rations in kind to enlisted personnel when the inactive-duty training period totals 8 hours in 1 day. However, the same problem exists as to officers. There is no authority to pay them subsistence allowances unless they are placed on active duty for the day involved, and such active duty entitles them also to quarters allowance, for which there is no necessity or justification. Accordingly, the furnishing of subsistence in these circumstances to both officers and enlisted members of the Reserve components has been authorized by appropriation act provisions, which are as follows in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1955:

"Reserve personnel requirements (Army): 'Subsistence for members of the Army Reserve for drills of 8 or more hours duration in any one calendar day.'

"Army National Guard: 'Subsistence for officers attending drills of 8 or more hours duration in any 1 calendar day.'

"(c) This subsection would repeal present statutes covering transportation, subsistence, and donations for persons discharged for fraudulent enlistment, since they would be authorized travel expenses by (b) above.

"Section 4: This subsection would amend section 125 of the National Defense Act, as it relates to issuance of civilian clothing to persons discharged for bad conduct, undesirability, unsuitability, or inaptitude. The amendment would delete the present $30 limit on the cost of clothing, which makes it difficult to provide a suit and an overcoat. It would also clarify the categories of discharges to whom such clothing may be issued, specifying that they include persons discharged otherwise than honorably, or otherwise than under honorable conditions. It would also add the category of persons interned or discharged as alien enemies, now covered by appropriation act provisions. These persons may be entitled to honorable discharges because of the character of their service, but should not be permitted to retain the uniform. Persons discharged under honorable conditions for reasons of unsuitability or inaptitude are not permitted to retain their uniforms, but persons discharged under honorable conditions for other reasons are permitted to retain them. The language suggested in the first clause of the revision is the same as now contained in the fifth proviso of 10 U. S. C. 1393.

"Section 5: (a) This subsection would provide permanent authority for the payment of expenses and rewards (not exceeding $25) for the apprehension and delivery of personnel absent without leave, deserters, stragglers, or persons who have escaped from custody. The amount of money is left to the determination of the Secretaries of the military departments in order to allow sufficient flexibility for a permanent law. This authority is now provided for the Army and Air Force by appropriation act provisions, which appear in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1955, as follows:

"Military personnel, Army: 'expenses of apprehension and delivery of deserters, prisoners, and soldiers absent without leave, including payment of rewards (not to exceed $25 in any one case).'

"Maintenance and operation, Army: 'expenses of apprehension and delivery of prisoners escaped from disciplinary barracks, including payment of rewards not exceeding $25 in any one case, and expenses of confinement of such prisoners in nonmilitary facilities.'

"Military personnel (Air Force): 'expenses of apprehension and delivery of deserters, prisoners, and members of the Air Force absent without leave, including payment of rewards (not to exceed $25 in any one case).'

"(b) This subsection would repeal a portion of section 22 of the act of August 2, 1946, the permanent Navy authority for expenses and rewards for apprehension of deserters. It would no longer be needed since subsection (a) would apply to all military departments on a uniform basis.

"Section 6: This section constitutes basic authority for section 706 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1955, and other provisions concerning prisoners contained in the appropriations for each military department, and spells out in somewhat greater detail the expenses which are authorized in the case of prisoners of war. Such authority appears necessary and desirable in view of the fact that the United States is obligated under the provisions of the Geneva Convention of 1929, relating to the treatment of prisoners of war, and other provisions of international law, to provide all of such services for prisoners of war of enemy nations. The section also covers similar personnel in custody who are not technically prisoners of war, such as interned enemy aliens.

"Section 7: The act of January 21, 1870 (sec. 1259, Revised Statutes; 10 U. S. C. 990), provides that no retired officer of the Army may be recalled to active duty unless such action is specifically authorized by law. For a number of years the appropriation for the United States Military Academy has included a proviso authorizing such recall for the duties of librarian at the Academy. It is worded as follows in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act 1955: 'that the duties of the librarian at the United States Military Academy may be performed by a retired officer detailed on active duty.'

"Section 7 enacts this authority into substantive law. It has been found that retired officers are well qualified for these positions by virtue of their background and experience. Their employment results in a saving to the Government, since the cost of the employment is limited to the difference between their retired pay and active-duty pay, which is much less than the cost of employing a qualified civilian.

"Section 8: Section 704 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1955, provides authority for the employment in additional numbers of such military and naval personnel as may be detailed to duty with agencies not a part of the Department of Defense. There are several provisions of law authorizing the detail of military and naval personnel to other agencies on a reimbursement basis, but there is no general authority permitting their employment in addition to the numbers otherwise authorized and appropriated for the respective military departments. Inasmuch as such assignments reduce the number of military and naval personnel available to the services for military purposes, the authority to employ such personnel in additional numbers should be permanent and in conjunction with the authority to detail personnel.

"Section 9: This section enacts into substantive law the following proviso of the appropriation 'Military personnel, Army,' which has been repeated in appropriation acts since the fiscal year 1945: 'Section 212 of the act of June 30, 1932 (5 U. S. C. 59a), shall not apply to retired military personnel on duty at the United States Soldiers' Home.' This provision permits the payment of compensation to retired military personnel employed in the operation and administration of the Soldiers' Home. Such compensation is payable from the Soldiers' Home Trust Fund rather than general funds of the Treasury.

"Section 10: (a) This subsection would enact into permanent law the authority contained in section 707 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1955, whereby the military departments are authorized to expend out of appropriations available for construction or maintenance amounts required for minor construction, conversion of and extensions to existing structures, and improvements at facilities of the department concerned, with a stated limitation of $50,000 for any one project, except that the limitation on the cost of any project determined by the Secretary of Defense to be urgently required for the national defense shall not exceed $200,000. The subsection states that the cost of any project shall not exceed an amount stated in the appropriation act concerned, which would permit annual adjustment of limitations.

"(b) This subsection repeals the permanent Navy law authorizing minor construction in amounts not exceeding $20,000 for any one project. The stated limitation has been increased by annual appropriation act provisions since 1946. The repealed statute would be supplanted by subsection (a).

"Section 11: The provisions of section 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, prohibit the expenditure of funds upon any public building until after sketch plans of the building, together with outline description and detailed estimates of cost, have been made by the Administrator of General Services. Since the military departments supervise construction programs for military purposes, and exercise jurisdiction over military installations, this requirement clearly should not be applicable to military construction. Accordingly, appropriation acts for a number of years have included provisions waiving the requirements of this section of the Revised Statutes. Such waivers appear in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1955, under the titles 'Aircraft and Related Procurement' (Navy), and 'Facilities' (Navy). This section would enact such provisions into permanent law to the extent of waiving the making of sketch plans and detailed cost estimates by the Administrator of General Services in the case of military construction authorized by law for the Department of Defense.

"Sections 355 and 1136, Revised Statutes, include provisions prohibiting the expenditure of funds upon any land purchased by the United States until the written opinion of the Attorney General in favor of the validity of title is obtained. The Department of Justice is able to act expeditiously on title clearances in most cases, and normally the requirement can be met without adverse effect on military requirements. However, occasional instances arise where the urgent need for the construction requires that title be obtained and construction started on the basis of the title examination made by the military department. In recognition of this need, appropriation acts since 1940 have included provisions either waiving the requirement or permitting acquisition of land and initiation of construction prior to written approval of title by the Attorney General. Examples of such provisions are contained in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1955, under the titles 'Aircraft and Related Procurement' (Navy), 'Facilities' (Navy), 'Aircraft and Related Procurement' (Air Force). This section would enact such provisions into permanent law so that the authority would be

available when its use is dictated by urgent circumstances.

"Section 12: The purpose of this section is to enact into specific permanent law the authority for the military departments to furnish utility services, without reimbursement, buildings on military reservations used by nationally recognized welfare organizations. Since 1931, the Army has had specific statutory authority for this in annual appropriation acts. The Air Force appropriations have carried similar provisions since 1949. This section would indicate clearly that such authority exists for all three military departments on a uniform basis.

"Section 13: This section enacts into substantive law the following provision of the appropriation 'Procurement and production, Army' of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act of 1954: 'Ammunition for military salutes at institutions to which issue of weapons for salutes is authorized.' A similar provision is not included in the 1955 appropriation act because the funds from 1954 were considered sufficient for the needs in 1955. However, future appropriation acts will undoubtedly contain this item. Comparable provisions have appeared in Army appropriation acts since the fiscal year 1897. An example of the institutions referred to in State homes for soldiers and sailors, to which the issue of obsolete but serviceable weapons for salutes is authorized by the act of February 8, 1889 (25 Stat. 657), as amended (50 U. S. C. 66). In the interest of uniformity, the section is made applicable to all military departments.

"Section 14: (a) This subsection would amend the act of May 28, 1928 (45 Stat. 786; 32 U. S. C. 181c), by deleting therefrom any reference to the amount ($7,500) which may be appropriated annually for incidental expenses of the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice. It has been the practice in annual appropriation acts for the Congress to specify the amount which may be used for this purpose, which is generally in excess of the amount herein specified. This amendment permits the amount to be adjusted from year to year in proportion to the requirements based upon the program for the year.

"(b) The existing statute authorizing the activities of the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, the Act of June 7, 1924, merely provides for the necessary expenses of the Board and its members, and is silent as to the rate of travel allowances to be paid to members when they are traveling in connection with their duties as such members. The Board includes a few civilian members in addition to the military personnel who make up the majority of the Board. The Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1955, includes a provision that travel expenses of civilian members of the Board shall be paid in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended. This subsection would amend the 1924 act to provide that travel expenses of members of the Board shall be paid on the basis now specified by annual appropriation acts.

"Section 15: (a) This subsection would enact into substantive law the authority now provided for the Army and Air Force by annual appropriation acts to make expenditures for inter-American cooperation, which includes such activities as military missions to Latin-American countries, the translation and printing of military texts to be used by their armies in the interest of standardization of methods, and expenses of visits of Latin-American officers to the United States for indoctrination in United States military methods.

"(b) This subsection repeals Navy permanent law on the above subject, since subsection (a) would be uniformly applicable to all military departments.

"Section 16: Annual appropriations for the National Guard since 1937 have included authority for the settlement and payment of claims for damage to or loss of private property incident to the operation of camps of instruction. These activities are not covered by existing claims statutes, such as the Federal Tort Claims Act or the Military Personnel Claims Act, since the units concerned are not in Federal service, even though the pay of the troops, the expense of operation of camps, and other training expenses are paid from Federal funds. However, since the training is for the purpose of improving the state of readiness of National Guard units to participate in the defense of the United States, it appears entirely proper that claims of this type should be paid from Federal funds as an incidental expense of training. This section would provide permanent statutory authority for this purpose, making clear that it creates no right of action against the United States, and would replace the appropriation act provision, which reads as follows in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1955: 'claims (not to exceed $1,000 in any one case) for damages to or loss of private property incident to the operation of Army and Air National Guard camps of instruction, either during the stay of units of said organizations at such camps or while en route thereto or therefrom.'

"Section 17: (a) This subsection would enact into permanent law provisions in the appropriations for the Army National Guard and the Air National Guard, reading as follows in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1955:

"Army National Guard: 'services of personnel of the National Guard employed as civilians without regard to their military rank, and the number of caretakers authorized to be employed under provisions of law (32 U. S. C. 42) may be such as is deemed necessary by the Secretary of the Army.'

"Air National Guard: '*Provided, further,* That the number of caretakers authorized to be employed under the provision of law (32 U. S. C. 42) may be such as is deemed necessary by the Secretary of the Air Force.' The provisions of section 90 of the National Defense Act were amended in 1935 to authorize placing the property and equipment of the National Guard of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia in a common pool for care, maintenance and storage. The advantages of this pooling, from the standpoint of economy, are apparent. However, the 1935 amendment placed a limit of 15 on the number of caretakers to be employed for any one pool. With the increase in the amount and size of National Guard equipment, the limitation to 15 caretakers became inadequate, and appropriation acts since 1939 (Public Law 179, 83d Cong., title III) have suspended the limitation. This subsection would delete the limitation from the permanent statute.

"Section 90 of the National Defense Act also prohibits the employment as caretakers of persons who hold commissions as officers in the National Guard, except for one officer not above the grade of captain for each pool or heavier-than-air squadron. In many cases, the persons best qualified to act as caretakers are those who happen to hold such commissions. In recognition of this, annual appropriation acts have suspended this prohibition since 1946. This subsection would also amend section 90 to include affirmative authority for such employment of caretakers without regard to their military rank.

"(b) This subsection would repeal the prohibition on employment of commissioned officers as caretakers, discussed in (a) above.

"Section 18: This section would enact into subtantive law the following provisions of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act of 1955 'Army National Guard' and 'Air National Guard': 'travel expenses (other than mileage), as authorized by law for Army personnel on active duty, for Army National Guard division, regimental and battalion commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau'; 'travel expenses (other than mileage), on the same basis as authorized by law for Air National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, of Air National Guard commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau.'

"The commanders specified perform travel, as directed by National Guard regulations, for the purpose of inspecting units to determine the status of training, condition of equipment, progress of organization, and similar matters. Since they are not in Federal status, they are not covered by existing laws relating to payment of travel expenses. It appears inequitable to require such commanders to pay travel expenses from their own pockets for official duties of this nature. However, this section would require specific authorization by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau for the use of official funds for such travel, as does the existing appropriation language.

"Section 19: (a) (b) These subsections provide the basis for expenditure of funds for emergencies, extraordinary expenses, and confidential activities of the Department of Defense and the Departments of the Army and Air Force, which have heretofore been covered by provisions of annual appropriation acts. The present authority appears in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1955, under the appropriations 'Salaries and expenses' (Office of the Secretary of Defense), 'Contingencies' (Department of Defense), 'Maintenance and Operations, Army' and 'Contingencies' (Air Force), and is not enlarged by this subsection. It is also provided that expenditures for confidential purposes shall be final and conclusive only when specified by the appropriation act providing the funds. In the interest of uniformity, the subsections are made applicable to the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of all the military departments.

"(c) The Secretary of the Navy having been included in the authorizing language of subsections (a) and (b), the authority granted in the statute repealed would no longer be necessary.

"Section 20: This section would enact into substantive law the same authority provided in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1955, under the heading 'Claims' as follows: 'repayment of amounts determined by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force, or officers designated by them, to have been erroneously collected from military and civilian personnel of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force or from States, Territories, or the District of Columbia, or members of National Guard units thereof.'

"This authority provides a quick and simple method of repaying amounts erroneously collected from the mentioned personnel, or from States, Territories, or the District of Columbia in connection with National Guard activities. The erroneous collections arise in various ways, such as charges for property thought to be lost, but later located after the collection is made. Direct payment avoids the delay, expense, and paperwork incident to processing claims through the General Accounting Office for the very small amounts usually involved.

"Section 21: Section 303 (b) of the Army and Air Force Authorization Act of 1949 provides that funds appropriated to the military departments for procurement of technical military equipment and supplies, construction of public works, and research and development shall remain available until expended unless otherwise provided in the appropriation act concerned. Since the enactment of that section, it has been necessary to carry in every military appropriation act a provision stating that none of the funds in

the act shall be available until expended unless expressly so provided in that appropriation or another appropriation act. For accounting and budget purposes, the provision in the Army and Air Force Authorization Act is unfeasible, since lump-sum appropriations do not indicate what portion of the total amount is for the procurement of technical military equipment and supplies, or for research and development. Thus an unspecified portion of the lump-sum appropriation would be available until expended, while the balance would be available for 1 year. This section would amend section 303 (b) of the Army and Air Force Authorization Act to provide that funds of the type specified shall remain available until expended when so provided in the appropriation act concerned. This will permit deletion of the superseding language carried in annual appropriation acts, which appears as section 713 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1955, as follows: 'No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available until expended unless expressly so provided elsewhere in this or some other appropriation act.'

"Section 22: This section would enact into permanent law the following provisions of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1955:

" 'SEC. 702. Section 3648, Revised Statutes, shall not apply, in the case of payments made from appropriations contained in this act, (1) to payments made in compliance with the laws of foreign countries or their ministerial regulations, (2) to payments for rent in such countries for such periods as may be necessary to accord with local custom, or (3) to payments made for tuition.

" 'SEC. 705. Appropriations contained in this act shall be available for insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries, when required by laws of such countries; payments in advance of expenses determined by the investigating officer to be necessary and in accord with local custom for conducting investigations in foreign countries incident to matters relating to activities of the Department concerned.'

"Maintenance and operations (Air Force): 'rental of land or purchase of options to rent land without reference to section 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended, * * * and other necessary expenses of combat maneuvers.'

"Maintenance and operations, Army: 'And in administering the provisions of 43 U. S. C. 315q, rentals may be made in advance; field exercises and maneuvers, including payments in advance for rentals or options to rent land.'

"Section 3648 of the Revised Statutes prohibits the advance payment of public moneys unless authorized by an appropriation act or other law. The various payments listed in this section have been authorized by the appropriation act provisions quoted above, which are not legislative in nature, but add unnecessary wording to the annual appropriation acts. In the case of activities in foreign countries, it is often necessary to make advance payments of the type mentioned in this section, under local law, regulation, or custom. In the case of tuition, it is the normal practice to require payment in advance. In the case of insurance on official motor vehicles in foreign countries, the Comptroller General has in the past held that it is the general policy of the United States Government to act as a self-insurer, and that payments for insurance from appropriated funds will not be approved in the absence of a clear expression of the desire of Congress that funds be used for that purpose. This has created difficulty in certain foreign countries, where mandatory laws require insurance coverage of certain designated types as a prerequisite to the operation of motor vehicles. In certain cases activities of the Department of Defense would be seriously hampered if official vehicles are precluded from entering the foreign country concerned.

"In the case of losses incident to termination of grazing permits, the provisions of the act of July 9, 1942, as amended by the act of May 28, 1948, authorize payments to holders of grazing permits or licenses on land owned by or under the control of the Federal Government, to compensate them for losses suffered when their permission to use the range lands is terminated because of the need of such lands for war or national defense purposes. These payments make it possible for these users of the public range to continue livestock operations in cases where they might otherwise be driven out of business by inability to obtain other grazing land. In many cases, such users urgently need advance payment of the compensation for losses, so that they will have sufficient funds to pay advance rental on other grazing property. In recognition of this, appropriation acts since 1949 have carried provisions authorizing these payments to be made in advance.

"Advance payments for rentals or options to rent land needed for field exercises or maneuvers are required to assure ability to use the required areas when owners insist on advance payments.

"Section 23: This section includes a number of items now covered by the appropriation 'Cemeterial expenses' in the Department of the Army Civil Functions Appropriation Act. All of the items are specifically authorized by the mentioned appropriation act with the exception of the maintenance of soldiers' plots or monuments in the United States, and the authority to purchase flags, however, present authorizing language has been interpreted to include these expenses.

"Section 24: Section 2 of the act of August 2, 1946, which would be repealed by this section, authorizes the Navy to provide for physical examination by civilians of employees engaged in hazardous occupations. The authority contained in that section is unnecessary in view of the provisions of the act of August 8, 1946, relative to health programs for Government employees.

"Section 25: (a) This subsection would provide uniform permanent authority for all military departments to pay rewards for information leading to the discovery or recovery of missing Government property (Public Law 458, 83d Cong., sec. 709). The Navy now has this authority in the statute which would be repealed by (b). The authority is particularly needed to assist in the recovery of valuable property such as torpedoes and guided missiles.

"(b) This subsection would repeal the Navy statute which provides the authority which would be granted to all military departments by (a).

"Section 26: Section 4 of Public Law 557, 82d Congress, an act to facilitate the performance of research and development work by the military departments, provides that contracts for research and development may provide for the acquisition or construction by, or furnishing to, the contractor of research, developmental or test facilities as determined necessary for performance of the contract. The reports of the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services (H. Rept. 548, S. Rept. 863) state the understanding of those committees that the wording of section 4 will make research and development funds available for the furnishing or construction of such facilities. However, appropriations specifically made for construction are available to the military departments and it has been a long-standing rule of the Comptroller General that where a specific appropriation for a purpose exists, a general appropriation may not be used for that purpose. Therefore, doubt exists as to whether or not section 4 permits the use of research and development funds for furnishing construction of facilities. This section will remove such doubt and amend section 4 to make specific reference to availability of appropriations, also making possible the deletion of appropriation language. This section would make permanent authority now found in section 728 of Public Law 458, 83d Congress.

"Section 27: This section authorizes delegation and redelegation, with stated exceptions, of the authority conferred upon the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments by this act. The exceptions, which may not be delegated, are (a) the authority to prescribe or approve regulations, and (b) the authority to approve use of funds for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, under section 23."

S. 798. A bill to provide for the tonnage composition of the United States Navy with respect to vessels, and for other purposes.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 798 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D. C., January 5, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to provide for the tonnage composition of the United States Navy with respect to vessels, and for other purposes, and a sectional analysis thereof.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955. The responsibility for representing the Department of Defense on this legislation has been delegated to this Department by the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

This proposed legislation is designed to provide a new basic authorizing act for the Navy with respect to vessels. The proposed bill reflects the changing needs of the Navy which cut completely across the traditional categories and types of vessels contemplated by existing law as based on the Washington and London Treaties. It would repeal all existing tonnage authorization and provide a new tonnage composition made up of four categories of vessels; namely, combatant vessels, auxiliary vessels, service craft, and experimental vessels. The combatant vessel category would consist of four subcategories, (1) warships (aircraft carriers, battleships, cruisers, etc.), (2) amphibious warfare vessels (including landing craft), (3) mine warfare vessels (minelaying and minesweeping), and (4) patrol vessels. Provision is made for the category, "experimental vessels," in order to provide a classification for certain types which may or may not have combatant characteristics and are not auxiliaries or service craft, and for ships which have been altered for test purposes to such an extent that they have for all practical purposes lost their initial classification. The Secretary of the Navy would determine the types of vessels included in each category and subcategory and would be authorized to classify vessels and to maintain a naval vessel register listing each vessel by appropriate category, subcategory, and classification.

A continuing shipbuilding, conversion, and modernization program would be provided in the proposed bill. Such program would include prototype vessels incorporating progress made in research and development. The proposed bill also provides for the disposition and for the orderly replacement of naval vessels.

The Vinson-Trammell Act (act of Mar. 27, 1934; 48 Stat. 503, ch. 95, as amended), provided a continuing shipbuilding authority, but subsequent acts authorizing construction of auxiliaries, mine craft, landing craft, patrol vessels, and district craft during World War II and the national emergency period preceding made no provision for replacement.

The tonnage composition of the Navy as of September 30, 1954, is set forth below accord-

ing to the categories and subcategories which the proposed legislation would employ. This tabulation includes active fleet vessels, reserve fleet vessels, naval reserve training vessels, vessels building, vessels suspended, vessels authorized and funded for but not started, and vessels delivered partially completed. It does not include noncommissioned vessels asigned to the Military Sea Transportation Service.

Combatant vessels:	Tonnage
Warships	4,275,680
Amphibious warfare vessels and landing craft	1,747,170
Mine warfare vessels	225,439
Patrol vessels	375,590
Total combatant vessels	6,623,879
Auxiliary vessels	1,957,641
Service craft	552,902
Experimental vessels	3,035
Grand total	9,137,457

For the purpose of providing continuing shipbuilding authorization, the proposed legislation provides for the following tonnage composition for the Navy:

Percentage of Sept. 30, 1954, tonnage

Combatant:		
Warships	4,500,000	105
Amphibious warfare vessels and landing craft	2,000,000	114
Mine warfare vessels	300,000	133
Patrol vessels	400,000	106
Total combatant vessels	7,200,000	109
Auxiliary vessels	2,000,000	102
Service craft	600,000	109
Experimental vessels	200,000	6,589
Grand total	10,000,000	110

In order to provide for the changing needs of the naval service, the Secretary of the Navy would be authorized to vary the tonnage authorizations by categories and subcategories a maximum of 20 percent, but he would not be authorized to exceed the total authorized tonnage of 10 million tons.

In the event of war or national emergency, the Secretary of the Navy would be authorized to acquire or construct vessels of such size, type, and design as he determines to be best suited for the prosecution of the war or for the national security without reference to tonnage authorizations contained in this bill. It is emphasized, however, that it is intended that the authority of this section is to be exercised only under the extreme emergency circumstances indicated.

The proposed bill requires new warships construction, by type, to be divided equally between private and naval shipyards. Inasmuch as the national security requires a nucleus of naval shipbuilding skills and facilities in both the private and naval shipyards, an exception is made to the equal division requirement in cases where the Secretary of the Navy, with the approval of the President, determines that such exception is necessary to develop prototypes or to maintain such skills and facilities. Provision is also made for the construction of such vessels on the Pacific coast as the President may deem necessary to maintain adequate shipyard facilities in that area.

Provision is made in the proposed bill for the acquisition and disposition of vessels for the Military Sea Transportation Service and for the transfer of vessels between the Departments of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Treasury, Interior, or Commerce, with or without reimbursement.

The proposed bill would reenact existing statutory provisions which prohibit the disposition of naval vessels by sale, charter, or by scrapping, except as provided by law; or the disposition of naval vessels by transfer, exchange, or sale, unless certified by the Chief of Naval Operations as not essential to national defense; or the sale, transfer, or other disposition of any warship, unless authorized by the Congress.

No provision in the proposal is intended to imply a request for contract authorization. Acquisition, construction, or conversion will not be undertaken by the Secretary of the Navy until appropriations have been enacted and approved for such acquisition, construction, or conversion.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES

S. 2862 and H. R. 6827 were introduced in the 81st Congress as a result of the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. The general purposes of S. 2862 and H. R. 6827 were to repeal the aircraft and ship construction limitations contained in the Vinson-Trammell Act and to provide for the suspension of the profit limitations contained in the said act with respect to contracts subject to renegotiation.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of this measure would result in no increased cost to the Government. Funds for shipbuilding would continue to be requested in annual budgets.

This proposed legislation has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The Department of the Navy, on behalf of the Department of Defense, recommends that the proposal be enacted by the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

C. S. THOMAS.

S. 799. A bill to provide that the enlistment contracts or periods of obligated service of members of the Armed Forces shall not terminate by reason of appointment as cadets or midshipmen at the Military, Naval, Air Force, or Coast Guard Academies, or as midshipmen in the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 799 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D. C., January 5, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of proposed legislation to provide that the enlistment contracts or periods of obligated service of members of the Armed Forces shall not terminate by reason of appointment as cadets or midshipmen at the Military, Naval, Air Force, or Coast Guard Academies, or as midshipmen in the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Navy has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of the legislation is to provide that members of the Armed Forces appointed as cadets at the United States Military Academy or the United States Air Force Academy, or as midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, or as midshipmen in the Naval Reserve, or as cadets at the United States Coast Guard Academy, from enlisted status in any of the Armed Forces, would have a contingent enlisted status while continuing as cadets or midshipmen. In the event of separation prior to graduation, these persons would revert to their enlisted status, and be continued in such enlisted status for the remainder of their obligated service.

This legislation is considered necessary due to the actions of certain cadets and midshipmen in recent years, subsequent to the enactment of legislation requiring compulsory military service. Those young men, having enlisted or having been inducted into one of the Armed Forces, having been appointed as cadets at the Military Academy, as midshipmen at the Naval Academy, as midshipmen in the Naval Reserve or as cadets at the Coast Guard Academy, and having been discharged from enlisted status for the convenience of the Government to accept appointments as cadets or midshipmen, have tendered resignations, had them accepted, and thus have evaded further military service. Under present selective-service regulations, all further military service is avoided in such a situation.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE

A similar proposal was submitted to the 83d Congress by the Department of the Navy on February 1, 1954, as part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1954. That proposal was introduced as H. R. 7788 and S. 2906. The act of April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47) established the United States Air Force Academy and this proposal has been extended to cover cadets of that Academy.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of this proposal would result in no increase in the budgetary requirements of the Department of Defense.

Sincerely yours,

C. S. THOMAS.

S. 800. A bill to repeal the act of January 19, 1929 (ch. 86, 45 Stat. 1090), entitled "An act to limit the date of filing claims for retainer pay."

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 800 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D. C., January 5, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to repeal the act of January 19, 1929 (ch. 86, 45 Stat. 1090), entitled "An act to limit the date for filing claims for retainer pay."

This proposal is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Navy has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this legislation is to repeal the act of January 19, 1929 (ch. 86, 45 Stat. 1090). Section 1 of the act related to claims for retainer pay of members of the Naval Reserve Force and the Marine Corps Reserve which accrued prior to July 1, 1925, and is no longer effective. Section 2 of the act established a 3-year statute of limitations on claims for advance payment by assigned members of the Fleet Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve, and on claims for compensation for the performance of drills, equivalent instruction or duty, appropriate duty or for administrative functions, and for uniform gratuity accruing to members of the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve subsequent to July 1, 1925. Section 3 provides that the provisions of the act shall not apply to certain members of the Fleet Reserve and the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve.

The 3-year statute of limitations on claims by naval and Marine Corps reservists, established by section 2 of the act of January 19, 1929, supra, was enacted at a time when there was no general statute of limitations on the filing of claims in the General Accounting Office. There is no counterpart applicable to claims of reserve personnel of the other armed services or to claims generally. Such claims are subject to the act of October 9, 1940 (ch. 788, 54 Stat. 1061;

31 U. S. C. 71a), which established a general 10-year statute of limitations on the filing of claims with the General Accounting Office.

There appears to be no sound reason why claims of naval and Marine Corps reservists should be subject to a 3-year statute of limitations while all other claims are subject to the 10-year limitation established by the act of October 9, 1940, supra. Enactment of this legislation would remove this discrimination and would make all claims subject to the same 10-year statute of limitations.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES

This proposal was submitted to the 83d Congress by the Department of the Navy on April 15, 1954, as a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1954, but was not introduced.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of this proposal would result in no increase in the budgetary requirements of the Department of Defense.

Sincerely yours,

C. S. THOMAS.

S. 801. A bill to provide for the crediting of certain service toward retirement of reserve personnel.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 801 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., January 5, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to provide for the crediting of certain service toward retirement of reserve personnel.

This proposal is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Navy has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this legislative proposal is to amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1081) so as to permit members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces to receive credit, for purposes of retirement under title III of that act (10 U. S. C. 1036a), for service as an appointed aviation cadet; a nurse; a dietitian or physical therapist appointed in the Medical Department of the Army of the United States under the act of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1072; 10 U. S. C., 81 note). The proposal would also amend section 6 of the act of February 21, 1946 (60 Stat. 27; 34 U. S. C. 410b), so as to permit officers of the Nurse Corps of the Naval Reserve to count for purposes of retirement, upon completion of 20 or more years of active duty, the same type of service which officers of the Nurse Corps of the Regular Navy may count for that purpose.

Under the act of April 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 156), the Navy's original aviation cadet law, candidates were appointed as aviation cadets in the Naval Reserve. Following the completion of their training they remained aviation cadets and performed active duty involving flying for a period of 3 years in that status, at the expiration of which time they were appointed commissioned officers in the Naval Reserve. The period of service performed as appointed aviation cadets may not now be credited under section 302 of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948, inasmuch as the status of appointed aviation cadet is not mentioned in that section. Since 1942, when the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 737; 34 U. S. C. 850a–850m) was enacted, aviation cadets of the Naval Reserve have an enlisted status and thus receive credit for the period they serve as aviation cadets. Aviation cadets of the Air Force have always had an enlisted status and thus receive credit for their aviation cadet service. The proposed legislation would permit members of the reserve components who performed active duty as appointed aviation cadets to count that active duty for retirement purposes under title III of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948.

Under the present wording of section 302 of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948, officers of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces who, prior to their appointment as commissioned officers under the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, served on active duty as Regular or Reserve nurses in the Army and Navy, or as dietitians or physical therapists in the Medical Department of the Army, may not count that service for purposes of retirement under title III of that act. Inasmuch as that service is considered active Federal service for retirement purposes for officers of the Regular Army, Navy, and Air Force, it is only equitable that officers of the Reserve components should have like credit for similar service. The proposed legislation would authorize credit for that type of service for officers of the Reserve components.

Section 6 of the act of February 21, 1946 (60 Stat. 27), as amended (34 U. S. C. 410b), permits officers of the Regular Navy or Marine Corps or of the Reserve components thereof to retire, in the discretion of the President, when they have completed more than 20 years of active service, at least 10 years of which has been active commissioned service. Section 207 (h) of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended (34 U. S. C. 43g (h)), provides the following for officers of the Regular Navy Nurse Corps:

"(h) The number of years' service to be credited to officers of the Navy Nurse Corps in determining their eligibility for voluntary retirement shall be based on the total of all active service either under an appointment or contract or as a commissioned officer in the Nurse Corps of the Army or Navy, or the Reserve components thereof and all active service in the Nurse Corps or the Nurse Corps Reserve abolished by this act, shall, for this purpose only, be regarded as commissioned service in the Navy or the Reserve components thereof, as the case may be."

The proposed legislation would permit officers of the Navy Nurse Corps Reserve to count for voluntary retirement after more than 20 years of active service the same type of service which section 207 (h) of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 permits officers of the Regular Navy Nurse Corps to count for that purpose.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES

A similar legislative proposal was submitted to the 83d Congress as a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1954 and was introduced as S. 3176. No further action was taken on the bill.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

It is not possible to make any worth while estimate of the fiscal effects of the enactment of this proposed legislation, inasmuch as there is no way to determine how many members of the Reserve components who would be affected by this proposal will eventually qualify for retirement. However, it is considered that the cost will be negligible and can be absorbed in current appropriations.

Sincerely yours,

C. S. THOMAS.

S. 802. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to remove the requirement for a final physical examination for inductees who continue on active duty in another status in the Armed Forces.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 802 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to remove the requirement for a final physical examination for inductees who continue on active duty in another status in the Armed Forces.

This proposal is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The proposed amendment to the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 614), as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 459 (a)) is designed to eliminate the necessity for a final physical examination when an inductee under the act continues on active duty in another status, as by enlistment in a Regular component or as a Reserve on active duty in the Armed Forces.

Section 9 (a) of the above act requires that each individual "who is inducted into the Armed Forces under this title for training and service shall be given a physical examination at the beginning of such training and service, and upon the completion of his period of training and service under this title, each such person shall be given another physical examination and, upon his written request, shall be given a statement of physical condition by the Secretary concerned." The necessity for both of these examinations is obvious in the case of the average inductee who serves a period of military duty and then is separated from the service. However, a large number of inductees, after short periods of service, desire to enlist in the Regular components of the Armed Forces or to continue on active duty in a Reserve status. It is necessary, in order to comply with the act cited above, to give these individuals a physical examination before this change in status may be made. Nonetheless, the Armed Forces are not required by law to give a physical examination to a member of a Reserve component who enlists in a Regular component under similar circumstances. Yet physical standards for induction, enlistment, and separation are the same whether the person is an inductee or a member of a Reserve or Regular component. Once the individual is accepted by one of the Armed Forces, the Government assumes certain responsibilities with respect to physical fitness irrespective of the individual's component. If the individual acquires a physical defect of such nature as to make him unfit for continued duty, he is ordinarily separated from the Armed Forces. If the individual acquires a nondisqualifying compensable defect, the Government is liable whether he is an inductee or a member of a Regular or Reserve component. In any event, the individual who changes his status during his service receives a physical examination when he is separated from the Regular service or from active duty in a Reserve status, in accordance with other regulations and laws. Accordingly, in an instance where there is no break in the military service the physical examination which is required for an inductee upon the completion of his period of training and service does not accomplish any useful purpose which is not already provided for in other existing procedures.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES

This proposal was submitted to the 83d Congress by the Department of the Army on

March 3, 1954, as a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1954 and was introduced as H. R. 8277 and S. 3122.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

It is estimated that if this proposal is enacted, it would result in a saving of $80,000 for the Department of the Army.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

S. 803. A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1948 (ch. 511, 62 Stat. 489), relating to the retention in the service of disabled commissioned officers and warrant officers of the Army and Air Force.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 803 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., December 23, 1954.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to amend the act of June 19, 1948 (ch. 511, 62 Stat. 489), relating to the retention in the service of disabled commissioned officers and warrant officers of the Army and Air Force.

This proposal is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The act of June 19, 1948 (ch. 511, 62 Stat. 489), provides in substance that disabled officers, warrant officers, and flight officers of the Army and Air Force of the United States without component and who hold no other military status will be retained in service, until their treatment for physical reconstruction has reached a point where they will not be further benefited by retention in the military service. The purpose of this act was to preserve the military status of certain disabled officers, warrant officers, and flight officers, who held no appointment other than a temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, until their treatment for physical reconstruction had reached a point where they would not be further benefited by retention in the military service, notwithstanding that the statutes under which they have received their appointments may be terminated or rendered inoperative.

Subsequent to the enactment of this act, the services have implemented the report to the President from the Committee on Veterans' Medical Services, approved February 3, 1951. The implementation prescribes early transfer to Veterans' Administration facilities and early separation for certain disabled members of the uniformed services. Members affected by the report from the Committee on Veterans' Medical Services may be Regular or Reserve officers. However, officers who hold no appointment other than a temporary appointment in the Army or Air Force of the United States are precluded from such early transfer and separation by reason of the act of June 19, 1948, and this situation creates an inequity in the treatment of disabled officers.

In addition to eliminating the present inequality of treatment of temporary officers as compared to that afforded other officers of the Army and Air Force, the legislative proposal will permit retention in the active service of those Army and Air Force Reserve officers whose 5-year appointments would otherwise expire while undergoing hospitalization and evaluation of their possible entitlement to disability retirement or severance benefits. Until July 8, 1957, the current 5-year appointments of Reserve officers of the Army and Air Force will be expiring. It is foreseen that in some cases the individuals concerned will, at the time of such termination, be on active duty but undergoing necessary hospitalization or physical evaluation of possible entitlement to disability benefits. It is very possible that some of these officers may, by reason of physical injury or disease, be mentally incompetent to accept the indefinite Reserve appointment.

Under such circumstances the disability benefits provided by the Career Compensation Act and to which the individual would otherwise be entitled would not be payable unless formal determination of such entitlement is made prior to termination of military status. Uncontrollable factors such as the time, the nature, or character of disabilities in such cases could result in loss of benefits. The proposed amendment will authorize retention of such individuals in active service for the purpose of hospitalization and determination of their possible entitlement to disability benefits.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES

This proposal was submitted to the Congress by the Department of the Army on December 16, 1953, as a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1954. It was introduced as H. R. 7332 and S. 2691.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of this proposal would result in no increase in the budgetary requirements of the Department of Defense.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

S. 804. A bill to amend section 201 (e) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for advance payments of certain pay and allowances of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 804 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., December 22, 1954.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to amend section 201 (e) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for advance payments of certain pay and allowances of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

This proposal is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

This proposed legislation would provide that members of the uniformed services may, incident to release from active duty or training duty, be paid in advance, without regard to the actual performance of travel, pay, and allowances to which they are otherwise entitled for the period required to travel from their last duty station to home.

A similar provision of law was first enacted by the act of March 4, 1923 (42 Stat. 1508), and was carried forward to section 3 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 360), which was repealed by the Career Compensation Act of 1949. However, the Career Compensation Act omitted such provision for advance payments. Section 98 of the National Defense Act (act of June 3, 1916, 39 Stat. 207), now authorizes payment in advance to members of the National Guard participating in encampments, maneuvers, or other exercises.

Payment of advance pay under this proposed legislation could be accomplished by one voucher at the time the member leaves the post of duty, incident to release from active duty or training duty, without the necessity of follow-up procedures or additional payments and without regard to whether or not the member, so far as pay and allowances are concerned, actually traveled to his home. This procedure would obviate the additional workload on personnel officers in preparing vouchers and also on disbursing officers in computing and paying such vouchers for 2 or 3 days' pay and in many instances only 1 day's pay when such a member is required to wait until he has performed the travel to his home.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES

A similar proposal was included in the Department of Defense legislative program for 1954 and was introduced in the 83d Congress in the form of H. R. 8540 and S. 3211. No further action was taken on the bills.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The enactment of this proposal will cause no apparent increase in the budgetary requirements for the Department of Defense.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

USE OF AN INFORMATION FILED BY PUBLIC PROSECUTING OFFICERS IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend sections 3182 and 3183 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to authorize the use of an information filed by a public prosecuting officer for making demands for fugitives from justice. I am introducing this bill at the request of the chief justice of the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 806) to amend sections 3182 and 3183 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to authorize the use of an information filed by a public prosecuting officer for making demands for fugitives from justice, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

IMPROPER SOLICITATION OF CONTRIBUTIONS BY CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for exclusion from the mails of matter violating certain State laws dealing with improper solicitations of contributions by charitable organizations and to forbid the payment of money orders therefor. I might say that this bill is introduced as a result of an investigation made by a committee of the senate of the State of New York, which showed that of millions upon millions of dollars collected ostensibly for charitable purposes more than 85 percent of the money collected was used by the persons who did the collecting.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 814) to provide for exclusion from the mails of mail violating certain State laws dealing with improper

solicitations of contributions by charitable organizations and to forbid the payment of money orders therefor, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952 in a minor respect in order to provide relief from deportation to illegally entered aliens who have served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States in the Korean conflict, in World War II, or otherwise for a period of 3 years. I ask unanimous consent that a statement on this bill, prepared by me, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 846) to authorize the Attorney General to suspend deportation and admit for permanent residence under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act certain aliens who have served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

I am today introducing a bill to permit veterans who have served honorably in the Korean conflict in the armed services of the United States but who originally entered the United States illegally to be relieved from deportation and be allowed to remain in the United States at the discretion of the Attorney General.

I am proposing an amendment to that section of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 which provides for suspension of deportation, applying that suspension to a number of veterans who have honorably served the United States but who have remained in the United States in technical defiance of the law. Most of them came over to this country as seamen and jumped ship. They were drafted or enlisted in the armed services and served honorably and in some cases with great distinction, and are now, despite their services and sacrifices in the cause of the United States, being faced with orders of deportation. The present law is so restrictive that no discretion is given to the Attorney General to suspend deportation in these cases. The entire section dealing with suspension of deportation needs to be drastically rewritten in order to be in accord with the traditions of the United States. Legislation is now being drafted which would accomplish this among many other sweeping changes in our present immigration law. However, pending the introduction of this bill and congressional consideration of this overall legislation, I feel that prompt relief should be provided in this restricted group of cases which, according to my information, does not include more than 100 individuals. Some of the cases that have come to me are truly appealing, including some veterans who have received high decorations for bravery and gallantry in Korea and elsewhere.

During their stay in the United States, they have abided by all our laws and have shown every indication of being good citizen material. If they have violated any law, suspension of deportation would not apply.

This legislation would only apply to the following classes of veterans:

(a) Those who have served in World War II.

(b) Those who have served in the combat zone in Korea.

(c) Those who have served for periods aggregating 3 years or more in the armed services of the United States.

They must be certified to have served honorably and to have been honorably separated from the services. It then comes within the discretion of the Attorney General whether to suspend deportation. No such discretionary authority is now vested in him.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were each read twice by their titles, and referred, or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 587. A bill to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. R. 2010. A bill to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; placed on the calendar.

PRINTING OF MANUSCRIPT ENTITLED "OUR CAPITOL" AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, during the 83d Congress, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] requested and received unanimous consent that the manuscript entitled "Our Capitol" be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

I am informed that the supply of that document is almost exhausted. Therefore, I aks unanimous consent that the manuscript, with corrections, and illustrations, be printed as a Senate document of the 84th Congress, and that 15,000 additional copies be printed for the Senate document room. The manuscript is well prepared, and is greatly in demand by all of the offices.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN HOSPITALS AND FACILITIES—DISCHARGE OF A COMMITTEE—REFERENCE OF LETTER

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from the further consideration of a letter from the Secretary of the Army dated December 21, 1954, relating to a bill to authorize the transfer of hospitals and related facilities between the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Defense, and for other purposes, and that the letter be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ARMY AND AIR FORCE NURSES—DISCHARGE OF A COMMITTEE—REFERENCE OF LETTER

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from further consideration of a letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, dated January 3, 1955, and addressed to the Vice President, forwarding a draft of legislation to provide for the relief of certain Army and Air Force nurses, and for other purposes, and that the letter be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, where the proposed legislation properly belongs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REVOLVING FUND FOR PURCHASE AND SALE OF CERTAIN AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES—DISCHARGE OF A COMMITTEE—REFERENCE OF LETTER

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a letter from the Secretary of the Army, dated December 21, 1954, relating to a proposed bill to repeal Public Law 820, 80th Congress, entitled "An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold," was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. I ask that this letter be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL POSTAGE STAMP AS A MEMORIAL TO THE LATE SENATOR TAFT — ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on yesterday, I introduced a bill (S. 783) to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the late Senator Robert A. Taft. It was intended that the bill be introduced on behalf of myself, and the two Senators from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER and Mr. BENDER]. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed with the names of the Senators from Ohio and myself as cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS OF PHILIP D. REED AND ERWIN D. CANHAM, TO BE MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Senate received today the nominations of the following-named persons to be members of the United States Advisory Commission on Information for a term

expiring January 27, 1958, and until their successors have been appointed and qualified: Philip D. Reed, of New York, and Erwin D. Canham, of Massachusetts.

I give notice that these nominations will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule.

THE CONSTRUCTIVE WORK OF THE ADVERTISING COUNCIL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased recently to receive a copy of the splendid annual report of the Advertising Council for 1953–54. This 30-page booklet is an impressive demonstration of the vitality and the civic-mindedness of the American free-enterprise system.

As is well stated on page 3 by Mr. Philip L. Graham, publisher of the Washington Post and Times Herald and chairman of the council for 1953–54:

If a demonstration were needed that the social conscience of American business has quickened or that industry now views the public good as indivisible from its own, the history of Advertising Council provides it.

The year of constructive work reflected in this booklet represents an inspiring story to America, and, indeed, to the world, which too often has had a distorted view of American free enterprise.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement I have prepared on this subject, along with an appended list of distinguished council participants, may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

One of the miracles of America is the role which advertising plays through all media of public expression.

Thanks to the Advertising Council, this great constructive force has been mobilized for a tremendous variety of patriotic and civic programs.

Each year around $60 milion in advertising space and time are contributed to Government campaigns alone by American business through the Advertising Council. In addition, the support of nongovernmental campaigns reaches a value of approximately $40 million annually.

The Advertising Council utilizes every medium available for public communication and information. This includes: magazines, newspapers, television, car cards, outdoor posters, radio business people, house magazines, and sheet posters.

VARIED PATRIOTIC PROGRAMS

Among its great campaigns during 1953–54 were programs for better schools; an appreciation of the future of America; support of CARE; strengthening of civil defense; aid to community chests; support of the Crusade for Freedom; strengthening of American engineering; fire prevention, including forest-fire protection; strengthening of the Ground Observer Corps; the national-blood program; the Red Cross; encouragement of religion in American life; accident prevention; student-nurse recruitment; United States savings bonds sales; USO-Mail Call.

CONSTITUENT GROUPS

The council has six constituent organizations: The American Association of Advertising Agencies, the Association of National Advertisers, the Bureau of Advertising of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, the Magazine Publishers Association, the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, the Outdoor Advertising Association of America.

OFFICIAL APPRECIATION

We read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and we hear in other media and forums of American life numerous criticisms from time to time of this or that feature of American business. So, I believe that it is altogether fitting and appropriate that we give praise when it is genuinely due and that we salute this great constructive institution—the Advertising Council.

The fact that the council's invaluable services are recognized and appreciated by our Government is indicated by the outstanding leaders of the executive branch and of the legislative branch, as well, who have participated in Washington conferences of the council or who have had other cordial contact with it.

I wish the Advertising Council well and trust that its members will carry on in their great job in the service of our Nation.

THIS IDEA SPREADS OVERSEAS

The social responsibility of the American free enterprise system is, I believe, one of the most distinguishing characteristics of 20th century America. It is a feature which should be duplicated by other free-enterprise nations throughout the world.

In this connection, may I say this: As ranking Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and as its former chairman, I am particularly impressed with the splendid job which the Advertising Council has performed in such work as its efforts for the Crusade for Freedom.

Moreover, the council idea, I am glad to say, has already gone global. Public service advertising is making headway now in various foreign countries. A right idea such as this cannot help but be of inspiration to freemen everywhere.

DISTINGUISHED EXECUTIVES

The officers, chairmen of board committees and the board of directors of the council represent a blue ribbon list of American industry. No corporation in America or group of corporations could possibly afford to employ men and women with such tremendous and high-compensated talent as the Advertising Council has available, enthusiastically and without pay, for the service of 163 million Americans.

The same is true of its public policy committee representing all phases of American life and of the industries advisory committee.

I append hereto a list of the individuals serving in these various important capacities.

THE ADVERTISING COUNCIL

OFFICERS AND CHAIRMEN OF BOARD COMMITTEES, 1954–55

Stuart Peabody, chairman; Louis N. Brockway, vice chairman; Leo Burnett, vice chairman; John C. Sterling, vice chairman; Theodore S. Repplier, president; Allan M. Wilson, vice president; George P Ludlam, vice president; Frederic R. Gamble, secretary; Paul B. West, treasurer; Louis N. Brockway, chairman, executive committee; Leo Burnett, chairman, campaigns review committee; Charles G. Mortimer, chairman, finance committee; Harold E. Fellows, chairman, Government relations committee; Chester J. La Roche, chairman, nominating committee; Philip L. Graham, chairman, planning committee; F. Bourne Ruthrauff, chairman, promotion committee; Edwin W. Ebel, chairman, radio and television committee; Henry G. Little, chairman, sponsorship committee.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS, 1954–55

Fred E. Adams, president, G. M. Basford Co.; William R. Baker, Jr., chairman, Benton & Bowles, Inc.; Harold S. Barnes, director, Bureau of Advertising of the ANPA; Theodore L. Bates, partner, Ted Bates & Co.; Nelson Bond, vice president and director of advertising, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc.; Frank Braucher, president, Magazine Advertising Bureau; Lee H. Bristol, president, Bristol-Myers Co.; Louis N. Brockway, executive vice president, Young & Rubicam, Inc.; C. H. Brower, executive vice president, Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborn, Inc.; Thomas D'Arcy Brophy, chairman of the board, Kenyon & Eckhardt, Inc.; Leo Burnett, president, Leo Burnett Co., Inc.; William G. Chandler, president, Scripps-Howard Supply Co.; Evans Clark, New York, N. Y.; Fairfax M. Cone, president, Foote, Cone & Belding; Felix W. Coste, vice president, The Coca-Cola Co.; David R. Daniel, publisher, The Hartford Times; Richard E. Deems, vice president and general advertising manager, Hearst Magazines, Inc.; Edwin W. Ebel, director of corporate marketing, General Foods Corp.; Philip J. Everest, vice president of sales and promotion, Transportation Displays, Inc.; Harold E. Fellows, president and chairman, National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters; Bennett H. Fishler, editor and publisher, Herald-News and Sunday News, of Ridgewood, N. J.; Edwin S. Friendly, vice president, New York World-Telegram and Sun; Kerwin H. Fulton, president, Outdoor Advertising, Inc.; Samuel C. Gale, vice president and director of advertising and public service, General Mills, Inc.; Frederic R. Gamble, president, American Association of Advertising Agencies; Edward G. Gerbic, vice president of merchandising and advertising, Johnson & Johnson; Philip L. Graham, publisher, The Washington Post and Times Herald; Robert M. Gray, advertising and sales promotion manager, Esso Standard Oil Co.; Arthur P. Hall, vice president in charge of advertising and public relations, Aluminum Company of America; George W. Healy, editor, New Orleans Times-Picayune; Joseph Katz, president, The Joseph Katz Co.; Robert E. Kintner, president, American Broadcasting Co.; Arthur W. Kohler, vice president and advertising director, Curtis Publishing Co.; Chester J. LaRoche, president, C. J. LaRoche & Co., Inc.; Roy E. Larson, president, Time, Inc.; Henry G. Little, president, Campbell-Ewald Co.; George P. Ludlam, vice president, The Advertising Council; Dean James E. McCarthy, director, Outdoor Advertising Foundation, University of Notre Dame; Howard J. Morgens, vice president in charge of advertising, The Procter & Gamble Co.; Charles G. Mortimer, president, General Foods Corp.; Wesley I. Nunn, advertising manager, Standard Oil Co. (Indiana); Harry O'Mealia, Jr., president, O'Mealia Outdoor Advertising Co.; Thomas F. O'Neil, chairman and president, Mutual Broadcasting System; Stuart Peabody, assistant vice president, The Borden Co.; W. B. Potter, director of advertising, Eastman Kodak Co.; Theodore S. Repplier, president, The Advertising Council; William Reydel, vice president, Cunningham & Walsh, Inc.; Burr L. Robbins, president, General Outdoor Advertising Co.; F. Bourne Ruthrauff, vice president, Ruthrauff & Ryan, Inc.; Myles Standish, chairman of the Board, Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc.; Frank Stanton, president, Columbia Broadcasting System; John C. Sterling, publisher, This Week Magazine; J. B. Stewart, treasurer, Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc.; Harold B. Thomas, Stamford, Conn.; J. L. Van Volkenburg, president, Columbia Broadcasting System Television Network; H. M. Warren, vice president of advertising and sales promotion, National Carbon Co.; Sylvester L. Weaver, Jr., president, National Broadcasting Co.; Paul B. West, president, Association of National Advertisers; Allan M. Wilson, vice president, The Advertising Council; Albert E. Winger, Crowell-Collier Publishing Co.; Chris J. Witting, president, Westinghouse Broadcasting Co.; James W. Young, senior consultant, J. Walter Thompson Co.

AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

Advertising Association of the West, Advertising Federation of America, Agricultural Publishers' Association, Associated Business Papers, International Advertising Association, International Affiliation of Sales and Advertising Clubs, National Association of Transportation Advertising, National Editorial Association, National Industrial Advertisers Association, National Retail Dry Goods Association, Newspaper Advertising Executives Association.

CONSTITUENT ORGANIZATIONS

American Association of Advertising Agencies, Association of National Advertisers, Bureau of Advertising of the ANPA, Magazine Publishers Association, National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, Outdoor Advertising Association of America.

PUBLIC POLICY COMMITTEE

Chairman, Paul G. Hoffman, chairman, the Studebaker Corp.; vice chairman, Evans Clark, trustee, Twentieth Century Fund; Dr. Sarah Gibson Blanding, president of Vassar College; Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, director, Department of Trusteeship, United Nations; Olive Clapper, publicist; Chester C. Davis; Henry Fleisher, director of publicity, Congress of Industrial Organizations; Clarence Francis, director, General Foods Corp.; Dr. Alan Gregg, vice president, Rockefeller Foundation; Helen Hall, director, Henry Street Settlement; Dr. Lawrence A. Kimpton, chancellor, University of Chicago; A. E. Lyon, executive secretary, Railway Labor Executives' Association; Eugene Meyer, chairman, board of directors, the Washington Post and Times Herald; Dr. William I. Myers, dean, New York State College of Agriculture at Cornwall University; Elmo Roper, public-opinion analyst; Boris Shishkin, economist, American Federation of Labor; Dr. George N. Shuster, president, Hunter College; Roger W. Straus, chairman, American Smelting & Refining Co.; Reese H. Taylor, president, Union Oil Co. of California; Dr. Henry M. Wriston, president, Brown University.

INDUSTRIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Chairman: Charles E. Wilson, chairman of the executive committee of the board of directors, W. R. Grace & Co.

Vice chairman: Donald David, dean graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University.

Members: S. C. Allyn, president, the National Cash Register Co.; Bromwell Ault, vice president, Interchemical Corp.; Melvin H. Baker, chairman, National Gypsum Co.; William Balderston, president, Philco Corp.; M. J. Baum, executive vice president, Hickey-Freeman Co.; Lawrence D. Bell, president and general manager, Bell Aircraft Corp.; S. Bruce Black, president, Liberty Mutual Insurance Co.; Fred Bohen, president, Meredith Publishing Co.; George P. Brett, Jr., president, the Macmillan Co.; Edward G. Budd, Jr., president, the Budd Co.; Harry A. Bullis, chairman of the board, General Mills, Inc.; M. W. Clement, former chairman of the board, the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.; John S. Coleman, president, Burroughs Adding Machine Co.; John L. Collyer, chairman and chief executive officer, the B. F. Goodrich Co.; George H. Coppers, president, National Biscuit Co.; Harlow H. Curtice, president, General Motors Corp.; E. A. Darr, president, R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.; Leland I. Doan, president, the Dow Chemical Co.; Thomas Drever, chairman, American Steel Foundries; Charles T. Fisher, Jr., president, National Bank of Detroit; Frank M. Folsom, president, Radio Corporation of America; Clarence Francis, director, General Foods Corp.; Joseph G. Griswold, Jr., partner, the Widdicomb Furniture Co.; F. G. Gurley, president, the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway System; Charles B. Harding, senior partner, Smith, Barney & Co.; Thomas J. Hargrave, chairman, Eastman Kodak Co.; Conrad N. Hilton, president, Hilton Hotels; H. E. Humphries, Jr., president, United States Rubber Co.; Roy C. Ingersoll, president, Borg-Warner Corp.; W. A. Johnston, president, Illinois Central Railroad; James S. Knowlson, chairman of the board and president, Stewart-Warner Corp.; Barry T. Leithead, president, Cluett, Peabody & Co., Inc.; J. Preston Levis, chairman of the board, Owens-Illinois Glass Co.; Philip Liebmann, president, Liebmann Breweries, Inc.; John A. Logan, president, National Association of Food Chains; George H. Love, president, Pittsburgh Consolidated Coal Co.; J. Spencer Love, chairman of the executive committee, Burlington Mills Corp.; John L. McCaffrey, president, International Harvester Co.; Neil McElroy, president, the Procter & Gamble Co.; J. A. Martino, president, National Lead Co.; Charles G. Mortimer, president, General Foods Corp.; J. J. Nance, president and general manager, Packard Motor Car Co.; J. B. O'Hara, chairman of the Board, Dr. Pepper Co.; Herbert A. Payne, vice president and secretary, the Home Insurance Co.; Charles S. Payson, chairman of the board, Refined Syrups & Sugars, Inc.; Harris Perlstein, president, Pabst Brewing Co.; Gwilyma A. Price, president, Westinghouse Electric Corp.; W. A. Roberts, president, Allis-Chalmers Mfg. Co.; Reuben B. Robertson, chairman of the board, the Champion Paper and Fiber Co.; T. J. Ross, Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross; Gen. Frank R. Schwengel, president, Joseph E. Seagram & Sons, Inc.; Robert B. Smallwood, president, Thomas J. Lipton, Inc.; J. P. Spang, Jr., president, Gillette Co.; Frederick W. Specht, president, Armour and Co.; Philip Sporn, president, American Gas & Electric Service Corp.; W. A. Stewart, president, American Optical Co.; Charles J. Stilwell, president, the Warner & Swasey Co.; W. C. Stolk, president, American Can Co.; John R. Suman, vice president, Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey); Reese H. Taylor, president, the Union Oil Co. of California; George Van Gorder, president, McKesson & Robbins, Inc.; Robert L. Warren, chairman of the board, Brockway Glass Co., Inc.; James B. Weber, Jr., vice president, the J. L. Hudson Co.; Sidney J. Weinberg, partner, Goldman, Sachs & Co.; C. M. White, president, Republic Steel Corporation; H. Fred Willkie, director, Distillers Corp.-Seagrams, Ltd. (Canada); Dr. Robert E. Wilson, chairman, Standard Oil Co. (Indiana).

CHAIRMAN OF THE GROUP COMMITTEES

Chairman, business paper advisory committee: Nelson Bond, vice president and director of advertising, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.

Chairman, house magazine advisory committee: K. C. Pratt, editor, Stet magazine.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR HUGH BUTLER, OF NEBRASKA

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, it is appropriate, I am sure, that my first remarks in this Chamber pay tribute to our former colleague, Hugh Butler.

The esteem in which he was held was noted by many Senators, on both sides of the aisle, at the time of his death last summer. To me, his loss was the loss of a friend in the truest and noblest sense of friendship. I sought his counsel before seeking membership in the House of Representatives in 1938. Through all my years in the House, I valued his contribution to me as a friend, and as a man of keen judgment and great character.

In his private life, Hugh Butler grew in a manner possible only in America. From a humble beginning, he overcame personal handicap, to gain an education and to earn a prominent role in the business and civic life of his community.

As he prospered, he devoted much of his time and wealth to the welfare of others. His church, his college, and many, many others were the recipients of his bounty.

Hugh Butler's life was marked with personal tragedy. Two sons died in childhood; and his devoted wife, Faye, died as he entered his first term in the Senate. He never overcame this grief, but it served to make him always mindful of another's tribulation. He lived selflessly and generously, devoting both his public and private roles to doing for others.

Perhaps the greatest achievement of Hugh Butler was that, despite his many successes, he lived a simple and frugal life. Whenever he paused in his travels over Nebraska he was among friends. He worked diligently for the people of Nebraska because he had a deep affection for them and he knew and understood their problems.

Success in life varies with individual interpretation. But, I am sure, when defined in the abstract, success is measured by one's contribution to others. If this be true, Hugh Butler was eminently successful. His contributions, both material and spiritual, enriched those who knew him, and will make life better for many who will never have known him.

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF ARMED FORCES TO PROTECT SECURITY OF FORMOSA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 159) authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of September 11, 1954, entitled "Questions on Quemoy," and I should particularly like to have the editorial writer of the Washington Post and Times Herald who wrote the editorial in today's Washington Post and Times Herald, entitled "No Preventive War," which I shall also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following the editorial of September 11, 1954, read the editorial of September 11, 1954, which starts with the sentence:

The defense of Quemoy is not worth risking world war III.

I would like to have him read the entire editorial, then read the joint resolution now before the Senate, and take note of what he clearly knows was the testimony of the Secretary of State and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as to the intention at the present time to defend the islands immediately off the mainland of China.

I say to the editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald that his previous editorial hits the nail right on the head, and with the Nationalist Chinese on Quemoy, there would be a strong probability that American boys would be sacrificed in the defense of the Nationalist Chinese on that island.

Mr. President, I will stand to the last in this debate in voting against the pending resolution until the preventive war objective in the resolution is stricken by a vote on the Humphrey amendment, or the Senate is given some other opportunity to strike it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request?

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of September 11, 1954]

QUESTIONS ON QUEMOY

The defense of Quemoy is not worth risking world war III. That is precisely what the administration will risk, however, if it insists on becoming a little bit pregnant respecting Quemoy; if it envisages a sort of limited defense through support of Chiang Kai-shek. For if the limited defense should fail, as it would in the face of a determined assault, the warhawks would cry defeat, and there would be intense pressure for a direct American tangle with Communist China.

What are the Communist interests in Quemoy? As parties in a civil war the Communist Chinese are, of course, anxious to capture the pair of islands athwart the port of Amoy, islands from which the Nationalists have staged raids and heckling operations. Undoubtedly, too, there is a larger political significance in the threat to Quemoy. In all probability a protected invasion or threat of invasion is designed to lose more face for the United States in Asia to show that here is a situation which the new SEATO pact cannot cope with.

What is the American interest, as distinct from that of Chiang Kai-shek (which is to use the affair as tinder for world war)? Surely our interest is to avoid the trap the Communists have so carefully baited. There is no question of the defense of Formosa, which has become a firm part of national strategy on which almost all Americans can agree. But Quemoy is not essential to the defense of Formosa. It is highly doubtful, given clear evidence of American determination, that the Communists presently contemplate any serious threat to Formosa, since they lack amphibious forces. Quemoy has no place in the pattern of American strategic outposts going from Japan to Okinawa to the Philippines. It is not important at all, except perhaps for a few intelligence operations and considerations of face. But by the same token the successful defense of an island so close to the mainland and within range of Communist jet aircraft would be costly.

Unquestionably the United States will lose some face if the Communists take Quemoy. But we shall assuredly lose less face if we make a hard decision that Quemoy is not essential; if we persuade Chiang Kai-shek to make a thunderous pronouncement and then pull out, than if we march up the hill and then have to back ignominiously down. American strategy must be based on careful consideration of broad objectives, not on the whims of every passing breeze. One of those objectives must be to make our intention absolutely clear to the Communists—and then stick to them. Since Quemoy is not important to larger world strategy, and since we can't defend it, except at unwarranted cost and risk, it will be far better not to confuse the issue with reckless talk in the first place.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 28, 1955]

NO PREVENTIVE WAR

President Eisenhower has given some very necessary reassurance about the Formosa resolution. The purpose of the resolution is to authorize the use of American military forces if necessary in the direct defense of Formosa and the Pescadores (as well as in direct self-defense) and the President personally will retain the decision on any other use. This does not meet all the questions raised about the ambiguities in the resolution, but it certainly should dispel most apprehensions that the authorization could be a mask for preventive war. The President has set his face firmly against any such course. He has demonstrated under trying circumstances that he is a man of peace and that he is not stampeded by risky advice. No one can doubt that he takes his responsibility on this point very seriously indeed, and that he would exercise the highest discretion in protecting the national interest.

Aggression and preventive war were, in fact, most unfortunate words to describe the situation feared by critics of the resolution. Unquestionably, the Senators who used this language were motivated by the deepest concern and patriotism. They feared a situation in which this country could be maneuvered—by its own zealots or by Chiang Kai-shek—into using Armed Forces against the Chinese mainland to prevent a Communist strike against, say, Quemoy rather than against Formosa. Such an involvement would be extremely perilous. Even so, such unlikely action in the face of direct provocation would not constitute aggression or preventive war in the usual meaning of those terms. And the broad meaning of the resolution is to emphasize that the United States harbors no aggressive designs against China.

All the same, the questioning has served a useful purpose. It has demonstrated a considerable feeling—to which the administration has responded—that the Quemoys and Matsus, whatever their bargaining value, are not essential to the defense of Formosa and are not worth a war. Mr. Eisenhower now has gone about as far as he can in meeting these crticisms without diluting the resolution. The niceties of judgment cannot in any event be fixed by legislation, and Senator GEORGE is right in calling for prompt passage of the resolution. In the circumstances it is necessary for the country to trust the President's broad understanding in the use of his powers, many of which he has had all along.

The important thing now is for Congress and the country to display unity and restraint, both in the unequivocal determination to protect Formosa against invasion and in the invitation to Communist China to settle differences by peaceful means.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, previously I asked and obtained unanimous consent to have two editorials printed in the body of the RECORD. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, immediately following those editorials, a brilliant and penetrating article written by Chalmers M. Roberts, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of September 11, 1954. The article is entitled "Question for Ike: War for Quemoy?"

Following the printing of that article, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed an exceedingly thought-provoking article on the entire question of the Asiatic issue, written by Marquis Childs, and appearing in this morning's issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of September 11, 1954]

QUESTION FOR IKE: WAR FOR QUEMOY?

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

The Quemoy question which will be before the National Security Council when it meets Sunday in Denver is another test of America's ability to handle its ultradifficult relationships with Red China without increasing the strain between Washington and other non-Communist capitals and without leading to a major war.

For Quemoy is certainly another example of the Communist tactic of divide and conquer, of playing on every division of opinion in the West in order to paralyze our ability to stand together against a common threat.

One would have thought that long before now the NSC and President Eisenhower would have decided whether or not American Armed Forces would be used to aid the Chinese Nationalist defense of Quemoy and the eight other groups of Nationalist-held islands ranged for several hundred miles along Red China's coast. But that appears not to have been the case and so this Government must make a decision under the pressure of the battlefield at Quemoy.

In that respect the Quemoy situation is similar to the almost-but-not-quite American intervention in Indochina last spring. The same arguments are being advanced by some of the same people, essentially to the effect that the United States cannot afford to allow a new Communist victory in Asia on top of Korea and Indochina.

It is hard to make much of a case, militarily speaking, for the risk of a major war with Red China over any or all of the Nationalist-held islands. Indeed, the Nationalists have voluntarily evacuated three sets of islands since Chiang Kai-shek was forced back on Formosa, two sets of them after the Truman order to the 7th Fleet to defend Formosa.

But the past fluidity of Nationalist policy, depending on Communist pressure, would be replaced by a rigid American policy if the NSC and the President should decide to defend Quemoy and the other islands, come what may.

It is not hard to imagine the emotional effect in the United States of the loss of American seamen and airmen in the defense of Quemoy. Already Chiang's planes are attacking the China mainland and the pressure would quickly be great for American planes to join in because Nationalist capabilities are limited. Chiang's raids are themselves enough to invite retaliatory raids on Formosa by the Communists. American air attacks on the China mainland would certainly offer the Communists an excuse in the world's eyes.

Much of the frustration of the Korean war, in American eyes, was due to the political wraps put on our military against air strikes across the Yalu. It obviously would be difficult, in the current supercharged political atmosphere in America about Red China, to limit our forces should the Reds strike at our ships or at Formosa. And this time there would be no United Nations allies to lay a restraining hand on Washington.

The Indochina affair convinced most of the non-Communist world that there is a strong faction in Washington which favors war with Red China, regardless of how strongly the President later opposed the preventive-war idea. It is widely known that Adm. Arthur W. Radford, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, then talked of striking at communication lines inside Red China and that the Pentagon was discussing use of A-bombs

around Dien Bien Phu. The Quemoy question renews fears in allied capitals that the United States may now be politically incapable of entering into a limited war and that any involvement with Red China would lead to a major conflict.

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles is fond of saying that this country should make its intentions clear so there will be no misunderstanding on the other side, as the Republicans contended in the 1952 campaign had not been the case with Korea. But we have not done that in relation to Quemoy and the related islands though we have over Formosa itself.

Now the United States is forced to make a decision which can be attacked one way as appeasement and the other way as recklessness. A Red Chinese misreading of our intentions could lead to miscalculations and military maneuvers which might set off a chain reaction.

The problem thus is likely to be how to prevent the Quemoy question from becoming such a matter of face that neither America nor Red China can appear to back down. The time, unfortunately, is very late.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald for January 28, 1955]

SENATORS DUBIOUS OVER MILITARY ROLE

(By Marquis Childs)

Once President Eisenhower had put before Congress the resolution asking authority for American air and sea forces to defend Formosa, its swift and virtually unanimous acceptance was inevitable. Any public difference would have been fatal to the effort to demonstrate American unity behind the resolve to hold not alone Formosa but those offshore islands essential to the defense of Formosa.

But some Senators, both Republicans and Democrats, are distinctly unhappy over the abruptness with which the problem was dumped in the lap of Congress. This sudden action came when, as these same Senators point out, it should have been apparent for months that American responsibility had to be more closely defined.

Nothing was done until Red China's attack on Tachen Islands made a decision urgent. The Nationalists could not hold those islands without American support. Once the Communists launched their attack, the military commanders on the spot had to know how far their authority extended.

There also are grave doubts both in the Foreign Relations and the Armed Services Committees of the consequences of this step. While the President insisted it was a move for peace, some Senators feel it can lead to war of indefinite duration and of unforeseeable magnitude.

The attitude of top air and naval commanders is well known. They have talked in the recent past of the inevitability of a showdown and they want that showdown to come as quickly as possible. From the beginning of his tour of duty as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on appointment by President Eisenhower, Adm. Arthur W. Radford has privately urged measures, including a naval blockade, for undermining the power of the Communist regime in China. He has said that America should press such measures even though it might mean an undeclared war of 50 years' duration.

Only a few days before the President asked Congress to act, Radford returned from a swing around the Far East, which included a visit with Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa, and advocated publicly a blockade of China if all other measures for freeing the 11 American fliers should fail. Radford is believed to have been one of those most influential in determining the language of the message to Congress, with its broad scope and the inspired interpretation that it covers the islands of Quemoy and Matsu immediately off the China coast.

But it can be stated with authority that when the Joint Chiefs testified before the Senators in closed session, Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, Chief of Staff of the Army, did not modify the view he has held from the beginning of the controversy over Chinese intervention. Ridgway reaffirmed his opinion that to permit American bombers to attack airports and points of concentration on the China mainland is to invite a full-scale Asian war in which American ground forces certainly will be involved sooner rather than later.

This was Ridgway's viewpoint last September when Radford and Gen. Nathan Twining, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, were urging attacks by American bombers on mainland air bases. At that time the President sided with Ridgway, holding in the National Security Council that the risk of war involved was too great.

The Senators who heard the Joint Chiefs on the President's resolution felt that Radford had finally had his way. In Radford's interpretation the military commanders in the Formosa Straits will have authority to determine what islands are vital to the defense of Formosa. Before the committee Ridgway was a lonely figure. Adm. Robert B. Carney, Chief of Naval Operations, sided with Twining and Radford.

Those Senators who fear an incident, or a series of incidents, that will mean all-out war in Asia have a sense of helplessness before the present situation. They are asking questions for which there seem to be no definite answers. If, for example, there are American casualties as a result of American efforts to help the Nationalist Chinese evacuate the Tachen Islands, will American commanders then have the authority to bomb Chinese airbases and naval centers? And will such bombings not precipitate the kind of war that the President said so earnestly in his message he wishes to avoid?

That, in the view of the doubters, is one of the weaknesses of the President's message. It leaves so many undefined areas. And determined men, who know what they want in relation to China policy, can move into those areas and take over.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in line with my action of yesterday, I wish to state that I have before me some editorials and articles taken from this morning's newspapers which have a direct bearing on the very important joint resolution now pending before the Senate. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, in connection with the pending debate, the following articles:

First, an article entitled "Senator GEORGE's Speech Hailed as Thrilling Show of Spirit," written by David Lawrence and published in today's issue of the New York Herald Tribune.

Second, an editorial entitled "Formosa 'Redeployment'," which was published in today's issue of the New York Times.

Third, portions of an article entitled "The 'Old Man' Lays It on the Line," written by Arthur Krock and published in today's issue of the New York Times. The title of the article is a very friendly reference to the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate [Mr. GEORGE], and I wish to have these portions published in the RECORD, in connection with the pending debate.

Finally, Mr. President, let me state there appears in today's issue of the New York Times the text of an important speech by Gen. Douglas MacArthur, delivered in Los Angeles, Calif., before the Los Angeles County Council of the American Legion, on the occasion of the dedication of a monument to General MacArthur in MacArthur Park. I consider the speech to be an important contribution to the pending discussion of our world affairs.

I ask unanimous consent to have all these matters printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles, editorials, and speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 28, 1955]

TODAY IN WASHINGTON—SENATOR GEORGE'S SPEECH HAILED AS THRILLING SHOW OF SPIRIT

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, January 27.—Seldom in the history of the United States Senate has there been an address of statesmanship comparable to that delivered by Senator WALTER GEORGE, of Georgia, Democrat, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, as he upheld President Eisenhower's request for unrestricted authority to use the Armed Forces to defend Formosa and the American defense line in the Far East.

In contrast to the petty quibbles of some of his colleagues and the narrow interpretations which they interjected to hamstring the American Armed Forces if they should be attacked from the small islands off the coast of China, the Georgia Senator made clear in his speech that this is not the time to give the enemy a privileged sanctuary of retreat, as was the case in Korea.

THRILLING EXHIBITION

Such Americanism is a thrilling exhibition of the spirit that has governed the Nation in all its past crises. It was especially stimulating to hear this doctrine from the lips of this Senator—a veteran in experience in foreign affairs—as he cast aside all partisanship and focused on the central issue.

For, instead of leading to a "preventive war"—which is the smokescreen raised against all proper defense measures whenever it suits critics to use that term to break down American firmness—Senator GEORGE showed how the American policy could deter the aggressor, prevent a big war from happening, and insure peace.

"I ask each man here," declared Senator GEORGE, "if the Congress of the United States is willing to withhold its moral support from the President of the United States under these circumstances, what is your alternative? I ask each man what is his alternative?"

This was a challenging point addressed to the restrictions—those who would, in effect, notify the enemy that American ships could be fired on and that the American Congress was unwilling to vote the authority to fire back.

Senator GEORGE's most telling point—and one that was persuasively presented, too, by Senator KNOWLAND, Republican leader, in the previous day's debate—is that nobody knows from what point Formosa might be attacked and that it is imperative to notify the Red Chinese there would be unrestricted retaliation.

The effectiveness of the resolution is that it tells the whole world America not only will defend Formosa but will not hesitate to bomb the approaches within a radius of several hundred miles if such a step becomes necessary to protect American ships and military installations.

The same old cry—which has been heard again and again in instances of appeasement or in episodes in which there has been a fateful hesitation—has been repeated this week in the Senate. It is that the passage of the resolution might bring on war. Risks

are always present in the evolution of international policy, but an unwillingness to make a clear statement of what counterforce will be brought to bear against an attacking force can only lead, as it has many times before, to an outbreak of a major war. The London Daily Mail in an editorial says that such a clear warning as President Eisenhower can give by means of the joint resolution might—if issued before 1914 and 1939—have prevented two world wars.

More and more Members of the Senate have begun to see the joint resolution not as a narrow legalistic instrument of international policy but as a pronouncement on a moral issue—to make the aggressors respect the neutrality of Formosa. For Formosa today has not been given to the regime on the mainland because it has violated international obligations, including a flagrant act of aggression in Korea.

The Chiang Kai-shek Government is still the recognized Government of China so far as the United States is concerned. Under international law, any request for military help from a recognized government is granted in accord with tradition and custom.

REQUIREMENTS MET

So the resolution now before Congress meets all the requirements of international law and at the same time confirms the right of the United States to protect its military position in the Far East. Some people in the Senate have forgotten that it was from Formosa that the Japanese planes launched their attack which caused our defeat in the Philippines in 1942. Had America been able to dominate the air a few hundred miles around Formosa, the surrender at Bataan would never have occurred.

The President has wisely assured Congress that he alone, as Commander in Chief, will make the decision as to when measures of retaliation against an attacking force will be ordered. For it will be within his power to order American forces to repel attack and also to go as far out as necessary in pursuit of enemy planes. Had the United States forces been given that right, they would have won a victory in Korea.

[From the New York Times of January 28, 1955]

FORMOSA "REDEPLOYMENT"

In the discussion of Formosa policy the "redeployment" of Chinese Nationalist forces, to which reference has been repeatedly made, means at this stage the evacuation of the Tachen Island group. As matters stand, the Chinese Nationalist Government has apparently given its consent to such a move and naval and air forces of the United States are in position to make it possible.

This seems on the whole to be a wise decision on both sides. The Tachen group is the least important and least defensible of the offshore islands that are held by the Chinese Nationalists. It is more than 200 miles from Formosa. It is less than 15 miles from the Chinese mainland. It is in a peculiarly exposed position because it lies within close striking distance of two important Chinese Communist airbases in Chekiang Province. It is now established that the Communists have had air control over the islands for some time, in spite of the fact that the Nationalists are still raiding against the recently captured island of Yikiang.

The Nationalist garrison on the Tachens, unlike that on Yikiang, which was a "guerrilla" group, is a regular division of the Chinese Nationalist Army, well trained and American-equipped. If the Communists decide that their losses in taking the Tachens by military action are worth the gain, such a garrison can be wiped out. It may be wiser to save it for another day.

This situation is not new. The offshore island positions have always been vulnerable. How wise it was to hold them, from the beginning, is still an open question. An early Communist attempt to overrun one of them, Quemoy, was beaten off early in the contest with heavy losses, but that situation could not continue indefinitely. These positions were and are at best far from invincible redoubts, close to the enemy. They are valuable as information posts and as part of a warning network. They are not part of a line that requires defense at all costs.

Naturally, the Chinese Nationalists have been reluctant to make any sort of withdrawal move. From 1949 to 1954 they held these outposts without Communist challenge. Their retreat had ended. There was no major loss after that of Hainan. It was good for Nationalist morale to be aware of this fact and to know that there were still close offshore positions that the Communists did not choose to attack.

Positions other than that in the Tachens have also had great value in restricting shipping into Amoy and Foochow. Those positions are still held and they are a factor in the pressure that is being brought to bear on the Peiping regime through economic channels. This does not apply, however, to the Tachen group, whose value was almost entirely that of a forward information post.

That the United States should take naval and air action to cover a retirement from the Tachens is certainly not belligerent or aggressive. It is an action closely linked to the ultimate defense of Formosa and the Pescadores, to which we are pledged, since it involves the preservation of a defense force which can be used elsewhere.

Moreover, while Taipei has strongly protested against any linking of this redeployment to the suggestion of a cease-fire, it should be obvious that the United States is committed to confining, rather than enlarging, any possible hostilities in the Formosa Strait. If the Communists choose to try to interfere with any withdrawal move there will probably be shooting, but it will be of their making, not ours. And such shooting, certainly, is not risking "global war."

Another problem arises in connection with any withdrawal on which nothing definitive has thus far been said. In addition to the military garrison on the Tachens there is a small civilian population. It is probable that most of these civilians would prefer to get to Formosa rather than to take a chance on their fate at the hands of Communist "liberators" of the islands. One contingent, in which children seem to have been in the majority, has been taken off and landed in Taipei. There is, however, no policy as yet in regard to the population as a whole. This, surely, is a matter that can and should be clarified both there and here.

The loss of the Tachens, in the long run, will be less serious than their continued presence as a point at which trouble could and undoubtedly would arise. In this sense their value is less than their handicap. Redeployment can make Formosa stronger. It can also lessen the chances of an explosion. In aiding this move we work for peace.

[From the New York Times of January 28, 1955]

IN THE NATION—THE 'OLD MAN' LAYS IT ON THE LINE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 27.—The chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, whose affectionate and reverent soubriquet is "the old man," went at once to the heart of the issue today when he opened the formal Senate debate on the Formosa-Pescadores resolution. "I ask each man," he cried, "what is his alternative?" And with that question Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, also put on the defensive his colleagues who were attacking the resolution and seeking either substantially to amend it or write a substitute.

Shall Congress tell the President, before the world, that whatever the Chinese Reds may do in the meantime he must immobilize the 7th Fleet and the Air Force until the United Nations has negotiated a cease-fire in the Formosa Strait or reported its inability to arrange it? Shall Congress tell the President, before the world, that it can approve a defense of Formosa and the Pescadores only with the proviso that in no circumstances shall he order the United States commanders to adjust the strategy of that defense to developments? Shall Congress, by adopting either position, thus notify the Chinese Reds in advance that if the President finds it essential to give such orders the other policy-activating arm of the American Government is alined with them in opposition and protest?

These questions are implicit in Senator GEORGE's inquiry. And, because they are, a large majority of his Senate colleagues are certain to answer them in the negative. Even though those who would substantially amend or supplant the resolution deny that the questions arise logically from their positions, and regardless of the skill with which their denials are expounded, the above are the only alternatives save one that can serve as answers to GEORGE's inquiry. And that exception—to abandon Formosa and the Pescadores to an attack by the Chinese Reds—is advocated by no Member of Congress.

THE PRESIDENT'S PLEDGE

Before GEORGE spoke the President dealt squarely with an issue raised by sincere congressional critics of the resolution that has troubled many others outside the Capitol who are equally sincere in raising it. This issue is that approval of the resolution by Congress means approval of that preventive war which they see as the possible consequence of the President's Far Eastern policy. General Eisenhower's statement was that, if the military protection of Formosa and the Pescadores is to expand beyond immediate self-defense or direct defense of the islands, he alone as Commander in Chief will make that decision and give that order—not Chiang Kai-shek or any American military commander. He is irrevocably pledged against preventive war, and to support this concept of the effects of approving the resolution the critics now must either dispute his honor or challenge his military capacity to know what is preventive war and what is not.

Senator MORSE yesterday anticipated Senator GEORGE's inquiry by advocating what he said was an alternative to the resolution. "I know," he said, "one of the arguments or rationalizations being used * * * in justifying following the course of action to which this resolution may lead is that we have to run the calculated risks of war. In answer * * * I plead with my Government and with my people also to show a sufficient determination to run the calculated risks of peace. [These] mean, in my opinion, that we must face the calculated risk of the Red Chinese massing forces in China without striking them unless they actually commit an act of war."

WHAT IS "AN ACT OF WAR"?

But the classification of this as an alternate is itself open to two questions. What will be an act of war in the unforeseeable circumstances? And has the President ever advocated that the United States, alone, strike the Chinese Reds until and unless they commit one? A massing of Red forces on the mainland shore opposite Formosa must, in the light of repeated announcements by Peiping, be evaulated as antecedent to obvious attack on the island. But until and unless the purpose is essentially furthered by assaults on the direct approaches to Formosa, the clear indication is that the President would not define it per se as an act of war.

As Senator GEORGE pointed out today, there is no commonsense, or military sense, or any sense at all in giving advance specifications

to a hostile government of exactly where, and on what manifestations, the line of defense will be drawn against its aggression. Consequently the President will not give them. And if this were not commended by every sensible consideration, the grievous history of the public limitations placed on the United Nations forces in Korea would alone be sufficient to commend it. Should the absence of such specifications make it more difficult for Peiping to make plans, and it will, so much the better for our side.

[From the New York Times of January 28, 1955]

TEXT OF GENERAL MACARTHUR'S TALK IN LOS ANGELES

Your excellency, your honor, Judge Pfaff, Commander Goshaw, and all those present tonight in this distinguished assemblage, seldom in history has living man been honored as this famous community of Los Angeles has honored me today. You have etched in my heart an unforgettable memory of patriotic fervor and national devotion. You have aroused an indelible emotion of gratitude that I am unable to express adequately in words. Yet, the reality of life enables me to apply an appraising perspective; to understand that your action springs not so much from a desire to memorialize a personality as to proclaim a people's adherence to ideals long ago fabricated into the warp and woof of what is called the American way of life. That you have chosen me to symbolize this rich heritage of principles is an honor which makes me feel far greater than any just merit; that my name should stand for the millions of unnamed others whose faith and courage built the immortal way from which was fashioned the true greatness of our country creates within me a feeling of humility far in excess of all possible pride. It makes me revere the stars in our flag far more than any stars on my shoulders.

I am so grateful to all who have wished me birthday greetings. I know such expressions of good will would have brightened the eyes of that gentle Virginia lady, my mother, on this her day. Thank you—thank you in her name again and again—and, as "old soldiers never die," I promise to keep on living as though I expected to live forever. That famous barrack-room ballad apparently counts on us, those old soldiers who have escaped the carnage of the battlefield, to find the fountain of youth. And, indeed, we might if we only understood what the poet said, that youth is not entirely a time of life—it is a state of mind. It is not wholly a matter of ripe cheeks, red lips or supple knees. It is a temper of the will, a quality of the imagination, a vigor of the emotions, a freshness of the deep springs of life. It means a temperamental predominance of courage over timidity, of an appetite for adventure over love of ease. Nobody grows old by merely living a number of years. People grow old only by deserting their ideals. Years may wrinkle the skin, but to give up interest wrinkles the soul. Worry, doubt, self-distrust, fear and despair—these are the long, long years that bow the head and turn the growing spirit back to dust. Whatever your years, there is in every being's heart the love of wonder, the undaunted challenge of events, the unfailing childlike appetite for what next, and the joy and the game of life. You are as young as your faith, as old as your doubt; as young as your self-confidence, as old as your fear; as young as your hope, as old as your despair. In the central place of every heart there is a recording chamber; so long as it receives messages of beauty, hope, cheer and courage, so long are you young. When the wires are all down and your heart is covered with the snows of pessimism and the ice of cynicism, then, and then only are you grown old—and then, indeed, as the ballad says, you just fade away.

TRACES WAR'S HISTORY

Many in this brilliant audience were my comrades-in-arms in the days of used-to-be. They have known war in all its horror and, as veterans, hope against its recurrence. How, we ask ourselves, did such an institution become so integrated with man's life and civilization? How has it grown to be the most vital factor in our existence? It started in a modest enough way as a sort of gladiatorial method of settling disputes between conflicting tribes. One of the oldest and most classical examples is the biblical story of David and Goliath. Each of the two contesting groups selected its champion. They fought and based upon the outcome an agreement resulted. Then, as time went on, small professional groups known as armies replaced the individual champions. And these groups fought in some obscure corner of the world and victory or defeat was accepted as the basis of an ensuing peace. And from then on, down through the ages, the constant record is an increase in the character and strength of the forces with the rate of increase always accelerating. From a small percentage of the populace it finally engulfed all. It is now the nation in arms.

Within the span of my own life I have witnessed this evolution. At the turn of the century, when I entered the Army, the target was one enemy casualty at the end of a rifle or bayonet or sword. Then came the machine gun designed to kill by the dozen. After that, the heavy artillery raining death upon the hundreds. Then the aerial bomb to strike by the thousands—followed by the atom explosion to reach the hundreds of thousands. Now, electronics and other processes of science have raised the destructive potential to encompass millions. And with restless hands we work feverishly in dark laboratories to find the means to destroy all at one blow.

CITES WAR'S BURDEN

But, this very triumph of scientific annihilation—this very success of invention—has destroyed the possibility of war being a medium of practical settlement of international differences. The enormous destruction to both sides of closely matched opponents makes it impossible for the winner to translate it into anything but his own disaster.

The Second World War, even with its now antiquated armaments, clearly demonstrated that the victor had to bear in large part the very injuries inflicted on his foe. Our own country spent billions of dollars and untold energies to heal the wounds of Germany and Japan. War has become a Frankenstein to destroy both sides. No longer is it the weapon of adventure whereby a shortcut to international power and wealth—a place in the sun—can be gained. If you lose, you are annihilated. If you win, you stand only to lose. No longer does it possess the chance of the winner of a duel—it contains rather the germs of double suicide. Science has clearly outmoded it as a feasible arbiter. The great question is—does this mean that war can now be outlawed from the world? If so, it would mark the greatest advance in civilization since the Sermon on the Mount. It would lift at one stroke the darkest shadow which has engulfed mankind from the beginning. It would not only remove fear and bring security—it would not only create new moral and spiritual values—it would produce an economic wave of prosperity that would raise the world's standard of living beyond anything ever dreamed of by man. The hundreds of billions of dollars now spent in mutual preparedness could conceivably abolish poverty from the face of the globe. It would accomplish even more than this; it would at one stroke reduce the international tensions that seem so insurmountable now to matters of more probable solution. For instance, the complex problems of German rearmament, of preventive war, of satellite dominance by major powers, of universal military service, of unconscionable taxation, of nuclear development for industry, of freer exchange of goods and people, of foreign aid and, indeed, of all issues involving the application of armed force. It would have equally potent political effects. It would reduce immeasurably the power of leaders of Government and thus render more precarious totalitarian or autocratic rule. The growing and dangerous control by an individual over the masses—the socialistic and paternal trends resulting therefrom—is largely by virtue of his influence to induce war or to maintain peace. Abolish this threat and the position of chief magistrate falls into a more proper civic perspective.

HOLDS WAR BAN POSSIBLE

You will say at once that although the abolition of war has been the dream of man for centuries every proposition to that end has been promptly discarded as impossible and fantastic. Every cynic, every pessimist, every adventurer, every swash-buckler in the world has always disclaimed its feasibility. But that was before the science of the past decade made mass destruction a reality. The argument then was that human character has never reached a theological development which would permit the application of pure idealism. In the last 2,000 years its rate of change has been deplorably slow, compared to that of the arts and sciences. But now the tremendous and present evolution of nuclear and other potentials of destruction has suddenly taken the problem away from its primary consideration as a moral and spiritual question and brought it abreast of scientific realism. It is no longer an ethical equation to be pondered solely by learned philosophers and ecclesiastics but a hard core one for the decision of the masses whose survival is the issue. This is as true of the Soviet side of the world as of the free side—as true behind the Iron Curtain as in front of it. The ordinary people of the world, whether free or slave, are all in agreement on this solution; and this perhaps is the only thing in the world they do agree upon. But it is the most vital and determinate of all. The leaders are the laggards. The disease of power seems to confuse and befuddle them. They have not even approached the basic problem, much less evolved a working formula to implement this public demand. They debate and turmoil over a hundred issues—they bring us to the verge of despair or raise our hopes to Utopian heights over the corollary misunderstandings that stem from the threat of war—but never in the chancelleries of the world or the halls of the United Nations is the real problem raised. Never do they dare to state the bald truth, that the next great advance in the evolution of civilization cannot take place until war is abolished. It may take another cataclysm of destruction to prove to them this simple truth. But, strange as it may seem, it is known now by all common men. It is the one issue upon which both sides can agree, for it is the one issue upon which both sides will profit equally. It is the one issue—and the only decisive one—in which the interests of both are completely parallel. It is the one issue which, if settled, might settle all others.

A MATTER OF PROFIT

Time has shown that agreements between modern nations are generally no longer honored as valid unless both profit therefrom. But both sides can be trusted when both do profit. It becomes then no longer a problem based upon relative integrity. It is now no longer convincing to argue, whether true or not, that we cannot trust the other side—that one maverick can destroy the herd. It would no longer be a matter depending upon trust—the self-interest

of each nation outlawing war would keep it true to itself. And there is no influence so potent and powerful as self-interest. It would not necessarily require international inspection of relative armaments—the public opinion of every part of the world would be the great denominator which would insure the issue—each nation would so profit that it could not fail eventually to comply. This would not, of course, mean the abandonment of all armed forces but it would reduce them to the simpler problems of internal order and international police. It would not mean utopia at one fell stroke, but it would mean that the great roadblock now existing to development of the human race would have been cleared.

The present tensions with their threat of national annihilation are kept alive by two great illusions. The one, a complete belief on the part of the Soviet world that the capitalist countries are preparing to attack them; that sooner or later we intend to strike. And the other, a complete belief on the part of the capitalistic countries that the Soviets are preparing to attack us; that sooner or later they intend to strike. Both are wrong. Each side, so far as the masses are concerned, is equally desirous of peace. For either side war with the other would mean nothing but disaster. Both equally dread it. But the constant acceleration of preparation may well, without specific intent, ultimately produce a spontaneous combustion.

I am sure that every pundit in the world, every cynic and hypocrite, every paid brainwasher, every egotist, every troublemaker, and many others of entirely different mold, will tell you with mockery and ridicule that this can be only a dream—that it is but the vague imaginings of a visionary. But, as David Lloyd George once said in Commons at the crisis of the First World War, "We must go on or we will go under." And the great criticism we can make of the world's leaders is their lack of a plan which will enable us to go on. All they propose merely gravitates around but dares not face the real problem. They increase preparedness by alliances, by distributing resources throughout the world, by feverish activity in developing new and deadlier weapons, by applying conscription in times of peace—all of which is instantly matched by the prospective opponent. We are told that this increases the chances of peace—which is doubtful—and increases the chances of victory if war comes—which would be incontestable if the other side did not increase in like proportion. Actually, the truth is that the relative strengths of the two change little with the years. Action by one is promptly matched by reaction from the other.

LOOKS FOR A PURPOSE

We are told we must go on indefinitely as at present—some say 50 years or more. With what at the end? None say—there is no definite objective. They but pass along to those that follow the search for a final solution. And, at the end, the problem will be exactly the same as that which we face now. Must we live for generations under the killing punishment of accelerating preparedness without an announced final purpose or, as an alternative, suicidal war; and trifle in the meanwhile with corollary and indeterminate theses—such as limitation of armament, restriction on the use of nuclear power, adoption of new legal standards as propounded at Nuremberg—all of which are but palliatives and all of which in varying form have been tried in the past with negligible results? Dangerous doctrines, too, appear—doctrines which might result in actual defeat; such doctrines as a limited war, of enemy sanctuary, of failure to protect our fighting men when captured, of national subversive and sabotage agencies, of a substitute for victory on the battlefield—all in the name of peace. Peace, indeed, can be obtained at least temporarily by any nation if it is prepared to yield its freedom principles. But peace at any price—peace with appeasement—peace which passes the dreadful finality to future generations—is a peace of sham and shame which can end only in war or slavery.

I recall so vividly this problem when it faced the Japanese in their new constitution. They are realists; and they are the only ones that know by dread experience the fearful effect of mass annihilation. They realize in their limited geographical area, caught up as a sort of no-man's land between two great ideologies, that to engage in another war, whether on the winning or the losing side, would spell the probable doom of their race. And their wise old Prime Minister, Shidehara, came to me and urged that to save themselves they should abolish war as an international instrument. When I agreed, he turned to me and said, "The world will laugh and mock us as impractical visionaries, but a hundred years from now we will be called prophets."

Sooner or later the world, if it is to survive, must reach this decision. The only question is, When? Must we fight again before we learn? When will some great figure in power have sufficient imagination and moral courage to translate this universal wish, which is rapidly becoming a universal necessity, into actuality? We are in a new era. The old methods and solutions no longer suffice. We must have new thoughts, new ideas, new concepts, just as did our venerated forefathers when they faced a new world. We must break out of the straitjacket of the past. There must always be one to lead, and we should be that one. We should now proclaim our readiness to abolish war in concert with the great powers of the world. The result would be magical.

TURNS TO FAR EAST

This may sound somewhat academic in view of the acuteness of the situation in the Far East. Strategically, the problem there has developed along classical lines—the familiar case of a concentrated enemy in a central position deployed against scattered allies. Red China, inherently weak in industrial output for modern war but strong in manpower, engaged on three fronts—Korea, Indochina, and in civil war with Nationalist China. Fighting on all three simultaneously meant defeat, but individually the chances were excellent. The hope for victory depended on getting a cease-fire on some fronts so that the full potential of its limited military might could be thrown against the remaining one or ones. That is what has happened and is happening. First was the cessation of the civil-war action by the isolation in the Formosa area, which practically immobilized Nationalist China, one of the allies. Red China then concentrated against Korea and Indochina. But even the double front was too much for its strained resources, so a cease-fire was obtained in Korea. This immobilized the so-called United Nations forces and the South Koreans and left Red China free to concentrate on the third front, Indochina and the French.

Successful there, the Reds now turn back to the old first front located in Formosa. As Napoleon Bonaparte once said: "Give me allies as an enemy so that I can defeat them one by one."

Militarily the situation demonstrates the inherent weakness of the theory of collective security—the chain is no stronger than its weakest link, and what is even more vital—its full power can only be utilized when all links are brought simultaneously into action. The diverse interests of allies always tend toward separation rather than unity.

Whatever betides the ultimate fate of the Far East, and indeed of the world, will not be settled by force of arms. We may all be practically annihilated, but war can no longer be an arbiter of survival.

I cannot close without once more thanking this beautiful city of Los Angeles for its gracious hospitality. It has been an inspiration to be here, where missions once stood as lonely outposts in the advance of our Christian civilization, but where this great metropolis now stands as a monument to American industry and adventure, a symbolic reminder of Californian strength and fortitude. I hate to leave, but, as I once pledged under very different circumstances, I shall return.

Mr. LEHMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield for that purpose and with that understanding.

Mr. MORSE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, at the outset I should like to say, in order to maintain the continuity of my arguments, I shall not yield during the course of my speech.

The decisions we are about to make have a gravity which cannot and should not be concealed from the American people.

The administration desires on the one hand a clear affirmation of congressional support for a policy of calculated risk—an affirmation designed, we are told, to serve notice upon the Chinese Communists that they must not, at their peril, engage in certain aggressive acts. On the other hand, the administration desires to avoid alarming the American people and our allies in Europe and to reassure them that the policy in question is designed to prevent war, rather than to bring it about.

This is a delicate and difficult undertaking at best. I am not sure it has been well done. For its success requires the highest order of confidence by the American people, and by our allies, in the discretion, skill, and ingenuity of those who today conduct our diplomatic and military affairs. It requires of us all that we have an implicit faith that every one of these officials is passionately attached to the quest for peace.

Each of us must search his own heart, mind, and conscience to determine whether both these conditions are fully met today.

We are told that there is an urgent necessity for the passage of this resolution. Yet at the same time the President told us that, in his opinion, he already has all the legal authority he needs to perform the acts he proposes to perform under the terms of the pending resolution.

If this is so—and I do not for a moment dispute his assertion without knowing in complete detail what acts he contemplates—why the rush, why the haste to pass this resolution?

I have heard, Mr. President, assertions by responsible spokesmen for the administration that this resolution is desired

in order to make clear that the Congress stands behind the President in the policy we are pursuing in the Far East. But it is not clear to me, Mr. President, what that policy consists of.

If that policy consists of the determination to defend Formosa and the Pescadores, I am wholeheartedly for it and I am ready to vote for a resolution which gives congressional sanction to that policy.

But that policy includes other things—things which are suggested and inferred in the resolution and which are to be understood only by reference to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] on the floor yesterday.

If the policy the Congress is asked to support in this resolution is the policy of defending the Quemoy Island group and the Matsu Island group and the Tachen Island group, right off the mainland of China, I am not for that part of the policy.

Senator KNOWLAND said on the floor yesterday that this is the policy of the United States and that it has already been arranged for United States air and naval forces to assist Chiang Kai-shek in deploying his forces in that area, and that if our planes and ships were fired on, we would undoubtedly fire back. I, myself, with my vote, would not approve activities by our Armed Forces which would involve us in such a situation.

If the President sees fit, on the basis of his own responsibility, to direct the Armed Forces of the United States to engage in such an operation, it is his responsibility, and what happens thereafter is his responsibility, although he may later need to come to Congress to justify its consequences.

But I am not going to support a congressional sanction for these activities. I repeat that I am glad to support a congressional sanction for the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores. That is the furthest I want to go.

The language of the resolution itself does not specify what further activities the resolution is designed to authorize beyond the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores, but it does contain a blank-check provision, to which I shall refer in a moment.

Certainly I have not been told—and the public has not been told, except by Senator KNOWLAND—what the administration contemplates under the terms of the "blank check" it is proposed we write.

It is for this reason, Mr. President, that I want to study this resolution and all the facts and statements concerning this resolution at much greater length and with much greater care than I have thus far had an opportunity to do.

Mr. President, I am being asked as a Member of the Senate, and as a representative in this body of the 15 million people of New York State, to cast my vote for a proposal which is more important than any other proposition which has come before this body in the 6 years I have been a Member.

Surely a resolution so full of significance for our country, so important to every man, woman, and child in this country, could well be subjected to even more careful scrutiny—line by line and word by word—than has been possible.

I mean no disrespect to the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees, which have, I know, studied this resolution as diligently and intensively as was possible under the administration's persistent demands for haste.

I mean no disrespect to the distinguished chairmen of these two great committees who, as I understand, gave every opportunity, under the circumstances, for the questioning of the administration spokesmen on this grave matter.

But I, for one, Mr. President, think that every sentence of this resolution could well have been subjected to days of inquiry, as to its meaning. I would have liked to have heard, from official sources, some explanation of what appear to me to be extraordinary contradictions between, first, what is contained in the resolution; second, what is apparently being told our allies abroad about the meaning of the resolution; and, third, what is being told to journalists in this country for background purposes.

Yesterday the great and distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, our eminent colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]—for whom no other Senator has higher respect and regard than I have—argued at great length about the necessity of defending Formosa. I do not believe there is a Member of this body—certainly not I—who differs with Senator GEORGE by one iota in this regard. I am strongly in favor of a resolution, since the President has asked for it, that affirms congressional support for the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

I am glad that President Eisenhower was so deeply impressed with the questions which I and some of my colleagues have raised that he saw fit to issue a statement reassuring us that a preventive war was not contemplated under the terms of this resolution, that he would not delegate to any other official the blank-check authority contained in this resolution, and that he alone would make whatever decisions are to be made under this authority.

Mr. President, I have great confidence in the personal integrity and patriotism of President Eisenhower. I appreciate his recognition of the fears that some of us have expressed and his desire to quiet these fears. But he has quitted them only in small measure.

He has not reassured me concerning his intentions with regard to the Quemoy group, and the Matsu group, and the Tachen Island group. He has not indicated to me any reason why the blank-check language should be contained in the resolution. Nor has he explained why there should be no reference to the United Nations in the resolution.

Mr. President, there are many aspects to the pending issue—the issue posed by this resolution, which, I, myself, for lack of expert competence, would not undertake to discuss.

For example, there is the problem of the precedent it establishes involving Congress in responsibility for those aspects of the conduct of military affairs and foreign relations which the Constitution entrusts to the President. As I have said, I do not propose to enter into that discussion. Others are better qualified than I to debate this matter. However, I cannot help but remark that in this aspect, this resolution seems to be an attempt to satisfy those in the Congress who feel that the Congress, and not the President, should conduct our foreign relations and participate in the military decisions of the President as commander in chief.

But, Mr. President, this aspect of the pending matter, while undoubtedly important, does not, for the moment, concern me so much as does the central question: Does this resolution, in its present form, contribute or detract from the maintenance of peace, security, and free world unity?

Mr. President, I would be false to myself if I did not say that this resolution, in its present form, disturbs, troubles and alarms me greatly.

Some of its language inspires grave doubts—the phrase about the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands and the taking of such other measures as he (the President) judges to be required or appropriate.

Mr. President, what does that language mean?

What is it, other than a blank check, signed by the Congress, for such action as the President or his military advisers should decide to take—action that can or may easily involve us in war.

Now, if the President feels that certain action is necessary to defend the United States and the interests of the United States—action that is within his constitutional powers—let him take that action. That is his duty and his responsibility. It is then up to him to justify it to the Congress, to the country—and to history.

But why should we in the Congress authorize and sanction such unspecified action in advance? Why should we write and sign this blank check?

Are we justified in the discharge of our duties and responsibilities as Senators, in affixing our name and authority to this sweeping grant of unchecked and unlimited power?

Ours is the responsibility to authorize specific action, and to authorize and to appropriate funds for specific and general activities and to judge, after the fact, whether the President acted in accordance with his powers and responsibilities. Surely our duty is not to sanction in advance unspecified acts which are within the implicit powers and responsibilities of the President.

If this portion of the resolution proposes to give the President powers which he does not now have, I want to know for what I am voting.

If this portion of the resolution merely approves in advance actions which the President already has the power to take, I think it is not only unnecessary but unwise.

And, Mr. President, I am further disturbed by the reference in this resolution to the mutual-defense treaty between the United States and the Repub-

lic of China, meaning Chiang Kai-shek. This treaty has not yet been approved by the Senate. It has, as yet, no force and effect. I, myself, have strong reservations about some aspects of that proposed treaty. Yet here in this resolution, this unratified treaty is cited as partial authority for the action proposed to be taken under the terms of this resolution.

Mr. President, I feel that this is wrong. It is like making an appropriation for an activity not yet authorized, regarding which there is doubt and controversy.

Further, Mr. President, this resolution is silent concerning the implementation of that purpose which many of us have urged and which the President has publicly endorsed, namely, to ask the United Nations to take jurisdiction and to direct a cease-fire as between the Communists and the forces of Chiang Kai-shek.

Mr. President, this resolution, in its present form, authorizes and endorses unilateral action in an area and in a situation which calls, above all, for united action—for action by all peace-loving nations, through the organization established to advance the cause of peace and security—the United Nations.

Whatever the difficulties in securing United Nations action, such action is our best and foremost hope. If the Congress is to act in this matter at all, the Congress surely should call for the intervention of the United Nations and ask that the organization designed for just such situations as this—where the peace and security of the world is threatened—assert the moral and physical authority of mankind.

To do otherwise, for Congress to authorize and endorse simply unilateral action, is to turn our backs on the United Nations and to serve notice that we have lost faith in the United Nations. This is, in my judgment, a tragic error, one of the worst committed by this resolution.

Mr. President, we are truly at the crossroads. In one direction lies the firming up of the possibilities of peace. In the other, lies grave danger for the cause of peace.

Not only can one false step—one rash or reckless action—involve us in a war of terrible magnitude; it can also, Mr. President, involve us in a war in which we could be without allies—stripped, isolated, and alone.

We must take the way that points toward peace. In that direction lies the best hope for uniting not only our country, but the entire free world.

We must frankly recognize that our China policy has not had the support of free mankind. We have been out of step with most of the rest of the world. This is not the time to dispute the absolute rightness or wrongness of our policy. It is surely not the time to try to force a military test of that policy.

We can, however, now try to bring free world support to a portion of that policy—the separation of Formosa and the Pescadores from the China mainland, and the maintenance of the security of Formosa and the Pescadores against Communist aggression.

But this cannot and will not, I fear, be done by extending the mantle of our protection to the very tidelands of the Chinese mainland.

The Congress cannot and must not take the position—actual or implicit—that American blood will flow, if need be, for the defense of Quemoy and Matsu, on the very doorstep of China proper. Those islands, from time immemorial, have been part of China proper. There is no juridical, legal, or historical basis for separating, alienating, or neutralizing those doorstep islands.

We have a legal and historical justification for intervening in behalf of the security of Formosa and the Pescadores which we and our associated allies wrested from Japan by force of arms, and which had belonged to Japan for half a century.

We have no such justification in the case of Quemoy and Matsu. Nor will the free world credit us with any such justification. We can, if we are unwise, save a few islands and lose the friendship and support of the entire free world.

Yesterday, Mr. President, in the British House of Commons, a sharp and vigorous attack was directed against this resolution and against our China policy by the party of the opposition, the Labor Party. This attack was led by the former Prime Minister of Great Britain, the Honorable Clement Attlee. Britain's Foreign Secretary, Sir Anthony Eden, in answering that attack and in defending the policy of the United States, said that the question of Formosa and the question of the offshore islands—Quemoy and Matsu—are separate issues. Sir Anthony Eden said, and I quote from the report of his remarks as they appeared in the press:

> The offshore islands have always been regarded, and are now regarded by us, as part of China.

But the British Government, Anthony Eden said, does not regard Formosa and the Pescadores as part of Red China. He said that his Government does not consider America's defense line to include the offshore islands—presumably the Tachens, Matsu, and the Quemoy group. Anthony Eden interpreted the President's message to the Congress to mean that the United States would not enlarge its defensive obligations beyond Formosa and the Pescadores.

I trust that this interpretation is correct. It does not, however, conform with interpretations that are current in this country.

The President's message and the statements by the Secretary of State, especially those delivered abroad, speak of peace as the purpose of our power efforts, and the purpose of this resolution. But there is language in the measure, and there is language in the resolution, which is ambivalent and ambiguous. The words of peace are intertwined with words which suggest war.

We must clear out this malicious underbrush from the resolution. We must speak boldly, in this resolution, of the United Nations, and of our active desire to have the U. N. order a cease-fire, and of our desire that the President urge, in the U. N., such an action.

We must refer to our responsibility, under the terms of the treaty with Japan, to defend Formosa and the Pescadores from aggression and attack, just as we have a responsibility to defend the mandated islands and Okinawa from aggression and attack.

Such reference in this resolution, excluding the offshore islands from our defense responsibility, would contribute to peace, to security, and to unity with our allies.

There is a clear implication, both in the message and in the resolution—as I read them—that we will regard any attempt on the part of the Communists to capture islands like Quemoy and Matsu—only a few miles off the port cities of China proper—as preparation for an attack on Formosa.

The President's message even suggests that we might take appropriate military action against the concentration or deployment of Communist forces on the mainland in the event that our military leaders should conclude that such concentrations are designed to facilitate an attack upon Formosa.

I will not undertake to pose as a military expert or strategist, yet it is clear to me that as long as the 7th Fleet is in the Formosa Strait—as long as we maintain forces in Formosa and as long as Chiang Kai-shek maintains forces in a state of readiness in Formosa—the Chinese Communist Government can, with some justification, refer to their forces on the mainland as concentrations designed to defend the mainland.

I recognize, too, Mr. President, that Chinese Communist officials have been issuing brash and provocative statements about their intention of conquering Formosa. But Chiang Kai-shek has been uttering equally provocative statements about reconquering the Chinese mainland, with the help of the United States, of course. And both sides have been engaging in nuisance raids.

This situation calls for a cease-fire order to preserve the peace. It calls for the releashing of Chiang Kai-shek and the leashing of the Chinese Communists by order and action of the United Nations.

Our interest—the interest of the free world and the interest of peace—clearly lies in the direction of maintaining, at this time, the separation of Formosa and the Pescadores from China proper, and the neutralization of Formosa and the Pescadores, with an accompanying guaranty of their security and integrity. Our efforts should be in the direction of obtaining U. N. support and sanction for such a policy.

There have been too many rumbles from military and political circles within the United States about the necessity of a preventive war against the Chinese Communists and the desirability of returning Chiang Kai-shek to power on the Chinese mainland by force of arms. I do not suggest that the President of the United States shares this view. I do not even suggest that this resolution is intended to facilitate this purpose.

I do suggest, however, that there are those in positions of influence in the administration and in the country who would not be averse to a series of events leading in that direction.

I suggest, Mr. President, that there is language in this resolution which lends aid and comfort to such a notion.

It may be the purpose as reported in the press, to keep the Communists guessing.

That is the prerogative, and perhaps even the responsibility, of the President within the limits of his constitutional powers. But I do not see how Congress can be asked to join in such a tactic at the expense of keeping the American people and our allies abroad guessing as to our purpose—whether for peace or for war.

In the extraordinary situation many of us in the Senate face today, being without easy access to official sources of information, even as to the testimony of our own Government officials before the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committee, we must sometimes turn to newspaper columnists for our information. I am sure that many of us noted the column written by Mr. Stewart Alsop, an unusually well-informed correspondent, which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 26. Mr. Alsop is frequently much better informed about what goes on inside the Government than are we in the Senate.

Mr. Alsop wrote that a definite decision has been taken by the administration to defend Quemoy and Matsu and, in pursuit of this purpose, to bomb the mainland of China. Senator KNOWLAND yesterday suggested almost as much.

If this is true, it would mean retaliation and then all-out war with Red China. If this should be the consequence, I fear that this war would be fought without substantial help from our friends and allies in the free world. This prospect is indeed terrifying.

Mr. President, I hope with all my heart that the Kefauver substitute, of which I am a cosponsor, will prevail, or that the Humphrey amendments, of which I am also a cosponsor, will be adopted. But, Mr. President, if this resolution, without changes, is enacted, I still would pray that we may avoid war.

I would pray, Mr. President, that the reported calculations of Admiral Radford are correct and that the Chinese Communists will, if this resolution is passed, refrain from attacking Quemoy and Matsu. I would pray that the Chinese Communists will indeed refrain from any act that would result in war. And woe unto all of us if Admiral Radford turns out to be wrong. But, Mr. President, I am not ready to place in the hands of this raw and savage regime—the Red regime of China—the responsibility for maintaining peace in the world.

I am not for peace at any price. But peace is precious, and peace has a price that I would be willing to pay. That price is prudence and patience, reasonableness and restraint. That price we can and must pay. Rashness and recklessness are no substitutes for persistence and courage.

We will strike no fire in the hearts of mankind with a crusade to restore Chiang Kai-shek to power in China. We may secure the acceptance of the Chiang regime as the sovereign authority in Formosa and the Pescadores. But the legions of mankind will not rally to our banners if our purpose is to promote not peace, but Chiang Kai-shek, and if our policy is dictated by a desire to serve not the decent opinion of the leading nations of the free world but the prestige and power of the Chiang regime.

The distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has explained in detail the purpose and provisions of our substitute resolution which amends the pending resolution in a way to quiet the fears and to eliminate the defects I have mentioned here today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, of which I am, as I have said, a cosponsor, and a detailed analysis thereof be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendment in the nature of a substitute and the analysis thereof were ordered to be Printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the primary purpose of the United States in its relations with all other nations is to develop and sustain a just and enduring peace, and in conformity with that purpose has undertaken as a member of the United Nations to be ready to settle its international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered; and

Whereas the treaty of peace between the Allied Powers and Japan, signed September 8, 1951, under which Japan renounced all right, title, and claim to Formosa and the Pescadores, did not specify the ultimate disposition of such islands; and

Whereas the United States has recognized and assumed a responsibility for the peace and security of Formosa and the Pescadores pending definitive settlement of their future status, and pending such settlement has recognized the jurisdiction of the Republic of China over these islands; and

Whereas in China or certain areas thereof there is armed conflict between the Republic of China and the Chinese Communists, and the Chinese Communists are threatening to extend that conflict and endanger international peace by armed attacks on Formosa and the Pescadores; and

Whereas the situation is one appropriate for action by the United Nations for the purpose of ending the present hostilities off the coast of China and their threatened extension in the Formosan Straits which clearly endanger international peace and threaten seriously to dislocate the existing, if unstable, balance of moral, economic, political, and military power upon which the peace of the Pacific depends; and

Whereas the United States would welcome intervention by the United Nations to bring about a cessation of hostilities off the coast of China and in the Formosan Straits, and it is in the interest of the United States and of world peace to facilitate efforts toward peaceful settlement, including a definitive settlement of the future status of Formosa and the Pescadores in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter; and

Whereas pending action by the United Nations the United States has a responsibility to protect and defend the peace and security of Formosa and the Pescadores from armed attack since the peace and security of these islands are essential to the peace and security of the United States and other nations with vital interests in the West Pacific: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That it is the sense of the Congress—in light of the above-described situation and so long as it continues, pending effective action by the United Nations to maintain peace and security in the Formosan Straits and the waters surrounding Formosa and the Pescadores—the President has authority to employ the Armed Forces of the United States if and as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of defending and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores from armed attack. Such authority would include the taking of such other measures consistent with international law and our obligations under the United Nations Charter as he judges necessary or appropriate militarily in the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

ANALYSIS OF THE KEFAUVER AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE

1. It avoids reference to the unratified defense treaty and other language which recognizes Formosa and the Pescadores as a part of China.

2. It avoids the assumption that the present Communist attacks or threatened attacks on the offshore islands are in aid and preparation for armed attacks on Formosa. This is not necessarily true. At least the Congress is not in a position so to aver and thereby to sanction in advance armed retaliation for any armed attack on the offshore islands. We must guard against becoming involved in a large-scale war, not in defense of Formosa and the Pescadores but in defense of the offshore islands.

3. It defines and explains United States responsibility for the peace and security of Formosa as a result of World War II and describes a basis for action by the President in fulfillment of that responsibility pending U. N. action.

4. It makes clear that the purpose of the United States in committing itself to the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores is to keep these areas from being involved in the Chinese civil war.

5. It makes clear that we welcome U. N. intervention and respect our obligations under the charter.

6. The revised language making clear the preexisting responsibility of the United States as a consequence of the war against Japan, for the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores, makes it possible for the Congress to recognize and affirm the authority of the President to act rather than to purport to authorize the President to act in a field which is the primary if not exclusive responsibility of the President.

7. Reference in the administration proposal securing related positions and territories as necessary to the defense of Formosa is unwise. This reference implies that the offshore islands are necessary to the defense of Formosa. As already stated, this is not necessarily true; to say so gravely increases the risks of war. If it be true it is a military judgment for which the President and not the Congress must take the responsibility. If the President decides that intervention in case of attack against an offshore island is necessary for the defense of Formosa, he can so declare and act accordingly. The inclusion of specific language suggests that the Congress thinks such intervention may be necessary and, in light of the imminent danger of war from such intervention, Congress should not so suggest. Many things may happen before Red China can prepare an all-out attack against Formosa. But hasty intervention to protect the offshore islands may precipitate war much more quickly than is generally realized, and when we are ill-prepared psychologically as well as militarily for it. Moreover, we may in time again free world support for the defense of Formosa but not for defense of the offshore islands. Serving due notice that we will defend Formosa may deter or at least

postpone war. Serving due notice that we will defend the offshore islands is more likely to precipitate than to deter or long defer war. If we are bluffing about the offshore islands, we will lose much more face than need be when our bluff is called, as it is likely to be.

If war comes, not from the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores, which can be divorced from the Chinese civil war, but from the defense of the offshore islands like Quemoy and Matsu, which cannot be divorced from the Chinese civil war, we may be without friends and allies in the free world. The defense of the offshore islands necessarily involving us in China's civil war is in its nature calculated to precipitate war with China rather than to forestall armed attack on Formosa. We cannot convince the world that the Communist attacks on the offshore islands are primarily designed in preparation for armed attacks on Formosa. The offshore islands are in truth more necessary to the defense of the mainland than they are to the defense of Formosa. Quemoy and Matsu are nearly as difficult to separate from the mainland as Staten Island. They are as close to the mainland as Alexandria is to the 14th Street Bridge in Washington.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I hope that the proposed substitute resolution will prevail. I think that it will accomplish all our national purposes—all the clear, specified, and constructive purposes expressed by President Eisenhower.

I hope that if the proposed substitute does not prevail, the amendments proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and myself will prevail.

This is the way to assure peace and security in the Far East. We must seek no other course.

Mr. HUMPHREY obtained the floor.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to permit me to make a very brief statement?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the senior Senator from Georgia may proceed.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have no desire to take the Senator from Minnesota off the floor, and my announcement shall be brief. However, I think it is an announcement that should now be made.

First. It is hoped, and there is some substantial ground to believe, that the consummation of the resolution will have a deterrent effect upon the Chinese Communists, who are building up positions of strength, from which they might be more tempted to strike if the resolution were still pending than if the resolution were passed.

Second. The Republic of China is holding military planning in suspense until the United States position is made clear by this resolution. That means that the build-ups by the Chinese Communists are not, while matters are thus in suspense, being matched by corresponding dispositions on the part of the Republic of China.

But the important reason, Mr. President, and the one which I should like especially to bring to the attention of the Senate, is the fact that the debate on the question in the Securiy Council of the United Nations is expected to start on Monday at noon. An effort will be made immediately to sponsor such a motion, according to my information, by the representatives of New Zealand and others; but the debate in the Security Council of the United Nations is due to start on Monday. It is therefore important that at the beginning of that debate there should be a position of strength, and not of vacillation, on the part of the United States.

Mr. President, I have made my statement largely as an announcement. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for yielding.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield me half a minute so that I may comment on the statement of the Senator from Georgia, without the Senator from Minnesota losing the right to the floor?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Oregon for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say I completely agree with the Senator from Georgia that we should proceed to close the debate on the resolution just as rapidly as the speeches can be completed. I think the points which have been brought out are so important that the Senate should remain in session for as many hours into the night as may be necessary in order that a vote may be taken on the resolution. I think it can be done.

I am very happy to join with the Senator from Georgia in urging early action on the resolution. I am glad to say that, Mr. President, because, for some unexplainable reason, there seems to be a rumor abroad that the senior Senator from Oregon seeks to prolong the debate on this matter for such length of time that it may take on the characteristic of a filibuster. There is not a bit of truth in that false charge made against the senior Senator from Oregon. In fact, I plan to make only one more speech, and a short one, on the resolution, by way of summarizing my answer on two points made yesterday in the speech of the Senator from Georgia.

The first point was that the language of the proposal of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is language of limitation. Saying so does not make it so. As a matter of law, it is not, as I shall show when I discuss the matter this afternoon.

I also propose to answer the Senator from Georgia with respect to an alternative, because there is an alternative, and the provisions of the resolution do not offer, in my judgment, the possibilities of an alternative.

The third point I should like to make is that the proposed language grants power to the President of the United States, no matter how strenuously the Senator from Georgia may maintain to the contrary, to make a strike against the mainland of China, if he so decides to do it before an act of war is committed against the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish first to state that as one Member of the Senate it is my hope and desire that, as has been suggested by the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Oregon, the debate on the joint resolution will be brought to a conclusion as expeditiously as possible, provided that the Members of the Senate who have views to express upon this all-important resolution have an opportunity to express them. I think this debate should come to a conclusion with a resolution of the points some of us have raised and we should agree on language which would signify to the world, to our friends and enemies alike, as well as to those who are not yet committed, the position of our Government, not only the position of our President but the position of the legislative branch of the Government of the United States.

We are faced with a momentous decision, as was described by one of the most able and distinguished officials of the Armed Forces of this Nation in the joint meetings of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services. I think it is fair to say that the Congress of the United States has seldom before, in the history of the Republic, been called upon to make a decision of such great importance as the one it is about to make.

Of course, the Congress has previously been called upon to declare war, or at least to meet the open hostility of an enemy, but that declaration has come after the fact of an attack. I think it is fair to say that we have never before in our history experienced a comparable situation to that which the people of the United States and the people of the world have faced in the postwar years.

We are confronted with a new form or type of adversary, not the old type represented by aristocratic and bourbon systems, but a new type, an international conspiracy, a world conspiracy, which does not abide or live by the rules of international law or of normal conduct between nations. Therefore, it is understandable that we should be faced with an entirely new legislative question, so to speak, and that Congress should be called upon to share in the responsibility of decisions in a manner in which other Congresses have not been called upon to do.

I say to my colleagues these are different days, and we are confronted with a different type of enemy. We are confronted with a kind of treachery, conspiracy, aggression, diversion, infiltration, and the possibility of attack which the people of no other age ever faced. If we will think clearly in the beginning, perhaps we shall better understand the problem we have to face. To be sure, it would be much easier for the Members of Congress if the President alone were to make these decisions. I might say very candidly it is my opinion that the President has the constitutional authority to take whatever action is necessary in the defense of the vital interests of the United States; but, more imporant, I believe the time has come, in view of the world situation we face, when those of us who are the elected representatives of the people of our respective districts

and States must share the burden of responsibility, not merely of voting money for defense, not merely of passing laws for selective service, not merely of proceeding in terms of overall discussions in the light of so-called briefings by our department heads, but actually of getting down to the hard, arduous, and difficult task of saying that we either join in or reject a policy, which could affect the life of this Nation for time untold.

I wish to say here and now that I do not shrink from doing my duty, and I do not in any way feel constrained or compelled to refrain from publicly expressing my views on this matter. I would be less than candid if I did not say that the 3 days at the beginning of this week—Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday—were among the most difficult ones of my life, and I think they have been difficult days for every Member of the Senate and every Member of the House of Representatives, particularly those who sat in the hearings, where we listened to the testimony of the Secretary of State and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Chiefs of Staff of the respective services, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. I can say to those who are within the range of my voice today that I do not recall one smile or one note of jest. It was serious business—serious to the point of literally making one tremble with the responsibilities of the decision which had to be made.

Now I wish to review very briefly the overtones and the overall views which were expressed in those committee hearings. Every Member of the Senate should read the record made there. It is must reading. I honestly believe that no Member of the Senate can really feel secure in his decision without reading that testimony. I think I am correct when I say that the testimony is open and available to every Member of the Senate. It would be well for every Member of the Senate to read what the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, had to say in support of the joint resolution. It is particularly important that Senators read what Admiral Radford had to say; and it is equally important, if not more important, that they read what General Ridgway had to say.

One of the reasons why I advanced my amendment in the committee, in an attempt to restrict the joint resolution—at least, by the intent of the amendment—to the immediate and the direct defense of Formosa and the Pescadores Islands, which has been and was until Sunday, last, the policy of the United States, was the testimony of General Ridgway. I suggested the amendment because of what I heard, not because of what I dreamed, and because of what I believe to be the very difficult assignments our forces would be called upon to accept if we went further than the immediate and direct defense of the island of Formosa and the islands of the Pescadores group.

On the committee there are those who disagreed, obviously; but I do not think the disagreement was as to whether the so-called offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu are points which are vital and essential to the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores. I think the disagreement came just as a matter of what one might call psychology, namely, whether we should in any way, by joint resolution of Congress, implicitly or explicitly restrict or restrain, by congressional enactment, the authority of the President of the United States to use the Armed Forces of the Nation as he deems necessary.

My objection to the language of the joint resolution is that by including the words "the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands and the taking of such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores," we would perhaps be undertaking an additional responsibility which, in my opinion, as one member of the committee and as one Member of the Senate, is a commitment we should not undertake and one which we might have a very grave and difficult time fulfilling. I point out that those words were not merely "the protection of such related positions"—in other words, not merely to see to it that in case there was an attack upon Quemoy Island, 6 or 7 miles from the coastline of China, we would send planes to help the Chinese Nationalist defenders. That is not what the joint resolution says. It also says that we shall secure that island—and here are the words "for the specific purpose of securing and protecting"—when Congress directs "the securing and protection of such related positions and territories."

So by those words Congress would perhaps be directing, by an act of Congress, and would perhaps be committing the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the Nation, as a matter of national policy—not as a matter of military strategy—to use the forces of the United States to secure the island of Quemoy and the island of Matsu, as objectives in themselves.

I say that is not a matter for legislative determination or joint resolution. It may be entirely necessary for the Commander in Chief or the officers in charge in the theater of military operations to use our ships or our planes, or both to help in the defense of the island of Quemoy. But to authorize, by joint resolution, the securing of such an island may mean what was testified to in the Senate committee, namely, the landing of American forces upon that island. I submit that the burden of proof as to the essentiality of that island for the defense of Formosa rests upon those who ask for this authority. I further submit there is not before the Senate committee one iota of evidence to show that Quemoy and Matsu are essential for the defense of Formosa. They are helpful, but they are not essential.

What is the risk involved? It is simply the taking of American forces that much closer to the area of the Chinese mainland, with the possibility of entrapment and the possibility of a military debacle in a restricted area, and the possibility of furtherance of the war on the Chinese mainland.

I think the record should be clear that I do not recall that any officer of our Government or any officer of the Armed Forces has suggested that it would be desirable to have warfare on the Chinese mainland. I want the record clear on that point, so that no Senator will presume that there were those who testified before the two committees that it was, within their belief, the pattern or the plan of the Government of the United States to advance to the mainland. I think it is clear that it was not the plan. I think it is clear that it was hoped that it would not be necessary. And I think it is also clear that all parties realize the tremendous burden which that would place upon this Nation, and even the possibility of an unsuccessful military activity.

Mr. President, what is the difference between Formosa and the islands of Quemoy and Matsu, for example? We happen to have some allies in this great world struggle. We have some allies who have stood with us throughout the years. One of those allies and, to my mind, the best one we have, or, I should say, one that is firm, strong, and competent, is Great Britain. At times, we have our problems with the British, on matters of policy. But when the chips are down, as the saying goes, the British come through. Again and again they have demonstrated their capacity for resistance, their capacity for strength, their diplomatic knowledge and strategy, and their competence as world leaders.

Anthony Eden, when speaking in the House of Parliament, had this to say:

> Formosa in this whole century has never been a part of China. The offshore islands are regarded by us as part of China, and we must be careful to draw a distinction between them and Formosa.

His statement, according to the wire service, implied that Britain was not challenging Red China's claim to such coastal islands as the Tachen and Matsu chain, about 200 miles north of Formosa.

Eden said the first concern of the British Government—

> is to stop the fighting. We have therefore continued to urge on all concerned the importance of doing this and of preventing a wider conflagration. * * * The British Government are convinced that the object of the United States administration has also been to reduce the risks of any extension of the fighting.

Mr. President, what I am trying to point out, in further reference to Mr. Eden's comment, is how he differentiates between the Pescadores and the offshore-islands group.

Mr. Eden had this to say:

> Eden stressed that the British Government is in constant touch with the United States on this problem. Referring to President Eisenhower's request to the Congress to authorize him to use United States forces to defend Formosa and the Pescadores and related localities, Eden said:
>
> "The British Commonwealth are convinced that the object of the United States administration has been to reduce the risks of extension of the fighting."

Then he goes on to point out that in the eyes of the British Government the offshore islands, particularly Quemoy and the Tachen group, are considered

to be a part of the Chinese mainland, and that Formosa is considered to be separate and distinct, and therefore not involved in the so-called civil war.

I ask my colleagues to look at the map. The island of Taiwan, or Formosa, as has been related during the course of this debate, was at one time a territory of Japan. Prior to that it was a territory of China, with very loose control over it. This island was ceded by Japan, and claims to it were relinquished by Japan following the Japanese Peace Treaty.

To this very hour the legal position of Formosa with respect to jurisdiction has not been determined; but, so far as Quemoy, the Matsu islands, and the so-called northern chain of the Tachen group are concerned, our best allies recognize them as being involved in the Chinese civil war, as a part of the Chinese mainland.

We may have a different point of view. We may say that that is not true, that they are not involved in the Chinese civil war, that they are not a part of the Chinese mainland. But I submit that a nation which is our No. 1 ally says that they are.

The fact of our evacuation of Chinese Nationalists from the Tachen group indicated for all practical purposes that those islands are involved in the so-called Chinese civil war, between the Communist government on the mainland and the Nationalist government on Formosa, and therefore are subject to separate treatment.

The junior Senator from Minnesota believes, and has believed for a long time, that we should confine our military operations and defensive operations directly and immediately to the island of Formosa and the so-called island group of the Pescadores.

Yesterday I listened attentively to the comments of the able and distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I wish to say for the RECORD that I consider his speech historic. It was delivered by a statesman who is second to none in his devotion to his country and to the purposes of this Republic. It was a clarifying speech, a speech which I think will help us to preserve the peace.

In that speech the Senator from Georgia not only brought to our attention his own views as to the purposes of the joint resolution—and those views represent not merely his personal views, but his views as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations—but he also called attention to the statement which was released at the White House by President Eisenhower yesterday. I shall not spend time on that statement, because it was discussed at length yesterday, but in that statement from the White House it was said:

> The President made it clear that these (United States) forces were designed purely for defensive purposes and that any decision to use United States forces other than in immediate self-defense or in direct defense of Formosa and the Pescadores would be a decision which he would take and the responsibility for which he has not delegated.

Why did the President make that statement? I will tell the Senate why. It was because of the hearings. The President of the United States need not have made any statement, if the resolution were crystal clear as to its purposes. The President made that statement not merely because of speeches on the floor of the Senate, but because of the testimony of his own Chiefs of Staff and the interrogations in the joint hearings before the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations. The President wanted to make it clear to the American people that Chiang Kai-shek, our ally in Formosa, was not to be the theater commander. He wanted to make it clear that he, as President of the United States, would take full responsibility not only for the political decisions, but for the military decisions which were to be made there.

I think it should be told to the Senate and to the American people that there was considerable discussion and considerable concern as to just who would be the leader, the commander, the man in charge of all military and political decisions which were necessary in the area around Formosa and the Formosa Strait. The President has now made it clear that he does not delegate that authority. The President has made it clear that while we may go to the defense of Formosa, we do not intend to allow any other person to direct the forces of the United States, to call the strategy, or to deploy the military forces of this country.

I think this is all to the President's credit. I think his statement should serve to quiet a number of the fears of Members of the Senate and the public. I am convinced that a large group of the American public justifiably believes that the one aim and ambition of the Nationalist Government on Formosa has been—and it has been so stated—the retaking of the mainland of China. I think everyone should know that no reasonably competent military officer of this Government has testified otherwise than that to retake the mainland of China would require American forces.

Let the record be clear. The time for plain talk has arrived. For the past 6 or 7 years we have been hearing the story of the ability and capacity of the Generalissimo on Formosa to retake the mainland. That story is a myth, pure and simple. There is no more possibility of that happening without American aid than there is of flying to the moon this afternoon. For far too long a time we have been led by some propagandists in this country to believe in the myth of the military, political, and economic capacity of the forces upon Formosa to retake the mainland. I regret to say that too many policies have been based upon that illusion. If the mainland is ever to be retaken, it will be retaken with American power, American manhood, American blood, American money, and American armament. The President is assuring the Congress, by his decisions, that no one is to lead us into that trap.

I respectfully submit that I appreciate that assurance. I respectfully submit that such assurance is long overdue. Let the record be clear. While I did not vote in committee as did the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the record is there for all to see. He justifiably pointed out that under the terms of the joint resolution it would be possible, within the legal framework of the joint resolution, to strike at the mainland. There can be no doubt about that.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The power is still there, notwithstanding the White House release of yesterday, is it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

I do not seek to join issue with the Senator from Oregon. I respect his judgment. I think he knows that it is basically my intention to support the joint resolution. I would appreciate the opportunity to have the language clarified so that it would be specific and precise. I shall vote for the Kefauver substitute because I think it is more desirable; but in the final analysis I shall explain my reason for ultimate support of the resolution.

So far as the joint resolution is concerned, we are finally driven to the point of having to place faith and confidence somewhere. In the area of emergency foreign policy, in the area of emergency defense and security, ultimately, regardless of whether we agree with the President or not, he is the final source of decision and authority.

We must put our trust and confidence somewhere. I grant, when the President comes to Congress with a resolution and asks not only for our consent but for our advice also, we are thoroughly within our rights, once that request has been made of Congress, to do with the resolution whatever we wish to do with it, in line with the security interests of the United States.

What I have said goes back to a statement which was made by the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] on the floor of the Senate on Wednesday of this week. I shall not read the statement in full, or even quote from it extensively. It is found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, January 26.

In that statement the senior Senator from Maine made it quite clear that what had actually happened was that the President had sent to Congress a resolution as a statement of policy and, as the Senator from Maine put it, we had no choice in the matter.

Some discussion followed the remarks of the Senator from Maine as to the difference between the pending resolution and a treaty. In a treaty the Senate is asked to give its advice and consent after the negotiations leading to the treaty have been concluded. It is a request after the fact. In this instance an effort was made to indicate that we were asked to give our consent before the fact. I regret to say that in this respect the resolution is almost identically the same as a treaty. However, in a treaty we have a right to add reservations. In a treaty we have a right to call upon our Government to add certain protocols and certain restrictions, as the Secretary of State did recently in connection with the new Formosa treaty, by an exchange of letters between

him and the Foreign Office of the Chinese Nationalist Republic.

To be told in this instance that we cannot in any way modify the resolution, to say that in this instance we cannot even so much as tinker with one word in the resolution, is to deny Congress anything but the right to be a complete rubber stamp. It is not a matter of advice and consent, but merely a matter of consent. I submit that under the constitutional processes of our Government that is an erroneous position to take. In the Constitution itself we find the words "advice and consent" not merely the word "consent."

Regretfully I say—and I say it with all respect—what happened was that once the decision had been reached to send the resolution to Congress, the resolution was not sent up in a cloak of anonymity or secrecy for general discussion, but was sent to Congress in the final words.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services. What is even more important, however, is that it was announced to the world as a public policy on the part of the Government of the United States by the President and the Secretary of State.

In that sense, the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] was correct in saying that once the President has announced the policy to the world, in his capacity as Commander in Chief and principal spokesman of this Nation in foreign affairs, it becomes exceedingly difficult to modify the resolution or in any way to change it.

The President's statement of yesterday should have told us what he was really asking for in the resolution, namely, the immediate and direct defense of Formosa and the Pescadores. If that is what is wanted, it is available under an amendment which is at the desk. My amendment is designed to clarify his intent.

I know of no Senator who desires to do less than to provide an all-out defense for Formosa and the Pescadores. I hope the record will be manifestly clear to every person throughout the country and the world that I know of not one soul I have talked to in Congress who does not feel that we should commit this Nation, as it has been committed since 1950, and even before then, to the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does not the Senator from Minnesota agree with me that even those of us who have been asking for modification in the resolution, because we believe its language is too broad, have made clear time and time again in the debate that we are in favor of the complete defense of Formosa and the Pescadores, but that we simply do not go along with a program which might involve us in the defense of the Quemoy and Matsu Islands and in that way risk the loss of American life in the defense of the Nationalist Chinese on those islands?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is the view of the Senator from Minnesota that the language in the resolution pertaining to "such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands" possibly commits Congress to a position which goes far beyond the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

I wish to be as honest as it is humanly possible to be, and I now say that the President of the United States, under his powers as Commander in Chief, if he thought the vital interest of the military personnel of this Government on the island of Quemoy, for example, required the use of airpower in a sortie or attack, I suppose he could use it. However, I say that when we have before us a resolution in which Congress stipulates, or states, that these other areas, or pieces of real estate, so to speak, are to be secured—which means holding them, of course—we are asked to go further than protecting Formosa and the Pescadores, which is the defined policy of this country.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. A few minutes ago the Senator from Minnesota stated some of the differences between this resolution and a treaty. He certainly did not mean that what he said was a complete list of the differences, did he?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, no; I just got started.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator further stated that in his opinion the President, as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, could order sorties or forays, or whatever we may wish to call them, or could send our planes to attack concentrations aimed at those other islands in order to defend them, and could do what he thought was necessary in order to defend Formosa. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. That is my understanding.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As a matter of fact, is it not the Senator's understanding that the pending resolution has no force of law?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; the resolution is concurrent, so to speak, with the Executive power.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is an expression of opinion by Congress, is it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is a backing of the President in the power he already possesses. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We cannot add to or take away from the President's constitutional powers as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. In legal terms, that is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. By way of a resolution, that is.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Whereas a treaty could.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. A treaty could do it because a treaty is on the same high level as the Constitution, according to the Consttiution itself. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Alabama is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, what the resolution amounts to is an expression of approval on the part of Congress, and that, incidentally, is one of the other differences between the resolution and a treaty, in that both Houses of Congress are involved in connection with the pending resolution, whereas in a treaty only the Senate is involved. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely right.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Therefore, the resolution constitutes approval by the Congress of a policy which the President stated in sending the resolution to Congress, and which he had a right to state, if he wished to do so, without putting it in the form of a resolution. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely correct. The President of the United States, in the case of Formosa and the Pescadores, in view of the established policy of our Government, which has been announced to the world, because of the importance of Formosa to the interests of the United States, could have taken precautionary action and defensive action for the protection of that area.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As a result of the change which has taken place in recent years since the outcome of World War II, and our interest that has developed in Korea, Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines, with the security pacts which have been negotiated, that area has become our western line of defense, has it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is so called. It is called the island chain of defenses in the Pacific, starting with the Aleutians and extending down through Korea, Japan, Okinawa, Formosa, the Philippines, and down through the area covered by the treaties which we have concluded with the ANZAC group, Australia and New Zealand.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And later, when we complete the South Asian treaty, it will apply there. It is what might be called a screen.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I take it the Senator from Minnesota feels that under the Constitution the President has a right to use the Armed Forces, certainly within the area included between our two lines of defense; is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is my point.

Mr. SPARKMAN. One in the east and one in the west.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My point is that those key areas from the Aleutians down to Korea have been listed clearly for the world to behold. We have concluded a treaty with the Republic of South Korea. With Japan we have a mutual defense pact, and we have military bases in Japan. On Okinawa we have one of the major military installations in the Pacific. Then from Formosa the line extends to the Philippines, and then to the Australian and New Zealand area, where we have treaty commitments. That is the line which we say is our forward wall of defense, established for

only one purpose—the security of the United States of America.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And up to that line the President certainly has the power to use our Armed Forces.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is my view that under the constitutional powers of the Chief Executive he would have the power to use our Armed Forces.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Without any authorization from Congress whatsoever.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Unless the President deemed it wise, because of a major military operation, to ask Congress for the support he may wish.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That would not be authorization; that would be concurrence.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, if he undertook to engage in a major war, he would be expected to ask Congress for a declaration of war, because, under the Constitution, only Congress can authorize the making of war by this Government.

Mr. HUMPHREY. One of the concerns which I have is that in this line of defense about which we have spoken, which is common knowledge to friend and foe alike, when it comes to Formosa we make an indentation, under this resolution, and we say it goes to within 6 or 7 miles of the Chinese mainland. We take it in and ask to include a broader area than we had before included. I think we should leave our line of defense where it is, and then if the President, as Commander in Chief, in the fulfillment of our obligations in the defense of Formosa, the Pescadores, Okinawa, or the Philippines, should feel that in order, in the case of hostilities, to bring in large-scale American strength, such as our naval or air power, against any outpost, that would be within the defense area.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator remembers, I am sure, that I raised the point in committee—not necessarily about an obligation on our part to cover Quemoy and Matsu—that there was an invitation, as I suggested, to the Chinese Communists to explore the situation and probe it, as they did early, in the Tachens, and then we announced to the world that we were not going to undertake to defend the Tachens, although I think we had been led to believe we were. I am not sure whether the Senator from Minnesota remembers some conversations we have pending the drafting of the Formosa treaty when we were led to believe there might be some of the islands in the Tachens which would be useful and essential to the defense of Formosa. It has seemed to us all along that when we immediately announced to the world that we were not going to defend the Tachens—and that was the effect of the statement which the Secretary of State made almost at the beginning of hostilities there—it gave an incentive to the Chinese Communists to probe and explore, and the farther they explored, the more we withdrew, and the uncertainty remained. I imagine there came into their minds quite logically the question, "Will they stand even on Formosa and the Pescadores?"

So my contention has been that so long as we leave open the question as to whether we will stand on Quemoy and some of the other islands, to be decided when and if attack comes, we are inviting attack. I am not greatly concerned about Quemoy and the Matsu Islands being left in, provided the Communists know that if they move there, we will hit them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is the Senator's view, as I gather, that the language of the resolution says to some that they are in there and to others that they are not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It leaves it vague and uncertain.

I think it is dangerous in that respect. I felt considerably relieved by the statement which the President made yesterday, because I think many of us had feared that some "trigger-happy" person in a position to do so might be the one to fire the shot that would start things off. But the President gave us assurance yesterday that he, and he alone, would assume that responsibility. In other words, I think his statement made it plain to the Congress, to the country, and to the world that whereas he welcomes the approval of Congress of the policy he has announced, and which he had a right to announce to pursue, yet, at the same time, he recognizes that the manner in which he pursues that policy, the manner in which he carries it out, is his responsibility, as the Constitution makes it, and not the responsibility of Congress. Does the Senator agree with me in that statement?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly do.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will yield further, because I shall have to leave the floor in a few minutes, I wish him to know that I commend him for the very able speech he is making, and I wish to thank him for giving me this opportunity to participate. There is one point, which perhaps the Senator will cover before he finishes his speech, but since I shall probably not be present when he concludes his remarks I hope he will let me ask him this question now.

Would the Senator from Minnesota not feel much better if the President would go further and give Congress assurance that he intends to utilize, so far as practicable, the good offices of the United Nations to bring about a cease-fire and try to work out a peaceful solution of the trouble in that whole area?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say that under date of Wednesday, January 26, I submitted an amendment to the preamble of the resolution, which reads as follows:

> Whereas the United States would welcome intervention by the United Nations to bring about a cessation of hostilities off the coast of China and in the Formosa Straits, and it is in the interest of the United States and of world peace to facilitate efforts toward peaceful settlement including a definitive settlement of the future status of Formosa and the Pescadores in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

In my judgment, one of the real weaknesses of the resolution is the failure of the Congress of the United States, as it authorizes the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States, not with equal clarity, equal vigor, and equal determination to say to the President, to the Secretary of State, and to the world, as the people's representatives of this great Republic, that we welcome action by the United Nations. We not only welcome it, but we beseech them to proceed, and call upon them to act. We should incorporate in the resolution language along the lines I have outlined. In any language which would commit Congress to searching and seeking for United Nations participation and action, we would show to the peoples of the world two things: First, that we Americans will not be the victims of appeasement; and, second, that we long for, search for, and pray for peace, and recognize that sometimes it takes more courage to seek peace than it does to get into a war.

I say that is one of the real weaknesses of the resolution. The message from the President called, again and again, for United Nations action. The President in his message to Congress placed great emphasis upon the United Nations and its usefulness in this tragic situation.

But I call upon my colleagues to examine the resolution. What the resolution does is to authorize the President to employ our Armed Forces not only for the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores but also of other areas in friendly hands, and then yields itself to a very weak position in reference to the United Nations.

I shall press for this amendment, whether the other language can be changed or not. I shall call upon my colleagues in the Senate to say to the world, and especially to the people of America, particularly now, in view of what we know to be true, that in the United Nations one of our friends is seeking some solution. Let us tell our friends in the United Nations that the Congress of the United States seeks not only to commit manpower to a possible war but also seeks to commit the United States to peace.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for one more question? Then I shall have finished.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am grateful to the Senator for yielding. I have been told within the last few minutes that an item has appeared on the news tickers that there will be introduced in the United Nations a resolution for the use of the good offices of the United Nations in seeking a cease fire, and that the sponsors of such a resolution—and this especially is what I want the Senator to hear—will be the United States, Great Britain, and New Zealand.

I believe the Senator from Minnesota will agree with me that that gives some hope of carrying out the wish that was expressed by the President in his message, if not too strongly in the resolution, that the United Nations would be used.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In view of this statement about another dramatic announcement, in a dramatic period of history, that our own Government, and the Governments of Great Britain and New Zealand and Australia——

Mr. SPARKMAN. The United States, Great Britain, and New Zealand. To be frank with the Senator, when I was told of this announcement, I questioned that

the United States was one of the sponsors. I insisted that it must have been Australia, as I had understood that the three sponsors would be Great Britain, New Zealand, and Australia. But I was told that the notice carried the United States as one of the sponsors, and did not include Australia.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then I ask my colleague this very fair and frank question: If that be the situation as of this hour—not the situation as it might be in the future, but as it is now—would it not be wise and prudent for the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, in a resolution which supports the hand of the President in the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores, also to support the hand of the President and the good name of this Republic by incorporating into the resolution a proviso calling upon our Government to commend the United Nations for its activities?

Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. CAPEHART addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall yield in a moment to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. President, I shall very shortly call up for consideration my amendment to the preamble. I understand that to conform with the parliamentary situation, if I am not mistaken, an amendment of the preamble must be acted upon following the action upon the resolution. I would appreciate a ruling from the Chair on that point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. At the appropriate time, I shall ask to amend the preamble by inserting the following:

Whereas the United States would welcome intervention by the United Nations to bring about a cessation of hostilities off the coast of China and in the Formosa Straits, and it is in the interest of the United States and of world peace to facilitate efforts toward peaceful settlement including a definitive settlement of the future status of Formosa and the Pescadores in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

In my opinion, such a declaration is just as ready now for congressional action as is any possible statement of principles the Senate could make. I hope that word will spread among our colleagues that as we take action to strengthen the hand of our Government in a possible situation of hostilities—I say "possible situation," because that emergency is not exactly on the doorstep as of this hour—at least we ought to back up our representations in the United Nations by action on the part of Congress at this particular hour, as we come to a decision on the resolution.

I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In view of the apparent policy of the Government to work for a cease-fire in the Strait of Formosa, which also is advocated by the Senator from Minnesota, would it not be well to probe some of the implications of such an order to cease fire? A cease-fire order, of course, would prevent any movement by Chiang Kai-shek and the Nationalist Chinese forces against the mainland of China. Is that not correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore it would mean in effect that any hope of reconquering China by military forces from the outside would have to be abandoned,

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would that not almost inevitably lead to the admission of Red China to the United Nations? Could such recognition be denied to a government which was in possession of the country, and which was recognized by the United Nations as being in possession; and would not such recognition, in effect, be a statement to the government on Formosa that they could not try to upset the government on the mainland? Would that not lead rather quickly to the admission of Red China into the United Nations?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not exactly think so, I may say to the Senator from Illinois. If the Senator is talking about recognition, that is one thing.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am speaking of admission to the United Nations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may point out to my good friend from Illinois that while the United States of America does not either recognize Red China or admit her anywhere, our Secretary of State joined with other representatives to invite Red China to the conference which finally disposed of the aspect of the problem which related to Indochina, even though I do not believe that problem is anywhere nearly settled.

In other words, we did not recognize Red China as a legal government, nor did we seek to sponsor her admission; in fact, we opposed the admission of Red China to the United Nations. But that did not prevent the highest Cabinet officer of the United States of America from extending an invitation to Red China to a meeting which ultimately arrived at the Indochinese truce.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would not the Senator from Minnesota say, however, that a cease-fire order would increase the likelihood that Red China would be admitted to the United Nations?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think it would certainly increase the possibility of Red China pressing her action more effectively. However, I think it should be noted that Red China has never asked to be admitted to the United Nations. She has never asked, although she has had a very powerful spokesman.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would that not increase the prestige of Red China in southeast Asia?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The admission of Red China to the United Nations?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; to have a cease-fire in the Straits of Formosa.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think that is possible.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would it not also reduce any military pressure which the forces of Nationalist China on Formosa might exert? Probably a large number of Red Chinese troops are deployed immediately opposite Formosa, and, if any possibility of invasion were removed, they could then be deployed southward, thus strengthening the Communist push in Southeast Asia?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think there is some truth in that suggestion. The number of troops which are on the offshore islands, while this is not open to public discussion, are limited. I am of the opinion that if there is to be a cease-fire anywhere, some kind of price will have to be paid for it. I would be less than candid if I did not say that. But I remind my distinguished colleague that if there is not to be a cease-fire, and we are to have open fire, we shall pay a big price for that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand that. I am simply trying to appraise the situation. In times past, I have been inclined to oppose a cease-fire, so long as there was solid hope that Chiang Kai-shek and the Nationalists might be able to invade the mainland. Like virtually all other Members of this body, I do not like the present Communist Chinese government; I should like to see it replaced.

We have been told by various Members of this body who visited Formosa that there were large numbers of well-trained troops on Formosa, and that all that was needed was to take the leash off, and that Chiang Kai-shek would then move on to the mainland, where large groups would rally behind him, and that in a relatively short time the Communist government of China would be overthrown. So long as that is a strong possibility, it would seem to be inadvisable to encourage a cease-fire agreement.

Does the Senator from Minnesota interpret the action of the State Department, or perhaps the action of the Government, mentioned by the Senator from Alabama, to mean that our Government has written off any possibility of Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalists invading the mainland, and that it now believes that Chiang Kai-shek cannot do so?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That question was discussed quite completely in the joint meetings of the two committees. I think I would be in error to say our Government had officially written off that possibility. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is present in the Chamber. He listened to the testimony in the hearings. I think it was the position of our Government that if the mainland of China were to be successfully invaded, it could be done only with American forces, not only with air and sea forces, but obviously with large commitments of American manpower.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, is it the general opinion of the military officials and of the Government that Chiang Kai-shek and the Nationalists do not have sufficient military strength successfully to invade the mainland?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say that is the probable view. That does not mean, however, that our Government thinks that Chiang Kai-shek's forces should not be strong.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Nor does it mean that his government should not be supported, because there is the possibility, though I think it is a remote possibility, that there may be some form of upheaval on the mainland of China.

Therefore, there ought to be forces ready to move into China, and there ought to be a government ready to take over.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand. Does not the Senator from Minnesota feel, then, that if that be true, some of the information which has been brought to us, and upon which our recent policy presumably has been based, has been incorrect, namely, that Chiang Kai-shek had strong, virile forces which, if fully unleashed, would take over China?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say to my friend, the Senator from Illinois, as I said earlier, that I felt we had been under some misapprehension and that there had been for too long a period a myth indulged, as to the possibility of Chiang Kai-shek's retaking the mainland. Very candidly, I want to restrain myself in this debate, and I made a sort of personal pledge to do that. I think the time has arrived when we as Americans should face up to some of the mistakes and miscalculations we have made, and misinformation we have been given. The time has come, in view of the momentous decision we shall have to make, to evaluate our entire policy in the Far East, to ascertain where we stand with our allies, and to find out where we stand in terms of the facts of the situation, rather than in terms of hopes, myths, and beliefs. When we decide to do that, then I think we shall get somewhere.

I believe the Senator from Illinois will be interested in hearing a London dispatch from the Associated Press which was just handed to me:

Official British informants said today Britain and the United States have agreed to invite Communist China to a United Nations Security Council meeting for discussion of a cease-fire in the China fighting.

These responsible informants said New Zealand, in agreement with Britain and the United States, will ask the Security Council to meet Monday to consider extending the invitation to the Peiping regime.

The United States and Nationalist China were reported ready to participate in the discussions with the Chinese Reds.

Mr. President, I wish to say what the Government is planning to do is all to the good, provided we have a program, and provided we know what we want to do. I am of the opinion, and I say this respectfully, that one of the reasons why the President desires Congress to pass the resolution is that it would give to the President, who is our chief spokesman—and this is no time for politics—a strong arm, so to speak, a firm position, and a solid commitment.

I think the Senator from Illinois has said many times, as I know I have said, that we cannot negotiate with the Communists if we are in a position of weakness or uncertainty. If one sits down at a table with a Communist nation, he had better sit down prepared to meet any eventuality, and to proceed from a position of strength, firmness, and preciseness. That is why I personally believe that we should clarify the situation during the course of the debate, come to a decision, and pass a resolution which will join with the President in stating our unequivocal position on the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores, so the whole world may know where we stand.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Prefatory to the question, the senior Senator from Illinois desires to say that so long as there is even a slight possibility or a reasonable chance that Chiang Kai-shek could successfully invade the mainland, I would be opposed to a cease-fire agreement. What I wish to ascertain is whether the administration and the military authorities have in fact virtually given up most of the hope of such a successful invasion, which in times past apparently they held?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I can speak only for myself, and I know the Senator from Illinois would not expect me or desire me to attempt to speak for the administration. I speak only from what I understand to be the facts.

I ask the Senator from Illinois to examine carefully the record which was made in the joint meetings of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services. Although it is a secret or highly confidential record, it is available for Members of Congress to read. That record will reveal beyond a shadow of a doubt that the official position of the Government is that the Nationalists cannot invade the mainland of China without all-out support from the United States.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois. Then I shall yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have not seen the press dispatch to which the Senator from Minnesota referred, but a previous statement of the President was that he would welcome intervention by the United Nations in order to bring about a cease-fire agreement. If such a desire is backed up by a declaration by the United States that a cease-fire agreement should be entered into, that would in effect be chaining Chiang Kai-shek; would it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think it is fair to say that the position of the Government officials is that an invasion of the mainland by Nationalist forces would fail unless it had the full support of the United States, and that the talk of leashing and unleashing is only talk. I think the sooner we get down to the fact that we have in Nationalist China an ally to whom we are committed, and the sooner we get down to recognizing the military possibilities of that nation, we will be a lot better off.

The record is manifestly clear, and many Members of the Senate have read it, that there are trained troops on Formosa. Our Government has expended much money in training and maintaining those troops. The Nationalist Chinese Government has made great efforts to expand its forces. We are grateful to it for those efforts. Without such Nationalist troops in that area there would be immediate need for hundreds of thousands of American men. So we should be grateful for the forces that are in that area, and we should do all in our power to support them. Let us admit that we are committed to that ally, but let us not fool ourselves or our friends, because we are not fooling the enemy.

The truth is that the only possible way there could be a successful defense of Formosa would be with our help, and the only way there could be a successful invasion of the mainland of China by the Nationalists would be with the help of the Armed Forces and the economic assistance of the United States of America. I think it is fair to say that no responsible official of the Government who is speaking for the administration recognizes that such an invasion could otherwise be successful.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Minnesota agree with me that if a cease-fire agreement were proposed by our Government to the United Nations, in effect our Government would have decided that Chiang Kai-shek could not successfully invade the mainland?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would say that or I would say the cost would be so terrible in terms of goods, bloodshed, and human resources, that such a venture would, in the view of responsible men and women, be out of order.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Indiana, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER].

Mr. CAPEHART. Would not the proper answer to the question of the able Senator from Illinois be that this administration is anxious to stop wars and to stop shooting and to stop killing people, and is anxious to try to bring about peace throughout the world and to settle all these international matters with that objective in view? Would not that be the proper answer to the question of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator from Indiana that I am not going to indulge at all in any partisanship in connection with this matter.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am sure of that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have resolved that I will not engage or indulge in any partisanship in connection with it. Later on, we can go on the stump and can make partisan speeches, if we wish.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me say that I have been in the Chamber for 20 minutes, and I have observed that the Senator from Minnesota has not indulged in any partisanship.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe the President of the United States and those of his official family are committed by his policy and by the policy of Congress to one purpose, and only one purpose, namely, peace with honor. I point out that has been true of other administrations, too.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

The question asked of the Senator from Minnesota was whether it was the purpose of the pending measure to stop

the Chinese Nationalists of Chiang Kai-shek from going to the mainland of China. That was the question of the Senator from Illinois; was it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think the proper answer to that question is that this administration—and I am sure of this—would like to stop all wars and would like to stop all shooting all over the world, and would like to bring about universal peace and would like to have matters settled with that idea in view. I think that is the proper answer, regardless of whether there is a belief that the administration wants or does not want Chiang Kai-shek to get to the mainland of China.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Indiana has been putting in my mouth words I did not utter. I did not say that the primary purpose of the administration was to prevent Chiang Kai-shek from getting to the mainland. I said that the effect of a cease-fire would be to prevent him from getting to the mainland; and if the administration purposes a cease-fire, it would be because in their judgment the cost of getting Chiang Kai-shek to the mainland and of overturning the Red government would be too great. So they are proposing the placing of a strict leash or, perhaps, a chain upon Chiang Kai-shek. This is in sharp contrast to their claim 2 years ago that they were unleashing Chiang Kai-shek for an attack upon Red China.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. My statement was in regard to the effect of what the Senator from Illinois said. But regardless of whether the administration believes that Chiang Kai-shek can or cannot get to the mainland, or even though the administration might feel that he could get to the mainland, I still say the correct answer is that this administration is trying to put a stop to fighting and the killing of people, is trying to obtain peace, and to have the world's problems settled in a peaceful manner. Regardless of whether it feels that Chiang Kai-shek is or is not strong enough to invade the mainland, it would like to get this whole matter settled. That is the proper answer; and no other answer is proper, if I may speak for this administration; and I believe I can. The reason for its attitude is that the administration wants to stop killing, to stop fighting, to stop hostilities, and it wants to bring about a cease-fire, and to have an end put to wars all over the world. I am sure the administration wants that just as much as all Senators do.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me at this time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota very much.

Let me say, by way of preface, that I was interested in the remark or observation of the Senator from Minnesota to the effect that perhaps the dilemma with respect to Formosa could be solved by having Red China's Communists come into the United Nations and agree to a cease-fire or an armistice.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let me make the record perfectly clear. I never under any circumstances intimated that Red China should be or would be admitted to the United Nations at this time.

Mr. WELKER. I did not say that. I referred to their coming into the United Nations for the purpose of a cease-fire agreement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, yes.

Mr. WELKER. Will the distinguished Senator from Minnesota tell me one time when the Red Communists have ever kept any agreement they have made, either at Panmunjom or anywhere else?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The President of the United States deemed it wise to conclude a truce in Korea. There were those who disagreed with that conclusion. I was one who supported the President. There were those who felt that the Indochinese war should be brought to a conclusion; and our Government, in at least a partial sense, cooperated in the conclusion of that war.

I think it is the view, as the Senator from Indiana pointed out, that cease-fire agreements and truces are better than continuation of warfare. I am of the opinion that the responsible heads of this Government, both now and in the past, have believed and now believe that there is a better chance to work out difficulties when there is not the sacrifice of war and when there is not the suffering incident to fatalities, casualties, and hostilities, and that therefore the Government of the United States has sought at all times to bring the contesting forces to agreement. I commend our Government for that. It is not a sign of weakness. I have said to the Senator and to this entire Chamber that the passage of a joint resolution which clearly commits this Government to a strong position of defense and, on the other hand, the putting of the stamp of congressional approval upon United Nations' participation to bring about some peace and order, constitute the kind of twin-edged sword that is needed in this particular instance.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I certainly know of no Senator who advocates war or the killing of human beings. I ask the Senator from Minnesota whether it is a fact that the sensible way to handle this matter is to let the Red Chinese and, in fact, all Communists, wherever they may exist, not only in Formosa, but throughout the world, know that we have sufficient force to compel adherence to any agreement they may make, even though they have wilfully violated their agreements for many, many years. Is that not the conclusion of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe the only way we can possibly live in this world, in view of the international Communist conspiracy and the powerful forces which are arrayed against us, is to be strong and to be committed to a position of strength; and when we make commitments, we must be willing to fulfill them, or else not to make them in the first place.

In this instance, we have made a commitment to Formosa. That commitment has been made, not only by the present administration, but by the prior administration. It is a nonpartisan commitment. We have made the commitment, and we must show the world that we will not back down from it, that we will not yield—or, in other words, that there will be no appeasement, no backtracking.

But on the other hand, we must also recognize that the solution of these difficulties may be worked out peacefully.

Mr. WELKER. By agreement?

Mr. HUMPHREY. By agreement, if our Nation is strong enough, so that the agreement it makes can be kept.

Mr. WELKER. Very well.

Let me ask a concluding question: Is it not a fact that our President, the Commander in Chief—and I refer to our President as the President of all of us, without regard to politics—wants, and it is exactly what he wants, an agreement which may be kept, so as to stop war among these nations and in these lands; but he also wants, based upon his military genius and knowledge of military science, a sufficient force to enable him to compel the carrying out of any agreement the Communists may make—so that for once, if you please, in the long, long era of the Communist aggression, they will keep an agreement they make, instead of doing as they have done in the past, namely, violate those agreements.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would hope that is his position, and I believe it to be.

Mr. WELKER. Then, let me say in conclusion, I beg my friend, the Senator from Minnesota, to go down the line with us and let the President of the United States—who, after all, was elected by the American people—let him, the supreme commander of our forces, advocate what is right and just.

I thank my distinguished friend.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Idaho. I do not think there is any great, basic disagreement here at all.

In a moment I shall elaborate on my position, and then I shall yield the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I now hold in my hand the press dispatch to which the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] referred. The salient paragraph is as follows:

> An official British informant said today Britain and the United States have agreed to invite Communist China to the United Nations Security Council meeting for discussion of a cease-fire in the China fighting.

Does not the Senator from Minnesota believe that it would be very helpful if this body this afternoon, when we are

discussing this issue, could have from the United States Government itself either a confirmation or a denial of the truth of this report?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think it would be very helpful. I will say to the Senator that in the hearings we asked the Secretary of State a number of times whether or not the United States was proceeding at the United Nations. He indicated to us that we were taking steps in the United Nations to arrive at such an understanding as has been referred to. I happen to be one of those who believe that this is all to the good, but I think it would be of great assistance in this Chamber and among the American public if there were a definitive statement on the part of responsible officers of our Government, to the effect that we are proceeding forthwith, in good faith, to try to arrive at some understanding at the United Nations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not somewhat embarrassing for Members of the United States Senate, when they are discussing this question, to get information on this vital point from London rather than from the State Department which is only a mile from here?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will say to my friend from Illinois that earlier on the day the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] made a brief announcement in reference to the possibility of action in the United Nations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Did he make a definitive statement?

Mr. HUMPHREY. He made that announcement on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I believe also on behalf of the State Department. The announcement was merely to the effect that negotiations were underway.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But the statement to which I refer is a definite statement that Britain and the United States have agreed to invite Communist China to the United Nations Security Council meeting for the purpose of discussing a cease-fire in the China fighting. This is not a statement that negotiations are under way or a statement that something is about to happen, but it is the definite policy. Would it not be much better if we obtained definite information on this point from the State Department itself, rather than to have it bootlegged to us through London?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; it would. I hope, before the day is out, that there will be official confirmation of this report. I say to the Senator that the State Department did inform me of this development this morning.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not the Senator feel that it might be unwise to proceed to a final vote until we have such an official confirmation? Let me say, as a preface to that question, that I think the discussions of the two preceding days have been very helpful in obtaining assurance from the President that no military commander in the field would have authority to initiate an attack upon the Chinese mainland, and that if such a decision were to be made, it would be made by him. That clarified the issue to a degree which was not present when the House of Representatives passed the resolution. But would not further clarification on this point be extremely important?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think it would be, and I expect it to be forthcoming during the remaining hours of the day. It is our hope to reach a decision on the joint resolution with the factors which the Senator has brought out fully clarified for the public mind.

Mr. President, lest there be any misinterpretation of the purposes of this discussion, let me set the record straight. First, in the Asian area the greatest menace today to the peace of the world and the peace of its neighbors is the Communist Government of China. This we know.

We also know that the Communist Chinese forces are supported economically, politically, and militarily by the Soviet Union.

We also know that the Soviet Union and the Communist Government of China are in alliance, or have a treaty arrangement for mutual defense.

These things we, as Americans, know; and we ought clearly to understand them as we proceed in the consideration of questions of policy.

As a Member of the Senate I have believed very strongly in powerful defense forces for our Nation. I have not been one of those who wanted those forces reduced, nor have I been one of those who thought the air power of this Nation should be reduced. In fact, I have joined with my colleagues, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and others, in one effort after another to increase the military strength of this Nation, including the Army, last year, and 2 years ago the Air Force. Yet at the very hour when we are considering a resolution which would commit this Nation unequivocally to a strong position in the Far East, the news services tell us that representatives of the Department of Defense are before the House Committee on Armed Services recommending a reduction in the Marine Corps, a reduction in the Navy, and a reduction in the Army. I say that we cannot, on the one hand, have a program and a policy of strength, of determination, of unequivocal commitment not only with respect to Formosa and the Pescadores, but with respect to the offshore islands, and, on the other hand, come before committees of Congress and suggest a reduction in the military strength of this Nation.

I am of the opinion that the Soviet Union has been hoping that we would be lulled into a false sense of security. That almost happened to us on a previous occasion. If there was one thing that came out of the Korean war to the benefit of this Nation is was that it aroused us to the menace at large in the world. It committed this country to a program of strength, armament, and defense.

In recent months I have been afraid that we were being lulled back into a false sense of security. Only a few months ago statements were made to the effect that the international scene was much more peaceful. That is what some would have us believe. The truth is that it is not peaceful. I would not be in the least surprised if at this very hour in the Kremlin there is deep concern, not because of what we are doing alone, but because of the action of the Chinese Communists in shelling and occupying certain islands and thereby again reminding us of the Communist threat to world peace. In my judgment, there is real concern in the Kremlin because again, as Americans, and as Members of Congress, we are going to see to it that our defenses are not weak. There is nothing the Soviet Union wants less than that. It wants to be sure that we are weak; and we must be sure that we are strong.

So, Mr. President, as we conclude this debate, it is my hope that we shall be able to clarify the language of the joint resolution by making it read as follows:

That the President of the United States be and he hereby is authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack.

That is the commitment which Congress should make. That is the policy statement which we should support. It tells the whole world that we in the Congress stand alongside our President in the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores. It leaves no doubt as to where we stand.

Secondly, I think we should amend the joint resolution by a reference in the preamble to the United Nations. Let us stand before the peoples of the world as a strong nation, both militarily and economically. Let us not boast about it. Let us be sure about it.

Equally important, let us stand before the world as peacemakers. Let us tell the world that we want peace with honor, peace with justice. If we are to be peacemakers we must be confident, calm, and poised. We must have presevering patience and confident courage, and we must have continuing strength.

I am of the opinion that what we are about to do in the United Nations, according to the announcements which have been made, will strengthen us in the eyes of the world—at least among the nations of the world—even if that effort should not be successful. In my judgment, however, the effort may very well be successful, because one of the sore points between this country and other countries has been our far eastern policy. That is not to say that we have been wrong and that they have been right, but there has been a difference between the United States and its allies on this issue. It is certainly fair to say that the Formosan area is a land of legal uncertainty as to who owns it, as to who has jurisdiction, and where it rightfully belongs in the society of nations.

If we can come out of the negotiations in the United Nations with a solution to this dilemma, wherein we and other nations will guarantee the integrity and independence and freedom of Formosa, which may require relinquishing some of the offshore islands, I would say that we shall have made progress toward peace; provided, of course, that we do not then proceed in the belief that peace will endure of itself and that the nations of the

free world may pursue their respective courses without any effort to maintain their strength.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I wonder whether the Senator from Minnesota agrees with me that the effect of the resolution is that Congress declares to the world that we are ready to stand with the President in the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores, and that if those islands are attacked we are ready to go to war with Red China in the defense of those islands; in other words, that we are ready to take whatever risk goes with that declaration? I say that because to say anything less or not to make it as clear as that is only to leave doubt as to our intentions. This Nation should be willing to make decisions even if those decisions could lead to war with Red China, knowing that China would undoubtedly call on Russia for assistance. When we vote for the resolution we must accept that risk. Is that the Senator's feeling?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not believe there is any doubt about it. I think that was made crystal clear by the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] in the first interview following the hearings before the two committees. There is no easy way out. Let me make it clear beyond peradventure that whenever the Soviet Union or Communist China feel they want to make war, they know how to make it.

We could have a resolution or no resolution and still have war. Our feeling is that we should have a firm commitment on the part of our Government, and we feel that if we make that commitment clear and state what we will defend, and what we consider to be our line of defense, the probability of war or hostilities is less. That is my belief. I grant that it is only a valued judgment of responsible men.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. If this situation results in war, of course all Americans will stand together. Nevertheless, questions will be asked by the nations of the world, particularly by the neutral nations, and questions will be asked among historians as to who started the war, who hit the first blow, who was the aggressor, and so forth.

Of course our side will argue that the enemy was the aggressor, and the enemy will argue that we were the aggressor. They will say we started the war, and we will say they started it. However, so far as history is concerned, some of us prefer to make very clear that our position was reasonable, that we were willing to have a peaceful settlement made of the problem, and that we offered to make a peaceful settlement of it, but that nevertheless the enemy started the war.

Some of us feel it would be better to make perfectly clear who started the war by attacking Formosa and the Pescadores, rather than that the enemy started the war by shelling the Quemoy Island, for example. That is the difference of opinion that some of us have. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. Some of us feel that a firm commitment, such as is contained in the resolution with reference to Quemoy, involves ourselves in greater risk of getting into war and the possibility of being called the aggressor. In other words, we would like to diminish that risk. We would like to have the language clarified. As I said yesterday, I believe the President went a long way to mollify our concern by indicating what his purpose was, namely, the immediate and direct defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

It is my opinion that one reason for the language in the pending resolution which refers to the offshore islands is what is transpiring in the United Nations. That language is a bargaining point. I would suggest that we watch very carefully what transpires at the U. N.

If we are to have a chance to get an agreement in the U. N. we must have something to give away, if we ask the other side to give up something also.

As I stated already, and now repeat, although the resolution involves a firm commitment—and we must realize that it could lead to war—I believe that basically it represents high diplomacy backed up by strength.

It is not sufficient to have only diplomacy when we deal with the Communists. In dealing with them we can argue and can use logic and reason, and be filled with loving kindness, but if we do not have the tools and the strength to back up our diplomacy, we might just as well not go into any meeting with them.

If the resolution is modified, as I hope it will be, there will be no doubt as to our position, and it will give us the strength and sense of direction that are needed, and I believe we shall have made a substantial gain toward world peace.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. It is just as well that we also face this fact, that when the decision is made, our enemies might as well take notice of and fully realize the possible consequences, and that we are prepared to face them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. It is not the type of decision that was made when we entered Korea, when we did not anticipate that we would finally find Russia an intervenor in that situation. On the contrary, in making this decision we fully realize that if Russia wants to force the world into war, she can take a position that will do that. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say to the Senator from Louisiana that I think that possibility does exist, and I think it exists whether we have a resolution or no resolution. However, with the resolution we make it crystal clear that there will be no more being pushed around, that there will be no more backtracking, and that there will be no more indecisiveness.

Frankly, I believe that could have been done in a much more simple fashion, but that was not my choice.

I believe if we keep in mind what commitments we make, we will be a little more careful, as we go through the session, as to how we cut the budget at the expense of security.

As one Member of the Senate, I serve notice now that if the Government is going to say, "We will defend this," and "We will defend that"—and we have made commitments under SEATO and other commitments all over the world, and we are now making a commitment under the pending resolution—if we make these commitments we must keep them, and before we make commitments we must be sure we can keep them. We cannot keep commitments with a paper army. We cannot keep commitments with planes that are on the drawing boards. We ought to have the force in being, or stop making commitments. We should do one or the other. Otherwise, someone, some day, will call our bluff. In this instance, we ought to recognize that this is not a bluff. If it is a bluff, it will result in a major disaster for the United States. This is real business, and we ought to let everyone know it is real business. It seems to me we ought to make sure how far that business goes.

I say we ought to include in the resolution the island chain that has been staked out as the defense line, and we ought not to make any unnecessary commitments with respect to islands which are 4 or 5 or 6 miles off the China mainland, in territory which is in legal contest and indefensible from a military point of view. If we do, we shall be running a calculated risk far beyond ordinary and prudent judgment.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Inasmuch as our real purpose is peace in the world, does it not seem to the Senator from Minnesota that it makes better sense to tell the enemy not to attempt to take an area that we know we can prevent him from taking, than telling him not to try to take something that we are not certain we can prevent him from taking?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I surely believe that to be true.

Unless there are further questions, I shall yield the floor. Does the Senator from Illinois wish to ask me a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is one question which I should like to ask. I have felt all along that there were possibilities that this resolution would stand not merely on the determination to defend these islands, but, as the Senator from Minnesota has suggested, on its availability as a trading point, so that the islands could be given up in return for a cease fire.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is strictly my personal opinion, not confirmed by anything else but my personal view.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If that be true, do we not take away the trading point from the administration by saying we shall defend only Formosa?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think that is a valid point. I considered, in view of my own personal attitude, that the gamble and the risk were too great. I personally felt that it was a risk we should not take. I feel much better about it today than I felt yesterday. As I have stated publicly, I felt the President actually rewrote, in a sense, the resolution. He gave

his own positive interpretation of what it contains. There have been several rewritings. We had, first of all, the Formosa treaty, which still lies in the Foreign Relations Committee. That treaty, in its essence, would be amended by the resolution which is before the Senate, because the treaty would limit the area of defense to the Pescadores and Formosa, unless there should be mutual consent between the parties with reference to other areas. That would require both parties to give consent. Then came the resolution, which includes in other areas without mutual consent—unilaterally on our part.

Then came the President's statement, that the purpose is to provide for the immediate and direct defense of Formosa and the Pescadores, and that if there is to be any further military action, the President himself will personally take the responsibility, thereby allaying the doubts and fears of some persons.

Then came the U. N. announcement of today.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I am sure the Senator realizes that there is not complete unanimity even in the United States regarding a cease-fire and an honorable peace based on the status quo. There are some elements in this country that want this Nation to continue to support Chiang Kai-shek, even with our Air Force, our Navy, and our Army, until the Communist regime is eventually overthrown. The Senator knows that, I am sure.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do know that.

Mr. LONG. Life magazine, one of the most influential magazines in this Nation, contained an editorial recently, this week, I think, saying the President was not an appeaser because he had suggested a cease-fire. The editorial suggested that perhaps he was an appeaser for permitting the Tachens to fall under Communist control, and stating that only a small force could have prevented that from happening. There is an indication that he would accept a cease-fire.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I realize that, and I think there are some elements, some even in the President's own party, that will cut right across political parties. My own feeling about it is that so long as there is an opportunity for peace we should honestly and honorably pursue it, and that hostilities or war—call it what you will—may be forced upon us. If so, we should be ready to meet that situation. We should not seek it, but we should do everything we can to avert it, and, at the same time, try to use all the strength at our command to bring about not simply an agreement, but some advancement of the cause of human freedom.

There are many things that could be settled, even in the Far Eastern area, if we could but get people to agree. I think the only way we will get an agreement is to have a close-working relationship with strong allies, on the one hand, and plenty of strength on the part of ourselves.

I am speaking for myself. I have been most unhappy and disturbed about this resolution, because of what it might result in, as has been truly set forth in the debate. The authority under the resolution, not the resolution itself, could lead to war. On the other hand, it could very well lead to a great period of peace. There is a calculated risk.

But, as I said in the beginning, we have one President at a time in this country. There are others who would like to be President, but there is only one President at a time. When the President of the United States sends a message to Congress, as he did in this instance, with a resolution, it is not comparable to a situation in which the Prime Minister of Great Britain makes a statement to the Parliament on policy matters, because, in Great Britain, if the Prime Minister delivers a policy statement and puts it up for a vote of confidence, if the vote of confidence is not given, the Prime Minister goes out and a new government comes in.

In the present situation, under our doctrine of the separation of powers, when the President has announced a policy and delivered his message and laid a resolution before the Congress, to repudiate it would not mean a change in the Government. The Government would merely be immobilized. It would literally mean taking away from the President as a public official, as the Chief Executive, the full support of the people of the United States, leaving him without power to act, or, at least, without the confidence of the people in his actions. So, I say there is a great deal of difference. It is not like laying before Parliament a policy statement, as Mendes-France did, for example, in connection with the London agreement, and saying, "Support this agreement. If you fail to support it, the Government falls and a new Prime Minister must come in."

That is not what we have in this country. Once the President has made and announced his decision, actually what we are left to do, in terms of our discussion, is to support it, hoping we may modify certain wide areas of authority, areas which are not precisely drawn. But the truth is that if the resolution should be defeated by the Congress, Mr. Eisenhower would still be President of of the United States, still be Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, still be the chief spokesman of the American foreign policy, but denied the confidence of the representatives of the people; and, to the Communist world, that would be a great day.

Therefore, Mr. President, as a member of this body and as a citizen, I have no effective choice, I frankly state, but to support the resolution. Even though the amendments which I hope will be accepted should be defeated, I would still feel that I owed the obligation to the Chief Executive, in view of his commitments, to go along with him.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the pending joint resolution is one of paramount importance not only to the citizens of the United States, but to the entire world. It is my opinion that prompt enactment of the joint resolution will promote the purposes behind its introduction, and in the remarks I am making, my first to the Senate, I shall limit my presentation to 6 minutes.

Passage of the joint resolution would mean that the Congress was supporting the firm stand being taken by the administration. Since 1950 the United Nations and the United States have given the Communists every opportunity to demonstrate their friendship in the Far East and in other parts of the world. These opportunities have been disregarded by the Reds as so tragically illustrated by the imprisonment of the 11 American airmen in China.

The actions of the Communists indicate they have mistaken patience as a sign of appeasement. Although this resolution in nowise casts aside our patience, it does remove any doubt the Communists may entertain that the United States is an appeaser. It evidences our firmness.

This statement of firmness simply demonstrates solidarity, that the American people, through their elected representatives in the Congress, are unified and dedicated to freedom and democracy against the degradation of communism. The statement makes clear to all the world that the United States is willing to meet its solemn obligations to our allies.

The fear which permeates the world today comes not as a result of the efforts of the United States to maintain peaceful relations with the other nations of the world. That fear is the result of the aggressive and warlike actions of the Communists in the Far East and elsewhere.

This resolution is not an act of aggression. Rather it is a step toward the preservation of peace.

If the Communists continue their encroachments against the Pescadores and Formosa after passage of this resolution, it will not be because of the resolution, but in spite of it. By that I mean to say that, in my opinion, the Communists will not attack in the Formosa area or elsewhere unless they believe themselves strong enough to conquer, or unless they believe us weak enough to submit.

I have advocated publicly a strong Defense Establishment because I believe it to be our best means of assuring continued peace. Appeasement promotes aggression and weakness invites attack.

As I have advocated strength in our military preparedness, I advocate firmness in our relations with aggressor nations.

Our earnest prayer is for peace. If war should come, it would not be the result of any aggressive act on the part of the United States. But war might come as the result of any display of weakness, of disunity, or of hesitation.

I shall cast my vote on the side of firmness, for unity and for decision.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, it is my intention to support the pending resolution.

I do so because I interpret it as a demonstration to the world that the American people are united in their resistance to Communist aggression. We do not propose to compromise with the naked brute force of the Red tyranny.

The resolution does not confer any new powers upon the President. It does not

grant him any authority he does not possess. It is not a move which shapes American foreign policy in any form other than that which it will take when we approve the Formosan Treaty.

The responsibility for action will still be upon the President—and I do not envy him that responsibility. We must still hope and pray that God will guide his hand in setting a course that will protect and preserve our basic freedoms and our cherished institutions.

To my mind, the resolution is merely congressional recognition of the tremendous burdens the President must carry during the days of peril which lie ahead of us. On that basis, I freely and willingly grant him my support—and I am confident that this is the sentiment of the overwhelming majority of Congress.

We cannot, through this resolution, make decisions of high military strategy. That is the prerogative of the President. It is his prerogative because there is no one else in a position to exercise it.

We cannot, through this resolution, lay down blueprints that will guide the United States for all time to come. In these swiftly changing times, the blueprints of today may be entirely inadequate for tomorrow.

We cannot, through this resolution, instruct all the Presidents of the future to take a certain course of action whenever a given set of circumstances arises. None of us can see clearly through the dark mists that shroud the days before us.

But we can express the unity of American opposition to Communist imperialism. We can express our understanding of the grave crisis which confronts all humanity. We can express our determination to stand firm for the preservation of the cherished values of our civilization.

Above all, we can express our assurances that, as responsible men, we will help the President to the utmost of our ability. We will try to meet this crisis in the spirit of Americans, not partisans, dedicated to the salvation of our country through a firm unification of our people against the enemy of liberty.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment "1–26–55—A" and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add at the end of the resolution the following paragraph:

Nothing in this resolution shall be construed to authorize the President to use our Armed Forces on the mainland of China, or to intervene in defense of any islands controlled by the Chinese Nationalist Government within 12 miles of the coast of China except for the specific purpose of helping to withdraw Nationalist troops and civilians from such islands.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, for the sake of continuity in the RECORD, I desire to read from the resolution which is under discussion. It reads:

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States be and he hereby is authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack, this authority to include the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands and the taking of such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

Mr. President, I have not heard a single argument on this floor that was not voiced before we got into World War II. The Senators who have spoken upon the resolution are apparently just as patriotic as were those who stated, before World War II, that Hitler was going to Africa, to Brazil, coming up to Mexico through South America, and then coming into the United States of America. I sat here through all that debate, and many things were afterward done by the President of the United States which various Senators thought never would be done.

I sat here on the floor of the Senate when $2 billion were voted for China. Some of us who were opposed to giving that money to China said that a part of, if not all, the $2 billion would go into the hands of Communist China. We were hopelessly outvoted. Indeed, those who voted against that amendment were charged with being Communists or as favoring communism. Yet only a few months later the then Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, admitted that 90 percent of the $2 billion worth of supplies was in the hands of the Communists in China.

Mr. President, what I am interested in knowing about the pending joint resolution is whether, if the Communists were to concentrate their forces five, six, seven, or eight hundred miles inside the mainland of China, and were concentrating airplanes, ammunition, and whatever else they might concentrate in that area, allegedly, perhaps, to attack Formosa, the Senate of the United States would have given authority to the President of this country to send armed forces into that area that far inland, in order to wipe out such concentrations.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In a conversation I had with the distinguished Senator a few days ago, I told him I hoped to have the yeas and nays ordered on his amendment. If the Senator will permit an interruption, I request the yeas and nays on the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished minority leader for his request.

Mr. President, I wish to read a part of the resolution again:

That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa.

What the Senator from North Dakota is interested in knowing is whether, under the resolution, the Senate would in advance give the President of the United States a blank check to send armed forces 500, 600, 700, 800, 900, or 1,000 miles inside the mainland of China, in order to wipe out concentrations of airplanes or whatever other kinds of military weapons the Communists may have concentrated.

My amendment simply provides that:

Nothing in this resolution shall be construed to authorize the President to use our Armed Forces on the mainland of China, or to intervene in defense of any islands controlled by the Chinese Nationalist Government within 12 miles of the coast of China except for the specific purpose of helping to withdraw Nationalist troops and civilians from such islands.

Mr. President, the amendment speaks for itself. It is very simple and very plain. It is simply a question of whether the Senate, in advance, is going to authorize our President to send forces into the mainland of China, or whether it is not. That is all there is to the question. If the President were to send such forces into the mainland of China, it would be an act of war. Therefore, for the first time in all the history of America, the United States would be the aggressor. If that were to be true, the United States, in the court of world opinion, would not be in so favorable a light as it would be if my amendment to the resolution were adopted.

It may be said that the President already has authority to send our Armed Forces anywhere in the world in order to protect Formosa, but certainly the Senate, if the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota were agreed to, would not have given the President that authority.

I might add, Mr. President, that so far as I am concerned, at this time I certainly shall not vote to send American boys to the mainland of China. I do not want them over there, to fight perhaps for years and years and years where, as the late Senator Taft said in a speech on the floor of the Senate, they would be hopelessly outnumbered.

Mr. President, I was very much interested in the speech made by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], in which he referred to the psychological effect the passage of the resolution would have, and said the passage of the resolution was being sought in order to secure the moral support of the people. As a result of many letters, telegrams, and telephone calls which I have received, I am entirely satisfied that the people of this country do not want American boys sent hundreds and hundreds of miles into the mainland of China any more than they want them sent into the swamps and jungles of Asia.

Mr. President, I was interested a few days ago at a hearing before the Foreign Relations Committee in a paper filed by Hamilton Fish, who for 20 years was on the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives when he was a Member of the Congress.

I may say in passing that Hamilton Fish's cousin, a Columbia University man, was the first man killed in World War I; and I may also say in passing that Hamilton Fish's family, in my opin-

ion, yields to no other family in America in patriotism and love of this country.

At this time I wish to state the substance—I shall not use his exact words—of some of the things Hamilton Fish said in testifying before the Foreign Relations Committee in connection with the Asiatic treaty, which he opposed at the public hearing:

I charge that this joint resolution is a war-provoking measure, and not, as claimed, a resolution to keep this country out of war.

Mr. President, I well remember when the lend-lease bill was passed and when we turned over destroyers to Great Britain. It was said that would keep us out of war, and that that measure was a peace measure. How well I remember what the distinguished late Senator Tobey said on that occasion. He said that measure and that action meant war. As all of us know, the prophecy of the late Senator Tobey was correct.

Mr. President, I read further from my version of the substance of the statement filed by Hamilton Fish:

I charge that this joint resolution is based on the same fallacious and false argument advanced in support of the lend-lease bill as a peace measure, whereas even its proponents admit today that it was a war measure. I charge that a bipartisan foreign policy is the most dangerous, warlike innovation in the last 10 years. Franklin Delano Roosevelt tried to establish it prior to World War II by appointing Colonel Knox, a Republican, as Secretary of the Navy, and Mr. Stimson, another Republican, as Secretary of War. But it failed lamentably in stifling the strong public sentiment in opposition to our entering World War II before the Jap attack on Pearl Harbor. Once more they declare there has to be unity and cooperation.

In time of peace, a bipartisan foreign policy is contrary to our two-party system and stifles criticism when it is most needed.

Just think, Mr. President, that the House of Representatives debated this measure for only 2 hours.

I read further:

It amounts to a gigantic coverup and virtually a fraud upon the American people.

Why not consult the free, sovereign American citizens on our foreign policy, involving the lives of their sons, the destruction of their wealth and resources, and the security of their Republic? That should be openly debated throughout the Nation. It is far greater and more vital to the American people than any other issue.

But, Mr. President, I do not believe that today one-half of 1 percent of the American people realize what the Senate is debating or what it means to the American people.

I read further:

No blank check should be given to any President or Secretary of State to involve us in war. Congress should never surrender to anyone its constitutional power to declare war. That is a sacred authority conferred on Congress by the American people and the founders of our Nation—to hold in check any warmongering, autocratic, or Fascist President.

Mind you, Mr. President, I am a friend of the President of the United States. I am not criticizing him at all. But when I think of what happened at Yalta and Teheran and some of the other places where President Franklin D. Roosevelt had a blank check to do almost anything he wanted to do, then certainly the Senator from North Dakota wants to protect the people of the United States against any deal of any kind made by that kind of a President.

I read further:

Only elected public officials can actually circumvent the Constitution, the supreme law of the land. It is in the Halls of Government that actual subversion may be taking place far more dangerous to the people and destiny of our country than all the propaganda of the Communists and their dupes in the United States. The Constitution is not a plaything to be bandied about by the Senate, the Congress, or the President.

Mr. President, we know what the Constitution provides in regard to declaring war; we know it provides that only the Congress can declare war.

I read further:

Our foreign policy, if it exists at all, is of the tweedledee and tweedledum variety. Under Mr. Truman, it was the Truman-Acheson-Dulles brand; and under Mr. Eisenhower it is the Dulles-Marshall-Acheson type of one worldism.

There is little or no difference between the internationalism of the New Dealers and the me-too Republicans. President Eisenhower is just as internationalistic as Franklin D. Roosevelt or Harry Truman.

The tragic death of Senator Taft has made it possible for President Eisenhower to assume the international mantle of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Truman, Marshall, and Acheson.

Mr. President, only 2 years ago we had a national election for President of the United States. I leave it to any Senator on this floor to state whether I am correct when I say that the greatest argument in favor of the election of Dwight Eisenhower, when he was a candidate, was the pledge he made to the fathers and mothers of this country that, if elected President, he would go to Korea. When he made that announcement over the radio, almost immediately all over the land there was a great wave of sentiment in favor of the Republican Party. The people of the United States do not want their boys on the mainland of China, thousands of miles from their homes, fighting 4 million men. Under my amendment, that would not be possible unless the President did it upon his own responsibility.

Mr. President, I charge that a bipartisan foreign policy in time of peace deprives the American people of any voice in the determination of the greatest of all issues, namely, that of maintenance of peace or involvement in war.

I charge that a bipartisan foreign policy of tweedledum and tweedledee internationalism, and the policing of the world singlehanded, will involve us in a disastrous war in southeast Asia if the SEATO treaty is ratified—and in my opinion it will be, as will the treaty with China, in all probability.

I do not profess to be a great prophet, but I remember very well when we were debating the United Nations. Newspapers all over the country said that if a Senator voted against the United Nations he was voting for war, and if he voted for the United Nations he was voting for peace. I listened to that debate. I heard one of our most distinguished Senators say that the United Nations was similar to the Thirteen Colonies, which organized the United States of America. I believe that the Senator to whom I refer was sincere when he said that. He is still a Member of this body. On at least one occasion he has said that he regretted that vote.

I said upon that occasion that the United Nations was entirely dissimilar from the Thirteen Colonies, and that if at the time of the Thirteen Colonies the State of New York or any other State had the right of veto over the other 12 States, certainly Virginia, for example, would not have joined the Union.

Mr. President, I wish to read a portion of the very brief speech which I delivered at the time of the approval of the United Nations Charter by this body. At that time I said:

Mr. President, during my service in the Senate in behalf of the common people, I have never sold the truth to serve the hour. I have no quarrel with the vote of any honest Senator upon this floor. Each one took the same oath that I took, namely, to defend and uphold the Constitution of the United States of America.

Practically all Members of this body have indicated that they will vote for the charter. Under my oath, Mr. President, and under my conscience, I cannot so vote. If I did I would feel that I was betraying the hundreds of thousands who have died in this war for the United States, and the hundreds of thousands who have sacrificed their loved ones and their treasure. I would be willing to vote for the appropriation of the last dollar in the United States Treasury, and the last dollar that we could borrow if, by spending that money, we could eliminate war, which we all abhor and hate. I would unhesitatingly vote for the charter if I felt that it offered even the tiniest hope of a permanent peace. But, in spite of that, Mr. President, I feel from the bottom of my heart that the adoption of the charter—and, make sure, we are going to implement it—will mean perpetuating war.

What have we had since the adoption of that charter, Mr. President, except one war after another, and trouble all over the world? So far as I can see, the only benefit to flow from the United Nations Charter has been that when Malik, of Russia, presided over the United Nations in New York, he had an opportunity to talk and spread the propaganda of communism all over the United States by radio.

At that time I said:

I feel that it will mean the enslavement of millions of people from Poland to India, from Korea to Java, as well as people in many other places on this earth.

I was correct with respect to Korea and Java. Perhaps it will yet appear that I was correct also with respect to Poland and India.

I said further:

Mr. President, I feel that the adoption of the charter will be one step more toward compulsory and military conscription, and all that goes with war.

Only 18 months after I delivered that speech, a bill was introduced providing for universal military conscription. I never could understand why the advice of George Washington, to keep America from becoming involved with almost every other country on the globe, has not been heeded.

I continued:

In my opinion, the charter is not at all similar to the Constitution of the United States which was adopted by the original colonies. I may say at this point that I agree with what the distinguished Senater from New Hampshire, Mr. BRIDGES, said earlier in the day, when he stated:

"Most important of all, the American Constitution went to great length to guarantee genuine equality to States entering into the Union. Neither Ben Franklin nor the other members of the Constitutional Convention would have tolerated a constitution by which 2 or 3 or 5 of the States were given a veto power over all of the rest."

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a copy of the charter which was adopted. Let me make it clear that from the day the Senate voted to approve the United Nations Charter, no Senator has been more loyal or more honest in carrying out the theory of the United Nations than has the Senator from North Dakota. So long as the experiment was to be tried, I was for it. Only one other Senator, Senator Shipstead, of Minnesota, voted against it. Hiram Johnson, on his deathbed in the hospital, was paired against the United Nations Charter.

Mr. President, have we not the right to wonder, in considering the pending joint resolution, who is to help us if we get into war on the mainland of China? Who is to send troops over there?

Who signed this charter? It was signed by China, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, France, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippine Commonwealth, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Yugoslavia.

That is a list of 51 countries, if I have counted correctly. Yet, when we became involved in the so-called police action in Korea, where were all these countries that had signed this high-sounding charter?

Is it not true that the United States paid 95 percent of the cost? Is it not true that 95 percent of the casualties of the United Nations forces in Korea were American boys?

I want to say, in passing, that my vote against the United Nations Charter is one vote I have never regretted.

If the resolution is passed, if 500 or 1,000 miles inside the mainland of China there is a concentration of hundreds of planes, or a concentration of trainloads of ammunition, or a concentration of troops in training, is the United States going to sit idly by?

We have a President who said yesterday that he is perfectly willing to assume the responsibility. However, I repeat I do not believe that the United States Senate ought now to give him a blank check, without coming back to the Senate, if he wants to come back, to involve our country in war with 400 million people on the mainland of China, a country that never has been defeated in all its history.

Mr. President, I for one by my vote do not intend to send a single American boy to the slaughter fields of the mainland of China.

I wish to come back to the resolution. The resolution provides:

The President of the United States be and he is hereby authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack, this authority to include the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands and the taking of such other measures—

I repeat—

and the taking of such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

In other words, we are authorizing the President to do anything he wants to do with the approval of the Senate, and we are authorizing him to do it in advance. If a war should come, how would any Senator be able to criticize the President several months from now for something he did?

Certainly now is the time to say that we do not want to become involved in any war on the mainland of China.

Mr. President, our State Department is a funny kind of organization. I voted on the floor of the Senate about 4 or 5 years ago to give the State Department millions of dollars, because it was said by the State Department that it wanted to set up a school to train diplomats. The spokesmen for the Department said that some of the other countries had such schools, some of which were 300 years old. They said, "Now we were going to see to it that our diplomats are just as smart as those of any other country."

The State Department has those millions of dollars. Yet, Mr. President, who have been appointed as diplomats under this administration? The vice president of the Chase National Bank; the son of John D. Rockefeller; a partner of Dillion-Reed, who knew no more about diplomacy when he was appointed than I do. We have a very fine lady, Clare Boothe Luce, in Italy, who had as much experience in diplomacy as I had. Mr. Guggenheim, the millionaire, represents us in Portugal. There are others.

Of course, I have forgotten Nelson Rockefeller, who was appointed a few weeks ago as some kind of roving Ambassador. Yet we appropriated millions of dollars to get trained diplomats.

I hold in my hand an article which appeared in the Washington Daily News a few days ago. The title of the article is "Five Years Ago Formosa Was Thought 'Worthless'." It was written by R. H. Shackford, a Scripps-Howard staff writer. I shall read a portion of the article:

There is no stranger case in modern American political and military "diplomacy" than the postwar policy toward Formosa.

Less than 5 years ago the United States considered Formosa worthless. Today it is considered vital to the defense of the free world.

Now that President Eisenhower has pledged to keep Formosa out of Communist hands, the State Department's Special Guidance No. 28 to its personnel on Formosa, dated December 23, 1949, makes strange reading today. It said in part:

"Loss of the island (Formosa) is widely anticipated. * * *

"All material should be used best to counter the false impression that its loss would seriously damage the interests of either the United States or of other countries opposing communism; that the United States is responsible for or committed in any way to act to save Formosa. * * *

"Emphasize as appropriate (that) * * * Formosa has no special military significance * * * the island is of no special strategic advantage to the Chinese Communist armed forces."

That is not BILL LANGER talking; that is the State Department of the United States of America, for which Congress appropriates hundreds of millions of dollars a year. Only a short time ago Formosa was said to be of no use; now it is of great importance.

It reminds me of World War I. Senator after Senator who upon this floor voted for World War I afterwards said we made a mistake, that we should never have become involved in World War I. That can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Today, when we talk with almost any Senator, he says, "How nice it would have been if we had let Germany and Russia fight each other and we had not been involved."

In conclusion, Mr. President, I simply wish to repeat that every Senator who votes for this resolution is authorizing the President of the United States, with the consent of the Senate, to send troops anywhere, possibly thousands of miles into the mainland of China. It may be desirable to do that as time goes on; I would not know about that; but, certainly, so far as the senior Senator from North Dakota is concerned, he is not going to vote at this time to give a blank check to the President of the United States to use "any and all other means"—to quote from the resolution—to do as he pleases.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks on my amendment, certain representative telegrams which I have received from various parts of the country.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

American Political Action Committee, a nationwide, nonpartisan political committee opposed to communism, socialism, and internationalism, favors the defense of Formosa and Pescadores, but urges amendment that nothing contained in resolution shall be construed as empowering President to send a single American soldier to mainland of China or to defend islands within 12 miles of Chinese coast. Former Senator Taft, in last public message, specifically warned against sending American troops to mainland of China.

HAMILTON FISH,
President, American Political Action Committee.

HOT SPRINGS, ARK., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:
As a Republican voter and campaigner for Eisenhower I hope—certainly with millions of other Americans—that you will not submit to pressure for hysteria because your courage can still save the lives of millions of American men, women, and children.
Dr. K. KAUFFMANN-GRINSTEAD.

SHAWANO, WIS., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:
Fight this malarkey staff. Be all-American.
M. E. BLACK.

LAFAYETTE, IND., *January 26, 1955.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank you for working against Chinese war. Keep debate going for few more days and even Washington will hear people's prayers for peace.
JOHN SCHUDER.

SYRACUSE, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Hearty congratulations on vote against the defend Formosa resolution in committee. Continue fight in Senate.
HORACE A. EATON.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We support your opposition to the resolution on Formosa which will serve only to start a third world war. To maintain peace this resolution must be defeated.
IRVIN and BEATRICE SCHREIBMAN.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Endorse your opposition to Formosa resolution. Urge you make every effort to get Senate to return resolution to your committee for purpose of holding public hearings so that people's sentiment can be heard.
MAX R. MILLMAN.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your opposition to involvement of our country in preventative war. The lives of our sons should not be sacrificed to promote the Chiang Kai-shek gang in China civil war. As parents we believe that you express the will of the American people.
DAVID and SOPHIE DAVIS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 26, 1955.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Vital you oppose war over Formosa.
Thank you.
CHED VUCKOVIC.

MOUNT VERNON, N. Y., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We support your stand opposing sending of United States troops to Chinese mainland.
Mr. and Mrs. JOHN PRATT.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Strongly urge opposition to Eisenhower's Formosa proposal a serious threat to world peace.
Mrs. ROSE SMUKLER.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank you for opposing the President's proposals regarding Formosa. Please keep up the fight.
Mrs. T. SURIAN.

DETROIT, MICH., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
I applaud your decision not to support another Korean adventure, this time in Formosa. Congratulations. Millions of people agree with you.
JOHN CONLEY.

DETROIT, MICH., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Commend you on courageous stand to protect American lives. No winner when the atom bomb falls.
Mr. and Mrs. AERON KRASNER.

MOUNT VERNON, N. Y., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations for your opposition to send United States troops to China.
LOU PRATT.

DETROIT, MICH., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR BILL: Encouraged by your TV analysis to believe that some Members of Senate will avoid emotional and blind following of trap set by China lobby. Thank you and more power to you.
IRVING RICHTER.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
I support your opposition to Eisenhower's resolution on Formosa. We must not risk war to support interventions in Chinese affairs.
JOSEPH SCHWARTZ.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulate your stand against preventive war resolution. Urge your continued opposition and urge holding of vote until sentiment of American public fully registered.
W. B. MORTON.

DETROIT, MICH., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Commend your position on Formosa. For the sake of our children let's not rush into a war. There is time for open hearings and work through the United Nations.
MARY ANN DOOHA.

PRESCOTT, ARIZ., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Millions of honest and loyal Americans are hoping and praying today that your behavior on the Senate floor will not discourage faithful Americans from performing wholeheartedly their duty to home and country, nor lend courage and comfort to our treacherous enemy. Ponder this seriously lest you fall victim to your own conceit.
Dr. S. H. ROBINSON.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Strongly and fervently urge Formosa question be taken to U. N. immediately. President's plan, especially protection of Quemoy and Matsu certain to involve us in war. This will be the saddest hour in our Nation's history if we permit ourselves to be sucked into this horrible situation. It will mean all-out war.
MONICA HALLER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
In considering Formosa resolution, following facts must be weighed: No Communist leader to date threatened invasion of Formosa by surface forces, which in presence of 7th Fleet, impossible. Communist threats alluded to liberation of Formosa and could be accomplished by aerial destruction of physical assets of Chiang Kai-shek regime and its complete elimination as political factor in world affairs. Threat to Formosa not Chinese army but Chinese air force. President's statement "We must be alert to any concentration or employment of Chinese Communist forces obviously undertaken to facilitate attack upon Formosa and be prepared to take appropriate military action," would give him power to attack any and all Chinese air force, a concentration of Chinese air force anywhere in China appears to constitute threat to Formosa. Such action by us would mean full-scale atomic global war with China and Russia—without participation of our allies—war for which, in my opinion, we are utterly unprepared. Since we have reached atomic stalemate in which both sides have necessary nuclear weapons and aircraft with which to destroy each other completely, our ability to survive enemy surprise air attack depends primarily on capability of our continental air defense to destroy the invading air force. We were officially informed throughout recent years that Russia was building powerful defensive air force. Yet our own effort in this direction has been meager. Today we have only 2,000 appropriate aircraft with which to defend continental United States, from Alaska to Florida, California to Maine. This means that regardless of superiority of our Strategic Air Force, if Russia's air armada, including even obsolescent propeller bombers, launch atomic attack against us, they could saturate our meager air defenses. Total destruction of United States under such circumstances is possibility. I suggest therefore that continental air defense of United States be given A–1 priority over and above any military expenditures for any other purpose whatsoever.
ALEXANDER P. DE SEVERSKY.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:
Warmest congratulations on your opposition to Formosa resolution. We believe resolution greatest war danger and should be killed and not amended.
JOSEPH and CHARLOTTE SCHATZ.

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your opposition to our involvement Chinese conflict deserves highest commendation. Please clarify issues on Senate floor; bring facts to people. They rally to your support. Great majority American people will bless your fight against involvement. Please accept our support.

God bless you.

EDWIN JOHNSON,
Chairman,
Northwest Peace Committee.

MARIN CITY, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Wish to congratulate you on your stand against the Eisenhower Formosa resolution.

Mr. and Mrs. MALLOUF.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Earnestly urge you vote no power to President to arbitrarily make war with China. This is invitation to all-out war, which would open door to nuclear destruction. World is sick of war. Cannot survive devastation of modern warfare.

PAULINE WATKINS.

SAUSALITO, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your opposition to Formosa resolution. Hope you will continue your efforts.

A. P. SAXTON.

LINDSBORG, KANS., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations. I am glad you had the courage to speak out as you did.

MARGARET S. GREENOUGH.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Appreciate your stand against war-power resolution. Urge you to filibuster or delay action any possible way so as to give people time to speak to their Senators. When they do, this monstrous measure will never pass. Yours for peace and the honor of America.

MALCOLM and LILLIAN CALDWELL.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

As patriotic American longtime former resident Far East, urge determined opposition administration policy Quemoy aspect Formosan issue. Radford should be able intercept Communist amphibious attack by deploying fleet off coast near Amoy without our holding the island, which has same relation to city of Amoy as Staten Island to New York. Question, Would the United States tolerate comparable situation? Radford not infallible; Joint Staffs declared only few years ago that even Formosa was not essential to defense our country. This is a political decision, and recall remark Clemenceau that war is too important to be directed by generals.

EDGAR SALINGER.

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: Your opposition to Eisenhower request for more undeclared war has enhanced your already tremendous standing in the country as an honorable, courageous, true-speaking Senator, deserving to be President. As soon as you appear Chicago you will see direct proof you speak for American people.

BURR MCCLOSKEY.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM E. LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

This is to express our appreciation at your efforts to remove the blank-check aspects of the Formosa resolution. Certainly this is no time for such ambiguity as this resolution contains regarding the coastal islands and possible military action. Every effort should be made to reach a solution to this tense situation through the United Nations rather than through unilateral action.

E. RAYMOND WILSON,
Friends Committee on National Legislation.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 27, 1955.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Hope fight will be continued for amendments, excluding Quemoy and Matsu from Formosa resolution. President's assuming responsibility for decision regarding scope of military action does not legalize our moving into islands which are clearly China's. Why must resolution be rushed through? People just beginning to realize possible dangers of action authorized by resolution. Time should be given for expression of public opinion. Appreciate stand you have taken. Please keep on fighting.

MABLE VERNON,
Chairman, Peoples Mandate Committee, Boston House.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

We heartily approve the position you have taken in the Formosa question.

Mr. and Mrs. ALLAN M. FERRES.

EVANSTON, ILL., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your courageous position regarding Formosan resolution. Urge you insist on referral of problem to United Nations for permanent solution.

FLORENCE ZINER.

BREWSTER, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Commend your stand and urge continued oposition to China lobby and preventive war.

CARL DREHER.

VAN NUYS, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep the power to declar war in hands of Congress. Urge we stay out of Formosa. It is a territory of China which we recognized at Potsdam and Cairo. Let's not risk our boys' lives and provoke a dangerous war. Admire your always watchful and courageous stand.

FREDA MALLEN.

HIGHTSTOWN, N. J., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We support your stand against the President's Formosa policy resolution. We urge you to act to defeat it.

Mr. and Mrs. A. LINOWITZ.

OBERLIN, OHIO, *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We wholeheartedly support your views on the Formosa situation. We hope the resolution will be defeated by the Senate.

GERALD LEHMAN
(For Eugent V. Debs Club, Oberlin Pacifist Fellowship, Oberlin Chapter, Students for Democratic Action, and 54 others).

SEATTLE, WASH., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Fight and stop the President's resolution on Formosa.

W. D. ANDERSON.

DETROIT, MICH., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Deeply appreciative of your courageous intelligent opposition to the war drive. I urge you to continue your good work for peaceful settlement of world tensions.

HELGA HERZ.

DETROIT, MICH., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your and your colleagues stand against possible third world war is a fortress of inspiration to us. You are leading the tide of reversal against leaders who are laggard in the abolition of war. The vast majority are with you.

DETROIT AMERICAN RALLY.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 27, 1955.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Public only now learning implications of United States commitments in Far East. Please fight for time to reach all the people. Urge acceptance of amendment which will restrict United States obligations to defense of jurisdictional line. We want continued support of our allies and also U. N. solution of Formosa problem. Want no war with China. Grateful for all your efforts to maintain peace.

EDITH J. GOODE.

DAVENPORT, IOWA, *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate:

This is no preventive war but the best hope to prevent war. I beg you not to give aid and comfort to the Communists and destroy hope that clear and decisive statement of our intentions may deter aggression. We who have sons of military age must hold you partly responsible for the issue.

EDWIN B. LINDSAY.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on the courage and wisdom you have shown on the China resolution. With kindest personal regards.

JOSEPH LYNCH.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:
Congratulations on fight against preventive war resolution. American lives should not be risked to maintain Chiang. MacArthur proposal we abolish war should receive consideration.
Regards.
GEORGE E. SHIBLEY.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Work as you never have before. The heart and hopes of those who share similar ethical first principles are with you.
THOMAS F. WRIGLEY.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations your fight for peace against Eisenhower war proposals. Urge continuous fight until American people able realize fully true meaning Eisenhower-Knowland war now program. War against China would mean devastating worldwide atom-hydrogen bomb war.
WILLIAM KELLY.

WHITESTONE, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
DEAR SENATOR: We were heartened by your courageous and independent stand on the crucial issue of Formosa. We are hoping that you can clearly and forcefully carry your argument through the committee in favor of presenting the case to the United Nations.
SEYMOUR CUKER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank you for your deep concern for peace as evidenced by your position against preventive on other war in current discussions on China.
BENJAMIN SEGAL, M. D.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Strong opposition to Eisenhower's Formosa proposal. A serious threat to world peace.
WILLIAM SMUKLER.

BALTIMORE, MD., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:
Congratulations on your courage and statesmanship in Formosa debate.
Mr. and Mrs. HERBERT SHUGER.

FARGO, N. DAK., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:
Bravo. Strongly support your Formosa stand. Glad someone thinks of boys who have to do the dying.
Dr. and Mrs. L. E. HUSCHKA.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:
We support your opposition against President Eisenhower's proposal to defend Formosa which could precipitate war.
Mr. and Mrs. LOUIS KATZ.

ALBION, MICH., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate:
Congratulations on opposition to President's Formosan policy. Peaceful solution imperative.
ARTHUR W. MUNK,
Albion College.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What is the pending question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	McClellan
Allott	George	McNamara
Anderson	Goldwater	Millikin
Barkley	Gore	Monroney
Barrett	Green	Morse
Beall	Hayden	Mundt
Bender	Hennings	Murray
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bible	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pastore
Bridges	Hruska	Payne
Bush	Humphrey	Purtell
Butler	Ives	Robertson
Byrd	Jackson	Russell
Capehart	Jenner	Saltonstall
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Smathers
Chavez	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Clements	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Cotton	Kuchel	Sparkman
Curtis	Langer	Stennis
Daniel	Lehman	Symington
Dirksen	Long	Thurmond
Douglas	Magnuson	Thye
Duff	Malone	Watkins
Dworshak	Mansfield	Welker
Eastland	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Ellender	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Ervin	McCarthy	Young

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] is absent on official business as a member of the American delegation attending the 10th anniversary of the World War II Battle of Alsace, at Colmar, France.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the question before the Senate is on the amendment offered by the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], numbered 1–26–55A, to Senate Joint Resolution 28, or its companion, House Joint Resolution 159.

First, I wish to say that at no point in any of the testimony which I heard before the combined committees, or, in fact, in no discussion at any conference I have ever attended, either during this session of Congress or at any prior session of Congress, and in no conversation I have ever had with any of our commanders in the Far East, beginning with General MacArthur and since that time, have I ever heard a responsible military official or a responsible civilian official of the United States suggest that there was any intent or desire to land American ground troops in China. So I think the RECORD should be very clear that that issue is not involved.

The amendment offered by the senior Senator from North Dakota reads as follows:

> Nothing in this resolution shall be construed to authorize the President to use our Armed Forces on the mainland of China, or to intervene in defense of any islands controlled by the Chinese Nationalist Government within 12 miles of the coast of China except for the specific purpose of helping to withdraw Nationalist troops and civilians from such islands.

Mr. President, if the amendment were agreed to by the Senate, and were concurred in by the House, while, of course, it could not affect in any way whatever the constitutional power of the President as Commander in Chief, nevertheless it would be a negative moral action by the Senate and, in effect, would at least morally, if not legally, constitutionally tie the hands of the Commander in Chief, regardless of what the circumstances might be.

While it is true and quite proper, as I think every Member of the Senate recognizes, that under the Constitution only Congress can declare war, nevertheless I believe that every Member of this body realizes that in this day and age of the airplane and atomic weapons, conditions have changed considerably from those which existed at the time the Constitutional Convention was held at Philadelphia. I merely wish to cite a practical problem.

Suppose that on a given day in the future—and we all hope that such a situation will never confront the people or the Government of the United States, or any president of the United States, regardless of his party—the outer chain of radar stations in far northern Canada and Alaska should disclose that a thousand Soviet planes were over Canada, headed for the United States and that intelligence prior to that time had indicated a great build-up of Soviet power and a stockpiling of weapons at the forward Soviet bases.

Does any Member of the Senate or any citizen of the United States, assuming that Congress was not in session, or even assuming that Congress was in session but had recessed over the weekend, or, indeed, even assuming that Congress was in session and had some matters under debate, believe that, under those circumstances, the President of the United States would wait until the first of those bombers were over North Dakota, Minnesota, Illinois, Washington, Oregon, or California, and had dropped their first bombs, before it would be considered that an act of war had been declared upon us? Of course, the answer is "No."

Would any Member of Congress wish to debate for 5 days whether, perhaps, that was merely an exercise by the Soviet air force to see how close they could come to the Canadian-United States frontier before turning around and going back? I think not. Any President of the United States who, as Chief Executive and Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, did not exercise his responsibilities under such conditions to defend the basic security interests of the United States probably would be subject to impeachment, if anyone was left in Washington, under those circumstances, to impeach him.

So, for better or for worse, the conditions under which we now live make it obvious that situations might arise in which Congress would not have an opportunity actually to make a declaration of war. Yet up to a certain point, at least, though there would be an obvious threat to the vital security of the Nation, there might not be a foot of United States territory invaded.

The President of the United States, as has been pointed out on several occasions, has made it very clear that his desire, in this resolution, is to stabilize conditions in the Pacific and to bring about a condition of peace in the world. He recognizes the fact that we cannot constantly back up without bringing on a greater danger of war. Thus, if a line were to be drawn, we could not continually retreat and allow island after island, and area after area, to be taken over by the Communist world without endangering the security of the basic defense line in the Pacific.

The amendment offered by the senior Senator from North Dakota would not tie the hands of the President, constitutionally, because nothing we could do by resolution would, in my opinion, add even one iota to or take away in the slightest any of his constitutional powers as Commander in Chief. But morally such action would tend to say to the President that though we recognize he has a responsibility, though we, as a Senate, place certain additional responsibilities upon him under the resolution, still, if the Chinese Communists attack our forces, we shall, to this extent at least, morally tie the hands of the President as Commander in Chief.

To take another practical example, what would the effect of the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota be? Suppose that on a mission of mercy, advance notice having been given to the entire world, as the President has given, after an agreement, if such an agreement be entered into with the Government of the Republic of China, there is to be a redeployment of certain Chinese Nationalist forces on the Tachen Islands. Let us assume that our naval vessels are acting as a screen; that our naval planes or Air Force planes from Okinawa, or elsewhere, are also present as a cover. Suppose that at that point the Chinese Communists send some of their Soviet-built MIG planes to attack the cover and to attack the American screen. Under those circumstances, do we want to say, even morally, though constitutionally it would have no effect, that when they have attempted to attack us, and have attacked us, with our planes fighting and firing back, as they would—and I do not think there is a single Member in the Chamber who would expect our forces to be present as sitting ducks, to be fired upon, and not permitted to fire back—that we could pursue them only to—where? Only to within 12 miles of the China coast, and that then we were to stop? Would we not be declaring publicly that the attackers would have a sanctuary at that point? A sanctuary for what? To fly perhaps a few miles inland, or, perhaps, as the Senator from North Dakota says, a hundred miles inland. To do what? To build up their air forces, to refuel their planes with jet fuel, to take on additional bombs, to fill their magazines with ammunition. For what purpose? So they could turn around and attack the American fleets and the American air units again. In other words, we would be building another Yalu sanctuary, and would be asking our men to fight in fact with one hand, if not both hands, tied behind their backs.

The President has made that aspect of the question very clear. This is a resolution designed to preserve the peace. There will be no war, under the resolution, unless the Chinese Communists elect to make war. But if they should elect to make war, then it seems to me we should not tie the hands of the Commander in Chief, either legally or morally.

For these reasons I ask that the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota be rejected.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, if the Senator from California yields the floor, I should like to make a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from North Dakota is an amendment which, taken alone, would commend itself to many people throughout the country. Because I do not expect to vote for the amendment, I wish to make a few brief statements about it, and to make clear that if the amendment should be rejected, as I think it will be, that rejection should not be construed by indirection to say that the intent of the pending resolution is to give the President a directive to use forces on the mainland of China. It does not do that. Many people, however, may get the wrong impression from various speculations that are being made.

Mr. President, I wish to give point to this situation by reading a part of Ned Calmer's broadcast as reported on the CBS World News Roundup this morning. It was Bob Schackne's report from Tokyo. I was startled by it when I heard it on the radio this morning. I had my staff call the CBS office in New York to get a transcript of the broadcast, and I have in my hand what they furnished me. I read now from Bob Schackne's report from Tokyo at 8 o'clock this morning:

> The Air Force has rushed war planes to Korea to meet the crisis in the Formosa Straits. Fifty planes, half sabrejets and half propeller-driven bombers, were sent to Korea at the same time they were ordered to Formosa. A glance at the map explains why. South Korea is closer than any other territory in the Allied hands to Shanghai, only 365 miles. It is in the Shanghai area that the Communists have concentrated twelve to fourteen hundred planes, including some 250 MIG's, and possibly some hundreds of IL–28 twin jet bombers. These are the planes that threaten the United States 7th Fleet and Formosa. In standard Air Force tactics, the best way to counter this threat is to strike directly and destroy the Red airbase. The best weapon to use is a tactical atomic bomb. The Air Force has the plane to do the job—the F–84 Thunder Jet, which can fly great distances and refuel in midair.
>
> Whether this will be done is a decision President Eisenhower has not yet made. What the Air Force is doing is positioning itself in case the order is issued.

Mr. President, I do not believe that the President of the United States is going to decide on any move such as this commentator suggests. If I did, I would support the pending amendment, because I do not believe in starting war under the guise of preventing war.

The resolution is intended, I believe, only to give congressional approval to defensive military action.

Nor do I believe that the illustration which the able and distinguished Senator from California suggested accurately describes the situation which would exist if the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota were to be adopted. If a group of foreign planes were to appear over Alaska or over Canada or over the North Dakota border, such action would violate the sovereignty of the territory of Alaska, Canada, or the United States as soon as the planes crossed the border. Even before they crossed the border defense would be in action.

To be able to resist attack or even to strike in another quarter after hostilities have begun is quite different than increasing the number of planes in South Korea, with the described intent of being in a position to strike preventively at Shanghai with a tactical atomic bomb to destroy a Red air base 365 miles beyond Korea—if that were the intent, which I do not believe.

Now, I do not know what the effect of this broadcast was when it was heard in other places of the world today, but I suspect it has created some suspicion of the intent of the resolution. It may add to unhealthy fears that do exist.

Mr. President, I was impressed by the speech of Gen. Douglas MacArthur yesterday at Los Angeles. On the occasion of his birthday memorial at Los Angeles General MacArthur was quoted as saying:

> Present tensions with their threat of national annihilations are kept alive by two great illusions. "The one a complete belief on the part of the Soviet world that the capitalist countries are preparing to attack them, * * * and the other a complete belief on the part of the capitalistic countries that the Soviets are preparing to attack us."
>
> Both are wrong, he said. For either side war with the other would mean nothing but disaster. "But the constant acceleration of preparation may well, without specific intent, ultimately produce a spontaneous combustion."

The wisdom of General MacArthur was attested no later than a few days ago, when the Subcommittee on Internal Security, by unanimous vote of Senators on both sides, as I understand, said that five commanders who had been in Korea applauded the wisdom of General MacArthur.

Mr. President, when a broadcast from Tokyo tells of a buildup in Korea of our planes and a concentration of Red planes in Shanghai, and says that the best way to counter this threat is to strike directly and destroy the Red airbase and that the best weapon to use is a tactical atomic bomb, I do not wonder that fears are being generated.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand him, the Senator from South Dakota has read from the opinion of a radio broadcaster in Japan, who referred to a buildup of 1,200 or 1,400 planes in Shanghai. Does it not make sense for us to warn the Chinese Government that if it uses those 1,200 or 1,400 warplanes in attacking Formosa, or in violating the armistice in Korea, or in any other friendly country, we shall do our utmost to blow them off the map in China?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes, but the premise of the Senator from Vermont does not conform to the broadcast. I wholly endorse the idea of saying to the Red Chinese, "Come no farther," but I do not endorse the idea of saying that we are increasing planes in Korea to make a preventive strike at Shanghai before there is an attack or movement from that quarter, and that we are going to use an atomic tactical weapon. I do not believe that the President will sanction any such first move on our part.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not fair to the Chinese, to the American people, and to the rest of the world, to tell them that if the Chinese Communists use those 1,200 or 1,400 planes against us or our allies, we shall take action?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If they use them, yes, but the Senator begs the question. The suggestion of the broadcast was not if the Reds used them, but if they concentrated them and build them up at Shanghai, "the best way to counter this threat is to strike directly and destroy the Red air force." To my mind, that is starting the war. As long as those planes are on the ground there is a possibility that hostilities may be averted.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Senator from South Dakota in favor of waiting until any or all of the 1,200 or 1,400 planes drop bombs on Korea?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No; I am not suggesting that we wait until they strike Korea or until they hit Formosa; but I am suggesting that it does not make for a solution of a very difficult problem if we suggest that the purpose of the resolution is to give the President a directive to make a preventive strike at Shanghai, 365 miles beyond Korea.

Mr. AIKEN. I, for one, cannot see the sense of letting them strike first. If they are warned, as the President is warning them, and as the Congress should warn them, the chances of their striking us are much less than if we draw a line and say, "Do all you want behind this line, but do not cross it." That simply does not make sense, from a defensive standpoint.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Well, until hostilities begin, they have as much right to do what they want on their own soil as we do. I do not want the Reds to limit what we do in our area. The Senator from Vermont must not misunderstand my position in regard to the Langer amendment. I have said I shall not vote for the Langer amendment, but I do not want my position in that connection to be interpreted as indicating that I believe the joint resolution carries a directive to the President to use our troops on the mainland of China in advance of any attack by the Chinese Communists.

Mr. AIKEN. But in the event the Red Chinese were to attack our planes in the air, or our ships on the waters around Formosa, and if we had instructed the President not to send our Armed Forces closer than 12 miles to the mainland of China, and then assuming that 1,200 or 1,400 planes from Shanghai were to make a diversionary attack upon Korea, would not the islands of Quemoy and Matsu assume tremendous importance to us at that time?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think so.

Mr. AIKEN. And should not the President be authorized to use our forces to hold them, and thus bottle up the harbors of Amoy and Foochow?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes, because the Senator includes in his hypothetical situation the attack upon Korea. I think the Senator from Vermont has pointed out one of the difficulties under the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota, the adoption of which I am not advocating. I do say, however, that if we fail to adopt it, there should not be read into the joint resolution a directive calling for a preventive strike before there is action on the part of a potential enemy.

Mr. AIKEN. No, and I do not think so.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In the assumptions the Senator from Vermont used—when he assumed they had struck, and so forth—of course he assumed a different situation.

Mr. AIKEN. Assuming that our intelligence were to advise us they were preparing for an attack at 5 o'clock tomorrow morning——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course if our intelligence had advised us that the Japanese fleet was steaming toward Pearl Harbor and intended to attack it, I think we should have struck before the Japanese struck Pearl Harbor.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me say I do not understand anything in the joint resolution to be a directive to the President to use our Armed Forces to engage in a preventive war.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I share the interpretation of the Senator from Vermont that nothing in the joint resolution authorizes the making of a preventive strike or a preventive war.

The Senator from Vermont may remember, however, that when the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] was placing an interpretation upon the statement made yesterday by the President of the United States, I expressly reserved the right to make a different interpretation from the one I thought the Senator from New Jersey was making.

I thought the President's statement of yesterday, taken as it was intended, was helpful. I did not like any interpretation of it which sought to read into it a directive to make a preventive strike.

Mr. AIKEN. But does not the Senator from South Dakota believe that we should warn the Chinese Communists that if they make a strike at Korea or Formosa or at any other place vital to us, we will strike back wherever we can do so most effectively, so as to make sure——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think that is the intent of the joint resolution.

Mr. AIKEN. So as to make sure that our defenses will be protected.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think that is the intent of the joint resolution.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. My only feeling of hesitancy about the joint resolution really is that, because of some of the indefinite phraseology it contains, Chou En-lai's declaration or ultimatum of a few days ago in regard to his intent regarding Formosa may lead him to probing around to determine the undefined position at which the trigger is pulled, and that he might touch off the spark. I am not anxious to have it touched off.

Mr. AIKEN. That is right; he has virtually served notice on us that he intends to take this territory, which has not as yet been declared as belonging to China; and that if we try to prevent his doing so, he will shoot at our forces on sight. But I think, insofar as I am concerned, there is nothing in the joint resolution, which authorizes a preventive war.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I share that view of the Senator from Vermont.

On the point of title to Formosa let me say my understanding is that when the Japanese surrender was ordered by the Japanese Government, it was agreed among the allies that the surrender in China and the surrender in Formosa should be taken by the Chinese troops. In our memorandum to the Far Eastern Commission in connection with the peace treaty for Japan, we indicated we thought the United Nations should make a final recommendation with respect to the jurisdiction over Formosa. But because of the circumstances, Nationalist China took the surrender in Formosa, as it took the surrender on the continent of China, which he was then occupying; and, naturally, Chiang Kai-shek established his headquarters of government on Formosa, when he was forced from the mainland.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator from South Dakota believe that the weakness of relying upon a United Nations' decision as to the ultimate disposition of Formosa lies in the fact that the

Chinese Communists have already registered a healthy disregard for the decisions of the United Nations, particularly in the case of Korea?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. They have; but I do not expect any head of either Chinese state to recognize the sovereignty until he has to do it. I do not see how any ruler of Nationalist China at this time could publicly take any position other than that which Chiang Kai-shek has taken, namely, that he intends to return to the mainland of China; nor do I see how any ruler of Red China could take any position, publicly, other than that Chou En-lai has taken—namely, that he expects to restore Formosa and the Pescadores to the control of mainland China. I think that during the years China has had a feeling that once a Chinaman, always a Chinaman; that once a national of China, always a national of China.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not a vital essential that we rely upon all means at our command, including our own Armed Forces, until such time as the United Nations has acquired the means to enforce its own decisions?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. When it comes to a matter of forces, yes. But I wish to affirm very definitely that the part of the message of the President in which he stated he would welcome action by the United Nations to obtain a cease-fire in the Formosa Straits was an integral part of his proposal.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Furthermore, in my own thinking, I also place a good deal of reliance upon the fact that the authority the President requested would terminate when he reported to the Congress that the peace and security of the area had reasonably been assured through action taken by the United Nations or otherwise. The last sentence of the joint resolution includes specific language to that effect.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true. We must rely upon the United Nations as a great moral force. But we must also realize that at present the United Nations does not have the strength to enforce its own decisions, especially against a country the size of China or Russia.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes. There is no disagreement on that score.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But, for the RECORD—since the United Nations has been brought into the discussion—I should like to call attention to the fact that the last paragraph of the joint resolution reads as follows:

> This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, and shall so report to the Congress.

I also call attention to that provision, Mr. President, because amendments have been suggested which would seek to spell out an appeal to the United Nations in more detail. It is important for the Senate and the country to realize that the President's message requesting this action stated he would welcome a cease-fire effort by the United Nations; and that in the precise text of the joint resolution itself, providing for termination of the authority proposed to be granted, there appears what the President himself requested, the specification that the authority granted under the joint resolution will expire "when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, and shall so report to the Congress."

Inasmuch as the United Nations has been brought into the colloquy, I take the opportunity at this time to say that this language of the resolution itself is why I do not think we are called upon to adopt any of the amendments which have been proposed for more elaborate reference to the United Nations. I think that is implicit in the resolution.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wish to yield first to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], who was first on his feet, if he wishes to ask a question. If not, I will yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I am grateful to my distinguished colleague from South Dakota. I should like to ask him a question.

Does the Senator happen to know where the commentator received the information which he broadcast to America and all the rest of the world by way of radio or television this morning?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No; I do not. However, I have in my hand a dispatch from the news ticker in the lobby. I think it is the United Press report. It is a dispatch from Taipei, dated Saturday, but received here at 2:34 p. m. Of course, Taipei time is a day ahead of our time. The dispatch reports that:

> United States Saberjets, flying from their new Formosan bases, joined the powerfully reinforced 7th Fleet in the anti-Communist patrol.

The dispatch contains more on the buildup in that general area, and also discloses that a Chinese pilot bailed out from a Saberjet over Formosa yesterday. The dispatch further refers to action around the Tachens, and seems to be thoroughly consistent with the one factual statement in the broadcast from Tokyo, to the effect that the number of our planes in Korea is being increased. However, the observations and the speculation obviously were those of the commentator.

Mr. WELKER. That leads me to a further—and perhaps final—question. I am certain that my distinguished colleague, who is a member of the Armed Services Committee, does not know of his own knowledge, nor has he heard through the medium of any competent evidence, that the jets allegedly flying from Japan to Korea are for the purpose of an attack on Shanghai, or are for the purpose of a defensive measure in the event that the North Korean Communists desire to try once more to take South Korea.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the implication of the Senator's question is correct. We do not know. The last two sentences I read were:

> Whether this will be done is a decision President Eisenhower has not yet made. What the Air Force is doing is positioning itself in case the order is issued.

Again, I appreciate and welcome the statement which came from the White House yesterday, that the decision would be the decision of the President, and not the chance decision of a local commander, without direct approval by the President.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a final brief question?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I am certain that in the hearings which we had the honor to attend and the sadness of listening to, the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota and the junior Senator from Idaho did not base their decision upon some military science or tactics broadcast by a radio commentator, but upon the opinions of the greatest military leaders in our Government today. Is that a correct conclusion?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Certainly the committee did not take testimony from radio commentators or outside experts. However, I think in all fairness it ought to be said——

Mr. President, I refrain from making the statement I was about to make, because I do not wish to make statements which might add fuel to certain fires and rumors which have been burning around the city during the last day or two.

Let me say, however, that it has been the privilege of the junior Senator from South Dakota to listen to military testimony for a great many years.

During many of the years when I was a member of the House of Representatives, and during all the years of World War II, and for sometime prior thereto, I was a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which made the original appropriations for the Manhattan District, the atomic bomb project, and appropriations for the War Department, and the old Air Corps. So, I have heard a great deal of military testimony since 1940, when I first joined that particular subcommittee, as well as in the Armed Services Subcommittee of the Senate.

While I pose as no expert, I have come to recognize that sometimes we obtain different advice from different experts; and it becomes the responsibility of Members of the Senate eventually to use their own judgment when they receive evidence which reflects differences in opinions of the experts. The judgments which the junior Senator from South Dakota ventures to exercise will be those based upon a melding of the several opinions he has heard expressed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I promised to yield first to the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that the question which the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER]

just asked was one which I intended to ask.

Is there any other means of knowing whether the statements made in the radio broadcast are accurate? I refer to statements with respect to the build-up in Shanghai, and also statements with respect to the number of planes which have been sent into the area.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The dispatch to which I alluded was a United Press dispatch. It has some further data in it. I do not know that it is quite so specific as the broadcast was. I read further from the dispatch:

Two more American flotillas were reported on the way to the Formosa area to join the already reinforced 7th Fleet and the 75 Sabrejets sent to Formosa in the defense of the islands.

One, composed of cruisers and destroyers, had left the west coast of the United States. The other, including the carrier *Midway*, was hurrying north from Singapore.

The 7th Fleet already had 4 carriers, 7 cruisers, and 50 destroyers massed north of Formosa, awaiting Washington orders for the evacuation of the Tachens.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Dakota will further yield, it seems to me that we cannot take notice of all the speculation indulged in between now and the time of final action, as reasons for our voting one way or the other upon the amendments or upon final passage of the joint resolution itself. Not all the queer things come out of China. I am wondering if this broadcast could not be classed in the realm of something that is rather queer.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would not so classify it. I think the speculation of the commentator is not the kind of speculation which would be unexpected when he is witnessing such a buildup as he is witnessing. I regret it, but it was on the radio this morning in the 8 o'clock World News Roundup. I say, I regret it, because I think it is bound to create some suspicion and fear, and add to a very difficult, tense situation, at best, but I do not blame the reporter for telling us what he sees.

Yet I think it does explain why many people in the United States will wonder why we do not adopt such an amendment as that offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. That is why I venture to make reference to it here. I do not want the rejection of the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota to imply that the joint resolution carries a directive to the President to make a preventive strike, using atomic weapons. It does no such thing.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the courtesy of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota in yielding to me in order that, first, I may compliment him and join him strongly in his statement, which I think very ably covers not only his position, but the position of many other Senators, including the Senator from Florida.

It seems to me that, rather than pay too much attention to the sensational statements of radio broadcasters and the like, it is much more important to realize that our strongest ally and our most cautious ally, who has repeatedly shown great nervousness heretofore whenever we did anything in the Far East which even looked as though it might tend to promote violence, has in this matter spoken out in strong approval of the message of the President and of the pending resolution. Senators will remember that twice since the President's message, Mr. Anthony Eden has found occasion to speak very strongly in support of the President's message.

At this time, with the indulgence of the Senator from South Dakota, I should like to read into the RECORD additional evidence of the fact that Great Britain is strongly with us in this position, and is not as nervous as was the broadcaster from Tokyo who was just mentioned by the Senator.

The statement of the British Ambassador I am about to quote was made by him when he called today on Governor Leroy Collins, of Florida, at Tallahassee. He made the statement while he was being interviewed by the Associated Press. The dispatch reads:

British Ambassador Sir Roger Makins today expressed the view that tension in the Far East will be lessened when the United States intentions under President Eisenhower's Formosa policy announcement are fully understood.

Now I quote directly the Ambassador's statement in the interview:

"The Chinese Communists have reacted rather sharply against the President's message but when its essential meaning is understood it should contribute to a lessening of tension," he said at a news conference.

"My personal view is that while we do not deny the dangers existing in the situation, when it is realized, as it should be, that the United States intentions are purely pacific and that it has no design against the Chinese mainland but at the same time it will maintain its essential interests in the Pacific, the effect will be good."

I ask the distinguished Senator from South Dakota if he does not feel that the Senate and the apprehensive people of the United States can repose great confidence in the interpretation contained in the official pronouncements of our strongest and most cautious ally, Great Britain, such as the statements made by Britain's distinguished Foreign Minister and its distinguished Ambassador, its spokesman in our country?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do. I agree with the Senator from Florida. I appreciate very much his reading the dispatch into the RECORD at this point. If it is clearly understood, that our attentions are solely for peace, and that we are not seeking to invade the mainland of China or to use this opportunity to provide a springboard for invading the mainland of China, I believe we will have an opportunity to work out the whole situation.

In closing, I wish to read again from the statement issued by the White House yesterday:

The President made it clear that these (United States) forces were designed purely for defensive purposes and that any decision to use United States forces other than in immediate self-defense or in direct defense of Formosa and the Pescadores would be a decision which he would take and the responsibility for which he has not delegated.

Mr. President, I have unbounded confidence in the expressed desire of President Dwight D. Eisenhower to create conditions in which the people of the world can live in peace, without fear of another world war, particularly an atomic war. I have heard him in public and in private express himself with great feeling on that point. I am convinced that by reserving these decisions to himself, he has protected us against the possible action of some person, who might be impelled, after seeing only a small segment of the total picture, to engage in action which could trigger the whole world into a terrific holocaust.

The President understands as few men in the world do the tremendous implication of starting a war with modern weapons. He understands as few people do the attitudes of the nations with whom we have been associating.

The very fact that the Senator from Florida was able to read the statement from a responsible British authority suggests another reason for confidence. Testimony at the hearings conducted by the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, sitting jointly, indicated that there have been consultations between our Government and other governments. If now representatives of other responsible governments give assurance that they do not misunderstand our intentions, if they clearly state that they know our intentions are purely in behalf of peace, that will help to maintain confidence both here and abroad.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall vote against the pending amendment, and I shall vote against the other amendments which have been proposed. I shall vote for the resolution. I do so in the belief that the President will use the power conferred by the resolution for the purpose of preserving the peace of the world.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I heard the distinguished Senator from Florida speak about the approval that has been expressed by Great Britain. I fully share the feeling of the Senator from Florida that Great Britain is our most dependable and most powerful ally. Great Britain has always been a great tower of strength in the defense of what we must always strive for in connection with freedom and the maintennace of liberty throughout the world.

However, my understanding of the position taken in Great Britain, both by the party in opposition, namely, the Labor Party, and by the distinguished Foreign Secretary of Great Britain, is that, while they fully approve of the position we have taken with regard to the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores, it has been emphasized very strongly that they consider there are two separate issues involved in the subject. They consider that one issue is the immediate defense of Formosa and the Pescadores, and that the other is the

attitude which we should take with regard to the Chinese mainland and the islands immediately adjacent to the Chinese mainland, notably Quemoy and Matsu and the Tachens.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What is the Senator's question?

Mr. LEHMAN. As I recall the statement, it was very clearly set forth that Britain would support us strongly in the position which we have assumed with regard to Formosa and the Pescadores. Of course every Member of the Senate takes exactly the same position. We are all in favor of the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores. However, the British have had a very strong question, and to some degree of opposition, with respect to the open-end powers which are being given to the President in the resolution, with regard to our attitude concerning the Chinese mainland and the islands adjacent to the mainland which, as the Senator I am sure will agree, are only 4 or 5 miles from the Chinese mainland.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I am not quite clear as to what the Senator's question is. However, in view of his statement about the position of Great Britain, let me say that I do not accept the idea that the question is the legal status of the Pescadores and Formosa, as against the coastal islands and the mainland. And if we did, we would find that involves three different areas. The jurisdictional question is somewhat different with respect to the three—the mainland, the offshore islands over which Chiang Kai-shek retains control, and the Pescadores and Formosa.

I think there are three jurisdictional questions, but I do not think we shall solve the problem immediately before the Senate by looking at the jurisdictional questions. There is a practical situation facing us. I am hopeful that the efforts of Australia, New Zealand, and Great Britain, all three of whom, I understand, are endeavoring to induce the United Nations to endeavor to obtain a cease-fire, will be successful. In my opinion, someone who is not a party to the immediate issues must take the lead right now. We might propose the action to the United Nations, but we are in a delicate position. So someone who is not a party must take the lead. The initiative will have to be carried by someone else and if Australia or New Zealand or the Prime Minister of Great Britain, by their representatives, are able to initiate action, I wish them success.

I hope the expectation and the prayer of our President that some way may be found to avoid conflict may be wholly achieved, and it is in that hope that I am supporting the resolution.

Mr. DUFF obtained the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the pending question is the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. I was wondering if it would be agreeable to the Senator from Pennsylvania, if he would not thereby lose his right to the floor, and if it would be agreeable to the Senate to have a rollcall on the Langer amendment before the Senator from Pennsylvania makes his remarks, which I understand are on the general resolution rather than on the pending amendment.

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I shall be very glad to yield, with the understanding that I may have the floor immediately after the vote.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Oregon desires to speaks on the pending amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Then I think, Mr. President, that the Senator from Pennsylvania may as well proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). The Senator from Pennsylvania may proceed.

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, as the adoption of the pending joint resolution may prove of momentous consequence in our further dealings with the communistic world, I feel impelled to make of record a short summary of my reasons for supporting it.

The leaders of imperialistic Soviet communism, their satellites and allies, makes no secret of their boasts to overrun and conquer the entire world.

Since the end of World War II there has been such a continuous advance of communism in power, in influence, and in territory subjugated, that in this short period the Communists have already brought under their control a vast portion of the surface of the earth and a considerable proportion of the whole human race.

The failure of the free nations to unite with a common purpose and intention, and the lack of a firm determination and policy of affirmative opposition, have made the success of this advance more rapid and effective than otherwise it possibly could have been.

To date the military power of the United States, our vast industrial complex, our financial resources, our military leadership, and our will as a people not to be overcome by this vicious and fanatical and evil force, have made the United States the main roadblock between communistic ambition and their goal of world dominion.

Our responsibility as leader of the free world has cast some of our lines in dangerous and faraway places. Abhorrent as it is to the average American to have our Nation in conflict with strange peoples half way around the world from home, nevertheless those places are where our obligation calls us if we are to preserve for ourselves and transmit to those who will come after us the liberties of which we have been the heirs, and which we have up to now so bountifully enjoyed.

At the moment the most serious point of conflict with the communistic world is at the Straits of Formosa and the surrounding islands. Chou En-lai has announced his intention to conquer Formosa and the Pescadores, to drive us and our allies away from the Straits of Formosa, and to erect in that area further bastions of communistic might so as to make the whole west Pacific untenable for us and the other free nations of the world.

The island of Formosa is only 725 miles from Manila in the Philippines; 830 miles from Pusan in Korea; 1,300 miles from Tokyo in Japan; 1,690 miles from the island of Guam; and from our strong base at Okinawa the distance is relatively the same as the short distance from Pittsburgh to Philadelphia in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

If Formosa is permitted to fall, a great and vital gap will have been torn in our western Pacific defense line. Eventually this great hole in our defenses will render untenable Okinawa, Korea, Japan, Guam, and the Philippines, and at the same time render immensely more vulnerable the whole of Indonesia, and eventually even New Zealand, Australia, and the Hawaiian Islands. Surely the magnitude of such a potential disaster is entirely beyond comprehension if the free world is to survive against this worldwide drive of communism.

Consequently it would seem that Formosa and the Pescadores are a "must" to be held unless the whole Far East is eventually to fall and collapse into the hands of the Communists. And, in the light of the announced intentions of Communist China, the same applies, within the President's sound discretion, in respect to the adjacent islands dominating the approaches thereto.

The pending resolution recommended for adoption is clearly based upon the assumption of a calculated risk that Russia is unwilling at this time to undertake an all-out war, and since Red China's action is predicated upon Russian approval or veto that consequently Red China is not ready at this time for all-out war.

It has been pointed out that this calculated risk may prove a bad calculation, and that is possible. But if the risk so calculated and assumed should bring on a major conflict, such a conflict would start, in any event, only at a time when even further communistic advances would have made more difficult an already difficult defense.

At a time of great decision, confidence must be reposed in someone somewhere. On this occasion it happens to fall upon the President of the United States. As Americans we are fortunate that the President of the United States has character, experience, and capacity that are known worldwide, even to his berating and abusive communistic critics. President Eisenhower is known to be a hater of war and a man devoted in every fiber of his being to the establishment of world peace.

The President has given the whole world assurance that the United States desires peace, not war, and that he will accept the personal responsibility of deciding whether our Armed Forces in the Far East are to be used for any purposes other than the defense of this vitally important stronghold in the Western Pacific defense line of the free world.

The time has surely come when we must say at last to the Communist world in the Far East, "So far, but from now on no farther." The drawing of that line affords the greatest possible prospect of settling the differences in that area by peace rather than by a resort to war.

The decision confronting us is a decision requiring the decisive action which the pending resolution calls for, and I shall vote for it as proposed.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, the resolution before the Senate is of a nature to give pause to any prudent man. No one who has any knowledge of the situation with which the resolution seeks to deal—or who is aware of the enormous increase in the destructive power of modern weapons—can contemplate with prudence the use of military force. However, I think it vital that in considering this resolution we do not let a human reluctance to assume the great risks inherent in this decision blind us to the urgent need for its approval.

I believe that if we examine this proposal in the context of the situation to which it is to be applied, the appearance of risk is far greater than the actuality. Moreover, I am convinced that if we fail to act with boldness and decision, we will invite losses more grievous than those we might otherwise encounter.

We are committed to the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores. This is a commitment of long standing, and is an expression of our association with the Government of Free China in the struggle to balk Communist expansion. We are confronted, then, with both a moral and a material obligation to an important ally. But the obligation of this country to keep the Island of Formosa in friendly hands is more binding even than that. It is directly linked to our own security and to the security of the free world because the island of Formosa is a component of our and the free world's line of defense in the Pacific. For us, therefore, and for our associates, it is vital that Formosa be kept out of Communist hands.

I make no pretense to expertness in the field of military strategy; but it seems to me that if there is nearly universal agreement that a position must be defended, we cannot logically ignore the possibility that force might be required in the conduct of that defense. I place stress on the word "possibility," because I am convinced that it is not as serious a possibility as some would have us believe. In my opinion, if we in the Senate vigorously affirm the power of the Chief Executive and Commander in Chief in this regard, we will have taken a step which will assist in resolving the issue without resort to violence.

Before elaborating on the premises that lead me to this conclusion, I shall review briefly the situation which confronts us. Since 1950, the Communist conspirators in Peiping have pursued a continuous, belligerent, constantly aggressive course. In Korea they were open aggressors. They sponsored and supplied the Communist Viet Minh in the guerrilla campaign in Indochina. They have waged economic war throughout southeast Asia. They have supported subversive elements in every nation of the Orient, from Japan to Indonesia. In this whole criminal course they have drawn back but once—when they were met with force on the Korean peninsula.

It may be asserted that calling the Communist suit for truce in Korea a withdrawal strains the meaning of the term; that in Korea the Reds were driven back. In a military sense, that is true. I regret that we did not go on to win. But it is too late now to make plans for something which I consider to have been a grievous mistake. We must now plan for the future, profiting by the mistake of the past. Let me emphasize that point.

But the abandonment of the conquest of the Korean Peninsula was a Red policy decision, taken, I am convinced, not only because of the defeats they had suffered in the field, but because they faced the certain prospect of an unyielding defense of South Korea, which made the achievement of the Red objective impossible. In fact, there is now reason to believe that if the Red strategists had known that their attack on the Republic of Korea was going to evoke a prompt response from the free nations, particularly the United States, the Communist armies never would have crossed the 38th parallel.

What analysis, then, can be made of this? If this were the only instance of this kind of Communist reaction, an analysis of any sort would be worth little. But it is not a single occurrence. It is one of a series which reaches back to 1946, when the Reds withdrew from northern Iran in the face of opposition from a freedom-loving people. It will be recalled, perhaps, that when the United States and Great Britain countered the blockade of Berlin with the airlift, the Communists became conciliatory and lifted the blockade. When the Red conspirators met strong opposition in their fight to bring down a freely elected Greek Government, they cut off the insurgents from support. Several Soviet efforts to pressure Turkey have been dropped when a courageous Turkish administration and army stood firm, ready to fight.

In view of this experience, I think it safe to conclude that it is against Communist policy to risk major trouble.

In the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I have been a member for the past 2 years, under the chairmanship of the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], we have heard the testimony of some of our great senior command officers to the effect that what the Communists are afraid of is the use of force.

Here we find the kernel of this resolution. For some time the Chinese Communists have been rattling the saber about Formosa. The Red propaganda line has noisily pronounced the determination of the so-called People's Republic to liberate the island.

In accompaniment, there have been military actions against the offshore islands. They have been bombed. Quemoy has been brought under artillery attack from Communist shore guns. Ichiang, off the coast of the mainland in the vicinity of the Tachens, was assaulted and captured despite bitter resistance from a small garrison of Nationalist irregulars. The Tachens themselves, some 200 miles north of Formosa, have been brought under pressure, threatening their sources of supply and reinforcement. As a result, it has become necessary to redeploy the military forces in the area for the better defense of the main redoubt—Formosa and the Pescadores. In effect, what the Chinese Reds have been doing is putting out a line of bellicose propaganda, and at the same time nibbling at the fringe of our Chinese ally's strategic line of defense. I specify the fringe because we are told that neither Ichiang nor the Tachens are essential to the defense of the Formosa complex.

It would appear, therefore, that the immediate purpose of the Chinese Communists is to probe. They are conducting a testing action to determine whether or not we mean business in defending Formosa. And to my way of thinking the pending resolution embodies the correct response. We do mean business, and I think it important that we make our intentions clear, so that the Chinese Communists can in no way misconstrue our intentions. The resolution under consideration does just that.

In essence, the main impact of this measure is not military. That by no means indicates that it is propaganda. It does not, and its psychological importance comes solely from the fact that we mean what we say. It draws a line that needs drawing—not a geographic line, to be sure—but one of position that is just as effective and far more practicable. In so doing we are telling the Communists what they need to know, although I am sure it is not what they wanted to hear. And I venture to predict that the Reds will not press the issue to provocative lengths.

There have been allegations that the pending measure is aggressive in nature; an assertion which overlooks a second psychological fact of the resolution which is of a consequence equal to the first.

This is a matter to which I have given much thought, and I cannot see that military action on the part of the United States, in these circumstances, could, in even small measure, be regarded as aggressive. I have examined every element, and it is my unqualified conviction that there can be no proper basis for labeling any action that might develop as anything but defensive in character. Further, I am satisfied that failure to act within the specified range would be imprudent to the point of folly.

Mr. President, on the floor of the Senate I have heard discussion as to what is or what is not self-defense. As my colleagues well know, self-defense is a fundamental law of nature. Should my neighbor say to me, "I desire to take your farm, on which your daughter and husband live, and which is located only 2 miles from my place, and you and the other members of your family can live a hundred miles away," I would resist such action with force and might. Chou En-lai has repeatedly made such a threat, and the Peiping government has broadcast the threat to all the world.

Mr. President, we all know that in the field of law, whether domestic or international law, such a statement would be a communicated threat, and the receiver of such a threat could take such action or such recourse as he saw fit. I am convinced that if a person who received communicated threats such as have been made were to defend himself, based upon reasonable judgment—and in this case

action would be based on the reasonable judgment of our Commander in Chief, who is one of the greatest military men in history—then certainly the judgment of a jury or of the people of the world could not be raised against such a man, even if he were accused of murder, or against defensive actions taken by this country.

When a friend and supporter is threatened with assault, one does not wait for him to be struck down. The intelligent, the necessary thing is to stand by him and let the assailant know that his assault will be met. Certainly if I saw a thug lifting a blackjack against any friend of mine, I would engage to defend him—and no decent person would call me an aggressor. By any code of ethics, my behavior would be commendable.

There is a very practical—if you will, a selfish—motive for defending my friend. In the first place, if I let him be struck down, his assailant may blackjack me next. I would not only have lost a friend, but I would have also deprived myself of his services in defending me. In the second place, when other friends would learn of my cowardice—for so they would rightly interpret my failure; at best they would call it indecision—they would lose confidence in me. They would not care to be in a position of dependence on a man who could not make up his mind about a vital matter. And, very understandably, they might look for a more reliable partner. They might, if they were small and not very strong, yield everything they possessed to avoid being blackjacked.

There is another aspect to friendship, and one that it would be perilous to ignore. Just as no man can afford to take a friend for granted, regardless of his own behavior, so no nation can afford to do so.

Some nations, particularly some Asian nations, very much desire to be our friends, and we greatly desire to count them as such. But a number of those nations, for their own safety, must exercise great care to avoid antagonizing the towering Communist bullies that stand so close at hand. Discretion requires that these nations refrain from an open acknowledgment of friendly attiude toward us—that is, they maintain, or try to maintan, a neutral position between us and the Communist bullies. Several of them—and let us recognize the distasteful truth—even though they fear communism, lack complete confidence in us and our motives and intentions.

If we fail to make our intentions clear, if we fail to convince them that they can trust us, if we fail to assure them that we want strong and independent friends, and not subservient followers, we risk losing them entirely. In despair, they may turn to the Communists, and may accept harsh protectors in lieu of unpredictable, and, hence, undependable, friends.

To this I must add the very serious thought that even our avowed friends—friends who have stood up and resisted the Communists—friends who depend for their lives upon us—cannot be counted upon to stand up forever against unrelenting and ever-increasing pressure. Foremost in this group is free China.

But where, one may ask, could free China turn but to us? The answer is simply that free China could turn to the Communists. She would then have to turn to the Communists, because she would have nowhere else to go. In the event of that dilemma, Mr. President, let us be realistic as to what would happen to the rest of Asia and what would happen to that bastion of defense, which protects the shoreline of our own country.

Do we talk about isolationism. No; never. But in the event of that tragic happening, there would be only one thing left for us to do, namely, to pick up our Armed Forces and try, if we could, to bring them home, and there try to defend the small part we would have left.

Mr. President, it is my hope and prayer that out of this matter will come peace, not war.

It is my hope and my prayer that when America draws a line and stands firm, as it has stood firm in the days of old, the sneaking, cowardly Red Chinese will soon know that we mean business, and that never again will they intimidate the weak, the poor, and the depressed.

Mr. President, I have nothing further to say. You were there, Mr. President, and you heard the testimony.

I pray to God that my decision to vote in favor of passage of the joint resolution is a correct one.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I shall vote for the joint resolution expressing congressional support of President Eisenhower's plan to protect Formosa, and the islands essential to its defense against the threatened Communist assault. I shall vote for it, without amendments, in the form in which it was reported by the Senate Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services.

This proposal does not solve all of the problems of Asian policy. There is no good reason why it should solve all the problems, which have been growing steadily worse under the mismanagement of 15 years or more.

I favor the joint resolution because it solves the most important problem. It tells the Chinese Communists and their Soviet allies that their bluff and bluster and bullying must stop. It tells them that the United States will not permit them to breach the borders of free Asia and add to their slave empire.

The Communist Chinese Armies invaded free Korea and made North Korea a wasteland. They invaded Vietnam. They hid North Vietnam behind their curtain of silence, and pockmarked South Vietnam with their guerrilla strongholds. Now they threaten to invade Formosa, and capture the anchor which holds the line from Japan and Okinawa to the Philippines, Indonesia, and Australia.

We have fought once over that vast world of seas and islands, and we do not wish to fight over it again. We have told the Red Chinese they will enter it at their peril.

President Eisenhower's message meets first things first, because it sets military action as the only answer to Communist military action. It puts the responsibility for choosing war entirely on the Reds. Their territory will not be attacked unless they choose war. But if they strike, they will have no sanctuaries within range of our ships where they can assemble their armies and equipment, shout warlike threats, and fire with impunity, as they did from the sanctuaries from which they killed our defenseless fighting men at the Yalu.

We know the Communists dare not attack. Let us not forget the military function of the Iron Curtain—or, if you like, the Bamboo Curtain. Its military function is to hide from the enemy the extent of the rebellion within, which eats away at the base of Communist strength. The Communists hold China much as the Japanese held it—by occupying cities and railroads and pushing out as far as they dare. South China is the weakest sector of Red China. South China has always been the foothold of Chinese rebellion against domination from invaders in the north.

The Red Chinese are, in Stalin's phrase, drunk with success, but they are not fools. Unless fear and violence have driven them mad, there is no smallest danger of war, when they know resistance is waiting.

Some of the amendments are important, but I am going to vote against them.

I am in full sympathy with the amendments offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. As a matter of fact, I sent to the two committees a message regarding an idea which I thought should be incorporated in the joint resolution. But it arrived too late for any formal action. Therefore, I prepared an amendment, and I was going to offer it. But I have not presented it, and I do not intend to do so.

The problem before us now is the problem met by this message. That part of the world which is governed by respect for God and man, by law and reason, has been in retreat before the rulers of the slave empire of communism, for 9 long years. The Communists will never stop the attack, and we will never cease retreating if we do nothing.

President Eisenhower's message proposes that we draw a militarily defensible line about the free world, a line which protects the coast of California, Washington, and Oregon, as truly as it protects the coast of Formosa. He proposes that we warn the Communists that that line, that frontier of freedom, is inviolate. If they cross it, this time we shall not retreat. We shall hold that line, and shall hold it by the only means the Communists accept, namely the military power to bring their bold adventures to an inglorious end.

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me for perhaps 3 or 4 minutes at this time, if I am able to obtain unanimous consent that he may yield to me for that purpose, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. MORSE. I shall yield under those circumstances, if such consent can be obtained.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I request such unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Senator from New Hampshire may proceed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on Monday of this week the President, taking full recognition of the seriousness of the Formosan situation, sent to the Congress a message asking authorization to use our Armed Forces in the defense of Formosa and the neighboring Pescadores. Today, the joint resolution granting that authorization is before us for debate, having successfully passed the House and having received a favorable report from our own Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees. While this may not set a record for rapid progress, nevertheless the joint resolution has moved along with rapidity, for one involving so grave a question. Grave as the question may be, nevertheless, I rise to ask that all of us do our utmost to expedite the debate on it, so that the joint resolution may be finally passed by the Senate today, or certainly not later than tomorrow.

The President knows full well the horrors of war as only a former professional soldier like himself can know it. For that reason perhaps if for no other he has been foremost in seeking every avenue for peace in this troubled world and in his message to us, besides asking for authority in the defense of Formosa, he made a clear, strong plea for the United Nations to take action in this latest act of aggression. His action clearly indicates that, although he will utilize all methods for the peaceful negotiation of the present situation, nevertheless, he recognizes the defense of Formosa as so vital to our own national security that he has made this unprecedented peacetime request; and his evaluation of the situation is unanimously confirmed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

There may be those among us who would question the need for the authority proposed to be granted in the joint resolution, stating, not without some reason, that sufficient authority now reposes in the Executive for him to make the commitment with respect to which he seeks authorization. For myself, I am pleased and proud that the President has adopted the course of asking the Congress to share in the responsibility of the grave step he proposes to undertake. In a matter so vital to our national security that branch of the Government which closely represents the people has a proper participation. Such joint action also will be a heartening sight for the eyes of the free world which are upon us. What a contrast to the Iron Curtain world of the Soviet aggressor, where whole peoples may be committed to the utter devastation of total war at the whim of one individual.

It has long been my position that we must determine through our Joint Chiefs of Staff what areas are vital to our national security, and then we should have the courage to take the calculated risk of making a firm stand on those lines. It is my deep conviction that world peace is more likely to be maintained by such determination. It will serve both as reassurance and as a rallying point for those with the will to maintain freedom of self-determination. It means, in short, a clear serving of notice of our intention, which should give serious pause to those planning a course of further aggression. The only alternative to such a stand would be more piecemeal attrition such as we have witnessed during the past decade. The end result of such a course would find us in complete isolation—the last remnant of the free world at the complete mercy of the final stroke of the Communist aggressor.

As I have already pointed out, the President, in seeking the authorization to defend Formosa, continues to seek to have the situation handled through the machinery of the United Nations. Imperfect as that machinery may be in some respects, I agree with his effort to continue to try to use its facilities as long as we are a member nation and as long as it offers the only facilities for concerted international negotiation. However, in the present time of emergency when quick action is called for, the President is fully justified in asking that as a matter of national security we be ready to take action alone, else the situation might be irretrievably lost while it was being debated.

I hope that we may shortly vote favorably on this resolution and that the vote may be unanimous, because the security of this Nation is truly a matter of bipartisan concern. I hope the amendments which have been proposed to the joint resolution will be rejected.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for his courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me in order that I may propound a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio, provided I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I have prepared a statement in support of the joint resolution authorizing the President to use the Armed Forces as he requested. Because of pressure of time, and because I do not wish to delay the final vote on the joint resolution, which I think is imperative at this time, and also because my name is not on the list at the desk, I ask unanimous consent that the statement which I have prepared may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BRICKER

I shall vote for the joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 28, authorizing the President to use the Armed Forces of the United States to protect Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack. My vote will be cast prayerfully, with full appreciation of the consequences that may ensue, but without any mental reservation whatsoever.

There is going to be no appeasement, no policy of vacillation in meeting the Communist threat in the Pacific. That is the clear import of the pending resolution. I commend the President for the firm stand he has taken. I should also like to commend the distinguished minority leader for the patriotic service he has rendered in focusing public opinion on the threat to our security in the Pacific area.

When the roll is called on passage of the pending resolution, no illusions should exist in regard to its meaning. It is, in fact, an ultimatum. It involves a calculated risk of war. Nevertheless, I sincerely believe that the policy of firmness embodied in the pending resolution is far more likely to prevent war in the Pacific than a vague policy of waiting for the dust to settle.

In the interest of prompt action by the Senate, I will say no more about the need for drawing a line around Formosa and adjacent islands. I would end my remarks at this point except for the fact that the legal significance of the pending resolution has been distorted in the press and in the Congress.

The junior Senator from Montana contends that the pending resolution is wholly unnecessary; that the President has full constitutional power to meet any emergency or to resist any sudden attack on Formosa. These sentiments have been echoed by the junior Senator from Arkansas and by the senior Senator from Missouri. A small reactionary number of editors and commentators contend that this joint resolution should not be construed as a precedent; that the President needs no authorization by the Congress to employ the Armed Forces of the United States in the defense of any foreign country.

Passage of Senate Joint Resolution 28 will not create any new precedent. It will, however, restore a long line of precedents which, over the past 10 years, have been disregarded, unconstitutionally in my judgment. If the crisis which has inspired this resolution were not so serious, I would find much pleasure in watching the advocates of omnipotent executive power back and fill to meet their unsound position. As I shall demonstrate, the joint resolution before the Senate fully vindicates the constitutional arguments of Bob Taft, myself, and others when the Senate debated the legality of the intervention in Korea and the sending of troops to Europe.

Senate Joint Resolution 28 authorizes the President "to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack."

This is not a simple or concurrent resolution which merely expresses the sense of the Senate or of the Congress. We are not called on here to express a purely advisory opinion. A joint resolution, unlike a simple or concurrent resolution, has legal force and effect. The Congress is authorizing the President to take certain action—action which may make a declaration of war a mere formality.

If there is any Senator who sincerely believes that the President needs no authority from the Congress in this situation, then he must vote against the joint resolution. Otherwise, he would be casting his vote for a resolution which, in his judgment, the Congress under the Constitution has no right to pass.

Let there be no misunderstanding about the constitutional significance of the step we are about to take. By approving this joint resolution we demolish, I hope for all time to come, the fallacious theory that the President, as Commander in Chief, has exclusive power to send Armed Forces of the United States anywhere in the world for the defense of any possible victim of aggression.

I can think of no action by President Eisenhower more praiseworthy than his seeking the approval of the Congress in this

Formosa matter. The framers of the Constitution expressly provided that only the Congress shall have the power—article I, section 8:

"To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water;

"To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years;

"To provide and maintain a Navy;

"To make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces;

"To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions."

The President's relation to the Armed Forces is stated in section 2 of article II:

"The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States when called into actual service of the United States."

But this power is limited by the 18th paragraph of article I, section 8, vesting in Congress power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any department or officer thereof."

Almost a year ago President Eisenhower pledged himself to respect the constitutional provisions just quoted. In his press conferences of March 10 and 17, 1954, he said that the United States would not be plunged into war without the approval of the Congress. He did not limit his pledge to the Indochina crisis then pending. As reported in the New York Times, the President said at his March 10, 1954, press conference:

"There is going to be no involvement of America in war unless it is a result of the constitutional process that is placed upon Congress to declare it. Now, let us have that clear. And that is the answer."

On March 17, 1954, President Eisenhower was reported to have said "that this country would not be carried into war without the approval of Congress." He also indicated that, in his judgment, there had been time to go to the Congress following the outbreak of hostilities in Korea. The President then stated two propositions to which no responsible person takes exception. The President must act without waiting for Congress if (1) the United States is under actual or imminent attack, and (2) the lives of American citizens abroad are in immediate jeopardy. Again I congratulate the President for demonstrating in a concrete situation his scrupulous respect for the constitutional distribution of war powers.

The Congress has received from the Washington Post and Times Herald (January 25, 1955) this editorial injunction:

"Care should be taken, however, to avoid any assumption that repetition of this procedure would be necessary in case of an attack upon our allies in Europe or in the Western Hemisphere."

The rationalizations of the Post and Times Herald are in vain. The joint resolution before us repudiates lock, stock, and barrel any theory that the Congress' power to declare war is only a ministerial function—an act involving little more descretion than that of the recorder of deeds in recording a sale of real estate in the District of Columbia. The distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has steadfastly and cogently maintained that each and every provision of the North Atlantic Treaty must be implemented in strict compliance with the constitutional processes of the parties to the treaty.

The pending joint resolution reaffirms the principle embodied in the United Nations Participation Act. Section 6 of that act provides that agreements for the use of armed forces by the United Nations under article 43 of the charter shall be subject to the approval of the Congress by appropriate act or joint resolution.

The difference between a joint resolution on the one hand and a simple or concurrent resolution on the other is a matter of critical importance. I opposed the simple resolution relative to the sending of ground forces to Europe because, in my judgment, it confirmed President Truman's theory that he had absolute discretion in the matter regardless of what the Congress might or might not do. The late Senator Taft held the same view. He said in the troops-to-Europe debate:

"Any other view means that the President today would have power to involve the United States in war in any section of the world in his unlimited and arbitrary discretion, and that Congress in creating a great American armed force of 3,500,000 men and drafting every boy of 18 for that purpose is completely without power to limit the President's arbitrary discretion. Merely to state this proposition should arouse the undying opposition of every man who believes in the maintenance in this country of government by the people." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 1, page 1119.)

Though I disagree with them, I can at least understand the thinking of people outside the Congress who seek to make the President omnicompetent. What I cannot understand is why some Members of the Congress are so eager to deny that we have any right to participate in this momentous decision. They are honorable men, and in most cases, able lawyers. It is hard for me to believe that they seek to defend past usurpations of power by the Executive for political reasons. Equally hard to believe is that these Members of Congress, also for political reasons, would like to duck the issue and thus be free to criticize the administration with the advantage of hindsight. Advocacy of congressional impotence by Members of the Congress is something I cannot fathom.

Last year the opponents of my proposed constitutional amendment trotted out Prof. Edward S. Corwin as a preeminent constitutional authority. It is, therefore, with some satisfaction that I quote Professor Corwin in support of the statements I have made. In his book, The President: Office and Powers, 1948, Professor Corwin says:

"In brief, the controlling theory of the [United Nations participation] act is that American participation in United Nations shall rest on the principle of departmental collaboration, and not on an exclusive Presidential prerogative in the diplomatic field. Not only is this a sound constitutional principle in that it can claim a great deal of support from the history of the conduct of American foreign relations, especially in the period prior to the war with Mexico, it is the only practicable principle unless we wish to establish outright Presidential dictatorship" (pp. 270, 271).

In addition to the constitutional question involved, a number of practical considerations attest the wisdom of President Eisenhower's action in coming to the Congress.

First, why should men of good will insist that the President make this terrifying decision all by himself? This is not strictly a military problem. It is a political question of the first magnitude.

Second, it is certainly desirable to show not only the Communists but also our allies that the President and the Congress have united in the making of this grave decision.

Third, it is certainly true that the redeployment of naval forces and certain other action that will be taken by the President requires no authorization by the Congress. It is equally true that the President will assume responsibilities which go far beyond those of military strategy and tactics. How utterly foolish it is to insist that the President have a constitutional lawyer at his elbow to check the legality of any action he deems necessary to meet the danger. When the power of the Congress is joined with that of the President, he can proceed in full confidence that his acts are constitutional.

And, finally, this decision to defend Formosa against attack should reflect not merely the judgment of one man but the combined judgment of all the elected representatives of the people. The end objective of the President's proposal is to preserve free institutions, not only in the Far East but throughout the world. Surely it is paradoxical to seek that end by reducing the Congress of the United States to the level of Hitler's Reichstag or Malenkov's Presidium.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I expect this to be my last major speech in opposition to the joint resolution. In the course of the remainder of the debate I may deem it necessary to make a few rebuttal statements in connection with certain amendments of which I am a cosponsor and which will be voted upon later. However, I do not propose, after this speech, to make another major speech on this issue.

The position taken by the Senator from Oregon throughout this debate has not been an easy one, but it has been one which my conscience and convictions have compelled me to take. In the course of this speech I shall devote myself primarily to referring to certain arguments made by one of the most distinguished Members of the Senate, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and comments on an argument or two made by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. Then I shall summarize my arguments in opposition to the joint resolution, and make that the closing of my case in opposition.

I am perfectly willing to allow history to judge whether or not my position was a sound one. Therefore I shall not yield in the course of these remarks to any Senator save and except the Senator from Georgia or the Senator from California, because it would be only courteous and proper to do so if they decided they had any questions they wished to ask me during the course of my remarks.

I am as eager as are the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from California to bring this debate to an early close, so that the Senate may reach a vote at the earliest possible moment.

There has been some discussion during the course of the debate about psychological advantages for the United States in this resolution. There have been statements to the effect that great psychological advantages are to be obtained by our taking action on the joint resolution, either in its present form or some modified form, and doing so at an early hour.

As I indicated earlier in the day, I am in complete agreement with the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from California that we ought to vote on the joint resolution today or tonight. In my 10 years in the Senate I do not know when there was a greater duty and responsibility resting upon Members of this body to remain in their seats until a measure was finally disposed of than there is in the case of the pending measure, even if it is not voted upon until 5 o'clock tomorrow morning.

From the standpoint of psychological factors, I think our recognition of the importance of action on the joint resolution, and the importance of remaining in the Chamber for whatever number of hours may be necessary to finish the job, would be clear notice to the world that, although there are differences of opinion among us as to the particular language which ought to be contained in the joint resolution, we are a united legislative body so far as concerns unity of opposition to the Communist segment of the world.

I do not expect ever to be able to catch up with the implications, the innuendoes, and downright misrepresentations which are appearing in some segments of the press against the Senator from Oregon, including one which appears in this evening's Washington Star. As I said the other day, I have no intention of answering irresponsible criticisms or ad hominem attacks on the Senator from Oregon. I wish to make sure, so that at least my descendants may read this statement when they come to read the RECORD long after I have passed from this earth, that there is not a man or woman in the Senate who is more opposed to communism and everything it stands for than is the Senator from Oregon.

However, I believe that freedom in the United States will be in jeopardy if we ever reach the point where a Member of the United States Senate, with a deep conviction, cannot express a disagreement with the President of the United States and with his colleagues in the Senate with respect to the form a resolution should take without being subjected to personal abuse and vilification. No other Member of the Senate is more insistent than I am that we make clear to Red China and to Red Russia that we have no intention of standing by and letting them take Formosa and the Pescadores. However I do not favor the pending resolution because I think it is very likely to be provocative of war.

With those introductory remarks, I turn to the able speech delivered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] yesterday.

I well know that when one crosses swords with the senior Senator from Georgia in a legal argument, he crosses swords with a legal Hercules. However, I disagree with the senior Senator from Georgia with regard to the legal interpretation he made yesterday of certain language in the resolution. I am satisfied that, from the standpoint of legal construction he is completely wrong in the legal theory he enunciated on the floor of the Senate yesterday. It is the same argument he made in committee. It is the same argument he has made in conversations with some of us since the close of the committee hearings. It is the argument that the language from line 7 through line 11 on page 2 of the resolution constitutes language of limitation, and is subject to the old legal construction that language of limitation modifies the general power granted elsewhere in a document, and subjects the general power to the restrictions of language of limitation.

Mr. President, there is not one word in the language from line 7 through line 11 on page 2 of the resolution which is subject to the interpretation that it is language of limitation. I shall now set forth the reasons for that statement.

First, I should like to quote from the speech of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia at page 821 of the RECORD:

> What does that mean? It means that the President is asking Congress to say to him, "You cannot take, secure, and hold any area on the mainland of China, because it is not in friendly hands." The authority can refer only to those islands lying not too far off the coast which, in some way or other, the Nationalist Republic of China has been enabled to hold, and which it now holds.
>
> So what the President himself is asking is that we agree, so far as we can agree, to give him support, not to go onto the mainland, and not to take any lands which are held by any people other than those who are friends of ours. He is asking that he be given the right, in this area, to secure and protect those lands that are now in friendly hands.

The Senator from Georgia greatly stresses in his argument the words "in friendly hands."

I continue to quote from the speech of the Senator from Georgia:

> That is what the President has asked for. It is a limitation upon his authority and power, from the point of view of those who believe the President has absolute power to reach as far back as he wishes in order to protect Formosa and the Pescadores. But he is asking for this authority, and I think he is asking it for a good reason and a good purpose.
>
> I can see no reason why Congress should hesitate to grant him that power, which is a probable limitation upon the power which, under the Constitution, he might exercise, but as to which assuredly he feels justified, by implication at least as strong as death, in saying to Congress: "I do not want the authority to go beyond the areas which are now in friendly hands. I want you to give me the authority to secure and protect lands now in friendly hands, and that only."

I respectfully say that the difficulty with the Senator's argument is that the language in the resolution referring to territories in friendly hands has absolutely nothing to do with the power granted in the resolution to the President to defend Formosa and the Pescadores.

Let us look at that language, because it is the language which would be stricken from the resolution by the Humphrey amendment, which now, I understand, will be offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and the Senator from Oregon.

This is the language which it is proposed to strike out:

> this authority to include the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands and the taking of such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

I discussed that language at some length last night. I reiterate my position by saying I do not know how the senior Senator from Georgia or any other Senator could draft language broader in scope than the language which says "and the taking of such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores."

I always try to be exceedingly fair in legal arguments, as in all other matters. Therefore let me say there is other language in the resolution, not touched by the Humphrey amendment, which reads:

> That the President of the United States be and he hereby is authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores.

The clause "as he deems necessary" in my judgment is also very broad, too.

I now come to the heart of the difference which exists on the floor of the Senate on this very fundamental issue. In my judgment the language to which I have been objecting is language which, read in line with testimony given before the committees in executive session, would authorize in advance, and, in effect, would predate approval by the Congress of the United States, of an order by the President of the United States to strike against the mainland of China, if he should decide that such an act was required to defend Formosa and the Pescadores.

There is no language of limitation to that power anywhere in the resolution. There is not one word of limitation to that power from line 7 to line 11 on page 2 of the resolution. On the contrary, it is the very language which makes perfectly clear that the President of the United States will have the authority to take such other measures as he judges to be necessary. Those other measures could include a preventive war strike against the mainland of China.

Here again we are involved in the very delicate point as to what the attitudes of the Secretary of State and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff happen to be in regard to the exercise of a decision to make a strike on the mainland of China.

I shall not say more on that point than I have already said, except to refer to the essence of it. It is, as the transcript will show, that both the Secretary of State and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in their testimony before the committee—and I can say it now because there has been a discussion of it in the press, and that discussion in the press found no source in the Senator from Oregon, let me say—was to the effect that it may be necessary to make a strike against the mainland of China before a strike or act of war could be made by the Red Chinese against the United States in our defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

We cannot escape the conclusion, in my judgment, that if that is done it will constitute an act of war on the part of the United States against Red China before Red China commits an act of war against the United States. In examination of these two responsible officials of our Government, there was no denial by them that a strike by our forces against the mainland of China under such circumstances would be an act of war. That is what I am talking about, Mr. President. That is the position I have taken throughout this debate. And in closing my case on this point, I reiterate that

never in the Senate of the United States shall I vote for language in a resolution which, in my judgment, cannot be reconciled with the glorious history of the United States in regard to our devotion to peace and the proof of our devotion to peace by a record which shows we never committed an act of war against a nation until that nation first committed an act of war against us.

One of the most dangerous implications of this resolution is that for the first time in our history we now enunciate a threat of aggression against a nation not now at war with us. What does the Senate think the effects of that will be all over Asia? One effect will be terrifying fear on the part of millions that war is imminent. The Asiatic peoples are becoming more and more alarmed over the potential threat on the part of the United States, that the United States will decide whether it will make a strike against another nation before that nation has made war against us. This threat of aggression is a departure from the great principles of the long established historic foreign policy of the United States. This is a closing of the book on that great record and the writing of a new chapter which, in my judgment, will be a black chapter in the pages of American history if we do not modify the language of the pending resolution.

So long as that language remains in the resolution, let me say, Mr. President, I am not going to accept the argument that there is any language of limitation upon the powers of the President of the United States to order a strike against the mainland of China if he should decide that such a strike should be made, because of military events occurring on the mainland of China.

Mr. President, let us consider some of the operative facts in this picture. It is perfectly clear that those who know me know how I hate the Communist regime of Red China. But there has been a great deal of discussion about a common hypothetical which has run through many of the speeches, which goes something like this: Suppose the Red Chinese start building jet airfields or airfields capable of accommodating jet planes in the area of the port of Amoy, or in that part of the mainland of China which is off the Quemoy Islands. Suppose they concentrate large military forces there, not only planes, but manpower. Suppose they also start congregating or assembling submarines and naval craft. Are we going to wait until some overt act of aggression against us is committed, or are we going to strike them first?

It is thought that by raising that hy-hypothetical question, Mr. President, any of us who do not agree that we should strike first are soft toward communism, or that for some reason we are following the Communist line. That is one of the charges made against the senior Senator from Oregon in the press today.

As I said on the floor of the Senate, the Supreme Court of the United States has rendered my decision on this matter many times in our past history in great cases where it has held that in the hour of great crisis we should hold fast to our constitutional processes. I say, Mr. President, let us hold fast to them now in this critical hour. Let us not put ourselves into such a position that we will be judged by the world as a Nation that has said, "We will decide for ourselves whether we should commit an aggression first." If we make that decision, I fear, Mr. President, the judgment that will rest upon the heads of generations of Americans 50 or 100 years from today will be to the great discredit of America.

Let Senators figuratively put themselves on the mainland of China for a moment. Knowing what we know about the viciousness of the police state and the totalitarian methods of Red China, it is easy for us to look at the picture only from our side and not have any understanding of the Chinese attitude. Although I hate the Red Chinese leaders, Mr. President, and although I despise the acceptance of communism by China, I, nevertheless, cannot get away from my early conditioning. I remember that as a little boy, on Sunday after Sunday after Sunday, in my Sunday-school class, I divided up the small amount of the contribution I was able to make each week into two parts. One part for the church, and the other for missionary work in China. That was true of millions of other American boys and girls, because the history of the United States is a history of great Christian understanding and charity toward the Chinese people. We have got to win this fight in the decades immediately ahead, Mr. President, for the hearts and the minds of the people behind the Iron Curtain, or freedom will not prevail in the world.

I say we must take a look at the picture from the standpoint of what the Chinese people, by the millions, see, and also from the standpoint of how their thinking is being poisoned by the vicious, lying propaganda of the Red leaders.

So, Mr. President, with the United States still claiming it should defend Quemoy and the Matsu, what do the Chinese see? They see an opponent in a civil war, the Nationalist Chinese, occupying those islands which they say, from the standpoint of their sovereign rights, belong to China. Sir Anthony Eden said so yesterday. The heads of free states around the world today are telling us that those islands belong not to the Nationalist Chinese, but to China.

The answer may be made, "We do not recognize China as a sovereign power." But most of our allies do, and we cannot escape the fact that her diplomatic relations with us are those of a de facto government. We seem to be willing to have conversations with her on some matters. But she is a de facto government, and there is a civil war going on between the Red Chinese and the Nationalist Chinese over Quemoy and the Matsu.

It would be a bad historic precedent if we should involve ourselves in a civil war over Quemoy and the Matsu.

That is why I said before, and repeat in this final argument, that I would rather walk out of the Senate of the United States; I would rather be defeated tomorrow than to cast a vote which I think may lead to the sacrifice of American boys in defense of the Nationalist Chinese on Quemoy or the Matsu. I fear that will be one of the results of passing this resolution, unless we are exceedingly lucky. If it shall not be one of the results, it will be because we will be protected in accordance with that great motto of our country, "In God we trust." I am afraid that if this resolution is passed, the only thing that will reduce the strong probabilities of war will be God Almighty directing human destiny from His throne in the high heavens.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will not the Senator from Oregon admit, historically speaking, that had the United States not intervened in the Greek civil war, all of Greece today would be communistic?

Mr. MORSE. I do not believe the United States intervened in the Greek civil war in the sense that we are arguing the point here. I think that what happened in connection with the Greek war was an aftermath of the whole European problem following World War II, and that we still had an obligation to settle that war in the interests of peace, and that was what we did in Greece.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MORSE. I may say further, if the Senator from California will pardon me for a moment, that if we had not intervened, I think all of Europe today would be communistic.

The Senator may recall that as we walked back from the joint session of Congress, at which President Truman laid down the Truman doctrine, I happened to be the first to rise in the Senate, at my desk on the other side of the aisle, and pledge to the President of the United States my support of the Truman doctrine. I did so because at that hour it seemed to me that he was, symbolicly, the great strength that stopped communism from marching across all of Europe. But that was directly connected, I may say, with our obligations still growing out of World War II to maintain peace in Europe.

In this instance, we have no rights in Quemoy or Matsu. We never have had. Those islands always have been sovereign territory of China. Were we to go into those islands and try to make them available to the Nationalist Chinese, we would be taking sides in a war which, in my judgment, we should stay out of; and also, in my judgment, we would be taking sides on an issue in which we do not have to become involved in order to defend and protect Formosa, which is many, many miles away from Quemoy and Matsu.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is it not a fact that so far as the Communist world is concerned, they considered the operation in Korea on June 25, 1950, as a civil war between the North Korean Communists and the South Korean Republic?

Mr. MORSE. There is no question about that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. We intervened in that civil war. Had we not intervened, probably today all of Korea, and perhaps even Japan and more of Asia, would be behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. MORSE. Let me tell the Senator from California what I believe our clear international law obligation was in regard to Korea, which not only justified our going into Korea but which dictated our doing so. The United States and Russia, in the first instance, partitioned Korea. That was not a United Nations decision. That was a military decision, first recommended by military advisers of our Government, and then sanctioned and entered into by civil officials of our Government. We did it; the United Nations did not do it.

When we did it, and when that understanding was entered into, then, let me say, we had an obligation to continue to protect the people of South Korea when the Russians, acting through their puppets, the Red Chinese, launched their attack across the 38th parallel. But that had already become an international law obligation of the United States.

We have no legal obligation to protect the islands of Quemoy and Matsu; to the contrary, in my judgment, we ought to get out of those islands, and get out quickly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is it not a fact that the question involved has to do with securing Quemoy and Matsu for the Government of the Republic of China, in whose possession those islands are now and have been historically for a long time? Furthermore, the Government of the Republic of China is a member of the United Nations, recognized by a majority of the members of the United Nations as being the legal government of the territory whose area is now occupied by the Government of the Republic of China.

Mr. MORSE. I understand that argument, but I do not accept its premise, from this standpoint: It is a civil war area, and we owe no obligation to the Nationalist Government of China to reestablish it on the mainland of China or to reestablish it on any island it may lose, or to keep it on Quemoy or Matsu. I say that because, in my judgment, if we were to do that, we would be clearly interfering with and trying to direct the internal affairs of a country involved in a civil war.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is not the Senator from Oregon familiar with the fact that the Chinese Communist regime admittedly, despite the fact that the United Nations itself called upon all member states and other nations of the world to resist the original Communist North Korean aggression in Korea, across the 38th parallel, sent into Korea, across the Yalu River, more than a million men, armed with weapons of war, either by Chinese Communist or Soviet Communist, to make war upon the United Nations and upon the United States, which was bearing 90 percent of the manpower burden, and more than 90 percent of the resource burden; that they continued that war and helped to inflict 140,000 casualties upon us, including some 35,000 dead; and that that war, which the Chinese Reds themselves initiated, and which they themselves carried on, has been terminated only by armistice terms, which the same Communist regime has violated, not only to the extent of building up their armed forces in North Korea, their air bases in North Korea, and their equipment in North Korea, but to the additional extent that they are now admittedly holding at least 15 American airmen, wearing the uniform of the United States, and perhaps as many as 800 additional American GI's?

Under those circumstances, the Chinese Reds have made war upon the United States and the other civilized nations of the world.

So does not the Senator believe, considering that historical background, that both the United Nations and the United States of America have some interest in seeing to it, as the Senator from Oregon himself has quite well pointed out, that a ruthless, godless regime, uninterested in decency and international law and order is prevented from moving out into the Pacific and putting itself in a better position, ultimately, to gain control of Formosa, as they have threatened to do?

Does not the Senator recognize that we are not discussing an innocent nation on the mainland, a nation which has not committed an act of aggression, but, to the contrary, a nation which stands condemned as an aggressor by the United Nations itself.

Does not that give us some purpose, some legality, in taking a stand, which we might not take if the situation related, let us say, to India or to some other nation, which had not such a history of aggression?

Mr. MORSE. I respond by saying, most respectfully, that if the conclusion of the Senator from California, as I have listened to the particulars he has listed in his statement, is that Red China is at war with the United States, then the Senator from California ought to have at the desk a proposed declaration of war against Red China. But he does not have one there.

I think it is generally recognized that the United States is not at war with Red China. We are at peace with Red China.

The argument of the Senator from California in which he calls the attention of the Senate and of the Senator from Oregon to the Korean situation is quite irrelevant and immaterial to the issue before us, as to whether or not we ought to defend the Nationalist Chinese on Quemoy and Matsu.

If the Senator from California thinks that I am at all happy about or am approving of what has happened in Korea, he is mistaken, because I think he knows that he and I agree on more phases of that situation than we disagree on.

But I wish to say, in answer to his argument, that we are not at war with Red China today; and I think we ought to try to see if we can win a peace with honor in the Pacific without becoming involved in a war with Red China. If we become involved in one, I think we shall be on our way to total war.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the key to the Senator's statement is that we should have peace with honor; but the question is, Where are we to draw the line between a peace with honor and peace at any price.

Mr. MORSE. I hate to think of the judgment which the Asiatic peoples are going to pronounce upon us if we get into a war by making a strike against a nation with whom we are not at war at the time a preventive war strike is made by us.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not wish to encroach upon the time of the Senator from Oregon unduly——

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from California has been very patient toward me in the past, and I am glad to yield to him.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the issue involved in the resolution and the statement by the President is not that we will make a strike against the Red Chinese, or that we might engage in preventive war or aggression against them. I think the resolution unties our hands in case an act of aggression shall be made upon us while we are carrying out certain of our obligations or certain of our desires to help redeploy the forces of the Republic of China, which is the legal government of China.

However, I shall drop that point and say to the Senator that I, too, as a youngster, contributed pennies to the Chinese; and I say I have a very strong conviction that there may be, behind the Iron Curtain of China, as I think, indeed, there may be behind the Iron Curtain of Eastern Europe, literally tens, if not hundreds, of millions of people who pray that in the not-too-distant future the tyranny which the Senator from Oregon has so clearly depicted may come to an end. The Senator pointed out the other day that in the enslaved labor camps literally millions of laborers are being worked to death, and those persons may be praying that they may not have to live under that tyranny much longer. Instead of the people of China feeling that the adoption of this resolution would be a threat to them, they may feel that the Republic of China, holding the coastal islands, continues to be the only reasonable hope that some day they may be free.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to interrupt the Senator, before he goes to the next point, to say that I certainly agree with his observation we have many friends among the many millions of people in China; but one of my fears is that we shall lose them quickly if we give them proof that we will make war before war is made upon us. I ask the Senator not to forget that Asiatic boys and girls have been brought up on the conditioning and the folklore that the great threat to Asia is western domination. Let us not give them any proof of our intention of dominating Asia and making war against them. It would be good communistic propaganda to proclaim that such was our intention.

I realize that, from a military standpoint, the Senator and I do not agree. My belief is that we do not have to hold

Matsu and Quemoy in order to defend Formosa. As I interpret a report over the wire of what the Senator said earlier today the Senator seems to think that the resolution in effect draws a line of demarcation in the Formosa Strait area. One of my objections to the resolution is that I do not think it draws a line of demarcation, but, on the contrary, makes the whole thing ambiguous. The resolution would result in putting us in the position of contending that, in order to defend islands, along the coast of China which are in possession of one side in a civil war, we will commit a preventive-war act if we think it would be to our military advantage. However, Mr. President, we have argued that point previously. We simply do not agree that preventive war is one of the dangers of the resolution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think many people in China, both behind and in front of the Iron Curtain, recognize that a free country cannot coexist, in the Communist interpretation of the word, with communism, because Communist governments coexist only until they can subvert a free country from within or destroy it by overt aggression from without.

Since the Senator from Oregon has referred to Christian teachings, I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that a minister of the gospel, whose parents spent many years in China, wrote me, strongly protesting the idea of coexistence with the Communist world, in the sense that I think a great many persons both in the Kremlin and in Peiping refer to it, and I should like to bring that passage of the Bible to the attention of the Senate. It is from Second Corinthians:

> Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: For what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I would reply to that good minister of the Gospel by suggesting to him that we would not get very far in our great Christian missionary movements in the world if we did not try to convert the infidels. After all, we have to mingle among them; we have to associate with them in order to lead them into the paths of righteousness.

Mr. President, I use that as the springboard for the observation that we ought to make the plea to the United Nations that it become the great evangelistic leader of political conversion in Asia. That is why I think this resolution ought not contain a provision which authorizes the President to exercise, if he desires to do so, such broad, sweeping power permitting of a preventive war act, but should contain language which will make it perfectly clear that if Communist China engages in aggressive action against Formosa, it will be at war with the United States. At the same time, we should try to prevail upon the United Nations to offer its good offices in an effort to settle the troubles in the Pacific by peaceful means. I think that is the Christian approach.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The difficulty is that while from time to time in the past the infidels would take violent measures against those who would preach the Gospel, at least the missionaries were allowed to preach it. The trouble with communism is that when persons enter the Communist countries either to preach the Gospel or to preach democracy and freedom, they are liquidated in an NKVD prison. That is the difference.

Mr. MORSE. I am not blind to the ugly realities which confront us in this situation. I disagree with the Senator from California that the way to meet those ugly realities is to give the President authorization under the terms of the resolution to make an aggressive threat against Asia. Let me repeat what I said last night. There was not a word in the White House release yesterday which in any way modified the language in the resolution. All the President said, in effect, was that if it should be decided to do more than engage in direct self-defense of Formosa, he, the President of the United States, would make the decision. Of course, I would want him to be the one to make the decision, if it is to be made, although I think such a decision should never be made by any President of the United States. I do not believe we ought to violate our historic peace policy.

However, there was nothing in the White House release of yesterday which changed the authorization in the resolution to strike against the mainland of China. Let me repeat to my friends in the Senate who believe that the release justifies their voting for the resolution that there is nothing in the release which in any way modifies the extraordinary power which it is sought by the resolution to give to the President.

I would not vote to give such authorization to any President, because we cannot get away from the fact that if a President, whether it be this President or any other President, would ever exercise such a power, in effect what we would be doing, by voting for such a resolution, would be predating a declaration of war, as was stated by a great Member of this body in conversation with some of us some days ago. That is what the adoption of the resolution would do.

A great many Senators who are supporting the resolution take refuge in the assumption that the President will never make a decision to use such power, the authorization of which I am protesting. I do not know whether he will or not. He is human. He may be persuaded to do it. If he should make such a decision he would not make it in a vacuum. He would make it on the basis of representations made to him. Who would make such representations to the President? Military advisers would have much to say about it. The Secretary of State would have much to say about it. In the kind of government under which we operate, a President would take such advice unless it could be shown that the advisers were wrong.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have said—and I shall keep my commitment—that I shall yield only to the two Senators whose remarks I am commenting upon, because if I do not proceed on that basis, in view of my position in this debate, I may be speaking here until 7 p. m. I wish to get through in a few minutes, and it will take me only a few minutes to make my case if I do not yield to others than the two Senators I have mentioned.

Mr. President, I wish to say the President is going to rely upon his military advisers; he is bound to rely upon them. That brings about in the Senate a split which is rather vital. There are some Senators who have complete confidence in the advisers of the President, and there are some of us who do not. Some of us are very much concerned about the fact that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has given clear evidence that he leans heavily toward a preventive-war policy. I have said I believe the difference of opinions within the Joint Chiefs of Staff—and there are differences—have arisen because some of our military leaders are afraid that if we get into a war situation on the mainland of China we do not have in being the Armed Forces required to successfully prosecute a war there.

Despite the fact that there are those who seek to give the impression that the arguments I have made in the course of this debate have not been in the interest of my country, I believe the fight that those of us who are opposed to the joint resolution have made during the debate already has resulted in some change in the Executive attitude. I do not think we can explain on any other basis the White House release of yesterday. I hope at least the debate will help make clear to the administration that in this country there is great concern about the danger that military advisers of the preventive-war school may succeed in persuading the Executive to take what some of us think would be a very unfortunate course of action if he were to authorize a strike against the mainland of China before an act of war was committed against us.

Now, Mr. President, I move to my next point by way of summary of my arguments against the joint resolution. It is that I think the uncertainty of the joint resolution increases, and does not decrease, the risk of war. The joint resolution is said to be based on the premise that miscalculation is a major cause of war. The argument is made that if the Kaiser and Hitler and Mussolini had known we would engage in the recent wars in which we have been involved—World War I and World War II—those wars would not have occurred. I think that is a correct premise. However, the joint resolution, instead of decreasing the area of possible miscalculation, increases it. The joint resolution does this both so far as the United States is concerned and so far as the Chinese Communists are concerned.

The joint resolution clearly contemplates that United States forces may be

used to attack Communist concentrations of shipping or airpower which are being assembled in preparation for an assault upon Formosa, the Pescadores, or related territories. Such an action on our part must be based upon a determination of Communist intentions. This is an area in which allowance must be made for a large margin of error.

Mr. President, I return to my discussion of what our attitude would be if we were Chinese and we saw powerful American military forces concentrated in areas close to China's shores. We say we have no right to assume that if the Red Chinese concentrate airplanes on an airfield which may be built near Amoy Harbor their intentions toward us are peaceful. However, if we were Chinese, would we think the concentration of American military forces so close to the Chinese coast, as in the area of Quemoy, would represent a very peaceful intention on the part of America toward these Chinese? What makes us think they are going to assume that our intentions are peaceful merely because we say they are? Because of the hysteria and the emotionalism which are involved in the public attitudes toward this problem, it is difficult for us to pause long enough, in calm reflection, to try to understand the workings of the oriental mind in circumstances such as these.

As I have said in previous speeches, I believe that as a matter of international law and right we are in a strong position when we say, "If you approach Formosa or the Pescadores, the areas regarding which we have international obligations, you will be at war with us." But I cannot think that when we include Quemoy and Matsu as areas to defend we are in the same position. Instead, in that case we shall be in a very different position.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. This is the only interruption I shall make. The Senator from Oregon asks, "What would be our thinking if we were Chinese and if American military concentrations were occurring on China's borders, and if there were a free government on Formosa?" Assuming that the Chinese Communists, as a tyranny, are slightly confused themselves, if there were any hope of such an effort being successful, if we were Chinese we might be glad to join in rebellion and try to throw off the Red tyranny.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I know that has been the theory of some; but I cannot get away from the fact that the Chinese Communists drove off the Nationalist Chinese, and have not allowed them to come back. I think it is fairly well agreed among most of us that the Nationalist Chinese do not have any chance of getting back to the mainland unless we give them the support which will put them back; and if we do that, and if we put them back on the mainland of China, we shall be at war. Then, Mr. President, it seems to me we are caught on the other horn of the dilemma.

No, Mr. President; I think we must make the tough decision—this is my view, although I know most of my colleagues disagree with me, and I respect their disagreement—I think we must make the tough decision that under international law we have no business of having our forces 8 or 10 miles from the coastline of China, trying to support Chinese Nationalist forces, parties to the civil war, on those islands. Our own obligations end with Formosa and the Pescadores. Our obligations to defend Formosa and the Pescadores grow out of the situation following World War II and grow out of the Japanese peace treaty.

Mr. President, I repeat that the joint resolution clearly contemplates that United States forces may be used to attack Communist concentrations of shipping or air power which are being assembled in preparation for an assault on Formosa, the Pescadores, or related territories. Such an action on our part must be based on a determination of Communist intentions. This is an area in which as I have said allowance must be made for a large margin of error.

At the same time, the joint resolution, of course, puts the Chinese Communists on notice that they may be attacked, without any overt act on their part, through an American misinterpretation of Communist ship movements or airfield construction. As a consequence, the Communists may misinterpret our own ship movements, and may thereby be led to launch an attack which otherwise they would hold in abeyance.

The joint resolution thereby creates an intolerable uncertainty. If we had conducted our affairs in Europe on the same basis, we might very well have been plunged into war there long ago, on the theory—which has not yet been borne out by the facts—that the Communist build-up in East Germany was a preliminary to an attack by them on Western Europe.

My next point is that the joint resolution weakens our worldwide political position. One of the primary sources of the strength of our position throughout the world has been that our military activities have been purely defensive. We have said to the Soviet bloc, in effect, "If you attack, we will beat you to death."

But now we are saying—or we are appearing to say, which amounts to the same thing—"If we think you are going to attack, we will beat you to death." We thereby lend a color of credence to the Soviet and the Chinese Communist propaganda which portrays the United States as an aggressor—either a potential aggressor or a threatener of aggression. Therefore I say, as my second summary point, that the resolution weakens our worldwide political position.

In the third place, I think the resolution would increase the temptation of Chiang Kai-shek to provoke an attack by Chinese Communists. The Chinese Nationalists are obsessed with the desire to return to the mainland. Newspaper reports that we have written off this desire may serve only to increase their desperation. The result may well be Nationalist attacks upon the Communists so that when the Communists retaliate upon Formosa, the United States will perforce have to retaliate upon the mainland. We would then be involved in a full-scale war in China.

There is another danger of involvement in mainland war inherent in the language of this joint resolution as I read it.

I should like to invite the attention of Senators to an Associated Press dispatch which appeared in the China World of January 1, 1955. A longer dispatch was published in the New York Times. Both of them I shall place in the RECORD momentarily. The one in the China World reads as follows:

CHIANG PREDICTS EARLY OUTBREAK OF FULL-SCALE WAR

TAIPEH, January 1.—Chiang Kai-shek Friday declared the Red attacks on Nationalist offshore islands were "the overture to the battle of Taiwan (Formosa) Strait."

"A full-scale war may break out at any time," Chiang declared in a New Year's statement to the people.

Chiang spoke after conferences with Adm. Arthur W. Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who is here for a series of meetings, presumably on the defense of Formosa.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the longer story, which is listed as a special dispatch to the New York Times, having been published in the New York Times for January 1, 1955. The article is entitled "Chiang Foresees War at Any Time."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHIANG FORESEES WAR AT ANY TIME—NEW YEAR MESSAGE CALLS RED ATTACKS ON ISLES OVERTURE TO FORMOSA STRAIT BATTLE

TAIPEH, FORMOSA, December 31.—A full-scale war between the Chinese Nationalists and Communists may break out at "any time," Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, president of Nationalist China, said today in a New Year's message. He declared that Communist attacks against the Nationalist island outposts of Quemoy and the Tachens in the last 3 months were overtures to the battle for the Strait of Formosa.

This statement in a New Year message was regarded as significant, since Generalissimo Chiang earlier had contended, as he did again today, that Communist invasion of Formosa would be the beginning of the destruction of the Communist regime on the Chinese mainland.

He also warned the world that "1955 will witness the further deterioration of international relations." He did not elaborate this statement.

For the first time the Generalissimo commented on the United States-Formosa mutual-defense treaty in his message. He said the treaty not only completes a necessary link nearest the fighting front but also strengthens our bastion for counterattack and increases our combat potential.

But the Generalissimo immediately added that in a Nationalist counterattack against the mainland "we do not ask for their [friendly nations'] active participation." He also added "in the final analysis we must realize that the future of China can be decided only by ourselves."

Adm. Arthur W. Radford, Chairman of the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff, who is in Formosa for a 4-day visit, held a top-level secret military conference this morning with key Nationalist military leaders, including Gen. Chou Chih-jou, secretary general of the National Security Conference; Gen. Sun Li-jen, Presidential Chief of Staff, who was educated at Virginia Military Institute, and Gen. Peng Meng-chi, Acting

Chief of the General Staff. Generalissimo Chiang presided at the 2-hour conference.

Well-informed sources felt certain that Admiral Radford had gone over the entire Formosan defense plan with the Nationalist generals.

Admiral Radford has conferred officially with the Generalissimo twice since his arrival yesterday afternoon. Another purpose of Admiral Radford's visit is believed to obtain data for testimony before a Senate committee on the mutual defense treaty. He may also intend to bring back to the Senate Generalissimo Chiang's assurance that the Nationalists would not undertake any actions that might increase the danger of a third world war.

The admiral is expected to leave Formosa Monday after spending the New Year's holiday with Generalissimo Chiang.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, we have discussed this point backward and forward, and thrashed it over, so that all I need to say in behalf of the opponents of the joint resolution is that we feel that one of the great dangers in this situation, because of what we believe are the commitments of defense which will be undertaken under it, is that it increases the possibility, the probability, and the danger of Chiang involving the United States in war because of some overt act he may commit along the coastline of China, either on the Quemoy or Matsu Islands, or at some other point.

I repeat that I do not propose to vote for a joint resolution which, in my judgment, would increase the probability of the danger of the Nationalist Chinese getting us involved in a war on the mainland of China, because of our defense of Quemoy or Matsu.

The evidence on this point is already beginning to pile up. The Washington Star of January 27 printed an Associated Press story from Taipeh which included these two significant paragraphs:

Emboldened by the rising concentration of United States air and sea strength around troubled Formosa, the Nationalists today staged an air raid in broad daylight on Yikiangshan Island. * * *

Yikiangshan has been raided only in early morning hours, but with Sabres on Formosa and powerful units of the United States 7th Fleet standing by, the Nationalists attacked possible Red invasion buildups on Yikiangshan in midafternoon.

I say that if the Nationalists were emboldened to attack this island, they may be sufficiently emboldened to attack Quemoy or Foochow tomorrow; and if the Communists should then retaliate from the mainland, we would be committing ourselves to carry the attack to the mainland. I do not see how we could avoid such a situation.

Fourth, by way of summary, I should say that the joint resolution insufficiently emphasizes the role of the United Nations. I have already commented on it, but I will say this in conclusion:

Our worldwide position would be immeasurably strengthened if we proceeded in this matter through the United Nations instead of projecting ourselves unilaterally into the situation. Formosa is no more important to the defense of the Western Pacific than is Korea. We could have made an equally good case for the unilateral defense of South Korea, from the viewpoint strictly of protecting vital United States interests in Japan. But our position throughout the world was greatly strengthened because the defense of South Korea was made a United Nations enterprise instead of a United States enterprise.

That is why I shall support with great enthusiasm the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], which proposes to amend the "whereas" or preamble section of the joint resolution so as to make it perfectly clear to the world that we are inviting, urging, and asking for United Nations participation in an attempt to settle this very troublous potential war situation in the Formosa area.

Fifth, I think the joint resolution is more likely to encourage additional fighting than to promote stability. The testimony and argument in committee were to the effect that the resolution was necessary to stabilize conditions in the area. In my opinion, the opposite would be the effect of the joint resolution. I do not believe it would produce stability, but instability. I do not believe it would produce peace, but would threaten war. If we really want to stabilize the situation in the Formosa area, then I think we ought to face the fact that until the United Nations really steps in and, by some sort of trusteeship, mandate, or protectorate—I care not what label may be applied to it—assumes jurisdiction under the obligations of the United Nations charter to maintain peace in the Pacific, we must defend Formosa and the Pescadores. We must make clear that we will defend Formosa and the Pescadores at least up until the time the United Nations works out some peaceful solution of the problem. We should make clear that we will use the 7th Fleet to prevent—from Formosa, at least—attacks on the mainland of China; and that we will use the 7th Fleet to prevent attacks from the mainland of China on Formosa. That leaves out of our jurisdiction entirely whatever the Chinese Nationalists want to do off Quemoy or off the Matsu Islands, on their own. I think we all know that they cannot do much on their own, without our logistic support, our military support, and our coverage and backing up.

It might be argued that such a course would encourage the Chinese Communists in their aggressions and subversions elsewhere in Asia. On the contrary, however, it would put us in a better position to counter their activities elsewhere.

China's future does not lie with either Chou En-lai or Chiang Kai-shek, and the more we disassociate ourselves from both, the better the position we will be in to take advantage of opportunities which may present themselves to help the Chinese people achieve the freedom which they deserve, and which all of us want to see them have.

On this point, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "United States Saberjets Fly to Formosa for 'Any Mission in Reason,'" published in the Washington Star of January 27, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SABERJETS FLY TO FORMOSA FOR "ANY MISSION IN REASON"—EMBOLDENED NATIONALISTS STAGE RAID ON YIKIANGSHAN IN BROAD DAYLIGHT

TAIPEI, FORMOSA, January 27.—Saberjets from Okinawa and the Philippines—possibly 75 strong, flew to Formosa today prepared "within reason to handle any mission."

The words were those of Lt. Gen. Roger Ramey, 5th Air Force commander, who flew from headquarters in Japan for the transfer operation, which showed the mobility of the Far East Air Forces.

Emboldened by the rising concentration of United States air and sea strength around troubled Formosa, the Nationalists today staged an air raid in broad daylight on Yikiangshan Island.

General Ramey told a news conference he did not know how long the Sabres of the 16th Fighter-Bomber Wing would remain here, nor would he discuss any possible missions.

United States planes and warships are expected to cover the expected Nationalist evacuation of the Tachens, 200 miles north of Formosa, but General Ramey would not even say if the wing had been assigned any mission.

The 18th brought its own ground crews and by afternoon Sabrejets were flying practice missions off Formosan fields. The jets have been modified to carry bomb loads.

The arrival of the United States jets, which outclassed the best Russian-made MIGs in the Korean war, served to underscore United States determination to fight for Formosa if necessary and raised Nationalist spirits.

Yikiangshan has been raided only in early morning hours, but with Sabres on Formosa and powerful units of the United States 7th Fleet standing by, the Nationalists attacked possible Red invasion buildups on Yikiangshan in midafternoon.

The Defense Ministry did not give the type of bombers involved, but it said that three Communist landing craft on the beach at Yikiangshan were strafed and heavily damaged. This indicated that light bombers, which can hit the deck, also were in on the raids. Military installations were reported hit and large fires started.

The Nationalists have been pounding Yikiangshan with four-engine bombers since the Communists seized the island last week. The big bombers attacked the island last night and again today.

The Sabres landed at a Nationalist airforce base as reports from elsewhere indicated the 7th Fleet—already given the additional muscle of three more aircraft carriers—was being reinforced further.

The jets would add tremendous striking power to the United States 7th Fleet, now gathered near here and ready for action if ordered.

(A report from Singapore said the fleet itself apparently would be beefed up by the addition of the aircraft carrier *Midway*. The 45,000-ton flatop was due there February 4 but United States Navy officials said she is now heading north. Four other United States carriers, the *Essex*, *Yorktown*, *Kearsarge*, and *Wasp*, are in Formosa waters with the fleet.

(Four United States destroyers cut short a courtesy call to Singapore and sailed from there today. American naval sources said they were presumably continuing their voyage to the United States, but their abrupt departure stirred speculation they, too, were headed for the Formosa area.

(United States naval sources in Hong Kong said a scheduled call there by the cruiser *Pittsburgh* had been canceled and the ship diverted to other areas.)

In Taipeh, the best guess was that Chinese Nationalist naval forces would carry out the actual evacuation of the Tachens, screened and covered by the gathering United States air and sea power.

(Gen. Earle E. Partridge, Far East Air Forces commander, said in Tokyo other FEAF offensive units are being redeployed to forward bases. He said the transfer exemplifies the global capability of United States Air Force units to move at jet speeds to any trouble spot.

(This could mean that long-range bombers were being moved closer to the troubled Formosa area, possibly Okinawa.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD representative communications which I have received from various parts of the country with regard to the joint resolution. I think it is very true that the American people are concerned and disturbed over the joint resolution. I happen to think that in a free political society they have the right to raise their voices, expressing their opinions and their viewpoint, because if war should come they, along with us here in the Congress, would be the ones who would do the dying. The chances are great, as our military briefings show, that death will befall millions of individuals in our own country.

So, as we come to take this historic course of action on this resolution, which each of us knows will be taken by an overwhelming vote in the Senate, I think it is particularly appropriate that the viewpoint of a cross-section of American grass-roots opinion be placed in the RECORD. I therefore ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks representative communications which I have received on the subject.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALEM, OREG., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We applaud your stand on Formosan resolution in Foreign Relations Committee. We urge a United Nations trusteeship for Formosa, pending a plebiscite by the inhabitants. Strong Senate minority vote against resolution would give encouragement to United Nations supporters in all parts of the world. Count on us for help.

Arthur H. Bone, Rev. Julian J. Keiser, J. W. Brasher, Guy Jonas Violet, N. Nettleton, J. E. Hyatt, Helen Jonas, Esther Hyatt, Laura B. Smith, David Stall, V. S. Andie, Hamet and Hayden Smithson, Alice H. Stoll, Cecil Wickline, Harold E. L. Barton, Marvin Nettleton, Corine K. Smith, Ruth O'Day, John W. Bollinger, John A. Rademaker, Elizabeth Rademaker, Lucy and Thomas Bennett, Margaret and Murco Ringnalda, H. Ivan Lovell, Cecil Monk, Alan B. Berg, T. J. Shipler.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

Am proud of Oregon for having sent you to Senate to serve America in this crisis. You are real statesman with sanity, courage, leadership of the highest quality, and keen insight into realities of situation. With you there is some hope of avoiding war. Much support here for your position.

HOWARD WILLITS.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We are in full agreement with your position on the Formosa resolution. Ask that you do all in your power to get this very dangerous development before the United Nations. We trust that you and Senator NEUBERGER will do everything possible to prevent world war III.

GEORGE BREWSTER and FAMILY.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

During 25 years of interest in national politics, this is the first time I have felt compelled to wire my protest to Washington over the impending action on Formosa. I hope you will do your best to prevent Congress from making the biggest mistake of its history.

JAMES S. FANTZ.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Glad you voted against China war resolution. Fully support your views. Hope Senate will go on record that it cannot by resolution either enlarge President's constitutional power nor share his constitutional duty. Senate should insist we play ball with U. N. team and not go it alone.

ERNEST BONYHADI.

MONMOUTH, OREG., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I commend your stand as reported on radio tonight on President's resolution. I strongly urge that Senate does not allow leeway for preventive war philosophy to prevail.

R. C. MORGAN.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Deepest heartfelt congratulations your stand regarding Eisenhower's provocative war moves. War danger great at this time. Compare present economic situation, unemployment, lower farm prices, stock-market fluctuation, etc., with period prior to Korean war. Not you but Eisenhower is committing political suicide. May your courage be contagious.

HERBERT SIMPSON.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Continue opposing the new resolution, which means certain war. We will be without allies if we act on our own outside the United Nations.

Mr. and Mrs. M. DRAGOON.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE:
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Sincere congratulations on your Formosan stand. May you thus always have the courage of your convictions. This time Eisenhower is dead wrong. Please mark us as two of your campaign workers for 1956.

KATHLEEN and ROBERT EVANS.

ESTACADA, OREG., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE:
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

I heartily approve your statement urging us to run the calculated risks of peace. Your efforts to counsel patience are splendid. Keep it up.

JOHN L. WALLEN.

ALBANY, OREG., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE:
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Stand firm against the interests and congressional representatives who are willing to sacrifice American lives in this Chinese civil war. Try to stop this reckless action of our Government that could start a world war and possibly destroy all of us. This message for Senator NEUBERGER also.

HARLIN TALBERT.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE:
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your stand on Formosa policy resolution.

LEO SAMS.

SALEM, OREG., *January 26, 1955.*
United States Senator MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your courageous vote against Ike's Formosa plan. More power to you.

A. M. VISTICA.
WOODBURN, OREG.

JUNCTION CITY, OREG., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Very proud of you Wednesday. Expect you to retain right to decide on war at time of incident, not to rubber-stamp blank-check authority for President or military to use at their discretion. We favor diplomacy, not military to ease tension. Hold you morally accountable to reserve right to make final decision. Saving world's peace more important than saving our face. Be cautious these days of impetuous actions.

Mr. and Mrs. MARVIN G. PURSINGER.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We applaud and admire your stand on armed forces in Asia. It takes real courage to take a stand on this issue and we trust more Americans will voice their support of your stand.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. BOLLINGER,
Bollinger's Farm and City Supply,
Salem, Oreg.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations—courage against fight against war. Interference in internal affairs of China lost American boys for profits.

H. S. MACKAY.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 26, 1955.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I see by tonight's paper you are against any resolution that might get us into world war III. Congratulations. Thank you.

Why can't the United States of America mind its own business and let China fight out its own problems?

If Chiang hadn't let inflation get out of hand, which starved the loyal Chinese, he would not have been deposed.

I have friends who lived in China and the plight of the poor was terrible.

Sincerely yours,

VIVIAN STRATTON.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 25, 1955.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am so very much opposed to President Eisenhower's request for special powers to order the attack on the mainland of China as a preventive war measure. This, I fear, would turn into its opposite, and be the beginning of a world war and not its prevention.

Hitler's attacks against the many European nations were also claimed by him as being preventive measures, but where did it lead to? Why or how can we expect any adventure of this nature by us to bring about any better ending?

Very truly yours,

NORMAN HAALAND.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 26, 1955.*

DEAR SENATOR: I am impelled to send you a note to congratulate you on your stand on the bill to bomb China. That's the greatest thing you've done to date in my way of thinking.

Very truly,

LARRY SUPOVE.

WILSHIRE METHODIST CHURCH,
Portland, Oreg., January 27, 1955.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I was happy to see that you were more cognizant than some of our representatives at Washington of some of the problems involved in giving the President almost dictatorial powers in the possible commitment of our Nation into a war with China.

It behooves the representatives of the people to keep the control of the Nation in its own hands.

Certainly the solution of the problems involved in the western Pacific can only be through the United Nations and China, no matter what its government, cannot finally be ignored by that body.

I feel sure that your influence will be on the side of a peaceful United Nations approach to the solution of the problems involved in the Pacific areas.

Sincerely yours,

EVERETT H. GARDNER.

NEWBERG, OREG., *January 26, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are glad that you voted against President Eisenhower's plan to use direct military intervention in the Formosa area. As yet, we do not know your reasons for so voting, but we feel it safe to assume you believed the danger of world war would be increased.

If the United States continues to stay in Chinese territories and interfere in what is a civil war, world war will be very close. Only by turning the Formosa territory over to the United Nations, can war be averted.

We hope you will continue your strong and courageous stand against those who would plunge us into a hopeless war.

Yours truly,

DONN SCHRODER.
EDITH M. SCHRODER.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 28, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We are terribly concerned about Eisenhower's new war proposals. Keep up the good work and vote against it. We want no third world war.

ROSE and BERNARD LEOPOLD.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 28, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington D. C.:

Keep up the good work. Time is needed to rally support.

JOHN MACKENZIE.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 28, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

My congratulatitons for your courageous and correct opposition to the war program advocated by our President. Keep the fight up. I feel the forces of peace are just beginning to get vocal on this issue.

NORMAN HAALAND.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 26, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington D. C.:

We're with you in fight to maintain Congress' constitutional position. Effort to prevent a standing declaration of war commendable. Urge filibuster to give other Americans chance to see consequences of this precedent-setting measure.

HARRY FUCIS, DAWN TOMLINSON, BODON ANDERSON, ANNE LUNT, BRUCE GRAY, BILL HUNT,
Reed College.

GRESHAM, OREG., *January 28, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

By all means continue your stand against the United States becoming involved in another major conflict.

LEWIS N. LEVY.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 28, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your courageous stand against administration's agressive war policy, China-Formosa area has earned deep gratitude of all peace-minded Americans. Congress must not make greatest blunder in American history. People here solidly support your efforts to defeat administration proposal in Senate. Keep up the good fight.

Mr. and Mrs. MELVIN N. LONDON.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 28, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations strong opposition Eisenhower's predated declaration war. Urge effort to extend debate to give time for more to become informed.

Mr. and Mrs. H. M. NEWMAN.

CHESTER, PA., *January 28, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate, the Capitol:

Do not let this Formosa folly pass unaltered. This moment of hysteria needs your strong conviction.

THEODORE OLSAN.

VAN NUYS, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C:

Urge you oppose congressional approval of any action that will involve us in war with China. Let Chinese settle their own problems.

ESTELLE BRISKER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 28. 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE:

Thanks for the courage to dissent.

J. SCHULMAN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 28, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

More power to your fight to preserve America's honor and peace of world.

PHILIP ALLEN.

WOODSIDE, N. Y.

BALTIMORE, MD., *January 27, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your stand against interfering in another country's affairs at the grave risk of war. Highly gratified to see you remain firm and courageous in face of the blind hysteria prevalent in Congress. Peace-loving Americans urge you to keep up the good work.

Mr. and Mrs. S. SCHMERLER.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 28, 1955.*

WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Your position in current Formosa debate entirely proper. However, I have grave misgivings in going even as far as you propose. An affirmative and armed stand against Communist aggression is needed, but I do not feel support of Chinese Nationalist Government, because of what it represents, is the best place to make such a stand. This is my personal view as a fellow Oregonian.

J. HOWARD HICKS,
Secretary-Treasurer, Office Employees International Union.

BALTIMORE, MD., *January 27, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Wholeheartedly back your position against preventive war drive. President Eisenhower's request for deployment of forces in Far East inevitable lead to world war. Wish you success in stopping this maneuver.

MILTON and GERTRUDE SEIF.

BREWSTER, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

Commend your stand and urge continued opposition to China lobby and preventive war.

CARL DREHER.

NORTH CONWAY, N. H., *January 28, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

I applaud your valiant and clear-sighted opposition to the Formosa resolution and pray that you may continue strong and confident until the sober, good sense of Congress returns. The Formosa resolution is dangerously unwise, it does not offer the Chinese Communists an opportunity for retreat, and it presents the Russians with a precise formula for provoking us to conflict, which they may speedily do, because their policy aims at getting us snarled up in Asia. We must take a resolute stand against Communist subversion and aggression, but let us not give away military secrets by announcing where and when, and let us choose our ground wisely in defense of genuine democracy.

Yours truly,

ROBERT P. BRUNDAGE.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *January 28, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Support your stand against intervention in Formosa. No more Koreas.

PAUL ALBERT.

PALO ALTO, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We strongly urge that you do your utmost to prevent the further involvement in Chinese affairs now being contemplated by our Government. We consider the proposed measures with respect to Formosa to be dangerously contrary to the best interests of our Nation.

Mr. and Mrs. DAVID E. ALLEN, Jr.

FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH,
Lakeview, Mich., January 26, 1955.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am confident that you will do everything in your power to induce the Senate to act with caution and restraint in the matter of the administration's request for broad powers to defend Chiang Kai-shek. This looks like a headlong plunge into world

catastrophe and national ruin. Senator LONG is quoted as demanding caution. Senator KEFAUVER is demanding U. N. action and not unilateral action on our part. The prayers for peace were meant to lull us to sleep. Why should American boys die for the Formosa dictator? Why should we precipitate a world war to defend this man who betrayed us and his own people in World War II?

Sincerely yours,

Rev. A. W. KAUFFMAN.

McGUIRE-JOHNSON, PUBLISHERS,
Wadsworth, Ill., January 27, 1955.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your courageous and farsighted stand in defense of the American people, of justice, and of morality. I refer to your opposition to giving a carte blanche go-ahead in this Far Eastern crisis. But I could say the same thing to you on numerous other matters, for your leadership and brilliance in guidance during these difficult days is one of the great bright hopes that perhaps ultimately some order can come to civilized society and nations can act maturely and with justice.

Why does our Government not make clear that we will defend only those lands lying east of the jurisdictional line released to us by Japan? What possible justification do we have for defending any other lands of China or what madness could prompt us to even thinking of bombing concentrations on the Chinese mainland?

What is the magic hold that Chiang and the China lobby has on our Government? What possible moral justification would we have for "pushing" Chiang and his corrupt and despotic government upon the Chinese people when they have once cast him out?

In the long run, what madness could prompt our Government to risk war now? Do we possibly think that Russia with her atomic bombs would stand idly by while we bombed China's mainland?

Please go on and try to bring some sort of enlightenment to our Government and our people in this hysteria-beclouded moment of our history.

May we again thank you for your strong leadership and clarity of thought and highly principled actions. You vindicate and justify the people's faith in democratic government. God bless you.

Faithfully yours,

MYRA C. JOHNSON and MARCELLA McGUIRE.

P. S.—Why can't we work through the United Nations on this Far Eastern matter?

WILMETTE, ILL., *January 27, 1955.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I hope you will continue to oppose President Eisenhower's plan, which includes interference in China's affairs and the very real chance of war.

The program which at first glance seemed to be for peace now seems to include approval by the Senate of a preventive war.

Thank you for your courageous fight for liberal views.

GLENN L. ANDERSON.

BIG RUN, W. VA., *January 26, 1955.*
GENTLEMEN OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

SIRS: Call it what you may, but it should be clear to anyone whose memory is as long as his shortest finger that the American people do not care for police actions or preventive war. They do not care for gag rule nor dictators under any disguise or exegesis. Their voices ring the theme that Chiang and all his filthy henchmen are not worth the spilling of American blood. They are not so concerned about aims as they are about effects. The stray bullet is just as deadly as the deliberately aimed one.

This game of ostrich, ostrich, who will be next, is now growing threadbare. We cannot dictate to, nor police, the Orient; to attempt it is to be swallowed by it. Five thousand years of history attest that the central Orient conquers its conquerors by swallowing them. The writer proposes that we tempt not the quagmire.

Very respectfully yours,

J. HERBERT HIGGINBOTHAM.

Thank you, Senator, for a voice of wisdom and reason. It is a premium commodity these days, even in the United States Senate.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your courageous stand. Continue the fight for peace.

MERLE H. MILLER.

JANUARY 27, 1955.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: May I express to you my wholehearted support and admiration for your position in regard to the President's resolution on the Formosa defense. I feel there is no moral or historical reason for our involvement in a civil war of the Chinese. We are endangering the entire world with all-out conflict when we act so irresponsibly.

Thank you for your position of sanity. American lives and morals are at stake, and I feel you are serving both when you oppose our involvement in China.

Respectfully yours,

MARY HORTATSAS.

CHICAGO, ILL.

NEW MILFORD, CONN., *January 27, 1955.*

DEAR SENATOR: We were glad to hear by radio that you oppose the President's demand for the power to make war without further recourse to Congress. Maybe he would never use it, but we think to give that power to any one single man is dangerous, as well as totally against the American way.

We wrote our own Senators to oppose this move, and we hope the House of Representatives will reconsider its rash and too-hasty action.

We note on this morning's broadcast that General MacArthur states that "we cannot get what we want by war." That is of course how we feel.

We hope you will be able to stem the tide of hysteria and stop the indecent rushing of our country into an adventure that might prove fatal to us and to the entire world.

We are grateful to you and are praying that you and those who think like you will prevail in this crisis.

Sincerely,

ELEANOR STEVENSON.
RUTH ERICKSON.

BALTIMORE, MD., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE:
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wholeheartedly support and appreciate your sane, principled, and courageous stand against President Eisenhower's Formosa policy. Your voice has already stemmed the prevailing war mood and brought before the American people at least an alternative to armed threats as an instrument of national policy.

Very truly yours,

HENRY and SHIRLEY MARK.
Mr. and Mrs. Henry Mark.

HARTFORD, CONN., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE:
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations; again congratulations. History will record that you performed great national service by your courage, your opposition to Eisenhower Formosan resolution. You speak for people of Connecticut and throughout America.

House of Representatives, as well as President Eisenhower, will soon realize they are victims of gigantic hoax. Ignore false charge of softness to communism and lead American people to peace. One month ago Secretary Dulles stated Red China had nothing with which to capture Formosa. Chiang Kai-shek must go. I lived throughout China off and on for 35 years including 6 years as consul in Foochow, 3 years in Swatow, and 3 years in Canton. Hence, I have particularly intimate knowledge of south China coast. Please give copy of this telegram to Senator SPARKMAN.

GORDON L. BURKE,
United States Foreign Service Office, Retired.

BALTIMORE, MD., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your stand on Formosa. May you be able to bring sanity to those who would rush our boys to war.

Mr. and Mrs. LOUIS SHUB.

ERIE, PA., *January 27, 1955.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your courageous stand on this Formosa business.

There are many people who feel that this resolution is too broad to be entrusted to the discretion of Dulles, Knowland, Radford, et al.

We could easily be blundered into an all-out war with Red China.

You will recall that Winston Churchill just a short time ago warned "that it would be the greatest tragedy that could befall the United States of America."

With best of regards,

ROBERT M. FINNELL.

MODESTO, CALIF., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your stand. Must not give any person power to involve us in war on China mainland.

TED KALSEEN.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank God for your courage and wisdom in voting against the proposal to defend Formosa. We are very much distressed to see the President's action rushing the American people into a war. We applaud your stand to safeguard our country from a catastrophic war with the Chinese. We depend upon you to alert the other Senators to the great peril of the President's proposal.

Respectfully yours,

Mr. and Mrs. IRVING WALLACH.

SOUTH HADLEY, MASS., *January 27, 1955.*

DEAR MR. MORSE: As a college senior and a Democrat who has followed your career of bipartisanship with pleasure, I want to thank you for a sound evaluation of the far-eastern situation and the Formosan dynamite. Your speech was earnest and forthright; we need you and the Senators like you in our Congress. I hope, at least, on the Senate floor the clause permitting United States bombing of mainland ports in any eventuality will be struck out.

Having lived in China till 1949, I keenly feel your point that the mainland, for all the evil of the Communist dictatorship, has a sovereign right to Formosa; and agree with Senator Long that Chiang Kai-shek has "no more certain purpose than to have the United States fully involved in an all-out war with Red China."

May God bless you in your continued dedication to your work and to your country.

Sincerely yours,

BEVERLY LINDHOLM.

MILL VALLEY, CALIF., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Peace-loving citizens here stand against administration resolution for sweeping war powers in Formosa Straits. Continue to oppose war drive and urge coworkers to join you. Appreciate your courageous stand for peace.

MARGUERITE EDISES.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 27, 1955.*
DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As always, your words, which came to me over WRC this morning, were enlightening.

May you and those helping you be able to hold off the decision until all of us can see this situation clearly and with understanding.

Sincerely,

MAY FRANK RHOADS.

OAKLAND, CALIF., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We heartily endorse your noble stand against granting warmaking powers to the President. Keep up the fight against those who would plunge us into catastrophe on the hollow pretext of defending Formosa.

Mr. and Mrs. IRWIN LUCKMAN.

VAN NUYS, CALIF., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge you to oppose giving away Congress' right to declare war as provided in our Constitution. Our Senators and Representatives reflect more thinking and conscience than is embodied in one man. We also feel our position regarding Formosa is unwarranted, as it is an internal Chinese affair.

LOUIS COSSAK.
JULIA COSSAK.
FRANCES KLEIN.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE:

Congratulations on fight against preventive war resolution. Lives should not be risked to maintain Chiang-MacArthur proposal. We who hope to abolish war should receive consideration.

Regards,

GEORGE E. SHIBLEY.

BOSTON, MASS., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

President's resolution is tantamount to declaration of war no matter how amended, and can mean war of attrition worse than 10 Koreas, if not a nuclear destruction of mankind. United States will only further alienate Asian countries. Ask you vote down this resolution.

LEON RABIN.

BRONX, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Having just read a partial account of your speech concerning the Formosa question to the Senate, I wish to say that I regret that I am not a resident of the State of Oregon. How much prouder of you I could be, were that to be the case. Since it is not, I must content myself with the lesser satisfaction it is to know that if I can't vote for you, I can at least root for you.

I am, in profound respect, and with the hope that I am one of a very great many who have been inspired and moved to respond because of your display of courage and integrity.

HARRY GRANT.

ALLENTOWN, PA., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on your fine stand on the Formosa question. Those are not our islands, and the more we act as if they were, the more friends this country loses in the world.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD W. REICHARD.

OAKLAND, CALIF., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up good work. Battle of Formosa is not our fight.

FRANCES TANDY.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly support your stand to defeat President Eisenhower's request for blank check to make war against China. Let no American life be lost to maintain reactionary unpopular Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa. I do not believe Formosa vital to defense of United States or territory.

THOMAS JACOBS.

LAKE FOREST, ILL., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As long time former residents of China, we heartily commend your stand on the current debate on the President's request regarding the Formosan crisis. We hope you and others of like minds will continue to urge an amendment limiting authorization to the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores against actual attack.

Mr. and Mrs. R. B. FULTON.

BALTIMORE, MD., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building:

You are to be commended on your stand on Formosa.

MABEL CHAPMAN.

BERKELEY, CALIF., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you use all efforts possible to defeat the Eisenhower resolution on Formosa.

WILLIAM LOWE.

QUEENS VILLAGE, N. Y., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your courageous statesmanlike stand on Formosa.

Mr. and Mrs. MORRIS SCHEFFLER.

BALTIMORE, MD., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your courageous peace stand. You and colleagues opposing war-now group arguing patriotic service. You speak for majority of Americans.

MILTON BATES.

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Thank you for raising a sane voice during the stampede. Good luck.

MARIANNE MCGEEHAN.

VILLA PARK, ILL., *January 27, 1955*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

In full accord with your view on the Formosa matter. Hope your usual wise judgment prevents a preventive war.

LEWIS ORLOW.

GEORGETOWN, LA., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your standing up against KNOWLAND and Radford. Please do not let them lead us into war with China which might result in world war and destruction of us all.

M. PHILLIPS.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We approve of your speech on the Formosa question.

C. L. DORN and N. C. DORN.

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please, please, please keep it up. Firmly behind you.

ROBERT LEWIN.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Thank God for your sane voice in Senate. Keep on speaking against preventive war.

EDITH GAINES.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We women listed below who work together urge you to vote against the resolution on Formosa which calls for preventive war and a suicidal policy of intervening in favor of Chiang Kai-shek and using armed forces for provocations against the mainland of China strongly urge you vote no.

JANET TOBIN,
JEAN MOORE,
SUSAN KING,
FLORENCE PARTON,
ELISE FOX,
VERA FAURE,
MAYONE GOLDEN,
LA MAR LEWIS,

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I am delighted with your courageous stand in regard to the China situation. You are not alone, but I believe represent the thinking of a large majority of people who have great hope that commonsense will prevail.

FRANK E. KARELSEN.

SCHENECTADY, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Independent, Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulate you on your patriotic stand on the Formosa issue. Keep up the good work.

IRVING HOROWITZ.

NAPA, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations for your courageous stand against war resolution.

LOUISE C. HEWITT.

ELGIN, ILL., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We strongly support your criticism of Ike's Formosa resolution as meaning preventive war. Please fight hard to restrict its terms.
RALPH and MARY SMELTZER.

PALO ALTO, CALIF., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
The undersigned active Democrats warmly support your courageous stand against administration preventive war plans. We stand solidly behind you in opposition to beginning world war III.
Miss A. CARNEY,
JOSEPH F. LEWIS,
EDWARD A. ROSS.
DONALD STOFFLE.
ELLIOTT H. WILSON.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We strongly support your action in resisting proposed legislation to give a free hand to our President to enter into war on behalf of Formosa. We urge working out peaceful solutions of world conflicts through the U. N.
Alex Muldavin, Jane Thiermann, Arthur Rose, Ethel Rose, Lorraine Anagos, Herbert Gutman, Sidney Moldofsky, Imagard Linel, Aris Anagos, Dorothy Palmer, Lena Mayers, Ian Thiermann.

BOSTON, MASS., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Commend your courageous stand against war. Please keep it up.
Mr. and Mrs. I. M. BUCKMAN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We support your courageous stand on Formosa issue.
ROBERT and JANET LIEBOWITZ.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your stand. Many people I have talked to, teachers, parents, social workers, are behind you. Save our children.
Nursery schoolteacher ALICE MASTERS.

EVANSTON, ILL., *January 27, 1955.*
WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your sane, courageous Formosa stand. A true independent, you have again put statesmanship over politics and expediency.
Admiringly,
SARA and FELIX POLLAK.

BALTIMORE, MD., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Heartily endorse your stand against the President's recommendation, and urge you continue action against preventive war.
ROSE and MARTIN BROWN.

HIGHTSTOWN, N. J., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:
We support your stand against the President's Formosa policy resolution. We urge you to act to defeat it.
Mr. and Mrs. A. LINOWITZ.

BALTIMORE, MD., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
The proposal advanced by President Eisenhower, I am in agreement with Senator MORSE.
MARSHALL W. JONES.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Support completely your speech on Formosa.
EDWARD YEOMAN, Jr.
JEAN DOUGLAS YEOMAN.
ANN ABBOTT YEOMAN.

BALTIMORE, MD., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Your opposition to administration's measure in Chinese situation is most heartening. Hasty action could plunge us into atomic world war, which would destroy all of us. Time for discussion and debate is imperative. Do not be deterred in your forthright position for peace.
MARCELLA AVNET.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Heartily appreciate the significant questions you raised on the Formosan issue. Our thanks to you, Senator FLANDERS, and supporting colleagues.
Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. ED HUMMEL,
Mrs. STANLEY HARBISON,
Mr. and Mrs. FRANK COOLEY,
Mr. and Mrs. J. ANDERSON,
Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.

BALTIMORE, MD., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We heartily congratulate you on the stand you are taking to keep us out of war. Also many of our neighbors feel the same way as we do.
Mr. and Mrs. HENRY GREENBERG.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
This is to support your courageous, patriotic stand against the Formosa resolution that would risk world war III. You must continue your great fight. The hopes of the American people for our country itself rests with you and those valiant Senators who are with you.
GLORIA GRAVES.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:
I applaud your courageous position. Your voice in the Senate is indeed hopeful. We are with you.
AARON RASHKIN.

PALO ALTO, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Strongly support your opposition to President Eisenhower's resolution which could lead to preventive war. Why should Congress abrogate its constitutional authority to declare war and allow one man the power to plunge the world into atomic destruction?
Mrs. S. F. BRYANT.
ALICE RICHARDS.
DAVID MEIGS.
VALEDA BRYANT.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your intelligent, courageous stand in interest of peace, morality, and sanity.
JOHN DOBBS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Chambers,
Washington, D. C.:
Support your stand on Formosa issue. Please do everything in your power to prevent dangerous situation.
Dr. ALBERT PARETS.

VAN NUYS, CALIF., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your courageous stand on the Eisenhower resolution. We do not want our boys to die to maintain Kai-shek in Formosa, nor do we want to give the President a blank check to involve us in world war III.
Mr. and Mrs. GLEN G. GIESLER.

AMBLER, PA., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Power to your courageous effort to halt the march to war. Keep talking until the people can be aroused. Inconceivable that Formosa should be a defensive necessity to us. Let the U. N. mediate. Protect Eisenhower from the pressures he faces by withholding the extraordinary power he asks.
MARK DEIBLER, Jr.

BALTIMORE, MD., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We oppose hasty acceptance of the President's proposal on Formosa. Our country must avoid action that may provoke war. Let us not send warships but work instead for a United Nations cease-fire.
SAM and EDNA LEGG.

SEATTLE, WASH., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Fight and stop the President's resolution on Formosa.
W. D. ANDERSON.

BALTIMORE, MD., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Support your stand in opposition to preventive war policy being urged by Eisenhower. Hope that your fight against the adoption of this most dangerous policy will be successful and we are certain that it has the support of all the peace-minded people throughout the land.
JOAN and GUNTHER WERTHEIMER.

PRINCETON, N. J., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
I warmly support your efforts to prevent our country from making major blunder in Far East. Keep it up. We should negotiate, not make military threats.
MARY FOLSOM.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
HONORABLE SIR: Your awareness of the situation in China is reflected in your vote of today.
Very sincerely,
Mrs. JOAN H. PERA.
SAUSALITO, CALIF.

MENLO PARK, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United State Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Permit me to commend your stand on the Formosa issue. It is obvious Congress will grant the desired powers, for your view is not the popular one. Let us hope that this action not prove to be a tragic error.

In the furtherance of what we deem to be our national interests, it seems we propose to take a unilateral action outside the U. N. which, in effect, can result in an open invitation to both sides to solve matters through force rather than by peaceful negotiation. Whatever the merits of our case, whether we are right or wrong, such a policy leaves small choice to the People's Republic of China and her friends. It is difficult to see but one reaction from her, the Soviets, and the Asian nations. Nor will the Arab bloc, the neutrals, and even some of our own friends regard it anything but an aggressive move.

Following World War I, in which I was wounded, I spent over 10 years in constant travel over most of the world and gained some understanding of its varied peoples and cultures. For many centuries, more than half of them have been conditioned by economic, social, political, and religious environments vastly different from those of the West. They will not change quickly or without great difficulty. That our way of life may be more conducive to human progress is beside the point, for these peoples must, in the very nature of things, in the last analysis, change by themselves, for themselves, and in their own way. If we cannot find a way to live with them more or less peacefully while these changes are taking place, there is nothing left but force—and all that implies for them and, let us not forget, for us as well.

In my opinion, Senator, you have taken the long view, the historical perspective, on these matters but, unfortunately, our people are an impatient one, and our affairs are in the hands of the military to a greater extent than is wise. And on top of it all is the sad fact that man is not yet a fully rational animal and war is his most irrational act. Best luck to your efforts.

Respectfully yours.

JAMES ARMSTRONG.

JANUARY 26, 1955.

DEAR SIR: We would like you to know that we are in complete agreement with your expressed views on the administration's save-Formosa resolution.

This Nation is badly and sadly in need of more statesmen of your caliber.

Very sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. FRANK NARDI, Jr.

CLINTON, IND.

JANUARY 27, 1955.

DEAR SENATOR: Wonderful, brilliant, courageous speech. I'm glad we have some Senators who can still think clearly.

Sincerely,

Dr. I. A. JAFFE.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We witnessed your telecast this morning and we wish to express our approval of your stand. Although you do not represent the State of New York, we feel that we are all involved in a higher loyalty that transcends narrow State interests.

Therefore, we take this opportunity to write to voice our agreement with you and also our gratitude.

The greatest assets our country has in these troubled times are public-spirited men of courage like yourself who place the welfare of country above partisan politics.

Respectfully,

HAROLD L. SCHICK and FAMILY.

NEW BEDFORD, MASS., *January 27, 1955.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I believe most Americans are with you. How can we win those people on the mainland of China by bombing them? Let them see we want peace with them. I think we are making more and more enemies.

Good luck to you.

NANCY E. BARON.

SEATTLE, WASH., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the fight.

L. C. WALKER.

LAWRENCE, MASS., *January 26, 1955.*
The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I commend you on your foresight for voting against the resolution giving President Eisenhower the power to defend Formosa.

If the United Nations is to continue to function, as all freemen pray that it will, certainly the United States should have enough faith in it to bring this before this world organization rather than make a mistake even more tragic than Korea and try to "save the world" singlehanded.

May God bless your efforts in the interests of our country, and give you the continuing courage and strength to aid your fellow Senators in choosing the unity of the U. N. rather than international disaster.

Very truly yours,

JEAN P. CONSTANTINEAN
(Mrs. Norman).

LAWRENCE, MASS., *January 26, 1955.*
The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to commend you on your vote against giving the President full war powers regarding the situation in Formosa. I think this Nation and the world should remember Korea before hasty action is again taken. I feel that we should show our faith in the United Nations by at least trying to reach agreement through it instead of being ready to go to war, or risk going to war, in trying to solve things by hasty actions.

I think also that we, a supposed Christian nation, should show our faith in God in dealing with world problems. We could help accomplish this by stepping up our relief program. I feel that more aid properly administered would do more to effectively combat communism than would a stockpile of H-bombs and arms. History has proved that stockpiling leads to an arms race which inevitably leads to war. There is much evil to overcome in this world, but we should not forget the teachings of Christ in trying to overcome it.

Sincerely,

NORMAN CONSTANTINEAN.

SPRING VALLEY DAIRY FARM,
Fincastle, Va., January 27, 1955.
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I listened to your talk this morning over TV channel 10, Roanoke, Va., discussing the resolution before Congress concerning China mainland, and I agree with you wholeheartedly and I wish that all Americans could have heard you. Oregon should certainly keep you as their Senator as long as you wish to remain as such.

Very respectfully,

F. W. BRUGH.

JANUARY 27, 1955.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are 100-percent right. Stick to it on this China-Formosa affair. Formosa ought to be a U. N. trusteeship. We must not have a preventive war. Chiang is a dictator—Formosa is not "free" China, nor is Red China, but war is not the answer.

W. WYGAL.

BOSTON, MASS., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on your speech of yesterday. I think you took exactly the right line.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE R. WALKER.

MONTCLAIR, N. J., *January 28, 1955.*

DEAR SENATOR: Mary thanks on your stand on the Formosa resolution. As a citizen, I think war for such a cause is barbaric.

Wishing you the best.

JESSE MORSE.

LEWISBURG, PA., *January 27, 1955.*

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Can we demand conduct of Peiping which the United States of America would not observe? Quemoy is China. A war started over Quemoy would find us fighting alone and deservedly. We must expect greater wisdom from the Senators.

Sincerely yours,

DESSA HARRIMAN
(Mrs. P. L.).

SCITUATE, MASS., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations on your vote against giving the President power to wage war to save Formosa. Your courage is to be admired.

President Eisenhower should remember that he was elected because of his promise to end the mess in Korea, and should not involve our Nation in backing up Chiang Kai-shek.

Very truly yours,

MARY W. CARLSON.
CLARE M. CARLSON.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Wholeheartedly agree your reservations concerning Formosa resolution. Hope you will join with FLANDERS and LANGER in voting against it and urge others to do same.

MARY H. HICHS.

NEW MARKET, VA., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate:

Congratulations. Keep on fighting war moves. People with you.

RALPH and LOUISE GALT.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Heartily endorse your position on Formosa.

W. ROSENBAUM.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your stand on Formosa.

Involvement might lead to war.

Very respectfully yours,

ETTA GOLDBAUM.

NEW YORK CITY, N. Y.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My family and I heard you this morning on the Today TV program on the interpretation of the implications of the Formosa resolution.

We want you to know that we wholeheartedly agree with your position and applaud you for your courageous outspokeness. We want more of your insightful patriotism that is good for our country and its real security.

Keep up the good work of letting the people know.

Very truly yours,

SAMUEL FISHZOHN.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have very much admired your position on the Formosa situation and your forthright statement of it in the current Senate debate. I believe it would be a great mistake for the United States to risk being triggered into a mainland war with China by an Asian leader who commands little respect anywhere in the world outside the United States. Certainly if the picture can be painted in perspective Americans will realize that we have no moral right, nor moral and political support from the rest of the world, in establishing no man's land at a distance of 4 miles from the Chinese coast. That we must not tolerate aggression is clear; that aggression consists of eliminating actively hostile military bases 4 miles off one's coast is very far from clear. Where is our sense of proportion?

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. DUDLEY.

TWIN LIONS MOTOR SERVICE,
Pasadena, Calif., January 27, 1955.
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your fight against the war resolution. The silent people are behind you.

Very truly yours,

KING TELLESON.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to congratulate you on your courageous stand on the question of Formosa.

I believe we should leave the Chinese people alone to settle their own problems. We can't expect a big sovereign nation like China to submit to pushing around by us, any more than we would submit to any big power from halfway round the world setting up bases just off our coast and threatening our security. If the shooting ever starts, who can say where it will end?

It takes real courage to be one of the few standing up for the right. Thanks to you, and keep fighting.

Very truly yours,

JUSTINE C. O'CONNOR.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *January 27, 1955.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your intelligent approach to the Eisenhower resolution on the Formosa situation lifted the hearts of millions of people in our country.

We support you and hope and pray that your approach to this problem will have wide support among your fellow Senators.

Sincerely,

ADELE V. HOLTZ.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am deeply grateful to you for opposing provocative action in the Far East. To risk war in today's world seems madness.

The problem of Formosa will never be settled right by violence or under duress of either side. It should be settled in the U. N. by the world community, including all parties to the conflict.

With appreciation of your courageous stand on so many issues,

Yours respectfully,

HELEN M. BEARDSLEY.

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 28, 1955.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for what you are doing on the Formosa situation. Please keep on trying.

All my admiration for your courage. I hope other Senators will join you before it is too late.

Sincerely,

ESTHER LINDAN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Heartily endorse your position on Formosa.

M. GERSMAN.

GALE HOUSE FARM,
Pennsburg, Pa., January 26, 1955.
The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: When you say the bill is a blank check I believe you are completely accurate. I am wholly with you on this point of view. One of the conditions, unless I am entirely wrong, granting Presidential authority to act is that should any unusual buildup be detected on the Chinese mainland, that condition alone would be sufficient reason to bomb such areas.

Under such conditions it would seem that some one or a group may with malicious intent advise falsely or greatly exaggerate almost any patrol or normal military activity that goes on along the coast.

Who is to say this is it? It looks far too dangerous and undefined.

Very truly yours,

MICHAEL FRYE.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have always admired the firm and liberal stand which you have taken on most important issues.

It was only this week that I have heard you speak on television, once on the Edward R. Murrow program, and this morning, on the Dave Garraway show.

I agree wholeheartedly with your realistic attitude on the resolution now before the Senate on the Chinese issue. The wonder is that more of our legislators do not hold views coinciding with yours. Keep up your good fight and others will be influenced by your good example.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs. ROSE M. SOYBEL.

PITTSTOWN, N. J., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I just wish to inform you I support your stand regarding the Formosan issue and am so informing the Senators from New Jersey.

Yours truly,

AUGUSTA W. DOWLING
Mrs. Arnold G. Dowling.

CORONA, N. Y., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: We are in full agreement with your position in regard to the President's resolution on Formosa and have written Senators LEHMAN and IVES urging them to join you in your courageous fight to avert the dangers of war with China.

We have also asked them to support the Kefauver amendment in regard to Formosa believing that this is a matter for the United Nations to handle.

Sincerely yours,

ELIZABETH and IRVING MERKELSON.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 26, 1955.*

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: I was very glad to hear tonight the newscaster reporting your stand on the power demand of the President. I agree with you that only Congress should decide peace or war and hope you keep up the fight in defense of peace. I urge you to stay in this fight for the interest of all the people the whole world over.

Sincerely yours,

GARY ALEXANDER.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I feel impelled to write and thank you for your courageous stand in the Senate yesterday. Not only did you vote against a measure which seems likely to force this country into a war which the majority of us do not want, but you defended your position forcefully and openly in the Senate.

* * * * *

It is doubtless futile to hope that your words will sway the outcome of the Senate vote. Please be assured, however, that a great many Americans like myself join you in your belief that the fall of Formosa would not be so grave a disaster as the outbreak of a general war and that there is no justification for a policy which contradicts our traditional morality.

Very sincerely yours,

RUTH DOSSICK.

LANSING, MICH., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This morning I saw and heard you on the Today television program from the Capitol. I was greatly encouraged to learn that there was at least one man in the Senate with sufficient intelligence and courage to speak out clearly and unequivocally on this terribly important issue. I strongly support your position, as described by you this morning, and hope you will keep up what may seem to be a hopeless fight against the current tide of mass unreason. I am sure that I speak for millions who would share my view if they could but realize the threat and the danger. You are carrying on in the highest American political tradition. More power to you.

WORRIED CITIZEN.

JANUARY 28, 1955.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I applaud your stand about the Presidential war powers. Formosa is not worth war. Let's not send men and arms there.

C. KOPP.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

NORWICH, CONN., *January 27, 1955.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Good for you. Have just heard you on TV this morning. I am just an obscure person living in this small New England city, but I believe I express the sentiment of thousands of folks situated similarly. I am thankful that there is someone around Washington like you. The world cannot afford another war.

Congratulations for your courage to speak your mind.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Lou M. Armstrong.

Joseph Brody & Bros., Inc.,
Chicago, Ill., January 27, 1955.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I am writing this letter to congratulate you on your refusing to rubber stamp approve the President's Formosa resolution. This is a very serious matter, and many of us throughout the country are not convinced that what is being done is entirely right, and such a matter as this should be given the careful study and consideration that you are giving it.

Regardless of the outcome of this matter, I am sure that you will be pleased to know that there are many who will long remember favorably your sincere actions in this respect.

Sincerely yours,

Stanton Brody.

Morris Plains, N. J.,
January 27, 1955.

Dear Sir: It's an effort for most people to write letters and I undoubtedly fall into that category.

I've unwittingly neglected to write you about past controversies; however, this latest issue before Congress; namely, the Formosa question, is of such import and could result in catastrophic consequences to us all, that my sense of responsibility has been sufficiently aroused to write this letter. At least it may afford some moral support.

When the people's welfare hangs in the balance you always vigorously defend their rights. My associates and I wish to pass on a few words of praise. All too often we do not give credit where it is deserved.

We think your type of sound leadership and astute judgment is rare but highly desirable in Congress of late. You have the sense to analyze this complex problem and see it in its true perspective. We wish you good luck in the future and want you to know that there are more supporting you, than most people realize. Keep up the good fight.

Auspiciously yours,

T. Tenhengel.

First Universalist Church,
Rochester, Minn., January 27, 1955.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator: I wish to commend you for both your courage and honesty in facing the serious issues involved in the resolution submitted by the Eisenhower administration to both Houses of Congress. I especially appreciated your willingness to be in a minority both within the committee and on the floor of the Senate and respect the consistency and sound analysis upon which your position is based. It is my hope that you will continue to oppose this resolution and use your best efforts to persuade the Senate to utilize increasingly the instrumentalities of the United Nations in the solution of international problems.

Sincerely yours,

George M. Lapoint.

New York, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Like most Americans, it is very unusual for me to take the time to write to "one of you politicians." Yet your statement in the Senate yesterday against preventive war impels me to write to congratulate you for your honesty, courage, and true representation of the desires and interests of all Americans.

I am a careful newspaper reader and have taken the trouble to go through the President's message, the text of the joint resolution, and the newspaper reports of congressional statements on the Formosa issue, as well as the reports of the reaction to this United States move overseas.

What is this crisis all about? Yesterday's New York Times report on the House passage of the Formosa resolution concludes with the observation that one of the oddest aspects of the crisis is that congressional galleries were less than half filled. The truth is that one feels no spirit of crisis, of emergency, of sudden need to go marching off to war, in this city, and I am of firm belief that no such spirit exists in other cities, or in villages and towns or countryside. There are no mass meetings, no demonstrations, no calls for action to save Formosa. Everyone seems to be going about his or her business sanely and calmly, with the only feeling of anxiety being that those politicians in Washington will get us into war again.

What is the reason for our becoming so involved in Formosa? The only justification offered in the joint resolution is that any nation in or bordering on the Pacific has a stake in the kind of government that exists in Formosa. This seems to me to boil down to our justifying our action by the geographic argument that we are on one side the Pacific and the Chinese Communists are on the other; to put it another way, "What is China doing on the other side of the Pacific, anyway?"

This seems to me to be a fight between 2 Chinese groups, 1 led by Chiang, 1 led by Mao. Let's not lose another 100,000 American boys in a police action which might this time turn into world war III.

For myself, a veteran of World War II; for my wife; and for my son.

Respectfully,

George F. Nelson.

Philadelphia, Pa., *January 27, 1955.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator Morse: Thank God there are people like you, and a few others, in our Senate, who oppose President Eisenhower's policy on Formosa, with its threat of military action (including the mainland of China), to safeguard Formosa and Chiang Kai-shek's government.

Plain common sense and an open mind, undistorted by the sense of overbearing self-righteousness, would seem to indicate that the Chinese Government (even though it is a Communist one) and the hundreds of millions of Chinese people have a right to their little islands. How can they take this new United States move otherwise than as an aggression by a foreign power? Would not we, Americans, think so if some foreign country told us to keep out of Long Island?

What sort of distortion of mentality can make our Government think that this move is in the interest of peace? I think it is a definite provocation and a warlike move, and no virtuous words can hide the fact.

The distress I felt on reading the news yesterday is weighing a little less heavily on my mind (and there are many others who feel likewise) now that I know that you have enough vision and courage to oppose President Eisenhower's new policy. May the opposition of you few in the Senate yet avert a terrible error in our foreign policy.

With deep appreciation.

Yours respectfully,

Galia Bodde.

Trinidad, Calif., *January 22, 1955.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: We are pleased to learn that you have been assigned to membership in important committees of your choice. Your considerable abilities certainly entitle you to corresponding responsibilities in our Government.

We note that President Eisenhower is requesting approval by the Congress of his projected removal of Nationalist Chinese armed forces from the Tachen Islands and from other islands considered to be too close to the Chinese mainland to be justifiable as necessary for the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

We are very much concerned about the risk of a general war that this operation would entail, and feel that such evacuations should be carried out strictly under the auspices of the United Nations. Our country under the Republican administration has been far too openly partisan on the Nationalist side for the Chinese Communists to permit our forces to intervene actively in their behalf, without attacking us.

This Republican administration must accept a very large share of responsibility for the present dilemma, since their vaunted "unleashing of Chiang Kai-shek" has had much to do with bringing it upon us. Neither do the Chinese Nationalists seem to act as responsible members of the United Nations when they warn that they would not accept a U. N. agreement for a cease-fire; this, despite the fact that they occupy and have long occupied an important seat in the United Nations, purportedly representing all of China.

We are confident that you will join other conscientious Senators on the Foreign Relations Committee in examining thoroughly the booby-traps in Secretary Dulles' treaty with the Chinese Nationalists that could bring us into war at the whim of Chiang Kai-shek.

Yours very sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. Fred Coleman.

January 27, 1955.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I am completely in accord with your policies about the defense of Formosa, it is the only solution and the only attitude the ordinary American parent can possibly agree with. I hope you will fight for us and succeed in bringing your views into being. In such a critical situation our only salvation is in men of wisdom and foresight holding their ground in spite of all odds. My gratitude is boundless to you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. L. J. Keller.

Birmingham, Mich.

Freeport, Pa., *January 27, 1955.*

Dear Sir: After seeing and hearing you on the Today program this morning, I felt I should write and tell you I agree 100 percent on all the things you talked about. I hope that you will be able to do something so that these things will work out.

I feel they must be worked out in this way if we are to stay out of war and we must.

I pray our leaders will find a peaceful way to settle this troubled spot in the Far East.

We must have faith that we wil come out on top if we continue to carry on as we have in the past.

We must believe we can find a peaceful way even if it does look hopeless, for then we will still have God as our guide.

I pray we can continue to have peace the world out.

Yours truly,

Mrs. Anna Barrage.

Toledo, Ohio, *January 26, 1955.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I applaud your courageous opposition to the President's request for extraordinary powers to defend Formosa.

Including related territories and positions, meaning Quemoy, and so forth, it is assumed

is unjustifiable and a provocation that could lead to war.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. GREENE.

JANUARY 26, 1955.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are to be congratulated on your courageous stand against those who would involve us in another war. If they succeed, one thing is certain: our democratic, free-enterprise system will be changed beyond recognition.

A saner age will honor you along with "Old Bob" La Follette and others of the handful who dared face the hysteria of their times.

Sincerely,

RODNEY R. ADLER.

MOUNT VERNON, N. Y.

CATONSVILLE, MD., *January 27, 1955.*

DEAR SIR: I am writing you to express my appreciation and thanks over the way you are fighting the request the President has put up to the Senate regarding the Chinese question. It is a pleasure to know that there are still some men about with courage and convictions. I am quite sure that there are millions of Americans who feel the same as you. Keep up the good work. I regret that I cannot cast a vote for you in future elections.

Sincerely,

ANDREW J. BICKEL.

PILOT POINT, MAINE, *January 26, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is indeed heartening to find a man of character like yourself in the Senate who feels, and rightly, that it is his duty as a Senator to thoroughly question such unequivocal actions as President Eisenhower would wish to carry out in regard to Formosa and the islands.

Please continue working against this needless involvement into war with China.

"By three things will a nation endure: Truth, justice, and peace."

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. MARTIN R. HAASE.

HOUGHTON, CLUCK, COUGHLIN & HENRY,
Seattle, Wash., January 26, 1955.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was very much concerned on reading what little there was in our Seattle Times Monday night about the President's message on Formosa.

I suppose that under the circumstances which now exist, it is proper to draw a clear line which the Chinese Communists are to cross at peril of war. Even that is quite debatable.

But to do what I understand the President proposes, to go out with our ships and planes and bring back to home plate some of Chiang's soldiers who have been caught off base, and who need our help in a military retreat—that seems to me not only abstractly improper but also very dangerous, in that it will justify Communist resistance or retaliation directly against United States forces, which would be an actual state of war. Surely we should not so invite conflict. Nor, I think, can we defend such a course of action before either American or world opinion.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL COUGHLIN.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *January 26, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: May God bless you and give you strength and courage to fight the noble cause of universal peace.

Keep it up and God bless you.

W. R. WILLIAMS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your keen insight into the Formosa resolution and the moral courage you are showing. It is my studied opinion that you are right in insisting on clarifying debate and even defeat of the measure if the facts indicate enlarging the conflict.

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

FRANK TUNGLEN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations and many thanks for your magnificent attack on the plan to defend Formosa.

At a time like this tremendous courage is needed to voice such an unpopular opinion, even though it's right, but those who think carefully about the situation are forever grateful for your bravery.

Best regards.

STUART SANKEY.

MARYLAND LINE, MD.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Too often, we citizens let go unrecognized many of the things for which we are grateful. Let me say, on behalf of many citizens across the Nation that we are grateful for an independent voice in the United States Senate. We do not always agree with you; but we appreciate hearing a viewpoint that is not colored by party policy or political necessity.

Specifically today, we are grateful for your very fine expression of your opposition to giving the President the power to wage war in the Orient. It was our privilege this morning to hear you give voice to the dangers of a preventive war on the mainland of China.

Our hopes, our interest, and our prayers follow you as you continue your statesmanship in the United States Senate.

We are grateful for your unselfish statesmanship.

Sincerely yours,

Rev. ROBERT E. MITZEL.

JERSEY CITY, N. J., *January 26, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I do very much want to express my gratitude to you for your courageous, honest appraisal of Presiden Eisenhower's request to Congress on the matter of Formosa and Red China.

If our country is to remain in a state of peace, the American people will have legislators and men of good will like yourself to thank for it.

I have absolutely no liking for Communist totalitarian governments and it is particularly for this reason that I dread the tendency for us to take on the characteristics of our traditional political opposites.

Sincerely,

JACOB H. JAFFE.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 26, 1955.*

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to say that your efforts to preserve peace have not gone unappreciated by the people of the United States. We stand at a perilous point, and look to those who have the wisdom and courage to act against the politically opportune and who can discern that we must not accept the Communist doctrine that the ends justify the means—the highest philosophy teaches that the means are the ends.

We commend you, pray for you, and urge that you keep up the fight to protect us from any act not morally justified, even though it may seem politically expedient. We do not want communism, but we feel that faith, prayer, and courage are more potent than the sword, and particularly when we have to go to the other side of the world to use it. If we would be justified in using it in case China sent military forces to South America, it seems the answer is obvious as to whether we should do so if China tries to protect her own shores and claim her own islands.

I wish to thank you personally for your continuous fine record in the Senate and all the work you have done in protecting the interests of the people and of our country. Your intelligent approach to our many complex problems and your courage and integrity in the presence of much self-seeking are indeed an inspiration.

Sincerely yours,

MIRIAM HOLMES.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am encouraged by your opposition to the Formosa resolution and can see that by hammering away at the plain and inevitable result of favorable action upon it you can bring home to the Senate the absolute necessity of rejecting it.

• • • • •

Never a truer word was spoken than that war is no longer a practical alternative. When are our leaders going to be realistic and face this fact and embark on a program based on the absolute necessity of never under any circumstances going to war again?

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES B. FINCH.

JACKSON HEIGHTS, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: As a private citizen, I wish to express my gratification over your address denouncing the resolution of President Eisenhower, in its present form, on the grounds that it implies the losing of an aggressive war.

I have confidence that you will use your good office to appreciably amend this resolution.

Yours truly,

BEVERLY SILVERMAN.

MOUNT HOLLY SPRINGS, PA.,
January 27, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I listened to your telecast on 'Today's show.

I appreciate your informing the public of the possible hazards involved if the President's proposal in its present form is passed.

I admire your independent thinking and stand in this issue and hope that you continue to express your straight forward views to the American people.

Respectfully,

EDGAR J. STEINBERGER.

NEW YORK CITY, *January 26, 1955.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Every time I hear you speak over radio or read something you have said in Washington, I thank God for you. Long may you live, and long may you

serve in the Senate to protect American liberty and our interests, and the welfare of the whole world.

Sincerely yours,

MARY S. POWELSON.

BLOOMINGTON, IND., *January 26, 1955.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WAYNE: I was proud to hear over the radio this noon that you have cast a negative vote in committee on the Formosa defense resolution. There seems to me to be need for much closer scrutiny of this proposal than has yet been given to it.

One thought that may need stressing is that any bombing of China by this country, especially with nuclear weapons, is likely to bring upon us the undying hatred of all of the people of Asia. We cannot afford to cast aside their possible friendship in such a manner. I think, therefore, that no authorization should be given for the use of force, except defensively against an actual attack on Formosa or the Pescadores. This is a matter in which moral and political factors ought strongly to outweigh immediate military considerations in determining tactics.

I am writing this same thought to Senators HENNINGS and KEFAUVER.

Best personal regards.

Sincerely,

RALPH FUCHS.

NEW YORK., N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Approve your stand against United States aggressive war with China urge peaceful settlement of Formosa dispute through United Nations.

SYLVIA BUCHHOLV.

DETROIT, MICH., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I deeply appreciate your courageous unyielding stand against the drive to war and urge you to continue your good work to save this Nation and the world from being driven into ultimate disaster.

HELGA HERZ.

BOZEMAN, MONT., *January 28, 1955.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge you to continue your opposition to any resolution that would empower the President to take this Nation into war over Formosa.

We think that if the Formosa problem were turned over to the United Nations there would be a greater chance for a peaceful settlement.

Mr. and Mrs. E. W. ANACKER.

WOODSIDE, CALIF., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Commend you most highly for your courageous effort to preserve for Congress sole power to declare war. Formosa is a menace to peace of the world and should be handled through United Nations not unilaterally by the United States. War against China would solve nothing and might destroy us all.

Dr. and Mrs. HENRY MAYER.

EVANSTON, ILL., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your courageous position regarding Formosan resolution. Urge you insist on referral of problem to United Nations for permanent solution.

FLORENCE ZINER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Thirty-five Los Angeles Democrats support you wholeheartedly in your fight against Eisenhower's call for war declaration rights. We must ask you to keep up the great fight. God bless you.

ARTHUR SKARET.

RESEDA, CALIF., *January 28, 1955.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please continue to urge the Senate to uphold the Constitution by retaining their right to declare war, this right not to be abrogated to the President.

JEROME RASKIN.

SAN JOSE, CALIF., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Heartily support your stand against President's request re Formosa.

Mrs. HELEN ROMERO.

PASADENA, MD., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Opposing Formosa resolution echoes President Washington. Paragraph 32, Farewell Address, gives detailed reasoning how our Republic can lose peace, perhaps liberty, by taking sides between nations while the generals take military view of defending America. We depend on our Senators to defend Americanism.

THOMAS L. CHRISTIAN,
Editor, Maryland Farmer.

PALO ALTO, CALIF., *January 28, 1955.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

In my judgment Formosa question should be referred to United Nations and not for unilateral action on part of our Government. War or peace is not merely an issue of foreign policy of anyone's survival on this planet. Please debate fully.

Thank you.

J. KEARNS PLAUCHE.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

We heartily approve the position you have taken in the Formosa question.

Mr. and Mrs. ALLAN M. FERRES.

BOSTON, MASS., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Whole Nation indebted to you for magnificent courageous stand against plunge toward war with China. We rely on you to fight to prevent railroading resolution through against wishes of American people who want peace.

Irma Otto, Sue Ainslie Clark, Louise Frye, Florence Luscomb, James Billings, Frances Siegel, Elizabeth Raymond, Jean Marcotte, Ruth Hillsgrove, and Marion Alexonian.

BOSTON, MASS., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Commend you on courageous, principled stand against preventive war. Urge you continue to defend best interests of our country now as in past.

Mr. and Mrs. CHARLES WOJCHOWSKI.
DORCHESTER, MASS.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *January 27, 1955.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please vote against the amendment. It is too vague and dangerous. In my opinion, the proper body to handle the Formosa problem is the United Nations.

Sincerely yours,

O. H. VOGEL.

PLULA, PA., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SIR: Millions of people in this country are counting upon you to see that wisdom and intelligence are used to keep this great and wonderful country out of an atomic war. You have a great responsibility.

Appreciatively,

Mrs. D. SCHATZ.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *January 28, 1955.*

DEAR SIR: You are speaking for many Americans when you oppose this lavish grant of power to President Eisenhower. We do not want any part of a preventive war at this time.

Very truly yours,

ALFRED D. SUAHN.

RICHMOND, IND., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We look to the Senate for badly needed statesmanship. We rejoice that you think it a case for the U. N. Our allies will not go along with us on a commitment as to "other islands and concentrations on the mainland," which makes it look like a preventive war of the Knowland type. Do push for consideration by U. N.

Sincerely,

Mrs. C. L. CHARLES.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the good work; we do not want world war three started by our trigger-happy admirals in the Pacific.

LEON J. ARNOLD.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on the courage and wisdom you have shown on the China resolution.

With kindest personal regards,

JOSEPH LYNCH.

PEORIA, ILL., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your stand regards Formosa resolution. You can always be depended on to take the right attitude in time of confusion and timidity such as this.

Dr. HARRY COSTEFF.

SEATTLE, WASH., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Continue to point out the dangers of giving the President sole authority to use our military forces as he sees fit. United Nations should be used to negotiate a cease-fire.

Mr. and Mrs. CHESTER KINGSBURY.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you resist with every power at your command any action that might involve us

in hostilities in Chinese waters. We cannot arbitrarily alter historical facts by attempting to demonstrate, through force of arms, that China rightfully belongs to Formosa. Chiang is not worth one drop of American blood.

Mr. and Mrs. NORMAN BERMAN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations on your forthright and courageous opposition to the Formosa proposal.

I would like to urge you to continue to fight against it, and to encourage other Senators to do the same.

Sincerely,

ROBERT FRIEDMAN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just heard over the air what you tell the American people regarding the secret testimony. I accept your word of honor, and so do countless more.

If necessary, you should, and I hope you will, deliver another 23-plus-hour speech. This offshore preventive war is far more vital than even the offshore oil to millions of us.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH RATNER.

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA,
Charlottesville, Va., January 27, 1955.
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: From what I have read in the papers this morning of your reaction to President Eisenhower's request for authority to attack China's mainland, "if necessary" to "assure the security of Formosa and the Pescadores," I wish to congratulate you on your courageous stand. It is not easy in our present hysteria for anyone in conspicuous public office, or in teaching, for that matter, to question the wisdom of the new belligerency of the United States. Our people seem to have been stampeded somehow into a belief that we must fight the Communist Chinese over islands historically and ethnically Chinese, on China's very doorstep, and in an Asian theater that is predominantly hostile to United States interference and without any prospect of substantial support from any other country in the world, despite the certainty of support to China from Russia at least.

Have we all gone nuts or are only a few of us crazy enough to wonder where we will come out, not in 1956 but, say, in 1965 or 1975, if we go into almost certain war with Communist China? To believe that Formosa is "only a ripple" is inconceivable. I spent some weeks working with Chiang Kai-shek's Government in Formosa (1952–53), and I know that they survive only because of their dream to reconquer the mainland, and that they know this is inconceivable unless the United States is fully involved on their side. Surely we can and must take Chou En-lai at his word that the People's Republic of China must and will incorporate Formosa and all the Chinese offshore islands into their domain. Yet, in view of these crystal-clear portents and admitted "warning signals," we blithely throw down an ultimatum, and yet say we can do this gargantuan task with no military buildup. In this fantastic muddle, the administration seems to have lost all sight of where we want, or ought to want, to be in our relations with Communist China and all the Asian states that have recognized Mao and written Chiang off as a "dead duck."

May you have the stamina to continue to raise the basic question, Is it "the serious and unified intention of our Government, our Congress, and our people" to "assure the security of Formosa and the Pescadores" by "whatever operations may be required to carry out that purpose." If this war is what the majority want, then in the name of all that is sensible let us prepare for it immediately and adequately.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN GRANGE,
Director, Woodrow Wilson Department of Foreign Affairs.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *January 26, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Knowing your fearlessness, I am sure you do not need advice from anyone on the Formosa situation and how to deal with it. I do think, however, that most of our Congressmen like to know the views of their public.

I am intensely concerned over the pending legislation, feeling that hasty wrong action may cause another Korea. The Chinese Communists made good their threat to come to the defense of the North Koreans if we continued to come north of the 38th parallel toward Manchuria, and I think the threats they are making now are not idle ones.

I believe friends of the Chinese Nationalists have forced the President into advocating a provocative policy, and think that an amendment such as that proposed by Senator LANGER should be adopted and that power of commitment should be limited.

Faithfully,

EDITH LOTT.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: More power to you in your courageous stand on the urgent question of Formosa. This is too vital a question to be rushed through without discussion. I hope you continue to fight for peace and against total destruction of all of us. Congratulations.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. GAIL GASTON.

JANUARY 26, 1955.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It was heartening to me to read of your decision on the China situation.

I had felt that we were going to have an era of peace after the settlement of the Korean war. To me, the most horrible thought is another war.

The actions in the past few days of our public representatives in Washington seem very warlike and frighten me.

It, therefore, gave some heart to me to learn that by your recent actions that you are helping to further the road to peace.

Good luck and be assured of my support.

Sincerely,

Mrs. SARAH BLANKEN.

BRIARCLIFF MANOR, N. Y., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate:

We are grateful for your courageous stand against a risky commitment.

ROBERT and ANITA STEIN.

BOSTON, MASS., *January 28, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Millions of loyal Americans commend your cautious stand. If military staff is allowed to determine our foreign policy, global war is inevitable. We stand behind you.

MARGARET WELCH.

JANUARY 26, 1955.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to congratulate you on your fine stand of the Formosa issue.

Truly this is a time of crisis, for if this granting of war power to President Eisenhower is granted I feel that everyone in this country will be sorry.

Let's not have American boys go over to other countries to die and be maimed in.

Sincerely,

Mrs. EVA GATES.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

JANUARY 26, 1955.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to commend you on your stand against the resolution bestowing war powers on President Eisenhower to touch off a preventive war.

We have had enough of bloodshed, etc., throughout the world. Some peace talks among great world powers are in order.

Mine is the voice of many friends and neighbors. Continue your efforts in the interests of peace.

Sincerely,

Mrs. RACHEL CHESTER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

WILMINGTON, DEL., *January 27, 1955.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I heartily endorse your stand on the Formosa defense bill as presented to the television audience on the program Today on Thursday morning, January 27. I have written to my Senators asking them to consider your arguments against the bill before voting.

Although I am not always in accord with your point of view, it is wonderful to know that there are still men in public life who are farsighted enough to risk their personal and political futures for the good of their country.

Continued success for your rugged individual attitude.

Sincerely,

MARY H. STREET.

MOORESTOWN, N. J., *January 27, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have just seen and heard you express your views on the Today program. Please understand that a large part of American opinion is with you completely. If the Congress would just understand that we haven't had time to express opinion, everything has moved too quickly.

I am a housewife with limited contacts, but I do deem it significant that in discussing this with neighbors and delivery men, etc., not one person has agreed with the Formosan proposal and all have expressed views similar to yours. All loyal, patriotic Americans in the war generations (30 to 40 age group), we have fought before, but never aggressively, and such a policy is beyond our understanding.

Please continue your fight. Don't give in until at least more of our opinion can be heard and felt in Washington.

Thank you for your stand and courage.

Respectfully,

ANN S. HEDGES.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 26, 1955.*

HONORABLE SIR: Hearty gratitude for your stand against our threatening entanglement in the Formosa mess. Keep up your good work. Heartiest support.

JEAN KASS,
A Mother.

LOS ANGELES, *January 25, 1955.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to congratulate you on your position of opposing our being involved in a war in Formosa.

All our neighbors are shocked at the turn of events which seem to be moving too swiftly, which may plunge us into a world war.

Please continue to oppose our participation in a war.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. HANNAH HORNE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your patriotic stand for peace, for the American people. I, too, am against spilling blood to prevent spilling blood.

Yours respectfully,

HENRY HORNE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 27, 1955.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Wish to congratulate you on your stand regarding Formosa. My friends and I are wholeheartedly behind you in the stopping of the war of prevention before it begins.

(Mrs.) RICKIE TAREY.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 26, 1955.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My grateful thanks to you for your magnificent and patriotic stand against this horrible attempt to involve us in a war. Please, please continue to do everything in your power to prevent this. You are speaking for the American people.

Sincerely,

Mrs. MADELYNE GERLACH.

MOUNT KISCO, N. Y., *January 27, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your present stand against giving the President more powers in the Formosa situation.

I do not know who the administration thinks they are fooling, but I am 100 percent behind your position and hope that you will continue your good fight.

Sincerely,

MILFORD H. WISE.

HIGHTSTOWN, N. J., *January 28, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Saw you on television. Agree completely. Keep up the fight.

NATALIE OSER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 28, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

We salute and support your brave fight to amend resolution.

Mr. and Mrs. ALFRED BERMAN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 28, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

We support you against granting illegal war powers to President.

EDITH HUNTINGTON SNOW.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *January 28, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE:

Accept our respect and admiration for your courageous stand against possible global war.

B. DRUCKMAN AND FAMILY.

NEWARK, N. J., *January 28, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

You speak for us in opposing the administration's war policy. Keep it up.

MURIEL AND RUSSELL DAVIS.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *January 28, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I do not believe that the Formosa resolution now in Senate hands would be helpful. I believe it would be dangerous. The right of declaring war ought not to be in any one man's hands. May God guide you in your vote.

FLORENCE OGDEN ASHLEY.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 28, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Urge no hasty action on China resolution which could end in world annihilation.

H. WEG.

KELSEYVILLE, CALIF., *January 28, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Appreciate your stand on Formosa question. Continue efforts to bring problem before United Nations.

Mr. and Mrs. ROSS FIELD.

MADISON, WIS., *January 28, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Approve your opposition President's demand for war power. Urge conciliation, not force, toward solution of tensions.

ELSA FAUERBACH.

BOSTON, MASS., *January 28, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I congratulate you on your stand on the China situation. Eisenhower proposals bring war too close for comfort. Why not hold public hearings? Why the rush?

Cordially,

JEROME GROSSMAN.

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 28, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Congratulations on your good fights against the President's resolution. Keep on with the good work.

PETER LEVINE.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 27, 1955.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express my thankfulness, as an American citizen, for your courageous, outspoken statement when voting against the resolution which, if passed, will threaten to make us an aggressive nation in the eyes of the rest of the world—including most of our allies.

Imagining how devastating and ugly an all-out war would be in this atomic age, I certainly am amazed that the President and large majority of Congressmen favor such resolution which may result in our starting a third world war without careful study and consideration for the possible seriousness of its effect.

Sincerely yours,

(Mrs.) DOLORES K. EBERT.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *January 26, 1955.*

DEAR SIR: We are pleased with your decision about the Presidents request. All of us are much concerned about the situation in the Far East. Hoping that there is other solution aside of any war.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. H. HOUGHTON.

MADISON, WIS., *January 26, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was glad to hear that you and several other Senators had spoken in opposition to the President's proposal that Congress give him a blank check to issue an ultimatum to China.

It seems to me that the President possesses the power and authority to do everything needful in conducting our foreign policy, and it looks almost as if he were asking Congress in effect to declare war on a contingent basis. This does not seem to me to be a line of action that would be at all helpful in promoting a peaceful settlement. In fact, it looks like an extremely dangerous step toward war.

I hope that you will continue to oppose this request of the President's, and that the Senate will show sufficient prudence and foresight to reject it, after thorough discussion.

Respectfully yours,

(Mrs.) JOSEPHINE RENTZ.

Mr. MORSE. I may say to my good friend from California—and I say this in all good humor, because even in tragic hours I believe we should keep our sense of humor—that he supported the tidelands bill not so long ago because he did not want any territorial limitations put on California. He claimed there was an offshore area to which California was entitled. I recall that he wanted certain islands included as State property of California. Therefore I assume it might help him to better understand why Red China feels that the islands, which are just about as close to the mainland of Red China as the islands referred to by the Senator from California were to California, ought to be included in the territorial sovereignty of Red China.

As I stated, I say this good naturedly. It illustrates the point that when we start dealing with the shoreline of a country we cannot escape the fact that its sovereignty extends a distance out into the ocean. I believe that the sovereign rights of Red China certainly encompass Quemoy and Matsu.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I have almost concluded. I stated at the outset of my remarks that I would not yield, except to two Senators. I shall not make any exception.

Mr. President, I finish with this restatement of my major attitude. It is the restatement of the point I made at the very beginning of my first speech. After the decision of our Government is made, after the position of the flag behind the Presiding Officer's chair is determined by this Government in respect to this issue, the Senator from Oregon will support that position. Under the democratic processes of Congress, after the policy is determined, and the President of the United States as Commander in Chief renders his decision, there will be no voice of dissent raised by the Senator from Oregon.

Now is the time to dissent. Now is the time to dissent, before legislation is passed which authorizes this sweeping power. It is a sweeping power. It is a dangerous power. There is not a word of limitation in the resolution with respect to the power. It is a preventive war power.

I believe it greatly increases the probabilities of war. It tends too much in the direction of our running calculated risks of war, and ignores the calculated risks of peace.

I hope that history will prove all my fears are unfounded. I hope history will prove that I am dead wrong in the posi-

tion I have taken in this case. For God help America if events prove that I am right.

Because I feel I am right, Mr. President, I have raised my voice in the course of these speeches in opposition to the resolution in its present form, and I have tried to answer the challenge of the Senator from Georgia—"What alternative do the opponents propose?" We have proposed alternatives in a series of amendments. We have proposed alternatives in our insistence that a line of demarcation be drawn.

If it is unity the President wants, as the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] said the other day, we can have unity, because we are in complete unison on the proposal that we should defend to the limit Formosa and the Pescadores Islands. However, we are not in agreement that we should defend Quemoy and Matsu, because we fear that would lead to world war III. As I close this argument I have no regrets over following the dictates of my conscience. I believe so much in winning permanent peace if we will only follow the moral teachings of our history and Christian faith that I cannot bring myself to support the language of war provocation which I believe characterizes the resolution. Therefore I prefer to be on the losing rather than the winning side of the vote which we all know is about to be cast on this preventive war resolution.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Oregon on another fine speech, and I very happily associate myself with it.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I rise not so much to reply to the Senator from Oregon. He is a learned lawyer, and he seems to be content with his interpretation of the resolution. I am certainly content with my interpretation of it.

I have never asserted that the resolution gave power to the President to strike wherever he may wish to strike. I distinctly said in my argument yesterday that under the Constitution the President had power outside the resolution. I was not discussing that point, and I said it was entirely immaterial so far as the resolution was concerned. I said that all the power the President may have, and all the power the Congress could give him, short of a declaration of war, which would confer on the President an unlimited right to act, is in this resolution.

What I said—and what the distinguished Senator from Oregon has misapprehended—was that Congress was by the resolution giving its sanction to the President to use only the authority "to include the security and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands."

I said that was a limitation. It undoubtedly is a limitation, because it could not apply to any territories or positions in unfriendly or hostile hands. It is not strictly a limitation. I was not speaking technically. I should not like to get into that habit too much.

It is a restriction upon the authority which the President may have, insofar as we express our judgment on it. I have not said that the President did not have authority to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of protecting Formosa. He may have that power under the Constitution, and I conceded that.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon speaks of Formosa and the Pescadores as having a status in international law which justifies our action in defending those islands against attack. I think that is true, and it is true for other reasons than those already given. Congress may very well say, "We authorized the President to use armed forces to do this, but in defining the President's authority we restricted it by saying, 'This authority, this power, which we, the Congress, are now conferring'—not what the President has or may have under the Constitution—'is to include securing the protection of such related positions and territories of that area which are now in friendly hands'." We would not take Hong Kong away from the British, of course. I know that is a restriction upon the President's authority under the resolution. It is just common sense. The services of a lawyer are not required to show that that is true.

Also, Mr. President, there is a word of limitation in the sentence below. In the amendment originally offered by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] he moved to strike out the word "other" in line 9. The authority includes the taking of such other measures as the President judges to be required or appropriate. It was proposed to strike out the word "other." I objected to that, because "other" undoubtedly applies to something other than taking a territory or holding any particular position. I said the President asked for this authority, and we should give it to him. As to whether it limits his power under the Constitution is an altogether different question. It is one with which I am not concerned here, and I do not think the Senate should be concerned with it.

Let us look at a few facts, Mr. President. I think if we consider facts, we will get further in an argument of this character. What are the facts?

Formosa and the Pescadores were held by Japan for 50 years or longer. They were adversely held. Japan may have stolen them, but that is beside the question. They were held by Japan after the Sino-Japanese War, when Formosa and the Pescadores fell to Japan. Very generally throughout that area the United States was the power actually carrying the long end of the task after World War II, if, indeed, it was not carrying the whole task.

So we took them over. The other allies left them in our hands. The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] says that gives us an international law status for holding those islands.

Let us use a little bit of commonsense, Mr. President. That is all I ask. Let us use a little bit of commonsense.

China was beset by an internal war which was waged in China for many years. Finally, the President of China representing the organized Government, which we recognized, went over to Formosa and also held some of the islands between the China coast and the island of Formosa on which he took refuge.

We recognized the Nationalist Government. We never have recognized the Red government. If there is any legal government which has any status in morals or in international law, so far as we in the United States are concerned, it is Nationalist China. It makes no difference what we may now think about Nationalist China, or whether we think it is wise, that is the fact.

What is proposed by the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota and defended by the legal argument of my friend from Oregon, for whom I have great respect? It is proposed that we simply get off, and, to use his language, "get off quickly," from the islands lying between the mainland and the large island on which the President of China has taken refuge. What are we going to do with them when we get off? I ask any sensible man or woman in America, What is meant by that? Should we turn them over to the Reds, or get off quickly and turn them over to Peiping, a government which we never have recognized, and take them away from the government which we have recognized and to which we have obligations? If we have any obligations to defend Formosa and the Pescadores—and everyone says we have; it is even said that this resolution is wholly unnecessary, because that burden rests upon the President, under the Constitution—we have authority, in the language of the resolution, under international law, and under our own Constitution, to defend Formosa and the Pescadores.

How shall we defend them? By getting off the islands that lie between the Pescadores and Formosa and the mainland? On Formosa and the islands in that immediate vicinity, or between Formosa and the mainland, there are some 350,000 to 400,000 trained soldiers. If we pulled back from the islands because they are close to the China coast—and the distinguished Senator from North Dakota wants us to get off—those islands would go to the Reds.

I am under no such obligation to Communist China, Mr. President. What would happen to the soldiers of the Republic of China on Formosa? The very heart would be taken out of them. They could not fight.

Why do we not look at things in a proper way? Why do we not look at the facts? Here we are with an obligation under international law to defend Formosa, and yet we are asked to take action which can only benefit the enemy of Formosa and which can only result in destroying the will to fight of every single soldier on Formosa. Is that not a beautiful way to keep our international obligations? Is that not a marvelous way to measure up to the high responsibility which has been imposed on us by virtue of those islands, Formosa and the Pescadores, coming to us as a result of war?

I undertake to say that no person in America when he understands this issue, would for one moment say that we would be justified in walking off those islands and saying that we will have nothing

to do with them simply because there was civil war in that area.

We would be saying, in effect, "It is true that we are under an obligation to defend Formosa, but we are going to let you fight this out. We are going to get off, and get off quickly, and leave every soldier on Formosa faced with the stark fact that he has no friend and no support."

The Chinese Nationalists would then look across the broad Pacific and say, "Yonder is the great Nation which recognized our Government. Yonder is the great Nation which recognizes its responsibility to defend us, and which has, under the international charter, known as the United Nations Charter, predicated its whole course upon resistance to armed aggression."

What are we going to do? Under that set of facts and circumstances, which always will stand on the pages of history, we propose to walk off of every island that reaches out to the Pescadores and to Formosa, and to say, "We will not have anything to do with them. It is true that your troops are there, and we do not know what will happen to them. It is true that your troops on the island will lose the heart and the will to fight."

The disintegration that would come to those islands would be swift, final, and complete, and they would have no friend there at all, unless when the Chinese Reds got there they should have a sudden change of heart, as did Paul on the Damascus Road, and should say, "We love those fellows across the sea with whom we have been fussing."

I cannot justify such a course of action. I know that Americans will not justify it when they understand the facts as they are.

It is true that some risk may be involved, but on that point I spoke yesterday, and I do not care to repeat what I said then. I am now merely speaking to the amendment offered by my very good friend the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], which wants us to say that nothing in the resolution shall be construed as justifying the defense of any island within 12 miles of the shores of China.

If that is all the amendment meant, it would be a different story. Actually it means that we would be handing over on a silver platter to Red China all the troops of Chiang Kai-shek and all the inhabitants of those islands. It means that we would be cutting the very heart out of every armed soldier on the very islands which we are obligated to defend, namely, Formosa and the Pescadores.

Such a course of action cannot be justified. No legalism in the world can justify it. No kind of legalistic reasoning can justify such an occurrence. The United States would stand condemned before the world as unworthy of its trust. We would be accused of a willingness to fight only against a power that we thought we could whip; and when the fellow on the other side was big enough really to give us some concern, we would find some way out of our obligation.

I shall not vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota. I propose to vote for the resolution with full confidence, as I said yesterday, in the good faith, prudence, patience, and experience of the President of the United States, who has said that the power that came to him would not be delegated—nondelegable, in fact, is what he meant—and that he would exercise the power himself.

I earnestly hope that the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota will be rejected, because if it should be adopted, in my opinion, it would destroy the effect of the resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD obtained the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How long does the Senator from North Dakota wish to speak?

Mr. LANGER. I desire to answer the argument made by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the distinguished Senator from North Dakota will confine his remarks to 1 minute, I shall be glad to yield for 1 minute.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator. Ten minutes, did the Senator say?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has yielded 1 minute to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I shall ask for the floor in due course of time in my own right to answer the argument made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should be delighted to yield for 1 minute; but I have been waiting all day for an opportunity to speak, and the Senator from North Dakota has had the floor previously.

Mr. President, the support which the President of the United States needs, which he must have, in the conduct of the foreign relations of the Nation is not to be measured by the feverishness of our actions. It is not to be measured by an enthusiasm which burns hot today and grows cold tomorrow. It is to be measured rather by the depth of our understanding of what we do and our capacity to stay with whatever decision we may reach as a Nation.

The President bears a particularly heavy burden of responsibility at this time. But so too does every Member of the Senate. For what we are dealing with here is not solely a matter of a few islands off the China coast. We are dealing with questions which weigh the safety of the Nation in the delicate balance of peace or war. What we decide today may well have to stay with our consciences for the rest of our lives.

Questions of this kind are not to be disposed of with light words or loud words.

Never, in almost a decade and a half of service in the Congress of the United States, have I been confronted with a more difficult decision than the one which now must be made. I have been a member of many committees of Congress. This resolution marks the first occasion in my years here that, while joining in reporting a measure favorably out of committee, I found it necessary to reserve the right to alter my position before the final vote.

What is there in the resolution which compelled me to take this course? To withhold final decision until the final hour?

The difficulty does not lie in the principal purposes of the resolution. They are clearly stated to be a just peace for all and the preservation of the vital interests of the United States and other friendly nations in the Western Pacific. I do not believe there is a Member of the Senate who disagrees with these purposes. I would go further and say that in pursuit of these purposes there is general, overwhelming agreement in the executive branch and in Congress that the Chinese Communists must not be permitted to seize Formosa and the Pescadores, and, if necessary, that American Armed Forces shall be used to prevent that from happening. That has been the policy of this Nation for almost 5 years and few, if any, objections have ever been raised against it.

The difficulty in decision, then, does not lie in what this resolution purports to do. On that we can generally agree, and the overwhelming vote in the House of Representatives is evidence of the extent of the agreement.

The difficulty is to be found in the clause which calls on Congress "to authorize"—and that is the word used, "authorize." Congress is called upon to authorize the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States to protect Formosa and the Pescadores by various means.

The Armed Forces of the United States, in the form of the 7th Fleet, have been protecting Formosa and the Pescadores for almost 5 years without specific authorization of Congress. The vessels of that fleet have been ordered there and kept there by two Presidents, under the powers of their office.

By this resolution, we are now asked to authorize what has in fact been done by two Presidents, without authorization and without objection from Congress for many years.

In stationing the 7th Fleet in the Formosa Strait, both President Truman and President Eisenhower were assuming great risks in the exercise of their constitutional powers as Commanders in Chief of the Armed Forces. At any moment during the past 5 years the Chinese Communists might have launched an attack on the vessels plying those waters. To take such risks in the vital interest of the United States, however, is a part of the heavy burdens of the Presidency. Only the President can decide when to take those risks, because only he has access to all the information on which such decisions must be based. When a President so acts, resolutely, and in full awareness of the consequences of his acts, he deserves, and will have, the unhesitating support of Congress and the American people.

It is one thing to support the President in his exercise of the powers of the Presidency. It is another to attempt to share his powers. In my judgment those powers cannot be diluted, obscured, transferred, or divided, resolutions of Congress to the contrary notwithstanding. To do so is to invite the irresponsible usage of those powers by both the

executive and the legislative branches of the Government.

It may be reassuring and comforting to Members of this body to be asked by the President to authorize him to act. But the power to authorize carries with it responsibilities for the action, taken pursuant to the authorization.

We cannot tell at this moment precisely what actions the President will take or will be taken in his name in consequence of this resolution. We can foresee, however, some of the possibilities that are developing in the Formosa Strait. Which of them, if any, actually develop will depend partly on what the Communists do or do not do. They will also depend on how the President exercises or delegates the powers of his office.

I review these possibilities because I believe that, resolution or not, they are inherent in the Formosan situation, and in passing this measure Congress would be subscribing in advance to any one of them. Members of the Senate ought to be aware of the range of consequences which we may be endorsing.

There may be a cease-fire in the Formosa Strait. It is clear from the President's message that he hopes fervently that hostilities will come to an end in that area. How he expects to achieve that result I do not know, but press reports suggest that what may be involved is a permanent division of China into two separate entities and a cease-fire between them, if it can be arranged by the United Nations. I do not say that this is desirable, but it is certainly a possibility in present circumstances, since the President is seeking a peaceful solution of the problem.

Mr. President, it appears to me that, at this juncture in our history, we are appraising and reappraising—agonizingly—our Far Eastern policy. We are appraising our position in the light of our commitments in Korea, in Formosa, and our mutual defense agreements with Asiatic and Pacific powers.

We are, as a matter of fact, in a quiescent state of war with Communist China. An armistice in Korea is not the same as a peace treaty. The Formosa area is the opposite flank to Korea. The loss of Formosa would strengthen the forces against us in Korea, break the island barrier chain of defense, weaken our Pacific alliances, and make sizable portions of southeastern Asia an easy prey to Chinese communism.

It appears that we are reappraising our policy in the Far East by seeking to obtain, if possible, a peaceful solution. It appears that we recognize that Chiang Kai-shek cannot return to the mainland without our help.

President Eisenhower, in his message to the Congress last Monday, invited the United Nations to bring an end to active hostilities in the Formosa Strait, and he has by this invitation indirectly recognized that there are two Chinas.

I hope the President and the Secretary of State realize what is being done by this resolution. I hope they recognize the possible consequences. If this resolution has the effect of preventing war, it may well be because we have in effect struck a bargain. It may well be that we will not let Chiang try to go back to the mainland in exchange for Communist China's agreeing not to attack Formosa. China will be split as definitively as Germany and Korea have been. It may well be that Communist China will gain support throughout the world for membership in the United Nations and that Nationalist China may lose her seat on the Security Council.

In another vein, the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores, under the terms of this resolution, may require military action by American forces within a dozen miles of the Chinese mainland. It may call for the bombing of transport facilities or airfields on the Chinese mainland. It may lead to a resumption of hostilities in Korea, full-scale war with Communist China, or war with Communist China and Soviet Russia if their treaty of alliance of 1950 is brought into play. We may have allies or we may not, in any of these potential conflicts. Almost any one of them would call for a vast expansion in our Armed Forces.

I do not know which, if any, of these contingencies may develop. No one knows at this time. I believe firmly, however, that Congress and the American people must recognize clearly what the reasonable possibilities are in the situation. Let us not wake up tomorrow and confront ourselves with the questions: "How did this happen? Who is responsible?"

Whatever the faults of the joint resolution, in its origin and content, however, I do not see how it can be rejected. In the words of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and a truly great American, "What is the alternative?" The Communists throughout the world are waiting for any indication of division among us which they can exploit for propaganda purpose. The morale of friendly nations, particularly in the Far East, may be adversely affected if there is any suggestion that the President does not have the power to use the forces of this country to defend the vital interests of this country. The Chinese Communists may assume, mistakenly, that they have been given a free hand in the Formosa Straits, and so may precipitate the very conflict we are trying to prevent.

I am glad that the President chose to come to Congress in a time of crisis. I regret, however, that the joint resolution is phrased in a manner that raises grave constitutional questions. The phraseology may have the effect of obscuring responsibility for some of the most important actions this Government can take. A simple affirmation by Congress of support for the President in this crisis, and a reaffirmation of our policy that Formosa and the Pescadores shall remain in friendly hands, in my opinion, would have accomplished all of the good that can come from this joint resolution, and would have avoided all of the potential evils.

It is, however, too late for that now. An adverse vote at this time, a failure to uphold the President, can only be interpreted throughout the world as a faltering in our resolve, with disastrous consequences to peace and to the free nations.

The desirability of supporting the President, particularly in vital matters of peace or war, is not open to question. The President is the leader of the Nation. He holds his office by vote of the people. The people and the Congress must inevitably place every reasonable and deserving trust in him; and as they trust him, they have every right to expect that trust to be well placed and their best interests protected acordingly by his official acts.

Mr. President, I shall vote for the joint resolution because circumstances leave us no other choice. In so doing, however, I want it clearly understood for the record that I regard my vote only as a reaffirmation of our policy of the past 5 years with regard to Formosa and the Pescadores. I regard it, too, as an expression of confidence, that the President will see to it that the powers of his office are exercised by his subordinates in the interests of this Nation and, as far as possible, in the interests of the preservation of world peace.

The President has now settled the question of responsibility which had been raised in the joint resolution before us. I am glad he emphasized that he alone had responsibility to decide whether American forces in the vicinity of Formosa should be used for purposes "other than immediate self-defense or in direct defense of Formosa and the Pescadores."

He further stated that the responsibility had been delegated to no one. This would mean of course that this authority had not been delegated to the Congress of the United States, but that the President in the maintenance of his own constitutional authority as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States would continue, as previous Presidents had done and future Presidents should, to exercise this responsibility.

I do not regard the term "authorize," as used in the joint resolution, as conferring additional powers on the President or as detracting from his constitutional powers. I most emphatically do not regard it as assigning to the President the power of Congress to declare war.

Responsibility for what happens in the Formosa Strait from here on, as it has until now, rests with the President. Responsibility must be lodged where, under the Constitution, power lies. The two are inseparable, and any dilution of the bond between them is an invitation to irresponsibility and to the destruction of the Republic.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 159 AND PLANNED MILITARY STRENGTH

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, based on the grave condition of the world today, it would seem imperative for us to have a united front in our resistance to the growing Communist aggression. Therefore, I will vote for the joint resolution requested by the President.

Having taken this position, I now make certain observations.

The letters and telegrams coming to my office are running heavily against this

request of the President. I do not believe that would be the case if the people knew the truth about the danger which now literally hangs over this country as the result of the possession, by the Communists, of both the atomic bomb and the hydrogen bomb, and also of the means of delivering them.

Only recently the distinguished former chairman of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee said:

> Today, atomic and hydrogen bombs exist in growing numbers on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Today—not next year, or the year after, but today—the Soviets have both the bombs and the planes needed to launch a devastating nuclear attack against the cities of North America.

Mr. President, a bomb we have already dropped would cause complete annihilation of people and buildings—and I mean complete—in an area of some 30 square miles, and would cause flash fires and the burning of such substances as wood, along with the destruction of some people, some 700 square miles.

It may be the Communists already have bombs of greater destruction than have we, just as it may be they are ahead of us in the development of guided and ballistic missiles. After extensive study, I believe they are ahead on missiles.

Because both the free world and the Communists now may have the capacity to destroy each other, there is a growing belief among military experts that we now may have reached a nuclear stalemate—a stalemate created by the fact that the originator of a hydrogen attack might, in turn, be destroyed.

With this knowledge, our Government has continued its earnest search for peace. That is not true of the Communists.

The free world no longer has a nuclear monopoly; and we should note that the Communists attacked in Korea and Indochina when it was generally believed we did have such a monopoly.

As stated, I want to support the President in this, his request, because I believe he is trying to achieve peace.

But I also believe this administration is making a grave mistake in not telling the people all the truth about the present danger to their survival as a result of the hydrogen bomb.

How can this administration expect the American people to rally behind this unprecedented request without reservation unless the facts are known? And how can the administration justify at this time a further reduction in some of our Armed Forces?

It is true that the new budget partially atones for the serious mistake made in early 1953, when the "budget-firsters" succeeded in cutting out of the development of our Air Force more than $5 billion. I say "partially atones" because in the new budget the administration asks for some $2.5 billion more for the Air Forces, as against last year.

If there now is atomic stalemate, then it is certain that any new hostilities will result in fighting on land—and I for one have always believed that any war of any kind will involve fighting on land. They always have, and they always will.

With that premise, look at the almost unbelievable differences between the size of our Army and the size of the Russian and Chinese armies. In both cases I have left out allies of the United States and satellites of the Soviet and the Chinese Communists. The Russian and Chinese armies now consist of some 575 divisions, 400 Chinese and 175 Russian, each with some 10,000 men.

The United States now has about 20 divisions, depending on how regimental combat teams are handled, of 17,500 men, and under the proposed new administration budget this tiny number as compared to the possible enemy will be still further reduced.

Interesting in this overall pattern of "strength through weakness," it is now planned to cut the Marines, an organization composed entirely of volunteers who enlisted because of a desire to defend their country, by 32,000.

There was considerable commotion, and rightly so, about cutting the Air Force more than $5 billion in the fiscal year 1954 budget.

In the fiscal year 1955 budget appropriations for the Army were reduced more than $5 billion, and in the new budget request for 1956, despite the fact that the President now is asking the Congress to share with him a policy which admittedly may result in action on the mainland of China, the already heavily reduced Army is being further reduced.

When the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and I were in Europe last spring, it appeared to me that the heavy reductions in our military appropriations were one of the reasons for the rapid rise of neutralism in some of those countries, and the extent of Communist infiltration in others.

Who can assert that there would have been a Korea if we had maintained our military strength, or a Dien Bien Phu if the strength of the free world had been respected?

I mention the latter because not long before the fall of Dien Bien Phu we were told that the preservation of Indochina for the free world was vital to our position in southeast Asia; that our position in southeast Asia was vital to our position in Asia; that our position in Asia was vital to the future security of the free world.

Who can be sure that the contemptuously aggressive policies of Chou En-lai, before and after Geneva, were not affected by these reductions?

But now, as we apparently plan to stiffen against further aggression, we are also asked further to reduce our already seriously weakened Army and Marine Corps.

The Communists have shown they were not afraid of us when we had the atomic deterrent. Why should they be afraid when we have not? And if that is a fair premise, why should we not build up our Army and Marines, instead of continuing to tear them down?

In recent months there have been press stories to the effect that the Chief of Staff of the Army, General Matthew Ridgway, objected to certain military policies which might commit the Army.

If that is true, those of us who know this American general and his great battle record also know that he must believe that his Army, shortly to be further weakened, is not strong enough to carry out missions which might be involved.

We have had sad comparable situations in the not too distant past. In 1950 the late great Hoyt Vandenberg, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, protested his "shoestring" Air Force: and when it became known that in order to defend Korea this country was forced to borrow fighter planes from Canada, people understood what General Vandenberg meant by the term "shoestring."

Korea was fought with both obsolescent and obsolete airplanes, in insufficient quantities. Under Secretary Talbott we have improved our Air Force, but the strength of our Army has continued to decline.

Recently the President was quoted as approving the following statement:

> From other sources, it was learned yesterday that the administration is counting on airlift of Army or Marine units as an important part of the mobile forces along with naval carrier and Air Force units.

But I have studied the airlift over recent weeks, and believe the airlift available to the Army is inadequate; and General Ridgway must know that.

In addition General Ridgway must also know that if we had real trouble which required ground action, the tragedy of ammunition shortage in Korea would be repeated because of the current plans for reserve ammunition.

There are some who assert that this country cannot afford adequate defense against Communist aggression because the cost of such defense would jeopardize our economy.

In the first place, I have said, and say again, that there is little merit in being the richest man in the graveyard; and in the second place, I do not believe that the assertion that we cannot afford adequate strength is true.

In his recent outstanding book, Mr. Thomas K. Finletter, former Secretary of the Air Force, and former Chairman of the President's Air Policy Commission, states the findings of a nonpartisan organization as follows:

> The National Planning Association in a report of October 1953 has said that additional annual defense expenditures of $10 billion over the administration's projected outlays would not interfere with further business expansion, would not prevent a continuing increase in the standard of living, and would even allow for tax reductions; that an increase in defense expenditures of $20 billion annually over the projected 1956 levels could be made and still permit a continuing increase in investment and a moderate increase in the standard of living, with no change in tax rates; and that only when the increase reached $33 billion annually over the presently projected rate of expenditures would the United States be brought close to the point where we would have to approach the issue of 'guns or butter'." Even at this point there would still be enough resources for some small increases in investments and in the standard of living.
>
> The question, considered only in fiscal terms, is not at all what we can afford to spend but what it is wise to spend in order to avoid the massive expenditures in man-

power, materials, and dollars we would be forced to make if we became engaged in general war.

There may be some who will dispute that statement, but I have full faith there is no American who is not willing to pay whatever the price may be for preserving our freedom.

Much has been said about the unfairness of the Chinese Government in imprisoning, as spies, the 11 American flyers who were shot down. Not much has been said, however, about the unfairness of this Government in sending them out in a plane designed before 1940, a plane obsolete before the Korean war.

I was just told this plane may have been designed shortly after 1940, and I will check the facts for the RECORD. I do know the plane was flown in 1943, and that such planes were flown in large numbers in 1944. It usually requires around 7 years to develop a bomber, design through production. But this ship was rushed.

If our Government has the right to draft men and send them out to fight and die for the protection of our country, then it also has the duty to see that these men are given the best possible training and have the best possible equipment.

In closing, may I again emphasize that I vote for this resolution to uphold the position of the President in taking this apparent stand against further Communist aggression.

But I believe that if this administration now thinks a showdown with the Communists in the interest of our security may be as close as this resolution request would seem to imply, the concurrent military appropriation request should involve improving the strength and mobility of all our forces instead of adding only to the strength of one, and reducing the two others.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, following the most impressive testimony I have heard on any measure during my service in the Senate, I shall vote for the joint resolution without amendment, because I am convinced that the defense line of our Nation is threatened in the Pacific; and, of course, it must be maintained.

I am not voting for the joint resolution as a military alliance in any way with Nationalist China, nor as a police action against the spread of Asiatic communism.

We do not have the manpower, the natural resources, nor the economic resources which can indefinitely plug all the weak spots in the spread of Asiatic communism. For emphasis, I say that we should support the resolution because the Pacific line of defense of the United States of America is threatened and we must protect it.

This policy of defending Formosa as a part of our own defense line is well developed over the years. The resolution has now been spread out before the world. The Chief Executive of the Nation has made his stand upon it and I think that it should be passed. I do not close my eyes to the fact that this action is a sharing by the Chief Executive with the Congress of certain executive power invested in him by the Constitution; that it is the taking over of certain power by the Congress and is the signing of a blank check by the Congress for military action that could involve actual war. This precedent may plague us in the future, but future conditions will have to be faced when they develop. It should be made clear now that this resolution is passed to meet an extraordinary situation.

With many others, I was greatly concerned at the hearings about the inclusion of certain islands near the China coastline as an area of security and protection. From my own viewpoint, I believe the small advantages of holding the islands is far less in importance than the harm that can come in international affairs from such a course, but when the entire case is considered I believe that this is a matter which we will have to leave to the judgment of the President after he has considered advice from both political and military sources.

The American people are relying on President Eisenhower and his firm statements that he will personally direct these activities and that he alone will give the final command as to any and all action. The Members of the Congress are personally relying upon this same assurance which precludes any military alliance or joint responsibility of the President and the leaders of any other nations.

I think, Mr. President, that we should also clearly recognize that this action can well involve both the early increase and the expansion of our military forces. This resolution could cause military action at an early date and instead of decreasing the size of our Army, I personally think that we should be increasing it. The American people ought to be warned now that this action may involve larger calls by the Selective Service and larger expenditures of money for the military program. I also think we ought to face the fact that this action clearly involves the possibility of the use of our own ground forces in Formosa, or on the mainland of China itself. I think we ought to squarely face the issue of this possibility now, and as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I see this step as one that may be involved in carrying out this resolution. I do not think that it is enough to merely say that this action does not call for an increase in our Armed Forces.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does not the Senator believe there is a possibility that some of the recent aggressions from behind the Iron Curtain resulted or were influenced by the heavy reductions in our Armed Forces in recent years?

Mr. STENNIS. That could well be.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I was interested in the Senator's statement that he believed we should increase the size of our Armed Forces, instead of reducing them. I am sure the Senator from Mississippi knows that the Army appropriation request was reduced more than $5 billion last year, and despite that it is now planned to cut the Army appropriation even further this year.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi has not seen any proof that would justify such a reduction, based on world conditions or based on technical advances or on improvements in machinery, or otherwise.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield further.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Today there are no draftees in the Marine Corps. Nevertheless the present plan of this administration is to cut the Marine Corps by 32,000 men, or about 15 percent of its total strength. We are now talking in terms of amphibious warfare, at which the Marine Corps is particularly expert. Does not the Senator consider unfortunate this planned further reduction in Marine Corps strength?

Mr. STENNIS. I wholeheartedly agree with the distinguished Senator from Missouri. I was greatly surprised when he brought out that fact, that the Marine Corps, that fine amphibious force, is faced with a reduction of 32,000 men, who are all volunteers in this special type of armed service.

Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate much longer.

The real basis of what hope I have for the eventual peaceful settlement of this Formosan question is for Formosa to be under at least partial jurisdiction of the United Nations with protection for us against the island being used as a springboard for military action against our defense line. These matters are for decision in the future. The present demands are for a firm, positive policy by us; and for this reason I shall support the resolution without amendments, and urge my colleagues to do the same. I hope it passes by a large vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). The senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] had asked for the floor, but he is not in the Chamber. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. CLEMENTS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senate, but I do desire to say a few words.

I am a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and I sat through every minute of the 2 days of hearings, and heard the testimony of all the witnesses. I believe I can say without fear of successful contradiction that I was the first

to bring up the question of whether the Nationalist Government of China might in any way involve us in a war on the mainland of China. I know other Senators were thinking about it; but in the committee we take turns in questioning, and I think I was the first to indulge in that line of questioning, because I was a little fearful at the time that Chiang Kai-shek might involve the United States in a war with Red China, and I did not wish to be a party to any resolution which might enable Chiang Kai-shek to involve us in such a war. So I asked questions about it. I became completely, 100 percent, satisfied as a result of the answers given the committee by Secretary of State Dulles, by Admiral Radford, and by other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The President of the United States made the statement yesterday that the purpose of this resolution is to defend and protect Formosa, and nothing else, and, in the discretion of the President, to take whatever measures he feels are in the best interests of the United States in defending Formosa.

At no time was I convinced as a result of any testimony or of anything that I have read in the newspapers or of any statements made by the President or anyone else that the purpose of the resolution is to do anything else than to defend Formosa. Period. That is all. There is nothing else to it.

I have been listening to debate on the part of the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and other Senators regarding the sovereignty of the mainland of China and to assertions that we would be violating international law if we permitted certain things to happen to the mainland of China. It is said that the Communists have sovereignty over the mainland of China, and that Great Britain and other nations have recognized the Chinese Red government.

Are we more interested in Communist China and what the British have done than we are in our own Government and our own people? We have not recognized the Chinese Communists.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, may we have order? The Senator from Indiana is making a very able address, and it is almost impossible to hear him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let there be order in the Senate. The Senator from Indiana may proceed.

Mr. CAPEHART. Are we more interested in Communist China than in the Chinese Nationalists? Is it the argument of some Senators that the Chinese Communists have more right to a foot of land on the mainland of China than have the Chinese Nationalists? Is that the argument? We have not recognized the Chinese Communists. We recognized the Chinese Nationalists. They have just as much right to the islands which are in dispute as have the Chinese Communists. They have just as much right to the mainland as have the Chinese Communists. How did the Chinese Communists acquire control? By overthrowing, by force, the Chinese Nationalist Government. They did it with the aid of Communist Russia. They have no legal right to the mainland of China. We have not recognized them as the Government of China, notwithstanding the fact that the English have so recognized them.

As to the offshore islands which the Chinese Nationalists now control and upon which they have troops, are Senators going to stand on the floor of the Senate and say they are not entitled to them, that they belong to the Chinese Communists? What sort of reasoning is that?

I remember, Mr. President, that during the Korean war I engaged in colloquies on the floor of the Senate and listened to the same sort of propaganda and arguments to which we have been listening in the past few days. I remember that Chiang Kai-shek offered to furnish a couple of divisions to help us fight in Korea.

The same able Senators at that time said, "No, it cannot be done, because if we permit them to flight in Korea, we shall have to transport them from Formosa to Korea, and the Chinese Communists will not like that. That might involve us in a war with the Chinese Communists."

I remember that very distinctly. That was the argument which was used. It was said that Nationalist troops could not be used in Korea because they had no ships and could not get from Formosa to Korea, unless they were transported in United States ships, and to do that might offend the Chinese Communists and might involve us in a third world war. So we were told we had better not attempt to do that.

Then I remember some arguments coming from the same sources along this line: Then when the Chinese Communists attacked our boys up at the Yalu River, we should not attack anyone north of the Yalu River. The argument was that, regardless of the amount of damage done or the number of American boys killed or wounded south of the Yalu River, we must not dare to send an airplane north of the Yalu River. We must not dare to bomb any of the airports or materiel depots in Communist-controlled territory, because if we did, the Communists might not like it; they might consider it an act of war and might retaliate.

So someone said to our generals, "You must stay south of the Yalu River."

We hear the same voices now saying, "We are for defending Formosa." I have even heard them say, "At any cost, we are for defending Formosa. But in defending Formosa, regardless of the amount of build-up on one of the offshore islands, of which the Nationalists have now lost control to the Communists from the mainland of China, regardless of the number of airplanes which may be assembled there, regardless of the amount of materiel which may be stored there, regardless of the number of troops who may be assembled there for the specific purpose of attacking Formosa, we dare not do anything about it until they have sent their airplanes over Formosa." To do what? To kill American boys who may be stationed on Formosa in order to defend it. That is what it amounts to. That is how simple the proposition is.

We are told that we must not attack the Chinese Communists on the mainland because they have sovereignty there. I say they do not have sovereignty, in the eyes of the United States Government. Since when have we become more interested in the Chinese Communists than we are in the Chinese Nationalists?

The purpose of the resolution is to defend Formosa. In passing the resolution, we shall be giving to the President of the United States the power really to defend Formosa. The Chinese Communists, not once, but many times within the past few days, have told us in no uncertain terms that they intend to capture Formosa. What more assurance of their intention do we want? They have told us that they plan to capture Formosa. Who is so naive as to believe that if they start to build up a great force opposite Formosa, on one of the offshore islands, or even on the mainland, for the purpose of taking Formosa, they will not attempt to carry out their objective? The President of the United States has told us that he will have the last word about that.

What American, knowing that we might have 50,000, 100,000, or 200,000 American boys on the island of Formosa, would deny the President of the United States the right to stop the Red Chinese before they started, rather than to wait until they came over Formosa, dropped their bombs, and killed great numbers of Americans?

What sort of thinking prevails among us? I am just as much opposed as is anyone else to engaging in a war. The able senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] discussed this matter at great length in the committee, as did all other members, because we are all opposed to permitting Chiang Kai-shek or anyone connected with any other government to trigger us into a war with Red China or any other country.

We satisfied ourselves in the committee by the testimony that that simply would not happen. I know I was convinced; I cannot, of course, speak for any other Senator. Oh, yes, it might happen, but it will not happen. We are not going to permit it to happen. There can be no question about that.

The question of our attacking the mainland came about in this way. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff was asked what he would do if the Red Chinese built up a tremendous force, and a supply of airplanes, materiel, guns, and so forth, on the mainland, and he knew it was being done for one purpose, namely, to attack Formosa. He was asked, "What do you think you would have the right to do, or what should you do, under the resolution?"

He could give only one answer. If that admiral had given any other answer than the one he gave, that he would protect American boys by stopping the Red Chinese before they had a chance to shoot down American boys, he should have been impeached.

What right have we to send American boys to the island of Formosa, and then to say to the President of the United States, "Even though you are convinced that those Red devils are building up an army a hundred miles away, with a thousand airplanes intended to fly over Formosa and to shoot down our boys, with-

out even giving them a chance to stop that kind of build-up, you cannot defend them"?

I put it up to the American people when I say that, in all fairness, we have no right to say that to the President.

Perhaps we should not be defending Formosa. Perhaps we should not be over there at all. Perhaps we ought to withdraw and get completely out of the far eastern Pacific. But that is not the question. The question is, if we are committed to defending Formosa, which means possibly placing American boys on Formosa, why should we want to tie the hands of the President of the United States and our commanders by requiring them to sit there like ducks, and wait until the Red Chinese fly over them and drop their bombs?

Those who take the position that we should not attack the Communists because they have sovereignty over the mainland of China are the same group who argued that we should not use any of the Chinese Nationalist troops in the Korean war, the same group who argued that we should not fly across the Yalu River.

How can we be in favor of defending Formosa, how could we have favored winning the Korean war, and then be against having our commanders follow the enemy? In what kind of thinking are we indulging?

We talk about international law and the attacking of a sovereign nation. We shall not be attacking a nation at all, if we are required to attack—and we are not going to do it under this resolution. The President of the United States is not going to do it. There is nothing in the resolution which says that he should do it, unless he is thoroughly convinced that the Communist Chinese are building up a force on the offshore islands or on the mainland of China to attack our boys and our friends on Formosa.

To me that is how simple this matter is. The Red Chinese have no sovereignty in China. They took China by force. We have never recognized the Red Chinese government. It is not the government of China. So far as we are concerned, the Nationalists government is the government of China.

Mr. President, as I have said, I sat through all the hearings. I assure my colleagues one cannot read into those hearings anything other than that every witness testified that the purpose of the resolution is to defend Formosa. The witnesses testified that the intention is to act only if, in the best judgment of the proper authorities, the Red Chinese should do something which would be detrimental to our defense of Formosa. One cannot read anything else into the hearings. There were present at those hearings the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the able Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the able Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] as well as other Senators.

Yesterday the President went so far as to say that if at any time we should engage in any act outside what might be called the scope of defending Formosa and the surrounding islands, the President alone would be responsible for the decision.

Why is it that some of us are more interested in Red China than in Nationalist China? Where does one get the facts from which to arrive at the conclusion that we ought to be more considerate of the Chinese Communists than of the Chinese Nationalists? What are the facts that would dictate to any man that we ought to be more careful with the Chinese Communists, and that we ought to permit them to do what they please?

The Chinese Communists have told us repeatedly that they are going to take Formosa. I do not know whether they will or not. I know that one able Senator today said he thought the Chinese Communists were bluffing and that they do not mean it. I do not know whether they are bluffing of not. They certainly were not bluffing in Korea. They certainly were not bluffing in Indochina. They certainly were not bluffing in many other areas. I again repeat my question, Where are the facts which would dictate any American to determine that we ought to be more considerate of Red China than of Nationalist China? What are the acts and actions of Red China which would indicate that we ought to be more considerate of the Chinese Communists than we are of the Chinese Nationalists?

If I remember correctly, it was the Red Chinese who attacked our armies and the United Nations armies in Korea. If I remember correctly, it was their armies that made it possible for us to be so unfortunate as to suffer 150,000 casualties, including about 35,000 deaths. If I remember correctly, it is the Red Chinese that are holding 11 American airmen against international law and in violation of the Korean truce agreements.

Are those facts on which one can come to the conclusion that we ought to be more considerate of the Chinese Communists than of the Chinese Nationalists? I do not think those are facts which would convince me of that. Although I am not a lawyer, I see nothing that would justify such preference under international law, and I feel certain we have not recognized the Chinese Communist Government as the Government of China. The Chinese Communists may be occupying China, but how did they get there? They took China from the Chinese Nationalists by force. There can be no question about that. So I do not see what the debate is all about. I do not understand the reasoning which has been set forth. I do not find the facts based on which one can stand up and say, "I am against the Chinese Communists. I am against communism; I am for defending Formosa at any cost, but—but—be nice to the Chinese Communists. They are nice fellows. They might provoke something, you know. Be nice to them. Under international law we must not do certain things."

We listened to the same kind of arguments during the Korean war. I do not understand that sort of reasoning. I do not understand how one can arrive at such conclusions, or on what facts one can come to such a conclusion. How can one say to an American boy, "We are going to send you over to Formosa to defend Formosa," and then say to his commanders that they must be as careful and as certain as human beings can be to observe certain precautions? We have been assured, by witnesses who are in a position to know of what the intention of the resolution is, and the President has also told us. Yet we delay while the Communists build up a great army, build up installations where many airplanes are concentrated, and get ready for aggression.

We hear statements made, and they may be right, that some of these days Russia may fly many airplanes to this country and bomb Washington, New York, and other cities, and that we should do something to prevent such an occurrence, and that our defense line is in the Pacific. I agree that that is where it is. Yet when it comes to the question of defending Formosa and sending our boys over there, the same persons refuse to permit the President of the United States to engage in a buildup of defense on one of the offshore islands, when those persons know that the Communists are building up their own forces for the specific purpose of attacking Formosa.

Mr. President, I was concerned over one aspect about which I am no longer concerned. One can never be certain about anything in this life, but I am thoroughly convinced that the purpose of the resolution is not to do anything except to defend Formosa. I am likewise thoroughly convinced that the President of the United States does not intend to permit Chiang Kai-shek or anybody else to "trigger" us into a war. If we get into a war, we shall do it on our own initiative. I am thoroughly convinced that our officials are not going to permit Chiang Kai-shek to get us into a war. I was concerned about that question in the beginning. The question was debated and discussed in the committee hearings and has been referred to in newspapers, and broadcast by radio and television networks.

I stood on this very spot last Monday and congratulated the President of the United States for sending to the Congress a message which, in effect, asked for a resolution. I thought at that time we ought to have hearings and thoroughly consider the matter, and that we should go into the question from every possible viewpoint. We have done that. I have satisfied myself that this is the best thing and the only thing we can do under existing circumstances.

I cannot find, anywhere, any facts which either were developed in the past, or were developed in the committee meeting the other day, or any facts which have been developed on the floor of the Senate, which would justify a Member of Congress in saying he is in favor of the defense of Formosa, but that he does not wish to give the President the power and authority to strike at a buildup 100 miles or less away from Formosa, which the President knows would, if permitted to continue and grow, would make it impossible for him to defend Formosa, and thus perhaps cause the loss of 100,000 or 200,000 American boys. I cannot be a party to that sort of thing.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. KNOWLAND. The yeas and nays have been ordered on this question, have they not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct; the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, before answering the distinguished Senator from Georgia, I wish to take only half a minute to answer the argument of the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

If his theory of sovereignty were correct, the Indians would still be controlling the United States of America, because the white people took this country away from the Indians by force. However, I do not wish to argue that point.

I am interested chiefly in the joint resolution and in the amendment I have submitted.

Mr. President, in my service in the Senate, I am never worried about having to vote alone. I remember that I stood on this floor for 3 hours, arguing against confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Stettinius to be Secretary of State. I voted alone against confirmation of that nomination. A little later I looked at a picture in Life magazine, and there I saw portrayed a scene at the San Francisco conference, where Alger Hiss was representing the Secretary of State, and was greeting President Truman.

I also remember that when Woodrow Wilson was running for office, time and time and time again he said he was running on the platform of keeping this country out of war.

Then I remember when another President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, said in a speech:

> I say again and again and again I am not going to send our boys to any foreign country.

And then I remember that after President Truman sent our boys to Korea, and when he was calling it "a police action," Senator after Senator after Senator rose and said, "I never voted for any measure of that kind; but the boys are over there now and are we not going to appropriate money to see that they get good guns and the protection to which they are entitled?"

Mr. President, I also remember that in the last political campaign, Republican Senator after Republican Senator said on the radio, "I never voted for the war in Korea; I have no responsibility at all for it. That was the action of Harry Truman, who never came to the Senate to request such authority before he sent the boys to Korea."

Mr. President, what does my amendment do? I am perfectly willing to accept a part of the joint resolution—the part which says:

> That the President of the United States be and he hereby is authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack.

I wish to state to my friend, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], that he will never find the Senator from North Dakota unwilling to protect our soldiers who may be on Formosa, whether their number be 50,000 or 100,000. But the entire tradition and history of the United States are that we have never attacked another nation. To that part of the joint resolution I have absolutely no objection.

If Senators wish to declare war, let them declare it. But what would we be doing by passing the joint resolution as it now reads? We would be saying that the President can take "such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores."

In other words, under the joint resolution, as it now reads, if the President were to deem it essential to send our troops to southeast Asia, in order to divert some of the Communist troops, he could send our troops there, without ever coming back to the Congress for authority, because we would have given him a blank check to do so. Or if the President wished to send American troops to Egypt or to Africa or to anywhere in South America, he could send them there, for Congress would have given him a blank check; and the Senator from Indiana will have voted for it, if he votes in favor of the passage of the joint resolution as it now stands.

Mr. President, if the joint resolution as now written is passed and is enacted into law, what will we say if the President sends our troops to the jungles or swamps of southeast Asia, 3 or 4 years from now? France was fighting in that area for some 7 long years. The distinguished Senator from Georgia asked, today, "Are we going to surrender the 350,000 people on those islands?" Well, Mr. President, after 7 years, France surrendered a million people and I notice that our State Department apparently did not have any objection. After a war lasting 7 or 8 years, the French surrendered a million people in Indochina.

Under the joint resolution as it now reads, build-ups on the few islands 12 miles from the coastline of China are dealt with. On the other hand, there may be military buildups 100 miles or 500 miles or 1,000 miles away from the coastline. Are we going to have the President use our Armed Forces to go that far and to attack the forces of the government of China before those forces attack us? That, in simple language, is what the joint resolution amounts to. If, 5, 6, 7, or 8 years from now, we find that our troops are still on the mainland of China, and if at that time the American people ask various Senators, "Did you vote to send our boys there?" the only answer Senators will be able to give will be "Yes," if they vote in favor of the passage of the pending joint resolution, for that is what may be its effect if it is enacted into law.

So far as I am concerned, I will never vote to send our boys there, under a joint resolution of this kind, ambiguous as it is, because if the President were to decide that he wanted to send our boys there, all he would have to do would be to come before the Congress and obtain authority for that purpose—just as the proposal now before us is one to give him authority to use our forces to defend Formosa. He could come to Congress and could say, "I want to send our troops to some of these foreign countries." If the President said he wanted authority to do that, I do not think there would be a single vote against it.

So, Mr. President, I request a vote on my amendment because I think that by adopting the amendment we shall be protecting the lives of the youth of America—the boys who will have to do the fighting. If we wish to send our troops to all these foreign countries later on, and if the President finds it is necessary for that to be done, he will be able to come to Congress and ask Congress for authority to take that action, and Congress can give him the authority. But certainly this is a blanket or blank-check resolution. Just read it, Mr. President:

> *Resolved, etc.*, That the President of the United States be and he hereby is authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack, this authority to include the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands.

Mr. President, those who prepared the joint resolution could have stopped there. But, no; they added the last 2½ lines, in which Congress is asked to give the President a blank check, so as to authorize him—with our approval—to send our Armed Forces to any country on the face of the globe; because the joint resolution, as it now stands, continues with the following provision:

> And the taking of such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

It is as simple as that. The senior Senator from North Dakota does not intend to vote to give such authority to any President unless we know where the troops are going. I do not propose to vote to attack any country which is getting its airplanes ready 500 miles from the coastline. We can get planes ready in this country as fast as the Reds can. We shall be ready for them, if they come. We shall be ready for the very first plane. Mr. Forrestal, the late Secretary of Defense, said that if an attack should come at any time we would be prepared to resist it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. On this

question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

On this question the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

I further announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] if present would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] is absent on official business as a member of the American delegation attending the 10th anniversary of the World War II Battle of Alsace, at Colmar, France.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are absent on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 3, nays 83, as follows:

YEAS—3

Langer	Lehman	Morse

NAYS—83

Aiken	Fulbright	Millikin
Allott	George	Monroney
Anderson	Goldwater	Mundt
Barkley	Gore	Murray
Barrett	Hayden	Neuberger
Beall	Hennings	O'Mahoney
Bender	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Bennett	Hill	Payne
Bible	Holland	Purtell
Bridges	Hruska	Robertson
Bush	Humphrey	Russell
Butler	Ives	Saltonstall
Byrd	Jackson	Schoeppel
Capehart	Jenner	Scott
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Clements	Kilgore	Sparkman
Cotton	Knowland	Stennis
Curtis	Kuchel	Symington
Daniel	Long	Thurmond
Dirksen	Magnuson	Thye
Douglas	Malone	Watkins
Duff	Mansfield	Welker
Dworshak	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Eastland	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Ellender	McClellan	Young
Ervin	McNamara	

NOT VOTING—10

Bricker	Green	Neely
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Potter
Flanders	Kennedy	
Frear	McCarthy	

So Mr. LANGER'S amendment was rejected.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out the preamble and all that follows and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

Whereas the primary purpose of the United States in its relations with all other nations is to develop and sustain a just and enduring peace, and, in conformity with that purpose, has undertaken as a member of the United Nations to be ready to settle its international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered; and

Whereas the Treaty of Peace between the Allied Powers and Japan, signed September 8, 1951, under which Japan renounced all right, title, and claim to Formosa and the Pescadores, did not specify the ultimate disposition of such islands; and

Whereas the United States has recognized and assumed a responsibility for the peace and security of Formosa and the Pescadores pending definitive settlement of their future status, and pending such settlement has recognized the jurisdiction of the Republic of China over these islands; and

Whereas in China or certain areas thereof there is armed conflict between the Republic of China and the Chinese Communists, and the Chinese Communists are threatening to extend that conflict and endanger international peace by armed attacks on Formosa and the Pescadores; and

Whereas the situation is one appropriate for action by the United Nations for the purpose of ending the present hostilities off the coast of China and their threatened extension in the Formosan Straits which clearly endanger international peace and threaten seriously to dislocate the existing, if unstable, balance of moral, economic, political, and military power upon which the peace of the Pacific depends; and

Whereas the United States would welcome intervention by the United Nations to bring about a cessation of hostilities off the coast of China and in the Formosan Straits, and it is in the interest of the United States and of, world peace to facilitate efforts toward peaceful settlement, including a definitive settlement of the future status of Formosa and the Pescadores in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter; and

Whereas pending action by the United Nations the United States has a responsibility to protect and defend the peace and security of Formosa and the Pescadores from armed attack, since the peace and security of these islands are essential to the peace and security of the United States and other nations with vital interests in the west Pacific: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That it is the sense of the Congress—in light of the above-described situation and so long as it continues, pending effective action by the United Nations to maintain peace and security in the Formosan Straits and the waters surrounding Formosa and the Pescadores—the President has authority to employ the Armed Forces of the United States if and as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of defending and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores from armed attack. Such authority would include the taking of such other measures consistent with international law and our obligations under the United Nations Charter as he judges necessary or appropriate militarily in the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on last Wednesday I submitted this amendment in the nature of a substitute, which is cosponsored by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I explained it in some detail on the floor. I should like to speak again briefly, and in doing so I want to make clear that I am not wedded to the words of my substitute. I am simply trying to incorporate certain principles into whatever resolution we eventually pass here in the Senate. I have done that to the best of my ability. If anyone can improve on them, I will gladly adopt their words.

These principles, all of which are present in my substitute, are:

First. That we separate Formosa and the Pescadores from the offshore islands, an end which we are told the President had in mind, but which his resolution, by the time it had gone through departmental conferences and changes, certainly does not accomplish.

Second. That we clearly state the legal and moral justification for our act, which is the treaty of peace between the Allied Powers and Japan, signed September 8, 1951, under which Japan renounced all right, title, and claim to Formosa and the Pescadores, but did not specify the ultimate disposition of these islands. The United States, therefore, whose arms liberated these islands from Japan, bears some responsibility to protect them until that ultimate disposition is arrived at. This, I believe, will show our true purpose to the world, and particularly to the peoples of the Far East.

Third. The clear statement that we welcome U. N. intervention and respect our obligations under the charter—something that the present resolution does not do.

Mr. President, let us not be met with the argument that this limits the President's authority. It does not. The President has the authority, under the Constitution, to take whatever action is necessary, from a military standpoint, to defend Formosa and the Pescadores. Under the resolution, he may defend the offshore islands, if he desires to do so.

Mr. President, I invite the Members of the Senate to look at the substitute resolution and to read the last two paragraphs before the resolving clause, which are as follows:

Whereas the United States would welcome intervention by the United Nations to bring about a cessation of hostilities off the coast of China and in the Formosan Straits, and it is in the interest of the United States and of world peace to facilitate efforts toward peaceful settlement including a definitive settlement of the future status of Formosa and the Pescadores in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter; and

Whereas pending action by the United Nations the United States has a responsibility to protect and defend the peace and security of Formosa and the Pescadores from armed attack since the peace and security of these islands are essential to the peace and security of the United States and other nations with vital interests in the West Pacific—

And so forth.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Tennessee will yield, in order that I may request the yeas and nays on the Senator's amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should be happy to yield for that purpose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair, there is a sufficient second. The yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to the wording of the resolving clause of the proposed substitute resolution:

Resolved, etc., That it is the sense of the Congress—in light of the above-described situation and so long as it continues, pending effective action by the United Nations to maintain peace and security in the Formosan Straits and the waters surrounding Formosa and the Pescadores—the President has authority to employ the Armed Forces of the United States if and as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of defending and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores from armed attack. Such authority would include the taking of such other measures consistent with international law and our obligations under the United Nations Charter as he judges necessary or appropriate militarily in the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

There is some feeling that the President has the authority to protect the vital interests of the United States without coming to Congress and asking its permission to do so. I would not want this to serve as a precedent at some future time when a President might be confronted with an emergency in connection with the defense of some vital island, such as Formosa or one of the Hawaiian Islands. So, Mr. President, my amendment is worded to express the sense of the Congress that the President has authority to do certain things.

Of course, it was not necessary for the President to ask authority of the Congress, or even for an expression of the sense of the Congress, in connection with this matter. But inasmuch as there was no immediate emergency, I am glad the President has done so in this instance. When there is time for the securing of the sense of the Congress on a matter of this kind, it is a wholesome attitude and procedure for the Chief Executive to take the course followed in the present instance, but I would not want the passage of the resolution which we are considering, House Joint Resolution 159, to constitute a precedent that it must be done in every case.

I feel, Mr. President, that under the circumstances the consideration of the resolution has been beneficial to our Nation and to those who are interested with us in the cause of peace in the world. It has given us an opportunity to debate the question, to acquaint the people of our Nation with the situation.

I am convinced that the great concern shown by the Members of the Foreign Relations Committee and of the Armed Services Committee, in the 2 or 3 days of executive hearings, over the desire not to get this Nation into war by some unhappy accident, over the desire not to let some action on the coastal islands involve us in conflict which might last for many, many years, has done much to temper the attitude of some of our military people. I think it has had a leveling influence. If the resolution has not done anything more than to inspire the President to issue to the Nation the statement that he and he alone would be responsible for any decision to start any actual shooting in the part of the world where the trouble is, I think it has proved to be very beneficial.

What many of us have feared is that some subordinate officer or some line officer, under the influence, perhaps, of Chiang Kai-shek, might get the American Nation into a war over the coastal islands.

Mr. President, I do not believe the American people want to go to war in defense of the coastal islands or to try to pull Chiang Kai-shek's chestnuts out of the fire.

Since the resolution is before the Senate, I know of no test in connection with it except that every Senator vote his own conviction as to what he thinks should be done. That, I am sure, every Senator will do.

We literally stand at the crossroads. If we turn one way we will strengthen the possibilities of peace. If we turn the other, we may seriously endanger the hopes of peace and precipitate our country into war with unforeseeably grave consequences and without allies.

I think that we can and should take the way that enhances the hopes of peace. It is the way not only to unite our country but to unite the free world.

The great difficulty and dilemma we face is that the President asks us to unite on the peace way, and I am sure he means that, but he allows his advisers to incorporate into his message and into the resolution language which plainly suggests that Congress should take the way which may lead to war.

Let us at least pause and consider what way we do wish to go. There is a fatal ambiguity in the President's message and resolution. We in the Congress have grave responsibility to the American people. We cannot escape by following blindly the President's ambiguity.

Make no mistake about it. We are united in favor of a United Nations call for a cease-fire and a cessation of armed hostilities in the Straits of Formosa. I think most of us here would go further than the President. We would not only welcome United Nations intervention but we would exert our influence as a member of the U. N. to the uttermost to secure a cease-fire.

Pending U. N. action we are also united in recognizing our responsibility to defend Formosa and the Pescadores from armed attack. We freed these islands from Japanese rule. In the Japanese Treaty, Japan renounced all her rights to them, but their ultimate disposition and future status was left undetermined. And until there is a treaty fixing their future status, we have a responsibility to defend them from armed attack.

As long as and insofar as our resolution makes clear our position in favor of a U. N. cease-fire and in favor of the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores, it is a move toward peace and a move toward unity with our allies.

But the proposed resolution and the President's message go far beyond these two essential points; and insofar as they do, they may turn us back from the road to peace, and I fear may turn us up the road to war. Indeed the resolution itself is even singularly silent on our attitude toward a United Nations cease fire.

The President's message, and the resolution read in light of the message, unfortunately indicate that we will regard any attempt on the part of the Red Chinese to capture islands like Quemoy and Matsu only a few miles off their port cities as in aid and the preparation for an attack on Formosa. The message even suggests that we might take appropriate military action against concentration or employment of Communist forces on the mainland should our military conclude that the concentrations were "obviously undertaken to facilitate attack upon the mainland" and it is obvious that concentration of the 7th Fleet about Formosa would obviously facilitate attack by us on the mainland in case of need.

If the joint resolution we are considering were entirely forthright, it would read something like this, because this is actually what it means:

That the President of the United States be and he hereby is authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa, the Pescadores, Matsu, and Quemoy, and all the little islands, the names of which most of our American citizens have never heard, against armed attack.

If the resolution had been worded in such a way, that would be actually what it meant. There would be no question that the Armed Forces of the United States would be used, under the authority of the joint resolution, for the purpose of protecting Quemoy, Matsu, and the other little islands just a few miles off the coast of China. Then there would really be tremendous concern about the authority which we purport to give to the President.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Tennessee agree that the debate shows that the spokesmen for the administration have definitely stated that the islands of Quemoy, Matsu, and the other islands within 8 or 10 miles of the mainland of China, islands now occupied by the Nationalist Chinese forces, are going to be defended?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The language of the resolution means the same as if those islands had been specifically named along with Formosa and the Pescadores.

When the people of this Nation understand that, they will be tremendously alarmed about the possibility of our country becoming involved in a war in that part of the world over some islands which the President of the United States said, not so long ago, were not tremendously important in connection with the defense of Formosa.

The people of the United States are going to be tremendously alarmed, when the truth is made know to them, that Congress, by this resolution, was authorizing the President to use the Armed Forces for the defense of little islands over which we have never had any claim,

and as to which there is no legal status, islands which were not ceded by Japan, and which have always been part of the Chinese mainland.

The people of the United States do not want to go to war over some unnamed little coastal island of the Chinese mainland, an island about which they have never heard and do not care anything about.

This clause of the resolution is not forthright:

> This authority to include the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands.

It means the same as if the islands of Quemoy and Matsu and all the other little islands, had been included along with Formosa and the Pescadores.

We cannot sustain our position in world opinion, and we shall not have any allies, if we get into a world war over what might happen to one of those little islands.

Furthermore, how can the United States defend one of those little islands without engaging in shooting? Just how can that be done? I have read some military discussions of this question. I read such an article by a distinguished writer, which was published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch a short time ago. How can a little coastal island, like Quemoy, be defended without taking some of the coast itself? Experts have said that it cannot be done so long as guns are placed on the mainland and are shooting at the island. The only thing that can be done is to take some of the coastline itself.

Mr. President, picture our situation with respect to these little islands. Suppose the Communists on the mainland began to shoot at forces of Chiang Kai-shek; or suppose the forces of Chiang Kai-shek began to shoot at the Communists first. Then suppose we went in and undertook to give Chiang's troops naval and air support and cover, even though we did not put any of our own troops on the island. I do not see how it would be possible for our ships and planes not to be hit and our men not to be killed and wounded. If that should happen, we would be engaged in world war III for certain. The grass would burn rapidly then. Things would move rapidly from one juncture to another, and we would quickly be engaged in a war over some little island in which we had no particular interest, which did not belong to us, which was not mandated to us, and in which we never had any trusteeship.

We would be in a particularly precarious situation on those little islands, considering the diverse interests of the United States and of Chiang Kai-shek.

Our interest is, and I hope it always will be, to stabilize that part of the world and to have peace. But that is not Chiang Kai-shek's interest. Chiang Kai-shek's interest is to get air cover in that area, so that he will be able to move his troops onto the mainland and to engage in a reinvasion of Communist China. He has said that all along, so there cannot be any question about his intention. He has been forthright.

I can imagine what would probably be the first thing to happen if we should place air cover over Chiang's troops on Quemoy, and the Red planes were driven back. If Chiang should go onto the mainland, and we could not stop him from going, then there would be nothing else to do but to give him air cover when he reached the mainland.

I have in my hand a copy of the New York Times of January 1, 1955, in which various world leaders were expressing their opinion about what the new year held in store. The following statement was special to the New York Times from Taipei, Formosa:

> A full-scale war between the Chinese Nationalists and Communists may break out at "any time," Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, President of Nationalist China, said today in a New Year's message.
>
> He declared that Communist attacks against the Nationalist island outposts of Quemoy and the Tachens in the last 3 months were overtures to the battle for the Strait of Formosa.
>
> This statement in a New Year message was regarded as significant, since Generalissimo Chiang earlier had contended, as he did again today, that Communist invasion of Formosa would be the beginning of the destruction of the Communist regime on the Chinese mainland.
>
> He also warned the world that "1955 will witness the further deterioration of international relations." He did not elaborate this statement.

No, Mr. President, we are there with someone who has a different motive from the one we have. We are there furnishing airpower and naval support for a man whose purpose is to get back on the mainland of China, and who knows that the only way the Chinese mainland can be successfully invaded is with our support. Our military leaders have said so. Naturally, he may be expected to try to get us into a war by whatever means he can. I think we are taking a course which may lead to the grave danger of war, and it is an unnecessary course.

We are on clear ground when we talk about Formosa and the Pescadores, and the American people think that that is all that is embodied in the resolution. I do not know why the administration did not put the names of the islands in the resolution, and let the American people know which ones we were going to defend. Why did not the administration put in the names of the islands, so the American people could know for the defense of what islands we were granting authority for the use of naval, air, and Army troops, if necessary, in defense of the little islands off the coast of China?

I wish to say frankly that the President's statement helps us a great deal. It at least alleviates the fear that a line officer might decide that a certain military concentration on the mainland of China should be bombed. But, Mr. President, that area is many miles away in the Pacific, and the President is in this country. After all, we must consider the language in the resolution as it is before the Senate.

I do not know what action the President would take under the proposed resolution, but it clearly authorizes action which the free world outside the United States may not regard as defensive, and authorizes action which is more likely to precipitate than deter war with Red China.

Mr. President, one of the great difficulties about this matter is that if we get into war over one of those little islands, which is where war would come if it should come—and I hope it will not—what is going to be our situation as far as having allies is concerned? Do we want to assume responsibility for getting into a war with Red China which will last for years and years, as a result of which war, even if our forces won, we would have a worse situation than existed before?

Other nations have an interest in protecting Formosa. Other nations are obligated, on high legal and moral principles, in joining with us, as they joined with us when we were in a war against Japan. But have we seen one ally that has stated it would join with us in a war against Red China if it happened as a result of protecting one of these little islands? I have not seen such a statement, and we should have powerful friends in the world. The statement I have seen nearest to that—and this has been spoken of many times—is a statement attributed to Anthony Eden, which was published in the Washington Star of January 26, 1954.

I wish to pay high tribute to the inincreasing wholesome influence of that leader of our great and powerful ally, Great Britain, in the interest of world security. It was Anthony Eden who had a large part in salvaging the nine-power agreement, which may be greatly worthwhile, from the defeat by the French Chamber of Deputies of the European Defense Community. Mr. Eden is a man of wisdom, vision, and friendship for this country, and I have great confidence in him. But, Mr. President, Mr. Eden, in defending the pending proposal before the House of Commons, tried to make it clear that, in his opinion, there was not involved the defense of the little offshore islands. I have in my hand a copy of the Washington Evening Star of January 26, 1954, from which I read the following:

> Referring to President Eisenhower's request to Congress to authorize him to use United States Armed Forces to defend Formosa, the Pescadores, and related localities, Mr. Eden said:
>
> "The British Government is convinced that the object of the United States administration has also been to reduce the risks of any extension of the fighting."
>
> Mr. Eden said that President Eisenhower, in his message to Congress, "has been careful to say that he is not suggesting that the United States should enlarge its defensive obligations beyond Formosa and the Pescadores as provided by the mutual defense treaty with (Chinese Nationalist) Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek.

In other words, Mr. Eden apparently is under the impression that we are not going to defend those little coastal islands, and that such a defense is not contemplated by the resolution. He has not had a chance to read the resolution. Some of us think such defense may be involved in the resolution. Mr. Eden thinks the resolution contains the same language as that contained in the proposed treaty of mutual assistance between Chiang Kai-shek and the United

States, which is now before the Committee on Foreign Relations. But the language is not the same. That mutual assistance pact merely mentions Formosa and the Pescadores. It does not contain the language, "and such other islands as are now in friendly hands." It is my opinion that if we should get into conflict as a result of trying to defend those coastal islands—and, frankly, I do not see how we could avoid it—we would be very lucky if we found we had any friends or allies who wished to fight with us. We need not, in an attempt to save our honor, take that position. We have a legal and an honorable status with regard to Formosa and the Pescadores. We have world opinion with us as far as those islands are concerned; but, Mr. President, we do not, under the terms of the pending resolution.

Mr. President, I do not know that any resolution is necessary to reaffirm our intention to defend Formosa and the Pescadores. I certainly would not object to the resolution if that is all it proposed to do. I would be strongly for it, as I have said. I had hoped that, in the interest of real national unity, without any equivocation or reservations whatsoever, the resolution could be limited to Formosa and the Pescadores; but I do have grave doubts and reservations about a resolution which might carry us beyond what is necessary for the defense of Formosa.

I am opposed to becoming involved in the Chinese civil war. I think our policy should be to divorce and isolate Formosa from the Chinese civil war, and I do not see how we can do that if we tie the defense of Formosa with the defense of Quemoy and Matsu.

I know it may be argued that if we do not undertake to defend the coastal islands, we might be letting Chiang Kai-shek down. Mr. President, I am interested in the welfare of this Nation. I do not think, over the course of years, Chiang Kai-shek has been too reliable. I do not wish to disparage Chiang Kai-shek, but I submit that it would be even to his advantage if the United States were to defend Formosa and the Pescadores, without getting involved in the other islands.

Frankly, I would rather have Chiang Kai-shek, even with all his shortcomings, in control on the mainland, than to have it controlled by the Godless Communists, whom we know will always cause us difficulty, and with whom we know we shall never be able to get along. But, Mr. President, I am unwilling to underwrite with American men, might, and military strength an undertaking to get Chiang Kai-shek back onto the mainland of China. It is reported in the press that the message and resolution include the offshore islands only for trading purposes, or perhaps only to keep the Reds guessing. But we have no assurance of that, and the very purpose of the resolution fails if it is unclear and murky. The administration may desire to keep the Reds guessing, but it also compels us to guess whether we are standing for peace or war.

Mr. President, it seems to me that in connection with the joint resolution as it now stands, since it has been sent to us, we have to consider what its language means. Direct language is before us for our consideration. We should not have to rely for an interpretation of the language on some press reports or upon an interpretation made by the President—either by the present President of the United States or by future Presidents. Our action should be controlled by a consideration of whether the language of the joint resolution will be good for the Nation or whether it will result in getting the Nation into an unjustified war.

An unusually well-informed correspondent, Mr. Stewart Alsop, told us in Wednesday's press that there is a definite decision, in accordance with Admiral Radford's recommendation, to defend Quemoy and Matsu and, in so doing, to bomb the mainland of China. As a result of the press conference given by Chiang Kai-shek on January 1, he was reported as saying he thought there would be a war there in a very short time, and the press dispatch went on to say that he made that statement immediately following a long conference with Admiral Radford. Certainly that does not look too good to me; that does not look as if there was any deterring effect upon Chiang Kai-shek as a result of his conversation or conference with Admiral Radford.

Let us make no mistake about it, Mr. President: The bombing of the Chinese mainland would mean all-out war with Red China, with the probable intervention of Russia, because of Russia's obligation under the Sino-Russian treaty. If war comes in that way, we shall have to fight it without assurance of any substantial help from our friends and allies in the free world.

Mr. President, if we are going to have to fight the Communists, I cannot imagine a worse place for us to do so than in a fight over these little coastal islands. We have already had the experience of fighting the Communists in a place which was most disadvantageous to us. I would imagine, Mr. President, that it would please very highly the Communists of Soviet Russia to have our military power be bogged down in a fight with Red China in that part of the world, over a little island as to which our legal and moral position is not too clear.

How about Europe? Are our forces in Europe going to be weakened, so as to make it easier for Red Russia to invade there, if she decides she wishes to do so? If we wish to maintain the balance of power we now have in Western Europe or the position of power we now have there, that would mean a very drastic enlargement of our armed services, because in that event we would have to deploy a great many men in the area of the world to which the joint resolution relates, if we were to get into a war there.

Mr. President, it is not surprising that in yesterday's press there were also indications that our stand in regard to the offshore islands is delaying and frustrating the efforts of our friends and allies in the United Nations to obtain a cease-fire agreement. A firm declaration of our intent to defend Formosa and the Pescadores will at least deter or at least long defer a war. At least it would have the effect of preventing a war for a long time. But I am afraid that a declaration of our intent to defend the offshore islands would not be likely to deter or prevent a war. On the contrary, I fear it would precipitate a war.

A strong, militant Red China is not likely to tolerate having these small islands in the immediate front of Red China's port cities remain in unfriendly hands, if Red China can help it. Chiang Kai-shek still claims the mainland, and Mao Tse-tung claims these coastal islands, which always have belonged to the Chinese mainland. These islands are not much further from those Chinese ports than Staten Island is from the port of New York. God grant that if the joint resolution in its present form is passed and becomes law, we may still avoid war. I doubt whether the action it authorizes even squares with our obligations under the United Nations Charter. I agree with the President that "its purpose is peace." But, Mr. President, I am afraid that the joint resolution, in its present form, may, if enacted into law, bring us nearer to war and farther away from our friends and allies in the free world.

Mr. President, today we are talking about a display of unity in connection with the joint resolution. I wish to have us united both at home and with our friends in the rest of the world. But I am afraid that we may be sowing the seeds of disunity.

If we wish to have absolute unity in this matter in the United States, we can have it, I think, to the extent of 99.9 percent, by limiting our defense to what is necessary for the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores. However, the joint resolution includes authority to defend these other islands. I know, Mr. President, that many Senators have said—and many of them have told me—"Well, the joint resolution is here; and if all Senators did not like it, what would happen?"

If all Members of the Senate felt about the joint resolution as I and a number of other Senators do, we would have before us a joint resolution behind which we could have absolute unity.

Besides, Mr. President, all Senators must follow the dictates of their conscience.

Of course, the joint resolution is here. But we did not ask that it be sent here. I know of nothing to do in this case except what each Senator thinks is right under the circumstances.

Mr. President, I should like to call attention again to the address made the day before yesterday by Mr. Anthony Eden, when he spoke in defense of the President. As I have said before, Anthony Eden stated, in defense of the President, that the policy of the United States is to defend Formosa and the Pescadores. However, I do not know what would have happened on that occasion if the actual wording "to include the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands" had been before the House of Commons at that time. The policy Mr. Eden stated on

the floor of the House of Commons—the policy with respect to Formosa and the Pescadores—I wish to see clearly stated here. It is a policy for which we can obtain firm and united support at home and abroad. For that policy there is a legal, moral, and military basis. My concern is that in the joint resolution Congress appears to be expressing a different policy.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and ask for a vote on my amendment.

During the delivery of Mr. KEFAUVER's speech,

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, immediately following the speech of the Senator from Tennessee, what I consider a very significant speech, which was made by the Honorable L. B. Pearson, Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs, in the Canadian House of Commons, on January 25, 1955, in which he discussed in a very able manner the message of the President of the United States, and with particular reference to the matter of a United Nations cease-fire, which the Senator from Tennessee has so ably discussed. I think Mr. Pearson's speech is one which should be available in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, not only for the reading of Senators, but also for the reading of the public at large.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Following is text of statement on Formosa and the coastal islands made in the House of Commons on January 25, 1955, by Hon. L. B. Pearson, Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs:)

The President of the United States yesterday sent to Congress an important message dealing with the situation in the Formosa Strait. The President's proposals in this message are, of course, a matter of United States policy. The United States has particular commitments of its own in this area. These, and the effect of the President's message on them, will now be under consideration by Congress and it would not, of course, be appropriate for me or for any member of this Government to comment on this aspect of the matter.

Although we are not involved in United States commitments in this area we are, of course, gravely concerned at the dangerous situation existing there and we are, with other free governments, anxious that steps should be taken to bring to an end fighting which has now been taking place for some time along the China coast.

In this message the President of the United States has referred to the possibility of action by the United Nations to bring about a cease-fire. The United Nations has, in Indonesia, Palestine, and in other parts of the world, been successful in bringing to an end fighting which might have had dangerous consequences, and if it could achieve similar results in this case it would be a cause, I am sure, for great satisfaction.

If the question is raised in the United Nations, and there are reports that it may be raised, this would presumably take place in the Security Council of which Canada is not at present a member. However, we are being kept informed of developments in regard to such a reference and are watching them with great interest and some concern. Incidentally, an essential party to any cease-fire of this kind would be the Communist government of China which, though a non-member of the United Nations, would have to be invited I assume to participate in the Security Council deliberations if they were to have any chance of success. Whether, of course, this particular government would accept such an invitation is another matter.

While it is not proper for me to comment on American policy on this matter which is now being considered by Congress, I think I can say that any move or proposal within the United Nations or through diplomatic channels which could serve to achieve the purpose as stated in the President's message "to improve the prospects of peace in the area" will be warmly welcomed by the Parliament and people of this country.

Before the Korean armistice, I expressed on more than one occasion in the House the view of the Government that Formosa should be neutralized as far as possible while hostilities continued in Korea. We thought then, and we think now that the final disposition of Formosa should be a subject to be discussed at a conference on Far Eastern problems which at that time we thought might be held after the cessation of fighting in Korea. This was the view adopted by the Political Committee of the United Nations General Assembly on January 13, 1951. Despite the developments since then, it remains the view of the Government that the final disposition of Formosa should be dealt with by international negotiation if you like, at a conference on Far Eastern problems if one could be held. In any decision regarding the future of Formosa the wishes of the people there, which are often forgotten, would naturally be a primary consideration. Pending such a decision I think that a strong case can be made for the neutralization of Formosa both in order to prevent any assault upon it by Communist forces and also so that it will not be used as a base for invasion of the mainland.

In this area of tension and danger a distinction, I think, can validly be made between the position of Formosa and the Pescadores and the islands off the China coast now in Nationalist hands. The latter are indisputably part of the territory of China; the former, Formosa and the Pescadores, which were Japanese colonies for 50 years prior to 1945 and had had a checkered history before that, are not. I suggest therefore that the considerations which recommend the neutralization of Formosa and the Pescadores do not apply to the coastal islands so close to the mainland but about 100 miles or so away from Formosa. Therefore, I welcome that part of the President's message which looks to the redeployment of the Nationalist forces. "Some of these forces," the President's message states, "are scattered throughout smaller offshore islands as a result of historical rather than military reasons directly related to defending Formosa."

My understanding of the basis of a truce or cease-fire is that neither the Nationalists, the government of China which we recognize, nor the Communists need be asked to give up their claims on the territory now held by the other side. What they would be asked to give up, of course, is the use of military means to achieve their aspirations. In other words, negotiations for a cease-fire need not involve any question of the final disposition of the territory in dispute, for in our view this is a suitable matter for international negotiation at a later date through the United Nations or otherwise.

I am sure that this House will particularly welcome the closing paragraph of the President's message which is as follows:

"Our purpose is peace. That cause will be served if, with your help, we demonstrate our unity and our determination. In all that we do we shall remain faithful to our obligations as a member of the United Nations to be ready to settle our international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon, and I know the speech to which he has referred is a very able one by a great Canadian statesman, and will be of interest to the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. CLEMENTS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is the pending question the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] numbered "1-26-55-E"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I hope this amendment will be rejected. It is a complete substitute for the joint resolution which has already passed the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] if present would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] is absent on official business as a member of the American delegation attending the 10th anniversary of the World War II Battle of Alsace, at Colmar, France.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are absent on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Vermont, [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and

the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 11, nays 75, as follows:

YEAS—11

Gore	Kilgore	McNamara
Humphrey	Lehman	Morse
Jackson	Long	Neuberger
Kefauver	Magnuson	

NAYS—75

Aiken	Eastland	Monroney
Allott	Ellender	Mundt
Anderson	Ervin	Murray
Barkley	George	O'Mahoney
Barrett	Goldwater	Pastore
Beall	Green	Payne
Bender	Hayden	Purtell
Bennett	Hennings	Robertson
Bible	Hickenlooper	Russell
Bridges	Hill	Saltonstall
Bush	Holland	Schoeppel
Butler	Hruska	Scott
Byrd	Ives	Smathers
Capehart	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Case, N. J.	Kerr	Sparkman
Case, S. Dak.	Knowland	Stennis
Clements	Kuchel	Symington
Cotton	Langer	Thurmond
Curtis	Malone	Thye
Daniel	Mansfield	Watkins
Dirksen	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Douglas	Martin, Pa.	Wiley
Duff	McClellan	Williams
Dworshak	Millikin	Young

NOT VOTING—10

Bricker	Fulbright	Neely
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Potter
Flanders	Kennedy	
Frear	McCarthy	

So Mr. KEFAUVER's amendment was rejected.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 7, it is proposed to insert a period after the word "attack" and strike the remainder of the sentence down through line 11.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me so that I may request the yeas and nays?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas nad nays on the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I shall not speak at great length on the amendment. The purpose of the amendment has been discussed very ably on previous occasions by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], by the junior Senator from New York, and by other Senators.

However, I believe the amendment is one of the most important amendments that has ever come before the Senate. It is simple in its implications. Section 1 of the resolution now reads, in part:

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States be and he hereby is authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack.

Up to that point I believe all Senators are in full and affirmative agreement. I have not heard a word uttered by any Senator that he would not wholeheartedly support the protection and defense of Formosa and the Pescadores. I have so expressed myself not once but many times.

I believe wholeheartedly that on both moral and strategic grounds the United States should and must defend Formosa and the Pescadores and prevent their falling into the hands of the Communists.

If section 1 of the pending resolution ended as is now proposed by our amendment, there would certainly be a unanimous vote in favor of its adoption. However, the section continues:

This authority to include the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands and the taking of such other measures as he—

The President—

judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

Of course, it is widely recognized—and I believe it is recognized without dissent so far as Congress is concerned—that the President has other broad powers which enable him to carry out the duties imposed upon him under the Constitution. Those powers stem from the Constitution. They are given to him without reserve. They are recognized as necessary for the conduct of the defense of our Nation. Those powers have been asserted many times by Presidents of the United States. It was under that constitutional authority that President Truman sent the 7th Fleet to Formosa.

The fleet was continued there under definite orders of President Eisenhower. No one, of course, can criticize a President for carrying out the responsibilities which repose in his office. This resolution does not limit the constitutional authority of the President, but rather it gives the President further powers, unlimited in scope, unspecified in character, and without any restriction at all, As I look at it, it seems to me that the powers we give him are not in any way powers which he needs in order to defend Formosa and the Pescadores, because those powers already repose, under the Constitution, in the President of the United States. What we do is to say, "Mr. President, you can do anything you want to do, whether it be constitutional or unconstitutional, because the Congress of the United States has given you that authority."

There is no limit, so far as I can see, to what the President of the United States—and I need not assure Senators that the President personally has my great respect and confidence—can do under the resolution. We are giving him a predated blank check to do in the Formosa Strait, or on the mainland, or on the islands adjacent to China, anything he thinks is advisable in his sole authority.

Certainly, Mr. President, I do not believe the Congress of the United States should limit the President in the performance of the duties which he believes to be necessary in the defense and security of our Nation. But when he goes beyond his constitutional responsibilities, he must do so on his own responsibility and not be able to say, "Yes; I did this even though it may not be constitutional, but I did it on authority given to me by the Congress of the United States."

Mr. President, I cannot conceive of anything more dangerous than that which is now proposed. We have confidence in the President of the United States who now occupies that high office. We do not know what is going to happen in the future. What we do here tonight will be a precedent. We both limit the constitutional authority of the President and, in the same breath, broaden the powers of the President which are not his under constitutional provision.

I believe, Mr. President, it is an extremely dangerous thing we are contemplating doing. I think it is very dangerous because I do not know what is going to happen in the future under the unrestricted and unlimited power we now propose to give to the President, not by constitutional means, but merely by action of the Congress. There is no question whatsoever, as I have many times said before, that we must and should defend Formosa and the islands immediately adjacent to it. But I do not think we are ready to say to anyone, either to the commander of our forces in that area, or even to the President of the United States, that we will allow him or anyone else to embroil us in a great war on the mainland of China which may light the fires of the third world war.

We have a perfectly sound position in defending Formosa. Formosa has not belonged to China for more than 50 years. During this time it was under the jurisdiction of Japan. We took Formosa from Japan at the end of the second world war and it was placed under the protection and jurisdiction of the United States. In accepting that jurisdiction we, of course, assumed a great responsibility which I believe we have carried out to the full.

We have a good case there, Mr. President. Communist China cannot claim that Formosa belongs to her. No other country, even though it recognizes Communist China, can claim that Formosa is a possession of or a part of the mainland of China. That is not true of Quemoy, Matsu, and some of the other islands which are now under discussion. They have always, so far as I know, certainly for centuries, belonged to China. They have not been taken away from China. The distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] pointed out in a colloquy with me yesterday that they belong to China. But to which China? It makes no difference for when we intervene in a fight on the mainland or in a fight on Quemoy or Matsu, or the Tachen Islands, we are directly intervening in a civil war.

Mr. President, the Senate just voted on a substitute amendment which called for the intervention of the United Nations in the hope that a cease-fire order might be secured. The moment we get away from our juridical right to protect Formosa and the Pescadores—and it is a strong juridical right—and we attempt to interfere in some other spot, I believe our action will inevitably be construed by the Communist Chinese government and by many of our allies as intervention in a civil struggle within China, and

I believe our chances of success in persuading the United Nations to intervene and to work for a cease-fire order, for which we all hope, will be greatly reduced if not completely lost.

The President of the United States does not need the completely unlimited, unrestricted, and undefined powers which we propose to give him under the resolution. The Constitutional powers which are lodged with the President today are so great that he can take care of any emergency which may arise. But, instead of being willing to accept the responsibilities of the office of the President, as every other President has done, we are now asked blindly to give him completely unlimited, completely undefined, completely unspecified and completely unknown powers which can involve us in difficulties the extent of which and the seriousness of which cannot possibly be foreseen or described.

Mr. President, I know perfectly well that my colleague from Oregon and I are not going to prevail in having the amendment adopted. I believe with all my heart that it should be adopted, so that we may all vote unreservedly for the affirmation of the principle which has been held for more than 5 years, namely, that the United States has a great responsibility to protect and safeguard Formosa and the Pescadores, and to prevent their falling into the hands of the Communist Reds on the mainland.

I know that we who are sponsors of the amendment are not going to win; but I believe we are, at least, doing the right thing. We are offering the President all the power which he needs. We are not only offering him that power, but we are urging its acceptance. We are urging the passage of an amended resolution for which every Member of the Senate can vote wholeheartedly, in complete sincerity, and with deep conviction.

The pending resolution is not designed to protect the rights of Congress. It is not designed to protect even the rights of the President of the United States. In my opinion, if we pass this resolution, it will be a declaration that Congress is willing to abdicate its responsibilities and to place them, unlimited, undefined, unspecified, and unreservedly, in the hands of the President of the United States.

It makes no difference how greatly we respect our President. I have respected every President whom I have known, and my recollection goes back a great many years, to the days of President Garfield. I would not give the unlimited powers which are set forth in this resolution to any President, be he Democrat or Republican. I would not have given those powers, if I had been in the Senate, to Wilson, a Democrat, for whom I had the greatest respect; or to Franklin Roosevelt or Truman, both Democrats, for both of whom I had the greatest respect and regard.

I am sorry the President has asked for these wide powers. I, as one Senator, do not think that we would be justified in giving them to him.

So, Mr. President, I very much hope, contrary to my expectations, that my colleagues in the Senate will support and agree to the amendment which the junior Senator from Oregon and I have offered.

Mr. LEHMAN subsequently said: Mr. President, this morning I received a telegram signed by four very distinguished professors of the University of Chicago faculty, namely, Walter Johnson, Charles M. Hardin, Hans J. Morgenthau, and Quincy Wright.

I ask unanimous consent that the telegram may be printed at the end of my remarks in connection with the amendment which I offered this evening.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 27, 1955.*

Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Undersigned members of University of Chicago faculty respectfully request your vote against authorization to start preventive war by extending defense of Formosa and Pescadores to offshore islands.

WALTER JOHNSON.
CHARLES M. HARDIN.
HANS J. MORGENTHAU.
QUINCY WRIGHT.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected. The fact of the matter is that the language contained in the resolution is as it was recommended by the President, by the National Security Council, and by the Joint Chiefs of Staff; as it was passed by the House by the overwhelming vote of 410 to 3; and as it was reported to the Senate by the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services.

If at this time, after the bluster of Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai regarding this situation, the Senate were to modify the resolution, in my judgment, such an action would be considered a backdown on the part of the Government of the United States of America. Furthermore, I think it would be interpreted throughout the Chinese Communist part of the world as being intended as a "come-on" to take the coastal islands. This would not be in our national interest, and certainly it would not be in the interest of the adequate defense of the island chain, of which Formosa and the Pescadores are an integral part.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, are we to understand that the Senate has under discussion amendment "1-26-55—B," originally proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut is correct.

Mr. BUSH. I listened attentively to the extended remarks of the Senator from Minnesota this morning, and I have listened carefully to the statement by the Senator from New York, who also is a sponsor of the amendment.

I say with all respect that it seems to me they are objecting to something which does not in any way increase the authority given to the President, or intended to be given to the President, by the joint resolution, but only clarifies the language which appears in the first part of the resolution down through the word "attack" on page 2, line 7, because in line 5 are the words "as he deems necessary."

After listening, off and on, to the debate throughout the day, it seems to me that the language "as he deems necessary" cannot be broadened, and that the language following the word "attack," which the amendment would strike out, is merely clarifying, and only suggests that if a defense shall be undertaken, the United States will not have to fight with its bare hands on the beaches of Formosa or the Pescadores.

So I fail to understand why there is objection to this language, because I submit, after listening to this argument all day, that it seems quite clear that the language does not amplify the powers given to the President, but simply explains what the language in line 5 says implicitly, namely, that the President can do whatever is necessary to be done, and only suggests that the other things might possibly be necessary.

I join with my distinguished leader in expressing the hope that the amendment will be rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] for himself and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The yeas and nays having been ordered, the Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], if present, would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] is absent on official business as a member of the American delegation attending the 10th anniversary of the World War II Battle of Alsace, at Colmar, France.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 13, nays 74, as follows:

YEAS—13

Byrd	Langer	Morse
Fulbright	Lehman	Murray
Humphrey	Long	Neuberger
Kefauver	Mansfield	
Kilgore	McNamara	

NAYS—74

Aiken	Ellender	Monroney
Allott	Ervin	Mundt
Anderson	George	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Goldwater	Pastore
Barrett	Gore	Payne
Beall	Green	Purtell
Bender	Hayden	Robertson
Bennett	Hennings	Russell
Bible	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hill	Schoeppel
Bush	Holland	Scott
Butler	Hruska	Smathers
Capehart	Ives	Smith, Maine
Carlson	Jackson	Smith, N. J.
Case, N. J.	Jenner	Sparkman
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Stennis
Clements	Kerr	Symington
Cotton	Knowland	Thurmond
Curtis	Kuchel	Thye
Daniel	Magnuson	Watkins
Dirksen	Malone	Welker
Douglas	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Duff	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Dworshak	McClellan	Young
Eastland	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—9

Bricker	Frear	McCarthy
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Flanders	Kennedy	Potter

So the amendment offered by Mr. LEHMAN, for himself and Mr. MORSE, was rejected.

Mr. BYRD subsequently said: Mr. President, following the vote on the last amendment, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement of my position on the amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

President Eisenhower's action in requesting the passage of a joint resolution authorizing him to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for the protection and security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories in that area is unprecedented in American history.

I commend the President for this approach to the problem confronting us. In his message, asking the Congress to approve this joint resolution, the President did not, in any measure, waive his constitutional authority to protect our security from attack. Evidently, it was his intention to ask the advice of the Congress of the United States before taking a momentous step affecting our national security.

I do not believe the President wanted Congress to be a mere rubber stamp. He wanted us, after careful consideration, to advise and counsel.

The President did not ask of Congress a present declaration of war. In effect, he asked for an authorization to use our Armed Forces, should necessity arise, to achieve the objectives set forth in his address to the Congress and in the resolution which has been presented.

Actually, he requested a predated declaration of war on the part of Congress. It was testified before the joint meeting of the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees that legally no further declaration of war would be required should hostilities break out in China or elsewhere in the area.

However, it was also stated that the President would come to Congress again if, in his opinion, a major land invasion of China becomes necessary.

The joint meetings of the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees, extending over a period of 3 days, and presided over jointly by Senators GEORGE and RUSSELL, developed clearly the purposes of the action requested by the President. They also developed the dangerous potentialities involved. The gravity of the situation was frankly recognized.

On December 2, 1954, a treaty was signed between the Republic of China and the United States of America. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles signed on the part of our country, and George K. C. Yeh on the part of the Republic of China. This treaty was submitted to the Senate for ratification on January 6, and it is now under consideration by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

It should be noted that the treaty differs in two important particulars from the joint resolution. Article No. 1 of the treaty provides that "the parties undertake, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle any international dispute in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace, security, and justice are not in danger; and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

This article of the treaty, therefore, provides that no action involving force can be taken "in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations," and thus requires other consultation with, or joint action by, the United Nations.

Section 6 of the treaty names the territories of the Republic of China as Taiwan (Formosa) and the Pescadores. It makes no reference to other territories but it adds that, by mutual consent, implementation can be made.

In contrast with the treaty which has already been signed, but not yet ratified by the Senate, the joint resolution omits any direct reference to the United Nations except in the last clause which reads as follows:

"This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and the security of the area are reasonably assured by international conditions created by the actions of the United Nations, or otherwise, and shall so report to Congress."

Is the joint resolution intended to implement the treaty? If it is, orderly procedure would seem to require the Senate to ratify the treaty first. If it is not an implementation of the treaty, is the treaty necessary?

I accept the judgment of the President and our military authorities that Formosa and the Pescadores are in the Pacific perimeter of our security. In the joint committee meeting I supported an amendment to exclude from the joint resolution the words "this authority to include the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands," so that the resolution would read:

"*Resolved, etc.*, That the President of the United States be and he hereby is authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack and the taking of such measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

"This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations, or otherwise, and shall so report to the Congress."

If this amendment had been adopted in committee, the resolution would authorize the protection of Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack; but to avoid provoking war, the shoreline islands just a few miles off the China mainland would have been excluded.

It should be understood that the pending joint resolution was introduced after Red China had already conquered one of these islands and attacked others. This means that our intervention comes after the act; not before.

If it becomes our obligation to protect the coastline islands—especially Quemoy and Matsu—now held by the Chinese Nationalists, it will be difficult to avoid war with China, assuming the Chinese Reds continue on the offensive. Our planes covering these island operations would necessarily have to fly over armed Red Chinese territory.

Can we, Mr. President, underwrite the conduct and operations of Nationalist Chinese garrisons in their day-to-day, hour-to-hour, contacts with a militarily aggressive enemy? Should we obligate ourselves for whatever force is necessary to maintain these garrisons and their extremely exposed positions?

It is probable that, day by day, for years to come, there will be conflict between troops on these offshore islands and the Communist regime. When someone attacks you from within 6 or 8 miles, you return the fire and counterattack. This means war and in this instance almost necessarily involves land operations.

Such circumstances are virtually certain to open wide the door for a shooting war on the mainland of China with all of its disastrous consequences.

It is for this reason, and in the belief that the President intended the Members of Congress to give frank opinion, that I voted in committee to delete the language including these offshore islands.

I will vote for the similar amendment now pending before the Senate.

In addition to what I have said to this point, there is another element in this situation which is somewhat delicate to discuss, but it cannot be ignored. If the pending treaty is ratified, we would enter into close partnership, on equal terms, with Chiang Kai-shek, the undisputed leader of the Republic of China. It was Chiang Kai-shek to whom America sent hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of war materials when the civil war began in China. Later, our valuable war materials were found not only in the black markets of China but also in the hands of the Communists.

We are becoming a partner with the leader of Chinese who have been driven from their country. Our purpose is to protect the perimeter of our defense. Above all, we do not want land warfare on the mainland of China. But the primary desire of Chiang Kai-shek is war on the mainland to recapture his power in Asia.

For his purposes, Chiang Kai-shek knows better than anyone else that he can never set foot on China again without American planes, troops, and ships.

As a Senator, it is my considered opinion that Chiang Kai-shek is motivated by self-interest; that when the critical time comes he may place his ambitions above the welfare of his American partner.

These conditions present an extremely dangerous situation which may force our country into a war with China, whether we want it or not. Preservation of our own security is the only justification for the United States to become embroiled in this controversy. In this instance, military experts assure us that this can be accomplished by protecting Formosa and the Pescadores. This perimeter should not be enlarged, and what we intend to do should be clearly set forth. This clarity does not exist in the pending resolution. The amendment I have just discussed would provide it.

Let us remember that in this cold war Russia has the timetable. Unless we engage deliberately in a preventive war, which is unthinkable to me, Russia can select the time and place of her attack. In the dangerous years ahead it is incumbent upon us to avoid in every possible way involvements which will weaken us should the final decision between Russia and ourselves come to climax in a world war.

Let no American underestimate the far-reaching consequences of the step about to be taken. We all hope it will bring stability

and peace in the Far East; but it may bring war. It may resolve in a land war with China, which would be interminable. With its nearly 500 million people, China has never yet been conquered.

For years I have been convinced that Russia deliberately is seeking to sap our strength and weaken us both financially and militarily by trapping us into wars which may be preliminary to a direct attack on this country. I think it is her purpose to strain our economy and our defense with remote and costly wars in which there is no chance of military decision.

During the Korean war, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I repeatedly inquired whether a single Russian soldier had been captured or killed among the North Koreans. The answer was "No" in every instance. Our Korean war casualties were numbered by the tens of thousands, and our expenditures were counted in the billions, but Russia did not lose a single soldier.

If we should engage our forces in China, and if the Korean war should break out again, what would be our position against a Russian attack? We would then be fighting two wars 10,000 miles from home.

I fully appreciate that the President's belief is that this is a step toward peace. I pray God that it is. But let us remember that when President Truman opened hostilities in Korea, he declared it to be a police action.

I am convinced he was completely sincere in his statement at that time, but that police action developed into a costly and bloody war that lasted more than 3 years and ended by an inglorious truce. There is no true peace in Korea. Like a snake in the grass, the Korean war situation is still treacherous and may break out again.

I have great confidence in President Eisenhower. I respect his military decisions. He is the outstanding military man of this age.

I am firmly convinced that he sincerely wants to keep us out of war. He has demonstrated this burning desire by ending the armed conflict in Korea and by refusing involvement in the Indochina war.

I hope the amendment to which I have referred will be adopted because it will more clearly define our objectives and lessen the danger of being drawn into the mainland of China.

I will support passage of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is open to further amendment.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the joint resolution, which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the joint resolution it is proposed to add a new section as follows:

SEC. 2. Inasmuch as—

(1) the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is the activating agent behind every aggressive move of the Red rulers of China;

(2) the Red regime at Peiping is wholly dependent upon the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the weapons with which to wage aggressive war in the Far East;

(3) the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics represents brutal tyranny which now holds sway over 800 million human beings and aims ultimately at the enslavement of the entire human race;

(4) hope would be reborn among the captive peoples of Soviet totalitarianism by the assurance that the Government of the United States has no intention of dooming them to perpetual slavery by any act which has the effect of freezing the status quo;

(5) no advantage of any kind accrues to the American people or to the cause of world peace by the presence in the Soviet Union of diplomatic representatives from the United States;

(6) the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has continually and flagrantly violated its pledge of noninterference in the internal affairs of the United States; and

(7) it is wholly inconsistent to treat the Red regime of China as an outlaw among civilized governments while according diplomatic recognition to the master gangster-state;

it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that all diplomatic relations between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics be suspended and the consular representatives of this Nation be recalled until such time as the President may determine that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics no longer constitutes a threat to our peace and security.

SUSPEND THE RECOGNITION OF COMMUNIST RUSSIA—AMENDMENT TO SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 28—TACKLE THE MAN WITH THE BALL

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the amendment I have offered sets forth seven reasons for suspending relations with the Government of the U. S. S. R. All of these reasons relate to the resolution which is pending, but which applies specifically to the Government of Red China, which we do not recognize, and which I hope we never will recognize, but the recognition of which I believe has been agreed upon by high officials of this Nation for a considerable time.

Mr. President, my amendment sets forth that the Government of the U. S. S. R. is behind every aggressive move of the Red rulers of Red China. We are tackling every member of the team except the man with the ball.

The amendment states correctly that the Red regime at Peiping is dependent upon the Government of the U. S. S. R. for the weapons with which to wage aggressive war in the Far East. There is not a member on this floor who will dispute that statement.

The amendment further states that the Government of the U. S. S. R. is exercising a brutal tyranny over 800 million human beings, including the 400 million human beings enslaved in Red China.

I do not think that anyone will challenge that statement.

My amendment states that its adoption would revive hope in the hearts of these enslaved peoples, that no advantage accrues to America from the fact of Soviet recognition, that the Government of the U. S. S. R. has continually and flagrantly violated its pledge of noninterference in the internal affairs of the United States, and that it is wholly inconsistent to treat the Red regime in Red China as an outlaw while according diplomatic recognition to the master gangster state of them all.

I do not think that any Senator will deny the facts as stated in my amendment. Unless they can be successfully challenged—which they have not been and cannot be—there is not a reason in the world, in my opinion, for rejecting this amendment and continuing our diplomatic relations with the master gangster-outlaw.

The adoption of my amendment will rectify the greatest mistake that has been made in the history of our foreign relations, and a mistake which was made by executive agreement.

On November 16, 1933, the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt entered into an executive agreement with Maxim Litvinov, people's commissar for foreign affairs of the U. S. S. R., to recognize Soviet Russia.

I am sure every Member of the Senate has Senate Document No. 170 of the 82d Congress, entitled "The Constitution of the United States of America, Analysis and Interpretation," prepared by the Library of Congress. It states:

> The executive agreement attained its fullest development as an instrument of foreign policy under President Franklin D. Roosevelt, even at times threatening to replace the treatymaking power, if not formally, yet actually, as a determinative element in the field of foreign policy.

Mr. President, no truer words were ever published in a Senate document.

The quotation continues:

> Mr. Roosevelt's first important utilization of the executive-agreement device took the form of an exchange of notes on November 16, 1933, with Maxim M. Litvinov, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, whereby American recognition was extended to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in consideration of certain pledges, the first of which was the promise to restrain any persons or organizations under its direct or indirect control from any act overt or covert liable in any way whatsoever to injure the tranquility, prosperity, order, or security of the whole or any part of the United States.

That pledge was, of course, never kept. It was never intended by Soviet Russia to be kept. And ever since the agreement was signed between the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt and the People's Commissar of Red Russia, Russia has carried on active efforts to overthrow this Government by force and violence and active espionage to gain our military secrets. Red Russia has succeeded, too, as witness her success in obtaining the most vital secrets of our atom bomb, and presumably those of the hydrogen bomb. Yet we continue to recognize the Russians. They are spying on us today, and we still recognize them—all because of the executive agreement between a late President and a People's Commissar of the Soviet Union.

Since the day Soviet Russia was recognized by us, she has sought to destroy us from within. She has always sought to destroy us from outside our boundaries, and always will; but recognition gave her the desired vantage point from which to sabotage us from within our own land and institutions. She is doing that today.

She already has increased her strength manyfold from the facts and secrets she has stolen from us—industrial secrets, as well as those of the atom and the hydrogen bomb. She has gained strength from the recognition we have accorded her, and today is passing on this strength to the Red Chinese, the target of the pending joint resolution, as it now stands.

As I stated on the floor yesterday this resolution, without my amendment, is an indictment of the wrong outlaw, and a minor one at that.

My amendment is, in a sense, a perfecting amendment. It names the real

gang leader, and cuts off his diplomatic privileges, pending determination by the President that the peace of areas in the Pacific we are pledged to defend has been restored.

Mr. President, peace and security in the Pacific will never be restored until Red Russia is held accountable before the world for her many sins of espionage and aggression. My amendment does hold her accountable.

It carries no declaration of hositilities or threat of any military action.

What it does is merely to send her spies and saboteurs—and that includes all of her diplomats—packing home, where they belong, and rids our country of the vermin seeking to destroy us from within. Good riddance it will be, too; and we can achieve that now by adoption of my amendment.

Mr. President, I am for the President in this move, because he has—and it is the first time it has been done in two decades—marked a point in the Pacific Ocean at which our security will be threatened. I hope he will soon complete the job, by establishing extension of the 133-year-old Monroe Doctrine to both the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans, so as to let the people of those areas know that if any nation seeks to extend its form of government, through political, economic, or military influence, we will destroy that nation's war-making capacity by striking through the air in the heart land of that nation's war industries, and by letting such nation know we are prepared to do the job.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada. (Putting the question.)

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be submitted, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question now is, Shall it pass?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on this question—the question of final passage of the joint resolution—I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

ACTION BY UNITED NATIONS TO TERMINATE HOSTILITIES BETWEEN COMMUNIST CHINA AND NATIONALIST CHINA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall defer, Mr. President, to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I appreciate this courtesy.

I had intended earlier this evening to call up an amendment numbered 1–26–55–C, relating to the preamble of the joint resolution. I have discussed the amendment with the distinguished chairman of our Foreign Relations Committee. It was deemed wise and prudent in the present situation that the amendment not be called up, but that a proposal of a similar nature be advanced for consideration by the Foreign Relations Committee and, subsequently, by the entire Senate.

Mr. President, I now send to the desk, and request appropriate reference for it, a Senate resolution reading as follows:

Whereas the President of the United States on January 19, 1955, stated that he would "like to see the United Nations attempt to exercise its good offices" with respect to arranging a cease-fire between Communist China and Nationalist China;

Whereas the President in his message of January 24 stated that the situation in the Pacific area "is one for appropriate action of the United Nations under its Charter"; and

Whereas House Joint Resolution 159 provides that it shall expire when he determines that peace in the area is "reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United States or otherwise": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that it would be in the interest of the United States and of world peace for the United Nations to take prompt action to bring about a cease-fire in the area of hostilities off the coast of China and in the Formosa Straits, and the President is requested to take appropriate steps to achieve that objective.

Mr. President, I send the resolution to the desk. I realize that the only way the resolution could be considered this evening would be to have it considered after the vote on the pending measure; and, of course, that would also require unanimous consent. I have had indications that unanimous consent might not be available. Therefore, I prefer that we deal with the resolution in the regular, normal manner, under the regular procedure.

I think I can say with certainty that a large number of Members of the Senate have spoken to me about the resolution, and a number of Senators desire to join in sponsoring it. Among them are the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]; and I imagine there will be other Senators who will wish to join in sponsoring it. I should like to leave open an opportunity for cosponsorship of the resolution, in order to make that opportunity available to any other Members of the Senate who would like to join in sponsoring it. The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] has asked that he be included as one of its sponsors.

So, Mr. President, I now send the resolution to the desk.

At this time I desire to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am very happy that the Senator from Minnesota has asked for the reference of the resolution in order that it may take its regular course before the Foreign Relations Committee. I may say that it will be considered at a very early date—perhaps on Tuesday of next week. So far as I know, there will be no opposition to the resolution, because already New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the United States are concerned with this very problem, and will present on Monday next for consideration by the United Nations Security Council, as I am advised, the substance of this resolution. Therefore I am very glad that it is to be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I assure the Senator that it will be promptly acted upon.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. President, I have submitted this resolution because I believe it would carry out a very pertinent part of the President's message. In the light of the decision we are about to make, which decision I support, namely, the passage of House Joint Resolution 159, it would appear to be very appropriate for the Senate to forward the work which is already underway in the United Nations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolution (S. Res. 55) favoring action by the United Nations to terminate hostilities between Communist China and Nationalist China, submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself), Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. HILL), was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the President of the United States on January 19, 1955, stated that he would "like to see the United Nations attempt to exercise its good offices" with respect to arranging a cease-fire between Communist China and Nationalist China;

Whereas the President in his message of January 24 stated that the situation in the Pacific area "is one for appropriate action of the United Nations under its charter"; and

Whereas House Joint Resolution 159 provides that it shall expire when he determines that peace in the area is "reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United States or otherwise": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that it would be in the interest of the United States and of world peace for the United Nations to take prompt action to bring about a cease-fire in the area of hostilities off the coast of China and in the Formosa Strait, and the President is requested to take appropriate steps to achieve that objective.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF PROGRAM FOR TUESDAY

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I know that following the vote on the final passage of the joint resolution Members of the Senate will leave the Chamber quickly. I desire to announce that a motion will be made tonight to adjourn until Tuesday, and I should like to announce the legislative program for Tuesday.

On Tuesday the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty will be given preferential consideration.

On the legislative calendar, there appear order of business No. 6, Senate bill 613, a bill to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress

at any time before April 1, 1957, and also 6 Senate resolutions, orders of business Nos. 9 to 14 inclusive. These measures will be taken up on Tuesday next.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the acting majority leader yield to me?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Earlier in the evening I talked with the acting majority leader with reference to the resolution which I submitted a moment ago. I wonder if the acting majority leader would care to give any indication as to the procedure which might be followed in case the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should report that resolution favorably.

Mr. CLEMENTS. It will be the intention of the acting majority leader to take up that resolution as soon as it comes from the Foreign Relations Committee and is ready for consideration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the acting majority leader.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the acting majority leader yield to me?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. As the acting majority leader knows, the junior Senator from Virginia sent to some Virginia newspapers advance copies of a speech which he planned to make in the Senate on Monday. The acting majority leader has announced that there will be no session on Monday. Can the junior Senator from Virginia be assured that he can make his speech on Tuesday?

Mr. CLEMENTS. The acting majority leader will give such assurance as he is able to give under such circumstances.

While I am on my feet, I should like to thank my friend from Virginia for the generous way in which he accepted the proposal to adjourn until Tuesday rather than Monday.

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF ARMED FORCES TO PROTECT SECURITY OF FORMOSA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 159) authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, before the vote is taken on the pending joint resolution, let me say that, as Senators know, I have had many misgivings about our position in connection with the coastal islands and have so stated. An important national policy is about to be decided. I have done my best to have the joint resolution amended or to have a substitute adopted which I thought presented a better and safer policy. However, present indications are that the joint resolution will be passed. The President has announced that he, and he alone, will make the decision and issue the orders for any action other than directly at Formosa or the Pescadores. In effect he has assured that he will not allow Chiang to push us into action, nor will he allow any officer, including the Chief of the Joint Chiefs, to make that decision. I am confident that the American people do not want war, and certainly they do not want to strike the first blow, nor do they want to engage in any conflict where there is not a clear legal and moral justification to do so. They want to abide by the United Nations Charter, and they want to cooperate with our allies in the world.

I shall accept the President's assurances, for I know him to be an honorable man. I think it is time for us to close ranks behind the position of the President of the United States and present to the world as nearly unanimous a front as we possibly can.

With that point of view, and for that purpose, I expect to vote for the joint resolution despite the misgivings which I have stated.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, two articles. The first is entitled "Context of the New China Policy," written by Mr. Joseph C. Harsch, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of January 26, 1955.

The second article is entitled "Prospects of the New China Policy," written by Joseph C. Harsch and published in the Christian Science Monitor of January 27, 1955.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of January 26, 1955]

STATE OF THE NATIONS—CONTEXT OF THE NEW CHINA POLICY

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

WASHINGTON.—To understand the new China policy of the United States it is necessary to understand that it reflects a long-postponed, but no longer postponable, exercise in reconciling and blending two equally strong urges within the Eisenhower administration in Washington.

The first of these urges has been to obtain a "disengagement" of the United States from war and the danger of involvement in war on the mainland of Asia.

The second of these urges has been to sustain the Nationalist Government of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek on its exile home of Formosa.

From the opening month of the Eisenhower administration these have both been officially proclaimed policies of Washington. But they are policies which conflict at many points and which cannot easily be reconciled or blended.

Had there been only a policy of "disengagement" from war and the danger of involvement in war in Asia, Washington would long since have cut itself loose from its ties with Formosa. The Pentagon never has been categorical in its opinion that the retention of Formosa in friendly hands is essential to the military needs of the United States in the Far East. South Korea is considered much more necessary to the military security of Japan and Indochina much more valuable to the military security of Southeast Asia than Formosa is considered valuable to the defense of Japan and the Philippines. The Pentagon regards Formosa as desirable, but not as vital. A policy of "disengagement" would long since have led to the abandonment of a United States commitment to Formosa.

On the other hand, had there only been a policy of sustaining the Chinese Nationalist Government, Washington never would have allowed the military position of that government to be eroded by Chinese Communist military action. This action has been going on for over 2 years. Yikiangshan is by no means the first Nationalist-held island off the Chinese coast to be taken by the Communists. By a year ago they already had taken a dozen. Also, had there been no "disengagement" policy the reinvasion of Hainan Island off the south coast of China would have been undertaken a year ago, and General Chiang might well by this time be ready to return to the mainland; in fact, it is conceivable he might already hold some beachheads.

The two policies have been in conflict, and have in part nullified each other. "Disengagement" has operated against a full policy of sustaining General Chiang's purposes. The determination to sustain General Chiang has prevented a full "disengagement" policy.

Yet Washington never has been able to choose between the two policies. It has had powerful reasons for clinging to both.

The Eisenhower administration has clung to a "disengagement" policy for obvious reasons. When it took office the United States was, in the larger sense, at war with Communist China on three fronts—Korea, Indochina, and the Formosa Strait. Its priority promise to the voters in 1953 was a promise to end the Korean war. This was stage 1 of disengagement. It was the most generally popular single act of the administration during its first year in office. It made possible military budget reductions, and, in turn, provided the rationale for tax cuts. Disengagement on that front was popular, and became a major feature of the whole Eisenhower program at home. Neither budget cuts nor tax reductions could have been justified on any other basis.

The program from a settlement of the Korean war to a settlement of the Indochina war was a logical progression in disengagement. With equal logic Washington desires to proced now to settle its last active war front with Communist China. Only if this is done will the disengagement be complete and lasting.

But at this point disengagement cuts straight across the other policy of sustaining the hopes of Chiang Kai-shek, for from the moment of a cease-fire in the Formosa Strait General Chiang becomes head of the government in Formosa and retains nothing more than an empty title to mainland China. But General Chiang cannot be abandoned totally any more than disengagement could be abandoned. General Chiang is the last residue of a vast American investment in China dating back over a century. There are deep emotional and ideological commitments to him, not to mention political commitments.

The end result is the President's special message to the Congress of this week. It represents a maximum disengagement compatible with sustaining General Chiang on Formosa. Conversely, it represents a maximum of support for General Chiang compatible with a policy of disengagement. It will sustain General Chiang on Formosa, territory which the United States liberated from Japan. It will disengage itself from all territory which is historically Chinese, provided the Chinese Communists will leave Formosa and the Pescadores alone.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of January 27, 1955]

STATE OF THE NATIONS—PROSPECTS OF THE NEW CHINA POLICY

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

WASHINGTON.

Washington would have been much happier had it never been forced to seek the largest common denominator of its two conflicting

policies toward China—its policy of sustaining Chiang Kai-shek and its policy of disengaging the United States from war and the danger of war on the mainland of Asia.

As a matter of fact, the attempted reconciliation was postponed until the action of Communist China acted as a precipitation agent on Washington. When the Chinese Communists not only declared a policy of seeking the conquest of Formosa, but also began what appeared to be a preliminary military campaign among the offshore islands, Washington was finally and reluctantly forced to the point of decision.

Until the last week or so Washington was still clinging to the luxury of pursuing two conflicting policies toward China. It had negotiated a settlement of the Korean war and recognized a settlement of the Indochina war, but at the same time it continued to recognize Chiang Kai-shek's hopes that some day he might obtain United States support for his dream of a reinvasion of the Chinese mainland. At home the Washington Government proceeded to a partial demobilization, but in the Far East it allowed Chiang to bomb and raid the mainland, seize a Soviet oil tanker, and control shipping along the China coast.

When the Chinese Communists opened their island offensive and declared that Formosa was its ultimate target, Washington had to find a reconciled and unified China policy. Since it could not abandon Chiang entirely and since it was committed to a policy of coexistence with the Soviet Union, of disengagement from war in Asia, and of budget retrenchment and tax cutting at home, it had no alternative but an attempted blending of disengagement and Chiang.

This is what we now have. Chiang is to be defended on Formosa, which is not Chinese territory, having been Japanese for half a century and having been won from Japan by United States arms. But by implication and by all that was not said in the President's message Washington has renounced a policy of attempting to seek a political restoration in China proper. It is prepared to accept a cease-fire in the Formosa Strait.

But what are the prospects for the success of such a new China policy?

The reconciliation of the two policies may have come too late. The Chinese Communists are committed now at home to the invasion attempt. Their government has engaged its prestige in the cause. It would be extremely difficult for it to extricate itself even if it wished to do so. No western diplomat can know whether the men of Peking really desire to find a way out of their own commitment to their own people.

The role of Moscow is another enigma. Obviously the problem is a major one in the Kremlin. The Soviets are generally believed not to want a war at this time. Yet the Kaiser probably did not want a war in 1914, but was pulled into it by his only ally, Austria. China is Moscow's only real ally, the others being dependencies. Also Moscow is uneasy over the trend in Europe and might decide that a Chinese invasion of Formosa would be an advantage to its purposes in Europe. The whipsaw technique is an old one in power politics.

Washington, on the other hand, cannot possibly back down on the defense of Formosa itself.

If the Chinese Communists attempt an invasion of Formosa, the United States will fight. There is no doubt whatever in Washington on that point.

The chance for avoiding a war, or at the very least a localized battle for Formosa, depends largely on whether some mediator, presumably Dag Hammarskjold, can persuade Peking that it can obtain right now by peaceful negotiation everything it can ever obtain by resort to arms.

There is no longer any doubt about what Washington is willing to offer in return for a Formosa Strait cease-fire. It will allow the military forces of Peking to obtain all the offshore islands if, in return, Peking will abandon its military campaign against Formosa.

A cease-fire could be had tomorrow on those terms insofar as the United States is concerned. And the United States has the ability to enforce an acceptance of the terms by the government on Formosa.

The question remaining is whether Peiping will accept such terms.

No western man can do anything but guess about that. Washington hopes, because the domestic policies of the Eisenhower administration have been staked upon the assumption that there will be no major wars.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Presiding Officer be authorized to sign House Joint Resolution 159, even though the Senate be in adjournment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered—that is, assuming the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I take that for granted.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I shall vote against the pending joint resolution. I do not cast this vote lightly. I do not cast it without some regrets.

I had wished I could vote in favor of a resolution on this subject. I had hoped that it would be amended, by the adoption of the Kefauver substitute or by other amendments which have been offered, so that it would be in a form which could command my wholehearted support and my vote.

I want to vote for a congressional statement of support for the defense and security of Formosa and the Pescadores. I would be glad to say to our friends of the free world, and our enemies wherever they may be—whether in Moscow or in Peiping—that the Congress is wholeheartedly behind the President, and that the country is behind the President, in a determination that the status of Formosa and the Pescadores shall not be altered by aggression or force of arms.

I am ready to support, with all my heart, an affirmation that Formosa and the Pescadores do not belong to Communist China, and never will so belong, by force of arms.

I think the free world—including major portions of the so-called neutral nations of Asia—would support such a position by the United States.

I am sure we could rally the free world to support such a position. Our military power plus that of our allies, plus the vast strength of our moral position if we are supported by all the nations of the free world would thus insure the security of Formosa and the Pescadores, against any aggressive designs that the Communists might have, no matter how loud their boast or their threats.

I am pleased to know that the United Nations is going to take up, first in the Security Council and then in the General Assembly, if need be, the question of a cease-fire order between Communist China and the Formosa Government.

But, Mr. President, I still cannot vote for the joint resolution so long as it contains language which writes a blank check of dangerous authority—authority which can be used, or which might be used—to involve us in a war which we do not want and which the free world does not want, and indeed greatly fears.

I will not cast my vote for any joint resolution containing language which, in my judgment, increases the risk and danger of war, without concomitant benefit to the United States, the cause of peace, and the cause of free-world unity.

PRESIDENT CANNOT TRANSFER RESPONSIBILITY TO CONGRESS

The President of the United States has broad constitutional powers and authority. He is free, within the limits of his judgment, to use such power and authority to defend the United States. Whatever activities he deems essential for that purpose he can direct, without let or hindrance from Congress, though, of course, he remains responsible for the consequences of such action. Why must or should Congress write him a predated blank check of authority for acts which might be beyond his constitutional powers, but which are not spelled out in the pending joint resolution?

I will not vote my permission for the President to send our forces into the Quemoy and Matsu and Tachen island groups, under the guns of an irresponsible enemy. I will not vote to tell the President that he can do this with the implicit permission of Congress.

He can send the fleet wherever he chooses, but he should not ask the Congress in advance to authorize him to send the fleet and our Air Force into action which may, or which is likely, to involve us in war.

The possession of Quemoy and Matsu may be important to Chiang Kai-shek, but they are not essential to the security of the United States, or of the free world. The free world recognizes these islands as belonging to China, and it is an established fact, whether we like it or not, that most of the nations of the free world recognize the Red regime as being the government of China.

We dare not and must not put the free world alliance to this acid test, from which that alliance may suffer tragic strains and shocks. The world must know that we seek peace, not war; security, not unnecessary risk; strength, not power. We are neither the instrument nor the agent of Chiang Kai-shek in the Far East.

We are the leading power of the free world. We have a responsibility to all the American people. We have a responsibility to all our allies. We have a responsibility to mankind. Let us discharge that responsibility.

Mr. President, because of my views on this subject, I must reluctantly but with deep conviction cast my vote against the pending resolution.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the pending resolution which I had hoped originally to press very strongly and to bring to a vote.

However, I discussed the matter with the minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], in whom I have the utmost confidence. He suggested that perhaps by my action we would hold up the passage of the pending resolution and, if my amendment were

agreed to, make it necessary to send the amended resolution to conference. Therefore, I have agreed not to press the amendment.

I may say, however, that I strongly feel that something should be done along the line of my amendment, which merely provides that United States aid shall be discontinued to any country which ships goods to Red China or allows ships flying its flag to be used in the Red China trade.

I am very much disturbed to learn what is going on. Although I approve of the pending resolution, I am very much disturbed by the fact that although we had agreed to give Chiang Kai-shek 6 destroyers, we have given him only 2. Although we had agreed to give him aircraft, we are, instead, using aircraft in New Mexico for anti-aircraft targets. At the same time we are sending B–29's to Costa Rica, at a cost of $1 a plane. I believe that we should send some of those planes to Chiang Kai-shek, at $1 a plane. I am sure many Senators would be glad to pay for a number of those planes.

Mr. President, we find ourselves in a fantastic position today. We find ourselves in the position of being about to go to war with Communist China, while at the same time, as of this very day we are sending millions of dollars to our friends, who are supplying the sinews of economic and military strength to Red China.

What does that mean? It means that if we should become involved in war—and the threat of war hangs over the Senate tonight—more American boys would be killed, that more sons of American mothers would be killed at our own hands, because of the indirect aid which we are giving to Red China.

I have a large number of newspaper clippings, which I intend to put into the RECORD tomorrow, or whenever the Senate meets again. I am very much disturbed to find that Mr. Stassen, the head of FOA, has agreed to give about $70 million to Yugoslavia. At the same time another clipping shows that Yugoslavia has signed a trade pact with Red China and with Soviet Russia.

This is only a part of the picture. I shall not hold up this very excellent resolution with an attempt to amend it. I hope, however, that my amendment will be added to appropriate appropriation legislation when the time comes to consider such legislation.

SEVENTY-SEVENTH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF SENATOR GEORGE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no intention to discuss the pending resolution. I had intended to do so, but I have foregone that intention.

I merely wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that on tomorrow the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, will reach his 77th birthday anniversary.

As one of the younger Members of the Senate, I wish to congratulate him on having reached that milestone. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. President, I also wish to congratulate him on the magnificent contribution he has made to the history of the Senate in the handling of the resolution which is about to be passed. I am glad to congratulate the Senator from Georgia and to welcome him into the fellowship of youth.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I would not wish the occasion to pass without saying that on this side of the aisle we hold the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia in as high regard as he is held by his colleagues on the other side of the aisle. We recognize not only his great service to his State of Georgia but his outstanding service to our Government and to all the people of the United States, not only in his present highly important position as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and as President pro tempore of the Senate but also as a Senator who has served as chairman of the Committee on Finance, and whose name is on much important legislation passed by Congress.

Mr. GEORGE subsequently said. Mr. President, since the Senate was kind enough to note the fact that I will reach my 77th year tomorrow, I wish to call attention to the fact that the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who is universally esteemed among and has the confidence of the membership of this body, and whose services to his country as a Member of the United States Senate are of a very high order, will reach his 75th birthday on Sunday, before the Senate will again convene.

So I wish to congratulate him, his State, and the country upon his entry into the Three-Quarters of a Century Club, a club which I entered 2 years ago, and which my distinguished friend, former Vice President BARKLEY, entered about 2 months in advance of my entry.

I can only say that I am very grateful for the appreciation expressed for me, and I am profoundly humble to think that in my lifetime I have done so little good for mankind. [Applause.]

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I rise to thank my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who is chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, for his kind reference to me, and to thank Senators for their kind expression of applause upon my attainment of three-quarters of a century, following close upon the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia in our Young Men's Club.

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF ARMED FORCES TO PROTECT SECURITY OF FORMOSA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 159) authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a statement which gives my reasons for voting in favor of the pending resolution, House Joint Resolution 159.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR NEUBERGER

I want to state for the record my reasons for my vote on the resolution to authorize the President to defend Formosa and the Pescadores.

Mr. President, the issue which has been submitted to the Congress in the form of this resolution may well be one of the most serious one to come before us during my present term in the Senate. It is a particularly grave and difficult issue to confront a new Senator within 4 weeks of his assumption of office.

As a freshman Senator, I do not pretend to have experience or expert knowledge in the field of our foreign relations or military strategy. To the best of my ability, I have tried to reach a conscientious judgment on the basis of the facts which have been made available to us and the considerations which have been ably presented by the debate on the floor of the Senate. I have studied with particular attention the arguments so forcefully put forward by my distinguished colleague from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who had the benefit of attending the executive session of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and—on the other hand—the equally forceful presentation of the distinguished chairman of that committee [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. President, I have decided to support the resolution. I have reached that decision in spite of the following doubts:

REASONS ARE LISTED

First. When the resolution was first requested, it seemed to ask the Congress to endorse a policy which presented a very serious danger—the danger that we might be drawn into a war by actions not of our own choosing, the actions of Chiang Kai-shek.

I would not vote to endorse a policy which presents that danger. I believe that a war which would start, not in defense of the recognized interests of the United States, but in support of the ambitions of Chiang and his regime to return to the mainland of China, would be fought without the support of our closest allies. It could mean the end of our vital North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It would be fought against the opposition of almost all other nations in Asia, and without any hope of recognition or support by the United Nations.

Second. I believe that the resolution is not particularly necessary, and that perhaps it went too far toward asking congressional endorsement of future decisions which belong properly in the field of military rather than foreign policy.

CONGRESS SHOULD BE CONSULTED

It may well be commendable to ask congressional consideration of a proposed foreign policy before taking action, if time permits this. Even when the speed of events makes this impossible, as in the Korean emergency, it might have been wise to obtain at the earliest opportunity a congressional determination of the hostilities which resulted from that collective resistance to Communist aggression. But when this resolution includes additional authorization of action for the purpose of accomplishing the major foreign policy objective, it comes close to matters of military strategy which ought to remain the responsibility of the Commander in Chief.

For that reason I have supported the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. This would have effectively gone to the heart of the problem by striking from the authorization the reference to "related" areas.

Third. I would have preferred to see added to the text of the resolution a recognition of the proper role of the United Nations in dealing with this threat to international

peace and security, a role which was recognized in the message from the President. This recognition of the role of the United Nations was also the chief purpose of the excellent amendment proposed by my distinguished colleague, Senator KEFAUVER. I supported that amendment, and I think the cause of peace and international standing would have been well served if the Senate had been asked to advise the President in the terms of the substitute rather than that of the present resolution.

ADMINISTRATION NOT CONSISTENT

Perhaps because these issues of foreign and military policy are still relatively new to me, I must confess I have been puzzled by the contrast between this administration's reaction to the crisis in Indochina and to the present Formosan crisis. We were told that the loss of Indochina would be irreparable, that it meant the prelude to the loss of all of southeast Asia. Yet, rightly or wrongly, no emergency action was asked of the Congress to forestall that loss, and North Vietnam has disappeared behind the bamboo curtain of tyranny. Yet now, the same administration has asked for congressional endorsement of a much stronger policy to defend an area which, though it is important, is no more so than Indochina, and whose defense would not command the wholehearted enthusiasm of our friends in the free world and the United Nations.

Nevertheless, I have concluded, in spite of misgivings, that I shall support the resolution.

PRESIDENT MUST BE TRUSTED

I do not regard the need for national unity behind the President's policies as alone enough to command an affirmative vote. I do not understand the Senate of the United States to play the role of a rubber stamp. If we are asked to consider a proposed policy, even a foreign policy, and to give our advice, each of us must do so conscientiously in the light of his own best knowledge and conviction.

Yet, although I often disagree most decidedly with the domestic policies of the President and his administration I shall support his foreign policies when, in his best judgment, they are necessary in the cause of peace.

I do not claim the knowledge to judge whether the policy here presented to the Congress will in fact—better than some alternative policy—promote the cause of security for the United States in a peaceful world. But I believe that President Eisenhower is sincerely seeking this goal—that peace in the western Pacific is, indeed, the objective of the policy he presents to us.

The public discussion of the past 2 days has convinced me that President Eisenhower does not, as at first appeared, ask a blank check which might even be said to have authorized preventive war against the Chinese mainland—and I believe the debate has successfully demonstrated that for such a blank check, no congressional endorsement is in fact being given.

In that belief, and in the confidence that the President's explanations should be taken at their face value and that a secure peace is his only objective, I support the adoption of the resolution by the Senate. I think we are impelled by many reasons to trust to the judgment of the President in this crisis.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared giving my reasons for voting in favor of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LONG

On Wednesday last I expressed my concern about the momentous decision that we are making at this time. For my part, I felt that it was both unfair to the country and to Senators themselves to be required to vote on the pending resolution before they fully understood its implications. I then said that I owed it to those whom I have the honor to represent to vote my own convictions in this matter after learning the facts.

I have since studied the facts and read the hearings carefully, mindful of the significance of the decision we are now making. The debate here has tended to make clear the purposes and intentions of the resolution.

As I said at that time, this resolution could very well be an invitation for a showdown with Communist China and Russia as well. During the past 2 days I have read much of the secret testimony upon which the 2 Senate committees based their recommendations. I believe I now understand the meaning of the resolution and its implications. I hope that this is true of my colleagues.

I personally would not have advised that this Nation should undertake to defend the small offshore islands held by the Chinese Nationalists along the China coast. In my judgment their defense is much more difficult than the defense of Formosa itself. To hold them is like defending the doormat in front of your enemy's home. Nevertheless, so long as these islands are held, they simplify the task of defending Formosa.

It has also been my feeling that we should avoid striking the Chinese mainland unless the nature of the attack upon us was such as to make it necessary. Even in that event, I would urge that we should not strike the first blow.

As a Senator of the United States, I am not in a position to dictate either the tactics or the strategy that this Nation will follow. That prerogative belongs to the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States. He has the responsibility for the decisions that will mean the survival of this Nation and of free governments throughout the world.

Of this much I am certain—the resolution before us will pass. It is only a question of the number by which it will be agreed to.

Basically, this resolution serves notice upon Communist China that she has taken all of the territory by force of arms which she will be permitted to take. The President is in the process of drawing the line upon which this Nation will stand.

In passing this resolution, this Nation accepts the risk that Russia will come to China's assistance. These are dangers which we must accept. The danger makes our duty more clear. As a matter of fact, we have already accepted the risk of war with Russia from the day that we undertook the Berlin airlift. We did it when we went to the aid of the Republic of Korea. I could see no other reason for the weakness that this Nation displayed when the Chinese intervened in North Korea, except that this Nation was not prepared to face the consequences of a third world war.

We might as well face the fact that we no longer have anything to gain by giving our enemies cause to feel that we fear them. By this, we do not mean that we will not readily agree to an honorable settlement at the peace table. We mean that we will fight rather than surrender any further territory to aggression.

It is for these reasons that I shall vote for the resolution. I will not vote against it because I seriously disagree with some of the tactics involved. In view of the matters involved here, I regard it as of the utmost importance that this resolution should be passed by an overwhelming vote.

If the resolution should fail, it would be interpreted by our enemies—and even our friends—to mean that during the next 2 years the word of the President of the United States would not necessarily speak the foreign policy of this Nation. It would be to display the greatest of weakness in the face of our enemies at a time when strength is our best hope. For that reason, I shall vote to strengthen the hand of the President. In doing so, I strengthen the hand of the United States in world leadership. If this leadership is exercised wisely, our Nation will survive. I would rather accept the risk that it would be used in error than the risk that it would not be used, or that it would be seriously weakened.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the final passage of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 159).

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], if present, would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] is absent on official business as a member of the American delegation attending the 10th anniversary of the World War II Battle of Alsace, at Colmar, France.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is absent on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Vermont, [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 85, nays 3, as follows:

YEAS—85

Aiken	George	Millikin
Allott	Goldwater	Monroney
Anderson	Gore	Mundt
Barkley	Green	Murray
Barrett	Hayden	Neuberger
Beall	Hennings	O'Mahoney
Bender	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Bennett	Hill	Payne
Bible	Holland	Purtell
Bridges	Hruska	Robertson
Bush	Humphrey	Russell
Butler	Ives	Saltonstall
Byrd	Jackson	Schoeppel
Capehart	Jenner	Scott
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Clements	Kilgore	Sparkman
Cotton	Knowland	Stennis
Curtis	Kuchel	Symington
Daniel	Long	Thurmond
Dirksen	Magnuson	Thye
Douglas	Malone	Watkins
Duff	Mansfield	Welker
Dworshak	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Eastland	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Ellender	McCarthy	Young
Ervin	McClellan	
Fulbright	McNamara	

NAYS—3

Langer	Lehman	Morse

NOT VOTING—8

Bricker	Frear	Neely
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Potter
Flanders	Kennedy	

So the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 159) was passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate Joint Resolution 28 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, now that the vote has been taken on the resolution and the record has been made, I merely wish to invite the attention of the Members of the Senate to what I think is a historic fact. It is that the two Senators from the State of Georgia presided during the hearings before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the Senate Committee on Armed Services, sitting jointly. I make this statement because I wish the record of the future to show that in this country we have the kind of a spirit under which unity develops and grows.

As I sat the other day in the hearings, seeing the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations on one side of the table and the members of the Committee on Armed Services on the other side of the table, I noted that at the head of the table there were seated the two Senators from the State of Georgia, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], as the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. There occurred to me the thought that less than 100 years ago he would have been a bold man, indeed, who would have predicted that such a thing would ever take place.

In the days when the Union was threatened with destruction and in the days when that threat to the Union was partially ended by a military campaign across the State of Georgia, he would have been a bold man who would have predicted at that time that the day would come when the United States Senate would be headed in its deliberations on a matter of such transcendant importance as House Joint Resolution 159 by the two Senators from the State of Georgia.

I call attention to it, Mr. President, because I wish to pay tribute to the leadership of those two men, and to the sort of country which has produced such a situation, and also because I desire to suggest it to the world as an example of the kind of unity and patriotism which develops in a free country.

FEDERAL RECORDS COUNCIL

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under authority of section 504 of Public Law 754, approved September 5, 1950, the Chair announces the appointment of Felton M. Johnston, Secretary of the Senate, as a member of the Federal Records Council, representing in part the legislative branch of the Government, vice J. Mark Trice, resigned.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, the Chair designates the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] to read Washington's Farewell Address to the Senate on February 22 next.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until Tuesday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, February 1, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received January 28 (legislative day of January 27), 1955:

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

The following-named persons to be members of the United States Advisory Commission on Information for a term expiring January 27, 1958, and until their successors have been appointed and qualified:

Philip D. Reed, of New York.
Erwin D. Canham, of Massachusetts.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

I. For appointment, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations, to be effective date of acceptance:

To be senior assistant surgeon

Jacob A. Haller, Jr.

To be assistant surgeons

Jack Durell
John R. Moran
Donn E. Leuzinger

To be senior assistant dental surgeon

James J. Kennedy

To be assistant dental surgeons

L. Charles Larsen
Charles H. Davis
George E. Garrington

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The following licensed officers of the United States merchant marine to the grade indicated in the United States Coast Guard:

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Ernest Lee Murdock
Paul Nichiporuk

The following for permanent appointment subject to qualifications provided by law, to the grade indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be commissioned lieutenant commander

John O. Boyer

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 31, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the way, the truth, and the life, Thou knowest how desperately we need Thee as we seek to be equal to the issues and the tragic necessities of our time.

We penitently confess that our plans and hopes for peace among men and nations have not always included a strong faith in Thee and in the vitality of the moral and spiritual resources.

Grant that in these days of crisis and challenge we may be aware of the weakness of our own finite wisdom and the futility of relying upon material strength.

Inspire us daily with a clear vision of the greatness and nearness of our blessed Lord as we strive to bring to fulfillment and fruition the nobler instincts, the fondest hopes, and the divine possibilities of all mankind.

In His name we offer our prayers. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 27, 1955, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On January 20, 1955:

H. R. 2369. An act to amend section 7237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

On January 25, 1955:

H. R. 2091. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

On January 29, 1955:

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores and related positions and territories of that area.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK

The Clerk laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

JANUARY 28, 1955.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on January 27, 1955, the Clerk today received from the Secretary of the Senate the following message:

That the Senate has passed without amendment the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 159) entitled "Joint resolution authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores and related positions and territories of that area."

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Thursday, January 27, 1955, he did on January 28, 1955, sign the following enrolled joint resolution of the House:

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores and related positions and territories of that area.

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found

truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores and related positions and territories of that area.

RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 31, 1955.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I hereby resign my position as member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Respectfully,
D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 28, 1955.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, effective immediately.

Sincerely yours,
FRANK M. CLARK,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 119) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That during the remainder of the 84th Congress, the Committee on Public Works shall be composed of 34 members.

The resolution was agreed to.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 120) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Agriculture: D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS, Florida.

Committee on Education and Labor: STEWART L. UDALL, Arizona.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: EDITH GREEN, Oregon.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, Michigan.

Committee on Public Works: FRANK M. CLARK, Pennsylvania; PAUL G. ROGERS, Florida.

The resolution was agreed to.

HEALTH INSURANCE — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 81)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Because the strength of our Nation is in its people, their good health is a proper national concern; healthy Americans live more rewarding, more productive and happier lives. Fortunately, the Nation continues its advance in bettering the health of all its people.

Deaths from infectious diseases have diminished. During the past year, important progress has been made in dealing with such diseases as rheumatic fever, high blood pressure, poliomyelitis and tuberculosis. Intensified research has produced more knowledge than ever before about the scourges of heart disease and cancer.

The 83d Congress, during the last legislative session, supported dramatic new strides in vocational rehabilitation. By 1959, consequently, we should be restoring to useful lives most persons who become disabled and who can be rehabilitated and returned to employment. In human terms, this will be a heartwarming achievement.

The 1954 amendments to the Hospital Survey and Construction Act opened another new chapter in the national drive for better health. Under these amendments, further provision was made to help build health care facilities for the chronically ill; to aid in the construction of nursing and convalescent homes; to provide for more diagnostic and treatment centers for patients who do not need hospital care; and to help make centers available for the rehabilitation of the disabled.

These achievements represent a major gain for the immediate and future welfare of countless Americans—in the health of both mind and body. Recent advances do not, however, represent our full capacity to wage war on illness and disability throughout the land.

THE IMMEDIATE NEEDS

As a Nation, we are doing less than now lies within our power to reduce the impact of disease. Many of our fellow Americans cannot afford to pay the costs of medical care when it is needed, and they are not protected by adequate health insurance. Too frequently the local hospitals, clinics, or nursing homes required for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of disease either do not exist or are badly out of date. Finally, there are critical shortages of the trained personnel required to study, prevent, treat, and control disease.

The specific recommendations that follow are designed to meet this threefold deficiency.

MEETING THE COSTS OF MEDICAL CARE

For most Americans, insurance—private, voluntary insurance—provides a sound and effective method of meeting unexpected hazards which may be beyond the capacity of the individual to bear. Risk sharing through group action is in the best tradition of vigorous and imaginative American enterprise.

The Government should cooperate with, and encourage, private carriers in the improvement of health insurance. Moreover, a great many people who are not now covered can be given its protection, particularly in rural areas where group enrollment is at present difficult.

Existing health insurance can also be improved by expanding the scope of the benefits provided. Not all private expenditures for medical care can or should be covered by insurance; nevertheless, many policies offered today are too limited in scope. They are principally for hospitalized illness and for relatively short periods of time.

I recommend consequently the establishment of a Federal health reinsurance service to encourage private health insurance organizations in offering broader benefits to insured individuals and families and coverage to more people.

In addition, to improve medical care for the aged, the blind, dependent children, and the permanently and totally disabled who are public assistance recipients, I recommend the authorization of limited Federal grants to match State and local expenditures.

Reinsurance: The purpose of the reinsurance proposal is to furnish a system for broad sharing among health insurance organizations of the risks of experimentation. A system of this sort will give an incentive to the improvement of existing health insurance plans. It will encourage private voluntary health insurance organizations to provide better protection—particularly against expensive illness—for those who now are insured against some of the financial hazards of illness. Reinsurance will also help to stimulate extension of private voluntary health insurance plans to millions of additional people who do not now have, but who could afford to purchase, health insurance.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been working with specialists from the insurance industry, with experts from the health professions, and with many other interested citizens, in its effort to perfect a sound reinsurance program—a program which involves no Government subsidy and no Government competition with private insurance carriers. The time has come to put such a program to work for the American people.

I urge the Congress to launch the reinsurance service this year by authorizing a reasonable capital fund and by providing for its use as necessary to reinsure three broad areas for expansion in private voluntary health insurance:

1. Health insurance plans providing protection against the high costs of severe or prolonged illness.

2. Health insurance plans providing coverage for individuals and families in predominantly rural areas.

3. Health insurance plans designed primarily for coverage of individuals and families of average or lower income against medical care costs in the home and physician's office as well as in the hospital.

Medical care for public assistance recipients: Nearly 5 million persons in the United States are now receiving public assistance under State programs aided by Federal grants. Present arrangements for their medical care, however, are far from adequate. Special provision for improving health services for these needy persons must be made.

I recommend to the Congress, therefore, that it authorize separate Federal matching of State and local expenditures for the medical care needed by public assistance recipients. The separate matching should apply to each of the four federally aided categories—the aged, the permanently and totally disabled, the blind, and children deprived of parental care.

STIMULATING THE CONSTRUCTION OF HEALTH FACILITIES

Many communities in the United States today lack the hospitals, clinics, nursing homes, and other modern technical facilities required for the protection of the people's health. In other communities, structures are antiquated or otherwise deficient in construction or equipment.

Present methods of financing are not always satisfactory in meeting this problem. Many sponsors and operators are unable to qualify for grants under the recently extended Hospital Survey and Construction Act. Sponsors of health facilities often find it difficult to obtain private capital for construction.

In other fields, Government-insured loans have consistently helped produce the new construction required in the urgent national interests. The tested procedures developed by such successful Government guaranty programs as these should now be used to stimulate construction of additional health facilities.

I recommend, therefore, that the Congress authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to insure, for a small premium, mortgage loans made by private lending institutions for the construction of health facilities.

The continuing responsibility of the mortgagor and of the lending institution should be preserved by limiting the insurance to less than the face amount of the loan and by requiring that a mortgage loan, to be eligible for insurance, must be for less than the full value of the property. The authorizing legislation should, of course, include any needed safeguards against the encouragement of substandard or unsound projects.

HEALTH PERSONNEL NEEDS

Whether we look at health problems in terms of services for the community or for the individual—at problems of research, prevention, or treatment of disease—we find that supplies of trained personnel are critically short.

The administration's legislative program for this year therefore contains proposals addressed to crucial areas of personnel shortages. These particular areas, moreover, hold the key to other possible advances and improvements in health programs.

Two proposals are aimed at shortages in nurse personnel: First, I recommend a 5-year program of grants to State vocational education agencies for training practical nurses. Second, I recommend an expansion of Public Health Service operations to establish traineeships for graduate nurses in specialties such as nursing service administration, teaching, and research.

In addition, my recommendations for the revision of the present public health grant programs include authority for the establishment of traineeships in all public health specialties, including mental health.

PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAMS

The Public Health Service, the Children's Bureau of the Social Security Administration, and the Food and Drug Administration are skilled and vigilant guardians of our Nation's health. All three of these agencies should be strengthened, and the programs of the Public Health Service and the Children's Bureau for aiding State health activities made more responsive to changes in State and local health needs. To this end, I urge the Congress to take the following steps:

1. Improve present grant-in-aid programs providing services for mothers, for crippled children, and for children requiring special health services. Separate funds should be provided for extension and improvement of these activities and for special projects designed to develop improved medical care techniques both for mothers and for children.

2. Permit greater flexibility in the use by the States of Federal grant funds for public health services. The States could adapt their programs more effectively to their own needs if the separate Public Health Service grants were combined into a single, unified grant-in-aid structure. In addition, separate funds should be provided for extension and improvement of existing public health programs and for special projects looking to the development of improved techniques.

3. Step up research on air pollution. As a result of industrial growth and urban development, the atmosphere over some population centers may be approaching the limit of its ability to absorb air pollutants with safety to health. I am recommending an increased appropriation to the Public Health Service for studies seeking necessary scientific data and more effective methods of control.

4. Provide greater assistance to the States for water pollution control programs. As our population grows and demands for water increase, and as the use of chemicals expands, our water supply problems become more acute. Intensified research in water pollution problems is needed as well as continuing authority for the Public Health Service to deal with these matters. The present Water Pollution Control Act expires on June 30, 1956. This termination date should be removed and the act should be strengthened.

5. Authorize the Public Health Service to establish traineeships for both graduate and specialized training in public health in order to increase the numbers of trained personnel.

6. Strengthen the Public Health Service commissioned corps by improving its status and its survivor benefits.

MENTAL HEALTH

Care for the mentally ill presents a special set of problems.

Only in the past few decades have we, as a people, begun to regard mental and emotional disorders as capable of specific diagnosis, alleviation, cure, and rehabilitation. We now know that effective preventive and control programs are possible in the field of mental health.

I recommend, therefore, new and intensified measures in our attack on mental illness. These are:

1. Strengthening of present aid to State and community programs for the early detection, control, and alleviation of mental and emotional derangements;

2. Increased budgetary support for training activities which are now authorized, so as to increase the number of qualified personnel available for care of mental patients; and

3. Authorization of a new program of mental health project grants. Such projects would aim at improving the quality of care in mental institutions and the administration of the institutions themselves. They would also search out ways of reducing the length of stay and the necessity for institutional care in as many cases as possible.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

As a vital part of our attack on a serious health and social problem, I also recommend new grants to the States to enable them to strengthen and improve their programs and services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of delinquency in youth. There should be assistance for State planning, for coordination of all State and local agencies concerned with juvenile delinquency, for training of personnel, and for special research and demonstration projects.

INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS OF HEALTH

For half of mankind, disease and disability are a normal condition of life. This incalculable burden not only causes poverty and distress, and impedes economic development, but provides a fertile field for the spread of communism.

The World Health Organization of the United Nations is exerting forceful leadership in a cooperative worldwide movement toward better health. Its program merits adequate and growing financial support on the part of the United States. Our contribution to the World Health Organization should be raised, so that the effort to release men from the bondage of disease through international cooperation may be increased.

These recommendations to the Congress represent a broad and coordinated offensive against many of the problems which must be solved if we are to have better health for a stronger America. All the proposals recognize the primacy of local and State responsibility for the health of the community. They encourage private effort, with private funds. With the cooperation of the States and the medical profession, they can form the basis for better health for all.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 31, 1955.*

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia (at the request of Mr. FORRESTER) asked and was given permission to transfer the special order granted him for today to February 7.

Mr. TUMULTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Monday, February 7, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

RUSSIAN TRADE FAVORED BY WILSON

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson told Congress recently he favors trading American butter for Russian manganese as a means of increasing free world strength.

Testifying to the House Ways and Means Committee for President Eisenhower's trade program, he emphasized he was using the butter-for-manganese exchange as an example of a broader field of trading possibilities.

Manganese is, of course, a highly strategic material. We depend on other nations for the greater part of our entire supply. None of these at present are Iron Curtain countries. Most of our requirements—for war or for peace—have been supplied by good friends who can be calculated to remain good friends. This could not by any stretch of the imagination be said of Russia.

Therefore to encourage dependence in any degree upon Russia or her satellites for strategic materials would be sheer folly. The supply would at the first indication of crisis be withdrawn. Meanwhile, what about our friends who now supply manganese? What about their mines and processing plants? Some, in Cuba and South America already have closed because of lack of business. Are we to announce to the world that we are prepared to force the closure of additional mines in friendly nations—mines which might well become invaluable at any moment—in order to indulge the Kremlin? Undoubtedly Russia's rulers would enjoy provoking a situation of this measure at our expense. However I believe we will do well to consider that the economic security of real friends is worth more to us than a few pounds of butter; that an assured supply of strategic materials is more important than keeping Red Russia contented.

CONVICTION OF COMMUNIST CLAUDE LIGHTFOOT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the conviction of Communist leader Claude Lightfoot represents another milestone in the fight by this administration to smash the Communist conspiracy in this country.

The case provided the first test of a Smith Act provision holding that membership in an organization which the member knows advocates overthrow of the United States Government is a punishable crime.

Other Smith Act convictions, 80 of which have been obtained by the vigorous action of the Department of Justice, all rested upon indictments for conspiracy to teach and advocate the overthrow of the Government. This one, based upon party membership plus knowledge of party aims, sustains another provision of the law and opens the way to further prosecution of first- and second-string Communist leaders. Several top-level party functionaries are now under indictment awaiting trial on the same charges.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation is also entitled to a special note of credit for its quick work in apprehending Lightfoot, who sought to conceal himself after his indictment, in June of last year.

This splendid work by the Department of Justice seldom makes splashy headlines, Mr. Speaker, but in the long run it will do more to arrest the cancerous growth of subversion in our country than all the other noisier assaults put together.

The President and his administration will be supported to the hilt by the American people in their determination to strike at the heart of the conspiracy which seeks to destroy our country.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Eisenhower administration is closing in on the most diabolical conspiracy in the history of the Nation—the Communist Party, United States of America.

The recent conviction of the executive secretary, Claude Lightfoot, of the Communist Party in Illinois, is the first step in what may well spell the final doom for such disloyal and traitorous Reds as still operate in America. This conviction highlights the fact that this is a continuing conspiracy.

It is just one more example of the tight rein our Government is daily drawing over Communists who were made welcome in our country and consequently gained access to some of our most vital secrets.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, the conviction of Claude Lightfoot, the Illinois Communist leader, for violation of the Smith Act, is another telling blow against the conspiracy of the Kremlin.

This is one more step in the administration's aggressive drive against disloyalty and subversion. That drive has netted jail terms for more than 50 Communist Party leaders, stripped the Communist Party of legal standing, led to the deportation of more than 100 Communist aliens, many of whom have enjoyed the freedom of the United States for decades.

Despite political attacks and disparagement of the administration's attempt to protect our country from subversion from within, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Department of Justice are continuing their relentless efforts to smash the Communist menace. The Illinois Communist leader's conviction prompted me to remind the House that the administration is maintaining its vigilance against these freedom wreckers.

UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON THE AGING AND THE AGED

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the bill introduced by me today seeks to meet a developing situation in our country that should no longer be blinked.

The fact is that we are permitting an erosion of our human resources that does not make sense. Indeed, we are permitting a continuation of an attitude that I can only describe as ignorant or indifferent; and time has come when we should, with devotion and zeal, get our best minds toward working for a solution that will adequately meet the increasingly growing problem of what best to do for that segment of our population which is past middle age and which finds itself substantially harassed by diminishing or barren employment opportunities, income maintenance, living arrangements, and, of course, proper health and physical care especially for those who, themselves, are not able to provide.

The seriousness of the foregoing conditions has been forcefully brought to my attention by talks with constituents back home. They tell me that it is practically impossible to be treated on equal basis because of older age; this, in spite of the fact that they have the required equal skills, but must take a reduction of incomes through no fault of their own. To me, this is shocking and not in the American tradition. The acuteness of the problem accentuates the overall need for immediate corrective action.

The counterpart of the proposal I am introducing in the House already has overwhelming support on the Senate side of the Capitol. Senator POTTER, of Michigan, is piloting the bill on the Senate side. We have been in conference repeatedly on this subject, and I am hoping that on the House side we will get many of our House Members to introduce similar legislation.

Under the bill, a commission would be appointed, composed of 10 members, 6 of whom would be designated by the President from the executive branch and private life, and 2, each, by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House. It would be a compact commission which would have access to our

Government resources for any information on the general subject, and its duty would be to study and investigate and assess existing knowledge and programs relating to the problems of the aging and the aged in this country so that we as a country would put ourselves into a proper and benefiting position by way of utilizing the tremendous skills and capacities that are now going to waste and which would also better meet our obligations in seeing to it that this segment of our population is helped to be put in the position of dignity and service which is their right.

HI HO, AQUALANTES

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, my eye was caught by a recent headline which said: "Aqualantes Ride To Save West's Water."

A great many self-appointed benefactors have ridden the dusty trails of the West. Frequently misjudged and more often misguided, they rallied under the banner of the vigilantes to perform deeds they thought necessary for the improvement of society.

That was in another day when law was a vague and distant force, and order depended on the swiftness of the .44 and the accuracy of the Winchester.

Yet, some of the psychological elements which influenced and motivated the early day vigilantes apparently have weathered the sociological changes which have taken place. This is indicated by attempts to form a mass organization called Aqualantes.

In this case, the thing to be saved is water—not gold or morals. And, in this case, the victims of the Aqualantes' assaults are the taxpayers of the Nation.

Formation of the Aqualantes was proposed by the Upper Colorado River Commission as part of a campaign to force through Congress the multibillion dollar upper Colorado River project—H. R. 270—for Utah, New Mexico, Colorado and Wyoming.

Membership will be urged on both adults and children, and anybody who coughs up a buck will get a plastic badge patterned after an old-time western marshal's star. The money received will be used to buy public relations.

In this proposed publicity campaign, the Aqualantes will tell the public the upper Colorado River project will cost about 1.5 billion.

But they will not tell the public that a hidden subsidy will cost the taxpayers of the country another 3 billion, never to be recovered.

The Aqualantes will tell the public that the project will increase the agricultural output of these States.

But they will not tell the public that the land to be irrigated by the project will grow crops of the kinds already surplus and already subsidized by the taxpayers; crops that will be good only to store in warehouses already bulging with more than $7 billion worth of food and fiber that cannot be used or sold.

The Aqualantes will tell the public that the project will create new farms in Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico, thereby improving the economy of those States.

But they will not tell the public that it will cost the taxpayers of all States about $640,000 for each new 160-acre farm created—an outright gift that can never be repaid.

The Aqualantes will tell the public that the project will create a great new recreation area called the Yampa-Ladore Playground.

But they will not tell the public that Yampa-Ladore is merely a deceptive name for Echo Park Dam which will flood the Dinosaur National Monument, destroy some of the finest wilderness scenery in the world, and open the door for commercial interests to gain entrance to our national parks and monuments that have been set aside for all Americans to enjoy, now and forever.

The Aqualantes will tell the public that the project will develop useful hydroelectric power.

But they will not tell the public that the power dams of the project would be built only as "cash registers" from which the money would be taken to pay for the irrigation projects which could not pay for themselves and otherwise could not be built.

The Aqualantes will tell the public that the project will grow fine crops where only sagebrush can now survive.

But they will not tell the public that the irrigation parts of the project are located in high altitude, desert country which has a short growing season, and some of which has frost the year around.

The Aqualantes will tell the public that the cost of the irrigation parts of the project will be repaid.

But they will not tell the public that these repayments will not start for at least half a century, and that actually the revenues from the project would never amount to enough to pay for it.

The Aqualantes will tell the public that the project means beneficial economic development for the Rocky Mountain area.

But the Aqualantes will not tell the public that this economic development will be accomplished at the expense of all other areas of the country, and that the people in the project area will pay very little of the cost.

The Aqualantes are not riding to save the West's water, as the headline said. The Aqualantes are riding to raid the Treasury of the United States; the Aqualantes are riding to force through Congress a gigantic scheme for improving their own lot; a scheme that is agriculturally unsound, economically unjustified, and absolutely unnecessary.

Hi ho, Aqualantes!

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. WILLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Wednesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today following any special orders heretofore entered, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to postpone his special order granted for tomorrow until Wednesday next.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

ONE HUNDRED AND TWELFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF WILLIAM McKINLEY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, for the last 25 years or more the Ohio delegation in Congress near the birthday of former President McKinley has asked for a few minutes to commemorate the life and the work of this great Ohioan. Every year the Speaker has been kind enough to give us a little time. We appreciate that, and we thank Speaker RAYBURN for giving us time today.

Former President McKinley was an unusual man in many ways. There can be no question about it. He was brilliant, kindly, honest, patriotic, and much beloved and when he was assassinated he was mourned by all the grown people of the country, and it was said that the children in Canton, Ohio who knew him cried in the streets when they heard of his tragic death.

He was of great effectiveness in many respects. I think that the greatest work he ever did was the work he did here in this room as a Member of Congress. That is why we feel like having this observance every year at his birthday. Some of you who have been here a long time will remember William Tyler Page. Mr. Page was a man who knew the history of Congress probably better than anyone, or at least better than anyone I knew. He used to tell me about Mr. McKinley. He remembered Mr. McKinley. He said that McKinley sat over here on what is now the Republican side. In those days, they had desks and chairs instead of a seating arrangement, as we have now. Mr. McKinley sat over in this section to which I am pointing and naturally everyone knew where to look when they wanted to find him.

Mr. McKinley was a very distinguished American in many ways. Our soldiers find in him a great inspiration because when he was 18 years of age, teaching in a northern Ohio school, the Civil War was just starting. He resigned his little job as a schoolteacher and went down to Columbus and enlisted in the Army. He was to the end of his life very patriotic. There he met a man who later in life proved to be a great friend of McKinley's in many ways. That was Col. Rutherford B. Hayes. Rutherford B. Hayes and William McKinley went through the Civil War together. After they came out there was always a strong friendship between them. When Mr. Hayes became President, he never failed to give to McKinley the credit that his genius and patriotism warranted. While it is not my purpose to dwell upon the many accomplishments of Major McKinley, I do want to tell you of some of his accomplishments as a soldier. Over here at Antietam a large monument is erected by the people of Ohio through the Legislature of the State of Ohio to commemorate the work of William McKinley, who was then just a young man, a young soldier, as it were, on the field of battle at Antietam. His participation in the battle of Antietam was so conspicuous and courageous that it ranks as one of the heroic incidents of the Civil War. And so it is with many other of his accomplishments. He was never boastful of his accomplishments.

Mr. McKinley served two terms as Governor of Ohio, after his great and worthy service as a Member of the Congress. His service as Governor of Ohio stamped him as a great executive, and he was elected to the Presidency by a very strong vote. He was reelected to his second term as President. He was serving as President when he was assassinated at Buffalo.

Mr. Speaker, time does not permit me to say more, although much more can be said of this great man.

Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to revise and extend my remarks, and I also ask that any Member who desires to do so may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and character of Mr. McKinley.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Now, Mr. Speaker, if it meets with your approval, we, of the Ohio delegation, have selected the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], who lives in the district formerly represented by Mr. McKinley, to speak at this time, and I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly honored to address the House today upon this 112th anniversary of the birth of William McKinley, who brought great distinction to the 16th Ohio District as a Member of Congress, as Governor of Ohio, and as President of the United States.

It was 78 years ago, in 1876, that William McKinley was first elected to Congress from the district that I now have the honor of representing, and it was then—as it is now—a district of great agricultural and industrial development.

William McKinley made his greatest mark and did his greatest work while a Member of this body. He served seven terms. He was a great authority on the problem of world trade, a problem that confronts all Members today. He served with high honor as a member of the Ways and Means Committee—a service to this Nation which Ohio is proud to see continued through the excellent work of the dean of its delegation, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

It was during his period of service in this House that William McKinley displayed to the Nation those qualities and characteristics of honesty, sincerity, and patriotism that later on won for him the unanimous nomination to the Presidency on the first ballot at the Republican Convention in 1896.

There are many stories which display William McKinley's greatness, but it is William McKinley the neighbor, the devoted husband and the devoutly religious man that we in Ohio have come to love best.

True, he was a great President. His domestic policies in the White House, as well as his conduct of the war with Spain, so endeared him to the people of this Nation that he won reelection in 1900 by an even greater plurality than in 1896.

And before that, during the uncertain years of the Civil War, William McKinley distinguished himself as a soldier. He enlisted as a private and rose to the rank of major.

Gen. Phillip Sheridan paid tribute to the bravery and organization of McKinley when he was a captain serving in the Battle of Antietam.

But through all of this—through all of his days in the executive mansion in Columbus and in the White House in Washington—William McKinley was still known to his friends in Canton as Major McKinley. He always remembered his friends back home. Success never changed him and the rigors of the Presidency did not affect his religious life. He was a Methodist—a plaque in the National Methodist Church here marks his regular attendance at its Sunday services—and he set that one day aside each week for rest.

When in Canton he faithfully attended the First Methodist Church and when visitors would come to the White House on Sundays, hoping to discuss some matters of state with the President, they more than likely wound up in the music room singing hymns with the McKinley family.

There is a most interesting story behind the beautiful red carnations, which have become a tradition of the House, and which you are wearing today in his memory. It is the story of how McKinley came to love the red carnation and how it was later selected as Ohio's official flower.

During the campaign of 1876 when McKinley was making his bid on the Republican ticket to be elected to Congress, he was opposed by a distinguished citizen, Dr. Levi L. Lamborn, a Democrat, of Alliance, Ohio, who had been successful as a doctor, a newspaper editor, a realtor, and a banker.

Dr. Lamborn's avocation was raising carnations. He had imported them from France, and he had become quite an authority. It was his practice to wear one each day, and during the campaign a series of debates had been scheduled and were looked upon as the highlight of the fall. However, McKinley had great admiration for Dr. Lamborn's ability, and Dr. Lamborn likewise admired McKinley.

The debates, because of their kindness to each other, had not enthused the electorate. Thus it was with that basis of friendship that Dr. Lamborn—feeling that the carnations which were so admired were giving him an unfair advantage—began taking the red flowers to each debate so that McKinley, too, might wear one.

When the election was over, McKinley came to look upon the flower as a sort of good-luck piece, and he started the habit of wearing one every day. All through his years here in the House, in the governorship of Ohio, and later in the White House he wore one of these lovely flowers.

It is interesting to add that the day he was shot, September 6, 1901, in Buffalo, N. Y., he had given the carnation he was wearing to a little girl who wanted a souvenir of her meeting with the President. The second person to follow the little girl was Leon Czolgosz, the anarchist whose gun claimed McKinley's life September 14, 1901.

Dr. Levi Lamborn was, in a large measure, responsible for the carnation—the flower which McKinley loved so well—becoming Ohio's official flower. Through his efforts, the Ohio Legislature adopted a resolution on February 3, 1904. It read, in part:

> Therefore, be it resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, the Governor approving; that the scarlet carnation be adopted as the State flower of Ohio as a token of love and reverence for the memory of William McKinley.

And so it is that we pause today to honor a man who served well his friends, his family, and his country as a good citizen, a devoted public servant, and a statesman.

But the words on his monument—his last resting place in my home city of Canton, the city which he also called home—seem to sum up so well his many qualities of greatness. The words are:

> In memory of William McKinley. A good citizen, brave soldier, wise executive, helper and leader of men, exemplar to his people of the virtues that build and conserve the State, society, and the home.

In 1901 the Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station at Wooster planted a tree in memory of William McKinley. He had served that station as an ex-officio member of its board while Governor and was much impressed with the work of the institution. This tree, a Dutch elm, is expected to live to 200 years of age, but there is no doubt that the memory of William McKinley and the things for which he stood will long outlive the tree which memorializes his revered name.

SHORTAGE OF AMERICAN SHIPS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald there appeared an article which purports to say that the Department of Agriculture is finding it difficult to sell our surplus agricultural commodities and ship them abroad, due to the lack of American shipping bottoms. Under legislation we provided in the last session of Congress, 50 percent of the cargo must be shipped in American-flag vessels.

Immediately on reading this article, Mr. Speaker, I directed counsel of the Merchant Marine Committee to prepare a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture asking for a complete report on this situation. I have also called on the Maritime Administrator and the American Merchant Marine Institute—that is the organization made up of American flagship operators—to explain why bottoms are not available to carry American commerce around the world.

Mr. Speaker, the Merchant Marine Committee of the House has now pending before the Committee on Rules of the House a resolution giving our committee, the Merchant Marine Committee, authority to go into construction subsidies, operating subsidies, and other matters pertaining to the operation of the American merchant marine. It is vitally necessary to our national defense that we have a strong, active, available American merchant marine. The Appropriations Committee of this House is interested in the subject, and other committees of the House have been interested in the subject.

With the assistance of the able gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON], who was chairman of the committee during the last session of Congress, we are going to make a thorough study of the 1936 act which is the keystone of the American merchant marine; and we intend, if it is possible, to make the merchant marine something of which all Americans can be proud. We are going to make it possible for American citizens to get employment in the merchant marine and to follow their vocation of seafarers, sailors, and so forth.

(The letters and article referred to follow:)

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald]

SHIP-AMERICA PROVISO SLOWS SURPLUS SALE

(By Patricia Wiggins)

The administration's program for selling farm surpluses overseas is running into a bottleneck because of a ship-American provision in the new law, informed sources said yesterday.

Congress provided in the law that half of all such shipments must be carried in United States ships which otherwise might not be able to compete with foreign vessels which generally have lower operating costs.

Officials cited the ship-American proviso in discussing complaints by some Congressmen that the Agriculture Department has not moved fast enough on the program.

They said the Department is having trouble finding space on American vessels for nearly $60 million worth of commodities already under contract for shipment abroad.

Enough foreign ships are available, they said, but the Department fears these vessels may be tied up elsewhere by the time the required American ships are lined up.

The Surplus Disposal Act passed by Congress last year authorized the Department to sell $700 million worth of surplus farm holdings over a 3-year period in exchange for local currency abroad.

About $60 million worth of grains and cotton have been earmarked for Turkey and Yugoslavia.

JANUARY 31, 1955.

Hon. LOUIS S. ROTHSCHILD,
The Maritime Administrator,
Maritime Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROTHSCHILD: On page 2 of the Washington Post and Times Herald this morning there is a story by a United Press reporter to the effect that the "50–50" provisions of the statute enacted by the Congress in the last session are causing a bottleneck in the administration's program for selling farm surpluses overseas.

The story goes on to say that the Department of Agriculture is having trouble finding space on American vessels for nearly $60 million worth of commodities already under contract for shipping abroad. It points out that sufficient foreign ships are available, but the Department fears that these vessels may be tied up elsewhere by the time the required American ships are lined up.

I am deeply concerned with this situation. If the story is true, it is apparent there is some deficiency of administration in connection with the "50–50" law which should be corrected immediately. Consequently, I would like to have a full and complete report of the facts pertaining to this matter insofar as they may be available to your Department.

Very truly yours,

HERBERT C. BONNER,
Member of Congress, Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

JANUARY 31, 1955.

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
The Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BENSON: On page 2 of the Washington Post and Times Herald this morning there is a story by a United Press reporter to the effect that the 50–50 provisions of the statute enacted by the Congress in the last session are causing a bottleneck in the administration's program for selling farm surpluses overseas.

The story goes on to say that the Department of Agriculture is having trouble finding space on American vessels for nearly $60 million worth of commodities already under contract for shipping abroad. It points out that sufficient foreign ships are available, but the Department fears that these vessels may be tied up elsewhere by the time the required American ships are lined up.

I am deeply concerned with this situation. If the story is true, it is apparent there is some deficiency of administration in connection with the 50–50 law which should be corrected immediately. Consequently, I would like to have a full and complete report of the facts pertaining to this matter insofar as they may be available to your Department.

Very truly yours,

HERBERT C. BONNER,
Member of Congress, Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

JANUARY 31, 1955.

Mr. FRANCIS T. GREENE,
Executive Vice President, American Merchant Marine Institute,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GREENE: On page 2 of the Washington Post and Times Herald this morning there is a story by a United Press reporter to the effect that the 50–50 provisions of the statute enacted by the Congress in the past session are causing a bottleneck in the administration's program for selling farm surpluses overseas.

The story goes on to say that the Department of Agriculture is having trouble finding space on American vessels for nearly $60 million worth of commodities already under contract for shipping abroad. It points out that sufficient foreign ships are available, but the Department fears that these vessels may be tied up elsewhere by the time the required American ships are lined up.

I am deeply concerned with this situation. Since your organization represents a substantial portion of the American merchant marine, I should like to have a report immediately as to the facts of the matter from the standpoint of the American shipowners.

Very truly yours,

HERBERT C. BONNER,
Member of Congress, Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, to include therein a letter addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture, a letter addressed to the Chairman of the Merchant Marine Administration, Mr. Rothschild, and newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN MANDT NELSON

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I inform Members of Congress of the death on Saturday, January 29, of John Mandt Nelson, who served in the House of Representatives for 25 years. Part of the district which he represented is now in the Second Congressional District which I represent.

Mr. Nelson's death followed a long illness. He has been in retirement for a number of years. Funeral services will be held at Madison, Wis., today.

Born in Dane County on October 10, 1870, Mr. Nelson was a lifelong resident of Dane County, and a graduate of the University of Wisconsin at Madison with the class of 1892. He then became superintendent of schools in Dane County, and in 1894 went into the State capitol as a State employee.

He was first elected to the 59th Congress to fill a vacancy caused by the death of Representative Henry C. Adams, and served consecutive terms until 1919. He later was elected to the 67th Congress, and served 5 more terms, last leaving Congress on March 3, 1933.

An earlier follower of the late Robert M. La Follette, Sr., John M. Nelson was campaign manager for the La Follette-Wheeler national ticket in the presidential campaign of 1924.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from the Third District, which includes

part of the district Mr. Nelson represented.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my distinguished colleague from the Second District in paying tribute to Mr. Nelson, a very distinguished citizen of Wisconsin. I have the pleasure and the honor of representing some of the counties that were formerly in Mr. Nelson's district. I do know of the very high esteem in which the people of the Third Congressional District held Mr. Nelson. He was indeed a great American.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from the Ninth District, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON], who, I believe, knew Mr. Nelson.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues from Wisconsin, Mr. DAVIS, of the Second District, and Mr. WITHROW, from the Third District, in paying respect to the late Congressman John M. Nelson, who died in Madison, Wis., last week.

While I was not personally acquainted with Mr. Nelson, I remember reading about him many times, and I often heard my father, the late John E. Johnson, former Progressive assemblyman in the Wisconsin State Legislature, speak very highly of Mr. Nelson. He was a personal friend of my father, and both were pioneers in the old Bob La Follette Progressive movement at the start of the century. Mr. Nelson was a close friend of the senior La Follette and managed the 1924 Presidential campaign of Bob La Follette and Burton K. Wheeler. I well remember the 1924 campaign, as this was the first time I voted for President, and my vote was cast for Senator Robert M. La Follette, Sr. With the death of John M. Nelson, Wisconsin has lost one more of its outstanding Progressives, who did so much to bring Wisconsin to the foreground in the passage of liberal and forward-looking legislation.

In talking with my colleagues, I find that there are not many contemporaries of the late Congressman Nelson who served with him still in Congress. Mr. Nelson served in the House of Representatives from 1906 to 1919, and again from 1921 to 1923. However, our Speaker, Hon. Sam Rayburn; Congressman Carl Vinson, of Georgia; and our Parliamentarian, Lewis Deschler, state they remember him well.

I would like to pay my tribute to the memory of this great Progressive leader and to convey my sympathies to Mr. Nelson's family.

LIMITING THE POWER OF CONGRESS TO TAX INCOMES, INHERITANCES, AND GIFTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago in the 1st session of the 83d Congress, the Honorable EVERETT W. DIRKSEN, Senator from Illinois, and I introduced in the House and Senate a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the power of Congress to tax incomes, inheritances, and gifts—House Joint Resolution 103 and Senate Joint Resolution 23. Senator DIRKSEN and I are introducing the same resolution again this year.

The principal provisions of the amendment may be summarized as follows:

First. Income taxes:

The amendment limits income taxes on both individuals and corporations to a maximum rate of 25 percent, but permits Congress by a vote of three-fourths of the Members of each House to exceed that rate, provided the top rate does not exceed the bottom rate by more than 15 percentage points. For example, if the bottom rate were 20 percent, the top rate could not exceed 35 percent. If the top rate does not exceed 25 percent, however, there is no restriction at all on the bottom rate. It could, for instance, be 1 percent or one-half of 1 percent.

Subject to the foregoing limitations, the rates on corporate income may vary from those on individual incomes.

Second. Death and gift taxes:

The amendment also gives to the States the exclusive power to impose death and gift taxes.

It should be observed that the amendment merely limits the degree of tax rate progression. It does not prescribe the top rate that Congress may impose. Hence, it cannot be argued that the amendment impairs the Government's power to raise needed revenue during either peace or war, except, of course, with respect to the revenue derived from the estate and gift taxes, which is only about 1½ perent of the total. In other words, the amendment does not limit the amount of revenue that may be raised, but limits merely the manner in which it may be raised.

Its purpose and effect are merely to eliminate in large measure from our system of taxation its socialistic features; namely, first, the heavy progressive feature of the income tax; and, second, the confiscatory death tax, which will eventually dry up the sources of private capital and lead to the establishment of socialism with the accompanying loss of the people's liberty.

In a statement to the Temporary Economic Committee prior to World War II, Adolph Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, made the following significant prophecy:

> The Government will have to enter into direct financing of activities now supposed to be private, and a continuance of that direct financing must be [mean] inevitably that the Government will ultimately control and own those activities. * * * Over a period of years the Government will gradually come to own most of the productive plants of the United States.

I am convinced that Mr. Berle's prophecy will come true unless action to prevent it is taken before it is too late.

Legislation by Congress is obviously insufficient; for the work of a good Congress may be easily undone by that of a radical Congress.

The need of reform would seem to be obvious and I know of no way of giving permanence to such reform except through a constitutional amendment.

The ultimate objective of the amendment is a top individual income tax rate of 25 percent and a beginning rate of much less than 10 percent.

In determining whether such an objective is realistic it will be helpful to consider the possible tax effect of a budget of more reasonable proportions than the present one. The budget estimate of expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, is $63.504 billion. According to the Federal Budget in Brief, Government expenditures for the comparatively recent fiscal years 1948 to 1951, inclusive, were as follows:

	Expenditures in billions
1951 (which included a full year of the Korean war)	$44.058
1950	39.606
1949	39.507
1948	33.068

Prior to 1942, which was a war year, the largest expenditure of the Federal Government in any year was $18.4 billion in 1918, which was also a war year.

Let us suppose now the following changes in the budget receipts as estimated for the fiscal year 1955:

First. A reduction in the individual income tax rates to 10 percent on incomes up to $10,000 and 25 percent on the amounts in excess of $10,000; and

Second. Elimination of estate and gift taxes.

These changes would reduce the budget receipts to $47 billion, which is $3 billion greater than the budget expenditures for the fiscal year 1951 which included a full year of the Korean war. It is $7.5 billion greater than the budget expenditures for the fiscal years 1950 and 1949.

A beginning rate of 5 percent, instead of 10 percent, on individual incomes would reduce the receipts to $41.5 billion. This is $2 billion above the 1950 and 1949 expenditures, to say nothing of the $33 billion expenditures in 1948.

It would, of course, take some years to secure the adoption of the amendment, since it must be approved by two-thirds of both Houses of Congress and ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States.

About 85 percent of the estimated revenue from the individual income tax, which produces over half of the total revenue of the Federal Government, is produced by the first bracket rate of 20 percent when applied to the entire amount of taxable income in all brackets. Only 3 percent—about $2 billion—is provided by the rates in excess of 34 percent.

Accordingly, if we are to have enormous expenditures and correspondingly large revenue, the great bulk of the revenue must come from persons of small and moderate means. The only possible way to give relief to such persons is either, first, by reducing the need for revenue through cutting expenditures; or, second, by increasing revenue through a drastic reduction of the present confiscatory higher bracket rates so as to increase incentive and investment in productive enterprise. This would increase the national income which constitutes the tax base and thereby increase the revenue.

Any immediate loss in revenue through the elimination of the higher individual rates would undoubtedly be only temporary. Eventually the lower rates would produce greater revenue than the higher rates now in force.

Another important effect of the amendment which has not been sufficiently stressed would be to restore to the States the power to be financially independent and to free themselves from Federal domination. The Federal Government should not be permitted to hog the revenue and hand back part of it to the States on conditions.

It should be remembered that with minor exceptions every dollar spent by the Federal Government comes from the same sources of revenue that are available to the States. The States should raise the revenue and spend it themselves. Responsibility for the raising of revenue is one of the best checks upon extravagant and unwise expenditures. It is too easy to spend money raised by someone else.

Moreover, the States and municipalities are better fitted than the Federal Government to perform the services which are primarily of State or local concern and they would do so at much less cost. Performance of these services by the Federal Government has meant the maintenance at great cost of a vast horde of bureaucrats on the Federal payroll, many of whom could readily be dispensed with.

To summarize, the proposed amendment—

First. Largely eliminates from our Federal system of taxation its socialistic features and thereby puts an end to the use of the taxing power as means of forcing us into socialism;

Second. Does not impair the power of the Federal Government to raise revenue;

Third. Does not shift the burden of taxation from the rich to the poor;

Fourth. Aims at reducing eventually the taxes of everyone so that the top rate will not exceed 25 percent and the bottom rate will not exceed 10 percent, with the prospect that it will be much less;

Fifth. With lower rates will increase the national wealth and over the years the Federal revenue;

Sixth. Will restore to the States the power to be financially independent and to free themselves from Federal domination.

In the final analysis the problem resolves itself into the simple issue of whether we are to have in this country a system of society based upon, first, private enterprise and our constitutional form of government; or second, socialism. Both reason and the experience of other countries lead to the conclusion that our present system of confiscatory income and taxes, if long continued, will ultimately result in the establishment of socialism in place of our present system.

The changes in the impact of Federal taxes on the great bulk of the taxpayers involved in the proposed amendment are, as I pointed out, comparatively minor. Their beneficial effect, however, would be far reaching and decisive.

The changes in the income-tax provisions proposed in connection with and partially effected by the 1954 Revenue Code, such as reductions in the tax on dividends and increases in certain deductions and exemptions, are costly in revenue and will have only minor effect on the economy. The major evil to be corrected is the one at which the proposed amendment is aimed.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that this amendment is vastly different from the amendment which has been going through the State legislatures, an amendment which limits the power of Congress to impose income, death, and gift taxes to a maximum rate of 25 percent with no right to suspend the limitation except in time of war. That amendment is altogether too rigid and would seriously impair the Government's power to raise needed revenue from the income tax in time of peace.

The text of the resolution I have this day introduced is as follows:

House Joint Resolution 182

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The 16th article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration. The maximum top rate (a term which shall mean the aggregate of all top rates) of all taxes, duties, and excises which the Congress may lay or collect on, with respect to, or measured by, income shall not exceed 25 percent: *Provided, however,* That the Congress by a vote of three-fourths of all the Members of each House may fix such a maximum top rate in excess of 25 percent, for periods, either successive or otherwise, not exceeding 1 year each, if such rate so fixed does not exceed the lowest rate (a term which shall mean the aggregate of all lowest rates) by more than 15 percentage points. Subject to the foregoing limitations, the rates of tax applicable to the incomes of individuals may be different from the rates applicable to the incomes of corporations, which term shall include also associations, joint stock companies, and insurance companies. The determination of income subject to tax shall be by uniform rules of general application which shall not vary with the size of the income.

"SEC. 3. The Congress shall have no power to lay or collect any tax, duty, or excise with respect to the devolution or transfer of property, or any interest therein, upon or in contemplation of or intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after death, or by way of gift.

"SEC. 4. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect at midnight on the 31st day of December following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax on, with respect to, or measured by, income for any period ending on or prior to said 31st day of December laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect.

"SEC. 5. Section 3 shall take effect at midnight of the day of ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax with respect to any devolution or transfer occurring prior to the taking effect of section 3, laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect."

GROWING CRISIS IN EDUCATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the papers and magazines daily carry informed articles on the growing crisis in education. The Washington Post and Times Herald last Friday had a front page story on Emergency Action Asked on Schools. Senate and House hearings and reports confirm the conclusion that there has been much study and little action in this vital field. It is the present generation which needs help. The time is now—the children are here. The need to develop every youngster's full potentialities as an American heritage need not be debated. The need to develop the full potentialities of our human resources in our struggle for freedom need not be debated.

While the crisis in education is currently in the limelight, we are all aware also of the great shortage in doctors, nurses, dentists, and health facilities generally in this land of plenty.

As the situation worsens daily, I find that a great source of help is being denied to school and health institutions of the Nation as the result of faulty administration and the lack of coordination between responsible executive agencies.

The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 provided that useful and needed surplus Government property if so determined by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare might be allocated by the Secretary to educational and health agencies. The program has been of great help to thousands of institutions during the past 6 years. In fact, hundreds of millions of dollars worth of real and personal property has been donated for such purposes. I should not say "donated," as the property belongs to the taxpayers who prefer to use it rather than see it given away for 5 or 6 or 7 cents on the dollar. At any rate, many educational and health institutions report that this property has enabled them to continue to operate during the growing crisis the past few years.

Most of the property has come from the military services which use so much of the tax base of the Nation and State that local needs cannot be met. War and other emergencies place great though necessary burdens on our citizens. I find, however, that a regulation issued by Comptroller McNeil of the Department of Defense on February 1, 1954, has had the effect of abrogating the carefully considered and expressed intent of Congress with respect to the school and health surplus property program.

The regulation causes much of otherwise donable property to be capitalized

into stock-fund arrangements. Such property though surplus to needs of holding agencies cannot be donated under the regulation but must be sold. May I add that Government agencies do not own property—they are merely custodians for the people of the United States.

Huge auction and bid sales have been and are being held throughout the land with the average gross return amounting to 6 to 7 percent of cost. Some returns are considered substantial. That is, they bring 40 to 50 percent on the dollar.

Taxpayers, who know of the growing crisis in education and health have complained by the hundreds to the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Defense, the Budget Bureau, and the White House. There has been no corrective action in a year though studies continue to be made day by day.

It is my understanding that the President will transmit a message to Congress on February 15 respecting the crisis in education which is so familiar to him because of his work at Columbia University and in the White House. I am looking forward to this message with great anticipation. I am sure that the general public awaits it also and perhaps with a degree of apprehension and concern.

In the meantime, I am today, introducing a bill which I consider necessary to correct the donable surplus property program where a regulation issued by an executive department has set aside the will of Congress which alone under the Constitution has the authority to make all needful rules and regulations concerning the Nation's property. Mr. Speaker, I urge that this bill be referred to the proper committee for speedy action.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SHEPPARD (at the request of Mr. DOYLE) and to include related matter.

Mr. DENTON and to include statements made before the Committee on Ways and Means on January 28.

Mr. JONES of Missouri.

Mr. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. KEATING and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MASON and to include an editorial.

Mr. HILLINGS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOSMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CEDERBERG (at the request of Mr. DEROUNIAN).

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska.

Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin).

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BARTLETT, for the week beginning February 1, 1955, on account of official business.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for an indefinite time, on account of illness in the family.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on January 29, 1955, present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores and related positions and territories of that area.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned to Wednesday, February 2, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

339. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 8 (e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

340. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report relative to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals," pursuant to subsection (h) of section 1211 of Public Law 759, approved September 6, 1950; to the Committee on Appropriations.

341. A letter from the Administrative Assistant, Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report relative to the Report on Status of Appropriation Accounts for the period ended September 30, 1954, for the appropriation "Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration, 1954," pursuant to subsection (i) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

342. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

343. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of the Government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 12 of the act approved June 11, 1878 (20 Stat. 108); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

344. A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a statement of receipts and expenditures of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1954, pursuant to chapter 1628, acts of Congress 1904; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

345. A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a comparative general balance sheet of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1954, pursuant to paragraph 14 of the act of March 14, 1913; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

346. A letter from the president, Capital Transit Co., transmitting a report of operations of the company with balance sheet as of December 31, 1954, pursuant to section 10 of an act of Congress approved June 10, 1896, and paragraph 14 of section 8 of an act of Congress approved March 4, 1913 (Public Law 435); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

347. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to strengthen and improve State and local programs to combat and control juvenile delinquency"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

348. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the World Health Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

349. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting the annual report of the Civil Aeronautics Board covering fiscal year 1954; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

350. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to improve the health of the people by encouraging the extension of voluntary prepayment of health services plans, facilitating the financing of construction of needed health facilities, assisting in increasing the number of adequately trained nurses and other health personnel, improving and expanding programs of mental health and public health, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

351. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Bureau of Mines, Anthracite Research Laboratory located at Schuylkill Haven, Pa., for the calendar year 1954, pursuant to the act of December 18, 1942, (56 Stat. 1056); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

352. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Lignite Research Laboratory, Grand Forks, N. Dak., for the calendar year 1954, pursuant to the act of March 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 85); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

353. A letter from the Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting the 17th Semiannual Report of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

354. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide punishment for certain confidence game swindlers"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

355. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the annual report of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts showing statistical tables reflecting the business transacted by the bankruptcy courts and other pertinent data for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 53 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U. S. C. 81); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

356. A letter from the Administrative Assistant, Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Ralph Bennett and certain other employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

357. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to extend and strengthen the

Water Pollution Control Act"; to the Committee on Public Works.

358. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the maternal and child-health, crippled children, and child-welfare provisions of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

359. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the public-assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to provide separate matching of assistance expenditures for medical care, to provide gradually for equal matching of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, and to make clear the purpose of encouraging States to provide services to help needy individuals attain self-support or self-care, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 63. Resolution to conduct an inspection of the Veterans' Administration; with amendment (Rept. No. 12). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 35. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the benefits provided under Federal law for the surviving dependents of deceased members and former members of the Armed Forces; with amendment (Rept. No. 13). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 118. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; with amendment (Rept. No. 14). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 3292. A bill to amend the maternal and child-health, crippled children, and child-welfare provisions of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3293. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to provide separate matching of assistance expenditures for medical care, to provide gradually for equal matching of old-age assistance expenditures supplementing old-age and survivors insurance benefits, and to make clear the purpose of encouraging States to provide services to help needy individuals attain self-support or self-care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 3294. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to $1.35; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BASS of Tennessee:

H. R. 3295. A bill to liberalize the definition of "widow of a World War I veteran" governing the payment of compensation or pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 3296. A bill to rescind and revoke membership of the United States in the United Nations and the specialized agencies thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 3297. A bill to promote the national defense and security by providing for a temporary program to aid in relieving the shortage of physicians and other health personnel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3298. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3299. A bill making an appropriation for the prosecution of the Delaware River channel deepening project, as heretofore authorized by law; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3300. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 3301. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to prohibit the segregation of passengers on account of race or color; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3302. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 3303. A bill to provide that Federal funds shall not be used for loans, grants, or other financial assistance to provide housing with respect to which there is any discrimination against occupancy on account of race, religion, color, ancestry, or national origin; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3304. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3305. A bill to withhold Federal aid from schools which discriminate between students by reason of their race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3306. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. R. 3307. A bill for the establishment of the United States Commission on the Aging and Aged; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 3308. A bill to provide for the sale of certain lands in Haskell County, Okla.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 3309. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide monthly insurance benefits in certain cases for brothers, sisters, and other relatives of individuals who die fully insured under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 3310. A bill to promote the further development of public-library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3311. A bill to make certain changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H. R. 3312. A bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3313. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Oklahoma, to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries as they affect such States; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3314. A bill to exempt States and political subdivisions thereof from the tax on conveyances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia:

H. R. 3315. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of manganese-bearing ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 3316. A bill to continue authority to make funds available for loans and grants under title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3317. A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 3318. A bill to amend section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the maintenance of the Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 3319. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KNOX:

H. R. 3320. A bill to provide that the fluid milk program for schools, established by section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of the National School Lunch Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 3321. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 3322. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to improve the administration of the program for the utilization of surplus property for educational and public health purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 3323. A bill to provide uniformity in the rates of disability compensation payable to certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 3324. A bill to provide for the construction of a Veterans' Administration Hospital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3325. A bill to amend subsection 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 3326. A bill to provide for emergency Federal financial assistance to the States and Territories in the construction of urgently needed public elementary and secondary school facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROBESON of Virginia:

H. R. 3327. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain war housing projects to the city of Warwick, Va., and the city of Hampton, Va.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 3328. A bill granting increases in the annuities of certain former civilian officials and employees engaged in and about the

construction of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 3329. A bill to provide additional time to file claims for the refund or credit of tax overpayments resulting from reductions in tax rates under certain international conventions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H. R. 3330. A bill to exempt farm equipment repair parts from the excise tax levied on automobile parts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 3331. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3332. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, to provide that members of the Armed Forces shall be granted leave upon the critical illness or death of a close relative; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Miss THOMPSON of Michigan:

H. R. 3333. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code relating to the mailing and transportation of obscene matter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 3334. A bill making an appropriation for the prosecution of the Delaware River Channel deepening project, as heretofore authorized by law; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 3335. A bill to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 3336. A bill to authorize the construction and conversion of modern naval vessels; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 3337. A bill to amend the Trade Agreements Extension Act of July 1, 1954, so as to assure the availability of materials essential to national security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 3338. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of March 12, 1914; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Kansas:

H. R. 3339. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall investigate and report upon the advisability of establishing a national monument and national cemetery on the site of the old Fort Wallace Post Cemetery, Kansas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 3340. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3341. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of June 27, 1934; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 182. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. J. Res. 183. Joint resolution placing certain individuals who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, and in the islands of Leyte and Samar after July 4, 1902, and their survivors, in the same status as those who served in the Armed Forces during the Philippine Insurrection and their survivors; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. J. Res. 184. Joint resolution to designate the 1st day of May 1955, as Loyalty Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. Res. 121. Resolution to direct the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate actual and contemplated action affecting production or consumption of newsprint; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to act in the matter in relation to the regulation of fishing in Yosemite National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the compensation of postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to authorize the Colorado River storage project, including the Echo Park Dam and participating projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate Federal funds to assist municipalities within signatory States of the Ohio River Valley compact in financing sanitary sewer systems and sewage treatment facilities; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 3342. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe (Joseph) Gualtieri alias Nicolo or Nicholas Gualtieri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BETTS:

H. R. 3343. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Blanche Houser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3344. A bill for the relief of Elfriede K. Bruck Beal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARRIGG:

H. R. 3345. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosa Pfiffner Stout; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 3346. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anne Alice Grunow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 3347. A bill for the relief of Ellen Kjosnes and Unni Kjosnes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3348. A bill for the relief of Erminio Cobbe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3349. A bill for the relief of Osamu Ikeda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 3350. A bill to provide for the sale by the Secretary of the Interior of certain public lands of the United States which have not been used for the purpose for which acquired; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3351. A bill to provide for the sale by the Secretary of the Interior of certain public lands of the United States which have not been used for the purpose for which acquired; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 3352. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ida Gordon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3353. A bill for the relief of Eli E. Hood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3354. A bill for the relief of Julius G. Watson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 3355. A bill for the relief of Gino G. Fabbian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H. R. 3356. A bill for the relief of Rachmiel Kawer and Ida Kawer (nee Grodner); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL (by request):

H. R. 3357. A bill for the relief of Colin D. Burgess; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 3358. A bill for the relief of Stanley Dusza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 3359. A bill for the relief of Raymond George Palmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 3360. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Ioanou Papadopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3361. A bill for the relief of Joe Kawakami; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3362. A bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, deceased, former Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3363. A bill for the relief of Rodolfo C. Delgado, Jesus M. Lagua, and Vicente D. Reynante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3364. A bill for the relief of Ernest W. Berry, Alaska Native Service schoolteacher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3365. A bill for the relief of Robert Burns DeWitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3366. A bill for the relief of Mary J. McDougall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3367. A bill for the relief of Col. Walter E. Ahearn, and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3368. A bill for the relief of Paolo Giuseppe Cambiaggio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 3369. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Taicia Meyers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H. R. 3370. A bill for the relief of John Flanagan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3371. A bill for the relief of Hildegarde Hiller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 3372. A bill for the relief of Vasilie Hulunga or William George Lucas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 3373. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Zella K. Thissell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3374. A bill for the relief of Dr. Kuo-York Chynn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 3375. A bill for the relief of Dr. James C. S. Lee, his wife Dora Ting Wei, and their daughter, Vivian Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY (by request):

H. R. 3376. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary A. Sansone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SILER:

H. R. 3377. A bill for the relief of John Y. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TABER:

H. R. 3378. A bill for the relief of Solomon Joseph Sadakne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 3379. A bill for the relief of Federico Ancheta (also known as Rodencio A. Cabotage); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 3380. A bill for the relief of Edith Kohn Vogel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

70. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution adopted by the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators, requesting the establishment of special low postage rates for mailing motor-vehicle license plates and certificates of title; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

71. Also, petition of Western Printing & Lithographing Co., Racine, Wis., opposing H. R. 1 and any drastic cut in tariffs which might seriously affect economy of printing and bookbinding industry of this country; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

72. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, Minneapolis, Minn., relative to a resolution adopted June 14, 1954, by the Evangelical Lutheran Church, relating to the appointment of a chaplain for the United States Military Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

73. Also, petition of the president, International Dental Federation, Nashville, Tenn., relative to a resolution adopted by the American Dental Association, relating to the association's interest in providing additional resources in support of the program of the World Health Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

74. Also, petition of Shepard B. Wetherington and others, Baltimore, Md., requesting the lowering of the old-age retirement age limit from 65 to 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

75. Also, petition of the president of the City Council, Philadelphia, Pa., relative to the deepening of the Delaware River at Federal expense; to the Committee on Public Works.

76. Also, petition of Eduard Heck, Leverkusen, Germany, relative to a request for the payment of the assets of William Kremer, deceased at Bronx, N. Y., 1942, to his inheritors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Joint Resolution To Provide for a Commission on Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in the House a joint resolution to provide for a commission to make available information as to the basic differences between the theories and practices of the American way of life and the theories and practices of atheistic communism which reads as follows:

Joint resolution to provide for a Commission to make available information as to the basic differences between the theories and practices of the American way of life and the theories and practices of atheistic communism

Resolved, etc.—

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION

SECTION 1. (a) There is hereby established a Commission to be known as the Commission To Make Available Information as to the Basic Differences Between the Theories and Practices of the American Way of Life and the Theories and Practices of Atheistic Communism (in this joint resolution referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of 11 members as follows:

(1) Two Members from the Senate of the United States, appointed by the President of the Senate;

(2) Two Members from the House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker of the House;

(3) Three members appointed by the President from among individuals each of whom is a member of the standing committee on American citizenship of the American Bar Association, and who have been nominated by the board of governors of the American Bar Association;

(4) Three members appointed by the President from among individuals each of whom is a member of the Association of American Colleges or the American Council of Education, and who have been nominated by the respective governing boards of those organizations; and

(5) One member appointed by the President from private life, to be Chairman of the Commission.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 2. The Commission—

(1) shall make a study of the testimony relating to the theories and practices of atheistic communism which, since the end of World War II, has been taken under oath by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the House Select Committee to Conduct an Investigation of the Facts, Evidence, and Circumstances of the Katyn Forest Massacre, the House Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression and the Forced Incorporation of the Baltic States Into the U. S. S. R., and by any other standing committee of the Senate or House of Representatives, and by any agency in the executive branch of the United States Government; and on the basis of its study, shall prepare material for a book, incorporating only testimony taken under oath by the committees and agencies referred to above, selections as to give the fullest possible information as to the theories and practices of atheistic communism; and

(2) shall prepare suggested curricula of studies, suitable for us in the teaching of courses in schools, colleges, and universities, which will make clear the basic differences between the theories and practices of the American way of life and the theories and practices of atheistic communism, and for this purpose it shall be the duty of the Commission to review all pertinent data available to it.

QUORUM

SEC. 3. Six members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) The members from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

AVAILABILITY OF RECORDS AND DATA

SEC. 7. To the extent necessary in order to enable the Commission to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution, the Commission shall be permitted to have access to the records and data of committees and agencies referred to in section 2.

APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN LAWS

SEC. 8. Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

REPORTS

SEC. 9. Upon completion of its work, but not later than December 31, 1955, the Commission shall submit to the President a report containing the textbook and curricula of studies referred to in section 2. Not later than March 1, 1956, the President shall submit the Commission's report to the Congress, together with such comments and recommendations as he deems advisable.

TERMINATION OF COMMISSION

SEC. 10. The Commission shall cease to exist on the 30th day following the date on which the President submits the Commission's report to the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this is the answer to communism.

There is absolutely nothing in this resolution which will in any way interfere with the local administration of the educational systems of the United States. The proponent of this resolution firmly believes that our educational systems belong on the State and local level and not in the Federal Government. The proposed Commission is to function as a purely advisory body to the Congress of the United States. The work of this Commission is to be made available for future action by the Congress if deemed

advisable. Let it be understood that the proponent of this resolution states that he emphatically believes that the Federal Government must not interfere with our educational systems as established in this country.

TEACHING THE PRACTICES OF ATHEISTIC COMMUNISM—DILEMMA

Today the United States of America finds itself suspended on the horns of what appears to be an impossible dilemma—atheistic communism as one horn and organized confusion the other horn. Every right-thinking person admits the existing danger to the free world in the armed atheistic communism marching throughout the world, but they are at a loss as to how to combat the menace. Thus we have organized confusion as to what our youth should be taught concerning atheistic communism. The people are completely confused and befuddled because of the many nebulous newspaper headlines of the past 3 or 4 years. They question the purpose and validity of many writers on the subject of communism. Yet the fathers and mothers of the youth who are going to be the real fighters against atheistic communism want the facts taught to their children. At the present time it is admitted that no textbook acceptable to all the people is available, but such a textbook can be made available without the Government interfering in any way with our educational system.

THE STRUGGLE FOR THE MINDS OF YOUTH

Much has been published in recent years concerning the atheistic Communist system forcibly taking the children from their parents at an early age and placing them in state-controlled schools. Older people know the reason for this inhuman practice, but do our children understand this destruction of the family? This practice is diametrically opposed to our way of life, but this system must be explained to our youth. Transportation facilities have caused the world to shrink and the aggressiveness of atheistic communism forces the United States of America to maintain a farflung Military Establishment which must be manned by our youth. We all appreciate that youth wants to know the cold, hard facts of atheistic communism, but it must be based on unimpeachable testimony. The leaders in education and legal professions have a mandatory duty to make available to our youth the truth about the practices of atheistic communism in order to better equip them to fight it, not only physically but mentally as well. There is one saying we all understand: "We never fear anything we know." Thus our youth will be better prepared to withstand the cruel and inhuman treatment they can expect to receive at the hands of their captors if they should become prisoners of war. Testimony verifying such treatment has been recorded by a Senate committee from survivors of POW camps in Korea. The newspapers have carried headlines of this cruel and inhuman treatment, but they have not given the detailed and accurate account so necessary for the youth who must face this possible situation. It is not enough to say, "Let the military teach them."

CAN YOU ANSWER THIS QUESTION?

Every speaker on the subject of communism sooner or later is faced with this question from the youth in his audience, "Why is everybody against communism or the Russians?" Can you answer that question from the floor in a few well-chosen sentences within the time allocation or would you have to spend hours in reply to satisfy the inquisitive mind of youth? Youth must see and hear in order to believe. We all know that theory is required but it is what is put into effect or practiced that counts. Atheistic communism and its practices cannot stand the light of truth, but this light must be lit with the torch of facts not fancy or theory. The Congressmen who have stood before public audiences telling the truth they have learned from their investigations into atheistic communism are always asked these questions, "Why haven't we heard about this work of your committee before—this is the real thing." "Why aren't these facts as you have given them tonight taught in our schools?" These are concrete, hard-hitting questions which the Congressmen find almost impossible to answer.

WHO IS TO BLAME?

No one person, group, Government agency, or congressional committee can be blamed for this incoherent situation concerning atheistic communism which exists today. The fact is that this inherent danger from atheistic communism has been ever present and known by many people, but in recent years it has suddenly burst on all the people and our leaders have not known how to cope with the problem. Yes, aggressive action has been taken by a great many different individuals and agencies with the result that we have created a muddled chaotic situation which permits those dedicated to the cause of atheistic communism to skillfully continue their nefarious methods to divide the people of America. We have all the necessary tools and instruments to thwart them but no basic plan of concerted action. Because of our own failure to think clearly and unemotionally are we going to stand by and allow others to keep us in a state of chaos and permit to rise in this country a system of fear and suspicion which the enemy has so successfully used throughout the world? To put it simply, are we going to let the system we are fighting destroy us from within by turning our people against each other without just cause and not in accordance with our own system of justice? The answer lies in pulling together documented facts concerning the practices of atheistic communism—facts which are irrefutable and already proved before the bar of public opinion. There are those among us who will question these facts, but then the burden of proof will shift to their shoulders.

NATIONALISM ON THE RISE

During World War II American GI's visited in many foreign lands and mingled with people who had never seen or heard about America. These GI's were typically normal, individual Americans with an appreciation of freedom which is theirs under the American system of self-government. These people had never seen such freedom in action, if in fact they had ever heard of such freedom. In their countries such liberty and prosperity was never heard of or permitted. Thus the American GI's left these people in a state of wonderment and dazed condition to return to their homes and ask, "Why can't we be like that?" Who asks such questions?—naturally the youth of those countries.

Then in the wake of departing American GI's the merchants of propaganda and deceit move in as agents for atheistic communism. They fan the imagination of the youth in those countries with promises never to be fulfilled but still very effective in their appeal. Subversion becomes rampant and mob psychology among the youth prevails with telling effect in country after country. All the strings being carefully and skillfully manipulated by subversive agents of atheistic communism appealing to the youth of the country. If you doubt this statement, look at the record in Indochina and what happened while the free world slept. Thus, America has a duty to make available to the world the cold, hard facts concerning the practices of atheistic communism and this can be done by congressional action now.

THE FUTURE

It is self-evident that America must maintain a strong military establishment for years to come and this can only be done by the training of our youth. During the course of military duty most of our young men will have to serve overseas at one of our 49 bases on foreign soil. This tour of duty will necessarily place them in direct contact with the natives of the country where the bases are located. America has now discovered with deep chagrin one glaring defect in our educational system, namely, the proper method of teaching foreign languages. Great strides have been made toward correcting this defect, but let us not forget that our young men also need a good knowledge of the practices of atheistic communism. In many lands the natives are uncertain and hesitant about the form of government they want. Therefore, it is only fitting that our young ambassadors of the American way be prepared to discuss the merits of self-government as practiced in the United States and intelligently point out the fallacies in the so-called self-government as practiced in the U. S. S. R. and its satellites. The same result will be obtained at home as well as abroad if irrefutable proof is presented to our youth during their formative years. Much has been said about our so-called materialism—well let us get real material and present the facts in approved concrete form that cannot be denied.

ACTION OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

May it be said to the everlasting credit of the Pennsylvania Bar Association which resolved this problem at its 1954 session and the American Bar Association through its standing committee on American citizenship they have come face to face with the problem. Last August before the 77th annual meeting of the American Bar Association this standing committee presented a recommendation as amended by a suggestion

of the board of governors which is as follows:

Whereas the American Bar Association believes that enlightened citizenship requires intelligent understanding of world problems, free discussion and courageous thinking: Be it

Resolved, That there be adequate teaching of the principles of the Constitution of the United States and the facts of the theory and practices of our Government thereunder in all educational institutions of each State; and be it further

Resolved, That students at appropriate levels of education in educational institutions of each State be made acquainted with the theory and practice of communism in order to demonstrate its inherent fallacies and its threat to the privileges and liberties of free peoples; and be it further

Resolved, That the Association stands ready to implement the purposes of this resolution by aiding in the preparation of suitable material and otherwise through its standing committee on American citizenship.

This matter was ably handled there by the Honorable Walter M. Bastian, circuit judge of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia. A number of amendments were proposed, including one which was also acceptable to the committee using the exact language of a comparable resolution adopted by the Pennsylvania Bar Association. After much debate the resolution and proposed amendment were laid on the table.

What action will the House take? Some action should and must be taken due to the present day world conditions which show no sign of abatement on the part of the apologists for atheistic communism. I raise this question of teaching the practices of atheistic communism in our schools, therefore, I propose a solution or plan. Is there a solution or plan? The answer is "Yes," definitely and unequivocally.

Since the end of World War II the Congress of the United States has conducted numerous hearings and investigations concerning the practices of atheistic communism. The major portion of this evidence and testimony has been taken under oath. The hearings have been held not only in the United States but also in London, Frankfort, Munich, and Berlin. The testimony of witnesses has been taken in public before audiences and in a legal atmosphere.

This data on the practices of atheistic communism was meticuously compiled and taken many times at great personal risk for the witnesses' lives or those of his relatives or loved ones still behind the Iron Curtain. Many of these witnesses were recognized and reputable leaders in their own countries before they were forced to leave the aggressive action of atheistic Communists. These men know the facts, their testimony cannot be denied.

There are thousands of Americans who are unaware of the painstaking and careful task their Representatives in Congress have performed in recent years. Furthermore, the money used to record this evidence was furnished by the American taxpayer. Thus, the taxpayer should receive a return on his investment to his children in our educational institutions.

Many Americans are rightly concerned about who is sponsoring what in this field of atheistic communism. They are also concerned about what material their children should read and study on this subject.

No one who believes in the American system of self-government and fair play can possibly object to having the sworn testimony of witnesses who have lived under atheistic communism presented to their children in textbook form. What is more, any tendency or attempt to discredit such testimony on the part of any teacher would result in the students asking, "How do you know—were you there—these men have lived under atheistic communism?"

Last year Congress outlawed the Communist Party in the United States. How many educators or lawyers can cite clearly and concisely the chain of events that led to such a law? Is there a book available today which traces a course of history begininng with the Smith Act? The youth must be told the reasons for this action on the part of Congress and what better way than to reproduce word for word the sworn testimony of men who have lived under atheistic communism.

Actually if Congress were to create a Commission to provide the necessary funds for the compilation of a textbook on the practices of atheistic communism, they would be doing their duty and the people would be receiving the facts that they paid for gathering in the first instance.

In addition, everyone in the United States would know the source material of such a textbook—who, where, when and how it was compiled and could object before its publication. The Congress of the United States would have to vote on such a textbook before it could be made available to our educational institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution.

California's Natural-Gas Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 31, 1955

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disturbed by reports from southern California that a recent cold snap there caused a serious shortage of natural gas, which required emergency measures to keep our industrial plants functioning and our citizens comfortable in such highly unusual California weather.

Shut-in storage wells had to be put on production at Goleta. The Southern California Gas Co. withdrew about 100 million cubic feet of gas from storage daily. Industrial consumers were cut off from their normal supply and were forced to fall back on standby fuel—which, fortunately, was available in the form of fuel oil.

Meanwhile, householders who rely on propane, or other liquefied petroleum gases, to heat their homes, were faced with an even more acute problem. I am happy to say that, after considerable effort on the part of the LPG companies, as they are called, they were tided over the cold spell. But, it was touch and go.

Now this was just a temporary cold front, seldom encountered in southern California. However, it has serious overtones for the future, for California, although a large producer of natural gas, has recently become dependent on other States for just about half of its natural gas supply. As late as 1946, we were able to produce all our natural gas needs. But, because of our tremendous population growth and the increasing popularity of this fuel, only 7 years later we were forced to import 41½ percent of our supply.

Only a year later, that figure was 49.7 percent, an increase of 8 percent in just 1 year, and it is still climbing.

These and other vitally important statistics on California's natural gas situation explain why the people of southern California are genuinely concerned with this problem.

Many representative groups in California have recently adopted resolutions calling upon this Congress to amend the Natural Gas Act and thus help to preserve that part of our supply which reaches us from other States. These great institutions, as well as some of the State's leading newspapers, are reflecting the great concern of the people of California when they call upon us for action, for they know that if the Federal Power Commission is permitted to clamp price controls on the production of natural gas it can mean only that the supply of this fuel available to California will shrink dangerously and rapidly while at the same time the demand for it is skyrocketing. For, Mr. Speaker, they know that the hard fact is that price controls of whatever kind have never created plenty; they always have created and always will create scarcity. And scarcity can only mean higher and higher prices.

It costs an average of $100,000 to drill a well, and who is going to gamble that much money in such a risky undertaking if Uncle Sam is going to place a low ceiling on his profit? Only recently, in California, the Ohio Oil Co. abandoned as a failure a well which had been drilled to 21,482 feet at a cost of $2¼ million.

In my State both household users and industrial users have a large stake in seeing to it that an abundant supply of this fuel is available. The number of gas customers in California, for example, jumped more than 50 percent between 1946 and 1953—from 2,210,000 to 3,326,000.

It is also a vital factor in our supply of electricity, for the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power estimates that in the next 30 years about 50 percent of its fuel needs will come from natural gas.

Those who are interested in the industrial development of southern California—and, indeed, in industrial development everywhere—must be concerned with what is happening right now in Oklahoma. There has come to my attention an attractive leaflet published by the Oklahoma Development Council, 135

Northwest Second Street, Oklahoma City, Okla. Here are three important paragraphs from this booklet:

A new situation is diverting billions of cubic feet of unsold natural gas from prospective interstate markets and making it available for use only within Oklahoma.

Formerly, there were plans to sell much of these huge, uncommitted underground supplies of gas for use outside the State. But because of the recent imposition of Federal regulation over gas produced for interstate sales, producers are abandoning this market in making new contracts for gas sales. They now plan to hold this gas for use within the State.

Locate your new plant in Oklahoma where you will not be faced with dwindling supplies of natural gas as a result of Federal regulation. With ample gas available for long-term contracts free of Federal regulation, Oklahoma offers the ideal location for industrial expansion.

Thus, the people of California know that the absence of corrective legislation gives them pause for many reasons. Federal price controls on production will eat into California's source of supply from two sides—it will destroy the explorer's incentive and it will keep at home in Texas, Oklahoma, and elsewhere, supplies of gas which, we have seen, are sorely needed in California.

Postal Rate Increase Long Overdue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 31, 1955

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am today inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the Boston Herald and another from the Washington Star, which set forth my thinking quite adequately in regard to the postal rate increases on first-, second-, and third-class mail, which I believe are long overdue.

The very fact that postage rates on letters are the same that they were in 1932 indicates to me that the Congress has not faced up to its responsibility as far as the revenues of the Post Office Department are concerned, since we are certainly all aware that costs—no matter whether they are in the Post Office Department or in our own personal lives or our personal businesses—have gone up tremendously since that time. The same situation exists as to second-class mail. Second-class rates are only about 3 percent higher than in 1932. On third-class mail, which is known as business mail, the expenses exceeded the revenues in 1954 by $147 million.

It is difficult for me to understand, in view of these facts, why any Member of Congress should not be willing to vote for adequate rate increases as proposed by this administration. I intend to vote for these proposed rate increases because I believe that, as a Member of Congress representing the citizens of my 10th Congressional District of Michigan, I would be derelict in my duty to them if I did not vote for these rate increases. I do not believe that we can expect the average taxpayer of this country to subsidize the users of the mails—whether they be individuals, business houses, or otherwise. Of course, I am excepting from this category religious and charitable organizations.

When we stop to consider that about 75 percent of the first-class mail handled in this country is that of business concerns, and that only 25 percent of it is attributable to individual use, then it seems to me that there is no excuse whatsoever in not being sure that these business houses—whether they use first, second-, third-, or fourth-class mail—pay the expense of handling letters and other mail matter.

There has been little or no opposition to this from the users of the mail, except in a few instances, but there has been no major concerted effort on behalf of business to block any rate increases, because after all businessmen are just as aware of the fact that the costs of handling mail have gone up as have costs in their own particular business. Therefore any opposition would not be sincere. They realize that their opposition would certainly be inconsistent in comparison with the costs of other operations of their business.

As a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee I intend to do all that I can to see that the users of the various classes of the mails pay a just rate for this service. I cannot in good conscience expect the citizens of my district to pay from their tax dollars to support the users of the mails.

The President has wisely proposed salary increases and new classification schedules for postal employees, and I intend to support him in this regard, as I have done in the past. If the recommendations are adopted—and I hope that they will be—and the requested rate increases are denied, the postal deficit will be about $500 million annually. Such a deficit, in view of the fact that the postal rates on first-, second-, and third-class mail have never kept pace with the increased costs, is in my judgment unthinkable.

There are those who fear that there may be political repercussions if the postage rates are increased. I take the opposite view, as I feel that there will be political repercussions if they are not increased. You can fool the American public just so long, but as soon as they become fully informed—as they will be—that their tax dollars are subsidizing the users of the mails at the rate of over $1 million a day, they will soon require an accounting of the activities of their representatives in this regard.

I believe that it is time that we approach this problem in a realistic, businesslike, and nonpartisan manner, so that we can, through our positive action, assure this Nation of a modern postal system, adequate not only for today's needs but capable of handling the additional needs which will arise as our economy expands during the coming years.

The Boston Herald editorial of January 22, 1955, appropriately asks "Why shouldn't the Post Office Department make money" and calls the mailing of a letter or parcel in the United States the biggest bargain on earth.

That editorial follows:

TOO BIG A BARGAIN

Why shouldn't the Post Office Department make money, or at least break even, rather than lose it at the rate of a million dollars a day?

The mail is big business. Why shouldn't it be good business, as it is in most European countries?

There are a number of reasons. We have the lowest postal rates in the world. Our postal system, unfortunately, is in politics. Our mails cover tremendous space and distance. The costs, labor and mechanical, are high. The franking privilege extended to Federal legislators alone costs $1,500,000 per year.

There is not too much we can do about labor and mechanical costs. Some post offices can be closed. Some employees can be discharged. Perhaps more automatic machinery can speed up the process.

There is nothing we can do about space and distance. The West and the East, the South and the North, will always be so many miles apart.

It is probably hopeless to get the post office out of politics or wrest the franking privilege away from our legislators, although both are desirable.

But we can do something about postal rates.

Mailing a letter or a newspaper or a book or a parcel in the United States has been called the biggest bargain on earth. It darned near is, too.

It costs 3 cents to mail a letter in the United States. According to a New York Times survey made last year, it costs 8.5 cents to mail a letter in Sweden; 9.6 cents in Germany, and 4.17 cents in England.

The 3-cent rate has been in effect for 25 years. While the cost of just about everything else has doubled, and even trebled, the cost of mailing a letter has remained the same. What could be less realistic?

President Eisenhower has asked for an increase in mail rates in order to cut down the huge postal deficit and cover a pay raise for postal workers. We hope the Democratic Congress will go along with him on this necessary measure. The American people and their businesses can afford it and would, in fact, benefit from such a step.

Only yesterday, in its Sunday edition, the Washington Star expressed the hope that Congress would act forthrightly on the postal-rate bill.

That editorial follows:

SEPARATE, BUT RELATED

Postmaster General Summerfield, a stickler for carefully wrapped parcels, sent his postal-pay and postal-rates proposals to Congress in a well-tied package. But it did not take congressional leaders long to unwrap the bundle and lay the postage problem aside for later consideration. This is the same procedure followed last year—with disastrous results, namely, a Presidential veto of a non-revenue-providing pay bill. Congress ought not make the same mistake twice in a row.

It is proper to handle the postage question in hearings apart from those called to consider a pay increase for post-office workers, but it is hiding one's head in the sand to contend that there is no relation between the two subjects. The administration has held that one should not be passed without the other as a companion piece. The postal deficit has been cut under the Summerfield regime from about $500 million a year to between $300 and $400 million. The 5-percent pay raise and fringe benefits recommended by the administration would add about $170 million to the deficit.

Mr. Summerfield again, therefore, has asked that the postal service be put more nearly on a self-sustaining level through

increased rates on letters and on second- and third-class mail. There is always an outcry against such proposals. The issue to be decided is to what extent the Government is to continue to subsidize mail costs. No Postmaster General has ventured to suggest that the whole postal system should be self-supporting, but many have urged Congress to reduce the deficit—and hence the subsidy. It is to be hoped that the new Congress will act as forthrightly on the postal-rate bill as it plans to act on postal and classified pay legislation.

Oil Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1955

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include two statements calling attention to the need for curtailment of the present heavy flow of foreign oil imports into this country. One is the statement made by Mr. Alfred A. Kiltz, of Evansville, Ind., president of the Independent Oil Producers and Land Owners Association of Indiana, Illinois, and Kentucky, before the House Committee on Ways and Means January 28, 1955, during hearings on extension of the Trade Agreements Act. The other is my statement to that committee on the same day, pointing out both the immediate injury that unrestricted importation of oil does to independent oil operators and the workingmen of the coal industry and the potential harm of this policy to our international relations and the national security.

The statements follow:

STATEMENT OF ALFRED A. KILTZ, PRESIDENT INDEPENDENT OIL PRODUCERS AND LANDOWNERS' ASSOCIATION OF INDIANA, ILLINOIS, AND KENTUCKY, JANUARY 28, 1955

My name is Alfred A. Kiltz, of Evansville, Ind. I am president of the Independent Oil Producers and Landowners' Association of Indiana, Illinois, and Kentucky. I am a director of the Illinois Oil and Gas Association; the Indiana Oil and Gas Association; a member of the Governor's Oil Advisory Committee of the State of Indiana, and of the regulatory practices committee of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission. I am also chief counsel of the Farm Bureau Oil Co., Inc., and the Petroleum Department of the Indiana Farm Bureau Cooperative Association, Inc., of Mt. Vernon, Ind. These two companies operate 300 miles of crude oil gathering lines throughout Indiana, Illinois, and Kentucky; purchasing about 20,000 barrels of crude oil per day from independent producers. They refine about 10,000 barrels per day, selling their excess of crude purchased over refinery requirements to other refiners of the Midwest. They operate a 230-mile finished products pipeline to central and northern Indiana, and furnish more finished petroleum products to the farm than any other company in Indiana. These companies are strictly farmer-owned and have always depended for crude supply upon oil produced in Indiana, Illinois, and Kentucky, by independent producers. They have worked closely with independent operators during the last 15 years, making available materials and equipment; loaning independents about $20,000,000 for operations and development; buying their crude oil and extending them pipeline facilities. Most of the crude of our area has been discovered by independent wildcatters.

Eight years ago, the Tri-State basin was producing about 500,000 barrels of crude oil daily; the price was stable and there was no difficulty in disposing of crude oil in excess of local refinery requirements. In fact, the obtaining of crude oil was upon a competitive basis.

Today, strange situations are developing in the basin, a thousand miles from any sea coast and in the heart of America's bread basket. This Tri-State basin now produces only 264,000 barrels of crude oil per day as compared to the former 500,000 barrels, or only 4 percent of United States production; yet, we are told that we must prorate production because we are flooding the market with crude. When the absurdity of this is pointed out, we are told that fabulous new supplies from the Northwest are flooding into our Middle West. We investigate and find that Colorado, Nebraska, Montana, Wyoming, and North Dakota have a combined production of only 483,000 barrels per day, or 7½ percent of the United States total. We made a fact-finding trip to the Northwest during the latter part of last June and determined that it could not be this area's production which was causing distress in our Tri-State basin.

The situation has become steadily worse with independent operators being unable to make pipeline connections for their new wells, even though such wells might be located within a few feet of an existing gathering line. Independents must be able to sell their oil in order to obtain loans with which to continue development and wildcatting.

Upon last July 1, one of the principal pipeline companies purchasing oil in the Tri-State basin, prorated all gatherings and purchases down to 70 percent of June runs. Upon the following July 9, another principal pipeline purchaser and gatherer of crude in the area did not prorate, but reduced the price of crude 12 cents per barrel, from $3.02 to $2.90. This disturbed the entire financial structure of the independent producers; the drilling of development and wildcat wells immediately began to drop off. Drilling rigs were stacked or made an exodus from the basin. Mass meetings were held by independent producers. Farm Bureau, the only remaining large purchaser of independent crude trying to hold the line against proration and price reduction, was besieged with pleas to take on connections; but its own tanks were full and crude oil could not be moved and sold to other refineries normally purchasing Farm Bureau's excess crude oil. The use for Tri-State crude had suddenly dried up. Imports of foreign crude through faraway seaports were supplanting the crude oil of our Tri-State area.

During the middle of last July, I was sent to Texas by our independent producers and there advised with Gen. Ernest O. Thompson, chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission—in our opinion the leading authority in the world today upon oil. He advised that he had obtained the promises of major importers that there would be a voluntary regulation of imports; that all States should cooperate in prorating production until the situation had adjusted itself; that the difficulty would be all over in 6 weeks and normalcy would be restored; and everything would rapidly fall into balance. This information was delivered to a meeting of independent producers of Indiana, Illinois, and Kentucky, July 23, 1954, and they agreed to voluntarily prorate production if necessary to help the situation.

That was July 23, not 6 weeks ago, but 6 months ago. Instead of imports being voluntarily regulated, as promised, they have steadily increased to the alarming figure of 1,443,000 barrels of crude and products per day. General Thompson apparently foresaw this as early as last September 23, when he said in a speech at Evansville, Ind., "If we let the importers dry up the lifeblood of domestic production in this country, then the responsibility must be upon those men. They may perhaps be great corporate officials, but the question has come right down to this point today: Is their loyalty greater to their stockholders than it is to America?" I might add that the applause was loud and prolonged.

Interviewing the general last week, January 19, in Dallas, his simple statement was, "All promises have been broken."

We now know what has happened to us in our Tri-State basin. Imports of foreign crude during December to the east coast of the United States alone amounted to 649,000 barrels per day, of which 240,000 per day were from the Middle East and the balance from Mexico and South America. The east coast refines 1,013,000 barrels per day. Thus there has been a 64 percent displacement of American crude with foreign crude upon the east coast. A major portion of needed crude formerly moved from the Southwest around the gulf and Atlantic seaboards by tanker to eastern refineries. Today it is being moved by river barge and pipeline into our Middle West. It is crude hunting a new home with all the attributes attached thereto and we have been unable to compete with it.

More and more independent drilling rigs are shutting down in Indiana, Illinois, and Kentucky. Lending institutions, which finance the independent operator, are taking another look before lending. Pipeline connections are more difficult to make. Excess crude over refining requirements cannot be disposed of. As of this coming February 1, Farm Bureau is ceasing to buy and disconnecting 2,000 barrels per day of crude being produced by independent operators. The tanks are full and there is no alternative. Can they sell to someone else? Can they stay in business? The future only holds the answer. Last week identical resolutions of bipartisan authorship were passed unanimously by both houses of the Indiana General Assembly, as follows:

"The national oil and gas policy adopted in January 1949 and endorsed by the independent oil producers of Indiana and of the several other oil-producing States recognizes as a basic objective the assurance that the United States shall have an adequate and available domestic supply of petroleum products for all peacetime and emergency requirements.

"The first fundamental principle of the national oil policy, formulated by the National Petroleum Council, states that due consideration should be given to the development of foreign oil resources but the paramount objective should be to maintain conditions best suited to a healthy domestic industry which is essential to the national security and welfare.

"The national oil policy further states that petroleum imports should serve to supplement and not supplant domestic supplies and not retard necessary domestic exploration and development efforts. This is a sound policy. Adherence to this policy is essential to our national well-being, security, and expanding strength as to oil.

"This accepted policy provides a place for petroleum imports and an opportunity for healthy foreign trade.

"The continuation of present excessive foreign imports of oil violates that policy. Wasteful inventories have accumulated and production has been substantially curtailed in Indiana as well as in other oil-producing States. Fair and equitable relationships between imports and domestic production are not being maintained. The independent producer of oil and gas has been thrown

into a serious economic situation and ultimately will be forced to abandon all exploratory and producing operations. This would be a serious threat to and could cause present oil and gas known and proven reserves to be used and exhausted. Exploration and the continued search is necessary to maintain a reserve replacing the requirements for daily demands and consumption. These are perilous times in America. We are living in an era of the hydrogen bomb. Our continued existence as individuals and as a nation depends upon our ability to build and fuel the weapons of war. In this race for survival, the domestic oil industry is the backbone of the defense of our Nation.

"Two world wars have proven this beyond any possible doubt. The importance of domestic oil in any future wars is evidenced by the fact that our defense planners recognize the logistical problems of moving imported oil by sea during a time of war. Let the American people make no mistake as to the basic issue now involved; a healthy capable domestic oil industry or the false and uncertain security that lies in the reliance on foreign oil: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Indiana General Assembly:

"SECTION 1. We urge the Congress of the United States to recognize this situation affecting an important industry of our State and its economic well-being and that some measure of limitation on the import of foreign oil should be enacted as a part of H. R. No. 1, the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, in order to maintain a healthy domestic oil industry.

"SEC. 2. The clerk of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to each Member of the United States Congress and Senate from Indiana and one copy to the clerk of the House Ways and Means Committee, Washington, D. C., and that a copy be sent to all governors of the various States, together with the request that their States adopt similar resolutions."

We feel that what is happening to us can and will spread with like results over the entire Nation unless the floodgates are at least partially closed upon foreign crude. We of the Tri-States of Indiana, Illinois, and Kentucky are presently witnessing the exodus, retirement, and disappearance of the independent operator and wildcatter who has found 80 percent of America's crude reserves. If we become dependent upon foreign crude and that oil is suddenly denied us, if we suddenly need more oil from and for America, the independent wildcatter simply won't be around any more. Born with Drake's well upon Oil Creek, Pa., in 1859; growing into full stature and furnishing America's petroleum needs in peace and in war; he will have passed from the scene as an American institution and the frantic trumpeting of Gabriel horns will not bring about his resurrection.

STATEMENT OF HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON, OF INDIANA, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, DURING HEARINGS ON H. R. 1, 84TH CONGRESS, JANUARY 28, 1955

I am Congressman WINFIELD DENTON, representing the Eighth District of Indiana. I want to thank the chairman and members of this committee for their courtesy in granting me time to appear here today and express certain views of mine with regard to the extension of the Trade Agreements Act.

First, let me say that I am emphatically in favor of the reciprocal trade program, and always have been. I know the advantages to this country of easy and friendly trade with other nations of the world and what such trade does to enhance our position in international affairs; and I would not in the slightest way want to cripple our progress toward the long-range objectives of the reciprocal trade program.

But I am here today on behalf of the workingmen of the coal industry and the independent oil operators, who have already suffered considerable distress, and face still more critical injury from the operation of the Trade Agreements Act in its present form. Yet, I believe the serious and sincere grievances of these important groups in our national economy do not oppose the original and legitimate aims of the reciprocal trade policy.

I have, of course, heard the common expression that everybody favors reciprocal trade—but wants some one item or industry protected. I hope I am not guilty of such a charge; and I believe that the well-being of our domestic oil and coal industries is of such peculiar and far-reaching importance to the national security that it can be considered almost in a category apart from the question of trade policy.

At the end of World War II, this country was importing crude and refined oil products at the rate of slightly more than 300,000 barrels a day. Since that time, oil production in the United States has been curtailed and restricted, without a corresponding reduction in oil imports, so that, for the past 2 years, total oil imports have been at a rate in excess of 1 million barrels a day—more than three times the rate at the end of World War II. Estimates of the import situation for the early months of 1955 show that oil may now be coming in at the rate of a million and a quarter barrels a day. And, where oil imports supplied 5 percent of the United States market prewar, they now are taking up about 15 percent of the market in this country.

A very significant part of the oil products imported is made up of residual oil, or heavy fuel oil. Being the last byproduct of the refining process, which operates at very low cost in certain foreign areas, this residual oil can be dumped on the east coast of the United States at prices so low that it easily displaces coal in the market for industrial fuel—pushing coal aside at the rate of 1 ton for every 4 barrels of residual oil.

This fuel oil was being imported at the rate of 45 million barrels a year at the end of World War II, and the influx has steadily increased until it nearly tripled last year at 131.8 million barrels, which took up about a quarter of our domestic market for residual oil. The coal equivalent of the oil imported in 1954, if this coal could have been produced for the market, would have meant jobs for 24,000 American coal miners.

I might go on reciting figures of this sort, but I expect that other witnesses will have amply supplied the Committee record. By now, I don't think there can be much doubt of the severe impact that oil imports cause in our domestic market for both oil and coal. What I want to emphasize is the serious effect that excessive importation of oil will have on the national security and our international position, in the long run.

The oil industry is of such a nature that it cannot maintain stable production or meet normal increases in demand by depending on existing supply sources. It must constantly seek new fields and prove up new reserves. This requires continuous exploration and discovery operations, which, as is well known, involves the drilling of many "dry holes" for the finding of a few good producing wells. Many risks of money and effort go into the development of even a one percent increase in United States oil production, or, for that matter, merely the holding of the existing level of output.

Experience in this country has shown that more than 75 percent of the "wildcat" wells are drilled by independent operators, and that these independents have discovered probably an equal percentage of new oil reserves. These men are the real pioneers in the industry, and their ranks are the source of the initiative and enterprise that must constantly be employed to keep up and improve productive capacity.

But they must be able to sell what they find, to raise capital to go and find more. Unlike the giants of the oil industry, the independent operators cannot go into lush foreign fields to reap profits which can set off the risk and cost of bringing in new production in this country. They cannot "hedge" operating costs by shipping in cheaper foreign oil. And the more of such oil that is imported, the less the independents are able to sell on the home market.

So long as imported oil is in heavy supply, domestic wells are sharply prorated and the allowable production per well continues to be reduced. These two factors—the curtailment of the market for domestic oil resulting from excessive imports, and heavy proration made possible by imports—combine to destroy the independents' incentive and financial ability to continue exploration for new wells. If no remedy of this situation is provided, the result will soon be a serious cut in production capacity, for the independents who make the vital new discoveries of oil reserves will be driven out of the industry.

This is not a matter that can be put aside until the appearance of some grave national-defense emergency. Proven reserves and production capacity must be kept always ready to be thrown into use as soon as any war might break out. Practically speaking, almost no new oil capacity can be developed once we should become involved in a military emergency, for materials and manpower are drained off to meet more immediate needs.

Rear Admiral Biggs, of the Munitions Board Petroleum Committee, who appeared before the House Small Business Committee in June 1949, said that the military authorities are concerned over conservation of petroleum reserves in the ground in those areas representing the greatest probable accessibility during war. However, the admiral emphasized—and I quote: " . . . first consideration for preparedness must be in a high level of developed production in those areas. Oil reserves that must be developed after the start of a war will probably contribute only minor quantities to that war effort, but shut-in production is an immediate military asset."

Most of our oil imports now come from Venezuela and the Middle East. Any enemy submarine activity in the Caribbean Sea would make it difficult for us to continue bringing in oil from Venezuela in time of war, and the great ocean distances separating us from the Middle East would make imports from that area all but impossible. Further, as Admiral Carney, now Chief of Naval Operations, told the Petroleum Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee in January 1948: ". . . the Middle East oil is vulnerable from the military standpoint under any circumstances. The fields are vulnerable to attack; pipelines and pumping stations are vulnerable to sabotage and attack; and I think we would be assuming too much to insure full availability of the capabilities and capacities of Middle East oil."

I think from that it should appear that we must take every precaution to avoid any dependence whatsoever on outlying foreign sources of oil for defense and military needs. And to maintain the health of our domestic oil industry, the only sure supplier in time of emergency, we must avoid undue damage to it from imports at any time. Not even the strongest advocate of free trade will say it should be achieved at the expense of national security.

As to the matter of proration of oil production, which complicates the import question, I can only say that some such system is certainly essential for the conservation and planned use of a vital national resource. But, if proration of oil production is good

for the United States, it should be good for Venezuela and the Middle East. Actually, their economies are so heavily dependent on oil production that they should have even a greater interest in its careful conservation than we have in our own.

In the practical sense, it is not good policy in the long run for the United States to maintain a trade program which encourages American companies to exploit and excessively drain away the natural resources of these other countries. We want the friendship of their people, not only for now but for years and decades ahead. We do them no real service now by taking great quantities of the oil they are sure to have need of 25 or 50 years from now. Heavy American imports of oil may lend a flush of prosperity that is a temporary advantage to the Latin American and Arab countries, but it is wrong for us and harmful to them in the long run.

Gentlemen, I have endeavored to show the weakness of our present trade program, as relates to oil, in the light of international policy and our national security.

I now offer the following proposals for your consideration while deliberating on H. R. 1:

1. That United States imports of crude and refined oil be restricted to a quantity not to exceed 900,000 barrels per day;

2. That United States imports of residual fuel oil, or similar heavy oil, be restricted to a quantity not to exceed 5 percent of the total permitted crude and refined oil imports;

3. That if, prior to the expiration of the Trade Agreements Act, as extended, international policy considerations should make it imperative that the United States afford a market for greater quantities of crude and refined oil than stipulated under the first and second proposals above, the proper authorities of the Executive Department shall be authorized to purchase, for national-defense stockpiling purposes, additional amounts of these items, or either of them, insofar as is feasible;

4. That the Committee urge as strongly as possible upon the Chief Executive the advisability of seeking international agreement among interested nations upon the proration of oil production in the interest of mutual security.

Again may I thank the committee for the privilege of appearing before it on this matter and express the hope that my remarks may be of some value in its deliberations.

Let's Be Counted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL C. JONES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 31, 1955

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, while individuals, organizations, and publications are following a line that seems to say "Do not expect much from Congress", I think what many of them seek to imply is that due to the fact that the majority in the two bodies of Congress is insufficient to bring about the passage of legislation over a Presidential veto, we can expect the passage and final approval of no highly controversial legislation.

This should not mean that Members of Congress, particularly those of the majority, should accept a defeatist attitude and reason that since it is not likely that the executive branch will change its position on certain matters that the legislative branch should not accept its responsibility in proposing even in the face of almost certain veto, changes that should be made.

I am referring, of course, to the status of agricultural legislation. The farmers of America suffered defeat during the 83d Congress, thanks to an administration that has proven itself hostile to the best interests of American agriculture.

From the Missouri Farmer, official publication of the Missouri Farmers Association, I am including herewith an editorial entitled "Don't Expect Much From Congress." I am taking this means of assuring my farmer friends throughout Missouri that, while they may have little reason to expect any relief during the period of the 84th Congress, it is not because of the fact that Congress itself is unsympathetic to the plight of the American farmer. Chairman COOLEY, of the House Committee on Agriculture, has indicated that hearings will be held on numerous bills seeking to restore the supports that were wiped out last session. There is every indication that such bills will be reported favorably on a bipartisan basis from this committee, and I have every reason to believe that such legislation will receive favorable consideration when it reaches the floor of the House.

Despite the fact that, according to this editorial which I believe reflects the general public opinion, the President has made it clear enough that he will veto any price-support bill, I still believe Congress is not only justified but dutybound to see that such legislation is presented and approved by the legislative branch of the Government. In so doing we will have met our responsibility.

Let us place the blame where it belongs, and let us not wait until next year to do it, when as this article states, many will say it was done for political reasons.

Let us show the farmers that they can place their confidence, trust, and hopes in the 84th Congress. Let us show the farmers that they can expect relief and constructive action from the 84th Congress.

Now is the time to meet the challenge in this editorial from the February 1955 issue of the Missouri Farmer:

DON'T EXPECT MUCH FROM CONGRESS

Farmers cannot hope that much in the way of constructive farm legislation will come out of the new Congress. About the most they can expect to be done in Washington is the passage of necessary appropriation bills, much talk, and considerable jockeying for position before the next presidential election.

The Democrats control Congress, that is true; but numerical superiority does not assure their control of legislation. On important legislation Republicans and Democrats cross party lines. They are motivated by economic considerations and not altogether by politics. And it must be remembered that the President is a Republican and that he has the last say on legislation. He can veto any measure passed by Congress.

It may be that this Congress will pass some kind of price-support law to take the place of the ineffectual flexible-supports law. But if that is done, it will likely be merely a political move.

The President has made it clear enough that he will veto any price-support bill. He is satisfied with the present flexible law. If the Congress does pass a price-support bill, it will be for the purpose of getting the President to veto it in order to put the administration in dutch with farmers. If this happens, you can bet that it will be as near to the next general election as possible so that farmers won't have time to forget about it when they go to the polls to vote.

Of course there is always the chance that Congress will pass a bill and that the President will sign it, or that Congress will override the veto. Hence, if any hearings are held, your association will testify in your behalf. The probabilities are, however, that we'll be merely "spinning our wheels."

Plans for Huge Upper Colorado Dam Uncertain, Says Secretary McKay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 31, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, proponents of the upper Colorado storage project are asking Congress to authorize an appropriation of $421 million for a gigantic power dam at Glen Canyon, Ariz., without knowing whether the rock foundations at the site would support the immense structure as it would have to be built to integrate with other overall features of the project.

This amazing fact was disclosed in a letter written November 30, 1954, by Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay to David R. Brower, executive secretary of the Sierra Club.

Glen Canyon is on the Colorado River, and the proposed dam would be a key structure designed to raise power revenues to help pay for the multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project—H. R. 270—now before Congress.

In his letter, Secretary McKay stated that the materials on which the dam would stand are "poorly cemented and relatively weak in comparison with the foundations common to most high dams." The Secretary also revealed that "experiments to improve the strength of the foundation through a chemical grouting process were unsuccessful."

Further, although the Bureau has presented preliminary plans for a 700-foot dam, it does not intend to present final specifications for it until after Congress has approved the present vague project.

On this subject, Secretary McKay wrote Brower:

Following congressional authorization, more intensive studies will be made of the foundation conditions and of the Bureau's preliminary design to secure information for the preparation of plans and specifications for construction of the Glen Canyon Dam. If such intensive studies indicate the advisability of modifying the present selected height of dam, appropriate changes will be made in the designs prior to construction.

Despite this situation, great pressure is on Congress to approve the project.

After that is done the Reclamation Bureau would conduct studies to determine what size and type of dam can be built. In other words, Congress is being asked to approve spending this great sum of Federal money when Reclamation Bureau engineers themselves do not know what the final plans and designs may be, how big the dam would be, how much it would cost, how much power revenues it would bring, and when there are grave doubts that such a structure would be secure.

Thus, Congress is being asked to buy a pig in a poke.

The Secretary's disclosures refute a 1950 report of the Reclamation Bureau which stated that the rock at the dam site "is remarkably free of structural defects."

This 1950 report also said:

The Glen Canyon site is geologically favorable for a high concrete dam.

Secretary McKay told Brower:

Subsequent to writing the 1950 report on the Colorado River storage project, the Bureau conducted grouting tests in the drift tunnels driven 50 or more feet into each canyon wall of the Glen Canyon Dam site. Also, special bearing tests of 6-inch cores and large fragments of the foundation materials were made in the Bureau's Denver laboratory. The poorly cemented and relatively weak condition of the materials in comparison with the foundations common to most high dams has given the engineers who prepared the preliminary designs of the dam some concern as to the competency of the foundation to support any structure higher than 700 feet. Experiments to improve the strength of the foundation through a chemical grouting process were unsuccessful. These are the geological reasons why Commissioner W. A. Dexheimer made his statement in Denver about the limitation on the height of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam.

It has been the custom of the Reclamation Bureau to secure authorization of a project based on a cost estimate which they assure Congress will be ample. However, it is rarely found that these cost estimates prove sufficient. Actual costs of projects usually have been 50 to 100 percent greater than the estimates made at the time of authorization.

The obvious result has been that the Bureau's assurances of economic and financial feasibility have collapsed.

The financial plan for the whole upper Colorado River project sets up Glen Canyon Dam as the "cash register" for the development.

Yet the Reclamation Bureau apparently does not yet know how much Glen Canyon Dam would cost or how much revenue it can be expected to produce.

In the face of these uncertainties Congress should not approve this project.

The full text of Secretary McKay's letter follows:

MY DEAR MR. BROWER: On October 21, 1954, you were informed that further reply would be made to your inquiries of September 28, 1954, addressed to the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Reclamation, concerning the effect of the proposed Glen Canyon Reservoir upon the Rainbow Bridge National Monument. We now have the necessary information from the field to complete that reply.

It is our intention to take whatever steps are necessary to protect the Rainbow Bridge National Monument from waters of the proposed Glen Canyon Reservoir and to ask Congress to provide for such protection in the authorizing legislation. Cooperative studies are under way by the field offices of the Bureau of Reclamation and the National Park Service to determine the best means of providing this protection, and to date these studies have revealed no unsurmountable problems. The topography of the area surrounding the monument indicates that a barrier dam 1 mile below the natural arch and outside the monument would provide adequate protection. Details of such a plan will require extensive study and are not available at this time.

On the basis of data available at the time of writing the 1950 report on Colorado River storage project and participating projects, a 700-foot dam (580 feet above stream level) at Glen Canyon was the maximum height which met the criteria of economy, safety of the structure, and adequate protection of the Rainbow Natural Bridge. Subsequent to writing the 1950 report on the Colorado River storage project, the Bureau conducted grouting tests in the drift tunnels driven 50 or more feet into each canyon wall of the Glen Canyon Dam site. Also, special bearing tests of 6-inch cores and large fragments of the foundation materials were made in the Bureau's Denver laboratory. The poorly cemented and relatively weak condition of the materials in comparison with the foundations common to most high dams has given the engineers who prepared the preliminary designs of the dam some concern as to the competency of the foundation to support any structure higher than 700 feet. Experiments to improve the strength of the foundation through a chemical grouting process were unsuccessful. These are the geological reasons why Commissioner W. A. Dexheimer made his statement in Denver about the limitation on the height of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam.

Following congressional authorization, more intensive studies will be made of the foundation conditions and of the Bureau's preliminary design to secure information for the preparation of plans and specifications for construction of the Glen Canyon Dam. If such intensive studies indicate the advisability of modifying the present selected height of dam, appropriate changes will be made in the designs prior to construction.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS MCKAY,
Secretary of the Interior.

Eddie Cantor's Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 31, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues will be pleased to hear that Eddie Cantor, the nationally known comedian and entertainer, is celebrating his 63d birthday today, Monday, January 31.

I know it is difficult for many of us to believe that the ever youthful and spry Eddie Cantor has reached the 63d milestone of his life. We like to think of him always as the man who dominates the stage with so much zest and life in him.

In recent years Eddie Cantor has also become known as a great supporter of various worthwhile humanitarian causes. I am sure that it is known to many of you that it was he who coined the name "March of Dimes" for the great annual campaign which we conduct at this time each year. In 1952 he made a tour from coast to coast and was successful in collecting 120,000 pints of blood which was badly needed for our veterans.

For many years Eddie Cantor has also been active in other charitable and philanthropic enterprises. Let me suggest a few of these, such as the Eddie Cantor Camp for Boys, the Youth Aliyah Movement sponsored by Hadassah in Israel, the United Jewish Appeal, the New York Federation of Jewish Charities, the Catholic Actors' Guild, the Episcopalian Actors' Guild, the Jewish Theatre Guild, and many other groups too numerous to mention.

Somewhere I recall a saying which is phrased something like this: "When you help a fellow up a steep hill, you get nearer to the top yourself." This is very true of Eddie Cantor. In his charitable activities he has helped many of his fellow men and in this way attained greater heights of humanitarianism himself. Charitable work is today a great part of his life. While he gives of his time and effort and money, he is also doubly enriched by the fact that his name has become associated in the public mind with philanthropic interests. Of Eddie Cantor it can be truly said in the words of the poet:

Give to the needy shelter and bread.
For giving is living, the angels said.
But must I give again and again?
My selfish, greedy question rang.
No, said the angel, piercing me through;
Give 'til God stops giving to you.

On this occasion of his 63d birthday there are thousands upon thousands of his fellow citizens who wish to extend to Eddie Cantor their sincerest felicitations and best wishes for many active years.

House Joint Resolution 172, Proposing a Constitutional Amendment To Limit the Treatymaking Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 31, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, recently the Honorable George A. Finch, an eminent authority on constitutional law, said that "the Yalta agreement is the blackest page in American diplomatic history."

To avoid more Yaltas I have proposed a constitutional amendment that if adopted would limit the treatymaking of the President.

Mr. Speaker, my House Joint Resolution 172 is a revised draft of a constitutional amendment to limit the treatymaking power. It will be observed that it omits in terms the controversial "which" clause.

However, it would not be fair to say that it puts no limitation on the crea-

tion of power in Congress to enact legislation through the exercise of the treaty power.

If, as was indicated by the late Chief Justice Hughes in his address before the American Society of International Law in 1929, the treaty power is not subject to any express, and may not be subject to any implied, constitutional limitations, then section 1 does subject the treatymaking power to constitutional limitations.

Section 1 provides that a treaty to become the supreme law of the land must be made pursuant to the Constitution. That provision is intended to overrule the concept that a treaty to be valid need only be made under the authority of the United States, and not in pursuance of the Constitution, as is the case with statutes. Under this provision treaties as well as statutes must conform to the Constitution.

Section 1 also provides that a treaty must not conflict with any provision of the Constitution. The purpose of that provision is to overcome a possible construction that since the treaty power is created without any express limitations, and perhaps even without any implied limitations, other provisions of the Constitution must be construed and reconciled with the treaty provisions and be regarded as not limiting the power to make treaties; in other words, that other provisions of the Constitution must give way to an unlimited treatymaking power.

An example of what the provision is intended to accomplish is illustrated by the *Pink* case (315 U. S. 203 (1942)). In that case an international agreement made without the advice and consent of the Senate accomplished the taking of property without compensation in violation of the prohibition of the fifth amendment. This taking was held valid. Why should it be possible to assert that a treaty should be permitted to violate constitutional prohibitions? Why should it be possible for a treaty to "override the Constitution"? Why should the treatymaking power be greater than its source, the Constitution of the United States? Why should it be constitutionally possible to cut across the Bill of Rights? He is indeed bold who asserts that it should be possible by treaty to subject an American citizen for an offense committed within our territorial limits to the jurisdiction of an international criminal court without the safeguards which our Constitution provides for the protection of persons charged and tried in our own courts?

The Constitution provides that "all legislative powers" therein granted are vested in the Congress. Can it be doubted that it should not be constitutionally possible by treaty to transfer that power to the Executive or to vest it in an international organization or body?

This does not mean that the power will not exist to make any treaty essential to the proper conduct of our foreign affairs and the carrying on of our external relations. But it does mean that the treaty power must conform to the provisions of the Constitution as a whole and must not violate the intent and spirit of any individual constitutional provision. This resolution will not interfere in any way with the power of the executive branch to conduct our foreign relations and enter into treaties, conventions, and agreements with foreign nations with respect to our external affairs; but it will prevent a violation of the provisions of the Constitution through the exercise of the treatymaking power. For example, it will prevent the taking by treaty of a person's property without due process of law and the payment of just compensation. It will prevent the creation of power in the Congress by international agreement to legislate with respect to those matters that have no legitimate relation to the conduct of our foreign affairs—matters that have traditionally been and should be within the local jurisdiction of the States.

Section 2 places no limitation on the power to make treaties or other international agreements self-executing by virtue of their terms, insofar as they bind the United States under international law as a party thereto, and deal with foreign relations and external affairs; but it does prevent them from becoming internal law within the United States binding on individuals without the sanction of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including the following copy of my resolution hereinbefore referred to as I have introduced it:

House Joint Resolution 172

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, within 7 years from the date of its submission:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. A treaty or other international agreement, or any provision thereof, not made in pursuance of this Constitution or in conflict with any of its provisions, shall not be the supreme law of the land nor have any force or effect.

"SEC. 2. A treaty or other international agreement shall be effective as internal law within the United States only through legislation.

"SEC. 3. On the question of advising on, and consenting to, the ratification of a treaty, the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate."

Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marked the 37th anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence. As a member of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression during the 83d Congress, I was impressed by the evidence received concerning the desire for freedom shown by the Ukrainians. During the Second World War millions of Ukrainian patriots attempted to rise up against the Communist dictatorship in the Soviet Union but were unsuccessful. The Ukrainians would be one of our most important allies in the event of a future uprising and resistance against the masters of the Kremlin. I extend my greetings to these freedom loving peoples on the anniversary of their proclamation of independence.

Benefits for Dependent Parents of Old Age Insurance Beneficiaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1955

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it is my desire to call attention to a bill, H. R. 4072, which will provide monthly benefits, under the Social Security Act, for the dependent parents of individuals receiving old-age insurance benefits.

The problem which this bill is designed to meet was called to my attention by a constituent who is over 65 and is supporting his 91-year-old mother. At first blush, I thought it was a very unusual problem. But when I began to check into it, I was astonished to discover that there are many similar cases.

What this gentleman pointed out to me, in effect, was that under the present social security laws, if he were supporting a wife or dependent children, he would be entitled to additional benefits. Supporting his own parents, however, he receives no such benefit. That seemed obviously unfair and improper to him, and it does to me. The income-tax laws, by way of contrast, permit the same deduction for any person, young or old, who is living in the taxpayer's household and receiving more than half his support from the taxpayer.

My bill would only add dependent parents on an equal footing with other dependents of the recipient of old-age insurance benefits. It does not put them in any special class.

The entire social-security program might well be subjected to a study and reexamination with respect to its benefits for elderly people. I think it is quite likely that other provisions in the law may be similarly discriminatory with respect to people of advanced years.

The life expectancy of our people is increasing so rapidly that we have not kept pace with it. Today thousands live comfortably and happily into their nineties. On the basis of 1950 figures, our average life expectancy is now 68 years, a gain of something like 21 years since 1900. Among people who have now

reached the age of 65, the men have an average expectancy of 13 more years, while the women have 15 years. And the span is increasing further all the time.

This longer life that has been given us is a wonderful thing, and I am sure that Congress will not lose sight of the legislative problems it creates. I hope I shall be around to introduce a measure for dependent grandparents when that becomes necessary.

Chemicals in Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask permission to include the following copy of an address I made before the 10th annual meeting of the food, drug, and cosmetic law section of the New York State Bar Association on January 27, 1955:

CHEMICALS IN FOOD

(Speech by Hon. A. L. MILLER of Nebraska, at the 10th annual meeting of the section on food, drug, and cosmetic law of the New York State Bar Association, January 27, 1955)

The increasing use of chemical additives, hormones, and vitamins in the production and processing of food has raised a problem as far as public health is concerned.

The select committee of the 81st Congress which explored the field of chemicals in foods and cosmetics came to the conclusion that existing Federal laws dealing with the problem are not adequate at this time to protect the public against the addition of some of the new chemicals, hormones, and vitamins that go into the production of food.

There is hardly a food on the markets of today which has not had some chemicals used in or on it at some stage in its production, processing, packaging, transportation, or storage. In this vast, complex problem, it is necessary that proper precautions be taken to make sure that no acute or chronic poisoning may develop.

The food and drug law, when first adopted, and the several amendments which have been added wtih the regulations, was designed for the purpose of safeguarding the public health. It is the law to those who deal in the manufacturing, processing, and packaging of food. This law provides sort of a badge of integrity and honesty, setting up a yardstick of standards designed to protect the public and those dealing in all the phases of handling food. This endorsement is coveted.

Tremendous progress in the science of food technology has been made in the past few years. This scientific progress has run ahead of the law, and the amendments of 1938 seem no longer sufficient for this day. In a tough economic and competitive world, there will be some who want to cut corners and apply methods or use chemicals that have not been adequately tested. These new problems require legislative and administrative attention. I am hopeful that all interested groups will cooperate in a constructive legislative approach to the problem.

It is indeed fortunate that industry has been able to enrich and improve foods by adding certain vitamins and minerals or other additions of chemicals which enhance their nutritive value. The American people should give a vote of thanks and be mighty proud because the scientists of the country and the processors of food have worked diligently to solve some of the serious food problems of the Nation. They have applied the knowledge thus gained to the benefit of the public.

As a medical man, I recognize that the addition of many vitamins, minerals, and hormones to food has brought a real benefit to the human diet. I am certain that many dietary diseases have been disappearing because industry and scientists have found a way to improve foods through the addition of new materials. This progress must continue.

The public has learned to have confidence in the manufacturers and chemists who deal with food. The public has confidence in the administration of the food and drug law. Any new legislative approach should enlarge and insure the confidence of all groups.

Living conditions have become so complicated that the responsibility of making determinations in this huge, complex field now seems to call for new, modern legislation to spell out and set up a new yardstick to conduct the business of governing chemicals and internal secretion uses in the production of food.

PESTICIDE LEGISLATION

It will be recalled that the 83d Congress passed a bill which I introduced to regulate the use of pesticides and insecticides in the production of food. The bill was a product of all groups interested in the problem. It met with their approval and would not have been possible without many conferences and the full cooperation of all concerned. As we propose the new amendments to the present law, I hope we may have the same type of understanding and cooperation that we had with the groups interested in the law governing pesticides.

THE FOOD LAW

A careful study of the present provisions of the Food and Drug Act brings one to the conclusion that the act is inadequate and cumbersome in operation. In fact, some sections cannot be administered. You who are familiar with section 406, must recognize how difficult it is for the manufacturer and the chemist to operate under that section. The food manufacturer, to obtain approval for the use of an ingredient, must first allege that the proposed ingredient is poisonous or deleterious, which, if properly interpreted, would mean that he proposes to use certain chemicals that would be injurious to health. I can understand why a food manufacturer would resist making such a statement or admission. The food manufacturer must also be prepared to prove that the chemical is required in order to produce food properly.

Few tolerances for food ingredients have been established under section 406. Section 402 defines as adulterated any food which contains any poisonous or deleterious substance in a quantity which ordinarily renders the food injurious to health. The section also sets up certain tests in respect to the added substances. It would seem to me that manufacturers of food are met head on with many difficulties created by section 402 and 406. It would also seem that the burden of proving that certain substances are not harmful should not be placed upon the Government. It ought to be possible to spell out in rather clear detail the procedures that should be followed before a chemical is added to food.

NEW LEGISLATION

Let me suggest that a new amendment should require that:

1. Any new additive to food shall be completely pretested as to safety in order to protect the consuming public.

2. There should be an advance submittal of the pretesting evidence to the Food and Drug Administration.

3. This evidence should be evaluated and the food industry should be given a definite answer within a reasonable time.

4. Under penalty for violation, no new additive should be added to food without the complete scientific pretesting and the official evaluation by the Food and Drug Administration.

5. If the Food and Drug Administration gives the green light, then this additive can be used.

6. If the Food and Drug Administration gives a negative reply as to the safety of the additive and the manufacturer differs with the evaluation and insists on using it regardless of the negative reply from the administration, the bill should authorize the Food and Drug Administration to enjoin its use. It is possible at this point or before the enjoining action that the evidence of the safety might well be passed on by an impartial board of experts. Their decision should be given in a reasonable length of time.

7. A provision should be added that, in the event of the manufacturer being enjoined by the FDA, a United States district court will appraise the evidence and decide the issue, which, of course, could be subjected to a higher judicial review. Some objections have been offered to a judicial review.

It is hoped that the new legislation, when introduced, will represent the composite and objective thinking of the majority of the chemists and food manufacturers. I know you are all interested in the vital problem of chemicals in food. I do not want to be dogmatic and insist that the changes I suggest would cure all of the deficiencies in the present Food and Drug Act. The principal purposes for which we have food laws is to protect the health of the public. This should have preference over economic factors.

It should not be necessary for the Government to assume the responsibility and the expense of proof that a chemical is harmful before it is used. Under the present law, the chemical can be used and the Government is frequently helpless and the consumer unprotected.

Industry should be willing to assume the burden of the proper studies on acute and chronic toxicity of the chemical before it is used. To require otherwise, might mean several years of costly experimental work and meanwhile the manufacturer could continue to market the product unmolested despite the question mark of whether it is harmful. It is for that reason that I would propose a board of experts to pass upon these disputed questions.

BOARD OF EXPERTS

As to the personnel of the Board of Experts, I would presume that the President, through the Food and Drug Administrator, might request several professional societies dealing with the chemical question to nominate individuals to represent them on the expert panel. The following organizations might be asked to participate in setting up such a panel: United States Public Health Service, American Chemical Society, American Society for Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics, American Society of

Biological Chemists, Institute of Food Technologists, Society for Experimental Biology and Medicine, and others.

The Board should have the right to invite testimony or opinions of specialists in particular fields in addition to those of representatives or applicants and the administrator. The members of the panel would naturally be adequately compensated for their services and expenses.

CHEMICALS NOW IN USE

Since a great many chemicals have been used for a long time and no tolerance has been set, it would seem that the Federal Drug Administrator should not have the authority to go back and force the testing of these chemicals and present a determination that they are harmful unless he has overwhelming evidence that such is the case. Then a review of all evidence and a finding should be made. Chemicals, long used, might well be folded in under what we call a "grandfather clause."

LEGAL STEPS

I personally like the idea of an impartial group of experts, of which the Public Health Service might be a member, in order to pass upon some of the evidence presented to the Food and Drug Administration. They would be used only in case of a disagreement as to the effect of the proposed chemicals. Certainly a manufacturer who has an adverse decision from the FDA and from the Board of Experts would have little chance of expecting a United States district court to overrule the expert opinion. Nevertheless, I am convinced that the section which would permit the FDA to enjoin a manufacturer and a section which would permit the manufacturer to appeal to the highest court should be a part of any new judicial procedure. In my humble opinion, no administrator of the law should want or expect the power of a life and death sentence over a chemical which a manufacturer might propose to use. The administrator should welcome the support of experts and the decision of the court. It seems to me this procedure would be the proper democratic process that should be observed in this great land of yours and mine.

HORMONES IN FOOD

They have the limited approval of the pharmaceutical section of the Food and Drug Administration.

While it may seem a little farfetched to bring in the question of the use of diethylstilbestrol or some antibiotic drugs, they are actually being used to produce food. Many of these hormones are chemical in nature. Their use represents a revolutionary approach to the production of meat and food. I believe their use represents progress which if not harmful, should be encouraged. As these new, both known and unknown, estrogens are used, we must be sure that they are not harmful to the human race.

Experiments have been carried out with the use of female hormones, now in common use on meat animals, on a group of women who have passed the menopause. Many of these women again exhibited all the symptoms of an active sex life plus sore and swollen breasts, just as during their menstrual periods. The question must be raised as to what effect the injudicious use of these sex hormones may have upon the reproductive organs of the male or female. Cold creams—indeed, it is a great wide field which calls for intensive research. This research is now being carried on, and I am sure some answers may soon be found.

A number of these estrogens and chemicals are potent and dangerous and cannot be purchased in a drugstore for medical purposes without a physician's prescription. Some of the hormones have been used by the medical profession to alleviate menopause difficulty, dysmenorrhea, and other male and female medical problems. Diethylstilbestrol has been used in the fight against prostatic cancer.

Our own body produces numerous hormones, male and female. They determine our moods, our actions, our growth and development. They even control the pitch of our voice or how tall or short we might be. I am certain more precautions should be taken in permitting these drugs to be made available to the general public without a medical certificate or prescription. I believe we are on the threshold of a whole new world in the matter of producing meat from the proper uses of certain hormones. Proper evaluation of their use must be made. I do believe a go-slow sign should be erected until all the scientific research has been evaluated and it can be definitely determined that no harm will result in their long, continued use.

URANIUM AND FOOD

It has been my privilege in the past year to visit the Brookhaven Laboratory on Long Island, and to witness there the great progress being made in the several uses of uranium. Probably the largest stockpile of uranium in the world is at this laboratory. It is amazing the things accomplished in the production of crops and the control of diseases both in man and the plant world. There seems to be no limit to which the isotopes and mesotopes may be used in the effect upon and in the production of food. It is my humble opinion that, in the years ahead, the effects of uranium on the production and processing of food may well dwarf the effects of the hundreds of chemicals now in use for the same purpose.

The military is greatly interested in the preservation and treatment of food by the uranium byproducts. Certainly, many new horizons are being opened by the scientists who are breaking down the heretofore unknown secrets of nature.

ANTIBIOTICS

The use of certain antibiotic drugs and chemicals have, in many instances, posed a real problem to the manufacturer of food. It has been shown that the milk from one cow given penicillin to control mastitis can destroy the cheese-starting culture from the entire herd of cows. The use of these antibiotic drugs in the treatment of animal diseases must be considered a chemical which is not without its hazards to the human race. The new chemicals that are now in many built-in feeds not only help to control disease, but they stimulate the growth of the animal and even cause the cows to produce more milk. These substances are not only drugs, but also must be considered a part of the chemical additives now going into our food supply.

Many physicians are reporting an increasing number of patients who are sensitive to penicillin and other drugs who have had no previous history of receiving the drug. We must be sure that penicillin, streptomycin, aureomycin, and other drugs or chemicals are not retained in the animal products to be consumed by the human being in such amounts as to cause toxicity to the user.

These new drugs and the new research being carried on today will tomorrow unfold a great new world, made better by the unceasing efforts of those who have contributed to their development. Progress cannot be stopped. You men in the legal profession, and you who deal in the business of furnishing food to a hungry world, are a part of a great parade in which progress must not outrun our scientific evaluations of the new drugs and chemicals offered in this rapidly changing scene.

It is no secret that scientists have been able to produce a product that looks, tastes, and smells like butter, yet has not one bit of animal fat in its production. It is made entirely from coal-tar products and is, of course, synthetic. It is also possible to produce what looks like a loaf of bread, tastes like bread, smells like bread, and stays soft for many, many days, and yet has a minimum amount, if any, of the good old ingredients that our grandmothers used in making bread. The synthetic loaf can be produced without wheat or shortening. Farmers, and those interested in agriculture, are quite concerned because a great, flourishing, ambitious chemical industry is now substituting many of the products of nature such as egg yolks, wheat, fats, oils, and animal fats for a hundred complex chemical formulas. This progress has a tremendous impact on agriculture.

In all of this scientific progress, we must make sure that the public in the end is not being used as a guinea pig. These new scientific products of the mind and laboratory will always be knocking at the door of the food industry, demanding recognition. The claimed advantages of foods which have these chemicals added or substituted for natural products are legion. Indeed, some of these foods are improved in appearance, texture, flavor, and quality. Some of these foods are cheaper to produce and process. All of you engaged in the business of producing food must ask the question over and over: Have these new chemicals been adequately tested before being placed in the food channels of the world?

There is considerable talk in the halls of Congress about reviving a committee similar to the old Delaney committee which would again explore, in public hearings, the question of chemicals in foods and cosmetics. This would also include the controversial use of fluorides in water to control dental caries. This business of fluorides in water is probably the most controversial facet of the entire problem. I personally have the feeling that constructive legislation can be formulated and adopted by Congress without further public hearings.

We live in a great, growing, dynamic country. The population of the United States has just about doubled since I graduated from medical school in 1918. The Census Bureau tells us that there were 4 million new babies born last year—4 million new mouths to feed. There may be 300 million people in the United States by 1975. They will require food.

We could join the nation of have nots in the next quarter of a century unless scientific research tells us how to produce more food on the same 462 million productive acres we had 25 years ago. Because of soil erosion, the productive acres are actually decreasing. We must conserve and maintain our fertile acres by using every new soil-building and food-producing chemical we have. We must, at the same time, have a wise and safe use of every conservative pesticide that will protect our crops in the future from the invasion of pests and insects.

We are the best-fed people in the world; but actually without scientific progress and without using the knowledge which comes from scientific investigation, we would be eating and breeding ourselves out of a home.

I have tried in this short paper to outline briefly and to stimulate your thinking on some of the problems confronting the food industry. We are all a part of this great parade of progress. If we do a good job now, future generations will bless us and live proudly and contentedly in a world made better because of the scientists' contributions to a better way of life.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all mercies, in anxious and uncertain hours we turn to Thee with deep needs that only Thou canst meet. Save us, we pray Thee, from the supreme hypocrisy of making this holy moment of communion with the unseen and eternal but a conventional gesture of unfelt piety. At this high altar of the national life, preserve us from praying with our lips only, and not with our hearts and minds.

As we come in a high hour of human destiny, solemnized by the tangled tragedy in which all human life is caught, help us in these trying days to rise above all that is base and small, to work together in glad and eager harmony for the honor and welfare of our Nation and of all the peoples of this stricken earth who unite in mutual good will, determined to open the gates of a new life for all mankind. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 28, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. LEHMAN was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate this afternoon after 3 o'clock p. m.

HEALTH INSURANCE — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 81)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to proposed health insurance, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(For message from the President, see House proceedings of January 31, 1955, pp. 996–997, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of January 28, 1955,

The VICE PRESIDENT, on January 28, 1955, signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 159) authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and other routine business, and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

INCREASED PAYMENT UNDER SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 8 (e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ALLOCATION OF FUNDS AVAILABLE TO DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General, reporting, pursuant to law, on the allocation of all funds available to the Department of Justice; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF OPERATIONS OF BUREAU OF THE BUDGET ON CIRCULAR NO. A–45

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report on the operations of Circular No. A–45 of that Bureau, on departments, agencies, and corporations of the Government (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the government of the District for the year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER CO.

A letter from the president, Potomac Electric Power Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that company for the year ended December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF CAPITAL TRANSIT CO.

A letter from the president, Capital Transit Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that company, together with a balance sheet, as of December 31, 1954 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the World Health Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

DISPOSAL OF NAVY EXCESS PROPERTY IN FOREIGN AREAS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the disposal of Navy excess property in foreign areas, for the calendar year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON ANTHRACITE RESEARCH LABORATORY, SCHUYLKILL HAVEN, PA.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Bureau of Mines Anthracite Research Laboratory located at Schuylkill Haven, Pa., for the calendar year 1954; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON LIGNITE RESEARCH LABORATORY, GRAND FORKS, N. DAK.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Lignite Research Laboratory, Grand Forks, N. Dak., for the calendar year 1954; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS BELONGING TO MEMBERS OF CREEK NATION OF INDIANS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the distribution of funds belonging to the members of the Creek Nation of Indians, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PUNISHMENT FOR CERTAIN CONFIDENCE GAME SWINDLES

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide punishment for certain confidence game swindles (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TRANSACTIONS OF BANKRUPTCY COURTS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, tables of bankruptcy statistics with reference to bankruptcy cases commenced and terminated in the United States district courts for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CLAIM OF ARKANSAS POWER & LIGHT CO., PINE BLUFF, ARK.

A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, a report of the payment of the claim of Arkansas Power & Light Co., Pine Bluff, Ark.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENTS OF WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES FOR RELOCATION AND CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC UTILITIES SERVICES RESULTING FROM HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, reporting, pursuant to law, on studies made of the problems posed by relocation and reconstruction of public utilities services resulting from highway improvements, and of all phases of highway financing; to the Committee on Public Works.

IMPROVEMENT OF STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS TO COMBAT AND CONTROL JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to strengthen and improve State and local programs to combat and control juvenile delinquency (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EXTENSION OF VOLUNTARY PREPAYMENT HEALTH SERVICES PLANS

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to improve the health of the people by encouraging the extension of voluntary prepayment health services plans, facilitating the financing of construction of needed health facilities, assisting in increasing the number of adequately trained nurses and other health personnel, improving and expanding programs of mental health and public health, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the members of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 17th Semiannual Report of that Commission, dated January 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value of historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

The petition of Adriano H. Aro, of Manila, P. I., relating to certain claims of persons against the United States who acted as guerrillas in World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the house of delegates of the American Dental Association, Nashville, Tenn., favoring additional appropriations to support the World Health Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the council of the city of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for the deepening of the Delaware River at Federal expense; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANGER:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution D

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States to suspend acreage controls on durum wheat during 1955

"Whereas North Dakota produces approximately 85 percent of all durum wheat grown in the United States, and the Legislature of the State of North Dakota is vitally interested in the production of this crop; and

"Whereas approximately 85 percent of the durum crop planted in North Dakota during the 1954 crop season was lost due to rust, making the year 1954 the third consecutive year in which the production of durum wheat was far below normal and below the needs of the United States; and

"Whereas because durum wheat is far superior to other grain in the manufacture of macaroni products, the shortage of durum wheat has handicapped the entire macaroni industry: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States is hereby urged and requested to suspend acreage controls upon the planting and raising of durum wheat during the year 1955, and that permission be granted to plant and raise durum wheat upon any acreage displaced from production by acreage controls upon other grain; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate forward copies of this resolution to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, to the North Dakota congressional delegation, and to the chairman of the respective Committees on Agriculture of the United States Senate and House of Representatives.

"C. R. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"K. A. FITCH,
"Speaker of the House.
"KENNETH L. MORGAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 25)

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably the bill (S. 462) to increase the salaries of justices and judges of United States courts, Members of Congress, and for other purposes, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, and ask that permission be granted to file the written report on this bill at a later date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 847. A bill to authorize the construction of two surveying ships for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 848. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. PURTELL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES):

S. 849. A bill to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions for construction of facilities for research in crippling and killing diseases such as cancer, heart disease, poliomyelitis, nervous disorders, mental illness, arthritis and rheumatism, blindness, cerebral palsy, and muscular dystrophy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 850. A bill for the relief of Konstantinos Zaferatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 851. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 852. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the State of North Dakota over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation, and the portion of Standing Rock Indian Reservation which is located within the boundaries of the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes; and

S. 853. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the State of North Dakota over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Devils Lake Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 854. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, so as to permit the return under such section of property which an alien acquired, by gift, devise, bequest, or inheritance from an American citizen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 855. A bill to amend the act of June 27, 1944, Public Law 359, and to preserve the equities of permanent classified civil-service employees of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 856. A bill for the relief of Jose Leal;

S. 857. A bill for the relief of Edoardo Maria Filippo Baldassare Perrone di San Martino; and

S. 858. A bill for the relief of Ingeborg Elisabeth Alt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

S. 859. A bill for the relief of Lidia I. Bongiovanni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 860. A bill to amend section 2 of the Missing Persons Act, so as to provide that benefits thereunder shall be available to certain members of the Philippine Scouts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 861. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands and the improvements thereon to the county of Missoula, Mont.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 862. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the late Charles Russell; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself, Mr. MALONE, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. CURTIS):

S. 863. A bill to govern the control, appropriation, use, and distribution of water; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 864. A bill to provide for a new third division of the northern judicial district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 865. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be reduced from 65 to 60; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 866. A bill for the relief of the South Carolina State Ports Authority; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIKIN (for himself and Mr. ALLOTT):

S. 867. A bill for the relief of Jacod Grynberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 868. A bill to declare the waterway (a section of the Acushnet River) north of the Coggeshall Street Bridge in Massachusetts a nonnavigable stream; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 869 (by request). A bill for the relief of Mario Fernandes Mano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, and Mr. ALLOTT):

S. 870. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to continue to make certain emergency loans and to provide an improved emergency credit source for farmers and stockmen; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 871. A bill for the relief of Dominic Gaetano Morin; and

S. 872. A bill for the relief of Sam Bergesen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. RUSSELL):

S. 873. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, so as to extend for 3 additional years the requirement that prices of basic agricultural commodities be supported at 90 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. CASE of South Dakota):

S. 874. A bill to enable the State of South Dakota to enter into a modification of its agreement under section 218 of the Social Security Act which will enable the cities of Aberdeen and Sioux Falls to obtain old-age and survivors insurance coverage for their policemen and firemen; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 875. A bill for the relief of Angel Maria Olaeta Goitia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 876. A bill to waive the provisions of section 513 of the National Housing Act with respect to the Waluhaje Apartments, Atlanta, Ga. (FHA project No. 061–42103); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 877. A bill to limit in certain cases the power of a single justice or judge of the United States to grant a stay of execution or sentence in connection with a habeas corpus proceeding or other proceeding collaterally attacking the conviction of any person; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS (for himself and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 878. A bill to amend the act extending the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah so as to authorize such State to exchange certain mineral lands for other lands mineral in character; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 879. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to increase public disclosure of security ownership; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAPEHART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself, Mr. BEALL, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. FREAR):

S. 880. A bill to provide for the control and regulation of bank holding companies and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CARLSON (for himself, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. JENNER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. POTTER, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARRETT, and Mr. MARTIN of Iowa):

S. 881. A bill to readjust postal rates, establish a Commission on Postal Rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 882. A bill to amend the rice-marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

S. 883. A bill to amend the rice-marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 884. A bill for the relief of Gabor Lanyi; and

S. 885. A bill for the relief of Alice Elizabeth Marjoribanks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. BENDER, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. THYE, Mr. BUSH, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. DUFF):

S. 886. A bill to improve the health of the people by encouraging the extension of voluntary prepayment health services plans, facilitating the financing of construction of needed health facilities, assisting in increasing the number of adequately trained nurses and other health personnel, improving and expanding programs of mental health and public health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 887. A bill to amend section 120 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the unlimited deduction for charitable and other contributions); to the Committee on Finance.

S. 888. A bill to make temporary provision for the payment of taxes, or the making of payments in lieu of taxes, with respect to certain real estate held by Government corporations, or transferred by them to other Government agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. DUFF, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. CASE of New Jersey):

S. 889. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DUFF, Mr. KNOWLAND, and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 890. A bill to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. MILLIKIN):

S. 891. A bill for the relief of Chokichi Iraha; and

S. 892. A bill for the relief of Jose Perez Gomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCNAMARA:

S. 893. A bill for the relief of Dr. Klaus Hergt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY (for himself and Mr. THYE):

S. 894. A bill to strengthen and improve State and local programs to combat and control juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 895. A bill to amend the cotton marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 896. A bill to amend subparagraph (c), paragraph I, part I, of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to establish a presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases becoming manifest within 3 years from separation from service; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 897. A bill for the relief of Erich Anton Helfert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 898. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate the use by motor carriers (under leases, contracts, or other arrangements) of motor vehicles not owned by them, in the furnishing of transportation of property; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 899. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 900. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 901. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. 902. A bill to reorganize the Department of Justice for the protection of civil rights;

S. 903. A bill to protect the right to political participation;

S. 904. A bill to strengthen the laws relating to convict labor, peonage, slavery, and involuntary servitude;

S. 905. A bill to amend and supplement existing civil-rights statutes;

S. 906. A bill to establish a Commission on Civil Rights in the Executive Branch of the Government; and

S. 907. A bill to protect the civil rights of individuals by establishing a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government, a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice, and a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights, to strengthen the criminal laws protecting the civil rights of individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LEHMAN (for Mr. MAGNUSON, himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 908. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he introduced the above bill, for Mr. MAGNUSON, which appear under a separate heading.)

Mr. BIBLE (for Mr. CHAVEZ):

S. 909. A bill for the relief of Elzie C. Brown; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 910. A bill for the relief of Lino Perez Martinez; and

S. 911. A bill for the relief of Eftalia G. Stathis and Ariadni Vassiliki G. Stathis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request):

S. 912. A bill to amend the act of April 23, 1930, relating to a uniform retirement date for authorized retirements of Federal personnel; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. J. Res. 34. Joint resolution to prepare triennially a cumulative supplement to the revised edition of the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America as published in 1953 as Senate Document No. 170 of the 82d Congress; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. J. Res. 35. Joint resolution making January 30 of each year a legal public holiday in commemoration of the birth of Franklin Delano Roosevelt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. DWORSHAK, and Mr. MALONE):

S. J. Res. 36. Joint resolution for the preservation of Rock Creek Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act in order to place greater emphasis on solving the problems in the field of mental health. This bill would not add any general authority that does not now exist in the basic law. But, Mr. President, it would augment the present law by making clear that mental health projects, especially in basic mental health research, the training of professional personnel, and grants to the States for mental health purposes, are to be given special recognition for a reasonable period of time. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD following my remarks, together with a statement I made yesterday concerning the President's health message.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, together with the statement, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 848) to amend the Public Health Service Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. Purtell, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "National Mental Health Act Amendments of 1955."

STATEMENT OF PURPOSES

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this act to provide for surveys of mental illness and to develop more effective methods of measuring the extent of the mental health problem in the United States; to improve and assist in the coordination of public and private programs and activities for the prevention, control, and treatment of mental illness; and to stimulate the development of more effective public health services in the field of mental health, and improvements in the direction and administration of institutions for the mentally ill and in the treatment of the mentally ill.

SURVEYS, STUDIES, AND COORDINATION OF MENTAL HEALTH PROGRAMS

SEC. 3. Section 303 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(c) (1) To make surveys and special studies of the population of the United States to determine the amount, distribution, economic impact, and other effects of mental illness, (2) to collect periodically data of national scope on the incidence, prevalence, and duration of disability for the major types of mental illness and psychiatric disorders, and (3) to study, through sample surveys and other appropriate means, and develop improved methods of measuring the extent of the problem of mental illness in the United States.

"(d) To promote and assist in the better coordination and integration of regional, interstate, State, and community mental health services and programs, and to participate in the planning and development of regional and interstate collaboration and cooperative projects and arrangements in the field of mental health, including joint planning for the joint use of highly trained or specialized personnel and interstate or regional use of highly trained or specialized personnel and interstate or regional use of physical facilities, including facilities for research and training.

"(e) To collect and maintain a central pool of information concerning the scientific, technical, organizational, operational, and other aspects and problems of public, private, regional, and interstate programs for the control, prevention, and treatment of mental illness, to disseminate such information (including the results of special projects supported by grants under section 314 (1)) by publication and other appropriate means, and to provide to responsible authorities and officers of public agencies and nonprofit private organizations technical advice and assistance in its practical application through consultation services, short-term loans of specialized personnel, and otherwise as appropriate."

APPROPRIATIONS FOR MENTAL PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES

SEC. 4. Section 314 of such act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end of subsection (c) thereof a new sentence as follows: "For the 5-year period beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, appropriations authorized by this subsection shall specify an amount to be determined by the Congress for the support of mental public health services, the total sum so specified to be available for allotment among the States in accordance with the provisions of subsection (d)."

SPECIAL GRANTS FOR MENTAL HEALTH PROJECTS

SEC. 5. (a) Section 314 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"SPECIAL GRANTS FOR MENTAL HEALTH PROJECTS

"(1) There is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years such sums as may be necessary to enable the Surgeon General to make grants to States and, with the approval of the State mental health authority, to interstate agencies or to political subdivisions of States for paying part of the cost of—

"(1) public health services in the field of mental health which are of importance for (A) the development of new techniques and better methods for the improvement of mental hygiene and the prevention of mental illness, (B) public education with respect to the causes of mental illness and methods of control and prevention, (C) the development of counseling and referral services to obtain full and effective use of community resources in the field of mental health, and (D) the development of prevention and control programs on an organized community-wide basis; and

"(2) demonstrations and experimental projects for (A) developing improved methods of care and treatment of the mentally ill, including grants to State agencies responsible for administration of State institutions for care, or for care, treatment and rehabilitation, of the mentally ill, (B) developing improved methods of operation and administration of such institutions, (C) reducing the length of institutional stay by improving or developing new methods for ambulatory care and for preparation for the return of the institutionalized patient to the life of the community, and (D) developing improvements in the design and equipment of physical facilities for institutional and ambulatory treatment of the mentally ill."

(b) Subsection (j) of such section is amended by inserting after "subsection (c)" wherever it appears the following: "or subsection (l)."

The statement presented by Mr. PURTELL is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PURTELL

I am pleased that the President in his health message today is continuing along the lines set out in his health message last year in which he recommends Federal action designed to meet some of our most urgent requirements for improving the Nation's health.

The President fully recognizes in his proposals "the primacy of local and State responsibility for the health of the community."

President Eisenhower specifically outlined immediate needs in the area of improving voluntary insurance so that it will better meet the requirements of the people. He recommends providing more health facilities and more trained health personnel. From my experience as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee during the 83d Congress, it is evident to me that Federal, State, and local action is necessary and urgent if these health needs are to be met and if we are to accelerate our attack on solving these problems.

I am especially pleased that the President has singled out the field of mental health for special emphasis. I think that the need for concerted action on problems of mental health is particularly urgent. In this connection it will be recalled that on January 26 I introduced the bill, S. 724, which provides for the establishment of a Presidential Commission on Mental Health. I propose to introduce additional legislation in this field,

which, along with my previous bill, I believe, will focus attention on mental-health problems to a greater extent than heretofore and will accelerate our positive action in correcting them.

THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION PROGRAM

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, one of the outstanding programs that has been and is of great benefit to the farmers of our Nation is the REA.

Great progress has been made in the REA program under the present allocation of funds to the various States. However, at present some of the States are unable to use their quota, while others lack sufficient funds to take care of their needs.

I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 which would eliminate the present requirements for distribution of the funds among the States and give the Administrator additional leeway in using funds which presently are not allocated.

Under the bill Kansas could be allotted additional funds by the Administrator, and thereby take care of some of the demands we are unable to meet at present. It is my sincere hope that early consideration will be given to this proposed legislation.

Last year the Nation's electric co-ops distributed almost 20 percent more power to their 4 million members than they did in 1953.

The year's increase of 2.8 billion kilowatt-hours was as much as all the co-ops together sold in 1946, just 8 years ago.

Personally, I know of no program that has done more to improve farm life and make farm life more livable for the farmer's wife than electricity on the farm.

During the year 1954 the co-ops' farmer members paid an average of 3.06 cents a kilowatt-hour. That is 5 percent less than they paid in 1953. This reduction in the cost to the farmer members is partially responsible for an increase of 14 percent more electricity used on the farms. The average consumption was 219 kilowatt-hours a month.

This great increase in the use of electricity by the co-ops has resulted in increased earnings and last year they averaged 2.58 mills against 2.25 in 1953.

In the past year they added 38,700 miles of line and 151,000 new customers.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that a copy of the bill be printed in the RECORD as a part of these remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 851) to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, is further amended by striking out all of subsections (c) and (d).

SEC. 2. Subsection (e) of section 3 is amended by striking out the following words: "without allotment: *Provided, however*, That not more than 10 percent of said sums for rural electrification loans may be employed in any one State or in all of the Territories" and by relettering said subsection "(c)", so that it will read as follows:

"(c) If any part of the annual sums made available for the purposes of this act shall not be loaned or obligated during the fiscal year for which such sums are made available, such unexpended or unobligated sums shall be available for loans by the Administrator in the following year or years."

SEC. 3. Subsection (f) of section 3 is amended by relettering it "(d)."

AMENDMENT OF SECURITIES ACT RELATING TO PUBLIC DISCLOSURE

Mr. CAPEHART. I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Securities and Exchange Act for the purpose of protecting the public interest and investors whenever the Securities and Exchange Commission finds that any person or group is soliciting proxies or purchasing any security for the purpose of gaining control of the issuer's business.

Stockholders have, and should have a controlling voice in the management of their business.

I would not change this and I would in no way discourage stockholders who seek to improve management policies in good faith.

However, stockholders and prospective investors are entitled to know who actually seeks control of a large corporate business.

In recent months we have seen heated contests for control of huge corporate enterprises.

A recent episode of this kind involved the New York Central Railroad.

In progress now is a struggle by the Wolfson group for control of the Montgomery Ward Co.

During the past year there have been 28 such cases before the Securities and Exchange Commission and, in all probability, there will be many more cases in the future.

I feel strongly that it is in the public interest and for the protection of investors that those seeking control of such large companies and corporations be required to make full disclosure of their identity and the identity of their associates.

This is the sole purpose of the bill.

There is no need for me to be specific in this recollection, but it is generally known that in recent years legitimate businesses have been acquired by underworld interests through proxy contests in which actual identities were hidden.

I submit this bill as one approach to this problem. The introduction of the bill will provide a basis for hearings which I hope will be held as soon possible in order that the Senate Banking and Currency Committee may fully explore the situation and obtain such suggestions as the SEC Commissioners and others may be able to furnish.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 879) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to increase public disclosure of security ownership, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

READJUSTMENT OF POSTAL RATES

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, last week the Postmaster General, Mr. Summerfield, sent to the Vice President a bill drafted by the Post Office Department "to readjust postal rates, establish a Commission on Postal Rates; and for other purposes."

The Vice President referred this bill to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

This measure embodies the recommendations of the Department.

On behalf of myself, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], my colleague, the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], I am today introducing this proposed legislation.

The bill will be at the desk today and it is open for other Senators to cosponsor if they so desire.

The 83d Congress, by Senate Resolution No. 49, authorized an Advisory Council appointed by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I was chairman of that council. It made a very comprehensive study of postal operations and submitted a number of recommendations to the Senate in its report.

One of the recommendations, No. 24, stated that "postal rate increases should be immediately considered by the Congress." This, together with other carefully considered recommendations submitted to the Senate and authorized by Senate Resolution No. 49 of the 83d Congress, should have early consideration.

I believe it is obvious that any legislation in this vital area must be subject to the closest congressional scrutiny and must be based on policy established and defined by the Congress.

This is emphasized when the Department recommends that the Congress yield to a Commission its responsibility to fix rates for the services of the Department which has a monopoly on the distribution of mail.

I ask that the bill be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 881) to readjust postal rates; establish a Commission on Postal Rates; and for other purposes, intro-

duced by Mr. CARLSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXTENSION OF VOLUNTARY PREPAYMENT HEALTH SERVICES PLANS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for the extension of voluntary prepayment health services plans, and so forth, reflecting in legislative form those parts of President Eisenhower's special health message which fall within the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I may note, as my colleagues know, that the President's message was delivered in the House of Representatives on yesterday and has come to the Senate today. Therefore, I am introducing in the Senate a bill on the subject referred to by the President.

I do this as the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. However, I am happy to list as cosponsors the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], all of whom are members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Since I have prepared this statement the following Senators have asked to be listed as cosponsors: The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and my colleague the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE].

I invite any other Senators to join in cosponsoring this bill and ask unanimous consent that their names may be added any time today.

It should be noted that the President's message contains recommendations which, to be made effective, require amendment of the Social Security Act. Since any such proposed amendments are not within the jurisdiction of the Senate Labor Committee, the so-called omnibus bill of six titles which I am now introducing, does not include those proposals.

I understand those amendments will be introduced by some member of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. President, I am confident that all who read the President's health message, and all who study the legislative proposals contained in the bill will be impressed by the scope and balance of the program outlined. Thus, it embraces provisions relating to a reinsurance service to stimulate the extension of voluntary health insurance protection; the insurance of private loans for the construction of additional health facilities; the training of additional personnel needed to provide nursing and public-health services; the development of new and more flexible State and local public-health programs; and the expansion of programs and services in the increasingly important field of mental health.

The program outlined in the bill has been carefully designed to advance the Nation's health, through measures within the framework of our free-enterprise society. I hope the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will proceed as rapidly as possible with the scheduling of hearings and committee consideration of all phases of the bill. I am confident that if the 84th Congress, after due deliberation, enacts legislation following the philosophy and pattern of President Eisenhower's recommendations, this Congress will long be remembered for its constructive contributions to the ultimate solution of the health needs of our citizens.

Mr. President, the bill itself is of such length that I do not ask that it be printed in the RECORD. However, I have had prepared a summary of the bill, and I ask unanimous consent that the summary be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 886) to improve the health of the people by encouraging the extension of voluntary prepayment health services plans, facilitating the financing of construction of needed health facilities, assisting in increasing the number of adequately trained nurses and other health personnel, improving, and expanding programs of mental health and public health, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The summary presented by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey is as follows:

SUMMARY OF TITLE I—HEALTH SERVICES PREPAYMENT PLANS

IN GENERAL

As a partial attack on the problem of making needed health services and facilities available to the maximum number of people on a prepayment basis, this title of the bill would authorize a two-pronged program within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, namely (a) technical advisory and informational services, without charge, to health services prepayment plans, and (b) reinsurance for health services prepayment plans established and operated by commercial insurance carriers or by nonprofit carriers.

ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

1. The bill would vest all responsibility for the administration of the program in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. (Under existing law, the Secretary could delegate all or any part of this function and either place it in an existing major unit within the Department or place it in a new unit.)

2. The bill would provide for a National Advisory Council on Health Services Prepayment Plans consisting of 12 members appointed by the President, one of whom would be designated by the President as chairman. The Council would advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Secretary on matters of policy relating to the Secretary's activities and functions under this title of the bill.

3. In addition to authorizing, in general terms, utilization of other Federal agences, or of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution, the bill would provide for maximum utilization by the Secretary of the various State insurance departments (or other State agencies supervising carriers of health services prepayment plans), especially in determining compliance with requirements and standards prescribed by the Secretary as a condition of approval of a health services prepayment plan for reinsurance. Final responsibility for such determinations would, of course, rest with the Secretary.

4. Regulations under this title of the bill could not authorize any Federal officer or employee to exercise any supervision or regulatory control over any participiating carrier, or over any hospital or other health facility or personnel furnishing personal health services covered by a participating prepayment plan.

TECHNICAL AND ADVISORY SERVICES

Under this part of the program, the Secretary would be authorized to conduct studies and collect information on the organizational, actuarial, and other problems of health services prepayment plans, make the results of such studies and the information so collected generally available, and provide to sponsors of such plans, without charge, organizational and other technical advice and information, including information on morbidity and organizational methods.

For this part of the program a separate appropriation would be authorized.

REINSURANCE PROGRAM

1. Four types of plans would be eligible for reinsurance under title I of the bill.

(a) Plans for average and lower income families: These are plans designed primarily to provide reasonable coverage for families of average or lower income, and which meet certain requirements set forth in the bill. These requirements are—

(1) For service-type plans, provision of

(i) 70 or more days' hospitalization per year,

(ii) in-hospital surgical and other medical care,

(iii) home and office physician care.

(2) For indemnity-type plans,

(i) not more than 15 percent coinsurance for hospital care, 25 percent for physician care, and 25 percent for other care and services included in the plan,

(ii) maximum deductible of $100 per illness per beneficiary or $150 per year per beneficiary or family and maximum liability of at least $750 per illness per beneficiary or $1,000 per year per beneficiary or family.

(3) For both types of plans,

(i) no illness exclusions (except for certain specified illnesses, such as tuberculosis, etc.),

(ii) maximum age of at least 70 years and automatic renewal on reasonable terms after 5 years,

(iii) conversion of group policies on reasonable terms,

(iv) compliance with other requirements in regulations.

(b) Major medical expense plans: These are plans designed to provide protection against the exceptionally high costs of medical and hospital care per illness per beneficiary, which meet certain specified conditions. These are: not more than 25 percent coinsurance (with respect to the personal health services specified in the plan), coverage of all illnesses (except for certain specified ones), conversion of group policies on reasonable terms, and other requirements in regulations.

(c) Plans for rural area families: Plans designed primarily for rural area families which comply with requirements in regulations.

(d) Other plans: Other plans which will carry out the purposes of this title of the bill and which comply with requirements in regulations.

The Secretary would also be authorized, as a condition of granting reinsurance, to establish by regulation terms, conditions, and requirements as to the other types and kinds of prepayment plans which will be

reinsured, coinsurance, deductible amounts, and so forth.

2. This program is designed to be self-sustaining, over a reasonable term, through reinsurance premiums paid into a revolving reinsurance fund. An appropriation of not to exceed $100 million to a capital-advance account in the Treasury would be authorized, which would be available, without fiscal year limitation, as a line of credit for advances of working capital to the reinsurance fund. When and as the condition of the fund permits, such advances would be repayable to the capital-advance account and the amount so repaid would again be available for future advances to the fund if needed. Until repayment, interest on the outstanding balance of advances to the fund would be payable to the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

3. Reinsurance premiums would, pursuant to regulation, be fixed by the Secretary at rates determined with a view to achieving the objectives of the program and fiscal self-sufficiency over a reasonable term. Such premiums could, and probably would, be fixed separately for each plan (for the initial reinsurance term, and thereafter again for each renewal term).

4. Reinsurance liabilities under the program would be limited to and paid from the fund, except that the Secretary could set up separate reinsurance accounts within the fund, in which event liability would be limited to the account to which a plan is allocated. It would be possible, under this provision, to establish, for example, special reinsurance accounts for each of the types of plans eligible for reinsurance as described above in paragraph 1, for classes of carriers, or for members of a group of affiliated or associated carriers.

5. The fund would be invested in Federal or federally guaranteed, interest-bearing securities.

6. Authority to write reinsurance in a given field would be subject to a standby or no-competition provision. That is to say, the Secretary could reinsure plans of a given kind or type only if, in the Secretary's judgment, reinsurance for such plans, on terms and conditions, and at premium rates, comparable to those offered under this title of the bill, is not available from private sources to an extent adequate to promote the purposes of the program. By implication, the Secretary would have to stop writing reinsurance when such a finding could no longer be made.

7. Reinsurance for a plan could not be granted unless (a) the applicant carrier is operating and proposes to operate according to law, (b) there is no reason to believe that the carrier is financially unsound or that it operates in an unsafe manner, (c) the reinsurance of the plan will promote the purposes of the program, (d) the carrier agrees to submit such reports concerning its operations under the reinsured plan as the Secretary may from time to time reasonably require, (e) the carrier has agreed to the reinsurance premium rate fixed by the Secretary for the plan, and (f) the plan, the policies, or contracts thereunder, and proposed method of operation comply with the terms and conditions prescribed for reinsurance. Certification by the State insurance department (or corresponding supervisory agency) of the carrier's home State as to whether there is reason to believe the carrier is financially unsound or unsafe, as determined in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary, could be accepted by the Secretary as conclusive. As to utilization of State agencies with respect to (f), see paragraph 8.

8. As a condition of granting reinsurance, the Secretary could, among other things, specify (a) minimum benefits; (b) safeguards against undue exclusions of preexisting conditions or of specific illnesses, or against other undue exclusions or limitation; (c) standards for deductible and coinsurance provisions, limits of maximum liability, waiting periods for benefits, and other such policy provisions; (d) standards for the duration, cancelability, and renewability of such policies or contracts; and (e) standards for plan provisions with respect to costs and charges of providers of personal health services payable by the carrier, to the extent such standards are necessary to protect the fund against abuses or arbitrary cost increases. The Secretary would be precluded from reinsuring any plan for which the carrier's premium rates are such as to make the plan financially unsound, or any plan with respect to which the carrier's breakdown of its single premium rate, as between reinsured and nonreinsured types of benefit costs, is unreasonable, or any plan reinsurance of which would not promote the purposes of this title of the bill, but in other respects the Secretary would be precluded from setting any standards for the carrier's premium rates. The State insurance department or corresponding State agency of a carrier's home State (as defined) would, if willing, be utilized to certify to the Secretary whether the plan complies with the terms and conditions stipulated as a condition of granting reinsurance.

9. The Secretary could not approve for reinsurance any plan for direct provision of medical or dental services by the carrier through a salaried staff of physicians, surgeons, or dentists in the employ of such carrier, unless the carrier has an organizational structure vesting control over the practice of medicine or dentistry solely in duly licensed members of the professions involved.

10. The liability of the reinsurance fund with respect to a reinsured plan would be fixed and limited as follows:

(a) The reinsurance base.

The fund would not underwrite all of the carrier's annual benefit costs under the plan. Rather, the reinsured portion of such costs would be limited to the excess, if any, of

(1) aggregate annual incurred benefit costs under the plan, over

(2) the difference between (i) gross annual earned premium income and (ii) a portion of such income called the administrative-expense allowance.

The administrative-expense allowance applicable to a given year for a reinsured plan would be determined by multiplying the gross earned premium income for the year by seven-eighths of the carrier's preestimated (and thus predetermined, prior to the commencement of the reinsurance term into which the year falls) ratio of its annual administrative expenses under the plan [1] to its annual earned premium income under the plan.

Thus, before reinsurance would begin to apply, the carrier would in effect have to absorb fully out of its premium income, as benefit costs, (1) the anticipated portion of premium income normally devoted to benefit costs for such a plan, (2) the portion anticipated as available for profits (in the case of a carrier organized for profit) and for contingencies, and (3) one-eighth of the portion of premium income anticipated as administrative expenses. However, there is one variation of the foregoing for rural-area plans. Instead of absorbing one-eighth of the anticipated administrative expenses, the carrier could at its option absorb 2 percent of its anticipated premium income if this would result in reinsurance of a larger portion of its benefit costs.

Procedurally, the ratio of administrative expenses to earned premium income of the carrier under the plan would be estimated by the carrier, and that estimate would be submitted (with supporting data) with the application for initial reinsurance or renewal of reinsurance. In order to prevent distortion, the Secretary could require the submission of an average ratio based on a period not in excess of 3 years. The carrier's estimate would have to be approved by the Secretary unless considered to be unreasonable or not in good faith.

For plans operated to a substantial extent on the basis of personal health services to be furnished by the carrier directly through its own staff or indirectly through the staff of an affiliate, or on the basis of payments made by the carrier to a provider of personal health services which is an affiliate of the carrier, the above formula would not apply, but the Secretary would, by regulation, prescribe a formula calculated to achieve for such plans reinsurance protection reasonably comparable in scope and extent to that provided for other types, taking into account their inherent differences.

(b) Coinsurance.

The liability of the fund would be limited to 75 percent of the carrier's "reinsured cost" so arrived at. This is an adoption, for this purpose, of the principle of coinsurance.

11. The reinsurance term would be stipulated for a given (regular) period, e. g., a year, in the reinsurance certificate, but the Secretary could, by or pursuant to regulation, provide for letting the reinsurance term extend beyond such regular period with respect to policies or subscriber contracts issued during such period and running beyond it. Also authorized pursuant to regulations would be the combination of a carrier's experience under two or more reinsured plans during the same term. In addition, regulations could provide for the extent to which experience during a term will be combined with experience during extensions thereof and the extent to which policies issued during but running beyond the reinsurance term will be treated as though issued in a subsequent term.

12. Reinsurance for a plan could be terminated by the Secretary on any ground specified in regulations in effect not less than 90 days in advance of the commencement of the current initial or renewal term of such reinsurance. However, reinsurance with respect to policies or subscriber contracts in effect on the effective date of such termination would remain in force until the normal expiration of the term.

MISCELLANEOUS

1. The bill would confer broad powers on the Secretary with respect to enforcement or settlement of claims, and would authorize the Secretary to hold hearings, etc., in connection with investigations under the program.

2. Criminal penalties would be imposed, not only for falsely advertising or representing that a carrier is reinsured or has applied for reinsurance but, regardless of the truth or falsity of the representation, also if the representation is not authorized by, or fails to conform to, regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

3. The effective date would be the 30th day following enactment, but in view of the necessity for a preparatory period the Secretary would not be required to receive or consider applications for reinsurance before a date determined by the Secretary.

SUMMARY OF TITLE II—MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF HEALTH FACILITIES

IN GENERAL

In order to facilitate further the financing and development of needed facilities, the bill would authorize the establishment, within

[1] As here used, the term "administrative expenses" is intended to include all of the carrier's expenses and charges incurred under the plan, except the benefit costs and except any provision for contingencies, profits, dividends, and refunds. The Secretary would be authorized to define "administrative expenses" for such purposes more particularly.

the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, of a program of mortgage insurance to stimulate, on a self-sustaining basis, a continuing flow of private credit to finance the construction, expansion, modernization, and conversion of privately owned and operated health facilities. It would also remove certain restrictions on certain Federally regulated lending institutions with respect to their investments in loans on real property in the case of such Federally insured mortgages, and the existence of the program would encourage the removal of similar restrictions imposed on such loans under State law.

ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

1. The bill would vest responsibility for the administration of the program in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Under existing law the Secretary could delegate all or any part of this function and either place it in an existing major unit within the Department or place it in a new unit. In addition, the bill carries express authority to utilize, by delegation or otherwise, the services and facilities of any other Federal agency by agreement with the head of the agency.

2. The bill would authorize the Secretary to consult with and otherwise use the services of existing advisory councils, to appoint new members to serve with such councils for purposes of this program, or to establish additional advisory groups as deemed necessary.

3. Except as otherwise specifically provided, no Federal officer or employee would be authorized to exercise any supervision or control over the administration, personnel, or operation of any privately owned and operated health facility. The bill also expressly precludes any possibility of its being interpreted as authorizing any association or corporation to engage in the practice of healing or medicine as defined by State law, or as conferring on any person the right to exercise any control over any individual's personal right to select his own hospital, physician, or group of physicians.

FINANCING OF THE PROGRAM

1. The health facilities mortgage insurance program is designed as a self-sustaining business-type financial operation. Premiums for insurance of the principal of eligible mortgages would be paid into a revolving fund, to be known as the health facilities mortgage insurance fund, which would be used for carrying out the program. An initial appropriation of $10 million, and such additional sums thereafter as necessary, would be authorized for the purpose of establishing a separate working-capital account from which needed capital would be transferred to the health facilities mortgage insurance fund by the Secretary. Such capital advances would be repayable to the working-capital account as the condition of the insurance fund permits, beginning not later than July 1, 1965, and would then be available for future advances to the fund on like terms. (Interest would accrue to the Treasury on such capital advances, and would be payable annually as and when sufficient reserves, etc., have been built up in the insurance fund.) Should additional funds be required to meet liabilities incurred under insurance contracts of the program, such funds could be obtained by the sale of notes or other interest-bearing obligations to the Treasury, which would become liabilities of the insurance fund and be redeemable out of income and other assets of the fund. This line of credit has a limit of $25 million or, if greater, 75 percent of the outstanding total insurance under the program.

2. The aggregate authorized insurance outstanding at any one time would be limited to $200 million. This program ceiling could be raised by the President up to an aggregate increase of $150 million, if he determined that such increases were in the public interest.

3. The Secretary would be authorized to fix premium charges at rates adequate to cover expenses and reserves but not in excess of 1 percent of the outstanding principal obligation of insured mortgages. Reasonable charges for appraisal and inspection would also be authorized.

ELIGIBILITY FOR MORTGAGE LOAN INSURANCE

1. Mortgages would be eligible for insurance if made to secure loans to finance health facilities conforming to standards of construction and equipment satisfactory to the Secretary and to all applicable requirements of State law. The mortgagor would also be required, as a condition of eligibility, to give satisfactory assurance that operation and maintenance of the completed facility would be in compliance with applicable requirements of State law. No mortgagor would be eligible who was not the owner and operator, or prospective operator, of the facility and who could not satisfy the Secretary as to his responsibility and ability to repay. However, employers and nonprofit organizations (as defined) would be considered "operators" for purposes of this program if they owned the facility and had made contractual arrangements with providers of health services to use the facility primarily for furnishing services in the facility for such owner's employees, subscribers, or members, or their dependents, under a plan of such employer or organization, though use of the facility would not necessarily be restricted to such employees, subscribers, members, or dependents. No mortgagee would be eligible unless approved by the Secretary as responsible and able to service the mortgage properly.

2. The mortgage insurance program would assist in financing the new construction, or expansion, modernization, etc., of a wide variety of health facilities, including hospitals, diagnostic or treatment centers, nursing homes licensed by the States, and rehabilitation centers. It would not be available to finance facilities devoted primarily to domiciliary care. The loan secured by the insured mortgage could include costs of construction, initial equipment, and site acquisition, and, in the case of expansion, remodeling, or conversion of an existing building, it could include the cost of acquiring the existing building and site or of refinancing an existing indebtedness thereon.

3. Mortgage insurance would be authorized for mortgages securing loans in amounts not in excess of 80 percent of the estimated value (upon completion) of the property (including the land), for terms not in excess of 30 years. This maximum percentage could be lowered by regulation, either for particular classes or types of facilities or otherwise. As a condition of insurance the mortgagor would be required to agree to repay forthwith any amount by which the mortgage loan exceeded 80 percent of the actual cost (as defined). (In determining such estimated value or such "actual cost," the Secretary would be required to deduct the amount of any Federal grant, such as a grant under the hospital survey and construction program, to which the sponsor is entitled for the project.)

4. The Secretary would be authorized to prescribe by regulation the form and content of applications to be made by the mortgagee and other terms and conditions for the insurance of eligible mortgages and would be required to find in each case, as a condition of insurance, that the project was economically sound and that the health facility would be operated on a basis that provided a reasonable prospect of continuing and adequate sources of revenue to pay the secured obligation. (In passing on the question of economic soundness in the case of a hospital project, the Secretary would be required to take into account available information as to existing hospital facilities, population-bed ratios, and bed-utilization rates in the area to be served, other programed hospital construction which would affect utilization of the projected facility, and similar relevant matters.) Each mortgage would be required, among other things, to contain an undertaking that, except as authorized by the Secretary and the mortgagee, the property would be used as a health facility during the life of the mortgage or until the contract of insurance had been otherwise terminated.

INSURANCE CONTRACT AND INSURANCE BENEFITS

1. The insurance fund would be primarily liable under mortgage insurance contracts. The Government's obligation under the contract of insurance would be to pay in cash to the mortgagee, upon 30 days' default of the mortgagor, 95 percent of the value of the mortgage (defined as unpaid principal, plus certain charges and expenses for taxes, insurance, etc.) with 3 percent interest from the date of default. As a condition of this payment the mortgagee would either assign the mortgage to the Secretary or, through foreclosure or otherwise, convey to the Secretary title to the mortgaged property, but in the event of mere assignment of the mortgage to the Secretary, which would relieve the mortgagee of foreclosure costs, etc., 1 percent of the unpaid principal of the mortgage would be deducted from the insurance payment.

2. In addition to the payment in cash of an amount equal to 95 percent of the value of the mortgage, the Secretary would also issue to the mortgagee a certificate of claim for the difference between the amount of the cash payment and the amount the mortgagee would have received if the mortgagor had paid all his obligations in full under the mortgage, plus an allowance for the mortgagee's expenses where the mortgagee had foreclosed the mortgage or otherwise acquired title for the Secretary. The certificate of claim would bear 3 percent interest but would be payable only out of the proceeds of the property after the fund had been made whole for all payments and expenses incurred under the mortgage insurance transaction.

3. The bill provides for adjustment of premium charges in case the principal obligation of an insured mortgage is paid in full prior to maturity, and for termination of the insurance contract in the event the mortgagee, after 30 days' default of the mortgagor, fails to assign the mortgage, or to have title delivered to the Secretary, as required under the bill in such cases and elects not to claim the insurance after default of the mortgagor. In addition the Secretary would be authorized to require the mortgagee to accelerate the debt on breach of covenant or other undertaking contained in the mortgage, if that course should be found to be necessary for the protection of the insurance fund or required by the purposes of the program.

MISCELLANEOUS

1. The Secretary would be given broad powers to sue and be sued, compromise claims, acquire, manage, and convey property in carrying out the program, and generally to exercise all the rights of a mortgagee with respect to mortgages and the rights of an owner with respect to property acquired in the administration of the mortgage insurance program. In order to facilitate the sale of mortgages acquired by the Secretary or executed in connection with the sale of property which had been acquired by the Secretary, the insurance of such mortgages would be authorized without regard to the limitations with respect to eligibility for mortgage insurance otherwise applicable.

2. The bill would authorize the collection and distribution of information and statistics pertaining to the insurance of mortgages.

3. Insured mortgages would be exempted from certain investment and other restrictions under Federal laws, as is the case with mortgages insured under the National Housing Act.

4. Criminal penalties are provided for in the bill for fraud or forgery in connection with transactions under the mortgage insurance program.

5. The effective date of this program would be October 1, 1955.

SUMMARY OF TITLE III—PRACTICAL NURSE TRAINING

Title III of the bill authorizes a 5-year program in the Office of Education for the extension and improvement of practical nurse training through grants to State vocational education agencies for the training of practical nurses.

GENERAL

Vocational education grants to States for the 5-year period beginning July 1, 1955, for extension and improvement of practical nurse training of less than college grade would be authorized. The program would be applicable to all States, including Alaska, Hawaii, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZATION

Two million dollars would be authorized for fiscal 1956, $3 million for fiscal 1957, and $4 million each for fiscal 1958, 1959, and 1960.

ALLOTMENTS

Allotments to the States would be based on relative State population, but with a minimum to each State of $7,500 per fiscal year ($3,750 in case of the Virgin Islands).

MATCHING

The Federal share of approved projects for extension and improvement of practical nurse training would be 75 percent for first 2 fiscal years and 50 percent for last 3 fiscal years.

STATE PLANS

The States would have to submit plans—

(1) Designating the State board (the State board of vocational education or the State board primarily responsible for supervision of elementary and secondary education) as the sole agency for administration of the plan, or for supervision of administration by local educational agencies, with a registered professional nurse in charge of or available for consultation to the State board.

(2) Showing the plans, policies, and methods to be followed under the plan and providing such fiscal procedures, etc., as are necessary for efficient administration.

(3) Containing minimum qualifications for teachers, teacher-trainers, supervisors, and directors.

(4) Providing for reports to the Commissioner of Education as necessary.

WITHHOLDING OF FUNDS

The Commissioner may withhold payments, after notice and hearing to the State board, for failure to comply with requirements applicable to State plans. A State may appeal to circuit court of appeals and then to United States Supreme Court if dissatisfied with the withholding of funds.

ADMINISTRATION

This title of the bill would be administered by the Commissioner of Education. The Commissioner would (a) make relevant studies, investigations, and reports; (b) render technical assistance to States; and (c) disseminate pertinent information. He would also be authorized to make rules and regulations and to delegate his powers and duties, other than rulemaking, within the Office of Education.

EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS

Nothing in this title would affect the availability of amounts paid to States under the Smith-Hughes Act (39 Stat. 929), as amended and extended, or the George-Barden Act (60 Stat. 775), as amended and extended, for practical nurse training.

SUMMARY OF TITLE IV—GRADUATE TRAINING OF PROFESSIONAL NURSES AND OTHER PROFESSIONAL HEALTH PERSONNEL

Title IV of the bill authorizes a revised program of traineeships in graduate nursing and in public-health specialties.

This title of the bill adds a new section 305 to the Public Health Service Act authorizing the Surgeon General to establish and maintain two broad categories of traineeships, in the Service and elsewhere. There would be traineeships for graduate or specialized training in public health for doctors, engineers, nurses, and other professional health personnel. Also authorized would be traineeships for training professional nurses for teaching or for administrative or supervisory duties in the various fields of nursing.

This new section of the Public Health Service Act also authorizes the provision of the traineeships through grants to public and nonprofit institutions. The traineeships would include stipends and allowances in amounts to be determined administratively.

SUMMARY OF TITLE V—PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES

This title of the bill would, effective July 1, 1955, replace the present separate authorizations for public health grants under section 314 of the Public Health Service Act, including the separate authorizations for control of particular diseases, with an authorization for grants for support of public health services generally and for extension and improvement of such services, and grants for special projects.

GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES

Allotments and payments for public health services

Allotments and payments under the revised section 314 of the Public Health Service Act for general support grants would be made as follows:

(1) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, each State would be allotted an amount equal to its allotment under section 314 for the current fiscal year (ending June 30, 1955), including its current allotment for cancer grants but excluding its current allotment for mental health grants.

(2) The remainder, after allotment according to paragraph (1), of the appropriations for the fiscal years 1956 and 1957, and all sums appropriated in succeeding fiscal years would be allotted in accordance with regulations on the basis of (A) population, (B) extent of particular health problems, and (C) relative financial need of the States.

(3) Payments from the State's allotment, except from sums set aside under subsection (c) for extension and improvement grants, would be made in accordance with the Federal share (established for each State, as described below, on the basis of relative per capita income) of the cost of public health services under the State plan, the cost of training personnel for State and local public health work and the cost of administering the State plan.

Extension and improvement grants

The Surgeon General would be authorized to establish a percentage, not in excess of 20 percent, to be set aside from the allotments to the States for public health services. The percentage would be uniform for all States. The percentage of the allotments so earmarked could be used only for approved projects for extension and improvement of public health services, which are included in the State plan. Payments for any one such project could be made for 4 years only. Payments would equal 75 percent of the cost of the project for the first 2 years, and thereafter could meet not more than 50 percent of project costs, including costs for administration and training of personnel for State and local public health work.

State plans

The Surgeon General would be required to approve any State plan which meets the requirements prescribed by regulation. Separate State plans for mental health would have to be submitted in States with a separate State mental-health authority.

Regulations

As under existing law, all regulations with respect to grants to States under the new section 314 could be made only after consultation with a conference of State health authorities, including State mental-health authorities when grants for work in the mental-health field are concerned, and with their concurrence insofar as practicable.

Withholding of grants

As under existing law, notice and hearing to the State authority is required prior to the discontinuance of grants for noncompliance with the requirements applicable to the State plan.

Such withholding would apply to the State's allotments for public-health services, including extension and improvement thereof, and including its allotments under the new section 315 for mental-health services, or the withholding could apply only to a particular project or portion of the State plan affected by the State's failure if the Surgeon General deemed such action appropriate.

Judicial review would be authorized for any State dissatisfied with the Surgeon General's action withholding its allotments.

The Federal share

The Federal share establishes the portion of the cost of public-health services which may be paid from grants under the new section 314 (not earmarked for extension and improvement projects). It is defined as a percentage which equals 100 percent minus the percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 percent as the per-capita income of the State bears to the per-capita income of the continental United States (excluding Alaska). However, the Federal share could not exceed a maximum of 66⅔ percent nor could it be less than 33⅓ percent; and the Federal share would be fixed at 50 percent for Hawaii and Alaska, and at 66⅔ percent for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Method of computation and payment of grants

Payments of amounts from the State allotments (including the portion for extension and improvement projects) would be based on estimates made on the basis of records and information furnished by the State and any other necessary investigation with subsequent adjustment to correct any errors in estimates. Payments would be made in such installments as the Surgeon General might determine.

In case an officer or employee of the Public Health Service is detailed to a State, or to a political subdivision, or public or nonprofit organization or agency in the State, for the convenience and at the request of the State, the Surgeon General would be authorized, when so requested by the State health authority, to reduce any payment to the State by the amount of the pay, allowances, traveling expenses and other costs related to the detail of such officer or employee. The amount of that reduction would then be available for payment by the Surgeon General of the costs of the detail.

Technical assistance and detail of personnel

The Surgeon General would also be authorized, in order to assist further in the extension and improvement of public health services, to train personnel for State and local public health work, to detail personnel to Guam and American Samoa, and to extend training investigation, demonstration, and

consultative services to Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Combination of allotments

The new section 314 also authorizes the Surgeon General, at the request of a State, to combine a portion of its allotment for public health services, or extension and improvement projects, with that of another State for purposes of supporting a particular and clearly defined public health service, or a project, undertaken by another State.

GRANTS FOR SPECIAL PROJECTS

Section 502 of the draft bill would amend section 303 of the Public Health Service Act (which now relates to mental health) by replacing it with a new section.

The new section 303 would authorize appropriations, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, to enable the Surgeon General to make two types of project grants: (1) grants to States (or with the approval of the State authorities, to interstate agencies or political subdivisions) for part of the cost of public health services having importance for the solution of public health problems which are emergent or acute in specific geographical areas or are common to several States, or problems for which the Federal Government has a special responsibility; and (2) grants to State and local agencies, universities, laboratories, and to individuals for investigations, experiments, demonstrations, studies, and research projects which have been recommended by the National Advisory Health Council.

For purposes of this section, Guam would be deemed a State.

SUMMARY OF TITLE VI—MENTAL HEALTH

Title VI of the bill would authorize a separate grant program for mental health for the 5-year period beginning July 1, 1955, consisting of grants for public-health services in the field of mental health, comparable to the grants authorized by title V for public-health services in general. It would also authorize special project grants for specific problems related to the improvement of care, treatment, or rehabilitation of the mentally ill and improvement in the administration of institutions providing care for such persons.

GRANTS TO STATES FOR MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Section 601 of the bill would amend the Public Health Service Act by redesignating present section 315 as 316 and inserting a new section 315.

The new section 315 would authorize, in addition to the sums appropriated under the new section 314, which are also available for mental public-health programs, additional appropriations for a 5-year period, beginning with the fiscal year 1956, to be available specifically for public-health services in the field of mental health.

Allotments from these appropriations to the States would be made in accordance with regulations on the basis of population, extent of mental health problems, and financial need.

The provisions on payments from the State allotments are the same as under section 314 (as amended by title V of the bill); and the provisions of that section on regulations, methods of payment, and combination of allotments of States would be applicable here also.

GRANTS FOR SPECIAL PROJECTS IN MENTAL HEALTH

Section 602 of the bill would amend the Public Health Service Act to add a new section 304.

The new section 304 would authorize annual appropriations for a 5-year period, beginning with the fiscal year 1956, to enable the Surgeon General to make project grants in the mental health field similar to the grants authorized in section 303 (a) (2) for public health in general. The special projects in mental health authorized under this section would be directed particularly toward improved methods of care and treatment of the mentally ill and improved methods of operation and administration for institutions providing such care and treatment. Grants could be made to individuals and to public and private agencies, including the State agencies responsible for administration of State institutions for care and treatment of the mentally ill. Grants could be made only upon recommendation of the National Advisory Mental Health Council.

For purposes of this section Guam would be deemed to be a State.

TRAINEESHIPS IN MENTAL HEALTH

Section 603 would amend the Public Health Service Act by adding a new section 306.

The new section 306 would make clear that the general authority of the Surgeon General (sec. 433 of the Public Health Service Act) to establish and maintain traineeships in fields of diseases in which an institute has been established in the Public Health Service applies in the field of mental health.

EXTENSION AND STRENGTHENING OF WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have prepared in regard to the bill, and also a summary of the contents of the bill. I make this request in the interest of the convenience of the Members of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement and summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 890) to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act, introduced by Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DUFF, Mr. KNOWLAND, and Mr. KUCHEL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The statement presented by Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MARTIN OF PENNSYLVANIA

The bill I have introduced concerning stream pollution control is designed to safeguard the Nation's health and to preserve one of our most vital natural resources. The bill provides for continuing the Public Health Service activities initiated under the Water Pollution Control Act of 1948. Based on experience gained under the present act—which expires June 30, 1956—the bill provides for a permanent, continuing program, incorporating several modifications to strengthen the national program and to facilitate cooperative efforts with the States, interstate agencies, and industry. The bill would continue to vest in the States the primary responsibility for water pollution control, with the Federal effort directed to the role of research, professional consultation, and control over interstate pollution problems.

Of our natural resources, water has become the No. 1 concern of the Nation. In more and more areas the steadily increasing demands for water are exceeding the available supplies. In the past year more than 1,000 cities experienced domestic water shortages. Many industries are finding it increasingly difficult to secure suitable water to maintain production.

Water deficiencies can be met in part by impoundments to even out stream flows, but by and large, the solution will be conservation of water quality through abatement of water pollution. It is becoming extremely important that we purify our used water from cities and industries to the extent needed to permit repeated reuse as the streams flow from city to city and from industry to industry.

The intensity of water pollution increases with the growth of cities and industries. In 1900 the national economy was primarily rural with two-thirds of the people living on farms. Today the population has more than doubled with two-thirds living in cities. Industrial production is up 700 percent, with half the increase occurring since 1940. Pollution from this phenomenal growth has increased more than 400 percent since 1900. More than that, the character of the waste is changing and is becoming more and more complex. Across the Nation, water pollution has reached alarming proportions.

For example, Pennsylvania—like most States—is striving to preserve the quality of her 100,000 miles of surface streams. Over the past 10 years progress has been made in protecting this vital resource, which sustains industrial growth and furnishes drinking water for 8 million people. In 1945 the State appropriated $6,625,000 to its Department of Health to promote pollution control work. More than 350 municipal sewage-treatment plants have been built, and significant progress made in abatement of industrial pollution. Despite this effort, the problem remains formidable.

Water pollution is of concern not only to cities and industries, but threatens recreational resources and wildlife. It is not a simple problem—it involves balancing at all times the many allied uses of water—including carrying away our waste materials and preserving recreational and wildlife uses. Its solution is much more than a State problem—it requires cooperative effort between States and the support of the Federal Government.

In this cooperative effort, the Federal Government undertakes those functions that go beyond the resources and jurisdiction of the individual States. The important needs are for research, expert consultation and assistance on difficult problems, and control of interstate pollution. The bill which I have introduced today will accomplish these objectives.

The summary presented by Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania is as follows:

SUMMARY OF THE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT AMENDMENTS

The bill, effective July 1, 1955, would amend the Water Pollution Control Act by replacing it with new provisions designed to extend and strengthen the act.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Section 1 of the new act declares it to be the policy of the Congress in relation to water pollution control to (a) recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in preventing and controlling pollution; (b) support and aid technical research; and (c) provide Federal technical services and financial aid to State and interstate agencies.

COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAMS

The amended act, as does the existing act, authorizes the preparation or adoption of comprehensive programs for control of pollution of all surface and underground waters, in cooperation with other public and private agencies and persons and with due regard

being given to all legitimate uses of these waters.

INTERSTATE COOPERATION

As under existing law, the Surgeon General would be directed to encourage interstate cooperation, enactment of improved State laws and compacts between the States for the prevention and control of water pollution. Congressional consent is given to negotiation of interstate agreements for cooperative work in the field of water pollution control and for establishment of interstate agencies to carry out the agreements.

GENERAL FUNCTIONS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The new act would expand and strengthen the research and related activities of the service by specifically authorizing the Surgeon General in the field of water pollution control—

1. To conduct, encourage, and promote the coordination of research, investigations, experiments, demonstrations, and studies in water pollution control and, for this purpose, to secure the help of experts and consultants, to establish research fellowships, and to provide training in technical matters relating to water pollution.

2. To cooperate with and aid appropriate agencies, institutions, and individuals in this field of work through grants-in-aid and contracts with them for research, demonstrations, and training.

3. In carrying out these functions, to collect and disseminate information on research, investigations and demonstrations.

STATE GRANTS FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAMS

The new act broadens the existing authority with respect to grants to States and to interstate agencies for water pollution control work. It authorizes grants to States and interstate agencies to aid in the establishment and maintenance of adequate measures for the prevention and control of water pollution, such grants to be used for meeting costs, under approved plans, of establishing and maintaining adequate water pollution prevention and control measures, including costs of training personnel and administering the State and interstate agency plans. The amount of the appropriations for such grants would be determined by Congress, except that for the first 2 years, a ceiling of $2 million is specified. The portion of the appropriations available for the States and the portion available for the interstate agencies are to be specified separately in the appropriation acts.

Allotments to the several States would be made by the Surgeon General in accordance with regulations, on the basis of population, extent of water pollution problem, and financial need of respective States. Allotments to interstate agencies would be made in accordance with regulations, on such basis as the Surgeon General finds reasonable and equitable.

The State allotments would be available for paying the Federal share (described below) of the cost of carrying out State plans. The Federal share is defined as a percentage which equals 100 percent minus the percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 percent as the per capita income of the State bears to the per capita income of the continental United States (excluding Alaska). However, the Federal share could not exceed a maximum of 66⅔ percent nor could it be less than 33⅓ percent; and the Federal share would be fixed at 50 percent for Hawaii and Alaska, and at 66⅔ percent for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

For interstate agencies, the Federal share of the cost of their programs would be determined in accordance with regulations designed, as far as possible, to place such agencies on a basis similar to the States.

The Surgeon General is to approve plans, submitted by States and by interstate agencies, which meet requirements prescribed by regulation.

Regulations and amendments with respect to grants to States and interstate agencies would have to be made after consultation with, and insofar as practicable, agreement by States and interstate agencies.

The new act also provides for termination of a grant if the change in the State's or the interstate agency's plan, or administration thereof, no longer complies with requirements prescribed by regulation. This action would be subject to review in circuit courts of appeal, and then in the United States Supreme Court if the State or interstate agency is dissatisfied.

ADVISORY BOARD

The amended act establishes a 13 member Water Pollution Control Advisory Board consisting of 8 Government members and 7 members appointed by the President as follows: the Surgeon General or a sanitary engineer designated by him, representatives of the Departments of the Army, Interior, Commerce, and Agriculture, and the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Science Foundation, and the Federal Power Commission, and Presidential appointees representing the fields of sewage and industrial waste disposal, wildlife conservation, and, unless better furthered by different representation, the fields of municipal government, State government, affected industry, recreation and agriculture. Provision is made for staggered terms of office of 3 years duration for members appointed by the President. The size of the Board has been increased slightly and its composition changed somewhat by the amendment. A few other technical changes have also been made.

WATER QUALITY STANDARDS

The amended act authorizes the Surgeon General, as an aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution, to prepare or adopt and publish standards of water quality applicable to interstate waters at the point or points where such waters flow across or from the boundary of two or more States. Such standards are to be based on present and future uses of water for all legitimate uses, as determined in accordance with regulations prescribed after consultation with State, interstate, and Federal agencies. Further, the Surgeon General is authorized to prepare such standards only if, within a reasonable time after being requested to do so, the appropriate State and interstate agencies have not developed standards found by the Surgeon General to be acceptable. Alteration of the quality of waters so as to reduce them below these standards, and also below the quality certified by the affected State as essential to its present and future uses is declared to be a public nuisance subject to abatement.

ABATEMENT OF INTERSTATE POLLUTION

The amended act, as does existing law, specifies the measures which may be taken by the United States to secure abatement of any pollution of interstate waters which endangers the health and welfare of people in a State other than that in which the polluting matter is discharged. It declares such pollution to be a public nuisance and provides that the Surgeon General give formal notification to the polluter specifying a reasonable time to secure abatement. If abatement action is not taken within the time specified, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to call a public hearing before a board which shall make findings as to whether a nuisance is occurring, and in the event that such is the case, shall make recommendations which it finds reasonable and equitable to secure abatement. After a reasonable opportunity is given to the persons causing the pollution to comply with the recommendations of the board, the Secretary may request the Attorney General to bring suit to secure abatement.

The new act authorizes administration of oaths and issuance of subpenas to require testimony or production of records, and continues the existing provision that no enforcement action is authorized in areas subject to the jurisdiction of a public body where there is in effect an agreement between the United States by stipulation entered into in the United States Supreme Court.

ADMINISTRATION

The Surgeon General would be authorized to prescribe necessary regulations subject to the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and to delegate his authority under the act to officers and employees of the Public Health Service. The Secretary could also utilize officers and employees of other agencies of the United States to assist in carrying out the purposes of the act, with the consent of the head of such agencies.

EXISTING AUTHORITY

The amended act preserves the authority and functions of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service and other officers and agencies of the United States relative to water pollution control under other legislation or treaties.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY CONTROL ACT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in fulfillment of one of the important phases of President Eisenhower's latest message, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to be known as the Juvenile Delinquency Control Act. I am co-sponsoring it with my distinguished colleague from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. This bill is designed to cope with the problem of young men and women in crime, by preventing waywardness before it starts and by helping to rehabilitate youngsters already in trouble.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of a statement which I have prepared on this subject be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 894) to strengthen and improve State and local programs to combat and control juvenile delinquency, introduced by Mr. WILEY (for himself and Mr. THYE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

May I begin by pointing out that I, as a former member of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee, am particularly interested in doing everything I can to help protect the young people of our Nation.

Today President Eisenhower has transmitted to the Congress his recommendation for a program of grants to enable the States to strengthen and improve their programs and services for the control of juvenile delinquency.

And so I am introducing now this bill, which embodies the President's recommendation.

The Juvenile Delinquency Control Act represents the best thinking of the expert Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which has been, and is, most deeply concerned with this problem.

This bill offers a new step in the direction of coping with this challenge, one of the most serious maladies of our times. It is serious because it concerns the boys and girls of our Nation, who are our most cherished possession. Not all of them are involved, it is true, but the number involved is much too great.

MOST YOUNGSTERS ARE LAW-ABIDING

In the New York Times Sunday magazine of November 7, 1954, Dr. Martha M. Eliot, Chief of the United States Children's Bureau, set this problem in proper perspective. She wrote, "Last year some 18 million boys and girls between the ages of 10 and 17 were not picked up by the police for any crime whatsoever, a vital statistic that somehow escapes attention in our eagerness to solve the problems of juvenile delinquency.

"In this group—95 percent of our juvenile population—are the youngsters who are living and growing and steadily progressing in families that understand their dual need for security and affection within their homes, and for freedom to explore life with their peers outside."

YOUTH CRIME IN MILWAUKEE COUNTY

I think that Dr. Eliot's statement helps prevent folks from "going overboard" and misrepresenting the overwhelming mass of law-abiding youngsters.

In my own State, in our heaviest populated area, Milwaukee County, it has been determined that the juvenile delinquency rate is around 2½ percent of the school-age population. Thus, in 1954 there were around 125,000 7- to 18-year-olds, around 5,000 of whom had one contact with the juvenile court.

Fortunately, Milwaukee County is experiencing a less rapid rise in delinquency than the Nation as a whole. My own State has always enjoyed a fine record of law enforcement, but we of Wisconsin know that there is a great deal more to be done within and outside our borders on behalf of our youngsters.

THE MOUNTING TIDE OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The hard fact of the matter is that never before in our history has America had such a large number of juvenile delinquents. The Children's Bureau, in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, reports 1¼ million youngsters picked up by the police, 435,000 appearing in juvenile courts; over 40,000 committed to training schools for delinquent youth. Juvenile delinquency now exceeds even the greatest peak reached during the last war. Yet, wartime, traditionally, is the time when this social sickness reaches its most acute stage.

In the 5 years from 1948 to 1953, juvenile court cases swelled 45 percent. That fact is enough to give us profound pause. But this is a crucial moment now, not only because of the great number of children who are presently affected, but for this reason:

Our population of teenagers is swelling each year. By 1960 we will have over 6½ million more youngsters 10 to 17 years old, than we had in 1953. If juvenile delinquency continues to mount, as it did between 1948 and 1953, we can be faced with the shocking total of 590,000 delinquent youngsters coming before the court in 1960.

How grievous the situation that confronts us is has been graphically spread before us during the past 15 months by the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, under the able chairmanship of former Senator Robert C. Hendrickson, and with the fine work of Senators Kefauver, Hennings, and Langer. The subcommittee hearings offer a sorry record of unhappy maladjusted, and destructive children, in rebellion with themselves, their families, or society, and in the wake of their rebellion spreading wreckage, tragedy, or death.

JUDGE COOPER'S COMMENTS ON THE FIRST OFFENDER

Let me quote Judge Irving Ben Cooper, widely renowned chief justice of the Court of Special Sessions of the City of New York, who has devoted some of the most intensive labor conducted almost anywhere in America to the problem of restoring the juvenile offender. He wrote in the October 1954 issue of the Journal of American Judicature Society, as follows, "Youth offenses are the bud stages of criminality."

He then went on to describe very pointedly the problem of the community attitude toward young people in crime, particularly toward the first offender:

"The community's attitude toward youthful offenders, like its treatment of youth generally, is a mixture of soft-heartedness, exasperation, wounded resignation, and sadistic pleasure in punishment. Nowhere is the common failing of acting first and thinking afterward more evident than in our handling of the social significance of youth crimes; that is, of how this traditional state between childhood and young manhood is being bridged. No responsibile authority operates in this field. Once a complaint is issued against the young offender, the good forces about him shrink and evil forces are alerted. Those he has injured are outraged, the parents of susceptible children become fearful, the godly draw their garments around them, the evil minded anxious for social support welcome a convert, the police close in on a quarry."

COMPLEX CAUSES OF CRIME

Now, why is the first offense committed at all?

The answer is that juvenile delinquency is an immensely complex problem, stemming from a wide variety of causes, calling for the application of many different kinds of treatment. Furthermore we are a long way from knowing all that we must know if we are to both treat and prevent such social sickness effectively.

But our experts know vastly more about both treatment and prevention than our States and communities are applying. They are held back from making application of good treatment procedures by not having enough access to expert knowledge; by lack of standards against which to measure their present methods; by great shortages in trained personnel; by insufficient or antiquated facilities; by confusion and lack of coordination amongst the various agencies dealing with the problem.

It is to help our States and communities put into operation the best that is known about the treatment of delinquent youth and to help them improve that "best," that Senator THYE and I are offering this bill.

No longer can the Congress stand aside and say that the struggles that our States and communities are having in coping with juvenile delinquency are no concern of ours.

PRECEDENTS FOR FEDERAL ACTION

Now, it is not new for the Federal Government to involve itself in the solution of the physical and social diseases of our people. For years, we have been helping States and communities treat, control, reduce, and prevent many of these disorders. We have done this with tuberculosis and venerial disease; with the physical handicaps of children and adults. We have helped States and communities clean up their polluted water streams and their milk supplies.

What has been achieved, even in the short time many of these Federal-aid programs have operated, is truly remarkable. States and communities have taken this Federal assistance, and, adding it to their own skills, resources, and enterprise in the way each of them sees appropriate, have translated it into greater health and longer lives for millions of citizens.

This bill extends this cooperative method of working into the field of controlling juvenile delinquency. It assures our States and communities that they will have technical and financial assistance from the Federal Government in extending, improving, and coordinating their programs for the control of juvenile delinquency. It encourages them to relate these to their programs for the prevention of juvenile delinquency.

It may be said by some that this program provides only modest appropriations. It is a fact that these funds, as compared with some of the larger items in the 1956 fiscal year budget, are indeed very modest. The important thing is, however, that they are an historic beginning, a worthwhile beginning. They are of an experimental, pioneering nature. We must achieve experience in applying the various programs now planned by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and then we will be in a position to improve and strengthen these programs.

THE HOME, CHURCH, AND SCHOOL

But the responsibility is not on Uncle Sam or on the States or cities alone. The ultimate responsibility resides in 3 places—the most vital centers of all—the home, the church, the school.

If these fail, then our efforts against youthful crime can hardly hope to succeed. If home, church, and school triumph in building a life of worth and dignity and dedication and character, then the problem of juvenile delinquency will fade.

Now we ask: What is seen and read in the American home? What books, magazines, TV programs?

Of late, there has been a good deal of discussion as to the alleged influence of crime comic books and crime television programs on juvenile delinquency. Fortunately, the comic book industry is now being cleaned up, thanks to the voluntary code being administered by former Judge Murphy. Fortunately, too, we are taking steps to battle pornographic literature—an evil which I for one have long exposed and combatted.

And, in another great area, the responsible television industry is increasingly demonstrating its awareness of the significance of getting across the right type of programs for youngsters, and avoiding the wrong type.

PROPOSED TV PROGRAM ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

One might wish, however, that a fraction of the theatrical genius, the time, and the money which have been poured into some of the great TV entertainment shows of recent months could be put into a show combatting juvenile delinquency—an interesting, factual, faithful representation of this human problem.

I am sure that the television industry has more than enough talent and am equally sure that there are ample public-spirited sponsors who would underwrite this type of network project. So I certainly hope that something of this nature will come to pass—not as one-shot documentary but as a continued (and I hope) high-rating series.

While I don't believe that television can be criticized as some people have, in attempting to blame it as one of the sources for youthful crime, still I believe that this can be said: Television has not, as yet, made a fraction of the potential constructive contribution which this great medium can indeed ultimately make toward coping with this problem.

CONCLUSION

I conclude with this thought:

The future of America is the youth of America. We can ill afford to squander this asset. We can ill afford to have youngsters get into trouble today, which they will have cause to regret for the rest of their lives.

We can ill afford to have them become so set in criminal patterns that they will become a liability to society for the rest of their lives.

This Nation cannot afford the cost, direct and indirect, of juvenile delinquency: the broken homes, the broken lives, the wreckage of society.

By a relatively small expenditure at the Federal level, such as is proposed under this act, we will save, I believe, an infinite amount of money; but, most important of all, we will save a great number of lives and avoid an infinite amount of human suffering.

Let the bill pass. Let the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency continue. Let us each carry on in fulfilling our respective responsibilities whenever we are in Congress, in State capitols, in city halls, in homes, in schools, and in the temples of the Lord.

Mr. THYE subsequently said: Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that a statement concerning the proposed Juvenile Delinquency Control Act, being a bill which was introduced earlier today by the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]—and I may say I am a cosponsor of the bill—be printed in the body of the RECORD following the introductory statement made by the Senator from Wisconsin at the time when the bill was introduced and sent to the desk.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THYE

I am happy to join with my colleagues in supporting the President's proposal for establishing a new program of Federal grants to the States to aid them in combating and controlling juvenile delinquency.

This problem of juvenile delinquency has been a deep concern of mine and of the citizens of my State for many years. I think I can say, without immodesty, that Minnesota has been at the forefront in studying the problem, in searching for new approaches to it, in experimenting with new methods, both of prevention and of treatment.

We have made some progress, but we have still far to go.

As Senator WILEY has reported, the number of young delinquents coming before all courts has swelled 45 percent in the past 5 years. I have no comparable figure for our own State, but if offenses by juveniles have followed the trend of all criminal offenses, then our increase in the same period was 36 percent, a somewhat less serious development, but still alarming.

Our Minnesota Youth Conservation Commission has been able to return many delinquent children to their own or to substitute homes for treatment, rather than to institutionalize them. This represents one wholesome development, not only for the youngsters themselves, but also for the taxpayers, since institutional care of delinquent youth is both costly and less effective in the rehabilitation of most of these children. Minnesota was able to save some $700,000 in 6 years in institutional care by the effective use of probation.

Our youth conservation commission is keenly aware that the effectiveness of all services for delinquent youth depends first of all on well qualified professional personnel. We are everlastingly in search for such workers, and everlastingly coming up against the fact that there is a desperate shortage of them, not only in our State but throughout the Nation.

We are conscious, too, in Minnesota, that there are a great many things we do not know about effective methods of prevention and treatment. We feel a great need for a central pool of information on which we can draw; for a greatly stepped-up program of research which can best be done through joint efforts with other States; and for an agency with nationwide experience and knowledge to whom we can look for expert advice and leadership.

In essence, the President's proposal would take a long step toward meeting these needs of ours in Minnesota. If Minnesota can gain from a strengthened program working out from the Federal Government, how much more urgently is this help needed by other States that have been unable to make even the modest progress we have achieved.

The Congress cannot blind itself to the fact that we are concerned here with a problem of national and mounting proportions.

The basic principle behind the President's proposal is simply this: That a problem that is common to all States calls for help from all States. The President's proposal provides the mechanism for such help. Actual treatment of delinquents and the operation of preventive services must, of course, be carried out by States and localities. But the Federal Government can, and must, help States and localities by stimulating the research that they need; by increasing the opportunities for training more workers; by providing consultation services by experts who are widely knowledgeable on what works and what does not work; and finally, by making it financially possible to experiment with new methods and new techniques.

Here is a proposal for a bold new venture which cannot fail to contribute to the well-being of all children while ministering to those whose lives and values have, somehow, already been twisted.

PROPOSED CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, once again I stand before this great democratic body, the United States Senate, to make a plea for an end to discrimination against Americans because of their race, religion, color, or national origin. Again I join with a distinguished array of my colleagues in asking the Congress for action on a legislative program for human rights.

We are presenting a series of 11 bills in the hope that the Congress will see fit to act on as many of them as can receive support from a majority of this body. In my own personal judgment, we would be striking a blow for freedom all over the world if we could enact even 1 or 2 or 3 parts of this program during the 84th Congress.

I want to make it clear, Mr. President, that my colleagues and I establish no priority system for our proposals that are strong links in the chain of liberty and democratic progress.

These bills are being introduced today and will be referred to the appropriate Senate committees for study. It is our intention to press for hearings on as many of them as possible. It is then our intention to ask the Senate to debate and take up any or all of these proposals which appear to have a majority support in the Senate.

Our program includes the following:

First. A bill to establish equal opportunity in employment.

Second. A bill to establish a Commission on Civil Rights in the Executive Branch of the Government.

Third. A bill to protect persons within the United States against lynching.

Fourth. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers.

Fifth. A bill to provide relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation.

Sixth. A bill to strengthen existing civil-rights statutes.

Seventh. A bill to protect the right to political participation and make it a crime to intimidate or coerce or otherwise interfere with a right to vote.

Eighth. A bill to create a joint congressional Committee on Civil Rights.

Ninth. A bill to reorganize the Department of Justice by establishing a Civil Rights Division in the Department under an Assistant Attorney General.

Tenth. A bill to strengthen the current laws with regard to peonage, convict labor, slavery, and involuntary servitude.

Eleventh. The omnibus civil-rights bill to strengthen existing civil-rights statutes.

Joining me in the introduction of some or all of these bills are my following distinguished colleagues: the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER].

Joining with me in the introduction of the bill to establish equal opportunity in employment are the Senators from New York, the distinguished senior Senator [Mr. IVES], and the distinguished junior Senator [Mr. LEHMAN]. Along with us in a bipartisan demonstration of support for the objective of equal opportunity are the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER].

Members of the Senate will recall that this bill is the result of hearings held in the 82d Congress by the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations of which I was chairman. During the 82d Congress this bill was known as the Humphrey-Ives bill. During the 83d Congress, it was known as the Ives-Humphrey bill. We are now once again introducing this proposal in the spirit of bipartisanship and in the conviction that we must place the consideration of human rights above partisan politics.

The civil-rights issue has in the past been characterized by conflict and bitterness in this body. We present our proposals with a prayer that the 84th Congress will crystallize and symbolize instead a feeling of good will and brotherhood and consensus in consideration of this vital legislative program.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators) were received, read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

S. 899. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 900. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 901. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. 902. A bill to reorganize the Department of Justice for the protection of civil rights;

S. 903. A bill to protect the right to political participation;

S. 904. A bill to strengthen the laws relating to convict labor, peonage, slavery, and involuntary servitude;

S. 905. A bill to amend and supplement existing civil-rights statutes;

S. 906. A bill to establish a Commission on Civil Rights in the Executive Branch of the Government; and

S. 907. A bill to protect the civil rights of individuals by establishing a Commission on Civil Rights in the Executive Branch of the Government, a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice, and a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights, to strengthen the criminal laws protecting the civil rights of individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am glad, indeed, to be able today to join the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and other Senators in introducing 11 separate legislative proposals whose object is forward movement and progress on the civil-rights front.

I do not think I need to remind my colleagues of my long-standing interest in and advocacy of the cause which would be served by the legislation we are introducing today. I have been working and fighting for the assurance of equal rights to all our citizens for more than half a century.

We have made some progress during the past 30 years. We must make more progress and at a much greater rate of speed.

The legislation introduced today does not purport to accomplish any revolutions. It does not single out for special privilege any group of our people. It represents merely the establishment of legal machinery for the prevention of intolerable injustice to those large groups of our population who are today denied some of the fundamental rights which belong to the status of citizenship in our country and to membership in our national society.

That such injustice and discrimination is permitted to exist without legal machinery and sanctions to prevent it, is intolerable not only to those who are the victims of this injustice and discrimination but to all Americans of good will and to the very conscience of America.

I hope that in the several committees to which these bills will be appropriately referred, prompt attention and consideration will be given so that the Senate, at this session, may have the opportunity to debate and to act upon these measures.

I hope that there will be hearings on all these bills. I hope the public sentiment on these measures may be expressed and that from our deliberations will develop a program of legislative action to which we can proudly point as evidence that we are actively concerned with injustice wherever it is found, both within and outside our borders.

Mr. President, the bills we are introducing today do not represent all the legislation to be introduced on this subject. I, myself, and others of my colleagues, I am sure, will make further proposals in the days ahead.

There is no situation confronting the Congress which more urgently calls for our intense and immediate consideration.

PROHIBITION OF SEGREGATION IN INTERSTATE TRAVEL

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to prohibit segregation in interstate travel. Including myself, the bill is cosponsored by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. I ask unanimous consent that a statement concerning the bill, prepared by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], be printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 908) providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN (for Mr. MAGNUSON and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement by Mr. MAGNUSON, presented by Mr. LEHMAN, is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

Today I am introducing a bill to prohibit racial segregation in interstate travel. Joining me in sponsoring this bill are the following: Senators DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois; HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota; JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington; LEHMAN, Democrat, of New York; MCNAMARA, Democrat, of Michigan; MORSE, Independent, of Oregon; MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana; NEELY, Democrat, of West Virginia; NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon; and PASTORE, Democrat, of Rhode Island.

This legislation will clear up a very confusing pattern on public carriers and facilities connected therewith. Although the courts have consistently held that segregation of passengers in interstate commerce is unlawful, many trains that leave Washington still carry separate colored coaches. A passenger bound for Savannah, Ga., from New York City may board a through train and ride to his destination without segregation. When he makes the return trip, however, he may find that he is forced to ride in a "white" coach if he is a member of the Caucasian race and "colored" coach if he is nonwhite.

On interstate buses colored passengers are required to occupy rear seats in most of the Southern States.

While there is no segregation on airplanes, there is extensive and bewildering segregation in airports. In North Carolina a colored passenger may be required to use a separate rest room. Farther south he may find that he must sit in special chairs while waiting for a plane and on reaching his destination he may find that the airport limousine will not transport him to the city. Instead he must use a special accommodation for colored passengers.

Sometimes these regulations enforcing segregation lead to disputes and the arrest of passengers. One of the famous cases arose in 1953 when Lt. Thomas Williams, a member of the United States Air Force, was jailed in Florida. He was charged with occupying a section of a bus that was for white people. Lieutenant Williams, a colored man, was aboard an interstate bus bound from Florida to Alabama.

The airman was in uniform at the time and had actually started his journey sitting in what he thought was the colored section of the bus. As additional white passengers came aboard the bus operator tried to force the lieutenant to move because "there was too much mixing." The driver pointed out that the bus was in Florida and under the law of that State he could make the officer move.

After some discussion, the driver called a policeman, who placed Lieutenant Williams under arrest. He was jailed and fined. That case is still pending in the Florida courts.

In a hearing on this legislation in 1954 this young man appeared before a House committee and told his story. It is my intention to hold hearings on this legislation at an early date.

I have read the testimony of Lieutenant Williams and I would like nothing better than to have him appear and tell his story to the Senate committee. Unfortunately this will not be possible because about 2 weeks ago this young man was killed in the crash of a jet plane while serving as a member of the New Jersey National Guard.

It would be a fitting thing for the Congress to honor his memory and the memories of thousands of other boys who have died while preparing to defend democracy by permanently forbidding segregation in interstate travel.

TRIENNIAL SUPPLEMENTS TO ANNOTATED CONSTITUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce once again for appropriate reference a joint resolution for the publication each 3 years of supplements to the Annotated Constitution of the United States.

Unfortunately, a similar proposal was not acted upon by the Senate Rules Committee in the 83d Congress.

I earnestly trust, however, that this project, which would be so welcome to the American bar, the American bench,

and laymen alike, will receive the approval of the present 84th Congress.

This proposed legislation is introduced to achieve that purpose, together with information which I had requested from the Library of Congress, with regard to (a) the reception which has been accorded to the 1952 edition of the Annotated Constitution—which incidentally had been prepared at my request—and (b) with regard to the probable cost of the proposed supplements.

I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum, prepared by the Library of Congress, be printed in the RECORD in connection with the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 34) to prepare triennially a cumulative supplement to the revised edition of the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America as published in 1953 as Senate Document No. 170 of the 82d Congress, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The memorandum presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

MEMORANDUM PREPARED BY LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

PERTINENT INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTS TO ANNOTATED CONSTITUTION

I. Evidence of public reaction to the publication of the 1952 edition of the Annotated Constitution

The best evidence of popular acceptance, which in fact constitutes an astounding record of sales of a nonfiction book so technical in content, is contained in the statistics compiled by the Procurement Division of the Office of the Superintendent of Public Documents at the Government Printing Office (Code 149, ext. 173, Mr. Murphy).

Within slightly less than 6 months following its release a total of 7,076 copies of the Annotated Constitution were sold; and this volume was attained without benefit of any facilities for publicity and advertising such as are commonly available to commercial booksellers.

Although approximately 450,000 one-page fliers measuring approximately 3'' x 6'' and announcing issuance of the publication were distributed by the Government Printing Office, not a single complimentary copy of the Annotated Constitution was made available to law journals, political science periodicals, or newspapers for review purposes.

As a consequence, professional appraisal of this publication, such as is customarily set forth in book reviews was delayed by almost 1 entire year; but notwithstanding these handicaps, sales of the Annotated Constitution, from October 10, 1953, to January 1, 1955, an interval of slightly less than 15 months, have attained a grand total of 8,930 copies.

Praise-Filled Comments

Comments on the Annotated Constitution received thus far from State court judges, practicing attorneys, constitutional historians, and individuals serving on the staff of Members of Congress uniformly have been expressed in terms of superlatives. By congressional staff personnel we have been advised that the Annotated Constitution is "the most sought after" Government publication which they are currently requested to distribute.

A practicing attorney and a constitutional historian, in almost identical accord, have described the Annotated Constitution as "the most valuable guide now available to an understanding, not only of the legal impact of the Constitution, but of its origin and development as well" and as "clearly the best map yet published [paraphrasing Senator WILEY] 'of the great historical landmarks of constitutional jurisprudence' ".

"By common consent," according to the Chief Justice of the highest appellate court in one State, "it has been agreed that the greatest individual contribution to the law in 1953 is" the Annotated Constitution. "All that one would like to know about American constitutional law and its background, as well as the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States construing it, is laid open to view in a single volume * * * of attractive format."

To these expressions of unlimited praise the constitutional historian, however appended this note of caution: "The time soon may come when we will not be able to afford the luxury of new editions of such works as this at fairly short intervals, but will be held to supplemental volume instead. With this in mind, the Legislative Reference Service might be well advised to keep careful notes as it makes use of this edition, looking toward the publication of a supplement. With such a supplement it could continue to serve as an excellent basic volume until such time as a completely new revision become imperative."

II. Probable cost of new supplement

With the completion in June 1955 of the present term of the Supreme Court, 3 years will have elapsed since fulfillment of the decision to extend the coverage of the Annotated Constitution to June 30, 1952.

Because of this existing backlog of cases on constitutional law which will have to be examined, it may be more expedient to authorize preparation of a supplement once every 3 years or once every 2 years rather than to require publication annually. Certainly, under present circumstances, the supplements would not be uniform in scope if sought to be prepared on an annual basis, and the aggregate cost of 10 annual supplements issued during the decade between publication of new editions of the Annotated Constitution might well be excessive, especially when compared with the cost of completing the 1952 edition covering a span of 14 years.

On the assumption that one professional staff member and one secretary would be competent to prepare a biennial or a triennial supplement, we estimate the cost in salary of preparing each issue would not exceed $15,000. It would be less, if the volume of decisions was relatively small. This would include provision for the necessary additional Legislative Reference Service staff and a consultant fee for Dr. Corwin, or someone of comparable stature.

DESIGNATION OF JANUARY 30 OF EACH YEAR AS A LEGAL HOLIDAY COMMEMORATING BIRTH OF FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, Sunday, January 30, marked the 73d anniversary of the birth of the 31st President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt. It is 10 years now since his death. While he was President his birthday was observed by many of his fellow citizens. It came to be a sort of national observance, although without official auspices. By his wish these celebrations became fund-raising events to combat the dread disease of poliomyelitis. The March of Dimes, which is currently being conducted in behalf of the fight against polio, still remains, for those of us who remember, a memorial to our late, great, beloved President.

His monumental achievements grow in the perspective of time. The mighty changes he helped to bring about in America have withstood not only the tests and shocks of war and world crisis but also a change in administration.

He saved this country and he saved the world from the totalitarian threat of his day. He led us to victory over the forces of evil. He presided over the greatest expansion in our productive might this Nation or any nation has ever known. He banished fear from our midst, giving us new hope and confidence in the future of America.

We have need of that spirit today. We have need of it whether we are Democrats or Republicans.

The party which is today in control of the executive branch of the Government, which fought him so bitterly while he lived and opposed all the programs he advocated, has ceased even to speak about repealing them. These programs and principles have become part of the structure and substance of the American way of life, permanently built into the institutions of our Government.

Mr. President, it would seem altogether fitting and proper that we give national recognition to the memory of this man—not as a hero of the Democratic Party but as a hero of America.

Mr. President, I believe that the American people, without regard to party, couple the name of Franklin D. Roosevelt with those of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln as saviors of our union and our freedom.

The Congress should take suitable action to recognize this sentiment.

Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution proposing that January 30 of each year be made a legal public holiday in commemoration of the birth of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I hope that Members of the Senate, irrespective of party, will join in approving this resolution and in commemorating this historic man, this architect of free world unity and symbol of hope, faith, and courage—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 35) making January 30 of each year a legal public holiday in commemoration of the birth of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRESERVATION OF ROCK CREEK PARK

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution for the preservation of Rock Creek Park. The proposed legislation is designed to prevent what is described as a threat to Rock Creek Park in the greater National Capital area. I ask

unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me, and a letter written by Hon. Louis Cramton, author of the Capper-Cramton Act of 1930, relating to the joint resolution, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 36) for the preservation of Rock Creek Park, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The statement presented by Mr. MURRAY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURRAY

Mr. President, I send forward for appropriate reference a joint resolution, which I am sponsoring on my own behalf and that of the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], to prevent what has been described to us as a threat to Rock Creek Park in the Greater National Capital area.

Mr. President, as I am sure all the Members of the Senate are aware, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I am chairman, has responsibility for legislation affecting the National Park System. Rock Creek Park here in Washington is a part of the National Park System, and the Federal Government also has certain direct responsibilities for the park areas situated in Maryland.

In the 83d Congress, the then chairman of the committee, former Senator Guy Cordon, of Oregon, called the committee's attention to the proposed extension of certain Maryland highways through Rock Creek Park. At least one of the plans envisioned the creation of a new six-lane speedway through Rock Creek Park. This modern superspeed highway, while bearing the name of a "parkway," would of course destroy, in its area of the park, the scenic and recreational purposes for which the park was intended.

The Interior Committee authorized its then chairman to make inquiry into this situation. The 83d Congress recessed before the inquiry could be completed. However, reports that Senator Cordon received indicate that the threat to the park may be very real indeed.

I do not wish to express a definite opinion on this matter before the evidence is in. However, in order that we may receive such evidence, the distinguished members of the minority have joined with the junior Senator from Oregon and myself in introducing this resolution.

Mr. President, I ask that a brief history of Rock Creek Park legislation, and a letter from the Honorable Louis Cramton, one of the authors of the Capper-Cramton Act, be published in the RECORD at this point. The Capper-Cramton Act is the legislation which established Rock Creek Park in its present form.

The intent of this resolution is to afford hearings and study such as will enable Congress to determine the sufficiency or inadequacy of existing law to preserve Rock Creek Park against encroachment of its seeming dedicated purposes.

Each year Congress is confronted with requests for authorization and appropriation of more money with which to acquire additional park and recreation areas in fast-growing metropolitan Washington. We have honored these requests from time to time, fully realizing that the growing population of our National Capital City quite naturally warranted additional recreation acres. And each time we have need to be wishful that Congress might have been able to better visualize the future needs of this city back in the days when lands could be acquired for so little as compared with present-day values.

We hardly dare criticize earlier Congresses, however, for there was great vision exercised back in 1890 when Congress made possible the creation and continued existence of Rock Creek Park, a preservation of magnificent natural resource unrivaled by similar possession of any other great city in the world. This action by Congress more than 60 years ago gave us, as a park and recreation area, all of Rock Creek valley reaching from the National Zoo to the north District line.

Again, another Congress, back in 1930, entertained splendid vision of future needs, when, observing the increasing use and need of recreation facilities by the growing city, passed what is known as the Capper-Cramton Act. This act, along with the appropriation of Federal funds, made possible the acquisition of many additional miles of the valley of Rock Creek reaching into Maryland from the north end of the original Rock Creek Park. This became known as Rock Creek Park Extended. Some of the finest residential subdivisions in metropolitan Washington have been developed along each side of Rock Creek Park. These extended acres of Rock Creek Park, were they still in private possession, could not be purchased today for 100 times the cost that was involved when the ground was acquired 20 years ago.

Congress could not wisely deny the use of Rock Creek Park for crossings by commercial highways. Many crossings already exist and more will doubtless be needed. But Congress ought to give most serious consideration to the challenge which now prevails in the form of plans which would let expressways and speedways (in this modern day sometimes called parkways) not just cross the park but run through it lengthwise. That challenge allegedly exists at this time with respect to the reaches of Rock Creek Park both in the District and in Maryland.

Hearings which the Interior Affairs Committee will probably hold on the subject of the joint resolution just offered should develop whether there is want or need for legislation governing the uses and purposes of Rock Creek Park. In the meantime I have given expression to the wish that all planning and highway authorities refrain from any action that could in any wise alter the present status of Rock Creek Park until such time as Congress shall have had opportunity to consider the subject and prospect from every angle.

The letter presented by Mr. MURRAY is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 8, 1954.*

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION,
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: As a citizen of the United States, I am very deeply concerned by reason of the reported possibility of extensive superspeed highway encroachments upon Rock Creek Park in the District of Columbia, and the extension thereof into Maryland.

While I was a Member of Congress, I had a part in the drafting an enactment into law of what is now commonly known as the Capper-Cramton Act of May 29, 1930.

That act dealt generally with park, parkway, and playground problems in the National Capital and its environs.

I am advised that highway authorities of Maryland seeking to connect their extensive highway development with downtown Washington are seeking the construction of a 4-lane or 6-lane highway through the valley of Rock Creek Park to accomplish that purpose.

This appears to me to be a virtual desecration of the scenic and recreation values of that park to the most extensive possible highway use.

Rock Creek Park as it existed in the District of Columbia when I came to Washington 40 years ago impressed me with all its natural beauty and seclusion as an ideal breathing spot in the Capital of the Nation. When one came to the District line it was very apparent that the charm and scenic values of the valley continued into Maryland.

At the time the Capper-Cramton law was proposed, your Commission was greatly disturbed about the possible pollution and destruction of Rock Creek by reason of rapid developments of resident sections in Maryland, "the cutting down of trees and the installation of artificial drainage" were diminishing the sources of Rock Creek and the very creek might cease to exist.

When we were drafting that bill we were seeking the preservation and proper utilization of the great scenic advantages of our National Capital and we realized that, with the constant development of this Nation, its Capital would need to extend far outside the very limited District of Columbia lines.

To save for the Nation in its greatest value Rock Creek Park, we then proposed Federal and Maryland cooperation that would extend the Rock Creek Park values for miles into Maryland. We had the very fullest cooperation of Maryland authorities at that time, including Governor Ritchie. The extension was authorized, and the result was the wonderful Rock Creek Park of today extending for miles into Maryland.

All of this was park planning, not setting aside a great valley as a possible site for a 4-, 6-, or 12-lane highway. And to open that valley today in any part of it to such superhighway use opens the door wide to ultimate destruction of the most beautiful park any capital city enjoys. There is an attempt in some quarters to call this wonderful park area a parkway. And when they do that they put all the emphasis on the second syllable and would have it become "way," dropping all emphasis on "park." It is not a parkway, and was never intended to be a parkway. In the days of Theodore Roosevelt, Rock Creek became world famous as a park. The Capper-Cramton law says nothing about extending a parkway. It does propose and does extend that great park for many miles not as an avenue by easy vehicle approach to a city that already has more street traffic than it can endure.

I, therefore, appeal to your Commission to close the door with definiteness to any alluring proposals that involve preeminence of highway use in any part of this park. Highways, of course, were to be permitted, but only as necessary incidents to public use of these delightful areas. Pending proposals would reverse the situation and make highway use preeminent and any recreation use only incidental.

It is because of my very deep interest in this great scenic asset in which the whole Nation takes pride that I venture to bring to your attention these thoughts that surrounded the beginnings of the Capper-Cramton Act.

With best wishes for your continued success in preserving and developing the beauties of the National Capital, I am,

Yours sincerely,

LOUIS C. CRAMTON.

PROPOSED INDIAN LEGISLATION—DISCHARGE OF A COMMITTEE—REFERENCE OF BILLS

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on January 6 there were referred to the

Committee on the Judiciary S. 27, relative to the jurisdiction over criminal offenses or civil actions committed or arising on Indian reservations, and S. 51, to amend the act entitled "To confer jurisdiction on the States of California, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, and Wisconsin, with respect to criminal offenses and civil causes of action committed or arising on Indian reservations within such States, and for other purposes."

At a meeting of the full committee on January 31, I was authorized to ask unanimous consent to have the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from the further consideration of these two bills and that they be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. President, I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 27 and S. 51 and that they be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. NEUBERGER) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is established a Joint Committee on Civil Rights (hereinafter called the "joint committee"), to be composed of 7 Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 7 Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The party representation on the joint committee shall as nearly as may be feasible reflect the relative membership of the majority and minority parties in the Senate and House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. It shall be the function of the joint committee to make a continuing study of matters relating to civil rights, including the rights, privileges, and immunities secured and protected by the Constitution and laws of the United States; to study means of improving respect for and enforcement of civil rights; and to advise with the several committees of the Congress dealing with legislation relating to civil rights.

SEC. 3. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 4. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony, as it deems advisable. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes, as amended (2 U. S. C. 192, 193, 194), shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with a subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section. Within the limitations of its appropriations, the joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistance, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as, in its discretion, it deems necessary and advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the Joint Committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall not exceed 25 cents per hundred words.

SEC. 5. Funds appropriated to the joint committee shall be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers signed by the chairman and vice chairman.

SEC. 6. The joint committee may constitute such advisory committees and may consult with such representatives of State and local governments and private organizations as it deems advisable.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

Address delivered by him at a luncheon meeting of the Panama Canal Society of Washington, D. C., on January 29, 1955.

Obituary on the late Representative Willis W. Bradley, published in the New York Times of Sunday, August 29, 1954.

By Mr. PAYNE:

Statement prepared by him and three editorials with reference to the death of Prof. Robert Peter Tristram Coffin.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS 4 AND 5, RELATIVE TO PROPOSED ANNUAL ADDRESS BY THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES ON THE STATE OF THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, February 4, 1955, beginning at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on Senate concurrent resolutions 4 and 5, relative to the proposed annual address by the Chief Justice of the United States on the state of the Judiciary. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the proposed legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman; the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]; the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL]; the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER].

THE NEW TREASURY 40-YEAR BOND

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the Treasury upon its offering of a 40-year 3-percent bond last Thursday. It marks an important step forward in lengthening the maturity structure of the public debt and reducing the dependence of the Treasury on short-term financing.

The new 40-year issue is the longest term bond which has been offered by the Treasury since 1911, when 50-year 3-percent bonds were issued to help finance the construction of the Panama Canal. The new bond is being offered on an exchange basis to the holders of maturing 2⅞ percent bonds which were issued 20 years ago—an issue which, in turn, refunded a large part of the Fourth Liberty Loan bonds, issued in World War I.

The 1995 maturity date on the new Treasury offering was selected so that the issue would have its greatest appeal to genuine long-term investors, such as pension and other trust funds, insurance companies, and endowment funds.

The decision to offer a long-term bond was made after a careful survey convinced the Treasury that a real investment need existed for such an issue, and that it could be sold without any adverse effect on the Nation's economy. The decision reflects confidence in the basic strength of the present sustained business growth. It was made after full consultation with Federal Reserve authorities.

This is only the second time since World War II that the Treasury has issued long-term marketable bonds. Up to now, the 3¼s of 1983 have been the only issue of Government bonds outstanding beyond 1972, and demand for a new issue has been growing. The new 40-year bond will provide in the long-term market a much-needed supply of bonds which can be absorbed by the people who want them. It will result in a more normal market environment, and the investor will now have a better choice between Government securities and mortgages or stock-exchange securities. The investor is entitled to a little freer choice, and this bond issue gives it to him. Up to date, he has been somewhat restricted, simply because not enough long-term Government bonds were available.

The 3 percent rate on the 40-year bond represents a reasonable interest cost to the Treasury, and is a rate that is squarely in line with going interest rates. The free capital market operated to set a rate of 3 percent on this issue in the same way that market conditions at the time set the rate on the 30-year 3¼ percent bond when it was sold in 1953. There was no rigging of the market by the Federal Reserve System.

During the last year, both Canada and Great Britain issued bonds at higher rates than that of the new Treasury issue. Last summer, Great Britain put out a 3½ percent issue due in 2004, and last fall Canada issued a 3¼ percent bond due in 1979.

The decision to offer the new bond in exchange for the maturing 2⅞ percent bonds means that the free market can itself determine the amount of long-term bonds to be issued in relation to investor need. The top limit on the new bonds will be $2.6 billion, therefore, since that is the total amount of the maturing issue. It should also be mentioned that income from the maturing 2⅞ percent bonds is partially tax-exempt, so their refunding into 3 percent fully taxable bonds will represent a considerable saving to the Treasury.

STATUS OF UNITED STATES SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY AND MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, on January 26, 1955, the Associated Press carried a dispatch from London, reporting that the United States has dropped to 12th place among the commercial shipbuilding nations of the world. Great Britain, Germany, Netherlands, France, Sweden, Japan, Italy, Norway, Spain, Denmark, and Belgium all surpass the United States. Our shipbuilding industry and our merchant marine are vital to the commerce and defense of our Nation. Their present status should be a matter of concern to every citizen.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this Associated Press story be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHIPBUILDING IN UNITED STATES TAKES DRASTIC DROP—WITH ONLY 99,568 TONS ON WAYS, NATION IS 12TH COMMERCIALLY

LONDON, January 26.—The United States, with only 99,568 tons of merchant shipping on the ways, has dropped to 12th place among the shipbuilding nations of the world.

This was disclosed today by Lloyds Register of Shipping in its report for the last quarter of 1954.

Of all nations, Lloyds said, the American shipbuilding industry showed the largest decrease.

BRITISH YARDS GAIN

On the other hand, British shipbuilding yards touched their busiest point since World War II.

On December 31 British yards were building 327 merchant ships of 2,140,752 tons gross, or 36.57 percent of the world's new tonnage. This was a gain of 82,295 tons over the previous quarter.

Germany improved its position as the second-ranking shipbuilding country with 772,012 tons, or 13.19 percent of the world total, under construction in the last quarter. This was a gain of 103,258 tons over the 3 previous months.

RANKINGS LISTED

The following table shows how the nations ranked as of December 31, 1954:

	Number of ships	Gross tons
Great Britain and Northern Ireland	327	2,140,752
Germany	204	772,012
Netherlands	136	529,679
France	55	449,096
Sweden	65	433,191
Japan	47	195,189
Italy	42	195,189
Norway	54	194,408
Spain	62	186,817
Denmark	30	130,533
Belgium	17	110,868
United States	15	99,568
Other nations	115	235,569
Total	1,169	5,854,247

NOTE.—No figures were available for Soviet countries.

THE AMERICAN MARITIME INDUSTRY

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on November 5, 1954, I addressed a communication to the Honorable Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce, inquiring as to his Department's contemplated program of legislation in the interest of the American maritime industry. On November 23, 1954, Mr. Weeks replied, and outlined a tentative program which revealed a most understanding and sympathetic attitude toward this strategic phase of our economy.

I ask unanimous consent that these two letters be printed in the body of the RECORD, as legislative background for any and all efforts on behalf of the merchant marine and shipbuilding and repair industry.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 5, 1954.

Hon. SINCLAIR WEEKS,
The Secretary of Commerce,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Due in large measure to the initiative and support of your Department, especially as embodied in the Maritime Subsidy Policy Report, we were able during the last session to solve legislatively many of the most pressing merchant-marine problems. However, as you so well know, a great deal remains to be done.

In his message to Congress on the report of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, President Eisenhower stated that specific legislation based on the Maritime Subsidy Policy Report's findings and recommendations would be developed for transmission to Congress in the 1955 session. In the same vein, your able Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, Mr. Robert B. Murray, Jr., while addressing the New York Propeller Club on October 27, 1954, stated that your Department plans to have a number or recommendations ready for Congress when it returns next year.

Accordingly, I am writing you today to request information concerning the maritime measures you plan to sponsor. Armed with this knowledge, our Water Transportation Subcommittee will be fully prepared to aid in advancing promptly all proposals which will serve to stabilize and strengthen our merchant marine.

Among the matters most in need of prompt legislative action, as I see it, are the following:

1. Reactivation of the ship-construction revolving fund:

Section 206 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 authorized the establishment of a revolving fund for the financing of vessels to replace obsolete units. In recent years operation of this fund has been discontinued under provisos of the Commerce Department's appropriation bills.

The revolving fund must be reactivated if we are to achieve the desired goal of orderly replacement of our merchant fleet. I am convinced that it is possible to draft statutory language which will reactivate the fund without affronting any of the other interested Government agencies or congressional committees.

2. Replenishment of the ship construction revolving fund.

To reactivate the revolving fund without replenishing it would be meaningless. Therefore we must enact legislation which will authorize deposits to be made in the fund from the following sources:

(a) Construction subsidy appropriations.

(b) Receipts to the Government from sale of Government-held mortgages on merchant ships.

(c) Interest and principal on Government ship mortgages.

(d) Receipts from sale and charter of Government-owned vessels.

It seems to me that consideration should be given to drafting a single bill for the twofold purpose of reactivating the revolving fund and replenishing it in each of the four ways described above.

3. Nonsubsidized operators to be authorized to place vessel earnings in a special reserve construction fund on a tax deferred basis.

Under the present law only subsidized vessel operators have the privilege of placing a certain portion of vessel earnings in a special reserve fund on a tax deferred basis if used for new vessel construction. In order to offer sufficient encouragement to those who might be expected to construct ships in American yards, it appears essential for similar benefits to be extended to nonsubsidized operators.

4. Permission to accelerate depreciation of new vessels.

As recommended in the Maritime Subsidy Policy Report, legislation should be enacted to provide that any vessel contracted for after July 1, 1954, and delivered prior to January 1, 1962, may be depreciated on a 20-year basis. Owners of such vessels should be authorized to take additional depreciation on them, on a sliding scale basis as follows:

(a) An amount not to exceed 3 percent each year if the ship is delivered before January 1, 1962; and

(b) If in connection with such construction a vessel of less than 20 years is traded in, pursuant to section 510 of the act, an additional one-half of 1 percent per year depreciation should be allowed for each year the vessel is less than 20 years old. Such depreciation should be used in the year taken to reduce the unpaid balance of any mortgage outstanding against the vessel and subsidized operators should be required to deposit such depreciation in their statutory reserve funds.

5. Certain tramp operators should be granted operating subsidy aid to place them in parity with foreign competitors.

This, too, coincides with a recommendation contained in the Maritime Subsidy Policy Report. As that report said:

"Such aid should be subject to the development of an administratively feasible program and be granted only if: (1) The operator replaces or agrees to replace existing tramp ships in a manner which will assist the achievement of the construction program required for national defense; and (2) the other segments of the United States-flag fleet would not be adversely affected."

In this connection, I have noted growing concern over the mounting number of foreign transfers of American-flag vessels. No, one is more cognizant than I of the dilemma which confronts the Maritime Administrator when he considers such applications. To approve the request for permission to go foreign; or to disapprove and force the vessel to be laid up—that, it seems to me, is often the enigma. Therefore, subsidy aid to certain tramp operators, conditioned with appropriate safeguards, seems essential.

6. Determination of construction differential subsidies should be simplified.

In order to avoid a repetition of that which culminated in the recently settled Court of Claims case, *United States Lines* v. *United States*; and in order to expedite and simplify the determination of construction differential subsidies, legislation to accomplish one of the following purposes, enumerated by Mr. Murray in his recent New York speech, probably should be enacted:

(a) determination of construction subsidy rates by major types of vessels,

(b) audit of construction subsidy rates approved by the Federal Maritime Board prior to the use of such rates, or

(c) clarification of language in existing statutes.

However, I hasten to qualify this recommendation with the suggestion that we should move cautiously in this legislative area lest we seriously impede the prompt and effective determination of construction subsidies for Grace, Moore-McCormack, American President Lines, and the Oceanic Steamship Co.

Undoubtedly there are other measures which should be enacted. We will have to appropriate additional funds in order to complete the job we started when we passed the emergency ship-repair bill.

Then, too, I am convinced that we must be prepared to take certain bold steps to prevent domestic shipping, especially that which is noncontiguous, from total destruction. The Alaska Steamship Co.'s abandonment of its passenger service after approximately 60 years of continuous operation, was the most recent in a long series of depressing developments in this field. Perhaps construction subsidy for noncontiguous operators might be in order.

A program similar to the "trade in and build tanker" program might be initiated for dry-cargo vessels.

Once I am informed of the maritime measures your Department plans to recommend when Congress reconvenes, I will seek to avoid duplication of drafting effort by concentrating on those which you do not plan to sponsor. Thus we should be able to get a sound and well-planned legislative program underway promptly on January 5, 1955.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Water Transportation.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, November 23, 1954.

Hon. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Water Transportation, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letter of November 5, 1954, requesting information concerning maritime measures the Department of Commerce plans to sponsor in the next session of Congress. I agree that while legislation enacted in the last session of Congress solved a number of the most pressing merchant-marine matters, some additional action is required.

We have submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for their consideration the following proposals:

1. Reactivation of the ship construction revolving fund, by authorizing deposits in that fund of appropriations and certain receipts from mortgages and the sale and charter of Government vessels.

2. Authorization of sale of Government ship mortgages, the receipts of which would be deposited in the revolving fund.

3. Authorization for nonsubsidized operators to place vessel earnings in a construction fund on a tax-deferred basis.

4. Specific authority to do experimental and developmental work on merchant ships and devices, including the operation of such ships.

5. Authorization for a uniform sales price for mariner ships. While there exists the possibility that a uniform sales price can be provided administratively, legislation may be required.

6. Authorization for the Government to accept dry-cargo vessels 10 years of age or more for an allowance against the construction of new vessels.

7. Authorization and appropriations for the completion of the reserve fleet repair program.

8. Permanent authorization to provide marine war-risk insurance under title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended. (Present authority terminates in 1955.)

In addition to the above measures, we have under consideration a number of other maritime matters which may require legislative action. These include:

1. Authorization of accelerated depreciation on new merchant vessels. In view of the provisions of the recently enacted tax law, Public Law 591, dealing with depreciation allowances, further study should be given to this proposal.

2. Assistance to operators of tramp vessels. The Department has under study the assistance now provided tramp vessels under cargo preference laws and the possible substitution therefor of other types of aid.

3. Procedure for the determination of construction-differential subsidy. Based on its recent experience in the matter of determining construction subsidy for the *Mariner*-type vessels, the Federal Maritime Board believes that under the present procedures the subsidy determination can promptly and effectively be made in connection with all pending subsidy applications. We do not believe, however, the matter is one which requires the immediate attention of Congress.

As you know, under established procedures, the determination as to those proposals which actually will be presented to Congress is a joint matter between the Bureau of the Budget and the Departments concerned. I assure you that as soon as a final determination is reached on the measures to be recommended to Congress, I will be pleased to inform you.

I personally convey my appreciation to you and other members of the committee for your efforts during the last session of Congress, without which the legislative accomplishments in the maritime field would not have been possible. I appreciate your comments with respect to the part played by the Department of Commerce.

Sincerely yours,

SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce.

FINANCIAL PROTECTION IN OLD AGE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the desire for economic protection in later years is one of the main concerns to millions of Americans.

On January 18, 1955, I introduced a bill to lower the social-security retirement age for women from 65 years of age to 60.

On January 21, 1955, an identical bill was introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

I am proud and pleased that the cosponsors of my bill include the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

Despite this widespread support for my proposal, I was attacked for fuzzy thinking and personal acceptance of the Socialist state by a member of the Oregon State Legislature on January 27, because of this bill reducing the social security qualifying age for women to 60 years.

In his verbal attack upon me, my critic made what seems to me an incredible statement. He said that "the benefit at retirement is sufficient only to insure society against the people."

This, of course, is an insult to those countless Americans of both sexes who are paying out of their wages into the social-security retirement fund, so that they and their loved ones may have some financial protection when old age is reached.

My critic even accused me of being ignorant of the social-security law because I favor reducing the qualifying age for women from 65 to 60. Evidently my critic does not know that Arthur J. Altmeyer, one of the founders of the social-security system and pioneer director of the program, advocated this reform as early as 1949. Is Mr. Altmeyer ignorant of the law which he administered for many years?

Inasmuch as my critic's letter is symbolic of that reactionary viewpoint which would wipe out safeguards for American working people and would turn back the clock to the era of the poorhouse, I ask unanimous consent that the letter criticizing me, written by State Senator John C. F. Merrifield, of Oregon, be printed in the body of the RECORD along with my reply, under date of January 29, 1955. I also ask that my bill, S. 521, appear along with the letters.

There being no objection, the letters and the bill (S. 521) to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to reduce from 65 to 60 years the age at which women may qualify for old-age and survivors insurance were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 27, 1955.

The Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Your proposal to lower the social security age for women from age 65 to 60 should be popular with some folks. However, the cost of such a program when weighed against the benefits is rather startling. The increase in cost for women would be approximately 25.1 percent, while there would be additional charges applied against the cost for males to care for their female beneficiaries. A woman age 60 has a life expectancy of 14½ years and among female annuitants this expectancy is increased by another 5 years over the men. It is also interesting to note that the average retirement age for males, according to old-age and survivors' insurance records, is 69.

Apparently you have never taken the time to study the old-age and survivors' insurance law or you would know that the concept is to primarily provide death benefits for dependent mothers who are left with children under age 18 while the benefit at retirement is sufficient only to insure society against the people. Your statement that it requires benefits for both husband and wife to assure a decent standard of living indicates further your complete lack of understanding of the purposes of social security.

According to your expressions, you would have social security provide for old age needs and remove the individual initiative and incentive to provide through savings and investments for one's own retirement.

How do you think the 70 millions of life insurance policyholders in this country will regard your proposal? Every life-insurance policyholder in the United States should take cognizance of your position which would increase the tax on all for the primary benefit of those who make no attempt to care for themselves.

You are completely inconsistent because you first indicate your primary reason for reducing the age of women to 60 is to match them up with husbands age 65. Then, later on, you indicate that eventually you would reduce both men and women to age 60, but you think it practical legislatively to make the reduction for women only at this par-

ticular time. One can only assume on that basis that, once you had both men and women down to age 60, you would then seek to start all over again and reduce women to 55 so that once again you would have them matched up with their husbands.

It is disappointing that your first bill as our freshman Senator should represent such fuzzy thinking and an expression on your part that our citizens should approve of your further actions in a personal acceptance of the socialist state.

Most of America's millions recognize we became the greatest country on the face of the earth by individual initiative and learning early in life to save and provide for emergencies and our own old age.

It is, indeed, regrettable that you, in these days when world freedom is at stake basically because of a lack of initiative, should propose greater paternalism in our Federal Government.

Very truly yours,

JOHN MERRIFIELD,
State Senator.

JANUARY 29, 1955.

The Honorable JOHN C. F. MERRIFIELD,
Senate Chamber, Salem, Oreg.

DEAR SENATOR MERRIFIELD: I have received your intemperate letter of January 27, accusing me of "fuzzy thinking" and "personal acceptance of the socialist state" because I introduced a bill in the United States Senate on January 18 proposing to lower the social security qualifying age for women from 65 years to 60.

It is regrettable that you have allowed your own obvious vindictiveness to enter what should be a major legislative discussion. As for your charge of "socialism," let me point out that, on January 21, 3 days after I introduced my bill, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, second-ranking Republican in the Senate, introduced a bill identical to mine.

Do you likewise regard Senator WILEY as guilty of "socialism" and "fuzzy thinking"?

I do not agree that the proposal to reduce the qualifying age for women is contrary to the purposes of the Social Security Act. Indeed, Arthur J. Altmeyer, one of the pioneer authors of the social-security bill and its chief administrator for many years, recommended as early as 1949 that "women should be eligible for benefits at age 60. Wives are generally a few years younger than their husbands. Requiring a wife to be age 65 before her benefits can be paid means that only one-fifth of the married men who retire at age 65 have families immediately eligible for wife's benefits. Some families must, therefore, live on very inadequate benefits for several years until the wife is eligible * * *."

Do you also regard Mr. Altmeyer as guilty of "a complete lack of understanding of the Social Security Act"?

It is hardly possible to believe that you—a State legislator in the 20th century—could really mean that retirement benefits exist "only to insure society against the people." And I emphatically challenge your statement that my proposal "would increase the tax on all for the primary benefit of those who make no attempt to care for themselves." This misstatement of yours is an insult to the millions of hard-working Americans, who contribute regularly from their salary checks toward social-security benefits as an earned measure of support in retirement.

During the recent political campaign of 1954, President Eisenhower cited expansion of social-security payments as one of the great achievements of his administration. Do you think this program of the President's was thought to be "for the primary benefit of those who make no attempt to care for themselves"?

In my opinion, social security is one of the great advances of our era. It represents a long stride upward from the poorhouse and potter's field. It assures working men and women a decent and dignified way of life in their later years.

I shall do all in my power as a Member of the United States Senate to expand and promote social security in a sound and orderly manner. Let me call your attention to the fact that the lowered age requirements for women would necessitate an additional payroll deduction of 1 percent, as I pointed out in submitting my bill. I further made clear that both of our largest trade-union organizations, the American Federation of Labor, and Congress of Industrial Organizations, had announced publicly that their members were "ready and willing to assume this cost." The additional levy would fall one-half of 1 percent on workers and the other one-half of 1 percent on management.

I am glad you wrote to me about this important problem. I regret, of course, that you felt impelled to phrase your letter in intemperate and accusatory terms.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

BILL INTRODUCED JANUARY 18, 1955, BY SENATOR NEUBERGER (FOR HIMSELF AND OTHER SENATORS)

S. 521

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 216 of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"RETIREMENT AGE

"(a) The term 'retirement age' means age 65 in the case of men and age 60 in the case of women."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this act shall be applicable in the case of monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for any month after, and in the case of lump-sum death payments thereunder with respect to deaths occurring after, the month in which this act is enacted.

THE PRICE OF EGGS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, once again I desire to invite the attention of my colleagues to the low price of eggs. I have received a letter from a lady named Mrs. Floyd Steele, of Edmunds, N. Dak. She writes as follows:

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I am writing again concerning the price of eggs. I do believe something should be done to keep the price of eggs and chickens up so a farmer don't have to lose on them. I do believe this poem I've composed will pretty well sum up how all the farmers' wives feel about a support price on eggs.

I wrote you in 1952, and after that the price of eggs did come up some; so hoping you can do something again, as eggs are only 23 cents for No. 1 eggs now, and everyone is going in the hole on them. I do believe you can help us.

Hoping to hear from you soon,

Sincerely,

Mrs. FLOYD STEELE.

There is a postscript on the back of the letter. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, as it deals with parity on grain.

There being no objection, the postscript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I attended a meeting last night at which there were farmers, and they felt we needed 90-percent parity on grains grown and a support on egg and cream prices in order to be able to keep producing and break even on everything, as living costs are so much higher accordingly than what we sell.

THE CHINA DECISION AND FORMOSA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in this critical and historical hour in the field of American foreign policy, I think we should always remember that there is no substitute for the application of brainpower to the solution of great public questions. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD 2 writings of recent days by 2 distinguished American scholars in the field of foreign relations.

The first is a letter addressed to the editor of the New York Times by Dr. John Gange, director of the Woodrow Wilson School of Foreign Affairs of the University of Virginia. The letter appears under the heading "China Decision Discussed." I wish to associate myself with the observations and remarks of Dr. Gange.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHINA DECISION DISCUSSED—ALL-OUT WAR IS BELIEVED THREATENED, DANGERS ARE OUTLINED

(The writer of the following letter, director of the Woodrow Wilson School of Foreign Affairs of the University of Virginia, served in Formosa in public administration work in 1952 and 1953.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

One of the chief functions a great newspaper can perform is to make possible the expression of public opinion on matters of public concern. This function is particularly important in a time of hysteria, panic, or a stampede led by our National Government. I write to you now as one of a few voices raised to question the sudden, and to me almost incredible, decision to rush into war with Communist China, albeit "in the interests of peace."

The public surely must be confused if what President Eisenhower sees as a threat to our peace and security for which we will fight with "whatever operations may be required" is seen by Secretary of Defense Wilson as "just a little ripple" in our defense picture. Perhaps a short summary would help us all.

No one need go beyond the indisputable fact that Mao Tse-tung, Chou En-lai, Chiang Kai-shek, and O. K. Yui believe Formosa and the Pescadores to be Chinese. Whatever anyone else says, the Chinese know the islands as Chinese. Our legalisms will not faze either side.

Both Chinese sides have repeatedly and categorically stated their positions and it is inconceivable that either could back down without disastrous loss of face.

CHINESE MATTER

Mao and Chou En-lai believe that control of Formosa is an internal Chinese matter; Chiang knows it is predominantly a Chinese matter; and most of Asia regards it as a Chinese matter.

Continued civil war among the Chinese over Formosa is inevitable and Asian sympathy almost certainly will be predominantly with the Government of the People's Republic of China.

Both Mao and Chiang have flatly rejected and must reject from their own imperatives of nationalism any outside interference to remove their claims to Formosa or, likewise, to the mainland.

The people of the United States and elsewhere outside of the two Chinas should have no illusions as to the intensity and bitterness and determination with which any peacemaking over Formosa will be resisted by both Chinas and that a policing operation will therefore have to be substantial,

continuous, and highly hazardous as the Communist Chinese build up steadily the wherewithal to attack Formosa despite any police protection.

As President Eisenhower clearly revealed, we face an all-out war with Communist China (why else ask for war powers?). If we insist on being policemen in the Formosan Straits there should also be a clear realization that we go into this all alone, unlike even the Korean police action where a few other countries joined us.

This war with China is precisely what the Soviet Union would like us to undertake; it will drain away our strength, it will alienate Asia and probably all nonwhite areas of the world, it will put us on a basis of permanent enmity with 600 million Chinese even if we can win it singlehanded and survive a healthy country.

FUTURE RELATIONSHIPS

What kind of relationships do we want in Asia in 1965 or 1975, not 1956? Will our going to war with China serve our long-range needs (and the future is where most of us will be living) or will it complicate or prevent what we want?

Is it the serious and unified intention * * * of our people to resort to whatever operations may be required to carry out [our] purpose to maintain Formosa and the Pescadores out of Chinese Communist hands? If this is our intention do we realize the dimensions of this undertaking or is it going to be regarded as only a ripple requiring no additional military strength?

JOHN GANGE.

CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA., *January 27, 1955.*

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a scholarly article published in Sunday's Chicago Sun-Times, written by Dr. Hans J. Morgenthau, who is recognized as one of the foremost living authorities in the field of foreign affairs. In this article he points out the great dangers inherent in the action taken by the Congress of the United States last week in the passage of House Joint Resolution 159.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SHIFTS POLICY OVER FORMOSA

(The Sun-Times presents the following analysis of the Far Eastern crisis as a public service to stimulate understanding of basic issues. While having specific opinions of his own, the writer of this article has been careful to present both sides of the world-shaking problem.)

(By Hans J. Morgenthau, director, Center for the Study of American Foreign Policy of the University of Chicago)

The Formosa resolution which has just been passed by Congress presents an extraordinary paradox to the American people and to the world.

In the context of the measures which have preceded it and which are likely to follow it, it constitutes a decisive change in the Far Eastern policies of our Government, an important step toward a peaceful settlement of the Far Eastern crisis.

Yet, in its most spectacular provision and in the dramatic measures and gestures accompanying it, it raises up the specter of an impending armed conflict. By doing this it gets in the way of the very purposes our Government is pursuing in the Far East.

When the Communists had driven Chiang Kai-shek from the mainland in 1949, the American people were united in assessing this event as a catastrophic defeat for the United States; for this event brought to pass what America's traditional policy of the "open door" had been able to prevent: That all of China would fall in the orbit of another great power.

DIVIDED ON CHINA

However, the American people and their Government were divided, and have remained so to this day, over the policies to pursue vis-a-vis Communist China.

By far the more articulate group, of which recently Adm. Arthur W. Radford, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has been the most eminent spokesman, maintains that the United States cannot live securely with Communist China in the same world, that the Communist Regime of China can and ought to be overthrown, and that this can be done now with a relatively small commitment of American air and naval forces.

The other group, by no means negligible in either size or influence (Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway is probably its most prominent representative in the councils of government) but hardly audible in public, assume that the Communists are in firm control of the mainland and can be overthrown only by a military effort of the first magnitude.

From this estimate of the military situation, it follows logically that the United States ought to make the best of a bad situation by recognizing a fact, however distasteful and dangerous in itself, which could be changed only at an exorbitant price and at enormous risks.

UNEASY BALANCE

Until recently the present administration, as its predecessor, has tried to strike an uneasy balance between those two positions. By refusing to recognize the Communist government of China, it has by implication denied its right to govern China and its ability to do so permanently.

By promising to unleash Chiang Kai-shek for an invasion of the mainland, it has given the appearance of encouraging and supporting such an undertaking. On the other hand, in its actual policies our Government has been very careful to minimize armed conflict between the two Chinas and to preserve the status quo.

Recent statements and measures make it obvious that the administration is moving decisively away from the counterrevolutionary attitude implicit in its nonrecognition policy.

The defense treaty with Formosa, concluded in December 1954, and now before the Senate for ratification, and more particularly the notes exchanged between Mr. Dulles and the Formosan Foreign Minister on the conclusion of that treaty make it perfectly clear that our Government has reconciled itself to the Communist domination of the Chinese mainland and seeks the preservation of the territorial status quo in the short run and an overall Far Eastern settlement in the long run. The recent statements by the President and the Secretary of State in support of a cease-fire to be arranged under the auspices of the United Nations are part and parcel of that new policy. And so is the resolution which has just been passed by Congress. It, too, serves the purpose of maintaining the territorial status quo in the Formosa Strait by peaceful means, and the President's statement of last Thursday to this effect expresses faithfully the peaceful and defensive purposes of our policy.

WHY JETS, SHIPS?

Why, then, have these purposes been obscured by flights of jet planes, Navy concentrations, and talk about preventive war? As so often before, the sound purposes of our foreign policy have been sacrificed to the requirements generally apparent rather than real, of psychological warfare and political pressures, foreign and domestic.

There can be no doubt that the drastic military and political measures taken during the last week have the primary purpose of impressing upon the Chinese Communists our determination to defend Formosa even at the risk of a general war. Nothing in the present military situation suggests that the 7th Fleet would not be strong enough to meet any immediate emergency without drastic reinforcements, and the constitutional authority of the President to commit the Armed Forces of the United States to the defense of Formosa has not been challenged since President Truman so committed them at the beginning of the Korean war. Thus the resolution considered by Congress only confirms what needed no confirmation on constitutional grounds.

A good case can be made in support of a policy which leaves the prospective enemy in no doubt about one's own intentions. Yet there is a difference between making it unmistakably clear that one has a loaded gun ready for use under certain conditions and waving a loaded gun under somebody's nose or aiming it at somebody's head, even though without any intention to pull the trigger. In the latter case, the psychological effects might well be the exact opposite from those intended. Instead of deterring a prospective enemy from taking a certain step you might provoke him into committing one because your dramatic demonstrations have filled him with the fear, however unfounded, of drastic action. In one word, in psychological warfare one can do too little and one can do too much, and one can only hope that we have not done too much.

POLITICAL COMPROMISE

The measures of the last week also show the obvious marks of a political compromise with Chiang Kai-shek and the supporters of his counterrevolution in this country.

We have attempted for months to persuade Chiang Kai-shek to evacuate the outlying islands which are of minor military importance for the defense of Formosa and untenable in case of serious attack. We have now succeeded in persuading Chiang Kai-shek to evacuate the Tachen Islands, and we have committed ourselves in return for this concession to defend, at least for the time being, the island groups of Quemoy and Matsu. A look at the map will show that, while the Pescadores are indeed essential for the defense of Formosa, Matsu and the Quemoys are not.

Anything the Communists could do to Formosa from these islands they could also do from the mainland. These islands are not stepping stones from the mainland to Formosa, but they are stepping stones from Formosa to the mainland. From them a determined enemy can harass the port of Foochow and paralyze the port of Amoy.

It is true that in this fashion the Communists can be prevented from using these ports to stage the invasion of Formosa. But another look at the map will show that an invasion force, even if it controlled these islands, would have to cross a large body of water, and it would be a reflection on the prowess of the 7th Fleet to assume that it would be unable to intercept such a force. Given the defensive purposes of our policy, the commitment to defend these islands for the time being must then derive from political rather than military considerations.

PURPOSES DIFFER

Yet while our purposes are defensive, the purposes of Chiang Kai-shek are not and cannot be. Chiang Kai-shek's regime stands and falls with the expectation to return victoriously to the mainland.

The policies upon which our Government has embarked in recent months preclude such a return by freezing the status quo. Chiang Kai-shek knows this, and so do the advocates of his counterrevolution in this country. Yet neither of them can fail to note the splendid opportunity which last Friday's resolution offers them to maneuver the Government of the United States into

supporting policies which run counter to its own purposes.

It would not be the first time that the Formosan tail has wagged the American dog. The islands of Quemoy and Matsu, lying in close proximity to the Chinese mainland, cannot be defended against actual assault. They can be defended only by preventing an assault from being staged in the first place. In order to defend these islands, we cannot allow the enemy to fire the first shot; we must fire it ourselves in order to prevent the enemy from firing any shot.

In other words, the philosophy underlying last Friday's resolution calls for our carrying the war to the Asiatic mainland in order to defend Formosa. Yet to carry the war to the Asiatic mainland is exactly what Chiang Kai-shek and his American supporters want our Government to do. Only their purpose is not the defense of Formosa, but the reconquest of the mainland.

The President's statement of last Thursday that any decision to use United States forces other than in immediate self-defense or in direct defense of Formosa and the Pescadores would be a decision which he would take and the responsibility for which he has not delegated does little to dispel the misgivings which the supporter of the President's own policies must feel.

For it is Chiang Kai-shek and not the President's subordinates, who controls the Quemoy and Matsu Islands. Hence, it is Chiang Kai-shek who can create in the proximity of the Chinese mainland a situation calling for Communist countermeasures in the form of concentrations of troops and war material. No military intelligence is smart enough to distinguish between the defensive and aggressive purposes of such a concentration and all military intelligence is prone to find what it would like to find.

A military commander, itching for action, will more likely than not find in the intelligence reports evidence for the need for action, especially if failure to act might cause defeat. Yet it is upon such intelligence that the President must base his final decision.

The implications of last Friday's resolution, then, run counter to the present purposes of our foreign policy. A case—and in our opinion an unanswerable one—can be made for the policies President Eisenhower has embarked upon.

A case also can be made for the policies Admiral Radford has been advocating. But no case can be made for a policy which tries to achieve the purposes of one with the methods appropriate for the other.

UNSOLVED EMBEZZLEMENTS FROM THE CONSULATE GENERAL'S OFFICE, LAHORE, PAKISTAN

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss the unsolved embezzlement of United States Government funds in the amount of $72,045.71 from the Consulate General's office in Lahore, Pakistan.

A discrepancy in the accounts in that office was first called to the attention of the State Department on February 13, 1951, at which time a draft for $2,500 issued by the disbursing officer to the Imperial Bank of India was listed as unaccounted for. On December 18, 1951, Mr. Herbert W. Griffin, Division of Finance of the State Department, was given notice that in addition to the questions raised regarding the $2,500 draft, there also were other "unaccounted for" items in that office's accounts.

On January 5, 1952, an investigation was ordered, and Mr. James S. Moose, Jr., inspector, was placed in charge.

On August 25, 1953, a report of that investigation was officially filed with the State Department.

During this investigation it was discovered that between January 18, 1949, and September 29, 1951, official funds had been received by these four disbursing officers, but that such funds had not been entered in the office accounts nor otherwise accounted for.

The actual shortage existing in the Lahore accounts as determined by these investigators amounted to $72,045.71. A breakdown follows with the names of the officials involved omitted; however, these names are available to any committee of Congress interested, or they can be obtained from the State Department.

Disbursing officer No.	Period of assignment	Amount
1	Aug. 1, 1948, to Feb. 28, 1949	$6,060.61
2	Mar. 1 to Dec. 31, 1949	13,636.36
3	Mar. 22 to Sept. 2, 1950	6,060.61
4	Sept. 2, 1950, to Feb. 10, 1952	41,288.13
	United States dollar shortage	5,000.00
	Total United States dollar value of shortage	72,045.71

The officers involved and the responsibility of each is as follows:

First. A Foreign Service officer, class 2, retired for age on July 31, 1950, before any shortages were discovered. He is now drawing an annuity of $5,833 per year, and at the time of retirement received a lump-sum payment for annual leave of $8,800.

He served as principal officer from July 22, 1948, to March 23, 1949, and as disbursing officer from August 1, 1948, to February 28, 1949.

The charges were that as disbursing officer he incurred a shortage of $6,060.61, and coliability as principal officer for failure to require officer No. 2 to file bond in a sufficient amount, $6,060.61. A total of $12,122.22 was charged against that particular officer.

He did not keep safely or account for all public moneys received; his accounts were incomplete and incorrect; he withdrew funds from the Treasury in excess of 30 days' requirements; he has not paid into the Treasury of the United States the unexpended and unaccounted for Government funds which were transferred to him and were in his possession as disbursing officer.

Second. A Foreign Service officer, class 6, separated on June 21, 1952, under provisions of the Foreign Service Act, by being "selected out." Officers who are not promoted within a period of years are automatically selected out by action of the Foreign Service Board. He is presently living in the United States.

He served as officer in charge from March 24, 1949, to December 2, 1949, and as disbursing officer from March 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949.

The charges were that, as disbursing officer, he incurred a shortage of $13,636.36; as officer in charge; the same, but no additional amount because the service was simultaneous. Total, $13,636.36.

He did not keep safely or account for all public moneys received; his accounts were incomplete and incorrect; he had not paid into the Treasury of the United States the unexpended and unaccounted for Government funds which were transferred to him and in his possession as disbursing officer; he withdrew funds from the Treasury in excess of 30 days' requirements.

Third. A Foreign Service staff officer, class 8, still with the Department and presently serving in South America.

He served as disbursing officer from March 22, 1950, to September 2, 1950.

The charges against him were that, as disbursing officer, he had a shortage of $6,060.61.

He did not keep safely or account for all public moneys received; his accounts were incomplete and incorrect; he has not paid into the Treasury of the United States the unexpended and unaccounted for Government funds which were transferred to him and were in his possession as disbursing officer; he did not keep his official funds in a bank which had been designated as a United States Government depositary, using an undesignated bank instead, contrary to the specific prohibition thereof in his general instructions; he did not file bond with specific penalty as instructed; and he withdrew funds from the Treasury in excess of 30 days' requirements contrary to instructions.

Fourth. A Foreign Service officer, class 5, separated on September 30, 1953, by being "selected out."

He served as disbursing officer from September 2, 1950, to February 10, 1952.

The charges against this individual were that as disbursing officer he had a shortage of $46,288.13.

He did not keep safely or account for all public moneys received; his accounts were incomplete and incorrect; he has not paid into the Treasury of the United States the unexpended and unaccounted for Government funds which were transferred to him and were in his possession as disbursing officer.

He drew a number of checks on his official checking account including checks on the authorized depositary to pay a relatively small amount of personal bills, such as rent and other local expenses. He claims that he always paid into the cash the amount thereof. There is no other evidence that he did do so or did not do so, but there is ample evidence that at the same time the cash was short.

There are additional variations because of the method of obtaining funds for deposit in the disbursing officer's bank account. One was a draft for $2,500 which was drawn on the Secretary of State negotiated for rupees, and deposited in his bank account but not taken up in the office accounts.

In another instance a check drawn on the Treasury of the United States for $4,700, negotiated in rupees, and deposited in his bank account but not taken up in the accounts.

In addition, his accounts indicated a loss through the accommodation cashing of checks. The accounts do not acknowledge receipt of the checks nor have the checks ever been found.

On another occasion this employee drew a check on the Treasury of the United States for $5,000 in favor of

Grindlay's Bank, Ltd., but in this case no deposit was made in his personal bank account nor was the amount taken up in the office accounts.

In fairness to these officers it should be stated that in their report the investigators did point the finger of suspicion against a local employee, an accountant, a native of Pakistan. The report states that there was a strong indication that this employee was the person who falsified the accounts, took funds from the cash box, or otherwise duped his superior officers to the degree of relieving the United States Government of approximately $72,000. However, the inspectors also stated in their report that it did not appear to have been possible for this local accountant to have embezzled these funds without the cooperation of some of the American Government officials in charge.

Nevertheless, the one fact still remains; that is, that there was an embezzlement of $72,000 in government funds, and thus far no one has been held accountable.

As a possible explanation as to why more aggressive steps were not taken to clear up the mystery surrounding this embezzlement until after the statute of limitations had expired on many phases of the charges, I quote one sentence from a letter dated March 4, 1952, signed by the American consul general, Mr. Raleigh A. Gibson, Lahore, Pakistan, and addressed to Mr. Louis F. Thompson, Chief, Division of Finance, Department of State, Washington, D. C.:

We might be able to win a court case with the material we have, but in a court case we would have to admit to the extreme carelessness of four American officials.

SUPPORT BY VENEZUELA OF UNITED STATES POLICY IN FORMOSA CRISIS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to note in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald a splendid public-service advertisement on the part of the American Chamber of Commerce in Venezuela, attesting to the solidarity of our great sister Republic of Venezuela with the cause of the United States in the interest of peace and security in the western Pacific.

The advertisement contains a statemen by His Excellency, Dr. Aureliano Otanez, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Venezuela, relating to Formosa.

I welcome Dr. Ortanez' statement as another heartwarming demonstration of pan American solidarity.

I look forward not only to a further strengthening of the splendid diplomatic ties between our two nations but to a strengthening of our already abundant economic and cultural interchange.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the advertisement be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOLIDARITY

The people and Government of Venezuela again express their solidarity with the people and Government of the United States.

STATEMENT OF THE VENEZUELAN MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS, JANUARY 30, 1955

"In view of the problem faced by the free world, and in particular the United States of America, as a result of the tension created by the situation in Formosa, I would like to reaffirm to our sister nation to the north, in the name of the Government and the Venezuelan people, our sentiments of sincere and traditional friendship, our firm moral support, and assure them that the natural and strategic resources of Venezuela, especially the petroleum and iron ore, will be available to the cause which has obliged President Eisenhower to solicit from Congress special powers for safeguarding the ideals of liberty and justice."

Thus, Venezuela reaffirms its traditional solidarity with the United States in peace or war, whether hot or cold.

A policy which has remained unchanged from the days of the liberator, Simon Bolivar, to the present regime of President Marcos Perez Jimenez.

A policy which has and will continue to assure the United States of strategic Venezuelan resources such as petroleum and iron ore.

Profoundly impressed by the sincere sentiments expressed in the statement of the Venezuelan Minister of Foreign Affairs, the American Chamber of Commerce of Venezuela, representing the numerous American companies doing business under the free-enterprise system in Venezuela, is proud to bring the Foreign Minister's statement to the attention of the American public.

THE AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE IN VENEZUELA.
CARACAS, VENEZUELA.

SUPPORT BY VENEZUELA OF UNITED STATES POLICY IN FORMOSA CRISIS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, for the past 3 or 4 years my colleague from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and several others of us have been talking about the importance of the Latin American countries to the United States, not only economically, but from the standpoint of their value to us in the event we should find ourselves involved in another total war.

I was particularly gratified to learn earlier today that Dr. Aureliano Otanez, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Venezuela, had issued in Caracas, a statement which illustrates the point I have been making, along with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the able and distinguished former chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. The statement is as follows:

Regarding the problem now faced by the free world, and particularly by the United States of America, due to the existing tension in Formosa, I wish to reiterate, in the name of the Government and people of Venezuela, to the sister nation of the United States, the sentiment of our sincere and traditional friendship, and express our definite moral support, as well as the assurance that Venezuela's natural and strategic resources, especially petroleum and iron ore, will be placed at the service of the cause which has led President Eisenhower to request the American Congress for special powers to safeguard principles of liberty and justice.

I have no doubt that if the situation worsens we shall find not only Venezuela, but the other Latin American and Central American Republics continuing to remain lined up with us in the battle for freedom in the world.

Mr. CAPEHART subsequently said: Mr. President, I had intended to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued by Dr. Aureliano Otanez, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Venezuela, pledging the support of his country to the United States in any emergency growing out of the Formosan situation. I understand, however, that it has been printed in the RECORD, and so, of course, I shall not ask that it be printed again.

UNEXPENDED BALANCES IN EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, for several years the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures has been reporting on unexpended balances in appropriations and other expenditure authorizations available to agencies in the executive branch of the Federal Government.

The latest committee report compiles these balances from United States Treasury accounts and is being made available today.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD a statement summarizing the figures in this report and commenting about on the situation they disclose.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Appropriations and other expenditure authorizations available to agencies in the executive branch of the Federal Government during the current fiscal year total $154.1 billion.

These appropriations and other expenditure authorizations were as follows:

Sixty-five billion nine hundred million dollars in balances in appropriations and other expenditure authorizations enacted prior to fiscal year 1954 which began July 1, 1953;

Thirty-two billion five hundred million dollars of balances in appropriations and other expenditure authorizations enacted in fiscal year 1954 which ended last June 30;

Ninety-eight billion four hundred million dollars, subtotal of balances in prior year appropriations and other expenditure authorizations carried over into the current fiscal year which started July 1, 1954;

Fifty-five billion seven hundred million dollars in new appropriations and other expenditure authorizations enacted for the current 1955 fiscal year;

One hundred and fifty-four billion one hundred million dollars, total appropriations and other expenditure authorizations available for expenditure in the current and subsequent fiscal years.

These figures were developed by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures in connection with a report compiling unexpended balances as shown in Treasury accounts for all executive agencies and programs as of the end of the past fiscal year on June 30, 1954.

Current action by Congress on appropriation bills and other expenditure authority before it offers relatively little opportunity to control expenditures from old appropriations and other expenditure authority enacted in prior years.

DOMESTIC CIVILIAN BALANCES INCREASE

Unexpended balances in defense and foreign aid accounts were reduced during the year by $7.5 billion to $65.4 billion, while unexpended balances in domestic civilian program accounts were increased by $2.7 billion to $33 billion. It is indicated that

unused balances in domestic civilian accounts will rise in the current fiscal year, and, if current proposals for highways, education, health, etc., are adopted, they will rise tremendously during next fiscal year.

Most of the $2.7 billion increase was in unused authority to by-pass appropriation procedure and spend directly out of the Federal debt. The larger increases in unexpended balances in the domestic-civilian program accounts were in agriculture (mostly commodity credit) and housing. In agriculture unused authority to spend directly out of the debt was increased by $1.2 billion to a total of $4.9 billion, and in housing unused authority to spend directly out of the Federal debt was increased by $800 million to a total of $5.7 billion.

RECONCILIATION OF TREASURY-BUDGET UNEXPENDED BALANCE FIGURES

It will be noted that the unexpended balance total in the committee report is $98.4 billion. The unexpended balance total at the start of fiscal year 1955 as shown in the Budget Document is $94.4 billion. The committee report total and detail correspond with figures in Treasury accounts.

Efforts are being made to bring Treasury and Budget Bureau unexpended balance figures more closely to the same basis, but there is still considerable difference between them, particularly with respect to the treatment of contract authority and balances for transfer to surplus accounts.

Budget figures include contract authority previously granted by Congress for which appropriations have not been enacted, whereas Treasury accounts reflect only appropriations enacted for these items to date. Budget figures exclude lapsed appropriations whether or not they have been written off. Treasury accounts include lapsed appropriations until the balances are actually written off. The committee report compiles balances in the executive branch only, and exclude $16 million in legislative and judicial branch balances.

Treasury and Budget figures on unexpended balances as of June 30, 1954, are reconciled in tabular form as follows (in billions):

Budget document	$94.4
Add: Lapsed appropriations not written off from which further actual expenditures may be made	+6.5
Less: Contract authorizations for which appropriations have not yet been enacted	−2.5
Treasury accounts	98.4

1954 EXPENDITURES

According to Treasury accounts, executive agencies last year spent a total of $67.7 billion. Of this total $31.7 billion were spent out of appropriations and other expenditure authorizations enacted for fiscal year 1954, and $36 billion were spent from old appropriations and other expenditure authorizations enacted in prior years.

A table showing expenditures during fiscal year 1954 from both current and prior appropriation and expenditure authority is attached.

EXPENDITURE AVAILABILITY—FISCAL YEAR 1955

The table shows the Department of Defense entered the current 1955 fiscal year with $55.5 billion in unexpended balances in prior appropriations and other expenditure authority. This, together with $30.1 billion in new appropriations and expenditure authority enacted for this year, makes military expenditure availability for the current and subsequent years $85.6 billion.

The table shows further that unexpended balances in funds appropriated to the President (mostly foreign aid) on July 1 this year totaled $11.5 billion. This, together with this year's appropriations and other expenditure authority totaling $2.8 billion, makes expenditure availability in funds appropriated to the President (mostly foreign aid) $14.3 billion for the current and subsequent years.

For all other executive agency programs unexpended balances in old appropriations and other expenditure authority totaled $31.4 billion. This, together with this year's appropriations and other expenditure authority totaling $22.8 billion, makes expenditure availability in domestic-civilian program accounts total $54.2 billion.

Federal appropriations and authorizations, expenditures, and unexpended balances (through June 30, 1954)—Summary of appropriations and other authorizations, expenditures, and unexpended balances, executive branch of the Federal Government, showing appropriations and other authorizations by current and prior years; and 1954 expenditures from appropriations for the current year and appropriations enacted in prior years, and unexpended balances, as of June 30, 1954

[In thousands of dollars]

Department or agency	Appropriations and authorizations			Expenditures (June 30, 1954)			Unexpended balances as of June 30, 1954
	Prior-year appropriations and authorizations	Current appropriations and authorizations, fiscal year 1954	Total after transfers among appropriation accounts [1]	Out of prior appropriations and authorizations	Out of current appropriations and authorizations	Total [2]	
Executive Office of the President	2,360	9,748	12,271	786	8,757	9,541	2,731
Funds appropriated to the President	12,150,951	4,533,024	16,745,846	4,284,594	997,575	5,282,168	11,463,677
Independent offices	11,741,736	7,783,565	19,252,961	2,646,815	3,831,596	6,478,411	12,774,548
General Services Administration	1,912,737	162,957	2,064,246	669,552	135,987	805,537	1,258,709
Housing and Home Finance Agency	5,079,486	273,596	5,308,970	69,954	−684,546	−614,594	5,923,563
Department of Agriculture	4,297,099	4,209,604	8,471,023	2,060,214	854,839	2,915,053	5,555,972
Department of Commerce	298,757	943,314	1,303,677	142,433	857,456	999,887	303,792
Department of Defense	62,567,591	35,093,282	96,411,418	24,794,056	16,146,790	40,940,854	55,470,562
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	636,544	1,938,064	2,569,809	510,372	1,470,659	1,981,030	588,778
Department of the Interior	331,680	499,627	824,337	262,645	272,496	535,140	289,197
Department of Justice	22,760	188,538	206,453	15,032	167,610	182,643	23,810
Department of Labor	14,274	396,462	410,502	10,789	343,724	354,514	55,987
Department of the Post Office	216,360	522,000	677,281	215,583	96,122	311,705	365,576
Department of State	105,959	211,582	216,128	39,641	116,827	156,466	59,662
Department of the Treasury [3]	3,891,317	7,389,971	11,634,318	287,830	7,063,417	7,351,245	4,283,072
Total	103,269,611	64,155,334	166,109,237	36,010,296	31,679,309	67,689,605	98,419,636

[1] Totals are adjusted to reflect interagency transfers, and are not necessarily the sum of cols. 1 and 2.
[2] Negative expenditures in this column represent an excess of collections over disbursements.
[3] Includes interest on the public debt.

INVESTIGATION OF FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Tax Court of the United States has today handed down an opinion in the so-called Gross housing windfall tax case.

I am in possession of informal advice as to progress of civil and criminal cases growing out of scandals in multibillion dollar Federal housing programs.

And, I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. Albert M. Cole, Housing and Home Finance Administrator, setting forth administrative action he has taken pursuant to investigations into these programs since they started openly last April. The letter was in response to my request of last November 1, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, for such information.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD a statement relative to these matters, along with the text of Mr. Cole's letter with certain attachments covered by it.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I think no one can quarrel too much with the United States Tax Court decision today in the Gross housing windfall case, holding in effect that loose housing laws and lax administration of them could be exploited in a manner to make tax windfalls legal.

The court points out in a concurring opinion that this type of windfall resulting from application of capital-gains tax instead of normal income-tax rates, encouraged by housing laws and those administering them, was outlawed by my amendment to the new tax code last summer. But Federal housing program builders who, with the aid of housing program officials, contrived under the housing laws, prior to the new tax bill, to get federally insured mortgages in excess of housing project costs are subject to the 25 percent capital-gains rate instead of the normal tax rate of 75 percent or more on the excess which they pocketed.

When the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, investigating this and other housing cases from the tax standpoint, caused all of the numerous housing-program scandals to be opened up to the public nearly a year ago, I was advised that hundreds of cases running to tens of millions of dollars in tax windfalls involved situations similar to that of the Gross case where the builders obtained $24

million under a federally insured mortgage for a housing project which cost $20 million, and divided $4 million of excess loan among themselves.

To what extent all of these tax cases will fall on this decision has not yet been made clear, but the Tax Court opinion reemphasizes the fact that the housing laws are loose and the administration of them is lax.

Not only do the taxpayers and the Government lose under this tax case decision, but I am officially advised that progress on both civil and criminal housing-scandal cases to date is slow and disappointing, due largely to loose law and lapse of time resulting from maladministration. As to administrative action, Mr. Albert M. Cole, Housing and Home Finance Administrator, has advised me that he has acted in what seems to be extremely few cases in view of the scope and seriousness of admitted scandals in the multi-billion-dollar housing programs.

Testifying before the Senate Banking and Currency Subcommittee on housing scandals, when it met in Chicago September 14, 1954, Mr. Cole indicted the Federal Housing Administration like no other Government administrator ever before discredited an agency under his own administration. He said:

Receipt by employees of gratuities was "the accepted norm of operations";

Employees engaged in activities involving "conflict of interest";

The Legal Division was inefficient;

The agency "lost capacity of self-appraisal and self-criticism";

It "tended to measure success in terms of volume";

It allowed its cost estimating system to "break down";

It accepted misrepresentation;

It allowed windfall profits;

It allowed charter violations;

It permitted irregular use of leaseholds;

It failed to "protect its own interests";

Its appraisal of land was "deficient";

It abandoned its established minimum architectural requirements;

It failed to enforce the law;

It allowed "wholesale victimization of homeowners";

It perverted the property-improvement program.

Mr. Cole, who indicted the FHA on these 16 counts, now advises me formally by letter that during 8 months following the inauguration of open investigations into this agency, by administrative action pursuant to the investigations, he has removed 3 Washington FHA employees and accepted the resignation of a fourth.

Among all the thousands of employees in numerous FHA field offices around the country, Mr. Cole says he has removed 6 others from office, accepted 13 other resignations, suspended 3, and reprimanded 29.

This list of removals, resignations, suspensions, and reprimands formally submitted over Mr. Cole's signature is attached. I shall insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
Washington, D. C., December 20, 1954.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This refers to your request for certain information with respect to personnel and other administrative actions taken by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator and the heads of constituent agencies in connection with the special investigation of the Federal Housing Administration.

The attached list contains detailed information regarding the personnel actions which arose out of the special investigation. All of the individuals involved were employees of the Federal Housing Administration.

As a result of the disclosures made during the special investigation, the constituent agency heads and I have taken a number of positive steps to strengthen the agency's compliance arms and procedures.

At the outset of the special investigation, which commenced on April 12, 1954, I directed that the Investigations Section of the FHA General Counsel's Office would thereafter report to the Deputy Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

At the same time I took action to rescind an agreement, dating from 1935, by which FHA assumed exclusive investigative jurisdiction over offenses against certain criminal statutes. This had the effect of returning responsibility for criminal investigations to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

By my order of October 1, 1954, there was established at the agency level a centralized compliance division. This division will perform two principal functions on behalf of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator:

(1) It will conduct all investigations required in the administration of the housing agency programs, except those referred to the FBI because possible criminal violations are involved.

(2) It will inspect and report on all of the facilities within the agency which are designed and used to assure integrity in operations and compliance with established standards, policies, and procedures.

The constituent agency heads have also taken action, within their respective jurisdictions, to evaluate and strengthen the means by which operational integrity may be assured. In the case of the Federal Housing Administration, this evaluation led to the establishment of an examination and audit group, reporting directly to the Commissioner.

In addition to these steps, affecting compliance activities throughout the agency and designed primarily to protect the public interest against a repetition of the irregularities found in the Federal Housing Administration, a number of actions have been taken within FHA by the head of that agency as a result of the facts disclosed during the special investigation.

On April 23, less than 2 weeks after the special investigation was ordered, Commissioner Mason set up a series of committees to advise him in the steps to be taken in improving the programs and operations of the Federal Housing Administration. These committees gave careful study to the FHA organization and to each of the programs for which FHA is responsible.

The recommendations of these committees were to a large extent embodied in the legislative recommendations which Commissioner Mason made to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on May 17, and in a series of administrative orders issued during the ensuing months.

Perhaps the most significant step which the Federal Housing Commissioner took was the announcement, on June 28, that he had ordered the reorganization and modernization of the top policymaking structure of the FHA. In addition to the establishment of the independent inspectional service already mentioned, the new organization sets up clear lines of authority and responsibility within FHA and gives specific recognition to the need for a senior staff officer to plan and evaluate the operation of FHA programs so as to assure that they are being carried out in accordance with the intent of the Congress.

Other administrative actions taken by Commissioner Mason since he assumed office on April 13, 1954, are described below.

TITLE I HOME IMPROVEMENT LOAN PROGRAM

On June 4, barbecue pits, kennels, swimming pools, and other luxury items were excluded from the benefits of title I financing.

On August 25, a committee of representatives of the home-building and lending industry was appointed to study the FHA home modernization and repair program.

On September 24, new regulations under title I, as amended in the Housing Act of 1954, were issued.

On October 5, steps were taken to eliminate the misuse of FHA in advertising.

Between April 13 and November 23, precautionary measures were taken against 983 title I dealers and salesmen to protect the public against unscrupulous transactions.

MULTIFAMILY HOUSING PROGRAMS

On May 10, instructions were issued requiring the submission of up-to-date financial statements prior to considering sponsor's requests for permission to pay dividends and to effect changes in capital structure.

On June 22, restrictions were placed on the processing of applications for FHA insurance involving sponsors whose operations were being examined in connection with the special investigation.

On July 1, a new minimum equity requirement on all sales-type cooperative housing projects was placed in effect.

On July 16, instructions were issued prohibiting multiple multifamily housing project loans in any one area.

On August 20, new rules and regulations under section 207 were issued.

On September 13, new rules and regulations under section 213 were issued.

On October 4, new rules and regulations under section 803 were issued.

On August 20, 1954, Commissioner Mason directed the president of Linwood Park Corporations, section 608, to call a special meeting of the preferred stockholders for the purpose of electing new directors of the corporation. This was the beginning of legal action to recover windfalls in connection with 608 projects. Since that time, action has been taken against five other corporations. On the basis of the outcome of litigation, the FHA will set up a program for future action in connection with windfall cases.

HOME MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAM

On June 8, Washington review of rental projects under section 203 was required as a safeguard against abuse of the home-insurance program and to avoid exploitation by promoters.

On August 12, new rules and regulations under section 203 were issued.

LEASEHOLDS

On May 26, instructions restricting the use of leaseholds were issued.

REFUSAL OF BENEFITS OF PARTICIPATION

On September 30, a formal procedure to be followed by FHA in refusing the benefits of participation in FHA programs under part 200 of the Federal Code of Regulations was issued.

In accordance with your request, this letter relates only to the actions taken by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator and the heads of the constituent agencies under his general supervision. There have been, of course, a large number of actions, complementing the actions taken within the Housing Agency, taken by the Congress and by other executive departments and agencies as a result of the recent FHA investigation.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT M. COLE,
Administrator.

Personnel actions resulting from the special investigation of the Federal Housing Administration, April–November 1954

REMOVALS

Name	Title	Location	Date	Action
Clyde L. Powell	Assistant Commissioner, Rental Housing.	Washington, D. C	Apr. 13, 1954	Removed for misconduct.
Arthur J. Frentz	Assistant Commissioner, Title I	do	Apr. 22, 1954	Termination of non-civil-service appointment. There was no allegation of criminal involvement.
Burton C. Bovard	General Counsel	do	July 15, 1954	Removed for failure to perform properly the duties of General Counsel. There was no allegation of criminal involvement.
Charles F. Spiess	Chief construction examiner	Philadelphia, Pa	May 28, 1954	Removed for accepting gratuities from persons having business before FHA.
Andrew Frost	Assistant Director	Albuquerque, N. Mex	Sept. 9, 1954	Removed for accepting gratuities from persons.
John W. Salmon	Supervisory appraiser	Los Angeles, Calif	Nov. 26, 1954	Removed for purchasing home from firm having business before FHA at a price several thousand dollars below Veterans' Administration appraised value and for engaging in outside activity in violation of FHA policy.
Carl A. Brand	Chief underwriter	Kansas City, Mo	Dec. 31, 1954	To be removed for engaging in outside activity in violation of the FHA policy.
Arthur I. Duffy	Construction inspector	New York, N. Y	do	To be removed for accepting gratuities from persons having business before FHA.
William J. Loughran	Assistant chief construction examiner.	Jamaica, N. Y	do	To be removed for failure to comply with request to complete questionnaire.

RESIGNATIONS

Howard M. Murphy	Associate General Counsel	Washington, D. C	Apr 23, 1954	Resigned upon request for the good of the service. There was no allegation of criminal involvement.
John P. McGrath	Supervisory appraiser	Philadelphia, Pa	Apr. 30, 1954	Resigned while under investigation for accepting gratuities from persons having business before FHA.
Wilmer Russell	Construction inspector	do	June 1, 1954	Resigned after receiving notice of proposed removal for accepting gratuities from persons having business before the FHA.
Hiram M. Cudabac	Chief underwriter	Albuquerque, N. Mex	Aug. 19, 1954	Resigned after being questioned by investigative staff regarding supervisory deficiencies.
James B. Kiser	Construction examiner	do	Sept. 10, 1954	Resigned after being questioned concerning receipt of gratuities from persons having business before FHA.
J. Marvin Wade	Director	Little Rock, Ark	Sept. 21, 1954	Resigned during investigation of outside activities in violation of FHA policy.
John F. Pratt	Assistant Director	Oklahoma City, Okla	Sept. 17, 1954	Resigned after being questioned concerning the receipt of gratuities and special favors from persons having business before FHA.
Kenneth Mitchell	Chief land planner	Los Angeles, Calif	Aug. 20, 1954	Resigned after being questioned concerning the purchase of a home from firms having business before FHA.
Horace I. Moses	Construction examiner	do	Oct. 15, 1954	Resigned after being questioned concerning outside activity in violation of FHA policy.
Maurice Golden	Assistant chief construction examiner.	do	Sept. 20, 1954	Resigned after receiving notice of proposed removal for accepting gratuities from persons having business before FHA.
Francis J. Thiefels	Assistant Director	Grand Rapids, Mich	Oct. 1, 1954	Resigned after being questioned concerning falsification of an official document.
Frank B. Davenport	Construction cost examiner	do	Oct. 19, 1954	Resigned after being questioned concerning outside employment in violation of FHA policy.
T. Maurine Anderson	Office manager	do	Nov. 19, 1954	Resigned after being questioned concerning falsification of an official document.

SUSPENSIONS

Harold A. Mather	Construction inspector	Phoenix, Ariz	July 26, 1954	Suspended 30 days for the acceptance of gratuities.
Peter J. Fallon	Executive assistant	Newark, N. J	Oct. 10, 1954	Suspended 14 days for the acceptance of gratuities.
Ralph C. Eckert	Construction inspector	Portland, Oreg	Nov. 29, 1954	Suspended 3 days for incorrect statements on application for employment.

REPRIMANDS[1]

Warren S. Pletz	Construction examiner	Newark, N. J	Sept. 23, 1954	Reprimanded for the acceptance of gratuities.
John J. Crotty	Attorney adviser	do	Sept. 10, 1954	Do.
Landis H. Litchfield	Administrative officer	Richmond, Va	Sept. 8, 1954	Do.
Leo A. Petz	Assistant chief underwriter	Detroit, Mich	Oct. 19, 1954	Do.
Floyd W. Fritcher	Construction examiner	do	Sept. 8, 1954	Do.
Myron F. Marrs	Real property officer	do	Sept. 23, 1954	Do.
Wendell O. Edwards	Director	do	Oct. 19, 1954	Do.
George E. Born	Chief underwriter	Pittsburgh, Pa	Sept. 17, 1954	Do.
Carl C. White	Assistant chief construction examiner.	Des Moines, Iowa	Oct. 19, 1954	Do.
Lewis DeMarco	Loan examiner	do	do	Do.
Harold B. McBride	Assistant Director	do	do	Reprimanded for allowing employees under his supervision to accept gratuities.
Charles O. Lamond	Chief construction examiner	do	do	Reprimanded for the acceptance of gratuities.
Daniel H. Madigan	Construction examiner	New York, N. Y	Sept. 8, 1954	Do.
Leroy W. Pierce	Project procedure representative	do	Nov. 17, 1954	Do.
Alfred Raven	Chief construction examiner	Grand Rapids, Mich	Oct. 19, 1954	Do.
John W. Kauffman	Supervisory appraiser	Jacksonville, Fla	Oct. 29, 1954	Reprimanded for failure to adhere to FHA policy with respect to reporting outside activities.
C. Crow Batson	Chief construction examiner	Charleston, W. Va	Nov. 9, 1954	Reprimanded for the acceptance of gratuities.
Ralph E. Renn	do	Camden, N. J	Oct. 25, 1954	Do.
John M. Corcoran	Appraiser	do	do	Reprimanded for incorrect statements on application for employment.
Philip A. McCarthy	Supervisory appraiser	Memphis, Tenn	do	Reprimanded for incomplete answers on questionnaire concerning receipt of gratuities.
Richard J. Regan	Chief construction examiner	do	do	Do.
John R. Burton	Appraiser	Greensboro, N. C	Oct. 27, 1954	Reprimanded for the acceptance of gratuities.
Charles D. MacKintosh	Construction examiner	do	do	Do.
Walter C. Folger	Appraiser	do	Oct. 23, 1954	Do.
Taylor Kennerly	do	do	Oct. 27, 1954	Reprimanded for failure to submit written statement upon obtaining a loan under sec. 2 of title I of the National Housing Act and the acceptance of gratuities.
J. Guy Arrington	Director	Portland, Oreg	Nov. 4, 1954	Reprimanded for the acceptance of gratuities.
W. Withers Adickes	Assistant Director	Columbia, S. C	do	Do.
Henry A. Wittekind	Construction examiner	Jamaica, N. Y	Nov. 24, 1954	Reprimanded for failure to submit questionnaire within specified time limit.
Isidore S. Rosen	Construction inspector	do	do	Reprimanded for soliciting and accepting discarded materials from projects on which he served as construction inspector.

[1] In instances where an employee was reprimanded for accepting gratuities from persons having business before FHA, the gratuity was of minor value and there was no evidence of intent to unduly influence official actions.

PAYMENT OF COMPENSATION TO EMPLOYEES OF FORMER SENATORS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now consider the resolutions listed on the calendar from No. 9 to No. 14, inclusive, embracing Senate Resolutions 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, and 48.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move the consideration of the resolutions.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 50) to pay compensation for a certain period to employees of former Senator Robert W. Upton;

The resolution (S. Res. 51) to pay compensation for a certain period to employees of former Senator Ernest S. Brown;

The resolution (S. Res. 52) to pay compensation for a certain period to employees of former Senator Thomas A. Burke;

The resolution (S. Res. 53) to pay compensation for a certain period to employees of former Senator Edward D. Crippa;

The resolution (S. Res. 54) to pay compensation for a certain period to employees of former Senator Alton Lennon; and

The resolution (S. Res. 48) to pay compensation for a certain period to employees of former Senator Eva Bowring.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, these six resolutions were considered and acted upon favorably by the Committee on Rules and Administration, and they come to the calendar with the approval of that committee. They are all similar in nature; that is, that a gratuity is awarded to the employees of a Senator who ceases to hold office, because a good deal of their time is entirely taken in closing the office and preparing it for his successor.

I read the names of the former Senators to whom the resolutions relate:

Former Senator Robert W. Upton, former Senator Ernest S. Brown, former Senator Thomas A. Burke, former Senator Edward D. Crippa, former Senator Alton Lennon, and former Senator Eva Bowring.

The amount of gratuity in each case is determined by the salary received at the time the Senator left office, and is for 30 days thereafter. If, in the meantime, an employee takes another position, he is required to make an affidavit to that effect, and the amount he receives is deducted from the amount he is awarded.

Mr. President, I move that the six resolutions be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to.

The resolutions agreed to en bloc are as follows:

Senate Resolution 50

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator Robert W. Upton, who were carried on the Senate payroll on November 7, 1954, salary for services in his office for the period November 8, 1954, through December 7, 1954, or for so much of that time through December 7, 1954, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of November 7, 1954.

Senate Resolution 51

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator Ernest S. Brown, who were carried on the Senate payroll on December 1, 1954, salary for services in his office for the period December 2, 1954, through December 31, 1954, or for so much of that time through December 31, 1954, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of December 1, 1954.

Senate Resolution 52

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator Thomas A. Burke, who were carried on the Senate payroll on December 2, 1954, salary for services in his office for the period December 3, 1954, through January 1, 1955, or for so much of that time through January 1, 1955, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of December 2, 1954.

Senate Resolution 53

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator Edward D. Crippa, who were carried on the Senate payroll on November 28, 1954, salary for services in his office for the period November 29, 1954, through December 28, 1954, or for so much of that time through December 28, 1954, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of November 28, 1954.

Senate Resolution 54

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator Alton Lennon, who were carried on the Senate payroll on November 28, 1954, salary for services in his office for the period November 29, 1954, through December 28, 1954, or for so much of that time through December 28, 1954, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of November 28, 1954.

Senate Resolution 48

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator Eva Bowring, who were carried on the Senate payroll on November 7, 1954, salary for services in her office for the period November 8, 1954, through December 7, 1954, or for so much of that time through December 7, 1954, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of November 7, 1954.

AMENDMENT OF ACT CREATING COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 5, Senate bill 539.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 539) to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that an identical House bill (H. R. 2010) be substituted for the Senate bill and be now considered. The House bill is Calendar No. 20. After action on the House bill, I shall move that the Senate bill be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2010), an act to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The House bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I now move that Senate bill 539 be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 6, Senate bill 613, a bill to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 613) to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1957.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Senate bill 613 provides for a 2-year extension of the Reorganization Act under which plans have been transmitted by the President to the Congress for the reorganization of certain divisions and functions of the executive departments of the Government. The House passed H. R. 2576, providing for a 3-year extension. It is the unanimous view of the Senate Committee on Government Operations that a 2-year extension is all we should countenance or support.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I support the Senate bill. I know of no reason for extending the act for 3 years instead of for 2 years. By extending it 2 years it will extend it for some 3 or 4 months into the new administration,

which will take office in 1957. During those months the new administration, whether it be the present one or some other administration, will have an opportunity to express its views on reorganization matters. I do not know why the act was extended by the House for 3 years.

The President requested an extension for only 2 years. That has been the general consensus of the Hoover Commission of which I am a member, and I know their general views about it. I know of no reason for extending the act for a 3-year period. Therefore I urge that the Senate bill be passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it now appears that it would be advisable for the Senate to act on House bill 2576, Calendar No. 19, rather than on the Senate bill, in order to avoid a conference and get immediate action. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House bill 2576, Calendar No. 19, be substituted for Senate bill 613, and be now considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2576) to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1958.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2576).

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the date of April 1, 1958, be amended to read "April 1, 1957."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 2576) was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 613 will be indefinitely postponed.

The title of House bill 2576 will be appropriately amended.

HIGHWAY FINANCING BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, while the prediction of Lord Macaulay that our Constitution would prove to be all sail and no anchor has not yet been fulfilled; weakening blows have been struck the anchor chain during the intervening 98 years since that statement was made. The Federal Government now blithely undertakes projects which the two patron saints of the Democratic Party, Jefferson and Jackson, were firmly convinced the Government had no power under the Constitution to undertake, and the Congress is being constantly confronted with proposals to expand powers which were merely assumed in the first instance.

The 100th anniversary of the birth of George Washington occurred during the administration of Andrew Jackson and the Congress provided for a suitable celebration. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Daniel Webster, served as chairman and made the principal speech. After extolling the personal characteristics of the immortal Washington and indicating how the 100 years since his birth had been the most momentous century of history, he attributed the contribution that the United States had made to the 19th century to the practical application of the fundamental principles of political and economic freedom which had been espoused by George Washington and embodied in a written Constitution.

In an eloquent appeal for the preservation of that Constitution, referring to its division of powers among the Federal Government, the States, and the people as the "well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty" and saying "if these columns fall they will be raised not again," Daniel Webster remarked:

> The world at this moment is regarding us with a willing but something of a fearful admiration. Its deep and awful anxiety is to learn whether free states may be stable, as well as free; whether popular power may be trusted, as well as feared; in short, whether wise, regular, and virtuous self-government is a vision for the contemplation of theorists or a truth established, illustrated, and brought into practice in the country of Washington.
>
> Gentlemen, for the earth which we inhabit, and the whole circle of the sun, for all the unborn races of mankind, we seem to hold in our hands, for their weal or woe, the fate of this experiment. If we fail, who shall venture the repetition? If our example shall prove to be one, not of encouragement but of terror, not fit to be imitated but fit only to be shunned, where else shall the world look for free models? If this great western sun be struck out of the firmament, at what other fountain shall the lamp of liberty hereafter be lighted? What other orb shall emit a ray to glimmer, even, on the darkness of the world?

JUST AS TRUE TODAY

Mr. President, to me, that eloquent tribute to what the world was expecting of America in the way of leadership in 1832 is just as true today. That our unparalleled prosperity, as well as our freedom and happiness, has been due in a large measure to our unique form of government cannot be questioned. At a time when our physical security is seriously threatened from abroad by communism and our fiscal security threatened at home because of debts already incurred and pending proposals to still further increase them, it well behooves us to review the concept of the Founding Fathers of what Webster called American constitutional liberty. Webster said:

> The domestic policy of Washington found its polestar in the avowed objects of the Constitution itself. He sought so to administer that Constitution as to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty. These were objects interesting in the highest degree to the whole country, and his policy embraced the whole country.

It must be frankly admitted, however, that during the formative years from 1789 to 1837 there were serious differences of opinion as to what the Constitution authorized the Federal Government to do in the domestic field and what it did not. Naturally, the subject of internal improvements such as roads and canals in the early days of the Government became the subject of heated debate. The recent proposal of the Clay Commission that the Federal Government embark upon a roadbuilding program involving an expenditure of more than $100 billion in the next decade was the occasion for me to refresh my memory of the position taken by some of the first Presidents on that subject.

APPLICATION TO HIGHWAY FINANCING

Their warnings, as I shall point out in quoting their statements, seem especially apt if we are to adopt new principles of highway financing which not only would enlarge the control of the central Government over paths of commerce within the States, but which would at the same time lessen the financial control of the elected representatives of the people over this program.

Before reviewing that history, however, I wish to make clear that I speak from an attitude similar to that of Andrew Jackson in 1830 when, in a message to the Congress vetoing a public-road bill, he said:

> Sincerely friendly to the improvement of our country by means of roads and canals, I regret that any difference of opinion in the mode of contributing to it should exist between us; and if in stating this difference I go beyond what the occasion may be deemed to call for, I hope to find an apology in the great importance of the subject, an unfeigned respect for the high source from which this branch of it has emanated and an anxious wish to be correctly understood by my constitutents in the discharge of all my duties.

While it is well known to my Virginia friends, many of my distinguished colleagues in the Senate may not know that one of my major political undertakings in Virginia was the improvement of our State highways. In the summer of 1915, when I first announced my candidacy for the Virginia State Senate, I announced a platform in which the principal plank was advocacy of a State highway system for Virginia and a State-financed program to construct it.

During my first term in the State senate, I, along with my deskmate, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, was a copatron of the bill to establish this State system; and when the bill became law, Senator BYRD and I were appointed by the governor as members of a commission to lay out the highway system. The report of that commission was adopted by the general assembly 2 years later.

Since there were at that time no State funds for highway construction, I sponsored a bill—subsequently known as the Robertson road law—which authorized the State to repay out of general State funds, when available, but without interest, any money advanced by a county for construction of roads within the State highway system.

Such slow progress was made during the first 2 years of operation under that law, that a bill was introduced in the assembly to submit to the voters a proposal for a State bond issue for highway construction. That bill passed the house, but when it reached the senate, Senator HARRY F. BYRD organized a fight against it, and delegated to me the chief responsibility for presenting our objections to the senate.

We were defeated in the senate by a majority of one vote; but when the issue went to the voters of the State, for ratification in the general election in 1923, Senator BYRD led the fight against it, and it was defeated by a substantial majority. The next session of the general assembly imposed a gas tax and an automobile license tax, and Virginia has proceeded ever since on that pay-as-you-go basis.

With all due deference to other States which have adopted other systems of highway financing, it is my conviction that Virginia's present system of farm-to-market roads, as well as arterial highways, gives solid proof of the argument we offered three decades ago that we could get good roads for less money by paying for them as they were built. The agreement of Virginians generally with that viewpoint was indicated in the fall of 1953, when one of the major issues in the gubernatorial campaign was again a State bond issue for roads; and the Republican who advocated the bond issue was defeated by the Democrat who opposed it.

My personal views on the subject of methods which should be used for improving our national highway system naturally are influenced by this background of experience in my own State.

I also have been influenced, however, by the thinking of former Virginians who played leading parts in national affairs, and who felt, as Andrew Jackson did, when he told the Congress in 1834:

I am not hostile to internal improvements, and wish to see them extended to every part of the country. But I am fully persuaded, if they are not commenced in a proper manner, confined to proper objects, and conducted under an authority generally conceded to be rightful, that a successful prosecution of them cannot be reasonably expected.

THOMAS JEFFERSON'S VIEWS

In his second inaugural address in 1805, Thomas Jefferson suggested that when the Government's debt had been redeemed, the revenue from tariffs which would then be released might be divided among the States, "and a coresponding amendment of the Constitution be applied in time of peace to rivers, canals, roads, arts, manufactures, education, and other great objects within each State."

The following year, in his sixth annual message to the Congress, Jefferson again indicated his belief that new constitutional authority would be needed if funds collected by the Federal Government were to be used for improvements within the States. Referring to taxes on "foreign luxuries, purchased by those only who are rich enough to afford themselves the use of them," he said:

Their patriotism would certainly prefer its continuance and application to the great purposes of the public education, roads, rivers, canals, and such other objects of public improvement as it may be thought proper to add to the constitutional enumeration of Federal powers.

Jefferson added:

I suppose an amendment to the Constitution, by consent of the States, necessary, because the objects now recommended are not among those enumerated in the Constitution, and to which it permits public moneys to be applied.

In his last annual message to the Congress in November of 1808 when Jefferson again raised the question of what should be done with surplus revenue in future years, he said:

While uncertain of the course of things, the time may be advantageously employed in obtaining the powers necessary for a system of improvements should that be thought best.

WHAT MADISON SAID

An indication that James Madison, who followed Jefferson in the Presidency, was concerned about the question of Federal authority to sponsor internal improvements is found in his seventh annual message to the Congress in 1815. Madison then said:

Among the means of advancing the public interest the occasion is a proper one for recalling the attention of Congress to the great importance of establishing throughout our country the roads and canals which can best be executed under the national authority. No objects within the circle of political economy so richly repay the expense bestowed on them; there are none the utility of which is more universally ascertained and acknowledged; none that do more honor to the Government whose wise and enlarged patriotism duly appreciates them. * * *

Whilst the States individually, with a laudable enterprise and emulation, avail themselves of their local advantage by new roads, by navigable canals, and by improving the streams susceptible of navigation, the general Government is the more urged to similar understakings, requiring a national jurisdiction and national means, by the prospect of thus systematically completing so inestimable a work; and it is a happy reflection that any defect in constitutional authority which may be encountered can be supplied in a mode which the Constitution itself has providently pointed out.

Madison's final message to Congress the following year contained a similar passage, inviting attention "to the expediency of exercising their existing powers and, where necessary, of resorting to the prescribed mode of enlarging them, in order to effectuate a comprehensive system of roads and canals."

WARNINGS FROM MONROE

The same note was sounded again in 1817 by James Monroe in his first inaugural address when he said:

Other interests of high importance will claim attention, among which the improvement of our country by roads and canals, proceeding always with a constitutional sanction, holds a distinguished place.

In his first annual message in December of that same year Monroe gave a more explicit statement of his philosophy on this subject. After speaking of the advantages to be derived from good roads and canals because of the extent of territory within the United States he said:

A difference of opinion has existed from the first formation of our Constitution to the present time among our most enlightened and virtuous citizens respecting the right of Congress to establish such a system of improvement. * * * Disregarding early impressions I have bestowed on the subject all the deliberation which its great importance and a just sense of my duty required, and the result is a settled conviction in my mind that Congress does not possess the right. It is not sustained in any specific powers granted to Congress, nor can I consider it incidental to or a necessary means, viewed on the most liberal scale, for carrying into effect any of the powers which are specifically granted. In communicating this result I cannot resist the obligation which I feel to suggest to Congress the propriety of recommending to the States the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution which shall give to Congress the right in question. In cases of doubtful construction, especially of such vital interest, it comports with the nature and origin of our institutions and will contribute much to preserve them, to apply to our constituents for an explicit grant of the power. We may confidently rely that if it appears to their satisfaction that the power is necessary, it will always be granted.

Monroe's advice regarding a clarification of constitutional authority was ignored; and 5 years later, in 1822, he received a bill passed by the Congress for preservation and repair of the Cumberland Road, which had been started during Jefferson's administration. He vetoed it with a message stating that although he approved the policy of building such a road, he was "under a conviction that Congress does not possess the power under the Constitution to pass such a law."

This Cumberland Road bill had in common with the recent report of the Clay Commission a provision relating to collection of tolls for highway use. The comments of President Monroe on this practice and where it might lead are, I believe, worthy of our consideration. He said:

A power to establish turnpikes with gates and tolls, and to enforce collection of tolls by penalties, implies a power to adopt and execute a complete system of internal improvement. A right to impose duties to be paid by all persons passing a certain road, and on horses and carriages, as is done by this bill, involves the right to take the land from the proprietor on a valuation and to pass laws for the protection of the road from injuries, and if it exists as to one road it exists as to any other, and to as many roads as Congress may think proper to establish.

A right to legislate for one of these purposes is a right to legislate for the others. It is a complete right of jurisdiction and sovereignty for all the purposes of internal improvement, and not merely the right of applying money under the power vested in Congress to make appropriations, under which power, with the consent of the States through which this road passes, the work was originally commenced, and has been so far executed.

I am of the opinion that Congress does not possess this power; that the States individually cannot grant it, for although they may assent to the appropriation of money within their limits for such purposes, they can grant no power of jurisdiction or sovereignty by special compacts with the United States. This power can be granted only by an amendment to the Constitution and in the mode prescribed by it.

Monroe then reviewed the powers specifically granted by the Constitution or incidental to some power specifically

granted, and concluded that the power in question could not be derived from any of these.

I must confess I am apprehensive that if the Federal Government now adopts a plan under which the States are encouraged to set up corporations to build roads, with assurance that the obligations of these privately controlled organizations will be backed by public tax funds, and especially if the plan encourages more roads on which users must pay tolls, we will find ourselves in the kind of situation envisoned by Monroe, with the Federal Government not only calling the tune on how these roads shall be built, what fees shall be charged, and how traffic over them shall be controlled, but also with this system used as a lever to promote similar Federal intervention in education, manufactures, arts, and all the objects which Jefferson described as advantageous when properly undertaken.

The insidious nature of such Federal expansion also is well illustrated by Monroe's experience. In 1817, as I have pointed out, he denied the right of Congress to establish internal improvements, and suggested the need for a constitutional amendment. In 1822, he vetoed a Cumberland Road bill with the message from which I have quoted. But in his annual message to Congress in December of the same year, he had reached the point of saying that if Congress did not recommend the amendment which he had advocated:

> They have, according to my judgment, the right to keep the road in repair by providing for the superintendence of it and appropriating the money necessary for repairs. Surely—

Monroe said—

> if they had the right to appropriate money to make the road, they have a right to appropriate it to preserve the road from ruin.

Thus, the practical necessity of dealing with a project whose value for "all military and commercial operations, and also those of the Post Office Department," Monroe said, "cannot be estimated too highly," forced him to approve spending money for upkeep of a road which he clearly thought the Government had no right to sponsor in the first instance.

And in his message of December 2, 1823, which is remembered today primarily because in it he announced the great doctrine of international relations which bears his name, Monroe went a step further. He said the Cumberland road would require annual repairs; and since Congress had not recommended an amendment to the Constitution to provide power for undertaking internal improvements, he suggested that the Executive be authorized to enter into an arrangement with the several States through which the road passed, for them to establish tolls each within their own limits.

VAN BUREN'S RESOLUTION

In December of 1825, Senator Martin Van Buren offered a motion stating that Congress does not possess the power to build roads and canals within the States, and proposing that a committee be appointed to report a joint resolution for an amendment to the Constitution "prescribing and defining the power Congress shall have over the subject of internal improvements, and subjecting the same to such restrictions as shall effectually protect the sovereignty of the respective States, and secure to them a just distribution of the benefits resulting from all appropriations made for that purpose."

In discussing his motion Van Buren said that the constitutional power of Congress to legislate on this subject had been a source of unbroken and frequently angry and unpleasant controversy, and that even those who agreed as to existence of the power differed in almost everything else in regard to it.

He said the intimate connection between the prosperity of the country and works of this description would always induce efforts to have the Federal Government undertake them and there was little reason to believe its claim of power would ever be abandoned. He felt, therefore, that it was the duty of Congress to have the question settled in the only way that could be final—an amendment of the Constitution "prescribing and defining what Congress may and what they shall not do."

No action was taken on the Van Buren resolution.

ANDREW JACKSON'S PHILOSOPHY

Internal improvement programs which had expanded rapidly during John Quincy Adams' administration were checked and tested once more after the election of Andrew Jackson, but by this time the line of battle had been withdrawn from the question of whether the Federal Government could undertake improvements to the issue of how far it could go in undertaking works of primarily, or even exclusively, local benefit.

In recalling the position taken by Jackson on this question, I hope to have the attention particularly of those colleagues with whom I have sometimes disagreed as to policies involving the TVA and other proposed authorities for river-valley development.

One of the show places near Nashville, Tenn., in the heart of the Tennesese Valley Authority's electrical empire, is the Hermitage, the stately columned home of Andrew Jackson. The thousands of visitors who go there every year see many objects intimately connected with Jackson's life, which are quite interesting, but it might also be helpful if they could be reminded of his emphatic views on the subject of limiting Federal activities to those of "general, not local, national not State, benefit," and his warning of the dangers of violating this principle.

Jackson would not have been blind to the value of a river-valley development program or of an expanded system of highways, including better farm-to-market roads. He said in his first annual message to the Congress in 1829:

> Every member of the Union, in peace and in war, will be benefited by the improvement of inland navigation and the construction of highways in the several States.

But, he continued:

> Let us, then, endeavor to attain this benefit in a mode which will be satisfactory to all. That hitherto adopted has by many of our fellow-citizens been deprecated as an infraction of the Constitution, while by others it has been viewed as inexpedient. All feel that it has been employed at the expense of harmony in the legislative councils.
>
> To avoid these evils it appears to me that the most safe, just, and Federal disposition which could be made of the surplus revenue (which he said was anticipated when the public debt had been paid) would be its apportionment among the several States according to their ratio of representation, and should this measure not be found warranted by the Constitution, that it would be expedient to propose to the States an amendment authorizing it. I regard an appeal to the source of power in cases of real doubt, and where its exercise is deemed indispensable to the general welfare, as among the most sacred of all our obligations.
>
> Upon this country more than any other has, in the providence of God, been cast the special guardianship of the great principle of adherence to written constitutions. If it fail here, all hope in regard to it will be extinguished. That this was intended to be a government of limited and specific, and not general, powers must be admitted by all, and it is our duty to preserve for it the character intended by its framers. If experience points out the necessity for an enlargement of these powers, let us apply for it to those for whose benefit it is to be exercised, and not undermine the whole system by a resort to overstrained constructions. * * * The great mass of legislation relating to our internal affairs was intended to be left where the Federal Convention found it—in the State governments. * * * I cannot, therefore, too strongly or too earnestly, for my own sense of its importance, warn you against all encroachments upon the legitimate sphere of State sovereignty.

The following year Jackson gave substance to this statement of his theoretical position by vetoing a public roads bill and giving in more detail his views on enlargement of Federal power to undertake internal improvements.

Jackson said the constitutional power of the Federal Government to construct or promote works of internal improvement had two angles, one bearing on the sovereignty of the States and the other having to do with the right to appropriate money for use by the States without a claim of Federal jurisdiction.

As to invading the sovereignty of States by undertaking public works without their approval, Jackson said power to this extent never had been exercised and that the Federal Government did not have such power and could not be given it by legislation.

As to appropriations, he said the view had been taken at an early period of the Government that money could be applied only to objects covered by the enumerated authorities vested in the Congress but that subsequent administrations had adopted "a more enlarged construction" of the power.

He recalled the Louisiana Purchase and the original appropriation for the Cumberland Road during Jefferson's administration and said no less than 23 laws had been passed appropriating more than $2,500,000 out of the National Treasury to support the Cumberland Road and he cited statements of Madison as conceding that the right of appropriation is "not limited by the power to carry into effect the measure for which the money is asked, as was formerly contended."

Jackson also referred to the views of Monroe and John Quincy Adams and then said:

This brief reference to known facts will be sufficient to show the difficulty, if not the impracticability, of bringing back the operations of the Government to the construction of the Constitution set up in 1798, assuming that to be its true reading in relation to the power under consideration, thus giving an admonitory proof of the force of implication and the necessity of guarding the Constitution with sleepless vigilance against the authority of precedents which have not the sanction of its most plainly defined powers.

He said grants by the Government always had been professedly under the general principle that the works should be "of a general, not legal, national, nor State" character and "a disregard of this distinction would of necessity lead to the subversion of the Federal system." He added that he viewed the bill under consideration as "a measure of purely local character" and said, "if it can be considered national, then no further distinction between the appropriate duties of the General and State governments need be attempted, for there can be no local interest that may not with equal propriety be denominated national."

Discussing the Nation's budgetary situation, Jackson said it should be possible to extinguish the national debt in another 4 years but that appropriations for internal improvements were increasing at a rate which pointed to either a continuance of the debt or resort to additional taxes.

He said a republic free of debt would exercise a salutary influence upon the cause of liberal principles and free government throughout the world, and a course of policy destined to witness events like these cannot be benefited by a legislation which tolerates a scramble for appropriations that have no relation to any general system of improvement and whose good effects must of necessity be very limited.

That statement of Andrew Jackson I commend to your particular attention. Today our choice is not between promptly extinguishing the national debt or extending it but is rather between adding to an already enormous debt or reaching the point where we shall begin to reduce it. But, certainly in our day, as in Jackson's, the course we follow will have an influence upon the cause of free government throughout the world.

Jackson went on to say—and I associate myself with his views on this point:

I will not detain you with professions of zeal in the cause of internal improvements. * * * But, although all are their friends, but few, I trust, are unmindful of the means by which they should be promoted; none certainly are so degenerate as to desire their success at the cost of that sacred instrument with the preservation of which is indissolubly bound our country's hopes.

Jackson again suggested that if the people wanted the Federal Government to build roads and canals there should be a constitutional amendment delegating, defining, and restricting the power.

In 1830 Jackson vetoed another bill authorizing subscription of stock in the Washington Turnpike Road Company and in his second annual message in December of that year he referred to two other internal improvement bills which he had vetoed.

He said he would not have withheld consent from a bill making direct appropriations for such objects but "in speaking of direct appropriations I mean not to include a practice which has obtained to some extent, and to which I have in one instance, in a different capacity, given my assent—that of subscribing to the stock of private associations."

Positive experience—

Jackson continued—

and a more thorough consideration of the subject have convinced me of the impropriety as well as the inexpediency of such investments. All improvements effected by the funds of the Nation for general use should be open to the enjoyment of all our fellow-citizens, exempt from the payment of tolls or any imposition of that character.

The practice of thus mingling the concerns of the Government with those of the States or of individuals is inconsistent with the object of its institution and is highly impolitic. The successful operation of the Federal system can only be preserved by confining it to the few and simple, but yet important, objects for which it was designed.

A different practice, if allowed to progress, would ultimately change the character of this Government by consolidating into one the general and State governments, which were intended to kept forever distinct. * * * If the interest of the Government in private companies is subordinate to that of individuals, the management and control of a portion of the public funds is delegated to an authority unknown to the Constitution and beyond the supervision of our constituents; if superior, its officers and agents will be constantly exposed to imputations of favoritism and oppression.

The power which the General Government would acquire within the several States by becoming the principal stockholder in corporations controlling every canal and each 60 or 100 miles of every important road, and giving a disproportionate vote in all their elections, is almost inconceivable, and in my view dangerous to the liberties of the people.

This mode of aiding such works is also in its nature deceptive, and in many cases conducive to improvidence in the administration of the national funds. Appropriations will be obtained with much greater facility and granted with less security to the public interest when the measure is thus disguised than when the definite and direct expenditures of money are asked for.

That, Mr. President, is a statement which I wish might have been studied and heeded by the authors of the recent report which proposed commiting the Federal Government to participation in an expanded program for toll highways and other roads which might be more lightly undertaken because direct appropriations for the purpose would not be required.

Jackson touched on this subject again in his fourth annual message to the Congress when he said:

Besides the danger to which it exposes Congress of making hasty appropriations to works of the character of which they may be frequently ignorant, it promotes a mischievous and corrupting influence upon elections by holding out to the people the fallacious hope that the success of a certain candidate will make navigable their neighboring creek or river, bring commerce to their doors, and increase the value of their property. It thus favors combinations to squander the treasure of the country upon a multitude of local objects, as fatal to just legislation as to the purity of public men.

If a system compatible with the Constitution cannot be devised which is free from such tendencies, we should recollect that that instrument provides within itself the mode of its amendment, and that there is, therefore, no excuse for the assumption of doubtful powers by the General Government

Improvements must be made with the money of the people, and if the money can be collected and applied by those more simple and economical political machines, the State governments, it will unquestionably be safer and better for the people than to add to the splendor, the patronage, and the power of the General Government.

In his sixth annual message, Jackson again expressed his concern over the course being taken by the Government in expanding its program of support for internal improvements.

He recalled that during his first year as President, when he had vetoed a bill authorizing the Federal Government to subscribe for stock in the Maysville and Lexington Turnpike Co., internal improvement bills already approved by congressional committees called for spending $106 million and bills calling for another $100 million of similar spending still were pending. To understand the significance of these figures, it should be pointed out that Jackson had estimated Federal revenue collections for that year at $24,600,000. So, the proposed spending for internal improvements was more than eight times the total of the Government's annual revenue. A program of similar proportions in relation to Federal revenues today would amount to around $475 billion, so no wonder Jackson was alarmed.

He told the Congress:

To suppose that because our Government has been instituted for the benefit of the people it must therefore, have the power to do whatever may seem to conduce to the public good is an error into which even honest minds are too apt to fall. * * *

I am not hostile to internal improvements, and wish to see them extended to every part of the country. But I am fully persuaded, if they are not commenced in a proper manner, confined to proper objects, and conducted under an authority generally conceded to be rightful, that a successful prosecution of them cannot be reasonably expected.

Mr. President, I have deliberately chosen to make these remarks to the Senate before I have had an opportunity to examine any bill to implement the President's recommendations for a future highway program, because I wanted to deal with principles rather than any specific legislation. We are clearly dealing with an assumed power and should move cautiously in exercising it. Each proposal should be carefully weighed not only from the standpoint of the benefits it promises to our generation, but also from the standpoint of the ultimate effect it might have on our cherished institutions. A constitution of all sail and no anchor means a government wrecked on the rocks of a loose fiscal policy.

My purpose today has been merely to illuminate some of the warning signs placed by those who have preceded us and to plead, as the writer of Proverbs

did to the children of Israel: "Remove not the ancient landmark which thy fathers have set."

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Edward J. Devitt, of Minnesota, to be United States district judge for the district of Minnesota;

Philip L. Rice, of Hawaii, to be associate justice of the supreme court, Territory of Hawaii, vice Louis LeBaron; and

George Glenn Killinger, of Virginia, to be a member of the Board of Parole.

By Mr. DANIEL, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Russell B. Wine, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the western district of Texas, vice Charles F. Herring, resigned.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Philip D. Reed, of New York, and Erwin D. Canham, of Massachusetts, to be members of the United States Advisory Commission on Information;

John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to India, and to serve concurrently as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Nepal; and

Donald R. Heath, of Kansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Lebanon.

THE SOUTHEAST ASIA COLLECTIVE DEFENSE TREATY AND THE PROTOCOL THERETO

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Executive K, the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty and the protocol thereto, commonly known as the SEATO treaty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the treaty by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Executive K, 83d Congress, 2d session, the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty and the protocol thereto, both signed at Manila on September 8, 1954.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the treaty (Executive K, 83d Cong., 2d sess.), the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty and the protocol thereto, both signed at Manila on September 8, 1954, which was read the second time, as follows:

SOUTHEAST ASIA COLLECTIVE DEFENSE TREATY

The Parties to this Treaty,

Recognizing the sovereign equality of all the Parties,

Reiterating their faith in the purposes and principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all governments,

Reaffirming that, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, they uphold the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and declaring that they will earnestly strive by every peaceful means to promote self-government and to secure the independence of all countries whose peoples desire it and are able to undertake its responsibilities,

Desiring to strengthen the fabric of peace and freedom and to uphold the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law, and to promote the economic well-being and development of all peoples in the treaty area,

Intending to declare publicly and formally their sense of unity, so that any potential aggressor will appreciate that the Parties stand together in the area, and

Desiring further to coordinate their efforts for collective defense for the preservation of peace and security,

Therefore agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

The Parties undertake, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle any international disputes in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered, and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

ARTICLE II

In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this Treaty the Parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack and to prevent and counter subversive activities directed from without against their territorial integrity and political stability.

ARTICLE III

The Parties undertake to strengthen their free institutions and to cooperate with one another in the further development of economic measures, including technical assistance, designed both to promote economic progress and social well-being and to further the individual and collective efforts of governments toward these ends.

ARTICLE IV

1. Each Party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the Parties or against any State or territory which the Parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes. Measures taken under this paragraph shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations.

2. If, in the opinion of any of the Parties, the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any Party in the treaty area or of any other State or territory to which the provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article from time to time apply is threatened in any way other than by armed attack or is affected or threatened by any fact or situation which might endanger the peace of the area, the Parties shall consult immediately in order to agree on the measures which should be taken for the common defense.

3. It is understood that no action on the territory of any State designated by unanimous agreement under paragraph 1 of this Article or on any territory so designated shall be taken except at the invitation or with the consent of the government concerned.

ARTICLE V

The Parties hereby establish a Council, on which each of them shall be represented, to consider matters concerning the implementation of this Treaty. The Council shall provide for consultation with regard to military and any other planning as the situation obtaining in the treaty area may from time to time require. The Council shall be so organized as to be able to meet at any time.

ARTICLE VI

This Treaty does not affect and shall not be interpreted as affecting in any way the rights and obligations of any of the Parties under the Charter of the United Nations or the responsibility of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security. Each Party declares that none of the international engagements now in force between it and any other of the Parties or any third party is in conflict with the provisions of this Treaty, and undertakes not to enter into any international engagement in conflict with this Treaty.

ARTICLE VII

Any other State in a position to further the objectives of this Treaty and to contribute to the security of the area may, by unanimous agreement of the Parties, be invited to accede to this Treaty. Any State so invited may become a Party to the Treaty by depositing its instrument of accession with the Government of the Republic of the Philippines. The Government of the Republic of the Philippines shall inform each of the Parties of the deposit of each such instrument of accession.

ARTICLE VIII

As used in this Treaty, the "treaty area" is the general area of Southeast Asia, including also the entire territories of the Asian Parties, and the general area of the Southwest Pacific not including the Pacific area north of 21 degrees 30 minutes north latitude. The Parties may, by unanimous agreement, amend this Article to include within the treaty area the territory of any State acceding to this Treaty in accordance with Article VII or otherwise to change the treaty area.

ARTICLE IX

1. This Treaty shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the Republic of the Philippines. Duly certified copies thereof shall be transmitted by that government to the other signatories.

2. The Treaty shall be ratified and its provisions carried out by the Parties in accordance with their respective constitutional processes. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited as soon as possible with the Government of the Republic of the Philippines, which shall notify all of the other signatories of such deposit.

3. The Treaty shall enter into force between the States which have ratified it as soon as the instruments of ratification of a majority of the signatories shall have been deposited, and shall come into effect with respect to each other State on the date of the deposit of its instrument of ratification.

ARTICLE X

This Treaty shall remain in force indefinitely, but any Party may cease to be a Party one year after its notice of denunciation has been given to the Government of the Republic of Philippines, which shall inform the Governments of the other Parties of the deposit of each notice of denunciation.

ARTICLE XI

The English text of this Treaty is binding on the Parties, but when the Parties have agreed to the French text thereof and have so notified the Government of the Republic of the Philippines, the French text shall be equally authentic and binding on the Parties.

Understanding of the United States of America

The United States of America is executing the present Treaty does so with the understanding that its recognition of the effect of aggression and armed attack and its agreement with reference thereto in Article IV, paragraph 1, apply only to communist aggression but affirms that in the event of other aggression or armed attack it will consult under the provisions of Article IV, paragraph 2.

In witness whereof, the undersigned Plenipotentiaries have signed this Treaty.

Done at Manila, this eighth day of September, 1954.

For Australia:
R. G. CASEY.

For France:
G. LA CHAMBRE.

For New Zealand:
CLIFTON WEBB.

For Pakistan:
Signed for transmission to my Government for its consideration and action in accordance with the Constitution of Pakistan.
ZAFRULLA KHAN.

For the Republic of the Philippines:
CARLOS P. GARCIA.
FRANCISCO A. DELGADO.
TOMAS L. CABILI.
LORENZO M. TAÑADA.
CORNELIO T. VILLAREAL.

For the Kingdom of Thailand.
WAN WAITHAYAKON KROMMUN NARADHIP BONGSPRABANDH.

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
READING.

For the United States of America:
JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD.

I certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty concluded and signed in the English language at Manila, on September 8, 1954, the signed original of which is deposited in the archives of the Government of the Republic of the Philippines.

In testimony whereof, I, RAUL S. MANGLAPUS, Undersecretary of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of the Philippines, have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the Department of Foreign Affairs to be affixed at the City of Manila, this 14th day of October, 1954.

[SEAL] RAUL S. MANGLAPUS,
Undersecretary of Foreign Affairs.

PROTOCOL TO THE SOUTHEAST ASIA COLLECTIVE DEFENSE TREATY

DESIGNATION OF STATES AND TERRITORY AS TO WHICH PROVISIONS OF ARTICLE IV AND ARTICLE III ARE TO BE APPLICABLE

The Parties to the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty unanimously designate for the purposes of Article IV of the Treaty the States of Cambodia and Laos and the free territory under the jurisdiction of the State of Vietnam.

The Parties further agree that the above mentioned states and territory shall be eligible in respect of the economic measures contemplated by Article III.

This Protocol shall enter into force simultaneously with the coming into force of the Treaty.

In witness whereof, the undersigned Plenipotentiaries have signed this Protocol to the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty.

Done at Manila, this eighth day of September, 1954.

For Australia:
R. G. CASEY.

For France:
G. LA CHAMBRE.

For New Zealand:
CLIFTON WEBB.

For Pakistan:
Signed for transmission to my Government for its consideration and action in accordance with the Constitution of Pakistan.
ZAFRULLA KHAN.

For the Republic of the Philippines:
CARLOS P. GARCIA.
FRANCISCO A. DELGADO.
TOMAS L. CABILI.
LORENZO M. TAÑADA.
CORNELIO T. VILLAREAL.

For the Kingdom of Thailand:
WAN WAITHAYAKON KROMMUN NARADHIP BONGSPRABANDH.

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
READING.

For the United States of America:
JOHN FOSTER DULLES.
H. ALEXANDER SMITH.
MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD.

I certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the Protocol to the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty concluded and signed in the English language at Manila, on September 8, 1954, the signed original of which is deposited in the archives of the Government of the Republic of the Philippines.

In testimony whereof, I, RAUL S. MANGLAPUS, Undersecretary of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of the Philippines, have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the Department of Foreign Affairs to be affixed at the City of Manila, this 14th day of October 1954.

[SEAL] RAUL S. MANGLAPUS,
Undersecretary of Foreign Affairs.

PACIFIC CHARTER

The Delegates of Australia, France, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Republic of the Philippines, the Kingdom of Thailand, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America;

Desiring to establish a firm basis for common action to maintain peace and security in Southeast Asia and the Southwest Pacific;

Convinced that common action to this end, in order to be worthy and effective, must be inspired by the highest principles of justice and liberty;

Do hereby proclaim:

First, in accordance with the provisions of the United Nations Charter, they uphold the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples and they will earnestly strive by every peaceful means to promote self-government and to secure the independence of all countries whose peoples desire it and are able to undertake its responsibilities;

Second, they are each prepared to continue taking effective practical measures to ensure conditions favorable to the orderly achievement of the foregoing purposes in accordance with their constitutional processes;

Third, they will continue to cooperate in the economic, social and cultural fields in order to promote higher living standards, economic progress and social well-being in this region;

Fourth, as declared in the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, they are determined to prevent or counter by appropriate means any attempt in the treaty area to subvert their freedom or to destroy their sovereignty or territorial integrity.

Proclaimed at Manila, this eighth day of September, 1954.

(Initialed by R. G. Casey),
Delegate of Australia.
(Initialed by G. La Chambre),
Delegate of France.
(Initialed by Clifton Webb),
Delegate of New Zealand.
(Sgd.) ZAFRULLA KHAN,
Delegate of Pakistan.
(Sgd.) CARLOS P. GARCIA,
(Sgd.) FRANCISCO A. DELGADO,
(Sgd.) TOMAS L. CABILI,
(Sgd.) LORENZO M. TAÑADA,
(Sgd.) CORNELIO T. VILLAREAL,
Delegates of the Republic of the Philippines.
(Sgd.) WAN WAITHAYAKON KROMMUN NARADHIP BONGSPRABANDH,
Delegate of the Kingdom of Thailand.
(Initialed ad referendum by Reading),
Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.
(Sgd.) JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
(Sgd.) H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
(Sgd.) MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD,
Delegates of the United States of America.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that the yeas and nays be ordered on the resolution of ratification of the pending treaty.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The treaty is before the Senate and is open to amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have been absent from the floor attending a policy committee meeting. Do I correctly understand that the Senate is now in executive session and that the treaty is before the Senate in executive session?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, on January 21, last, the Committee on Foreign Relations ordered reported to the Senate the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty signed at Manila on September 8 of last year. The committee recommended by a vote of 14 to 1 that the Senate give its advice and consent to the ratification of this important and desirable document.

In the face of unremitting danger from Communist aggression and subversion, we have long hoped that the nations of this sensitive area could be brought together in a solid unity for security and peace. The Manila pact is an impressive stride toward that goal. It is the capstone of a structure of security treaties in the Pacific which the United States began to build 4 years ago.

Prior to the Southeast Asia Treaty we had concluded mutual defense agreements with Korea, the Philippines, Aus-

tralia, New Zealand, and Japan, but these bilateral or trilateral arrangements were not regarded as definitive solutions of the Pacific defense problem. They expressly contemplated the development of a more comprehensive, collective security system when circumstances made that feasible.

Two distinguished Members of this body accompanied the American delegation to Manila and actively participated in the deliberations of the Conference. The senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] returned with praise and enthusiasm for the spirit shown by the other signatories and the determination they manifested to preserve their freedom and independence. The preservation of that freedom is a primary objective of the treaty. It is, moreover, of vital concern to the United States; for we have realized that any significant extension of the Communist world would generate the gravest danger for our own Nation.

PURPOSE OF THE TREATY

To the extent that we support the independent governments of Southeast Asia in maintaining their freedom, therefore, we also defend the highest interests of the United States. It is our purpose, Mr. President, to give advance notice to any Communist nation contemplating aggressive action in that area that they will have to reckon with the United States. Like the other security treaties which have preceded it, the Southeast Asia Pact is inspired by the conviction that a potential aggressor may be deterred from reckless conduct by a clear-cut declaration of our intentions. Never again must it be said that a world war broke out because the enemy miscalculated what we would do.

The Southeast Asia Defense Treaty is not directed against any people or against any government. It is a threat to no nation, but rather proof of our will to live in peace and to preserve the peace through collective action. It is directed only against aggression, whether direct or indirect, and for the United States it applies only to Communist aggression.

The treaty now before the Senate attempts to meet the threat to freedom in Southeast Asia by a dual course of action. In the first place, it provides for countermeasures in the case of an armed attack upon any of the parties or upon any of the territories covered by the treaty. In the second place, it deals with the difficult problem of indirect aggression and subversion directed from without, which are familiar weapons of world communism.

The heart of the treaty on these two matters, Mr. President, is article IV, which we gave a most careful examination in the committee. Article IV, paragraph 1, of that article provides as follows:

> Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the parties or against any state or territory which the parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes.

The obligation we assume in this provision is patterned after commitments we have already approved in the Korean, Philippine, and Australia-New Zealand defense treaties, but there are several significant differences. It introduces a new concept, that of the flexibility of the area to which the treaty may apply. Article VIII of the treaty defines the area covered as the general area of southeast Asia, and the general area of the Southwest Pacific not including the Pacific area north of 21 degrees 30 minutes north latitude. If the parties unanimously agree to do so, they can modify or enlarge the treaty area, or designate additional states or territories which benefit from the protection given in case of an armed attack. This provision, Mr. President, does not signify that the executive branch of our Government can expand the scope of the treaty by its own action or decision. On the contrary, the administration has made it quite clear that any proposed change of this kind would require the advice and consent of the Senate. It would have to be ratified as in the case of any other treaty.

One such agreement has already been concluded, and is submitted to the Senate for ratification along with the treaty. I refer to the protocol which designates the States of Cambodia and Laos, and the free territory of Vietnam, as coming within the purview of article IV. The protocol really is an alternative method of extending the treaty itself to those states. Because of certain provisions in the Geneva armistice agreements pertaining to the Indochina war, there was some question as to whether the remaining associated states could properly subscribe to the treaty as signatory parties. However, since they indicated their desire to come under the umbrella of protection which article IV furnishes, this was accomplished by the protocol which the signatory parties signed on the same date as the treaty.

UNITED STATES COMMITMENTS

Just what is the nature of the obligation we have assumed under article IV, paragraph 1? It is important to point out that the approach used in this treaty reproduces what Secretary of State Dulles has described as the "Monroe Doctrine" formula, which appears in the previous security treaties concluded by Mr. Dulles. This approach embodies the concept that an armed attack within the treaty area would be "dangerous to our peace and safety," the language employed by President Monroe. We therefore agree to meet the danger in accordance with our constitutional processes. The formula avoids the constitutional controversy which was provoked by the principle of the North Atlantic Treaty that "an attack upon one is an attack upon all."

Under that principle, an attack made upon one of the other parties is regarded as tantamount to an attack upon the United States, even if it were not made against our territory. By contrast, the present treaty leaves no doubt that the constitutional powers of the Congress and the President are exactly where they stood before. It has no effect whatsoever on the thorny question of whether, how, and under what circumstances the President might involve the United States in warfare without the approval of Congress.

I should also like to emphasize that only a Communist armed attack will bring the treaty into play as far as our Government is concerned. An understanding to this effect is incorporated in the text of the treaty itself, and for a very good reason. The United States was the only country at Manila which did not have territorial interests in the treaty area. It could hardly be said that all kinds of armed attacks threatened our peace and safety, although we could quite properly say it of a Communist armed attack. As a result, for the other signatories the treaty is not only an anti-Communist pact, but a regional pact against aggression; whereas for the United States it is limited, as I have described, to an armed attack by a Communist country.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

The second notable feature of this treaty, Mr. President, is the manner in which it deals with subversive activities directed by an external power. Paragraph 2 of article IV refers to threats against the territorial integrity or political independence of any party protected by the treaty, by anything other than an armed attack, or "by any fact or situation which might endanger the peace of the area." In such circumstances, the parties agree "to consult immediately on the measures which should be taken for the common defense."

The treaty does not call for automatic action; it calls for consultation. If any course of action shall be agreed upon or decided upon, then that course of action must have the approval of Congress, because the constitutional process is provided for.

The provision I have just been discussing takes on added meaning when read in conjunction with article II. In that article the parties pledge that—

> By means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid [they] will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to * * * prevent and counter subversive activities directed from without against their territorial integrity and political stability.

It is clear that the threat to territorial integrity and political independence contemplated in article IV also encompasses acts of internal subversion. This does not mean that the United States has undertaken to suppress bona fide, local revolutions by the native population wherever they may break out. On the other hand, if there were a subversive, revolutionary movement in, let us say, Vietnam or Thailand, propagated by communism, that would be regarded as a threat to us. Even in that event we would not be bound to put it down. I cannot emphasize too strongly, Mr. President, that we have no obligation under this portion of article IV to take positive measures of any kind. All we are obligated to do is to consult together

about it. In the course of the consultation we would try to agree as to whether the situation called for action. It remains only to be noted that while the measures taken under paragraph 1 to meet an armed attack must be reported to the Security Council, no such requirement is postulated with respect to the measures which may be agreed upon under paragraph 2. I have discussed article IV at some length because it is that article which sets the course of our Nation in undertaking to strengthen this part of the free world in the critical period before us.

Mr. President, the nations of the free world sustained a serious setback in southeast Asia with the loss of northern Vietnam to the Communists. The peril to the southern area, the free territory of Vietnam, as well as to the remaining associated states, Laos and Cambodia, is serious, continuing, and unrelenting. It is important that our Government should act promptly to give approval to this treaty as an act of confidence in the determination of other governments in the area to defend their freedom, individual liberty, and independence. We should be proud to join with them in the cause of peace in this instrument of mutual trust and protection.

I strongly urge the Members of the Senate to give their advice and consent to the ratification of this treaty.

I may say, Mr. President, that of interest, or of possible interest, to the Senate is the fact that Thailand has completed its ratification process and has deposited its instrument of ratification with the Government of the Philippines, the depository government.

The following countries have completed necessary governmental action in the ratification process, but have not yet actually deposited their instruments of ratification: Australia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, France, and Pakistan.

The Philippine Congress reconvened late in January and has been going through its organizational phase. We are informed that it is expected that the Philippine Congress will complete ratification of the Manila Pact early in February.

Mr. President, the two distinguished Senators, both of whom are members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, who were in the Philippines at the time of the actual signing of the treaty are present, and are prepared to give to the Senate additional information regarding the treaty, and probably are prepared to answer any questions that might arise.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am happy to rise to support the position so ably set forth by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], in support of the treaty. As the chairman of the committee has stated, the committee voted in favor of the treaty by an overwhelming vote, and it comes before the Senate with the support of the committee.

I believe the Members of the Senate may be interested in some first-hand observations on the Conference which led to the negotiation of the treaty which is now under consideration. Together with the Secretary of State and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], I had the honor to serve as a delegate at the Manila meeting. It was a singular experience, and one of the most gratifying I have known in many years of public life.

In connection with the Conference, I should like to call attention to the splendid contribution of Secretary of State Dulles and the entire American delegation. I should like especially to call attention to the work of what was called the task force, under the leadership of the Counsellor of the Department of State, Mr. Douglas MacArthur II, which the Secretary of State sent to Manila 2 or 3 weeks before the Conference convened. This group of trained staff members of the State Department performed outstanding work in preparing the material on which we were to pass at the Conference, and thereby save a great amount of time in the Conference itself.

I am sure my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] will agree with me when I say that the careful planning of the State Department was very instrumental in producing the fine results which were obtained.

Of course, as a background for the treaty there were several years of contemplation over what was the best course to pursue in the far Pacific area in bringing together the freedom-loving nations to defend their own freedom and security.

ASIAN INITIATIVE

In pointing out the American contribution, I do not want to leave the impression that we ran the show at Manila. Quite the contrary; the United States was only 1 of 8 nations participating in the Conference. We did not in any way seek to dominate the proceedings. The initiative was assumed largely by the Philippines, as the host nation, and the other Asian countries.

I might say in passing, as a compliment to Secretary of State Dulles, who was representing the United States, that delegates from other nations who were present begged him to be Chairman. Very properly, in my judgment, he refused that office. The Conference was headed by the Vice President of the Philippines as Chairman. A masterly job was done by our Philippine brother in presiding over the Conference.

The manner in which President Magsaysay of the Philippines provided the necessary leadership to the Conference was most inspiring. I could not help but feel that the close association of his country and ours over the years, the education of the Filipinos in self-government, and the processes of democracy had yielded rich fruit.

To single out President Magsaysay's splendid work as presiding officer at the Conference is not to ignore the contribution of other Asian leaders. Sir Zafrulla Khan of Pakistan brought to bear the weight of his profound knowledge of the affairs of Asia and his insight into the Asian mind. From Prince Wan of Thailand came many of the important proposals which helped to shape the treaty, and, I might add, some of the most inspiring remarks we heard during the course of the Conference.

One of the most moving aspects of the Conference was to see these men, and other able statesmen of the new but ancient nations of the East, exercising the prerogatives of nationhood. They conducted themselves with restraint, with a high sense of responsibility, and with deep and compelling conviction. That they were acting on the basis of equality, in concert with great nations of the West, promises much for the future of southeast Asia.

I wish to stress that fact, because the attitude of absolute equality throughout the proceedings and the participation of the Asian countries were two of the most inspiring things I noted. I must express appreciation also for the support we received from the United Kingdom, France, and our special friends in the Pacific, Australia, and New Zealand.

Kipling has written in one of his famous poems:

> And never the twain shall meet.

He was referring to the East and the West, of course. However, we felt that at the inspiring Manila Conference real progress was made in bringing the East and the West together, particularly in view of the friendships made there between the representatives of the eastern countries and the representatives of the western countries.

NATURE OF THE TREATY

In that respect the treaty represents a reconciliation of the spirit of Asia and the West. As such it lays the basis for the development of an enduring security and sound peaceful relationships. We have achieved, I believe, a formula by which the West can safeguard its legitimate security interests in southeast Asia. And at the same time the nations of that area can protect themselves and can be protected from the further encroachments of the Chinese Communist imperialists, and, I may add, from encroachments by Soviet Russia if Russia should try to put her hand into that area. Of course, she already has done so, although on the surface she supposedly has not.

It is a formula that should react not only against overt aggression but against the more subtle but no less potent poisons of Communist infiltration and subversion. This is the first of our Far East Asia treaties, in which there is contained a section dealing especially with Communist infiltration and subversion, short of actual armed attack. In this particular treaty we are endeavoring to deal with that particular and very difficult problem.

The formula was not easy to devise. In southeast Asia a unique situation has existed which did not lend itself to precisely the same measures of collective defense that have come into practice elsewhere in the world. It was necessary to develop a defense against aggression that would take into consideration the sensitivity of the Asian nations to

any suggestion of western domination. In the Conference, because we are a stronger nation, we had to be very careful about appearing to tell them what to do. But under the skillful leadership of Secretary Dulles, the United States was kept in the background; and those who were there made the suggestions and took the leadership. The nations of that area, proud and jealous of their newly achieved freedom, would not accept any arrangement which might be construed as putting them in an inferior status, regardless of the defense against communism which it might offer them. Moreover, we could not in justice to our own ideals, traditions, and beliefs associate ourselves with any agreement based upon principles other than those of full national equality. The importance of maintaining the principle of full national equality and freedom and independence of all the participating countries was obvious every minute of the time we were there. The trend of the entire history of our activity in that part of the world has been in the direction of sustaining the rights of peoples to national freedom and self-government.

In the example of the Philippines, fortunately, we have tangible evidence of our faithfulness to that principle. We had no need to prove our professions of anticolonialism to the Asian members of the Conference. That they were meeting in Manila at the invitation of an independent Philippine Government spoke far more authoritatively of our intentions than words ever could.

AVOIDANCE OF THE NATO FORMULA

Mr. President, I wish to speak now of the avoidance of the NATO formula, to which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has already referred.

While it was clear from the outset that any formula for the defense of southeast Asia would be based on the equality of the participants, it was not equally evident that the NATO approach was not practicable in the situation there. When I say "the NATO approach," I refer to the provision of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization that an attack on one is an attack on all. That was the formula we did not think it wise to apply to this Far East Asian area. Some of the participants came to Manila with the intention of establishing an organization modeled on the lines of the North Atlantic Treaty arrangements. That would have been a compulsory arrangement for our military participation in case of any attack. Such an organization might have required the commitment of American ground forces to the Asian mainland. We carefully avoided any possible implication regarding an arrangement of that kind.

It was in contrasting the two situations, namely, the one in Europe and the one in southeast Asia, and in securing the understanding of the Asian nations in this respect—that is to say, with regard to Europe with the NATO program, and southeast Asia with the other approach—that Secretary Dulles was most effective.

There are real differences in the problems of defending the North Atlantic and southeast Asia. Had the Secretary not been successful in bringing them out, had these differences been ignored at Manila, the result could only have been the failure of the Conference or the creation of an unrealistic and misleading structure of defense among the free nations of the treaty area.

In the first place, the integration of the nations of southeast Asia has not progressed to the degree that it has among those of Western Europe. In southeast Asia national freedom is, for the most part, a new experience; and the Asian nations are very jealous of that freedom as they feel their way carefully and cautiously in a world of independent nations. They will find unity among themselves, I am sure; but they must find it in their own way and in their own time.

Moreover, this country does not have the military resources to establish the kind of joint command which a NATO arrangement in southeast Asia would require. We have enormous power at our command, but its effective use depends on its judicious use. Unless we avoid the temptation to spread our resources thin by overcommitments, we can greatly reduce our ability to act in a crisis.

The great contribution which this country is capable of making to the defense of southeast Asia in the event of an act of open aggression would be, as Secretary Dulles has said, "to strike at the source of aggression rather than to try to rush American manpower into the area to try to fight a ground war." We have no purpose of following any such policy as that of having our forces involved in a ground war. Beyond this, our contribution to the defense of southeast Asia can take the form of development in common with those nations of their spiritual, moral, and economic power. In that fashion, we can help them to act against internal subversion, which is an ever-present threat in that region. In fact, my own judgment—after having been there a number of times—is that at the moment the internal-subversion approach is the one which is most dangerous, and which really is more dangerous than an immediate military act.

A MONROE DOCTRINE APPROACH

Mr. President, let me now turn to the Monroe Doctrine approach, which is the other approach I have been discussing, and is the approach we have taken in the Far East, as distinguished from the NATO approach.

The problem which confronted us and the other delegations at the historic meeting in Manila last September was, in short, to develop effective treaty mechanisms for the defense of southeast Asia, based on the full national equality of the participants and free of the pitfalls of overcommitment.

I believe the treaty which emerged from Manila, and which is before the Senate today, meets that problem most successfully by adopting the Monroe Doctrine principle for this area, just as we have a Monroe Doctrine for the Western Hemisphere, comprising North America and South America. This treaty meets the problem by an approach perhaps best described as a kind of restatement of the Monroe Doctrine. Under this treaty, each party recognizes that an armed attack on any country within the treaty area would endanger its own peace and safety. Each party, therefore, agrees to act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes. That means, by implication, that if any such emergency as is contemplated by the treaty should arise in that area it will be brought before the Congress by the President and the administration, and will be considered under our constitutional processes. We are not committed to the principle of NATO, namely, that an attack on one is an attack on all, calling for immediate military action without further consideration by Congress.

EFFECT OF THE TREATY

The net effect of this provision is to serve notice now and for the future to the Chinese Communists—and, I may say, to any Communists in that area—as the Monroe Doctrine did in the case of the European colonial powers in the early 19th century, that they shall not encroach further on this area of free nations. It should leave no uncertainty in Peking or in Moscow, either, as to the intentions of this Nation. They are no longer free to isolate and absorb the countries of southeast Asia, one by one. Laos or Cambodia or south Vietnam or Thailand cease to be individual entries on their timetable of conquest. That was taken care of by the special protocol which was added to the treaty at the time when it was signed. The Chinese Communists and those of the Kremlin know now, clearly and unmistakably that they have reached the end of the line insofar as cheap and easy aggression is concerned. From now on, any further aggression will set in motion the defense potentialities of eight nations. Through consultation and under their constitutional processes, these nations shall bring to bear the power which they command and are able to deploy most effectively in the common defense of southeast Asia.

For ourselves, the arrangement means that we will have avoided the impracticable overcommitment which would have been involved if we attempted to place American ground forces around the perimeter of the area of potential Chinese ingress into southeast Asia. Nothing in this treaty calls for the use of American ground forces in that fashion. Instead, we shall be able to conserve our strength so that in a moment of crisis we can use it to most effective advantage.

We also have achieved in this treaty a means by which we should begin to get at what has been probably the most perplexing of the threats in southeast Asia—the problem of internal subversion. I mentioned that before, but this is a special feature of the treaty. Much of the Communist advance in the region has been registered by this subtle form of conquest rather than by the cruder forms of external aggression. We have found it difficult to deal with subversion in the past because of the degree

of suspicion which attaches to any intervention by a western nation in the internal affairs of the Asian nation.

This treaty, however, at last recognizes that when internal strife in any given country has its origins in the international Communist conspiracy, it is in reality as much an international problem as it is a national problem. The participants, therefore, agree to consult on common measures for combating it. That is a great advance in the whole idea of collective security.

THE PACIFIC CHARTER

I wish to speak about the Pacific Charter, which was approved separately and after this treaty was signed. I think the Pacific Charter originated in the mind of Mr. Magsaysay, the new President of the Philippines. I know he brought it to our attention. There were a number of discussions over its wording. I think it deserves reference here, because it is a part of the whole picture.

I have dwelt at some length on the mechanics of defense which the treaty established for southeast Asia. There was another accomplishment at the Manila conference which is likely to prove equally important in its impact on the Asian situation. I refer to the Pacific Charter, which was signed by the delegates and proclaimed at the conference. The charter is a natural corollary of the treaty and inseparable from it. For as the treaty serves to marshal the military and economic resources of the participants for common defense, the Pacific Charter mobilizes their spiritual and moral strength. It speaks in bold and reverberating words of the determination to uphold the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples. It calls on the nations to strive to promote self-government and to secure the independence of all countries whose peoples desire it and are able to understand its responsibilities. That charter was approved unanimously by every country represented.

These are sentiments which will strike a responsive chord in the heart of Asia. They are ideals to which the spiritual bonds between East and West can be anchored. They are the principles around which the free peoples of this country and Asia can rally to make common cause against the Communist aggressors.

I wish to bring these brief remarks to an end by reading the conclusions in the report of the committee, which sum up our approach. I read from the final paragraphs of the report of the committee:

> It is the committee's view that the Manila Pact constitutes a considerable accomplishment in bringing together a group of eight countries of divergent religious, racial, and political backgrounds, in a common resolve to defend their freedom against the menace of international communism. By strengthening that resolve the United States will make a substantial contribution to the preservation of free governments and to the defense of its own security.
>
> The principle underlying this treaty is that advance notice of our intentions and the intentions of the nations associated with us may serve to deter potential aggressors from reckless action that could plunge the Pacific into war. To that end, the treaty makes it clear that the United States will not remain indifferent to conduct threatening the peace of southeast Asia.
>
> Until now, our protective system in the Pacific area has been predicated upon a group of treaties of a bilateral and trilateral character.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has just outlined what those treaties were. They were treaties with Japan, the Philippines, Australia, New Zealand, and Korea; and now we have pending the treaty with Nationalist China.

> The southeast Asia treaty is a long step toward a more comprehensive, collective security arrangement which has been regarded as desirable by the administration and the committee.
>
> The committee is not impervious to the risks which this treaty entails. It fully appreciates that acceptance of these additional obligations commits the United States to a course of action over a vast expanse of the Pacific. Yet these risks are consistent with our own highest interests. There are greater hazards in not advising a potential enemy of what he can expect of us, and in failing to disabuse him of assumptions which might lead to a miscalculation of our intentions.

It is our earnest hope that this treaty will be ratified by a large vote of Members of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty signed in Manila on September 8, 1954, has been submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee and reported to the Senate for its approval. This treaty will be another milestone in the evolution of our policy to try and create a solid collective-security system in the western Pacific and southeast Asia areas.

It was my distinct pleasure, along with my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], to represent the Senate at this conference. Before I turn to the various sections and provisions of the treaty itself, I wish to make note of the outstanding job that Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and his party did at Manila in carrying out the policies of our Nation on a bipartisan, statesmanlike basis. The Secretary of State and Senator SMITH are to be highly commended for the work they did there.

The Southeast Asian Treaty is another part in the total pattern of strength which we have been trying to create throughout the free world. The armistice agreements at Geneva did not end the need for a pact in the southeast Pacific area; rather, it emphasized it. The need for the collective-security pact becomes more apparent each day as the aggressive tendencies on the part of the Communists become more evident. The nations at the Manila Conference have recognized this fact and have endeavored to form a bulwark against the aggressive intentions on the part of the Chinese Communists.

The members of the treaty organization are the Philippines, Thailand, Pakistan, Australia, New Zealand, France, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

Eight member nations, and only three of them Asian, may seem to be an insignificant number for a southeastern Asia treaty, but it is sufficient to start a very substantial defense buildup against the Communist menace in Asia. Admittedly, we would have been glad if there were more Asian members, but the door is not closed to them. Whenever these nations, within the confines of the treaty area, wish to avail themselves of the opportunity to join, they may do so, the only prerequisite being the concurrence of the present members. As a clarifying note, I will say that the name of any future members will be submitted to the Senate for approval.

When the delegations met in Manila, prior to the signing of this momentous document, the delegates had three major areas in which to find solutions: the definition of the treaty area, how much emphasis to place on the problem of subversion, and the economic clause, if there was to be one.

The treaty area is defined in the treaty itself and also in a protocol to the treaty which brings in Laos, Cambodia, and the free portion of Vietnam as treaty territory which, if attacked, would be under the protection of the treaty. Those nations themselves are not members of the Manila Pact. The reason is that the armistice provisions at Geneva at least raised a question in the minds of some of the parties to those agreements as to whether the Associated States could actually join such a pact. Nevertheless, those states welcomed the fact that the mantle of protection of the treaty was thrown around this area.

Broadly speaking, the treaty area includes the territory of the parties and the Pacific Ocean area which is south of 21 degrees and 30 minutes; that is a line which runs north of the Philippines. The area therefore is Pakistan, Thailand, and by protocol, Laos, Vietnam, and Cambodia, Malaya, Australia, New Zealand, and the Philippines. This treaty does not cover the Hong Kong area, Macao, Formosa, Japan, or Korea.

The major difference in this treaty from any other security treaty is that it places more emphasis on the danger of subversion. It deals of course, as other treaties have, with an open armed attack and it is hoped that what is said in this respect will constitute a deterrent against such an act of aggression.

The problem of subversion is dealt with more specifically than in any other treaty. Subversion in this area is very strong and it has been recognized as such. The signatories are planning a meeting in Bangkok later this month at which time they can begin to think of ways and means to meet the subversive threat which is recognized by the treaty as being a particular danger in this area.

The proposal before the Senate is a significant new undertaking providing for mutual aid to prevent and counter subversive activity directed from the outside against the territorial integrity and political stability of the member states. This situation, in Indochina in particular, is by no means satisfactory at the present time, although it is improving, and it is hoped that something fruitful will come from the Bangkok meeting.

The treaty has a brief economic clause which says that the parties will cooperate together in economic matters. Secretary Dulles made it clear, when he

appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in November, as he did in Manila, that this is not meant to and does not bind the United States to any particular program of vast economic and military aid.

The situation in Europe after World War II was quite different than the one which exists in Asia today. In Europe our aid programs helped to recreate something that had been destroyed. We were working with people who were well versed in industrial life, and they needed a big boost to get on their feet again.

In Asia the problem is to create something that is totally new. Our first problem under this clause is to find a proper means to help before sums of money are requested. There are a number of economic problems of acute necessity in southeast Asia, particularly in free Vietnam. It is my understanding that a report will be forthcoming from the administration when a definite plan of approach has been formulated. This proposal merely recognizes the economic problem and lays the groundwork.

The treaty ends with a declaration that the armed aggression which is referred to and which the United States declares would be dangerous to its own peace and security would be Communist aggression. There was a great deal of discussion at the Conference as to whether the treaty, as a whole, should be exclusively directed against Communist aggression, or whether it should deal with any form of aggression. The United States does not have any territory in the treaty area, and therefore we are not interested in internal quarrels as such. Our interests would be involved only if there should be Communist aggression. The other countries were unwilling to limit the treaty to Communist aggression, so the issue was resolved by the United States including in the treaty a declaration that as far as it was concerned the open aggression which we would regard as dangerous to our peace and security would be Communist aggression. As a compensation the United States has agreed that if there should be local controversies in the area, we would join with others in consultation to see what should or could be done to alleviate them. This treaty is aimed primarily at Communist aggression, not at difficulties that might arise between friendly states.

At the conclusion of the Manila Conference the Pacific Charter was issued. It is in the nature of a declaration which is very important, in that it expresses by joint action of so-called western colonial powers and the Asian powers a common position with reference to self-determination and self-government by the peoples of Asia. This document was suggested by President Magsaysay, an outstanding statesman and leader, who exerted a great deal of influence during the entire conference. He thought it would be useful for the conference to draw up what he called a Pacific Charter declaration, affirming the intention of all the parties to this treaty to work for self-determination and self-government among the Asian peoples who wanted self-government and were capable of exercising its responsibilities.

This charter is a notable achievement in bringing together the divergent viewpoints of those concerned. This document should have a great deal of impact.

Mr. President, as my colleagues here know, it is not necessary for the Pacific Charter to be submitted to the Senate for action.

One of the first questions to arise out of any discussion of this new treaty is: What is the major difference between the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty and NATO?

First of all the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was built up as a defensive force on the continent of Europe—a force strong enough to resist attack by the armies of the Soviet Union. That is not the purpose of the Southeast Asia Treaty. This new treaty does not dedicate any major elements of the United States Military Establishment to form any army of defense in this area. According to the Secretary of State's testimony, in this area "we rely primarily upon the deterrent of our mobile striking power." A NATO-type organization in the Far East would be an overextension of our military power as it stands today.

This new treaty follows a formula similar to that used in the Philippine Treaty, the Anzus Treaties, and the Korean Treaty. This avoids the dispute which arose during the debate over the NATO Treaty relative to the powers of the President and the Congress.

The less controversial language declares that an intrusion in the treaty area would be dangerous to our peace and security and that we would, in that event, act to meet the common danger in accordance with our constitutional processes. The NATO Treaty says that "an attack on one is an attack on all." The former may not be as automatic, depending on the circumstances, but it avoids any constitutional controversy, and it stems from one of our oldest foreign policies—the Monroe Doctrine.

The Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty is consistent with the provisions of the United Nations Charter. This treaty would come under the provisions of article 51, providing that nothing contained in the U. N. Charter shall deprive any of the states from the individual or collective right of self-defense. Under article 51 regional enforcement measures do not need prior approval of the Security Council, where the Soviet Union has a veto.

One of the most fruitful things to come out of this conference was the initiative shown by the Asians themselves. The Filipinos, our long-time friends, were hosts, and the Asian delegates contributed immensely in working out the form that the treaty was to take.

In conclusion, I wish to stress again the importance of this treaty and the Pacific Charter. They are needed steps in building security for freedom in the Pacific area. I sincerely hope that the Senate will give its prompt approval and ratification.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the preceding discussion of the pending treaty has been ample, so there is no real reason for me to take the time of the Senate on this subject. It is sufficient to say that this particular treaty came into being, so far as our State Department and so far as the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] were concerned, during the period when I was chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and it was signed on the 14th of October 1954. Many persons, of course, realized that, as the Kaiser of Germany said on one occasion, a treaty may be only a scrap of paper, depending upon the character of the negotiators and upon the moral responsibility of the nations which negotiate the treaty. We are satisfied that in this instance the group of nations involved mean business and that they will keep the treaty. Therefore, it is all important, in this day when the world has been shrunken by the ingenuity of man and when we have come to the conclusion that our first defense line is far away in Asia, from the standpoint of our own welfare and from the standpoint of the signatories, that this treaty be ratified.

I wish to speak very briefly in support of the pending treaty, a document in which we can, I believe, take particular satisfaction. In the course of the past 3 years our Government negotiated several security agreements of a bilateral or trilateral character with other nations in the Pacific. Those agreements, in a sense, were but first steps toward a more ambitious collective security arrangement for that area. In fact, the agreements themselves expressly called for the "eventual development of a more effective system of regional security."

On several occasions, and most recently when the Korean treaty was before us, the Committee on Foreign Relations expressed its convictions as to the desirability of such a pact. But this kind of unity was not something that could be easily achieved. The relations between many of the free countries in the Pacific area have been, and in some instances continue to be, overcast with cultural and political differences which, in addition to the geographical distances involved, distinguish it from Europe. Between some of these countries exist rather deep-seated elements of friction and antagonism which have militated against the creation of a more general multilateral undertaking of mutual defense.

The Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty does not effect such a combination of all the free nations of the Pacific, but it is a substantial and courageous step forward in the direction of a more comprehensive security pact. The unity which it reflects is most gratifying. When we consider that eight nations, of diverse religious, racial, and political backgrounds, were able to compose their several points of difference and resolve firmly to defend their freedom, then, indeed, is there reason to feel encouraged.

It is, indeed, a very significant thing. The Secretary of State is to be commended for his part in such an accomplishment.

It is true that several important powers in the southeast Pacific area have elected to remain outside the treaty system. But it is also true, Mr. President, that among the nations covered are some

which may be most vulnerable to future assault by subversion and armed attack. The aggressive tendencies of the Communists were by no means satisfied with the results of the Indochina campaign and the Geneva Armistice agreements.

We cannot ignore the fact that on Chinese Communist soil there is a so-called Free Thai movement, the purpose of which is to overthrow the lawful government of Thailand. In that portion of Vietnam which was conquered by the Vietminh with Chinese support, military forces have been doubled in size since the date of the armistice. This, of itself, would be alarming to the neighboring states. But that it not all.

The provinces in northern Laos are largely dominated by the Communists who repudiate the authority of the Laos Government. In Singapore, the Communists are vigorously conducting activities against the large Chinese population, most of whom are themselves not Communists. Moreover, it is known that the Red Chinese are maintaining a very large military force in the province of Yunan, China, although there is no risk whatsoever of an armed attack against that outpost. Other strategic countries, such as Burma and Indonesia, are not free from the dangers of subversion. A despatch a few days ago from New Delhi informed us that maps published in an official Chinese journal now claim as Chinese soil huge chunks of strategic territory in India, Kashmir, and Burma.

All these factors, Mr. President, dilute the so-called peaceful protestations of the Communists, and amply justify our decision to encourage and strengthen the free nations of southeast Asia to safeguard their freedom. This is no high altruism on our part. Let us not delude ourselves. This is of the essence of enlightened self-interest; for to act otherwise would be to risk exposing the remainder of free Asia and the Near East to greater hazards.

It is significant, Mr. President, that today 4 Senators, including myself, have spoken, 2 Democrats and 2 Republicans, who sense the significance and the importance of the treaty. In other words, we are standing at the waterfront united, Democrats and Republicans, in the interest of America.

We all know what the loss of that part of the globe would mean to our own security. And we must not weaken our own resolve at this critical moment. Recent information, in contrast with pessimistic advice received earlier, appears to offer greater hope for a favorable outcome in free Vietnam. Surely now is not the time to dampen the morale of its people and its leaders.

I do not intend to dwell at any length upon the specific provisions of the treaty. That has been amply covered by the distinguished Senator who spoke prior to my taking the floor. The distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has already touched upon the principal features of the instrument. Rather do I wish to emphasize the larger significance of the treaty, not merely as an addition to the system of defense pacts we have perfected, but as a vehicle through which the countries of southeast Asia, in particular, the Philippines, Thailand, and Pakistan, have uttered a cry of faith in their own destiny, and a defiant proclamation of their own conviction in the eternal worth of the individual man.

Mr. President, at the same time the treaty and protocol were negotiated, a document known as the Pacific Charter was signed. This is a declaration which expresses a common position relative to the self-government of the peoples of Asia, by both their governments and the western colonial powers. It reaffirms the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples as a basis for maintaining peace and security.

This ringing declaration, in the opinion of Secretary of State Dulles, should have far-reaching effects in meeting the propaganda of the Communists that West and East cannot work together for freedom in a spirit of mutual understanding.

The same principles are reaffirmed in the preamble to the treaty which we are now considering. We are all familiar with the basic pattern of the treaty, for it corresponds, generally, with prior defense pacts which the Senate has repeatedly approved. There is the familiar reference in article I to our obligations under the United Nations Charter, and our undertaking to settle international disputes by peaceful means—article I. There is the principle of the Vandenberg resolution—Senate Resolution 239, 80th Congress—which is found in article II, and which pledges the parties, separately and jointly, to maintain and develop their collective capacity to resist armed attack, as well as to counter subversive activities directed against their territorial or political integrity. There is the Monroe Doctrine formula, as has been stated, and the determination by us, in case of an armed attack upon any of the parties, to take such steps as we may decide to take, in accordance with our constitutional processes.

But all these provisions have been sufficiently discussed by the esteemed chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. It remains for me only to express my deepest conviction that this treaty is an important one for the United States, and is important for peace in the Far East. I therefore join with the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, the senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], in urging the Members of the Senate to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Foreign Relations and give its approval to the treaty and the protocol.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am certain that in the various speeches which have been made in support of the treaty, its specific provisions have been spelled out quite well; but in the early part of his remarks the able senior Senator from Wisconsin referred to some of the very strong nations, countries capable of being very strong allies of the United States, which are included in the treaty. Undoubtedly the Senator has heard some criticism from time to time of the fact that other nations of Asia are not included.

It is a fact, is it not, that the door is left open with the anticipation that perhaps, as time goes on, other Asiatic nations may see fit to become parties to the treaty?

Mr. WILEY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The able Senator from Wisconsin also mentioned article I and article II as incorporating the principles of the United Nations. The whole pact is made, is it not, within the framework of the United Nations and under that part of the collective security provisions of the charter which recognizes the individual or collective right of self-defense?

Mr. WILEY. Again the Senator from Alabama is right.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I did not quite understand the Senator. Did he say I was right?

Mr. WILEY. Sometimes the Senator is right; and sometimes he is right. This time the Senator is right.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Wisconsin will remember that when the first regional pact was made between the United States and other nations, after the formation of the United Nations Charter, it was upon the insistence of the late distinguished Senator from Michigan, the very able leader, Senator Vandenberg, that there was written into the pact the principle that it should accord full recognition to the United Nations Charter and should exist only until the United Nations Charter should be able to take care of the situation within its own framework.

Is it not true that that principle has been written into every one of the regional pacts which we have entered into since that time?

Mr. WILEY. I think the Senator is right for the third time. There is, of course, a distinction between the principle of article 51, the self-defense provision, and article 52 which contemplates regional organizations. In my humble opinion, that provision in the charter which looks forward to utilization of the regional pact idea, indicated the wisdom of those who worked for the charter. At that time they thought, of course, that the Kremlin would play ball with us; but apparently there was really some mental reservation, so there was written into the charter the provision that regional pacts would be in accordance with the charter.

All over the globe, wherever we have entered into regional pacts, such as the Rio and NATO Pacts, we have done so in accordance with the provision of the United Nations Charter. Our mutual security pacts in the Pacific have likewise been concluded pursuant to provisions in the charter.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Have not those provisions actually, from experience, proved to be quite realistic?

Mr. WILEY. I have no question that they have operated as provisions which kept certain segments of the West, or of the free peoples, united as against the encroachment of the Kremlin and the Commies.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Always looking toward the day when the United Nations might be sufficient to carry on the job without the necessity of having regional pacts.

Mr. WILEY. When that millennium comes—and it is not around the corner—there will not be any need for what the Senator calls regional pacts. But since I cannot foresee that occasion, as I read the signs of the times today, I see the significance of pacts such as the one which is now before the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin knows that from time to time we hear criticism from good, stanch friends of the United Nations to the effect that we are not abiding by the spirit of the United Nations, but are weakening the United Nations by entering into the regional and other pacts.

My last question is, Does not the Senator from Wisconsin agree with me that not only are we pursuing a realistic course within the framework of the United Nations, but actually, by so doing, we are strengthening the United Nations?

Mr. WILEY. I agree that, at least, we are living up to the letter and the spirit of the United Nations in this way, and I think we also are building what might be called outer ramparts against the time, if ever it shall come, and pray God it will not, when America may be attacked.

We are building allies, we are building strength, and I think we are saying to the Kremlin—not to the Russian people, but to the Kremlin—"thus far, and no farther." This Nation of ours is going to stand firm and to protect the great rights of which we are the custodians. Our American way of life is something all peoples want, and we would like to have other nations and other peoples enjoy the same liberties which we have.

We know that defensive pacts of this kind do not, in the slightest, infringe upon Russia or the Kremlin; we simply say that we do not want communism to take over the West or to interfere with our way of life. I think that pacts such as this cannot fail to prove very helpful in stabilizing the world.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the members of the United States delegation to the meeting on the Southeast Asia Pact, held at Manila, on September 6, 1954, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

In my opinion, the United States delegation was an intelligent, tireless group, the members of which worked night and day, contributed greatly to the success of the meeting because of their ability and understanding, and, therefore had much to do with the success of the Manila conference. They were persons of whom the United States of America could well be proud.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The names of the United States delegation are as follows:

UNITED STATES DELEGATION TO THE MEETING ON THE SOUTHEAST ASIA PACT, MANILA, SEPTEMBER 6, 1954

United States plenipotentiary representatives:

John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State.

H. Alexander Smith, United States Senator from New Jersey.

MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD, United States Senator from Montana.

Roderic L. O'Connor, special assistant to the Secretary.

Delegation coordinator:

Douglas MacArthur II, counselor, Department of State.

Special advisers:

Arthur C. Davis, vice admiral, United States Navy, Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs, Department of Defense.

Carl M. McCardle, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs.

Herman Phleger, legal adviser, Department of State.

Ambassador William J. Sebald.

Raymond A. Spruance, American Ambassador to the Republic of the Philippines.

Press officer:

Henry Suydam, Chief, News Division, Department of State.

Advisers:

James D. Bell, officer in charge, Philippine Affairs, Department of State.

Chester L. Cooper, Office of Chinese Affairs, Department of State.

James Cross, Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs, Department of State.

John E. Dwan, lieutenant colonel, United States Army, Department of Defense.

William J. Galloway, Office of the Counselor, Department of State.

Outerbridge Horsey, officer in charge, commonwealth affairs, Department of State.

William S. B. Lacy, American counselor of Embassy, Manila.

N. Paul Neilson, Deputy Assistant Director for the Far East, USIA.

Charles C. Stelle, policy planning staff, Department of State.

Charles A. Sullivan, Chief, American and Far East Division, Office of Foreign Military Affairs, Department of Defense.

Deputy Coordinator:

Walter N. Trulock, Executive Secretariat, Department of State.

Reports officer:

Eugene V. McAuliffe, Executive Secretariat, Department of State.

Administrative officer:

Bruce Grainger, Division of International Conferences, Department of State.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I cast the lone vote against reporting the treaty favorably to the Senate. Whether folks agree with me or not, at least I have been consistent. I voted against the Connally resolution; I voted against the Vandenberg resolution; I voted against the United Nations Charter; and I voted against practically all the giveaway programs with the exception of UNRRA, to which we became a party in order that we might assist in feeding the hungry and clothing the naked.

I am one who believes that the United States of America ought to mind its own business and to keep out of foreign entanglements all over Europe and Asia.

When the public hearings were held I was delighted to have appear there a man who has had a world of experience, a man who for many years was a leading member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Hon. Hamilton Fish. I remember that the first man killed in the Spanish-American War was a cousin of Hamilton Fish, a man by the same name—Hamilton Fish. So, certainly, the patriotism of the Fish family cannot be challenged.

The record of Mr. Fish as a Member of Congress was an outstanding record against communism. He fought against communism at every turn of the road. He was attacked, time and time again, in the press of this country, on the platforms, and on the radio, by those who favored communism. So I cannot let this opportunity pass without bringing to the attention of the Senate, futile as it may prove to be, the testimony of one of the outstanding men of America, the Honorable Hamilton Fish.

When he appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations on January 19 last, he said:

> I appear here in my capacity as an American citizen and as a former Member of Congress who served for more than a score of years on the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, for 20 years, or more, Mr. Fish was a member of that committee. He is a man who has been profoundly interested in the welfare of his country. Mr. Fish said further:

> More particularly I appear before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, as president of * * *, a nationwide, nonpartisan political committee to combat communism, socialism and superinternationalism. Our committee considers the pending treaty as the worst and most dangerous type of one-worldism and interventionism ever presented to the Congress. It is a clear-cut example of superinternationalism that would inevitably drag us into a jungle war 10,000 miles away and actually play into the hands of the Communists at Moscow.
>
> It is not even based on our own security or self defense except in words, platitudes and generalities.
>
> I thank the committee for this open hearing and for listening to my views in opposition to the so-called Southeast Asia Defense Pact. I use the word "so-called" advisedly, as it does not include the four largest southeast Asian nations. Furthermore, we own no territory in the Far East, and France will soon have none. Besides, both France and Britain are both regarded as predatory colonial powers in the Far East.

They were referred to a short time ago, by my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], as Western colonial powers. The Senator also mentioned the fact that four of the countries had not joined in the pact, but he said, in response to a question by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], that the door was still open.

Mr. Fish continued:

> I plead for an extended hearing and debate so that the American people will know all the facts and the inevitability of war involved in this pact. I plead that ample time be allowed the American people to read, learn, and thoroughly digest the warmaking provisions of this treaty before it is too late. At the present moment the American public, and including most Members of Congress except this committee, have not the faintest idea of the extreme war commitments made in this treaty. The fact is the American people have almost no knowledge of even the existence of such a hazardous warlike treaty.

I am mindful of the fact that not one-tenth of 1 percent of the American people had or have any idea or knowledge that President Eisenhower, Secretary Dulles, and Chief of Staff Admiral Radford had agreed, on April 28, 1954, with the French Government to enter the war in Indochina by using our airplanes and naval units there. This would have meant an all-out war within a few days as the Red Chinese armed forces would have poured into Indochina immediately and that was so stated by the British Foreign Minister, Anthony Eden.

Mendes-France has openly admitted this war agreement and publicly stated that President Eisenhower planned to take the issue to Congress for its approval on April 28, 1954. The one individual who stopped this war from being consummated and this crime against the American people was Winston Churchill, who had previously helped to drag us into World War II.

If I could but call up the spirits of Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, and many other great Americans of the past, they would, in no uncertain language, warn the American people that they are being betrayed into perpetual wars through foreign entanglements, alliances, and treaties that provide for sending American boys to fight and die in every swampland, jungle, and ricefield on the mainland of Southeast Asia. This Southeast Asia Defense Treaty is more than a meaningless scrap of paper; it well may be the death certificate of a million or more of the selected youth of America in the bloody jungles of Indochina, Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand.

In that connection, Mr. President, I wish to refer to article II of the treaty. I now read it:

In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this treaty, the parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack and to prevent and counter subversive activities directed from without against their territorial integrity and political stability.

In other words, if there should be an uprising in any one of the countries which is a party to the pact, or if certain peoples living under colonial regimes should not like those who were governing them, and should take some action, all that would have to be done would be to charge such movements as being communistic, and immediately the United States would be called upon to take action. If such a treaty had been in force among the nations of Europe at the time of the Revolutionary War, the United States would still belong to Great Britain.

I continue to read from the statement of Mr. Fish:

The time has come for an open public debate before the American people whether they favor this new brand of superinternationalism that causes us to virtually police the entire world singlehanded with American blood and treasure and at our own instigation. The American people were never consulted about sending their sons to fight and die in Korea with only token support from the U. N. forces. But South Korea, surrounded on three sides by the ocean which we controlled, was incomparably better fighting ground than the malarial swamps and jungles of Southeast Asia. At least, we had a moral obligation to the South Koreans, but we have absolutely none on the mainland of Southeast Asia.

As Al Smith used to say, "Let us look at the record and see what the record discloses." The fact is, due to U. N. interference and our own State Department intervention, Gen. Douglas MacArthur was forbidden to bomb the bridges over the Yalu River. Our Armed Forces were greatly outnumbered and driven back to the northern boundary of South Korea, where the war ended in an unsatisfactory armistice. It was the first great defeat of an American Army in our entire history. It also became the most unpopular war in our history, as evidenced by the desire of all our people to end the useless, stalemated United Nations fighting, where we put up 90 percent of the men and money.

In my opinion, Mr. President, that situation was directly responsible for the victory of the Republican Party in the national election that followed. I believe the American people overwhelmingly voted for Dwight Eisenhower because they thought he would go to Korea and get our boys home. I believe that the people of the United States are just as determined today that we shall not become involved in all the troubles of Europe and Asia which apparently we are getting into by one treaty after another.

I continue to read from the statement of Mr. Fish:

Despite the Korean fiasco and its bloody holocaust it is now seriously proposed that we enter into a binding treaty requiring us to send our Armed Forces to fight in defense of four small nations on the mainland of Asia where, I repeat, we have no moral obligations or interest as we did in Southern Korea. The fact that India, Indonesia, and Burma, the three largest nations in Southeast Asia, refused to join or cooperate with the proposed defense pact shows clearly that there was something wrong about it from the beginning.

With India, Indonesia, and Burma out it is obviously built on shifting sands without permanent or moral foundations. It has the earmarks of being made in America and backed by dollar diplomacy, and that may be why we failed to enlist the actual or even moral support of the three largest South Asian nations.

From an American point of view, it is a preposterous, suicidal proposal that could involve us in disastrous wars within a short time after the ink on the treaty is dry and last many years—that is, if the terms of the treaty are adhered to and we mean what we say.

As the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin said a few moments ago, when the United States signs a treaty, it does not regard it as a scrap of paper.

I continue the quotation from Hamilton Fish:

Unfortunately in recent years we have acquired a habit of letting our friends and allies down as we did in China in 1945–48 and in Poland at Teheran and Yalta. Toward China and Poland we had the highest possible moral obligations and understandings. They both have a right to renounce our actions as a great betrayal that turned them over into Communist slavery. I do not advocate ratifying a treaty unless it is meant to be kept. That is why I am 100 percent against the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty. It is a deceptive treaty with fine sounding but useless terms. The very term "collective defense treaty" is virtually meaningless, and if I did not have a high respect for three honorable gentlemen who signed it as our delegates I would use a much stronger and more apt word. There is nothing collective about this treaty except to deceive the American people and make it sound acceptable.

Does any fair-minded person believe that the French who will soon be out of the Far East will send any armed forces or that Britain will send more than a token force, if any at all? I anticipate that the British will not be so interested when the zero hour arrives, owing to its possessions at Hong Kong and Singapore, and growing trade with Red China. Furthermore, I doubt if New Zealand, Australia, or the Philippines will transport more than token forces for the Asian mainland if the British sidestep the fighting by saying they have their hands full in Malaya.

If the treaty is ratified, Uncle Sam will again be holding the bag and doing all the fighting, dying, and paying. This will not appeal to the American people once they know the facts. I propose, in my limited way, to help give them the facts and the awful truth as it affects the lives of their sons. I hope that I may be able to influence some Senators to come out fighting against this program of military intervention in Southeast Asia before it is too late. This treaty, if ratified, will confront the United States with a war crisis in a hydrogen age.

The fearless, outspoken leadership of Senator Taft against military intervention in Southeast Asia is tragically missed. He would have inspired and rallied the Congress and the American people to violent protests against this treaty requiring military intervention in Indochina, Thailand, Cambodia, and Laos. He would have warned the American mothers and fathers that it meant that their sons would do the fighting and dying and not British or French or U. N. forces. He would have repeated his protest against sending a single American soldier to the mainland of Asia. From the grave comes the sound logic and practical reasoning of Senator Taft, a great American statesman who, shortly before his death, in a speech delivered by his son at Cincinnati, May 26, 1953, said: "I believe we might as well forget the United Nations as far as the Korean war is concerned."

Mr. President, I have been quoting from a statement by Mr. Hamilton Fish, who, I repeat, for more than a score of years was a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, whose honor and patriotism have never been successfully attacked, and whom the Communists hated and feared while he was in the Congress more perhaps than any other Member of the entire Congress.

Mr. Fish also said:

I confess that I am willing to rush in where angels—Senators—fear to tread, because I am convinced that if this Southeast Asia pact is ratified it will result in a huge sacrifice of American lives and treasure in vain, in the jungles of Vietnam, Cambodia, Loas, and Thailand. Why should American boys be slaughtered in the rice paddies of Southeast Asia in a bloody war with countless hordes of fanatical Communists? It would be a fight against terrible odds with the chances against us far more than they were in Korea. Why drain the best blood of our American youth in a suicidal war that we cannot win, and fall into the bloody boobytrap that Moscow and Peking have set for us in Indochina and Thailand? It would be a perpetual slaughterhouse for American soldiers. For every thousand we send, Red China can send her tens of thousands. Besides, we would be in an unenviable position of substituting ourselves for French or British colonialism. No matter what noble platitudes we used the Communist propaganda will depict us as foreign invaders or devils come to exploit Asiatics and reestablish colonialism and imperialism.

Let's be realistic. The Orientals are brave and fatalistic fighters with a will to fight, and when trained, are efficient in the use of military weapons. Nothing would please the Red general staff at Moscow more than

transporting an American Army into Indochina to be bogged down in the swamplands and jungles of Southeast Asia. There is not a Russian soldier within a thousand miles. Naturally the Red army generals at Moscow would celebrate such an event with vodka as a windfall and a bloodless victory for them.

If we must fight Soviet Russia or even Red China we should choose the battleground where we have the best chance of winning and not of losing. We must not enter into any commitment to fight, no matter what our sympathies, in a hopeless jungle war where the enemy would have every advantage. I have no objection to a mutual defense pact with the Philippines, Australia, New Zealand, Formosa, and Japan, where our Navy and Air Force, together with that of Great Britain, would be more than sufficient to prevent an invasion in force and would be efficiently supported by the land forces in those countries. I agree with Senator Taft and am unalterably opposed to sacrificing a single American life in the jungles and swamps of the Southeast Asian mainland.

Mr. President, I have been reading from the principal part of the statement made by Mr. Fish in opposition to the treaty which is now before the Senate. On that occasion, Mr. Fish also said:

The proposed treaty is one-worldism carried to its logical and highly dangerous and war-provoking conclusion. No American is more bitterly opposed to the terrible evils and menace of world communism than I am. That is why I am against any suicidal military intervention on the southeast mainland of Asia, where the chances are all against our winning.

I am in sympathy with most of the views of Senator KNOWLAND and Senator MCCARTHY on Red China. I favor initiating an economic boycott to compel her to free not only our 11 air pilots but probably hundreds of other American soldiers rotting in Chinese prisons. If a boycott is not successful then I would favor a naval blockade 12 miles from the Chinese coast. I am not in favor of dropping bombs or a shooting war. I believe once Red China understands we mean business they would release our prisoners.

I am very proud of my record in Congress against intervening in World War II before the Jap attack on Pearl Harbor. Our former enemies are now our most reliable allies. I opposed our intervention in the war against Germany, as I knew then, and so stated, that she was the main barrier against the menace of world communism and that if Germany was defeated, Soviet Russia would swallow up Eastern and Central Europe. Today I favor the armament of Germany and creating an invincible fortress across Germany supported by the NATO armed forces. The only thing Moscow fears and respects is armed might—not paper armies.

The same is true of Red China. She has no fear of a bamboo curtain in Indochina or in the swamps or jungles of Southeast Asia. She could keep the jungle fighters in Vietnam supplied with arms, munitions, and food for an unlimited time, or as long as our troops survived on the mainland of Southeast Asia. I am appealing to you Senators not to substitute by this proposed treaty an inevitable and more ghastly Indochina and Thailand for a tragic Korea. It is my honest conviction that if the American people knew what war commitments were contained in this treaty, that there would be an avalanche of public opinion against any war intervention in the southeast mainland of Asia.

If this treaty is ratified, it will be an evil day for America. It would inaugurate a ghastly and tragic policy for which we will pay in blood, sweat, and tears for generations to come. Why not consult the American people before making any binding war commitments? Not one American in ten would favor our entrance into war in Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, or Thailand. Nothing would be more unpopular. We cannot afford to squander our wealth, resources, or manpower all over the world without weakening our own economy and national defense, a condition which Moscow ardently desires. We must keep out of wars especially selected by Moscow and Peiping irrespective of our sympathies. We must stop our ceaseless campaign of rampant internationalism, one-worldism, and military intervention all over the entire world.

In conclusion, I am opposed to any military commitments that will involve us in a frightful jungle warfare in Indochina or Southeast Asia which would keep us tied down for years, provided we were not driven out by the Red hordes from China. We must not forget that Western Germany is the decisive battleground. We cannot police the world alone or act as military protector for either French or British imperialism in the Far East or elsewhere. We should concentrate our Armed Forces in Western Germany and Korea, arm the Japs, and choose our own battleground whenever necessary and not be committed by treaty to be drawn into jungle boobytraps in Southeast Asia.

If the Eisenhower-Dulles-Stassen policies involve us in a jungle war on the Asian mainland there will be a political revolt such as has never been seen in this country. One hundred million Americans or more would resent it bitterly if a small handful of rabid interventionists, internationalists and one-worlders succeed in dragging us into a bloody, costly, and disastrous jungle war in Asia.

The American Political Action Committee is opposed to preventive wars, global intervention, police actions, or sending American boys to fight throughout the world without the consent of Congress. It is, and so am I in favor of the ratification of the Formosa defense pact. I have presented my reasons to your distinguished committee for urging the defeat of this dangerous war pact by the Senate. I have no quarrel with anyone who holds opposite views for that is still the free American way. I do, however, offer for your consideration and that of the Senate a reservation that might somewhat lessen the dangers involved in the terms of the impending treaty and thereby assure our not being involved in war without definite consideration and action by Congress.

Reservation: No United States ground, air, or naval forces shall engage in any defense actions in accordance with the provisions of this treaty before the Congress has consented to their use against Communist armed attack or armed aggression by a declaration of war.

Mr. President, in conclusion I simply wish to say that I am opposed to this treaty, and I intend to vote against it. There have been a great many times when I have voted alone on various measures. I believe in my conscience that the Senate is making a mistake in ratifying this treaty, just as I believe the Senate will be making a mistake in ratifying the treaty with Nationalist China. Therefore, I shall vote against both of them.

Mr. GEORGE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bridges	Clements
Allott	Bush	Cotton
Anderson	Butler	Curtis
Barrett	Byrd	Douglas
Beall	Capehart	Duff
Bender	Carlson	Dworshak
Bible	Case, N. J.	Eastland
Bricker	Case, S. Dak.	Ellender
Ervin	Knowland	Payne
Flanders	Kuchel	Purtell
Frear	Langer	Robertson
Fulbright	Lehman	Russell
George	Long	Saltonstall
Goldwater	Magnuson	Schoeppel
Gore	Malone	Scott
Green	Mansfield	Smathers
Hayden	Martin, Iowa	Smith, Maine
Hickenlooper	Martin, Pa.	Smith, N. J.
Hill	McClellan	Sparkman
Holland	McNamara	Stennis
Humphrey	Millikin	Symington
Ives	Morse	Thurmond
Jackson	Mundt	Thye
Jenner	Murray	Watkins
Johnston, S. C.	Neely	Welker
Kefauver	Neuberger	Wiley
Kerr	O'Mahoney	Williams
Kilgore	Pastore	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] are absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] is absent on official business as a member of the American delegation attending the 10th anniversary of the World War II Battle of Alsace, at Colmar, France.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

If there be no objection, the pending treaty and the protocol thereto will be considered as having passed through their various parliamentary stages, up to the consideration of the resolution of ratification.

The resolution of ratification will be read.

The resolution of ratification was read, as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive K, 83d Congress, 2d session, the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty and the protocol thereto, both signed at Manila on September 8, 1954.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], if present would vote "yea."

Mr. GEORGE. I wish to announce that the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, voted for the treaty in committee. If he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] is absent on official business as a member of the American delegation attending the 10th anniversary of the World War II Battle of Alsace, at Colmar, France.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is detained on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 82, nays 1, as follows:

YEAS—82

Aiken	George	Morse
Allott	Goldwater	Mundt
Anderson	Gore	Murray
Barrett	Green	Neely
Beall	Hayden	Neuberger
Bender	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bible	Hill	Pastore
Bricker	Holland	Payne
Bridges	Humphrey	Purtell
Bush	Ives	Robertson
Butler	Jackson	Russell
Byrd	Jenner	Saltonstall
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Carlson	Kefauver	Scott
Case, N. J.	Kerr	Smathers
Case, S. Dak.	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Clements	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Cotton	Kuchel	Sparkman
Curtis	Lehman	Stennis
Douglas	Long	Symington
Duff	Magnuson	Thurmond
Dworshak	Malone	Thye
Eastland	Mansfield	Watkins
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	Wiley
Flanders	McClellan	Williams
Frear	McNamara	
Fulbright	Millikin	

NAYS—1

Langer

NOT VOTING—13

Barkley	Hennings	Monroney
Bennett	Hruska	Potter
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Young
Daniel	Kennedy	
Dirksen	McCarthy	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall be exceedingly brief in my remarks on the Southeast Asia Treaty, since the vote has already been taken.

I did not expect that the debate on the treaty would be as brief as it was. I was in conference with Mr. J. A. Hoffbuhr and Mr. Glenn Jackson, of Oregon, on a very important Oregon problem involving the Talent Irrigation District project. That project was omitted from the President's budget message, and its omission does a grave injustice to the people of Oregon in respect to the development of the State's natural resources.

The matter is so important to my State that I was in conference with Mr. Hoffbuhr and Mr. Jackson when the Senate debate on the Southeast Asia Treaty was progressing. I had expected to make these remarks during that debate and prior to the vote of ratification. But in view of the fact that they are remarks in explanation of my vote for ratification, the important thing now is simply to have them in the RECORD for future reference.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, after listening very carefully to the hearings on the treaty, I voted to report the treaty to the Senate for ratification. I did so for several reasons, the most primary one of which is that there is no doubt in my mind that the treaty is in conformity with the United Nations Charter. There is no doubt in my mind that the treaty is in the same conformity with the United Nations Charter as was NATO, because the United Nations Charter contemplates and authorizes, within its term of reference, the making of treaties or alliances of this nature in the interest of preserving peace in the world.

But I wish to make it very clear in this brief speech that, in my judgment, the hope for peace in the Pacific rests with the United Nations. In these days, we in America ought to be frank enough to confess that the hope for peace in the Pacific does not rest with the United States, with Red China, or with Red Russia, on the basis of any unilateral course of action those powerful nations may follow in Asia. I am very fearful—and this explains in large measure the position I took last week in the historic debate in the Senate—that if the course of action, so far as peace or war in Asia is concerned, is left to the determination of the United States, Red Russia, or Red China, that the Communists will commit some provocation which will throw us into an Asiatic war. I am also fearful that the Nationalist Chinese may commit some act of provocation that will give the Communists some propaganda excuse for committing an act of war against our forces in the Straits of Formosa or on or near the Quemoy or Matsu Islands. Thus I think that the cause of peace is crying out today for action by the United Nations in the settlement of the Formosan crisis.

In my judgment, the hope for peace in Asia rests upon our conforming to the principle of international justice through law, which is the base on which the entire United Nations Charter rests.

Oh, I know that when one makes such a statement in the United States Senate, he will be subjected to severe criticism. But I repeat what I said in the debate last week: There are in America at this hour powerful forces who want to go to war; and so long as those forces, many of whose representatives sit in high positions, continue their efforts, and so long as that great danger to peace in the world exists within my own country, I shall raise my voice in a plea for the assumption by the United Nations of jurisdiction over the threat to a third holocaust in Asia.

In my judgment, the southeast Asia treaty greatly strengthens the chance that the United Nations will be able to help preserve peace in the world. I voted for the treaty in committee, and I voted for its ratification on the floor of the Senate today, because article I provides, in principle, what ought to have been included in the joint resolution passed by the Senate last week. In the joint resolution passed by the Senate last week there should have been a clear rededication to the United Nations. Article I of the Southeast Asia Treaty rededicates the United States and the other signatories, at least through the framework of the treaty, to the principle of the jurisdiction of the United Nations. Listen to this language:

ARTICLE I

The Parties undertake, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle any international disputes in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered, and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

Mr. President, that is the lesson we ought to speak into the teeth of the Communists around the world 24 hours of the day and night in these critical days. We must make it clear and leave no doubt or uncertainty in the minds of the Communist segment of the world that the United States of America stands shoulder to shoulder with the other free nations in fighting the cause of peace through the principles and the framework of the United Nations, and that it is not our purpose or desire by way of a resolution, as was done last week, or otherwise, to give to the President of the United States a pre-authorized power to commit an act of war on the mainland of China. Nothing which has transpired since the action which the Senate took last week raises the slightest doubt as to the soundness of the statement made by the senior Senator from Oregon in that debate that one of the acts authorized by the resolution was a strike against the mainland of China if the President should deem it desirable in defense of Formosa even though no act of war had been committed against us.

If we read the statements which are coming out of the capitals of the world these days, that is the fear of statesmen in other countries. That is why I think it is so important that before any more time passes the Senate of the United States should make it perfectly clear that we are working for peace through the United Nations. The Southeast Asia treaty pledges us to do that.

Mr. President, I call attention to section 2, article IV, of the treaty, as follows:

2. If, in the opinion of any of the Parties, the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any Party in the treaty area or of any other State or territory to which the provisions of paragraph 1 of this article from time to time apply is threatened in any way other than by armed attack or is affected or threatened by any fact or situation which might endanger the peace of the area, the Parties shall consult immediately in order to agree on the measures which should be taken for the common defense.

That is a pledge, in my judgment, to resort to peaceful procedures to settle disputes, and it is an indication of the realization on our part that we are not going to avoid war by resorting to military threats.

I call attention next to article VI of the treaty, as follows:

ARTICLE VI

This treaty does not affect and shall not be interpreted as affecting in any way the rights and obligations of any of the parties under the Charter of the United Nations or the responsibility of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security. Each party declares that none of the international engagements now in force between it and any other of the parties or any third party is in conflict with the provisions of this treaty, and undertakes not to enter into any international engagement in conflict with this treaty.

There again we have made crystal clear and have emblazoned in the treaty the proposition that the United States repledges itself to seek peace in the world through the procedures and policies of the United Nations.

That is why I voted in committee to recommend ratification of the treaty, and that is why on the floor of the Senate today I voted for the ratification of the treaty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement which I released to the press about an hour ago, expressing my deep regret and my great concern over the fact that at a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations this morning the committee postponed consideration of the Humphrey resolution.

The Senate will recall that in the closing minutes of the debate on the joint resolution which was before the Senate last week, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] offered a resolution, of which I became one of the cosponsors, which in effect would make it clear that it was the sense of the Senate of the United States that the United Nations should proceed to use its good offices and procedures to the end of seeking to effect a cease-fire order in Southeast Asia, where the ominous threat of a Formosa war hangs over the world like an ugly cloud.

I say, Mr. President, as I said in the Committee on Foreign Relations this morning, and in my statement released to the press an hour ago, that had the principle of the Humphrey resolution been written into the joint resolution which was before the Senate last week, both the nature and the content of that debate would have been greatly different, because there were those of us, as the RECORD will show, who pleaded then for the Kefauver substitute, which was bottomed upon the proposal to have the United Nations take over jurisdiction of this very serious international crisis.

Mr. President, I am greatly saddened that there should be a postponement of the consideration of such a resolution; and I am greatly saddened that there is any colleague of mine in the Senate of the United States who would rationalize any postponement of such consideration on the ground that if the resolution should come to the floor there might be acrimonious debate, and amendments might be offered to the Humphrey resolution which might raise questions as to whether we in the Senate of the United States are unanimously behind the United Nations. The world ought to know. The world is entitled to know. The American people ought to know. The American people are entitled to know.

Mr. President, as a lawyer who has tried to understand some of the principles of international law, I desire to say that so long as this country is a member of the United Nations, never will I take the unlawyerlike position of saying that this country should serve a threatening notice on the United Nations, which has jurisdiction which it ought to exercise, that we will abide by a cease-fire order in southeast Asia if the terms of that order are to our liking, but we will not if the terms are not to our liking. We are not going to promote an international system of justice through law by proceeding on any such premise as that.

No member of this body is more opposed to the recognition of Red China than is the senior Senator from Oregon. However, Mr. President, I am not going to try to circumvent the United Nations or to bypass the jurisdiction of the United Nations by giving countenance to any fear arguments that the Humphrey resolution might put us in a position of having to abide by a decision of the United Nations that we might not like. One of these fear arguments being made by some of my colleagues in the Senate is to the effect that if we adopt the Humphrey resolution, any Senator voting for it would then be estopped from protesting any proposal of the United Nations that Red China should be admitted into the United Nations. This argument seems to be based on the false assumption that we should lay down a condition precedent to our calling upon the United Nations to try to settle the Formosan dispute and that condition should be that if Red China is admitted to the United Nations, we will not accept the decision of the United Nations. I cannot imagine the United Nations voting to admit Red China on the basis of the many violations of international agreements and diplomatic immorality of which Red China has been guilty. I think our opposition in the United Nations expressed time and time again by the American Ambassador against the admission of Red China has been a sound opposition on the merits of the issue.

It should be stressed in this debate that each time the issue has come before the United Nations General Assembly, an overwhelming majority of the members of the assembly have agreed with us. However, I am willing to meet head-on what I think is a false assumption of some of the opponents to the Humphrey resolution. My answer to them is that if we should lose an argument on the Red China admission issue before the United Nations and are outvoted, we should not take the position of going it alone in international affairs outside of the United Nations. I believe that if we ever adopt a go-it-alone policy, the world will be plunged into war because of the consequences that are most likely to follow from such a unilateral course of action on the part of the United States.

We are not going to promote world peace in that way, Mr. President. In this great struggle of the century, a struggle for freedom which may last for a hundred years, we have got to learn that we are not going to have formulated overnight a system of international justice through law. It is going to require an evolution of thought to bring all people to a realization of the great superiority of settling international disputes by rules of reason instead of by resorting to the jungle law of military force or threats.

So long as I sit in this body, Mr. President, I shall never be a party, under the oath I took when I became a Member of the Senate, to a proposal that we should accept the jurisdiction of the United Nations so long as its decisions may conform with what our predetermined self-interests may dictate. That would merely be feeding the furnaces of Communist propaganda. That is why I issued my press statement an hour ago. It is pertinent to my position on the Southeast Asia Treaty, because I am worried, disturbed, and frightened by the attitude which exists in so many places in our country today. We cannot even talk about living up to the jurisdictional responsibilities of the United States under the United Nations without running into the fallacious argument of the preventive war advocates that unless we can have our way in the United Nations, we will go it alone in Southeast Asia.

My warning may fall on some deaf ears across the country, as it is falling for the most part on empty seats in the Senate of the United States at this moment; but I say to my colleagues in the Senate that what has happened in the last few hours—the last 72 hours—has convinced me that the rank and file of the American people are listening attentively to the warnings of the results which may follow unilateral action in the South Pacific. They are pondering the dangers of this war crisis more attentively than are some Members of the United States Senate. I think the voice of American public opinion is raising itself in clarion tones which should be heeded by Members of the United States Senate.

The people expect this body to rededicate itself to the jurisdiction of the United Nations as the greatest force in the world today for maintaining peace in the world. I think the treaty to which we have just given our advice and consent to the President, is a great step

forward in an attempt to help preserve and strengthen the bulwarks of peace. It represents what I argued for last week, namely, one of the calculated risks for peace. Again today I am pleading that we assume greater risks for peace. I am pleading that we be willing to lay before the United Nations questions involving the fate of the world, whether there shall be peace or war, and, on the basis of its decisions, if they are made within its jurisdiction, to rest our cause. I am pleading that we use the United Nations as our forum for the presentation of America's points of view as to what should be done to secure peace, and that we try to convince the United Nations that any of the fears which may have been expressed this morning by some of my colleagues as to what the United Nations might do are groundless. That is my plea, and that also, Mr. President, is my explanation both for my vote upon the treaty and for my press release on the Humphrey resolution, which I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Independent of Oregon, issued the following statement today on the decision of the Foreign Relations Committee to postpone until a later date action on the Humphrey Resolution, of which MORSE is one of the cosponsors calling upon the United Nations to take prompt action to bring about a cease-fire in the area of hostilities off the coast of China and in the Formosa Strait:

"I deeply regret that the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate decided at a meeting this morning to postpone action on the Humphrey resolution which states 'That it is the sense of the Senate that it would be in the interest of the United States and of world peace for the United Nations to take prompt action to bring about a cease-fire in the area of hostilities off the coast of China and in the Formosa Strait, and the President is requested to take appropriate steps to achieve that objective.'

"It is my opinion that in this very critical hour of world history, when the issue between war or peace is nip-and-tuck, the Senate should pass the resolution without delay, and thereby give assurance to our allies in the United Nations that we accept and respect the jurisdiction of the United Nations. The passage of the resolution would also serve clear notice on Red Russia and Red China that we intend to stand shoulder to shoulder with the free nations of the world in preserving peace. The resolution also would be an effective answer to the vicious, lying Communist propaganda that the United States insists upon following a unilateral course of action in Southeast Asia, unless the United Nations accepts the American point of view on all phases of foreign policy questions which have arisen over the defense of Formosa and such coastal islands as Quemoy and Matsu.

I fear that the postponement of action on the resolution will be misunderstood and in some capitals of the world misinterpreted. It is important that the United States make crystal clear to the world that we seek an honorable peace in Southeast Asia, and that we accept the jurisdiction of the United Nations in its endeavor to bring about a solution of the serious threat of war by way of the procedures of the United Nations Charter, based upon the goal of settling international disputes by applying the principles of international justice through law.

It is my view that no postponement of consideration of the Humphrey resolution can be justified on the basis of any threat or fear that an immediate consideration of it would result in debate on the floor of the Senate over amendments to the resolution which would be offered by some who seem to be of the opinion that we should seek to restrict the United Nations as to the terms and conditions that it might recommend for a cease-fire order. My answer to that rationalization for postponing action on the resolution is simply to say—let such a debate come. It would be a further lesson to people in other countries as to the superiority of our system of political freedom and constitutional processes. Further, I say let such a debate come because now is the time to find out whether we are going to accept the jurisdiction of the United Nations.

The principles of the Humphrey resolution should have been written into the resolution that was passed by the Congress last week. If that resolution had clearly pledged the United States to accept the jurisdiction of the United Nations over the Formosan issue, the entire nature and content of the Senate debate would have been different.

The failure to take early action on the Humphrey resolution only tends to strengthen the fears of many of us who believe that there are powerful forces in America both in and out of the Congress and in other branches of the Government who are seeking a showdown war with Red China and Red Russia now.

I am confident that we can and will fight such a war successfully, if it should be forced upon us by an act of war committed against us or against our allies. But I think we should be very careful to see to it that we follow a course of action that will leave no room for doubt in any capital of the world of our complete willingness to follow the jurisdiction of the United Nations under the charter of which we are a signatory with all the solemn obligations that flow therefrom.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the junior Senator from South Dakota cannot let this matter rest on the remarks of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], if his remarks would imply in any way a modification of what I definitely understood to be the portion of the President's proposal with respect to the place of the United Nations in meeting the situation in the Pacific.

During the debate in the Senate on January 28, last week, when I was speaking, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] asked:

Is it not a vital essential that we rely upon all means at our command, including our own Armed Forces, until such time as the United Nations has acquired the means to enforce its own decisions?

I read further:

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. When it comes to a matter of forces, yes. But I wish to affirm very definitely that the part of the message of the President in which he stated he would welcome action by the United Nations to obtain a cease-fire in the Formosa Straits was an integral part of his proposal.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true.

At that point I wish to read into the RECORD today the precise words of the President of the United States in his special message to the Congress, namely, the special message of January 24, when he submitted the Formosa proposal. In his message, as it appears on page 2 of the House Document 76, the President said:

Clearly, this existing and developing situation poses a serious danger to the security of our country and of the entire Pacific area and indeed to the peace of the world. We believe—

The President said—

that the situation is one for appropriate action of the United Nations under its charter, for the purpose of ending the present hostilities in that area.

Then the President said:

We would welcome assumption of such jurisdiction by that body.

The President went on to say:

Meanwhile, the situation has become sufficiently critical to impel me, without awaiting action by the United Nations, to ask the Congress to participate now, by specific resolution, in measures designed to improve the prospects for peace.

So, Mr. President, that was the reason why, on Friday of last week, I said:

I wish to affirm very definitely that the part of the message of the President in which he stated he would welcome action by the United Nations to obtain a cease-fire in the Formosa Straits was an integral part of his proposal.

Mr. President, I am not a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I do not know what transpired in that committee this morning, or what statements which may have been made there have alarmed the Senator from Oregon. But, as one Member of the Senate and, furthermore, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, which heard the proposals as they were presented earlier last week by Secretary Dulles and by the head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and by the Joint Chiefs of Staff themselves, I wish to state very emphatically that my vote for the Formosa joint resolution and my statement of last Friday were bottomed on the part of the message of the President in which he said he would welcome "appropriate action of the United Nations under its Charter, for the purpose of ending the present hostilities in that area."

That was an integral part of his proposal; and I repeat it today, and I wish to have it made a part of the legislative record.

Furthermore, I call attention to the other way in which the United Nations is implicated, insofar as we are concerned, in the action we took on last Friday; for, on last Friday, I said:

Furthermore, in my own thinking, I also place a good deal of reliance upon the fact that the authority the President requested would terminate when he reported to the Congress that the peace and security of the area had reasonably been assured through action taken by the United Nations or otherwise.

Mr. President, those words are taken from the last sentence of the joint resolution. So I pointed out that:

The last sentence of the joint resolution includes specific language to that effect.

Again I wish to read the last sentence of the joint resolution which was passed by the Senate on last Friday. That sentence reads as follows:

This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, and shall so report to the Congress.

Mr. President, I recognize that no one Senator can bind any other Senator's expressions, opinions, or thoughts; but it seems to me that the recitation of the statement in the President's proposal, to which I have called direct attention, namely:

> We believe that the situation is one for appropriate action of the United Nations under its charter, for the purpose of ending the present hostilities in that area.

And the further statement that "we would welcome assumption of such jurisdiction by that body" should be conclusive.

I cite those sentences in the message of the President, in submitting to the Congress the Formosa joint resolution, and the further sentence in the joint resolution itself, namely, that the authority of the joint resolution will terminate when the President reports that a cessation of hostilities or a satisfactory arrangement has been obtained "by action of the United Nations or otherwise."

Those specific references to the United Nations have written a record; and what any individual Senator may say as to his fear about what the United Nations may do or may not do cannot change the fact that the Senate acted upon that submission by the President, in which he welcomed action by the United Nations, and also on the wording of the joint resolution itself, which says that the authority it grants will terminate when the President reports that "the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise."

That record is written. While the junior Senator from South Dakota happened to call attention to these statements in his remarks of last Friday, they are a part of the RECORD; they are found in the President's proposal and in his message to the Congress, and a provision to the same effect is in the joint resolution itself.

Mr. President, my reason for emphasizing this is that I do not want individual expressions, either on the floor of the Senate or off the floor of the Senate, in any way to give to the country the impression that the Senate or the Congress is welshing in any degree upon the express reliance, which was written into the President's message on the joint resolution, upon the idea of expecting or welcoming action by the United Nations. True, it is that we said we would take action, if necessary, alone; but that was conditioned upon recognizing action by the United Nations when it came.

So I call attention to that because I think the country and the world should know that we do welcome action of the United Nations, and that we earnestly hope and pray that it may be successful in attaining what the joint resolution describes, namely, "that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my reply to the Senator from South Dakota will involve these points:

First, there is no question about the fact that the President of the United States would welcome United Nations' intervention and participation in the Formosa situation. He said so in his message.

Second, there is no question about the fact that he is cooperating in the United Nations' attempt now to put on its agenda, as they have voted to do, a proposal for a cease-fire.

But the President's message is not a part of the joint resolution which was passed by Congress, and in the joint resolution there is no wording which involves an affirmative petition that the United Nations proceed to intervene in the case.

The Senator from South Dakota has referred to the language in the last paragraph of the joint resolution, which provides, in effect, that the joint resolution shall come to an end if certain conditions are fulfilled, one of which might be action by the United Nations. But that is not an affirmative request that the United Nations proceed to take jurisdiction. It is not an affirmative statement on the part of the Congress of the United States that we want our President to proceed through the United Nations. In this hour of crisis we ought to deal in the affirmative, not in the negative. We should be direct and not indirect in our approach to this crisis.

The second point I wish to make is that I am satisfied that President Dwight Eisenhower will do everything he can to avoid a war in the South Pacific. I have complete confidence in his intentions of peace. When I said earlier this afternoon that I fear what the result will be of peace or war in the Pacific if it is left to the unilateral action of the United States and Red China, and Red Russia, I meant it, in the sense that I fear that if the United Nations does not take jurisdiction and does not impose some prohibition—to use a descriptive term, a preliminary injunction against the disputants—until the United Nations can decide the issues on the merits, there is great danger that others besides the President of the United States may follow a course of action in the South Pacific which will involve us in a war.

That is my fear, and that is why I think it is so important to bring the United Nations into this question affirmatively, openly, and effectively at the earliest possible hour.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I will not yield until I complete my reply to the Senator from South Dakota.

That is why I say I think it was so important that we should have incorporated in the resolution passed last week, the heart and substance of the Humphrey amendment or resolution. Do not forget, the Humphrey amendment was to be offered last week to the joint resolution. Do not forget that there were conferences in the cloakrooms, as there always are when matters of such vital concern are before the Senate.

It was urged, because of a technical parliamentary point, that the Humphrey amendment with respect to the United Nations had to be offered to a "whereas" clause; and an amendment to a "whereas" clause in the preamble could not be offered until a vote had been taken on the joint resolution itself. It was urged that perhaps what he ought to do was to submit the Humphrey amendment as a separate resolution, to be considered today. The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee rose—and the RECORD will so show—and expressed approval of the so-called compromise of the parliamentary procedure which was entered into with the Senator from Minnesota and the others of us who were cosponsors of the Humphrey amendment to the joint resolution. It was stated that the proposed resolution would be taken up on Tuesday. We went along with that suggestion. There was no suggestion then by anyone that we would not proceed expeditiously and without delay to bring the resolution to the floor of the Senate.

I do not charge anyone with bad faith. I simply say that it is very disappointing, and I think unfortunate, that on the floor of the Senate today we are not debating the Humphrey resolution on the basis of a report from the Foreign Relations Committee. Instead, we are confronted with a situation in which the Foreign Relations Committee has postponed action on the Humphrey resolution.

What does that resolution provide? I am interested in finding out how many Members of the Senate dissent from it. I think the world ought to know to what extent the Government of the United States, through its legislative body, dissents from this resolution.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I will not yield at this point, until I conclude this argument. Then I shall yield.

First, we have the so-called "whereas" clauses of the Humphrey resolution. The first such clause is:

> Whereas the President of the United States on January 19, 1955, stated that he would "like to see the United Nations attempt to exercise its good offices" with respect to arranging a cease-fire between Communist China and Nationalist China.

That is language from the message of the President, which the Senator from South Dakota has quoted. It is language in the message which I highly praised, because it reflects the spirit and intent of a policy which I think we ought to be following; but we ought to be following it as a matter of legislative action, and not by way of individual speeches by Senators or messages by the President.

The next whereas clause reads as follows:

> Whereas the President in his message of January 24 stated that the situation in the Pacific area "is one for appropriate action of the United Nations under its charter."

Again, a sentiment and a point of view with which I completely agree, and a statement by the President which I highly praised last week, because again, I think it is the course of action which the United States should follow:

> Whereas House Joint Resolution 159 provides that it shall expire when he determines that peace in the area is "reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise."

Again, that is language which the Senator from South Dakota has quoted, and upon which, along with the message of the President, he bottoms his case almost entirely; but it is not an affirmative request that the United Nations proceed. It is only the negative recognition that it might proceed, and that after it shall have proceeded, if it settles the controversy, the joint resolution we passed last week would automatically end.

That is an entirely different thing from the Congress of the United States amending a joint resolution, or the Senate approving an independent resolution saying that it is the sense of the Senate that the United Nations should proceed to exercise jurisdiction on this critical Formosan issue.

Next we come to the resolving clause. I should like to know now, as I expressed a desire to know in the Foreign Relations Committee this morning, what is wrong with such a request:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that it would be in the interest of the United States and of world peace for the United Nations to take prompt action to bring about a cease-fire in the area of hostilities off the coast of China and in the Formosa Straits, and the President is requested to take appropriate steps to achieve that objective.

That is in the affirmative. In my judgment, that is in line with our clear moral and legal obligations to the United Nations, so long as the signature of the United States is attached to the solemn document creating that organization. Why do we not do it? Let us look at a hypothetical or two.

I think the fallacy in the "fear" arguments of those who want postponement of the consideration of this resolution is that it does not follow that if all their fears should come to pass, we would then be in any different position than we shall be in if we do not approve the resolution.

As was brought out by one of my distinguished colleagues in argument this morning—and I thought it was an unanswerable argument—"Cite any major issue in connection with Formosa or Southeast Asia on which our allies in the United Nations have turned us down." We have won every point to date. Why have we won it? Because I think, on the merits of the argument, we have been able to show that we are right. Ambassador Lodge has won issue after issue because of the unanswerability of America's case. We have won the arguments in the United Nations because they have been based upon America's historic policy of peace and justice. That is why we have won them.

What are we afraid of now? We have no right to be afraid when our cause is just. Our cause is what? Defense of Formosa and the Pescadores—the defense of America's line of defense from the Aleutians down through Japan, the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand. We have a legal obligation growing out of both the Cairo agreement and the Japanese Peace Treaty to see to it that no blood bath is visited upon the Nationalist Chinese on Formosa.

A new element has crept into this debate in recent weeks. In September the policy of this administration was that Quemoy and the Matsus were not vital to American interests in the Pacific, and not essential to the defense of Formosa. Since then something has happened. Now there are those who even suggest—and I am shocked by the suggestion—that perhaps we had better pretend the islands are essential, in order to use them for bargaining purposes. Anyone who advances that idea is advocating a principle which cannot be reconciled with America's dedication to the highest moral standards in the positions she has always taken in international negotiations. I do not believe we have a right to go into international negotiations by way of a subterfuge any more than I believe one of us has the right to sit down with an individual in a bargaining position and seek by subterfuge to obtain an advantage.

Either the islands are essential to our defense in the Pacific, or they are not. Either we have a legal claim to them, or we have not. I believe that the debate last week proved beyond the shadow of a doubt that we have no legal claim to the Quemoys and the Matsus. We have no legal right to be on the Quemoys and the Matsus. I believe we jeopardize our position in the Pacific if we assert such a right.

And, furthermore, Mr. President, I believe we feed the furnaces of Russian propaganda and Red China's propaganda to whatever extent we suggest that we are going to defend the Quemoys and the Matsus.

As Professor Morgenthau said in his great article which appeared in the Sunday Chicago Sun-Times, the Quemoys and the Matsus are not steppingstones to Formosa; the Quemoys and the Matsus are steppingstones to the mainland of China.

If we take the position that we can strike against the mainland of China in the event our military intelligence indicates that a strike is about to be made against the Quemoys and the Matsus, we have maneuvered America into an intolerable position so far as international judgment is concerned. I happen to be one who believes that the judgment will be against us if we strike the mainland of China because we believe a strike is about to be committed, or has been committed, for that matter, against the Quemoys and Matsus.

These have not been nights of 8 hours continuous sleep for me. No one can face these problems—and all of us have been greatly disturbed by them during the past few days—no one can face these problems as a United States Senator and go to bed and enjoy continuous sleep.

The problem that gives me sleepless hours is the difficult one of what we are going to do to protect the Nationalist troops on the Quemoys and Matsus. We cannot walk out on them and leave them to a blood bath.

That is why I am pleading for the most speedy possible action by the United Nations by way of some kind of temporary order, to use legal language, that will make clear to Red Russia and to Red China that a blood bath imposed upon the Nationalist Chinese troops on the Quemoys and the Matsus will be considered a violation of the obligations of peace which every nation under the United Nations Charter is obligated to defend and protect. Red Russia is a member of the United Nations, and she is the master of her servant, Red China.

Without being bound with any finality by this thinking out loud as to the kind of temporary order that should be made, I believe the United Nations ought to lay down, as soon as necessary procedures can be complied with, a clear statement that the Nationalist Chinese shall be allowed to withdraw from the Quemoys and the Matsus within a reasonable period of time, and that no attack against them will be tolerated by the United Nations. In that way we would be relieved of the unilateral threat that we have been making that we will respond alone.

I believe it is that threat that has so rocked the capitals of the world within the past few days.

Then, if the Nationalist Chinese take the position, in spite of the protection which the United Nations seeks to give them, that they nevertheless will stay on the islands, they will do so at their own risk as a participant in a Chinese civil war.

I do not believe the United States should become involved in a Chinese civil war over the Quemoys and the Matsus. If the Nationalist troops withdraw to Formosa, we will protect them on Formosa.

Our military authorities, although they point out it will be more difficult to do, say the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores nevertheless can be consummated without possessing the Quemoys and the Matsus. The American people should be on guard against the representation of some of those who are urging that we defend the Quemoy and Matsu Islands to the effect that maintaining control of those islands by the United States is absolutely essential to the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores. Such a representation is not true. On the other hand, if we refuse to undertake the defense of the Quemoys and the Matsus we ruin and puncture the balloon of one of the Communist propaganda devices, namely, that we are trying to hold the Quemoys and the Matsus as stepping stones to the mainland of China. Let us make clear to the world that we have no intention of stepping onto the mainland of China unless China makes war against us. Let us make that perfectly clear.

I believe that is another one of the indirect accomplishments which would result from the adoption of the Humphrey resolution. I believe the greatest hope for preserving peace in the days immediately ahead—and now it is touch and go, and nip and tuck—is to make perfectly clear, affirmatively and directly, not negatively or indirectly, that we are calling upon the United Nations and that it is the sense of this Government that we call on it to take jurisdiction over the Formosan issue.

The last point I wish to make, before yielding to the Senator from South Dakota or yielding the floor, is that there is no justification for the fears of those who say they will not vote for the

Humphrey resolution without amendments, which would really destroy its spirit and intent.

What are some of those fears? One of them is that the United Nations will lay down a rule that Red China must be admitted to the United Nations. I do not believe it. I believe that our international lawyers can build up an unanswerable case to show that Red China does not have a single just claim for admission to the United Nations at this time.

She has no right to admission to the United Nations so long as she continues to violate her agreements over Korea. She has violated them in instances the recital of which would require a long time. She has no right to admission to the United Nations so long as she keeps imprisoned, without legal justification, in Communist jails Americans and citizens of other free nations. She has no right to admission to the United Nations until she demonstrates by record that she can be relied upon to keep her international commitments. She has no right to be admitted into the United Nations so long as she keeps the Iron Curtain dropped and continues by threats and propaganda and intrigue and subversion and espionage to undermine free institutions and the free governments in many of the free lands of the world.

Nor do I think there is any basis for the fear that if we adopt the Humphrey resolution we shall invite the United Nations to render some decision which would take from Formosa the protection of the United Nations, because, in my opinion, with our power in the Pacific and our vital interests in the Pacific, it is important for as many years as it is going to take to settle the issue on a juridical basis that we protect Formosa physically, through the United Nations, from domination and control by Red China.

That is my position on that point, Mr. President, and I see not one word in the Humphrey resolution that would indicate that the United Nations would hand down a decision such as some of our colleagues fear would be handed down.

Mr. President, I come now to the question which is supposed to put me under the desk, if I listen to some of my colleagues. Suppose the United Nations should hand down a decision contrary to the arguments and pleas we make in presenting our side of the Formosa issue? My answer is that if we have made the best case we can make, if we have argued our point of view, and the United Nations does not agree with us in all or some respects then at that point I would say it would be a historic mistake for our country to go it alone. It would be a historic mistake for our Government to establish the precedent that if we did not like the decision, we would go it alone, because we would throw back, I think for centuries, the goal which is the ideal of America, the goal of permanent peace based upon a system of international justice through law.

As a nation and as individuals we have to learn that when a court of last resort rules against us we must take the law handed down by the court. I pray for the future of mankind if the United States, the most powerful Nation in the world, should ever take the position that because of our power and because of our present military might, we would go ahead with strong-arm methods and override the United Nations if it should hand down a decision against us. I pray my country will never resort to the jungle law of force. That is why, with a sincerity as deep as is that of the Senator from South Dakota—and I know of no man in the Senate more sincere or more devoted to the convictions of his conscience than is the Senator from South Dakota—I think the Humphrey resolution would be the most effective "atomic bomb" for peace that could be dropped on the world today. It would be clear proof that the legislative body of this Government, and the President, who, in his message, I submit, to all intents and purposes, has endorsed the spirit of this resolution, are looking to the juridical processes of the United Nations to settle the issue of peace or war in the Pacific.

I now yield for a question, or I shall be glad to yield the floor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I deeply respect the sincerity of the Senator from Oregon, not only in this, but in other matters, and I respect the urge which drove him to make the statement which he has made. But there is one very great difference between the position of the senior Senator from Oregon and my position at this point. We both welcome action by the United Nations, but the Senator from Oregon stated that he would like to determine whether there was any dissent in the Senate to having action taken by the United Nations. He is interested in determining how many dissenters there are.

Mr. President, if there be dissent in the Senate over the point which was implicit in responding to the President's proposal that the United Nations take action, or that we rely upon the action of the United Nations, I am not interested in determining the number of dissenters. I would not, Mr. President, by any single word of mine today, weaken in any respect the responsibility which rests upon the Government of the United States to welcome action by the United Nations. I do not see how we can avoid in any way the fact that in this proposal the President did say that he would welcome the assumption of such jurisdiction by that body. Let me again quote a few words from the President's message:

> We believe that the situation is one for appropriate action of the United Nations under its charter for the purpose of ending the present hostilities in that area. We would welcome the assumption of such jurisdiction by that body.

That was a clear-cut statement by the President of the United States of the premises upon which the resolution was being submitted to the Congress. I think it would have been weakened had we put a "whereas" clause into the resolution. That is why I did not favor that course of action being followed, I thought it would imply in some way that we were weakening the resolution, or that we did not take at face value the words of the President when he said we would welcome action by the United Nations, or the words of the resolution itself, in the resolving clause, the really effective part of the resolution, where in the concluding sentence recognition of the United Nations is written.

I would not want action to be taken which could be construed as weakening that position. I do not know to what extent there is any dissent from the view that the United Nations should take action or that we would welcome action by it. I did feel last Friday, when we were concluding our action, that for myself I wished to make it perfectly clear that my vote for the resolution and against amendments was bottomed upon the fact that a part of the proposal of the President was to welcome action by the United Nations and upon the clause in the resolution itself to which we have alluded so many times in the debate.

I also invite attention to the fact that in the conclusion of my remarks last Friday evening I recognized the situation which the senior Senator from Oregon has mentioned, namely, the necessity for somebody to take the initiative in securing action by the United Nations. As I thought about it, it occurred to me that it would be difficult, and it possibly would not be the best tactic, for the United States itself to take the initiative, because, whether we like it or not, to a certain extent we have become parties to the Formosa Strait issue by the presence of our troops there and by the orders given to the Seventh Fleet, and so forth, so that any solution we might propose would seem to be the solution of a party in interest. So I said this at the very conclusion of my remarks last Friday night:

> I do not think we shall solve the problem immediately before the Senate by looking at the jurisdictional questions. There is a practical situation facing us. I am hopeful that the efforts of Australia, New Zealand, and Great Britain, all three of whom, I understand, are endeavoring to induce the United Nations to endeavor to obtain a cease-fire, will be successful. In my opinion, someone who is not a party to the immediate issues must take the lead right now. We might propose the action to the United Nations, but we are in a delicate position. So someone who is not a party must take the lead. The initiative will have to be carried by someone else and if Australia or New Zealand or the Prime Minister of Great Britain, by their representatives, are able to initiate action, I wish them success.

I concluded with this sentence:

> I hope the expectation and the prayer of our President—

I wish to interpolate to say that I interpreted this statement to be essentially an expectation and a prayer on the part of the President—

> that some way may be found to avoid conflict may be wholly achieved, and it is in that hope that I am supporting the resolution.

So, Mr. President, while I desire, just as earnestly, I think, as does the senior Senator from Oregon, to have the United Nations take the initiative and point the way to a solution of this problem, I do not desire to have the RECORD indicate that the failure of the Committee on Foreign Relations—and I am not a

member of that committee—to report the Humphrey resolution today shades or minimizes or modifies in any respect the clear understanding which I had last Friday night in voting for the resolution which was then before the Senate. There was a clear understanding that we would welcome action by the United Nations, as the President had said; and the resolution itself provides tremendous authority to the President for unilateral action until appropriate action is taken by the United Nations to achieve the desired result.

I think also that the obligations which rest upon the members of the United Nations in the difficult situation which today exists calls upon them to attempt to work out a solution.

Personally, I welcome the statements of various public leaders in New Zealand, Australia, and Great Britain to the effect that they would attempt to have action taken by the United Nations.

I welcome also a statement by Mr. Molotov that he would transmit to Red China the suggestion that the matter be referred to the United Nations.

As the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, was quoted as saying the other day, we cannot afford in these circumstances to close our ears or to close the door to any possibility of a peaceful solution of this situation. I think it is important that we try to get the issues before the United Nations.

I do not want the President to feel in any way that anything has happened to indicate any dissent in any degree whatsoever from the acceptance of his statement that we would welcome action by the United Nations.

CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATIONS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, as the Senate is still in executive session, I ask that the nominations on the Executive Calendar be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated in order.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Glen E. Edgerton, of the District of Columbia, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Lynn U. Stambaugh, of North Dakota, to be First Vice President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Hawthorne Arey, of Nebraska, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George A. Blowers, of Florida, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Vance Brand, of Ohio, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I move that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations, and also of the ratification of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until noon on Friday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM FOR FRIDAY

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I desire to announce the program for Friday.

On Friday it is proposed to have the Senate consider Calendar No. 15, Senate Resolution 49, to extend the times by which the Committee on the Judiciary may conduct studies and investigations; Calendar No. 16, Senate Resolution 13, to investigate certain problems relating to interstate and foreign commerce; Calendar No. 17, Senate Resolution 25, authorizing the employment of an additional clerical assistant by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; Calendar No. 18, Senate Resolution 34, authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to employ 4 additional temporary clerical assistants; Calendar No. 21, Senate Resolution 28, extending the authority of the Committee on Armed Services for hearings and investigations; Calendar No. 22, Senate Resolution 23, to investigate problems relating to economic stabilization and mobilization; Calendar No. 23, Senate Resolution 36, extending the time for a study by the Committee on Foreign Relations of technical assistance and related programs; Calendar No. 24, Senate Resolution 37, providing additional funds for the study of strategic and critical materials by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; and Calendar No. 25, Senate Resolution 39, authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to employ temporary additional assistants.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand adjourned until Friday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being under the order previously entered, until Friday, February 4, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 1, 1955:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

George T. Moore, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Curtis Clark, of Kentucky, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Kentucky, vice John M. Moore, retired.

Lama A. DeMunbrun, of Kentucky, to be United States marshal for the western district of Kentucky, vice Loomis E. Cranor, retired.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named persons for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of section 407, Public Law 351, 81st Congress (Career Compensation Act of 1949):

To be major

Robert Crawford, 10333A.

To be captain

Leota H. Clark, 21095W.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947); title II, Public Law 365, 80th Congress (Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947); and section 307 (b), Public Law 150, 82d Congress (Air Force Organization Act of 1951), with a view to designation for the performance of duties as indicated:

To be majors, USAF (Medical)

David W. Davis, AO521575.
James T. Hardy, AO2260447.
Leon A. Knight, AO2260147.

To be captains, USAF (Medical)

Edgar N. Gipson, AO1906336.
Clarence Langerak, AO727227.
Donald J. Largo, AO2240757.
John C. Wells, Jr., AO1906320.

To be captains, USAF (Dental)

Vance L. Crouse, AO862546.
Robert W. Hayes, AO1906508.
Edward Jones, O61078.
Julius G. R. Staerkel, AO1907285.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical)

John A. Barrett, Jr., AO3000121.
Robert R. Burwell, AO2260645.
Richard L. Butler, O1939081.
Laully J. Credeur, O1940138.
Walter A. Fairfax, Jr.
Billye G. Gant, AO694665.
Theodore J. Haywood.
James M. Lancaster, Sr., AO2260204.
Victor J. Lash.
Michael J. Maffei.
Joseph A. Murney, AO939124.
Howard M. Pollack, AO3001185.
Russell E. Randall, Jr., AO2261683.
James P. Taylor.
Robert Van Hoek.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Dental)

Sam R. Adkisson, AO1906549.
Jack E. Troutt, O985900.

To be first lieutenant, USAF (Medical Service)

Frank M. Isbell, AO2239819.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947), and section 307 (b), Public Law 150, 82d Congress (Air Force Organization

Act of 1951), with a view to designation for the performance of duties as indicated:

To be captain, USAF (Judge Advocate)

Walter L. Lewis, AO2069057.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Judge Advocate)

William E. Cordingly, AO2217187.
James S. Haught, AO2216194.
Colonel S. Ray, Jr., AO1864887.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Chaplain)

Curtis M. Bean, AO2249234.
John B. Schoning, AO2253278.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be first lieutenants

Robert K. Ace, AO1854892.
Eugene W. Ainsworth, Jr., AO1912134.
Leon W. Amos, AO2075831.
John E. Anderson, AO591615.
Robert S. Anderson, AO1910361.
Tom M. Arnold, Jr., AO1856879.
Oliver P. Arquilla, AO1908489.
Marcus L. Arwine, AO2219105.
William E. Augsburger, AO1912199.
Frank D. Baker, AO1911955.
William C. Barnes, AO2222163.
William E. Barnes, AO1905286.
Ben A. Barone, AO1909822.
Carl A. Barr, AO2060453.
Frank J. Bath, Jr., AO1911337.
Robert W. Bazley, AO2086462.
Billingsley Beatie, AO1860763.
Joseph P. Beaulieu, Jr., AO1911465.
William R. Benbow, AO1865021.
Joseph C. Biscone, Jr., AO2101967.
Leon A. Blackmon, AO1856660.
Charles E. Blair, AO2025062.
Morton C. Blaisdell, AO773998.
Hugh S. Bowden, AO1910306.
Donald J. Bowen, AO1907660.
Wallace R. Boyer, AO2233302.
William R. Brazill, AO946543.
James E. Briggs, AO2219138.
Thomas R. Brock, AO2070611.
Robert O. Brockman, AO687671.
William D. Brockmeyer, AO2231702.
Gerald Brown, AO770160.
James T. Brumbeloe, AO2230634.
Deane B. Bruning, AO1903056.
James C. Buckner, AO710812.
Herbert Bunker, Jr., AO1908886.
Paul H. Bynum, AO2234690.
Milton M. Byron, AO1910454.
Billy J. Carter, AO2077727.
Robert W. Casey, AO2075844.
Chester E. Chellman, Jr., AO2222199.
John P. Cherney, AO941826.
William L. Childers, AO842598.
Harrison B. Clancey, Jr., AO930388.
Eubert W. Clark, AO820225.
Stanley S. Clark, AO1911081.
Jack D. Clement, AO1907653.
John S. Coady, Jr., AO2222111.
Ray B. Coffman, AO1849089.
Alan Coville, AO2222138.
Robert W. Cowne, AO2219170.
Myron K. Cox, AO2218647.
John C. Crocker, AO2228600.
Thomas M. Dailey, AO2077218.
David E. Davenport, AO2089360.
John G. Davis, AO939545.
George A. Day, AO2083856.
Robert E. L. Day, AO1853802.
Harry C. DeLaney, Jr., AO1909028.
Peter E. Dempsey, AO2086796.
Robert B. Doggett, AO1860742.
Carl E. Donahue, AO2234569.
Robert F. Donohue, AO2068973.
Thornton T. Doss, AO2216521.
Charles R. Dougherty, AO784311.
Flavious F. Drake, AO815544.
Kenneth E. Druckenbrodt, AO823819.
Obadiah A. Dugan, AO2094177.
Charles M. Dunn, Jr., AO1853609.
James D. Duval, Jr., AO2074678.
Loren S. Eastman, Jr., AO944941.
Warren B. Eaton, AO776256.
John A. Eckweiler, AO1911915.
Jerome J. Eichhorn, AO1863689.
Roscoe F. Epperson, AO1909732.
Charles E. Evans, Jr., AO2075156.
Clyde G. Evans, AO2221835.
Howard R. Eyer, AO2100374.
J. Logan Fagner, AO1909472.
Clifford L. Fenell, Jr., AO1849343.
Victor G. Fisher, AO788752.
Francis P. Fitzgerald, AO737756.
Eugene C. Fletcher, AO2215097.
Myron D. Forbes, AO837917.
Jack B. Ford, AO1857904.
Hugh B. Foster, AO1848094.
Robert E. Foster, AO2231510.
Norman C. Gaddis, AO788180.
Laurence F. Gardner, AO1862954.
Henry L. Gibbs, AO678023.
Daniel C. Gilmore, AO2222726.
James M. Glassmeyer, AO1910590.
James E. Gore, AO2219209.
Harold L. Griffith, AO1848067.
Joseph M. Griffin, AO2232729.
Truman L. Griswold, AO826943.
Marvin E. Grunzke, AO590540.
Cipriano F. Guerra, Jr., AO968486.
Frank S. Guzak, AO829683.
William J. Hagan, AO2222437.
Carl F. Hale, Jr., AO888814.
Harold T. Hamilton, AO1905045.
Robert G. Hamilton, AO2023071.
Earle S. Hamley, AO1861479.
Theodore J. Hammer, AO787497.
Donald A. Haney, AO1910872.
Donald C. Hanto, AO1861171.
Warren J. Hare, AO671535.
Roger D. Harrington, AO1847028.
Thomas P. Harrison, AO2076634.
Warren G. Haugen, AO842031.
Frank J. Heffernan, AO937676.
Lexie E. Herrin, AO2088062.
John S. Hines, AO2219231.
Franklin J. Hitt, AO591358.
Robert D. Hoffman, AO1850735.
Robert W. Hoffman, AO2099469.
Ralph S. Hoggatt, AO778472.
Wallace G. Holder, AO1909986.
Edgar A. Holmes, AO2083902.
Victor H. Hopple, AO2095414.
Charles E. Horton, AO2076303.
David F. Howard, AO2222006.
Robert V. Hudgens, AO2222233.
Walter W. Hudkins, AO2081083.
Lawrence R. Hulsey, AO710701.
Thomas R. Humphrey, AO1910889.
John D. Hungerford, AO1909987.
William J. Huxley, AO1909162.
Ronald L. Ingraham, AO1862999.
John E. Jarrell, AO2076641.
Charles B. Jiggetts, AO1904809.
Frank M. Joachim, AO2222518.
George W. Johnson, Jr. AO1865876.
James W. Johnson Jr., AO824495.
Lloyd F. Johnson, AO941087.
Bruce D. Jones, AO1911103.
John E. Jones, AO1853221.
Donald A. Kaehlert, AO2235072.
Dudley G. Kavanaugh, AO2066676.
Elwood A. Kees, Jr., AO1909491.
Frank O. Keller, AO1910983.
Walter R. Keller, AO2222550.
Burton M. Kellogg, AO1909325.
John L. Kelly II, AO1909326.
William L. Kieffer, Jr., AO838266.
Robert C. Kimble, AO838331.
Roy W. King, AO830245.
William E. Kinnikin, AO1849906.
Grady E. Kitchens, AO1911855.
Edward Klosterman, AO1696883.
Robert L. Kollman, Jr., AO2069553.
Herman L. Knapp, AO2233425.
Clarence S. Kuritzky, AO1908559.
Myron L. Kuzma, AO2022851.
Edward M. Ladou, AO1908691.
Norman C. Lamb, AO770316.
William H. Landers, Jr., AO1909073.
Glen Lingenfelter, AO1853949.
Barton C. Libby, AO705977.
Horace G. Linscomb, Jr., AO1909614.
George J. Liotis, AO748613.
Patrick G. Long, AO2217101.
James G. MacAlpine, Jr., AO2218175.
Richard C. Malot, AO2222388.
Paul D. Marks, AO2072830.
Shirrel G. Martin, AO1909342.
Horace W. Martineau, AO2222447.
Robert J. Massoni, AO782771.
William H. Matthews, Jr., AO774239.
Eugene E. McClurg, AO937836.
Thomas G. McConnell, AO2218104.
Richard D. McCreary, AO2231766.
Gene S. McElroy, AO2222053.
Ivan L. McGuire, AO820294.
Frank B. McKenzie, AO1857122.
Donald D. McLaren, AO824527.
Harold J. McLoud, Jr., AO2222263.
Allie E. McMullian, Jr., AO1848430.
Charles C. Mercer, AO2057359.
Charles E. Messerli, AO1909086.
James W. Miller, AO1909182.
Richard O. Miller, AO2082629.
Charles F. Minter, AO2090143.
Darrell J. Misgen, AO1858438.
Glenn L. Mitchell, AO1903984.
Ronald B. Montague, AO2233027.
Eugene E. Moody, AO1865470.
James L. Morton, AO2216243.
George A. Mursch, AO824541.
Milton E. Nelson, AO836328.
Charles A. Neuendorf, AO1911673.
Charles A. Neyhart, AO828028.
Tom H. Nichols, AO1854612.
Richard D. Noe, AO2228868.
Warren M. Odenthal, AO722873.
Norman E. Oram, AO2065607.
Stephen W. Pahs, AO1895954.
Wilson V. Palmore, AO839886.
Robert L. Parks, AO2024963.
Robert E. Parnelle, Jr., AO2081550.
Michael J. Paroby, AO2222398.
Edward C. Patterson, AO590222.
Leon Perekslis, AO1904857.
Melvin F. Petermann, AO833041.
Carl D. Peterson, AO767628.
Frank H. Pettway, AO2218758.
Delphin J. Pichon, AO1848480.
David W. Pinkerton, AO2065418.
Stanley Polezoes, AO706240.
Elliott W. Porter, AO779215.
Eugene R. Porter, AO1692749.
Freddie L. Poston, AO2085716.
Joseph M. Potts, AO1903248.
Mitchell A. Putt, AO2222401.
John L. Quann, AO2215161.
James B. Ramsey, AO1911440.
Robinson Risner, AO779602.
Harry F. Rizzo, AO2219012.
John R. Rogers, AO2218342.
Gene F. Rogge, AO2222017.
Robert W. Roig, AO1852356.
Rudolph F. Rose, Jr., AO2086298.
Elisha P. Sanders, AO2217133.
James L. Savage, AO2063101.
Richard O. Savoye, AO2231855.
Eugene D. Scott, AO1911514.
James K. Secrest, AO938352.
Norman G. Sexton, AO1911127.
John R. Sheekley, AO2232569.
Kenneth D. Sill, AO1909219.
Leslie K. Skews, AO2088000.
Warren L. Slagle, AO773839.
Donald A. Slezak, AO2222101.
Gerald E. Smallwood, AO1862424.
Kennard R. Smiley, AO1862514.
Click D. Smith, Jr., AO1863521.
Norman L. Smith, AO1863368.
Henry G. Snider, AO1862659.
Joseph Q. Spell, AO1911281.
Sidney M. Spilseth, AO1911947.
Glenn F. Stauffer, AO1861392.
Joseph N. Steingasser, AO1862660.
Henry L. Stevens, Jr., AO2232236.
Maurice R. St. George, AO785913.
Frank A. Stickney, AO2218187.
James S. Stimson, AO1904118.
Charles J. Stumpf, AO2222409.
Walter Suhar, AO926700.
Joseph V. Sullivan, AO1851774.
LeRoy W. Svendsen, Jr., AO1908601.
Kenneth C. Swisher, AO2083042.
Robert W. Taylor, AO2094399.

John D. Thompson, AO785145.
Richard J. Threlkeld, AO1904663.
Myron L. Tone, AO2092971.
Raphael O. Tuten, Jr., AO1851182.
Alvin Twitchell, AO2101948.
Lawrence D. Underwood, AO698056.
William L. VanMeter, AO815602.
Donald Vechik, AO2231675.
Paul W. VonWiedenfield, AO1908974.
Wilmer C. Walters, Jr., AO2233906.
Everett H. Webster, AO1859924.
Keith W. West, AO2216683.
William A. Weston, Jr., AO788618.
William C. Whicher, AO2216787.
Charles W. Wilkie, AO2072935.
Paul K. Wilkinson, AO2221709.
Garry A. Willard, Jr., AO1909791.
Robert E. Williams, AO780352.
Clayton A. Wilson III, AO2219405.
James L. Wilson, AO1910447.
James W. Witherspoon, Jr., AO2222655.
Joe E. Woelke, AO1910354.
John A. Wollmers, AO1911461.
Stanley C. Wood, AO2216771.
Edward Wootten, AO828867.
Paul R. Zavitz, AO2261921.

To be second lieutenants

Charles E. Adams, AO2226529.
Robert H. Allen, AO2228014.
Donald T. Anderson, AO2224185.
Carl G. Baily, AO2236808.
James R. Bennett, AO3021837.
Joseph A. Berthelot, AO3009213.
Chester A. Beverly, Jr., AO2220041.
Ronald A. Bird, AO2224815.
David E. Blais, AO2234466.
Albert S. Borchik, Jr., AO2226756.
Richard C. Brumfield, AO2247678.
Voris R. Burch, Jr., AO2244768.
Kelly H. Burke, Jr., AO2244761.
Curtis M. Burns, AO2244606.
John A. Caddell, AO2245267.
William E. Campbell, AO2244610.
Wayne E. Cantrell, AO2236539.
Donald G. Carpenter, AO1852454.
James H. Cash, AO2244928.
Marion F. Chamblee, AO2224323.
Albert E. Chapman, Jr., AO2224546.
Norman J. Clark, AO2249997.
Charles R. Coble, Jr., AO2260230.
Carl K. Coffman, AO2235551.
Paul T. Comeau, AO2250856.
Lawrence Y. Conaway, AO2247685.
Robert F. Coverdale, AO2246849.
James W. Culp, AO2245107.
Brice C. Custer, AO2227831.
Owen C. Davis, Jr., AO3005871.
John W. Dawson, AO2225822.
Donald A. Dees, AO2244698.
Kenneth P. DeMent, AO2229380.
Edgar H. Denk, Jr., AO2225285.
Howell A. Dennis, AO2247070.
Ralph C. Dresser, AO2244642.
Donald B. Fincher, AO3021871.
Robert A. Franklin, AO2224438.
Mark D. Gale, AO2237982.
Thomas G. Gargiulo, AO2226452.
Lawrence D. Garrison, AO2226303.
Robert C. Geiss, AO2224635.
Frank E. Gilk, AO2251211.
Richard J. Gipple, AO1851175.
Victor B. Goodrich, Jr., AO2252642.
Thomas L. Graham, AO1853614.
Horace R. Grant, AO3005194.
Arthur G. Greif, Jr., AO1865040.
John Hansen, AO2230422.
James W. Harrison, Jr., AO2246236.
James T. Harwood, AO3021960.
Ernest J. Herzwurm, AO2235091.
Joe E. Howard, AO2224932.
Franz W. Imker, AO1860704.
Allyn C. Johnson, AO3006358.
Donald C. Johnson, AO2224564.
Gordon J. Johnson, AO2225410.
Julian C. Johnson, Jr., AO2230273.
Eldon L. Keebaugh, AO2247094.
Joseph C. Kent, AO2227180.
Melbourne Kimsey, AO3009865
Douglas A. Kraus, AO2246299.
Robert W. Kunstel, AO2226853.
Joseph K. Lambert, A2249023.
Robert G. Lapham, AO2227472.
Melvin M. LaVail, AO2251184.
Jerry W. Lawson, AO2227770.
Edwin A. Liddell, AO3004554.
Rudolph L. Magnane, AO2220679.
Peter A. Marinelli, AO2246656.
Billy J. McNair, AO2227717.
Frank F. Mead III, AO2228332.
Brian G. Moore, AO2249612.
William A. Murphy, AO3005531.
Charles H. Neale, AO2226063.
Frederick C. Obarr, AO2246257.
Kenneth D. Ohman, AO2236968.
Henry R. Parnell, Jr., AO3005027.
Beverly S. Parrish, Jr., AO3014605.
William M. Penney, AO2253141.
Harold G. Pierce, AO2227022.
Lucian W. Pinckney, AO2227558.
Paul J. Plucinsky, AO2225492.
Thomas D. Portanova, AO2225629.
John C. Poston, AO3005422.
William E. Rains, AO2230515.
Raymond V. Reyes, Jr., AO2229611.
Noel R. Reynolds, AO2228196.
James H. Rigney, Jr., AO3022145.
Robert D. Ringle, AO2245056.
Kenneth E. Robins, AO2229518.
John S. Roosma, Jr., AO3004962.
Robert W. Ruffin, AO2225808.
Herman E. Schumacher, AO3007136.
Wilburn R. Schrank, AO2236132.
John K. Schroeder, Jr., AO2247979.
Douglas M. Schwartz, AO2249327.
Maurice E. Seaver, Jr., AO2225883.
Lowell E. Shearer, AO2224255.
David W. Stahl, AO2246971.
Robert T. Slater, AO2225217.
Fendrick J. Smith, Jr., AO2224256.
Herman C. Stafford, Jr., AO2245730.
Richard C. Stanley, AO2229913.
Marvin A. Starn, AO3005930.
James F. Stech, AO3004542.
Elmer L. Strom, AO2100967.
Michael E. Styer, AO3004648.
Richard L. Sullivan, AO2235303.
Harry K. Taylor, AO2219977.
Thomas H. Thompson, AO3006517.
Jack E. Tullett, AO3005579.
William T. Twinting, AO2227748.
Vern F. VanBuskirk, AO3006630.
Dean A. Wadsworth, AO3005207.
Chester A. Walborn, AO2227932.
James C. Webb, AO2237480.
James H. Webber, AO3021547.
William R. White, AO3007216.
Conrad I. Williams, AO2225275.
William J. Wilson, AO2247871.
William E. Winemiller, AO2254823.
Edward D. Young, AO2233713.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947); and section 301, Public Law 625, 80th Congress (Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948):

To be first lieutenant

Juanita D. Schiltz, AL2236010.

To be second lieutenants

Mina P. Costin, AL2238160.
Mary L. Crosby, AL2220096.
Jessie J. Heney, AL2220596.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate Tuesday, February 1, 1955:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

TO BE PRESIDENT OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Glen E. Edgerton, of the District of Columbia.

TO BE FIRST VICE PRESIDENT OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Lynn U. Stambaugh, of North Dakota.

TO BE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Hawthorne Arey, of Nebraska.
George A. Blowers, of Florida.
Vance Brand, of Ohio.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Representative Willis W. Bradley: Naval Officer, Scholar, and Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 1, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, during the 80th Congress, of which I was a Member of the House, I had the great privilege of knowing well one of its most distinguished Members—the late Representative Willis W. Bradley, of California.

Qualified by a lifetime of experience as a line officer of the United States Navy, Captain Bradley, after his election to the Congress, rapidly became a respected leader in matters affecting national defense, the merchant marine, and the Panama Canal. So far as the latter was concerned, he was a discriminating student and a vigorous exponent of congressional thinking about Isthmian Canal policy.

As the best means for resolving the many sided canal issue in the broadest interests of the United States, he introduced a measure for the creation of an Interoceanic Canal Commission—H. R. 4833, 80th Congress—which served as the model for like bills introduced in later congresses.

Representative Bradley's views on the vitally important canal question are preserved in two notable presentations, which I studied. The first was delivered on April 19, 1948, before the distinguished membership of the Cosmos Club of Washington, D. C., on the subject What of the Panama Canal?—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 80th Congress, 2d session, volume 94, part 10, April 21, 1948, page A2449. The second was on February 24, 1949, before the Engineers' Club of Washington, D. C., on the subject The Whys of the Panama Canal—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 81st Congress, 1st session, volume 95, part 12, March 4, 1949, page A1303.

These two statements by Representative Bradley are undoubtedly among

the most comprehensive treatments of the canal problem in the annals of the Congress, and are commended for careful study by all concerned with this subject, for he stresses operational requirements as the true basis for interoceanic canal planning.

Other important contributions by Captain Bradley were his great achievements as Governor of Guam, 1929–31. There he exhibited the highest form of administrative initiative and statesmanship in the creation of a representative form of government for this insular possession of the United States. He lived to see its adoption by the Congress. His name is now a great tradition among the natives of Guam.

Captain Bradley died suddenly on August 27, 1954, at Santa Barbara, Calif. His death is mourned by a host of friends throughout this Nation, which he served with such distinction, and by the surviving Members of the 80th Congress. I am sure that all these join me in extending to his widow and daughters the assurances of the deepest and most tender sympathy.

I ask unanimous consent that an obituary published in the New York Times of August 29, 1954, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the obituary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILLIS BRADLEY, LEGISLATOR, DIES—CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLYMAN AND FORMER UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE WAS NAVAL HERO IN 1917

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF., August 28.—Willis W. Bradley, of Long Beach, Republican State assemblyman and former United States Representative, died yesterday after suffering a heart attack while attending a legislative hearing. He was 70 years old.

A native of Ransomville, N. Y., Mr. Bradley was graduated from the United States Naval Academy in 1907. He served as Governor of Guam from 1929 to 1931 and retired in 1946 with the rank of captain.

Mr. Bradley was a Member of Congress from the 18th California District from 1947 to 1949. He was elected to the State assembly in 1952 and was a member of the Board of Visitors at Annapolis.

His widow, Sue, and four daughters survive.

AWARDED MEDAL OF HONOR

Mr. Bradley won the Medal of Honor for heroism aboard the cruiser *Pittsburgh* when ammunition exploded on July 23, 1917. He was then a lieutenant. Badly dazed, he crawled through heavy smoke to rescue a man and then extinguished the fire in close proximity to other explosives.

In Congress, as a member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and chairman of the Subcommittee on Ship Construction and Operation, Mr. Bradley campaigned for additional safety measures on American vessels. He also was on the Panama Canal subcommittee and in 1947 went to inspect the canal with 11 other Members of Congress. He supported the Navy's plan for improvement of the canal.

As a young officer in the Navy, Mr. Bradley also won the Silver Medal of the Italian Red Cross for his rescue work at the disastrous Messina earthquake of 1908. Subsequently, Pope Pius XI also awarded to him a medal. He held a master of science degree from George Washington University (1914) and was a graduate of the Naval War College and the Navy's postgraduate school of ordnance and gunnery.

Robert P. Tristram Coffin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 1, 1955

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief statement prepared by me, and three editorials regarding the death, on January 20, 1955, of Prof. Robert Peter Tristram Coffin, nationally renowned Pulitzer prize-winning poet, and one of the outstanding citizens of the State of Maine.

There being no objection, the statement and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROBERT P. TRISTRAM COFFIN

(Statement by Senator PAYNE)

In the death of Robert Peter Tristram Coffin, whose untimely end occurred as he was preparing to do what he loved best, unite man with nature, Maine and the world have lost a great and beloved poet-guide. For, even though the Maine bard was intrinsically and deeply rooted to the natural virtues of his State, his message was universal. So fired was Tristram Coffin with the urge to acquaint man with those God-given things that count, that he was compelled to take his message beyond the borders of his country.

Born in Brunswick, Maine, the site of Bowdoin College, Coffin was raised on a salt-water farm tilled by his father on Great Island, in Casco Bay. Following the illustrious footsteps of two earlier Bowdoin literary figures, Nathaniel Hawthorne and Henry W. Longfellow, Coffin was graduated from that institution summa cum laude in 1915. From there he went to Princeton where he gained his A. M., and thence to Oxford as Rhodes scholar from Maine.

It was at Oxford that Coffin began writing his poetry and almost at once he exhibited an uncanny deftness and feeling for many of those subjects on which Hawthorne and Longfellow had so magnificently dwelt. As was the case with Longfellow, who as a child found his imagination capturing the beauty and adventure of the sea from the wharves of Portland, and about which he later wrote, Coffin also found himself returning to his childhood and putting into poetry those early scenes which had become imprinted on his mind.

A Pulitzer prize winner in 1936 for his Strange Holiness, a volume concerning his favorite topics, Coffin lectured and taught at many of the leading colleges and universities in this country and abroad. Among these were Columbia, Johns Hopkins, University of New Hampshire, University of Cincinnati, Harvard University, University of Indiana, University of Florida, and the University of Athens in Greece.

He was book review and poetry editor of Yankee at one time, taught for 5 years at the Corpus Christi Fine Arts Colony, inaugurated the George Elliston professorship of poetry at the University of Cincinnati, and was largely responsible, while a professor at Wells, for founding and carrying on the Oxford idea of honor work in English Literature.

As a poet, lecturer, essayist, and biographer, Professor Coffin possessed not only a brilliant academic mind but he possessed a practical viewpoint as well that enabled him to blend such rarity into his works. With an ingenious facility he combined them both to make himself a master spokesman in "the art of making people feel well about life."

The tall and portly poet, with an imposingly sweeping moustache, once described himself as looking like a pirate. Although there were no pirates in his lineage, he did come from a family of early seafarers. He was a descendant of the Coffins of Nantucket, a famous early American whaling family. One of his early books, Lost Paradise, was built on his memories of island life. Later he compiled a collection of poems which he called Salt Water Farm. A biography of his father, Portrait of an American, won him honorary life membership in the National Arts Club.

As a teacher and lecturer he inspired his audiences and filled their minds with a wonderful awe and appreciation of the Pine Tree State and all its natural attributes. Salty sea spray, wind-swept fields, towering pines, rock-ribbed coasts, and, yes, even blueberry pie. These he instilled in the minds of his listeners.

And even though the atomic age, at the time of his death, was fully on him, its impact seemed only to spur his prolific pen in the ways of Nature. Although he never labored the point, you knew that Robert Peter Tristram Coffin, the apostle of Nature, was praising God for endowing Maine with such an abundance of magnificence, and for making him its leading spokesman.

[From the New York Times of January 21, 1955]

ROBERT P. TRISTRAM COFFIN

Robert P. Tristram Coffin had two great loves—one can really call them passions—poetry and Maine. And out of Maine he made the poetry: the bitter tang of the sea, the pungency of fir and bayberry, "the cranberries touched red by frost." "This is my country," he wrote, and nowhere in his writings is his native State long absent, either the place or the people. He loved and celebrated, often uncritically, their unwavering independence, their yea-saying, their Emersonian self-reliance.

It must not be thought that Mr. Coffin was a local rustic bard, tuning his song to a homemade lyre. He was a Rhodes scholar, member of Phi Beta Kappa, author of more than 30 books, a Pulitzer prize winner in poetry, a teacher of long standing, both in his own State and elsewhere. But he turned back to Maine because he felt that life there could be made most meaningful. Urban civilization repelled him; it was axiomatic to him that country living was superior to city life, that a man could get down to things that count only when he was close to earth and to nature.

His poetry reflects this. It is full not only of New England ways and people but of common things, carefully observed. His verse was sometimes roughhewn, unplaned, or homespun, but he never cared. They were virtues he prized in life. And there will always be those who, forced to live in a civilization that is mechanized, streamlined, and brassy, will turn to his work for a glimpse of a life that is simpler, unfettered, and, as he would have said, more beautiful.

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald of January 22, 1955]

MAINE LOSES ANOTHER DISTINGUISHED MAN

The face of Robert P. Tristram Coffin bespoke ruggedness, kindness, and intelligence. These characteristics of a memorable face typified the personality and career of Bowdoin's poet who died before his time in Portland Thursday night.

He can in truth be called Bowdoin's poet, because as the college's president, Dr. James S. Coles, said, "Bowdoin was always one of

his loves and all of Bowdoin loved him." Bowdoin revered him for the mark he made beyond the borders of the town where he went to college and later returned to teach. He succeeded in the fiercely competitive field of poetry and literature, succeeding not through talent alone but through sincerity and an authentic devotion to his family and his country.

Like his famous predecessor and fellow alumnus, Henry W. Longfellow, Robert Coffin was a consumer of literature as well as a producer, a scholar and teacher as well as a poet. Many worldly honors were his, a Rhodes scholarship, a Pulitzer prize, a Fulbright fellowship, and certainly these rewards brought him a deserved happiness, but the measure of the man is also shown by his pleasure in the quiet academic life of the Bowdoin campus.

He found great reward in opening the doors of good literature to young men who would survive him to teach, to write poetry, to inspire.

[From the Lewiston (Maine) Journal of January 21, 1955]

BELOVED BOB COFFIN

The passing of Prof. Robert P. T. Coffin, of Bowdoin College, removes from Maine the State's most noted modern poet. His death also deprives his college of an unusual teacher and a writer of English textbooks.

"Bobby," as he always was referred to by his students, loved Maine deeply.

In both poetry and prose he extolled the Maine life. His poems were concerned with the commonplaces of life; the little things the average individual overlooks or dismisses with a shrug.

His ability to extract from these the common denominators of living enabled him to paint graphic, lyrical word pictures of the universals of life—nature in its glory and wonder, man in his daily tasks and the home with its attendant joy and pathos.

In a real sense he was able to translate for his readers the beauties of nature and the rewarding virtues of such hard work as chopping wood or milking the cows. His imagery was ever vivid. His style was pure and readily understood even when the simile involved such complexities of nature as a spider spinning her web in the noonday sun.

Through the poetry and prose of Professor Coffin, readers the Nation over came to be familiar with the salt spray, the smell of fir and bayberry, the joys of blueberry picking and blueberry pie, to name a few typical subjects of his pen. And Maine people came to appreciate more fully the wonders of their State because of his writing.

It was this selfsame ability that won for him the Pulitzer prize in 1936 for his book Strange Holiness.

A prolific writer, he continued to the day of his death to produce compelling poetry founded upon his microscopic attention to the Maine scene.

Panama Railroad Centenary: 1855–1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 1, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, the Panama Canal Society of Washington, D. C., of which Mr. Andrew W. Dewling is president and Mr. Martin A. Seiler is secretary-treasurer, on January 29, 1955, in the Nation's Capital, celebrated with a luncheon meeting at the Burlington Hotel the 100th anniversary of the completion of the Panama Railroad.

The occasion was notable for the large number present who were associated with the building of the Panama Canal and others who rendered distinct services for the Panama Railroad Company. Also present were a number of ladies who had lived in the isthmus during the construction years.

The attendants included Hon. Maurice H. Thatcher, sole surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission and Civil Governor of the Canal Zone during the construction era, who later served several terms in the Congress as a Representative from Kentucky and was the author of important legislation for the benefit of the canal and the isthmus. An out-of-town visitor was Mr. William R. McCann, consulting engineer of Hopewell, Va., who started his engineering career on the isthmus during the building of the canal and through the years since then has retained his interest in the problems of the Panama Canal, of which he is a keen student.

Also among those present was Capt. Miles P. DuVal, United States Navy, retired, former captain of the port, Pacific division, 1941–44, and author of 2 excellent volumes on the Panama Canal, with a third in progress.

Governor Thatcher served as toastmaster, and it was my privilege to be the guest speaker. The text of my address follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR THOMAS E. MARTIN BEFORE THE PANAMA CANAL SOCIETY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AT ITS LUNCHEON MEETING IN WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 29, 1955, IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OPENING TO TRAFFIC OF THE PANAMA RAILROAD COMPANY

Mr. Toastmaster, ladies and gentlemen, 100 years ago, on January 27, 1855, rail-laying gangs were eagerly working on the final lap in building the Panama Railroad. At midnight, in the tropical darkness and rain, the last rail was laid near Summit, at a point 37 miles from the Atlantic terminus and 10½ miles from Panama.

The next day was Sunday. People on the isthmus, filled with festival spirit, gathered at points along the line of the railroad to see the first trans-isthmian train. Apprised of its approach by the shrill sound of the locomotive whistle, they awaited the train with mingled feelings.

In the course of the trip, it passed through jungles and forests, across pleasant valleys and dreadful swamps, over wide chasms and around mountain tops. As it rattled along toward Panama, the onlookers, impressed by the appearance of the train and the facility with which it was handled, gave lusty cheers.

To them, it meant the end of pack mules and muddy trails, which for so long had been the principal means for travel over the continental divide. It represented the culmination of more than 6 years of heroic effort. It was the omen of good times to come.

What were the principal features of this celebrated railroad? It traversed the Isthmus in one of the two places where the land is lowest; the other place was Nicaragua. It was a single track road 47½ miles long and the final cost of completion was approximately $8 million. The gauge was 5 feet.

The last, because it is wider than our standard gauge of 4 feet 8½ inches, has been a subject of endless discussion and numerous writings. Many, who visit the isthmus and do not have the opportunity to examine all the angles of the problem, go away to urge changing over to standard gauge. They do not know that this matter has been studied previously and rejected, based on economic considerations.

In the course of construction there developed a number of fables well-known to all who have lived on the isthmus. One of these was that the station Matachin, being a corruption of the verb matar, meaning to kill and chino meaning Chinese, was so named because of the death of large numbers of Chinese who worked on the project. Another was to the effect that there was a "dead man for every tie."

Historical research has revealed some interesting facts. The name, Matachin, was on isthmian maps long before the start of the Panama Railroad and arrival of the Chinese laborers.

The total force during the construction period was estimated at 6,000 men. Deaths during that time totaled 835 (whites, 295; blacks, 140; and Chinese, 400). This rate was not great under the health conditions that then obtained in the Tropics. About 140,000 ties were used.

These facts throw into irrefutable discard these widely quoted fables of the isthmus.

In the perspective of history, the completion of the Panama Railroad is tremendously significant. It was the first major American construction project in the Tropics. It was the first transcontinental railroad of the three Americas. Its timely inauguration, following the discovery of gold in California, facilitated the settlement of the Far West. It was the first great step toward constructing an isthmian waterway. Thus, the builders of the Panama Railroad were the true pioneers of the Panama Canal.

Years later when French interests decided to undertake a canal project at Panama, as they had at Suez, one of the main factors that led Ferdinand de Lesseps to chose that route was the existence of an operating railroad. Recognizing that this road would be essential in construction of a canal, the French gained control of it.

The tremendous French effort at Panama, 1879–89, is a dramatic story. Starting in brilliance and ending in tragedy, the collapse had repercussions that shook France to the roots. Nevertheless, the endeavor had its constructive aspects. Most significant was a legacy of engineering knowledge, that was to be of great value later. They also left the Panama Railroad.

Here it should be recorded that in 1879 when the French enterprise was being organized, there was a heated debate as to the type of canal. Unfortunately for them this issue was not resolved on the basis of its merits. Instead, the Congress of Paris called to decide that fundamental question was induced by its promoters, led by De Lesseps, to approve what was a predetermined objective of a sea-level undertaking. That decision, because of the magnitude of the undertaking, guaranteed its ultimate failure even before starting.

The French effort, nevertheless, demonstrated the vastness of the canal project and the inability of private enterprise to conduct so extensive an undertaking. It also emphasized the importance of the Monroe Doctrine. Moreover, it forced the United States to adopt a national policy of an American canal under American control.

This policy became active coincident with events preceding the Spanish-American War. In implementing it, the Congress on recommendation of President McKinley, directed a comprehensive investigation of the Nicaragua route by a Nicaragua Canal Commission, 1897–99, followed by an examination of all interoceanic canal routes by an Isthmian Canal Commission, 1899–1902. To head these two commissions, the President selected Rear Adm. John Grimes Walker, from my

home State of Iowa, who was one of the leading naval officers of that time.

It was the work of these two commissions under Admiral Walker that supplied the technical basis for the choice of the Panama route. This fact alone establishes him as a leading architect in the evaluation of Isthmian Canal policy of the United States.

The American effort at Panama attracted world attention, with President Theodore Roosevelt as its great leader. Work had hardly started when construction was complicated by revival of the fundamental question of the type of canal, based largely on hypothetical questions of the comparative vulnerability of the types.

Fortunately, at the critical period, President Roosevelt had selected as chief engineer of the Isthmian Canal Commission one of the greatest engineers of the Nation—John F. Stevens, builder of the Great Northern Railroad and discoverer of Grand Marais Pass through which it was constructed.

After studying available literature and observing the terrain of the isthmus, which he crossed by foot, Mr. Stevens decided in favor of a high level lake and lock type. Coming to Washington in 1906, he led in a memorable legislative struggle known as the battle of the levels. In that, the advantages and disadvantages of each type, including the question of vulnerability (now called security) was fully debated.

With the support of the Isthmian Canal Commission, Secretary of War W. H. Taft and President Theodore Roosevelt, the views of Mr. Stevens prevailed. Congress directed construction of the high-level (lake and lock) type. That was the great decision in building the Panama Canal.

For that notable achievement President Roosevelt rewarded Mr. Stevens by appointing him to the combined positions of chairman and chief engineer of the Isthmian Canal Commission—the first man to be so honored.

Subsequently, Mr. Stevens left Canal service. The project was brought to completion by others under the chairmanship of Col. George W. Goethals, substantially in accord with the Stevens plan.

In constructing the canal, two stupendous problems were excavation of Culebra Cut and the disposition of spoil. In the solution of both, the transportation afforded by the Panama Railroad was the key. The brilliant performance of that 47½-mile railroad during those action-packed years constitutes an enduring monument in transportation history.

When opened to traffic in 1914, the Panama Canal was recognized as the greatest engineering achievement of man. The transit since then of about 240,000 vessels of various types and the contributions of the canal during two World Wars prove both the success of the project and the wisdom of Congress and the President in adopting the high-level plan in preference to the tidal lock proposal.

Now more than 40 years have passed since inauguration of the canal. Possibly because it has been viewed as a completed work, the canal has not kept pace with progress expected of a great interoceanic utility.

As the first step toward improvement of its administration, Congress in 1950 enacted legislation changing the name of the Panama Railroad Company to the Panama Canal Company with jurisdiction over transit and commercial operations. This law also created the Canal Zone Government with jurisdiction over the purely governmental functions. The enterprise is still in the growing pains of adjusting to the new setup, which is required to be self-sustaining.

Other problems facing the Nation are how to increase the capacity of the Panama Canal and whether to construct a second canal at Nicaragua or elsewhere.

For the Panama Canal, many independent canal experts have urged the modification of the authorized third locks project to provide a summit anchorage on the Pacific side of the isthmus to correspond with that on the Atlantic. Other interests, in the name of security, have campaigned vigorously for construction of a practically new Panama Canal that would abandon the largest part of the existing waterway.

Here I wish to pay a tribute to my former colleague, the late Representative Willis W. Bradley, of California, who in 1947 addressed this society after a trip to the Canal Zone. A careful student of the interoceanic canals question, he became the spokesman of the Congress on that subject. His addresses and writings, published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vigorously and fearlessly clarified the issues. They are classics of exposition that should be read by every serious student of the canal problem.

But the form of the Panama Canal and the question of a new Isthmian Canal are not the only problems facing the country. There are also those of diplomatic and economic character.

In the diplomatic field, there would be the question of a new treaty for constructing a new canal at Panama or elsewhere. In the economic, there are the questions of costs and their effect on transit tolls. Since tolls must be calculated to reflect the costs of construction, maintenance, operation, protection, sanitation and civil government, the economic factor is a matter of national and international concern. Yet we do not have expert independent opinions on any of these important elements that constitute the Isthmian Canal policy of the United States.

To supply the Congress with the best means of arriving at a wisely reasoned and stable policy, last Thursday I introduced a measure (S. 766) to create an independent and broadly based Interoceanic Canals Commission to conduct the necessary studies and to make its recommendations. In my judgment, this is the indispensable way to have this tremendously important subject properly examined under the everchanging conditions of this dynamic age, with all views presented, and a full, fair evaluation made. Congress would thus be able to determine—not only the best plan for the needed increased facilities of the Panama Canal, but, as well, the other long-range questions involved. Undoubtedly, this solution merits general consideration and support.

Just a few words in conclusion. On the isthmus, I understand, this hundredth anniversary is being appropriately observed, and the Canal Zone Government has issued a postage stamp in commemoration.

I am sure that, for many years to come, the Panama Railroad will continue its great historic role in relation to the Panama Canal and isthmian affairs.

It is most fitting that the Panama Canal Society of Washington should celebrate this centenary date, and I thank you very much indeed for the invitation to be present today, and to speak to you.

To those of you who worked in the Panama Railroad organization, or that of the Isthmian Canal Commission, in the construction era of the Panama Canal, I desire to extend my heartiest congratulations for the vastly important work you did; also to the good women who made your homes and shared whatever of good or ill fortune was yours during that period, I would tender sincerest commendation. The Nation and the world owe you much, and forever they will be your debtors.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the source and inspiration of every noble impulse and good deed, we are again turning unto Thee in the sacred attitude of prayer that we may be renewed in faith, hope, and love, and receive the interpreting and guiding light of Thy divine spirit for all our problems.

Forgive our many sins and purify our hearts that, unfettered by sinful and unworthy thoughts and desires, we may be wise to know Thy truth and strong and courageous for the difficult tasks that await us.

May we never surrender and abdicate the rights and duties of moral criticism, righteous indignation and fearless resistance when evil forces are striving to further their own selfish interests and rob mankind of its freedom.

Help us with all the wisdom and strength at our command to build a social order which is spiritually great and that recognizes its supreme duty to obey Thy holy will and bring peace and good will among men and nations.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 31, 1955, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2010. An act to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2576. An act to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1958.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States, numbered 55–56.

PUNXSUTAWNEY GROUNDHOG DAY

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, today is the traditional Groundhog Day—February 2—and that great meteorologist, that great prognosticator of the weather, has again spoken from his den on Gobbler's Knob in the Pennsylvania hills at Punxsutawney, Pa., where it has been during the last few days 18° below zero.

I am in receipt of a wire from Mr. Sam Light, president of the Punxsutawney, Pa., Groundhog Club, and he states:

Hear ye! Hear ye! All ye disciples of the sage of sages, the seer of seers, the world's greatest weather prophet, the Punxsutawney groundhog.

The time is 8:51 this morning.

The place is a windy, snow-covered knoll at Gobbler's Knob, home of the world's foremost weather prophet, the Punxsutawney groundhog.

For the 74th consecutive year, members of the Groundhog Club, the press, radio, and television shiver before the groundhog den, awaiting the seer's prediction.

At last the door of the burrow creaks open and a weary prophet blinks his eyes at the unaccustomed sunlight. Will he see his shadow, foretelling 6 more weeks of winter, or will there be no shadow, meaning early spring?

All await with bated breath.

"Sorry, fellows," speaks our seer as he casts a long, dark unmistakable shadow on the snow. "You might just as well have stayed in bed. It's cold. Brrr, and it's going to stay that way. So put another log on the fire or turn up the thermostat. I'm going back to bed. See you in the spring."

And with that he backed into his den and slammed the door on the outside world.

So that is that. And it is 6 more weeks of winter.

In closing, I might say that I presume the petulant fakers, the synthetic groundhogs from Quarryville, Pa., and Sun Prairie, Wis., will again attempt to secure some publicity at the expense of this great weather prophet from Punxsutawney by making one of their usual quack pronouncements.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

INVESTIGATION OF FRAUDULENT ADVERTISING BY RADIO AND TELEVISION

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have submitted a resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate and study the broadcasting of false, fraudulent, misleading, and deceptive advertisements by radio or television.

Such an investigation is vitally necessary at this time. Millions of dollars are stolen annually from the pockets of those who fall prey to fraudulent advertising. Although the big networks claim they do not permit fraudulent advertising, the fact remains that dishonest persons and companies do manage to get their ads broadcast or televised. So far, no progress has been made in stopping the rackets, prosecuting the offenders, or fixing blame; there is confusion as to who is supposed to act, to whom those defrauded can look for redress, and where the responsibility lies to prevent such fraudulent practices from continuing.

This is no witch hunt on my part. My sole purpose is to obtain information and after the facts have been obtained on this serious situation, then we will be in a better position to work together to protect the public.

Disclosures brought forth by a recent investigation in Brooklyn show that the methods of some of the electronic hucksters constitute a racket involving more than $1 million a year. The investigation was directed particularly toward programs on which a response to an advertisement was followed by a visit to the potential customer's home by a salesman. A temptingly low price on a famous-name product, factory rebuilt, stated in the ad, appeals to the person who has to count pennies; the salesman who calls brings a defective antiquity of the brand name advertised and then high-pressures the prospective customer into buying inferior, off-brand merchandise for an exorbitant price. Reports show that currently the racket is worst in vacuum cleaners and sewing machines, but the same trickery is worked as to other commodities, TV sets, radios, refrigerators. This condition, prevalent in New York, exists throughout the country; the frauds are being perpetrated in every State.

The Federal Communications Commission reports that more than half of the complaints it gets about TV and radio advertising are against such bait ads. The tragedy is that the people who are cheated are those who can least afford to lose the money.

When we ask why the racket has not been stopped, we are told that it is so widespread that it is impossible to do so; the local better business bureaus cannot cope with all the cases and complaints; some of the gyp firms are in town for a week or less and then are gone; they make 1-day or 1-week stands, bilk the customers, and disappear.

In view of the conclusive evidence we have as to the flourishing rackets referred to, and in view of the fact that the individual stations, the networks, local communities, and authorities have not rid themselves of the frauds and dishonest practices of advertisers, it now becomes the duty of Congress to give the problem its attention. We must have the facts, responsibility must be fixed, people must be protected against the continuance of such frauds.

My resolution provides that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study, first, to determine the extent to which the public is exposed to false, fraudulent, misleading, and deceptive advertising by radio or television; second, to determine what steps licensees of radio and television stations have taken in order to protect the public from such advertising; and, third, of the practice of the Federal Communications Commission with respect to the renewal of radio and television licenses of persons who make no effort to protect the public from such advertising.

The committee would report the results of its investigation and study to Congress, and based upon such report remedial legislation should be passed and constructive action taken to prevent continuance of this injustice to the public.

CONQUEST TO NOWHERE

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last week there was published a very interesting and realistic description of warfare in Korea by a young sergeant from my congressional district.

The title of the volume is "Conquest to Nowhere" and the author is Tony Herbert, from the town of Herminie, Pa. I know him well, and he did have a terrible experience and came out alive after his whole company was lost. He is reputed to be the most highly decorated soldier in the Korean campaign. Tony is now a student at the University of Pittsburgh, where he is majoring in journalism.

I can recommend this book; however, it has the most God-awful word pictures and one thinks of Dante's Inferno. There is no doubt in my mind that this is the actual experience as described by the author. I can, therefore, recommend Conquest to Nowhere to every Member of Congress.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may sit today during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

SUN PRAIRIE, WIS., GROUNDHOG

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in contrast to the usual annual carping remarks of my colleague from Penn-

sylvania, on this Groundhog Day of 1955, I have good word for my colleagues from official sources.

This morning, at 7 a. m., central standard time, 8 a. m., Washington time, I received by long-distance telephone from Mr. Wilmar Trodahl, Esq., the village attorney at Sun Prairie, Wis., the following communique:

This morning, among cheers of his faithful followers, at exactly 5:57 a. m., in Sun Prairie, Wis., the world headquarters of the groundhog, Prince Dauphin aroused from his winter sleep and peered out of the royal burrow. He stretched lazily and took a short walk around the royal garden. He looked to his right and then to his left, but could not see his shadow. There were a few snowflakes in the air, and he predicted then and there that the winter season was passing fast and that spring was just around the corner.

Mr. Trodahl, with the meticulous care of a lawyer, was careful to point out to me that this communique came from Sun Prairie, Wis., the world headquarters of the groundhog, and was the only official weather prognostication direct from the Crown Prince Dauphin, prognosticator extraordinaire. This year, as in past years, on Groundhog Day, Sun Prairie will be the scene of a celebration befitting the world groundhog capital. In addition to the gathering of the faithful at the royal burrow this morning to receive the true prognostication, there will be special menus at all the Sun Prairie restaurants, with a huge banquet and 2 dances, 1 for the youngsters, and 1 for those not so young, this evening.

Presiding over all of these festivities, as representative of the Dauphin Prince, will be Jerry Waller, grand chief guardian of the royal burrow.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, can we have a little order? The gentleman is making a very important speech.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, every highly successful venture seems to have its copycats, and every highly successful character of worldwide renown seems to have his imposters. So it is with Sun Prairie and the Dauphin Prince. The most persistent and painful of these copycats and imposters in this case are a group of constituents of my colleague from Pennsylvania, LEON GAVIN. I bear no resentment toward my good friend from Pennsylvania because of his espousal of these confusing and illegitimate contentions.

For several years he has championed the claims of a remote crossroads called Punxsutawney. This year the hogs of Punxsutawney have remained underground but the telegraph office at the royal headquarters at Sun Prairie has been kept busy receiving spurious messages from a clandestine lodge at an even more remote place called Quarryville. So remote is this hamlet that it apparently has no communication with the outside world—its messages to Wisconsin this year emanated from Lancaster.

As I said, I bear no ill will for my colleague from Pennsylvania. Rather it is a feeling of pity. This is not the first time, in or out of Congress, that he has been sadly confused and mistaken. Because I wish to be helpful to him, and because I want to help free him from the false claims of his backward constituents, I take pleasure in presenting to him at this time an official application blank for membership in the Sun Prairie Groundhog Club. If he will fill it out carefully and return it to me, I shall do my best to obtain acceptance for him into this enlightened organization, of which, I am happy to say, I am a member in good standing.

IN MEMORIAM

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I just received a short letter from a constituent of mine which I think would interest the House and the Nation as a whole very much. I am going to take the liberty of reading this short letter. It is as follows:

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS,
DESOTO PARISH,
Mansfield, La., January 28, 1955.

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROOKS: Thinking of the unnecessary death of Mr. Ira Hays, I am inclined to ask a favor of you as follows: Please introduce a bill in Congress asking for the erection of a miniature bronze monument of the raising of the flag on Suribachi, at the head of the grave of each one of those heroes as they are called to their reward by the Great Commander in Chief of us all, with this inscription:

"We, six Americans [naming them] planted our flag on Suribachi [inserting the date]. It is now up to you other 160 million Americans to keep it there, signifying to the world its principles for which we served and died."

You and I, sir, are both veterans of World War I, and I don't believe anyone would make light of our efforts since this is one of the most outstanding heroic deeds of the world.

Sincerely your friend,
J. A. H. SLAWSON.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the thought to the attention of the Congress and the Nation.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, had I been present last Thursday, I would have voted "aye" on the bill, H. R. 587. The reason for my absence was a pleasant one. We greeted the arrival of a new son, Stephen Blake.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 122) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That WALTER M. MUMMA, of Pennsylvania, be, and is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS AND LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, February 22, 1955, Washington's Farewell Address may be read by a Member to be designated by the Speaker.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman be good enough to tell us the legislative program for the rest of the week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be very happy to do so. There are several reports out of the Committee on House Administration providing money for the committees for surveys and investigations to be made by them. They are coming up today. They are privileged resolutions reported out of the Committee on House Administration in connection with resolutions which have already been passed by the House. There are three resolutions which have been reported by the Committee on Rules, which I discussed with my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, yesterday, if he will recall. They are in connection with authorizing inquiries and investigations by standing committees, and one of the select committees to study survivors' benefits. Tomorrow there will be a resolution reported out of the Committee on Rules of the same nature having to do with the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I think this is a good time to project my mind into next week and advise the membership as far as I can.

We have an agreement that from Wednesday night on there will be no business until the following Tuesday.

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman means nothing controversial.

Mr. McCORMACK. Thursday: There will be no business.

Friday: No business.

Monday: No business.

Is that correct?

Mr. MARTIN. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. I assume that if matters that have been cleared with the leadership can be handled by unanimous consent there will be no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. That is all right with me.

Mr. McCORMACK. There will be no business requiring a vote on Thursday, February 10, or Friday, February 11.

We will not be in session on Saturday, February 12.

Tuesday, February 15, if there is any legislation in order—it is understood and agreed between the minority leader and myself that while legislation can be scheduled for that date—should there be a rollcall in connection with it, the rollcall will go over to the following day,

Wednesday, February 16. Is that correct?

Mr. MARTIN. That is the understanding.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might say, projecting my mind into next week: It is expected that the Committee on Armed Services will report out a bill tomorrow or some day this week extending the Selective Service Act. In this event, if a rule is obtained, I shall schedule that bill for Tuesday. I think it is reasonable to expect—so that I may alert the membership—that there will be a rollcall on that bill. I, therefore, wish to advise the membership as far ahead as I can see so that they can govern themselves accordingly.

Outside of what I have said I see nothing else for this week.

Tomorrow, of course, I shall ask unanimous consent that we go over to Monday.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts that the Chair designate a Member to read Washington's Farewell Address on February 22?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 70) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 3, 1955, the expenses of the study and investigation to be conducted by the select committee created by House Resolution 55, incurred within or outside the continental limits of the United States, not to exceed $150,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 1, strike out "January 3, 1955" and insert "January 4, 1955."

Line 3, strike out "H. Res. 55" and insert "H. Res. 114."

Line 2, following the word "committee", insert "to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business."

Line 5, strike out "$150,000" and insert "$135,000."

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Which resolution is this?

Mr. BURLESON. It pertains to the request of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. MARTIN. The regular Armed Services Committee?

Mr. BURLESON. That is right.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

The title of the resolution was amended to read: "To provide funds for the expenses of the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 114."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 102) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1955, expenses of conducting the investigations authorized by section 17 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, incurred by the Committee on Un-American Activities, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $225,000, including expenditures for employment of such experts, special counsel, investigators, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. That the official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 1, strike out "January 3, 1955" and insert "January 4, 1955."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the fact that the amount sought, while less than the usual amount heretofore alloted to the committee, was agreed upon unanimously.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 113) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1955, the expenses of the investigation and study to be conducted pursuant to House Resolution 112, by the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $150,000, including expenditures for the employment of a special counsel, investigators, attorneys, experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authoried by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee or subcommittee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "or subcommittee."

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. Is this the Armed Services Committee?

Mr. BURLESON. The first was the Small Business Committee. I am sorry I erred.

Mr. MARTIN. The first one that was passed was for the Small Business Committee?

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman is correct. I am sorry about that.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Does this resolution, House Resolution 113, apply to the Armed Services Committee?

Mr. BURLESON. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. There are no amendments to the resolution?

Mr. BURLESON. Only a perfecting amendment which requires the chairman to sign vouchers whereas originally the resolution provided that subcommittee chairmen might sign vouchers.

Mr. VINSON. All vouchers under this resolution must be signed by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services?

Mr. BURLESON. Yes.

Mr. VINSON. Instead of by the chairman of the subcommittee conducting an investigation?

Mr. BURLESON. That is correct. That has been the policy of the committee heretofore.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. There has been some inquiry from Members on this side as to the amount that was given to the Committee on Small Business.

Mr. BURLESON. One hundred thirty-five thousand dollars for the entire calendar year.

Mr. LECOMPTE. That is $15,000 less than the resolution originally called for?

Mr. BURLESON. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 123) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers provided for by section 5 of Public Law 115, 78th Congress, shall consist of two members of the Committee on House Administration, to be appointed by the Speaker.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOINT COMMITTEE PERSONNEL

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 124) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. BURLESON, Texas; Mr. HAYS, Ohio; Mr. LECOMPTE, Iowa.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr BURLESON, Texas; Mr. JONES, Missouri; Mr. SMITH, Mississippi; Mr. LECOMPTE, Iowa; Mr. HARRISON, Nebraska.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 125) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on House Administration may have until April 15, 1955, to consider the report filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to House Resolution 692, 83d Congress, and to report thereon to the House.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, may I say just a word on this resolution in order that it may be understood. The membership will recall that in July of last year the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] introduced a resolution which passed this House, asking that certain investigations be made of the dining facilities in the Capitol and House Office Buildings. That survey was made, and it devolves upon the Committee on House Administration, according to the resolution, to report our findings to this body by February 15.

Mr. Speaker, we would like to do a job, if we are going to do any at all, on this resolution. It is not possible for us to make such a report in the proper form in the time specified. This resolution asks that we may have until April 15 to complete a study, and a subcommittee has been appointed to look into the matter. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] has been designated as chairman of the subcommittee.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

FEBRUARY 2, 1955.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 712 (a) (2) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, I hereby appoint the following members of the Committee on Banking and Currency as members of the Joint Committee on Defense Production: PAUL BROWN, WRIGHT PATMAN, ALBERT RAINS, RALPH A. GAMBLE, HENRY O. TALLE.

With kind regards and all good wishes, I am

Very sincerely,

BRENT SPENCE.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 118 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, acting as a whole or by subcommittee authorized by the chairman, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to the following matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee, namely—

(1) a thorough study of the administration and operation of the Maritime Administration and the Maritime Board operating under the act of 1936 and amendments thereto;

(2) all matters relating to operating and construction differential subsidies and any other subsidies being paid or assumed;

(3) operational disputes that would tend to increase subsidy payments or otherwise be detrimental to the merchant marine;

(4) administration and operation of laws relating to the Fish and Wildlife Service;

(5) the administration of laws relating to the Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Panama Canal Company; and

(6) any other conditions or practices that have a detrimental effect on the American merchant marine or tend to increase the cost thereof to the United States Government:

Provided, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject matter which is being investigated by any other standing committee of the House.

For such purposes the said committee or any subcommittee thereof as authorized by the chairman is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 21, after "places," insert "within the United States, its Territories, and possessions."

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution speaks for itself. It would authorize the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to investigate those matters set out in the resolution.

The Committee on Rules, in line with its policy announced here earlier in the session, gave very careful, thoughtful, and thorough consideration to this resolution before reporting it out. The committee felt that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries made a very good showing on why this resolution should be adopted and this investigation conducted. I might add in that connection, Mr. Speaker, that this problem of maintaining an adequate merchant marine under world conditions is, indeed, a most difficult, as well as an important one. We realize that under our standard of living in this country it is very difficult to construct ships in competition with foreign nations whose standard of living is not as high as ours. Again, it is equally as difficult, if not more so, to keep our flag on the high seas in competition with foreign flags, for the very same reason.

In addition to that, it was brought out in the hearings before the Committee on Rules that there were certain practices going on in the operation of our ships that needed thorough investigation, all of which add to the problem of maintaining our merchant marine.

We have found in previous wars, without exception I believe, unless it was in the Korean conflict, that this country was caught without an adequate merchant marine. The result was that we had to start to build up our merchant marine under adverse circumstances, to meet an emergency.

While we recognize, as I have already pointed out, that it is most difficult for us to compete with foreign nations, we must realize that we must have an adequate merchant marine. Therefore, the Committee on Rules saw fit to approve this resolution so that this very important committee of the House might have the tools with which to make such investigation as is necessary, so that we may meet this problem.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question or two?

Mr. COLMER. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. My purpose in asking the gentleman to yield is to determine, if possible, if the resolution now before the House is in such form that it conforms to the policy of the Committee on Rules as announced previously.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield to me for the purpose of answering that question?

Mr. COLMER. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. BONNER. I should like to take this opportunity to say to the House that prior to the statement of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], chairman of the Committee on Rules, this resolution, or a resolution of this type, had been introduced, as a result of the desire of the entire Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to look into one of the largest subjects in our Government, the merchant marine and the various ramifications of the merchant marine.

When the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], chairman of the Committee on Rules, made known the policy of the Committee on Rules, on the floor of the House, I immediately withdrew the first

resolution, the original resolution, and prepared this resolution to conform to the various reasons and desires of the Committee on Rules as presented by Mr. SMITH.

I assure the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from Tennessee and the other Members of the House that this committee will go into the study seriously, not with an extremely large staff but with a highly technical professional staff, to study the 1936 act and what is necessary to bring the act up to present-day requirements so as to make the American merchant marine, which is the fourth arm of our national defense, as well as a great adjunct of the commerce of the United States, in keeping with the merchant marines of the other great nations of the world. Today we are the 12th in ship construction. We should not be in that position.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, may I say to the distinguished chairman of the committee that my question was not intended as any indication of opposition. I was seeking guidance, because my own committee has about three subjects that we feel may require some investigation beyond hearings on a specific piece of legislation. If this is the form desired by the Committee on Rules, I simply wanted to make my own resolutions conform, so was asking for information. I thank the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. BONNER. I am glad the gentleman from Tennessee raised the question.

Mr. COLMER. If I may comment further, in addition to what the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine has had to say, and for the benefit of my friend from Tennessee, I do not understand that the Committee on Rules has adopted any policy whereby any resolution has to be in a specific, straitjacket form. What I do understand to be the policy, and it has the approval of the leadership on both sides of the House, is that we do not want to have committees set up that are not absolutely necessary. I think I can safely say, and I see the chairman of my committee is here and I am sure he will correct me if I do not state it correctly, that any Member of the House may feel perfectly free to introduce any resolution for an investigation that he sees fit to offer. The test will be when he comes before the committee with that resolution to justify its adoption.

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman thinks, then, that a special resolution in any field of investigation should be introduced and justified before the committee, rather than have a general resolution for general investigations by the committee or subcommittees thereof?

Mr. COLMER. I would say that each resolution should stand on its own feet.

Mr. BONNER. If the gentleman will yield further, may I say that I appreciate all that has been said by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and I appreciate what the gentleman from Mississippi has said about this resolution. In preparing the resolution, I have endeavored to make it conform with the idea of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia. However, may I point out in connection with the restriction of this resolution that there is one phase of the matters coming within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries that has never been solved and that has been in controversy in the courts between the Administrator of Merchant Marine Affairs and the General Accounting Office. I do not know how it is ever going to be solved unless some study is made and it will necessarily have to be made in the foreign countries that are the major shipbuilders to determine the foreign cost of ship construction as compared to the domestic costs here in the United States.

Another phase of this matter is the operating differential. What is the foreign cost of operation and what is the domestic cost of operation? Those are the two items of the greatest cost and expense to the American merchant marine, which the Committee on Appropriations of the Congress has had complaint about and given a great deal of attention to. I hope some day this question can be solved positively by either this committee, the Committee on Appropriations, or the General Accounting Office. There will have to be a time when a foreign study is made which can be depended on. So far as we are concerned at the present time, we are not asking for any travel beyond the continental boundaries of the United States.

Mr. COLMER. If I may say further, in response to this colloquy, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries justified its request for this resolution and it has been granted. Does the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] desire any further time?

Mr. BONNER. No, I appreciate the time that the gentleman from Mississippi has given me, and I appreciate the courtesy the chairman of the Committee on Rules has shown us. I have no further statement to make except, of course, I hope that the resolution is adopted.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield belatedly, I am sorry to say, 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, as has been so ably stated by the gentleman from Mississippi, does conform with the statement made by our chairman of the Committee on Rules previously. It specifies and details the matters which the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will investigate. I think it is an excellent resolution. It is properly itemized. The House should accept it readily. It is certainly not controversial. Moreover, the matters to be studied, as called for in the resolution, are matters which are of great interest, not only to this Congress but to the entire country, and the information which this committee can—and I am sure will—develop as a result of those studies is information which is badly needed and which could result in a saving of much money for the taxpayers.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution. I think there are no further requests for time and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up a resolution (H. Res. 63) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct an inspection of the Veterans' Administration with a particular view to determining the efficiency of the administration and operation of Veterans' Administration installations.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session), as soon as practicable during the present Congress, the results of its inspection, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such records, documents, and papers, to administer oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

Resolved, That the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the following programs of benefits for veterans and their dependents and survivors:

(1) The programs of compensation and pension;

(2) The programs of hospitalization, domiciliary care, medical and dental care and treatment, and furnishing of prosthetic appliances;

(3) The insurance and indemnity programs;

(4) The housing and business loan programs, and the program of furnishing assistance for the acquisition of specially adapted housing;

(5) The programs of education and training (including vocational rehabilitation);

(6) The furnishing of burial allowances; and

(7) The furnishing of unemployment compensation under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952; with a view to determining whether or not such programs are being conducted economically, efficiently, in the best interests of the Government and the beneficiaries of such programs, and in such a manner as to avoid the misuse of Government funds; whether or not such programs adequately serve the needs and protect the welfare of the beneficiaries of

such programs; and whether changes in the law or in the administration and operation of the programs either will lead to greater efficiency and economy or will make such programs more adequately serve the needs of the beneficiaries of such programs. The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any matter which is under investigation by another committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session), as soon as practicable during the present Congress, the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such records, documents, and papers, to administer oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution calls for the continuation of the investigation which the Congress authorized in the last session. Our colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, who sponsors this resolution, has been very active in supervising and investigating to make sure that the money appropriated for the Veterans' Administration is properly spent.

The appropriation made by the Congress this year for the Veterans' Administration is the largest nondefense appropriation—with the exception of the military—that the Congress has made. It amounts to $4,452,300,000.

The Veterans' Administration has approximately 160,000 employees, and over 170 regional offices throughout the country. It is a large and complex department of the Government.

This committee under the chairmanship of our colleague from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] will conduct a very fair investigation. Veterans' Administration money must be properly spent. The veterans in our hospitals and in our various benefit programs must receive the care which the American people are so anxious to extend by reason of these appropriations.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Will this investigation by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in any way conflict with the one which is coming up later regarding which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] has offered a resolution?

Mr. MADDEN. It is my understanding that there is no conflict at all between the two investigations.

Mr. MARTIN. Is any member of the committee present who can tell us?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I wish to assure the distinguished minority leader that there will be no duplication between the investigations authorized in this resolution and that authorized in the resolution yet to come. I was on that committee last summer and I am well aware of what they are doing and looking into. There will be no duplication in any way.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. One of the finest Members of the House I have ever served with, or that I have served with in any legislative body, is the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. I know my colleagues will join with me in congratulating him today, which is his birthday anniversary. I know they will join with me in extending to him our very best wishes and that for countless years to come he will continue to serve our country.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. I wish to concur in the warm endorsement of our colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. I, too, think he is one of the most useful Members of the House.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I also wish the gentleman from Virginia many, many happy returns of the day and to congratulate the House that he is a Member of this body. I recently appeared before his Committee on Rules and at that time I was impressed again by his very gracious manner of receiving witnesses and conducting hearings. He represents a State that has produced able statesmen—he is one of the finest and most able. A true southern gentleman—the House is lucky to have his services.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned of the birthday of our distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Rules. In his usual modesty, he had not confided that fact to any of his friends or referred to it in the Committee on Rules, which was in session this morning. But I would like to add my word of congratulation, and I think in doing so I speak for the entire Committee on Rules. In fact, I can go further than that and say that the entire membership of this House on both sides of the aisle felicitates and congratulates this distinguished Virginian—this distinguished American—upon his having arrived at another milestone in his travels through life and upon his great contribution to a free democratic government in these United States.

If I may, I would like to offer another thought which is not at all new. Someone has said, "Give me the flowers while I am still living." I would like to just append this little bouquet on our distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. In my twenty-odd years of service in this House I can truthfully and honestly say that I have served with no Member, of the thousands who have gone through this Chamber, who has had the interest of his country at heart any more than has the gentleman whom we honor at this time, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. He is a real American patriot. We hope for many more years of service for him in this body.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I could not let this opportunity pass without saying a word about my very good friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. I, too, came here about 20 years ago. After a couple of years I was assigned to the Committee on Rules. I served on that committee with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. I also served with him once upon a time as a member of a special committee. By reason of the committee service I have alluded to and also by reason of my contacts with the gentleman from Virginia on the floor and in many other ways, I have come to know him very, very well.

First of all, may I say that not only is he one of the most able men in the House of Representatives, he is one of the most able men I have ever met. While he is courageous and ready to fight for those principles in which he believes, he is always tolerant and fair, he is always humble, he is honest, he speaks what he believes and because we all know that we listen to him and we are always impressed by what he has to say.

I had thought that perhaps he had ceased to have birthdays, but, in any event, since it is known now that today is his birthday, I wish him well on this occasion. I wish him many, many more occasions of this kind in the years to come and ask that we may be privileged to be associated with him during those years.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for the past 14 years I have had the honor and the high privilege of serving on the Committee on Rules with the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. He is one of the most able, one of the most honest, one of the most conscientious, and one of the most courageous Members of Congress with whom I have ever had the pleasure of serving.

He must have entered the Congress at a very young age, because he is certainly still a young man in spirit and in energy, and in his viewpoint on public affairs. We all join in extending to him felicitations on his birthday and our best wishes for many, many more years of devoted service to his beloved country.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, may I, on behalf of the Virginia delegation, extend

felicitations to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] on this, his birthday?

Virginia has produced some great men in the past. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] is living proof of the fact that Virginia is still producing great men in this generation. His colleagues are proud of him. The whole State of Virginia is proud of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and the record he has made, and I take great pleasure in extending to him our best wishes for many more years of service and happiness.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Rules—and I think I am speaking the minds of all the members of the committee—we unanimously agree that our chairman the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has made a great record while serving in the Congress and is and will make a great chairman of the Committee on Rules. His outstanding ability as a statesman and parliamentarian is known to all of us. We also appreciate his sense of fairness and consideration for the views and opinions of his colleagues. We all join the Members of our Congress in wishing him many happy returns of his birthday.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, while I cannot speak with the eloquence of those who have just spoken regarding the chairman of our great committee, the Committee on Rules, I yield to no one in the sincerity of my expression. I have long admired the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. I have served with him on the Committee on Rules now for 4 years, and it is again my pleasure to serve on the committee with him as its chairman, and I shall continue to admire and respect him. I join the others in wishing him many, many happy returns of this day.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Republican delegation of the State of Virginia, I wish to reecho the felicitations that have been extended to our distinguished dean of the delegation. In the 2 short years that I have served here, I have noticed that whenever Judge SMITH takes the floor he receives the undivided attention of the Members from both sides of the aisle, and I am persuaded that the reason for that is that he always speaks his heart and his mind and is steadfast to principle regardless of the political implications involved. I wish him many happy returns of the day.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, referring now to the pending resolution, House Resolution 63, it authorizes the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, to conduct full and complete investigations and studies of certain programs enumerated in the resolution itself. Like the resolution previously considered for the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, this resolution itemizes the work which the committee intends to do and will be given authority to do. I might say, at least in partial reply to a question raised regarding the possible duplication as between this committee and the select committee called for in the resolution now pending, there is on page 3 of the pending resolution in the amendment this language:

> The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any matter which is under investigation by another committee of the House.

It will also be noted by the House that item No. 1 in the pending resolution provides for an investigation and study of the programs of compensation and pension. The other pending resolution would call for the investigation of payments which might be described as pensions or compensation. I assume that the two committees will work out their own area of jurisdiction and that there will be no conflict, because the House has heard the assurance of the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs that there will be no duplication of work as between these two committees.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the work of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs should logically include the study proposed in this resolution. The resolution is limited; it is not a travel resolution, and we were told by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs that not a great deal of money will be required. In fact, this committee has a record of having returned back to the House a portion of the previous appropriations allowed to it for such investigations. So, Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of this resolution.

I now yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the author of this resolution, and also the chairman of the Committee on Rules, if they would be willing to eliminate that part of the resolution which the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] just read. It reads:

> The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any matter which is under investigation by another committee of the House.

I do not see that that adds very much to the resolution. Certainly it would, or would it, prohibit the Committee on Veterans' Affairs from investigating many things that the Committee on Apropriations is investigating, and that other committees are constantly investigating. There was a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor, as well as a special and select committee that can investigate matters that should be investigated by us. I wonder if the author of the resolution would object to my suggestion.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield to me?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. This sentence to which the gentlewoman has referred was inserted in the resolution at the suggestion of the chairman of the Committee on Rules. I did not disagree with the gentleman on this language. Of course, it is difficult to say that there will be no overlapping by any other committee. But certainly there is no reason why two committees of the House should investigate the same subject. The select committee, which I hope will be created, is going to conduct an overall-policy investigation. They will not go into the details of disability compensation and pensions that I foresee as a part of the work of this committee.

Personally, I have no desire to eliminate that sentence from this resolution, because I do not think it will hinder the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. It merely says that we are not going to duplicate the work of some other committee.

As the situation develops, and if we think it necessary to do so, we can go back to the Committee on Rules and point out what the situation is and indicate what we want to do; and I am sure they will give us permission to do what is necessary.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, my feeling is that that may be too late. It seems to me that our committee has the primary duty and obligation to investigate the work done by the Veterans' Administration. I cannot see any objection to eliminating this sentence from the resolution.

When I appeared before the Committee on Rules I did not realize that that sentence was in the copy of the resolution that the chairman presented. It was not in the original resolution of the gentleman from Texas, our committee chairman.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield to me?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I know that the gentlewoman was not aware that it was in the resolution, and I am sorry that the resolution was prepared in such a hurry that I did not have the opportunity to point it out. As far as I am concerned personally, I am not worried about it. If under certain conditions we want to investigate some matter that may seem to be precluded by this language, I am sure the Committee on Rules will very promptly give us that permission.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Would the gentleman object to eliminating this sentence?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I would not object to taking it out, and I would not object to having it in. I do not think it will affect the work of our committee.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Would the chairman of the Committee on Rules object to an amendment striking this language?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, if the lady from Massachusetts will yield to me, that is a clause that the committee has adopted for all of these resolutions, so that there may be no duplication of work. I think to eliminate it in any one resolution would seem to invite a duplication of work. That would be my only objection to the suggestion of the lady. I do think it is a good clause. I do not think it will give us any trouble. I think we can get along with it all right.

It was the purpose of the Committee on Rules to indicate by that clause that they did not want to see any duplication, and I do not think there ought to be any duplication. Whichever committee has authority should make the investigation, and no other committee should interfere.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I sometimes feel that we might as well abolish certain committees because the Committee on Appropriations legislates so much and eliminates certain benefits that the House puts in for the veterans, and other groups. I have discussed that on the floor a good many times. With a committee of 50 holding the purse strings it is a very powerful committee.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I feel sure that the fears of the gentlewoman are unfounded. I want to affirm what the chairman of the gentlewoman's committee has said. If you do find yourselves in a fix where you think you are justified in making some justification concerning a matter with which some other committee may be dealing, if you will come to the Committee on Rules I am sure you will have sympathetic consideration.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is being done all the time, may I say to the gentleman.

Can this resolution be amended?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am not in charge of the resolution. I have no authority to yield for that purpose. However, I do not think it should be done, if I may answer the gentlewoman. I do not think this language should be eliminated.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I should like to offer an amendment if the resolution can be amended.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Massachusetts 3 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if the resolution can be amended I should like to offer an amendment, on page 3, line 15, to strike out the sentence reading:

> The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any matter which is under investigation by another committee of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield for that purpose?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that not only the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs but the chairman of the Committee on Rules have stated the position in regard to this resoluion, that it very fully covers the objection the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has set out, and I do not feel that I should yield for an amendment.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is there any way to place such an amendment in the resolution? Is there any prohibition against it? Under the rules of the House, if there is not, I will offer that amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair wishes to state that the gentlewoman does not have that right in the time yielded her for debate.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Then at a later time, if I have the right to do it, and if it does not pass I will introduce another resolution of investigation and ask for a hearing before the Rules Committee.

May I say I heartily endorse the purposes of these investigations. In the 80th Congress we had a number of such committees that did valiant work, and we also did in the 83d Congress, and we turned back money to the House in both the Congresses. We turned back $28,000 in the last session.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], the chairman of the committee, is a past master of investigations. I have a great deal of admiration for the work he does along that line. However, I would like to perfect the resolution. At the present time there are departments and special committees that are constantly investigating the Veterans' Administration. Why the Veterans' Administration should be the whipping boy of all the departments for investigation and chastisement I do not know. Everybody here is vitally interested in the veterans, who pay the heaviest bill of war. I feel that today we are practically in war conditions. I know the rest of the Members of the House agree with me that we should protect the veterans in every way possible.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer a motion to recommit striking out the language on line 15 beginning with "The committee" and ending with "House."

The SPEAKER. Under the rules, a motion to recommit a resolution from the Committee on Rules is not in order.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I feared that that was the case.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 30, Rept. No. 18), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may make investigations and studies into the following matters within its jurisdiction: In Alaska, the aboriginal and possessory rights of the Eskimos and Indians in and to the some 400 million acres of public lands in Alaska; in Hawaii, the operation of the Hawaiian Homes Commission under the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920, and the return of public lands to local authority and/or private ownership; in the Trust Territories, the provisions and local conditions for an organic act for that area, including legislation concerning American Samoa, the Organic Act for Guam, and legislation affecting the civilian population of the Ryukyu Islands; in Puerto Rico, the liquidation of the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration; and in the Virgin Islands, the operation of the Organic Act of 1954 and the Virgin Islands Corporation; in the continental United States, the production of uranium and other critical and strategic minerals and metals, irrigation and reclamation projects proposed for authorization, including but not limited to the upper Colorado River Basin project, Hells Canyon project, and the Trinity-San Luis project in California, in the national parks and monuments requiring study and inspection and the administration of the public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management and the national forests created out of the public domain, and various Indian tribes and reservations for the purpose of improving the management of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and planning the ultimate freedom of the Indians from Federal wardship: *Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject matter which is being investigated by any other standing committee of the House.

For the purpose of making such investigations, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, possessions, Puerto Rico, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

BENEFITS FOR SURVIVING DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 35) creating a Select Committee To Conduct an Investigation and Study of the Benefits Provided Under Federal Law for the Surviving Dependents of Deceased Members and Former Members of the Armed Forces and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed (1) to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the benefits provided under Federal law for the survivors of deceased members and former members of the Armed Forces, and (2) on the basis of such investigation and study, to make such recommendations as it may deem advisable and to prepare such legislation as it may consider appropriate to carry out such recommendations.

As soon as it is practicable during the present Congress, the committee shall (1) report to the House the results of its investigation and study, and (2) report to the House, by bill or otherwise, its recommendations made under the preceding paragraph.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during

the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings, as it deems necessary.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, strike lines 3 through 14, and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"The committee shall (1) report to the House the results of its investigation and study, and (2) report to the House, by bill or otherwise, its recommendations made under the preceding paragraph not later than January 15, 1956.

"For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times within the District of Columbia whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings, as it deems necessary."

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Before I speak on the resolution, I want to give a hand salute to my chairman. I did not know that today was his birthday. Mr. Chairman, on your "39th" birthday may all the happiness in the world be yours; and may all of your years be happy ones.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, if adopted, will continue the select committee which was created by the adoption of House Resolution 549 of the 83d Congress. This resolution goes one step further than that of the last Congress in that it clothes a special committee with the power to report legislation, if they deem it advisable, after they have concluded their investigation. As the resolution states, the select committee would investigate survivors' benefits accruing to survivors of deceased members of the armed services or former members of the armed services. Applicable laws on this subject are very complicated and have created quite a bit of confusion for and, I might say, injustice to these survivors. I think the investigation is a worthwhile project. The task is an arduous one. The committee has already done a fine job and I think they should have an opportunity to finish it and report legislation to the House. I hope the resolution is adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Arkansas, provides for the continuation of work begun in the 83d Congress by a similar select committee. In all respects but one, I believe, the resolution now before us is identical with the one under which the select committee operated in the last Congress.

That one difference, however, I think should be explained to the House, because it is extremely important. This select committee will undertake to look into benefits provided under Federal law for the survivors of deceased members or former members of the armed services—in other words, veterans—and on the basis of such investigation and study make such recommendations as it shall deem advisable, and to prepare such legislation as may be considered appropriate to carry out such recommendations.

Up to that point the wording is identical with the wording previously enacted by the House. However, according to the testimony produced before the Committee on Rules, this problem which the select committee would undertake to look into has many ramifications; in other words, it was discovered in the past experience of this committee and brought out in testimony before the Rules Committee that legislation to improve or remedy these matters which were bound to need legislation might come under the jurisdiction or could conceivably come under the jurisdiction of 4, or perhaps 5 or 6 committees. In other words, the presentation of the legislation recommended by this select committee would involve automatically a problem of committee jurisdiction. So it was decided by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], author of the resolution, to lay before the House the further provision in the resolution that this select committee shall—and I read from the resolution, line 15, page 2:

The committee shall: (1) Report to the House the results of its investigation and study; and (2) report to the House by bill or otherwise those recommendations made under the preceding paragraph not later than January 15, 1956.

I call your attention to two phrases of that wording: One is that this select committee will be given power not ordinarily given to select committees of this House, namely, to prepare and report to the House legislation that would accomplish the committee recommendations. For such legislation to be handled by any other legislative committee would, of course, cause jurisdictional problems. So the Committee on Rules favors this innovation and feels it is proper wording for the resolution.

The second matter in the paragraph which I wish to point out is that the Committee on Rules wrote an amendment to the resolution calling for a report and a completion of the study by January 15, 1956. The purpose was to make it the duty of this select committee to report back to the House so that this Congress, the 84th Congress, could have time in which to act upon the reports or bills submitted by the select committee.

So, Mr. Speaker, with that explanation and in the belief that the matters sought to be investigated by this resolution should be looked into by the committee, I urge the adoption of the pending resolution, House Resolution 35.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, when I appeared before the Committee on Rules I stated my objections to this rule which gives the select committee the power to bring in legislation, the same power enjoyed by the standing committees of the House. Last year the select committee did not have the authority to bring in legislation. I think the Members do not realize the full import of it. There have been other precedents, but not many. In doing this you are setting another precedent voting for the future to take away the prerogatives of the committees. As I stated before, I think the Committee on Appropriations has taken away a great many of the prerogatives of the standing committees; and this select committee will take away jurisdiction over a matter which logically should come under the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the Armed Services Committee, the Ways and Means Committee, and other committees. I think all of the ills could be remedied by legislation from within our own committees. I fear for the fate of some of our investigations under the resolution that has been offered.

If we start an investigation I am wondering if the Speaker will decide that some other committee may be barred from it. I suppose the select committee would be over all of the committees, so there might be some investigations that will tie our hands behind our backs. I think hearings on these matters are very valuable. I am wondering, though, if there will be a select committee created later on which could take away the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs involving such matters as housing and loans under the GI bill of rights and turn it over to the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. Speaker, we face a very serious situation here. This resolution will undoubtedly pass, but I feel that I ought to issue a warning. I know many veterans over the country are very much alarmed. Their feeling is that the investigations should be pursued, then fight if a bill is brought out that they fear may hurt veterans' benefits and veterans' services.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. May I make the observation that if the committee should bring out a bill which is an improper one, I hope the gentlewoman will fight it and that the veterans' organizations will fight it. If it is an improper bill I shall join in fighting it myself.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know the gentleman is very much interested in this matter. We had a bill making certain adjustments up for consideration some time ago. I am heartily in favor of the dependents receiving more money. Some of these amounts are pitifully small, as the gentleman will recall. It is unnecessary to go into the history of that legislation for the benefit of the older Members here. We have had many battles on veterans' legislation. In raising certain benefits, however, I have found that in the past, even in our own committee, other benefits have been lowered. I am anxious to protect those benefits, and I know the gentleman is, too. I think cuts may be recommended to save money, but we must consider them thoroughly.

Mr. HARDY. I certainly hope that the gentlewoman from Massachusetts is not prejudging the action of the committee before the committee has gathered the facts. Certainly the committee has to act, as my objective would be, on

the basis of the facts gathered, and that it would make such recommendations as the facts might justify. I am sure the gentlewoman would have it that way.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think they should act. But in watching other investigations and other changes I am fearful there may be some bypassing. There were certain men, for instance, as a result of legislation from the Armed Services Committee, who did not receive their mustering-out pay. I am sure that was an accident when the legislation was passed; I am sure it was a mistake, but the situation has not been rectified to date. Also in one of the retirement bills from the Armed Services Committee enlisted men benefits were cut, while those of the officers were raised.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I can understand the concern of the chairman of any standing committee concerning the jurisdiction of a particular committee. They, of course, want to protect the committee. I have listened to my colleague from Massachusetts make the statement that there are many veterans' groups throughout this country that are opposed to this legislation. The facts do not support such a statement, Mr. Speaker, because, as a matter of fact, all the veterans' organizations appeared before our committee and all of them were in favor of the hearings.

Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand at the moment a letter which I just received today from the American Legion, a portion of which I would like to include, to indicate the position of the American Legion in this particular matter.

It was signed by Miles D. Kennedy, director:

> I well appreciate the fact that in your studies on the question of survivor benefits you were and are necessarily faced with many complex problems and several of them are going to be difficult of solution.
>
> There is no question but that under the current laws dealing with veterans, their survivors and dependents, many inequities do exist. Like yourself, our organization's primary concern is to adjust these inequities wherever possible.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is the purpose of this committee. Back in the year 1941, it was the intent of the administration to make certain changes in the program, but unfortunately, with the advent of the war, it was impossible to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this resolution is particularly necessary, and I urge its passage.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I personally wish to compliment the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] in taking on a very tough problem, a problem that becomes a bigger problem every day that it is not solved and a problem that Congress must solve. A member of the armed services may receive about five different survivor benefits or a combination of those survivor benefits.

Now, I want to read to the House from Defense Department records actually what is happening in some cases on survivor benefits. Here is an officer of the Armed Forces who drew in total pay $437. Today his survivor is drawing $730.70. Another case from the Defense Department records is a private, first class, who drew in total pay and allowances $191.81. Today his survivors are drawing $324.30.

Now, there are 68,000 widows who are drawing a total of $87 a month. Surely, those figures will prove to this House that there is something that needs to be done. As I said before, every day that passes this becomes a bigger problem, and again I compliment the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] for taking on a very tough job, and I hope the resolution will be approved.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, with the permission of those who have other special orders today, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] take precedence over other special orders for the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE LATE PRESIDENT FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, with humility and a sense of inadequacy, I appear before my colleagues, one the first-born child, others who had been the coworkers of the greatest personality of our times in the years of trials and of triumphs when there was being written a page in the history of our country and of the world that will be read and reread with ever-increasing interest and inspiration as long as our civilization endures.

Mine was that of an observer in an outpost in a great and stricken city. Everything had been washed away, even hope. Age no longer had protection for declining years in the savings of long days of toil and sacrifice, savings washed as cleanly and completely away as sands on the oceanside by a tidal wave. Youth looking ahead could see only the blackness of the night. Hunger was in every home. Silence enveloped the factories and there was no place where man could go to earn food and raiment and shelter for growing families.

As the prophet Isaiah came to a stricken Israel to lift from misery and despond to a new exaltation by faith and courage and the dignified charity of brotherhood so did Franklin Delano Roosevelt in our day come to the suffering people in the cities, the hamlets, and the regions of sparse population. It was faith in him, and nothing else, that carried us through the first 9 months when banks were closed, employment stopped and man had lost his confidence in everything and everyone human, save only Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Faith, courage, the spirit of brotherhood spread as never before in our history, and a nation reposing its faith in Roosevelt, as did the people of ancient Israel in the prophet Isaiah, gained the strength to battle through the night. It was a new and brighter day into which the Nation came, a day in which stout and good laws broadened the horizons of opportunity and of contentment for all our people in every sphere and in every segment of our population.

Seventy-three years ago Sunday, which was the 30th day of January, a great soul came our way. For a brief 63 years that soul remained among us in physical encasement. A brief 63 years, and during many of those years when all the world by his effort and his inspiration was being changed and mankind everywhere was being led to new pinnacles of human achievement and human contentment, the physical encasement of the great soul that had come to us was imperfect to the extent that every physical movement was attended by pain as agonizing at times as that which must have attended the Christ with ugly spikes nailing Him to the cross.

Ten years ago, on April 12 of 1945, the great soul that had come our way, and that had reached into the lives and hearts of men and women in all the countries of the world, passed from us. When the news came over the wires from Warm Springs, Ga., late in the sad afternoon of April 12, 10 years ago, I was working in the office of the corporation counsel in the city of Chicago.

When I left there were three women assigned to the humble but honorable chores of cleaning the office. One was a fine Negro woman, one I believe was of Irish descent, and the third a fine woman in whose veins coursed the proud blood of Poland. All three were sobbing. Each was bowed in the grief of one who had lost a brother, a father, or a personal friend deep and warm in her affection.

I went on to the streets, and everywhere men and women, by their tear-broken utterances and the stunned and hopeless looks on their faces, were showing that, to them, the sun that had carried them from their sore distresses, from their wilderness of despondency and of doubt, the sun that had carried them to new heights and to a closer touch of affinity to the God of whom they were children, that sun had sunk below human horizon.

It was at 4:35 in the afternoon of April 12, 1945, that death came to Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He left behind a message, which I think he would like to have read today, on the occasion of this observance of his 73th birthday.

At this moment, 10 years after his passing, we are at a trying period of crisis. But recently the President has sent to us a message, to which we have

responded by passing a resolution which may bring the peace for which we all devoutedly pray. Or it may be that despite our purpose and our prayers from this position which we have taken in the hope of assuring the peace will come events multiplying one upon the other until the third world war has come to end our civilization and to send mankind back to the caves again to begin the hard march of many centuries to build a new civilization.

For such a moment of perplexity and of resolution, the great soul that came our way 73 years ago has left for us a message. It is in the last words that he wrote, some of them in his own handwriting. They were written on April 12, 1945, the day of his death. He was then working, with the end only hours and minutes away, on an address to be delivered on Jefferson Day. Let me read to you those words:

> Today, as we move against the terrible scourge of war, as we go forward toward the greatest contribution that any generation of human beings can make in this world—the contribution of lasting peace—I ask you to keep up your faith. I measure the sound, solid achievement that can be made at this time by the straight edge of your own confidence and your resolve; and to you, and to all Americans who dedicate themselves with us to the making of an abiding peace, I say the only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith.

My colleagues, on this observance of the 73d birthday of the great immortal, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, may we place ineffaceably in our memories the last words written by our fallen leader:

> The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith.

The challenge to our generation is the attainment of permanent peace. To that end the immortal Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in the last words penned for our reading, bids us to move forward, unafraid, with the faith that knows no doubt. On this his birthday and in fitting reverence to his memory, we rededicate ourselves to that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the majority leader, the great and beloved statesman of Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], whose name will remain imperishably in our history as that of one of the chosen group of immortals who were in personal and official intimacy with the greatest personality of our times and who shared the close confidences, the burdens, and the mighty achievements of the President when, from the wreck of the world that was, a new and better was rebuilt.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, those of us who stood at the elbow of Franklin Delano Roosevelt through the great years of the last three decades owe it to history to speak out in his name on his birthday anniversary, January 30. For here was an American of Americans whose imprint we can see now is vivid not only for our time but for the ages. And those of us who were his friends, and at the same time his lieutenants in this very House and on this very floor, would not let his anniversary pass without a tribute to his greatness and a word of reverence for the boldness of his leadership in crises that shook this Nation and made the very world tremble.

Here was a life that from the very beginning was pitched in the heroic scale. Every phase of that career from his birth near Hyde Park, N. Y., January 30, 1883, to his death at Warm Springs, Ga., April 12, 1945, was marked by the touch of destiny. The letters that passed between him and the handsome and distinguished lady who was his mother—Sara Delano Roosevelt—during his childhood and later are in themselves a record of a sublime relationship. If the aristocracy that so marked his youth, his schooling, his travels in childhood, adolescence and young manhood, tended to render him somewhat aloof from his fellow man, he was not long in establishing the common touch and never letting it pass from him.

For who, of all our Presidents, except Abraham Lincoln, had more of an understanding heart than Franklin Delano Roosevelt? Indeed, if I had to catalog his talents, itemizing the abundance of the gifts which God had bestowed upon him, the greatest of these, I should have to conclude, was his understanding heart and mind.

The reason Franklin Delano Roosevelt had the understanding mind and heart was because he sought them. He sought to understand his fellow man on all levels of the human scale and to help him to help himself when the hours were blackest. His ancestor Claes Martensen van Roosevelt, came to New Amsterdam from Holland in 1649, and the sturdy strength of body and of mind had its roots in that tough and resilient Dutch stock. His graduation from Harvard in 1904, his admission to the bar after his law studies at Columbia, his Dutchess County representation in the New York Senate in 1910, and 1913, seen today in retrospect, were steps that marked the beginning of what was yet to come. The Roosevelt horizon reached the first grand level when Woodrow Wilson in 1913 made him his Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

Not a few who moved with or clashed against him then in Washington discerned in his lean body, quick speech, his incisive manner, his vast capacity for work, the outlines of superior leadership. But none would have guessed the true dimensions of his greatness as history was soon to demonstrate them. For the Roosevelt we came to know was not really recognized even when he ran as the Vice Presidential team-mate of James M. Cox in 1920. We can only guess what great inner illumination filled his soul as the result of that devastating attack of infantile paralysis, which crippled his legs, and for the rest of his life compelled him to walk—if at all—with braces and a cane. But if he had ever lacked the understanding heart he acquired it then. If ever the finger of God touched the human soul it surely touched the man who was to become the 32d President of the United States.

The sweep of that undefeated, dynamic personality—the new Roosevelt—flared across the political skies first when he presented the name of Alfred E. Smith to the Democratic convention of 1924 in New York, and 1928 in Houston, Tex. The Roosevelt genius for language began to make history when he knighted Governor Smith "the happy warrior." I can see him now, as I saw and heard him in Boston, in the 1928 campaign, when he dramatically said: "If any person votes against Alfred E. Smith because of his religion, may God have mercy on his miserable soul." From thence forward who of us breathing today has not lived with the grandeur of that man, no matter how close or how remote we were to the scene of action? By the hard road of achievement and decision he had made himself known to the country as an administrator during his governorship of New York in the late 1920's and the early 1930's. The accent was always on leadership within the democratic process, and the aura that surrounded him was charged with a kind of electricity that gripped us all.

Every word he uttered, every syllable, every gesture he made, every ceremony he attended, the legislation he advocated, held high courage, proud promise, and sound faith. The depression had drained the faith of people in their Government. The American tradition had turned to ashes for millions. The world of business had lost caste. Strange and ugly voices were heard in the land. New and dangerous allurements were dangled before the American people and found many takers. Words filled the headlines. "Fascism" was one; "nazism" was another. "Communism" had become the most common word in the language of politics. The men of little faith jumped from their high windows in the great financial canyons of Wall Street. They had so little inside themselves of the true values of life that the loss of money was enough to make them eager to quit.

But the voice that moved over the ruins to the White House did not quit.

Shall we ever forget? Shall we ever forget how Franklin Delano Roosevelt took hold of the helm? Legislation poured from this House—progressive American legislation—that took the vast strength and resources of this country and gave them meaning against the evil of the day. The frightful potentialities for bankruptcy of the spirit that lurked beneath the surface of the American mind was dissipated. The people heard their President speak—always within the democratic framework of our system—and the fireside chat became a new institution. Men were appointed to his right hand because of their capacities. "We have nothing to fear but fear," he told us, and the words rang out like a visitation from on high.

When imminent danger, clear and present—and violent—loomed in the form of a challenging nazism he reached the height of his leadership. There was history close to this hour and all of us fought the fight with him. I have memories of his superb and distinguished leadership involving my own relation-

ships to him that constitute the greatest moments in my life. He knew where the Nation was headed and his understanding heart kept him surrounded by dedicated men who loved their country. By being loyal to him they were loyal to America. He moved through drama and crisis to victory.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, more than any other man, led the free world out of the morass of a threatening engulfment by the forces of total tyranny, and let us today keep it from engulfment by another total tyranny.

I remember well in 1942, in one of my many conferences with Franklin D. Roosevelt, I said to him, "Mr. President, this war in one respect is like politics. You remember the old saying, 'Politics makes strange bedfellows.' This war in one respect is like this old saying. Who would ever think that our country and the Soviet Union would be fighting on the same side against the same common enemy?" Quick as a flash, the President said, "John, there is an old Rumanian proverb that you are justified in crossing the bridge with the devil until you get to the other side." In other words, we had to lick the first devil first.

In reverence, affection, and profound remembrance, I bow my head for my friend, Franklin Delano Roosevelt—one of the greatest men of all time—on the occasion of his recent birthday.

We might well keep that in mind today.

Four times the people of the United States elected Franklin Delano Roosevelt President. He left the world with a dream couched in ideals precious to his inmost being. Some day that dream shall, like so many ideals he brought to fruition, achieve reality. That dream was to bring an era of the four freedoms all over the world: freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear.

In reverence, affection, and profound remembrance, I bow my head today for my friend, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, on the occasion of his recent birthday.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA], and also our majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], for calling the attention of the Congress to this anniversary birthday of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Ex-President Roosevelt will go down in American history as the greatest and most constructive statesman of this century. He was stricken by that crippling disease, infantile paralysis, when in the prime of life. For several years he not only suffered untold pain but was physically handicapped and unable to walk. When the leaders of the Democratic Party asked him to be a candidate for Governor of New York in 1928, he refused because of his physical condition and further stated that he could not devote sufficient time to the campaign and that his doctors advised him that rest and treatments at his Warm Springs, Ga., home might eventually bring about his recovery. His inborn patriotism and also love of the Democratic Party compelled him to change his mind, and he was elected Governor of the great State of New York in the fall of 1928. The great record and abiilty which he displayed as executive of his home State laid the foundation for his nomination and election to the Presidency in 1932. Congressman O'HARA and Congressman MCCORMACK have already outlined in detail his exceptional qualities as a patriot, statesman, and humanitarian, which I shall not reiterate.

I do believe that many people during the past 23 years have forgotten the terrific task which confronted President Franklin Roosevelt the day he was inaugurated as our President on March 4, 1933. The younger generation does not possess firsthand knowledge of the dark clouds which hovered over our Nation's economy in that sorrowful period of our Nation's history. I am sure that other congressional districts throughout Indiana and other localities were suffering by reason of unemployment and depression the same as the great industrial Calumet region of northwest Indiana. The steel mills and factories were either closed or operating but a few days a week. Banks were crashing throughout the country; in fact, the city of Gary, Ind., on March 4, 1933, had but 1 bank operating out of 13 which were open in 1930. Thousands had lost their life's savings. The depression not only had hit the industrial areas, but also farm prices and the prosperity of the folks in agriculture was at the lowest ebb in history. Newspapers in the Middle West were printing photographs of farmers in great numbers riding in trucks into the county-seat towns and threatening judges and lawyers against foreclosing their farms. Representatives of the chambers of commerce, manufacturing associations, labor groups, and other segments of our economy sent committees to Washington asking the new President to resort to any method that would save our Nation from economic collapse. If there ever was a time when the United States needed a real leader, it was in 1933, when over 14 million men were walking the streets and highways of America looking for work. God provided us with that leader in 1933. He lifted our country out of the depths of despondency, panic, and depression. The accomplishment of that task alone should place him side by side with the other two greatest Presidents of our history.

I am not going to review the fight he made to prepare us against the oncoming and inevitable attack of Hitler and the Japs and his great leadership as our Commander in Chief because my colleagues have dwelt on that phase of his career.

As our history marches on, the record of Franklin Delano Roosevelt will expand and become greater in the minds of future Americans for all time, and I am happy to join in the tributes being paid to him by the Members of the House on this the anniversary of his birth.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, all Members may have the right to revise and extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the other Members of the House of Representatives in this expression of high regard and of grateful memory to the splendid record of achievement and leadership of Franklin Roosevelt in his four terms in the White House. I remember very well, as if it were within the last month or so, the day on which the news reached us on our ship in the Pacific that we had lost the Nation's gallant leader. There was a period of 24 hours when we were a ghost ship, when every man in uniform on that ship walked and talked as if he had lost a close friend or member of his own family.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was a man who had the love of the people as no other man on the American scene, a man who held the love and affection of the people of this country. It is true that he was also a man who had enemies, but I think he was a man who was always faithful to the trust of public office, a man who was always faithful to the high ideals of the Presidency of the United States. I think it is very fitting that this House at this time should honor his memory on a date so close to his birthday.

I join in commending the gentleman from Illinois for securing time for this observance.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, representing the fourth district of Georgia where the Little White House was located for so many years and from which Franklin D. Roosevelt left this life to the life eternal, I rise to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the gentleman from Indiana, and the gentleman from Oklahoma. Like the gentleman from Oklahoma, I, too, was in the service, but his service was in the United States Navy, mine was in the United States Army. When we suddenly learned of President Roosevelt's death a sadness settled over the minds and hearts of all as we realized that our great Commander in Chief, the great President of the United States, the leader of the forces of democracy of the world, had been taken from our midst. His personal courage was a source of inspiration to all of us. He inspired every American, young and old, to have the courage always to stand up and be counted on the side of the things that have made America a great Nation. If we, too, following him, have the courage to stand up and be counted, then we can count ourselves as among those who also will help preserve our great America and the American traditions which we honor and which we love.

He taught us the true meaning of—

For Truth is Truth, and Right is Right,
And Right the day must win.
To doubt would be disloyalty,
To falter would be sin.

This great American, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, whose memory we honor today, never doubted and he never faltered. He led this Nation forward.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] who is very much in our minds and hearts at this time to come down into the well so that I may yield to him?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, may I have the privilege on behalf of my whole family to express my great appreciation and their appreciation to the very distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA], the eloquent majority leader [Mr. MCCORMACK], and all of my fellow colleagues who have paid these very wonderful tributes to my father.

I am sure that many of you whom I have had the privilege of knowing in previous years realize that to me my father was in every sense a father as well as a public servant. One of the things which I shall always remember is that in spite of the fact that the Presidency called at all times for the greatest attention to detail, nevertheless there always was in his mind and in his heart an overall philosophy and belief in fundamental principles.

This philosophy and belief were well summarized and expressed at the time of his funeral when the services were held in the White House here in Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would like the privilege of just repeating that prayer today for I feel it is something that perhaps can guide all of us in the very difficult times in which we live:

O God, from whom every good gift cometh, we thank Thee for steadfast courage in adversity; for clear vision of dangers to which many shut their eyes; for sympathy with the hungers and fears of common men; for trials met without surrender, and weakness endured without defeat; for unyielding faith in the possibility of a more just and ordered world, delivered from the ancient curse of war.

Keep us in this land and those peoples who struggle at our side, steadfast and united in the unfinished task. Revive us when in weariness we are tempted to grow slack and each man to seek first his own advantage. As we look ahead to final victory, enable us to strive even more mightly in peace than in war to bring new freedom and dignity to every member of our human race, and to bear without stint our destined responsibilities in the family of nations. Make ready our shoulders to carry the burdens of victory; to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, to free the oppressed, and to lay the foundation for a more just and ordered common life for all Thy people.

And do Thou, with whom a thousand years are as one day and before whom our lives pass like a watch in the night, help us to walk this day and all our days in the light of Thine own eternity.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday this House passed H. R. 587, a bill to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes.

On that day I was confined to bed by the orders of my doctor and, therefore, was unable to vote on this measure. Had I been present, I would have joined my colleagues in voting for this measure which corrected this injustice in our law.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the United States Congress is a 19th century body in a 20th century world. In the field of civil rights we are still conducting ourselves along the pattern of yesterday's world. Tremendous changes are taking place in our country eradicating the concept of second class citizenship. Yet the United States Congress has done absolutely nothing in this sphere. We are behind the times. We are a legislative anachronism. In an age of atomic energy, our dynamic is no more powerful than a watermill.

The executive and the judicial branches of our Government have passed us by so completely and are so far ahead that the peoples of our Nation do not even look to the United States Congress any longer for any dynamic leadership in the field of making democracy real. So many changes, tremendous changes, have taken place under our Supreme Court and under the leadership of President Eisenhower that many of the civil rights bills which I used to introduce are no longer of any value. This year, for instance, I did not introduce the bill to abolish segregation in the Armed Forces—it was not needed. Nor did I introduce the bill to guarantee civil rights in the District of Columbia—it was not needed.

I think it highly significant to point out that the appointment of my distinguished colleagues, Representatives DIGGS, of Detroit, Mich., and DAWSON, of Chicago, Ill., to the Veterans' Affairs Committee and the District of Columbia Committee, respectively, was due entirely to the changing climate.

Two years ago the leadership of this House, Republican or Democrat, would not have dared to place a Negro on either of these two committees because both were committees which dealt with segregation.

Our Veterans' Administration rigidly maintained the bars of segregation, especially in our veterans' hospitals. Two years ago, this Capital was a cesspool of democracy where not only I, as a Negro congressman, was banned from all public places but also visiting chiefs of state and their representatives, if their skin happened to be dark. But under the vigorous leadership of H. V. Higley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, there is no longer any segregation in any veterans' hospital. And under the leadership of District Commissioner Samuel Spencer, from Mississippi, if you please, this Capital has become a glorious place, truly representative of the finest of our American way of life. And, again I repeat, all of this was done without the help of the Congress and ofttimes in spite of the opposition of the Congress.

For 10 years, my colleagues and I have introduced civil rights amendment after amendment, civil rights bill after bill, pleading, praying that you good ladies and gentlemen would give to this body the glory of dynamic leadership that it should have. But you failed and history has recorded it.

I am proud to be a Member of the Congress of the United States. I am proud to be a Member of the legislative branch of the United States Government and I know you are too. But I beseech you to transform this emotion of pride into the deed of leadership. This is an hour for boldness. This is an hour when a world waits breathlessly, expectantly, almost hungrily, for this Congress, the 84th Congress, through legislation to give some semblance of democracy in action. Our President and our Supreme Court cannot do all this by themselves and, furthermore, we should not expect it. We are derelict in our duty if we continue to plow looking backward. No man is fit for this new world, for this new kingdom of God on earth, who plows looking backward. And it is coming with or without us. Time is running out, ladies and gentlemen; Asia has almost slipped from our grasp and Africa will be next. There is no guaranty of our position in Europe. Only a resolute three-pronged drive can make democracy live, breathe, and move now. Only legislative, judicial and executive action can completely guarantee the victory of the free world.

The legislative branch—this Congress—must immediately change its childish, immature, compromising, 19th century attitude and not just become a part of the 20th century world but a leader.

Therefore I ask all of you, on both sides of the aisle, to support this year the bill to eradicate segregation in interstate transportation; to support the omnibus civil rights bill offered by Representative EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the Judiciary Committee. Prompt hearings on these bills should be held immediately and swift passage with a minimum of friction should be brought about. We should have a bipartisan approach to domestic democracy or our bipartisan foreign policy approach will be utterly meaningless.

The fair employment opportunities bill did languish in the Committee on Education and Labor, of which I am a member, under the chairmanship of both the Republican and the Democratic leaders, and that should immediately be considered.

The opponents of a fair employment opportunities bill state that they do not believe that the Federal Government

should intrude in States rights. I do not agree with them, but until such time as we do pass a national FEPC, I am introducing today an FEPC bill for the District of Columbia. There can be no argument of violation of States rights now. An FEPC bill for the District of Columbia would automatically allow this Congress to become a part of the glorious, victorious, forward march of our executive and judicial branches in the District of Columbia.

We who believe in civil rights urge first: Unity of thought and action for the passage of an interstate antisegregation bill to ban segregation on all interstate carriers. This bill has been introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative HESELTON. Also, I have introduced a companion bill.

Last year when the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was considering legislation to end segregation in interstate travel, a 29-year-old witness appeared. He was Lt. Thomas Williams, formerly of the United States Air Force. Lieutenant Williams had volunteered for duty when he was 19 years old. He served in the Air Force with merit until 1953 when he was dropped. The testimony he gave to the committee showed that he was dropped following his arrest in the State of Florida because he refused to move from a so-called white section of an interstate bus. That young man, in the uniform of his country, was jailed and fined even though the United States Supreme Court had told carriers to end racial segregation. That case is still before the courts on appeal. After he was dropped by the United States Air Force, Lieutenant Williams was so eager to serve his country that he enlisted in the New Jersey National Guard. He served for nearly a year. About 2 weeks ago, while flying a jet plane, he was killed serving his country before he had a chance to see democracy come to pass.

We believe in the second place in unity of thought and action toward the passage of an omnibus civil-rights bill.

We believe in the third place in unity of thought and action for the passage of a fair employment opportunities act.

I would like to serve notice that some of us intend after a reasonable time of waiting for our committees and our committee chairmen to act to use every parliamentary device we can to bring before this Congress civil-rights bills of worth and value. We intend to use, after a reasonable period of time, Calendar Wednesdays and discharge petitions. I trust that the leadership will give us cooperation and that we will not be stymied by the use of counterparliamentary methods to prevent us from bringing Calendar Wednesday forward.

On this day, when we bow our heads and hearts in the memory of one of the greatest human beings that ever lived, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, may we not use some of the breadth of his greatness in our hearts and minds, realizing those great words of his that "We have nothing to fear but fear."

So let us be strong.
We are not here to play, to dream, to drift.
We have hard work to do, loads to lift.
Shun not the struggle that is God's gift.
Be strong. It matters not how deep entrenched the wrong,
Nor how hard the battle goes, nor the night how long.
Faint not, fight on.
Tomorrow will come the dawn.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to my colleague from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to commend the gentleman from New York for again filing his bill on civil-rights legislation. During the last 10 years the gentleman, along with Congressman DAWSON of Illinois and others, have consistently fought for effective civil-rights legislation. I am glad that during these years I have aided in our effort to pass Federal legislation to abolish some of the timeworn and narrowminded racial yardsticks possessed by too many people in this great Republic of ours.

We have just finished several appropriate speeches commemorating the birthday, life, and record of former President Franklin D. Roosevelt. It was about 20 years ago that he spoke out for emphatic civil-rights legislation. He was the first President in history to call for overt action on the part of Congress.

His successor, Harry S. Truman, was the first President in history who called for effective civil-rights legislation before a joint session of Congress.

President Eisenhower has followed his two illustrious predecessors and has called for abolishing segregation and other unfortunate distinctions of ignorant racial bigotry.

We have come a long way in a brief 20 years. The deplorable poll-tax laws are rapidly disappearing. Progress must continue on civil-rights legislation. We must inform the peoples of all nations on the globe that the citizens of this great, free land practices what it preaches. I wish that favorable action on the gentleman's bill can be secured in this session.

Mr. POWELL. May I say to my esteemed and distinguished colleague from Indiana that he has played a major part in carrying forward this battle. I thank him publicly for his great contributions.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I compliment our distinguished colleague from New York for focusing our attention on the tremendously important area of civil-rights legislation here this afternoon. I am also grateful to our distinguished colleague from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] who just spoke and who is in accord with our feelings about these matters. While I do not wish to minimize the progress in human relations under the present administration, I wish to bring to your attention that I believe we should not ignore the contributions which were made under the Roosevelt and Truman administrations in this particular regard and the fact that current Presidential committees against discrimination actually had their inception under them. Furthermore, I do not believe we should ignore the contributions that civic and religious organizations have made in the field of civil rights which have contributed to the healthier atmosphere in which we live today. Further, I do not think we should forget the growing, voting strength of minority groups in America, and its relationship to the healthier human relations atmosphere in which we are living today. Lastly, I do not think we should forget that the pressure of the present world conflict and tremendous struggle between democracy and international communism is certainly a prime factor in accelerating these changes in human relations. While I believe that there is some credence to be given to the statement that our assignment to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the assignment of our distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] to the Committee on the District of Columbia, perhaps might not have occurred as recently as 2 years ago or 5 years ago, I certainly think that the Democratic Party leadership in the House is aware of the fact that there are many, many more civil-rights problems to be solved for which these committees will have the responsibility. I am also certain they are aware, as I am, of the fact that the Veterans' Administration is a party to discrimination in GI home loans and business improvements because thousands of loans are denied to Negroes. This is a matter which I intend to turn the spotlight on at a later date with the Veterans' Affairs Committee and Congress in general. I am also certain that the Democratic Party leadership is aware that there are many problems here in the District of Columbia relative to human relations that have not been solved; for example, the problems of suffrage and home rule which are directly related, in my opinion, to the fact that you have a large segment of minority group people in this community, and the fact that we do not have fair employment practices, not only in private industry but here in our Federal Government. I think that our leadership is aware that these problems will be before these committees. I am sure that our assignment to these committees represents recognition that our presence there will help resolve these matters in the proper manner.

Our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, has a right to expect a swelling of liberalism here in the Congress of the United States. Certain congressional elections in Alabama, Arkansas, Tennessee, Maine, and Michigan, among others, indicate that the people are ready for more liberal thoughts to be espoused here in the National Legislature. When I speak of liberalism, I am not talking about some form of radicalism, but liberalism which means the full force of our democratic government being utilized for the advancement of personal freedom and social and economic justice at all levels. I am not talking about liberalism which will attempt to tear out any roots; I am talking about liberalism which will take the best of our past and combine it with a new imaginative and sensible solution to the problems which face us today. Members of Congress who have feared that their affirmative action on civil-rights issues would result in political reprisals back home can see from these particular

congressional races that their apprehensions are unfounded.

I would in closing admonish the Republican Party that the Negro people, because they are an integral part of the American economic life stream, are interested in more than just civil rights; and, whereas the Negro people certainly appreciate the progress that has been made under the present administration, they are concerned about measures which will lift them up economically. They are concerned, among other things, about raising the minimum wage; they are concerned about repeal of the Taft-Hartley measure which is so restrictive to the labor movement; they are concerned about increased income-tax exemptions; and they are concerned about a housing program for the lower income groups.

Failure to recognize that the Negro people are interested in a broader program is the reason why the Republican Party was not able to capture more of the Negro vote in the past election.

To the Democratic Party which has enjoyed the support of the Negro people and other minorities in large numbers for over 20 years, I would add this admonition: In this last election most Negroes would not vote for a Republican Congress but expressed considerable admiration for the work that has been done under our present President. If the present President elects to run again in 1956 many people of the minority groups will vote for a Democratic Congress but for a Republican President—unless the Democratic Members of this body wake up and match the executive and judicial departments in civil-rights accomplishments.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself wholeheartedly with the remarks of my colleague from Michigan.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to say that the gentleman is making a wonderful new member of our Committee on Veterans' Affairs; also I wish to call attention to the wonderful contribution those of his race have made in peace and war.

Mr. POWELL. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. I wish to congratulate the gentleman from New York on his speech, and especially do I appreciate the compliments that were paid to a Republican President by an eminent Democratic Congressman. It warms the heart, and I assure the gentleman that we do appreciate the work he is doing and the support he is giving to our President.

Mr. POWELL. I believe that, after all, when a man is elected the Chief Executive of our Nation we should forget the party that elected him and rally round him 100 percent strong. We cannot survive as a divided America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SUGAR LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I represent the Sugar Belt of Louisiana, and, of course, I am vitally interested in the operations of the Sugar Act, which has been on the books for over 20 years. The act was originally enacted into law in 1934, and was successively renewed in 1937, 1948, and 1952. In each instance, however, it was renewed well ahead of the respective dates of expiration. Thus, the Sugar Act of 1948 was actually adopted in 1947, and the Sugar Act of 1952 was actually adopted in 1951. And in each case the renewed Sugar Act was an improvement over the one it replaced; that is, in each case we added desirable amendments to take care of situations which arose in the interval. I do not say that everyone was ever wholly satisfied, and this for the simple reason that we all at least tried to approach this important subject in a spirit of give and take. But, most important of all, sugar legislation has always been handled on a bipartisan basis. For instance, when we acted in 1951 there was not a dissenting vote in the House, and there were only three negatives votes in the other body.

Now, the present Sugar Act will expire next year, and, following well-established precedents, we, of course, expect to renew it this year. Proceeding in a cooperative manner, representatives of the domestic-sugar industry have been considering appropriate amendments. I firmly believe that areas of differences, if any should arise, will, as in the past, be narrowed down to a minimum and finally resolved. And, as so well demonstrated by our meeting at the White House recently, we are all particularly proud of the fact that the legislation will again be presented and handled on a bipartisan basis.

In the light of this bipartisan approach and the careful and thorough consideration we always give to sugar problems, I was amazed, Mr. Speaker, to find the district governor of Rotary of Havana, Cuba, Mr. Jose Manuel Vidana, and the Secretary of the United States Cuban Sugar Council, Mr. Roy A. Ballinger, trying to plant seeds of discord in this country in connection with pending proposals to renew and amend the Sugar Act.

On November 24, 1954, Mr. Vidana, the district governor of Rotary of Havana, Cuba, circulated a printed form letter to the president of every Rotary Club in the United States. The purpose or at least the effect of the letter was to try to influence Rotary Club members in the United States in favor of Cuba in connection with pending sugar legislation.

About the same time last November, Mr. Ballinger, secretary of the United States Cuban Sugar Council, wrote to county agents in the United States. The ostensible purpose of that letter was to seek certain statistical information from the county agents, but the real idea behind it was to lobby the county agents on the side of the 16 large corporations which the employees of the council represent as paid lobbyists in Washington.

I am one of the organizers and a former president of the Rotary Club, of St. Martinville, La. Much as I deplored the necessity for doing so, Mr. Speaker, I felt duty bound to express to the members of the Rotary Club of my own home town my personal views with reference to those two communications addressed respectively to the Rotary Club presidents and county agents in the United States. I wrote a letter to the President of the Rotary Club in St. Martinville and sent a copy of it to the county agents in my congressional district. I think my letter fairly described the nature and implications of the circulars and clearly explained the pending proposals to renew and amend the Sugar Act. I do not think it would be fair for me to enlarge or detract from my letter and I will, therefore, simply read it in full to the Members of this body:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 13, 1955.

Mr. MIASEL BERNARD,
President, St. Martinville Rotary Club, St. Martinville, La.

DEAR MR. BERNARD: It has been called to my attention that the district governor of Rotary of Habana, Cuba, has apparently circulated a printed form letter to the president of every Rotary Club in the United States "placing before you some interesting information on the Cuban sugar quota," and I assume that you received one of these letters.

The letter subtly but plainly suggests that "Rotary Clubs * * * can play a leading role at this moment" in favor of Cuba and, "in the spirit of Rotary * * * cordially requests that you see fit to devote a session of your club to disseminating the data enclosed." In turn, the data enclosed state that "every effort * * * in avoiding the cut in Cuba's sugar quota * * * is both plausible and necessary"; that, "It does not appear sensible to hurt the countless concerns who have been able to make Cuba an excellent market * * * just in order to give additional advantage to a handful" of domestic farmers, and winds up with the veiled threat that unless the Cubans have their way, then Cuba "might be forced to implement a defensive policy of negotiating bilateral trade agreements with other countries."

I am aware of the importance of the sugar industry to the economy of Cuba and I do not question the concern and sincerity of the Habana district governor of Rotary. But in the same spirit of Rotary and as one of the organizers and a former president of your club, I do seriously question the wisdom of Rotary Clubs being circularized to take sides or to sponsor or to be embroiled in pending national legislation on the basis of a biased presentation of the facts, when, as usual, there are two sides to the question.

Let me point out at the outset that the data submitted in the letter appear to state Cuba's case with typical oversimplification. Thus, as a coincidence (if it was a coincidence), at the same time that the district governor circulated his form letter to the presidents of all Rotary Clubs, the United States Cuban Sugar Council also wrote a circular letter to all county agents in the United States. This letter has a twofold purpose. The first to seek information from the county agents to try to prove some of the very things which the data sheet in the governor's letter alleges as facts; and the second, in plain language, is to lobby the county agents in favor of the 16 large corporations represented by the council and, I submit, against the best interests of sugarcane and sugar-beet farmers in the United

States. I make this point-blank statement because, according to the records of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, the representatives of the United States Cuban Sugar Council in Washington are paid lobbyists, drawing an aggregate of $73,000 per year, with well-appointed offices and liberal expense accounts.

Moreover some of the facts and statistics submitted to the Rotary Clubs are misleading and erroneous. For instance, instead of a handful, there are over 46,000 farmers producing cane and beet sugar in 22 States of the Union. Again the so-called data sheet states that it is proposed to increase the domestic quotas by 400,000 tons of sugar and that 96 percent of this amount would be deducted from or made up at the expense of Cuba's present quota. Under the current proposal, however, the initial increase of domestic quotas, in the first place will be far less than 400,000 tons, and in the second place not a single pound will be deducted or taken away from Cuba's regular or present quota. The modest initial domestic quota increase and thereafter the fair annual domestic increases will come entirely from tapping a portion of annual domestic increased consumption, which up to now has gone almost in its entirety to Cuba.

To understand this you must realize that under the terms of the Sugar Act, Cuba gets three bites at the cherry. First Cuba gets a quota under the formula of the act, second it gets 96 percent of the unused or deficit reallocated quotas, and third it gets 96 percent of the annual increase of domestic sugar consumption. Due to the annual population increase alone, our domestic sugar consumption increases by 125,000 tons every year, and Cuba has been receiving 96 percent of this windfall. Thus in the last 10 years Cuba has received well over 1 million tons of sugar, over and above her normal and reallocated deficit quotas.

On the other hand, under the terms of the Sugar Act, the domestic sugar quotas are rigid, the mainland area cane quota being fixed at 500,000 tons per year. But that is not all. While the mainland area acreage has not varied over 2 percent in the last 5 years, greater yields have been achieved due to better farming and milling practices, under the guidance and encouragement of the Department of Agriculture. And instead of being rewarded for good performance, the farmers' acreage was cut on an average of 10 percent in 1954 and an additional 8 percent has been ordered in 1955. Therefore, while Cuba has been enjoying an annual increase from our consumption, our farmers have been suffering a cutback. This, in short, is what the current proposed amendments seek to correct, by devoting to our own farmers a fair share of the annual increased amount of sugar it takes to feed our own babies, without deducting from or taking away a pound of Cuba's present quota. What's wrong with that?

I would not presume to tell you what to do, but if you decide to devote a session of your club to a discussion of this matter, I urge you to take both sides of the question into consideration.

Very sincerely yours,

EDWIN E. WILLIS,
Member of Congress.

It will be noted that in the letter I have just read, I did not question the concern and sincerity of the Havana district governor of Rotary, but I did seriously question the wisdom of Rotary Clubs being circularized to take sides or to sponsor or to be embroiled in pending national legislation on the basis of a biased presentation of facts when, as usual, there are two sides to the question. I meant just that; no more, no less. But the fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that unless restrained, a practice of this kind would inevitably lead to discord in the noble Rotary movement.

It is not surprising, therefore, that many Rotary Clubs have already expressed themselves in opposition to the method employed by Mr. Vidana in this instance. Permit me to quote passages from a few of the letters I have in my files.

Here is what the St. Martinville Rotary Club had to say:

At a meeting of the St. Martinville Rotary Club held on Tuesday, January 11, 1955, the members of our club deplored the action of the district governor of Rotary of Havana, Cuba; first for circulating the letter among Rotary Clubs of the United States, and secondly, because of the information given to Rotary Clubs which we do not consider quite fair and in order, thirdly, we resent the attitude of the district governor in exerting pressure by Rotary in this matter. I was directed by our Rotary Club to issue a protest and to advise you of the attitude and the feelings of our members.

On January 4, 1955, Mr. Harry Maxfield, Rotary governor of district No. 206, referring to Mr. Vidana's letter, wrote to the head of the service governors and clubs of Rotary International as follows:

I object to this letter, first, because I think that it is contrary to the regulations regarding requests of member clubs to participate or to take any action; secondly, because this is a very controversial topic; and thirdly, because if one side is to be presented, we should give the local sugar growers the opportunity of presenting their side.

On January 14, 1955, Dr. William L. Bendel, Rotary governor of district No. 202, addressed a letter to the secretariat of Rotary International and expressed his views in this way:

This is a controversial subject and it is my opinion that it has no place in Rotary. I was rather surprised to learn about this circular which I presume has gone to other clubs. I don't feel that Rotary should be used in this type of question.

And finally, on January 19, 1955, Mr. Martin Zwart, of Rotary International, repudiated Mr. Vidana's action as having been taken "contrary to the established policy of Rotary International," and in that letter Mr. Zwart pointed out the following:

The circular letter to which you referred has been the subject of comments from other clubs in the United States. As a result, a letter has been written to the district governor, advising him of the unfavorable reaction to his letter on the part of clubs in the United States and pointing out to him the established policies with respect to circularization of clubs and seeking the cooperation of clubs, with which you are familiar.

We must never permit civic clubs to be used as a vehicle for political or legislative propaganda. The principle here involved is much bigger than the feelings of Mr. Vidana, however sincere. And although I am satisfied that no personal reflection on Mr. Vidana was intended by the officials of Rotary International, I want to congratulate them on their good judgment in setting the record straight once and for all.

But, Mr. Speaker, I cannot say as much for the representatives of the United States Cuban Sugar Council in Washington. They are paid lobbyists, who can all be very useful experts in their proper field of operation. Because of the very nature of their position, however, they cannot be excused for lack of tact or judgment and it must be assumed that their actions are deliberate.

In fact, I underestimated the resourcefulness of the representatives of the council. In his form letter, dated November 24, 1954, addressed to "Dear Mr. Farm Agent," Mr. Ballinger, secretary of the council, had this to say:

We are confident that one or more of the commodities purchased by Cubans, as listed in the enclosed pamphlet, are produced in your county. However, we would like to have more information about them. We will be extremely grateful if you will answer the two questions listed below, and return your answers to us in the enclosed stamped self-addressed envelope.

And then, no doubt intending to impress "Dear Mr. Farm Agent," Mr. Ballinger asked each farm agent to list farm products exported to Cuba produced in his county, and to state the relative importance of such products in that county. I really thought that Mr. Ballinger's letter had a twofold purpose and I so stated in my letter of January 13, 1955, which I have already quoted in full. To be sure, I knew that lobbying activities were involved but I assumed that Mr. Ballinger was also seeking reliable statistical information from county agents in every part of the United States and in every State of the Union. I was in error, or rather I made the mistake of accepting Mr. Ballinger's letter at face value. In the first place, the various departments in our Nation's Capital are literally full of statistical information, and it would be rather naive to believe that the information sought from the county agents is not available right here in Washington, especially through the facilities of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce. And I was astonished to find out that Mr. Ballinger did not contact those county agents who were in the best position to inform him, if he had really wanted information. For instance, he deliberately failed to get in touch with the county agents in the Third Congressional District of Louisiana, which I have the honor to represent in Congress and which is the largest sugar-producing area in the United States; and although I have no proof of it, it can probably be assumed that he also skipped the county agents in the other sugar-producing areas in the country.

In reply to my letter, the county agents in my district expressed their restrained but deep-rooted resentment concerning this sleight-of-hand maneuver on the part of the United States Cuban Sugar Council. I quote their replies in full:

JANUARY 18, 1955.

I have been told that the United States Cuban Council has written a circular letter to county agents in the United States to get information to try to prove that Cuba's quota of sugar should not be reduced in order to benefit domestic farmers.

St. Mary Parish is one of the largest sugar producing parishes in the State of Louisiana. I have never received this letter. If such a letter has been sent out by the United States Cuban Sugar Council for correct information certainly it should be sent to the county agents in the sugar parishes of Louisiana.

P. J. DEGRAVELLES,
County Agent, St. Mary Parish.

JANUARY 19, 1955.

Reference is made to your letter dated January 17, 1955, and the copy of letter written to Mr. Miasel Bernard, president of the St. Martinville Rotary Club, dated January 13, 1955, and to our phone conversation of yesterday.

In regard to the part that has reference to county agents in the letter to Mr. Bernard, I would like to state that I as a county agent don't like the idea of being used or drawn into the picture for proposed legislation. That is against all principles for which county agent work was established.

I might add that we have our hands full to put practices into operation for farmers which have been proven successful by our experiment stations.

With best wishes, I am,

MURPHY VEILLON,
County Agent, Vermilion.

JANUARY 19, 1955.

I am in receipt of your letter written to Rotarian President Bernard, St. Martinville. I wish to concur wholeheartedly with your remarks in regard to our planted sugarcane acreage. The planted acreage of Lafourche Parish also has not varied over 2 percent during the past 5 years.

Due to growers adopting better farming practices the average yields per acre have increased during that period. Therefore, it appears to me that the growers are being penalized for a job well done instead of being rewarded.

If any additional acreage cut beyond the present reduction is inflicted upon our growers it will result in putting many of our growers out of business. Their margin of profit will not be sufficient for them to remain in business due to the large capital investment necessary for them to maintain their present operation.

It appears to me that the Cuban Mainland Sugar issue is too controversial for the Rotary Clubs or any other civic organization to take issue in the matter.

C. J. ARCENEAUX,
County Agent, Lafourche Parish.

JANUARY 18, 1955.

I did not receive any letter from the United States Cuban Sugar Council. Your views are very honest, justified, and shared by our cane growers.

E. J. LOUSTEAU,
County Agent, Parish of Assumption.

JANUARY 18, 1955.

I was informed by very reliable sources that the United States Cuban Sugar Council wrote a circular letter to many county agents in the United States. This letter I understand, seeks information for the council to use to propagandize the cause which it represents.

As a county agent in a sugarcane-growing parish, I'd like to tell you that I did not receive the circular letter. I do feel that extension workers in sugar-producing parishes are very familiar with the facts about the industry. Furthermore, I do not believe that county agents should take part in international issues by giving information to only one side of a very controversial issue.

Sugarcane production is the heart of the economy of this parish. Growers are improving the efficiency in the production and without any increase quotas, the industry will suffer drastically in both progress and economically. This will also have more effect than just locally because the industry is a big consumer of materials and goods from many areas of the United States.

It is my humble opinion that when the people of the United States know all the facts about the sugar industry that a majority would favor the proposed amendment to the Sugar Act. I also believe that extension workers in general would rather give facts about both sides of a controversial issue when they are familiar with the issue.

I do not presume to tell you the action to take but I felt it was my duty to advise you of what was happening in the extension field and to ask that you consider all sides of the question.

With best wishes and personal regards, I am,

RICHARD L. SONNIER,
County Agent, Terrebonne Parish.

JANUARY 19, 1955.

I received your letter of January 17, 1955, enclosing a copy of your letter of January 13, 1955, to Mr. Miasel Bernard, president of the St. Martinville Rotary Club, St. Martinville, La.

I note in your letter to Mr. Bernard you mentioned, "The United States Sugar Council also wrote a circular letter to all county agents in the United States." This matter has a twofold purpose. The first is to seek information from the county agents to try to prove some of the very things which the data sheet in the governor's letter alleges as facts; and the second, in plain language, is to lobby the county agents in favor of the 16 large corporations represented by the council, and, I submit, against the best interest of the sugarcane and sugar beet farmers in the United States.

I have never received any letter, as far as I know, from the United States Cuban Sugar Council, therefore, I do not know anything about it. I do not know whether other county agents in the sugar-producing areas of the United States received such a letter or not.

I feel that if such a letter is being sent to county agents in the United States that county agents in the sugar-producing areas should receive the letter as well as those where sugar is not produced. In the event this is the situation, I cannot understand why such a letter would be sent to county agents in non-sugar-producing parts of our country and not to those in the sugar-producing areas.

As you know, the production of sugarcane here in Iberia Parish accounts for approximately 60 percent of the income of about 1,400 sugarcane producers, and naturally I am vitally interested in the production of sugarcane here, because of its economical value to our people.

With kind personal regards, I am

W. E. WILLIAMS,
County Agent, Iberia Parish.

Mr. Speaker, the United States Cuban Sugar Council deliberately circularized only a portion of the county agents on the eve of our consideration of proposals to renew and amend the Sugar Act. I cannot help but feel that in this particular instance the council did not proceed with complete frankness, and that their action was not in good taste. In my opinion, they planted bad seed and they are now reaping the bad fruit that they justly deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD the entire contents of the letters of Mr. Harry Maxfield, Dr. William L. Bendel, and Mr. Martin Zwart, portions of which I quoted in the course of my remarks:

JANUARY 4, 1955.

Mr. LEON F. MONTAGUE,
Head, USCB Department, Sevice Governors and Clubs, Rotary International, Evanston, Ill.

DEAR MONTY: My attention has been called to a copy of a letter (which is enclosed) from District Governor Jose Manuel Vidana, district 101, who has apparently circularized clubs in the United States. He enclosed propaganda regarding the Cuban "sugar quota * * * with the hope that it will serve as a basis of an important session of your club." He then asks that "in the spirit of Rotary, I cordially request that you devote a session of your club to disseminating the enclosed data."

I object to this letter, first, because I think that it is contrary to the regulations regarding requests of member clubs to participate or to take any action; secondly, because this is a very controversial topic; and thirdly, because if one side is to be presented, we should give the local sugar growers the opportunity of presenting their side.

My attention has been called to this propaganda through the American Sugar Cane League, whose leaders feel that they have been unfairly treated and that the facilities of Rotary have been utilized illegitimately. I share their feelings. For your information, I enclose a sheet giving some information about the domestic sugar production.

Mr. G. J. Durbin, vice president and general manager of the American Sugar Cane League, 414 Whitney Building, New Orleans, says that if there is any likelihood of local clubs taking any action regarding the request from the Cuban district governor, the American Sugar Cane League would like to place its view regarding sugar quotas in the hands of local club presidents. He asked my advice as to how this should be done. I, in turn, request your views.

We understand that the United States Congress is scheduled to consider this question during the current session, and we shall, therefore, appreciate your advising us as quickly as possible.

Sincerely,

HARRY MAXFIELD,
Governor, District 206.

JANUARY 14, 1955.

GEORGE MEANS,
Secretariat, Rotary International, Evanston, Ill.

DEAR GEORGE: I am in receipt of a letter from Howard Smith, president of the Thibodaux Rotary Club. They have received a letter from the district governor of district 101 asking that Thibodaux go on record as being in favor of an increase in the sugar quota for the Republic of Cuba.

Louisiana is one of the greatest sugarcane producing States in the world. It is one of our most important crops in south Louisiana and it concerns many of our citizens.

This is a controversial subject and it is my opinion that it has no place in Rotary. I was rather surprised to learn about this circular which I presume has gone to other clubs. I don't feel that Rotary should be used in this type of question.

I am enclosing a copy of the letter I received from Howard Smith. The Rotary Club of Thibodaux feels that if Rotary is to be used in this movement that they should have an opportunity to present their side of the case by the American Sugar Cane League. I feel that this is not necessary and I feel sure that Rotary International does not approve of this procedure.

Harry Maxfield, district governor of 206, has written a letter to Rotary International through Leon Montague which you may have already seen.

I note that the Board of Rotary International will meet this month and it may be that you would like to bring this up before the board. Anyway, I would like to hear from you as soon as possible.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

WILLIAM L. BENDEL, M. D.

ROTARY INTERNATIONAL,
Evanston, Ill., January 19, 1955.

Dr. WILLIAM L. BENDEL,
Governor, District 202, Rhode Island.

DEAR BILL: You certainly had reason to be concerned about the circular letter addressed to Rotary clubs in the United States by the governor of district 101, as you mentioned

in your letter of January 14 to George Means, for whom I'm acknowledging it.

As you stated, we had a letter from District Governor Harry Maxfield on the same subject. You may be interested in what we wrote him in reply, as this may also serve to answer the questions put to you by President Howard Smith, of the Rotary Club of Thibodaux.

The circular letter to which you referred has been the subject of comments from other clubs in the United States. As a result, a letter has been written to the district governor, advising him of the unfavorable reaction to his letter on the part of clubs in the United States and pointing out to him the established policies with respect to circularization of clubs and seeking the cooperation of clubs, with which you are familiar.

It is understandable that Rotary clubs should object to such circularization and, particularly, that those who are connected with domestic sugar production should be especially concerned. The comments we have received have not come from a great many clubs, but it is clear that the use of lists of Rotary clubs for purposes of such circularization is not appreciated. It is apparent that the reaction to this communication has been unfavorable, not only toward circularization as such, but also to the subject matter of the communication. Thus, it appears that there would be little likelihood of clubs in the United States acting in accordance with the request made of them in that circular.

Notwithstanding the fact that action has been taken contrary to the established policy of Rotary International, that the lists of Rotary clubs shall not be used for the purpose of circularization or for any commercial purpose, that policy would apply with respect to other organizations.

Sincerely,

MARTIN ZWART,
Service to Clubs, USCB.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain correspondence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CHELF (at the request of Mr. GREGORY), for an indefinite period, on account of attending the funeral of his brother, William Wrather Chelf.

Mr. PELLY (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for week of February 14, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BURDICK in two instances.

Mr. OSMERS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RIVERS in two instances and to include speeches delivered at The Citadel, S. C., by General Ridgway, Chief of Staff of the Army, and Admiral Carney, Chief of Naval Operations.

Mr. GORDON.

Mrs. KEE and to include a statement.

Mr. BOLLING and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOYLE and to include appropriate material.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. MILLER of California and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OSTERTAG and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DODD (at the request of Mr. JONES of Missouri).

Mr. BOW (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POFF.

Mr. KLEIN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. MACK of Illinois) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2010. An act to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 3, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

360. A letter from the president, Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting the report of the Potomac Electric Co. for the year ended December 31, 1954, pursuant to the act of Congress, approved March 2, 1907; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

361. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the Navy's sixth annual report on the disposal of Navy excess property in foreign areas for the calendar year 1954, pursuant to section 404 (d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U. S. C. 514 (d)); to the Committee on Government Operations.

362. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the distribution of funds belonging to the members of the Creek Nation of Indians, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

363. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

364. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting a report by the National Labor Relations Board showing a claim paid during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C. 2672); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

365. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

366. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

367. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, 80th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

368. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (5)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

369. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a tabulation showing the number of articles bearing penalty indicia procured or accounted for through the Post Office Department for the period from July 1, 1953, to June 30, 1954, pursuant to the provisions of section 302, title III, Public Law 785, approved June 25, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

370. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a letter asking that the time for submission of certain reports be extended 60 days beyond February 1, 1955, as required by sections 11 and 13, chapter 181 of Public Law 350, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 70. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 55; with amendment (Rept. No. 15). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 102. Resolution to authorize the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities; with amendment (Rept. No. 16). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 113. Resolution to provide for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 112; with amendment (Rept. No. 17). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 30. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 18). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 3381. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of manganese-bearing ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 3382. A bill for the establishment of the United States Commission on the Aging and Aged; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 3383. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H. R. 3384. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 3385. A bill to provide for the credit, upon retirement of an officer or employee from Government service, to the individual account of such officer or employee in the civil-service retirement and disability fund of a sum representing compensation for accumulated and current sick leave; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 3386. A bill making an appropriation for the prosecution of the Delaware River Channel deepening project, as heretofore authorized by law; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 3387. A bill to amend and supplement existing civil-rights statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3388. A bill to establish a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3389. A bill to protect the civil rights of individuals by establishing a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government, a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice, and a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights, to strengthen the criminal laws protecting the civil rights of individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3390. A bill to protect the right to political participation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3391. A bill to reorganize the Department of Justice for the protection of civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3392. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 3393. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3394. A bill to strengthen the laws relating to convict labor, peonage, slavery, and involuntary servitude; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 3395. A bill to provide a residence for pages of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, under the supervision of a Capitol Pages' Residence Board; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 3396. A bill to provide that the fluid milk program for schools established by section 201c of the Agricultural Act of 1949 shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of the National School Lunch Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 3397. A bill to increase the national minimum wage to $1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 3398. A bill to amend the penalty provisions applicable to persons convicted of violating certain narcotic laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3399. A bill to lower the age requirements with respect to optional retirement of persons serving in the Coast Guard who served in the former Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BOW:

H. R. 3400. A bill to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce; to stabilize prices of milk and dairy products; to impose a stabilization fee on the marketing of milk and butterfat; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. R. 3401. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to reduce from 65 to 60 the age at which the spouse's annuity becomes payable, and to revise the formula used in the computation of annuities thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 3402. A bill to provide that time spent as a civilian internee during World War II shall be considered as active service in determining priority for induction into the Armed Forces of medical, dental, and allied specialists; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3403. A bill to require the express approval of Congress before any irrigation project whose estimated cost is more than $5 million shall be commenced; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3404. A bill to govern the control, appropriation, use, and distribution of water; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 3405. A bill to amend section 507 (c) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 3406. A bill to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 3407. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit taxpayers who are severely disabled to deduct certain transportation expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 3408. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3409. A bill making an appropriation for the prosecution of the Delaware River Channel deepening project, as heretofore authorized by law; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 3410. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3411. A bill to authorize Federal payments to the States to assist in constructing schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 3412. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1956, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE:

H. R. 3413. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities shall not apply to amounts paid for the installation of equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 3414. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to protect the surface values of lands within the national forests and other lands administered by him, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 3415. A bill to make certain changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 3416. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Social Security Act to eliminate those provisions which restrict the right of a spouse or survivor to receive benefits simultaneously under both acts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 3417. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 3418. A bill to reorganize the Department of Justice for the protection of civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3419. A bill to protect the right to political participation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3420. A bill to strengthen the laws relating to convict labor, peonage, slavery, and involuntary servitude; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3421. A bill to amend and supplement existing civil-rights statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3422. A bill to establish a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3423. A bill to protect the civil rights of individuals by establishing a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government, a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice, and a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights, to strengthen the criminal laws protecting the civil rights of individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3424. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 3425. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims of customs officers and employees to extra compensation for Sunday, holiday, and overtime services performed after August 31, 1931, and not heretofore paid in accordance with existing law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 3426. A bill to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 3427. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Ventura River reclamation project, California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 3428. A bill to increase the salaries of judges of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 3429. A bill to provide that the fluid-milk program for schools, established by section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of the National School Lunch Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 3430. A bill to exempt regular and classified substitute employees in post offices of the first, second, and third classes from residence requirements governing appointment and service of postmasters at post offices to which such employees are assigned; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 3431. A bill to provide for the construction of the San Luis Reservoir, the San Luis West Side Canal, the Avenal Gap Reservoir, and the Antelope Plain Canal, Central Valley project, California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3432. A bill to provide for construction of the San Luis Reservoir and the San Luis West Side Canal, Central Valley project, California, and to direct the Secretary of the Interior to develop and file with the Congress a planning and feasibility report of the Avenal Gap Reservoir and Antelope Plain Canal; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. HARDEN:

H. R. 3433. A bill to provide for a system of turning, starting, and stopping signals for the operation of motor vehicles, and a system of highway signs, to be uniform throughout the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 3434. A bill to provide for the election of a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives, and for the election of delegates from the District to national political conventions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (by request):

H. R. 3435. A bill to limit the acquisition and use by agencies of the Federal Government of equipment for reproducing documents, drawings, papers, and so forth, on sensitized materials; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 3436. A bill to provide that sums paid to States from moneys received from national forests may be used for governmental purposes other than for the benefit of public schools and public roads; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 3437. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for a maximum manufacturers' excise tax on the leases of certain automobile utility trailers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3438. A bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which prohibits payments under the agricultural conservation program in certain cases; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 3439. A bill to authorize the Farm Credit Administration to make loans of the type formerly made by the Land Bank Commissioner; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3440. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 3441. A bill to provide punishment for certain confidence game swindles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 3442. A bill to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of deceased members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 3443. A bill to provide that an individual who is entitled to a monthly insurance benefit under title II of the Social Security Act shall not be deprived of that benefit because of work performed by him or by the person on whose wage record that benefit is based; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3444. A bill to authorize Federal payments to the States to assist in constructing schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3445. A bill to repeal the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 3446. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp, in commemoration of the Bowne House, located in Flushing, Queens County, N. Y., which Bowne House was dedicated as a national shrine to religious freedom and tolerance on October 10, 1945; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H. R. 3447. A bill to improve and extend, through reciprocal legislation, the enforcement of duties of support in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 3448. A bill to amend section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C. 1431), as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 3449. A bill to allow certain members of the Armed Forces to designate the Eastern Orthodox faith as a religious preference on their identification tags; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3450. A bill to authorize Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of privately owned real property as well as the shores of publicly owned real property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 3451. A bill to transfer to the Secretary of Agriculture the functions performed by the Bureau of Land Management; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 3452. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3453. A bill to authorize the construction of a bridge over the Port Allen-Indian Village Canal in West Baton Rouge Parish, La.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 3454. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 3455. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to bring employees of Gallaudet College within its coverage; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POFF:

H. R. 3456. A bill to establish a temporary commission to study the publication and sale of books, magazines, and similar materials containing immoral or otherwise undesirable matter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 3457. A bill to eliminate certain practices involving racial or religious discrimination in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 3458. A bill to improve the health of the people by encouraging the extension of voluntary prepayment health services plans, facilitating the financing of construction of needed health facilities, assisting in increasing the number of adequately trained nurses and other health personnel, improving and expanding programs of mental health and public health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3459. A bill to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions for construction of facilities for research in crippling and killing diseases such as cancer, heart disease, poliomyelitis, nervous disorders, mental illness, arthritis and rheumatism, blindness, cerebral palsy, and muscular dystrophy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3460. A bill to further amend section 20 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, relating to fees of agents, attorneys, and representatives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3461. A bill to prohibit the transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce by communication facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3462. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act relating to debt claims; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3463. A bill to improve the administration of the public airports in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H. R. 3464. A bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 3465. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to repeal the limitation upon the amount of outside income which may be received by an individual while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 3466. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to increase the deductions for personal exemptions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3467. A bill to authorize the coinage of special 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the founding of Groton, Mass.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3468. A bill to provide that the special fourth-class postage rates for books shall apply to certain 16-page instructional publications; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3469. A bill to authorize the coinage of special 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the founding of Billerica, Mass.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3470. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the founding of Groton, Mass.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3471. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the founding of Billerica, Mass.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 3472. A bill to protect the civil rights of individuals by establishing a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government, a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice, and a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights, to strengthen the criminal laws protecting the civil rights of individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3473. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3474. A bill to amend and supplement existing civil-rights statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3475. A bill to establish a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3476. A bill to protect the right to political participation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3477. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3478. A bill to reorganize the Department of Justice for the protection of civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3479. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 3480. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3481. A bill to strengthen the laws relating to convict labor, peonage, slavery, and involuntary servitude; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 3482. A bill to repeal the retailers excise tax on handbags; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3483. A bill to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce; to stabilize prices of milk and dairy products; to impose a stabilization fee on the marketing of milk and butterfat; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3484. A bill to provide for programs of in-service and out-service training for Government employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 3485. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10 to provide that the term "child" shall include a child of a veteran who is a member of the veteran's household and who becomes permanently incapable of self-support; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 3486. A bill to amend the act increasing the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service in order to make such increase permanent; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3487. A bill to increase the specific amounts which are exempt from the tax on the transportation of persons from amounts which do not exceed 35 cents to amounts which do not exceed 76 cents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 3488. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Ventura River reclamation project, California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H. R. 3489. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to bring employees of Gallaudet College within its coverage; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VANIK:

H. R. 3490. A bill to amend section 6 (a) of the Natural Gas Act in order to establish a rule with respect to the valuation of gas reserves for the purpose of ratemaking under the provisions of such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 3491. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to provide that feed grains acquired through price-support operations shall be sold to dairy farmers and poultry growers at prices equivalent to 75 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 3492. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the 3-percent limitation on the amount of medical and dental expenses which may be deducted from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 3493. A bill to authorize Federal payments to the States to assist in constructing schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3494. A bill to provide Federal assistance for construction and reconstruction of a highway from the Nevada State line across the Sierra-Nevada Mountains into the San Francisco Bay area; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3495. A bill to protect the essential security interests of the United States by stimulating the domestic production of lead and zinc, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 3496. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. J. Res. 185. Joint resolution to increase 1955 cotton allotments of certain farms receiving 5 acres or less; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. J. Res. 187. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1955, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. J. Res. 189. Joint resolution to state explicitly the longstanding national policy to preserve and strengthen the family-farm pattern of American agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution placing individuals who served in the temporary forces of the United States Navy during the Spanish-American War in the same status for those individuals who served in the Army for equal periods of time during that war and who were given furloughs or leaves upon being mustered out of the service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAYWORTH:

H. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution extending felicitations to Michigan State College on the 100th anniversary of its founding; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to invite the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates to a Federal convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. Con. Res. 63. Concurrent resolution establishing a joint congressional committee on civil rights; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. BUCHANAN:

H. Res. 126. Resolution authorizing the House Banking and Currency Committee to conduct a study and investigation of problems affecting consumer interests; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. Res. 127. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate and study the broadcasting of false, fraudulent, misleading, and deceptive advertisements by radio or television; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARDY:

H. Res. 128. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 35; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Res. 129. Resolution to provide funds for the investigations and studies to be made by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs pursuant to House Resolution 63; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the Governor and Executive Council of Massachusetts to amend the provisions relating to pardons contained in the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to give full recognition to the responsibilities of the Federal Government to make funds available for the completion on schedule of the Chief Joseph, McNary, and the Dalles projects now under construction, upon which the Pacific Northwest unavoidably must rely for its growth requirements during the next 5 years; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, requesting the Civil Aeronautics Board to maintain our present air service to Alaska, and to resist by every means within their power, the efforts of any person, board, or agency to reduce the number of airlines serving the Territory, to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 3497. A bill for the relief of Margot Cohen (Mrs. Irwin J. Keinon); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 3498. A bill for the relief of Mehdi Radpur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 3499. A bill for the relief of Howell Donald Trousdale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3500. A bill for the relief of Charles A. Waleski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 3501. A bill for the relief of Nisan Sarkis Giritliyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3502. A bill for the relief of Virgin Giritliyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 3503. A bill for the relief of certain Basque sheepherders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 3504. A bill for the relief of Eveline Wenk Neal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. R. 3505. A bill for the relief of Louis Kao-Hui Lu, Margaret Ethel Lu, David Yuen Kwang Lu, Diana Su Yu Lu, and James Gordon Lu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 3506. A bill for the relief of Lillian Schlossberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 3507. A bill for the relief of Luise Pempfer (now Mrs. William L. Adams); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS:
H. R. 3508. A bill for the relief of Harry B. Girdley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. FINE:
H. R. 3509. A bill for the relief of Celia Herskovits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. FOGARTY:
H. R. 3510. A bill for the relief of Purita Rodriguez Adiarte, Irene Grace Adiarte, and Patrick Robert Adiarte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. GORDON:
H. R. 3511. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Lis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. GWINN:
H. R. 3512. A bill for the relief of Gunther H. Hahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:
H. R. 3513. A bill for the relief of Efstathios N. Dermatis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. HORAN:
H. R. 3514. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Leonard O. Erickson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. JACKSON:
H. R. 3515. A bill for the relief of Ponciano R. Mauricio, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3516. A bill for the relief of Aly Wassil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. LATHAM:
H. R. 3517. A bill for the relief of Khadije Maria Zelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3518. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ashraf Zeman Afkham Ebrahimi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mrs. KEE:
H. R. 3519. A bill for the relief of Chakib Kassem Aboul-Hosn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. KLEIN:
H. R. 3520. A bill for the relief of Miriam Leser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MORANO:
H. R. 3521. A bill for the relief of John V. Saly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3522. A bill for the relief of Thomas Marfoe (also known as Tao-Wen Ma); to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MULTER:
H. R. 3523. A bill for the relief of Michele Giordano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3524. A bill for the relief of Calogero Tocco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. NORBLAD:
H. R. 3525. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Smanda (Laavola) Salo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. PRESTON:
H. R. 3526. A bill for the relief of the estate of Neil McLeod Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. REUSS:
H. R. 3527. A bill for the relief of Josef and Perla Natanson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. RODINO:
H. R. 3528. A bill for the relief of Miss Hisako Takeo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:
H. R. 3529. A bill for the relief of George Verrios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3530. A bill for the relief of Moshe Kuperstoch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. ROOSEVELT:
H. R. 3531. A bill for the relief of F. Yao da Silva and Soo Chen da Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:
H. R. 3532. A bill for the relief of Seymour Robertson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3533. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mary Youn (Byung Soo Youn); to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. SADLAK:
H. R. 3534. A bill for the relief of Edward Lis Michonski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3535. A bill for the relief of Esteny Rodriguez Witlicki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. SAYLOR:
H. R. 3536. A bill for the relief of Erma Marie Yasuko Kuzina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. SHELLEY:
H. R. 3537. A bill for the relief of Pablo Ruiz de Alda, Maria Dolores Gomez Ruiz de Alda, Ana Maria Ruiz de Alda, and Antonio Ruiz de Alda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3538. A bill for the relief of Charles Han (also known as Ching Chang Han); to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:
H. R. 3539. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Stafford Ordnance Corp., a corporation, against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. TOLLEFSON:
H. R. 3540. A bill for the relief of Christian Halvorsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. VANIK:
H. R. 3541. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Geordt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. WITHROW:
H. R. 3542. A bill for the relief of Rosette Sorge Savorgnan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

77. By Mr. BENTLEY: Petition of the Birch Run Community Group, Saginaw County, Mich., Farm Bureau, concerning postal rates and third-class mail delivery; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

78. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution of the Passaic County Bar Association, Passaic County, N. J., expressing its support of legislation relating to social-security coverage for lawyers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

79. By Mr. MILLER of California: Petition to make food surpluses available to China for famine relief; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

80. By Mr. VANIK: Resolution of the Woodland Hills Community Business Men's Association, Inc., supporting the appropriation of necessary funds for the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes Seaway; to the Committee on Appropriations.

81. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Anselmo A. Ursudan and others, Carranglan, Philippines, relative to certain petitioners requesting relief for having extended financial aid and foodstuffs to guerrilla units and USAFFE during World War II; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Need for Standby Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remind this House that we have a great need for legislation authorizing standby controls. Today the newspapers and the news broadcasts are stressing the warlike developments in the Formosa area. I am hopeful that the measures we have taken in the last few weeks have lessened the danger of war.

Without in any way magnifying these Formosan developments, I want, today, to call your attention to the terrible situation we would find ourselves in if all our peaceful activities should suddenly prove to be inadequate. Our economy is operating at top speed. We are turning out all kinds of civilian goods and substantial quantities of military supplies. A sudden outbreak of war would not catch us entirely unprepared. In the military field we would be better prepared than in any earlier peacetime period. In the civilian field, however, we would be far from ready for such an emergency.

One has only to look back to the Korean situation to realize what might result from the lack of standby controls. After inflation set in and supply shortages developed, a system of controls was adopted. These controls were adopted too late, however, to prevent a general price rise of 20 percent and many dislocations in civilian supplies. It should be obvious to anyone that our civilian economy is becoming more intricate and more complex with each passing year. It also should be evident that dislocations in the civilian economy surely will be greater than ever before if we have another outbreak of war. We are supporting new measures in the United Nations in the interest of obtaining a peaceful settlement where gunfire is heard today. But at the same time we are reappraising our military requirements in the light of current developments in the world.

It is with these things in mind that I call your attention again to the fact that we do not have standby controls which would automatically go into effect if an emergency occurred. Are we going to continue to drift so far as our civilian economy is concerned? If an emergency occurs, will we be forced to enact legislation after much of the damage has been done to our civilian economy?

You are all aware, I am sure, that there are still many tensions in the world even though the Formosa situation is settled. The program to rearm Germany has its dangers. Unrest continues in the Middle East and in Africa. In view of all these tensions it seems to me it would be the course of wisdom to provide now for any emergency by enacting legislation which authorizes standby economic and supply controls for our civilian economy.

The 100th Anniversary of the Panama Railroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1955

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my remarks on the 100th anniversay of the completion of the Panama Railroad on January 28, 1855. A commemorative stamp was issued, which was designed by Leo C. Page, chief of the architectural branch, and printed at the Mount Hope Printing Plant, Canal Zone. It is of artistic design and shows a sketch of the first Panama Railroad engine.

This great historical event has been brought to my attention by James F. Campbell, a personal friend of mine, who has spent many years of loyal service in the Customs Service at Cristobal, C. Z.

On January 28, last Friday, the railroad which crosses the Isthmus of Panama marked its 100th anniversary. All of us are fully aware of the economic and the strategic significance of transportation between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans across this 50-mile isthmus. I suspect, however, that not many of us are aware of the fact that for over half a century before the Panama Canal opened, in August 1914, passengers and freight had been transported along the general route of the canal by railroad.

When the first train linked the Atlantic and Pacific in Panama, on January 28, 1855, a year was to elapse before the first railroad in the United States crossed the Mississippi River and 14 years before the first rail link between the Atlantic and the Pacific was completed in the United States.

The completion of the Panama Railroad in 1855 was a tribute to United States private enterprise and engineering skill. The promoters were United States citizens. The corporation which operated the railroad from its beginning until 1948 was chartered in New York State and the contractors which handled the original construction were Americans.

The railroad across the isthmus was built at an enormous cost in human lives and human suffering. The connection between the mosquito and malaria was not known at that time and the various curative and precautionary measures then used were of no value. Thousands died. The terrain was extremely difficult, involving both swamps and hills. It is difficult for us today to understand how the project was ever completed.

The history of our own West is reflected in the history of the Panama Railroad. It began operation in time to benefit from the heavy movement of people and freight to California following the gold rush. Until 1870 the railroad was enormously profitable. After the completion of our own transcontinental railroads, the Panama Railroad went through a period of lean years.

French interests bought control of the railroad company in 1878 in connection with their efforts to build a canal across the isthmus. The railroad, after 1904, was of vital importance to the United States construction of the canal and is recognized today as essential to the maintenance and the security of the canal.

The Panama Railroad has been operated by the United States Government since 1904, but it is not financed from appropriated funds. I have visited Panama on several occasions and have had an opportunity to observe the railroad in operation. I feel that we should all take pride in its record.

I would like to recommend to the Members of the House the special centennial edition of the Panama Canal Review of January 28, 1955, published in the Canal Zone, which contains a detailed history of the railroad with a number of very interesting illustrations.

The Communists in the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, in order to fortify what I have already said about the makeup of the United Nations, I quote here the words of Dr. George Dimitrov, chairman of the Bulgarian delegation to the assembly of captive European nations:

> We think that it is high time for the democratic representatives in the United Nations to make their courageous decision and determinedly say:
>
> "Out with the enemies of the United Nations from the United Nations.
>
> "Out with the professional Red warmongers from this temple of freedom and peace.
>
> "Out with the bloody dictators and criminal Red Fascists.
>
> "Out with the agents of Communist conspiracy.
>
> "Out with the greatest enemies of human rights, human dignity, human freedom, and human civilization."

In this Formosa situation the United Nations will attempt to obtain a cease-fire armistice and either maintain Nationalist China under the protectorate of this Communist-infiltrated United Nations or recommend some other move equally disastrous to Nationalist China.

The President has full power to act now, no matter what the United Nations recommends, and he has already said that he will take charge of the matter. He now has the Congress squarely behind him and we hail his statement in his message that—

> The situation has become sufficiently critical to impel me, without waiting action by the United Nations, to ask the Congress to participate now.

Public opinion overwhelmingly supports the President and this resolution of Congress.

For the exact language of Dr. Dimitrov, I am indebted to the research of Paul O. Peters in his Washington News Bulletin.

It is obvious that the President has no intention of attacking Red China, but it is equally obvious that he does not intend to abandon Nationalist China. The situation is in good hands and the general public now is united behind the President.

Uncomical Comic Books

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD H. POFF
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1955

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time to call to the attention of the House a bill which I have introduced today. It deals with a problem of supreme importance to the parents of our Nation.

It has been well said that a nation's literature fashions a nation's culture. In recently modern times, our young people have been swamped by a great avalanche of library barbarism in the form of so-called comic books. The unhappy fact is that many of them are anything but comical. Legislation with respect to publications has always been a very delicate subject. One of our most cherished rights is the freedom of the press guaranteed by the Constitution. Any degree of Government censorship of the publication and dissemination of reading matter impinges upon that constitutional safeguard. The ultimate extreme of Government censorship is the book-burning technique of the Nazi regime. On the other hand, the Government is charged with the protection of the general welfare. There can be no doubt that some of this weird, sadistic, and immoral literature is inimical to the public interest. Thus it will be seen that in legislating in this field, the Congress is necessarily confronted with two vitally important principles, the sanctity of both of which must be preserved. Just as freedom of speech cannot be stretched to justify treasonous words, just so freedom of the press cannot be stretched to justify corrupt literature.

Because of the two principles involved, and because of the complexity of the legal questions entailed, I feel that a temporary Presidential commission should be established to study both the problem and the legal implications of possible new legislation. Under my bill, this commission would "make a thorough investigation and study of the publication and transportation for sale in interstate commerce, by mail, rail, or vehicular or personal conveyance, of books, magazines, leaflets, circulars, and other publications containing pictures, drawings, paintings, sketches, or other illustrations or language which may be characterized

as lewd, lascivious, immoral, obscene, inhuman, or sadistic, or calculated to teach, encourage, or glorify a breach of moral or secular law."

As soon as the commission has completed its investigation, the bill requires it to report to the Congress its recommendation for such legislation as it may consider just and justified.

It may well be that legislation is not the answer at all. An atmosphere of Christian discipline in the home can do more to solve the problem than all the laws in the world. It is simple to teach righteousness; it is difficult to legislate morality.

To Incorporate the Legion of Guardsmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 3137, a bill to incorporate the Legion of Guardsmen. This is an organization made up of members and former members of the volunteer armies of the United States. These are men who have voluntarily served their country in peace and war and most times without remuneration. Their courage and devotion to their country, their giving of their time and their treasure, their self-sacrifice is an inspiration to the whole Nation. They are the successors to the Minutemen at Lexington and Concord, to the men who answered the call of Jackson at New Orleans in 1812, to men who served the Armies of the Republic in the Mexican War, to the men who rallied to the defense of the Union in the Civil War, and to the men who were the eagle's scream at San Juan Hill and Manila Bay in the Spanish-American War. Today these men have served in the National Guard, called first in World War I, and a whole year before Pearl Harbor in World War II. Their glorious history has been written on the battlefields of the world. These men have served in the Naval Reserve and Militia, the Coast Guard Temporary Reserve and Auxiliary, the Civil Air Patrol, and the State Guards. These men deserve recognition. The Legion of Guardsmen deserves to take its place along with the other great patriotic organizations chartered by act of Congress.

The Legion of Guardsmen was organized in June of 1944 at Jersey City, N. J., for the purpose of perpetuating the friendships and associations of persons having served in the Armed Forces of the United States and its Territories; to obtain recognition for its members for military services rendered; to foster and promote governmental legislation for the betterment of its members and for the general welfare of the Nation; and to initiate and support ideas and to formulate plans to effect adequate national defense for the greater peace and security of our country. Its constitution and bylaws and those of its subdivisions, chapters, and posts prohibit it from engaging, directly or indirectly, in either political activity or business for a pecuniary profit.

This organization serves a special need. It is not just another organization of war veterans. It provides our volunteer guardians in both peace and war with their own organization. Its doors are open not only to those who are serving or have served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States and their reserve components but also to those who have served or are serving in the Armed Forces of the States, the Territories, and the District of Columbia; the Coast Guard and its reserves and auxiliaries; and the Civil Air Patrol. It covers all those who have given or are voluntarily giving of their time and treasure, remunerated or not, to defend the State and Nation.

Gentlemen, let me reiterate, this great organization deserves to take its place along with the other great patriotic organizations chartered by act of Congress. Let us honor the principles for which this organization stands. Let us recognize the great services which these men have rendered and are rendering to our country. Let us foster the spirit of the slogan: When America needs the minuteman—then America first, last, and always.

Conclusions on Travel and Exchange of Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, there has been brought to my attention a recently released European survey made for the Appropriations Committee of the other body by Brig. Gen. Julius Klein, of Chicago, a special consultant to that committee.

Of particular interest to me among General Klein's recommendations are his conclusions on travel and exchange of persons. General Klein, among other things, calls for—

First. Intensification of the interchange of persons program at all levels;

Second. Encouragement of European tourist and business travel to the United States through cooperation with the established American travel industry; and

Third. Reexamination of existing law with a view toward facilitating and, with all safeguards of our interests, expanding the opportunities for foreign travel to the United States, and the assignment of adequate staffs to our consular services abroad to speed screening and other processing procedures required for the admittance of foreign visitors.

Since the end of World War II, the annual volume of dollars spent by American tourists abroad has more than doubled. Travel, in Europe, is now the biggest single source of earned dollars. The importance of Americans traveling abroad as a painless import and as an implementation of the "trade, not aid" program was well recognized by the report of the Randall Commission. Not measurable in dollars, however, is the value in strengthening the bonds of true friendship and understanding on a real personal level that international two-way travel brings. This understanding of America, its institutions, and its people, bought not by dollars but sold through travel, can well be one of the strongest deterrents to Communist subversion of the minds and wills of men.

H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives during hearings on H. R. 1:

Mr. Chairman, and other distinguished members of the House Committee on Ways and Means, thank you very much for your courtesy in granting me this opportunity to submit a brief statement with reference to the important proposal presently pending for your consideration.

The economic conditions now existing throughout the coal-producing areas of the United States are just about as serious and dark as it is possible for them to be. The continuing and growing unemployment is, to say the least, heartbreaking. The residents of these areas are anxiously looking forward to the Congress of the United States as a last hope for positive and definite action in order to alleviate this unnecessary human suffering and misery—the insecure and dark future they are now facing.

On a recent trip to Europe I had an opportunity to see at firsthand a number of communities where industrial recovery has been slow and real prosperity is still not in sight. Let me point out, however, that nowhere did I find the economic stagnation that has enveloped the coal-producing communities of West Virginia since foreign residual oil began its relentless surge into the fuel markets of the east coast.

In recent years the State of West Virginia has been producing nearly one-third of our Nation's supply of coal. The Fifth Congressional District of West Virginia is an important part of one of America's basic and most important industries. Over the years we have been proud of the coal—an indispensable commodity—produced by the citizens of West Virginia. As a matter of fact, this district is the second largest coal-producing district in the United States.

In 1950 the population of my congressional district, which comprises 16.5 percent of the State's population and includes the seven southernmost counties, was 330,450 men, women, and children. It is now my sad duty to report that in the intervening period West Virginia has suffered a greater population decrease—amounting to 2.9 percent of our residents—than has any other State in the Union. You can be sure my district has suffered more than a proportional loss. Most of these citizens were forced to move

away due to the shortage of job opportunities. In addition, there is more widespread distress among our remaining residents than probably has been experienced by the citizens of any other State.

On December 31, 1954, in 6 of these 7 counties—Mingo, Wyoming, Mercer, McDowell, Summers, and Greenbrier—a total of 75,856 individual American citizens, living within this area, were dependent upon surplus commodities for survival.

From this, it is indisputable that more than 22.9 percent of the population of the Fifth West Virginia Congressional District—or nearly 1 out of every 4 persons—that is, men, women, and children, are absolutely dependent upon Federal aid because of the lack of job opportunities.

In five of these counties—Greenbrier, McDowell, Mingo, Mercer, and Wyoming—there were 310 coal mines operating and employing a total of 31,324 men as of December 31, 1952. On October 1, 1954—just 22 months later—in these same counties there were only 213 coal mines operating—a loss of more than 31 percent—employing only 21,800—a loss of nearly 31 percent. In other words, 9,544 men—most of them responsible heads of families—and through no fault of their own—found themselves out of jobs in a basic and major American industry.

In these five important coal-producing counties in southern West Virginia, during the year 1952, 39,806,802 tons of bituminous coal were produced. During 1953 these same counties produced only 38,590,683 tons. From January through November 1954—the production figures for the month of December are as yet unavailable—these counties produced only 31,308,821 tons of coal. This represents a loss of 8,497,981 tons, or, from a percentage standpoint, a loss of 21.4 percent of our 1952 production. In any area of the United States, when we see such a rapid rise in loss of production, we are in serious difficulties. In some communities, the situation is worse. For example, in some individual areas, production has fallen from 1,771,842 tons in 1952 to a mere 502,902 tons in 1954—a loss of 1,268,940 tons.

The great railroads—the Norfolk & Western, the Virginian, and the C. & O.—serving this coal region have also found it necessary to furlough a large percentage of their employees—numbering into the thousands—because of the loss of coal transport.

This is a most serious problem. Every day the conditions of misery, unrest and despair are brought to my attention. Some of our men have spent more than a year diligently searching for work and are still looking. Many residents, former coal miners, railroad workers, small-business men and others, have gone away from southern West Virginia never to return. After more than a year of bitter disappointments and poverty, it is a wonder to me that a man can still retain his desire to work. These men are not asking for Government handouts. They are demanding that this grossly unfair competition to the coal industry—this unrestricted import of foreign oil—be restricted now. Today there is very little incentive to our younger generation to remain at home. For 2 years many of them have been forced to go elsewhere to search for employment.

In the entire history of our country, the coal industry has never failed to stand by the United States Government. It is now time for the United States Government to stand by the men and women of the coal industry.

From the national security standpoint, in 1952 there were 466,840,782 tons of bituminous coal produced in the United States. In 1954, our entire production amounted to only 391 million tons of this most valuable product.

It is an unquestioned fact that the production of coal is essential to a rapid industrial expansion. Unless coal is readily available, we cannot expand our industrial production capacity as quickly as would be necessary in the event of a national emergency.

Outstanding fuel experts estimated that, in the event of a national emergency—that is, if we are attacked by a hostile foreign power—we would need a minimum of 650 to 700 million tons of bituminous coal during the first year of such emergency. These same fuel experts also insist that, in order to meet this requirement, we must maintain an absolute minimum production of 500 million tons of bituminous coal each year. Last year, as has been previously pointed out, we produced less than 400 million tons of bituminous coal, which is over 100 million tons of coal less than the minimum required for the protection of our own national security.

This is a grave situation—one that demands immediate congressional corrective measures. We must now, at this time, limit the importation of foreign residual oil and crude. This foreign oil competition is grossly unfair. The Members of the Congress of the United States have an inescapable obligation to our own people here at home. We must now face that responsibility squarely and stand up to be counted.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I feel quite strongly and most respectfully urge this committee to extend its hearings in order to permit members of your committee an opportunity to go into the coal areas for firsthand observations of the widespread destitution now current. In my considered opinion, a full understanding of the prevailing situation in the coal industry is a prerequisite to judicial determination of matters pertaining to international commerce.

As this committee is aware, the Randall Commission, which is admittedly responsible for the recommendations contained in the bill now under consideration, made no effort to obtain firsthand information on coal status. For that matter, it seems to me that Congress has a responsibility to obtain authoritative information of this type regardless of the course taken by the executive branch of the Government.

In recent years, it has been customary to send delegations from both the House and the Senate on missions into the four corners of the globe so that the Congress might be properly advised. In this light, what excuse can be offered for refusal to treat particular areas of our own country in the same manner?

My congressional district is little more than an hour away from Washington by air, or you may make the trip overnight on the train. I can assure you that our mine operators and mineworkers will be glad to assist any delegation in making a thorough study of conditions in our communities.

Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will continue in force for the next 5 months whether or not a report comes out of this committee in the interim, am I asking too much in the interests of my people's welfare and my country's security?

Are We Going To Stand Firm for the Principles on Which This Government Was Founded?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, action on the part of the United Nations may nullify the resolution passed by Congress to support President Eisenhower in his demand for authority to solve the Formosa problem, as he said, without waiting for the United Nations to act. The President left the door open for the United Nations to get behind a cease-fire in that explosive situation. Should the United Nations decide that Formosa should be turned over to the Reds of China, and it is quite probable that this is precisely what it will do, then where do we stand on the Eisenhower resolution? Should the United Nations agree that Red China should be let into the United Nations as our partner, then where do we stand concerning the Eisenhower resolution?

If this country backs up and agrees to these probable conclusions, it means for us a bigger defeat than we suffered in Korea. If this country ever consents to let the Reds into the United Nations, we automatically should withdraw from that organization if we have an iota of sense left. If we have not gone too far on the road to appeasement it may be that we will have courage enough to face the Communist menace.

We have been driven out of our reasoning faculties by trying to appease the Reds. They hold our soldiers as prisoners, condemned by a kangroo court, and we do nothing about it but run to the United Nations for help. This organization is not going to support a direct demand on our part for the surrender of our men. Red China knows that but hopes we will let her dictate the terms and the consideration for their release and the United Nations as now constituted, will yield and yield to the Reds no matter what they want. The reason is that the United Nations is infiltrated with Communists. Notice the vote in the United Nations on the Human Rights resolution. On the question of the individual's right to personally own property, the vote was 15 to 2 against it. Does that not clearly prove what I have always contended—that the United Nations is the agent of a Communist conspiracy?

When I voted to give the President authority to act in the Formosa situation I had confidence that he meant what he said, that he did not want to wait for any action of the United Nations. I have confidence that he will not back up. However, with Great Britain haranguing for the recognition of Red China, and our own administrators wanting trade with Russia, it is a pretty tough assignment for the President. If we would rise up in our might and pull out of the United Nations as soon as Red China is admitted it would best serve this country to let them in. The Reds of China really belong in the United Nations, as the preponderance of ideas in that organization will be quite homelike for the Reds. That is what the one worlders are striving for, just as much as Russia—to build a world government of a Communist complexion. It surely is communistic in design, or that organization would not vote overwhelmingly to ban the private ownership of property. That ownership is the basis of capitalism and this vote clearly proves that communism and not capitalism is the present theme of the United Nations.

This struggle between capitalism and communism cannot be settled by any treaty or understanding. That struggle will go on until we are all one thing or the other. What Lincoln uttered nearly a hundred years ago is a good doctrine now—that a house divided against itself cannot stand. Anyone with just a smattering of commonsense ought to know that nations, differing in history, religion, and experience in government cannot be held together by agreements. We believe in Jesus Christ, but the Russians do not; we believe that a government exists for the people; Russia does not, but believes that people exist for the government. Can these views be harmonized? It is about time we stopped this woolgathering thinking and get down to first principles—we should hold fast to our religion, our history, our Government, which has proven to be the hope of mankind in his struggle for freedom and liberty, and let the atheists and the pledged destructionists of our way of life keep out of our company. Are we in the United States ready to sit down side by side with brigands, cutthroats, liars, and atheists? I think not.

The Communist slogan of peaceful coexistence is a new move to further delude the people of this country. There never can be any peaceful coexistence with man or nations unless each party respects the right of the other, and that relations are honorable. Would the dictator of Russia keep any agreement? Would he desist from his propaganda? Would he consider honor in dealing with us? When we know from the writing of Karl Marx, the remarks of Lenin and Stalin that their purpose is to utterly destroy capitalism, by any means, we can see the futility of trying to live a peaceful coexistent life with Russia under its present government. "The lamb shall lie down with the lion" is the expression of a noble sentiment, but as the dictators would handle the situation, that statement would be paraphrased to read, "The lamb shall lie down with the lion, but on the inside of the lion."

Problems of the Dairy Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1955

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, despite the best efforts of hundreds of sincere and earnest men, in Government as well as in private life, the dairy industry of the United States is in difficulty today, faced with problems of low producer prices, inadequate marketing systems, and an excess of production that cannot be used even though our Nation includes thousands of people who have an inadequate supply of dairy products.

As the representative of an extremely important dairy region, I am one of those who is seeking a solution to the problems of this vital industry. Today I have reintroduced for the consideration of the Congress and all those connected with the dairy industry the self-help bill that I sponsored originally in the 83d Congress. I offer it as a possible solution to the problems of American dairymen. I am happy to state that it already enjoys the support of a great many of them.

This bill proposes to permit the dairymen to do for themselves those things that the Government is now trying to do for them. In short, it is a program by which the dairy industry itself may control production, promote distribution, and establish a system of prices fair to both the producer and the consumer of dairy products.

Our objective is to provide the American people with a continuous and ample supply of milk and dairy products at a fair price—a price that will encourage greater consumption of these vital, health-building foods.

The first prerequisite is a fair return to the original producer, plus assurance of a steady and growing demand. The Department of Agriculture is working toward these same objectives, but it is slow work, indeed. I feel very strongly that the industry itself can do the job, do it more quickly, without expense to the Government, and without the Government controls that are so onerous to our independent and self-reliant dairy farmers.

The self-help bill proposes establishment of a Federal Dairy Stabilization Board appointed by the President from nominees selected by the industry. The Board would be empowered to collect a fee from all producers to finance its operations. The amount of the fee is to be related directly to the production of each farm so that each will pay his fair share of the cost of the marketing program. In years of surplus production a high fee will be charged. When production is low and the marketing problems are thereby simplified, the fee may be very small.

The present Government system of flexible price supports tends to aggravate the problem it seeks to correct. By lowering price supports to 75 percent of parity, the Government encourages many dairy farmers to increase production in order to maintain their usual level of cash income. Milk production did increase last year in the face of reduced supports and outlook for this year is that it will remain high. The self-help program would have the opposite effect.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND], estimates that this program would have permitted farmers to improve their income by 37 cents per hundredweight in 1954, if the proposed Board had set price supports at 90 percent of parity. The gross income to farmers would have been 60 cents per hundredweight greater than under the Government's 75-percent support program. The self-help fee would have averaged about 23 cents per hundredweight even if all of the surplus production acquired by the Board were a total loss, and the difference—37 cents per hundredweight—would have been added to the income of every participating producer.

The normal functions of supply and demand, the relationship with the prices of other foods, and the marketing program of the Board should insure that the self-help plan establishes prices that are fair to the consumer and to the producer. Government has never been able to control prices successfully. There is reason to hope that a cooperative effort of the kind here proposed could do a better job.

In the event the program does not operate as anticipated, the bill contains provisions that will permit the Secretary of Agriculture to intervene.

The bill also creates a 12-man dairy advisory committee, representing all interested parties. The advisory committee should serve as a useful agent in counseling and guiding the administration of the program and enlarging the demand for dairy products.

One objective of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to relieve the taxpayers of this Nation of the costly burden of the price-support program for dairy products. Another is getting the Government out of the dairy business and permitting the dairy farmers to operate their own program of price stabilization, surplus proposal, and production stabilization.

Mr. Speaker, the dairy industry accounts for 20 percent of our total farm income. Thousands of independent farmers throughout the country make this the largest single branch of agriculture. I hope that these men and women will consider and study the self-help proposal, and will give us their advice and counsel. I know of their dissatisfaction with Government controls. I am confident of their desire to operate the dairy industry in the traditional pattern of American free enterprise.

I trust that the measure will have the earnest consideration of the Congress this year.

Regulation of Water Levels of Lake Ontario

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, for more than 2 years now, property owners on the shores of Lake Ontario have been faced with the threat of severe flood damage as a result of the joint development of the United States and Canada of the great power potential of the St. Lawrence River.

Under an order of approval issued by the International Joint Commission on October 29, 1952, the two Governments were authorized to proceed with the power development under a so-called method of regulation No. 5 which would permit the raising of the water levels of Lake Ontario to disastrous heights.

While the order of approval set forth as one of its findings that the shore-front property owners have adequate protection against such damage under the Constitution and laws of the United

States, experience has given the affected property owners no reason for any such sanguine view of the matter. In an analagous situation, where a dam was built by Canada across a portion of the St. Lawrence River, the property owners who sustained resultant damage were unable to get any satisfaction in the courts.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the International Joint Commission has itself recognized in the past that the Constitution and laws of the United States do not by themselves provide necessary protection to property owners whose lands are damaged by waterpower developments on the United States-Canadian border. In at least 2 instances—one involving the Lake of the Woods in Minnesota, and 1 involving development of the Kootenai River in Idaho—the Commission has itself arranged for the protection and indemnification of property owners. I have urged this course on the Commission, in connection with the St. Lawrence power development, and shall continue to do so.

Meanwhile, however, I am happy to report that the Commission itself, acting under a reference submitted to it by the Governments of Canada and the United States in June 1952, is seeking to establish a range of fluctuation of the Lake Ontario water level which, if maintained with due regard to natural factors, would go far to protect the shorefront property owners.

Moreover, I am in receipt this week of a letter from the chairman of the United States section of the International Joint Commission, the Honorable Len Jordan, stating explicitly that the objectionable and hazardous method of regulation No. 5 has been abandoned, and that the method of regulation which will be substituted for it will be calculated to reduce, rather than aggravate, flood damage along the Lake Ontario shores.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to applaud and commend this forthright statement on the part of former Governor Jordan. I am certain it will be welcomed by the lakefront property owners, and will give them reason to hope that the added steps necessary to insure their protection will be taken.

The problem is not one affecting Lake Ontario properties alone, of course. It is a potential problem wherever power developments affect the water levels along the entire length of the United States-Canadian border. Its proper adjudication now will therefore prevent limitless confusion in the future as the development of these international water resources proceeds.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD at this point Governor Jordan's letter, together with the correspondence from Representative KENNETH B. KEATING and myself which preceded it:

INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., January 31, 1955.

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. OSTERTAG: This will acknowledge the joint letter dated January 21, 1955, signed by Representative KEATING and yourself, relative to possible injury to property owners along the shores of Lake Ontario in your State after the power project in the International Section of the St. Lawrence River is completed and commences operation.

Pursuant to the reference submitted to this Commission by the Governments of the United States and Canada on June 25, 1952, the Commission is now causing a study to be made with a view to reducing the range of fluctuation of the level of Lake Ontario heretofore experienced, which means that the extreme high levels such as have heretofore damaged shore properties, would be reduced, with consequent benefits to the property owners.

These matters of concern to you were discussed quite fully at a special meeting of the Commission in New York on January 26–27, 1955, and I am pleased to inform you that the Commission contemplates being able to submit to the two governments a recommendation of the fluctuation range through which Lake Ontario shall be operated, together with upper and lower limits of the range expressed in feet above mean sea level. Tentative figures may be available by May of this year. You know of course that the Commission does not contemplate regulating the lake level in accordance with method of regulation No. 5 which is now known to be unsuitable for use.

No basis exists for thinking that the method of regulation to be substituted for the objectionable method No. 5 will cause injury to the owners of shore properties in excess of that which they would suffer if the lake and river were in a state of nature.

It should be reassuring to you however, that the Department of State has concluded, with the Department of Justice concurring informally, that such property owners, if injured would have a remedy in the courts of the United States and Canada; and that while this Commission apparently considered the internal laws of the United States and Canada to be sufficient to take care of the claims for compensation to property owners, the Commission nevertheless retained jurisdiction over the subject matter of the applications and kept itself free to make such further order concerning such subject matter, which of course would include indemnification, as it might consider desirable.

You may be very confident that the Commission will spare no effort in evolving and putting into effect a method of regulation calculated to reduce in some measure rather than aggravate flood damage to properties along the shores of Lake Ontario.

I trust the information contained herein will reassure you. A similar letter is being sent to Representative KEATING.

Sincerely yours,

LEN JORDAN,
Chairman, United States Section.

JANUARY 21, 1955.

HON. LEN JORDAN,
Chairman, United States Section,
International Joint Commission,
Federal Trade Commission Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GOVERNOR JORDAN: We are in receipt of a letter from the Department of State, under date of January 20, with respect to adjudication of claims of owners of property bordering on Lake Ontario, which may arise out of construction and operation of the St. Lawrence power project.

The letter points out that, in issuing its order of approval of this project, the International Joint Commission indicated its continuing responsibility for the protection and indemnity of all interests which might be injured by it, but that no provisions were made in the order for submission of claims to the Commission. The letter further points out that the Commission alone can decide whether to take further action in this matter.

We respectfully submit that, as a result of certain international undertakings in the past affecting the water levels of Lake Ontario, of which the Commission is cognizant, the legitimate interests of shorefront property owners have been injured, but they have thus far been denied indemnity and are deprived of the protection guaranteed to them under the Constitution and laws of the United States. The serious threat of further injury under the pending international power developments on the St. Lawrence River therefore creates the greatest apprehension as to the protection to be afforded these citizens.

In the light of these facts, we urgently request that the United States section of the International Joint Commission act now to allay these apprehensions, by reaffirming, in concrete terms, its mandatory responsibility to protect the interests of citizens of the United States against injury.

Specifically we request that the Commission place on its agenda for the forthcoming meeting on January 26 the matter of amending the order of approval to provide for the establishment of concrete and orderly procedures under which property owners on the Lake Ontario shores may know (1) the conditions under which shore property damages are to be compensable under the provisions of the Boundary Waters Treaty; (2) who is to be responsible for the payment of damages; (3) the means of making claims for damages; and (4) that whoever is responsible for payment of damages shall provide reasonable assurances of ability to pay.

Trusting that we may have an early and favorable response to this request, we remain

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
Member of Congress.
KENNETH B. KEATING,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 20, 1955.

The Honorable HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. OSTERTAG: Reference is made to your letter of June 17, 1954, also signed by Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, in which you raised questions concerning the adjudication of claims of owners of property bordering on Lake Ontario which may arise out of the construction and operation of the St. Lawrence power project undertaken by the United States and Canada.

Your letter states that the level of the lake will always be controlled by one or more of the structures to be built by the Power Commission of the State of New York and the Ontario Hydroelectric Power Commission, and that in every instance involving injury to the shore properties, the injury will result from the joint action of the two power authorities. You add that a United States citizen cannot sue a Canadian entity in the United States courts, and that a Canadian citizen cannot sue a United States entity in the Canadian courts. You, therefore, apparently feel that the International Joint Commission, created under the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, should establish procedures for the indemnification of property owners who may be damaged by the power project. However, in this connection, you call attention to a reported difference of view between the American and Canadian sections of the Commission as to its authority to determine and approve indemnification that might be due on account of injury to owners of shore property, and you request that the Secretary of State take steps through diplomatic channels to establish appropriate international machinery for the solution of the problem.

If the Department understands your letter correctly, it raises two fundamental questions. First, whether, under existing law, property owners who may be injured through the construction or operation of the power project have adequate remedies without re-

sort to the International Joint Commission, and, second, whether the Commission should provide the machinery to deal with such damage.

After careful consideration, the Department has reached certain conclusions concerning these matters which have been informally concurred in by the Department of Justice. The first is that owners of lakefront property have a legal remedy in New York against the Power Authority of the State of New York for flood damage, either under section 10 (c) of the Federal Power Act or under general principles of law relating to the joint and several liabilities of joint tort-feasors. This remedy is probably open in the courts of New York to both United States and Canadian property owners. Similar remedies appear to be open to both United States and Canadian property owners against the Ontario Hydroelectric Power Commission under arbitration procedures of Ontario.

The second conclusion which the Department has reached is that, while the International Joint Commission was concerned with the possibility of injury to property owners, it apparently considered that the internal laws of Canada and of the United States are sufficient to take care of claims for compensation to property owners. In its order of approval, the Commission made a finding, set out in the preamble, "that suitable and adequate provision is made by the laws in Canada and by the Constitution and laws in the United States for the protection and indemnity of all interests on either side of the international boundary which may be injured by reason of the construction, maintenance, and operation of the works." The order made no provision for submission of claims to the Commission. Nevertheless, the Commission "retains jurisdiction over the subject matter of these applications, and may, after giving such notice and opportunity to all interested parties to make representations as the Commission deems appropriate, make such further order or orders relating thereto as may be necessary in the judgment of the Commission." So, the Commission has kept itself free to make such further orders concerning the subject matter of the applications, which, of course, would include indemnification, as it may consider desirable.

Whether the Commission, having decided that suitable and adequate provision is made by the laws in Canada and by the Constitution and laws of the United States for the indemnification of injured interests, should take further action is a matter which it alone can decide.

In the circumstances, the Department sees no reason for approaching the Canadian Government with a proposal for the establishment of further procedures for the settlement of such claims.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

Sgt. Prudencio Uranga

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1955

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under the stimulus of battle men of great patriotism have willingly risked death and destruction.

Men have gone forth under the most hazardous conditions to rescue fellow men from death. It takes great courage to do these things.

We honor those who have performed them. They become an inspiration to all of us.

Let me tell you of a man of great courage. A man who with great deliberation, fully recognizing the consequences of his decision, risked the most horrible of deaths to save his comrades and companions.

I can best tell the story by quoting from paragraph 2, general orders No. 34, Department of the Air Force, dated September 16, 1954:

2. By direction of the President, under the provisions of the act of Congress approved July 2, 1926, and transfer order 30, 1948, the Soldier's Medal for heroism not involving actual conflict with an enemy is awarded to the following named airmen:

T. Sgt. Prudencio Uranga, AF18199466, distinguished himself by an act of heroism involving voluntary risk of life at Hayward Air National Guard Base, Hayward, Calif., on December 7, 1953, while serving as a civilian air technician with the California Air National Guard. An explosion in the pumping compartment of an F-2 refueling unit set the unit afire and threw burning aircraft fuel upon Sgt. Uranga. After extinguishing the flames on his clothing, Sergeant Uranga displayed outstanding courage and selfless disregard for his own safety by entering the tractor of the furiously burning fuel trailer and driving it from the aircraft parking area. Sergeant Uranga without benefit of protective clothing, and although he had sustained first- and second-degree burns of his hands, arms, and face, then assisted in subduing the fire in the fuel trailer. The courage and devotion to duty displayed by Sergeant Uranga in this emergency reflect great credit upon himself, the Air National Guard and the United States Air Force.

By order of the Secretary of the Air Force:

N. F. TWINING,
Chief of Staff, United States Air Force.

Official:

K. E. THIEBAUD,
Colonel, USAF,
Air Adjutant General.

Sgt. Prudencio Uranga is a member of the California Air National Guard.

He has lived up to the proved tradition of the National Guard.

He risked his life to save those of his comrades. He saved his country a great sum of money by reducing the hazard of a bad conflagration.

I hail Sgt. Prudencio Uranga as a hero.

Persons Entering Armed Services for the First Time On or After February 1, 1955, Will Be Regarded as Peacetime Veterans When They Leave Military Service and as Such Will Be Entitled Only to Peacetime Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, according to a statement released recently by the Veterans' Administration, the following benefits will be available to persons entering the Armed Forces on or after February 1, 1955, when they leave the service under honorable conditions.

These veterans will be regarded as peacetime veterans and, under present laws, will not be eligible for any of the benefits provided by the Korean GI bill, nor for any wartime service benefits payable to veterans of the Korean conflict period.

Peacetime veterans may be entitled, under certain conditions, to medical and domiciliary care, disability compensation, aid for the blinded, "wheel chair" homes, servicemen's indemnity, guaranty of commercial life-insurance premiums, burial expenses, burial flag, guardianship service, and appeals. Their dependents may be entitled to death compensation where the veterans die of service-connected causes.

The benefits and conditions are:

Medical and dental care: A peacetime veteran may be entitled to hospitalization, outpatient medical and dental treatment and prosthetic service, provided he was discharged under other than dishonorable conditions for a disability incurred in line of duty or is receiving compensation for a service-connected disability.

Domiciliary care: A peacetime veteran may be entitled to domiciliary care if he meets the above eligibility requirements and is incapacitated from earning a living and has no adequate means of support.

Disability compensation: A veteran disabled by injury or disease incurred in, or aggravated by, peacetime service may qualify for disability compensation. Discharge must have been under other than dishonorable conditions.

Monthly rates range from $14 to $145, depending on the degree of disability, plus statutory awards for amputations, blindness, and so forth, up to a maximum of $336.

Where the disability resulted from extrahazardous service, such as simulated warfare, the veteran may be entitled to wartime rates. These are $17 to $181, plus statutory awards, up to a maximum of $420.

Veterans rated 50 percent or more disabled may be entitled to additional compensation for a wife, children, or dependent parents.

Aid for the blinded: VA may provide special aid to veterans who are blinded and are entitled to compensation for service - connected disabilities. The blindness itself need not be service-connected.

Aids include approved electronic and mechanical equipment, as well as seeing-eye or guide dogs. VA also pays the expense of training the veteran to use the dog and for the dog's medical attention.

Wheelchair homes: Seriously disabled veterans who cannot get about without the aid of wheelchairs, braces, crutches, canes, or the like, may be entitled to a grant from VA for a wheelchair home, especially adapted to their needs.

These veterans must be entitled to compensation for permanent and total service-connected disability for the loss,

or loss of use, of both legs due to certain specified conditions.

Eligible veterans will receive a Federal grant of not more than 50 percent of the cost of their homes up to a maximum of $10,000. This grant may be used to pay part of the cost of building or buying such homes, or to remodel existing dwellings for their requirements.

The grant also may be used to pay off the indebtedness on such homes already acquired by eligible veterans.

Servicemen's indemnity: Persons entering active service on or after today are automatically covered against death in active service for $10,000—less any other Government life insurance in force at time of death.

For those called to active duty 31 days or more, this free indemnity protection continues for 120 days after separation or release from active service.

After their separation from service, these veterans may obtain two types of postservice Government life insurance under certain conditions.

The first type is a 5-year level-premium term policy that is renewable every 5 years at the premium rate for the then-attained age without medical examination. This type of term policy is not convertible to any other form of Government life insurance; nor does it pay dividends.

Veterans who may apply for this insurance are those who were ordered into active duty for 31 days or more and who were entitled to indemnity protection while they were in service. They must have been released from such active service.

These veterans may apply to VA for the insurance within exactly 120 days—not always 4 months—of their separation or release. While they do not need a physical examination, they must pay the required premiums. They may take out up to $10,000 of this term insurance, less any other Government life insurance in force at the time of application.

The second type of insurance is available to eligible disabled veterans. This coverage is a special form of national service life insurance—NSLI—on either term or permanent plan policies.

Veterans eligible for this special insurance are those released or separated from active service on or after April 25, 1951, under other than dishonorable conditions and who are found by VA to be suffering from a service-connected disability or disabilities for which VA compensation would be payable if the disability is 10 percent or more in degree. They must not be suffering from nonservice-connected disabilities that make them uninsurable.

These veterans must apply to VA for the special NSLI within 1 year from the date that VA finds their disability or disabilities to be service-connected. Each application must be accompanied by the required physical examination and the necessary premium.

This special NSLI is issuable to eligible disabled veterans on either term or permanent plans in amounts ranging up to $10,000, less any other Government life insurance in force at the time of application.

If such veterans are totally disabled, they may apply for any of the special plans except those issued under endowment contracts. They also may apply for waiver of premiums at the time they file applications for the insurance, but they should tender the full premiums with their applications and continue to pay such premiums on time until they are notified by VA that their waiver has been granted. Premiums paid during waiver will be refunded.

Guaranty of premiums on commercial life insurance policies: Persons entering or in the Armed Forces, who have commercial life insurance, may apply to VA for the guaranty of premiums, indebtedness, or interest up to $10,000 of insurance per person. The VA guaranty covers the period of service and for 2 years thereafter.

Any amount paid by VA to an insurance company for a protected policy becomes a debt due the United States by the policyholder and must be repaid.

Burial expenses: Funeral and burial expenses up to $150 may be paid by VA in the death of certain peacetime veterans. The veterans must have been receiving compensation at the time of death or must have been discharged or retired from service for disability incurred in line of duty.

Payment is made only to the undertaker or to the person who paid the expense involved. Claims must be filed with VA within 2 years from the date of permanent burial or cremation.

Burial flag: An American flag to drape the casket, which may be retained as a memorial by the next of kin, may be supplied in the death of peacetime veterans who have been discharged under conditions other than dishonorable after serving a full enlistment, or for disability incurred in line of duty. Such flags may be issued, upon application, by VA field offices, most first-, second-, and third-class post offices, and those fourth-class post offices located in county seats.

Death compensation: The widow, children, and dependent parents of deceased peacetime veterans may qualify for compensation where the veterans' death was due to service.

A widow loses her entitlement upon remarriage. Unmarried children normally lose their entitlement upon reaching age 18, but if they are attending a school approved by VA they may continue to receive death compensation while attending this school, but not after 21 or married.

Monthly amounts vary according to the number and relationship of the dependents. Examples are: Widow, no children, $69.60; one child alone, no widow, $53.60; one parent, $60. Corresponding rates where death was due to extra-hazardous service are $87, $67, and $75.

Guardianship service: Incompetent peacetime veterans, their minor dependents, and incompetent beneficiaries are entitled to protection of their estates derived from benefits paid by VA under acts of Congress.

Such protection is provided by the chief attorneys of VA regional offices in accordance with State and Federal laws and VA regulations.

The chief attorneys maintain supervision over guardians appointed by State—probate and county—courts, as well as legal custodians recognized by VA in their respective jurisdictions.

Appeals: The Board of Veterans' Appeals is available for rendering final decisions in all cases appealed to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, wherein a claimant has been denied benefits to which he claims entitlement. The board has no original jurisdiction; its work is similar to that of a court of appeals.

Sidney Friedman Organization, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the occasion of the Presidential proclamation of the week of February 7 to 11 as Dental Health Week leads me to report on a dramatic and invaluable service, organized by some of the constituents of my district, that has a bearing on just that subject. Indeed, I feel that what they have done is an example of the finest work done by the many voluntary groups that make up the United States; and that it could be an example for other communities throughout the country.

About a year ago a group of young men and women, organized as the Sidney Friedman Organization, Inc., of 236 East Broadway, cast about for a community service that they could render. They found it in the need to provide dental care for the underprivileged children in the neighborhood. They went into this very carefully. They studied the needs. They studied the available resources, and they found that in my district alone there were several thousand indigent children who needed dental care and who could not obtain it from other sources.

Under the chairmanship of Leon W. Katz, this group interested Mr. Abraham Schlacht, publisher of the East Side News, a local newspaper in my district. Through its members and friends, they built a free dental clinic, which they report is the only one of its kind in the State of New York functioning on a completely volunteer basis. There are no administrative expenses in the operation of the clinic. Neither dentists nor dental aides associated with it receive any compensation. And the indigent children receive the best in dental care. The clinic is now in its fifth month of operation and has Prof. Oscar Ginder as its director and Dean Raymond Nagle, of the New York University College of Dentistry, as its adviser and consultant.

The free dental clinic has had over 700 monthly visits by children and it will examine over 300 youngsters during Dental Health Week. The free den-

tal clinic, in addition to regular dental treatment, gives orthodontia and prosthetic work.

It should be noted that the indigent children are recommended by the public, parochial, and nursery schools. And the two requisites for accepting children by the free dental clinic are inability to pay and need for dental care.

I wish to extend to all my fellow Members of this Congress an invitation to see this clinic in operation and to judge for themselves its fine community spirit.

Some Reminiscences of Abraham Lincoln by Distinguished Americans Who Personally Knew Him

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, heretofore granted me, I have the privilege and honor of making these few remarks about Abraham Lincoln—he it is who has been my idol and example in American political life ever since I was a young elementary schoolboy and my schoolteacher in the fifth grade frequently cracked my knuckles with a heavy wooden ruler because she would frequently catch me making a drawing of Abe Lincoln's birthplace cabin when I should, in her judgment, have been studying my lessons.

This coming Saturday, February 12, 1955, is again the birthday of this former Member of this House of Representatives—he having been born February 12, 1809.

In making these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, on this occasion, I am again doing what I have had the privilege of doing each of my 8 previous years as a Member of this great legislative body. On this present occasion I am doing something which I have not done on any other occasion; to wit, I will quote from comments about Abraham Lincoln as set forth in one of the very valuable books in my Lincoln library—Reminiscences of Abraham Lincoln by Distinguished Men of His Time—collected and edited by Allen Thorndike Rice, editor of the North American Review.

These incidents which I set forth will prove of different and unique interest and inspiration to all of us, I hope, because they were published fairly soon after the untimely assassination of Mr. Lincoln and were by distinguished men who knew him personally.

Gen. Benjamin F. Butler, ex-Governor of Massachusetts:

I first saw Lincoln in 1840, making a speech in that memorable campaign in the city hall at Lowell; and not again till I was more than 21 years older, when I called on him at the White House to make acknowledgments for my appointment as major general. When he handed me the commission, with some kindly words of compliment, I replied, "I do not know whether I ought to accept this. I received my orders to prepare my brigade to march to Washington while trying a cause to a jury. I stated the fact to the court and asked that the case might be continued, which was at once consented to, and I left to come here the second morning after, my business in utter confusion." He said: "I guess we both wish we were back trying cases," with a quizzical look upon his countenance. I said: "Besides, Mr. President, you may not be aware that I was the Breckinridge candidate for governor in my State in the last campaign, and did all I could to prevent your election." "All the better," he said, "I hope your example will bring many of the same sort with you. "But," I answered, "I do not know that I can support the measures of your administration, Mr. President." "I do not care whether you do or not," was his reply, "if you will fight for the country." "I will take the commission and loyally serve while I may, and bring it back to you when I can go with you no further." "That is frank; but tell me wherein you think my administration wrong before you resign," he said. "Report to General Scott."

Hon. Schulyer Colfax, ex-Vice President of the United States:

Finally, there was a very flagrant case of a soldier who, in the crisis of a battle, demoralized his regiment by his cowardice, throwing down his gun and hiding behind the friendly stump. When tried for his cowardice there was no defense. The court-martial, in examining his antecedents, found that he had neither father or mother living, nor wife nor child; that he was unfit to wear the loyal uniform, and that he was a thief who stole continually from his comrades. "Here," said Judge Holt, "is a case which comes exactly within your requirements. He does not deny his guilt; he will better serve the country dead than living, as he has no relations to mourn him, and he is not fit to be in the ranks of patriots, at any rate." Mr. Lincoln's refuge of excuse was all swept away. Judge Holt expected, of course, that he would write "approved" on the paper; but the President, running his long fingers through his hair, as he so often used to do when in anxious thought, replied, "Well, after all, Judge, I think I must put this with my leg cases."

"Leg cases," said Judge Holt with a frown at this supposed levity of the President in a case of life and death. "What do you mean by leg cases, sir?"

"Why, why," replied Mr. Lincoln, "do you see those papers crowded into those pigeonholes? They are the cases that you call by that long title, 'Cowardice in the face of the enemy,' but I call them, for short, my 'leg cases.' But I put it to you, and I leave it for you to decide for yourself, if Almighty God gives a man a cowardly pair of legs, how can he help their running away with him?"

Hon. George S. Bautwell, ex-Secretary of the Treasury:

Mr. Bancroft gave voice to the considerate judgment of mankind when, in conversation, he said, "Beyond question, General Washington, intellectually, is the first of Americans." If this statement be open to question, the question springs from the limitation, for beyond doubt Washington is the first of Americans. His preeminence, his greatness, appear in the fact that his faculties and powers were so fully developed, so evenly adjusted and nicely balanced, that in all the various and difficult duties of military and civil life he never for an instant failed to meet the demand which his position and the attendant circumstances made upon him. This was the opinion of his contemporaries. His preeminence was felt and recognized by the leaders of the savage tribes of America, by the most sagacious statesmen and wisest observers in foreign lands, and by all of his countrymen who were able to escape the influence of passion and to consider passing events in the light of pure reason.

It is the glory of Washington that he was the first great military chief who did not exhibit the military spirit; and in this he has given to his country an example and a rule of the highest value. The problem of republics is to develop military capacity without fostering the military spirit. This Washington did in himself, and this also his country has done. The zeal of the young men of the Republic to enter the military service for the defense of the Union, and the satisfaction with which they accepted peace and returned to the employments of peace, all in obedience to the example of Washington, are his highest praise.

With this estimate, not an unusual nor an exaggerated estimate, I venture to claim for Abraham Lincoln the place next to Washington, whether we have regard to private character, to intellectual qualities, to public services, or to the weight of obligation laid upon the country and upon mankind. Between Washington and Lincoln there were two full generations of men; but, of them all, I see not one who can be compared with either.

Submitting this opinion, in advance of all evidence, I proceed to deal with those qualities, opportunities, characteristics, and services on which Lincoln's claim rests for the broad and most enduring fame of which I have spoken. We are attracted naturally by the career of a man who has passed from the humblest condition in early life to stations of honor nad fame in maturer years. With Lincoln this space was the broadest possible in civilized life. His childhood was spent in a cabin upon a mud floor, and his youth and early manhood were checkered with more than the usual share of vicissitudes and disappointments. The chief blessing of his early life was his step-mother, Sally Bush, who, by her affectionate treatment and wise conduct, did much to elevate the character of the class of women to which she belonged. His opportunities for training in the schools were few, and his hours of study were limited. The books that he could obtain were read and re-read, and a grammar and geometry were his constant companions for a time; but his means of education bore no logical relation to the position he finally reached as a thinker, writer, and speaker.

Of all the self-made men of America, Lincoln owed least to books, schools, and society. Washington owed much to these, and all his self-assertion, which was considerable, in society, in the Army, and in civil affairs, was the assertion of a trained man. Lincoln asserted nothing but his capacity, when it was his duty to decide what was wise and what was right. He claimed nothing for himself, in his personal character, in the nature of deference to others, and too little, perhaps, for the great office he held. The schools create nothing; they only bring out what is; but as long as the mass of mankind think otherwise, an untrained person like Lincoln has an immense advantage over the scholar in the contest for immortality. In this particular, however, the instincts of men have a large share of wisdom in them. When we speak of human greatness we mean natural, innate faculty and power. We distinguish the gift of God from the culture of the schools. The unlearned give the schools too much credit in the work of developing power and forming character; the learned, perhaps, give them too little. But whether judged by the learned or the unlearned, Lincoln is the most commanding figure in the ranks of self-made men which America has yet produced.

Mr. Lincoln possessed the almost divine faculty of interpreting the will of the people without any expression by them. We

often hear of the influence of the atmosphere of Washington upon the public men residing there. It never affected him. He was of all men most independent of locality and social influences. He was wholly self-contained in all that concerned his opinions upon public questions and in all his judgments of the popular will. Conditions being given, he could anticipate the popular will and conduct. When the proceedings of the convention of dissenting Republicans, which assembled at Cleveland in 1864, were mentioned to him and his opinion sought, he told the story of two fresh Irishmen who attempted to find a tree toad that they heard in the forest, and how, after a fruitless hunt, one of them consoled himself and his companion with the expression, "An' faith, it was nothing but a noise."

Mr. Speaker, I wish to again do that which I have often frequently done in this great legislative body, which is to urge that each and every one of my colleagues and any who may read these humble remarks by me, and these reminiscences by these former great American citizens, visit as many of the landmarks, statues, and memorials of Abraham Lincoln—and former Lincoln dwelling places—as possible. Also, I urge that if any of you do so you take your children and young people in your families and in your family connections with you. For instance, go to New Salem, Ill. Go to Hodgensville, Ky. Go to Springfield, Ill. Go to the old Ford Theater here in the Nation's Capital. Go to the Lincoln Memorial here at the Nation's Capital.

The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1955

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, Chief of Staff, United States Army, at The Citadel, Charleston, S. C., Tuesday, December 7, 1954:

I am honored and grateful for the opportunity to be here today. For more than 40 years it has been my good fortune to have served in peace and war—at work and at play—with your distinguished president, General Clark. To be with him again and with you young gentlemen, preparing yourselves for the responsibilities and duties of the future of America, is an inspiring experience.

The Citadel has a long and honorable tradition. Its graduates have gone out to serve the Nation, both as soldiers and as civilians, for well over a hundred years. As one of the oldest military schools in the United States, The Citadel has an atmosphere, a curriculum, and a tradition with a sound and strong military orientation.

While I realize that it is not the primary purpose of the military college of South Carolina to train officers for the Armed Forces, it is of the military responsibilities of its prospective graduates that I want chiefly to speak, and it is to you young gentlemen that I primarily address my remarks.

The greatest opportunity to which you can aspire is the opportunity for useful service. That opportunity will soon be given to you. Most of you expect, upon graduation, to begin a tour of duty as a member of the active military forces. I hope that many of you will go on, as so many distinguished alumni of this school have done, to follow military careers. But even if you do not choose to continue as professional soldiers—and I use the term "soldiers" to refer to all military men—the skills and the integrity which The Citadel has given you will prove invaluable to your communities, and to the Nation, whatever profession you may pursue.

You do not need to ask yourselves why you are receiving military as well as purely academic training. Presumably, you answered that question for yourselves when you chose to come here to school.

It may be, however, that you wonder why it is that you and so many of your contemporaries must give a number of years of your lives to full-time military service, and why, having completed your active service, you will continue to be available for military duty in case of national need.

The answer is simple: Our Nation, with all it stands for, lives under a continuing threat of attack by godless communism. Only by maintaining strength can we hope to deter such an attack. Only by readily available strength can we win victory—and win we must—if we are unable to prevent the outbreak of war. And only through the provision of trained, determined men can we attain the strength essential to achieve either of these objectives.

The rendering of service to the Nation is no imposition upon the individual. It sometimes seems to me that people are too prone to feel sorry for themselves. The soldier is frequently called upon to endure discomfort, it is true. He may have to accept real hardship and grave danger. Sometimes he is called upon to make the supreme sacrifice and lay down his life for the cause he defends.

None of this is new. Such sacrifices have been made throughout the history of man. Our own history is replete with them. Nothing is free. Nothing worthwhile is cheap. The service we perform, the sacrifice we may be called upon to make constitute the price we must be ready to pay to preserve for the future the blessings of liberty and justice, of human dignity and of individual freedom which have been handed on to us from the past.

It has been said that all true love includes a willingness to sacrifice. Certainly love of country and of God must include that spirit.

To all of you, let me say that seldom have young officers been afforded more challenging opportunities, more engrossing tasks than those which will confront you after your entry upon active service.

To those of you who will enter the Army, let me say, never doubt the vital significance of the responsibilities which will be placed upon you as members of the Army of the United States. Among some circles today, there is sometimes a tendency to believe that modern wars may be quickly won by means of mass destruction weapons which will make unnecessary the operations of ground combat forces. No assumption could be more dangerous, if used as a basis for planning.

Entirely apart from the employment or nonemployment of mass destruction weapons, a primary issue in combat is the destruction of the enemy's will to fight. Experience indicates that, when a people is devoted to its cause, its will to fight endures as long as its capability of fighting continues. In short, enemy resistance would continue so long as enemy armed forces could continue in combat. Ultimately, only ground forces can defeat enemy ground forces. And because enemy air and naval forces must operate from land bases, the seizure and occupation of such enemy bases by ground forces are important contributions to the achievement of victory at sea and in the air.

And, finally, since defeat of the enemy armed forces is not an end in itself, but only a means to an end, the victory must be consolidated. Domination over land and the enemy people occupying it must be gained and maintained, and only ground forces have the capability of so doing.

Obviously, none of the Army's tasks and missions can be carried out effectively without full support and assistance from the air and naval members of the team. Control of the air and the sea is essential to the projection of our military power overseas. However, the location of Army units on the ground is a true index of the progress of armed warfare. There is a direct analogy in football. If your ball advances, you win. If it is pushed back, you lose.

As members of the Army, therefore, you will be part of a vitally important element of our military forces.

Whichever service you may enter, to develop and maintain the proficiency necessary to carry out your responsibilities, you will find that your talents, your skills, and your energy will be called upon to the utmost.

You must maintain an open mind. There is no mind so fine today that it sees solutions to all the tremendous problems which we all perceive in the military field alone.

We are passing through a period of transition. There is a greater requirement than ever for mental flexibility.

As new weapons become available you will have to master new techniques. In the Army, for example, already we have such weapons as the Honest John rocket, the Corporal guided missile for surface-to-surface firing, and the Nike antiaircraft guided missile. We have the 280-mm. gun, capable of firing either conventional or atomic projectiles and capable, also, of operating effectively regardless of conditions of weather or visibility. We have recently announced the development of the "Bat," a 106-mm. recoilless cannon designed for antitank use. We have still other new weapons, including a number still under test and design, some of which you will doubtless have occasion to work with. In addition to weapons as such, there have been many innovations—and there will be more—in vehicles, in communications, in electronics.

All these advances in technology are having a marked influence upon tactics and tactical organization. One effect is that tactical deployments will entail much greater dispersion, both laterally and in depth. Necessarily, significant responsibility for tactical decisions will be delegated still farther down the chain of command. As a result, the responsibilities—and consequently the opportunities—which will be granted to you even as very junior officers will be substantially greater than has ever been true before.

Partly for this reason the opportunities which you will have for leadership will also be increased. You will be granted the chance to direct the activities of the soldiers who, when properly led, have repeatedly proved themselves the finest fighting men in the world.

When I first came into the service the drill regulations provided that a second lieutenant marching with his company was a "file closer"—he brought up the rear, it was said, like the tail on a dog but not half so useful. If there was ever any truth in that desription, it long since disappeared. Today the responsibilities of all officers, however junior in rank, are very great indeed.

Never forget, however, that you are responsible for your men, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and that your success as an officer rests solidly upon them. Their intelligence, their enthusiasm, their ingenuity, and their initiative are among the strongest assets which

our Army has, but the responsibility for bringing out these qualities will rest squarely upon you. It is the greatest challenge you can face, for you will be working with the finest material there is—American youths—and your success with them will bring commensurate success throughout your life.

Finally I want to mention the implications to you of the fact that units of our Armed Forces are standing guard at points throughout the free world.

In all likelihood, you will spend a good part of your active service overseas. As a member of such a unit, you will be charged with a share of the vital task of keeping up our guard against any sudden assault. In standing ready, you will not be merely going through a drill or an exercise for its own sake. The proficiency which you develop, the alertness which you maintain will constitute the index of our hope for success in building the collective strength through which war may be prevented and through which, if it cannot be prevented, it can be won.

Although the responsibilities you face are weighty ones, you are fortunate in the excellence of the preparation which you are being given, militarily and academically, to assume them.

Under the guidance of General Clark, the eminent soldier, whose courageous leadership is known world-wide, assisted by the distinguished members of the faculty and staff of this splendid school, you are acquiring skills through which you will go out to serve the Nation, whatever your profession, in the magnificent manner which your predecessors have taught us to expect of Citadel men.

And you are being granted something else of value equal to the academic training you are receiving. That is a sense of tradition, of continuity, of dedication to the preservation of those spiritual values which are the basis of all that we know and have of real and unchanging worth.

Finally, to you is being given a limitless opportunity, the opportunity for useful, meaningful service to your families, your communities, and your country. I know of no higher opportunity to which anyone could aspire.

The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1955

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Adm. Robert B. Carney, United States Navy, Chief of Naval Operations, before The Citadel, Charleston, S. C., Monday, January 24, 1955:

EDUCATION AND LEADERSHIP

The contributions and accomplishments that have been made by the graduates and faculty of this distinguished military college form an important part of America's past. Famous deeds and famous names have become a part of this institution's heritage. One whose magnificent accomplishments in wars both hot and cold will be indelibly inscribed in our history is that of your president, Gen. Mark Clark.

Our Nation is indeed fortunate in having this great military leader here at Citadel where he can continue to lead and inspire such young men as I see in this audience.

The Citadel performs a unique function and service in the American scheme of things in that it gives a selected group of young citizens insight and training into the essential requirements of citizenship; it emphasizes the citizens' responsibility in rising to the defense of this country. What is more important, by the nature of its ideals, traditions and academic standards, Citadel stresses development in the field of leadership; and responsible leadership is urgently needed today.

It becomes more apparent every day that our system of education is being posed with a greater challenge than we have ever known before. Both in government and industry, there is an ever-growing need for wider understanding of the interrelation between sound economics and national security. The time has passed when it is enough for a military man to be familiar with the tactics of his particular service arm or for the civilian to pleasantly limit himself to the civic affairs of his own community.

The nature of the world we live in is such that if general war should come again, not a man, woman, or child would be unaffected; more than that, virtually every citizen would be confronted with the responsibility of his own personal care in a desperate effort to survive. This stark reality is being brought home to people as never before by the growing awareness that we are no longer insulated by the oceans and the Arctic wastes. If this great test of national effort should ever come, every military man would be vitally concerned with the affairs of industry and civilian defense; and every nonuniformed contributor would, in some measure, need to have knowledge of military requirements in order that they can be intelligently supplied and fulfilled. Toward the top of the ladder of national effort, where the great decisions must be made, there will be a corresponding requirement for a greater and broader understanding of human affairs. All of these things point to a need for broadening the scope of our national educational system with the difficult concomitant of increasing the amount of actual precise knowledge of an ever-expanding list of subjects. Actually, these are the only principles on which an effective educational structure can be built.

Education, today, must serve the dual purpose of supplying adequate personnel to the Armed Forces and continuing the uninterrupted flow of trained men to fill our other vital national needs, including our international commitments.

Always, there is the intense awareness of the fact that the incredibly complex organism which is the United States will need at every level a wise and informed leadership.

If one single attribute were to be singled out as the most important foundation-stone of leadership, there can be little doubt that it would be labeled "knowledge."

In the past, and perhaps under some circumstances still to be encountered, the rare personal quality that inspires others to follow may suffice to bring about the desired results. There are those men, who without apparent effort, have the gift to inspire subordinates to superlative effort. There have been occasions in military action when a dashing offensive spirit was enough to turn the tide of victory. But for every such opportunity and for every such man, there have been thousands and thousands of situations where saberwaving was not enough. Knowledge, and knowledge alone, will enable the men at the top, in positions of heavy responsibility, to evaluate the myriad factors and make the wise decisions. If this premise is accepted, and it would be hard to deny, it is all too apparent that a heavier burden is placed on leadership in these days of fantastically rapid and radical change than at any time in our history.

The wisdom that is essential in handling our national and international affairs is not so much a wealth of specialized knowledge as it is skill in handling problems that involve many diverse and sensitive viewpoints which must be applied to new situations. Wisdom of this general sort will always require the help of experts, so there is a continuing need for some men to specialize in specialties and others to specialize in specialists.

The ability to think and to make sound decisions in areas where uncertainty is the dominant note is not something easily and quickly attained. It is wisdom that cannot be achieved by shallow methods or by shortcuts or by undisciplined mentalities. It can only be acquired after hard work and much practice. There is no shortcut in developing the ability to think constructively and make wise decisions in the field of human relationships. There is no quick and easy formula, no slogan and no label that will replace the trials, disappointments, and general experience factors that are involved in acquiring this sort of a general education.

Man learns slowly, and if he keeps up to date, he must learn constantly. He learns by composition of study, experiment, conversation with informed men, and association. He learns through books, travel, human contact, and personal experience. He learns, too, by his own mistakes; and he can also learn by the mistakes that are made by others. There is no substitute for repetitive experiences in the acquisition of knowledge and in the building of character.

Thus, you can understand why the military emphasizes the drill. It is the basis of indoctrination and discipline. It inculcates a skill to the point where it becomes automatic reaction.

If our young people are to have confidence in themselves and faith in themselves, they must be given assignments involving challenge. The more gifted children should be given more complicated problems, and greater opportunity to forge ahead. The exceptional mentality should never be sacrificed to mediocre conformity and particularly so in these perilous times which are testing and challenging all of us to our utmost capacity. The mentality that can see ahead and formulate new ideas needs encouragement today.

It is a sobering thought in light of today's brainpower needs and capabilities that fewer than half our people with mental capacity for higher learning actually go to college. Regardless of the individual's mental capacity, his brain must actually be put to work and challenged if it is to be improved.

In the field of leadership, the handmaiden of knowledge is the ability to be articulate. Knowledge and ideas do little good if retained in a vacuum; they must be conveyed to others in a highly skilled manner.

It should be pointed out also that knowledge, in itself, is not enough. Nor is leadership alone a proper goal because evil men can acquire knowledge, achieve brilliance, and become leaders. The spiritual values were never more important than they are today, beset as we are by the plausible-sounding truth distorters in the Kremlin.

The question that quite naturally confronts each of us is to what extent international communism actually threatens our individual lives. Today, we are encouraged by the strengthening of our alliance and the strengthening of our retaliatory capabilities which all, added together, would seem to any rational man to make aggression less probable.

But the Communists' pattern of aggression is sometimes hard to discern. The point to remember is this: The Communists are covertly attacking our liberties every hour of the day, every day of the year, and have been since the end of World War II; they are continuously on the offensive, if not on the battlefield, then in the free press, free

speech, and free economy, to serve their own black and loathsome purposes.

What may cause optimism today is the apparent improvement in our own situation rather than from any dimunition of threat to our form of government. The threat, in terms of international communism's purpose and methods, is just as great today as it ever was.

One of the most insidious aspects of communistic methods is their perverted usage of our own Anglo-Saxon words. Today, before our young people are old enough to fully comprehend and appreciate the true meaning of such words as "freedom" and "democracy," they are hearing these wonderful, meaningful words mouthed by the Communists in their effort to deceive and confuse. For instance, they label a satellite dictatorship, such as they are running in North Korea, as the People's Democratic Republic. They call us warmongering imperialists when they, themselves, state that it is their avowed purpose to gain control by force, if necessary, of our democratic processes. They call us reactionaries when, in fact, it is their government that is writing one of the most tyrannical chapters in world history.

The Soviets are constantly strengthening their armed forces quantitatively and qualitatively. They are developing new weapons and new uses of weapons. Their economy is expanding as is their interest in maritime matters. And the cells of their political structure are still being imbedded in every nook and cranny of the universe.

The truth is, then, that we need great national power as never before. We need technological achievement and a reservoir of trained personnel as never before.

In comparing the two education systems—ours and theirs—we see that the Soviet Union implements its requirements from the top down. They start with the needs of the state and educate from the realization that they must have trained experts to support their aggressive aim. Any benefits that might accrue to the individuals are simply byproducts.

In contrast, the American education system is designed to serve the purposes of the individual by offering him the opportunity to pursue the things in which he is most interested. The national needs of the United States are served as a result of our educational achievements from the bottom up.

We must recognize that despite the inherent political and ideological restraints of the Soviet Union's communistic society, she is making both quantitative and qualitative improvement in planning and coordinating her educational requirements to go forward with her economic, military, and political plans. She is placing increasing emphasis on scientific advancement in her educational system, both in her universities and her secondary schools, and in the engineering field she is reported to be graduating nearly twice as many specialists as are we.

I have been speaking of precise knowledge in the precise sciences, but there are cultural and political sciences, the mastery of which is just as essential, not only for safety but for progress. Perhaps the greatest of these is the science of understanding people—not just the people of your own nation or your own community, not just the people with similar sociological and political experiences—but an understanding of the historical and political backgrounds which underlie the thinking of the peoples of other nations.

Many of the international frictions which plague us in our effort to band together under the banner of freedom can be charged to ignorance of our neighbors' backgrounds.

The thing that we call freedom stems from the fierce determination of our early settlers to escape the old way of life and to build something new of their own choosing. The Government which we evolved arose out of our pioneering and our revolt against Old World customs and systems. The same Old World geography is now populated with people who have known nothing but the system from which our forebears severed themselves.

Quite naturally we must expect a great divergence of viewpoint concerning such matters as government, sociology, community customs and educational viewpoints. But even when we are not prepared to agree with the modes of life or the philosophy of other people, we should seek to understand the reasons behind their hopes and their fears, for in no other way can we hope to achieve the real human accord which is absolutely essential for harmony and security.

Illustrative of this is the splendid NATO concept—a field in which I had the great privilege of serving at one time.

In southern Europe where I labored in this cause were nations, which in my lifetime, had been at each others throats. There were fears and suspicions centuries old. Those ancient enmities and apprehensions existed in some measure in the hearts of the individual people when, by the stroke of the NATO pen, they found themselves allied together. It took more than the stroke of the pen to overcome those feelings of doubt and warniess; and yet, in an incredibly short time, these feelings did change in great measure. Of course, at times, there were understandable reluctance and hesitation. This is why, earlier in my talk, while discussing the great problem of security which confronts the free world today, I stressed the fact that it cannot be solved by the politician alone, nor the diplomat alone, nor the soldier alone. If the urgently needed results are to be achieved, it requires, at every level, leadership built of an appropriate measure of all the components—political, spiritual, economic, military, and perhaps most important of all, an historical understanding which leads to a tolerant and useful understanding of the workings of other men's minds. There is a terrific challenge for this kind of leadership.

One of the lessons that stands out from my experience in dealing with the problems of others is that they must be approached with patience and an understanding of other points of view, and a firm resolve to find a mutually acceptable solution. When men of good will, wisdom, and tolerance approach problems in this manner, progress can be achieved. And, if there is one educational clarion call, it is the need for a breadth of education to the end that all of the free countries develop enlightened leadership—enlightened in the field of the problems of neighbors as well as their own.

If we are to cope with today's perpetrators of falsehood and deception, our most important long-range objective must be the achievement of an alliance possessing a more solid base in free nations, in armed might, in raw materials, in industry, and educational productivity than the Communists are able to command.

Our capacity to accomplish this long-range objective is transitory; and its success depends on the free peoples of the free nations, mutually understanding each other, the threat that exists to them in common, plus the will to maintain sufficient strength—moral and physical—to overcome this threat.

In short, the situation calls for a national and international educational effort to the end that we all have leaders who can keep pace with an environment that is constantly changing.

Every literate citizen has a responsibility in this undertaking to know what freedom really is, and, as far as is humanly possible, to be conversant with the factors in order that he can explain them to others. Freedom must be related to every phase of personal and national life; we must understand the rights and the responsibilities of freedom, the techniques of individual and mass persuasion in accordance with free world concepts.

As far as our military needs are concerned, the machines of modern war are so complex that they can neither be conceived, built, nor operated by uneducated men. They require the best brains that we can develop. These mentalities, as they grow and develop, must be dovetailed with those who toil in the realms of politics and economics. We must always remember that wars are not won by weapon alone. They are won by men who know and believe in the principles for which they fight. The more knowledge a man has, the more potentially capable he is of rendering a service to himself, his community, his country, and the world.

I would like to leave this thought in conclusion: The mere defense of our land and our own way of life, even when we are defending ethical and moral principles, constitutes a defensive attitude. In this day and age, there is no earthly reason to be defensive about the great ideal we believe in, which, in its simplest terms, is the achievement of the maximum measure of freedom and fair play for the people of all nations. Our individual efforts of the future must not be predicated on the defense of our way of life but rather on the creative principle that we will help it spread and flourish for all men.

Which brings me back to my topic—education and leadership. The type of leadership needed in this era can only evolve from a system of education which inculcates a vast knowledge, and trains men to assimilate and sort out the facts and factors for profitable use. The country should be thankful for institutions such as this where both sides of the medallian—civic and military—can be exhibited, explained, and accepted as the cornerstone of the leadership which alone can keep us on the path to a shining destiny.

Engineers and Our National Well-Being

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1955

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the 84th Congress I introduced H. R. 286 which has as its purpose the establishment of scientific scholarships throughout the United States in order to meet the needs of the national defense and the general welfare as to scientific training.

My friend and former constituent, Donald A. Quarles, now Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Development, has made a most interesting address on the subject of Engineers and Our National Well-Being. Because of the wide interest in scientific development, I include this very fine address in the RECORD:

ENGINEERS AND OUR NATIONAL WELL-BEING

(Address by Donald A. Quarles, Assistant Secretary of Defense, at First Annual Assembly of the Engineers Joint Council, New York, N. Y., January 21, 1955)

Ladies and gentlemen, it gives me a great deal of satisfaction to take part in this First Annual Assembly of the Engineers Joint Council. As an officer and director of the American Institute of Electrical Engineers, I have been much interested in EJC and the progress of its organizational growth. I have

felt and still feel that unless or until another unity organization is created, EJC should be the senior policy body representing the engineering profession. In saying this, I am aware that there are still important segments of the profession not represented on the council. The present membership is, however, so broadly representative of the profession that in professional matters I feel the council is entitled to assume and should assume this role of spokesman for the United States engineering fraternity.

I particularly appreciate the opportunity to address you on this occasion as a number of matters stand out in my mind as deserving the thoughtful attention of the profession. I realize that these are not new subjects and, in fact, that most of them are already receiving the active consideration of those assembled here. Since the subjects I would discuss all touch on national security policy in one form or another, I think it would be appropriate for me to say something about our security position vis-a-vis the Communist world. This, as you appreciate, has many facets, including our mutual security ties with the rest of the free world, our economic position, our military strength in being, and what might be called our cold war or psychological position. Because this is so big and complex a question, I think I should limit myself to the strictly technical aspect of it in which engineers would naturally have a primary interest. Viewed in this aspect, the cold war is a technological race with the Communist world. The question is how our team is doing in the race.

If there is any doubt in anybody's mind that weapon technology is a very important factor in our cold-war position, I remind you that even at the present state of development, 1 airplane in 1 trip can deliver at great distances a bomb load to knock out 1 large city. This means that research and development efforts to increase the effectiveness of the payload, to improve the means and reliability of delivering it, and conversely, efforts to defend against it, tend to dominate our national-security program.

At the end of World War II it seemed evident that we had a fairly comfortable technological margin over the Communist world and, in fact, it is probably not an exaggeration to say that our air/atomic advantage was a principal factor in maintaining a balance of power and, consequently, a semblance of peace. In the decade that has followed, however, the Soviets have made very great strides in improving their technical position not only in the atomic field, as evidenced by their atomic test in 1949 and their thermonuclear test in 1953, but also in the fields of aeronautics and electronics, both of which are essential to the effective exploitation of their atomic developments. The quality of the jet fighters they threw into the Korean war, and the advanced types of jet bombers they flashed in their last May Day air show are adequate evidence in the aeronautics field.

In electronics, the evidence has been more obscure. Their technical publications have boasted of their radio communications and navigational aids. One of these also states that "on bombers airborne radar devices are used as sighting devices for bombing various targets," and it shows typical illustrations of airborne radar PPI presentations. The Soviet air defense system is apparently not unlike our own with GCI radars, IFF techniques, spotter networks, and so forth. They have, of course, a very great incentive to build up a defense against our atomic retaliatory forces. We got our first concrete evidence of their electronic progress when we saw what a gigantic and sophisticated system they had built up to jam our Voice of America broadcasts.

In the summer of 1953, we saw another very significant straw in the wind when the U. S. S. R. sent their modern cruiser *Sverdlow* to the British coronation ceremonies, bristling not only with guns but with an assortment of search and fire-control radar antennas very comparable with one of our own cruisers of similar tonnage.

Perhaps the most important thing the Communists have done has been to modernize their educational system and to orient it strongly toward the physical sciences and industrial technology. As a result of very comprehensive work along these lines, they have increased their scientific and technological potential by an order of magnitude, and, as others have pointed out, they are today turning out engineers and scientists at more than twice the rate we are in this country. If current trends continue, it will only be a matter of a few years before their scientific and technical manpower exceeds our own.

This is not to imply that even with such numbers they would have a stronger technological base than we, since this depends on many things besides numbers. We would still have the stronger and more virile industrial system, and there is no question in my mind about our ability to stay out ahead in this technological race. In the military field, however, it is clear that we are competing with a single-mindedness of purpose and a ruthless concentration on the aims of militant communism that constitute a serious challenge to our way of life in the free world.

Fortunately, this situation is clearly recognized by our Government, and our national policy has been shaped to meet it. President Eisenhower stated this clearly in his recently publicized letter to the Secretary of Defense. The President said in part that—

"Due to the destructiveness of modern weapons and the increasing efficiency of long-range bombing aircraft, the United States has reason, for the first time in its history, to be deeply concerned over the serious effects which a sudden attack could conceivably inflict upon our country * * * Because scientific progress exerts a constantly increasing influence upon the character and conduct of war, and because America's most precious possession is the lives of her citizens, we should base our security upon military formations which make the maximum use of science and technology to minimize the numbers of men. * * * Security must be founded on a strong and expanding economy."

This all suggests that we should have a careful look at the course we are following in the conservation of our scientific and technical manpower. Quite obviously in a long-range sense, our technical position vis a vis the Communist world will be strongly influenced by the way we handle this manpower problem.

It is thus important for us to work toward national policies that enhance and conserve engineering manpower. The dilemna we are now in about drafting engineers is a case in point. There are good policy reasons for insisting that no young man escape the sacrifice that other young men must make in military service. On the other hand, engineers are scarce and, if we are to sustain a program that will keep us out ahead in this technological race, our need for engineers and scientists must be expected to increase rather than decrease.

This is a problem that we must deal with on a strictly national-interest basis. If we are to win this race, our manpower must be disposed to our greatest national advantage. The military services require some specialists in the performance of their missions. Beyond this, we cannot afford to put engineers and scientists into uniforms.

As you know, we have some important decisions to make along these lines in the months immediately ahead. The Selective Service Act expires on June 30, 1955, and legislation is required to replace it and also to bring our reserve program into line with present-day realities. In this connection, I recently arranged for discussions between members of the Engineering Manpower Commission, the Scientific Manpower Commission, and Mr. Burgess, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Personnel. I hope that further discussions can be held, not only with responsible officials in the Department of Defense, but also before other Government officials and the congressional committees that will work on the legislation.

There are also educational aspects of this problem that the Engineering and Scientific Manpower Commissions have addressed themselves to and that deserve the active support of the profession. Best utilization of available engineers requires, too, that industrial and other employers recognize an obligation to develop the full potential of each engineer and to avoid waste of his talents on nontechnical duties.

One aspect of this matter that I should mention briefly is the heavy concentration of our technical manpower on defense and defense-related work. In the latter category I include the atomic weapon and military reactor work of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the research work of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics in the aerodynamics and aircraft propulsion fields. It is estimated that these defense lines use about one-half of the total research and development potential of the country. This is not to say that the results of these programs are useful exclusively for defense, as there are, of course, many by-products of value to our civilian economy; nor does it imply that the nondefense half of the total national research and development effort is without benefit to defense since, in the long-range sense, defense technology is founded, in large measure, on the fundamental research in our universities and other similar institutions, and on the technology developed in our civilian industry.

In my judgment, this great concentration of our scientific and technological resources on the problems of defense is not only justified but necessitated by the world situation in which we find ourselves. To do less would jeopardize our position of technological superiority so essential to our long-term security. On the other hand, to attempt to use directly on defense projects a bigger proportion of our total potential might be unwise as a long-term program, particularly when one considers the interdependence of the military and civilian fields.

Atomic energy has been a key topic of this assembly. There is no doubt in my mind that it deserves this kind of treatment. Some here have been associated with the program from its earliest beginning. One might say we are just entering the third era—the first was research and crash military development culminating in the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombs; the second was also dominated by the military requirements, culminating in our 1954 thermonuclear experiments; and the third or power reactor phase had its roots in the first two but might be said to have been ushered in by the launching of the *Nautilus* a year ago. Several significant things have happened since. Congress passed the Cole-Hickenlooper Atomic Energy Act last summer which opened up the field for private enterprise to come in and develop it for the greater good and welfare of the country. In line with the President's leadership, Congress also made provision for sharing our very valuable power-reactor know-how and even moderate amounts of nuclear materials with other countries to make it possible for them to share with us the great benefits of this new technology. On Labor Day, the President, by remote control, broke ground for the

first large commercial powerplant, first in this country, and so far as we know, first of its size and kind in the world. This, in fact, is just one instance of the many ways in which our Atomic Energy Commission is cooperating with private industry in this field.

Looking to the future, the Commission is spending an estimated $8.5 million a year on general reactor research and development work and is well into a 5-year civilian power reactor development program estimated to cost nearly $200 million. The program calls for the building of five power reactors of as many different types, which were chosen to be the most promising for eventually leading to economic power.

While all of these are experimental and only one can be called large, they will serve for a period of testing and operation and as the prototypes of large plants where the experimental results are sufficiently promising.

Nuclear power is also of great potential military importance and, in addition to the *Nautilus* there are half a dozen military projects underway, notably to apply nuclear propulsion to aircraft, to large naval vessels as well as submarines, and to an Army project for the development of a semiportable powerplant for field use.

There is, of course, a close interplay between this military project and the general reactor development mentioned earlier. Taken as a whole they constitute a very broad and progressive national program that will, no doubt, have a very important impact on the development of the industry, both in this country and abroad, in this last half of the 20th century.

One can hardly deal with the matter of nuclear power without raising a basic question of national policy as to the proper place of the Government in this field. The question is complicated by the fact that, for good and sufficient reasons, the Government arrives at the present crossroads with an absolute monopoly in the field, and with national security reasons for perpetuating some aspects of the monopoly. This poses a difficult question. On the one hand it is apparent that, if we really believe in free enterprise and in getting the Government out of all business activities except those that are necessary in the public interest and that cannot be properly performed by private enterprise, then the time certainly has come to start getting the Government out of the atomic power business. On the other hand, there are plausible arguments that the people's money has been spent to develop the art and to produce the fissionable or nuclear fuel materials and that the Government should therefore exploit and operate the power plants for the people. Of course, the hitch in this argument is the hidden premise that Government operation of such power systems would be in the best interest of the people. I, at least, believe that it would not and therefore I take great satisfaction in the enactment by Congress of the Cole-Hickenlooper Act which, while not proscribing Government operation, wisely provided for an orderly transition to private ownership and operation of nuclear-power facilities.

In closing I should like to return to a subject I touched on in my opening remarks, namely the organization of the engineering profession. This subject has been worked over on so many different occasions by so many different groups and with such care and competence that I offer my views with some trepidation. Without further apology, however, I suggest:

1. That the guiding principle should be to serve the public welfare; and only to serve the interests of groups of engineers, no matter how large, to the extent that this is incidental to serving the public welfare. I believe this is in the enlightened self-interest of the profession.

2. The unity organization should have professional standards of membership. Membership should be open to all who meet such standards, either directly or through membership in a constituent society. I feel that State registration should not be a necessary requirement, at least under present circumstances.

3. The unity organization should be effective in developing the views of the profession; in developing policy for the profession; and in representing the profession in the formulation of national policy. If this kind of effectiveness can only be achieved by individual dues-paying membership then I am for such membership but this has never seemed to me to be a paramount consideration. I am sure, however, that the federation concept will only work if there is a sense of urgency in the member bodies to make it work.

It is tremendously heartening to see this enthusiastic assembly of representatives, not only of the constituent societies of EJC but also of many other national and regional bodies with the common bond of professional interest in the engineering field. It is obvious that great progress is being made in drawing the profession together under a unity organization, and I pay tribute to the many leaders of the profession who have contributed to this end, including the first president of the expanded EJC, Mr. Pigott on my right, and our chairman, Dean Saville on my left, who is just embarking on his second very noteworthy term as president of our joint council.

I appreciate more than I can tell you, the opportunity you have given me to take part in this historic first assembly.

Total Defense or Total War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1955

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, on next Monday, February 7, I expect to reintroduce my concurrent resolution providing for a study of the economics of atomic defense by a joint committee of the Congress. In the 83d Congress this was House Concurrent Resolution 229. In this connection there follows a speech I delivered at a luncheon of members of the National Planning Association last December:

TOTAL DEFENSE OR TOTAL WAR

Today, I will attempt to raise questions not to answer them. But before doing even that there must be some preliminaries.

In the first place, let us assume, and we are supported by the excellent NPA study of Gerhardt Colm, that the American economy can afford much larger expenditures for total defense than those currently being made or planned.

Secondly, let us assume that in 15 years or less the Communist bloc will possess large numbers of guided missiles with atomic and hydrogen warheads and speed of thousands of miles an hour and that there will be no effective way of preventing most of such missiles from arriving in the vicinity of their targets.

Today the United States still has a lead in the air-atomic armaments race. So-called massive retaliation even now can force stalemate in terms of the big war. However, we and our allies apparently have neither the programs nor the forces to prevent the deterioration in our position in the Far East which is so evident in Indochina.

There are many ways to lose freedom. It need not disappear in a cataclysmic clap of atomic thunder. It may. But its strength may also be destroyed by the less dramatic destruction of peoples, seduced or conquered by more conventional totalitarian tactics.

From one point of view, the point of view of previous poorer performances, it may be said that the democracies have done well in their efforts since 1946. From another point of view, that of the future, it may be that we have only done well enough to prolong a process leading to an ultimate defeat. That we have not yet arrived at the point where defeat is inevitable is my conviction. I am equally convinced that unless we do better than we have in preparing our defenses our defeat may soon become inevitable.

Some of us believe that one of the primary reasons for that condition is the fact that we have never succeeded in arriving at a balanced and whole policy of advancing democracy, or, if you insist, of defense against Communist aggression. Today there must be not a foreign policy, a defense policy and a domestic policy, but one policy which includes all these and is the policy.

Most of us here will agree that our efforts beyond our shores depend on a growing domestic economy. Without an effective foreign policy to maintain and strengthen the coalition of democratic peoples, an air-atomic striking force twice as large as necessary would not save us. Without adequate strength in the more familiar weapons of warfare there can be no effective policy to prevent the gradual destruction of the nations which seek to practice democracy but are not yet in a position to defend their sovereignty. Without the best in early warning, continental air defense and civil defense, an enemy is actually encouraged to have hope of success in an all-out stab-to-the-heart attack.

There have been too many special pleaders, too many over-simplifications, too many exaggerations by the proponents of one element or another of the whole defense we need. No one method of defense will succeed without the others. And we need not choose from among necessaries because we think we cannot afford all.

It was with these points in mind that early last summer House Concurrent Resolution 229 which provides for a study by a special joint committee of Congress into the economics of atomic defense was introduced.

The details of the resolution are not too important. It will be reintroduced, perhaps with some modifications. But what it might lead to could be very important. It may even be that whether or not Congress acts on it will prove to be the difference between war and peace. You notice the use of the word "may," not some more positive word. Frankly, no one knows whether effective dispersion of people and plants is practicable or wise. I strongly suspect that it is. I even suspect as I said before that effective dispersion can tip the balance to peace. But I do not know this for the simple reason that the facts do not exist upon which to base an intelligent decision.

Excellent studies have been made in this area—once excellent but now largely out of date because they were based on the existence of A-bombs only. One hears that various top-level members of the administration are studying the new problems raised by the H-bomb. What they will come up with I do not know. But I have the impression that at least some of their minds are frozen in the notion that a balanced budget is essential to our defense.

At any event, right now we do not have the facts on which to base a decision. Presumably if there were no limits to the amount of money and effort we could expend and if we did not care what happened to our free society, the decision to disperse effec-

tively would have been made and implemented long ago. But since there are limits on our resources and our effort is directed to strengthening a free society, there are preliminary questions which must be answered before we can intelligently answer the larger question.

But, you say, we do have a governmental policy of dispersal, promulgated years ago. Many plants have been dispersed. Fine, but the indications are that the choicest target areas have actually grown more attractive. Apparently, as one man moved out of an area more than one moved in. If one factory dispersed, larger ones did not. Our efforts have not been adequate to achieve our purpose. The problem of concentration still remains.

Here are a few of the questions which must be asked. If today much of our population and industrial strength is concentrated in 70 urban areas, each a prize target for enemy attack, how much safer can we make ourselves by reducing our concentration by 100 percent? By 500 percent? How much more effort would it take for an enemy to effectively attack 350 urban areas rather than just 70? Would the problems of our own military defense be increased five times also? What would such a program do toward making civil defense easier and more effective? Or would dispersion in fact make civil defense harder? Or does the dreadful area of radiation contamination, which an H-bomb explosion creates, make the whole problem of civil defense impossible?

Let us suppose the answers to all these questions demonstrated that selective dispersion would be very valuable as a defense measure—as a measure of defense so effective as to play a real part in deterring an enemy, willing to use surprise attack, from launching such an attack. Then we must answer the even more difficult questions of how to accomplish dispersion.

What would be the cost of this massive task? How long would it take? Who would pay for it? By what means? How could it be accomplished without using the methods of authoritarianism? In other words, how could the people in a society in which each individual homeowner and entrepreneur has and must have a large area of free choice, be persuaded that it is in their interests to participate in dispersal—even at some inconvenience or perhaps personal or corporate cost? And, of course, the people's participation would include paying for dispersion personally or through some level of government.

Unless I am in error, well-founded answers to most of these questions are not available. In part, no doubt, because of the swiftness of events. We read that the last hydrogen bomb greatly exceeded in yield even the expectations of its inventors. It is perhaps not much of an exaggeration to say that the age of fusion is as different from the age of fission as the latter is from that ancient day, 10 years ago, when all man had was blockbusters. Our minds, our imaginations lag behind. And this lag, of course, may be more fatal to mankind than radiation.

There is no reason why we should not have the answers to all the questions which must be answered before we can decide the big question of the desirability and the feasibility of dispersion. We do not have them because too few of us have asked the questions and demanded answers. I believe that we have the ingenuity to devise means of encouraging the people in our mixed economy to disperse their homes and their places of business without spending more money than we can afford and without significantly decreasing the number or character of our free choices. I believe that dispersion can significantly decrease our vulnerability to surprise attack by making the chances of success in such an attack much less likely. But in this case, much more than the belief of a few is needed. We must have facts and conclusions. It is not that these facts are so difficult to obtain. Rather we have not bothered to get them. Certainly, it need not cost as much as even one atomic bomber to determine the answers to these questions and the others we need to answer. Should the answers add up to the conclusion that dispersion would not be practicable or effective, that, in itself, would be important and valuable. But should the studies reveal that dispersion can be effective and that ways can be devised to achieve effective dispersion without undue strain either on our economy or our institutions, then the cause of peace might be advanced appreciably.

In our ignorance there is no bliss. Freedom cannot afford such ignorance.

I care not at all whether these studies are made by Congress, the Executive, or private groups. I care only that we use to the fullest that great advantage which democracy has over totalitarianism, its ability, at least in greater measure, to make decisions based on facts and to constantly seek for more facts and more knowledge. Our discipline is that of self. We have nothing to be proud of in the history of our attempt as a people to pretend that first the A-bomb and now the H-bomb do not exist. We must face the facts, but first we must know them.

Surplus Disposal Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1955

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of a statement by the Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Ezra Taft Benson.

Mr. Speaker, I have been disturbed in recent days by statements on the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities that give a completely erroneous impression of the program and the achievements of Secretary Benson. I refer to a newspaper article on Monday quoting the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] as being highly critical of the Secretary, and to an address at the annual meeting of the National Agricultural Limestone Producers by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. This address has now been inserted in the RECORD, where it appears on pages 895–898, and I feel that it is unjustly critical of the Department of Agriculture. Many members who attended the annual meeting of the limestone association will recall the following statements by the gentleman from Mississippi:

What was not in the President's speech is the fact that his administration is trying to give these commodities away under Public Law 480 without even offering them for sale for dollars, under the general authority of the law. The administration's approach would continue to hold an umbrella over world prices.

Representatives of the United States Government are going around the world trying to give away to foreign countries that which they will not offer for sale, commodities which they have the authority to sell but which they will not sell, all to add to foreign aid.

In another part of this talk Mr. WHITTEN says:

The prices of farm products have declined about 25 percent since February 1951. The cost of farming continues to increase. The net farm income in 1954 was down about 30 percent from 1951.

And the outlook is for still further declines in net farm income in 1955 because of the reduction in acreage of controlled crops and the low prices of nearly all farm products.

In reading these remarks and others in Mr. WHITTEN's speech, a totally erroneous impression of the efforts of the Department of Agriculture and of the condition of the American farmer would be gained.

On January 19 the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture, and I am sure that if Mr. WHITTEN had heard the testimony of the Secretary at that time he would not have made some of the remarks found in his address. I am not going to burden you today with all the testimony, but I do want to place in the RECORD portions of Secretary Benson's presentation before the Senate Agriculture Committee so that you may have a clear and accurate understanding of the handling of surplus farm commodities and the financial condition of the American farmer.

Mr. Benson had this to say:

GENERAL ECONOMIC SITUATION IS GOOD

At no time since the end of the Korean war has business optimism concerning the future of the American economy generally been stronger or more widespread than now. The longtime outlook for America is good.

Our country has been enjoying a period of relative economic stability during the past year. The widely advertised business readjustment of 1954 evidently reached its bottom about last July. The slow erosion of prices and business activity which had been in progress since shortly after the Korean boom halted then, and has turned up modestly. The upward course has been fairly steady, although not spectacular, for the past several months. Our economy is growing at a healthy rate, production is increasing absolutely and on a per worker basis, consumer incomes are rising, and higher average standards of living are in prospect.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-four was the second biggest economic year in the history of America. This was accomplished without war, with Federal Government expenditures down $11 billion and Federal taxes reduced over $7 billion. During 1954, for the first time in several years, American soldiers were not being shot at anywhere around the world. And yet we achieved a stable economy at a high level. The transition from post-Korean inflation to semipeace conditions was made with the least disturbance to our economy of any post-war economic adjustment in our history.

Truly the economic health of America is good.

Gross national production in 1955 will equal, probably exceed the 1954 level of $357 billion. It could even equal the record of $365 billion in 1953. It is reliably predicted that our gross production will reach $500 billion by 1965. This will mean an average increase of 20 percent for each of us, above our present living standards.

American agriculture will share in the growth and prosperity ahead of us, to the extent it continues to apply science and

technology to its production and merchandising. Continued high levels of employment and growing consumer incomes in this country will provide a continued strong domestic demand for the products of our farms. Moreover, we expect export outlets for farm products to be significantly larger than last year. This should also add strength to our domestic farm economy.

1954 PRODUCTION

Total agricultural production last year was substantially the same as the 1953 all-time high, despite widespread drought. With average growing conditions, another record or near-record output is expected in 1955. Some further reduction in wheat acreage is likely to be offset at least partially by increases in other crops, principally feed crops, since restrictions on the use of diverted acres have been relaxed.

Total output from agriculture in 1954 was 14 percent greater than in 1947, the year when net realized income from agriculture was at an all-time high. This output was produced by 18 percent fewer workers than we had on farms in 1947. This means that output per man was about 40 percent above the 1947 level and nearly double 1939, when World War II began. These comparisons give eloquent proof of the continuing technological revolution that has made American agriculture the most efficient in all the world.

FARM FINANCIAL SITUATION HAS STABILIZED

In this overall environment of a stable to strong general economy, American agriculture may also look forward to economic stability and continued growth. Although farm income has declined slightly more in the last year than has that of the general economy, it is significant that its decline has been very markedly slowed from the rapid drop of 2 years ago. The most rapid drop in farm prices and income occurred in 1951 and 1952 following the Korean inflation.

The price-parity ratio has been remarkably stable during the past year. It stood last month at 86, only 8 points below the figure for 23 months earlier when this administration assumed office. In the 23 months before January 1953, the price-parity ratio had dropped a total of 19 points.

Realized net income of farmers last year was approximately $12.5 billion. The United States farm income has about stopped its postwar decline. Net farm income in 1955 should approach that of 1954. Prices received by farmers may be expected to average close to the levels prevailing at the present time, and cost rates or prices paid by farmers probably will not change much in the year ahead. This means that the parity ratio, likewise, will remain fairly stable in the year ahead.

The small changes in farm income and farm prices between 1953 and 1954 suggest that most of the postwar adjustment has been completed, and that we are in a period of comparative stability. The adjustment agriculture has undergone the last few years has been difficult. However, statistics alone don't tell the full story.

While our total farm income was declining from 1947 to 1954 by some 25 percent, our farm population was also declining about 20 percent. This means, therefore, that per capita income in agriculture has declined markedly less than has total income. In the last 7 years, per capita income from agriculture has declined only about 5 percent. If we take account of the income that farm people receive from nonfarm sources, the realized per capita income of farm people from all sources actually increased 6 percent from 1947 to 1954.

It is essential that we maintain fluidity in our agricultural population. As we increase efficiency of our production of food and fiber, it is possible to do our production job with fewer workers on farms. This results in a higher living standard for our farmers as well as for our urban people.

PRODUCTION CONTROLS AND DIVERTED ACRES

Marketing quotas approved for wheat and cotton, along with the impending rice referendum, call for a reduction of about 9½ million acres in 1955 from the acreage planted to these crops in 1954. Most of this reduction is in wheat. The 1955 acreage allotment for the commercial corn producing area may be larger than the 1954 allotment, however.

This is the second consecutive year in which wheat and cotton acreages have been curtailed, and likewise the second successive year in which quotas for these crops have been established. In the absence of any minimums, the national wheat acreage allotment for 1955 would have been about 19 million acres instead of the 55 million acres proclaimed, and the cotton national acreage allotment about 15 million acres instead of the 18.1 million acres proclaimed.

This situation points up the fact that in 1955 we again face the question of how best to use acreage taken out of production of the basic commodities. In 1954 feed-grain plantings increased by 13 million acres over 1953 and flaxseed and soybeans increased by 4 million acres.

The sole purpose of production controls is to balance production with markets—actual and prospective. New market imbalances created by crops produced on diverted acres can offset in considerable measure the purpose of the original controls.

In 1955 we will be operating for the first year under our new farm program. In submitting that program we expressed the hope that it would increase both domestic consumption and exports to the point where controls would be reduced to a minimum. However, we must recognize that achievement of this objective will take time for some crops, such as wheat, where there are exceedingly large surpluses. In addition, it will depend upon the extent to which the acreage reduction is offset by higher per-acre yields.

SURPLUS DISPOSALS

The primary authority of the Department of Agriculture in the disposal of stocks acquired in price-support operations is contained in the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act and the amendments enacted by Congress from time to time. Under this authority, sales have been made from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks to the private United States trade totaling approximately $940 million during 1954. About $500 million of this total have been sold for export. The total value of all dispositions of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks during 1954 have totaled about $1,400,000,000.

Public Law 480 enacted by the 83d Congress broadened the existing authority for the disposal of price-support stocks. First, sales for foreign currency were authorized in addition to that provided in the mutual-security program administered by the Foreign Operations Administration. Second, the authority of the President to provide emergency relief abroad was broadened and made effective for a period of 3 years. Third, existing authority to make donations of price-support stocks to meet domestic and foreign relief needs was liberalized. Fourth, new impetus was given to the Commodity Credit Corporation's existing barter authority.

Since there has been so much interest expressed in the sales for foreign currency under title I of Public Law 480, I would like to give you a fairly complete report on this operation.

TITLE I, PUBLIC LAW 480

We are making real progress in the implementation of this authority. Agreements have already been signed with Turkey and Yugoslavia. We expect to be in position to issue purchase authorizations under the $85 million Japanese program by the end of January or early February. Some of the negotiations with other countries are now being concluded, and we believe we will be able to sign agreements with 2 or 3 of them by the end of this month. Programs negotiated or under negotiation total approximately $453 million against the $700 million authorized by the law. Therefore, present programs will utilize about two-thirds of the total funds authorized for a 3-year period. Finally, purchase authorizations have already been issued totaling about $60 million at export market value, including ocean transportation for wheat, barley, oats, and cotton under the Turkish and Yugoslav programs. Six cargoes of wheat have already been sold for prompt shipment by the private trade under the latter program.

This is concrete progress.

I know there has been some comment that there was delay in getting this program underway. In this connection, I want to emphasize that the safeguards and requirements contained in the statute necessitated careful planning of integrated country programs. This careful planning had to be implemented by painstaking and extended negotiations with the governments of the countries involved, in order to assure achievement of the purposes of the act, before agreements could be signed and sales made.

I said this is a new law. It is also a complex law affecting the interests of other agencies of the Government in addition to the Department of Agriculture. The law provides that agreements must be negotiated with foreign governments covering necessary standards and safeguards prior to sales for foreign currency. In addition to these matters directly affecting the sale and utilization of the agricultural commodities, it is necessary in negotiating agreements under the act to make provision for:

1. The protection of our usual marketings.
2. The uses of the foreign currency payments among the eight categories permitted under the law.
3. Appropriate exchange rates governing initial payments and exchange rate guaranties.
4. The terms, and method of administration and supervision of, any economic or multilateral trade development loans.
5. The deposit of foreign currency payments to special United States accounts.
6. United States cargo preference requirements.

It has been said that title I programs may endanger our normal marketings. This is certainly a possibility unless programs are carefully developed and carried out. We believe we are taking the necessary steps to prevent such interference. For example, in the Japanese program, we have obtained firm assurances from that government that purchases of about 175,000 bales of cotton for yen will be in addition to 775,000 bales which they will purchase with dollars. I think you will find general agreement in the cotton trade that this usual marketing figure is realistic in view of Japan's balance of payments situation.

The statement has been made that title I is a "give-away" program. Let's analyze this statement. The test of this point is the use to which the foreign currencies are put. Analysis of the programs within the $453 million target show that about 25 percent of the foreign currencies will be used to meet United States obligations. These obligations would otherwise be paid with appropriated funds. These are in effect dollar sales. About 5 percent of the currencies will be used to expand markets for United States agricultural commodities—about 12 percent to purchase strategic materials for the supplemental stockpile and 7 percent for other uses beneficial to the United States, author-

ized under the law. All of the above United States uses which total 49 percent are for the primary benefit of the United States.

About 38 percent of the foreign currencies will be loaned to foreign governments for economic development and multilateral trade purposes. These are not grants. They are loans which are to be repaid with interest, either in dollars or in foreign currency which can be used for any purpose of the United States. I can assure you that foreign governments do not consider the terms of those loans as "give-aways."

About 13 percent of the proceeds are scheduled to be used to strengthen the armed forces of friendly countries. While this use results in no return of materials to the United States, it will further the common defense effort of the free world.

We have been asked on several occasions for our estimates of the different commodities that will be included in the first year's program. It is not possible at this early date to give a clean-cut answer to this question because several of the negotiations are still underway. However, based on our experience to date, it appears that about 43 percent of the export market value of programs will be spent for grains, about 28 percent for cotton, 14 percent for tobacco, 7 percent for other commodities, and 8 percent for ocean transportation. These percentages are based on export market values rather than on CCC costs since the purchase authorizations to foreign governments will reflect export market values.

It is possible to indicate a tentative breakdown of the $453 million target by geographical areas. This breakdown is as follows:

	Millions
Western Europe	$205.5
South America	44.0
Middle East (Turkey)	30.3
Southeast Asia	173.0
Total	452.8

Title I is one of the immediate tools that we have for moving our surpluses abroad in a constructive manner. It is particularly helpful in assisting us to overcome the obstacles that have been confronting American agriculture in seeking markets abroad under the prevailing conditions which have resulted from foreign-exchange problems and restrictions on imports from the dollar area. But we must not lose sight of the fact that in the longer run our primary emphasis must be directed to sales for dollars based on our ability to deliver quality merchandise at prices competitive in world markets.

Under Title II of Public Law 480, surplus agricultural commodities may be furnished, out of CCC stocks and on a grant basis, to friendly governments or friendly peoples to assist in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements. Of the $300 million authorized for 3 years, on the basis of CCC investment in the commodities, programs already authorized or under active consideration in the first half of this year approximate $125 million. It has been estimated that additional commitments of $25 million will be required during the remainder of the first fiscal year under the program. Shipments authorized up to this time total $68 million of which $52 million is grain, $10 million is fats and oils, and $6 million in other categories.

SECTION 416 DONATIONS

Title III of Public Law 480 amends and liberalizes the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949 providing for the donation of price support commodities under Section 416. The new legislation authorizes CCC to pay reprocessing, packaging, handling, and distribution charges of commodities donated up to the time of delivery to a designated agency for domestic distribution or to shipside in case of distribution abroad.

The broadened authority has been extremely helpful in expanding the distribution of surplus foods to eligible groups in this country and abroad. During the July through December 1954 period, foods donated under this authority totaled 442 million pounds compared with 602 million pounds during the entire previous fiscal year. Donations to groups in this country totaled 244 million pounds in the last 6 months of 1954 compared with 418 million pounds during the previous fiscal year. Donations to welfare agencies for distribution abroad totaled 198 million pounds in the last half of 1954 compared with 184 million pounds during the entire 1953–54 fiscal year.

BARTER

No new legal authority for barter was added by section 303 of Public Law 480, but this legislation established a policy of encouraging the barter of surplus commodities for strategic materials or for goods required in the foreign assistance program or off-shore construction. Prior to the enactment of this legislation, the Department generally limited its barter activities under the CCC Charter Act to those materials which could be immediately transferred to the stockpile or to other agencies with full reimbursement to CCC. Under this policy, during the first 5 years of the barter program through last July 1, about $110 million in surplus agricultural commodities were exported under the program.

After Public Law 480 was enacted, the Office of Defense Mobilization established long term stockpile goals and agreed that it would request appropriations for strategic materials acquired by CCC within these long term goals. Under this arrangement, the CCC broadened its policies and is now accepting strategic materials for its own account within these goals for transfer at an appropriate time to the national stockpile.

As a result of the broadened program, barter activity has about doubled over the amount of barter previously being carried out. Over the last 6 months, barter commitments have been made for about $93 million, an amount almost equal to the value of total barter activity during the 5 years up to July 1, 1954. We expect that the barter program will reach a total of $200 million during the current fiscal year.

All operations are conducted through private United States trade. The materials acquired are accepted by CCC at prices not in excess of fair market values. CCC arranges to release from its own inventories against the barter contracts an equivalent value of agricultural commodities based on the export market prices established for sales within friendly nations of the world.

SECTION 402 OF THE MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1954, PUBLIC LAW 665

In addition to the sale of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies authorized by Public Law 480, section 402 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, Public Law 665, also provides for sales for foreign currencies. It requires that $350 million of the funds appropriated for FOA programs must be used for the sale of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies. Nearly one-third of this minimum, $103 million, had been authorized by the end of December. The Foreign Operations Administration has estimated that about 50 percent of these funds will be used for cotton, 30 percent for grains, 15 percent for fats and oils and the remaining 5 percent for other agricultural commodities.

COTTON

Cotton exports this year are expected to be about 20 percent above those of a year ago. Excessive foreign stocks had been reduced at the beginning of the season and demand has been good. In addition, the private cotton trade in this country is doing an excellent selling job. I know that many people within the trade are firmly convinced that the way to build world markets for the long pull is through aggressive and competitive selling, rather than through outright dumping or other Government action which would adversely affect trade.

American cotton today is being offered for sale upon a competition basis which reflects generally better quality.

Prices received by American farmers for cotton have been at or above the 90-percent support level since last April. They will be supported at the same level next year.

Disposition commitments of CCC commodities, Jan. 1 through Dec. 31, 1954

A. Commercial sales (to private U. S. trade):	
1. Domestic sales	$439,099,312
2. Export sales	499,783,561
B. Noncommercial sales (to foreign governments, relief societies and others)	16,269,466
C. Intragovernmental transfers (to FOA, including title II, Public Law 480, armed services, sec. 32, drought emergency program and other U. S. agencies)	133,228,105
D. Barter (under CCC Charter Act and Public Law 480)	68,663,383
Total returns	1,157,043,827
E. Donations (title III, Public Law 480 and Public Law 690)	246,899,165
F. Fire, theft, spoilage, etc	2,729,792
Total value, all dispositions	1,403,942,992

By way of conclusion, let me assure you that we see a great decade ahead for American farmers. American agriculture is still a good stable industry and it always will be. Those who are actively engaged in it must never lose confidence in its future.

The basic philosophy underlying the Agricultural Act of 1954 will encourage individual farmers who are efficient and ambitious to participate profitably in the thrilling opportunities immediately ahead of us in the growing science of agriculture.

Agriculture offers equally as good an opportunity over the next generation as any other comparable vocation for the young man or young woman who desires a satisfactory living standard, an opportunity to live and rear a family in a wholesome environment, and the ability to provide one's own security for his declining years.

Our constant objective in the United States Department of Agriculture is to do all in our power to promote a stable, prosperous and free agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, for further light on this subject, I would like to refer to the hearings on the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation bill for 1955 in the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate. On page 21 of the printed hearings, Senator DIRKSEN asked Undersecretary True D. Morse to explain the operations. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include as a part of my remarks the pertinent sections of the Senate hearing:

HOUSE REPORT

Senator DIRKSEN. Mr. Morse, what I am getting to, and I don't want to belabor this,

Mr. Chairman, but doubtless you have seen the House report, and they write on page 1, and they are speaking now about a majority of the members of the committee over there on appropriations who heard your testimony:

"They believe that this difficulty is due to the failure of the Corporation to discharge its responsibility under its charter to sell its commodities competitively in world markets. Testimony before the committee shows that none of the large stocks of cotton, cheese, corn, rice, seeds, naval stores, tobacco, and wool have been or are being offered for sale on a competitive basis, despite basic authority in law to do so."

Now, if that is not correct, I would not let that stand, if I were sitting over on your side of the table. That can be considered as something of an impeachment of your operations unless you have got an answer for it, and I am just trying to find out what the answer is.

SALES UNDER INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

Mr. MORSE. I believe, sir, that the reading of the total hearing will develop the answer. I would like to further state here that the largest single item that we own is wheat.

As the committee well knows, and the Senate well understands, under the International Wheat Agreement, we are selling wheat at a subsidized price, and outside of the wheat agreements we are meeting world markets by selling wheat competitively. That is being done right along. Corn is not much of an export item, and that is an item on that list.

When you take our holdings of wheat and corn and add to it the commodities which CCC holds which are being sold competitively, it leaves a total for the group that is named, of $661 million against an inventory of $3,779 million.

One item named is naval stores. Because of the drought supplies of naval stores are quite low, the market is about at the support price, and we might run the risk of domestic shortages if we were trying to push naval stores out into export.

Also, I would like to call the attention of the committee to the fact that in the case of cottonseed oil, for instance, we had reached a peak inventory of 1,035,000,000 pounds, but primarily through export sales, our present inventory as of January 5 is down to about 314 million pounds. That is about a third of the peak amount.

We are aggressively making efforts to sell, and we have had success in selling. Furthermore, may I call the committee's attention to the fact that this Public Law 480 authority is used in a way which will not disturb regular marketings. After we have gone as far as we can in moving these products to market and if it then appears there can be disposal in a constructive way to help in our own development of future markets, military uses and technical assistance, and so on, then we utilize the authority under Public Law 480.

CLARIFICATION OF HOUSE REPORT

Senator DIRKSEN. May I make this suggestion? I do believe because of the tremendous interest in this matter that Mr. Morse ought to submit perhaps a 1-page memorandum that is responsive to this item in the House report.

I would not care to let that stand. If that is not a correct estimate, I think that should be done. And do it in ordinary language so that we have a pretty clear picture of what you are doing in the competitive field and in this assistance field.

I do not want to fool anybody on this. If half of this is grant and it is turned over for administration to FOA, or to the Department of Defense, I just want to know what additions these are getting. That is just like providing them the money.

You say, "All right, money comes from another source," but you are going to manage the money and the supplies over there.

This gives point to what Senator ELLENDER said, that actually without the knowledge of Congress you could be building up a fund that is going to require a good many people in all countries where foreign aid goes on to continue this long after that agency may have been liquidated.

Senator ELLENDER. As I pointed out, I came across at least a dozen countries in which I obtained from our FOA representatives information to the effect that they expected to get money from that source in order to keep themselves in the picture.

Senator DIRKSEN. I would just like to know.

Senator ELLENDER. Certainly.

Senator DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, if you are amenable to that suggestion——

Chairman HAYDEN. I think we would be glad to have Mr. Morse do that.

Mr. MORSE. We will do that, and I would call attention to this report which gives on page 98, at the end of 1954, this greater utilization of surplus foods will give you the donations domestically and abroad. That bears on this, and we would be very happy to provide the other, and we would be very happy to sit down with congressional committees and explore this whole thing. It is a new program. We are getting started in it and we would like to discuss it with the appropriate committee of the Senate.

(The statement referred to follows:)

"EXPORT SALES AT COMPETITIVE WORLD PRICES

"The Department is keenly aware of the effect large Government stocks can have on the domestic market and of the need for effective action to dispose of these surpluses in an orderly manner.

"We also recognize that exports are an important outlet for our agricultural commodities and that a policy of encouraging exports should be followed. In line with this policy, we now are offering a large number of commodities now in inventory for export on a competitive-bid basis.

"At the same time we must recognize that use of our authority to reduce prices for export sales must be resolved on a commodity-by-commodity basis in which major consideration is given to the effect of such action on farmers and the farm program.

"There are many factors that must be considered in determining whether such reduced sales prices have advantages to farmers and the farm program. For example, we must consider the cost to the whole farm program, the effects upon other farm commodities, the extent to which exports will be increased, the genuine longtime benefits, if any, to the commodity, the world commercial demand for the commodity, and the likelihood that other exporting countries may match or shade any price we may establish.

"It might be injurious to the interests of farmers to adopt a blanket policy under which all our stocks not required for reserve purposes would be offered for export sales at world price levels. We must constantly consider whether such action would greatly weaken world commodity markets and whether other producing countries would have no alternative except to lower prices still further. If buying countries delayed purchases as long as possible, with repercussions on our regular commercial sales, we might have no alternative except to follow prices down.

"As pointed out in the committee report, at present the Department is not offering for export sale on a competitive bid basis its stocks of these commodities: Cotton, naval stores, tobacco, cheese, corn, rice, seeds, and wool. The reasons why we are not doing this are as follows:

"COTTON

"The Commodity Credit Corporation has in its inventory approximately 1.8 million bales of cotton.

"The Department's policy has been to not sell its inventory stocks in competition with producer cotton during the heavy marketing season since whenever the available supply of producer's cotton exceeds the demand the surplus will go into the price-support program. At present CCC has loans on approximately 7 million bales of cotton in which the individual producer still has an equity. A policy of offering cotton for sale on a basis competitive with world prices would result in all export sales of cotton first moving through the loan program into the stocks of the Corporation and back out to the trade rather than through normal trade channels. Such a program would result in materially larger administrative costs to the Corporation and in our opinion find little, if any, support from any segment of the cotton trade, including the cotton producer. It also would tend to depress the world price, widening the spread between domestic and world prices and increase CCC's losses, because we export such a high percentage of cotton sold in world trade. In the 1953–54 marketing year cotton exports totaled 3.2 million bales. The estimate for the 1954–55 marketing year is 4.5 million bales.

"NAVAL STORES

"Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of rosin and turpentine represent the bulk of these commodities available both in the United States and abroad. CCC turpentine stocks represent less than 1 month's supply and its rosin is equal approximately to 3 months' supply. There is no surplus in naval stores.

"CCC is offering its turpentine and rosin available for sale at stated weekly prices in line with market prices. In view of the domestic and foreign short supply position, which has been gradually building up for the past year as evidenced by an increase in rosin exports of 27 percent in the 1954 crop year, there would be no justification in pricing export shipments at less than prices for domestic sales.

"TOBACCO

"The small lot in CCC inventory is cigar-type tobacco of qualities normally used domestically for chewing tobacco and is available for sale on a list-price basis by the grower cooperative association along with other tobaccos still pledged for loan by these associations. Practically all tobacco under price support still is under loan through grower cooperative associations which receive, pack, store, and sell the loan tobacco. These tobacco grower organizations, as well as the industry, have consistently opposed the sale of loan stocks at reduced prices except into new markets. Tobacco pledged for loan may not be redeemed. Instead, the associations apply all proceeds of sales to reduce the indebtedness to CCC until the loan is fully repaid or the tobacco is all sold. The associations offer the tobacco on a catalog list-price basis, and the sales price is the same without regard to whether the tobacco is to be used domestically or exported.

"CHEESE

"Our current inventory consists of Cheddar cheese. World trade in Cheddar cheese is limited almost entirely to imports by the United Kingdom, which generally buys on the basis of long-time contracts from Commonwealth countries. CCC has offered

Cheddar cheese for export sale at 25.5 cents per pound for grade A and 24.5 cents per pound for grade B, since May 1954. These prices were established at levels in line with world market prices. Despite the fact that these prices are close to 10 cents a pound below domestic prices, we have sold only a very small quantity. We have recently offered limited quantities of butter on a competitive bid basis and intend to utilize our experience under these butter operations in connection with future disposals of cheese and other dairy products.

"WOOL

"CCC stocks of wool have never been offered on a competitive bid basis for export. For many years, the United States has imported from 2 to 3 times more wool than has been produced in this country. Wool imports are subject to a fairly high duty, and domestic prices of wool are usually substantially higher than prices in foreign markets. Under such conditions sales of CCC wool can be made much more advantageously in the domestic market to replace imports than they can be made in foreign markets. Under the provisions of the National Wool Act of 1954, an incentive program for expanding wool production was recently announced. This program provides for price support at 106 percent of parity with payments being made to producers for the amount by which average prices of wool fall below the support level. Thus after CCC takes over defaulted loans under 1954 wool program, no more wool will be acquired by CCC. The Secretary announced on October 12, 1954, that through May 1955 no CCC stocks of wool would be sold for less than 103 percent of the 1954 loan rate plus sales commission. This was done to protect farmers in selling the balance of the 1954 wool clip at prices at or above 1954 loan rates. At the same time the Secretary also announced that after May 1955, CCC would proceed in an orderly manner to liquidate its wool holdings over a 2-year period.

"CORN

"The United States has never been a large seller of corn for export. It is probable that the United States will export a normal quantity without CCC selling its corn at less than the market price. Last summer CCC had a 15-cent per bushel export subsidy on corn. Sales under that program were small. The subsidy on corn exports was suspended at the beginning of the heavy marketing season for corn because it was felt that CCC sales for export at reduced prices should not be made at a time when farmers were making large sales of corn. Sales are now made at the market price. Because corn is widely used for feed in the United States, feeders might object if CCC corn were sold for export at substantially less than it is available to them.

"RICE

"CCC rice inventories are small relative to the total carryover, but loans are at record levels, in excess of 15 million 100-pound bags. Rice producers have repeatedly requested that CCC not offer rice for export because of the large 1954 crop, which caused the domestic price to be below support and because CCC sales for export would interfere with commercial export sales.

"SEEDS

"CCC stocks of seed have been reduced sharply in the past year. Some of the seeds were sold for export on a competitive bid basis. There is no current support program for seeds. In view of the 1954 drought and other factors increasing domestic seed requirements, it is expected that most of the remaining stocks can be moved in domestic channels.

"In addition to the above comments on the commodities mentioned in the House committee report, the following information is pertinent in the case of wheat, tung oil, and cotton linters:

"WHEAT

"CCC has sold substantial quantities of wheat, about 130 million bushels from July 1954 through December 1954, from all three coasts under both IWA and non-IWA. Additional quantities are under negotiation under Public Law 480 and will move in the immediate future. Wheat sales are made at the market price less the IWA subsidy in effect at the time of sales. This gives exporters an opportunity to compete at world prices. Such sales, because of the futures market, do not lend themselves to competitive bids.

"TUNG OIL

"The United States usually imports substantial quantities of tung oil, and large foreign supplies of this oil are available. Sales of tung oil by CCC for export would simply result in United States tung oil replacing foreign tung oil in normal foreign markets, which in turn probably would result in larger imports of tung oil into the United States.

"COTTON LINTERS

"CCC has not offered its stocks of cotton linters for export sale primarily because such sales would interfere with commercial export sales of linters or products made therefrom. So long as the present cottonseed price support is in effect, any export sales of linters by CCC would result in an equivalent quantity of linters being acquired by CCC under the support program. In its current support program, CCC has attempted to value linters at a level low enough so that little, if any, linters would be acquired by CCC, but no sales are currently being made from CCC stocks."

Newsletter to the East Side News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an article which I have prepared for the East Side News, a weekly newspaper circulated in my district on the East Side of New York:

FROM INSIDE CONGRESS

Washington is a serious city these days. The changeover from Republican to Democratic control of the House has brought with it a sober awareness that our international policy, and in many respects our internal legislation, must be bipartisan in character. Democratic leadership in Congress is demonstrating that it puts concern for the Nation highest in its thinking. I hope that the President will be big enough to express publicly his regrets at the warning he gave before elections of a cold war in our Government in the event of a Democratic victory. The plain fact is that the Democratic Party, which is now in control of both Houses, is showing no rancor, no opposition for opposition's sake, and a genuine spirit of cooperation that deserve the President's and the country's thanks. I hope that will be forthcoming.

I voted for the resolution on Formosa. It was not an easy decision to make. I share the deep feelings of my constituents and, I believe, of the American people generally that we must not fail to pursue any honorable course that will maintain peace and secure our national defense.

With this in mind I joined the overwhelming majority in the House and in the Senate who voted for the resolution. There have been many experiences of history where wars were not begun, but were blundered into. Often the blunder was based on ignorance or miscalculation or misunderstanding. In an atomic age we cannot run the risk of being misunderstood. It seemed to me, and I gave this deep and careful consideration, that we owed it to ourselves and to the world to state just how we felt about our essential defense outposts.

This, together with the assurance that we have been given that the United Nations will be called upon to arrange a cease-fire off the coast of China, seems to me to be a step toward peace and not toward war.

There is another kind of defense the we need, in fact that we cannot do without; and that is the defense of our own morale and of our own historic traditions. That's why I introduced a resolution into the House last week, calling for the outright repeal of the present Immigration and Nationality Act, better known as the McCarran Act. I am not kidding myself. I can't speak with any certainty about how that resolution will be acted upon in committee, but I felt that it was the moral and the American way to stand up clearly and to say, as this resolution indicates: This is a blot upon our statute books, an affront to millions of Americans, unworthy of our tradition and inconsistent with our claim to speak up for the democratic forces and institutions and peoples of the world.

I don't think that Congress would be indifferent to the voice of these millions of Americans if only they would speak up. That's a job for Mr. John Citizen. I hope he will do it in such volume and with such persistency that my resolution will be passed and that we can then tackle the reorganization of our immigration and nationality laws, with a new liberal spirit.

Last week I had occasion to speak on a radio program on the subject of wiretapping. Several weeks earlier Judge Hofstadter handed down a very significant decision, refusing a New York Police Department's request for the right to wiretap and expressing himself forcibly on this practice as a steady erosion of our individual liberties. He also pointed out that the number of convictions obtained by wiretapping was not consequential.

I have steadily maintained that wiretapping is a dirty business and that, tolerated, is sure to injure our dignity as a nation and our heritage as Americans. In a debate on the subject in Congress last year I said very clearly:

"Wiretapping is dirty business. Nothing that we can do or say here will change that. And while I think that every legal means should be used to convict traitors and saboteurs, we must not overlook the fact that this country is based on law and order and justice. If we deviate one iota from those principles, we are forgetting our great heritage of freedom and joining those who believe in totalitarian methods.

"It is doubtful whether such random, haphazard searches of the population at large are very efficient police methods, but efficient or not, the undesirability of most of them was decided a long time ago by the adoption of the Bill of Rights."

My stand is with our Founding Fathers who insisted on the Bill of Rights as a condition for the adoption of the Constitution.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who alone canst supply our temporal needs and satisfy our timeless longings, may we daily commit ourselves gladly and unreservedly to Thy kind and loving providence and find the secret of courage, joy, and hope.

Give us the glad assurance that Thy grace is sufficient and that Thou art willing and able to grant our requests and do for us abundantly above all that we can ask or think.

May our vision of peace on earth and the victory of righteousness be so glorious and wonderful that all our energies and capacities shall be pledged and dedicated to make it a blessed reality.

To Thy name, through Christ Jesus, our Lord, we ascribe all the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 3005.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the national acreage allotment for the 1955 crop of cotton has recently been fixed at 18,100,000 acres, as compared with 21,400,000 acres for the 1954 cotton crop. This sharp reduction has resulted in corresponding reductions in State acreage allotments in almost every cotton producing State. When low acreage allotments threatened to create extreme hardship among cotton farmers for the 1954 crop, legislation was enacted raising the national average allotment to the 21,400,000 figure. My bill, H. R. 23, would raise the 1955 cotton acreage allotment up to the level provided by the 1954 law for each State whose 1955 allotment is below this level. The bill would give the State and county committees the same authority to apportion the increases in 1955 allotments as they had for the 1954 increases under the 1954 law.

The long and extreme drouth in my section of the country—in fact throughout the entire Southeast—not only destroyed practically all food crops, but the farmer produced only about one-half of a normal cotton crop. Some farmers did not produce more than 20 percent of a normal cotton crop. Cotton is the main money crop that we have in the 10th Congressional District of Georgia, and unless farmers can have more acreage allotted to them many of them will thereby be required to go on the relief rolls. We do not produce tobacco or peanuts, and those who have gone into the production of livestock certainly have not made any profit from their operations.

In the State of Georgia the farmers have been cut from 20 percent to 35 percent in acreage allotments below what they had last year, and many of these farmers have only 2 or 3 acres allotted to them. If these small allotments are not increased many of the cotton producers will go out of business in my section of the State and much of the land cannot be planted in other crops and will remain idle. Many of these cotton farmers would thereby be required to go on relief or to seek employment away from the farms. Those cotton farmers who have reached 45 years of age, and who have been engaged mainly in the production of cotton, would find it extremely difficult to find employment in industry or elsewhere. On account of the extreme drought, there is certainly more justification for increasing the cotton acreage than last year.

It is a mistake to undertake to dispose of the surplus cotton in 1 or 2 years, but should be carried out gradually in order that the cotton farmers may remain on the farms. The cotton industry in my section of the country provides a living for the farmers. These farmers have never made large profits out of cotton and they do not expect to do so. They want and are entitled to survive.

Eli Whitney's first cotton gin was operated in Wilkes County, Ga., which is in my district, and not far from my present home. The old gin house was standing until a few years ago. From 1791 to the present time cotton has been the main money crop of that section of the country.

I appreciate the fact that we should dispose of surplus cotton in excess of our defense requirements, but we should do so over a period of years and not in 1 or 2 years. Our surplus cotton resulted in part from Government requests to increase cotton production for defense purposes and was created over a period of years. Let us not forget that there have been recent years of international uncertainty and hostilities, and that during these times our surplus cotton was an asset and not a liability. The Communist threat is such today that we could well be proud that our cotton farmers have stockpiled an abundant supply of cotton for the period ahead. Let us not forget that years are required to materially increase agricultural production, and that we must maintain a strong agricultural base to attain the high national income levels which are possible as well as to adequately provide for the defense of the Nation. Cotton is an important and necessary part of that agricultural base and the entire economy of the Nation will be seriously imperiled if the present plight of the cotton farmer is not remedied. To fail to increase cotton acreage allotments means that many of the cotton farmers will be out of employment, and it is doubtful if the goal of $500 billion in national income can be achieved with widespread unemployment on the farms.

In my district there are many cotton farmers with 3 or 4 acres of cotton, with 5 or 6 children who help to cultivate and gather the cotton. The failure to increase cotton acreage allotments means also that these children will be out of employment, for there is no other employment available for them. With the present high prices which the cotton farmer must pay for the goods and servics which he buys, he and his children must be provided with employment opportunities. I am strongly in favor of 90 percent of parity as a support price, and I have introduced a bill to increase the support price to 90 percent of parity, but 90 percent of parity does not mean anything in the cotton industry unless the farmer can plant cotton.

The poor man with 5 or 6 children will be forced to do 1 of 2 things: First, if there is no other employment available to him he will be forced to resort to the relief rolls; or second, to plant as much cotton as he desires and to obtain half price for the cotton in order to provide some employment for his children and himself.

It is imperative that greater use be made of the laws which have been passed to aid in the sale of cotton and other agricultural products. It is inconsistent to adopt a defeatist attitude with respect to this basic segment of the economy and an optimistic attitude with respect to the overall economy. The tools which the Congress has provided, through the passage of these laws, must be fully and effectively utilized. It is my belief that a combination of American salesmanship and full utilization of existing laws by the Government would bring about more effective results in the disposal of surplus cotton and agricultural products. I have urged the passage of laws which would increase the sale of cotton and agricultural products. I was one of the prime movers in the passage of legislation authorizing $100 million for insurance against risks of loss or damage to cotton and tangible personal property exported commercially. I now urge that greater effort be made to produce more tangible results in the administration of existing laws which have as their purpose and objective the sale of more cotton and agricultural products abroad.

REGULATION OF RATES ON NATURAL GAS

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I am filing today a bill which would require the Federal Power Commission to regulate the rates of the natural gas companies on the basis of actual legitimate cost, rather than permitting valuation on the basis of fair field value, as was used in the decision in the Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Co. case some months ago.

In my own city of Chicago a newspaper story appeared last week in connection with an increase in rates to the gas-rate payers which stated that the increase of over $5 million which is being allowed to the People's Gas, Light, & Coke Co. stems entirely from the fact that the rates the company has to pay for natural gas are being increased.

The purpose of the Natural Gas Act is to shield consumers from exorbitant charges by companies furnishing natural gas in interstate commerce.

In my opinion, the Federal Power Commission is not carrying out this primary purpose of the law, and for that reason I have filed this bill to require the Commission to regulate natural gas companies engaged in interstate commerce, and to determine the value of their properties on the basis of the actual legitimate costs rather than the fair field value.

Mr. Speaker, I hope for an early hearing on this bill.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may sit today while the House is in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

MINORITY MANAGERS OF CONSENT AND PRIVATE CALENDARS AND LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that the Republican managers of the Consent Calendar will be the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

The Republican managers of the Private Calendar will be the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN], and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. Speaker, while I have the floor, I would like to inquire of the majority leader if there is any change in the plans for the legislative program next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. As was announced yesterday, the program has not changed for next week. There will be no business on Monday. Of course, anything that is screened by unanimous consent may be brought up for consideration, but at the present time I know of nothing that is coming up. Of course, anything that is to be brought up by unanimous consent is very carefully screened and the rights of the Members are thoroughly protected. I might further add that matters which may be brought up by unanimous consent are not usually matters of major importance. We would not think of considering matters of major importance under unanimous-consent procedure. If anything is to be brought up by unanimous consent, it will be very carefully screened by the leadership on both sides and the appropriate members on both sides of the committees concerned. As I said, there is no business on Monday.

On Tuesday we will take up H. R. 3005, the extension of the Selective Service Act. As the gentleman from Georgia stated to me yesterday, and as I indicated to the membership, there will be a rollcall vote requested on that bill. Is that not correct, may I inquire of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MARTIN. While the gentleman from Georgia is on his feet, may I inquire if we will not undoubtedly finish that bill on Tuesday?

Mr. VINSON. I am satisfied the House can finish it after 2 or 3 hours of debate on Tuesday. I think on a bill of this character and importance we ought to have a yea-and-nay vote so I will ask for a rollcall vote at the conclusion of the debate on the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. To continue further with the program, I know of no business that is going to come up on Wednesday. I do not want to foreclose the possibility of anything coming up, but I think the Members can proceed with the knowledge that the leadership will try to have Wednesday so arranged that there will be no legislation other than what might be acted upon by unanimous consent. I do not want to absolutely and flatly state now that there will be nothing, but I can see nothing which will come up Wednesday. So I hope to do everything I can to have it arranged so that on Tuesday after the termination of the consideration of H. R. 3005, carrying out the agreement made with the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished minority leader, that our colleagues can then proceed on their commitments until the following Wednesday.

There will be no business on Thursday or Friday. I expect, of course, to ask unanimous consent that the House go over from Thursday until the following Monday next week.

Monday: No business. If there is any business available to be brought up the understanding is, as I stated yesterday, that it can be scheduled for a week from Tuesday, but if there is any rollcall as distinguished from a quorum call, the rollcall will go over until the following day, Wednesday.

Mr. MARTIN. I appreciate the gentleman's information.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AMENDING REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2576) to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1958, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DAWSON of Illinois, HOLIFIELD, McCORMACK, HOFFMAN of Michigan, and BROWN of Ohio.

HARVEY MATUSOW

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, it has just been announced that a man by the name of Matusow who testified before several congressional committees, is about to publish a book.

It was my fortune to see part of the manuscript. I am thoroughly convinced that this man has always been a Communist planted by the Communist conspiracy for the purpose of appearing before congressional committees in order to make an attempt to discredit them, thus damaging our democratic institutions.

The whole thing is in the best traditions of the Soviet NKVD, top specialists in planting double agents.

It seems to me that certain segments of the press and certain commentators who are now taking up that double agent's case might do well to examine his book—a true brainwash product—before they go way out on the limb. The nauseating mental meanderings of this man, now ready to be served to the public in print, provide positive proof that he has been placed in the position of a professional witness in order to discredit committees of Congress which are charged with the responsibility of exposing the Communist international conspiracy.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I understand, then, that in the gentleman's

opinion this fellow was planted there for the purpose of discrediting the committee and its activities?

Mr. WALTER. There is no question about it.

LAKE MICHIGAN WATER DIVERSION BILL

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include an editorial from the Chicago American of February 2, 1955.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, all Members of this body from the metropolitan Chicago area, both Democratic and Republican, have joined in the introduction of a Lake Michigan water diversion bill. This is along the lines of the bill passed by the 83d Congress and vetoed by the President. What changes there are in the 1955 bill from the 1954 bill are calculated to meet the main objections of the veto message. The bill as now drawn, approved and sponsored by all Democratic Members and all Republican Members from our area meets every reasonable and valid argument previously raised in opposition. As there is no good and honest reason why anyone should not support the measure, we expect its early enactment by an almost unanimous vote.

On motion of the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] and unanimously adopted by a bipartisan conference of Chicago area members, Congressman O'BRIEN was delegated to lead the fight for this legislation of vital importance to the entire Middle West and in not inconsiderable measure to the entire Nation. H. R. 3210 is the bill introduced by Congressman O'BRIEN. H. R. 3211 to 3225 are companion bills, sponsored by Congresswoman CHURCH and Congressmen BOWLER, BOYLE, DAWSON, GORDON, GRAY, HOFFMAN, KLUCZYNSKI, MACK, MCVEY, MURRAY, O'HARA, PRICE, SHEEHAN, and YATES. From the names listed it will be seen that this is in all truth a bipartisan approach, both parties equally and all members equally to share what credit many result.

In the entire absence of any good and valid reason why Chicago and the Middle West should be denied the benefit of this sorely needed relief, the lake carriers have resorted to name calling and to the making of false and ridiculous statements deeply resented by the people of Chicago and which the press of Chicago is not permitting to go unnoticed.

Mr. Speaker, I am commissioned by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN] to ask unanimous consent in behalf of all the Members, Democratic and Republican, of our area to include in my remarks, an editorial from the Chicago American of February 2, 1955. This virile editorial, forthrightly presenting the facts and the truth, knocks the tirade of the lake carriers into a cocked hat. I join with my colleague and dean [Mr. O'BRIEN] and all other Members from our area, both Democratic and Republican, in urging its careful and thoughtful reading in order to be informed of the real facts when H. R. 3210 reaches the floor of the House. The editorial follows:

SHORT OF FACT

Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last week a violent statement in which he described Chicago's effort to increase diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway as a "steal."

The Senator's statement indicated that he doesn't really know much about the subject.

He proclaimed, indignantly, that Chicago should not ask Congress to authorize an increase in the flow but should try to get the Supreme Court to change the 1930 decision in which it limited diversion to 1,500 cubic feet a second. In going to Congress, he charges, we are making a political issue of something that should be settled judicially.

For his information, we went to Congress on the advice of the Supreme Court itself. The Court in its decision held that Chicago's remedy against the 1,500-foot limitation lay in persuading Congress to change it.

When Congress at the last session finally did relax the limit to the extent of granting Chicago 1,000 cubic feet a second more water on an experimental basis, Wisconsin and other Lake State politicians persuaded President Eisenhower to veto it.

In his statement of last week, Senator WILEY repeated one of the misrepresentations that were pressed upon the President to induce his veto. The Senator said the increase in diversion would be "for the benefit of a single community," meaning Chicago.

Actually, the increase, when it comes, will benefit the whole Nation, and in particular the entire Middle West, including Wisconsin and other Lake States.

The Illinois Waterway, into which the additional water would flow, is not a Chicago ditch, but an integral, important, and very long section of the great inland waterway that connects the Great Lakes and the Gulf of Mexico.

The added water would increase the channel's ability to carry its rapidly growing traffic, and the more commerce it carries the more it contributes to the general prosperity.

Senator WILEY ran into a little trouble in his effort to make it appear that owners of shore properties in Wisconsin would suffer from a lowering of lake levels if Chicago took out a little more water.

The Wisconsin shore owners, like others in Illinois, Michigan, and all around the Great Lakes, know the water is so high that it is washing away their land and undermining their buildings. Nevertheless, the Senator assured them that draining any of the surplus water away at Chicago "is actually contrary to their interests." He didn't say how.

At this point the Senator handed the ball to Harry C. Brockel, port director of Milwaukee, by introducing into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report made by Brockel to Mayor Zeidler on January 21.

Brockel argued in this document that shore owners would not be helped by increased diversion at Chicago, because it would hardly reduce the water level at all. But, at the same time, he said lake shipping would be injured because the increased diversion would lower the lake so much that shiploads would have to be reduced.

Although he conceded that Chicago's sewage is all treated now, he said the Chicago Sanitary District wanted more water to dilute untreated sewage.

But the sanitary district's basic motive in asking for more water, he said, was to make a lot of money producing more electric current at the Lockport powerplant.

Brockel's object, we suppose, and Senator WILEY's too, was to divert attention from a charge made by a former superintendent of the Milwaukee disposal plant that Milwaukee dumps raw sewage into Lake Michigan from time to time in order to preserve the quality of a fertilizer it produces and sells.

Illinois will urge the increase again in the present Congress, and Representatives and Senators from other Midwestern States can serve their own constituents best by joining Illinois in the fight.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE FAIR IN UNITED STATES

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have a newspaper clipping which indicates that the United States is to take part in 20 international trade fairs this year, which is a very good idea. I have no objection to that. It could be 40 as far as I am concerned. But I wonder why the Secretary of Commerce or the responsible agency of Government does not provide for the establishment of such an international fair in this country?

There is no doubt that the Soviet nations and satellites make quite a point out of their propaganda in Europe especially, and it would occur to me that with this country participating in 20 or more international fairs it is about time that we take advantage of this great propaganda opportunity and this chance to display our wares in this country by inviting the nations of the world to an international fair in the United States of America upon occasion.

POLLUTION OF THE AIR AND STREAMS

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I suspect that there is no congressional district in the country that does not have the problem in a greater or lesser degree of either pollution of the air or pollution of the streams, rivers, and waters in the area. This has become a real problem in our country.

The President in his health message the other day called attention to the need for action in the field of abating air and stream pollution. In furtherance of the objective of attacking this problem and getting something done to abate this problem and to eventually correct it, I along with a number of other Members of this Congress have introduced a bill which will give impetus to the construction by private initiative of waste treatment facilities both to eliminate stream pollution and air pollution.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 10, sections 1055 and 1056, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. TEAGUE, Texas; Mr. EVINS, Tennessee; Mr. JOHNSON, California; Mr. FORD, Michigan.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 34, sections 1083 and 1084, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. NATCHER, Kentucky; Mr. LANKFORD, Maryland; Mr. OSTERTAG, New York; Mr. O'HARA, Minnesota.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON THE OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES DEVISE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution No. 124, 75th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee on the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. MCCORMACK, Massachusetts; Mr. MCDOWELL, Delaware; Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Massachusetts.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 46, section 1126c, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. KEOGH, New York; Mr. DEROUNIAN, New York.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 14, section 194, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. GARY, Virginia; Mr. DORN, New York.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 16, section 175a, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. PRESTON, Georgia; Mr. ANDRESEN, Minnesota.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE FEDERAL RECORDS COUNCIL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 44, section 394, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Federal Records Council the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. STAGGERS, West Virginia; Mr. MILLER, Maryland.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON NAVAJO-HOPI INDIAN ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 25, section 640 (a), United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. ENGLE, California; Mr. UDALL, Arizona; Mr. RHODES, Arizona.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 20, sections 42 and 43, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. CANNON, Missouri; Mr. BROOKS, Louisiana; Mr. VORYS, Ohio.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 44, section 393 (a), United States Code, the Chair appoints as a member of the National Historical Publications Commission the gentleman from California, Mr. MILLER.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER OF THE JAMESTOWN - WILLIAMSBURG - YORKTOWN CELEBRATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 263, 83d Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. ROBESON, Virginia; Mr. POFF, Virginia.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES COMMISSION FOR THE CELEBRATION OF THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF JOHN MARSHALL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2, Public Law 581, 83d Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the United States Commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of John Marshall the following Members on the part of the House to serve with himself: Mr. WALTER, of Pennsylvania; Mr. GARY, of Virginia; Mr. BETTS, of Ohio; Mr. POFF, of Virginia.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE ALEXANDER HAMILTON BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 601, 83d Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission the following members on the part of the House to serve with himself: Mr. ROONEY of New York; Mr. RODINO of New Jersey; Mr. COUDERT of New York; Mr. REECE of Tennessee.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE WOODROW WILSON CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 705, 83d Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. HARRISON of Virginia; Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN of New Jersey.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 601, title VI, Public Law 250, 77th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee to Investigate Nonessential Federal Expenditures, the following members of the Committee on Ways and Means: Mr. COOPER of Tennessee; Mr. DINGELL of Michigan; Mr. REED of New York.

And the following members of the Committee on Appropriations: Mr. CANNON, of Missouri; Mr. MAHON, of Texas; Mr. TABER, of New York.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 123, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers the following Members of the House: Mr. LONG, of Louisiana; Mr. CORBETT, of Pennsylvania.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS TO MAKE INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 30 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction. For the purpose of making such investigations the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, possessions, Puerto Rico, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses

and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after *"Resolved,"* and insert "That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may make investigations and studies into the following matters within its jurisdiction: In Alaska, the aboriginal and possessory rights of the Eskimos and Indians in and to the some 400 million acres of public lands in Alaska; in Hawaii, the operation of the Hawaiian Homes Commission under the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920, and the return of public lands to local authority and/or private ownership; in the Trust Territories, the provisions and local conditions for an organic act for that area, including legislation concerning American Samoa, the Organic Act for Guam, the legislation affecting the civilian population of the Ryukyu Islands; in Puerto Rico the liquidation of the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration; and in the Virgin Islands, the operation of the Organic Act of 1954 and the Virgin Island Corporation; in the continental United States, the production of uranium and other critical and strategic minerals and metals, irrigation and reclamation projects proposed for authorization, including but not limited to the upper Colorado River Basin project, Hells Canyon project, and the Trinity-San Luis project in California, in the national parks and monuments requiring study and inspection and the administration of the public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management and the national forests created out of the public domain, and various Indian tribes and reservations for the purpose of improving the management of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and planning the ultimate freedom of the Indians from Federal wardship: *Provided,* That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject matter which is being investigated by any other standing committee of the House.

"For the purpose of making such investigations the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, possessions, Puerto Rico, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member."

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment to correct a typographical error.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DELANEY: On page 2, line 15, after the word "Guam", strike out "the" and insert "and."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH]. I now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution grants to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs the right to investigate matters already under its jurisdiction. I know of no reason why we should have any extended debate, except to say that 20 percent of the legislation that passed this House during the last session came out of this committee. It is a hard-working committee, and I think they are entitled to the relief they seek.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution, as stated by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY], authorizes the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to make investigations. As amended, it is in accord with the policy under which the Committee on Rules has been operating during this session.

This resolution has been amended, with the approval of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, so as to include a complete listing of all the matters which the committee proposes to investigate under the authority granted in this resolution.

Also included is the sentence which has been added to all such resolutions, namely, that there shall be no duplication of investigation as a result of this resolution.

These two provisions—the listing and itemizing of those things to be investigated and the provision calling for no duplication in investigation by committees—are, I think, new this year in the handling of these resolutions. But I believe, Mr. Speaker, that they do represent a step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution authorizes the committee, which has a great responsibility both inside continental United States and also with respect to the possessions, to go into the field and have a look-see for itself concerning bills which come before it. In my opinion, it is a highly desirable thing for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to do, and I, therefore, join with the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY] in urging the adoption of this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "A resolution to authorize the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to make investigations into certain matters within its jurisdiction."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HON. JAMES B. BOWLER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday our colleague from Illinois [Mr. BOWLER] will celebrate his 80th birthday. As on that day we will not be in session, it is the desire in the hearts of the members of the Illinois delegation at this time, the last occasion we will be together until next week, to give expression of our great affection for our colleague and of our hope and prayer that God in his infinite wisdom will spare him for many, many years to come in the performance of the great public work and service to which he has dedicated his life.

For 46 years JIM BOWLER was a member of the City Council of Chicago. Part of the time he was chairman of the all-important finance committee. Part of the time, in the earlier years of his aldermanic career, crusading newspapers frequently referred to some members of the council as "grey wolves" and cries of corruption were common. It is noteworthy that JIM BOWLER emerged from this era, as free from the faintest whisper of scandal and from the touch of suspicion as the wife of Caesar. His reputation in the city of his love, his residence, and his service remains that way as he swings into the 80th year of a noble, a clean, and an honest life. Never in his life has he touched a drop of alcoholic liquor. Never has he smoked. His one and only sweetheart, the former Anastasia Sweeney, remains today his one true love, a vibrant personality, a remarkable woman who shares with him the doing of a thousand services of human helpfulness in the community in Chicago where they live.

There are 50 ward committeemen in Chicago. It is they who have large authority in the makeup of political tickets. Under the law of Illinois they are elected every 4 years by the voters of their respective wards in party elections. They are not named by appointment nor their selection dictated by the whim of an individual, but before they can take over the authority of the office they must receive at a primary election a majority or plurality of the votes cast. Sometimes I think people lose sight of this fundamental fact in the functioning of our representative government. A ward committeeman represents in his ward and in party affairs the voters of his party, exactly as a Congressman represents his district. The source of authority is the same, derived from the will of the people as shown at open elections.

JIM BOWLER has been committeeman of his ward for many years. That has been the will of the people of that ward. How well he is intrenched in the affection of his congressional district is shown in the 70,635 majority he received in the elections of November 1955.

JIM BOWLER, a man who never smoked or drank, a God-fearing family-loving man, going into his 80th year with an unsullied reputation for stout, unbending integrity is a ward committeeman in Chicago. I wish to place emphasis on this circumstance.

At the turn of the century bicycle racing was the great sport. There were tremendous and perilous contests, giant crowds of spectators, almost hysteria among the fans following their respective idols. JIM BOWLER was a champion among champions. At every meet he was among the top contenders, and his gallery of fans in all the great bicycle races of the period, the national classics of sport, far surpassed that of others. There at the turn of the century the name BOWLER was on every sporting page, on tongue-edge of every fan who

followed the thrilling, perilous, breathtaking sport of bicycle riding.

Elected to the City Council of Chicago in 1906, when he was 31 years old, he remained there until 1953 when he was elected to the 83d Congress to fill the vacancy occasioned by the death of the late beloved A. J. Sabath. He served as chairman of the finance and other committees, as president pro tempore and acting mayor, and was by the side of the late Mayor Anton J. Cermak when Mayor Cermak was fatally shot by an assassin in Miami at an affair given in honor of President Roosevelt. The bullet that struck down Chicago's mayor narrowly missed JIM BOWLER.

Since his election to this body no Member has been more attentive or conscientious in the discharge of his duties. Daily at our sessions he arrives before the time of prayer and remains in thoughtful attention to the very last moment, to the very last word. He is equally faithful in attendance and in helpful participation in the meetings of this committee, the very important Committee of Education and Labor.

JIM BOWLER is a great legislator, a great American, and on his 80th birthday we wish him to know how very much we love and appreciate him.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very glad to join my dear friend from Chicago [Mr. O'HARA] in honoring our friend, JIM BOWLER, who has endeared himself to all of his colleagues. His sincere and effective service in this body reflects credit on the people of his district. His whole life has been dedicated to honorable and trustworthy public service. He is a man who exemplifies and symbolizes the highest ideals of public service and in my opinion the rendering of public service is second only to those who are the ambassadors of God on earth, priests, ministers, and rabbis.

JIM BOWLER is one I am proud to number not only among my close friends. My respect for him is deep and lasting because of the honorable and trustworthy service he has rendered for so many years and for the noble things of life that he symbolizes in an outstanding manner.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF MICHIGAN STATE COLLEGE

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 61) extending felicitations to Michigan State College on the 100th anniversary of its founding.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas February 12, 1955, marks the 100th anniversary of the founding of Michigan State College, the first agricultural college in the United States and the model for the land-grant college system; and

Whereas Michigan State College and other land-grant colleges subsequently established have improved the American standard of living, helped bring real economic prosperity to the American people, and played an important role in the evolution and development of the American way of life to its present position of world leadership: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby extends its greetings and felicitations to Michigan State College on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of its founding, and joins with the people of the United States in expressing its recognition and appreciation of the role which Michigan State College has played in the establishment of a democratic type of education under which the benefits of higher education and related services have been made available to Americans in every walk of life.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, ordinarily this would go to a committee, but I understand that has not been the case in this instance but that both the chairman and the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] have agreed on this resolution; is that not true?

Mr. McCORMACK. I might say in agreement with the distinguished minority leader that the matter has been screened by the leadership. It is a matter of recognizing the importance in the field of education, particularly in higher education of Michigan State College. While this is a most unusual procedure, I might say, time is short, and the resolution is a tribute to that great college.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

MICHIGAN STATE COLLEGE

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the record of this body does contain precedents, but it is most unusual for the House to consider a resolution of this kind without its having gone through committee. The suggestion that this resolution be submitted came to me only yesterday. On February 12 Michigan State College will launch a year-long program in commemoration of the centennial of its founding. To have waited for this resolution to go through committee would have made it impossible for it to pass before February 12. I am deeply grateful, as I know will be all the friends of Michigan State College, for the generous cooperation of Mr. CELLER, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Mr. McCORMACK and Mr. MARTIN, majority and minority leaders, respectively, and to Speaker RAYBURN in making it possible for this concurrent resolution to pass the House today.

It has been my good fortune to have been a faculty member of Michigan State College since 1937. During that time its plant has increased by tens of millions of dollars and its student body has tripled. The people of Michigan look upon its spectacular growth in a kind of awe.

"State," as it is affectionately called, has given much directly to the Federal Government. Its faculty and administrative officers have beaten a path to Washington. Although I am the first faculty member of that college ever to have been in Congress, literally hundreds of its faculty members, during and since World War II, have been associated from time to time with the executive departments and agencies. In fact, for the first 18 months of the present administration, the president of the college, John Hannah, served as Assistant Secretary of Defense.

A few days hence, therefore, on February 12, it will be my pleasure, and, I understand, the pleasure also of the two Senators and perhaps several other Michigan Congressmen, together with leading educators and outstanding citizens from all over the country, to attend a large meeting at the college, which will thus initiate the year-long program of educational conferences and other activities celebrating this centennial year. I know the friends of Michigan State College will be most grateful to the Congress for recognizing today the great contributions made by that institution to the State of Michigan and to the Nation.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TELEVISING PROCEEDINGS OF CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have requested time today to discuss an interesting and somewhat controversial subject, the ruling by the distinguished Speaker that the proceedings of the several committees of the House may not be televised.

I approach this matter with diffidence because I realize that the brilliant gentleman who is Speaker of the House needs no defense from a comparatively obscure Member. Even those who object to the ruling will concede that no one in this country has greater regard for the prestige of the House and for the public interest therein than the Speaker.

I also approach this subject with some confidence. During my service here, I have listened with respect and deference to arguments advanced by Members who contributed to the debate from their own special experience or background. One of the great things about our Congress is that it provides a sort of melting pot of experience. Its membership includes lawyers, bankers, farmers, editors, manufacturers, undertakers, and men and women who have operated in the fields of labor. From that vast bank of experience in private life, those Members can and do contribute to the rest of us ideas which help us fashion public laws for the good of all.

Not being a lawyer, banker, or farmer, I have been unable, previously, to contribute my special mite of personal experience to the problems arising in connection with matters springing from law, finance, and agriculture. Today, however, I can talk from background.

Some of those who have exercised here their right to disagree with the ruling by the Speaker on the televising of committee hearings have injected the question of freedom of the press. May I say that I was, prior to coming to Congress, a newspaper reporter for 30 years, specializing in political writing. I covered most of the national political conventions of the two major parties from 1932 to 1952 and traveled on several presidential campaign trains. I was familiar with and wrote about legislative proceedings at the New York State level for both a wire service, International News Service, and for a number of individual newspapers, including the New York Times, the Albany Times-Union, the Syracuse Herald-Journal, and others. I was and am fully conscious of the great need to prevent any infringement, for any reason, upon the basic freedom of the press in the United States.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I come here with a further bit of personal background which touches directly upon the question at issue. I have been and am a television and radio commentator by profession—one of very few Members of the House specifically in that category at the present time. I do not present myself as a great network personality, but I have had the honor, since 1950, of winning three national awards, including the 1951 award of Sigma Delta Chi, the national professional journalistic society.

I recite this background, Mr. Speaker, not for the purpose of self-praise, but to give some weight to my firm belief that the ban on televising House or committee hearings is right and proper, at least at this time.

Perhaps, from a selfish viewpoint, I should agree with the distinguished gentlemen who want the TV cameras admitted. I would have some slight advantage over most of my colleagues in the rush to face the camera's eye. I know, from hundreds of hours of speaking on television about the problems of the day, including those in Washington, some of the little tricks and techniques. I even have a plentiful supply of blue shirts, which well could become part of our daily uniform here if we are to perform steadily for the television audience.

I should like to address myself first to those who believe or claim to believe that if you do not permit the camera to go anywhere the reporter carries his pad and pencil, you are curtailing freedom of the press.

Is television the press or is television a full brother of the working press?

It will be argued that any medium which can or does disseminate news is the press. That is true only in a limited sense. It is my firm belief that television, while it often performs a useful and most desireful function in the news field, is still primarily an entertainment medium. That is the guiding principle of its operation, and that is the light in which it is regarded by the great majority of our people. Most of the televising of congressional proceedings in Washington would go out as a "show" rather than as news. You and I, gentlemen, would become actors and actresses, and you would be rated by the viewers largely on your ability to emote. What a golden opportunity for the glib Members who starred in their high school plays and what a dismal prospect for the solid members who scorn histrionics.

I have great respect for the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, who has offered a resolution amending the rules of the House to give committees the right to grant or refuse permission to televise their public proceedings. However, I was intrigued by the following language on page 2 of the resolution. I quote:

> Each committee is authorized, in its discretion, upon such terms and conditions as it deems advisable, to permit the broadcasting and telecasting of its proceedings by radio and television, and the dissemination of news of such proceedings by other methods and media of communication.

I assume "other methods and media of communication" includes the wire service and newspaper reporters. Would the reporter, attending and covering a public hearing, be required to submit to "terms and conditions" the committee might impose? Could those "terms and conditions" include the actual editing of copy before it was sent? Gentlemen, if such was attempted by any committee of Congress, you would bring down upon your heads an entirely proper charge that you were, in very truth, invading freedom of the press.

The gentleman from Michigan spoke more directly to that subject on January 24 last, when he told the House:

> I would not want television and radio reporting to be authorized beyond the power of the committee to police it, because the committee should continually have control of its proceedings and should not permit distortion.

The gentleman further said he thought the committee should retain editorial control over its proceedings and its record.

Mr. Speaker, that is a rather horrifying thought. The committees would have authority to police this reporting. It would prevent distortion, and it would retain editorial control.

Would this policing, prevention of distortion and editorial control extend to the news reporters also? If, so, we are on mighty dangerous ground.

I would not even hint that a committee or its chairman would police reporting to a pattern of personal vanity or political advantage. I am sure no committee of this House would find that distortion would involve factual reporting of something unfavorable to its members or the political party of a majority of its members. I cannot believe that editorial control would be exercised for political or personal gain. But, it could. That is the danger.

Much has been said here about drawing shutter curtains between the people and their government, the implication being that if our proceedings are televised all the operations of government will become as clear as day and that, conversely, the banning of television will permit operation of government in the dark. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, how we ever managed to function in this great country of ours during the long years in which we have operated in the dark, without the benefit of the telescopic lens.

A learned Member of the House said recently that 1 look was worth 1,000 words. I assume he meant that a single picture would be more factual than the 1,000 words. The reporters who cover proceedings of the House and of its committees strive, within the limit of time and space and personal ability, to give the public a rounded picture. They are not infallible and there have been instances, I suppose, of bias. But, the reporter endeavors to present the important and informative, as well as the spectacular. The cameraman operates a little differently. He likes the unusual or the bizarre. As far as television is concerned, so do the viewers, who see television as a show.

The camera does not lie is a familiar expression, but like many such expressions it is only partly true. The camera does not tell the whole story, either, and often it misinforms by telling part of the story, impressing on the eye of the viewer only half of the apple, sometimes the overripe and sometimes the deceptively rosy. There have been instances where a picture has been a complete falsity. Some years ago, a group of radicals came to the capital of my State and started a riot in front of the capitol. I covered that affair as a reporter. I saw a woman slip and fall to the ground. An extra large State trooper, booted and spurred, reached down to assist her to her feet. As he bent over, with his left arm extended, his right arm went up in the air. He was clutching a club in his right hand. As a reporter, I would have been subject to the libel laws if I wrote that the trooper clubbed the prostrate woman. The picture which appeared the day after that episode showed the trooper and the woman and the club without explanation. All who saw that picture believed the trooper was about to strike the woman.

I do not claim that television, admitted to our committee proceedings, would do such a thing. I am only trying to emphasize that such authority can be dangerous and that there is more to it than saying, "Look, ma, I'm on television."

It has been claimed that the public demonstrated, during some recent televised congressional shows from Washington, that they want more of them. I will concede that they had a high Hooper rating, but, despite the millions of unwashed dishes in the kitchens of our land, the reaction of the people with whom I talked was one of disgust. They felt that too much emphasis had been placed on one tiny corner of government. Some believed that everything in Washington, except those hearings, was stopped on dead center. People looked at the shows, it is true. They also would look, in great numbers, at the televising of some great disaster, such as a fire, or

flood, or wreck. Should we, to satisfy that curiosity, stage such disasters?

With the control committee chairmen would exercise over televised hearings, you can be very sure that the parts of those hearings which appeared in the livingrooms would be the parts most likely to impress on the viewers the things the chairman wanted to impress.

Every good show, of course, must have its villain to be a success. Some unhappy person, summoned to Washington as a witness, would have the unwanted role, with his likeness pinned, like a fluttering moth, on millions of screens. The press might print his side of the story, but how much time would he have to present that side to those who flip the knobs in their livingrooms.

I wonder, if television is admitted to these hearings, how many sessions of the Committee on Ways and Means will be covered. Very few, I think. They are important, but dull. Perhaps, the members of such committees, denied the limelight given their less important but more spectacular brethren, might appoint as counsel some of the luminaries of the stage or screen. Lucille Ball might find herself in the role of consultant to the Committee on the Judiciary or the Committee on Rules.

Many committees meet in the mornings now, freeing themselves for the House sessions starting at noon. They might discover that morning time is not so good. With the committee sessions attracting the public attention, the House itself, as a minor bit of background, might decide to meet in the morning, quitting in time for the rendezvous of the committees with the housewives, who have an hour or two of free time in the afternoon.

Or, perhaps all committee hearings will be conducted at night. That is when the real audiences are available, if we can produce a show spectacular enough to compete with Dragnet, or I Love Lucy, or Ed Sullivan.

Last Sunday night, I had as my television guest the distinguished Republican speaker of another house, the New York State Assembly. The gentleman, while still comparatively young, has been speaker for 19 years, longer than any man in history. I asked him the direct question: "Would you authorize the televising of assembly proceedings?"

"I would not," he replied. "I believe the legislative branch of government should operate in a calm, deliberative manner. I do not believe the presence of television cameras will lead to either calmness or deliberation. I'm afraid they would result in much more talking and a lot less thinking."

I believe the speaker of the New York Assembly spoke wisely. I believe the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives has ruled wisely.

And to my friends in the television industry—if I still have some—I say, "Not yet."

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

TELEVISING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DELANEY). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, without being critical at all of the Speaker of the House, the Governor of New York, or the other gentlemen who were mentioned here awhile ago, permit me to give at least one of the arguments in favor of televising committee hearings. I just came in and heard the conclusion, or I assume it was the conclusion, the last few words, the expression of the thought that the hearings of our committees should not be televised. I know that the Members of the House will all recognize the fact, yes, and realize without any doubt at all that I have nothing to gain by televising committee hearings. Anyone who is as old and shows the ravages of the years as I do certainly cannot hope for any advantage on television. For me that is just out. So, I think you will agree that I am not speaking from a personal standpoint. Now, there are some very, very handsome, intelligent looking, eloquent Members of this House, younger Members, like my colleague here, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES]. There is no question but what any argument that he might advance, even though it was wholly illogical to an extreme, presented in his way, with his looks, pleasing manner, and musical voice, I am sure would go over—not unduly—but far better than from one less attractive. I repeat—not solely because of those advantages, do not think that; but it would—because of the advantages I have mentioned—merit the attention which it should have.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. O'NEILL. I challenge the remarks of the gentleman at the microphone. There are many, many people who think the gentleman looks like Will Rogers.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will Rogers was a great man. He was honest, he was patriotic, in addition he had the ability to express himself clearly and convincingly. Had he lived he might well have influenced, and for the better, our national policies. I know of but few whose character, advocacy, and objectives I more greatly admired. However, if it was a question of personal appearances, I might have preferred to look at Mae West. I prefer to look like Mae West, if I had my choice; I mean as she did years ago. I am sure that the gentleman merits all that I said about my colleague.

Mr. O'NEILL. The gentleman means when he was in his heyday?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am afraid I would be overcome by my emotion over what the gentleman might say. Therefore, I cannot, at the moment, yield further.

To get back to the merits of this proposition, of televising congressional hearings.

When the question first came up, I was opposed to televising the hearings of our committees because there were some—no, I will say there was one, meaning myself—who liked to crowd into the limelight. Perhaps it is unfair for me to claim to be the only one who might like the limelight. I stand corrected because some who write for the papers incessantly accuse Members of Congress of being publicity hounds, although as a rule none of us can get his name in the paper except as they permit us. However, there are no other Members of the House whom I would accuse of having that thought in mind. But I got that from my grandson. From the time he was 2 or 3 years old until he was 6 or 7, you could not take a picture, you could not have a camera in your hands and point it in any direction but what he was right out there is front. They say that he inherited that characteristic from me. Of course, I made no comment on that, because I did not want to get into any argument in the family. But in the beginning I was opposed to televising hearings, because I did think that being new some of us—well, I will talk about myself and let it go at that—would get into a position where I would be seeking the limelight. And I guess that was true.

But now when I go home in the evening, and I see wrestling matches—and the other night I noticed this; and if the fellows who are responsible for the manufacture, distribution, and sale of Bohemian beer do not get better refereeing services, if their beer is no better than the refereeing, then I am in favor of abolishing the televising of wrestling matches and outlawing the production of their beer. But the other night things got so rocky, a fellow named Becker, who is a wrestler—and I hope you will take occasion to watch him. Tough as he is, he just could not take the incompetency of the official who was supposed to be watching and calling illegal holds. Becker was not wrestling then, he was on the outside of the ring in the audience. And I will have to admit that I saw this. I looked at it. I was just peeking in.

The other fellow grabbed his opponent by the hair when he was outside of the ring, ran him right along that duck walk, whatever it is just outside the ropes, and jammed his head into an iron post. Becker, being on the outside, jumped into the ring, and he certainly gave the hair-pulling, rule-violating wrestler a beating; I mean the fellow on the inside who was doing the dirty work, what our former colleague the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. BENDER, calls the "works." The crowd, the women and children as well as the men, just stood up and roared and applauded and shouted, "Give it to him." And it seemed they included the official who was getting an occasional push from Becker.

We would not have that kind of action in committee, I am sure. We have had some pretty rough times, but nothing improper. And over in the other body apparently now no language seems to be barred. But here in the House we would not have anyone engaging in quarrels

like that or in using bad language. From my experience I know that to be true.

So television having been accepted as one of the everyday and every night methods of enlightenment, why not let the people know the facts? Let them see; let them hear. In the courts, when a case went up for review, especially a chancery case, before a judge or in a jury trial the court says the jury, or a judge in a chancery case, having seen and heard the witnesses, or the jury having been able to judge from what they saw and heard, were in a better position to determine the facts than the appellate court, which neither saw nor heard the witnesses.

Now, I recall those hearings over there where the Army was concerned, as well as was a gentleman from Wisconsin—do you remember? The papers here in Washington, anyway, had their version of that testimony. But when the people saw the hearings on the television, and heard the voices of the witnesses they were able—each and every individual who looked and listened was able to judge for himself as to where is the truth of the charges.

Why deny that opportunity to the people, the opportunities which would enable them to determine for themselves where the truth might be?

I have just noticed my colleague from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN], who has just come in. Think of having that gentleman on the radio or television with his distinguished statesmanlike appearance and his slogan: "All is made for love." He would be irresistible if he were right.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. BATES. In spite of the very nice remarks which the gentleman directed toward me——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Please do not express your opinion of me.

Mr. BATES. I would only say this, after listening to the gentleman for the last 5 or 6 minutes——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did the gentleman listen?

Mr. BATES. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is a compliment.

Mr. BATES. I listened most carefully. If I had my choice between listening to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] or listening to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I am quite sure, if they were on two different stations, I would turn to the station on which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] was speaking.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. A more than generous and charitable statement.

Of course, I best could aid the gentleman in his own State by opposing him, but if there is anything I can do to assist him at any time I am at his service. I knew the gentleman's father and admired him. He was a statesman. The son is a worthy successor, and I wish him all success here and at home.

I conclude with this: I think you will all agree that television and radio broadcasting are two sources of information that are here to stay. The people should have both. Perhaps more people get news from broadcasts and from television than from the printed word. And do not forget this: I think the people are better able to judge whether a fellow is a ham, as they call it, or is sincere and honest if they see and hear one, than if they but have the printed word from a third person and a retouched photograph. Soon televising and broadcasting would get our committees down to the real job of trying to get testimony which would tell them what course they should follow in enacting legislation.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ASHMORE (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Wednesday, February 9, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

INCREASING PAY OF CONGRESSMEN AND FEDERAL DISTRICT JUDGES

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah.

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, last year I was 1 of 3 Members of Congress who testified against increasing the pay of Congressmen and Federal district judges. At that time I recommended that increases in our salaries be held in abeyance until more than a token tax reduction has been granted and until the budget is balanced. In other words, let any salary increase come from a surplus in our Nation's Treasury.

I see no reason to change my position. Like every other ambitious American, I feel personally I am worth more than I am being paid. But I will not feel I have earned it until the pledge of a balanced budget—a pledge I made over 3 years ago—has been achieved.

When I campaigned for office, I told the taxpayers that the business in which they held stock—the Federal Government—was in a sad way. Despite heavy assessments in the form of taxes, it was going deeper into the red every year.

They elected me an officer in this public corporation to correct this.

The best information I have is that despite our efforts, the Federal Government will continue to operate at a deficit next year. When a government or a business is operating at a loss, it is no time to raise the salaries of its officers. And any officer who makes this recommendation to the stockholders on the grounds it will improve the financial position of the Government is talking through his hat.

You will hear testimony to the effect that the raises asked would increase Federal expenditures only a fraction of 1 percent. Even if this were true, the taxpayers could not afford to give us a salary raise at this time.

But the effect of the increase of congressional salaries would be much greater than the submitted figures would indicate. There is no way to estimate what the final cost to the taxpayer would be.

The present level of our salaries acts as a brake on the salaries paid in our own offices, and to workers and officers throughout all other branches of government.

An increase in congressional salaries would set off a chain reaction for increases in all other departments at a time when the country can least afford it.

Some assume that there is a direct measurable relationship between the caliber of our public officials and the salary paid to them.

Given an adequate salary, the relationship between pay and qualifications is very sketchy indeed.

No salary can ever be high enough to recompense an outstanding public official for the service he renders to the people. And it's mighty hard to underpay a bad one.

At the present salary, the Federal district court judge is the highest paid public official in the State and there would certainly be no dearth of highly qualified candidates for his job should it become vacant tomorrow.

I am convinced that our employer—the people of the United States—does not want us to work for niggardly salaries. And I suspect the taxpayer now rather resents any imputation that our present salaries are niggardly.

I recommend that the increases be held in abeyance until more than a token tax reduction has been granted and until the budget is balanced.

In other words, let any salary increase come from a surplus in our Nation's Treasury. Such a recommendation, if followed, would give us something to work toward in Congress and if we are successful might convince some of the people that we have earned an increase in pay.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. CORBETT in two instances.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WATTS and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 7, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

371. A letter from the Librarian of Congress transmitting the annual report of the affairs of the Library of Congress, including the copyright business, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954; to the Committee on House Administration.

372. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report of claims paid by the

Department of Labor during the calendar year ending December 31, 1954, pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C. 2671, 2673); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

373. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

374. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 2 of the act of March 2, 1945, pertaining to the Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg."; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3005. A bill to further amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending the authority to induct certain individuals, and to extend the benefits under the Dependents Assistance Act to July 1, 1959; with amendment (Rept. No. 19). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. H. R. 3406. A bill to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 20). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 3543. A bill to promote the national defense and security by providing for a temporary program to aid in relieving the shortage of physicians and other health personnel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 3544. A bill to provide for the acquisition of lands by the United States required for the reservoir created by the construction of Randall Dam on the Missouri River and for rehabilitation of the Indians of the Lower Brule Sioux Reservation, S. Dak., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 3545. A bill creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 3546. A bill to provide grants to municipalities for the construction of sewage-treatment works to prevent and abate pollution of the Connecticut River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3547. A bill to encourage the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 3548. A bill to encourage the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 3549. A bill to encourage the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 3550. A bill to encourage the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 3551. A bill to encourage the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 3552. A bill to encourage the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 3553. A bill to encourage the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. R. 3554. A bill to encourage the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 3555. A bill to encourage the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3556. A bill to encourage the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3557. A bill to further amend the act of July 3, 1943 (ch. 189, 57 Stat. 372), relating to the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or certain civilian employees of the United States, by removing certain limitations on the payment of such claims and the time within which such claims may be filed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3558. A bill to amend section 2680 (j) of title 28 of the United States Code so as to permanently exclude claims arising out of combatant activities or warlike operations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3559. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3560. A bill to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3561. A bill to further amend the act of January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps Forces in foreign countries"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 3562. A bill to protect the civil rights of individuals by establishing a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government, a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice, and a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights, to strengthen the criminal laws protecting the civil rights of individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3563. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3564 A bill authorizing an appropriation to enable the Secretary of Labor to make additional unemployment compensation payments to States having large numbers of unemployed persons in labor surplus areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3565. A bill to offset declining employment by providing for Federal assistance to States and local governments in projects of construction, alteration, expansion, or repair of public facilities and improvements; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3566. A bill to amend and supplement existing civil-rights statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3567. A bill to strengthen the laws relating to convict labor, peonage, slavery, and involuntary servitude; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3568. A bill to establish a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3569. A bill to protect the right to political participation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3570. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 3571. A bill to reorganize the Department of Justice for the protection of civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3572. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COON:

H. R. 3573. A bill granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Klamath River by the States of Oregon and California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 3574. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by individuals, to promote thrift, and to stimulate expansion of employment through investment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 3575. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3576. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. R. 3577. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3578. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3579. A bill to establish a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3580. A bill to amend and supplement existing civil-rights statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3581. A bill to strengthen the laws relating to convict labor, peonage, slavery, and involuntary servitude; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3582. A bill to protect the right to political participation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3583. A bill to reorganize the Department of Justice for the protection of civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3584. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 3585. A bill to protect the civil rights of individuals by establishing a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government, a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice, and a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights, to strengthen the criminal laws protecting the civil rights of individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3586. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 3587. A bill granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Klamath River by the States of Oregon and California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 3588. A bill to make the calendar fixed and perpetual; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 3589. A bill to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean service period in combat or from an instrumentality of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 3590. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 3591. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3592. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of John M. Phillips; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3593. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Andrew W. Mellon; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 3594. A bill making an appropriation for the prosecution of the Delaware River channel-deepening project, as heretofore authorized by law; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 3595. A bill to suspend for 1 year certain duties upon the importation of aluminum and aluminum alloys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 3596. A bill to provide recognition as veterans of the Indian Wars for persons who took part in the capture of the Ute Indians in 1906, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 3597. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3598. A bill to repeal the retailers excise tax on handbags; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3599. A bill to extend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to individuals engaged in the practice of law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 3600. A bill to require bills and resolutions authorizing appropriations reported by committees of Congress to be accompanied by an estimate of the probable cost of the legislation; to the Committee on Rules.

H. R. 3601. A bill to require that the budget shall include each year a special analysis of certain long-term construction and development projects; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 3602. A bill to provide for the acquisition of lands by the United States required for the reservoir created by the construction of Randall Dam on the Missouri River and for rehabilitation of the Indians of the Crow Creek Sioux Reservation, S. Dak., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3603. A bill to preserve the wheat acreage history of farms voluntarily underplanting their allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 3604. A bill to suspend for 1 year certain duties upon the importation of aluminum and aluminum alloys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 3605. A bill to grant an additional income-tax exemption to a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 3606. A bill creating a Federal Commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 3607. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide full annuity for individuals who have completed 30 years of service; to provide annuities thereunder equal to 50 percent of the average monthly salaries or wages based on the 5 years of highest earnings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3608. A bill to amend section 9 (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 3609. A bill to suspend for 1 year certain duties upon the importation of aluminum and aluminum alloys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 3610. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the payment of old-age insurance benefits to certain disabled individuals who are under retirement age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3611. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 65 to 60 the age at which old-age and other monthly insurance benefits may become payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 3612. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Kansas:

H. R. 3613. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Waconda Springs, Mitchell County, Kans., as a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 3614. A bill to require that whenever an officer or member who is discharged from the Armed Forces is so mentally deranged or unstable as to be potentially dangerous, his family and certain other persons are to be placed on notice of such potential danger; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 3615. A bill to provide for the equitable adjustment of compensation for physicians assigned to residency training in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 3616. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to require that the rates and charges of natural-gas companies be determined on the basis of the actual legitimate cost of the companies' property, less depreciation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. J. Res. 191. Joint resolution directing the Civil Aeronautics Board to procure an amendment to the Warsaw Convention with reference to limitation of liability on oversea travel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. J. Res. 192. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish the electoral-college system and to provide for the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. J. Res. 193. Joint resolution providing for a commission to make available information as to the basic differences between the theories and practices of the American way of life and the theories and practices of atheistic communism; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SISK:

H. J. Res. 194. Joint resolution to designate the General Grant tree (known as the Nation's Christmas tree) in Kings Canyon National Park, Calif., as a national shrine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. Con. Res. 64. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. Con. Res. 65. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. Res. 130. Resolution amending the rules of the House of Representatives with respect to the organization of standing committees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. Res. 131. Resolution to provide funds for necessary expenses of the Committee on the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 3617. A bill for the relief of Jan R. Cwiklinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 3618. A bill for the relief of Miss Bae Myo Hwa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES (by request):

H. R. 3619. A bill for the relief of Andronikl Kalafatides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3620. A bill for the relief of certain spouses of United States citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 3621. A bill for the relief of Continental Hosiery Mills, Inc., of Henderson, N. C., successor to Continental Hosiery Co. of Henderson, N. C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3622. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Remo Guastucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 3623. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Andriola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3624. A bill for the relief of Olga I. Papadopoulou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3625. A bill for the relief of George Vourderis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3626. A bill for the relief of Ilse Werner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 3627. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Robert T. C. Rasmussen, the right, title, and interest of the United States, in foreign countries, in and to certain inventions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 3628. A bill for the relief of Luise Isabella Chu, also known as Luise Schneider; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3629. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nika Kirihara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3630. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Uto Ginoza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3631. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Noriko Sato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3632. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kama Asato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3633. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tomeko Kishi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3634. A bill for the relief of Fusa Kimura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3635. A bill for the relief of Birgit Camara, also known as Birgit Heinemann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3636. A bill to authorize the issuance of a land patent to certain lands situate in the city and county of Honolulu, island of Oahu, to the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Hawaiian Islands; to the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 3637. A bill for the relief of Hanna Florian Sulner and George Andrew Sulner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 3638. A bill for the relief of Joseph H. Washburn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3639. A bill for the relief of Ralph Bennett and certain other employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 3640. A bill for the relief of Sister Saveria (Angela Lauria); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 3641. A bill for the relief of Nabiha Elias Audi, also known as N. E. Audi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 3642. A bill for the relief of Colin Noyes Clinch-Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 3643. A bill for the relief of Shlomo Zalman Blumenfeld (Sol Blum); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3644. A bill for the relief of Fuh Yu Yang (John F. Y. Yang); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3645. A bill for the relief of Concepcion Galloffn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3646. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Louise Nanton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3647. A bill for the relief of Rolando Aravena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 3648. A bill for the relief of the estate of Bobby Gene Jackson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 3649. A bill for the relief of Placido Parato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H. R. 3650. A bill to provide for the conveyance to Eilef Rue of certain real property situated in Cassia County, Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 3651. A bill for the relief of Gertrude Riley-Sexton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

82. By Mr. FINO: Petition of Miss G. F. Hogan, of New York, N. Y., urging that legislation be enacted to amend the Social Security Act to provide monthly insurance benefits for dependent brothers and sisters, and other dependent relatives, of deceased individuals who were fully insured under the act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

83. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the director, Government Relations Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc., Washington, D. C., relative to submitting and requesting enactment of a 10-point legislative program designed to speed the day when the Indians can take care of their own affairs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Reawakening of the Civil Service Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. WATTS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1955

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert an excerpt from Jerry Kluttz's column, the Federal Diary, appearing in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald.

The gist of the item relates to a reversal of position by the Civil Service Commission with respect to the right of a department or agency passing over an eligible veteran, a veteran who has taken the required civil-service examination and received certification of eligibility by the Civil Service Commission for appointment to the particular position.

Heretofore, if the appointing agency of the Government desired to pass over an eligible veteran, the civil service had ruled that all that was necessary was for the agency to submit in writing its reasons for such action; the Commission would then pass upon these reasons and if found to be insufficient would so notify the agency, the agency thereupon would advise the Commission that it had considered the Commission's views, and had reconsidered the veteran involved and then proceed to pass him over. The veteran had no recourse as the Civil Service Commission felt that this was full compliance with the intent and purpose of Congress.

The Civil Service Commission now feels that Congress was not performing an idle gesture when it adopted the 1953 amendment requiring the Commission to pass upon the sufficiency of the Department's reasons for passing over the veteran; but that Congress intended for this procedure to mean something toward establishing an independent forum of review of such actions for the protection of eligible veterans against the ruthless, arbitrary and overzealous acts of patronage-hungry politicians and misdirected departmental or agency heads.

Mr. Speaker, this voluntary action of the Commission in this instance is a source of gratification to me. While it may be termed "a slight opening of one eye," it nevertheless may be the prelude or forerunner of a complete reawakening to the fact by the Commission that Congress, when enacting a law does not indulge in idle gesturing. It is refreshing to know that at least one agency has again commenced to reestablish itself and assume the responsibilities vested in it by the Congress. And particularly is this true because it is the Civil Service Commission, the agency created by the Congress for the purpose of protecting the veteran and the career-service employees of the Federal Government from those that would reestablish the old system of "To the victor belongs the spoils" in manning the personnel of our Government.

This action by the Commission is well taken. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, for the past 10 days, pursuant to my request, experts have been conducting research on this very subject matter for the purpose of drafting whatever legislative proposal may have been necessary to obtain the very objective which the civil service has accomplished by its voluntary administrative action. My congratulations to the Civil Service Commission; may this slight awakening be a good omen. While on this subject

matter, I may suggest to the Commission that they review section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, with the view of reassuring themselves of the intent and purpose that Congress may have had in mind in creating the right of appeal provided for thereunder. Should they do this, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that they give consideration to the role of the Civil Service Commission in Federal employment as pronounced by the Commission in pamphlet No. 52, issued by it in January 1955. I am sure that if this is done, a new era will be developed which will tend to eliminate the wholesale dismissal of veterans and career-service employees upon inconsequential charges, or other charges unsupported by substantial and relevant evidence.

The excerpt follows:

VETERANS' PREFERENCE GIVEN GREATER FORCE UNDER CSC RULING

A new ruling gives the Veterans' Preference Act greater force and agency heads less in appointing eligibles from Civil Service's eligible lists.

After hearing a stout protest from groups of veterans, CSC ruled that an agency can't pass over an eligible veteran and appoint a nonveteran unless it agrees that its reasons are justifiable and sufficient.

A restudy of the 1953 amendments to the preference act, CSC explained, has convinced it that its more stringent interpretation of that law is proper and was so intended by Congress.

Heretofore, an agency could pass over a veteran and give CSC its reasons for doing so. CSC could decide the reasons were insufficient but it didn't attempt to force the agency to appoint the veteran anyway. Now it will insist on the appointment.

Result of Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1955

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, during my years of service in the Congress, I have regularly conducted polls of public thinking on vital national issues in my congressional district. These polls have been in the form of a printed questionnaire, requiring simple yes-and-no answers, mailed to registered voters in my district, regardless of political affiliation.

Responses to these questionnaires have always been excellent. The tabulated results, which virtually constitute a referendum of the district, have proved of enormous value to myself and I hope to my colleagues in the Congress.

My congressional district is probably as representative and contains as many varied interest groups as any in the Nation. It has the wealthy, the poor, and the middle class. It has a high concentration of labor, white-collar workers, small business, large industries and some of the finest farm areas found anywhere. It includes a thickly populated section of Pittsburgh, extends to the rural areas, and takes in many large and small towns in northern Allegheny County.

This latest poll covered 13 questions raised by President Dwight D. Eisenhower's state of the Union message. The percentage tabulation of answers is included here without comment.

I trust they will prove as interesting and informative to all who study them as they are to me.

POLL RESULTS

1. Do you approve of Eisenhower's program in general? Yes, 90 percent; no, 10 percent.

2. Should the budget be balanced prior to any important tax cuts? Yes, 83 percent, no, 17 percent.

3. Do you believe that our expenditures for national defense are adequate? Yes, 76 percent; no, 24 percent.

4. Should the Federal Government encourage and guaranty private health insurance programs? Yes, 51 percent; no, 49 percent.

5. Should tariffs be selectively lowered through reciprocal trade agreements? Yes, 72 percent; no, 28 percent.

6. Should the draft law be renewed? Yes, 85 percent; no, 15 percent.

7. Should the minimum wage be raised to 90 cents per hour? Yes, 77 percent; no, 23 percent.

8. Eisenhower says a salary raise for Members of Congress "is long overdue." Do you agree? Yes, 64 percent; no, 36 percent.

9. Should the incentives for men to remain in the military services be increased and the incentives to be discharged be reduced? Yes, 82 percent; no, 18 percent.

10. Should the voting age be lowered from 21 to 18 years? Yes, 35 percent; no, 65 percent.

11. Do you agree that the flexible price-support program is a marked improvement? Yes, 88 percent; no, 12 percent.

12. Eisenhower said: "The transition to a peacetime economy is largely behind us. The economic outlook is good." Do you agree? Yes, 78 percent; no, 22 percent.

13. Do you think the Eisenhower administration is making satisfactory progress in securing world peace? Yes, 81 percent; no, 19 percent.

H. R. 1, Extending Reciprocal Trade Agreements, Will Continue the Disastrous Effects on Our Economy That Have Resulted From the Reckless Importation of Foreign Goods Manufactured at a Fraction of the Wages Paid American Workmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on February 1, 1955, I appeared before the House Committee on Ways and Means in opposition to H. R. 1 providing for an extension of reciprocal trade agreements.

My statement follows:

I appreciate the privilege of appearing before this committee.

When I first came to Congress in 1939 I opposed Reciprocal Trade Agreements on the grounds that they were destroying the jobs of coal miners in my Congressional District in Pennsylvania. At that time, imported Russian coal had captured some of the eastern seaboard coal markets from coal producers in my Congressional District.

During the early part of World War II and before resigning my seat in Congress to return to military service, I supported the extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements in the 78th Congress because we were at war and the demand for coal revived our coal industry.

When I was elected to the 80th Congress I voted in favor of extending Reciprocal Trade Agreements with the understanding that American industries would be protected from unfair competition resulting from a flood of cheaply manufactured foreign goods.

For example, in Pennsylvania residual oil from Venezuela was beginning to flood the eastern seaboard, thus destroying the market for Pennsylvania-mined coal.

During the 82d Congress I voted to extend reciprocal trade agreements because there was contained therein the so-called peril-point amendment which was designed to provide a checkrein on imports that could destroy the jobs of American wage earners.

During the 83d Congress I joined many of my colleagues in an effort to stop the uncontrolled flow of foreign goods. Many of you will recall that we were supporting the Simpson bill. My special interest was in regulating the flood of foreign residual oil by placing a quota limitation on the importation of such oil. As many of you will recall, the Simpson bill was returned to the committee.

During the early part of 1954 the so-called Randall committee was created and took testimony from spokesmen for industries adversely affected by the importation of cheaply manufactured foreign goods. I regret to state that the coal industry was denied the opportunity to present its side of the case. Consequently the Randall report ignored the increasingly serious situation existing in the coal-producing States of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, by my votes as a Member of Congress there is ample proof that I believe in the principles of reciprocal trade agreements and that I supported them until I found a wholesale disregard for protecting the jobs of American workmen.

It became evident that the so-called peril-point amendment was meaningless and that the Randall committee merely performed a window-dressing job and actually by their recommendations threw American wage earners to the wolves.

Mr. Chairman, I voted against the extension of reciprocal trade agreements last year and I intend to continue to do so until the interest of the American working man is protected.

As a means of attaining the objective of protecting the jobs of American workmen, I have three bills pending before this committee, namely: H. R. 345, H. R. 864 and H. R. 3019.

H. R. 345 is designed to provide a 5 percent quota limitation on imports of foreign residual oil; while H. R. 3019 would increase the limitation to 10 percent.

H. R. 864 provides a permanent procedure for the adjustment of tariff rates on a selective basis and regulates the flow of imported articles on a basis of fair competition with domestic articles. H. R. 864 also contains a 5 percent quota limitation on imports of foreign residual oil.

If hearings are scheduled on these three bills now pending before this committee, I am prepared to testify in support of their objectives.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to H. R. 1 because it will continue the disastrous effects on our economy by the reckless importation of foreign goods manufactured at a fraction of the wages paid American workmen.

For the past several days this committee has heard expert testimony from spokesmen for various industries regarding the adverse effects reciprocal trade agreements are having on our industrial economy. These ex-

perts produced facts showing that the employees of the industry affected not only lost their jobs but many of the manufacturing plants have been driven to financial distress, and in some instances were forced to close their doors.

You have heard from spokesmen for the coal industry and how the flood of foreign residual oil from Venezuela has destroyed the domestic coal markets of the miners in Pennsylvania, Maryland, and West Virginia.

Back in 1939 when I first voiced my opposition to the importation of slave-mined Russian coal and other cheaply manufactured foreign products, I predicted that such a reckless policy would create ghost towns out of many communities in my congressional district and throughout the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, my prediction in 1939 has become a reality. Practically all of our deep mines in central Pennsylvania are closed and thousands of miners have been out of work for several years. In fact, many mining towns have been abandoned and their empty and dilapidated rows of houses stand as a monument to the destructive effects of the importation of foreign residual oil. Because they have nowhere to go there are only a few of the unemployed in the coal fields of central Pennsylvania that have left the area. The result is that today, according to the United States Department of Labor, my congressional district is classified as a critical area because of the fact that nearly 18 percent of the civilian labor force is unemployed.

This unemployment is not confined to coal miners but includes those employed in affected related industries such as the railroads.

Mr. Chairman, in my home city of Altoona, Pa., nearly 10,000 people are unemployed, 6,000 of whom are railroad employees with 4,100 of this number having exhausted their rights on January 10, 1955, to railroad unemployment insurance benefits. A similar condition exists among coal miners and others who have lost their right to unemployment compensation benefits from the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, every community in my congressional district has an active committee engaged in trying to attract new industries and millions of dollars have been raised by voluntary subscription to finance this long-range program of rehabilitating the industrial economy of the area.

While this united community effort goes on, thousands of my constituents—all good Americans and victims of this reckless foreign trade policy—are today dependent for their existence upon public assistance and surplus food commodities.

I regret that every member of this committee is unable to talk to these unemployed Americans as they stand in line to pick up their food coupons. If it were possible for you to talk to them, you would hear the pitiful story of their plight as citizens of a Nation that boasts of its high standard of living.

As I mentioned a moment ago, communities affected by unemployment in cooperation with the State and Federal Government are endeavoring to rehabilitate their economy by attracting new industries. The unemployment situation, however, is getting worse as mines continue to close and more miners and railroaders are losing their jobs.

While this unfortunate situation prevails in the United States, residents of Venezuela which is the chief exporter of residual oil, are enjoying unbridled prosperity.

Let me read you Hal Boyle's syndicated column of January 24, 1955, titled "Venezuela Seen as the Texas of South America":

"VENEZUELA SEEN AS TEXAS OF SOUTH AMERICA

"(By Hal Boyle)

"CARACAS, VENEZUELA.—Leaves from a cruising notebook: Venezuela today is the Texas of South America.

"So much money is being made here that visiting Texans actually get an inferiority complex, and the United States dollar feels like 50 cents.

"Just to be sure he wouldn't be mistaken for an ordinary bum, one new millionaire from the interior of the country came to town with calling cards that bore this message printed after his name: 'Capital; 6,000,000 bolivars.' That's nearly $2 million.

"There is so much wealth flowing around that even tourists get a break. If you kick a diamond out of a rock here, the Government lets you keep it tax free unless it is worth more than $1,700. You can also go pearl diving and keep any pearls you find.

"The visitor has a dazed sensation he is caught in a mid-century Klondike gold rush. The atmosphere of quick money is overwhelming, and tales of riches made overnight are a bolivar a dozen.

"Venezuela is bigger than Texas and Oklahoma combined and larger than any European country except Germany. Its chief income is from oil—no land except the United States produces more—but it also has iron ore deposits rivaling the famed Minnesota Mesabi Range. It also has cowboys and Indians, 16,000-foot tall mountains, jungles, beach resorts, and the world's highest waterfalls.

"Although the nation has a population of only 5½ million, the Government spent half a billion dollars in 1954 on vast public works projects and still ended up with $80 million left in the till. Its huge modernization program calls for the future expenditure of $800 million alone for a new 2,640-mile railway network to open inland mineral and agricultural areas for further development.

"Foreign investors from the United States and Europe are pouring untold more millions into the industrialization of the country. It has taken in more than 100,000 immigrants from Europe the last 10 years.

"Caracas, the 388-year-old capital, is now one of the world's greatest boom cities. Fifty years ago milkmen herded cows through its ancient streets. Today they are jammed by thousands of new high-priced motor cars.

"You reach the city from the nearby port along recently completed 11-mile highway that cost $71 million, which Caraquenos proudly boast is, mile for mile, the most expensive ever built.

"Nearly a million people live in the metropolitan area, and so many new buildings are going up construction workers have no time even to take Sundays off to go to the bull fights.

"Dominating the heart of the city is Centro Bolivar, Venezuela's "Rockefeller Center," which will cost $300 million. Its twin 300-foot towers, housing Government offices, have 4 traffic levels beneath them.

"Caracas also has a baseball park the size of Yankee Stadium, the new $8 million Hotel Tamanaco, a technicolored $30 million polyclinic hospital, and a university as modern as any in the world.

"But the city has abysmal poverty as well as tremendous wealth. The shanties of the poor still crowd many of the raw red hills that stud Caracas. The Government has torn down thousands of these eyesores and replaced them with forty 15-story apartment buildings at a cost of $24 million. Workmen can rent the apartments for $6 to $30 a month, own them after a period of 20 years.

"In 1955 the Government plans to tear down 6,500 more shacks, spend $2 million more on apartment projects for low-income workers.

"Oddly, many uprooted workmen's families are unhappy in their fine new apartments.

" 'The old shacks had a small yard in which the families could raise a pig and a few chickens,' explained our guide. 'It is all but impossible, of course, to raise a pig in an apartment, and many of the old people in particular get lonesome for their old way of life. They don't feel as free as they did.'

"Progress always has its price, and to some the price doesn't seem worth it."

Mr. Chairman, what a contrast it is to compare living conditions in Venezuela with the coalfields of Pennsylvania.

May I add that the prosperity enjoyed in Venezuela is to a great extent at the expense of the misery and suffering of residents of the coal-producing States of our Nation and especially of my congressional district.

At this very minute a quarter of a million ton tanker ship is tied up at an east coast dock carrying disaster to the coal, railroad, and related industries of this Nation, in much the same manner as rat-infested vessels brought disease into our port cities in years gone by.

This foreign tanker with its bunker space filled with residual oil is dumping it in violation of every American concept of fair competition. As a matter of fact, even if the miners of our Nation would work for nothing and the railroads transported the coal for practically nothing, the coal industry could not compete with this unfair competition from foreign residual oil because its price is continually manipulated downward to capture the eastern seaboard coal market.

Mr. Chairman, it is being said in defense of residual oil that the oil companies have been requested to restrict voluntarily the amount of residual oil imported quarterly.

It has also been said that if any restrictions are placed on the importation of foreign residual oil that we will offend Venezuela.

Let me state, Mr. Chairman, that every time a coal miner loses his job because of unfair competition from foreign residual oil a railroader has also been added to the list of the unemployed.

As far as I am concerned, it is about time we start adopting some of the policies foreign nations apply against us in protecting the jobs of their industrial workers.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 1 will not correct the unemployment situation by affording the necessary relief to distressed industries and therefore I cannot conscientiously vote for it.

No doubt H. R. 1 will be sent to the floor under a closed rule prohibiting any amendments, thereby denying us as representatives of the American people the opportunity to translate their wishes into law.

Mr. Chairman, those of us who represent coal-producing States recognize foreign residual oil as the archenemy of our industrial economy. I hold in my hand a bottle of this toxic economic poison. Therefore, I plead with you that during your consideration of H. R. 1 you will amend its language to include a 10-percent quota limitation on quarterly imports of foreign residual oil.

If this committee will adopt such an amendment, you will be granting a large measure of relief to the unemployed coal miners and railroaders in my congressional district and the Nation at large.

Chairmen and Minority Leaders of Standing Committees of the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1955

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for the election of the chairman and the minority leader of each standing committee of the House of Representatives

by the duly elected members of each committee. This proposed change in the rules of the House of Representatives would have very wholesome and significant results and has long been overdue.

The rules of the House of Representatives provide amazingly well to let the majority eventually work its will while protecting all the proper rights of any minority. However, in actual practice the power of the Rules Committee to deep-freeze legislation is seldom successfully challenged, and the dictatorial control, where it exists, of the chairman of any standing committee over procedure and action in his committee is less seldom hurdled. I have earlier introduced legislation to partially dilute the power of the Rules Committee.

Why is there a need for a change in the manner of selecting committee chairmen? Every Member of the House knows and every student of committee procedures knows that the chairmen of the committees schedule pending bills for action in the order that they see fit. He may never schedule some bills at all; he may not assign them to a subcommittee; he may assign them to a special subcommittee of handpicked members; he may select or reject any witnesses for or against a given proposal. The chairman can limit the time of witnesses; he can select who does the questioning in hearings; he can determine in part who shall speak in the House and for how long. He may even delay to death reporting a bill favorably acted on to the Rules Committee or the House. Likewise, in the selection of conferees the chairman may often control the shape and design of House-passed legislation, and he can dominate, terminate, or prevent investigations and studies by his committee. Further, the selection and direction of the committee staff members can be and generally is at the will of the chairman. Finally, the chairman can be most effective negatively by simply not calling meetings of the committee or stall a bill to death by hearings, protracted discussion, and intervening matters. All of these powers and more reside in the hands of the chairman of a standing committee and all of them have been abused too often.

How would the election of the chairman by the members of the majority party improve the situation? Most obviously by making the chairman of a committee responsible to the committee members instead of the seniority system, his power to behave in an arbitrary manner would be diluted if not eliminated. Certainly no chairman could long remain such or hope to be reelected if he did not treat his colleagues with the consideration they deserve as elected Members of Congress. Certainly any action on his part which was contrary to the will of the majority would place his chairmanship in jeopardy and he would know it.

It is also evident that in many cases; election of the chairman by the committee members would result in better-qualified chairmen. It is assumed that the senior member of any committee on the majority side, all things being equal, would normally be elected chairman under this proposal. But where it happens that the impairments of advanced age; lack of energy; lack of ability to properly explain or persuade; lack of consideration, fair play, and open-mindedness, and lack of proper qualifications generally makes a person unfit to be a chairman, someone else would probably be elected in his stead.

The election of the chairman of the standing committees would, therefore, end the dictatorial powers of the chairman and would frequently result in a more capable chairman filling that vital post.

All that has been said about the importance of electing committee chairmen applies with greatly decreased force, but nonetheless does apply to the office of minority leader of the committee. If we regard the committee system as making the House of Representatives a collection of little Congresses subject finally to the will of the whole House we have the picture quite accurately and consequently the election of a minority leader for the committee comes in regular order.

I commend this measure to the consideration of my colleagues many of whom know its necessity and desirability without any prompting by me.

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, even amid the encircling gloom of anxious days, lift up our hearts by the assurance that behind the shadows, and in them, standeth One who slumbers not nor sleeps. Our shuddering souls are called to peer into pits of human horror which but reveal the awful depths to which man falls when he turns utterly from Thee. Take not Thy holy spirit from us, O Thou God of our salvation, who, only, redeemeth our life from destruction.

Steel our hearts to meet tirade and threats with quiet strength, to face falsehood resolutely with the truth, over which at last no weapon can prevail. Even amid a barrage of abuse from those who in their blindness imagine a vain thing, keep our hearts void of hatred, our speech temperate, the desire for a just peace our ruling passion, knowing he that keepeth his own heart is greater than he that taketh a city. In the unknown days of peril and of challenge which loom ahead, give us spirits that are calm and sure, wise and just, in the protecting shadow of Thy unfailing love. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 1, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 2010) to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2576) to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1958; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DAWSON of Illinois, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio were appointed managers on the part of the House on the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 61) extending felicitations to Michigan State College on the 100th anniversary of its founding, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message informed the Senate that Mr. BURLESON of Texas, Mr. HAYS of Ohio, and Mr. LECOMPTE of Iowa, had been elected members of the Joint Committee on Printing; and that Mr. BURLESON of Texas, Mr. JONES of Missouri, Mr. SMITH of Mississippi, Mr. LECOMPTE of Iowa, and Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska had been elected members of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library.

The message also informed the Senate that pursuant to the provisions of Title 10, sections 1055 and 1056, United States Code, the Speaker of the House had appointed Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. JOHNSON of California, and Mr. FORD of Michigan as Members on the part of the House to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy.

The message further informed the Senate that the Speaker of the House, pursuant to the provisions of title 34, sections 1083 and 1084, United States Code, had appointed Mr. NATCHER of Kentucky, Mr. LANKFORD of Maryland, Mr. OSTERTAG of New York, and Mr.

O'HARA of Minnesota as members on the part of the House to serve as members on the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 124, 75th Congress, the Speaker of the House had appointed Mr. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts; Mr. MCDOWELL, of Delaware; and Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, of Massachusetts, as members on the part of the House to serve as members of the Committee on the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise.

The message further informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 601, title VI, Public Law 250, 77th Congress, the Speaker of the House had appointed as members of the Joint Committee To Investigate Nonessential Federal Expenditures, the following members of the Committee on Ways and Means: Mr. COOPER of Tennessee, Mr. DINGELL of Michigan, and Mr. REED of New York; and the following members of the Committee on Appropriations: Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. MAHON of Texas, and Mr. TABER of New York.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 123, 84th Congress, the Speaker of the House had appointed Mr. LONG, of Louisiana, and Mr. CORBETT, of Pennsylvania, as members of the Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers on the part of the House.

The message further informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 2, Public Law 581, 83d Congress, the Speaker of the House had appointed Mr. WALTER of Pennsylvania, Mr. GARY of Virginia, Mr. BETTS of Ohio, and Mr. POFF of Virginia to serve with him as members of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the 200th Anniversary of the Birth of John Marshall.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 705, 83d Congress, the Speaker of the House has appointed Mr. HARRISON of Virginia and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN of New Jersey as members on the part of the House of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission.

The message further informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 601, 83d Congress, the Speaker of the House had appointed Mr. ROONEY of New York, Mr. RODINO of New Jersey, Mr. COUDERT of New York, and Mr. REECE of Tennessee as members on the part of the House to serve with him, as members of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 263, 83d Congress, the Speaker of the House had appointed Mr. ROBESON of Virginia, and Mr. POFF of Virginia as members on the part of the House of the Jamestown - Williamsburg - Yorktown Celebration Commission.

The message further informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of title 44, section 393 (a), United States Code, the Speaker of the House had appointed Mr. MILLER of California as a member on the part of the House to serve as a member of the National Historical Publications Commission.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of title 20, sections 42 and 43, United States Code, the Speaker of the House had appointed as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution on the part of the House Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana, and Mr. VORYS of Ohio.

The message further informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of title 25, section 640 (a), United States Code, the Speaker of the House had appointed Mr. ENGLE of California, Mr. UDALL of Arizona, and Mr. RHODES of Arizona as members on the part of the House of the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of title 44, section 394, United States Code, the Speaker of the House had appointed Mr. STAGGERS of West Virginia and Mr. MILLER of Maryland as members on the part of the House of the Federal Records Council.

The message further informed the Senate, that pursuant to the provisions of title 16, section 715a, United States Code, the Speaker of the House had appointed Mr. PRESTON of Georgia, and Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN of Minnesota as members on the part of the House of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of title 14, section 194, United States Code, the Speaker of the House had appointed Mr. GARY of Virginia and Mr. DORN of New York as members on the part of the House to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy.

The message further informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of title 46, section 1126c, United States Code, the Speaker of the House had appointed Mr. KEOGH of New York and Mr. DEROUNIAN of New York as members on the part of the House to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

On request of Mr. MCCLELLAN, and by unanimous consent, the Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate next Tuesday.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may sit during the next 2 weeks and hold hearings on the so-called home-rule bill, while the Senate is in session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, under the rule there will be a morning hour, and I ask unanimous consent that any statements made in connection with the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and other routine business, be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON STUDY OF PROGRAMS FOR HOMEBOUND HANDICAPPED INDIVIDUALS

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a study of programs for homebound handicapped individuals, dated February 2, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PENALTY MAIL

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a tabulation showing the number of envelopes, labels, wrappers, cards, and other articles bearing penalty indicia procured or accounted for through the Post Office Department during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, by the executive departments, independent establishments, organizations and persons authorized by law to use the penalty privilege (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 2 OF THE ACT OF MARCH 2, 1945, PERTAINING TO THE COLUMBIA RIVER, BONNEVILLE, OREG.

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2 of the act of March 2, 1945, pertaining to the Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT ON LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursant to law, a report on the activities of the Library of Congress, together with supplements thereto, for the year ended June 30, 1954 (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the House of Delegates of the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Resolution 12

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to appropriate Federal funds to assist municipalities within signatory States of the Ohio River Valley Compact in financing sanitary sewer systems and sewage treatment facilities

"Whereas the Federal Government was instrumental in securing the signatures of eight States to the cooperative interState anti-pollution agreement known as the Ohio River Valley Compact, and sponsored the organization known as the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission, for the purpose of clearing the Ohio River, its branches and tributaries of pollution; and

"Whereas the antipollution program of the said Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission is rapidly moving forward and municipalities in signatory States are being called upon to immediately construct sanitary sewage systems and sewage treatment facilities; and

"Whereas many municipalities in this and other signatory States now find that they are financially unable to carry out the antipollution programs required of them by law, and appear to be powerless to help themselves: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the house of delegates, That we urge the Congress of the United States to appropriate Federal funds for the purpose of giving assistance to municipalities within the signatory States of the Ohio River Valley Compact in constructing sanitary sewage systems and sewage treatment facilities required of them by law, and that we respectfully recommend that the Members of Congress from the State of West Virginia do everything within their power to further the purposes of this resolution; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to all Members of the Congress of the United States from the State of West Virginia, to the chairmen of the appropriate committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, and the clerk of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Joint Memorial 1

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition, as follows:

"Whereas the findings of the Pacific Northwest Governors' Power Policy Committee and their engineering committee, representing all generating agencies, both Federal and local, show that power use in the region will increase 6,400,000 kilowatts by 1964, requiring the expenditure of approximately $2 billion on the construction of new electrical facilities, at the rate of more than $200 million per year over the next 10 years; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Oregon and of the Pacific Northwest region as a whole depend primarily upon the utilization of falling water for their supply of electric power; and

"Whereas the Federal Government, through its construction of multiple-purpose river projects, has become a major supplier of electric power to the region; and

"Whereas it is of utmost importance to the Pacific Northwest that the Federal projects now under construction in the region be kept on schedule so that the estimated firm load requirements can at least be met until 1960; and

"Whereas the McNary, Chief Joseph and the Dalles projects, when completed, will have a combined generating capacity exceeding 3 million kilowatts; and

"Whereas it is of vital importance to maintain these Federal projects on a full construction schedule: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to give full recognition to the responsibilities of the Federal Government to make funds available for the completion on schedule of the Chief Joseph, McNary and the Dalles projects now under construction, upon which the Pacific Northwest unavoidably must rely for its growth requirements during the next 5 years; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be and hereby is directed to send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the President and Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress.

"Adopted by house January 13, 1955.

"E. A. GEARY,
"Speaker of House.

"Adopted by senate January 20, 1955.

"ELMO E. SMITH,
"President of Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Resolution 2

"Joint resolution relative to repair of Morro Bay breakwater

"Whereas the Morro Bay breakwater which forms the harbor at Morro Bay, County of San Luis Obispo, has been in serious need of repairs for a period of 2 years; a breach in the breakwater which confines the present channel will allow the channel to become hopelessly choked and useless if allowed to become more extensive; and

"Whereas, unless the breakwater is maintained in a proper condition, the harbor will soon become inadequate as a haven for widespread commercial fishing activities, various types of ships and small craft, and United States Coast Guard stations; and

"Whereas extensive and serious property damage has occurred because of the inability of the breakwater in its present condition to protect the harbor of Morro Bay, and recent storms have considerably weakened the breakwater itself so that property damage is mounting in severity each day; and as the severity of the damage mounts the eventual cost of repair continues to increase in direct ratio, thus requiring the expenditure of a great deal more money for belated repairs than would be required if the already serious damage were corrected; and

"Whereas the serious condition of the channel has already reached a state of clogging which will soon require the removal of the United States Coast Guard Station to another base much less suitable to its operations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California earnestly requests the United States Army Corps of Engineers to take immediate steps to make such repairs to the breakwater at Morro Bay as may be necessary to adequately protect the harbor of Morro Bay and to protect Federal, county, and private property at Morro Bay; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Chief Engineer of the United States Army."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the Secretary of the Interior of the United States and other officials and agencies authorized to act in the matter in relation to the regulation of fishing in Yosemite National Park

"Whereas the orderly regulation and preservation of the fish in the waters of Yosemite National Park are of great concern not only to the people of the State of California but to all citizens of the United States who visit this wonderful recreation land; and

"Whereas unnecessary confusion and hardship is presently brought about by the variance between the fishing regulations governing the Yosemite National Park area and the surrounding territory; and

"Whereas law enforcement agencies find it most difficult to properly protect and preserve this recreational activity so long as one section of streams lying within the boundaries of Yosemite Park may be fished at times differing from those during which the same streams may be fished outside of the park boundaries; and

"Whereas the territory of the counties surrounding the Yosemite National Park is all governed by the same opening and closing dates for fishing; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Secretary of the Interior of the United States and all other officials and agencies possessing authority to act in establishing the fishing season in Yosemite National Park to establish such season to correspond with the opening and closing dates of the fishing season in the territory of the surrounding counties; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States and to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States."

"Senate Joint Resolution 5

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and Congress of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior to take appropriate action to permit prospecting and mining in the Joshua Tree National Monument

"Whereas hundreds of square miles of the area of California's Riverside and San Bernardino Counties are located within the Joshua Tree National Monument in a region which abounds in valuable strategic materials vital to national defense; and

"Whereas the Federal Government, at the present time, prohibits prospecting and mining in this vast area, thereby denying many citizens an opportunity to engage in profitable labor and depriving our national defense industries of this source of scarce raw materials; and

"Whereas prospecting and mining could be carried on without causing damage to the scenic desert growth for which this great primitive area is deservedly famed: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respect-

fully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior to take appropriate action to permit, with proper provision to prevent damage to the scenic desert growth, prospecting, and mining within the Joshua Tree National Monument; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to prepare and transmit suitable copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of the Interior."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Senate Joint Resolution 6

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to cause the issuance of a postage stamp honoring the California redwoods as 'the world's oldest living things'

"Whereas their living crowns borne on high by massive sparlike trunks, the California redwoods, from time immemorial have stood, as symbols of the power of God; and

"Whereas even when Christ walked forth among mere mortal man their lofty branches were arched against the blue; and

"Whereas during the vast span of their existence haughty empires have risen to rule the known earth then vanished virtually without trace, yet still the redwoods live on; and

"Whereas the glory of their story could be known to all the world if a properly inscribed stamp were issued in their honor: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to cause the issuance of a postage stamp honoring the California redwoods as 'the world's oldest living things'; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be, and hereby is, directed to prepare and transmit suitable copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Postmaster General."

A petition signed by M. R. McCann, and sundry other citizens of the State of New York, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by Parkway Council, No. 1433, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for Mr. THURMOND):

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation limiting the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts

"Whereas Federal courts and more particularly the United States Supreme Court have through numerous opinions and decisions invaded the fields of the legislative and executive branches of government; and

"Whereas through numerous opinions and decisions Federal courts and more particularly the United States Supreme Court, have invaded the field of government which should be left to the control of the several States of the Union; and

"Whereas Congress is authorized under the Constitution of the United States to control and limit the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That Congress be memorialized to enact legislation limiting the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts so that the fields of government of the executive and legislative branches and that of the several States shall not be invaded, but shall remain separate and distinct; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each United States Senator from South Carolina, each Member of the House of Representatives of Congress from South Carolina, the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives of the United States."

PARITY PRICES FOR FARM PRODUCTS—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Williston (N. Dak.) Cooperative Credit Union relating to full parity prices for farm products.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE WILLISTON COOPERATIVE CREDIT UNION, JANUARY 29, 1955

I

"We, the members of the Williston Cooperative Credit Union in annual meeting assembled this 29th day of January 1955, in Williston, N. Dak., do hereby respectfully petition and urge that the present Federal administration fulfill their campaign promises to work for and obtain for American agriculture full parity price for farm products; we further recommend that the administration and Congress increase the present minimum wage from 75 cents per hour to not less than 90 cents per hour; and we further recommend proposed minimum annual wages be established for all wage earners."

II

"We recommend that a farm program be created which will establish the size of a family-type farm based on production necessary to maintain a decent standard of living for the farm family operating such farm; and on such family-size farms no quota, allotment, or acreage restriction should apply, but such restrictions would apply only on farms exceeding such family-size farms."

III

"We favor the proposed congressional salary increase, in order to provide our Congressmen with a living wage; but only if included in the same bill is incorporated a provision for a $1,000 Federal income tax exemption for all individuals."

IV

"We heartily endorse the present evident attitude of Congress to oppose the Dixon-Yates power contract; and we urge the fullest development of all natural resources in such manner as to insure to the American people the greatest benefits."

Moved and seconded that copies of all foregoing resolutions be sent to the President of the United States, to our Senators and Congressmen, to the North Dakota Credit Union League, the North Dakota Farmers Union, to Williston and Minot labor organizations, and to the North Dakota Federation of Labor. Carried unanimously.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR PREVENTION OF RIVERBANK EROSION—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution, adopted by the board of electors of the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, of Trenton, N. Dak., relating to appropriations for the prevention of riverbank erosion, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUFORD-TRENTON IRRIGATION DISTRICT

At a special meeting of the board of directors of the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District duly called and held in their office at Trenton, N. Dak., on the 29th day of January 1955; all members being present the following resolution was offered for their consideration and approval:

"Whereas the Missouri River is badly cutting and eroding its banks immediately adjacent to Main Lateral 3.8 of the West Bottom; and Main Lateral 8.9 of the Middle Bottom; and points on the Main Canal of the Buford-Trenton irrigation project, and such erosion is so serious that it will cut out the canals of the project system and thus completely ruin the project; and

"Whereas the continuous relocation of said canals is not economically feasible, and the continuous deleting of valuable irrigable acres from the project lands by erosion further constitutes a serious hazard to the success of the project.

"Now, therefore, upon motion duly made, seconded, and unanimously carried, it was—

"Resolved, That the board of directors of the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District hereby respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to make an emergency appropriation for the purpose of performing the necessary work to protect and stabilize the riverbanks so as to prevent such erosion."

RONALD GORDON,
President.
D. L. HOUSTON,
Secretary.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, for the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit an additional report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the month of December 1954 and, in accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, together with a statement prepared by me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The report and statement referred to are as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, DECEMBER AND NOVEMBER 1954, AND PAY, NOVEMBER AND OCTOBER 1954

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for December 1954 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized.

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In December numbered—	In November numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In November was—	In October was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	2,368,073	2,385,024	−16,951	$781,995	$757,942	+$24,053
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,188,167	1,204,386	−16,219	402,628	393,463	+9,165
Department of Defense	1,179,906	1,180,638	−732	379,367	364,479	+14,888
Inside continental United States	2,141,110	2,156,660	−15,550			
Outside continental United States	226,963	228,366	−1,403			
Industrial employment	708,373	709,227	−854			
Foreign nationals	340,450	337,306	+3,144	25,133	[2] 24,560	+573

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside continental United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside continental United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1954, and comparison with November 1954, and pay for November 1954, and comparison with October 1954*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands of dollars)			
	December	November	Increase	Decrease	November	October	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	70,348	72,202		1,854	23,424	23,192	231	
Commerce [1]	63,386	74,483		11,097	17,939	16,432	1,507	
Health, Education, and Welfare	36,677	36,446	231		12,975	12,653	322	
Interior	49,845	51,250		1,405	19,020	18,831	189	
Justice	30,249	30,502		253	12,965	12,459	506	
Labor	4,918	4,957		39	2,136	2,103	33	
Post Office	[2] 507,928	508,519		591	164,856	163,965	891	
State	20,997	21,074		77	6,820	6,901		81
Treasury	79,181	79,463		282	31,369	30,070	1,299	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	263	265		2	137	136	1	
Bureau of the Budget	430	425	5		257	247	10	
Council of Economic Advisers	34	34			23	22	1	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	68	67	1		22	20	2	
National Security Council [3]	26	26			16	15	1	
Office of Defense Mobilization	295	291	4		153	147	6	
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	6	5	1		4	3	1	
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Committee on Weather Control	12	11	1		5	3	2	
American Battle Monuments Commission	820	836		16	102	101	1	
Atomic Energy Commission	5,966	6,016		50	2,932	2,745	187	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	586	[4] 567	19		259	245	14	
Civil Aeronautics Board	533	535		2	279	262	17	
Civil Service Commission	4,106	4,120		14	1,698	1,651	47	
Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	65	70		5	27	25	2	
Defense Transport Administration	18	20		2	11	11		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	135	131	4		73	65	8	
Farm Credit Administration	1,087	1,096		9	518	486	32	
Federal Civil Defense Administration	687	679	8		341	329	12	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	8		1	4	4		
Federal Communications Commission	1,094	1,091	3		541	517	24	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,086	1,091		5	504	460	44	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	355	354	1		233	215	18	
Federal Power Commission	636	639		3	322	308	14	
Federal Trade Commission	594	595		1	312	303	9	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	182	233		51	102	89	13	
Foreign Operations Administration	6,129	[4] 6,067	62		2,601	2,564	37	
General Accounting Office	5,791	5,829		38	2,415	2,315	100	
General Services Administration	25,863	25,897		34	8,341	7,938	403	
Government Contract Committee	10	14		4	4	4		
Government Printing Office	6,781	6,843		62	2,813	2,605	208	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	10,427	10,437		10	4,624	4,361	263	
Indian Claims Commission	13	13			9	9		
Interstate Commerce Commission	1,831	1,847		16	869	834	35	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,160	7,141	19		3,115	3,004	111	
National Capital Housing Authority	287	287			97	98		1
National Capital Planning Commission	18	18			10	9	1	
National Gallery of Art	315	315			98	91	7	
National Labor Relations Board	1,172	1,167	5		605	476	129	
National Mediation Board	108	110		2	70	64	6	
National Science Foundation	250	227	23		95	86	9	
National Security Training Commission	7	6	1		3	3		
Panama Canal	15,758	15,751	7		2,717	3,944		1,227
Railroad Retirement Board	2,390	2,397		7	853	830	23	
Renegotiation Board	606	620		14	355	338	17	
Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission	23	23			13	13		
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	22	[4] 13	9		3		3	
Securities and Exchange Commission	694	700		6	376	365	11	
Selective Service System	7,157	7,195		38	1,655	1,588	67	
Small Business Administration	756	746	10		394	371	23	
Smithsonian Institution	633	[5] 637		4	226	[5] 215	11	
Soldiers' Home	976	929	47		193	179	14	
Subversive Activities Control Board	35	35			20	19	1	
Tariff Commission	195	195			107	101	6	
Tax Court of the United States	142	142			74	72	2	
Tennessee Valley Authority	22,712	23,107		395	10,746	10,357	389	
United States Information Agency	9,551	9,526	25		2,335	2,301	34	
Veterans' Administration	177,735	178,051		316	56,413	53,293	3,120	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,188,167	1,204,386	486	16,705	402,628	393,463	10,474	1,309
Net change, excluding Department of Defense			16,219				9,165	

[1] December figure includes 508 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.

[2] Excludes extra Christmas employment.

[3] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.

[4] Revised on basis of later information.

[5] Revised to include 136 employees of the National Zoological Park and their pay.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1954, and comparison with November 1954, and pay for November 1954, and comparison with October 1954*—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands of dollars)			
	December	November	Increase	Decrease	November	October	Increase	Decrease
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,914	1,889	25		1,016	961	55	
Department of the Army	464,590	[4] 463,843	747		126,965	[4] 122,439	4,526	
Department of the Navy	408,885	408,969		84	149,056	144,896	4,160	
Department of the Air Force	304,517	305,937		1,420	102,330	96,183	6,147	
Total, Department of Defense	1,179,906	1,180,638	772	1,504	379,367	364,479	14,888	
Net change, Department of Defense			732				14,888	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,368,073	2,385,024	1,258	18,209	781,995	757,942	25,362	1,309
Net change, including Department of Defense			16,951				24,053	

[4] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during December 1954, and comparison with November 1954*

Department or agency	December	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	69,144	70,950		1,806
Commerce [1]	60,510	71,536		11,026
Health, Education, and Welfare	36,159	35,934	225	
Interior	44,219	45,299		1,080
Justice	29,735	29,994		259
Labor	4,807	4,845		38
Post Office	[2] 505,584	506,175		591
State	5,789	5,844		55
Treasury	78,192	78,470		278
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	263	265		2
Bureau of the Budget	430	425	5	
Council of Economic Advisers	34	34		
Executive Mansion and Grounds	68	67	1	
National Security Council [3]	26	26		
Office of Defense Mobilization	295	291	4	
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	6	5	1	
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Committee on Weather Control	12	11	1	
American Battle Monuments Commission	17	17		
Atomic Energy Commission	5,951	6,001		50
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	586	[4] 569	17	
Civil Aeronautics Board	529	531		2
Civil Service Commission	4,096	4,110		14
Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	65	70		5
Defense Transport Administration	18	20		2
Export-Import Bank of Washington	135	131	4	
Farm Credit Administration	1,075	1,084		9
Federal Civil Defense Administration	687	679	8	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	8		1
Federal Communications Commission	1,067	1,064	3	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corportation	1,085	1,090		5
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	355	354	1	
Federal Power Commission	636	639		3
Federal Trade Commission	594	595		1
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	182	229		47
Foreign Operations Administration	1,627	1,637		10
General Accounting Office	5,742	5,780		38
General Services Administration	25,751	25,782		31
Government Contract Committee	10	14		4
Government Printing Office	6,781	6,843		62
Housing and Home Finance Agency	10,302	10,313		11
Indian Claims Commission	13	13		
Interstate Commerce Commission	1,831	1,847		16
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,160	7,141	19	
National Capital Housing Authority	287	287		
National Capital Planning Commission	18	18		
National Gallery of Art	315	315		
National Labor Relations Board	1,151	1,146	5	
National Mediation Board	108	110		2
National Science Foundation	250	227	23	
National Security Training Commission	7	6	1	
Panama Canal	551	541	10	
Railroad Retirement Board	2,390	2,397		7
Renegotiation Board	606	620		14
Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission	23	23		
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	22	[4] 13	9	
Securities and Exchange Commission	694	700		6
Selective Service System	6,958	6,994		36
Small Business Administration	756	746	10	
Smithsonian Institution	631	[5] 635		4
Soldiers' Home	976	929	47	
Subversive Activities Control Board	35	35		
Tariff Commission	195	195		
Tax Court of the United States	142	142		
Tennessee Valley Authority	22,712	23,107		395
U. S. Information Agency	2,190	2,175	15	
Veterans' Administration	176,476	176,797		321
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,129,068	1,144,890	409	16,231
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			15,822	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,859	1,833	26	
Department of the Army	373,050	373,343		293
Department of the Navy	377,552	377,894		342
Department of the Air Force	259,581	258,700	881	
Total, Department of Defense	1,012,042	1,011,770	907	635
Net increase, Department of Defense			272	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,141,110	2,156,660	1,316	16,866
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			15,550	

[1] December figure includes 508 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.
[2] Excludes extra Christmas employment.
[3] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[4] Revised on basis of later information.
[5] Revised to include 136 employees of the National Zoological Park.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1954, and comparison with November 1954*

Department or agency	December	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,204	1,252		48
Commerce	2,876	2,947		71
Health, Education, and Welfare	518	512	6	
Interior	5,626	5,951		325
Justice	514	508	6	
Labor	111	112		1
Post Office	2,344	2,344		
State	15,208	15,230		22
Treasury	989	993		4
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	803	819		16
Atomic Energy Commission	15	15		
Civil Aeronautics Board	4	4		
Civil Service Commission	10	10		
Farm Credit Administration	12	12		
Federal Communications Commission	27	27		
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1	1		
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission		4		4
Foreign Operations Administration	4,502	[1] 4,430	72	
General Accounting Office	49	49		
General Services Administration	112	115		3
Housing and Home Finance Agency	125	124	1	
National Labor Relations Board	21	21		
Panama Canal	15,207	15,210		3
Selective Service System	199	201		2
Smithsonian Institution	2	2		
United States Information Agency	7,361	7,351	10	
Veterans' Administration	1,259	1,254	5	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	59,099	59,498	100	499
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			399	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	55	56		1
Department of the Army	91,540	[1] 90,500	1,040	
Department of the Navy	31,333	31,075	258	
Department of the Air Force	44,936	47,237		2,301
Total, Department of Defense	167,864	168,868	1,298	2,302
Net decrease, Department of Defense			1,004	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	226,963	228,366	1,398	2,801
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			1,403	

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during December 1954 and comparison with November 1954*

Department or agency	December	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	2,819	2,805	14	
Commerce	2,110	2,111		1
Interior	7,846	8,037		191
Treasury	6,534	6,543		9
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	131	130	1	
Federal Communications Commission	14	14		
General Services Administration	868	862	6	
Government Printing Office	6,781	6,843		62
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,160	7,141	19	
Panama Canal	7,686	7,702		16
Tennessee Valley Authority	19,470	19,866		396
Total, excluding Department of Defense	61,419	62,054	40	675
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			635	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside continental United States	[1] 207,800	[2] 207,955		155
Outside continental United States	[1] 26,934	[1] 26,934		
Department of the Navy:				
Inside continental United States	236,791	236,914		123
Outside continental United States	6,922	6,957		35
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside continental United States	153,394	153,172	222	
Outside continental United States	15,113	15,241		128
Total, Department of Defense	646,954	647,173	222	441
Net decrease, Department of Defense			219	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	708,373	709,227	262	1,116
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			854	

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under United States agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of December 1954, and comparison with November 1954*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	December	November	December	November	December	November	December	November
Austria	171	181					171	181
England	7,117	6,880					7,117	6,880
France	20,274	19,176	14,001	[1] 13,122			6,273	6,054
Germany	124,019	123,855	101,551	[1] 101,304	1,971	1,961	20,497	20,590
Japan	157,762	157,819	95,959	95,959	18,499	18,490	43,304	43,370
Korea	28,343	27,891	28,343	[1] 27,891				
Libya	1,077	200					1,077	200
Ryukyus	214	209			214	209		
Saudi Arabia	734	442					734	442
Spain	95						95	
Trinidad	644	653			644	653		
Total	340,450	337,306	239,854	238,276	21,328	21,313	79,268	77,717

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

NOTE.—The Germans are paid from funds provided by German Governments. The French, English, and Austrians reported by the Army and Air Force are paid from funds appropriated for personal services. All others are paid from funds appropriated for other contractual services.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported regular civilian employment in the month of December totaling 2,368,073. This was a net decrease of 16,951 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of November.

The reported regular employment resumed the downward trend it has followed for 26 of the past 29 months. But the decrease resulted largely from the separation of temporary employees by the Bureau of the Census.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1955, which began July 1, 1954, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July	2,387,833		5,187
August	2,375,988		11,845
September	2,355,170		20,818
October	2,359,325	4,155	
November	2,385,024	25,699	
December	2,368,073		16,951

Total employment in civilian agencies during the month of December was 1,188,167, a decrease of 16,219 compared with the November total of 1,204,386. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in December was 1,179,906. This was a net decrease of 732 as compared with 1,180,638 in November.

Civilian agencies reporting the major decreases were: Department of Commerce with a decrease of 11,097, Department of Agriculture with a decrease of 1,854, Department of the Interior with a decrease of 1,405, and the Post Office Department with a decrease of 591.

The Department of the Army reported an increase in civilian employment of 747 during December. The Department of the Navy reported a decrease of 84, and the Department of the Air Force reported a decrease of 1,420 in civilian employment during December.

Inside continental United States civilian employment decreased 15,550, and outside continental United States civilian employment decreased 1,403.

Industrial employment by Federal agencies in December totaled 708,373, a decrease of 854 as compared with November.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies, as compiled today by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,368,073 civilian employees certified to the Committee by executive agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports included some foreign nationals employed in United States Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 340,450 foreign nationals working for United States military agencies overseas during the month of December who were not counted in the usual personnel report. The number in November was 337,306. A breakdown of this employment for December follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Austria	171			171
England	7,117			7,117
France	20,274	14,001		6,273
Germany	124,019	101,551	1,971	20,497
Japan	157,762	95,959	18,499	43,304
Korea	28,343	28,343		
Lybia	1,077			1,077
Ryukyus	214		214	
Saudi Arabia	734			734
Spain	95			95
Trinidad	644		644	
Total	340,450	239,854	21,328	79,268

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 913. A bill to eliminate the need for renewal of oaths of office upon change of status of employees of the Senate; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 914. A bill to provide for research into and development of practical means for the production of alumina, abrasives, refractories, and cements from domestic clays in the interests of national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 915 (by request). A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp honoring the coal miners and coal industry of America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. DUFF):

S. 916. A bill providing for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Andrew W. Mellon; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. DUFF, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. POTTER, and Mr. WILEY):

S. 917. A bill to encourage the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 918. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 919. A bill to suspend for 1 year certain duties upon the importation of aluminum and aluminum alloys; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. MARTIN of Iowa):

S. 920. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of manganese-bearing ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 921. A bill for the relief of the late George Needham Cooke; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 922. A bill to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to further extend the program to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 923. A bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 924. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims of customs officers and employees to extra compensation for Sunday, holiday, and overtime services performed after August 31, 1931, and not heretofore paid in accordance with existing law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 925. A bill for the relief of Sun Fo (also known as C. S. Sun) and his wife, Mrs. Sun Fo (also known as Sukying C. Sun); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. KNOWLAND):

S. 926. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Ventura River reclamation project, California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 927. A bill to provide that Imperial and San Diego Counties in the State of California shall constitute a new and separate judicial district to be known as the Southern District of California, and to redesignate the present Southern District of California as the Central District of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KUCHEL when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate hearing.)

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, and Mr. DUFF):

S. 928. A bill to amend the Water Pollution Control Act in order to provide for the control of air pollution; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. MCNAMARA):

S. 929. A bill to provide for aid to the States in the fields of practical nursing and auxiliary hospital personnel services; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 930. A bill to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce; to stabilize prices of milk and dairy products; to impose a stabilization fee on the marketing of milk and butterfat; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 931. A bill for the relief of the Chamberlain Water Co., of Chamberlain, S. Dak.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUNDT when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 932. A bill to amend certain eligibility requirements in connection with the payment of benefits of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to certain officers and enlisted men of the Army Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) (by request):

S. 933. A bill to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of deceased members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes;

S. 934. A bill to provide medical care for dependents of members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 935. A bill to provide for the administration of the Ryukyu Islands, and for other purposes; and

S. 936. A bill to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. RUSSELL when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 937. A bill for the relief of the heirs of the late John Morgan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 938. A bill to provide for the payment and collection of wages in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 939 (by request). A bill for the relief of Demetrius John Monoyioudes and his wife Angelika Monoyioudes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRICKER (for himself, Mr. POTTER, and Mr. BENDER):

S. 940. A bill to provide that the law limiting the hours of labor of certain officers and seamen on certain vessels navigating the Great Lakes and adjacent waters shall not be applicable to such officers and seamen on tugs principally used for harbor towing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRICKER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 941. A bill to amend section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to authorize the Federal land banks to purchase certain remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation; and

S. 942. A bill to repeal Public Law 820, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 1098), entitled "An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold"; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 943. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims of customs officers and employees to extra compensation for Sunday, holiday, and overtime services performed after August 31, 1931, and not heretofore paid in accordance with existing law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 944. A bill for the relief of Howard L. Gray; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 945. A bill for the relief of Sara Kapel Gildar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 946. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Ruth Long Crow Running Horse; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 947. A bill to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 948. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 949. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 950 (by request). A bill to prohibit transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce by communication facilities; and

S. 951 (by request). A bill to amend part III of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to remove the bulk commodity exemption with respect to certain water carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 952. A bill to provide for the acquisition of lands by the United States required for the reservoir created by the construction of Randall Dam on the Missouri River and for rehabilitation of the Indians of the Crow Creek Sioux Reservation, S. Dak., and for other purposes; and

S. 953. A bill to provide for the acquisition of lands by the United States required for the reservoir created by the construction of Randall Dam on the Missouri River and for rehabilitation of the Indians of the Lower Brule Sioux Reservation, S. Dak., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 954. A bill to redefine the commercial wheat area; and

S. 955. A bill to perfect the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to grain inspection under the United States Grain Standards Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. CASE of New Jersey):

S. 956. A bill to provide that compensation of a Federal officer or employee shall be subject to State tax only in the State where he is domiciled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. HENNINGS, and Mr. LANGER):

S. 957. A bill to permit any taxpayer who provides a home for any foster child placed in his home by a licensed agency to treat

such child as a dependent for Federal income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 958. A bill relating to the handling of juvenile delinquents; and

S. 959. A bill to prohibit juveniles, unaccompanied by a parent or guardian, from going outside the United States without a permit issued by the Attorney General for such purpose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 960. A bill for the relief of William T. Collins, also known as Vasilios T. Buzunis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 961. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing projects for the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 962. A bill to increase the specific amounts which are exempt from the tax on the transportation of persons from amounts which do not exceed 35 cents to amounts which do not exceed 76 cents; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

S. 963. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Andrej (Avram) Gottlieb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 964. A bill to require that the prices of 1955, 1956, and 1957 crops of basic agricultural commodities be supported at 90 percent of parity, to continue through 1957 the existing method of computing parity for basic agricultural commodities, to provide permanent price support at 90 percent of parity for soybeans, flax, and cottonseed, and to provide permanent price support for oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghum on the basis of their feed-value equivalent to corn; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. KERR):

S. 965. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to construct certain works of improvement for runoff and waterflow retardation, and soil-erosion prevention, on the Beaver Creek watershed in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 966. A bill for the relief of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIEL (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas):

S. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution to utilize underplanted cotton acreage to correct inequities and hardships due to 1955 cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. DANIEL when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BENDER, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DUFF, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. IVES, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KERR, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PREVENTION OF AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to encourage the prevention of air and water pollution.

This bill would permit the amortization, at an accelerated rate of 60 months, the cost of treatment works for the abatement of stream and air pollution. I wish to point out, Mr. President, that this bill contains controls which would permit only those facilities which are installed on the basis of a demand from a local governmental body, to qualify for certification. Thus, to qualify, a facility must be a part of an over-all program aimed at eliminating the present-day scourges of air and stream pollution.

President Eisenhower, in his health message on Monday of this week, called for more effective methods of control and a step-up in research in these areas. By encouraging the installation of abatement facilities, the bill I introduce could go far in helping to find quickly the most effective methods of control and, without question, would accelerate any research program.

The increasing seriousness of contaminations in the air we breathe and in the water in our streams and rivers is known to all. Surely every reasonable step should be taken at once to expedite the solution to these problems. This bill would go far in accomplishing that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 917) to encourage the prevention of air and water pollution by allotting the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income-tax purposes, introduced by Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO PRICE SUPPORTS FOR BASIC COMMODITIES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, it is my privilege today, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to introduce a bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, which would guarantee the farmers of our country support prices for basic agricultural commodities at 90 percent of parity for the years 1955, 1956, and 1957. The bill reads:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (6) of subsection (d) of section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(6) the level of support to cooperators shall be 90 per centum of the parity price for the 1955, 1956, and 1957 crops of any basic agricultural commodity with respect to which producers have not disapproved marketing quotas."

I feel strongly that the Congress made a mistake last year when it abandoned the policy of assuring the farmer at least 90 percent price supports for basic crops, and adopted, in lieu of 90 percent parity, flexible price supports. This action by Congress, based on the fact that there are surpluses of some farm products, was unfair and unwise, when we recall that, as recently as 1952, our farmers were being urged by the Government to increase production in order to meet the critical needs for our farm products here and abroad.

Farmers had responded to the plea of the Secretary of Agriculture, as they have always done. They had increased their production expenses, often went into debt, and had expanded their output, patriotically responding to the requests of their Government for all-out production. Farmers had assumed, in good faith, a moral obligation on the part of the Government to keep supports at a level which would protect them from heavy losses during the period of readjustment following the Korean conflict.

While suppliers of military goods were cloaked with cost-plus contracts to protect their financial positions, and certificates of necessity authorizing accelerated depreciation were issued by the Government in order to stimulate production of war goods, electric power, railroad equipment, and other lines of business and industry, the farmer was provided with no protection at all as a cushion during the cutback period.

Since the end of the Korean emergency, our exports have fallen sharply, as nations which had depended on the United States for supplies have cut back their purchases of our farm products. In fact, these foreign nations have expanded their own agricultural production, often with financial and technical assistance from this country. The result is that substantial surpluses accumulated in several crops; and, without adequate price supports, farm income may drop disastrously.

The need at this time is clear: Congress must provide price supports at the 90-percent level if we are to honor the Nation's moral obligation to our farmers. To refuse 90-percent support prices for basic commodities now would, in effect, ignore an obligation, and, just as important, would demonstrate a lack of reasonable and confident patience.

Congress has insisted upon treating suppliers of other classes of war materials in a fair manner. Now it must make certain that it is not placed in a position of treating one class of citizens—the farmers—less fairly and less generously than other groups. We owe a moral obligation to our farmers in this, their time of need.

Mr. President, any Member of the Senate who knows farmers as I know them, will agree that a failure to provide 90-percent price supports at this time, when farmers are beginning to make real progress in adjusting their production, would be unwise. It would serve to de-

feat the very farm programs which Congress has authorized.

When surpluses develop and market prices weaken, the farmers, unless they are provided with some protection by the Government, feel forced to offset lower prices by increased production. This is, as we all know, the course of desperation; and it tends to weaken their own economic position, as well as to damage the national economy as a whole.

We have had farm depressions time after time in the past, and no means of dealing with them except to permit prices to decline, leading ultimately to bankruptcy, foreclosure, and squeezing from among the farmers on the land a substantial group, forcing them into some other line of work. These forced marches from the farms need not be revived.

For many years the farmer has sought equality with other groups in our economy. One of the basic demands throughout these years has been recognition of the need for assistance from the Government to establish needed production-adjustment programs beyond the ability of farmers to undertake. This price support is such a program. Thus support prices at 90 percent of parity will serve as a major tool to assist farmers in an orderly retreat from overproduction in this period when we are returning to normal conditions. Price supports will help farm families stay on the farm, will assist in maintaining a "take-home pay" for farmers, and will provide a degree of stability which all too often has been denied to the farmers of our country.

Support prices at 90 percent of parity will help farmers weather the present and perhaps temporary crisis of surpluses and reduced exports. To cut and thus to weaken further the farm-commodity price support represents an unrealistic approach to our farm problem.

I know, of course, that the costs to the Government in connection with these surpluses are important; but they represent no burden of overwhelming proportions. In fact, the cost is small as compared with the money we have put into foreign aid or as compared, on the other hand, with the potentialities of this great and growing Nation.

Mr. President, in the past 2½ years, net farm income has declined approximately 15 percent. The loss of farm income, already felt by many segments of business and industry, will ultimately be reflected throughout our economy. Except for price supports, farm income during the last 2 or 3 years would have been several billion dollars lower. But with price supports at 90 percent of parity, farmers have been able to maintain a far stronger position than would have been the case; and they have thereby contributed more to a healthy national economy.

In my opinion, a flexible parity means only one thing—a lowering of farm income, for however much the support level is lowered, it represents a reduction in farm prices and income. The net result is that in 1955, 1956, and 1957, the net farm income realized may be below $10 billion. Farmers know that means a farm depression. Such a depression—which would eventually affect every segment of our national economy—is preventable if 90 percent price supports are adopted. The situation we face today is very much like the one which brought on the great agricultural and industrial depressions of 1920–21 and 1929–33. Farmers find themselves caught in a cost-price squeeze. Rising costs of the middleman have cut down the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar, and inflexible or rising prices of the goods farmers buy have cut down farm prices and income.

A major principle is involved between those of us who urge 90 percent price supports and those who favor supports at lower, or sliding, levels. Those who support lower levels embrace, knowingly or unknowingly, the principle that farmers must suffer low prices before they will cut down their crops to a level which will guarantee fair prices. They are wrong for two reasons: first they assume that farmers can shift from one cash crop to another, or decrease their acreage, without much trouble. That simply is not so. Farmers cannot move so easily from one crop to another. Second, when prices start dropping, farmers feel they must—and they will—increase their acreage and increase their production to a point where surpluses are increased and, of course, until prices are driven down further.

Mr. President, if Congress does not reestablish 90-percent supports now, when they are most needed, it will signal not alone weakness, but a lack of resolute courage to protect our farmers and our country from a depression.

With these thoughts in mind, I urge the Congress to enact the bill I am introducing today for the protection of our farmers and for the benefit of our entire national economy.

Mr. President, the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Mr. COOLEY, has introduced a companion bill in the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 918) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

VENTURA PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on numerous occasions I have pointed out to my colleagues and others how the conservation, distribution, and utilization of water is undoubtedly the most serious and immediate problem confronting my State of California. It is a matter of urgency, because of the steady migration of population, in many areas of the entire West.

The inadequacy and maldistribution of present supplies is reaching the critical point in a thriving section of California. Therefore, I am introducing at this time a bill to authorize the Department of the Interior to proceed with construction of the Ventura project.

I am joined in the introduction of this bill by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

This project has been thoroughly investigated by the Bureau of Reclamation, which recently reported that due to the wide variation in rainfall, the mushrooming population, and industrial growth, and the threat of salt-water intrusion into existing wells, development of an additional firm water supply is urgently needed.

The measure I am introducing would call for a project costing $27,600,000 to be paid for within the usual 50-year period to serve an area of 20,000 acres. This is one of the fastest developing sections of our State and its growth is expected to continue. During the last 10 years the population of the city of Ventura and its immediate suburbs, which make up about 60 percent of the population within the project area, jumped from 16,000 to 25,000. The growth trend indicates an increase to more than 80,000 in the next 50 years.

This project has an exceedingly high benefit-cost ratio. The Reclamation Bureau studies indicate returns will be a little more than 3.3 times the expenditure. The Ventura Municipal Water District already has taken preliminary steps to contract for purchase of the water and for operation of the project. The district demonstrated its earnestness by paying half of the cost of the preliminary investigation.

I trust that this measure will receive early and favorable consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 926) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Ventura River reclamation project, California, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. KNOWLAND), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AIR POLLUTION RESEARCH

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, during recent months both the executive branch of the Government and the Senate have displayed concern about the spreading menace of air pollution throughout major cities and industrial communities of our Nation.

In his health message earlier this week, President Eisenhower called on the Congress to take early action to step up research into this problem which endangers the health and safety of millions of our citizens. Because I come from an area which regrettably has been conspicuously plagued by this exasperating phenomenon known as smog, I was greatly encouraged to hear the Chief Executive say that the Federal Government must join the fight to clean up the contaminated atmosphere in which tremendous numbers of our people live and work.

The problem of air pollution has been most dramatically brought to the attention of the people of California, and is now brought to the attention of the people of the Nation. However, the menace

which smog presents to people, to growing things, and to livestock is present in many other areas and scientists have reported the threat can be found in widely separated parts of the Nation.

Many of my colleagues will recall the extremely serious seige of smog in Los Angeles last October. Photographs of the murk were published widely. None of them, no matter how graphic, could convey an idea of the extreme discomfort inflicted upon tens of thousands of residents and visitors. The condition shown in those pictures happily is a rare occurrence, yet the intensity of such attacks seems to be increasing despite bold and aggressive efforts in the metropolitan area to isolate and remove the causes.

Scientists generally agree that many factors are possible reasons for such conditions. Intensive research has been in progress for several years, but, so far, no solution has been found because the problem apparently is very complex.

The occurrence, intensity, and duration of smog unquestionably are linked with terrain and geography, weather conditions, presence of various industries, means employed to dispose of trash, volumes and movement of traffic, and many other influences.

To isolate the causes of air pollution is a momentous job. It must be done before successful countermeasures can be carried out.

The Federal Government possesses some unique, unparalleled facilities to carry on research and investigation in such fields. The know-how and techniques of such agencies as the Bureau of Standards, Bureau of Mines, Weather Bureau, and Agricultural Research Service cannot readily be duplicated, and are not easily equaled elsewhere.

Under President Eisenhower's direction, the United States Public Health Service is expanding its studies in the field of air pollution in its effect on human health. There are many aspects of the problem which seem to require attention from other agencies of Government, however.

Because this menace is increasing in seriousness and a potential threat exists in numerous places where so far the danger has not become apparent, I have become convinced that a broad attack must be made on smog without delay. I have consulted with eminent scientists, civic leaders, and public officials in all levels of government. They invariably concur in my feeling that Federal participation is essential if any campaign to clean up the atmosphere is to succeed.

For that reason, Mr. President, I am offering a measure which would make possible a vigorous antismog program by the Federal Government. I am joined in this by my colleagues the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN and Mr. DUFF].

I believe this proposed legislation might well be linked with the measure introduced earlier in the week by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania to make permanent and broaden the water pollution control law. It is my intention to move this air-pollution proposal as an amendment to the water-pollution legislation when the matter is considered by the Committee on Public Works.

This proposal would centralize in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare responsibility for directing and coordinating the efforts of the Government. It embodies features found in the water-pollution law and in the statute under which the Federal Government is aiding the search for ways to convert saline water into a potable and otherwise usable fluid. The bill would authorize the intensive investigation which I firmly believe is vital, but would give an incentive to efforts of others through grants-in-aid and contracts for research projects which other agencies might be specially fitted to carry out.

The program envisioned is of modest proportions. When one considers that the danger to health and life is so great, that injurious effects of smog may reduce the production of many agricultural crops, that smog snarls traffic and deteriorates properties, the proposed expenditure is indeed conservative and well within the resources of our Government.

I earnestly request that serious and speedy attention will be given to this measure so that no more time will be lost in searching for data and methods that will bring air pollution under control.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 928) to amend the Water Pollution Control Act in order to provide for the control of air pollution, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, and Mr. DUFF) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

STABILIZATION OF PRICES OF MILK AND DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce; to stabilize prices of milk and dairy products; to impose a stabilization fee on the marketing of milk and butterfat; and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, pertaining to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 930) to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce; to stabilize prices of milk and dairy products; to impose a stabilization fee on the marketing of milk and butterfat; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MUNDT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The statement presented by Mr. MUNDT is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MUNDT

The bill I am introducing would enable the more than 2 million dairy farmers of the Nation to pay for their own production, stabilization, and price-control program through a self-imposed assessment on their own milk production or butterfat production.

If enacted by Congress, the bill would take the Federal Government out of the dairy business, and would return the financing, management, and control of this great industry, which is the largest single segment of the Nation's agriculture, representing 20 percent of the national gross farm income, to the industry itself.

It seems to me that this is an objective which will not be challenged by anyone who believes in the fundamental responsibilities of a free-enterprise system.

Under the provisions of the bill, the milk-producing farmers of the Nation would elect, from their own number, 45 representatives from 15 districts, from whom the President of the United States would name 15 members to a Dairy Stabilization Board, which would administer the provisions of the bill.

The Board would have the power to purchase and hold for resale any amount of dairy products necessary to stabilize an ample dairy production to meet the needs of the Nation and to maintain, without burden to the taxpayers as a whole, an adequate price to the farmers who produce the milk. There would be no control or interference on the part of the Federal Government over the sale of dairy products to the consuming public. The Board would have the authority to push the sale of dairy products by means of education, research, publicity, advertising, and any other legitimate means.

The Board would have authority to acquire capital structure with which to launch the program and would be authorized to borrow up to $500 million, either from the Commodity Credit Corporation or from private lending agencies. The money would be borrowed at the prevailing rate of interest on such Government financing.

Senators may recall that I sponsored similar legislation (S. 3152) during the last Congress. Two notable changes have been made in the legislation which I am now introducing.

1. Section 45, providing for a review of policies of the Board in connection with its operations, has been added. This section is similar to the provisions of the Capper-Volstead Act and insures that the Board cannot pursue any policies which would unduly enhance the price of milk and other dairy products.

2. Section 27 provides for a Federal Dairy Advisory Committee which would act as sort of a watchdog committee and would have the authority to ask the Secretary of Agriculture for a review of the operations of the Board as provided in section 45 of this legislation.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR ARMED SERVICES

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I introduce, by request, four bills relating to the Armed Services.

Three of these bills are requested by the Department of Defense and one by the Comptroller General and are accompanied by a letter of transmittal explaining the purposes of the bills.

I ask unanimous consent that the letters of transmittal be printed in the RECORD immediately following the listing of the bills.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters of transmittal will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) (by

request), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

S. 933. A bill to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of deceased members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 933 is as follows:)

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, January 27, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Under date of July 1, 1953, the former Comptroller General transmitted to the then chairman of your committee a draft of a proposed bill to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of deceased members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes. This bill was designed to simplify the settlement of the accounts of deceased members of the uniformed services and to expedite payment of the amounts found due.

The proposed draft was introduced in the 83d Congress as S. 2311, but failed of enactment. Under date of June 22, 1954, the General Accounting Office, at the request of the Bureau of the Budget, reviewed a proposed report of the Secretary of the Army for the Department of Defense to your committee on the bill. Such report disclosed general agreement with the purposes of the legislation with certain proposed changes of a minor nature, none of which are the subject of serious objection by the General Accounting Office.

There are enclosed a copy of the draft of the bill, a copy of the letter addressed by the former Comptroller General to the then chairman of your committee under date of July 1, 1953, which letter sets forth in detail the nature of the proposed legislation and the purposes sought to be accomplished thereby, and a copy of letter of June 22, 1954, to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget expressing the views of the General Accounting Office on the proposed report of the Department of Defense on the bill.

It is believed that the enactment of the legislation proposed will result in an improvement in the manner of the handling of payments of the type involved, that it will facilitate such payments and will result in substantial administrative savings to the Government. Therefore, and since the several departments affected by the bill have indicated their agreement with the purposes sought to be accomplished thereby, it is recommended that the matter be given early consideration by your committee. Representatives of the General Accounting Office will, of course, be available to furnish any additional explanation or information desired by the committee.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, July 1, 1953.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Chairman Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There is enclosed for your consideration a draft of a proposed bill to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of deceased members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes, which bill is designed to simplify the settlement of the accounts of deceased members of the uniformed services, and to expedite payment of the amounts found due.

The proposed legislation is patterned after Public Law 636, 81st Congress, 64 Stat. 395, applicable to civilian officers and employees of the Government, and would authorize members of the uniformed services to designate a beneficiary or beneficiaries to receive the amount found due from the Government in the settlement of their accounts at the time of death. In the event no beneficiary is designated, payment of the amount due would be made to the member's surviving spouse; his child or children and descendants of deceased children by representation; his parents or their survivor; each class to the exclusion of the latter. If none of these relatives survive, the amount due would be payable to the legal representative of the decedent's estate or, if none, to the person determined to be entitled under the laws of descent and distribution of the decedent's domicile.

The proposed bill provides that amounts payable under the legislation would be paid by the department concerned or upon settlement by the General Accounting Office as the Comptroller General of the United States may by regulation authorize and direct. This would leave to the Comptroller General the determination by regulation of the types or classes of claims which could be paid by the service involved and those which would be settled by the General Accounting Office. Should the bill be enacted, it is contemplated that regulations would be promptly promulgated extending to the services involved the authority to pay all claims where there exists a designated beneficiary, as is now being done in the case of civilian officers and employees. It is further contemplated that consideration would be given in the future, based upon a study of the percentage of members who designate beneficiaries and of the other factors involved to authorizing the services to make payment to certain of the other classes of beneficiaries named in the bill. Payments of amounts due would be made at the direction of the service, subject to a post audit by the General Accounting Office and subject to settlement by the General Accounting Office of any disputed claims. It is the opinion of this Office that such procedure will adequately protect the interests of the United States as well as the interests of the beneficiaries.

It has been the experience of the General Accounting Office under Public Law 636 that prompt payment has been effected by the administrative office, where a beneficiary to receive compensation has been designated under that act, without the necessity of settlement by the General Accounting Office. It is assumed that the services would by regulations and instructions insure the designation of a beneficiary by practically all service personnel. In these circumstances it is believed that payment of the accounts of practically all deceased service personnel could be promptly effected by the services, that the payments would be expedited and that substantial savings of administrative costs, both to the services and to the General Accounting Office, would result. Also, it is believed that by permitting the amounts to be paid to a designated beneficiary, there would be eliminated to a great extent the troublesome problems faced by the services and by the General Accounting Office in the "multiple widow," "foster parent," "father-desertion," and "illegitimacy," cases.

The bill provides further that designations of beneficiaries under the act and changes therein shall be made under regulations promulgated by the Secretaries of the services concerned and that such regulations shall be uniform for all services insofar as practicable. However, with certain exceptions, provision is made that any designation of beneficiary made for the purposes of any 6-month death gratuity available to the department before the effective date of the payment provisions of the proposed bill shall be considered as a designation of beneficiary for the purposes of this legislation in the absence of a specific designation of beneficiary thereunder. Since the payment provisions would not be effective until the sixth month after enactment, there would be adequate time for members so desiring to make a different designation for the purposes of this legislation.

It has been the experience of the General Accounting Office that Public Law 636 has resulted in the more prompt settlement of the accounts of deceased civilian officers and employees of the Government as well as in substantial savings of administrative costs to the agencies and to the General Accounting Office. The enactment of similar legislation for members of the uniformed services, as is here proposed, should result in similar advantages to the survivors of members of the services and to the United States.

The legislation proposed herein has been discussed informally with representatives of the Department of Defense, and it is believed that it meets generally with their approval.

I believe that the enactment of the legislation proposed will result in an improvement in the manner of the handling of payments of the type involved, that it will facilitate such payments, and will result in substantial administrative savings to the Government. I, therefore, recommend that the matter be given early consideration by your committee, and would appreciate an opportunity for representatives of the General Accounting Office to appear to furnish any additional explanation or information desired by the committee.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, June 22, 1954.

Hon. ROWLAND R. HUGHES,
Director, Bureau of the Budget.

DEAR MR. HUGHES: Reference is made to letter dated June 4, 1954, from the Assistant Director, Legislative Reference, Bureau of the Budget, enclosing for comment a copy of a report dated May 26, 1954, by the Secretary of the Army, for the Department of Defense, to the chairman, Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate, on S. 2311, 83d Congress, entitled "A bill to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of deceased members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes."

S. 2311 was introduced at the request of this Office for the purpose of simplifying the procedures for closing out the accounts of deceased members of the uniformed services and expediting the payment of amounts found due the estates of such decedents.

The bill is patterned after Public Law 636, 81st Congress (64 Stat. 395), applicable to civilian officers and employees of the Government, and would authorize members of the uniformed services to designate a beneficiary or beneficiaries to receive the amount found due from the Government at the time of death. In the event no beneficiary is designated, payment of the amount due would be made to the member's surviving spouse; his or her child or children and descendants of deceased children by representation; his or her parents or their survivor; each class to the exclusion of the latter. If none of these relatives survive, the amount due would be payable to the legal representative of the decedent's estate or, if none, to the person determined to be entitled under the laws of descent and distribution of the decedent's domicile. The procedural safeguards, either written into the bill or contemplated to be imposed by regulations, will adequately protect the interests of the United States and the interests of the beneficiaries.

It has been the experience of the General Accounting Office that Public Law 636 has resulted in substantial savings of administrative costs to the agencies and to the General Accounting Office and has been

quite effective in causing prompt payment of balances due in accounts of deceased civilian officers and employees of the Government in cases where a beneficiary has been designated. It is believed that S. 2311, if enacted, will result in similar advantages to the survivors of members of the uniformed services and to the United States. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the Public Health Service and the Treasury Department for the Coast Guard have formally advised this Office of their approval of the bill.

Respecting the suggested amendment in section 2 of the bill, it is the view of this office that the meaning of the section will be unchanged by such amendment and that, technically, an amount due a member of the uniformed services in his account as such member is an amount due from the United States Government, as such, and not an amount due from any particular department or agency. However, it is not believed that the suggested amendment is otherwise objectionable and since the amended language will accomplish the purpose of the original language, the suggested amendment in section 2 is acceptable to this Office.

The language of section 3 of the original bill was chosen advisedly to permit flexibility in the administration of the bill by giving the Comptroller General authority to meet changing situations as they arise without the necessity of further legislation. It was contemplated that soon after the enactment of the bill into law, regulations would be issued by this Office extending to the services the authority to pay all claims of the nature involved in cases where there is a designated beneficiary. Doubtless some extension or enlargement of that authority would be feasible in the future. This Office had no thought of suddenly changing procedures or of transferring functions to the Departments concerned without consulting them. Hence, the practical effect of the language of the original bill probably would be substantially the same as the practical effect of any substituted language based on section 3 of the act of August 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 396). However, if the Department of Defense is seriously opposed to the original language of section 3, this Office would be willing to accept different language having an effect similar to that of section 3 of the said act of August 3, 1950.

This Office has no serious objection to the deletion of section 6 of the bill since the Department of Defense considers such section superfluous and indicates that appropriate steps will be taken, in any event, to notify members of the uniformed services of the provisions of the bill if and when it is enacted into law.

Sincerely,

FRANK H. WEITZEL,
Acting Comptroller General of the United States.

S. 934. A bill to provide medical care for dependents of members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 934 is as follows:)

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., January 13, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are forwarded herewith a draft of legislation, "To provide medical care for dependents of members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes," and a sectional analysis thereof.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget advises that the proposal is in accord with the program of the President. The Office of the Secretary of Defense is the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

This proposal is designed to implement a recommendation of the President contained in his recent message on the state of the Union and a special message submitted to the Congress on January 13, 1955.

This proposed legislation would authorize the Department of Defense to provide medical care for all eligible dependents of military personnel wherever located. Heretofore, medical care has been largely confined to those living near military medical installations. Although those living at a distance have been eligible for such care, as a practical matter adequate medical attention could not be provided them. Additionally, in congested areas, military medical facilities were often inadequate to meet the needs.

On April 1, 1953, the Secretary of Defense established a Citizens Advisory Commission on Medical Care for Dependents of Military Personnel to study this problem. The Chairman of the Commission was Dr. Harold G. Moulton, president emeritus of the Brookings Institution, Washington, D. C. Other members were Thomas I. Parkinson, president of the Equitable Life Insurance Co. of America, New York City; Dr. Lewis Webster Jones, president of Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.; Mrs. Eugene Meyer, student and writer on social problems, Washington, D. C.; and Dr. George William Bachman, senior staff member in charge of health studies of the Brookings Institution, Washington, D. C. In June 1953 the Commission submitted its report and recommendation, copies of which were sent to the Armed Services Committee of the House and Senate.

Basic recommendations of the Commission are incorporated into this proposed legislation. Some of the salient features of the program which this proposal would authorize are:

1. The present system of medical care would be supplemented by the use of civilian facilities when military facilities are not available with the Government meeting a substantial part, but not all, of the costs.

2. The medical care provided heretofore has not been complete, and it has differed in extent in the three services. The limiting factor in general has been the availability of facilities; but at the same time certain types of illnesses have been excluded as a practical matter. The Commission recommended uniformity in practice throughout the Armed Forces as well as strict limitations with respect to the illnesses covered.

3. Specifically excluded from the bill are the following: Hospitalization for domiciliary care and chronic diseases, and chronic mental and nervous disorders, the provision of prosthetic devices, hearing aids, orthopedic footwear and spectacles (however, overseas and in remote areas of the United States where if available from military stocks prosthetic devices, hearing aids, orthopedic footwear and spectacles may be provided at cost prices to the Government), ambulance service except in acute emergency and home calls except in special cases as determined by the cognizant physician. Dental treatment is restricted to emergency dental care except outside the United States and in remote areas where adequate civilian dental facilities are not available. In such cases dental treatment may be provided from military dental sources but will depend upon the availability of space, facilities, and capabilities of the dental staff. The bill specifically provides that dental treatment is not authorized at Government expense through civilian dental sources, except as a necessary adjunct to medical or surgical treatment.

4. Medical care would be provided for the following: Diagnosis; treatment of acute medical and surgical conditions; treatment of contagious diseases; immunization; and maternity and infant care.

5. The limitations on the type of medical care provided dependents under this bill is an important factor in keeping the costs of the program down; however, the universalization of the program will involve substantial additional costs under present conditions. The Commission pointed out, however, that in the long run, that is, when world tensions are eased, only career personnel would be involved and there would be few who could not be cared for at military medical installations; hence, the cost of the broadened program should progressively decline.

6. The recommendations of the Commission call for uniform regulations pertaining to eligibility. The Commission recommended that all Regular or Reserve and inducted members of the Armed Forces on active duty and certain categories of retired members be eligible for care of their dependents.

7. The proposed legislation incorporates various safeguards and specifically gives the Secretary of Defense the authority to promulgate regulations and to fix such charges as he deems appropriate in order to implement this legislation fairly and to prevent excessive demands for medical care. This legislation is also designed to be flexible enough to provide a basis in law for the needs in this area during peacetime and in times of national emergency.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES

This proposal was submitted to the 83d Congress as a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1954 and was introduced in the form of S. 3363. No further action was taken on the bill.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The following tabulation indicates the estimated fiscal effects of this legislation. It demonstrates the cost of providing dependent care in military hospitals worldwide for fiscal year 1954, together with the estimated costs of implementing this program.

[In millions]

	Cost of providing dependent care in military hospitals, worldwide, fiscal year 1954	Estimated cost of implementing proposed legislation	Total estimated cost
Gross cost	$73.0	$84.0	$157.0
In-patient	50.0	58.0	108.0
Out-patient	23.0	26.0	49.0
Patients' contributions	−5.0	−31.0	−36.0
	68.0	[1] 53.0	121.0

[1] Excludes $5.8 million estimated administrative costs.

While such increased costs were not included within the proposed operating budget for fiscal year 1956, funds for this and certain other items will be shown in the budget as proposed for later transmission, contingent upon authorizing legislation.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD A. BUDDEKE,
Director, Legislative Programs.

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF A BILL TO PROVIDE MEDICAL CARE FOR DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Section 1 provides for the short title.

Section 2 provides a declaration of policy by the Congress.

Section 3 defines certain terms used in the bill. It should be noted that section 3 (a) (2) is intended to cover persons of the regu-

lar components who are retired and those of the reserve components who, for all practical purposes, are like those of the regular components. It does not cover those individuals entitled to receive retired or retirement pay pursuant to title III of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948.

Section 4 provides for medical care of dependents of the members of the Armed Forces in accordance with the provisions of the act and subject to the regulations of the Secretary of Defense as approved by the President.

Section 5 (a) provides that military medical facilities will be used whenever space and facilities are available.

Section 5 (b) provides that when military medical facilities are not available or capable of providing the authorized type of treatment, dependents are authorized medical care from civilian sources. Schedules of maximum fees and costs for such medical care would be established by the Secretary of Defense.

Section 6 (a) provides that in order to prevent excessive demands for medical care under this act, dependents shall be responsible for contributing to the cost of such care.

Section 6 (b) provides the Secretary of Defense is authorized to establish charges for any subsistence given in connection with medical care.

Section 6 (c) provides that amounts received in payment for subsistence and medical care rendered dependents in military medical facilities shall be deposited to the credit of the appropriation supporting the maintenance and operation or subsistence of the military medical facilities furnishing the care.

Section 6 (d) provides that amounts received in payment for medical care rendered dependents by civilian medical sources shall be deposited to the credit of the medical appropriation of the military department of which the sponsor is a member.

Section 7 provides that, if the Secretary of Defense finds it more economical, he may contract for dependent medical care under such private insurance plan as he deems appropriate.

Section 8 provides for the types of medical care authorized.

Section 9 provides for the types of hospitalization not authorized.

Section 10 (a) provides for further limitations on medical care. Prosthetic devices, hearing aids, orthopedic footwear, and spectacles are not authorized. However, outside the United States and in remote stations where adequate civilian facilities are not available these devices, if available from Government stocks, may be provided to dependents at cost prices to the Government.

Section 10 (b) provides for limitations on ambulance service and home calls.

Section 11 provides the extent to which dental treatment may be given to dependents of members of the Armed Forces. It specifically provides that dental treatment is not authorized through civilian medical sources except as a necessary adjunct to medical or surgical treatment.

Section 12 provides that when an individual serving on active duty as a member of the Coast Guard dies while the Coast Guard is operating as a part of the Navy, his widow and dependents shall be eligible for medical care, the same as if such individual had been a member of the Navy on active duty.

Section 13 authorizes appropriation of funds to carry out the provisions of this act.

Section 14 (a) (1) repeals the act of July 5, 1884 (10 U. S. C. 96), which provides that the medical officers of the Army and contract surgeons shall, whenever practicable, attend the families of the officers and soldiers free of charge.

Section 14 (a) (2) repeals the act of May 10, 1943 (24 U. S. C. 32–36) relating to the hospitalization of dependents of naval and Marine Corps personnel, and the limitations with respect to medical, surgical, or hospital services that may be rendered.

Section 14 (a) (3) repeals that part of section 326 (b) of the act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 697), which reads as follows:

"Such cost shall be at such uniform rate as may be prescribed from time to time by the President for the hospitalization of dependents of naval and Marine Corps personnel at any naval hospital, pursuant to section 2 of the act of May 10, 1943 (57 Stat. 80)."

Section 14 (a) (4) repeals Public Law 108, approved June 20, 1949, to the extent that it authorizes hospital and medical care for dependents of the Regular and Reserve components of the Armed Forces.

Section 14 (b) provides that all laws and parts of laws to the extent that they are inconsistent with the provisions of this proposal are hereby repealed.

Section 15 provides that this legislation shall be effective 90 days from the date of its enactment.

S. 935. A bill to provide for the administration of the Ryukyu Islands, and for other purposes.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 935 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., January 14, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation, "To provide for the administration of the Ryukyu Islands, and for other purposes," together with a sectional analysis thereof.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955, and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this proposed legislation is (a) to establish a basis in law for the exercise of the authority granted the United States by article 3 of the Treaty of Peace with Japan, (b) to outline broad policy objectives for the administration of the islands, and (c) to provide that Federal statutes, except those which have force and effect outside the territorial limits of the United States, will not apply to the Ryukyus pending investigation to determine which laws should be made applicable thereto.

The interest of the United States in the Ryukyu Islands is dictated by strategic military considerations of the highest importance. Consequently, the task of administering the islands has been assigned by the President to the Department of Defense, an assignment necessitated by the inextricable linking of civil and military functions there. In the tightly constricted area of the Ryukyus virtually all activities and policies of the native Government directly affect military planning and operations. The proposed legislation would formalize existing arrangements for assuring continued effective performance of the basic military mission and would also establish, in broad outline, United States objectives for the conduct of the civil administration.

Certain Federal statutes are applicable not only to the continental United States but also to its Territories and possessions. There exist varying rules of construction with regard to the application of Federal laws to outlying areas, and there is some confusion, for example, as to the meaning of the term "Territories and possessions." In some instances the designation has been held to apply to any area over which the United States exercises control, whatever the technical status of the area, an application which would embrace the Ryukyu Islands. Since any nonselective application of Federal statutes to the Ryukyu Islands could give rise to problems inimical and injurious to the interests both of the United States and the Ryukyus, it is proposed that no Federal statutes, except those which have force and effect outside the territorial limits of the United States, shall have application in the Ryukyu Islands until the Congress takes appropriate action with respect to the recommendations submitted to it by a three-member Commission appointed by the Secretary of Defense. It is further provided that future legislative enactments must contain specific reference to the Ryukyu Islands if they are to be made applicable thereto.

It is the view of the Department of Defense that continued effective operation of the military installations on the Ryukyu Islands can best be assured by the enactment, as a matter of priority, of legislation granting the President of the United States, acting through the Secretary of Defense, broad authority to administer the islands in such manner as (a) to facilitate performance of the basic United States military mission and (b) to insure proper regard for the interests and requirements of the Ryukyuan people.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The enactment of this proposal will cause an increase of about $65,000 in the budgetary requirements for the Department of Defense to cover costs of the three-member Commission to review Federal statutes.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE RYUKYU ISLANDS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Section 1 provides for the exercise of all executive, legislative, and judicial authority necessary for the civil administration of the Ryukyu Islands by the Secretary of Defense or his designated representative in such manner as the President may direct or authorize. It further sets out that the objectives and intent of the United States administration is the development of a financially sound, responsible Ryukyuan government based on democratic principles, yet safeguarding their native economic and cultural status. It further provides that relations of these islands with foreign countries and international organizations shall be conducted by the Secretary of State.

Section 2 provides that the representative of the Secretary of Defense administering these islands to be known as the High Commissioner of the Ryukyu Islands.

Section 3 stipulates that no United States law will, except those which have force and effect outside the territorial limits of the United States, apply to the Ryukyu Islands unless made specifically applicable by act of Congress. It further provides for the appointment of a three-man commission to survey the field of Federal statutes and within 12 months to advise Congress concerning those statutes which should be made applicable to the Ryukyu Islands, either in present form or by amendment as may be necessary.

Section 4 provides for the continuance in force of the laws of the Ryukyu Islands and the laws, proclamations, ordinances, directives and regulations of the United States Civil Administration in the Ryukyu Islands which are not inconsistent with this law but subject to modification or repeal by Congress or by the President of the United States acting through the Secretary of Defense or his designated representative.

Section 5 provides that proceeds of all taxes, assessments, and fees collected in the

Ryukyu Islands shall be expended for governmental purposes and for the general welfare of the people of the islands.

Section 6 authorizes annual appropriations of funds necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this law.

S. 936. A bill to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 936 is as follows:)

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., January 15, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955, and the Bureau of the Budget advises that the proposal is in accord with the program of the President. The Office of the Secretary of Defense has assumed action responsibility for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

This legislation implements the President's recommendations concerning military career incentives contained in the recent state of the Union address and in his special message to the Congress on January 13, 1955.

This proposal is designed to restore the military pay structure to approximately the same relative position in the economy which it held immediately following the enactment of the Career Compensation Act of 1949. With regard to basic pay the bill would provide selective increases for personnel who elect to make a career in the uniformed services.

On September 1, 1954, a special committee was established within the Department of Defense to study the military pay and allowance structure and to recommend substantive legislation designed to modernize that structure. The committee observed that there has been a sharp decrease in the number of reenlistments in the Armed Forces; for example, in 1949 the Army had a reenlistment rate of 41.2 percent but in 1954 that rate dropped to 11.6 percent.

At the present low reenlistment rates it will be necessary to replace 800,000 of the 1,000,000 enlisted men who will become eligible for release from the military services during the coming year. The loss of such large numbers of trained men results in the dissipation of a considerable financial investment which the Government has made in the training of such individuals, both basic and specialized training; and necessitates the reinvestment of time and money in new personnel in order to bring those individuals to the same level of efficiency possessed by trained military members. If the pattern continues at the current composite reenlistment rate of 20 percent the burden of constantly reinvesting training costs for 80 percent of the personnel will not only result in greatly increased costs to the Armed Forces but will also cause an unhealthy dilution of the trained military force.

The situation is equally acute with regard to young officers whose training in their initial years of service involves a substantial expenditure. For example, in the Navy approximately 4,000 young officers terminated their obligated military service in calendar year 1954. Out of that number only 200 elected to remain in the active service. Additionally of this 200, 141 requested extensions of their active duty for only 6 months. Forty-six requested, and received, active duty agreements varying from 1 to 5 years and 13 expressed an interest in transferring to the Regular Navy. Experience in the other services is generally the same as that of the Navy. As a result, there is an alarming shortage of officers in the 4- to 10-year experience category. Failure to attract more officers who will serve on a career basis will cause a deterioration in leadership and skill which will endanger our future security.

Field studies of the problem of high military personnel turnover reveal that there are two major factors dissuading personnel who might otherwise reenlist. These are the level of compensation in relation to private industry; and the instability of military life. The rise of widespread supplementary pay and retirement practices and employee's benefits now being granted in private industry has neutralized any advantage the military services had only a few years ago in procurement and retention of career personnel.

Additionally, this legislative proposal would provide for selective increases in incentive-hazardous-duty pay for air and submarine crews and would also increase the hazardous duty pay for demolition work, parachute duty, deep sea diving and certain other specialties.

The Department of Defense is convinced that the military services must offer adequate special pay in order to attract men who are willing to undertake certain unusually hazardous duties involving risks of death or disability in the execution of military functions. It is believed that this legislation will provide a more adequate incentive for men to engage in such hazardous duties than is now provided under current law.

The per diem allowances for temporary travel duty would be raised from $9, but not to exceed $12, per day and a dislocation allowance would be provided military personnel with dependents who are ordered to a new permanent duty station. The proposed dislocation allowance is based on the principle that persons who must move to new stations of duty on the orders of their employer should be assisted in absorbing the additional costs of such dislocation. The practice of providing an additional monetary allowance for this purpose is widely used in private industry as well as in the Armed Forces of many other countries. Surveys conducted by the military services reveal that moving costs to the servicemen generally vary in amounts relating to grade and that such costs exceed the amount of the monthly quarters allowance.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

In the event this legislation is enacted it is estimated that the following increased costs will result for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1956:

	In millions
Army	$222.4
Navy	205.3
Air Force	265.6
Marine Corps	36.4
Total	729.7

While such increased costs were not included within the proposed operating budget for fiscal year 1956, funds for this and certain other items will be shown in the budget as proposed for later transmission, contingent upon authorizing legislation.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD A. BUDDEKE,
Director, Legislative Programs.

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF A BILL TO PROVIDE INCENTIVES FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES BY INCREASING CERTAIN PAYS AND ALLOWANCES

Section 1 is the short title of the bill.

Section 2 amends the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (37 U. S. C. 231 et seq.) in the following respects:

(1) In clause (1), section 201 (a) is amended by striking out the present pay tables contained therein and inserting a new table providing increased pay for commissioned officers with more than 3 cumulative years of service and warrant officers and enlisted members with more than 2 cumulative years of service.

(2) In clauses (2) and (3), section 201 (c), which was repealed by section 20 (n) of the Warrant Officer Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 167), is replaced by the present subsection 201 (d) which is redesignated as (c), and the present subsection 201 (e) is redesignated as (d). A new subsection is added dealing with the pay of aviation cadets in order to bring provisions dealing with their pay together in section 201 with the pay of other members of the uniformed services. The pay of aviation cadets is raised from $109.20 per month (including flight pay) to the rate of 50 percent of the basic pay of a commissioned officer in pay grade O–1 with less than 2 cumulative years of service which amounts to $161.15 (including flight pay). The pay of aviation cadets was formerly covered by section 4 of the Army Aviation Cadet Act and section 4 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942.

(3) In clause (4), three new clauses numbered (10), (11), and (12) are added to section 204 (a) to provide hazardous duty incentive pay for duty as a low-pressure chamber inside observer, duty as a human acceleration or deceleration subject, and duty involving the use of helium-oxygen for a breathing mixture in the execution of deep-sea diving, respectively.

(4) In clause (5), section 204 (b) is amended to provide a new table of hazardous duty incentive pay authorized under subsection (a) (1) and (2). The new rates increase the amounts of incentive pay for hazardous duty on a selective basis to provide more adequate incentives to continue a career in hazardous duties. This method permits payments of incentive pay for hazardous duty more nearly commensurate with experience and responsibility.

(5) In clause (6), section 204 (c) is amended to increase the rate of hazardous duty incentive pay prescribed therein to $110 and $55, respectively.

(6) In clause (7), section 204 (e), prohibiting the payment of incentive pay to aviation cadets, is repealed, and subsection (f) is redesignated as subsection (e).

(7) In clause (8), section 205 (a) is amended to increase the monthly minimum and maximum rates of special pay diving duty prescribed in that subsection to $5.50 and $33, respectively.

(8) In clause (9), section 205 (b) is amended to increase the hourly special pay diving duty thereunder to $5.50 per hour.

(9) In clause (10), section 205 (c) is amended to provide that the receipt of incentive pay under section 204 will not prevent the member from being entitled to $5.50 for each hour or fraction thereof, in addition to basic pay, as authorized by section 205 (b).

(10) In clause (11), the last sentence of section 303 (a) is amended to increase the per diem allowance from $9 per day to $12 per day.

(11) In clause (12), a new sentence is inserted after the first sentence of section 303 (c) to provide a dislocation allowance, under such regulations as may be approved by the Secretary concerned, in an amount equal to 1 month's basic allowance for quarters for the member concerned, whenever a member makes a permanent change of station under orders and his dependents are required to move in connection with that change of station. The allowance may not be paid more than one time for any one permanent change of station.

(12) In clause (13), section 411 is amended to extend, for 2 years from the effective date of the Career Incentive Act of 1955, the authority to elect retired pay or retirement

pay under that section or under the methods set forth in section 511 of the act, and to authorize the revocation of any prior election under that section.

(13) In clause (14), section 415 is amended to authorize a member who elected to receive retirement benefits under that section computed under the laws in effect on September 30, 1949, to revoke that election and thereby receive retired pay computed under this section of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended. It is further provided that such member is entitled to retroactive pay as a result of this amendment.

(14) In clause (15) section 511 is amended by adding a new subsection authorizing certain members retired before October 1, 1949, and whose retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay is computed under a law enacted before October 1, 1949, to have that pay recomputed under the Career Compensation Act of 1949, if the recomputation provides him a greater amount of pay.

Sections 3 and 4 amend the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942 and the Army Aviation Cadet Act, respectively, to delete the present language dealing with the pay of aviation cadets, which will hereafter be covered by section 201 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949. Aviation cadets are considered to be enlisted members and, therefore, are entitled to the same travel and other necessary expenses as other enlisted members.

Section 5 provides that any person who is entitled to retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 on the effective date of this act is entitled to have his pay computed under the amendments made by this act.

Section 6 is a savings clause to protect active or retired personnel from suffering a decrease in basic or retired pay as a result of enactment of this legislation.

OVERTIME WORK FOR CERTAIN OFFICERS AND SEAMEN ON THE GREAT LAKES

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Michigan, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to permit officers and seamen engaged in harbor towing on the Great Lakes to work overtime. The present law prohibits an employee on a harbor tug on the Great Lakes from working more than 8 hours a day, even though he is willing to work overtime. The purpose of this bill is to enable these men to have the same working privileges as other American seamen.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 940) to provide that the law limiting the hours of labor of certain officers and seamen on certain vessels navigating the Great Lakes and adjacent waters shall not be applicable to such officers and seamen on tugs principally used for harbor towing, introduced by Mr. BRICKER (for himself, Mr. POTTER, and Mr. BENDER) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PROHIBITION OF TRANSMISSION OF CERTAIN GAMBLING INFORMATION IN INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Attorney General of the United States, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to prohibit the transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce by communication facilities.

This might be termed "perennial" legislation. The first bill on this subject was introduced on April 4, 1950, by Senator Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado, then chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and he introduced it at the request of Attorney General J. Howard McGrath. That bill—S. 3358, 81st Congress—stemmed directly from the Attorney General's Conference on Organized Crime which met in Washington on February 15, 1950, and was attended by mayors, State attorneys general, and other local and State law-enforcement officials.

Following the introduction of S. 3358, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce promptly held comprehensive hearings and favorably reported the legislation to the Senate on May 26, 1950. It was objected to on several occasions and died on the Senate Calendar. The hearings held by the Kefauver crime committee confirmed the findings of the Interstate Committee that without the wire services this nefarious traffic would be brought to a virtual standstill.

Coincidental with the introduction of the gambling information bill back in 1950, former Senator Johnson also introduced another proposal requested by Attorney General McGrath, namely, S. 3357, to prohibit the transportation of slot machines in interstate and foreign commerce. That bill was given expeditious consideration by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and on April 12, 1950, it was reported favorably, and passed the Senate on April 19. Following lengthy House committee hearings the bill passed the House, and on January 2, 1951, it was approved by President Truman. The Johnson Slot Machine Act has been of great aid in drying up a big source of revenue for the racketeers and gamblers.

Again, in the 81st, 82d, and 83d Congresses, bills to prohibit the transmission of gambling information were introduced and favorably reported from our committee but they never got off the Senate Calendar.

The bill which I am introducing today at the request of Attorney General Brownell is not so stringent a bill as that recommended by Attorney General McGrath in 1950 and subsequently reported from our committee. The instant bill is restricted in its application to horse and dog racing and is aimed specifically at one aspect of the bookmaking racket—the wire service.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD in connection with the bill Attorney General Brownell's letter of January 25, 1955, requesting this legislation, also an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 30, 1955, endorsing the principle of the proposed legislation but calling for caution in our consideration thereof.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and editorial, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 950) to prohibit transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce by communication facilities, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the purposes of this act are to assist the various States, Territories, and possessions of the United States, and the District of Columbia in the enforcement of their laws pertaining to gambling, bookmaking, and like offenses, and to aid in the suppression of organized gambling activities by prohibiting the use of or the leasing, furnishing, or maintaining of communication facilities which are or will be used for the transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce.

SEC. 2. As used in this act, the term—

(a) "Communication facility" means any and all instrumentalities, personnel, and services (among other things, the receipt, forwarding, and delivery of communications) used or useful in the transmission of writings, signs, signals, pictures, and sounds of all kinds by wire or radio or other like connection between points of origin and reception of such transmission.

(b) "Gambling information" means bets or wagers or related information assisting in the placing of bets or wagers on any horse or dog racing event or contest, or transactions, or information facilitating betting or wagering activities on any such horse or dog racing event or contest. In connection with horseracing, gambling information includes among other things entries, scratches, jockeys, jockey changes, weights, probable winners, scheduled starting time of race, actual starting time of race, track conditions, the betting odds, changes in the betting odds, the post positions, the results, and the prices paid.

(c) "Transmission in interstate commerce" means transmission directly or indirectly from any place in any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or the District of Columbia to any place in any other State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or the District of Columbia.

(d) "Transmission in foreign commerce" means transmission directly or indirectly from or to any place in the United States to or from a foreign country or ship at sea or in the air.

SEC. 3. (a) The use of, or the leasing, furnishing, or maintaining of any communication facility which is or will be used for the transmission of gambling information in interstate or foreign commerce is prohibited. When any common carrier, subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission, is notified in writing by a Federal, State, or local law-enforcement agency, acting within its jurisdiction, that any facility furnished by it is being used or will be used for the purpose of transmitting or receiving gambling information in interstate or foreign commerce, it shall discontinue within a reasonable time, or refuse, the leasing, furnishing, or maintaining of such facility, but no damages, penalty or forfeiture, civil or criminal, shall be found against any common carrier for any act done in compliance with any such notice. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to prejudice the right of any person affected thereby

to secure an appropriate determination, as otherwise provided by law, in a Federal court or in a State or local tribunal or agency, that such facility should not be discontinued or removed, or should be restored.

(b) Nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent the transmission in interstate or foreign commerce of information in connection with the news reporting of sporting events or contests, which might be gambling information as defined in this act, if such information is intended, transmitted, supplied, delivered, and received only for printed news publication in newspapers, magazines, journals, or like periodicals, or for radio and television broadcasting.

Sec. 4. (a) Any person or persons who shall lease or otherwise obtain from a common carrier or other supplier a private line communication facility to be operated in interstate or foreign commerce for or in connection with the transmission of news or other information pertaining to sporting events or contests shall file with such carrier or other supplier a statement that the communication facility so obtained is to be used for such purposes. Failure to file such a statement shall create a presumption that such communication facility is being used in violation of the provisions of this act. The statements on file with the carriers or other suppliers shall be open to inspection by appropriate State and Federal law-enforcement agencies.

(b) Each common carrier or other supplier shall maintain a list of the terminal points and drops (receiving and sending) on any private line communication facility leased or otherwise furnished for the transmission in interstate or foreign commerce of news or other information pertaining to sporting events or contests, including the address of each such terminal point and drop, and such list shall be open to inspection by appropriate State and Federal law-enforcement agencies.

Sec. 5. (a) The interstate or foreign character of any transmission of gambling information in, or intended for transmission in, interstate or foreign commerce shall not create an immunity in respect of any criminal prosecution under the laws of any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia pertaining to gambling, bookmaking, and like offenses.

(b) Any remedies afforded by this act are in addition to remedies now existing under State or Federal law, including law applicable within the Territories and possessions of the United States and the District of Columbia.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

JANUARY 25, 1955.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: There is attached for your consideration and appropriate action a legislative proposal to prohibit the transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce by communication facilities.

The twofold purpose of this legislation is (1) to assist the State, Territories, and possessions of the United States and the District of Columbia in the enforcement of their laws pertaining to gambling, bookmaking and like offenses and (2) to aid in the suppression of organized gambling activities by prohibiting the use of or the leasing, furnishing, or maintaining of communication facilities which are or will be used in the transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce.

By its limited definition of "gambling information" the measure is restricted in its application to information relating to horse and dog racing. Specifically, it is aimed at one aspect of the bookmaking racket—the wire service, without which that racket cannot exist on a national scale. It is recognized, of course, that gambling exists with respect to sporting events other than horse and dog racing, but it is believed that the limited application of the statute will effectively deal with the wire service problem, and that a broader statute is not necessary.

The measure creates no criminal sanctions. Rather, it prescribes that whenever "any common carrier, subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission, is notified in writing by a Federal, State, or local law-enforcement agency, acting within its jurisdiction, that any facility furnished by it is being used or will be used for the purpose of transmitting or receiving gambling information in interstate or foreign commerce, it shall discontinue within a reasonable time, or refuse, the leasing, furnishing, or maintaining of such facility." Thus it will accomplish its purpose by establishing a procedure to prevent persons from using communication facilities for transmitting prohibited gambling information beyond State lines.

This legislative proposal would constitute a sensible exercise of congressional power under the commerce clause of the Constitution of the United States (art. I, sec. 8). It will assist the States and local governments in the dispatch of their law-enforcement responsibilities insofar as organized gambling and bookmaking are concerned, yet violations of local gambling laws will continue within the sole province of local law-enforcement officials. Incidentally, it should be noted that the measure contains adequate safeguards to protect the operations of legitimate news-gathering and news-disseminating services.

Accordingly, I urge the early introduction and enactment of this legislative proposal.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation.

Sincerely,

HERBERT BROWNELL, Jr.,
Attorney General.

The editorial presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 30, 1955]

CUTTING THE RACE WIRES

Attorney General Brownell is on solid ground in asking Congress to forbid the use of interstate wire facilities for the transmission of "gambling information"—meaning bets and related data in regard to horse and dog racing. At present gambling rackets flourish because full details regarding race entries, scratches, track conditions, betting odds, results, and prices paid are carried over a network of leased wires. In the absence of a law, public utilities are in effect contributing to the success of these rackets in direct conflict with the public interest. The Attorney General's bill would deprive the bookmakers of this advantage and thus, it is anticipated, put some of them out of business.

In our view, the objective of this measure is not only legitimate but also laudable. It would apply in interstate commerce a method that has already proved successful in at least one State—California. The fact that gambling is primarily a State concern should not prevent Congress from using its power over interstate commerce to aid law enforcement. The danger that this power might be abused to curb the transmission of legitimate news seems to have been obviated by a specific exemption for information transmitted and received "only for printed news publication in newspapers, magazines, journals or like periodicals, or for radio and television broadcasting."

There is, however, one aspect of the bill that needs further analysis. It would instruct any interstate communications company to discontinue service to anyone reported by a local, State, or Federal law-enforcement agency to be using such facilities for the purpose of transmitting or receiving gambling information. No criminal penalties are attached, but the person so deprived of telephone service, for example, would have to go to court to regain his right to have a telephone in his home or place of business. This seems to us to overlook due process. A businessman deprived of a telephone would be under a critical handicap. Such punishment should not be applied arbitrarily nor upon a mere order from a police officer. In our opinion, such a step should be taken only after a fair hearing has been held. It is not enough to maintain access to the courts for citizens who may be aggrieved in this respect. They have a right to a hearing before the deprivation is enforced, and the Department of Justice would do well to modify the otherwise praiseworthy bill in this particular.

REMOVAL OF BULK COMMODITY EXEMPTION WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN WATER CARRIERS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend part III of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to remove the bulk commodity exemption with respect to certain water carriers.

A substantial number of water carriers are interested in this proposed legislation, and it is at their request that I introduce the bill. However, it is controversial, and extensive hearings will be necessary so that all parties in interest may have an opportunity to appear and present their views.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 951) to amend part III of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to remove the bulk commodity exemption with respect to certain water carriers, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

TREATMENT OF CERTAIN CHILDREN AS DEPENDENTS FOR INCOME-TAX PURPOSES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to permit any taxpayer who provides a home for any foster child placed in his home by a licensed agency to treat such child as a dependent for Federal income tax purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me, together with an analysis of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 957) to permit any taxpayer who provides a home for any foster child placed in his home by a licensed agency to treat such child as a dependent for Federal income-tax purposes, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. HENNINGS, and Mr. LANGER), was re-

ceived, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. KEFAUVER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

On behalf of myself, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I am introducing a bill designed to meet a serious obstacle in the field of child welfare; namely, the acute shortage of decent homes available for the care of children who lack homes and families of their own. The Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency has found during its investigations that this lack is for many children a push toward delinquency and crime.

It is not too hard for our welfare agencies to find homes for infants and very small children in most instances, but the plight of the homeless child from 5 or 6 years of age through his school years is often tragic. And this tragedy particularly befalls to the boy or girl who is evidencing behavior problems. The family taking such a child into their home is undertaking a most difficult, trying, and important task—a task which may save many a youngster from a delinquent career.

This bill which provides certain tax advantages to such families would at least offset a portion of the financial sacrifice they now make. It would not and could not truly reward them for the service which they are rendering in behalf of all of us.

The analysis presented by Mr. KEFAUVER is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED BILL TO PERMIT ANY TAXPAYER WHO PROVIDES A HOME FOR ANY CHILD PLACED IN HIS HOME BY A LICENSED AGENCY TO TREAT SUCH CHILD AS A DEPENDENT FOR FEDERAL INCOME-TAX PURPOSES

Section I amends section 152 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to enable any taxpayer providing foster care for a child for a duly licensed agency to count such child as a dependent for income-tax purposes. The provision of such foster care involves both financial and personal sacrifice on the part of foster parents. This measure should aid immeasurably in meeting the present drastic lack of adequate foster homes.

Section II makes the proposed amendment effective after December 31, 1954.

HANDLING OF JUVENILE DELINQUENTS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to the handling of juvenile delinquents. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me and an analysis of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 958) relating to the handling of juvenile delinquents, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. HENNINGS, and Mr. LANGER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. KEFAUVER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

On behalf of myself, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I am introducing a bill to provide for the more effective waiver to State authorities of juveniles who have also violated Federal law. As members of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, we have become deeply conscious of the waste, both in human welfare and in dollars and cents, which is involved in handling under Federal statutes the majority of juveniles now so handled.

It is virtually impossible for a juvenile to commit a Federal offense, without, at the same time, violating a State or local ordnance in the community where the offense occurs. Welfare and correctional authorities unanimously subscribe to the principle that a delinquent boy or girl is most effectively rehabilitated when he can be kept close to his own home, family, and community. Unlike an adult, a released juvenile offender usually returns to his parental family. His effective rehabilitation, therefore, requires that the family, as well as the juvenile, be worked with to the end of creating a home situation in which the juvenile can eventually find himself.

It is, therefore, inefficient to transport a youngster from a State hundreds of miles away to the National Training School for Boys here in Washington. Such procedure also involves an unnecessary and unproductive expenditure of Federal funds.

Our subcommittee has within the past few days also introduced legislation which would give assistance to States and localities in improving their programs to prevent delinquency and to rehabilitate youngsters in trouble. We believe that this is the proper and the effective way for the Federal Government to give assistance to States and localities in meeting the problem of juvenile delinquency. We do not believe that sound, long-time goals will be achieved through a process which merely relieves States of responsibility for individual delinquent boys and girls.

The analysis presented by Mr. Kefauver is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF BILL RELATING TO THE HANDLING OF JUVENILE DELINQUENTS

Section 1 (a) makes the following changes in existing law: It amends title 18, United States Code, section 5032, so as to place in the United States district court the determination as to whether a juvenile, over 16 years of age, who has committed a felony, but one not punishable by death or life imprisonment, shall be proceeded against as a juvenile delinquent or under the criminal statutes. Under the present statutes, the authority is given to the Attorney General to make such a determination "in his discretion" with respect to any child irrespective of age or offense. The bill provides that the United States court is to make these determinations only after an investigation of the juvenile's background and a determination that the juvenile is not treatable in any Federal facility for juvenile delinquents.

Section 1 (b) makes no change in existing provisions of law which provide that if it is decided to proceed against a juvenile as a juvenile delinquent, the proceedings are to be begun by information, rather than criminal prosecution.

Section 1 (b) (1) changes the analysis of chapter 403 of title 18 to conform to the changes made by the bill.

Section 1 (b) (2) removes from the provisions of section 5033 the requirement for obtaining the consent of the juvenile to proceeding with respect to him as a juvenile delinquent.

Section 2 makes the following changes in existing law: It strengthens the present provisions of title 18, United States Code, section 5001, by requiring that when a person under 22 years of age is charged with the commission of a Federal offense, the commission of which may also subject that person to the jurisdiction of any State juvenile court, the United States attorney is to forego prosecution, turn such person over to the proper authority of the State, and take steps to cause a proceeding to be begun in the State juvenile court with respect to such offense. Under existing statutes, the United States attorney is only required to ascertain whether there is any State that can and will assume such jurisdiction. The present statutory age with respect to this diversion is 21; the bill raises this age to 22, in line with the age limit of the Youth Corrections Act.

Where the person in question may be subject to the criminal laws of a State, the bill retains the provisions of existing statutes; i. e., requiring of the United States attorney only that he ascertain whether any State can and will assume jurisdiction. The bill retains the present provisions of the law with respect to (a) authorizing the marshal to convey such persons upon order of the United States attorney, (b) obtaining the person's consent to return, and (c) paying the expenses for the return out of appropriated funds.

PROHIBITION OF TRAVEL BY CERTAIN JUVENILES OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to prohibit juveniles, unaccompanied by a parent or guardian, from going outside the United States without a permit issued by the Attorney General for such purpose. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me, together with an analysis of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 959) to prohibit juveniles, unaccompanied by a parent or guardian, from going outside the United States without a permit issued by the Attorney General for such purpose, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. HENNINGS, and Mr. LANGER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. KEFAUVER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

On behalf of myself, the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HENNINGS), and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. LANGER), I am introducing a bill to restrict the present free passage of unaccompanied juveniles across our national borders. This bill is designed to combat a very serious problem uncovered by the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency during its hearings along the Mexican border.

Despite sincere efforts to curb vice in certain communities along the border, our respected neighbor, Mexico, is still confronted at points with a serious traffic in narcotics, prostitution, and other vices from which juveniles should be protected. The Mexican Government itself has taken laudable steps to achieve this end through legislation prohibiting the entry of unescorted minors into that country. The United States has not yet passed such legislation and, therefore, is severely handicapped in its attempts to cooperate in meeting the problem.

This is not a problem which affects only a small number of youth nor only the youth

of a few border States. Testimony taken in San Diego revealed that the sheriff of that county, operating within the severely limited authority of a local curfew ordinance, turned back 2,326 unescorted juveniles, under 18 years of age, and coming from several States, over a period of 8 short months. Hundreds, perhaps thousands, of other juveniles, traveling during the some 19 of the 24 hours each day when the curfew is inoperative, crossed the border at this one point.

The imposition of restrictions upon this traffic represents, I believe, an essential safeguard to a significant number of American youth.

The analysis presented by Mr. KEFAUVER is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED BILL TO PROHIBIT JUVENILES, UNACCOMPANIED BY A PARENT OR GUARDIAN, FROM GOING OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES WITHOUT A PERMIT ISSUED BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR SUCH PURPOSE

Section I provides that no juvenile shall be permited to go outside the United States unless accompanied by a parent or guardian unless such juvenile presents to the proper authorities a permit issued by the Attorney General of the United States. This section further provides that the Attorney General shall issue such permits if parent or guardian of such juvenile gives consent either in person to the issuing officer or by duly verified written statement to issuing officer.

The problem of unescorted juveniles leaving the United States without restriction constitutes a serious menace in certain border communities where such juveniles are thereby subjected to narcotic traffic and other vices.

Section II excludes persons serving in the armed services from application of this Act.

Section III requires that the Attorney General administer and enforce this Act through existing facilities of the Department of Justice.

Section IV defines "juvenile" as any unmarried person under 18 years of age, and the term "United States" as the continental United States.

MODIFICATION OF EXISTING PROJECTS FOR GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the construction of improvements on the Great Lakes connecting channels of Lake Erie, so as to make it possible for the States of Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota to receive the full benefits of the St. Lawrence seaway project. I know that the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] is very much interested in this particular bill and in the welfare of Michigan.

Mr. President, the Senate will recall that during the 83d Congress the Committee on Public Works, as a result of a joint resolution which I was privileged to introduce, authorized the making by the Corps of Army engineers of a survey of the channel-deepening project. The survey has been completed and it is my hope that a favorable report on it will soon reach the Congress. As a matter of fact, I understand that the report is now in the hands of Congress, following a meeting of the Army Engineers Review Board, which acted favorably upon the channel-deepening program.

The next step is for the Congress to authorize the construction. In my judgment, it is essential that the authorization be made as quickly as possible, so that Congress can take action on the making of an appropriation for the project.

Mr. President, an examination of the map of the Great Lakes will indicate that it is essential to deepen to 27 feet the channels of the Detroit River and the St. Clair River and the Sault Ste. Marie, so that oceangoing vessels may travel through the St. Lawrence Seaway project and into the heartland of America. Certainly this project is in the public interest. Therefore, Mr. President, I urge favorable consideration and favorable support of the bill I introduce by the Senate Committee on Public Works and by the entire Congress.

Finally, Mr. President, the economic surveys which have been made by the Corps of Engineers as to the feasibility and economic soundness of the project are most revealing. It is indicated that by means of the construction of the project, there will be decided advancement in the development of trade and commerce in the area affected, and that the cost of the project will be a very small fraction of the benefits which will be available within a period of 10 years, much less the long-term benefits.

I think I can speak for a number of the Members from that Midwestern area when I say that we look with great favor and great hope upon the fulfillment of this proposal. I know that the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] has spoken to me many times about this matter; and I am sure that when a convenient opportunity presents itself he will wish to make favorable comments regarding the program I have announced.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 961) to authorize the modification of the existing projects for the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

REDISTRIBUTION OF ESTIMATED UNDERPLANTED COTTON ALLOTMENTS

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas], I introduce, for appropriate reference a joint resolution to utilize underplanted cotton acreage to correct inequities and hardships due to 1955 cotton allotments. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a brief statement in explanation of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Texas may proceed.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 37) to utilize underplanted cotton acreage to correct inequities and hardships due to 1955 cotton allotments, introduced by Mr. DANIEL (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, this joint resolution provides for the redistribution of estimated underplanted cotton allotments for the purpose of increasing 1955 allotments in individual hardship cases.

This approach would permit us to keep actual planting within the present national cotton allotment figure and at the same time care for individual farmers who have been seriously damaged by drastic cotton allotment reductions this year.

There are over 13,000 cotton farmers in Texas whose acreage allotments have been reduced below 5 acres. These and even larger family-size farms will suffer terrible hardships if something is not done to remedy the situation.

This bill is a combination of bills previously introduced in the House by Representative CLARK THOMPSON, of Texas, and Representative TOM ABERNETHY, of Mississippi. It would provide that individual hardship increases in present cotton allotments would come from an estimate to be made by the Secretary of Agriculture of acreage presently allotted but not expected to be planted. Unplanted allotments usually run into several hundreds of thousands of acres.

This bill provides for all farms to be raised to the 5-acre minimum provided in the basic Agricultural Adjustment Act, and that all remaining acreage would be distributed by county committees to prevent hardships, especially on resident or family-operated farms and in drought areas.

Early consideration and relief must be given to these hardship cases, or there will ensue great losses and further deterioration of our family-sized farms.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 37) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law within 15 days after the enactment of this joint resolution, the Secretary of Agriculture shall estimate for each State receiving a State acreage allotment for the 1955 crop of cotton the number of acres of such allotment which, on the basis of previous experience, will probably not be planted to cotton in 1955 and shall apportion to each such State an additional allotment for 1955 equivalent to the underplanting so estimated. The additional acreage required for such apportionment shall be in addition to the national acreage allotment and the production from such acreage shall be in addition to the national marketing quota. So much of such additional State acreage allotments as may be required therefor shall be apportioned to counties within the respective States for the purposes of effectuating the provisions relating to small farms of section 344 (f) (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and any acreage remaining thereafter shall be used to correct inequities in farm allotments and prevent hardship, especially on family-operated farms and in drought areas.

EXTENSION AND STRENGTHENING OF WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on last Tuesday I introduced the bill (S. 890) to extend and strengthen

the Water Pollution Control Act. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] may be added as an additional cosponsor of that bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED JOINT COMMISSION ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, several days ago I submitted Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 2, a resolution seeking to establish a joint commission to look after the Central Intelligence Agency. Since that time two additional Senators have asked that they be included with the list of 33 cosponsors whose names already appear on the concurrent resolution. I ask unanimous consent that the names of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] and the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] may be listed as cosponsors, and so shown in any new copies of the concurrent resolution which may be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ENTITLED "INTERLOCKING SUBVERSION IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS"

Mr. JENNER submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 9), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary not to exceed 20,000 additional copies of parts 21, 22, 24, 25, and 26 of the hearings entitled "Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments", held before a subcommittee of the above committee during the 83d Congress.

CONTINUATION OF SHALE-TO-OIL EXPERIMENTAL AND RESEARCH PLANT, RIFLE, COLO.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT and Mr. O'MAHONEY], I submit for appropriate reference, the following concurrent resolution:

That it is the sense of the Congress that the Government-owned shale-to-oil experimental and research plant at Rifle, Colo., should be continued in operation, without decrease in its present scale of activity, until at least June 30, 1956.

The purpose of this concurrent resolution is to spell out and express specifically the sense and feelings of the Members of the 84th Congress. By adoption of this concurrent resolution, the Congress will go on record in favor of the continuation of the basic research in the development of new oil reserves within our national boundaries. The oil-shale deposits in the Rocky Mountains constitute the largest presently known source of untapped energy in the world. It is estimated that the proven undeveloped reserve in Colorado alone approaches 464 billion barrels of oil.

In the budget for fiscal year 1956, which is presently before the Congress, there is no provision for the continuation of the experimental shale-to-oil plant of the United States Bureau of Mines located in Rifle, Colo. I emphasize that this is a research and an experimental plant, not a plant designed to produce oil from shale in commercial quantities. It is most necessary to maintain the operation of this plant in order to continue the objective research program in this important energy source, particularly when we in the United States depend to such a large extent upon the importation of foreign crude oil to meet the petroleum needs of our people. If there should occur a national emergency that would threaten the safety of our sea lanes, our domestic petroleum industry would most assuredly be called upon to produce a much greater quantity of crude oil to make up for the possible loss of oil from foreign sources.

It seems only prudent, therefore, that the United States should continue in behalf of the public interest a plant that has been so successful in approaching the economic utilization of this vast domestic energy source.

In submitting this concurrent resolution, we seek the voice of the entire Congress in an appeal to the Appropriations Committees, in both the House and the Senate, to restore to the budget the same amount of money that was appropriated for the 1955 fiscal year so that this 200-man plant may continue, in the interest and welfare of all the people of this country, to develop the very latest methods in the mining and retorting of oil shale. We sincerely and earnestly request our colleagues in both Houses of the Congress to approve this concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 10) was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the Government-owned shale-to-oil experimental and research plant at Rifle, Colo., should be continued in operation, without decrease in its present scale of activity, until at least June 30, 1956.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to say just a word or two in connection with what the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] has stated. The subject is of importance not only to the State of Colorado but also to the States of Wyoming and Utah. In those three States, according to expert geologists, there are deposits of oil and shale which contain more oil reserves than all the known reserves in Saudi Arabia. The concurrent resolution should be adopted.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT ENTITLED "THE KOREAN WAR AND RELATED MATTERS"

Mr. JENNER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 56), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary 28,000 additional copies of the report entitled "The Korean War and Related Matters," prepared by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary during the 83d Congress.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

Address delivered by him at Roosevelt Day dinner held in New York City on February 2, 1955.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

An address delivered by him and an address delivered by Senator GREEN at testimonial dinner in honor of Stephen S. Scopas, supreme president of the Order of Ahepa, in New York City, on January 30, 1955.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Excerpts from the address delivered by him at the seventh annual Roosevelt Day dinner sponsored by the Americans for Democratic Action, in New York City, on February 2, 1955.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Program and transcript of proceedings in connection with dedicatory prayer breakfast in Washington, D. C., on the morning of February 3, 1955.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF GILBERT H. JERTBERG TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Gilbert H. Jertberg, of California, to be United States district judge, southern district of California, vice Campbell E. Beaumont, deceased.

Notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee on or before Friday, February 11, 1955, any representations or objections in writing they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled later.

Following the receipt of such representations or objections the committee will consider such, and at its next meeting determine whether a hearing will be held.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Curtis Clark, of Kentucky, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Kentucky, vice John M. Moore, retired.

Lama A. DeMunbrun, of Kentucky, to be United States marshal for the western district of Kentucky, vice Loomis E. Cranor, retired.

Notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee on or before Friday, February 11, 1955, any representations or objections in writing they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled later.

Following the receipt of such representations or objections the committee will consider such, and at its next meeting determine whether hearings will be held.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There was received today the nomination of Philip W. Bonsal, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador of the United States to Colombia, vice Rudolf E. Schoenfeld, resigned. There was received also a list of 59 names of persons for appointments and promotions in the Foreign Service, which appears elsewhere in the RECORD of today. In his capacity as a Senator the Chair gives notice that these nominations will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule.

FIRMNESS OF THE PRESIDENT ON THE FORMOSA ISSUE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me applaud the firmness of the President on the Formosa issue. And let me utter the hope that there will be no retreat from that stand as diplomats begin bargaining for a cease fire.

The news from London makes it evident that various powers are in a bargaining mood. The reported demand of Red China for the surrender of Formosa is certain to be followed by a face-saving alternative, such as the surrender and evacuation of Quemoy and the Matsu Islands. It is the age-old business of demanding a whole loaf, and then accepting a half loaf rather than no bread at all.

In such a deal, it is we who would lose face. It would be a shameful submission to Red China. And it would be more. It would dim and destroy the hopes of millions of Chinese on Formosa and elsewhere who still look for liberation from the leprosy of communism which was imposed upon them by force.

Despite the comfort and assurance contained in the overwhelming support for the Southeast Asia Treaty, what shall the peoples of southeast Asia believe if, after the evacuation of the Tachen Islands, we then agree to the surrender of Quemoy and the Matsu islands? Could they do other than believe that in good time, we would be prepared to let Asia fall?

To be sure, the pending treaty between the United States and the Nationalist Government of China limits our responsibilities to Formosa and the Pescadores. But by its very terms it is a mutual defense treaty, and to permit such important outposts as Quemoy and the Matsu islands to be bargained away would be disastrous to the strongest force on Formosa, which is the will and morale of the defenders.

Since this piecemeal approach comes from Red China, the words of Lincoln, when he said, "I walk slowly but I never walk backwards," are timely. Once we step backward, no matter what the bargain-hunters in U. N. may devise, we shall have jeopardized the hope and the freedom of all of southeast Asia.

PRESIDENT MAGLOIRE, OF HAITI

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, President and Mrs. Paul E. Magloire, of Haiti, are near the end of their visit to the United States, a visit that will be long remembered. I sincerely hope that this marks a new era of continued cooperation and friendship between the island-nation of Haiti and the United States.

President Magloire took office in 1950, facing problems of almost insurmountable dimensions, but he has succeeded where few thought he could. He has bettered relations among his people and he has led a continual and winning battle against fear, suppression, ignorance, and want in his country. Through the United States technical assistance program in Haiti, great advances are being made in improving the standard of living of these island peoples. Continued cooperation between our two nations in matters of defense and mutual assistance can lead to a very harmonious future.

In conclusion I wish to say that it has been an honor for the United States to have as its guest this courageous and gifted leader, a bastion of strength among our Latin American neighbors.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a selection of newspaper articles regarding the visit of the Haitian President.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of January 31, 1955]

HAITI CHIEF IMPRESSES UNITED STATES

(By Robert M. Hallett)

So far in his public appearances in the United States, the President of Haiti has been conservatively dressed in dark suits. He was seen thus when he addressed a joint session of Congress January 27.

But Paul Magloire at home inclines to ceremonious uniforms with spurred boots, epaulets, and aiguillettes. There is almost a touch of the regal in his actions in Haiti, which occupies the western third of the Caribbean island of Hispaniola.

A six-foot-two Negro with a quiet sort of dignity, the Haitian President has aids stand by him in ceremonial appearances to hand him his gold-headed cane or his plumed hat.

Despite his royal air, or perhaps because of it, Haitians are overwhelmingly behind their "bon papa," who has done much to unify his people and bring political and economic stability to the island republic.

ALL-NEGRO NATION

Although Haiti is proud of its distinction as an all-Negro nation, certain class distinctions exist among its 3,500,000 population. The aristrocracy is composed of a mulatto elite (about 2 percent of the population). From this group are traditionally drawn the lawyers, doctors, poets, and government servants.

The mass of Haitians, however, are barefoot Negroes eking a living from small patches of eroded land.

The history of Haiti is punctuated with the squabbles between these two extremes, the rich and the poor, the mulatto minority and the Negro mass.

NO CLASS DOMINATION

When President Magloire took office in 1950, he followed Dumarsais Estimé, who espoused a strong antimulatto line.

President Magloire immediately made it clear that neither Negroes nor mulattoes should dominate Haiti, and he has carefully followed this policy, which has bettered the relations between the two factions.

However, it should be pointed out that Haiti's class divisions are based more on economics than on race. What racial intolerance that does exist can be traced in part to United States occupation of the Republic (1912 to 1934) by the Marine Corps who placed the mulatto elite in key positions.

In his public appearances, President Magloire apparently believes that the pageantry of fancy uniforms and royal trappings are part of his job.

But between ceremonies, the President gets into business clothes and works in the white marble Presidential Palace in Port-au-Prince in a manner that rivals the pace of a New York executive.

He works in a small office conspicuously free of ornamentation, although other suites in the palace are filled with alabaster busts, stuffed cranes, empire clocks, and pictures of Haitian heroes.

In New York, Representative ADAM C. POWELL, JR. (Democrat), of New York, whom President Magloire is now visiting, said the reception accorded the Haitian by President Eisenhower in Washington was "a mighty earth-shaking symbol of an orderly New World."

Mr. POWELL specifically referred to the fact that Mrs. Eisenhower went in to dinner on the arm of President Magloire and was followed by President Eisenhower with Mrs. Magloire.

"The masters of the Kremlin," said Mr. POWELL, "know that such integration on a world basis carries more of an impact than the explosion of any hydrogen bomb."

ACTIVE COOPERATION

The lawmaker said that as President Magloire continues his trip throughout the United States, he will be "a visible reminder to people everywhere that the United States of America cannot continue as a first-class power without the active cooperation of the 2 billion colored people of the earth."

On January 28, President Magloire spoke before a joint session of Congress, thanking the United States for its help "which has been intensified since the beginning of the present administration" in combating poverty and fostering the evolution of all the Latin American Republics.

Since 1950, the United States has contributed $3,581,000 to programs of agricultural and education development in Haiti. Emergency aid following Hurricane Hazel last fall, which brought great devastation to the little country, totaled $3,740,000.

POLICY PRAISED

The Haitian President praised President Eisenhower's continuance of the "good neigh-

bor policy" begun by President Roosevelt. He also said his people "follow with interest President Eisenhower's personal efforts to eliminate prejudices of all sorts, which constitute handicaps to the mutual understanding which is our common objective in this hemisphere."

President Magloire declared that he sought to make the people of his country immune to communism by raising standards of living. His government, he said, has "constructed schools, clinics, and workers' housing projects."

Meanwhile in Washington, State Secretary John Foster Dulles and Haitian Foreign Minister Mauclair Zephirin have signed a mutual-assistance agreement. This is the 11th of its kind between the United States and a Latin American country. It provides that the United States will furnish Haiti with military assistance and equipment, and that Haiti will not undertake aggressive action against other countries.

[From the Chicago Daily News of January 27, 1955]

HAITI CHIEF LAUDS UNITED STATES AID IN FIGHT AGAINST REDS

WASHINGTON.—President Paul E. Magloire of Haiti said Thursday that aid in raising living standards, such as the United States has been giving his country, is "the most efficient weapon for fighting communism."

Addressing a joint session of Congress, the visiting dignitary said Haiti has taken all possible legal measures to outlaw the "pernicious doctrine" of communism.

Magloire said Haitians are doing what they can "with our limited means" to build schools, clinics, housing projects, and other needed improvements.

He expressed Haiti's gratitude for past United States aid and the hope that the United States will continue this good neighbor policy.

[From the New York Times of January 27, 1955]

HAITI'S PRESIDENT IS IN WASHINGTON—GENERAL MAGLOIRE WELCOMED AT AIRPORT BY NIXON—WILL ADDRESS CONGRESS TODAY

WASHINGTON, JANUARY 26.—President Paul Eugene Magloire of Haiti arrived today for a 3-day state visit. It will be devoted to cultivating good neighborly relations between the United States and Latin America.

President Eisenhower sent his private plane, the *Columbine*, to Miami to bring to Washington President Magloire and Mme. Magloire and the principal Haitian Cabinet officials, who accompanied the President.

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON and Mrs. Nixon and the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Henry F. Holland, were at the airport here to welcome the Haitian leaders. A guard of honor there stood at attention and a 21-gun salute boomed in the background. Mrs. Dulles represented the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, who was unable to be present.

Speaking to the welcoming delegation, General Magloire said:

"To the happiness of meeting old friends and shaking again hands, the warmth of which is familiar to me, is added the happiness which all men of my race feel on being in a country which is making one of the greatest efforts ever undertaken for the true liberty of man."

From the National Airport Mr. NIXON accompanied President Magloire and Mme. Magloire to the White House, where the President and Mrs. Eisenhower met them on the steps of the north portico. The Haitian party was entertained at a state dinner and President Magloire and Mme. Magloire spent the night at the White House. In accordance with protocol, they will stay at Blair House afterward.

On the way to the White House through streets bedecked with crossed United States and Haitian flags, the party halted at the District Building, where the Commissioners of the District of Columbia presented a key to the city to President Magloire.

Tomorrow at noon General Magloire will address a joint meeting of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

The only other official business scheduled for the visit is the ceremonious signing of a military assistance agreement between the United States and Haiti.

General Magloire will address the Council of the Organization of American States on Friday and will go to West Point on Saturday. Thereafter he will visit New York for 3 days and will make a week's tour of the United States. On February 9 he will begin an official visit to Canada.

President Magloire is accompanied by Mauclair Zephirin, Haitian Secretary of State for Foreign Relations and Worship; Marcel Fombrun, Secretary of State for the Presidency and Commerce; Brig. Gen. Antoinelevelt, Chief of Staff of the Haitian Army, and other leading Haitian officials.

[From the New York Times of January 28, 1955]

HAITI'S PRESIDENT EXPLAINS HIS AIMS—TELLS CONGRESS HE WOULD LIFT NATION'S LIVING STANDARD TO EXCLUDE COMMUNISM

WASHINGTON, January 27.—President Paul Eugene Magloire, of Haiti, declared today that he sought to make the people of his country immune to communism by raising standards of living.

He spoke before a joint session of Congress in the House Chamber.

He thanked the United States for its help "which has been intensified since the beginning of the present administration," in combating poverty and fostering the evolution of all the Latin American Republics.

President Magloire said that while the Haitian Government had taken all legal steps to outlaw "not merely the extension but the very manifestation of this pernicious doctrine (communism)," it has also sought "the liberation of Haitians" by introducing "decent living conditions of life." Thus, he added, it has "constructed schools, clinics, and worker's housing projects."

Haiti, the only French-speaking republic in the Americas, occupies the western part of the island of Hispaniola in the Caribbean. The country has 3,100,000 inhabitants.

TECHNICAL AID UNDERWAY

The United States launched a joint United States-Haitian technical cooperation program in 1942. Since 1950 the United States has contributed $3,581,000 to programs of agricultural and educational development in Haiti. Emergency aid following Hurricane Hazel last fall totaled $2,740,000.

The Haitian President asserted that President Eisenhower had happily continued the good neighbor policy begun by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. He said his people "follow with interest President Eisenhower's personal efforts to eliminate prejudices of all sorts which constitute handicaps to the mutual understanding which is our common objective in this hemisphere."

President Magloire is making a 3-day state visit to Washington at President Eisenhower's invitation.

This afternoon he decorated with the Grand Cross of the Haitian National Order four United States officers who played a prominent part in rushing emergency hurricane relief to Haiti last fall.

They were Rear Adm. G. B. H. Hall, commandant of the 10th Naval District; Brig. Gen. K. S. Sweany, commanding general of United States forces in the Antilles; Rear Adm. E. B. Taylor, commandant of the United States naval station in Cuba, and Capt. D. G. Donahoe, commanding officer of the aircraft carrier *Saipan*, which arrived off the Haitian coast the day after the hurricane. In addition, Captain Donahoe received a unit citation for his entire ship.

PRESIDENT TO VISIT HERE

President Magloire will arrive by automobile here from the United States Military Academy at West Point tomorrow afternoon. He will remain here, save for a visit on Tuesday to the Brookhaven, Long Island, Atomic Laboratories, till Thursday, when he will go by plane to Nashville, Tenn.

Many honors will be showered on President Magloire during his visit. At 12:05 p. m. on Monday he will take part in a ticker-tape parade from Bowling Green to city hall, where Mayor Wagner will present to him the city's scroll for distinguished public service and medal of honor.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 28, 1955]

HAITI'S PRESIDENT THANKS UNITED STATES IN TALK TO CONGRESS

WASHINGTON, January 27.—President Paul E. Magloire, of Haiti, said today his Government has taken all possible legal means to stamp out communism but that "decent" living standards are the only sure immunity against its "noxious germs."

Addressing a joint session of the House and Senate, President Magloire thanked the United States for financial aid in setting up projects designed to raise living standards in Haiti. Such projects, he asserted, "represent for us the most efficient weapon for fighting communism."

THREE-DAY VISIT

Mr. Magloire, who arrived yesterday for a 3-day official visit as the guest of President Eisenhower, said the people of Haiti "follow with interest General Eisenhower's personal efforts to eliminate prejudices of all sorts which constitute handicaps to the mutual understanding which is our common objective in this hemisphere."

He praised General Eisenhower as a great soldier and statesman who "seeks to guarantee the rights of life to those states whose very existence is threatened today."

He said his own administration in Haiti has begun an extensive program of building schools, clinics, and workers' housing. He said the recent hurricane that hit the island republic "forced us to limit our efforts considerably," but he added, "we are determined to continue the task, trusting in the great solidarity which the United States demonstrated on that occasion."

NIGHT AT WHITE HOUSE

The Haitian President, accompanied by his wife, stayed over night last night at the White House, the customary honor accorded visiting chiefs of state.

Today, aside from addressing Congress, he toured historic landmarks in the Capital and conferred with Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. Although his visit is billed only as a good-will mission, Mr. Magloire is expected to sign a military-aid agreement with this country before departing Saturday to tour the Nation.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of January 27, 1955]

CHIEF OF HAITI GUEST OF IKE IN WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON, JANUARY 26.—President Paul Eugene Magloire of Haiti, with his wife and a party of eight, arrived in Washington today for a state visit.

They were met at the National Airport by Vice President NIXON and his wife and escorted to the White House, where they spent

the night as guests of President and Mrs. Eisenhower.

The head of the only Negro Republic in this hemisphere was presented with a key to the city. Six Negro couples were invited to a state dinner in the White House tonight. They included Marian Anderson, the Metropolitan opera contralto and her husband, Orpheus Fisher.

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 27, 1955]

MAGLOIRE TO CONFER WITH DULLES AFTER ADDRESS TO CONGRESS

President Paul E. Magloire of Haiti, here on a 3-day state visit, went to the Capitol today to address a joint session of the Congress.

Later he planned to see Secretary of State Dulles.

The Caribbean visitor, who arrived late yesterday with Mrs. Magloire and ranking Haitian officials, spent the morning at Arlington Cemetery and Mount Vernon. He placed wreaths in tribute to the Unknown Soldier and the first President of the United States.

His afternoon schedule included a ceremony for decorating members of the American Armed Forces at a reception in the Haitian Embassy.

DULLES TO GIVE DINNER

Secretary and Mrs. Dulles are giving a dinner tonight for the Magloires in Anderson House as evidence of the friendship this country holds for his.

President Magloire is the first visiting chief of state received in Washington this year. Arriving yesterday in a special military Air Transport Service plane, he was greeted by Vice President and Mrs. Nixon. Then he was accorded full honors—a 21-gun salute and a formal review of a military guard of honor.

From the airport, the Magloires proceeded by auto to the District Building for a warm reception from the people of Washington.

Commissioner Samuel Spencer and Edgar Morris, chairman of a citizens' committee, expressed the pleasure of the city for his visit.

GIVEN STATE DINNER

Then the visitors were escorted to the White House for a welcome by the President and Mrs. Eisenhower. Remaining as overnight guests, they were tendered a state dinner.

In addition to his speech before the Senate and House today, President Magloire plans an address to the Council of the Organization of American States tomorrow. Both he and Mrs. Magloire will be honored at numerous social functions.

Wherever the Magloires have been in Washington, both they and their official greeters have stressed the warm friendship between Haiti and the United States. On his arrival at the White House, Mr. Magloire told President Eisenhower:

"The welcome which has been given me by the authorities at my arrival, and the enthusiasm shown by the citizens of this Capital, who have come in great number to greet me, are a new manifestation of the solidarity which has always existed between the first and the second independent Republics of the New World."

[From the Washington Evening Star, January 27, 1955]

PRESIDENT MAGLOIRE VISITS

The democratic government of the Haitian Republic stands today as one of the tangible evidences of the good neighbor policy which has prevailed in our relationship toward the southern parts of this hemisphere for the past 20 years. For almost that many years prior to 1934 United States troops had been in occupation of that troubled western end of the Caribbean island of Hispaniola but their evacuation that summer has been followed by a period of relative political stability and of recent economic progress.

President Magloire, now on an official visit here, was elected by the National Assembly—a popularly elected branch of the bicameral legislature—in 1950. Intensive development of the little country's agricultural and mineral resources has been under way in the years since and a 5-year program of industrial construction—dams and power-producing plants—is now in operation.

Hispaniola was one of Columbus' discoveries in 1492 and the early history of the island revolves around Spanish colonization. From 1677 to 1804, the colony was French and it is still a French-speaking country. Except for the United States occupation, from 1915 to 1934, forced by disorders in the country, it has been independent since French rule ended. Its tourist attractions have become increasingly popular and profitable in recent years and it is considered today a stable and responsible member of the American community of nations.

[From the Washington Evening Star, January 28, 1955]

MAGLOIRE'S SCHEDULE INCLUDES CEREMONIAL VISIT TO OAS TODAY

President Paul E. Magloire, of Haiti was to pay a ceremonial visit to the Organization of American States today in another round of events in connection with his state visit to Washington.

The visit to the OAS is scheduled to include a formal reception of the stocky, smiling Haitian President by the OAS council at the Pan American Union. At this ceremony, President Magloire will be greeted by Jose A. Mora, of Uruguay, chairman of the council, and will make a reply.

This is scheduled for noon, and is to be followed by a state luncheon in the Hall of the Americas.

Meanwhile, Mrs. Magloire and the other women of the presidential party will be tendered a reception by Senora de Mora and Senora Davila, wife of Carlos Davila, OAS Secretary-General. This will be given in the Secretary-General's house and there will be a luncheon afterward.

TO OPEN EXHIBITS

The two luncheon parties will then unite for the opening of an exhibit of Haitian paintings by Mrs. Pierre Noel in the reading room of the Pan American Library.

The first thing on the schedule of the visiting President today was a visit to the American Red Cross. There President Magloire and Mrs. Magloire were greated by George A. Garrett, staff members and volunteer workers of the District chapter. Mr. Garrett, Washington investment banker, is deputy to Red Cross National Chairman E. Roland Harriman, who is absent from Washington.

President Magloire spoke warmly in appreciation of Red Cross help when Hurricane Hazel devastated the south coast of Haiti last October. About 100,000 persons were left homeless.

SEES DULLES TODAY

President Magloire spoke in French, and an interpreter provided an English translation. French is the language of Haiti. While the President understands English, he does not feel his command of it is adequate for formal addresses.

At 3:30 p. m., President Magloire will call on Secretary of State Dulles at the State Department.

Tonight President and Mrs. Magloire will give a state dinner for President and Mrs. Eisenhower in the Sheraton Park Hotel.

It will be the third formal dinner of the visit, beginning with the state dinner at the White House Wednesday night, which was followed by a dinner last night given by the Secretary of State and Mrs. Dulles at Anderson House.

President Magloire addressed a joint session of Congress yesterday. In an address which was warmly received he firmly alined his country with the United States in opposition to international communism. The President and the Haitian dignitaries with him were then the guests at a luncheon at the Capitol given by Vice President NIXON.

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 29, 1955]

MILITARY AGREEMENT CONCLUDES 3-DAY VISIT OF MAGLOIRE

President Paul E. Magloire, of Haiti, left Washington by air today, after a 3-day state visit which was climaxed by the signing of a military assistance agreement between his country and the United States.

The President and Mrs. Magloire, accompanied by a large suite, emplaned at National Airport for West Point and planned to go later today to New York. His state visit will be continued there until next Thursday morning. Then he will proceed, in unofficial status, to Nashville, Chicago, and Boston.

The military assistance agreement was signed yesterday at the State Department by Secretary Dulles and Foreign Minister Mauclair Zephirin of Haiti, after President Magloire called upon Mr. Dulles. It is the 11th such pact between the United States and Latin American countries.

Secretary Dulles said it is consistent with and conforms to various other inter-American instruments now in effect. The other countries already signatories to such pacts are Cuba, Brazil, Uruguay, Chile, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Peru.

In the course of a final busy day, Mr. Magloire visited national headquarters of the American Red Cross, addressed the Council of the Organization of American States at the Pan American Union, was honored afterwards at a luncheon there and, with Mrs. Magloire, opened an exhibition of Haitian paintings in the library of the Pan American Union.

Later he held a news conference, and last night he gave a dinner to honor President and Mrs. Eisenhower at the Sheraton Park Hotel. President and Mrs. Magloire had been entertained by the Eisenhowers at the White House Wednesday night.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 27, 1955]

PRESIDENT OF HAITI WELCOMED HERE—OVERNIGHT GUEST AT THE WHITE HOUSE—MAGLOIRE GREETED AT AIRPORT WITH FANFARE—RECEIVES KEY TO THE CITY

(By Richard J. Maloy)

Washington rolled out its red carpet yesterday to welcome President Paul E. Magloire, of Haiti, as he began a 3-day state visit to the Nation's Capital.

The chief executive of the tiny island republic praised America as "a country which is making one of the greatest efforts undertaken for the true liberation of man."

President Magloire, his wife, and official party were met at National Airport by Vice President and Mrs. RICHARD M. NIXON. He received the key to the city at the District Building, and was greeted by President and Mrs. Eisenhower at the White House.

TROOPS AND SALUTE

The United States Army Band and crack detachments of troops from the other services were drawn up to salute Magloire at the

airport. A 21-gun salute boomed as he alighted from an Air Force Constellation and reviewed the troops.

Mme. Magloire was presented with a bouquet of roses by Mrs. Nixon. The Vice President told Magloire 50,000 American tourists who visited Haiti last year were warmly received and expressed the hope "that you will find as warm a welcome here."

The Haitian chief executive said his country "is determined more than ever to be beside America in the everyday struggle of the occidental culture, in order to save the hopes of the free world."

Leaving the airport, the motorcade moved along the traditional flag-bedecked parade route. Fourteen bands, 2,300 troops, and crowds estimated at 40,000 by Police Chief Robert V. Murray line the route.

At the District Building Edgar Morris, chairman of a citizens committee, hailed sweeping progress made by Haiti during 4 years of leadership by President Magloire.

Commissioner Samuel Spencer, recalling that America and Haiti were pioneers in the democratic form of government, presented the key to the city. The French-speaking chief executive, whose words were interpreted by an aide, expressed sincere gratitude.

GREETED BY PRESIDENT

As the motorcade moved to the White House, President Eisenhower emerged to welcome President Magloire and introduce him to Mrs. Eisenhower. Magloire delighted assembled photographers by kissing Mrs. Eisenhower's hand when he was introduced.

The couple stayed overnight at the White House, and were guests at an 8 p. m. dinner given by President Eisenhower. During the dinner President Magloire raised a toast to this friendly country and thanked Mr. Eisenhower for American aid sent when Hurricane Hazel laid waste parts of Haiti.

Today the Magloires will move to Blair House, and begin a round of official appearances. Today's agenda includes a visit to Arlington Cemetery and Mount Vernon, and a noon speech before a joint session of Congress.

MAGLOIRE DYNAMIC BUT GENTLE LEADER

President Paul E. Magloire, of Haiti, is the fifth generation of his family to provide leadership to the small island nation.

Like his ancestors, President Magloire started out as a career military man, but switched over to public life during the postwar years, becoming Haiti's first popularly elected President in 1950.

A husky man of medium height, he finds relaxation as a horseman and in a fast game of tennis. He is dynamic at work, but gentle in dealing with people.

HAVE FIVE CHILDREN

Magloire, 47, was married in 1936 to Yolette Leconte, 10 years his junior. The couple have 5 children, ranging in age from 18 to 6.

Two daughters, Elsie, 16, and Mirtha, 14, are students at Oak Grove School in Vassalboro, Me.

Haitians in general are a poor people, with a population of 3,250,000 compressed into 10,714 square miles. But despite this poverty they are intense, happy, proud, and independent. The President shares these traits.

After graduation from school in 1929, the future President taught for a year and then entered the national military academy. He was commissioned a second lieutenant in 1931, and had risen to colonel by 1947.

HAITI'S BEST SALESMAN

Mme. Magloire was educated at the St. Joseph de Cluny School, the Institute of Andree Leroy, and the Mme. Maude Turin School in Haiti. She also studied music, painting, and the arts at other institutions.

The Magloires are considered their country's best salesmen and good will ambassadors. They made a state tour of Colombia, Cuba, Nicaragua, Panama, Puerto Rico, and Venezuela last year.

They also have made frequent unofficial visits to the United States, but the current trip is the first state visit to this country. It will take them to New York, Boston, Chicago, and Nashville, besides Washington.

[From the New York Times of February 2, 1955]

COLUMBIA HONORS HAITI'S PRESIDENT—DOCTOR OF LAWS CITATION PRAISES HIS LEADERSHIP—FORDHAM TO CONFER DEGREE TODAY

President Paul E. Magloire, of Haiti, received an honorary degree of doctor of laws from Columbia University yesterday. He will receive another LL.D. today from Fordham University.

Columbia trustees, the university council, and members of the faculty attended yesterday's ceremony in Low Memorial Library.

M. Magloire was presented to Dr. Grayson Kirk, president of the university, by Dr. Phil C. Jessup, Hamilton Fish professor of international law and diplomacy.

"We honor today," Dr. Jessup said, "a stanch soldier in man's eternal fight for freedom from fear, from ignorance, and from want, an imaginative dreamer who makes his dreams for Haiti come true."

In his citation Dr. Kirk described the Haitian President as follows:

"Statesman of long vision; by family tradition a military man whose forebears 15 decades ago fought for the independence of their mountain land; today, by mandate of his nation, its civil servant, sworn to lead the Republic in the ways of security, industrial development, and peace; student of the problems of modern society, who calls to his nation's aid the educator, the medical scientist, the engineer, the agriculturalist; with their help making rich natural resources serve the people, building their economy, enriching their storied culture; firm friend of the United States, devoted admirer of the institutions that have helped us serve freedom's cause; courageous and gifted man of government, whose complex challenge is the achievement of a single purpose—the increasing opportunity of all his fellow citizens to grow in the pursuits of learning, in the arts of living, in the rights of freemen."

Midway in the citation the overhead light in the room failed. A photographer held up his battery-powered floodlight.

In its waning illumination, President Magloire replied, speaking softly in French.

He said the courses taught on "the banks of the Hudson" for 200 years had "encouraged development of the whole personality in that atmosphere of true democracy which is, in general, found only in the United States."

M. Magloire continued:

"The electicism that has produced philosophers like William James, statesmen like Franklin Delano Roosevelt, scientists like Thomas Edison, or outstanding soldiers like Dwight D. Eisenhower * * * is that which guides the average American performing his task in the community, whether he chooses to be a merchant, a businessman, an industrialist, a lawyer, or a bookkeeper, or simply wants to be a man of letters, an artist, or just a citizen conscious of his rights and duties."

The most prolonged cold spell of the winter continued yesterday to dog President Magloire and his party of 12. A scheduled morning trip to the Brookhaven Atomic Laboratories, Brookhaven, L. I., had to be abandoned at about the halfway point. Snowfall made road traveling slow and it became apparent the trip could not be completed in time for the party to keep a luncheon engagement at the United Nations headquarters.

Today's ceremony at Fordham University will be held at 4 p. m. The Haitian party, which arrived in New York Saturday evening, will leave tomorrow at 8 a. m. for Nashville, Tenn.

OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS BY SENATOR ELLENDER ON UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES IN 37 COUNTRIES

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, yesterday I filed with the Appropriations Committee a report on 37 individual countries which I visited last year. I hold in my hand a summary of my report, relating to our diplomatic functions overseas and also to our Information Service. I ask unanimous consent to have the summary printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ELLENDER

The following observations and/or recommendations constitute a brief summary of comprehensive surveys embodied in the attached 37 reports made by me to the full Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

DIPLOMATIC FUNCTIONS

1. As a result of my inspection of United States diplomatic missions during 1952 and 1953, I submitted to the Committee and to the applicable departments of the executive branch, detailed recommendations as to ways and means of streamlining the operations of these missions. I was gratified to find that in many instances some of my recommendations have borne fruit. I found examples of reduced reporting demands by Washington agencies; these unnecessary demands had constituted one of the principal sources of staff expansion among our foreign missions. While improved, however, the reporting program is still susceptible to further streamlining.

2. There is room for improvement in other areas, also. Our Treasury is still being drained by proponents of the theory that the United States must "keep up with the Joneses" on a worldwide basis—both as to size of staffs, luxury of buildings, et cetera. I recommend that the Department of State immedately implement a policy of frugality and reasonableness in its various operations. Specifically, I suggest the following:

(a) Termination of all programs which would elevate United States missions to higher status simply because other countries maintain senior missions in that area.

(b) Consolidation of all United States activities in one building or, at least, one specific area of a city whenever possible. The practice of scattering staffs throughout a metropolitan area results in higher transportation costs, higher rents, greater expenses for security, and certainly more inconvenience to our personnel.

(c) Termination of all efforts to greatly increase the size of structures occupied by our missions, or to construct new buildings, unless such can be justified on the basis of future, as well as present, requirements. I found examples of proposed building programs which could perhaps be justified on the basis of present staff sizes, but which would be grossly excessive when our extraordinary efforts (information programs, foreign aid, et cetera) are terminated.

(d) The transfer of our primary mission in Morocco from Tangier to Rabat, the capital of that country. Such a move would

make possible reductions in staffs, as well as facilitate information-gathering.

(e) A further reexamination of administrative reporting requirements by our foreign mission. In numerous instances I was told that unrealistic administrative reports (requested in identical form of small, as well as large, posts) mean unnecessary work and, ultimately, larger staffs in the field and in Washington.

(f) Evaluation of present disposition of special allowances. More emphasis should be placed upon individual responsibility, with a reduction in vouchering requirements for authorized purchases, and the elimination of complex forms covering the disposition of other personal allowances. The redtape presently involved in such practices is staggering; it results in much unnecessary work.

(g) Examination of present disparities in pay scales for regular and nonregular Foreign Service officers. I heard some complaint as to the requirement that regular officers must accept favorable retirement credits, rather than the cash pay differential that is presently given nonregulars.

(h) Greater emphasis upon political reporting to be performed by the chief of mission and his immediate deputy, thus making possible reductions in the mushrooming political reporting sections presently assigned to practically all of our missions. Much trivial political reporting would be eliminated if dependence for reporting were placed upon the shoulders of the chief of mission.

(i) A more stringent policy with respect to physical examination of dependents before permitting them to join our Embassy families abroad. I was told of several instances where newly arrived dependents had to be returned to the United States because of physical defects or diseases which a thorough medical examination prior to their departure would have disclosed. Since these trips are costly, and since they are at Government expense, tightened physical requirements should result in financial savings.

(j) Increased recreational advantages in remote posts. Our Department of State employees in many areas of the world are assigned to posts that are practically devoid of companionship and bare of recreational opportunities. The Department of State should provide as much in the way of entertainment as is reasonable under the circumstances.

(k) Government-owned housing, plus Government-owned furniture, should be provided for all State Department employees abroad. Such a course would be much cheaper in the long run. As the situation now stands, the cost to the Government for transporting and storing the furniture of Foreign Service personnel is tremendous; it results in waste of funds. Pending the adoption of the above recommendation, rent allowances provided so as to assure the recipient of sufficient funds to maintain a fitting place of abode, should be spent by the employee without his having to account for each item of expenditure. A statement from the head of the mission to the effect that the allowances had been properly spent should be sufficient. The cumbersome accounting procedure now involved could thus be eliminated.

3. I call the committee's attention to the fact that in many areas of the world no effort is being made to terminate special programs, even though their objectives have been accomplished. On the contrary, there is a definite tendency to perpetuate jobs, increase programs, and maintain spending, without any regard to the impact their continuance may have on our own economy. The western European nations offer ample ground for committee attention in this respect.

4. I wish to state that despite the recommendations of the committee in its report on the fiscal year 1955 Defense appropriation bill to the effect that the Department of Defense should "effectuate Senator ELLENDER's recommendation with a view to the accomplishment of substantial economies" in the conduct of its military attaché functions (see S. Rept. 1582, 83d Cong., p. 2), there not only has apparently been no effort made to do so, but, on the contrary, I found every indication that there is a continued emphasis on swelling attaché staffs and maintaining the emoluments that accompany these positions overseas. The waste involved in duplication of staffs, vehicles, office space, housing, etc., which the maintenance of separate, distinct offices for each branch requires, is inconceivable. I reaffirm my observation that in many instances the operation of the majority of United States military attaché offices abroad is shockingly extravagant and wasteful. There is no reason for maintaining separate staffs, separate administrative functions, and separate motor pools for each of the three branches of the military service. The Department of Defense should immediately implement the Armed Forces Unification Act in its attaché operations abroad. There should be no difficulty in unifying our attaché services abroad. Further, I recommend that the Department of Defense examine the feasibility of assigning essentially attaché tasks to other military groups in foreign lands—particularly military advisory groups, where such exist—thus eliminating the attaché staffs and their attendant expenses wherever possible.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

1. I am pleased to report to the committee that, in many instances, my recommendation submitted last year that Embassy and USIA vehicles be pooled has been implemented. Unfortunately, there still remains much room for improvement and I must reemphasize my prior comments.

2. This year, as last, I recommend that USIA again reevaluate its efforts on a country-by-country basis, with a view toward adapting its program to the objectives it seeks to accomplish. I found extensive library programs in operation in nations where the literacy rate touches rockbottom. In many instances these libraries were used almost exclusively by the members of the local legislature as a reference source or by students. In instances such as these the same results could obtain if the books were placed in local libraries.

I also recommend that, in countries where the host country already maintains libraries (such as in England, France, and Italy), we discontinue separate USIA libraries. If need be, we could supplement local libraries with American books.

3. I recommend that the maintenance of large press units in countries whose press is heavily censored be discontinued. I recommend that, instead, a member of the embassy staff act as the official United States spokesman in these countries rather than our maintaining a full-fledged and separate information press unit for that purpose.

4. The exchange program cries for reexamination. While I am in full accord with the tenets of that program, it should not be permitted to devolve into simply a means of spending local currency balances. Merely because funds for exchange student purposes are available is not of itself reason why those funds must be spent. If a need exists, and good can be accomplished by an exchange grant, then, and only then, should the program be effected. I recommend also that the practice of sending nonnatives to the United States under the Fulbright or similar programs be halted. In Tunisia I found that the beneficiary of the only grant available was a Frenchman, not a Tunisian. This practice both violates the spirit of the Exchange Student Act, and leaves the United States wide open to the oft-used Red propaganda line that our country favors colonialism. It should be the purpose of the United States information effort abroad to counteract the effect of Communist propaganda, not to provide it with fuel to feed its fire.

5. I recommend that USIA take steps to inform its officials abroad of our own fiscal picture with respect to budgetary prospects in this country. Many of our programs have become popular, and the local people should be informed that in order for us to continue them they should induce their respective governments to assist us in defraying the expenses involved.

6. I recommend that USIA bear in mind the fact that one operation, well planned and well executed, is much more effective than several haphazard programs. As I warned last year, too many of our planners seem to believe that we are bound to operate a library, a press program, a film program, an exchange program, as well as others, in each and every nation which is host to the Agency. This has resulted in much wasted effort. The programs maintained in each country should be tailored to local educational levels and needs, and should be administered in accord with the fiscal capabilities of our own country.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS ADMINISTRATION

1. Again, this year as last, I discovered that the United States foreign assistance program is misinterpreted in that it does not mean the same thing to all who administer it. Technical assistance, as generally understood by the Congress and the American people is definitely not the same brand of technical assistance I found in operation in many of the areas I visited.

Even though Congress, as the result of criticisms offered by me, took steps last year to separate the funds spent for technical aid from those spent for development purposes the situation has not been remedied. Technical aid is being operated more or less in the nature of an economic aid program. The fact is that the technical assistance program, as I saw it practiced, is a combination of two entirely different concepts of assistance and the sharing of American know-how. The legislative divorce of the 2 phases has been a divorce in name only. Technical aid and economic assistance are combined on the operational level. The result is that we are still supplying not only the technicians but also the funds to construct many of the capital improvements such as schools, hospitals, fertilizer plants, and the like.

I cannot make too emphatic my recommendation that the process of developing these long-dormant nations be a gradual one. We must not seek overnight miracles. In too many instances our technical assistance programs are much too advanced for efficient utilization by native populations. If continued, this practice will ultimately lead to our Nation maintaining at least standby programs in these lands for indeterminate periods. Otherwise our investments will be lost, for there are ample indications that native populations will not be able to pull the whole load alone.

In short, the technical-aid programs should be geared to the mental capacity of those we are trying to assist, and under no condition should we advocate programs beyond the financial means of the countries we attempt to help.

2. I recommend that the Foreign Operations Administration reexamine and reevaluate each and every instance where the United States is contributing to mammoth land reclamation schemes and the like. While these are doubtless worthwhile efforts, they should be made by local governments on their own. Our contributions should be relegated to supplying technical know-how.

3. The Agency should immediately terminate the practice whereby foreign nations match United States contributions for technical assistance projects with local currency funds derived from the sale of United States-donated commodities. I found that local contributions to joint projects were obtained by selling surplus food stuffs which had been donated by the United States. In essence, the local contributions were but token ones; the joint fund was a sham. Practices such as these will ultimately defeat the technical assistance program in the eyes of the Congress.

4. While I am in full accord with efforts to increase available cropland in the arid areas of the world, such undertakings must be sensibly conducted. In one country I found "desert reclamation experts" who had never before seen a desert. Many projects they advocate are not suitable for desert areas. Needless to say, this practice is wasteful.

The scope of this program should also be made to conform to the amount of water available for irrigation and similar purposes. I found attempts being made to put into cultivation more land than potential water supplies will support. In at least one instance we are attempting to increase dairy production by increasing herds, when there is not enough land to raise foodstuffs, much less graze larger numbers of dairy cattle.

5. I believe that the increasing of food supplies in many areas of the world offers the key to victory in the cold war. Efforts in that direction can bear fruit, but they must be practical. Unrealistic programs are wasteful and should be terminated. For example, the scheme to increase fish production by providing more ponds in Egypt does not appear sensible; the money involved could be put to better use in other areas.

6. I recommend immediate termination of such obvious capital-investment schemes as aerial-photography surveys, hospital- and school-building programs, the construction of fertilizer plants, et cetera, which could not be classified as developmental projects as I understand the term. In this connection, I recommend that the Congress reexamine the use to which development-assistance funds are being put. The definition of development assistance should be spelled out in detail.

7. I recommend a reevaluation of the practice of contracting out technical-assistance programs to colleges, universities, and private firms. While in some instances this practice may be beneficial, I found several examples which are extremely costly. Specific reference is made to them in the attached country reports. In this connection I must warn FOA that I saw indications of the rise of fly-by-night institutions which seek to feed upon the contract program. In one country I was told that technical-assistance contracts were held by an institution which bears all the earmarks of the thousands of schools which sprang up overnight as a result of weaknesses in the original GI bill of rights.

8. I recommend a termination of all assistance to countries which do not at least meet us halfway in providing financial contributions to improvement programs. In Lebanon the United States is carrying the total burden because the Lebanese do not wish to operate their Government "in the red"; hence, our planners have magnanimously saddled the debt-ridden United States Government with the full load. No attempt is made to obtain local aid. A similar situation obtains in Jordan. Examples such as these, few though they may be, should shock the conscience of the responsible FOA leaders.

Personnel responsible for the diversion of Indian program funds from their originally understood purposes should be severely chastised by FOA. The situation there was ably summed up in a staff report to the committee in April of 1954:

"On the basis of the FOA program presented for India for fiscal year 1954, Congress approved in July 1953 an appropriation which enabled an allocation of $89,100,000. According to the presentation to Congress FOA intended to pursue, in general, a further development of programs already in existence from fiscal years 1952 and 1953. On this basis the appropriation was voted and approved. No mention was made during the presentation of a railroad-rehabilitation program. Four months later, without advice to the Appropriations Committee, FOA committed itself to a $20-million railroad-rehabilitation program (almost a quarter of the total funds available for the year)."

Such action borders on gross mispresentation and should not be sanctioned, much less repeated.

I recommend that all economic aid to Western European nations be terminated. My experience in Europe convinced me that the economies of the Western European nations allied with us are in sound condition. Industrial production ranges from 130-180 percent of prewar; corresponding increases are found in agricultural production.

I recommend further that we take steps to obtain increased European contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and other Western defense groups on the continent. The economies of these lands are well able to bear an increased portion of their rearmament burden; American arms aid should be reevaluated with a view toward immediately increasing European shares, by further allied budgetary contributions, if necessary.

10. I recommend that the FOA be permitted to expire on June 30 as now provided by law. All remaining counterpart funds should be spent under the direction of those who will administer our technical aid program.

GENERAL

This summary would be incomplete without a reference to the explosive situation which obtains with respect to Israeli-Arab relations in the Near East, and the threat it poses to the maintenance of peace and freedom, as well as United States alliances in that vitally-important area. We should immediately press for a solution of the problem posed by the smoldering conflict between the Jews and the Arabs. It should be realized that both parties blame the United States for their present difficulties; it must be understood that both factions have imposing arguments to advance in favor of their respective causes. I shall not offer specific recommendations concerning a settlement of this issue, but I would be derelict in my responsibility as a United States Senator if I did not warn the committee that unless the sources of friction between the Arab world and the infant State of Israel are promptly recognized, and an active effort made to resolve them, world war III may find its origin at this crossroads of Asia. The said plight of Arab refugees is indescribable. It is not possible to settle the problems in that area of the world through financial assistance made available by us to both sides. My findings as to the situation obtaining in the Arab countries I visited, as well as the situation in Israel, are outlined in the applicable country reports.

TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE EDWARD T. MILLER, OF MARYLAND

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], who is unavoidably absent from the session at this time, I read the following remarks prepared by him:

Mr. President, we in Maryland are particularly proud of Representative EDWARD T. MILLER, of Easton, representing the first Maryland district, who was presented a certificate of appreciation Tuesday, February 1, 1955, by Secretary of the Army Robert T. Stevens in recognition of his 37 years' service to the Army.

Representative MILLER, a member of the Infantry, United States Army Reserve, who served on active duty during both World Wars I and II, is being transferred to the Retired Reserve.

In a letter presented to Mr. MILLER on Tuesday, Secretary Stevens noted the outstanding performance by the Congressman while serving as Chief of the Troop Movements Section in the China theater during World War II.

Mr. President, also on behalf of the junior Senator from Maryland, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of today's RECORD the text of the certificate of appreciation, signed by Secretary Stevens.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the certificate of appreciation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDWARD T. MILLER

Throughout his military career of more than 37 years' service in World Wars I and II and in peacetime, Colonel MILLER contributed immeasurably to the accomplishments of the Army's vital mission and to the prestige and effectiveness of the Army's Reserve forces. His long and distinguished record of achievement, both as a combat commander and as an administrator, is indicative of his supreme patriotism, unswerving devotion to duty, and the high order of his professional competence. Colonel MILLER's courage and outstanding leadership, his capability, enthusiasm, initiative, and resourcefulness under all circumstances, have earned him richly deserved honor, and reflect great credit on the service.

COLLEGE HOUSING PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. Albert M. Cole, Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, on the subject of the college housing program under his agency, addressed to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement prepared by me, and the letter from Mr. Cole, with attachments to the letter.

There being no objection, the statement, letter, and attachments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Albert M. Cole, Housing and Home Finance Administrator, has advised me that in its Federal program for student and faculty housing HHFA has made commitments to 117 colleges and universities in 36 States for loans out of the Federal debt totaling over $110,500,000, and that it has approved, pending final commitments, 14 additional loans totaling $8,800,000.

These colleges and universities are both State and private, and to qualify for the loans under the law they had to show that they were "unable to secure the necessary funds for such housing from other sources

upon terms and conditions generally comparable to terms and conditions applicable to loans under this title" of the National Housing Act.

Under the act, these direct loans from the Federal Government, to be financed out of the Federal debt, bypassing appropriation procedure, may be for terms up to 40 years, putting their maturity virtually at the eve of the 21st century. This Federal housing program appears to be encouraging 40-year debts for both private and State colleges and universities to the Federal Government.

Under the law, colleges and universities, through this Federal housing program, may borrow in the Federal debt up to $300 million. To date the loans on which final commitments have been made to colleges and universities under this program are shown in the tabular attachment to Mr. Cole's letter of December 23, 1954, to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

In addition to the commitments finally made the Housing and Home Finance Agency has approved, pending final commitment, colleges and universities for the loans which are listed in the text of the attachments to Mr. Cole's letter.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
Washington, D. C., December 23, 1954.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: This is in further reference to your letter received here on November 1, 1954, requesting certain information in regard to the college housing program.

Enclosed are statements or listings covering the 10 points set forth in your letter.

Please note that two listings have been submitted in order to make a complete reply to item 3. One includes approved loans and sets forth the information requested in points (a) through (h). The second listing covers applications which are pending or which have been disapproved, rescinded, withdrawn, or deferred.

I would have no objection to the first listing being made public; in fact, each of these loans has already been announced by a press release at the time of its approval. I believe you will agree, however, that the second listing should not be made public as the rejection of a loan could conceivably have an adverse effect on the financial standing of an institution of higher learning. This is particularly true as many loans have been rejected due to conditions of eligibility or need which are no reflection on the financial stability of the institutions in question.

Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT M. COLE,
Administrator.

ITEM 1. TOTAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED TO DATE, INDICATING AMOUNTS AUTHORIZED FOR DIRECT LOANS, INSURED LOANS, GUARANTEED LOANS, GRANTS, ETC., AND APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, ETC., WITH CITATIONS TO AUTHORITY

Title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, a copy of which is attached, authorized borrowings from the Treasury in the amount of $300 million.

The Bureau of the Budget has authorized periodic releases within this borrowing authority which now total $200 million. These releases by fiscal years have been in the following amounts:

Fiscal year:	
1951–52	$40,000,000
1953	60,000,000
1954	50,000,000
1955	50,000,000
Total	200,000,000

Administrative expenses in the 1952 and 1953 fiscal years were provided from the consolidated appropriation for such expenses for the Office of the Administrator. The amounts expended for this program from the consolidated appropriation are as follows:

Fiscal year:	*Amount*
1952	$239,250
1953	317,066
Total	556,316

No appropriations for the administration of this program were requested for the 1954 and 1955 fiscal years, but authority was granted for the use of program funds for this purpose. The amount expended in fiscal 1954 was $316,625, and the estimate for the current fiscal year is $375,000.

Citations of legislative authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1952, Public Law 137, 82d Congress (65 Stat. 268) and Public Law 375, 82d Congress (66 Stat. 101).

Fiscal year 1953, Public Law 455, 82d Congress (66 Stat. 393).

Fiscal year 1954, Public Law 176, 83d Congress (67 Stat. 298, 305).

The cost of inspection and audit of college housing projects by agency personnel is borne by the applicant and is paid from loan funds.

Title IV authorizes only direct loans, and no insured loans, guaranteed loans or grants can be made under the college housing program.

As you will note from the legislation, Congress provided a differential between the interest cost of funds borrowed from the Treasury and the interest rate to be charged on college housing loans which would be sufficient for the program to operate without eventual cost to the Federal Government. At the present time, borrowings from the Treasury are at interest rates averaging 2.22845 percent, while the average rate on commitments to colleges and universities is 3.0775 percent, thus providing a spread of 0.84905 percent. As disbursements increase, this differential will cover all costs of administration and the establishment of substantial reserves.

ITEM 2. LIMITATIONS ON LOANS, GRANTS, ETC., SUCH AS PERCENTAGE OF COST, VALUE, ETC., IF ANY

Title IV of the Housing Act of 1950 provides that "A loan may be made in an amount not exceeding the development cost of the housing, as determined by the Administrator * * *." The same legislation defines development cost as "costs of construction of the housing and the land on which it is located, including necessary site improvements to permit its use for housing purposes."

For your information, most college housing projects have been erected on land already owned by the applicant and in only a few instances have the loans included funds to purchase land.

The legislation also provided that not more than 10 percent of the funds shall be made available to educational institutions within any one State.

In all instances the institutions have been required to defray from other than loan funds the cost of moveable furnishings within the project.

ITEM 3. COMPLETE LIST OF INSTITUTIONS WHICH HAVE APPLIED FOR FUNDS

Showing:

(a) name of institution;

(b) its location;

(c) whether it is State, city, private or other;

(d) amount applied for in each application;

(e) status of each application, with reasons for any rejected;

(f) interest rate on each loan granted;

(g) duration of each loan granted;

(h) amount of interest paid on each loan, and amount of principal repaid.

Attached are two listings, one including all approved loans and covering points (a) through (h), and one including all loans which have been withdrawn, disapproved or deferred and loans which are presently under review in the regional or central offices.[1] The latter listing, of course, covers only points (a) through (e).

Rescinded projects, i. e., those which were cancelled after approval of the loan agreement between both the applicant and the Government are carried on both lists because advances were made in some instances from which interest income was derived.

The following applications have been approved for college housing loans but loan agreements have not yet been executed by the applicant:

[1] Attachment 2, listing disapproved loans, omitted pursuant to paragraph 4 of covering letter.

Project number	Institution and location	Type	Amount	Interest rate	Project number	Institution and location	Type	Amount	Interest rate
				Percent					*Percent*
Fla. 8–CH–10	University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.	State	$600,000	3¼	N. Y. 30–CH–16	Yeshiva University, New York, N. Y.	Private	$1,225,000	3¼
Ill. 11–CH–7	Lewis College of Science and Technology, Lockport, Ill.	Private	310,000	3¼	Ohio 33–CH–15	Baldwin-Wallace College, Berea, Ohio.	do	700,000	3¼
Ill. 11–CH–17	Lake Forest College, Lake Forest, Ill.	do	680,000	3¼	R. I. 37–CH–1	University of Rhode Island, Kingston, R. I.	State	950,000	3¼
Kans. 14–CH–2	Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kans.	State	1,000,000	3¼	Tex. 41–CH–23	Texas College of Arts and Industries, Kingsville, Tex.	do	750,000	3¼
Md. 18–CH–5	Washington College, Chestertown, Md.	Private	380,000	3¼	Tex. 41–CH–24	Huston-Tillotson College, Austin, Tex.	Private	450,000	3¼
Mo. 23–CH–5	St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.	do	875,000	3¼	W. Va. 46–CH–4	Potomac State College of West Virginia University, Keyser, W. Va.	State	370,000	3¼
N. Y. 30–CH–14	Alfred University, Alfred, N. Y.	Private and State.	370,000	3¼					
N. Y. 30–CH–15	Cazenovia Junior College, Cazenovia, N. Y.	Private	140,000	3¼					

The above listing is current through Oct. 26, 1954.

Housing loans to educational institutions, status of loans, 1951 through Oct. 31, 1954

Project No.	Institution and location	Type	Loan commitments	Canceled commitments	Construction advances: Disbursements	Construction advances: Repayments	Construction advances: Balance	Advance interest repayments
ALABAMA								
Ala. 1-CH-1	Marion Institute, Marion, Ala	Private	$150,000					
Ala. 1-CH-5	Spring Hill College, Spring Hill, Ala	do	525,000		$300,000.00	$300,000.00		$3,754.11
			75,000					
ARIZONA								
Ariz. 2-CH-1	Arizona State College, Tempe, Ariz	do	400,000		300,000.00	300,000.00		2,280.17
Ariz. 2-CH-2	University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz	do	400,000		300,000.00	300,000.00		2,280.18
ARKANSAS								
Ark. 3-CH-8	Henderson State Teachers College, Arkadelphia, Ark	do	375,000		175,000.00	175,000.00		856.65
Ark. 3-CH-1	Ouachita Baptist College, Arkadelphia, Ark	do	143,000	$68,000	36,000.00	36,000.00		475.00
Ark. 3-CH-10	Hendrix College, Conway, Ark	do	350,000					
Ark. 3-CH-6	University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark	State	352,000	352,000	88,000.00	88,000.00		1,092.47
Ark. 3-CH-7	Arkansas State College, Jonesboro, Ark	do	460,000	460,000	115,000.00	115,000.00		876.28
Ark. 3-CH-3	State Agricultural, Mechanical, and Normal College, Pine Bluff, Ark.	do	581,000		243,000.00	243,000.00		2,455.99
CALIFORNIA								
Calif. 4-CH-1	Menlo College, Atherton, Calif	Private	50,000					
			470,000		390,000.00	390,000.00		7,731.10
Calif. 4-CH-2	University of San Francisco, San Francisco, Calif	do	1,500,000		750,000.00		$750,000	
Calif. 4-CH-4	Whittier College, Whittier, Calif	do	350,000					
COLORADO								
Colo. 5-CH-3	University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo	State	350,000		85,000.00	85,000.00		7,395.85
Colo. 5-CH-6	do	do	2,200,000		800,000.00	800,000.00		
Colo. 5-CH-5	Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colo	Private	600,000		150,000.00	150,000.00		1,385.42
Colo. 5-CH-10	do	do	800,000					
Colo. 5-CH-4	Colorado Agricultural and Mechanical College, Fort Collins, Colo.	State	1,320,000		200,000.00	200,000.00		2,193.59
Colo. 5-CH-7	do	do	1,320,000					
Colo. 5-CH-1	Colorado School of Mines, Golden, Colo	do	200,000					
Colo. 5-CH-9	Western State College of Colorado, Gunnison, Colo	do	575,000	181,000	110,000.00	110,000.00		1,983.01
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA								
D. C. 49-CH-2	American University, Washington, D. C	Private	400,000					
D. C. 49-CH-1	Georgetown University, Washington, D. C	do	1,188,000					
FLORIDA								
Fla. 8-CH-3	University of Miami, Coral Gables, Fla	do	1,508,000		750,000.00	750,000.00		6,463.25
Fla. 8-CH-6	John B. Stetson University, De Land, Fla	do	600,000		450,000.00		450,000	
Fla. 8-CH-11	do	do	420,000					
Fla. 8-CH-1	University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla	State	1,998,000	200,000	400,000.00	400,000.00		5,364.40
Fla. 8-CH-4	do	do	1,000,000					
Fla. 8-CH-2	Florida Agricultural and Mechanical College for Negroes, Tallahassee, Fla.	do	900,000		225,000.00	225,000.00		2,059.58
GEORGIA								
Ga. 9-CH-1	Emory University, Emory University, Ga	Private	650,000		162,500.00	162,500.00		2,036.90
Ga. 9-CH-3	do	do	990,000		494,000.00	494,000.00		2,362.80
IDAHO								
Idaho 10-CH-2	University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho	State	1,150,000		500,000.00		500,000	
Idaho 10-CH-1	Idaho State College, Pocatello, Idaho	do	425,000					
ILLINOIS								
Ill. 11-CH-5	Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Ill	do	1,100,000		275,000.00	275,000.00		1,859.60
Ill. 11-CH-2	Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Ill	Private	1,045,000					
Ill. 11-CH-4	do	do	2,280,000					
Ill. 11-CH-11	Loyola University, Chicago, Ill	do	1,200,000					
Ill. 11-CH-1	Knox College, Galesburg, Ill	do	426,000		85,000.00	85,000.00		659.62
Ill. 11-CH-6	Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill	do	200,000					
Ill. 11-CH-8	North Central College, Naperville, Ill	do	350,000					
INDIANA								
Ind. 12-CH-3	Anderson College and Theological Seminary, Anderson, Ind	do	550,000					
Ind. 12-CH-4	Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind	State	2,024,000					
Ind. 12-CH-8	St. Joseph's College, Collegeville, Ind	Private	460,000					
Ind. 12-CH-2	Butler University, Indianapolis, Ind	do	890,000					
Ind. 12-CH-7	do	do	70,000					
IOWA								
Iowa 13-CH-6	Luther College, Decorah, Iowa	do	504,000					
Iowa 13-CH-1	Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa	do	1,000,000		750,000.00	750,000.00		21,058.23
Iowa 13-CH-5	Upper Iowa University, Fayette, Iowa	do	175,000					
Iowa 13-CH-7	Waldorf Lutheran College, Forest City, Iowa	do	150,000					
Iowa 13-CH-4	Simpson College, Indianola, Iowa	do	225,000		75,000.00	75,000.00		346.36
Iowa 13-CH-3	Iowa Wesleyan College, Mount Pleasant, Iowa	do	330,000		247,500.00	247,500.00		6,123.08
Iowa 13-CH-2	Morningside College, Sioux City, Iowa	do	475,000		403,750.00	403,750.00		5,353.62
KANSAS								
Kans. 14-CH-4	Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kans	do	240,000					
Kans. 14-CH-1	Municipal University of Wichita, Wichita, Kans	City	741,000		185,250.00	185,250.00		1,577.16
KENTUCKY								
Ky. 15-CH-2	University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky	State	1,400,000					
Ky. 15-CH-4	do	do	722,000	447,000				
Ky. 15-CH-5	Kentucky Wesleyan College, Owensboro, Ky	Private	350,000					

Housing loans to educational institutions, status of loans, 1951 through Oct. 31, 1954—Continued

Project No.	Institution and location	Type	Loan commitments	Canceled commitments	Construction advances			Advance interest repayments
					Disbursements	Repayments	Balance	
LOUISIANA								
La. 16-CH-2	Tulane University, New Orleans, La	do	$1,755,000					
La. 16-CH-3	Centenary College of Louisiana, Shreveport, La	do	175,000		$44,000.00	$44,000.00		$380.99
MARYLAND								
Md. 18-CH-1	Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md	do	1,632,000		816,000.00	816,000.00		8,209.63
Md. 18-CH-4	University of Maryland, College Park, Md	State	2,350,000		1,762,000.00		$1,762,000	
MASSACHUSETTS								
Mass. 19-CH-2	Tufts College, Medford, Mass	Private	1,065,000					
Mass. 19-CH-3	Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass	do	620,000		155,000.00		155,000	
MICHIGAN								
Mich. 20-CH-2	University of Detroit, Detroit, Mich	do	900,000					
MINNESOTA								
Minn. 21-CH-1	Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minn	do	600,000					
MISSOURI								
Mo. 23-CH-1	University of Kansas City, Kansas City, Mo	do	1,515,000	$515,000				
Mo. 23-CH-2	St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo	do	875,000	163,000	218,750.00	218,750.00		1,153.68
Mo. 23-CH-3	Central Missouri State College, Warrensburg, Mo	State	900,000					
MONTANA								
Mont. 24-CH-2	Montana State College, Bozeman, Mont	State	750,000 375,000	750,000 375,000	562,250.00	562,250.00		11,818.11
Mont. 24-CH-1	Montana State University, Missoula, Mont	do	750,000		375,000.00	375,000.00		4,351.03
Mont. 24-CH-3	do	do	500,000	169,000	82,750.00	82,750.00		651.80
NEBRASKA								
Neb. 25-CH-4	Nebraska Wesleyan University, Lincoln, Nebr	Private	250,000					
NEW YORK								
N. Y. 30-CH-8	Alfred University, Alfred, N. Y	do	550,000 40,000		294,000.00		294,000	
N. Y. 30-CH-11	Briarcliff Junior College, Briarcliff Manor, N. Y	do	340,000					
N. Y. 30-CH-3	St. Lawrence University, Canton, N. Y	do	800,000		397,000.00	397,000.00		3,106.24
N. Y. 30-CH-10	New York University, New York, N. Y	do	900,000					
N. Y. 30-CH-5	Thomas S. Clarkson Memorial College of Technology, Potsdam, N. Y.	do	1,150,000		862,000.00		862,000	
N. Y. 30-CH-7	St. Bonaventure University, St. Bonaventure, N. Y	do	1,725,000	475,000				
N. Y. 30-CH-2	Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y	do	2,750,000	200,000	937,000.00	937,000.00		10,542.16
N. Y. 30-CH-12	do	do	2,200,000					
N. Y. 30-CH-1	Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N. Y	do	2,880,000		720,000.00	720,000.00		8,733.70
NORTH CAROLINA								
N. C. 31-CH-3	Campbell College, Buie's Creek, N. C	do	200,000		150,000.00		150,000	
OHIO								
Ohio 33-CH-18	Ashland College, Ashland, Ohio	do	450,000					
Ohio 33-CH-8	Xavier University, Cincinnati, Ohio	do	600,000					
Ohio 33-CH-19	John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio	do	750,000					
Ohio 33-CH-5	University of Dayton, Dayton, Ohio	do	1,320,000					
Ohio 33-CH-11	Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio	do	485,000					
Ohio 33-CH-13	Findlay College, Findlay, Ohio	do	250,000					
Ohio 33-CH-17	Heidelberg College, Tiffin, Ohio	do	240,000		60,000.00		60,000	
Ohio 33-CH-6	Antioch College of Yellow Springs, Yellow Springs, Ohio	do	430,000					
Ohio 33-CH-20	Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio	do	1,160,000					
OREGON								
Oreg. 35-CH-3	Lewis and Clark College, Portland, Oreg	do	465,000		348,750.00	348,750.00		4,765.27
Oreg. 35-CH-4	Reed Institute, Portland, Oreg	do	230,000		172,500.00		172,500	
Oreg. 35-CH-5	do	do	390,000					
PENNSYLVANIA								
Pa. 36-CH-10	Juniata College, Huntingdon, Pa	do	400,000		300,000.00		300,000	
Pa. 36-CH-8	Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa	do	355,000					
Pa. 36-CH-17	St. Francis College of Loretto, Loretto, Pa	do	457,000					
Pa. 36-CH-1	LaSalle College, Philadelphia, Pa	do	400,000		300,000.00	300,000.00		3,277.40
Pa. 36-CH-4	Philadelphia Textile Institute, Philadelphia, Pa	do	600,000					
Pa. 36-CH-7	Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pa	do	1,000,000	100,000				
Pa. 36-CH-6	Augustinian College of Villanova, Villanova, Pa	do	1,218,000		912,000.00		912,000	
SOUTH CAROLINA								
S. C. 38-CH-2	Medical College of South Carolina, Charleston, S. C	State	1,000,000		250,000.00	250,000.00		1,406.04
SOUTH DAKOTA								
S. D. 39-CH-2	Augustana College, Sioux Falls, S. Dak	Private	675,000					
TEXAS								
Tex. 41-CH-29	Abilene Christian College, Abilene, Tex	do	1,575,000 926,000		528,000.00	528,000.00		4,967.37
Tex. 41-CH-14	Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene, Tex	do	386,000 3,000,000	3,000,000	525,000.00	525,000.00		5,219.16
Tex. 41-CH-12	University of Texas, Austin, Tex	State	402,000	402,000				
Tex. 41-CH-15	Lamar State College of Technology, Beaumont, Tex	do	400,000		100,000.00	100,000.00		1,039.07
Tex. 41-CH-20	do	do	750,000					
Tex. 41-CH-5	Howard Payne College, Brownwood, Tex	Private	900,000		225,000.00		225,000	
Tex. 41-CH-11	University of Texas—Medical, Galveston, Tex	State	1,167,000		725,000.00		725,000	

Housing loans to educational institutions, status of loans, 1951 through Oct. 31, 1954—Continued

Project No.	Institution and location	Type	Loan commitments	Canceled commitments	Construction advances			Advance interest repayments
					Disbursements	Repayments	Balance	
TEXAS—CON.								
Tex. 41-CH-2	St. Mary's University of San Antonio, San Antonio, Tex	Private	$400,000		$150,000.00	$150,000.00		$1,227.33
			480,000		175,000.00	175,000.00		2,123.48
Tex. 41-CH-8	Trinity University, San Antonio, Tex	do	220,000					
Tex. 41-CH-4	Baylor University, Waco, Tex	do	1,250,000		312,500.00	312,500.00		3,289.36
Tex. 41-CH-6	do	do	700,000		175,000.00	175,000.00		284.67
UTAH								
Utah 42-CH-2	Branch Agricultural College of Utah, Cedar City, Utah	State	250,000		125,000.00	125,000.00		1,707.54
Utah 42-CH-3	Utah State Agricultural College, Logan, Utah	do	600,000					
Utah 42-CH-1	University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah	do	1,000,000					
VERMONT								
Vt. 43-CH-1	Norwich University, Northfield, Vt	Private	340,000		135,000.00	135,000.00		1,397.98
VIRGINIA								
Va. 44-CH-1	Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va	do	775,000		386,000.00	386,000.00		5,234.79
WASHINGTON								
Wash. 45-CH-12	Western Washington College of Education, Bellingham, Wash.	do	370,000					
			475,000		475,000.00		$475,000	
Wash. 45-CH-9	Pacific Lutheran College, Parkland, Wash	do	425,000		275,000.00		275,000	
			100,000					
Wash. 45-CH-8	Seattle Pacific College, Seattle, Wash	do	400,000		300,000.00	300,000.00		6,102.28
Wash. 45-CH-4	Seattle University, Seattle, Wash	do	1,320,000		990,000.00	990,000.00		25,994.61
Wash. 45-CH-10	Seattle University, Seattle, Wash	Private	1,190,000					
Wash. 45-CH-1	University of Washington, Seattle, Wash	State	1,500,000		1,125,000.00	1,125,000.00		19,268.83
Wash. 45-CH-7	Gonzaga University, Spokane, Wash	Private	800,000		598,738.66	598,738.66		9,257.62
			85,000					
Wash. 45-CH-6	Whitworth College, Spokane, Wash	do	385,000		288,750.00	288,750.00		5,167.20
Wash. 45-CH-2	College of Puget Sound, Tacoma, Wash	do	300,000		150,000.00	150,000.00		1,310.54
WEST VIRGINIA								
W. Va. 46-CH-3	Bethany College, Bethany, W. Va	do	350,000					
W. Va. 46-CH-2	Morris Harvey College Charleston, W. Va	do	300,000					
WISCONSIN								
Wis. 47-CH-1	Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis	do	1,000,000		250,000.00	250,000.00		3,183.22
Wis. 47-CH-2	do	do	1,180,000					
Wis. 47-CH-3	St. Norbert College, West DePere, Wis	do	600,000					
Wis. 47-CH-8	Carroll College, Waukesha Wis	do	525,000					
	Total		110,560,000	$7,857,000	26,777,988.66	18,710,488.66	8,067,500	245,195.52

Project No.	Institution and location	Bond purchases			Undisbursed commitments	Interest rate	Duration of loans	Bond interest repayments
		Disbursements	Repayments	Balance				
ALABAMA								
Ala. 1-CH-1	Marion Institute, Marion, Ala	$150,000		$150,000		2.75	1992	$5,740.62
Ala. 1-CH-5	Spring Hill College, Spring Hill, Ala	525,000		525,000		3.125	1993	
		75,000		75,000		3.5	1993	
ARIZONA								
Ariz. 2-CH-1	Arizona State College, Tempe, Ariz	400,000		400,000		3.01	1993	
Ariz. 2-CH-2	University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz	400,000		400,000		3.01	1993	
ARKANSAS								
Ark. 3-CH-8	Henderson State Teachers College, Arkadelphia, Ark	350,000		350,000	$25,000	3.01	1994	
Ark. 3-CH-1	Ouachita Baptist College, Arkadelphia, Ark	75,000		75,000		3.01	1993	1,260.44
Ark. 3-CH-10	Hendrix College, Conway, Ark				350,000	3.25	1995	
Ark. 3-CH-6	University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark					3.125	1993	
Ark. 3-CH-7	Arkansas State College, Jonesboro, Ark					3.125	1993	
Ark. 3-CH-3	State Agricultural, Mechanical, and Normal College, Pine Bluff, Ark	581,000		581,000		3.01	1993	8,876.32
CALIFORNIA								
Calif. 4-CH-1	Menlo College, Atherton, Calif	50,000		50,000		3.5	1993	
		470,000		470,000		3.01	1993	
Calif. 4-CH-2	University of San Francisco, San Francisco, Calif				750,000	3.01	1993	
Calif. 4-CH-4	Whittier College, Whittier, Calif				350,000	3.25	1994	
COLORADO								
Colo. 5-CH-3	University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo	350,000		350,000		2.75	1992	4,438.21
Colo. 5-CH-6	do	2,000,000		2,000,000	200,000	3.01	1993	25,392.52
Colo. 5-CH-5	Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colo	600,000	$24,000	576,000		3.01	1993	7,749.08
Colo. 5-CH-10	do				800,000	3.25	1995	
Colo. 5-CH-4	Colorado Agricultural and Mechanical College, Fort Collins, Colo	1,320,000		1,320,000		3.01	1992	18,416.18
Colo. 5-CH-7	do				1,320,000	3.125	1993	
Colo. 5-CH-1	Colorado School of Mines, Golden, Colo	200,000		200,000		3.01	1993	2,943.11
Colo. 5-CH-9	Western State College of Colorado, Gunnison, Colo	394,000		394,000		3.5	1993	
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA								
D. C. 49-CH-2	American University, Washington, D. C	400,000		400,000		3.5	1993	
D. C. 49-CH-1	Georgetown University, Washington, D. C				1,188,000	3.125	1993	

Housing loans to educational institutions, status of loans, 1951 through Oct. 31, 1954—Continued

Project No.	Institution and location	Bond purchases			Undisbursed commitments	Interest rate	Duration of loans	Bond interest repayments
		Disbursements	Repayments	Balance				
FLORIDA								
Fla. 8-CH-3	University of Miami, Coral Gables, Fla	$1,508,000		$1,508,000		3.01	1993	
Fla. 8-CH-6	John B. Stetson University, De Land, Fla				$150,000	3.5	1994	
Fla. 8-CH-11	do				420,000	3.25	1995	
Fla. 8-CH-1	University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla	1,798,000		1,798,000		2.75	1992	$60,586.32
Fla. 8-CH-4	do	550,000		550,000	450,000	3.01	1994	1,128.75
Fla. 8-CH-2	Florida Agricultural and Mechanical College for Negroes, Tallahassee, Fla.	800,000		800,000	100,000	3.01	1992	6,103.61
GEORGIA								
Ga. 9-CH-1	Emory University, Emory University, Ga	650,000		650,000		3.01	1992	5,978.19
Ga. 9-CH-3	do	990,000		990,000		3.01	1993	
IDAHO								
Idaho 10-CH-2	University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho				650,000	3.01	1993	
Idaho 10-CH-1	Idaho State College, Pocatello, Idaho				425,000	3.01	1983	
ILLINOIS								
Ill. 11-CH-5	Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Ill	1,100,000	$6,000	1,094,000		3.01	1992	58,034.48
Ill. 11-CH-2	Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Ill	1,045,000		1,045,000		2.75	1992	34,358.58
Ill. 11-CH-4	do	600,000		600,000	1,680,000	3.125	1993	7,809.50
Ill. 11-CH-11	Loyola University, Chicago, Ill	600,000		600,000	600,000	3.125	1993	1,404.77
Ill. 11-CH-1	Knox College, Galesburg, Ill	426,000	6,000	420,000		2.75	1991	25,903.19
Ill. 11-CH-6	Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill	200,000		200,000		3.01	1993	861.15
Ill. 11-CH-8	North Central College, Naperville, Ill	350,000		350,000		3.01	1993	731.60
INDIANA								
Ind. 12-CH-3	Anderson College and Theological Seminary, Anderson, Ind	539,000		539,000	11,000	3.01	1991	8,401.91
Ind. 12-CH-4	Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind				2,024,000	3.125	1993	
Ind. 12-CH-8	St. Joseph's College, Collegeville, Ind				460,000	3.5	1994	
Ind. 12-CH-2	Butler University, Indianapolis, Ind	890,000		890,000		3.01	1992	10,236.27
Ind. 12-CH-7	do				700,000	3.25	1994	
IOWA								
Iowa 13-CH-6	Luther College, Decorah, Iowa				504,000	3.5	1994	
Iowa 13-CH-1	Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa	1,000,000		1,000,000		2.75	1992	9,930.56
Iowa 13-CH-5	Upper Iowa University, Fayette, Iowa				175,000	3.25	1994	
Iowa 13-CH-7	Waldorf Lutheran College, Forest City, Iowa				150,000	3.5	1994	
Iowa 13-CH-4	Simpson College, Indianola, Iowa	225,000		225,000		3.01	1993	
Iowa 13-CH-3	Iowa Wesleyan College, Mount Pleasant, Iowa	330,000		330,000		3.01	1993	3,890.43
Iowa 13-CH-2	Morningside College, Sioux City, Iowa	475,000	16,000	459,000		2.75	1992	10,776.56
KANSAS								
Kans. 14-CH-4	Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kans				240,000	3.5	1993	
Kans. 14-CH-1	Municipal University of Wichita, Wichita, Kans	741,000		741,000		2.75	1992	26,610.53
KENTUCKY								
Ky. 15-CH-2	University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky	900,000		900,000	500,000	3.01	1992	5,585.22
Ky. 15-CH-4	do				275,000	3.01	1994	
Ky. 15-CH-5	Kentucky Wesleyan College, Owensboro, Ky				350,000	3.5	1994	
LOUISIANA								
La. 16-CH-2	Tulane University, New Orleans, La	1,755,000		1,755,000		3.01	1992	17,056.67
La. 16-CH-3	Centenary College of Louisiana, Shreveport, La	175,000		175,000		3.01	1993	3,233.66
MARYLAND								
Md. 18-CH-1	Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md	1,632,000		1,632,000		3.01	1993	21,286.72
Md. 18-CH-4	University of Maryland, College Park, Md				588,000	3.125	1983	
MASSACHUSETTS								
Mass. 19-CH-2	Tufts College, Medford, Mass	1,065,000		1,065,000		2.75	1992	32,785.73
Mass. 19-CH-3	Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass				465,000	3.25	1994	
MICHIGAN								
Mich. 20-CH-2	University of Detroit, Detroit, Mich	225,000		225,000	675,000	3.125	1993	
MINNESOTA								
Minn. 21-CH-1	Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minn				600,000	3.25	1994	
MISSOURI								
Mo. 23-CH-1	University of Kansas City, Kansas City, Mo				1,000,000	3.01	1994	
Mo. 23-CH-2	St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo	712,000	13,000	699,000		2.75	1991	27,277.71
Mo. 23-CH-3	Central Missouri State College, Warrensburg, Mo	900,000		900,000		2.75	1972	25,308.09
MONTANA								
Mont. 24-CH-2	Montana State College, Bozeman, Mont					2.75	1993	
						3.01	1993	
Mont. 24-CH-1	Montana State University, Missoula, Mont	750,000	21,000	729,000		2.75	1992	35,204.82
Mont. 24-CH-3	do	331,000		331,000		3.125	1993	
NEBRASKA								
Neb. 25-CH-4	Nebraska Wesleyan University, Lincoln, Nebr				250,000	3.5	1994	
NEW YORK								
N. Y. 30-CH-8	Alfred University, Alfred, N. Y				256,000	3.01	1993	
					40,000	3.5	1993	
N. Y. 30-CH-11	Briarcliff Junior College, Briarcliff Manor, N. Y				340,000	3.5	1994	
N. Y. 30-CH-3	St. Lawrence University, Canton, N. Y	800,000		800,000		3.01	1992	3,010.00
N. Y. 30-CH-10	New York University, New York, N. Y				900,000	3.5	1993	
N. Y. 30-CH-5	Thomas S. Clarkson Memorial College of Technology, Potsdam, N. Y				288,000	3.01	1993	

Housing loans to educational institutions, status of loans, 1951 through Oct. 31, 1954—Continued

Project No.	Institution and location	Bond purchases			Undisbursed commitments	Interest rate	Duration of loans	Bond interest repayments
		Disbursements	Repayments	Balance				
NEW YORK—con.								
N. Y. 30-CH-7	St. Bonaventure University, St. Bonaventure, N. Y.				$1,250,000	3.125	1993	
N. Y. 30-CH-2	Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.	$2,550,000		$2,550,000		3.00	1992	$41,800.75
N. Y. 30-CH-12	do				2,200,000	3.25	1994	
N. Y. 30-CH-1	Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N. Y.	2,880,000		2,880,000		2.75	1992	67,087.40
NORTH CAROLINA								
N. C. 31-CH-3	Campbell College, Buie's Creek, N. C.				50,000	3.5	1974	
OHIO								
Ohio 33-CH-18	Ashland College, Ashland, Ohio				450,000	3.25	1994	
Ohio 33-CH-8	Xavier University, Cincinnati Ohio	200,000		200,000	400,000	3.01	1993	719.06
Ohio 33-CH-19	John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio				750,000	3.5	1994	
Ohio 33-CH-5	University of Dayton, Dayton, Ohio	1,147,000		1,147,000	173,000	3.01	1992	29,595.83
Ohio 33-CH-11	Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio	485,000		485,000		3.5	1993	
Ohio 33-CH-13	Findlay College, Findlay, Ohio				250,000	3.25	1994	
Ohio 33-CH-17	Heidelberg College, Tiffin, Ohio				180,000	3.5	1994	
Ohio 33-CH-6	Antioch College of Yellow Springs, Yellow Springs, Ohio				430,000	3.125	1993	
Ohio 33-CH-20	Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio				1,160,000	3.25	1994	
OREGON								
Oreg. 35-CH-3	Lewis and Clark College, Portland, Oreg.	465,000		465,000		3.01	1993	
Oreg. 35-CH-4	Reed Institute, Portland, Oreg.				57,500	3.01	1993	
Oreg. 35-CH-5	do				390,000	3.25	1994	
PENNSYLVANIA								
Pa. 36-CH-10	Juniata College, Huntingdon, Pa.				100,000	3.5	1993	
Pa. 36-CH-8	Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa.				355,000	3.125	1993	
Pa. 36-CH-17	St. Francis College of Loretto, Loretto, Pa.				457,000	3.5	1994	
Pa. 36-CH-1	LaSalle College, Philadelphia, Pa.	400,000		400,000		2.75	1977	16,133.33
Pa. 36-CH-4	Philadelphia Textile Institute, Philadelphia, Pa.				600,000	3.5	1993	
Pa. 36-CH-7	Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pa.				900,000	3.125	1993	
Pa. 36-CH-6	Augustinian College of Villanova, Villanova, Pa.				306,000	3.01	1993	
SOUTH CAROLINA								
S. C. 38-CH-2	Medical College of South Carolina, Charleston, S. C.	1,000,000		1,000,000		3.01	1992	25,668.61
SOUTH DAKOTA								
S. D. 39-CH-2	Augustana College, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.				675,000	3.5	1994	
TEXAS								
Tex. 41-CH-29	Abilene Christian College, Abilene, Tex.				1,575,000	3.25	1995	
		926,000		926,000		3.01	1993	16,646.39
		386,000		386,000		3.125	1993	7,207.46
Tex. 41-CH-14	Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene, Tex.					3.01	1993	
Tex. 41-CH-12	University of Texas, Austin, Tex.					3.125	1993	
Tex. 41-CH-15	Lamar State College of Technology, Beaumont, Tex.	400,000		400,000		3.01	1993	4,824.37
Tex. 41-CH-20	do				750,000	3.5	1995	
Tex. 41-CH-5	Howard Payne College, Brownwood, Tex.				675,000	3.5	1994	
Tex. 41-CH-11	University of Texas—Medical, Galveston, Tex.				442,000	3.01	1993	
Tex. 41-CH-2	St. Mary's University of San Antonio, San Antonio, Tex.	400,000	$2,000	398,000		2.75	1992	17,358.62
		480,000		480,000		3.01	1993	4,795.93
Tex. 41-CH-8	Trinity University, San Antonio, Tex.	195,000		195,000	25,000	3.125	1993	2,311.45
Tex. 41-CH-4	Baylor University, Waco, Tex.	1,250,000		1,250,000		3.01	1993	20,146.09
Tex. 41-CH-6	do	700,000		700,000		3.125	1993	10,058.18
UTAH								
Utah 42-CH-2	Branch Agricultural College of Utah, Cedar City, Utah	250,000		250,000		3.01	1992	1,191.46
Utah 42-CH-3	Utah State Agricultural College, Logan, Utah				600,000	3.5	1993	
Utah 42-CH-1	University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah				1,000,000	2.75	1994	
VERMONT								
Vt. 43-CH-1	Norwich University, Northfield, Vt.	340,000	30,000	310,000		2.75	1976	20,524.18
VIRGINIA								
Va. 44-CH-1	Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va.	775,000	150,000	625,000		2.75	1973	23,369.27
WASHINGTON								
Wash. 45-CH-12	Western Washington College of Education, Bellingham, Wash.				370,000	3.5	1994	
						3.01	1993	
Wash. 45-CH-9	Pacific Lutheran College, Parkland, Wash.				150,000	3.125	1993	
					100,000	3.5	1993	
Wash. 45-CH-8	Seattle Pacific College, Seattle, Wash.	400,000		400,000		3.01	1993	
Wash. 45-CH-4	Seattle University, Seattle, Wash.	1,320,000		1,320,000		3.01	1992	4,304.30
Wash. 45-CH-10	do				1,190,000	3.25	1994	
Wash. 45-CH-1	University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.	1,500,000	23,000	1,477,000		2.75	1991	27,183.75
Wash. 45-CH-7	Gonzaga University, Spokane, Wash.	800,000		800,000		3.01	1993	
		85,000		85,000		3.5	1993	
Wash. 45-CH-6	Whitworth College, Spokane, Wash.	385,000		385,000		3.01	1992	6,502.44
Wash. 45-CH-2	College of Puget Sound, Tacoma, Wash.	300,000		300,000		3.01	1992	
WEST VIRGINIA								
W. Va. 46-CH-3	Bethany College, Bethany, W. Va.				350,000	3.5	1994	
W. Va. 46-CH-2	Morris Harvey College, Charleston, W. Va.				300,000	3.5	1994	
WISCONSIN								
Wis. 47-CH-1	Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis.	1,000,000	15,000	985,000		2.75	1991	47,995.14
Wis. 47-CH-2	do				1,180,000	3.125	1993	
Wis. 47-CH-3	St. Norbert College, West DePere, Wis.				600,000	3.5	1994	
Wis. 47-CH-8	Carroll College, Waukesha, Wis.				525,000	3.25	1994	
	Total	53,421,000	306,000	53,115,000	41,214,500			913,735.51

ITEM 4. STATEMENT OF HHFA PREREQUISITES FOR GRANTING LOANS, SUCH AS LEGAL AUTHORIZATION AND APPROVAL BY STATE AND CITY AUTHORITIES FOR STATE AND CITY INSTITUTIONS, ETC.

An educational institution making application for a college housing loan is required to evidence that (1) it is either a public corporate body or a nonprofit private corporation legally capable of constructing, financing, and maintaining and operating the desired student or faculty housing for which the need is certified by the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Welfare, and Education; (2) the approvals as to local zoning, building codes, and land uses, or specific covenants regarding such housing project sites, are secured and complied with; (3) the education institution owns fee-simple title in the land comprising such sites; and (4) recognized bond counsel render and furnish to the HHFA an approving opinion as to the validity and legally binding character of the bonds to be delivered under the terms of the loan.

Municipal and State institutions must secure the approval of municipal and State authorities if these are required under their charter.

ITEM 5. STATEMENT AS TO WHETHER PROJECTS CONSTRUCTED WITH LOANS UNDER THIS PROGRAM MAY BE IN CONJUNCTION WITH ASSISTANCE UNDER ONE OR MORE OTHER PROGRAMS UNDER GENERAL JURISDICTION OF THE HHFA—FOR EXAMPLE, CAN COLLEGE HOUSING PROJECTS BE ERECTED IN A SLUM-CLEARANCE AREA, IN COMBINATION WITH ANY OTHER HOUSING PROGRAM?—IF SO, INDICATE POSSIBLE COMBINATIONS AND LIST ALL ACTUAL COMBINATION PROJECTS APPROVED TO DATE AND ALL OTHER APPLICATIONS INVOLVING COMBINATION OF PROGRAMS

Loans for college housing are not made in conjunction with assistance from other programs under the general jurisdiction of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

An educational institution requesting a loan is usually one of long standing and is located on a well-established campus with its improvements developed over a long period of time. Consequently, the projects constructed with loans under this program are within a highly specialized field of planning and are not combined with community-wide or overall regional planning. It is conceivable that where a college or university is located in a congested area or section of a large city its housing construction program could be coordinated with local community planning. So far there have been no situations presented which might feasibly be combined with any other housing program, including the overall slum-clearance program.

In reply to your specific question, "Can college housing projects be erected in a slum-clearance area?" a university can purchase land in such an area and undertake to erect a dormitory there with a Federal or private loan. Illinois Institute of Technology in Chicago, Ill., has been purchasing and clearing land in the neighborhood of its campus and has erected three buildings with the assistance of college housing loans. Johns Hopkins University Medical School has a pending application in which it proposes to erect a building on a site adjacent to the University Hospital, which would be purchased from the city of Baltimore at a cost of $100,000. Title to such land has been or is being acquired by the city by purchase or condemnation proceedings in connection with the redevelopment of this area and adjacent blocks by the Baltimore Redevelopment Commission. The use of this site for university purposes has been contemplated since the area was declared a redevelopment area in 1949.

These two projects, which are in no sense combination projects, are the only projects approved or pending which involve the construction of college housing in slum-clearance areas.

ITEM 6. A STATEMENT AS TO WHETHER IT IS POSSIBLE TO MORTGAGE OUT OR BORROW IN EXCESS OF COST UNDER THIS PROGRAM; AND IF SO WHAT PRECAUTIONS HHFA HAS TAKEN AGAINST THESE PRACTICES

There is no possibility of mortgaging out or borrowing in excess of cost under this program because (1) the loans are direct; (2) the proceeds of the loan are required to be deposited as trust funds in construction accounts; (3) the contract is awarded on the basis of competitive advertised bid; (4) the loan agreement specifically limits the amount of the loan to the costs of construction; and (5) a Government inspection and audit are made on each project with expense thereof paid by the borrower. Such protective provisions are included in all loan agreements under the program.

In the event of an overrun following competitive bidding, the applicant is obligated to furnish the additional funds. In some instances it has been possible to bring the project costs within the loan amount by the use of deductive alternates. In another instance it was necessary to redesign the facility to keep within the loan amount. In a few instances it has been necessary to increase the loan amount because of overrun in cost after competitive bids had been taken.

ITEM 7. A STATEMENT AS TO WHETHER HHFA CONTROLS TO ANY DEGREE THE RENTALS OR FEES CHARGED FOR OCCUPANCY OR OTHERWISE OF THESE PROJECTS

It is clear that the intent of the legislation was to make it possible for colleges and universities to construct housing for their students without excessive increases in their dormitory rates. Therefore, the Agency has not undertaken to dictate the rentals to be charged in the facilities constructed under these loans. In making its application, the applicant submits its plan for the operation of the facility, including proposed rentals to be charged the students. It is generally the rate which already obtains in other dormitories operated on its campus.

A financial analysis is made of the application in which the net income to be derived from the operation of the facility is one of the most important considerations. It is frequently necessary for the applicant to make some adjustments in rentals before an economically sound project can be worked out.

A condition which is a part of the loan agreement between the Government and the applicant states:

"The borrower shall establish and maintain, throughout the life of the loan hereunder, such parietal rules, rental rates, and charges for the occupancy and use of the project as are necessary (1) to assure maximum occupancy and use of the project, (2) to provide debt service on the bonds, and (3) to provide a debt service reserve required under condition (a) above."

As holder of the bonds delivered under the program, the Government has the legal right to enforce such provision by court action if necessary.

Many loans have been rejected because they were not economically feasible, i. e., the projects could not be amortized from the rentals proposed, an increase in rentals was not believed possible, and other sources of funds to supplement the net income from rentals were not available.

ITEM 8. A LIST (IDENTIFIED) OF ANY PROJECTS IN THIS PROGRAM WHICH WE HAVE DEFAULTED

Of the 144 loans approved under this program from its inception to date there have been no defaults in either principal or interest.

The historical record of dormitory bond financing is excellent. During the depression of the 1930's there were some 440 dormitory issues extant of which 10 went into temporary default, all of which were later refunded without loss of principal. The cause of default in nearly every case was the cumulative effect of the depression, resulting in small enrollments and competition from residents of the community who, under extremely depressed economic conditions, offered rooms at substantially below the moderate dormitory rates.

A number of safeguards against default are implicit in or have been incorporated into the program and are listed below:

1. Estimated net income from the dormitory is generally depreciated by a 10-percent vacancy factor.

2. Revenue type issues have a coverage over debt service of at least 1.35 times debt service.

3. Reserves are established to cover 2 years' debt service.

4. Loans to private institutions are secured by the full faith and credit of the institution, a mortgage on the project and its site, and a pledge of specific income from the project or otherwise sufficient to assure payment of debt service and to create the 2 years' reserve.

5. Use and occupancy insurance is maintained to provide continued revenue in the event of fire or other disaster.

6. Parietal rules are established under which the project dormitories must be occupied before other dormitories are occupied.

7. Housing constructed under the program provides only a small fraction of total enrollment.

8. Enrollments have increased for the third successive year to an all-time high this fall of 2,472,000 students and are expected to increase to more than 3 million students by 1960.

9. As disbursements increase under the program, the differential between the cost of funds from the Treasury and interest on loans will provide substantial reserves against the possibility of defaults under the program.

ITEM 9. A LIST OF ALL IRREGULARITIES, OR ILLEGALITIES, FOUND TO DATE IN THIS PROGRAM, IF ANY, AND ACTIONS TAKEN IN EACH CASE

No irregularities or illegalities have been found to date in this program, and every precaution possible is taken, in the field offices and in the central office, at all stages of processing and construction to avoid such conditions.

ITEM 10. A STATEMENT AS TO WHETHER THIS PROGRAM IS BEING EMPHASIZED AT THIS TIME MORE THAN IN THE PAST, AND IF SO, THE MEANS OF PROMOTION

This program is not conducted on a promotional basis. The passage of the initial legislation put the educational institutions on notice of the availability of funds. Applications are not solicited and application forms are furnished only in response to specific requests from institutions of higher learning. The inception of the program was delayed for more than a year due to the outbreak in Korea, and until the summer of 1953 it was severely restricted by requirements that the projects have defense-connected aspects such as the training of ROTC students.

The number of applications received under the program has increased each year since its inception, as shown by the following table:

Number of applications received

Fiscal year:	
1952	95
1953	119
1954	125

The increasing number of applications appears to reflect the need for housing resulting from increased college enrollments. These enrollments have fluctuated rather widely in the last 15 years. From a prewar

normal of 1,365,000 in 1939, enrollments dropped to a wartime low of 733,000 in 1943. In 1947 the enrollment of 1,081,000 GI's brought total enrollments to 2,078,000. In 1949, although the enrollment of GI's had dropped to 860,000, the enrollments of nonveterans had rised to 1,597,000, making a postwar peak of 2,457,000 students. As GI entitlements ran out, total enrollments dropped slightly in 1950 and 1951, but have risen steadily through 1952, 1953, and 1954, until they have now passed the postwar peak. Estimates by the Office of Education indicate that this trend will continue, reaching 3,000,000 or more students by 1960.

The need for housing during this period has been intensified by the deterioration of temporary barracks which had been erected on the campuses to accommodate the influx of veterans. Many of these must now be removed because they are fire hazards, uneconomical to maintain, and because the special permits under which they were erected have expired.

The number of applications approved in each fiscal year follows:

Number of applications approved

Fiscal year:	
1952	25
1953	[1] 71
1954	[2] 41
1955 (to 11–15–54)	[3] 25

[1] Includes 3 rescissions.
[2] Includes 7 rescissions.
[3] Includes 4 rescissions.

Since March of 1953, the major emphasis on this program has been in the direction of developing the maximum degree of private participation. New procedures were developed to provide that before the bonds were purchased by the Government they must be advertised in the Bond Buyer and that bids for the whole or parts of issues must be accepted if the bids were at interest rates comparable to the Government rate. Meetings were held with representatives of the Investment Bankers Association in an effort to develop a wider market for this type of security. In the last 9 months, some $17 million in loans which would otherwise have been direct Federal loans have been purchased by private investment firms. A listing of these loans is attached. Since the inception of the program more than $60 million in college housing loans have been withdrawn or rescinded in favor of private investment.

Recent bond sales to private investment houses

Date of sale or report	Institution and location	Amount	Years	Interest rate	HHFA action
Mar. 1, 1954	Western State College, Gunnison, Colo	$181,000	20	3.60	Took last 20 years, at 3.5 percent.
Mar. 22, 1954	Western Illinois State College, Macomb, Ill	700,000	30	3.394	Withdrawal.
Apr. 15, 1954	Central Washington College of Education, Ellensburg, Wash	310,000	20	3.15	Do.
Apr. 19, 1954	Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio	2,250,000	40	3.368	Rescission.
Do	Southern State College, Magnolia, Ark	450,000		3.5	Withdrawal.
May 13, 1954	Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Ind	2,856,000	40	3.48	Rescission.
June 2, 1954	Montana State University, Missoula, Mont	169,000	20	3.195	Took last 20 years, at 3⅛ percent.
June 15, 1954	Arkansas Polytechnic College, Russellville, Ark	790,000	40	3.40	Rescission.
Do	University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark	450,000	30	3.125	Do.
June 29, 1954	Arkansas State College, Jonesboro, Ark	460,000	30	3.19	Do.
July 12, 1954	Eastern Kentucky State College, Richmond, Ky	465,000	25	3.05	Do.
July 14, 1954	Montana State College, Boseman, Mont	1,125,000			Do.
July 21, 1954	New Mexico College of Agricultural and Mechanical Arts, State College, N. Mex	700,000 300,000	30	3.5686	Withdrawal.
Aug. 18, 1954	University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich	1,700,000		2.25 3.25	Do.
Sept. 14, 1954	University of Texas (Main), Austin, Tex	3,402,000	40	2.985	Rescission.
Sept. 20, 1954	University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho	395,000	20	3.106	Took last 20 years at 3.01 percent.
Sept. 22, 1954	University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky	447,000	30	2.936	Took last 10 years at 3.01 percent.
Oct. 11, 1954	Utah State Agricultural College, Logan, Utah	600,000	40	3.45	Rescission.
	Total	17,750,000			

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is concluded.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CITATION OF DIANTHA D. HOAG FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 3, Senate Resolution 31.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 31) citing Diantha D. Hoag for contempt of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which was read as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on Government Operations of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Diantha D. Hoag to answer questions before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, said refusal to answer being pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Diantha D. Hoag may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], who reported the resolution to the Senate, is absent, and he asked me to pursue it for him. However, I am sure there is no need for any speech on the subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 31) was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 15, Senate Resolution No. 49.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 49) to extend the times by which the Committee on the Judiciary may conduct studies and investigations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the times in which the Committee on the Judiciary may expend funds under authority of Senate Resolution 172, agreed to January 27, 1954; Senate Resolution 181, agreed to January 26, 1954; Senate Resolution 187, agreed to January 26, 1954; Senate Resolution 188, agreed to January 26, 1954; Senate Resolution 190, agreed to January 27, 1954; and Senate Resolution 227, agreed to April 28, 1954, are hereby extended through February 28, 1955.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have stated how much money remains available to the committee from last year?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I am sorry I cannot give the Senator from Louisiana the exact information on that point. However, there is sufficient money on hand to carry on the work of the committee for the remainder of this month. I am sure the Senator will understand that the main difficulty is that the chairman of the committee has not yet arranged for the selection of the subcommittees and has not yet determined what their functions will be. However, there is sufficient money on hand to take care of the needs of the committee for this month.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, no new money is being asked for?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I express the hope that before the Committee on the Judiciary requests additional money of the Senate, it will try to curtail the expenditures of the committee. Last year I pointed out that the Committee on the Judiciary received from the Senate a little more than $750,000

with which to perform the functions of that committee.

My hope is that the new chairman will look into the subject, in an effort to curtail the expenditures of the committee.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, one reason for asking that the resolution be agreed to is to give me, as chairman of the committee, ample time to look into the question of expenditures. There are sufficient funds on hand with which to conduct the functions of the committee during this month, and in the interim opportunity will be afforded to conduct a proper study of the subject in order to decide what should be done. We are asking for permission to spend money now available to enable the subcommittees to function for an additional month, which will give us time to determine the situation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I again express the hope that the Senator from West Virginia, the chairman of the committee, will be able to curtail the expenditures of the committee.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary during the last Congress, I should like to say that I do not know of so much as $1 being wasted by any subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. As a matter of fact, every subcommittee did a first-class job. Although $700,000 may look like a large sum of money, the amount is very modest when we consider the many bills which are referred to the Committee on the Judiciary every year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I have pointed out on the floor of the Senate many times, most of the bills reported by the Committee on the Judiciary are claims bills. I served as chairman of the Committee on Claims before the Reorganization Act went into effect. At that time the Claims Committee employed 2 clerks to do the work which now requires the services of 3 or 4 attorneys and quite a number of additional workers in the Department of Justice.

It is my hope that some of the expenditures will be curtailed. There are working on these committees entirely too many persons who, in my humble judgment, are professionals at being able to maintain themselves in jobs.

Mr. LANGER. I may say to my distinguished colleague that he is entirely mistaken. Last year the committee considered more than 2,000 claims. No politics are involved in that committee. We kept on the committee every attorney and member of the staff who had been hired by the former chairman of the committee, the late Senator from Nevada, Mr. McCarran.

To indicate the vast volume of work and the great amount of money involved, let me say that we had before us one bill, introduced by the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], involving more than $500 million. Certainly, as a member of that committee, I do not propose to consider lightly a bill involving that amount of money. Such a bill requires thorough investigation.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I wish to correct the distinguished former chairman of the committee. The bill involved $1,500,000,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. When I was chairman of the old Claims Committee, many bills involving large sums were referred to that committee. The difference is that the work is now being conducted by a group of attorneys, whereas formerly the Senators did the work themselves. That is the difference.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to reply to my distinguished colleague by saying that, of course, the committee does have the assistance of attorneys. They go over each bill in order to determine the legal aspects involved. They must look up decisions of the Supreme Court on a variety of matters. As a matter of fact, however, not one bill went through the committee which was not thoroughly considered by the committee, and a report was made on every one of the bills.

I do not believe the committee has sufficient help at the present time, and I sincerely hope the new chairman of the committee will ask for additional counsel. I certainly do not want to vote for a bill involving $100,000 or $200,000, or a bill of the size introduced by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], involving $1,500,000,000, without knowing what I am doing. Each year the committee passes upon bills calling for the expenditure of millions and millions of dollars. I am confident that under the chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] the committee will not pass favorably upon any of these claims unless the members of the committee know exactly what is involved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 49) was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR HEARINGS AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 28, Calendar No. 21.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 28) extending the authority of the Committee on Armed Services for hearings and investigations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment in line 4, after the word "thereof", to strike out "March 31" and insert "February 28", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 185, 83d Congress, agreed to January 26, 1954, is amended by striking out "January 31, 1955", wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "February 28, 1955."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this resolution provides for the extension of the authority of the Senate Committee on Armed Services to use the funds which have heretofore been made available to carry on investigations relating to the preparedness program. The resolution was submitted by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and it provided that the period within which the funds might be utilized would be until March 31. The committee proposed to amend the resolution by substituting the date of February 28. By reason of the fact that some of the key personnel of the committee have not been present, we have not been able to organize the preparedness investigations. The resolution does not involve any increased funds. It would really be in the interest of economy to extend the authority for 2 months rather than for 1 month. In view of the circumstances which obtain, I hope the Senate will reject the amendment and extend the authority to use the funds for 2 months.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I was the one who made the motion in the Committee on Rules and Administration to shorten the time, on the assumption that 30 days would be ample. I did not realize that some members of the Committee on Armed Services were necessarily absent. Furthermore, I have great confidence in the committee, and I know it never has expended the amount of money which has been appropriated to it. Last year, for example, it was allowed $150,000, and it has an unexpended balance of $63,647. So the committee is not a wasteful committee.

For that reason, Mr. President, I have no objection to the rejection of the amendment, and the adoption of the resolution as originally submitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 28) was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should not like the record to be closed without expressing my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] for his kind comments. The Committee on Armed Services has recently been under the jurisdiction of a New England Yankee. New England Yankees are very prudent people, and I hope that in the years which lie ahead the committee as now organized may be equally saving in its operations.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN PROBLEMS RELATING TO INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 13, Calendar No. 16.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 13) to investigate certain prob-

lems relating to interstate and foreign commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 13) which was read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of any and all matters within its jurisdiction as set forth in section (1) (j) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and especially all matters pertaining to—

(1) maritime matters generally, including a continuation of the study of the maritime subsidy program;

(2) communication by telephone, telegraph, radio, and television;

(3) domestic surface transportation;

(4) civil aeronautics; and

(5) fisheries and wildlife, including research, restoration, refuges, and conservation.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized, from February 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $200,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the resolution?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce requested that certain funds for a continuing study be provided. The study has been going on in the committee during the past session of the Congress. We submitted a very rigid budget covering the many aspects of the jurisdiction of the committee. As the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] pointed out with reference to the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, because of conditions beyond its control, did not spend all the money appropriated for it last year. It turned back a considerable sum.

The committee has many important problems, including a continuing study of the American merchant marine and fisheries. I see my good friend from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], who has done yeoman work on surface transportation, is present. The committee also has a railroad and trucking problem, a radio problem, and other problems. The committee has jurisdiction over many of these problems covering the entire Nation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much money was appropriated last year?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Last year $115,000 was appropriated. I think that figure is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, of that amount the committee is returning to the Treasury, according to the record which I have before me, $60,564.42.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why is it necessary to authorize $200,000?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Because the studies were started late in the session, and they must continue. The committee did not have the opportunity to prepare and submit final reports. Some of the members of the staff are still busy on these matters which cover the whole field of transportation. We felt we could complete the job by asking for the additional amount of money. We could have spent the amount allowed, but we felt the timing was such that we could not complete these very important studies and investigations.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do I correctly understand that the staff which was hired in order to perform these duties to which the Senator has referred is no longer on the payroll?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I sent notices to the members of the staff that as of January 31 they were all to be dismissed; but we shall have to rehire some in order to proceed with these studies.

Mr. ELLENDER. What becomes of the work which had been previously done by the staff members who have been discharged?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is all there.

Mr. ELLENDER. In what form?

Mr. MAGNUSON. There are available many hearings; there are supplemental reports to be considered; there are documents and files, and all the things that are included in an inquiry which is not yet completed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the Senator presented to the Committee on Rules and Administration facts or evidence to show that additional funds will be needed?

Mr. MAGNUSON. We have information which I should like to put into the RECORD. As I have said, the committee submitted a very rigid budget.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would it not be possible for the committee to do this work for $50,000 less? Why not try to save a little money?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I assure the Senator from Louisiana that if we do not need this amount of money, we shall do what we have always done in the past—turn it back into the Treasury.

Mr. ELLENDER. I would rather see the Senator come before the Senate and request more money, than to take that chance.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The amount of money requested is comparatively small compared with the problems which are before the committee for solution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the chairmanship of the late Senator Tobey some years ago the committee started out with an appropriation of $50,000. Then the amount was increased to $75,000, and, later, to $115,000. Now almost twice that amount is being requested.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to assure the Senator from Louisiana that I think when my late friend from New Hampshire was its chairman the committee did not have the great burden of matters which are now confronting it.

I have appointed a number of major subcommittees. I am sure the Senator from Louisiana will appreciate the fact that their work is very important. It involves the whole problem of surface transportation, the question of railroad mergers, and the question of the conflict of freight rates involving truck and bus lines.

In the field of the merchant marine, an almost continuous study has been in progress, which has saved the Government more than 100 times the small amount asked for in the resolution.

The distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation. I think he will bear out my statement that the problems in the aviation field are multiplying rather than diminishing.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the distinguished Senator from Washington knows, each standing committee is provided with $90,000 with which to carry on its work. The committee is permitted to have four experts. An additional $200,000 would give the Senator's committee almost $300,000 with which to operate. I do not see why the work cannot be done with much less money than the amount which is asked.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator from Louisiana will bear with me, I assure him that we shall do the work just as economically as possible. Last year the committee turned back the amount which was not used, and we shall be glad to do so again this year. We are not trying to promote the creation of staffs. The money is not really being sought for investigations; it is needed for the continuation of studies of matters which are so important to the entire United States, including the State of Louisiana, that I think it would be very desirable for the committee to complete the work.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that on line 16 the figure "$200,000" be stricken, and that "$150,000" be inserted in lieu thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 16, it is proposed to strike out "$200,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$150,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I notice on page 6 of the report language indicating that the committee intends to investigate the electric-utility field. Is it the intention of the Senator from Washington to have the committee investigate, for example, the Dixon-Yates contract?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Under the jurisdiction of the committee is the Federal Power Commission. The entire field of power, in which the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota did such marvelous work in the last session, is to be explored. I believe the Senator from

North Dakota understands my interest in respect to such matters and my views with reference to how far the committee should go in its investigations.

I plan to offer a resolution relating to the Dixon-Yates contract after the Senate has disposed of the pending resolution.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator plan to have his committee make an investigation of the proposed Hells Canyon project?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. And also of electric light and power rates in New Hampshire, Vermont, and the other New England States?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Another thing which I wish to point out to the Senate, particularly to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], is that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has under its jurisdiction, first, the Federal Power Commission; second, the Federal Communications Commission; third, the Interstate Commerce Commission; fourth, the Federal Maritime Board; fifth, the Federal Trade Commission; and also the Coast Guard, the Weather Bureau, and similar agencies.

The basic legislation relating to these commissions established them as arms of Congress and not as independent executive agencies. Therefore, it is felt that Congress should keep in close touch with what the commissions are doing because, in effect, they are really working for Congress.

If there is one important thing which can be done with this amount of money it is to reimpress upon these agencies that they were established as arms of Congress and not as independent executive agencies.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In view of the fact that an amendment has been offered which may be of some importance to all the Members of the Senate, I wonder if the Senator from Washington, without losing his right to the floor, will yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was hopeful that we might have a vote without having a quorum call.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Since an amendment has been offered, I think it would be preferable to have a quorum call, so that Members may be advised of the action which is proposed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to complete my statement, which I expect will take only about a minute, and then I shall yield the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I refer to page 6 of the report, in which there is reference to electric-utility industries. Is it the intent of the Senator from Washington to go into the monopoly situation?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is the intention to make studies and to enter upon investigations, or inquiries, only of matters over which the Federal Power Commission has control, and perhaps into some specific situations, such as certain power dams in the West. However, I wish to make it clear that in the study now being conducted and continued regarding radio, television, and the Dixon-Yates contract, if any evidence of monopoly in those fields should be developed, it is my intention to send such evidence to the Committee on the Judiciary, which I think has jurisdiction over monopoly questions. However, the committee had jurisdiction over the original Holding Company Act, and the Federal Power Commission, as an arm of Congress, comes particularly under the committee. On the question of monopoly, if evidence of monopolistic practices should be developed during the inquiry, I would surely wish to send that evidence to the Committee on the Judiciary. As the Senator may know, I have for a long time been a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and I appreciate that subject would technically come under the purview of that committee.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the committee intend to investigate TVA?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No, in no respect. I may say to the Senator from North Dakota that I should like to have the question of the TVA looked into. I might do that in another capacity, as chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations; but that subject has nothing to do with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I hope the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana will not be agreed to, because I know the importance of the field which the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will investigate. It is of vital interest to our people. The facts involved are complex and difficult to develop. It will take much hard work to get the evidence. I wish to have it made clear by the Senator from Washington that, insofar as the questions of monopoly, concentration of economic influence, and antitrust activities are concerned, matters of which the Judiciary Committee has always had jurisdiction, it is not the intention of the Senator from Washington to have any conflict with the Committee on the Judiciary on those matters. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. There will be no conflict whatsoever. It may be that in the course of the hearings matters relating to antitrust activities will be brought out in the testimony. So far as any corrective legislation in that regard is concerned, the Senator from Washington will give his wholehearted support to the consideration of those matters being handled by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I call to the attention of the Senator from Washington the language appearing on page 6 of the report, which reads:

> There have been complaints of the practices and activities of commercial companies engaged in the production, distribution, and sale of electrical energy, and particularly that they have engaged in large-scale endeavors to influence the election of State and Federal officials, and that they have attempted to oppose and discredit municipal, State, Federal, and cooperative production and distribution of electrical power.

Those are monopoly and antitrust questions which a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary has already been investigating, and on which a report has now been filed. Is that not correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. At one time the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee directed the Federal Power Commission to make an investigation. The Senator from Tennessee was one of the cosponsors, with me, of a request for such an inquiry. The investigation had to do with the Pacific Northwest area. I assure the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from North Dakota that there will be no conflict between the Judiciary Committee and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee over matters which technically belong to the Judiciary Committee, because, having served on both committees for a long time, I think I understand the problems involved.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield for a further question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I forgot to ask the Senator about the power development on the Niagara River, in New York State. Does the Senator from Washington intend to investigate that matter?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I know nothing about that except what I have read.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] was interested in that question some months ago, and I think that considerable work has been done by the committee on that matter.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As a matter of fact, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has so much work to do on other matters besides those embraced in the justification for the pending resolution, that I hope it will not shock the Senator from Louisiana if I come back later for further funds and justify the request.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Louisiana does not object if a Senator can justify requests. That is what I am trying to have done. The reason I asked that the appropriation be cut to $150,000

is that a large sum of money was requested and provided last year, much of which was not used.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; but that request was justified when it was made.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understood there was work done in the crime and racketeering field. What does the Senator expect to do in that field?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know what the committee may want to do, but all the files of the Kefauver subcommittee, all the jurisdiction, and all the bills suggested by the special subcommittee were turned over to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. There are boxes of files in its possession.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I may say in that connection that at the time the special subcommittee was dissolved by resolution, it was provided that all the rights, jurisdiction, and powers of the special subcommittee should go to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. There is a big field involved in that matter. I think it is very important, from the public viewpoint, that at least some consideration be given to the new techniques of racketeering and other unlawful activities. A number of bills still are pending, and a number of recommendations by the Department of Justice have been made.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to say that, as a matter of fact, I am today introducing a departmental bill on a phase of the Senator's investigation; it deals with the question of bookmaking. Our committee has jurisdiction over that matter. I do not know how deeply the committee will go into it; but if the committee goes into it to the same extent that the Senator from Tennessee did so vigorously in his approach to the problem, probably the committee will have to request additional funds from the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Right now we are dealing with problems relating to communications, the merchant marine, surface transportation, and fisheries. Those problems are very important to the entire country. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] has done yeoman work, as I have said, in connection with surface transportation. So far as the other matters are concerned, the committee will have to decide what it wishes to do about them.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is why I question the necessity of providing funds for investigations as to auto bootlegging and crime racketeeing. Do they not come within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Not in the case of investigation of auto bootlegging. A resolution dealing with an investigation of auto bootlegging has been before our committee since the last session. The matter was not resolved. Some members of the committee would like to pursue it, and I believe that the public as a whole would like to have the matter pursued, because of its importance to the purchasers of automobiles. That problem comes within the jurisdiction of our committee.

However, the matter dealt with by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] was referred to our committee by Senate resolution.

I wish to assure the Senator from Louisiana that I do not wish to be a policeman.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Washington, apparently, is headed in that direction.

I notice in the report, on page 5:

> More recently, Senator KEFAUVER and others have suggested that we look into complaints of racketeering in amateur and professional sports.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why should they be studied?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely point out to the Senate that the Senator from Tennessee made the suggestion. What the committee will do about it, I do not know.

Mr. ELLENDER. In making up the committee's budget, I assume that allowance was made for an investigation by the committee of automobile bootlegging and crime racketeering. Those subjects, in my judgment, should be handled by the Judiciary Committee, not the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But automobile bootlegging is a matter relating to commerce.

Mr. ELLENDER. It relates primarily, however, to crime.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, no; the word "bootlegging" is used advisedly in this case. The problem relates to contracts between automobile manufacturers and their dealers.

Mr. ELLENDER. But that matter deals with a crime.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; it relates to trade practices. Insofar as crime is dealt with in that case, let me say that matter was referred to our committee by means of a Senate resolution for which the Senator from Louisana probably voted.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the distinguished Senator from Washington also inquire into the rates charged by steamship companies for transportation to Alaska? I understand the companies engaged in that traffic have charged very high rates. Does the Senator from Washington or does his committee intend to study that problem?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, yes. That problem is almost perennial. Of course, we shall have to look into that matter. Passenger service by steamer to Alaska is virtually suspended now, and at this time there is no way to get to Alaska except by airplane. So of course we wish to look into those matters.

If the Senator from Louisiana will examine the committee's proposed budget, he will see that the amount we have suggested includes allocations as to these particular matters, which it has been suggested that the committee study. What the committee will do with them, I do not know. But the jurisdiction of the committee is rather broad.

If the Senate desires to take away some of the committee's jurisdiction, I am sure that some of the hard-working members of the committee would not be too perturbed about it. Nevertheless, these problems come before us.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wonder what the work of the full-time professional staff employed by the committee is. Do they not study these problems? Is it not contemplated by the Reoganization Act that they will study them? Is that not the reason why the employment of such professionals was provided for?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; and they work all the time.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In view of the decision of the Supreme Court that professional boxing comes within the antitrust laws, and in view of the demand of the people of the United States, particularly those interested in sports, to have steps taken so as to see to it that boxing is kept clean and that racketeering and frame-ups do not exist in connection with boxing, it seems to me that it is of great importance to have some congressional committee look into the many allegations which have been made in regard to the "fixing" of fights and the entrance of improper influences into professional sports, as well as amateur sports. When such complaints have come to me, I have sent them to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And properly so.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Because I thought they were matters in which that committee primarily would be interested.

On the other hand, insofar as violation of statutes involved in sports racketeering is concerned, I believe that problem might come before the Judiciary Committee. I am sure there will be no difficulty in regard to jurisdiction.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course not.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, section 1 of the resolution reported last year by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], as chairman of the Judiciary Committee. It sets forth the jurisdiction given at that time to the Committee on the Judiciary in connection with antitrust and monopoly matters. I also ask that an excerpt from the report on the resolution be printed in the RECORD. I make this request in order that all matters relating to the discussion may appear at one point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the excerpt from the resolution (S. Res. 14, 83d Cong., 1st sess.) and the excerpts from the report (No. 37) were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a complete and comprehensive study and investigation of the antitrust laws of the

United States and their administration, interpretation, operation, enforcement, and effect and to determine the nature and extent of any legislation which may be necessary or desirable to—

(a) clarify existing statutory enactments, and eliminate any conflicts which may exist among the several statutes comprising such laws;

(b) rectify any misapplications and misinterpretations of such laws which may have developed in the administration thereof;

(c) supplement such statutes to provide any additional substantive, procedural or organizational legislations which may be needed for the attainment of the fundamental objects of such statues; and

(d) improve the administration and enforcement of such statutes.

STATEMENT

The Committee on the Judiciary under the Legislative Reorganization Act has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the "protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies."

This resolution, as amended, proposes that a complete and comprehensive investigation be made of the Federal antitrust laws. It should be noted that the basic law, the Sherman Act, is now 63 years old, the Clayton Act is almost 40 years old, and the Robinson-Patman Act is 17 years old. During this 60-year period, no attempt has yet been made by the Congress to survey the entire field of antitrust laws with a view toward a comprehensive revision and coordination of these basic laws. During past years controversy has arisen as to whether these basic policies may have become outdated. Because of the many differences of opinion about the objectives of these antitrust statutes, suggestions have been made in many sources that now is the time for a study of our antitrust policy.

Criticism has been raised regarding the procedures and remedies of the antitrust laws. The overlapping of jurisdiction of Federal antitrust agencies, highlighted especially by the overlap in jurisdiction of the Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission, has generated demands for congressional action to centralize antitrust administration and enforcement in one source of authority, or at least to cordinate through a central agency the concurrent jurisdiction of the several Federal agencies. Questions have been raised as to whether the legislative policies embodied in these laws are intrinsically sound in approach, and whether the separate provisions of these statutes and their relationship to one another are sufficiently consistent and coordinated to effectuate a united Federal policy of maintaining competition.

Because of the tremendous technological progress of the past 60 years in American industry, it is necessary that a thorough review be made of the entire antitrust field in order to achieve such realinement of the antitrust laws as may be shown necessary by such review.

If the committee is to discharge its responsibility as imposed by the Legislative Reorganization Act, it is the view of the committee that the resolution, as amended, be approved by the Senate, in order to provide the necessary funds for the proposed study and investigation of the antitrust laws, as outlined in Senate Resolution 14.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I believe it should be clear that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is primarily concerned with what are termed regulated industries, not the question of monopoly when considered as a violation of the antitrust laws. There are various regulated industries, such as the telephone companies, the power companies, the transportation companies, the railroads, and the bus lines. So the committee is primarily concerned with questions relating to such regulated industries, and is not concerned with the broad question of monopoly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Washington a question apropos the point raised by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]: What was the total amount allowed to the committee last year?

Mr. MAGNUSON. One hundred and fifteen thousand dollars for the last session.

Mr. KNOWLAND. How much was turned back by the committee?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Approximately $50,000.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Fifty thousand dollars over and above the $115,000?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have given the figures to the Senator from Louisiana. For the entire 83d Congress, $230,000, approximately, was given to the committee, for the purpose of making these studies; and there was turned back, unspent, a total of $80,000, for both sessions of the 83d Congress.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Then, actually, insofar as the spending experience of the committee is concerned, the $150,000 suggested by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] would give the committee, in the 84th Congress, approximately the same sum of money it had in the 83d Congress. Is that not correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; but I am trying to point out to the Senator from Louisiana—and let me also say to the Senator from California—that many of these studies, which should have been continued, were stopped during the last session; and all this money would have been spent if those studies had run their normal course. So this is the money the committee needed. Of course, Senator Tobey, of New Hampshire, died. As a result, one investigation, in particular—that relating to activities along the New Jersey waterfront—was stopped. The study of surface transportation, which involves the entire railroad industry, did not continue because we decided we would wait until this session; we thought the matter so important, and regarded it as involving so many complex problems, that we decided to wait until this session. However, a great deal of the preliminary work was done by us during the last session.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me say to the Senator from Washington that I wish to see the committee of which the Senator from Washington is chairman, and the other committees of the Senate, have ample funds with which to carry out their legislative responsibilities and also the investigative responsibilities they have under the Reorganization Act.

On the other hand, I think there is considerable merit in the position taken by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], namely, that if, in fact, the amendment he submitted will allow the committee what it had during the 83d Congress, that should suffice.

Of course, I am sure that if it should not suffice, the Senate would be found to be reasonably receptive and in an open frame of mind. If the committee ascertained that sum of money did not take care of the situation, and thus found it necessary to make a further request of the Senate and to have the Senate consider the committee's case, I believe the Senate would be entirely reasonable.

As a matter of general practice, I do not like to see funds appropriated over and above what reasonably might be expected to be expended, and considerably over and above what actually was used during the prior Congress. I wonder if the distinguished Senator would not be agreeable to acceptance of the amendment, which would give the committee the amount which it had in the 83d Congress. Then if the committee and its staff are able to conduct the proposed investigations, and find that they will need $10,000, $15,000, or some other amount in addition to complete their work, they would have an opportunity to come to the Senate and make their presentation at that time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am trying to point out to the Senator from California and the Senator from Louisiana that this estimate was carefully calculated. We hope that it was calculated very conservatively and wisely. The fact that we spent a certain amount last year does not necessarily mean that we shall require more or less this year. We are trying to calculate and project the expenditures on what we think is a reasonable basis. The record of the committee shows that if the money is not spent, it is returned to the Treasury.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. This committee does have a good record for turning money back. Two years ago it turned back $30,000, and last year, $50,000.

I listened to the presentation made by the other members of the Committee on Rules and Administration in considering the scope of the committee's authority and the work to be done. I think the Committee on Rules and Administration wisely approved the request for money, and I hope the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will ceive the full amount requested. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I point out to the Senate that the figure of $230,000 referred to by my friend from Washington was for the two sessions of the 83d Congress. The amount which is being asked today is $200,000 for the 1st session of the 84th Congress. As the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has stated, if the committee needs more money and can justify its request for additional funds, I am sure the Senate will grant it. All I am trying to do is to bring the appropriation into line with what was spent in the entire 83d Congress.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. In the last Congress the committee had a total of $230,000. As has been shown, in the first year the committee spent $85,000 and turned back $30,000. In the second year it turned back $50,000, which indicates to me that the committee is not a wastrel committee, and that it could be trusted to make this expenditure in a proper manner. I think it should be allowed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the reason a portion of the appropriation was turned back the first year was that the distinguished late Senator from New Hampshire, Senator Tobey, did not use the money for the studies we desired to continue. He was diverted to a waterfront study. All the other investigations were at a standstill. That does not mean that the money requested is not needed during the coming session.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, it is a rather strange situation to find that, because the committee conserved its money and was frugal, when it asks for a budget which it thinks necessary, the fact that it was frugal enough to return large sums of money to the Treasury is used as a basis for denying its request for the funds which it believes will be needed.

There is before the Aviation Subcommittee a complete study on the recodification of all our aviation laws. We were stymied on that program last year. We did not complete it.

We have before us the problem of rebuilding, with some Federal aid, all the commercial airports of the country in order to get ready for the jet transports. Yet the budget of the administration recommends only $11 million in Federal aid for all the airport work in the country.

If we want an obsolete and antiquated Federal program in connection with civilian airports let us chop down the committee funds so that it will not be able to make an adequate study, which, if properly made, would save 100 or 1,000 times the amount the committee has requested.

There is needed a study which has been demanded by almost every independent automobile dealer throughout the country, because of unstable conditions in the industry, because of phantom freight, and because of bootlegging practices which prevail. The automobile dealers are entitled to be heard. They are entitled to have an intelligent study made of the problem. What could be more important than a sound distribution policy which would protect small business in the vast automotive field? If we do not want these studies made, let us reduce the appropriations.

Members of the Senate know the burden of work on every Senator who serves on 2 or 3 subcommittees of a major committee such as the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Unless some of these studies are made, the committee will have to rely on the executive departments for information—departments which we are supposed to regulate, and with respect to which we are supposed to legislate. If Senators desire to compel the committee to rely on spoon-fed information handed to us by the departments, let them cut the appropriation and help to render the arm of the Senate impotent to do anything about it. I think the proposed amendment is an example of being penny-wise and pound-foolish.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I intend to vote against the amendment. I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that from my State hogs and cattle can be shipped all the way to New York at lower rates than those which prevail when such shipments are made through Montana and into the State of Washington, or to packing plants in California. Something is radically wrong when it costs more to ship livestock and grain west than to ship it east. The rates certainly ought to be the same. I hope a complete study will be made of that question, because the condition to which I have referred is hurting the development of the Northwest.

Mr. MONRONEY. It could mean hundreds of millions of dollars in savings to various areas if we could bring some rationalization out of the crazy-quilt pattern of freight rates.

We are continuing a study dealing with the proper transportation of seasonal agricultural commodities. Every farm organization in the United States has been knocking at the door of Congress and asking for help. We could not get any legislation through last year. We must resume hearings on that study.

Certainly, in view of the broad jurisdiction of the committee and the complex questions before the committee and its subcommittees, the cut of $50,000, on the ground that we did not use all that was given us last year, is not justified. That does not hold water as a reason for denying us enough money to get started on a program which the chairman and other members of the committee feel to be necessary in the fulfillment of our duty.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I wish to add my voice to those of Senators who oppose the proposed reduction. It will be my privilege this year to serve as chairman of the Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

As the able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has already pointed out, one of the great abuses of our entire transportation system thus far has been the evil of discriminatory freight rates. It has been the consensus of the committee that possibly we should look into that question to determine why it is, for example, that in the Southern or Western States the rate on a particular commodity may be 10 cents a mile, whereas the same commodity can be shipped for 1 cent a mile in other States. Such a study is needed throughout the country, to determine why we cannot have fair and equitable freight rates for everyone. Such a study, of course, would require a great deal of money.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has pointed out that trip leasing is something the farmers have been wanting for some time. There should be hearings on that question. There should be a committee investigation of the facts in the case. That, of course, would require some money. The conduct of proper hearings on that particular question would require a sizable staff.

The other day someone pointed out to me a newspaper article to the effect that the income of the Pennsylvania Railroad was down 50 percent as compared with the previous year. I do not mean to say that we hold any particular brief for the Pennsylvania Railroad; but, if the railroads are getting into such a situation that their income is dropping off by such proportions, it indicates that there is a sick industry, and that perhaps Congress ought to do something to equalize the benefits among various transportation media. The maritime industry and the aviation industry enjoy the benefits of certain subsidies which the railroads do not have. No doubt that is a subject which the committee ought to explore.

A few days ago I read a statement to the effect that the President had authorized the appointment of a transportation committee, to investigate and make a report on what should be done about the overall transportation problem. From a preview it would seem that the committee will recommend a basic change in the whole subsidy program, and a basic change in the law. The questions involved present a serious problem, and when the report comes from the committee, no doubt the Senate will have to consider it and go into it thoroughly.

Only a week ago the able and distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] made a wonderful speech in New York on the whole subject. It was referred to in Tom Stokes' column last evening. In his speech the Senator referred to the regulatory agencies which, in effect, through their personnel, were destroying small business in the United States. In fact, it may have come to the point where the agencies may be taking their orders directly from certain businesses, rather than recognizing the fact that they are creatures of Congress.

All of that is very important to the economy of the United States. We have an opportunity to save billions of dollars through investigations, and to strengthen the whole economy of the United States. It will mean much in dollars and cents to the whole country.

For the reasons I have stated, I join the other Senators in hoping that the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana will not be agreed to.

The committee has a fine record of returning money which it does not spend. I am confident that the chairman of our committee this year will continue to follow that precedent and return money which is not used by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

DELINQUENT TAXES

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, several weeks ago I became very much concerned over the rumor that the delinquent taxes in many of our collection districts were at an all-time high. In order to check the accuracy of this report I directed an inquiry to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and on December 28, 1954, I received a reply thereto. Both letters I now ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., November 15, 1954.

Mr. T. COLEMAN ANDREWS,
Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Department of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDREWS: It is being rumored that the outstanding delinquent taxes are at an all-time high.

In order to check this report will you please advise me the total number of delinquencies and the total dollar volume as of the most recent date. I would also appreciate receiving the same information regarding delinquent accounts as of January 1, 1953.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

UNITED STATES TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, December 28, 1954.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: We have been giving careful consideration to your letter of November 15, relating to the matter of delinquent taxes. Commissioner Andrews had hoped that he might be able to send an answer to you before leaving for a short vacation but found at the last minute that he was unable to do so.

As you know, we have been engaged in the installation of a new accounting system which will provide a great deal more information than we have previously had with respect to delinquent accounts. The installation of the system has resulted in the issuance of a great many warrants which were not being issued under the methods previously in effect. We expect to obtain much more complete information as to our delinquent-account position as of December 31, 1954, than we have previously been able to obtain, and we are hopeful that this information will permit us to improve our collection procedures so that we may reduce the number and the amount of delinquent accounts outstanding.

We feel sure that you would not wish us to furnish you with figures which are not strictly comparable and we believe that a comparison of outstanding warrants as of a current date with those at January 1, 1953, might convey a misleading impression. We recognize that the number and amount of outstanding warrants are currently at a very high level, but we believe that a substantial part of the recent increase is the result of the conditions indicated in the preceding paragraph. On the other hand, we find that the total amount of our outstanding open accounts (including the delinquent accounts) has been going down and at September 30, 1954, was approximately $500 million below the corresponding amount a year earlier. This information is not too conclusive, however, as the decrease in open accounts may be caused, in part, by changes in the payment schedule for corporation income taxes.

Please be assured that we are making every effort to obtain more complete information as to the nature of our accounts receivable and to provide more adequate methods of collecting delinquent accounts.

Very truly yours,

O. GORDON DELK,
Acting Commissioner.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I still do not have an answer to my question, apparently for the reason that such information has never been tabulated up to this time.

It is hard to understand why in previous years no effort was made to assemble such information at a central point; however, I am glad to note that a new accounting system is now being installed to correct this condition.

The Bureau admits that the number of outstanding warrants are currently at a very high level, but it gives as a possible explanation that it could be the result of a more accurate tabulation under the new accounting system.

Since the Department has given assurance that complete information on this question is being tabulated—as of December 31, 1954—and that within the near future a detailed report will be submitted to the Congress, I am not pressing them for an estimate of these delinquent accounts at this moment. However, I shall with interest await this report, which will show, first, the total amount of outstanding delinquencies of all types of Federal taxes in the United States; second, a breakdown of these delinquencies by type of tax, that is, income, corporation, excise, stamp, and so forth; third, a breakdown by districts.

This absence of any centralized control over delinquent taxes was criticized 3 years ago when a report was made on the third collection district in New York. In that district we found over 600 delinquent accounts in excess of $25,000 each, aggregating in that 1 district over $130 million.

A substantial number of those accounts were found to be so old that it was impossible to locate the present addresses of the taxpayers. Unquestionably failure to have served warrants or to have taken prompt action resulted in the loss of millions of dollars in that one office.

Even now as this overall inventory is being taken under the new accounting system we are advised that many instances are being found where delinquent notices have never been mailed to the taxpayers involved. One particular case was noted where a deputy collector had pigeonholed delinquent notices to a taxpayer for 5 consecutive years, and it was discovered only after the man died and then during an appraisal of his estate.

Such conditions could not have gone so long undetected had there been proper control over the accounts. The installation of the new accounting system by the Treasury Department, along with an accurate tabulation as to the existing conditions, should bring this long neglected problem under control.

Likewise, when this report is completed it should be carefully examined by both the Treasury Department and the appropriate committees of the Congress to see whether or not these lax conditions resulted from undue negligence, and if so, who the responsible officials were.

EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL CLERICAL ASSISTANT BY COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 25, Calendar No. 17.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 25) authorizing the employment of an additional clerical assistant by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment in line 2, after the word "from", to strike out "January 31" and insert "February 1", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized, from February 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, to employ one additional clerical assistant to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 25), as amended, was agreed to.

EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY CLERICAL ASSISTANTS BY COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 34, Calendar No. 18.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 34) authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to employ four additional temporary clerical assistants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 34).

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, is it the purpose of the resolution to authorize the employment of four persons who have been on the payroll during the past session of the Congress?

Mr. HILL. To continue in service four positions which existed during the first and second sessions of the last Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 34) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized, from February 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, to employ four additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS RELATING TO ECONOMIC STABILIZATION AND MOBILIZATION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 23, Calendar No. 22.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 23) to investigate problems relating to economic stabilization and mobilization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment on page 1, line 1, to strike out all after the word "*Resolved,*" and insert:

That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in accordance with its jurisdictions under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the resolution?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, instead of allowing the use of an unexpended balance and providing an additional sum, the committee has recommended a new appropriation and wiped out the old unexpended balance.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Was that done in the case of the resolution which the Senate adopted a moment ago, relating to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; but there is an explanation in the committee report on this resolution, and I think it would be proper to have the explanation printed in the RECORD. The report states as follows:

The amendment offered by the Committee on Rules and Administration, in the nature of a substitute, seeks to eliminate the practice formerly adhered to by many committees of using unobligated funds from past investigations for new or continuing studies. This has resulted in increased bookkeeping for the Disbursing Office and also has resulted in the hidden growth of many investigative funds.

In requiring each committee to ask for separate amounts at the beginning of each session, this committee can, by such procedure, give the Senate from year to year a factual presentation of how much its investigations will cost. In this way, also, each committee, coming in January to the Senate for additional sums to continue investigations already begun, will be impelled to report to the Committee on Rules and Administration, for the information of the Senate, how much of its old budget it was returning to the Senate, less any obligation accrued but not met.

Thus, each committee, desiring extra funds for studies and investigations, will be limited to a certain allotment for 1 year, and must stay within that allotment during that year unless it receives an additional sum by a supplemental resolution. This method also will give more importance and effect to the budgets now submitted by committees for proposed investigations.

Mr. ELLENDER. What will be the total amount appropriated if the resolution is agreed to?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arizona will yield, I think I can answer that question. The amount will be $100,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I shall be glad to discuss the resolution. The chairman asked me to explain it if there were any questions.

The regular appropriation has been $50,000, and the committee is now asking for $100,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. For what was the $50,000 used?

Mr. BUSH. For the ordinary expenses of the committee. The committee has never used it all. Some of it has been turned back to the Treasury.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the money used to employ extra help, or merely to carry on investigations?

Mr. BUSH. It has been employed for both purposes. The money has never all been used. The resolution requests an additional $50,000 to be used in connection with the proposed investigation of the stock exchanges and a study of the Securities Act of 1934, which the committee unanimously agreed to undertake.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I join with the Senator in support of this resolution.

Is it not true that last year our committee returned $17,000 out of the $50,000 appropriated? At our meeting this year we unanimously approved of a general outline of a program which would, we think, require the expenditure, with every dollar well spent, of the usual amount of $50,000 that goes to the committee. Is not that correct?

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator for his absolutely correct comments.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not also true that we were unanimously of the opinion that a study—not an investigation, but a study—of the operations of the stock exchange and the whole problem of the stock-exchange question should be undertaken, and that the action of the committee was taken with the support of the president of the stock exchange, who came to Washington and stated to the chairman of the committee that he would be very happy to have such a study continue and that he would cooperate fully? We were unanimously of the opinion that it would be very settling and helpful to our whole economic system and to the peace of mind of the American people to have such a study made, rather than to let their fears be fed, as they are now being fed by some propagandists operating on the stock exchanges?

Mr. BUSH. Again I thank the Senator from Oregon. I think he has very correctly stated the sentiments of the committee in connection with the investigation.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not also true that the committee was unanimously of the opinion that $50,000 would be an exceedingly economical, reasonable amount of money for such a study, and that if it were not needed, or if the committee did not use the money, based upon past proof which the committee has presented, we would not attempt to spend it uselessly, but would let it revert to the contingent fund?

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from Oregon is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I sincerely hope the resolution will be agreed to.

Mr. BUSH. I, too, hope that the resolution will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 23), as amended, was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR STUDY BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 23, Senate Resolution 36.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 36) extending the time for a study by the Committee on Foreign Relations on technical assistance and related programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, on

page 1, line 1, to strike out all after the word *"Resolved"*, and insert:

That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, insofar as they relate to—

(A) studies of technical assistance and other related foreign programs (in connection with S. Res. 214, 83d Cong., 2d sess., agreed to July 6, 1954); and

(B) studies of proposals to amend or otherwise modifying existing international peace and security organizations, including the United Nations (in connection with S. Res. 126, 83d Cong., 1st sess., agreed to July 28, 1953, and S. Res. 193, 83d Cong., 2d sess., agreed to Jan. 26, 1954),

the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $52,000, and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate in amounts of no more than $24,000 for the purposes defined in subsection (A) nor more than $28,000 for the purposes defined in subsection (B) upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, what is the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. HAYDEN. The resolution as originally submitted simply authorized a study of the subject matter, and made the unexpended balance available, without asking for any new money. The amendment provides that the study shall be made, the money for it is actually appropriated, and the unexpended balance is wiped out.

Mr. ELLENDER. What was the amount of the unexpended balance?

Mr. HAYDEN. Fifty-two thousand dollars.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was the amount of the unexpended funds from last year, was it?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is exactly the sum, and what is now sought is a new, clean appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 36), as amended, was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR STUDY OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS BY COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 24, Senate Resolution 37.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 37) providing additional funds for the study of strategic and critical materials by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the resolution which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment on page 1, line 1, to strike out all after the word "Resolved", and insert:

That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to proposed and continuing studies of strategic and critical materials, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $70,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the subcommittee has been studying this problem for some time. I am wondering if we might have a report on the progress it has made. What has the subcommittee been doing?

Mr. MURRAY. The committee has been carrying on very extensive investigations, and a partial report has been made. But the committee intends to go forward with other investigations connected with the same matter, namely, all investigation of stockpiling and the need for stockpiles in connection with the national defense.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why is that necessary? Why should the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be concerned with such a study?

Mr. MURRAY. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has jurisdiction of mines and mining, and therefore has jurisdiction of this subject, which has previously been acted upon by the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the committee jurisdiction over stockpiling?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thought the committee had jurisdiction over mining.

Mr. MURRAY. The committee has jurisdiction of the stockpiling of strategic minerals, metals, and similar materials.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the study connected with mining in the United States only?

Mr. MURRAY. It relates also to mining in foreign countries.

Mr. ELLENDER. In foreign countries?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes. It is engaged in locating sources of supplies of scarce strategic metals and minerals which might be needed for the national defense. The committee has conducted hearings in South America. The Government itself is already carrying on studies in other countries of the world.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is any portion of this study being made by specialists now with the committee, for whom provision is made in the regular appropriation bill?

Mr. MURRAY. I do not understand the Senator's question.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are any of the studies being made by the four professional staff members whom the committee is permitted to employ under the Reorganization Act?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes. Some of the investigations have been in progress for a considerable time. They are very important.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much money is being requested? The resolution does not seem to state the amount.

Mr. MURRAY. Seventy thousand dollars.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much money was spent last year?

Mr. MURRAY. The committee returned a certain amount.

Mr. BARRETT. I believe it was $30,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the committee asking for as much money as was granted last year, or is it requesting more?

Mr. MURRAY. For about the same amount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 37), as amended, was agreed to.

EMPLOYMENT OF TEMPORARY ADDITIONAL ASSISTANTS BY COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 25, Senate Resolution 39.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 39) authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to employ temporary additional assistants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Adminis-

tration with an amendment, on page 1, line 1, to strike out all after the word "*Resolved,*" and insert:

That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdictions under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of this committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $60,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the resolution provides for the employment of additional assistants?

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are these to be professional assistants?

Mr. MURRAY. The resolution provides for both professional and clerical assistants.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why are they necessary?

Mr. MURRAY. Because of the work which is required to be done. The task to be performed is very difficult and important, and without the necessary assistants it could not be accomplished very well.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has just been given $70,000 for some special work related to mining. Why is it necessary to employ additional professional help?

As I pointed out a while ago, under the Reorganization Act each standing committee is allowed $90,000 with which to operate the committee. With that amount, the committee usually employs 4 professional and 6 clerical employees.

The committee has just obtained $70,000 to conduct special studies. With that amount I presume professional assistants will be employed. Does the Senator propose in the resolution now under consideration to employ more professional assistants?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Because I have been appointed chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, and because in my previous service in the Senate I was chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I presume to make a remark or two in response to the question of the Senator from Louisiana.

When this committee was organized by reason of the Legislative Reorganization Act, it became a combination of five standing committees; namely, the Committee on Indian Affairs, the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, the Committee on Public Lands, the Committee on Mines and Mining, and the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

I have no hesitation in saying that the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs extends farther around the world than that of any other committee of the Senate, with the exception of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations, the latter committee providing money for all the activities of the Government.

It is utterly impossible for the members of the committee to give their personal attention to all the research work which must be done if the various tasks imposed on the committee are to be undertaken. I can say that without any hesitation, because I also am guilty, and have been in the past, of some failures along this line. With respect to Indian affairs, for example, they have been honored by neglect rather than by performance during the history of the Government.

If the Senators are to be able to perform their work, it is necessary that they have the assistance of qualified experts to carry on the essential research in order that the Senate may legislate intelligently.

We are now facing a condition in which it is necessary to continue to develop the water resources of the United States. This is not only a matter of dealing with irrigation and reclamation in the Far West, but also with the problem of the falling water table throughout the United States. It is not understood, Mr. President, but the fact is clear, that industry uses more water than it was dreamed, even 20 years ago, it would. Water is being used and consumed in industry to a very great extent. Such studies must be undertaken by men of the highest quality of efficiency.

While it is true that the subcommittee to which the Senator from Louisiana has referred, the Subcommittee on Strategic Minerals, has been awarded an appropriation of $70,000 for that particular study, there is additional work to be done upon minerals and natural resources of another type.

The junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] a few moments ago submitted a resolution calling upon the Committee on Appropriations to restore an appropriation for investigation and experimentation in the case of oil shale. That is merely one instance. Another instance I can give relates to coal. How many people realize that the deposits of coal in the United States are greater than those in any other country in the world? How many of us realize that unemployment in the coal-mining industry has been mounting, not only in the West, but in the East? I speak with knowledge about it, because the State of Wyoming has larger coal deposits than has any other State in the Union. As I have said, although the United States has larger deposits of coal than has any other country in the world, there is serious unemployment in the coal-mining industry.

It is necessary for us to have men who can cooperate with the experts in the Department of the Interior and report to us. The resolution which the junior Senator from Colorado has offered is an illustration in point. That resolution was required because the budget which was submitted by the President contained no appropriation to carry on the experimentation work in the oil-shale demonstration plant at Rifle, Colo. Yet that is of the greatest importance, because in the last world war, World War II, our oil resources abroad were cut off by German submarines. We had to depend upon a stimulation of oil production in the United States. The Congress has just passed a joint resolution dealing with the defense of Formosa, and the 7th Fleet may shortly be called into greater activity than we had hoped would be necessary. Those activities will be motivated by oil.

The studies I have referred to should be continued. The point I am making now is that there is reason to believe, as indicated by the resolution offered by the junior Senator from Colorado, that the action of an executive department—the Interior Department—is not what is desirable in the public interest.

I hope that the Senator from Louisiana will recognize that there is a great demand in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for the sort of expert assistance provided for, because the work of the committee is of such a character that it cannot all be done by the members of the committee individually.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to say, as the ranking Republican member of the committee, that I have been very much interested in the remarks of the chairman of the committee, and his request, namely, for increased funds for the employment of experts by the committee. Upon both the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], when he was chairman, and the present chairman, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], there have been heaped very burdensome problems, with which they ought not to be expected to contend without a sufficient number of qualified technical assistants, and such assistants are not now available to the committee.

It happens that the subcommittees will cover fields which, as pointed out by the Senator from Wyoming, were, prior to the Reorganization Act, covered by different committees, and the fields are separate and not related. An expert in public lands cannot be used as an expert in irrigation, reclamation, Indian affairs, or mineral matters. Separate experts have to be selected for such tasks. I think there is a great need for such experts in the committee.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to refer to a matter which was just mentioned by the Senator from Colorado. The committee has jurisdiction over such a great diversity of subjects that it is necessary for it to operate through five

standing subcommittees. The committee otherwise would not be able to accomplish the work before it. For instance, in the last session of the Congress the committee considered 511 different bills. On those measures, 264 days of hearings were held. Two hundred and fifty-eight bills were reported to the Senate, of which 171 were enacted into public law and 35 into private law. However, these statistics, impressive as they are, do not by any means give a complete picture of the workload of the committee. There is no question about the need for the funds.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not privileged to serve as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, but I wish to bring to the attention of the chairman, who has made a request for additional funds and authorization for the employment of additional assistants on a temporary basis, that for a long period of time there has been in the State which I am privileged in part to represent in the Senate, a desire for a full-scale study by the Interior Department of the peat resources of the State. The matter has been kicked around a long time by the Congress, I may say to the chairman of the committee, but we now have from certain administrative offices an expression of a desire for the Congress to take a good look at these valuable resources of peat. I hope—and I say this only as a suggestion and as a word of admonition, I might add—that the chairman of the committee and the appropriate subcommittee chairman, will look into the possibility of the development of peat and peat resources.

I know that the committee needs the manpower to do the job. This morning, in a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations of which I am the acting chairman, we were discussing the General Services Administration and its stockpiling program. For a considerable time it was the duty of the Committee on Government Operations to audit and investigate the stockpiling program. That duty has been taken over by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It places on that committee, and upon its chairman, the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the additional burden of a full review of the stockpiling program. The committees have to be properly staffed, and the sooner that is done, the better we will be able to do our work.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator from Minnesota is entirely correct, and he may be assured we shall pursue the study to which he has referred.

Mr. President, I submit the matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I merely wish to point out that if the resolution as proposed to be amended by the committee is adopted, the committee will be empowered to employ four additional members on its technical staff. Under the Reorganization Act, the committee now has the right to appoint four specialists. Under the budget presented to the Committee on Rules and Administration by the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs, the latter committee will employ four technical staff members; in other words, it will double the size of its present technical staff.

Although this change is proposed to be made on a temporary basis, my guess is that the increased staff, if authorized, will remain for an indefinite time in the future. Of course, similar action has been taken by too many other committees; and at every session of Congress we are confronted with resolutions calling for an extension of the same force or, in many cases, an addition to the existing staff.

For the past 9 years the committee has been doing very good work with the staff it now has. Therefore, I do not think it proper, in one swoop, so to speak, to double the size of the staff.

I was very hopeful that the resolution might go over, so that we could look further into the matter. If the resolution as proposed to be amended by the committee is adopted, then, Mr. President, believe me, every standing committee of the Senate will make similar requests.

As I have said, the committee has been doing good work with its present staff. Therefore, to double the size of its staff at this time would be improper, in my opinion, and would merely result in additional expense, whereas we should curtail the expenses of the Senate.

As I expect to point out when similar requests are made by the larger committees, vast sums of money, spent for hearings, are in many cases, spent uselessly. As I have often said, there are on Capitol Hill a large number of professional job hunters who somehow, when once successful in their quest, are very apt to have their jobs perpetuated.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Louisiana has gone far afield when he has spoken about job hunters. We are the ones who require the services of technical experts. The Senator from Louisiana cannot be very well informed about the great load of work the committee has to carry. If he were well informed about it, he would not talk so idly about the money being spent in this case. This is a very insignificant amount of money, when we consider the diverse matters and problems which must be considered by the committee.

As I have said, in the last session the committee had 511 bills before it. Already at this session the committee has before it the 68 bills I now have on my desk. Without the requested assistance, we might just as well close up the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not a fact that many of the bills before the committee concern the transfer of land titles and therefore are very insignificant?

Mr. MURRAY. Some of them do, but most of them are so important that we have to have expert advice.

Mr. ELLENDER. Such as what?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana thinks the committee could operate properly in the way he suggests, without proper expert assistance, he is badly mistaken. I now have on my desk printed copies of some of the hearings the committee is conducting. The committee has jurisdiction of some of the most important problems. As the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has pointed out, no other Senate committee has such far-reaching jurisdiction. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is outstanding in that respect.

So it seems to me that the amount requested is a very insignificant one; and the Senator from Louisiana cannot possibly be well informed regarding this matter, or else he would not talk about it so idly.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to remind my good friend the Senator from Montana that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] rose—I am sure the Senator from Montana was here at the time—and said that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is the Senate committee which has the most to do.

Furthermore, let me point out that I am chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and I, myself, do quite a bit of work on that committee. During the Congress in which I was chairman of the committee—namely, the 82d Congress—I believe my committee did a great deal of work and investigated many matters. I am proud to say that, as chairman of that committee during the 82d Congress, I was able to operate the committee on $39,050, instead of the $90,000 which was appropriated for that purpose.

I am hopeful that other committees will follow that example.

The Senate is spending entirely too much money for its operations. It strikes me that something should be done—and done soon—in order to curtail these expenditures. We cannot in good faith ask other branches of the Government to curtail expenses unless we ourselves are willing to take the lead in doing so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 39), as amended, was agreed to.

FELICITATIONS TO MICHIGAN STATE COLLEGE ON ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 61, extending felicitations to Michigan State College on the 100th anniversary of its founding. The concurrent resolution will be read.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 61) was read, as follows:

Whereas February 12, 1955, marks the 100th anniversary of the founding of Michigan State College, the first agricultural college in the United States and the model for the land-grant college system; and

Whereas Michigan State College and other land-grant colleges subsequently established

have improved the American standard of living, helped bring real economic prosperity to the American people, and played an important role in the evolution and development of the American way of life to its present position of world leadership: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby extends its greetings and felicitations to Michigan State College on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of its founding, and joins with the people of the United States in expressing its recognition and appreciation of the role which Michigan State College has played in the establishment of a democratic type of education under which the benefits of higher education and related services have been made available to Americans in every walk of life.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair invites the attention of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be immediately considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, as Senators will note, this is a concurrent resolution which has been adopted by the House. The distinguished junior Senator from Michigan, who is now occupying the chair, and I planned to submit a similar resolution in this body, conveying felicitations to Michigan State College, one of the great universities of our State, in its celebration on February 12.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

PROPOSED JOINT COMMITTEE ON CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and myself, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on Civil Defense, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) to provide for a Joint Committee on Civil Defense, was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 11

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on Civil Defense to be composed of seven Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In each instance not more than four members shall be members of the same political party.

SEC. 2. The joint committee shall make continuing studies of the activities of the Federal Civil Defense Administration and of problems relating to civil defense. The Federal Civil Defense Administration shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to its activities. All bills, resolutions, and other matters in the Senate or the House of Representatives relating primarily to the Federal Civil Defense Administration or to civil defense shall be referred to the joint committee. The members of the joint committee who are Members of the Senate shall from time to time report to the Senate, and the members of the joint committee who are Members of the House of Representatives shall from time to time report to the House, by bill or otherwise, their recommendations with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of their respective Houses which are (1) referred to the joint committee or (2) otherwise within the jurisdiction of the joint committee.

SEC. 3. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 4. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to (a) hold such hearings, (b) sit and act at such places and times, (c) require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, (d) administer such oaths, (e) take such testimony, (f) procure such printing and binding, and (g) make such expenditures, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 5. The joint committee is empowered to appoint such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government.

SEC. 6. The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let me discuss for a few moments the purpose of the concurrent resolution and what it proposes to do.

The concurrent resolution proposes that the joint committee be composed of 7 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 7 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In each instance, not more than four Members shall be members of the same political party.

Our Government has a responsibility to the people of the United States to provide means for their safety and welfare. That responsibility calls for us to prepare our Nation for every eventuality. Our policy as a people is to search for peace and avert war, but we must never allow ourselves in that search to ignore the planning and the preparation in the event of war and in the event of attack.

There is no more vital function being performed by our Government today than that of civil defense. Yet, I must say that very few subjects of such great importance receive as little attention by the Congress. This is nobody's fault, Mr. President. It is more the reflection of our organization. There is no committee of the Congress with the clear authority or with the staff and primary responsibility to help guide and lead the Congress on this problem.

I point out that civil-defense activities cut across Federal, State, and local jurisdictions. It seems to me that this is one of the most important intergovernmental relations problems we have. Strange as it may seem, in view of the tremendous outlay of funds for national defense and the constant concern which our military authorities express as to the possibility of aerial attacks upon our mainland, the Congress has not as yet taken any forward step in terms of cooperating with or coordinating its efforts with those of the executive branch of the Government on civil-defense programs and development.

We spend billions of dollars to build up our security forces, for research and development of weapons, and to provide our defense forces with mobility and resources, but proper defense means more than a resort to arms. It also means a well-planned program to minimize the effects of destruction in order to save lives and property.

I wish to make it clear, Mr. President, that in my judgment the present Civil Defense Administrator, Mr. Val Peterson, is doing a most commendable job. His seriousness, his energy, and his dedication to his responsibilities have been amply demonstrated to the American people. Working with him there are hundreds of people applying themselves unselfishly and devotedly to the task of civil defense. The agency, however, operates with inadequate appropriations and inadequate guidance from the Congress.

To date we have acted on the assumption that the primary responsibility for civil defense is in our State and local governments. This emphasis should be changed so that it becomes a joint responsibility with the National Government on the one hand and the States and their political divisions on the other. The National Government must be responsible for overall planning, for the development of civil-defense policy and technical guidance, for coordination and leadership of State activities, State facilities, of interstate cooperation, and the sharing of preparedness costs. On the other hand, State and local governments must be responsible for day-to-day planning operations, for the adaption of national policies to local problems, and for sharing of preparedness costs.

The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, on which I am privileged to serve as a member, is now giving serious consideration to the whole problem for civil defense and the reduction of urban vulnerability, particularly to aerial attack. I do not know what the Commission will recommend, but I do know once it makes its recommendations Congress should be prepared to study and act upon them seriously and

carefully. There is serious doubt in my mind that the Congress is so organized in its committee system so as to accomplish that objective at this time. I refer to the fact, for example, that in early 1953 Project East River, a broad study of civil defense conducted under the sponsorship of our Government, made more than 200 specific recommendations pertaining to civil defense. So far as I know, the Congress has still not acted on them or given them serious consideration.

Yet the problem remains serious and grows more serious every day as the Soviet Union strengthens itself with bigger and more terrible atomic and hydrogen weapons.

At the present time, more than 71 percent of our Nation's industrial capacity and 54 percent of the workers engaged in manufacturing are located in 50 metropolitan areas. These are areas which are probable targets for attack, and there are many other such areas considered vulnerable.

As a means of reducing the vulnerability of essential industry, a national industrial dispersion policy was promulgated in 1951. This policy directed that applications for tax amortization and for the expansion of defense plants as well as for the allocation of critical materials be reviewed so that new defense plants would be dispersed anywhere from 10 to 20 miles from the target areas. This calls for a cooperative effort by the Department of Defense in awarding contracts and by the Office of Defense Mobilization and the Department of Commerce in issuance of certificates of necessity, allowing an accelerated amortization.

This is a necessary policy. Yet, whatever investigating I have done indicates that the departments and agencies responsible for carrying out this policy have not adhered to it. As a result, our defense plant construction has continued with only the minimum regard to the reduction of vulnerability by dispersion.

There is a serious problem of population density. More than one-fourth of the people live in the 12 largest urban areas. Urban vulnerability to enemy attack is actually increasing at this very moment in spite of the rapid growth of suburban areas, and an attack upon our cities would create casualties of staggering proportions. This problem would, of course, be partially resolved with an effective program of industrial dispersion, but it cannot be ultimately resolved in that manner. We, therefore, face the need in time of crisis to disperse the great numbers of people who will continue to live in the central city areas of the metropolitan centers. Suggestions have been made calling for interspersal of parks and other recreational areas, and, of course, slum clearance is very useful, as well as the development of new suburban residential areas and the dispersal of public housing developments and apartment buildings. Here again is an area which has not yet been acted upon, though the policy is already on its way to formulation.

These are vital questions which are the business of all Americans for the survival of millions of American people depend on the solution to these questions. These are problems that concern the people's government—the National Government.

The civil defense problem does not arise out of domestic conditions over which the States have control, but as a direct outgrowth of international relations between the United States and other nations. Civil defense is an integral part of our national defense. It is largely interstate in character. Its nature, scope, and severity need national planning, leadership, and direction.

Furthermore, an effective civil defense effort requires financial resources which are beyond the capacities of State and local governments. Were any one State to fail to act, this would in turn do serious damage to other States and to the Nation as a whole.

These are all reasons why the American people have a right to expect leadership from their National Government. They have a right to expect from Congress concerted and careful attention to this problem. They know and we know that a strong civil defense program may cut casualties in half in case of an attack—Gordon Dean, Report on the Atom, 1953, page 129.

Let me bring to the attention of the Senate a statement of an eminent psychologist, Dwight W. Chapman, who said:

> The Federal Government has a unique role in providing authoritative information. Whether an individual will act wisely or foolishly during an attack will depend on what he knows. * * * If no proper precautions are made, the already certain casualties and physical damage will be compounded by foolish actions verging on panic.

An effective program means evacuation, and it means an early warning system. It means a dissemination of information so that we develop an informed public.

There is another whole series of problems connected with a possible atomic attack that has scarcely been touched by the Federal Government. The Washington Post and Times Herald reporting on an article by Dr. Hornell Hart, said a Soviet attack on the Nation's Capital would paralyze the Federal Government by obliterating Washington, D. C., as far south as Alexandria, as far north as Chevy Chase, and beyond the city limits to the east.

The Supreme Court, most of the Congress, the President and perhaps all of his successors, all destroyed. Who would carry on? Who would constitute the new Government? Who would be the new commander in chief? What would happen to the records of revenue collection or of Selective Service? Or picture the explosion of an atomic bomb over the financial heart of New York City. The stock exchange would be closed and with it the exchanges across the whole country. New York's banks, the greatest clearing houses of the Nation would be in ruins. What would happen to America's whole credit structure? How would the vast number of bankruptcies caused by the bomb be handled? If we can devise the solutions to some of these problems now, it will literally be money in the bank when and if the awful eventuality should ever arise.

Mr. President, our problem is not the printing of ration books ahead of time; that is no problem. Our problem is figuring out what would happen if our great, complex industrial society, with great areas of communication, transportation, and industrial production, were disrupted or laid low by atomic attack. The whole Nation depends upon our credit structure. No other nation is so integrated as is ours. All means of communication, whether it be by rail, highway, telephone, telegraph, radio, television, are vital to the efficient functioning of the American economic system. We have done little or nothing to plan ahead as to how we would protect ourselves and protect this lifeline of the vitality of our national well-being.

Prof. David F. Cavers, writing in the excellent periodical, the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, has proposed several measures which would help extricate us from the nightmare of business confusion that would follow an atomic attack. Professor Cavers writes:

> A plan of protection should start with the banking system. Provision should be made for a bank holiday (probably on a nationwide basis). Advantage should be taken of this to transfer accounts from bombed-out banks to untouched banks by prearranged plan. The microfilm account records that are now going daily to holes in the ground would have been sent to banks chosen for this purpose. * * * Arrangements could be made to initiate a system of emergency loans to be administered by the banks, using Government funds; * * * preservation of a functioning civilian economy would be the objective * * * prompt substitution of drastically revised bankruptcy laws for the cumbersome machinery we worry along with in peacetime * * * the system would have to be free to allocate cases without regard to State lines * * * (authorize) a court to rewrite (long-term) contract terms to conform equitably to the new conditions.

These are just a few of the many proposals made by Professor Cavers and others. The adoption of foresighted measures like these, or the examination of equivalent alternatives, is a step toward the elimination of atomic havoc which must not be forestalled by complacency or preuranium mentality. When the bombs fall, it will be too late for planning. That is my plea.

Mr. President, it is nothing short of shocking to see a nation which spends, on national defense, as this Nation does, as much as $40 billion or $50 billion a year, almost totally ignore the protection of the civilian economy.

I submit that no civil defense planning is being carried out in terms of our industrial expansion, in terms of new plants, and in terms of new highways and new rail systems. We are continuing to plan as if the world was still in the Victorian age.

Yet every day of our lives we hear about new atomic tests. As recently as last week we heard of new hydrogen tests in the Soviet Union. Every American from the age of 5 years on knows that the Soviet Union has bombers capable of carrying a destructive attack to

American cities. However, we close our eyes to the realities of protecting our cities. All we do is say that at least 80 percent of the planes would get through and that a maximum of 20 percent of the planes might be stopped. Then we say that we hope somehow or other we will survive. I say that is not the attitude for a responsible government to take.

Industrial and urban dispersion, evacuation rehearsals, provisions for emergency Government credit facilities, duplication of vital Government and business records, succession to office, emergency bankruptcy procedures—these are all matters which must be taken care of now. Of course, it is my prayerful hope that they will never be needed; but one can never be sure. In view of the tense international situation it would appear to me that we should be a little more concerned about our national defense and our civil defense than about our blood banks, even though I believe that blood banks are important.

Yet, Mr. President, I am sorry to say the initiative for such action seems to have been largely lacking in Congress—and I say this without partisanship. Preceding administrations did not do very much in this area, either. However, Mr. President, as we consider the full portent of a problem we have largely ignored, we recognize the fact that this is a condition we cannot allow to persist.

We, therefore, have proposed the creation of a special Joint Committee on Civil Defense. This committee would have the responsibility of drafting and introducing legislation to take care of America's civil-defense needs. Its activities would focus the public's attention on this vital problem and would bring to light the full information which is necessary for an intelligent public response. Moreover, such a committee would soon constitute itself the spokesman for America's civil-defense needs. Having become aware of the terrifying portent of the problem, no such committee would allow Congress to shunt aside the urgent requests for civil defense and offer appropriations which put such an insignificant price on the safety of the American public.

I fully realize that the suggestion for the creation of such a Joint Committee on Civil Defense is not one to be made lightly. There are already many demands being made on Congress' time. For a while I thought that possibly the establishment of a Special Commission on Civil Defense might suffice. I proposed such a commission some 3 years ago. Then I considered the manifest task of Congress is to provide for the present welfare of the Nation and to promote the future. But to what avail is our concern for the farmer's, the worker's, the businessman's prosperity if we do not exert every effort in insuring their security in the face of the greatest threat that has ever menaced our civilization?

This will cost money. Of course, it will, but I want to point out to the Senate the recent study sponsored by the National Planning Association, which demonstrates that the United States could appreciably add to its defense budget without sapping its economic strength—Gerhard Colm, Can We Afford Additional Programs for National Security? October 1953. Defense spending, rising gradually above current levels at a rate of $10 billion a year by 1956 would—given a normal growth of the economy—neither interfere with further economic expansion nor prevent a continuing rise of civilian consumption. It would, in fact, even permit tax reductions without any direct controls over spending. A larger increase by $20 billion per year would still permit per-capita consumption to rise moderately and net investments to increase, provided the labor force were somewhat expanded and the average work week somewhat lengthened—and this could be achieved by only continuing 1953 rates of taxation or their equivalent.

Mr. President, I make note of the fact in the RECORD that these observations were made by distinguished economists. They are not my personal observations, and I cite them to show the problem of defense and its cost.

It is in this spirit of urgency and deep concern that I have addressed myself to a topic which apparently has no political appeal and which is of little or no national interest. But I want to be on the record now, as a Member of the United States Senate, as saying that the Government has been derelict in its responsibility for the protection of the people. A defense structure has been planned which provides a defense in conventional military terms without any thinking having been done to provide an appropriate organization for the protection of the civilian population.

In an age of intercontinental bombers, guided missiles, and hydrogen bombs, I submit that Congress is, in effect, back in the horse-and-buggy days with respect to civil defense. We appropriate money for modern warfare, for thermonuclear weapons, for guided missiles, and for bacteriological warfare, but we persist in conducting our civil defense program as if we were in the age of William Tell, or were dealing with the oldest cannon of pre-Revolutionary days.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article appearing in the November 29, 1953, issue of the New Leader, entitled "Safety From Atomic Attack," by Richard Bolling and Lewis Anthony Dexter; also, an article, Is United States Civil Defense Adequate? from the Congressional Quarterly of June 18, 1954.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Leader of November 29, 1953]

SAFETY FROM ATOMIC ATTACK

(By Richard Bolling and Lewis Anthony Dexter)

American military defense policy may be thought of as a chair with two legs which reach the ground, a third which is viciously foreshortened, and a fourth which is a mere stub. This article deals with the fourth leg—safety against attack, ways and means of making it less effective for an enemy to attack with A-bombs and H-bombs. Since the significance of this fourth leg lies in its relationship to the other three, let us first identify them.

The first leg may be seen as representing hardware, the weapons of massive retaliation. Obviously, without such weapons we would be naked in a world of power politics; but, it should be emphasized, the very notion of retaliation presupposes that the enemy first attacks us.

The second leg stands for the military aspects of defense—radar screens, continental air defense and the rest, which may permit us to detect and knock out some attacking enemy bombers. However, the situation here seems to be still generally the same as when the late Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg, then Air Chief of Staff, wrote: "Should war come, we can be expected to destroy no more than 30 percent of the planes making an attack in strength on the United States before their bombing missions are accomplished." (Saturday Evening Post, February 19, 1951.) In other words, this system of continental defense presupposes an attack—and an attack which will be successful in damaging and perhaps ruining many of our big cities.

The third, foreshortened leg stands for immediate pre- and post-attack civilian defense. Civilian defense concentrates on mass evacuation before an attack, putting out fires, rebuilding telephone lines, rescuing the wounded, etc. All these things presuppose that the enemy successfully completes a most unpleasant attack—or at least threatens to do so. An effective program of civilian defense could mean the difference between a rapid resumption of military production and public services in many areas and a situation so catastrophic that we could not continue fighting. Consequently, one of our pressing needs at present is to rescue the Federal civil defense program from the no-man's land of buck passing to which an unrealistic notion of States' rights has condemned it.

But the fourth leg—safety from attack—still remains to be considered. A group of scientists and scholars over the last 8 years have pointed out that the basic reason why we must fear the atomic bomb is that we are all bunched up together like lambs in a slaughterhouse. The 67 critical target areas contain most of our productive resources—including defense factories and a lot of skilled people. We must, these scholars have pointed out, spread out, or in the event of a war we shall surely perish, individually and perhaps nationally.

For instance, an editorial in the September 1951 Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists said: "Dispersal is the only measure which could make an atomic super-Pearl Harbor impossible * * *. The most exhaustive preparations for (civilian defense), while they can promise a considerable reduction in the number of casualties, could do little to protect the production facilities of an attacked city—facilities whose incapacitation is likely to be the prime aim of the attack."

The reasons why this is so have been cogently, patiently, carefully, scientifically, and persuasively presented in a series of publications, the most notable of which is probably Project East River, part V (published by Associated Universities, New York, 1952). This report should have set off wide discussion, but, in fact, it has been almost completely ignored; as of July 1951 neither Harvard nor MIT even had library copies.

These arguments were cogent, careful, scientific, and persuasive to those who read them. But they were and are largely, though not entirely, ineffective; the national industrial-dispersion policy, announced by the President in the summer of 1951, has never been broadly implemented, and, by and large, since then, target cities have kept on growing faster than the rest of the country. For example, there is every reason to suppose that about 30 percent of all investment in plants in metropolitan areas during

the last 3 years has been in the central target areas. (The city manager of Cambridge, Mass., was quoted in July 1954 as urging that Cambridge, which is right in the heart of a high-priority area, start to build skyscrapers.)

It is only fair to say that the use of certificates of necessity sometimes has encouraged new construction outside rather than inside target areas. But what has been done has been only a drop in the bucket compared with what could be done.

To be sure, a number of communities, under some prodding from Federal authorities, have formed industrial-dispersion committees. The chairman of the New Haven committee said in the spring of 1954: "Industrial dispersion is not accepted as practical. Most people recognize the sense of it but don't want to face up to its implications." In San Diego, the assistant city manager says: "There have been no cases of [industrial dispersion] in the last 2 years." A member of the industrial-dispersion committee in a New England area says: "As a matter of fact, there is a conflict between the idea of industrial dispersion from a defense and security point of view and the attitudes of our local civil organizations with respect to holding industry within the city." Dudley Harmon of Boston says: "Our committee [on industrial dispersion] seems destined for complete inactivity."

Basically, the Federal Government has merely given undramatically presented advice on industrial dispersion and on some means of making cities less attractive targets. It has then chiefly left things up to the individual manufacturer, institution or worker. That is what Senator Norris used to call the "lazy fairy" notion of government run mad.

It is about as sensible as it would be for the Federal Government to proclaim that in order to defend ourselves we need battleships, tanks, airplanes, guns, uniforms, trained officers, etc., and then to leave it up to the manufacturers or the cities to produce them. If the Federal Government wants weapons or officers, it has to supply incentives for producing or training them; otherwise, since what is everybody's business is nobody's business, we would all be left defenseless. Similarly, if we want safety, we have to provide incentives for those who can secure it.

A coauthor of this article, Representative BOLLING, has introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives which is directed toward finding out how we can most effectively and inexpensively purchase safety by using space. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota, introduced a similar resolution in the Senate last July and, in his remarks explaining the meaning of the resolution, discussed the possible establishment of an urban decentralization authority. Like any proposal for a legislative investigation, the Bolling proposal is not altogether new and has numerous ancestors and antecedents. But it goes well beyond any previous proposal in that it assumes that it is and should be national policy to use all the economic powers of the Federal Government to encourage industrial dispersion wherever such use will increase the safety of the country.

How can and should this be done?

At present, nobody knows very clearly; and, consequently, the gist of the Bolling proposal is the establishment of a Joint Committee on the Economics of Atomic Defense, which would "conduct a special study of the ways in which existing and proposed Federal economic powers and programs can make their greatest contribution to defense against modern atomic attack."

The resolution declares that "it is the purpose of this resolution to bring before the Congress and the American people the best judgments of scientists, lay leaders and congressional experts on the effect of the H-bomb or its successors on existing concentrations of population and industry; the possibilities for defense measures within those areas; the degree to which industrial dispersion and urban decentralization can be expected to reduce the dangers of present-day atomic warfare; the length of time and the scale of action necessary to arrange for dispersion and relocation of population and industry now in target areas; and the ways in which the Federal Government in cooperation with State and local governments can, within our free-enterprise system, contribute to such dispersal or relocation policies through its monetary, credit and fiscal policies and through purchases and construction, aids to education, health and welfare, the regulation of transportation, and other programs or policies affecting the pattern of the Nation's economic development." Congress has, of course, adjourned since the Bolling and Humphrey resolutions were introduced, but they will be reintroduced next year.

We hope that investigation and analysis by such a committee will lead to the invention of better ways of making us safer from attack than anything we now propose. Indeed, one of the biggest arguments for such a committee is simply that it may focus attention and discussion on the question: How can we best preserve our lives and our civilization against atomic attack?

But, in any case, the first, obvious task of such an investigation would be to find out how and where the H-bomb and other developments of the last 3 years affect the conclusions of Project East River about how far we must spread out to be safe. This, in itself, is a question on which we must rely upon scientific judgment; but it seems probable that the area of great danger is considerably smaller than most people (or chambers of commerce) now fear. If so, this is of considerable importance; it means that industries can remain at their present locations.

However, whatever the facts are, they should be established, and the first function of the committee will be to summarize and interpret them so that the people can understand what decisions must be made.

Having done this, we are inclined to believe that the committee will decide to explore and make recommendations on the following points:

1. New building: The major target cities add new buildings each year which altogether is the equivalent of four Bostons. That is, we make the target cities more attractive to attack—and less safe to live in—by something like this amount.

Through mortgage insurance, housing loans, and taxes, the Federal Government can influence who builds what where. It could shut off new building almost entirely in obvious target areas by refusing to give the same tax and loan considerations to building there as elsewhere. If a firm knows that it can deduct all expenses from gross—from the top—if it builds in Brunswick, Md., for instance, but not if it builds in Baltimore, it is likely to build in Brunswick; if, at the same time, Federal loan and mortgage policy makes it less profitable to build new houses or new department stores in Baltimore than in Brunswick, new buildings of this sort will take place in Brunswick and not in Baltimore.

So stated, the problem seems simple. But it isn't. Only a few firms should be encouraged to build in Brunswick; otherwise, Brunswick itself would become a new target area. And under what circumstances does an addition to plant get counted as new building? Who shall make the decision on such knotty points as this: Radcliffe College builds a new center for graduate students: Is it new building? And what if a manufacturer puts a new wing on a plant? And in order to avoid fire storms, if for no other reason, slum clearance in target cities is still highly desirable, how can it be encouraged if new housing is not to be built in its place and the land is to be turned (as for safety it should be) into parks?

2. Vital products and services: Many basic national products and services are manufactured or developed entirely in target cities. In some cases, if the target cities were to be destroyed the goods and services could not be obtained elsewhere. Probably many essential parts of vital weapons are now produced exclusively in target cities; if several of these cities were knocked out, our capacity to retaliate would be much reduced or destroyed altogether. Conversely, then, our capacity to retaliate would be increased by some measure of dispersion.

At present, the purchasing agents for the Defense Department do not systematically take the contractor's safety from attack into account in placing contracts. Congress should make it unmistakably clear that they should do so. But, here again, the problem is complicated. Some order of priority needs to be set up. It matters relatively little if a contractor engaged in making uniform buttons is bombed out; some substitute can doubtless be found, and in all probability other button manufacturers in smaller cities can, at need, replace the defunct button king.

But, on the other hand, along the Charles River in Boston and Cambridge there is a terrifying concentration of scientific research, most of it defense oriented, all of it with defense implications. And it is right at the center of a target area. Yet, the Defense Department has kept on placing contracts with MIT, Harvard, and adjacent institutions; in most cases, new contracts have led to an even greater concentration of research talent in the field under study by bringing more specialists to Cambridge. But, in most instances, with some effort and perhaps at a slightly greater cost, it would have been possible to place the contracts at institutions like Cornell, the University of Missouri, the University of New Hampshire, or the University of the South, at Sewanee, Tenn.

3. Government operations: The Government itself is a prime offender in making life unsafe for everybody. The Federal Civilian Defense Administrator has often declared that he thinks Washington is the No. 1 target for any enemy. Yet only one Federal agency, the Federal Civilian Defense Administration itself, has actually arranged to move in order to meet the atomic threat.

The National Security Resources Board proposed plans, which were approved by President Truman, for dispersing essential governmental bodies into units so scattered that an A-bomb attack would use too much of the enemy's power to be worthwhile. This proposal, which seems the most obvious commonsense, has run up against a stone wall of indifference and hostility. Commonsense, similarly, would suggest dispersing Federal agencies out of metropolitan New York and San Francisco.

4. Inducements and compensations: A basic reason why the Federal Government has been unable to persuade itself to seek safety, so to speak, is the unwillingness of its employees to move. Indeed, at present writing it appears probable that a substantial number of Federal Civil Defense Administration employees will refuse to move to Battle Creek and will transfer or resign. They own houses, their children go to school in Washington, a wife or husband works in Washington and cannot find employment in Battle Creek, they like the metropolitan atmosphere of Washington, and so on.

All this proves, of course, that it is awfully hard to persuade a man who lives on a volcano to get off it—tomorrow never comes. So, no doubt, the elegant Romans of Britain in 390 A. D. would have disregarded any warning that they had better get out while the getting was good; 10 to 15 years later, most of them had been killed off or enslaved by the barbarian invaders.

Such historical parallels are unlikely to be convincing without the provision of concrete inducements. These the Federal Government can offer, if it will, to its employees in large measure. For instance, the Government could—and perhaps should—assume carrying charges on houses which are vacated and cannot be sold as a result of its requiring employees to move. In instances where employees suffer a loss because, for instance, a wife has to give up a job, a very substantial nontaxable cost of moving bonus should be provided; and, furthermore, the United States Employment Service or some similar agency should provide special aid and help in getting new jobs for displaced wives. The Government cannot exactly transfer Maryland schools to Battle Creek, but there should be legislation permitting it to give aid to Battle Creek schools as federally impacted areas immediately, before the move takes place.

The biggest obstacle to getting people to move out of cities is that they will miss some service that they are accustomed to. In some cases, for instances, there might be considerable movement to a town without obstetricians. In such cases, inducements should probably be provided for specialists to move into the area. A parallel has already been provided by loan programs for GIs entering business, and no doubt such legislation could be adapted to help those establishing new businesses or professional services in towns showing a population increase because of spreading out from the cities.

5. Transportation: This problem of services could also be tackled by improving our transportation arrangements between smaller towns. At present, roads, railroads and bus schedules spread out from the big city like spokes from the hub of a wheel. This means that people who want any sort of service—use of a big library, beauty treatment, medical care from a specialist, a chance to see the Pajama Game—have to go into the city. Consequently, the daytime population of cities is needlessly large, and anybody who lives outside the city is at a disadvantage. But if there were easy rapid transit between the smaller suburbs and outlying districts—that is, from spoke to spoke, rather than through the hub—the difficulties involved in getting people to move out would be reduced. In some instances, all the Government would need to do would be to provide subsidies to the bus companies for more frequent bus trips. In other cases, it would need to stimulate—financially—the building of roads or bridges, or the development of ferry services.

There are, no doubt, dozens of other ways in which people could be persuaded to seek safety by spreading out. Very likely many of these ways, if adopted, would be equally effective. The actual problems are: (1) What proposals would be adopted with the least resistance and resentment? (2) What proposals permit the most economical and effective administration? Discussion anywhere, but particularly before a congressional committee, will throw a good deal of light on what will be accepted most readily and some on the problems and difficulties of administration.

But public discussion of this sort can have even greater value. It might dispel the deadly lethargy of hopelessness about the possibility of effective defense against H-bomb attack. It might then reveal alternative methods of defense among which an informed choice could be made. And this could have consequences far beyond the military field.

[From the Congressional Quarterly of June 18, 1954]

IS UNITED STATES CIVIL DEFENSE ADEQUATE?—CONGRESS, SOON TO SET FCDA BUDGET, SURVEYS 4-YEAR PROGRESS OF COMBINED FEDERAL-STATE-LOCAL EFFORT TO PREPARE NATION AGAINST SNEAK ATOMIC ATTACK

Every American who watched the televised explosion of an atomic bomb last year or recently saw films of the detonation of a hydrogen bomb, dramatically was made aware of the urgent need for preparedness against enemy attack.

On the other hand, motorists who have traveled on civil defense highways dotted with signs warning that "this road will be closed" to all but military traffic in case of enemy attack, and all who have heard the warning sirens or scuttled for shelter during a test-attack drill, know of increasing preparation against a sudden and devastating attack.

President Eisenhower said April 30, "The task of civil defense is vital to our national life. It demands preparedness that can do more than limit the damage of wartime disaster. It means developing a preparedness, a vigilance, so impressive as to deter aggression itself. This awareness must touch every community, every citizen of our land."

PREPARATION COUNTS

The Federal Civil Defense Administration, set up in 1950, is dedicated to this principle that every ounce of preparation is worth a pound of security.

How great is the threat? In a recent report (H. Rept. 1340), the House Armed Services Committee said "it is believed that this country is in as much danger of enemy attack, if not more, than when Congress" first set up the FCDA. The unresolved Korean problem, fighting in Indochina, and Communist control in Guatemala have heightened United States—and world—tensions.

The possibility of an onslaught against the United States must be weighed in the light of these assumptions: The United States does not have a monopoly on atomic or hydrogen weapons; the Soviet Union, according to the FCDA, "is now capable of striking any target within the United States, probably with nuclear weapons delivered by air;" and that, as President Eisenhower said, "the awful arithmetic of the atomic bomb" allows no one to think that even the most powerful defense can "guarantee absolute safety for the cities and citizens of any nation."

BOOM. THEN DEATH, DESTRUCTION

The FCDA estimates that in an area eight-tenths of a square mile, hit directly and without warning by 1 of the smaller atomic bombs, 90 persons out of every 100 would die, no one would escape injury, and destruction would be almost complete.

FCDA has prepared a list of 193 potential atomic target areas, of which 70, with the greatest concentration of population and industry, are cited as critical target areas. These 70 critical targets, which include 92 key cities in 29 States, comprise less than 3 percent of the Nation's area but have a population of about 68 million, or almost half the national total.

Immediate civil-defense problems are how to give cities adequate advance warning of an enemy attack (present advance notice: About 20 minutes. This is expected to be lengthened to an hour's warning time by mid-1955), disperse the population from congested areas and provide adequate shelter.

Civil defense planning and activities to meet these problems are increasing. Numerous test drills, evacuations and "take shelter" exercises have been held, and the first Nation-wide test was conducted June 14–15. "Operation Alert" involved a mock atomic attack on 41 key United States cities. Canada joined in this test.

More than half the attack-warning systems planned have been completely installed.

By the end of 1953, at least 32 States had mutual-aid civil defense compacts, more than 4.5 million persons had been assigned to civil defense jobs (however, this was only about a third of the number required), and more than 4,000 key personnel had completed FCDA staff and instructor training courses. The FCDA stockpile of emergency supplies and equipment is growing, while the CONELRAD (public emergency radio broadcasting) system became operative May 15, 1953.

The FCDA describes its "primary preattack function" as "helping the States and local communities in making preparations to protect life and property in case of enemy attack or other civil defense emergency." The States and the Federal Government have spent millions in this effort, with State and local organizations carrying the primary operational responsibility.

FUNDS FOR CIVIL DEFENSE

In a budget that calls for cuts in fiscal 1955 funds for most Federal departments and agencies, President Eisenhower has asked Congress to grant for fiscal 1955 almost twice the amount appropriated for civil defense in fiscal 1954.

If the lawmakers grant the full $85,750,000 requested the fiscal 1955 appropriation will be the largest in any year since creation of the FCDA in 1950 and almost half the entire amount appropriated in the 4-year period. However, in the past Congress has sharply pared Presidential requests for civil defense funds. In 1954, after President Eisenhower sought $150 million and the House voted $37,700,000, Val Peterson, Civil Defense Administrator, told a Senate committee that the United States was "living in a fool's paradise" in its reluctance to spend for civil defense. In the end, Congress restored some of the funds, appropriating $46,525,000.

Congress appropriated $191,585,000 for civil defense in the fiscal years 1951 through 1954. Of that total, $29,835,000 was for FCDA operations, $58,250,000 for Federal grants to States, and $103,500,000 for emergency supplies and equipment. This table shows how appropriations have compared with Presidential requests:

Fiscal year	Civil defense appropriation	Presidential requests
1951	$26,750,000	$403,000,000
1952	75,310,000	535,000,000
1953	43,000,000	600,000,000
1954	46,525,000	150,000,000
1955	----------	85,750,000

Congress has not yet acted on the fiscal 1955 appropriation. However, the comparison indicates that in the past it never has considered the need as urgent as did the executive branch.

CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950

It was not until 5 years after the first atomic bombs fell on Nagasaki and Hiroshima that Congress in 1950 acted to set up civil defense plans against any such attack on the United States civilian population. With the end of World War II, the threat of attack had receded, but the outbreak of hostilities in Korea in 1950 gave new impetus to the drive in Congress for a civil-defense program.

As they began work on civil-defense legislation, the lawmakers were aware of the atomic bomb as the major threat. A dispute arose between the Joint Committee on

Atomic Energy and the Senate Armed Services Committee over which group should handle the pending civil-defense bills. The armed services unit won out with its argument that an atomic attack wasn't the only kind that could be made on the United States.

On December 20, 1950, the House passed its version of the Federal Civil Defense Act, on a 247-to-1 rollcall. The only opponent of the bill, Representative CLARE HOFFMAN, Republican, Michigan, charged it was open to "boondoggling." The Senate passed its legislation December 22, and in January of 1951 a compromise bill was agreed to. The measure became law January 12, 1951. (Congressional Quarterly Almanac, vol. VI, 1950, pp. 458–462.)

The bill established a permanent Federal Civil Defense Administration, with an Administrator empowered to:

Prepare and direct civil defense planning, provide for civil defense communications and a system of warnings of enemy attack, develop measures to protect persons and property from such attack, and conduct training programs for civil defense officials and instructors.

Encourage States to make interstate pacts for mutual aid in case of attack; make financial contributions on a matching basis to States for civil defense; utilize the services of other Federal agencies, and, with their consent, of State and local agencies; establish security regulations with mandatory loyalty oaths for all Federal civil defense employees.

The bill also created a Civil Defense Advisory Council, consisting of 12 members to be appointed by the President—3 to be representatives of State governments, 3 of political subdivisions of the States, and the rest from among United States citizens.

The measure provided that the President or Congress (by concurrent resolution) could proclaim the existence of a civil defense emergency, and gave the President and the Civil Defense Administrator emergency powers to meet such a situation.

The declaration of policy carried in the law set the pattern of responsibility for civil defense planning with these words: "It is * * * declared to be the policy and intent of Congress that this responsibility for civil defense shall be vested primarily in the several States and their political subdivisions. The Federal Government shall provide necessary coordination and guidance."

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FOUR: CONGRESS AND CIVIL DEFENSE

The Nation's current civil-defense efforts are geared to preparing for and minimizing the effects of a possible attack. There is a distinct line between this education-for-survival program and the actual defense of the Nation against an attempted attack, which is a military function handled mainly by the Defense Department and the National Security Council.

In April alone, nine resolutions (H. J. Res. 491–496, 499, 501, and 503) were introduced in the House, all designed to make the Federal Civil Defense Administration a separate executive department with wider power and a Secretary who would be a member of the National Security Council. A similar resolution (H. J. Res. 540) was offered June 1 by Representative PETER W. RODINO, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey, who said the need was for a realistic civil-defense program thoroughly integrated with our continental-defense system.

Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of California, charged April 12 that "civil defense is completely inadequate and unless improved it will become a national scandal." He called for greater "Federal leadership in the field of civilian defense." Said, "we cannot divorce the problem of civilian defense from military defense."

DEPARTMENT STATUS

Representative R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, Republican, of New York, and Representative Charles R. Howell, Democrat of New Jersey, have offered resolutions (H. Con. Res. 233 and H. J. Res. 510) aimed at establishing FCDA as an executive department within the Department of Defense. RIEHLMAN criticized the present civil defense setup as a "loose confederation of individual State programs," and called it obsolete. He said, "Civil defense must be considered as a part of our military planning." Along the same lines, Senator Edwin C. Johnson, Democrat of Colorado, February 15 introduced a bill (S. 2943) which would transfer the powers, duties, and functions of the FCDA to the National Guard Bureau of the Department of the Army.

The lawmakers are also concerned about the disruptive effects of an atomic attack on the functioning of Congress. The Senate June 4 passed on a 70–1 rollcall, a measure (S. J. Res. 39) proposing a constitutional amendment to permit State governors to appoint temporary Members of the House of Representatives whenever a national emergency or disaster creates vacancies in more than 145 House seats. Governors can make temporary appointments to fill Senate vacancies. But under present law, House vacancies must be filled by special elections, and it was argued, this usually requires at least 60 days and might paralyze the work of Congress if too many House Members became casualties in an atomic or other attack.

Congress May 20 also gave final approval to a bill (H. R. 7308, Public Law 383) extending the standby emergency powers of the President and the Federal Civil Defense Administrator to June 30, 1958. These powers would be employed in case of imminent or actual attack.

The highway-aid bill approved this year (Public Law 350, 83d Cong.) includes a provision authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to consult with the FCDA head on the civil defense aspect of highways to be built or improved.

CIVIL DEFENSE SINCE WORLD WAR I

Nineteen hundred and sixteen: Congress created the Council of National Defense composed of the Secretaries of War, Navy, Agriculture, Interior, Commerce, and Labor.

Nineteen hundred and forty-one: The Office of Civilian Defense was created by Executive Order 8757. It was subsequently abolished on June 30, 1945, by Executive Order 9562.

Nineteen hundred and forty-six: The War Department created the War Department Civil Defense Board to determine what should be civil-defense policies, responsibilities, and organization on Federal, State, and local levels. Maj. Gen. Harold R. Bull headed the Board.

Nineteen hundred and forty-seven: General Bull's group issued a report calling for creation of an effective national civil defense program under civilian authority, with the Secretary of the Armed Forces responsible for additional overall civil defense planning. The Board recommended that planning begin at once.

Nineteen hundred and forty-eight: The Secretary of Defense established the Office of Civil Defense Planning to prepare a United States civil defense program and a plan for a permanent Federal civil defense agency that would work with the States and local government in preparing a civil defense against enemy attack on the United States. The late Russell J. Hopley was named as Director.

In November 1948 the OCDP submitted a report recommending: A National Office of Civil Defense to lead in organizing and training people for civil defense tasks with basic responsibility for operations held by States and local communities; special preparations to meet hazards of an atomic attack, or any other enemy attack on the United States with modern weapons.

Planning assigned to NSRB

Nineteen hundred and forty-nine: Basing his action on wartime civil defense, and the Bull and OCDP reports, the President assigned the National Security Resources Board (created by Congress in 1947) to take over civil-defense planning.

The first two NSRB advisory bulletins on civil defense were sent to State governors.

Nineteen hundred and fifty: Additional civil-defense bulletins were issued which: Dealt with medical aspects of atomic weapons; announced training courses for key personnel in radiological monitoring; suggested the State approach to civil-defense planning; and defined the role of the American Red Cross in civil defense.

President Truman September 18 sent to Congress the NSRB report entitled "United States Civil Defense," which set forth the basic civil-defense plan. He recommended Federal civil-defense legislation and creation of a civil-defense agency.

On December 1 the President issued Executive Order 10186 establishing the Federal Civil Defense Administration in the Executive Office of the President to "promote and facilitate the civil defense of the United States in cooperation with the several States."

Congress began work on civil-defense measures.

Defense Act passed

Nineteen hundred and fifty-one: The Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 became Public Law 920 on January 12. The act created permanent FCDA, outlined its job, and gave the President and its Administrator emergency powers for civil-defense purposes.

By Executive Order 10222 on March 8, many of the functions, property, and records of the National Security Resources Board which related to civil defense were transferred to the FCDA.

By Executive Order 10248 on May 11, many of the powers and functions under the First War Powers Act of 1941, as amended, were extended to FCDA. These powers related to engaging in emergency, developmental, specialized, and other contracts.

Nineteen hundred and fifty two: Public Law 268, 82d Congress, amended the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 to permit limitations on Federal contributions for civil defense to be varied for the Territory of Alaska. And Public Law 412, 82d Congress, amended the Civil Defense Act to authorize the FCDA Administrator to lease property for civil-defense purposes, but barred him from acquiring title to such property without authorization from Congress.

By Executive Order 10346, President Truman, April 17, directed all Federal agencies and departments to prepare civil-defense emergency plans.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-three: Outgoing President Truman, January 16, issued Executive Order 10427, authorizing the FCDA to direct Federal agencies to provide aid in major disasters, coordinate activities and plans involving Federal aid in disasters, and foster development of plans on a State and local level to cope with such disasters.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-four: Executive Order 10529, President Eisenhower, April 22, directed that Federal employees be made available for participation in State and local civil-defense preemergency-training programs.

Civil Defense: Money and manpower

	Federal grants, (fiscal 1951–53)	Federal grants, fiscal 1954 [1]	Major items in Federal grants through June 30, 1953					1953 CD workers	
			Health and weapons	Fire services	Training and education	Communications	Warning devices	Required	Enrolled-assigned
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Alabama	$264,318	$209,170		$120,159	$39,274	$69,126	$33,661	$451,753	$27,136
Arizona	52,254	51,208		3,585	23,796	5,167	18,412	70,202	21,891
Arkansas	15,944	130,452		12,437	807	2,700		115,500	26
California	6,027,412	723,219	$2,088,384	1,346,611	1,245,047	648,742	437,142	1,030,113	637,502
Colorado	114,346	90,531	15,891	24,468	33,094	9,642	29,869	155,818	33,705
Connecticut	714,303	137,130	318,426	171,126	65,761	70,216	62,979	200,600	102,994
Delaware	440,073	21,735	48,747	227,917	32,664	88,923	27,647	43,722	8,679
Florida	99,734	189,325	3,192	1,553	26,333	18,985	49,171	300,417	72,965
Georgia	359,791	235,326	511	168,174	11,688	55,836	54,951	414,794	49,421
Idaho		40,215						52,907	14,979
Illinois	1,172,362	595,192	16,869	780,354	22,828	164,891	174,950	1,345,151	168,143
Indiana	344,111	268,779	55,190	164,451	49,878	10,175	38,230	135,416	24,416
Iowa	64,856	179,067		25,932	15,423	4,494	5,000	47,618	9,713
Kansas	275,389	130,168	57,778	67,783	90,940	22,715	35,627	177,460	29,019
Kentucky	132,524	201,180	14,847	72,388	13,502	26,435		134,540	35,969
Louisiana	315,010	183,330	499	184,251	45,902	60,429	20,977	195,509	66,634
Maine	84,854	62,422	23,729		26,510	9,377		33,934	23,308
Maryland	934,200	160,072	418,753	28,394	158,302	128,904	170,336	274,192	71,510
Massachusetts	1,639,924	320,449	781,688	262,927	148,976	155,172	210,976	641,930	216,300
Michigan	994,954	435,298	206,525	279,048	205,620	172,937	106,550	474,174	151,953
Minnesota	391,364	203,752	54,204	91,363	70,040	16,878	65,083	519,980	106,073
Mississippi	29,932	148,858			503	17,591	10,250	56,890	1,527
Missouri	425,939	270,175	11,630	212,085	22,776	51,139	106,268	298,790	98,170
Montana	16,935	40,373		11,253	1,103	4,579		43,334	19,974
Nebraska	92,299	90,552	12,912		27,868	34,119	17,400	99,196	40,666
Nevada	18,674	10,941			18,627			15,139	5,308
New Hampshire	40,971	36,435	14,177		14,889	11,231		19,743	19,743
New Jersey	1,231,972	330,340	369,612	519,076	105,016	132,275	45,427	231,875	231,875
New Mexico		46,536						21,751	9,638
New York	8,507,539	1,013,155	3,764,341	1,638,508	1,081,399	1,130,680	523,929	2,209,185	944,450
North Carolina	57,984	277,504	19,520	13,335	1,576	4,569	13,647	203,500	40,043
North Dakota	22,497	42,336	827		21,670			32,465	23,292
Ohio	2,304,548	542,892	600,209	524,928	315,364	165,919	454,754	860,800	198,800
Oklahoma	238,076	152,575	12,430	58,691	3,197	161,960	1,585	189,896	20,197
Oregon	351,833	103,929	109,470	84,748	54,386	46,984	39,695	111,619	28,141
Pennsylvania	4,051,078	717,192	1,549,234	1,590,390	235,672	295,657	243,988	324,000	324,000
Rhode Island	185,080	54,096	10,350	87,803	14,252	41,778	25,424	69,334	29,244
South Carolina	9,645	144,627	53		9,557			3,136	1,211
South Dakota	787	44,593			787			25,860	16,854
Tennessee	566,212	224,878	86,767	219,813	69,997	104,821	72,808	275,037	54,374
Texas	337,150	526,816	225	118,121	37,018	54,215	57,775	440,000	112,058
Utah	58,119	47,061	6,803	5,240	23,645	18,574	1,794	39,675	5,347
Vermont	42,504	25,809		27,328	10,792	3,934		21,520	17,713
Virginia	448,911	226,726	66,778	136,604	63,298	76,016	83,805	177,700	76,166
Washington	772,530	162,529	277,574	143,883	86,644	88,280	107,280	226,720	79,018
West Virginia	20,285	137,014	3,536		1,025	8,120	7,263	173,257	28,680
Wisconsin	337,244	234,643	155,988	8,635	46,437	78,258	45,278	359,283	73,987
Wyoming	12,586	19,845			3,682	757	8,100	28,884	6,494
Alaska	411,663	8,788	57,608	152,055	26,727	75,298	98,392	9,972	5,063
Guam	22,121	4,064	661		6,113	5,750	4,928	6,598	3,764
Hawaii	266,123	34,146	197,401	7,049	51,960	6,759		70,485	26,444
Puerto Rico	297,500	151,032	59,179	100,674	75,407	58,071	4,169	211,200	91,198
Virgin Islands	614	1,817			614			646	332
District of Columbia	170,511	54,799	97,747		255	198	72,311	191,358	55,088
Total	35,792,318	10,500,000	11,594,998	9,693,140	4,758,641	4,419,276	3,587,831	13,864,578	4,561,195

[1] Initial allocations (as of Apr. 30, 1954).

Source: Federal Civil Defense Administration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to summarize by saying:

First. There is no absolute military defense—a realistic view is that in case of attack some attackers will pierce the best active defense that can be provided. An active civil defense can save literally millions of lives which cannot be saved by any military countermeasure.

Second. Everyone in the country is involved in civil defense; the thermonuclear bomb has changed the character of warfare and our civil defense because it affects a vast area and crosses State and national political boundaries as no other weapon. There is no such thing as a miss. Whereas an atomic bomb was a city problem, the super modern weapons of today are truly a national problem, particularly because of the great areas affected by residual radiation and the huge number of people who will require assistance.

Third. Civil defense is not hopeless; top scientists and military men agree that civil defense can be of immense value if proper planning and education take place. This means that we must raise the stature, responsibility, and scope of civil-defense program over and above the present ridiculous situation which finds the Federal Civil Defense Administration budget to be about a tenth of 1 percent of the total Department of Defense budget.

Fourth. A civil-defense policy must be clearly stated. We face a serious threat from atom bombs, hydrogen bombs, and from themonuclear missiles. The extent of that threat must be indicated to the American people, and a policy should be stated which establishes a criteria for planning evacuation, shelters, cover from fall-out, welfare, and other needed aspects for a full civil defense.

Fifth. The civil-defense program must be continuing. A plan with sufficient forethought must be instituted which is so compelling that we need not make repeated alarmist statements to arouse the public interest. Civil defense must be an essential part of Government responsibility so that it is accepted as a reality of living in the thermonuclear age.

Mr. President, I hope the Congress will take at least a few of these observations seriously. There is not a Member of the Senate or of the House of Representatives who would be content for a minute to go home and face his constituency if he had not voted for the defense of his Nation. I hope that some constituents will be asking if we voted for the defense of their homes. Let us hope and pray that an attack will never come, but I suggest that preparedness is the best way to avoid an attack or to stop one. Preparedness does not mean merely a strategic air defense force or command that can strike at the enemy; it also means the interception of enemy planes and an adequate civil defense for the civilian population which makes possible resistance and striking back at any aggressor or attacker.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

Mr. GOLDWATER obtained the floor.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me to permit me to make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I gladly yield for that purpose.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn until noon on Tuesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield further to me so that I may make another unanimous-consent request if it is understood that in yielding for that purpose he will not lose the floor?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to yield under those circumstances, Mr. President.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now proceed to consider executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEELY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Harlan Bruce Munger, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration; and

George P. Daley, of Minnesota, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Albert Pratt, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Armed Services:

General Walter Bedell Smith, United States Army, retired, to be a member of the National Security Training Commission.

Mr. JACKSON. From the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the nomination of Charles C. Finucane, of the State of Washington, to be Under Secretary of the Army, vice John Slezak, resigned, and ask that this nomination be placed on the Executive Calendar.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a biographical sketch of Mr. Finucane.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar; and, without objection, the biographical sketch will be printed in the RECORD.

The biographical sketch presented by Mr. JACKSON is as follows:

CHARLES C. FINUCANE, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY (FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT)

Charles C. Finucane was born in Spokane, Wash., on September 6, 1905, the son of Francis J. and Mary Gertrude (Sweeny) Finucane. He received his early education in Spokane, attended the Taft School at Watertown, Conn., for 4 years, and was graduated from the Sheffield Scientific School, Yale University, in 1928 with a degree in industrial engineering. In the same year he married Marion Madeleine Burke, of New York City. They have no children.

After his graduation from the Sheffield School, Mr. Finucane returned to Spokane and entered his father's wholesale hardware business, which he was instrumental in selling in 1930. In that year he became vice president and general manager of the Sweeny Investment Co., which owns and operates commercial buildings. Since 1949 he has been its president.

In 1936 he became vice president of the Callahan Lead-Zinc Co. and treasurer of Sunshine Consolidated Mining Co. After resigning 2 years later, he purchased and operated a wheat- and pea-ranch in southeastern Washington. In 1939 he was elected to the State legislature and served as majority (Democratic) floor leader during the 1939 session. He was then appointed chairman of the Board of County Commissioners of Spokane County and was active in the county government until military service intervened. In 1940 he ran for Congress in the Fifth District of Washington and was defeated.

Mr. Finucane was commissioned an ensign in the Naval Reserve in 1934 and went on active duty in June 1941. During the war he served as an Ordnance officer in various important staff assignments with the Northwest Sea Frontier, the 13th Naval District, and the Bureau of Ordnance, Washington, D. C., rising to the rank of commander.

In 1946, with T. H. Galland, of Spokane, he founded Finucane & Galland, which manages commercial buildings and handles general insurance. The following year he purchased the Davenport Hotel in Spokane and operated it until its sale in 1953. Since 1946 he has been a director of the Spokane and Eastern Division of the Seattle First National Bank and also treasurer and a director of the James Smyth Plumbing & Heating Co., of Spokane. He also owns and operates cattle ranches.

Mr. Finucane was vice president of the Spokane Chamber of Commerce from 1947 through 1953. He has been active in the Republican Party in Washington for a number of years. He is a member of the Elk and Moose Lodges and of various social clubs in Spokane and New York City.

He was nominated by President Eisenhower on August 4, 1954, and confirmed by the Senate on August 18, 1954.

Mr. STENNIS. From the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably a group of nominations of flag and general officers in the Navy, Marine Corps, and Army and ask that they be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The nominations were placed on the Executive Calendar, as follows:

Vice Adm. Ralph A. Ofstie, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander;

Vice Adm. Thomas S. Combs, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Air);

Rear Adm. Harold P. Smith, United States Navy, to be Director of Budget and Reports in the Department of the Navy, for a term of 3 years;

John H. Sides and sundry other officers for permanent appointment in the line and staff corps of the Navy;

Rear Adm. Bartholomew W. Hogan, Medical Corps, United States Navy, to be Surgeon General and Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery in the Department of the Navy;

Brig. Gen. Raymond A. Anderson, United States Marine Corps, to be Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps, with the rank of major general; and

Brig. Gen. LeRoy Hagen Anderson, and sundry other officers, for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army.

Mr. STENNIS. From the Committee on Armed Services, I also report favorably a number of routine nominations in the Army, for the grade of colonel and below, which have already been printed in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that these nominations lie on the table, in order to avoid the expense of having them again printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated in order.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Nepal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Donald R. Heath, of Kansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Lebanon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Philip D. Reed, of New York, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Information for a term expiring January 27, 1958, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Erwin D. Canham, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Information for a term expiring January 27, 1958, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

SUPREME COURT, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Philip L. Rice, of Hawaii, to be an associate justice of the Supreme Court, Territory of Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

BOARD OF PAROLE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George Glenn Killinger, of Virginia, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1960.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward J. Devitt, of Minnesota, to be United States district judge for the district of Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Russell B. Wine, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the western district of Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

THE DIXON-YATES CONTRACT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I thank my friend, the Senator from Arizona, for yielding to me.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have been happy to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. President, the subject of the Dixon-Yates contract has been peculiarly quiet since the resumption of the session. But that has not been true of the press, particularly of the press of the city of Washington.

I do not wish to detain the Senate long this afternoon, but I should like to invite attention to the comments of several newspapers in Washington on this subject.

Mr. President, in last night's Evening Star there was an article by Mr. O'Leary which went on to say regarding the Dixon-Yates contract:

ATOM PROGRAM SEEN SNAGGED BY DIXON-YATES—DEMOCRATS ACCENT DANGER AS GOP DEFENDS CONTRACT

(By J. A. O'Leary)

Senate Democrats charged today that the administration distracted the Atomic Energy Commission from its primary task of assuring atomic leadership by involving it in the power needs of the Tennessee Valley area through the Dixon-Yates contract.

The Joint Atomic Energy Committee made public a report of more than 100 pages in which Republicans and Democrats summarized their conflicting positions on the contract.

That follows very closely an article printed in the Washington Star of the previous evening, quoting the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], as follows:

JACKSON SEES FIGHT ON DIXON-YATES DEAL AS BURDEN ON AEC

Senator JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, said today it is quite obvious that the furor over the Dixon-Yates contract has interfered with important tasks of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Senator JACKSON said this had been clearly shown in testimony by Commission members this week before the Senate-House Atomic Energy Committee on which he serves.

AEC Chairman Lewis L. Strauss told the group yesterday the Dixon-Yates project may have added to the burdens of AEC members, but he said it had not interfered with their work.

Senator ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, chairman of the joint committee, said in a separate interview "The differences they have in the Commission seemingly have all developed since they got into Dixon-Yates.

CLOSED SESSION TODAY

The hearings, continuing today with a closed session, are designed to review progress on peaceful uses of atomic energy.

However, they have been punctuated by a debate on the Dixon-Yates contract, negotiated by the AEC last year at President Eisenhower's order.

On Monday, Commissioner Thomas E. Murray announced that he believed the contract should be dropped by AEC—an action already asked by the present Democratic majority on the joint committee.

Mr. Murray said the contract was a drain on the time and energies of the Commission and not in the public interest, because, he said, it diverted the agency from concentrating on its two big jobs—weapons and peacetime uses of the atom.

COMMENTS ON MURRAY

Yesterday Mr. Strauss told the committee he had not known of Mr. Murray's statement until it was read Monday, and he declared:

"I must not allow the inference to stand that the effectiveness and the results of the Commission's efforts have been impaired by the controversy over the Dixon-Yates contract.

"Commissioner Murray has access to the same information we all do and surely is aware that the production of atomic weapons for our Armed Forces is at an all-time high."

But Senator JACKSON commented: "There are just so many hours in a day. The more time the Commission devotes to nonatomic matters, the less time it has to give to its important tasks that really matter."

Mr. President, I suggest to those persons who are concerned with the extra burden which may be placed on the AEC that they realize that the contract is in the best interests of free enterprise in this country and in the best interests of the people. If they wish to unburden the AEC, it is within their power to do so by approving the contract. Certainly, those of us who have advocated the adoption of the contract have not laid additional work upon the AEC.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. Will the Senator explain what business the Atomic Energy Commission has negotiating a contract when not one kilowatt of power to be generated under it is to be sold for the use of the AEC?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is that unusual in Government operations? Are they restricted in their contract negotiations?

Mr. JACKSON. But they are supplying the power needed in Ohio for the great gaseous diffusion plant in Portsmouth, Ohio. Not one kilowatt of power under the Dixon-Yates contract is to be used to produce a single atomic weapon.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The TVA has for years asked for additional sources of power, and this is a free-enterprise way of providing the TVA the power of which it has been deprived by the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. JACKSON. Then, why not let TVA negotiate the contract?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Because the people of this country have never had an opportunity to vote on the question of whether they want the Government to engage in the production of power.

Mr. JACKSON. The people of the country have the right at every election to vote for Representatives and Senators to pass such laws as those Representatives and Senators deem to be in the best interests of the country. Does the Senator mean to infer that we should have a plebiscite on various issues? Are we going to refer these national issues to the States and let them decide the issues on an initiative and referendum basis?

Mr. GOLDWATER. On an issue so basic as this, I would go so far as to suggest that some day it be put to a plebiscite, but I do not think it is necessary now.

Mr. JACKSON. Does the Senator from Arizona want to amend the Constitution so as to provide for national plebiscites on issues such as that involved in the Dixon-Yates contract?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No less an authority than Norman Thomas has stated that the TVA is socialistic. I do not believe that in its original conception it was intended to be socialistic. I do not believe it was looked upon at that time as a Government sponsored and financed source of power. I think when it was first envisioned, it was to be a flood control and navigation control facility; but as it developed, it became a source of power supply, with a complete prohibition of private power. Private power industry could not come into that area. I do not believe that was envisioned by Members of Congress.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator from Arizona would not say, would he, that when Mr. Eisenhower, during the campaign in the fall of 1952, gave great praise to TVA, he was praising a socialistic project?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I would say that he gave great praise to TVA.

Mr. JACKSON. Was he praising socialism?

Mr. GOLDWATER. He was praising a project which is socialistic.

Mr. JACKSON. He was?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Does the Senator say that, therefore, the President was supporting a socialistic project?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No. I do not think the President was supporting a socialistic project.

Mr. JACKSON. But he was praising it?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I say that during the campaign Mr. Eisenhower, as a candidate for President, made some remarks about TVA that could be construed as being complimentary. I do not say the President supports socialism, but he has made complimentary remarks about TVA.

Mr. JACKSON. I see. He did not support socialism, but he praised it. Is that correct?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No.

Mr. JACKSON. He praised TVA, and TVA is socialistic. I am glad to hear the Senator admit it, according to the Senator's statement.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am not quoting any statement made by me, I am quoting Norman Thomas. I am quoting a report in the newspapers of last night.

Mr. JACKSON. In other words, if Norman Thomas had said that reclamation in the State of Arizona was socialistic, would the Senator say that reclamation projects in the State of Arizona were socialistic?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think a very sound argument could be presented to show that that is not so.

Mr. JACKSON. But reclamation is a government project and is entirely Government-financed, is it not?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Washington is entirely wrong. Reclamation is a cooperative enterprise, with which he is fully familiar, and from which the sums expended are paid back.

Mr. JACKSON. The revenue from power provides a means for paying back the costs of TVA. Is that not correct?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is entirely incorrect about that.

Mr. JACKSON. Does the Senator say that revenues are not used to pay back the costs of the power facilities provided by the TVA?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I did not intend to get into this phase of the matter this afternoon.

Mr. JACKSON. I would not have referred to it either, but my name was mentioned, so I thought it was necessary to get into it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Since the Senator has brought up the question, I will ask him if he thinks this is paying the Government back: Since 1934, $1,785 million have been appropriated for the TVA. Of that amount approximately $341,719,000 can be subtracted for flood control and navigation. That leaves a balance, roughly, of $1,400 million. There has been paid back in this time about $87 million.

Mr. JACKSON. So the Senator agrees that some money has been paid back.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not agree to that.

Mr. JACKSON. I am merely taking the Senator's figures.

Mr. GOLDWATER. There has been repaid $87 million. If we simply take the compound interest at 2.6 percent, which is the figure given me by the Government as an average figure that should be used in these computations, then to the $1,400 million should be added about $244 million in interest alone. So we find only $87 million having been paid back to the Government by TVA, with not even the interest beginning to be paid.

I have no quarrel about any project which will eventually pay back to the Government what is put into it. At this rate, as I stated last year in the debate, it would take about 300 years to pay back what the Government has put into the TVA.

Mr. JACKSON. In connection with power facilities of the TVA, the principal will be paid back, including interest, which varies according to the interest rate on the national debt.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The best estimate is that that will take 300 years.

Mr. JACKSON. I do not agree with the Senator's statement.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Figures do not lie. I have obtained the figures from the TVA reports.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it not true that the power features of the TVA are scheduled to pay out, the time varying with some projects, in from 40 to 50 or 60 years?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Not in the TVA.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it not true that in the Senator's State, where there are several fine Federal reclamation projects, not one dime of interest is paid on the investment, but the interest is used as a subsidy? However, as to the power features, the entire cost, including principle and interest is paid back?

Mr. GOLDWATER. In this case, as I have tried to illustrate to the Senator—and he can certainly examine the figures—only $87 million has been paid back by the TVA during the entire period. If that covered all the cost of interest and the other carrying charges, I would not be here today objecting.

Mr. JACKSON. Is the Senator saying that as to the power features, no arrangement has been made to pay the interest on the investment or the principle, or both?

Mr. GOLDWATER. In the case of TVA, the only interest which is being paid is on the bonds which TVA has floated itself. I think the rate is about 1 percent or a fraction over that amount.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it the Senator's position, as to the power features in the TVA project, that no arrangement has been made to pay the interest on the Government investment?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have said to the Senator——

Mr. JACKSON. I am merely asking a question.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not believe that any payment at all is being made; in fact, up to 1950 I believe the law provided that the payment of interest was not necessary.

Mr. JACKSON. That the TVA did not have to pay interest on the investment?

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is my understanding of the original act.

Mr. JACKSON. I think the Senator from Arizona will find that he is in error.

Let us get back to Dixon-Yates. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the only reason why the Atomic Energy Commission was used as a contracting vehicle for entering into the agreement with Dixon-Yates to build a steam plant was that the AEC was the only Government agency on which the Government could hang its legal hat to enter into that kind of contract?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think the Senator is a little wrong in his statement. The TVA has tried for many years to secure approval for the construction of a steam plant. I think in the first session of the last Congress a request was made for some $60 million for the building of a steam plant. It has been obvious for many years that Congress—at least, it is true of the present Congress and of the past Congress—does not intend to grant additional money to the TVA for the purpose of constructing a steam plant. Power in the TVA area has been wheeled into other sections where it is needed, and where it could have been produced by free enterprise.

Mr. JACKSON. The Atomic Energy Commission is not a free enterprise; it is a Government monopoly.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It is an agency of the Government.

Mr. JACKSON. Why does not the Government enter into an agreement with TVA, which is an agency that markets power? The Atomic Energy Commission is in the business of splitting the atom; it is not in the business of selling power to another agency.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If it were a question of private power, and the AEC and the TVA came forward and asked that private enterprise be allowed to build a plant in Arkansas where the proposed plant is to be located, would the Senator be perfectly agreeable to doing that?

Mr. JACKSON. I am certain the distinguished Senator is aware of the real reason why the contract was entered into with the Atomic Energy Commission; namely, that the Government cannot dictate to the TVA at this time and tell the directors they should enter into this contract, because the directors are determined to assist the people of the valley to get cheap hydroelectric power firmed up with steam. I think that is the reason why the administration did not go to the TVA. They knew that TVA would turn them down.

So the Atomic Energy Commission was embroiled into a useless fight over a matter that has nothing to do with atomic weapons and nothing to do with peaceful uses of atomic energy in any way, shape, or form.

I think it is regrettable, indeed, that the Atomic Energy Commission should be split so many ways, as it is today, because it has had foisted upon it a contract that has nothing whatsoever to do with the duties of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does the Senator from Washington favor the development of power by private industry in that area?

Mr. JACKSON. I am in favor of having TVA develop power in that market-

ing area; that is, in its own marketing area as provided by law.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator has hit right at the heart of my argument. The Senator is in favor of public power; I am in favor of private power. Basically, that is the whole argument.

The argument does not revolve around the AEC. It revolves around one thing, namely, that we have in this country people who advocate public power, and also people who advocate private power. It is as simple as that, to me; there are no other ramifications.

Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

Mr. JACKSON. May I ask one other question?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Is the distinguished Senator from Arizona aware of the fact that the TVA was soundly endorsed and soundly supported by none other than Hon. B. CARROLL REECE, a Republican Representative from eastern Tennessee, and former chairman of the Republican National Committee? Would the distinguished Senator think the distinguished Representative from eastern Tennessee, Mr. B. CARROLL REECE, would be supporting a socialistic venture?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. REECE is from Tennessee.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator does not impugn his motives, does he? The Representative would not support a socialistic project, which touches not only eastern Tennessee, but goes all over the State, would he? Does the Senator think Mr. REECE would advocate for one moment a socialistic enterprise?

Mr. GOLDWATER. All I can say to the Senator is that it has been called socialistic by better experts than I.

Mr. JACKSON. Would the Senator take the word of Norman Thomas over that of Representative REECE?

Mr. GOLDWATER. In the matter of socialism, yes.

Mr. JACKSON. If Norman Thomas were to state that reclamation in Arizona were socialistic, would the Senator accept his word for it?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No; I would argue with him on that.

Mr. JACKSON. Because it was in Arizona?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No; I would argue with him if the project happened to be in Washington, Arizona, or any other State, because reclamation projects pay back. TVA does not pay back.

Mr. JACKSON. TVA has paid back $87 million.

Mr. GOLDWATER. There has not been paid back even a third of the interest.

Mr. JACKSON. How much has been paid back in Arizona

Mr. GOLDWATER. The cost of the Roosevelt Dam was paid back completely. With respect to the Hoover Dam——

Mr. JACKSON. When was the Roosevelt Dam started?

Mr. GOLDWATER. In 1911.

Mr. JACKSON. And it has only recently paid back?

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is not an accurate statement.

Mr. JACKSON. Was it not recently?

Mr. GOLDWATER. If my memory serves me correctly, the cost of the dam was paid back some 14 years ago. I would not want to stand on that answer, but it was about that time.

Mr. JACKSON. The costs of TVA projects, as well as the costs of projects in the Sepator's State and my State are being paid back, and I am proud of that record. The fact that in one case, where power is supplied by Government-owned facilities, it is called socialism, and in the other case, where the project is for reclamation purposes, it is called free enterprise, does not add up.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Washington is completely missing the point. He and I know that the law providing for reclamation projects contains a provision for paying back, and the Senator and I know that TVA is not paying back in like manner. Only $87 million out of a total expenditure of $1,400,000,000 has been paid back. That is not really paying back.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I merely wish to say that a great many people opposed to the Dixon-Yates contract are not primarily concerned in wrangling with the question of public versus private power. An examination of the record will disclose that as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I supported strongly the construction of the EEI and the OVEC plants. Both of those plants had groups of private utilities brought together to furnish power directly to the Atomic Energy Commission. That has been the accepted pattern. That is private enterprise. It is that pattern we were trying to work out. In the Dixon-Yates contract that program has been abandoned entirely. Those concerned tried to make use of the Dixon-Yates contract to accomplish a wholly different purpose than the supplying of power to the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. GOLDWATER. What would that purpose be?

Mr. ANDERSON. To build a plant at West Memphis, Ark., to supply power.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Would TVA have been able to supply the power?

Mr. ANDERSON. That I cannot answer. I understand those who were not able to build the Fulton steam plant will provide their own facilities, and I think they should; but, nonetheless, the fact is that if the Atomic Energy Commission had wanted to deal with any power shortage which it could not reach, it could have come to the Congress with a request to build another plant of the type of EEI or OVEC. It would have been private money to be used for the Atomic Energy Commission. It was the failure of the Atomic Energy Commission to follow the pattern which had been worked out that precipitated the entire discussion and debate. It still tears the Atomic Energy Commission to pieces. It is a constant source of friction. Personally I think it is going to remain so until the matter is resolved in a different fashion than has been undertaken up to this time. I wish to repeat that not all those who are opposed to the Dixon-Yates contract are opposed to it on the basis of public versus private power.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I appreciate that, and I do not want my remarks to infer that that is the case. Nevertheless, the issue has been brought out into the open. It is a point of difference between public-power and private-power adherents. If the discussion has served no other good, it has served that particular good.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. I wish to make it clear that I happen to be one who is in favor of both private and public power. I think a complete monopoly of power by the Government is bad for the country, and I think a complete monopoly of power by private interests is bad for the country.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does the Senator from Washington mean public power in the true sense of the word, as I am speaking of the term?

Mr. JACKSON. What does the Senator from Arizona mean by public power?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I mean power produced by the Government in competition with private enterprise without paying charges or taxes.

Mr. JACKSON. Power developed by a local municipality or a State is publicly owned power. If the Federal Government develops the power, it is likewise public power. The truth is that in the case of the great rivers in this country, most projects involve more than power. They involve reclamation, navigation, and flood control, and in many cases it would be unfair for a private utility to be called upon to engage in those many and diverse activities.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think that is where the program of this administration comes in. If a project involves areas where private utilities cannot venture, because of the scarcity of population or the immensity of the project, the Federal Government should cooperate in advancing the money for such a project, and then the Government should be paid back. In the Northwest the money advanced for projects is being paid back.

Mr. JACKSON. In the Northwest?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. The Federal partnership power program of this administration is quite simple. It means that the Federal Government will pay for the nonreimbursable features, that is, navigation and flood control. The local private utility will pay for and build the reimbursable features. It would be a project such as the Senator and I would go into if the Senator were getting the bills, he being Uncle Sam, and I was getting the profits. It is difficult for me to understand how the Federal Government is going to come out even in that kind of program, because the Federal Government would be saddled with the nonprofitable features of the project, whereas the private utility would get the profitable features, namely, those from which power is to be developed and sold.

Before I conclude—and I wish to say that the distinguished Senator has been very fair, in yielding to me—I should like to point out that under our reclamation laws it is true that the water users pay back a certain portion of the cost of the water. The remainder of the cost comes from revenue derived from the sale of power at the dams. In addition, the water user does not have to pay interest on the Federal investment. On the other hand, where power features are installed in a dam, under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 all of the investment must be paid back with interest. In the Northwest the Bonneville Power Administration has paid back $128 million.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am not arguing about Bonneville. My statement does not include Bonneville. I am talking about paying back the cost of projects. TVA has paid back a little less than one-third of the interest which ordinarily would be due on the amount invested by the Government.

Mr. JACKSON. What did the Senator say TVA had paid back?

Mr. GOLDWATER. A little more than $87 million.

Mr. JACKSON. What is the total investment in TVA?

Mr. GOLDWATER. When there is subtracted from the investment the costs of flood control and navigation, we arrive at the figure of approximately $1,400,000,000.

Mr. JACKSON. And $87 million has been paid back?

Mr. GOLDWATER. If we were compounding the interest at 2.6 percent on $1.4 billion——

Mr. JACKSON. Where did the Senator get the figure of 2.6 percent?

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is an average figure I obtained from the Treasury Department. We have paid lesser and higher rates of interest; 2.6 percent interest paid on a private loan is a rather low figure.

Mr. JACKSON. Eighty-seven million dollars has been paid back on TVA out of a total investment of how much?

Mr. GOLDWATER. One billion four hundred million dollars.

Mr. JACKSON. The Government will get its money back in less than 300 years.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Oh, yes; 300 years; but I will not be here then. I should like to see TVA pay back as other projects do, namely, in from 50 to 74 years. If they did that, I would not be here quarreling with the TVA.

Mr. JACKSON. I wish to say in all sincerity——

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. JACKSON. Certainly.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The purpose of my participation in the discussion this afternoon is to insert in the RECORD—which I shall do at the conclusion of these remarks—a column of figures to show what it has cost each State to support the TVA. If the TVA did not require the support of all the States constantly and in the years ahead, there would be no objection to it. But I am sure the people of the State of Washington are not particularly interested in providing at their own expense cheap power rates in the Tennessee Valley year after year. If the purpose is to give the TVA a start toward taking care of itself, that is fine. I think we would agree about that.

Mr. JACKSON. I do not think we are subsidizing the power features.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is a matter on which the Senator from Washington and I disagree, and I think we could stand here and could argue it for days and days.

Mr. JACKSON. Does not the Senator from Arizona agree that everything that has transpired on this floor during this discussion goes back to the Dixon-Yates contract, which in turn goes back to the Atomic Energy Commission.

I wish to say to the Senator in all candor that politics and the atom do not mix; and I say that the administration made a serious mistake in injecting the whole issue of public power and private power into the atomic-energy question, in connection with a matter wherein not one kilowatt of power is being used to aid and abet the atomic-energy effort.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, there again I call the attention of the Senator from Washington to the remark I made, which brought his name into the discussion. If he does not wish to have the AEC burdened with this matter, and if he never wanted it to be burdened with it, then they should have acceded to the request for this contract in the first place.

Mr. JACKSON. Who should have acceded to the request?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Those who objected to it.

Mr. JACKSON. I did not request it. Why did the administration not go to the Department of the Interior with the request? It is the official agency in this field, and is established by law to handle such contracts. Why did it not go to the TVA, the marketing agency in that area?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The TVA has been denied, time and again—through Federal means—the right to expand.

Mr. JACKSON. But congressional authorization is not needed in order to go ahead on the basis of the contract. Why did the administration come to Congress?

Mr. GOLDWATER. It is my suspicion that, regardless of whatever agency might have been named, objection would have been raised to the Dixon-Yates contract.

Mr. JACKSON. I am sure of that; but the administration made the fatal mistakes of selecting an agency which does not have a single thing to do with this activity. If the contract had been placed with the TVA or the Department of the Interior, I think the terrible split which now has developed in the Atomic Energy Commission would have been avoided. Our committee is holding a hearing on the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission. In the course of the hearing, we are spending much of our time discussing the Dixon-Yates contract.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I suggest to the Senator from Washington that that is not because of the desire of anyone except himself and of his group—not the desire of his party, even.

Mr. JACKSON. Is the Senator from Arizona aware of the fact that the Democratic members of the committee were unanimous—the vote was 10 to 8—in voting to rescind the approval previously given to waiver of the 30-day period, in the case of the Dixon-Yates contract? Let me point out that those members come from the North, the South, the East, and the West.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes; and I think the Republican members did the same thing last year, when they were in power; and I think the remark made by the Senator from New Mexico was rather apropos, namely, that the Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away.

Mr. President, I am about to conclude my remarks on the subject under consideration.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to yield, Mr. President.

Mr. NEUBERGER. A moment ago the Senator from Arizona was discussing with the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] the question of Federal power monopoly. Is it not correct that if there is any power monopoly in our country, it is a private-power monopoly?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No; I do not see how the Senator from Oregon can say that, because the private utilities—and, of course, they are looked upon, I assume, as natural monopolies, or whatever one may wish to call them from the point of view of law—are regulated by the State agencies; and so long as such regulation exists, I do not subscribe to the idea that they are monopolies, as such. If they operated completely on their own, without any regulation at all, I would agree that they would be monopolies, just as I would agree that any business which dominated a field and which was without regulation would be a monopoly.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is it not true that the distinguished President of the United States, in his state of the Union message, made the very plain statement that only a very small proportion of the electricity used in the United States is generated by the Federal Government?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes. I think the figures are 84 percent as against 16 percent generated by the private utilities.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I think the Senator from Arizona will find that the correct figures are approximately 81 percent generated by private power companies, approximately 13 percent generated by the Federal Government, and the remaining 6 percent generated by municipal systems.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If I said 86 percent——

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Arizona said 84 percent.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If I said 84 percent was generated by the Federal Government, I should have said that 84 percent is generated by private power companies; and I will use those figures, because in listening to the testimony given

yesterday by Mr. Olds, those were the figures he used.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Would not that again indicate there is no danger of a Federal power monopoly, such as has been alleged by the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. So if 1 percent of the electricity used in the United States were generated by the Federal Government, I think those of us who are interested in the maintenance of free and private enterprise should be vigilant. Certainly it would not be alarming if 14 percent or 16 percent or even 25 percent were generated by the Federal Government; even 25 percent might not be a figure indicating a trend. But certainly such a doctrine speaks against the accepted free enterprise of this country; and we do not wish to see it grow.

Mr. NEUBERGER. At the present time, only 13 percent of the power is generated by the Federal Government; and the Senator from Arizona has suggested that it would not be alarming if 25 percent were so generated. Therefore, at least 12 percent more could be produced by the Federal Government, and the Senator from Arizona would not be objecting, I assume.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Oh, no; I think the Senator from Arizona would be objecting to one-half of 1 percent more, just as today he is objecting to 13 percent or 14 percent.

Mr. NEUBERGER. But the Senator from Arizona just said it would not be alarming if the figure were 25 percent.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is possible, but it would alarm me.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield further to me?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Certainly.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Arizona was commenting on the partnership proposal in the Pacific Northwest. This administration is dedicated to fiscal solvency and to reduction of the public debt, according to the Secretary of the Treasury and the distinguished President of the United States. Is it not true that if the Federal Government enters into such a partnership arrangement in the Northwest, the Federal Treasury will be sacrificing millions and millions of dollars of revenue which now comes into the Federal Treasury and aids in reducing the national debt?

Mr. GOLDWATER. That might be possible in the immediate future, but under a true partnership arrangement, those properties would produce taxable wealth in their own right.

Let the Senator understand that I am not discussing the situation in the Northwest. I am not discussing the situation which exists in the reclamation States of the West, where these payments are being made. I am discussing TVA, and TVA only. I do not believe the Senator can compare the operation of TVA with the operation of the Northwest plants he is discussing. I maintain, as I have repeatedly said, that TVA is not paying its way, as are the other projects of the country. That is why I pick on TVA.

Mr. NEUBERGER. But the Senator recently referred to the Northwest, because he endorsed the partnership plan as it applies in the Northwest. The Senator himself brought that into the discussion only a few moments ago.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Certainly I endorsed the partnership program.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator endorsed the partnership plan; but I recur to the fact that at the present time the Federal Government has invested a total of $128 million in the Bonneville Dam on the Columbia River between the States of Oregon and Washington. That represents construction costs, operation costs, and maintenance. That project with all its turbines and generators has been in full operation only 11 years, and yet $48 million, or about 38 percent, has already been returned to the Treasury. Does the Senator know of any similar project, either public or private, with respect to which there is such a speedy return of the investment to the Treasury?

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the Senator wishes to discuss Bonneville, I suggest that he do it at another time, because we are not discussing Bonneville. I have not criticized Bonneville. I have not given Bonneville the study I have given TVA. I am discussing TVA and the Dixon-Yates contract.

I am not particularly familiar with the situation in the Northwest, but had private enterprise been able to construct a project of that size, I suggest that far more wealth, in the form of taxes, would have been returned, not only to the States concerned, but also to the Federal Government.

I return to the statement which prompted me to bring this subject up today. Fundamentally, this is an argument between the proponents of public power and the proponents of private power. The proponents of partnership power had not entered into any discussion at all, until the Senator from Oregon brought up the question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. GOLDWATER. Let me refresh the Senator's memory for a moment. I was discussing this problem with the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. In Arizona we have partnership agreements. I believe it was in that connection that the Senator heard the word "partnership." We have a true partnership in my State, which has been operating beautifully for years.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I hesitate to disagree, but I think, if the Senator will check the remarks in the RECORD as they have been taken down by the reporter, he will find that he endorsed the partnership program of this administration.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator was talking about the Northwest.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is where the partnership program is mainly localized.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Let us say that I extend it to the Northwest, although I was not discussing the Northwest in particular.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In his remarks a moment ago, the Senator was referring to the possibility that private enterprise could build projects like Bonneville. The Senator will grant, will he not, that private enterprise cannot build projects like Bonneville?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I will not say it is impossible. I will say it is improbable, because of the amount of money involved. But if private enterprise were able to do it I maintain that it would be far more desirable to use that approach than to use the Government approach, even though the Government would be paid back.

Again I return to the statement that when the Government builds these projects and the projects pay themselves out, and ultimately come under the control of the State, or even under the control—let us hope, some day, of private citizens—no quarrel can be found. I am only complaining about a project which does not pay itself out, a project which has not paid itself out, and is not paying itself out at an acceptable rate, or even approaching an acceptable rate.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator said he hoped these projects would ultimately come under the control of private citizens. Earlier in his remarks the Senator praised Roosevelt Dam, in his own State. I am not too familiar with the Senator's State. Is that dam under the control of private citizens?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No. It is under the control today of a quasi-governmental agency called the Salt River Valley Water Users Association. I say "quasi-governmental." In some respects it is tax-free. It is operated entirely by the users of the water. The Federal Government enters into the operation now only because of certain agreements made since the paying off of the entire debt, when the organization had to get additional Federal aid for improvements.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President——

Mr. GOLDWATER. Let me finish my reply.

I say that it is my hope that these projects will be turned over to private citizens some day. That is my personal hope. Many people share that hope. Many others do not. However, that is my personal hope.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask one further question about Bonneville. Inasmuch as the Senator stated that he would grant that it was probable that private enterprise could not build a project like Bonneville, would not the Senator be willing to agree that the Federal Government should build other projects of the size of Bonneville, if private enterprise cannot build such projects?

Mr. GOLDWATER. If they will pay themselves out, and if they will compete on the same basis on which private enterprise must compete, then I find no quarrel with them. As I have said, in Arizona we operate from Federal dams up and down the Colorado River. The power is purchased by a State authority and is sold by private utilities. Over the same transmission lines comes power generated by private utility steam and diesel plants.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Then the Senator will have no objection when my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. MORSE] and I, and other Members of the Senate, propose to build, at Hells Canyon, a great project like Bonneville?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes, I will, because I am convinced that private enterprise can build it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Does the Senator believe that private enterprise can build a dam of the same magnitude as the Federal Government can?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think private enterprise can build 3 dams. There will be an argument between the Senator and myself as to whether 3 dams are equal to 1. I think we should rely upon the engineers to tell us what is right. I believe that wherever private enterprise can develop the resources of this country it should do so. Wherever private enterprise cannot do so, and the people of a certain area need such development, Federal money should come in on a partnership basis, as has been done. There is no argument about that.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Has the Senator from Oregon concluded?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I have not, but I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to make one observation. I have not been present throughout all this debate. I agree with the Senator from Arizona that this question is fundamentally one of private ownership versus public ownership of the hydroelectric power resources—of the public heritage.

I came from an area which can offer very potent and convincing testimony as to the gain which comes from publicly developed power. We in New York State and in New England today pay at least twice as much for our industrial and domestic power as the people in the Pacific coast area are paying. That, in my opinion, is due to the fact that we in New York State and in New England have virtually no publicly developed water power, whereas we know, of course, of the great public hydroelectric developments on the Pacific coast and in the Northwest and Southwest.

At the same time, while we are paying twice as much for power in New York and in New England as do the people on the Pacific coast, in the Northwest, the per capita consumption there, because of the low cost of power, is double what it is in New York and New England. Yet today the administration objects to the public development of power, with safeguards of the consumer interest, in the State of New York. I refer to the power which could be generated from the waters of the Niagara River. It has been boldly proposed that this great asset, which belongs to all the people, should be turned over to a monopoly of five privately owned utility companies.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President——

Mr. LEHMAN. At the same time we are estopped from reducing the cost of power which is delivered to the consumers in our section of the country.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I am always surprised to hear the Senator from New York advocate public power. Last year it cost the people of his State, to support TVA, $15 million in taxes as their share for giving the Tennessee Valley area what the Senator calls extremely low power rates.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I cannot understand why the Senator from New York is so willing to say that his people will support, to the tune of $15 million, the Tennessee Valley development, so that it can take business away from New York State.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield. I can answer that question.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The reason the people of New York State are willing to bear a considerable cost in the development of the resources of other areas, is, I am proud to say, that the people in New York State realize that we are one Nation. We do not believe in setting off one region against another. We do not want one part of the country to profit at our expense. But we do want all parts of the country to share in a general prosperity.

I believe—and I am glad to say that the people in New York State also believe—that what is good for Arizona, in spite of what the distinguished Senator from that State is saying, is good for New York. I feel that what is good for Pennsylvania or for Alabama or for Mississippi or for California or for Oregon is good for New York, too.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does not the Senator from New York realize that with the $15 million to which I have referred private interests with invested money could start to develop a plant on the Niagara River and provide the power the Senator is talking about?

I am amazed at the Senator's willingness to give away money of the people of New York State so that other areas can compete with his State on a more favorable basis. If the Senator does not have any feeling for industry in New York or for the people in New York, I suggest that he is working on the right track in developing TVA.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, may I answer the Senator with one further observation?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Will not the Senator agree with me that when we develop the trade and commerce of the country as a whole, either through the development of cheap waterpower or through the building of that great seaway for which I have fought for 30 years, we benefit not only New York, but every other part of the country? We have passed the stage where we feel only in terms of what is good for Arizona or New Mexico or Mississippi or New York. What is good for the development of New York is good for the growth of Arizona; and I think if Arizona grows and prospers, we in New York also benefit.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to learn of the continuing generosity of my friend, the Senator from New York. I should like to suggest that if he wishes to collect $15 million in his State and send it to Arizona to help the State of Arizona, we will be glad to have him do so.

However, the Senator from New York is missing the point. The point is that the private power companies pay taxes. TVA does not pay taxes. The power companies in his State, for example, must pay back the money they borrow. TVA does not need to pay back the money it borrows. I am not quarreling with the operation of the companies in the Northwest, the Southwest, or in the Far West. I am quarreling with TVA, period.

Mr. COTTON and Mr. LEHMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield first to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I had not expected to venture to ask the Senator from Arizona to yield for a question, or to take any of his time. However, I was no little surprised when the distinguished Senator from New York, who, in part, represents New York so ably, insisted, in effect, on also representing New England in the questions which he propounded to the able Senator from Arizona.

In the first place, New England, or at least a large portion of it, with perhaps the exception of a small area in the extreme southern section, is not starved for power because it is not the recipient of public power.

We are starved for power because the development of our rivers has reached its limit. We cannot increase the power derived from them without moving cities which have been in existence for 150 to 200 years.

I was particularly interested in the Senator's statement with regard to power being made available to New England from the great Niagara development. The people of New England have long been interested in power from that source either through private or public power development; but we have never been able to get that power.

As the Senator from Arizona has pointed out, in New England we have paid taxes to furnish the Tennessee Valley power in such quantities that it is being used even for heating houses there, for the maintenance of recreational facilities, which are widely advertised, and for the production of white pine seedlings.

While I have no doubt that the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New York apply to the State he, in part, so ably represents, I take exception to his speaking, also, for the New England States.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield further?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The contribution of the New England States toward TVA,

through the payment of taxes by the citizens of that area, was $4,398,000. I am sure the Senator from New Hampshire would not object to having the people in his area get that money back.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether the Senator from New Hampshire realizes that the rate which the consumers in his State pay for both industrial and commercial power is twice as high as that paid by the industrial and domestic consumers on the Pacific Coast, where power is furnished by great public development projects.

I wonder whether he recalls that when the Federal Power Commission issued a license to the State of New York to develop the St. Lawrence power, it insisted—the provision is contained in the license—that a fair share of the power developed on the St. Lawrence River shall go to the New England States?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. First, in response to the observation of the distinguished Senator from New York, I should like to say that we in New England fully realize that power is more costly in our section of the country than in any other section. However, it is not because of the cost of the production or development of power.

As we face the challenge of the development of power by atomic energy and by other means, which we hope will take care of our power situation, we feel it is, in a sense, adding insult to injury to reach into our pocket for developments in other sections of the country, where the cost of power is much cheaper.

With reference to the second point made by the Senator from New York, which I am glad he made, it is true that in the legislation looking toward the development of Niagara power, lipservice is rendered to the idea of providing New England with some of that power. The legislation provides that a fair share shall go to New England. However, I should be very happy to have placed in the RECORD this afternoon a definite statement as to what a fair share is. We have long desired to have some definite assurance along that line.

It is the opinion of the Senator from New Hampshire, as well as the opinion of other people in my section of the country who have watched very anxiously this proposed development, that the term "fair share" is rather general. I am sure the Senator from New York will agree that that term has never been defined.

Because of the long distance and other conditions which are involved—not because of the desire of the people of New York to deprive us of anything—it is our opinion that the portion of the power which will actually come to New England will be infinitesimal so far as adequately dealing with our power problem is concerned.

Again, Mr. President, I should like to commend the distinguished Senator from Arizona. What he has said this afternoon has struck a responsive chord in my heart. We in New Hampshire desire to see the TVA prosper; we are proud of the manner in which the defense plants have been operated there and the manner in which power has been generated, but my people are becoming tired of being told that the remarkable development in the Tennessee Valley is something they should be very happy about, and that they own part of it. We own a part of the White House, but we cannot live in it. We keep pouring our money into the TVA, but TVA power does not heat our houses or turn our wheels of industry.

So I should like to commend the Senator from Arizona for his very timely speech and for furnishing to my State a reminder of what we are contributing to this socialistic experiment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield in order that I may comment on the statement of the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from New Hampshire said he objected to asking funds from the people of his section to develop power in other parts of the country. Does the Senator object to developing improved navigation in other parts of the country?

Mr. COTTON. I shall answer the Senator in this way: Had I been a Member of this body at the time of the beginning of the Tennessee Valley Authority, I doubt that I would have opposed it, because, not being gifted with second sight, I might have accepted the idea, which I think was sincerely suggested, that the Federal Government was lending a helping hand to develop navigation, increase agricultural facilities, and, as a byproduct, to aid a valley that had its problems by the power developed from the Tennessee River.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. If the Senator from New Hampshire concedes that it is within the province of the Federal Government to develop and improve navigation, what logical reason is there for suggesting that while doing that the Federal Government should not develop hydroelectricity to more than pay for the cost of improving navigation? On the Columbia River, Bonneville Dam was built as a navigation project. The year the development was started, only 85,000 tons of cargo moved by river into the upper Columbia River. Two years ago, more than 1,350,000 tons of cargo moved into the upper Columbia. It has been very important in keeping down trucking rates and rail rates, not only in that section, but also in Utah. Bonneville has also been able to build generators, turbines, and penstocks and pay back 80 percent in the short time it has been in operation.

The Senator from New Hampshire would not say it was all right to develop navigation, but that it was all wrong to install in the river turbines and generators to more than pay for it. Even the annual report of the Secretary of the Interior, who is one of the Government officials most opposed to Federal power development in this country, admitted last year that Bonneville was many years ahead of schedule in repaying to the Treasury the investment in it. What is wrong with doing that and, at the same time, improving navigation?

Mr. COTTON. I dislike to keep inviting this to the Senator's attention, but we did not start out to discuss Bonneville. I have not made any criticism of Bonneville on the floor this afternoon. I am talking about the Tennessee Valley Authority. The TVA was to be merely a helping hand, and the money invested in it was to be paid back.

I probably would not have foreseen then what we all know now, that, after the last kilowatt of power that could be developed by dams and by hydroelectric plants in the Tennessee Valley had been developed, the TVA would go on and on and on, building steam plants and reaching out and expanding its perimeter, until it has become a great power-producing activity, and everytime anyone raises a voice to say it has gone far enough, a great deal of discussion is caused.

The trouble with the proposition is that it started out and got a foot inside the tent with the perfectly modest suggestion that it was desired to develop navigation, which was a project in which all the people were interested. Then it was sought to develop the power which was latent in the stream. Soon it reached the point where it was producing power, and then more and more power was wanted. We in my section of the country are not in the happy situation of having those facilities, but are paying our share for them.

So, Mr. President, I must say to the Senator that I would not have objected, and would not now object, to a reasonable development of navigation, but I think I would go very slowly in supporting any more of these propositions which are so fair and attractive on their face and are advanced with great sincerity, I am sure, by their supporters, but which lead we know not where.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the Constitution provides that the Federal Government is responsible for navigation on interstate streams. That certainly cannot be compared with power. I have found no place in the Constitution where it is stated that it is the duty of the Federal Government to supply power to any of its people. I believe, by inference, it has to provide flood-control, although I have not noticed that specifically stated in the Constitution.

When the Tennessee Valley project was started it was to control floods and improve navigation and also for the purpose of reclamation. Its sponsors should have been sure that the power would pay for itself. The power has not paid and is not paying for itself. That is the whole question. I am not arguing about projects which pay for themselves.

The whole question of the Dixon-Yates contract is one of private power versus

public power; and the day when the Tennessee Valley Authority starts to pay its share, as Bonneville evidently has, then I shall certainly not make any comments on the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In the course of the Senator's remarks on the Dixon-Yates contract and the TVA, he endorsed the partnership program of the administration, which means the end of projects like Bonneville in my region; it means the giving away of the great Hell's Canyon site to a private corporation for piecemeal development. The Corps of Engineers of the Army, which is nonpolitical and is very conservative, specifically recommends a high Federal dam at that site.

The Senator, also, in endorsing the partnership program, says there should be no more projects like Bonneville. But Bonneville and Grand Coulee are paying for themselves. That is the reason why I entered into the discussion. The Senator endorsed that program. That program will mean the end of regional development on a sound paying basis in the part of the country in which I live.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I note the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon calls attention to the fact that the administration would end all public power——

Mr. NEUBERGER. In my region.

Mr. WATKINS. I doubt that very much. I invite attention to the fact that the President of the United States, in his state of the Union message, asked Congress to approve and authorize the upper Colorado storage project, which calls for nine multiple-purpose dams, much of the power to be hydroelectric power, for the development of the community. At the same time, much of the power will be sold to private utility companies, that will take it on terms which will protect the Government and the public. So I think the generalization with respect to the administration's power program misses the point just a little.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I was referring to the region from which I come. I am glad the Senator brought up that point.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield, to allow me to proceed further?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In my region there are some excellent sites where power can be generated at very low cost and sold at a profit within very economical transmission distances. Therefore, the administration proposes that the power development at those sites be turned over to private utilities.

But in regions such as that of the Senator from Utah, where the rivers are not so steady in their flow, where power cannot be developed at nearly so low a cost, as I think all engineering studies demonstrate, the administration proposes that the entire development shall be made by the Government.

I wonder what the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], who only a few moments ago said that the people of his region resented the taking of money to develop power in other parts of the country, will say about the upper Colorado River project.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in my opinion, the Senator from New Hampshire cannot help do anything but approve it, for the simple reason that it will repay with interest all the capital costs for power allocations and for the water used for industrial and municipal purposes. The only item on which interest will not be paid is that part which will be allocated to irrigation, which is about 7 percent of the total, and that will come under the basic reclamation law, which has been on the books and has been regarded as sound policy for more than 50 years. The upper Colorado project will repay all the capital outlay with interest.

But the Tennessee Valley Authority in the beginning, and for a large period of its existence, has been a project which has provided for no compensation to the public treasury, no repayment of cost to the Government. That is a far different situation.

Mr. NEUBERGER. May I suggest, then, that the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire speak for himself, inasmuch as the Columbia River project will pay for itself much more quickly than will the project on the upper Colorado? Will he not then join both of us in urging the development of the upper Colorado and the upper Columbia and the projects for Hells Canyon, John Day, and Ice Harbor?

Mr. WATKINS. I would not expect the Senator from New Hampshire to do so unless he has had an opportunity to study some of these projects. With respect to some of them, I have been very much misrepresented, particularly with respect to the upper Colorado storage project. Very few Members of Congress really understand what it is all about.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am certain the Senator from New Hampshire will accept the word of the Senator from Utah and my word.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. In view of the fact that my distinguished friend insists that I answer these questions, I shall make my position very clear. For the past 5 years, as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, I have been dealing with questions affecting the Tennessee Valley Authority, and my remarks with respect to the development of the Tennessee Valley under that Authority were intended to indicate what I believe to be a fact that it has been continuously borrowing and reaching for more money, but has paid back only a nickel every time it collected a dollar.

In response to the suggestion made by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], that I go on record in favor of some of the vast projects which are so dear to his heart, and also projects which are dear to the heart of my friend, the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], I simply say that if I, as a good New Hampshire Yankee, can be convinced that the money spent on such projects will come back to the Treasury, then a different situation will be presented.

What I said a few moments ago in response to the Senator's very innocent question about navigation was this: As a result of my sad experience with the Tennessee Valley Authority, from this day forward, and forevermore, I intend to scrutinize with great care every proposal coming before the Senate which contemplates taking Uncle Sam's money to develop a particular area of this country.

If I should be convinced that the money will be repaid—if the distinguished Senator from Utah can assure me of that —then I might go along with him. But I am not going to sign on the dotted line this afternoon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Would the Senator from New Hampshire vote for funds for the development of navigation on the Mississippi River, where there is absolutely no possibility of the development of power, and no possibility of any repayment of the funds? Would the Senator vote funds for such a project?

Mr. COTTON. I am very happy to say that I would never vote for such a project on such a basis. When my friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon, has been here longer, and understands the old-time New England Yankee a little better, he will find that it will be a long, cold day before I shall vote to pour Federal money into projects from which it may never be returned. I shall want to be convinced that all the people of the country are being treated fairly.

If the people in any given area of the United States can develop their own section, I say more power to them.

The people of New England have been fighting their battles in an area where the problems with respect to soil and other conditions would appall some of my distinguished colleagues from other areas. Yet we in New England have received less Federal help than has, I think, any other section of the country.

If people are able to develop their own localities, we admire them. If they desire some help from the Federal Government on a partnership basis, in a safe proposition, which will result in repayment to the Government, and as to which a great Frankenstein monster will not develop, we might go along with them if we were convinced of the worthiness of their project.

But the question which the Senator from Oregon asked me was the easiest question I have ever been asked to answer in my life. If I should be asked to pour money down the Mississippi Valley, from which it will never return, most certainly I should vote against it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Then, as I understand, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote against appropriations for the development of navigation on the Mississippi River, would he?

Mr. COTTON. I shall meet these problems one by one, when I see what they are.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield further to me?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from New Hampshire said he would be willing to support partnership proposals on a safe basis in instances when the money would be returned.

Mr. COTTON. I said that perhaps I would if I were convinced that a proposal was sound and that the money advanced would be returned. I ask the Senator not to put words in my mouth.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Does the Senator think there is the slightest possibility that the money will be returned under the partnership proposals of this administration? Under the partnership proposals of the present national administration, does the Senator think there is the slightest possibility of the money being returned by the private utility corporations?

Mr. COTTON. Oh, yes; most certainly I do. If I did not, I would not be prepared to vote for some of them.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Has the Senator studied any of them? Does he know what they entail?

Mr. COTTON. I am certain I shall study them before I vote upon them.

Mr. NEUBERGER. May I describe one of them?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I think we are getting far afield. If the junior Senator from Oregon wishes to extoll the virtues of Bonneville and the power development in that region, I shall be very happy to sit here some afternoon and listen to him. But what started out to be a discourse on Dixon-Yates and the Tennessee Valley Authority has suddenly become transformed into a discussion about another very beautiful section of the United States.

I am certain that all Senators, as well as all the people of America, are aware of the problem of that area, and also are aware of the progress which has been made everywhere in America under the free-enterprise system.

I hope to bring this discussion to an early close.

To continue with the newspaper account of the report which was made 2 days ago, it concludes by saying:

> Let us be frank. To adopt that policy would be rank, unrestrained, unadulterated socialism.

To that statement I can only add my amen.

Earlier during the colloquy I supplied various Senators with the amounts their States had to pay in support of the TVA during last year.

I should like to insert this table in the RECORD at the end of my remarks. But I wish to call to the attention of persons who might read it that there are two columns on the right-hand side of the table. In one column is the amount of money paid by each State for the support of TVA this year. The next column contains the amount of money which would be saved to the various States by the construction of private-enterprise facilities, as under the Dixon-Yates contract, the total sum being $107,250,000.

This is a most interesting compilation of figures, which I urge every Senator to study. I urge them also to ask themselves the question, Has TVA gone on long enough without paying back to the Government its proper share of the cost of its development, based upon the figures I have submitted this afternoon? I believe that the answer will be "No."

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a table I have compiled, which I will designate as exhibit 1, be printed at the end of my remarks, and that the table to which I have previously referred be designated as exhibit 2, to be printed following table 1.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

Fiscal year	Total appropriation	Charged to flood control and navigation	Balance	Compound interest at 2.6 percent	Years used
1934	$50,000,000	$25,000,000	$25,000,000	$17,859,756	21
1935	25,000,000	12,500,000	12,500,000	8,376,808	20
1936	36,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	11,314,819	19
1937	39,900,000	19,900,000	20,000,000	11,745,440	18
1938	40,166,270	20,166,270	20,000,000	10,940,974	17
1939	40,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	10,156,895	16
1940	39,003,000	19,003,000	20,000,000	9,392,685	15
1941	65,000,000	32,500,000	32,500,000	14,054,746	14
1942	196,800,000	117,902,000	78,898,000	30,558,787	13
1943	136,100,000	56,100,000	80,000,000	28,864,813	12
1944					11
1945					10
1946	9,648,000	648,000	9,000,000	2,339,606	9
1947	39,906,000		39,906,000	9,099,666	8
1948	$18,700,000		$18,700,000	$3,682,543	7
1949	30,339,061		30,339,061	5,051,564	6
1950	61,041,650		61,041,650	8,358,695	5
1951	194,714,000		194,714,000	21,052,288	4
1952	238,389,600		238,389,600	19,082,966	3
1953	336,027,000		336,027,000	17,699,136	2
1954	188,480,000		188,480,000	4,900,480	1
Total	1,785,214,581	$341,719,270	1,443,495,311	244,532,667	
Less credits for repayments			87,098,166	10,863,790	
Balance			1,356,397,145	233,668,877	

EXHIBIT 2

Division, State, or other area	Internal revenue collection, 1952 [1]		Appropriations by Congress plus transfers of property to TVA by War Department	Portion of $80,000,000 annual subsidy of TVA which was paid in taxes by citizens of various States	Portion of immediate reduction in tax outlay by States through Dixon-Yates contract being financed by private funds
	Percent of total	Amount			
New England	5.497	$3,574,000,000	$90,242,000	$4,398,000	$5,895,000
Maine	.251	163,000,000	4,121,000	201,000	269,000
New Hampshire	.172	112,000,000	2,824,000	138,000	184,000
Vermont	.103	67,000,000	1,691,000	83,000	110,000
Massachusetts	2.827	1,838,000,000	46,425,000	2,262,000	3,033,000
Rhode Island	.451	293,000,000	7,404,000	361,000	484,000
Connecticut	1.692	1,100,000,000	27,777,000	1,354,000	1,815,000
Middle Atlantic	29.781	19,360,000,000	488,900,000	23,825,000	31,940,000
New York	18.962	12,327,000,000	311,297,000	15,170,000	20,338,000
New Jersey	2.923	1,900,000,000	47,985,000	2,338,000	3,135,000
Pennsylvania	7.895	5,133,000,000	129,618,000	6,316,000	8,467,000
East North Central	27.155	17,654,000,000	445,790,000	21,724,000	29,124,000
Ohio	6.980	4,538,000,000	114,587,000	5,584,000	7,486,000
Indiana	2.090	1,359,000,000	34,310,000	1,672,000	2,242,000
Illinois	8.277	5,381,000,000	135,879,000	6,622,000	8,877,000
Michigan	7.830	5,090,000,000	128,541,000	6,264,000	8,398,000
Wisconsin	1.978	1,286,000,000	32,472,000	1,583,000	2,121,000

[1] Includes individual income and employment taxes, corporation taxes, and miscellaneous internal revenue. Does not include customs collections of $550 million in 1952.

EXHIBIT 2—Continued

Division, State, or other area	Internal revenue collection, 1952		Appropriations by Congress plus transfers of property to TVA by War Department	Portion of $80,000,000 annual subsidy of TVA which was paid in taxes by citizens of various States	Portion of immediate reduction in tax outlay by States through Dixon-Yates contract being financed by private funds
	Percent of total	Amount			
West North Central	6.927	$4,503,000,000	$113,717,000	$5,542,000	$7,429,000
Minnesota	1.496	973,000,000	24,559,000	1,197,000	1,604,000
Iowa	.804	523,000,000	13,199,000	643,000	862,000
Missouri	3.084	2,005,000,000	50,628,000	2,467,000	3,308,000
North Dakota	.107	69,000,000	1,756,000	85,000	115,000
South Dakota	.117	76,000,000	1,921,000	94,000	125,000
Nebraska	.604	393,000,000	9,916,000	483,000	648,000
Kansas	.715	465,000,000	11,738,000	572,000	767,000
South Atlantic	10.615	6,901,000,000	174,261,000	8,492,000	11,385,000
Delaware	1.183	769,000,000	19,421,000	946,000	1,269,000
Maryland [2]	2.685	1,745,000,000	44.078,000	2,148,000	2,880,000
District of Columbia	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Virginia	1.617	1,051,000,000	26,545,000	1,294,000	1,734,000
West Virginia	.487	317,000,000	7,995,000	390,000	522,000
North Carolina	2.341	1,522,000,000	38,431,000	1,873,000	2,511,000
South Carolina	.406	264,000,000	6,665,000	324,000	436,000
Georgia	.980	637,000,000	16,088,000	784,000	1,051,000
Florida	.916	595,000,000	15,038,000	733,000	982,000
East South Central	3.403	2,212,000,000	55,865,000	2,722,000	3,650,000
Kentucky	1.834	1,192,000,000	30,108,000	1,467,000	1,967,000
Tennessee	.760	494,000,000	12,476,000	608,000	815,000
Alabama	.594	386,000,000	9,751,000	476,000	637,000
Mississippi	.215	140,000,000	3,530,000	172,000	231,000
West South Central	5.269	3,425,000,000	86,499,000	4,215,000	5,651,000
Arkansas	.242	157,000,000	3,974,000	194,000	260,000
Louisiana	.760	494,000,000	12,476,000	608,000	815,000
Oklahoma	.984	640,000,000	16,154,000	787,000	1,055,000
Texas	3.283	2,135,000,000	53,895,000	2,627,000	3,521,000
Mountain	2.041	1,327,000,000	33,506,000	1,633,000	2,189,000
Montana	.178	116,000,000	2,922,000	143,000	191,000
Idaho	.181	118,000,000	2,971,000	145,000	194,000
Wyoming	.098	64,000,000	1,609,000	78,000	105,000
Colorado	.885	575,000,000	14,529,000	708,000	949,000
New Mexico	.157	102,000,000	2,577,000	126,000	168,000
Arizona	.219	143,000,000	3,595,000	175,000	235,000
Utah	.226	147,000,000	3,710,000	180,000	243,000
Nevada	.097	63,000,000	1,593,000	77,000	104,000
Pacific	90,021	5,865,000,000	148,093,000	7,217,000	9,675,000
Washington	1.161	755,000,000	19,060,000	929,000	1,245,000
Oregon	.714	464,000,000	11,721,000	571,000	766,000
California	7.146	4,645,000,000	117,312,000	5,716,000	7,664,000
Alaska	.068	44,000,000	1,116,000	55,000	73,000
Hawaii	.208	135,000,000	3,415,000	166,000	223,000
Puerto Rico	.015	10,000,000	246,000	12,000	16,000
Total	100.000	[3] 65,010,000,000	[4] 1,641,650,000	[5] 80,000,000	107,250,000

[2] Collections for the District of Columbia included with Maryland; separate data not available.
[3] Statistical abstract of the United States, 1953.
[4] TVA Annual Report, June 20, 1953, includes $45 million of transfer of property.
[5] In 1953 private utilities paid out approximately 9 percent of plant account for taxes and cost of money. If TVA paid 9 percent on its plant investment of approximately $1,100 million, they would have paid approximately $99 million as compared to payments of $4 million for taxes and interest, and approximately $14 million repayments to U. S. Treasury, leaving a net difference of approximately $80 million that TVA did not pay on a comparable basis.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, inasmuch as the so-called power-partnership proposal of this administration was discussed at length this afternoon, I should like to take just 2 or 3 minutes to say what that proposal really involves. The major partnership bill proposed by this administration had reference to the John Day powersite on the upper Columbia River. What the bill proposes is this: The Government should invest $156 million in a great multipurpose power site. The so-called local partner, which in this case would be the Portland General Electric Co., would invest $164 million. After the great dam is built it would be divided as follows: The Government would get the fish ladders, the floodgates, and the navigation locks. The utility company would get a lease on the powerhouse and all its kilowatts for at least 50 years. In other words, the way it is divided up is that the Government gets those parts of the dam which return no revenue, and the utility company gets the only part of the project which yields income and receipts.

At the present time the projects on the Columbia River, which have been built by the Federal Government and are exclusively under Federal operation, have been more than paying for themselves. As I mentioned earlier, even the annual report by Secretary McKay admits that the Bonneville Power Administration is far ahead of schedule in repayments to the Federal Treasury.

Although Bonneville Dam itself has been in full power operation only 11 years, it is approximately 38 percent paid for, which is a remarkable record either for a public or a private project. Yet at the John Day site, the Government would put up half the investment, but would relinquish virtually all the revenue.

I think the best description of the so-called partnership was sent to me in the mail by a schoolteacher in Yamhill County, Oreg., who wrote me that the so-called partnership was similar to two men owning a cow. One man got the front end of the cow to feed, and the other man got the rear end of the cow to milk. That is the way the so-called partnership works. The Government gets to pay half the investment, but surrenders nearly all the revenue. That is why, in view of the success which has come from Federal management of existing Columbia River projects, many of us are opposed to this kind of so-called partnership.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, it is extremely gratifying to me that Time magazine has seen fit to devote an article in its January 31 issue to the Colorado

River storage project, an eminently sound water-resource development of vital interest to 3 million residents of 4 semiarid States—Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

The article is a well-written, condensed, and objective report of the project. It provides helpful background material of interest to all Members of Congress.

When the Colorado River storage project bill is approved, one of the most arid parts of the country will be provided with a project based on sound reclamation law of over 50 years standing to construct some dams to control a great river and provide vitally needed water and power for communities, industries, and thirsty irrigated farmland in a 4-State area. The dams will yield all those regional benefits, return enough money into the Federal Treasury to more than repay the cost of construction of the big, long-range project, and create a superb recreational area for all America to use and enjoy.

In addition to all these benefits, I can assure honest conservationists that the few remaining fossils in Dinosaur National Monument will be left safely high and dry, 25 miles from the proposed Echo Park dam site.

These facts are made clear to help correct impressions formed by several years of distorted reporting and speechmaking by individuals who should have been better informed. For example, several years ago, paid propagandists and self-styled conservationists deliberately fostered the impression that water backed up by Echo Park Dam would flood out valuable dinosaur fossils located in Dinosaur National Monument. We who live there and know the area feel that we have at long last laid this canard to rest, but it still occasionally rises to haunt us in our mail and in conversations with uninformed people.

Other misrepresentations are still being foisted upon Congress and the public to this day, so Time's honest reporting is greatly appreciated by the residents of our area. People who know the facts and appreciate our need for water, approve the project overwhelmingly.

We of the upper basin have waited since 1922, when the Colorado River Compact was signed, to begin development of the upper Colorado. During that time, we have cooperated with the lower basin States in the almost complete development of the lower river. Congress has appropriated many hundreds of millions of dollars toward this development, and I am sure that each of us recognizes that it was a wise Federal investment.

We also have seen other great river basins developed with Federal assistance or open sponsorship. Today, as Time so aptly pointed out, the upper Colorado is the last great unharnessed river system in the United States.

During that period, I am pleased to observe, we have not been content merely to wait. We have now spent nearly $10 million in basinwide studies and surveys of the river and plans for the construction of this giant project.

Consequently, the Colorado River storage project offers to the Congress a sound, engineered program of river development, produced over years of on-the-spot study and research by the world's foremost reclamation engineers. This approach is so sound and logical, that I predict that it will become a pattern for similar water resource development planning in the future.

The Colorado River storage project is, in fact, the greatest conservation project ever devised for the West's so-called intermountain area, with first consideration given to the natural resource most vital to us—water. For much of the area involved, the Colorado River is our last waterhole, and the future development of a great domain, as large as New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania combined, depends largely upon its authorization.

Mr. President, one of our State newspapers, the Deseret News and Salt Lake Telegram, was so pleased to see a fair and objective report of this project that it reproduced the Time article in full. Carried on the same editorial page was a terse commendation, which I would like to append to my remarks. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD both the Time magazine article and the Deseret News editorial.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Time magazine of January 31, 1955]

ECHO PARK BENEFITS OUTWEIGH WRATH OF DINOSAUR FANCIERS

Early one morning shortly after he had fought the McCarthy censure proceeding to a finish, Utah's Republican Senator ARTHUR WATKINS dragged himself from bed to answer his telephone. On the line was a Presidential aide who wanted to know if WATKINS could be at the White House by 9:30. Weary, ARTHUR WATKINS managed to put off the appointment until 10 o'clock, then went down to receive Dwight Eisenhower's congratulations for a job well done.

Just before he left, WATKINS had an idea. "Mr. President," he asked, "would you permit a suggestion for your state of the Union message?" Said Ike: "Go ahead."

WATKINS proceeded to put in a plug for something near to his heart: The billion-dollar power and reclamation project proposed for the upper Colorado River Basin. There was, said WATKINS, nothing socialistic about the idea; private utilities in the West were ready and eager to buy the power. Moreover, backing by the President would help refute some of the talk about the administration's "giveaway" policy on natural resources.

"That's a good idea," said Ike, turning to an assistant and giving the necessary order.

The President did mention the upper Colorado Basin project in his state of the Union speech. He went even further than WATKINS had hoped: last week, in his budget message, the President recommended that $5 million be appropriated to get engineering started.

TREASURE HOUSE

Ike's powerful support was thereby given to a plan which has been talked about for some 50 years and has been passed over by 4 previous Congresses, largely because of unrelenting opposition from (1) southern California power interests who profit under the present distribution of Colorado River water, and (2) conservationists (e. g., Ulysses S. Grant III) who for years charged (erroneously) that the big dam proposed for Echo Park, Colo., would flood out the dinosaur remains in the national park there. They have since shifted their argument to the claim that if Dinosaur National Monument is invaded today, Yellowstone will be tomorrow's victim.

To the conservationists, Interior Secretary Douglas McKay has a trenchant answer. Says he: "As it is now, 2,200 people a year see that park. On the other hand, more than 3 million people live in the upper Colorado Basin States and they are hungry for water. Which is more important?"

The upper Colorado Basin includes 110,000 square miles of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, New Mexico, and Arizona (the upper and lower basin are defined in a seven-State compact signed in 1922, with the dividing line at Lee Ferry, Ariz.). More than 43 million acres—an area larger than the 6 New England States combined—are already given over to public recreational use (the Federal Government owns 72 percent of all the land in Utah and 52 percent of Wyoming). Some 70 percent of the farming in the upper basin depends on irrigation but only a small portion of the land is irrigated.

The upper basin is a treasure house: lead, gold, silver, zinc, coal, oil—and now, uranium. But the water is not to be had for full development of these resources.

THE BIG SIX

The upper basin's water shortage is the supreme irony, for through the area flows the Nation's fifth longest river, the Colorado, draining one-twelfth of the United States. It rises in the Rockies of Colorado and Wyoming, travels some 1,400 miles southwest past mountain meadows, breath-taking gorges, and desert wastelands. It borders southern California, which diverts its share of the water.

Then it empties, with more than half its volume still unused (and of that which is used, the lower basin gets some 60 percent), into the Gulf of California. Along its vast upper reaches, the Colorado is the last great unharnessed river system in the United States.

The project now being backed by President Eisenhower proposes six major dams at Glen Canyon, Echo Park, Cross Mountain, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, and Navaho. Each would have a dam, a reservoir, and a power plant (exception: Navaho, for which no power unit is planned).

The Glen Canyon Dam would be the most imposing; next only to the Hoover Dam, it would stand 700 feet high, provide storage for 26 million acre-feet of water, and produce 800,000 kilowatts of power. In addition to the big 6, there would be 14 lesser projects, for irrigation purposes at such odd-sounding sites as Gooseberry, Seedskadee, and Silt.

The entire system, say its supporters, would open 300,000 new acres to farming, vastly enhance the agriculture of 470,000 acres now partly under irrigation, and produce 1,622,000 kilowatts of electrical energy for an area now in desperate short supply.

Insofar as the administration is concerned, the Upper Colorado Basin has another great virtue. The people of the area want water; how they get it is less important. Missing, to a large extent, is the highly emotional issue of public versus private power that hampers reasonable discussion of power development in the Pacific Northwest. Administration advisers feel that they can make the upper Colorado a showcase for their policies on power development.

If so, they consider it well worth braving the wrath of dinosaur fanciers and southern California.

[From the Deseret News and Salt Lake Telegram of January 29, 1955]

TIME ON THE COLORADO

We have just one point to make regarding the reprint on this page of Time magazine's story on the Upper Colorado Basin.

It is this: Isn't it gratifying how logical and persuasive the case for the project appears when the story is told—at last—factually, without bias, and, without maudlin emotions? Congratulations to Time.

THE FORMOSA TREATY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have 3 or 4 miscellaneous items I wish to comment on briefly for the RECORD.

The probability is that next week there will be before the Senate the so-called Formosa Treaty. At least I understand it is the present intention of the Committee on Foreign Relations to have it considered. There is much that can be said in support of the observation that the ratification of that treaty at the present time will constitute putting into treaty form, with the sanctity of a treaty, the joint resolution passed last week, which has already caused so much world disturbance, as a few of us, in debate last week, tried to indicate that it would.

I have in my hand an editorial published in the Oregon Statesman, of Salem, Oreg., written by Mr. Charles Sprague, its editor and former Governor of the State of Oregon. Mr. Sprague is a recognized leader in the Republican Party of the State of Oregon, and formerly a United States delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations. In the editorial he raises some very serious questions as to the efficacy and the desirability of the Formosa Treaty.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT SEEMS TO ME

(By Charles A. Sprague)

On December 2 Secretary of State Dulles and the Ambassador of Nationalist China signed a treaty of mutual defense. (Why is it called mutual? What has Chiang Kai-shek to give the United States of America?) Its key provisions are:

1. Agreement for mutual help in resisting armed attack and Communist subversive activities directed from without against their territorial integrity and political stability.

2. Recognition that an armed attack in the western Pacific against the territories of either "would be dangerous to its own peace and safety," and a joint declaration for action to meet the common danger in accordance with constitutional processes.

3. Grant by the Republic of China to the United States to dispose its military forces around Formosa and the Pescadores as may be required for their defense.

Dispatching the 7th Fleet to guard Formosa when the Communists launched their aggression in Korea was a move to protect Formosa and confine the shooting to Korea. The Truman order was made without any limit as to time. In other words it was issued to meet an immediate emergency, leaving to the future the decision as to United States responsibility for protecting Formosa from the Reds.

This treaty, however, would freeze that protection into permanence. Insofar as its terms go it imposes no restraint on the Nationalists who might by raids provoke the Reds to an attack although there are intimations that Chiang has agreed to keep his forces under some measure of restraint.

The fault of the treaty lies in creating a block against any overall settlement in the Far East. It preserves a friction point which promises us continuous trouble with Red China and serves as an irritant with our Allies, Britain in particular. The wise course is to avert warfare for the time being while the nations grope for some settlement with a promise of endurance. As I have remarked in this column previously, it just doesn't make sense to keep our ships and planes on patrol duty in Formosa straits, month in, month out, year in, year out.

The United States has its differences with Red China. They are serious; but the hope is general that we can resolve them without resort to war. To that end we have exercised great patience both in the Korean war and in regard to later acts violating normal good relations between nations. Just now we are seeking through peaceful agencies the repatriation of our prisoners-of-war. The future of Formosa poses one of the most difficult problems in any general peace settlement in the Orient. Yet it must not serve as the perpetual roadblock to such a settlement.

Nathaniel Peffer, professor of international relations at Columbia University, who writes with a considerable degree of authority on Far Eastern questions, offered in a recent issue of the Nation this compromise for solving the Formosa question:

"Formosa must be declared to be part of China, within the scope of Chinese sovereignty. The present Nationalist regime must be liquidated, with asylum elsewhere given to the leaders of the government and such others as wish to leave. But for a transitional period—10 years, if possible, 5 years certainly—Formosa must have a special status. It must be put under the jurisdiction of the U. N. and administered by a commission composed of representatives of three small states. After 10 years, or 5, Formosa would be incorporated in China proper, whatever government was in power. By that time all the important men now in Formosa would have left or died and the incidence of penalization by the Communists minimized."

This is one suggestion which at least looks to a solution without keeping Formosa dangling as an appendage of the United States of America, dependent on this country for military support and continuous economic wetnursing. Some other plan might be more practical; but one is urgently needed which will get the United States off the hook in Formosa and Asia. It is vital to our own interest to hammer out a settlement in the Far East. Our diplomacy should be directed to that end, not toward bolstering the repudiated regime of Chiang Kai-shek which maintains itself by United States beneficence as a rump China Government on the island of Formosa.

Mr. MORSE. The observations by Mr. Sprague in his editorial involve points which must necessarily be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations next week. I shall see to it that those points are raised for committee discussion. I am afraid that, in its present form, the treaty will only tend to increase the tension in the south Pacific because of language in the treaty which may very well encompass the protection by the United States of Chinese territory within 7 to 10 miles of the Chinese coast—territory in which the United States does not have a scintilla of legal interest. Obviously, an attempt on the part of the United States to maintain a defense of the Quemoys and the Matsus will be bound to be a continued threat to peace in that quarter of the world.

Mr. President, I repeat that we and the American people had better be willing to run the risks of peace and to start talking less about running the risks of war. It should be surprising to no one that the Premier of China would be making the warlike statements he has made in recent hours, for certainly he has no appreciation of human life, human values, or human dignity. But we do. As a Christian nation, we have the great moral and traditional obligation of running the risks of peace. I hope the Senate will take a long, hard look at the Formosa treaty and will make certain that it is not subject to the interpretation that its ratification will place upon the United States an obligation to defend territory in the East over which we have no sovereign interest.

I wish to repeat that in my judgment the Formosa issue should be submitted to juridical, not military, determination, and that we should continue to exercise our military obligation of carrying out caretaker interest until the United Nations, under its charter, proceeds with its obligation to make a juridical determination as to Formosa. We have a clear duty to defend Formosa and the Pescadores until the United Nations disposes of those islands. We have no international-law right to defend the Quemoys and the Matsus. Until we are at war—and we are not now at war—I shall continue to plead with my country not to proceed in the South Pacific with a course of action that increases the risks of war and lessens the possibilities of peace.

While there is hope of peace I favor standing on the side of peace. While there is hope of having this threat to the peace of the world settled by the juridical processes of the United Nations, I shall continue to urge my Government to lay the matter formally before the United Nations for final determination, with no conditions attached.

It is anomalous, Mr. President, to walk before a court and say to it, "We will let you render a decision, provided you render it within the terms and conditions we lay down." We must not permit ourselves to be put into a comparable position on the Formosa question. If we do so, we merely feed the furnaces of Red propaganda.

That is why, Mr. President, in a period of time in which so much thinking is being done by so many through their glands rather than through their cortexes, it is well for us to pause long enough to reflect upon such contributions of intellect as the one to be found in the February 1 issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald. I refer to an article entitled "The Dark Tunnel," written by Walter Lippmann. I have been waiting to hear some arguments in answer to Mr. Lippmann. I believe the American people are greatly indebted to the calm, penetrating, intellectual approach he has made to the South Pacific problem, both before the passage of the joint resolution and since then. It is not too late for us to demonstrate more clearly that we are willing to let this matter be determined by the United Nations. It is no answer to say that the vicious, threatening, dictator leader of Communist China is hurling more and more insults and warlike talk toward us, because we would make a great mistake if we were to let his threats cause us to

make, in Asia, a mistake which would throw us into a war on the mainland in China.

Mr. President, is it not interesting what the Russsian attitude has been during the last week? I may be wrong, but I think it is more and more clear that there would not be mourning in the Kremlin if we were to be sucked into a war on the mainland of China. On the other hand, I think it is also quite clear that there would be mourning in the capitals of some of our allies if that should happen, because they are expressing obvious concern as to what might happen to Europe if we should become tied down in China.

So, Mr. President, as we go over the weekend preceding what undoubtedly will be another historic debate in the Senate over the Formosa Treaty, let us, as Americans, unite on two propositions: first, that once again we make clear to the world that we will defend to the hilt Formosa and the Pescadores. That has always been my position; it has been my position from the very beginning of the issue in the South Pacific, and I repeat it today, because, despite the fact that it has been my position, newspaper story after newspaper story and radio commentator after radio commentator have given the American people the impression that the three of us who, last week voted against the joint resolution, voted against the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores. We did not. On the contrary, we argue that we could better defend Formosa and the Pescadores if we did not follow a course of action which would involve a greater danger of getting into a war on the mainland of China by reason of the defense of some islands within 7 to 10 miles of the mainland of China.

We pointed out that the defense of those islands is not at all necessary to the defense of Formosa, but that the defense of those islands might very well increase the military danger of an attack on Formosa, and might very well increase the danger of Chiang sucking us into a war on the mainland of China. I hold to that point of view, which is held by many who voted for the resolution. The time has come to make it very clear to the American people that this Government is not going to go to war to protect Chiang on the Quemoys and the Matsus. If he wants to stay there, let him stay there and take the consequences. We are not going to sacrifice American boys to keep him there.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. In a moment. However, we will protect his withdrawal from there if his remaining there means that we will become sucked in and involved in the Chinese civil war on the Quemoys and on the mainland.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Is Chiang less reprehensible in Formosa than he is in the Quemoys? The Senator is painting a dreadful picture of Chiang, but Chiang is running the show in Formosa. When do we love Chiang, and when do we stop loving him?

Mr. MORSE. All I can say to the Senator from Ohio is that I will vote to protect Chiang on Formosa, but I will not vote to get my country involved in a civil war in China over Chiang. Formosa has nothing to do with the civil war in China. Formosa involves a territorial obligation of the United States as a caretaker over that area until the United Nations disposes of Formosa.

But we have not the slightest legal right to the Quemoys or the Matsus; and when we are dust, and decades go by, would that we could come back and read the judgment of history. I say that will be the judgment of history. As a matter of international law we have not the slightest right to defend the Quemoys and the Matsus, because we have no sovereign interest in them. We never have had, and there has never been any question as to the territory to which they belong. They belong to China. But I am a good enough Christian, I hope, never to advocate that we walk out on Chiang and let him be subjected to a blood bath if he is willing to evacuate and go back to the territory where we have the sovereign right to protect him. That is my position, and that was my position all through the debate last week.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. Is it not a fact that Formosa was a part of the Chinese Empire——

Mr. MORSE. Not at all.

Mr. BENDER. Seventy or eighty years ago before the Japanese took over?

Mr. MORSE. But China ceded it to the Japanese under solemn treaty.

Mr. BENDER. She ceded it to the Japanese when she had a pistol at her head.

Mr. MORSE. It was in settlement of a war.

Mr. BENDER. Formosa on that basis certainly was a part of the Chinese Empire.

Mr. MORSE. Not after she ceded it.

Mr. BENDER. The fact of the matter is that it was a part of the Chinese realm.

Mr. MORSE. Decades and decades ago, of course it was, but it ceased to be when, by a solemn treaty, Japan and China entered into a territorial settlement. Unfortunately, throughout history the animalistic side of man has caused him to fight wars, and as a result of those wars there have been treaty settlements. In those treaties there have been territorial adjustments. As a matter of international law, when that solemn treaty was signed and became the settlement of that war, Formosa became Japanese territory, and we joined in taking it away from Japan as a result of the peace treaty with Japan.

Mr. BENDER. I am sure the Senator will agree that all of us are endeavoring to avert any possibility of another Pearl Harbor.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. BENDER. I am sure all of us appreciate the fact that the Senator from Oregon is just as sincere as any other Member of the Senate. I respected him in the convention which nominated his then leader and our present President. I shall never forget joining in the demonstration for the late great Senator Taft on the floor of that convention hall. The Senator from Oregon was yelling himself hoarse for President Eisenhower and telling us what a great military leader he was, and what a fine Christian gentlemen he was. I was for Taft, but now I have come to know that the Senator from Oregon was right then.

The Senator from Oregon speaks of President Eisenhower as being a fine Christian gentleman, and he speaks of this Nation as being a Christian Nation. That is correct. We have never had a greater military leader or a greater statesman in the President's chair than President Eisenhower. There has never been a greater Christian in that office than the present President. If the Senator from Oregon knows of any other who has been greater, I should like to have him name him.

So far as the present situation is concerned, I am reminded of what an editor back home instructed one of his reporters to ask me. He asked me the following question:

Do you believe that the people of the United States should go to war with Red China, if necessary, to defend Formosa?

I replied:

I do not think we should go to war for anyone unless we have to. The entire purpose of the resolution which we passed last week and the present policy of the administration with respect to Formosa is to prevent the outbreak of a major war. We are doing our best to show the Chinese and the Communists that we are prepared, if necessary, to fight against any further Communist aggression. I pray that this will prevent the necessity of war, and that it will serve as a guidepost to the United Nations in compelling peace.

That is what we are endeavoring to do. The Senator from Oregon referred to the radio and television commentators misrepresenting his position. Frankly, I assumed, after sitting here listening to my good friend from Oregon on the floor of the Senate, that what the radio and television commentators and the newspapers said was correct. The Senator was opposing a program to which the overwhelming majority of Members of Congress, not only here, but in the other body, agreed. Certainly we know that if we fail to preserve peace in the Formosan area, the entire problem will be on our doorstep.

I did not intend to get into this discussion. At the moment I happen to be sitting in one of the seats of the mighty. Temporarily I am occupying the chair of the minority leader. When the Senator from Oregon speaks, I try to understand what he says. I cannot quite figure it out. However, I know that in my judgment we are pursuing the only course we can pursue to preserve the peace. That is our only objective.

So far as our great President is concerned, I am sure my distinguished friend from Oregon would not say that the President is acting in a warlike manner, or that he wants war. Certainly he craves peace. No man in the world knows the cost of war better than he does. No man knows the price we all pay for war any better than our great President knows it.

Under the circumstances, I say that his judgment and the advice he receives are the kind of judgment and advice we need at this time in a world of strife.

Mr. MORSE. In reply to my good friend from Ohio I should like to say that I certainly have complete confidence in his sincerity. I respect his devotion and dedication to peace. However, as to many of his remarks I must say most respectfully that I find myself in the position in which one sometimes finds himself in a courtroom when he is confronted with arguments which are irrelevant, immaterial, and inconsequential so far as the issue before the court is concerned. Because I feel that so much of what the Senator has said is immaterial to the subject I was discussing, I shall make no additional comment on his remarks but return to a further discussion of the issue I was talking about before the Senator from Ohio interrupted.

The question is how best to defend Formosa. The Senator from Oregon is perfectly willing to let the record speak for itself on that question. He voted against the joint resolution last week because he did not believe it provided the best way to defend Formosa. He believed that the resolution increased the danger of war on the mainland of China.

Certainly nothing has transpired since the resolution was passed which would indicate that we have decreased the danger of such a war. I repeat my major thesis that we best defend Formosa when we remain within the international law rights of the United States. We do have those rights on Formosa, and we do not have them on the Quemoys and the Matsus.

Therefore, I believe we should continue to make perfectly clear that we shall defend Formosa from attack. I believe we ought to try, through some such resolution as the Humphrey resolution, which was postponed in the Committee on Foreign Relations last week, to urge the United Nations to exercise its jurisdiction, because it has the power to call upon the countries involved in this dispute to submit their case for judicial determination.

One more point, and I shall have completed my argument on this issue today.

I wish to express again, for the weekend consideration of the American people, the fact that we have a legal duty to defend Formosa. Formosa is not Chinese territory. Under the Sino-Japanese treaty of many years ago, following the Sino-Japanese war, it became Japanese territory. Under the Japanese treaty following World War II, it ceased to be Japanese territory. If I read correctly the writings of international lawyers, its status awaits final settlement and international legal determination by the United Nations.

That is why the Senator from Oregon for many months has been urging the establishment of a United Nations trusteeship over Formosa, and that we maintain a military protectorate over Formosa until the United Nations assumes jurisdiction.

It seems to me that the real threat of war in that area at this time lies in the fact that there may be committed in connection with Quemoy and the Matsus some act which may make it necessary to proceed to exercise all the power contained in the joint resolution passed last week.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is quite right when he points out that the intentions and objectives and purposes of our President are intentions and objectives and purposes of peace. I said as much over and over again in the debate last week. I am satisfied the President seeks only peace. What I fear is that he and all the others of us may be maneuvered into such a position that peace cannot be attained. I believe we greatly increase the risks of war unless we get the whole question before the United Nations for juridical determination, without any strings attached, either by Red China or by the United States. If we believe in a system of international justice through law, that must be done.

Interestingly enough, in my 10 years in the Senate I do not know of 2 Senators who stood more firmly in support of a system of international justice through law than the late Senator from Michigan, Mr. Vandenberg, and the late Senator from Ohio, Mr. Taft. When I stood on the other side of the aisle and fought for the Morse resolution in 1945, calling for the acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction of a world court, which subsequently became the United States attitude in our membership in the United Nations, no one helped me more than the late Senator from Ohio, Mr. Taft. He was always one of the most ardent advocates in the Senate for the settlement of international disputes, not by a show of military force, but by the force of reason in a juridical body.

I believe it is not too late for us to win world opinion solidly behind us, and thereby throw the vicious, lying Russian Communist propaganda for a great loss, by making clear to the world that we are willing to let the issue of the Quemoys and the Matsus and Formosa and the Tachens be settled by juridical decision through the United Nations, or by whatever tribunal the United Nations wishes to create to settle it. Certainly some of the phases of the issue might very well be determined by a world court.

I now turn my attention to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

OUR TRADE POLICY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this morning in the hearings on H. R. 1, the so-called trade-program bill, there appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. William R. Shinn, of Salem, Oreg. He appeared in behalf of the Cherry Growers and Industries Foundation. He submitted testimony, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks before I make certain comments on it.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON H. R. 1 BY WILLIAM R. SHINN, OF SALEM, OREG., FOR THE CHERRY GROWERS AND INDUSTRIES FOUNDATION, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, FEBRUARY 4, 1955

I appear at this hearing on behalf of the Cherry Growers and Industries Foundation, the principal office of which is located in Corvallis, Oreg., for the purpose of discussing H. R. 1 from the point of view of the sweet cherry industry of the United States, comprising the growers, handlers, processors, and shippers of sweet cherries grown commercially throughout the United States.

The sweet-cherry industry is vitally interested in H. R. 1 for the reason that this industry to a large extent is dependent upon tariff protection on imports of brined cherries and finished maraschino or glacé cherries.

The Cherry Growers and Industries Foundation is a trade association of 18,432 growers, shippers, and processors of sweet cherries in California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Michigan, and New York. It presumes to speak on these matters on behalf of the sweet-cherry industry by reason of its wide membership among all factors of the industry. I offer for the record a list of the officers and members of the board of trustees of this organization.

I am a member of the board of trustees of the foundation, and have been directed by the executive committee of the board to present this statement. My personal connection with the industry is as secretary and assistant general manager of Willamette Cherry Growers, Inc., a cooperative marketing association of cherry growers in Oregon's Willamette Valley.

Brined cherries (also known as "sulphured" cherries) are cherries which have been treated in a sulphurous acid solution as the raw stock for manufacture of maraschino, glacéd and candied cherries widely used by the confectionery, ice cream, and bakery trades, sold as cocktail cherries, included in canned fruit salad or fruit cocktail packs, and bottled for household use.

The domestic cherry industry is highly vulnerable to imports, by reason of the much lower foreign production and processing costs. There is a tremendous disparity between the labor costs in the foreign and American cherry orchards and processing plants. Basic wage rates prevailing in the Pacific coast cherry brining plants are about $1.31 per hour for men and $1.13 for women, for unskilled workers. Classified rates, such as for brine makers, barrel headers, and mechanics are much higher. These rates are exclusive of the cost of health and welfare coverage, overtime and double time, guaranteed minimum work periods, and other fringe benefits.

In comparison, our latest reliable information is that Italian and French plants brining cherries for export to the United States have been paying average wages equivalent to from about 25 cents to 46 cents per hour, inclusive of the value of certain government benefits to workers. These competitive foreign wage rates range between about one-fifth and one-third of our lowest base wage rates.

Labor costs in growing and harvesting the American cherries likewise are far greater than those applicable to the Italian and French cherries. The foreign growers are content to receive prices amounting to about one-half of the American growers' costs of production.

These differences in labor costs, which the American industry cannot possibly reduce or overcome, are of critical significance, for more than 60 percent of the cost of growing

and harvesting sweet cherries, and approximately 50 percent of the cost of brining and pitting cherries in the United States, is cost of labor, despite recourse by the American industry to every practicable mechanization in producing, handling, and processing the cherries.

The disparity between foreign and American production costs is not overcome by delivery costs. Ocean freight rates on brined cherries from Italy or France to the United States are less than rail or water rates on Pacific coast cherries to the eastern buyers. Even as to cherries grown and processed on the east coast, the shipping costs of the imports far from make up for the higher domestic costs.

The present tariff rates, particularly the reduced rates on finished cherries, do not equalize these cost differences. Present import duties merely place a low floor under import prices. The domestic industry is now particularly vulnerable to French glacé cherries, which have entered the United States in substantially increasing quantities since the second tariff reduction on those cherries in 1948, and at prices which American glacé manufacturers report to be below their costs of production.

The obvious purpose of H. R. 1, considered in the light of the majority report of the Randall Commission, is to continue the course of widespread tariff reductions as an instrument of international politics. No doubt those nations which have been gratuitously advising us on our tariff policy and clamoring for further reductions of our already low duty rates, without manifesting any sincere intent to lift the artificial barriers which they so effectively maintain against our own products, will take this measure, if enacted, as an assurance of wholesalesale reductions of our tariff rates, and accordingly will press vigorously for such reductions.

We object to provisions of H. R. 1 which would authorize the President to reduce to a 50 percent ad valorem equivalent any and all rates determined by him to have exceeded that figure during such time as he may consider to be "representative." The implication of H. R. 1 that any rate in excess of 50 percent ad valorem is excessive is wholly fallacious. For example, the present 9½ cents per pound rate on pitted brined cherries is equivalent to 58.2 percent ad valorem if computed on the basis of 1952 imports, or 55.3 percent if based on 1953 imports; yet as I have pointed out, the present cherry rates cannot possibly be considered excessive with relation to comparative domestic and foreign costs of production, and do not now give the American producers an even break with the foreign producers in their own American markets. The American cherry industry should have more, rather than less, tariff protection than the present duty rates provide. We submit that the 50 percent ad valorem basis specified in H. R. 1 as one of the devices for tariff reduction is without adequate basis in fact, is delusive, and should be deleted from the bill.

Certainly any such provision should be surrounded with limitations beyond the present "representative period" wording. The ad valorem equivalent of specific duty rates may fluctuate widely from season to season or even month to month, according to variations of market prices as affected by supplies available and many other factors. In fact, it is during times of domestic or foreign surpluses and consequent depressed prices, when the ad valorem equivalent of the duty rates is highest, that tariff protection is most urgently needed. Low import values and thus a high ad valorem level of the import duty, may even be the result of foreign subsidizing of exports, or artificial "rigging" of foreign export prices. We propose that any determination of ad valorem equivalent rate be required to be on the basis of a definite period of time, such as the previous 3 years, rather than left to the unlimited discretion of the President.

Of similar concern to us are the provisions for possible 50 percent reduction of rates on commodities the President determines are being imported in "negligible" quantities. The bill does not define the word "negligible." Does this mean inconsequential in comparison with imports of other commodities, or with the dollar average of all imports, or in relation to imports of the one commodity involved; and if this latter, then in comparison with imports of that commodity during what period of time? Even more alarming is the fact that this provision would make the quantity of imports at the time the trade agreement is entered into, the controlling factor.

Imports of brined cherries vary widely in volume according to the size of domestic and foreign crops or brined packs, price levels, and even the extent of pure food and drug surveillance of imports in any particular period. The imports at the time a trade agreement is signed may thus be negligible in comparison with imports of all commodities at that time, or in comparison with the imports of brined cherries during the same time in previous years. The "negligible" standard makes no allowance for prospective or potential imports. More than 20 million pounds of brined cherries were imported from Italy in 1929, before the present tariff rates took effect. Italy is reported to have more than doubled its cherry production since that time. Even if current cherry imports could be considered "negligible" (and certainly they are not), such would not necessarily mean that present tariff rates are excessive or not needed. A dike erected against a known flood danger is not torn down merely because at the moment no water is pouring over its top.

If multilateral trade agreements are to continue, or if tariff rate revisions are to be made in any other manner by Presidential action, then certainly peril point and escape clause procedures are essential. Future bargaining with foreign governments on trade matters must preserve for American industry the opportunity to compete fairly with foreign products in our own markets. If a trade commitment is found to have the result or potential effect of destroying that opportunity for fair competition, and thus destroying or seriously injuring the American industry concerned, there must be reserved a method for correcting that result. We, of course, disagree with and deplore the proposals of some individuals (who we note usually are from industries without serious import competition) that our Government deliberately sacrifice those of our industries which cannot survive without some import protection.

We favor making the Tariff Commission's determinations in peril point and escape clause proceedings mandatory upon the President. We feel strongly that if the purpose of peril point and escape clause provisions is sound, and if the intent is to protect the opportunity of American industry to compete fairly with imports in the American markets, then there can be no proper basis for continuing the present authority of the President to disregard or veto the factual determinations of the expert Tariff Commission arrived at after public hearing and thorough competent consideration. The entire peril point and escape clause mechanism at the Tariff Commission level tends to be farcical so long as the President may arbitrarily and for reasons entirely foreign to the purposes of the peril point and escape clause provisions disregard the Commission's findings.

We strongly believe that the tariff should be taken out of executive control, removed from the realm of international politics, and handled by the Congress as a domestic matter, with fact-finding functions final in the Tariff Commission.

Our concern about these matters is not academic. More than one-third of the commercial sweet cherry production of the United States is now brined. Practically the entire large Michigan production of sweet cherries goes into brine, and from 75 percent to 90 percent of the New York crop. Oregon also brines most of its cherry production.

The tariff-protected brined market is now the keystone to the advantageous and orderly marketing of the entire sweet cherry production of the United States. The fresh and canning markets, which before the rise of the cherry brining industry in the United States were the only markets for the sweet cherry crops, could not now possibly absorb sufficient quantities of the annual production of cherries to keep today's sweet cherry industry in business.

The domestic brined cherry industry has developed entirely since the Tariff Act of 1930 established the present tariff rates on brined cherries, and the rates on finished cherries which prevailed until reduced under the 1936 trade agreement with Italy. Prior to 1930 it was impossible for the American growers and processors to compete with the cheaply produced foreign cherries, with the result that practically all brined cherries then used in the United States were imported. There was no important commercial cherry brining industry in the United States prior to 1930. This is an industry which was created and is largely maintained by tariff protection, and which would rapidly fall back to insignificant size without adequate tariff protection.

The American cherry industry has no present or potential export market. It depends entirely upon its own domestic markets which it has developed by vigorous effort and enterprise to their present substantial proportions. Its tariff protection has been the cherry industry's sole reliance upon Government assistance to date. We consider this to be far more wholesome for the industry and for the Nation as a whole than any kind of Government subsidy program or public relief. We believe further that no practicable type of Government support or relief program could sustain the American cherry industry if it were deprived of reasonable tariff protection.

We are appalled by the apparently serious suggestions now being made that industries such as ours should acquiesce in the sacrifice of our hard-won domestic markets on the altar of international diplomacy, and that we be content with assurances that upon destruction or serious limitation of our industry we shall all have the opportunity of being retrained, relocated, and rehabilitated at public expense. You can well imagine the reaction of an Oregon or New York cherry grower who may have spent the larger part of his mature life in bringing his cherry orchard up to a point of economic production, when told that if the cherry tariffs are cut to the point where he cannot make a living out of his cherry orchard, the Government will pay the expense of relocating him in Detroit as an automobile mechanic or in California to work in the airplane factories.

Much of the cherry production in the United States is in areas best suited to that crop, and has been established under strong encouragement by the United States Department of Agriculture and by the State agricultural colleges, as the best utilization of certain types of land and for agricultural diversification. Loss of this agricultural industry in those areas could not be made up to any substantial extent by production of other commodities. A case in point is the specialized cherry producing district in the area of The Dalles in eastern Oregon. Land use committees of growers

and government officials set up for the purpose of considering what use might be made of such cherry acreage should it become necessary to pull the orchards have failed to find any possible satisfactory alternative utilization for that land.

A mature cherry orchard represents a heavy investment, and frequently constitutes a lifetime family enterprise. It cannot be converted under any circumstances to some other crop or usage without a tragic loss of time, effort, and investment.

The growing of cherries is typically a small-farm family-size operation. It is carried on in the United States by many thousands of farm families heavily reliant upon their "cherry money" for their livelihood.

The great amount of hand labor required in the harvesting, packing, and processing of the cherry crop results in extensive employment and payrolls in the States involved. For instance, approximately 6,500 people were employed in harvesting the 1954 sweet cherry crop in the Willamette Valley in Oregon which is served by the cooperative association with which I am identified. It is estimated that the gross returns from the 1954 crop brined cherries packed in the Salem, Oreg., area, covering the fruit itself, wages paid, and cost of the Oregon fir barrels, will total approximately $7 million.

Our operations in Salem, Oreg., of course, are only a small portion of the United States cherry industry, but the economic importance of this activity to this one relatively small community indicates the substantial extent of the national industry when measured in terms of payrolls and returns to the many communities and separate areas involved.

The American industry does not seek to exclude the foreign cherries. It does, however, require equalization of the cost of the foreign and domestic cherries, through the medium of import duties, so that the domestic industry may continue to exist and compete fairly with the foreign cherries in its own domestic markets. We know very well and very clearly that without adequate tariff protection our domestic markets frequently would be demoralized and ultimately would be taken over by the foreign cherries, at least in years of normal foreign crops. The domestic industry could not exist under such conditions in the future, any more than it was able to exist under such conditions prior to the Tariff Act of 1930.

H. R. 1 appears to be aimed directly at this and similarly protected industries. It is no comfort to us that H. R. 1 purports to dilute its lethal dosages over a period of 3 years. An untimely, even if slow and agonized, death would be the prospect for our national brined cherry industry.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a reading of the testimony will bring to mind a problem I have discussed on the floor of the Senate many times in the last 10 years. I discuss it now as one who favors a reciprocal trade program. I discuss it as one who knows that the program of "trade, not aid," if it is put into operation, will cause some dislocations in some segments of our economy.

However, there are certain phases of the program on which I wish to comment briefly. In the Willamette Valley of Oregon, which is of great agricultural value, and which produces a large volume of the agricultural commodities of my State, there are a great many soft spots today. The cherry industry is soft. The filbert and walnut industries are soft. The dairy industry is experiencing difficulty. The hop industry, which is a very important agricultural industry in the Willamette Valley, is in a serious situation. Some hop growers have written to me, saying that they believe the importation of hops might very well make it completely unprofitable in the near future to produce hops in the Willamette Valley. The fruit industry generally is greatly concerned.

Therefore, Mr. President, as we move into a consideration of H. R. 1 and the international trade program which will grow out of it, I think we need to recognize the importance of a proposal which I made, as I recall, 5 years ago in the Senate when I pointed out that cherry trees, walnut trees, filbert trees, and other fruit and nut crops are not grown in a year. It takes years to produce them. The investment in them is exceedingly heavy; and the following of a course of governmental action which makes it impossible for the growers to market their harvests at a profit places, I think, a moral obligation on the Government to take the necessary steps to come to the assistance of the farmers who suffer as a result of such action.

I have made suggestions in the past as to the form of assistance, but I think it is well at this point to take note of two comments of Mr. Shinn in his testimony this morning:

The sweet cherry industry is vitally interested in H. R. 1 for the reason that this industry to a large extent is dependent upon tariff protection on imports of brined cherries and finished maraschino or glacé cherries.

* * * * *

The domestic cherry industry is highly vulnerable to imports, by reason of the much lower foreign production and processing costs. There is a tremendous disparity between the labor costs in the foreign and American cherry orchards and processing plants. Basic wage rates prevailing in the Pacific coast cherry brining plants are about $1.31 per hour for men and $1.13 for women, for unskilled workers. Classified rates, such as for brine makers, barrel headers, and mechanics, are much higher. These rates are exclusive of the cost of health and welfare coverage, overtime and double time, guaranteed minimum work periods, and other fringe benefits.

In comparison, our latest reliable information is that Italian and French plants brining cherries for export to the United States have been paying average wages equivalent to from about 25 cents to 46 cents per hour, inclusive of the value of certain Government benefits to workers. These competitive foreign wage rates range between about one-fifth and one-third of our lowest wage rates.

Labor costs in growing and harvesting the American cherries likewise are far greater than those applicable to the Italian and French cherries. The foreign growers are content to receive prices amounting to about one-half of the American growers' costs of production.

These differences in labor costs, which the American industry cannot possibly reduce or overcome, are of critical significance, for more than 60 percent of the cost of growing and harvesting sweet cherries, and approximately 50 percent of the cost of brining and pitting cherries in the United States, is cost of labor, despite recourse by the American industry to every practicable mechanization in producing, handling, and processing the cherries.

Then Mr. Shinn points out a procedural matter about which I wish to comment in conclusion. He says:

We object to provisions of H. R. 1 which would authorize the President to reduce to a 50-percent ad valorem equivalent any and all rates determined by him to have exceeded that figure during such time as he may consider to be "representative." The implication of H. R. 1 that any rate in excess of 50 percent ad valorem is excessive is wholly fallacious. For example, the present 9½-cents-per-pound rate on pitted brined cherries is equivalent to 58.2 percent ad valorem if computed on the basis of 1952 imports, or 55.3 percent if based on 1953 imports; yet as I have pointed out, the present cherry rates cannot possibly be considered excessive with relation to comparative domestic and foreign costs of production, and do not now give the American producers an even break with the foreign producers in their own American markets.

Elsewhere in his testimony Mr. Shinn points out:

If multilateral trade agreements are to continue, or if tariff rate revisions are to be made in any other manner by Presidential action, then certain peril-point and escape-clause procedures are essential. Future bargaining with foreign governments on trade matters must preserve for American industry the opportunity to compete fairly with foreign products in our own markets. If a trade commitment is found to have the result or potential effect of destroying that opportunity for fair competition, and thus destroying or seriously injuring the American industry concerned, there must be reserved a method for correcting that result.

I shall have something to say in a moment about possible methods. I read further:

We favor making the Tariff Commission's determinations in peril-point and escape-clause proceedings mandatory upon the President. We feel strongly that if the purpose of peril-point and escape-clause provisions is sound, and if the intent is to protect the opportunity of American industry to compete fairly with imports in the American markets, then there can be no proper basis for continuing the present authority of the President to disregard or veto the factual determinations of the expert Tariff Commission, arrived at after public hearing and thorough competent consideration.

Elsewhere in his statement this morning Mr. Shinn pointed up the procedural problem which I now wish to emphasize.

I do not go all the way with Mr. Shinn in regard to the operation of the peril point. Neither do I believe that the President of the United States should be given the very arbitrary discretionary power he will have unless some check is placed upon him.

I am talking about a procedural matter which greatly concerns me these days in the operation of the executive branch of our Government. This is no new position with me. I expressed a similar point of view under the administrations of both President Roosevelt and President Truman, because I think we are moving too far in the direction of eliminating congressional check upon the executive branch of the Government. We are placing entirely too much executive discretionary power in the President in connection with trade. We see this problem cropping out these days, Mr. President, in connection with the President's relationship to a great many commissions. Do not forget that the United States Tariff Commission is our "baby." The United States Tariff Commission is a child of the Congress, as is the Interstate

Commerce Commission, as is the Atomic Energy Commission, and as are all the other commissions established by Congress.

What is happening in our country is that many of our people are overlooking the fact that under our constitutional system the functions being performed by these commissions originally were performed by the Congress, but the job of administering government became so extensive and complex that it became perfectly obvious that the Congress of the United States could not function as a regulator of railroad rates and tariff rates or perform the many other functions now performed by commissions. So what did the Congress do? Congress passed legislation which delegated the administrative power of the Congress—not legislative power—in the field of law administration to bodies which have become known as commissions and similar regulatory bodies. But they are carrying out primarily the work of the Congress. We must keep a check on them.

In recent years there has been developing on the part of the Congress a tendency to allow the President to pass final judgment upon the decisions of these congressional bodies, with the result that the President is coming to exercise more and more quasi-legislative power. The big fuss over the Dixon-Yates contract is because the President has stepped in and ordered a congressional agency to enter into it. That is an abuse of the executive power. The act of the President of the United States in directing and ordering the Atomic Energy Commission to make the contract when a majority of that Commission was on record as being opposed to it, because, in the opinion of the majority of the Commission, it represented unsound public policy, was, in my judgment, an abuse by the President of the United States of executive power and a trespass upon legislative prerogatives and rights. This tendency is increasing.

The last item I shall take up this afternoon will deal, in my judgment, with another improper use of Executive power by the President of the United States in connection with another Government commission. But in connection with the matter of the Tariff Commission, I do not go along all the way with Mr. Shinn on the point that the President should not have the power in any way to modify the recommendation or the decision of the Tariff Commission in the operation of the peril point. I do say, however, that when the President of the United States reverses one of our agencies, one of our legislative children, one of the bodies responsible to Congress, we had better review the President's act. We had better exercise a check upon him.

So as we begin the debate on H. R. 1, I wish to say that, in my judgment, in connection with agricultural problems such as Mr. Shinn brought out in relation to the cherry industry of my State—and there are other phases of agriculture which are going to be likewise adversely affected—Congress clearly has the duty of reviewing the action taken by the President. I shall give very careful consideration to proposals, which I understand are in the making, for some procedural modifications in regard to the exercise of power by the President of the United States whereby Congress will exercise a check upon him. In this connection I think we should give serious consideration to the suggestion that Congress should have a limited time within which to review the President's actions in these trade cases. In the absence of such congressional review the President's ruling would become operative.

This afternoon all I have sought to do in connection with the cherry problem in my State is to get the material into the RECORD and to point out the serious injury which is likely to flow, not only to the cherry industry, but also to other types of orchards in my State—in fact, also, I think, in regard to some other phases of American agriculture.

I am for working along with the President in building up world trade, recognizing that some dislocations are bound to occur in the national economy. But I also say that all the people of the United States, when these dislocations occur, owe a responsibility to the people of our country who are damaged thereby, at least to the extent of providing a procedure whereby some adjustment will be made for losses which will be suffered by some segment of the industry until it can make another agricultural adjustment.

To be specific, I remember that about 5 years ago I pointed out that I did not think it was fair, as happened in many parts of my State, to have the importation of Turkish and Italian filberts result in the tearing out of acres and acres of filbert orchards in my State, with the Government taking the attitude that because it had inaugurated that policy, 164 million American people had no responsibilities whatsoever to the filbert growers, who, in fact, were subjected to the tremendous losses which followed from that course of action.

On the basis of the moral principles of a fair insurance policy, I felt that our Government ought to have been looked upon somewhat as an insurer in that case, and that there should have been some adjustment made to the farmers who suffered those losses. I think the principle is sound. The problem is to find a way to work out the mechanics and the equities which would do justice to the taxpayers as well as to the persons who suffer losses.

I now turn to another matter, which involves another regrettable example of this administration's concern on behalf of big business. It is to be found in the President's action of February 2, in which he refused approval of the unanimous recommendation of the Civil Aeronautics Board that the Northwest Airlines be recertified for service from the Pacific Northwest to Hawaii.

I recall that it was a few years ago when I fought on the floor of the Senate shoulder to shoulder with the Senators from Washington in an attempt to get authorization for certification for Northwest Airlines to fly schedules to Hawaii via Portland and Seattle. We were successful, although, as is the case in this instance, approval is always on a so-called temporary basis.

What has happened has been that the temporary permit being subject to renewal, the Civil Aeronautics Board, by a unanimous decision, recommended that the permit be extended. But the President has reversed the Board, and the result of the reversal is to do great damage to Northwest Airlines and to subject my section of the country, the Pacific Northwest, to the monopoly of Pan-American.

By action which is little short of amazing, the President specifically disapproved the Portland-Seattle-Hawaii route certification for Northwest Airlines, and expressed a desire that the certificate to Pan-American World Airways be renewed on a temporary basis on this Hawaiian run. By the President's action, Pan-American will be placed in a monopoly position over this route.

The people of the Pacific Northwest share my deep concern over this mandate of the President to the Civil Aeronautics Board. The protests of the people in Oregon have come to my office in the form of many urgent telegrams.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks some of the telegrams I have received on this issue from citizens of Oregon in recent hours.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Desire your urgent attention to President's reversal CAB's recommendation that Northwest Airlines serve Pacific Northwest-Hawaii route subsidy free Northwest Air Lines sole interest in Seattle-Portland Gateway. NWA has been first and foremost on the route from Pacific Northwest.

BOB MADDEN.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In interest of national economy request you investigate the President's refusal to accept the unanimous decision of Civil Aeronautics Board to grant permanent subsidy free certificate to Northwest Air Lines from Pacific Northwest to Hawaii. This refusal is serious blow to Pacific Northwest as Northwest Air Lines' sole interest is development of Pacific Northwest instead of California Gateways.

ALLEN W. MCCAULEY.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Northwest Air Lines offer of subsidy free service Portland-Honolulu is a refreshing confident move in an industry that has too long been Government supported; urgently request you investigate why President has refused to accept CAB unanimous decision in favor of NWA, whose sole interest is the development of Pacific Northwest Gateway and your State.

W. D. WHITE.

VANCOUVER, WASH., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Pacific Northwest wants and needs Northwest Air Lines' service exclusively to

Hawaii as evidenced by past CAB hearing and records. Urgently request you investigate why President Eisenhower or advisers refuse to accept original CAB unanimous decision to grant NWA permanent subsidy free certificate for this route.

C. O. LINDSEY.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Desire your urgent investigation of Seattle-Portland-Hawaii route case. Records show Northwest Air Lines has carried more passengers and did more to develop and promote the Pacific Northwest Gateway as its sole gateway to Hawaii. In addition only Northwest Air Lines had offered to operate this route on a subsidy-free basis. This is backed by CAB recommendations.

GEORGE J. MIKULA,
Employee, Northwest Air Lines.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Desire your urgent investigation of Seattle-Portland Hawaii route case. Records show Northwest Air Lines has carried more passengers and done more to develop and promote the Pacific Northwest gateway as its sole gateway to Hawaii; in addition only NWA has offered to operate this route on subsidy-free basis, and this is backed by CAB recommendation.

DENNIS E. LYSNE.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 3, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Request you investigate why President refused to accept CAB's original unanimous decision in favor of Northwest Airlines in Pacific Northwest Hawaii route case. Northwest is as much interested in Pacific Northwest as you. This is the one and only gateway. Their service is excellent and should be continued.

DOROTHY LAWRENCE.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 3, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Request that you investigate President's refusal to accept CAB's unanimous decision to grant permanent subsidy-free certificate to Northwest Airlines for the Portland to Honolulu route. NWA is the only carrier which can assure full development of the Pacific Northwest gateway to Hawaii, as Northwest Airlines has no California interest.

GUS N. BALLAS.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 3, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Desire your urgent investigation of Seattle Portland Hawaii route case. Records show Northwest Airlines has carried more passengers and done more to develop and promote the Pacific Northwest gateway as its sole gateway to Hawaii. In addition only Northwest Airlines has offered to operate this route on a subsidy-free basis. Then this is backed by CAB recommendation.

W. R. WATSON.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 3, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In the interest of national economy we request that you investigate the President's refusal to accept the CAB's unanimous decision to grant a permanent subsidy free certificate to Northwest Airlines from Portland to Hawaii.

ERVIN A. WAGNER,
Wagner Tractor, Inc.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 3, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Pacific Northwest wants and needs Northwest Airlines service exclusively to Hawaii as evidenced by past CAB hearing and records urgently request you investigate why President or advisers refuse to accept original CAB unanimous decision to grant NWA permanent subsidy-free certificate for this route.

C. GUILES.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 3, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

In the interest of national economy we request that you investigate the President's refusal to accept the CAB's unanimous decision to grant a permanent subsidy-free certificate to Northwest Airlines for the Portland-to-Honolulu route.

THEODORE THYE,
Western Athletic Club.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Desire your urgent investigation of Seattle-Portland-Hawaii route case records show Northwest Airlines has carried more passengers and done more to develop and promote the Pacific Northwest gateway as its sole gateway to Hawaii. In addition only NWA has offered to operate this route on a subsidy-free basis. This is backed by CAB recommendation.

HOWARD Q. PEASE.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Pacific Northwest wants and needs Northwest Airline service exclusively to Hawaii as evidenced by past CAB hearing and records. Urgently request you investigate why President or advisors refuse to accept original CAB unanimous decision to grant NWA permanent subsidy-free certificate for this route.

ROY ZORN.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge congressional attention Eisenhower's recommendation reversing Aeronautics Board decision regarding Portland-Honolulu route. Northwest pioneered route. History indicates Pan Am received certification through political pressure. Northwest offered flying subsidy free. Feel Eisenhower ill advised on decision promoting monopoly in Pacific area. Suggest pro Pan Am policy, Eisenhower and Weeks be examined.

BORDEN F. BECK, Jr.

HILLSBORO, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Request urgent investigation President's reversal of CAB's unanimous decision and recommendation to certificate Northwest Airlines as sole operator Seattle-Portland-Honolulu not consistent with avowed policy of administration to reduce Government spending inasmuch as NWA only carrier offering to operate Pacific-Northwest-Hawaii route subsidy free.

JOHN TEUFEL.

ROSEBURG, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you investigate CAB ruling effecting Northwest gateways to Pacific in order to insure Northwest Airlines receives fair deal.

LEWIS TRAVEL SERVICE.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Request your urgent investigation President's refusal to accept the CAB's unanimous decision to grant a permanent subsidy-free certificate to Northwest Airlines for the Portland to Honolulu route.

HARRY E. HEATHMAN,
President, Heathman Hotels.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Desire urgent investigation of Seattle-Portland-Hawaii route case. Records show Northwest Airlines has carried more passengers and done more to develop and promote Pacific Northwest as its sole gateway to Hawaii in addition only NWA has offered to operate route subsidy free. This backed by CAB recommendations.

HELEN MADDEN.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Pacific Northwest wants and needs Northwest Airlines service exclusively to Hawaii as evidenced by past CAB hearing and records. Urgently request you investigate why President or advisers refuse to accept original CAB unanimous decision to grant Northwest Airlines permanent subsidy-free certificate for this group.

ALLEN E. FOXWORTHY.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Request your urgent investigation President's refusal to accept CAB's unanimous decision to grant a permanent subsidy-free certificate to Northwest Airlines for the Portland-Honolulu route.

H. D. LEWIS.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Pacific Northwest wants and needs Northwest Airlines service exclusively to Hawaii as evidenced by past CAB hearing and record. Urgently request you investigate why President or adviser refused to accept original CAB unanimous decision to grant Northwest Airlines permanent subsidy-free certificate for this route.

CHARLES E. ALBERT.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Request that you make immediate investigation into the reversal by the President of recent CAB recommendation that would name Northwest Airlines as the operator of the Seattle-Portland-Hawaii route. Northwest Airlines is the only carrier which can assure full development of the Pacific Northwest gateway to Hawaii as Northwest Airlines has no California interest. In addition only Northwest Airlines has offer to operate this route on a completely subsidy-free basis.

JOHN W. KELLY, Jr.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The reversal by the President of the CAB's unanimous decision and recommendation to certificate Northwest Air Lines as the sole operator Seattle, Portland, Honolulu is not consistent with the avowed policy of the administration to reduce Government spending, inasmuch as NWA is the only carrier offering to operate the Pacific Northwest to Hawaii route on the absolutely subsidy-free basis.

D. LILE.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Desire your urgent investigation of Seattle, Portland, Hawaii route case. Records show Northwest Air Lines has carried more passengers and done more to develop and promote the Pacific Northwest gateway as its sole gateway to Hawaii. In addition, only Northwest Air Lines has offered to operate this route on a subsidy-free basis. Then this is backed by CAB recommendation.

O. RONALD MCCLEOD.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Hope you can protest CAB Northwest Air Line Hawai decision. Letter follows:

IVAN BLOCH.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As businessmen and taxpayers, we feel a great disservice is being done Oregon and the Northwest by the President's decision to reverse Civil Aeronautics Board recommendation in canceling Northwest Air Lines franchise to fly to Hawaii. Urgently request your immediate investigation of this serious error.

ED J. DEARING and LEE G. ALLEN.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

President Eisenhower's reversal of CAB unanimous recommendation respecting air service from Pacific Northwest to Hawaii shocking politics. Believe President Eisenhower ill advised. Northwest Air Lines much more vitally interested in serving Northwest area than is Pan American. Northwest has been first to introduce improvements and increase service to Hawaii and to decrease Government expenses, by offering to operate route without subsidy. Urge you exert all possible influence on behalf of fair competition.

DOROTHY VAN NUYS TRAVEL SERVICE.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As former student of yours and now in partial travel agent, request your investigation of President's refusal to accept CAB's unanimous decision to grant permanent subsidy free certificate to Northwest Air Lines for Portland, Honolulu route so valued by our tourists.

ROBERT POWELL TRAVEL SERVICE,
ROBERT POWELL.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We are very disturbed by the President's overruling of CAB's decision to grant Northwest Airlines permanent subsidy fee certificate from Portland to Hawaii. Please review permit.

LOYAL D. NELSON.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Request your investigation in regard to President's reversal of CAB decision to have Northwest Airlines fly Hawaii route. Northwest will fly subsidy free. Pan American interest not in Northwest area. Recommend Northwest continue present service.

Dr. J. P. CRAVEN.

VANCOUVER, WASH., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Northwest Airlines offer of subsidy-free service, Portland, Honolulu is a refreshing confident move in an industry that has too long been Government supported. Urgently request you investigate why President Eisenhower has refused to accept CAB unanimous decision in favor of NWA, whose sole interest is development of Pacific Northwest gateway and your State.

CHARLES B. SHOEMAKER.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Desire your urgent investigation of Seattle, Portland, Hawaii route case. Records show Northwest Airlines has carried more passengers and one more to develop and promote the Pacific Northwest gateway, as its sole gateway to Hawaii. In addition, only Northwest Airlines has offered to operate this route on a subsidy-free basis. Then this is backed by CAB recommendation.

C. R. NELSON.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Request urgent investigation President's reversal of CAB's unanimous decision and recommendation to certificate Northwest Airlines, sole operator Seattle, Portland, Honolulu. Not consistent with avowed policy of administration to reduce Government spending inasmuch as NWA only carrier offering to operate route subsidy-free.

K. S. MADDEN.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please investigate reason president of CAB reversed decision and recommendation to certify Northwest Airlines as sole subsidy free operator from Pacific Northwest to Honolulu.

GEORGE L. BLOMBERG.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Request you make immediate investigation into the reversal by President Eisenhower of the recent unanimous recommendation by the Civil Aeronautics Board that would name Northwest Air Lines as the operator of the Seattle, Portland to Hawaii route. It seems essential in the interest of economy to certificate Northwest Air Lines, who offer to provide this service with no subsidy to the Government. The interest of this area will also be better served by a carrier who can assure full development of the Northwest gateway to Hawaii as Northwest Air Lines can, who has no California interest. In addition, Northwest Air Lines was first to seek the route, first to operate the route with Boeing Stratocruiser equipment, first to offer tourist rates to this area, and first to increase frequency of service. In the face of the foregoing, how can President Eisenhower justify the appointment of Pan American Airways who will require subsidy payment from the Government when Northwest Air Lines will provide equal or better service at no cost to the taxpayer.

JAMES W. SPEER.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In the interest of national economy we request that you investigate the President's refusal to accept the CAB's unanimous decision to grant a permanent subsidy-free certificate to Northwest Air Lines from Portland to Hawaii.

JOSEPH and MAURE SOLARI,
Solari Sales.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please examine President's reversal of unanimous recommendations of Civil Aeronautics Board regarding air route to Hawaii. Northwest Air Lines has offered to fly the route without subsidy. The President awarded the exclusive to Pan American with subsidy. Why?

DON J. ALLEN.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Am surprised at decision favoring Pan American over Northwest Air Lines on Northwest Hawaii flights. Pan American does not belong here. Northwest by virtue of direct service from Midwest does. Understand Northwest is willing to operate without subsidy. Please reconsider.

M. S. FARRELL.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I have today sent the following message. Northwest Airlines is sole subsidy free operator to Hawaii. Elimination of Northwest Airlines service to Hawaii will cause numerous job losses here. Urge you to reconsider your decision which is contrary to your CAB Department recommendation.

BILL WAY,
President, Portland Central Labor Council, AFL.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Request your urgent investigation President's refusal to accept the CAB's unanimous decision to grant a permanent subsidy free certificate to Northwest Air Lines for the Portland to Honolulu route.

MELVIN G. REAVIS.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Request that you make immediate investigation into the reversal by President of recent CAB recommendation that would name Northwest Airlines as the operator of Seattle-Portland-Hawaii route. Northwest Airlines is the only carrier which can assure full development of the Pacific Northwest gateway to Hawaii as Northwest Airlines have no

California interest. In addition only Northwest Airlines has offered to operate this route on a completely subsidy-free basis.

RONALD C. KIELTY.

BEAVERTON, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In the interest of national economy, we request that you investigate the President's refusal to accept the CAB unanimous decision to grant a permanent subsidy free certificate to Northwest Air Lines from Portland to Honolulu.

Mr. and Mrs. ALLEN HOSS.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Reversal by President Eisenhower of the CAB unanimous decision and recommendation to certificate Northwest Air Lines as the sole operator Seattle-Portland to Honolulu is not consistent with avowed policy of the administration to reduce Government spending, inasmuch as Northwest Air Lines is the only carrier offering to operate the Pacific Northwest to Hawaii route on a subsidy-free basis.

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT MALMBERG.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1955.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Pacific Northwest wants and needs Northwest Air Lines service to Hawaii, as evidenced by the past CAB hearing and records. Urgently request that you investigate why the President or his advisers refused to accept the original CAB decision to grant Northwest Air Lines a permanent subsidy-free certificate for this route.

J. E. DICKEY,
First Vice President, International Woodworkers of America, CIO.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it seems to me that the President's action on the airways matter deserves serious reconsideration. It sets an example of Government action which cannot be justified, and establishes a precedent for hasty, ill-considered reversals of Federal administrative agency rulings in the future. It is another example of the point I made a few minutes ago of the growing tendency on the part of the President of the United States to exercise a very arbitrary discretion over Federal agencies.

Furthermore, the President's reversal action, if put into effect, will constitute a serious blow to the whole Pacific Northwest. The traveling public in the northern tier of States should not be denied through service to Hawaii via Portland or Seattle. The Pacific Northwest would be bound to suffer from this decision relating to the Northwest Airlines because it would play right into the hands of the whole monopolistic trend in America today.

Mr. President, I desire also to have printed at this point in my remarks the press release of the Civil Aeronautics Board indicating the decision of the President reversing the Board.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANS-PACIFIC AND WEST COAST-HAWAII CASES DECIDED BY PRESIDENT

The Civil Aeronautics Board announced today that orders disposing of the pending Trans-Pacific Certificate Renewal Case (Doc. No. 5031 et al.) and the West Coast-Hawaii Case (Doc. No. 5589) were being prepared for submission to President Eisenhower in accordance with his instructions transmitted to the Board by the following letter dated February 1, 1955:

"DEAR MR. GURNEY: I am returning herewith without my approval the proposed orders of the Board in the West Coast-Hawaii Case (Docket No. 5589 et al.) and in the Trans-Pacific Certificate Renewal Case (Docket No. 5031 et al.).

"I approve the actions proposed by the Board in the Trans-Pacific case with reference to the applications of Trans-World Airlines and Transocean Airlines. I do not approve at this time the permanent certifications of Northwest Airlines, but desire that its certificate be renewed on a temporary basis for 7 years. The continuation of two United States-flag carriers across the Pacific at this time is required by considerations of national defense and foreign policy. However, I believe that permanent certification of Northwest Airlines is premature as long as subsidy payments are necessary for its operations. A temporary certificate will provide the carrier with the opportunity to demonstrate its ability to operate without subsidies within a reasonable period of time and will give the Government the opportunity to review the matter when the certificate expires. I desire to hold in abeyance my decision concerning the use of the Great Circle route by Pan American pending further study and later report on the economic and technical feasibility and the military and foreign policy implications of nonstop service between the west coast and the Orient.

"I approve the actions proposed by the Board in the West Coast-Hawaii case with reference to the applications of United Air Lines and Transocean Airlines. I do not approve at this time the continued certifications of Northwest Airlines on the Seattle to Portland-Hawaii route, but desire that the certificate of Pan American World Airways be renewed on a temporary basis. I believe that the choice of this carrier will contribute most to the sound development of our air transportation system in the Pacific.

"Accordingly, I request that the Board present for my approval revised orders in these cases, consistent with the above comments.

"Sincerely,

"DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

"HON. CHAN GURNEY,
"Acting Chairman,
"Civil Aeronautics Board,
"Washington, D. C."

In the Trans-Pacific Case, the revised order will provide for the following authorizations: (1) For Northwest Airlines, a Seattle/Portland-Anchorage-Tokyo route for a period of 7 years; beyond Tokyo to Okinawa, Formosa, and Hong Kong, and beyond Okinawa to the Philippines, for a period of 5 years; and to Korea for a period of 3 years; (2) For Pan American World Airways a route from Hawaii to Tokyo and beyond to Hong Kong, for a period of 5 years; and between Hong Kong and points in India for a period of 3 years. Decision as to the renewal of previous authorizations to serve points in the Orient now in Communist hands will be deferred, as will PAA's application for service over the Great Circle route between the United States and Tokyo. Applications for new services filed by TWA and Transocean will be denied, and Northwest's previous authority to operate direct between the Twin Cities and Tokyo via Anchorage will not be renewed, although the question of local service between Anchorage and the Twin Cities remains for decision in the pending States-Alaska Case.

In the West Coast-Hawaii Case, the order to be approved by the President will not provide for renewal of Northwest's present service to Hawaii, but will authorize the continuation of PAA's existing Seattle/Portland-Hawaii route for a period of 5 years. United's present route from Los Angeles and San Francisco to Hawaii is to be made permanent, and the application of Transocean will be denied.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I close by saying that I also have the feeling that if there are administrative agencies in Washington which are the children of Congress, which are making such mistakes in judgment and are doing such poor work that they should be subjected to this kind of reversal on the part of the President, then Congress had better bring about some personnel changes in those agencies. We must not forget that in this instance the parties do not have the right to appear and present their case before the so-called Appeal Board, which in this case is the President of the United States. But it is very dangerous in a democracy to turn over to a mere man, even though he may be the President of the United States, the kind of veto power which is exercised in instances such as this, and as was exercised, in effect, in the Dixon-Yates case. In that instance it was really a veto by way of affirmative order—a veto of the Atomic Energy Commission. I say it is very dangerous to turn such power over to a mere man, even though he be the President, unless Congress is willing to get busy and pass some amendments to the laws governing these agencies which will require such a decision to come before Congress for check and approval.

So I am again standing on the floor of the United States Senate, as I have done so many times in the past, pleading with my colleagues to give meaning to our constitutional system of checks and balances. I say that this example of what has happened by way of a reversal of the Civil Aeronautics Board shows the need of legislation which will strengthen our system of checks and balances.

Lastly, Mr. President——

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. I am glad the Senator mentioned the difficulty the President has been having. Most of these persons have been frozen into service during the 20 years preceding the President's taking over his office. I am sure the Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle would be very happy to have the senior Senator from Oregon give us the formula as to how we can make these changes.

Mr. MORSE. I may say to the Senator from Ohio this particular decision was handed down by a bipartisan board. It has to be bipartisan under the law. The chairman was Chan Gurney, former Senator from South Dakota. If the Senator from Ohio is concerned about his being frozen in the Government, let me point out to him that he holds his job by appointment for a definite number of years. After that period has passed and an opportunity is had to review his record, if the President should desire to appoint him for a further term, he would be reappointed.

Mr. BENDER. The Senator referred to some of the members of the board.

Mr. MORSE. No; the Senator is mistaken. I am talking about a unanimous decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board. It is the Board the President has reversed, and he has reversed a unanimous decision of a bipartisan board, composed of both Democrats and Republicans.

Mr. BENDER. Is the Senator from Oregon complaining about the Democrats as well as the Republicans?

Mr. MORSE. I am saying, on the basis of the study I have made of the decision to date, I think the Board is completely correct and the President is completely wrong in reversing the decision. I have read the Board's decision, and I have read the President's announcement of the reversal.

Mr. BENDER. The Senator from Oregon is not complaining about our former colleague, is he?

Mr. MORSE. I am supporting the Board and complaining about the President's act, because we do not have a check on it.

Mr. BENDER. I admit I sometimes have difficulty following the Senator. Of course, I am a brand new Senator. I shall learn after a while.

Mr. MORSE. I express that hope.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I am glad it was my good fortune to be here today to listen to my colleague. I not only heard about cherries, but about the Dixon-Yates contract, Formosa, and China. I heard about so many different subjects I had difficulty in following the Senator, but I am sure it will be a pleasure to read the RECORD and try to understand exactly what the Senator was referring to.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like the Senator to yield for a question, then.

Mr. BENDER. Very well.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Ohio and I temporarily occupy these two majestic seats, he that of the minority leader, and I that of the majority leader. Quite a while ago, when the Senator from Ohio asked the senior Senator from Oregon about his views on Formosa, the Senator from Ohio read a statement which he had sent to an editor in Ohio about the policy of this Government on further Communist aggression. I believe the Senator from Ohio used that language in his statement. It was quite a while ago, and I am not certain of the language he used.

Mr. BENDER. The junior Senator from Oregon is uncertain of what I said, just as I am uncertain of what his colleague from Oregon said.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Ohio made the statement. I wondered if he would return to it.

Mr. BENDER. I have the statement in my hand.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Would the Senator read the portion wherein he referred to Communist aggression?

Mr. BENDER. I stated that—

I do not think we should go to war for anyone unless we have to. The entire purpose of the resolution which we passed last week and the present policy of the administration with respect to Formosa is to prevent the outbreak of a major war. We are doing our best to show the Chinese and the Communists that we are prepared, if necessary, to fight against any further Communist aggression.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The last was the sentence to which I was referring.

Mr. BENDER. That is what I stated.

Mr. NEUBERGER. This is the question I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio, inasmuch as he is, at least temporarily, spokesman for the administration, as I am the temporary spokesman for the majority leader in the Senate: What is the policy of the administration in case there should be further Communist aggression, to use the words of the Senator, in Indochina?

Mr. BENDER. I think the administration has stated its position regarding that situation. Indochina was under the control of a colonial power, and certainly our attitude was based on other considerations than those which now prevail in the Senate.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In other words, am I to take it as the policy that if there is, to use the language of the Senator, further "Communist aggression" in Indochina, the administration does not propose to do anything?

Mr. BENDER. That is a program or a policy to which we are not committed, as we are in the Formosan situation.

Mr. NEUBERGER. My reason for asking the question is that something has puzzled me in this whole situation. I think I was as faithful as was any other Senator in attendance on the debate on both sides of the question.

One of the questions which has puzzled me in this entire situation, as one who knows extremely little about the question, and as one who was hard put to know how to vote on the question, is that Indochina was scarcely mentioned in the debate at all. Yet was it not the President of the United States who used the simile of dominoes being knocked down, and was not Indochina the key domino? Yet in the debate, Indochina was scarcely mentioned. I wonder what the policy of the administration will be in the event there is further aggression in Indochina.

Mr. BENDER. I am sure the policy will be considered very carefully. Whatever our position is, I am sure Members of Congress in both Houses will have an opportunity to learn the President's policy and be consulted regarding any decision which is made, just as the Congress was consulted in the Formosa action of last week. Certainly this administration did not create this problem; it inherited the problem as a result of the deals which were made at Yalta, Potsdam, and Teheran, and as a result of millions of people in the world being placed behind the Iron Curtain as a consequence of those decisions. Under the circumstances, we are coping with a problem we inherited, and it is necessary for this country to maintain a tremendous defense machine and keep ourselves prepared for any exigency.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Inasmuch as the Senator from Ohio indicated that the administration was not responsible for the problem, but merely inherited it, is he inferring that if at some future hour other persons should sit in these august seats, and there should be a discussion of Indochina, and of the people who are behind the Iron Curtain or the Bamboo Curtain, those persons, in discussing the problem in the future, should say they inherited the Indochina problem, and place the blame on those who were responsible for their inheriting the problem? Is the Senator inferring that should be the sequence of discussion throughout our history?

Mr. BENDER. No; I was merely referring to dealing with any situation which might arise, and I was referring to the action of the administration, which was meant to insure world peace, being confirmed by an almost unanimous vote of the Congress. We are doing something to stop the march of communism everywhere throughout the world.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to repeat my question. Does the Senator think it should be the policy of those in the legislative branch of Government, whenever they have a problem to discuss, to bring up the faults and alleged blunders of those who served in the previous administration, right on through our history?

Mr. BENDER. I say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that I have heard discussions relating to past events in our history; and I am sure we will hear such discussions as long as our country exists.

Certainly we profit by our mistakes. But the mistakes of the past should not be applied to this administration, which is coping with the mistakes of the past, and is endeavoring to handle them in an intelligent, forward-looking, and realistic way.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am wondering whether we are to profit by the mistakes made diplomatically or otherwise.

Mr. BENDER. In every way.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). If there is no further business to come before the Senate, under the previous order, the Senate will now stand adjourned until Tuesday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

Thereupon (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Tuesday, February 8, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 4, 1955:

Philip W. Bonsal, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Colombia, vice Rudolf E. Schoenfeld, resigned.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 2, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Stephen P. Dorsey, of the District of Columbia.
George Mason Ingram, of Tennessee.
S. Houston Lay, of Illinois.
Francis A. Linville, of Maryland.
Samuel T. Pareiman, of Pennsylvania.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 3 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Robert G. McGregor, of Massachusetts.
William L. S. Williams, of Wisconsin.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Miss H. Alberta Colclaser, of Ohio.
Alton L. Gillikin, of Virginia.
John W. Halderman, of Oregon.
Alton W. Hemba, of Mississippi.
Gilbert E. Larsen, of Illinois.
James A. McDevitt, of Illinois.
Adrian T. Middleton, of Texas.
John Patterson, of Maryland.
Samuel E. Perkins IV, of Indiana
William G. Vale, of New Jersey.
John A. Armitage, of Tennessee, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 5 to class 4 and to be also a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Joseph B. Alexander, of Virginia.
Arthur P. Biggs, of California.
William B. deGrace, of Massachusetts.
Miss Nyal C. Dokken, of California.
Norman H. Grady, of Maryland.
Carl O. Hawthorne, of California.
Milan W. Jerabek, of Maryland.
Charles K. Johnson, of Virginia.
John A. Lacey, of Maryland.
Miss Anita C. Lauve, of Maryland.
Dean B. Mahin, of Maryland.
Melville E. Osborne, of New York.
Wendell A. Pike, of Washington.
Albert Post, of the District of Columbia.
Henry W. Prentice, of Minnesota.
Robert M. Sayre, of Virginia.
Walter W. Sohl, of Illinois.
George D. Tibbits, of the District of Columbia.
Miss Edith C. Wall, of California.
Charles C. Carson, of Mississippi, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Carl E. Forkel, Jr., of Texas.
Robert F. Griggs, of New York.
Donald C. Mansfield, of Virginia.
Earl R. Michalka, of Michigan.
Richard W. Ogle, of Indiana.
Monteagle Stearns, of New York.
Roger Steinkolk, of Virginia.
Miss Cherry C. Stubbs, of Minnesota.
Harold C. Voorhees, of New Jersey.
Miss Julia L. Wooster, of Connecticut.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Eugene H. Bird, of Oregon.
Carl A. Bischoff, Jr., of Missouri.
Miss Jane A. Culpepper, of Louisiana.
David R. Gottlieb, of New York.
J. Daniel Loubert, of Maine.
Robert E. Mangan, Jr., of Minnesota.
Gerald F. Nollette, of Washington.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Miss Norah Alsterlund, of Illinois.
John R. Bartelt, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Mrs. Elizabeth L. Engdahl, of New Hampshire.

Herbert M. Hooker, of Minnesota, a Foreign Service reserve officer, to be a consul of the United States of America.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Trevor Gardner, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Newell Brown, of New Hampshire, to be Administrator, Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Ross Rizley, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term expiring December 31, 1960.

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Allin H. Pierce, of Illinois, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States for the unexpired term of 12 years from June 2, 1948, vice Arnold R. Baar, deceased.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Galen B. Allen	Grant R. Johnson
David L. Ayers	Edwin R. Kohn, Jr.
George W. Baumann, Jr.	James C. Lafferty, Jr.
	Charley H. Lucas
John R. Bond	Thomas S. McCaffrey
Ronald A. Brush	Leo M. MacCourtney
Leland E. Butler	Donald C. Magee
George R. Curry	Jesse E. Matheny, Jr.
Sherrill A. Conna	John A. Michael
James J. Connors	Ward J. Miottel, Jr.
Ian E. M. Donovan	David B. Murton
Raymond D. Dowsett	Richard E. O'Leary
Francis J. Eberhardt	John J. Pakiz
Joseph G. Endres	Ben W. Phillips
John P. Engvall	John P. Rasmusson
Gerald R. Etcheson	Charles E. Schott
Richard P. Evans	Robert J. Schwartz
William L. Flowers	Leland R. Selna, Jr.
Gerald F. Fricker	Jimmy Simmons
James J. Gainor	Thomas M. Thomas
Gerry W. Gillispie	Richard C. Turnblade
M. John Guhl	Gordon F. Udall, Jr.
Jerald T. Hage	Gordon G. Vaughan
Robert O. Harger	Ellis E. Whiting
William C. Hawley III	Leonard Whistler
George W. Holyfield	William F. Wiese
Harry A. Hoover	Frederick C. Williams
David N. Immendorf	Jack E. Young

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Delbert H. Beumer	James M. Robbins
Terry D. Burton	William H. Sibley, Jr.
Donald P. Kohl	

The following-named (Naval Reserve aviators), to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Ronald F. Carlson	Richard S. Olson
William M. Clew	Joseph J. Ortega
Verlyne W. Daniels	Edgar H. Preston
John W. Dawley	Leon R. Shelley
Terry L. Lane	Joseph F. Small
John S. Kelly	John F. Triplett
John E. McBrayer, Jr.	

The following-named officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the line in the Navy (special-duty officers), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Phillip K. Folk	Robert C. Stubbs
Richard L. Fruchterman, Jr.	William S. Sullivan
	Bernard G. Sykes
Donald E. Gross	Richard A. Walsh
Donald E. Selby	

The following-named Reserve officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Paul E. Black

LIEUTENANT

Jack O. Stoffel

The following-named Reserve officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIEUTENANT

William J. Kennedy
Philip C. Hotz

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Jean-Pierre E. Bouquet

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Donald M. Adams	Charles L. Meserve
Arthur H. Anderson	Donald E. Moors
William B. Cobb, Jr.	Robert D. Peloquin
Curtis E. Comer	John J. Powell
George F. Comstock, Jr.	John J. Prendergast, Jr.
Norman F. Daly	Fernando Ramirez-Rodriguez
Bernard F. Gilmartin, Jr.	Rolph E. Schaber
Charles E. Hepner	David E. Sigsworth
Louis R. Lester, Jr.	Robert R. Simmons
Paul W. Lindgren	Donald L. Stephenson
William R. Lowry	Homer J. Swope, Jr.
Billy Matthews	David H. Thomas

ENSIGN

George J. Adams, Jr.	Roy E. McCoy
Buele G. Balderston	Harry Ohan
Malcolm L. Barringer	Harvey P. Rodgers
John C. Barrons	"C" "J" Rorie
Ernest Fischbein	Harold H. Sacks
Richard E. Heon	Walter G. Squires, Jr.
Harold L. Hinkley	Eugene K. Walling
Robert L. Logner	Philip W. Wehrman
Henry W. Marbott	John R. Weimerskirch
James F. McAvoy	

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line (aviation) of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Miles J. Barnes	Joe P. Howell, Jr.
William T. Barron	Robert F. Lawson
Don "H" Black	Henry G. Moxey
James Bradfield	Russell G. Walden
Wilbur B. Cretsinger	"J" "D" Ward
Joseph D. Duddleston	

ENSIGN

Loinel R. Harsh	William J. Ogle
Edward F. Havel	Tommy H. Warren, Jr.
John MacGregor	Marvin M. Weissman

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

William W. Anderson	Robert E. Hendrix, Jr.
Charles W. Crowley	Robert Kauder
Oscar T. Fleisher, Jr.	Frank G. Pattermann
Raymond W. Funk	Arch C. Roll
John J. Gordon	"H" "L" Sumner, Jr.
Robert L. Harn	Fred Wolter

ENSIGN

Charles R. Hohenstein	Charles C. Madeira
Frank J. Jerich	Augustine G. Saukas
Hugo M. Luoto, Jr.	Donald W. Searles

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

John W. Clark

ENSIGN

John W. Woodring

Lindsay C. Getzen (Naval Reserve officer) to be lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Herbert G. Arm
John P. Charles
Charles D. McGuire
Norbert A. Schlamm
Leroy E. Walter, Jr.

The following-named officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Roger "M" Baxter, Jr.
John W. Berger
James W. Conte
Jacob A. S. Fisher
Robert H. Heath
Rodger F. Hill

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIEUTENANT

Florence C. Brown
Betty J. Coady
Alice L. Davis
Eva C. Deming
Virginia Donson
Mary G. Elias
Caroline A. Kelcec
Ann R. Kubicz
Shirley A. Miller
Olive C. H. Ogden
Phoebe T. Singley

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

June J. Everett
Grace O. Fisk
Peggy S. Heimberger
Violet M. MacKenzie
Thekla W. Morris
Dorothy F. O'Loughlin
Lily M. Pechal
Rose M. Quillin
Johnanna Reid
Marion M. Seabury
Mary J. Wathen

ENSIGN

Emily E. Guillotte
Betty J. Price

The following-named women officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Frances J. Krebs
Margaret A. McMillan

ENSIGN

Shirley L. Carter
Marion F. Collins
Ann Dixon
Pauline M. Hartington
Sylvia N. Haugen
Carolyn E. Kearney
Madella L. Knoph
Dolores A. Milford
Nancy B. Miller
Marjorie H. Mogge
Robin L. C. Quigley
Margie A. Screws
Shirley S. Simpson
Eleanor S. Swing
Clara A. Vereen
Joanne P. Vradenburg
Lois J. Wilson
Sue E. Young

The following-named women officers to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Janet Slater
Joan L. White

John J. Mitchell, United States Navy, retired, to be lieutenant commander in the line of the Navy pursuant to 34 U. S. Code 275, 276, 277, section 403 (a), 406 (a), 407 (a).

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Gerald G. Abel
David R. Adams
Donald R. Adams
James M. Adkins
Mars M. Adkins
Carl M. Albert
Donald E. Albert
Karl V. Albert
Philip L. Altick
Harry T. Ambrose
James D. Anderson
Philip T. Arman
William P. Arnold
Michael W. Arnstein
Henry E. Austin, Jr.
Richard C. Bahler
Richard A. Bailey
Herbert S. Ball
David A. Ballantyne
Douglas B. Barfield
Alfred P. Barra
John A. Barry
Levi G. Bateson
Thomas J. Bath
William A. Baxley
Thomas E. Beasley, Jr.
John T. Beatty
Charles A. Beeman
Richard L. Beery
Robert M. Benning
James H. Benson
Francis N. Berdanier
Robert H. Berendzen
Herbert T. Berwald, Jr.
Barton M. Biggs
Charles S. Bishop, Jr.
John W. Bjorke
Ronald E. Blanchard
Philip H. Bohart, Jr.
Howard P. Borjeson
Charles E. Bottcher
Donald V. Bowers
Brinton D. Bowles
Robert L. Bradley
Joseph E. Brent, Jr.
Frank E. Brinegar
Robert P. Broussard
Boyd R. Brown
Donald P. Brown
Leonard K. Brown
Joseph A. Busl, Jr.
Leland E. Butler
William P. Byrne
Robert C. Caldwell
Gordon B. Cameron
Robert S. Cameron, Jr.
Joseph R. Capka
Robert A. Cappelletti
George W. Carey
Randall C. Carll
Thomas J. Carmody
Elwayne Carter
Thomas V. Cassidy
Robert W. Charlton, Jr.
Rufus Choate, Jr.
Don C. Clark
Edward A. Clark
Edward J. Clarkson
Robert H. Clayton
Watson S. Clifford
Morrel G. Clute
Kenneth J. Coffey
John C. Coffin
George F. Coleman
Richard M. Condrey
James A. Connelly II
Arthur B. Cornthwaite, Jr.
Bernard A. Coyne
Stuart W. Cragin, Jr.
Thomas T. Creamer
Robert E. Crevier
Edward W. Cuthbert
Michael B. Cwayna
George R. Darnold, Jr.
Frank S. Davis
Robert D. Davis
John W. Day
Burley A. Daye
Johnny O. Dean
Robert L. Decker
Robert H. Dee, Jr.
James B. Devlin
John L. Dickinson
William O. Doll
Kerry M. Donovan
Edwin J. Doran
Edward F. Doyle, Jr.
Francis X. Doyle, Jr.
John A. Drexel
Rudolph W. Driscoll
Donald Ducoff
James W. Duff
Rupert W. Dunevant
Jack P. Durrett
Albert S. Eaton
Thomas J. Ebner
Herbert R. Edson
Louis G. Edwards
Myrddyn E. Edwards
Randall E. Egertson
John F. Elvig
Donald E. Endacott
Franklin S. Evans
John W. Evrard
Donald D. Ewbank
Edward E. Faber
John J. Fahle
Edgar R. Ferguson
Samuel J. Fisher, Jr.
Terry N. Fiske
William M. Foley
William L. Foote
Harry V. Foster
Kenneth F. Fox, Jr.
Donald H. Franklin
Charles H. Frazier
Thomas F. Fricke
Eugene R. Friederich
William N. Frengel
Jack A. Gaffney
Robert A. Galliart
Grigsby V. Gamble
Dominic R. Gannon
William R. Garrett
Robert D. Garton
Gerald W. Geraghty, Jr.
Loren D. Gerleman
James S. Gill
John G. Gleichauf
George C. Gohde
Patrick F. Golden
William L. Golemon, Jr.
Edward W. Graeff
Robert D. Grant
James B. Green
Samual J. Greene II
James T. Griffin
Esta D. Grissom
Donald J. Gruber
Michael J. Hadfield
Denis A. Haggerty
George P. Haley, Jr.
Richard C. Hallden
Richard D. Hanna
Billy M. Hansen
Carl A. Hanson
Charles I. Harding
James H. Harding, Jr.
James D. Hargleroad
Michael H. Harrington
Charles E. Haupt
Joseph W. Hayes
John F. Heifner
Samuel H. Helms
Robert R. Henrich
James M. Herron
Louis A. Heyd, Jr.
Robert E. Hill
William P. Hill
John A. Hoag
Harvey B. Hoff
William L. Hogan
Richard A. P. Hogarty
George L. Holdridge
Glenn A. Holloman
Robert K. Hopkins, Jr.
George E. Hotz
Noel R. Hueber, Jr.
Homas O. Hunter
Marvin A. Huss, Jr.
Arthur M. Jackson
Howard A. Jackson
Frank C. Jacobs
Robert V. Janis
Vincent T. Jazwinski
Willard B. Jensen
James H. Jiranek
David K. Jones
George E. Jones
Charles H. Kalbach
William F. Keith
Thomas E. Keller
Hugh T. Kerr
Robert D. King
William J. Klaess
James E. Knowles
Robert F. Koontz
Tom L. Kornegay
Nathan K. Kotz
Billy D. Kraxberger
Preston C. Kronkosky
Conrad W. Kuhlthau III
James A. Lamar
Andrew J. Lampe
Anthony J. Larocca
John E. Larsen
Ralph L. Lary
Francis M. Logan, Jr.
William R. Loss
Robert L. Loucks
Charles J. Lynch III
James E. MacDonald III
Donald P. Madden
John A. Magadini
Richard L. Maher
Mark E. Mahowald
James J. Mallett
William M. Manes
Robert W. Manning, Jr.
Roy M. Marks
Ronald C. Martin
Frank W. Martino
Mathias M. Mattern
Richard J. Matuska
Lauriston H. McCagg
Philips R. McCarty
John H. McClintock, Jr.
Jaren K. McCormick
John S. McCormick
William O. McCoy
Howard M. McElroy
James M. McGarvey
Richard J. McKee
Lawrence V. McMurrer
Clifford J. McNamara, Jr.
Robert A. Meyer
Paul W. Miller
Tracy L. Moon
Ralph E. Moore
Hunter M. Morris
McLendon G. Morris
William S. Mortensen
Richard C. Movich
John A. Mulcahy
John D. Murphy
Alfred P. Murrah, Jr.
John D. Murray
James B. Murty
Joshua A. Muss
Jack P. Nelson
Haril W. Newton
Raymond A. Njos
Caldwell V. Norred III
Alan R. Novak
Kevin O'Connell
Robert G. Ohly
Richard E. Onofrey
Robert C. Onslow
William M. Osgood
Fred Owlett
John W. Paden
Robert J. Patrick
Hal V. Patton
Ray B. Patton
Bruce D. Peterson
David W. Phifer
Frank J. Pike, Jr.
Lloyd A. Pine
Max R. Pirner
Robert A. Pokorny
James A. Poland
Russell W. Porter
Marlin A. Pound
Sherwood F. Prescott, Jr.
Reding F. Putman
Charles E. Randall
Thomas O. Raney
Troy G. Rankin
Niles Rasmussen
Stephen L. Reveal
Richard S. Robertson
James L. Robinson
Marcus B. Rogers
Charles D. Rollings, Jr.
John P. Roos
Richard D. Ross
Julian H. Rountree, Jr.
James P. Rourke
Rudolf A. Ruda
Donald J. Russell
Barry P. Rust
Thomas D. Samford
Richard P. Sanders
Dale S. Sappenfield
George M. Sasko, Jr.
Francis V. Scanlan
John R. Schaupp
David E. Scherer
Edward Schoenfeld, Jr.
William C. Schrader
James E. Schulken
Frederick W. Schwab
Leo J. Scolforo, Jr.
Paul D. Searles
Devon C. Seeley
John L. Sentous
Paul J. Shank, Jr.
George L. Shea
Jerry L. Shelton
Alvah R. Shepherd
John J. Sheridan
James E. Shildneck
James M. Shoemaker, Jr.
Albert E. Shohfi, Jr.
Larry L. Shupe
James J. Sieger
Colben K. Sime, Jr.
Ronald L. Sipie
James D. Skinner
Emery T. Smith
Robert E. Solomon
Roland F. Spahr
Roy W. Staggs
Richard M. Stahler
Philip J. Sterling
Wallace Stettinius
James T. Stewart, Jr.
Charles H. Stoy
Jimmy S. Sullivan
Patrick A. Sullivan
James N. Swift
Williston B. Symonds
Paul A. Taglia
James B. Talley
William N. Temple
Bernard R. Terhorst
Edward L. Thomas
William E. Thomas, Jr.
John R. Thornton
George B. Thurmond
John E. Torbett
David C. Townsend
George O. Trabue, Jr.
John Tramontine
George M. Trautman
John M. Traynor
Stephen A. Trimble
Donald R. Trundle
Brandon E. Tynan
Walter S. Underhill
Mario S. Valentini
Hildebert VanBuren IV
Arthur B. Vance
James D. VanPelt
Andrew R. VanSickle
Peter A. VanWagenen
Peter A. Voneschen
Eugene R. Vosicky
George L. Vosmik
Gerald A. Walsdorf
Donald R. Wash
John D. Way
William H. Weaver
Wesley E. Wedge
Winfred E. Wedge
Robert C. Wenrick
John T. Whatley
Robert B. Whigham
Francis V. White, Jr.
Edward P. Whittemore
Robert J. Wiedemann
Jack H. Williams
Robert H. Williams
Edward H. Williford
Donald B. Wilson
Milner B. Wilson III
Peter B. Wilson
Thomas E. Wilson
James M. Winberg
Gerald O. Witt
James R. Wright
Milan K. Yager
Donald G. Yeckel
Richard E. York
Lawrence H. Yost
David L. Young

The following-named (ROTC) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Arthur K. Groppe
Herbert S. Larosa
John S. Oldham

Robert C. Miller (civilian college graduate) to be second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

James C. Hitz (meritorious noncommissioned officer) to be second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

James E. Knott for temporary appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named Reserve officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Howard A. Aronson	Joe S. Hitt
William T. Baldwin	John E. Hurley, Jr.
Charles A. Barstow	Russell I. Kramer
Keith L. Christensen	John E. Kussmann, Jr.
Thomas M. Culligan	Arthur S. Loughry
Stanley J. Czubai	Thomas Martin
Daniel Ellsberg	Charles O. Pitts
John W. Engelhardt	John K. Porter III
Fred T. Eslick	Thomas W. Raphael
Tommy I. Folks	Hugh L. Scott III
Henry R. Gannan, Jr.	Lloyd W. Smith, Jr.
Robert E. Green	Willard M. Stephens
John L. Groff	John W. Terwilliger
Vincent J. Guinee	Frederick N. Vansant
John W. Hamber	Charles Ward
Richard W. Hanneman	Daniel E. Wight, Jr.

The following-named Reserve officers (naval aviators) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Joseph C. Anderson	Robert W. Lewis
Stanley D. Cox	Leroy A. Madera
Robert J. Fagot	Reynold M. Olson
Thomas E. Fish	Frank E. Petersen, Jr.
William E. H. Fitch III	Donald R. Reese
Richard N. Gehrsitz	Richard E. Romine
Austin H. Green	Raymond C. Shinkle
Gale Harlan	Don J. Slee
Richard J. Kern	

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officers, W-4, in the United States Coast Guard:

Samuel Henson, Jr.	Ralph H. Amon
Birney Fullington	Floyd J. Coulter
Dewey W. Bowling	Donald A. MacLean
Otto A. Tregner	Earl F. Rickman
Bernard S. Loebig	James A. B. May, Jr.
Raymond A. Fraley	Leon R. Duclos
Russell R. Hiatt	George E. Bohannon
Ray E. Brown	Robert M. Bruce
Harold T. Jackson	Peter R. Thompson
John W. Ballman	Julian L. Gray
Charles A. O'Reilly	Earle A. F. Verry
Aubrey Rogers	Philip F. Stone
James Galante	Robert V. McLaughlin
Herbert E. Schwalbe	Arthur W. Cloves
Edward E. Helfst	Lawrence W. Farnsley
Wandelin B. Sonntag	William G. Schaefer
Henry J. Burness	William R. Echols
Anthony M. Spiri	Clemens H. Brendle
Hobart W. Means	Albert D. Stumpff
James W. Winchester	James F. Sandwich
George R. Pearce	Floyd Bieri
Erich Raschack	Alford C. Atkinson
Harry W. Midgette	Bernard S. Koffler
Donald S. Talfourd	George R. Donald
Burt H. Kilmer	David W. Herr
Samuel H. Howell	Ralph A. McCurdie
Sidney F. Schweppe	James Harrison, Jr.
Paul Ward	Jalmar Sortland
Andrew Ramstad	Eilif H. Tobiason
George A. Tardif	George R. Homan
Hannibal H. Hilliard	Harold E. Major

The following-named person to be a chief warrant officer, W-3, in the United States Coast Guard:

Victor Koll

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

James R. Moncus, Birmingham, Ala., in place of A. H. Allbright, resigned.

Max A. Wilder, Dadeville, Ala., in place of J. B. Tillery, resigned.

William S. Griffin, Dutton, Ala., in place of R. L. Cothran, retired.

William Lee Howell, Fairfax, in place of B. S. Combs, retired.

Daniel R. Tyner, Florala, Ala., in place of E. D. Manning, retired.

Willis J. Marsh, Gordon, Ala., in place of M. V. Marsh, retired.

ARIZONA

Henry L. Worischeck, Flagstaff, Ariz., in place of G. G. Babbitt, Jr., resigned.

Jerome B. Roberts, Parker, Ariz., in place of J. M. Thompson, transferred.

Theodore Ralph Schmidt, Tolleson, Ariz., in place of E. M. Schmidt, deceased.

ARKANSAS

Calvin O. Stevens, Biscoe, Ark., in place of K. B. Farris, removed.

James S. Rollins, Cotter, Ark., in place of H. S. Evans, deceased.

Mack Hooper, Glenwood, Ark., in place of Edbert Jessup, removed.

Alfred T. Smith, Hindsville, Ark., in place of W. C. Mayfield, retired.

Paul E. Francis, Hot Springs National Park, Ark., in place of S. A. Kemp, deceased.

William C. Baker, Lowell, Ark., in place of E. R. Tucker, transferred.

William E. Hodge, Jr., Mineral Springs, Ark., in place of W. H. Bridgeman, resigned.

Arvie H. West, Mountainburg, Ark., in place of C. A. Lovell, deceased.

Commie C. Pollard, Oil Trough, Ark., in place of M. M. Saylors, removed.

Icy M. Wood, Pangburn, Ark., in place of K W. Crook, retired.

John J. Mueller, Paragould, Ark., in place of W. A. Branch, removed.

Richard E. Williams, Rogers, Ark., in place of L. V. Spikes, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Paul D. Hickcox, Agnew, Calif., in place of L. L. Allen, retired.

Windol M. Martin, Bellflower, Calif., in place of D. C. Tierney, resigned.

Keith D. Rice, Blythe, Calif., in place of F. V. DeDecker, resigned.

Julius George Ponchak, Bostonia, Calif., in place of E. K. Curran, deceased.

Paul S. Kinsey, Cloverdale, Calif., in place of F. G. Zittleman, removed.

Vincent P. Murphy, Daly City, Calif. Office established April 20, 1954.

Stanley A. Powell, Downey, Calif., in place of J. A. Bryson, resigned.

Harry B. Woodbury, El Centro, Calif., in place of W. F. Richmond, retired.

Mary J. Ramos, Farmington, Calif., in place of O. S. Beck, resigned.

Charles C. Clark, Fullerton, Calif., in place of F. D. Lowrey, removed.

Winifred B. Thomas, Happy Camp, Calif., in place of E. I. Palmerton, resigned.

William E. Kester, Independence, Calif., in place of J. H. Brammer, resigned.

Delpha P. Furgeson, Indio, Calif., in place of R. J. King, transferred.

Bessie E. Hardy, Inyokern, Calif., in place of W. R. Cox, removed.

Harvey J. Kohler, Irvington, Calif., in place of M. C. Joseph, retired.

Marion M. Davis, La Habra, Calif., in place of Bertha Hilbert, retired.

Marion S. Karrh, La Jolla, Calif., in place of N. L. Rannells, retired.

Fred J. Figge, Lockeford, Calif., in place of J. L. McKindley, resigned.

Rocco V. Pernetti, Los Banos, Calif., in place of W. J. Degregori, removed.

Robert V. Ely, Lucerne Valley, Calif., in place of F. A. Clark, removed.

Leland C. Barnard, Lynwood, Calif., in place of H. C. Coe, retired.

Lewis W. Hartwell, Madera, Calif., in place of E. V. Murphy, retired.

Evelyn O. Lesley, Mt. Baldy, Calif., in place of A. H. Bradhurst, deceased.

Everett T. Carpenter, North Hollywood, Calif., in place of B. W. Harris, removed.

Bernard P. Piotrowski, Northridge, Calif., in place of D. I. Love, removed.

Norman Elwood Case, Orange, Calif., in place of Vera Wettlin, retired.

Burnice C. Wellband, Pine Valley, Calif., in place of B. D. Schlegel, deceased.

Constance H. Post, Randsburg, Calif., in place of R. M. Rinaldi, retired.

Phillip R. Freer, Rocklin, Calif., in place of A. L. West, retired.

Wilma E. Graham, Sloat, Calif., in place of B. J. Gilliam, resigned.

Samuel G. Andersen, Stateline, Calif., in place of J. A. Caple, resigned.

Joseph Beeson, Sunnymead, Calif., in place of F. J. Ishoy, resigned.

Ralph A. McWaid, Twentynine Palms, Calif., in place of B. H. Steeg, retired.

Frank B. Johnson, Westmorland, Calif., in place of E. H. Cain, resigned.

Walter J. Fitzpatrick, Yosemite National Park, Calif., in place of F. C. Alexander, retired.

COLORADO

Richard D. Nelson, Lafayette, Colo., in place of D. W. Kelly, deceased.

Millard E. Ryan, Rocky Ford, Colo., in place of J. F. North, retired.

CONNECTICUT

Roger H. Clark, Cobalt, Conn., in place of Sol Adler, resigned.

Joseph Rocco Ferrigno, Meriden, Conn., in place of J. J. Scanlon, resigned.

Benjamin F. Wells, Shelton, Conn., in place of Joseph Stewart, retired.

Fred H. Grimshaw, Windsor, Conn., in place of E. G. Donegan, resigned.

DELAWARE

Clarence A. Willis, Jr., Laurel, Del., in place of H. R. Elliott, resigned.

David W. Steele, Ocean View, Del., in place of A. A. Anderson, deceased.

FLORIDA

Echo C. Beall, Campbellton, Fla., in place of J. E. Woodham, retired.

Floid B. Schneider, Dover, Fla., in place of R. B. Renfroe, resigned.

Clyde P. Stickney, Key West, Fla., in place of H. R. Bervaldi, retired.

James L. Ennis, Merritt Island, Fla., in place of W. F. LaRoche, resigned.

GEORGIA

George W. Greene, Bluffton, Ga., in place of W. B. King, transferred.

Marian L. DeLoach, Clyo, Ga., in place of F. L. Dekle, deceased.

Mathew H. Stevens, Jr., Danville, Ga., in place of L. W. Maxwell, retired.

Ora W. Adams, Dewey Rose, Ga., in place of B. B. Adams, resigned.

Carl V. Ivey, Lincolnton, Ga., in place of N. C. Wilkes, resigned.

Clara B. Kilpatrick, Midway, Ga., in place of C. L. Browning, retired.

Horace L. Fletcher, Mount Berry, Ga., in place of M. G. Keown, retired.

William H. Marshall, Parrott, Ga., in place of M. L. Webb, resigned.

Shelby Deck, Rocky Face, Ga., in place of J. H. Wood, deceased.

Paul P. Hunt, Silver Creek, Ga., in place of R. S. Porter, retired.

Leon C. Lewis, Twin City, Ga., in place of C. M. Proctor, deceased.
Mildred B. Pierce, Waverly Hall, Ga., in place of G. L. Sinclair, retired.

IDAHO

Richard P. Swanstrum, Ashton, Idaho, in place of J. A. Hargis, resigned.
Taylor R. Bowlden, Cascade, Idaho, in place of I. F. Madden, retired.

ILLINOIS

Vernon L. Wilking, Chebanse, Ill., in place of J. L. Brown, removed.
Carl D. Roadarmel, Cowden, Ill., in place of Meda Lorton, retired.
John Edwin Mickens, Danvers, Ill., in place of H. R. Daniel, removed.
Edward J. Kleen, Elmwood, Ill., in place of C. R. Bowers, retired.
Edward J. Hickey, Fox River Grove, Ill., in place of C. L. Kampert, resigned.
Lester T. Peacock, Harvard, Ill., in place of D. E. Palmer, removed.
Walter Lueking, Hoffman, Ill., in place of Q. J. Meyer, resigned.
Richard C. Atwood, Hutsonville, Ill., in place of M. E. Conrad, resigned.
Mary E. Burleigh, Ingleside, Ill., in place of E. J. Ambacher, removed.
George C. Bryce, Irving, Ill., in place of W. A. Cook, deceased.
Vincent E. Cyrier, Manteno, Ill., in place of F. J. Keigher, resigned.
William Harold McCreery, Mason City, Ill., in place of J. A. Peters, removed.
Cuma F. Holtzclaw, Maunie, Ill., in place of J. W. Scamahorn, resigned.
Justus A. Gibson, Mount Carmel, Ill., in place of Fay Moyer, removed.
Merlyn Reatherford, Moweaqua, Ill., in place of H. R. Richardson, removed.
Warren S. Plant, National Stock Yards, Ill., in place of G. F. Bennett, retired.
Earl J. Thompson, O'Fallon, Ill., in place of J. L. Anheuser, resigned.
Warren G. Hess, Ontarioville, Ill., in place of W. G. Whitham, retired.
Sidney L. Shaw, Petersburg, Ill., in place of P. R. Smoot, retired.
Erwin H. Brandt, Saint Peter, Ill., in place of H. B. Reiss, retired.
John R. Evans, South Beloit, Ill., in place of L. J. Walsh, retired.
Ronald E. Shawger, Sterling, Ill., in place of J. M. Ward, removed.
Delbert R. Britt, Ullin, Ill., in place of Parke Burnham, removed.
Arnold C. Lapsansky, Witt, Ill., in place of R. M. Short, retired.
Arthur Hay, Wonder Lake, Ill. Office established July 1, 1951.

INDIANA

Gordon L. Schaefer, Andrews, Ind., in place of J. J. Wintrode, resigned.
Reuben Leon Ridenour, Angola, Ind., in place of F. B. Faulkerson, retired.
Hiram J. Shepherd, Butlerville, Ind., in place of P. L. Hyden, resigned.
Maude Kendall, Cannelton, Ind., in place of E. A. Hemphill, deceased.
Byron V. Hoover, Carlisle, Ind., in place of Ozro Latshaw, deceased.
Gilbert C. Gerster, Dillsboro, Ind., in place of A. E. Pate, retired.
Rollo M. Swaim, Frankfort, Ind., in place of J. W. Shafor, resigned.
Thomas R. Spence, Galveston, Ind., in place of A. R. Wilson, retired.
Ruth L. Wilson, Hartsville, Ind., in place of B. B. Finley, retired.
Edmund G. Sollman, Haubstadt, Ind., in place of Matthew Halbig, retired.
Lester J. Britton, Hillsdale, Ind., in place of B. H. Pierson, resigned.
Martin H. McNeelan, Holton, Ind., in place of O. J. Montgomery, resigned.
Clifford K. Smith, Leesburg, Ind., in place of B. L. Anglin, retired.
Lloyd D. Spann, Madison, Ind., in place of Stella Cisco, retired.
Don P. Guild, Medaryville, Ind., in place of Lowell Odom, deceased.
Rex E. Daugherty, Merom, Ind., in place of B. E. Leach, retired.
John L. Lontz, Morocco, Ind., in place of G. H. Clarkson, retired.
Joseph S. Dean, Napoleon, Ind., in place of E. A. Behlmer, retired.
Robert Craig Dillon, New Augusta, Ind., in place of R. A. Shaw, removed.
Armin F. Schramm, New Palestine, Ind., in place of Udell Smith, transferred.
Arthur Heiny, Noblesville, Ind., in place of G. B. Olvey, retired.
Donald J. Mustard, Poland, Ind., in place of M. A. Sendmeyer, resigned.
Franklin O. Rarick, Warsaw, Ind., in place of R. E. K. Bowen, deceased.
Vera G. Wilkins, Wolflake, Ind., in place of Z. M. Miller, retired.

IOWA

Ray L. Haefner, Arthur, Iowa, in place of A. C. Watts, retired.
Oscar J. Hertel, Burlington, Iowa, in place of K. W. Baxter, resigned.
Allan H. Rohwer, Dixon, Iowa, in place of E. H. Engel, retired.
Duane V. Clow, Gladbrook, Iowa, in place of A. T. Wieland, deceased.
Clarence A. Forslund, Harcourt, Iowa, in place of C. V. Nordblom, transferred.
Evadne V. Fehrer, Lacona, Iowa, in place of F. F. Konrad, retired.
Alvin J. Goemaat, Leighton, Iowa, in place of T. D. Beintema, retired.
Mary E. Colwell, Livermore, Iowa, in place of F. W. Baumgardner, deceased.
Sylvia M. Raecker, Meservey, Iowa, in place of A. N. Wendel, resigned.
Doris M. Beaman, Mondamin, Iowa, in place of H. H. Johnson, resigned.
Thelma A. Godfredsen, Ringsted, Iowa, in place of A. L. Anderson, retired.
Louis F. Clay, Rudd, Iowa, in place of C. A. Baber, retired.
Robert E. Lathrum, Saint Charles, Iowa, in place of H. V. Brooks, retired.
William D. Parker, Stanhope, Iowa, in place of W. L. Hurd, retired.
Orlyn M. Enabnit, Swaledale, Iowa, in place of Edward Moroney, retired.
Sigfred M. Johnson, Swea City, Iowa, in place of I. E. Larson, retired.

KANSAS

John H. Leach, Arlington, Kans., in place of H. P. Hinshaw, transferred.
Melvin E. Decker, Bison, Kans., in place of Clara Sainer, removed.
Clarence W. Taylor, Chapman, Kans., in place of J. W. O'Connor, retired.
Melvin L. Butler, Fulton, Kans., in place of E. C. Keating, retired.
Irvin L. Magner, Galesburg, Kans., in place of C. S. Duecy, resigned.
Alfred H. Martens, Hepler, Kans., in place of H. L. Hanson, removed.
Arthur H. Penner, Hillsboro, Kans., in place of H. D. Cornelsen, deceased.
Jacob C. Gaeddert, Inman, Kans., in place of J. F. Lambert, transferred.
Harry W. Arnold, Le Roy, Kans., in place of W. A. Harris, retired.
Kenneth D. Bretz, Lucas, Kans., in place of Elizabeth Mansfield, retired.
Cleo L. Greenfield, Melvern, Kans., in place of J. S. Dooty, retired.
Herman F. Kiesow, Osage City, Kans., in place of E. F. Hammond, resigned.
Julian S. Forrer, Ulysses, Kans., in place of J. R. Fogleman, resigned.

KENTUCKY

Escar O. Coe, Burkesville, Ky., in place of J. G. Talbot, resigned.
Clark N. Scott, Crab Orchard, Ky., in place of W. H. Pettus, resigned.
Roy C. Lutes, Florence, Ky., in place of L. L. Aylor, deceased.
Roy Burl Phillips, Grahn, Ky., in place of J. T. Powell, retired.
Orville Edwards, Gravel Switch, Ky., in place of R. O. Harmon, retired.
Mattie F. Cole, Louellen, Ky., in place of M. B. Vaughn, retired.
Clarence B. Howard, Loyall, Ky., in place of H. F. Saulinas, resigned.
Paul D. Fowler, Saint Mary, Ky., in place of W. R. Logsdon, retired.

LOUISIANA

Benjamin J. Haygood, Jr., Belcher, La., in place of M. M. Gleason, retired.
Erma E. Poland, Bienville, La., in place of W. L. Huckabay, retired.
James F. Roberts, Downsville, La., in place of M. P. Jones, retired.
Merlin A. Hymel, Edgard, La., in place of B. J. Jacobs, retired.
William T. Thurmond, Gibsland, La., in place of A. D. Williams, retired.
Howard P. Bullock, Greenwell Springs, La., in place of A. B. Meador, resigned.
Carl D. Walker, Lena, La., in place of R. R. Wilson, removed.
Melva E. Robinson, Mandeville, La., in place of H. J. Smith, deceased.
Milford L. Green, Natchitoches, La., in place of P. M. Potts, deceased.
Malin A. Mary, Pleasant Hill, La., in place of L. O. Ramsey, retired.
Mary B. Farmer, Princeton, La., in place of Lena Rushing, retired.
Robert Mitchell, Jr., Ringgold, La., in place of M. J. Perry, resigned.
Ione M. Estopinal, Saint Bernard, La., in place of E. M. Serpas, retired.
Arthur L. Layton, Shreveport, La., in place of R. H. Nelson, retired.

MAINE

Joseph S. Dinsmore, Bangor, Maine, in place of J. G. O'Connor, retired.
Snowdell M. Holden, Jackman, Maine, in place of H. L. Holden, retired.
Homer C. Woodward, Newport, Maine, in place of G. L. Murray, retired.
Raymond P. Salls, York Beach, Maine, in place of T. J. Donohue, deceased.

MARYLAND

Pierson M. Roe, Cordova, Md., in place of G. L. Hopkins, resigned.
Josephine P. Allison, Deale, Md., in place of W. W. Nihiser, resigned.
Ernest C. Zebuhr, Jr., Derwood, Md., in place of E. P. Ganley, deceased.
Elizabeth H. Roberson, Dickerson, Md., in place of R. W. Swank, deceased.
Norman J. Schnepfe, Edgewood, Md., in place of J. C. Frasch, retired.
John Russell Carroll, Federalsburg, Md., in place of F. S. Bradley, retired.
Margaret R. Randall, Glen Echo, Md., in place of D. B. Canada, deceased.
Marion E. Slingluff, Mitchellville, Md., in place of Harold Slingluff, retired.
John D. Mumford, Vienna, Md., in place of H. W. Hurst, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Marshall E. Carroll, Chilmark, Mass., in place of R. E. Weeks, removed.
Carl H. Carlson, Franklin, Mass., in place of M. J. Costello, retired.
Jerome A. Gallant, Jr., Green Harbor, Mass., in place of S. G. Sampson, deceased.
John S. Burnett, Housatonic, Mass., in place of J. F. Mack, retired.
Frances V. Conley, Manchaug, Mass., in place of G. E. Plante, removed.
Carroll A. Strysko, Montague, Mass., in place of D. J. Newton, retired.
William R. Richmond, Jr., North Wilbraham, Mass., in place of J. B. Logan, retired.
Donald M. Lincoln, Rutland, Mass., in place of T. F. Welch, retired.
Laurence J. Stange, South Deerfield, Mass., in place of H. J. Cuff, deceased.
Rosamond T. Marshall, Sterling, Mass., in place of Alice Fitzgerald, retired.

Robert L. McCarthy, Warren, Mass., in place of J. E. Madigan, removed.

Robert P. McMahon, Westfield, Mass., in place of G. E. Brady, retired.

MICHIGAN

Lulie M. Frick, Atlas, Mich., in place of Jessie Evans, resigned.

Jean N. Carruthers, Bancroft, Mich., in place of E. H. Shelp, transferred.

Roland W. Reese, Birmingham, Mich., in place of B. E. Fowler, removed.

Ronald C. Cheever, Britton, Mich., in place of B. J. Beasley, retired.

Robert J. Terrell, Byron Center, Mich., in place of M. G. Wells, deceased.

Chester V. Muntz, Cass City, Mich., in place of A. M. Bigelow, resigned.

Olga L. Thoms, Centreville, Mich., in place of Frank Mandigo, retired.

Wynne Vanderkarr, Corunna, Mich., in place of C. S. Carland, retired.

Clayton P. Anderson, Croswell, Mich., in place of W. D. McCaughey, removed.

Donovan E. Springsteen, Fenwick, Mich., in place of G. S. Ehle, retired.

Carl F. Riebow, Harrisville, Mich., in place of S. B. Pizer, retired.

Charles H. Hinman, Hastings, Mich., in place of R. G. Hubbard, retired.

Wilbur T. McLane, Lake, Mich., in place of C. C. Malosh, retired.

Leslie B. Palmer, Mason, Mich., in place of W. J. Barber, resigned.

George D. Smith, Morenci, Mich., in place of H. F. Clark, resigned.

Ralph H. Jokipii, Pelkie, Mich., in place of M. H. Oja, retired.

Robert J. McIntosh, Port Huron, Mich., in place of L. C. Sellers, deceased.

Chester J. Orr, Standish, Mich., in place of A. M. Rokosz, removed.

Myrtle E. Kennedy, Topinabee, Mich., in place of L. W. Kennedy, resigned.

Harold J. Hawkins, Wayland, Mich., in place of M. R. Ehle, removed.

MINNESOTA

George Ralph Laniel, Brooks, Minn., in place of Arthur Laniel, retired.

Eugene C. Wensman, Chokio, Minn., in place of A. L. Nelson, resigned.

Raynold O. Johnson, Cloquet, Minn., in place of C. E. Scheibe, retired.

Donald J. Bode, Courtland, Minn., in place of F. A. Heidemann, deceased.

Celia M. Mattinen, Esko, Minn., in place of H. J. Mattinen, deceased.

Walfred R. Wicklund, Isanti, Minn., in place of K. W. Oleson, transferred.

Irven J. Kopischke, Janesville, Minn., in place of R. P. Nolan, retired.

Dale A. Lahti, Kelly Lake, Minn., in place of I. A. Gonsolin, retired.

Edward C. Distel, Lakeland, Minn., in place of R. E. Sanderson, deceased.

Melvin J. Moravec, Lonsdale, Minn., in place of Charles Mechura, transferred.

Verlyn F. Cornelius, Medford, Minn., in place of R. W. Corchran, resigned.

Martha M. Freer, Oak Park, Minn., in place of E. J. Finden, retired.

Felix J. Eggen, Underwood, Minn., in place of Alfred Gronner, retired.

Walter A. Lienke, Windom, Minn., in place of E. C. Ebert, removed.

MISSISSIPPI

Luther V. Taylor, Sr., Belmont, Miss., in place of L. C. Davis, retired.

Philip E. Swayze, Benton, Miss., in place of C. R. Berry, retired.

Dora F. Lynd, Escatawpa, Miss., in place of L. J. Megehee, retired.

William D. Kenneday, Meridian, Miss., in place of B. K. Culpepper, retired.

Joseph B. Pickett, Pope, Miss., in place of A. L. Robertson, deceased.

Carroll M. Butler, Raleigh, Miss., in place of F. J. Robinson, retired.

Elizabeth H. Branch, Shelby, Miss., in place of H. E. Wilkinson, deceased.

Roy A. Schmidt, Sontag, Miss., in place of E. A. Douglas, transferred.

Rufus A. Ware, Stringer, Miss., in place of J. G. Ishee, retired.

MISSOURI

Gene D. Callison, Barnett, Mo., in place of H. C. Gunn, transferred.

Charles E. Jones, Burlington Junction, Mo., in place of A. B. House, retired.

Theodore R. Shell, De Soto, Mo., in place of H. W. Ames, transferred.

Perry M. Sprague, Fair Play, Mo., in place of Raymond Nickles, transferred.

George W. Lowrance, Golden City, Mo., in place of M. E. Woody, retired.

William H. Lovell, Henrietta, Mo., in place of W. E. Sisk, resigned.

John R. Smith, Jameson, Mo., in place of M. H. Reed, retired.

Cyrenius J. Jones, Jonesburg, Mo., in place of J. B. Diggs, resigned.

William H. Adams, Memphis, Mo., in place of A. O. Hendrickson, deceased.

Fred W. Aderhold, Purdy, Mo., in place of H. W. Harter, resigned.

Robert E. Nichols, Seymour, Mo., in place of Raymond Carrick, transferred.

Raymond M. Buckley, Warsaw, Mo., in place of P. M. Blanchard, removed.

MONTANA

Ruth Ish, Chester, Mont., in place of Shebel Reihal, retired.

Clifford V. Long, Frazer, Mont., in place of G. N. Westland, removed.

Elizabeth L. Calvert, Lima, Mont., in place of O. M. Cantrell, resigned.

Olga Strand, Reserve, Mont., in place of E. K. Riley, retired.

Alma E. Fischer, Somers, Mont., in place of Ralph Drew, deceased.

NEBRASKA

Bernard J. Holen, Bertrand, Nebr., in place of C. E. Opitz, removed.

Harold D. Lessig, Gurley, Nebr., in place of A. O. Kruger, transferred.

Duane M. Vannice, Halsey, Nebr., in place of L. F. Besley, retired.

Edwin A. Misegadis, Lodgepole, Nebr., in place of G. E. Minshall, retired.

Harley G. Lofton, McCook, Nebr., in place of R. E. Scott, resigned.

Lois J. Larson, Macy, Nebr., in place of Donald Maslonka, resigned.

Elet M. Wagner, Roseland, Nebr., in place of R. G. Lynch, retired.

Anton F. Fisher, Weston, Nebr., in place of I. M. Davis, removed.

NEVADA

Norma N. Bianchini, Beawawe, Nev., in place of T. A. Mahoney, resigned.

James Donald Morrison, Eureka, Nev., in place of J. V. Hooper, removed.

Anna M. Houck, Weed Heights, Nev. Office established March 16, 1953.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Thomas W. Golden, Hinsdale, N. H., in place of F. J. Young, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Elmer Stanton Holmes, Jr., Avalon, N. J., in place of M. F. Locke, declined.

J. Ward Johnson, Belford, N. J., in place of J. P. Euler, retired.

Lyman H. Graham, Bradley Beach, N. J., in place of J. M. Timcoe, retired.

Joseph J. Kelly, Coytesville, N. J., in place of G. D. Drums, deceased.

George E. Cusick, Demarest, N. J., in place of A. T. Heus, retired.

Anna P. MacGill, Lafayette, N. J., in place of J. D. Treible, retired.

Dorothy L. Curley, Lyons, N. J., in place of E. B. Egan, resigned.

Ralph G. Shreve, Moorestown, N. J., in place of A. B. Nixon, deceased.

Ruth E. Alt, Morganville, N. J., in place of L. F. Slover, removed.

Edna I. McTamney, Neshanic Station, N. J., in place of E. W. Hoagland, retired.

Henry J. Formon, Ridgefield, N. J., in place of C. A. Hildebrand, retired.

Amelia S. Applegate, South River, N. J., in place of C. F. Hausermann, removed.

Philip N. Mazziotta, Towaco, N. J., in place of J. N. Rumley, deceased.

NEW MEXICO

Lucille G. Salazar, Dulce, N. Mex., in place of I. H. Hobgood, resigned.

Charles Earnest Cooper, Melrose, N. Mex., in place of G. E. White, retired.

NEW YORK

Florence M. Drankhan, Boston, N. Y., in place of S. H. Dye, retired.

George A. Moses, Brushton, N. Y., in place of C. H. Hamlin, deceased.

John Wesley Sinnickson, Center Moriches, N. Y., in place of T. E. Havens, resigned.

Ida Mae Hopkins, Cincinnatus, N. Y., in place of L. H. Ingersoll, retired.

Marjorie S. Mann, Clyde, N. Y., in place of W. A. Bramer, resigned.

Joseph Del Giudice, Croton-on-Hudson, N. Y., in place of E. L. Van Tassell, removed.

Kenneth C. Lasher, Dover Plains, N. Y., in place of E. A. Wyman, retired.

Eva H. Chambers, Dresden, N. Y., in place of M. D. Leach, retired.

Ignatius Fafinski, Dunkirk, N. Y., in place of D. P. Scannell, resigned.

Donald R. Young, East Branch, N. Y., in place of F. A. Yager, resigned.

Richard S. Laing, Eden, N. Y., in place of A. H. Flint, removed.

W. Arthur Lewis, Fishers, N. Y., in place of H. A. Barry, resigned.

Amelia L. Donovan, Forestport, N. Y., in place of M. A. Murphy, retired.

Ralph L. Marshall, Freeport, N. Y., in place of E. A. Rice, retired.

Florence Thompson, Harriman, N. Y., in place of F. L. Brady, deceased.

William F. Pfarrer, Hilton, N. Y., in place of B. C. Randall, resigned.

Fred A. Griffin, Holtsville, N. Y., in place of W. L. Lester, removed.

Howard W. Wheeler, Kinderhook, N. Y., in place of C. M. Magee, retired.

Joyce K. Holmes, Lindley, N. Y., in place of M. A. Cobb, retired.

Revelon M. Wimmer, Marilla, N. Y., in place of Clifford Veeder, retired.

Donald M. Baker, Moriah, N. Y., in place of W. L. Pepper, retired.

Russell A. Southard, Otego, N. Y., in place of D. L. Palmer, retired.

Rudolph H. Reed, Painted Post, N. Y., in place of C. L. Wright, deceased.

Leonard Lincoln Hunt, Piermont, N. Y., in place of M. T. Scott, removed.

Gordon E. Fahey, Port Leyden, N. Y., in place of E. J. Claffey, retired.

Jack A. Follis, Pound Ridge, N. Y. Office established November 16, 1953.

Richard I. Gates, Redwood, N. Y., in place of L. S. Martin, retired.

Joseph Huber, Rockville Centre, N. Y., in place of W. J. Murray, resigned.

Henry M. Engelmann, Round Top, N. Y., in place of C. O. Alberga, retired.

Madelein W. Matthews, Russell, N. Y., in place of H. J. Dygert, retired.

Lloyd A. Carter, Saranac, N. Y., in place of A. E. Pellerin, transferred.

Ely E. Mulliken, Savona, N. Y., in place of J. W. Moore, retired.

John L. Button, South New Berlin, N. Y., in place of Josephine Westphall, resigned.

John Wesley Pullman, Tappan, N. Y., in place of E. C. Jones, retired.
Edmon L. Sowers, Thiells, N. Y., in place of Walter Stanhope, retired.
Berta L. Wixom, Trumansburg, N. Y., in place of M. E. Fausette, retired.
Donald M. Tobey, Victor, N. Y., in place of F. B. Mead, retired.
Urban W. Newman, Westmoreland, N. Y., in place of H. K. Morrison, resigned.
John A. Harrington, West Oneonta, N. Y., in place of S. A. Gregory, resigned.
Margaret C. Wilcox, Whitney Point, N. Y., in place of A. D. Driscoll, retired.
Leon P. Carey, Woodstock, N. Y., in place of Howard Bell, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA

Harry C. Robbins, Blowing Rock, N. C., in place of G. M. Sudderth, retired.
Lyle B. Cook, Boone, N. C., in place of J. E. Brown, Jr., removed.
James L. Chestnutt, Edenton, N. C., in place of R. D. Dixon, deceased.
Lee G. Phipps, Grassy Creek, N. C., in place of E. R. Duvall, retired.
Victor F. Harris, Harrisburg, N. C., in place of W. D. Sloop, retired.
John F. Drake, Holly Springs, N. C., in place of Beulah Paxton, retired.
Kathryn H. Perry, Kitty Hawk, N. C., in place of H. M. Baum, retired.
Numa D. Redmon, Jr., Leaksville, N. C., in place of W. W. Hampton, retired.
Robert Duke Tutterow, Mocksville, N. C., in place of Daisy Holthouser, transferred.
James L. Oakley, Providence, N. C. Office established September 1, 1953.
Neil D. Shively, Spray, N. C., in place of O. H. Hodges, retired.
James D. Glisson, Stokes, N. C., in place of G. L. Clark, resigned.
John H. Norton, Stony Point, N. C., in place of D. F. Cockrell, removed.
Enos R. Boyd, Waynesville, N. C., in place of J. H. Howell, retired.
Iris S. Powell, Wentworth, N. C., in place of J. G. Wilson, deceased.
Hugh D. Bradner, Yanceyville, N. C., in place of T. D. Boswell, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Pearl E. Taylor, Alexander, N. Dak., in place of B. K. Jenner, removed.
John B. Williams, Barney, N. Dak., in place of R. A. Halvorson, resigned.
Agnes E. Butts, Big Bend, N. Dak., in place of A. J. Irwin, resigned.
Anna E. Schlabach, Driscoll, N. Dak., in place of A. M. Bruschwein, retired.
LeRoy B. Wentz, Elgin, N. Dak., in place of M. C. Rausch, retired.
Eugene M. Shea, Hazelton, N. Dak., in place of A. H. Simpkins, removed.
Lyle A. Opdahl, Litchville, N. Dak., in place of M. G. McGregor, transferred.
James Wallace Scott, Manning, N. Dak., in place of Helen Morton, retired.
Mildred L. Knudsen, Marion, N. Dak., in place of Cleo Flugga, transferred.
Orris K. Rowe, New Leipzig, N. Dak., in place of H. T. Storm, deceased.
Esther Ward, Palermo, N. Dak., in place of H. D. Ward, deceased.
Joseph A. Scholand, Reynolds, N. Dak., in place of D. F. McMenamy, transferred.
Franklin V. Frykman, Souris, N. Dak., in place of A. M. Sletten, transferred.
Harold W. Bachman, Streeter, N. Dak., in place of Paul Kietzke, deceased.
Herman C. Becker, Wahpeton, N. Dak., in place of R. L. Hawes, retired.
Lawrence W. Grahn, Walhalla, N. Dak., in place of W. S. McCabe, deceased.
Robert G. Brown, Wimbledon, N. Dak., in place of L. E. Peterson, resigned.

OHIO

Dorothy S. Hagelberger, Anna, Ohio, in place of W. D. Day, transferred.
Smith B. Applegarth, Barton, Ohio, in place of M. I. Timko, resigned.
Harry M. Hollerbach, Batavia, Ohio, in place of C. S. Coyle, deceased.
Keith W. Lowery, Buckeye Lake, Ohio, in place of L. G. McKnight, retired.
Jean Ray Swihart, Eldorado, Ohio, in place of C. V. Stayton, removed.
Jack Richard Turner, Forest, Ohio, in place of B. A. Fishburn, retired.
Helen M. Hall, Fredericksburg, Ohio, in place of G. R. Spencer, removed.
Earl G. Golliver, Grover Hill, Ohio, in place of J. H. Kohn, retired.
Olive G. Spangler, Harrisburg, Ohio, in place of M. G. Liff, resigned.
Walter Thomas Woolard, Hebron, Ohio, in place of M. J. Rosebraugh, retired.
Verne A. Miner, Lodi, Ohio, in place of E. A. Rowland, retired.
Robert H. Shafer, McComb, Ohio, in place of R. H. Strouse, retired.
Billy A. Calendine, McConnelsville, Ohio, in place of H. W. Gordon, retired.
Ralph M. Hardy, Mansfield, Ohio, in place of C. L. Ford, removed.
Veryl D. Rodocker, Mount Eaton, Ohio, in place of H. M. Rodocker, deceased.
Phillip H. Gifford, Urbana, Ohio, in place of W. A. Strapp, deceased.
Barras George Birkbeck, Wadsworth, Ohio, in place of W. I. Dague, retired.
Ben S. Daniels, Willoughby, Ohio, in place of J. D. Ryan, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Ruth M. Stanley, Alma, Okla., in place of J. Y. Elmore, transferred.
Hobart F. R. Higdon, Avant, Okla., in place of E. V. Hamrick, deceased.
J. T. Haney, Jr., Big Cabin, Okla., in place of Verdia Comer, resigned.
Jack J. Higgins, Blackwell, Okla., in place of C. H. McMullan, removed.
Margaret Marie Duel, Carmen, Okla., in place of E. D. Peck, retired.
Martha C. Roach, Chelsea, Okla., in place of N. I. McHenry, retired.
Loetta Jo Conditt, Countyline, Okla., in place of Grady Gossett, deceased.
Phil H. Underwood, Custer, Okla., in place of E. R. Cunningham, retired.
Floyd P. Johnson, Davis, Okla., in place of O. V. Lowther, removed.
Grady V. Duncan, Durant, Okla., in place of B. W. Johnson, deceased.
Agnes V. Peer, Gage, Okla., in place of F. L. Burrow, removed.
Gerald L. Ridle, Gracemont, Okla., in place of E. L. Hatchett, resigned.
Velma D. Wilkins, Grant, Okla., in place of H. E. Hathaway, resigned.
Harvey Bowen, Jr., Meeker, Okla., in place of T. F. Green, deceased.
Glenn M. Moore, Morris, Okla., in place of C. W. Jeffress, removed.
Carson Scott, Okmulgee, Okla., in place of H. B. Torbett, removed.
Joseph T. Courts, Quinton, Okla., in place of F. R. Hendrickson, retired.
George W. Sewell, Sayre, Okla., in place of Oscar Speed, deceased.
John Masino, Schulter, Okla., in place of A. B. Swan, resigned.
William L. Bozeman, Soper, Okla., in place of C. C. Sanders, resigned.
Everette E. Johnson, Stillwater, Okla., in place of H. A. McNutt, resigned.
Thomas J. Winters, Jr., Stringtown, Okla., in place of Eleanor Barnhill, resigned.
Isaac L. Thomson, Valliant, Okla., in place of A. M. Mills, resigned.
Blanche D. Browning, Wynona, Okla., in place of Roy Broaddus, retired.

OREGON

Neil L. Morfitt, Astoria, Oreg., in place of E. P. Burke, retired.
Flossie M. Coats, Boardman, Oreg., in place of Florence Root, retired.
Thomas M. Biggar, Jr., Canyon City, Oreg., in place of E. E. Mulcare, transferred.
Julia H. Decker, Island City, Oreg., in place of S. E. Hyde, deceased.
Leon M. Matheny, Jacksonville, Oreg., in place of M. R. Christean, resigned.
David I. Hoover, Mapleton, Oreg., in place of L. A. Wheeler, resigned.
E. Marjorie Ogan, Marcola, Oreg., in place of N. J. Neil, retired.
Glen R. Sandford, North Plains, Oreg., in place of J. R. Sandford, retired.
Francis G. Petrie, Rogue River, Oreg., in place of H. M. Laws, retired.
Nellie A. Bembry, Sisters, Oreg., in place of S. J. May, resigned.
Ray Kurz, Umatilla, Oreg., in place of T. G. Tucker, deceased.
Doris H. Weaver, Valsetz, Oreg., in place of E. C. Blaisdell, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Edna M. Darragh, Amity, Pa., in place of C. T. Darragh, deceased.
Bernard E. O'Connor, Bainbridge, Pa., in place of J. H. Bryan, resigned.
Evart L. Ervin, Beaver, Pa., in place of J. P. Bryan, retired.
Walter L. Stuart, Brownsville, Pa., in place of W. C. Storer, retired.
Walter F. Rhine, Canonsburg, Pa., in place of S. J. Bondi, removed.
Bertha E. Snyder, Dickerson Run, Pa., in place of O. K. Weise, resigned.
Catharine B. Shultz, Dublin, Pa., in place of P. G. Shultz, deceased.
Kenneth H. Williamson, Edgemont, Pa., in place of M. P. Smith, retired.
Frank L. Bucko, Ford City, Pa., in place of M. J. Glenn, retired.
Clayton E. Hollinger, Lebanon, Pa., in place of D. E. Walter, removed.
Bruce B. DeLong, Mertztown, Pa., in place of E. F. Fox, retired.
William Jerome McMullin, Millheim, Pa., in place of C. E. Musser, retired.
Joshua J. Baker, Mineral Point, Pa., in place of M. J. O'Connor, retired.
Elmer L. Zerphey, Mount Joy, Pa., in place of C. J. Bennett, Jr., resigned.
Robert W. Stahl, Mount Pleasant, Pa., in place of Clark Queer, resigned.
Bian B. Walker, Jr., Mount Pocono, Pa., in place of L. J. DePaul, resigned.
Fred D. Starr, Muncy Valley, Pa., in place of H. W. Bender, retired.
Ward O. Sharpe, Murrysville, Pa., in place of H. S. Welsh, resigned.
Rita P. Ritchie, Prospect, Pa., in place of R. K. Humphrey, resigned.
James M. Dougherty, Ralston, Pa., in place of H. L. Schaefer, declined.
Ralph H. Landes, Royersford, Pa., in place of M. S. Anderson, retired.
Arthur Mosteller, Shawnee on Delaware, Pa., in place of A. B. Smith, resigned.
Harold E. Walters, Sidman, Pa., in place of A. A. Plummer, retired.
Demetrius Gula, Southwest, Pa., in place of W. A. Bailey, retired.
Marie H. McDannell, Spartansburg, Pa., in place of W. L. Blakeslee, resigned.
C. Lyman Sturgis, Uniontown, Pa., in place of J. A. Reilly, removed.
Jane E. McKenry, West Bridgewater, Pa., in place of N. K. McKean, resigned.
David L. Dickson, West Monterey, Pa., in place of B. M. Logan, resigned.
Howard J. Short, Willow Grove, Pa., in place of H. T. McEvoy, removed.

RHODE ISLAND

Amelia M. Bottomley, Greystone, R. I., in place of Frederick Malone, deceased.
Earle W. Belknap, Wakefield, R. I., in place of E. F. McCarthy, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Lucille G. Heyward, Bluffton, S. C., in place of G. P. Harrison, retired.

Elizabeth Y. Curran, Brunson, S. C., in place of Pearl Youmans, retired.

Floyd C. Hammond, Myrtle Beach, S. C., in place of G. S. Beard, retired.

William W. Cone, Saluda, S. C., in place of A. J. Nicholson, transferred.

Lee M. Blanchett, Summerville, S. C., in place of E. O. Reynolds, retired.

Arace M. Crouch, Wallace, S. C. Office established September 1, 1950.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Clarence L. Shabino, Alexandria, S. Dak., in place of Gwyneath Field, deceased.

Eunice A. Sjerven, Bristol, S. Dak., in place of V. A. Sjerven, deceased.

Ranald A. Bishop, Hurley, S. Dak., in place of S. P. Hutchinson, resigned.

Russell G. Dupic, Lesterville, S. Dak., in place of George Kremer, retired.

William L. Truex, Montrose, S. Dak., in place of T. W. Lalley, deceased.

Thomas V. Niederman, Morristown, S. Dak., in place of M. F. McGrath, resigned.

Matthew Voigt, Spencer, S. Dak., in place of Ross Bennett, transferred.

Harold J. Engel, Wagner, S. Dak., in place of R. C. Hoyer, removed.

TENNESSEE

Jim N. Bone, Cumberland Furnace, Tenn., in place of E. L. Smith, deceased.

TEXAS

Edward A. Buffington, Anderson, Tex., in place of T. L. McDougald, deceased.

Wesley M. Robbins, Aspermont, Tex., in place of M. N. Guest, resigned.

William J. Foxworth, Cisco, Tex., in place of L. H. McCrea, resigned.

Bernice F. Hines, Diboll, Tex., in place of Zettie Kelley, retired.

Hal E. Hanson, Dickinson, Tex., in place of M. S. Walters, resigned.

Conrad H. Starr, Elkhart, Tex., in place of B. F. Weatherford, retired.

Edmund F. Jendrusch, Jr., Falls City, Tex., in place of S. F. Labus, retired.

Emory D. Estes, Jr., Hawkins, Tex., in place of H. E. Minshew, removed.

Irving M. Horton, Humble, Tex., in place of W. J. Reeves, deceased.

Martin B. Glasscock, La Feria, Tex., in place of A. L. Allen, retired.

Raymond E. Jones, Livingston, Tex., in place of J. T. Coleman, retired.

Samuel S. Williams, Marshall, Tex., in place of T. J. Agnor, deceased.

Eleanore L. Walston, Nome, Tex., in place of B. O. Collins, resigned.

James Everett, Jr., Oglesby, Tex., in place of I. A. Stockburger, deceased.

Howard G. Turner, Orange, Tex., in place of C. R. Coale, resigned.

Gerald J. Shipp, Ore City, Tex., in place of C. C. Coppedge, retired.

Odie K. Gaylor, Pampa, Tex., in place of W. B. Weatherred, transferred.

Billy N. Fine, Petrolia, Tex., in place of M. A. Price, removed.

Grace Roach, Rankin, Tex., in place of M. J. Edwards, deceased.

Evelyn Neale Walker, Robstown, Tex., in place of R. B. Horney, resigned.

Claud M. Erwin, Rocksprings, Tex., in place of M. S. Henry, deceased.

William W. Schulz, Schertz, Tex., in place of G. J. Bolton, retired.

Oscar C. Hope, Jr., Scottsville, Tex., in place of O. C. Hope, retired.

Mattie K. Elmore, Shepherd, Tex., in place of P. H. Fuller, resigned.

Paeder T. Hoovestol, South Houston, Tex., in place of I. M. Meador, resigned.

Donald H. Smith, Spearman, Tex., in place of M. S. Chambers, resigned.

Ruth Brown, Sylvester, Tex., in place of M. S. McHaney, resigned.

Leila D. Kelley, Valentine, Tex., in place of J. J. Williams, removed.

Miller E. Herrington, Whitney, Tex., in place of J. W. Hardison, transferred.

Esta L. Matson, Zephyr, Tex., in place of M. L. Cobb, retired.

UTAH

Donald F. Keele, Dugway, Utah. Office established December 1, 1953.

Byron L. Huish, Magna, Utah, in place of V. A. Haws, removed.

VERMONT

Gaylord C. Gale, Stowe, Vt., in place of H. J. Bashaw, deceased.

VIRGINIA

Robert A. Wilkinson, Arrington, Va., in place of W. A. White, deceased.

Theodore Reese Hall, Callao, Va., in place of G. M. Sandy, resigned.

Silverius C. Churn, Cape Charles, Va., in place of S. T. Nottingham, retired.

Homer J. Amos, Chatham, Va., in place of J. J. Patterson, retired.

Walter H. Sealock, Falls Church, Va., in place of B. F. May, retired.

Robert K. Drumwright, Jr., Fork Union, Va., in place of B. S. Weaver, retired.

Jerry W. Alford, Glasgow, Va., in place of L. B. Peak, retired.

WASHINGTON

William A. Penn, Bothell, Wash., in place of A. D. Hannan, deceased.

Daun Ringer, Bridgeport, Wash., in place of M. S. Willms, resigned.

Gilbert E. Manuel, College Place, Wash., in place of E. H. Davis, retired.

Loring E. Bundy, Edwall, Wash., in place of M. P. Hutton, resigned.

Willis E. Goodwin, Houghton, Wash., in place of W. E. Jones, retired.

Walter E. Soehl, La Center, Wash., in place of Edna Smith, retired.

Samuel E. Edwards, Ritzville, Wash., in place of Henry Thom, retired.

James T. Likes, Rosalia, Wash., in place of H. C. Roberts, retired.

Wanda G. Wyatt, Union, Wash., in place of H. G. Anderson, retired.

George A. Morrison, Vashon, Wash., in place of J. E. Ober, deceased.

Bertha L. Mills, Vaughn, Wash., in place of R. A. Stratford, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

Paul F. Sheets, Clarksburg, W. Va., in place of W. H. Garrett, resigned.

Mary M. Leslie, Cowen, W. Va., in place of W. O. Starcher, resigned.

Jesse J. Martin, Ethel, W. Va., in place of C. T. Lee, removed.

Glen R. Dial, Harts, W. Va., in place of Herbert Adkins, retired.

Howard L. Carpenter, Hepzibah, W. Va., in place of C. A. Lyon, retired.

William D. Workman, Hillsboro, W. Va., in place of C. H. Callison, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Inez Myrtle Rautio, Amberg, Wis., in place of A. S. Port, retired.

Marvin W. Babbitt, Bloomer, Wis., in place of E. R. Kranzfelder, retired.

Raymond T. Huinker, Cato, Wis., in place of A. M. Pritzl, retired.

Lester V. Gilbertson, Coon Valley, Wis., in place of N. O. Neprud, retired.

Archie W. Christman, Darien, Wis., in place of J. E. Thorpe, resigned.

Wendell G. Williams, Elcho, Wis., in place of T. W. Schuh, resigned.

Arthur L. Ewen, Francis Creek, Wis., in place of C. J. Hessel, retired.

Floyd A. Fralick, Glen Haven, Wis., in place of D. L. Bennett, removed.

DuWayne J. Bloch, Green Lake, Wis., in place of M. R. Alling, deceased.

Robley H. Evans, Hawthorne, Wis., in place of F. W. Thoms, deceased.

Edward C. Hammer, Hillsboro, Wis., in place of S. E. Ferriter, retired.

Richard C. Cross, Larsen, Wis., in place of G. J. Cross, resigned.

Dan H. Kimball, Marengo, Wis., in place of J. F. Koin, retired.

Arnold L. Peters, Marinette, Wis., in place of W. F. Coffey, resigned.

William A. Knoll, Mayville, Wis., in place of M. J. Bachhuber, retired.

DeWayne W. Jensen, Minong, Wis., in place of N. H. Adams, resigned.

Julius C. Sarafolean, Portage, Wis., in place of C. J. Rubin, deceased.

Arthur E. Bauer, Sussex, Wis., in place of P. E. Boots, retired.

Lloyd W. Bryant, Waterford, Wis., in place of G. W. Shenkenberg, retired.

Gordon A. Peterson, Waupaca, Wis., in place of J. W. Carew, retired.

Ernest M. Iverson, Williams Bay, Wis., in place of S. V. Johnson, removed.

Leo J. Verhasselt, Wrightstown, Wis., in place of T. C. Buboltz, retired.

WYOMING

Charles F. Hessenthaler, Byron, Wyo., in place of M. B. Cozzens, retired.

Anthony M. Ries, Cheyenne, Wyo., in place of Hugh Coffman, retired.

Allen L. Swan, Douglas, Wyo., in place of J. L. Downs, resigned.

Robert A. Lowham, Evanston, Wyo., in place of F. P. Nelson, resigned.

Walter S. Brown, Jr., Pine Bluffs, Wyo., in place of A. D. Keenan, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 4, 1955:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Nepal.

Donald R. Heath, of Kansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Lebanon.

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

TO BE MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 27, 1958, AND UNTIL THEIR SUCCESSOR HAS BEEN APPOINTED AND QUALIFIED

Philip D. Reed, of New York.

Erwin D. Canham, of Massachusetts.

SUPREME COURT, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Philip L. Rice, of Hawaii, to be associate justice of the supreme court, Territory of Hawaii.

BOARD OF PAROLE

George Glenn Killinger, of Virginia, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1960.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Edward J. Devitt, of Minnesota, to be United States district judge for the district of Minnesota.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Russell B. Wine, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the western district of Texas.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Hon. Joseph C. O'Mahoney, of Wyoming, at Roosevelt Day Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 4, 1955

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it was my privilege on Wednesday night to address the Roosevelt Day dinner in the city of New York. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNFINISHED TASK OF FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

(Address by Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, at the seventh annual Roosevelt Day dinner, at the Hotel Commodore, February 2, 1955)

I speak tonight of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the conservative, and his unfinished task. Roosevelt was a conservative, not in the sense that he wanted to preserve things as he found them, but in the sense that he knew that new conditions impose new duties, and that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. He was a leader of vision who understood that the foundations of freedom were under attack in the modern world.

He knew that economic reform was essential to the preservation of the basic objectives of the American system of government. From the day he took office as President of the United States until the Nation became involved in the Second World War, the purpose of his policy was to restore economic opportunity to the masses of the people, to safeguard the concept of private property, and to eliminate abuses arising from the concentration of economic power.

Throughout his career Roosevelt was misunderstood by those who deemed him to be a radical reformer, whose efforts could result only in tearing down the edifice of popular government. They were blind leaders who not only did not realize that once again mankind needed a new birth of freedom, but who mistakenly believed that the remedy for the obvious economic ills, which brought the crash of 1929, was nothing more than a restoration of the conditions which existed before the collapse. They did not understand that a system of collectivist capitalism had developed which promoted monopoly, impaired production and distribution, caused widespread unemployment, and threatened the very existence of economic freedom.

Far from being a Socialist whose aim was to undermine the constitutional system and make the government superior to the citizen, Roosevelt was dedicated to the preservation of the right of private property. He knew that it could not be preserved except by honest and far-reaching reform, and he had the courage to devise and defend a program of reform that even those who most harshly criticized him have now been obliged, reluctantly it is true, to accept.

DEDICATED TO THE CONSTITUTION

He was dedicated to the American Constitution. He knew that the framers of that document gave to the Congress complete control over commerce, and he was aware that conditions, developing as long ago as the administration of President Grant, had been gradually imposing upon the people a new national but unregulated economic government, affecting the whole people and over which the Federal Government was exercising no effective influence to protect competition. It was a system by which a few industrial and commercial leaders were slowly gaining control of all the instruments of trade, commerce and industry without respect to the authority of either State or national government.

Mr. Roosevelt was a devoted supporter of Woodrow Wilson who had perceived the need for more effective public regulation of the new national economic system and who, in his first term in the Presidency, successfully secured the enactment into law of essential reforms over the stubborn resistance of Republican leadership which had arrayed itself on the side of those whom Theodore Roosevelt had called malefactors of great wealth. He had seen the program of Wilson and of Republican progressives brought to a sudden halt by World War I when the exigencies of international conflict claimed the undivided attention of both the Government and the people. Victory in the war was followed by confusion and uncertainty. In the wake came the Harding campaign for the return to normalcy, and there followed 12 years of reactionary policy under a government which saw no need for economic reform or social justice. Its leaders wanted merely a return to the conditions which in 1912 had ruptured the Republican Party and elected Wilson.

These were 12 years which proved the need of a progressive and vigorous policy, designed to restore economic opportunity and social justice to all the people by putting an end to economic domination by private operators whose major concern was their own personal aggrandizement. They earned the name "reactionary" because they really wanted to turn the hands of the economic clock back, an objective so impossible to achieve that the attempt resulted only in the collapse of 1929. Into this crisis stepped Franklin D. Roosevelt when, in 1929, he succeeded Alfred E. Smith as Governor of New York. He continued the battle for social reform, and he came face to face with the subtle methods by which the managers of national business were successfully resisting regulation in the public interest by both State and Federal Governments. Again he learned the imperative need of economic reform, and he began the campaign of 1932 with a masterful mobilization of public opinion to demand the removal of the economic capital of the United States from Wall Street to Washington. He saw that business and industry had become continental in their operations and that the public interest could be protected only by a constitutional American Government in the Nation's Capital through the authority of elected representatives of the people instead of through the private manipulators of concentrated economic power.

LAUNCHES DRIVE FOR ECONOMIC REFORM

I was there when this campaign began. I was a Democratic national committeeman from the State of Wyoming. I was one of those who raised the cry in the Far West for the nomination of Franklin Roosevelt for the Presidency. Like my associates, I was moved by the conviction that it was absolutely necessary to resume the struggles of Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson for national economic reform if the living generation and the generations to come were not to be deprived of their heritage of freedom and opportunity under the Constitution.

I had in mind Mr. Roosevelt's record as Governor. He stood for the conservation of natural resources and for reforestation; he stood for the protection of bank deposits, and he sought in various other ways through the State government to advance the cause of government, of, for, and by the people. It was apparent to him already, however, that victory for economic freedom could not be won through State governments, because economic concentration in private hands was being managed on a national scale.

Beginning early in 1932 with his speech on The Forgotten Man, the new presidential candidate, in meeting after meeting throughout the country, both before and after his nomination at Chicago, convinced the people that a new leader had arisen in the spirit of Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, and Woodrow Wilson. Finally, late in September before the Commonwealth Club in California, he traced the development of the crisis the Nation faced and clearly demonstrated that he was indeed a conservator of the underlying free principles of this Govment.

"The issue of Government," he said, "has always been whether individual men and women will have to serve some system of government or economics, or whether a system of government and economics exists to serve individual men and women. This question has persistently dominated the discussion of government for many generations."

Who does not know now that this is the very issue that rocks the world in our time? It will be for this generation to determine, and that most speedily, whether the people are to become the pawns of totalitarian governments or whether they are going to preserve for themselves and their children a system of government and economics which is designed, in Roosevelt's words, "to serve individual men and women." This paragraph from the Commonwealth Club speech, delivered 23 years ago, is proof that Mr. Roosevelt had both the vision to see the developing threat to free government, and the will to battle for freedom.

DEFENDER OF PRIVATE PROPERTY

Paragraph by paragraph in the San Francisco speech Roosevelt outlined the philosophy of popular government and private property, and showed that he cherished no thought of economic revolution but sought only economic reform and the reestablishment of the basic concepts of free government. The task ahead, he said, was that of "meeting the problem of underconsumption, of adjusting production to consumption, of distributing wealth and products more equitably, of adapting existing economic organizations to the service of the people." Note the words "existing economic organizations."

This is the language, not of a man who sought the abolition of private property, but of a man who realized that the development of government in the western world, coming to a climax in the establishment of the American Union, was marked by "the rise of the ethical conception that a ruler bears a responsibility for the welfare of his subjects."

It is not only the political ruler who bears this responsibility for the welfare of the people, but it is likewise the responsibility of the industrial and commercial manager.

Here was a program cast in the best mold of Americanism. It was understood by the people and, because it was so understood,

they kept Roosevelt at the helm of government for a longer period than any man in history. He was kept there because, as in the case of Woodrow Wilson, his program of economic reform in the American tradition was interrupted by another international war.

Those who would now follow in the footsteps of the founders of this Government must realize that once again we face the task of enacting those economic reforms which are necessary to protect the system of private property from collectivism of the right as well as collectivism of the left. This is the unfinished task of Franklin D. Roosevelt. His first term was devoted to rebuilding the ruins which reaction had wrought. He had to reopen the banks, he had to create jobs, he had to make opportunities for business, he had to restore the confidence of the economic leaders as well as that of the people. This confidence was evidenced in the overwhelming reelection the people gave him in the campaign of 1936, though in that campaign the opposition of reactionary leaders impelled him, in a famous speech at Chicago, to make the well-remembered remark that already recovery had so far advanced that some of the patients were "throwing their crutches at the doctor." Now these patients, or their successors, seem to be striving with might and main to remove the economic capital from Washington, where Roosevelt restored it, and move it back to the countinghouses of Wall Street.

It was on April 29, 1938, that President Roosevelt sent a notable message to the Congress asking for a study of the concentration of economic power. He was urging no attack upon business. He was seeking only to find a stable formula by which idle men, idle machines, and idle money could be put to work profitably for the benefit of all. It posed no threat to the honest managers of the existing economic organization, of which he had spoken in the Commonwealth address, but called only for the adoption of the ethical concepts of the responsibilities that economic leaders, as well as political leaders, should bear for the welfare of the people.

ROOSEVELT'S FAITH IN AMERICA

Mr. Roosevelt preached the doctrine of faith in America, its heritage, and its future. He believed in the people and in American institutions. He sought only, to use his own words, to "recognize the new terms of the old social contract."

This message, therefore, was in complete harmony with his vision of a people's government, united in tolerance and freedom, which he expressed in his first inaugural when he declared that the course of action he proposed was "feasible under the form of government which we have inherited from our ancestors." He respected the Constitution, he admired the Constitution. He felt that it was the best instrument of government yet devised by men. This faith he expressed in the following eloquent words:

"Our Constitution is so simple and practical that it is possible always to meet extraordinary needs by changes in emphasis and arrangement without loss of essential form. That is why our constitutional system has proved itself the most superbly enduring mechanism the modern world has produced. It has met every stress of vast expansion of territory, of foreign wars, of bitter internal strife, of world relations."

Great as was the stress of the period in which the people placed Roosevelt in the seat of power, it is not to be compared with the stress under which the whole world now trembles. Just as the reactionaries of 1920 called for an easy return to normalcy, and abandoned all effort to achieve the reforms made necessary by the changing times, so now there are leaders in Washington who seem not to have understood the deep necessity of stable economic reform if the door of opportunity is not to be closed again to the masses of the people.

Once more a Republican administration, like those which followed the administration of Woodrow Wilson, finds it impossible to repeal the enlightened laws enacted under Franklin D. Roosevelt and his successor, Harry Truman. They descended upon Washington convinced no doubt that the New Deal was an illusion that ought to be completely eliminated, as if it were an adventure in socialism which never should have been undertaken. The welfare state, as the 20-year Democratic regime was derisively called, has taken such deep roots that it has borne fruit in this administration in the appearance of a new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Uncertain of step and slow of pace, the new administration yields reluctantly to the inevitable. On the international front it has not surrendered to the isolationists. It still painfully follows the path laid down by its predecessors who sought the union of the free world to maintain the objectives of liberty for all mankind, but it seems still determined to go back to the economic era in which neither the Federal nor the State Government was able to enforce a formula of social responsibility in the field of economics.

A NEW CYCLE OF REACTION

It seems not to be understood that the capitalistic system is in mortal danger unless the Federal Government resumes the drive for economic reform. Scarcely a day passes that the journals of finance in New York and Chicago do not announce another industrial or financial merger. Boards and commissions, created by Congress to enlarge opportunities for the people as a whole, seem to have altered their policies and to regard themselves as champions of big rather than of little business. A member of the President's Cabinet, at the head of the Department of Commerce, would amend the antitrust laws so as to make human labor a commodity of trade and commerce like a bag of meal or a ton of bricks. It is true another Cabinet member, the Secretary of Labor, seems to resist the reactionary demand for what is falsely claimed to be "the right to work law," but which is intended rather to put human labor at a disadvantage before collectivist capital. The Hoover Commission is busily at work reorganizing the Government under a grant of power never issued by any previous administration, authorizing it to recommend the alteration of the functions of government. The legislative powers of Congress, outlined in the very first article of the Constitution, are the bedrock of popular government, yet they are now being absorbed by the White House which, to a degree never before undertaken, even in World War II, is becoming a lawmaking as well as a law-enforcing arm of Government. Every lobbyist in Washington knows that the lines of control, even of the quasi-judicial commissions, are in the hands of anonymous assistants in the White House. Thus, the legislative powers delegated to commissions are being, as it were, redelegated to the White House staff.

The pattern of this new change is well illustrated by the Dixon-Yates contract. Here two holding companies are authorized by executive authority to conclude an agreement with the Atomic Energy Commission whereby they create a subsidiary corporation under the laws of one State to transmit electric energy to atomic plants in another State. This subsidiary is capitalized at $5½ million to construct and operate a $165 million generating plant. All the rest of the capital cost of this plant is secured by debt financing. The equity of the owning company is so small that it would not be tolerated in any ordinary private enterprise contract. This the attorneys for the Securities and Exchange Commission admit by saying in their opinion approving the financial arrangement that "in the case of the usual public utility company, the Commission would not approve a capital structure with so high a proportion of debt to equity because * * * both the debt and equity would be of too speculative a character."

What possible justification can there be for the approval of a contract of a Government agency and the subsidiary of two holding companies which the attorneys of the Securities and Exchange Commission say to be too speculative to be tolerated in private enterprise? This question the SEC legal staff answers with the amazing words that so long as the contract between the subsidiary of the holding company and the Government agency, the Atomic Energy Commission, is in force, "the annual debt service requirements (including amounts needed for annual debt retirement) will be adequately met by the payments from the Government." The disproportion of debt to equity, thus condemned, is justified by the SEC counsel only because the Government is paying, is another illustration of how the national debt is being increased clandestinely.

THE ECONOMIC WAR WITH RUSSIA

Thus at a time when the whole Government knows, when all private business knows, that we are engaged in an economic war with Communist Russia, the administration in Washington perpetrates a transaction of high finance of a kind we have not seen since the American public was exploited by the utility magnates of the Insull-Hopson era. This is not an escape from creeping socialism. It is a plunge into creeping conservatism, to borrow a phrase of the president of the General Electric Co., used by him in another connection only a few weeks ago. It is even more than creeping conservatism. It is reckless reaction to methods and deals which will do more to destroy the system of private property than anything the Soviets can accomplish.

Two other instances of reactionary economic policy recently were revealed in the Presidential budget. Out in Wyoming, Colorado, and Utah there are deposits of oil shale of such magnitude that geologists tell us they contain an oil reserve far greater than that of Saudi-Arabia and perhaps the whole Middle East. Under the Synthetic Fuels Act, enacted in 1946, the Bureau of Mines was authorized to operate demonstration plants to test the scientific possibility of refining these shale deposits at a cost comparable to that of refining oil. The law also authorized similar tests with respect to coal. A year ago the coal plant was closed at Louisiana, Mo., and the experiments abandoned just at the time that unemployment in the coal field was becoming distressful. This year the petroleum industry, acting through its advisory council to the Secretary of the Interior, has recommended the elimination of experimentation in oil shale, and the Bureau of the Budget sent no estimate to Congress for the continuation of the work.

Many other illustrations could be cited to show how important it is to take up the task which President Roosevelt had to lay down when World War II began.

Surely everyone must understand now that the cold war with Soviet Russia in which we are engaged is an economic war. Stalin, long before his death, outlined the Soviet plan in the plainest of plain words in his "History of the All-Union Communist Party." He wrote that in the conflicts between the Soviet regime and the bourgeois states the Red army would not be committed to action until absolutely necessary. To him a conflict with the capitalistic states was inevitable. He once wrote that "the struggle between these two systems (by which he meant communism and capitalism) will fill up the history of the development of the world revolution." This epoch, he wrote at

the same time, "is an all strategic period embracing a whole series of years, and I dare say, even a number of decades."

Hitler, before World War II, wrote his book which all the world ignored until it was too late. Already the Western World has too long ignored Stalin's books, and seems to continue to drift into the cauldron of a third world war more terrible than all of its predecessors combined unless we here in America open our eyes to the absolute necessity of economic reform which will abolish the possibility of the exploitation of the masses of the people by economic rulers who have no sense of social responsibility.

THERE IS AN ALTERNATIVE TO WAR

The Formosan resolution was passed last week by the Congress, many Members of which felt that it was just a step to only another little war around the periphery of the Soviet Empire. Big or little, it will place additional drains upon our economic strength. The resolution was passed because there appeared to be no ready alternative to preserve the peace.

Yet there is an alternative. It is a recognition of the fact that Soviet Russia is certain that the capitalistic system will collapse of its own weight. The dictators of the Kremlin are confident that we are unable or unwilling to cure the defects and abuses of the system of private property. The alternative of which I speak depends also upon a recognition of the fact that the economic power of America is our greatest weapon of defense if it is used for constructive and not destructive purposes by leaders of both Government and business. These constructive purposes concern the efficient production and distribution of the goods and commodities the people want. The masses of mankind, it is safe to say, have never actually wanted war. They are driven to war by fear and by oppression, and even in our time war comes because we lack the wisdom and the foresight to adopt effective policies of peace before it is too late.

Everywhere, as we sit here tonight, confusion and uncertainty is mounting throughout the world. We are represented to the peoples of Asia as warmongers, bent upon stepping into the imperialistic shoes of the colonial powers which for centuries had exploited the Asiatic peoples. We know what we are and what we want. We know that we are not imperialists, that we are not exploiters and that after the victories in two world wars, we have taken no spoils. Yet we seem to be on the threshold of another conflict. I have no hesitation in saying that if we desire to avoid a third world war and to win freedom for ourselves and for the people of the world, we must begin the struggle here on the homefront in the United States by strengthening the capitalistic system. We must eliminate its abuses. We must promote its expansion by stopping its concentration. We must show Soviet Russia and Communist China by our example that the free system of private property is better by far than any type of authoritarian state.

Let us turn again to the economic message of Franklin D. Roosevelt of April 1938:

"Unhappy events abroad have retaught us two simple truths about the liberty of a democratic people.

"The first truth is that the liberty of a democracy is not safe if the people tolerate the growth of private power to a point where it becomes stronger than their democratic state itself. That, in its essence, is fascism—ownership of government by an individual, by a group, or by any other controling private power.

"The second truth is that the liberty of a democracy is not safe, if its business system does not provide employment and produce and distribute goods in such a way as to sustain an acceptable standard of living.

"Both lessons hit home.

"Among us today a concentration of private power without equal in history is growing.

"This concentration is seriously impairing the economic effectiveness of private enterprise as a way of providing employment for labor and capital and as a way of assuring a more equitable distribution of income and earnings among the people of the Nation as a whole."

These words are just as applicable today as they were 17 years ago when they were first sent to Congress. If we would gain the goal that all desire, we must take the beam out of our own eyes and turn with vigor and devotion to the unfinished task of one of the great leaders of democracy. The road to economic reform and coexistence among ourselves is the road to peace.

Stephen S. Scopas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 4, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Sunday evening, January 30, I was proud and pleased to be present and to speak at a fine testimonial dinner in honor of Mr. Stephen S. Scopas, supreme president of the order of AHEPA—the American Hellenic Educational and Progressive Association.

It was a remarkable occasion. Scores of leading figures in public and communal life and in the diplomatic world paid tribute to Steve Scopas. Among them were Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan; Mayor Wagner, of New York; the secretary of state of New York State, Carmine DeSapio; the Ambassador of Greece to the United States; the president of the Borough of Queens; and many past and present officials of the order of AHEPA and the other great Greek-American organizations in the United States. It was an impressive evening and an impressive tribute to my good friend, Stephen S. Scopas, who is an outstanding citizen of my State, truly dedicated to the communal, civic, and national interests of his fellow men.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I made on that occasion and the remarks made by my distinguished colleague the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LEHMAN

I am glad to be here, very glad, to join in the well-deserved tribute of this testimonial dinner to my friend, and to the friend of so many of us here, Stephen S. Scopas.

Steve is typical of that kind of American who has helped to make America great, and who has also helped to build in our country the noble traditions of humanitarianism and brotherhood.

The organization of which Steve Scopas is national president and which is sponsoring this testimonial dinner, can bear witness to the tireless industry and devotion to good causes which has characterized this man all his life.

He is a young man, but mature in his experience in those great organizational activities which are a hallmark of America. He has given unselfishly of his efforts to assist and counsel his fellow men and women, those of Greek birth and descent, and those of every other race and descent, and without regard to race and descent, who make up the American people.

He has worked hard as a long-time officer of AHEPA, and in its ranks, because he is part of that great American tradition and custom of "belonging"—of belonging to and helping to build unofficial, voluntary organizations and association of people to advance the interests of the membership of those associations and of the interests of our country.

But Steve has done much more than merely devote himself to AHEPA and other organizations. He has given similarly of his time and efforts to the political life and activity of his city, State, and Nation. He has been a partisan, a Democrat, and active in the Democratic Party, but as long as I have known him, he has been the kind of Democrat who has placed the interests of city, State, and country above the interests of party. He has been a Democrat with a small "d" as well as with a capital "D." He has been a good, a useful, a constructive, and responsible citizen leader.

Steve Scopas is a Greek-American; that is, he is an American of Greek descent, who is as proud of his descent as are the descendents of those immigrants who arrived here, either steerage or first class, on the *Mayflower*.

He has always had a special interest in the land of his fathers. He has always had a special interest and concern for those who have just come, or still desire to come, from the old country, in search of freedom and opportunity.

And I think I can say for Steve that his interest has not been confined to Greeks. He has also had a special concern for those from other lands who desire to come to the United States as immigrants, to make their future here, to become citizens here, and to contribute to that great land which is our own.

And looking at Steve Scopas, and at the other eminent Americans of foreign birth and descent sitting here on this resplendent dais, I am reminded, with special indignation, of that incredible aspect of our immigration law which asserts that individuals of Anglo-Saxon birth and descent are far preferable, by virtue of their birth and descent, as American citizenship material to those of Greek, Italian, Polish, Swiss, Scandinavian, French, Czech, and Baltic birth and descent, to name but a few.

I refer, of course, to the national origins quota system which is imbedded in our immigration and citizenship laws, in the McCarran Act.

Just think of it, a Greek, an individual born in Greece, is judged under our law to be only one-hundredth as good citizenship material for America as a person born in England. The law is based on the utterly false and ridiculous theory that for every person entering this country from Greece, 200 must enter from Great Britain in order to keep the population of the United States in balance.

That notion is, of course, preposterous, unrealistic, insulting, and degrading. Yet it is there, written into our immigration laws—the heart and soul of our immigration laws—and it constitutes a challenge to all of us to eradicate it, and to expunge it from our statute books.

I hope no one here will rest and be satisfied until the iniquitous and discriminatory national origins quota system is wiped out and repealed completely and totally. There can be no compromise with this evil, racist and ridiculous theory which stands as a

constant reproach to each of us, and holds us up to contempt in the eyes of the world.

Where is our belief in brotherhood, and in the equality and dignity of each human soul, when we have on our statute books a law which says that no matter what the conditions or need abroad, 65,000 may enter annually from Great Britain—born in Great Britain, that is—and only 308 from Greece.

And even that paltry number, 308, has been cut in half for years to come, by mortgaging provisions of the Displaced Persons Act, 150 immigrants a year from Greece—no more—under the terms of the McCarran Act.

I know that many of you here have indicated a concern for the status of the island of Cyprus. I, myself, have reached no conclusions on that subject, although I am continuing to study the question with sympathetic attention to the arguments which are being made by your organization and others.

Let me say, however, that there is one aspect of the Cyprus question on which I have a strong opinion; there is one injustice which has recently been done to Cyprus which was done not by Great Britain but by a law passed by the Congress of the United States. And those of you who are concerned for the welfare of Cyprus and of the Cypriots might well consider what ought to be done about that. I am referring to another provision of the McCarran Act.

Before the McCarran Act—before December 1952, in other words—Cypriots could enter the United States under the British quota and, in fact, there was a steady emigration of about 500 Cypriots per year, sometimes more, sometimes a little less. Then in 1952 the McCarran Act said that colonies of Britain could no longer use the quota of the motherland, and that immigration from Cyprus, among other colonies, would be limited to 100 per year. And so the emigration from Cyprus, a wholesome and healthy immigration, both for Cyprus and the United States, was cut by 80 percent.

Today only 100 Cypriots can enter the United States per year. And if Cyprus should become a part of Greece, even that immigration would be cut off, or rather, the total immigration from both Greece and Cyprus would be 150 per year.

So, my friends, one thing that can be done for Cyprus, right here in the United States, and in the Congress of the United States, is to revise the McCarran Act, repeal the national origins quota system, and make immigration a matter of individual worth and usefulness, and need, rather than a matter of national origin and birth.

When I think of the heritage which western civilization has from Greece, of the vast contribution which Greece has made to the culture and values of the western world, I blush to think how we discriminate against Greece in our immigration laws—and against many other great countries which have likewise made great contributions to the world and to the United States.

Scores of our cities are named after the great centers of Greek civilization—Troy, Athens, Sparta, Corinth, Olympia—and there is no American child who does not learn the glories of ancient Greece, her philosophers, her poets, her dramatists, her statesmen, her heroes—Demosthenes, Aristotle, Plato, Socrates, Euripides, Hippocrates, Pericles—and yet we say that only 150 Greeks and 100 Cypriots can enter the United States annually, at the risk of perverting American culture and traditions and our way of life.

What country has greater democratic traditions than Greece? The very word, democracy, is of Greek origin. The concept of a republic is Greek. The concept of the rights of citizens is Greek.

Of course, I have emphasized the Greek contribution and the discrimination against Greece in our immigration laws because this occasion is in honor of Steve Scopas, and under the auspices of AHEPA. The same incredible discrimination is practiced against scores of other great countries which have made great contributions to our culture and our way of life.

I am against discrimination of any kind, in any form, against any country, in our immigration laws. Immigration is a matter of people and of individuals, and should be regulated accordingly—not on the basis of national origin, but on the basis of individual qualification, in accordance with need, national and individual.

Yes; we have a Refugee Relief Act on our statute books, which was supposed to get around the McCarran Act and to relieve its inflexibility. That act has been a fraud, a sham, and a delusion. Up to now it just hasn't worked. I hope that in the remaining time of its effectiveness it may be made to work to the extent possible, to admit into this country some of the escapees from behind the Iron Curtain, some of the refugees from Communist war, aggression, and terror.

I pledge myself to support and fight for necessary amendments to the Refugee Relief Act in this session of Congress. I pledge myself to fight for a more equitable and humane administration of that law. I shall insist that the red-tape curtain which has been erected here to prevent the admission of refugees under the Refugee Relief Act be drawn to the maximum possible extent.

There are many other things which must occupy my time and attention in Washington. I shall continue to work for peace with honor, security, and justice.

I said in the course of a debate on the Senate floor the other day that, while I did not favor peace at any price, I did and do think that there is a price which we must be willing to pay for peace. That price is prudence and patience, reasonableness, and restraint.

If we show courage and determination, firmness and strength, wisdom and understanding—if we seek persistently to hold together the union of the free nations and the alliance of free mankind, if we exhibit responsibility in our leadership of the free world, we can and will prevail against the forces of darkness, against the evils of Communist aggression.

Bravado is no substitute for bravery and recklessness is no substitute for patient courage.

With a belief in the worthiness of peace and a faith that in ways of peace the forces of freedom will triumph in the end, let us go forward together under God to serve our country's welfare.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GREEN

Mr. Chairman, officers of the Order of Ahepa, our honored guest, your supreme president, Mr. Scopas, and friends, it is indeed both a privilege and a pleasure for me to be with you here tonight as you honor your supreme president, and my good friend, Stephen Scopas.

The Order of Ahepa has selected for its highest office one who is respected for his patriotism, who is active in civic affairs and one whose term of office, I know, will be successful.

I am especially happy to have this opportunity to talk with you, my fellow Americans of Greek heritage, about our common friend, Stephen Scopas. Throughout the years, in fact ever since my boyhood, I have been a great admirer of Greece. My father had lived in Greece in his youth and taught me its language. I read stories from its mythology and its history. Its heroes became my heroes and it has been my good fortune to visit the Greek homeland several times. I have climed the Acropolis; admired the restoration of Peiraieus and seized the opportunity to relax and swim in the Aegean Sea. In 1947, as a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, I actively participated in the formulation of the Marshall plan of aid to Greece and Turkey.

In the formulation of this plan to roll back Communist aggression, I could not help but think of that time, 750 years ago, when the godless and destructive forces of Genghis Khan were pouring, apparently without limit, from the center of the European-Asiatic heartland. Those destroyers controlled almost the same vast area then, as the Communist forces do now; west nearly to the Rhine, east to the China Sea, north to the great Arctic tundras, and south to the Indian subcontinent. And, sad to relate, there they remained for 200 years until they finally broke asunder as a result of their own internal distrust and weaknesses and the compelling influence of Christianity.

However, there is this difference between the lot of that territory today as compared with three-quarters of a millennium ago. To my mind, conditions now are better than then, and hence, victory should come to the present free world sooner.

Why are conditions better? On the positive side, the forces of Christianity are stronger than ever and cover a far greater portion of the globe. Then, on the negative side, the last 35 years of Soviet history, with their interminable plots and counterplots, accusation and hasty trials, assassinations and executions, show us that suspicion and disunity are today as rampant in the Soviet Union as they once were among the Mongol hordes.

But the main difference is the unity of the free world. This unity is our salvation. Remember how 2,500 years ago the forces of the Persians, the then invaders from the east, were hurled back by the less numerous but better unified and equipped alliance of the Greek free cities? So, today, the speed of our salvation depends upon the firmness and closeness of our unity. This unity is the main factor which will reduce the length of stay in the free world of the Kremlin invaders.

It was only 8 years ago that Greece and Turkey were given the aid whereby they became the bastions of the free world which they are now. Steadily, since that time, the United States has taken the lead in attempting to forge the links of the free world into an unbreakable chain. Always, in its forging, we have had to remember that no chain is stronger than its weakest link.

Accordingly, it is my belief that in forging this chain we must carefully scrutinize each and every link. Many of us are thinking of our treaty with the Nationalist Government of China. This is, indeed, a far-reaching commitment on the part of the United States, binding us for many years to a government which is weak and apparently not growing stronger. As a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, I was in attendance when the hearings were held on this important treaty. All of us are concerned with it and we hope that it is a step in the right direction. We also hope that the plan relating to Formosa recently sent by President Eisenhower to the Congress for approval, and approved by it, will accomplish all that is expected of it.

In these matters it is important that the United States of America act as a unit; otherwise our country will lose not only in prestige and influence but actually in power.

This same result will, in my opinion, occur if, at this time when power and force may be called upon to settle controversial international issues, any reduction in our Armed Forces is effected, or even seriously proposed, by either the President or by the Congress. We should have learned by now that we cannot trust the promises alone of aggressor nations which disregard international law, treaties, and agreements. Our

Armed Forces should be kept at maximum strength until we have definite conviction that peace in a free world is established.

To you, Steve, I wish to extend my heartiest congratulations on your election to this, the highest office of the Order of Ahepa in this country, and I congratulate also the members of the order, since I feel sure they will all benefit by your administration; and, in conclusion, I offer my sincere good wishes for the future welfare of the Order of the Ahepa itself.

Excerpts From Address by Hon. Richard L. Neuberger, of Oregon, at Seventh Annual Roosevelt Day Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 4, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from a speech I delivered at the annual Roosevelt Day dinner of the Americans for Democratic Action, held at the Hotel Commodore, New York City, on February 2.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEUBERGER TELLS ADA DINNER ADMINISTRATION "TURNING BACK THE CLOCK" ON CONSERVATION

The following are excerpts from a speech by Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon, delivered at the seventh annual Roosevelt Day dinner sponsored by the Americans for Democratic Action, at Hotel Commodore, New York City, February 2, 1955:

"The policies of the present administration relating to natural resource conservation are turning back the clock to conditions prevailing before the days of Theodore Roosevelt. The end of the public-power program by this administration can only mean economic stagnation in many key regions of the United States.

"The stalemate in electric power development which has resulted from administration insistence on a so-called partnership program has already been felt in the Pacific Northwest States. No new multipurpose water projects have been started there by this administration and the effect has been to put the brakes on the dynamic industrial expansion which followed construction of Federal dams like Bonneville and Grand Coulee.

"If there is any one thing which I hope the new Democratic Congress will accomplish, it is a return to the tried and tested program of conservation and resource development which was nearly half a century old. People of the Eastern States may not fully realize the damage done to these great programs by politicians of the present regime in the executive branch of the Government. But the harmful effects of policies which are turning back the clock in regard to resources are of great significance to both East and West. Integrated economically as we are, policies which adversely affect growth and prosperity of one region also threaten other sections of the Nation."

PRESENT POLICIES HIT RESOURCES

"The administration's most serious onslaughts against established resource policies strike at forest, grazing, and electric-power matters. The former policies had been developing for nearly 50 years—since Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot fought a monumental political battle to set aside in forest reservations vast timbered areas in the uplands beyond the Continental Divide. That administration was also largely responsible for initiating the concepts of multipurpose development of our waterways which shaped Federal programs until the former Republican Governor of Oregon became Secretary of the Interior 2 years ago.

"After that fight was won, the American people took more or less for granted the protection of these wilderness sanctuaries in the interest of everyone. Development of these resources proceeded in an orderly manner, under what Teddy Roosevelt called equal opportunity for all, special privilege for none.

"This administration has tried to change that. An administration-endorsed bill was sent to Congress which would have enabled the largest timber companies to take over choice land inside the national forest areas in return for their own land that would be taken by the Government for any purpose. This was special-interest legislation in the sense that it applied only to the big operators and not their smaller competitors; but it also placed timber on a higher level of possession than any other property—including churches, schools, farms, and homes—and removed from United States Forest Service authority the timber acreage committed to its protection for the last 50 years.

"Fortunately, that bill was rejected by the House of Representatives, and it is my hope that enactment of such bills will be even more unlikely under Democratic control of the new Congress."

ADMINISTRATION TURNS BACK CLOCK

"The 50-year-old Federal public-power program went out the window when the new administration came in the door. Termination of this program, which not only paid for itself in dollars-and-cents returns to the Federal Treasury but also in great social and economic advancements, was signaled by the new Secretary's abandonment to a private power company of the finest natural hydroelectric power site on the North American continent to the Idaho Power Co.

"In an attempt to gloss over the reversal of national policy, administration spokesmen said the Hells Canyon site was being given over to the company so it could be developed by local interests. In this case the local interests were an absentee-dominated corporation which holds its annual meeting 2,500 miles from Idaho. To the Pacific Northwest and to the Nation, this decision meant that full conservation and development of a primary national asset was being liquidated in favor of piecemeal exploitation of the Snake River at high rates, precluding the extension of rural electrification and, particularly, industrial development in the Northwest. It meant asking the American people to accept less than full development of their resources, to abandon conservation in favor of corporate profits.

"An index to the kind of thinking behind the scuttling action was adoption by administration spokesmen of two of the more odious slogans which utility propagandists have used for years in an attempt to discredit the public power program—creeping socialism and subsidized power. Although the Secretary of the Interior uses the phrase 'subsidized power' in his press statements, it is a matter of record that the Federal power investment in the Bonneville Dam project has already been 38 percent paid for through power revenues collected by the Government—and the project has been in full operation only 11 years. What other undertaking of the Government can boast of such a favorable financial record, providing great impetus for industrial growth and a higher standard of living?"

POWER PROJECTS REPAY TREASURY

"The Secretary and other administration spokesmen have sought public endorsement of their abandonment of the river-development program on the grounds that it is a drain on the National Treasury. But they fail to mention that power projects of the Columbia River system alone have returned to the Treasury, with interest, a total sum of $170,409,916 as of June 30, 1954.

"Figures by themselves fail to disclose the great national benefits derived from the public power program. They do not reveal the amount of back-breaking labor from which it has freed thousands of American farm women, nor the strengthening of our industrial potential, and opening the way for production of atomic energy and 50,000 planes a year for our national defense.

"When Franklin Delano Roosevelt gave the go-ahead signal to build great Federal projects in 1933, only 27 percent of farms in my own Pacific Northwest enjoyed the blessings of electricity. By the time those undertakings were in full operation, 98 percent of the region's farms were electrified. I have heard my wife's mother, who owns a dairy farm, describe how this has lightened women's work, removing drudgery and making life more worthwhile. These are values on which no dollars-and-cents price tag can be placed—a kind of residual benefit which makes abandonment of the program even less acceptable to a people bent on the pursuit of happiness. Under the Roosevelt administration, many housewives learned for the first time what it was like to press a button and have a room illuminated brightly."

BONNEVILLE POWER BOOSTS OREGON

"During the first 10 years that Bonneville power was available, the Northwest enjoyed its greatest industrial expansion since Lewis and Clark sailed down the Columbia. From 1939 to 1948, the growth of manufacturing employment in the Northwest outstripped the national average for the first time in history. Navigation features of these river projects increased cargo tonnage on the upper Colorado from 85,000 tons annually to 1,375,000 tons, and water pumped by Grand Coulee power provided irrigation for 15,000 new homesteads, many settled by former GI's.

"When we view these widespread advancements and benefits to the national welfare it raises the question: 'Why did the Eisenhower administration, through the Secretary of Interior, abolish it in favor of a program called partnership?' Under partnership, the Government will put up half the cost of dams and private utilities approximately the other half. When the dam is built, the Government gets whatever revenues can be derived from the fish ladders, locks and floodgates, and the utility gets the kilowatts from the powerhouse for a period of at least 50 years.

"I think it is significant that the administration is proposing partnership for development of the power-rich Columbia, but recommends full Federal construction in the Colorado River Basin where power output is more costly and less profitable. It appears that the administration program is designed to let the private power companies skim the cream while Uncle Sam gets the dregs."

PRESENT PROGRAM ERODES CONSERVATION

"I mention all of these things to show how, bit by bit, administration policy has been eroding the tried and true public protections which Americans had come to accept as necessary to conservation and full use of our resources. It is my opinion and my hope that the new Democratic Congress will go forward with the public power program with which we associate the names of Teddy

Roosevelt, George Norris, Gifford Pinchot, and Franklin Delano Roosevelt. In that direction lies the best national interests and the greater welfare of our Nation. Our American heritage, for this generation and generations to come, rests with return to sound conservation policies."

Dedicatory Prayer Breakfast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 4, 1955

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, yesterday morning more than 900 persons, including the Vice President, the Chief Justice, members of the Cabinet, members of the Supreme Court, Members of Congress, and other citizens attended the dedicatory prayer breakfast at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D. C.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the program and transcript of the proceedings of this service. Conrad Hilton was host on the occasion.

In my opinion, this prayer breakfast, with the outstanding leaders in every field, will add much to the religious life of our Nation.

There being no objection, the program and transcript were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRAM FOR PRESIDENTIAL BREAKFAST, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1955, 8 A. M., MAYFLOWER HOTEL

Presiding: Hon. FRANK CARLSON, United States Senate, president, International Council for Christian Leadership.

Greetings: By Senator FRANK CARLSON.

Message from the President.

Good-morning greeting by the host, Mr. Conrad Hilton.

The Meaning of ICL: By Lt. Gen. W. S. Paul, president of ICL.

Scripture from Old Testament: Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY.

Scripture from New Testament: Hon. RICHARD NIXON, Vice President of the United States.

Silent prayer for the President, concluded by audible prayer: By Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON.

Message: By Billy Graham.

Prayer of dedication: By Abraham Vereide, secretary general.

(The third annual prayer breakfast was opened by Senator FRANK CARLSON, president, International Council for Christian Leadership.)

Senator CARLSON. We will have the opening prayer this morning by Congressman WAINWRIGHT, chairman of the House prayer breakfast group. Congressman WAINWRIGHT.

Hon. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT 2D. O Lord, in these troubled times Thy guidance is asked, not only upon our leaders but upon the whole world for upon our faith rests our only hope of peace.

We ask Thee to bless this gathering and the food we are about to receive in Thy name. Amen.

(The breakfast period.)

Senator CARLSON. First, I want to express my appreciation for the fine response we have had to the invitation of our host, from whom we will hear later.

We meet this morning at a prayer breakfast. In fact, it is the first session of the International Council for Christian Leadership.

We have three or more people at the table who will not participate in the program, but I want to present them.

First, we have the Chief Justice of the United States who last year, as those of you who were privileged to be here will remember, gave us a very fine address.

We have also at the head table the assistant to the President of the United States, Gov. Sherman Adams.

We have at the head table Dr. Carlos Davila, head of the American States of the Pan American Union. We have the Vice President of the International Council for Christian Leadership, Congressman BROOKS HAYS, of Arkansas.

The theme of the meeting will be A Worldwide Spiritual Offensive. In these troublous and uncertain times we need and must rely on divine guidance. In other words, we need consecration and prayer. St. Paul wrote, "The effectual, fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much."

President Eisenhower, in his recent message on the state of the Union to the United States Congress, presented a basis for such an offensive when he said: "It is of the utmost importance that each of us understand the true nature of the struggle now taking place in the world.

"It is not a struggle merely of economic theories, or of forms of government, or of military power. At issue is the true nature of man. Either man is the creature whom the psalmist described as 'a little lower than the angels,' crowned with glory and honor, holding 'dominion over the works' of his Creator; or man is a soulless, animated machine to be enslaved, used, and consumed by the state for its own glorification."

I am pleased this morning to read to you a message that I have just received from the President of the United States:

The WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 1, 1955.

DEAR FRANK: To all attending the prayer breakfast on February 3, please convey my warm good wishes and my regret that I am unable to be present on this occasion.

Such a meeting is inspiring evidence of the conviction of each of you that religious principles must not be kept in a realm apart from everyday life, that they must more and more be put into practice in business, law, government, diplomacy—in every area of practical pursuit.

Your meeting shows also your realization that the need for such practice is worldwide, and that the task of spearheading a global spiritual offensive demands not only the efforts of the clergy but also of laymen of dedication and courage and foresight.

On the significance of your meeting, I congratulate all of you. And I am glad to share your hope and your determination that our world may yet see time-honored religious and ethical principles become, in reality, the standard of conduct for all its peoples.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

As citizens of this great Nation, we are again rediscovering that God who was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, has come to live in us by His Spirit.

We are convinced that the answer to all our problems finds a basic solution through a spiritual rebirth and the revival of genuine religion. This morning we are here to renew our faith and our commitment to God.

We are privileged to be the guests of a great American who has made an outstanding success in the business world. We applaud him for this great success, but I want to commend him for his active interest and participation in national and world affairs.

Those who were privileged to be present at the prayer breakfast in 1953 well remember how we had in the background an enlarged picture of America on its Knees.

That picture and that prayer, which was written by our host, has, through his generosity, been distributed in practically every country on the globe. I am advised that he has personally printed and distributed over 400,000 copies.

Many speakers and writers have quoted the prayer and the illustrated text has been reprinted in many publications. America on its Knees won for Conrad Hilton the 1953 Freedom Foundation award.

America has a great heritage and we of this generation owe much to those who have gone before, but we do have an obligation to preserve for future generations—our children and their children—the fundamental principles advocated by the Man that walked the shores of Galilee 2,000 years ago.

Mr. HILTON. Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen. It is an honor to be host to a group such as you, leaders of America, and I appreciate that honor. It is good to be with you.

Right here let me say congratulations also, congratulations to ourselves, to all of us here this morning on the third anniversary of our prayer breakfasts at the Mayflower.

This is only one of thousands of meetings at which people pray together, but since so many of you are leaders of a great government this gathering has a special significance. Because of your positions in public life you have greater responsibilities and therefore greater opportunities for good than are given to other citizens. By your example you are in a position to exert great influence on many people. By your presence here and by joining in prayer you are placing our Nation on God's side.

The world has come to look to the United States for material aid, but we must not overlook the opportunity our strength gives us to assume leadership in things of the spirit. We have been shocked at times by the coolness that has met our assistance of money and material to less fortunate nations. It is apparent that their needs cannot be fully met by bread alone.

There is a worldwide shortage of prayer and the grace of God, and we can help to supply these precious ingredients. We must lead the peoples of the world to a warm living faith in God's love, the practical kind of faith displayed by our Founding Fathers.

As we meet here year after year we are doing that by our prayers and by our example.

It struck me in thinking out my comments to you that the purpose which brings us together must be a continuing thing. We must not be limited to what we can accomplish during the hour we meet here once a year. Religion is not to be taken by the spoonful.

What I mean is this: Some of you will remember when the last great cholera epidemic struck the Orient just after World War I. Periodically it swept through India, the Malay Peninsula, Burma, practically all of Asia except China. The cholera germ cannot survive boiling water, and because the Chinese drink tea almost exclusively they were not subject to the disease. Consequently, when the epidemic threatened to run wild through the Philippines the American doctors ordered the people to boil their water. But the cholera continued. When the health inspectors investigated they found that the people were taking 3 or 4 teaspoons of boiled water a day as if it were medicine. The water they drank was water they had not boiled.

Now, I think we make exactly the same mistake when we take religion as a medicine instead of a food. Like food, religion

should be within us constantly as a kind of fuel for our whole being, body, and soul. Taking religion as a medicine, as a kind of annual tonic instead of food, is just wrong.

Let me say this, that the enemy, the counterfeit religion of communism which is moving over the world, is not being taken by the spoonful. Almost a billion people are being fed it constantly, being bathed in it, their bodies and souls washed in it. And if we are to survive we must do the same thing. We must feed ourselves in the grace of God, bathe in it, live in it, live by it. We must be religious men and women, not just at an annual prayer breakfast or once a week on Saturday or Sunday but 24 hours a day every day in the year. We must meet this dedicated enemy with dedication of our own. We must live our faith and live by our faith.

Communism can be effectively opposed only by religious men, men of faith and spiritual stature.

As we undertake a task of this importance, I think you will be the first to admit our need for more divine wisdom, the first to distinguish the difference between wisdom and knowledge, science and know-how. To be smart is not to be wise. Wisdom implies the highest exercise of all the faculties, of the will as well as the intellect, and it strikes me as an operation dedicated to the grace of God and steered by divine wisdom.

The way to get that wisdom into ourselves and into our Government is by prayer—ours and the prayers of the Nation. To have that wisdom is to have happiness and peace, the peace of Christ—that kind of peace that has nothing to do with the surface of the nations today. Thanks to our President, to you, leaders of American life, and to millions more across the Nation and over the world, we are slowly praying our way toward peace.

Again I think you are to be congratulated on this, our third prayer breakfast. Indeed, it is little we do, little we have to offer, but to me we have here a facade, a showcase illustrating what millions of Americans have discovered, that prayer is the beginning of wisdom, that religion is not to be taken by the spoonful.

Senator CARLSON. Thank you, Mr. Hilton.

We are going to have the Meaning of ICL, by Lt. Gen. Willard S. Paul, president of the ICL. General Paul.

General PAUL. Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, members of ICL, and friends, 20 years ago a small group of men who were disgusted with the conditions in their city at that time decided to do something about it. Their decision was to bring into every-day living and every-day working the Sermon on the Mount, the principles of Christianity. They cleaned up the city and went on to other things. One of those men is now the governor of that State. Another of those men, Mr. Vereide, sitting at this table, is now the spiritual leader and executive director of an organization which covers the United States and is spread around the world. That organization is the ICL.

A few weeks ago the governor of another great State at his inaugural ceremonies formally committed his gubernatorial stewardship to God, with a pledge of righteousness as a rule of his administration.

There is a story back of that. Months before his election that governor was carrying personal burdens which he felt were beyond his power to bear. In this crisis he sought the counsel and advice of a friend. This friend was the director of an ICL group. Their visit ended in prayer. There on his knees this governor found a new-born faith, a new calm and courage, as he yielded his will to God's. In the weeks following he discovered the comfort and power of prayer. He found in the Bible both inspiration and guidance. He came to a commitment of life in the service of God.

I have been asked to explain the meaning of ICL. These two examples, I think, tell graphically more than I could by listing them in 3 parts. But they are only 2 of the actual case histories in the files of ICL.

What do we have? First a man was reconciled to God. ICL means that we have a concern for the lives of men. It is with great gratitude and a sense of responsibility that we find men and women in positions of executive leadership in government and in civic responsibility throughout the Nation who have embraced this sort of thing.

ICL means a man-to-man evangelism, quiet, unostentatious, but effective.

It means, secondly, a commitment transferring the resources and talents which are available to individuals, in the service of God. ICL means that we are inspiring Christians to Christian living, Christian working, and Christian associations.

Third, a partnership was formed with God to make a better world. ICL is dedicated to mustering Christian citizenship in the fight for civic righteousness, as indicated in the first example I gave you.

I believe that when a significant fraction—and I say fraction—of the conventional Christians apply the dynamics of their faith to working hours, as Conrad Hilton has indicated, the world will see a transforming miracle. We in ICL are proud to help in bringing about that miracle. Thank you.

Senator CARLSON. Thank you, General Paul.

We are going to have scripture reading from both the Old and the New Testament. The scripture reading will be by the senior Senator from Wisconsin, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, and the Vice President of the United States. Following this scripture reading, prayer will be offered by the senior Senator from Virginia, Senator WILLIS ROBERTSON.

Senator WILEY read from the 20th chapter of Exodus.

Vice President NIXON read from the 7th chapter of Matthew.

Senator ROBERTSON. Each one exercising the God-given right to directly petition the giver of all good gifts, may we bow for a moment in silent prayer.

Our Father, we give thanks for endowing us with a conscience and this beautiful proof that we were made in Thy image. Help us to keep that God-given means of testing truth and honor, from being crystallized into the habitual moral form of a Pharisee inquisitor obligate. With the growing revelation to us of Thy true nature, help us to give a living response to fresh truth.

Teach us to see our obligations both to Thee and to the state. Help us to realize that the gift of self and the discipline of self involves service to God and to government. Guide us as we strive to fulfill our Christian duty in all things and in behalf of men everywhere. In His name, Amen.

Senator CARLSON. We are fortunate to have with us this morning a very personal friend of mine, a great American, a great Christian leader, a great preacher, one of God's chosen people, who has moved hundreds of thousands of people to a closer life with their God and whose message has been carried to every country of the globe—Rev. Billy Graham.

Reverend GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, 4,000 years ago a man with a long white beard and flowing white hair stood on top of a mountain and probably one of the greatest prayer meetings of all time took place. Moses said to Almighty God that he was not worthy to be there; neither are we worthy to come into the presence of the Almighty.

But Moses went into the presence of God and in those moments God hewed out of the mountain some stones and put on those stones the Ten Commandments. Those Ten Commandments have been read to us this morning. They form the basis of all moral law. Within those Ten Commandmants we find an expression of the character of Almighty God.

Do you want to know what God is like? Read the Ten Commandments. Do you want to know God's requirements of man? Read the Ten Commandments. Do you want to have those commandments interpreted and amplified so that we common people might understand? Read the Sermon on the Mount from which our scripture text was taken this morning.

From Him, Moses had received those stones with the Ten Commandments written on them. He came down the mountain and there he saw Israel in one of the most critical periods of her entire history. Israel had for a moment forgotten the God that brought them out of Egypt; Israel for a moment had forgotten the God that took them across the Jordan; Israel for a moment had forgotten the God that had been with them at the Red Sea and had fed them manna in the wilderness; and Israel had made a golden calf and was now worshiping strange gods.

Fire came to Moses' eyes. His eyes blazed, his jaw was set, his shoulders squared, and he stood in the midst of the camp of Israel and said, "Who is on the Lord's side? All of you that are on the Lord's side come unto me. Take your stand. Be counted."

I wonder at this present critical time in the history of the world if God isn't saying to us this morning, the leaders who are gathered in this room, "Who is on the Lord's side? All of you who are on the Lord's side let them take their stand this day and be counted as on God's side."

We are living in a critical period and the world is looking to the United States for leadership. We are very much like a fishbowl. The whole world is peering in to see how we live, how we act, the way we dress, the way we talk, the statements that we make, and there are many people around the world that I have found in my travels who doubt that we have the moral and spiritual qualities of leadership. Unfortunately, we have been sold in some parts of the world by propaganda as a nation of drunkards, gangsters, and immature politicians. We have presented to the world a wrong type of picture of the United States and much of the world does not know or does not seem to realize the moral and spiritual qualities and the moral and spiritual heritage that we have as a nation.

I think all of us agree this morning that we do have the potentialities and qualities of leadership. Our roots are deep in Christianity and America has been one of the most Christian nations of all history. But in the last 25 years, as in Israel of old, we have had a spiritual drought. We decided we did not need God. We did not need religion. So we departed from the supernaturalistic concept. We departed from God and we departed from this book called the Holy Bible. As a result, we became an age filled with frustration, nervous tension, selfishness, fear, lawlessness, immorality, and in spite of our high standards of living we became a nation of insecurity.

But during the past 5 years something has happened. This has been an era of unprecedented religious renaissance and resurgence in the United States. Evidences of spiritual awakening are on every hand. For example, last April 10, 75 million Americans attended church. That was 14 million more than voted in the last presidential campaign, 13 million more than the largest radio audience in history, five times the total attendance of all major league ball games last year.

The membership in United States churches today exceeds 100 million. The distribution of Bibles doubled in the last 6 years, and last year alone 10 million Bibles were distributed in the United States. The sale of religious books is three times that of all of the other books put together. Films with religious themes are doing a land office business. Religious songs are now in jukeboxes everywhere. We have changed the pledge of allegiance recently and inserted the words "This Nation under God." For the first time in history we had a postage stamp that had on it "In God we trust."

Rabbi Wise recently said, "The evidence of religious resurgence goes far beyond statistics of church membership and giving," and indeed it does. This year, 1955, the Methodist Church has designated 900 churches in the United States to have an unbroken chain of prayer from January to December. One thousand people of the Roman Catholic faith meet here in Washington every month for all night prayer meetings.

We read about juvenile delinquency, so much so that even the President in his state of the Union message had to refer to it, and it is one of our great social problems. But we don't stop to realize that thousands of our university and college young people today are turning to Christ, and there were 2 million more in Sunday school last year than in any year before in history. Seminaries and Christian colleges are overflowing with thousands of young people giving themselves in dedication to Christian service. Mass evangelism is the largest and greatest in history. In the city of Nashville, Tenn., recently they had an evangelistic campaign. They averaged 25,000 every night for 1 month—unprecedented in our history.

The same is true in Great Britain. There are today evidences in Great Britain of religious resurgences, perhaps a little behind the United States but definitely on its way. All over western Europe there are reports of tremendous religious interest unprecedented in the history of recent times, and there are evidences at this moment that behind the Iron Curtain God is beginning to move. Something is beginning to take place, so much so that a few weeks ago Pravda admitted that so many young people are turning to religion in Soviet Russia that atheistic propaganda must be increased. Everywhere we went last summer around the Iron Curtain I heard thrilling stories of what God is doing in Russia today.

Is this a genuine religious awakening, many people are asking. Some people say it is just a fear psychosis that we have. Some people are saying that people are afraid today because of the hydrogen bomb and afraid of a third world war and therefore they are using religion as escapism. I do not know. Many think it is a fad. Many think it is a vogue and a passing phase. Only history can provide the answer.

But I do know this, that it is easier to discuss religion and talk religion than ever before in the history of the United States. I think that people are beginning to realize that we are more than just materialistic bodies to be fed by the appetites that we have. We are beginning to realize that we are more than a body with eyes and ears and nose and hands and feet and stomachs to be fed, and a body to be dressed and made up. We have everlasting and eternal souls.

We were created in the image of Almighty God. It is a strange thing that we spend most of our time dressing the body which soon dies and goes to the grave. The Bible says that our bodies are very much like the grass that withers and the flowers that fades. We soon die and we waste away and go to the grave. Yet our souls live on forever and ever. The Bible teaches that our souls are eternal. Yet we exercise the body, feed the body, give the body its demands, try to satisfy its appetites, though it is only temporary.

Your soul also has appetites. Your soul has hungers and thirst and desires and longings and yearnings, and if they are not satisfied it ends in frustration, confusion, bewilderment. There are many people here today who are bewildered, confused, mixed up. You have everything in life to make you happy but you are not happy. You have everything in life to make you peaceful, but you are not peaceful inside. There is turmoil and fighting and striving and difficulty inside that seem to have no answer. Why? Because your soul has never been satisfied. You have never exercised it.

What is the exercise of the soul? We have heard this morning: prayer. How long has it been since we spent an hour in prayer? Half an hour in prayer? Ten minutes in prayer? Bible reading is another. There is the true word that ye may grow thereby. How long has it been since we really read the Bible?

I have talked to a lot of Communists in Europe and in the Far East. Did you know that they know the writings of Lenin and Stalin and Marx almost by heart? How many of us in the Western World know our Bibles and have the dedication that Mr. Hilton spoke of a moment ago?

We talk about the Bible. We have a Bible in the courtrooms and in our home rooms, but how many of us really open the Bible and study it? The ignorance of the Bible in America is appalling at the moment. Yet there is where we have our roots as a Nation. We need to know it and we need to study it. It becomes a spiritual exercise. Going to church and worshipping God is a spiritual exercise. Then living His life.

The Gallup poll said the other day that 95 percent of the American people now believe in God. But that is not enough. God requires more than just an intellectual acceptance and an intellectual belief. He requires more than our name on some church roll. He requires more than being confirmed or baptized. He requires that we go out into our homes and shops and into our offices and put into practice the teachings of Christianity.

In the days of Jesus they saw the miracles that He performed. They said, "This is a great man. We are going to follow Him. We believe in Him. He is a miracle worker." So they followed Him. In the last part of the second chapter of John, Jesus said, "Nothing doing; I am not committing myself to you." They were religious minded. They were ready to follow Him, but He said, "You are not willing to pay the price and you cannot follow me." One of those men slipped aside and said, "Master, I would like to say a word to you." The Master came aside and this great leader of Israel said something concerning spiritual things and Jesus turned to him and said, "Ye must be born again."

The problem of the world today is not the hydrogen bomb. The problem of the world today is not poisonous gas. The problem of the world today is not the germ warfare that is being devised and built all over the world. The problem of the world today is human nature, and until we solve human nature we have not solved the problems of the world. As our good friend Senator WILEY said in the little room before we came in—something that I will never forget—"We are never going to end war until the mind of Christ is in us." And we never will. You have got to do something about hating and cheating and lying and stealing. You have got to do something about the things that bring wars and fights on.

The only one that has the answer is the Master, Jesus Christ. He said that if we have a spiritual rebirth as individuals we can change the world, and the starting place is the spiritual rebirth.

From that starting place we can go out to pray, to read his word, to go to church and to live and put into practice in our several fields the teachings of Jesus Christ. We don't go out to live this life alone. There is not a man in this room that can live this life alone. It is too hard for you. You can only live it by the presence of Christ in your life, who gives you supernatural power to live it.

I want to tell you this morning that there is not a man or woman in this place who cannot come to a knowledge of God this day and go from this place with the help of God, determined to live a life for Jesus Christ. There is enough potential power in this room to change the entire world. I want also to tell you this: Unless we have the dedication that Mr. Hilton spoke about and unless we put into practice the teachings of Christ as individuals and unless we go out as a nation collectively to live for Christ and God and have the dedication, we cannot possibly survive the dedication of atheists that are today hammering at our gates and the moral termites that are eating within. We as a nation will fall as surely as Rome fell unless we have this dedication of purpose and life.

You say, "That is all very good but what can I do? I am only 1 man, only 1 person." Today you can go to your room, tonight you can go to your bed, and for the first time perhaps in a long time you can get out your Bible and open its pages and read it. For the first time in a long time you can offer a prayer to God and give your life to God.

The Bible says that "If My people, which are called by My name, shall humble themselves and pray and seek My face, then will I hear them from heaven. I will hear their cries and I will forgive their sins."

Thank you.

Senator CARLSON. I have just been handed a cablegram from the Netherlands:

"May God's blessing and inspiration be with you all in your endeavor to put into practice living Christianity on a worldwide scale.

"WILHELMINA,
"Princess of the Netherlands."

This has been a splendid morning. We are going to rise and be dismissed with a benediction by Abraham Vereide, secretary-general of the international council.

Mr. VEREIDE. Eternal God our Father, for this hour we thank Thee; for this evidence of Thy working in our hearts and in our midst, for intelligence, for trained minds and lives in tolerance and experience, dedicated to the doing of God's will.

Here, O God, we dedicate ourselves to Christ. We want as a nation and as representatives from many nations to become one great team, working in the rhythm of defined purpose and in the warmth of God's love and with the firmness and the fitness of disciplined minds. We want to go forward in this spiritual quest and the spiritual advance to proclaim the unmatchable riches of Christ and live out the Christian plan and Christian will and Christian spirit and principles day by day.

To this end, O God, take us now as leaders in various fields of endeavor. Endow us with Thy spirit and with Thy power and grant us the grace to affirm day by day, "I can do all things through Christ whose strength is with me, and to Thee, O God, the glory, world without end." Amen.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, in these strange and troublous days, wilt Thou be especially favorable unto our President, our Speaker, and all the Members of Congress, granting them insight and understanding, wisdom and guidance.

Inspire them with a high sense of duty and a fearless determination to follow the ways of peace and righteousness, and do that which is well pleasing unto Thee.

May the kind of civilization we are longing and laboring for be one that has in it the Christlike spirit of justice and kindness, of brotherhood and love.

To Thy name we ascribe all the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 3, 1955, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution extending felicitations to Michigan State College on the 100th anniversary of its founding.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 31, 1955.

The SPEAKER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Public Law 301 of the 78th Congress, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy for the year 1955: Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN, Hon. EDWARD J. ROBESON, JR., Hon. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Sincerely,

HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 4, 1955.

The SPEAKER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 194 of title 14 of the United States Code, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy for the year 1955: Hon. EDWARD A. GARMATZ; Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN; Hon. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Sincerely,

HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman.

BETTIE M. BACON AGAINST UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

FEBRUARY 5, 1955.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia the disbursing clerk of the House of Representatives has received a subpena duces tecum, directed to him as such officer, to appear before said court as a witness in the case of *Bettie M. Bacon* v. *United States* (civil action No. 2384–53), and to bring with him certain and sundry papers therein described in the files of the House of Representatives.

The rules and practice of the House of Representatives indicates that no official of the House may, either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpena duces tecum, produce such papers without the consent of the House being first obtained. It is further indicated that he may not supply copies of certain of the documents and papers requested without such consent.

The subpena in question is herewith attached, and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The Clerk read the subpena, as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—BETTIE M. BACON, PLAINTIFF, *v.* UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, DEFENDANT—CIVIL ACTION NO. 2384–53

To: Mr. HARRY M. LIVINGSTON, *United States Capitol, House Disbursing Office, Washington, D. C.:*

You are hereby commanded to appear in (this court) to give testimony in the above-entitled cause on the 8th day of February 1955 at 1:30 o'clock p. m. (and bring with you) the records concerning the salary of the plaintiff, Bettie M. Bacon, during the months of April and May of 1953 and do not depart without leave.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By WM. A. YATES,
Deputy Clerk.

Date: February 4, 1955.

JAMES A. WILLEY,
Willey & Crooks, 925 15th Street NW., Attorney for Plaintiff, Washington, D. C.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 132) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas in the case of *Bettie M. Bacon* v. *The United States* (No. 2384–53, civil docket) pending in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, a subpena duces tecum was issued by the said court and addressed to Harry M. Livingston, disbursing clerk of the House of Representatives, directing him to appear as a witness before the said court on the 8th day of February 1955, at 1:30 post meridian and to bring with him certain and sundry papers in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice, or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That Harry M. Livingston, disbursing clerk of the House, be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in the subpena duces tecum beforementioned, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in possession of the Clerk of the House; be it further

Resolved, That when said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers and documents called for in the subpena duces tecum, then the said court, through any of its officers or agents, have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House and take copies of any documents or papers and the Clerk is authorized to supply certified copies of such documents and papers in possession or control of said Clerk that the court has found to be material and relevant, except minutes and transcripts of executive sessions, and any evidence of witnesses in respect thereto which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, so as, however, the possession of said documents and papers by the said Clerk shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under said Clerk; and be it further

Resolved, That copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena aforementioned.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the Draft Act legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FORRESTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMICS OF ATOMIC DEFENSE

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, today, I have reintroduced my concurrent resolution providing for a Joint Committee on the Economics of Atomic Defense. In the 83d Congress this was House Concurrent Resolution 229.

The achievement of a durable peace must be our first order of business. Peace is possible and it is our duty to the future to do everything we can to achieve it. Selective industrial and urban dispersal might make the difference between atomic war and peace. In the event of atomic war dispersal might make the difference between defeat and victory.

Terrifying as are the threat of thermonuclear warfare and the dreadful implications of radioactive fallout, we must steel ourselves to face the facts and prepare our defenses. There seems little doubt that space is still the best defense against H-bomb attack.

The committee I suggest would study the feasibility of and ways of achieving industrial and urban dispersion. My resolution has received support from top-flight scientists and civil defense officials and is favored by the Federation of American Scientists and the American Municipal Association.

Only if we can absorb an all-out enemy surprise attack can we be sure that we will have the ability to retaliate against an aggressor. There are many things we must do if our defenses are to be adequate—dispersal is one of them.

AIR SERVICE BETWEEN SEATTLE, WASH., AND HONOLULU

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the President on February 1 issued instructions to the Civil Aeronautics Board overruling the Board in the West Coast-Hawaii case, Docket No. 5589, thus killing the flight of Northwest Airlines on the route New York-Milwaukee-Twin Cities-Seattle-Portland-Hawaii, and vesting an effective monopoly over the Seattle-Portland-Hawaii flight in Pan-American World Airways.

No reason is assigned by the President for his action beyond the statement: "I do not approve."

I was in Milwaukee over the weekend when I first heard of the President's instructions. It is an understatement to say that Milwaukee was shocked by the President's decision to cut it off from its one direct access to world air service. The Milwaukee Association of Commerce has strongly protested the President's action of February 1, pointing out the blow that this strikes at hundreds of Milwaukee tourists and businessmen. In a telegram addressed to me, the association states:

> The growing volume of Milwaukee and Wisconsin business with Hawaii, Alaska, and the Orient would be seriously affected unless the President's order for the termination of the inner great circle route from Milwaukee to Alaska and the Seattle-Hawaii route of Northwest Airlines is completely rescinded.
>
> These air routes are vital to national defense and basic to Milwaukee's $6 billion volume of manufacturing and trade as well as our growing volume of foreign trade with the Orient.
>
> We respectfully request that you do all in your power to have the President not only modify his previous order as reported in the Sunday press, but to completely rescind this order and issue permanent certificates for both of these routes based on past performance and in the public interest as recommended by the CAB.

Gov. Walter Kohler, Jr., has telegraphed his protest to the President, and a resolution has been introduced in the Wisconsin Assembly likewise protesting the Presidential order. In addition, I have received many protests from men and women in all walks of life, of which the following telegram is typical:

> President's decision to close Hawaii routes of Northwest Airlines believed detrimental to Wisconsin and national interests, also NWA-Twin Cities-Edmonton Alaska route. Northwest only major international airline servicing State. Wisconsin's first airline is Northwest. Wisconsin helped Northwest grow to a major American-flag carrier. Northwest vital to Wisconsin's transportation needs. Why should Northwest be denied these routes they pioneered? Why should Wisconsin be denied direct service to market areas where Wisconsin does business? Northwest has offered to operate to Hawaii subsidy free. This should be good reason to request the President to reconsider his order to the CAB. Will Wisconsin residents have to go to Chicago for this air service, or will they continue to have it at home? I am an employee of Northwest and lifelong resident of Wisconsin. Wisconsin needs Northwest for the same reason as the St. Lawrence Seaway. It is our air outlet to the East, the West, and the Pacific. It is increasingly important to Wisconsin business interests. Request your sincere efforts to have decision reconsidered. Time is of the essence.
>
> JOHN H. MAY.
>
> MILWAUKEE, WIS.

When I heard of the President's order, I could hardly believe it. I have tried to determine if one shred of justification for the order exists. If there is one, I have yet to find it. I believe the President's instructions are not only unfair to large numbers of our people in Milwaukee, the Twin Cities, Seattle, Portland, and eleswhere, but that they encourage monopoly and fly in the face of the policy set up by this Congress for the governing of our air transportation system.

Since Northwest Airlines' service to Hawaii was started in 1948, thousands of people from Milwaukee and elsewhere have benefited by its use. Their interests should not be wiped out by an unexplained stroke of the President's pen. But there is something far greater at stake than the commerce, the comfort, and the convenience of the people of my city and the other cities served: That something is the stern requirement of the Civil Aeronautics Act that, wherever taxpayers' dollars are not going to be wasted thereby, competition is to be encouraged and monopoly frustrated in our air transportation. Section 2 of the act sets forth the considerations which shall govern the certification of airline routes in foreign and domestic commerce:

> (a) The encouragement and development of an air-transportation system properly adapted to the present and future needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense;
>
> (b) The regulation of air transportation in such manner as to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of, insure the highest degree of safety in, and foster sound economic conditions in, such transportation, and to improve the relations between, and coordinate transportation by, air carriers;
>
> (c) The promotion of adequate, economical, and efficient service by air carriers at reasonable charges, without unjust discriminations, undue preferences or advantages, or unfair or destructive competitive practices;
>
> (d) Competition to the extent necessary to assure the sound development of an air-transportation system properly adapted to the needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense;
>
> (e) The regulation of air commerce in such manner as to best promote its development and safety; and
>
> (f) The encouragement and development of civil aeronautics.

The emphasis on competition set forth in criterion (d) should be particularly noted.

Since before 1948, Pan American World Airways and United Airlines have operated to Hawaii from Los Angeles and San Francisco and, since 1948, Pan American and Northwest have operated to Hawaii from Seattle-Portland. Hearings in the West Coast-Hawaii case before the Civil Aeronautics Board and its examiner have been conducted at great length this past year, with volumes and volumes of exhaustive testimony. After due deliberation, the Civil Areonautics Board has voted that the national interest would be best served if all three airlines continued to operate on the Hawaii route, with the Seattle-Portland-Hawaii run of Pan American to be canceled, Northwest left on that run, and Pan American and United left on the Hawaii run originating in Los Angeles-San Francisco.

The Civil Aeronautics Board's decision is reported to be unanimous—without dissent from any of the three Republicans and two Democrats who are its members. The Board's decision has not yet been made public, but from the overwhelming public testimony before the Board at the hearing, the following pieces of undisputed evidence indicate that the decision to leave Northwest on the Hawaii run is the only proper decision:

First. From the start of the Seattle-Portland-Hawaii service in 1948 to the commencement of the hearings, Northwest has carried a majority of the pas-

senger traffic on that run, and would hence seem to be making a go of it.

Second. Northwest offers a direct flight from New York-Milwaukee-Twin Cities-Seattle-Portland-Hawaii, whereas Pan American operates solely on the Seattle-Portland-Hawaii end of the run.

Third. Most important, Northwest Airlines at the hearings voluntarily undertook to operate the Hawaii run without subsidy and hence without cost to the taxpayers. Their counsel, Mr. Edward Leasure, on May 28, 1954, stated to the Board:

> Northwest can and will operate on a compensatory rate without subsidy, and we make that offer. (Record, p. 127, docket 5589.)

Pan American, as is well known, gets the lion's share of all the subsidies we pay to our United States airlines operating internationally. Its subsidy for last year alone is in excess of $15 million. Pan American made no such offer of foregoing a subsidy, and under the President's order, will continue to be eligible for one on the Seattle-Portland-Hawaii route.

Fourth. Continuing Northwest as a certified carrier on the Hawaii route will mean that Pan American will have some competition on the northern leg of the Hawaii route. Competition may not be good for Pan American, but it is assuredly good for the public.

I submit that the Civil Aeronautics Board's decision is a good one; that it carries out the intention of this Congress; that, indeed, it is the only conceivable decision under the facts.

This same Presidential order of February 1 upheld a ruling of the Civil Aeronautics Board—a closely-split decision, I am informed—that Trans World Airlines not be granted a certificate to fly, in competition with Pan American which flies it now, the route Rangoon-Bangkok-Hong Kong-Formosa-Tokyo. Granting Trans World Airlines this right would have enabled it to join with Northwest Airlines at Tokyo, and thus complete a round-the-world service. Pan American—again, our most heavily subsidized international airline—now enjoys a monopoly on round-the-world service. Trans World Airlines has operated for more than a year without subsidy, and expects to perform the Rangoon-Tokyo leg without subsidy. Pan American, again, receives a multimillion dollar subsidy, and shows no signs of wanting to stop receiving it.

I have studied the February 1 Presidential order closely, trying to determine what thread of philosophical unity, if any, runs through it, since here it affirms, there reverses what the Civil Aeronautics Board has done. The one philosophical unity possessed by the Presidential order seems to be a granting to a heavily subsidized Pan American of a monopoly, whether it be on the Seattle-Portland-Hawaii run, or the Rangoon-Tokyo run—and this monopoly despite the fact that in each case a competing airline is able to make the run without subsidy. I had always thought that monopoly was something our Government tried to prevent, not something it paid people for achieving.

The only basis I can see for giving a subsidized Seattle-Portland-Hawaii and a Rangoon-Tokyo monopoly to Pan American instead of having the routes covered by the unsubsidized TWA and Northwest Airlines, is to make Pan American, already our biggest airline monopoly, a bigger one.

In his economic report of January 20, the President bravely proclaimed:

> Government should persist in its efforts to maintain easy entry into trade and industry, to check monopoly, and to preserve a competitive environment.

The President's action of February 1 is an odd way to start on this bold and dynamic antimonopoly program.

In his budget message of January 17, the President promised that:

> This administration will continue to exercise the utmost care in the manner in which it uses the taxpayers' money. It will continue to purchase what we must have for our security, well-being, and prosperity with the fewest possible number of dollars. And it will continue to administer the huge Government organization more efficiently.

The explanation of why we should waste taxpayers' dollars on subsidizing Pan American, when we can get the same service without subsidy, I leave to Alice in Wonderland.

Tuesday, February 1, the date of the President's order, will go down in history as Giveaway Day. We have heard a good deal about giveaways of timberlands and rubber plants. This is the first attempt, so far as I know, to give away large segments of the world to one airline operator, and to charge the taxpayers for the privilege of giving it. February 1 will go down in history as the day that put the World in Pan American World Airways.

Now, what is this all about? I hope that the President will make haste to rescind, wipe out, repudiate, and declare null and void his order of February 1. No modification will do. But, more than that, the American public deserves prompt answers to the following questions:

First. When did the Civil Aeronautics Board's decision reach the White House, and how long did the White House deliberate before issuing its February 1 order to give Pan American World Airways the monopoly?

Second. Did the administration confine its review to the voluminous record made before the CAB, or did it listen to hearsay or to unsworn witnesses?

Third. What officials of Pan American World Airways visited the White House, or any Cabinet officer, during the period during which West Coast—Hawaii Docket No. 5589—was under adjudication, and what did they have to say?

Fourth. What opportunities did officials of the Civil Aeronautics Board have to present their views to the President in person before those views were repudiated by him?

J. HAROLD FLANNERY

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it could be that my remarks in this historic forum today will not be world shattering but in the midst of the storm and stress of world events I bring you a heartwarming and typical American story. I have before me a newspaper story from the Washington Post and Times Herald to the effect that little Wilkes College in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., my hometown, defeated the great Princeton University in the recent intercollegiate debates held in Baltimore, Md., this past week. Twenty-four of the Nation's best colleges and universities took part in the contest, and it is a high honor for the victor, Wilkes College.

But the thing that will warm your hearts today is the fact that the outstanding debater, also the individual scholar who took part, was J. Harold Flannery, Jr. Most of you I am sure will recall with friendly pleasure this brilliant young man's father, my distinguished predecessor in this House of some 12 years ago, the then Congressman J. Harold Flannery. A great speaker, a keen debater, a great raconteur par excellence, a true public servant, an excellent representative of his district, Mr. Flannery is now the Honorable J. Harold Flannery, judge of the court of common pleas of Luzerne County, Pa., and reelected recently without opposition to a second 10-year term. Truly the son is a chip off the old block, a handsome and able son of his distinguished father and the beautiful and gracious Ann, wife and mother.

Mr. Speaker, may I assure you and the House that back home we love the whole darn family.

Because of its interest I include at this point the newspaper story about the son of our former colleague:

WILKES IS VICTOR IN DEBATE ON RECOGNIZING RED CHINA

BALTIMORE, February 5.—Little Wilkes College, of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., defeated Princeton University in the finals tonight to win a 24-team college debate on whether the United States should recognize Red China.

Wilkes favored recognition in the final round, but the Communist China regime lost out in the overall competition, taking but 28 of the 60 debates over the 2-day tournament.

Runners-up were Fordham, Temple, and Howard University. George Washington was 9th, Georgetown 15th, and Catholic U. last

The marathon debate, which started yesterday and ran more than 130 hours before tonight's finals, was sponsored by the debating council of Johns Hopkins University.

Each of the 24 teams—Loyola of Baltimore entered 2—had to debate both sides of the question—"Resolved: That the United States should extend diplomatic recognition to the Communist Government of China."

James Neveras and J. Harold Flannery, both seniors, made up the winning Wilkes-Barre team which successfully argued that the United States should recognize Red China.

Flannery also won a special award as the top debater of the tournament. Runner-up for individual honors was Regional Station, of St. Peters College, Jersey City.

The question debated had been a hot topic from the first in college debating ranks, particularly for the Naval Academy and West Point. Both service academies were forbidden to debate the question by officials who ruled it was not a suitable subject for debate by service personnel.

RURAL MAIL DELIVERY SERVICE

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which would extend rural mail delivery service to persons residing on or near improved roads. In representing a semirural district in Congress, one of my major concerns is the lack of adequate mail service to rural constituents. I would appreciate the support of my colleagues who reside in districts having similar problems.

I recognize the fact that the adoption of this measure may incur additional costs, but certainly rural citizens are entitled to adequate mail service if they are expected to bear their equitable share of the tax burden. At the same time I wish to commend the Post Office Department for its continuing efforts to extend this service within existing legal and budgetary limitations.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A PURCHASE AND STOCKPILE DEPOT FOR LOW-GRADE MANGANESE ORES FOR THE SOUTHERN APPALACHIAN AREAS

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, without putting the Public Printer to the unnecessary expense of printing an identical bill, I wish to take this means of affixing my name as a cosponsor of H. R. 3126 introduced on January 26, 1955, by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Among other things, this bill would authorize and direct the establishment of a purchase and stockpile depot for low-grade manganese ores for the southern Appalachian areas. In spite of the fact that Virginia has been through the years the second largest domestic producer of high-grade manganese and even though there have been many surveys, both private and governmental, which demonstrate the plentiful supply of low-grade ores throughout the Appalachian region, and although America is now dependent on foreign sources for more than 90 percent of her manganese supply, and despite the fact that practically all industrial manganese consumers are located in the eastern half of the United States, not a single low-grade purchase depot has been established east of the Mississippi River. On the other hand, the Government has established four such depots in the West, to each of which is assigned a quota of 6 million long-ton units of low-grade manganese, a quota which could easily be filled by the Southeastern States in only 3 years. Such rank discrimination is both unexplainable and unpardonable.

H. R. 3126 would empower the Administrator of General Services to select the depot site in the southern Appalachian areas. Based on a recent survey report, GSA would be compelled to recommend a site in southwestern Virginia. I am prepared at the proper time to present evidence to show that, from the standpoint of qualitative and quantitative deposits, transportation, beneficiation facilities, and location of major consumers, the best possible site is in the neighborhood of Lynchburg, Va.

In view of the present international tension, it becomes increasingly imperative that America takes steps to reduce her helpless reliance upon foreign sources for her manganese supply, an essential component of the steelmaking process. The establishment of this depot will not only enable us to utilize known deposits of manganese but will encourage additional exploration which will open up presently unknown deposits. The relatively small cost entailed will be the cheapest possible national security insurance premium. Accordingly, I most respectfully urge the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to hold early and exhaustive hearings on H. R. 3126.

THE SELLOUT OF POLAND

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include the text of a speech he made in Detroit in 1950 entitled "The Sellout of Poland."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, I wish to include the text of a speech entitled "The Sellout of Poland" which I made in Detroit in 1950 and which I think appropriate to repeat at this time as we call attention to the fact that February 7 marks the 10th anniversary of the infamous wartime meeting at Yalta. The agreements reached at Yalta indeed marked a sellout of the Polish people as well as those of many other countries who have since been enslaved by international communism:

THE SELLOUT OF POLAND

(Address of Hon. ALVIN M. BENTLEY, of Michigan)

I would like to talk to you today about the tragic betrayal and sellout of a country which was the first participant in World War II against Hitler Germany, a country which fought for the right to freedom longer than any other of the United Nations, a country which, above all others, should be expected to reap the rewards of victory. That country, Poland. And today the people of that country are enslaved more thoroughly than they ever were under Nazi domination.

I am going to tell you how this came about. Everything that I say here, every single word, is a matter of published record. My sources have been the writings of three former Secretaries of State, Cordell Hull, Edward Stettinius, and James Byrnes, as well as our former Ambassador to Poland, Arthur Bliss Lane, the ex-Polish Ambassador to this country, Jan Ciechanowski, the former Polish Prime Minister Stanislaw Mikolajczyk and certain other authorities such as Mr. Robert Sherwood and Professor Konovalov.

The late President Roosevelt always took a special interest in Poland and Polish affairs, partially due to the large number of Americans of Polish descent in this country who supported the Democratic ticket. But, even before we entered the war, this interest in Polish affairs was conditioned by the fear that Russian resistance to Hitler might be broken by the overwhelming German power. Mr. Averell Harriman, who was the first of Roosevelt's special emissaries to Stalin—in September 1941—was convinced that Stalin's confidence had to be won by promising him the fullest material and moral support. Mr. Harriman went to Russia in 1941 to encourage the Soviets to hold out and all other matters were secondary to this purpose.

There could be no strings attached to the support of the Soviet war effort. Neither Mr. Harriman, nor Mr. Harry Hopkins, who followed him later, believed that Stalin was a revolutionary communist, bent on world domination, but rather a Russian nationalist leader, primarily interested in building up the Soviet Union before turning his attentions elsewhere.

The fear that the Soviet Union might give way to the Germans, or, worse yet, might conclude a separate peace with Hitler, thus recreating the 1939 Nazi-Communist alliance, initiated a policy of Soviet appeasement which was propagandized into its adoption by Great Britain and especially by Mr. Winston Churchill. I am a great admirer of Mr. Churchill but there is no question that, throughout the war, he insisted upon unconditional support of Russia and the avoidance of any questions of principle. It was in these early days also that pro-Communist American literary circles began to speak of the Soviet Union's ethnographic right to eastern Poland as well as the Baltic Republics which had already been incorporated into the U. S. S. R.

In early 1942 Mr. Adolf Berle, at that time Assistant Secretary of State, made the statement that, because the Soviet Union would emerge from the war as one of the world's greatest powers, its special demands had to be granted. He said, and I quote, "It is difficult to conceive that the unlimited sovereignty of the smaller states in the prewar sense of the word can stand in the way of the natural and inevitable political and economic expansion of a great powed." This, if you please, was less than 1 year after President Roosevelt had signed the terms of the Atlantic Charter. As a matter of fact, when General Sikorski, prime minister of the Polish Government-in-exile, visited the United States, I think it was about June 1942, President Roosevelt said to him, and I quote again, "The United States is determined not to depart from its declared position of not admitting the settlement of any territorial issues in time of war. I want you to understand that the American Government has not forgotten the Atlantic Charter."

This principle was confirmed by a declaration prepared for the President by Mr. Sumner Welles, then Under Secretary of State. This declaration stated categorically that the United States Government would enter into no secret treaties on the solution of any postwar problems during the course of the war. It added that the solution of all frontier matters and territorial issues would have to await the end of the war.

Even at that early date, however, there were powerful elements within our Government which were working to direct the course of American policy to one of compromise with the fundamental principles of the United Nations. The Soviets were being oversold to the American people by a group led by Vice President Henry A. Wallace and the political elements of the CIO. The New Deal politicians close to the White House were openly criticizing our Government for its "inadequate" aid to the Soviets, especially the failure to open a second front. The Office of War Information under Mr. Elmer Davis was heaping unqualified praise of Soviet Russia upon the minds of American public opinion. With regard to Poland, the OWI was even issuing maps which showed a final incorporation into Russia of the Polish territories given by Hitler to the Soviets in 1939 and 1940.

The influential men around the White House in those days had adopted a blind pro-Soviet psychosis which tended to regard Soviet democracy as a first cousin of American principles and to adopt the American way of life for his country. They also believed that the war was being won primarily by Russia and that the Soviets were therefore entitled to privileged treatment and to have their demands unconditionally granted.

By the end of 1942 our official policy was to avoid discussion of any issues which might create Soviet-American friction or which might displease Stalin. We were determined to allow and even to encourage pro-Soviet propaganda, we were determined to ignore Communist infiltration and we were even determined to encourage such un-American organizations as the American Slav Congress. Our propaganda broadcasts abroad, which were conducted by foreign Communists and fellow travelers, the pro-Soviet propagandists of the OWI, was directed straight from the White House. In other words, the people of occupied Europe were getting the same line of Soviet propaganda from Washington as they were getting from Moscow. Our appeasement of Soviet Russia was leading to compromises on the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the declaration of the United Nations.

I have had to give you this background in order that you may understand some of the reasoning behind our policy so far as Poland was concerned. Our pro-Soviet appeasement relating to Poland was first indicated early in 1943 when Sumner Welles, the Under Secretary of State, unofficially inquired whether the Polish Government-in-exile was prepared to make any territorial concessions to Soviet demands. It was at this time that President Roosevelt began preparing the way for his first meeting with Stalin at Teheran. Roosevelt was persuaded by Harry Hopkins not to repeat his earlier declaration of nonrecognition of territorial changes since Stalin might regard such a statement as an unfriendly act. American public opinion was not to be allowed to speak its mind with respect to Stalin's imperialist designs on Poland. The Soviets were not to be told that American democracy was not ready to sacrifice its principles to one totalitarian imperalism while fighting another. President Roosevelt ordered that the whole Polish affair be kept a strict secret.

This theory of using great caution in dealing with the Soviets, of not using any forceful language in dealing with Stalin, was chiefly propounded by Mr. Walter Lippmann in his newspaper columns. The tendency was also noticeable in American official circles to pass the buck to the British, so far as Poland was concerned. The British, naturally enough, passed it right back to us. Poland was deserted by both countries and left to become the first victim of Soviet imperialism. The Polish Government was told to remain silent, to make no appeal to public opinion, as a condition for Anglo-American assistance. This assistance was not forthcoming. It never was forthcoming.

I have already mentioned the American Slav Congress which was infiltrating communism among the American working masses. It was at this time that considerable loads of the Communist Polish language paper, Free Poland, which was published in Moscow, were being brought into this country by ships returning from Russia, ships which had been delivering lend-lease supplies to the Soviets. That is what you call lend-lease in reverse. This paper was being circulated extensively among Americans of Polish descent in Detroit, Chicago, and other large cities. And yet it was at this time, in the spring and summer of 1943, that Stalin was being praised for his dissolution of the Comintern, which was supposed to mean an end to Moscow's direction of international Communist activities.

Now I would like briefly to say something about one of the leading proponents of Soviet-American friendship. This is Mr. Joseph E. Davies, whose book, Mission to Moscow, many of you may have read. Mr. Davies, incidentally, is the father-in-law of ex-Senator Millard Tydings, of Maryland, who headed the committee to investigate communism in the State Department. Let me read you some quotations from this book: "I am not sure but what the democracies of the world might not be damn glad some day to have the friendship and the power and the devotion to peace which the Soviet Government could supply in case of another world crisis" (p. 321). "It would not be within the realm of possibility after this war or for many years thereafter for the Soviets to project communism in the United States or even in Europe" (p. 496). "It is bad Christianity, bad sportsmanship, bad sense to challenge the integrity of the Soviet Government. * * * The Soviet Government has a record of keeping its treaty obligations equal to that of any nation on the earth" (p. 550). And more of the same. Men such as this, men such as Corliss Lamont, were engaged in overselling Russia to the American people. Anyone who dared to criticize Russia was suspected of Fascist leanings. The fellow travelers were coming into our official and political circles and were even ready to attack the Bill of Rights if it differed with Soviet ideology. This same Mr. Davies, incidentally, was assigned by President Roosevelt to entice Stalin to the meeting at Teheran. A favorable atmosphere of Soviet-American good will had to be artificially created for this meeting to take place.

Even at this time, however, President Roosevelt was becoming conscious of American political reaction with the 1944 presidential elections in view. Harry Hopkins, for example, said, and I quote, "Perhaps President Roosevelt has oversold Russia to the American people. But now that we are getting busy preparing his reelection, how can one expect him suddenly to get up and express doubt that Soviet-American friendship and collaboration is possible?" And I would like to say right here that our pro-Soviet propaganda at this time was getting a tremendous boost right in Wall Street with such persons as Joseph E. Davies, Thomas and Corliss Lamont, and Marshall Field selling it to the skies. The leading American labor unions, however, were definitely anti-Communist and realized the dangers of Soviet totalitarianism.

A story that was going around Washington at this time about Mr. Davies was that President Roosevelt had offered him the position of Ambassador to Russia but that Davies had turned it down on the grounds that he couldn't eat Russian food. The President asked him why he had praised Russian food so much in his book and Davies replied that propaganda had made it necessary for him to do so.

You are all generally familiar with the Teheran Conference where the doctrine of balance of power was supreme and which caused the United States and Great Britain to agree to the division of Europe into spheres of influence. I can tell you that at this time Mr. Dean Acheson, then Assistant Secretary of State, was a steadfast supporter of Soviet demands in four-power conferences being held in the United States on a lower political level. It was also at this time that Tony Biddle, our Ambassador to the Polish Government-in-exile, asked to be relieved of his post because President Roosevelt had failed at Teheran to defend the legitimate interests of Poland and the sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country. Actually, however, at Teheran, it was Winston Churchill who was foremost in compromising with Stalin concerning the fate of Poland. Just the same, it was Roosevelt who declared that he believed that Stalin was a realist, but not an imperialist and not a Communist.

As the election year of 1944 opened up, it became increasingly important for the administration to make every attempt to secure the votes of the 6 million Americans of Polish descent. These votes were centered in key States such as New York, Illinois, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Michigan. In May of 1944 almost all of these voters had been organized into a body termed the Polish-American Congress, under the leadership of Charles Rozmarek, chairman of the Polish National Alliance. On October 11 a large delegation from the Congress was received by Mr. Roosevelt at the White House, a reception which was extremely well publicized. Arthur Bliss Lane had already been appointed to succeed Tony Biddle as Ambassador to Poland as a proof of the administration's continued interest in Polish affairs. Things were still not too satisfactory, however, so on October 28, when Mr. Roosevelt's campaign train passed through Chicago, he met again with Mr. Rozmarek, chairman of the Polish-American Congress, and promised him, and I quote, that he would "take active steps to insure the restoration of Poland's full independence." This assurance influenced Mr. Rozmarek to deliver an overwhelming Polish-American vote for Roosevelt on election day.

I merely want to remind you of one thing at this point. I want to remind you that, at Teheran, in 1943, over a year before Mr. Roosevelt had expressed his complete agreement with the Curzon line as the Polish-Soviet frontier, an agreement which turned Eastern Poland over to the Soviet Union. I also want to remind you that at Teheran Mr. Roosevelt had requested that this agreement not be made public. The White House palace guard, the radical New Dealers, and the CIO leftists organized into the PAC, as well as certain elements of big business, were bending every effort toward the reelection of Mr. Roosevelt and no possible stake in world affairs could be allowed to interfere with that goal. The Atlantic Charter and the four freedoms were things of the past. Power politics had become the dominant note in international relations.

The Yalta Conference of February 1945 witnessed the final abandonment by the United States of the principles of democracy, of the Atlantic Charter, of the four freedoms, and of the rights of smaller nations. President Roosevelt had already said that the big powers should decide what Poland should have and that he didn't intend to go to the peace conference and bargain with Poland or any other small state. Harry Hopkins had declared that Great Britain and the United States should decide what was to be done about Poland and then tell the Poles rather than ask them. He added that the only desire of the people of the United States was to see a Poland that was friendly to the Soviet Union. The Teheran agreement had given 70,000 square miles of Polish territory

to the Soviet Union without consulting the Polish people or the Polish Government. The Yalta agreement confirmed this surrender to the Soviet Union and moreover it permitted the Russians to determine the composition of the so-called Polish Provisional Government of National Unity which had been set up in Moscow under Soviet auspices. The well-known State Department expert on Russian affairs, Charles Bohlen, was prominent in solving this Polish question at Yalta. May I remind you that Alger Hiss was also there?

Mr. Edward Stettinius had been appointed Secretary of State in time to go to Yalta. This was the same Mr. Stettinius who at the San Francisco Conference declared that we must not sacrifice unity, big-power unity, for the sake of idealism. This was the same Mr. Stettinius who said: "It was not a question of what Great Britain and the United States would permit Russia to do in Poland, but what we could persuade Russia to accept. We were in no position at Yalta to change the Russian attitude on the eastern boundary of Poland."

Perhaps the attitude of some of our foreign-policy thinkers in those days can best be expressed by quoting from a conversation between the Polish Ambassador Jan Ciechanowski and Mr. Elbridge Durbrow, one of the leading experts in Eastern European and Russian affairs in the State Department and the Foreign Service. Mr. Durbrow is quoted as telling the Ambassador—and I quote: "You appear to have an exaggerated opinion of the power of the United States. You are wrong. America is not sufficiently powerful to impose her will on Soviet Russia." This statement was given as the reason whereby Poland, a friendly nation, lost more of its territory as a result of the war than did Germany, our enemy.

You know how the decisions of the Big Three at Yalta concerning Poland were taken, not only without the participation and authorization of the Polish Government but also without its knowledge. You know what kind of a government the Big Three handed the Polish people, a government that was supposed to have been reorganized on a broader democratic basis, but which was actually dominated by the Communist Poles of Lublin, even though Harry Hopkins told President Truman that it fulfilled the provisions of Yalta. You know what happened to the free and unfettered elections which Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin pledged themselves to carry out in Poland, but which turned out to be a farce and a mockery of democratic electoral procedures.

But the sellout and the betrayal continued even after Yalta. Even though he wasn't a member of the United States delegation, Mr. Joseph E. Davies, the same Mr. Davies, was seated during the Potsdam Conference at the conference table during all the deliberations. This is the same Mr. Davies who was successful in arranging for the acceptance of an American Communist Pole, and American citizen, Prof. Oscar Lange, as the first Ambassador from Communist Poland to the United States. So long as Mr. Davies' voice was heard in the ranks of American foreign policy, he deliberately or unconsciously followed the wishes of Stalin. I will not say whether or not he is still regarded as an expert on the Soviet Union.

It was also at this time that Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, then Director-General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Association, appointed a Soviet citizen, Mr. Menshikov, as director of the first UNRRA mission to Poland. Mr. Menshikov promptly negotiated an agreement with the Polish Communist Government which provided that this government, and not the UNRRA, would have complete jurisdiction over all UNRRA supplies distributed in Poland. Naturally these supplies were used for the purposes of the Communists themselves.

In spite of the assistance rendered by the United States Government in the establishment of a Communist regime in Poland, American citizens living in Poland suffered severely. According to Arthur Bliss Lane, our former Ambassador to Poland, over a hundred persons claiming United States citizenship were in Polish jails by the time Mr. Lane left Poland at the end of 1946. In almost all cases these persons were alleged to be members of the Polish underground which had been formed during the war to fight Nazi occupation. American Embassy officials were helpless to intervene in these cases or even to visit the prisoners. One American citizen, Stanislaw Tupaz, was even condemned to death and executed without being able to obtain assistance from our Embassy.

And yet, during all this time, the Voice of America, our official medium of propaganda, persisted in telling the suffering, oppressed people of Poland all about the blessings of democracy in the United States. It did not need to tell the Polish people that they, too, would have enjoyed our democracy if the United States Government had not sold them down the river at Teheran and at Yalta.

And, finally, as if enough damage had not been done already, the Department of State agreed, on April 24, 1946, to extend to the Polish Communist Government 2 credits totaling $90 million, which would enable this Communist government to purchase surplus war property in Europe and to buy locomotives and coal cars elsewhere. If the Polish people still had any hope that the United States Government would support them in their fight against Soviet communism, this must have killed their hopes forever. This action was taken by the Department of State over the repeated protests of Ambassador Lane and was a direct cause of his subsequent resignation from the Foreign Service. When Mr. Lane returned to the United States, he again protested this extension of credits; he protested to Dean Acheson who was then Acting Secretary of State. According to Mr. Lane, Mr. Acheson was characteristically noncommittal. In this connection you will recall that it was Mr. Acheson's former law firm in New York which had negotiated the extension of these credits on behalf of the Polish Communist Government.

I have attempted to show you how our overweening concern for the friendship of the Soviet Union during the war led to our acquiescing in the complete sellout and betrayal of Poland and the Polish people who first took up arms against Hitler and Nazi Germany. I have tried to show you how President Roosevelt and his closest advisers deliberately concealed the truth of the Polish situation from the millions of Polish-American voters for partisan political motives. I have also tried to show you how the Department of State assisted and persisted in the appeasement policy, first of Soviet Russia and later of the Polish Communist Government itself. I have not uttered one word which has not already appeared in public print, but I hope I have been successful in pulling together some of the tangled threads of this problem and in showing you some of the motives which lay behind this abandonment of Poland.

Our foreign policy has had some black pages these past few years. But it has no blacker page than this total desertion of our Polish ally; this sale of millions of freedom-loving Poles into Communist slavery. May God forgive the men who were responsible for our country's foreign policy in those days, who connived and assisted at this groundless act of treachery beside which Munich pales into insignificance. By our support of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms," by our espousal of the declaration of the United Nations, we supposedly took the lead in consecrating ourselves to make the world a better and a finer place in which to live, and for a mess of political pottage our leaders sold this birthright while it was still newborn. In the name of human decency, in the name of moral integrity, in the very name of Christianity itself, the people of this country should denounce the actions of our Government in those evil days and should denounce any and all associations of this character that still persist with us today; otherwise it may well be our lot some day to look for a helping hand and instead to receive the kiss of Judas.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

THE HONORABLE ISAAC BACHARACH

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to announce, somewhat belatedly, the 85th birthday of former Congressman Isaac Bacharach on January 5, 1955. Mr. Bacharach was my distinguished predecessor in the House and served the Second Congressional District of New Jersey with great distinction for some 22 years. A substantial part of this service was spent as a highly influential member of the Committee on Ways and Means. He was a warm and personal friend of the late Nicholas Longworth, a highly regarded Speaker of this body, and enjoyed an almost unprecedented friendship and affection from the Members here with whom he served, and from the people of his district who were grateful for the fine quality of his service.

Mr. Speaker, I recollect that a good many years ago Time magazine referred to the then Congressman Bacharach as one of the 3 or 4 most influential men in Washington.

I have been the beneficiary of his friendship and his wise counsel during the years of my service here.

It is especially gratifying for me to report to his friends, and many of our senior Members are his friends and served with him in this House, that he is vigorous and well, and if he will permit me to say so, as handsome as ever.

On the occasion of his birthday and as an indication of the affection which his hometown has for him, there appeared in the Atlantic City Press a full-page picture with the following text:

Member of a pioneer Atlantic City family, Isaac Bacharach has served the city, the State, and the Nation in public office, was for many years a dominant figure in business and financial circles. A grand old man at 85, he can look back on a useful and purposeful life. He has the rare distinction of having represented this district in Congress for 22 consecutive years, from 1914 until 1936, and before that had been a member of the New Jersey Assembly, following two terms in the city council.

This text was subscribed by a considerable number of the leading citizens of Atlantic City, including not only the leaders of our two great political parties, but some of the principal businessmen, bankers, lawyers, and doctors of the community.

I am likewise including, with the permission of the House, an editorial from the Vineland Times Journal marking the birthday of one of our most distinguished citizens of southern New Jersey, still known to thousands of us as Ike. The article follows:

ANOTHER IKE STILL ACTIVE

Long before an Army officer named Eisenhower was selected to lead the invasion of north Africa in 1943, his first important step to fame, south Jersey had been well acquainted with the nickname "Ike."

It referred to the Congressman from the Second District, Representative Isaac T. Bacharach, of Atlantic City, one of the most respected and admired men ever to represent this part of the State in Washington. Ike Bacharach, a Republican, served as this district's Congressman for 22 years until he was upset by Vineland's Elmer H. Wene in November 1936.

Our friend Allison Carney, who worked for Mr. Bacharach in a lumber business in Atlantic City before he came to Vineland, reminded us this week that Wednesday, January 5, was Congressman Bacharach's 85th birthday. He's hale and hearty and still active as a realtor in Atlantic City.

Perhaps a third of Vineland's population has never heard the name Isaac T. Bacharach. To another third, it's just a name from the past. But the remainder will find it hard to believe that 18 years have passed since Ike Bacharach was this district's Congressman, and we are certain the many who regarded him as their friend would want to join in wishing him many more years of health and activity.

Mr. Speaker, I could say much more about my dear friend, but my only purpose this morning is to remind the House of the happy news that a former Member and leader of this body is well and happy and enjoys fine recollections of his brilliant service here. As he thinks of us with affection, I am sure that we think of him in the same way.

POLAND

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to addres the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, today—February 7, 1955—marks the 10th anniversary of the Yalta agreements which led inevitably to the enslavement of the Polish Nation and eased the advance of communism throughout the entire world.

Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by the many and loyal Polish-American citizens of my great district to take this occasion to call the attention of the House to their inconsolable regret that Poland at present has died as a free nation; and to express also their hope and mine, and that of the freedom-loving peoples of the world, that the people behind the Iron Curtain, who share our passion for freedom and love of liberty and respect for human dignity, may in time see the liberation of that country.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 133, Rept. No. 21), which was referred to the House, and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3005) to further amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending the authority to induct certain individuals, and to extend the benefits under the Dependents Assistance Act to July 1, 1959. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

NORTHWEST AIRLINES

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to associate myself with the comment and the remarks made by the gentleman from Wisconsin. The people of the State of Minnesota and the surrounding area of that northwest part of our United States were stunned and completely surprised by the action of the President last Thursday in revising and modifying the order of the CAB, crippling and laming and threatening the existence of Northwest Airlines, serving our Northwest country and up to Alaska, and across the Pacific to the oriental countries.

I received a number of telegrams and communications serving notice that action ought to be taken to have that order amended to maintain Northwest Airlines on their present routes.

I think the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] said what I wanted to say better than I could have said it myself.

EXTENDING VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION TO PERSONS IN ARMED SERVICES INJURED IN LINE OF DUTY

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I am today filing a bill which would extend vocational rehabilitation to all persons disabled in line of duty in the armed services in war or peacetime. This measure would entitle men and women serving in our Armed Forces now and in the future, who receive handicapping injuries, to the same educational and vocational training to become useful citizens which already is enjoyed by veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict.

It is an honor and privilege, upon my first opportunity to address the House, to do so in support of legislation I feel will fulfill a moral obligation of our country as an employer of millions of young men and women who may be injured in their country's service, and will strengthen our economy by restoring handicapped persons to economic usefulness and reduce potential relief and charity costs. I will be pleased to have other Members join in cosponsoring this bill.

I do not consider the providing of vocational rehabilitation and training to overcome the handicap of disability and restore a person to economic productiveness a wartime benefit. It is good business so far as our country is concerned, and certainly a moral obligation of any employer to an employee disabled in his service.

Labor, management, and governmental leaders have joined in urging strengthening and extension of vocational rehabilitation for civilian and industry employees throughout the country and many of our States provide for rehabilitation and training under workmen's compensation laws. The growth of rehabilitation centers for all types of handicapped workers has been phenomenal with the growing realization this is one way we can relieve misery and distress with a net gain in income and a decrease in the heavy burden of continuing relief costs. I see no valid reason why the same basic principles should not apply equally to persons injured in the armed services in line of duty at any time.

From a humanitarian viewpoint, it makes little difference to a disabled person whether he is injured in conflict with the enemy, in peacetime maneuvers, or during other line of duty assignment, and I believe the obligation of the United States to provide rehabilitation and assist in overcoming his handicaps and restoring him to a useful and productive life is equally binding.

I would like to direct the attention of the Members to the fact that many of them have gained an erroneous impression during discussion of the extension of educational benefits recently on the floor, when it was inferred that persons in the armed services prior to January 31, 1955, would continue to receive the protection of vocational rehabilitation provisions of the present law. This is true only so far as disabling injuries incurred on or before January 31, 1955, are concerned.

As the law now exists, a serviceman injured and disabled in line of duty on February 1, 1955, or thereafter is entitled to no rehabilitation or vocational training, and the educational benefit extension measure recently approved by the House will not extend vocational rehabilitation coverage, even to those now in the Armed Forces. To me, this is a most unjust and illogical situation.

May I suggest to the Members that in their consideration of this bill they consider it upon its merits as a sound policy appropriate for application at any time, rather than an extension into peacetime of a war benefit to veterans. We are engaged in formulating policies which will require service for years into the future of millions of our finest young men and women, who otherwise would be embarking on careers of productive usefulness, which will be delayed and perhaps permanently altered by the necessity of military training. The least we can do is to assure them that if they are disabled and handicapped we will assist in restoring them to useful future lives.

FAILURE OF PRESIDENT TO FOLLOW RECOMMENDATIONS OF AGENCIES OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the example which has just been cited to the House by the gentleman from Milwaukee [Mr. REUSS] regarding the President's action in overruling the unanimous recommendation of the Civil Aeronautics Board should, I think, serve to call to the mind of the House that similar action has been taken with regard to many other recommendations made to the President by other agencies of Government. The most publicized example, of course, is that of the Dixon-Yates contract.

The Tariff Commission, too, has made recommendations, in some cases unanimous, which have been overruled by the Chief Executive and in this case the Civil Aeronautics Board. We must remember that while these decisions are being made in public protestations the President expresses his great respect for Congress and its agencies and his concern not to disregard the will of Congress or its recommendations.

THE YALTA COMPLEX, 1955

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, at a recent briefing to freshmen Congressmen I was so disappointed by the do-nothing attitude of the State Department toward Poland, the following remarks were prompted. Ten years ago, the Yalta Conference ended the restoration of a free and independent Poland. Since then voices have been raised in constant protest over the betrayal of a gallant people who for centuries fought and died for freedom. After the Yalta Conference, the United Nations was born. The U. N. Charter eloquently proclaims such worthwhile goals as "to reaffirm faith in fundamental rights in the dignity and worth of the human person; in the equal right of men and women and of nations large and small and to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained and for these ends to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors and unite our strength to maintain international peace and security," and so forth. These and other noble sentiments were bugled forth to a waiting world at San Francisco.

The U. N. was organized as the charter states, "based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members." Signing the charter as the sovereign of the people it claimed to represent was a member which called itself Poland. Time, however, has demonstrated that the U. N. Charter signatory, which called itself Poland 10 years ago, was, and is, an alias, for Commissars of the Soviet Union. Because it was thought by men in high authority at the time of the adoption of the U. N. Charter, that time, or the alchemy of association with free nations would convert these international muggers into peaceloving good neighbors the shocking contradiction between the noble ideals of the U. N. Charter and the true nature of some of its members, was ignored.

Orators, who over the years, declaimed on the subject of Yalta, generally condemned the betrayal of true Poland, few urged that anything be done about the beneficiary of Yalta—Red Poland—which was sitting as big as life in the U. N. masquerading as a peaceloving and independent nation.

Special Report No. 1 of the 83d Congress, 2d session, of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression, reporting under authority of House Resolution 346 and House Resolution 438, which report was ordered printed on December 31, 1954, on page 32 tells the tragic story as follows. These quotations are in part:

> 1. Poland is not an independent country. * * * 2. The independence of Poland was destroyed by Soviet Russia. * * * 3. Poland lost its independence against the will of her people. 4. The Polish regime and the Polish diplomats represent neither the Polish people nor Polish interests; they are oppressors of the Poles and represent only Soviet Russian interests. * * * 7. Freedom of Poland must be a permanent goal of our national policy.

Now that these facts have become known, certain questions arise.

By what right does Red Poland sit in the United Nations?

Since Red Poland is not an independent country, but an oppressor, of her own people, how does she qualify as a continuing member of the U. N. under the principles of the charter?

Since the Polish regime and Polish diplomats represent neither the Polish people nor Polish interests, how can the U. N. in good conscience permit Red Poland to continue casting votes in the U. N. as if she did represent the Polish people and Polish interests?

Certain statesmen now in high places publicly condemned Yalta and declared the restoration of free Poland to be a basic and never-to-be-forgotten objective of our whole national policy. These statesmen are now in a position to translate their words on the evils of Yalta into action rectifying those evils.

Why should they not start to end the evils of Yalta by beginning in the U. N. itself? Are not those who for years preached about the evils of Yalta now that the facts on Red Poland have been revealed most censurable if they fail to act?

The Charter of the U. N. contemplates that its members represent the people whom they claim to represent. The charter also requires its members to fulfill "in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the charter." Among these obligations are the right of self-determination of peoples and many other principles which place Red Poland in a position where it cannot carry out its duties to the U. N.

Is it not the duty of the United States through the U. N. to institute action to determine whether Red Poland should continue in the U. N.? Too often the Yalta complex in some thinking prompts distinguished Americans to urge the admission of more aggressors, such as Red China, into the U. N. It would be more logical to call for the ousting of Red Poland as unrepresentative of civilized nations. The battle of men's souls cannot be won with hyprocrisy. An international organization which treats with equal affection, freedom-loving, God-fearing nations, and freedom-hating, God-defying nations, cannot long endure. Nor can international muggers and bandits be halted by the Marquis of Queensbury rules or Roberts' rules of order, any more than love of country can be promoted by honorably discharging from the Army soldiers who fail in their first duty as soldiers—unreserved loyalty to the country. To treat those who are generous in devotion to country in the same manner as those whose love of country is barricaded behind legal technicalities, is to chill the ardor of patriotism, and to work an injustice to the devoted. The fifth amendment is a privilege against self-incrimination, not a reward for honorable service nor a decoration for bravery, and should be treated accordingly. I cite this example to demonstrate that the Yalta complex on the international level oftentimes overflows and had its bad effects on the national level.

Parenthetically, I intend to introduce legislation to deprive soldiers who hide behind the fifth amendment while in the Armed Forces—or in the forces of the U. N.—of the same privileges under the GI educational laws as are awarded to those who love their country unreservedly.

To resume, a free and independent Poland was the work of the United States. Woodrow Wilson championed

the cause of a free and independent Poland and brought its existence about. The Poland which sprung from World War I with American help was a great and heroic nation. She proved her greatness when she went down fighting in World War II before the combined attacks of Hitler and Stalin. She proved her devotion to the West when her sons continued to fight in the armies of the West long after she had been engulfed. We owe the murdered Poland a debt of gratitude. We owe her suffering people the duty of sincerity. We ought not to treat the Soviet Communists, masquerading in the U. N. and elsewhere as the representatives of a free and independent Poland, as if we believed that masquerade.

Let us make it clear to the world that we distinguish between the oppressed and the oppressor, between his prey and the wolf.

Therefore, I propose that the United States urge the U. N. to reexamine the question of Red Poland's admission and right to continue in the U. N. Should the State Department and its representatives so act, a thrill of hope will rise in the hearts of the hopeless now languishing under the heel of Red Poland.

As Woodrow Wilson said, in 1916:

> My dear Paderewski, I can tell that Poland will be resurrected and will exist again. For Poland this miracle will come from the West.

U. N. Ambassador Lodge said in February 1951, restoration of Poland should be "a basic and never to be forgotten objective of our whole national policy."

Let the U. N. act, and the free world as one man will shout: "Polania restituta. Deo volenti—Poland is restored. God wills it."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUMULTY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

REPUDIATE YALTA

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from New Jersey for his factual statement regarding the unfortunate Yalta agreement and his review of Soviet duplicity and malicious violation and nullification of all its agreements and treaties. The Communist leaders at the time of the Yalta agreement never intended to seriously carry out any of its promises and agreements, as the world has learned during the 10 years that have elapsed since this regrettable pact was signed.

In the intervening time from World War I up to 1939, the Kremlin made 36 pacts and agreements with neighboring nations and other free nations of the world. In 1939, when Stalin and Hitler entered into the Ribbentrop agreement, every single one of these pacts and treaties were nullified and canceled by Stalin. For a period of 35 years free nations have witnessed the Soviet Government throw agreements and treaties into the wastebasket whenever it suited their convenience and their program of aggression. Democracies during this period of time have yet to find the leaders of communism, honor and carry out any of its agreements when the rejection of same would expand the Soviet sphere. Last June at Geneva we still find the free nations of the world sitting across the table of arbitration and appeasing the tyrants of the Kremlin.

Last year almost 14 million more humans were forfeited to communism slavery in Indochina and only yesterday the newspapers and radios heralded the Tachen Island evacuation as an evacuation to lead finally to cease fire in the Formosa area. How long will it be before the leaders of free nations stop paying blackmail to the Communist aggressors on the theory that they can be appeased and stop their mad rush for world domination. As chairman of the Katyn Forest Massacre Committee, we heard over 220 witnesses, a great number of whom were leaders of the governments of now captive countries, including Poland, and they unanimously testified that their countries were now in slavery because of communistic duplicity, lies, broken promises and military conquest.

Also as a member of the committee in the last Congress investigating Communist aggression, we took the testimony of over 330 witnesses which revealed in substance that the present Communist leaders for 35 years have not changed or deviated from the statement and advice of Lenin when he said "Capitalism and communism cannot live together; one or the other must triumph in the end." Every Member of Congress, if they have not already done so, should read the report of our committee which was filed and completed on January 1 of this year. Any person who reads this report must realize that communism cannot be appeased and retreats and concessions merely add strength to their march for world domination.

Yalta was nothing more than duplication and repetition of the Communist blueprint and it should be officially repudiated. Our country and other free nations should immediately inaugurate an effective international program which in the end will not only curb and destroy communism but also free Poland and other captive nations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY] has expired.

HAVE WE LEARNED THE LESSON OF YALTA?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 10th anniversary of the famous, or as it might better be described, the infamous meeting of the Big Three which culminated on February 12, 1945, in the so-called Yalta agreement.

This meeting, which the representatives of Poland were not permitted to attend, sealed the fate of Poland in a unilateral agreement in which the ally Polish nation, friendly to the western democracies and which contributed so richly to the defeat of the Nazis, had no voice. It was that agreement also which paved the way for the sovietization of China, which is causing us so much worry and trouble today.

The Yalta agreement will go down in history as the beginning of a series of retreats of the free world before the forward march of Soviet aggression, a march which has not yet stopped and which shows absolutely no indication of slackening, despite fine-sounding slogans and assurances of the leaders of western democracies, including our own.

The Yalta agreement, secretly drafted, violating all western concepts of international law, has been repeatedly violated by the Soviets. If there is any question of that, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that the skeptics read carefully the documented reports and findings of the special congressional committees, the Katyn Committee of the 82d Congress and the Committee on Communist Aggression, appointed in the 83d Congress. Everyone seems to agree now that these repeated violations have deprived that document of its last vestige of questionable validity.

Certainly the Republican Party, in the last presidential campaign, made it clear that it would demand a renunciation of the agreement. In his first message to Congress in January 1952, President Eisenhower called for a resolution repudiating by this country of this and other similar secret pacts. Immediately after the President's statement resolutions were introduced in both Houses of Congress, by Republicans and Democrats alike, to put into effect the statements of the President and to declare Yalta no longer binding on this country. And then began a series of acts of appeasements, of retreats, of weakness, unrivaled even in the Yalta days.

The present Secretary of State decided that such an act of renouncement of Yalta would be unwise and uncalled for. As a matter of fact, administration spokesmen did a complete turnabout, defended the Yalta agreement in principle, and denounced only its violation by the Soviets. This was the exact position of those who had defended the Yalta agreement previously, a position bitterly criticized before that by Republican spokesmen. As a result, the highly publicized resolutions denouncing Yalta died a natural death. They were never voted out of the committees.

What caused this sudden turnabout of the Republican policy spokesmen? That is a question of great interest to the people of America. Why has this administration set about on a continuation of the policy of appeasement and coexistence with a Communist system which has no intention of keeping any agreement it makes unless it works toward the advancement of worldwide communism?

To those who would debate with me the correctness of my charge that the policy of appeasement still reigns unabated in the present administration, may I ask what positive steps, not mere slogans, have been advanced in the last 2 years to stop the tide of communism?

Were not the Berlin and Geneva meetings a step in the same direction we have always been following? What about Indochina and now the Tachen Islands?

Only yesterday it was jubilantly announced that "Chiang bows to United States and yields Tachens." This is the actual headline of one of Washington's newspapers of yesterday. Why should we Americans be so proud and happy because we have again forced one of our loyal allies to yield to the Communists, just as we forced the Poles, the Koreans, the Indochinese, and so many others? Is there anyone so naive as to believe that this contributes to the security of the United States? Does anyone honestly believe the Red Communists will stop there and not eventually take Formosa, if not in the immediate future, then at least in the near future? They have said they will not stop there, and they have usually kept their word in such instances. Is it any wonder that many of us fear that this is only one more step toward the eventual entry of Red China into the United Nations?

Mr. Speaker, on this solemn occasion many of us are denouncing the sad mistake made 10 years ago at Yalta. But how many of us are willing to forget the political implications of Yalta and resolve to actually do something about it?

Enough has been said of Yalta, maybe too much. Let us now actually do something about it. If Yalta was a moral and political mistake, let us not continue that mistake, at the same time denouncing others who made it. Ten years ago there may have been some justification in not realizing the complete untrustworthiness of the Soviet leaders. Today there can be no such excuse. The record is too clear for that.

To all those who denounce Yalta, may I respectfully submit that I have again introduced House Joint Resolution 63, calling for the repudiation of Yalta. Regardless of the unwillingness of the Secretary of State to recommend its passage, let us insist on it. I appeal to my colleagues to give living proof of the many fine declarations made here today and during the rest of this week. Let us insist on the passage of a clear and unambiguous declaration in order to prove to the rest of the free world that we have learned the lesson of Yalta, that there will be no more appeasement, and that there is real hope for the restoration of freedom and liberty to nations now under Communist control. Only by such action can we contribute to the safety and the future of our own United States.

CITIZEN DAVE DOUGLAS

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, in his budget message, sent to the Congress on January 17, the President said:

> During the past year the Treasury Department has continued to examine possible changes in the tax laws concerning which no recommendations were made in the revision of the tax laws last year. As final conclusions are reached by the Department they will be sent to the Congress.

From this statement I deduce, with considerable satisfaction, that we shall be asked to give attention to more than routine matters of taxation at this session of the Congress. The President gives us some notion of what these further changes may be when he adds, in his budget message, this significant paragraph:

> I have also directed the Secretary of the Treasury promptly to make recommendations for any other changes in the laws which may be found necessary to prevent anyone from avoiding his fair share of the tax burden.

I call attention to the President's words, Mr. Speaker, for two very closely related reasons: First, because the changes in the tax laws which are needed to prevent certain business corporations and organizations from avoiding their fair share of the tax burden are clearly set forth in H. R. 43, a bill to equalize taxation and provide revenue, which I introduced on the opening day of this session; and, second, because I have just seen a motion picture that dramatizes this tax avoidance and its burdensome effect on most of our taxpayers in a way that I commend to the attention of every Member of this House and every citizen of the United States.

It is quite likely, Mr. Speaker, that you and other Members of this body have heard already of this half-hour talking picture, for it is causing a national sensation. It is called Citizen Dave Douglas. It was produced by the National Tax Equality Association and it is being released by that organization and by the public information committee of the cotton industry. It is being shown in every State of the Union to luncheon clubs, chambers of commerce, veterans' organizations, women's clubs, and business groups. It is on television.

It has already been seen by millions, although frantic efforts are being made by building and loan associations, credit unions, cooperatives, and certain other mutuals to stop it before it is seen by still more millions of citizens and taxpayers. The reason, we can assume, is that it tells in very simple and understandable terms how these big corporations and organizations—to use the President's own words—"avoid their fair share of the tax burden." Furthermore, these frantic efforts are being made at the very time when the Dave Douglases of this Nation, along with their schoolteaching daughters and their veteran sons, are overburdened with a crippling load of Federal taxes.

Mr. Speaker, in each of the past four Congresses I have proposed legislation which would do just exactly what Citizen Dave Douglas asks to have done. H. R. 43 would amend our tax laws so that the earnings of cooperative corporations would be taxed in exactly the same way that the earnings of other corporations are taxed; so that the earnings of building and loan associations and mutual savings banks would be taxed in exactly the same way that the earnings of the commercial banks with which they compete are taxed; so that the earnings of credit unions would be taxed like the earnings of other lending agencies; so that there would no longer be an unfair discrimination between the taxation of mutual fire and casualty insurance companies and the taxation of competing capital stock insurance companies in the same fields.

That, I understand, is the program of Citizen Dave Douglas, as presented in this excellent talking picture. That, I understand, is the program of the National Tax Equality Association and other groups which sponsor the showing of this dramatic picture.

Mr. Speaker, the tax-dodging opponents of the film Citizen Dave Douglas say it is misleading. I say they are wrong. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I have earnestly studied this matter for years. I have listened to the testimony of scores of witnesses. And I tell you that Citizen Dave Douglas is an honest presentation of the facts in the matter. It should be seen not only by every taxpayer in the land but also by every Member of the Congress that writes the tax laws.

The National Tax Equality Association is to be congratulated for producing this picture and for telling the tax story in an interesting and straightforward way. It is in keeping, Mr. Speaker, with the sincerity of program and the integrity of purpose that have characterized this organization, its members, its officers, and its management in all the years I have known them. I can only hope that the association's burdensome task may be ended soon by final congressional action to impose the income tax where it belongs—to prevent anyone from avoiding his fair share of the tax burden.

From the beginning I have said, along with Citizen Dave Douglas, that this is a fight to tax the untaxed to ease the burden on the overtaxed. I say again, with Citizen Dave Douglas, let us tax the untaxed to ease the taxload upon the overtaxed.

YALTA: A RETREAT FOR THE FREE WORLD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, when President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Prime Minister Winston Churchill, and Marshal Joseph Stalin met at Yalta in the Crimea in February 1945 to begin drafting plans for the postwar world, the war in the European theater was fast drawing to a close. Within 3 months Germany capitulated, and the war ended on the European continent.

Much remained to be done, however, after the signatures were affixed to the German surrender documents. A war had yet to be won in the Pacific against Japan. That war, hard fought and carried on at great cost in life and treasure by a series of extraordinary naval engagements and heroic island-hopping operations, had not as yet reached the home islands of Japan, at least in the form of an actual land invasion, when

the three wartime leaders met at the famed Crimean resort. In fact, the Navy-Marine operation at Iwo Jima which was to penetrate the outer shell of Japanese home defenses for the first time was still in the assembling stage. Many of our highest military advisers believed that the Japanese war was going to last for a considerable period after the projected invasion of Japan was launched in the fall of 1945. A great and continuing war was forecast for the Pacific and Far Eastern theater. America, they said, had to prepare for a long and gruelling fight. For this reason they thought that Russian assistance was necessary for the conquest of Japan.

The destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki changed the course of the war radically. Only 6 months after the conclusion of the Yalta agreement the war in the Pacific came to an end. There was no invasion of Japan. Soviet military aid was not needed to destroy the Japanese war potential as many of our military advisers had previously estimated. But in the meantime at Yalta Soviet Russia had been given a position of great advantage for spreading the Communist conspiracy throughout Eastern Europe and the Far East. Concessions were made at Yalta that opened the sluicegates for the expansion of Soviet power in the postwar world.

As a consequence of the agreements at Yalta the Soviet Union was given territories and areas of privilege in the Far East as the price of entry into the Japanese war. At about the same time the Red armies conquered and occupied all Eastern Europe where they held sway with virtually uncontested authority. Once in control of Eastern Europe, Soviet military authorities laid the groundwork for ultimate Soviet domination over the whole area and began preparations for its ultimate consolidation within the Soviet orbit of power. In the Far East, the Soviets accelerated their aid to the Chinese Communists in their efforts to conquer China. And, in North Korea the Soviets began to construct a Communist state which in 1950 set out to conquer the entire Korean Peninsula.

Unfortunately, America and Great Britain concluded a pact at Yalta which was based upon false premises and an erroneous political assessment of the intentions of the Soviet Union. They relied heavily upon Soviet good faith, particularly in carrying out the provisions of the agreement which called for free and unfettered elections in the Soviet-occupied areas of Eastern Europe. To the woe of all the free world, however, it soon became apparent that Soviet good faith was only a figment of the imagination of the Western statesmen at Yalta. The Soviet armies, which were in defacto control of Eastern Europe, became one of the instruments for destroying the liberties of the peoples in that area. In Poland, the Soviet Union prevented the holding of free and unfettered elections, thus perpetrating one of the most flagrant breaches of faith which it has committed with regard to the provisions of the Yalta accord. Through terror, intimidation, and other tactics typical of the Communists, the Soviets were able to render ineffectual whatever democratic elements existed in Poland after the massacre at Katyn Forest and the Warsaw uprising and to place in positions of authority so-called Poles, traitors to their people, who had long been the trained and faithful servants of the Kremlin. Thus, Polish freedom was destroyed and the hopes of President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill that out of the Yalta accord would come a free and independent Poland and a world at peace, free from want and fear, were crushed under the weight of Communist tyranny.

Poland, like all of Eastern Europe, lies today under the boot of the Soviet oppressor. In the Polish people, however, there are national characteristics that defy conquest. The Poles are a courageous people, long used to the burdens of oppression. They are a people whose spirit was never broken even after a century of dismemberment and foreign domination. They are a people with a will to national greatness. Above all else, they are a people who love and cherish freedom and independence. We must continue to blend our voices of sympathy with those of the free world that cry out "Justice for Poland," hoping that one day the chain of the Communist tyrant will be broken, and Poland will once again be free. For not until there is justice for Poland will there ever be peace and repose on the European continent.

TRIBUTE TO POLAND

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote the great Polish poet Adam Mickiewicz who wrote of his oppressed country 100 years ago:

> Poland, you will be taken out of the tomb, because you are believing, loving, and full of hope.

Those words ring equally true today as we see constant evidence of the spirit of freedom and love of liberty which still exists behind the Iron Curtain. We have read news accounts and heard testimony of escaped Polish refugees as to how their determination to be free has led these courageous people to go hungry and in hiding, to steal airplanes, trucks, and trains, and to risk their very lives to break through to freedom.

During my own 2 years of experience with Radio Free Europe I met hundreds of Polish patriots who by one means or another escaped the Communist slavery which has befallen their beloved homeland.

These brave men and women, many of whom know they will never return to the place of their birth, live each day with but one purpose in mind, one burning determination in their souls: The liberation of Poland and the freeing of their 26 million unfortunate countrymen from Communist shackles.

Their spirit is reminiscent of our own particular Polish hero, Thaddeus Kosciusko, who left his native land to aid the American colonies in their struggle for freedom.

I think it fitting that we pay tribute to the Polish people still behind the Iron Curtain and in doing so give some sign that we are mindful of their suffering, proud of their indomitable spirit, and hopeful of their eventual independence.

NORTHWEST AIRLINES

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join in the remarks of my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, Hon. EUGENE MCCARTHY. I would like to commend him in condemning the action of the President in ignoring the recommendation of the Civil Aeronautics Board. I would also like to call the attention of this body to the fact that the gentleman from Minnesota compared this action of the President to that of his action and attitude toward the Dixon-Yates contract. I would also like to remind you that the gentleman from Minnesota is not a resident of the Tennessee Valley area and his attitude toward the Dixon-Yates deal is certainly not a prejudiced or biased one from any standpoint. I certainly want to go on record in saying that these acts of the President seem to establish a precedent that I think is very bad for our Nation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FULTON (at the request of Mr. HAYS of Arkansas) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRANAHAN (at the request of Mr. O'HARA of Illinois).

Mr. CELLER in two instances.

Mr. MCVEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MASON and to include an analysis of H. R. 864 introduced by Mr. VAN ZANDT of Pennsylvania.

Mr. AYRES (at the request of Mr. POFF) and to include an editorial.

Mr. BURDICK in two instances.

Mr. HIESTAND and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALLECK and to include an address delivered by him at the Nancy Hanks Lincoln State Memorial.

Mr. MCCORMACK to extend his own remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCDONOUGH and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLTZMAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT).

Mr. KEARNS.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, for the period from February 9 to February 28, 1955, inclusive, on account of official business.

Mr. JOHNSON of California, for February 10 and 11, 1955, to attend the meeting of the Board of Visitors of the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did, on February 5, 1955, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2010. An act to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 8, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

375. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting the report of the proceedings of the annual meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held at Washington, D. C., September 22–24, 1954, pursuant to title 28, United States Code, section 331 (H. Doc. No. 83); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

376. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes' "; to the Committee on Armed Services.

377. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the crediting, for certain purposes, of prior active Federal commissioned service performed by a person appointed as a commissioned officer under section 101 or 102 of the Army-Navy Nurses' Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

378. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, relative to the transfer to the American University of Beirut, a nonprofit educational institution, one SQ-type radar set for educational purposes, pursuant to section 2 of the act of August 7, 1946 (c. 804, 60 Stat. 897, as amended; 34 U. S. C. 546g); to the Committee on Armed Services.

379. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report covering claims paid on account of the correction of military records of Coast Guard personnel during the 6 months' period ending December 31, 1954, pursuant to section 207 (e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended by Public Law 220, 82d Congress (5 U. S. C. 275 (e)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

380. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners, government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to authorize the District of Columbia government to establish an office of civil defense, and for other purposes'," approved August 11, 1950; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

381. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Armory Board, transmitting the seventh annual report of the District of Columbia Armory Board, pursuant to section 10, Public Law 605, 80th Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

382. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report on a study of programs for homebound handicapped individuals, with recommendations, pursuant to Public Law 565, 83d Congress (H. Doc. No. 98); to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

383. A letter from the executive director, National Capital Housing Authority, transmitting the National Capital Housing Authority's statement on painting of war housing prior to disposition, made in connection with the General Accounting Office report on the audit of the National Capitol Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953; to the Committee on Government Operations.

384. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of certain listed legislation passed by the municipal council of St. Thomas and St. John and the legislative assembly of the Virgin Islands, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

385. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed award of a concession permit to Anton Ashenbrenner, which will, when executed by the Superintendent on behalf of the Government, authorize him to operate a store, gasoline station, and cabin camp, known as Ashenbrenner's Camp, in Olympic National Park, Wash., during the calendar year 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

386. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the Ninth Annual Report describing the operations of the Department of Commerce under the Federal Airport Act, as amended, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

387. A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting the 20th Annual Report of the National Mediation Board, including the report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 442, approved June 21, 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

388. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

389. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible into the United States, pursuant to section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

390. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

391. A letter from the Director, Legislative Programs, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to enact title 10, 'Armed Forces', and title 32, 'National Guard', of the United States Code"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 133. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 3005, a bill to further amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending the authority to induct certain individuals, and to extend the benefits under the Dependents Assistance Act to July 1, 1959; without amendment (Rept. No. 21). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MORANO: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report pursuant to rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives pertaining to a special study mission to Cuba; without amendment (Rept. No. 22). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 3652. A bill to amend certain subsections of subchapter B of chapter 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 3653. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of amorphous graphite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 3654. A bill to provide that coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system for self-employed farmers and ranchers shall be on a voluntary basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BETTS:

H. R. 3655. A bill to extend rural delivery mail service to persons desiring such service and residing on or near improved roads; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CARRIGG (by request):

H. R. 3656. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3657. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, section 871 to provide penalties for threats against the President-elect and the Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3658. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3659. A bill to increase criminal penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3660. A bill to provide punishment for certain confidence-game swindles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3661. A bill to amend section 490 of title 14, United States Code, relating to the settlement of claims of military and civilian personnel of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 3662. A bill to encourage the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 3663. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended, so as to increase the limit of amounts payable thereunder in connection with the funeral and burial of deceased veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 3664. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to allow certain insurance policies to be issued or reinstated; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H. R. 3665. A bill to amend section 47c of the National Defense Act to grant certain credit for military training furnished subsequent to August 8, 1953, by certain retired or Reserve officers of any of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 3666. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. R. 3667. A bill to establish public use of the national forests as a policy of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3668. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 3669. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to exempt certain wheat or other grain producers from liability under the act where all the wheat or other grain crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 3670. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 3671. A bill to amend the Trade Agreements Extension Act of July 1, 1954, so as to assure the availability of materials essential to national security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3672. A bill to provide that the Uniform Simultaneous Death Act shall apply in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 3673. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, in respect to the marital deduction under Federal estate taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3674. A bill to amend section 2 of the Missing Persons Act, so as to provide that benefits thereunder shall be available to certain members of the Philippine Scouts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H. R. 3675. A bill to authorize the conveyance by quitclaim deed of certain land to the Brownsville Navigation District of Cameron County, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 3676. A bill to establish the United States Customs Port Patrol in the Bureau of Customs for the purpose of enforcing the antismuggling laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3677. A bill to provide that the first $250 received by an agricultural worker from an employer in a calendar year shall be excluded in determining such worker's coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KRUEGER:

H. R. 3678. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 3679. A bill to amend section 120 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 (relating to unlimited deduction for charitable contributions); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 3680. A bill to provide for intensified research into the causes, hazards, and effects of air pollution, and the methods for its prevention and control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 3681. A bill to provide for a heliport in the District of Columbia, for use in helicopter service between the Friendship International Airport and the downtown area of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3682. A bill to authorize an investigation and report on the advisability of a national monument in Brooklyn, N. Y.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3683. A bill for the relief of the city of Baltimore, Md.: to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3684. A bill to make ineffective a certain requirement of local cooperation with respect to the river and harbor project on the Pearl River, Miss., below Jackson; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3685. A bill to amend section 1 (d) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide certain benefits for employees engaged in law-enforcement work who, because of disability or other reasons, are unable to complete 20 years of service in such work; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 3686. A bill to provide Federal assistance for construction and reconstruction of a highway from the Nevada State line across the Sierra Nevada Mountains into the San Francisco Bay area; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 3687. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 3688. A bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3689. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3690. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 3691. A bill to eliminate certain practices involving racial or religious discrimination in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 3692. A bill to amend subsection 403 (c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (relating to misbranded food); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3693. A bill to amend title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 3694. A bill to establish a joint committee of Congress to study postal field service reclassification, to increase the rates of basic compensation of postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service pending reclassification pursuant to recommendations of such joint committee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3695. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 3696. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the Fort Devens Military Reservation, Mass., to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 3697. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 3698. A bill creating a Federal Commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 3699. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide that the interest rate on veterans' loans shall not exceed 4 percent per annum, and to provide that the Secretary of the Treasury may purchase such loans from the national service life-insurance fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3700. A bill to establish a program of grants to States for the development of fine arts programs and projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 3701. A bill to make certain exceptions to the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States and of the United States courts of appeals and to the jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in actions relating to the public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 3702. A bill to amend sections 2311, 2312, and 2313 of title 18, United States Code, so as to extend the punishment for the transportation of stolen motor vehicles in interstate or foreign commerce to tractors, commercial truck trailers, and truck semitrailers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 3703. A bill to provide that the provisions of the Natural Gas Act shall not apply to the sale of natural gas, as an incident of its production and gathering, by an independent producer not engaged in the interstate transmission of natural gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 3704. A bill for the establishment of the United States Commission on the Aging and Aged; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SILER:

H. R. 3705. A bill to provide for compensating local peace officers who seize vehicles which are forfeited to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3706. A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3707. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a) to provide that the burial allowance payable thereunder shall be increased to $250; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3708. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, 74th Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar, Leyte, and Luzon, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3709. A bill to amend section 120 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 (relating to the unlimited deduction for charitable and other contributions); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3710. A bill relating to the definition of the term "public utility" for purposes of computing the deductions for income-tax purposes for dividends paid and received on certain preferred stock of public utilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SISK:

H. R. 3711. A bill to provide vocational rehabilitation for certain persons who serve in the active military or naval service of the United States after January 31, 1955; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3712. A bill to extend the period during which claims for floor stocks refunds may be filed with respect to certain manufacturers' excise taxes which were reduced by the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 3713. A bill to suspend for 1 year certain duties upon the importation of aluminum and aluminum alloys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 3714. A bill to grant to Federal employees the right to have security charges against them determined by a panel composed of experienced judges and attorneys; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 3715. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act in order to provide that revenues under the provisions of such act shall be used as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3716. A bill to amend the cotton marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3717. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 3718. A bill to authorize the Public Housing Commissioner to enter into agreements with local public housing authorities for the admission of elderly widows, widowers or a single person to federally assisted low-rent housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 3719. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act which reduce the annuities of the spouses of retired employees, and the survivors of deceased employees, by the amount of certain monthly benefits payable under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 3720. A bill to improve the health of the people by encouraging the extension of voluntary prepayment health services plans, facilitating the financing of construction of needed health facilities, assisting in increasing the number of adequately trained nurses and other health personnel, improving and expanding programs of mental health and public health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 3721. A bill to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act so as to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of blasting caps unless they are stamped or labeled so as to indicate that they are dangerous; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3722. A bill to assist certain classes of municipalities to finance vitally needed and specific types of public works by providing for a guaranty by the United States of approved bonds hereafter issued by these municipalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. J. Res. 195. Joint resolution to prohibit the importation from the Dominion of Canada into the United States of fermented malt beverages, wines, and distilled spirits manufactured in the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. J. Res. 196. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide that a new State may be admitted only with the consent of two-thirds of both Houses of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. J. Res. 197. Joint resolution to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. J. Res. 198. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. J. Res. 199. Joint resolution to increase 1955 cotton allotments of certain farms receiving 5 acres or less; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 200. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the procedure for amending the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 201. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the procedure for amending the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. Con. Res. 66. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to conduct a special study of the ways in which existing and proposed Federal economic powers and programs can make their greatest contribution to defense against modern atomic attack; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution favoring universal disarmament; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. Res. 134. Resolution requesting the President of the United States of America to request the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish the House of Representatives certain information concerning Veterans' Administration expenditures; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. Res. 135. Resolution to establish a new dining room or cafeteria in the House wing of the Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 136. Resolution requesting the Secretary of Defense to furnish the House of Representatives certain information as to extent and cost of military installations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BEAMER: Memorial of Indiana State Senate urging some limitation on the import of foreign oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: Memorial of the State of Arkansas urging enactment of legislation which would require sellers of merchandise shipped in interstate commerce to comply with sales tax laws of States into which such merchandise is shipped for sale, use, or consumption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the observance of the centennials of the opening of the Pacific overland mail; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation limiting the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States urging enactment of legislation amending the Sugar Act of 1948 to enable the domestic sugar industry to have a fair and equitable share of sugar consumption in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALGER:

H. R. 3723. A bill for the relief of Freda H. Sullivan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. R. 3724. A bill for the relief of Meir Tinowitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 3725. A bill for the relief of Herman F. Gierke, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 3726. A bill for the relief of Mr. Gino Evangelista; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 3727. A bill for the relief of Luigia Reggio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3728. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hannah Mae Powell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 3729. A bill for the relief of Eustratios Vournazos and Marina Vournazos and Mary Vournazos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 3730. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleonore Blackburn (nee Brenner); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3731. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fusako Takai and Thomas Takai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 3732. A bill for the relief of Musaitif Mustafa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 3733. A bill for the relief of Charles A. Barron; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H. R. 3734. A bill for the relief of Azzam Issac Rafidi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 3735. A bill for the relief of Gertrud Babette Kraeutter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 3736. A bill for the relief of Georgette Charalambo Harrison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEEHAN:

H. R. 3737. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vasilike J. Daskalake; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 3738. A bill for the relief of Roy M. Hofheinz and wife (Irene); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 3739. A bill for the relief of Rev. George Kazaka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 3740. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kathryn Kraus Eble; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

84. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the city clerk, Wyandotte, Mich., requesting earnest and favorable consideration be given proposals for increasing compensation of postal workers, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Sale of Government-Owned Synthetic-Rubber Plants to Private Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1955

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, on January 24 there was submitted to this House and referred to the Armed Services Committee a report recommending sale of the Government-owned synthetic-rubber plants to private industry.

I have spoken on previous occasions of the legislation which we passed to authorize this sale. Today I would like to commend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission on an outstanding job.

Since we required them to operate under a very strict set of ground rules with respect to assuring free competition, obtaining full fair value, and guaranteeing the security interests of the United States, they were compelled literally to pioneer new fields. No previous disposal of Government property had ever been taken under such restrictive rules.

How well they did this job is reflected in the report now before us.

As for security, contracts for every facility contain clauses assuring the availability of that facility to the Nation's security needs for 10 years.

As to the fair value criterion, the recommendations point out that the synthetic-rubber program, including contract prices, cash on hand, and inventories to be disposed of, will return $401,565,000 to the United States Treasury. Of this amount, the recommended sales of the plants, miscellaneous equipment, and inventory accounts for $310,565,000.

Not all of the facilities are being sold. Because there were no bids on some facilities or because bids on another were too low, the Commission recommends placing in ready standby three facilities with a net book value as of April 30, 1955, of $18,557,000.

The unrecovered investment of the American people in the plants recommended for sale, plus the plants to be put in standby, plus operating losses for the wartime years, is placed by the Commission at $272,918,800. Recommended plant sales—even taking into account the plants earmarked for standby—represent 96.6 percent of the taxpayers' unrecovered investment.

Against the yardstick of any previous disposal of Government's property, this would certainly represent full fair value, in my opinion.

As regards the Commission's directive from the Congress to develop a disposal pattern shaped to foster a free and competitive industry, I would call attention to this phase of the report.

Rubber manufacturers who were successful bidders and have in their own requirements for rubber a captive market are required by contract to divert fixed percentages of their production to the free market to be available to small business.

In two instances, sales were made to nonrubber manufacturers who have no captive market. It is interesting to note that the several hundred rubber manufacturing companies which will have no interest in the facilities disposed of, purchased from the Government last year 127,000 long tons of general purpose synthetic rubber to meet their requirements in a year of high industrial activity.

The disposal recommendations create a pattern which would make 242,000 tons of total rubber available to the noncaptive market.

This would in effect put 2 pounds of supply in competition for every pound of market in the whole area of noncaptive rubber requirements. This will be a reassuring thing, I am sure, to the small consumer. It is evidence, moreover, of the earnest effort put forth by the Commission to satisfy the criterion of free competition which we laid down in the Disposal Act of 1953.

In this connection, I would like to call your attention to the following editorial from the Akron Beacon Journal of January 26, 1955, which I feel makes significant comment on the Commission's report:

GOING, GOING

Unless Congress disapproves within 60 days, 24 plants which comprise the bulk of the Government-owned synthetic rubber industry will be sold to private corporations for a total of $310,565,000.

Far from disapproving, Congress and the Nation as a whole ought to applaud this highly satisfactory conclusion of a history-making chapter of cooperation between the Government and private industry.

Of the billions upon billions of dollars which the United States had to spend to carry World War II to a successful conclusion, none produced a greater money's worth at the time nor has turned out to have a better "cash-in" value.

Creation of the plants early in the war was an industrial miracle, brought about by Government money and priorities and the rubber, chemical, and oil industry's technical knowledge. Without this source of rubber, every phase of our military and civilian activities would have been crippled and victory would have been long delayed.

In the years immediately following the war, the rubber-making facilities kept consumers—and that includes everyone in this country—from being gouged of hundreds of millions of dollars in inflated prices for natural rubber.

Ever since 1948, the Beacon Journal has been urging that the plants ought to be sold to private industry; that in peacetime the Government had no proper function as a manufacturer and that private competition might improve the product and lower the cost.

The Korean war postponed active steps toward disposal but in 1953 a Republican Congress set up a procedure for sale, based largely on a pattern set under a Democratic administration in 1948.

On July 25, 1953, we said:

"The surest way to carry the rubber disposal program on to a successful conclusion would be for the President to name to the Commission three men of such recognized integrity and sound judgment that no one would think of questioning their recommendations.

"This would be a Commission of comparable standing to the one which, in 1942, sized up the Nation's serious rubber shortage and made drastic recommendations for its solution."

President Eisenhower appointed Holman D. Pettibone, a Chicago banker, as Chairman; Leslie R. Rounds, a banker from New York and Maine, and Everett R. Cooke, a Memphis cotton broker. They, in turn, chose Eugene Holland, a Chicago industrialist, as executive director.

This group was not as well known as the Baruch-Conant-Compton Commission of 1942 but its performance has been equally as competent, hardheaded, and patriotic.

After surveying its responsibilities through a personal inspection of all the facilities,

the Commission carried on months of tough bargaining with potential buyers and has come up with bids that represent a return to the taxpayers of 96.6 of their total unrecovered investment.

No one but an out-and-out demogog could possibly call these proposed sales a giveaway.

No one but an out-and-out Socialist would argue that ownership of these facilities should remain in the hands of the Government.

Adequate safeguards have been provided to make sure that defense need will be fulfilled in case of war. The Attorney General has certified that the prospective distribution of ownership is such that no problem of monopoly is involved.

By all means, Congress ought to give its blessing to the sales as arranged by the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission.

Salary Increases for Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1955

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, many times in the past 2 years have I spoken to this body on the need to enact adequate legislation to increase the salaries of our postal workers.

During the last Congress, I had introduced a bill calling for an $800 per annum increase for postal workers, but, unfortunately, no action was taken on this measure. However, legislation granting somewhat smaller increases to postal and other Federal workers was approved by the House and the Senate and sent to President Eisenhower for signature. The President chose to veto the bill on August 23, 1954, after the adjournment of Congress when it was impossible for the Congress to take any additional action to override the veto.

Legislation has been introduced in in both the House and the Senate which will provide a 10-percent increase in the basic compensation of postal employees, with a minimum increase of $400 per annum, and I am introducing similar legislation in the House today, with the hope that this measure will be reported favorably by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

There has been a move afoot to tie in the salary increase with an increase in the postal rates. The one is not interdependent upon the other and to approve such tie-in legislation would be to establish a very poor precedent.

The last increase granted the postal employees was in 1951, and we are all well aware of the fact that the cost of living has increased considerably since that time. These employees have been desperately trying to catch up with the rapidly rising cost of living, but are far short of the goal and hard pressed to provide their families with even the bare necessities. The vast majority of postal workers have been forced to supplement their incomes by taking part-time employment elsewhere or having their wives work—a situation which is certainly far from ideal, particularly when there are children in the home.

The employees of the Post Office Department are hard working, loyal, and most deserving of our prompt and favorable consideration, and I respectfully urge each and every Member of the House to get behind this legislation to provide more adequate remuneration for those who have served us so faithfully and efficiently.

An Analysis of H. R. 864

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1955

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 864, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, introduced by Congressman VAN ZANDT, is designed to restore to Congress the final responsibility for any adjustments made in the tariff. To this end H. R. 864 would empower the Tariff Commission under stated conditions to increase or reduce or to establish rates of duty, or to impose, modify, or withdraw import quotas, subject only to congressional veto.

The stated aim of the bill is to establish imports on a fair competitive basis, first, by avoiding import injury to domestic producers; and, second, by providing means of reducing excessive rates to the peril point, that is, to the point below which import injury would occur. This might include complete removal of a duty.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 864 would give statutory standing to the rates now owing their existence to a trade-agreement concession. Therefore, there would be no increase in any rate of duty upon expiration of the existing trade agreements law. All existing trade agreements would remain in effect in accordance with their own terms until or unless expressly repealed.

The overall objective of this bill is to assure the largest volume of imports that may be absorbed by this country without causing import injury. It provides the machinery by which our tariff may be adjusted, item by item in individually investigated cases, to bring about such a maximum volume of trade.

The adjustment of any tariff rate could be initiated in a manner very similar to the present initiation of an escape-clause action. To date this has been confined to applicant industries that have alleged serious injury from imports. Under H. R. 864 producers who suffer injury from import competition could apply to the Tariff Commission for a tariff adjustment. The Commission would make an investigation, hold hearings, and—if convinced of the need for relief—would issue a tariff adjustment order consisting of a change in the tariff or a quota limitation or both.

The tariff adjustment order would then go to Congress where it would lie for a period of 60 days. If the order were not voted down by either House during that period, it would go into effect.

Export or import interests who feel that a particular rate of duty is too high could likewise apply to the Tariff Commission under the same procedure. If the Commission found the rate to be too high, it would issue an order reducing it to the peril point. From there the procedure would be the same.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress, through the provisions of this bill, would lay down guides to the Tariff Commission for its use in judging whether import injury or lack of fair import competition exists. Eleven points of evidence of injury are set forth as a guide.

While the executive branch would no longer have the final word in a tariff adjustment, the bill, nevertheless, provides that the Department of State might, if it so desired, send to Congress a statement setting forth its views on any tariff adjustment order. The National Security Council would likewise be given a voice in the determination of cases to the extent of having a representative sit with the Tariff Commission during hearings.

Mr. Speaker, the system proposed by H. R. 864 would not lead to any general increase or reduction of the tariff. Rate changes would be made or quotas would only be imposed or modified after investigation of individual cases. If an existing rate were satisfactory or no application were made to have it modified, there would be no modification. Thus, only a limited number of rates would be changed—increased or reduced—per year. The Tariff Commission would be given 9 months to conclude any 1 investigation.

There is no similarity in this procedure to—or remote connection with—the old system of logrolling when Congress itself wrote the rates. The principal difference between this method of changing the tariff and the present system lies in changing the final authority in a tariff modification from the executive to the legislative branch. Also, the tariff would no longer be used as an instrument of diplomacy by the State Department or as a means of bargaining for concessions from other countries.

The Tragedy of Yalta Should Be Repudiated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, today, February 7, 1955, marks an anniversary in history. Not a glorious anniversary day for celebration and rejoicing, for honor and commemoration, but the anniversary of an event which has cast a shadow across the bright unsullied shield of the United States itself.

Today, February 7, is the 10th anniversary of the "Big Three" meeting at Yalta which led to the now infamous Yalta agreement.

This was an agreement reached by Stalin, Churchill, and Roosevelt. It was an agreement entered into by Franklin Delano Roosevelt as a great career was fast drawing to its close. Ill, worn by the terrible responsibility of the war years, forced to look to those he trusted for the facts upon which to base his momentous decision, with a scant 60-odd days of life remaining, Roosevelt in the eyes of history made a tragic mistake in entering into the Yalta agreement.

The United States was just emerging triumphant in victory in the last months of World War II. By force of arms and sacrifice, at the cost of the youth of our Nation, a war was won. At Yalta in a few ill-fated hours, the victory and the peace were irrevocably lost.

A decade of uneasy peace, hot and cold war, record spending and debt which has placed a yoke of high taxes, military conscription, and depleted value of currency upon the American people has emerged as the result of the Yalta agreement.

Through the door opened at Yalta, Russian imperialistic expansion has reached the proportions of a menace to all freedom-loving nations of the world.

During the last decade China has been lost to the Reds. Poland was abandoned to Soviet domination. The Iron Curtain was forged shutting off millions from the freedom they had cherished and fought for. Korea brought a futile war where for the first time in the history of the United States victory was not the objective. Indochina fell.

And today only the 11th hour decision of our great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, to stand firm in the Far East to stem the Communist aggression of Red China, and the instant backing of his policy by the Congress, has momentarily stemmed the Red tide.

The Yalta agreement was indeed the opening of a modern Pandora's box which has brought and is still bringing tragedy to the free world.

But we can be grateful for one thing. The Yalta agreement was never given the force of a treaty. It was referred to the Senate but it was never ratified, and thus is not legally binding upon the United States.

And its complete repudiation should be effected by the Congress and the Executive to eliminate all doubt as to the position of the United States on this agreement.

To fully realize the infamy of the Yalta agreement, perhaps the best example for examination is the tragic plight of Poland, a nation which throughout its history has championed the cause of individual freedom and religious tolerance, two of the most cherished ideals of our own Nation and fundamental to our American philosophy.

The Poles have fought courageously and tirelessly in the face of insurmountable odds to restore freedom to Poland during their darkest hours of enslavement. During the black years of partition, Polish legionnaires fought with French troops in the hope that a Napoleonic victory would bring liberation to Poland. Seventy thousand of them marched with Napoleon's Grand Army into Russia, and the battlefields of Europe heard the song of the Polish legions:

> Poland has not perished wholly
> While we live to own her.

This song is echoed in the hearts of Poles wherever they may be found in the world today.

Parliamentary procedure existed in Poland dating from 1454, and as early as 1505 Poland gave its citizens the greatest guaranty of personal freedom and independence. It was a nation where religious wars never took place in spite of the deep religious conviction of its people.

As an example of Polish tolerance, these were the words of Chancellor Zamoyski, who served the Polish people during the reign of Stephen Batory. Referring to Poles who had strayed from the church, he said:

> I would give half my life if those who have abandoned the church should voluntarily return to its fold; but I would rather give all my life than suffer anybody to be constrained to do it, for I would rather die than witness such oppression.

Poland regained its independence as a nation at the end of World War I as a result of the Allied victory. The work of restoration of the Republic was monumental, but great strides were made and a nation described as "by the whole of the people for the whole of the people" emerged.

It is, indeed, a tragedy that the Allied victory in World War II and the resultant Yalta agreement destroyed Polish hopes of freedom and independence.

Poland enjoyed a scant 20 years of liberation before the German invasion, and now Poles in all parts of the world as well as in the Polish homeland pray for independence for their nation, which was denied at Yalta.

It is high time the Congress of the United States takes official action to repudiate the Yalta agreement which has brought so many millions under the Communist domination of Soviet Russia, and on this 10th anniversary of the Yalta agreement I sincerely urge that this action be taken without further delay.

Administration Health Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1955

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced the administration's health bill, H. R. 3720. It is an omnibus bill that has six titles. These separate titles provide the necessary legislation to make effective the several recommendations made by President Eisenhower in his health message addressed to Congress.

The enactment of the legislation would go far in providing improved health facilities for our people. It deserves the favorable consideration of the Congress.

The following is a summary of the several titles of the bill as they deal with separate features of the legislation:

SUMMARY OF TITLE I—HEALTH SERVICES PREPAYMENT PLANS

IN GENERAL

As a partial attack on the problem of making needed health services and facilities available to the maximum number of people on a prepayment basis, this title of the bill would authorize a two-pronged program within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, namely (a) technical advisory and informational services, without charge, to health services prepayment plans, and (b) reinsurance for health services prepayment plans established and operated by commercial insurance carriers or by nonprofit carriers.

ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

1. The bill would vest all responsibility for the administration of the program in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. (Under existing law, the Secretary could delegate all or any part of this function and either place it in an existing major unit within the Department or place it in a new unit.)

2. The bill would provide for a national advisory council on health services prepayment plans consisting of 12 members appointed by the President, one of whom would be designated by the President as chairman. The council would advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Secretary on matters of policy relating to the Secretary's activities and functions under this title of the bill.

3. In addition to authorizing, in general terms, utilization of other Federal agencies, or of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution, the bill would provide for maximum utilization by the Secretary of the various State insurance departments (or other State agencies supervising carriers of health services prepayment plans), especially in determining compliance with requirements and standards prescribed by the Secretary as a condition of approval of a health services prepayment plan for reinsurance. Final responsibility for such determinations would, of course, rest with the Secretary.

4. Regulations under this title of the bill could not authorize any Federal officer or employee to exercise any supervision or regulatory control over any participating carrier, or over any hospital or other health facility or personnel furnishing personal health services covered by a participating prepayment plan.

TECHNICAL AND ADVISORY SERVICES

Under this part of the program, the Secretary would be authorized to conduct studies and collect information on the organizational, actuarial, and other problems of health services prepayment plans, make the results of such studies and the information so collected generally available, and provide to sponsors of such plans, without charge, organizational and other technical advice and information, including information on morbidity and organizational methods.

For this part of the program a separate appropriation would be authorized.

REINSURANCE PROGRAM

1. Four types of plans would be eligible for reinsurance under title I of the bill.

(a) Plans for average and lower income families: These are plans designed primarily to provide reasonable coverage for families of

average or lower income, and which meet certain requirements set forth in the bill. These requirements are—

(1) For service type plans, provision of—

(i) Seventy or more days hospitalization per year;

(ii) in-hospital surgical and other medical care;

(iii) home and office physician care.

(2) For indemnity-type plans—

(i) not more than 15 percent coinsurance for hospital care, 25 percent for physician care, and 25 percent for other care and services included in the plan;

(ii) maximum deductible of $100 per illness per beneficiary or $150 per year per beneficiary or family and maximum liability of at least $750 per illness per beneficiary, or $1,000 per year per beneficiary or family.

(3) For both types of plans—

(i) no illness exclusions (except for certain specified illnesses, such as tuberculosis, etc.);

(ii) maximum age of at least 70 years and automatic renewal on reasonable terms after 5 years;

(iii) conversion of group policies on reasonable terms;

(iv) compliance with other requirements in regulations.

(b) Major medical expense plans: These are plans designed to provide protection against the exceptionally high costs of medical and hospital care per illness per beneficiary, which meet certain specified conditions. These are: Not more than 25 percent coinsurance (with respect to the personal health services specified in the plan), coverage of all illnesses (except for certain specified ones), conversion of group policies on reasonable terms, and other requirements in regulations.

(c) Plans for rural area families: Plans designed primarily for rural area families which comply with requirements in regulations.

(d) Other plans: Other plans which will carry out the purposes of this title of the bill and which comply with requirements in regulations.

The Secretary would also be authorized, as a condition of granting reinsurance, to establish by regulation terms, conditions, and requirements as to the other types and kinds of prepayment plans which will be reinsured, coinsurance, deductible amounts, etc.

2. This program is designed to be self-sustaining, over a reasonable term, through reinsurance premiums paid into a revolving reinsurance fund. An appropriation of not to exceed $100 million to a capital-advance account in the Treasury would be authorized, which would be available, without fiscal-year limitation, as a line of credit for advances of working capital to the reinsurance fund. When and as the condition of the fund permits, such advances would be repayable to the capital-advance account and the amount so repaid would again be available for future advances to the fund if needed. Until repayment, interest on the outstanding balance of advances to the fund would be payable to the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

3. Reinsurance premiums would, pursuant to regulation, be fixed by the Secretary at rates determined with a view to achieving the objectives of the program and fiscal self-sufficiency over a reasonable term. Such premiums could, and probably would, be fixed separately for each plan (for the initial reinsurance term, and thereafter again for each renewal term).

4. Reinsurance liabilities under the program would be limited to and paid from the fund, except that the Secretary could set up separate reinsurance accounts within the fund, in which event liability would be limited to the account to which a plan is allocated. It would be possible, under this provision, to establish, for example, special reinsurance accounts for each of the types of plans eligible for reinsurance as described above in paragraph 1, for classes of carriers, or for members of a group of affiliated or associated carriers.

5. The fund would be invested in Federal, or federally guaranteed, interest-bearing securities.

6. Authority to write reinsurance in a given field would be subject to a standby or no-competition provision. That is to say, the Secretary could reinsure plans of a given kind or type only if, in the Secretary's judgment, reinsurance for such plans, on terms and conditions, and at premium rates, comparable to those offered under this title of the bill, is not available from private sources to an extent adequate to promote the purposes of the program. By implication, the Secretary would have to stop writing reinsurance when such a finding could no longer be made.

7. Reinsurance for a plan could not be granted unless (a) the applicant carrier is operating and proposes to operate according to law, (b) there is no reason to believe that the carrier is financially unsound or that it operates in an unsafe manner, (c) the reinsurance of the plan will promote the purposes of the program, (d) the carrier agrees to submit such reports concerning its operations under the reinsured plan as the Secretary may from time to time reasonably require, (e) the carrier has agreed to the reinsurance premium rate fixed by the Secretary for the plan, and (f) the plan, the policies or contracts thereunder, and proposed method of operation comply with the terms and conditions prescribed for reinsurance. Certification by the State insurance department (or corresponding supervisory agency) of the carrier's home State as to whether there is reason to believe the carrier is financially unsound or unsafe, as determined in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary, could be accepted by the Secretary as conclusive. As to utilization of State agencies with respect to (f), see paragraph 8.

8. As a condition of granting reinsurance, the Secretary could, among other things, specify (a) minimum benefits; (b) safeguards against undue exclusions of preexisting conditions or of specific illnesses, or against other undue exclusions or limitations; (c) standards for deductible and coinsurance provisions, limits of maximum liability, waiting periods for benefits, and other such policy provisions; (d) standards for the duration, cancellability, and renewability of such policies or contracts; and (e) standards for plan provisions with respect to costs and charges of providers of personal health services payable by the carrier, to the extent such standards are necessary to protect the fund against abuses or arbitrary cost increases. The Secretary would be precluded from reinsuring any plan for which the carrier's premium rates are such as to make the plan financially unsound, or any plan with respect to which the carrier's breakdown of its single-premium rate, as between reinsured and nonreinsured types of benefit costs, is unreasonable, or any plan reinsurance of which would not promote the purposes of this title of the bill, but in other respects the Secretary would be precluded from setting any standards for the carrier's premium rates. The State insurance department or corresponding State agency of a carrier's home State (as defined) would, if willing, be utilized to certify to the Secretary whether the plan complies with the terms and conditions stipulated as a condition of granting reinsurance.

9. The Secretary could not approve for reinsurance any plan for direct provision of medical or dental services by the carrier through a salaried staff of physicians, surgeons, or dentists in the employ of such carrier, unless the carrier has an organizational structure vesting control over the practice of medicine or dentistry solely in duly licensed members of the professions involved.

10. The liability of the reinsurance fund with respect to a reinsured plan would be fixed and limited as follows:

(a) *The reinsurance base*

The fund would not underwrite all of the carrier's annual benefit costs under the plan. Rather, the reinsured portion of such costs would be limited to the excess, if any, of

(1) aggregate annual incurred benefit costs under the plan, over

(2) the difference between (i) gross annual earned premium income and (ii) a portion of such income called the "administrative-expense allowance."

The administrative-expense allowance applicable to a given year for a reinsured plan would be determined by multiplying the gross earned premium income for the year by seven-eighths of the carrier's pre-estimated (and thus predetermined, prior to the commencement of the reinsurance term into which the year falls) ratio of its annual administrative expenses under the plan [1] to its annual earned premium income under the plan.

Thus, before reinsurance would begin to apply, the carrier would in effect have to absorb fully out of its premium income, as benefit costs, (1) the anticipated portion of premium income normally devoted to benefit costs for such a plan, (2) the portion anticipated as available for profits (in the case of a carrier organized for profit) and for contingencies, and (3) one-eighth of the portion of premium income anticipated as administrative expenses. However, there is one variation of the foregoing for rural-area plans. Instead of absorbing one-eighth of the anticipated administrative expenses, the carrier could at its option absorb 2 percent of its anticipated premium income if this would result in reinsurance of a larger portion of its benefit costs.

Procedurally, the ratio of administrative expenses to earned premium income of the carrier under the plan would be estimated by the carrier, and that estimate would be submitted, with supporting data, with the application for initial reinsurance or renewal of reinsurance. In order to prevent distortion, the Secretary could require the submission of an average ratio based on a period not in excess of 3 years. The carrier's estimate would have to be approved by the Secretary unless considered to be unreasonable or not in good faith.

For plans operated to a substantial extent on the basis of personal health services to be furnished by the carrier directly through its own staff or indirectly through the staff of an affiliate, or on the basis of payments made by the carrier to a provider of personal health services which is an affiliate of the carrier, the above formula would not apply, but the Secretary would, by regulation, prescribe a formula calculated to achieve for such plans reinsurance protection reasonably comparable in scope and extent to that provided for other types, taking into account their inherent differences.

(b) *Coinsurance*

The liability of the fund would be limited to 75 percent of the carrier's reinsured

[1] As here used, the term "administrative expenses" is intended to include all of the carrier's expenses and charges incurred under the plan, except the benefit costs and except any provision for contingencies, profits, dividends, and refunds. The Secretary would be authorized to define "administrative expenses" for such purposes more particularly.

cost so arrived at. This is an adoption, for this purpose, of the principle of coinsurance.

11. The reinsurance term would be stipulated for a given (regular) period, e. g., a year, in the reinsurance certificate, but the Secretary could, by or pursuant to regulation, provide for letting the reinsurance term extend beyond such regular period with respect to policies or subscriber contracts issued during such period and running beyond it. Also authorized pursuant to regulations would be the combination of a carrier's experience under two or more reinsured plans during the same term. In addition, regulations could provide for the extent to which experience during a term will be combined with experience during extensions thereof and the extent to which policies issued during, but running beyond, the reinsurance term will be treated as though issued in a subsequent term.

12. Reinsurance for a plan could be terminated by the Secretary on any ground specified in regulations in effect not less than 90 days in advance of the commencement of the current initial or renewal term of such reinsurance. However, reinsurance with respect to policies or subscriber contracts in effect on the effective date of such termination would remain in force until the normal expiration of the term.

MISCELLANEOUS

1. The bill would confer broad powers on the Secretary with respect to enforcement or settlement of claims, and would authorize the Secretary to hold hearings, etc., in connection with investigations under the program.

2. Criminal penalties would be imposed, not only for falsely advertising or representing that a carrier is reinsured or has applied for reinsurance but, regardless of the truth or falsity of the representation, also if the representation is not authorized by, or fails to conform to, regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

3. The effective date would be the 30th day following enactment, but in view of the necessity for a preparatory period the Secretary would not be required to receive or consider applications for reinsurance before a date determined by the Secretary.

SUMMARY OF TITLE II—MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF HEALTH FACILITIES

IN GENERAL

In order to facilitate further the financing and development of needed facilities, the bill would authorize the establishment, within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, of a program of mortgage insurance to stimulate, on a self-sustaining basis, a continuing flow of private credit to finance the construction, expansion, modernization, and conversion of privately owned and operated health facilities. It would also remove certain restrictions on certain federally regulated lending institutions with respect to their investments in loans on real property in the case of such federally insured mortgages, and the existence of the program would encourage the removal of similar restrictions imposed on such loans under State law.

ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

1. The bill would vest responsibility for the administration of the program in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Under existing law the Secretary could delegate all or any part of this function and either place it in an existing major unit within the Department or place it in a new unit. In addition, the bill carries express authority to utilize, by delegation or otherwise, the services and facilities of any other Federal agency by agreement with the head of the agency.

2. The bill would authorize the Secretary to consult with and otherwise use the services of existing advisory councils, to appoint new members to serve with such councils for purposes of this program, or to establish additional advisory groups as deemed necessary.

3. Except as otherwise specifically provided, no Federal officer or employee would be authorized to exercise any supervision or control over the administration, personnel, or operation of any privately owned and operated health facility. The bill also expressly precludes any possibility of its being interpreted as authorizing any association or corporation to engage in the practice of healing or medicine as defined by State law, or as conferring on any person the right to exercise any control over any individual's personal right to select his own hospital, physician, or group of physicians.

FINANCING OF THE PROGRAM

1. The health facilities mortgage insurance program is designed as a self-sustaining business-type financial operation. Premiums for insurance of the principal of eligible mortgages would be paid into a revolving fund, to be known as the health facilities mortgage insurance fund, which would be used for carrying out the program. An initial appropriation of $10 million, and such additional sums thereafter as necessary, would be authorized for the purpose of establishing a separate working-capital account from which needed capital would be transferred to the health facilities mortgage insurance fund by the Secretary. Such capital advances would be repayable to the working-capital account as the condition of the insurance fund permits, beginning not later than July 1, 1965, and would then be available for future advances to the fund on like terms. (Interest would accrue to the Treasury on such capital advances, and would be payable annually as and when sufficient reserves, etc., have been built up in the insurance fund.) Should additional funds be required to meet liabilities incurred under insurance contracts of the program, such funds could be obtained by the sale of notes or other interest-bearing obligations to the Treasury, which would become liabilities of the insurance fund and be redeemable out of income and other assets of the fund. This line of credit has a limit of $25 million or, if greater, 75 percent of the outstanding total insurance under the program.

2. The aggregate authorized insurance outstanding at any one time would be limited to $200 million. This program ceiling could be raised by the President up to an aggregate increase of $150 million, if he determined that such increases were in the public interest.

3. The Secretary would be authorized to fix premium charges at rates adequate to cover expenses and reserves but not in excess of 1 percent of the outstanding principal obligation of insured mortgages. Reasonable charges for appraisal and inspection would also be authorized.

ELIGIBILITY FOR MORTGAGE LOAN INSURANCE

1. Mortgages would be eligible for insurance if made to secure loans to finance health facilities conforming to standards of construction and equipment satisfactory to the Secretary and to all applicable requirements of State law. The mortgagor would also be required, as a condition of eligibility, to give satisfactory assurance that operation and maintenance of the completed facility would be in compliance with applicable requirements of State law. No mortgagor would be eligible who was not the owner and operator, or prospective operator, of the facility and who could not satisfy the Secretary as to his responsibility and ability to repay. However, employers and nonprofit organizations (as defined) would be considered "operators" for purposes of this program if they owned the facility and had made contractual arrangements with providers of health services to use the facility primarily for furnishing services in the facility for such owner's employees, subscribers, or members, or their dependents, under a plan of such employer or organization, though use of the facility would not necessarily be restricted to such employees, subscribers, members, or dependents. No mortgagee would be eligible unless approved by the Secretary as responsible and able to service the mortgage properly.

2. The mortgage insurance program would assist in financing the new construction, or expansion, modernization, and so forth, of a wide variety of health facilities, including hospitals, diagnostic or treatment centers, nursing homes licensed by the States, and rehabilitation centers. It would not be available to finance facilities devoted primarily to domiciliary care. The loan secured by the insured mortgage could include costs of construction, initial equipment, and site acquisition, and, in the case of expansion, remodeling, or conversion of an existing building, it could include the cost of acquiring the existing building and site or of refinancing an existing indebtedness thereon.

3. Mortgage insurance would be authorized for mortgages securing loans in amounts not in excess of 80 percent of the estimated value (upon completion) of the property (including the land), for terms not in excess of 30 years. This maximum percentage could be lowered by regulation, either for particular classes or types of facilities or otherwise. As a condition of insurance the mortgagor would be required to agree to repay forthwith any amount by which the mortgage loan exceeded 80 percent of the actual cost (as defined). (In determining such estimated value or such "actual cost," the Secretary would be required to deduct the amount of any Federal grant, such as a grant under the hospital survey and construction program, to which the sponsor is entitled for the project.)

4. The Secretary would be authorized to prescribe by regulation the form and content of applications to be made by the mortgagee and other terms and conditions for the insurance of eligible mortgages and would be required to find in each case, as a condition of insurance, that the project was economically sound and that the health facility would be operated on a basis that provided a reasonable prospect of continuing and adequate sources of revenue to pay the secured obligation. (In passing on the question of economic soundness in the case of a hospital project, the Secretary would be required to take into account available information as to existing hospital facilities, population-bed ratios, and bed-utilization rates in the area to be served, other programed hospital construction which would affect utilization of the projected facility, and similar relevant matters.) Each mortgage would be required, among other things, to contain an undertaking that, except as authorized by the Secretary and the mortgagee, the property would be used as a health facility during the life of the mortgage or until the contract of insurance had been otherwise terminated.

INSURANCE CONTRACT AND INSURANCE BENEFITS

1. The insurancy fund would be primarily liable under mortgage insurance contracts. The Government's obligation under the contract of insurance would be to pay in cash to the mortgagee, upon 30 days' default of the mortgagor, 95 percent of the value of the mortgage (defined as unpaid principal, plus certain charges and expenses for taxes, insurance, etc.) with 3-percent interest from the date of default. As a condition of this payment the mortgagee would either assign the mortgage to the Secretary or, through foreclosure or otherwise, convey to the Secretary title to the mortgaged property, but in the event of mere assignment of the mortgage to the Secretary, which would relieve the mortgagee of foreclosure costs, etc., 1 percent of the unpaid principal of the mortgage would be deducted from the insurance payment.

2. In addition to the payment in cash of an amount equal to 95 percent of the value of the mortgage, the Secretary would also issue to the mortgagee a certificate of claim for the difference between the amount of the cash payment and the amount the mortgagee would have received if the mortgagor had paid all his obligations in full under the mortgage, plus an allowance for the mortgagee's expenses where the mortgagee had foreclosed the mortgage or otherwise acquired title for the Secretary. The certificate of claim would bear 3-percent interest but would be payable only out of the proceeds of the property after the fund had been made whole for all payments and expenses incurred under the mortgage insurance transaction.

3. The bill provides for adjustment of premium charges in case the principal obligation of an insured mortgage is paid in full prior to maturity, and for termination of the insurance contract in the event the mortgagee, after 30 days' default of the mortgagor, fails to assign the mortgage, or to have title delivered to the Secretary, as required under the bill in such cases and elects not to claim the insurance after default of the mortgagor. In addition the Secretary would be authorized to require the mortgagee to accelerate the debt on breach of covenant or other undertaking contained in the mortgage, if that course should be found to be necessary for the protection of the insurance fund or required by the purposes of the program.

MISCELLANEOUS

1. The Secretary would be given broad powers to sue and be sued, compromise claims, acquire, manage, and convey property in carrying out the program, and generally to exercise all the rights of a mortgagee with respect to mortgages and the rights of an owner with respect to property acquired in the administration of the mortgage insurance program. In order to facilitate the sale of mortgages acquired by the Secretary or executed in connection with the sale of property which had been acquired by the Secretary, the insurance of such mortgages would be authorized without regard to the limitations with respect to eligibility for mortgage insurance otherwise applicable.

2. The bill would authorize the collection and distribution of information and statistics pertaining to the insurance of mortgages.

3. Insured mortgages would be exempted from certain investment and other restrictions under Federal laws, as is the case with mortgages insured under the National Housing Act.

4. Criminal penalties are provided for in the bill for fraud or forgery in connection with transactions under the mortgage insurance program.

5. The effective date of this program would be October 1, 1955.

SUMMARY OF TITLE III—PRACTICAL NURSE TRAINING

Title III of the bill authorizes a 5-year program in the Office of Education for the extension and improvement of practical nurse training through grants to State vocational education agencies for the training of practical nurses.

GENERAL

Vocational education grants to States for the 5-year period beginning July 1, 1955, for extension and improvement of practical nurse training of less than college grade would be authorized. The program would be applicable to all States, including Alaska, Hawaii, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZATION

Two million dollars would be authorized for fiscal 1956, $3 million for fiscal 1957, and $4 million each for fiscal 1958, 1959, and 1960.

ALLOTMENTS

Allotments to the States would be based on relative State population, but with a minimum to each State of $7,500 per fiscal year ($3,750 in case of the Virgin Islands).

MATCHING

The Federal share of approved projects for extension and improvement of practical nurse training would be 75 percent for the first 2 fiscal years, and 50 percent for last 3 fiscal years.

STATE PLANS

The States would have to submit plans—

1. Designating the State board (the State board of vocational education or the State board primarily responsible for supervision of elementary and secondary education) as the sole agency for administration of the plan, or for supervision of administration by local educational agencies, with a registered professional nurse in charge of or available for consultation to the State board.

2. Showing the plans, policies, and methods to be followed under the plan and providing such fiscal procedures, etc., as are necessary for efficient administration.

3. Containing minimum qualifications for teachers, teacher-trainers, supervisors, and directors.

4. Providing for reports to the Commissioner of Education as necessary.

WITHHOLDING OF FUNDS

The Commissioner may withhold payments, after notice and hearing to the State board, for failure to comply with requirements applicable to State plans. A State may appeal to Circuit Court of Appeals and then to United States Supreme Court if dissatisfied with the withholding of funds.

ADMINISTRATION

This title of the bill would be administered by the Commissioner of Education. The Commissioner would (a) make relevant studies, investigations, and reports, (b) render technical assistance to States, and (c) disseminate pertinent information. He would also be authorized to make rules and regulations and to delegate his powers and duties, other than rule-making, within the Office of Education.

EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS

Nothing in this title would affect the availability of amounts paid to States under the Smith-Hughes Act (39 Stat. 929), as amended and extended, or the George-Barden Act (60 Stat. 775), as amended and extended, for practical nurse training.

SUMMARY OF TITLE IV—GRADUATE TRAINING OF PROFESSIONAL NURSES AND OTHER PROFESSIONAL HEALTH PERSONNEL

Title IV of the bill authorizes a revised program of traineeships in graduate nursing and in public-health specialties.

This title of the bill adds a new section 305 to the Public Health Service Act authorizing the Surgeon General to establish and maintain two broad categories of traineeships in the service and elsewhere. There would be traineeships for graduate or specialized training in public health for doctors, engineers, nurses, and other professional health personnel; also authorized would be traineeships for training professional nurses for teaching or for administrative or supervisory duties in the various fields of nursing.

This new section of the Public Health Service Act also authorizes the provision of the traineeships through grants to public and nonprofit institutions. The traineeships would include stipends and allowances in amounts to be determined administratively.

SUMMARY OF TITLE V—PUBLIC HEALTH

This title of the bill would, effective July 1, 1955, replace the present separate authorizations for public-health grants under section 314 of the Public Health Service Act, including the separate authorizations for control of particular diseases, with an authorization for grants for support of public-health services generally and for extension and improvement of such services and grants for special projects.

GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC-HEALTH SERVICES

Allotments and payments for public-health services

Allotments and payments under the revised section 314 of the Public Health Service Act for general support grants would be made as follows:

1. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, each State would be allotted an amount equal to its allotment under section 314 for the current fiscal year (ending June 30, 1955), including its current allotment for cancer grants but excluding its current allotment for mental-health grants.

2. The remainder, after allotment according to paragraph (1), of the appropriations for the fiscal years 1956 and 1957, and all sums appropriated in succeeding fiscal years would be allotted in accordance with regulations on the basis of (A) population, (B) extent of particular health problems, and (C) relative financial need of the States.

3. Payments from the State's allotment, except from sums set aside under subsection (c) for extension and improvement grants, would be made in accordance with the Federal share (established for each State, as described below, on the basis of relative per capita income) of the cost of public health services under the State plan, the cost of training personnel for State and local public health work and the cost of administering the State plan.

Extension and improvement grants

The Surgeon General would be authorized to establish a percentage, not in excess of 20 percent, to be set aside from the allotments to the States for public health services. The percentage would be uniform for all States. The percentage of the allotments so earmarked could be used only for approved projects for extension and improvement of public-health services, which are included in the State plan. Payments for any 1 such project could be made for 4 years only. Payments would equal 75 percent of the cost of the project for the first 2 years, and thereafter could meet not more than 50 percent of project costs, including costs for administration and training of personnel for State and local public-health work.

State plans

The Surgeon General would be required to approve any State plan which meets the requirements prescribed by regulation. Separate State plans for mental health would have to be submitted in States with a separate State mental health authority.

Regulations

As under existing law, all regulations with respect to grants to States under the new section 314 could be made only after consultation with a conference of State health authorities, including State mental health authorities when grants for work in the mental health field are concerned, and with their concurrence insofar as practicable.

Withholding of grants

As under existing law, notice and hearing to the State authority is required prior to the discontinuance of grants for noncompliance with the requirements applicable to the State plan.

Such withholding would apply to the State's allotments for public health services, including extension and improvement thereof, and including its allotments under the new section 315 for mental health services, or the withholding could apply only to a particular project or portion of the State plan affected by the State's failure if the

Surgeon General deemed such action appropriate.

Judicial review would be authorized for any State dissatisfied with the Surgeon General's action withholding its allotments.

The Federal share

The Federal share establishes the portion of the cost of public health services which may be paid from grants under the new section 314 (not earmarked for extension and improvement projects). It is defined as a percentage which equals 100 percent minus the percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 percent as the per capita income of the State bears to the per capita income of the continental United States (excluding Alaska). However, the Federal share could not exceed a maximum of 66⅔ percent nor could it be less than 33⅓ percent; and the Federal share would be fixed at 50 percent for Hawaii and Alaska, and at 66⅔ percent for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Method of computation and payment of grants

Payments of amounts from the State allotments (including the portion for extension and improvement projects) would be based on estimates made on the basis of records and information furnished by the State and any other necessary investigation with subsequent adjustment to correct any errors in estimates. Payments would be made in such installments as the Surgeon General might determine.

In case an officer or employee of the Public Health Service is detailed to a State, or to a political subdivision, or public or nonprofit organization or agency in the State, for the convenience and at the request of the State, the Surgeon General would be authorized, when so requested by the State health authority, to reduce any payment to the State by the amount of the pay, allowances, traveling expenses, and other costs related to the detail of such officer or employee. The amount of that reduction would then be available for payment by the Surgeon General of the costs of the detail.

Technical assistance and detail of personnel

The Surgeon General would also be authorized, in order to assist further in the extension and improvement of public health services, to train personnel for State and local public health work, to detail personnel to Guam and American Samoa, and to extend training investigation, demonstration, and consultative services to Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Combination of allotments

The new section 314 also authorizes the Surgeon General, at the request of a State, to combine a portion of its allotment for public health services, or extension and improvement projects, with that of another State for purposes of supporting a particular and clearly defined public health service, or a project, undertaken by another State.

GRANTS FOR SPECIAL PROJECTS

Section 502 of the draft bill would amend section 303 of the Public Health Service Act (which now relates to mental health) by replacing it with a new section.

The new section 303 would authorize appropriations, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, to enable the Surgeon General to make two types of project grants: (1) grants to States (or with the approval of the State authorities, to interstate agencies or political subdivisions) for part of the cost of public health services having importance for the solution of public health problems which are emergent or acute in specific geographical areas or are common to several States, or problems for which the Federal Government has a special responsibility; and (2) grants to State and local agencies, universities, laboratories, and to individuals for investigations, experiments, demonstrations, studies, and research projects which have been recommended by the National Advisory Health Council.

For purposes of this section, Guam would be deemed a State.

SUMMARY OF TITLE VI—MENTAL HEALTH

Title VI of the bill would authorize a separate grant program for mental health for the 5-year period beginning July 1, 1955, consisting of grants for public health services in the field of mental health, comparable to the grants authorized by title V for public health services in general. It would also authorize special project grants for specific problems related to the improvement of care, treatment, or rehabilitation of the mentally ill and improvement in the administration of institutions providing care for such persons.

GRANTS TO STATES FOR MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Section 601 of the bill would amend the Public Health Service Act by redesignating present section 315 as 316 and inserting a new section 315.

The new section 315 would authorize, in addition to the sums appropriated under the new section 314, which are also available for mental public health programs, additional appropriations for a 5-year period, beginning with the fiscal year 1956, to be available specifically for public health services in the field of mental health.

Allotments from these appropriations to the States would be made in accordance with regulations, on the basis of population, extent of mental health problems, and financial need.

The provisions on payments from the State allotments are the same as under section 314 (as amended by title V of the bill); and the provisions of that section on regulations, methods of payment, and combination of allotments of States would be applicable here also.

GRANTS FOR SPECIAL PROJECTS IN MENTAL HEALTH

Section 602 of the bill would amend the Public Health Service Act to add a new section 304.

The new section 304 would authorize annual appropriations for a 5-year period, beginning with the fiscal year 1956, to enable the Surgeon General to make project grants in the mental-health field similar to the grants authorized in section 303 (a) (2) for public health in general. The special projects in mental health authorized under this section would be directed particularly toward improved methods of care and treatment of the mentally ill and improved methods of operation and administration for institutions providing such care and treatment. Grants could be made to individuals and to public and private agencies, including the State agencies responsible for administration of State institutions for care and treatment of the mentally ill. Grants could be made only upon recommendation of the National Advisory Mental Health Council.

For purposes of this section, Guam would be deemed to be a State.

TRAINEESHIPS IN MENTAL HEALTH

Section 603 would amend the Public Health Service Act by adding a new section 306.

The new section 306 would make clear that the general authority of the Surgeon General (sec. 433 of the Public Health Service Act) to establish and maintain traineeships in fields of diseases in which an institute has been established in the Public Health Service applies in the field of mental health.

Granahan Says Showdown on Delaware River Project Will Come in Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1955

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith a statement I have made in support of legislation I introduced making an appropriation for the prosecution of the Delaware River Channel deepening project:

GRANAHAN SAYS SHOWDOWN ON DELAWARE RIVER PROJECT WILL COME IN APPROPRIATION BILL

Congressman WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, Democrat, of Philadelphia, said today the showdown on the Delaware River Channel project from Philadelphia to Trenton "will probably have to come in the appropriation bill if present efforts to persuade the President to change his mind do not succeed."

GRANAHAN introduced a bill today to provide for a $25 million Federal appropriation in the coming fiscal year to begin work on the $90 million project. President Eisenhower's budget for the 1956 fiscal year had called for only a $6 million appropriation contingent on local industrial interests (United States Steel Corp.) providing $18 million toward the project before any Federal funds are made available.

"The series of conferences we have been holding in devising strategy to try to get the President to change his mind and allow this project to go forward—as Congress said it should—without the $18 million local contribution, may be effective, and should certainly be pushed full-speed ahead. Governor Leader, Governor Meyner, and Governor Boggs are all making a fine contribution to this goal.

"But unless the President changes his mind, we will have to get this thing accomplished in the same way we pushed through the enabling legislation last year—that is, by convincing the Congress of the dangerous precedent which would be set if the administration's position were allowed to prevail.

"That is why I am cosponsoring a special appropriation bill to get this matter formally before the House Appropriations Committee when the civil functions appropriation bill is called up for hearings.

"We must not only convince the Appropriations Committee of the soundness of our position but we must also impress on all Members of Congress whose districts include navigable waterways that the President's idea of requiring huge private contributions to waterways-development work will stifle industrial expansion and raise all kinds of serious economic problems for the future.

"We are pretty much in the same situation that we were last year when the enabling legislation was before Congress. At that time the administration insisted that the authorizing law require an $18 million local contribution. Intense efforts were made to try to get the administration to change that position. When those efforts failed, we took the fight to the Congress and won. We may have to do exactly the same thing again—and I sincerely believe we can win the fight all over again."

Rules of Debate in the Senate and House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the people generally have an idea from what is taught in our schools just how Congress works, but that theory is far from the actual operation of Congress. I am not familiar with how the Senate operates, but, from reading the newspapers, it seems to me that it is like ancient Gaul, divided into three parts. Those are the majority, the minority, and investigation committees. In this body there are more investigating committees than fleas on a homeless dog. Every department has to be investigated, employees have to be investigated, Senators have to be investigated, then, finally, the Senators have to talk. There is no limit in the Senate how long a Senator can talk. It depends not on what he knows about the subject but the state of his health. If he can talk for 4 nights and 3 days without stopping he impresses the country. There may be no one in the Senate but the Presiding Officer and the clerks, but he can take encouragement because when one of the 2-mile horses gets going the public likes to see him go. I do not know whether the public bets on him or not, but it is safer than betting on horses. A horse may quit, but a Senator never. Senators like two I have heard do not look like endurance champions, but you cannot always go by looks. You would swear that neither one of them could last 30 minutes, but there is where the public is fooled. Either one can talk from Washington's Birthday to the Fourth of July without any perceptible weariness. One stumbled and fell once, but before he received any aid he was up and going stronger than ever.

It is an education in itself to hear these 2-milers talk. You can never tell what the subject is, for they go into minute details from building a mousetrap to building an atomic bomb, and, of course, they are not experts at either. They are not curtailed because they might give away top secrets. What they say is not top secret at all, but it is something that everybody already knows. New thoughts are seldom added, but they grind up known information and spit it out in better rhetorical form than the language facts come in. Football, baseball, horseracing, and the other sports will never please the rooters like one of these marathon exertions of a Senator.

In the House the Members have no such unbridled liberties. The majority and minority committee members deal out the time. Committee members have the first call, and if a Member wants to talk on a subject where there are 30 committee members each having 30 minutes—and this is greatly underestimated—900 minutes are consumed by these members. That would be 15 hours debate. Usually the longest debates are 8 hours, so you can see where a Member, if not a committee member, gets limited time.

There is only one way another Member can talk at all, and that is when the actual debate ends and the bill is read for amendment. A Member can speak then, providing he offers an amendment that the Speaker thinks is germane, and he has 5 minutes. Most of these attempts are ruled out as "Not being germane," whatever that means. Anyway, it means that the Member cannot talk.

The worst part of the whole proceeding is that if a Member thinks he has just a mere chance of getting the floor, he has to stay in the Chamber and hear all these speeches and grin and bear it. Some do not even grin. Another impediment to a noncommittee Member is that after he gets his 5 minutes, he is asked to yield by some friendly Member—and these noncommittee Members are always polite—and the natural result is that most of his time has been consumed before he has said a word on the pending bill. This happened to me one time—I obtained 5 minutes and a friendly Member asked me to yield and, being polite, I did so. This Member consumed 4 minutes—a little over that—and I saw that the Chairman was getting all set to bang down the gavel and end the great contribution I was making to the bill. I saw my time was short. I did not want to say "Goodby" as I was too riled up for that, so I had time to say, "I have waited a year to speak on this bill. I did not have time to say a word about it, so if you Members do not see me in the well of this House for another year, allow me to wish you all a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year."

There is one good thing about the House practice, though. If you never say anything, you cannot be quoted in the next campaign by some devilish upstart that goes gunning for your seat in Congress. This has brought me through a winner in many campaigns. Probably if I had been permitted to talk, as I wanted to, I would not be here now. So you can see that while you are limited in debate by the rules of the House, plus the advice of the Speaker, I presume it is a premeditated plan to keep these silent Members in Congress.

Personally, I would rather spend a short time in Congress than to be roped and hog-tied for 20 years. During my service here I have learned to be a good listener, and while you hear very little that will enlighten you, good manners and the rules of the House give you great protection in campaigns if you have your heart set on being a Member of Congress term after term. Increased congressional salaries will be before the House in a few days now, and when it comes up I am going to propose that hog-tied Members receive a raise and the volatile Members get just what they are now getting, or less. It is worth more to sit here year after year and be compelled to listen to what committee members have to offer—which is not much.

Here you have a picture of the debates in the Senate and House; which method to pursue, for political reasons, I hesitate to say.

The Spirit of Free Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1955

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, the 7th of February marks the 10th anniversary of the famous wartime meeting of the Big Three which marked the beginning of a series of retreats of the free world before the forward march of Soviet aggression. The spirit of Poland, although at times under the yoke of foreign aggression, still lived in the hearts of the Polish people, and we firmly believe that it survives today. Her courage under various circumstances should be an inspiration for future generations of Poles to carry on with that same indomitable spirit which has characterized their actions throughout the years.

Much disappointment has been felt not only by the people of Poland, but by many nations who share the spirit of liberty, that the Atlantic Charter has failed to carry out its provisions with regard to the rights and freedoms of people who have been subjected to the yoke of oppression. Those who committed their signature to the Atlantic Charter gave their approval to the following ideals on the part of the charter's membership.

First. Countries should seek no aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise.

Second. The signators desire no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.

Third. The rights of all people to choose a form of government under which they will live is sanctioned by the Atlantic Charter, and the charter expresses the dictum that the sovereign rights and self-government shall be restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics endorsed these objectives and became a signator to this charter on January 1, 1942. The freedom-loving people of Poland accepted this charter and hoped that it meant a spiritual rebirth of the principles of freedom to which they had dedicated their lives on May 3, 1791. By their previous record they had earned the right to such expectations. They had made the same sacrifices on the altar of human decency and liberty as the soldiers of other lands in their fight against the tyranny imposed by Adolf Hitler. They had also placed their trust and their faith in the intellectual honesty of America.

But what happened? The agreements made at Yalta surrendered much of the principles which had been laid down in the Atlantic Charter. The freedom-loving people of Poland were locked behind the Iron Curtain, where they remain today. The events of those fateful hours at Yalta in the year 1945 constitute, perhaps, the darkest pages in the history of our Republic. We pray that in some manner we may atone for the wrongs committed on a people who placed their trust in our honor.

Today the Polish people are under the yoke of a conqueror, but their spirit is not crushed. That intense patriotism which has always characterized this people will continue to exist until the day when they will again throw off the rule of the oppressor and take their rightful place among the freedom-loving peoples of the world.

Lincoln: A Great American Who Sought To Preserve Union Without Bloodshed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, in the history of the world truly great men seldom advance beyond their own geographical confines and become world characters. Again, it is not only the ability of the man himself, but the surroundings in which he is placed and the gravity of the situation before him that brings out those characteristics and qualities that stamp him as an immortal in history.

The United States has contributed its share of great statesmen who have risen above their own territorial limits.

In this category George Washington's name stands out among us, and throughout the world itself, because he led a movement for freedom, and not content with winning the cause of which he was the commander, he followed it up with the organization of a great republic in the New World, where life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness was guaranteed to every citizen. This purpose of government was the prayer of man for ages; hence it was that the name of George Washington is a familiar one in every country on earth.

The name of Thomas Jefferson is another name that has flashed across the history of the world, due to his able writings on the principles to be pursued in a republic such as ours. Many nations in adopting their constitutions, were inspired by Jefferson and their documents followed his words very closely.

HOPE TO OPPRESSED

The name of Abraham Lincoln flashed across the country and did not dim at territorial lines, but went on and on throughout the world where people were struggling for freedom. Abraham Lincoln was unique, as he came up from poor people and did not have the advantages of schools to attend, but was largely his own teacher. He struggled for an education; he struggled against poverty; and what he learned in this fiery furnace of necessity he never forgot.

Some have said and written that he was an accident, but when you come to study his ancestry you find that one of his granduncles was a surveyor for General Washington and author of a book on mathematics. The textbooks he wrote were written in longhand and illustrated in freehand; and anyone examining one of these rare books is impressed with the exactness of the writing and the illustrating figures. There is not a blot in the whole book, not a line retraced. Several of the early Lincolns were men of this type, and it is not surprising that Lincoln's speech at Gettysburg is a model of English expression.

The environment surrounding Lincoln was a grave epoch in the history of the United States. The old question of the sovereign rights of States as to owning slaves was not settled in the Constitutional Convention, and in Lincoln's time was threatening the preservation of the Union. The South was backing the cause of States rights and the North was aroused over slavery. Lincoln saw that the people were divided and he did his utmost to pacify the two divergent views. His famous statement that "a house divided against itself could not stand," while logical and prophetic, did not allay the rising storm.

ASKED COMMONSENSE

On entering upon his duties as President of the United States he again appealed to the commonsense of the people to avert hostilities and unite in preserving the Union. This failed of its purpose and the War Between the States ensued.

Some of his contemporaries thought he was too slow to action and too temporizing with those who had declared themselves out of the Union, but he stood firm as a rock upon the proposition that the Union must be preserved, and prayed that it might be done without bloodshed.

His own administrative assistants were not always working in the best interests of the President, and many of them were candidates for that office themselves. Knowing of the many disloyal acts and disagreements between himself and some members of his Cabinet, most Presidents would have discharged these men, but Lincoln knew, and said that in spite of their interference with his plans they were the best men for their places.

He was besieged for jobs, and one illustration of this annoyance may be cited. A gentleman from Ohio, who had done outstanding work for the President in the campaign, wanted a job. He came to Washington and saw Lincoln. During the course of his conversation with the President, this man asked, "Mr. Lincoln, don't you think I merit a job with the Government?" Lincoln then stated, "Of course you are entitled to a place, but the trouble is I do not seem to have much influence with my administration."

CONVINCED BANKERS

When a delegation of bankers met with the President and protested against his plan to issue greenbacks directly from the Government, a great and noisy argument ensued. In the midst of all the talk Lincoln said that the situation reminded him of a man who was traveling horseback through an unsettled portion of Kentucky where there were only trails and no roads and in some way missed his path. To add to his difficulties night came on, and with it a terrific rainstorm. The lightning crashed all around the traveler, and it was only on these occasions that he could see any portion of the trail. Soon a terrific flash of lightning struck. The man fell off his horse and was brought to his knees on the ground. He was by no means a praying man, but since he was already on his knees and the storm still raged, he made the following prayer: "Oh, Lord, if it is all the same to you, give us a little more light and less noise." That settled the conference and the bankers left. The greenbacks were issued, and some are still in circulation.

People in any country who read the life of Lincoln can see how a very humble citizen had arisen in the Republic of the United States to carry the torch of freedom.

Lincoln's ringing voice we still hear when he said:

> Our safety, our liberty, depends upon preserving the Constitution of the United States as our fathers made it, inviolate.
>
> The people of these United States are the rightful masters of both Congress and courts, not to overthrow the Constitution, but to overthrow the men who pervert the Constitution.

Lincoln's sound judgment, his patience, his indifference to any consequences that might come to him, his great human heart, his deep and abiding sympathy, always exhibited in every act of his as President, gave a new definition to this Republic, and people throughout the world came to love this great man of the people. A world character he surely is, and his thoughts and actions live with us today. The name of Abraham Lincoln today means more to the people of the world than the name of any other man who has crossed the stage of history, save one.

Reclassification of Postal Jobs and Increase in Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

I appear here today in support of H. R. 1592, a bill offered by Representative JAMES H. MORRISON. This bill provides for a reclassification of all postal jobs and sets up a 10-percent salary increase—or $400 per annum, whichever is the greater—for all postal workers. It provides also that after salaries are increased they shall then be adjusted to the nearest multiple of $100.

Let us take the case of letter carriers, for example: A letter carrier in 1939, claiming 3 exemptions, had a take-home pay of $2,007.47. This same letter carrier in 1952 took home $3,378.78. If we were to provide the equivalent purchasing power of 1939, the take-home pay should be $3,927.60, or a gross average for letter carriers of $4,800. The gross average, however, would be considerably less because the preponderating majority of letter carriers are not in the top longevity grade. This picture holds true not only for letter carriers but for postal clerks and others proportionately.

The administration takes the position that the Post Office Department should be self-supporting. I am in emphatic disaccord.

Farmers receive from $750 million to $1 billion annually, depending upon the level of price supports. There are no questions asked with reference to farm parity supports and balancing anything. Business receives benefits totaling approximately $900 million. These are subsidies for airline companies and shipowners and others. We don't ask the companies thus aided to balance the Federal budget or any other budget of any department. In the same manner, the Post Office deficit should be charged to business and the public generally, because the loss sustained arises primarily in the handling of second-, third-, and fourth-class business mail.

We have many departments in the Federal Government where no question of income exists. We do not set a policeman's salary on the basis of the income of the police department. We don't set the salary of men who work for the FBI on the basis of the income received through the FBI. The Post Office Department renders a general public service for which the public generally must pay. The Postmaster General seems obsessed with the idea that the Post Office Department must be self-sustaining. If it is to be self-sustaining, then I suggest that Mr. Summerfield speak to the owners of publications like Life, Time, the Saturday Evening Post, Look, and others. They are the ones who do a great deal to create the deficit. But neither they nor the Federal employees should be charged with making up the deficit.

In these last years, there has been a greatly increased productivity on the part of postal employees. Frequently, wages are kept down because of inadequate productivity. Concomitantly, they should be raised where increased productivity occurs. Postal employees have, in recent years, almost doubled their value and services in their workload and benefit to the public generally. It is estimated that a single employee handled 20 percent more mail per year in 1952 than in 1938.

One cannot exaggerate the importance of the work of our postal employees. They benefit immeasurably our industry, commerce, education, religions, politics, and our cultural development. We dare not be pinch-penny nor niggardly in our approach to an evaluation of the monetary value of their services.

Free China Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include remarks made by me on October 10, 1954, in Boston, Mass., at a dinner conducted by the Chinese Community in Boston celebrating Free China Day, proclaimed by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the city council and mayor of the city of Boston.

The address follows:

October 10 is a great day among freedom-loving Chinese all over the world. It is to the freedom-loving people of China and to Chinese nationals here and abroad what the Fourth of July is to our beloved country.

And it was on October 10, 1911, that Dr. Sun Yat-sen put into motion the democratic revolution in China that changed the face of Asia. This is the "double 10" anniversary of the free Chinese all over the world, commemorating that great event and rededicating themselves to the principles for which Dr. Sun stood and which the Chinese revolution carried into effect.

We all know of the great principles that Dr. Sun stood for and put into operation, of his struggle for a free government in China, of the ideal of government that was truly representative, truly free, and dedicated to the welfare of the people.

The policy of our Government in relation to Formosa and adjoining islands under control of the Nationalist Chinese Government is most confusing to me, and I am sure to you.

We know that under President Truman there was a firm policy which was clearly understood by everyone. That policy did not change from week to week or from month to month.

We remember the promise of the present administration to unleash Chiang Kai-shek and his forces, meaning they would return some day to the mainland to liberate China and its people. It is well know that millions of Chinese on the mainland oppose the Communist regime and are waiting and praying for the day of their deliverance.

They are waiting to help overthrow their vicious tyrants, for the Chinese are a liberty-loving people with an intense love of the family life.

Some months ago we found out that Chiang could not engage in any activity—even from islands other than Formosa, without the consent or permission of our Government. That was a great surprise to me, as I am sure it was to you. That secret agreement was inconsistent with the other promise openly made: To unleash the forces of Chiang Kai-shek.

There was certainly no unleashing if Chiang and his forces could not move without our permission.

In recent months, the aggressive Red move against Quemoy has brought about some noticeable changes.

You will remember, as I do, that the President said, in substance, that the Red Chinese would have to roll over the 7th Fleet if they attacked Formosa.

That was a clear and understandable statement.

But statements have been made in recent months which tend to conflict with this and to confuse me.

It was only recently that an admiral with the 7th Fleet said that we would not consider nuisance air attacks by Red China on Formosa as a violation of our policy. In the first instance, it was strange that a military man should issue this statement which if true, and it has not been denied, constitutes a change in our policy toward Formosa itself.

It is most unusual under our form of government for military men to announce a policy, and this particularly applies to foreign affairs. This disturbs me very much.

Military leaders submit their views within their proper field. But decisions on foreign affairs and their announcement is a civilian duty and responsibility under our form of government.

When made, involving the military, the military carries out the decisions and the policy.

This is not the first time in recent months when a military leader has made public announcement concerning foreign policy.

You will also remember it was an admiral who publicly announced that the Pescadore Islands would be defended by the 7th Fleet, in the event of a Red attack. While I agree with this, it should have been announced by civilian and not military authorities.

For ours is a civilian and not a military government. I am greatly disturbed during the past 2 years with the military usurping civilian responsibility.

I am a strong supporter of a powerful military organization—but as the servants are not the masters of our Government, we cannot afford the military to inject themselves further into matters that belong to the civilian side of government.

Furthermore, what is a nuisance attack?

That raises many serious questions.

It might well be observed that that statement could well operate as an excuse for the Reds to attack Formosa by air. If so will we tie the hands of Chiang in any action to meet and prevent such attacks?

Is such a statement consistent with rolling over the 7th Fleet?

When is nuisance attack not a nuisance attack?

Who will determine this question?

My understanding is that the Reds would have to roll over the 7th Fleet was that any kind of attack on Formosa would violate this policy. That seems to me to be commonsense.

And I now find out that nuisance attacks will not. What number of Red planes would constitute a nuisance attack?

I am wondering where does that leave us.

What interpretation will be placed upon it by the Chinese Reds and the Soviet Union? Will they consider such a statement an excuse or an invitation to attack by air?

And what about Quemoy?

Outside of a few persons, and I am not one of them, no one knows what our policy will be if the Reds attack Quemoy.

There have been intimations from responsible American sources that if Quemoy is attacked—outside of furnishing arms and advice—the United States will remain inactive.

One admiral connected with the 7th Fleet has indicated this in a press conference of a few weeks ago.

Admiral Radford, to the contrary, in a recent speech strongly indicated that the loss of Quemoy would be harmful to the defense of Formosa. In other words, the defeat of Quemoy would make it easier for a successful Red attack on Formosa.

And yet our policy, so far as I can ascertain from the newspapers, is supposed to be a flexible one—we will keep the Reds guessing. That involves a calculated risk, either way.

It is my strong opinion that a firm statement by our duly substituted authorities that a Red attack on Quemoy would be considered an act of aggression might well deter such an attack being made.

It is my feeling that our present policy in relation to Quemoy will invite and might well prompt the Reds to attack.

And then we come to the latest information with reference to our policy in relation to Formosa and the islands held by the Nationalist Government.

While to date there is no official announcement, all papers have carried the story from reliable diplomatic sources that "Nationalist China has stopped bombing attacks on the Chinese mainland at the suggestion of the United States." This confuses me further.

Certainly this is not carrying out the promise of unleashing Chiang Kai-shek and his forces. It seems to me that, if the news item is correct, this would seem to be tying his hands.

I am frank in stating that I am confused. I have no definite idea as to what our policy is now in connection with Formosa and that important area of the world.

It is my opinion that our policy should be a firm one, should be made known, and the line drawn, and that we let the Reds know we will stand by our policy.

Certainly, if we will help defend Formosa and the Pescadores Islands in case of attack, if that is our policy, and I consider it a wise one, it seems to me that this should cover any other Nationalist-held islands that are important to the defense of the Formosa and the Pescadores group.

Lincoln and Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1955

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to participate in the 30th annual Lincoln Day memorial exercises held Sunday, February 6, at the Nancy Hanks Lincoln State Memorial at Lincoln City, Ind. The impressive program honoring the memory of Abraham Lincoln and his mother, Nancy Hanks Lincoln, was sponsored by the Santa Claus (Ind.) Chamber of Commerce. Among organizations taking part in thees traditional ceremonies were St. Meinrad's Archabbey, the Funkhouser American Legion Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Indiana Department of Conservation, and the Spencer County Home Demonstration Chorus. It was a matter of particular pleasure to me that I was introduced by my former colleague in the House of Representatives, the Honorable D. Bailey Merrill. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the text of my address on Lincoln and Unity, delivered on this occasion:

Not so long ago, as the world measures time, a barefoot lad came with his family from the hills of Kentucky to begin a new life here among the rugged pioneers of the old Pigeon Creek neighborhood of Spencer County.

The family's heavy burden of poverty is a matter of historic record.

We can only imagine the added anguish suffered by the little boy and his sister occasioned by the illness and death of their beloved mother not long after they had arrived on Hoosier soil.

That we are here today paying homage to the memory of Abraham Lincoln, a backwoods boy, and his mother, Nancy Hanks Lincoln, is, in itself, a tribute to the greatness of America and to the greatness of our people.

Abraham Lincoln and his family were what our sociologists today would probably call underprivileged people.

Fortunately for us, Lincoln didn't know he was underprivileged.

My guess is that he felt lucky to be a freeborn American.

Certainly, at any rate, he refused to give up to what must have appeared to him a forlorn prospect that he would ever amount to much.

There is, perhaps, little new we can say about Lincoln's life here in southern Indiana.

We know this is where he spent his formative years—14 of them—growing into manhood before he moved once more with his family, this time to Illinois.

In our mind's eye, we can see Abraham Lincoln, the boy, doing what he could as a child to help the family carve a home out of the wilderness.

We can see him as a youth, doing the physical work of a man to provide the essentials of life, not only for himself but for others of a household enlarged as a result of his father's remarriage to a good widow with three children of her own.

We know of Lincoln's early thirst for knowledge and we have read of his attempts to educate himself by reading the Bible, Pilgrim's Progress, Weem's Life of Washington, and whatever other books might come his way in a day when schools were few and far between and public libraries were an unknown luxury.

Yes; history leaves no doubt that Lincoln's earlier life was one of underprivilege as far as material blessings were concerned.

We must go deeper into his background to discover and to understand the secret of his greatness.

The devotion of mother and son offers us a clue.

The later understanding and sympathy of a stepmother offers another.

What did Sarah Johnson, this widow with three children of her own, see in little Abe that led her to give him the encouragement that meant so much?

Did she, perhaps, detect the spark of greatness even then developing into a flame destined to light the way for freemen through the ages?

As Hoosiers, we like to think, and I believe not without justification, that the hard and simple life of Pigeon Creek in the early part of the 19th century offers us another clue to the genesis of Lincoln's wisdom and character.

Lincoln came to Indiana because his was a family seeking a better way of life—not an easier way of life, but a better way.

Here he joined in the work and play of other rugged Christian pioneers—God-fearing people dedicated to the simple virtues of honesty, thrift, and self-reliance, a dedication, may I say, still appropriate for every American citizen.

It was here in Indiana that Abraham Lincoln developed his sense of perspective.

It was as a Hoosier that he learned patience, tolerance of others, and his deep humility.

And we can surmise with safety that here he enjoyed a companionship rich in the ways of homely Indiana humor—a peculiarly Hoosier type of wit which Lincoln himself employed so often and to such good purpose throughout his adult career.

The sad face of Lincoln the President portrays vividly the loneliness, the personal tragedies, and the compassion of this great man.

But if the gravity of his responsibilities left their mark on his soul, one thing we know about Lincoln—and it is one more great-hearted virtue that endears him to us—Abraham Lincoln could laugh at himself.

He was a man of positive virtues—integrity, ambition, courage in the face of adversity, and an abiding faith in his fellow men.

However, there is, it seems to me, something else we must consider in seeking the ultimate answer to Lincoln's greatness.

Lincoln was a man incapable of malice.

"I shall do nothing in malice," he once wrote to a friend. "What I deal with is too vast for malicious dealing."

There was no trace of bitterness in his soul—this man who might well have excused whatever failures came his way on the grounds that, after all, he had never had the advantages of more than the barest material wealth nor more than a meager formal education.

Here, I think, was the true measure of Lincoln's greatness: the measure of a man fighting his way from humble circumstance to the most powerful office in the world, without losing that most precious of gifts—gentleness of character.

This, my good Hoosier friends, is the mark of a truly noble man.

The time of Abraham Lincoln was a difficult period for America.

This young Nation, dedicated, as he put it, "to the proposition that all men are created equal," had been forced to the acid test by the secession of the Southern States.

Fortunately for us, the country had at its helm during those trying days a man who had learned, as a member of a family working together for its very survival here in Indiana, that in unity there is strength.

Succeeding generations of Americans have revered Abraham Lincoln as the man who saved the Union in its darkest hours. Engraved on the wall of the magnificent Lincoln Memorial in Washington are these majestic words: "In this temple as in the hearts of the people for whom he saved the Union the memory of Abraham Lincoln is enshrined forever."

Today, we look to his memory for strength and guidance in another battle to preserve our way of life from the threat of a creeping menace—the menace of a militant communism determined to destroy human liberty as we have known it.

These, too, are times that try men's souls.

Already a great portion of the world's people has been trapped into a new form of bondage—slavery to political masters—and the end is not yet in sight.

There can be only one answer to that threat.

It is the answer Lincoln would have given.

Americans must stand united in their determination to defend the precious birthright of freedom regardless of the sacrifice.

We have witnessed a heartening demonstration of such unity of purpose in recent weeks.

The Congress of the United States, almost to a man, acting as the elected representatives of the people of this Nation, has stood foursquare behind the President in his courageous decision with respect to our foreign policy in the Pacific.

By this action, we have demonstrated our ability once more to rise above partisanship for the common good.

By this action, we have kept faith with Lincoln's admonition: "Let us at all times remember that all American citizens are brothers of a common country, and should dwell together in the bonds of fraternal feeling."

Lest I be misunderstood, let me hasten to assure one and all that we have not reached the millenium in Washington.

The art of politics—that art so deeply relished by our good citizens of Indiana—and an art, I might say, in which Abraham Lincoln himself was no amateur—is still very much alive in the Nation's Capital.

Lincoln, we must not forget, was a firm champion of the two-party system—a champion who understood its strength and its weaknesses.

And it is by no means to his discredit that he worked for the success of the party he represented—that he worked at politics, if you please—in his long and difficult campaign toward the Presidency.

One of the Lincoln anecdotes which took on a new significance for me after November of 1952, and which serves to illustrate the ridiculous extremes of responsibility which sometimes fall to a man in the White House, is this one:

When Lincoln became President, the Democrat Party had been in power for many years.

(That part of the story certain has a familiar ring.)

Every patronage job had been filled with a Democrat, and now Republicans besieged the White House demanding appointments.

(So does that.)

One day, a Senator, coming into the President's office, found him holding a note. There was an expression of anxiety and dejection on Lincoln's face.

"What's the matter, Mr. President?" the Senator inquired.

"Has something gone wrong? Have you heard bad news from Fort Sumter?"

"No," said the President, shaking his head wearily, "It's the post office at Jonesville, Mo."

So, I don't want to imply that the recent display of unity in Washington means that a complete moratorium has been declared as far as partisan politics is concerned.

But I do think this action in support of President Eisenhower serves to point up an awareness on the part of all men and women in responsible positions that these are, indeed, serious times.

These are times when all of us—we in public life and you with your important duties and obligations as private citizens of this great Republic—must do our best to heed the precepts of Lincoln.

We must do our best to be worthy of the priceless heritage of freedom—a heritage, may I say, saved for posterity by this noble man and the thousands of his fellow Americans who rallied to his leadership.

Make no mistake about this: America is faced with a battle for survival today just as much as America was faced with a battle for survival during the time of Abraham Lincoln.

The foe today is external, but it is no less dangerous to our national security.

History plays no favorites.

During the Civil War, the Nation was guided by Republican leadership.

During World Wars I and II, and for most of the Korean war, leaders of the Democrat Party were at the helm.

At all such times, right-thinking Americans dedicate themselves to the task of defending their beloved country.

So today, as we struggle to solve the problems arising from the aggressive intent of dictator nations, it seems to me that all loyal citizens will want the present leadership to succeed in its program to provide for the security of our Nation and to achieve a just and lasting peace for the world.

We are not in a war.

Living, as we are today, in the awesome shadow of the mushroom of the atomic bomb, it is the hope and prayer of all of us that we will never be subjected to the horrors of a military holocaust.

But ours is a world of uneasy peace.

The task before us is to win that peace, however long and difficult the road.

It is a task calling for an exercise of those virtues which characterized Abraham Lincoln's leadership:

Integrity.

Patience and forbearance.

Courage and steadfastness of purpose.

Self-reliance and a willingness to sacrifice.

Faith in the Almighty and a belief in the dignity of man.

The program set before us for winning the peace is not an easy one.

The burden of building and maintaining a defense adequate for America is heavy.

The necessity for calling our young men into the service as long as the threat to our freedom exists is not to the liking of a people by tradition unmilitary in their inclinations.

But we are today in a zone of uncertainty—a zone of dim shapes and shadows, some reassuring in their promise of things to come, others fearful in their portent of evil.

Let us all hope we are in the morning light of a lasting peace and not groping in the twilight hours before a new darkness of armed conflict.

In such a period, these words of Abraham Lincoln echo from another age:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew."

Today it is the challenge of communism which must be met.

We dare to hope the time will never come when that challenge must be resolved on the field of battle.

Of this you may be certain: Under the leadership of Dwight D. Eisenhower, every avenue in the direction of an honorable world peace is being—and will continue to be—explored.

But until that way is found, we cannot relax our efforts to provide a maximum defense against armed attack—a maximum defense consistent with the minimum needs of our domestic economy.

This is the crux of the Eisenhower administration's program for a secure and prosperous Nation.

Somewhere between the extremes of opinion on what our course of action should be lies the proper balancing of needs—needs of our Armed Forces and needs of the civilian machinery on which the military must always depend for its sustenance.

I see these extremes of opinion reflected in the mail I get as a Congressman and I respect the sincerity of those expressing such views.

There are some, for instance, who believe the efforts we are making to provide an adequate defense against Communist aggression are too little.

These people urge an all-out mobilization now.

There are others who hold that the defensive structure we are undertaking to maintain is too much—that disarmament and wholesale discharge of military personnel, together with an end to the draft, is the surest way to peace.

Close examination of either position poses sober questions.

How long, we may fairly ask, could this Nation, great as it is—with all its vast resources, its massive industrial potential, its inventive genius, and its capacity for production—how long could we stand the strain of an all-out mobilization?

And what if, having mobilized, we found ourselves without a war?

The risk of such a course is obvious.

It is the risk of the destruction of our economic system from within—a system crushed under the sheer weight of a defense-spending burden—without a shot having been fired either by or at us.

The Communists would like that. It must not happen.

Even more evident, however, is the peril to our security in a course of drastic disarmament and cutbacks in military manpower at this time.

No, my friends, the realism and commonsense that was so typical of Abraham Lincoln demands that we maintain what has been aptly called a posture of strength as long as the leaders of Communist-dominated nations maintain their hostile and belligerent attitudes toward the peoples of the free world.

Until, by acts of good faith, these leaders demonstrate an unmistakable willingness to forego aggression as an instrument of international policy, realism and commonsense dictate that we remain prepared and vigilant.

As we set ourselves to this continuing task, it is vital, as President Eisenhower pointed out in his state of the Union message to the Congress, "that each of us understand the true nature of the struggle now taking place in the world."

"It is not," he said, "a struggle merely of economic theories, or of forms of government, or of military power. At issue is the true nature of man.

"Either man is the creature whom the psalmist described as 'a little lower than the angels,' crowned with glory and honor, holding 'dominion over the works' of his Creator; or man is a soulless, animated machine to be enslaved, used, and consumed by the state for its own glorification.

"It is, therefore, a struggle which goes to the roots of the human spirit, and its shadow falls across the long sweep of man's destiny. This prize, so precious, so fraught with ultimate meaning, is the true object of the contending forces in the world."

No mortal in the history of the world was ever more deeply conscious of the majesty of the human soul than Abraham Lincoln.

None was ever a greater champion of liberty.

We honor him today for his magnificent contribution to freedom, justice, and peace, the support of which is—today as then—foremost among the purposes of government.

As we meet here on ground hallowed by association with our martyred President, it is fitting and proper that we heed his admonition, delivered in those immortal words at Gettysburg:

"It is * * * for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave their last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

A man named Homer Hoch once wrote, "There is no new thing to be said of Lincoln.

"There is no new thing to be said of the mountains, or of the sea, or of the stars.

"The years go their way, but the same old mountains lift their granite shoulders above the drifting clouds, the same mysterious sea beats upon the shore, and the same silent stars keep holy vigil above a tired world.

"But to mountains and sea and stars men turn forever in unwearied homage.

"And thus with Lincoln.

"For he was mountain in grandeur of soul, he was sea in deep undervoice of mystic loneliness, he was star in steadfast purity of purpose and of service. And he abides."

Yes, Lincoln abides.

And we need say nothing new of him.

We need only look to his memory as a source of towering strength in these years of turmoil and strife.

His strength is our strength and his great faith in America—her institutions and her people—is our faith as we move with courage and diligence toward a brighter and happier tomorrow.

Statement on Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1955

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, this is the 10th anniversary of the enslavement of the Polish Nation at Yalta on February 7, 1945. We who have friends and relatives in Poland under the present dictatorship, and who are interested in the regaining of the freedom and independence by the Polish people, keep this date on our calendars for remembrance and for renewed hope.

We commemorate this day each year and renew our associations with our friends in a determined resolve to see a free and independent Poland.

We look forward with confidence to the time when Poland, a free and independent nation, will join the peaceful nations of the world in advancing the progress and raising the standards of living in cooperation with all the friendly nations and the citizens of the free world.

The Admission of Scientists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill relating to the admission into the United States of scientists and others, in an attempt to eliminate restrictions placed upon them which have caused serious loss to the body of our scientific information and to the enrichment of our cultural life.

Defects in the present procedures for the issuance of nonimmigrant visas have prevented the participation of aliens in meetings, conferences, temporary employment, and other transactions in the United States—such as scientific, scholarly, trade, and industrial conferences, employment in temporary research positions and the conduct of commercial, industrial, or professional transactions. The contribution of such aliens to the advancement of scientific and scholarly knowledge by their participation in such meetings, conferences, temporary employment, and other transactions in the United States is essential to the national defense and the furtherance of the industrial, technological, and cultural leadership of the United States. Such aliens are invited to such meetings, conferences, temporary employment, and other transactions in the United States by learned institutions and societies of national renown who, by their invitation, vouch for the character and learning of such aliens. Such meetings, conferences, temporary employment, and other transactions in the United States do not involve access to information the dissemination of which would prejudice national security.

The importance of the contribution of such aliens has, heretofore, not been sufficiently recognized in the procedure for the issuance of nonimmigrant visas to such aliens.

The text of the bill which I have introduced is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 101 (a) 15 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 169; 8 U. S. C. 1101) is amended by addition of the following paragraph:

"(J) An alien having a residence in a foreign country which he has no intention of abandoning, who is invited by an institution, organization, or governmental agency, to take part in a scientific, technological, artistic, sport, or other cultural conference or meeting in the United States, or to occupy temporarily a teaching or research position at an institution of learning or research, or to take part in an industrial, technological, scientific, or cultural transaction which is temporary in nature: *Provided*, That the Attorney General shall establish and maintain in consultation with the Office of Education of the United States and make public from time to time a list of such institutions, organizations, or governmental agencies, which may, under regulations issued by the Attorney General, invite such alien, and which shall have agreed to the Attorney General the termination of attendance or visit of such alien."

SEC. 2. Section 212 (d) (2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act as amended to read as follows:

"(2) The provisions of paragraph (28) of subsection (a) of this section shall not be applicable to any alien who is seeking to enter the United States temporarily as a nonimmigrant under paragraph (15) (A) (iii) or (15) (G) (v) or (15) (J) of section 101 (a)."

The Republican Record and the Challenge We Face

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1955

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address made by the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, before the Women's National Republican Club at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City on January 29:

THE REPUBLICAN RECORD AND THE CHALLENGE WE FACE

(Address by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson)

It is a signal honor and a most welcome privilege to be your guest at this 34th annual luncheon of the Women's National Republican Club.

Since November 2 my talks have been largely concerned with such things as parity, the corn-hog ratio, and efficient farming. I am happy to have this opportunity to don my political headgear for the day and discuss the Republican record and the challenge which confronts our party.

Although this is a larger gathering of women than I ordinarily have the pleasure of dining with, I am not a complete stranger to such company. In addition to Mrs. Benson, there are four young ladies on the distaff side of our family. Consequently, although I may not always know what women are thinking about, I am something of an authority on what they are talking about.

And—very seriously—I believe the foremost issue American women are thinking about, talking about, and trying to do something about is the preservation of peace. They want, above all else, a world in which the family life of each succeeding generation shall not be broken or even shattered by the juggernaut of war. The wives and mothers and the children of this world have suffered too long from such disasters.

Here in the United States, this quest for a peaceful and more secure world has unquestionably been reflected in political developments of recent years. American women are participating more actively in politics than ever before. They are not only registering and voting. They are joining political organizations such as yours. They are becoming candidates—and successful candidates—for public office in greater numbers.

I am told that in New York State, more women than men registered for the 1952 elections—the first time this had ever happened. The conclusion is inescapable that a great majority of the new women registrants voted for President Eisenhower. The political pulse-takers are generally agreed the women of this country contributed greatly to the sweeping Republican victories of 2 years ago.

There is some evidence that the women of America are still more strongly Republican than the men. As you know, Minnesota has been one of the most consistent "barometer" States in presidential elections. A recent poll conducted in that State by the Minneapolis Tribune is most interesting in that connection. It shows that President Eisenhower would again carry Minnesota by a comfortable margin, against the same opponent, and that his popularity is greatest among women voters. Fifty-eight percent of the women polled said they would vote for President Eisenhower; only 38 percent for Governor Stevenson. Male voters indicated a preference of 53 percent for the President; 41 percent for Stevenson.

There is a further statistic which I pass along to you without comment. Six percent of the men who were polled couldn't make up their minds. Among women the figure was only 4 percent.

All of this suggests that American politics might be in surer hands if we follow the advice of that panel show and Leave It to the Girls. Certainly "the girls" — the women of America—our wives and mothers—have made themselves a force to be reckoned with in the political arena. And I will be candid enough to admit that this has come about in no small measure because the men were not always doing the best possible job. Women are exerting a constructive, healthy influence upon our national affairs today—in elective and appointive positions and as informed and vigilant voters.

When historians of the future appraise the record of the Eisenhower administration, I am certain that the efforts to achieve lasting world peace will rank high on the list of accomplishments. The constant objective has been to attain not peace at any price but a permanent peace with honor.

There is peace in the world today, uneasy though it may be. The prolonged fighting in Korea has been brought to an end.

The transition from war to peace always involves some economic readjustments. The American people infinitely prefer these readjustments to war and bloodshed.

Actually, we have been making the change-over to a peacetime economy with far fewer dislocations than ever before. There is still some unemployment, but it is less than in 1950 and only a fraction of what it was in the decade preceding World War II. Disposable personal income reached a record rate last month. As a matter of fact, 1954 was the most prosperous year of peace in all of our history.

Truly the economic health of America is good.

Gross national production in 1955 will equal, probably exceed, the 1954 level of $357 billion. It could even equal the record of $365 billion in 1953. Our gross production is expected to reach $500 billion by 1965. This would mean an average increase of 20 percent for each of us, above our present living standards.

Ranking high on the overall list of administration accomplishments is the restoration of honesty, integrity, and efficiency in Government. The saving, rather than the spending, of a dollar has again become a respectable objective in Washington. Sharp reductions in Government expenditures—$11 billion last year—made possible the greatest tax cut in history—$7.4 billion. That is the equivalent of $180 for every family in America.

Inflation has been halted. The dollar has been stabilized. The savings of our people, the pensions of our retired citizens are no longer being gnawed away by a continuing decline in the buying power of the dollar.

Stifling bureaucratic controls over the national economy have been ended. The housewife no longer has to get in line to buy a roast at the grocery store.

Today we have the strongest and most efficient Armed Forces in all of our peacetime history. A tax dollar is buying a dollar's worth of defense.

We have an agricultural program which will permit us in the years ahead to work toward better balanced production and a

generally prosperous, expanding, and free farm economy.

This Nation has made real progress during the first 2 years of the Eisenhower administration. That forward march will be continued during the 2 years ahead and—I sincerely hope—well beyond 1957.

In our great President, we have a man of character, a man of honor, a man of unswerving devotion, and dedication to the eternal principles which made this Nation great. Yes, he is a man of deep spirituality who recognizes that this Nation has a spiritual foundation. He is providing the kind of leadership that is so sorely needed in this troubled world—the kind of leadership that gave this country direction in its formative years.

I believe with all my heart that our Constitution was established by men whom the God of Heaven raised up for that very purpose. I believe that this is a Nation with a great mission—a great destiny. It's not just another nation. It's a truly special great country. The God of Heaven intended that it should serve as a beacon to liberty-loving people everywhere.

I believe that liberty—freedom—is a God-given eternal principle. It didn't begin with the Founding Fathers. They didn't originate it. It came from above. It's one of those inalienable rights—this right of men to be free. It's not right in the eyes of the Almighty that men should be in bondage one to another. It was intended that men should be free. This means freedom of choice, freedom to make their own decisions, freedom to move about, freedom to choose their own vocations, freedom to assemble and speak their own minds, freedom to make mistakes and to pay the penalty for those mistakes.

Governments were intended to be the servants of the people, not their masters. There's no true joy without freedom. When there's coercion, intimidation, and force, the antithesis of freedom, there can be no real soul-satisfying joy and happiness.

I believe today we are living a part of eternity and it is our obligation while living here to build ourselves into upright men and women. Character is the one thing we make in this life and take with us into the next. Any program, whether it is sponsored by one party or another, one group of men or another, by one government or another, any program which tends to weaken character, is not worth the price.

A planned and subsidized economy tends to destroy character—to demoralize the people. Programs sponsored by government should help people to help themselves and protect, preserve, and strengthen their freedom of activity. No program sponsored by government should ever be manipulated to serve partisan political purposes.

Now, I don't claim to be a historian but I love to read history. I enjoy prophecies. And true prophecy is just history in reverse. It's an account of things before they happen and history is an account of events after they have transpired. I am deeply impressed by the causes eminent historians have assigned for the collapse of some of our earlier civilizations. One book, entitled "Caesar and Christ," embraces the years from 800 B. C. to 325 A. D. It covers the period of the rise and fall of the Roman Empire and the coming of Christianity. As I read it for the first time some years ago, I couldn't help but think: Are we in America moving in the same direction? And I became convinced that in some particulars, at least, we were tending to move in the same direction. I checked some other accounts of the fall of the great Roman Empire and other empires now dead. I jotted down a summary of the things that seemed to cause those great empires to crumble.

The first reasons were what you might call social. They have to do with the family, the weakening of the home, the refusal of people to shoulder the sacred, all-important responsibilities that must go with home and family life. Moral decay resulted. There was a deferment and avoidance of marriage. It started first among the wealthy classes, the so-called educated classes, and then spread.

Another group of causes had to do with the waste of natural resources; with deforestation, erosion, neglect of irrigation systems. But most important of all was the national neglect of harassed and discouraged men—the failure to teach high moral principles even to the youth of the land. Of course, youth is every nation's greatest asset.

Then, there was another group of causes: the rising costs of government created by great standing armies, by doles, public works, expanding bureaucracy, by parasitic courts. There was depreciation of the currency and absorption of investment capital by confiscatory taxation. Inflation stole the savings of the people. Doles weakened the poor. Luxury weakened the rich. National decay resulted.

Then, there was a group of political causes rooted in centralized control and the increasing despotism of the state. This tended to destroy the citizens' civic sense and to dry up statesmanship at its source. People became powerless to express themselves because of the authority of the state and its control over the mass media of information. The people lost interest in government. Yet I presume, in the case of Rome at least, she had few rivals in the art of government. She certainly achieved a democracy of free men and then destroyed it by mismanagement, by corruption, by violence.

We have seen in the last two decades some evidence of tendencies in these same directions. Nations may sow the seeds of their own destruction while enjoying high prosperity, full employment, and other outward appearances of strength.

In fact, a nation may sow the seeds of its own destruction long before it reaches the zenith of its power. I believe there are a few signposts along the road today if we will look. Even in this blessed land, there is always the danger that we will be lulled away into a sense of false security. That is why we need real leadership in government—men of strength, men of character and principle, men of vision—for where there is no vision the people perish—men who will put the national welfare above their own personal interests.

It seems to me that the goal of any administration in Washington should be—and the goal of this administration is—to preserve our eternal principles, to strengthen the American way of life, to achieve a productive, free, and expanding economy in which all of our people will share. It should preserve and strengthen our capitalistic system—our free enterprise system. Admittedly this system has some weaknesses because it's operated by men and women who have weaknesses. Yet it has produced more of the good things of life, a higher standard of living, and a greater abundance of individual freedom, than any other system. It is still fashionable in some quarters to point out the weaknesses of our system without referring to its virtues and its accomplishments.

The job of defending the American way against creeping socialism and the other "isms" has fallen largely upon the Republican Party during the last 2 decades. This is not to say that only the Republican Party stands for free enterprise and for the preservation of our Constitutional rights. Millions of Democrats believe in these same things. But I do say that the Republican Party has never been successfully penetrated by left-wing elements. Republican Party policies have never been shaped by the starry-eyed dreamers who would remake America as a welfare state. And, to borrow a phrase from the advertising copywriters, no other major political party can make that statement.

Now I realize that some of our Democratic friends are very sensitive on this point. They have never been at all comfortable in the associations which have been forced upon them through the ADA and certain other adjuncts of the Democratic Party.

It is the responsibility and the duty of the Republican Party to carry forward the fight against creeping socialism, subversion and undue concentration of power in the Federal Government. In that effort I am sure we will be joined by those Democrats who still believe in the principles of representative government laid down by Thomas Jefferson many years ago. We must preserve and strengthen the foundations of our free enterprise system which has made possible so many of the good things of life for all of us.

The Republican Party must also exercise continued vigilance to insure integrity and efficiency in the operations of our Government. This must flow from the top down, as well as from the bottom up.

Economy must remain a watchword. We know that greater local responsibility—both in administration and cost-sharing—can promote increased efficiency and considerable savings in some of our Federal assistance programs. A tax dollar just can't make the trip to Washington and back home again without a substantial bite being taken out of it. We'd like to see our people spend more of their tax dollars at home.

I believe there is a growing sentiment in America for less competition by Government with its own citizens in various business fields. Before Government embarks upon any new enterprise, it seems to me that we should ask three questions: First, can this service, assuming it is needed, be performed more efficiently by Government than by private enterprise? Second, how will this venture affect our free institutions, our State and local governments, the home, and our schools and churches? Third, we need to ask how will it affect the morale, the character and the general well-being of our citizens? Unless the people can be reassured on these three points, Government should certainly not undertake the program.

Just as an example of government encroachment, you might be interested to learn that when I became Secretary of Agriculture, I also found myself in the hotel business. As a member of the Virgin Islands Corporation Board, I discovered that among our properties, which by the way were losing huge sums annually, was Blue Beard's Castle Hotel, a plush establishment when built by the Government back in 1934.

For a hotel operating as far in the red as this one was, the use of the word "blue" in its name seemed singularly inappropriate. We sold it for $410,000. It has been estimated that when the Eisenhower administration was installed 2 years ago, the Federal Government owned or had a stake in $130 billion worth of railroads, ships, coffee roasting plants, sawmills, paint factories, bakeries, and refineries, as well as a rum distillery and a package liquor trade, and countless other enterprises. It was operating more than 100 business-type activities and was adding steadily to the list.

We are at last moving steadily in the opposite direction now. And none too soon.

You—along with many other active party workers throughout the Nation—will determine in large measure whether this Republican crusade shall continue. Your ability to convince your fellow citizens—Republicans, Independents and Democrats alike—that the interests of this country will be best served under a Republican administration will again be tested next year. It is not too early even now to begin the spadework within the precincts.

The Women's National Republican Club, under the fine leadership of Mrs. Anderson and your other officials, has a great opportunity to keep the fires of freedom burning.

I know that you, as members of this great organization, will welcome this opportunity for service to your country and will accept the challenge under the leadership of our great President. With your help we will not fail in the great task that lies ahead.

I have never posed as a political expert. Most of my experience has been in other fields. Yet I have always felt that what is right is good politics. And I know that this administration is firmly dedicated to what is economically, morally, an spiritually right. I wish I might take each one of you into a Friday morning Cabinet meeting that you too might feel the spirit of your administration in Washington.

"Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair; the rest is in the hands of God." These words of George Washington, spoken before the Constitutional Convention, are as sound today as they were in 1787.

Yes, there is a new look in Washington today and the Nation is better off because of it. Government costs have been cut. Taxes have been reduced. Inflation has been halted. Living costs have been stabilized.

We have proven that it is possible to have peace and prosperity at the same time. The transition from war to peace has been made with fewer dislocations than most people thought possible. The economy is prosperous and stable. The trend toward centralized controls has been reversed. Bureaucracy is on the decline. There is less looking to Washington for direction and more of a feeling of pride and responsibility in the States, counties, and local communities. Integrity, honesty, and efficiency in government have been restored.

But we have only made a start. The crusade for honesty, integrity, and efficiency in government must go on.

Some of the grave decisions which lie ahead may not be ours to make. The Communist aggressors who have enslaved half the world give little indication that they will be content with less than all of it. We may have to live with this constant threat for many years.

However difficult the road ahead may appear, however discouraged we may become in our diplomatic dealings with men who recognize neither truth nor compassion, we must for the sake of all humanity continue to seek a peaceful solution to the seemingly insoluble problems of our age. At the same time, we must remain strong—strong economically, strong socially, and, above all, strong spiritually—strong enough to meet this ever-present threat of new Communist aggression. To be strong, we must remain productive, for it is the almost unlimited productivity of our Nation which stands as the great barrier against the Red onslaught.

We must hold high America's bright-burning torch of freedom that one day it will surely dispel the shadows of ignorance and despair now blanketing the minds of communism's slaves.

May God strengthen us in that resolution.

The Poor Man's Tax Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1955

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the big tax-revision bill of the 83d Congress, completely rewriting the tax code, which after a desperate fight became Public Law 591, is, in effect, a poor man's bill.

Those who would make political capital for purely political purposes by attacks upon this magnificent measure have called it a rich man's bill. The exact opposite is true. It's a poor man's relief law.

Now we have an abortive attempt to kill several of the most important parts of the 1954 tax legislation, all of which favored the lower income groups; but the attack on these favoring measures is being made by those who assert they are fighting the battle for the little man. Actually, they would hurt the little man, the average wage-earner, and the millions of people on small fixed incomes, small pensions, and especially the white collar workers.

Opponents of the administration would extend the excise tax law 2½ years instead of just 1; therefore, they would be guilty of taxing the little man, the poor man, the fixed income people, and the pensioners, an extra year and a half on such necessities as light bulbs, telephone calls, transportation, handbags, cosmetics, gasoline and many other everyday needs, of some of which we had hoped to unburden them at the end of the year. Does this proposed measure sound like relieving the little man?

They would again soak the little man, the poor man, and the pensioner by again double-taxing him on his meager dividend income. The vast majority of millions of stockholders are little people whose income is the result of hard work and lifetime savings, invested in a few shares of corporate stocks. To millions of these people, this is their only income. The law written last year gives 100 percent relief to those in the lowest income bracket, 67 percent in the next group, 52½ percent in the next group, and tapers down to only 11 percent to the wealthy, who are relatively few in number. Why soak these millions of little people and claim you are soaking only the rich? Isn't that the height of deception? Does that sound like relieving the little man?

Now most of you are not kidded about this corporation tax measure. Only people pay taxes. Corporations, actually being groups of people, cannot exist unless they pass along taxes in the prices of their production. If they do not, they go broke and throw thousands of people out of work. So if you extend, as the opponents of the administration are now proposing, the 52 percent corporation earnings tax to 2½ years instead of 1, you are again taxing millions and millions of the people that pay for the goods and services produced by the corporation. Does that sound like relieving the little man?

And then, this politically inspired $20 and $10 tax cut amounts to 40 cents a week or 20 cents a week per individual. How much relief is that going to give the average individual? And yet it will cost your Treasury over a thousand million dollars, which added cost must be raised by deficit financing, which means bank borrowing, which is tantamount to the printing of that much new money, which in turn causes inflation and penalizes most deeply the people in the lower income bracket. The rich man can afford $100 per year increased cost of living from inflation, but the little man—those on fixed incomes and pensions—would be cruelly hurt every time we allow inflation to creep in. Does this sound like rclieving the little man?

It is hard to conceive this poorly disguised attempt at cheap politics which so obviously hurts the lower-income people by repealing tax relief given them by last year's Congress. It was bad enough to call that great tax revision measure a rich man's bill, but to attempt to repeal some of the parts of it most important to poor people, seems the height of hypocrisy.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everliving God, as in this forum of national deliberation we bow in this quiet moment dedicated to the unseen and eternal, confirm our faith, we beseech Thee, in those deep and holy foundations which the fathers laid, lest in foolish futility we attempt to build on sand instead of rock. In a day of violence and of swift and shifting change, when the angry passions of men are bursting anew into devouring flame, enable Thy servants in the discharge of grave responsibilities of public trust to be sure and steady, their hope in Thee as an anchor that is steadfast and their faith unshaken, that out of the ruin and wreck of today Thou art making all things new. We ask it in the Name that is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 4, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES IN CONSTRUCTION OF SCHOOL FACILITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 84)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(For President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 85)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(For President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, under the rule there will be a morning hour, and I ask unanimous consent that any statements made in connection with the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and other routine business, be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT, RELATING TO REGISTRATION FEES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 8a (4) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR ENLISTMENT OF ALIENS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the authority for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

MAINTENANCE OF PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATELY OWNED PLANTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to continue the effectiveness of the Act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177), as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

CREDIT FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES OF PRIOR ACTIVE SERVICE OF CERTAIN COMMISSIONED PERSONNEL

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the crediting, for certain purposes, of prior active Federal commissioned service performed by a person appointed as a commissioned officer under section 101 or 102 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

DISABILITY BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN VOLUNTEER CIVILIAN MEMBERS OF CIVIL AIR PATROL

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PAYMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS OF COAST GUARD PERSONNEL

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering claims paid during the 6 months' period ended December 31, 1954, on account of the correction of military records of Coast Guard personnel (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF SQ-TYPE RADAR SET TO AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF BEIRUT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the American University of Beirut had requested the Navy Department to transfer one SQ-type radar set, to be used for educational purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

STATEMENT ON PAINTING OF WAR HOUSING PRIOR TO DISPOSITION

A letter from the Executive Director, National Capital Housing Authority, Washington, D. C., transmitting a statement on painting of war housing prior to disposition, referred to in the report on the audit of that Authority, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, AND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, and the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED AWARD OF CONCESSION PERMIT, OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK, WASH.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed award of a concession permit in the Olympic National Park, Wash. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS UNDER FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Ninth Annual Report of operations under the Federal Airport Act, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF ANNUAL MEETING OF THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE

A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the proceedings of the annual meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, at Washington, D. C., September 22–24, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department for the calendar year ended December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered, granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES UNIFORM ALLOWANCE ACT

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1941 PERTAINING TO EMERGENCY FLOOD CONTROL WORK

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, as amended, pertaining to emergency flood-control work (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution relative to the observance of the centennials of the opening of the Pacific overland mail

"Whereas by act of Congress, dated March 3, 1857, the Postmaster General of the United States was, for the first time, authorized to contract for the conveyance overland, from the Mississippi River to San Francisco, Calif., of all letter mail; and

"Whereas until that time the conveyance of letter mail to the Pacific coast had been by the long, slow, arduous ocean route fraught with danger from storm and sea and totally dependent upon the vagaries of the wind; and

"Whereas the opening of service upon the overland route authorized by Congress was the culminating event of a series of events of prime importance not only to the development of the West and California, but also to the development of the United States; and

"Whereas centennial celebrations of these events should be fittingly observed throughout the length and breadth of the Nation for from the modest 'four-horse coaches, or spring wagons, suitable for the conveyance

of passengers, as well as the safety and security of the mails,' required by the act, have developed our modern systems of communications which bind the East and West into one great Nation; and

"Whereas the American Association for State and Local History has undertaken the national sponsorship of centennials and has established regional committees to plan such centennials; and

"Whereas a regional committee has been set up in California which is known as the 'California Committee, Overland Mail Centennials, 1957–1958': Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly). That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to insure the cooperation of the Federal Government in the celebration of the centennials of the opening of the Pacific overland mail; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully urges that all State and local governmental units; public schools; civic, patriotic, and historical societies; and all agencies of communication do participate wholeheartedly in the observance of the celebration of the centennials of the opening of the Pacific overland mail by cooperating fully with the California Committee, Overland Mail Centennials, 1957–58, in commemorating the acts, the accomplishments, and the memories of those sturdy pioneers who engineered the beginnings of overland communication between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of California does hereby commend the American Association for State and Local History for its action in undertaking on a national scale the sponsorship for the centennial observances of the opening of the Pacific overland mail; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of California does hereby respectfully request that the Governor of the State of California transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Speaker of the House; to the Senators and Representatives of the State of California in Congress; to the governors of the several States and Territories; to the board of supervisors of each California county; to the mayor of each incorporated city; to the titular head of the American Association for State and Local History, American Historical Association, Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association, California Historical Society, Historical Society of Southern California, Conference of California Historical Societies, California History Foundation, Native Sons of the Golden West, Native Daughters of the Golden West, National Committee for the Overland Mail Centennials, and California Committee for the Overland Mail Centennials."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 7

"Joint resolution relative to the Caryl Chessman case and writs of habeas corpus

"Whereas on or about January 11, 1955, the Chief Judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit stayed execution of a judgment imposing the death penalty on Caryl Chessman, convicted sex terrorist and kidnaper; and

"Whereas this infamous criminal has been convicted of 17 felonies as a result of jury verdicts and the criminal record upon which the conviction of this depraved person is based is so shocking that it is hereby briefly summarized:

"January 3, 1948: (1) First degree robbery.

"January 13, 1948: (2) Grand theft of an automobile which was used in perpetrating subsequent crimes and in which Chessman was fleeing when he was apprehended.

"January 18, 1948: (3) First degree robbery

"January 18, 1948: (4) First degree robbery.

"January 19, 1948: (5) First degree robbery. (6) First degree robbery. (7) Kidnaping of a female person for the purpose of robbery with infliction of bodily harm; punishment fixed at death. (8) Violation of California Penal Code Section 288a, relating to a crime of sex perversion, committed against a female person ((7) above).

"January 20, 1948: (9) First degree robbery.

"January 22, 1948: (10) Attempted robbery. (11) Kidnaping a female person for the purpose of robbery with infliction of bodily harm; punishment fixed at death. (12) Attempted rape of a female person ((11) above). (13) Violation of California Penal Code, section 288a, relating to a crime of sex perversion, committed against a female person ((11) above).

"January 23, 1948: (14) First degree robbery. (15) First degree robbery. (16) Kidnaping a male person for the purpose of robbery, with infliction of bodily harm; punishment fixed at life imprisonment without possibility of parole. (17) Kidnaping a male person for the purpose of robbery.

"Each of the above paragraphs represents a separate general criminal enterprise, in each of which one or more offenses were committed. The jury further found that Chessman was armed at the time of the commission of each of the crimes except that of grand theft, No. (2) above; that he was armed at the time of arrest; and that he had been twice convicted previously, once for robbery, and once for assault with a deadly weapon; and

"Whereas one of the female victims of this brutal and fiendish sex pervert suffered a mental breakdown which permanently deprived her of soundness of mind, requiring her confinement in an asylum where she remains to this day; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the State of California affirmed the decision of the trial court, upholding the judgment of conviction of the 17 felonies; and

"Whereas our Anglo-American legal history apprises us of our righteous sensitivity to the fact that, in the course of ordinary legal procedures, men may occasionally be convicted of a crime through no fault of their own. Nevertheless, cases of the Chessman type forcibly remind us of the inadequacy of the postconviction procedures which have been erected to guard against the contingencies of improper conviction when such procedures have the effect not of releasing the convict but of clogging the courts with the fraudulent and unfounded claims of the guilty; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has come to realize the gravity of this situation by remarking in the case of *Wade* v. *Mayo* (334 U. S. 672 (1948), note 51, 681–682):

" 'Statistics compiled by the administrative office of the United States courts show that during the fiscal years of 1943, 1944, and 1945 there was an average of 451 habeas corpus petitions filed each year in Federal district courts by prisoners serving State court sentence; of these petitions, an average of but 6 per year resulted in a reversal of the conviction and a release of the prisoner. The releases thus constituted only 1.3 percent of the total petitions filed'; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States as recently as the year 1952 has again recognized this situation in a note to its decision in *United States* v. *Hayman* (342 U. S. 205), at pages 212–213 that:

" 'In several districts, up to 40 percent of all applications for habeas corpus filed during the years 1943, 1944, and 1945 were so-called repeater petitions'; and

"Whereas Chessman has compiled an astonishing record in his relentless and seemingly unending pursuit of postconviction remedies. Chessman has been turned down by the California Supreme Court on his appeal from the trial court and has been refused 3 applications for a writ of habeas corpus in the same court; he has been rejected by the United States Supreme Court in 5 applications for a writ of certiorari, or review; he has been denied 5 times by the United States district court on applications for a writ of habeas corpus; he has been turned down previously by the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit on an appeal from the district court; and

"Whereas Chessman has been refused executive clemency upon several occasions both by Gov. Goodwin Knight and by former Gov. Earl Warren, now Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court; and

"Whereas the prostitution of our legal procedures by this depraved sex terrorist brings sharply into focus this aberration in the law of postconviction procedures; and

"Whereas the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws has prepared and urges the adoption of a uniform postconviction procedure act designed to remedy the defects in State court procedures; and

"Whereas the Federal law with respect to the writ of habeas corpus should be made the subject of a congressional study for the purpose of devising more adequate safeguards for society as well as the wronged individual by amendment of the appropriate Federal laws now permitting a convicted person serving a term in a State prison to repeatedly clog the calendars of the Federal courts with petitions for writs of habeas corpus: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to undertake an investigation and study of the Federal laws relating to the repeated use of the writ of habeas corpus by convicted persons serving terms in State prisons with a view to providing a limited right in the Federal courts to entertain such writs consonant with the due-process-of-law requirements of our Federal Constitution; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 4

"Joint resolution relative to the compensation of postal employees

"Whereas employees of the United States Post Office Department have received but one wage increase since 1949, which increase failed to compensate them for the great increase in the cost of living that has occurred since 1949; and

"Whereas most other public and private employees have received wage increases which more nearly enable them to meet the increased living costs; and

"Whereas any increase in the cost of living particularly affects postal employees because of their relatively low wages; and

"Whereas postal employees should receive an increase in wages not only because such an increase would be equitable but also because the efficiency of the postal system would be enhanced thereby: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to enact legislation for an increase in the compensation of postal employees commensurate with existing costs of living; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be directed to transmit copies of

this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Postmaster General, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 10

"Joint resolution relative to the extension of veterans' benefits

"Whereas the very foundation of the governmental system of this Nation is the principle that all persons similarly situated are entitled to and shall be given equal treatment within the law; and

"Whereas this Nation has ever held as inviolate its obligations both formal and implied to those persons serving in its Armed Forces; and

"Whereas the citizen soldier who is drafted today is being deprived of equal benefits by way of veterans aid to education as have been received by those persons drafted but a short time before even though he is asked to make much the same, if not identical, sacrifices as were made by those veterans; and

"Whereas many persons today in the Armed Forces volunteered with the implied and, in many instances, stated promise that they would receive educational benefits commensurate with their length of service; and

"Whereas it would be dishonorable and unjust to fail to keep faith with those serving our Nation in the Armed Forces during this hour of need; and

"Whereas many draft boards have urged young high-school graduates and others to volunteer for induction as soon as possible so that the time spent in the service would not break into a school year and emphasizing that the few months of education thus sacrificed would be more than amply repaid by the veteran's educational benefits; and

"Whereas the failure to provide educational benefits for the present-day citizen soldier is not only a failure to fulfill agreement with its citizens serving in the armed services but also is a failure to keep faith with those citizens serving on our draft boards who have contributed immeasurably to the success of the selective-service system; and

"Whereas such action is a blot upon the sacred honor and integrity of this Nation which if allowed to remain will jeopardize the future of the selective service system at a time when the perils facing this Nation are as grave as any it has ever been called upon to face: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to restore the educational benefits for present and future service in the Armed Forces of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 11

"Joint resolution relative to the Sacramento River Ship Channel

"Whereas the Sacramento River Ship Channel project was authorized by Congress in 1946 in Public Law 525, 79th Congress, 2d session, and construction started in 1949 with the completion date scheduled for July 1953; and

"Whereas the California State Legislature by Chapter 1152, 1947 Statutes, approved and adopted the project for navigation and flood control on the Sacramento River in cooperation with the Federal Government in accordance with Senate Document 142, 79th Congress, 2d session; declared the State interest therein; provided certain powers and duties of the Sacramento-Yolo Port District and the Department of Finance in connection therewith; provided for the acquisition of certain property rights therefor; and made an appropriation; and

"Whereas the State of California has a total investment of approximately $1 million in the project at the present time, including as a phase of the West Sacramento Freeway the Harbor Boulevard overpass to the port terminal area; and

"Whereas the Sacramento-Yolo Port District voted $3,750,000 in bonds for local participation, and has sold $1,750,000, and is presently burdened with amortization of those bonds; and

"Whereas the port district has constructed a grain elevator, belt railroad, and highways, with the grain elevator leased to private grain merchants who are depending upon completion of the deep-water channel for successful operation of the grain elevator; and

"Whereas private local businessmen and farmers, depending upon early completion of the project, have invested $2,500,000 in private warehouses, elevators, and other works adjacent to the port area; and

"Whereas the Federal Government required the Sacramento-Yolo Port District to give assurance that local interests would meet requirements in the act of authorization, and the port district has met each and every one of those requirements; and

"Whereas construction was stopped at the outbreak of the Korean war, after completion of 4 miles of channel north of Rio Vista at a cost of $2,548,000 to the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the deep-water channel when completed will serve more than 20 counties in the northeastern part of California north and east of Sacramento: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States, and the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, to take such steps as may be necessary to resume construction on this project immediately, and to make an appropriation sufficient to defray the cost of such work as can be accomplished by the Corps of Engineers during the 1955–56 fiscal year; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the House and Senate Appropriation Committees for Civil Functions, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of the Army."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 12

"Joint resolution relative to the Forest Service

"Whereas the Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture was created by Congress on March 3, 1905; and

"Whereas, the Forest Service is charged with the responsibility of promoting the conservation for best use of the Nation's forest lands, which comprise approximately one-third of the total land area of the United States; and

"Whereas the service administers approximately 150 national forests, extending over 180 million acres in 40 States and Alaska and Puerto Rico, and improves them, protects them from fire, insects and disease, and manages their resources for orderly and continuous service and for the maintenance of stable economic conditions in the national forest communities; and

"Whereas the service applies technical methods of forestry to the growing and harvesting of timber; scientifically regulates the grazing of livestock to obtain range conservation along with the use of the annual growth of forage; manages watersheds for the regulation of streamflow, reduction of flood danger of soil erosion, and the protection of water resources for power, irrigation, navigation, and municipal and domestic supply; provides for recreation; and proceeds scientifically in the development and maintenance of wildlife resources; and

"Whereas the States and private owners of forest lands receive the cooperation of the Forest Service in the application of sound management practices, in the maintenance of organized protection of forest lands against fire, and in the distribution of plans to farmers for windbreaks, shelter belts and farm woodlands; and the service cooperates with the States in stimulating the development, proper administration and management of State forests; and

"Whereas in carrying on its activities the Forest Service has fully justified the fondest hopes and expectations of its founders: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the State of California hereby congratulates the Forest Service on this, the fiftieth year of its existence, and expresses its recognition and appreciation of the splendid work that has been and is being done by it in the attainment of its objectives; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of California, the Department of Agriculture, and the Forest Service."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation limiting the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts

"Whereas Federal courts and more particularly the United States Supreme Court have through numerous opinions and decisions invaded the field of the legislative and executive branches of government; and

"Whereas through numerous opinions and decisions Federal courts and more particularly the United States Supreme Court have invaded the field of government which should be left to the control of the several States of the Union; and

"Whereas Congress is authorized under the Constitution of the United States to control and limit the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That Congress be memorialized to enact legislation limiting the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts so that the fields of government of the executive and legislative branches and that of the several States shall not be invaded, but shall remain separate and distinct; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each United States Senator from South Carolina, each Member of the House of Representatives of Congress from South Carolina, the Senate of the United States,

and the House of Representatives of the United States."

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Wyandotte, Mich., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide increased compensation for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from Paul Kramer, of New York, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for the restyling of the facade of the Department of Justice Building in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the board of supervisors, San Bernardino County, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide sufficient funds for processing Federal Housing Administration loans; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Resolution adopted by the 42d international convention of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees and Moving Picture Machine Operators of the United States and Canada, at Cincinnati, Ohio, relating to a revision of the Taft-Hartley law, and so forth; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

NORTHWEST AIRLINES—RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Minnesota and other States of the upper Midwest and Northwest have been seriously upset in the last few days by the extent to which the White House appeared willing to completely override the findings of the Civil Aeronautics Board and deprive one of our major airlines an international route it has pioneered, in order to provide a monopoly for a heavily subsidized competing line.

I refer to the originally announced decision of the President regarding operations of Northwest Airlines in the transpacific renewal case.

We are grateful, of course, that after a storm of protest from Minnesota and other States the President last night partially modified his order to permit continuation for 3 years at least the Seattle-Portland-Hawaii service by Northwest.

Yet even that is a far cry from the permanent certification the CAB recommended by a 5-to-0 decision, a modification obviously granted reluctantly under political pressure and in no way changing what appears to be the basic attitude of this administration toward international air routes.

It is regrettable that the semijudicial functions of the CAB are being bypassed by the White House. It is unfortunate that political favoritism and a leaning toward monopoly control seems to be injecting itself into issues that should be settled on an economic basis in the full spirit of our free-enterprise system, and in accordance with the intent of Congress in creating the Civil Aeronautics Board. This may well be a trend some of our appropriate committees of the Congress may find worth looking into in more detail.

Another important issue affecting the economy of the Midwest is still unresolved. It is the question of permanent certification of Northwest for the inside route from Minneapolis-St. Paul to Anchorage, Alaska, as a link in international travel from New York to Tokyo. If Northwest is deprived of this route, more than an airline is hurt. It may well mean loss of a vital route to United States carriers, and mean turning that route over to Canadian carriers. If so we will be sacrificing a link in the shortest route from New York to the Orient. Many of us shall be watching closely the pending final decision on this inside route.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a resolution adopted by the house of representatives of the Minnesota Legislature on February 4, requesting the President of the United States to reconsider his earlier action relative to Northwest Airlines.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, printed in the RECORD.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House resolution requesting the President of the United States to reconsider action relative to Northwest Airlines

Whereas Northwest Airlines is an important segment of the economy of the State of Minnesota and the upper Midwest; and

Whereas Northwest Airlines has pioneered air service between the Pacific Northwest and Hawaii by which it has developed a substantial community of interest between such islands and the State of Minnesota; and

Whereas it appears that Northwest Airlines is to be deprived of its charter to continue such service; and

Whereas the loss of such charter will be a serious impairment to the economy of Minnesota and the upper Northwest; and

Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Board recently decided by unanimous decision to renew Northwest Airlines' charter to continue its airline service between the Pacific Northwest and Hawaii; and

Whereas the President of the United States has directed the Civil Aeronautics Board to reverse its action and to deny the renewal of Northwest Airlines' charter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota, That the President of the United States be most respectfully requested to reconsider his action wherein he requested the Civil Aeronautics Board to reverse its decision to renew Northwest Airlines' charter to operate air flights between Seattle and Honolulu for the reasons that failure to renew the charter of Northwest Airlines will work a great hardship upon the said airlines; will injure the economy of the State of Minnesota, and will seriously impair essential transportation services in the upper Midwest; be it further

Resolved, That an enrolled copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and to each member of the Minnesota congressional delegation, Washington, D. C.

ALFRED I. JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Adopted by the House of Representatives, the 4th day of February 1955.

G. H. LEAHY,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION—RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the people of America noted with deep interest the comments by President Eisenhower in his health message regarding our increased contribution to the World Health Organization, a great institution which has performed tremendous service throughout the world.

I present a resolution which I have received from Dr. Harold Hillenbrand, secretary of the American Dental Association along this same line.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN DENTAL ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., February 4, 1955.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The American Dental Association, which has a total membership of 82,000, adopted, at the recent session of its house of delegates, the following resolution which it desires to call to your attention:

"*Resolved,* That the interest of the American Dental Association in removing the present ceiling on this Nation's assessment for the World Health Organization be expressed to the Members of the Congress of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service."

The association is deeply interested in the provision of additional support for the program of the World Health Organization and earnestly solicits your cooperation in achieving that objective.

Very truly yours,
HAROLD HILLENBRAND, D. D. S.,
Secretary.

RESOLUTIONS OF GREAT LAKES HARBORS ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present two resolutions which were adopted by the Great Lakes Harbors Association on September 14, 1954.

One of these resolutions rightly opposes the notorious Chicago water steal—a subject on which I see our friends from the Chicago area commented in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the other day with their customary vigor but with regrettable inaccuracy.

The other resolution rightly supports the deepening of the Great Lakes connecting channels and the necessary improvement of port facilities.

I heartily endorse the comments in both of these association resolutions.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions may be printed in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE GREAT LAKES HARBORS ASSOCIATION, SEPTEMBER 14, 1954

Whereas President Eisenhower has vetoed H. R. 3300 which would have permitted additional diversion of waters from the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system through the Chicago Drainage Canal; and

Whereas the Great Lakes Harbors Association feels that it is in the best interests of the Great Lakes area to preserve the integrity of the levels of the Great Lakes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Great Lakes Harbors Association expresses its unalterable opposition to any proposed legislation which purports to circumvent or defeat the United State supreme decree of April 21, 1930, which authorizes diversion at Chicago of 1,500 cubic feet per second, plus domestic pumpage; further

Resolved, That the proper forum for applications for increased diversion is the United States Supreme Court which has expressly retained jurisdiction over the matter of diversion of water from the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence water system; further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the official records of the association and that copies thereof be sent to all Members of Congress and the United States Senate.

Whereas Congress at each session considers many requests for appropriation of funds for the improvement and development of waterways in all sections of the United States; and

Whereas the Great Lakes constitute the greatest inland waterway in the world, with low freight rates: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Congress be requested:

1. To continue its appropriations of funds in an amount sufficient to complete the study already authorized and now being undertaken by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, of the Great Lakes levels, their effect, their control, damages caused by high levels, and the like.

2. To appropriate at the next session of Congress funds sufficient to improve and develop the connecting channels between the upper and the lower lakes in order to provide minimum depths of 27 feet so as to permit the large foreign and domestic ocean-going freighters to navigate Lakes Michigan, Huron, and Superior when the St. Lawrence Seaway is completed.

3. To appropriate funds sufficient to deepen the channels in the harbors on the Great Lakes which will require deepening in order to be ready for the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

4. To appropriate funds sufficient to permit the port cities on the Great Lakes to maintain their harbors in a proper condition from year to year; further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the official records of the association and that copies be mailed to each Senator and Congressman from the States bordering upon the Great Lakes.

CONTINUATION OF FEDERAL SOIL CONSERVATION PROGRAM—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter I have received from the Montana Association of Soil Conservation Districts, Bozeman, Mont., enclosing a resolution adopted by that association favoring the continuance of the Federal soil-conservation program.

I urge my colleagues to pay very careful attention to the resolution, because it embodies the thoughts of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONTANA ASSOCIATION OF
SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS,
MONTANA STATE COLLEGE,
Bozeman, Mont.

To All Members of the United States Senate.

HONORABLE SENATORS: The Montana Association of Soil Conservation Districts in their 13th annual business meeting in Butte, Mont., November 30 and December 1, 1954, adopted the enclosed resolutions and directive that it be sent to you.

Respectfully submitted.

REX F. CAMPBELL,
Secretary.

Whereas the Federal Soil Conservation Service, working with soil conservation districts has accomplished outstanding success in putting conservation on the land; and

Whereas the Federal Commission on Conservation and Agriculture has recommended that this program be relegated to the various States with a "grant-in-aid" status; and

Whereas the present corps of Soil Conservation Service technicians would be gradually shifted to the status of State employees: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Montana Association of Soil Conservation Districts object to this recommendation and support and urge all efforts to the end of retaining the present program as a Federal service for the following reasons:

First, the idea is financially impracticable because a number of the States, including Montana, have, in the past, been unable to make sufficient appropriations to meet their obligations on other similar grant-in-aid programs such as Federal highways and other worthwhile projects.

Second, a good program must be based and dependent on well-trained and educated personnel who can be assured of the security and permanence that only the civil-service status could provide. Many would not accept employment by the States.

Third, that a high standard of achievement could not possibly be obtained in all the 48 States under separate programs.

Fourth, the benefits of a nationally administered program of soil conservation accrues to all people; be it furthermore

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to every Member of both Houses of Congress, to the Governor of Montana, to our State legislators, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the President of the United States.

Whereas Public Law 566, commonly known as the Watersheds Protection and Flood Prevention Act, is designed primarily to furnish financial assistance for prevention and control of floods; and

Whereas only a very limited number of projects can be justified in Montana on the basis of flood prevention alone: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Montana Association of Soil Conservation Districts respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to so amend the act as to permit both Federal financial and technical assistance in making beneficial uses of floodwater prior to giving consideration to structures for flood prevention. In the West where water for irrigation is of primary importance because of the semiarid climate, and flood conditions are usually caused by a combination of mountain snow-melt and rainfall during the spring season, followed generally by drought conditions, the storage of sufficient water to carry crops through the summer is the major problem and should receive primary consideration. Structures to handle floodwaters in excess of irrigation requirements are necessary but should be made the secondary objective of most projects in this and other States of the semiarid West; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Montana and other Western States' congressional delegations, the chairmen of the Senate and House Agricultural Committees, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, the president of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, the Governors of the State of Montana and other Western States, and the chairman of the State Soil Conservation Committee.

REPEAL OF TRANSPORTATION TAX—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have received from the Northwest Shippers Advisory Board, of St. Paul, Minn., a letter transmitting a resolution adopted by that board favoring the repeal of the transportation tax. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and resolution may be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTHWEST SHIPPERS ADVISORY BOARD,
Minneapolis, Minn., February 1, 1955.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Your attention is directed to the attached resolution adopted by the Northwest Shippers Advisory Board at its 32d annual and 110th regular meeting held in St. Paul, Minn., January 26, 1955, in connection with the repeal of the transportation tax on passenger, sleeping-car accommodations, and freight.

In conformity with instructions given me by this board, I am passing this resolution to you for your consideration and action toward fulfilling the views expressed therein.

Very respectfully yours,

W. C. ANDERSON,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE NORTHWEST SHIPPERS ADVISORY BOARD AT ITS 32D ANNUAL MEETING, ST. PAUL, MINN., JANUARY 26, 1955

REPEAL OF TRANSPORTATION TAX

Whereas the transportation tax on passenger and sleeping-car accommodations was a war measure to discourage travel; and

Whereas the transportation tax on freight was a war measure to increase revenue for the conduct of World War II; and

Whereas this board has repeatedly pointed out that the tax on passenger and sleeping-car accommodations has passed the need to discourage travel and the tax on freight is a burden on transportation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this board reiterate its previous action on these two matters and respectfully request its secretary to transmit its opposition to these taxes to all Members of Congress from the States comprising this board area.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LEHMAN, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

H. R. 587. A bill to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 26).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1960 Olympic games in Detroit, Mich.; without amendment (Rept. No. 27).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unani-

mous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. WILEY, Mr. IVES, and Mr. HENNINGS):

S. 967. A bill to amend section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the maintenance of the Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. BENDER, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. THYE, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. DUFF, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. BUTLER, and Mr. BEALL):

S. 968. A bill to authorize Federal assistance to States and communities to enable them to increase public elementary and secondary school construction; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FLANDERS:

S. 969. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, relative to the process of selection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 970. A bill for the relief of Burgal Lyden and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FREAR:

S. 971. A bill to stabilize farm incomes by providing a system of insurance to indemnify farmers against certain losses occurring in the operation of their farms; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. FREAR (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 972. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 973. A bill to provide a residence for pages of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, under the supervision of a Capitol Pages' Residence Board; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 974. A bill for the relief of Casimero Rivera Gutierrez, Teresa Gutierrez, Susana Rivera Gutierrez, Martha Aguilera Gutierrez, and Armando Casimero Gutierrez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 975. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the invaluable service rendered to the United States by Amelia Earhart Putnam; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 976. A bill to provide for the release of the right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain tract or parcel of land conditionally granted by it to the city of Montgomery, W. Va.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 977. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to duties of judges of the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 978. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, so as to require that prices of basic agricultural commodities be supported at 90 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. THURMOND when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 979. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that old-age and other monthly insurance benefits shall be payable at age 60 in lieu of at age 65, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 980. A bill to provide a system of scholarships for persons of unusual ability in certain sciences; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 981. A bill to assist the enforcement of State laws licensing insurance companies, by prohibiting the use of the mails to evade such laws; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 982. A bill to amend the Water Pollution Control Act; and

S. 983. A bill to provide grants to municipalities in those States which are parties to the Ohio River Valley sanitation compact to aid in the construction of sewage treatment works to prevent pollution of waters in the Ohio River Basin; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 984 (by request). A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the District of Columbia government to establish an Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes," approved August 11, 1950; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. WELKER):

S. 985. A bill to establish an Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 986. A bill to provide that the Uniform Simultaneous Death Act shall apply in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 987. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to assist the States of Maryland and Delaware to reestablish their common boundary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 988. A bill to provide certain decorations for outstanding and heroic conduct or service by persons serving in the American merchant marine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 989. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents to certain lands in Hancock County, Miss., conveyed as swamp and overflowed lands by the State of Mississippi to private individuals in 1926; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 990. A bill to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 991. A bill for the relief of Rabbi Aron Katz and his family;

S. 992. A bill for the relief of Antonio Carreri; and

S. 993. A bill for the relief of Eugene Alexander Figueiredo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE (for himself and Mr. IVES):

S. 994. A bill to suspend for 1 year certain duties upon the importation of aluminum and aluminum alloys; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KILGORE (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN):

S. 995. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 996. A bill for the relief of Hans Kuzura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 997. A bill to provide punishment for certain confidence game swindles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. KERR):

S. 998. A bill to authorize the conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Oklahoma to the city of Woodward, Okla.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 999. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1000. A bill for the relief of Andrius Kuprevicius; and

S. 1001. A bill for the relief of Haralambos Pavlides (Harry Pavlos); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1002. A bill to increase the amount of guaranty by the Veterans' Administration on certain home loans made pursuant to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 1003. A bill to establish a Federal policy concerning the termination, limitation, or establishment of business-type operations of the Government which may be conducted in competition with private enterprise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. BENDER, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. WILEY):

S. 1004. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to improve the administration of the program for the utilization of surplus property for educational and public health purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN (by request):

S. 1005. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1006. A bill to authorize reciprocal fire protection agreements between departments and agencies of the United States and public or private organizations engaged in firefighting activities, and for other purposes; and

S. 1007. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 1008. A bill for the relief of Isabelle S. Gorrell, Donald E. Gorrell, Mary Owen Gorrell, and Kathryn G. Wright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. BARRETT):

S. 1009. A bill for the relief of Kathleen Schrater; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1010. A bill to create the office of Senator at Large in the Senate of the United States for ex-Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENDER, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DUFF, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. JENNER, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. POTTER, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. THYE, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. CAPEHART, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. J. Res. 39. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. J. Res. 40. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. NEELY, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. DOUGLAS):

S. J. Res. 41. Joint resolution to establish a national policy for the production and utilization of food and fiber, so as to make full economic use of the productive capacity of United States farms to improve domestic nutrition and clothing standards and buttress the foreign policy of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

MAINTENANCE OF MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, last year I was pleased to be the cosponsor of the bill (S. 3610) to provide for the maintenance of the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., as a permanent Federal institution. A similar bill passed the House and was reported favorably by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, but that action came at such a late date that it prevented the Senate from taking up this measure prior to adjournment in August.

Today, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], I introduce for appropriate reference a similar bill to amend section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the maintenance of the Merchant Marine Academy. I ask unanimous consent that a statement explaining the background and nature of this legislation be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 967) to amend section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the maintenance of the Merchant Marine Academy, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. WILEY, Mr. IVES, and Mr. HENNINGS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

On behalf of myself, and Senators IVES, WILEY, and HENNINGS, I am introducing a bill which would amend section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the maintenance of the Merchant Marine Academy.

This Academy, located at Kings Point, Long Island, N. Y., has been in existence since 1938. Since that time it has established an enviable record of providing trained midshipmen for the United States merchant marine. Members of this body who have from time to time served on the Board of Visitors of the United States Merchant Marine Academy can attest to the fine facilities and reputation which the Kings Point academy possesses, not to mention the splendid caliber of young men who have graduated from this Federal institution.

This bill would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to maintain the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point on a permanent basis for the instruction and preparation for service in the merchant marine of selected persons as officers. The importance of the merchant marine cannot be overstated, particularly in these critical times. With the responsibility for proper operation of the merchant marine follows the duty to see that this merchant marine is properly manned by qualified officer personnel. This the Federal academy at Kings Point has been doing to a great extent and will do even more completely with the establishment of the academy on a permanent basis as a Federal institution.

During the past couple of years much confusion has arisen within and without the Academy concerning the future of that institution. This has had the unfortunate but inevitable result of adversely affecting the morale of the students and of the faculty. In the words of the report of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee on a similar bill last year: "As one witness stated, one of the undoubted assets of the school is an indefinable esprit which certainly is not encouraged by continued rumors and acts which indicate an uncertain future. In order to meet this problem, the subcommittee is of the opinion that the Merchant Marine Academy should be recognized as one of the group of academies training young men for the service of their country and to that end should receive status equivalent to that of the Military, Naval, Coast Guard, and Air Academies."

Last year's House bill was similar to one which I was pleased to cosponsor with Senator WILEY and Senator IVES. The House bill, H. R. 9434, passed the House on July 30, and was reported in the Senate by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on August 18. Unfortunately, because of the press of business so close to the August 20 adjournment date, it was impossible to obtain Senate approval of this bill at that time.

I am pleased to know that three distinguished Members of the House have in this Congress already introduced bills identical to the one which I introduce today. Chairman BONNER of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which has jurisdiction over this legislation, is the sponsor of one of these bills. Another was introduced by Congressman VAN PELT, who, in the 83d Congress, was chairman of the House subcommittee handling this matter. The third identical bill was introduced by Congressman EUGENE KEOGH, of New York, who has long demonstrated his great interest in and devotion to the cause of the American merchant marine. I am pleased to join with my colleagues in the House in sponsoring this measure in the 84th Congress.

I hope that this Congress will be able to act favorably upon this legislation which is of importance not only to young men interested in serving in our merchant marine, but of greater importance to the country in its efforts to provide an adequate number of properly trained officers for the merchant marine.

At this time, I wish to take this opportunity to point out that my bill in no way jeopardizes the continuance of the State maritime colleges which have done such a splendid job of graduating young merchant marine officers for such a long period. These four schools, located in New York, California, Maine, and Massachusetts, have their distinct part to play in the important task of adequately manning our merchant fleet. I and many of my colleagues in the Senate have been greatly disturbed by the President's budget recommendation that no funds be appropriated for fiscal 1956 as the Federal share of maintaining these four State maritime schools. I intend to support efforts in the Appropriations Committee and on the floor, if necessary, to provide Federal funds to these State schools as we have for so many years. Indeed, I feel that the bill which I am introducing today serves only to emphasize the importance of training officer personnel for the merchant marine, and both the Federal and the State maritime colleges are equally necessary.

EMERGENCY SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill reflecting in legislative form the special message on emergency school construction, which we have just received from the President. I am happy to have as cosponsors of the bill the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], and the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

I also invite any other Senators to join in cosponsoring the bill, and ask unanimous consent that their names may be added any time today.

The Presidential message delivered this morning is of extreme importance, for the unprecedented classroom shortage we are now facing is, as President Eisenhower said in his state of the Union message, "of immediate concern to all our people."

The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as its first item of business in the 84th Congress, commenced public hearings on bills relating to Federal aid to school construction. At the opening of the hearings I stated that Congress must proceed with dispatch in the consideration of such proposed legislation. I also stated that final Committee action on the problem would hardly be appropriate until we had re-

ceived, studied, and considered the President's recommendations.

We have now received those recommendations, which were made after thoughtful study and consultation with experts in the field, in both public and private life. I am convinced that the approach recommended today by President Eisenhower is much to be preferred to the straight grant-in-aid proposals now before the Committee. The President's program will do a bigger job better, and, in my opinion, just as quickly, as any proposal heretofore made. In addition, and of the first importance, is the fact that the vital interests and responsibilities of the States and local communities in the field of public education are more perfectly preserved by these recommendations than by any program for general Federal handouts, with or without matching provisions.

President Eisenhower's recommendations are entitled to the thorough study and consideration of the members of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, of all other Members of the Senate, and of the public, to the end that the Senate may enact the best possible solution to meet this emergency need. With somewhat more leisure, the Congress can study the results of the State and White House conferences on education and the results of other studies soon to be forthcoming, in order to determine the proper role of the Federal Government in public education over the long run.

Mr. President, the bill I have just introduced will, if enacted, provide:

First. For the purchase by the Federal Government of bonds issued by local school districts to finance school construction, where such bonds are not marketable to the public at reasonable rates of interest.

Second. For support by the Federal Government, in association with the States, of the bonds issued by State school building agencies established to finance the construction of buildings for rental to and eventual ownership by local public school systems.

Third. For Federal grants-in-aid, matched by the States, to enable local school districts to qualify for 1 of the 2 forms of assistance previously described.

Fourth. For Federal grants-in-aid, matched by the States, to meet administrative costs of developing and initiating programs designed to overcome obstacles to local financing of school construction or to furnish State advisory and financial aid to local public-school systems.

Several points deserve reemphasis. I wish to emphasize that enactment of this bill, first of all, would make possible a tremendous volume of new construction. Over the next three years, the bill will make possible the joining of local, State, and Federal resources, amounting to $7 billion, which would result in approximately 200,000 new classrooms, to house close to 6 million children. Second it should be made clear that this bill will permit the building of schools as fast as would be permitted by any alternative program now under consideration. Third the bill is completely voluntary in its provisions. In the fourth place it is comprehensive and is designed to meet the varying needs of our varied school districts and their problems. Fifth, it fully preserves local initiative and local responsibility.

I commend to the earnest consideration of my colleagues the President's message and the bill I have just introduced.

Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a summary of its provisions, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 968) to authorize Federal assistance to States and communities to enable them to increase public elementary and secondary school construction, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "School Construction Assistance Act of 1955."

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that—

(1) free public education is of fundamental importance to the self-governing citizens of a free democracy;

(2) in the United States of America, public education has been from the earliest times the right and the responsibility of the States and communities;

(3) the growth of our population and the enforced curtailment of construction during the years of war and defense mobilization and other factors have combined to cause a serious shortage of public elementary and secondary school facilities;

(4) despite the efforts of local communities, which have increased current school construction to an unprecedented level, there is still a serious national shortage of public school facilities;

(5) the local communities are often, in their efforts to expand school construction to the extent required, confronted with obstacles in applying their potential resources to their needs, including an inability to borrow the necessary funds at reasonable rates, restrictive debt and tax limits, uneconomical school districting and similar matters;

(6) while overcoming these obstacles is primarily the responsibility of the States and communities, the Federal Government, recognizing the Nation's interest in our public school system, can and should take all appropriate steps, consonant with State and local responsibility, to help the States and communities meet their emergency school construction needs.

(b) It is, therefore, the purpose of this act to provide assistance of a substantial and effective nature to States and communities which are handicapped by the shortage of public school facilities, through—

(1) purchase by the Federal Government of obligations issued by local educational agencies to finance school construction where such obligations cannot otherwise be marketed at reasonable rates of interest;

(2) support by the Federal Government, with the participation of the States, of the obligations issued by State school building agencies established to finance the construction of school facilities for rental to and eventual ownership by local educational agencies;

(3) Federal grants to the States to assist them in helping local educational agencies, economically unable to qualify for the assistance described above, to obtain urgently needed school facilities;

(4) Federal grants to the States to assist them in meeting the administrative costs of developing and initiating programs designed to overcome obstacles to local financing of school construction.

TITLE I—FEDERAL PURCHASE OF OBLIGATIONS OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITH MARGINAL CREDIT

PURPOSE

SEC. 101. For the purpose of assisting local communities to construct public elementary or secondary school facilities, the Commissioner of Education (hereinafter in this act referred to as the "Commissioner") may purchase obligations of local educational agencies, as hereinafter provided, to aid in financing the construction of such facilities by such agencies.

AMOUNT OF OBLIGATIONS PURCHASED

SEC. 102. The total of the obligations of a local educational agency purchased under this title with respect to any school facilities may not exceed the Federal percentage, determined under the succeeding sentence, of the cost of constructing such facilities. The Federal percentage for any local educational agency in a State shall be 100 percent minus that percentage which bears the same ratio to 40 percent as the per capita income of the State bears to the per capita income of the continental United States (excluding Alaska), except that (1) the Federal percentage shall in no case be more than 80 percent or less than 50 percent, and (2) the Federal percentage in Hawaii and Alaska shall be 60 percent, and in Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands shall be 80 percent. Such Federal percentages shall be promulgated by the Commissioner as soon as possible after the date of enactment of this act on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the continental United States for the 3 most recent years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce, and the percentages so promulgated shall be conclusive for purposes of this title.

TERMS OF OBLIGATIONS; LIMITATIONS

SEC. 103. (a) (1) Obligations purchased under this title may be either general or special obligations of a local educational agency, shall be purchased at par or face value, shall be in such form and be secured in such manner and be repaid within such period, not exceeding 30 years, as may be determined by the Commissioner, and shall bear interest at a rate equal to the quarterly rate which the Secretary of the Treasury shall specify as applicable to the calendar quarter during which obligations are purchased by the Commissioner, plus one-half of 1 percent.

(2) The quarterly rate applicable to each calendar quarter shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury by estimating the average yield to maturity, on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations of prices during the month preceding such calendar quarter, on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having a maturity date of 15 or more years from the first day of such month, and by adjusting such estimated average yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent.

(b) Not more than 15 percent of the sums appropriated under this title for any fiscal year shall be available for purchase of obligations of local educational agencies in any State.

(c) No obligations may be purchased under this title after June 30, 1958.

CONDITIONS TO PURCHASER OF OBLIGATIONS

Sec. 104. Obligations of a local educational agency may be purchased under this title only upon application by the State educational agency to the Commissioner certifying that—

(a) such local educational agency is, as evidenced by a public offering of such obligations, unable to obtain the funds necessary to finance the cost of construction of the school facilities involved from other sources upon reasonable terms and at the interest rate applicable to obligations purchased under this title;

(b) there is an opinion by a qualified attorney that such obligations have been legally issued and are binding on such local educational agency;

(c) the school facilities to be constructed with the proceeds from the sale of the obligations are needed for current or reasonably anticipated enrollments, are consistent with any applicable State redistricting plans or policies, and will be undertaken in compliance with applicable State construction laws and standards;

and including such additional information as may be necessary to make a showing, satisfactory to the Commissioner, that such local educational agency is financially able to pay such obligations as they become due.

APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 105. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1955, and the next 2 fiscal years, such sums, not to exceed an aggregate of $750 million, as may be necessary for the purchase of obligations as authorized by this title. Payments of principal and interest by local educational agencies on obligations purchased by the Commissioner under this title shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States, as miscellaneous receipts.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Sec. 106. In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this title, the Commissioner, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, may—

(a) sell or exchange at public or private sale, upon such terms and at such prices as he may fix, any obligations purchased by him under this title;

(b) subject to the specific limitations in this title and where necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States, consent to the modification, with respect to the time of payment of any installment of principal or interest, security, or any other terms of any obligation, contract, or agreement to which he is a party or which has been transferred to him pursuant to this title; and

(c) include in any contract or instrument made pursuant to this title such other covenants, conditions, or provisions as he may deem necessary to assure payment of obligations purchased under this title.

ACCOUNTING AND AUDITS

Sec. 107. The Commissioner shall, with respect to the financial operations arising by reason of this title—

(a) prepare annually and submit a business-type budget as provided for wholly owned Government corporations by the Government Corporation Control Act; and

(b) maintain an integral set of accounts, which shall be audited anually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions, as provided by section 105 of the Government Corporation Control Act.

(c) determine the character and necessity of expenditures under this title and the manner in which such expenditures are incurred, allowed, and paid, subject to the provisions of law specifically applicable to wholly owned Government corporations.

TITLE II—FEDERAL CREDIT ASSISTANCE TO STATE SCHOOL BUILDING AGENCIES

PURPOSE

Sec. 201. For the purpose of assisting States desiring to do so to issue and market obligations to finance the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities for rental to, and ultimate ownership by, local educational agencies, the Commissioner is authorized, as provided in this title, to enter into agreements, on behalf of the United States, with State school building agencies for making advances to reserve funds established by such agencies to help assure payment of such obligations.

AGREEMENTS WITH STATE SCHOOL BUILDING AGENCIES

Sec. 202. The Commissioner shall enter into an agreement with the State school-building agency of any State only if

(a) such agency is empowered to enter into an agreement with the Commissioner under this title and otherwise comply with the provisions of this title,

(b) the governor of such State certifies to the Commissioner that methods for securing effective coordination between such agency and the State educational agency have been provided, and

(c) the State law empowering such agency to take the action referred to in clause (a) authorizes payment by the State, subject to and within the limits of appropriations made available for the purpose, of advances for deposit in the State account of the basic reserve fund (or funds) of such agency equal to the amount withdrawn pursuant to the agreement from such account in any year (other than the year in which occurs the latest maturity date of the obligations).

ESTABLISHMENT OF RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 203. (a) An agreement pursuant to this title shall provide that the State school-building agency shall establish and thereafter maintain a basic reserve fund and a supplemental reserve fund with respect to each issue of obligations, which funds, so long as any such obligations remain outstanding, shall be held in trust for and irrevocably pledged to the payment and retirement of such obligations.

(b) Where so provided in the agreement at the request of the State school-building agency, such basic reserve fund, or such fund and such supplemental reserve fund, may be established with respect to two or more issues of obligations; and in such case such issues shall, to the extent provided in the agreement, be regarded as a single issue of obligations.

STATE ADVANCES TO BASIC RESERVE FUND

Sec. 204. Such agreement shall provide for establishment of the basic reserve fund with respect to an issue of obligations on or before the date of delivery of any such obligations to the purchasers thereof, and for deposit by the State therein, upon establishment of such fund, of an amount equal to one-half of the maximum annual debt service on such obligations. The amounts so advanced, plus any amounts subsequently advanced by the State thereto, together with any interest thereon or increments thereof accrued, shall be known as the "State account."

FEDERAL ADVANCES TO BASIC RESERVE FUND

Sec. 205. (a) In the case of any State school building agency which has entered into an agreement as provided in this title with respect to an issue of obligations, the Commissioner shall advance to such State school building agency for deposit in the basic reserve fund for such issue an amount equal to one-half of the maximum annual debt service of such obligations. Such advance shall be made on or before the date of delivery of any such obligations to the purchasers thereof. The advance so made, plus subsequent advances by the Commissioner, together with interest thereon or increments thereof accrued, shall be known as the "Federal account."

(b) If any funds are withdrawn in any year (other than the year in which occurs the latest maturity date of the obligations) from the Federal account in a basic reserve fund pursuant to an agreement under this title, the Commissioner shall make an additional advance to such account in an amount equal to that withdrawn.

(c) The faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of all advances contracted to be made to the Federal account in a basic reserve fund pursuant to this title.

(d) Advances by the Commissioner to the Federal account in a basic reserve fund, together with any other sums in such account, shall be invested, as provided in the agreement—

(1) in interest-bearing securities of the United States or securities guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States, or

(2) in bonds or other obligations which are lawful investments for fiduciary, trust, and public funds of the United States.

PAYMENT TO SUPPLEMENTAL RESERVE FUND

Sec. 206. An agreement pursuant to this title shall provide for payment into the supplemental reserve fund established with respect to an issue of obligations of all sums collected for such purpose pursuant to section 209 (d) (2).

USE OF SUPPLEMENTAL AND BASIC RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 207. The agreement pursuant to this title shall provide that if the rentals and other funds available therefor for any year are, after payment of the other expenses specified in section 209 (d) (other than clause (1) thereof) with respect to which such rentals were collected, insufficient to meet the annual debt service for such year on any issue of obligations,

(a) the State school building agency shall use the sums, if any, in the supplemental reserve fund established for such issue for meeting such debt service;

(b) if such sums are insufficient for this purpose, such agency shall use the sums available in the basic reserve fund established for such issue;

(c) withdrawals from the basic reserve fund for this purpose shall be equally divided between the State account and the Federal account in the fund, to the extent the balance in the State account is adequate for this purpose; and

(d) if such balance is not adequate, the amount of any remaining deficiency shall be withdrawn from the Federal account to the extent of any balance therein, except that the total of the withdrawals from such account with respect to such debt service may not exceed one-half of such debt service.

REPAYMENTS OF ADVANCES

Sec. 208. An agreement under this title with respect to any issue of obligations shall provide that whenever the aggregate of the sums in the basic and supplemental reserve funds, including interest or other increments from the investment thereof, exceeds two times the maximum annual debt service on such issue for any of the ensuing years, the State school building agency shall pay to the Commissioner, first (and until all advances made by the Commissioner, subsequent to the original advance made by him, together with interest or other increment received from the investment of such advances, have been repaid), an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such excess as the sum of such subsequent advances bears to the sum of such advances plus the sum of any payments made by the State to the State account in the basic reserve fund in addition to the original amount of such State account; and second (and until all advances made by the Commissioner, together with interest or other increment received from the investment of such advances,

have been repaid), an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such excess as the sum of all advances made by the Commissioner bears to such sum plus the sum of all payments made to the State account. Amounts paid to the Commissioner under this section shall be used to redeem any outstanding obligations of the Commissioner issued pursuant to section 212 and any excess shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS OF AGREEMENT

SEC. 209. In addition to the foregoing provisions and such other covenants, conditions, or provisions as the Commissioner may deem necessary to provide reasonable assurance that advances by the Commissioner under this title will be repaid as provided in section 208, each agreement entered into by the Commissioner with respect to any one or more issues of obligations of a State school building agency shall provide—

(a) that (1) all such obligations shall mature in not more than 32 years from the earliest date of any of such obligations and the first payment of principal shall become due not later than the end of the third year following such earliest date, and (2) the proceeds of the sale of such obligations shall be used to finance the cost (including interest prior to, during, and for such period not exceeding 1 year after completion of construction as may be provided in the agreement, and other necessary carrying charges) of construction of school facilities, for rental by local educational agencies requesting such facilities;

(b) that such school facilities shall be limited to those certified by the State educational agency to be needed for current or reasonably anticipated enrollments and to be consistent with any applicable State redistricting plans or policies, and that construction thereof will be in accord with applicable State construction laws and standards;

(c) that such school facilities, upon completion of construction, shall (1) be leased to the local educational agency for the school district in which the school facilities are located, (2) if the State so desires, be conveyed to such local educational agency upon the making of adequate provision for repayment of advances made by the Commissioner with respect to the issue of obligations and for retirement of such issue or an agreed upon portion thereof, as provided in the agreement; and

(d) that the rentals for such facilities shall be fixed, charged, and collected in amounts which will in the aggregate, together with other sums available for the purpose, provide sufficient funds to pay, to the extent payment is not otherwise provided for, (1) the annual debt service on the issue of obligations, and (2) in each year until the latest maturity date of such issue of obligations, for deposit in the supplemental reserve fund, an amount equal to one-fourth of 1 percent of the original principal amount of such issue of obligations, and (3) the cost of the maintenance, repair, replacement, and insurance of such facilities, and administrative and other expenses of the State school building agency in connection with such facilities or the financing thereof.

AUTHORIZATION ON APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 210. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1955, and the next 2 fiscal years, such sums as may be necessary to provide the initial Federal advances authorized by this title to be made to basic reserve funds.

LIMIT ON AMOUNT OF OBLIGATIONS

SEC. 211. The issues of obligations with respect to which Federal advances may be made pursuant to this title shall be limited to obligations issued in the period beginning July 1, 1955, and ending June 30, 1958, in an aggregate principal amount not to exceed $6 billion.

OBLIGATIONS ISSUED BY SECRETARY

SEC. 212. (a) To obtain funds for additional advances under section 205 (b), the Commissioner shall issue notes, debentures, or other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury. The total amount of such obligations issued in any year may not exceed the aggregate amount needed for such additional advances for such year.

(b) Obligations issued by the Commissioner under this section shall be in such forms and denominations, have such maturities, and be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of such obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any obligations of the Commissioner issued under this section and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of the Commissioner's obligations hereunder. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary, together with repayments made by State school building agencies hereunder, for payments on obligations issued by the Commissioner under this section.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 213. (a) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in the Commissioner by this title, the Commissioner, in addition to other powers conferred by this act, shall have power to agree to modifications of agreements made under this title and to pay, compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, lien, or demand, however arising or acquired under this title; except that nothing in this subsection shall be construed to affect the power of the Attorney General in the conduct of litigation arising under this act.

(b) Financial transactions of the Commissioner in making advances pursuant to this title, and vouchers approved by the Commissioner in connection with such financial transactions, shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government.

SUITS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 214. Any State school building agency with which the Commissioner has made an agreement under this title, or any holder of obligations with respect to which a reserve fund has been established under this title, may bring suit against the United States to enforce any duty of the Commissioner under this title or any undertaking of the Commissioner under an agreement under this title. In any action arising under this title to which the United States is a party, the district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction, without regard to the amounts involved. Such action shall be brought in the district court of the United States for the judicial district in which the plaintiff, or any of the plaintiffs if there are more than one, resides or has his principal place of business or, if he does not have his principal place of business within any such judicial district, in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia.

PURCHASE OF OBLIGATIONS BY NATIONAL BANKS

SEC. 215. The last sentence of paragraph seventh of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U. S. C. 24), is amended by inserting "or State school building agency (but only in the case of obligations, of such an agency, with respect to which advances have been made pursuant to title II of the School Construction Act of 1955)" after "International Bank for Reconstruction and Development" and by striking out (in the proviso) "either of said banks" and inserting in lieu thereof "any of said banks or State school building agencies."

TAX EXEMPT STATUS OF OBLIGATIONS

SEC. 216. Obligations of any State school building agency, including interest thereon, with respect to which advances are made pursuant to this title, and income of such agency in connection with the school facilities financed by such obligations, shall be exempt from all taxes (other than estate, inheritance, and gift taxes) now or hereafter imposed by the United States.

TITLE III—FEDERAL GRANT ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR SCHOOL DISTRICTS ECONOMICALLY UNABLE TO FINANCE OR LEASE URGENTLY NEEDED SCHOOL FACILITIES

PURPOSE AND APPROPRIATION

SEC. 301. For the purpose of enabling local educational agencies to finance or lease urgently needed school facilities in cases where such agencies, because of lack of economic capacity, are unable—

(a) to sell their obligations to the Commissioner under title I, in the amounts needed to construct the facilities, or

(b) to rent such facilities from a State school building agency at rentals which the Commissioner determines to be comparable to those charged by State school building agencies pursuant to agreements with the Commissioner under title II,

there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1955, and the next 2 fiscal years, such sums, not to exceed an aggregate of $200 million, as the Congress may determine. Sums appropriated under this section for any year shall remain available for obligation until June 30, 1958.

ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 302. (a) (1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 301 for a fiscal year, the Commissioner shall allot initially to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to such sums as the school-age population of such State bears to the school-age population of all the States.

(2) At such time or times after December 31 of each fiscal year as the Commissioner determines, after receiving advice from the States with respect thereto, that the amounts (if any) to be paid to any State from its initial allotment for such year under this subsection will total less than such allotment, he shall reallot the portion of such initial allotment which he determines will not be so paid to such State. Such reallotments shall be made by the Commissioner to the States with respect to which he has not made the determination referred to in the preceding sentence for such year, on the same basis as the initial allotments for such year under paragraph (1).

(b) The sums allotted to a State for a fiscal year under subsection (a) shall be available (as provided hereinafter in this title) for paying the Federal share of payments by State educational agencies to assist in financing the cost of construction of school facilities for local educational agencies in the State.

STATE PLANS

SEC. 303. The Commissioner shall approve a State plan for purposes of this title if such plan—

(a) provides that the State educational agency shall be the sole agency for administration of the plan;

(b) sets forth standards and procedures, conforming to regulations of the Commissioner (prescribed after consultation with a

conference of representatives of State educational agencies), for determining eligibility of local educational agencies for payments under the plan and the amounts thereof, and the need for the facilities to be constructed, which standards and procedures provide reasonable assurance that

(1) such payments will be made only if, and to the extent, necessary to enable any local educational agency (A) to sell to the Commissioner, pursuant to title I, obligations in the amounts needed by such agency to construct the school facilities with respect to which the payments are made, or (B) if such agency is legally unable to sell such obligations, to rent such facilities from a State school-building agency at rentals which the Commissioner determines to be comparable to those charged by State school-building agencies pursuant to agreements with the Commissioner under title II; and

(2) such payments will be made only with respect to the construction of school facilities needed to relieve or prevent extreme overcrowding, double shifts, or unhealthful or hazardous conditions;

(c) provides such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the plan; and

(d) provides for the making of such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require to carry out his functions under this title, and for compliance with such provisions as he may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

PAYMENTS

SEC. 304. (a) In the case of each project for the construction of school facilities for a local educational agency with respect to which the State educational agency requests any funds under this title, the State educational agency shall include in its request—

(1) a description of the school-facilities project with respect to which the request is made;

(2) its estimate of the cost of construction of such project and a statement of the amount of the payment proposed to be made by the State educational agency with respect thereto under the plan.

(3) a certification that—

(A) it has determined, in accordance with the standards and procedures in the State plan, that the local educational agency is eligible for the payment proposed and that the school-facilities project is needed to relieve or prevent extreme overcrowding, double shifts, or unhealthful or hazardous conditions;

(B) such local educational agency has requested the Commissioner to purchase, under title I, the Federal percentage of the obligations needed to finance the project and the Commissioner has denied such request because the agency is financially unable to repay the obligations or, if it is legally unable to sell such obligations, has requested a State school-building agency, which provides school facilities at rentals which the Commissioner determines to be comparable to those charged by State school-building agencies pursuant to agreements under title II, to provide such facilities and has had its request denied because it is financially unable to pay the rental for such facilities;

(C) State funds to cover the State share of such payment will be available.

(b) Each request for funds pursuant to subsection (a) shall be accompanied by a statement of the facts on which the State educational agency based its certification and its estimate of the cost of construction of the project, and such further information as the Commissioner may require for purposes of this title with respect to the school-facilities project involved.

(c) (1) The Commissioner, unless he finds that a payment under a State plan with respect to a school-facilities project for a local educational agency, for which a State has requested funds as provided in subsections (a) and (b), would not be in accord with the standards and procedures set forth in the State plan approved under section 303, shall reserve for such project a sum equal to the Federal share of such payment to the extent such sum is available in the State's allotment; and such sum shall remain available for payment to the State educational agency (unless the State withdraws its request) under paragraph (2) of this subsection until the end of the fiscal year following that in which such sum is so reserved.

(2) Upon certification by the State educational agency that—

(A) State funds equal to the State share of the payment with respect to such school-facilities project has been paid to or on behalf of the local educational agency, and

(B) the financing of the remainder of the cost of construction of such facilities has been arranged,

the Commissioner shall pay the State educational agency the Federal share of such payment.

(d) The "Federal share" for any State shall be 100 percent minus the "State share", and the State share shall be that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 percent as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the continental United States (excluding Alaska), except that the State share shall in no case be more than 60 percent or less than 40 percent, and except that the State share for Hawaii and Alaska shall be 50 percent, and for Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands shall be 40 percent. Such Federal and State shares shall be promulgated by the Commissioner as soon as possible after the date of enactment of this act on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the continental United States for the 3 most recent years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce, and the percentages so promulgated shall be conclusive for purposes of this title.

ABANDONMENT OF FACILITIES

SEC. 305. If the construction of any school facilities with respect to which funds have been paid to a State under this title is terminated or abandoned or not completed within such reasonable period as may be determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, such State shall be obligated to repay to the United States, for deposit in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, the amount of such funds or such lesser amount as the Commissioner deems reasonable under the circumstances.

LABOR STANDARDS

SEC. 306. (a) The Commissioner shall not make any payments under this title to assist in financing the construction of any school-facilities project, except upon adequate assurance that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of work on such project will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U. S. C. 276a–276a–5), and will receive compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times his basic rate of pay for all hours worked in any workweek in excess of 8 hours in any workday or 40 hours in the workweek, as the case may be.

(b) The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in subsection (a) of this section, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F. R. 3176, 64 Stat. 1267), and section 2 of the act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U. S. C. 276c).

TITLE IV—FEDERAL GRANT ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PROGRAMS TO INCREASE SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 401. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $5 million each for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1955, the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1956, and the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1957, $3 million for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1958, and $2 million for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1959, for grants to States to assist them in meeting their administrative expenses in the development and initiation of State programs designed to increase public-school construction and promote efficiency in such construction.

ALLOTMENTS AND PAYMENTS

SEC. 402. (a) From the sums appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to section 401, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount bearing the same ratio to such sums as the school-age population of such State bears to the school-age population of the United States. The allotment to any State under the preceding sentence for any fiscal year which is less than $25,000 (or, in the case of Guam or the Virgin Islands, which is less than $12,500) shall be increased to that amount, the total of the increases thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the allotments of each of the remaining States under the preceding sentence, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than that amount.

(b) From each State's allotment under this section for any fiscal year, the Commissioner shall pay to such State 50 percent of the State's administrative expenses in the development of any State program for increasing construction of school facilities or promoting greater efficiency in planning or financing the construction of such facilities, or in the initiation of any such program when authorized by law, including the development and initiation of programs such as those to—

(1) extend State technical assistance to the local educational agencies in the planning and financing of construction of school facilities;

(2) extend State financial aid to local educational agencies, through loans, grants, or otherwise, in the construction of school facilities;

(3) adjust or modify unduly restrictive debt or tax limits or other obstacles to adequate and economical financing of construction of school facilities, including the basing of debt or tax limits on the full value of real property; or

(4) achieve a more efficient organization of school districts in the State.

(c) No payment may be made under this title with respect to any program unless the State plan approved under section 403 includes such program or has been modified to include it and unless the State educational agency certifies that it is a new program for the State (which, for purposes of this title, includes an addition to an existing program of the State). In the case of any program of the State (or any addition to a program) initiated after December 31, 1954, the continuation thereof shall be considered a new program for purposes of the preceding sentence if submitted under this title by the State prior to July 1, 1956.

(d) Payments under this section with respect to any program may be made during a period of not to exceed 3 years beginning with the commencement of the first fiscal year for which any payment is made with respect to such program from an allotment under this section, but only if such program has been submitted under this title prior to July 1, 1958.

APPROVAL OF STATE PLANS

SEC. 403. The Commissioner shall approve any State plan for purposes of this title if such plan—

(a) provides that the State educational agency shall be the sole agency for carrying out programs under the plan, either directly or through arrangements with other agencies of the State;

(b) provides such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for the proper and efficient administration of programs under the plan;

(c) provides for the making of such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require to carry out his functions under this title, and for compliance with such provisions as he may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports; and

(d) sets forth the programs proposed to be carried out under the plan and the general policies to be followed in doing so.

METHOD OF MAKING AND COMPUTING PAYMENTS

SEC. 404. The method of computing and paying amounts pursuant to section 402 shall be as follows:

(a) The Commissioner shall, prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter or other period prescribed by him, estimate the amount to be paid to each State under the provisions of such section for such period, such estimate to be based on such records of the State and information furnished by it, and such other investigation, as the Commissioner may find necessary.

(b) The Commissioner shall pay to the State, from the allotment available therefor, the amount so estimated by him for such period, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this paragraph) by which he finds that his estimate of the amount to be paid the State for any prior period under such section was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State for such prior period under such section. Such payments shall be made in such installments as the Commissioner may determine.

(c) Any funds paid to a State under this title which are not used for the purposes for which paid shall be returned to the Commissioner for deposit in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 501. For purposes of this act—

(a) The term "Commissioner" means the (United States) Commissioner of Education.

(b) The term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

(c) The term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if different, the officer or agency primarily responsible for State construction or supervision of construction of such schools, whichever may be designated by the Governor or by State law.

(d) The term "State school building agency" means the single agency, official, governmental entity, or instrumentality of a State, designated or established by the State for purposes of title II.

(e) The term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of free public education in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State. If a separate public authority has responsibility for the provision or maintenance of school facilities for any local educational agency or the financing of the construction thereof, such term includes such other authority.

(f) The term "school-age population" means that part of the population which is between the ages of 5 and 17, both inclusive, and such school-age population for the several States shall be determined on the basis of the latest figures furnished by the Department of Commerce.

(g) The term "debt service" means the aggregate amount required to pay the interest on and principal of each issue of obligations.

(h) The term "annual debt service" means the aggregate amount required to pay the interest on and principal of each issue of obligations becoming due in each successive 12-month period designated in accordance with the agreement under title II.

(i) The term "school facilities" includes classrooms and related facilities for public elementary and secondary education; initial equipment, machinery, and utilities necessary or appropriate for school purposes; and interests in land (including site, grading, and improvement) on which such facilities are constructed. Such term does not include athletic stadia, or structures or facilities intended primarily for events, such as athletic exhibitions, contests, or games, for which admission is to be charged to the general public.

(j) The terms "construct," "constructing," and "construction" include the preparation of drawings and specifications for school facilities; erecting, building, acquiring, altering, remodeling, improving, or extending school facilities; and the inspection and supervision of the construction of school facilities.

WITHHOLDING OF FUNDS AND JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 502. (a) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State educational agency, finds that—

(1) the State plan approved under section 303 or 403, as the case may be, has been so changed that it no longer complies with the requirements of such section; or

(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such requirement;

the Commissioner shall notify such State agency that no further payments will be made to the State from its allotments under section 302 or 402, as the case may be, (or, in his discretion, that further payments will not be made to the State for projects or programs under the State plan affected by such failure), until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure. Until he is so satisfied the Commissioner shall make no further payments to such State from its allotments under such section (or shall limit payments to projects or programs under the State plan in which there is no such failure). The foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not apply to payment or any amount reserved under section 304 (c) with respect to any school facilities project not affected by such failure; except that, after notice as provided in this subsection to any State, the Commissioner may suspend the making of further reservations of funds under section 304 (c) for projects in such State pending the making of the findings under this subsection.

(b) (1) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's action under subsection (a) of this section, such State may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States.

(2) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence.

(3) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

UTILIZATION OF OTHER AGENCIES

SEC. 503. In administering the provisions of this act, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and, without regard to section 3709, as amended, of the Revised Statutes, of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, and the head thereof. Payment for such services and facilities shall be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the head of the agency or institution concerned.

DELEGATION OF COMMISSIONER'S FUNCTIONS

SEC. 504. The Commissioner is authorized to delegate any of his functions under this act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

APPROPRIATION FOR ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 505. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such sums as may be necessary for the administration of this act.

The summary presented by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey is as follows:

SUMMARY OF SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION PROPOSAL

The bill, in addition to a section containing the findings and declaration of purpose, has four substantive titles (there is a fifth title with definitions and miscellaneous provisions). All are designed to assist the States and local communities in increasing public-school construction.

Title I authorizes Federal purchases of part of the obligations of local educational agencies where such obligations cannot otherwise be marketed at reasonable rates of interest.

Title II authorizes Federal support, with State participation, of obligations issued by State school building agencies established to finance the construction of school facilities for rental to and eventual ownership by local educational agencies.

Title III authorizes grants to States to assist them in helping local educational agencies, economically unable to qualify for either of the two forms of assistance described above, to obtain urgently needed school facilities.

Title IV authorizes grants to States to assist them in meeting the administrative costs of developing State programs to overcome obstacles to local financing of school construction and of initiating such programs when authorized by law.

The bill would be administered at the Federal level by the Commissioner of Education.

TITLE I—FEDERAL PURCHASE OF OBLIGATIONS OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITH MARGINAL CREDIT

Eligibility

The Commissioner of Education would be authorized to purchase a part of the obligations issued by a local educational agency to finance the cost of constructing school facilities upon certification by the State educational agency that the local agency is unable, as evidenced by a public offering of its obligations for the purpose, to obtain financing from other sources at rates and

on terms comparable to those applicable to obligations purchased under this title.

Such purchase by the Commissioner would also be conditioned on certification by the State educational agency that the facilities to be constructed with the proceeds of the obligations are needed to meet current or future enrollments, are consistent with any applicable State redistricting plans and policies and will be constructed in accordance with State construction laws and standards; and that, under the opinion of a qualified attorney, the bonds are legally issued and binding. The State educational agency would also be required to submit additional information to satisfy the Commissioner that the local educational agency is financially able to pay its obligations when due.

Appropriations

Appropriations aggregating $750 million would be authorized for the three fiscal years 1956, 1957, and 1958.

Amount of purchase

Not more than 15 percent of the amount appropriated for any year for purchases of obligations under the title would be available for purchase of the obligations of local educational agencies in any one State. The percentage of the cost of construction of any school facilities which could be covered by any such purchase would depend on the relative per capita income of the State. This percentage would vary between 50 and 80 percent; the percentage for the State with the national average per capita income would be 60 percent.

Interest, duration, and other attributes of obligations

Obligations could be purchased under this title during the 3-year period beginning July 1, 1955, and ending June 30, 1958. The obligations could be any general or special obligations of the local educational agency. They would have to be purchased at par or face value, must be repaid within such period, not exceeding 30 years, as the Commissioner might determine, and would bear interest at the quarterly rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury (on the basis of the rate for United States obligations with a maturity date of 15 or more years) to be applicable to the calendar quarter during which the obligations are purchased, plus one-half of 1 percent.

Administrative provisions

In addition to his other powers and duties, the Commissioner could sell or exchange the obligations purchased, could make adjustments in the obligations, and contracts with respect thereto, to protect the interest of the United States, could determine the character and necessity of expenditures, and would have to maintain a set of accounts, to be audited by the General Accounting Office, and a business-type budget.

TITLE II—FEDERAL CREDIT ASSISTANCE TO STATE SCHOOL BUILDING AGENCIES

Agreements with State school building agencies

The Commissioner of Education would be authorized on behalf of the United States to enter into agreements with State school building agencies under which the State and the Commissioner would make advances to a State school building agency for establishment of reserve funds to help assure payment of obligations issued by such agency to finance the construction of schools for rental to local school districts. This agency could be a State school building agency or any other State agency, official, governmental entity, or instrumentality designated by the State and empowered to construct school facilities and otherwise carry out the provisions of an agreement entered into under this title. But there could be only one agency for a State for purposes of this title.

The agreement could be made with respect to any one or more issues of obligations and could be amended from time to time, as agreed upon by the State school building agency and the Commissioner.

Where the State school building agency is not the same as the State educational agency, the agreement would be conditioned upon certification by the Governor that methods of securing effective coordination between the two agencies had been provided.

Basic reserve fund

An amount equal to one-half of the maximum annual debt service on any issue of obligations under the agreement would be advanced by the State. A like amount would be advanced by the Federal Government. The amount advanced by the State would be known as the State account and that advanced by the Federal Government would be known as the Federal account. These two advances, plus interest and increments, would constitute the basic reserve fund.

Supplemental reserve fund

There would also be a supplemental reserve fund for each issue of obligations consisting of amounts deposited in such fund by the State school building agency out of rentals collected from the local educational agencies for which it provided school facilities. As indicated below, the rentals, in the aggregate, should be sufficient to cover, among other items, a deposit in this reserve of one-quarter of 1 percent of the original principal amount of any issue of obligations.

Combination of issues

At the option of the State school building agency, a single basic reserve, or a single such reserve and a single supplemental reserve, could be established for any two or more issues of obligations of the State agency. In that case, the agreement would provide the extent to which the combination of issues would be treated as a single issue.

Conditions of agreements

Under an agreement, all obligations in any issue for which a basic reserve fund is established would be required to mature in not more than 32 years from their earliest date, and the initial payment of principal would have to be due within 3 years from such date. The proceeds from the sale of the obligations could be available only for construction of school facilities for rental to local educational agencies requesting them.

The agreement would have to provide that the school facilities constructed would be certified by the State educational agency to be needed for current or anticipated school enrollments and to be consistent with applicable State redistricting plans and policies and in accord with State construction laws and standards.

The agreement would also have to provide for rentals which in the aggregate produced sufficient funds (together with other funds available) to pay, to the extent not otherwise provided for, the annual debt service, one-quarter of 1 per cent of the original principal amount of the issue of obligations (for payment into the supplemental reserve fund), the cost of maintenance, repair, replacement, and insurance, as well as the administrative and other expenses of the State school building agency.

Additional advances and use of reserve funds

If the rentals collected for any year by the State school building agency are insufficient to pay the items specified above with respect to any issue of obligations, the State school building agency would draw on the supplemental reserve to pay the portion of the annual debt service not covered by the rentals. After exhaustion of that reserve, the State and Federal accounts in the basic reserve fund would be equally available for payment of the annual debt service. If the State account were inadequate to bear its share of the unpaid annual debt service, the deficiency could be made up from the Federal account, to the extent of any balance therein. In the case of no year, however, could the Federal account be drawn upon for more than one-half of the annual debt service for that year.

After any withdrawals from the Federal account in the basic reserve fund for any year, the Commissioner would be obligated to restore the account to its original balance.

The State would also pay into the State account in any year the amount withdrawn for payment of the debt service for that year, but only to the extent of appropriations made available for the purpose.

Borrowing authority for additional Federal advances

The faith of the United States is pledged to the advances contracted by the Commissioner to be made under the title; and the Commissioner would be authorized to issue obligations to the extent necessary to make the additional advances. The Secretary of the Treasury would be directed to purchase such obligations. Obligations so issued would bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury after considering the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States.

Repayments of Federal advances

Whenever the total of the sums in a supplemental reserve and a basic reserve fund, including interest and accruals, is more than twice the maximum annual debt service in any ensuing year on the issue of obligations involved, the excess would be required to be applied to repayments of the advances made by the Federal Government under this title. Repayments would first be made to the extent of any additional advances made by the Commissioner after the original advance to the basic reserve fund. These repayments would be made from the excess in the proportion that such additional advances bore to any additional advances made by the State to the State account in the basic reserve fund, after its original advance to that account.

After the subsequent advances of the Federal Government had been repaid, any excess over twice the maximum annual debt service for any ensuing year would be used to repay the Federal Government's original advance to the basic reserve fund in the proportion that the total of all advances by the Federal Government under the title bore to the total of all advances made by the State to the State account for the purpose of establishing and maintaining that account.

Repayments to the Federal Government as above provided would be used to retire any obligations issued under the Commissioner's authority to borrow funds, and any excess would be deposited in the Federal Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Duration of program

Appropriations would be authorized for the fiscal years 1956, 1957, and 1958 to cover the amount of the initial Federal advances to basic reserve funds. Such advances could be made only with respect to obligations issued during such 3 fiscal years. Obligations so issued, however, could (as indicated above) have maturities of up to 32 years after the earliest date of the obligations in the particular issue.

Total of obligations secured

Advances could be made by the Commissioner under this title for establishment of reserve funds to help assure payment of obligations in a principal amount aggregating up to $6 billion.

Investments by national banks

National banks would be permitted to deal in the obligations covered by agreements under the title and by reserve funds established pursuant thereto, to the extent that they would be lawful investments for such banks.

Administrative provisions

The Commissioner would be authorized to waive and compromise claims, and his financial transactions under the title would not be subject to review by any other governmental official.

Investment of funds in Federal account

Funds in the Federal account of basic reserve funds would have to be invested in United States securities, or United States guaranteed securities, or obligations which are lawful investments for public funds of the United States. The distribution as between these various types of interest-bearing securities and the maturities thereof, would be provided in the agreement.

Court action

Suits would be authorized in the district courts of the United States, by the State school-building agency or any bondholder to enforce any undertaking of the United States under the title.

Exemption from taxation

Obligations of State school building agencies covered by agreements made pursuant to this title, and the income of these agencies in connection with facilities financed therefrom, would be exempt from all Federal taxation except estate, inheritance, and gift taxes.

TITLE III—FEDERAL GRANT ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR SCHOOL DISTRICTS ECONOMICALLY UNABLE TO FINANCE OR LEASE URGENTLY NEEDED SCHOOL FACILITIES

Appropriation

An aggregate amount of $200 million for the three fiscal years 1956, 1957, and 1958 would be authorized to be appropriated for grants to States to cover the Federal share of payments by the State to local educational agencies, urgently in need of school facilities but unable to sell their obligations to the Commissioner of Education under title I because of their lack of economic capacity, or unable for the same reason to lease facilities to be built by State school building agencies which charge rentals comparable to those available under title II agreements.

Allotments

Initial allotments to the States of funds appropriated in any year under this title, would be made on the basis of their respectice school-age populations. After receiving advice from States indicating they would not use up their entire allotments, reallotments could be made by the Commissioner, from time to time between January 1 and June 30, among the other States on the same school-age population basis.

Allotments to the States would be available for paying the Federal share of payments by State educational agencies to assist in financing the cost of constructing school facilities for local educational agencies. The Federal share would be varied, on the basis of relative per capita income, between 40 percent and 60 per cent, with the Federal share for the State with the national average per capita income being 50 per cent.

State plans

State plans would be approved under this title if they (1) provided for administration by the State educational agency; (2) set forth standards and procedures, conforming to regulations of the Commissioner, providing reasonable assurance that payments to local educational agencies will be made (a) only if, and to the extent, necessary to enable the local agency to sell its obligations, to finance the remainder of construction costs, under title I of the bill or to arrange with a State school building agency (which charges rentals comparable to those charged under an agreement under title II of the bill) to build the building and lease it to the local agency, and (b) only with respect to school facilities needed to relieve or prevent extreme overcrowding, double shifts, or unhealthful or hazardous conditions.

The plan would also have to provide for adequate accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal procedures and for the making of necessary reports to the Secretary.

Payments from allotments

The State educational agency would have to file a request for Federal funds in connection with any school facilities project. The request would have to contain a certification by the State agency (1) that the local educational agency is eligible for the proposed payment (of Federal and State funds) under the standards and procedures in the State plan (relating to eligibility and amount of payment and need for facilities), (2) that because of its lack of economic capacity the Commissioner had refused the local agency's request to purchase part of its obligations for the needed facilities, or the State school building agency had refused it the rental of such facilities at rates comparable to those charged under the agreement, and (3) that State funds to cover the State share of the proposed payment to the local agency are available.

The Commissioner would reserve the Federal share of the proposed payment to the local educational agency unless he determines that the payment would not be in accord with the standards and procedures included in the State plan as to eligibility and amount of payment and need for facilities. The reservation would stand until the end of the succeeding year.

Payment of the Federal share of the State educational agency's payment to the local agency under the State plan would be made upon certification by the State agency that it had paid the State share to the local agency and that the rest of the financing of the cost of constructing the facilities had been arranged.

The State share would be varied among the States, on the basis of relative per capita income, between a minimum of 40 percent and a maximum of 60 percent, with the State share for the State with the national average per capita income being 50 percent. The Federal share would be the difference between the State share and 100 percent.

Abandonment of facilities

The Federal share (or lesser amount determined by the Commissioner) would have to be repaid to the United States if the construction of facilities with respect to which such share was paid is terminated, abandoned, or not completed within a reasonable time.

Labor standards

The Commissioner would not be able to extend any assistance under title I for financing the construction of school facilities except upon assurance that labor standards, relating to payment of prevailing wages and overtime pay for work in excess of 40 hours per week or 8 hours per day, would be observed in such construction.

TITLE IV—ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF STATE PROGRAMS TO INCREASE SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation

Five million dollars each for the fiscal years 1956, 1957, and 1958, $3 million for the fiscal year 1959, and $2 million for the fiscal year 1960 would be authorized to be appropriated under this title for grants to States to assist in meeting their administrative expenses in developing State programs designed to increase school construction, and in initiating such programs when authorized by law.

Allotments and payments

The appropriation for any year under this title would be allotted among the States on the basis of school-age population but with a minimum allotment of $25,000 ($12,500 for Guam and the Virgin Islands). Each State allotment would be available for paying half the cost of the State administrative expenses in the development of State programs for increasing construction of school facilities and promoting greater efficiency in planning or financing the construction of such facilities, or in the initiation of any such program when authorized by law.

Programs eligible

To be eligible for Federal support under this title, a program would have to be a new program, or an addition to an existing program, initiated after December 31, 1954, and submitted under this title prior to July 1, 1958 (prior to July 1, 1956, if initiated prior to enactment of the bill). The program would have to be included under a State plan approved by the Commissioner.

The types of programs, for the development or initiation of which grants under this title would be available, would include programs such as those extending technical or financial aid in planning or financing school construction and those to achieve more efficient school-district organization or to adjust or modify unduly restrictive tax or debt limits.

Duration of payments

Payments under this title could be made for only 3 years with respect to any one program.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Definitions

This title defines a number of terms used in the act. These terms are Commissioner, State, State educational agency, State school-building agency, local educational agency, school-age population, debt service, annual debt service, school facilities, and construct, constructing, and construction.

Withholding of funds and judicial review

Notice and hearing to the State educational agency would be required before grants to the State could be withheld under title III or IV for failure to comply with the required provisions of approved State plans under those titles. A State agency dissatisfied with such withholding action could obtain judicial review thereof in the Federal circuit courts of appeals.

Miscellaneous

The title also authorizes utilization of other agencies in the administration of the bill and delegation of the Commissioner of Education's functions under the bill to personnel of the Office of Education.

Mr. THYE subsequently said: Mr. President, President Eisenhower has presented an excellent program in his message and in the proposed legislation for Federal assistance to States and communities to enable them to increase public-school construction. I am very glad to join as a cosponsor of the proposed legislation, which is based on a careful study of the needs throughout the country, providing effective Federal assistance, and recognizes that our public-school system must be founded on local control and responsibility.

It is in the field of construction of school facilities to meet expanding requirements that our school need is great, and it is in this field that the Federal Government can most effectively assist the States and local school districts.

The program proposes to provide substantial and effective assistance in four major phases:

Purchase by the Federal Government of obligations issued by local educational agencies to finance school construction, where such obligations cannot otherwise be marketed at reasonable rates of interest.

Support by the Federal Government, with the participation of the States, of the obligations issued by State school-building agencies established to finance the construction of school facilities for rental to, and eventual ownership by, local educational agencies.

Federal grants to the States, to assist them in helping local educational agencies, economically unable to qualify for the assistance decribed above, to obtain urgently needed school facilities.

Federal grants to the States, to assist them in meeting the administrative costs of developing and initiating programs designed to overcome obstacles to local financing of school construction.

Many States, such as Minnesota, have in the past recognized the need for aid to distressed school districts which are unable to finance their school needs. Today, the problem is nationwide in scope, due to greatly increased enrollments and other factors. We must meet this problem if we are to maintain the standards of our public schools and meet the needs of our growing boys and girls. President Eisenhower's proposals are sound, and will command wide support.

AMENDMENT OF UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT RELATIVE TO PROCESS OF SELECTION

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, relative to the process of selection, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is to revive both the name and the process of selection under the Universal Military Training and Service Act, so that selection will be retained as a part of the purposes of that act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 969) to amend the Universal Military Training Service Act, as amended, relative to the process of selection, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FLANDERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

RESIDENCE FOR CONGRESSIONAL PAGES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide a residence for pages of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, under the supervision of a Capitol Pages' Residence Board.

If enacted, this bill would create a Capitol Pages' Residence Board composed of 3 Senators and 3 Members of the House of Representatives who would be authorized to establish a home for the young men who serve here as pages. I feel sure that every Member of the Senate realizes the need for such a home and the need for adult supervision in this home. Under the present setup, the pages have living quarters scattered over the city. Not only are some of these young men paying exhorbitant rents, but they are in many cases exposed to the evils of a large city. We in the Congress have appointed these young men to leave their homes and travel to this city and live here many months of each year. We should feel a bit of responsibility toward them and their families back home. I feel that it is our duty and moral obligation to establish such a residence board which would in turn acquire a home near the Capitol in which the pages would live under adult supervision. My proposal would require that the pages pay rent as they now do; therefore, the home would be self sustaining. I am sure that the parents of the pages would thank the United States Congress for legislation of this kind.

It is my sincere hope that the Senate will consider favorably this proposed legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 973) to provide a residence for pages of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, under the supervision of a Capitol Pages' Residence Board, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PARITY PRICES FOR BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended. The bill requires that prices of basic agricultural commodities be supported at 90 percent of parity on a permanent basis.

I introduce the bill because I am deeply interested in the welfare of our farmers, who form a vital part of our economy. If we are to remain economically strong, the farmers must have some assurance of a fair return from their labor; and they should have this assurance on a permanent, rather than a temporary year-to-year basis.

I wish to call attention briefly to figures cited in a recent issue of U. S. News & World Report. They show that farmowners have had the lowest buying power of 12 wage-earning groups in 1950 and 1954. The same is expected to be true again this year.

Figures released by the United States Department of Agriculture demonstrate another point I wish to make, namely, as compared with the official 1910–14 base, from which the parity formula is derived, prices received by farmers now stand at only 239 percent, while they are forced to pay 279 percent for production costs.

In addition, while the overall farm parity ratio on December 15, 1953, was 91 percent, by December 15, 1954, it had dropped to 86 percent.

Mr. President, I believe it is time that we give to the farmers of the Nation economic justice, not only for the sake of our hard-working farm population, but also as a stabilizing influence for our national economy in these uncertain times.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 978) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, so as to require that prices of basic agricultural commodities be supported at 90 percent of parity, introduced by Mr. THURMOND, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PUNISHMENT FOR CERTAIN CONFIDENCE GAME SWINDLES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received from the Department of Justice a draft bill to provide punishment for utilization of interstate commerce in the perpetration of confidence game swindles.

I believe that this proposed legislation is necessary in the public interest, in view of the increasing amount of such swindles perpetrated on the innocent public.

This bill has previously passed the Senate, and I hope that in this Congress it will not only be quickly approved by the Senate, but will be promptly enacted by the House of Representatives as well.

I send to the desk a letter from Attorney General Brownell asking enactment of this bill. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD, and thereafter be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 997) to provide punishment for certain confidence game swindles, introduced by Mr. Wiley, was received, read twice by its titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JANUARY 31, 1955.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. VICE PRESIDENT: The Department of Justice recommends enactment of legislation to provide punishment for the utilization of interstate commerce in the perpetration of confidence game swindles and a draft of a bill to carry out such recommendation is attached for your consideration and appropriate action.

Existing law provides punishment, in section 2314, title 18, United States Code, for the transportation in interstate commerce of goods, wares, merchandising, securities or money, of the value of $5,000 or more, knowing the same to have been stolen, converted, or taken by fraud. This section also includes other paragraphs providing punishment for transportation in interstate commerce of certain articles used in counterfeiting. The statute, however, fails to afford means to prosecute for interstate transportation of persons in the perpetration of confidence games.

One of the more extensive activities of the confidence man is often directed toward retired businessmen and their families or individuals of some prominence in the community who are reluctant to report their gullibility. This reluctance on the part of the victim, together with the element of the scheme set up by the confidence man to lead the victim to believe that his money will be returned, causes a delay in the reporting

of the violation to the authorities. This delay permits the confidence man to move to another section of the country, dispose of the money or property taken from the victim, and thus destroy the necessary evidence to establish certain elements of the crime.

In many of the major confidence swindles perpetrated by professional confidence men the victims are located when they are away from home. After inducing the victim to participate in some false stock market or race track transaction, the confidence man induces the victim to return to his home, obtain the necessary money and return to the scene of the swindle where the money is turned over to the operator. After the money has been turned over to the confidence man, the victim is instructed to go to another city where he is to receive the return on his "investment." Such moving of the victim is a part of the scheme and gives the confidence man time in which to dispose of the money or property taken in the swindle and to flee to a distant "cool-off" spot.

Section 2314 of title 18 may be appropriately amended by the insertion of a new paragraph to supply the needed means to punish the perpetrators of this type of swindle.

This legislation in the identical form here suggested was introduced in both the Senate and House of Representatives in the 83d Congress as S. 3441 and H. R. 8914. S. 3441 was passed by the Senate on August 11, 1954, and referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary on August 16, 1954.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this legislation.

Sincerely,

———— ————,
Attorney General.

POLICY CONCERNING THE TERMINATION, LIMITATION, OR ESTABLISHMENT OF CERTAIN OPERATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a Federal policy concerning the termination, limitation, or establishment of business-type operations of the Government which may be conducted in competition with private enterprise, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1003) to establish a Federal policy concerning the termination, limitation, or establishment of business-type operations of the Government which may be conducted in competition with private enterprise, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The statement presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCLELLAN

I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which proposes the declaration of a national policy against the Government's encroachment into fields of commerce, industry, and finance in competition with its own taxpaying citizens.

It has been a matter of common knowledge for many years that Government has engaged in, and should continue to do so, certain activities that are broadly classified as business—for example—the operation of the post office; the manufacture of various essential items by the navy yards, ordnance, and quartermaster branches of the armed services; the production of electric power at TVA.

It becomes a matter of serious congressional concern, however, when studies by the Committee on Government Operations and other committees of the Congress develop the fact that more than 100 commercial activities are being carried on by various Federal departments and agencies. After the approval of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, the Senate Committee on Government Operations devoted much time and study to the development of programs designed to eliminate Government competition with private industry. Various other committees of the House and the Senate have conducted similar studies, and have advanced proposals with the objective of taking the Government out of business and encouraging private enterprise to provide necessary services to the Government.

One of the most important steps taken by the committee toward attaining this objective was the approval of legislation creating the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. The Commission was directed to make studies and submit recommendations to the Congress with the objective of "eliminating nonessential services, functions, and activities which are competitive with private enterprise." The Commission's task forces recently reported, unofficially, that there are many Government businesses that are questionable as to necessity and value. The Commission will shortly present its recommendations, including certain legislative proposals to do away with Government's improper competition in business.

In the meantime, it is timely that the Congress go on record in favor of a definite policy of noncompetition with private industry in the production of goods and the securing of necessary services by the Government where such action is not inconsistent with the national interest and security, as proposed by the subject bill.

The time has come, that the Congress should give assurance to taxpaying businesses that once the present situation has been corrected it will not be permitted to grow up again. With this objective in mind, the bill I am introducing today includes, in addition to section 2, which sets forth a broad statement of national policy, two other exceedingly important sections.

One of these—and I believe it to be of the utmost importance in whatever legislation the Congress may adopt—seeks to establish what might be called a court of complaint to which businessmen, especially small businessmen, may seek relief through the presentation of their grievances whenever they feel that they are being unduly and unnecessarily discriminated against by competitive Government business. The responsibility for administering this provision would be vested in the Department of Commerce, because it is more deeply concerned with business than any other agency of Government. No such court of complaint now exists. I believe that it is most desirable that it be established.

The other special feature of the proposed legislation is the declaration that any new competitive business-type operation which any department or agency plans to initiate must be reviewed by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget before the expenditure of any appropriation therefor is permitted. This objective is based on the premise that too many of the existing commercial and industrial activities of Government have been quietly put into operation before even the head of the department or agency knew about them—and once started they are exceedingly difficult to stop. Under my proposal many of them would never get started.

Approval of the bill I am introducing today would indicate the support of the legislative branch of the program initiated by the Executive Office of the President on January 15, 1955 (Bulletin No. 55–4), which expanded the review of commercial and industrial activities under the direction of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to determine the number and character of commercial and industrial-type activities now being conducted by the Government. This directive also requires that agencies engaged in such activities shall consider the pertinent legal authorization for the activities which are in competition with private enterprise and seek congressional approval when necessary to permit continuation of such activities.

UTILIZATION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY FOR EDUCATIONAL AND PUBLIC HEALTH PURPOSES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to improve the administration of the program for the utilization of surplus property for educational and public-health purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me pertaining to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1004) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, so as to improve the administration of the program for the utilization of surplus property for educational and public-health purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The statement presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCLELLAN

On behalf of myself and 21 other Senators, I am introducing for appropriate reference, a bill which would amend section

203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to provide that no surplus Federal property, including property capitalized in a working-capital fund, shall be sold until it has been determined whether or not such property is usable and necessary for educational or public-health purposes, including research.

The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 included an amendment which I sponsored, authorizing the donation of surplus real and personal property to State departments of education and health, and to research institutions. Under this authority, surplus Federal property which was urgently needed by these institutions has been made available to them without cost.

On February 1, 1954, however, the Department of Defense issued a directive which provided that, when working-capital funds are established and property is taken up in such accounts, surplus property would no longer be donated for these public purposes, but could be sold to replenish the working-capital account. Since this directive became effective, the amount of surplus property generated by the Defense Establishment which is usable for education or public-health purposes has decreased substantially. The purpose of this bill is to reestablish the authority which existed prior to the date of this directive, in order that educational and health institutions may continue to obtain surplus Federal property which is essential to their needs, in the same manner as they did prior to February 1, 1954.

Since 1949, the State surplus property offices have performed a considerable amount of paperwork entailed in screening and channeling surplus property into the State agencies on a mutual-agreement basis. The utilization of local personnel and offices for screening and allocating surplus property has enabled the State and local agencies to acquire the property more expeditiously, and has permitted the Federal Government to save on manpower and appropriations. In order to give legal authority to these mutual arrangements, the bill contains a provision for the establishment of cooperative agreements between the Federal Government and State departments of education or health which are responsible for carrying out the surplus property utilization program.

This bill further provides for clarifying the authority for placing restrictions and limitations on the allocation and use of surplus property allocated to State agencies. Under existing law, the Federal Government has placed certain restrictions on the transfer of both real and personal property. There is some doubt as to whether the Congress intended that these limitations should be imposed, at least to the extent they have been applied, with reference to the utilization of personal property. Under the bill which I have introduced, this provision would be clarified in order that the required restrictions and limitations will apply only to real property, and that all of the restrictions heretofore placed on the utilization of personal property under the donation program would cease to exist 1 year after the effective date of this act.

The passage of this bill will not only improve the surplus property utilization program, but should effect considerable economy and efficiency in its administration.

An identical bill, H. R. 3322, was introduced in the House of Representatives on January 31, 1955, by Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts.

REDUCTION OF VOTING AGE TO 18

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, President Eisenhower, at various times, has recommended that 18-year-old citizens be allowed to vote. I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 40) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL FOOD AND FIBER POLICY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to establish a national policy for the production and utilization of food and fiber, so as to make full economic use of the productive capacity of United States farms to improve domestic nutrition and clothing standards and buttress the foreign policy of the United States.

The purpose of this joint resolution is to set some policy guideposts for wise use of America's abundance.

Many of us who have actively supported effective farm programs for stability in agriculture and decent standards of farm living have long been equally concerned with the wise use of the abundance America's farmers are capable of producing. A few weeks ago I introduced with a group of colleagues Senate Joint Resolution 20, the family farmers bill of rights resolution, setting forth policy objectives for agricultural legislation itself. I regard this as a necessary companion joint resolution, aimed at the broad interest of farmers and consumers alike in seeing that good use is made of our abundance.

The great productive ability of American famers and farm families should be put fully to work in the interest of national security and the maintenance of the health, efficiency, and morale of the American people. That is our purpose in asking for a national policy for the production and utilization of food and fiber so as to make full economic use of the productive capacity of United States farms to improve domestic nutrition and clothing standards, and buttress the foreign policy of the United States. It can well serve as a yardstick by which to measure future legislation aimed at achieving objectives laid down in the policy resolution.

The new joint resolution declares it to be the policy of the Congress that:

First. The means of obtaining sufficient food for an adequate diet and clothing for an adequate standard will be placed, so far as possible, within the reach of every person in the Nation;

Second. The food and fiber products on American farms and not needed for fully adequate domestic consumption will be put to work to implement United States foreign policy through facilitating—

(a) The inauguration of universal public general and vocational education systems in friendly nations not now having them;

(b) More rapid economic development that will expand markets and increase consumer purchasing power in friendly nations;

(c) The elimination of the threat of starvation and famine; and

(d) increases in the security and income earning capacities of farm families in friendly nations.

Third. Adequate safety reserves of farm commodities and of food and fiber products will be developed and maintained;

Fourth. Extreme price fluctuations in the international market for farm products will be prevented and production will be kept expanding; and

Fifth. American farm families will be assured of adequate income to maintain a standard of living equivalent to those afforded persons dependent upon other gainful occupations, while maintaining full production on the family farms of the Nation, conserving and improving the Nation's farm soil and water resources, and meeting all costs of production and capital replacement.

The joint resolution calls upon the President to incorporate in the economic report required by the Employment Act of 1946 an appraisal of whether or not existing legislation is serving these objectives adequately, and a program for carrying out the policy together with such recommendations for legislation as he may deem necessary or advisable in connection with the program.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 41) to establish a national policy for the production and utilization of food and fiber, so as to make full economic use of the productive capacity of United States farms to improve domestic nutrition and clothing standards and buttress the foreign policy of the United States, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That this joint resolution may be cited as the "National Food and Fiber Policy Joint Resolution."

FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that—

(a) Food and clothing supplies per person in many families in the United States and in many areas of the world are far below the minimum required for healthful and productive living.

(b) The basic adequate food allotment for the average individual, with appropriate adjustments for eating habits and climate, consists of the following amounts of food per week or the equivalent thereof in other foods as determined by scientific nutrition and dietetic research:

(1) milk, and its equivalent in cheese, evaporated milk, or dry milk, 5¼ quarts,

(2) potatoes and sweetpotatoes, 3 pounds, 7 ounces,

(3) dry beans, peas, and nuts, 8 ounces,

(4) tomatoes and citrus fruits, 1 pound, 10 ounces,

(5) green or yellow vegetables, such as green cabbage, kale, snap beans, and carrots, 1 pound, 9 ounces,

(6) other vegetables and fruits, 2 pounds, 6 ounces,

(7) eggs, 4,

(8) meat, poultry, and fish, 1 pound, 12 ounces,

(9) flour and cereals, 4 pounds, 4 ounces (enriched or whole grain),

(10) fats and oils, 14 ounces, and

(11) sugars, sirups, and preserves, 11 ounces.

(c) Failure of food supplies to attain this basic adequate allotment, and of fiber supplies to attain equivalent standards for clothing, undermines the maintenance of health, efficiency, and morale of the American people and the people of friendly nations.

(d) Supplies of food and fiber available from time to time should be efficiently distributed among the various sections of this Nation and friendly nations among persons in all income groups.

(e) The assurance of adequate food and clothing supplies would be an important step toward strengthening democracy throughout the world and creating the economic foundations and atmosphere of hope and confidence necessary for world peace.

(f) The development of more adequate reserves of farm products would provide essential safeguards against shortages resulting from natural causes such as drought, flood, and pestilence; from breakdowns in distribution; and from inflation, insurrection, and war.

(g) It is essential to the national security and the general welfare that production and consumption of farm products be maintained at a high level in the United States as a means of maintaining a healthy population and a strong, productive economy, and to buttress the Nation's foreign policy.

(h) In many friendly nations more rapid economic development is blocked by lack of universal general and technical education and facilities resulting from the inability of parents of farm children to release them from day-to-day labor in food and fiber production; United States farm products could be used to break the poverty cycle in these nations by supplying food and clothing for children and adults attending and teaching schools.

(i) Both the foreign and domestic markets for American farm products have historically been characterized by fluctuations and recurrent depressions.

(j) The maintenance of a healthy and prosperous agriculture on the family-farm pattern is essential to the preservation and improvement of democracy in America.

(k) The prices and income received by American farm families have been declining and threaten to decline still further; each such decline bring with it the threat of reduced farm purchasing power and purchases, reduced demand for industrial products used on the farm and by farm families, and a resulting enforced reduction of industrial employment.

(l) American farms and farm families are fully capable of producing efficiently a greater abundance of food and fiber products, while at the same time conserving and improving the Nation's farm soil and water resources.

(m) This great productive ability of American farmers and farm families should be put fully to work in the interest of national security and the maintenance of the health, efficiency, and morale of the American people.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 3. It is the policy of Congress that the United States should take appropriate action to insure that—

(a) the means of obtaining sufficient food for an adequate diet and sufficient clothing for an adequate standard of clothing will be placed, so far as possible, within the reach of every person in the Nation;

(b) the food and fiber products produced on American farms and not needed for fully adequate domestic consumption will be put to work to implement United States foreign policy through facilitating (1) the inauguration of universal public general and vocational education systems in friendly nations not now having them, (2) more rapid economic development that will expand markets and increase consumer purchasing power in friendly nations, (3) the elimination of the threat of starvation and famine, and (4) increases in the security and income-earning capacities of farm families in friendly nations;

(c) adequate safety reserves of farm commodities and of food and fiber products will be developed and maintained;

(d) extreme price fluctuations in the international market for farm products will be prevented and production will be kept expanding; and

(e) American farm families will be assured of adequate income to maintain a standard of living equivalent to those afforded persons dependent upon other gainful occupations, while maintaining full production on the family farms of the Nation, conserving and improving the Nation's farm soil and water resources, and meeting all costs of reproduction and capital replacement.

PROGRAM TO BE INCLUDED IN ECONOMIC REPORT

SEC. 4. The President shall incorporate in the economic report required by the Employment Act of 1946 a program for carrying out the policy declared in section 3 of this joint resolution, together with such recommendations for legislation as he may deem necessary or advisable in connection with the program.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

Address delivered by Senator KNOWLAND before the Montgomery County, Md., Republican organization on February 2, 1955.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address entitled "Some Lessons of Our International Experience," delivered by him on February 3, 1955, before the Dayton, Ohio, Council of World Affairs, at Dayton, Ohio.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Address entitled "Progress in Reverse," prepared by him for delivery before the antitrust law section of the New York State Bar Association, New York, January 26, 1955.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF TREVOR GARDNER TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the RECORD will show that the nomination of Mr. Trevor Gardner to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force was referred to the Committee on Armed Services on February 4, 1955.

The committee rules require that nominations lie over a specified period of time before they may be considered. The purpose of this delay is to make it possible for the Members of the Senate, as well as the general public, to be apprised of the fact that consideration of the nomination will be forthcoming.

I have risen at this time, Mr. President, to state that the Committee on Armed Services will hold a public hearing on this nomination on Thursday, February 17 at 10:30 a. m. in room 212, Senate Office Building.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JOHN MARSHALL HARLAN TO BE ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

John Marshall Harlan, of New York, to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, vice Robert H. Jackson, deceased.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, February 23, 1955, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on the above nomination. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. It is requested that such persons notify the committee on or before February 19, 1955, whether they will be present.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JULIUS C. HOLMES TO BE AMBASSADOR TO IRAN

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Senate received today the nomination of Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador of the United States to Iran, vice Loy W. Henderson. I give notice that this nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE YALTA AGREEMENT

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, for the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the Yalta Agreement, I have prepared a statement which I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES

A decade has now passed since the signing of the infamous Yalta Agreement, a decade which has been a tragic reminder of betrayal of national honor. The sacrifice of long-standing friends, which was agreed to by our representatives at the Yalta Conference, remains a dark chapter in the history of American foreign policy.

The American people have never sanctioned this agreement nor has it ever been approved by either House of the Congress. In the face of repeated violations by the Soviets, who have used this agreement as another device to further their imperialistic designs, it is a sham and a delusion to perpetuate the hoax of its validity.

To the brave people of Poland, who have borne the suffering and the persecution resulting from this sellout, I join in reaffirming our traditional friendship and in voicing our sincere hope for speedy liberation. Let us never waver in our firm obligation to correct the injustice committed on that infamous day 10 years ago.

On this anniversary let us renew a firm determination to right the horrible injustice perpetrated in the name of our Government.

EFFECT OF YALTA AGREEMENT ON POLAND—LETTER FROM POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to me from the Polish-American Congress, Inc., dated January 25, 1955. The letter calls attention to the fact that February 7, 1955, which was yesterday, when the Senate was not in session, marked the 10th anniversary of the famous wartime meeting of the Big Three at Yalta which resulted unhappily, among other things, in shutting Poland off behind the Iron Curtain, and the enslavement of the wonderful people of Poland.

We in Connecticut have a special feeling in regard to that situation, because a very high percentage of the people who live in our State came there from Poland. There are in Connecticut first, second, and third generation Poles by the thousands. I could not let this anniversary pass without paying tribute to those people and their relatives, those oppressed people who unhappily were placed behind the Iron Curtain largely as the result of the agreements reached at Yalta.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
Washington, D. C. January 25, 1955.

The Honorable PRESCOTT S. BUSH,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUSH: We are taking the liberty of bringing to your attention that February 7, 1955, will mark the 10th anniversary of that famous wartime meeting of the "Big Three" which marked the beginning of a series of retreats of the free world before the forward march of Soviet aggression.

We refer, of course, to the meeting of Joseph V. Stalin, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Winston S. Churchill at Yalta, in 1945.

Under an agreement reached there—or, rather extracted by Stalin under the threat not to join in the war with Japan—the Soviet sphere of influence has been carved out in Eastern Europe. The enslavement of several European nations, Poland included, has been sanctioned by the two western leaders, caving in under Stalin's blackmail.

At Yalta, too—the way was paved for the Sovietization of China.

The Yalta compact remains an executive agreement, never ratified by the United States Senate and therefore not binding. Repeated Soviet violations of the Yalta agreement deprive that document, secretly drafted, of its last vestige of questionable validity.

Millions of Americans believe that the Yalta agreement should be denounced and declared not valid. All unilateral actions undertaken by Stalin under the cloak of that most unfortunate result of personal diplomacy, should be declared illegal.

Only a complete and unhesitating renunciation of the Yalta agreement by the Congress and the executive branch of our Government could restore American prestige in Europe and Asia.

Referring to your splendid record in the fight for American security and our moral leadership of the free world, we beg to submit to your attention the necessity of raising your voice on the floor of the Senate on Monday, February 7, in defense of the Polish nation—the prime victim of the Yalta deal—and the other nations, victimized by Soviet imperialism.

You may rest assured that the expression of your views on that occasion will find most appreciative response in the minds and hearts of those who deeply believe that as long as Yalta remains unrepudiated and undenounced, the enslaved nations of the world—our most faithful allies—will be unable to trust our word.

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES BURKE,
Washington Representative,
Polish-American Congress, Inc.

TARIFF REVISION—THE PAYCHECK PERIL POINT

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on Monday, January 24, 1955, I referred in a brief address on the Senate floor to a letter addressed by me to Mr. Samuel C. Waugh, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, in which I urged that constant thought be given to the paycheck peril point during the forthcoming tariff negotiations at Geneva, Switzerland.

I have now received his reply, and I am pleased to observe that Mr. Waugh shares my concern over this problem, and my belief that improvement of the paycheck reflected in higher real wages and improved living standards is one of the basic objectives of the President's foreign trade program.

Enclosed with my letter to Mr. Waugh was an exhibit showing comparative wage rates in the rubber footwear industry in Hong Kong and in Connecticut's Naugatuck Valley. An example of the wage differentials in this exhibit is the rate paid to male packers—8 cents an hour in Hong Kong; $2.05 in Naugatuck.

In addition to the rubber footwear industry, other Connecticut industries may be vulnerable to unfair competition based on such a startling disparity in the wages paid here and abroad. Among them are the hat industry in Danbury and Norwalk, the bicycle industry in Torrington, the manufacture of vacuum bottles in Norwich and New Britain, our clock and watch and textile industries, and the flashlight industry in Bridgeport and New Haven.

Mr. Waugh quite properly points out that a wage advantage may be offset by other factors. As I said in my statement on January 24, in some cases the lower wage rates paid abroad may be offset by the greater skill and productivity of American workers, and by the superiority of our production methods. I repeat, however, that it is impossible to believe that such factors can close a gap so great as that between the starvation levels prevailing in Hong Kong and the wage standards which our Connecticut workers earn and deserve.

I am pleased by Mr. Waugh's statement that my letter and the wage differentials exhibit will be brought to the attention of the agencies participating in the deliberations of the Interdepartmental Trade Agreements Committee. If the paycheck peril point is kept constantly in mind by these agencies, it will serve as a danger signal against indiscriminate and injudicious reductions in tariffs.

Mr. Waugh also points out that Connecticut has a very considerable stake in expansion of exports, referring to a study made a few years ago by the Connecticut Development Commission, in which 552 Connecticut manufacturers reported that they exported goods valued at $144,526,000 in 1947 and at $139,899,000 in 1948.

These figures, reflecting only direct exports and not including products manufactured in Connecticut which go into the production of export goods, tend to support the estimate of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston that approximately 10 percent or more of our employment in Connecticut is dependent on exports.

Mr. Waugh's letter confirms my conviction that the administration intends to proceed carefully in carrying out the President's foreign trade program. By faithfully observing the principles of gradualness, selectivity, and reciprocity insisted upon by Mr. Eisenhower, we can achieve a result beneficial to Connecticut's economy as well as the economies of other highly industrialized areas of the Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Waugh's letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 4, 1955.

DEAR SENATOR: I have examined with interest the exhibit attached to your letter of January 21 showing comparative wage rates in the rubber footwear industry in Hong Kong and in the Naugatuck Valley of Connecticut. The disparity in wage rates between rubber footwear workers in Hong Kong and in Connecticut seems startling when so dramatically presented. Yet a wage advantage of itself does not necessarily determine the competitive position of the foreign producer in view of the greater productivity of United States workers, the greater mechanization of United States industry, the more advanced technical know-how and managerial skills and other important advantages which American workers and American manufacturers have in their favor.

I certainly agree that we must be concerned with what you refer to as the paycheck peril point. In fact—quite aside from the additional urgency which our national security gives to the President's foreign trade program—the improvement of the paycheck reflected in higher real wages and improved living standards is one of the basic objectives of that program.

I am having copies of your letter and of the data contained in the United States Rubber Co.'s booklet distributed to the various agencies participating in the Interdepartmental Trade Agreements Committee.

The committee, before making a recommendation as to a possible tariff concession on any product, takes into careful consideration all available information and views applicable to that product. As you know, one of its constant guides is the avoidance of recommendations for tariff concessions which would cause or threaten serious injury to any domestic industry. The committee also has been directed by the President to make sure that none of the products on which concessions are recommended are made by workers receiving wages which are substandard in the exporting country which is the principal supplier. In fact the trade-agreements legislation itself and the procedures established under it contain safeguards against hardship which all of us realize would be a regrettable disservice to the Naugatuck Valley and to the country as a whole.

It would be equally regrettable, on the other hand, to ignore the interest of the Nation as a whole or of its component areas in the expansion of world trade on a mutually profitable basis. For example, the position of the State of Connecticut as an exporter of a wide variety of products is clearly an important factor in its continuing prosperity. According to a survey made a few years ago by the Connecticut Development Commission, 552 Connecticut manufacturers reported that they exported goods valued at $144,526,000 in 1947 and at $139,899,000 in 1948. These figures represent only the direct exports of Connecticut products in those years and do not include products manufactured in Connecticut which go into the production of export goods. The Commission pointed out as an example the use of ball bearings made in Connecticut in motor vehicles exported from the United States. Those same motor vehicles may well be equipped with tires made in Connecticut plants or in United States Rubber Co. plants in other States paying the high wages which are characteristic of American industry.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL C. WAUGH,
Assistant Secretary.

THE ETHICS OF THE FOURTH ESTATE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on January 22, 1955, the North Carolina Press Association unanimously adopted a truly magnificent statement of the ethical principles which ought to guide those who gather, publish, and comment upon the news. The statement was prepared by a committee the chairman of which was one of North Carolina's ablest newspapermen of all time, Mr. D. Hiden Ramsey, of Asheville, who was assisted by the following outstanding associates: Mr. Frank A. Daniels, of the News and Observer, Raleigh; Mr. Al G. Dickson, of the Wilmington Star-News, Wilmington; Mr. Rupert Gillett, of the Charlotte Observer, Charlotte; Mr. Weiman Jones, of the Franklin Press, Franklin; Mr. Thomas J. Lassiter of the Smithfield Herald, Smithfield; Mr. C. A. (Pete) McKnight, of the Charlotte News, Charlotte; Mr. Lynn Nisbet, of the Associated Afternoon Dailies, Raleigh; Mr. Roy Parker, Sr., of the Hertford County Herald, Ahoskie; Mr. E. A. Resch, of the Chatham News, Siler City; Mr. Thomas J. Shaw, of the Thomasville Tribune, Thomasville; Mr. David J. Wichard, of the Greenville Reflector, Greenville; Mr. William J. Woestendiek, of the Journal and Sentinel, Winston-Salem; Mr. Clarence Whitefield, of the Durham Herald-Sun, Durham; and Mr. Miles H. Wolff, of the Greensboro Daily News, Greensboro.

Since this statement of ethical principles is worthy of full commendation and acceptance, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLE

The newspapers of North Carolina, conscious of their obligations, and mindful of their own human imperfections, rededicate themselves to these principles which guide a responsible press in a free society.

I

Freedom of the press exists in a democracy, not for the power or profit or pleasure of any individual, but for the common good. The right of the people to know cannot be denied or diminished without endangering democracy itself. It is the obligation of the press to provide accurate, timely, and complete information about all developments which affect the people's political, economic, or social well-being. Given the facts, the people usually will reach wise decisions.

II

The trusteeship of a free press is the final responsibility of the publisher. He may share it, but he cannot escape it. The good publisher provides the necessary money and space for adequate coverage of the essential news and employs personnel of integrity, ability, and sound judgment. He exalts accuracy above every other consideration, and insists upon prompt, full, and even generous correction when errors occur.

III

Every citizen deserves the stimulus of a strong editorial page, on which the editor voices his own well-informed opinion, clearly and forcefully; yet willingly provides space for contrary opinion. The good editor often takes sides, but without arrogance or intolerance. He champions boldly the rights of the people, sometimes against government itself. He provides leadership, particularly in his own community. He has a special responsibility to defend the weak, to prod the public conscience, and to speak out against the injustices of which a majority can sometimes be guilty.

IV

The primary function of a newspaper is to report the news. The good reporter strives constantly to find and write the truth. This task, no matter how difficult, is his unescapable responsibility.

To be true, a story, together with its headlines, must be honest. To be honest, it must be fair. To be fair, it must be accurate and complete.

Honesty demands objectivity, the submergence of prejudice and personal conviction. Fairness demands regard for the rights of others. Accuracy demands courage, painstaking care, and perspective to assure a total picture as true as its individual facts.

V

The final test of every story, every headline, every editorial, every newspaper is:

Is it honest?

Is it fair?

Is it accurate?

To the end that they can more frequently answer these questions in the affirmative, the newspapers of North Carolina adopt this statement of principle.

NORTHWEST AIRLINES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a brief statement with regard to the letter sent by President Eisenhower yesterday to the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board with regard to Northwest Airlines service to Hawaii.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to be followed by the text of the President's letter and the text of a telegram from the Milwaukee Association of Commerce regarding the still pending issue of the vital direct inner great circle route to Alaska.

There being no objection, the statement, letter, and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT'S LETTER ON HAWAII SERVICE WELCOME

The State of Wisconsin is gratified at the decision of President Eisenhower represented in his letter of February 7 to the Honorable Chan Gurney, Acting Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The President's letter, which is admittedly of a compromise nature, certifies both Northwest Airlines and Pan-American World Airways to continue to operate the Seattle-Portland-Hawaii route for a temporary period of 3 years.

I want to say in all frankness that if Northwest had been denied the opportunity to continue the route to Hawaii, which it pioneered, the entire area of our Nation which this great airline has served so long and so well would have been deeply disturbed.

For some months, I have taken up this problem and the matter—already decided—of Northwest service to Tokyo, with the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Immediately upon learning of the order which would have canceled Northwest's right to Hawaii, I conveyed my respectful communication of protest to the White House.

In all fairness to our great Chief Executive, let it be stated that this is but one of a thousand problems which he faces and which his staff faces. With all the heavy problems pressing down upon them—at home and abroad—it is understandable why now and then some decision may be reached which may not be, in the judgment of many folks, all that it should be.

In this instance, I respectfully disagreed with the President and so stated to his staff.

While the letter of February 7 does not represent a perfect and permanent solution to the present problem, at least it goes a long way toward relieving the concern in the minds of many people.

We of Wisconsin—particularly in Milwaukee and Madison—have a vital stake in the continuation of Northwest Airlines' great service. Innumerable business enterprises throughout my State depend crucially upon this great transportation artery. Its severance would have been a heavy blow to us and to our neighbor States as well.

Now I intend to continue to keep in close touch with the President and the Civil Aeronautics Board on this situation and in particular on the decision on Northwest's vital service to Anchorage via Edmonton, Alberta. This later route is an indispensable commercial artery for my State and many others. A favorable decision is therefore essential. Wisconsin respectfully urges a "green light" for this Northwest Airlines route.

LETTER OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER TO CHAN GURNEY, CHAIRMAN OF CAB, RELEASED FEBRUARY 7, 1955, AT WHITE HOUSE

DEAR MR. GURNEY: I desire to amend my letter of February 1, with reference to the west coast Hawaii case.

As you know, I believe in the strength of competitive enterprise if based on sound economic considerations, but it must not be wasteful duplication at the expense of the

Federal Government. Both carriers operating on this Seattle-Portland-Hawaii route have built up substantial business. Moreover, since my original action in this case, I have received from you information to the effect that within 2 years all airlines subsidies in the Pacific area will probably have been eliminated or will at least approach that point. Renewing the certificates of both carriers for a limited period would afford them an equal opportunity to demonstrate their capacity to develop adequate traffic to operate without subsidies or to prove definitely that the route cannot economically support two carriers.

Accordingly, I request the Board present for my approval a revised order in this case which would certify both Northwest Airlines and Pan-American World Airways for operation between Seattle-Portland and Hawaii for a temporary period of 3 years from now.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *February 8, 1955.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Milwaukee business highly pleased with President's decision to reverse his previous order and to authorize CAB to issue a 3-year extension to Northwest Airlines for continuation of profitable route from the Pacific Northwest to Hawaii. We sincerely appreciate your effective action in this respect.

However, we are sorely disappointed that the President's latest action did not include reversal of his previous decision to eliminate the direct inner great circle route from Milwaukee to Alaska. We earnestly believe this route is basic to Wisconsin's future growth in domestic trade with Edmonton, Canada, and Anchorage, Alaska, as well as our foreign trade with the Orient. This is the most direct route of any American carrier to Japan, the Philippines, and to the cold war areas of the Far East, hence should be developed commercially in the interests of national defense.

We sincerely trust that you can prevail upon the President to retain this direct route from important industrial areas of the Midwest to the Orient.

WILLIAM A. MANN,
President, Milwaukee Association of Commerce.
AUGUST K. PAESCHKE,
Chairman, Air Service Division.

PROPOSED REFORMS IN THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement which I have prepared on the subject of the need for a nationwide primary and reforms in the electoral college.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMATHERS

We have recently heard a great deal about the need for reforms in the electoral college, which has the responsibility each 4 years of formalizing the election of the President and Vice President of the United States.

I am among those who believe that this archaic institution should be reformed, if not abolished altogether, if we are to maintain democratic realism in the conduct of our elections, and hence insure that the operation of government will continue responsive to the people.

However, Mr. President, I think that our need for reform goes far beyond any indicated changes in the process of the electoral college. I have been convinced for some time that if our free government by the people is to continue, and if the convictions of the individual private citizen are to count, there must be improvement in the means by which the nominees of the various parties who contest any of these elections gain their places on the ticket.

One of the first legislative proposals which I submitted to Congress when I came to the House some 9 years ago called for a national system of primaries. I now have pending before the Senate such a proposal.

I do not claim to be the author of the idea for a system of a nationwide nominating primary. To my knowledge, it first was advocated 42 years ago in 1913 by President Woodrow Wilson in his first annual message to the Congress. Various Members of the Senate have urged the national primary idea since that time, and there are in the Senate a number of Senators who, like me, earnestly believe that the primary system of naming a Presidential candidate is a most desired extension of the democratic process.

Mr. President, there is a demand on the part of the people throughout the Nation for a voice in the naming of Presidential candidates. Even prior to the 1952 conventions, the report of a survey of public opinion by Dr. George Gallup indicated that 73 percent of the people favored doing away with the convention system of nominating candidates for President and Vice President and placing in its stead the nationwide nominating primary.

Since the staging of the 1952 conventions, which was taken into the American homes for the first time by television, I am convinced that there is a greater demand than ever before for a change.

The people saw for themselves how conventions were operated, how party hacks and political back-room maneuvers operated right in full view of the public. I don't think the people liked it. In my opinion, they want this great power taken out of the hands of a few professional policitians and restored to the people where under our system of democracy, it belongs.

I had hoped that after the 1952 conventions, the Congress would return here and promptly take steps to make the reforms whose need is so clearly indicated. We did have some hearings, Mr. President, but no action resulted.

We are now virtually upon the eve of the 1956 campaigns. Within a very few months—less than a year—the speechmaking, the handshaking, and the organizing will be underway. Thirteen months from today the first primary will be held in New Hampshire, and there may be as many as 20 other primaries in advance of the political conventions. That's fine and all to the good, but what about the people of the other 27 States? Eighty-two million people in the United States have a voice in the selection of their party candidates. Are not the other 78 million people likewise entitled to an equal voice?

Yet here we are just 13 months away from our first Presidential primary in a State. We are going to have to get busy if we are to do anything by 1956. Even now it may be too late for 1956; if it is, we should start right now in anticipation of the primaries for 1960.

I am just as much in favor of changing the electoral college as anyone else. That is a change long needed. But that is not all that is needed.

The proposal that I have before the Senate—Senate Joint Resolution 9—calls for a reform of the electoral college. But, in addition, it calls for establishment of the national primary. It also proposes a change in succession to the Presidency in the event of the death in office of the President.

Mr. President, I hope that we may get some action. The public has long awaited action by Congress on this vital subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, the morning business is closed.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR FRED HERBERT BROWN, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, Fred Herbert Brown, formerly a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, passed away at his home in Somersworth, N. H., last Thursday, February 3. New Hampshire mourns the loss of a distinguished son.

My colleague, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is unavoidably absent, filling an engagement in his home State. When he returns he will wish to speak of his memory of Senator Brown, with whom he served both in this body and for many years on the public service commission of New Hampshire.

Fred Brown's career reads like a thrilling and romantic story. Born in the little town of Ossipee, he was educated at Dartmouth College where he was an outstanding baseball star. In his early years he played professional baseball in minor leagues and then on the Boston Braves. After graduating from Boston University Law School, he settled in the city of Somersworth and practiced law there. He climbed the ladder of public office: mayor of Somersworth, United States District Attorney, Governor of New Hampshire, and finally, United States Senator.

New Hampshire is an overwhelmingly Republican State. In the 90 years since the Civil War it has had but 2 Democrat governors, 1 elected in 1912 when the Bull Moose movement split the majority party, and Fred Brown, elected Governor in 1922. Since the Civil War, New Hampshire has had but 2 Democrat United States Senators, 1 elected under the same circumstances in 1912, and the other Senator Brown, elected in 1932. I would not refer to political affiliations which fade into insignificance when the time of parting comes. I mention them because the fact that Fred H. Brown was the only member of the minority party to win the highest offices in the gift of the people of New Hampshire in a straight two-party battle is eloquent testimony of the unique place he held in the hearts of men and women of all parties in the Granite State.

He was the intimate friend of two Presidents, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman. After his service in the Senate, President Roosevelt appointed him Comptroller General of the United States, but the stroke which began his long illness compelled him to resign shortly after his appointment. Later, the President called him to the Tariff Commission, but again his health made it impossible for him to serve. For 15 years he has been an invalid confined to his home at Somersworth where he has been visited by his friends and admirers with whom he served in public life both here and in New Hampshire.

We who knew him are saddened by his death, but the sadness is lightened by our realization that his long vigil is ended. After 15 years of dreary invalidism, he has passed to his eternal rest.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it was my high privilege to serve in the Senate with the late Senator Brown, of New

Hampshire. I desire to associate myself with the very eloquent tribute paid him by the distinguished junior Senator from that State.

Senator Brown's career served as an inspiration to the young men of this Nation. Because of his diligence, his patriotism, and his unswerving loyalty to his country and to those whom he served, he achieved the heights under great difficulties. He was a great public servant, and I know that the people of New Hampshire appreciate his many contributions to the welfare of that State and of the Nation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to join with a number of my colleagues in paying tribute to the life, the useful public service, and the character of the late Senator Fred Brown, of New Hampshire. It was my privilege, as a Member of the House of Representatives, in 1939, to meet and to come to know Senator Brown.

He had a distinguished career as a public servant in the State of New Hampshire and as a Member of the United States Senate. He was progressive, forward-looking, and always interested in the small-business man and the farmer. He proposed and helped to enact a great many worthwhile laws which are now on our statute books.

Later he was appointed Comptroller General of the United States, in which position he rendered excellent service for a few months. Unfortunately he had to retire because of ill health.

After a period of convalescence and recovery, he was again appointed, by President Roosevelt, who had a very high opinion of Senator Brown, as a Member of the Tariff Commission.

Senator Brown was always interested in the young Members of the House and of the Senate. He was always willing to take time to discuss their problems with them, as it was my privilege to talk with him on a number of occasions.

In 1952, at Somersworth, New Hampshire, where he lived, I had the privilege of calling on Senator Brown on two occasions. At that time he was an invalid and bedridden, but his mind was alert. He maintained a continued interest in the affairs of his country, in the proceedings of Congress, and in the personalities in the National Legislature.

I feel that the State of New Hampshire and the Nation have lost a very useful citizen. Many of us have lost a personal friend. I wish to join in extending my sympathy to the members of the late Senator's family.

"PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE" PROPAGANDA OF SOVIET UNION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the replacement of Georgi Malenkov by Marshal Bulganin as Premier of the Soviet Union demonstrates anew several things:

First. The unending bitter struggle for power among the Soviet leaders—a struggle which may intensify rather than lessen now.

Second. The fact that the free world definitely cannot rely upon the so-called peaceful coexistence theme which Malenkov had been stressing for some months.

So long as a Soviet foreign policy trend can be established at the whim of one of the members of a dictatorial clique, it can also be upset by a change in that clique.

Regardless of individual changes in the Kremlin, however, the fact of the matter is that its overall strategy, aimed at world revolution, has remained unchanged, even during the period of Malenkov's ascendancy.

The free world should not indulge in any wishful thinking that the Soviet problem will solve itself merely because of these eruptions in the struggle for power. The latest defense budget in which the Soviet Union spends, in effect, more than ever before—112 billion rubles for arms, or around $28 billion—is far more meaningful than any temporary propaganda line which the Reds adopt.

Khrushchev, who is apparently riding high, gives every indication of continuing to emphasize heavy war industry at the expense of consumer items.

To the extent that Khrushchev's position has been strengthened by the latest change, the danger to the free world has not lessened.

THE SITUATION IN ASIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be published in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, viewpoints on the situation in Asia with which I wish to associate myself. They are in the form of a series of articles written by Mr. Walter Lippmann, an article written by Marquis Childs, appearing in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, and an article written by Joseph Alsop, appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald of yesterday morning.

By way of comment on the series Mr. President, I desire to say that it is exceedingly interesting to note that since the passage of the joint resolution a few days ago numerous articles written by some of the keenest students of American foreign relations, such as Mr. Lippmann, Professor Morgenthau, of the University of Chicago, Mr. Marquis Childs, Mr. Alsop, and professors of foreign relations in a great many American universities, have been writing articles which I think expressed the fears by some of us on the floor of the Senate who could not go along with the resolution. We could not go along because of what we regarded as the increasing danger of the Nationalist Chinese involving the United States in a war in Asia, which would result in the unnecessary sacrifice of many American boys.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 8, 1955]

TOWARDS A CEASE-FIRE

(By Walter Lippmann)

The evacuation of the Tachens has now begun, and if it is successful, which we need not doubt, the position will be stronger and safer than it was before.

A great deal has been said and written about how important it is to hold positions of strength. The Tachens were not a position of strength. They were a military and political liability. They could not be defended except at the risk of a general war which no one in his senses would undertake for such unimportant territory. The Chinese Nationalist troops on them had nothing useful to do, and they were in a military trap—like the French at Dien Bien Phu. Had they been lost, instead of being evacuated, Chiang would have made the same military error as the French made when they locked up a garrison at Dien Bien Phu, locked it up in an outpost of no decisive importance which could not be defended. The story in Indochina might well have been different from what it is today if a policy of evacuation from indefensible outposts to concentrated strong points had been carried out.

These considerations apply to the other offshore islands, and the sound American policy would be to follow up what is being done in the Tachens by doing the same thing in Quemoy and Matsu. This is the surest way to carry out the policy which the President laid down in his message to Congress. The policy is to keep Formosa and the Pescadores out of unfriendly hands, and to bring about a cease-fire in the Formosa Strait. There is one way by which at present Formosa can be defended. That is by American military power. But there are two ways in which the policy of the cease-fire can be put into effect. The one—which we have been attempting—is to negotiate a cease-fire with Peiping. If they would agree to it, they would tacitly assent not to attack Formosa and we—so it is generally understood—would in return bring about either the neutralization or the evacuation of the offshore islands.

This way of arriving at a cease-fire has been rebuffed angrily by Chou En-lai. We ought not to be surprised. It was wishful thinking to suppose that the Chinese government, which has won the civil war on the mainland, would appear as a nonmember before the Security Council in which China is represented by a faction that is no longer on the Chinese mainland. It was no less wishful to suppose that the Red Chinese would publicly sign a cease-fire which meant that they had renounced the right to complete the defeat of Chiang and to recover by force the island of Formosa.

It is most improbable that the cease-fire can be obtained by public agreement either in the U. N. or in any other kind of conference.

There is, however, another way to bring about the cease-fire for which the United States national policy calls. It can be done by direct American action, and it does not depend upon the negotiation of an agreement with Peiping. This is to do in Quemoy and Matsu what we are doing in the Tachens—to evacuate them not as the result of a bargain but as a strategic measure to liquidate a position of weakness, and to fall back on Formosa, which is a genuine position of strength.

Once that is done, there will be in fact, whatever Peiping may or may not agree to, a practical cease-fire in the Formosa Strait. Pin-prick bombing and shooting and raiding, which the Nationalists do from these offshore islands, will stop. There will be a hundred miles of blue water between Red China, which has no navy, and Formosa, which we are defending. In a military sense this will be for all practical purposes a cease-fire between the two Chinas—as there is between the whales and the elephants who cannot get at one another. Formosa will not be in Peiping's military orbit. The fantasy of putting Chiang back on the mainland by an all-out American war will have been dissipated. The risk of a great war over trifling islands will have been greatly

reduced. We shall have protected our genuine, as distinguished from our fictitious interests, and we shall have the moral and political support of our allies.

It will be said by some that to evacuate the islands is appeasement. But if we are talking about appeasement and about prestige, which is the firmer American policy: to sell these islands for a cease-fire, treating them as pawns in a bargain, or get rid of them as military and political legal liabilities, and to take a stand on a line—that of Formosa and the Pescadores—which is a defensible legal line, a defensible strategical line, which is a sound political line in that it has the support of our allies? I think it is more dignified to evacuate the islands for our own reasons than to sell them to obtain the benefits of a truce. We can have the benefits of the truce without bargaining and by our own voluntary action.

There is only one considerable doubt about this policy. It is whether Chiang can be induced to agree to it without demoralizing his army and his officialdom. There is no denying that that could happen. But we have to remember that if it is going to happen because of the evacuation of the offshore islands, it is going to happen anyway. For the administration has taken the fundamental decision not to support a war for the reconquest of the mainland. It cannot be sound policy to use Quemoy and Matsu as a way of allowing the Formosan Chinese to deceive themselves into thinking that the administration does not mean what it says. It cannot be sound policy to use these islands as bait to the Formosan Chinese, as a way of causing them to keep on thinking that the United States can be pushed, pulled, ensnared, and entangled into the kind of war that the United States has decided not to wage.

We cannot go on forever, or for long, sacrificing the national interests of the United States to our fears and to our guesses of what will and what will not happen to the morale of Chiang's regime. If our true interest is to evacuate the offshore islands and to stand on the legal line of Formosa and the Pescadores, then we owe it to the people of this country to follow our true interest, refusing to let high policy be controlled by the internal politics of the Formosa regime.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 7, 1955]

A MAIN CLUE

(By Walter Lippmann)

In calculating the risks and in estimating the probabilities in the Far East, we need an explanation of the fact that both Peking and Washington talk as if the struggle to seize Formosa were a near possibility. Yet, except for the lone voice of Joseph Alsop, who thinks that the intelligence estimates of Chinese power may be unreliable, the general assumption is that the Red Chinese do not have the military means needed to conquer Formosa. They have no navy and the hundred miles of water in the Formosa Strait are guarded by the most powerful navy in the world. Yet, as Mr. Alsop says, "The Peking government has been promising its people to take Formosa this year at the top of its voice" and "it is really hard to see why the brilliant Chou En-lai should have engaged Peking's prestige to the very hilt, if the threat to Formosa is a mere vainglorious maneuver.

Mr. Alsop's point is, I believe, well taken. The question then is why Chou En-lai, who has no navy, can afford to talk about conquering an island a hundred miles out at sea? How does he think he can capture Formosa this year, or even next year? The answer to this question, and the answer to many of the obscurities and ambiguities in the whole problem, is that Chou En-lai is counting upon the instability of Chiang Kai-shek's regime in Formosa. He could not be promising to "liberate" Formosa soon unless he hoped and believed that the Chinese army and officials might do on Formosa what was done so often during the civil war on the mainland—that is to say, to change sides and to make peace.

If this is the basis of Chou En-lai's hope, it is the basis of Washington's underlying fears. No doubt we believe that Chiang's regime is more solid than Chou En-lai is assuming it to be. But a dominating consideration in our whole Chinese policy is the knowledge that the regime at Formosa is fragile and that to keep it going everything must be done to bolster its morale. If the Administration felt sure that Chiang's regime in Formosa were solid, it would not hesitate much longer to recognize it for what it really is—as the government not of China but of Formosa. The block to that policy is the well-grounded fear that the Chinese in Formosa would not settle down peacefully as exiles but would come to terms with the mainland Chinese.

The Chinese on Formosa tell us, and Americans who are in close touch with them believe, that Chiang's regime would crumble in disaffection and intrigue if there were cut off the practical hope of a return to the mainland. Whether or not this is the fact, the Formosan Chinese insist on it and their supporters in Washington agree with it. Yet the fact of the matter is that the United States Government has not only abandoned hope of a restoration but has put its decision in this matter in writing in connection with the proposed Formosa pact.

Nevertheless, in Formosa the decision is not regarded as final and conclusive. The speculation is still alive that the United States will be and can be drawn into a great war in which Chiang might be able to return to the mainland. The administration, afraid that morale might crumble, has allowed the government in Formosa to nourish this hope. It has at least refrained from dashing it conclusively. This desire to keep up Chiang's spirits by letting him go on hoping for war is almost surely the real reason for the costly and dangerous fuzziness about the offshore islands. These islands are not part of the strategic defense of Formosa. They are symbols of a conceivable return to the mainland.

The administration does not have a clear policy. There is in it a basic contradiction which will in one form or another have to be resolved.

On the other hand, there is the decision not to support an attempt by Chiang to return to the mainland. This decision carries with it the unavoidable conclusion that Chiang's government in Formosa is not the government of China, and that it is not entitled to the Chinese seat in the United Nations.

On the other hand, there is the desire to keep Formosa out of Red Chinese control, and the assumption that the only way to do this is by supporting the Chinese Government in Formosa.

The combination of these two decisions would be the policy of the two Chinas, and it would be a feasible policy if only one uncertainty could be removed. That is whether the Chinese in Formosa would stay in Formosa and would not make their peace with Peking. If we could be sure of that, which we cannot be, the defense of Formosa ought to be quite feasible.

Chou En-lai's hopes are based on the belief that the Chinese in Formosa can be induced to come over to his side. We are not sure that they cannot be induced to do that. It is not a comfortable situation and that is why everyone who is serious about this business feels that he is standing on very uncertain ground.

We have staked a lot on the reliability of Chiang's regime. Yet in deciding, as our own vital interest required, against supporting his return to the mainland, we have done what is most likely to sow fatal doubts within his regime. To offset these doubts, to preserve the morale of the Chinese of Formosa, we have felt compelled to become entangled in the Chinese civil war on the offshore islands. So we find ourselves unable to draw a clear line or to take an intelligent position that can command the support of world opinion.

MUTUAL DEFENSE PACT

(By Marquis Childs)

The close relationship between Nationalist China and the United States, which has been one of the most troubling factors in formulating American foreign policy, is being formalized in a mutual defense pact. Virtually no interest has been shown in hearings on the pact by either proponents or opponents.

Many Senators believe that since Congress overwhelmingly approved the Formosa resolution, the treaty with Chiang Kai-shek is a mere formality. The Eisenhower resolution commits the United States to defend Formosa and the Pescadores and other related territories should their defense be necessary in protecting Chiang's island bastion.

But the treaty is a mutual commitment, and for the Nationalist Chinese this is an important distinction. The Eisenhower resolution is a unilateral statement of policy which can be altered at any time that American policymakers wish to change it.

But the doubts over America's course in formalizing this link with Chiang will persist. As was pointed out during the debate on the Formosa resolution, there is an imporant discrepancy between the treaty and the resolution. The latter puts the umbrella of American protection over other related territories, a phrase interpreted to mean the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu. The treaty is restricted solely to Formosa and the Pescadores.

During the debate on the resolution this discrepancy was pointed out by Senator HARRY BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, one of the leading conservatives in the Senate. An Eisenhower supporter who declared his intention of voting for the resolution, BYRD nevertheless sharply challenged the commitment to Chiang. He said:

"Can we underwrite the conduct and operations of Nationalist Chinese garrisons in their day-to-day, hour-to-hour contacts with a military aggressive enemy? Should we obligate ourselves for whatever force is necessary to maintain these garrisons in their extremely exposed positions? * * * Such circumstances are virtually certain to open wide the door for a shooting war on the mainland of China with all of its disastrous consequences."

BYRD offered his statement in connection with his vote in favor of an amendment which would have stricken from the Formosa resolution the phrase, "other related territories," and would thereby have eliminated responsibility for defense of the offshore islands. But the Senator from Virginia went on to raise these doubts about the mutual defense pact:

"* * * If the pending treaty is ratified, we would enter into close partnership, on equal terms, with Chiang Kai-shek, the undisputed leader of the Republic of China * * *. For his purposes, Chiang Kai-shek knows better than anyone else that he can never set foot on China again without American planes, troops, and ships. As a Senator, it is my considered opinion that Chiang Kai-shek is motivated by self-interest; that when the critical time comes he may place his ambitions above the welfare of his American partner."

There are those who hope that the Formosa resolution is the beginning of a new China policy which will evolve in the months ahead. While a formal cease-fire may not be possible, particularly since Chou En-lai, Communist foreign minister, has refused the invitation to come to the United Nations to

discuss a cease-fire resolution, a cease-fire in fact may result.

Through diplomatic negotiations the way may be prepared for Red China's admittance to the U. N. on a two-China basis. There are already rumors of a package deal which would admit Communist China along with Spain, Italy, Finland, and other countries long excluded by the Russian veto. If America's allies were to favor such an arrangement, it would be hard for this country to stand alone in opposition.

This is precisely the fear of those who want to keep Red China isolated. They count on the fanaticism of China's leaders to reject any solution the West would consider reasonable. And for the long pull, an isolated China, as they see it, will be subject to internal stresses and strains that are self-destructive. This last may be wishful thinking, but that has been a major ingredient through the years in America's China policy.

THE ENEMY BUILDUP

(By Joseph Alsop)

TAIPEH, FORMOSA.—The buildup and the current deployment of Chinese Communist military power ought to give pause to those who regard the Formosa crisis as a mere passing flurry.

Since the Korean truce, important ground and air forces have been transferred southward to the coastal provinces which are the natural jump-off points for an attack on Formosa and/or Formosa's offshore islands. And the modernization of Red China's land army has, meanwhile gone rapidly forward, so that most of this huge force is now almost as well equipped as the Soviet Union infantry.

Authoritative intelligence sources now credit the Peking government with regular ground forces with a strength of more than 3,100,000. These are organized in 210 infantry divisions, 22 artillery divisions, 6 armored divisions, plus considerable numbers of independent tank and artillery regiments, engineer regiments, and cavalry outfits.

On the ground, the post-Korean redeployment has been dramatic. At the end of the fighting, the Chinese had 17 of their armies on the Korean front. Seven of these armies (composed of 3 divisions each and equaling an American corps) have now been transferred out of Korea into China proper.

Three armies from Korea, the 12th, the 20th and the 26th, have been sent down to Chekiang and Kiangsu provinces, where the force threatening the Tachen Islands is massed. A fourth army from Korea, the 60th, is in first reserve position at Nanking. Three more armies from Korea are in North China, close to the north-south railroads that can carry them rapidly to the Yangtse Valley.

The Chekiang-Kiangsu force, immediately threatening the Tachens, now comprises four armies in all. Further south, in Fukien Province, across the narrow waters from Quemoy and the Matsu Islands, there is a second large mass of troops comprising 3 armies. None of these armies in Fukien, however, is of Korean origin.

The air redeployment has followed almost exactly the same pattern. Before the Korean armistice, the main strength of the Chinese Communist air force of just under 2,000 combat planes was stationed in Manchuria, to support the ground troops at the Korean front. In this period, the dispositions along the China coast were obviously defensive.

Now, however, an additional 500 aircraft, including 5 air divisions of MIG 15's, have been transferred southward. Instead of being in the north, the main strength of the Communist air force is thus concentrated in Chekiang, Kiangsu and the lower Yangtse Valley, where the air-base building program has been intensive. And there is a secondary concentration, of 5 additional air divisions, in the more southerly region around Canton.

In the air picture, however, there is one important difference from the ground picture. There is a striking gap in Fukien Province, in the immediate neighborhood of Quemoy and the Matsus. No air units are as yet stationed here. Only one, Fukien airfield, at Foochow, is fully ready to support jet operations. In view of the distances involved and the short range of the MIG 15, the Communists would, therefore, find it difficult, at this time, to use their most important plane in large numbers in support of assaults on Quemoy or the Matsus.

The slow but inexorable movement of all forces southward points to an eventual attack on Quemoy and the Matsus and, beyond much doubt, on the main island of Formosa.

In short, what the Communists can do if they choose to risk the consequences is only too grimly clear. What they will do is not by any means so clear. But the consensus in Taipeh, which seems logical to this reporter, is not particularly encouraging.

In brief, it is plain for all the world to see that President Eisenhower is hoping that evacuation of the Tachens plus a show of firmness about the other islands, will eventually enable him to make a deal. Quemoy and the Matsus are to be traded for a promise of toleration of the Nationalists on Formosa. Two Chinas, one small and in the process of withering away, the other vast and growing stronger by the month, are thus to be recognized.

This must look logical in Washington. But the consensus here, even among the few who favor such a deal, is that the President will not get what he wants by mere hints that he may perhaps fight for Quemoy and the Matsus. It seems likely, rather, that the President will have to prove he means it, by actually fighting for those islands when the time comes.

FACING THE FACTS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, too often we are impressed not with what a speaker says but rather the manner in which he says it. We pay too much attention to the form instead of the substance. We are too often carried away with the mellifluous orator who, in tones of pleasing resonance and intriguing gestures, whispers and coos sweet nothings to us and tells us only that which we want to hear. Too rarely do we hear an honest speaker exhibit the courage to tell us the facts and tell us what we should hear and are entitled to know.

I will take the courageous and honest speaker anytime over the mellifluous orator. Ezra Taft Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture, is the honest and courageous kind of speaker. He proved that in my home State of Maine on February 2, 1955, at Fort Fairfield, when he made a speech I should like every Member of the Senate to read. And so I request that his speech be printed in the RECORD for that purpose.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S FACE THE FACTS

(Address by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson)

This is my first visit to Maine since becoming Secretary of Agriculture and it is a great pleasure for me to be here with your Governor, Senator Smith, Congressman McIntyre, Dean Deering, and all you. We in the Department of Agriculture and you in Maine are very fortunate in your entire delegation in Congress. They have kept us closely informed on your agricultural problems and programs. They are intensely interested in your welfare. They have been most helpful to us in the Department and we shall continue to work closely with them.

I was greeted by another pleasure when I got off the train and saw all this snow. Snow is something that I have missed since coming to Washington 2 years ago. So it was an engaging sight to see the Maine landscape covered with this charming white mantle.

At the same time I recognize that all of this precipitation coming on top of your abnormally rainy summer creates additional problems for Maine farmers.

We in the Department of Agriculture are very much concerned over the difficulties you have been having. Your Senators and Congressmen have told me that few of the major agricultural commodities produced by Maine farmers had a good year in 1954. I understand that dairy producers did better than others, but the dairy situation certainly has not been one to arouse great joy. I know. We have been struggling with dairy problems for many months, and it is only recently that we have been able to see definite signs that the situation is on the upturn. We do see such signs now.

There is an unmistakable trend toward a better balance between dairy supplies and demand—a balance which is being brought about not through distasteful and uneconomic production controls, but rather through voluntary adjustments in production and increased consumption of the health-giving dairy foods.

This past December, milk production was 1 percent below December of a year ago. Dairymen are bringing their production into line with market demand.

Our Government-owned stocks of butter have come down sharply during the past 6 months. Last summer we owned 466 million pounds; on January 12 we held 262 million pounds. Stocks of cheese have recently been reduced by more than 100 million pounds. In December, the Government bought not a single pound of butter, the first month of no purchases in 2 years.

Your poultry industry, like poultry everywhere, has been hard hit by falling prices. But we now can foresee the end of the cost-price squeeze which egg and poultry producers have faced during the last season. Indeed, egg prices at the farm level have increased contraseasonally in the last few weeks. Poultry prices likewise have improved in recent weeks.

In response to the relatively low market prices of last fall, fewer chicks are now moving out for laying flock replacement next spring. Prices next summer and fall should be substantially above those of last season, thus permitting efficient producers to experience more normal profit levels.

Your orchards were hurt by hurricanes Carol and Edna, which, I am told, stripped the trees of most of their fruit.

And Maine potato growers, as we all know, are in their third successive year of adversity.

Last year Maine potato growers had to fight continuously against the elements in planting, cultivation, disease control, and harvest. Your production costs were among the highest on record. Other areas of the Nation suffered from drought, but in Maine the potato-growing areas suffered from too much rain. Your problem of blight control was aggravated and even frequent spraying of your fields did not produce satisfactory results. Rain made the harvest difficult and poor. It required extra careful conditioning of the crop for storage to prevent spoilage.

And now this year you must compete with growers in areas less distant from terminal markets, where growing conditions have

been favorable, and good quality crops have been the rule.

Well might you say, "These are the times that try men's souls."

They are indeed trying times.

But the people of Maine have stood firm under economic gales before. You are the same resolute stock as those who peopled this land in an earlier century. You have their spunk and their heart.

Here at Fort Fairfield in 1774 a few hardy pioneers settled in what was then a vast wilderness. They paved the way for the busy rural community of neat homes that we see here today. They and their followers set in motion the train of events that led to the typical Maine farm of today, with its well-kept fields, its large barns, and trim white house encircled by lovely orchard trees.

With a background of this kind, you farmers of Maine are, I know, determined to do what needs to be done to build a sound and prosperous future for your agriculture.

And speaking for the Department of Agriculture, I pledge you our whole-souled cooperation.

What are the ingredients that must go into the building of this sound and prosperous future?

I'm sure I don't know all the ingredients, but I do know some. I know we must have the facts. Facts are the road maps of economic progress. Second, we must face the facts honestly, which means interpreting them with scrupulous objectivity. Now what are some of the facts that we know about potatoes?

We know that potatoes are one of our primary foods. In terms of farm income potatoes are one of the top 10 crops.

We know that the industry has been noted for its outstanding, capable leaders.

We know that the industry has demonstrated the ability to overcome many adverse production and marketing situations. Having done it before, we are confident that you can do it again. And our confidence has been strengthened by the current activities of your industry organizations—the Maine Potato Industry Council, your Young Farmers Association, and your local potato growers associations such as the one here in Fort Fairfield. These organizations can continue to perform an increasingly valuable service by pooling ideas and working jointly toward the solution of common problems.

Another basic fact that we know and must face is this: Except for 1 or 2 years, there has been a consistent overproduction of Maine potatoes in relation to demand since 1943.

Production of Maine potatoes has been running substantially higher than it did during the 1930's. Commercial shipments, on the other hand, have been lower. Carlot shipments from the 1954 Maine crop will probably be 25 percent less than the prewar average.

There are only two alternative solutions to this problem of overproduction: Either your markets must be expanded or your production must be curtailed.

Maine currently seems to be able to market successfully about the same quantity of potatoes as before the war. With the present high yields, this means that 125,000 to 135,000 acres in a normal year will give you adequate production.

The Department has for a number of years issued acreage guides for potatoes and other vegetables. The guides are based on our best appraisal of market requirements for the Nation. They are broken down to each State on the basis of the current production pattern. We issue these acreage guides to provide growers, shippers, suppliers, credit institutions, and other persons interested in the industry with our best judgment of the acreage level which, under current market conditions and with an orderly marketing program, should be expected to reflect a fair price return to growers.

We have just released the 1955 potato acreage guide for Maine. It recommends 132,600 acres. This is about 7 percent more than last year's guide, but 15 percent less than last year's harvested acreage.

Just in passing, let me say that we would welcome the opportunity, through our service agencies and your State extension service, to explain and discuss fully the basis for this guide with all growers and other interested groups.

You have serious marketing problems this year. The leadership of the Maine potato industry, recognizing these difficulties, recommended that a marketing-agreement program be applied. This is another indication of your willingness to face the facts, especially as they concern the shipping of low-grade potatoes to terminal points where they would meet the competition of better-quality potatoes from other areas.

The marketing-agreement program you have adopted this year, through referendum, is a move to help the industry in Maine by keeping low-grade potatoes out of competition. The current shipping regulations may, because of the quality of your 1954 crop, keep 25 to 30 percent or even more of the crop off the market. I believe that these regulations have contributed significantly toward improving the market prices, and I think it is extremely fortunate that the marketing-order regulations were available for use this season in view of the grade and size composition of your crop.

This, however, leaves the problem of disposition of low-grade and cull potatoes. It is a matter to which we have given a great deal of study.

Early in January your congressional delegation recommended that we consider a starch-diversion program with a Government subsidy on these lower grades and sizes to increase the price to farmers. We discussed this proposal thoroughly with your congressional group. It was agreed that we should wait until the January 1 stocks reports were available before making a decision.

As you know, the Department announced last week that a starch-diversion program would not be undertaken at this time. I assure you this was not an easy decision to make. It is much simpler sometimes to say "Yes" than to say "No." But I feel very deeply that "yes" would have been the wrong answer at this time. Let me tell you why.

A careful appraisal of the prospective situation for the balance of the 1954 crop season points to a favorable outlook. Market prices this year are well above last year and there has been a moderate increase since the first of the year. The stocks report of 10 million bushels less than last year has been received with a considerable degree of confidence by the potato industry. Merchantable stocks do not appear greatly to exceed requirements. Here in the Northeast particularly, these stocks are only 4 million bushels more than the short supply of 3 years ago; also, shrinkage during the rest of the season probably will continue to be greater than normal. This will further reduce the supply of good-quality potatoes.

For these reasons, we concluded that market prospects do not justify a diversion program on the lower grades of potatoes. Nevertheless, we are keeping the market developments under continuing review.

Our decision, moreover, was determined by the long-range view as well as by the immediate situation.

Assume that a starch-diversion program were started with the Department paying a subsidy of, say, 60 cents per barrel for all potatoes above culls going into the factories. How much good—or how much harm—would this shot-in-the-arm type of treatment do to the Maine potato industry?

It would, of course, increase the total returns to potato growers this year. But in the normal course of events, higher returns mean larger acreage planted next year and greater marketing difficulties. More fundamentally, however, an artificially high price on the poorer quality potatoes is not a basically sound approach. Why should pickouts and strip-stock be regarded as part of the merchantable supply for tablestock shipments? A subsidized starch price might well do more harm than good by deferring full recognition by growers that these potatoes are really worth only their actual salvage value. It comes down once again to a question of fact and a willingness to face the fact.

I will not hesitate one moment to approve a price-assistance program—whenever it lightens the immediate economic burden and does not interfere with the important long-range objectives. But I do not believe we wish—or can afford—to sacrifice the future to the present. American farmers—and New England farmers particularly—are not penny-wise and pound-foolish.

There is reason to feel that the price-support programs of a few years ago were an instance in which potato growers unwittingly may have sacrificed the future to the present. You recall what happened in years of big supply. Early potatoes went to market; but where did Maine potatoes go? They stayed in storage. It became a highly unsatisfactory situation. It was a program that broke down under its own weight—but not before it hurt the potato industry in the estimation of the American people and cost the taxpayers $478 million. It led to legislation specifically excluding potatoes from support provisions.

That is why I am so deeply convinced that we must weigh all programs on the scales of both future and present effects.

We are well aware that many Maine farmers have unusual credit requirements especially this year because of the losses they have suffered.

Loans from the Farmers' Home Administration have helped Maine potato growers keep going during rather critical periods. Last year the FHA made available to Maine an additional allotment of production and subsistence loan funds amounting to approximately $1½ million. These loans helped finance the operations of family-type farms in the Aroostook potato area.

We are quite proud of the way this loan program was handled. In developing the operating plans, production costs per acre were held to a minimum. As a result it was possible to make loans that were clearly within the ability of the borrowers to repay. The records show also that farmers who were assisted by these loans reduced their acreage substantially.

While the FHA does not have comparable production and subsistence funds for allotment this year, it does have authority and funds for making emergency loans. This authority grows out of the designation of Maine as an emergency loan area following the hurricanes last fall. As a result the operating loan program this year will be operated on substantially the same basis as last year.

We have been talking thus far mostly about efforts to stabilize the potato industry in Maine through production adjustment, and marketing regulations. Before passing on to another area in this discussion, I want to reemphasize the vital importance of growers' planting within the recommended acreage guides announced by the Department. Let us face the facts. Acreage planted in excess of the guides in various States has in the past resulted in excess production and disorderly marketing conditions. This was particularly true, as you all know, for the 1953 crop-marketing season.

Adjusting production to market requirements will mean better prices and more in-

come. This is just commonsense. Too much production glutting the market gives about the same results as too many boys around the fishing hole. Nobody gets any fish.

At the same time, we recognize that adjusting production raises the question of what to do with the idle acres. Maine farmers, like those in many other States, have been trying to deal with this problem through more diversification, and that is certainly a logical solution. You have increased your dairy production in Maine. Poultry now brings in considerably more of the State's farm income than potatoes. Egg production for the use of hatcherymen is building up, and there has also been an increase in egg production for table use. Broiler production was 5 to 10 percent higher in 1954 than in 1953. Turkey production increased by about one-fourth. Maine farmers are growing more grain for poultry feed, and to some extent are using combines for harvest, which indicates that they are very seriously in the grain business.

Obviously, then, diversification has made important strides. But there is always more that can be done. I urge you to explore the situation thoroughly. Our departmental agencies are available to work very closely with you. The Extension Service is pushing ahead with its farm unit approach—a program designed to get the most out of the farm's total resources. The Farmers Home Administration helps small farmers with credit and a sound plan of operation.

I want to repeat what I consider to be the theme of my remarks—that we are interested in your problems; that our agencies are your agencies; and that they exist to serve you.

Let us turn now to an examination of the possibilities of expanding markets for Maine potatoes.

Here again we must have facts. What are the facts behind the decline in commercial shipments of Maine potatoes?

We feel that among the major causes are these:

Competition from other areas; loss of Maine's premium quality; the national decline in consumption of potatoes; and Maine's shorter marketing season and smaller marketing area.

Changing freight rate relationships have affected the competitive position of the major potato-producing areas.

The concentration of potato production among fewer commercial growers has brought improved grading practices in many areas. This has lessened the big market premium which once existed for Maine potatoes. Washing of potatoes and other vegetables is the common practice for all important production areas except the Northeast; this may also have affected market-price relationships. Moreover, the variation in eating quality among the many different varieties produced in Maine has certainly not helped.

The decline in per capita consumption of potatoes is important.

Potato consumption per person has fallen at least 20 percent since the 1930's.

The marketing season for the bulk of the sales of Maine potatoes is much shorter than it was 20 years ago. The bulk of the movement is now confined to the January through April period. For example, a yearly average of 11,000 carloads were shipped before December 1 during the 1930's as compared to 2,000 cars this year and 5,500 cars last year. A higher proportion of the commercial shipments are being made to Massachusetts, New York, and nearby States with a sharp decrease in shipments into the southeastern area.

A careful and unified analysis by the industry groups in Maine of these factors and some of their underlying causes should prove helpful as a move toward expanding your potato market. Again, the Department is eager to help by supplying more detailed market information. We are starting this year to separate the summer crop in most of the so-called late States where it is important and will report both a summer and fall crop. A much better estimate of the potential storage stocks will thus be available several months earlier in the season.

We announced last week that reports of storage stocks of merchantable potatoes will be issued for February 1 and March 1 this year. In fact representatives of the potato industry have raised the question of whether we should not have a more adequate reporting program every year. Our budget this year contains a request for funds to initiate an expansion of our reports on trucks receipts of potatoes and other fruits and vegetables in terminal markets. With an estimated 50 to 60 percent of the fresh fruits and vegetables now moving by truck, it is essential that our daily rail shipment and unload figures be supplemented by comparable data on truck movement. We hope eventually to be able to issue a combined daily report on the total unloads for all major markets in order to provide information urgently needed by the industry to gage the volume of movement and supplies on hand in the different markets.

If there are any two words which best describe the key to a sound and prosperous agriculture for Maine potato growers—and for United States agriculture generally—they are: Better marketing.

Sometimes it is said that a fundamental cause of highway accidents is that we have cars powered to go 120 miles an hour but roads designed for 50 miles an hour. So it is in the potato industry. Your productive machinery is powered to do 120 miles an hour, but the marketing channels are geared to a slower speed.

To improve marketing channels we must have more knowledge, more facts effectively applied. Consequently, we are seeking to give marketing and marketing research the emphasis it must have to complement our vast productive machine.

Of course there are some who would say: "Why have more research on potatoes? Research is largely responsible for the surpluses we have now."

But I know it isn't necessary to point out the fallacy in that opinion to Maine farmers—particularly since Maine potato growers were the first to go to their legislature and ask a tax on themselves for research and promotion to improve the industry. These funds that have been used for research and promotion are the cornerstone of your merchandizing program. Other States have flattered you by imitating your example.

And I know I don't need to sell marketing research to a group who were among the first to market potatoes in consumer-size packages.

But I do want to tell you some of the work that has been done or is now going forward, because I think it is an impressive portent of the sound and prosperous agriculture that is our common goal.

Much research is carried out in cooperation with State agricultural experiment stations, agricultural colleges, and industry.

Working together as a team, we spent nearly $900,000 in fiscal year 1954 on potato research. To a large extent we are guided by the Potato Research and Marketing Advisory Committee. This committee is made up of men who know potatoes, men who represent every phase of the industry.

Present research, of course, builds on the knowledge uncovered by past efforts.

For example, from 1948 to 1950 a study was made of grade quality and price relationships of potatoes in Boston, Philadelphia, and New York City. It showed that there were a high proportion of grade defects in the potatoes being offered to consumers. At about the same time the Department conducted a study of consumer preference for potatoes throughout the United States. This study indicated that consumers wanted and were willing to pay for uniformly sized clean potatoes.

As an outgrowth of such earlier studies specific research projects have analyzed the effect of washing, sizing, and sorting according to specific gravity upon the sales of potatoes in Boston and other important eastern markets. The findings are that consumers will pay more for potatoes graded for the purpose to which they are best suited—baking, boiling, or frying. These studies are being continued in retail stores in Syracuse this year.

The idea is to find out what Mr. and Mrs. Consumer want—then give it to them. It has taken agriculture a long time to learn what certain other industries have long known: the customer is nearly always right.

A year ago there were only a handful of potato washers in use in Maine. Now there are more than 100. I congratulate you on this excellent start toward a much-improved marketing practice.

We want to know more about the development of improved facilities, equipment, and handling methods for storing and packing. This work is just getting underway in Maine. It is being carried out cooperatively between the Maine Agricultural Experiment Station and the Department. Last fall a field station was established at Presque Isle where a research team of engineers, physiologists, and economists are working together on studies to reduce the costs of handling and packing potatoes and to reduce damage during distribution.

We are studying what happens to potatoes when they are stored at different temperatures. We want to find out the best way to store potatoes so that acceptable qualities can be guaranteed to the consumer.

In January and February last year we studied ways of protecting Maine potatoes against freezing when shipped by rail. The efficiency of various car heaters was investigated as well as preheating before loading and heating in transit.

We are working also on means of keeping potatoes dormant—preventing the sprouting that takes place along toward the end of the marketing season in late-crop potatoes. A number of sprout inhibitors have been tried and some of them show considerable promise of keeping potatoes dormant longer than is now possible and even at fairly high temperatures.

We are seeking facts on new and better ways to use potatoes, both as human food and for livestock and industrial uses.

We are giving special attention to the cause and control of market diseases. We want to know why potatoes sometimes turn gray or even black after cooking. We are keenly interested in all phases of potato processing technology.

We all know what improved processing has done for the citrus industry. And we have seen some of the results that can be obtained through procesing of potatoes. Out of the total quantity of potatoes used each year for human consumption in the United States, over 40 million bushels or about 15 percent are processed potato products. In 1940, by comparison, such products accounted for the annual use of only about 2 percent, or 5.4 million bushels out of the total quantity consumed for food. This could be only the beginning of a new and growing market.

For example, the manufacture of potato chips has become an important industry. It takes almost two-thirds of the total quantity of potatoes processed each year. The success of the chip industry can be credited largely to USDA research which has helped the industry determine the best varieties of potatoes for chips, the storage temperatures at which they yield the best product, and methods of conditioning and

processing, including cooking temperatures, oils used in cooking, and their effect on the end product. Further research was conducted last year on potato chip bars.

The use of prepeeled potatoes, especially by restaurants, is growing rapidly and there is room for far greater expansion. In an effort to appraise market outlets, a survey of United States firms marketing peeled potatoes was completed last August. There were 118 firms marketing peeled potatoes, and using about 3¼ million bushels of potatoes. In the East your Chef Special brand was favorably received by potato peeling firms and restaurants.

Maine has three potato food processing plants where frozen prepared potatoes are processed. The majority of frozen frenchfried potatoes have been processed in Maine. This food item has been so well received that it is one of the most popular frozen vegetables.

Potato granules are a relatively new product on which considerable basic research was done by USDA last year and will be continued in 1955. They have possibilities for mass feeding and military uses. They could become a top item in processed potatoes.

Drum drying of potato flakes is a relatively new process on which experiment was emphasized in the past year because it holds greater promise than present procedures as a commercial method.

Pilot plant experiments using a double drum drier turned out flakes that can be made into mashed potatoes with texture, color, and flavor comparable to that of a high-grade baked potato. Future work on this product will investigate its storage stability, means of preventing off-flavors, use of emulsifiers, and other agents to upgrade lower solids content potatoes, and methods of cutting the product to produce flakes of uniform size.

Research went forward last year on potato puffs, an item in which consumer interest seems to be growing.

The Potato Research and Marketing Committee is especially interested in expanding extension programs of consumer education. The committee has suggested that extension increase its activity in training wholesalers, retailers, and secondary suppliers in better merchandising, and at country points, working with producers and marketing agencies on marketing methods and organization. The extension service in Maine, as you may know, has done an outstanding job in this whole field.

I hope you will not conclude that because I have devoted quite a lot of attention to marketing research, we are not interested in production research. We are interested—intensely so. We must continue to study and improve disease-resistant varieties. We must learn more, and yet more, about the best uses of insecticides, fungicides, and herbicides. Often it takes a long time to produce a new potato variety—and disease will not wait while we study. Potato breeders spent 14 years in developing the new Saco variety that was released last year.

Maine is the leading producer of certified seed. In order to improve the quality of your seed potatoes, your seed certification officials and producers pioneered in improving your foundation seed program by actually planting the foundation seed in Florida, thereby checking freedom from disease under field growing conditions. To further this program, you went still further and your State department of agriculture acquired a seed farm far off in the woods to insure isolation from other fields and to minimize the possibilities of subjecting them to disease.

We must push forward with research to lower costs of producing potatoes. Here in Maine you require from 30,000 to 40,000 pickers to harvest your crop. Wage rates, I am told, have tripled since 1943, so that the total harvest cost alone is as much as the price for which the entire crop has sometimes been sold. Mechanical advancements in potato harvesting seem to have lagged far behind progress in some other areas of agriculture.

Now I would like to sum up the fundamentals of this discussion by repeating again our intention—no, more than that, our determination—to do our utmost to help you build the strong and prosperous agriculture you want to have. Yes, our goal is a stable, prosperous, and free agriculture.

Today I pledge anew to you and to all of our farm people that I will never knowingly sponsor or support any policy or program which I believe is not in the best interests of our farmers and all of our people, regardless of political pressure.

You have problems, serious problems—let us all face that fact.

But the road leading to the solution of those problems seems fairly clear. Let us all work together toward the stabilization of the potato industry by adjusting production as well as possible to demand. Let us use the programs and services available for orderly marketing, for credit requirements, and for diversification. Let us push forward with research—especially marketing research—as the best long-term method of providing the facts upon which a better future can and will be built.

And let us always remember this solid truth:

The basis of a sound future in agriculture depends primarily upon what the farmers actually do for themselves. Programs originating in Washington can help to guard against economic pitfalls. They can provide information and technical knowledge to advance the frontiers of agricultural know-how. But the big job, the important job, the basic job, has always had to be done on the farm by the farmers themselves—and it always will.

Let us summon our strength to meet the challenge that confronts us. With God's help we shall succeed.

FORTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF BOY SCOUTING IN AMERICA—NATIONAL BOY SCOUT WEEK

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this week we observe the 45th anniversary of Boy Scouting in the United States. In this country there are 2,765,000 Boy Scouts, and approximately 1 million leaders who are giving their time in behalf of the Scout program.

I wish to extend my congratulations and best wishes to all of them on this occasion. As a member of the advisory committee of the Coronado Council of the State of Kansas I feel signally honored in having the privilege to make this statement. I know of no program that is doing more to promote clean living, Christian ideals, and good citizenship among our boys than Boy Scouting. Here I desire to recite the Boy Scout oath:

On my honor I will do my best to do my duty to God and my country and to obey the Scout law; to help other people at all times; to keep myself physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, it was my privilege the other day to be presented with a Boy Scout badge—truly an honor—for there is nothing more pleasing than to have the confidence of young Americans.

This is Boy Scout Week. And the story of Boy Scout Week is told very well in a letter written to me by Tiger Conroy, a Cub Scout from St. Michael's School in Silver Spring, Md.—the young man who last week made the presentation of the Boy Scout badge to me.

I think the Members of this body would enjoy reading Tiger's letter, and so I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SILVER SPRING, MD., *February 4, 1955.*

Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: The following is a copy of my presentation speech which you asked me to jot down for you.

I am Cub Scout Tiger Conroy, from St. Michael's School in Silver Spring, Md.

During Boy Scout Week, February 6–13, the Boy Scouts of America are celebrating their 45th anniversary. As a representative of the Boy Scouts of America, we want you to join in our celebration by wearing this Scout badge during Boy Scout Week.

The Boy Scouts of America was chartered by Congress in 1916. Next week, Boy Scout Week, our Nation will honor its 3 million Scouts and leaders. In 45 years, more than 20 million men and boys have been members of the Boy Scout organization. Many of these boys have grown to become outstanding leaders.

The National Capital Area Council, which I represent, has a membership of 29,000 boys and over 11,000 adult leaders. We want you to say "Happy birthday" to the Boy Scouts of America by wearing this Scout badge during Boy Scout Week.

As a personal request, may I ask you to wear this pin in memory of my dad, who was born and educated in Portland, Maine, and, "in my books," was another grand person from the State of Maine.

Thank you, Senator, for your time and kindness. I am enclosing copies of the pictures which were taken in your office.

Very sincerely,

TIGER CONROY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues who have today expressed themselves in behalf of the Boy Scouts of America and of the week which has been dedicated to this splendid youth organization.

It has been my privilege for several years to be active in Scout work, and some years earlier to have been a scoutmaster for 6 years.

I look upon the Boy Scouts of America as the true answer to the so-called totalitarian youth movements of the Iron Curtain countries.

The Boy Scouts represent a national organization which develops good character and the other attributes of manhood second to none.

I feel that the American people owe this organization a great debt of gratitude. I hope the mothers and fathers of America will give more of their time and assistance to this outstanding group of young men, and to those who participate as their counselors and leaders.

Those who live in the District of Columbia and in the surrounding States are fortunate to have a growing Boy Scout organization.

I take particular pride in the Boy Scouts because only last week my 12-year old son received his second-class scout badge. I have an 11-year-old who will become a tenderfoot within a month.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on January 6, 1955, I introduced, for myself and on behalf of 25 other Senators, S. 49, a measure to enable Hawaii and Alaska to obtain statehood. In introducing the measure I had occasion to refer to the book, The State of Alaska, recently written by the distinguished former Governor of Alaska, the Honorable Ernest Gruening. I think all Members of the Senate will agree that Governor Gruening qualifies as an expert on Alaska and on statehood.

The statehood bill is under active consideration by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, hearings having been scheduled to begin a week from Monday, February 21. Therefore, I am certain that all Members of the Senate will be interested in the review of The State of Alaska, by Father Paul C. O'Connor, which appears in the February 5, 1955, issue of the weekly magazine America. I feel certain that all of the Members of the Senate know that America is a leading Jesuit weekly which is widely read and widely respected.

Therefore I ask unanimous consent that Father O'Connor's review of this timely study by Governor Gruening be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF ALASKA

(By Ernest Gruening, Random House, 606 pages)

I think this is the first book that has ever been written about Alaska as Alaskans really see it. They have many grievances against both the policy of the Federal Government and absentee ownership. Alaskans have voiced their criticism in a thousand ways, but now, for the first time, we have a well-documented and incisive account of the whole history of Federal mismanagement. This short-sighted policy has gone on from the beginning and still paralyzes our great territory.

Former Governor Gruening knows his Alaska from top to bottom. I have met him time and time again in the most out-of-the-way places in Alaska. During his long tenure, of office, 14 years, he has studied it at firsthand from every possible vantage point. Mines, fisheries, lifelines, health conditions, housing problems, native claims, failure of law-enforcement, and, finally, Alaska's undying demand for statehood—all are given studied and revealing attention. The sources investigated are amazing.

This definitive history of America's northernmost frontier should interest every Member of Congress. From many intimate conversations with the former Governor I have always felt that his keen mind was ever seeking the best interests of Alaska. What I failed to realize until I read this book, was that all his ideas were backed up by a scholarly study of governmental policies from the time of our acquisition of Alaska from Russia.

This is a book I have no hesitation recommending to all students of politics, as well as to those interested in a well-documented history of Alaska. Its case against the Federal Government is difficult to refute. Given statehood, it would be almost impossible to mismanage Alaska as woefully as Congress has done. I was especially happy that Mr. Gruening has given the proper niche in history to two stalwart statesmen—delegates Anthony J. Diamond and Edward L. "Bob" Bartlett.

PAUL C. O'CONNOR.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in connection with Governor Gruening's book, the Senate will be interested to know that it was cited by the Supreme Court of the United States in the opinion handed down only yesterday in the Tee-Hit-Ton case. In the dissenting opinion written by Mr. Justice Douglas, in which the Chief Justice and Justice Frankfurter concurred, Governor Gruening was referred to as "our foremost Alaskan authority," and his book, The State of Alaska, is quoted at some length.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON EDUCATION

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, today the President has sent to the Congress his message on education, and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], along with others of us, has joined in proposed legislation to bring about the objectives of the President in this matter.

While I am a cosponsor of the bill, that does not diminish my belief that the Federal Government should enter this field only in an emergency way, to help the States to build the schools which they need. I feel that much can be done within the States that has not been done, and I feel, further, that the Federal Government can be of assistance to the States by seeing to it that lands and properties are not removed from the tax rolls. This is a situation which has had the effect of causing the States to lose large sums of money, thereby creating not a small part of our school problem.

My staff has made a study of this matter covering a period of several months, and I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks several documents prepared by the staff, namely:

First. The Problem.

Second. Outline of All Proposals.

Third. Letter to Meyer Kestnbaum, chairman, Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

Fourth. Tabulation of Amounts in 1954.

Fifth. Staff Research Showing Changes.

Sixth. Properties Exempt in Arizona.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE.

Hon. BARRY GOLDWATER,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR GOLDWATER: We are enclosing herewith information which Mr. Donald Coover requested from Mr. Claude M. Hirst of this office by telephone today.

This contains a list of the properties which have been claimed by school districts in the State of Arizona under Public Laws 815 and 874 for the fiscal year 1954. We are giving the location of these properties, the number of acres and the estimated taxable value.

I hope this information will be useful to you. If there is any other way in which we can be of assistance to you please let us know.

Sincerely yours,
B. ALDEN LILLYWHITE,
Associate Director for Federally Affected Areas.

THE PROBLEM

We submit that there is no single, overall solution to the problem of education in the United States. Therefore, this means that several plans will have to be put into operation, both to meet the immediate needs of school construction and to handle the long-range problem of a growing population.

School financing is one phase of this gigantic problem, but it is a very important one. The major basis of financing education has been the property tax. However, since funds from this source have continued to be diverted to other uses, the income has declined. We do not deplore the other services which these funds have helped develop, but we do deplore the removal of property from tax rolls by the Federal Government, especially when that same property is used for commercial purposes.

An estimated total of more than 62 million acres of land is now being claimed by school districts for funds under Public Laws 815 and 874. The overall total of Federal land taken off the tax rolls of school districts would far exceed this. But this 62 million acres would return more than $307 billion to the school districts, if taxed at the average annual rate.

Therefore, it becomes increasingly obvious that Congress must take action to remedy this situation whereby commercially-used Federal properties escape taxes, while schools suffer for lack of a proper tax base.

The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations is expected to release its report by June 1, and this problem of Federal-State relations is among many which will be considered. Congress should take positive action, bearing in mind the recommendations of the Commission and of previous hearings before Congress, which have been stalemated due to lack of adequate research on the matter.

Congress has several alternatives—direct tax payments, "in lieu" payments, direct payments or "in lieu" payments to the States which would then allocate the funds locally and continuation of Public Laws 815 and 874. Actually, these are more than alternatives, they are supplementary, since they may meet different problems in different areas. The choice of one should not eliminate the use of another.

Although this may solve the problem in just one-fourth of the federally-impacted school districts, long-range planning demands that commercially-used Federal property pay its full share of taxes—taxes that will be another step forward in meeting the educational demands imposed upon a Nation by a growing population.

COMPENSATION OF LOCAL TAXING AUTHORITIES FOR FEDERALLY OWNED LAND AND FOR OTHER FINANCIAL BURDENS IMPOSED BY THE FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

I. STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

How can the Federal Government best meet its responsibility for compensating local taxing authorities, particularly in school districts where land has been removed from the local tax rolls by Federal acquisition and where other financial burdens are imposed by Federal activities.

Comment:

A. In the passage of Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 Congress stated that it was

the policy of the Federal Government to compensate local educational agencies for burdens imposed on them by Federal activities in the manner and to the extent provided by these 2 acts.

B. If it is the policy to compensate local educational agencies for burdens imposed by Federal activity it could be generally agreed that the method proposed should produce the maximum local control in administering the compensation payments.

II. SUPPLEMENTARY PROPOSALS

A. Permit local taxing authorities to tax directly Federal property within its jurisdiction.

B. Provide for a payment in lieu of taxes to local public bodies on federally owned property within their jurisdiction.

C. Provide tax payments or payments in lieu of taxes to States for all Federal property in a State and authorize the State to allocate the funds to the local jurisdictions.

D. Continue Public Laws 874 and 815 in essentially the present form.

III. BACKGROUND FACTS

Current programs:

A. Public Laws 815 and 874 authorize payments for educational purposes only, not for other local governmental functions.

B. These acts place the Federal compensation generally in terms of:

1. Children living on nontaxable Federal property.

2. Children whose parents are employed on nontaxable Federal property.

3. Sudden and substantial impacts in school enrollments because of defense production.

C. The Federal payment is made to the school districts where the children live and attend school; not just those districts where the Federal property is located.

D. Payments in lieu of taxes for schools and other local services have been authorized for certain wartime constructed federally owned housing. Much of this housing is now being transferred from Federal ownership.

E. There are various other kinds of payments to local governmental units for federally owned land in connection with reclamation projects, forest lands, and game preserves.

F. These other Federal payments are deducted from entitlements of applicant districts under Public Law 874.

Experience under present legislation:

A. For the 1954 fiscal year there were 2,478 school districts eligible for assistance under Public Law 874 for payments on account of 849,271 children living on Federal property or living with a parent employed on Federal property.

1. There was federally owned property in 787 of these districts, or about one-third of the total.

2. These 787 districts had 502,000 children, or about three-fifths of the total claimed under section 3 of the act, but they received about four-fifths of the entitlements.

3. One thousand four hundred and thirteen districts, or two-thirds of the total, having no Federal property, received approximately one-fifth of the entitlement for about 40 percent of the children.

B. Applicants under Public Law 874 in the 1953 fiscal year claimed 2,034 separate Federal properties containing over 62 million acres with an estimated taxable value based on local rates of assessment at just under $20 billion.

1. Applicants claiming children living on Federal property or living with a parent employed on Federal property received that year $49,451,000 in Federal payments under the act.

2. This amounted to an average tax of 2.5 mills on the Federal property.

(a) The average tax on privately owned property paid for school purposes in the same districts was 15.6 mills. Had this tax rate been applied to the federally owned property it would have amounted to $307 million.

C. Various bills to provide payments by the Federal Government of taxes or in lieu payments on federally owned property have been introduced and considered in the past 10 years. Most of the bills that have been introduced restrict Federal payments to certain kinds of federally owned property or to property acquired within specified periods of time, or place other restrictions which greatly narrows the scope of the Federal payments.

D. Hearings were held by subcommittees of the Committee on Government Operations in both the House and Senate last year on bills related to this problem.

1. The House Report No. 1217, lists four major reasons why uniform policies in this regard should be developed.

2. It further indicates that the executive departments opposed enactment of the bill and stated that these objections although meritorious do not in the judgment of the committee outweigh the hardships imposed on municipalities because of loss of revenue due to Federal activities.

E. The Senate Report No. 1966, indicates that meetings were held by the Subcommittee with the Commission on Inter-Governmental Relations and with the Bureau of the Budget, and that various Federal agencies were asked for their comments on the proposed legislation.

The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations advised the committee that it did not deem it proper to comment on the legislation.

2. The Bureau of the Budget and other Federal agencies advised the committee that pending review of the forthcoming report and comments of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations no determination had been made with respect to the relationship of the proposed bill to the President's program. No action was taken by the Congress on these proposals.

IV. PROS AND CONS OF THE VARIOUS PROPOSALS

A. Direct taxes:

Pros:

1. A direct tax by the local taxing authority on federally owned property would be the most direct approach and the simplest to administer.

2. It would place the administration directly in the local governmental agency and remove any threat of Federal domination or interference.

3. It would permit districts to bond on the basis of this Federal property for schoolhouse construction.

Cons:

1. It makes no provision to take care of the impact caused by an increase in population due to Federal activities in those cases where these new families live and go to school in a different place from the one in which the Federal property is located.

2. It may encourage gerrymandering of school districts or other local jurisdictional boundaries.

3. It would increase the cost to the Federal Government for school purposes alone over the cost under Public Law 874 by 5 or 6 times.

B. Payments in lieu of taxes:

The same general advantages and disadvantages apply to this alternative as to alternative A except that:

1. It would be less direct in its administration, and school districts could not issue bonds against the Federal property.

2. There would be some possibility of holding down the cost to the Federal Government.

C. Tax payments or payments in lieu of taxes to State governments for allocation to local units.

Comment:

Under this proposal the Federal Government would pay to the States tax on federally owned property located within the State. The amount of such tax could be the average tax rate for school purposes in all school districts in the State applied to the value of all Federal property in the State, or the actual tax rate in the various school districts applied to the assessed value of the federally owned property in that school district. The States would then allocate funds to the communities on either of the following bases—

1. On basis of need as determined by State, or

2. On basis of Federal property located in each municipality, or

3. On the basis of the Federal impact as evidenced by federally owned land and increased population.

Pros:

1. This method could eliminate the difficulties inherent in a direct tax payment which goes only to those districts where Federal property is located, by allocating funds to districts experiencing severe increases in population because of Federal activities, but having no Federal property.

2. This method would probably eliminate the desire to gerrymander school-district boundaries in order to get a piece of the federally owned property.

3. It could result in a uniform tax rate on all Federal properties in a State and prevent imposition of excessive tax rates by some districts.

4. It would reduce the number of jurisdictions with which the Federal agency had to deal on a tax payment, or payment in lieu of taxes basis.

Cons:

1. It would remove administration of the program one step above the local government level.

2. It could result in reduction of State appropriations for various local purposes.

3. It is conceivable that the funds could be diverted from districts having Federal property and other federally caused burdens to other financially distressed districts.

4. It could result in encouraging Federal agencies to hold large tracts of land in order to get tax payments from the Federal Government. (This also would apply to the first three alternatives.)

D. Continue Public Laws 815 and 874 in essentially the same form as at present:

Pros:

1. Public Laws 815 and 874 distribute the Federal payment in such a manner as to meet the whole impact caused by Federal activities of school districts.

2. This method probably would cost the Federal Government less money than any of the other alternatives.

3. They are in existence and have operated successfully.

Cons:

1. They are extremely complicated pieces of legislation and difficult to understand.

2. They require direct Federal-local administration.

3. They contain some undesirable features primarily because of temporary extension.

JANUARY 27, 1955.

MEYER KESTNBAUM,
Chairman, Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, General Services Administration Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KESTNBAUM: It is my understanding that the Commission on Intergovern-

mental Relations, under your capable leadership, is currently studying the problem of the removal of properties from State, county, school, and local tax rolls by the Federal Government.

As you know, the removal of these properties from the tax rolls has resulted in a serious problem for many areas, including my own State of Arizona. In the case of schools, these areas are faced with a large and continually increasing student population, but with insufficient amounts of property remaining for providing revenue through property taxation.

It is my sincere hope, therefore, that the Commission, through its study groups, will arrive at some solution consistent with the highest aims of Federal-State relations, in which proper remuneration will be given the school districts through 1 or 2 methods. The two alternatives are "in lieu of property tax" payments to local communities or direct tax payments by the Federal agency or department administering the property or nongovernmental person or firm making use of such Federal property, as in the case of defense production facilities.

My research into this question indicates that such a move would solve the problem of school funds for more than one-fourth of the Federally-affected areas in the Nation. This would enable the local school district to retain full control of its own educational facilities, thereby halting the threat of Federally-controlled education. I personally prefer placing all commercially-used properties on the tax rolls, but I am amenable to the "in lieu" payments if you should judge this to be the better course.

In my State of Arizona alone, the latest available figures show that more than 29 million acres, with an estimated taxable valuation of more than $518 million, have been taken off the tax rolls by the Federal Government. This includes defense facilities, Indian reservations, national parks, reclamation projects, and Federal office buildings. In the United States as a whole, property taken off the tax rolls by the Federal Government is valued at nearly $20 billion and would yield more than $300 million in taxes.

I fully realize that certain safeguards must be provided in any legislation to make certain that the funds reach the school districts which are federally affected and that certain necessary Federal functions are not disturbed, as well as the fact that the Federal Government should not completely lose its immunities from local taxation in all cases. However, I firmly believe that all commercially used properties taken off the tax rolls by the Federal Government should be placed back on these rolls.

As you know, several bills in this field of taxation have been introduced in previous Congresses, and progress on such legislation is now awaiting the results of the report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

I sincerely hope that the Commission's report will reaffirm the right of the local school district to govern itself and to tax properties within its district in order to provide the type of schooling that is so essential to the continuing growth of our Nation, without the hindrances imposed by a system of Federal tax immunity which has grown beyond all the bounds of its original scope.

My thanks to you for your consideration of this vital problem which so greatly affects us all.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

BARRY GOLDWATER.

TABLE 10.—*Estimated amount eligible Federal property claimed by sec. 3 applicants would yield if taxable at average local rate, number and acreage of such properties, estimated taxable value, gross entitlements, and tax rates*

State	Eligible Federal properties claimed by applicant school districts		Estimated taxable value of Federal property based on local rates of assessment	Gross entitlements under subsecs. 3 (a) and 3 (b), Public Law 874, for 1953	Local tax (in mills) required on Federal property to equal Public Law 874 entitlement	Average local school tax in mills	Estimated amount Federal property would yield if taxable at average rate
	Number of properties	Number of acres					
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Alabama	45	551,957	$485,537,249	$562,051.03	1.2	8	$3,884,298
Alaska	31	742,383	609,388,395	322,574.22	.5	10	6,093,884
Arizona	41	11,126,299	418,961,707	447,493.71	1.1	19	7,960,272
Arkansas	26	1,667,179	263,936,748	375,190.80	1.4	20	5,278,735
California	327	9,266,915	1,582,339,595	11,640,989.29	7.4	12	18,988,075
Colorado	46	1,845,989	270,803,389	1,380,205.88	5.1	14	3,791,247
Connecticut	37	2,237	84,678,835	1,164,078.97	13.7	14	1,185,504
Delaware	1	417	1,142,152				
Florida	54	621,293	377,281,401	988,721.08	2.6	15	5,659,221
Georgia	47	681,118	599,262,184	1,021,670.92	1.7	14	8,389,671
Hawaii	35	51,556	487,204,303	958,170.56	2.0		
Idaho	25	4,760,817	84,031,149	269,750.91	3.2	23	1,932,716
Illinois	24	65,892	579,811,151	1,269,858.42	2.2	10	5,798,112
Indiana	23	199,902	630,238,605	684,121.28	1.1	18	11,344,295
Iowa	4	19,780	64,922,000	193,175.33	3.5	39	2,141,958
Kansas	28	128,096	597,753,450	2,472,609.47	4.1	12	7,173,041
Kentucky	29	456,958	479,116,543	905,388.78	1.9	14	6,707,632
Louisiana	15	713,614	147,849,750	165,343.41	1.1	10	1,478,498
Maine	31	19,130	136,107,310	345,640.73	2.5	27	3,674,897
Maryland	78	113,982	673,047,236	1,283,596.68	1.9	10	6,730,472
Massachusetts	24	43,518	428,057,223	591,639.68	1.4	16	6,848,916
Michigan	35	48,854	234,413,065	558,498.31	2.4	11	2,578,544
Minnesota	6	593,537	77,943,216	66,490.42	.9	6	467,659
Mississippi	16	12,998	56,815,228	330,881.27	5.8	17	965,859
Missouri	30	588,661	375,015,305	490,588.00	1.3	22	8,250,337
Montana	17	3,280,432	46,847,174	205,050.20	4.4	36	1,686,498
Nebraska	29	140,371	198,655,440	610,635.87	3.1	26	5,165,041
Nevada	15	4,173,652	126,770,792	457,520.31	3.6	7	887,396
New Hampshire	4	3,189	4,071,281	31,434.93 [1](305,609.13)	7.7	26	105,853
New Jersey	40	73,388	332,215,590	893,781.66	2.7	37	12,291,977
New Mexico	17	3,135,148	145,956,281	299,312.34	2.1	7	1,021,694
New York	69	149,263	435,005,124	785,197.91	1.8	20	8,700,102
North Carolina	20	261,398	130,261,137	216,386.68	1.7	13	1,693,395
North Dakota	10	347,886	29,249,680	160,118.22	5.5	35	1,023,739
Ohio	61	56,944	395,596,248	1,809,285.79	4.6	11	4,351,559
Oklahoma	35	310,440	370,772,828	1,780,219.52	4.8	21	7,786,229
Oregon	27	2,996,561	447,964,892	363,290.74	.8	38	17,022,666
Pennsylvania	72	58,129	323,391,780	1,109,115.52	3.4	21	6,791,227
Rhode Island	12	5,822	122,273,804	497,901.00	4.1	11	1,345,012
South Carolina	31	230,363	1,227,261,425	827,293.48	.7	28	34,363,320
South Dakota	19	368,542	59,607,633	453,273.01	7.6	31	1,847,837
Tennessee	28	141,985	792,680,400	334,254.78	.4	14	11,097,526
Texas	133	2,578,157	1,699,139,312	3,269,985.40	1.9	8	13,593,114
Utah	22	2,327,494	314,718,339	567,719.56	1.8	16	5,035,493
Vermont	6	12,729	9,776,320	49,558.82	5.1	28	273,737
Virginia	97	314,245	1,268,092,299	4,109,523.15	3.2	18	22,825,661
Washington	140	4,940,331	1,299,240,468	1,576,293.12	1.2	14	18,189,367
West Virginia	3	821	39,100,000	27,841.33	.7	16	625,600
Wisconsin	5	68,028	142,146,000	218,888.98	1.5	14	1,990,044
Wyoming	22	1,957,263	31,194,044	3,042.54	.1	10	311,940
Total	2,034	62,255,663	19,727,645,480	49,451,253.14	2.5	15.6	307,349,870

[1] Represents entitlements paid New Hampshire claimants under Public Law 11 (83d Cong.) for children living in New Hampshire but connected with property in Maine. Excluded from calculation of tax required.

ESTIMATED AMOUNT OF ELIGIBLE FEDERAL PROPERTY CLAIMED BY SECTION 3 OF PUBLIC LAW 874 APPLICANTS WOULD YIELD IF TAXABLE AT AVERAGE LOCAL RATE, NUMBER AND ACREAGE OF SUCH PROPERTIES, ESTIMATED TAXABLE VALUE, GROSS ENTITLEMENTS, AND TAX RATES

Latest figures for the United States, according to my research.

Two thousand seven hundred and six properties, compared to two thousand and thirty-four for the previous annual report of the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

One hundred and five million six hundred twenty-two thousand and sixty-four total acres, compared to sixty-two million two hundred fifty-five thousand six hundred and sixty-three for the previous report.

An estimated taxable value of $22,492,-761,859 based on local rates of assessment, compared to $19,727,645,480 in the previous report.

A local tax of 2.9 mills required on Federal property to equal Public Law 874 entitlement, compared to 2.5 mills in the previous report.

An average local school tax of 15.6 mills, compared to 15.6 mills previously.

This property would bring an estimated $348,165,504 if taxed at the average rate, compared to $307,349,870 in the previous report.

For my State of Arizona the totals are:

Sixty-nine properties, compared to forty-one previously.

Twenty-nine million two hundred thirty-one thousand one hundred and thirty-five acres, compared to eleven million one hundred twenty-six thousand two hundred and ninety-nine.

An estimated taxable value of $508,317,047 based on local rates of assessment, compared to $418,961,707.

A gross entitlement under subsections 3a and 3b of Public Law 874 for 1954 of $528,-455.52, compared to $447,493.71 for 1953.

A local tax of 1 mill required on Federal property to equal Public Law 874 entitlement, compared to 1.1.

An average local school tax of 19 mills, compared to 19 mills.

This property would bring an estimated $9,658,024 if taxed at the average rate, compared to $7,960,272 previously.

Information regarding federally owned property in the State of Arizona located in or near school districts that are applicants under Public Laws 874 and 815 during the 1954 fiscal year

Name of property	Location	Number of acres	Estimated taxable value
All American Canal, Gila project	Yuma	19,300	(1)
Apache National Forest	Springerville	677,823	$10,272,522
Avondale Circle No. 2038, No. 2355, PHA.	Avondale	(2)	133,392
Border patrol station	Tucson	(2)	10,000
Camp Verde Indian Reservation	Camp Verde	476	6,525
Casa Grande National Monument	Coolidge	473	226,362
Catalina Federal Prison Camp	Tucson	20	230,060
Coconino National Forest	Coconino and Yavapai Counties.	1,830,470	12,813,290
Colorado River Indian Reservation	Parker	204,800	35,000,000
Consolidated dwellings No. 2027, PHA.	Tucson	(2)	107,855
Coronado National Forest	Pima and Pinal Counties.	1,982,721	220,000
Courthouse	Phoenix	(2)	500,000
Customhouse	Yuma	1	10,050
Davis Dam project	Bullhead City	1,000	24,825,000
Davis-Monthan Air Force Base	Tucson	6,575	20,000,000
Davis-Monthan Air Force Base Wherry Housing No. 123-80000-80007.	do	89	5,001,770
Davis-Monthan Dwellings No. 2025	do	21	46,415
Fort Apache Indian Reservation	White River	1,664,872	11,654,104
Fort Huachuca	Fort Huachuca	33,713	10,000,000
Gila project (Wellton-Mohawk division).	Wellton	115,000	575,000
Gila River Indian Reservation	Sacaton	372,022	2,526,000
Grand Canyon National Park	Grand Canyon	604,809	650,000
Grand Central Electronics Bldg	Tucson	1	100,000
Hopi Indian Reservation	Mesa	631,291	5,000,000
Hualapai Indian Reservation	Yavapai County	997,045	837,305
Hughes Aircraft Co. plant	Tucson	2,560	2,952,205
Indian Hospital	do	1,280	1,024,000
Indian Irrigation Service	Coolidge	400	11,770
Indian school and hospital	Phoenix	476	2,200,000
Ingalls Victory Homes No. 2338	Yuma	(2)	27,573
Katherine Wash ranger station	Katherine	160	50,500
Luke Air Force Base	Phoenix	384	12,946,000
Mesa Vista Homes No. 2063, No. 2337, PHA.	Yuma	20	108,084
Mesa Vista Homes Annex 2-D-1	do	6	(1)
One Forty West Monroe Bldg	Phoenix	(2)	73,575
Navaho Indian Reservation	Window Rock	10,812,884	$75,690,188
Navaho Homes, Inc., No. 123-80006, FHA.	Flagstaff	35	(1)
Navaho Ordnance Depot	do	28,426	10,536,000
Naval Air Facility	Phoenix	658	15,035,000
Naval and Marine Corps Training Center.	Tucson	(2)	14,387
Neighbors Village 1-D-1, 1-D-2	Yuma	18	(1)
Padre Garces Homes	do	(2)	15,322
Papago Indian Reservation	Pima County	2,855,920	1,750,000
Parker Dam power project	Mesa	13	2,545,580
Petrified Forest National Monument	Holbrook	85,303	(1)
Pima Indian Reservation	Chandler	31,000	1,175,000
Pinel District ranger station	Globe	4	5,000
Post office	Phoenix	(2)	500,000
Post office and courthouse	Tucson	(2)	200,000
Post office	Yuma	(2)	167,521
Reclamation substation	Coolidge	40	2,509,750
Reclamation houses	Yuma	(2)	83,125
Reclamation substation	Tucson	(2)	10,000,000
Rincon Vista	do	22	800,000
Salt River Valley project	Phoenix	(2)	200,000,000
San Xavier Indian Reservation	Tucson	29,352	205,464
Sitgreaves National Forest	Holbrook	808,237	5,657,659
Sky Harbor Airport	Phoenix	(2)	2,000,009
Tonto National Forest	Mesa, Maricopa Counties.	2,410,508	1,071,800
Veterans' Administration Hospital	Phoenix	27	2,040,000
Veterans' Administration Center	Prescott	(2)	500,000
Veterans' Administration Hospital	Tucson	(2)	2,000,000
Wenden manganese purchasing depot	Wenden	142	187,000
Whipple Barracks	Prescott	60	(1)
Williams Air Force Base	Chandler	2,114,614	13,386,394
Williams Air Force Base Housing No. 123-80001, 2, 3, 4, 5.	do	(2)	1,102,500
Yuma County Airport	Yuma	(2)	4,000,000
Yuma Test Station	do	906,064	5,000,000
Total		29,231,135	518,317,047

[1] Taxable value unknown.

[2] Number of acres unknown.

MONOPOLIES AND SUBSIDIES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a copy of the GTA Daily Radio Roundup of Friday, February 4, 1955. I make this request because it shows that the Government has paid billions of dollars in subsidies, approximately $16 billion since 1940 in connection with research, and that farm price supports in the same period have cost only a little more than $1 billion.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When President Eisenhower cancelled out the Northwest Airline's permit to fly to the Orient and to Hawaii, he put the spotlight on some things that have not generally been publicized. Monopolies and subsidies. The big airlines, for the most part, get substantial subsidies from Uncle Sam, and in many instances, it is important that they do as a means of improving airline service and national defense. But at the same time, there seems a definite trend toward a few big airlines monopolizing the business. Getting the best runs, best routes, into their hands (with Government approval, business is made in Washington, as well as prices).

It's the big squeeze. The biggest firms do the squeezing, and the little ones get the squeeze. According to newspapers, subsidies are increasing for the airlines which the President said would get the right to fly the Pacific air routes. And, oddly enough, Northwest Airlines, which lost out by Presidential order, says it would make these runs without Government subsidy, according to the newspapers.

Now what confounds us is not so much as to who is right or wrong, or what subsidies should be paid. What bothers us is that so many people and some editors keep complaining that farmers get subsidies, but hardly a word is said about the out-and-out helping hand payments to other businesses from the Federal Treasury.

And when subsidies are necessary, they perform a good service. We don't quarrel with that idea. We just say subsidies should be judged by how much good they do, or don't do. You've heard a great deal of ballyhoo over TV and radio, and in the press, about how industrial research has improved your living standards and material welfare. It has. But who pays for it? The industries? They do pay for part of it, but only about half. You, the taxpayers, pay the rest of the research bill. And all to our mutual good.

This is what Newsweek magazine says about subsidies for industrial research: "The United States Government, these days, supports about half of all the Nation's research and development. The President's budget request for science for the fiscal year starting July 1 * * * totals $2,218,000,000." Of course, a lot of that is spent to develop new airplanes, guns, tanks, etc. But then the blueprints are turned over to industry along with profitable contracts for manufacture.

Since 1940, some $30 billion has been spent on scientific and engineering research in industry. The Federal Government has paid more than half of that. The taxpayers have put up about $16 billion. Yet, you hear little about this huge subsidy, and you hear a lot about the much smaller sum spent on supporting prices on basic farm crops at 90 percent of parity.

Let's compare the costs of these two programs to the Government, industrial research on the one hand, farm price supports on the other. We've already said that the Government has subsidized research to the tune of $16 billion since 1940. Farm price supports in that same period have cost only a little more than $1 billion. Sixteen billions for industrial research, one billion for farm price supports.

Don't think that we are complaining about the money spent on research. We aren't. It was money well spent for a good purpose. But we think the farm price-support money was also well spent. We don't like to see farmers raked over the coals by press, radio, and high Government officials just because they got one-sixteenth of the financial help that industry got for research alone.

Certainly a healthy agriculture, producing abundantly, is as important to the Nation as new and better machines of war and peace. This is GTA, the co-op way.

PROBLEMS OF THE POULTRY INDUSTRY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Mr. and Mrs. Lynn Springer, of Wyndmere, N. Dak., which I ask to have printed in full, together with a copy of a letter from Lloyd A. Opperud, of Oppy's Hatchery & Produce. I wish to read one paragraph of his letter:

Prices at the farm today all over the great Central States on poultry and eggs are so far below cost of production and, in fact, are at ruinous levels as far as the farmer is concerned. Values at the farm are below the disaster level. They are, comparatively speaking, even lower than the depression prices of 1932 and apparently no more is being done about it today than was at that time. In my 15 years in this great industry I have never seen conditions worse for the poultry and egg farmer than they are today. Markets on medium size and small eggs are especially depressed at this time due to seasonal heavy production of these grades.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, together with the other letter to which I referred.

There being no objection, the two letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WYNDMERE, N. DAK., *November 9, 1954.*
Senator LANGER.

DEAR SIR: Am sending you a copy of letter put out by our hatchery and produce man. The situation is very serious. Couldn't something be done about this? It has always been that when action was needed, you always do your best. So am hoping for a betterment in the poultry industry of this Midwest.

Yours truly,
Mr. and Mrs. LYNN SPRINGER.

WYNDMERE, N. DAK., *October 21, 1954.*
Hon. EZRA T. BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BENSON: I am writing you about the serious plight of the poultry and egg farmer in the Midwest.

Prices at the farm today all over the great Central States on poultry and eggs are so far below cost of production and, in fact, are at ruinous levels as far as the farmer is concerned. Values at the farm are below the disaster level. They are, comparatively speaking, even lower than the depression prices of 1932 and apparently no more is being done about it today than was at that time. In my 15 years in this great industry I have never seen conditions worse for the poultry and egg farmer than they are today. Markets on medium-size and small eggs are especially depressed at this time due to seasonal heavy production of these grades.

It is my suggestion these fine quality medium-size eggs to be purchased for school lunches during the season they are in such heavy supply. In addition we suggest the Army pay for mediums on the basis of their true value instead of the unjust differentials they are now using. For example grade A mediums weigh only 5 pounds per case less than grade A large. It is obvious at present levels this grade based on the actual is worth within 5 cents per dozen of large eggs. Yet the Army is paying currently 20 cents per dozen less for mediums than for large eggs.

This means the farmer is receiving $4.50 per case less than actual worth for these eggs. I consider it very unjust that a department of our Government would take advantage of our farmers in this way.

Prices on hens in the Midwest today range from 8 to 10 cents per pound. These prices are ridiculous. A large percentage of the hens sold move to market during October and November or when the farmer is making room for his new crop of layers.

I suggest Government purchases of dressed fowl during this period to eliminate the glut on the market. This fowl to be stored and sold in the season to stabilize prices.

The Midwest poultry and egg farmer feels he is the forgotten man in agriculture. Action is needed not next month or next year, but today. It is my candid opinion that if proper action had been taken just a few months ago this deplorable condition would not now exist.

No one expects a handout but if business can be protected by tariffs and subsidies, labor by a guaranteed minimum wage, surely the poultry and egg farmer is entitled to some consideration in his present serious situation.

Yours truly,
OPPY'S HATCHERY AND PRODUCE,
LLOYD A. OPPERUD.

OBJECTIONS TO APPEARANCE BEFORE CONGRESS OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, last Friday I appeared before the Judiciary Committee and filed written objections to the proposal of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] to invite the Chief Justice of the United States to appear before a joint session of the Congress. The press did not print my objections in full. Therefore, I wish to read them into the RECORD. I said at that time:

I appear before the subcommittee in opposition to this resolution.

The reasons are three:

First, during the 2 years that the present Chief Justice has been occupying that office, he has never once either asked to appear before the Judiciary Committee with any recommendations to improve the legal machinery of this country; nor has he sent any recommendations personally to that effect.

Secondly, to me this resolution smacks again of British internationalism and the aping of British custom by our American Government. The argument has been made that we should follow the British custom of having members of the Cabinet appear before joint sessions of Congress just as British ministers appear before Houses of Parliament.

However, I call your attention to the fact that in Great Britain they have no committees such as we have under our American procedure. In other words, in Great Britain, there is no judiciary committee to which the head of any judicial system could go and he, therefore, goes directly to Parliament.

In the United States, however, we have committees covering practically every important subject and even if the Chief Justice appeared before the joint session of Congress, whatever the recommendations might be, they in turn would be referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee or the House Judiciary Committee, or both.

It is therefore absurd to take the time of this Congress to listen to a speech on the part of either a member of the Cabinet, or the Chief Justice, when everything that he says will have to be referred to a committee anyway and would simply be a waste of time.

My third objection is that it sets a precedent which will likely result in members of the Cabinet sooner or later requesting the opportunity to be heard; with the result that we would not only have members of the Cabinet, but heads of the various departments asking to appear before joint sessions. As I said before, the proper way to handle the matter under our American system of government is to go directly to the appropriate committees.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in connection with this matter, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter dated January 18, 1955, and signed by John Marshall, addressed to the editor and published in the New York Times under the headline, "Selecting Federal Judges—Factors in Filling Vacancies in Judiciary Are Discussed."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SELECTING FEDERAL JUDGES—FACTORS IN FILLING VACANCIES IN JUDICIARY ARE DISCUSSED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

I was interested in reading the article by Arthur Krock on the plan proposed by one of my successors in Justice to put the Chief Justice before Congress. I note that John W. Davis favors the plan, which ordinarily would give me pause, but I am constrained to offer a mild dissent.

In my humble opinion it would be better if the Chief Justice and Associate Justices would make fewer speeches and engage in fewer extracurricular activities. The television recently portrayed the Chief Justice leading a parade, and the papers here carried accounts of his participation in a dinner here awarding citations for prominent athletes.

Other Justices have written and spoken on their mountain-climbing achievements, presided at trials outside the country, and generally participated in many activities outside the law.

My view is that the best thing for the judiciary and the country would be the selection of better judges. The appointment of an inexperienced lawyer as a judge inevitably leads to a crowded docket.

It is fair to say that in recent years the advice of politicians rather than lawyers has been controlling in the selection of Federal judges. Mr. Davis and I were admitted to practice in the Federal Court of West Virginia by a judge who had been appointed by Lincoln and had served 50 years before his retirement. This is one illustration of the importance of getting the best possible man for this service.

One recent administration appointed a score of lame-duck Congressmen. In another the woman head of a national committee here proudly boasted in the press that she was responsible for a judicial appointment.

I can only speak of the administration of President Coolidge. Neither President Coolidge nor his Attorney General consulted the heads of the national committee but rather the Chief Justice, senior circuit judges, and bar associations. There is a popular misconception that because Senators have to confirm, they nominate the Federal judges. This was not true in President Coolidge's administration.

I know that there are presently committees of the American Bar Association and State and local bar associations which continue to make recommendations. It may well be that it is their fault that the recommendations go unheeded.

It is my opinion that the most logical field from which to select members of the Supreme Court is the Circuit Court of Appeals. It is unfortunate that great judges like Learned Hand, Orie Phillips, and Harold Stevens, just to name a few, have been passed over.

JOHN MARSHALL.

NEW YORK, *January 18, 1955.*

PUBLIC LAW 664—CARGO PREFERENCE LEGISLATION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in the closing days of the 83d Congress legislation was enacted to broaden and make permanent certain existing cargo-preference guaranties to the American merchant marine.

Public Law 664, signed by President Eisenhower on August 26, 1954, affirms a national policy, which had previously been proclaimed time and again by the Congress, of assuring to privately owned United States-flag merchant vessels of at least 50 percent of all oceanborne cargoes purchased for, or given away by, or financed by the Federal Government.

The policy thus incorporated into permanent legislation previously had been laid down in the Merchant Marine Acts of 1920, 1928, and 1936, and again in the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946. The substantial portion of the waterborne export and import foreign commerce which these acts called for as necessary to maintenance of an adequate, privately owned merchant fleet,

was made more specific in various military and foreign economic provisions of the past half century.

As far back as 1904 Congress legislated to require that "vessels of the United States and no others" were to be employed in the transportation by sea of coal, provisions, fodder, or supplies of any description, purchased pursuant to law, for the use of the Army or Navy.

Again, in 1934, Public Resolution 17, 73d Congress, required that all cargoes financed by the Export-Import Bank or any other instrumentality of Government should be carried in American bottoms. This resolution still is effective.

In the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, and the ECA Amendments of 1949, the principle of "at least 50 percent" was adopted, and this interpretation of the policy of "substantial portion" was continued in the Korean Aid Act—Public Law 447, 81st Congress—and in all emergency aid and assistance acts since that time, as well as in the Mutual Security Act of 1951.

In all these enactments, it was provided that the 50-percent guaranty should apply only to the extent that such vessels were available at market rates. That same safeguard was included in Public Law 664.

Why is such a guaranty necessary? Why, from earliest time, has it been felt necessary to take specific measures to assure continued existence and operation of an adequate, privately owned merchant fleet? The reasons, basically, are quite simple.

As a maritime nation, America's progress and prosperity have always been possible only to the extent that shipping has been available to carry its products to foreign shores, and bring back the raw materials lacking here.

Furthermore, as a nation open to attack by water on more than half of its borders, and, more recently, because of the urgent shipping needs of our military forces in action, or in constant danger in stations in many parts of the world, certain facts regarding ocean transportation have become inescapable.

First. Peacetime needs require a merchant fleet capable of carrying our foreign commerce. Otherwise, our economy is at the mercy of foreign shipping, as bitter experience has proven.

Second. World Wars I and II, and the Korean hostilities, have given indisputable evidence that America's Military Establishment, or its defensive setup, cannot operate without a vast auxiliary of merchant shipping. We suffered in World War I, and the free nations were in extreme danger in World War II, because there was not adequate shipping available. Actually, it was not until the spring of 1945 that our Military Establishment could plan its strategic moves with entire confidence that sufficient shipping would be available. It is no secret that World War II was prolonged needlessly, with resulting additional losses in men and in national wealth, because our merchant marine was not nearly adequate to war's requirements.

With all this a matter of record, the third fact then becomes equally clear: namely, that United States-flag vessels cannot compete in the world transportation field—it cannot survive—without some aid from Government. Wages, supplies, safety requirements, all stemming from America's higher standard of living, give the low-cost foreign vessels an insurmountable advantage over American ships.

So we come to the nub of the problem—how best to aid American-flag vessels to meet this competition. Some have suggested that we entrust our commerce, and our national security, to the low-cost foreign vessels and stop worrying about how to meet their competition. But one does not hear any such suggestions from informed sources—such as military leaders who have to meet logistic requirements throughout the world, and industrial leaders who must depend upon the United States merchant fleet.

The military leaders have the experience of World War II and Korea fresh in their minds. Industry remembers its experience of years gone by. It remembers when ocean freight rates jumped as much as 2,000 percent, and when American cargoes rotted on docks everywhere because the foreign shipping on which reliance had been placed was nonexistent, or was too busy taking care of their own nations' need to bother about American commerce.

When it comes to a question of how to aid American-flag vessels, there can be only one truly sensible answer.

That answer is—cargoes. Shipping lives, and prospers, by the cargoes it carries. Deprived of those cargoes, as much of America's shipping has been lately, in the face of vastly increased foreign competition, shipping cannot survive. It was to fill this breach—which always will exist except in time of emergency—that the cargo-preference, or 50–50 policy, was devised. American shipping does not want handouts from the Government. It wants to earn its way, in the one manner that justifies the existence of shipping anywhere; namely, by carrying cargoes. And certainly it is not too much to ask that cargoes for our own needs, those which we give away, and those which we finance in one way or another, be divided equally as between our own shipping and that of other nations.

Opposed to the school of thought which would entrust our commerce to ships of foreign nations on a false "economy" basis, is another school which maintains that we should demand not 50 percent, but 100 percent of Government aid or financed cargoes, for our own flag vessels.

They point out that even with this 50–50 division, American-flag vessels have been carrying less—sometimes far less—than a third of our foreign commerce. On the other hand, foreign shipping is in better health than at any time since World War II.

As a matter of fact, Public Law 664, as originally conceived, provided for 100 percent carriage of Government-owned or financed cargoes in American-flag vessels. Mainly because of the adverse effect which such action might have on our allies abroad, I refused to support those demands. But, as between the two schools of thought, as between the policy of guaranteeing our own ships no part of those ocean cargoes paid for or financed by Government, or of guaranteeing them 100 percent of such cargoes, I could have no hesitancy in taking a stand. I would be with those who urge 100 percent. But it is fortunate, indeed, that no such choice is necessary. Common sense will always require that we do not place reliance on foreign shipping, but, rather, that we take such reasonable measure as will protect our merchant fleet from disappearing from the seas.

It has come to my attention that the Department of Agriculture, which stated that it had no immediate interest in this 50–50 bill when it was before the Senate for consideration, now is having trouble finding space on American vessels for transportation of surplus agricultural products.

If that be a fact, certainly there is no reason to attach any blame to the cargo-preference bill. Rather, there should be genuine satisfaction over the improved, but still far from healthy, state of the American merchant marine, which this bill has certainly helped to accomplish. How much better it is to have our shipping generally busy, rather than rotting at the wharves, as was the case a few months ago before this bill became effective.

My information, however, is that competitive bids have been submitted by American ship operators on every occasion when the Department of Agriculture has asked for bids. Moreover—and this is most important—I am told that American-flag tramp-vessel quotations as of the present time are 20 cents per ton less than even our National Shipping Authority rates.

Rates on United States-flag berth liners, of course, are identical with those of competing foreign vessels. I suggest that the Department of Agriculture may resolve these transportation difficulties by seeking a greater number of competitive bids from American shipping.

It should be kept in mind that Public Law 664 foresaw just such a situation as is now reported—and provided for it. The law makes application of the 50–50 provisions dependent upon the condition that American vessels are "available at fair and reasonable rates for United States-flag commercial vessels." If privately owned United States-flag vessels are not so available, there is no requirement in the law that such vessels be used for the transportation of these surplus agricultural commodities.

Another point to be kept in mind, however, is the desirability of maintaining our tramp fleet in an active, prosperous condition. Anyone familiar with ocean shipping history can recall the numerous instances when American exporters have been forced to pay outrageous rates for space on foreign ships because no privately owned American-flag vessels were available.

Public Law 664, with its assurance of 50 percent of Government-purchased or Government-financed cargoes to United States-flag vessels, is a reasonable measure.

Even under it, our shipping will still be far from the goal, as fixed in the basic merchant marine legislation, of carrying

what might reasonably be considered a "substantial portion" of our country's waterborne export and import foreign commerce. Even under this "50–50" law, our ships will not be carrying the 50 percent of all our commerce which can rightfully be claimed as their due.

At least, however, Public Law 664 will help the American merchant marine meet to some extent the terrific competition of foreign shipping operating at one-fourth to one-half of the cost of American-flag vessels. On a realistic basis, this looks like as much as we can hope for. But it is as little as we can afford to take, in the interest of American prosperity and national security.

I will oppose to the utmost any efforts to deprive American shipping of the relatively feeble aid it now enjoys as a result of the operation of Public Law 664.

TAX AVOIDANCE IN CONNECTION WITH POLITICAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The senior Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on August 4, 1953, Mr. Welburn Mayock, an attorney in Washington, D. C., was testifying before the Kean subcommittee. At that time the Kean committee was investigating the scandal-ridden Bureau of Internal Revenue. In his testimony of that date Mr. Mayock explained how in 1948, while serving as the chief counsel of the Democratic National Committee, he had entered into an agreement with Mr. William S. Lasdon, Katonah, N. Y., whereby he was to obtain for Mr. Lasdon a favorable ruling from the Treasury Department on his then pending tax case. In return for obtaining this favorable ruling, which would save nearly $7 million for Mr. Lasdon, Mr. Mayock was to receive a $65,000 cash fee, with the understanding that $30,000 of this amount was to go to the Democratic National Committee. Mr. Mayock, without any power of attorney to represent this taxpayer, but solely in his capacity as chief counsel of the Democratic National Committee, then contacted Mr. John W. Snyder, the Secretary of Treasury, and promptly obtained the favorable ruling on Mr. Lasdon's tax question.

Mr. Lasdon previously had been denied a favorable decision upon this same question by the Treasury Department.

After this tax-fix scheme had been arranged, and after Mr. Mayock had collected his $65,000 fee, he was confronted with the problem of how to get the $30,000 into the Democratic campaign fund without obviously violating the Hatch Act. The Hatch Act prohibits contributions to a political campaign in excess of $5,000 by any one individual. However, once having agreed to fix a tax case for $65,000, the question of violating the Hatch Act apparently was not bothersome to Mr. Mayock and his associates.

Accordingly, as Mr. Mayock explained it, he merely arranged to have some of his friends write their personal checks payable to the Democratic National Committee, in exchange for an equivalent amount of cash. In this manner he siphoned this $30,000 of hot money into the treasury of the Democratic National Committee.

While freely admitting all of the above transactions during his testimony before the Kean subcommittee under date of August 4, 1953, Mr. Mayock flatly refused to tell that committee the names of the individuals who cooperated in this underhanded method of financing a political campaign. Each time the committee pressed him for the names of these individuals, Mr. Mayock replied, "That I am going to refuse to answer."

Since Mr. Mayock was reluctant to publish the names of the individuals who exchanged their personal checks, payable to the national committee, for an equivalent amount of this "tax-fix fee," I shall read that list to the Senate, along with a breakdown of the amount handled by each individual, plus the dates of the transactions.

Date	Name and address	Amount
Oct. 13, 1948	Democratic County Central Committee, William H. Malone, chairman, 955 Mills Tower, San Francisco	$10,000
Oct. 14, 1948	Harold A. Berliner, 10 Crown Terrace, San Francisco	5,000
Do	William J. Mahaney, 2412 Russ Bldg., San Francisco	5,000
Oct. 18, 1948	Roy G. Owens, 1204 South Hill St., Los Angeles	2,500
Do	Willis Allen, 634 North Cherokee Ave., Los Angeles	2,500
Do	William B. Peeler, 7133 Sunset Blvd., Hollywood	2,500
Do	Lawrence W. Allen, 2104 North Highland Ave., Hollywood	2,500
	Total	30,000

This was not the only time that the Treasury Department, under the New Deal administration, resorted to the issuance of questionable rulings for the purpose of financing the 1948 political campaign.

On April 29, 1952, I incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copies of a series of political rulings which had been issued by the Treasury Department while Mr. John W. Snyder was Secretary of the Treasury, wherein Mr. Richard J. Reynolds, Winston-Salem, N. C.; Mr. Marshall Field, and Mr. David A. Schulte, both of New York City, were permitted to charge off as "bad business debts" their approximately $400,000 contributions to the 1948 Democratic campaign. Since incorporating those rulings in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I have discovered that the same Mr. Welburn Mayock was one of the prime factors behind those rulings.

On December 27, 1948, Mr. Mayock, without any power of attorney to represent Mr. Reynolds or the others involved, but solely in his official capacity as chief counsel of the Democratic National Committee, held a conference with Mr. Edward H. Foley, Undersecretary of the Treasury, and Mr. Thomas J. Lynch, General Counsel of the Treasury Department. At that meeting they discussed the Richard W. Reynolds case, which involved a $300,000 contribution to the Democratic Party, as a party case, and arranged for the issuance of a favorable ruling allowing him to write off this contribution as a bad business loan.

As further evidence of the callousness of the political regime then in power, we find that the Treasury Department even permitted Mr. Mayock to get away with reporting on his 1948 Federal income-tax returns only $17,500 of this $65,000 fee collected from Mr. Lasdon. Before computing his taxes he was permitted to deduct from the fee the $30,000 which he set aside for the Democratic National Committee. He deducted from the gross fee another $17,500 solely upon his claim that he paid $8,750 each to Mr. William Solomon, 275 Central Park West, New York City, and Mr. Louis Markus, 9445 86th Road, Woodhaven, Long Island, as their share of the tax-fix payoff.

This latter deduction was allowed, notwithstanding the fact that when both Mr. Markus and Mr. Solomon testified under oath August 5, 1953, before the Kean subcommittee, they emphatically denied that they had received any of this fee, and accordingly they had paid no taxes on their alleged share.

But the mere fact that no one was paying any tax on the $17,500 in controversy did not in the least bother the Treasury Department. They merely placed it in the same category as the $30,000 contribution to the Democratic National Committee and allowed everyone to write it off in his tax returns.

This procedure of issuing favorable Treasury rulings in exchange for contributions to a political party was extremely costly to the American taxpayers from two angles:

First. The granting of these favorable rulings which apparently would not otherwise have been extended resulted in a substantial loss in revenue.

Second. The issuance of these rulings had the indirect effect of financing a part of the 1948 Democratic campaign out of the Federal Treasury.

The disclosure of these transactions was a shock to the American people, and the overwhelming majority of the members of the Democratic Party were just as indignant as were the members of the Republican Party to find that certain high officials in that administration had stooped to such low tactics for the purpose of financing a political campaign.

Even after publication of the additional list of names of those involved in this deal there are still many questions left unanswered in this case, and I suggest that both the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department reexamine the conflicting testimony given before the Kean subcommittee in August 1953.

For example, the conflict of testimony wherein Mr. Mayock under oath told the committee that he paid $8,750 each to Mr. William Solomon and Mr. Louis Marcus and their testimony of the following day emphatically denying this statement obviously is the basis of a perjury charge.

The statute of limitations may have expired on violations of the Corrupt Practices Act in 1948, but it has not expired on any possible perjury charges resulting from testimony given before

the Kean subcommittee in 1953, nor has it expired upon the ability of the Treasury Department to collect back taxes due on the erroneous deduction of the $30,000 fee to the Democratic National Committee as well as the controversial $17,500 previously referred to.

Grand juries are now in session at both Omaha and St. Louis, and their work should shed additional light upon the scandal-ridden Tax Bureau of that era.

The San Francisco News of February 8, 1955, reported a statement of two of the individuals involved, Mr. William Malone and Mr. Harold Berliner, outlining their version of the transaction, and in the Los Angeles Times of February 9, 1955, others mentioned in that area explained their position.

I think the explanation of the entire group can best be summed by the statement of Mr. William R. Peeler, of Hollywood, and one of the participants, who said:

The attorney who handled the contributions out here just came around to the office where we worked and asked several of us if he could use our names in making the donation.

I asked him if using my name would carry any financial, moral, or legal responsibility.

He said "No." He said "it was just a way of getting around a law that neither party paid any attention to anyway".

Unquestionably this shady transaction from the beginning was recognized as a violation of the law by all concerned, and it should be noted that the only reason criminal prosecution was not invoked was that it was kept covered up by the preceding administration until the statute of limitations had expired.

I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the body of the RECORD the statements of these individuals as appearing in the San Francisco News of February 8, 1955, and in the Los Angeles Times of February 9, 1955.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the San Francisco News of February 8, 1955]

TWO SAN FRANCISCO DEMS DEFEND ROLES IN MONEY SHIFT

Two of the three San Franciscans named by United States Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS today warmly defended their participation in a Democratic money transfer described by the Delaware Republican.

William M. Malone, former chairman of the Democratic County Committee, reserved comment until he could read WILLIAMS' complete statement on the $10,000 check which Malone, in that capacity, sent to the Democratic National Committee in 1948.

The other two—Harold A. Berliner, former Internal Revenue Service collector here, and William J. Mahaney, attorney—freely discussed their forwarding of $5000 each to the national committee.

"I had never heard of Mayock (former chief counsel of the Democratic National Committee, who arranged the fund transfers) and didn't know he was in the picture," said Berliner.

"I was told by our county chairman that some money had come into our committee, and was asked, with Mr. Mahaney, if I would send this money in my name to the national committee as a contribution. So I did.

"People frequently make contributions to committees, and want it sent in to the national committee without having their names used. It was an absolutely clean transaction.

Mahaney, too, said he never had heard of Mayock at the time.

"The amounts that came to Berliner and me came from Malone," he said.

"I didn't know anything about the background, but it was not unusual to have the head of the organization here put money in through you, and hand you the money to make a contribution—or have you hand him some.

"That was the beginning and end of the whole transaction."

Mahaney added that the matter "already has been investigated very thoroughly."

[From the Los Angeles Times of February 9, 1955]

ANGELENOS NAMED IN TAX DONATION—SENATOR SAYS 7 CALIFORNIANS HELPED CHANNEL $30,000 FEE TO DEMOCRATIC PARTY

WASHINGTON, February 8.—Senator WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, today named 7 Californians who, he said, had participated in channeling $30,000 of a lawyer's fee to fix a tax case into the treasury of the Democratic National Committee in 1948.

WILLIAMS said he was listing the names since Welburn Mayock, Washington, D. C., lawyer involved in the case, had refused to do so in testimony August 4, 1953, before a House subcommittee investigating the Internal Revenue Bureau.

CALIFORNIANS NAMED

The Californians named by WILLIAMS in a Senate speech were William H. Malone, San Francisco; Harold A. Berliner, San Francisco; William J. Mahaney, San Francisco; Roy G. Owens, 1204 South Hill Street, Los Angeles; Willis Allen, 634 North Cherokee Avenue, Los Angeles; William R. Peeler, 5107 Sunset Boulevard, Hollywood; and Lawrence W. Allen, 2104 North Highland Avenue, Hollywood.

WILLIAMS said Mayock collected a $55,000 cash fee in the tax case, with the understanding that $30,000 of it was to go to the Democratic National Committee.

"But," said WILLIAMS, "the lawyer was confronted with the problem of how to get the $30,000 into the Democratic campaign funds without violating the Hatch Act ban on individual contributions in excess of $5,000."

METHOD EXPLAINED

"As Mr. Mayock explained it" in his testimony, WILLIAMS said, "he merely arranged to have some of his friends write their personal checks payable to the Democratic National Committee in exchange for an equivalent amount of cash."

"In this manner," the Senator added, "he siphoned this $30,000 of hot money into the treasury of the Democratic Committee."

WILLIAMS said that Mayock freely admitted these transactions in testifying before the House investigators but that he flatly refused to tell that committee the names of the individuals who cooperated in this underhanded method of financing a political compaign.

At the top of a list of transactions read by WILLIAMS was an item of Democratic County Central Committee, Willian H. Malone, chairman, San Francisco. The amount given was $10,000 and the date October 13, 1948.

He listed $5,000 each for Berliner and Mahaney, both on October 14, and $2,500 each for Owens, Willis Allen, Peeler, and Lawrence Allen, all on October 18, 1948.

WILLIAMS said testimony before the House subcommittee showed that Mayock, while serving as chief council of the Democratic National Committee in 1948, had entered into an agreement with William S. Lasdon, of Katonah, N. Y., "whereby he was to obtain for Lasdon a favorable ruling from the Treasury Department on his then pending tax case."

"In return for obtaining this favorable ruling which would save nearly $7 million for Mr. Lasdon," WILLIAMS said, Mayock was to receive a $65,000 cash fee with the understanding that $30,000 was to go to the Democratic National Committee.

RULING CLAIMED

WILLIAMS said that Mayock, "without any power of attorney to represent this taxpayer but solely in his capacity as chief counsel" of the national committee, then contacted John W. Snyder, who was Secretary of the Treasury, and "promptly obtained the favorable ruling on Mr. Lasdon's tax question."

WILLIAMS said Lasdon previously had been denied a favorable ruling on "this same question" by the Treasury Department.

After commenting on Mayock's problem of turning the $30,000 over to the national committee, WILLIAMS said:

"However, once having agreed to fix a tax case for $65,000 the question of violating the Hatch Act apparently was not bothersome to Mr. Mayock and his associates."

In San Francisco, both Berliner and Mahaney readily confirmed they each sent in $5,000. Both said they did so at Malone's request, did not ask where the money came from and considered it a routine action, innocent of any implications of wrong doing.

"I understood it was county committee money being forwarded to the national treasury," Berliner said.

"I had no knowledge of the source, knew nothing of the background, and never heard of Mr. Mayock," Mahaney said.

He added he would be glad to send in $5,000 to the national committee "any time anybody will give it to me to send."

Malone was out of his San Francisco office and not immediately available for comment.

Lasdon, reached through his office at Yonkers, N. Y., issued this statement:

"As the record before the Kean committee goes, the record shows every cent I paid to Welburn Mayock for his services in connection with representing me before the Treasury Department in 1948 with respect to securing the tax ruling in question was in payment of a legal fee.

"I never knew, and do not now know, that any part of the legal fee so paid went to anyone other than Mr. Mayock."

ANGELENOS DENY MAKING DONATION

In Los Angeles, William R. Peeler, named by Senator WILLIAMS as a contributor of $2,500 to the 1948 Democratic campaign fund, yesterday said that he neither donated the money nor received cash from Attorney Welburn Mayock to donate.

"The attorney who handled the contributions out here," Peeler said, "just came around to the office where we worked and asked several of us if he could use our name in making the donation.

"I asked him if using my name would carry any financial, moral, or legal responsibility."

EXPLANATION GIVEN

"He said no. He said it was just a way of getting around a law that neither party paid any attention to anyway.

"He said he just wanted to use my name as a channel through which to put the donation."

Peeler said that the attorney who contacted him died a year ago. Peeler added that Government investigators questioned him about the contribution 3 years ago. He said that he told them about the matter in an affidavit.

HANDLED NO CASH

Willis Allen said last night that the circumstances under which he donated $2,500 were similar to those described by Peeler.

"Mayock was our attorney," he said, "and had helped a group in which I was interested in a case before the Supreme Court in Washington. When my brother and I and the other men were asked to lend our names for

the purpose of donating money to the Democratic fund, we were glad to do so.

"I did not handle any actual cash. As I remember, four cashier's checks were purchased and the money was sent in in this way."

Allen explained his brother Lawrence died last year. Owens works in the advertising business and Peeler was a mutual friend of the Allens and Mayock.

The Times was unable to locate the other two men, Lawrence W. Allen and Roy G. Owens, named by Senator WILLIAMS in Washington.

THE SPIRITUAL ARMAGEDDON

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in March 1951 one of our most distinguished elder statesmen, Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, wrote a short article published in the Reader's Digest magazine. It was called "Spiritual Armageddon Is Here Now." I desire to read excerpts from that article.

"These are times that try men's souls," wrote Thomas Paine when America was struggling to be born.

"Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered. * * * Heaven knows how to put a price upon its goods; and it would be strange indeed if so celestial an article as freedom should not be highly rated."

Today we are being asked to place our own valuation on freedom, in the things we are ready to give up, the taxes we will pay, the self-discipline we embrace—in how quickly we will do all this. Let us not haggle, clinging to petty profits and petty comforts. Should we price freedom too low, it will be taken from us.

Unfortunately, when I urged mobilization of our military, economic, and spiritual resources—

This was in 1951—

there were too many who felt we should wait and see. They hoped that something would happen to change the attitude of our enemies—those without and those within.

Those without are Russia, and her satellites.

No doubt today he would include Communist China.

Those within are the pressure groups, selfishness, cowardice, inflation, and above all, incompetence in the management of our affairs.

The world is shaping up to a struggle between communism and individualism, between that system which feels the state should be the master and that system, ours, which feels the state should be the servant of the the individual.

The first battle of the great Armageddon is taking place within this country—now. If our democracy, our Government and the institutions founded under its Constitution, cannot control the conflicting and selfish interests for the overall welfare, Armageddon will be lost here in this country.

How can our conscience rest easily when we so unflinchingly send our young men to battle and hesitate to send our profits?

The situation demands self-denial and sacrifice. Unless we practice these things we shall lose first the spiritual battle of Armageddon and then the last battle will surely be lost—the physical one.

I repeat what I said before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, July 1950:

"Nearly 3 years ago—"

That would be 8 years now—

I clipped an item from a newspaper which seems ominously prophetic today. It told of a boast made by a Soviet general. The western democracies were bound to be defeated by the Soviet Union because they would not make the sacrifices necessary to arm themselves. They prized their standard of living too highly. They would not be willing to accept the disciplines to put "guns" over "butter."

"In Russia, though, this general boasted, the people were inured to hardship. The Soviet Government would force the sacrifices to mobilize. A lean and hungry, but mobilized Russia would overrun a western world which couldn't bring itself to mobilize—in time.

"That is the test which confronts us—not only this country but all of the free peoples of the world."

I appreciate how harsh a time Europeans have had. But the Soviets, whose people endured even more, have ruthlessly chosen to put military power ahead of improving living standards. That challenge cannot be ignored. If what is required is not done now, infinitely more will have to be given up later.

Everything might be lost under the heel of a Soviet occupation.

For almost 5 years (9 years now), since the last war's end, the Atlantic powers have put off a choice that cannot be evaded. It is the choice of mobilizing our strength now, while peace can still be saved, or of clinging to petty wants and petty profits, imperiling our freedom, and our civilization.

No outside enemy can defeat us. We can defeat ourselves. Yours is the decision. Which shall it be—less comfort or defeat?

The spiritual Armageddon is here.

Mr. President, that message was delivered by perhaps the foremost living authority on a mobilization economy. This message was delivered 4 years ago. Based upon what has happened recently, I believe it is wise policy for us to view world conditions, since he delivered that message.

The position of the free world as against the Communist position during the past 2 years gives a saddening picture of compromises and reversals.

Let us look briefly at the record. On July 26, 1953, after 3 years of bloody warfare, an uneasy truce was signed in Korea.

We are not proud of some of the terms of that truce, and less proud of the fact that we know those terms have been consistently violated, and are being violated every day.

Starting in January 1954, the month this administration announced its new reversed policy of "massive retaliation," a foreign ministers' conference was held in Berlin. The major result of that session was an invitation to the Chinese Communists to meet with the free world in Geneva; and at the subsequent Geneva conference, the Communists defeated the proposal for free elections in Korea. Defeats continued in Indochina. These defeats were highlighted finally by the loss of Dien Bien Phu.

An armistice in Indochina was signed in July 1954. By that action the free world gave up 77,000 more square miles of territory and 12 million more people to the Communist rulers behind the Iron Curtain.

On August 30, 1954, the European Defense Community collapsed when the French Assembly refused to ratify the plan.

Twice the United States Senate has expressed itself in favor of the unification of Germany, and that, too, has been blocked by the Communists. Nor have the French finally approved the subsequenty plan to rearm Western Germany, the plan developed after the failure of EDC.

I might add that at this time that possibly there are grim forebodings about the situation in Western Germany. The Chancellor of West Germany is fighting to carry out the idea of West German rearmament. In any case, is it not fair to say that, as of now, this country has fewer friends in the world than it has had in a long, long time? Certainly it is right to say we have stronger possible enemies.

The United States has just announced that, if necessary, it would defend Formosa unilaterally as a key link in its defense line in the Far East. The Communist Chinese during past months, and as recently as last week, announced that they intend to conquer Formosa. Unless this administration or the Communist Chinese change their minds, ultimately war is inevitable.

The Communists, with from 800 to 900 million people under their control, grow steadily stronger day by day, week by week, month by month, and year by year. They grow stronger, not only in absolute terms, but also relatively with respect to the military strength of the free world.

The head of the Soviet military was today made the Premier of the Soviet Union; and the first acts of this planned new government, made in recent hours and in recent days, are interesting. These acts include the following:

First. The Soviets have reaffirmed their respect for, and their alliance with, Communist China.

Second. The Soviets have changed the policy of Malenkov established after the death of Stalin. They have gone to greater emphasis on military production as against Malenkov's policy of increasing the production of consumer goods.

Third. They have speeded up their plans for military expenditures. This new group of rulers in the Soviet Union as of today, however, in addition to establishing the head of the army as head of the entire Soviet Government, have announced that they will increase Soviet military expenditures by 12 percent.

Fourth. The Soviet Communists have just fired Mr. Malenkov, the one man in the Communist world who has stated that atomic warfare might destroy us all.

In that connection, Mr. President, it is interesting to note that as of today any nuclear warfare advantage which this country had may well be over. We now have what some people term the "intolerable absolute," which others term "atomic symmetry." A more simple expression would be "strategic standoff."

We have the power to deliver atomic and hydrogen bombs; and we have those bombs. The Soviets have the power to deliver atomic and hydrogen bombs; and they have those bombs.

I do not necessarily criticize this administration for the great advances the Communist world has made during the past 2 years. I do say that under the circumstances it is absolutely incredible for this administration to announce a policy which reduces our Army by

275,000 men and reduces our Marine Corps by 31,000 men—every man in the Marine Corps today is a volunteer—and creating a false impression in the minds of the American people that our Air Force is being greatly strengthened, when actually this administration is adding only 5,000 men to increase the size of the Air Force 17 full wings.

I intend later to present what is involved in these military reductions in more detail on the floor of the Senate. But surely, we must realize how these steady reductions in our plans for more military power have not only affected the morale of our allies, but have also played directly into the aggressive plans and programs of the Communist conspiracy for world conquest.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Missouri is the former very able Secretary of the Air Force. If we should, God forbid, become involved in a war on the mainland of China, does the Senator believe we could win the war with the Air Force and Navy alone, or whether we would need American ground forces?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I may say to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon that I have heard many prophecies made about wars being won without ground troops. With the certain exception of the island of Japan, where there was tremendous ground-force fighting on the islands coming up to Japan, I know of no war being won without ground-troop action. A basic reason for Japan's surrender was that we had the atomic bomb, and they did not. That condition does not prevail today. I believe if there is war with the Communists, there will be ground fighting.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. In addition to the kind of bomb we dropped in the war with Japan, we had ground troops engaging the best troops of the Imperial Japanese Army. Is not that true?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is true. As the Senator knows, there are many American crosses on Tarawa, Iwo Jima, Okinawa, and other islands in the Pacific. These islands illustrate fully the Senator's observation.

Mr. MORSE. It was a ground war as well as a naval and air war, was it not?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Missouri feel that there is some justification for concern on the part of some of us, at least, that there is a potential danger of becoming involved in a war on the mainland of China?

Mr. SYMINGTON. If the Chinese Communists are sincere in their intention to conquer Formosa, and if this administration is sincere in its expressed intention to defend Formosa, inasmuch as it has already received from Congress approval to attack the mainland of China, in any manner it may see fit to prevent the fall of Formosa, it is obvious there is now a chance of land warfare on the Chinese mainland.

Mr. MORSE. If we should become involved in a war on the mainland of China, would it not be in our national self-interest to have ground forces in being to engage in the first part of the war until we could prepare our reserves for land engagements?

Mr. SYMINGTON. If I may attempt to penetrate behind the question of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, the point is whether we should have forces in being as against forces in reserve.

In January 1953 a report was issued by a well-known businessman which stated it was better to have mobilization lines—a mobilization base—capable of production than it was to store military production items themselves. In my years in government I have never seen or heard a more erroneous statement, because if we should become engaged in a war, and it should develop into a nuclear war, production availability would mean relatively little. What would count would be our forces in being.

It is interesting the Senator from Oregon should bring up this question of ground troops. For many years Russian Communist divisions have been understood to be 175 in number, the Chinese Communist divisions have varied from 200 to 400. But not counting the Soviet and Chinese satellites, and not counting our allies, we see from 375 to 575 divisions for the Russian and Chinese Communists.

This country now has 20 divisions, which are now planned to be cut to 13 combat divisions and 4 training divisions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield for a further question and observation?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that, in view of the potential dangers in Asia which I think exist from the standpoint of the security of our country, it would be better, if we are thinking about the psychological effect on the Kremlin, to be announcing to the world that we are increasing our ground forces rather than decreasing them?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Of course. The Senator has, as is usual with his penetrating mind, singled out a major point. The implication is that we are stronger everywhere, and that, therefore, we can slough off our ground-troop strength. With utmost sincerity I say I do not believe we can ever side-line our ground-troop strength.

Mr. President, the Soviets are far superior under the sea than the Nazis ever were, as compared to the under-the-sea strength of the free world.

Although our Navy, on the surface of the sea, is relatively very strong, and in all forms of war that is important, in the Far East as we announced we will go to war if Formosa is attacked we are badly outnumbered in the air.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield for a further observation?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am one Senator who thinks that in this critical hour it is much more important that we balance our military strength against what we know to be the Communist strength than to pay so much attention to balancing the budget. I think it is more important at the present time that the American people go down into their pockets and pay for adequate defense than that they go along with an administration which I believe, in the name of economy, is weakening our defense and our Military Establishment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

I should like to read three or four paragraphs which conclude my remarks, and then shall be glad to yield for any questions. I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon for his penetrating analysis of what can be properly called America's new policy of "strength through weakness."

But I do say that under these circumstances it is absolutely incredible for us, to announce a policy which is reducing our Army some 275,000 men, reducing our Marine Corps 31,000 men, every man of whom is a volunteer, and providing only 5,000 men to increase our Air Force 17 wings.

I intend later to present these matters in more detail on the floor of the Senate, but surely we must realize how these steady reductions in military power have not only affected the morale of our allies, but also have played directly into the progressive plans and programs of the Communists.

Not only have we increased the morale in the lands of our possible enemies and reduced it in the lands of our possible allies, but we have played false with the American people by reassuring them as against telling them the truth about the danger in the world in which we now live.

As the Communists continue to develop their position, gaining ground for their oft-repeated intention of destroying the free world, we should remember two basic factors in this entire picture.

First, now nearly a billion people are ruled directly by men who do not believe in God, and therefore have little respect for human life as they continue their plans and programs to conquer the free world.

Mr. President, we should never forget that the Soviets in turn have almost never failed ultimately to do what they said they were going to do. Stalin himself often said before and after V–J Day that they intended to make their plans and programs coincide with their primary desire—the conquest of the entire world.

The second basic factor is that the only possible justification for reducing our armed strength, despite the diplomatic failures of the past 2 years and the great and growing strength of our possible enemy, is a desire to pursue our luxurious way of life.

It would seem we are now turning our back on Almighty God in favor of the almighty dollar.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I congratulate and thank my distinguished colleague for his very able and useful speech. I wonder whether the Senator from Missouri recalls that before it was generally known that the United States had developed the atom bomb, which we were able then to drop on Japan, it was the generally accepted estimate that if it were necessary to fight with our ground forces in Japan, we would suffer a minimum of one million casualties, even though at that time we were not fighting alone but had the support of many of our very dependable allies.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from New York I am sure knows those figures. I do not happen to know them. But I am confident his memory is proper.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. My recollection on that point is very distinct. I do not think it would be very difficult to demonstrate it both by the many releases to the press and statements made on the floor of the Senate.

But what I am seeking to drive home at this time is this: We are undertaking responsibilities in Asia which are beyond those that were contemplated 2 or 3 years ago, responsibilities which may involve us not only in a naval war and an air war, but also in ground fighting. Yet we find ourselves in a position in which our air strength is little greater than it was 2 or 3 years ago; our naval strength certainly is no greater; and each year we have seen a diminution in the strength of our Army.

Coincidentally with the lessening of our strength, we know that the military strength, in the air, on the sea, and on the land, of both Russia and China has vastly increased over the last 3 or 4 years. In other words, is it not true that the gap which existed some years ago between our military strength and the strength of our potential enemies, the Communists principally, Russia—because China at that time was not a great military factor—instead of being narrowed as our responsibilities increased, has actually widened? Is not the gap today very substantially larger than it was some years ago?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Our responsibilities have been growing steadily, not only because of our commitments, but also because—and I believe this to be a fair statement—the United States is the one great power left in the free world which is able to resist the advances of world communism provided we become adequately strong.

Second, for many years after World War II the United States had what has been called, and I believe properly so, the atomic deterrent. It was known that our strategic air force could destroy any country which attacked us. But now there is a strategic standoff from the standpoint of nuclear weapons, so that, if there are to be peripheral wars, the chances are we shall be fighting such wars on terms favorable to the enemy.

Without getting into any discussion of when, where, or how we will use nuclear weapons, my belief is this country can in no way justify what it has been doing in the past 2 years, namely, steadily reducing its plans for military strength while its possible enemy has been steadily increasing its military strength and, at the same time, steadily increasing its international commitments.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wish to join with other Senators in congratulating the Senator from Missouri on his very timely, forthright, and necessary speech concerning our national defense and its inadequacy at the present moment.

But I gathered from the Senator's remarks that he believes there is a greater threat to the security of the United States and the peace of the world by reason of the removal of Mr. Malenkov as the head of the Soviet Union. Is that correct?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct. I made that statement based not only on what I have read in the newspapers and heard on the radio today, but also after discussing the matter with experts on Soviet Russia.

Mr. SMATHERS. It is because of that fact, I take it, that the Senator from Missouri is urging in the Senate today that we take some affirmative action immediately in respect to the entire defense situation. Is that correct?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wonder if the Senator read in last night's Washington Evening Star an Associated Press article which quoted Secretary of Defense Wilson. The article reads, in part, as follows:

> Secretary of Defense Wilson said today the Armed Forces are losing far too many trained men to private industry and lately we have seen an already critical situation get worse.

Had the Senator been aware, as the Secretary of Defense had suddenly said, that the situation is critical? Or is this something new? I had not read of this previously; I wondered if the Senator from Missouri had.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I saw that article. Sometimes it is hard to follow the Secretary of Defense in his comments and opinions on the problems of military departments.

Mr. SMATHERS. I will ask the Senator from Missouri if he can explain to me the following quotation by the article of a statement by Mr. Wilson:

> "Approximately 1 million men—one-third of our planned size for the active forces—will become eligible for some form of release during the next year. This high turnover rate is extremely costly in dollars, but it is even more costly in terms of loss of experience and operational efficiency.
>
> "The readiness of our combat units will be difficult to improve if we are unable to induce more men to stay with us longer."

In the light of that statement, with which I personally agree, can the Senator from Missouri help me reconcile the reduction by the Secretary of Defense in the size of the Army by 275,000 men, and the reduction in the size of the Marine Corps by 32,000?

Mr. SYMINGTON. My answer to the distinguished junior Senator from Florida is that it is all too obvious to some of us, as it is to him, based upon the article to which he has referred, that this administration is not practicing what it preaches.

The morale in the armed services is low. Two interesting letters were published only last night on the editorial page of the Evening Star, one from a lieutenant colonel in the Army, the other from a captain in the Navy. Much of the personnel in the armed services today believe that the services are little more than training grounds for private industry.

They point out that the relative differences in salaries received by various personnel—mechanics, electricians, pilots, etc.—and the salaries received by such persons in private industry handling the same type of work. Recently the Secretary of the Air Force announced he expected to lose 150,000 out of the 200,000 four-year enlistments at about the time of the Korean War. The average cost of training such individuals is $14,000. The loss in personnel would therefore represent a loss to the American taxpayers of more than $2 billion. The loss of a jet pilot incidentally costs the American taxpayers $120,000.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Would the Senator not agree that if Secretary Wilson actually desired to keep in the Armed Forces the trained and experienced men to whom reference was made in the article, it would be the course of wisdom for him to set aside the called-for reduction of 31,000 Marines and 275,000 Army personnel, who have been trained? We know the Marines want to stay in the service. Would that not be the best way to get the additional men needed?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have seen many paradoxical programs but never before one which involved discharging 31,000 men from the Marine Corps (every one a volunteer) at the same time a request is made for continuation of the draft in order to draft untrained men into the armed services.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURRAY in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Before I put my question, I should like to commend the Senator for recognizing that it is time that America made up its mind about making a sufficient sacrifice to guarantee the peace. I have a question or two to ask the distinguished Senator from Missouri about things he said during the course of his statement.

The first question is directed at his remarks in reference to the Korean

truce we signed, and the apparent violations of it and the lack of enforcement of its terms. I should like to ask the Senator if he thinks we should not have signed a truce at all.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is the distinguished Senator asking me whether I think we should or should not have signed a truce?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I believe a truce was desirable, but I hesitate to think of the criticism which would have been visited on the previous administration first if it had signed the type of truce which was signed, and, secondly, if it had been as casual in seeing that the terms of the truce were enforced.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Would the Senator think the war in Korea as it was waged under the former Democratic administration was waged in the traditionally honorable American fashion, when, having won the war twice on the field of battle, we nevertheless lost it?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not know whether the war in Korea was fought in the way either the Senator from Arizona or many other persons believe it should have been fought. But I am less interested now in what has happened in Korea than what is going to happen, not only around Formosa, but in many other parts of the world. I do not believe that this time there is much use in crying over what has already taken place in Korea.

The reason for my making these few remarks on the floor today, is that any man who can read now knows about the military strength of the Communists all over the world. This strength is steadily increasing, and the Communist forces are steadily advancing, despite the efforts of this administration to prevent this advance. This country, the only real power in the free world able to stop the world advance of atheistic communism, is steadily, day by day, reducing its military strength. I believe the reduction endangers our freedom. That was the point of my remarks.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does the Senator deny that the result of Korea and the way we handled that struggle has an effect upon the situation today?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The results of World War II also have effect on the situation today. The results of World War I have effect on the situation today. I think the results of all wars fought in this century have effect on the situation today. We have been affected by our first war and every war since the first. A military expert has said that 20,000 regulars on either side could have decided in a few weeks our bloody 4-year-long war between the States.

If there is one thing we should have learned from the Korean war, along with every war in which this country has ever engaged, it is that we always pay heavily because we are not prepared.

My point today, I repeat once more, is that in this time of hydrogen bombs and nuclear standoff, we are not facing up to the growing strength of communism. What we are facing up to is the importance of the dollar to the few.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. With regard to what the Senator from Missouri has said about our facing up to the problem, does he feel that we faced up to the Communists in Korea in the way America has traditionally faced up to its military problems? If our traditional methods had been followed, we would not be faced with the danger we confront today in the Formosa Strait.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think that premise is wrong. Korea in no way affected the growing strength of Russia. In that respect Korea was the same to the Russians as the Berlin airlift, which was described by Winston Churchill as proving that we could stand on our heads indefinitely while the Russians sat in an armchair. No matter who won in Korea, the fact is that while the Chinese Communists, Korea, and the United States were destroying their resources, the Soviet leaders in Moscow were sitting back in an armchair.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Then the Senator agrees with the way the Korean war was conducted, namely, that our pilots should not bomb beyond the Yalu or destroy military or strategic supplies in that area. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. SYMINGTON. No; the Senator from Arizona is not correct in assuming that is my viewpoint. I have often said that if American boys are sent out to fight, they should be sent with every opportunity to win. However, I say to my colleague, for whom I have great admiration and respect, that this country must now face up to the change in Soviet policy, if it was a change, just announced.

I do not see how it is constructive to debate and refight the Korean war in the Senate. What I think important are plans to resist future Communist aggression. I emphasize to my distinguished colleague, if I may, the word "future."

Mr. GOLDWATER. If my colleague will yield further, I have just 1 or 2 other questions in connection with the Senator's statement. I am inclined to agree with him that it is wrong to rehash the Korea fighting, but military history has a way of repeating itself. Having drawn attention to what should not have been done or should have been done in the Korean fighting by the former administration, does the Senator from Missouri feel that we should again be drawn into a war in which we could not bomb beyond a certain point for fear of injuring the feelings of the Soviet Union?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not remember any such argument about Korea. I do not think it is constructive at this time to argue about the way the Korean war was fought. That was all I said about the Korean war.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri will pardon me, let me say he was criticizing the present administration for a truce; and I wanted to bring out, by questioning, which I feel I have done, that the truce was better than a continuation of the conditions in Korea at the time the truce was brought about.

Mr. SYMINGTON. No, Mr. President; if I may say to the distinguished Senator from Arizona, I was not criticizing the truce. What I was criticizing was what has happened after the truce.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Missouri has not answered my question regarding Formosa; and I understand that he does not care to answer it because he feels it relates back to Korea.

So I shall proceed, if I may——

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, at this point let me interrupt the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I did not quite understand the Senator's question with respect to Formosa. I shall be glad to try to answer, although I am not a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and I may not be as well versed in the matter as he is. However, I shall be glad to try to answer.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Of course, the Senator from Missouri has discussed a military subject. Neither am I a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. I am sure the Senator from Missouri realizes my limited knowledge, as well as his own, in this field.

However, my question, as I recall it, was as follows: Having drawn a line in the Formosa area—an action which I said I felt we should have done at some more advantageous spot, 10 years ago, instead of turning our backs on Chiang Kai-shek—and following the events of the Korean episode, would the Senator from Missouri now suggest a line on the Continent beyond which we should not bomb, for fear of injuring the feelings of the Soviets?

Mr. SYMINGTON. First, as to some of the Senator's premises to his question.

As I remember, the line regarding Formosa was drawn in 1950 under the previous administration. Incidentally, let me say that I was glad to see that the President had the judgment to reverse himself with respect to the "unleashing" aspect of something he said in January 1953—something obviously wrong, and which I am sure he said only because he was misadvised by some of his advisers.

About Formosa, I voted for the request of the President of the United States; and I did so on the theory that in these times we should all stick together. I voted for his request to handle the Formosa situation the way he saw fit.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have a further question to ask, and it is prompted because of many conversations the Senator from Missouri and I have had on the subject of airpower. He mentioned the retaliation speech of Secretary Dulles. I think it was delivered on either January 12 or January 13 of last year. Does not the Senator from Missouri think that speech might prove to be the first recognition of the true use of airpower in our national strategy?

If the Senator from Missouri will indulge me, I should like to elaborate a bit on that point, because during our conversations we have not quite gone into the aspect I have in mind. I have always been interested—in fact, ever since the days when the distinguished Senator from Missouri was head of the Air Force—in the possibilities of applying to

airpower Mahan's doctrine of naval supremacy. It is my feeling that Secretary Dulles' statement about massive retaliation is the first recognition that we are now in a new epoch of geophysical condition, wherein a new means of communication dictates another look at the method of waging war.

Let me say, if the Senator from Missouri will permit a further interruption—and I shall be brief in this reference—that in this field we might start with a consideration of the massive land-attack theory of Genghis Khan, and its subsequent improvement by Alexander the Great, and its modern development by Admiral Mahan, in his application of it to naval power in the British Isles and the British Empire.

Today, now that another means of communication has come into the picture, is it not the feeling of the Senator from Missouri that we should take another look at the weapons system and at the way war will be waged in the future?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I agree, Mr. President, with some of the very interesting and well-thought-out comments the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona has just made. The idea of an all-powerful army, as developed by Genghis Khan, or an all-powerful navy as developed by the British in the 19th century, however, has now gone out the window from the standpoint of our exercising of air power on a similar basis in this age, because today the Soviets and their satellites have an air force comparable to our own; and they also have atomic and hydrogen bombs.

I refer the distinguished Senator from Arizona to recent articles, among them the excellent Walkowicz article on the "Counter-Force Strategy," question of having the punishment fit the crime, and also the Leghorn article, "No need to bomb cities to win wars"—along the same line. They relate to the question of whether we can and should use nuclear weapons in peripheral wars, or wars of discrimination; or whether we should reserve such weapons for all-out wars, and so forth. That is a subject in itself.

I do not think it possible for the United States to now consider that it possesses a deterrent shield as a result of its airpower because our airpower is little greater than Communist airpower at this time, and that is especially true if we include the great advantage of a surprise attack in this nuclear age.

Therefore, I feel the massive-retaliation speech was a mistake. In a sense it was a bluff which did not work, for the Communist attack in Indochina was made after the speech was made. In my opinion, the massive-retaliation theory does not represent a military philosophy behind which we can establish the security of the United States.

I would have much more respect for that character of approach to military policies if we were not chopping our military strength in order to be sure we have the best possible financial position. I believe we are putting figures—money—before forces; I believe we are stressing our high standard of living ahead of our security. I do not think we should be lulled by the false premise incident to the massive-retaliation theory presented last January.

As a matter of fact, many subsequent talks by this administration have been efforts, subsequent to Mr. Dulles' statement, to refute the massive retaliation theory.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri will permit me to make one more observation, let me say that my question was directed at one point, namely, that while Secretary Dulles' statement might have been misunderstood or misapprehended around the world, nevertheless I believe it is the first pronouncement by anyone in this Government to indicate that we now understand airpower as a part of our national strategy.

As for the possibility that Russia and ourselves are equal either in nuclear weapons or in airplanes, I might suggest to the Senator from Missouri that such a situation almost always exists in warfare. Offhand, I cannot recall any war in which one side was predominantly stronger than the other, in the matter of weapons. So far as weapons are concerned, the situation is always one of a stand-off.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Missouri for permitting me to ask these questions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. SYMINGTON. First, Mr. President, let me say that I always enjoy discussion on military matters with my good friend, the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. In World War II, he was a great pilot; and he has a broad understanding of these problems. So it is a privilege to discuss them with him on the floor of the Senate.

Now I am very glad to yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, I wish to thank the Senator from Missouri for the fine address he has made today, and to associate myself with the objectives and the philosophy of that address. I should like to ask 1 or 2 questions to round out the record. In due course, I intend to speak on my own time.

With reference to the very practical matter which faces us, is the Senator aware of the fact that over the weekend the Department of Defense announced the withdrawal of the 1st Marine Division from Korea, to return home?

Mr. SYMINGTON. This is further evidence of the policy of strength through weakness.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, the Senator sees in the withdrawal of this very important combat division from a critical area a withdrawal from the scene of tension into a scene of greater calmness and solemnity. Is that correct?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Let me ask my brilliant and distinguished friend from Minnesota to consider some of the battles of the War Between the States. I refer to such encounters as Antietam, Chancellorsville, Fredericksburg, and so forth. If one side had announced that it did not intend to give up a particular piece of ground, and the other side announced that it intended to capture that piece of ground, and then the next day it heard, or saw, that the troops of its opponent had retreated, what would be the natural reaction in terms of morale, or in terms of additional aggressiveness, on the side of those who did not retreat?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield further to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. HUMPHREY. This publicized withdrawal of the 1st Marine Division is a withdrawal from the cease-fire line in Korea. Is the Senator aware of that?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, at a time when tension in the Far East is at a critical point, to the extent that the Congress is called upon to give a preauthorization for the use of armed forces in the Pacific area, and at a time when we are told that the world faces one of its most critical hours, we withdraw the best fighting division we have from Korea, where we know that there is a Chinese buildup for an attack at any time.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is true.

Within recent weeks an excellent article was written by Ernest Lindley, which showed that in the past 9 months we have changed our military plans and programs 5 times. Anyone who knows anything about the military service, or industrial operations, knows that under such a type and character of procedure we are steadily wasting great sums of the taxpayers' money. This administration will probably again change its recently announced policies if what we read today is true. That will be change No. 6 in 10 months.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There was some colloquy a moment ago with the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] over the action in Korea. Without going into the military merits or demerits of that action, is it not true that by the action in Korea the United States took on a position of strength and defense, as compared with what was happening just prior to Korea? Did we not build up our strength?

Mr. SYMINGTON. There is no question about that. The basic point about Korea is that we fought a bloody war in a limited periphery, thousands of miles away from home, primarily because we were not prepared. Yet it seems that now we are undertaking infinitely greater commitments without taking any advantage of our experience gained from the Korean war, from World War II, and from all the other wars, as to the importance of being prepared.

Now we are in the hydrogen age. The situation has never been better stated than it was by President Theodore Roosevelt when he said, "Speak softly, but carry a big stick." At a time when we are apparently becoming more belligerent and outspoken about what we intend to defend and how, we are also steadily whittling away at our stick.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I conclude with this observation. Up to the point

of the truce in Korea, the military planning and the forces in being of the United States of America were on the increase. In other words, our strength was being increased monthly. Beginning in January 1953, we cut $5 billion from the Air Force appropriations. We cut more than $11 billion, in terms of new money and unobligated funds, from the total defense budget. We have been steadily cutting. Even as late as December 1954, from the highest office in this land, word came that the international scene looked better, that there were better prospects for peace. My comment then was that the statement reminded me of what another President said in the spring of 1950. He said that we then confronted our best opportunity for peace, and that the prospects for peace looked better than ever before. In the spring of 1950, from high places the international scene looked good. In December of 1954, the international scene looked good. In February of 1955, the international scene looks bleak, and the cold winter of our discontent is settling upon us.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I agree with the junior Senator from Minnesota.

In September 1951, while the Korean war was going on, the Joint Chiefs of Staff unanimously gave to the administration and thereupon to the American people, a program for increasing our strength. Shortly after January 1953 that program was sunk. Today, in the face of the growing danger, we continue to make plans to weaken our military position. It does not make sense.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE DEFENSE OF FORMOSA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial written by Mr. Charles A. Sprague, former Republican Governor of the State of Oregon, in connection with the Formosan issue. The editorial is dated January 24, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT SEEMS TO ME

(By Charles A. Sprague)

CHICAGO, January 24.—The afternoon papers report President Eisenhower's appeal to Congress for authorization to use United States military forces for defending Formosa and the Pescadores from conquest by Red China. This will require United States assistance in ferrying Nationalist troops from the exposed islands adjacent to the mainland. Then the President made this startling declaration of policy:

"Be alert to any concentration of employment of Chinese Communist forces obviously undertaken to facilitate attack upon Formosa, and be prepared to take appropriate military action."

There in miniscule but nonetheless sharp and clear is "preventive war." We would not only defend Formosa from Communist attack but bomb troop concentrations and boat assemblies which point to the launching of a Red invasion of Formosa. The President's message brought a prompt rejoinder from Premier Chou En-lai of Communist China, denouncing United States intervention in China's affairs, even quoting the Charter of United Nations in support of the Communist decision.

The Daily News here reports this conflict of policy between the United States and Red China; and between the two statements runs a dispatch from its own veteran correspondent in the Far East, Keyes Beech, who reported from Taipeh, Formosa:

"The United States is closer to war with Red China than at any time since the critical battle of Dien Bien Phu."

He reported before Eisenhower's message reached him and based his judgment on the imminent evacuation of Nationalists from the Tachen islands which would expose American shipping to Communist bombing or shelling.

I persist in the view that no general war between the United States and Red China will break out in the immediate future. But the ratification of the treaty with Chiang and the grant of authority by the Congress to the Executive to defend Formosa even to the extent of destroying Communist military concentrations preparing for an invasion freezes hostility which points toward war. This seems to me to be a wrong course.

The President says: "Our purpose is peace;" but goes on to say that Red China's threats pose a serious danger to this country's security, "and indeed to the peace of the world." But do not our formal warnings amount to threats which endanger peace in the Orient and perhaps for the world?

Our Government faces very critical problems and seeks I know solutions which will preserve our national security without resort to war, if that is possible. It inherited this defense of Formosa from the Truman Administration. I cannot help but believe, however, that we are letting Formosa become a stone around our necks. Instead of becoming more deeply involved with Chiang Kai-shek we should seek honorable release from our extended commitments through processes of negotiation or mediation.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to associate myself with Governor Sprague's remarks. I desire particularly to emphasize this paragraph:

I persist in the view that no general war between the United States and Red China will break out in the immediate future. But the ratification of the treaty with Chiang and the grant of authority by the Congress to the Executive to defend Formosa even to the extent of destroying Communist military concentrations preparing for an invasion freezes hostility which points toward war. This seems to me to be a wrong course.

Governor Sprague then goes on to expand his point of view. I think he is unanswerably right, and in my judgment the events of history will prove how right he is.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial from the February 3, 1955, issue of the Manchester Guardian weekly. It is not complimentary to the United States or to Red China, or to the course of action which is being followed in Asia. It gives some support to the view of a few of us who have dared to rise on the floor of the Senate and caution our country about what we think is a greatly mistaken course of action in Asia.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STAND BACK

The Commonwealth conference is opportune. Having no doubt begun with Formosa it may unite the commonwealth governments in saying some necessary words to China and the United States. These words should be said plainly, whether in public through a joint declaration or in private through Mr. Nehru and Sir Anthony Eden. China should be told that any attempt to take Formosa by force would be wrong and would certainly bring upon her severe American action. It would be wrong in law and humanity. The legal question is, admittedly, obscured because the status of Formosa as an island seems in suspense. The Japanese peace treaty removed it from Japan, but no other treaty has returned it to China; the Cairo and Potsdam declarations were expressions of intent and were subject to review, which has not yet taken place. But whatever the legal position, there is a much greater aspect in humanity. It is that a Chinese attempt to take Formosa by force would lead to immense slaughter even if the Americans did not intervene. For the Nationalists it would be a last stand, since they have nowhere else to go and could expect no mercy from the Communists. The inevitable slaughter is something that no civilized nation could condone. It would be wrong by any acceptable standard of morals and by the spirit of the United Nations Charter. If Nationalist attacks upon the mainland are stopped—as we must hope they will be by the United States at once—the Chinese Communists would condemn themselves of barbaric inhumanity if they were to try taking Formosa by force. The reiterated threats from Peking to exterminate Chiang's "traitorous" clique may have some justification while the Nationalists continue bombing the mainland, but they will have none when such attacks finally cease. Then an assault across the straits would bring upon China not only the military weight of America but the moral hostility of most other nations.

To the United States also stern words should be said by the Commonwealth conference. It must withdraw the Nationalists to Formosa and the Pescadores at once and confine them there. To pretend that the United States cannot stop the bombing across the Straits is nonsense. The aircraft are American, the bombs American, and the Nationalist headquarters are in close consultation with the American military commanders. The bombing would stop tomorrow if Washington insisted. The United States should further be told that its reasons for supporting the defence of the Matsu and Quemoy islands are gravely mistaken. It is an error even to say, as the State Department is now doing, that these islands should not be abandoned except as part of a negotiated cease-fire. The chances of negotiating a cease-fire now are tiny, whereas the chance of producing a cease-fire by direct action are great. The comment from Peking leaves little likelihood that the fighting can be stopped through negotiation, whether by the Security Council or some other agency. But by physically separating the forces—by putting the width of the Straits between them—a cease-fire may be produced in fact if not formally. The Chinese would probably not want to challenge the American Seventh Fleet, especially if the mainland were no longer being hit. They would continue to fulminate, but the fighting would be over. The Commonwealth countries ought strongly to advocate this practical method of reaching a cease-fire. One other thing they ought to say to the United States. It is that the maneuvering of American naval and air units beside the Tachen islands or anywhere close inshore is highly dangerous and should be avoided. Mr. Molotov has given a plain hint that if it is known which islands are being evacuated by the Nationalists their departure will be unmolested. Let that be tested in practice. The alternative of providing American naval and air cover means sending ships and planes over Chinese territory and through territorial waters. A small skirmish—perhaps starting with reconnaissance patrols on each side—may draw in greater units and so lead to a violent explosion. The risk is not worth taking.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall not take time today to discuss the Formosa treaty. I voted against it in the Foreign Relations Committee this morning. I shall state my reasons in opposition to that treaty tomorrow; but because I have been pressed by the newspapers at least to give some inkling of the reason for my opposition to the treaty, let me say that I believe in saying what we mean and meaning what we say. In the treaty we do not say what we mean. The evidence of it is that this morning the majority of the Foreign Relations Committee had to agree upon language to be embodied in the committee's report which qualifies and changes the meaning of the treaty, so far as they, as individuals, are concerned. But the sad thing is that every member of the Foreign Relations Committee knows that language written into a committee report has no legal status whatever so far as the meaning of the treaty under international law is concerned.

In a Senate committee report Senators can write to their heart's content their views and ideas of what they think should be in a treaty itself. But unless the provisions they favor are embodied in the treaty itself, they have no standing in the eyes of treaty law. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I do not propose to vote for a treaty which does not convey the meaning I believe it should convey, and then go along with some explanatory or clarifying language in a committee report which has no legal effect upon the treaty itself. The fact is that if we mean what we say in a committee report, we ought to write it into the treaty.

I believe the American people will understand that. I believe the American people want us to mean what we say, and to say what we mean.

I should like to say, for the benefit of the press, that my last argument on this point today is: I do not believe in entering into a treaty with a man who is involved in a civil war in China. We have legal rights in Formosa under international law. We ought to protect those rights. But we should not enter into a treaty with a participant in a civil war, who even as recently as within the last few hours has notified the world of his intention to return to the mainland of China.

Mr. President, when we ratify the treaty I hope Senators will remember that we place ourselves under the moral obligation to back up what it says.

We will not get very far by saying, "Oh, literally, we will not have to go along with any attack on the mainland."

Moreover, Mr. President, we will strengthen Chiang's claim to sovereign rights over Formosa. At the present time, under international law, no one owns Formosa. The question of ownership ought to be settled by the juridical processes of the United Nations. It cannot be denied that even the Secretary of State admits that if we enter into the treaty we necessarily strengthen the claim of the Nationalist Chinese to sovereign rights over Formosa. When we do that we augment the danger of war in Asia. We do not augment the danger of a war in Asia if we hold fast to the principle of the joint resolution which Congress passed with respect to our right to defend Formosa.

As the Manchester Guardian points out, we greatly enhance the danger of our whole position in Asia when we go along with the ambiguities of the resolution—and the same thing applies to the treaty—with respect to defending areas outside the island of Formosa and the Pescadores.

I believe that is sufficient for me to say today, to enable the press to have some understanding of the legal basis of my objection to the treaty.

Oh, I know that it will be called another one of those legalisms. Mr. President, we have actually reached such a point in debate in the Senate that when we argue in favor of respecting existing international law, we are charged with resorting to legalisms. Let me tell everyone that my country cannot afford to walk out on the obligations we owe in international law, and we cannot justify such a course. With all the emphasis at my command I say that we cannot afford to besmirch the glorious record the United States has maintained for all the decades of its history of standing fast to its obligations under international law. In both the joint resolution which has been passed and in the treaty, in my judgment, we are not keeping faith with the international law obligations of this country. If that is resorting to a legalism, I plead guilty.

I am willing to let history be the judge as to whether the fight we made in opposition to the joint resolution was justified and whether the fight we will make in opposition to the treaty will be justified so far as the best interests of this country are concerned. Eventually we will have to submit our cause to a juridical tribunal. I hope we will be able to hold up our heads and take the judgment of history on the record we make.

Let me say that on the record we are making, both in the joint resolution and in the treaty, we are headed straight for a decision against us in the decades ahead by any juridical tribunal that lets international law be the basis of its decision.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, when the joint resolution giving the very broad powers to the President of the United States was before the Senate last week, I stood beside the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in voting to limit those powers and finally in voting against the joint resolution. I did so because I felt strongly that the resolution would increase the danger of our country becoming involved in a disastrous and catastrophic war, and would also cause us to surrender the sound juridical positions which this country must always assume and follow if we are to have the confidence and support of the free world.

I wish to make it very clear that I intend to support the Senator's position when the debate on the treaty begins tomorrow. In the meantime, this afternoon I wish to associate myself with his remarks and with his reasoning. I, of course, expect in due time to speak at length on several of the provisions of the treaty.

I cannot help but express very deep regret that the treaty, which is certainly as important and far reaching in its effect as any treaty that has come before the Senate in a generation or more, should be hurried through with as little chance for orderly consideration as is proposed.

I hope there will be full debate on the treaty.

There has been very brief consideration of the treaty by the Committee on Foreign Relations. The report of the committee is not yet available, and probably it will not be available until shortly before the treaty is called up in the Senate. The public has had no chance to study or consider it.

I think that is most unfortunate. A treaty of such importance should be given ample consideration in committee, and on the floor of the Senate, after deliberate and careful study. And above all, the public should have an opportunity to know and give weight to its implications.

Only 15 Senators serve on the Committee on Foreign Relations. For an account of what happened in the committee room the other 81 Senators must in great part depend upon the report of the committee. That report will not be available until tomorrow very shortly before the treaty is taken up in the Chamber. The public will have little or no chance to know how it affects them or time to make their views known to their representatives in the Congress. The issue before us is much too important and farreaching to be determined in this summary fashion.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I should like to announce the program for the Senate beginning tomorrow.

When the Senate concludes its business today, it will adjourn until tomorrow, when the legislative program will be as follows:

First, the Senate will take up H. R. 587, commonly known as the GI bill, to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to obtain educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes.

Following the disposition of that bill, the Senate will consider Senate Joint Resolution 14, which deals with the Olympic Games, which should take very little time to consider.

Following the disposition of those two measures, the Senate will take up the treaty between the United States and the Republic of China. How long consideration of the treaty will take, of course, will be determined by the membership of the Senate.

TAX EXEMPTIONS IN PUERTO RICO

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Utah rises to remark the twilight of a principle that most of us have always accepted as everlasting, a principle contained in the

famous phrase, "There is nothing more certain than death and taxes."

Death we still have with us, but those of us who have accepted taxes as inevitable and eternal have reckoned without the genius of a great American tax authority, Mr. Beardsley Ruml. This history-making achievement deserves reporting in Mr. Ruml's own words, which I shall read from an advertisement which has appeared recently in several of our more forward-looking weekly magazines and daily newspapers. The text I have before me appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, January 23, 1955.

The headline reads "Now Puerto Rico Offers a 100-Percent Tax Exemption to New Industry."

It is written by Mr. Beardsley Ruml. It continues:

"We do not want runaway industry," says Governor Muñoz, "but we want new and expanding industries. To get them we promise freedom from all taxes, local and Federal."

Let me repeat the heart of Mr. Ruml's achievement so that its full import will sink in:

We want new and expanding industries. To get them we promise freedom from all taxes, local and Federal.

No wonder another American businessman, now resident of Puerto Rico, can be quoted in the advertisement as having said, "The climate is probably as close to Paradise as man will ever see." If he refers to the tax climate, this is a modest understatement. It is Paradise, pure and undefiled.

Lest any reader should believe this is mere enthusiasm, the advertisement features a box, setting forth in cold figures the glorious prospects. First it gives examples of "how corporate tax exemption boosts profits." One of these says that if a mainland corporation's profit after United States corporate income tax is $485,500, its net profit in Puerto Rico would be $1 million, a gain of 106 percent.

But this is only the beginning. In this Paradise they have dividend tax exemption, too. These twin exemptions, corporate and dividend, can really produce a money miracle.

Consider first the case of a mainlander who is the sole owner of a corporation earning $1 million a year. On the mainland, after corporate taxes, this will shrink to $480,000; and if he pays all that to himself as a dividend, he has less than $70,000 to spend, 7 percent for himself and 93 percent for Uncle Sam.

And then he reads Ruml's advertisement and moves his corporation and himself to Paradise. Here he begins and ends—with his million intact, tax-free—14 times better off than he was. All this is also explained with beautiful figures in another section of the advertisement captioned "How Dividend Tax Exemption Boosts Income."

But lest the reader of the advertisement be left to believe that these figures are theoretical only, Mr. Ruml quotes a specific instance of an actual blessing that has already come to pass.

He says:

A recent analysis for one Ohio firm revealed that due to tax exemption and operating economies, it will increase its net profit from $187,000 to $442,000 a year by locating its plant in Puerto Rico.

As a member of the Senate Finance Committee, Mr. President, I feel some responsibility for our Federal income-tax structure, which Mr. Ruml dismisses so lightheartedly. Therefore I have rapidly developed what might be called a professional curiosity about what goes on. This speech is in the nature of a very preliminary report.

First, why can Puerto Rico offer Federal-tax exemptions to emigrant mainland industries? The first step was taken approximately 36 years ago in the Organic Act, which provided that residents of Puerto Rico, who by the act also became American citizens, would not be subject to the Federal income tax.

However, the real gimmick appeared in 1950, when the law was changed to provide that citizens born or naturalized anywhere in the United States, but who later became residents of Puerto Rico, could enjoy the same exclusion privilege with respect to income earned from sources within Puerto Rico. A similar privilege was provided for corporations. These provisions were affirmed in the 1954 Revenue Act, specifically by sections 931, 932, and 933 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Does that mean that all such citizens and corporations during these years have escaped income tax in Puerto Rico? By no means—because the Commonwealth has set up its own system of Commonwealth income taxes roughly paralleling our own, and we can assume that, at least until recently, these taxes have been applied for the benefit of the revenue of the Commonwealth.

But the Puerto Rican tax structure is fearfully and wonderfully made, for it contains a most unusual feature known as "industrial tax exemptions." This permits the government of the island to give complete exemptions from the Puerto Rican individual or corporate income tax, or any other island taxes, to income derived from investments in Puerto Rico. Under the Puerto Rican law, the investment must be unique in Puerto Rico, or of a type the government believes will aid the economy. It is this feature of the act which Mr. Ruml now advertises in leading American papers and magazines as an inducement for American industry to come to Puerto Rico. The fact that the government reserves the right to give this exemption at all constitutes a frightening departure from the principle of equality before the law on which our whole theory of American taxation is based. This is empirical bureaucratic determination of basic tax obligations, which anyone with a ready imagination can translate into potential official favoritism. To quote the advertisement again:

To get all the facts and find out whether you and your company would be eligible for complete tax exemption, mail the coupon below.

The address, of course, is 579 Fifth Avenue, New York 17, N. Y.

Mr. Ruml, in his advertisement, says:

This is perhaps Puerto Rico's finest hour and the United States manufacturers who decide to become a part of it will not go unrewarded financially or spiritually.

There is no question about the financial reward, but since the blatant tone of this advertisement is tax avoidance, I question the spiritual benefits, even though the advertisement steers close to the wind of morality and quotes Governor Muñoz as saying, "We do not want runaway industry."

As though this were not paradise enough, Puerto Rico offers really to gild the lily. To quote the advertisement again:

The Commonwealth will leave no stone unturned to get you started. It will build a factory for you. It will help you secure finance. It will even screen job applicants for you—and then train them to operate your machines.

There is at least an inference in these statements that this will be done, either without cost or a rate below the corresponding rate on the mainland. And, there are still more blessings to come tumbling out of this golden cornucopia. Puerto Rico is not bound by our Federal minimum wage laws. Its average industrial wage rate is about 45 cents an hour as compared with about $1.35 an hour for similar industries on the mainland, and costs will reflect this great competitive advantage. No taxes—low wages. Let us stop and add this up.

"Come to Puerto Rico," says the government of the Commonwealth. We will finance your company, build your building, train your people, all at government expense. Then you can build larger profits on a wage scale two-thirds below that on the mainland, and we will exempt the whole shebang from any taxes—factory, corporate profits and dividends—provided we like you well enough to agree that your company is either unique or of a type that will aid the economy.

So long as the tax and other advantages given in Puerto Rico operated largely, if not solely, to increase the standard of living in the Commonwealth, we in the Congress, and specifically in the Senate Finance Committee, could probably maintain a benevolent blindness to its effect on the Federal revenue, but when official advertisements, which quote the Governor and carry the authoritative hallmark of Mr. Beardsley Ruml, are printed in mainland newspapers, inviting persons and corporations from the mainland to come to Puerto Rico and escape from their share of the tax burden that is being borne by all of us who remain on our native mainland soil, including all corporations and most American wage earners, I think it is time the whole problem is carefully studied.

Exemption of native born Puerto Ricans and their emigrant ex-mainland neighbors is not the only fiscal advantage this Commonwealth has been given. Its most conspicuous export to the mainland has been the native rum on which the American liquor stamp tax amounts to approximately $16 million a year. We obligingly collect this tax and then turn right around and give it back, in full, to the Puerto Rican Government.

On the surface, this adds up to paradise all right, but maybe this paradise,

like the one in Genesis, will not last forever.

Though the advertisement does not say so, the present Puerto Rican tax exemption law will provide complete 100 percent exemption only until June 30, 1959, then it will fall rapidly—1 year at 75 percent, 1 year at 50 percent, 1 year at 25 percent, and after June 30, 1962—nothing. But, of course, they can always extend the period, as we do so well here in Congress.

And there have been other doubts cast on the accuracy of the advertisement. When it appeared in the New York Times on January 23, it said in further describing this paradise:

> The swimming, sailing, and fishing are out of this world—and your wife will rejoice to hear that domestic help is abundant.

Only 2 days later, January 25, there appeared in the Washington Post, a George Dixon column entitled "The Big Switch" which said:

> New York's Puerto Rican problem had its genesis in the servant shortage—the ladies of Manhattan yearned so desperately for serf-like nursemaids, scullery maids, cooks, butlers, and general suckers of all work that they began importing Puerto Ricans in clusters, like coconuts—the movement finally reached such proportion that one of the most ironic switches imaginable has come to pass. The Puerto Ricans are now trying to import servants from the Dominican Republic.

So, sadly, we must read Mr. Ruml's advertisement with Mr. Dixon's correction as follows:

> And your wife will rejoice to hear that domestic help is abundant if you can find it in the Dominican Republic.

I think it is time this whole thing is carefully reviewed. There is considerable potential loss of Federal Revenue inherent in this situation. Not only will we lose the tax income from those who emigrate to Puerto Rico, but to the extent that wage and tax advantages there are translated into lower competitive prices, we may find our income from taxes paid by their mainland competitors reduced.

Finally, I am intrigued by Mr. Ruml's sponsorship of such an advertisement. By the ordinary American income taxpayer, he is remembered as the father of "pay as you go," and the withholding tax. Now, to the favored emigrant to Puerto Rico he says, "If you go, you don't have to pay." I confess, I am coming to look with a jaundiced eye at this conception of a taxless Eden, with its twin angels—rum and Ruml.

This is a situation we must watch.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Jacob A. Haller, Jr., and sundry other candidates for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service.

TREATY WITH NATIONALIST CHINA

Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred Executive A, 84th Congress, 1st session, the mutual defense treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of China, signed at Washington on December 2, 1954, reported it favorably with a report (Ex. Rept. No. 2).

AUTHORIZATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS TO FILE REPORT DURING ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations may be permitted to file its report on the treaty between the United States and the Republic of China during the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles C. Finucane, of the State of Washington, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Albert Pratt of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, United States Army, retired, to be a member of the National Security Training Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 19, 1956.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harlan Bruce Munger, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George P. Daley, of Minnesota, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, with reference to the nomination of George P. Daley and its confirmation, I wish to say that we in Minnesota have the highest regard for this very distinguished citizen, who is one of the most prominent citizens of the State in the field of agriculture, and his appointment by the President and his confirmation by the Senate will be all for the public good.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nomination on the calendar.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of officers for promotion as reserve commissioned officers of the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

NOMINATION OF SENATOR THURMOND TO BE BRIGADIER GENERAL IN THE ARMY RESERVE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I should like the RECORD to show that the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] would wish to be recorded as supporting the confirmation of the nominations of all the officers mentioned, save and except himself.

The name of the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina will be found on page 3 of the executive calendar, where he is nominated to be promoted from the rank of colonel to the rank of brigadier general.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to have it noted that the Senate is feeling considerable pride in connection with the fact that one of its Members, formerly a colonel in the U. S. Army Reserve, has just been made a brigadier general. I should like to extend my compliments and congratulations to the distinguished Senator and to the great State of South Carolina over which he presided so graciously and effectively as its Governor, and which he now represents so ably as its junior Senator.

The entire Senate, I am certain, joins with me in expressing its pride and gratification in the fact that this fine Senator and splendid public servant in time of peace has found occasion to stay active in the Army Reserve until he now has attained the rank of Brigadier General.

Incidentally, I think we all know, with pride, that Senator Thurmond is at this time the president of the Association

of the Reserve Officers of the United States.

I wish to express my own pride and pleasure, and I feel certain that all other Senators will wish to join with me in that expression.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, as the acting minority leader, I claim the privilege of expressing for all Members on this side of the aisle our satisfaction and joy in joining in the confirmation of the nomination of our new colleague from South Carolina. The junior Senator from South Carolina is in many ways a remarkable freshman Senator. He brings to the Senate not only a wonderful career, but also a very interesting election tradition. We look for great things from him.

So far as I am concerned, I observe that the junior Senator from South Carolina has replaced me physically in the office I have occupied for four years. I hope, in reverse, that I may thus get some inspiration from that relationship.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. Raymond A. Anderson, United States Marine Corps, to be Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps, with the rank of major general, for a period of 2 years from February 1, 1955.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATIONS REPORTED FAVORABLY AND PLACED ON THE VICE PRESIDENT'S DESK

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the confirmation of the nominations of George N. Anderson and 688 other officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, which were reported favorably by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] from the Committee on Armed Services, and were received by the Senate on January 21, 1955. The nominations were ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk in order to avoid duplicate printing.

Is there objection to the confirmation of the nominations? The Chair hears none, and the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I ask that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nominations.

The Senate resumed legislative business.

THE FARM BLOC DIEHARDS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an excellent, highly pertinent editorial entitled "The Farm Bloc Diehards," published in today's New York Times.

In order that there may be no misunderstanding as to the position taken in this excellent article by this leading newspaper, I wish to quote with particular approval the last two sentences of the editorial, as follows:

> While the fantastic farm surplus accumulated over the past few years is an economic burden on the Nation and a vexing problem to the Government, it has at least one compensating virtue. It is not only a standing monument to the folly of those responsible for the policy of high, rigid price supports, but a warning of what might be expected to follow a return to that disastrous program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FARM BLOC DIEHARDS

When the Senate voted 49–44 last August to substitute flexible farm price supports for the rigid 90 percent supports obtaining in the Nation's so-called "basic" farm commodities it marked the culmination of one of the most difficult and important struggles in the entire legislative program of the Eisenhower administration. It meant the scrapping, at long last, of the machinery that had been set up to meet the emergency created by World War II and to which short-sighted farm bloc leaders in Congress had clung ever since as a vested interest with all the tenacity and strength at their command. It meant a return to the apparatus that had been employed previous to the war and to which the Congress had contemplated a return 2 years after the war came to an end.

The fact that the process of wartime overstimulation of production was maintained long after the need for it had passed is reflected in the mountain of surplus farm commodities that has backed up into Government hands in these post-war years. Only now has it been possible even to make a beginning in the complicated and time-consuming task of reducing this enormous hoard from its present level of roughly $7 billions.

But the leaders of the farm bloc are still not reconciled, apparently, to the fact that the war is over. Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina made a speech from the floor at the end of last week calling for the restoration of rigid price supports "for the next 3 years" and has introduced a bill which would have that effect. A companion measure, sponsored by Representative COOLEY, Chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, is already before that committee. Senator YOUNG, as few readers will be surprised to note, is cosponsoring a similar measure with Senator RUSSELL of Georgia.

There is little reason to believe that these exponents of a discredited cause will succeed in reversing last year's historic return to sanity on the issue of price supports. While the fantastic farm surplus accumulated over the past few years is an economic burden on the Nation and a vexing problem to the Government, it has at least one compensating virtue. It is not only a standing monument to the folly of those responsible for the policy of high, rigid price supports, but a warning of what might be expected to follow a return to that disastrous program.

VIEWS ON UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier today, as we listened to the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] address the Senate, many of us in the Chamber rose to express our general agreement with the thesis of his argument and with the observation he was making in reference to the reduction of our Armed Forces in this hour of tension and crisis. I wish to take a few minutes of the time of the Senate to make observations upon some developments which have concerned me as, I am certain, they have concerned others.

The foreign policy of the United States is not a partisan affair; at least, it should not be. The defense of this Nation should be the responsibility, the privilege, and the duty of all.

I think each and every one of us is hoping and praying that the policy of our Government will lead to peace—peace with honor and peace with freedom. But I think we would be derelict in our responsibilities if we did not, at least, wish to make a constructive analysis of what has been transpiring and, at least, some pertinent observations as to what the future may offer. I think it is fair to say that none of us can safely predict the future, but we can certainly learn from the past and thereby have some guidance for the future.

My first observation is that it was natural and to be expected that following World War II there would be a desire in this Nation for a reduction in our Armed Forces and a return to what has so traditionally been called normalcy. Of course, we all know that following any war there is no such thing as normalcy, and there is no such period to return to.

But from 1946 through 1949 we witnessed in this Nation, not as a matter of political policy alone, but as a matter of desire on the part of the American people, a substantial reduction—yes, an almost crucial reduction—in the military strength of the United States of America. We dedicated our efforts toward the economic rehabilitation of our allies, and then toward the compassionate use of our goods and services, even to those who had been our enemies.

Then we recall that period when we settled down to the overall economic strengthening of the NATO nations, the nations of Western Europe; and finally the extension of economic and military assistance to friendly nations all around the globe.

I desire the record to be clear that despite all the tortures and sacrifices of the war in Korea, the disappointment of the war in Korea, and the disappointment of many persons in the manner of its conclusion, I think it is fair to say that the Soviet Union made a mistake in North Korea. It is true to say at this hour that because of the tragedy of Korea, the American people were alerted to the danger in the world, and we set about the task, late as it was, to build the strength of this Nation. It was the war in Korea which compelled us to strengthen our Air Force, to expand and

strengthen our Army, and to rehabilitate and revitalize our Navy. Then, at long last, the American people and their Government were in a position to back up their diplomacy with power.

Negotiation on the part of a free country, such as ours, is dependent upon maximum strength, strength which is clearly understood by friend and foe alike. That strength must be not only in our own country and our own people, but also in our allies. Therefore, it is of the utmost importance that the great Western alliance nations, the nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, be further strengthened in every way in which it is humanly possible. It is very important that we try to bring into the circle of our friends and into the orbit of freedom more and more peoples, and to bind them together in a common defense, in collective security, in a compact or a series of compacts, which will provide the maximum amount of strength for one and all.

But what has been happening? Following the truce in Korea, which was longed for by the American people—I shall not discuss its terms, because the truce in Korea is a subject of sharp debate and difference of opinion—following the truce in Korea, immediate moves were taken by the United States Government, on the basis that some kind of peace had been arrived at to reduce the strength of this Nation's Armed Forces. This was done in the name of economy, in the name of balancing the budget, in the name of deficit financing. As the Senator from Missouri has pointed out, the military policy of this country has changed as much as 5 or 6 times in the past year. For example, 2 years ago we saw a drastic cut in the Air Force. Last year we saw an admission of the mistake and the replenishing of the funds. The only result of that policy was to lose time in production and contract authorization, and thereby place us further behind in the buildup of our air power and air strength.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In the statement made by the Secretary of Defense, he stated that expenditures in the Military Establishment this year will be reduced by $1,750,000,000. In other words, he does not intend to spend one billion three quarters of a million dollars of the money which has been appropriated by the Congress. He has not stated where he will put those reductions into effect. Would not the Senator from Minnesota agree that the only way he could obtain such reductions would be, one, by impounding the money appropriated by the Congress, or, two, planning, with the civilian secretaries of the three services, deliberate slippages in the military program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator is correct. I may say that once before, in another administration, we had an instance of certain money appropriated by the Congress for the Air Force being impounded and held back for the purposes of contract and buildup of airpower. Without intending to make any party reference at all, such action is a mistake. We ought to have learned that lesson from the previous sacrifices and the previous difficulties that we have had in this area of military strength.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Will not the Senator from Minnesota agree with me that the impounding by the President of the moneys in 1948 and 1949 appropriated by the Congress for the Air Force was far different from the apparent impounding of money this time by the Secretary of Defense, who at the same time does not say which service is going to come up with the enforced savings?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I say there is considerable difference.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, what I have said thus far may well be termed a preface to what I wish to say now in terms of the immediate, or at least the recent and contemporary, period. We witnessed a certain program at the Geneva Conference. Prior to that conference there was a meeting in Berlin, at which time our Government joined with France in extending an invitation to a conference at Geneva for the purpose of a discussion of the Indochinese war and its settlement. I recognize that our representatives were working under severe pressure, particularly from our ally France, and undoubtedly also from our ally, Britain, the British Empire, and its representatives. But I state here again, as I have stated publicly throughout the country, that the American degree of participation in the Geneva Conference was beneath the dignity of the country in terms of the kind of leadership we should have extended. Out of that conference came a settlement of the Indochina fighting. It is our hope that something can be salvaged from that agreement. We are sending to that area a former chief of staff, General Collins. He is being assigned to South Vietnam to strengthen that country so it can stay free.

Mr. President, I used this example of Geneva for a purpose which will soon be obvious. In recent months we have viewed the failure of the European defense treaty, that failure taking place in the French Parliament. Following that there was the London agreement, which resulted in a formula for the rearmament of Western Germany. Once the London agreement was presented to the respective parliaments, it had to be subjected to difficult debate and decision. The Government of France, under Mendes-France, finally was able to get through the Chamber of Deputies, by a close vote, the ratification of that aspect of the London agreement which pertained to the rearmament of Western Germany. That Government of France has fallen, and France finds itself in a very unfortunate and most indecisive position.

Mr. President, I think the Members of the Senate should remember that for months the Soviet Union, through its leadership, has been preparing the Soviet people for war. There has been a change in Russia's propaganda which, if not brought to the attention of the Senate, should have been. I have seen it again and again in reports I have read from scholars of Soviet propaganda. But there has been little information to those of us who have to share in the making of these policy decisions.

I repeat, for over 5 months the Soviet people have been conditioned to what happened today in the meeting of the two houses of the Soviet Parliament. If anyone has any doubt about that fact at all, I invite him to examine the propaganda which has been fed to the people of the Soviet Union.

Further, we have witnessed the Soviet Union threats on the Germans, the French, and the British, that they would break their alliances and treaties if those countries were to yield to what Russia called American leadership and American advocacy of Western German rearmament. It is to the credit of France, England, and Chancellor Adenauer of Western Germany, and the coalition that he has, that thus far they have stood firm.

Make no mistake, while threats and intimidation have been going on, something else has been happening. The Soviet Union has offered a peace treaty within the last month to Japan. Russia has made repeated offerings and solicitations to the Western Germans for the unification of West and East Germany. I believe what is going on in the Far East is all part of a general strategy that has been laid down from the Kremlin carefully and precisely, just as I am confident that the attack of the North Koreans upon South Korea was masterminded by the Soviets. That plan misfired. Russia's objective was not realized. The attack was stopped, and Russia's whole purpose of being able to encircle Japan, cut it off, and finally take it into its orbit, and move into Japan was checked by the timely resistance of the American Armed Forces and the action of the United Nations. We received help from some our allies in the United Nations, together with the valiant service and courage of the men, women, and troops of South Korea.

In September—at the very time when there was talk of the London agreements and when there was talk of the Manila pact—we witnessed the attacks on the islands of Quemoy and Matsu. That was a step-up of what might be called the cold war by intimidation and violence. All the time these attacks are occurring, we see the Soviet Union using every trick in its black kit of treachery, which is a part of its diplomacy, to intimidate our friends in Western Europe.

Recently our country has been brought to believe that the major question before the whole world is Formosa. Mr. President, do not misunderstand me; I voted for the Formosan joint resolution. I had some doubts as to all its implications; but I resolved those doubts in terms of faith in our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, and also in terms of the vital need of

our country, namely, the security of the United States.

But, Mr. President, although Formosa is an important part of the defense line of our country, I repeat here what I have said privately to friends and publicly to audiences and in conferences with radio, newspaper, and television people, namely, that the grand prize of Soviet strategy—today, tomorrow, and next month—is Western Germany: Germany, with her air power; Germany, with her millions of people; Germany, with her industrial strength and with her science and technology; Germany, with her central position in Western Europe.

Let me repeat as a warning, this afternoon, Mr. President, that today Germany is in a more precarious situation, in terms of her affiliation with the West, than she has been at any other time in recent years. Today the government of Chancellor Adenauer is weaker than it was last week. If all my colleagues do not know it, let them read the press of Germany. If we do that, we shall find that today the strength Chancellor Adenauer had a year ago is slowly being whittled away. I rise now to pay tribute to that great man, who has been our friend, and who has been a stanch friend of freedom throughout his life. But today his power is weak, and it was not helped by the collapse of the French Government of Mendes-France.

I repeat that today the Soviets are pressing, with every means at their command, to have the eyes of America turned to the east, while they pick off the plum, the grand prize, of their diplomacy and their maneuverings, namely, to have a neutral Germany, which the Russians hope then would turn toward the east, in line with a Germany's traditional trade pattern. Mr. President, we need to be students of history. Germany has always traded with the east, and she has had some common interest with Russia in the east, in the past. Today, there is in Germany a large bloc of persons who have been advocating a neutral Germany—and I am not referring to the Social Democrats alone, who are a political party. Instead, I am speaking of the great industrialists and of a former Chancellor of Germany, Mr. Brüning, who only last summer, when speaking to a group of industrial leaders, assembled in Dusseldorf, the capital of the great German industrial combines, said it was Germany's destiny to be a balance between the west and the east. So he called upon Germany to be a vital neutral.

Mr. President, I ask anyone in America: Today, with France as uncertain as she is, with France torn by dissension and by instability of government, what is going to happen to the Western European alliance if Germany is removed from the orbit of the nations who believe in freedom?

Italy has done well; and we love the Italian people, and we admire the stand of their government. But, Mr. President, let us make no mistake about it: Italy is a weak reed, as compared with the thundering, massive power Germany is able to demonstrate today. The most phenomenal recovery ever to occur on the face of the earth, in view of what has happened to the nation concerned, has been made by Western Germany; her recovery is almost unbelievable. Today her industrial production is far above her production schedule. Germany represents a tremendous power for good or for evil. A neutral Germany, which could play off the East against the West, could well destroy the western alliance system of freedom and security.

So, Mr. President, I warn my colleagues and the country; and I do so, not in a spirit of acrimony, but in a spirit of prayer and hope: Keep your eyes on Western Europe, and keep your eyes on Japan. They are the prizes in their respective, opposite areas, among all the prizes on the face of the globe. How paradoxical that is, Mr. President, in view of the fact that those two countries are former enemies of ours, and are the two nations which caused so much bloodshed and so much trouble. But, Mr. President, honestly, they are the two nations on the face of the earth, second only to the United States and Great Britain, which represent industrial power and manpower and technological ability and a willingness to stand up and be counted.

At this very hour, the new government of Japan—and, Mr. President, by the way, the government of Japan has changed. Not long ago we honored the former prime minister of Japan, by having him speak to us, here in the Senate. However, when he returned from Washington, D. C., to Japan, he lost his power in the Japanese Diet, I would remind my colleagues; he had been home less than a month, when he was ousted from office. So I would say that his visit to the United States may have made him popular here, but it did not help him there. At this very hour, efforts are being made by the Soviets to seduce the Japanese Government, by offering the Japanese Government trade concessions. The Soviets seek to get their trade "nose" into the Japanese tent; and the Soviets also wish to make some kind of working arrangement with the Japanese, so as to keep the Japanese from being an effective, participating partner with the West, namely, the United States and our allies.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I am much impressed with the presentation being made by the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota, in his discussion of the growing dangers incident to advancing Communist aggression all over the world, especially in many countries which we in America believe are our allies.

Nevertheless, it is true, as the junior Senator from Minnesota has so ably stated, that in Germany, in Japan, in France, and in other countries, communism is advancing, both internally and externally, because of pressures which are put on some of those countires, seductions in the form of favorable trade offers, and so forth.

I ask the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota whether he believes that by cutting our military appropriations, month after month, during the last few years, we are, and have been, very possibly responsible for many of the successes, both internally and externally, made by the Soviet conspiracy in some of the countries to which he has referred. Do not they feel we are not serious in our determination to resist communism, when it is pointed out to them that we are steadily reducing our own military strength?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Missouri that I am confident in my own mind—and, of course, one can speak only for himself, and from his own limited experience and ability—that surely these reductions have not added to our prestige, nor have they bolstered our efforts at diplomacy, in trying to strengthen our position and the position of our allies.

The effect has all been negative, so to speak. I develop that point by pointing out that I think one of the biggest mistakes that has been made was in the April conference in 1953 of the NATO powers, following the Lisbon Conference of April 1952. At the conference in April 1953—I believe my chronology is correct—instead of the United States representatives insisting that our allies meet their goals, instead of our keeping a tight hold on the situation, what we said was that there was no dateline for preparedness; that there was no real urgency; that we would do certain things in good time.

Why did we say that? Because it cost us less money to say it. It meant that we could string out for a longer period of time the military and economic assistance, rather than arriving at certain goals by a particular date and sustaining those goals for an indefinite period of time thenceforth. I can frankly state, from my point of view, that once we were willing to say to our European friends that they could take things a little easier, they really wanted to take it easy. That is understandable. They had borne the full brunt of the war and the devastation of fire and bomb. Their peoples were restive under heavy taxation, lack of consumer goods, and the lack of housing which was everywhere evident. They were delighted to be able to release more of their productive capacity in terms of what might be called soft goods, consumer goods. They were delighted to have someone say, "You can ease off a bit."

Since that time we have had some trouble. I point out that while, of course, it was good public relations to make such announcements, and to enter upon such a policy, it may very well not have been good, sound political and diplomatic relations, because the task of leadership is to ask people who work with us to do more than they expected to do.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator mentioned diplomatic relations. Would he not say that the only possibility of success of our diplomats in negotiating with the Soviet Communists is to be able to negotiate from a position of relative military strength?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Therefore, as we have steadily reduced our military appropriations in the past 2 years, have we not, in effect, been playing into the hands of the Soviet leaders?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is my opinion.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a final question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. We know that the soldiers on Formosa, equipped with American equipment and trained by American officers, are not going to stay there, under these circumstances, forever. If we do not reverse our policy and follow the policy suggested by the Senator this afternoon, building up our military strength, will not the same results ultimately occur in countries like Japan, and very possibly Western Germany, that have already happened to the disadvantage of the free world in these other countries?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure that will be the situation. At least that is my belief. Perhaps the word "sure" is too positive. However, the facts so indicate.

Mr. President, prior to the colloquy between the Senator from Missouri and myself, I was speaking of what I felt was the "grand prize," to use the vernacular, in the struggle between the totalitarian Communist area and the free world. I repeat that it is Western Germany at this hour.

This does not mean that we should not be interested in the defense of Formosa. Indeed we must be. I say, however, that this is all a matter of emphasis, perspective, and weighted importance. Surely we have done what needed to be done in drawing the line in Formosa, and saying that was vital to the interests of the security of the United States. But I do not want the policy of our Government, as expressed by executive officers, to be so totally affixed to the Far East that we forget the immediate design of the Soviets in the West.

There are some factors which I think should be discussed in this connection.

Mr. President, I should like to complete an analysis I was trying to make of conditions and problems with which we are confronted. I stated earlier that these matters are of serious import. I lay no claim to expert knowledge. However, there seem to be some areas which can stand some review.

I said it has been the policy of this country since 1950 to defend Formosa. There is no doubt about it. I was pleased to hear the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] clarify the record again.

What is important about Formosa can be placed in two areas. What about the Formosans, whom no one seems to talk about? There are quite a number of people in Formosa who are Formosans.

Second, Mr. President, what is important for the vital interests of the United States of America? Chiang Kai-shek is incidental. I repeat—incidental, and, in this instance, accidental. I would not feel it was my duty or right by any vote of mine to commit one man or woman, one boy or girl, in this country to the defense of Chiang Kai-shek. But I do feel, as a member of the United States Senate, that I have an obligation, a moral responsibility, and a patriotic duty to face up to the responsibilities, no matter how difficult they may be, in connection with the defense of the vital interests and the security of the United States of America. That is what we are here for. Every vote we cast can be justified only on that basis. We are not running a social welfare agency or a retrieving club for deposed leaders. We have but one obligation—our Nation. That may include the closest alliance with other people. It may, because of the moral foundations of our society, compel us to be interested in the welfare of our brothers. Do unto others as you would have them do unto you. There are many good Scriptural passages which would fit into my remarks, such as the story of Cain and Abel—"Am I my brother's keeper?"

When I took my oath of office before the Presiding Officer of the Senate, and stood in solemn attention, I swore to defend and protect the interests of the United States of America. That is the way we should justify treaties, resolutions, or anything else on which we pass here. I do not think it is in the interest of the United States of America to be getting ourselves into what General Bradley so well and aptly referred to as the wrong war in the wrong country at the wrong time with the wrong enemy.

Red China is like a substation compared with the master powerhouse of the Kremlin. The switches of Soviet control are not in Peiping. They are running on low wattage there. The center of Communist power is in the Kremlin, and we had better keep our eyes not only on Charley McCarthy in this instance, but on Edgar Bergen. I hope Mr. Bergen will forgive me for this analogy. We had better keep our eyes on the center of the stage rather than on the blinds around the sides. This does not mean that we should not pay any attention to diversionary actions. To be sure, we do; but we should also pay attention to the attitudes of the people in the Far East. We are committed, whether it be good or bad, to an alliance with the present leadership on Formosa. That has developed to a point where there is no backing out. But I would have the record of the testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee read by every Senator in this Chamber. How many countries does any Senator think are desirous of associating with that leadership, to associate by treaty, by alliance, by mutual security pacts, or collective security pacts? I shall not name the number; I shall only say that it is very, very small. All our major allies in the world, what allies we have, are favoring a policy in the Far East with which we do not agree. So the only force we have in the Far East with which we agree is the only force in the Far East that has no other ally. I say that is a most unfortunate position, but that is the position in which we find ourselves.

That tells me that we had better limit our operations in that area to one purpose, namely, the interests of the United States of America, in the interest of stopping Communist aggression which, if it continues, could seriously jeopardize our whole security.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall ask to continue for a moment, and then I shall be glad to yield.

That is why, Mr. President, I was concerned about becoming too involved in the offshore islands. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] voted differently from the Senator from Minnesota. But there is no secret about the fact that Chiang Kai-shek wants to go back to the mainland, and he wants us to put him back there. There is no secret about it, in my mind, and I do not wish to help him. Why? Because I do not wish to see the Chinese Nationalists become the supreme power on the Chinese mainland? Not at all. I think any government on the Chinese mainland that had any modicum of respect for the institutions of freedom would be better than the Communist Government. But I do not want to see the American people caught in the Soviet trap. The Russian bear is setting a trap for the American people, in China. If we get ourselves sucked into that vast area with our manpower, our economic resources, our trained military forces, the Soviet Union will have a happy hunting ground throughout the rest of the world while we are battling with the huge masses of humanity which the Chinese Communist war lords and dictators can rally against us.

Defend Formosa? Yes. Meet the aggressor at any place? Yes. Defend our manpower, our vital installations, and our fleet? Yes. But do all this with calmness and courage, and do it all with steadfastness and extreme caution. I think we need calm courage and persevering patience. I think we need sustained strength. What we have too much of is sporadic treatment of international developments, getting concerned on one day and then wishing to lean back and say that it looks very good on the next day. We have not had competent courage. We have had the kind of youthful courage that comes every time someone shakes his fist at us. We have not had persevering patience. In fact, we have been very impatient; and we have not had sustained strength. The U. S. S. *Missouri* is the pride of the fleet one month, and is in mothballs the next month. The First Marine Division is in Korea when it is peaceful and quiet, and now that we are evacuating the Tachens, and it looks like there will be trouble in Formosa, they are coming home.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Not in a spirit of criticism, but as a statement of fact, Does the Senator know any country in Europe or in the Orient where our position has materially improved in the past 2 years?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Philippine Islands, I would say, our traditional ally.

I would hope we are a bit better off in Italy; but if the Senator wishes to know whether, in the overall, we are better off, I would say I doubt it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would agree with the Senator as to the Philippine Islands.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We are probably in worse relationship with India.

Mr. SYMINGTON. With reference to Italy, which I had the opportunity of visiting with the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire last spring, I believe the question of our relations with Italy may well depend upon the decision made by the head of the Socialist Party, the Moscow trained Mr. Nenni, as to whether he does or does not intend to join the Communist Party headed by Mr. Togliatti. There are many countries with whom our relationship has deteriorated and our position has been materially reduced. Is not that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. At the same time, is it not true, that those countries have watched us constantly reducing the military strength from which we could have negotiated with them, and their possible enemies, and our possible enemies?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is true.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think signs of weakness can only lead to a further diminution of our position of influence and leadership in the world.

Mr. President, within recent weeks an attempt was made by our Government and other governments, through the United Nations, to arrive at a cease-fire in Formosa. I presented a resolution in the Senate at the time we adopted the resolution on Formosa. My resolution carried out the other 50 percent of the President's message on the critical situation in the Strait of Formosa and off the coast of the Chinese mainland. My colleagues may recall that the President endorsed the efforts of the United Nations to seek a cease-fire arrangement. He said the position of our country was one of seeking peace; and the President is a man who seeks peace.

My resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and it was discussed in the committee. Mr. President, I regret to say that my resolution was not reported by the committee. I am here to make the record clear that the reason why it was not reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations was that certain Senators and forces in the committee felt that a cease-fire proposal by the United States Senate might result in appeasement.

My answer to those particular Senators was that if any appeasement was to be done at the United Nations, it would have to be done by this administration, because the foreign policy of the United States Government is in the hands of the President and the Secretary of State. Many Senators may think they are the Secretary of State, but they are not; the foreign policy of this country is in the hands of the President and the Secretary of State. Frequently the Senate is asked for advice and consent; most of the time we give only consent, not advice.

If there was to have been any appeasement, I may mention to my colleagues, on the basis of the United Nations action in seeking a cease-fire, appeasement could only have come as the result of an order of the administration forwarded to those who represent us in the United Nations. Our representatives in that organization hold their positions by appointment of the President of the United States and follow the policy established by the President and the Secretary of State.

I was shocked to hear some of my Republican colleagues on the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations state that they thought my resolution might result in appeasement, when, as a matter of fact, the President of the United States is responsible for the foreign policy of this Nation. I have more faith in our President than they have. I did not vote for the President, but I have more faith in him than to think that he would appease. I was literally shocked to find some of the leaders of the Republican Party—in fact, the minority leader of the Republican Party himself—concerned about the fact that the United Nations resolution we were considering, and the whole discussion on cease fire, might lead to untimely concessions to and ultimate appeasement of the Chinese Communist forces.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator from Minnesota recall that at the time the Korean truce was entered into, some persons in public life were urging that it would be, in effect, absurd to enter into a truce in Korea upon the basis on which the truce was being entered into?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. I recall such statements being made right here in the Senate.

Mr. LONG. There are some today who say we never should have agreed to a truce in Korea, are there not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; and those same some, while on the one hand they regret the truce, point with justifiable political pride to the fact that the truce was concluded. They attempt to play both sides of the street.

Mr. LONG. If we are ever to arrive at a time when the shooting in the Chinese civil war in the Strait of Formosa will be stopped, and our forces and the enemy forces can be disengaged, there will have to be some negotiating again.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. LONG. Does it seem apparent to the Senator that perhaps we are appeasing some of our so-called friends by committing this Nation to a position which will make it very difficult for us ever to arrive at a possible settlement, honorably agreed to both by us and by those who oppose us today?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The perception of the junior Senator from Louisiana is exceeded only by his intellect and his knowledge of the situation. How right the Senator is. It is more important to have a united free world than it is to have a united political party. I think the duty of the administration is to achieve as much unity as is possible among our allies, and to rely upon the good sense and judgment of patriotic Senators to rally around the cause. We do not really need a united Republican Party or a united Democratic Party. We need enough people in both parties to see the need of strength to back up the free nations of the world. If there were less effort to appease within the local political framework, and more effort directed toward a more firm foreign policy, a policy which would yield strength, we would make considerably more progress.

I am one who believes, as I have said before, that our action in the Far East must be one of prudent caution, but also one of courage and determination.

Why do I make these statements? Because I am afraid there are some forces in the United States who feel that the only way in which Asia can be saved is to have a war on the Chinese mainland. I suggest to those persons that the Soviet Union and international communism, which sees great opportunities within Asia for Communist expansion, know full well that if the Soviet is to be a world power, convincing in its industry, its stability, and its economic ability, it must have, at least, a neutral Germany and a neutral Japan. So, as I have said, we ought to keep our eyes on the main scene.

I wish to make 1 or 2 further observations. I believe we must persist in the United Nations in the policy upon which we have set our course. I believe the United Nations offers to the United States the best opportunity in which to gain some sense of stability and tranquillity in the Asian area.

I know that we cannot act alone in that area. Not only do we not have strong allies in Asia, but we are constantly weakening ourselves among our allies in the European area. The farther we go with unilateral action, the more steps we take on our own with a weak partner alongside us; namely, only the Chinese Nationalist leadership, the more and more trouble we shall have in Asia, and the fewer friends we shall have in Europe.

It does us no good to say that we are disgusted with the people of India or with Mr. Nehru. The fact is that the Government of India represents the largest single democracy in the world, in terms of numbers. Mr. Nehru was elected by the people of India; but Chiang Kai-shek was never elected in Formosa. There has not been a national election in Formosa since the day the forces of Nationalist China landed there.

We find it easy to get along with the Nationalist Government of China on Formosa, but we find it difficult to get along with the leadership of India.

I am not taking up the cudgels for Mr. Nehru, his policies, or even his eccentricities. It is more important that the United States have a working, friendly relationship with India than it is to be bludgeoned by some political forces into a form of inflexible policy regarding Nationalist China. What we need to do is to be practical in our judgments.

To me the United Nations proposition to seek a cease-fire is the honorable, the sound, proposal that we need. I do not think we should act like a postman and renew it every week, but I think it should be left standing to show our good intentions, our wish for peace, and our willingness to talk about any pertinent matter.

Why do I say this? Because I am of the opinion that there are moves underway right now on the international scene to get us off into another one of these side conferences. If we get into another one of these international conferences outside the U. N., it will be an international conference or movement started by the Soviet Union, India, Great Britain, or perhaps 1 or 2 other countries. What are the chances of the United States of America and its policies receiving very much support in such an atmosphere? They would be negligible. I say our chances of getting a reasonably good settlement in the United Nations are infinitely better.

I ask my colleagues in the Senate to show me in the record a case in which the United States has ever suffered a defeat of its policies in the U. N. I ask them to show me where in a substantive and procedural matter we have not had an overwhelming majority of the members of the U. N. on our side. The only way the Soviet Union is able to trip us up on international diplomacy is when they get us out in some sideshow, in another international conference. There are persons who have condemned the United Nations as if it were a den of treason, when, in fact, it has been the best forum for American policy and action we have ever had. Soviet propaganda may be able to fool some people, but Soviet propaganda has not even won a single substantive and procedural issue in the United Nations. I think that is very good batting for the United Nations. That fact shows that when there are present persons of knowledge, experience, and background, the hoax, the fraud, and the hypocrisy of the Soviet propagandists are fully exposed and thereby not accepted. So I hope our Government will continue to pursue whatever course toward peaceful actions it seeks through the counsels of the United Nations. Furthermore, we are not estopped in the United Nations just because a veto power exists in the Security Council. We were able to amend the rules of the General Assembly so that we can take our problems to the General Assembly and, by a majority vote in the General Assembly, work out an effective program of collective security or collective action. That change in rules occurred as a result of the Korean war. The Soviet Union made a big mistake once of walking out of the Security Council. Just about a month after it walked out of the Security Council, lo and behold, the Security Council acted, which was the only time it so acted, with decision, dispatch, and definiteness when we presented the case of North Korean aggression. By unanimous vote, the Security Council voted North Korea to be the aggressor, and ordered collective action by the United Nations.

The Soviet Union quickly returned to the fold after it made that mistake, but former Secretary of State Acheson set about devising a plan whereby the veto power of the Security Council could be bypassed. He conceived a program and plan in the General Assembly whereby, even with the Soviet veto of sensible proposals in the Security Council, a proposal still could be gotten to the General Assembly, and action could be taken.

I only repeat, I hope and pray, and I believe, it is the policy of our Government to pursue, through the councils of the United Nations, whatever course of action may be desired in its objectives.

I warn our Government to beware of being enticed into international conferences under the wrong auspices, because if we should be so enticed, we would be likely to lose our shirt, as is said in some parts of the country. It would not be so bad if it were just our shirt that we would lose.

Mr. President, while attacks on Quemoy and Matsu are being made, and there exists a critical situation in the Formosan Straits, while all the blustering, the threats, and the intimidation of the Soviet Union are going on, what else do we see? We have witnessed changes in Soviet policy. After the death of Marshal Stalin, there were those persons who let the wish be the father of the thought in the hope that the Soviet would change. They hoped for such a change so much that they were almost willing to believe whatever propaganda came out of the Kremlin. To me that is a demonstration of immaturity and a lack of understanding of international communism.

Communism is not a person; it is an ideal, a system, an ideology, backed up by powerful forces and brute strength. Stalin could die 10 times, and that fact would not change what international communism is. Mr. Malenkov, Mr. Bulganin, and Mr. Khrushchev could die, and it would not change international communism. In communism there is a design for conquest. Literally an orthodox mechanism of political power has been developed. Those that run it are incidental except insofar as they are in control of the political apparatus. But many wanted to believe that the Soviet Union was going to become more peaceful. That was a good excuse for cutting the budget. Some of us in the Senate rose and warned repeatedly that the bear may change its head, but it never changes its disposition. The bear may change its strategy and tactics, but it never changes its objectives.

Not only that, but actually sometimes the Soviet Union gives us a lot of information about what it is going to do. Not once, but half a dozen times, this Senator has mentioned the 19th international congress of the Communist Party in Moscow in the month of September 1952. The congress was held while we were holding a national election here. Not many persons paid much attention to it. Even in that congress of the Communist leaders of the world, some of the objectives of communism were laid down. Marshal Stalin said at that time, which was just a few months before his death, that the No. 1 objective of the Soviet Union was to divide the United States from its allies. That objective has never been erased. The second man to speak at that congress was Malenkov. It was pointed out that an effort would be made to have an economic war entered into between the United States and its allies. Knowing that our trade picture was somewhat uncertain, knowing that our allies needed trade, and knowing that we in America were less desirous of having world trade, what did the administration do? When the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act should have been extended for 3 to 5 years, instead it was extended for only 1 year. We had people in high places promising that if the act was extended, nothing would be done under the act. A leading official of this Government said, "If you will extend the act for 1 year, we give you our word we will not do anything with the act or under the act."

I delivered a speech in the Senate in which I pointed out that the Soviet Union had signed over 40 trade agreements, and we had yet to sign but one. We wanted to believe that Russia was going to be more peace-loving, and there was all kinds of talk about coexistence. There was talk about the Soviet Union's having internal trouble. The Soviet Union has internal trouble, but they do not stand there talking about it. Those who cause internal trouble are liquidated. We do not do that. That is one big difference between a police State and a democracy.

Then we heard that the Soviet Union had to do something more about the production of consumer goods; and Mr. Malenkov had, as one of his programs, eased the economic pressures—in terms of consumer goods—upon the people. I think that was understandable, following the death of Stalin. Perhaps Malenkov had read a little about American politics, and had read a little, perhaps, to the effect that it is a good idea once in a while to sort of firm up yourself with your constituents. So a program of improved agriculture was at least announced to the world, and it was accompanied by the appointment of key Soviets to key positions—all in an effort to see that those things happened.

Incidentally, Mr. President, it is very interesting to observe that although we in the United States have been having a row about too much agricultural production and about our more productive and abundant agriculture, as if those things were the curse of our time, the Soviet Union has had as its major problem the failure of Russian agriculture to produce. So perhaps we should be grateful that our farm people have been able to meet production quotas, and then some; and we did not need any commissar to get them to do it, either. They were willing to do it on the basis of their own ability and capacity.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask my colleague to permit me to pursue this thought for a moment, please.

Mr. President, within recent weeks we have heard of another change. I wish to say that what happened today, in terms of the new dictator of the Soviet Union, should not have been unexpected. If we would only exercise as much foresight as we exercise hindsight, we would all be a lot better off by a darn sight, as someone has said. [Laughter.] For the past year there have been, in some of the European journals, and also in the American press, comments to the effect that a man by the name of Khrushchev seemed to be coming into power in Soviet Russia. In the last week, one of the leading American publications stated that although it is true that Mr. Khrushchev has been traveling around a great deal, and has been making addresses in Indochina and in Siberia, and has been attending the big meetings, yet Mr. Malenkov has just been letting him do all of that. Of course, Mr. President, such an arrangement may work in the United States, but in a dictatorship it is seldom that more than one person takes a bow at any one time. We heard continuously that a new force was coming into being in the Soviet Union—or, at least, that a new personality was coming into being there. This morning we learn from the newspapers that that personality has come to the forefront.

Mr. President, I should like to say a word or two about that personality. The man behind that man is Mr. Khrushchev; he is the one who is behind Marshal Bulganin. Who is Marshal Bulganin? Well, lest anyone have any doubts about it, Marshal Bulganin is not what might be called a regular military officer. Instead, he is a political-military officer. He was used by Marshal Stalin to police the armed forces of Soviet Russia—the Red army. Marshal Bulganin was the chief political commissar of the Red Army. He represents both the military and the Communist Party; both of them are represented in his one person. He has held a number of positions during the last 10 years; he is not new. He has been in official positions in the Soviet Government; and at times he has been in nonofficial positions, as an adviser on defense matters to the Central Politburo. Marshal Bulganin represents political control over the military establishment; and he is backed up by Mr. Khrushchev, who represents full control over the political establishment. When the political party and the military are united in one person, under a dictatorship, that shows the existence of about as close to a perfect police-state apparatus as could be obtained.

Furthermore, Marshal Bulganin is said to be a former member of the Russian secret police. He knows the policies of liquidation and the means thereof. So he is not only the master politician, and the political-military boss, but he incorporates in his person some of the talents of the late but not lamented—and I emphasize that he is not lamented—Beria, who was liquidated.

Mr. President, what does this mean to us? I suppose we can only engage in conjecture. Certainly we should have more information. As a Member of the Senate, I should like to know what our Government knows about these matters. As a Member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I wish to see what some of the scholars of Soviet propaganda and Soviet policy have to say about these things. How can we legislate properly if all we hear is what the Secretary of State wants to tell us? As one Member of the Senate, I have received communications from persons who told me, 2 months before Mr. Beria was liquidated, that he was on the block, ready for liquidation. Before the name of Khrushchev was in the American press to any great degree, one scholar of Soviet propaganda said to some of us who serve in the Senate, "Watch out for the rise of the Khrushchev star." And within the month, a gentleman who has been kind enough to communicate with me, off and on, about Soviet propaganda and political strategy, told me there was very likely to be a major change in the Soviet Government because of the rise of Mr. Khrushchev and the weakness of Mr. Malenkov.

Just read what Mr. Malenkov had to say, Mr. President. Then we see what is going to happen to him. He is reported as having said, "I admit my guilt and my unsatisfactory leadership."

Mr. President, the Soviet courts save time; the accused pleads guilty early in the proceedings. I will only say that Mr. Malenkov's position is precarious.

The Minister of Consumers Goods Production was removed from his job. Pravda, the official newspaper of the Communist Party, says that all this talk about consumer goods almost borders on treason. That should have been a sign in the wind, should it not?

I am saying this today, Mr. President, only because in the Foreign Relations Committee I have been engaged in hearings, as other members have, for two weeks; and during those hearings I have heard about Chiang Kai-shek, and I have heard about the 350,000 Nationalist Chinese troops on Formosa, but I have not heard about what is happening in the greatest military enemy America has ever had, the Soviet Union. Why don't our committees receive information from the State Department or the Central Intelligence Agency, about what is going on? Or are we concentrating all our attention on the morale of the 350,000 troops on Formosa? Do not misunderstand me, Mr. President; that is important too. But I think we have lost ourselves. We have been concentrating on the sideshow, at a time when the main show is ready to change acts.

I think the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations needs a special study committee on Soviet strategy and Soviet tactics. I think we should be calling upon our Government specialists and the scholars in our Nation—and we have plenty of them—who understand Communist tactics. Let us note that when Mr. Khrushchev yesterday walked into the joint session of the Supreme Soviet, he walked at the head of the parade.

In America we have persons who have spent 25 or 30 years studying nothing else than the placement or position of Soviet political personalities in pictures—the placement of certain Soviet political figures in photographs. Those students have noted where those political figures stand at a certain wedding or at someone's funeral, or the position in which they stand the next week in the Red Square, or their position at the time of a review of the Red army. In the United States we have students who understand the placement of various items in various parts of the Soviet newspapers. That may very well tell what is "in the works."

In America there are students in and out of Government who for 25 or 30 years have studied the Soviet language, and the translation of the idiomatic expression of the Russian into the language we read, the English language.

In other words, we not only need military intelligence to spot airfields on maps, but we need analytical intelligence, political intelligence, and understanding of what is going on. I am afraid we have not had quite enough of it in the Congress. This is not unexpected. We are not an old power in the field of diplomacy, but we had better learn fast, because time is running out.

With respect to the Soviet budget, I read in the American press that the Soviets are planning to increase their defense budget by 12 percent. Whom do they think they are kidding? I hope we are not being fooled. What I want to know is, What are the budgets of the satellites—Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Albania, Poland, and Hungary? Moreover, how much are the Soviets concealing in the budget, which they are not telling their own people or telling us?

We may very well ask ourselves what we should do at this moment. I think we had better follow some of the advice laid down by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] this afternoon. I know one thing. It does not sound very good for this Senator, on the very next legislative day after he votes for the Formosa resolution, to hear the Secretary of Defense say that Formosa is but a ripple, unless he really means that the attention of our State Department is being concentrated in other parts of the world, or at least a part of its attention.

I cannot put the picture together. I really cannot understand why it is necessary to be so firm and definite about our commitments in a certain area, and then to reduce our military strength.

I also believe that we had better be emphasizing something besides military strength. We cannot afford to be writing off any peoples. It would be very pleasant to know that we had the closest relationship with the people of Burma and the Government of Burma. There is a friendly relationship, but I wish it were better.

Further, I wish to point out that the second largest nation in Asia is India. I for one feel that we must exercise infinite patience, and at times have the boldest programs in that area, so as to enable the Indian people to save themselves from ultimate collapse. Much of this we ought to do through the United Nations Technical and Economic Assistance Program. Some of those nations will not accept our aid unilateral-

ly. But, however it needs to be done, let us do it. Then let us further step up our programs of information, understanding, and education. Let us become the chief exponent of the United Nations and its agencies and activities. The United Nations is located in this country. That gives us a glorious opportunity to talk and work in and for an organization which touches the lives of more people than any organization ever before created by man. Let us not fall into the Soviet trap by weakening the United Nations. Let us not fall into the habit of working our way out into other areas for international negotiation, if it can be avoided.

Mr. President, those are only a few observations. I have had some of these things on my mind for quite a little while, and I thought I would like to say them. I know that the Congress of the United States needs sound information, and needs more of it. I know that the American people need it too. I know that we need to know how strong we really are, and that we are basically a strong people. We ought to know that the leadership requires a knowledge of our own assets and liabilities.

In view of the developments we have seen in recent days, I hope that every effort will be made in the Congress to supplement our information. This is not to say that we should not rely upon that which comes from the executive departments. Indeed, we must. However, I think we would be better serving the American people if we should go out of our way to seek our own avenues of information, to try to find out what we can on our own, and see how our information compares with the official policy laid down by the executive departments. In that way we shall be able to give advice, as well as consent. In that way we shall be able to share the responsibility, rather than having to shoulder some of it without having a voice in the policy. I believe that the only way to bring about such a situation is for some of us to continue talking about the subject and working toward that end.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for an observation and a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was about to yield the floor, but I am glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The observation is that I have seldom heard a more penetrating or brilliant analysis of the problems which face the free world today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The question refers back to something which the Senator said about food. As I understand it, the history of the rise and fall of civilizations has been related to their success or lack of success in obtaining food. I also understand that today this country is the most fertile and prosperous country in the history of the world. In connection with the discussion of the question of the free world against the Communist conspiracy, does not the Senator consider it unfortunate that, at the same time we are, in effect, apparently losing some of our allies and some of our position in the free world, instead of producing all the food we can, we are increasing our controls in order to reduce the production of food?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say to the Senator that the hue and cry that has gone up about our God-given abundance of food, when half the world is barely on a subsistence diet, has never impressed me. I have always considered it false political crocodile tears.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I respect the Senator's opinion especially in this area, because of his great knowledge of the problems of agriculture.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to say also to the distinguished Senator from Missouri that recently he may have read articles in the paper dealing with the fact that the Department of Agriculture at long last has found a way of processing our butter into a product which is very palatable and useful and desirable in various areas of the Far East.

Of course, someone will say that that will cost money. My reply is that it also costs money to send guns abroad, and that those guns may some day be turned against us.

I should like to point out also that processes are available today, which are commercially feasible and commercially proven, by which wheat is converted into a cereal grain which can be used as a substitute for rice, and that that substitute has far more nutritional value and is actually cheaper in cost than the rice.

If we used as much imagination with respect to the use of our God-given abundance of food that we use in complaining about them, we would solve half of our world problems.

I regret that sometimes we get ourselves into a position of "politicking" about this abundance of food. For the life of me I cannot understand why we should complain about a few extra bales of cotton, a few extra gallons of vegetable oil, or a few extra bushels of cereal grains or feed grains, in a world in which food is the primary basic need and deficiency of a majority of the people of the world.

I am pleased by the way our agriculture has performed. It has performed well indeed. Would it not be wonderful if we could get the information behind the Iron Curtain that a free agriculture, composed of family farms, has out-produced in every way the collective agriculture of state planning? Let us make no mistake about the fact that the peasantry of Europe and the great farm people of the United States and of Canada are the backbone of a free society. They are the last ones who yield to the omnipotent power of the totalitarian state.

Stalin found out about it, and history records the fact that even Hitler could never regiment the German farmer.

One of the great assets we have today in the cold war—and it will also be an asset in any hot war we may get into—is the productive capacity and the production in being—just like forces in being, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Missouri—ready and available. That production is not excessive in view of the kind of world we live in.

We may well need that so-called excess food if things get out of hand.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 9, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 8, 1955:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran, vice Loy W. Henderson.

IN THE ARMY

Lt. Gen. Anthony Clement McAuliffe, O12263, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), for appointment as commander in chief, United States Army, Europe, with the rank of general and as general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 8, 1955:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Charles C. Finucane, of the State of Washington, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Albert Pratt, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION

Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, United States Army, retired, to be a member of the National Security Training Commission; remainder of the term expiring June 19, 1956.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

TO BE MEMBERS OF THE FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BOARD, FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION, FOR TERMS OF 6 YEARS FROM DECEMBER 1, 1954

Harlan Bruce Munger, of New York.
George P. Daley, of Minnesota.

IN THE ARMY

The officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (Public Law 476, 82d Cong.), to date from December 8, 1954:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. LeRoy Hagen Anderson, O239452.
Brig. Gen. Claude Thomas Bowers, O183291.
Brig. Gen. James Francis Cantwell, O396657.
Brig. Gen. Clyde Emerson Dougherty, O190855.
Brig. Gen. Charles Lyn Fox, O154765.
Brig. Gen. Roy Albert Green, O226513.
Brig. Gen. John David Higgins, O152439.
Brig. Gen. Hugh Stanford McLeod, O143285.
Brig. Gen. John Williams Morgan, O140899.
Brig. Gen. Ralph Albert Palladino, O232912.
Brig. Gen. Russell Archibald Ramsey, A215598.
Brig. Gen. Isidor Schwaner Ravdin, O399712.
Brig. Gen. Herbert Norman Schwarzkopf, O190484.

Brig. Gen. Albert Hummel Stackpole, O103158.
Brig. Gen. William Miles Stokes, Jr., O166391.
Brig. Gen. Carl Thomas Sutherland, O258676.
Brig. Gen. Lamar Tooze, O107927.
Brig. Gen. Frederick Marshall Warren, O266247.
Brig. Gen. Warren Claypool Wood, O295588.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Otwa Tilden Autry, O332367, Artillery, National Guard of the United States.
Col. Ernest Oscar Black, O293790, Artillery, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Aloysius Maximius Brumbaugh, O225777, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Louis Henry Charbonneau, O142965, Infantry, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Harold Richard Duffie, O126221, Transportation Corps, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Robert Ernest Frankland, O277098, Artillery, National Guard of the United States.
Col. Thomas Fuller, O248411, Transportation Corps, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Robert Morgan Jones, O270821, Infantry, United States Army Reserve.
Col. John Harry LaBrum, O909644, Signal Corps, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Frank Lawrence Lazarus, O242867, Artillery, United States Army Reserve.
Col. James Bryant Mason, O219601, Medical Corps, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Charles Sumner McCormick, Jr., O332054, Transportation Corps, United States Army Reserve.
Col. John Adair McEwan, O280352, Artillery, United States Army Reserve.
Col. George Augustus Morris, O266651, Corps of Engineers, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Henry George Nulton, O205635, Infantry, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Charles William O'Bryant, O328896, Infantry, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Almerin Cartwright O'Hara, O328935, Infantry, National Guard of the United States.
Col. Charles Adam Ott, Jr., O428375, Artillery, National Guard of the United States.
Col. Maston Samuel Parham, O299244, Infantry, National Guard of the United States.
Col. Don Archibold Parkhurst, O284478, Corps of Engineers, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Manfred Ullman Prescott, O224176, Medical Corps, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Philip George Rettig, O903151, Corps of Engineers, United States Army Reserve.
Col. William Thomas Rice, O320906, Transportation Corps, United States Army Reserve.
Col. William Edwards Roberts, O233906, Artillery, National Guard of the United States.
Col. Forrest Lee Roe, O226907, Artillery, National Guard of the United States.
Col. James Earl Rudder, O294916, Infantry, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Clifford LeRoy Sayre, O201040, Chemical Corps, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Carlton Kimball Smith, O231996, Infantry, National Guard of the United States.
Col. Alden Earl Stilson, O320041, Corps of Engineers, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Louis Frank William Stuebe, O170245, Artillery, United States Army Reserve.
Col. James Strom Thurmond, O191221, staff specialist, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Morgan Montrose Wallace, O275387, Artillery, United States Army Reserve.
Col. Clyde Jefferson Watts, O269820, Artillery, United States Army Reserve.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The nominations of George N. Anderson and 688 other officers for promotion in the Regular Army, which were received by the Senate on January 21, 1955, were confirmed today, and may be found printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 21, 1955, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of George N. Anderson, which is shown on page 595 and ending with the name of Andrew W. Zulli, Jr., which occurs on page 598.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Bartholomew W. Hogan, Medical Corps, United States Navy, to be Surgeon General and Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery in the Department of the Navy, for a term of 4 years.

Vice Adm. Ralph A. Ofstie, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

Vice Adm. Thomas S. Combs, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Air).

Rear Adm. Harold P. Smith, United States Navy, to be Director of Budget and Reports in the Department of the Navy, for a term of 3 years.

Adm. John E. Gingrich, United States Navy, retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

Vice Adm. Murrey L. Royar, Supply Corps, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Chief of Naval Material.

Rear Adm. Ralph J. Arnold, Supply Corps, United States Navy, to be Paymaster General and Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts in the Department of the Navy, for a term of 4 years.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the line and staff corps indicated:

Line

John H. Sides	Edwin T. Layton
Victor D. Long	Frederick R. Furth
Henry Crommelin	Robert L. Swart
Redfield Mason	Schuyler N. Pyne
Edward N. Parker	Robert E. Cronin
Edmund B. Taylor	Chester C. Smith
Frederick B. Warder	Harold O. Larson
George C. Wright	Thomas Burrowes
David M. Tyree	Donald C. Varian
Lewis S. Parks	Albert E. Jarrell
Willard K. Goodney	William G. Beecher, Jr.
Frederick N. Kivette	Charles H. Lyman, III
Ira E. Hobbs	Paul D. Stroop
Harry H. Henderson	Fitzhugh Lee
Joseph H. Wellings	Frank O'Beirne
Joseph M. Carson	Francis D. McCorkle
Charles F. Chillingworth, Jr.	Elton W. Grenfell
John Sylvester	Charles A. Buchanan
John M. Taylor	William G. Cooper
James S. Russell	Clifford H. Duerfeldt
Henry C. Bruton	George C. Weaver
Robert B. Pirie	Albert G. Mumma

Medical Corps

James R. Fulton
Ocie B. Morrison, Jr.

Supply Corps

Lloyd H. Thomas
Joel D. Parks
William L. Knickerbocker

Civil Engineer Corps

William Sihler

Dental Corps

Ralph W. Taylor

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Brig. Gen. Raymond A. Anderson, United States Marine Corps, to be Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps, with the rank of major general, for a period of 2 years from February 1, 1955.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, may we be very conscious of the clear and unmistakable leading of Thy spirit, as, in these perilous days, we are considering how best to defend our freedom and maintain the sanctity and safety of our Republic.

Grant that in the midst of all of life's bewildering problems we may be numbered among those who are working zealously and waiting patiently and hopefully for the dawning of a new and better day.

We pray that, when the dark moods of fear and anxiety haunt us and disturb our peace, we may encourage ourselves and our fellow men with the assurance that Thou art our God, sovereign and supreme, transcendent and triumphant.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on February 7, 1955, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2010. An act to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 84)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

For the consideration of the Congress, I herewith propose a plan of Federal cooperation with the States, designed to give our schoolchildren as quickly as possible the classrooms they must have.

Because of the magnitude of the job, but more fundamentally because of the undeniable importance of free education to a free way of life, the means we take to provide our children with proper classrooms must be weighed most carefully. The phrase "free education" is a deliberate choice. For unless education continues to be free—free in its response to local community needs, free from any suggestion of political domination, and free from impediments to the pursuit of knowledge by teachers and students—it will cease to serve the purposes of freemen.

STATE AND LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR EDUCATION

A distinguishing characteristic of our Nation—and a great strength—is the de-

velopment of our institutions within the concept of individual worth and dignity. Our schools are among the guardians of that principle. Consequently, and deliberately, their control and support throughout our history have been, and are, a State and local responsibility.

The American idea of universal public education was conceived as necessary in a society dedicated to the principles of individual freedom, equality, and self-government. A necessary corollary is that public schools must always reflect the character and aspiration of the people of the community.

Thus was established a fundamental element of the American public school system—local direction by boards of education responsible immediately to the parents of children and the other citizens of the community. Diffusion of authority among tens of thousands of school districts is a safeguard against centralized control and abuse of the educational system that must be maintained. We believe that to take away the responsibility of communities and States in educating our children is to undermine not only a basic element of our freedom but a basic right of our citizens.

The legislative proposals submitted to the last Congress were offered by the administration in the earnest conviction that education must always be close to the people; in the belief that a careful reassessment by the people themselves of the problems of education is necessary; and with a realization of the growing financial difficulties that school districts face. To encourage a nationwide examination of our schools, the 83d Congress authorized funds for conferences on education in the 48 States and the Territories and for a White House conference to be held in November this year.

THE CURRENT PROBLEM

These are the facts of the classroom shortage:

The latest information submitted by the States to the Office of Education indicates that there is a deficit of more than 300,000 classrooms, a legacy—in part—of the years of war and defense mobilization when construction had to be curtailed. In addition, to keep up with mounting enrollments, the Nation must build at least 50,000 new elementary and high school classrooms yearly. It must also replace the thousands of classrooms which become unsafe or otherwise unusable each year.

During the current school year, about 60,000 new classrooms are being built. Capital outlays for public school construction will reach an alltime high of $2 billion this year. During the last 5 years, new construction costing over $7 billion has provided new classrooms for 6,750,000 pupils in our public schools. During that time more than 5½ million additional children enrolled in school. Thus the rate of construction has more than kept pace with mounting enrollment. But it has only slightly reduced the total classroom deficit.

As a consequence, millions of children still attend schools which are unsafe or which permit learning only part-time or under conditions of serious overcrowding. To build satisfactory classrooms for all our children, the current rate of school building must be multiplied sharply and this increase must be sustained.

Fundamentally, the remedy lies with the States and their communities. But the present shortage requires immediate and effective action that will produce more rapid results. Unless the Federal Government steps forward to join with the States and communities, this emergency situation will continue.

Therefore—for the purpose of meeting the emergency only and pending the results of the nationwide conferences—I propose a broad effort to widen the accepted channels of financing school construction and to increase materially the flow of private lending through them—without interference with the responsibility of State and local school systems. Over the next 3 years, this proposed effort envisages a total of $7 billion put to work building badly needed new schools—in addition to construction expenditures outside these proposals.

THE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Bond purchases by the Federal Government:

The first recommendation is directed at action—effective as rapidly as school districts can offer bonds to the public for sale.

I recommend that legislation be enacted authorizing the Federal Government, cooperating with the several States, to purchase school bonds issued by local communities which are handicapped in selling bonds at a reasonable interest rate. This proposal is sound educationally and economically. It will help build schools.

To carry out this proposal, I recommend that the Congress authorize the appropriation of $750 million for use over the next 3 years.

2. State school building agencies:

Many school districts cannot borrow to build schools because of restrictive debt limits. They need some other form of financing. Therefore, the second proposal is designed to facilitate immediate construction of schools without local borrowing by the school district.

To expand school construction, several States have already created special statewide school building agencies. These can borrow advantageously, since they represent the combined credit of many communities. After building schools, the agency rents them to school districts. The local community under its lease gets a new school without borrowing.

I now propose the wider adoption of this tested method of accelerating school construction. Under this proposal, the Federal Government would share with the States in establishing and maintaining for State school building agencies an initial reserve fund equal to 1 year's payment on principal and interest.

The State school-building agency—working in cooperation with the State educational officials—would issue its bonds through the customary investment channels, then build schools for lease to local school districts. Rentals would be sufficient to cover the payments on principal and interest of the bonds outstanding; a payment to a supplemental reserve fund; and a proportionate share of the administrative expenses of the State school-building agency. In time, the payments to the reserve fund would permit repayment of the initial Federal and State advances. When all its financial obligations to the agency are met, the local school district takes title to its building.

I recommend that the Congress authorize the necessary Federal participation to put this plan into effect so that State building agencies may be in a position to issue bonds in the next 3 years which will build $6 billion worth of new schools.

3. Grants for school districts with proved need and lack of local income:

My first message to the Congress on the state of the Union stated the view that "the firm conditions of Federal aid must be proved need and proved lack of local income." In my judgment, any sound program of grants must adhere to this principle. Some school districts meet the conditions. In them the amount of taxable property and local income is so low as to make it impossible for the district either to repay borrowed money or rent a satisfactory school building.

I now propose a program of grants-in-aid directed clearly and specifically at the urgent situations in which the Federal Government can justifiably share direct construction costs without undermining State and local responsibility. Under this proposal the Federal Government would share with the States part of the cost of building schools in districts where one of the following conditions is met:

(a) The school district, if it has not reached its legal bonding limit, cannot sell its bonds to the Federal Government under proposal 1 because it cannot pay interest and principal charges on the total construction costs.

(b) The school district, if it has reached its legal bonding limit, is unable to pay the rent needed to obtain a school from a State agency on a lease-purchase basis, as described in proposal 2.

The State would certify the school district's inability to finance the total construction cost through borrowing or a rental arrangement. It would also certify that the new school is needed to relieve extreme overcrowding, double shifts, or hazardous or unhealthful conditions.

The Federal and State aid would be in an amount sufficient for a school district to qualify under either proposal 1 or proposal 2 for financing the remainder of the building costs. The requirement that Federal funds be matched with State-appropriated funds is an essential safeguard to preservation of the proper spheres of local, State, and Federal responsibility in the field of public education.

By authorizing this program of joint Federal-State aid to supplement the financing plans set forth in proposals 1 and 2, a workable way will be provided for every community in the Nation to construct classrooms for its children. I

recommend that the Congress authorize the appropriation of $200 million for a 3-year program.

4. Grants for administrative costs of State programs:

In addition to immediate school construction, the Nation needs to plan sound long-term financing of the public schools free from obsolete restrictions. Our State conferences on education will help accomplish this. Out of these meetings of parents, teachers, and public-spirited citizens can come lasting solutions to such underlying problems as more efficient school districting and the modification of unduly restrictive local debt limits.

The Federal Government, having helped sponsor the State conferences on education, should now move to help the States in carrying out such recommendations as may be made. I propose, therefore, that the Federal Government furnish one-half of the administrative costs of State programs which are designed to overcome obstacles to local financing or to provide additional State aid to local school districts.

For this purpose I recommend a total authorization of $20 million with an appropriation of $5 million for the first year of a 3-year period.

This program is sound and equitable. It accelerates construction of classrooms within the traditional framework of local responsibility for our schools. It does not preclude other proposals for long-range solutions which undoubtedly will grow out of the State conferences and the White House Conference on Education.

CONCLUSION

The best possible education for all our young people is a fixed objective of the American Nation. The four-point program, herein outlined, would help provide proper physical housing for the achievement of this objective. But the finest buildings, of themselves, are no assurance that the pupils who use them are each day better fitted to shoulder the responsibilities, to meet the opportunities, to enjoy the rewards that one day will be their lot as American citizens.

Good teaching and good teachers made even the 1-room crossroads schools of the 19th century a rich source of the knowledge and enthusiasm and patriotism, joined with spiritual wisdom, that mark a vigorously dynamic people. Today, the professional quality of American teaching is better than ever. But too many teachers are underpaid and overworked, and, in consequence, too few young men and women join their ranks. Here is a shortage, less obvious but ultimately more dangerous, than the classroom shortage.

The conferences now under way and the massive school-building program here proposed will, I believe, arouse the American people to a community effort for schools and a community concern for education, unparalleled in our history. Taken together, they will serve to advance the teaching profession to the position it should enjoy.

Federal aid in a form that tends to lead to Federal control of our schools could cripple education for freedom. In no form can it ever aproach the mighty effectiveness of an aroused people. But Federal leadership can stir America to national action.

Then the Nation's objective of the best possible education for all our young people will be achieved.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 8, 1955.*

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 85)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, a report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems submitted to me through its chairman, covering its operations from October 1, 1953, to June 30, 1954, and describing, in accordance with section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the period April 1-June 30, 1954.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 8, 1955.*

EXTENDING UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 133 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3005) to further amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending the authority to induct certain individuals, and to extend the benefits under the Dependents Assistance Act to July 1, 1959. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, as the resolution indicates, this is an open rule providing for 2 hours of general debate on the bill to extend the Selective Service Act for a period of 4 years.

We had a very interesting session and gained quite a bit of information before the Committee on Rules when the distinguished chairman and other members of that committee appeared before the Rules Committee seeking this place on the calendar. Briefly speaking, the bill would extend the Selective Service Act for 4 years and provide for some two amendments that were not in the old law regarding which I shall not go into much detail. Briefly they affect the National Guard and the status of veterans. I am particularly interested in the provision affecting the National Guard, because I think it gives that splendid organization recognition which it justly deserves. I am sure these two amendments will be discussed at length.

On the overall picture of the Selective Service Act itself and the necessity for the continuation of that law, I think there can be no disagreement.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. There can be disagreement over the extent of the time to which the law is extended, 4 years, can there not?

Mr. COLMER. Of course, the gentleman or anybody else can disagree with my statement, and I even go so far as to anticipate that there will be disagreement on the time to which it is extended. I can understand that, but that was not what I had reference to; I had reference to the necessity for the extension of the draft law, and I am sure the question of the time limit will be debated. On the other hand, may I say to my friend in that connection that in the absence of some other provision or an adequate reserve of military strength I fear that we are going to be burdened with this for many years to come.

In the absence of some other provision for an adequate reserve strength, a military force, for this country, I cannot see that we can extend it for much less than 4 years. As a matter of fact, as just one of the garden variety Members of the House, not one who sets himself up as an expert but one who has given an awful lot of thought and study to this question and who has expressed his convictions on this many times from the well of this House, I cannot see, despite of what we understand happened or possibly I should say what we do not understand happened in Moscow on yesterday or maybe a month ago and we are just hearing about it now, that we are going to be relieved of this intense financial manpower burden in the foreseeable future. As long as that little band of willful men in the Kremlin are in power or those of like ilk, we are going to be faced with the necessity of maintaining a reasonable armed force in this country, and I use the word "reasonable" advisedly because I think the greatest mistake we could make would be to go into an all-out effort to build up the military strength of this country upon an all-out war basis and keep that

force indefinitely for the very simple reason, in my humble judgment, that these Russian masters want to require us to spend ourselves into bankruptcy. Therefore we could not play better into their hands than by trying to do that very thing. That is my considered opinion; and I am very much pleased over the fact that more and more of those in authority in our military as well as in our civilian life are coming to this point of view.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I was very much pleased a few days ago when I noted that the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House, the able gentleman from Georgia, came out with a statement that he is going along with the President's recommendation, the recommendation of our Commander in Chief, upon a cutback in the standing Army. I think that is sound and I think our distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services is on sound ground when he says he is going to back the President on that move. That is in line with the philosophy I have been advocating here for some time. Certainly if we cannot trust the President of the United States who is a military man in reference to these military matters, I do not know whom else we can trust.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I was very glad to hear this statement from the gentleman just now because of the fact that as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, with those of us who have been in the recent days privileged to listen off and on the record from the Secretary of Defense and the various heads of our Military Establishment, having heard also on and off the record statements from our high military leaders, I adopt the same position the gentleman does in establishing the Armed Forces in the pattern to be set forth for the future.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Can the gentleman give us an idea as to where the line of defense will be, or is? I mean, the extent of it.

Mr. COLMER. Of course, my friend, who is so much more learned in all matters generally than I am—and I say that in all seriousness——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, the gentleman's sarcasm is all wasted. I want to know——

Mr. COLMER. I am sorry. I yielded to the gentleman for a question, and I want to yield to him further if he wants to say anything, but let me just finish.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did I not ask a sensible question?

Mr. COLMER. May I finish?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did I not ask a sensible question?

Mr. COLMER. And then I will be glad to yield to the gentleman for a question. I said that I cannot set myself up as a military authority, but I do say to my friend from Michigan that I think this Congress was wise in backing up the President the other day in asking for the authority that he asked upon the Formosan issue. Does the gentleman want to ask me anything further?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes. My question was, growing out of my dumbness, as the gentleman has inferred——

Mr. COLMER. No; I did not.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Just where are these men who are to be drafted going to be sent, or where are they to fight, in order to maintain what particular line of defense? Where? It was on the Rhine in one war, and now it is on Formosa, apparently. Now, what are these men to do? I mean, how far do they go? how long do they fight? and what is the objective?

Mr. COLMER. Now, if I may reply to my friend's question, I certainly had no idea——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, that is all right with me. I do not care anything about that part of it——

Mr. COLMER. That I was trying to infer that the gentleman was dumb. We all know to the contrary. So much for the personalities.

Now, to answer the gentleman's question, did the gentleman support the resolution that stated the other day that we would defend Formosa?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That we would?

Mr. COLMER. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is not the question that I asked the gentleman.

Mr. COLMER. I am asking the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You answer my question first.

Mr. COLMER. I asked him, did he not support that resolution?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, I did not, and I did not vote against it. I did not vote. I want to know what our policy is, whether it is the policy of the Armed Forces or whether, as the committee over in the Senate unanimously reported, the next war is to be run by the politicians. That is what I want to know.

Mr. COLMER. Of course, I learned long ago not to get into an argument with the gentleman, and I would not undertake to get into an argument now.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not want an argument.

Mr. COLMER. If the gentleman did not know how to vote on that question the other day, I do not see how I can answer his question now.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I had my reason for not voting the other day, and I explained it.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi has explained the rule which is presently before us most ably, and I think effectively, and I do not know of anyone opposed to the rule. However, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a report on the presentation to former President Hoover of the silver quill award and the address made in response thereto by Mr. Hoover. I further ask unanimous consent that should the printing require more than the usual amount permitted, that it be printed notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL AID FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower has apparently come up with the solution to that long-standing problem of Federal aid to education without Federal control of education. The administration's school-construction proposals are as imaginative as they are simple; they are as constructive as they are revolutionary.

Here for the first time, a President of the United States has presented a Federal plan which will function within the historic constitutional concept of State control of education.

For years we have been faced with critical problems in education, of which a shortage of school buildings is not one of the least.

There has been much talk in and out of Congress on a plan to meet the needs of the boys and girls in every State of this Nation. There have been some suggestions presented here. But they have been defeated because they were unsound.

The President has presented today a new approach to the problem of school construction in this country. It is well to note, first of all, that no violence is done to local and State responsibility.

The local school districts are going to construct and control their school building with a minimum of Federal interference. The States will determine the building standards and will retain authority in local and State bond issues. In the first proposal, only when school bonds are not purchased by private investors will the Government enter into the picture. There is no attempt here to deprive those who want a safe investment from buying school bonds.

Under the lease-purchase plan, the States will set up the agency to build the schools, while the local district rents the building. This is no giveaway program. The rent will include payment for the annual debt service, cost of maintenance, repair, replacement, insurance, and so forth. This is simply helping our people to help themselves.

We must recognize, however, that there are, in this expansive country of ours, boys and girls growing into the full obligations of American citizenship in communities too poor to provide adequate schools by bond issues or by rentals. In these children, too, we are

deeply interested. In these cases we propose to cooperate with the States in financing school facilities so that every child maturing in our Nation does secure that great national heritage of an equal opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, the President's program is most encouraging in its fresh approach to a complicated and controversial matter. It is a historic departure from past refusals to assist in helping the youth of the Nation. We are proud of the moral leadership demonstrated by the President here today. We must build more classrooms. Here is a simple, sound constitutional plan which preserves local control but helps where help is needed.

Many new schools are being built without any Federal assistance. For that we are proud and thankful. But the President's proposal today is a step in the direction of granting to all children in all the Nation the blessings of an opportunity to learn.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] was addressing the House, I asked a question. In substance, the question was that, inasmuch as he was supporting the bill before the House, he advise the House as to the necessity for drafting every physically and mentally fit young American into the armed services; that is, as to where, for what purpose, they would be used to engage in combat and when, after being so engaged, they might know that their task had been accomplished.

He came back with the statement that, inasmuch as I did not know how to vote on the resolution authorizing the President to use the Armed Forces to retain Formosa and adjacent territory after the Chinese Communists had announced that they intended to take it, he was not able to answer my question.

In my judgment, the two issues are not necessarily connected in any way. However, I have not the slightest hesitancy in giving my reasons for standing silent when the roll was called.

The so-called Formosa resolution was a declaration of war, contingent only upon the determination of the President as to when the actual fighting should begin.

Not only because the Constitution provides that only the Congress shall declare war, but because I believe that the people's representatives should decide that issue, I did not believe that I should shirk my responsibility to my constituents and leave it to a President, acting perhaps upon the recommendations of the State Department to decide when and where we should engage in world war IV.

If, last week, when that resolution was before the House, the Congress was not prepared to declare war, why should it shirk its responsibility, shove the issue over to the President?

Well might I have asked the gentleman and all others who supported the Formosa resolution whether they—yes, each of them—was personally willing to, on that occasion, have declared war. And, in addition, whether they would have declared war against China or against China and Russia?

For myself, before I vote to declare war, I want to know, if that is possible, whether the war in which we are about to engage is to be conducted by the military authorities or by the State Department.

It would also be helpful to know whether our drafted men are to fight under the Stars and Stripes or under the flag of the United Nations—whether they are to be ordered into battle by some officer of the U. N.—who it may well be cannot even speak our language.

We have the unanimous report of a committee from the Senate—4 Republicans and 3 Democrats—which unequivocally states that we did not win the war in Korea because the politicians dictated our policy.

Men died—many—perhaps thousands because that was permitted. I want no more of that.

If we are to fight the Communists; if that is necessary to promote the welfare of our people or make secure the future of our Nation, all right, I will vote for that, but I want no more of a war to fatten the purses of the moneychangers or the ambition of an Old World politician.

Permit me to add that, if we are to declare war, I would prefer that we fight our real enemy—Russia—and not the Chinese Communists.

Before the Congress declares war, in my judgment it should be advised, and fully advised, as to the reasons for the war and as to the objectives sought.

It should also be told in terms which it can understand and which the drafted men can understand, just what must be accomplished by our Armed Forces before the objective has been attained.

Before I vote for a declaration of war, I want to know where our men are to be sent and the goal they are to reach.

Before I vote to take 8 years out of a young man's life, draft him to fight under the flag of the United Nations for objectives which that organization may have in mind, I must know whether they are to fight for home and country or whether they are to fight for the establishment of the policies of some self-seeking international politicians.

Perhaps what has been said will give you some idea as to why I could not vote for that resolution.

Perhaps you want to know now why I did not vote against it. A vote in opposition to the request would undoubtedly have been interpreted by Communists and their supporters as a repudiation of the administration; that, in my judgment, we should not at any time or for any cause wage war against the Communists.

To that position—that policy—I do not subscribe. There may at any time arise a situation which will make it necessary to declare war against the Communists.

It is my hope that before that day comes—and I hope it will never come—our State Department or whoever speaks for the administration will, as I have before attempted to make clear, tell our people just what objective we seek, and just how far we are going under the direction of the United Nations.

I am all through supporting any and every move which internationally minded politicians may think will best serve their interests.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to get into an argument involving the discontinuance of the draft law at this time. I want to talk on some matters involved in the draft law as it is now proposed to be extended.

I have always tried to be a reasonable man. I have tried to be as practical as possible. I am perfectly aware of conditions in this world. I am aware of the fact that a great Nation such as ours cannot afford to take chances either with its liberty, its institutions, or its people. So the discontinuance issue is not here. I want to discuss something that is closer to the people, that is a practical, every-day matter with which the people come in contact.

My distinguished friend, the chairman of the committee [Mr. VINSON] is a great leader in this House. He can hold hearings in the most quiet manner and in the shortest space of time, but he is very effective. I intended presenting this matter before the Committee on Armed Services. Probably it was due to my carelessness, at least to some extent, but the hearings were opened and they closed before I knew they were opened. Being a chairman of a committee myself, it is difficult to find the time to either keep up with or do everything I would like. I could not get a copy of the hearings because they did not come off the press until yesterday. So that, in a way, accounts for my imposing myself upon the House at this time.

I think before we begin to talk about continuing this act for 4 years that we had probably better look back behind us and measure a few of the tracks made by Selective Service and the Defense Department—which according to a letter I received today is fast approaching the point of being one and the same.

Personally, the 4-year period I think is unnecessary; and to some extent it is an admission that we must be and must remain upon the brink of war the rest of our lives. God grant that will not become true.

I think the 2 years' stretching was done as another nibble on the program that this House has once before turned down, so when this bill comes into the Committee of the Whole for consideration I shall support an amendment to limit the renewal to 2 years. I think 2 years is long enough, and I have not found any justification for more. Once this House gives away authority, I have never seen it come back. I hope some day I will see a little dribble back. I am sure the American people concur in this hope, for after all when we give away power and so forth; that is, power rights and so forth of the American people.

What brings me here? We have just listened to a message from the President

of the United States in which he depicts a pretty bad picture relative to the field of education. We are all interested in education, every one of us. We know the contribution that education has made to America militarily, scientifically, socially, economically, and in every other way. Yet for the last few years we have been guilty of frustrating, stirring up, mixing up, and discouraging boys from attending college, and I think unnecessarily.

When this Nation is at war or in a national crisis and the chips are down, all bets should be called off, certainly, because we should defend America with everything we have, including our lives; and I am for that, make no mistake about it. But I fear that we have not sought very energetically to find a way to help the kid who wants an education for himself in order that he may be able to make a greater contribution to his country, and the welfare of not only his country but the world.

There is no need to talk about freeing the world unless we are going to free the boys and the men and the people of the world from the shackles of ignorance. You cannot do it. If you do free them, it will not be long before they will lose it again.

I have a suggestion I think will work. This morning I talked over long-distance phone with a dean of one of the finest institutions in America and one of the largest. I said, "What is uppermost in the minds of the young men who come in to discuss their problems with you?" He said, "Congressman, they want to know whether they should stay in or go on and get through the military, or just quit. They have gotten another notice that if so and so and so and so does not happen they leave, and that so often happens just before examinations."

He said, "It is bad, but the colleges of the country have refrained from emphasizing that because there is a great danger of the colleges being misunderstood, and some would think that they are not wholeheartedly behind the program of defense and do not want to make their contribution."

My suggestion now, and I think it is worthy of being explored by the committee, is that we should not take a boy year by year, and say he can be deferred next year if he is in the upper half. Some of the highest ranking generals in the Pentagon would have never been deferred because they were in the lower half of their class. But in the next year, they have to be in the upper half again. Oh, how feeble are we to pass upon and evaluate the contribution that a man can make at so tender an age as 18 or 19, and to say, "If you do not make such and such a grade, the War Department says, 'Out you go, you are not worthy of an education'." That is the answer.

I do not want the colleges, of course, to become a refuge for anyone to avoid any proper or patriotic service to the country. But listen to this. A boy could go into the service in June and serve 3 months, come out, and then go to college and come out in June, serve 3 months, and at the end of his 4-year college course, he would be a freshly trained man for 4 years. He will have been available for 4 years. If it is necessary for him to go another year, then all right. But now you say, "Well, can he be trained in that time?" Certainly, he can. The United States Marine Corps can make some of the best soldiers on the face of this earth in 8 weeks. If the United States Army cannot do it, then why not? That is their training period.

There is another point with reference to that. Let me read this to you, and this comes from the Department of the Army, the office of The Adjutant General, signed by William E. Bergin, who is a major general of the United States Army. This is the record of a boy who went in the service on March 6 and was killed in Korea on August 27 of the same year. Listen to this:

He was trained from March 14 to June 20 when he left to go over.

During that time—

Here is how the general gives the description of his training—

His records indicate that he was qualified in the use of M1's, carbines, and light machine guns. While undergoing training with the 8th Infantry Division, he completed the following basic courses—infiltration, close combat, overhead artillery fire and combat maneuvers.

All of that was accomplished in 3 months and 10 days, and he was off and in another month he was killed.

Now I do not have just this one case where they were killed after 4 or 4½ months, even though every one of you remember the guaranty given this Congress by the Defense Department that no man would be sent into combat with less than 6 months' training, when they were calling for 17-year-old boys. So I say when the high brass tell me they cannot train a man and give him good training in 90 days, then they have to take back all they said about making 90-day-wonder officers—the kind that served over me—and the kind that have served over servicemen right on through the ages. You say, "Why just pick out that group?" No. You can take any group. The agricultural boy. He can take 3 months in the wintertime when agricultural activities are light and put his time in. You can take the manufacturing plants where the off-season time occurs, and they can select that time also. Why some of them take 2 or 3 months off anyway. Then, too, all of them may have the chance to go in and serve the full length of time if they want to do so. I do not think that it is absolutely necessary in order to make the draft work to do everything against somebody's wishes. We might at least fit it in a little bit and make it as convenient as possible.

Now we have had some other things to come up in this draft, and we might just as well thrash it out right here. There is no sensible, practical, fair or decent handling of hardship cases. I have had some cases called to my attention that made my blood run cold. I have talked to the colonel in charge of the State of North Carolina, and I sometimes think icewater flows through his veins. He apparently does not know what a hardship case is, nor is he interested in knowing what a hardship case is, and I have told him those very words to his face. And may I add this: I am certainly not the only member of the North Carolina delegation who has very little respect for his administration of the selective service law. But he is still head man and if you do not believe it, ask him or General Hershey, who will not only defend anything he does but attempts to justify it. The State selective service director is absolute dictator over the local boards and the local boards who render a patriotic service without pay have to take the blame.

His answer was, "Well, Congress has not given us any money for investigation. I did not know that case was that bad. I had no way of investigating it. We depended on somebody sending up the information." I must confess he was right. He should have more staff; he should have investigators. I say give him investigators, give him the necessary staff and help. Give him some clear language in the law, in the way of instructions. We are dealing with human beings, their rights, their happiness; and the happiness of their loved ones are precious to them. And there can be no justification for us to leave the law in such shape that would permit the same kind of inconsiderate injustice to continue.

Let me tell you something. This law is like any other law passed by the United States Congress. It will remain on the books only so long as the people of America think it is fair and that they are being treated fairly. For in the final analysis we may temporarily occupy this Hall, but this Government belongs to the people. When you mistreat some poor widow woman back in a community, who is unable to file the necessary papers to take care of herself before the selective service department, then you have irritated and lost the respect of the people around that community. All you have to do to start trouble is to get enough communities dissatisfied with that kind of situation.

There is another angle. You say, "Well, why are you taking up this time when the bill is here for passage?" I say that this bill needed a pretty thorough going over and some things being called to the attention of the House and the committee that General Hershey would not dare whisper about. There is not any such thing as some of the commands ever getting what they call compassionate reassignment. These matters are human things. That is, giving the kind of attention to human beings that engender respect. So, in my opinion, it is very necessary that we give serious consideration to the matters I have called to your attention in the order I have mentioned.

I do not know what the distinguished gentleman from Georgia is about to bring out later. I understand he has two or three bills. I do not know what they are, as far as that is concerned. We will hear about them when they come up.

I say that in the consideration of this bill it is not sufficient to brush lightly over this question of college students. Where are we going to get our scientists? Where are we going to get those that we depend upon so heavily? The last war was not won by brawn alone; and if we have another, it will not be won

by brawn alone. Brains and science must be among our weapons.

Now I want somebody to raise an objection. I will welcome anyone who wants to take issue with the statements that I have made. It is a practical proposal to say that upon the request of a student that he should serve 3 months every year for 4 years and be a freshly trained member of the Armed Forces, trained each year for a period of 4 years. If he is still needed for 6 months or 1 year, then O. K. Give the same privilege to others along with the privilege to volunteer for any length of time. Then not ask but tell the Pentagon to so arrange their schedule as to take care of and level off a regular flow of personnel.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BARDEN. All I want is someone to tell me what is wrong with that proposition?

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. How is it that you did not appear before the committee and present these matters at the time when the bill was under consideration by the committee?

Mr. BARDEN. Where was the gentleman when I started to speak? I told the gentleman that the meetings were opened and closed before I even found out they were holding hearings. The afternoon I found out they were holding hearings I understood they were closed and everybody limited to 10 minutes, I am not fussing with the committee.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman could have found out when the hearings were to be held.

Mr. BARDEN. I am not fussing with the chairman about that; I am just stating what happened.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield for a consent request to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY].

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my support of H. R. 3005 which extends the period of the so-called draft law for 4 years. The bill before us, Mr. Speaker, must be considered solely in the light of the needs of our Nation.

There are few of us here today who view the necessity of pressing the youth of our country into compulsory military service with anything but the most deep-seated abhorrence and regret.

But it is equally true that there are few of us here who do not realize the gravity of the international situation which dictates the need for continuation of the compulsory draft system.

The precise question, Mr. Speaker, appears to be with respect to the period for which the draft should be extended. It is my belief that two very important and persuasive reasons support extension for a period of 4 years.

First, it has been estimated by our most informed military experts that our national defense requires a minimum of 2,850,000 men and women in our Armed Forces. There also has been reliable testimony that voluntary enlistments cannot be expected to provide more than 1,500,000 on a sustained basis to our Armed Forces. Thus, the absolute necessity of continuing the present draft law is clear.

Because the above manpower requirements are based upon efforts of both the executive and legislative branches to stabilize our Military Establishment over an indefinite period of time, extension of the draft for 4 years appears to have ample justification.

Mr. Speaker, continuation of the draft for 4 years allows long-range planning, not only for our Military Establishment, but for our youth as well. The 4-year extension as provided in H. R. 3005 in no manner changes the period of service set forth in our present draft law. The 24-month period of service remains the same. The program continues to be universal in that it applies equally to every American boy, and it continues to be selective in the manner in which draftees are called for duty.

The 4-year extension, Mr. Speaker, presents to our draft-age youth a realistic and honest appraisal of our national needs which they will be called upon to meet. To do otherwise, Mr. Speaker, would be less than candid on our part and would contribute substantially to the insecurity of this country's youth.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I feel that passage of H. R. 3005 is essential if we, as a country, are to give unmistakable notice to the Communist world of our intention to defend the freedoms and liberties upon which the Nation is based.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3005) to further amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending the authority to induct certain individuals, and to extend the benefits under the Dependents Assistance Act to July 1, 1959.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3005, with Mr. PRIEST in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am awfully sorry that the Armed Services Committee did not have the information that the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina desired to appear before it. The first information I had about it was this morning when he stated he had a matter that he did not present due to the fact that the committee closed about the time he thought the committee opened.

In reply let me say it was generally known—carried throughout the country in the press—that the Armed Services Committee was going to conduct a hearing on the extension of the Selective Service Act.

It was our privilege in the past to have the benefit of the counsel and advice of the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, and I am very sorry we were deprived of the opportunity of having it on this measure. The other Members knew we were having hearings. The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] was there. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON] was there. May I say, though, that had the gentleman appeared—and all the facts he has submitted this morning would have been the facts he would have submitted then—I would be compelled to say that I could not find myself then or now in accord with his proposition to only limit the draft to 2 years. I think a 4-year extension is proper.

Mr. Chairman, my fondest hope is that one day I may be able to stand in the well of the House and say to the membership that a firm and lasting peace in the world makes unnecessary the further maintenance of a large standing force. I would like to think that the immediate future holds the hope of a world no longer dominated by fear and oppression and the threat of extinction. Unfortunately, that wonderful day is not on the horizon.

The situation in the world today is one that calls for sacrifice, courage, and determination on the part of the American people. We are faced with the inevitable requirement of maintaining an Army, a Navy, an Air Force, and a Marine Corps, for the indefinite future, of not less than 2,850,000.

Recently the President, in a message to the Congress, stated that we could probably attain a force of 1½ million persons in our Armed Forces by volunteer means, but that was a maximum. Regrettably, that statement by itself means that we must make up the difference in manpower by a method of selective service. It is for that reason that the bill before the House today extends the Universal Military Training and Service Act until July 1, 1959.

To maintain an armed force of a strength of 2,850,000 through fiscal 1959, with 1 million of these men in the Army, will require approximately 670,000 24-month inductees, or an average of 14,000 inductees monthly. In addition, the Armed Forces will need approximately 2,100,000 voluntary enlistments during this same 4-year period. There can be little doubt, as testified by representatives of all the services, that the existence of the selective service law is the major factor in obtaining volunteer enlistments for all of the services.

Now this is not a new subject to the American people; nor is it a new subject to the membership of this House.

We have had considerable experience in the operations of the Selective Service System since 1917. In World War I 2,810,296 men were inducted; in World War II, from November of 1940 to March 31 of 1947, when the Selective Service Act of World War II expired, 10,022,367 men were inducted; and under the present law, the Selective Service Act of 1948, now known as the Universal Military Training and Service Act, we have inducted 1,966,526 men up to January 1, 1955.

So the Nation has lived with the present form of the Selective Service System almost continuously since September 16, 1940. You may recall that on November 18, 1940, the first selectees were sent to Army induction centers. And it was on August 12, 1941, that the House passed by a majority of only 1 vote, not quite 4 months before Pearl Harbor, an act extending the period of service for induction from 12 months to 18 months. On March 3, 1947, President Truman recommended to Congress that the Selective Service Act be permitted to expire on March 31, 1947, with the understanding that reenactment of the selective-service law would be requested if the Armed Forces would be unable to maintain required strengths through voluntary enlistments.

On March 17, 1948, 1 year later, President Truman requested the Congress to enact selective-service legislation stating that voluntary enlistments had failed to maintain the Armed Forces at a level consistent with national safety. And on June 24, the present law, then known as the Selective Service Act of 1948, was signed by the President. That was a 2-year law scheduled to expire on June 24, 1950. On June 23, the Selective Service Act was extended for a period of 15 days to July 9, 1950. In the meantime, the war in Korea began, and on June 30, 1950, the President signed into law the act which extended the present law until July 9, 1951. On June 19, 1951, Public Law 51 was enacted which extended the Selective Service Act for a period of 4 years to June 30, 1955.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have given this chronology of the history of selective service to recall to the Members of the House the number of times the Congress has discussed this subject, pro and con.

We have a fairly equitable law now in effect. It is understood, and it is administered by local boards who know the conditions in their local areas. I think you would be interested to know that as of December 31, 1954, there were 3,951 local boards, 92 appeal boards, and 28 panels, throughout the United States and our Territories. And while there were 7,195 employees who received compensation, there were 39,793 patriotic citizens contributing their time to the Selective Service System without compensation from the Government. Insofar as the costs of administration are concerned, I think you would be interested to know that since June 24, 1948, up to January 1, 1955, the Selective Service System has cost $184,194,931; in other words, the Selective Service System has operated at a cost of approximately $100 per person inducted. This, of course, is not a true cost figure for each inductee since these costs also account for the expenses of registration, appeals, deferments, and more important, includes the costs of selective service processing of many thousands who prior to induction voluntarily enlisted in the branch of service of their choice.

Now I believe the Congress has been very wise in placing the responsibility for induction in the hands of local boards. After all, who knows whether or not a young man should be deferred better than those people who sit on these boards in the areas in which these young men live. Certainly no board in Washington, or no system operating from Washington, could ever have done as fine a job as these local boards have done.

The extension which is proposed in the bill now under consideration will continue in effect the system of induction that we all know so well. Every male citizen of the United States upon attaining the age of 18 must register with his local board; male aliens admitted for permanent residence in the United States must likewise register. And male aliens other than those admitted for permanent residence who remain in the United States for a year or more, must register. These aliens may be inducted unless they make application to be relieved from such liability, but if they do so they forever bar themselves from citizenship.

Young men may be inducted into the Armed Forces upon attaining the age of 18½, and up to the age of 26, but no person under the age of 19 may be inducted if there are persons within the jurisdiction of his local board who are available for induction and who are 19 or over. For practical purposes, this means that nobody under the age of 19 is inducted, although the authority is there if it is necessary to use it. As a matter of fact, the present draft age is about 21.

The mental and physical standards now in effect are the lowest in the history of the Selective Service System; they are the minimum standards which were in effect in January of 1945.

There is ample protection in the law with regard to training. Every young man who enters our Armed Forces must be given full and adequate training for a period of not less than 4 months, and during this period he cannot be assigned to any place outside the continental United States or its possessions. No member of the armed services can be prevented from communicating with Members of Congress, and there is adequate protection with regard to living conditions and moral standards.

Individuals have and will be drafted for a period of 24 months. Individuals can volunteer for induction or can enlist in the Regular Army for 24 months.

Under the law, every person who enters the Armed Forces after June 19, 1951, is required to serve on active duty in the Armed Forces and in a Reserve component for a total period of 8 years. In other words, a man drafted for 2 years has a 6-year Reserve obligation when he completes the 2-year duty; if he stays in the service for 4 years, he has a 4-year obligation upon the completion of his active duty.

We make no change in the Reserve obligation, although our committee is of course studying intensively the new National Reserve plan submitted to the Congress by the President.

Now there are certain persons who are exempt from induction by statute—these are active-duty members of the Armed Forces, cadets and midshipmen at the Service Academies, students enrolled in a military college, if the college has been approved by the Secretary of Defense, ministers and students of ministry, veterans, and sole-surviving sons. Members of organized units of the National Guard, and all other organized units of the Armed Forces, who were members of such units on February 1, 1951, and have continued to serve satisfactorily in such units, are likewise exempt from induction. On the other hand, young men who join the National Guard prior to attaining the age of 18 years and 6 months, are deferred from induction so long as they participate in their National Guard unit. Likewise, young men who are in the senior division of the ROTC, or other officer-training programs, are deferred from induction.

The question often arises as to who is a veteran and thus not liable for induction. Well, any individual who served on active duty for a period of 12 months or more between the period September 16, 1940, and June 24, 1948, is not liable for induction. Likewise, any person who served on active duty for a period of 90 days or more between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, is not liable for induction. Certain training, such as the Army specialized training program or similar programs in the other services, and service at the Naval or Military Academy, or Coast Guard Academy, is not considered active duty. Likewise, all persons who are discharged from the Armed Forces after June 19, 1948, with 3 or more years of active duty to their credit are considered veterans. No veteran may be inducted, except in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress, unless of course he is a special registrant under the doctors' draft law.

Now the big question as to who is deferred and who is not, comes in section 6 (h) of the present law. Let me say at the outset, that there is no such thing as a blanket deferment for anybody under this section. The law specifically grants the President the authority to provide for the deferment of any or all categories of persons whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose continued service in an office under the United States or any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or whose activity in study, research, or medical fields is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest.

But this same section contains another provision that no person within any category that I have named may be deferred except upon the basis of his individual status. In other words, the President cannot defer all people who are engaged in research, or industry, or in agriculture, or are studying medicine or dentistry, or optometry, and so forth.

And let me mention this, that any person who is deferred for any reason, remains liable for induction until the 35th anniversary of the date of his birth. We suggest one change in this part of the law which I will discuss later. You might also be interested to learn that this extension of liability beyond 26 accounted for 6.1 percent of the inductees in fiscal 1954. The law also specifically prevents the President from deferring anybody because of marriage except in cases of extreme hardship. The President has the authority to defer individuals with wives and children, or children alone, but since August 25, 1953, registrants not already deferred as fathers, could not use fatherhood as a basis for obtaining deferment from the draft, except in cases of extreme hardship.

Other provisions of law provide for automatic deferment for high-school students until graduation, or until attaining the age of 20. College students are entitled to an automatic deferment to complete an academic year. All further college deferments are based upon class standings, under regulation prescribed by the President.

Now let me talk just a moment about college deferments. I realize that it is very difficult for Mrs. Jones to see her son go off to the Army for 2 years because her son is not a college student, while Mrs. Smith across the street has her son home every weekend because he is a college student. One method by which this could be eliminated would be to abolish our college deferments. But if we do that, we would seriously jeopardize the future of this Nation. We must continue to produce doctors, dentists, scientists, engineers, chemists, and all of the other specialists that keep us ever progressing in this modern age of miracles. We cannot compete with the Soviet Union in manpower, so we must excell them in technological advances. To do this we must continue to educate a portion of our young men and give them the opportunity to obtain advanced education without a 2-year interruption for service in our Armed Forces. We defer only those students who stand high in their classes, for those will undoubtedly become the graduate students and the specialists of the future.

Now I do not want to give the impression that the Selective Service System is not granting industrial and agricultural deferments. I think you should know that as of December 31, 1954, there were 44,026 men deferred because they were engaged in agriculture. On the other hand, there were only 17,733 men deferred because they were engaged in industry. However, there were 165,812 men deferred as college students under Presidential regulations. I have already explained the reason for this situation. I should also add that this is less than 10 percent of the male students in college today.

So the proposed bill is simply an extension of the authority to induct men under the present selective-service law for 4 years. We have made two minor changes in the law to remove an inequity in one case and to eliminate confusion and possible future inequity in the other.

Under the present law, a young man who joins the National Guard prior to attaining the age of 18½ is deferred from induction so long as he continues to serve satisfactorily in his National Guard unit. Now note that under the present law he is deferred. This means that he is liable for induction up to the age of 35, which in effect means that he has a 16½-year reserve obligation. On the other hand, members of the Organized Reserve, including the National Guard, who were members on February 1, 1951, are exempt from induction so long as they participate satisfactorily in such organized units. If they leave an organized unit upon attaining the age of 26, they are not liable for induction; on the other hand, the young National Guard man who joined after February 1, 1951, would be liable up to age 35. Both have assumed a responsibility and a liability, but one has assumed a much greater liability. We have remedied that by reducing the liability from age 35 to age 26 for the young man who joins a National Guard unit prior to attaining the age of 18½.

The other change deals with veterans. Strangely enough, under existing law, no man discharged from the armed services after June 24, 1948, with less than 3 years of service, is a veteran. Now once a man has fulfilled his obligation of 24 months, he may not be reinducted. On the other hand, there are many individuals who have been or will be discharged with 3, 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, or 22 months of service, who have not fulfilled the requirements of the law with respect to service and who, therefore, can and have been reinducted. As a matter of fact, the President, not long ago, in a directive required the local boards to reclassify all persons discharged from the services for any reason with less than 6 months' service. This was the prelude to their reinduction if the reasons which justified their release had changed. In other words, if a man is released for hardship reasons, and the hardship no longer exists, he can be reinducted if he had less than 6 months' service. This can be true of persons released with 16, 18, 22, or 23 months of service if the President should direct this reclassification.

In addition, we had a large group of young men in the Nation who had prior service which did not entitle them to a veterans' status with respect to the Selective Service Act. I am referring to young men who did not serve for a period of 12 months or more between the period September 16, 1940, and June 24, 1948. Some people had 10 or 11 months of service between those dates, but had up to 2 years of service after June 24, 1948. Still they were not veterans, and they were liable for induction and many of them were inducted. This was justified with the war in Korea, and with the heavy demand for manpower. Now the manpower situation has eased and we can adopt a more liberal attitude toward these young men and at the same time remove the confusion that must exist in the minds of these young men. For that reason, we have adopted an amendment which is simple in nature which provides that no regular registrant who served on active duty for a period of 6 months or more may be inducted under the Universal Military Training and Service Act, except in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress. It will not apply to those already in service, but these men are already receiving credit under a Department of Defense directive for prior service. They can credit their prior service so that they only have to serve a total of 24 months, so long as they serve a minimum of 12 months. But the amendment will clarify the status of all other regular registrants heretofore or hereafter discharged with 6 months or more of service.

Now this bill before the House today has one additional section dealing with the Dependents Assistance Act. This is the act under which the enlisted men in our Armed Forces receive allowances because of their dependents. By contributing varying amounts ranging from $40 in the lower enlisted grades, to $60 in the middle grades, and $80 in the higher grades, enlisted men may obtain from the Government, in the nature of a quarters allowance, sums ranging from $51.30 for 1 dependent; $77.10 for 2 dependents; and $96.90 for enlisted men with 3 dependents.

Obviously, if we are going to continue to draft men into our Armed Forces we must provide a system whereby they can obtain assistance from the Federal Government to take care of their dependents. We do not attempt and never have attempted to give amounts which would in all cases compensate for their loss of earning power while in the service. That would be manifestly impossible considering the various wage scales and skills possessed by these young men who enter our Armed Forces. But the Dependents Assistance Act does prevent hardship and does make it possible for men to serve in our Armed Forces knowing that their dependents are receiving sums ranging from $91 a month, to $176.90 a month, depending upon their grade and the number of dependents who look to them for care.

Now Mr. Chairman, what I have given you is the Selective Service System as it operates today with two minor changes we have made in the law and the extension of the Dependents Assistance Act.

I do not believe that a Member of this House will question the need for extending our draft law for 4 years. If anyone can see any method by which we can safely defend the Nation without a draft act or without going bankrupt, I must confess that it has not been brought to our attention. If we do not extend the draft law, what is our alternative?

We need only look at any daily newspaper to see the peril which lies ahead for any nation foolish enough to reduce its armed forces below that required for security.

Now let us analyze our Armed Forces as they exist today. I hope that we have finally reached a point in our maturity as a nation where we all recognize the necessity for stability and permanence in the size of our Armed Forces. That stability must of necessity range in the neighborhood of 2,850,000 men for the

indefinite future. I do not believe we are going to be kidded into another siege of valleys and peaks in the size of our Armed Forces; I hope we have learned our lesson; I hope the Nation is now fully conscious of the cost in men and money when we reduce our Armed Forces below a minimum safety figure and have to rapidly expand and mobilize our reserves at such a high cost in broken homes, hardships, bloodshed, and taxes.

The Congress has the constitutional responsibility to raise and maintain armed forces in defense of the Nation. In discharging that responsibility, we must base our decision on the obvious facts which confront us. Those facts are clear and we must not permit our Armed Forces to decrease below 2,850,000 men, beyond June 30, 1956, so long as the international situation remains as it is.

Every man in this body earnestly hopes for peace and will lend every effort to its attainment. On the other hand, we have learned through bitter experience that a Communist promise is nothing more than a trigger for another trap. So, if we are to represent our people in this great body, we must support, to the best of our ability, an adequate armed force.

We all remember where we stood just before Korea, and we saw the consequences of the relatively small armed force we had at that time. And I shall always feel that our pellmell demobilization after World War II did more to bring on Russian conquest than any other single factor. The Soviet Union respects only the might of weapons and the skill of the men who handle those weapons. Unless we have a stable armed force, equipped with modern weapons of war, together with the men who know how to use those weapons, we are asking for trouble—and lots of it.

Now what has that got to do with the extension of the draft act? Well, it is simply this: Regardless of whether draft calls are for 12,000, 30,000, 50,000, or 80,000 men a month, we must have a draft law to maintain an armed force ranging in size from 2,850,000 to 3 million men. If we can only maintain a volunteer force of 1,500,000, and I am confident that this is the maximum, then we must find a way to obtain the additional 1,500,000 men necessary to maintain our Armed Forces.

Now they do not all come through the draft system, but I think we all know that 1,500,000 come into the Armed Forces because of the draft process. Men join the Air Force, the Navy, and the Marine Corps because they do not want to be drafted. Some men prefer to consider themselves as volunteers, others envision a life of sailing the high seas. Others, knowing that they must serve in some branch of the Armed Forces, prefer 4 years in the wild blue yonder rather than 2 years of life as a doughboy. Be that as it may, whatever the motivation, do not let anyone fool you that the size of the draft calls reflect a decreasing need for a draft law. I will make this statement, and I am afraid that I will have to make this same statement 4 years from now: So long as we must maintain an armed force in excess of 1,500,000 men, we are going to have to have a draft law. And so long as I am a Member of this body, I will insist, with all my strength, that we not allow our Armed Forces, come what may, to go below a figure of 2,850,000 men. I will not be a party to a reduction in the size of the Armed Forces that is not warranted by the conditions which prevail in the world today and undoubtedly will prevail for many years to come. I will not jeopardize the security of this Nation through any methods of false economy which provide a dollar savings today at $100 cost tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman, since we are all so familiar with the operation of the Selective Service System and know that it is as equitable a law as is possible under the circumstances, I hope that the House will overwhelmingly, yes, without a dissenting vote, support this 4-year extension which is not only necessary, but is absolutely essential for the preservation not only of our Nation, but of the free world as we know it today.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the exemptions today in this bill are the same as they were and that therefore, inasmuch as there are no agricultural exemptions listed here, there have been no such exemptions in prior bills?

Mr. VINSON. There has never been an agricultural exemption in this law.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield, with pleasure.

Mr. BONNER. Will the gentleman please put in the RECORD where these agricultural deferments were granted? To my knowledge, none has ever been granted in my part of North Carolina. It would be most interesting to find out where those 44,000 favored young men resided.

Mr. VINSON. I will be glad to break those figures down by States and show how many agricultural deferments there are in each State. Under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I shall include those statistics.

Farm workers engaged in production of necessary foodstuffs (as of Dec. 31, 1954)

	Class I-D	Class II-A	Class II-A (app.)	Class II-C	Class II-S	Class III-A	Class IV-A	Class IV-B	Class IV-C	Class IV-D	Class IV-F	Class V-A
United States and Territories	298,688	17,733	6,669	44,026	165,812	1,128,775	254,271	23	8,999	61,444	1,992,376	5,993,694
United States, continental	293,124	17,598	6,663	43,820	164,377	1,110,668	253,477	22	7,939	61,170	1,858,100	5,907,084
Alabama	4,946	117	20	141	1,389	30,771	3,512		6	762	64,311	108,278
Arizona	1,935	61	15	56	947	6,310	1,675		38	361	11,570	26,782
Arkansas	4,113	112	19	264	1,833	21,807	2,081	2	5	729	35,348	64,271
California	15,013	1,088	478	283	10,443	68,346	21,180		2,129	3,216	100,376	412,292
Colorado	2,322	107	17	97	1,737	10,628	2,667		39	487	13,912	50,532
Connecticut	3,463	655	204	616	4,856	8,469	7,150		55	734	18,971	83,359
Delaware	1,134	58	35	189	511	2,107	316		12	77	3,920	12,135
District of Columbia	1,212	55	33	4	923	3,204	1,170		79	173	8,827	33,124
Florida	5,629	101	13	33	2,504	17,518	3,066	1	119	853	36,755	89,551
Georgia	6,618	238	37	827	1,847	39,763	8,616	1	38	911	67,638	111,839
Idaho	1,652	46	8	53	631	6,027	858		36	579	5,243	23,002
Illinois	11,617	470	617	272	12,836	50,663	9,764		508	3,854	90,817	353,696
Indiana	8,615	219	115	78	3,708	36,356	5,088		113	1,876	34,417	161,885
Iowa	5,765	208	16	350	1,825	22,128	3,243		24	1,235	23,186	100,155
Kansas	5,481	125	10	1,957	1,839	16,795	3,017		42	1,001	15,035	73,481
Kentucky	2,881	144	29	176	1,670	31,805	2,501		14	915	49,557	110,956
Louisiana	9,033	137	18	11	2,499	22,666	3,637		35	879	53,344	99,924
Maine	1,527	203	31	204	755	8,041	1,121		86	271	10,184	35,839
Maryland	4,510	237	183	1,896	1,954	14,713	3,644	3	31	965	24,950	92,006
Massachusetts	13,521	969	139	680	8,556	19,443	7,730		167	2,192	39,706	193,311
Michigan	8,771	608	990	1,649	7,297	52,712	16,995		252	2,193	68,527	274,143
Minnesota	5,838	186	41	1,914	4,810	19,063	4,242		42	1,839	24,009	115,238
Mississippi	2,808	137	8	115	1,875	24,603	1,827	1	16	613	56,569	70,094
Missouri	8,072	178	13	120	2,621	29,590	4,696		42	1,999	41,514	149,035
Montana	1,861	111	10	922	455	3,830	3,887		16	198	4,842	22,614
Nebraska	3,447	127	15	197	601	11,024	2,507		25	730	11,778	53,347
Nevada	550	7	1	19	32	977	259		8	42	1,261	5,500
New Hampshire	1,786	77	32	195	908	3,299	675	1	30	222	4,529	20,993
New Jersey	14,062	1,000	191	1,246	10,127	20,077	8,735		292	1,782	44,667	196,455
New Mexico	1,842	38	4	40	262	6,220	1,135		11	260	11,013	25,607
New York City	12,746	1,999	69	25	6,444	27,615	12,928		1,164	3,724	111,889	327,131
New York (except New York City)	17,416	1,573	678	6,490	6,603	36,271	11,053		441	3,690	60,388	262,531
North Carolina	4,146	82	84	107	3,141	43,293	3,582		13	1,017	83,911	155,771
North Dakota	1,002	77	2	3,537	729	5,438	680		5	335	6,230	24,589
Ohio	11,990	866	667	1,523	16,132	55,798	16,612	2	166	3,128	76,621	331,308
Oklahoma	3,940	359	18	501	2,123	22,296	3,232	1	45	1,075	24,920	84,719
Oregon	4,648	150	22	157	1,352	11,376	1,915		43	770	14,648	58,203
Pennsylvania	14,154	1,582	742	5,087	16,435	65,167	18,888		182	4,146	103,300	460,389

Farm workers engaged in production of necessary foodstuffs (as of Dec. 31, 1954)—Continued

	Class I-D	Class II-A	Class II-A (app.)	Class II-C	Class II-S	Class III-A	Class IV-A	Class IV-B	Class IV-C	Class IV-D	Class IV-F	Class V-A
Rhode Island	2,135	88	31	81	837	3,156	1,054	----------	19	383	7,215	33,354
South Carolina	7,605	158	7	393	1,438	23,490	7,492	1	13	570	48,974	76,867
South Dakota	1,429	65	----------	829	356	5,683	3,282	----------	23	373	5,450	22,724
Tennessee	6,780	384	59	1,470	2,923	35,325	4,043	1	23	1,051	55,806	117,204
Texas	18,595	1,212	134	777	7,508	69,536	9,952	7	1,236	3,054	137,134	298,415
Utah	3,264	73	2	119	292	7,256	4,269	----------	32	1,338	5,854	28,780
Vermont	979	48	9	773	520	2,648	518	----------	37	111	3,767	14,113
Virginia	4,014	313	211	897	2,691	25,101	4,710	----------	21	776	52,125	126,087
Washington	6,514	141	66	----------	3,172	16,417	2,859	----------	82	990	18,688	85,782
West Virginia	2,626	85	32	72	1,699	19,395	10,861	1	4	473	27,726	84,221
Wisconsin	8,370	490	488	6,269	3,460	23,945	4,131	----------	74	2,076	34,347	134,005
Wyoming	747	34	----------	109	271	2,507	422	----------	6	142	2,331	11,447
Alaska	250	5	2	----------	19	403	307	----------	7	12	1,753	3,998
Canal Zone	42	----------	----------	----------	18	27	6	----------	2	----------	136	86
Guam	10	1	----------	----------	11	428	38	----------	982	14	796	424
Hawaii	3,924	38	2	180	676	2,832	360	----------	14	89	7,179	22,637
Puerto Rico	1,321	90	2	26	700	14,356	67	1	17	157	123,740	58,809
Virgin Islands	17	1	----------	----------	11	61	16	----------	38	2	672	656

Source: SSS Form No. 116.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman also break that down as to whether those were directly engaged in agricultural production or whether they were engaged in the processing of agricultural products?

Mr. VINSON. For our information they are classified as agricultural deferments. I presume these were inductees who made applications to local boards on the basis that they were engaged in agriculture and the local boards granted the deferments. That is all I know about it. Those matters are handled entirely by the local boards.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I think it should be pointed out that these are deferments rather than exemptions.

Mr. VINSON. I have already pointed that out.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I think that is a point that everyone should understand clearly.

Mr. VINSON. There is no occupational exemption at all. Practically no one in this country is entitled to an exemption, under the statute, because of his occupation. But he may get a deferment.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I apologize for laboring the point, but I do want to get this clear. Deferments in those cases are given usually on the basis of hardship, as well as other causes, rather than because of the fact that these men are engaged in the business of agriculture; is that not correct?

Mr. VINSON. I do not know upon what grounds individual local draft boards grant deferments. But they are classified in the Office of the Director of the Selective Service as agricultural deferments.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Under the statute there are deferments because of national health, safety, and interests.

Mr. VINSON. That is correct. Mr. Chairman, bear in mind there is no change proposed by this extension except in two instances. There has been a considerable amount of confusion as to what constituted a veteran under the law. We have had instances where men have served as much as 22 months, and then the local boards have drafted them because they did not serve 24 months. There are hundreds and hundreds of cases where men were inducted who had 13, 14, or 15 months, who were discharged from the service, had gone home, and then the local draft boards picked those men up and inducted them for an additional 24 months. That was the situation that confronted the committee.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Would the gentleman give us information as to the number of students who are deferred because of reasons for which students may be deferred, because of service in the ROTC, and so forth?

Mr. VINSON. I shall give that information, with pleasure, but I should like to finish with this part of the matter before I take that up.

As I saying, there were a great many men who were required to serve again because they had not served 24 months and were not classified as veterans. We sought to correct that, and we have proposed an amendment to the effect that if a man serves or has served a period of 6 months after September 16, 1940, he is to be classified as a veteran and therefore may not be reinducted. That is nothing but fair and right.

The Department does not look with favor on that amendment. They do not like it. But we think it is fair and proper, for after a man has served 13 months and is discharged by the Army and has gone home and gotten married and started life again, it is not fair for the local draft board to say, "We are going to induct you because under the law you are not classified as a veteran. You have not served 24 months." There are thousands in that situation today. So his total of service will be not only 24 months but probably 12 months or 15 months plus 24 months. We seek to clear that up.

That is one amendment. We had the privilege of having General Hershey and the Department comment on it. I say to you the Department does not look with favor on it. They probably did not want any amendments at all to this bill, but we thought that equity warranted the committee in doing that.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. As to the amendment the gentleman has just discussed, he means now that this will make it possible for those who have been reinducted after having served 10, 12 or 13 months to be released?

Mr. VINSON. No, they do not get out.

Mr. LANDRUM. The gentleman's statement was that it would excuse from reinduction any person who had served since September 18, 1940, so his statement about September 18, 1940 is not correct?

Mr. VINSON. In broad principle it is correct, but there is some variation to it. It does not take out those that are already in.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. GROSS. I commend the gentleman for that amendment. The gentleman will recall that I had a bill before his committee for 2 or 3 or perhaps 4 years—I have forgotten—to do exactly that thing. I never could get a hearing on it, but I am glad that the committee has at last seen the light, and I again commend the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to say the longer I serve with the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, the more I begin to find myself more in accord with him. He is often pretty sound, and I hope he will be sound today in continuing this for a period of 4 years.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. With pleasure.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will accept as a reproof all that you said about him. But here is my question. Why was the Tydings amendment left out?

Mr. VINSON. I do not know what the gentleman refers to as the Tydings amendment. On what subject matter?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. One time they came in with what was called the Tydings amendment, which provided that if a man was exclusively engaged in an agricultural pursuit, and could not be replaced, he should be deferred for a certain length of time. But later that was taken out.

Mr. VINSON. That has been out of the law for 4 years.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know, but why was it taken out? That is what I want to know.

Mr. VINSON. I cannot remember the reasons which actuated the committee 4 years ago, but I can only say this: There is nothing in the law which grants deferments by class. Nobody in any particular occupation is given an exemption.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I beg the gentleman's pardon, but are not people given deferments because of industrial relationships?

Mr. VINSON. It defers them, but no man gets an exemption under the law.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am talking about deferments.

Mr. VINSON. He may get a deferment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. They defer industrial workers? Why not defer agricultural workers?

Mr. VINSON. The deferment is granted on the ground of public health and safety and the other standards which have to be met.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. May I ask one more question, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. VINSON. While the gentleman was at lunch, I stated that the information submitted to the committee was that there were 44,000 deferments given to agricultural workers.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is, such deferments were given previously or before?

Mr. VINSON. No; those deferments have been given as of the present time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Now?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But my understanding was that the reason they do not defer agricultural workers now is because there was a surplus of farm products.

Mr. VINSON. We are going to correct that today. An amendment is going to be offered here that those factors cannot be taken into consideration, that is, the factor of whether there is a surplus or a shortage. That is going to be corrected.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If I may impose just once more, and I am seeking information, I want the gentleman to understand.

Mr. VINSON. I know that. The gentleman and I understand each other.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I notice with reference to industrial workers that individuals who had supervision over organizations which were contributing or which were representing labor were deferred. For example, a man like Frankenstein, and up in Detroit, and some more of those top people—in order to have industrial peace. Is that still in there?

Mr. VINSON. No; I would not say it was ever in the law to do that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It was in.

Mr. VINSON. That is entirely up to the local draft board.

In regard to the question asked by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, I invite the attention of the entire committee to this information. As of December 31, 1954, 96.2 percent of the total men registered, 18 years of age and above, had been classified. Of this number, 240,909 had been examined and found acceptable; 1,317,057 were classified as I–A, but not yet examined, including a few conscientious objectors who were available for nonmilitary service; 71,923 were deferred to complete high school; 3,934 were deferred in order to complete an academic year in college; 44,026 were deferred for agricultural reasons; 17,733 received occupational deferment other than agriculture; 165,812 received occupational deferments as students.

Now that is the information submitted to the committee.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. If the gentleman would yield, my question was with reference to the 165,000. Does that include those engaged in ROTC training, or those who are not engaged in ROTC training but have student deferments?

Mr. VINSON. That figure involves only student deferments. ROTC deferments are classified as reserve deferments.

Mr. Chairman, in the next amendment with reference to the National Guard, we sought to clarify another situation. Under the law to date, if a boy joins the National Guard, and if he is under a draft age, he gets a class D deferment, and as long as he stays in the National Guard he is subject to deferment. The age limit for draftees is 26 years. Under the law for a National Guard man it is 35 years. He is subject to draft until he reaches his 35th birthday. We propose to change that, and say that if a boy joins the National Guard and serves honorably up to the age of 26, he is out and is no longer liable for induction.

Those are all the amendments, except the amendment by Mr. HARRISON. I sincerely trust you will reach the same conclusion the committee has reached, the same conclusion that the President has reached: That the military necessity, in the proper defense of this country, requires that we maintain an armed service of 2,850,000 men for an indefinite period of time. To support that requires a draft law of at least 4 years, in order to enable the Department to have orderly planning; to enable the Department to have an armed force that can meet local aggression, and to enable this country to have an armed force of such strength and might that it can block any major aggression until the country can be prepared.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. As I understand, you bring up the extension of the selective service law first. Did your committee consider the question of whether to bring out the Selective Service Act which you asked be extended for 4 years and at the same time consider the recommendation made by the Defense Department as to a universal military training program which I understand the Department favors?

Mr. VINSON. Let me say—and I yield myself another minute—that there is nothing in this bill about universal military training. This is no universal military training bill.

Mr. GROSS. Except the title.

Mr. VINSON. I am going to explain that. And there is no Reserve training program in this except the young man has an obligation to serve.

The title of this act is the Universal Military Training and Service Act. The law under which we are operating today means that every man upon attaining the age of 18½ years has an obligation to serve; in other words, the obligation to serve is universal; it applies to every boy in America alike, but the system upon which he is brought into service is selective. That is the whole thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has consumed 33 minutes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, first I want to congratulate the very distinguished and able chairman [Mr. VINSON]—in fact, all the members of the House Committee on the Armed Services—for thoroughly and expeditiously considering this piece of legislation and bringing it by a unanimous vote—34 to 0—before the House at this time considerably in advance of its expiration on the 30th of June this year.

The draft act of 1940 expired in 1947; and, as usual following a great conflict, the American people the American Government demobilized too many too soon. We made that great mistake following World War I, and refused to learn through sad and painful experience and committed the same mistake following World War II by letting our Armed Forces sink to the level of a million and a half in all branches of the service. The year from 1947 to 1948 when the draft was not in operation taught us beyond question of doubt that voluntary enlistments would not supply a sufficient number of men in our armed services consistent with our national safety. So the Congress felt constrained to reenact the selective service law in 1948 for 2 years. It was further extended for 15 days and then quickly extended for another year. In 1951 we extended the draft act for 4 years which will automatically end on the 30th of June 1955. It could almost be called the Act of Extensions.

It perhaps is trite and superfluous even to remind you, not to inform you, that our American way of life—and when I say our American way of life, I mean the Christian religion, our democratic processes of government in a constitutional representative republic, and our fundamental economic philosophy of individual initiative and free private enterprise—those three things, the Christian religion, our American form of

government, and our fundamental economic philosophy, that have made America the greatest and most powerful Nation in all the world in less than two centuries under our constitutional form of government—is being challenged today as it has never been challenged before.

A great American, Will Rogers, once said that the United States of America never lost a war but it never won a treaty or conference. There is a lot of truth in that statement.

Whatever future historians might write about the 20th century, I think they will call it an age not only of marvelous scientific progress but an age of strife and turmoil, of violence and bloodshed, of disappointment and disillusionment, because in your generation and in mine we have fought two world wars and the Korean conflict, and really failed to achieve our goal or objective in any one of them.

Suffering 334,000 casualties, spending $34 billion, with a national debt of $26 billion we came out of World War I failing to make the world safe for democracy. Instead we witnessed democracy die, we saw the establishment of dictatorships and the rise of totalitarian regimes, fascism in Italy, nazism in Germany, and communism in Soviet Russia.

We fought World War II and we won that conflict, to be sure, at the astronomical cost of more than $400 billion, 1,065,000 casualties, and with a national debt of $265 billion. But we failed to grant and guarantee the territorial integrity or to respect the geographical boundaries of the little nations or to give the small peoples in the small countries of the world the right to determine for themselves in free, open, and untrammeled elections the right to determine the kind of government they wanted. We failed to reach our goal in World War II just as we failed to reach our objective in World War I.

Since the close of that conflict we have gone through another period of strife and of bloodshed in Korea that has cost the American people $15 billion and 145,000 casualties, perhaps the only war in our history we did not actually win, because the hands of our military leaders were tied by the politicians and diplomats, but we did not lose it. We did stop aggression at the 38th parallel and uneasy as that truce might be we are all grateful that the shooting has stopped. All lovers of liberty still hope and pray for a united and free Korea.

But on this February afternoon in 1955 we find ourselves neither in war nor in peace, but in a sort of twilight zone. It is neither black nor white. It is a dull gray, an era of uncertainty, what our President has so well described as an age of peril; not an hour, not a month, not a year, but an "age of peril." It is highly doubtful if there will ever be any peace in our time.

Disagreeable and repugnant as it may be, we must be practical and realistic; we must realize that for our own Nation's safety and for our own self-survival we must remain strong on land, sea, and in the air by building up and maintaining our military might in such a manner and to such a degree that our domestic economy can support and carry.

Often the American people when you mention national defense think only of armies, navies and air forces, of planes, ships, tanks and guns, but, Mr. Speaker, the military aspect is only one of the many facets of our national defense and of our national strength. We all know that great as is the burden, and onerous as is the taxation, we have got to spend more money than we ever dreamed of a few years ago in order to maintain a superior Air Force, the greatest and most powerful Navy on earth, perhaps not the largest Army but the most highly trained and best equipped with the most modern and up-to-date weapons.

Never should we attempt to match the manpower on the continent of Asia. Our only hope of victory or chance for survival in another global war is in our superiority of weapons and in the superior skills of our men who man those weapons. That is the reason and the justification for our spending such huge sums of money and effort on scientific research and technological development.

I am happy that due to the constant prodding and insistence of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] the men in the Pentagon, not only our military leaders, but many of our civilian leaders in Government, have reached the point where they are not only going to avoid in the future these peaks and valleys, these periods of feast and famine of our armed services, but are going to level off on a stable program maintaining our armed strength at approximately 2,850,000 men at an annual expenditure of somewhere between $33 billion and $35 billion. As long as there are brigands abroad and aggressors in the world, we must build up and maintain our military might, and I think due to the wonderful teams we have, both in civilian clothes and in military uniform over in the Pentagon, we are getting more defense for our dollars today than we have in a long time.

But, military might cannot be achieved or maintained without economic strength. I am happy that the man in the White House, who spent most all his life in the military service, is wise enough to realize that the battle front can never be stronger than the home front; that in order to have military might we have got to have economic strength; that after all in World War II, without disparaging the heroism and the gallantry of our men and women, the 12 million who fought on land, sea, and in the air, it was after all America's industrial might and productive capacity that brought victory to the allied powers over the axis foes. On our farms, in our forests, in our mines and factories, we produced the food, the fiber, the weapons and the sinews of war that enabled us to triumph. Without economic strength you cannot have military strength, and there is where we should pause a moment to be calm and cool, cautious and careful not to overextend ourselves, because Lenin once wrote that the United States, like every capitalistic country, will "spend herself into bankruptcy." That is what the present occupants of the Kremlin, the 14 mad dogs, are hoping and praying that the United States, by siphoning off our wealth and depleting our natural resources in economic and military aid all over the world, will bleed ourselves white and become so weak and impotent that then, at the propitious moment, at the opportune time, the enemy can move in and take over. I repeat, along with military might we must have economic strength, and while there have been some reductions in the forces of our armed services in certain branches, a small reduction in the Navy and the Marine Corps and a bigger reduction in our Army, there has been an increase in our Air Force. I would rather trust than anyone else the Chiefs of Staff under the able chairmanship of Admiral Radford, the Secretary of Defense, and particularly our Commander in Chief and the National Security Council, who for long weeks and many months of earnest study—and as the President told us in January in his state of the Union message after much prayerful consideration—have arrived at what they believe to be a sane, sensible, and sound military program.

The so-called new look at our national defense is misleading. There is nothing new under the sun. There is constantly a new look every day at our military preparedness and our national defense. It must necessarily be so in this scientific age of rapid technological development, with the quick changes in the techniques and methods of warfare. The shift is one of emphasis, perhaps from one branch of the service to another, but all of our great leaders, military and civilian, know that we are going to have to have an Army, a Navy, a Marine Corps, and an Air Force at all times.

It is a matter of which particular branch needs the most at any particular given place and moment. I am glad that our distinguished and able chairman has gone along with the administration's recommendations, believing that the decision finally arrived at, after much prolonged study, thoughtful reflection, and prayerful consideration, is a safe and a sane program.

Mr. Chairman, not only must America have military might and economic strength, but we must have intellectual power and moral and spiritual strength. I am glad that my good friend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] pointed out the necessity of improving our schools, and of having better and more advanced education; because no nation is ever stronger than the intelligence and the character of its own citizens. After all, if we are going to win the cold war in which we are engaged, it will be won not only by military might and by economic strength—security with solvency—but it is going to be won in the realm of the thoughts of men; because nothing in the world is great but man, and nothing in man is great but mind.

After all, we are engaged in an ideological war. Sometimes I think our psychological warfare has been the weakest link in our chain of defense and the lamentable and tragic thing is that the United States of America, in spite of all the billions of dollars in economic and military aid that we have extended to

other nations of the world following World War II, has been a rather poor salesman and has not gotten it across to the people of the various countries to which this aid has gone as to who is responsible for the succor and help given.

After all, an idea is the most powerful weapon on earth and it can become the most dangerous weapon on earth because you cannot shoot an idea with a rifle, stab it with a bayonet, or destroy it with an atomic bomb.

So in this cold war that is going to last for how long only divine providence knows, we are going to have to remain strong militarily, maintain our economic strength, increase our intellectual powers, and return to the moral concepts, the ethical ideals and spiritual principles instilled into us at the knee of our fathers and mothers. We have got to have a balanced national defense. We must not succumb to a blatant and arrogant jingoism and we must avoid a flabby and sentimental pacifism.

I repeat, there are many facets and angles to this knotty problem. No one is here voting for a draft because he likes it. It is really contrary to the spirit of freedom and to the lovers of liberty everywhere. But we are not the ones who are going to determine the size of our Armed Forces or the amount of money that we shall spend in building up and maintaining them. The size of our Armed Forces and the amount of money that we spend to defend this Nation will be determined largely by the actions of our enemy. And the men in the Kremlin are the ones who seem to be determined on worldwide domination and who, since the close of World War II, have extended Russia's physical and political domination from a population of less than 200 million to a population of more than 800 million, or one-third of the human race.

And they have evidenced no desire or intention of changing their fundamental aim and ambition of worldwide conquest and of domination of all peoples.

Realizing the precarious position in which we find ourselves, we are constrained in your House Committee on Armed Services, charged with the responsibility for the defense of this Nation, to bring to the House here in February, before the act expires on the 30th of June, this bill which will extend the draft, with two very proper and necessary amendments, in my opinion, which the committee has offered, for another 4 years, because certainly no man among us can foresee what is going to happen in the trying days ahead when the old ship of state is floundering and rocking amidst treacherous shoals, and in dangerous waters.

There is little I or anyone among us could add to the comprehensive and clear explanation given by the distinguished chairman of our committee. I am glad he pointed out that this is wholly divorced from the Reserve program or from universal military training or any modified form of it. This is something that, however distasteful it may be to us, we are compelled to pass in defense of the Nation and for our own survival as a free people. I do not like to take castor oil, but sometimes it is good for the patient.

A few days ago the Members of this body by an almost unanimous vote not only served notice on our enemies but gave assurance to our allies that the American people are united and determined that there shall not be further Communist aggression. I think that because of that firm stand, with all of the inherent dangers that go with it, we serve notice to the world that we mean business. All we can do now is work and hope and pray earnestly that a third world conflict will be avoided. If it comes it will not be of our choosing.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. You speak of assurance to our allies. If we have any allies they must be in the United Nations. What assurance have we from our allies that they propose to stand with us, any part of them? What are the terms of conscription among the member states of the United Nations? How long do they conscript in their countries?

Mr. SHORT. Practically all the countries of the NATO organization have conscription, but only Britain and Turkey, and I think perhaps Greece, have the 24 months we do in the United States. All the others are for a shorter period of time, from 14 to 18 months.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, there are 3 out of the other 59 member nations of the United Nations that carry on conscription as we do in this country?

Mr. SHORT. That is right. I will say to the gentleman that all of us have been more or less disappointed at the failure to achieve a greater cooperation and greater success in the United Nations. I know that I have been disappointed; at times disgusted. But being an infant organization, it has to crawl before it can walk and it has to walk before it can run. Though I believe we should have allies and assist them in every way, I agree wholeheartedly with the feeling of the gentleman from Iowa, whom I know so well and whose feelings and philosophy I know and respect, that we cannot go on forever siphoning off our wealth in economic and even military aid to take care of every nation from Zamboanga to Zanzibar without weakening this Nation and going completely bankrupt.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. May I ask the gentleman if the committee heard any testimony or gave any consideration to amending the provision in the law which says, and I think it became effective in 1950 or 1951, a man when he becomes 26 years of age is nevertheless still liable if he enjoyed a deferment. That applies not only to deferments for occupational reasons and questions of support and matters of that sort, but applies to men, for example, who are found to be disqualified for military service perhaps on one, two, or three occasions and later, after they passed their 26th birthday——

Mr. SHORT. And those causes of deferment were removed?

Mr. JONAS. That is right. I know the case of a man who was called up for examination on three separate occasions when he was under 26 years of age, and when he was not married and did not have a family. He was perfectly willing to go on each of those occasions, but he was rejected by the Armed Services Induction Station. Then he married and started a family. He is now approaching 30 years of age and has been recalled for examination and found qualified, and finds that he must go into the service. It seems to me that that kind of situation was not contemplated by the framers of the law when they said that if the man enjoyed a deferment, his period of service would be extended to 35 years. I just wondered if the committee had heard any testimony or given any consideration to that?

Mr. SHORT. That poor fellow—who is one of very few in the overall picture is most unfortunate, I would say, under existing law. However, one of the amendments which the committee adopted and submits to you is to reduce the length of required reserve service of members of the National Guard and their liability for service from the age of 35 down to 26 to conform with the draft law of drafting men from 18½ to their 26th year. But the fellow who through no fault of his own was not inducted or selected before his 26th birthday, and then who got married and whose physical defect, perhaps, was removed or overcome, under existing law is liable until the age of 35.

Mr. JONAS. May I interrupt—he may not have overcome it—he was just examined by a different doctor.

Mr. SHORT. He makes a fool out of the doctors, and there are some among them.

Mr. JONAS. I just wondered whether the committee has given any consideration to the advisability of eliminating that sort of thing from the deferment category.

Mr. SHORT. I should say that that is one rare case out of a thousand.

Mr. JONAS. Oh no—I know of scores of cases.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman realizes the difficulty, if not the impossibility of writing a formula that will apply universally to all people which will give exact justice in all cases.

Mr. JONAS. I realize that.

Mr. SHORT. In fact, the first lesson I think I learned as a Member of Congress—and I was not here many months before I found out how difficult it was to vote for a law to help somebody without stepping on somebody else's toes.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Is it not true that the physical requirements or the physical standards were dropped, and that is the reason many of these people are now liable to induction and service—because those requirements were dropped?

Mr. SHORT. Both the physical and mental standards were lowered.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Yes; mental standards were lowered also.

Mr. SHORT. Both the physical and mental standards were lowered to the

irreducible minimum, and notwithstanding those lowered standards, I was shocked, as were members of our committee, when we were told by the Director of Selective Service and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower that one-third of the young men of this Nation were rejected from induction because of a mental or a physical incapacity.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I know of scores of cases in my own State and district where men were declared essential to agriculture and given a 2C classification where they are now occupying the same status, and the situation is more essential now for them to remain on the farm due to sickness in the family or on account of the father dying and probably leaving the widow behind, and where they have invariably in the past year put these men in class 1A and inducted them into the service. The essentiality has not changed. Has the committee given any consideration to that?

Mr. SHORT. If it has changed at all, they are needed more today than previously.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right.

Mr. SHORT. I have many of these cases and I have the greatest sympathy for them. I do not like it to be given out that men who are engaged in agriculture in sections of the country where we have a surplus of certain commodities should be immediately inducted.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It would appear to me that the Selective Service and the Army are trying to handle the agricultural problem, trying to do away with the surpluses. That is one reason why they are inducting these men into service.

Let me ask the gentleman another question. As I understood it, back in 1951 the Congress did not approve universal military training.

Mr. SHORT. That is correct, by a margin of 73.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is something in the preamble of the Selective Service Act which would indicate universal military training. Does the gentleman agree that universal military training could be put into operation because of the words contained in the preamble?

Mr. SHORT. I do not think so, under this particular legislation, although I want to say to the gentleman that I feel very much as he does, that the title that was given it is rather misleading to the American people. This is really an extension of the Draft Act, and the title rather diplomatically, smoothly, and surreptitiously slipped over when we passed the extension of the Draft Act 4 years ago.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is exactly what the Selective Service has done in many areas. They have put universal military training into operation. Men who have been deferred for essential occupations have been classed I–A, and have been inducted.

Mr. SHORT. Of course under the present law I think it is up to the local boards to make the decision whether or not a man is to be inducted and whether or not he is essential to the health, safety, and welfare of the Nation, although we have received many complaints. I dare say every Member has received complaints that the military and some of the directors of the Selective Service System in various States have put pressure on the local boards to draft more men in particular categories.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Was it ever the intention in the House of Representatives or the Congress that this last act, passed in 1951, would do away with essentiality in occupation, to determine whether or not a man should be inducted into the military service?

Mr. SHORT. I do not think it was the intention of Congress.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then the Selective Service System is going contrary to the intent of Congress.

Mr. SHORT. In certain spots I am sure that is true, but it is a most difficult problem, and in spite of all the criticisms that have been leveled at Selective Service and these local boards, practically all members of the local boards are serving without pay or compensation. They have rather a thankless task. I have considerable sympathy for most of them. Of course, power is abused in places, in a program so vast and large that it is nationwide. But power is abused sometimes even in other branches of government.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Following up the thoughts suggested by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], the chairman of the committee has stated in his closing remarks that under this act the obligation to serve is universal, but the system of choosing who shall serve is selective. Did the committee give any consideration to the fact that the very mechanics of the selection is what causes hardship under this act, and that, therefore, by lowering the age it would require more equal distribution of the obligation in the age group, and would permit an individual, once he is beyond a certain age, to plan his life.

Mr. SHORT. Yes. I think the committee heard all those questions the gentleman has raised.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I take it that the committee would oppose an amendment which was introduced to lower the age limit.

Mr. SHORT. Yes.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. In that connection, when we were considering the advisability of dropping the age, or encouraging the local draft boards to take younger men than older men, it was definitely brought out that should we have done such a thing we would have relieved these older men.

Mr. SHORT. Men in their late twenties.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Twenty-three to twenty-six. Men in that class would have been relieved of their obligation and privilege of serving at all, which is contrary to the basic concept.

It was also pointed out very definitely that if these young men had been afraid of having their lives seriously dislocated they could very well have enlisted for 2 years or volunteered for induction.

Mr. SHORT. They had the choice. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DEVEREUX. They had the choice. I do not see that we are doing any injustice to these particular people.

Mr. SHORT. They have the choice to enter the service freely at an earlier age, as the gentleman from Maryland so well pointed out.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I merely want to point out that there are those men who have been repeatedly deferred until they reach age 26.

Mr. SHORT. That is right.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. But, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's remarks leave out of consideration the young men who are deferred not to escape an obligation but to meet an obligation, perhaps an obligation to his home, to his job in which he may be making an equal contribution to the welfare of the country; and he is absolutely incapable of planning his life, the life of his family, his marriage plans, or the plans of his children or his wife until he has reached age 35.

Mr. SHORT. That uncertainty, of course, confronts every young man in the Nation.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. That is the major reason we are discussing it.

Mr. GAVIN. It is still a matter for the local draft boards, the members of which are appointed by the Governors of their respective States, men of character and integrity, representative citizens of the community, who reach a decision on these matters.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has consumed 35 minutes and has 25 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has consumed 33 minutes and has 27 remaining.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentlemen from Texas [Mr. KILDAY.]

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my pleasure in endorsing what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], my very good friend, has had to say as to the necessity for the extension of this law for another 4 years. The gentleman from Missouri has had the opportunity, as have I, from the beginning of the compulsory training program of being thoroughly cognizant of the facts. He has just completed 2 years, 2 very efficient years, as chairman of our committee, during which time he was a most able, considerate, and fair chairman. I am glad to know that he

comes here today in wholehearted support of the extension of this law for a period of 4 years.

Mr. Chairman, it was not necessary for our committee to hear witnesses as to the necessity for the extension of the law; nor is it necessary for us to quote to the Members of this House the testimony of any witness as to the necessity for its extension; we all know the situation which exists in the world; we know the necessity for an extension of this law.

As to whether the extension should be for 4 years or a lesser time, as the gentleman from North Carolina has suggested, let me remind you that if this act is extended as provided in this bill we will have had, except for a very limited period of time, a selective service and training act, or a universal service and training act in force for a period of only months less than 19 years. With the exception of the 1 year period from 1947 to 1948, we have had legislation of this kind in effect for 15 years.

I do not believe we can learn anything from our experience in the past 15 years that could give us any confidence in hoping that the extension of this act for 2 additional years would relieve us of the necessity; and as to the concern of those who are unfortunately subject to these provisions, we have been through many occasions since 1940 when the law was about to expire.

We know that the uncertainty which then confronted the young man as to whether or not the law itself would be extended far exceeds the uncertainty as to whether or not he is going to be called. So long as the law is in effect then, of course, every man knows that there is an obligation imposed upon him by that law.

After all, what is the Selective Service System? It is a system by which we supply to the armed services the manpower needed. The passage of it does not require that inductions continue or that they continue at any particular rate. Whenever the executive department, the President, determines that no further increase in the armed services is necessary he may reduce or even completely suspend inductions under it. So that in passing it we place it in a position to be there if necessary, not to be used if unnecessary.

Let us go back 4 years so that we may understand exactly what we have here, particularly in view of the statement made by the gentleman from North Carolina as to the period of time and as to periods of training. In 1951 we passed the Universal Military Service and Training Act. Prior to that time we had had the Selective Training and Service Act. Now it is the Universal Military Service and Training Act. The emphasis was placed in the opposite direction.

That law is a permanent one. That law has no expiration date. What we are extending here is the provision of that law as to the date upon which inductions shall cease. That provision was put in for the very purpose the gentleman from North Carolina has mentioned of giving the Congress the right to reexamine periodically as to whether or not men should continue to be inducted. We are now approaching the expiration date of the period during which they can be inducted and the question is whether or not we are going to continue to permit them to be inducted.

The other phase of the law in 1951 was the UMT portion. In the law that we are considering here today, the one we are extending the power to induct under, it provided for universal military training, but before that could go into effect there had to be submitted to the Congress by a commission which we created a plan for universal military training which had to be approved by the Congress. We brought in a plan submitted by the Training Commission and the House rejected it. So that that phase of the law never came into effect. That phase of the program is not concerned here.

The gentleman from North Carolina has spoken about taking men in for a period of 3 months and permitting them to return to school. I am firmly of the opinion that something of that character can be worked out. I believe that the provision we brought in here to implement the Universal Military Service and Training Act would have done so. My recollection is we provided for a period of 6 months' training, then he would go to the reserve organization. I do not believe the gentleman from North Carolina supported that. I believe he quite vigorously opposed it.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. I very definitely did and I found myself with the overwhelming majority of the House.

Mr. KILDAY. I shall never forget the gentleman's opposition. It was not only firm but loud. We had quite a good time here discussing that matter for several days.

I believe that a period of active duty training and then into the reserves is the proper thing for this country but we have never been able to get it done. We have had hearing after hearing and attempt after attempt, but it has never been done.

I was interested in the unfortunate case which the gentleman from North Carolina described here of the young man who went into the service in March and was killed in August. I do not care if every general in the Pentagon says he was adequately trained, I would have felt much better about the example had he survived rather than been killed after having entered the service in March and finding himself on the front lines in August and being killed in the service. But that is not the issue here. That phase is not involved here.

We attempted in 1952 to pass something along that line. As the gentleman from North Carolina stated, he was successful on that occasion in beating our ears down and that proposal was defeated. It was recommitted by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. If the gentleman wants to enter into another debate on that bill, I welcome it, but I do not think the gentleman is fair——

Mr. KILDAY. I insist I am being fair——

Mr. BARDEN. In repeating the language of the act. The gentleman who just spoke, who was chairman of the committee, and whom the gentleman just bragged about as being about the greatest civilian leader, a great past chairman——

Mr. KILDAY. Do not take all of my time.

Mr. BARDEN. You remember that he opposed that, too, did he not?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes, sir; he opposed it. He has consistently opposed it.

Mr. BARDEN. I do not think the gentleman would except either the gentleman from Missouri or myself in opposing some of the things—and probably by now does not blame us. I certainly have no regrets.

Mr. KILDAY. I yield no further, because I only have 10 minutes. The point I am making is that the gentleman from Missouri is totally consistent. The gentleman from Missouri is also differentiating between two different proposals. The gentleman from Missouri has always and invariably and vigorously opposed universal military training, and I am not too sanguine that he will ever support it. That has always been the position of the gentleman from Missouri. But the gentleman from Missouri has always supported selective induction when it was needed to raise men for the services, but the gentleman from Missouri has not raised here any question as to a limited period of training. He has endorsed its extension because it is just to secure men for service, not for training.

Mr. BARDEN. Does the gentleman mean to say to this House, because I make a suggestion to improve this bill, that I am not supporting selective service and the proper defense of this country?

Mr. KILDAY. I made no such statement. It may be that unfortunately the gentleman from Texas is given to expressing himself a little bit positively, but I know a gentleman from North Carolina who has the same failing. The thing I like about him is that we can have these fights and stay the best of friends. He gives no quarter and asks for none.

What I want to point out here is that this has nothing to do with the limited period of training and then going into the Reserve. This is the extension of the induction for a period not to exceed 24 months where these men are liable for training and for service, and having completed their 24 months they have a Reserve obligation, as all men have had since the original act of 1940, and that the two should not be confused. So, I hope that we will not have an amendment adopted that would reduce the period of extension from 4 to 2 years, because the events have not shown that we can be so sanguine as to expect that the situation in which we now find ourselves will have cleared within a matter of 2 years.

There are probably in the existing law many situations that could be cured. I believe it is true, however, that most of those things found to be irritating result from administration rather than the provisions of the law itself. I do not know how you could provide against arbitrary administration any better than the Selective Service Act has provided against it, because the final say as to who shall go and who shall not go is vested not in any bureaucrat but in the local citizens who serve without compensation. They are appointed in Washington, it is true, but the law provides that they shall be appointed upon the recommendation of the Governor of the State. So we have decentralized this as much as possibly can be done. There may be provisions in the law which should be removed. I do not know that this is the time to do it. I think that this is the time to see to it as nearly as we possibly can that the administration of the law be in accordance with the written word and the spirit of the law.

So I sincerely trust that we will extend the existing law for a period of 4 years; and that in our consideration of it we do not become confused as to those things which we proposed here in 1952 and did not accomplish; but that we are proposing to extend the period, in a time when we do not know what is going on in Russia, when we wish to we knew more about what is going on in Formosa, we are extending authorization for induction for training and service for 4 years, and that we do not become confused about shortening our period of training under universal military training, which is not before us today.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, the necessity for extending the Universal Military Training and Service Act is evident. The purpose of this bill is to extend the authority to induct individuals into the armed services through the operation of the Selective Service System from the present expiration date of June 30, 1955, to July 1, 1959.

The United States must maintain an armed force of at least 2,850,000 men for the indefinite future. Previous experience has proved that the maximum that can be maintained on a voluntary basis is 1,500,000.

To maintain an armed-force strength of 2,850,000 through fiscal year 1959, with 1 million of these men in the Army, will require approximately 670,000 24-month inductees, or an average of 14,000 inductees monthly. In addition, the Armed Forces will need approximately 2,100,000 voluntary enlistments during this same 4-year period. There can be little doubt that the extension of the selective-service law is the major factor in obtaining voluntary enlistments for all of the services.

I believe that statistics will prove that during the periods when the draft law was not in effect, or was not in operation, the Armed Forces were unable to obtain their authorized strength from voluntary enlistments. Therefore, it is obvious that the only practical method by which the Armed Forces can be maintained at the proposed strengths for the next 4 years is through the extension of the authority to induct individuals into the Armed Forces.

Mr. Chairman, in these troubled times our Nation must maintain a strong military posture. This is no time to be weak, for those who would advance the cause of communism respect only strength.

Under the provisions of the bill which would extend present law, exemptions are held to a minimum and, of course, there are provisions for deferments of certain individuals. It should be pointed out that these are deferments only, and that, in most instances, after deferments have expired those individuals will be required to serve and complete their military obligation to our country.

Representatives of the Department of Defense and of the military services have assured our committee that an honest attempt is being made to reach a period of stability in our Armed Forces. We all know of the "peaks and valleys" concept whereby the Armed Forces were increased during periods of war or national emergency and then allowed to almost deteriorate, only to be expanded again when the danger to our national security seemed apparent.

I should also point out that the bill carries an extension of the Dependents Assistance Act, which otherwise would terminate on July 1, 1955. This is necessary to enable enlisted members of the uniformed services with dependents to continue in receipt of increased allowances for quarters, thereby assuring adequate financial assistance to members of the Armed Forces and their dependents, inducted or enlisted, in the future, as well as those now on active duty.

Much as I dislike the necessity of having a large military force in peacetime, I am nevertheless convinced that it is necessary now. It is one important vehicle that will enhance our power to develop a stable peace. The President has declared that the development of world peace is his major objective. He thinks that the step which we should take to help him is to stabilize our Military Establishment at the size recommended in this bill.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, until such time as volunteer enlistments are sufficient to fulfill our military requirements, it is necessary to continue this draft. It may perhaps be unfortunate that we must continue to call our young men into the service, but the reasons are compelling.

This action is necessary if we are to safeguard our heritage, accept the challenges of our generation and meet any future test that might threaten to imperil our security and peace. There is certainly no evidence that the future of our country will face a diminished challenge in the years ahead.

There can be no question in the minds of those who have considered this problem and analyzed the world situation, that as long as the threat of communism hangs over the world, we must have a strong military force that can discourage aggression or effectively combat it if the occasion demands.

It is generally estimated that our personnel level in the Armed Forces can be maintained at approximately 1,500,000 on a voluntary basis. Present planning indicates the requirement of approximately 2,850,000 as of June, 1956, and which is some 300,000 less men than are on active duty today. This goal for 1956 is about double the number of men on active duty prior to the Korean war.

As long as the size of our military forces exceeds the number of voluntary enlistees, it is the duty of the Congress to assure that this gap be filled. That is the purpose of this legislation and I urge its passage.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], the ranking member of the committee, for allowing me this time to discuss some of my views on the pending bill.

Let me say that I certainly hope to live long enough to see the time that we do not have to have a Draft Act or a Selective Service Act or a Universal Military Training Act in this country. But I do recognize the realities enough to know that we must have a continuation of the present Selective Service System which, by title, is now being referred to as the Universal Military Training Act, although it is not and I do not consider it as such. But I do say that there is a need for a continuation of it. I should like very much to see it continued for a 2-year rather than a 4-year term, and I will explain to you as best I can some of the reasons why I think it should be a 2-year term.

My district is a heavy agricultural and dairy district. I have had probably as many national health, safety, and interest cases as any Member of the Congress—or at least my share of them. I have repeatedly been impressed with two phases of those cases. Men who were deferred during World War II because they were engaged in agricultural pursuits, deferred during the Korean emergency, and deferred until the last year or 18 months are now being drafted, at the age of 28 or 29 when obviously they were under the same conditions for deferment as existed during all that time. But now they are being told that unless they serve before they are 35 years of age, they are going to serve now. I do not think that was ever the intention of the Congress either under the Tydings Act or under the general provisions of the present act.

Many of these cases are cases where old people own the farm which is being

operated by their son. I had one case of a widowed mother with a son operating the farm and a 12-year-old boy. Neither she nor the young boy could operate the car. They took the older son, who had been deferred for some years, and put him in the service. I wonder just what kind of soldier that boy is going to make all the time he is in the service while worrying about the hardship conditions which face his mother and his young brother on that farm.

That happened in many more instances where there was an old couple on the farm, with the father perhaps being as old as 70 and beyond, and the son, who had had the sole management of the farm, after having been deferred for years was taken at 27, 28, or 29 years of age. The only answer I got from the State selective service was, "Well, he has not served. He had better serve as early as he can, even if he is that old, before he is 35."

The same applies to these hardship cases that we all get. The services have indicated time after time that they would discharge a man on a hardship bases, but under the rigamarole they go through now they have to refer the application for discharge back to the Selective Service. The Selective Service will not admit they could possibly make a mistake, or resist the inference that they made a mistake in the first place, so they disapprove, the matter goes back to the service concerned, and the man stays on; and the hardship on that individual and his dependents increases day by day.

I say that some of the things that are done in some of these hardship cases when they are examined are some of the most pitiful that you can imagine. They are the cruelest administrative acts I have ever seen.

Let me say briefly upon the matter of compassionate reassignments that I have sometimes found the military quite inconsiderate. I think there could well be a little shaking up of the military departments in connection with the request for a compassionate reassignment, for instance, of a boy who is overseas and who might be sent back to serve at least some place where he could give some aid and comfort and assistance to his family, who have lost a husband and father and who as a consequence face difficult problems.

One or two Members have spoken about the local boards' using their judgment. Generally speaking, I have the highest regard for our local Selective Service boards, but some of them are simply tools of the "hard-boiled Smiths" and the "I–A Browns" that the State Selective Service send out and who tell the local boards what to do, that they are not to make their own judgments but are to take the judgment of these experts from the State Selective Service. With that I heartily disagree. I want the local board to make its own judgment, but I am not willing for it to have imposed upon it the brow-beating judgment of someone in the State Selective Service setup who comes down there and in 5 minutes tries to determine what the board may have spent days and weeks in determining, as to whether a certain young man should be deferred.

There is one other observation I should like to pass on to you. I think the average youngster would like to enlist rather than be drafted. That applied to me and it applied to my three sons. But now you have a couple of the services that will not take them in for any shorter period of time than 4 years, and I am speaking of the Air Force and the Navy. To the average youngster who enlists, that last year is just like serving a year in the penitentiary. He does not mind the 3 years, but he loathes and hates the fourth year. I think it is tragic that the great Committee on Armed Services has not taken that apart at some of the committee hearings. I talked to a lot of youngsters who feel just exactly that way. There is no reason or justification except that it is the easy and lazy way for the services to add another year to the years that are taken off a boy's life.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I think the gentleman has gone a little far and has used pretty strong language when he says it is the easy and lazy way. Because of the very nature of the service, particularly the Navy and the Air Force, 4 years is a much better period of time in which to train skilled men, particularly in the field of electronics and radar and in the other kinds of the latest equipment. You can train a soldier in 2 years time, of course. The Army takes them for 2 years. But the Navy and Air Force need a longer period of time to properly train their men.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Of course, the gentleman knows very well that many of them cannot get it in 4 years so far as some types of training are concerned, and they have to reenlist and reenlist. My point is they can do it just as well under a 3-year enlistment as they can under a 4-year enlistment.

Mr. SHORT. If the gentleman had listened to all the testimony that has been given to us by the experts, I do not believe that he would hold that opinion. We learn that it is much cheaper to train a man for 4 years instead of having this expensive system of rotation every 2 years.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. If the services treat these boys right, they will reenlist and they would not have to worry about that.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this time to make a simple, general statement in reference to the need of the renewal of this law under the draft statute. I was in Congress when our first draft law in time of peace went through and was put on the statute books. We made it of limited duration, and each time when the termination date came around, we have had to extend the draft law and place another termination date upon it. When the President first requested authority for a 4-year extension, I thought perhaps that was a little long to ask the Congress to extend the draft law. But, then, when I went back and reviewed the history of the Draft Act, I found often we have had to extend this act, and each time we went through hearings and then went through the ordeal of extending the draft law, I realized that 4 years was not too long a period of time to ask the Congress to extend this law to draft our young men into the armed services of the United States.

I have been asked, since I have been on the floor, what this has to do with reference to the strength of the Military Establishment. Does this weaken or does this strengthen our Military Establishment? Have we, from the Committee on Armed Services, performed our duty properly in the extension of this draft by failing to incorporate within the terms of this proposed law some reference to the strength of our Military Establishment at the present time? Personally, I think not. I think that we have a duty first to place this law upon the books and let the country know that the draft is going to be extended over a period of time. Then, I think we have the obligation, and a serious obligation, to go more fully into the question of the strength of our armed services at the present time. There is no question, Mr. Chairman, but that the world is in very serious danger at the present time. There is no question but that we face serious and grave troubles in the Far East. I think, under the provisions of article I of the Constitution, section 8, the Congress is obligated to follow through on the question of the strength of the military department to find out from day to day and week to week and month to month, if necessary, whether or not we are providing for the Nation that type of military establishment which will do the very best that can be done to defend this country and provide for the continuation of free institutions in the United States and other parts of the world that are in need of assistance at this time.

I wish to say at this time that I think this is a separate matter, to be handled separately from the extension of the draft. It is unthinkable, to my mind, that other problems should arise at this time to delay this particular piece of legislation in its passage through the Congress. We have too much at stake to quibble over side issues at the present time. This bill ought to be passed and it should be passed at once. I concurred with our distinguished chairman when he suggested that we take up the legislation this year and divide it so that the extension of the draft would not be delayed, but would be passed by the House and Senate and signed by the President at the earliest possible date, to give further assurance to those nations who stand with us in time of peril that we are providing a military establishment with the proper means of insuring its continued strength; and, furthermore, that we are telling the Soviets in no uncertain terms that we are providing for at least 4 more years that our Military Establishment will be built up to its necessary strength by the use of the Draft Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to extend the colloquy I engaged in with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] when he was making his original presentation.

The existing statute is section 6 (h) as amended. I refer to the amendment which became law on June 19, 1951. That section provided as follows:

> That persons who are or may be deferred under the provisions of this section shall remain liable for training and service in the Armed Forces, or for training in the National Security Training Corps, under the provisions of section 4 (a) of this act until the 35th anniversary of the date of their birth.

My point is that if an individual is taken to an Armed Forces induction station and there rejected because he failed to meet physical standards, when he goes back to his local board he is automatically placed in a deferred classification by reason of that finding by the Armed Forces that he is unfit for military service.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is confining his complaint to physical disabilities of the inductee, or does the gentleman want to broaden it to include education?

Mr. JONAS. No, sir. I would not object to including rejection for mental conditions, but I am thinking now in terms of rejection for physical conditions.

Mr. VINSON. Now suppose a man had gone before a board 3 or 4 or 5 times and had been rejected on account of physical disability, and he passes his 26th year of birth. We will say he is 30 years of age. Then, under the law, he is subject to the draft until he is 35.

Mr. JONAS. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. Thereafter a new doctor passes upon him and says he is physically fit.

The gentleman's point is that having been rejected 3 or 4 times before he was 26 he should not be required to serve after that age.

Mr. JONAS. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. How many times is the gentleman going to give him a rejection on physical grounds? Five times?

Mr. JONAS. I would not impose any particular number. I would say that if an individual is deferred solely by reason of the fact that the Armed Forces induction station rejected him, it ought not to count as a deferment so as to extend his liability for service beyond 26, because such individual did not ask for deferment; he reported when he was told to report for induction, went to the induction center but was rejected by the Armed Forces.

Mr. VINSON. Let us go over it again so we may understand it. The young man is drafted by the local board, reports to the induction center and the induction center finds that he is physically disqualified. He goes back to his domicile, stays there a while; the induction board drafts him again and sends him to the induction center where he is again turned down. The gentleman takes the position that that should continue only until he reaches 26 years age.

Mr. JONAS. And then it ought to end. That is exactly my position.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman holds that when he gets to age 26 if they have not accepted him, then he ought to be free.

Mr. JONAS. If they have not accepted him up until he is 26 years of age, his liability for service ought to be like that of anybody else.

Mr. VINSON. I am somewhat in sympathy with the gentleman's proposition, but it depends upon the skill with which such an amendment is drafted. While we are talking about his plan we understand it, but when it comes to reducing it to black and white, it has got to be so drafted that it cannot be subject to any other interpretation.

The theory of the 35-year-age limit was to keep these boys who get college deferments and other types of deferments from escaping liability for induction. That is the base of the whole thing. It wasn't intended, as I recall, to apply it to one who has been rejected by the induction center on account of physical disability.

Mr. SHORT. If the gentleman will yield, after he passes his 26th birthday he is not much good anyway.

Mr. JONAS. The gentleman is correct; and I would like to say to the gentleman from Georgia that he has put his finger exactly on the point I have in mind: It was never intended; I think it was inadvertently left in the law.

Mr. VINSON. It all depends, as I have said, on the drafting of the amendment. These matters are technical, and you cannot write this kind of bill on the floor of the House. It takes considerable time and study to learn how it affects other factors so that we do not set a precedent. In our desire to achieve an objective we may leave a loophole through which people can go that we do not want to get through.

Mr. JONAS. Just for the information of the members of the committee listening, I want to read the text of the amendment I propose to offer if given an opportunity:

> At the end of the first sentence of section 6 (h) before the word "shall" in the second proviso, add this language: "except persons deferred at any time by reason of having been found to be physically unfit for service at an Armed Forces induction station."

That would apply only to men who are rejected on account of physical disqualification after having been delivered to an induction station.

Mr. VINSON. And he would continue to be eligible for induction up to age 26.

Mr. JONAS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Would the gentleman accept a modification of his amendment of substantially these words: "Provided the standards had not been lowered"?

Mr. JONAS. No; I would not favor that change. I think selective service ought to be able to get these individuals back up to induction stations before they are 26 years of age if they have not been deferred for some other reason; and my amendment would not apply to them.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, the measure before us today, of course, is one that is necessary. Most of us are of that opinion. But I have been somewhat disappointed in the operation of this act on many occasions, and other Members of the House have, too.

The operation of it has got a little bit away from what the House intended when the act was first adopted. This measure was set up primarily as a civilian agency. Today it is operating primarily through the military in the country. The military has its place in our life, but the civilian has his place, also. The operation of it has been complained of today by the status of certain of these individuals as has been indicated by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] and others. Most of the complaints can be alleviated by the directors and others who administer the law. Many of the inequities should be corrected.

Under the law we inducted this year 6.1 percent of all inductees over 26 years of age into our Army. Just think what that means. If you had all of that flock of kids and their wives together you would have something that this country I think would simply rise up and say: "We are not going to let such a thing as this exist any longer." But that is what is going on under this act. These boys are deferred for high school, for 4 years of college, then they wind up with 2 years in the service and are married with 1 or 2 children and over 26 because of deferment. That is a very expensive soldier. I think the Congress should correct that situation and we should correct it in this measure here today.

We might just as well be realistic about this. We hear about a plan, and our chairman today has stated that this is a long-range program, one that we should make up our minds about. But if you are going to adopt a long-range program in this country, we should adopt one with some commonsense in it. That simply does not exist today. This is a training program. Whatever you say it is nothing else, it is a training program. You will find a very few boys today who are not inducted under this measure but all are expected and do service. So what is it except a Universal Military and Training Act? You cannot get away from it. You have a few deferments but in the end to carry out the directives everybody has got to take the training up to 35 years of age. In peacetime here we say, by extending this act there are going to be no deferments, we should be realistic by lowering the induction age, with no deferments except hardship and physical.

In peacetime today we say that by extending this act there are going to be no deferments but we should be realistic. We turn around and defer all high-school students until they finish high

school. Then we defer the boys for 4 years of college work provided, they make certain grades. Many of these boys are 24 or 25 years of age when they finish college. They then have to go into the Army and spend 2 years.

Therefore, you almost deprive the country of a very large percentage of the science students, especially, those in the master degree and doctor degree categories. Many of the boys are coming out of the service at 26 and 27 years of age. They are not likely to take further work in college. If this continues for the next 25 years, it will affect seriously our supply of scientists in this country.

With the turn of events today in Russia and our commitments in almost all parts of the world, it seems to me that we should look at this manpower problem in a serious manner. I have always supported the Armed Forces but I want to support them in a realistic manner because certainly our country cannot afford to go backward and lose our technical know-how. It takes human beings for this job and not machines. A machine is only the product of technical know-how.

World conditions today make it necessary that we ever remain in a state of readiness. This measure provides a part of that and on this basis, I am supporting it.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, conscientious, thinking, patriotic, but anxious and worried constituents ask and write inquiring whether we are to have a military or a labor government, rather than a government of, by, and for all the people.

A LABOR GOVERNMENT

Since 1935, when the Wagner Act, written in the main by a Communist, and enacted by Congress to give employees the opportunity to organize and better their working and living conditions, labor organizations have become politically powerful.

Some of their leaders, instead of confining their efforts to bettering the overall welfare of employees as did the father of organized labor, Samuel Gompers, have used the unions to advance their own political ambitions.

Through the collection of initiation fees, union dues, special assessments, and the sale of right-to-work permits, unions have accumulated millions, if not billions, of dollars. Millions of dollars of these funds have been used in political campaigns to elect to public office individuals who too often accept domination from union officials.[1]

The net result has been that legislation granting special benefits and special privileges to labor organizations and their members has been pushed through State and national lawmaking bodies.

Though rightly and logically taxes can be levied or collected only by governmental organizations, unions have seized and hold the power to levy and collect contributions from employees, the burden in turn being passed along to employers, and through them paid ultimately by consumers—taxpayers.

The merger of the AFL and the CIO will undoubtedly bring on an organizing drive which, using not only argument, but beating and rioting, will result in forcing millions of additional unwilling workers into the union, where they will be governed and taxed by the unions.

Unless forthwith drastic action is taken, through amendment of the Sherman Act and the LaGuardia Act, to confine the activities of unions to their legitimate sphere—that is, an increase in wages, the betterment of the working conditions of employees—we will shortly have here in the United States a political government by labor with resultant legislation enacted primarily to advance the interests of employees, regardless of the effect which it may have upon industry and those who do not belong to the union.

We will then more certainly and with greater rapidity follow along down the road recently pursued by England and which, it has been demonstrated, leads to a destination unacceptable to anyone.

A labor government is on its way.

Whether labor organizations first attain their goal, acquire political control, determine our national policy, before we have a government by and for the military, is a question the answer to which is not clear.

One thing is certain, and that is, that, though here in America organized labor may at the moment go along with the military, basically their ends are diametrically opposed. Under the military, as has been demonstrated by history, the workingman is but another form of ammunition to be used and expended, as are atomic, hydrogen, and other weapons.

Organized labor's program, and the effect thereof, will be referred to later.

Our people do not want, and the Congress has more than once rejected, universal military training. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] a member of the Armed Services Committee, just stated, we have conscription, and I quote:

> Except for a very limited period of time, a selective service and training act, or a universal service and training act [has been] in force for a period of only months less than 19 years. With the exception of the 1-year period from 1947 to 1948, we have had legislation of this kind in effect for 15 years.

Then he added:

> I do not believe we can learn anything from our experience in the past 15 years that could give us any confidence in hoping that the extension of this act for 2 additional years would relieve us of the necessity.

The gentleman was speaking in opposition to limiting the extension of the act from 4 to 2 years. Apparently, we are here to adopt—and retain control by the military as a permanent policy.

THE PENDING BILL

The bill before us today is a bill to extend the conscription act for a period of 4 years—until July 1, 1959. This bill is but a milestone on the road which leads us to complete universal military training—to a military government.

Among other things, the act as amended will provide for the conscription into the armed service for a period of 8 years, or 96 months, of every physically and mentally qualified young American who has reached the age of 18 years and 6 months, and who has not passed his 26th birthday.[2] For 2 years he will be in the active service. Following that, he will be required for 6 additional years to serve when and where the military may direct. The plan is that he shall, during those 6 years, be required to take active training with the reserves, and be subject to call to combat service if the military determines his service to be necessary.

One of the reasons which impelled our forefathers to leave their homes and friends in the Old World, cross the sea, and endure almost unbelievable hardships in a hostile land, finally declare their independence, create and adopt a constitutional form of government, was their desire to escape compulsory military service under their feudal lords or a king.

Another reason was their desire to be independent, to escape economic as well as military slavery. They created a nation free and independent. The people of that Nation have, as has the Nation itself, prospered.

Our Republic as a nation grew great and powerful. It became a land to which the oppressed throughout the world looked as the one place where they might make their home and be free. It is a nation to which we are told all so-called free nations, when in trouble, look for aid, economic and military. It is the Nation to which the free nations look for military defense when danger threatens.

In the harbor of New York, the Statue of Liberty, with its ever-flaming torch, beckons the oppressed of the world to a land where the lowliest is welcome to an opportunity to be free, prosperous, and happy.

Present trends indicate that beacon will soon be a false guide.

If we are, throughout the world, to create and maintain economic conditions which will secure to other people the material blessings which we here all enjoy, then indeed will we be required to bend our backs, flex our muscles, employ our creative ability, perhaps become economic slaves of the rest of the world.

If we are to assume the obligations of and continue through military might to guarantee the continued national existence as separate and distinct entities of every other nation in today's world, then assuredly our natural resources, our productive ability, are not sufficient, and we must conscript our manpower to fight, as did the mercenaries of old, but without pay except as we provide that compensation.

---

[1] See hearings before a special subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 83d Cong., November 23, 24, 25, and 27, 1953, Investigation of Welfare Funds and Racketeering, pp. 139–441.

A casual glance at two reports filed by the CIO-Political Action Committee, Washington, D. C., and the UAW-CIO, Washington, D. C., shows Michigan political contributions of something over $200,000 for the 1954 general election campaign.

[2] The proposed bill H. R. 3005.

Since 1942,[3] we have followed a course of action which has finally led us into a surrender of our national sovereignty to an organization [4] whose policies and actions are dictated by nations other than our own. That surrender has destroyed the individual's liberty, made it possible to force us to expend our manpower and our resources in wars throughout the world; wars which, for either the protection of our people or our Nation, were unnecessary.

For 15 years, the youth of America has been forced into universal military service, where they now serve under an international flag—not the Stars and Stripes—under the orders of a one-world organization—the United Nations—an organization controlled, not by the representatives chosen by our people, but by politicians of the Old World.

Under recent policies, our men have fought three wars, none of which brought us either a greater degree of independence, prosperity, individual or national security.

This bill—and hereafter it will be referred to as an act, for undoubtedly it will be adopted by both Houses and signed by the President—gives the youth of America into the control of the armed services for 8 years, which, in turn, in wartime, will be controlled and directed by United Nations to serve the interests of nations other than our own.

The armed services have, in recent years, when engaged in a fighting war, been subject to the control of the State Department. The State Department, in turn, to a remarkable degree, has been subservient to international politicians and foreign interests.[5]

For the first time in our history, we fought a war—the Korean war—in the field under the command of a State Department, rather than under the direction of our military experts.

Our Republic is founded upon the assumption that the Federal Government is the servant, not the master, of the people.

More recently, it seems that the Government is supreme and the people are but puppets of the Government, and, far worse, of a government which accepts and attempts to execute the orders of United Nations.

Our people, who reserved all power not granted to the Federal Government,[6] are now actually and in fact, through their Government's subservient attitude, being committed to the control of the United Nations.

If men or women are needed to maintain the welfare of our people, their independence and their freedom—if manpower or dollars are needed to make secure the future of our Nation—all that is required is that we adopt a national policy designed to attain those ends.

Our youth will fight for home, for fireside, and for the security of our Nation. There is no reason why they should fight for the political aggrandizement of any world politician or aggressor nation.

It is doubtful if there exists an intelligent informed individual who will contend that the power, the wealth, or the productive ability of America, unsurpassed as they are, can successfully put forth an effort great enough to fight and win a war wherever in the world some power-seeking individual, some quarrelsome nation, or United Nations may start a conflict.

It has been said that communism is an ideology—a way of thought. History teaches us that thought control cannot be imposed by persecution [7] or by, from a military standpoint, a successful war.

Advocating the disuse of the sword by using the sword is strange logic.

It is my understanding that General MacArthur recently told us, in substance and effect, that peace could not be established and maintained by war. That being true, the only way that we can overcome communism — establish and maintain our political and economic philosophy—is not by war but for us to declare and establish a line of defense which our resources will enable us to successfully defend; and then, if our policies be sound and workable, our thinking, our way, through teaching and example, will prevail throughout the world, for all nations will find it good.

I will not vote to take 8 years out of the life of every physically and mentally sound young American and make him subject to a policy which calls upon him to risk his life thousands of miles from home in a war declared by and at the dictation of a United Nations organization controlled by representatives of other countries, who, on every single occasion, speak and act for the advantage of their respective countries.

IF OUR CAUSE BE JUST, WE DO NOT NEED CONSCRIPTION

American youth are patriotic.

They are courageous.

They are self-sacrificing.

They love their country, and for home and country they will fight, and to the bitter end.

American youth are independent. They have as great a love for freedom, for independence, for self-government, as did those who, throughout 8 long years, against overwhelming odds, fought for and established their independence; conceived and gave birth to the United States of America.

That the youth of America, of yesterday and of today, are as patriotic, as courageous, as self-sacrificing, as determined, as any whose like qualities are praised in history, can, if anyone doubts, be learned from a knowledge of the record they established in World War I, in World War II, and in world war III in Korea.

If one would learn of individual or group heroism, he has but to read any of the histories put out by the armed services, which in detail and with illustrations record the deeds of the teenagers as well as of those who had passed the voting age.

If one needs inspiration, let him look at the statue, the paintings, the pictures, which show the raising of the flag on Iwo Jima. Let him read the story of that heroic event.

The record of the trained and the untrained men who, since 1914, have fought, and of those who have died, in support of our present foreign policy, is one of which we can all be proud, even though those heartbreaking sacrifices have done little, if anything, to promote the welfare of our people or make secure the existence of our Republic.

But American youth are intelligent. They want to know the reason for a national policy in support of which they are asked to sacrifice all that is near and dear to them and go forth to battle on the far side of the world.

No Horatio at the bridge; no Leonidas as the pass of Thermopylae; no Spartan, was ever more willing to fight and to die in defense of country than is the American youth of today.

Our youth know or they have learned that President Wilson was reelected primarily because he "kept us out of war." Forthwith, we became involved in war. They fought and they died because, so they were told, war was an evil thing. They were fighting a war to end all war, and since that war ended, their sons and grandsons have been fighting World War II and world war III in Korea, while they have been trying to carry the tax burdens imposed by those wars.

They know that American ships were engaged in World War II months before the Congress declared war. They were told that our frontier was on the Rhine, and that all that stood between us and being overwhelmed by the German armies was the British Fleet; that our armies must travel abroad in order to maintain our own independence. A falsely described situation.

Today, our frontier, we are advised, is in Formosa. The armed services advise that we have some 950 military installations outside of continental United States.

We are told that voluntary enlistments are not sufficient to meet the Army's demand for manpower.

In every other field, before the successful individual or business organization decides upon its need to carry on its program, it determines what it intends to do and the extent of the operation, its ability to carry out the program. There has been no such determination by those in control of our Government.

Yesterday, we had one line of defense and one purpose. Today, we have a different one. Tomorrow, we may have another. Since 1914, we have had no clear, fixed foreign policy.

The purpose of all wars is to protect the individual citizens and the nation as a nation. Today, the first issues before the people and the Congress should be: First, what is our policy; are we an aggressor Nation or do we seek only peace? Second, just what do we intend to do; when and where does a war to

[3] See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 27, 1942, vol. 88, pt. 1, 77th Cong., 2d sess., pp. 744–747; January 30, 1942, supra, pp. 886–889.

[4] United Nations.

[5] See report of the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws to the Committee on the Judiciary, U. S. Senate, 84th Cong., 1st sess., on the Korean War and Related Matters, dated January 21, 1955.

[6] Amendment X to the United States Constitution: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

[7] Roman persecution of Christians.

protect us from communism or from any nation become necessary in order that the Republic may continue to exist?

The determination of those two questions comes first and we must naturally take into consideration our ability to accomplish our objective. Until those two issues have been made clear, it is not my purpose to vote to conscript our young men or to require them to accept what, in effect, amounts to universal military training.

Today we are told that Formosa is the front or the back door to our homeland. Formosa, 10,000 or 15,000 miles away from our base of supplies, depending upon whether we go east or travel west. Formosa, which just a few years ago we were told by our military and by our State Department was of no value to us as a military outpost. Formosa, which today it is said we must defend, no matter how great or even how impossible that task may be.

Sometimes the thought occurs that if Formosa, under the domination of China as directed by Russia, is the key to our national defense, and if we must, for the future, maintain Formosa as a military outpost, just, militarily speaking, a stone's throw from China's communistic mainland with its hundreds of thousands of potential fighting men, we must be prepared to sacrifice our men for no apparent gain in the impossible task of conquering and holding China subject.

If our real enemy is communism, then Russia is the enemy to which we should look. If we have the military might, the airpower and guided missiles, the bombers, and bombs which our experts say we have; if their destructive force is what they tell us it is, then, if Russia is the undercover aggressor, it is time to use those weapons on the source of our trouble. We waste our energy in fighting a puppet enemy. If, for our national existence, we must fight, let it be against the real enemy.

And let the battle be directed by those who are trained to win wars, not by international politicians, who accept unworkable, security-destroying theories, who turn an eye when they see fool's gold on the horizon.

In World War II Russia was our ally. Before the war was over, and after, through our efforts she became a world power. Through our negligence, Russia gained control of China. With her help, China sent her Communists into North Korea.

And once again we were in a third war. A war in which our Armed Forces were denied the opportunity of winning, a war fought not under our military commanders but under the direction of the international politicians, a war the first in which we ever became involved which we did not win.

The foregoing is only a small part of what the youth of America today knows.

Knowing as they do that we became involved in the last three wars, and especially the last two, because those who formulated and directed our foreign policy have been thinking of trade or dollars or world government, rather than of the independence, the welfare of our people, and the security of our Nation, it is not strange that the young men have not rushed to enlist in an armed service where their destiny is controlled by politicians instead of by military men; where the objective is not a new declaration of our independence as a nation, the making secure their freedom as individuals, nor safe the future of our country, but rather a surrender of many of the principles which guided the men of 1776.

They have no desire to establish a one-world government under which they and their fellow countrymen have been, are, and will be, for time without end, bound not only to work and contribute to the well being of many who are unwilling to earn the blessings which we enjoy, but where they and those who come after will be under the command of the representatives of other nations, which fail to carry their fair share of any burden which may be imposed by a one-world government.

The last three wars have gained nothing for our people except an ever-increasing tax burden and an ever greater dictation by United Nations telling us how we should live and die.

We have heard overmuch about free people, free nations. We have contributed in dollars, in munitions, and in human flesh and blood to other nations under the assertion that our sacrifices were being made to protect our national security, to contain communism. And the burden is still on our shoulders.

When we, with tax dollars, give Communists Federal jobs, it is ironic to tell our youth that they must be conscripted to fight Communists twelve or fifteen thousand miles from the homeland in order to protect our country.

It is silly, it is absurd, to tell the farmer boy, the clerk behind the counter, or the young professional man that he is being called to fight a war to make men free when, in his home community, he cannot even go to work as a laborer without paying tribute to a union, or, if he be a farmer, drive his dad's truck with a load of produce to the home market without being required to pay tribute to a union whose boss lives in luxury and spends union dues in an attempt to purchase elections.

This act will call upon every young American who is physically and mentally fit to give 2 years of his life in the military service. In addition, he is required to be at the call of the military services for an additional 6 years.

It is charged that the act is necessary, that is, that our men must be forced to be under the command of the military for 8 years in order that our national existence may be protected.

That argument is an assertion that the youth of today is so lacking in patriotism, courage and determination that he must be forced to fight to defend his homeland. In my judgment, that is a false assertion.

Permit a repetition. The youth of today are as ready to fight in a just cause, to make sacrifices as great as were those of 1776 to 1782 or at any other time in the history of mankind.

NOR WILL THE MILITARY ACCEPT LEGISLATION

A previous conscription act provided for the deferment or exemption of individuals belonging to certain groups. Because exceptionally large amounts of food were needed to implement our foreign policy, those who were exclusively engaged in agricultural production and whose services could not be replaced were exempt from military service. The Tydings amendment was the one which carried that exemption.

The Tydings amendment was openly and flagrantly disregarded and set at naught by General Hershey, Selective Service Director, and those who accepted his advice and acted upon it.

I cite that action for no other reason than that it shows the complete and utter disregard by some in the military services of the will of the people and their representatives' opinion as enacted into law.

If you doubt that assertion, read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of February 2 and February 5, 1945.

Given a situation where the youth of the land are convinced that their welfare and freedom is threatened, the Nation's security involved, they will volunteer.

One of the reasons they do not enlist today in sufficient numbers to satisfy the demands of the armed services and the State Department is because they think the demands are unreasonable, unnecessary, and excessive.

Another is that they are firmly convinced that the threatened war is not a war for the preservation of their country.

Russia conscripts her men for from 24 to 60 months.

This bill today calls for the conscription of every mentally and physically fit man in America for a period of 96 months—24 months in the active service; 72 months in the Reserves but at all times subject to the call of the armed services.

Shortly, there will be—at least so I am advised—a proposal by the armed services for the enactment of further supplemental legislation which will call for universal military training—conscription—for 10 years or 120 months.

I cannot vote for this bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I think that our committee has just completed one of the most important actions that it will be called upon to perform during this or any other Congress.

The phrase that we live in an age of peril and not in a moment of peril has been somewhat overworked, but in the process it has not become any less true. I cannot conceive of any Member of this House raising a serious objection to this bill, because it is obvious that every one one of us has exactly the same thought in mind—the maintenance of a free world.

There may be some among you, on either side of the aisle, who have certain reservations as to the precise manner in which we should go about providing for an adequate defense, but to me the need for an adequate number of young men is not an area which even admits of serious dispute.

We are not a warlike Nation. We fight only when we have to. We do not

like to maintain large military forces unless there is such an immediate and clear need as to make any other course suicidal. Today any other course is suicidal.

Nor can I believe that there can be any serious objection to the two well-considered amendments which the committee put in the bill. I refer to the amendment which provides that no person who has been, or may be, deferred under the provision of section 6 (c) (2) (A), of the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall by reason of such deferment be liable for training and service in the Armed Forces, under the provisions of section 6 (h), after he has attained the 26th anniversary of the date of his birth; and to the other amendment which provides, in substance, that no person who has served honorably on active duty after September 16, 1940, for a period of 6 months in any of our uniformed services, or for a period of 24 months in the Public Health Service, shall be liable for induction and service except after a declaration of war, or what is the same thing, in essence, a declaration of a national emergency by the Congress.

The gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] has expressed his concern over the 4-year extension of the Selective Service System. Many of us share his concern and I think quite properly so.

Many laws we extend for a single year, others for 2 years, but in this case, and in the kind of world in which we are living today, it would to my mind be unwise to extend the draft for less than 4 years. Running a military force is in every sense of the word a big business, and there is not a big business in the world which would think of projecting its planning for only a single year or 2 years. To have a strong, efficient, and well-planned force, we simply cannot extend the draft for less than a 4-year period.

Most fervently I say that I hope we are wrong in extending the draft for 4 years; I hope there will be no need for a draft 4 years from now, but I can only hope that this will be so. All information available to me—and, indeed, to every Member of this House—indicates that that is a small and puny hope.

International communism, our one great enemy, may fall from its rotten foundations within the next few years. We all hope it will, but at this time to lessen our military force on hope alone would be worse than unwise—it could be catastrophic.

Any act of Congress can be changed by a subsequent Congress, and should we find a year or 2 years from now that a draft is no longer necessary, then it simply takes another action similar to the one we are taking today to change the law.

Let us not vacillate and quibble at this time. A 4-year draft extension is notice to all others outside the free world that we really mean to preserve the peace and, if this is impossible, to fight with every power at our command.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection 17 (c) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (ch. 144, 65 Stat. 87), as amended, is further amended by striking out "July 1, 1955" where it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1959."

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIER: In line 6, on page 1, strike out "1959" and insert in lieu thereof "1957."

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, offering this amendment to the bill H. R. 3005 before us permits me to express my opposition to the 4-year extension and my sincere hope that this provision will not be adopted.

Let no one in this Committee have any illusions as to my not being aware of what I am undertaking here in face of the unanimous decision of the powerful Committee on Armed Services, a committee that is composed of such worthy Members of this House, with a world of eloquence. Their keen insight into such military affairs as it is possible to gain lends to us at least some leadership. However, I have sat here and listened carefully to such recommendations and presentations as would warrant my support of going along with the 4-year plan. Behind this amendment I feel quite safe in my prediction and fear of that ever-threatening compulsory universal military training. I think this is another step in that direction. It is for that purpose, and for no other purpose, that I offer this amendment.

I happened to serve in World War I. I was one of those who went to a camp where inductees were being trained. I have not found any argument here this afternoon which would warrant me subscribing to the theory that a 4-year length of service would serve any greater need or supply or any greater strength to the Military Establishment than the present 2-year law. I, too, like many other Members here today, have had 6 years of experience with this draft law. I think all of us can subscribe to the statement that one of our greatest problems and worst headaches, particularly during the Korean war, was with this draft legislation. I shall not attempt to repeat much that has been said here by Members who I think are far more capable of delivering this message than I am. I heartily support my proposed amendment and I subscribe and associate myself with the words of my chairman of the committee upon which I serve, the gentleman from North Caroline [Mr. BARDEN], in his opening remarks while speaking on the rule, and I also want to associate myself and my statement and my position with my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA]. So I leave with you this problem which I know rests in the minds of many of you concerning the wisdom, the correctness, the desirability of extending this law for 4 years when it has served quite fruitfully over 2 years.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota introduced the amendment which it was announced during the consideration of the rule, would be offered by the gentleman from North Carolina. It makes no difference who introduces the amendment. The issue is clear cut: Whether there should be a 2-year extension or a 4-year extension. What is the history and the background in regard to previous extensions? In 1948, we passed the selective-service law for 2 years. At the expiration of the 2-year period, Congress extended it for 1 year. That was in 1950. At the expiration of that period, in 1951, the Congress after careful consideration and by a bill bearing this name, the Universal Military Training and Service Act, extended it for 4 years. Now that expires on June 30, 1955. So we come here today with the recommendation of the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States and ask that this law be extended for a period of 4 years. Bear this in mind. It has no relation to service or the length of time that a man may serve nor has it any relation to deferments or exemptions. It is a question merely of how long a time this law will stand on the statute books before it ceases to be in existence or before it has to be renewed.

Now what was the basic reason for the 4-year period? My distinguished friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] said:

> Why keep this hanging over the heads of the youth of the country for an indefinite period of time or for a long period of time?

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. Never did the gentleman hear me make that remark.

Mr. VINSON. That is the reason why I thought you wanted the 2-year period.

Mr. BARDEN. You heard me use the term "a 2-year period." The reasoning was your own. I was talking about service in the college. I was referring to the fact that every few months during his college course the Selective Service was reminding and threatening him. I was not referring to life of the law, the truth about it, I am afraid, is that the Pentagon has little respect for any college except West Point.

Mr. VINSON. Very well. What I was trying to get across was what I thought the gentleman had said—the danger of a 4-year period is the uncertainty that hangs over the heads of the youth of the country. They cannot plan because they do not know when they are going to be called. So therefore you should have a lesser period of time. It should be 2 years so that he can make plans and preparations. Well, I think the 4-year period is far more conducive to orderly planning than a 2-year period. Then a young man knows that within a 4-year period he owes an obligation and will have to serve. Under a 2-year extension he will say, "What is the history of the draft? Every time it has been extended it has to be re-extended. So therefore, I cannot, with any degree of certainty, make any proper plans over a period of 2 years."

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. The gentleman made reference to an extension of 4 years in 1951. That is true, but we were at war in 1951. We are not in war at this time.

Mr. VINSON. Well, let us talk about that a little bit. Perhaps I had better not talk about it. This is a time when we should not rock the boat. We had better keep our mouths shut unless we know exactly what we want to say. But we are about as close to shooting as at any time that has ever happened.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes; and in that connection I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] may have 10 minutes to address the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Now, here is the sound military reason why we are asking for it, and it is a sound reason. What is the Department seeking to do today? For the first time in the 40 years that I have served in this House a stable military program has been submitted to the country. Every man who has testified before the committee has said the day of huge forces and the day of cutting down has passed away. We are trying to level off, so the world can know and the country can know. It is going to cost aproximately $36 billion a year to support the armed services for an indefinite period of time, and it is going to take around 2,850,000 men to maintain that kind of defense. So therefore, in their planning the military leaders said they must have orderly planning; planning that requires a law under which we will know we have a sufficient number of men coming in year by year at the rate of 14,000 a month as inductees. In addition, there must be on the lawbooks a law that will keep voluntary enlistments up. Do you think you could maintain a service of 2,850,000 men on a voluntary plan? Of course you could not. So you must have selective service. And you must have, combined with selective service, voluntary enlistments. Voluntary enlistments plus the draft will furnish a stabilized army and a stabilized force of some 2,850,000 men. In fiscal 1955 the authorized enlisted end strength of the Army will be 979,800 men. In fiscal 1956 it will be 911,600. We are trying to level off. We are trying to have an orderly program. We are trying to write a law that will let the country know that for 4 years every man 18 years of age is liable to be inducted.

I say this proposed amendment has nothing to do with the training; it has nothing to do with the service; it merely indicates that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] and the gentleman from Minnesota say, "Come back here 2 years from now and let us extend it again."

I say that creates the greatest uncertainty in the minds of the youth of the country, because they want to know how long this obligation is going to hang over them.

So I trust this committee will reject this proposition of the gentleman from Minnesota and let this draft law be extended for a period of 4 years just as it was extended in 1951. In 1951 there was trouble in Korea. In 1955 we are in trouble in the straits of Formosa.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the consent agreement the gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my keen appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia for the very courteous suggestion made to the chairman in the matter of extension of time.

The amendment introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota is the same amendment I had drawn and expected to introduce.

I do not see much argument in the facts presented by the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Georgia, when he tells you what the Pentagon wants to plan. I do not see why every other department in the Government does not come in here and say they could plan much better if we would give them all the money they wanted for 4 years instead of 1. But the Pentagon should not be so disturbed; they have much more job security then we; our jobs last for but 2 years.

If this amendment is adopted this draft law is extended for approximately 2½ years from this date. It does not expire until July 1, 1955, and then it is extended for 2 years from that date.

I was very sincere in my suggestion to the House that I thought there were other things in this bill to which we should give consideration. One has been developed on the floor this afternoon and the chairman indicated that with the proper language he would take it, which was right much of a change.

If I were capable of writing the kind of amendment here on the floor I thought would accomplish the objective relative to the college students of the country and the other folks who want to serve but should be given more consideration as suggested in my talk I would do it, but I simply cannot do it on the floor of the House; that is one of those kinds of things you cannot do without technical assistance in such a complicated bill as this.

What did the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] say? And he and I accept each other as authorities when the one says something that helps the other; and I take his word. "There are in the existing law many defects that could be cured."

If there are defects in the law that can be cured, and the Chairman says this is not the proper place to cure them or the proper time, then it strikes me that we should not put off that necessary job any longer than 2½ years from now. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] has been one of the stanchest supporters of the Defense Department in the House of Representatives during all of the years he has been here, but he is apprehensive of the color that this situation is taking on in various States.

Who knows how many more directives there may be or, how repulsive they may be, how they may be a misfit in our economy and among our people in the next 2½ years? In my opinion, it would be a very sensible, very prudent, and a very wise thing, too. Let us look-see at this legislation 2½ years from now. This is the time the gentleman's amendment extends the law to.

We are not unmindful of the dangers of the world. Certainly we are not. There is no attempt on the part of anyone to avoid or to underestimate it. We are all conscious of our duty. We may be brought to be very much conscious of it if this law begins to be maladministered. I have seen some laws maladministered in the 20 years I have been in this House. There is not a gentleman here who has served very long but what has seen the same thing. We get more trouble from administrative orders and from the laws they write. We write a little law: They write a big law. I think every department of this Government should be made to account to the Congress of the United States—the representatives of the people—every 2 years, at least, and I certainly would make no exception for the Department of Defense.

I say again that an extension of this law for 2½ years is a safeguard against their just running away with the situation. If it works well, then the House will be of the temperament it is today and can extend it.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. If the gentleman's amendment is adopted, will the act expire while Congress is in session?

Mr. BARDEN. If the gentleman can tell me when the Congress is going to adjourn in 1957 I can answer the question.

Mr. DIES. We pretty generally know that Congress on the average continues until the latter part of July or the first part of August. I will ask the gentleman this question: What is the date of expiration?

Mr. BARDEN. July 1, 1957. It expires this year on July 1, 1955, so it is extended 2 years from July 1.

Mr. DIES. The gentleman has referred to 2½ years.

Mr. BARDEN. It is approximately 2½ years from now. I was looking into the future as our eyes look forward. It is approximately 2½ years from now. But it extends the law for 2 years from July 1, 1955. I cannot see any objection to that.

I am not at all frightened about the fact that we may be in trouble. We have been in trouble during the 20 years I have been here, but I do not think you are going to either cure it or put off the trouble by extending a law for 4 years that even on the floor today is

one that admittedly contains many defects. Two and a half years from now it seems to me would be time for the House to take another look at the law we have written. Whether we are here or not a Congress will be here, a competent Congress sent by the people. I think the better part of wisdom requires that we legislate within reason.

The Pentagon can draw their plans, yes, but the responsibility of legislation rests here in this body. I will listen to their suggestions and to their advice, but I will not have them lead me around and tell me what is going to be good for me or for this House 2½ years from now. They have shown no inclination to be very modest. I am sure they would agree to a 10 year extension with their recommendation as to appropriations, but if that is good for the greatest spending department of the Government, why is it not good for the lesser departments. So I sincerely hope that the House will adopt the gentleman's amendment and extend the law from July 1, 1955 to July 1, 1957, which is, I repeat, approximately 2½ years from the present date.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, much as I dislike to disagree with my friends from Minnesota and from North Carolina, I am constrained to oppose this amendment because, as has been pointed out by the chairman of our committee, I think the 4-year extension will give to the youth of the Nation advance notice of what the Government reasonably expects from them and will enable them to plan their futures better than a shorter period. I think that it will help not only the men inducted into the service but it will help our Defense Department immeasurably in planning for the future and will result in economic savings. I think it will also relieve the Members of Congress from some of the worries of having to take up this rather unpleasant problem every 2 years.

I tried to point out earlier this afternoon that the President has stated we are living in an age of peril. If we extend this act for 4 years, it will serve notice on our enemies or potential enemies that we have the long pull in mind; that we are not going to change our plans overnight, and at the same time it will give assurance to our allies that America means business; that we are going to build up and maintain a reasonable posture of national defense over the long pull or the long haul, certainly in the foreseeable future, and I trust that the Members of the House, bearing in mind that it will help not only the inductees and the Department of Defense in their long-range planning, but will also relieve the Members of Congress of the necessity of taking this up every 2 years, will vote the amendment down.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I would just like to say to the gentleman that I have been particularly impressed with the last suggestion that he has made, and that is this: By the action we take here today we serve notice to all that there shall be no slackening off in our determination to defend ourselves and protect ourselves. I think that is the most potent argument of all. Of course, as a Nation of unmilitary or nonmilitary people, none of us likes selective service. We did not like it in the beginning, and we do not like it any more now. But, as long as the situation in the world continues as it is, in my opinion there is no course for us to take except to see to it that we have the necessary men in our Armed Forces and that they are there for the security of the Nation.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Would it not be fair to say also that if the millenium should arrive or some great change in international affairs should take place——

Mr. SHORT. Which we cannot reasonably expect.

Mr. KEATING. Which we should not expect, yet it is open to us at any time during the 4-year period to amend this law and to approach it from that point of view rather than cutting down the period at this time when international affairs look so critical.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman is eminently correct. I think the 4-year extension would have a great psychological and beneficial effect.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Would the gentleman from Missouri care to comment upon the close relationship that a 4-year extension of selective service will have on the new Reserve plan we started to consider this morning in committee?

Mr. SHORT. I do not know that I can comment intelligently upon that. Of course, the Reserve plan has not yet been reported to the House. A subcommittee of our full committee started hearings on that, I understand, today. The gentleman I am sure is more familiar with that than I.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct. We started hearings this morning and we find that the selective service is very closely related to the overall Reserve plan that we hope to write into a law.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I commend the gentleman for a very compelling statement of the reasons for continuing this law. Is it not true that one of the things we are trying to do is to maintain peace by avoiding a war of miscalculation?

Mr. SHORT. That is correct.

Mr. VORYS. Twice we have gotten into war because our enemies thought we would not fight.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Referring to the resolution on page 2 it says "(62 Stat. 410)." I cannot find any "62 Stat. 410" that has anything to do with this. I wonder if it should not be 610?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say first of all that that is not a parliamentary inquiry. I am sure the gentleman from Michigan can get that information elsewhere.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BURDICK. Is it in order to move to strike out the last word?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly it is.

Mr. BURDICK. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, it is harder to get speech in this Congress than it is to get out of the Army. As everyone knows, I am in favor of being ready. There is no one in the United States smart enough to know how to plan. They are talking about a 4-year plan. They do not know anything about it because it is not within their control. We will plan according to what the enemy does. And when that time comes we will have plenty of time to do planning, as we have always done in the history of this country.

I think a 2-year period is long enough because remember that democracy ends to them when these million men are inducted. With them democracy ends for that period of time and 2 years is long enough. I think the Constitution also ends, because under the Constitution you cannot have men serving in foreign countries unless there is a declaration of war against that country. But they serve there just the same.

As the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] says, you can view this situation again. There is no logic in the amendment of the gentleman heading this committee. I admire him. And that statement is not made for the purpose of decapitating him. I admire him as most of the Members do. But I do not agree with his logic. The very fact that we are here now indicates that we can come in at the proper time and extend this draft. If that is not the case, why are we here now 6 months before this act expired? Two years from now you can come in again and you may want to induct 4 million men instead of 1 million. Let this country protect itself and be ready for whatever happens, but do not plan a 4-year course when the next Congress may have more information than we now have.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 18 minutes, the last 3 minutes to be reserved to the committee, this time not to include the time allotted to the gentleman from Massachusetts, who has already been recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, as this bill is being considered my mind goes back to September 1951, when a similar bill was before the Congress to extend the then Selective Service Act. That bill passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 202 to 201.

On that occasion I made remarks that are still strongly impressed on my mind. One of my remarks, and this impression of mine is based upon experience, was that the most dangerous period in a democracy is when danger is imminent. In a world of peace we can have malfeasance, nonfeasance, and misfeasance in office, but the people are able to take care of it in their own way at the ballot box. In time of war the laws of self-preservation apply to ourselves and to our country. Whether we agree or disagree with the policies of an administration, we have to support it because the laws of self-preservation call for such action. It is in the period in between peace and when war occurs, the period of what I call imminent danger, that we must be very careful in what we do.

I think it is self-evident that the world is in a very disturbed situation. I think it is unnecessary for me to make any remarks about it at this time that might tend to alarm, because the people of our country and the people of the world realize the world situation. But you and I are elected by one-hundred-and-sixty-odd millions of Americans from our districts to represent them in this body and to exercise our judgment to the best extent we possibly can in the national interest of our country not only for today but for tomorrow.

While I am not in agreement with some of the views about the reduction in the Army, that is not involved today. I am very much concerned about the sharp reduction in the Army that is taking place, and I hope it will be reconsidered in the near future because I think world conditions call for it from our angle. It is not a question of whether we have a strong military organization but whether it is strong enough in relation to manpower, and particularly firepower of the military organization of the Soviet Union and its satellites. But that is a debate for another day.

We have before us a measure which is of vital concern to the national interest of our country. Directly before us now is the question whether we should extend this law for a 2-year period from July 1 of this year or for a 4-year period. My judgment, projecting my mind ahead, is that it is in the best interest of our country if we extend it for the 4-year period.

I am unable to agree with my dear friend from North Dakota when he says that democracy ends for those in the service. I am sure he did not mean exactly that, because those of us who served in our own little way thought we were serving to preserve democracy, and I am sure that is what my dear friend meant. What I think he means is that the complete freedom of a civilian is taken away from those in the service, and of necessity that must be so.

The other day when the Formosan resolution was up I voted for that basically because to me it represented firmness and strength. It also represented the unity of the people of the United States as expressed by the Members of this House and the Members of the other body. I was proud of the vote of this body—409 to 3—because if ever there was a manifestation of unity, if ever there was a manifestation of courage on the part of public officials, and if ever there was a manifestation of strength and firmness on the part of the Representatives of the people in this Congress, it was there expressed, clearly and unmistakably in the vote which was taken on that occasion. I think we are faced with another similar situation in this vote. The same basic questions are involved in the amendment before the Committee of the Whole at the present time. I think a vote for a 4-year service is one of firmness and strength. I think as between 2 years and 4 years that it is a message which will be more clearly understood by the potential enemy than the adoption of a 2-year extension. It is true during the next 2 years Congress can act, but I think it is a manifestation of firmness and strength. On the question of coordinating our facilities and processing our facilities in connection with our national defense, it seems to me that a 4-year period is decidedly in the best interests of our people and in the national interest of our Nation. For reasons which I have expressed, profoundly respecting the views of those who disagree with me, as I do, I hope the amendment to reduce the period of the extension to 2 years will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement, limiting debate, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] for 5 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, almost every speaker in behalf of this bill this afternoon, has in some form or another referred to assurances to our so-called allies as the necessity for this 4-year extension. Well, I might ask—what allies—in view of the lack of participation by most foreign governments at the present time and during the war in Korea. But where does this assurance to our allies originate? Turn to page 16 of the hearings to a statement submitted by Secretary of Defense Wilson to the House Committee on Armed Services. I read just one sentence:

> The extension of this law represents another assurance to our allies that the size and effectiveness of our armed services will be maintained at the planned level.

About the same time that Secretary of Defense Wilson was making this statement, a press dispatch from Paris reported that France, one of the allies to whom we allegedly must offer assurance, was planning further cuts in its military contribution to the defense of Western Europe. France's tactic of making sweeping promises but never producing is an old story. Back in 1949, the French promised to contribute 35 to 40 divisions for Western European defense. That was soon cut to 28 and in 1952 was further reduced to 21; and in 1953 the goal went down to 18 divisions and by the end of that year it was discovered that the French in reality were making plans for only slightly more than 14 divisions. Now it is reported, and not denied, that actually French planning calls for no more than 12 understrength and underequipped divisions for Western European defense. How fantastic it is, quoting the Secretary of Defense, that we must give "assurance to our allies" that thousands of American boys will continue to be drafted for 4 years of military service when this so-called ally refuses to make more than a token contribution toward defending itself.

Mr. Chairman, I am disturbed by this unreciprocated assurance to foreign governments.

I am disturbed by the period of service here proposed. I am disturbed by the drafting and sending overseas of men involuntarily, and subjecting them to the Status of Forces Treaty. I doubt if the Armed Services Committee has made on-the-spot inquiries since that Status of Forces Treaty went into effect as to the conditions under which American soldiers have been tried in the civil courts of foreign countries, and under what conditions they are serving in foreign prisons. There are many things that ought to be looked into before this Draft Act is extended for 4 years.

I wholeheartedly support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER] limiting the extension to a period of 2 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] is recognized.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask our distinguished colleague, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], if he does not feel that the extension of the draft for 4 more years might not preface the drive to bring universal military training back before us in this House.

Mr. SHORT. On the contrary, I think it would have the opposite effect. That is one of the reasons why I would like to see the Draft Act extended for 4 years. It will make unnecessary the passage of the so-called Universal Military Training Act.

Mr. POWELL. I wish you would just explain that to me. I remember in days gone by we defeated UMT; now this seems to be a part of the package deal that includes UMT.

Mr. SHORT. No. The gentleman asked me an honest question. I know he was absolutely honest, and I have tried to give him an honest answer. One of the reasons, in addition to the three I have already given for extending this act for 4 years, is that I hope before it expires the international situation will greatly improve, and there will be no necessity for passing the UMT Act, even in any modified form. That is one of the imponderable and unpredictable things that neither you nor I, nor any other man, with our finite minds can probe the depths or accurately prognosticate. I just have the feeling that if we continue this present law for 4

years perhaps we will not need UMT, although I may say to the gentleman—and he knows my position very well—I know the very valuable assistance the gentleman gave in the fight we made when we won by a margin of 73 votes in defeating the passage of UMT. I will say that my mind is open to the consideration of any bill that is brought before our committee. I must confess that the matter is now being considered by a subcommittee, and a study is being made of our manpower problem. Although I am not yet convinced that I could support this modified UMT, because it still has many bugs in it, I admit it is the best study that has thus far been made. However, that is completely divorced from the present legislation.

Mr. POWELL. I thank the gentleman.

I rise, Mr. Chairman, because of a profound spiritual conviction against any peacetime conscription. To me, this is part of a package deal that is going to lead to it. A 2½-year extension of the draft is plenty of time to meet any crisis. In fact, the more imminent the crisis the less time needed to meet it. In fact in this 2½ years we will know whether we are going to be alive or not. This crisis is going to come to a head one way or another within the next 2½ years.

This is a giveaway program, to give away our young people and our homes, and a portion of our democracy, too. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] was right.

This is a drafting of Congress. If we pass a 4-year extension, it will be drafting the 85th Congress and shackling public opinion that they would represent if they came here. There is absolutely no reason for this except that our Commander in Chief and our Pentagon want it.

I respect our Commander in Chief, no one here has greater esteem for our President, but I believe the House of Representatives should be representative of the people. You know and I know that the people of the United States of America, the mass of the voters, the young people, all of the religious organizations, every one of them, are opposed to an extension of the draft for 4 years.

If you vote for this amendment, you are voting for unity, for national preparedness, for democracy, and you are voting for the protection of the finest of our American life, our young people and our homes.

If you vote for 4 years, you are giving away Congress, you are giving away our young people, you are shackling the opinion of the 85th Congress of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] is recognized.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I shall take only a few minutes. I agree with my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] in his clear and coherent reasoning. His reasoning is fundamental and essentially correct, that we need to have a show of strength at the present time.

I think that by cutting the draft extension down to 2 years, we would be making a serious mistake. The committee has agreed unanimously to the 4-year extension. I think we are fooling these young people throughout the United States if we make it less. When you and I go home, we are faced by these young men who want to know what their future may be. They have been watching the action of Congress in the extending of this act from time to time for short periods of time and they have entertained the hope that at the end of a comparatively short period of time, if they could drag this thing out, there might be the possibility that they might not have to render this service under the Selective Service Act. That hope is a false hope, and we are doing our part to carry in the hearts of some of them the false hope that eventually by dragging this thing out they will avoid military service. I think as Members of Congress we ought not to encourage them in that false hope.

This is a long-term obligation and it is going to be with us for a long, long time. To adopt this amendment and cut this extension of time down and make them feel that perhaps by going to school and getting a few deferments, or getting deferments for some other reason, they can drag out the time and thereby avoid the obligation of selective service, is the wrong way to handle this matter. The amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WIER) there were—ayes 62, noes 153.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 16 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 (ch. 922, 64 Stat. 797), as amended by the act of March 23, 1953 (ch. 8, 67 Stat. 6), is further amended by striking out "July 1, 1955" where it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1959."

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRISON of Virginia: On page 2, following line 2, insert a new section as follows:

"Section 6 (h) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, is further amended by adding after the first proviso the following: *'Provided further,* That no person otherwise found, on his individual status, to be eligible for deferment because of his employment which is determined to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest, as herein provided, shall be granted a deferment on account of the existence of a shortage of any agricultural commodity, or denied a deferment on account of a surplus of any agricultural commodity'."

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, for several years now the Selective Service System has been denying deferments to agricultural workers otherwise entitled thereto when local draft boards think that crops raised by these agricultural workers are in surplus. The purpose of my amendment is to put a stop to that.

Mr. Chairman, under the law industrial and agricultural workers are deferred when their employment is necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest. That must be determined upon their individual status and the President is authorized and directed to draft regulations to carry out the intention of the Congress with respect thereto. The regulations that we have had in force for years provide three criteria for determining whether or not an agricultural or an industrial worker is entitled to deferment.

The first is that he must be actually engaged in a necessary occupation. Second, he must show he cannot be replaced and, third, that his removal would cause material loss of effectiveness in such activity.

An agricultural deferment must be measured by whether or not the worker produces for market a substantial quantity of agricultural commodities necessary for the national health, safety, or interest. The formula for determining that is in the regulations.

The Selective Service System, without regard to those regulations, has proceeded to add a new requirement. It has provided that even where all three of the situations required by the regulations are present and the registrant is therefore entitled to deferment, yet in spite of that fact he shall not be deferred if in the opinion of the local draft board the crop he is producing is in surplus.

To show you to some extent the absurdity of such a regulation, let us apply that to a wheat crop that might be produced. A man shows to the satisfaction of the draft board that he is actually engaged in producing that crop of wheat.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Can the gentleman tell me where the draft board got that idea that he has just expressed?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I have no idea on earth. They got it out of the air.

The power to determine which crops are in surplus is the power to control the agricultural production of the Nation.

If any agency of the Government should have such power, it should not be the military or a bureau whose sole function is to procure manpower for the military.

In his statement the other day before the Committee on Armed Services, General Hershey tells how it is determined whether or not a crop is in surplus. Here is what he says:

We get that probably from the newspapers, from the Department of Agriculture, from the list of storages, and all that sort of thing. Now, that is a fact. We interpret it in different ways.

Should the agricultural supply of the Nation be determined by what the officials of the Selective Service System read

in the newspapers or learn from a list of storages?

The effect of this policy can be seen from these figures: For the year ending June 30, 1945, in the midst of desperate war, agriculture accounted for 5.7 percent of all deferments, but in the year ending June 30, 1954, agriculture accounted for but six-tenths of 1 percent of deferments.

Mr. Chairman, the policy does not make sense; it is unjust, it is not supported by law, and it should be stopped.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I will say to the gentleman that he appeared before the committee and discussed this amendment. I have had the privilege of examining it, and as far as I am concerned, I have no objection, personally, to accepting this amendment. I would like to incorporate what I interpret the amendment to mean, if the gentleman has no objection.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. No.

Mr. VINSON. As I have stated, there is no objection as far as I am individually concerned. I cannot accept it as a committee amendment, because the committee has never passed on it. But, here is what the amendment does.

Once the amendment has become law, local boards will no longer be able to take into consideration the existence of a shortage of any agricultural commodity, or the existence of a surplus of any agricultural commodity in deciding whether or not a man should be deferred.

In other words, local boards will have to decide whether a man's employment is necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest, but in arriving at this determination they will be precluded from taking into consideration the existence of a surplus of an agricultural commodity, or the existence of a shortage of an agricultural commodity.

All other factors can be considered, but the supply of an agricultural commodity may not be taken into consideration either for granting deferments or denying deferments.

Now, is that a correct interpretation to be placed upon this amendment?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. VINSON. With that understanding, Mr. Chairman, as far as I am individually concerned, I accept the amendment.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia is a good amendment, a sound amendment. I think General Hershey made a mistake when he sent out that directive. Personally I am in favor of the amendment and I know of no objection on the minority side of it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman said that General Hershey sent out that directive. What directive is the gentleman talking about?

Mr. SHORT. The directive to the boards that they should not defer men engaged in production of surplus crops in agriculture.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman means the one in January 1945?

Mr. SHORT. Where there is a surplus of an agricultural product.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did not know he sent out any directive like that.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. General Hershey did not send out that directive. It was an arrogation by some of the boards. That is the reason for this amendment.

Mr. SHORT. Then I certainly want to withdraw my statement. I understood the directive was sent out by General Hershey.

Mr. RIVERS. He denied it.

Mr. SHORT. Then I withdraw my statement and I apologize to General Hershey.

Mr. RIVERS. This makes it plain how far they can go, and it takes it on a local level. They have to adjudicate it locally and not nationally.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. It was not sent out originally by General Hershey, but he approved it, and for that reason we want to change the law.

Mr. SHORT. Whether he originated it or approved it, it was bad, in my opinion, and I think the gentleman's amendment will correct the abuse.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to correct a typographical error. On line 13, page 2, where the figure "410" appears, it should be "610."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, now you have taken away the only amendment I expected to get through.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 6 (c) (2) (A) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 610), as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "Provided, That no person who has been or may be deferred under the provisions of this clause shall by reason of such deferment be liable for training and service in the Armed Forces under the provisions of section 6 (h) of this title after he has attained the 26th anniversary of the date of his birth."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps the query that I should like to address to the members of the committee comes appropriately at this point.

I have received from Mr. E. S. Foster, the general secretary of the New York State Farm Bureau Federation, a telegram stating:

In extension Selective Service Act we strongly urge law provide that registrants 23 years and older should be drafted only after available registrants in younger age group have been inducted. Induction of older men who have become farmers in their own right when many younger men are standing by waiting for induction is unsound. Such procedure means tough adjustment for established farmers in the late twenties when they cannot possibly be of as much value to the armed services as the younger men. It often means breaking up families and liquidating farm business at great sacrifice. Supply of younger men greatly exceeds induction rate. Most younger men want to satisfy military requirements as early as possible. Under present situation large numbers of young men and many older men who have been deferred for agricultural purposes are left dangling in an atmosphere of uncertainty which is not good.

May I ask the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee whether, in the consideration of the bill, this precise problem was presented and how the committee has resolved it?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the distinguished gentleman from New York that a representative of the Farm Bureau appeared and suggested to the committee the proposed amendment that the gentleman has just read. After considerable discussion with him and after discussion in the committee, we rejected it because everyone has the right to volunteer any time he sees fit. There is nothing in the world to prevent a boy before he becomes 23 or 24 or 25 from volunteering. Therefore, he has no valid complaint when he is drafted at that age having passed over an opportunity to volunteer at a younger age. We rejected it with all deference to the position of the great Farm Bureau.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the explanation of the chairman. It has come to my attention that there have been a number of cases where older men in their late twenties engaged in agricultural pursuits have been called whereas, for some reason, a neighbor who is in his early twenties or perhaps 19 has not yet served.

Mr. VINSON. It all depends upon the age of the group in the pool. Under the law today you cannot draft anyone 18½ years of age if there are any in the pool that are 19 years of age or over. We are now drafting in the 21-year-age group in certain sections. In other sections the pool age limit will be higher. It all depends upon the pool and how many people are in the pool.

In some sections of the county if a farmer is in his 25th year he will be drafted and in another section they may draft them at age 21. Anyhow, they have the right to volunteer any time they see fit to do so for induction for 2 years.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the chairman's explanation. It seems to me the New York State Farm Bureau Federation which is a thoroughly patriotic and highly valuable organization has

raised a point which is deserving of the most thoughtful consideration.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I had a similar telegram and some of the questions I asked earlier were based on that.

Mr. KEATING. I think this is a problem of which we all ought to be conscious. I appreciate the explanation made by the members of the committee. But I must add that the Farm Bureau has certainly presented a problem which coincides with some personal experiences I have had in the administration of the existing draft law.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I think there is one thing we do not wish to lose sight of. The fact is that if the board defers one man, under similar conditions it must defer another man. So if you lower the ages, you are going to have the mothers hollering about a certain group of people, "Why do you take these young men, who are not able to go out and face the world, when you allow older men not to serve?"

Mr. KEATING. That may be so but my understanding of the position taken by the Farm Bureau is that their only contention is that the older men who have become established and often have families dependent on them should not be called until after the younger men without family obligations or established pursuits.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, insert the following:

"SEC. 4. Section 6 (b) (3) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 410), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, except section 4 (1) and paragraph (5) of this subsection, no person who has served honorably on active duty after September 16, 1940, for a period of 6 months or more in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard, or for a period of 24 months or more in the Public Health Service, shall be liable for induction for training and service under this title, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by the Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this title.'"

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARSHALL: On page 2, after line 24, add the following: "Section 6 (h) is amended by striking out 'That persons who are or may be deferred under the provisions of this section shall remain liable for training and service in the Armed Forces or for training in the National Security Training Corps under the provisions of section 4 (a) of this act until the 35th anniversary of the date of their birth', and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'That persons who have or are or may be deferred under the provisions of this section for educational, study, or research purposes shall remain liable for training and service in the Armed Forces or for training in the National Security Training Corps under the provisions of section 4 (a) of this act until the 35th anniversary of the date of their birth.'"

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, the sole purpose of this amendment is to correct an inequity of increasing proportions in existing law. Very simply, it provides that the maximum age for induction under the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall be 26 years, except for men who have been deferred for study, educational, or research purposes.

The present military program of the President and the Department of Defense contemplates very material reductions in the size of our Army. The testimony of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower indicates that 240,909 men have been examined and found acceptable for military service under present standards. Even at the present rejection rate, it is estimated that more than 800,000 other men, still not examined, are physically and mentally qualified for induction.

Department estimates indicate that the monthly draft call will average about 14,000 men at the present rate of enlistment and under current needs. This is 168,000 men a year.

This means, Mr. Chairman, that if not another man comes of age for induction from this day forward, inductions can continue for over 5 years.

Since approximately 800,000 men each year attain the age of 18½, it is clear that every man eligible for induction under present circumstances cannot possibly be required to serve.

The point I make is that regardless of the purpose or significance of the action taken in 1951 in removing the word "Selective" from the title of the law, the system contained in the law is necessarily selective. The title may now read "Universal Military Training and Service Act" but the real facts of the situation require that men be selected to serve or inductions would exceed many times over the President's manpower estimates.

In passing this act in June of 1951, the Congress rejected what was then proposed as a universal military training plan, adopting only the words for a title. Is this action of the Congress without significance?

The law, you will recall, clearly states:

The Congress further declares that in a free society the obligations and privilege of serving in the Armed Forces and Reserve components thereof should be shared generally in accordance with a system of selection which is fair and just and which is consistent with the maintenance of an effective national economy.

This language has been read by the Director of Selective Service to mean that "the only question is when, not whether, a man shall be inducted." If this be true, what is the meaning of the words "system of selection"?

When we are inducting 14,000 men a month out of 1 million known to be qualified, with new thousands becoming eligible each day, there is no need to pretend that the process of induction is not selective.

Any selection by its very nature implies standards for choosing. It is these standards that I am trying to clarify by my amendment. The Director has said:

I think the Congress ought to be sure that the law is clear enough that even I could understand it.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Director has given us sound advice and that we ought to face up to the realities of the present situation. The Department and the Director point with pride to the fact that 6.1 percent of the men inducted last year were over the age of 26.

Service for the sake of service is a new concept in American life. In a Nation that has been traditionally suspicious of militarism for the sake of militarism, it is a concept foreign to both our experience and our philosophy. We have raised armies in time of need and will continue to do so, but we have never held that men should be conscripted without grave cause.

As I have said, selective service implies a standard for choosing and it implies that those best able and best qualified to serve be called. When we are limiting the number of men to be called, it is logical that those best suited be called in the national interest.

I am sure that every Member of Congress has been informed of cases which would indicate that qualifications are completely disregarded and men are inducted for the sake of induction. This is certainly true in many cases in the age group above 26.

Recently in my district, a man who was 29 years of age was inducted despite a silver spike in his heel, the result of an accident. He is now assigned to limited service and presumably will spend his next 2 years in that category.

In other cases, men over 26 were inducted because they failed to use the proper form in advising boards that children were conceived before August 25, 1953, the date fixed by the President in his order ending deferments for fathers. Despite the fact that the date of birth indisputably fixed the date of conception prior to August 25, Selective Service held the fathers eligible for induction on various technicalities. In one case, the registrant notified the board in writing, though improperly. The clerk intended to advise him that the proper form required a physician's affidavit but neglected to do so.

I am not an attorney but I am sure that the demands of justice were clear in this case from every viewpoint of commonsense which we regard as basic to wise and good administration of any law. If Congress did not intend this to be so, certainly the law could be more simply drawn without so great a reliance upon human judgment throughout its operation.

Day after day these cases continue to come to our attention. Most of them involve men in the upper age groups who have had the period of liability extended because of previous deferments. Many of them, of course, would not have occurred if the men had been inducted at

an earlier age. Some of them, it is true, could have volunteered for induction but in other cases the reasons for deferment were so compelling that volunteering was impossible.

Therefore, in view of the decision of the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to reduce our ground forces, it does not seem desirable or necessary to induct men over 26 except in special cases where they are not sufficiently trained in the special skills needed by the services until after that age.

Almost without exception, our military commanders, including General Eisenhower, have testified before the committees of Congress that they need younger men better suited to military service and more likely to be available in future emergencies. This was one of the arguments used so forcefully to obtain authority for induction at age 18½. If the argument had validity then, it does now.

Within a few years most of the men in the upper age group under present law will be either unfit or ineligible for service should an emergency occur. There are special cases in which men require longer periods of education, study, or research, before they can make their full contribution to the services. In such cases, they would remain liable for service under my amendment to age 35 as they are at present.

However, the great body of inductees who are assigned to the ground forces are available at an early age and better qualified then for the purposes of military service. Service then does not interrupt family life or establishment of a lifetime occupation on the farm, in the factory, or in business. In the overwhelming number of cases it is to the young man's advantage to complete his service while in the lower age group.

Moreover, such a policy would be eminently in keeping with our tradition of encouraging family life as the basic unit of a sound and stable Nation. If the present situation warrants drastic reductions in our standing forces, it seems impossible to me to justify the utter disregard for the good of the family which is the ultimate good of the Nation.

It will be said that this amendment removes the liability for induction of men now in the upper age group. It does, but it does so on the same selective basis already created by the real facts of our present military situation. If all men eligible for induction are not needed and cannot be called under manpower limitations, then it must be decided which group is best able to serve.

If this can be called discriminatory, it is so only in the sense that military service by its very nature is discriminatory, and particularly so if it is selective. Mental and physical qualifications established for induction in themselves cause selection.

Last year there were already nearly 2 million persons deferred for physical and mental reasons and its is estimated that in the future 30 percent of all the men reaching 18½ will be deferred for such reasons. They will not be called upon to serve under present conditions.

When men are inducted, the process of selection, or discrimination if you prefer, continues. Some men are assigned as infantry riflemen, others are assigned as officers' mess boys. Some are assigned to the United States, others are assigned to Korea. The very needs of the service result in selection.

Any examination of the work performed by men in service reveals that at least 80 percent—and some make higher estimates—is noncombat duty. This figure even excludes such combat-related duties as field maintenance or field feeding. So the percentage of men inducted who are expected to engage in actual combat is a relatively small percentage indeed.

Now the Armed Forces must decide which men are best qualified to carry a rifle and which are best qualified for a desk at the Pentagon. We recognize this as necessary and do not imply unworthy motives of discrimination.

Similarly, it is wise and proper to make selection before induction for the whole good of the Nation. This was recognized by provisions of the law establishing first exemptions and then deferments. If our military chiefs now decide that the Armed Forces can be reduced, it is necessary that the process of selection be extended.

In extending this process, it is sensible and essential that we take into account both the welfare of the individual and the welfare of the Nation. By both of these standards, it would seem that the upper age group is best established in the community and least valuable to the Armed Forces except in the special cases I have cited.

The interruption of family life has dire consequences for the whole community and can be warranted only in the most serious emergency. By the same token, young men have a right to know with some degree of certainty under present circumstances at what point they can establish a family without the threat of interruption and the resulting financial and personal hardship.

Operation of a family farm, for example, is not the kind of occupation that can be interrupted for 2 years after a man has reached 26 or 28 and must leave a young wife with several children to carry on. Yet we know that such cases occur each day under the present law when no realistic appraisal of the manpower situation can possibly warrant such action.

You have been told today that in some areas State directors have advised local boards to consider the supply of farm commodities in reaching a decision on deferments. By what standards should the local boards determine if a commodity is regarded as surplus? The Director of Selective Service told the Committee on Armed Services:

> In the first place, I have no desire to determine surplus. We get that probably from newspapers, from the Department of Agriculture, from the list of storages and all that sort of thing. Now, that is fact. We interpret it in different ways.

Surely this standard is not acceptable to anyone familiar with the complexities of modern agriculture and with the Nation's need for productive farms in the years just ahead.

The same arguments can be made in business and industry, which, like agriculture, need a degree of stability to insure steady progress in building and maintaining the kind of economy necessary to support the defense effort required in our time.

One further question which cannot be overlooked is that of cost to the Government. The number of dependents of servicemen in the upper age group is clearly larger than for the younger group. Therefore we have not only the cost of training with the knowledge that the soldier probably cannot be recalled in a future emergency but adequate dependency allowances must also be paid. And the possibility of ailments developing for which later benefits must be paid certainly increases in direct relation to the age group involved.

I am mindful, Mr. Chairman, of the realities of the present world situation which require us to maintain forces in sufficient strength to provide an adequate defense and to deter aggression. The President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff assure us that their manpower estimates will provide such a force.

It is important, therefore, that the force be provided in such a way as to insure the most efficient use of manpower in both the military and civilian economy. I think the amendment before you will correct some of the inequities now existing while at the same time improve the services by the induction of the men best qualified for the present and the future.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. So the issue can be clear before the Committee, the gentleman is making it applicable only to educational deferments that a man can be drafted over 26 years of age?

Mr. MARSHALL. What I am saying is that except for those who have been deferred for educational, research, or study purposes, all others between 26 and 35 would be exempted.

This is a comparatively simple amendment. We have been faced with a rather odd situation which was mentioned on the floor earlier today. The Army has lowered its mental requirements and its physical requirements, and one of the things that that has brought about has been the induction of people who were previously exempt from induction. That has brought these people into the service at a later period in their lives and it has created uncertainty among the local boards because they do not know exactly what to do in connection with some of these people. They have no way they can find to exempt them and, therefore, they induct them. They induct them into the service and the Army as a rule does not want them. They do not want them because their years of service are certainly limited and their ability to take the rigors of training is somewhat limited. We had an odd thing happen. I know of one young man, 29 years of age, who was inducted in my district. He has a

crushed ankle and a silver spike in that ankle. He was inducted at the age of 29 years. The Army doctors examined him and they immediately said he is subject to limited service. All I am doing by this amendment is to exempt those who have previously been deferred for hardship reasons or for any other of a number of reasons, and to permanently exempt those between the age of 26 and 35 who are presently subject to induction. I am making an exception. I am saying that those who are granted deferments to complete their education or to engage in research or to engage in the numerous other things that some of these people were exempt for in the way of education will not be deferred, and they are subject to induction into the Army to complete their period of service as I justly think they should be. That was the obligation of the contract that they entered into. Then I again want to repeat, this merely exempts those who at the age of 26 to 35 are available for induction. I am granting permanent deferment to those men. I think that is the thing that local boards desire, and I think it is the thing that local communities desire. I cannot for the life of me see any purpose in inducting that group of men into the armed services. The testimony before the committee itself said that this past year this group only made up 6 percent of the number inducted. That 6 percent includes people who were previously deferred to get their education and to get their training and for research and other purposes. It seems to me this would be a good and fair way to handle this problem. I hope that the chairman of the committee who is such an outstanding American and who so thoroughly understands these things agrees with me. I am sure he would agree with me if he understood fully what I am trying to say. I am sure he must understand what I am talking about. I am sure he wants a strong armed services. I am sure he wants one of the best armed services we can possibly get. I am sure we are going to get a better and a more vigilant and a more useful Armed Force and get a better training program, if my amendment is accepted.

Mr. Chairman, I do hope that the gentleman from Georgia accepts my amendment and I am glad now to yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the gentleman for the compliments, but I am sorry to say that notwithstanding I have to disagree with you because what you accomplish will, as I mentioned today, free these people from induction. As I said, there are 17,000 occupational deferments. Under your amendment, everyone of those 17,000 men would go free of liability for induction if they reached the age of 26. Under the law today they are liable to age 35. The only people your amendment will hold are those engaged in research, educational work or studies. But so far as all occupational deferments are concerned, if they are still deferred when they reach 26 years of age, you turn them loose and they will have served the country at no time and yet have received constant deferments because of their occupation. Do you think that is fair?

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I have a high regard for the gentleman from Georgia, but I must disagree with you to the extent that you use the word "occupational deferment."

Mr. VINSON. Well, that is what it is.

Mr. MARSHALL. I would almost be inclined to agree with you to an extent if you were to say it was a hardship deferment, but I believe there has been ample testimony before your committee in favor of this younger group. I believe someone testified before your committee saying that if your present policies were carried out in connection with the age limits before you would get a group at the present rate of induction that is needed for the armed services, some of the men would be 90 years of age before they would have a chance to serve their country.

Is that right? That is before your committee, is it not?

Mr. VINSON. I am sorry to say I could not follow the gentleman on that. But go ahead and make your statement.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, may I ask this? Are there not ample people in the age limits below 26 to fill all of the requirements this country is going to have?

Mr. VINSON. What the gentleman is driving at is to have this burden fall exclusively almost on the shoulders of the younger group each year as they come in, and let out those in the over 26-year group. Now it is not fair. These other people owe an obligation as well as the 18-year-old boys.

Mr. MARSHALL. I think my amendment is fair.

Mr. VINSON. I hope this amendment is voted down. I think the committee understands the purport of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARSHALL) there were—ayes 15, noes 106.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONAS: On page 3, line 1, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 5. The first sentence of section 6 (h) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (602 Stat. 611) as amended, is amended by inserting before the word 'shall' in the second proviso the following: 'except persons deferred at any time by reason of having been found to be physically or mentally unfit for service by an Armed Forces examining or induction station'."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] is recognized.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman has done the committee the kindness to consult with us in the preparation of the phraseology of the amendment. It was discussed in general debate. It is now in such language that I think we can with propriety accept it. The committee understands what it is, and it was clearly disclosed in the general debate.

The committee accepts the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Page 2, line 24, add a new subsection as follows:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (h) (2) (B) of section 6, add the following subsection reading as follows:

"'(k) Every registrant found by a selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation, or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained: *Provided*, That should any such person leave such occupation or endeavor, except for induction into the land or naval forces under this Act, his selective service local board, subject to appeal, shall reclassify such registrant in a class immediately available for military service, unless prior to leaving such occupation or endeavor he requests such local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), determines, that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to leave such occupation or endeavor for other work'."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this is the Tydings amendment, so-called.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, it is possible I may be absent from the Chamber at the time the vote is taken on this bill. If so, and I could be present, I would vote for it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this is the so-called Tydings amendment which the Congress wrote into the law when the draft act was earlier before us and again when the act was extended.

I understand an attempt was made to remedy the situation by the amendment which was accepted by the chairman of the committee, and which was adopted earlier today. But under the law as it is written even with that amendment there is doubt about what will happen to farm workers.

This amendment is offered because the armed services just does not pay proper attention to the laws which the Congress enacts; and I would like to make it clear to the departments if I may, that when we write a law we would like to have the executive department execute it.

To substantiate what I say I am reading a directive issued by General Hershey on the 3d day of January 1945. The directive follows:

EXHIBIT B

State Director Advice (No. 288) Issued: January 3, 1945.

Subject: Reclassification of registrants in agriculture, ages 18–25.

(Confirmation of telegram to all State directors within continental United States dated January 3, 1945.)

The following letter from the Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion has been received by the Director of Selective Service:

"The Secretaries of War and Navy have advised me jointly that the calls from the Army and Navy to be met in the coming year will exhaust the eligibles in the 18-through 25-year-age group at an early date. The Army and Navy believe it essential to the effective prosecution of the war to induct more men in this age group.

"You have reported that other than the men becoming 18 years of age the only remaining substantial source in this age group is in the 364,000 men now deferred because of agricultural occupation. You have further advised me that if this group is not available, you must call into the service occupationally deferred men in the next age group, 26 years and older, most of whom are fathers.

"The Chairman of the War Production Board, Mr. Krug, advises me that the loss of these men would make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to meet critical war demands. Moreover, these older men would not meet the expressed needs of the Army and Navy.

"The War Food Administrator, Mr. Jones, has advised me that although we still need all of the food we can raise, the loss of production through the induction into the armed services of the physically qualified men in this 18- through 25-year-age group who do not clearly fall within the scope of the Tydings amendment should not result in a critical condition.

"The Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act does not give the agricultural worker absolute exemption from selective service. It was not so intended. In asking Congress to adopt this amendment Senator Tydings said: 'All my amendment seeks to do is to provide that whenever a person is employed continuously in good faith in the production of food, and taking him off the farm would leave a large section of land uncultivated, and there is no replacement, he shall be deferred upon those facts until a replacement can be found.'

"I have reported these facts to the President. He has found that the further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18-through 25-age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men. The President feels in view of existing conditions, agriculture like our other war industries can, with few exceptions, be carried on by those in the older age groups.

"The President has authorized me to ask you to take such action in connection with the administration of the Tydings amendment as may be necessary to provide to the full extent permitted by law for the reclassification and induction of the men agriculturally deferred in the age group 18 through 25."

Forward text of Justice Byrnes' letter to all local boards and boards of appeal. Direct all local boards to promptly review the cases of all registrants ages 18 through 25 deferred in class II–C excluding those identified by the letters "F" or "L." In considering the classification or retention of such registrants in class II–C, local boards will consider the President's finding that "the further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18- through 25-age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men." Also direct local boards to issue orders for preinduction physical examination to all registrants ages 18 through 25 in class II–C excluding those identified with the letters "F" or "L" in accordance with the most expeditious schedules it is possible for you to arrange with the commanding general of your service command. In order to accomplish the review and preinduction physical examination as promptly as possible, local boards may conduct the review of any such class II–C registrants at the same time as they are forwarding such registrants for preinduction physical examination.

HERSHEY.

That directive created so much criticism that the general issued another one on the 23d day of the same month.

The second directive follows:

EXHIBIT C

State Director Advice (No. 288–A) Issued January 23, 1945.

Subject: Reclassification of Registrants in Agriculture, Ages 18–25.

(Confirming telegram to all State directors within continental United States dated January 22, 1945.)

Questions of interpretations of State Director Advice 288 have been brought to my attention by Members of Congress and by others.

The directive of January 3, 1945, State Director Advice 288, did not change or modify in any manner the Tydings amendment. The opinions and findings contained in State Director Advice 288 were for the consideration of the local boards in determining the classifications of registrants in the age group 18 through 25.

Section 5k of the Selective Training and Service Act known as the Tydings amendment places upon each local board the responsibility to determine, subject to appeal, in the case of the individual registrant whether or not the registrant meets the requirements prescribed by this section.

Notify all local boards immediately.

HERSHEY.

(This telegram was dispatched only to State directors within the continental limits of the United States as it is not applicable in the Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.)

The result was that the State authorities instructed the local boards to disregard completely the Tydings amendment.

In support of that statement I cite the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 2, 1945, when this same issue was before us. Permit me to read a part of that debate.

At that time—February 1945—the Honorable Earl Michener—as capable, as industrious a Member as ever served in this House—addressed the House and called attention to the disregard of the provisions of this amendment by local authorities interpreting and administering the act. Permit me to quote:

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I called the attention of the Congress to the alarming condition in agricultural sections because of the interpretation being placed by local draft boards on General Hershey's directive of January 3, requiring the reclassification and induction of boys 18 through 25 years of age who were deferred because of agricultural occupation.

Then, referring to a statement issued by the local board, our former colleague said:

The above statement by the board was published on January 29, and in the evening of the same day Maj. Nick A. Luscombe, representing the Michigan State director of selective service, addressed a meeting in Lenawee County and made it clear that all farm registrants 18 through 25, who were physically qualified, were to be inducted into the military service, the Tydings amendment and the statutory law of the land to the contrary notwithstanding.

The gentleman then added:

We are asking that the local boards, whose members live in the community and know the facts, be permitted and required to draft or defer under the provisions of the law provided by the Congress. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 91, pt. 10, 79th Cong., 1st sess., Feb. 2, 1945, pp. A411–A412.)

On the same subject, from the Well of the House, on February 5, 1945—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 1, page 829, 79th Congress, 1st session—will be found a statement which, taken in connection with what happened at that time, shows clearly that the executive departments do not follow the law as it is written by Congress:

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the confusion which has arisen over the drafting of agricultural workers, in my judgment, can be laid to the directive of General Hershey issued on the 3d day of January 1945, No. 288. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook] inquired of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Knutson] where there was any reason to charge the drafting of these men to the President. If the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook] will read Directive No. 288—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 1, page 761—sent out by General Hershey he will find there quoted the statements of Mr. Byrnes and Mr. Jones, and in the statement signed by General Hershey, quoting Mr. Byrnes, it is stated:

"I have reported these facts to the President. He has found that the further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18-to-25 age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interests of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men."

There is where the trouble started, and you cannot get away from it. The fact is that after that order went out the local draft boards throughout the country, acting on it, as the President must have expected they would, began to ignore the Tydings amendment. They began to put men who were in II–C directly over into I–A, and to send them into the Army without any review as to whether they fell under the Tydings amendment and should be deferred. When they did that they disregarded their duty.

In my judgment, they are not to be criticized, because the idea that the Commander in Chief can do no wrong, make no mistake, has been stressed so often and so strongly by some papers, by Members of Congress, by almost every columnist, that as a practical matter the local draft boards had no choice.

I know what has happened and so do you. A local draft board which deferred these agricultural workers would have been charged, just as you and I have been charged during past months, with being disloyal, with aiding the enemy, with exempting men who were not entitled to be exempted, with refusing to support the war effort. Who is there in a local community who wants to

stand up to that kind of criticism from the daily press, from the administration, and the administration spokesmen?

There is more to the same effect to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Permit me to quote—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 2, page 2431, 79th Congress, 1st session, March 19, 1945:

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, whether, if the present policy of General Hershey in disregarding the Tydings amendment is followed there will be a shortage of food, I do not know. * * *

I do know that notwithstanding the so-called corrective of the directive sent out by General Hershey some local boards were advised by selective service officials under General Hershey to disregard that corrective.

Similar complaints were made in the Senate. On April 23, 1945, Senator Shipstead of Minnesota, among other things, said—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 3, page 3634, 79th Congress, 1st session:

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a concurrent resolution which was adopted by the House of Representatives by a vote of practically 4-to-1, dealing with the question of drafting farm help, and its effect upon the production of agricultural products, and asking for the appointment of a joint committee of the House and the Senate to investigate.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 29) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in order that there may be no further misrepresentation of the will and the desire of the Congress in enacting subsection K, section 305, title 50, United States Code, commonly known as the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act, Congress reaffirms the necessity to our war effort of said subsection K and again expresses its will and desire that the local selective-service board, in classifying the registrant, observe subsection K and concern itself solely with the registrant's essentiality to an agricultural occupation or endeavor, and to the question of whether or not a satisfactory replacement can be obtained."

The purpose of this amendment is to call attention to the fact that, as long as there is a provision in the law which permits the President to use his discretion as to deferments, the will of the Congress will not prevail.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] made the statement that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON] took care of the situation. In my humble judgment, it does not take care of the situation, because, under the law as it would read, the President still has authority to make the rules and regulations governing deferments. This situation is not new, nor is the disregard by the executive department of legislation enacted by Congress new.

Please note that the House, by the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 29, on March 19, 1945, recognized the necessity not only for the Tydings amendment, but for a further directive to the executive department.

We are today putting through legislation which gives the armed services control for a period of 8 years over the lives of every physically and mentally fit American young man.

Why enact a draft or conscription act which carries a loophole which will enable the executive department to conscript into the service individuals that the legislative department—the Congress—declares shall be entitled to deferment or exemption?

The amendment which I have offered is the Tydings amendment. It was debated in both Houses. It was adopted by a substantial majority in both Houses. After its terms had been disregarded by the armed services, the House and the Senate found it necessary to call attention to this maladministration. There would seem to be no reason why today, extending the act for 4 years, that Congress should not, in unequivocal terms, express its will.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. Chairman, I trust the Committee will vote down any and all amendments at all times when it does not understand what the amendments are. That is good commonsense; it is good, sound philosophy. Outside of the gentleman from Michigan, I doubt that there is a Member on the floor who knows what is in this amendment.

I tried to follow the reading of the amendment as best I could, and we have a very able counsel who knows the selective-service law by heart, but the only thing that we could discover in it was that back in 1940, when there was an agricultural scarcity in this country, we were giving certain considerations to production so that certain favors were extended to persons engaged in agriculture.

The only thing that the committee thinks should have been corrected is that which we have corrected by an amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON]. So, I repeat, it will not help any legislation to legislate when you do not know what you are legislating about; when you do not know the substance of something that is as complicated as exemptions and deferments. The wisest thing, therefore, is to accept the gentleman's challenge and vote down his amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is typical of the attitude of the armed services.

Mr. VINSON. That is exactly right; it is typical of the Armed Services Committee because we never legislate with reference to things we know nothing about, and, unfortunately, the gentleman's amendment is in that category.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, H. R. 3005, is not a Universal Military Training Act; its title is a misnomer and will be greatly misunderstood by the people throughout the Nation.

Universal means all comprehensive, it means to include all, the whole and not a part of the whole. This bill will affect and include only those males who are 18½ years old and not over 26 years old; they must be physically fit, and retains them in the armed services only 24 months.

This bill is selective, not universal. It is an extension of the Selective Service Act and it should not be designated as a Universal Military Training Act, which it is not.

The American people are opposed to regimentation especially during a period of apparent peace. The American people are opposed to universal military training because it smacks too much of regimentation, unless our national security is seriously threatened and total mobilization of our manpower and resources is necessary. Today we are in a precarious situation as the leading nation in the free world. We must have sufficient manpower under arms ready and able to meet and defend any armed aggression which may threaten us.

Because of the threats, danger, and imminent peril we are facing from aggressive communism in many parts of the world, it seems to me we must pass this bill.

I am supporting it as an extension of the Selective Service Act which it is. I do not recognize it as a Universal Military Training Act, which in my opinion, it is not.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRIEST, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3005) to further amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending the authority to induct certain individuals, and to extend the benefits under the Dependents Assistance Act to July 1, 1959, pursuant to House Resolution 133, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves to recommit the bill H. R. 3005 to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 394, nays 4, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—394

Abbitt	Corbett	Harrison, Va.
Abernethy	Coudert	Harvey
Adair	Cramer	Hays, Ark.
Addonizio	Cretella	Hays, Ohio
Albert	Crumpacker	Hayworth
Alexander	Cunningham	Hébert
Alger	Curtis, Mass.	Henderson
Allen, Calif.	Curtis, Mo.	Herlong
Allen, Ill.	Dague	Heselton
Andersen, H. Carl	Davidson	Hess
	Davis, Ga.	Hiestand
Andresen, August H.	Davis, Wis.	Hill
	Dawson, Ill.	Hinshaw
Andrews	Dawson, Utah	Hoeven
Anfuso	Deane	Hoffman, Ill.
Arends	Delaney	Holifield
Ashley	Dempsey	Holmes
Ashmore	Denton	Holtzman
Aspinall	Derounian	Hope
Auchincloss	Devereux	Horan
Avery	Dies	Huddleston
Bailey	Diggs	Hull
Baker	Dixon	Hyde
Baldwin	Dodd	Ikard
Barden	Dollinger	James
Barrett	Dolliver	Jarman
Bass, N. H.	Donohue	Jenkins
Bass, Tenn.	Donovan	Jennings
Bates	Dorn, N. Y.	Jensen
Baumhart	Dorn, S. C.	Johansen
Beamer	Dowdy	Johnson, Calif.
Becker	Doyle	Johnson, Wis.
Belcher	Durham	Jonas
Bell	Eberharter	Jones, Ala.
Bennett, Fla.	Edmondson	Jones, Mo.
Bennett, Mich.	Elliott	Jones, N. C.
Betts	Ellsworth	Judd
Blatnik	Engle	Karsten
Blitch	Fallon	Kean
Boggs	Fascell	Kearney
Boland	Feighan	Kearns
Bolling	Fenton	Keating
Bolton, Oliver P.	Fernandez	Kee
	Fine	Kelley, Pa.
Bonner	Fino	Kelly, N. Y.
Bosch	Fisher	Keogh
Bow	Fjare	Kilburn
Bowler	Flood	Kilday
Boykin	Flynt	Kilgore
Boyle	Fogarty	King, Calif.
Bray	Forand	King, Pa.
Brooks, La.	Ford	Kirwan
Brooks, Tex.	Forrester	Klein
Brown, Ga.	Fountain	Kluczynski
Brown, Ohio	Frazier	Knox
Brownson	Frelinghuysen	Knutson
Broyhill	Friedel	Laird
Buchanan	Fulton	Landrum
Buckley	Gamble	Lane
Burleson	Garmatz	Lanham
Burnside	Gary	Lankford
Bush	Gathings	Latham
Byrd	Gavin	LeCompte
Byrne, Pa.	Gentry	Lesinski
Byrnes, Wis.	Gordon	Lipscomb
Canfield	Granahan	Long
Carrigg	Grant	Lovre
Cederberg	Gray	McCarthy
Celler	Green, Oreg.	McConnell
Chase	Green, Pa.	McCormack
Chatham	Gregory	McCulloch
Chelf	Griffiths	McDonough
Chenoweth	Gross	McDowell
Christopher	Gwinn	McIntire
Chudoff	Hagen	McMillan
Church	Hale	McVey
Clark	Haley	Macdonald
Cole	Halleck	Machrowicz
Colmer	Hand	Mack, Ill.
Cooley	Harden	Mack, Wash.
Coon	Hardy	Madden
Cooper	Harris	Magnuson
Mahon	Ray	Taylor
Marshall	Reed, Ill.	Teague, Calif.
Matthews	Reed, N. Y.	Teague, Tex.
Meader	Rees, Kans.	Thomas
Merrow	Reuss	Thompson, La.
Metcalf	Rhodes, Pa.	Thompson, Mich.
Miller, Calif.	Richards	
Miller, Md.	Riehlman	Thompson, N. J.
Miller, Nebr.	Riley	Thompson, Tex.
Miller, N. Y.	Rivers	Thomson, Wyo.
Mills	Roberts	Thornberry
Minshall	Robeson, Va.	Tollefson
Mollohan	Robsion, Ky.	Trimble
Morgan	Rodino	Tuck
Morrison	Rogers, Colo.	Tumulty
Moss	Rogers, Mass.	Udall
Moulder	Rogers, Tex.	Utt
Multer	Rooney	Vanik
Mumma	Roosevelt	Van Zandt
Murray, Ill.	Rutherford	Velde
Murray, Tenn.	Sadlak	Vinson
Natcher	St. George	Vorys
Nelson	Saylor	Vursell
Nicholson	Schenck	Wainwright
O'Brien, Ill.	Scherer	Walter
O'Brien, N. Y.	Schwengel	Watts
O'Hara, Ill.	Scott	Weaver
O'Hara, Minn.	Scrivner	Westland
O'Neill	Scudder	Wharton
Osmers	Seely-Brown	Whitten
Ostertag	Selden	Wickersham
Passman	Sheehan	Widnall
Patman	Shelley	Wier
Patterson	Sheppard	Wigglesworth
Perkins	Short	Williams, Miss.
Pfost	Shuford	Williams, N. J.
Philbin	Sieminski	Williams, N. Y.
Phillips	Sikes	Willis
Pilcher	Siler	Wilson, Calif.
Pillion	Simpson, Ill.	Wilson, Ind.
Poage	Simpson, Pa.	Winstead
Poff	Sisk	Withrow
Polk	Smith, Miss.	Wolcott
Powell	Smith, Va.	Wolverton
Preston	Spence	Wright
Price	Springer	Yates
Priest	Staggers	Young
Prouty	Steed	Younger
Quigley	Sullivan	Zablocki
Rabaut	Taber	Zelenko
Rains	Talle	

NAYS—4

Burdick	Mason	Smith, Kans.
Hoffman, Mich.		

NOT VOTING—36

Ayres	Dondero	Morano
Bentley	Evins	Norblad
Berry	George	Norrell
Bolton, Frances P.	Gubser	O'Konski
	Harrison, Nebr.	Pelly
Budge	Hillings	Radwan
Cannon	Holt	Reece, Tenn.
Carlyle	Hosmer	Rhodes, Ariz.
Carnahan	Jackson	Rogers, Fla.
Chiperfield	Krueger	Smith, Wis.
Clevenger	McGregor	Van Pelt
Davis, Tenn.	Mailliard	
Dingell	Martin	

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be permitted to correct section numbers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, no one regrets more deeply than I the need to continue and extend the Universal Military Training and Service Act. I regret the need for any legislation which will serve to take our young men out of their homes and schools. I regret the need to interrupt their lives and plans from the peaceful pursuit of their education and professions. But most of all, Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that in this highly advanced age, society has not yet found the avenue to a lasting peace.

Much as I regret the need for this legislation, I am constrained to support it now as I did in our committee. As a matter of fact, I expressed grave doubts in committee as to the wisdom of the cut in our ground forces at this time. With the Communist threat looming larger and more serious every day, we must not, even in the slightest degree, lessen our defense effort or weaken our national security.

With our goal as peace, we must be so strong that no aggressor will dare to challenge us. We must never close the door to the conference room. We must, as we strengthen and fortify ourselves, proceed on the theory that peace is attainable and that war is not inevitable.

In supporting this legislation, I voice the hope and prayer that events prove it to have been unnecessary and that the safety of our country will never again require it.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted to all Members for extension of remarks on H. R. 3005, I would like to state for the record that illness prevented my being present to vote for the passage of this bill. The large vote by which it was passed speaks for the importance in which it is held and the unanimity of feeling of the Members of the House for its merits.

The world situation is one that calls for sacrifice, courage, and determination. We are faced with the inevitable requirement of maintaining an Army, a Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps for the indefinite future, of not less than 2,850,000. Our military experts have estimated and testified to the fact that voluntary enlistments cannot provide this number, essential to our national defense.

I believe that continuation of the draft for 4 years allows long-range planning for our Military Establishment, which is essential. I believe it also allows long-range planning for our youth, though it in nowise changes their period of service.

In the light of world conditions, this is necessary legislation—essential for the preservation of our Nation and of the free world.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a brief announcement, to advise the membership that the Committee on the Judiciary has just reported out a pay-raise bill for Federal judges and Members of Congress, and if a rule is reported, which I expect will be, the bill will be brought up for consideration

in the House on Wednesday of next week, 1 week from tomorrow. I wanted the Members to be advised so that they might govern themselves accordingly.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATION AND STUDY OF BENEFITS FOR SURVIVORS OF DECEASED MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 35, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Select Committee To Conduct an Investigation and Study of the Benefits Provided Under Federal Law for the Survivors of Deceased Members and Former Members of the Armed Forces the following Members of the House: Mr. HARDY of Virginia, chairman; Mr. KILDAY of Texas; Mr. TEAGUE of Texas; Mr. BATES of Massachusetts; Mr. KEAN of New Jersey.

DESIGNATING MR. CRAMER TO READ WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. At the suggestion of the minority leader, and pursuant to a special order agreed to on February 2, 1955, the Chair designates the gentleman from Florida, Mr. CRAMER, to read Washington's Farewell Address, immediately following the reading of the Journal on February 22, 1955.

PERMISSION TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file a supplemental report to accompany House Report No. 20 of the 84th Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE LATE CHARLES F. MARTIN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the indulgence of the Chair and the House to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the gentleman may proceed.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues will feel very sorry to hear that our beloved colleague and distinguished former Speaker, the present minority leader, Mr. MARTIN, of Massachusetts, has sustained a great loss in the death of his beloved brother. Notwithstanding his bereavement he stayed here throughout the day performing his duty as a Member of Congress in the House on this important bill. We all deeply respect him for his devotion to duty which he has so clearly shown throughout the years.

I know that each and every one of us feel exceedingly sorry for JOE MARTIN and we extend to him and his loved ones our profound sympathy in his great loss and sorrow.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. On behalf of the Members on this side of the aisle I join the majority leader and other Members in expressing our deep sympathy and sorrow to our beloved minority leader, JOE MARTIN.

Death came to his brother unexpectedly last night while on his journey to Florida. Mr. MARTIN said he would stay here throughout the day but felt it was his duty to go home this evening. We all send with him our deepest sympathy in this hour of his bereavement.

HELP AMERICAN WORKERS

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, recently, I proposed on the floor of the House that some effort be made to help the West Virginia victims of the reciprocal trade program.

I asked that a $175 million program be initiated to provide direct aid both to the victims of the scourge of unemployment which has followed our low tariff policy and the factory owners and coal mine operators who have been forced into bankruptcy for the same reason.

I am happy to report that my mail has overwhelmingly endorsed this proposal. The letters and telegrams have come not only from West Virginia, but from seven other States as well.

However, I am saddened by the fact that the most ardent supporters of the present free-trade policy have chosen to ignore the proposal. Although they are directly responsible for the ravages of unemployment in West Virginia, and other States in the Union, they have remained mute.

It means nothing to them that thousands of Americans have been thrown out of work. It means nothing to them that thousands of schoolchildren are deprived of the advantages of the good home and good food that weekly pay envelopes would assure them.

I sincerely hope that those who are depriving American workmen of their jobs and their right to make a living will consider this plan. Or, if they do not agree with it, let them offer something else.

Today they offer the most valuable market in the world to the foreign worker and they offer not a crust of stale bread to the unemployed American. This is not justice. This is not honesty.

If you strip a man of his job, then, I plead with you, give him another job in its place. Or, at least, give him the opportunity for a job.

Under my proposal the Federal Government would be empowered to conduct a far-reaching industrial survey of the State of West Virginia and report back a workable industrial plan to take up the slack in distress areas.

This is something that the Federal Government has a moral obligation to support. The State government of West Virginia did not force our industries into bankruptcy. The State government did not force our workers into idleness.

These conditions are the direct result of the trade policy of our Federal Government as approved by Congress. It is therefore up to Congress to act.

I wish to congratulate my colleague, Congressman HERMAN EBERHARTER, for his interest in this problem. Mr. EBERHARTER is an exception to my complaint that those who support free trade have ignored my proposal.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has proposed a plan of his own which would give help to the men and women who are unemployed because of free trade. I hope that others who have contributed to this unemployment will respond to their obligations to the unemployed as nobly and as wholeheartedly as Mr. EBERHARTER has done.

The advocates of our present free trade policy say that it is in the interest of stopping communism, and I agree, but should we not be interested in eradicating those conditions here at home as well as abroad, such as want and hunger that breed communism wherever they exist?

At the present time I am in the process of getting together all available data that will help me in preparing a proper resolution for introduction in the Congress. I feel that every Representative should be interested in this and should help, as it is not a local problem, but one of national consequence. The entire Congress cooperated in helping the sugar, tobacco, and cotton people because we knew of the nationwide importance resulting from anything that affected these industries.

My effort in this matter is to get something done for the unemployed in my State. If those that have been advocating free trade do not agree with me on this proposition, then they should offer something more concrete.

The proponents of free trade remind me of the man who had a sick child and heard that his neighbor also had a sick child. He immediately went to the aid of his neighbor and worked diligently in helping to doctor his neighbor's child, while all the time his own child was home ill and neglected.

It is my belief that charity begins at home, and it is time we looked after our own as well as the needy of the world.

THE LATE OSCAR E. HEWITT

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Chicago and the Nation have lost a great public servant in the passing of Oscar

E. Hewitt. It is proper that his death should be noted here in the Congress of the United States.

Many years ago he and I were members of the editorial staff of John R. Walsh's Chicago Chronicle. Later he went to the Chicago Tribune, specializing in local government and local transportation. There he showed his tremendous capacity for work, never putting in less than 12 hours a day, frequently on a self-imposed 7-day schedule.

For two decades prior to his retirement in 1952 at the age of 75 he was commissioner of public works of the city of Chicago. He worked at the job 7 days a week. Always he showed up in the early hours of the morning, never later than 7 o'clock, on occasions as early as 5 o'clock. He was the last to leave the city hall in the evening, seldom before 6 or 7 o'clock, often much later. He took the minimum time for lunch, just time enough for a quick bite at a lunch counter, then back to his desk.

This schedule he lived by to the very last day of his official service.

The record of his industry, his integrity, which stood as the Rock of Gibraltar, his great accomplishments in the field of local government, in which perhaps he was the outstanding authority in the United States, should be preserved as a pattern for deportment in public affairs.

I grieve in the loss of a dear friend of a half a century.

Chicago grieves in the loss of one of her greatest sons and servitors.

THE FORCED REPATRIATION PROGRAM

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOSCH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, ever since the end of World War II, there have been stories, articles, and reports which, in effect, allege that there were violations of the terms of the Yalta agreement and other secret agreements dealing with the repatriation program instituted with respect to displaced Russian nationals to the Russian Government. So long as this problem remains shrouded in secrecy and embarrassed silences, our American Nation will be besmirched and possibly even castigated for its part in that program.

Recently there appeared in the December 14, 1954, issue of the American Legion Magazine an article entitled "How We Served as Partners in a Purge" by Julius Epstein.

This article clearly demonstrates the need for a clarification of the wherefor of such a program. Repatriation, in and of itself, is a question of deep concern and distress. It is in the interest of our Nation that we determine this issue and cleanse the national record for all time.

Mr. Speaker, it is for that reason that I am today introducing a resolution for the creation of a committee of the Congress to conduct an investigation and study of the forced repatriation program carried out by our military and civilian authorities in the years 1945–47. I sincerely trust that this resolution will be favorably reported and a committee appointed at the earliest possible moment in the interest of justice.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

THE NORTHWEST AIRLINES CASE

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the President's decision, remanding his earlier orders denying the application of Northwest Airlines for authority to maintain through service from the Pacific Northwest to Hawaii, has pleased many of us. As things stand today, the Civil Aeronautics Board has been instructed by the President to draft orders authorizing Northwest Airlines and Pan American to continue operating this route on temporary basis for 3 years.

This decision is fair and consistent with the purposes and the intent of the Civil Aeronautics Act; the earlier one did not possess these virtues.

I am certain that the protests voiced earlier this week on this floor, and those conveyed directly to the White House, were instrumental in securing a reconsideration of the President's original decision on the Northwest Airlines' case. To my mind, these protests were valid, based on fact and reason. It is indeed gratifying that they produced results.

I have been deeply interested in the disposition of the Northwest Airlines' case not only since the President's decision of February 1, but for many months preceding that date. The issues involved were important because they involved the question of a national policy outlined by Congress, and because they seriously affected the transportation needs of Wisconsin and of other Midwestern States.

On June 3, 1954, Mr. H. O. Pihl, chairman of the aeronautics subcommittee of the Wisconsin Manufacturers' Association, called to my attention the possibility that the services rendered by Northwest Airlines between the Pacific Northwest and Hawaii were in danger of being discontinued.

Mr. Pihl's letter read as follows:

WISCONSIN MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION,
Madison, Wis., June 3, 1954.

CLEM J. ZABLOCKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ZABLOCKI: It has been brought to our attention that the continuance of air service by Northwest Airlines, Inc., from Seattle to Hawaii is in danger of discontinuance.

The facts appear to be as follows:

This service was inaugurated by Northwest several years ago and has been conducted under a temporary authorization by the CAB.

There are now two airlines operating between Seattle and Hawaii—Pan American and Northwest—although it has been recognized that the route cannot feasibly be operated with financial success by more than one line. Northwest was the first to apply for this route back in 1943 but upon objection on the part of Pan American was denied a certificate in 1946. Thereafter the CAB reopened the case and in 1948 found that the service was necessary but that only one carrier could feasibly render it and directed that it be rendered by Northwest. This decision was approved by President Truman on July 29, 1948. Nevertheless, in September 1948 President Truman directed that Pan American also be given the right to operate paralleling service and both lines have operated since that time.

The rights then granted were merely temporary and there is now pending before the CAB applications to make them permanent. The examiner in this proceeding has again found that only one line should operate between Seattle and Honolulu but has recommended that Pan American be certificated and that Northwest be denied, despite the fact that it has carried more passengers than has Pan American.

Pan American lines do not extend into the interior from the west coast and the interests of Wisconsin would seem to be far better served by a single-line operator which could be used for the entire service between the State and Hawaii. Pan American would still be serving Hawaii from San Francisco and Los Angeles.

We would not be calling this to your attention if it were purely an administrative matter, but as we understand it, these overseas routes are the subject of Executive approval, veto, or even of initiation, as indicated by President Truman's action in 1948, and we feel that in view of the circumstances and the fact that the best interests of the State of Wisconsin favor the service of Northwest rather than Pan American, you might indicate to the President, if not the CAB, your opinion or desire in the matter.

No doubt we, the traffic committee of the Wisconsin Manufacturers' Association, would have intervened in and been represented in the proceedings had we been aware of the danger in which the Northwest service was being placed. Your interest and any assistance you may be able to give in retaining that service, if the opportunity presents itself, would be greatly appreciated, and our appreciation, we believe, would be shared by the Wisconsin public generally.

H. O. PIHL,
Chairman, Aeronautics Subcommittee.

Upon the receipt of the above correspondence, I contacted Chairman Chan Gurney, of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and advised him of the interest of Wisconsin businessmen in adequate air-transportation facilities. He assured me that, in reaching the final decision, the Board would weigh most carefully all the facts of record, and give thorough consideration to the Northwest proposal.

When I learned last week that the President instructed the CAB to deny the application of Northwest Airlines to continue through service from the Pacific Northwest to Hawaii, in spite of the fact that Northwest offered to operate without subsidy, I immediately contacted the White House and the CAB, urging

careful review of that decision. My letter to Gov. Sherman Adams, the assistant to the President, read as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 5, 1955.

GOV. SHERMAN ADAMS,
Assistant to the President,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GOVERNOR ADAMS: The announcement of the President's instructions to the Civil Aeronautics Board, recommending that that agency deny the application of Northwest Airlines for authority to maintain through service from the Pacific Northwest to Hawaii, and from Minneapolis-St. Paul to Tokyo via Edmonton, Alberta, and Anchorage, Alaska, has deeply disturbed the people of Wisconsin who have benefited from this service during recent years.

The Northwest Airlines' routes have constituted our important air outlets to the East, the West, and to the Pacific. Our businessmen have relied on this direct service to areas where they do business. Northwest Airlines has pioneered these routes, and they are important to Wisconsin's transportation needs.

The President's instructions were particularly disturbing in view of the Northwest Airlines' offer to fly the Seattle-Hawaii route without Government subsidies, as part of the carrier's plan to be free of all subsidies by the end of 1955, and in view of the fact that the instructions apparently failed to set forth the reasons for the President's decision.

I will appreciate being advised of the specific reasons which constitute the basis for the President's instructions, and I wish to urge careful reconsideration of the proposal to deny the above-mentioned applications of the Northwest Airlines. Will you kindly convey my sentiments on this subject to the President.

Respectfully yours,

CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
Member of Congress.

It was gratifying to learn subsequently that the President had amended his decision so as to allow both Northwest Airlines and Pan American to compete on the northern Hawaii route. Competition of this sort is good, and it benefits the public.

I should like to note at this point that there is another air route, important to the air transportation needs of Wisconsin and the entire Midwest, which was affected by the President's instructions to CAB of February 1, 1955. This is the northern overland route from Milwaukee and Minneapolis-St. Paul to the Orient. This route was pioneered by Northwest Airlines, and the President ordered the CAB to discontinue it.

In order to show how many Wisconsin businessmen feel about the importance of this route, I should like to read into the RECORD the telegram which I received earlier today from Mr. Ray H. Weisbrod, executive vice president of the Milwaukee Association of Commerce. The telegram is, I believe, self-explanatory.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *February 8, 1955.*

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
Representative From Wisconsin,
House Office Building:

Milwaukee business highly pleased with President's decision to reverse his previous order and to authorize CAB to issue a 3-year extension to Northwest Airlines for continuation of profitable route from the Pacific Northwest to Hawaii. We sincerely appreciate your effective action in this respect.

However, we are sorely disappointed that the President's latest action did not include reversal of his previous decision to eliminate the direct inner great circle route from Milwaukee to Alaska. We earnestly believe this route is basic to Wisconsin's future growth in domestic trade with Edmonton, Canada, and Anchorage, Alaska, as well as our foreign trade with the Orient. This is the most direct route of any American carrier to Japan, the Philippines, and to the cold war areas of the Far East, hence should be developed commercially in the interests of national defense.

We sincerely trust that you can prevail upon the President to retain this direct route from important industrial areas of the Midwest to the Orient.

RAY H. WEISBROD,
Executive Vice President,
Milwaukee Association of Commerce.

While the President has decided to eliminate the inland great circle route which leads from Milwaukee and Minneapolis-St. Paul, through Edmonton, Alberta, and Anchorage, Alaska, to the Orient, it is my understanding that the Civil Aeronautics Board is presently considering a separate application of the Northwest Airlines for authority to maintain service along the inland portion of that route. That particular portion stretches between Milwaukee and Anchorage, and the proposed route would terminate at that latter point instead of going on to the Orient.

It would appear to me that both proposals—the proposal for a limited route between Milwaukee, Minneapolis, and Anchorage, and the proposal for the much more extensive Orient route—warrant careful consideration. It is my hope that they will receive thorough study before the ultimate decision is reached, and that, in arriving at the final determination, the President and the CAB will carefully weigh the needs of Wisconsin, and of other Midwestern States, for adequate air transportation facilities.

TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 1 would give the President full authority to negotiate trade agreements with other nations on the basis of reducing United States tariff restrictions. Many of us fear that this would lead to a reduction in our industrial capacity, the wiping out of many small industries and the unemployment of thousands of American workers through the resulting ruinous competition from cheap-labor-produced foreign imports.

The country is now being overwhelmed by propaganda favoring new tariff cuts, much of it inspired by the State Department. On January 8, 1955, Dr. George Gallup in a Public Opinion News Service release gives the result of a Gallup poll on this program. From this poll, Dr. Gallup draws the conclusion that the majority of the American people favor what the President proposes. This has been given wide circulation in the press, which, generally speaking, has a pro-free trade orientation.

Yet the figures from which Dr. Gallup draws this conclusion say exactly the opposite. Dr. Gallup's figures show that 42 percent of informed voters favor lower tariffs and that 26 percent prefer higher tariffs. But he completely fails to include in his own computation his own figure that 22 percent of informed voters favor maintaining tariffs at their present level. If those 22 percent are added to the 26 percent who favor higher tariffs, we find that 48 percent of informed voters are opposed to the principle expressed by H. R. 1, while only 42 percent support it.

Then, Dr. Gallup goes on to find that Republican voters favor lower tariffs 5 to 4.

The Public Opinion News Service of January 8, through which Dr. Gallup published his findings, begins with this headline: "Sentiment Favors Lowering Tariffs, Latest Poll Finds—Rank-and-File GOP Voters Who Would Change Present Policy Favor Lower Tariffs by 5 to 4." This headline was repeated by the press all over the Nation, much of which subscribes to this presumably objective service provided by Dr. Gallup.

But, by reading his own figures, we find that only 34 percent of informed Republicans favor lowering tariffs. On the other hand, 27 percent of informed Republicans favor the higher tariffs and 29 percent favor the tariffs we have now—or a total of 56 percent of informed Republicans would be against H. R. 1. Similarly, 43 percent of informed Democrats would be against H. R. 1 and 47 percent of informed Independents.

More details on this poll are set forth below.

While the phraseology of Dr. Gallup's questions is simple and objective, his findings by no means add up to anything resembling overwhelming national approval of lower tariffs. The following points seem significant:

First. The number of voters who are informed on the issue has increased materially since a similar poll was taken in February 1954.

Second. The number of informed voters who actually favor higher tariffs has also increased materially in the same period, from 16 percent to 26 percent. The number who favor lower tariffs has scarcely increased at all. The number who favor no change has decreased somewhat, and the number holding no opinion has decreased materially.

Third. There is no great difference in the percentage of Republicans, Democrats, and Independents who favor higher tariffs.

Fourth. It should be noted that the statement concerning a ratio of 5-to-4 favoring tariff reduction among rank-and-file Republicans can easily mislead the careless reader. This refers only to those Republicans who want to see a change in existing tariffs. It disregards the 22 percent who want no change and the 10 percent who hold no opinion. This whole finding could easily be restated with equal truth to read: "only 1 Republican in 3 and 1 Democrat in 2 actively favors lower tariffs."

Another way of putting it would be to say that "56 percent of Republicans and 43 percent of Democrats either want no change or want higher tariffs and are thus inferentially opposed to lower tariffs."

EXCESSIVE OIL IMPORTS

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of the House the serious problem created by excessive oil imports. My State of Oklahoma is largely dependent on the oil industry. Any adverse effect upon the oil industry in Oklahoma is immediately felt. The loss of State revenue required for essential State government activities is keenly felt. This is also reflected in the national picture. During recent years, oil imports have been increasing, taking more and more of the domestic market from producers. As a result, domestic oil producers have been repeatedly cut back.

Last week I appeared before the Ways and Means Committee urging that any extension of the Trade Agreements Act incorporate a provision that will eliminate the injury being suffered by the domestic oil industry because of ever-increasing oil imports.

I have introduced a bill which I believe offers a sound and reasonable method of solving this problem of excessive oil imports. My bill is based primarily upon the principle that we should encourage trade among nations to the fullest extent. But at the same time we should take steps to assure that the program does not endanger and destroy essential domestic defense industries. To further this principle, my bill provides that oil imports should not exceed 10 percent of domestic demand. My bill also includes a specific provision limiting residual fuel oil to 10 percent of the domestic demand for residual fuel oil, which is designed to give relief to another essential domestic industry; namely, the coal industry.

My proposal would not bar all imports. It would permit the continuation of healthy trade in oil. It is a reasonable and fair limitation. Last year all imports averaged 1,060,000 barrels daily. My bill would reduce imports to approximately 800,000 barrels daily. This would not destroy trade with our good neighbor Venezuela. It would permit Venezuela and other Western Hemisphere countries to continue imports at about current rates, if imports from the Middle East, which are most insecure from a defense viewpoint, were, through some unseen eventuality, eliminated. In addition, a 10-percent quota is justified on a historical basis. With the exception of the last 2 or 3 years, during the postwar period, imports have averaged about 10 percent of domestic demand. Prior to World War II, imports average about 5 percent. The 10-percent quota under my bill would permit a very healthy trade in oil. Far more than at anytime within the past few years.

Mr. Speaker, I am vitally concerned about the effects of excessive oil imports on the economy and welfare of my State. But of far greater importance to the Congress is the problem that is now facing the oil industry requiring the most careful attention of every Member of Congress. I believe that the bill that I have introduced provides a fair and effective solution. I urge every Member of the House to give this matter his immediate consideration.

THE SCHOOLS IN TROUBLE

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, because of the current crisis facing our schools I am submitting the following material for your information.

By way of introduction, it seems appropriate to insert the following article by Walter Lippmann which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on February 3, 1955:

THE SCHOOLS IN TROUBLE

Everyone who has paid any attention to the condition of the public schools knows that they are in serious trouble. They are being called upon to do more and more. They do not have the resources—the money, the buildings, the facilities, the teachers—to do what they are expected to do.

There are, it is estimated, about 700,000 pupils who are being deprived of full-time schooling. There are not enough classrooms and not enough teachers. More than a million and a half children go to school in rented garages, churches, barracks, and other makeshift quarters. The number of pupils in one class that a teacher can teach effectively is generally put at a maximum of 30. Yet it is reliably estimated that there are more than this maximum number in at least half the classes in the country, and there are a large number with as many as 50 or 60 pupils per teacher.

The general picture is that of a Nation which has outgrown the capacity of its school system. This enormous growth and change, which has been very rapid in the past 30 years, raises formidable problems of how to educate adequately such a rapidly increasing number of children.

The whole educational community is engaged in a continuing reappraisal of its functions. Many of the problems of adapting education to the modern world are complex and controversial—particularly as they have to do with how to teach and with what to teach. Here there are differing views and one cannot generalize and be dogmatic. But there is a fundamental condition on which there can in fact be no dispute. It is that the American system of public education is now out of scale with the educational needs of the country. The money and the public effort which we are putting into the public school system are on the scale of an earlier age. They do not permit the school to keep pace with the growth of the population, with the change in the American ways of life, and with the new position of this country in the world.

The simplest way to visualize the overall problem of scale is to remember how we have changed our way of thinking about national defense and about public highways. Since the beginning, the country has always maintained Armed Forces. It has always built roads. But if we compare the military budget today with the budget on the eve of the Second World War, the difference in the amount is a difference not merely in degree but in kind. There has been a radical change in our whole conception of the scale of our national defense, and of its relation to whatever else the Nation does. We have gone through a smaller but a simpler change of attitude toward the public highways, having been compelled by the automobile to raise our effort to a scale of expenditures undreamed of in the horse and buggy days.

We have come into a time when we shall have to make a comparable change in our thinking about what we need to spend on education, what we believe we can afford to spend on education. At a very conservative estimate in the next 10 years we shall have to double the amount spent each year on the public schools. We shall have to go up from the $10 billion spent now to around $20 billion.

That is, as compared with the national defense, a modest amount of money. But it is still a large sum, and almost certainly it is too large if it has to be borne wholly or in the main by the States and localities. As we go into the matter closely there will be little doubt at the end of the argument that we have no choice as to how to finance the educational deficit. We shall have to turn to the Federal Government. For it alone has the capacity to raise the necessary revenues.

It goes without saying that we shall not solve our educational problems merely by spending more money. We shall not make the schools adequate only by putting up new buildings. We shall not solve the problem of the shortage of teachers only by offering more pay; we shall have also to give to the teaching profession the attractiveness and the dignity which in the American tradition it is supposed to have.

Though we cannot solve all the problems with more money, that is no excuse for failing to meet the gross, material, obvious deficiencies which can be cured and have to be cured with money. We shall never have the chance to solve the other and higher problems of our schools if we allow them to become more and more overcrowded, if we allow the teachers to become more and more overworked, if we allow the educational community to become more and more overwhelmed and discouraged.

The material and quantitative problems will have to be brought under control if we are to face lucidly and calmly and productively the problems of purpose and the problems of quality in the education of children for the modern age.

It would seem highly undesirable to encourage States and local communities to borrow unduly for the purposes of school construction. Of all the fields where future development should not be mortgaged to the payments of debts incurred during the past, the field of education stands in the forefront. As Walter Lippmann said in the above article:

We shall never have the chance to solve the other and higher problems of our schools if we allow them to become more and more overcrowded, if we allow the teachers to become more and more overworked, if we allow the educational community to become more and more overwhelmed and discouraged.

The future of our children is too important to the basic fiber of America to permit a continuation of the present lag in providing adequate school facilities.

We must not hamstring the potentialities of the future. That is why no approach should occupy our first attention but the grant-in-aid approach of Federal assistance. States and school districts have already made tremendous efforts to meet their school needs, and the figures presented herein graphically indicate that those efforts will continue. In applying Federal aid for school construction on a necessarily larger basis, it may be appropriate to consider an additional and supplemental form of aid by providing a program of Federal loans to assist States and local communities in building schools. But this latter approach clearly does not help to meet the urgent school capital outlay requirements in the manner provided by Federal grants-in-aid.

There is no reason to believe that Federal contributions to State and local systems have been contrary to the public interest. Nobody can deny that adequate education for all who are educable, in this world of increasing complexity, is a crying need. That any substantial increases in Federal aid to education should continue to take the form of additional funds for construction, operation, and maintenance of public schools, payments in lieu of taxes, and for more and better science and technology should go without saying.

Perhaps the greatest weakness in the overall American public-school system is the insufficient salaries paid to teachers in every category. Being confronted with the overwhelming problem of school construction, States and local communities have slighted teachers' salaries. Indeed, to lessen the State and local burdens with respect to school construction, operation, and maintenance would be to leave State and local school authorities with more funds for salary payments.

To emphasize the tremendous problem faced by State and local school systems in providing and maintaining adequate school housing for the rapidly growing school population, I would like to refer to page 138 of the Report of the Statue Phase of the School Facilities Survey, published in December 1953 by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Covering the public elementary and secondary school facilities in 39 States, existing facilities were examined. Dollar need for new construction and rehabilitation were calculated. From the dollar-need totals in the various States were subtracted the amounts available in those States for new construction and rehabilitation of public-school buildings.

It was possible to present a rough comparison of the need in any State with the needs of the others by reducing to percentages the amounts lacked in the various States. Thus it was shown that 1 State lacked less than 10 percent of needed funds for capital outlay, 13 lacked more than 50 percent, and 6 more than 75 percent.

For Michigan the figures pointed out that 23.26 percent of the funds for needed capital outlay were absent. Minnesota lacked 27.83; Ohio lacked 20.50 percent; Illinois lacked 44.96 percent; Pennsylvania lacked 54.07 percent; California lacked 29.77 percent; Iowa, 38.62 percent; and Wisconsin, 40.41 percent. Thus, a strikingly high percentage of the so-called wealthy States are short of the necessary funds for school capital outlay requirements.

And these figures only begin to tell the story. Six States lack more than 75 percent of such funds needed; 13 States lack more than 50 percent. Add these difficulties to the increased birth rate and one can visualize the overwhelming impact that the problem of school construction, operation, and maintenance presents. Approximately 4 million new babies were added to the population during 1954. And all of this does not take into consideration population shifts.

In 1952 it was estimated that a shortage of 312,000 classrooms existed in the Nation. The term "shortage" includes both obsolescence and overcrowding. Obsolescent school buildings include those that are substandard. It is calculated that 2 percent of currently satisfactory classrooms become obsolescent each year. In 1952 there were 967,000 classrooms in the Nation. About 174,000 of them were obsolescent; and about 138,000 additional classrooms were needed because of overcrowding. Thus there was a critical need of 312,000 classrooms altogether. A continuing obsolescence of 2 percent of the classrooms means that between 16,000 and 20,000 are needed annually in the course of normal replacement.

The needed 312,000 classrooms to house 8,881,360 pupils as of 1952 would cost $10.6 billion. See Report of the Status Phase of the School Facilities Survey, December 1953, page 114, which shows a backlog of need as of 1952 of $10.6 billion, that of this amount, $5.9 billion could have been provided from applicable resources, leaving a deficit of $4.7 billion for all States.

There are no data on the question relative to what districts have to pay higher interest because their bonding capacity is limited or if bonds have been voted up nearly to bonding limits. This question is not fully applicable except in States having no- or only high-bond limits.

In attempting to present a fair picture of the difficulties that arise in meeting the classroom shortage, it should be pointed out that State reports show total debt but do not show bonded debt by school districts. Hence they do not give information on the number of districts that have exhausted all of their bonding capacity. One of the reasons the State totals do not reveal this picture is that local bonds are usually voted on local assessed valuations and surplus capacity in one district is not transferable to another district.

S. M. Brownell, Commissioner of Education, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, stated in a release of August 29, 1954, that—

> Although our communities are building more schools than ever before in any single period of our Nation's history, the rate of construction will have to be nearly tripled if we are to keep pace with the number of children to be educated.

Today there is an estimated shortage of 350,000 classrooms. To accommodate the growing numbers of children, to erase the estimated current shortage of 350,000 classrooms, and to take care of continued obsolescence, more than 600,000 public elementary and secondary school classrooms and related facilities will be needed during the next 5 years. It is estimated that 50,000 classrooms were built in 1952–53; 55,000 in 1953–54; and 60,000 in 1954–55. These figures truly dramatize the dangerously increasing backlog facing the Nation. Considerably more than 100,000 classrooms will have to be built each year to overcome the present crisis.

It is not easy to cite an average cost of a classroom. In a publication of September 20, 1954, of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, School Housing Section, titled "Data on School Building Unit Costs and the Consumption of Critical Materials in the Public Elementary and Secondary School Buildings Erected During the Controlled Materials Program, 1951–52," the authors, N. E. Viles and Ray L. Hamon, show costs that average about $33,000 per classroom on a contract basis. If construction supervision, sites, and equipment, and so forth, are added, these costs probably would have averaged around $36,000 or $37,000 at that time. The cost covers classrooms and related facilities. Future costs are unpredictable.

Although data are not available to show the costs by regions of classrooms during the past 20 years, the following figures are indexes on building construction costs by the years mentioned. These are on the basis of one nationally known index. These indexes are rounded and are based on the 1913 base, that is, 1913 equals 100.

Year:	Index
1932	141
1934	167
1936	172
1938	199
1940	203
1942	222
1944	235
1946	262
1948	344
1949	352
1950	375
1951	400
1952	416
1953	431
1954	447
1955	453

The following table vividly illustrates the increase of expenditures for school capital outlay:

Expenditures for capital outlay and interest by public elementary and secondary school systems, biennially, 1931–32 to 1951–52

[Thousands of dollars]

School year	Capital outlay	Interest
1931–32	210,996	140,235
1933–34	59,277	137,036
1935–36	171,322	132,983
1937–38	238,853	114,102
1939–40	257,974	130,909
1941–42	137,552	108,781
1943–44	53,856	96,805
1945–46	111,046	76,923
1947–48	412,467	76,331
1949–50	1,014,176	100,578
1951–52 [1]	1,477,332	114,310

[1] $36,454,528.42 was paid to school districts for school construction pursuant to title II, Public Law 815 during fiscal year 1952. This may apply, however, to expenditures made by the school districts in several fiscal years.

Source: Statistics of State School Systems, Biennial Surveys of Education in the United States.

Compare the last figure given for 1952, $1,477,332,000, with the 1952 need of $10.6 billion, and we see that there is only about one-tenth of the necessary expenditure for classrooms. Today the figure of needed expenditure is probably closer to $15 billion.

The following table illustrates that the aggregate current expenditures from State and local sources for public elementary and secondary schools have been tripled during the past 20 years:

Non-Federal current expenditure for public elementary and secondary schools: United States, and Michigan

REVENUE INCOME FROM STATE AND LOCAL SOURCES

[Thousands of dollars]

Year	Continental United States	Michigan
1951–52	6,195,018	315,874
1949–50	5,281,075	265,435
1947–48	4,190,934	197,468
1945–46	3,018,213	137,655
1943–44	2,568,163	120,994
1941–42	2,382,028	102,962
1939–40	2,220,422	98,487
1937–38	2,196,049	97,058
1935–36	1,961,258	92,741
1933–34	1,788,732	73,131
1931–32	2,059,237	101,429

The following table indicates the overall expenditures for public elementary and secondary education. The existing expenditures are far short of the need.

Expenditures for public elementary and secondary education for 1951–52 (actual) and 1954–55 (estimated)

Expenditure	1951–52	1954–55 (estimated)
Current expenditures (including summer, adult, and evening schools)	$5,752,594,000	$7,070,000,000
Capital outlay	1,477,332,000	[1] 1,800,000,000
Interest	114,310,000	170,000,000
Total	7,344,236,000	9,040,000,000

[1] Tentative estimate, made in July 1954. This estimate should be regarded as minimal.

NOTE.—The figures in this table include expenditures from all sources (local, State, and Federal). The figures for current expenditures include expenditures for summer, evening, and adult schools, as well as regular day schools. Data for 1951–52 are taken from the forthcoming chapter II of the Biennial Survey of Education; the figures for 1954–55 represent estimates by the U. S. Office of Education.

The next table offers a projected figure relating to the aggregate non-Federal expenditure of State governments and school districts.

It should be observed that the estimated non-Federal current expenditure for 1951–52—$5,452,932,000—is not equal to the actual such expenditure for that year; namely, $6,195,018,000.

Estimated non-Federal current expenditure for public elementary and secondary day schools for continental United States, 1951–52 to 1959–60

Year	Estimated enrollment kindergarten to 12th grade (thousands)	Estimated average daily attendance kindergarten to 12th grade [1] (thousands)	Estimated non-Federal current expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance [2]	Estimated non-Federal current expenditure (thousands)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5=col. 3×col. 4)
1951–52	[3] 26,563	[3] 23,257	[4] $234.46	[4] $5,452,932
1952–53	27,739	24,299	244.46	5,940,134
1953–54	29,183	25,564	254.46	6,505,015
1954–55	30,663	26,861	264.46	7,103,660
1955–56	32,026	28,055	274.46	7,699,975
1956–57	33,351	29,215	284.46	8,310,499
1957–58	34,679	30,379	294.46	8,945,400
1958–59	36,054	31,583	304.46	9,615,760
1959–60	37,363	32,730	314.46	10,292,276

[1] Percent of pupils enrolled attending daily equal 87.6 in 1951–52; assumed the same for subsequent years.

[2] 1951–52:

Current expenditure allocable to pupil costs	$5,680,643,000
Federal revenue	227,711,000
Estimated non-Federal current expenditure allocable	5,452,932,000
Average daily attendance	23,257,000
Estimated non-Federal expenditure per pupil	$234.46

$10 added to the $234.46 each year.

[3] Actual, not estimated.

[4] Comparable data for Michigan: Col. 4, $263.89; col. 5, $267,589,000.

Intergovernmental expenditure, by function and by State: 1952

State	Percent distribution of intergovernmental expenditure								State	Percent distribution of intergovernmental expenditure							
	All intergovernmental expenditure	Function not specified	Public Welfare		Education	Highways	Health and hospitals	All other		All intergovernmental expenditure	Function not specified	Public Welfare		Education	Highways	Health and hospitals	All other
			Categorical assistance programs	Other								Categorical assistance programs	Other				
All States	100.0	10.9	16.5	2.8	50.1	14.4	2.5	2.8	Nebraska	100.0	1.0	45.4	3.6	17.3	30.3	1.4	0.9
Alabama	100.0	2.7	23.9	1.9	50.3	17.1	3.5	.5	Nevada	100.0	2.4	------	------	65.3	25.0	------	7.3
Arizona	100.0	39.4	------	------	44.7	13.5	.3	2.1	New Hampshire	100.0	59.1	------	------	34.1	3.5	------	3.3
Arkansas	100.0	12.0	------	------	69.9	15.4	2.0	.7	New Jersey	100.0	1.4	19.4	3.3	39.6	23.9	6.6	5.9
California	100.0	5.2	34.6	.4	41.9	9.7	1.7	6.5	New Mexico	100.0	1.7	------	------	90.6	4.6	1.6	1.5
Colorado	100.0	.4	63.0	2.9	15.3	15.9	1.2	1.2	New York	100.0	13.2	25.0	7.9	43.8	4.8	3.6	1.7
Connecticut	100.0	16.5	------	14.7	59.9	7.6	.3	1.0	North Carolina	100.0	9.3	34.5	1.0	40.7	6.6	7.6	.3
Delaware	100.0	------	4.6	2.5	88.5	2.3	------	2.1	North Dakota	100.0	2.7	------	1.1	59.9	34.1	------	2.2
Florida	100.0	4.7	------	------	72.2	17.9	1.3	3.9	Ohio	100.0	17.5	5.3	8.7	37.0	28.8	2.1	.6
Georgia	100.0	------	------	2.2	76.0	15.3	6.5	------	Oklahoma	100.0	------	------	------	62.6	34.8	.6	2.0
Idaho	100.0	11.5	------	------	47.5	39.1	1.7	.1	Oregon	100.0	2.3	.2	1.5	63.8	31.3	.1	1.0
Illinois	100.0	------	------	15.1	53.7	28.3	2.0	.9	Pennsylvania	100.0	3.1	------	------	80.2	11.7	.2	4.8
Indiana	100.0	2.4	20.1	.3	49.5	25.4	1.8	.4	Rhode Island	100.0	46.6	------	22.6	28.4	.7	1.6	------
Iowa	100.0	31.9	------	.1	29.1	37.1	1.4	.4	South Carolina	100.0	11.6	------	------	73.1	8.7	5.8	.8
Kansas	100.0	11.7	31.3	5.5	30.4	13.3	1.0	6.8	South Dakota	100.0	9.1	------	3.3	65.9	17.6	.3	3.8
Kentucky	100.0	1.2	------	------	82.9	3.1	5.1	7.7	Tennessee	100.0	10.8	------	------	68.9	16.6	3.2	.4
Louisiana	100.0	23.5	------	------	61.2	6.5	1.4	7.4	Texas	100.0	------	------	------	88.6	6.9	2.7	1.8
Maine	100.0	3.3	------	4.9	59.1	31.9	.1	.6	Utah	100.0	4.7	------	------	82.8	9.6	.9	1.9
Maryland	100.0	22.2	13.0	3.3	38.7	19.5	.9	2.4	Vermont	100.0	.2	------	.7	49.4	48.0	------	1.8
Massachusetts	100.0	23.5	48.7	3.6	15.5	3.4	.4	4.9	Virginia	100.0	13.3	12.4	2.1	63.6	4.9	1.2	2.5
Michigan	100.0	18.3	------	2.0	50.4	24.8	3.7	.8	Washington	100.0	7.5	------	1.8	63.9	17.1	5.2	4.5
Minnesota	100.0	7.1	30.8	1.2	48.1	10.2	1.5	1.0	West Virginia	100.0	------	------	3.0	95.3	------	.6	1.1
Mississippi	100.0	14.8	------	------	53.6	23.3	7.1	1.2	Wisconsin	100.0	40.1	20.0	.2	14.2	20.9	3.3	1.3
Missouri	100.0	3.1	------	------	92.4	1.9	1.6	1.1	Wyoming	100.0	12.3	22.0	2.6	48.2	10.8	1.6	2.4
Montana	100.0	------	------	2.8	91.1	------	.9	5.2									

By far the largest segment of State payments tc local governments is for support of public schools. About 50 percent of all State intergovernmental expenditure in 1952 was for education, the amounts so provided being in excess of $2.5 billion. The term "State intergovernmental expenditure" is synonymous to the term "State payments to local governments." By definition, State intergovernmental expenditure involves the actual payment of money to local governments. It thus excludes State transactions or activities which benefit localities without involving flow of funds to local governments. In the publication, State Payments to Local Governments in 1952, State and Local Government Special Studies, No. 55, dated 1954, much valuable data was compiled by the Bureau of the Census, United States Department of Commerce. The preceding table, showing the percentage of distribution of intergovernmental expenditure by function, is taken from that publication, page 73. Observe that around 50 percent of all intergovernmental expenditure goes for the purpose of education.

The most recent figures on the debt limits for the issuance of school bonds per State are shown below:

Limitations on the issuance of bonds for school capital outlay expressed as percents of taxable assessments, 1953–54

LESS THAN 6 PERCENT OF THE TAXABLE VALUATIONS

State:	Percent
Illinois	5
Indiana	2
Iowa	[1] 5
Kentucky	2
Massachusetts	2.5–5

[1] Bonds in Iowa are subject to a further limitation of 7 mills for debt service.

Limitations on the issuance of bonds for school capital outlay expressed as percents of taxable assessments, 1953–54—Con.

LESS THAN 6 PERCENT OF THE TAXABLE VALUATIONS—Continued

State:	Percent
Montana	5
New Hampshire	5
Oklahoma	5
Rhode Island	3
South Dakota	5
Texas	5
Utah	3–4
Hawaii	5

6 TO 9 PERCENT OF THE TAXABLE VALUATIONS

State:	Percent
Alabama	[2] 0
Georgia	7
Kansas	6–7
Maine	5–7.5
Maryland	[3] 0
New Jersey	4–8
New Mexico	6
North Carolina	5–8
Ohio	8
Oregon	3–9
Pennsylvania	7
South Carolina	8
West Virginia	8
Wisconsin	6
Wyoming	6

9 TO 12 PERCENT OF THE TAXABLE VALUATIONS

State:	Percent
Arizona	10
Colorado	5–10
Connecticut	10
Delaware	5–10
Florida	10
Idaho	6–10
Missouri	10
New York	[4] 5–10
North Dakota	10
Tennessee	10
Vermont	[5] 10
Washington	10
Alaska	10

12 PERCENT OR MORE OF THE TAXABLE VALUATIONS

State:	Percent
Arkansas	15
California	5–15
Louisiana	20
Michigan	15
Minnesota	15–50
Mississippi	15
Nebraska	40
Nevada	10–13
Virginia	18

NOTE.—Alabama and Maryland are included in this table, although the debt limitations in these States are measured on different bases.

[2] Bonds may not be issued in an amount which would require more than 80 percent of the proceeds of the taxes pledged to debt service.

[3] No limit except that bond issues are approved by the State legislature which may also require a county referendum.

[4] Bonds above these limits must be approved by larger-than-majority votes.

[5] No limit for projects financed under the State School Construction Program.

In conclusion I would like to make some candid observations. It is true that obstacles to local and State progress often prevent a desirable rate of change, just as it is frequently true on the national scene. Perhaps more State equalization funds should be established. Perhaps a faster pace of redistricting could be achieved. But we all recognize, I am sure, that unprecedented efforts are being exerted by the States and local communities. We ought to know by now that nothing is accomplished by sacrificing the future of our children on the altar of our shortcomings. It will take all of our combined efforts—local, State, and Federal—to meet the current school crisis. I hope that this session of Congress will act swiftly in assuming its share of the common burden. My bill, H. R. 2357, is a long way toward achieving this.

NORTHWEST AIRLINES

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, for quite some time, the peope of my State, of the entire Northwest region and of those many States which make up the northern portion of our Nation from Oregon to the Middle West, have awaited with some anxiety, the action of one of the Government's important administrative agencies—the Civil Aeronautics Board. It is not necessary for me to call to your attention that this action, which is regarding renewal of certification for certain United States air routes in the Pacific, was called to public attention on February 1, 1955. The recommendations of the Board are by this time well known.

Among these recommendations, one particularly stands out as a monument to either sheer carelessness of decision or grandiose misapplication of reasoning. I refer directly to the Board's recommendation that Northwest Airlines not be renewed for certification in service to Hawaii, which it pioneered in 1948, which it has developed, promoted, and flown for the years between, and in which it established a most enviable record, a most satisfactory and convincing reputation.

But as startling as the Board's decision is to the people of the States and areas to which I have referred, even more startling is the statement of the Board which accompanied its decision—that its original, unanimous conclusions, though favoring renewal of this Northwest Airlines service, had been discarded by President Eisenhower and sent back to the Board and thence reissued in direct contradiction to the Board's first recommendation. In short, the unanimous approval of CAB, a nonpartisan administrative agency, reached after months of consideration, had overnight been reversed in hasty, ill-advised contemplation by the President.

And now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard this morning that a third rendering of opinion in this matter has occurred. We have heard, much to our continued bewilderment, that another version of the Government's policy has been rendered by President Eisenhower in respect to this Nation's civil air industry. We have heard and seen an amazing spectacle—an example of hasty decision after hasty decision. We have witnessed in a few short days a round robin of confusion in a matter which has much more than just regional significance, because it involves our entire civilian air transport industry.

There are those of my colleagues who would suggest that the final decision has been made—that both Northwest Airlines and Pan American World Airways will be allowed to fly competitively. And if such is the case, I am certain many of the people who have registered protest after protest over this affair will have been somewhat satisfied. But I emphasize this is a third decision on a single case in a matter of several days—and there are other cases yet to be decided; for example, the States-Alaska case, which involves the vital air link from Portland and Seattle to the Territory.

It is not my intention to direct criticism to anyone who is willing to reconsider a bad decision. As a matter of fact, I have urgently proposed reconsideration in this instance, as have many others in both the House and Senate. I seek only to make some fundamental points in this statement today—and they concern the manner in which recommendations or our administrative agencies have been held in disdain by the President. It is for this reason I am going to refer briefly to some of the important phases of this case.

Now, though they have been recorded in numerous publications and on numerous occasions these last several days, I feel impelled to make reference to some of the facts apparent in this case, for rarely have such overwhelmingly important facts either been totally overlooked or ignored. It is my hope that by repetition and by emphasis the shocking shallowness in the handling of this case will be seen in the light of indisputable, factual evidence.

Northwest Airlines has flown the Portland-Seattle-Hawaii flight successfully at low governmental cost. There exist ample statistics to support this beyond a shadow of doubt. Proof beyond statistical evidence in this fact exists in the offer made by Northwest that if allowed to continue its service, it would do so without subsidy. Further, it has reportedly asserted that it would willingly apply domestic rates to this Hawaiian extension of domestic routes leading from Chicago and points east through Portland and Seattle. Yet, the recommendation of CAB, in strict accordance with the President's instructions, certificated Pan American World Airways, out of San Francisco and Los Angeles, to fly the west coast-Hawaii route under subsidy. One cannot, by the greatest measure of imagination, construe that one service, functioning efficiently and providing highly satisfactory service to thousands of people without subsidy, should be thrown aside in favor of another service which functions under heavy subsidy, and even then, fails to provide the sort of service to which the greatest majority of users are accustomed.

In May of 1954, the Civil Air Policy, a report by the Air Coordinating Committee, by direction of the President, was made public. I would like to refer to a statement made by the President on May 26, 1954, and included as a preface to the printed version of the report, and then, I would like to quote directly from that report.

The following is quoted from the statement by the President:

I shall use this report as a guide in the future consideration of questions related to the subject of civil aviation and in making appropriate recommendations to Congress.

The following is quoted from the report:

In some cases—

Mainly in international operations—it may be necessary to continue subsidy for an indefinite period to preserve a service which is essential in the national interest, and which cannot be provided feasibly on a nonsubsidized basis. However, in each case, it must be carefully considered, not only whether the service itself is sufficiently essential to justify indefinite Federal support, but also whether the service can be rendered by other United States carriers with less or no subsidy. * * * We believe that reduction of subsidy assistance at this time will provide the most effective stimulus for the type of industry adjustments and operating economies which are needed to strengthen the air transport system.

Is it surprising, then, to any of us, that the people of my State and most every other State are bewildered by a policy which aims intentions in one direction and acts in direct opposition to its aims? Is it not startling and is it not bewildering and is it not frightening to realize that decisions affecting the people of not just my State, but of many States, can be and seemingly are made with disregard for carefully mapped policy and with disdain for recommendations painstakingly reached and honestly rendered—as was the CAB original recommendation in the West Coast-Hawaii case?

Another fact apparent in the Board's reconstructed decision was seen in the monopolistic condition which surrounded the service as provided by Pan American World Airways. Certainly the monopoly which would have fallen to Pan American by this decision is not justifiable. It is not pleasant to reflect on the implications. It is distasteful to suggest that monopoly is not being prevented by our Government. It is shocking to consider that monopoly is supported with subsidy by our Government. Yet, this is what happened. And what happened could have been tragic.

True, Mr. Eisenhower's decision granting monopoly was reversed by Mr. Eisenhower. Nevertheless, we must not be misled. It is all too obvious that tragedy occurs also in the policy which permits—and again, I use the phrase—the aiming of intention in one direction and the actual acting in direct opposition to the aim.

I quote from the President's Economic Report of January 20, 1955:

Government should persist in its efforts to maintain easy entry into trade and industry, to check monopoly and to preserve a competitive environment.

The direction of the initial action is clear. Mr. Eisenhower's first decision accords to Pan American World Airways: First, a monopoly; and, second, a noncompetitive environment.

The initial shock of this affair first settled like a shroud on many people in the Northwest. But now the shock is over, now the anger has become evident and like every other delegate from my State I have been flooded with wired and written paragraphs of protest. I shall not add these to the many already a matter of record.

In compliance with my own convictions and the desires of the people of my State I joined with the two Senators from Oregon in urging the President's reconsideration. Others of my colleagues were similarly impelled.

We have let the President know how we feel—and in no uncertain terms. And we are grateful that he has responded to act favoring Northwest Airlines' flight to Hawaii.

And so we await other decisions in other instances such as the States-Alaska case, which will determine the future of air service to Alaska from the great Northwest. We await the occasion of action which again may very well fall hastily and in discord with the President's so-called policy. We wait to learn whether Alaskans face a blow to their economy, whether they will be allowed the opportunity of a competitive market, whether they will necessarily pay for the conception of a monopoly.

And we pause to ponder the implications of a once-rendered, ill-advised and thoughtlessly made decision based illogically on what readily appears to be a reward to monopoly and a tribute to pressure.

NORTHWEST AIRLINES

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of our colleague from Oregon just shows what a great President we have. In spite of all of the misinformation that he gets and of the erroneous advice which is given him and urged on him, attempts to pressurize him, probably, and sometimes, evidently in this place successfully, when the facts come to his knowledge he makes the right decision. I hope that our Democratic friends will not blame him if sometimes, when they go down to a Presidential reception, the food happens to be scorched or the wine is not quite to their taste.

PROTESTS TEXTILE TARIFF REDUCTION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, just a few minutes ago a man who represents the wool growers and manufacturers and workers in the woolen industry protested bitterly by long-distance telephone the suggested reduction in tariff rates. I know, Mr. Speaker, if the reduction proposed in textiles is pursued, it will mean almost complete annihilation of both the woolen and textile industries.

We cannot in this country compete with the labor of Japan, and India and Italy in velveteen and corduroys.

I hope the entire House will rise in revolt against this tremendous injustice to our textile institute all over the United States.

(The telegram referred to is as follows:)

MEDFORD, MASS., *December 19, 1954.*
Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Lowell, Mass.:

Much interested your published Boston Globe interview with the President regarding textile situation. If every woolgrower received 30 cents per pound from the Government as subsidy, the cost would be less than one-third the price paid for one battleship. This country is being flooded with cheap foreign goods while our manufacturers who are supposed to hire American labor cannot secure orders for American yardage of cloth. Raise the tariff $2 per yard on imported goods before it is too late and put wool on the free list paying subsidy to woolgrowers. The taxes paid by successful manufacturers will more than pay the subsidy and in addition American labor will be employed instead of going on welfare lists and unemployment rolls for taxpayers to finance. How much longer do you think the country can stand this nonsense? Regards and more power to you.

KENNETH HUTCHINS.

NORTHWEST AIRLINES CASE

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, some comments have just been made about the Northwest Airlines case and the suggestion was left that there was something improper in what the President did in overruling the recommendation of the Civil Aeronautics Board and granting to Pan American Airlines the route from Seattle and Portland to Honolulu.

For the purpose of the full record perhaps the House ought to be reminded that in July 1948 the Civil Aeronautics Board recommended and the then President approved that this route to Honolulu be given to Northwest Airlines and denied to Pan American. Two months later, in September 1948, the same President of the United States without public explanation, so far as I can recall, reversed himself, overruled the CAB and cut Pan American in on the route. I have not heard any Democrats insinuating that the then President was being influenced by big interests.

When President Eisenhower recently renewed the route to Pan American and denied it to Northwest, he said it was because of the laws written by this Congress directed him to reduce subsidies. Facts submitted by the examiner indicated Northwest required twice as big a subsidy as Pan American to break even. But this case has been pending for many

months and when it was demonstrated to him that the subsidy situation has changed recently so that it is expected both lines will be subsidy free by next fiscal year, he had the courage publicly to change his position and modify the decision so both lines will continue to operate the route as at present, for 3 more years.

The President was not bowing to public protests, as the papers have said. He was acting on the basis of the more current facts. I admire a man who will do that and am glad the country now has such a man as its President.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address the House on behalf of the President's program to provide assistance to increase school construction across the country. These proposals are another example of the constructive conservatism of the Eisenhower administration. They deserve the earnest consideration of the Congress. As a member of the Education and Labor Committee, I am happy today to introduce a bill authorizing his recommendations. I trust that early hearings by our committee will be in order.

This bill lays the framework for positive and constructive steps to meet our national needs for additional schoolroom facilities. I should like to emphasize that the program outlined in the bill is specifically designed to keep the responsibility for American education at home, in the local school district where it belongs. It is designed also to elicit the greatest possible use of State and local resources without transferring the responsibility from the States to the Federal Government with the consequent threat of centralized control.

The program recognizes the great diversity of conditions affecting our 63,000 school districts in 48 States and provides alternative solutions to meet their differing problems. We must face the fact that no single or simple remedy will solve the varying problems of our communities across the country.

The program outlined in the bill seeks to facilitate immediate State and local action to meet effectively our national needs, within the framework of the traditional responsibility of local communities and the States for the education of our children. To this end, the Federal Government proposes to assist the States and communities in a working partnership to build the needed facilities. This effort seeks to widen customary channels of financing and materially expand the flow of capital for construction of facilities.

Several points deserve emphasis. I should like to make clear to my colleagues that the enactment of this bill, first of all, would make possible a tremendous volume of new construction. Over the next 3 years this bill makes possible the joining of local, State, and Federal resources amounting to $7 billion which would result in approximately 200,000 new classrooms to house nearly 6 million children. Secondly, it should be made clear that this bill will permit the building of schools as fast as any alternative program now under consideration. Thirdly, it is completely voluntary in its provisions. In the fourth place, it is comprehensive and is designed to meet the varying needs of our varied school districts and their problems. Finally, it fully preserves local initiative and local responsibility.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House on Thursday next for 10 minutes, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

THE LATE HONORABLE EDWIN YATES WEBB

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it has become my sad duty to announce to the House the death of a distinguished North Carolinian and former Member of this body, the Honorable Edwin Yates Webb, of Shelby, N. C. Judge Webb died Monday morning, February 7, 1955, at Wilmington, N. C., while on a short vacation.

Mr. Speaker, Judge Webb was a predecessor of mine and one of my most honored constituents. He was born of a pioneer family on May 23, 1872, in Shelby, N. C., and resided there all of his life. Educated at the Shelby Military Institute, Wake Forest College, the University of North Carolina, and the Law School of the University of Virginia, he was well equipped to serve the people of North Carolina for more than half a century. Judge Webb was elected and served with honor in the North Carolina State Senate during the 1901 session. Dedicated to the principles of the Democratic Party, he served as chairman of the Cleveland County Democratic Executive Committee from 1898 to 1902, and as temporary chairman of the Democratic State Convention in 1900.

His qualities of leadership, character and ability were soon recognized on a wider scale and the people of the old Ninth Congressional District of North Carolina selected Judge Webb to serve in the 58th Congress and 8 succeeding Congresses. While a Member of the Congress, he distinguished himself by his successful sponsoring of legislation prohibiting the sale and use of intoxicating beverages and served as chairman of the great Committee on the Judiciary. In recognition of his legal and judicial ability, President Woodrow Wilson selected him for appointment as district judge of the United States Court for the Western District of North Carolina. Judge Webb served in this capacity with great honor and distinction for almost 30 years until his retirement on March 1, 1948.

Mr. Speaker, in these turbulent times our Nation can ill afford to lose men of the character and high purpose of Judge Webb. He was devoted to the highest ideals of public service and his entire record of such public service stands today without a single blemish. He was a man of sterling character, unquestioned integrity, fierce patriotism and undying devotion to country and family. His great understanding of human nature enabled him to serve his people well and to administer justice from the Federal bench with a noble purpose.

Mr. Speaker, the foundation upon which rested the character, life, and service of this great man was his dedication to church and God. For above all else Judge Webb was a Christian gentleman of the highest order. He followed the Christian principles in the home, in the Congress and on the bench. North Carolina and the Nation have lost a great and noble man. He will soon be laid to rest on the rolling hills of Cleveland County alongside of Governor and Ambassador, O. Max Gardner, and Governor and Senator, Clyde R. Hoey. These three sons of Cleveland County have left their marks on county, State, and Nation which time will not soon erase.

To Judge Webb's widow and children I extend my deepest sympathy in their loss.

Mr. SHUFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. SHUFORD. Mr. Speaker, we pause today to pay tribute to a great man, Hon. E. Yates Webb, of Shelby, N. C., who recently died within the boundaries of his beloved State. He was a former Member of this body and judge of the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina. His passing has saddened the hearts of all who knew him.

During his life he came in contact with many people. His outstanding character, wise counsel, and absolute impartiality set a pattern for all to follow. His influence for good will be lasting.

His was an outstanding career of service to the people of his judicial district and to the State and Nation he loved so well. Blessed with a great spirit of warmth, coupled with complete sincerity of purpose, he vigorously championed the principles in which he believed. We will sorely miss Judge Webb but his many good works will long be remembered.

To his widow, children, and other members of his family I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the people of North Carolina, and the Nation generally, were saddened when it was announced that Judge Edwin Yates Webb, of Shelby, N. C., had passed away.

Judge Webb was a most distinguished jurist, a statesman, and a beloved and respected citizen. He was born in Shelby, Cleveland County, N. C., was a graduate from Wake Forest College, and studied law at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and the University of Virginia, Charlottsville. He was a member of the State Senate of North Carolina in 1901 and a Member of the United States House of Representatives from 1903 to 1919 when he resigned to accept a judicial position. He served a long and useful term as United States district judge for the Western District of North Carolina, from which he retired in March 1948. His contributions to the State of North Carolina and to the Nation have been outstanding and his accomplishments and many years of service will long be an inspiration to everyone to follow. His life is a worthy example many should do well to pattern after.

To his family I extend my sincere and heartfelt sympathy. All of us here will miss him, but our grateful remembrance of Judge Webb shall remain forever constant.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues on the floor this afternoon in paying brief tribute to the memory of Judge E. Y. Webb. I have known Judge Webb all my life and reside only about 20 miles from the city in which he lived all of his life. My father was a contemporary of Judge Webb and, although they were not of the same political persuasion, they were close personal friends all down through the years. My father ran for Congress against Judge Webb and they engaged in a heated political campaign, but that did not mar the regard each held for the other.

My father introduced me to Judge Webb soon after I became licensed to practice law and I had the opportunity to appear frequently in the court over which he presided. He was a profound legal student and had the ability to go right to the heart of any problem before him. He was a wise judge who understood human nature and he administered justice with mercy.

I once served as assistant United States attorney in the court over which Judge Webb presided and frequently found myself in his court in the trial of civil and criminal cases. I found him to be uniformly courteous and considerate to litigant and counsel. And then when court was in recess, lawyers and court officials would gather around his chair in the hotel lobby and listen to him discuss the important questions of the day.

Before Judge Webb was a judge, he served in Congress the district I now have the honor to represent here. This was before our district was divided a few years ago and the county in which he lived is now in the 11th Congressional District, so ably represented now by our colleague, Congressman JONES. Judge Webb had a long and distinguished career here in Congress. I have been pleased to learn that his ability was so pronounced and his devotion to duty so outstanding that he is still remembered by some of the older Members of Congress even though it has been more than 30 years since he served here in the House. He retired voluntarily in order to continue his public service on the bench.

I considered Judge Webb a warm personal friend. He has extended many favors to me in the past and I learned with profound sorrow of his sudden passing. I join my colleagues here today in extending Mrs. Webb and to his children my deep sympathy in this hour of their bereavement.

North Carolina has lost one of her great men in his passing. I predict that he will long be remembered by people in all walks of life throughout our State for the faithful and devoted service he rendered throughout his long and distinguished career.

EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, today our President sent his message to this House urging Federal aid to education, and particularly stressing the need for school construction. Anticipating that request, and also that there undoubtedly will be legislation upon that subject, I have introduced today a bill which I think becomes peculiarly applicable in view of the fact that we will probably entertain legislation along the lines of the President's recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, the bill that I have introduced reads as follows:

A bill to prohibit the courts of the United States and all other Federal agencies from deciding or considering any matter drawing in question the administration by the several States of their respective educational systems

Be it enacted, etc., That the Supreme Court of the United States, the United States courts of appeals, the United States district courts, and all other Federal judicial tribunals, quasi-judicial tribunals, and all administrative or executive agencies, shall have no jurisdiction to decide or consider, either originally, on appeal, or by other means of review, any matter drawing in question the administration by the several States of their respective educational systems.

SEC. 2. All laws or parts of laws inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed or modified to the extent of such inconsistency.

If passed, this bill will restore to the respective States the administration of their educational systems. The passage of this bill would be the complete answer to the threat or fact, as the case may be, that the Federal Government is regimenting, or trying to regiment, education. It appears to many in this body, and, indeed, to the public generally, that the Federal Government is presently trying to dominate the field of education. If this is not true, the claimed power by some in the field of education that the Government should control education on a national level remains a serious threat, and can mean that this claimed power may be asserted in the future, if possible.

I know no Member of this body who does not say that they are against the Federal Government exercising power over our school systems, and who does not admit it would be disastrous if such should happen. This bill will prevent that danger, and I hope it will receive the overwhelming support of this 84th Congress.

There is nothing new or novel in this legislation proposed by me. The power to pass this legislation is found in article 3, section 2, clause 2, of the Constitution of the United States, dealing with the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, the pertinent part reading as follows:

In all the other cases before mentioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make.

In other words, the Congress has the constitutional authority and the duty to make such exceptions and regulations as it deems proper regarding the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. Consequently, the responsibility for making proper exceptions and regulations rests upon the Congress exclusively. This authority and duty imposed upon Congress has been recognized many times by the United States Supreme Court. See *Durosseau* v. *U. S.* (6 Cranch 307, 313), *Barry* v. *Mercein* (5 How. 103, 119), *U. S.* v. *Young* (94 U. S. 258, 259), *Ex parte McCardle* (7 Wall, 506). The principle enunciated in the McCardle case has been affirmed so many times that it is firmly entrenched in our legal jurisprudence.

That Congress can likewise regulate the jurisdiction of the lower Federal courts and Federal agencies is a power apparently without dispute. See *Turner* v. *Bank of North America* (4 Dall 8), *U. S.* v. *Hudson and Goodwin* (7 Cr. 32), *Cary* v. *Curtis* (3 How. 236). See United States Code Annotated Constitution, article 1, section 10 to article 10 for citation of authorities too numerous to specifically refer to.

The present administration says it wants to aid the States in the field of education without dominating, regimenting, or impairing the State school systems. The motive inspiring me to introduce this bill is to make it safe for the Federal Government to assist education as the need may arise—aid which the States cannot furnish for themselves—without fear upon the part of the Congress, or the States, that the power of the States to control the administration of their educational systems will be destroyed or abridged.

I invite every Member of Congress to join with me in the passage of this bill. I will greatly appreciate every Member of this body who approves this legislation, advising me that they will assist in making this needed legislation the law of our land.

THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TUCK). Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a list.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, at the opening of the present session of Congress I introduced House Joint Resolution 82, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for women.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced this resolution before, and before my time it was introduced by the gentleman from Kentucky, the late Mr. Robsion, who was, I believe, the original sponsor.

I am happy to say that this year we have a list of 156 sponsors, to date, which is considerably more than we had last year when we had only 105.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the list may be placed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. The same arguments and dire predictions that were made in the battle for women's suffrage are being trotted out once again, and they are hardly even being dusted off for modern consumption. We are told that all the protective legislation for women will be instantly wiped off the statute books when and if this amendment becomes law.

Let us look at this terrifying amendment and see what it says. Here it is, and I quote:

> Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.
>
> SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States.
>
> SEC. 3. This amendment shall take effect one year after the date of ratification.

What is taken away by these words? Absolutely nothing, of course. All it does is to bring the Constitution up to date by adding the word "sex" to the original "race, creed, or color" that appear elsewhere in our much vaunted laws against discrimination.

Now, someone will say, Why do we need the amendment? Because the Constitution's provisions are framed in the language of the English common law and under that common law, which as we all know, is very, very ancient, women had no citizens' rights whatsoever.

The 14th and 15th amendments give equal protection and political rights to all persons—citizens—regardless of race. Yet the effect of court decisions has been to except women in certain of their applications.

The 19th amendment, in 1920 gave women the right to vote, but did not alleviate the legal results of the denial of their other citizens' rights and responsibilities.

Laws throughout the States prohibit women from engaging in business without court or husband's consent, grant the father preference in children's guardianship, provide different bases for divorce, discriminate against widows, capriciously protect some working women, relegate women to inferior role, despite the responsibilities they must assume in a modern world.

In the absence of a constitutional amendment, what the State legislature gives this year, it can take away next year.

Jury service is still denied women in 5 States and there are separate provisions for qualifying women jurors in 20 States.

Court sanction and in some cases the husband's written consent are necessary before a wife may go into independent business in five States.

Married women are treated unequally in all community-property States. While provisions vary, in general: The husband may will one-half of the property, the wife may not; management and control of property are vested in the husband; husband but not wife may contract against it; husband may spend or dispose of community property while wife has no redress.

A husband is owner of his wife's earnings in both North and South Dakota.

Widows' rights are inferior to widowers' in many States, including that of title to real estate, personal property, and right to will property.

Restrictive work laws for women only—minimum hours, wages, and conditions of work applying to women only serve to make employment of women a matter of additional reports to employers. Hence in times of depressed employment this serves as a hardship to women workers.

The amendment will preserve States' rights—States may still legislate under their police power on health, welfare, civil matters—only proviso is that laws shall apply to citizens without regard to sex.

This amendment has been adopted and sponsored by many organizations, among others the General Federation of Women's Clubs; National Association of Negro Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.; National Association of Women Lawyers; National Education Association of the United States; National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc; and National Woman's Party.

Arthur M. Schlesinger, professor of history, Harvard University:

> Many well-meaning persons have opposed the equal rights amendment on the ground that it would deprive women of special statutory protection in industry. In recent years, however, legislation has extended to men wage earners most of the advantages earlier granted exclusively to women. Hence no substantial objection of a practical character remains for treating the two groups of workers differently, whereas the principles of democracy require that they should be treated alike. For these as well as for other reasons, I favor the proposed amendment.

There is a much deeper reason for the activity against the amendment than the reasons given by its opponents today. Their crocodile tears over the rights they do not want women to lose are an absurdity anyway. How can granting equal rights take away any rights under the law? There are many men today who fear the competition of women in the labor market. They smilingly tell you that they are strongly against equal rights but wholeheartedly for equal pay for equal work. This is like saying you can walk in the rain bareheaded and not get wet. Women will never obtain equal pay for equal work until they are equal citizens under the Constitution. It is therefore excellent strategy to prevent the passage of the amendment by Congress and its submission to the States for ratification, as the front behind which equal pay for equal work remains a pious hope and nothing more.

Why should equal rights take away any special rights necessary for women, any more than they are taken from veterans, members of the Armed Forces, the blind, the indigent, the sick, the insane, and numerous other citizens, men, women, and children, for whom special legislation has been passed and will continue to be passed, whenever it is found necessary to do so?

Both sexes should, in the modern world, have equal rights under the Constitution, no more, no less. That equality will in no way affect special legislation needed for special cases, any more than equality in the past has affected the laws pertaining to the many various groups of citizens that have been mentioned earlier.

The amendment has been veiled by its opponents with a lot of legalistic knots and tangles that terrify the average laymen, men or women. This, of course, is the intention. We in this country are beginning to suffer, not only from too much law but from too many lawyers. Many great civilizations of the past suffered from this same disease. In the end they became so rigid and inflexible that progress was impossible and their decay and fall were merely a question of time.

The protagonists of this amendment have no power to have it enacted into law. All they ask is the right to have this simple amendment submitted to the people. If they do not want it, let them say so. Up to now they have been prevented from expressing any opinion.

We are weary of hearing those who do not want women to obtain their rights in the labor market of this Nation disguise their unpopular stand under the protests of protecting women and fighting to save these few protecting laws, which would in no wise be affected.

This amendment means just what it says, in spite of all the lawyers and their clever interpretations. It gives women equality under the Constitution. It takes nothing away, but it will make possible and probable equal pay for equal work and equality of opportunity for all our citizens regardless of sex.

If this amendment will be harmful to women, let them express that opinion by their votes. Give them the opportunity to do so. Obviously the opponents of the measure dare not do this. They do not feel their cause is very strong and

they prefer to smother the baby in the cradle rather than let it grow up and go out into the world and fight its way to victory.

But, just as woman's suffrage was slow and hard to come by, so the equal-rights amendment will be. Just as woman's suffrage was another inevitable step forward on the road of progress, so this amendment will be another such step. It will come, maybe not in the next session of the Congress, maybe not for several. But it will come, because you cannot stop the waves of progress in the United States any more than King Canute could stop the waves of the sea.

SPONSORS OF THE EQUAL-RIGHTS AMENDMENT, FEBRUARY 8, 1955

(Sponsors now number 156; in the last Congress there were 105 sponsors)

Alabama: FRANK W. BOYKIN; CARL ELLIOTT; GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

Arizona: STEWART UDALL.

Arkansas: WILBUR D. MILLS, OREN HARRIS, W. F. NORRELL.

California: HUBERT B. SCUDDER; JOHN E. MOSS, JR.; JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.; J. ARTHUR YOUNGER; CHARLES S. GUBSER; B. F. SISK; HARLAN HAGEN; GORDON L. MCDONOUGH; DONALD L. JACKSON; CARL HINSHAW; JAMES ROOSEVELT; HARRY R. SHEPPARD; JOHN PHILLIPS; ROBERT C. WILSON; GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB.

Colorado: BYRON G. ROGERS, WAYNE N. ASPINALL.

Connecticut: THOMAS J. DODD, ALBERT P. MORANO, JAMES T. PATTERSON.

Delaware: HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, JR.

Florida: WILLIAM C. CRAMER; A. S. HERLONG, JR.; BOB SIKES; D. R. MATTHEWS; DWIGHT L. ROGERS.

Idaho: GRACIE PFOST.

Illinois: RICHARD W. HOFFMAN, TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, LESLIE C. ARENDS, WILLIAM L. SPRINGER, CHARLES A. BOYLE.

Indiana: E. ROSS ADAIR, WILLIAM G. BRAY, EARL WILSON, JOHN V. BEAMER, CECIL M. HARDEN.

Iowa: FRED SCHWENGEL, HENRY O. TALLE, H. R. GROSS, PAUL CUNNINGHAM.

Kansas: WILLIAM H. AVERY, CLIFFORD R. HOPE, WINT SMITH.

Kentucky: WILLIAM H. NATCHER, BRENT SPENCE, CARL D. PERKINS, EUGENE SILER.

Louisiana: F. EDWARD HÉBERT, OTTO E. PASSMAN.

Maine: CHARLES P. NELSON.

Maryland: EDWARD T. MILLER, JAMES P. S. DEVEREUX, EDWARD A. GARMATZ, GEORGE H. FALLON, RICHARD E. LANKFORD, DEWITT S. HYDE, SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL.

Massachusetts: EDWARD P. BOLAND, HAROLD D. DONOHUE, EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, DONALD W. NICHOLSON.

Michigan: GERALD R. FORD, JR., DON HAYWORTH, ALVIN M. BENTLEY, RUTH THOMPSON, CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS.

Minnesota: EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, COYA KNUTSON.

Missouri: GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER, W. R. HULL, JR., MORGAN M. MOULDER.

Montana: ORVIN B. FJARE.

Nebraska: ROBERT D. HARRISON, A. L. MILLER.

Nevada: CLIFTON YOUNG.

New Jersey: WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

New York: FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.; STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT; ALBERT H. BOSCH; LESTER HOLTZMAN; VICTOR L. ANFUSO; ABRAHAM J. MULTER; IRWIN D. DAVIDSON; HERBERT ZELENKO; J. ERNEST WHARTON; LEO W. O'BRIEN; DEAN P. TAYLOR; BERNARD W. KEARNEY; WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS; WILLIAM E. MILLER; EDMUND P. RADWAN; JOHN R. PILLION; DANIEL A. REED; HAROLD C. OSTERTAG; RALPH W. GWINN.

North Dakota: USHER L. BURDICK.

Ohio: GORDON H. SCHERER, THOMAS A. JENKINS, WILLIAM H. AYRES, FRANK T. BOW, J. HARRY MCGREGOR, WAYNE L. HAYS, JAMES G. POLK.

Oklahoma: PAGE BELCHER, TOM STEED, VICTOR WICKERSHAM.

Pennsylvania: WILLIAM A. BARRETT, WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, EARL CHUDOFF, IVOR D. FENTON, RICHARD M. SIMPSON, JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, FRANK M. CLARK, JAMES G. FULTON, JAMES M. QUIGLEY, BENJAMIN F. JAMES, CARROLL D. KEARNS, JOHN P. SAYLOR, JOSEPH L. CARRIGG.

South Dakota: HAROLD O. LOVRE, E. Y. BERRY.

Tennessee: JOE L. EVINS, CLIFFORD DAVIS.

Texas: BRADY GENTRY, BRUCE ALGER, OLIN E. TEAGUE, FRANK IKARD.

Utah: HENRY ALDOUS DIXON.

Vermont: WINSTON L. PROUTY.

Virginia: HOWARD W. SMITH, PAT JENNINGS, JOEL T. BROYHILL.

Washington: JACK WESTLAND, RUSSELL V. MACK, WALT HORAN, THOR C. TOLLEFSON.

West Virginia: ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN, HARLEY O. STAGGERS, CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, M. G. BURNSIDE.

Wisconsin: GARDNER R. WITHROW, WILLIAM K. VAN PELT.

Wyoming: E. KEITH THOMSON.

Hawaii: Mrs. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ASHMORE (at the request of Mr. FLYNT) asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday, February 17, after the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

TRANSOCEAN AIRLINES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, during the last Congress I had occasion to address this House on the subject Transocean Airlines, an international airline whose principal operating base is in my district and whose welfare is of vital importance to the economy of that area. This company and its subsidiaries employ approximately 2,500 people, with an annual payroll in excess of $10 million.

On February 1 the President accepted a recommendation of the Civil Aeronautics Board which denied Transocean's application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity to perform air services in the Pacific between California and the Orient. I sincerely believe that the Board was in error in denying Transocean's application and that the President should reverse this position.

For 9 years this company has been pioneering new and novel ideas in the field of air transportation. Starting as a contract carrier to the Military Air Transport Service, it very quickly moved into the field of mass transportation of laborers to the Pacific area, then in the process of being rebuilt, and into the movement of immigrants from the ravaged areas of Europe to Canada and to South America. In these years it has supplied the know-how of American aviation to the Philippine Islands through the Philippine Air Lines; to Japan through the Japan Air Lines; to the Middle East through Air Jordan and Iranian Airways; to Indonesia through training air cadets for the New Indonesian Air Force, and is participating in the training of one of the world's newest airlines, the Lufthansa of Germany.

During these years it has contributed to our military efforts principally in the Berlin airlift and in the Korean airlift. Transocean supplied almost 11 percent of the commercial lift between the United States and Japan during the Korean conflict.

The Transocean payroll is absolutely essential to the economy of the San Francisco Bay area.

If the company is forced to abandon its operations the labor market will be glutted with the high-type skilled mechanics that constitute the major portion of its labor force.

The Transocean pool of highly qualified and well-coordinated mechanics, skilled in airplane construction, maintenance, and rehabilitation, is a valuable and indispensable asset in our defense effort. Can we afford to see it dissolved and vanish into thin air?

Some 30 months ago Transocean applied to the Civil Aeronautics Board for a certificate to engage in scheduled operations in the Pacific Basin to give low-cost nonsubsidized service from the west coast to Hawaii, Guam, and various points in the Orient. It is important to note that the application specifically stated that no subsidy would be requested. Civil organizations, service clubs, chambers of commerce, and so forth, in my district and in surrounding areas, were unanimous in the support of this request for certification. Nonetheless, the Civil Aeronautics Board saw fit to deny this application.

If Transocean is to continue to live, it is necessary that it have a stable future and it must live for many reasons, only one of which is that if there arose a military need for commercial air services the company would be equipped and trained and ready to be of service.

I felt that every logic pointed to certification of this company. Without this, the people of my district employed by Transocean will be deprived of the economic stability that is necessary to their present and future welfare. Furthermore, the people of this country will be denied the benefits of competition on one of the principal air routes of the world.

The very foundation of our great democracy is based on the principles of free enterprise and vigorous new ideas. This carrier's record is an outstanding example of self-sufficiency, proven fitness, and ability. The development of a strong United States air-transportation system linking the United States with Asia demands a carrier with these qualifications.

Further, it is most important that a company experienced in logistic support at this critical time in the history of our country be recognized as a certificated carrier of the United States.

On Friday, February 4, 1955, the Oakland Tribune, published by the Honorable Joseph R. Knowland, carried the following editorial:

AN UNFAIR DECISION

The decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board to refuse Transocean Air Lines a

certificate for regular scheduled service across the Pacific is difficult to understand and is to be regretted.

This is particularly so when it is remembered that Transocean offered to carry out a scheduled service under an operational program that would have waived all Government subsidies, something entirely new in international air traffic.

Transocean, which has headquarters in Oakland, is one of Alameda County's biggest industries with a correspondingly large payroll. It will not go out of business, as it can operate on an unscheduled and charter basis under a letter of authority issued by the CAB, but expansions it has planned, if the request for a certificate for scheduled flights had been granted, will be held in abeyance.

The decision of the CAB is final as far as the routine procedure in such matters is concerned. But Transocean and its supporters in this area propose to carry the fight to Congress and even to the White House, although technically it was an order from President Eisenhower to the CAB which made the refusal an effective order.

The decision deprives Oakland of the honor of being the terminus of a scheduled international line. Transocean and those who plan to continue the campaign should be accorded all the additional support that can be registered.

The Washington Post and Times Herald on Saturday, February 5, 1955, also touched on the subject in its editorial columns:

RIZLEY TO THE CAB

Apparently President Eisenhower has at last found a nominee for the Civil Aeronautics Board who can satisfy all the requisite clearances. Let us hope that the nomination of Ross Rizley (who presumably will be designated CAB Chairman) will bring some order out of the confusion in which the Board has been left since the first of the year. Mr. Rizley, a former Republican Member of Congress from Oklahoma and more recently an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, is a man of wide acquaintance and very conservative political views. He gained prominence several years ago because of his energetic efforts to prohibit Federal regulation of natural-gas producers; later he worked effectively on Capitol Hill to gain support for the flexible farm program. Incidentally, he will become the second Oklahoman currently on the CAB. The other is Josh Lee, a Democrat whose term expires this year.

Mr. Rizley will be the fourth former Member of Congress on a five-man board. It is perhaps regrettable in this connection that the CAB vacancy was viewed as a political roost rather than as a spot for a man skilled in regulation and aviation economics. In any event, Mr. Rizley will need to demonstrate his independence and his ability to withstand pressures. Few jobs in Washington are so subjected to lobbying influence. The White House itself apparently yielded to such pressures when—following the unceremonious dumping of a Republican CAB member with 16 years' service, Oswald Ryan—it abandoned its first candidate to succeed him after opposition developed.

Almost simultaneously with the Rizley appointment, President Eisenhower again overruled the CAB in an international route decision, this time in the so-called transpacific case. Although this newspaper dislikes to see the recommendations of regulatory commissions upset, except for compelling reasons, it is hard to quarrel with the President's decision that the renewal of Pan American and Northwest Airlines routes across the Pacific ought to be on a temporary basis so long as both carriers require subsidy. More controversial is the President's refusal to renew Northwest's Seattle-Honolulu route, thus leaving Pan Am to serve this particular segment alone even though Northwest reportedly had offered to forego subsidy on the route. Evidently the President is saying that Northwest ought to concentrate on its northern route to Japan and that competition in the Pacific ought to be on an area rather than a parallel basis.

On one point we regret that neither the CAB nor the President saw fit to adopt the examiner's recommendation. That was in the request of Transocean Airlines for some sort of permanent status as an irregular carrier across the Pacific. Transocean is one of the most reputable and responsible of the nonscheduled carriers; it has transported military passengers and cargo without subsidy and with scrupulous regard for regulations. If the CAB ever intends to do something about the anomalous situation of the nonskeds, it missed an admirable opportunity here to recognize a worthy contender. Perhaps with Mr. Rizley's assistance the CAB will take another look.

That all may know the vital part played by Transocean since 1946, I invite your attention to its splendid record of service in peace and war:

MAJOR AERONAUTICAL SERVICES ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES

1946

Air Transport Command; California-Hawaii round trips; volume, 2 per day; duration, 11 months.

1947

United States Navy and Civil Aeronautics Administration; operation Landing Aids Experiment station Arcata, Calif.; duration, 3 years.

United States Army; military dependents Seattle-Tokyo; volume, 750.

United States Army engineers; civilian defense workers; United States-Pacific bases; volume, 25,000 to 30,000.

1948

United States Army; military dependents Germany-United States; volume, 2,700.

United States Army; military dependents Seattle-Tokyo; volume, 700.

International Refugee Organization of United Nations; war refugees from Munich to Caracas, Venezuela; volume, 25,000.

United States Air Force; Berlin Airlift support, United States-Europe; volume, 100 transatlantic flights.

United States Air Force; Berlin Airlift support; United States-Europe; volume, 11 Air Force bomber groups.

United States Air Force supervision; aircraft ferry, United States-China; volume, 158 C–46 aircraft.

International Refugee Organization; evacuees from Shanghai; volume, 13,000.

1949

United States Navy; cargo flights, Seattle-Adak; volume, weekly; duration: 2 years.

Military and Transport Service; cargo flights, California-Orient; volume, weekly; duration: 1 year.

1950

United States Navy; airlift and bush living in Alaska, Petroleum No. 4 project; duration, 2 years.

United States Air Force; airlift California-Tokyo (Korean Airlift); volume, 25 to 35 flights per month; termination, February 1954.

1951

United States Army; movement of domestic military personnel; duration, continuing.

United States Navy and Interior Department; scheduled passenger, cargo and mail flights in the Trust Territories; duration, continuing.

Military and Transport Service; en route service to military transport aircraft at Wake Island; duration, continuing.

1952

United States Navy; modification and overhaul of C–46 aircraft.

State Department; spraying and dusting activities in 21 Middle East countries; duration, continuing.

1953

United States Army; military dependents across the Pacific; volume, 360.

United States Army; transportation of military dependents Europe-United States; volume, 3,400; duration, 2 months.

1954

United States Army; transportation of military dependents Europe-United States; volume, 3,000; duration, January, February.

Completed 43 months of Korean airlift; volume, 17,750,489 aircraft miles, 92,035 aircraft hours, 13.7 hours average daily aircraft utilization.

United States Army; transportation of military dependents between Europe and United States; volume, 306 flights; duration, 6 months.

United States Air Force; miscellaneous flights between the United States and Tokyo.

1948

United States Air Force; overhaul C–54 aircraft by wholly owned subsidiary; volume, 555 aircraft; duration, 4 years by successive contracts.

1953

United States Air Force; overhaul T–33 jet trainers by wholly owned subsidiary; volume, 516 aircraft; duration, 1 year.

Classified movements involving the transportation of nuclear material and airlift to secret bases are not included in the foregoing.

Transocean Air Lines, as is its privilege, will make formal request upon the President to reexamine the facts of this case and to make a secure place for this company in the air-transportation industry.

MRS. ROOSEVELT, MR. DIES DEBATE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much controversy lately as to the truthfulness of certain testimony that was taken before the Dies committee that at this time I desire to read certain correspondence between the chairman of that committee and one of the former first ladies of the land, and the gentleman referred to in that correspondence.

I read:

MRS. ROOSEVELT, MR. DIES DEBATE—RECOLLECTIONS OF EARLY CONGRESSIONAL INQUIRY INTO COMMUNISM

(Controversy has arisen over what happened in the early days of the Dies investigation into communism by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. It grows out of statements by Representative MARTIN DIES in an interview in the August 20, 1954, issue of U. S. News & World Report. Mrs. Roosevelt questions Mr. DIES' recollection. Mr. DIES, in his reply, draws Mrs. Roosevelt's attention to the same statements made by him repeatedly for 14 years and, he says, without previous challenge from her. Here, in full text, is the exchange of correspondence.)

MRS. ROOSEVELT: "YOUR MEMORY SEEMS QUITE SHORT"

(Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt wrote to Representative DIES on August 17, 1954, as follows:)

DEAR MR. DIES: I have asked Mr. Lawrence to deliver this letter to you as I did not want it to go through the regular mail at the Capitol. As you know, I never make it a practice to answer remarks that are made where they affect me alone but in this case, I must refresh your memory which is quite incorrect.

I never admitted to you, because I could not have, since Mr. Joseph Lash never admitted to me that he had been a Communist. I knew that in the youth organizations he had been close to many Communists and he had helped me greatly to learn about Communist lines of thought, and that I might have told you, but Mr. Lash was never a member of the Communist Party.

If influence such as you describe was used, it was without my knowledge or that of my husband, but I am quite sure that my husband never said, "It would be bad for the Democratic Party to alienate elements friendly to communism."

You are correct about what you say as regards the Youth Congress hearings but incorrect when you say that it was the evidence which disturbed me and made me ask you to the White House. What really disturbed me was the outrageous type of questioning indulged in by Mr. [J. B.] Matthews. The reason I asked you to the White House was because I wished you to know that the Student Union which Mr. Lash organized had been taken over, in spite of Mr. Lash's efforts, by the Communists and they had thrown him and a number of his friends out of office and out of the union. This had never been brought out and I felt that you should know it.

Mr. Lash could not have admitted that he was a Communist but he is away on vacation, and therefore I cannot ask him what he said to you, but no influence was ever brought to bear, as far as I ever knew, on his draft board.

I am constantly being accused of having used influence in ways which, of course, I did not know anything about even, but this is something which might hurt someone else, and therefore I would like the truth to be known both by you and Mr. Lawrence since your memory seems quite short.

Very sincerely yours,

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT.

MR. DIES: "I HAVE BEEN SAYING FOR 14 YEARS—"

(Representative DIES replied to Mrs. Roosevelt on August 19, 1954, as follows:)

Mrs. ELEANOR ROOSEVELT,
Valkill Cottage,
Hyde Park, Dutchess County, N. Y.

DEAR MRS. ROOSEVELT: This acknowledges receipt of your letter of August 17th instant, in reference to my report of our meeting at the White House and our discussion of Joe Lash.

For many years since this meeting, I have stated in speeches and articles what occurred upon this occasion. On September 22, 1950, Congressman HAROLD VELDE, of Illinois, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech, which I had made some time prior, in which I detailed the account of my conversation with you concerning Joseph Lash. In view of the fact that my recent statement, which appeared in the U. S. News & World Report, is a repetition of what I have been saying and writing for 14 years, I cannot agree that my memory is short.

Mr. Joseph P. Lash first appeared before our committee on December 1, 1939. He testified at length, under oath, and answered the questions which were propounded to him. His next appearance was before our committee on January 21, 1942, when he again testified, under oath, and contradicted his previous testimony on material points. In the course of his testimony on January 21, 1942, he was asked the following question:

"The CHAIRMAN. You are definitely convinced that you were wrong in being closely associated with the Communists during that period?"

He answered as follows:

"Mr. LASH. Yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. There is no question in your mind, but that was an error?

"Mr. LASH. Yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. But it was an error that you made as a result of false beliefs in the objectives of these people?

"Mr. LASH. Yes, sir; that is right.

"The CHAIRMAN. To what extent do you agree with the Communists, to what extent is your association with them and moving in that circle, on what points do you agree with them and on what points do you disagree? I am trying to get the extent of it, not do you now but did you at that time, I mean?

"Mr. LASH. Oh, I thought you were referring to the present. At that time substantially I agreed with their position, Mr. Chairman."

I submit that Mr. Lash's admission before our committee that he had associated closely with the Communists and was in substantial agreement with the Communists was a confession that he was a Communist. It was not necessary for Joseph Lash to be a card-holding member of the Communist Party of the United States to be a Communist. It has been clearly established that some Communists do not hold a formal membership in the party for strategic reasons.

For instance, Mr. Lash was asked the following question by Mr. Matthews: "Were you there as a member of the Young Communist League?"

He answered: "No I was not there as a member of the Young Communist League."

He was then asked: "Were you there as a delegate?" And he answered: "I was never a Communist. I never held a membership card."

He also was asked by Mr. Matthews the following question: "Were you ever, in any circles of the Young Communist League, or in any circles of the Young Communist Party, or otherwise treated in a manner in which they might presumably treat persons who were backing them and taking their instructions, but who, for strategic reasons, were not issued cards of membership?"

Mr. Lash answered: "I worked very closely with them but I have always preserved my independence of judgment."

From 1950 speech

In my speech, which was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Congressman VELDE on September 22, 1950, I said:

"There was a perennial youth by the name of Joseph Lash, who was head of the Youth Congress. Joseph Lash had been very active in communism and we exposed him. One day I got a telephone call from Mrs. Roosevelt asking me to have dinner with her.

"Well, I knew something was up because I had heard that Mrs. Roosevelt was trying to persuade Naval Intelligence to give Joseph Lash an appointment. He had never been inducted into the armed services. I went to the White House and there seated in the anteroom were 4 or 5 young Communist youth leaders waiting for Mrs. Roosevelt. They sat at the table with me and Mrs. Roosevelt.

"At the conclusion of the lunch, Mrs. Roosevelt said to me, 'Mr. Congressman, I presume you know why I asked you to have lunch with me.' I said, 'Well, I have an idea. It is about Joseph Lash.' And she said, 'Yes.' I said, 'Mrs. Roosevelt, I have brought the record of Joseph Lash. He perjured himself before our committee.'

"She said, 'Yes; he told me he did but he is very sorry and I think he should have another chance.' I said, 'Well, maybe, but not in Naval Intelligence.' I said, 'Did he tell you he was a member of the Communist Party?' She said, 'Yes; but he was just an idealistic venturesome youth who embraced communism impulsively and now he wants to repent.' I said, 'Mrs. Roosevelt, how do you know he has repented? How can you afford to ask that he be put in Naval Intelligence?'

"Well, we sat around and discussed it pro and con. When I went back to the office, I called the committee together and told them about my conversation with Mrs. Roosevelt. The committee agreed to permit Joseph Lash and his counsel, who was a New Deal official, to appear before it so that he could make his confession and ask for forgiveness.

"Among other things, I asked him why he wasn't in the Army and he was unable to give a satisfactory explanation. Later the committee instructed the secretary to telephone the draft board in New York to find out why Joseph Lash had not been inducted. We were informed that it was because of White House intervention."

I reported my conversation with President Roosevelt during his lifetime, and what I stated in my interview is merely a repetition of what I have been saying for many years. A more detailed account of what I told the President and what he told me may be found in the speech which Congressman VELDE inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Hearings text cited

Your explanation that you sent for me because you wished me to know "that the Student Union which Mr. Lash organized had been taken over, in spite of Mr. Lash's efforts, by the Communists and they had thrown him and a number of his friends out of office and out of the Union," is not borne out by the facts and the record, and on its face is unreasonable. If this were the reason, why did you tell me that Mr. Lash could get a Naval Intelligence appointment if our committee would give him a clean bill of health?

Why did Mr. Lash appear voluntarily before the committee? Why did he admit, on page 2810 of the hearings, that he had applied for a position in Naval Intelligence? Why did he admit, on page 2811 of the hearings, that when he first appeared before the committee in 1939, he "tried not to answer questions because the more I answered questions, the more difficult it made my work in trying to get the Communist influence out of the American Students' Union"? Why did he apologize to the committee for his testimony in 1939?

If you will read the hearings from page 2812 to 2819, you will find that Mr. Lash admitted membership in a number of organizations which he stated were Communist controlled and dominated. If you will search your memory carefully, you will recall that I told you I could not give Mr. Lash a clean bill of health, but that I would afford him an opportunity to appear before the committee if he would agree to tell the truth.

Before summoning the committee, I had Mr. Lash come to my office to find out if he was willing to tell the truth. In our conversation, while he insisted that he had not been a card-holding member of the Communist Party, he agreed that he had been a Communist in all other respects, because of his belief in the Communist program and doctrines and because of his close association with them. And he admitted that he and certain other Communists were not required to join the party formally for strategic reasons. He also agreed that he had not told all the truth when he appeared before the committee in 1939. Upon his assurance that he would be truthful and frank, I summoned the committee.

When Mr. Lash appeared before the committee he was accompanied by counsel.

When he was put under oath and questioned he hedged and was not as frank as he told me he would be. I presume that he had talked to his counsel between the time I talked to him and his appearance before the committee.

Although I have stated publicly many times the basic facts of the Lash affair, this is the first time you have challenged the accuracy of my account of what happened. I am, therefore, surprised that at this late date you should seek to discredit my statement. I am compelled to attribute your belated challenge to a faulty memory.

Very sincerely yours,

MARTIN DIES.

(Full text of a letter written by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt to Representative MARTIN DIES on August 23, 1954:)

DEAR MR. DIES: I am very much interested in your letter [U. S. News & World Report, August 27, 1954]. The fact that you have made statements and speeches for years does not make these statements and speeches truthful.

As you recount the conversation which Mr. [Joseph] Lash had in answering the questions, I see nothing which makes Mr. Lash a Communist. You say that because he was close to them and agreed with many of their positions he must have been a Communist. I disagree with you. At that period there were many things in the Communist doctrine with which many people agreed. It is the development of communism under Lenin and Stalin and the ways of carrying out its doctrines which we are today finding obnoxious and difficult to deal with. I am sure Mr. Lash never considered that he admitted he was a Communist and neither did I ever admit that he was a Communist.

I asked you to luncheon to find out what you thought of Mr. Lash. I did not want him in Naval Intelligence and I don't think I so specified. I had thought he was material for an officer and not for a private. I doubt whether the draft board was interfered with by the White House, but they were perhaps told that an effort was being made by Mr. Lash to find out if he could get a commission. What I was really anxious to get across to you and which I now realize never registered, was that the manner in which the investigation was being done by Mr. [J. B.] Matthews was a shocking performance.

You are quite wrong in saying I did not give you the correct evidence about the Student Union. I gave that exactly as it occurred.

Of course, Joe Lash wanted a clean bill of health and he wanted to get into the Navy as an officer. I did not know that he wanted to get into Naval Intelligence. Of course, he could not get an officer's commission without a clean bill of health from your committee. He apologized to you because he thought he had been rather flippant in answering your questions. I remember the circumstances very well. He had been thrown out and no one had been appointed in his place, so he appeared for an organization which he did not wish to see destroyed and yet he was not actually accepted in that organization. It is true that Mr. Lash and many others were in organizations which were Communist-controlled and dominated but that did not make people Communists, and I assure you Mr. Lash has never been a Communist. His admission that he believed in the program and doctrines does not make him a Communist.

My memory is not faulty. I remember everything very clearly and I will gladly testify under oath. You have not been challenged before because I do not read your statements and speeches. The only reason I read this one was because I saw it in David Lawrence's column.

My husband is dead and I can't speak for him, but I can easily see how he might, in the light of the day in which you were speaking, have said what you say he said, without meaning what you now imply he meant. It is true there was no hysteria in those days and he may have felt there were a great many liberals who were in sympathy with certain Communist doctrines that he and many others might not have wanted to antagonize. My husband knew what the trends were and the differences between what was developing in the Communist Party then and some of the writings and tenets of the Communist Party in the past.

You seem to forget the change brought about under Lenin and Stalin and the change in attitude that has occurred here in consequence.

Very sincerely yours,

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT.

(Representative DIES gave the following statement to U. S. News & World Report on Mrs. Roosevelt's letter of August 23, 1954:)

I regard the last letter of Mrs. Roosevelt as a historic document. It shows the thinking and attitude of the Roosevelts with reference to the Communists and Russia. It was this attitude that was responsible for the tragic blunders at the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences which brought about the emergence of Russia from a third-rate power to the status of a world menace. I think Mrs. Roosevelt's letter needs no reply since it speaks for itself.

Representative DIES has also made public a letter written to him by Mrs. Roosevelt from the White House on January 23, 1942—2 days after Mr. Lash had appeared before the committee—and says that it is in contradiction to her recent statements. The text of the letter follows:

"MY DEAR MR. DIES: I am sorry that there was any misunderstanding as to the purpose for which I asked you to lunch with me.

"I want to assure you that I had not the slightest intention of trying to exert any pressure on you to do anything which did not arise from your own conviction and sense of fairness, and it never entered my mind to make the slightest attempt to change the decision of the Navy Department. Mr. [Joseph] Lash accepted that decision long ago and has tried since to be useful in the way that seemed to offer itself and await the decision of the Selective Service.

"I simply thought that it might be possible for you in a quiet way to talk to the young man and make up your mind as to whether he is sincere or not. It never occurred to me that this would be taken up again by the full committee. I am convinced of his sincerity and I feel that continuing to pillory him in the public press has a bad effect upon the morale of our young people as a whole.

"Very sincerely yours,

"ELEANOR ROOSEVELT."

(Apropos of Mrs. Roosevelt's references to "the light of the day in which you were speaking," Representative DIES directs attention to the following answer that he made in his interview in the August 20 issue of U. S. News & World Report:)

Question. Did you find in those [late 1941] days that the prevailing view was that the Communists were just another political organization—not connected with the Soviet Government?

Answer. Well, that was partly true. But the evidence was very, very clear. In 1938, in our first report, we unanimously—and that was 5 Democrats and 2 Republicans—found that the real purpose of the Kremlin was world conquest, and that all of this camouflage, all of these tactics, were all solely for the purpose in the end of conquering the world.

So that certainly there was no excuse after 1938—which was when the first report we filed and which was supported by ample evidence—for anyone in the Government to believe that the Communist Party was just another political party. * * *

It's a long story, but, in other words, we fought all the way through. Now, in 1941 I submitted to the Executive a list of about 2,000 Communists on the Federal payrolls, including Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, Harold Glasser, and others, and asked that they be discharged. They refused to expel them. Then I got the House to appropriate $100,000 for the purpose of financing an investigation by the Department of Justice.

I said to the House and to the administration, "Since you won't take my evidence, I'm going to make the Department of Justice investigate this list and this evidence." I got $100,000 for the work—not with the approval of the administration, for they were not in favor of it—and we overruled them. The Department of Justice then took the information that I had and the evidence and yet flatly refused to do anything about it.

Question. Is this recorded in some letter?

Answer. This is all in the reports; yes, filed in the House of Representatives.

Here's the basis on which they reported back to the House. They said to the House that the Department of Justice had submitted the list to the heads of the departments with the request that the departments indicate which ones they wanted investigated. There were only several departments that asked for any investigation at all, and therefore no investigation was made in the majority of cases.

That list of 2,000, then, stayed there for a little more than a decade before they finally were discharged.

MR. LASH REPLIES TO MR. DIES

(Following is the text of a letter written September 1, 1954, by Joseph P. Lash:)

EDITOR, U. S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT:

I have been on vacation until today but trust that you will give me an opportunity to comment, even though somewhat belatedly, on what Mr. DIES calls the Case of Joe Lash.

That "case" can be put in a nutshell. Motivated by what H. L. Mencken used to call the Babbitry of the twenties and the depression of the thirties, I became a radical in college. That radicalism led me first into the Socialist Party and later during the period of the Popular Front toward the Communists.

The Nazi-Soviet Pact convinced me that something had gone tragically wrong in the Soviet Union, that the Communist Party here was not a free agent and that cooperation with it was impossible. At the same time the great achievements of the New Deal under Franklin D. Roosevelt showed me that it was possible and desirable to achieve significant social reforms within the framework of the two-party system. I remain of that view.

While it is fashionable now to suggest that communism grew because the Roosevelts were not sufficiently tough-minded about it, the salient fact is that the courage of the Roosevelts restored the faith of millions of people in the American system and confined radicalism in this country to a minority sect. With millions of unemployed and Hitler on the march, this country under Roosevelt did not act from fear but from hope and solved its problems without the outlawing of political parties or thought control.

Mr. DIES' reliability as a witness about this period may be judged by the following:

1. Mr. DIES alleges that Mrs. Roosevelt told him that I had confessed to her to joining the Communist Party in my youth after having denied it under oath before his committee. The Dies committee transcript shows that I was not asked questions about membership in either the Communist Party or the Young Communist League in the appearance before the committee to which Mr. DIES refers, so the matter could not possibly have come up in the discussion with

Mrs. Roosevelt in the form in which Mr. DIES now alleges.

Although I cooperated closely with the Communists in the period of the Popular Front I did not become a member of either the Communist Party or the Young Communist League.

2. Mr. DIES states that when I again appeared before his committee on January 21, 1942 (incidentally my "counsel," Dr. William A. Neilson, was not allowed to come into the meeting with me) I could not explain to his committee why I had not been drafted. "I then called the draft board in New York," asserts DIES, "to find out in the presence of the committee, and the draft board said that because of White House interference they did not draft Lash." It is noteworthy that in his recent letter to Mrs. Roosevelt, Mr. DIES has the committee's "secretary" and not himself calling my draft board.

In any event the fact of the matter is that when I appeared before Mr. DIES in 1942 I was 32 years of age and as such automatically in class I-H. This category was set up before Pearl Harbor following congressional legislation deferring all men from 28–35. At the end of January 1942 Selective Service headquarters announced that it was having local draft boards review the cases of all registrants over 28. In the course of that review I was reclassified and I applied for immediate induction.

Clearly if at the time of my appearance before the committee I had wanted to stay out of the draft, which I did not, there was no need for pressure from anybody since I was in I–H.

While I never sought special consideration from the draft board, some members of the DIES committee, and former Representative Parnell Thomas, Representative of New Jersey, particularly, demanded publicly that Selective Service give me special treatment by having me transferred out of I–H to a classification calling for immediate induction.

Very sincerely yours,

JOSEPH P. LASH.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SCRIVNER (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ARENDS and include remarks of Minority Leader MARTIN on the TV program Voice of the Nation last Sunday.

Mr. MCDONOUGH.

Mr. LANE in two separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REUSS.

Mr. VORYS.

Mr. GWINN and to include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GEORGE (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), on account of serious illness in family.

Mr. JACKSON (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin), until February 27, on account of official business.

Mr. GUBSER, on account of official business in his district.

Mr. BERRY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, February 10, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

392. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 8a (4) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

393. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to extend the authority for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

394. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to continue the effectiveness of the act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177), as amended"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

395. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of December 31, 1954, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

396. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, as amended, pertaining to emergency flood-control work"; to the Committee on Public Works.

397. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize Federal assistance to States and communities to enable them to increase public elementary and secondary school construction"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. Supplemental report. H. R. 3406. A bill to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 20, pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 107. Joint resolution to permit the United States of America to release reversionary rights in a 36.759-acre tract to the Vineland School District of the county of Kern, State of California; without amendment (Rept. No. 23). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 145. An act to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 24). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 3741. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land to Haileyville School District, No. 11, at Haileyville, Okla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 3742. A bill to establish public use of the national forests as a policy of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BEAMER:

H. R. 3743. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act to provide that the annuity of the widow of a deceased employee shall not be reduced on account of any benefits to which she may be entitled under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 3744. A bill to amend an act of July 1, 1947, to grant military leave of absence with pay to classified substitute clerks in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 3745. A bill to remove the excise tax on musical instruments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 3746. A bill relating to the handling of juvenile delinquents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 3747. A bill to amend the Trade Agreements Extension Act of July 1, 1954, so as to assure the availability of materials essential to national security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 3748. A bill to provide for the application of prevailing wage policy to officers, members, and positions of the fire department for the Washington National Airport; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3749. A bill to provide for the application of prevailing wage policy to officers, members, and positions of the police force for the Washington National Airport; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3750. A bill to suspend for 1 year certain duties upon the importation of aluminum and aluminum alloys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 3751. A bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and reenact the Wagner Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 3752. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents to certain lands in Hancock County, Miss., conveyed as swamp and overflowed land by the State of Mississippi to private individuals in 1926; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 3753. A bill to set aside the action of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia with respect to the reassignment of certain Fire Department personnel; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3754. A bill to require that all officers of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall be appointed on the basis of competitive civil-service examinations; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois (by request):

H. R. 3755. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 3756. A bill to authorize reciprocal fire-protection agreements between departments and agencies of the United States and public or private organizations engaged in fire-fighting activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 3757. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to donate certain property to the American National Red Cross; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 3758. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. R. 3759. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3760. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 3761. A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 3762. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3763. A bill to allow a parent, under certain circumstances, to deduct for income-tax purposes amounts paid for the care of children while the parent is working; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3764. A bill to provide for payment of an annuity to widows of justices and judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3765. A bill to provide an additional income-tax exemption to certain physically handicapped individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3766. A bill to grant an additional income-tax exemption to a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is permanently handicapped; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3767. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 3768. A bill to repeal the excise tax on the transportation of coal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H. R. 3769. A bill to prohibit the courts of the United States and all other Federal agencies from deciding or considering any matter drawing in question the administration by the several States of their respective educational systems; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 3770. A bill to authorize Federal assistance to States and communities to enable them to increase public elementary and secondary school construction; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3771. A bill to strengthen and improve State and local programs to combat and control juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 3772. A bill to suspend for 1 year certain duties upon the importation of aluminum and aluminum alloys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 3773. A bill to provide for the distribution of certain surplus food commodities to needy persons in the United States, by use of a food-stamp plan; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 3774. A bill to permit involuntarily separated postmasters, when post offices are discontinued, to acquire classified civil-service status through noncompetitive civil-service examinations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 3775. A bill to provide for a municipal auditorium for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 3776. A bill relating to the information required from certain tax-exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3777. A bill relating to the information required from certain tax-exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 3778. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit the accelerated amortization of certain devices and equipment for the collection at the source of atmospheric pollutants and contaminants; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 3779. A bill to extend the period for the filing of certain claims under the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, by World War II prisoners of war; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. R. 3780. A bill to state explicitly the long-standing national policy to preserve and strengthen the family-farm pattern of American agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3781. A bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1348); to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3782. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, and for other purposes (7 U. S. C. 1441); to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3783. A bill to continue through December 31, 1957, the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3784. A bill to amend the act of August 28, 1937 (16 U. S. C., sec. 590x–3), as amended, to provide additional credit facilities for farm enlargement and development and to assist beginning farmers to become farm owners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3785. A bill to provide for stockpiling an adequate national safety reserve of food and fiber; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 3786. A bill to authorize the incorporation of Army and Navy Legion of Valor of United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 3787. A bill creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 3788. A bill to authorize the Federal Government to guard strategic defense facilities against individuals believed to be disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3789. A bill to amend section 315 (a) of the Communications Act of 1934 to withdraw from individuals convicted of subversive activities and members of certain subversive organizations the right of equal opportunity for the use of broadcasting facilities in political campaigns; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3790. A bill to accelerate consideration by the courts of criminal proceedings involving treason, espionage, sabotage, sedition, and subversive activities, and to increase to 15 years the statute of limitations applicable to such offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3791. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3792. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 3793. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 3794. A bill to establish the rank and grade of the Chief of Naval Material; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POFF:

H. R. 3795. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3796. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act to provide that the annuity of the widow of a deceased employee shall not be reduced on account of any benefits to which she may be entitled under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 3797. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to $1.25; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 3798. A bill to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to further extend the program to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 3799. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 3800. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to provide a permanent procedure for adjustment of tariff rates on a selective basis, to regulate the flow of imported articles on a basis of fair competition with domestic articles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3801. A bill to amend section 1016 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the adjustment of the basis of property for carrying charges on unimproved and unproductive real property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3802. A bill to provide for the correction of inequities under the Excess Profits

Tax Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 3803. A bill to provide that in the construction of reservoirs by the United States, consideration shall be given to the future development of such reservoirs and the surrounding area for recreational purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 3804. A bill to provide a transcontinental superhighway with alternate sections; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 3805. A bill to simplify and make more nearly uniform the laws governing the payment of compensation for service-connected disability or death, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3806. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to pensions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H. R. 3807. A bill to define the term "substantially gainful occupation" in determination of eligibility for non-service-connected pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3808. A bill to increase the rates of compensation for disability incurred in combat; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3809. A bill to authorize the transfer of hospitals and related facilities between the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3810. A bill to revise the basis for certain disability awards; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 3811. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of the New England, New York, Long Island, and New Jersey coastal and tidal areas, for the purpose of determining possible means of preventing damages to property and loss of human lives due to hurricane winds and tides; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3812. A bill to authorize Federal assistance to States and communities to enable them to increase public elementary and secondary school construction; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3813. A bill to amend the act incorporating the American Legion so as to redefine eligibility for membership therein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 3814. A bill to amend the Trade Agreements Extension Act of July 1, 1954, so as to assure the availability of materials essential to national security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 3815. A bill to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 3816. A bill to require public hearings prior to withdrawals of the public lands, to limit temporary withdrawals to 5 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3817. A bill to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 3818. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 3819. A bill to consolidate and revise certain provisions of law relating to additional compensation of civilian employees of the Federal Government stationed outside the continental United States and in Alaska, except as otherwise authorized herein, and to facilitate recruitment, reduce turnover, and compensate for extra costs and hardships due to oversea assignments; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3820. A bill to provide leave of absence for officers and employees stationed outside the United States, for use in the United States, its Territories or possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 3821. A bill relating to withholding, for purposes of the income tax imposed by certain cities, on the compensation of Federal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 3822. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, by striking out the termination date; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 3823. A bill to permit partially disabled veterans to reenlist in the Armed Forces of the United States, including the Coast Guard, for limited duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

H. R. 3824. A bill to authorize Federal assistance to States and communities to enable them to increase public elementary and secondary school construction; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 3825. A bill to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of jurisdiction over certain land in the vicinity of Fort Devens, Mass.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 3826. A bill to provide that railroad employees may retire on a full annuity at age 60 or after serving 30 years; to provide that such annuity for any month shall be not less than one-half of the individual's average monthly compensation for the 5 years of highest earnings; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 3827. A bill to amend section 303 (c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (37 U. S. C., sec. 253 (c)) so as to authorize transportation in kind, reimbursement therefor, or payment of a monetary allowance in lieu of transportation in kind to members of the uniformed services for the transportation of baggage and household effects in a house trailer or mobile dwelling; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3828. A bill to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. R. 3829. A bill creating a Federal Commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. J. Res. 202. Joint resolution to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. J. Res. 203. Joint resolution to designate Mrs. Elizabeth (Ben) Kennedy as "United States GI Mother"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. J. Res. 204. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. J. Res. 205. Joint resolution designating the second Sunday in October of each year as National Grandmothers' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 206. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the third week in April of each year as National My Family Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. J. Res. 207. Joint resolution to provide for investigating the feasibility of establishing a coordinated local, State, and Federal program in the city of Boston, Mass., and general vicinity thereof, for the purpose of preserving the historic properties, objects, and buildings in that area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. J. Res. 208. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of Senators from States hereafter admitted to the Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 209. Joint resolution to establish May 14 of every year as WAC-Veterans Day in recognition and appreciation of the patriotic devotion to duty of all members of the Women's Army Corps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. J. Res. 210. Joint resolution to provide for the construction of a nuclear power reactor in Japan; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. Con. Res. 68. Concurrent resolution expressing the condolences of Congress to the families of officers and crew members of the USS *Bennington* who lost their lives in the explosions on May 26, 1954, and commending those who displayed gallantry and devotion to duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution providing for annual address to the Congress by the Chief Justice of the United States on the state of the judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to conduct a special study of the ways in which existing and proposed Federal economic powers and programs can make their greatest contribution to defense against modern atomic attack; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. Con. Res. 71. Concurrent resolution extending greetings on the occasion of the 200th anniversary of the creation of Fort Ticonderoga to the director; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 72. Concurrent resolution for an Atlantic Exploratory Convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. Res. 137. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the forced repatriation program carried out by our military and civilian authorities in the years 1945–47; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FINE:

H. Res. 138. Resolution favoring the embracing within the Republic of Ireland of all the territory of that country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: Memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States

to act promptly and favorably upon the Canton irrigation distribution system; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 3830. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Atamant Chantikian and her child, Kosrof Chantikian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3831. A bill for the relief of Oscar Neumann, Mrs. Magdalena Neumann, and Judith Gabrielle Neumann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3832. A bill for the relief of Kervok Sevag, Mrs. Virginia Sevag, and Sonia Sevag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3833. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Como; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 3834. A bill for the relief of Alex Premysler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3835. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria Beck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3836. A bill for the relief of James E. Savage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 3837. A bill for the relief of Lazar Petrovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 3838. A bill for the relief of Anastasio Cauchon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 3839. A bill for the relief of Pak-Chue Chan, Oi-Jen Tsin Chan (nee Tsin), Chee Tao Chan, and Wai May Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 3840. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frieda Fleischer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3841. A bill for the relief of Dr. Nobutaka Azuma and Mrs. Tsugie Azuma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 3842. A bill for the relief of Antonio Mion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3843. A bill for the relief of Roseen Koury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 3844. A bill for the relief of Michaela Murphy Mole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 3845. A bill for the relief of Guillermo Pedraza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 3846. A bill for the relief of Poulicos S. Loucacos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3847. A bill for the relief of Panayotis Koutsoyannopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 3848. A bill for the relief of Daisy Cecile Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 3849. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jill (Wiggett) Varga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL (by request):

H. R. 3850. A bill for the relief of George L. Maronitis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYWORTH:

H. R. 3851. A bill for the relief of Samuel Chalut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 3852. A bill for the relief of Angel Medina Cardenas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3853. A bill for the relief of Guadalupe Zuniga (also known as Benita Chaparrao-Venegas or Guadalupe Acosta); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3854. A bill for the relief of Kui Hung Tam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 3855. A bill for the relief of Grace Janet Murphy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 3856. A bill for the relief of Leopoldine Simonetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 3857. A bill for the relief of Constantin David, Paula Marie David, Claire Edmonde David, and Ariane Constance David; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 3858. A bill for the relief of Gee Yon Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H. R. 3859. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis John Foradis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 3860. A bill for the relief of Tomas Gumtang Subia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 3861. A bill for the relief of George Seeman Jensen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 3862. A bill for the relief of Berthilde Vogler Ganno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 3863. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yio Gik Him, nee Guadalupe Reyes Chip; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3864. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth A. Traufield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 3865. A bill for the relief of George McPherson Gray (Reginald Pugh); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3866. A bill for the relief of Leon Popiel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 3867. A bill for the relief of Iwan Bonk, Tacianna Bonk, Mike Bonk, and Sam Bonk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3868. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Proudian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 3869. A bill for the relief of Esther Ledea Escobedo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3870. A bill for the relief of Oswald E. Kohlruss, Antonie Kohlruss, and Evelyne Hedy Kohlruss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3871. A bill for the relief of Orville Ennis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3872. A bill for the relief of Adolf and Rosa Iliescu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 211. Joint resolution to confer jurisdiction on the Attorney General to determine the eligibility of certain aliens to benefit under section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

85. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Travis Hayden and others, Atascosa County Farm Bureau, Jourdanton, Tex., requesting that the import duty be increased on broom corn to $55 per ton in order to protect the market at home; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. VORYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, Yalta is a word that will live in infamy in history. On this 10th anniversary of the ill-fated meeting between Stalin, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Winston S. Churchill, which started February 7 in 1945, we should remind ourselves of the tragic events that have occurred in the decade since that meeting during which the whole series of World War II agreements have been misinterpreted, ignored, or violated by the Soviets to enslave millions of free peoples.

Two years ago, in accordance with one of the first foreign-policy requests of President Eisenhower, I introduced House Joint Resolution 200, declaring that the United States reject any interpretations or applications of any international agreements or understandings made during the course of World War II, which have been perverted to bring about the subjection of free peoples; and proclaiming the hope that the peoples who have been subjected to the captivity of Soviet despotism shall again enjoy the right of self-determination within a framework which will sustain the peace; that they shall again have the right to choose the form of government under which they will live, and that sovereign rights of self-government shall be restored to them.

This resolution was unanimously reported by our committee, without amendment, but this denunciation of Soviet misinterpretation and violations of the Yalta agreement became involved in a partisan debate as to whether the Yalta agreements and other ill-considered wartime agreements could safely be repudiated in toto, and the House took no further action on the resolution.

In August 1953, however, the House had another opportunity to act in this regard. On August 1, I secured unanimous consent for consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 178, "expressing the hopes of the American people for the early reunification of Germany by free elections and for the achievement by the

peoples of East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, and other Communist-dominated countries of their basic human rights and freedom."

This was a combination of a number of resolutions by various Members of Congress. My own contribution was one sentence, "that the Congress commends and encourages the valiant struggle of these captive peoples for freedom."

This combination resolution passed the House without a single objection and was substituted by Senate Concurrent Resolution 36 by Mr. WATKINS, of Utah. The Senate concurred in the House amendment and thus this resolution represents a formal concurrent expression of the House and Senate on the results of Yalta.

This action, which took place during the closing days of the 1st session of the 82d Congress, has not received the attention it deserves. Many Members of Congress have introduced resolutions on this subject. Each such resolution causes encouragement to the captive peoples when it is introduced, and a measure of discouragement that it fails of final approval. I learned, from my experience with my own resolution, and from my efforts to resolve and adjust the differences in the series of resolutions which were combined in House Concurrent Resolution 178, how difficult it is to secure language which is satisfactory to many Members who may have a single purpose in view. Under the circumstances, I am proud to have had a part in putting through House Concurrent Resolution 178. I am proud that this resolution was unanimously approved by both the House and Senate and that it contains the sentence I inserted, "that the Congress commends and encourages the valiant struggle of these captive peoples for freedom."

On this somber 10th anniversary, the Polish nation, the prime victim of the Yalta deal, and the other nations victimized by Soviet imperalism, can take heart in knowing that this recent and unanimous condemnation and encouragement of their struggle for freedom stands unchanged as an official expression of Congress.

At Yalta, Poland Was Betrayed and Enslaved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the time is February 7, 1955.

The American people are restive, fearful that another secret arrangement may be in process that will sanction Communist aggression and dishonor the principles by which we live.

Even as the blunders at Yalta deprived Poland of its independence, led to the enslavement of other peoples who trusted us, and opened the way to the spread of communism which now threatens the world.

Secret diplomacy continues to be the curse of international relations.

It is dictatorial by nature, considering itself superior to the common sense and character of the people.

In its preoccupation with convenience and expediency, it loses sight of moral values.

Even in the United States today, for narrow partisan reasons, the true facts of Yalta are withheld from the people, while subtle negotiations are going on that will lead to the admission of Red China to the United Nations by the back door.

Appeasement on the installment plan. This will not fool the people.

We never endorsed the Yalta deal with Red Russia, and we will never approve of a Red China deal.

Communism must purge itself of every aggression committed against every other nation.

This is the policy of the American people, based on moral principles that we will never compromise or surrender.

In justice to the Polish people, first victims of the new appeasement, we denounce the furtive Yalta agreements.

Until those freedoms which have been betrayed are restored the freedom of the United States is in danger.

God grant us leadership with the courage to be right and honorable.

Negation of the Yalta Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, February 7, 1955, marked the 10th anniversary of the Yalta Conference which culminated in the controversial and widely criticized Yalta agreement.

On a number of separate occasions since my first election to Congress, I stated on this floor that I favor the negation of that agreement. I wish to reiterate and reaffirm that position today.

I believe that I have made it very plain that I have no sympathy for the extremist critics of the Yalta agreement, whose vociferous condemnations were founded in political expediency rather than in any sincere desire to repair the damage done by the pact. Nevertheless, it has been my steadfast contention that the agreement was shortsighted and, in the provision dealing with the eastern boundary of Poland, inconsistent with the traditional policies and principles of the American people. For these reasons, I had repeatedly urged that the negation of the entire Yalta agreement, which can be accomplished on valid grounds, be given favorable consideration.

There are several basic reasons for the negation of the Yalta agreement. In the first place, it is uncertain that the late President Roosevelt intended to enter into an agreement at Yalta which would be legally binding on the United States.

Secondly, there is no body of established precedents with respect to Executive agreements to show that any one of them is to be regarded as valid beyond the term in office of the Chief Executive who entered into it. In conjunction with this point, we should note that there is nothing in the Yalta agreement as to its intended duration.

Thirdly, the Yalta agreement has been in effect nullified by the repeated violations of its terms on the part of the Soviet Union. This is perhaps the chief reason why we should negate the agreement.

The negation of the Yalta pact will not free Poland, any more than the absence of this agreement would have prevented Soviet occupation of that country. We must remember that at the time of the Yalta Conference the Soviet armies had already moved through Poland and were within 32 miles of Berlin. Even if the Yalta agreement had never materialized, it would probably have been necessary to start a new war in 1945 in order to free Poland of Soviet occupation. I need not add that the allies, led by the United States, were not in favor of such a course at the time. It was believed during that period that the restoration of independence to the Eastern European nations could be achieved gradually through peaceful means. This belief, of course, had proved to be completely unjustified with the passage of time.

The negation of the Yalta agreement would, however, give us a starting point for demanding the restoration of Poland's proper boundaries and Poland's return to the family of free nations.

If the persons who had clamored for the repudiation of the Yalta pact are sincere, I urge them to lend their efforts to the task of bringing about the negation of the agreement.

United States "Dorchester Day"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, there is a heroic story of the sea which has earned its right to be forever memorialized in the history of our country. It is a story valuable to the American tradition because it is a lesson in the essential unity of our people and their separate faiths—Catholic, Protestant, Jewish. It is a story of sublime sacrifice by men of religion who thus gave concrete, physical expression to their religious ideals. It is altogether a story so rich in human drama, so gripping on the imagination, and so colored by crisis and excitement at sea in time of war, that I ask the event be set down in the official calendar of American holidays. To me it is essentially a story of basic American solidarity.

It is for these reasons that I have introduced into the first session of this, the 84th Congress of the United States, House Joint Resolution 77. It designates the 3d day of February in each year as Dorchester Day. In doing this we shall commemorate the sinking of the Army transport *Dorchester* by enemy action off the coast of Greenland on the day thus set apart. You will remember that was the tragedy at sea when four Army chaplains of different religious faiths lost their lives because—according to the reports of survivors—they pressed upon soldiers caught helpless on the sinking craft, their own lifebelts. They then perished together, linked arm in arm, in the high seas.

What the record does not and cannot show—because of the dreadful circumstances of the tragedy—is something I take the liberty to assume. I assume that when these four noble Americans—Catholic, Protestants, and Jew—went down into the ice and the water of that awful night, they uttered a common prayer in a joint plea to the God and Father of all men. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, an act of incredible neglect that an event written in terms of grand tragedy, so meaningful for all future generations of Americans, should thus go undistinguished on the calendar of the days we honor. Therefore, I ask that this year this omission be corrected and that this House act favorably on my measure.

Subsidies Became Our Lifeblood—The Remedies Now Appearing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, some time ago the Government took by force private property by taxation and gave big gobs of it to the beef cattlemen. In effect, beef became the public property of the Government. More and more people went into raising beef for Government subsidies. Surpluses of cattle increased. Prices to the consumers were fixed high by the Government, in spite of increasing surpluses.

BEEF REVOLTS

Suddenly the people quit eating beef. They struck. Just as suddenly the sturdy big-hatted ranchers woke up to the fact that they were raising socialized beef for Government, a most unreliable political customer. They had lost their real dependable customers, the American people. So the cattlemen took a vote and threw out Government price supports and control of their business. They chose the hard road of winning back their customers in a free beef market. That meant lower prices, but increased beef consumption from 62 to 76 pounds per capita—an alltime record. Congress was not smart enough to stop subsidies, but the cattlemen were.

POTATOES GAIN FREEDOM

The potato growers were corrupted for years by Government checks totaling $478 million. They, too, delivered their potatoes to the Government instead of the consumers. Suddenly the taxpayers were shocked to see the Government paying farmers for potatoes with taxpayers' money, then burning the potatoes to make them scarce to keep the prices high. To make it worse, after destroying the potatoes on one side of the road, the Government bought potatoes from Canada to feed the people on the other side. Year after year Congress could not stop it. The growers themselves did stop it. Potatoes won their freedom from Government. And tough as freedom is, potatoes would not go back into socialism, viz, management, ownership, and control by the Government.

PEOPLE REJECT GOVERNMENT HOUSING TOO

In the same way the Government has been insisting on taking by force of taxation uncountable millions of private property and building publicly owned Government houses. It rents them at half rent, exempt from taxation. Here again uncountable millions of taxes must be paid by private property owners which Government tenants should but do not pay. They are exempt.

Of course, Government expects tenants to vote right in return for such favors. A very narrow majority in Congress has been insisting lately on forcing public houses onto the people in spite of the fact that the people do not want them. Generally wherever the people vote they throw out Government housing, keep their own money at home and build their own houses. Constitutional amendments are proposed to stop this sort of Government business.

SCHOOLBOYS UNDERSTAND BUT CONGRESS DOES NOT

Now come the people of Tennessee telling the true story of TVA, the first and most highly touted of American socialistic experiments. It is turning out very badly for Tennessee. For Tennessee has become totally dependent upon Government for electric power and appropriations from Congress. It is falling behind the other 10 Southeastern States in production and distribution. That is because the other States are not dependent on what Congress may or may not do. The other States make and pay for their own electric power and depend on themselves. Tennessee has found by bitter experience that business firms will not move into their State where electric power depends on Congress taking money by force from far-distant States. What's more, Congress is finding it more and more impossible to buy votes in Tennessee by charging the cost to Massachusetts, New York, Illinois, and other States. Even the little schoolboys now define TVA as "a river that flows through 7 States and drains 41." They were drained again in 1954 for the 22d year. TVA will be coming up to the public trough again in 1955. The total take to date by TVA is about $2 billion—all from taxpayers. That will help heat Tennessee houses with electricity, though Tennesseans have plenty of coal in their backyards which they could use. They could also use oil like other people. But it is cheaper to use electricity so long as taxpayers in other States can be socked to provide it. But Tennessee knows that no scheme to buy votes as crazy and incredible as TVA can last. This administration has already given fair warning. So Mr. Robert M. Metcalf, Jr., vice president of Guaranty Mortgage & Trust Co., of Memphis, Tenn., comes up with this remedy. He proposed a new and greater TVA in Spotlight for the Nation.

He suggests that the power-generating facilities of TVA be sold to the people in the area which it serves. This would result in relief for the taxpayers of the remainder of the Nation and at the same time give to the people of the TVA reservation exclusive control over the agency upon which they are completely dependent for their power. Perhaps even more important than these immediate tangible gains, is the fact that such a sale would represent a reversal of the largest, most clear-cut Socialist step the United States has ever taken.

I have been criticized for characterizing TVA as socialistic. However, my opinion conforms with that of the authorities. The Chattanooga (Tenn.) Times of February 15, 1934, quotes Norman Thomas as saying:

> The TVA is the only genuinely socialistic act (in the New Deal)—a flower in the midst of weeds.

Of course, TVA has never been officially represented as being the first Socialist experiment undertaken in the United States. But it is common knowledge that the Public Utility League pressed for passage of TVA legislation all through the 1920's. It was finally passed in the early days of the New Deal as conservation, flood control, and navigation legislation.

Since that time about $2 billion of capital has been invested in and used to finance TVA. Only $101.1 million has been repaid and that merely represents a credit on the books. The 1954 appropriation to TVA was $188,546,000, which is about the average of congressional advances that have been made in recent years. Thus, in a single year, Congress appropriated $87 million more than TVA was credited for repayments during its entire life of 23 years.

Except for a low rate of interest paid on about $65 million worth of bonds which were bought by the United States Treasury, TVA has paid no interest on the capital advances made to it. It has been estimated that if TVA repaid the Federal Government for the interest costs alone of Federal moneys spent through TVA, the bills from TVA to its customers would have to be increased over $40 million a year.

TVA pays no Federal taxes at all. Therefore, it does not contribute a dime of its proper share in our national defense. It pays nothing toward the salaries of the Congress and the President. In 1954 the Consolidated Edison Co., of New York, paid $113,442,477 in State and Federal taxes, or about 24.4 percent of its revenues. TVA, in 1954, paid $3,578,668 in lieu of State taxes, or 2.7 percent of its revenues.

From the foregoing it is clear that about 24 cents out of every dollar of power bills paid by customers of private utility companies is used in part to pay the costs, the taxes, the interest, and the capital of TVA, which it should pay for but does not.

The TVA is so weak and totally dependent on what Congress will do that it cannot build new power facilities to meet the growing demand for power; it cannot pay interest or principal; the payment of proper taxes alone would sink the TVA ship. In a debate on the floor of the Senate — 1939 — Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, the author of the TVA legislation, had this to say:

A proposal from a great association of Tennessee says, in effect, "Let the TVA property be subject to taxation the same as everybody else's property." * * * If we go to that extreme, Senators, you can see that the TVA would be out of business in 3 months.

For 20 years Congress indulged itself in a kind of vote-getting game, sometimes under the lash of a President, to redistribute the wealth. They indulged in doing good with other people's money without too much disturbance to conscience. If conscience were disturbed, alleged national defense relieved it.

But by now each group getting the benefits of the redistribution are running head on into each other or running out of benefits. Indeed the mess, which Congress came into power 2 years ago to clean up, has smeared the faces of those who have quite diligently wrestled with it.

WHICH SUBSIDY TO KNOCK OUT FIRST

If there are critics of the failure of Congress to reverse the New Deal trend and reduce taxes much more, let them answer these questions. Which particular group feeding in the public trough would they knock out first? Which subsidy law would they repeal to start with? They must be repealed one at a time. That is, which group's vote would they risk losing first? The attempt has been made.

CORN ATTACKS PEANUTS

In the last session of Congress the Illinois delegation in Congress representing corn attacked peanuts. Corn having been for nearly 20 years in the public trough and feeling quite secure said in effect: "Now what basic rights have peanuts to put their feet in this trough?" "Why the country would never miss them if we never raised another peanut. They are indigestible anyway." And corn called for a vote of all the others to throw peanuts out. Whereupon peanuts furiously counterattacked with most devastating effect. They said, "Why of all those feeding in this trough that have grown sleek and fat and should be thrown out, it's corn. Above all others it should fall on its knees and ask forgiveness for its sins in the well of this House." So little peanuts, who really had no case at all shamed corn and scared the others so that the vote was 228 to 170 to keep peanuts in. After the fight it appeared that peanuts might get nearly as much subsidy as corn got for keeping itself padlocked in cribs so as to make itself look scarce and high priced.

APPLES TAKE INTEREST

After that vote in which peanuts did so well, apples were heard tumbling all over themselves out in the Halls of Congress. They said, "Why sure enough we are just as basic as any of the rest. Besides we can be kept by freezing. What's more basic than an apple a day keeping the doctor away?" In the distance you could hear groups without number organizing the votes. So every seat in the House may be endangered unless the Member votes to give each new group theirs for no good reason except that all the others are getting theirs. When I asked a friend on the floor if this would ever stop, he answered "No; it will go on forever." Of course it must go on forever unless an overall reversal and total stoppage is devised. For if corn subsidies are lawful, the steer, the cow, the pig, and chicken that eats corn must be subsidized. And so it must go on and on without end until it is all stopped.

GOVERNMENT SUBSTITUTE FOR GOD

Does history not prove that when Government controls the economic laws of food, it controls the moral laws of people surrounding food? If Government owns your house, and rents it to you, it will tell you how to live in it. You may commit one sin or have one illegitimate child in Government housing but not two. This is the rule in the housing authority book of morals in Houston, Tex. You are free to vote, of course, but if you vote against the party that provided your house you may expect to move. And so all dependents on Government power loans, health, houses, fruits of fields and forest must do the will of Government and not of God. Government pretends to be a substitute for God. The remedy is to reject the idea utterly.

CONGRESS NEEDS HELP OF THE STATES

The people of the United States have witnessed two decades of unprecedented assumption of governmental power, confiscation of private property by taxation, inflation, and debts. As the Government has grown in power and property the individual has been correspondingly reduced in property and weakened in his power to manage his own affairs.

The January 25, 1955, issue of Look magazine concludes that these conditions are here to stay, regardless of which political party wins. This is so because each party tries to be elected by promising to exercise the unlimited power of Government to tax and spend and borrow to satisfy special interest groups in return for their votes. Indeed, this is in itself a fatal blow to the two-party system and makes the one-party or monolithic state inevitable. It makes no sense to have two candidates each with the same idea.

Resistance to the trend has been wholly ineffectual. The economic groups affected either use the Government's power for their special advantage or seek exemption from it in return for votes. Presidents and Congresses will not do anything about this situation because as long as they have unlimited power they will use it to satisfy these groups. It should be obvious, therefore, that unlimited Government is absurd.

The remedy can be found in this paraphrase of Edmund Burke:

When government acquires unlimited power, good men must associate; else they will fall, 1 by 1, an unpitied sacrifice in a contemptible struggle.

And so, united action of good men has become apparent and necessary. This effort must be made in and by the States. As parties to the original contract, they must come forward to redefine, clarify, and reaffirm the limitations of that contract.

The Eternal Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity of a private preview of the motion picture, The Eternal Sea, at the invitation of a friend and acquaintance of mine for many years, the producer and director, Mr. John H. Auer.

The Eternal Sea is a present-day historical episode of the actual experiences of a living Navy admiral, and it is not only an inspiring patriotic story but also an impelling story which would increase the admiration of any American for the United States Navy and the courageous spirit that overcomes all obstacles including physical handicaps to obtain its objectives.

The Eternal Sea will also assure the American people of the security and protection for which the great and powerful United States Navy has been built and organized to provide.

Mr. John Auer, the director and producer, is a devoted and patriotic naturalized American citizen. He came to the United States in 1929 and in that same year took his first oath of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, as he says in very broken English. He resolved to serve his new country to the best of his ability, and in 1951 he produced and directed the picture Thunderbirds, which was dedicated to the National Guard. This picture was highly received by all, and Mr. Auer received a citation from the Department of Defense and the National Guard for his patriotic contribution.

The Eternal Sea, which Mr. Auer directed and produced for Republic Pictures, pays homage to the United States Navy, naval aviation, and above all to a courageous American who, despite the great handicap of losing his leg in battle, carried on to express undying devotion to his family, the service, and all mankind. This great American is Rear Adm. John Madison Hoskins, who is still on active duty with the United States Navy.

Private showings of the Eternal Sea have been given to many high officials in the Department of Defense, and a few of

the comments received as a result of these showings follow:

Mr. HERBERT J. YATES,
President, Republic Pictures Corp:

Congratulations on a truly great American epic of courage. The Eternal Sea is excellent theater and gripping entertainment. It will make all who see it prouder than ever before of their American heritage. In behalf of all those who have borne wounds for their country and for those other Americans who have triumphed over disability, our heartfelt thanks for this fine film.

Maj. Gen. MELVIN J. MAAS,
USMCR, Retired; Chairman, the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

Mr. HERBERT J. YATES,
Republic Productions, Inc.:

The Eternal Sea was reviewed by the Department of Navy and the Office of the Secretary of Defense and hereby is approved for public release. We believe it is a picture you should be proud of. It captures a fine spirit and will be of great value to the service. Its inspirational qualities should be of great value to every American. We consider it an excellent motion picture which justifies our cooperation. Sincere thanks for a job well done.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. HERBERT J. YATES,
President, Republic Studios:

Congratulations to you, Mr. John Auer, and Republic studios on the Eternal Sea. It is a great picture which will reflect much credit to Republic and Navy. Feel that it will have strong dramatic and human-interest appeal to general public.

Adm. W. G. BEECHER,
Chief of Information, Navy Department.

I urge all patriotic Americans to see this picture not only because of its dramatic appeal, but especially because of its pariotic and inspirational qualities.

Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, it is the 10th anniversary of the Yalta Conference, at which Russia promised free elections to Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the other lands now behind the Iron Curtain.

In the 10 years that have passed, we have seen this solemnly pledged word betrayed again and again. The gallant people of Poland and the other countries of Eastern Europe groan under a totalitarian regime.

"Though the mills of God grind slowly, yet they grind exceeding small." Just as surely as the daylight follows the darkness, as truth and justice ultimately prevail over deceit and wickedness, the time will come when the people of Poland and the other enslaved lands will once again breathe the air of freedom. The United States will never forget its goal of free elections for the unhappy people of Eastern Europe.

Opposition to H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include the text of my statement registering my opposition with the House Ways and Means Committee against H. R. 1, to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements.

My statement follows:

Mr. Chairman, the case for the extension of reciprocal trade has one fatal weakness; it cannot explain away the harm that would be done to the American textile industry (in company with some other industries) by forcing it to compete in our domestic market, with foreign goods produced at a fraction of our labor costs.

The wage gap cannot be rationalized into balance.

And protection is stripped away from those of our industries that need it.

With their eyes on export opportunities for some industries, the supporters of Reciprocal Trade would sacrifice textiles, watchmaking, fishing, and other industries.

They would sell out our textile industry to Japan, giving up our self-sufficiency, and making us dependent upon other nations for the cloth we once manufactured ourselves just to provide extra export-markets for favored industries under the guise of international cooperation.

And what of the tens of thousands of Americans who would be added to the labor surplus existing in so many of our textile manufacturing communities?

Studies prove that these middle-aged unemployed are not absorbed by growth industries. Those few who do find other work, have to back down into jobs that barely pay the so-called minimum wage, better known as the starvation wage.

Our duty is toward our own people first even unto the least of them.

Not to give away a vital but hard-pressed industry just to promote international good will.

Gentlemen, I ask you not to dodge this fact.

Look at the labor-surplus areas in the United States.

Observe how many of them are depressed textile communities.

Consider the inevitable damage you would inflict upon these communities by opening the gates to competing imports produced at one-half to one-tenth of the wages necessary to maintain the average American worker's standard of living.

And ask yourselves if there is any possible justification for doing this to the people of our textile communities.

The gross hourly earnings of the textile industry in the United States range from a high of $1.59 in Connecticut to a low of $1.22 in Alabama and Georgia.

This disparity has brought real hardship to New England textiles.

But if we have to contend with unlimited competition from low-cost imports, our situation will become hopeless.

On this the battling factions of the American textile industry join ranks in united opposition to reciprocal trade.

Reciprocity would be impossible.

The traffic would be all one way—an invasion of our home market by foreign textiles that would put most of our mills out of business and would add to the critical unemployment prevailing in this industry.

For the mills in Georgia and Alabama could not compete with the mills in Great Britain that pay only 45.5 cents per hour, or those in Japan whose labor costs are at the impossibly low level of only 11.9 cents per hour.

And if these fatal figures are not enough to convince you that reciprocal trade would be a death sentence for our textile industry, I put to you this further challenge: Why should we encourage imports of those manufactured goods that we are overproducing ourselves?

It would be just as senseless and inhuman to import agricultural commodities at half price or less to add to our own surpluses.

We from the textile areas demand the same consideration in our domestic market as that enjoyed by agriculture which has the protection of Government supports.

We submit that it is grossly unfair and dangerous to coddle one industry and abandon another.

Those who beat the drums for free trade slide over the fact that we cannot compete with slave-labor products that are admitted to the American markets without abandoning our own progress and retreating to the 19th century.

They also ignore the fact that there is no such thing as unlimited competition.

We have laws on our own books to guarantee a minimum wage that is already considered to be inadequate.

That minimum will soon be raised and rightly so.

The extension of reciprocal trade would result in the cancellation of that law by indirection. It is a thinly disguised move, among other purposes, to increase Japanese textile exports to the United States at the expense of our own textile industry. It would drive mills and workers out of business, bringing back all the abuses of unfair competition.

Healthy trade depends upon the import of those products or materials that we need and the export of such goods as others want from us.

We cannot risk the delegation of arbitrary authority over such matters through the medium of a blank check.

Where it is clear that some industries will be hurt they must be given some protection in the national interest.

We oppose extension of reciprocal trade as being too large a grant of power.

The American textile industry needs sympathetic understanding and assistance from the Federal Government in place of the proposed legislation which threatens its survival.

Address Delivered by Hon. William F. Knowland, of California, Before the Montgomery County Republican Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on February 2, 1955, at the Congressional Country Club, Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND delivered an address before the Montgomery County Republican organization.

The force and scope of that address so impressed me that I ask unanimous consent to have it made part of today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE OF THE PACIFIC

(Address by Senator WILLIAM E. KNOWLAND)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and fellow Americans, we are gathered here to pay tribute not only to our first President but to discuss in the limited time that we have some of the accomplishments of the administration of a great American and outstanding President of the United States, Dwight Eisenhower. Now in the few years that he has occupied the office of President of the United States, he has given leadership to this Nation and has helped to bring our economy back to our free economic system which built this Nation of ours from a small colony of 3 million on the Atlantic seaboard to a great Nation of 165 million people with the most productive industrial and agricultural economy the world has ever known. When he took office, the Nation was under a system of controls—price controls, wage controls, and the allocation of materials. And in conformity with the platform pledges, they were removed. The cost to the Federal Government in the limited period of time he has occupied the White House has been cut by more than $10 billion. The American people have been given substantial tax reductions by the last Congress amounting to over $7½ billion. In addition to that we have had a better administration of the Federal Government. We have had a number of reorganization acts passed. We have created the new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The President, who perhaps more than any other man has a keen knowledge of the defense needs of the Nation, has been giving his personal attention to the increasing of the firepower of our armed services in the troubled world in which we find ourselves. There has been an extension of social-security legislation and the unemployment-reserves legislation.

But tonight I want to talk with you about one of the great problems that concerns us not as Republicans, not as Democrats, but as Americans. I speak of the issue now growing up in the Pacific relating to the defenses of this Nation and the defenses of the free world. It has been my position, and I believe it has been the position of responsible Republicans in the administration and in the Congress of the United States, that in these grave problems facing our Nation, Americans regardless of their partisan affiliation must stand shoulder to shoulder in meeting whatever the challenge that may confront us. I have said time and time again that there is only one party of treason in our Nation. That is the Communist Party and all Americans should stand shoulder to shoulder in seeing that that does not subvert our institutions. So it happens that in addition to being the anniversary of the first of our Republican Presidents, the month of February is also another anniversary and one that we do not remember quite as timely. This coming week is the 10th anniversary of the Yalta conference which met in the Crimea 10 years ago from February 4 to February 11, and in that brief span of 1 decade, the Communist world has increased its hold upon human beings—increased it from 200 million in 1945 until today they control more than 800 millions of people as we meet here tonight. This has been a tremendous change in the world's balance of power. The President of the United States this past week came to the Congress with a message dealing with the critical situation in Formosa and in the far Pacific. He made his recommendations, and in a display of national unity seldom equaled in our Nation, the House by a vote of 410 to 3, and the Senate by a vote of 85 to 3 approved the necessary resolution supporting the President. Now I believe that this was a demonstration of President Eisenhower's fundamental belief in our constitutional system of Government. There are some who legalistically might argue that as Commander in Chief, it was not necessary for him to come to the Congress of the United States, but he has felt and he has known that under our constitutional system, the President and the Congress are coequal branches of the Federal Government. He has never wanted and he has never expected and does not want and does not expect the Congress of the United States to be a mere rubber stamp. And in this great problem which confronted our Nation and after consultation not alone with his own party leaders in the House and the Senate but on a bipartisan basis with the Democratic leaders as well, he determined to submit the matter to the Congress so that we could present to our friends abroad and to the would-be aggressors abroad a demonstration of what a great and free constitutional Republic can do when it has finally been challenged in the matter that affects its own vital security interests. And that was done. Now there are some who tried to make out that this resolution was an act or a prelude to an act of aggression on our part. It was no such thing. Those who made charges of that kind knew that they were not true. There is not a single scintilla of evidence to support any such thesis that this was anything other than what the President purported it to be and that was an effort to stabilize conditions in the Pacific and to preserve the peace of the world. It was on this basis and after free and full debate in the House and in the Senate of the United States that he received overwhelming approval. Now some may have asked what is the importance of Formosa in this scheme of things as far as our defense is concerned. Formosa is not some isolated island in the Pacific.

It contains 9½ million of free Chinese. This is a larger population than 32 members of the United Nations have today. It is a larger population than such important countries as Sweden, Norway, Finland, Denmark, Austria, Ireland, and New Zealand, and it is the approximate population of Australia. So, in itself from a population point of view, it is important that it not pass behind the Iron Curtain. But what is more important is that it is a part of a defense chain in the Pacific for ourselves and the free world which runs from the Aleutians down through Japan through our great air base at Okinawa through Formosa to the Philippines and anchors on Australia. And if the island of Formosa should pass into unfriendly hands, it would drive a wedge into the heart of that defense position. It would outflank Okinawa a few hundred miles to the north and would outflank the Philippines a few hundred miles to the south. The thing that is difficult for me to understand is how some of our associates in the United Nations or elsewhere constantly feel that the way of solving the problem with the Communist world is by taking the road to appeasement. The world should have learned at the time of Munich that the road to appeasement is not the road to peace. It is only surrender on the installment plan. Now we have drawn a line in the Pacific. It is for the purpose of preserving the peace in the Pacific and the peace of the world. There is no intent of aggression against any other nation on the face of the earth. But if our Air Force is challenged and fired upon, they are not going to sit there as sitting ducks. They are going to fire back with effective fire. If our fleet which in consultation with the Government of the Republic of China may be used for a screening opposition is subjected to attack, they in turn will defend themselves. But this, Mr. Chou En-lai and Mr. Mao Tse-tung should understand; they should understand in advance. If there is trouble in the Pacific, it will come because they have precipitated it. And if they precipitate trouble in the Pacific, they must know in advance that there will never again be a Yalu River sanctuary behind which they can go to rearm and refuel. Now we must not be deceived by those who would think that we can get a cheap and easy solution to this problem through the course of appeasement.

There are some who believe that this doctrine of so-called peaceful coexistence is some new indication of a basic change in Soviet policy. It is no such thing. The basic concept of Soviet policy is no different today under Malenkov than it was under Stalin or under Lenin. Their idea and peaceful coexistence was discussed by Lenin and by Stalin. Their idea of peaceful coexistence is that they will allow their neighbors to exist only until they can be subverted from within or destroyed by armed aggression from without. It is the type of peaceful coexistence that they planned for us that a Thanksgiving turkey has up until a few days before our national holiday of being well fed and housed until the ax falls on its neck. Now I had a letter not many days ago from a minister of the Gospel who had been concerned by this talk of peaceful coexistence. He had known some associates of his who had suffered at Communist hands in Communist China and in some of the satellite states of eastern Europe. He sent me this quotation from the second Corinthians 6, 14: Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers, for what fellowship has righteousness with unrighteousness, and what communion has light with darkness. I think that the minister who wrote me had a much better appreciation of the meaning of communism and their type of coexistence than the sum of our so-called neutralist friends of India and others who even tonight as we are meeting here have come up with various suggestions including the admission of Communist China into the United Nations; the giving up of the islands of Quemoy and Matsu to the Chinese Communists; the ultimate turning over if need be of the entire island of Formosa to the Chinese Communists. I have said on the floor of the Senate of the United States and I repeat to you here tonight that in my judgment the admission of Communist China into the United Nations would be a betrayal of every principle that that organization is supposed to represent. They have not qualified in any sense of the word as being either willing or able to live up to the charter obligations of a nation devoted to international law and order. As far as I am concerned, as long as I have a voice and a vote in the Senate of the United States, I shall oppose the admission of Communist China into that Organization.

Now the American people want peace, but we want peace with honor, and there is a vast difference between peace with honor and peace at any price. If anyone asks what the hopes and the aspirations of the American Government and the American people are in regard to living together with our neighbors, I would point to our great neighbor of Canada to the north where we have a frontier of more than 3,000 miles stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Along that entire frontier there is not a single fort or military post of any type or character whatsoever. Our hope would be in our lifetime or that of our children other nations would be as civilized and as peaceloving as our great neighbor of Canada to the north so that not only in the Americas but in Europe and in Asia and in the Middle East people might live together as good neighbors as we live with our great neighbor of Canada to the north. But, if we are half as prudent as the men who gave us our Republic, if we are half as prudent as those who pioneered

the winning of the West, we will continue to hope and to pray for peace, but we will, like they, keep our powder dry. For we know that the age in which we find ourselves all nations are not as civilized or as peaceloving as are some of our friends to whom I have referred. I am reminded of a quotation out of one of Kipling's verses called the "Truce of the Bear." He said, "When he stands up like a tired man, tottering near and near; when he stands up as pleading, in wavering, man-brute guise; when he veils the hate and cunning of his little, swinish eyes; 'when he shows as seeking quarter, with paws like hands in prayer, that is the time of peril—the time of the truce of the bear'."

I think we must recognize that the mere fact that the Chinese Communists may accept an invitation to go to New York and discuss a cease-fire is no guaranty that while they are discussing they may not at the same time be fighting. I call your attention to the fact that when the negotiations at Panmunjom were going on some of the bitterest fighting of the Korean war took place. Why? because the Communist technique is to try to win victories and to break the morale of the opposition. When the great powers had gathered together at Geneva, out of a spirit of mercy the request had been made that they permit the evacuation of the wounded from the fortress of Dien Bien Phu. They turned it down and they insisted—while the countries were meeting—on reducing that fortress and causing a complete surrender of its garrison. So in that case the mere fact that they negotiate in no sense guarantees that they may not use the same time to cause us trouble if they can. There have been some who have suggested that perhaps, as a price of a temporary cease-fire, the Chinese Nationalist Government should be requested to give up fortress outposts of Quemoy and Matsu. This not only would be detrimental, in my judgment, to the defense of Formosa because it would open up the great harbors of Amoy and Foochou in which invasion fleets would be mobilized for the amphibious attack upon Formosa, but, in addition to that fact, it would be psychological defeat for the Republic of China, which again would be asked to give up more territory as the price of appeasement to the Chinese Communists. They will not be satisfied with any such price being paid, for they have publicly time and time again announced that their determination, regardless of our position and that of the free world, is to take Formosa by force. I do not know why it is that there are some nations in the world, who should know better, who constantly advocate that the free world retire and give up territory and give up human beings behind the Iron Curtain. I have never seen a suggestion from Mr. Nehru or any of the others that the Communist world give up some of its territory and free some of its people.

They suggest the doctrine of the two Chinas—a fatal policy. For in the first place neither the Communists or the Nationalists could possibly accept the doctrine of the two Chinas. You would not bring peace in the Pacific. You would make inevitable a conflict. Just as in the long term of history you cannot have two Germanys or two Koreas. But I am convinced that if we as a Government and we as a people only use the same courage and the same commonsense that motivated the men who sat at Philadelphia and under what I believe was divine inspiration gave us first our Declaration of Independence and later our Constitution of the United States, there are none of our domestic problems which we as a free people cannot solve, and there is no foreign foe we need ever fear.

Face the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following transcript of a television broadcast of Sunday, February 6, 1955:

FACE THE NATION

Guest: Representative Joseph W. Martin, Jr., Republican, of Massachusetts; Ted Koop, director of public affairs, CBS, Washington, moderator; William H. Lawrence, national correspondent for the New York Times; Jack Steele, Washington correspondent for Scripps-Howard newspapers; William K. Hutchinson, Washington bureau chief for International News Service.

Mr. KOOP. How do you do. And welcome to Face the Nation.

Mr. MARTIN, or, as many people call you, "Mr. Republican," we are particularly happy to have you with us today on your first appearance of this kind.

You are starting your 31st year as a Member of the House of Representative from Massachusetts. Today you are the minority, that is the Republican, floor leader. You and the Democrats' SAM RAYBURN have been swapping the title of "Mr. Speaker" back and forth for more years than we care to remember.

And, as you phrased it when you turned over the gavel to him last month, it's been a case of "Off agin, on agin, gone agin, Finnegan."

Next Saturday is Lincoln's birthday, and this week the Nation will resound with traditional Republican oratory. You, as "Mr. Republican," will be in the forefront of the celebrations, and within this oratory may well lie some of the answers to success or failure of President Eisenhower's legislative program, for which you are responsible in the Democratic-controlled House.

The storm signals are already flying on such issues as the size of the Army, the Dixon-Yates contract, and, above all, the serious situation in Formosa, where the answer may well be peace or war.

Millions of Americans are seeking responsible answers to these vital issues.

To direct their questions to you, here is our panel of newsmen:

Mr. William H. Lawrence, national correspondent for the New York Times; Mr. Jack Steele, Washington correspondent for the Scripps-Howard newspapers; and Mr. William K. Hutchinson, Washington bureau chief of International News Service.

Now, for the first question, Mr. Lawrence.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, are we heading into war in the Far East?

Mr. MARTIN. No; I don't think we are. I think the Formosa resolution showed strength and was the best guaranty I know of for peace. I believe that the—Red China, they are going as far as they possibly can go without fighting, and that they are testing the American people, but I don't believe there will be any war.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, there was, of course, remarkable unanimity on this action proposed by the President and approved by the Congress; and it is, of course, the hope of everybody who passed it that it doesn't mean war. But, do you expect any challenges, do you expect some skirmishes, perhaps, if not fighting?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, no one could say with certainty that there wouldn't be some skirmishes, but I don't think that it could lead to war. Because, after all, you must realize that Red China can't make any war with the United States. Red China is a country that has no manufacturing of ammunition, and no chemical industry; half of the freight of China is transported on human backs. A nation like that couldn't wage a successful war with the United States.

Mr. HUTCHISON. Mr. Speaker, along that line, I have heard estimates in the last few days that if the United States was forced into war with Red China, the United States would win within a possible 6 hours, or possibly it might last as long as 30 days.

What are your views on that?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, I am naturally conservative and don't want to go in for any extravagant claims; but I wouldn't think that Red China could hold out for 30 days.

Now, of course, they'll get, if they should get support from Communist Russia, which I doubt very much, that might keep some semblance of fighting going on, but it couldn't be much because you have to remember that Russia doesn't want to lose its existence, either. It isn't going to go into a hopeless engagement.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. You don't expect Russia to intervene, then, if the United States should go——

Mr. MARTIN. No; I don't think so because the Russian people must realize what happened to Hitler and those others—the other people who have challenged the free world. I don't believe that Russia would dare risk a general engagement.

Mr. KOOP. Gentlemen, just as we came on the air I was handed this Associated Press bulletin from Tokyo that reads:

"The Red Chinese Peiping radio says the United States 7th Fleet has been conducting military provocations near Chinese waters. The broadcast, which was heard in Tokyo, says the provocations threaten the peace and security of China and the Far East. The broadcast gives no clue as to whether the Communists would interfere with the Tachen evacuation, but, the Associated Press adds, it has an ominous sound."

Mr. MARTIN. Well, every sound that comes from the Far East will be ominous from now on, and, of course, I am a newspaperman, like you folks are, and we don't underwrite a story.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. MARTIN, the agreement yesterday between Nationalist China and our Government to evacuate the Tachens focuses the spotlight on two other island groups, Quemoy and Matsu. As you know, they are just off the coast of China and they are regarded as possible stepping stones for a Communist invasion of Formosa.

Do you think we should defend Quemoy and Matsu in event the Reds try to invade them?

Mr. MARTIN. I'll answer that question, which I had anticipated, by reading a quotation from a very famous statesman. He said:

"The belief that security can be obtained by throwing a small state to the wolves is a fatal delusion."

Those are the words of Mr. Churchill, of England, and I believe it. I believe it is necessary—and I think, from what I understand, what I gather, it is necessary—I believe that we shouldn't permit the Red Chinese to get these islands, which would make it easier for an attack on Formosa.

If we are going to defend Formosa and the Pescadores, we've got to make—defend it under the best possible conditions; and I agree with Churchill that giving another—a little more to—another little nibble, you might call it that—to the Red Chinese would not be the best way of defending Formosa.

Mr. STEELE. May I carry that one step further?

President Eisenhower has not given any public pledge to Chiang and the Nationalists that we will help them defend Quemoy and Matsu if they are invaded. At the same time,

administration spokesmen have been quoted as saying that we will.

Do you think it will be our policy, or is our policy now, to defend them in that case?

Mr. MARTIN. I would not want to anticipate what the President would do, or the State Department might make—recommend; but I do believe that it is wise not to make it too definite. I believe President Eisenhower should have all the leeway that he desires to do that which he thinks is best to establish the American viewpoint in Formosa.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Well, indeed, Mr. Speaker, the Congress did give him precisely that broad authority.

Mr. MARTIN. That's why we gave it to him.

Mr. LAWRENCE. In the face of efforts to restrict it.

Mr. MARTIN. That's right.

Mr. LAWRENCE. It did not include Quemoy and Matsu.

Mr. MARTIN. We wanted to give him a free hand because we can trust Mr. Eisenhower. And we know he is a soldier; he knows the dangers of war and peace, and he knows also how to protect the country; and so we did, with, I think, only three exceptions in both the House and the Senate, we gave him that authority.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Well, now——

Mr. KOOP. Go ahead, Mr. Lawrence.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to follow up a bit an answer which you gave to Mr. Hutchinson.

You said that you thought if war came, and you don't regard it as likely, but if it came, that you didn't think the Red Chinese could hold out for 30 days.

Mr. MARTIN. No; not as the Red Chinese.

Mr. LAWRENCE. By that are you talking about a limited kind of war, or are you talking about conquering the mainland of China?

Mr. MARTIN. Oh, well, what I mean is that they wouldn't be any formidable opposition after 30 days. They'd be so flattened out.

Wars can go for years, and—take the Philippine Insurrection, how many years that ran after war was practically at an end. I wouldn't say there wouldn't be some guerrilla warfare.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Where, sir? On the mainland of China?

Mr. MARTIN. Not with us, because we wouldn't send troops to the mainland.

Mr. LAWRENCE. That is what I was getting at. Are you talking about a successful defense, or resisting an attack based on these current operations, rather than a full-scale war with Red China?

Mr. MARTIN. Oh, I don't think there will be a full-scale war. It's not our policy, and I don't think it will be our policy to send any troops into the mainland. We, I think, are pretty unanimous, both Democrats and Republicans, as far as that's concerned.

Mr. LAWRENCE. I just wanted to bring that back into scope, because——

Mr. MARTIN. I am glad you did, so there will be no misunderstanding.

Mr. STEELE. May I follow that, one other step further: Do you think we might have to send our ground troops into Formosa, or into Quemoy or Matsu, to defend them in case of a Nationalist—or a Communist invasion of the Nationalist territory?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, of course, I am not a soldier, Jack, but I don't believe we would. I think the Chinese Nationalists have got troops enough to defend it with the aid of our Air Force and our Fleet. The Chinese Nationalists in the last 2 years have come a long way in being trained and equipped, and I think they have sufficient forces to defend themselves with our umbrella, so to speak.

Mr. KOOP. In such a case, you would not anticipate the Congress would issue a declaration of war, but would just let the President act under his new authority?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, I think, Ted, we probably would let him act under his authority, but you can never safely predict what Congress would do.

Mr. STEELE. Well, in a sense, Mr. Martin, didn't Congress, in this resolution, which passed so overwhelmingly, abdicate its power to declare war to the President?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, it makes a difference, Jack, what you mean by "declaring war."

There are wars that go along, and they are pretty good sized wars, too, but you make no declaration.

Mr. STEELE. But this war might be, perhaps, as violent and as vigorous and as large-scaled, perhaps, as the Korean war, without having a declaration of war.

Mr. MARTIN. We gave the President unreserved authority to defend Formosa and the Pescadores Islands, and he doesn't need to come to Congress, if he doesn't want to. He didn't need, I don't believe really, to ask for that authority. I think that's in his—although I understand that it was a twilight border, and he wanted to get this authority to, not only to have the united support of the people back of him, but also to clear up any doubt that might exist in anybody's mind.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Well, politically, you were drawing a bit of a contrast, were you not, between the handling of this one and the handling of Korea?

Mr. MARTIN. Why, there is no politics in foreign affairs, you know, Bill.

Mr. LAWRENCE. There never has been, you'll excuse me; it was just an oversight on my part, because I thought there was.

But, to return to the political thing, didn't you think that was a pretty remarkable demonstration of Republican and Democratic——

Mr. MARTIN. I though it was a remarkable demonstration of unity on both the Democratic and Republican sides.

Mr. KOOP. In view of this situation in the Far East, Mr. MARTIN, what do you think of the President's proposal to cut the size of the Army?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, I think it is a good suggestion, because, I'll tell you why: He is going to devote, he believes, as I understand it, in devoting more money for the atomic weapons that would keep war away from the United States.

You take, it would cost probably, if these additional soldiers were kept, about $2 million a year, which is a lot of money, and before those soldiers could ever be brought into action, in the event of war, before they could ever be brought into action, we'd have to provide the transportation to bring them over to across the water, and in that interval you could train all the men you wanted to.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Well, you do remember that we found ourselves caught a little short when we ran into an old-fashioned type of war in Korea.

Mr. MARTIN. Well, I don't think we are in that position today.

Yes, we were caught very well short in Korea.

I remember when the Tenth Army was being chased to the sea, we didn't have but one division in the United States that could be sent, and they didn't quite dare to send that because they thought it might be needed somewhere else; but we have come a long way in the last 2 or 3 years——

Mr. LAWRENCE. Well, aren't the Republicans and the administration taking a chance with this cutback in the Army, that if we should get into that kind of a situation again, the country would be pretty well up in arms about it, that there was this cutback with the possibility of that situation?

Mr. MARTIN. I don't think we'll get caught in that way.

Another thing to be thought of is this: You can collapse through spending just as well as you can collapse through assault on the battlefield, and apparently the Communist is intent on war some time or other, at least his actions would indicate that. He is only waiting for the day when he thinks he can safely attack. He knows he can't beat us now, and we've got to have—be able financially to continue that defense, so that hour he waits for will never come.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. You see a whole difference, a lot of difference between fighting in Korea and fighting in China; this time there won't be any river boundary that you can't go across.

Mr. MARTIN. Well, I would expect, Mister, if we got into any war, that all—we would fight to win.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. And with the atomic bomb, too, wouldn't we?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, I would expect we would——

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Atomic weapons.

Mr. MARTIN. Use all the weapons within the command of the American forces to win, because we can't—if we got forced into another engagement, we can't continue these frittering wars that fritter away the strength of America and not affecting the nation that is particularly seeking to put its ideology all over the world.

Mr. STEELE. Has something the President said convinced you that that would be the case, that we would attack the Chinese mainland and bomb it?

Mr. MARTIN. No, the President has never given me any intimation of what his course would be, and of course I wouldn't tell you if he had, to be perfectly frank about it, but I am not disturbed over the strength—

You know what I think? I think we, here, not so much in America but in many of the other nations of the world, and perhaps it's logical they should be, because they are nearer to the scene, I think the free world is losing because they fear Russia.

Mr. LAWRENCE. And this is a step in the other direction, you say——

Mr. MARTIN. Let them know that we are determined that there is going to be a free world, in this country, in this world.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Well, again, the answer you gave Mr. Hutchinson, it seems to me, I'd like to follow up a bit.

It's been suggested in very responsible quarters that we are not talking in terms of conflict here that would involve trying to destroy China; it would simply be to try to destroy any attack upon our forces or upon any attack which might be made against Formosa or in the related areas, which includes Quemoy and Matsu.

Mr. MARTIN. There isn't any question, the United States wants peace, and they are not going to be the aggressor, but we are not going to let Red China take islands that would make it so that we would be subject—that not only Japan and the Philippines and western coast of the United States would be open to attack.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Well, we've talked a lot in the last year about massive retaliation, the doctrine laid down by Mr. Dulles. It's been suggested in this occasion that massive retaliation is "out the window," that that is not what we are talking about.

Mr. MARTIN. We are not going to send soldiers over. I haven't got the slightest idea that we will send soldiers in millions, like we did in the other wars. No, I don't think that, I think that's out of the question. That's why it isn't necessary to have so many men on the mainland. We are building up a pretty good National Guard, we are developing reserves, we've got pretty good forces that could take care of anything that might happen, if we come under attack here.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Can I take you to politics for a moment?

Mr. MARTIN. Certainly.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. You've been, I think you have a world's record as serving as convention chairman—four times.

Mr. MARTIN. I don't know anything about the world's record; I have the record in America here.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Political party conventions, let me put it that way.

Do you intend to serve again in 1956 as chairman of the Republican Presidential Convention?

Mr. MARTIN. Bill, I'd even hate to think of it. That's the hardest job I know of. A chairman of conventions sees less of the convention than any man in the convention.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Except the reporters.

Mr. KOOP. Do you know where the Republicans are going to held their convention yet?

Mr. MARTIN. No; I do not. I suppose it will be between Chicago and Philadelphia, and, of course, Philadelphia is handicapped a bit because of its hotel situation; and, it is further handicapped by the decision of the Democrats to go to Chicago.

I don't necessarily mean that we've got to do what the Democrats do. I'd like once, if it could be brought about, for the Republicans to have their convention after the Democrats. I don't think it makes too much difference in 1956, but one year I'd like to try that just for the novelty of it.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Who are you going to nominate in 1956?

Mr. MARTIN. Personally, I believe that it will be inevitable that Mr. Eisenhower will be renominated and reelected.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Has he suggested to you that he would prefer not to run?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes. He has, but I will tell you a little story:

A year and a half ago, I, in an indiscreet moment perhaps, said in Wellesley, Mass., that I thought Mr. Eisenhower would be nominated and elected. The next—2 days later—I happened to be sitting next to him in the Gridiron dinner, and he says, "I saw what you said," and he says, "What would you bet on that?"

"Well," I says, "I am not a betting man, and I wouldn't bet."

I says, "No; let me tell you, Mr. President: I know you are sincere, and I know you believe what you say, but I've been here 30 years, and I know conditions develop that make it inevitable for a President to be—to accept another nomination and be reelected. Those things work that way."

And, in my judgment, they are getting more serious than I could have anticipated at that time. You have a foreign situation so tense and so—everybody wondering what is going to happen. He's an experienced man, a man that has been through it all. You have the soldier that knows how to fight a war, if one comes, which we all pray to God won't come. So, I think it's inevitable, his nomination and election.

Mr. STEELE. You think he would yield to that pressure?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, I'll tell you why I think he will.

They teach, at West Point and Annapolis, service to the country. Mr. Eisenhower has been taught to serve his country if the call comes. If the call comes, I don't think he would refuse.

Mr. STEELE. Well, despite your confidence——

Mr. MARTIN. That he could refuse.

Mr. STEELE. If he should refuse, does the Republican Party have a lot of other potential candidates around that you could go to, do you think?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, I haven't even thought of any more because I felt for a certainty that he would be the one.

Mr. KOOP. Now that the Democrats are in control of Congress, how are you getting along with them?

Mr. MARTIN. Oh; I always get along very well with the Democrats.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Going back to your 30 years, Mr. Speaker, in the Congress, you came here about 1924, didn't you?

Mr. MARTIN. That's right.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. What do you think of the seniority rule for bossing Congress?

Mr. MARTIN. For what?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. The seniority rule.

Mr. MARTIN. You mean in the committees——

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Committee chairmen.

Mr. MARTIN. I don't know; there are faults in that system but, frankly, I don't know of any system that is a better system.

Most any man who reaches the top of a committee has had years of service and years of study, and if he is of the caliber that he normally is, he makes a good chairman.

Now, there are exceptions. There are people that get there at the top that aren't; but I think, on the whole, that the—service is the only way you can pick a chairman.

Mr. LAWRENCE. To go back to the statement you made a while ago, that you always get along with the Democrats, I did a little research and find that on September 15, out in Louisville, Ky., 1954, when there was a campaign going on, you said this:

"Should the Democrats control the Congress, there would be a stalemate in Washington. That is something no thoughtful American wants to see happen."

Is your prophecy standing up, or——

Mr. MARTIN. I don't know yet. That will be dependent on how the Democrats take action on major parts of the Eisenhower legislation. Certainly anyone knows that it would be—that a stalemate in Congress, between the Congress and the President, is not desirable for the country. It's not a healthy picture, because you can't plan your program as you'd like to plan it. You can't put it through in the shape in which you always want it to go through.

Mr. STEELE. Do you see any signs——

Mr. MARTIN. What's that?

Mr. STEELE. Do you see any signs of this stalemate developing as yet in the action in the House?

Mr. MARTIN. Jack, we haven't started yet. We have—the committees are still working, and I think—of course, they are protesting; many Democrats were elected on the platform that they could support the President more efficiently than could the Republicans.

They haven't been given their chance. I think they will, in many instances, and I think occasionally, probably on a vital bill, the temptation, thinking of 1956, will be too much for them.

Mr. LAWRENCE. What is the—what are the big, vital bills that you see, that have just got to go through this year?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, there is the reciprocal-trade bill.

Mr. LAWRENCE. The Democrats will help on that; won't they?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes——

Mr. LAWRENCE. Probably more than the majority of the Republicans?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, I don't know. I'm not so sure about that, Bill. I did think so before the session started, but I have noticed that since the industry went down South, that there's been quite a parade of Alabama and Georgia and North Carolina and Louisiana people up and down to the well of the House, all preaching for protection. So, you see, you can't always anticipate what will happen.

Mr. LAWRENCE. You think somebody else's ox is being gored?

Mr. MARTIN. It's just as General Hancock said a great many years ago:

"A tariff is a local issue; when it gets so that it affects adversely any local industry, why, sometimes statesmanship vanishes."

Mr. KOOP. I believe you are making some Lincoln Day speeches down South this week, aren't you, Mr. MARTIN?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, I am. I am making 3 in Florida and 1 in Texas. It happens these speeches are for the most part in—where we elected a Republican Congressman last year, the party having had a beachhold, we are going to try to see if we can expand a little bit more.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Do you expect to win more Republican seats in the South next year?

Mr. MARTIN. We've got very substantial chances.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. In Florida?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, we might get 2 more; that may amaze you, but there are 2 good chances, and of course we are not going to——

Mr. HUTCHINSON. What about Texas?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, I wouldn't say too much about Texas, although we have—if they redistrict Texas, and cut up Houston, it will take one of the Houston districts.

Mr. LAWRENCE. When is that up; is that up this year?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, it can always be up, because they have a Congressman at Large in Texas, and at some time or other they get around to redistricting.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. MARTIN, I would like to get in a question——

Mr. MARTIN. And in Houston is where probably the break would come, because Houston has got more people than two Congressmen would take care of.

Mr. STEELE. I would like to get in a question that some of your colleagues consider rather touchy.

As you know, the House Judiciary Committee has reported out a bill to increase the pay of Members of Congress from $15,000 to $25,000 a year.

I wondered whether you are going to be for that; have you made up your mind?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, Jack, I don't know. It hasn't come out. I think they are going to report it out on Tuesday. I think that—I don't know what the amount will be when it finally comes out of committee, but I am frank to admit, this doesn't apply to me so much because I'm a single man and don't have the demands upon my purse that a great many other people would. But these young men, the very type of men you want in Congress, they are coming in with a couple of boys they have to send to college, and girls that they have to send to school, and they are unable to live on the salary that they get, and I think it is better for the country to pay them satisfactory salaries.

Mr. KOOP. Since you brought it up, how have you managed to remain a bachelor all this time? I can ask the question which the married men here cannot.

Mr. MARTIN. And I am glad you asked, rather than Bill.

Because I haven't had any great temptations——

Mr. KOOP. Thank you, Mr. MARTIN, for facing the Nation, and answering the questions being asked today by our panel of correspondents: Mr. William Lawrence, of the New York Times; Mr. Jack Steele, of the Scripps-Howard newspapers; and Mr. William K. Hutchinson, of the International News Service.

Some Lessons of Our International Experience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk the text of an address which I was pleased to deliver last Thursday night in Dayton, Ohio, to the Dayton Council of World Affairs. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME LESSONS OF OUR INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE: THE DANGER OF APPEASEMENT AND THE DANGER OF CHARACTERIZING ALL NEGOTIATION AS APPEASEMENT

(Address by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin)

It is a great privilege to address this outstanding organization.

I am talking tonight to leaders in this community and its surrounding area, leaders in constructive thinking on America's position in world affairs.

DAYTON: CENTER OF THE AIR AGE

It is most appropriate that we consider America's future course in this great city of Dayton whose plants and laboratories produce so vast a quantity of goods for America's security, as well as for our ever-higher standard of living.

It was a fortunate choice for America's welfare that placed the Wright-Patterson Air Base in your area.

The Wright Air Development Center spends, I understand, more than 75 percent of all funds allocated for Air Force research. It has contracts assigned to over 130 colleges and universities in addition to commercial laboratories and manufacturers. This research money is as integral a part of future American defense as is the Strategic Air Force, or the Continental Air Defense Command, or any of the other indispensable arms of United States security which depend so crucially on research.

Fortunately, the leadership of Dayton in science and invention is not a new thing. Many Daytonians who are living today knew the modest pioneer inventors, Orville and Wilbur Wright, thanks to whose efforts man first took wing, thus ushering in a new age of speed and opportunity and challenge.

One of the great inventors of our time "Boss" Kettering, chairman of the Department of Commerce's National Inventors' Council, calls Dayton home. This Council by the way, is in my judgment, one of the outstanding instrumentalities for American strength in this atomic age. Unfortunately, in the postwar years, it has practically been starved for funds, but I have hopes that we are going to see some constructive changes in that picture.

The inventive genius of America, joined with the inventive genius of other Allied Nations, is one of our greatest assets in the critical race—with the Soviet Union—for technological superiority.

"Research, research, and more research"—pure and applied research—these are the indispensable ingredients for our survival.

You, here in Dayton, a center of the Air Age—know that we of America cannot rest on previous laurels or live in an outmoded past. You know that we cannot, in this contracted world, live unto ourselves alone. You know that the free, peace-loving nations must stand together or they will fall separately.

You know that the moth-eaten arguments of the isolationists, the backward longers for a so-called "Fortress America", are as impractical as the horse and buggy in this jet age of supersonic flight.

Peace is only attainable by the strong, the forward-looking, the bold.

SEVERAL SIGNIFICANT CURRENT PROBLEMS

Now, as we look around this fast changing world of the atomic age, we see innumerable phases of foreign policy which command our attention. The most obvious phase is, of course, the crisis in the western Pacific.

But there are a great many other problems as well, less dramatic, perhaps, less urgent, but in the long run, equally or almost as significant.

I refer, for example, to the challenge of implementing the inspiring "Atoms for Peace Program," which was advanced by President Eisenhower in his unforgettable address to the United Nations General Assembly on December 8, 1953.

I refer to the future of the U. N. itself and to possible revision of the U. N. Charter;

I refer to the vital world economic problem, to the conference in Geneva on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and other phases of the problem of increased worldwide exchange of goods and services;

I refer to the nationalist and racial and economic ferment in the huge underdeveloped regions of the earth, the scene of communism's most spectacular advances—in the recent past, and, unless we are alert and adequate, possibly in the early future.

But since time will not permit my attempting to cover these important questions, let me turn to the immediate problem in the Pacific. And then let us look at a few of the overall lessons which we have learned on the international scene.

LITTLE MARGIN FOR ERROR TODAY

Why learn these lessons?

The reason we must do so is that, as one wise man well said:

"Those who ignore the errors of history are condemned to repeat those errors."

And another thinker said:

"Every time history repeats itself, the price goes up."

Today, it is particularly important that we profit from the lessons of the past. Why? Because we have little margin for error in today's world.

In times past, diplomats or military leaders or politicians could make mistakes. The consequences of their mistakes were usually rather limited—by today's standards.

But today the results of international error, the results or miscalculations are potentially so ominous as to give pause to any thinking individual anywhere in the world.

The decisions which we make must be the right ones—and they must be timed right.

This does not mean that we can be certain in advance that they are indeed the right ones. On the contrary, almost anything we do or don't do involves risks. Invariably, our choices are between several possibilities, none of which is particularly appealing, and all of which are fraught with varying degrees of danger.

CONGRESS' FORMOSA RESOLUTION A BOLD STEP FOR PEACE

When Congress so overwhelmingly enacted the joint resolution relating to Formosa, the Pescadores, and related areas, there could be no guaranty of the resolution's success in deterring war in the Pacific.

But the fact of the matter is that the alternative to our passing that resolution was an almost certain guarantee of failure.

And so, we chose a path of strength and firmness. We did so with due deliberation and in one of the great historic demonstrations of executive-legislative teamwork in our time.

Thus the test which we must continue to apply is: not which path is certain to bring us peace, but which path is relatively more likely than other paths to bring us peace.

When you are making history, as we particularly of the Atlantic community are, by our system of collective security—there is no guaranty that history will occur ultimately the way we want it.

But if you leave it to others to make history—particularly if you leave the initiative to the force of international communism—you can be quite sure that the contents of tomorrow's pages in history books will not be anything like what you and I would want them.

COMPLEX EVENTS INTERACT

Making history constructively is not easy. It cannot be done at any one place and in only one way.

The Pacific crisis is a striking illustration of how events breaking in the four corners of the world interact on one another. You cannot simply keep your eye on Matsu or Quemoy, you must keep pace with developments almost everywhere. The recent events have been breaking principally in 7 places: In the committees and on the floor of the United States Congress; in the Conference of Commonwealth Prime Ministers in London; at United Nations headquarters in New York; in the Kremlin in Moscow; in Peking, headquarters of the so-called Chinese People's Republic; in Taipeh, capital of Formosa and of our brave Nationalist Chinese ally; and in the embattled Straits of Formosa themselves.

Some people, however, refuse to open up their eyes to these facts.

They refuse to acknowledge the nature of today's world is such that we cannot assume to contribute to it alone from the capital of our own country. We cannot wave a magic wand in Washington, D. C., or anywhere else in our land and have history as we would want it. We must work and consult with our friends and allies in many different places, and, yes, we must talk with our foes as well—a point to which I shall refer again later on.

Only a child believes that daddy can remake the world exactly the way the child wants it. A mature adult knows that we can and should do our part for a better world, but we must not assume that we are omnipotent or omniscient.

THE LESSON OF THE FOLLY OF APPEASEMENT

We should have learned this from the past.

But now what about those overall lessons to which I referred earlier?

The very first lesson which I shall elaborate on is the lesson of the folly of appeasement.

I need not spell out to you in detail that the world has learned to its sorrow that you can never succeed in satisfying the appetite of a criminal by offering him new victims.

In the 1930's, we witnessed the criminal aggression, step by step, nation by nation, of the Axis Powers.

In the latter part of World War II, and in the postwar years, we witnessed step by step the aggression of international communism and its enslavement of peoples.

We should know now that communism cannot be appeased. We should know that it respects only strength. We should know that surrender of one free nation to it only paves the way for the Politburo's demanding the surrender of additional free peoples. We should know that appeasement whets the Communist appetite, increases the Communists' disrespect for the free world, tempts it to further aggression.

THE DANGER OF TERMING ALL NEGOTIATION AS "APPEASEMENT"

At the same time, I want to state very clearly that there is a danger of "going overboard" and characterizing every effort to negotiate—through strength—with the Communists, as so-called appeasement.

I say that there are some quarters in the United States that seem to think that any and every reasonable effort which we make—even with utmost caution and care—in trying to sit down with the Communists and work out our problems at the United Nations or at other international conferences constitutes "appeasement."

"Appeasement" has become such an evil label that it is being used irresponsibly by some to smear reasonable diplomatic efforts.

I say that it is not appeasement to explore every possible basis for a stable, workable system of peace.

It is definitely not appeasement to talk face to face with the Red Chinese, as the

United Nations Secretary General did at Peiping, or as the United Nations has sought to do in connection with the proposed cease-fire in the Formosa Strait.

It is not the act of talking with the Communists which is appeasement. It is what might conceivably be said to the Communists at the talk which theoretically could constitute appeasement.

But I say we need have little fear that Secretary of State John Foster Dulles or U. N. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge—two great courageous public servants—will talk appeasement. So, I say, give them a chance, give our other allied and neutralist diplomats a chance to talk, to explore, to evaluate, rather than mistakenly label every discussion as "appeasement."

There are some people, however (and I do not question their patriotic motive) who seem to want to slam the door to all east-west talk. These are the people who talk irresponsibly of "our getting out of the United Nations." These are the people who want us to proceed unilaterally, independent of our allies, independent of the U. N., in attempting now—all by ourselves—an arbitrary naval blockade of the more than 2,000 miles of Chinese coast.

Some likeminded people—the extremists in this group—even seem to want to throw ultimatums at Red China. They, of course, ignore what could happen if the ultimatum deadline were to pass.

Yes, some few of these extremists talk loosely of a "showdown now with Red China," as if we were doomed unless we were to force issues to a head within the next few days or weeks.

"PREVENTIVE WAR TALK" IS NONSENSE

Fortunately, these people are in the minority—a very tiny minority. Fortunately, the responsible leadership of the United States Government, executive and legislative, totally rejects this type of an "all-or-nothing" concept, of a "showdown now" concept.

You and I know that the concept of a so-called preventive war which is implied by a very few extremists—all of whom are out of office—is sheer madness. A preventive war actually means world war III—in all its horror. This absurd concept has gotten exactly nowhere, and will get exactly nowhere with our countrymen. Moscow, kindly note. Your propaganda to the contrary is a lie and you know it. Peace is and always has been our mission.

We are grateful that the man who occupies the White House today is a man of peace. He has seen war in all its fury and bitterness and devastation. He has seen young men under his command make the supreme sacrifice. He has seen the tragic aftermath of war in the wrecked minds and bodies in the Nation's veterans hospitals. So, Dwight D. Eisenhower is determined to maintain peace and the American people are determined to give him every possible support in his patient efforts for peace.

It will not be—it could not be—a peace of appeasement. But neither can it possibly be a peace which refuses all diplomatic face-to-face exchanges, a peace which spurns efforts at reasonable negotiation—from strength.

Now, before I leave this matter of the problem in the Pacific, let me point out that the next move is squarely up to Red China. If the Peking government and the Moscow-government desire war (which I for one doubt) then the world will recognize that the sole blame for whatever ensues is at the doorstep of Peking and Moscow.

For ourselves we desire peace, security and freedom in the Pacific and elsewhere.

We are not looking for trouble. We do not want trouble. But neither are we running away from trouble.

Now, no man here can foretell what Red China will choose to do in the Western Pacific.

My own feeling is that the strong demonstration of American unity and American toughness will deter Peking from starting a chain reaction which could lead to world war.

The long-run danger I feel is really elsewhere, as in southeast Asia. The Formosa Straits issue should not blind us to ominous events there and in other areas.

DANGER IN OTHER THEATERS

I refer, for example to the disturbing intensification of Red activity in the Republic of Indonesia. There, a Communist party, reputedly 500,000 strong is wielding increasing power.

But, that is not the only danger sign. Inflation, guerrilla war and other difficulties are also occurring in this land which, by all rights, should be a garden of Eden. But due to a combination of circumstances, Indonesia is unfortunately experiencing serious internal difficulties—which provide ideal setting for the Reds to exploit.

As for ourselves, we have nothing but good will for Indonesia. We wish naught but peace and prosperity and freedom for this vast nation which emerged less than a half-decade ago from colonial rule. It is our earnest hope that the forces of freedom in Indonesia will find it possible adequately to protect that land from Communist imperialism.

DANGER OF STRAIGHTJACKETING PRESIDENT

But now, let us turn to a second lesson of our recent past.

It is the lesson that the Chief Executive of our country must remain in a strong position to fulfill his Constitutional authority.

Our experience with respect to the Formosan crisis is a complete vindication of the position which many of us had taken last year on the controversy over treaties and executive agreements.

You will remember that in the 83d Congress, the Senate soundly rejected efforts which would have attempted seriously to limit the treatymaking powers of the President of the United States and the powers of making executive agreements.

It was our position that there are more than ample safeguards under the Constitution against any Executive abuse of power.

We contended that the nature of the atomic age is such that the President of the United States must at all times be in a position to take emergency action with our allies—action necessary for the protection of our country. Such action would always, of course, be within the framework of the Chief Executive's constitutional authority.

On the other hand, our opponents (who were then fortunately in the minority and who are today in a still smaller minority) contended the reverse. They preferred in effect to straitjacket the hands of the President. They were so fearful of abuse of power that they wanted very little power to be exercised without the most detailed congressional supervision.

I, for one, throughout the debate, had pointed out that no one could possibly foresee the many types of emergencies which might arise which might require almost split-second decision by the executive branch.

EVENTS HAVE DEBUNKED OPPOSITION ARGUMENTS

I contended that it would gravely weaken American foreign policy if the strongest Nation in the world, to whom all freemen look, were to paralyze the one man who, under the Constitution, is supposed to spearhead our foreign policy—the Chief Executive.

Now, my contentions and those of many individuals who supported this position, have been completely sustained. The opposition has been flattened—not by words, but by events—whether they realize it or not.

Many of those who wanted to tie the hands of the Chief Executive practically did a complete flip-flop once they were confronted with the Formosa crisis. Most of them said nothing about the considerable power which was being confirmed as residing in the Chief Executive's hands.

Some who did speak, emphasized that, in their judgment, there was really no alternative but to pass the joint resolution.

I want to commend these men with whom I have disagreed for recognizing the hard facts of the international situation.

I hope, however, tht they will realize that the Formosa crisis was not a rare exception. It is the sort of crisis which may recur on many occasions in many places in the future—when international communism prepares a thrust and when the Chief Executive must be in a position to parry that thrust.

THE LESSON OF "DOING THE IMPOSSIBLE"

The third and last lesson to describe within the available time—another lesson that we should have learned—is that the word "impossible" should rarely be used in foreign affairs. "Impossible" is usually used by gloomy pessimists to justify a status quo position.

Some people dismally assumed it was impossible to set up an effective United Nations Organization or to make the Marshall plan work, or the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, or now the Southeast Asia Alliance.

They assumed that it was impossible to make the Organization of American States a dynamic entity.

As a matter of fact, every time we have tried to progress in international relations the gloom mongers have said that it "couldn't be done." But usually it has been done. We have made substantial progress. We have done the so-called impossible in all the instrumentalities which I have just mentioned.

Further, I cite to you the situation in the troubled Middle East. Certainly here is an area in which there are difficulties which would faze even the most optimistic negotiator.

Yet what do we see? We see a skilled Presidential envoy, Eric Johnston, patiently making splendid progress toward an historic Arab-Israel agreement on Jordanian and other water, long considered a so-called impossible objective.

Now, too, we see Iraq prepared to enter into an agreement with our stanch friend, Turkey, thus complementing the Turkish-Pakistani Alliance already existing in a necessary northern tier of security.

We see, too, that the so-called impossible dispute over the Suez Canal has been settled; the so-called impossible Iranian oil impasse resolved.

Now, I do not mean to imply that we can expect miracles. I do not mean to imply that all disputes are capable of quick solution, because obviously they are not. But what I do mean is that there are very few, if any, problems which do not yield to progressive change if we are willing to dedicate our abilities and our hearts to the cause.

We have seen our great Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, travel tirelessly around the world in the cause of peace. We have seen him time and again snatch diplomatic victory from the jaws of apparent defeat. We have seen his great spiritual faith vindicated by the resolving of apparent deadlocks and defeats, as when EDC was transformed into a Western European Union.

Let us, therefore, share the President's and Mr. Dulles' faith.

Let us give no heed to the gloom-mongers, who assume that what exists today will exist tomorrow, or that evil will grow stronger and good weaker, that tension will give way only to increased tension.

Let us have faith that we can make progress, and I say, we will indeed make progress.

CONCLUSION

It is on this sound note of faith that I should like to conclude. It is on this note of realistic optimism that I should like to

turn this subject over to your own consideration.

I began by stating that it is appropriate that here in Dayton, a great center of aeronautical research, that you and I ponder America's future in world affairs.

The essence of research is faith—faith that we can unlock the mysteries of nature, the mysteries of the atom, the mysteries of time and space.

The essence of research is courage—the courage to look forward and not backward.

You of the Dayton Council on World Affairs are similarly dedicated to blazing new trails for America.

As the scientist in his laboratory pierces the veil of the future, so you in this council seek to have us pierce the past mists of international prejudice, of blindness, of fear, and emerge into the clear light of peace and progress and faith.

Few missions could be more important for a citizen or for a public official.

Thanks for your kind attention, and good luck to you all.

Progress in Reverse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address which I had prepared for delivery before the antitrust law section of the New York State Bar Association, New York, on January 26, 1955.

Unfortunately, because of the meeting of the Senate on that day, I was unable to deliver the address personally. Instead, it was delivered by the very competent and able counsel for the Antimonopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, Mr. Sidney Davis, to whose work on the subcommittee I wish to pay high tribute. I have been informed by Mr. Davis that the subject matter of the address gave rise to some interesting discussions at the meeting.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRESS IN REVERSE

(Address of Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee)

The general theme of today's session is given as Antitrust Law Progress. For reasons which I shall endeavor to make clear the title of my address is Progress in Reverse.

As the antimonopoly subcommittee pointed out in a report printed Monday, January 23: "The attention of the country has been focused more and more on the gathering momentum of the corporate merger movement. Our economy was subjected to its first great merger movement in the two decades, 1885–1905. A second significant wave of corporate mergers took place in the latter part of the 1920's * * *. Against this background, it is understandable that the third great corporate merger movement in our history, now in progress, should be the subject of widespread public, governmental, and congressional concern."

As I look at what has become of our antitrust laws in very recent years, and note the continuing increase in economic concentration and the wave of industrial mergers now taking place, I am reminded of the story of a recent atomic bomb explosion which took place down in my part of the country. After everyone had been moved to a safe distance, the bomb was set off, creating an enormous hole in the ground. The experts went to the edge of the chasm, peered over the side, and much to their astonishment saw at the bottom a human figure who slowly picked himself up off the ground and then began to climb to the top. When he reached the top, they found themselves confronted to their further amazement with a gaunt old man dressed in an old Confederate uniform and carrying an old Confederate musket. The man shook the dust from his clothes, looked into the chasm, sighed, and said, "I don't care what General Lee says, I'm giving up."

Back in 1946, as chairman of a Subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee, I issued a 432-page report on the then current status of the antitrust laws, entitled "United States versus Economic Concentration and Monopoly." In our report we stated that: "Concentration of economic power is a constantly moving, powerful force which can only be fought by an aggressive and consistent Federal legislative program, followed up by a steadily continuing active enforcement of antitrust laws by the executive agencies." After making an industry-by-industry analysis of the concentration problem and a detailed investigation of the operations and effectiveness of the antitrust agencies, we concluded that "the imprint of failure is everywhere." In retrospect, all I can say is that if "failure" was the right word for 1946, the right word for today is "calamity." The temptation is strong indeed to echo the sentiments of the old Confederate veteran.

Let us consider some of the differences between then and now. There is first the subject of appropriations, a matter of prime interest to the antitrust agencies. In the late forties and early fifties appropriations for the antitrust agencies were on the increase; between 1946 and 1953 appropriations for the Federal Trade Commission rose by 92 percent, while those for the Antitrust Division increased by 106 percent. Despite these increases the resources available to the antitrust agencies were pathetically inadequate. Yet, since 1953 the trend has been in the opposite direction; between 1953 and 1955 appropriations have fallen 3 percent for the Federal Trade Commission and 11 percent for the Antitrust Division.

Then what has become of the Government's efforts to break up existing monopolies? In 1946 we had grounds to be reasonably hopeful on this score. In its decision in the Aluminum case handed down in 1945 the special court headed by Justice Learned Hand held that 90 percent control of an industry by one company was sufficient and that 64 percent control might be sufficient to constitute a violation of the Sherman Act. In the Tobacco case decided a year later the Supreme Court stated that it welcomed the opportunity to endorse certain statements in the Aluminum case opinion, which were to the effect that a monopoly cannot be disassociated from its power, that its power cannot be dissasociated from its exercise, and that if 90 percent of the ingot producers had combined it would have constituted an unlawful monopoly. On May 31, 1946 the then Attorney General, Mr. Tom Clark, announced a new program designed to break up existing monopolies, stating that the times required that competition be restored "by the seldom used processes of divestiture, divorcement and dissolution." The cases instituted in the next few years against the United Shoe Machinery Co., the major meatpacking companies, the Western Electric Co. and A. T. & T., the Du Pont Co., and General Motors were all part of this program. But where is any dissolution program today?

Perhaps the bitterest pill is what has happened in the field of mergers and acquisitions. In 1946 we were striving to plug up the long-standing loophole in section 7 of the Clayton Act, and we had every reason to believe that once this had been done, the Government would at long last be able to put a halt to competition-destroying mergers. Finally, after a truly incredible amount of work the Celler-Kefauver Antimerger Act was passed in 1950. As anyone who reads its legislative history and the accompanying committee reports must agree, this is a strong and potentially far-reaching measure. Yet what use has been made of it? According to the Federal Trade Commission 2,300 mergers and acquisitions were reported to have taken place between 1951 and 1953. If the merger movement continued at the same rate through 1954, this would mean a total of around 3,000 mergers and acquisitions since the act was passed. I am not contending for a moment that all mergers are necessarily harmful in and of themselves. Yet it is almost inconceivable that out of this total there are not at least scores which might have adverse effects upon competition. Against this wave of merger activity what have the antitrust agencies done? We find that the Federal Trade Commission has issued 3 complaints and the Department of Justice has announced in the case of 1 proposed merger that it will object, should the merger take place. No final orders of any kind have yet been issued. So the box score reads, out of probably scores of times at bat, 4 hits and no runs.

There are still other issues where the promise of yesterday is the despair of today. Take, for example, the matter of basing point pricing. In 1946 we were most hopeful that the Supreme Court would uphold the Federal Trade Commission in the Cement case and that we would at last be rid of the evil, restrictive effects of this monopolistic price-fixing device. Insofar as the Court's decision is concerned, our hopes proved to be not unfounded. But what use has been made of that magnificent legal victory? During the last 2 years accounts have appeared in the press suggesting that industries which, following the Cement decision, abandoned the basing point system, have been quietly returning to it, or to something which closely resembles it.

Or, as another example, we did not dream back in 1946 that in an antitrust case the Supreme Court would turn back the clock and make the question of subjective intent paramount above all other considerations, even the effect on competition. But that is exactly what did happen when the court handed down its decision in the Standard Oil of Indiana case. As a result "good faith" is now a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination. As Senators MAGNUSON, LANGER, and I said in a report dealing with this decision: "We do not think that good faith should be paramount and controlling above all else. * * * We know of no other statute, past or present, in which good faith licenses a person to violate the prohibitions of the law with impunity and without interference. The controlling consideration must be the actual effect on competition, not the question of good faith."

The crippling effects of that decision can be seen in the fact that since it was handed down, the Federal Trade Commission under its new administration has not issued a cease and desist order in a single contested Robinson-Patman Act case in which the good faith defense was offered.

I could go on to cite other illustrations of deterioration in the antitrust laws and in antitrust enforcement, but these examples should make it clear why I have entitled my address, "Progress in Reverse".

As serious as these setbacks have been, they may well be overshadowed by a new development which casts a threatening shadow over the entire structure of the antitrust laws. I am referring to the current agitation not only to revive but to extend the so-called Rule of Reason.

There is something plausible about the phrase "Rule of Reason," which, unfortunately has a peculiar semantic appeal. The semantics are also beguiling for other terms, such as "workable competition" and "taking all relevant economic factors into consideration," terms which appear with such frequency in current antitrust literature, and which seem to be the modern-day synonyms of the "Rule of Reason."

Apart from its plausible sound, the term "Rule of Reason," as every member of this audience knows, is a term of art, with a special, and to my way of thinking, deplorable meaning of its own. Since first handed down in the Standard Oil case in 1911, it has probably done more damage to the effective enforcement of the antitrust laws than all other rulings combined. Let us recall the prophetic words of Justice Harlan in his vigorous dissent in that case. Pointing out that the Supreme Court had on two previous occasions refused to accept this doctrine, Justice Harlan stated:

"But my brethren, in their wisdom, have deemed it best to pursue a different course. They have now said to those who condemn our former decision and who object to all legislative prohibitions of contracts, combinations and trusts in restraint of interstate commerce, 'You may now restrain such commerce, provided you are reasonable about it; only take care that the restraint is not undue.' * * * When Congress prohibited every contract, combination, or monopoly, in restraint of commerce, it prescribed a simple, definite rule that all could understand and which could be easily applied by everyone wishing to obey the law, and not to conduct their business in violation of the law. But now, it is to be feared, we are to have, in cases without number, the constantly recurring inquiry—difficult to solve by proof—whether the particular contract, combination, or trust involved is or is not an 'unreasonable' or 'undue' restraint of trade." (221 U. S. 102, 103 emphasis in original.)

Before this audience I need not dwell upon the catastrophic effects of the introduction of this doctrine into the enforcement of the Sherman Act, particularly with respect to dissolution cases. Against the known record of the carnage which it has wrought, it is hard to realize that this doctrine is not only being strongly urged as the standard of lawfulness, but is apparently receiving increasing acceptance.

It may have been forgotten in some quarters, but one of the principal reasons behind the enactment of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act in 1914 was the desire of Congress to pass legislation to which the "rule of reason" would not be applicable. The legislative history leaves no room for doubt on this issue. Thus the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee in its report of February 26, 1913 on what became the Federal Trade Commission Act recognized that the Sherman Act had become subject to the "rule of reason," and stated that because of that very fact new legislation was needed to which this doctrine would not apply. Referring to the majority decision in the Standard Oil case, the committee said:

"The fair conclusion is that it is now the settled doctrine of the Supreme Court that only undue or unreasonable restraints of trade are made unlawful by the Sherman Antitrust Act, and that in each instance it is for the Court to determine whether the established restraint of trade is a due restraint or an undue restraint."

Then after making it clear that it had "full confidence" in the "integrity, intelligence and patriotism" of the Supreme Court, the committee went on to state that—

"It is unwilling to repose in that court or any other court, the vast and undefined power which it must exercise in the administration of the statute under the rule which it has promulgated. It substitutes the court in the place of Congress, for whenever the rule is invoked the court does not administer the law, but makes the law. If it continues in force, the Federal courts will, so far as restraint of trade is concerned, make a common law for the United States just as the English courts have made a common law for England.

"The people of this country will not permit the courts to declare a policy for them with respect to this subject. * * * It is inconceivable that in a country governed by a written Constitution and statute law the courts can be permitted to test each restraint of trade by the economic standard which the individual members of the court may happen to approve." (62d Cong., 3d sess., S. Rept. No. 1326, p. 10.)

It is gratifying for me to note that Judge Medina, speaking for the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, made the same interpretation of Congressional intent in his recent decision in the Dictograph case. This case involves exclusive dealing contracts which, the court held, were in violation of section 3 of the Clayton Act. In discussing the legislative history of this section Judge Medina stated:

"With respect to exclusive-dealing contracts, the evident impulsion toward including a specific proscriptive provision was the desire on the part of the Congress to overrule by legislation an earlier decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals * * * upholding, as not violative of the Sherman Act, what was tantamount to the refusal, by a leading producer of chewing tobacco, to sell to a dealer because the dealer would not agree to deal exclusively in the seller's products * * * It was to make sure that the Sherman Act 'rule of reason' would not be employed to validate further transactions of such a patently undesirable nature that the proscriptive provision under discussion was thought necessary. It is hardly likely that the insertion of the qualifying phrase, 'where the effect * * * may be to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly,' was intended to reinstate the same Sherman Act tests which had, at that very time, been determined to be inadequate." (*Dictograph Products Inc.* v. *Federal Trade Commission*, October term, 1954.)

Frankly I have become increasingly distressed by signs that the Federal Trade Commission, is reading the "Rule of Reason" into parts of the law where it is no longer applied by the Supreme Court, or what is worse, reading it into other parts of the law where Congress never intended it to apply. The essential question is whether the requirements now being imposed as to the amount and type of evidence constitutes in effect the adoption of the "Rule of Reason." I am concerned particularly with recent actions by the Federal Trade Commission in requiring extensive and perhaps unnecessary bodies of evidence.

The best description of what I am worried about appears in the November 1954 issue of Fortune magazine, entitled "The Urge to Merge." Referring to the Department of Justice's case against the Du Pont Co. for monopolizing the cellophane industry, the article states that, "Unless the decision is reversed by the Supreme Court, the case appears to have shifted antitrust enforcement policy back to the 'rule of reason' of the 1920's." The article then goes on to say:

"Essentially, this means that management, using its own data, can itself decide how much of a market it can exploit safely through a merger without inviting an antitrust action. Economists and statisticians, in other words, take the place of lawyers in helping management reach decisions of this kind. How good this is for the economy and how much it will lessen competition only the future will tell. Rule-of-reason enforcement has undoubtedly slowed down enforcement of antitrust; neither the Department of Justice nor the Federal Trade Commission has the budget or trained personnel to watch the markets constantly and move against a company or a group of them trying to rig one. The threat of antitrust action probably will stop flagrant attempts to minimize competition, but it need not stop a merger if management's conception of the market position after merger is sound in antitrust terms. If Eugene Grace, for example, believes that the proposed merger of Bethlehem and Youngstown will strengthen competition in the steel industry (and many outsiders believe it will), chances are the merger will go through."

I realize, of course, that no journal speaks officially for the administration. At the same time, however, Fortune is a most reputable organ which, before publishing such an article, could certainly be expected to have familiarized itself with the administration's views. Moreover, the emphasis upon the rule of reason as the test of what is sound in antitrust terms is, of course, wholly in keeping with the general philosophy of Professor Oppenheim who, after all, is the cochairman of the Attorney General's committee on antitrust law revision. If this passage represents anything approaching an accurate reflection of the administration's views, the area of difference between the administration's interpretation of congressional intent and the interpretation made by those of us in Congress who sponsored and supported the measure is rather wide.

There is a possible historical parallel here which is worth noting. Several years before the Supreme Court established the "rule of reason" in its decision in the Standard Oil case, a bill was introduced to accomplish this same result through legislation. On behalf of the Senate Judiciary Committee Senator Nelson in 1909 reported adversely on the bill and it subsequently died. In his report Senator Nelson stated:

"The injection of the rule of reasonableness or unreasonableness would lead to the greatest variableness and uncertainty in the enforcement of the law. The defense of reasonable restraint would be made in every case and there would be as many rules of reasonableness as cases, courts and juries. A court or jury in Ohio might find a given agreement or combination reasonable, while a court and jury in Wisconsin might find the same agreement and combination unreasonable * * * To amend the Antitrust Act, as suggested by this bill, would be to entirely emasculate it, and for all practical purposes render it nugatory as a remedial statute." (Cited and quoted in 221 U. S. 96, 97.)

What Congress refused to enact in 1909, the Supreme Court read into the law in 1911. The Federal Trade Commission may be sorely tempted to emulate the Supreme Court of 45 years ago. It may be sorely tempted, but I trust it will not do so.

The daily press tells us that American business is today combining, uniting, grouping and regrouping, merging, remerging and merging again. Competition as a way of life is under constant attack and small, independent business is on the decline. I, therefore, think it is of the utmost importance that Congress develop facts concerning the scope of the merger movement, the extent and strength of the thrust toward monopoly, and the decline of competition in our economic life.

Congress needs to make an examination into the rise of new financial and industrial oligarchies, and highly integrated forms of business and management. Congress needs to examine business practices aimed at limiting or eliminating competition. The investigation which our subcommittee conducted of monopoly in the power industry should be continued and broadened and deepened, so that the Congress may be fully informed as to the extent of monopolistic abuses which threaten a repetition of the

Insull-Hopson scandal. We need a full-scale inquiry into the growth of monopoly, its withering effects upon the small business of this country, and its effect upon our free competitive economy.

Perhaps new and better tools and policies of enforcement are called for. Meanwhile, it is important that the executive branch make the best use possible of the tools now at its disposal. Congress meanwhile must concern itself not only with its important policymaking function in the field of monopoly but also with enforcement of these policies by the executive branch of the Government.

I can emphasize the necessity for this no better than by reading to you the concluding paragraph of the report published Monday by our subcommittee:

"The danger to the country from monopoly run wild is written in large letters across the recent economic and political history of this Nation. The committee therefore feels that it cannot overstate the imperative necessity for the Congress to deal with this issue immediately."

Thank you.

Kansas, the 34th Star

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, on January 29, 1861, the 34th star was added to our flag, denoting the admission of the Territory of Kansas as a State in the Union.

In keeping with the birthday spirit, I gave a radio talk over KCMO, Kansas City, Mo., the subject of which was Kansas.

That speech, substantially as given, follows:

Inasmuch as January 29 is the 94th birthday of the State of Kansas, a day that will be celebrated all over the Nation, and especially at Topeka, it seems fitting and proper that, as a native Kansan, and as a Representative in Congress from Kansas, I should make Kansas the subject of my initial broadcast.

Did you ever notice what happens when you meet somebody from Texas? The first thing they do is start bragging about Texas—it's Texas this—Texas that. Let's admit, right off of the bat, that Texas is a big State.

Now Texas does raise a lot of cattle, but that beef wouldn't be fit to eat if it wasn't fed on that fine blue stem grass of the Kansas Flint Hills, and if it wasn't finished off with Kansas—yes, Missouri—corn in Kansas and Missouri feed lots.

Take away the military installations in Texas—yes, and its oil wells—well, you guess what would happen.

Kansas and Kansans have lots of things to be proud of, and to rightfully boast about. We have even more right to brag than Texans, and we should do it every chance we get.

Kansas is roughly 200 miles wide and 400 long; a little better than 80,000 square miles. That's about one-third the size of Texas.

In those 80,000 square miles, we have many natural resources, for which we claim no credit. The Lord provided those. But they are there. There's lots of oil, although not as much as Texas. There's natural gas—and there's coal. Kansas is the greatest supplier of fuel and energy in the United States.

When you speak of gold, most of us think of Alaska, or perhaps, Cripple Creek, Colo., and gold means great wealth. We don't mine any gold in Kansas, but in mineral resources, Kansas produces five times as much as Alaska with its gold, and our mineral production far exceeds the minerals produced in the reputedly mineral rich States of the Rocky Mountains.

Salt is a commonly accepted household item here, but in many countries I have visited it is a luxury selling for as much as $10 a pound. Kansas has enough salt to last the entire world thousands of years.

In less spectacular quantities, Kansas produces lead, zinc, gypsum, clays, cement, chalk, helium, and an enviable amount of fine sand and gravel.

Far from being the drab, ugly, flat State many uninformed writers have pictured it, Kansas is full of scenic beauty, starting with the rolling hills and the valley of the Marais des Cygne on out to prehistoric grounds and the Rock Canyons of Ellsworth which vie, in beauty, with some of the highly advertised national parks.

The heart of America, the very center of the United States, Kansas is crossed and recrossed by 13 railroads, 4 of which are transcontinental lines. Several major airlines cross the State; and talking of flying, Kansas has more "flying farmers" than any State in the Union. Even though Texas is three times as big as Kansas, Kansas has far more miles of improved highways than Texas. In fact, Kansas is second, in the United States, in highway mileage.

Although visited by droughts at times, we are not as hard hit by them as many other States. Kansas is a commercial corn-growing State. Its output of soybeans is prodigious and everybody knows that Kansas grows one-fifth of all the wheat grown in this country.

Kansas raises lots of high-grade beef, but what is not generally known is that turkey raising is a multi-million dollar business in Kansas, and that Kansas ranks among the top eight States in poultry and egg production.

While 90 percent of our area is farms, Kansas is growing rapidly as an industrial State. More than 3,000 factories turn out thousands of various industrial items.

Much of the cement going into our new homes, highways, and buildings comes from Kansas plants like those at Bonner Springs, Iola, and Humboldt.

The automobile tire plant at Topeka and the huge oil refineries like the Phillips plant in Kansas City, Kans., keep the Nation's wheels of commerce turning.

Better crops are grown as the result of the chemical plants such as the Co-op plant at Lawrence, and Spencer, and Pittsburg.

Strange as it may seem and sound, during World War II, Kansas had 2 shipyards in operation, 1 at Leavenworth and 1, the Darby plant on Kaw Point in Kansas City, Kans. In these yards were built landing craft used in the beachhead operations at Omaha Beach, Anzio, and Iwo Jima.

In Kansas City, Kans., B–25 Mitchell bombers were turned out by the hundreds, while at Wichita, Boeing made the famous B–29. Today the Kansas City, Kans., plant is turning out F–84–F's and just recently Boeing, at Wichita, turned out its 1,000th B–47 jet bomber and is now producing the even bigger B–52.

At Sunflower, millions of pounds of explosives were produced, and at Parsons countless thousands of bombs were loaded and sent on their way to bring victory.

Tell your Texas friends to come to Kansas and we'll show them the biggest grain elevator in the world—right in Kansas City, Kans.; the biggest natural cold storage cave at Bonner Springs; and down by Pleasanton they'll see the biggest electric shovel in the world which digs coal almost by the carload. Yes, we have big things in Kansas, too.

These are only a few of the industrial contributions Kansas makes in war or peace—a production so great that Kansas in dollar volume was 5th in the 48 in World War II.

With all of the vast production and the problems involved, Kansas had the best labor record of all, with little or no loss of time or war material from strikes.

Kansas has an amazingly interesting historical background. Even though we have no Alamo, our future was determined by hard-riding, hard-fighting men skilled in handling the six-guns and Sharp's rifles.

Our earliest recorded history goes back to Coronado's conquest in 1541—60 years before Pocahontas saved John Smith's neck.

Kansas is dotted with historical sites reminiscent of the gold rush, and the Santa Fe Trail, Indian wars, the Pony Express, border warfare, cow towns, along the Chisholm Trail, Dodge City, Abilene.

At the mouth of the Kaw, Lewis and Clark started their famous expedition.

Close at home is the Shawnee Indian Mission. Osawatomie is the site of John Brown's cabin. Then, too, there is Trading Post, scene of ruffian border war, Lawrence, and Quantrill's raid, with the reciprocating raids into Missouri by Jayhawkers.

Council Grove was the site of Indian treaties. At Fort Scott we still have the old pre-Civil War barracks and blockhouse.

All of these are part of the great heritage of Kansas. However, the greatest asset of our State is its people.

Today the No. 1 Kansan is President Eisenhower—but we have had other great men. Charles Curtis, proud of his Indian blood, was Vice President. We have given the Nation outstanding men and women in all fields of activity.

One of the long-time best sellers, "In His Steps" was written by Rev. Charles Sheldon.

The literary world recognizes such men as William Allen White and his son young Bill; yes, and John J. Ingalls, President pro tempore of the United States Senate and author of Ironquill. Albert T. Reid, Gene Howe, and Arthur Capper graced the news field, along with today's Ben Hibbs, of the Saturday Evening Post, and Ernest K. Lindley, and last but by no means least is the beloved Merle Thorpe.

In the broadcasting field a Kansan's voice is ranked best, John Cameron Swayze, and close behind him is a Kansas University graduate, Richard Harkness.

Whenever one thinks of sports he thinks of Jess Willard, heavyweight champion, and the "Big Train" Walter Johnson in baseball, and the epitome of determination and grit, the great runner, Glenn Cunningham, and in more recent years the all-American football star, Ray Evans.

In the field of adventure two Kansas women are at the top of the list, Mrs. Osa Johnson, explorer, and Amelia Earhart, the lost aviatrix.

When it comes to beauty and grace Kansans can be proud of little Donna Attwood, star of Ice Capades.

Bradbury Thompson, of Topeka, art director of Madamoiselle and Living, was recently declared the art editor of the year.

Walter Beech in aviation history; George Washington Carver in science and racial progress; yes, ever so many others, including the top men in industry, science, and business throughout the Nation.

That Kansas should have produced such men is no accident. Their background, training, and surroundings were exceptional. Kansas is proud of its churches and schools. Despite the fact that Massachusetts has Harvard and Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Kansas, second in the United States, is far above the Bay State in literacy, and Kansas has the largest number of college students per thousand of any State in the Union.

In all of our wars, Kansas has made big contributions. Missouri had her Pershing. Kansas had her Funston. Kansans have won all sorts of awards from the Congressional Medal on down. In World War I, Kansas had the smallest number of men rejected for military service—which demonstrates the physical sturdiness of her sons. In World War II, with many Kansans having settled there, Oregon pushed us into second place. But with the coming of the Korean war, Kansas again had the fewest rejections. Yet Texas has the audacity to brag of the hardiness of her menfolk.

Kansas has the highest percentage of native-born residents of any of the States. And while we think of New York as a wealthy State, the per capita wealth of Kansas is greater than that of New York.

From what I have said you may well guess that I am proud of Kansas and proud to be a Kansan. I am.

We have more than our share of good things—and fewer of the bad than many have claimed. We have had far fewer cyclones than many of the southern States, so stories about Kansas being a cyclone State are libelous. We have had our share of hard times, too. Our motto—Ad astra per aspira—"To the stars through difficulty" is particularly appropriate. Those courageous ancestors of ours, who left comforts behind, came to Kansas and carved out a great future for us, did face hardships and difficulties. Their courage, stamina, and faith brought them through. We, their children, can see the bright stars of the future.

With this great history, it is perfectly natural that on Kansas Day, Kansans should gather together and celebrate their State's birthday.

These Kansas Day celebrations were started nearly 75 years ago by about 100 men headed by a great threesome of newspaper fame, William Allen White, Ewing Herbert, and Charles Harger, the sole survivor of that famous trio.

For nearly fourscore years these meetings have taken place with the activities centered around Topeka.

Soon we will celebrate the 100th anniversary of Kansas statehood, just as we have celebrated the Territorial Centennial this past year.

That century has marked the development of God-given natural resources by resourceful courageous Kansans.

The story of that century is as gripping as fiction, as colorful as a modern-day western. The cast of characters is as varied as can be imagined: Indians and white men, saints and sinners, lawmakers and lawbreakers, laborers and financiers, teachers and preachers. Long-remembered names such as Billy the Kid, Bat Masterson, Kit Carson, Lincoln and Douglas and their great debates, Carrie Nation, Horace Greeley, Walt Mason, all left their mark as the story of Kansas unfolds.

The scenes were as varied as the characters; tepees and sodhouses, churches and saloons, courthouses and jails, factories and farms, battlefields, cradles, and graves.

The pages of that century of history are punctuated by spurting six guns, splattered with blood of border warfare, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, two World Wars, and Korea.

That hundred years has served to try Kansas and Kansans. They have been tested; they've been found true, loyal, and courageous.

Here, indeed, and in fact, is the heart of America.

And in closing, may I read the product of the skilled pen of Charles Harger, what has been called the Kansan's Creed:

"We believe in Kansas, in the glory of her prairies, in the richness of her soil, in the beauty of her skies, and in the healthfulness of her climate.

"We believe in the Kansas people, in their sturdy faith, and abounding enthusiasm; in their patriotism and their fidelity to the good things of civilization; in their respect for law and their love of justice; in their courage and zeal; in their independence; and in their devotion to uplifting influences in education and religion.

"We believe in Kansas institutions; in the Kansas language and in Kansas ideals; in her uprightness in society; and in her demands that honor, sobriety, and respect be maintained in public and private life; in her marvelous productiveness; and in her wonderful future."

Yes, I am a Kansan. I am proud of it. If you, too, are a Kansan, I trust that you join me in that pride. If you are not a Kansan, I hope you feel that this pride is justified.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, trusting only in Thy mercy, bringing nothing in our hands—our selfish hands which we confess too often yield to the temptation to grasp so many fleeting baubles—we wait in contrition at this shrine of grace for Thy benediction. We would face whatever the day may bring in the confidence of Thy guidance, in the gladness of Thy service, and in the solemn realization that we are indeed our brother's keepers.

May the great causes that will mold the future of human life on this planet into the pattern of Thy desire and design, that will heal the hurts of this sorely wounded world, that will create good will and usher in abiding peace, challenge the best that is in us and gain the supreme allegiance of our love and labor as we serve our brief day in these fields of time. We ask it in the name of the Master of all good workmen. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 8, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3005) to further amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending the authority to induct certain individuals, and to extend the benefits under the Dependents Assistance Act to July 1, 1959, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, under the rule there will be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and other routine business, and I ask unanimous consent that any statements made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE CONTRIBUTIONS PROGRAM

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Battle Creek, Mich., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Federal Civil Defense Contributions Program, for the quarter ended December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS IN ALASKA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the disposal of public lands within highway, telephone, and pipeline withdrawals in Alaska, subject to appropriate easements, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PUBLIC RECREATION FACILITIES IN ALASKA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to the establishment of public recreation facilities in Alaska, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SALE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO NAVAHO TRIBE OF INDIANS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Pueblos of San Lorenzo and Pojoaque in New Mexico to sell certain lands to the Navaho Tribe, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF REFUGEE RELIEF ACT

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the third semiannual report of the Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTRUCTION OF SCHOOL FACILITIES

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize Federal assistance to States and communities to enable them to increase public elementary and secondary school construction (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS

Petitions were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MORSE:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Joint Memorial 1

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most

respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the findings of the Pacific Northwest Governors' Power Policy Committee and their engineering committee representing all generating agencies, both Federal and local, show that power use in the region will increase 6,400,000 kilowatts by 1964, requiring the expenditure of approximately $2 billion on the construction of new electrical facilities, at the rate of more than $200 million per year over the next 10 years; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Oregon and of the Pacific Northwest region as a whole depend primarily upon the utilization of falling water for their supply of electric power; and

"Whereas the Federal Government, through its construction of multiple-purpose river projects, has become a major supplier of electric power to the region; and

"Whereas it is of utmost importance to the Pacific Northwest that the Federal projects now under construction in the region be kept on schedule so that the estimated firm load requirements can at least be met until 1960; and

"Whereas the NcNary, Chief Joseph, and the Dalles projects, when completed, will have a combined generating capacity exceeding 3 million kilowatts; and

"Whereas it is of vital importance to maintain these Federal projects on a full construction schedule: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to give full recognition to the responsibilities of the Federal Government to make funds available for the completion on schedule of the Chief Joseph, McNary, and the Dalles projects now under construction, upon which the Pacific Northwest unavoidably must rely for its growth requirements during the next 5 years; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be and hereby is directed to send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the President and Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress.

"Adopted by House January 13, 1955.

"E. A. GEARY,
"Speaker of the House.

"Adopted by Senate January 20, 1955.

"ELMO E. SMITH,
"President of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Senate Memorial 1

"To the President of the United States of America, to the Chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate, to all Members of the Senate and to all Members of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board:

"Your memorialist, the Senate of the 22d Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d session assembled, respectfully represents:

"Whereas because of its location, the economy, and likewise the welfare of the people, of the Territory of Alaska are entirely dependent upon adequate transportation both within and without its borders; and

"Whereas air transportation is now one of our major industries providing work for hundreds of residents, there being more airplanes per capita in Alaska than in any other country in the world, and this air travel industry being vital to both such employees, and to the other people of the Territory who receive benefits therefrom by means of rapid transportation and lower living costs; and

"Whereas this legislature has in the past, and is now, doing everything within its power to promote a stable peacetime economy, and has during recent years encouraged tourist travel to Alaska by the creation of an Alaska Visitors Association, hoping thereby to establish the tourist business as one of our major industries; and

"Whereas the Alaska Steamship Co. has recently ceased carrying passengers between Alaska and the States, leaving the airlines as our only commercial carriers accommodating passengers; and

"Whereas we, the Senate of the 22d Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, believing in free enterprise, and deploring the creation of monopolies which would restrict industrial development and hamper the activities of otherwise free American citizens; and

"Whereas believing in the maintenance of strong defensive measures against outside aggressors for both the Territory and for the States to the south of us, and knowing that retaining sufficient air service between the States and Alaska would provide aircraft, experienced flight crews and ground personnel as well as airway facilities for the use of the military establishment in case of sudden emergency.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist respectfully urges the President, the Congress of the United States, and the Civil Aeronautics Board to maintain our present air service to Alaska, and to resist by every means within their power, the efforts of any person, board or agency to reduce the number of airlines serving the Territory.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the Senate, January 26, 1955.

"JAMES NOLAN,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
"Secretary of the Senate."

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 4

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Navaho project as one of the participating projects in the Colorado River storage project

"Whereas there has been introduced in the 84th Congress of the United States a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects; and

"Whereas the foregoing proposed legislation includes the Navaho project in New Mexico, as one of the participating projects, for the irrigation of reservation and nonreservation lands located on the Navaho Indian Reservation and adjacent thereto; and

"Whereas the Navahos are at present a low-income, underprivileged group, numbering more than 75,000, whose population is steadily increasing, and whose economic condition is steadily declining because of the extreme drought existing on the Navaho Reservation; and, recognizing that where a group of people exist under such adverse economic conditions as do our neighbors, the Navahos, it affects the whole economy of the surrounding area; and

"Whereas the proposed Navaho project will irrigate reservation lands which will provide for approximately one-fifth of the present Navaho Indian population with a living standard equal to that of non-Indian agriculturists within the area, and, will greatly improve and better the economic condition of our neighbor, the Navahos: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby respectfully memorialized and urged to enact legislation authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Navaho project as one of the participating projects in the Colorado River storage project; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from New Mexico.

"JOE M. MONTOYA,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD G. ROMERO,
"Chief Clerk of the Senate.
"DONALD D. HALLAM,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"FLOYD CROSS,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Approved by me this 31st day of January 1955.

"JOHN F. SIMMS,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

THE REFUGEE RELIEF ACT—RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE CONVENTION, BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the eighth national convention of the American Veterans Committee, at their recent meeting at Boston, Mass., relating to the Refugee Relief Act.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON REFUGEE RELIEF ACT ADOPTED BY THE EIGHTH NATIONAL CONVENTION, AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE (AVC), BOSTON, MASS., DECEMBER 5, 1954

Whereas the Refugee Relief Act was enacted by the Congress of the United States to provide for the admission of 214,000 refugees to this country; and

Whereas during the first 10 months under this law exactly nine refugees were admitted: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we condemn the apparent disregard shown by the administrators of the Refugee Relief Act for the expressed will of the Congress and of the President of the United States; and further be it

Resolved, That we urge the Congress and the executive department to give immediate attention to the complete failure of the State Department to carry out the intent of this law, and to take immediate steps to secure effective implementation.

RESOLUTIONS OF FARMERS UNION LOCAL, BISBEE, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter from Joseph Weltin, secretary, the Farmers Union Local, at Bisbee, N. Dak., embodying resolutions adopted by that local, relating to parity prices for all farm commodities, and the extension of the Federal crop insurance program to all growers of wheat in North Dakota.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BISBEE, N. DAK., *January 4, 1955.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: The following resolutions were passed at the regular meeting

of the Farmers Union Local at Bisbee, N. Dak., on December 13, 1954, with 150 persons present:

"That the Federal governmental farm program should provide price supports or income programs at 100 percent of parity prices for all farm commodities actually produced on the farm up to the limit of the family farm production. Parity price formula should be designed to maintain a purchasing power of farm commodities at levels equal to that of 1947–49 with the goal of full parity farm income.

"That the Federal crop insurance should be made available to all growers of wheat in North Dakota for the year 1955. The Federal Crop Insurance Agency should not discriminate against a farmer who did not happen to carry crop insurance for the year 1954, as there are those who have carried it before and dropped it last year and never have collected a loss, while there are some who have carried it for the first time last year and collected a loss. This is a Federal project and there should be no discrimination except when fraud is committed."

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH WELTIN,
Secretary.

RESOLUTIONS DEALING WITH INDIAN PROBLEMS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on January 30, 1955, the New Mexico Association on Indian Affairs, in the course of its annual meeting at Santa Fe, adopted three resolutions dealing with Indian problems.

The first resolution expresses the opposition of the association to legislation which has for its purpose the liquidation of Indian tribal governments.

The second resolution urges that the lands formerly occupied by the Mescalero Apache Indians at Fort Stanton, N. Mex., be returned to that tribe now that the Federal Government has discontinued using the hospital facility.

The third resolution expresses the sense of the association that every effort be made to ensure the enactment of S. 500, the upper Colorado River storage project bill, and in particular the construction of the Navaho Dam project.

I ask unanimous consent that the three resolutions may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there has been introduced into the Senate of the United States a bill known as S. 401 and referred to as the Malone bill; and

Whereas the purpose of the said bill is to liquidate the tribal governments of the American Indians within 3 years from the date of the enactment of the proposed law and to repeal the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), as amended; and

Whereas the said bill is wholly unacceptable to the Indian tribes of New Mexico and also to members of the New Mexico Association on Indian Affairs, and is so unreasonable and so unfair in its provisions as to shock the conscience; and

Whereas every effort should be made to prevent passage of such a measure as S. 401: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it be declared to be the sense of the annual meeting of the New Mexico Association on Indian Affairs that this bill should not be allowed to become the law of the land, that efforts be made to prevent its passage, and that this resolution be made known to appropriate officials of New Mexico and of the Congress of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the National Congress of American Indians, to the All-Pueblo Council, and to the executive heads of the Navaho Tribe, the Mescalero Apache Tribe, and to the Jicarilla Apache Tribe.

CATHERINE FARRELLY,
President.

Whereas the Mescalero Apache Tribe did in 1855 allow the United States Government the use of certain of their lands whereon to build a fort and later a merchant-marine hospital; and

Whereas the United States Government promised that said land would revert to the Mescalero Apache Tribe whenever the said Government discontinued its operations of the said installation; and

Whereas the said Government did discontinue its use of the said fort and later the marine hospital, which is now being operated by the State of New Mexico; and

Whereas there are some 26,500 acres of land outside the said hospital grounds which are no longer being used by the said Government and which rightfully belong to the said Mescalero Apache Tribe, which needs the land for the development of tribal resources; and

Whereas the said tribe has no desire to claim the said hospital but only the land promised to be returned to it when relinquished by the said Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New Mexico Association on Indian Affairs, at its annual meeting in Santa Fe, on January 30, 1955, urge upon the New Mexico State Legislature adoption of Senate Joint Memorial 6, introduced by Senator Murray Morgan and hitherto referred to the rules committee of the senate; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Governor Simms and appropriate officers of the New Mexico State Legislature, also to the Representatives in Congress of the people of New Mexico, to the end that the Congress act to return the said land at Fort Stanton to the Mescalero Apache Tribe.

CATHERINE FARRELLY,
President.

Whereas there has been introduced into the Senate of the United States a bill known as S. 500, creating the upper Colorado water project; and

Whereas there has been introduced into the House of Representatives a similar bill; and

Whereas the said upper Colorado water project is vitally important to the Navaho people and to the people of New Mexico; and

Whereas the said upper Colorado water project, and particularly the Navaho Dam, is of great value in human rehabilitation as well as in the conservation of natural resources; and

Whereas the citizens of New Mexico, both Indian and non-Indian, are heartily in favor of enactment of the said project into law as speedily as possible, so that the work of rehabilitation and conservation can be commenced with the least possible delay; and

Whereas the Governor of New Mexico and members of the State legislature are also strongly in favor of the enactment of this legislation, as are the Senators and Representatives from New Mexico in the United States Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of this meeting that aid, cooperation, and every available effort by this association be given to the furtherance of steps to insure enactment of the said S. 500, and that copies of this resolution be sent to the State officials mentioned herein and also to the Senators and Representatives from New Mexico in the United States Congress.

CATHERINE FARRELLY,
President.

This is to certify that the above resolutions were passed unanimously at the annual meeting of the New Mexico Association on Indian Affairs at its meeting in Santa Fe on January 30, 1955.

CHARLES E. MINTON,
Executive Secretary.

TERMINATION OF FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR INDIANS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have recently received a letter from Mr. William Zimmerman, Jr., of the Association on American Indian Affairs, pointing out the various problems connected with termination of Federal responsibility for Indians.

Accompanying Mr. Zimmerman's letter is a proposed legislative program recommended by the association in the interests of the American Indian. I think the suggestions of this organization would be of interest to the Members of the Congress, and I ask unanimous consent that these two items may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and proposed legislative program were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSOCIATION ON AMERICAN INDIAN AFFAIRS, INC.,
New York, N. Y., January 28, 1955.

The Honorable CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: The American Indians, a small minority of the Nation, with unique problems difficult to understand, cannot command national attention every day. Yet the day is here when their problems must be resolved.

In the past 2 years the Congress and the administration have emphasized the need for termination of Federal responsibility for American Indians. Almost no one objects to termination in theory. The issues are when, how, and with what safeguards, if any. A distinction must be made also between extermination of Indians and the elimination of responsibility of a particular bureau. Many sincere Americans urge that Indians must cease to be Indians, even if that process requires governmental pressures. This association is opposed to the use of such pressures. We believe, for example, that it is not in accordance with the principles of fair and honorable dealing that the United States require a tribe, as a condition precedent to withdrawing a part of its funds held in trust in the United States Treasury, to assent, or give a show of assent, to a bill terminating Federal jurisdiction and responsibility.

The plenary power of Congress is not in question; rather, the question breaks into these parts: (1) What do the Indians need? (2) What do they want? (3) What is best for them and their neighbors? (4) How can the United States best discharge its obligations to the Indians and to the States in which they reside? The Congress must establish the criteria or direct their establishment.

In the hope that the 84th Congress will take a fresh look at these Indian questions, the association is submitting to every Member a copy of a 10-point legislative program. We believe that these bills or groups of bills should be enacted before the Congress should consider any new withdrawal or termina-

tion bills. These 10 points include the debris of misunderstanding, uncompleted programs, half-kept promises, and outmoded restrictions on Indian rights. We are convinced that enactment of this program will speed the day when the Indians can say truthfully, "We can take care of our own affairs."

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM ZIMMERMAN, Jr.,
Director, Government Relations.

A LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM IN THE INTERESTS OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN SUBMITTED TO THE 84TH CONGRESS BY THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN INDIAN AFFAIRS, INC.

1. An amendment to House Concurrent Resolution 108, 83d Congress, which stated the policy of Congress to terminate the special relationship of the Federal Government to Indian tribes and individual Indians "as rapidly as possible." The proposed amendment should either (a) specifically define criteria for termination, or (b) direct the establishment of such criteria, with provision for the addition from time to time of new tests geared to the situation of the Indians immediately involved, and as knowledge is gained from experience. The amendatory resolution should provide that it is the intent of Congress not to enact further withdrawal legislation unless and until the established criteria are met, and further that the administrative officers of the Government shall conform their actions to these same criteria in any steps they may lawfully take with a view to termination.

2. A bill to amend sections 6 and 7 of Public Law 280, 83d Congress, to provide for Indian consent to the assumption of State civil and criminal jurisdiction over Indian reservations.

3. A bill to amend the Indian Claims Commission Act of 1946, to provide an extension of time during which pending claims may be determined. Present law requires the Commission to complete its work by April 1957. The Commission cannot possibly meet that deadline.

4. A bill to facilitate the readjustment of Indian land holdings, with special reference to lands in heirship status, that is, lands held by the United States in trust for the benefit of two or more heirs. The bill should give Indians and Indian tribes a first preference in the purchase of such lands, and should further provide funds through which purchases could be financed on a long-term repayment plan either (1) by the establishment of a special loan fund or (2) by express authorization and direction for the use of existing Federal loan funds.

5. A bill to authorize long-term leases for the development of Indian land holdings for public, religious, recreational, educational, commercial, and other worthy purposes.

6. A series of special bills to confirm Indian tribal title to certain lands, including minerals. Such bills would include the transfer of title to submarginal lands purchased for Indians and now used by them; the repeal of the 1934 provision which leaves the Papago Reservation open to mineral entry under the Federal mining laws; the clarification of title to the diminished reservation at Colville; and similar corrective measures. Included in this group should be a bill to correct the Eastern Cherokee tribal roll, not strictly a land bill, but a bill which would in effect limit the rights to tribal lands and other property to those Indians recognized by the band as members.

7. Three bills to eliminate or modify the Departmental authority in certain administrative matters: (1) to eliminate or modify the supervisory powers of the Secretary of the Interior over attorney contracts with Indian tribes; (2) to give the tribes control over their current income, with strong provisions for penalties for mishandling or misappropriating such funds; (3) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to use appropriated gratuity funds for the expenses of tribal delegations which would not otherwise be able to testify before the Congress on bills affecting their property and their future, particularly termination bills, and also to forbid the use of tribal funds except when authorized by the tribal owners.

8. A bill or bills, like the Navajo-Hopi Rehabilitation Act, to provide for the economic rehabilitation of certain depressed Indian groups, such as the Papago, Sioux, and Minnesota Chippewa. The Upper Colorado River legislation should include adequate language directing construction of the Navajo (Shiprock) irrigation project.

9. A bill to provide for the equitable settlement of native land claims in Alaska.

10. A bill to amend the Johnson-O'Malley Act to require the transfer of Indian Bureau extension services to appropriate State and local agencies, if and when the Indians concerned so request.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1011. A bill to make certain exceptions to the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States and of the United States courts of appeals in actions relating to the public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1012. A bill for the relief of Juan Jose Moya Ramirez; and

S. 1013. A bill for the relief of Melecio Acosta-Morales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for Mr. MALONE):

S. 1014. A bill for the relief of Henry Duncan; and

S. 1015. A bill for the relief of the city of Carson City, Nev.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1016. A bill to make certain exceptions to the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States and of the United States courts of appeals in actions relating to the public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. THURMOND when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 1017. A bill to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PAYNE:

S. 1018. A bill to amend section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KERR:

S. 1019. A bill for the relief of Ibrahim Eldib; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1020. A bill for the relief of Laurie Dea Holley and the legal guardian of Karmen Lael Holley, minor child; and

S. 1021. A bill for the relief of Leo A. Ribitzki, Mrs. Charlotte Ribitzki, and Marion A. Ribitzki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1022. A bill to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, and to provide for the insurance of loans thereunder; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1023. A bill to retire submarginal lands from the production of surplus agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1024. A bill to amend section 5701 (b) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to adjust the rates of tax on cigars; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1025. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Look-Out Mountain National Park in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1026. A bill for the relief of Nihat Cengiz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 1027. A bill providing for the location, establishment, construction, equipment, and operation of a hospital for the mentally ill of Alaska; and

S. 1028. A bill to provide for the hospitalization and care of the mentally ill of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1029. A bill giving the Commissioner of Education the authority to issue to certain local educational agencies quitclaim deeds to certain temporary facilities, upon a showing of need therefor; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EXCEPTIONS TO APPELLATE JURISDICTION OF UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT AND UNITED STATES COURTS OF APPEALS IN ACTIONS RELATING TO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to make certain exceptions to the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States and of the United States courts of appeals in actions relating to public schools. I have received a letter from the Governor of South Carolina, George N. D. Timmerman, Jr., requesting me to introduce the proposed legislation. I ask unanimous consent that a concurrent resolution adopted by the South Carolina Legislature, relating to this subject, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1011) to make certain exceptions to the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States and of the United States courts of appeals in actions relating to the public schools, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The concurrent resolution of the South Carolina Legislature, presented by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, is as follows:

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation limiting the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts

Whereas Federal courts and more particularly the United States Supreme Court have through numerous opinions and decisions invaded the fields of the legislative and executive branches of government; and

Whereas through numerous opinions and decisions Federal courts and more particularly the United States Supreme Court have invaded the field of government which

should be left to the control of the several States of the Union; and

Whereas Congress is authorized under the Constitution of the United States to control and limit the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That Congress be memorialized to enact legislation limiting the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts so that the fields of government of the executive and legislative branches and that of the several States shall not be invaded, but shall remain separate and distinct; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each United States Senator from South Carolina, each Member of the House of Representatives of Congress from South Carolina, the Senate of the United States, and the House of Representatives of the United States.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Supreme Court's decision of May 17, 1954, overturned all of the legislative action and judicial determination on the subject during the past 90 years, both Federal and State. Under that decision local school authorities are required, as the price of operating public schools, to attempt to engage in a most difficult sociological experiment.

The Supreme Court recognized in its decision the large variety of local conditions to which the decision must be applied. Presumably its implementation will be left by that Court to the district courts which sit in the different localities and are familiar with the problems that they face.

The situation would not be helped by a flood of appeals from the district courts in school cases. Such appeals will only clog the appellate courts and dissipate the time and resources of the school authorities.

I have been studying the problem for some months, and believe that Congress can help in a difficult situation by limiting the appellate jurisdiction of the Federal courts to cases involving public schools in which inequality of a tangible nature is claimed to exist.

The Constitution in article III, section 1, vests judicial power in the Supreme Court and "in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish."

In section 3 of the same article, the Constitution specifically provides that the Congress has the power to make certain exceptions to the appellate power of the courts. It says:

In all the other cases before mentioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make.

Thus, it is clearly within the power of the Congress to limit the appelate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and the court of appeals, as I propose in the bill I am about to introduce.

The enactment of this bill will strengthen the hands of both the district courts and the school authorities in dealing with the problems now before them. This step has been recommended by the Governor of my State, and endorsed unanimously by the South Carolina General Assembly, in the interest of preserving efficient public school education for all of our people.

I propose this bill because I believe it to be in the best interests of all people of the United States.

Therefore, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to make certain exceptions to the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States and of the United States courts of appeals in actions relating to the public schools.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1016) to make certain exceptions to the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States and of the United States courts of appeals in actions relating to the public schools, introduced by Mr. THURMOND, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED ATLANTIC EXPLORATORY CONVENTION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and myself, I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution favoring the calling of an Atlantic Exploratory Convention.

I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes to make an explanation of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Tennessee may proceed.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 12), submitted by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and other Senators) was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the preservation of democratic institutions everywhere demands united action by the world's leading democracies; and

Whereas the North Atlantic Treaty has already committed its members to "contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions" and to "encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them"; and

Whereas it is essential to determine by what means the democracies can further unify their efforts in the military, political, and economic fields to achieve these objectives; and

Whereas the Nine Power Agreement to extend the North Atlantic Treaty and defence system to include the German Federal Republic makes such exploration still more timely; and

Whereas it is desirable that this problem be considered by delegates who would act in accordance with their individual convictions and make a public report of their joint findings and recommendations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is requested to invite the other democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates, including members of their principal political parties, to meet in a convention with similarly appointed delegates from the United States and from such other democracies as the convention may invite, to explore and to report to what extent their peoples might further unite within the framework of the United Nations, and agree to form, federally or otherwise, a defense, economic, and political union.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the concurrent resolution I am submitting asks the President to call a convention of delegates of the sponsors of the North Atlantic Treaty to explore and report "to what extent their pecples might agree to form, federally or otherwise, a defense, economic, and political union."

I am informed that it was the intention of a number of House Members to submit simultaneously a similar resolution. Since we have learned the House is not meeting today, it is my understanding that they will introduce a similar resolution at the first opportunity. House Members taking this action, I am informed, are, Representatives HALE BOGGS, STERLING COLE, CLIFF DAVIS, ROBERT HALE, CHET HOLIFIELD, LEROY JOHNSON, WALTER JUDD, LEE METCALF, ABRAHAM MULTER, JAMES MURRAY, JOHN PILCHER, PERCY PRIEST, FRANK SMITH, FRANCIS WALTER, and CLEMENT ZABLOCKI.

The purpose of the concurrent resolution is best expressed in its resolving clause. This clause reads as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is requested to invite the other democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates, including members of their principal political parties, to meet in a convention with similarly appointed delegates from the United States and from such other democracies as the convention may invite, to explore and to report to what extent their peoples might further unite within the framework of the United Nations, and agree to form, federally or otherwise, a defense, economic and political union.

I feel that it is urgently important that we take this step. The sudden shift from Malenkov to Bulganin in Moscow yesterday adds greater urgency to the long and ever-growing need to unite the Atlantic community effectively.

It embodies a shift from the civilian to the military side of the Red apparatus, and from accent on consumer goods to accent on heavy industry, or war production. It is too early to say how much of a move it is from a policy of coexistence to one of no-existence—the end result of atomic warfare. Certainly it is a warning flag that shows that the danger of war is nearing, not receding. To shift from consumer goods to military production brings with it internal dangers in the Communist empire. What better way for the Kremlin to forestall possible

unrest and to unite its people than by war?

Certainly the Atlantic democracies would be wise to heed this storm signal and delay no longer in seeking better means to unite their action.

At the same time, the Formosa problem which faces us again in the Senate today points up the chronic failure of diplomacy to assure concerted action by the democracies in the explosive powder magazines of Asia, and save us from the increasing danger of finding ourselves isolated there, without any powerful allies or friends standing with us.

We could not have been in so dangerous a situation had the resolution for a convention to explore the possibility of forming an Atlantic union been adopted when it was last submitted in the 82d Congress. Instead of developing through these years the disunion on which the Kremlin is openly counting for the destruction of freedom, we would have had a plan worked out—and, I hope, in action—for assuring at much less cost effective united action in the Atlantic community by the democratic processes common to all its people against the twin threats of military aggression and economic depression by which communism plans to capture the free nations one after another.

Judging from the experience of the past few years—and indeed, from the long history of military alliances—the longer we delay exploring better means of uniting the free peoples, the worse emergencies we shall face in the coming years, and months.

Mr. President, despite the increase of Communist power since the end of World War II, the democracies of the Atlantic community have together today the ability to insure their security and peace. They still possess together some 80 percent of the industrial capacity of the entire world, the greater part of the world's skilled technicians and workers, and most of the world's resources. Their present lack of security and their fears of a third world war are directly due to their failure as yet to establish adequate political unity.

Most Members of the Senate will recall a day 4 years ago when President Eisenhower, at that time NATO Supreme Commander, addressed the Congress. In his speech he asked this question: "Why, then, are we frightened of dictatorial government?" And he gave this answer: "Only for one reason—because they have a unity of purpose. What we have to do—the only thing we have to do—is to meet that unity with a higher type, the unity of freemen that will not be defeated."

Since that day, the Atlantic democracies have increased their collective military strength and the military effectiveness of the North Atlantic Alliance. Let us not forget, however, that during this same period the rulers of Russia and Red China have increased their military strength and effectiveness and that Soviet Russia is now building hydrogen bombs and transoceanic planes which can drop them on the United States.

During these 4 years, the Atlantic democracies as a group, and notably some of the nations of Western Europe, have increased their economic strength. Let us not forget, however, that Soviet Russia and Red China have also increased their economic strength even more rapidly under the lash of dictatorial power.

But in these 4 years the Atlantic democracies have not made comparable progress in increasing their political unity. Indeed, conflicts of policy between them concerning relations with areas of Asia and attitudes toward Communist propaganda offensives suggest that they are less united in some respects than they were 4 years ago. Our need for such unity, emphasized then so clearly by our present President, remains both critical and urgent. Threatened by a Communist bloc which can maneuver and strike with dazzling speed, we must still negotiate before we can act jointly.

This contrast between our respective accomplishments in the military field and in the political field is the more striking when our potential capabilities in those two fields are recalled. For our military capabilities are clearly subject to strict limitations for the "long haul," limitations set by the need to maintain a free and prosperous economy.

But there is no limitation on our political capabilities except ourselves. As free men, nothing except our own attitudes, our own will, and our own intelligence can bar us from doing anything which our security and welfare demand.

Our forefathers demonstrated unsurpassed political capacity throughout our history as a nation, first in creating our American Union and afterward in expanding that Union from a fringe of 13 States along the Atlantic seaboard into a continental area containing 50 times as many people and constituting the freest and the most powerful and productive nation in the world. They met the challenge of their time. Shall we fail to meet ours?

Mr. President, we have not yet seriously attempted to achieve the political unity among the principal free nations which is so critically necessary. How necessary it is has been emphasized in the past by the leaders of the present administration.

In his report of April 1952, as NATO Supreme Commander, the President made the following statements:

> As we look back over these developments, it seems almost as if the nations of the West have been, for decades, blindly enacting parts in a drama that could have been written by Lenin, prophet of militant communistic expansion. This pattern of events, which points so surely to ultimate disaster, can be changed if only the peoples of the West have the wisdom to make a complete break with many things of the past and show a willingness to do something new and challenging.
>
> It is common knowledge that peacetime coalitions throughout history have been weak and notoriously inefficient. Sovereign nations have always found it difficult to discover common ground on which they could stand together for any length of time.
>
> There is power in our union—and resourcefulness on land, sea, and air. Visible and within grasp we have the capability of building such military, economic, and moral strength as the Communist world would never dare to challenge.

The Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, has also made some impressive statements in this connection in the past.

In a letter addressed to the Atlantic Union Committee on October 22, 1949, he stated:

> As a Senator I shall vote for the Atlantic Union Resolution (S. Res. 57) * * * Largely at the insistence of Senator Vandenberg and myself, the arms aid bill was amended to assure that its assistance would be integrated into a common defense under the direction of the Council to be established under the North Atlantic Treaty. However, that Council does not now have adequate authority to establish a genuine common defense.
>
> That is one of the matters that could be, and should be, considered by an Atlantic Union Convention. There are economic and monetary problems that ought also to be considered, in accordance with the Federal principle that matters which are of common concern should be dealt with through an agency dedicated to the interests of all of those concerned. Within any such area of common concern, common action is much more effective and more economical than a multiplicity of separate actions.

In a telegram addressed to the Atlantic Union Committee on November 13, 1952, Mr. Dulles stated:

> As you know, I am quite familiar with the work of your committee. I feel that it has an understanding of the nature and infinite capabilities of the Federal system. It is important that this be understood in connection with the development of the NATO organization, because NATO can hardly succeed if it is merely a political alliance of temporary expediency.

In the introduction he wrote in January, 1950, to the New Federalist, Mr. Dulles stated:

> There can, however, be little doubt but what this principle of federalism ought to be thoroughly explored as providing a possible way for free peoples to gain the added strength needed to meet the severe tests that fate may hold in store for them. Most Americans have forgotten, and few Europeans have known, how light, but yet how strong, can be the bond of federation.

These words of leaders of the present administration underline the action that needs to be taken. NATO is now the most integrated and developed international organization of the free world as well as the principal bulwark of its security. But NATO is still fundamentally a military alliance. In the military field it has created an Atlantic defense force under a unified command exercised by a supreme commander. But in the political field, power of decision still rests with 14 separate national governments which must agree unanimously before action can be taken—and NATO action is strictly limited to making recommendations. NATO has as yet no adequate machinery for the exercise of civil control over its military forces, despite the fact that civil control over military force is a basic principle of every democratic people.

The danger implicit in this deficiency was indicated by the issue which arose at the December ministerial meeting of the North Atlantic Council concerning the employment of atomic weapons in the event of war. No adequate machinery exists as yet through which 14 national governments could reach agreement within a few hours on this

decision, directly affecting the lives of literally tens of millions of people. Certainly there is now no machinery through which the peoples of these nations could have a voice in this awesome decision through their elected representatives.

Four months ago, on October 4, 1954, eminent leaders of eight of these peoples joined in a declaration of Atlantic unity, addressed to their governments and to the North Atlantic Council, which called for action to repair this glaring and dangerous deficiency. Pointing out that defense in today's terms extends beyond military requirements and into the political, economic, and cultural aspects of our lives they stated:

> We believe that nothing less than an effectively integrated Atlantic community, which would include German defense forces, will in the end adequately meet the challenge of the times. The first of five specific measures they requested their governments to initiate was: The development of NATO as a central agency to coordinate the political, trade, and defense policies of the member nations.

The importance of this declaration, formally presented to the North Atlantic Council on December 16, was underlined by the stature of its signatories. Those from the United States included President Truman, General Marshall, Adlai E. Stevenson, Governor Byrnes, Henry Ford II, Paul Hoffman, and John J. McCloy, while the British, Canadian, French, Belgian, Norwegian, and Danish signers comprised many of their countries' most prominent citizens. This declaration furnished convincing evidence that the most eminent citizens of the principal Atlantic democracies realize the urgent need for Atlantic political integration.

The events of the last 6 months have clearly increased this need. The failure of EDC has diverted political development to an important extent from a six-nation basis within Europe to an Atlantic basis. The nine-power agreement which replaces EDC with the Western European Union involves a further extension of NATO in the military field through an increase in the powers of the supreme commander, thereby increasing the pressure and the need for its development in the political field.

NATO is also to be enlarged through the inclusion of the German Federal Republic. Instead of German forces within a European army, there is to be a German national army. In view of the widespread fears this development has raised within several countries in Western Europe and in view of the inevitable uncertainty which clouds the future of a Germany divided by the Iron Curtain, we shall be running very grave risks if we fail to develop Atlantic political machinery adequate to allay these fears and to solidify the adherence of the German people to the Atlantic community on an enduring basis.

The future of Germany is of decisive importance not only to Europeans but also to all the peoples of the Atlantic area. It is essentially a political problem which cannot be solved by military arrangements since any present international military arrangements could be overriden subsequently by a national political decision. The only sure solution of this problem must be a political one, the development of international political machinery, which, if it is to be adequate, must include the United States.

It was with a profound sense of shock that the American people learned in August of the failure of EDC. This event, I believe, casts some light on the shortcomings of our past and present operating procedures within the Atlantic community. This treaty had been worked out by the foreign offices of the nations concerned and was signed in 1952. The foreign offices reached agreement, but the peoples concerned had no part in this agreement. When the treaty was finally submitted to the legislative body representing the people of France, it was rejected. This event emphasizes the danger of proceeding in matters of common concern on a merely intergovernmental basis.

Mr. President, we have tried for 10 critical years now to meet the overriding problems of attaining security and safeguarding freedom by the methods of diplomacy, which depend upon cooperation between national governments. To claim that we have succeeded would be to claim that the outlook in 1955 is less dangerous than it was in 1945, when there was widespread hope that the end of the Second World War would open a new era for mankind.

Our failure to solve these problems does not imply that the methods of diplomacy have been unwisely applied. It implies that these methods, and any methods limited to intergovernmental cooperation, are inadequate to meet problems of such complexity and scope. It implies, further, that we need to do more than seek by piecemeal methods to tackle these problems separately one at a time, while the stockpiles of hydrogen bombs progressively grow. We need to explore on the broadest basis the possibility of a comprehensive, overall solution. Diplomatic agencies can seek to correlate governmental policies, but, however skillful and experienced their members may be, they cannot themselves create unity or policy.

Within our country, both nationally and locally, the peoples participate in the determination of policy through their elected representatives. But in the policymaking of the Atlantic community the peoples have no part; the role of their elected representatives is limited to accepting or rejecting policies which their executive officials have determined.

Mr. President, the events of the last decade demonstrate the urgent necessity of bringing the peoples into the effort to solve our overriding problems, enlisting the aid of their wisest minds, and providing them with an opportunity to study these problems together and to explore such solutions as appear to them to be practicable. Such a meeting would neither halt nor interfere with the diplomatic operations of their governments; it would supplement them.

The purpose of the resolution for an Atlantic exploratory convention is to bring about such a meeting of the most competent citizens of the Atlantic democracies. On behalf of the other sponsors of this resolution, I wish briefly to explain certain provisions in its enacting clause.

It requests the President to invite the other democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty—Canada, Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg—to name delegates to meet in a convention with similarly appointed delegates of the United States. There is no reason why the President should not, if he deemed it desirable, undertake this initiative jointly with the Prime Minister of Canada or Britain or of any other of these nations. Because these seven nations have already joined in sponsoring the North Atlantic Treaty, this exploratory convention can most appropriately be initiated by them.

But the resolution provides that the convention may invite other democracies to participate, thus removing the onus of our Government having to choose between one friendly nation and another. The convention can issue such invitations without disturbing the friendly relations between governments.

The proposal for such a convention as a means of dealing with overriding problems which intergovernmental cooperation has failed to solve has its roots deep in our history, in the Philadelphia Convention which achieved such outstanding success in 1787. There the delegates were officially appointed by their State governments but were not instructed by them. They deliberated as individuals in their search for solutions, made proposals and withdrew them or modified them as a result of argument and debate. This method resulted in the most astonishing and enduring success in history—the United States Constitution. Yet our war-torn generation of today has tried to solve our problems only by the Old World methods of diplomacy. We have never once tried to solve them by this Philadelphia Convention method, which produced so remarkable a result. It is this successful method which the present resolution would have us try now.

The delegates to the convention proposed in this resolution would be appointed by their governments, thereby insuring that men of the highest competence and experience would devote their full time to this high mission for as long a period as might be required. The delegates from the United States could appropriately be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. They would include members of the principal political parties, a provision which clearly envisages the participation of Members of both Houses of the Congress. They would, however, as the last paragraph in the preamble makes clear, act as individuals, in accordance with their individual convictions, just as the delegates did in Philadelphia in 1787. Under this procedure, division of the convention into national delegations, which would be instructed by their governments and would negotiate and bargain with each other as in a diplomatic conference, would be avoided.

The purpose of the convention is delineated clearly in the resolution. It is

to explore and to report to what extent their delegates believe their people might further unite within the framework of the United Nations and to what extent they might agree to form, federally or otherwise, a defense, economic and political union. After comprehensive exploration of possible courses of action within this broad framework, the delegates would draw up a public report of their joint findings and recommendations.

This concurrent resolution is purposely drawn in these broad terms in order to provide the convention with the widest scope for study and recommendation. The phrase "federally or otherwise" was inserted for this purpose. In our own historic experience, we have built upon Federal foundations, and found them most successful. But it is quite possible that new and different methods may be found today to unite more closely the peoples of the democracies concerned. This phrase makes it clear that the delegates need not confine themselves to any one line of approach. The broad language of this resolution appears all the more desirable in view of the provision that the delegates shall consider "to what extent their peoples might agree to form a defense, economic and political union."

Members of this House will recall Senate Concurrent Resolution 4, which was submitted in the 82d Congress on January 15, 1951, and was popularly called the Atlantic Union resolution, with impressive bipartisan support in both Houses of the Congress.

It was supported also by the Atlantic Union Committee which was formed in 1949, with former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts as president and former Under Secretary of State Will L. Clayton and the late Robert P. Patterson, former Secretary of War, as vice presidents. This committee comprises more than a hundred local chapters in all parts of the country, as well as a national council of 600 leaders in American life, which includes three former Under Secretaries of State.

That resolution provided for a convention of the same form and character as this concurrent resolution. But it was the subject of considerable misunderstanding and not a little willful misrepresentation. Its opponents charged that it would establish a superstate; that it would destroy the Government of the United States even though its actual text provided only for the meeting of such an exploratory convention.

In order to make it clear to all that the purpose of this resolution is solely the convocation of the exploratory convention for which it provides, the text of this resolution has been modified to avoid such misunderstanding and minimize the possibility of willful misrepresentation. The title also states this purpose.

There is no commitment in this resolution other than to call for such exploration and recommendations by a body selected from the peoples of our democracies. There is certainly no commitment to any action which would decrease the powers of the Government of the United States. Any such action which the American people might consider wise at some future date in the light of the recommendations of the convention would necessarily be undertaken by the Congress of the United States in accordance with our constitutional processes.

I do not see how any Senator of the United States who believes in our political system and acknowledges the sovereignty of the people can oppose the convocation of a convention of this nature, limited in its function to exploration and recommendation. To oppose it is to say "No, we will not give the American people and other Atlantic peoples a chance to explore possible solutions of their common problems. We insist that the task of seeking solutions of these problems, even though they involve the lives of tens of millions of Americans and the future of our country, shall be entrusted solely to diplomatic officials."

Objections which have been raised in past years to such a convention have suggested that their proponents prefer that the security and welfare of the United States and the Atlantic Community should indeed be sought solely through diplomatic machinery.

It has been objected that before any American citizens could attend this convention, a detailed United States position would have to be prepared such as is customarily prepared before a diplomatic conference. In that case, of course, other nations would also prepare national positions and the result would be negotiations based on these positions similar to those which occur in diplomatic conferences.

One of the great advantages of the convention we propose is that it avoids this roadblock. The delegates to the convention could speak and act as individuals, unable to commit their governments or even reflect governmental positions. They would meet as outstanding leaders of the Atlantic Community to explore the possibilities of finding practicable solutions of our common problems.

They would be able to take a new look at these problems and seek, as individuals, a meeting of minds upon what appeared to them to be viable solutions. Instead of seeking to resolve conflicts between predetermined national approaches, they would be free to seek a common approach.

Objections have been raised in the form of fears of the consequences of the convention, fears that reflect a negative view of this new approach to a solution of our common problems and a disregard of its positive potentialities.

Fears have been expressed that the convention might fail and thereby retard rather than promote progress toward greater Atlantic solidarity. Expression of these fears raises the question "fail to do what?" The convention might, indeed, fail to produce any overall and viable plan for solving the acute and complex problems which confront the Atlantic democracies. But it is surely exceedingly unlikely that a convention comprising many of the best minds in the Atlantic Community could explore possible solutions of our common problems over a period of several months and fail to produce some constructive proposals. When these problems are as difficult and as complicated as they are today, any constructive proposals which might facilitate their solution would be of inestimable value.

A related fear is that the convention might fail to live up to popular expectations, and thus produce a psychological setback. This hypothetical danger can easily be averted by the Atlantic governments before the convention meets and by the delegates themselves after it is convened. They need only point out the complexity of the task before the convention and make public such realistic appraisals of its prospects as appear desirable.

A third fear is that the convention might go too far and make recommendations which the peoples of the United States and the other participating democracies would not be willing to accept. The answer to this objection can be found in the character and caliber of the men who would serve as delegates. Most of them would assuredly be men with long experience in public life, unlikely to agree to visionary or impractical proposals. Senators, Congressmen and parliamentarians among the delegates would be in close touch with their colleagues and their constituents. I do not have to stress here the sensitivity of legislators to public opinion. Most of the delegates, moreover, would be in frequent contact with leaders in their governments.

Finally, there is the fear that differences of opinion within the convention might divide the Atlantic democracies on some of the issues discussed. To yield to this fear would be to distrust the democratic process at its best. Some conflict of views is inevitable in any public meeting, but conflicts of views between individuals do not produce the serious divisions between nations which result from similar conflicts between their national representatives. Yet this far greater risk of division is readily incurred by the United States and the other democracies, in all the organs of the United Nations and in all international conferences.

In recent weeks the question has been raised whether this resolution may not be untimely in view of the urgent importance of ratification of the Paris agreements. This question merits consideration and I believe it has a readily evident answer as soon as it is analyzed. It may be that the implementation of this resolution by the President, the dispatch of invitations to other governments to name delegates to the convention, might introduce a new factor into Atlantic relationships and thereby influence the ratification of the Paris agreements in Europe. But such implementation lies, at the best, many months away. First, the resolution must be adopted by both Houses of Congress, and before that can happen it must be passed upon by the Foreign Relations Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee which both have a high sense of responsibility and an expert knowledge of the immediate objectives of our foreign policy.

I am convinced, however, that the submission of the concurrent resolution sponsored by 14 Senators in the United States Senate today and its simultaneous submission in the House of Representatives, will contribute directly to early ratification of the Paris agreements. It will be regarded in France, in the German Federal Republic and in all other nations which must still ratify these agreements as a proof that there is powerful support in the Congress of the United States for further development of the Atlantic community. They also recognize that the failure of EDC and the inclusion of the German Federal Republic directly in NATO have made further development of the Atlantic community imperative. Knowledge that this impressive support exists in the Congress for a resolution proposing a convention which would explore on the broadest basis the possibilities of achieving this objective will give them new hope and confidence that ratification of the Paris agreements will not lead up a dead end street, but will contribute toward the Atlantic development which these agreements themselves and the time in which we live have made urgent and necessary.

Mr. President, the history of the last few years has shown that progress on an Atlantic basis and progress in Europe are closely interrelated. When we have taken the lead in developing NATO and have emphasized the importance of increasing the solidarity of the Atlantic community, which includes our country, Canada and Britain as well as the countries of Western Europe, we have seen progress toward unity in Europe. But when we have refrained from mentioning the word "Atlantic," have called only for unity in Europe and have exerted pressure to persuade Europeans to take steps in which we were to have no part, the result has been failure.

Yet we recognized in 1949 by becoming a party to the North Atlantic Treaty that our defense and theirs were inseparable. Surely, there is every reason why we should explore together in common, in a convention comprising our best minds and theirs, how our common defense might be made more effective and less costly and how we might attain that greater unity for which President Eisenhower has so consistently called.

This concurrent resolution opens to the democracies a new and broad road toward the attainment of this objective. At the same time, it provides the free nations with a means of taking the initiative in the war of ideas which forms a central part of the cold war. We cannot win the war of ideas if we remain on the defensive. To move forward toward ultimate victory in this ideological struggle, to make possible an expansion of the frontiers of freedom which have receded so far in the last decade, we must take the offensive.

The passage of this concurrent resolution by the Congress of the United States would electrify free men everywhere, providing them with a new and tremendously dynamic idea. It would give us the initiative in the war of ideas, politically and psychologically, and force the Communists onto the defensive. It would generate hope and confidence wherever people are permitted to read the news and listen freely to the radio, and some of that hope would seep through the cracks in the Iron Curtain.

For with all their military strength and all their skill at subversion, the Communists are powerless to stop the calling of this convention to explore to what extent democratic nations can further unite. This initiative depends solely upon us. In seeking closer union between free peoples, there is no limitation upon our capabilities except ourselves.

ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE OF SENATOR - AT - LARGE FOR EX-PRESIDENTS—ADDITIONAL SPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, yesterday, I introduced the bill (S. 1010) to create the office of Senator-at-Large in the Senate of the United States for ex-Presidents of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] be added as a cosponsor of this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3005) to further amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending the authority to induct certain individuals, and to extend the benefits under the Dependents Assistance Act to July 1, 1959, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Address on the subject of American foreign policy, delivered by him at the University of Cincinnati, February 4, 1955.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

Address delivered by Senator BRICKER before the Edison Pioneers, in New York on February 5, 1955, in observance of the 108th anniversary of Thomas A. Edison's birth.

NOTICE OF MEETING OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, SENATE SECTION

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I should like to give notice that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Senate Section, has determined to hold a public hearing in the matter of the confirmation of Dr. John von Neumann to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission at 2:00 p. m. on Tuesday, March 8, in the old Supreme Court Chamber of the Capitol.

I give this notice so that any Senator who may wish to attend or present testimony will have sufficient notice.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR RUSH DEW HOLT, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, it is with deep regret that I announce the death of our former colleague, the Honorable Rush Dew Holt, of Weston, West Virginia.

Senator Holt died yesterday in the National Institutes of Health, where he was being treated for a rare form of cancer.

Although he was only 49 years of age, he had lived a full and active life, and he long will be remembered in both his home State and the Nation's Capital.

Senator Holt was a brilliant young man, first winning statewide prominence upon his election to the West Virginia House of Delegates when he was only 25 years of age.

Almost immediately he attracted statewide attention, and while only 29 years of age he was elected to the United States Senate.

As many of our senior colleagues well remember, Senator Holt's seat was contested.

After a long debate, the United States Senate voted to seat Senator Holt, following a precedent established 130 years earlier when another brilliant young American, Henry Clay, then only 29, sought admission to the Senate.

Following his 6 year term in the Senate, Senator Holt returned to West Virgina and took an active part in politics, later serving in the State legislature.

At the time of his untimely death, Senator Holt was a member of the West Virginia House of Delegates, but because of his critical condition he was unable to take his seat during the current session now in progress in the State Capitol.

During his colorful career, Senator Holt was affiliated with both great political parties, and he achieved great prominence for his ability as an orator and advocate.

Senator Holt is survived by his widow and two children, Helen Jane and Rush D. Holt, Jr.

Funeral services tentatively are set for Friday in the Weston Methodist Church, of Weston, West Virginia, where Senator Holt taught the men's Bible class for the past several years.

Mr. President, on behalf of my colleagues, I wish to extend deepest condolences to Senator Holt's family in this grave hour of tragedy.

Senator Holt will be greatly missed.

No one can ease the pain for his family, but there is some consolation in the fact that Senator Holt achieved great heights in his short life, and he will be remembered for years to come.

THE PRICE OF EGGS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, approximately 2 weeks ago I placed in the RECORD a letter written by Mrs. Lloyd Randall, of Lake Williams, N. Dak., stating that she had sold eggs at 6 cents a dozen. Later, off the floor, some Senators challenged the accuracy of that price, and stated that the price of eggs in the Northwest was 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25 cents a dozen.

I have in my hand a receipt from the Farmers Co-op Creamery Association, of LaMoure, N. Dak., given to Charles Roth, of LaMoure, N. Dak., signed by Donald L. Lauf, showing that Mr. Roth had sold on October 7, 1954, 30 dozen eggs at 6 cents a dozen. The receipt shows that Mr. Roth got $1.80 for the 30 dozen eggs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that as much of this receipt as may be printed be published in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the receipt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS CO-OP. CREAMERY ASSOCIATION No. 12307

LAMOURE, N. DAK., ... 195-- 77-125

Pay to the order of Charles Roth $1.80

(Not good after 60 days)

Farmers Co-op. Creamery Ass'n ..... $1 and 80 cts.

The First State Bank, LaMoure, North Dakota

FARMERS CO-OP. CREAMERY ASSOCIATION
By DONALD L. LAUF

FARMERS CO-OP. CREAMERY ASSOCIATION
LaMoure, North Dakota

Grade	Doz.	Eggs	Price	Amount
Extra	Oct. 7, 1954			
No. 1				
No. 2				
Pullets	30		0.6	1.80
Short				
Rots				
Total				

WINNING ESSAY ON THE SUBJECT OF "WHAT THE BILL OF RIGHTS MEANS TO ME"

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in recent months the National Association of Real Estate Boards has conducted a very noteworthy essay contest among students of parochial, private, and public high schools on the subject of What the Bill of Rights Means to Me. The Real Estate Board of Baltimore, my home city, was a participating sponsor of this contest, and I am proud to state that an outstanding student of Baltimore City College, Samuel F. Lambert, Jr., not only was the winner at the local level, but also placed third as a national winner.

On December 15, 1954, it was my pleasure to entertain young Samuel Lambert here in Washington. I was so impressed by him and his very excellent and moving essay, that I should like to read it into the RECORD:

WHAT THE BILL OF RIGHTS MEANS TO ME

(By Samuel F. Lambert, Jr., Baltimore, Md.)

The Bill of Rights grants me privileges for which men have struggled for centuries. It is the guardian of my personal freedom. Because of it, I shall never endure such hardships as did some of my ancestors.

I need not fear death or banishment because I worship God according to the dictates of my conscience. I will not be imprisoned for expressing my own opinions. My person, house, or belongings cannot be seized or searched without legal warrant. I am assured of justice, of fair trial. I will never undergo cruel or unusual punishment.

Besides granting me such protection, the Bill of Rights truly recognizes my dignity as an individual. Democracy is based on the belief that the majority of people instinctively know what is best for them. The Bill of Rights firmly supports this belief. Public opinion is an important factor in the forming of our domestic and foreign policies. And what is public opinion but the collective voice of individuals whose dignity is recognized by the granting of freedom to speak and write their own opinions?

Much of America's growth in various fields is due to the impetus given to individual effort and achievement by our Bill of Rights. Without freedom of worship there could not have been the spiritual development which has not only strengthened us, but has also inspired a feeling of brotherhood toward other peoples, creating in us the desire to help them. Without freedom of speech and press, we could not have made such great progress in science and industry, nor such improvement in our general living conditions. Only a people who are free to make their voices heard can really grow materially as well as spiritually.

All men everywhere can dream of a better life, but only where there is freedom of expression and action can the dream become reality. It is this freedom that is given us by our Bill of Rights.

Because of it, I believe in America and in America's future. I believe that with this freedom there is no limit to what we can accomplish. I believe that under the Bill of Rights any man, regardless of race, creed, or color, can by earnest application and hard work make his dreams come true.

Because I believe all this, I regard the Bill of Rights not only as a protector of my freedom and a recognition of my personal dignity, but also as a challenge. I accept its challenge to be a good citizen, to use these precious rights and freedoms only for the good of the country that has given so much to me.

In brief, I regard the Bill of Rights as our hope for keeping America a land where a man can walk without fear. To me, this is a hope that makes life worth living, a hope that is worth defending with life itself, if need be.

PRESIDENT'S SCHOOL-AID PROGRAM HOLDS SCANT HOPE FOR STATE OF OREGON

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the school-aid program proposed by the President fails utterly to meet the needs of the State of Oregon, which has experienced one of the largest increases in school population of any State in the Nation.

It is another demonstration of "government by gimmick." Great fanfare heralds an administration proposal. Yet, the proposal itself adds up to virtually nothing.

The present school emergency calls for a Mae West lifejacket. The President threw out a lifesaver—a candy one.

About the only direct aid in the President's plan is to so-called impoverished districts. The districts in Oregon are not impoverished, but they are staggering under an incredible load of school needs. Are they to be denied Federal aid?

The rest of the President's program consists principally of borrowing facilities. It may be easier for school districts to borrow money—often at banker's rates. What kind of assistance is this?

A brief summary of the situation in my State will show vividly how completely inadequate are the proposals which came from the White House on February 8, 1955.

School enrollment in Oregon in 1952 was 295,800. Today, it is 353,987. In 1960, it will be 463,428.

The schools of Oregon will need 3,500 new classrooms by 1960. The estimated cost of these new facilities will be $100,698,319—a huge burden in a State of only 1,620,000 population. For example, an additional $3,335,000 will be required just to furnish school buses to transport the increase in enrollment.

The Oregon Education Association, a conservative organization which is cautious in its statements, announced at the start of the last school year that the critical Oregon situation seemed to make essential some form of Federal aid. But the President's proposal offers no genuine aid. It merely encourages overburdened districts to add to their burdens.

The Oregon Education Association estimates that if Oregon teacher salaries are to be raised at least to the existing level in the State of Washington, the extra cost by 1960 will be $36 million annually—especially after Oregon hires 5,300 new teachers to train the children who will be among the increased school enrollment.

Such expenditures cannot be postponed. Each generation comes this way but once. If schooling is inadequate or backward, the children will suffer for it all through their lives as American citizens. If teachers are not properly trained, the harm thus done can affect adversely the whole future of our Nation. Can we enlist competent and well-educated men and women in the teaching profession unless salaries, tenure, and conditions of work are attractive?

All these things confront the United States today, and particularly States like Oregon, where school enrollment has risen astronomically because of a 40 percent general population increase between 1940 and 1950.

Because of the critical school situation, I have been pleased to join with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and 35 other Senators in sponsorship of a bill (S. 772) which would allocate to the schools of the Nation all revenues from the valuable outer continental shelf oil reserves which lie off some of our seacoasts. I also have been privileged

to join in sponsorship of a bill by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] (S. 686) providing Federal financial assistance to the States for the construction of elementary and high-school facilities such as classrooms and other needed structures. In addition, I have joined with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and other Senators in sponsorship of the Hill bill to provide $500 million in financial assistance for construction of urgently needed school facilities in the Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD with my remarks a statement entitled "Schools in Our Expanding Economy," published by the Oregon Education Association of my State; a column from the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 18, 1955, by the distinguished columnist, Marquis Childs, entitled "Budget Fails To Inspire Educators"; and an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 9, 1955, entitled "Half a Loaf," which accurately assays the feebleness and inadequacy of the President's proposals for school aid.

There being no objection, the statement, article, and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Better Schools—Oregon Education Association]

SCHOOLS IN OUR EXPANDING ECONOMY

American standards of living have been rising steadily for decades and at an accelerating pace. But few citizens stop to consider that their Government, at all levels, is an important factor in their living standards.

In our expanding economy, people have demanded more and better governmental services. They have sought sewage-disposal plants, added fire protection, more efficient police departments, better school buildings and broadened teaching services. In seeking these and other services, they have simply been asking that their Government keep pace with their economy—with their rising living standards.

An expanding population and technological improvements have made these added governmental services possible. We have demanded them and are able to afford them.

Machines now make it possible for fewer and fewer workers to provide the basics of life—food, clothing, and shelter. New methods and materials have relieved more and more workers and professional people to provide the services of government, education, law, medicine, and other activities that are not productive in the material, hand-labor sense, but that are an integral part of our standard of living.

Especially in the past century, there has been a spectacular expansion of American life.

Schools have shared in this spectacular change. The numbers of pupils have vastly increased, the school plant is vastly bigger, students are staying longer in school, the curriculum is broader. School changes have, in general, kept pace with our rising living standards.

We Americans have always attached great importance to our schools—and made provision for their maintenance. Through the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, our pioneer forebears set aside one section of land in every township for support of schools. When Oregon gained statehood in 1859, two sections of land in every township were earmarked for educational support. Oregon's first governor was also designated superintendent of public instruction, and legislation early in our Territorial history gave specific attention to schools.

Education was exalted by the early Americans because they knew the importance of a literate citizenry. A citizenry that could read the Bible; that could know and observe the Nation's laws; that could learn new trades; that could master the lessons of common defense—quickly if need be.

Schools in Oregon met most of the State's fundamental needs until the depression of the 1930's. But then serious problems arose.

School buildings were neglected for nearly a decade due to the rigors of our economy. New construction was barely underway following the depression when World War II struck and halted building for another 5 years. By the time new building plans could be implemented in 1947, a 17-year lag in construction had accumulated.

During World War II, teachers left the profession by the hundreds for higher paid wartime work. And then came the unpredicted tidal wave of postwar births, climbing to a high point of nearly 40,000 in Oregon in 1953.

School needs—and school costs—climbed and climbed and climbed. The end is not yet in sight. Enrollments are continuing to rise, and we citizens continue to seek further services from our schools.

Financing our schools is part of the overall problem of financing our Government. School taxes are paid by the same group of people who finance other governmental services. That is why, in the following pages, school financing is considered in relation to all governmental costs—Federal, State, county, local. The vast requirements of the Federal Government are shown; the growing demands of the State in the fields of road-building, welfare, and building construction are indicated.

It is the intention of the Oregon Education Association, in publishing this booklet, to give citizens this overall picture—and especially to encourage wider knowledge and study of the special problems of the schools.

THE NEXT 10 YEARS WILL BE CRITICAL FOR OREGON SCHOOLS

1. New births have been at high levels since 1947. Inmigration continues strong.

2. School plant construction was neglected during the depression, and later during World War II. It has not caught up.

3. Teacher supply both in numbers and qualifications, remains too low.

4. Local districts will be heavily bonded, on the average, by 1960.

5. Competition for public funds with highways, public institutions, city and county governments, is keen and getting keener.

Meanwhile, our schools' future remains closely tied to the world situation. In the long run, our whopping defense budget is the only possible source of major local tax relief. Thus a definite easing of world tensions might make school financing much simpler. On the other hand, a new crisis or war would boost defense expenditures, multiply the national debt and put our schools even farther behind.

We cannot safely base our actions on any assumed trend in world affairs. We must decide on the type of schools we want, and plan to provide them with the means at hand, under existing conditions. This will mean hard choices and additional sacrifices, but the fruits of this course will be bountiful. We will be investing in the future well-being of our State, its economic well-being, its social well-being, its spiritual well-being. Less we should not attempt. Less we cannot afford to do.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 18, 1955]

BUDGET FAILS TO INSPIRE EDUCATORS

(By Marquis Childs)

What was not included in the Eisenhower budget for the new Government year has caused almost more stir than what it did contain. Educational leaders who obtained advance copies of the President's budget message were shocked to find that there was no allocation for Federal aid for school construction.

They felt especially let down since in his state of the Union message President Eisenhower had said that "positive affirmative action must be taken now" to overcome an unprecedented classroom shortage. The educators had thought that this meant at least some Federal aid would be forthcoming to help overcome the shortage of classrooms throughout the Nation, estimated up to 370,000.

When he addressed Congress on January 6, the President promised a special message on education to be sent up on February 15. But since there is no allocation to school aid in the new budget, educators are putting slight hope in the forthcoming message.

Several Congressmen are reported to have been given a preview of what the President intends to propose. He will recommend, it is reported, a Federal school-building authority which will aid and encourage the formation of State school-building authorities.

The Federal authority will have a small fund for grants-in-aid to States least able to finance their own schools. According to one report, this will be only $25 million. In the light of present school-construction needs, estimated conservatively at $4 billion a year for the next 5 years, and somewhat less thereafter, this in the view of education officials would be an insult.

It is also reported that the President's message may recommend an additional sum for scholarships and fellowships in colleges and graduate schools. This will start at $50 million a year and go up to $200 million at the end of 4 years. Linked with this is the report that the President will recommend construction aid for colleges.

But in view of the desperate need at the grade-school and high-school level it seems unlikely that the White House would propose funds for advanced education. One authority estimates that 20 percent of all pupils are now attending school in firetraps, while 10 percent of all elementary pupils are in buildings more than 50 years old.

The President in his budget message sticks closely to the line of State responsibility. Educational leaders had hoped that perhaps this line had been breached when in his state of the Union address he had spoken of the need for the Federal Government to serve as "an effective catalyst" in dealing with the serious school shortage. The word "catalyst" appeared in the text of the President's talk as released by the White House. But in reading it Mr. Eisenhower substituted the word "agent."

Senator LISTER HILL, Democrat, of Alabama, new chairman of the Senate Labor and Education Committee, has introduced a bill providing $500 million a year for school construction. It has 30 sponsors, 28 of them Democrats and 2 Republicans. There has been some talk of bringing this out of committee without formal hearings, since it is identical with a bill sponsored in the last Congress by former Senator John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky, except for the fact that the Cooper bill called for expenditures of $250 million a year.

Favorable action is expected from the Senate. The bill will have tougher going in the House. Those opposing it are said to feel that the segregation issue—an amendment stipulating that no State practicing segregation in education shall receive funds under the measure—will kill it in the House.

Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, head of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has repeatedly opposed Federal help for school construction. She has counseled patience until the White House conference on education to be held this fall, which will be followed by a series of State conferences.

The President in his budget message also refers to these conferences, holding out the hope that they will provide "long-range solutions to the problems and will place in better perspective the obligations and opportunities of the respective levels of government." But those who are concerned over the desperate overcrowding in the schools, which they link with the rapid rise in juvenile delinquency, insist that waiting for a long-range solution will deprive a whole generation of a decent opportunity for education.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 9, 1955]

HALF A LOAF

The President's education message is an attempt to apply a poultice to a cancer. It recognizes the disease—a deficit, as the President put it, of more than 300,000 classrooms in the physical facilities for learning available to the Nation's children. This recognition is a signicant step forward and renders a most valuable service to the Nation. But the remedy proposed by the President seems to us hesitant, temporizing, and inadequate.

Mr. Eisenhower's hesitation grows out of a fundamental misapprehension. He fears that Federal aid to State public school systems may introduce an element of national interference in local activities which ought to be kept resolutely independent. But the fear is an unreal one. The proposals for Federal aid put forward by the appropriate committees of the House and the Senate obviate any danger of Federal control. They offer financial assistance from the Nation because the problem is a national one and because the States lack the resources to meet it; but they carefully preserve local responsibility and local independence.

Instead of a program of direct and simple financial aid to the States, Mr. Eisenhower has proposed a complicated system under which the States and the Federal Government cooperatively would purchase school bonds issued by local communities. He acknowledges, however, that restrictive debt limits forbid many school districts to borrow in this fashion and that in many others the amount of taxable property and local income is so low as to make it impossible for the district either to repay borrowed money or rent a satisfactory school building. To the impoverished districts he would make Federal grants in conjunction with the States—thus breaching, so far as they are concerned, the wall he had previously erected against Federal intervention. If direct Federal aid will not imperil the independence of communities unable to borrow, it will not imperil the independence of more solvent communities.

We think the President has balked at a bugbear. The condition of the schools as he has pictured it constitutes a national crisis. Congress now has before it carefully considered bills which will meet this crisis more quickly, more generously, and more effectively than the President's plan. We hope it will enact one of them soon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I did not know that my colleague from Oregon was going to make the statement he has just made. I wish to commend him for the soundness of his position on the President's window-dressing school-aid bill, and I desire to join my colleague in all his comments on the President's very unsound school-aid program.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the editorial entitled "Half a Loaf," which appears in today's Washington Post and Times Herald, and which was just ordered inserted in the RECORD at the request of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], contains a number of timely and impressive observations and many words "fitly spoken" which, as usual, are "like apples of gold in pictures of silver."

The attention of the Senate is invited to a few of those observations, as follows:

The President's education message is an attempt to apply a poultice to a cancer. It recognizes the disease—a deficit, as the President put it, of more than 300,000 classrooms in the physical facilities for learning available to the Nation's children. This recognition is a significant step forward and renders a most valuable service to the Nation. But the remedy proposed by the President seems to us hesitant, temporizing and inadequate.

* * * * *

We think the President has balked at a bugbear. The condition of the schools as he has pictured it constitutes a national crisis. Congress now has before it carefully considered bill which will meet this crisis more quickly, more generously and more effectively than the President's plan. We hope it will enact one of them soon.

Mr. President, let me wholeheartedly concur in that praiseworthy expression of hope, and reduce the generality to Senate bill 5, which was prepared and sponsored by the eminent Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and in which 29 other Members of this body have joined. In my opinion, it would be as impossible to solve the Nation's present educational problems in the manner recommended by the President as it would be to extinguish a city-wide conflagration with a squirt gun.

SPREAD OF SEA LAMPREYS—LETTER FROM FEDERATION OF FRESH-WATER FISHERIES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a very important letter from the managing director of the Federation of Fresh-Water Fisheries, located in Grand Haven, Mich.

Mr. Claude Ver Duin writes concerning the importance of continued adequate appropriations to combat the vampire eel menace which has all but destroyed Great Lakes fisheries.

Ever since the sea lamprey first struck against Great Lakes fisheries, I have been in contact with the Fish and Wildlife Service and have been urging an all-out fight against this menace. I heartily endorse Mr. Ver Duin's statement on the continued significance of allocating sufficient funds for this task.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his letter be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERATION OF FRESH-WATER FISHERIES,
Grand Haven, Mich., January 29, 1955.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The United States Fish and Wildlife Service has done an admirable job of retarding the spread of sea lampreys in Lake Superior. The Service is now prepared to launch an all-out campaign against these dangerous parasites in Lake Michigan. We believe that a continuation of the present program will save the Lake Superior fisheries, and lead to the rehabilitation of those located on Lake Michigan.

To date a little more than $1 million have been spent in an effort to control the lampreys and save our valuable fisheries. This year budget officials in Washington propose to curtail the sea-lamprey program by cutting the appropriation more than 50 percent. We believe that such a reduction in the program could nullify all of the efforts and investments to date. Sea lampreys have a 7-year life cycle. A reduction in the program at this time, for even a year, would permit the spawning of a year class that could completely overrun the lakes again. It is imperative that sufficient funds are appropriated to keep the program moving ahead at the level that has been established in the past 3 years.

Wisconsin has a real stake in this program. Commercial and sport fishing in your State is big business. The fisheries are also a tourist attraction that brings thousands of dollars to the shore communities each year. We must continue our fight to save this valuable natural resource.

On September 10, 1954, a treaty was signed with Canada for coordinated sea-lamprey control and fisheries research. This new program cannot possibly be inaugurated during the coming fiscal year. Each country will continue its own program, coordinating their efforts through close liaison. Canada has secured and plans to spend $500,000 during the next year. We shudder to think what their reactions will be if the $320,000 budget request of our Fish and Wildlife Service is cut to $150,000.

We hope that you will support a continuation of the fight against the sea lamprey menace and help secure the necessary funds to properly finance this work.

Sincerely,

CLAUDE VER DUIN,
Managing Director.

LETTER FROM WISCONSIN JUVENILE OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as I have stated on many occasions, the real answer to the problem of juvenile delinquency throughout our Nation is by constructive action at the grassroots. I am proud to say that my own State of Wisconsin has been in the forefront in this effort.

I was pleased today to hear from one of the distinguished law-enforcement officers of my State, Capt. Michael S. Wolke, director of the Youth Aid Bureau of the Police Department of the City of Milwaukee. This department is, I may say, one of the great police organizations of the United States, famed throughout the Nation for its integrity and its high standards of personnel and achievement.

I believe that my colleagues will be interested to know that there is a statewide Badger organization, of which Captain Wolke is the president, the Wisconsin Juvenile Officers' Association, dedicated to grassroots work against youthful crime.

I send to the desk the text of Captain Wolke's letter, and the forepart—the first three articles—of the organizational charter of that distinguished group.

I ask unanimous consent that this material be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

I earnestly hope that other States throughout the Nation will follow the splendid example of the Wisconsin Juvenile Officers' Association.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF MILWAUKEE,
DEPARTMENT OF POLICE,
Milwaukee, Wis., February 7, 1955.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator From Wisconsin,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: As president of the Wisconsin Juvenile Officers' Association, may I take this opportunity of expressing our most appreciative thanks and pleasure in commending you for your decisive stand and introduction of the proposed resolution calling for grants-in-aid to States conducting tried and tested youth-welfare programs.

We in Wisconsin can be proud of the numerous projects that concern the needs of our children, and we are grateful to you particularly and to the other representatives of this fine State in the Nation's Capital, who are constantly striving to better the condition not only of their own State, but, also, that of the other 47 States which make up this wonderful land of freedom, hope, and inspiration.

Enclosed please find a copy of our organizational charter explaining our functions and purposes. May we also insure our continued cooperation and support in all your endeavors where we as individuals or as an organization can be of some assistance.

Our sincerest thanks again for your profound concern and interest in the welfare of our future citizens and kindest personal regards from your many friends in Wisconsin, I remain,

Respectfully yours,
Capt. MICHAEL S. WOLKE,
Director, Youth Aid Bureau.

CONSTITUTION OF THE WISCONSIN STATE JUVENILE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

ARTICLE I

Name: The name of this organization shall be the Wisconsin State Juvenile Officers Association.

ARTICLE II

Objectives: The objectives of this association are:

1. To encourage active participation in all matters that have to do with youth and youth's problems as they pertain to the field of law enforcement.

2. To uphold the principles of good government.

3. To assist in every honorable way the furthering of the interests of its members and to bring about better understanding, not only of those engaged in the work, but with the various youth agencies with whom we have contact.

4. To recognize and teach that organization, cooperation, and reciprocity are better than rivalry, strife, and destructive competition.

5. To cooperate with all youth organizations, both governmental and la[illegible], which have a common interest in youth and the public's welfare.

6. To encourage the application of the highest ethical standard of our profession, and to endeavor by the exchange of methods and ideas to increase our efficiency within our respective organization.

7. To concern ourselves with legislative programs and contemplated legislation which in our opinion would affect the welfare of the youth of the State of Wisconsin.

8. To afford full protection to all law-abiding citizens of this State and to the end that the juvenile's best interests will be served.

ARTICLE III

Membership: Membership in this organization shall be open to all law-enforcement officers who are or will be working specifically with juveniles.

Voting membership shall be limited to those who are members of a bona fide law-enforcement agency and assigned, full or part time, to juvenile activities. Voting membership may be retained by members of law-enforcement agencies who have been reassigned to other duties.

CONFERENCE ON INTER-AMERICAN INVESTMENT IN NEW ORLEANS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, later this month a conference of outstanding significance to the Western Hemisphere will be held in New Orleans. I refer to the Inter-American Investment Conference from February 28–March 3, cosponsored by Time-Life International and by the city of New Orleans, and conducted with the cooperation of numerous outstanding organizations.

The purpose of this conference is to fulfill the goals set forth so ably by the International Development Advisory Board—goals which had been cited, too, by our own and other diplomats and economic experts of the Western Hemisphere at the Inter-American Conference held last December in Brazil.

For this New Orleans conference, an outstanding assembly of financial leaders of the hemisphere will be on hand.

I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared on it, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement and appended material be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement and appended material were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

It has been my pleasure to be in close touch with Mr. Rudolph S. Hecht, chairman of the New Orleans conference committee, and Mr. Edgar Baker, managing director of Time-Life International, with regard to this very important conference.

Mr. Baker in a letter to me yesterday advised me of the splendid progress in the conference's advance work. I may say that the names of the distinguished Americans whom he mentioned will contribute to the conference, underline the outstanding caliber of this meeting. The conference's importance is recognized at the highest level of the United States Government, as evidenced by the fact that President Dwight D. Eisenhower will deliver a closed-circuit telecast address to the conference.

I believe that the text of Mr. Baker's letter will be of interest to my colleagues. Here it is:

TIME-LIFE INTERNATIONAL,
New York, February 8, 1955.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Because you have shown such great interest and have been of so much encouragement to us with regard to the Inter-American Investment Conference, I wanted to write you again to tell you of the progress of our plans. With acceptance of invitations running in excess of 90 percent, we now expect more than 250 top-ranking Latin-American businessmen from 19 countries and the British and Dutch Caribbean territories. We are also assured of at least 200 from the United States, drawn largely from top-management levels reflecting a broad cross section of United States industry and finance.

The Conference's 3½-day program will include addresses by the President speaking over a closed-circuit telecast from the White House; Eugene Black, president of the International Bank; Gen. Glen Edgerton, president of the Export-Import Bank; Dr. Milton Eisenhower, president of Pennsylvania State College; Peter Grace, president of W. R. Grace and Co.; Walker Cisler, president of Detroit Edison; Eric Johnston, chairman of the International Development Advisory Board; and Henry R. Luce, editor in chief of Time, Inc. Latin-American speakers and panel members include Carlos Dávila, Secretary General of the Organization of American States; Eduardo Suarez, of Mexico; Eugenio Mendoza of Venezuela; Martin del Corral, of Colombia; Burke Hedges, of Cuba; and Antonio Aycenena, of Guatemala. The United States business community in Latin America will be represented on the program by Walter Donnelly and Gen. William Draper.

I would greatly appreciate receiving any comments or suggestions which you may have for enhancing the success of the Conference.

Very truly yours,
EDGAR R. BAKER,
Managing Director.

EXPANSION OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES

For many years, it has been universally recognized that additional private American investment is needed in Latin America. Already, Latin America is our greatest single field of direct foreign overseas investment. It is our greatest single supplier of raw materials. It is our best single customer.

Latin America's population is expanding; its needs are increasing.

Today, its production aggregates $40 billion a year in goods and services. This amount is increasing rapidly.

More and more American companies are investing in Latin America. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the Export-Import Bank are both playing an exceedingly important role, as is private American capital, especially through our great private banking system.

Yet, it is only realistic to point out that problem after problem arises in connection with the much-needed vast expansion of private Latin-American investments. I refer to such problems as some nations' overly restrictive laws and regulations on foreign investments as well as the problems on incontrovertibility of currency.

Again and again, private businessmen have come to my office indicating that, much as they would like to invest in Latin America, there are certain common problems which they face which must first be resolved.

How to resolve these problems to the mutual satisfaction of American capital and to the satisfaction of the Latin-American nations, their sovereign governments and their peoples, is a matter requiring close and continuing cooperation.

There is no obstacle, however, which is insuperable, and the tremendous economic expansion in recent years confirms that fact.

Of course, the burden of future action does not rest upon our Latin American friends alone. There are many things which we must do jointly, as well as individually. Thus, we must work out an improved system of bilateral treaties so as to eliminate double taxation.

Here in our Congress, we should act upon the administration's recommendation for lighter taxation on earnings from overseas investments.

This could mean, for example, a reduction of the corporate income rate by 14 points on foreign investments.

But even if these and other steps are taken, as we believe they will and should be, still, strengthening of American investment is not going to come about overnight. It is not going to be achieved with a magic wand, and the able group of leaders who will be assembling at New Orleans fully realizes that fact.

SPLENDID WORK OF IDAB

Few more important long-range guideposts to the future have been set forth than are contained in the report of the International Development Advisory Board filed in Washington on September 1954, by Mr. Eric Johnston, Chairman, with the Honorable Harold Stassen, Director of the Foreign Operations Administration.

This International Development Advisory Board has rendered great service to the cause of prosperity in the hemisphere by its comprehensive program for the encouragement of investment of capital. It has given us a clear picture of the problems in terms of diversifying Latin American agriculture and industry, strengthening its transportation, its power, and its fuel. The Board has stressed the importance of balance in development and the importance of stability in development. The Board is truly to be complimented for its splendid work.

SENATOR WILEY'S INTEREST IN LATIN AMERICA

For a long time, I have personally been deeply interested in Latin America. I have been interested in my capacity as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1953 and 1954. In that capacity, I was privileged to serve as a delegate at the Rio Conference. Here at home it has been my pleasure on many occasions to consult with the able Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, the Honorable Henry Holland. I had noted with pleasure to fine work performed by our Consultative Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, headed by the Honorable BOURKE HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa.

During my term as chairman, an important report on Latin America was made by my colleague, the Honorable THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island, based on a tour which he had made at the request of Senator HICKENLOOPER. Similarly deep interest in inter-American affairs has been demonstrated by our other subcommittee colleague, the Honorable JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama.

Two members of our committee staff had toured Latin America: Mr. Pat Holt, consultant, had accompanied Senator GREEN. Mr. Julius H. Cahn, counsel, had, at my direction, made a study on the scene throughout the Caribbean and in parts of South America for the purpose of analyzing both the problem of communism (particularly under the previous Red-dominated regime of Colonel Arbenz in Guatemala) as well as on overall economic problems in the area. His studies have been kept up to date at my request, especially on this United States investment phase.

Now, as ranking Republican member, I know that my interest in Latin America is shared by my distinguished successor as chairman of the full committee, the Honorable WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia.

I want to say, too, that I have been interested in this subject as an individual United States Senator representing a great State—Wisconsin—which conducts a tremendous amount of business with many countries in the hemisphere. That business—and business everywhere in our land—will be stimulated by the New Orleans conference.

WELCOME TO OUR VISITORS

Now, I want to welcome to the conference the distinguished array of citizens and public officials from Hispano America who will shortly be arriving in our land.

They and we know that this will be a working conference. It is aimed at results. It is going to get down to cases, and it is, I trust going to constitute a milestone of achievement in this important field.

And, so, I wish it every success.

This is private enterprise at work. It is Pan-Americanism at its finest.

Latin America today is undoubtedly the greatest single economic frontier in our world. Great opportunities lie before the peoples of the hemisphere. Tremendous rises in standards of living are in store for the various nations.

The people of the United States extend good will to our friends to the South, and we know it is reciprocated.

We look for that favorable economic climate in which American investors can make the most significant possible contribution to Latin American growth.

DATA FROM CONFERENCE BOOKLET

Fortunately, the New Orleans Conference is getting under way with the finest type of auspices. I believe that perhaps the best illustration of that is contained in a booklet on the conference which lists the sponsors and hosts, the cooperating organizations, and the cosponsoring organizations.

I am pleased to append this material at this point:

AUSPICES

"An imposing group of business and other organizations both in the United States and in Latin America are actively supporting the conference, indicating the widespread interest of the business communities of both continents. As of December 7, 1954, the list of sponsoring and cooperating organizations was as follows:

Sponsors and hosts

The city of New Orleans: International House, International Trade Mart, Chamber of Commerce of the New Orleans Area, Port of New Orleans, New Orleans Board of Trade, Green Coffee Association.

Time-Life International: Publishers of Time, Latin American edition, and Life en Español.

Cooperating organizations

Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Investment Bankers Association of America.

National Association of Manufacturers.

United States Inter-American Council.

United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce, Inc.

Organization of American States.

International Development Advisory Board.

Latin American cosponsoring organizations

Argentina: Confederación General Económica de la República Argentina, Confederación General de Comerciantes.

Bolivia: Cámara Nacional de Industrias, Cámara Nacional de Minería, Santa Cruz Agricultural and Industrial Organization; banking group: Banco Central de Bolivia, Crédito Hipotecario de Bolivia, Banco Nacional de Bolivia, Banco Mercantil, Banco Popular Colombo-Boliviano, Banco Popular del Perú en Bolivia.

Brazil: Centro das Indústrias do Estado do Rio Grande do Sul, Federação das Associações Rurais do Rio Grande do Sul, Federação das Associacões Comerciaes do Rio Grande do Sul, Banco de Curitiba, Federação das Indústrias do Estado de São Paulo (FIESP), Centro das Indústrias do Estado de São Paulo (CIESP), Sociedade Rural Brasileira, Federação do Comércio do Estado de São Paulo, Confederação Nacional da Industria, Confederação Nacional do Comércio, Federação das Industrias do Rio de Janeiro.

Chile: Comité Interamericano de Inversiones.

Colombia: ANDI—Asociación Nacional de Industriales, Asociación Bancaria, ACOPI—Asociación Colombiana de Pequeños Industriales.

Costa Rica: Cámara de Industrias, Banco de Costa Rica, Cámara de Agricultura, Junta de la Caña.

Cuba: Asociación Nacional de Industriales de Cuba, Cámara de Comercio de la República de Cuba, American Chamber of Commerce of Cuba, Asociación de Bancos de Cuba, Asociación de Colonos de Cuba, Asociación Nacional de Hacendados de Cuba.

Dominican Republic: Cámara Oficial de Comercio, Agricultura e Industria del Distrito de Santo Domingo.

Ecuador: Cámara de Industriales de Pichincha, Cámara de Industrias (Guayaquil), Cámara de Agricultura de la Segunda Zona, Banks of Guayaquil, Cámara de Comercio de Guayaquil.

El Salvador: Cámara de Comercio e Industria de El Salvador.

Guatemala: Cámara de Comercio e Industria de Guatemala, Asociación General de Agricultores, Bancos de Guatemala.

Honduras: Cámara de Comercio e Industrias de Tegucigalpa.

Mexico: Secretariado Mexicano de Relaciones Internacionales de la Iniciativa Privada, representing Asociación de Banqueros de México, Confederación de Cámaras Industriales, Confederación de Cámaras Nacionales de Comercio, Cámara de Comercio de Monterrey.

Nicaragua: Comité para Inversión de Capital Privado in Nicaragua, representing, Cámara de Comercio e Industrias, Cooperativa Nacional de Agricultores, Sociedad Cooperativa Anónima de Cafetaleros de Nicaragua, Banks.

Panama: Cámara de Comercio, Industria y Agricultura de Panamá; Sindicato de Industriales de Panamá; Instituto de Fomento Económico; Zona Franca de Colón.

Paraguay: FEPRINCO (Federación de la Producción, la Industria y el Comercio).

Peru: Cámara de Comercio; Cámara de Industrias; Sociedad Nacional Agraria; Sociedad Nacional de Minería y Petroleo; Banco de Crédito del Perú; Banco Wiese, Ltdo.; Banco Popular; Banco Internacional del Perú.

Surinam: Commissie Voor Internationale Investeringen in het Westelijk Halfrond.

Uruguay: Comité Interamericano de Inversiones.

Venezuela: Federación Venezolana de Cámaras y Asociaciones de Comercio y Producción, American Chamber of Commerce in Venezuela.

THE CURRENT CAMPAIGN TO AMEND THE NATURAL GAS ACT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD three items relating to the current campaign to amend the Natural Gas Act. The first is an article from the Wall Street Journal of January 12, 1955, entitled "Gas Producers Enlist Consumers in Battle Against FPC Control."

The second is a resolution and committee explanation adopted at the last annual meeting of the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers.

The third is an article by the thoughtful columnist, Thomas L. Stokes, from the Washington Evening Star for February 5, 1955.

Mr. President, I fear that the $1,500,000 propaganda drive reported in the Wall Street Journal is a tipoff to one of the principal attacks on consumer interests that may be made in this Congress. The lavish display advertisements appearing in many newspapers a few days ago confirm this report.

I am requesting that this material be inserted in the RECORD for the fuller information of Members of Congress on the nature of this serious danger. At the same time it should be encouraging to note the forthright resolution and committee explanation opposing any

weakening of the Natural Gas Act overwhelmingly passed by the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers which has consistently fought for the consumers against this legislation which would cost them so many hundreds of millions of dollars.

There being no objection, the articles and the resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of January 12, 1955]

GAS PRODUCERS ENLIST CONSUMERS IN BATTLE AGAINST FPC CONTROL—INDUSTRY MOBILIZES GIANT LOBBY TO BACK LEGISLATION TO UPSET PHILLIPS PETROLEUM DECISION

(By Harlan Byrne)

HOUSTON.—Some 21 million natural gas users and other millions of potential customers are about to be enrolled in a giant lobby.

The oil and gas industry this month will kick off a king-sized publicity campaign with this goal: To gain consumer support for legislation coming up in Congress this session to free gas producers from Federal control decreed by the United States Supreme Court last June.

The industry's educational story will be told and retold in newspapers ads, feature stories, editorials; on radio and TV programs, at conventions and civic club meetings. The initial costs of bringing the message to the people may run up to $1,500,000, industry officials estimate.

In addition, literally thousands of oil and gas workers will give part-time service in carrying the gospel—through publicity work, speech making, and personal contacts.

INDUSTRY'S MESSAGE

To win the tough tussle, oil and gas industry leaders believe they must convince consumers that an assured future supply of the fuel can be guaranteed only by competitive, unregulated production.

The job of wooing consumers falls to the Natural Gas and Oil Resources Committee, an industry group formed last October. The committee is headed by L. F. McCollum, president of Continental Oil Co., and Paul Kayser, president of El Paso Natural Gas Co.

"We would be naive to be too optimistic of our chances of getting favorable legislation this year," says Mr. McCollum. "I don't believe there's any question we can get the average consumer to see our side, but right now the time element is a terrific handicap."

Privately, other oil and gas company executives say chances are better than even that Congress this year will amend the Natural Gas Act of 1938 to exempt producers from regulation by the Federal Power Commission. Principal opposition is expected from Congressmen of consuming States, especially the Midwest and East.

State and city officials of Wisconsin, Missouri, and Michigan pressed the Phillips case to a Supreme Court decision. Officials from those consuming areas argued that control of producers' prices was needed to protect gas users from continuing rate boosts. The Supreme Court ruled that producers' sales of gas in interstate commerce are subject to regulation of the Federal Power Commission.

PUBLIC RELATIONS PROGRAM

Mr. McCollum's group then lost no time. A national headquarters was set up in New York City, to be run by Baird H. Markham, a veteran official of the American Petroleum Institute. The committee hired Hill & Knowton, Inc., as public relations consultant. A number of gas producing companies, too, put their own public relations people at the full-time disposal of Mr. Markham.

His staff has drawn up an elaborate plan of action, reaching down through regional and State committees and individual companies.

"This is the most extensive and best coordinated program I've ever seen the industry undertake," says one oil-company official close to behind-scenes activity.

While all oil- and gas-industry groups, generally speaking, are giving lip service to the cause, producing companies are financing most of the McCollum committee's work.

Oil companies are the biggest contributors since they, too, are the big producers of gas. Oil firms also fear Federal control of gas production will lead eventually to regulation of oil output and prices.

In many instances, oil and gas are produced from the same wells, and oilmen believe it's hard to separate the two, economically. Interstate pipelines and local gas distributing firms around the country are sympathetic to the producers' drive for legislation, but for the most part they've stayed on the sidelines so far.

OTHER COMMITTEES AT WORK

Besides Mr. McCollum's group, other industry committees are busily at work. There's a general gas committee headed by Maston Nixon, president of Southern Minerals Corp., of Corpus Cristi.

His committee has subcommittees that are drumming up support from Congressmen and seeking the backing of other industry groups, including their competitors, the coal producers. Gas people argue that if their commodity is controlled at the producing level, the same thing may happen to coal later.

Beginning next Monday, the McCollum group will launch a full-blown campaign with a nationwide series of ads in newspapers of more than 1,500 circulation. Advertising will be heaviest in key consuming areas of the Midwest and East.

Newspapers, magazines, trade papers and radio and TV stations will soon be bombarded with feature stories—and even suggested editorials—pleading the gas producers' case.

Already McCollum committee members have called on more than 100 editors and publishers of metropolitan papers, asking their support. A number of big dailies are said to be unsympathetic.

A film on the natural-gas industry is being prepared for use by TV stations. Oil and gas people will be seeking appearances on radio and TV quiz-panel shows. National headquarters is setting up a speakers' bureau for talks at conventions and club meetings.

"We're not asking industry leaders to speak; we're drafting them," says Mr. McCollum.

Producers have been called on to throw their own public relations staffs into the fight. They'll contact local civic groups, such as the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Rotary, American Legion, chambers of commerce, and women's clubs, asking for an audience.

CONSUMER SUPPORT

Companies are urged to send letters to employees and stockholders, enlisting their help in winning consumer support. Phillips Petroleum Co. and Continental, for example, already have followed through with pamphlets and copies of speeches, mailed out with dividend checks.

Several firms have mailed letters to supervisory employees urging them to contact friends and explain the gas industry's position. They're asked to tell the natural gas story in understandable terms, not industry jargon.

In key cities, monitoring teams will be reading newspapers and checking radio and TV programs regularly, on the lookout for adverse publicity. They'll seek to correct misinformation by quickly calling it to the attention of the paper or the station. Letters to the editor columns also will be used.

There was a time, before World War II, when natural gas was pretty much an unwanted commodity. Its use was confined to a handful of Western States outside the traditionally big producing and consuming areas of the Southwest, which now supply about 90 percent of total output.

With improvements in pipeline technology and a sharp climb in oil and coal prices right after the war, a great clamor arose for cheap gas from the Southwest. A dozen or so pipelines since then have been built to supply faraway areas with gas.

Sales of natural gas have more than doubled since World War II, and now total around 9 trillion cubic feet annually. Natural gas supplies almost one-fourth to the Nation's energy requirements, compared with a little over one-tenth in 1940.

The number of natural gas customers has more than doubled. And several hundred thousand customers right now are on waiting lists for service.

Discovery of underground reserves of gas has not kept pace with consumption. While sales have more than doubled since the war, reserves have increased only about one-third—from 160 trillion cubic feet in 1946 to 211 trillion at the end of 1953.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MUNICIPAL LAW OFFICERS, SAN FRANCISCO MEETING, SEPTEMBER 1954

RESOLUTION OPPOSING WEAKENING OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION JURISDICTION

Whereas the primary purpose of the Congress in adopting the Natural Gas Act of 1938 was to protect consumers from exploitation by suppliers of natural gas, while at the same time assuring the suppliers of a fair and reasonable price for their product; and

Whereas the means whereby the Congress accomplished this purpose was to confer jurisdiction upon the FPC to fix reasonable rates for sales of natural gas in interstate commerce for resale to consumers; and

Whereas NIMLO has since the adoption of this act taken the clear and consistent position that this purpose of the Congress should be carried out and that the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission thus conferred should remain unimpaired: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That NIMLO hereby reaffirms its prior position and opposes the enactment of Federal legislation which would weaken or impair the jurisdiction and functioning of the Federal Power Commission under the Natural Gas Act as now written; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Cabinet Committee on Energy, Supplies, and Resources Policy which is now considering the natural resources.

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE EXPLANATION

This subject was the only one upon which there was controversy at the open hearing conducted by your committee. Your committee was urged to recommend no action upon this subject until a newly created Cabinet Committee has completed a study of natural resources and reported, with NIMLO appointing a committee thereafter to recommend a position for this organization. We were also urged to recommend that NIMLO adhere to and reaffirm the prior position consistently taken by NIMLO since adoption of the Natural Gas Act of 1938 that this act should be carried out as originally written.

It was suggested that two States, Kansas and Oklahoma, prescribe minimum prices for intrastate sales of natural gas at the wellhead whereas the FPC only passes upon the reasonableness of maximum prices of sales in interstate commerce for resale and

that some conflict in Federal and State jurisdiction exists in reaffirming NIMLO's prior position taken not only in resolution but in the brief amicus curiae filed in the United States Supreme Court in the recently decided Phillips case. Your committee fails to find such conflict and notes that such conflict was urged upon the Supreme Court of the United States in the Phillips case and found to be nonexistent. In fact, your committee is impressed with the fact that since the States are constitutionally unable to control the reasonableness of sales in interstate commerce no conflict with FPC jurisdiction can arise. And no producing State fixes maximum prices for natural gas for the protection of consumers. They fix only minimum prices to protect producers.

Upon checking with NIMLO's staff, your committee was informed that while a copy was mailed to each one of NIMLO's 881 member municipalities of the brief amicus curiae filed in the Phillips case, not 1 member wrote in protest against or in disagreement with the position taken therein; that is, the position urged in the foregoing resolution.

Under these circumstances your committee finds no reason whatever to depart from the prior position of NIMLO on this matter. The proponents of a change of position frankly informed your committee that legislation to remove FPC jurisdiction to pass upon the reasonableness of rates charged by Phillips Petroleum Co. for sales in interstate commerce is certain to be introduced in Congress in January. NIMLO has not wavered down through the years in opposing such legislation, and no valid reason was advanced to your committee why NIMLO should change its position now. We were urged to recommend a change in NIMLO's position to one of "no position," and that we cannot do when no valid reasons were presented for such action.

Your committee was also informed that unless the Natural Gas Act is amended so as to nullify the decision in the Phillips case, the suppliers of natural gas would not sell their gas in interstate commerce, thus depriving thousands of users of this commodity and making the price higher because pipelines will not operate at full capacity. This argument in the nature of a threat by oil companies to deny themselves profitable interstate markets is one to which your committee cannot give credence. The FPC requires reserves to be dedicated for the use of each pipeline before the line can be constructed. The millions in cities who have changed over to the use of natural gas should not thus suddenly find their supply cut off due to this Supreme Court decision against Phillips Petroleum Co.

In NIMLO's brief amicus curiae it was pointed out that some 40 million consumers are now dependent upon natural gas. Nearly every large city—and many of the smaller cities—now have pipelines bringing this valuable commodity to them. Your committee is impressed by the argument urged upon it that we as city attorneys represent not oil companies but the consumers who reside in our cities. To here adopt the position of Phillips Petroleum Co., and depart from our representation of the consumers who pay us to represent their interests seems wholly inconsistent. We who represent consumers cannot be in the position of urging higher prices for consumers of natural gas. In the Phillips case the Supreme Court noted that a scuttling of FPC jurisdiction meant an increase in price for these consumers—an increase estimated from authoritative sources in NIMLO's amicus curiae brief there at $200 million per year. Action to support such a result your committee cannot recommend.

Consistent with our position as a representative of the consumers who reside within municipal corporate limits, your committee, therefore, recommends that NIMLO reaffirm its prior position in this matter.

CI——87

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 5, 1955]

THE CRUSADE TO CAPTURE FPC—OIL AND GAS INDUSTRY, WITH LONG STRING OF VICTORIES, PLANS NEW FIGHT TO PUT THE "BITE" ON CONSUMER

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

The pocketbook nerve, when pinched, eventually reacts. The screech often is echoed here.

That explains the outburst here from Representative SIDNEY YATES, Democrat, of Illinois. He echoed a complaint from constituents back home about an increase in natural-gas prices that will cost nearly a million and a half consumers of Chicago and 17 northern Illinois counties some $5,216,000. The Peoples Gas & Light Co., which was allowed the increase, blamed it on higher prices it must pay for natural gas.

Mr. YATES, in turn, traced the higher prices for natural gas to a decision several months ago by the Federal Power Commission here, the now-famous Panhandle Eastern Pipeline case, which changed the basis for ratemaking from cost of production to fair field price. The Illinois Congressman introduced a bill in the House to change the rate base back to actual legitimate cost.

What is happening in Mr. YATES' constituency, and what is happening similarly elsewhere, should not be surprising. Such increases were forecast at the time of the decision by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, among others, who predicted price increases of several million dollars in Chicago and northern Illinois in a Senate speech nearly a year ago, in March 1954.

We may expect a rising crescendo of protests from consumers all over as they get the "bite" and "the business."

This is perhaps lucky. For once alert, maybe consumers will get on to another project which big oil and affiliated natural-gas interests are about to spring and try to get through Congress. This will add still more to the higher costs already caused by the Panhandle Eastern Pipeline decision.

Behind this project is the biggest propaganda campaign of its sort—and one of the most expensive—seen by this city or the country since that of the electric utilities several years ago trying to avoid regulation of abuses turned up during investigations of the Hoover and Roosevelt administrations.

The objective is enactment of a bill to repeal a recent Supreme Court decision in the long-drawn-out Phillips Petroleum case. In its decision, the Court ruled that the Federal Power Commission must include natural-gas producers and gatherers in investigations and calculations relative to fixing rates.

The proposed bill would exempt producers and thus prevent the FPC from getting all the necessary facts for decisions and weaken it as a regulatory agency. In the Phillips case, the FPC tried to free itself of such authority over producers; but the Supreme Court held it must embrace them. The proposed bill would do what was the aim of the Kerr bill passed by the Republican 80th Congress, but killed by President Truman's veto.

The prime movers in this new drive to break down the FPC's regulatory authority are, of course, the big oil companies that own the bulk of natural-gas reserves. They are following a pattern which is becoming almost too familiar here for the public good. That is, if you are overruled by the Supreme Court, then you go to Congress and get a law passed to overrule the Supreme Court. Oil did that, you will recall, in the case of the offshore oil lands, getting Congress to hand them over to the States, after the Supreme Court had ruled they belonged to the Federal Government and the people.

The new oil-natural gas drive to tear down Federal regulation is directed at the consumer in an attempt to prove that removal of regulation and return to competitive conditions will help the consumer rather than hurt him. That was not the belief at all among over 500 city officials who gathered in San Francisco at the annual convention last September of the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers and got the first taste of the new drive to break down regulation which we have seen flower so luxuriantly since. Oil interests engineered a drive to get through that meeting a resolution endorsing the FPC's original attitude that it should exempt producers as exemplified in its Phillips case decision. City officials were not only contacted at home before they went to the convention, but were high-pressured there over long-distance telephone and otherwise in what one of them, James H. Lee, assistant corporation counsel of Detroit, branded "flagrant, unethical procedure." The resolution was overwhelmingly defeated, with only a few votes for it.

But that did not deter the oil and gas people. Where the propaganda campaign has reached now is indicated by a recent dispatch to the Wall Street Journal from Houston, saying industry officials estimated a million and a half dollars would be spent initially, of which oil would be the biggest contributor. Various advertising media are being used, newspapers, magazines, radio, television, moving pictures. From national headquarters in New York the campaign is organized down through the States almost literally to the precinct.

They have even set up monitoring teams to read newspapers and check radio and television programs for any hint of adverse publicity so that they can send missionaries around to talk to any offender and set him straight about their crusade.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is concluded.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS FOR PERSONS SERVING IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 587, Calendar No. 27.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 587) to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, as Members of this body know, the President issued a proclamation on January 1 terminating the Korean war emergency, so far as it affects veterans' benefits, as of January 31, 1955. Immediately, Members of Congress were made aware of the fact that this proclamation, taken under authority granted to the President by Public Law 550 of the 82d Congress, commonly called the Korean GI bill, ended the accumulation of any additional education and training time under Public Law 550 for those already in the Armed Forces.

H. R. 587 insures the full educational entitlement under Public Law 550 to members of the Armed Forces who were

on active duty on or before January 31 of this year. It provides that such an individual may continue to accrue entitlement to education at a rate specified in the law until his first discharge or until the maximum of 36 months entitlement is accrued. It further amends the law to provide an overall delimiting date of January 31, 1965, so as to permit an individual who has entered the service in January of this year on a 4-year enlistment to complete his enlistment and have 6 years in which to complete his educational program.

Many young Americans entered the Armed Forces during the past year or more with the understanding that they would have full entitlement to all wartime benefits. By enacting this bill Congress will be keeping faith with thousands of young men and women who enlisted prior to the effective date of the President's proclamation.

H. R. 587 passed the House on January 27 by a vote of 366 to 0. The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare held a hearing on the bill, receiving the views of the Veterans' Administration, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Chairman OLIN TEAGUE of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, all in favor of passage of the bill. The Senate committee has unanimously reported the bill without amendment; and, speaking for the committee, I hope that it will be speedily enacted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 587) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INVITATION TO HOLD 1960 OLYMPIC GAMES AT DETROIT, MICH.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 28, Senate Joint Resolution 14.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 14) extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1960 Olympic games at Detroit, Mich.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, the pending joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 14, is non-controversial. The United States Olympic Association appointed a committee to select a site in the United States best suited for the Olympic games of 1960, and the committee selected Detroit. The invitation to hold the games at Detroit, which has been unanimously endorsed by the United States Olympic Association, will have to be extended to the International Olympic Committee this spring.

I ask favorable consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is before the Senate. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 14) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, That whereas the United States Olympic Association will invite the International Olympic Committee to hold the Olympic games in the United States at Detroit, Mich., in 1960, the Government of the United States joins in the invitation of the United States Olympic Association to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1960 Olympic games in the United States at Detroit, Mich.; and expresses the sincere hope that the United States will be selected as the site for this great enterprise in international good will.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is directed to transmit a copy of this joint resolution to the International Olympic Committee.

THE PROPOSED RECLASSIFICATION OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article appearing in yesterday's edition of the Washington Daily News.

This article is entitled "Job Racket Exposed" and was written by John Cramer, Washington's very able civil-service reporter.

The Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is currently holding hearings on proposed legislation to increase the pay of postal employees and the administration's proposal to reclassify all jobs in the Post Office Department.

Mr. Cramer, by drawing attention to remarks made by Mr. Hallbeck, legislative representative, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, has very ably pointed out some of the many inconsistencies in this proposal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOB RACKET EXPOSED

(By John Cramer)

The often-phony Government job-classification racket got itself caught bare naked yesterday—and, just as you suspected, it has bow legs and wears falsies.

The catching came at the expense of embarrassed Post Office Department job classifiers, who were revealed to the amused scrutiny of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee with their job descriptions at half-mast.

It was accomplished by E. C. Hallbeck, legislative representative of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks.

He exposed the Department's classifiers in a typical classifiers' fraud—inflating the description of some jobs to justify higher grades for them and deflating others to jusify lower grades.

Post Office Department is trying to sell Congress a new classification plan for the postal field service.

In testimony yesterday, Mr. Hallbeck gave the House committee these examples of how the Department's classifiers had inflated some descriptions and deflated others:

Example 1: Here Mr. H. took the Department's official job description for clerks in medium third-class post offices and compared it with the job description for postmasters in smallest third-class offices. These latter offices have no employees. The postmaster is the entire staff.

Obviously, such a postmaster performs all the duties performed by a clerk in a slightly larger office, and more, too.

The clerk, however, is destined for lowly grade 2 in the Department's new pay ladder. So in describing his duties the Department used these words:

"1. Sorts incoming mail for general delivery, lock boxes, and one or more delivery routes.

"2. Postmarks and prepares mail for dispatch by train or other mail route; closes, locks, and affixes labels to pouches and mail sacks.

"Performs services at public windows, such as selling stamps, stamped envelopes, or other routine functions."

THE OTHER WAY

These identical duties apparently become much more important when performed by postmasters in one-man offices—perhaps because the postmasters are destined for grade 5 in the new salary scale.

The postmaster job description reads this way:

"1. Conducts the activities of the office in such a manner as to provide prompt and efficient postal service to the patrons of the office.

"2. Maintains direct contact with the public and gives personal attention to complaints.

"3. Sorts incoming mail for boxholders and general delivery; faces, cancels, sorts by destinations, ties, and sacks outgoing mail..

"4. At a window delivers general-delivery mail, issues and cashes money orders, delivers c. o. d. and customs mail, accepts and delivers parcel post, registered and insured mail, sells stamps and stamped paper, and collects box rents."

Example 2: In the Department's new plan special-delivery messengers will be upgraded to bring their pay up to the level of rank-and-file clerks.

Perhaps to help justify the upgrading, it's alleged in their job description that they "maintain pleasant and effective public relations with patrons."

But when it comes to postal window clerks, who have far more contact with the public than special-delivery messengers, there is no mention of "pleasant and effective public relations."

Example 3: Here Mr. H compared job descriptions for clerks in the Postal Transcript Service with those for distribution clerks in post offices.

The former would go into grade 5 of the new pay schedule. So in their job descriptions it was alleged that they "must qualify periodically through examination on knowledge of distributing schemes, postal regulations, train connections, etc."

Mr. Hallbeck told the committee the same duties are required of post-office distribution clerks, but aren't mentioned in their job descriptions.

Perhaps, he suggested, because the office clerks are destined for a mere grade 4 in the new pay schedule.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Philip W. Bonsal, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Colombia, vice Rudolf E. Schoenfeld, resigned; and

Stephen P. Dorsey, of the District of Columbia, and sundry other persons for appointment in the foreign and diplomatic service.

Executive D, 83d Congress, 2d session, the convention between the United States of America and Japan for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, signed at Washington on April 16, 1954; without amendment (Exec. Rept. No. 3);

Executive E, 83d Congress, 2d session, the convention between the United States of America and Japan for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on estates, inheritances, and gifts, signed at Washington on April 16, 1954; without amendment (Exec. Rept. No. 3); and

Executive G, 83d Congress, 2d session, the convention between the United States of America and Belgium for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on estates and successions, signed at Washington on May 27, 1954; without amendment (Exec. Rept. No. 3).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Ernest Lee Murdock and Paul Nichiporuk, licensed officers of the United States merchant marine, for appointments in the United States Coast Guard.

John O. Boyer, to be lieutenant commander in the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

George T. Moore, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce; and

Samuel Henson, Jr., and sundry other persons, to be chief warrant officers in the United States Coast Guard.

RETURN TO THE PRESIDENT OF CONVENTION WITH CANADA ON GREAT LAKES FISHERIES

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report favorably an order, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read, as follows:

That the Secretary of the Senate is directed to return to the President of the United States, as requested in his message to the Senate under date of January 26, 1955, the convention between the United States of America and Canada, for the development, protection, and conservation of the fisheries of the Great Lakes, signed at Washington on April 2, 1946, and received by the Senate on April 22, 1946 (S. Ex. C, 79th Cong., 2d sess.).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the order?

There being no objection, the order was considered, and agreed to.

MUTUAL DEFENSE TREATY WITH REPUBLIC OF CHINA—RESERVATIONS

Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. LANGER) submitted reservations, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the resolution of ratification of the Mutual Defense Treaty with the Republic of China, signed at Washington on December 2, 1954, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Public Health Service are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the President be notified of the nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

MUTUAL DEFENSE TREATY WITH THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Executive A, the mutual defense treaty with the Republic of China.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the treaty (Ex. A, 84th Cong., 1st sess.), the mutual defense treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of China, signed at Washington on December 2, 1954, which was read the second time, as follows:

MUTUAL DEFENSE TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The Parties to this Treaty,

Reaffirming their faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all Governments, and desiring to strengthen the fabric of peace in the West Pacific Area,

Recalling with mutual pride the relationship which brought their two peoples together in a common bond of sympathy and mutual ideals to fight side by side against imperialist aggression during the last war,

Desiring to declare publicly and formally their sense of unity and their common determination to defend themselves against external armed attack, so that no potential aggressor could be under the illusion that either of them stands alone in the West Pacific Area, and

Desiring further to strengthen their present efforts for collective defense for the preservation of peace and security pending the development of a more comprehensive system of regional security in the West Pacific Area,

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

The Parties undertake, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle any international dispute in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace, security and justice are not endangered and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

ARTICLE II

In order more effectively to achieve the objective of this Treaty, the Parties separately and jointly by self-help and mutual aid will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack and communist subversive activities directed from without against their territorial integrity and political stability.

ARTICLE III

The Parties undertake to strengthen their free institutions and to cooperate with each other in the development of economic progress and social well-being and to further their individual and collective efforts toward these ends.

ARTICLE IV

The Parties, through their Foreign Ministers or their deputies, will consult together from time to time regarding the implementation of this Treaty.

ARTICLE V

Each Party recognizes that an armed attack in the West Pacific Area directed against the territories of either of the Parties would be dangerous to its own peace and safety and declares that it would act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes.

Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result theref shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security.

ARTICLE VI

For the purposes of Articles II and V, the terms "territorial" and "territories" shall mean in respect of the Republic of China, Taiwan and the Pescadores; and in respect of the United States of America, the island territories in the West Pacific under its jurisdiction. The provisions of Articles II and V will be applicable to such other territories as may be determined by mutual agreement.

ARTICLE VII

The Government of the Republic of China, grants, and the Government of the United States of America accepts, the right to dispose such United States land, air, and sea forces in and about Taiwan and the Pescadores as may be required for their defense, as determined by mutual agreement.

ARTICLE VIII

This Treaty does not affect and shall not be interpreted as affecting in any way the rights and obligations of the Parties under the Charter of the United Nations or the responsibility of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security.

ARTICLE IX

This Treaty shall be ratified by the United States of America and the Republic of China in accordance with their respective constitutional processes and will come into force when instruments of ratification thereof have been exchanged by them at Taipei.

ARTICLE X

This Treaty shall remain in force indefinitely. Either Party may terminate it one year after notice has been given to the other Party.

In witness whereof the undersigned Plenipotentiaries have signed this Treaty.

Done in duplicate, in the English and Chinese languages, at Washington on this second

day of December of the Year One Thousand Nine Hundred and Fifty-Four, corresponding to the second day of the twelfth month of the Forty-third year of the Republic of China.

For the United States of America:
JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

For the Republic of China:
GEORGE K. C. YEH.

JOINT STATEMENT REGARDING THE CONCLUSION OF NEGOTIATIONS FOR MUTUAL SECURITY PACT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, at his news conference today, made the following announcement:

"The United States of America and the Republic of China have concluded negotiations for a mutual security pact. The treaty will follow the general pattern of other security pacts which the United States of America has concluded in the Western Pacific.

"The treaty will recognize the common interest of the parties in the security of Taiwan and the Pescadores and of the Western Pacific islands under the jurisdiction of the United States. It will provide for inclusion by agreement of other territories under the jurisdiction of the parties. It is directed against threats to the security of the treaty area from armed attack and provides for continuing consultation regarding any such threat or attack.

"This treaty will forge another link in the system of collective security established by the various collective defense treaties already concluded between the United States and other countries in the Pacific area. Together, these arrangements provide the essential framework for the defense by the free peoples of the Western Pacific against Communist aggression.

"Like the other treaties, this treaty between the United States and the Republic of China will be defensive in character. It will reaffirm the dedication of the parties to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations."

The above joint United States-Chinese statement is being released simultaneously at Taipei.

DECEMBER 1, 1954.

STATEMENTS BY SECRETARY OF STATE JOHN FOSTER DULLES AND FOREIGN MINISTER GEORGE K. C. YEH UPON THE OCCASION OF THE SIGNING OF THE MUTUAL DEFENSE TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA AT WASHINGTON, DECEMBER 2, 1954

Secretary Dulles:

"It is a great pleasure to welcome Foreign Minister Yeh, Ambassador Koo, and the members of his staff here this afternoon for the signing of this Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and the Republic of China. I wholly concur in what President Chiang Kai-shek said in his message to me yesterday, that "a necessary link in the chain of Far Eastern defense has now been forged." It is my hope that the signing of this Defense Treaty will put to rest once and for all rumors and reports that the United States will in any manner agree to the abandonment of Formosa and the Pescadores to Communist control. The signing of this treaty is not only an expression of the good will and friendship existing between the Governments of the United States and of Free China, but also of the abiding friendship of the people of the United States for the Chinese people."

Foreign Minister Yeh:

"It has been my privilege and honor to be associated with Mr. Dulles in the making and signing of this Treaty of Mutual Defense between my country and the United States of America. I am happy to recall that throughout the negotiations for this treaty, conducted at Taipei and Washington, we have been guided by the principle of mutuality and the spirit of friendly cooperation.

"It is the hope of my Government that this treaty will serve to promote the common cause of freedom, particularly at this juncture of the world situation."

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 10, 1954.

His Excellency GEORGE K. C. YEH,
Minster of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of China.

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to refer to recent conversations between representatives of our two Governments and to confirm the understandings reached as a result of those conversations, as follows:

The Republic of China effectively controls both the territory described in Article VI of the Treaty of Mutual Defense between the Republic of China and the United States of America signed on December 2, 1954, at Washington and other territory. It possesses with respect to all territory now and hereafter under its control the inherent right of self-defense. In view of the obligations of the two Parties under the said Treaty, and of the fact that the use of force from either of these areas by either of the Parties affects the other, it is agreed that such use of force will be a matter of joint agreement, subject to action of an emergency character which is clearly an exercise of the inherent right of self-defense. Military elements which are a product of joint effort and contribution by the two Parties will not be removed from the territories described in Article VI to a degree which would substantially diminish the defensibility of such territories without mutual agreement.

Accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

/S/ JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State of the United States of America.

DECEMBER 10, 1954.

His Excellency JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State of the United States of America.

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of Your Excellency's Note of today's date, which reads as follows:

"I have the honor to refer to recent conversations between representatives of our two Governments and to confirm the understandings reached as a result of those conversations, as follows:

"The Republic of China effectively controls both the territory described in Article VI of the Treaty of Mutual Defense between the Republic of China and the United States of America signed on December 2, 1954, at Washington and other territory. It possesses with respect to all territory now and hereafter under its control the inherent right of self-defense. In view of the obligations of the two Parties under the said Treaty and of the fact that the use of force from either of these areas by either of the Parties affects the other, it is agreed that such use of force will be a matter of joint agreement, subject to action of an emergency character which is clearly an exercise of the inherent right of self-defense. Military elements which are a product of joint effort and contribution by the two Parties will not be removed from the territories described in Article VI to a degree which would substantially diminish the defensibility of such territories without mutual agreement."

I have the honor to confirm, on behalf of my Government, the understanding set forth in Your Excellency's Note under reply.

I avail myself of this opportunity to convey to Your excellency the assurances of my highest consideration.

GEORGE K. C. YEH,
Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of China.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, my statement on the treaty will be very brief.

The Committee on Foreign Relations on February 8, by a vote of 11 to 2, authorized me to report favorably to the Senate the Mutual Defense Treaty with the Republic of China.

This treaty is the sixth mutual defense treaty which the United States has concluded in the Pacific area within the last few years. It states clearly and unequivocally that an armed attack in the West Pacific area, including an attack specifically on the islands of Formosa and the Pescadores, would be dangerous to the peace and security of the United States. It underlines policies which were developed on a bipartisan basis during the Truman administration and which have been supported on a similar bipartisan basis during the present administration. Indeed, the Far Eastern Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which has been under the alternating chairmanship of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] during the past 4 years, has maintained a close and intimate working relationship with the Secretary of State in developing our policy in this area.

I know of few instances in which there has been more successful functioning of our constitutional concept of the Senate advising with the President and his Secretary of State in the formulation of foreign policy.

The treaty now before the Senate is in a sense the keystone to our western Pacific defense chain, starting in northern Japan and coming south through Korea, the Ryukyu Islands, including Okinawa, thence to Formosa, the Pescadores, the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand. Formosa is in the middle of this chain of island defenses.

I know of no competent military authority who would deny that it would be dangerous to the security interests of the United States should Formosa fall into unfriendly hands. During our discussion of House Joint Resolution 159, which has now become Public Law 4, the former chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], inserted into the RECORD a series of statements from our outstanding military authorities over the past 5 years indicating the unanimity of their views in this respect. I commend that unanimity of expression to any who may doubt the depth of our interests in Formosa.

Some people will ask why it is that the United States should proceed now to enter into a mutual defense treaty with Nationalist China.

In addition to the argument that Formosa and the Pescadores form an important link in our island chain of defense in the western Pacific, there is the obvious fact that the Republic of China constitutes one of the strongest anti-Communist forces in the East. A vigorous force in being on the island of Formosa is a helpful deterrent to aggression in that area.

But, Mr. President, there is another reason which to me is very compelling. Some have suggested that we have con-

cluded treaties with Japan, Korea, the Philippines, New Zealand, and Australia, but have omitted Nationalist China because we might want to trade Formosa and the Pescadores to Red China as a part of an overall settlement in the Far East.

This charge has no doubt done a great deal of damage to the morale of the Nationalist Government and the people on Formosa. It has also reflected upon the integrity of our Government and our good relations with Nationalist China.

It seems to me that the approval of this treaty now will dispel any clouds of doubt that may exist on this point.

In spite of virtually unanimous agreement on the part of members of the Foreign Relations Committee that Formosa and the Pescadores must not be permitted to fall into unfriendly hands, there was considerable worry in the committee about three aspects of the treaty. I shall discuss these matters briefly.

THE LEGAL STATUS OF FORMOSA

The view was advanced during committee's consideration of the treaty that it may have the effect of recognizing that the government of Chiang Kai-shek has sovereignty over Formosa and the Pescadores. On the one hand, reference was made to the Cairo Declaration which stated that Japan was to be stripped of her island territories in the Pacific and that territories stolen from the Chinese, such as Formosa and the Pescadores, shall be restored to the Republic of China. On the other hand, reference was made to the fact that while Japan in the peace treaty renounced all right, title, and claim to Formosa and the Pescadores, such title was not conveyed to any nation. After full exploration of this matter with Secretary Dulles, the committee decided that this treaty was not a competent instrument to resolve doubts about sovereignty over Formosa. It agreed to include in its report the following statement:

It is the understanding of the Senate that nothing in the present treaty shall be construed as affecting or modifying the legal status or the sovereignty of the territories referred to in article VI.

In other words, so far as the United States is concerned, it is our understanding that the legal status of the territories referred to in article VI, namely, Formosa and the Pescadores—whatever their status may be—is not altered in any way by the conclusion of this treaty.

MUTUAL AGREEMENT

Another matter which concerned the committee was the last sentence of article VI which provides that the provisions of the treaty will be applicable to such other territories as may be determined by mutual agreement. This means that, although article VI is applicable now only to Formosa and the Pescadores, it would be possible to make it applicable to other territories, such as Quemoy and Matsu, by mutual agreement. Secretary of State Dulles stated, when he appeared before the committee, as follows:

It is our view that an agreement to extend the coverage of the China defense treaty to additional territories would in practical terms amount to an amendment of the treaty, and should be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent.

During the committee's consideration of this matter, one of the members proposed that the last sentence of article VI be stricken, arguing that since it could not be given effect except by resubmission to the Senate, there was no point in having the sentence in article VI. The committee felt, however, since similar language appears in the southeast Asia pact that it would be unfortunate to strike it from the treaty with the Republic of China. It was agreed, however, that specific language on this point should be included in the committee report. That language is as follows:

It is the understanding of the Senate that the mutual agreement referred to in article VI, under which the provisions of articles II and V may be made applicable to other territories, shall be construed as requiring the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States.

EXTERNAL ARMED ATTACK

Finally, several members were concerned that, because of unique conditions in Formosa, some emphasis should be given to the idea that an armed attack against either of the parties which would bring the treaty into operation should be identified as an attack from outside—that is, an external attack. It was also noted that in the exchange of notes between the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of China and Secretary of State Dulles, dated December 10, 1954, it was made clear that the use of force from either the Pescadores or Formosa or from other territory under the control of the Republic of China would affect both parties, and therefore the use of such force would be a matter of joint agreement. In order to resolve any doubts that might exist with respect to the obligations of the parties in the event of an armed attack which would bring into operation article V of the treaty, the committee agreed to insert the following language in its report:

It is the understanding of the Senate that the obligations of the parties under article V apply only in the event of external armed attack, and that military operations by either party from the territories held by the Republic of China shall not be undertaken except by joint agreement.

Somewhat similar language was incorporated in an understanding in connection with the Senate's approval last year of the Mutual Defense Treaty with Korea.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PUBLIC LAW 4 AND TREATY

The question will surely be raised as to the differences between Public Law 4, which we passed a few days ago, and the treaty now before us. There are those who will ask why it is necessary for the Senate to act on this treaty when we have already given the President authority to employ the Armed Forces of the United States to protect Formosa, the Pescadores, and "related positions and territories" against attack.

There are several differences which warrant our attention. In the first place, Public Law 4 was in effect a unilateral declaration of intent on the part of the United States. The treaty before us is a mutual undertaking between two nations.

Had it not been for the overt Communist aggression in the area, I am sure the administration and the Senate would have preferred to act first on the treaty and then, if necessary, to take the step embodied in Public Law 4. Unfortunately, we have learned by now that Communist threats do not always permit us the time to act in the way in which we might like.

Another important difference between the treaty and Public Law 4 is the fact that Public Law 4 is broader in territorial scope than is the treaty. The treaty applies only to Formosa and the Pescadores. Public Law 4, however, applies to related positions and territories whose defense the President judges to be required to assure the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

A final difference between the two is that the treaty is to remain in force indefinitely except that it may be terminated on 1 year's notice, whereas Public Law 4 is to expire as soon as the President finds that the peace and security of the area are reasonably assured.

In summary, aside from the fact that the pending treaty is considerably narrower in geographical coverage than is the resolution, the essential difference is that by the treaty the United States undertakes an international obligation, whereas by the public law our action was unilateral and voluntary.

Mr. President, before concluding my remarks I desire to stress the fact that the Committee on Foreign Relations believes that it is in the national interest of the United States for the Senate to give its advice and consent to this treaty. Secretary of State Dulles testified that the Chinese Communists are now probing our resolution. Any display of weakness or uncertainty now might have catastrophic consequences. We can be sure that the Communists will undertake aggression if they think they can get away with it. This treaty will make it clear that the United States would view any attack on Formosa and the Pescadores as a danger to our peace and safety.

The history of the Far East since the war has not been happy. Hundreds of millions of people have fallen under Communist domination. I do not attempt to pass judgment on whether or not it might have been possible to stem this advance. I do know now, however, that the United States, supported by nearly every free country in the western Pacific, has made its intentions known. It intends that no other areas of the western Pacific shall fall under Communist control by the used of armed force. This very fact should be of tremendous significance to the morale not only of the people on Formosa, but to our friends from northern Japan on south to Australia and New Zealand.

I ask that those who would oppose this treaty give most serious consideration to the consequences of their action. I feel certain that, as responsible Members of this body, they will do so. It is not enough to say that there should be

drafting changes or that there are imperfections in language. We are dealing here with issues and attitudes that involve the future of freemen in the western Pacific. Our leadership of freemen requires responsibility. I ask the Senate to give its overwhelming approval to this treaty.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly in support of the treaty which is now before the Senate and which I consider to be a most important and desirable instrument.

As I have said before on the floor of the Senate, we are likely to be confused, in our thinking of the Formosan situation, as to exactly what the significance of this particular treaty is. We are apt to think that Formosa is a piece of real estate. We are likely to think of these discussions as an attempt by us to support an administration which is led by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. That aspect, of course, should be taken into consideration, but I must emphasize that the Formosan issue is a part of the global issue today. The Formosan issue is very definitely a part of the whole Chinese issue. Today the Formosan issue is closely related to the Korean situation, which involves a very questionable truce, so far as its continuing nature is concerned.

The Formosan issue is very definitely related also to the very uncomfortable, uneasy truce in Indochina.

So we are not dealing merely with the question of title to Formosa. We are dealing with one of the main items in the security of the free world, and a main item in the actual security of the United States, as the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia has just pointed out.

As many of my colleagues know, it has been my privilege to visit Formosa several times in the course of the past few years. I had many occasions to discuss the Far Eastern situation with Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, and to obtain first-hand knowledge of the problems which the Nationalist Government faces, of its aspirations, and its hopes. From this experience, I have confirmed my previous conviction that in the leadership on Formosa, which is one of the free nations of the eastern world, we have a friend and ally. Nay, more, the cause of the people of Formosa is common with our own and they have the capacity and the determination to fight attempts by the Communists to extend their dominion over Formosa and the Pescadores.

Late last summer, together with Secretary Dulles, I visited Formosa, at a time when negotiations looking toward the conclusion of a mutual defense treaty were initiated. Secretary Dulles, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and I had been to the Manila conference when the Southeast Asia defense treaty was signed; and on the way back, we stopped in Formosa to discuss the situation there. On that visit to Formosa, in speaking with the Generalissimo and members of his government, I was particularly disturbed by the feeling that there was much uncertainty in their minds as to why we had not extended to them the treaty pattern we have followed in the Pacific. The distinguished Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, has just outlined those other treaties and has listed them. They include our mutual security treaties in various areas of the Far East.

I had the feeling that the people of Formosa could not quite understand why they, of all the critical targets under assault by international communism in the Far East, had been singled out, so to speak, and excluded from the general pattern of treaties which we were entering into. It seemed to me that there was grave danger that the morale of the Nationalist Chinese was being adversely affected. In view of their importance to us as a bastion of defense which is vital to our lines in the Pacific and, as I said a moment ago, to the free world globalwise, I confess that their attitude appeared quite understandable to me.

That is one of the reasons why I feel so strongly that this treaty should be ratified, and ratified promptly. Indeed, it is almost incongruous that we have not concluded a treaty of this kind before now. It is not only that Formosa and the Pescadores are a vital anchor in our island defense chain, but also that in this Pacific fortress there is a strong military force whose very presence is a deterrent to Communist ambitions. I stress again the fact that there is in Formosa a well-trained army, equipped by us during the past few years; and the fact that that army is a strong deterrent to aggression in that area. If that force were not in existence, and if we wished to exclude Formosa from falling under the control of Communist China, it would be necessary for us to station American troops there. I am one who believes that the training and strategic placing of native Nationalist Chinese troops is the way to solve the problem in the Far East, in an area where the people are trying to gain their own freedom and independence. It is therefore most essential not only that Formosa be kept in friendly hands, but also that the Nationalist strength on the island be maintained.

I believe that approval by the Senate of the pending treaty will go far toward preserving the Nationalist morale. If the Formosan people feel that they are part of the western free nations which are resisting the onrush of communism, they will feel that we are with them. If in any way they are bottled up and are prevented from being effectively used, if they have to be used, their morale certainly will be adversely affected. This is particularly true when better judgment has required the evacuation of the Tachens, which, as all Senators are aware, is now under way. The Senate's approval of the treaty will go far toward offsetting any dejection which might be felt over the relinquishing of those islands; and I am advised that there is a good deal of dejection locally. At the same time, it will, I am convinced, make it as plain as we can make it, that the United States is determined to resist further encroachments by the Communists, by giving them advance notice that if they attempt to seize Formosa and the Pescadores they will have to run over us.

By embodying a commitment of this kind in a positive treaty obligation, we disabuse the Communist Chinese of any lingering misapprehensions they might entertain that our course in that area is a purely voluntary one, which might shift with the dictates of expediency.

I think it is worth emphasizing, Mr. President, that the treaty really does not commit us to anything which we have not already determined to do as a matter of policy. The treaty actually is narrower in scope, as the distinguished Senator from Georgia has pointed out, than the joint resolution which Congress passed near the end of last month, and which is now Public Law 4. It omits any reference to the additional controversial territories covered by the resolution; but it does solemnize our convictions that this Government must protect Formosa and the Pescadores in its own national interest.

I know, Mr. President, that there may be some among us who may be concerned over the possibility that, in an unforeseen moment, the Nationalist government might embark on a course of action which would inevitably involve us in war with the Chinese Communists. I submit, Mr. President, that the risks of such involvement are inherent in the situation prevailing in that area. The treaty does not add to such risks, but, in fact, because it makes perfectly clear to the world what we will do in the event of aggression, it may contribute to reducing the risks which do exist.

On the other hand, I think it is important to emphasize again that this is a purely defensive treaty. It is not an instrument designed to facilitate our participation in offensive military operations against the mainland.

That phase of the question was discussed to a great extent in the debate on Public Law 4, as pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Georgia. That discussion need not be repeated; but I should like to emphasize that the treaty is not an instrument designed to facilitate our participation in offensive military operations against the mainland.

As in the case of all the other mutual defense treaties we have concluded in the Pacific, the basic commitments of the treaty do not come into operation except in the event of an armed attack against the territory of either of the parties. And even in the event of such an attack, Mr. President, the United States is not automatically committed to military action, but the measures which we do take must be in accordance with our constitutional processes.

It might be said this is all very well and good, but what assurance do we have, in view of the delicate conditions prevailing in the Formosan Straits, that the other party to the treaty, by unilateral action, might not maneuver us into a position where we have no choice but to embark upon military operations which are not truly of a defensive nature? The answer to that, Mr. President, is that we do have assurances of precisely that kind from the Government of the Republic of China. In an exchange of notes on December 10, 1954, between Mr. George Yeh, China's Min-

ister of Foreign Affairs, and Secretary of State Dulles, it was agreed that the use of force from any of the areas covered by the treaty will be a matter of joint agreement, subject to action of an emergency character which is clearly an exercise of the inherent right of self-defense. This undertaking, together with the defensive nature of the treaty before us, meets the needs of our own security.

There is one further point I wish to make concerning the area dealt with in the treaty. I have already referred to the fact that the treaty is narrower in its geographic scope than the resolution we recently approved authorizing the use of our Armed Forces in the Formosan area. Its protective shield covers only Formosa and the Pescadores, avoiding the area of controversy represented by such islands as Quemoy and Matsu.

Article VI of the treaty, however, does provide that the obligations of the treaty may be made applicable to other territories by mutual agreement. But Secretary Dulles was careful to assure the committee that, as in the case of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty and the North Atlantic Treaty, "an agreement to extend the coverage of the China defense treaty to additional territories would in practical terms amount to an amendment of the treaty, and should be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent."

To eliminate any doubt that such was its interpretation of the instrument, the committee decided to include in its report an understanding to that effect.

Mr. President, there are two paragraphs in the committee's report which I should like to read at this time, because I think they are important. One is under the heading Need for Prompt Ratification, which appears on page 7 of the report as paragraph 10. I shall now read from the report of the committee:

> It is common knowledge that the area for which protection is sought by this treaty is under a direct and immediate threat of Communist attack. Certain islands under the control of the Republic of China, not covered by the treaty, have been attacked by air, and from the sea; and recently one of these islands fell to Communist invaders from the mainland. There is, therefore, cogent reason to expedite the Senate's action on the treaty, to the end that the Mao Tse-tung regime may be deterred from reckless attempts to liberate Formosa in the face of our pledged word to help keep it from falling into unfriendly hands.
>
> On January 14, the Legislative Yuan of the Chinese Nationalist Government ratified the treaty. The committee believes that for the Senate to delay giving its approval to this treaty, whose aims are solely defensive, would be unfortunate.

Mr. President, I should like to read at this point the final conclusions in the committee report, which are as follows:

> Our Government has determined that it is in the national interest that Formosa and the Pescadores be kept in friendly hands, as an important anchor in the defensive chain from the Aleutians to Australia. It is, therefore, of great importance that this policy, which until now has been voluntary and unilateral, be supported by a concrete undertaking to take appropriate action to help defend Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack. By doing this in terms which cannot be misunderstood, it is hoped that the Communist military regime will be deterred from further attempts to aggrandize its position in the Far East at the expense of the free world. At the same time, the treaty will give further evidence of our intention not to abandon a wartime ally who fought valiantly in a long and exhausting struggle against a common foe. Finally, it is believed that the treaty, by putting the world on notice as to our intention, will contribute to the peace and security of a dangerous and sensitive zone.
>
> For these reasons, the Committee on Foreign Relations urges the Senate to give its advice and consent to the ratification of this treaty.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I say personally, as a member of the committee and through my experience on the Far Eastern Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, that it is my conviction the treaty which is before the Senate will strengthen our position in the Far East. Not to approve it would only give aid and comfort to the Communists, and unquestionably encourage them to further aggressive action. I, therefore, join with the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee in urging the Members of the Senate to give their approval to the ratification of this treaty.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I do not desire to speak at length on the pending treaty, but I wish to make brief observations as a basis for some questions which I should like to address to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and also to the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], one of the ranking minority members of the committee, both of whom have already spoken ably and, I think, very convincingly on the pending treaty.

Mr. President, as a basis for my own questions, I merely wish to say that insofar as the joint resolution which the Senate passed a few days ago was concerned, I was one of those who felt it was highly necessary that it be passed, and that it was a matter of immediacy, requiring prompt action by the Senate. Since then there has been no doubt in my mind as to the soundness of those conclusions. It seemed to me that it was vitally necessary for our form of government to show its ability to function effectively and promptly to meet threats actually developing under present conditions, which threats did not exist, of course, in the earlier history of the Nation; and that not only was there need for the action we took when we passed the joint resolution by such an overwhelming vote, but there was need for our very prompt and affirmative action upon it. At this time I shall not attempt to go further into that matter; but I wish to say that I completely differentiate the joint resolution from the pending treaty. The joint resolution was not only unilateral, but it was an expression of our own interest and of our own need to defend the territories involved in the Far East, and to defend them effectively under the conditions of modern warfare, if such conditions should develop.

In the present instance, the proposal before the Senate is bilateral; it is permanent, instead of temporary; and it has to do with mutual interests and commitments, instead of a unilateral expression in our own interest, under which, in passing the joint resolution, we showed that the legislative branch of our Government saw the matter eye-to-eye with the executive branch, and therefore took united action, so that the world might understand what we were doing in the defense of our own vital interest.

In the instant matter I have been cognizant not only of the fact that the pending treaty is mutual and that, if ratified, it will create international obligations, but also that it is of permanent importance, rather than of merely temporary importance, as we hope the joint resolution may prove to be.

I have been disturbed and concerned about the very matters which are dealt with by the three recitals of understanding which appear in the printed committee report, all of which have been ably discussed by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia and the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey. I shall now read for the record those three recitals of understanding which I understand from the addresses which have been made by the two distinguished Senators to whom I have referred have been inserted in the committee report in an attempt to clarify certain questions which were in the minds of themselves and other Senators, and which I hope have done so.

The first of those statements, which is to be found on page 6 of the committee report, is as follows:

> It is the understanding of the Senate that nothing in the treaty shall be construed as affecting or modifying the legal status or sovereignty of the territories to which it applies.

The second appears on page 4 of the committee report, and is as follows:

> It is the understanding of the Senate that the obligations of the parties under article V apply only in the event of external armed attack; and that military operations by either party from the territories held by the Republic of China, shall not be undertaken except by joint agreement.

The third which appears on page 5 of the report, in subdivision 6, is as follows:

> It is the understanding of the Senate that the "mutual agreement" referred to in article VI, under which the provisions of articles II and V may be made applicable to other territories, shall be construed as requiring the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, upon the basis now laid, I should like to address some questions, if I may, to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and of course with the understanding that they are likewise addressed to the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], so that he will feel perfectly free to amplify or supplement or object to—if he cares to do so—any statement which may be made by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia.

Before stating the questions, let me say that it certainly is cause for comfort,

to me, that these distinguished Senators from opposite sides of the aisle, who have made a careful study of this question, stand so closely together as their addresses already have indicated they do, upon this important matter.

Mr. President, if I may ask the questions, therefore, let me say that my first question to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia is based on my understanding that, at one time, Senators who had doubts about the matters dealt with by the three statements of understanding which I have just read, and which are inserted in the committee report, had expected to ask the committee to report reservations along the same line, as now included in the statements of understanding on the part of the committee. It had also been my understanding that Senators who were not members of the committee had intended to offer reservations from the floor.

Now let me ask this question of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia: What is the effect of the inclusion in the report of the committee of those three statements of understanding, and their repetition and approval in the arguments and debates of the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from New Jersey? Is that effect in any sense tantamount to the adoption of reservations by the Senate, either as between the parties to the treaty, or as between the Senate and the executive branch of our Government, or as notice to the world and to the family of nations as to the precise meaning of the treaty, if it be ratified without the attachment of specific reservations which would mean the same, as to content, as those three statements of understanding mean?

To state the question more briefly, do these three statements of understanding operate in the same manner as would the adoption of reservations on the same subject, and are they tantamount to the adoption of reservations?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I may say that, clearly, these statements in the committee report are not reservations; neither would they have been reservations if they had been included in the resolution of ratification of the treaty. In that case, they would have had the effect which they have in the committee report and in the statements which have been made, but particularly in the report of the committee.

Under all the circumstances in this particular case, and in relation to this particular treaty, and bearing in mind that the treaty is between the United States and the Republic of China, only—the two parties to it—I think those statements of understanding are tantamount to reservations. Certainly there is the explicit and express approval of the Secretary of State as to those points on which it was thought desirable or even necessary to make any statements; and therefore they have been included in the report, for the obvious reason that they do become substantially reservations, in the particular situation in which we find ourselves.

There was never any intention to deal with the sovereignty of Formosa or the Pescadores. We have never asserted sovereignty, and certainly have made no claim of title. There could have been no occasion for a treaty between the United States alone and the Republic of China, so far as title or sovereignty is concerned.

So far as joint action or joint agreement is concerned, to which reference has been made, it is covered by one of the express statements. It will be found that in the treaty, or attached to it as a portion of it, is the interpretation or agreement of the representative of the Chinese Republic and of the Secretary of State of the United States, and there is no variance between the statements made in the report and this annex to the treaty.

So far as the return to the Senate for its advice and consent of any agreement to include any area other than Formosa and the Pescadores is concerned, that would, of course, be an extension of the very terms of the treaty, and without this express statement it would necessarily come back to the Senate. In any event, this is the exact statement made by the Secretary of State, and everything else in the committee report has the express concurrence, at least, of the Government of the United States. Therefore, these statements are tantamount to reservations, so far as this treaty, this particular contract between the two governments, is concerned.

There are different degrees of solemnity, even in the making of treaties, or in the making of international agreements. A reservation, of itself, would go to the text of the treaty. An understanding on which one of the governments acted in the ratification of a treaty, which understanding might be incorporated in the resolution of ratification, would represent the understanding of that government alone. It might be open to question by the other government or party to the treaty, but it would have a high degree of solemnity.

Under the circumstances in this particular case, these explicit declarations by the committee have the actual effect, in my opinion, of reservations—that is, of interpretations—and have a high degree of solemnity. While technically they are not reservations, and are not technically inserted in the resolution of ratification, they, nevertheless, become a part of it.

I may say to the Senator from Florida that I am emboldened to make the statement that, with the express assurance by the Government of the United States itself, which is a party to the treaty, that we were proceeding upon perfectly sound ground in the statement of our interpretation of this treaty and of its requirements, any effort to act beyond these express statements of understanding on the part of the Senate would restrain the executive branch of the Government, as if those statements had themselves been incorporated in the resolution of ratification with respect to this treaty. So while technically they cannot be described as reservations, they, nevertheless, have the effect of reservations in this situation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the clear answer of the distinguished Senator from Georgia. If the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] cares to amplify that answer, I shall be happy to have him do so.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Florida that, as usual, the distinguished Senator from Georgia has made the subject entirely clear. He has given complete answers as to the reasons for the procedure which the committee adopted.

I call attention to the fact that, with respect to each of the points which the distinguished Senator from Florida raised, the language opens in every case with the words: "It is the understanding of the Senate—." The reason that language is used is, as the distinguished Senator from Florida has said, that this is an interpretation of language with respect to which some question had been raised in the committee.

We wish to make it clear that this interpretation was arrived at after an extended discussion with the Secretary of State, in which every possible angle was presented. It is an interpretation of language which appears in the treaty or language which appears in the exchange of notes with Mr. George Yeh, who is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of China. I read from the language found on page 4:

> It is the understanding of the Senate that * * * military operations by either party from the territories held by the Republic of China shall not be undertaken except by joint agreement.

That language was taken from the George Yeh correspondence.

In all these cases it is the feeling of the committee that the interpretation of the language is the important thing to stress. No reservation of any sort is needed. The language speaks for itself. There is no question about the interpretation of the language. We tried to make it crystal clear in the report what that interpretation was.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from New Jersey. I should like to ask a specific question.

What was the intention of the committee in embodying in its report the particular statement of understanding which reads as follows:

> It is the understanding of the Senate that nothing in the treaty shall be construed as affecting or modifying the legal status or sovereignty of the territories to which it applies.

Was it the understanding of the committee in incorporating those words that by its report, by its approval of the treaty, and by ratification of the treaty—if that should follow—any question of sovereignty would be specifically reserved, and that there would be a specific reservation of every question with respect to the determination of the specific legal rights of the Republic of China? Was it the intention of the committee that in dealing with the Republic of China, now occupying that area, we would be acting upon a basis of attempting in no way to affect, impair, or enlarge the title, right of possession, right of ownership, right of occupancy, or whatever right exists, leaving that question exactly as it now is, for other determination?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator is entirely correct in that suggestion. The statement was embodied in the report because the suggestion had been made by someone outside the committee that possibly in entering into this treaty we would be recognizing a certain status of the Republic of China which might be the subject of controversy. We desired to make it crystal clear that we were not going into that subject in any way, and that whatever the status was before the treaty was signed, it would be exactly the same after the treaty was signed. As the distinguished Senator has well pointed out, we did not intend to bring that question into the picture.

Mr. HOLLAND. If I may, I should like to ask one further question, relative to the other two recitals, other than the one just referred to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Before the Senator goes into the other two recitals, I think it is very important that there be no misunderstanding as to the action of the committee. As I understand the action of the committee, what it did was to say in the report that, wherever the sovereignty of Formosa lies, and without passing judgment upon that sovereignty, it will not be changed by the action of the Senate in ratifying the treaty.

It should be borne in mind that a reservation would require action on the part of the other party. The other party might not be willing and probably would be unwilling to consider any question with respect to its interpretation of the sovereignty of the land on which it has 9½ million citizens and an army of roughly a half million. What we are saying is that whatever the sovereignty may be, and without passing judgment on it, the situation is not changed in the slightest by the action of the Senate of the United States in ratifying the treaty.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from California and I are not too far apart. However, the way in which he phrases his statement makes it mean something vastly different from the way I would understand it if I had phrased it. He has stated that we do not wish to affect the sovereignty of Formosa in any way. My understanding of the committee report is that we do not want to affect any right or title of the Republic of China, whatever it may be, under the present occupancy and control that exists, whether it be sovereignty or something else.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am not quibbling about words. I care not whether we call it sovereignty or title or occupation or population. Whatever it is, this treaty does not change it. The Republic of China has a very clear idea as to what it believes the situation is. We are not changing it by our action. We are not changing our views upon it, whatever the sovereignty is or whatever the title is. That is not changed one way or another by the action of the Senate. I believe it is important that we keep that in mind.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am in entire accord with the Senator from California in his statement.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the last statement made by the Senator from California is completely in accord with my own belief. We are not quibbling about the title. Some may have ideas in one direction, and others may have ideas in some other direction. Our own Nation has recognized the Republic of China. The United Nations has recognized the Republic of China. The Republic of China certainly has very definite rights. Whatever those rights may be, it is my hope that the report of the committee indicates that that is not a question we are determining, and that we are simply entering into a mutual understanding for defense, regardless of what that title may be, and whether or not it reaches as far as sovereignty.

Therefore, regardless of how we may feel on that question, we can all join in expressing our approval, for the same reasons that we joined in expressing our approval of the joint resolution the other day. After all, it is a matter now of making a mutual contract out of some of the substance which we recited in the joint resolution—which was a unilateral declaration—as to our feeling with respect to Formosa and the Pescadores and how far we should go in defending them.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I believe the expression just made by the distinguished Senator from Florida is the feeling the committee had regarding the matter to which he has referred.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have another question I wish to ask, and my asking the question is not to be regarded in any way as a reflection on the present State Department or on any past or future State Department at any time.

It is the understanding of the Senator from Florida that the State Department, an arm of our Government, is just as much bound by our intentions and understandings, as we pass upon this treaty, as is the Senate, if it ratifies the treaty.

The purpose of addressing my question to the Senator from New Jersey is to discover for the RECORD whether the effect of the two recitals relative to mutual agreements which are contained in the committee report are just as binding on the State Department and on the Senate in connection with domestic issues that might arise in our own Government, as if they were, in fact, reservations, as between ourselves and the other party signatory to the contract.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Secretary of State himself was really the source of the thinking with respect to the two understandings on pages 4 and 5—I assume that is what the Senator from Florida is referring to. In the light of that fact and the fact that a joint agreement would have to be entered into before any military operation could be undertaken, as referred to in the exchange of letters between the Secretary of State and the Foreign Minister of the Republic of China—and because the Secretary of State has stated very definitely that with respect to article VI an amendment to the treaty would be required, which would necessitate action by the Senate, I would say that the Senator from Florida is correct in his understanding.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then we are to understand that the expression of understanding with reference to the necessity for having an amendment of the treaty in the event new territory should be added, and, likewise, relative to the meaning of the words "joint agreement," in the event operations are to be attempted elsewhere, apply just as strongly to the Secretary of State—those expressions having in fact, been suggested by the Secretary of State—and bind the State Department just as much as the expression of the Senate would bind the Senate?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It is the opinion of the Senator from New Jersey that the understanding of the Senator from Florida is correct. That is the way I understood the matter when we discussed it with the Secretary of State. In fact, I discussed the matter with the Secretary of State on the return trip from Formosa. I can say without hesitation that the same restrictions would apply to the Department of State that would apply to Congress, and that with the legislative history which is being developed in connection with the treaty, it would be very difficult to evade the implications or the statements here made of the understanding.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is the understanding of the committee, and it is so stated to the Senate, that the Department of State subscribes to those statements of the understanding, and, in fact, was a party to wording them. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It is a fact that the statements originated with the Secretary of State, and that the Secretary of State gave his full approval to the inclusion of the statements in the committee's report. Therefore, it would seem to me that the members of the committee gave their full approval to the matter, that it was done with the consent of the committee, and that every member of the committee who dealt with the matter regarded it as being the expression of the committee, the Senate, and the State Department.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Jersey and I am also greatly indebted to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I associate myself with the conclusions which have been arrived at in the discussion today, particularly with the remarks of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I wish to say, briefly, that our Government has determined that it is in the national interest that Formosa and the Pescadores be kept in friendly hands as an important anchor in the defensive chain from the Aleutians to Australia. Therefore, I urge that the Senate support the treaty on the ground of self-interest.

Every general who has been acquainted with the situation in the Far East, from General MacArthur to the present commanders, has arrived at the conclusion that Formosa is an anchor in the defensive chain. That is why we are making this treaty. All other matters are irrelevant so far as the defense of the United States is concerned. I

urge the Senate to support this treaty on the grounds of the self-interest of the United States. This is not an altruistic undertaking for the benefit of the Republic of China; it is a hardheaded enterprise for the defense of the United States and of the free world. The sooner we see the importance of this treaty, the better. It may not be so important 10 years from now, because the inventive genius of man may find that the bulwark of Formosa is not necessary. But let us get it firmly into our minds that Formosa should be held in friendly hands, or we shall have to hold it ourselves.

As has been stated, Chiang Kai-shek is our friend. He has some 350,000 well-armed, well-equipped troops, and if he holds Formosa for us, we do not have to place our men there. That is simple commonsense.

We are getting men out of South Korea. With 600,000 well-equipped South Korean soldiers, we can take most of our men from Korea.

I am not a military man, Mr. President. If the decision were up to me, in the first instance, I might arrive at a different conclusion, but I have long since learned that as a Senator of the United States it is not my business to be a judge or to undertake to administer the affairs of the executive branch of the Government. This is a government of divided powers. Thank God, it is a government where power is divided, where checks and balances operate, not one where the Executive is the "whole show" or where the judicial branch is the "whole show."

It is the function of the executive branch to make foreign policy decisions, and it has performed that function by deciding that Formosa and the Pescadores are a most important anchor in our defense. The executive branch of the Government has made its decision, and I accept it. It has come to the Senate with this treaty and stated that in its judgment the treaty is in the interest of America and in the interest of our self-defense.

In substance, the executive branch has said that we can either defend the United States in the Straits of Formosa, now, or we may have to defend it later in San Francisco Bay. That is what the question boils down to, and that is where we would be if we were to insist on eliminating all risks from our foreign policy. That is why I am in favor of this treaty. All the legal argument is of no consequence, so far as I am concerned.

I could argue the question of sovereignty and present facts showing that for some centuries China did not have control; that the Japanese held Formosa for some 50 years; that China ceded it to the Japanese. But we took it from the Japanese. We are only one of the allies. Nationalist China is in control now. Nationalist China is an ally and a friend. We do not have to place our troops there, because the territory is in friendly hands.

I repeat, Mr. President—repetition sometimes emphasizes matters—that from MacArthur down, it is the judgment of every general who has been in the Far East that the island of Formosa is essential to the defense of our beloved country, and it must remain in friendly hands.

The treaty confirms our vital interest in the strategically important area it covers. In this respect, the treaty is complementary to the joint resolution which we passed 2 weeks ago authorizing the President to use the Armed Forces of the United States to defend Formosa and the Pescadores.

That joint resolution in no way detracts from the desirability of prompt ratification of the treaty. I remind the Senate that the joint resolution was a unilateral action on the part of the United States. It is further a temporary action, in that it lasts only until the danger in the area has passed.

The treaty is more nearly permanent, and is a mutual agreement to take certain action in conjunction with one of our good friends and allies. As between nations of character, nations which are dedicated to principles of morality, treaties in and of themselves are perhaps not very important, Mr. President. We know, and our Chinese friends know, that we would concert our actions in this area whether we had a treaty or whether we had no treaty at all. The ties of warm friendship that bind the Chinese people and the American people can never be adequately reflected in the legalisms of so formal a document as a treaty.

But the important thing, Mr. President, is to let the world know that we—that is, the United States and the Republic of China—intend to do what this treaty says we will do, and particularly to let the Communist part of the world know it.

Letting the Communists know what we will do has proved very beneficial with reference to the Tachen Islands. We are simply saying to the Communists, "Thus far and no farther"; and that has kept them back. They have kept away. As a consequence, Nationalist Chinese forces are leaving the Tachens without being attacked.

From every point of view, it is not only good politics but also good economics for friendly nations to pool their strength in mutual assistance.

I again invite attention to the fact that with these islands in friendly hands some 350,000 efficient fighting men are at our disposal. It has already been estimated that 10 Turkish divisions can be sustained for the cost of 1 American division. I do not know what the figures are in relation to the Chinese.

As I have said, this also is an economic proposition, and I am sure the facts I have stated show that statement to be true.

Sometimes in the Senate we concern ourselves so much with the obligations which the United States assumes under a treaty that we overlook some of the benefits which accrue to the United States. Among the important benefits which we will receive under this treaty is the help of the armed forces of the Republic of China. These forces are substantial. We have played an important role in furnishing them with equipment, and we should continue to do so. By the expenditure of a relatively small amount of money in that way, we can build up collective strength far greater than would otherwise be available. Certainly it would cost us many times more to attempt to build up solely with American manpower forces equal to those of the Republic of China now in existence.

The principle of mutual collective security which is embodied in this treaty is one of the most appealing things about it, Mr. President. Anyone who surveys the world today with an objective eye must be struck by the fact that the cause of the free world needs all the support we can get for it. This treaty is one more link in the chain of collective security agreements—a chain which began, chronologically, with the Rio Treaty and which now includes the North Atlantic Treaty, the Southeast Asia Treaty, and our treaties with Japan, with Korea, with the Philippines, and with Australia and New Zealand.

These treaties are all, in a sense, complementary. Although we must not underestimate the importance of the particular treaty now before us, we must not lose sight of the fact that it is, after all, only one link in the chain which we must keep strong. Formosa is only one spot in the world where communism now threatens freedom. We must not become so engrossed in one spot that we neglect the whole.

It has been stated, and I believe it to be true, that this may even be a diversionary tactic on the part of the planners in the Kremlin.

We cannot be sure what the recent changes in the government of the Soviet Union portend. We know that the situation in Europe is disturbing; conditions in the Middle East are not entirely satisfactory; and we have no grounds for complacency in regard to Southeast Asia. News from Germany and France indicates how well the Kremlin has been playing its cards.

Above all, Mr. President, we must not lose sight of the fact that Western Germany is high on the priority list of the Soviet Union. If the leaders in the Kremlin could only draw our attention away from that vitally important area while their diplomats and their agents are at work trying to undermine the morale and the determination of the German people to remain free, nothing would please them better.

I trust that the Senate will approve the treaty and get it started on its way. Let us open our eyes to the whole picture throughout the world.

We must be alert and keep our collective defenses up around the world. This treaty will help us to do that in one segment of the world, and for that reason I urge prompt action by the Senate to advise and consent to its ratification.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not intend to delay the Senate very long in discussing the pending treaty. I wish to say, first, that I join with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who is chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, in the excellent presentation which he made. I am confident that he spoke with the overwhelming approval of Members on both sides of the aisle in support of this

important treaty which is a link in our collective defense system in the Pacific.

Because of the misunderstandings which might arise, both at home and abroad, it is important that we place the Province of Formosa, which is a part of the Republic of China, in the proper perspective. At present, there are on the islands of Formosa and the Pescadores 9,500,000 free Chinese. How does this number compare with that of other nations in the world? It is larger than the population of 43 independent nations today. I shall take the time to call the roll of those nations, so that we may judge, from a population point of view, how important it is to keep Formosa and the Republic of China out of Communist hands.

So that we may understand what the situation would be if some of the other nations whose names I shall read happened to be threatened by Communist aggression I state their populations, as follows:

Republic of China: Formosa Province	9,500,000
Ceylon	8,269,000
Australia	8,917,763
New Zealand	2,074,781
Albania	1,175,000
Andora	5,231
Saudi Arabia	6,500,000
Austria	6,949,000
Belgium	8,778,000
Bolivia	3,107,000
Bulgaria	7,160,000
Costa Rica	881,000
Cuba	5,814,112
Denmark	4,408,000
Dominican Republic	2,291,000
Ecuador	3,439,000
El Salvador	2,054,000
Finland	4,164,500
Greece	7,865,000
Guatemala	3,048,000
Haiti	3,112,000
Honduras	1,557,000
Iceland	150,000
Iraq	5,100,000
Ireland	2,942,000
Israel	1,669,397
Jordan	1,500,000
Lebanon	1,353,000
Liberia	2,750,000
Libya	1,340,000
Luxembourg	300,000
Nicaragua	1,166,000
Norway	3,375,000
Panama	864,000
Paraguay	1,496,000
Peru	9,035,000
Portugal	8,621,000
San Marino	13,500
Sweden	7,192,316
Switzerland	4,884,000
Syria	3,535,000
Uruguay	2,525,000
Venezuela	5,440,000
Yemen	4,500,000

Mr. President, as I said at the beginning, the Republic of China, on Formosa, has a population larger than that of any of the nations which I have mentioned. It would seem to me that both in the United Nations and outside that organization some of these small nations, which later on might become the victims of the appetites of the men in the Kremlin, or at Peiping, would think twice about giving even remote consideration to a Far Eastern Munich or a Geneva-type conference, or about giving their assent to any plan involving the sacrifice of 9½ million human beings on Formosa as a price to buy a temporary peace, a peace which could not, by its very terms, last very long, but which, by its nature, would destroy the hope of mankind of being able to maintain a free world of freemen.

I should think that there would be moral indignation among the people of the great nations of the world if, in order to satisfy the ruthless, godless tyranny in the Kremlin or in Peiping, their governments should consent to sacrifice 9,500,000 human beings in an international poker game, when the territory is not theirs to give and the lives are not theirs to sacrifice.

The world should have learned at the time of Munich that the road to appeasement is not the road to peace; it is only surrender on the installment plan. The great nations of the world should have understood that they had no moral right at Munich, without the knowledge or consent of the Government of Czechoslovakia, to barter away the sovereignty of a large segment of that country and its vital defenses. Those who sat at Munich thought they were buying peace in our time. We know they were buying no such thing. They were only making inevitable World War II; because when international blackmail is paid, it is the same as the paying of any other type of blackmail: the rate of demand of extortion on the part of the blackmailers is only increased.

So much for that phase. The question has been raised as to the legality or sovereignty or title. I am not a lawyer. Men may honestly differ on this subject. I suppose that lawyers could argue the question for months on end.

It is true that Formosa has a history of first having belonged to the old Empire of China and of then having been acquired by Japan in a war of conquest. Japan later was forced to give up Formosa, as a result of her defeat in World War II.

The Government of the Republic of China, which was our ally during World War II, was promised the return of her lost territory, both at the Cairo conference and at later conferences, in which similar understandings were had.

The Government of the Republic of China accepted the surrender of Japanese forces on the island of Formosa, and since then has been in occupation of the island and is the legal Chinese Government.

But so far as any legal technicality is concerned as to where the title presently rests, I do not intend to argue that point now. It was ably argued by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the distinguished Senator form New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. Whatever it is, it will not be changed by the action we shall take on the pending treaty.

In view of certain questions raised in memorandums which were circulated some time ago, I consider it to be important to have a statement which I read into the committee hearings on a recent day repeated in the Senate itself, so that it may appear in the RECORD. On January 5, 1950, President Harry S. Truman made the following statement:

> The United States Government has always stood for good faith in international relations.
>
> In the joint declaration at Cairo on December 1, 1943, the President of the United States, the British Prime Minister, and the President of China stated that it was their purpose that territories that Japan had stolen from China, such as Formosa, should be restored to the Republic of China.
>
> The United States was a signatory to the Potsdam Declaration on July 26, 1945, which declared that the terms of the Cairo Declaration should be carried out. The provisions of the declaration were accepted by Japan at the time of its surrender.
>
> In keeping with these declarations, Formosa was surrendered to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and for the past 4 years the United States and other Allied Powers have accepted the exercise of Chinese authority over the islands.

That is the end of the quotation from former President Truman's statement.

On the same day the then Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, said:

> The Chinese have administered Formosa for 4 years. Neither the United States nor any other ally ever questioned that authority in that occupation. When Formosa was made a province of China nobody raised any lawyer's doubts about that. That was regarded as in accordance with the commitments.
>
> Now, in the opinion of some, the situation has changed. They want to say, "Well, we have to wait for a treaty." We did not wait for a treaty on Cairo. We did not wait for a treaty on the Kuriles. We did not wait for a treaty on the islands over which we have trusteeship.

I believe it to be important that those statements appear in the RECORD at this time.

It is true, Mr. President, that the Republic of China has temporarily, at least, been forced off the mainland to Formosa, the Pescadores, and certain adjoining areas. During World War II some free governments of the world were completely forced out of any territory they held. When Poland was occupied by the Nazis, and then when the Soviet Union, contrary to the solemn agreement it had with Poland, stabbed that nation in the back, the Government of Poland went into exile in London. Yet, despite the fact that the Government of Poland did not occupy a single foot of Polish territory, the powers dealt with the Government in exile. Unfortunately, relying on the promises of the Soviet Union at Yalta—and the promises in every agreement the Soviet Government has entered into have been violated—those representing Poland disbanded the free Government of Poland in exile, and relied on the Soviets to provide for free elections in Poland to establish a government.

We know now, from the bitter lessons of history, that the Communist idea of a free election is much different from that of the free world; and Poland passed behind the Iron Curtain as tightly as though she were a province of the Soviet Union. So in this instance there is a government which is occupying a province of its own country, and yet some nations of the world are willing to deal

with 9½ million human beings in another vast area of the world in an international poker game.

Mr. President, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee very clearly pointed out that we have drawn a defense line in the Pacific area, as we have in other sections of the world. The island of Formosa is a key part of that defense line. It is not only important to our own vital interests, as was disclosed in the evidence adduced by competent military and other personnel, but the loss of Formosa would have a detrimental effect upon all the other free nations of Asia, even though Formosa were not a key part of the defense line.

So, again, if we hope to maintain free nations in Korea, in Japan, in the Philippines, in New Zealand, and Australia, if you please, in Southeast Asia, and even in some of the neutral nations, such as Indonesia, Burma, and India, it must be realized that their vital security interests are very much linked to the question whether or not the free world shall now stand firm, or shall again retreat in the face of Communist threats. That is true because, as certainly as that we are here today, if we abandon this line, if we sacrifice the people of Free China, all of Asia will go down the drain. If the Communists should take Korea, Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, and coming up through Thailand, Burma, Malaya, eastern Pakistan, they should knock at the doors of India, I think Mr. Nehru would be very naive to think that they would say to him, "Mr. Prime Minister, because you were a neutral, more or less favorable to our side, now, when our legions are at the door of India, we will stop in consideration of your past efforts." No, Mr. President; India would be next in line, and then it might be too late to call upon the nations of the free world, because the number of nations capable of interposing resistance would be much smaller than it is today.

Another thing which I consider to be extremely important is that we serve notice that this area will not be used as a blue chip in an international poker game. We have had friendly relations with the Republic of China over a long period of years. China has contributed much to human civilization. Just as we can hope that the people of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia may some day once again be free, so we can at least hope that some day the great people of China may throw off the yoke of the Godless Communist tyranny. No man can know under what circumstances that event may come about, but at least we should not destroy the hope of those people who have been forcibly taken behind the Iron Curtain that some day they may be able to live as civilized human beings, worship their God according to their own consciences, live their daily lives as they might wish to do, and have such educational institutions as they would like to have.

Mr. President, for these reasons I was glad in the Committee on Foreign Relations to support the treaty without any reservations of any kind. I believe the committee action in making clear its intent in the report is perfectly sound; but I think time is of the essence because of the very critical situation which exists in the Pacific.

I hope the Senate will promptly and overwhelmingly approve the treaty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The treaty is before the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, and is open to amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the order for the call of the roll be dispensed with and that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard on the part of the Senator from Oregon. The clerk will continue to call the roll.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Monroney
Allott	Gore	Morse
Anderson	Green	Mundt
Barkley	Hayden	Murray
Barrett	Hennings	Neely
Beall	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bender	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bennett	Holland	Pastore
Bible	Humphrey	Payne
Bricker	Ives	Potter
Butler	Jackson	Robertson
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Carlson	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Case, N. J.	Kerr	Scott
Chavez	Kilgore	Smathers
Clements	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Lehman	Sparkman
Daniel	Long	Stennis
Douglas	Magnuson	Symington
Duff	Mansfield	Thurmond
Dworshak	Martin, Iowa	Thye
Ellender	McClellan	Watkins
Ervin	McNamara	Wiley
Flanders	Millikin	Williams

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent by leave of the Senate, because of illness.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. JENNER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] is necessarily absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I undertake this discussion of the Formosa treaty fully cognizant of the solemn obligation I owe to the people of my State. I undertake it also with a very sad heart, because it is not easy to stand up, in an hour which I believe to be so historic as is this one, and find myself diametrically opposed to the views of some of my closest and most respected friends in the Senate, of whose sincerity and patriotism and devotion to the public interest there can be no doubt. I appreciate their assurances to me privately that they have the same high regard for the sincerity and patriotic impulses which motivate me.

I shall not yield during the course of my formal remarks. However, I shall be very happy, when I have completed those remarks, to yield for any questions that may be asked of me.

Mr. President, I shall vote against this treaty unless reservations can be attached to it. I shall vote against it because I do not believe the treaty is in the best interest of my country. I shall vote against the treaty unless reservations can be attached to it, because I believe the treaty will increase, rather than lessen, the danger of our becoming involved in a third world war.

I shall vote against the so-called treaty because, in my judgment, it is not a treaty. By it we pledge ourselves to defend a government whose claim to the territory it rules at present is at best very doubtful.

In my judgment it is not an instrument of agreement with a sovereign power. Therefore the document does not even meet the definition of a treaty. I am of the opinion that in the years to come, if and when this document comes before a juridical world tribunal, it will not be recognized as a treaty between two sovereign powers. This document is a military alliance, not a treaty.

Oh, I know the argument that will be made. When I try to hold firm to the historic, established doctrines of international law, as I did in connection with the joint resolution recently passed and as I do now in connection with this treaty, the argument in opposition will be to the effect that the Senator from Oregon is dealing in legalisms.

Let me forewarn my country that it cannot afford to turn its back on established international law doctrines unless it wishes to lose the fight in the battle which lies ahead to win the minds of millions of people throughout the world in the cause of freedom. Those minds at the present time are in doubt as to America's intentions in Asia.

As I have been heard to suggest on another occasion on the floor of the Senate, let us never forget, that from the time Asiatics reach the age of reason, from the time when Asiatic folklore and tradition can be drilled into their minds, they are brought up on the intellectual food that the great enemy of Asia is Western domination. That has been true for decades and decades and dec-

ades. It was that traditional point of view which gave the British Commonwealth and the Republic of France years of trouble in Asia.

I do not want to see my country inherit the imperialistic policies of France and Great Britain and other Western powers in Asia. Although mighty are we today, in terms of time, I believe we will come to the end of the same road if we give the Asians cause to believe that America's course of action in Asia leads to another form of Western domination.

There is nothing about us that will be any more appealing to the Asians than were the British and the French and the Dutch and other great imperialistic powers, who in years gone by exercised tremendous domination over Asia, only to fall. And they have fallen.

Great Britain and France and Holland no longer are great dominating forces in Asia. Their days of empire are over. Asians, both on this side of the Iron Curtain and on the other side, are appealed to by the propaganda that they must always be on guard against the threat of Western domination.

I say we must win the fight against the spread of the vicious, lying Russian Communist propaganda that the West seeks to dominate the East. We are not going to do it by by seeking to extend spheres of influence beyond our international law rights. When we do it we play right into the hands of Communist propagandists, and we manufacture the fuel for their Red furnaces.

We have rights in the Pacific, and the Senator from Oregon is for protecting those rights to the hilt. But the Senator from Oregon believes that the rights of the United States in the Pacific can be protected within the framework of international law—that never should we as a nation become guilty of stepping outside that framework, and that we should resolve all doubts in favor of staying within that framework. That is why I wish to plead with my colleagues in the Senate that we resolve all doubts in regard to the meaning of certain language of the treaty by writing into it by way of reservation language which will leave no room for doubt as to the intent and meaning of the Senate of the United States.

Oh, Mr. President, the argument is made that this will cause delay; that the legalistic approach of the Senator from Oregon will cause delay and that new negotiations will have to be undertaken. I say, Mr. President, I think this treaty is so dangerous to the welfare of my country that we had better renegotiate it.

We have made very clear that we are going to protect our legal rights in the Pacific. I am for protecting them. We made very clear in the joint resolution which was passed some days ago that we would fight to protect those rights, if necessary. The record is clear as to my opposition to that part of the resolution which did not deal directly with the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores. I said, as Senators will recall, that I knew what would happen to me when the reactionary segment of the press went to work on me and the editorials were penned. In the past 10 days there have been published in reactionary newspapers, and in some other newspapers, editorial after editorial attacking my position and urging a preventive war by this country. Only because I have been so attacked do I exercise my right on the floor of the Senate to answer that argument once more.

There is no Member of this body who would urge moving faster to defend Formosa and the Pescadores than would the Senator from Oregon. That is why I cosponsored the Lehman amendment to strike from the resolution the language, which by no legal definition could be called language of limitation, which authorized the President of the United States to take such further action or to take such other action or such other measures as he should decide to be necessary to defend Formosa and the Pescadores. That language was as broad as China.

Let me say to the people of my State today, Mr. President, that under such language the Congress of the United States bestowed legal authority on the President to order a bombing of Shanghai if he should decide to do so. I do not think he would do that, but let me say that when we are dealing with great legal principles we should not authorize the application of a legal doctrine which permits of abuse. I do not propose, knowingly, intentionally, or wilfully to do that on the floor of the Senate.

There is no question about what we authorized. Although the reactionary segment of the press has been trying to cover it up for 10 days and attacking those of us who said that under the joint resolution a preventive war could be started, the fact is that the testimony of the Secretary of State and of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States Military Establishment leaves no room for doubt as to the power authorized by the Congress of the United States in that resolution.

Let me repeat, Mr. President, and it needs to be repeated, in order to counteract, at least to some extent, the slanderous attacks of certain newspapers against the men who dared to stand up and vote for what they believed to be a fundamental principle of international law and also a fundamental principle of the Constitution, that the power to declare war rests upon and vests in the Congress of the United States and not in the President. So we disagreed with the joint resolution which sought to authorize the President to take such other measures as he decided were necessary, when the testimony showed that it was clearly intended to authorize him to strike at the mainland of China if he decided—on the basis of military advice—that a concentration of military forces on the mainland of China, no matter where it might be on the mainland, was intended to be directed shortly against Formosa and the Pescadores.

It was our judgment, Mr. President, that the exercise of such authority, if it should result in a strike against the mainland of China before an act of war was committed against us, would constitute a declaration of war or the commission of an act of war against China.

Is that legalistic? If so, let me tell the Senate that those who argue against me on that point cannot meet the terms of my argument, because there is no answer to the point that if such power was granted—and they did not deny that it was granted—and if the power were exercised before an act of war was committed against us, then we would become guilty for the first time in all America's history of committing an act of war against another nation before an act of war had been committed against us.

I do not wish to sentence future generations of American boys and girls to that judgment of history, because it will not be complimentary. I do not think that is the way to win the peace. One of the ways to win the peace is always to keep ourselves in such a position that there can be no basis in truth for any of the vicious things which the Russians say about us.

When our hearts are clean, when we have nothing but peaceful intentions, it is easy to make the false assumption that the rest of the world agrees with us.

In the world today there is a variety of public opinion toward the United States. There is the poisoned mind of the Communists who think we are all sorts of hideous creatures designing only to make war. There are people in Asia, on this side of the Iron Curtain, who do not swallow the Communist line, but who simply cannot understand some of the things we do. They cannot understand such threats as are contained in the joint resolution recently passed by the Congress. It makes them wonder. They can understand when we say, "Listen, China and Russia, if you strike the Pescadores or Formosa, you are at war with us; if you start a strike against them you are at war with us." But, Mr. President, as we are thousands of miles away from the scene and are not attuned to the oriental mind—and we Anglo-Saxons are not so attuned—we should recognize that we do not do a very good job of interpreting and understanding the oriental mind. Our whole intellectual conditioning has been different. Our bringing up has been different. We are a Nation of doers. We are a people who, when we see a job which should be done, ask the simple question: Why not go about doing it?

The oriental mind is not attuned to that sort of direct action. The oriental is much more inclined to think philosophically, religiously, and historically. To him time is not the precious commodity that it is to the American. To him materialism is not the precious wealth that it is to the American. He cannot quite understand our haste. There are many differences between us, such as color of skin, spiritual values, and social and cultural values. But he has a great common denominator with us, namely, human instinct.

He knows the difference between international right and international wrong. He knows, from a long line of historic tradition, that a tremendous display of military might, accompanied by a dare-if-you-do threat of aggression, is not

conducive to peace. He has been trampled under throughout the centuries. He has had the conqueror march over him before. All his folklore teaches him those lessons. He wants to believe the best about us.

But there he is in India. Let us keep our eyes on India. She has been the downfall of other Western powers in Asia, and she can be the downfall of the United States in Asia. Today our prestige in India is at the lowest ebb of many, many years, because the Indians, not on the basis of Russian Communist propaganda, but on the basis of their own thinking, have been warning us for many months past that they do not like our actions in Asia.

If proof of that fact is needed, check the Commonwealth Conference, just closed in London. There were not many hurrahs for America from the Indian delegate; in fact, there were no hurrahs for America from most of the delegates. Why? We have them worried. We have them puzzled. They are afraid that we may stumble into a course of action which will lead us into serious trouble in Asia, and possibly involve them in war, and they do not want war. Of all the causes of war, one which they do not want is a cause of war based upon protecting the Nationalist Chinese. I do not think we shall have any allies in that kind of war in Asia.

That is why I say, Mr. President, that free Asians recognize our legal right to defend Formosa and the Pescadores, for reasons which I shall set forth momentarily; but they are not with us in the American idea that the way to show the Communists that we mean business is to pass legislation in the Congress of the United States which authorizes a preventive war. That scares them. They are not sure that they like that kind of ally. I wonder, if we were Asians, whether we would blame them too much.

I repeat, as the whole thesis underlying my argument this afternoon, as it was about a week ago this afternoon: I am for protecting Formosa and the Pescadores to the hilt, and by war if necessary, if war should be made upon us. The resolution provides for that. This treaty is not necessary to do that.

Oh, but it is said, "What about the Nationalist Chinese forces? We must protect them."

Mr. President, we have been protecting them for a long time. I am for continuing to protect them from a blood bath. When we protect our legal rights in Formosa, we protect the Nationalist Chinese.

But it is said that we may destroy their morale, and they might not be effective allies. There is no good reason for such consequences. I think they know how lucky they are. I think they know that, for the most part, they are alive today because of the United States.

Strong appeals are made to us on the ground that we owe a great moral obligation to the Nationalist Chinese to back them up on the islands of Quemoy and Matsu, which lie 8 or 10 miles off the mainland of China; that we should give them the kind of recognition which this treaty will give them.

But I do not forget history easily. We owe the moral duty to protect the Nationalist Chinese as human beings from a Communist blood bath, and I am for doing it on Formosa within the framework of our legal rights. But I cannot forget the civil war in China which was taking place while we were still at war with Japan.

BACKGROUND IN CHINA

When I listen to the sentimental, emotional descriptions of the Nationalist Chinese regime, I pinch myself to make certain that I am hearing correctly because history shows clearly that the Generalissimo never controlled North China; his power always was in South China. A group of war lords always controlled North China, so far as the particular era about which we are talking is concerned, and the Generalissimo never made any progress in North China.

The United States poured munitions into the hands of Nationalist China by the hundreds of millions of dollars worth, and again the record is clear that great quantities went into the hands of the Communists, much of it unpacked from the packing boxes in which it was shipped to China.

We hear much about the alleged sellout of the Nationalist Chinese by that great American, Gen. George Marshall. Anyone who will read the record will know that there was no sellout. Anyone who will read the record will know that when General Marshall went to China on his mission, with no preconceived notions, and with no plan drafted for him to carry out except first to find out what the facts were and to see what could be done in behalf of making China an effective ally in that war, he came up against the hard, cold reality that the Generalissimo never had power in North China.

The Communists ruled it. It is not a fact to my liking. It is not to my liking that the Communists rule even 1 square inch of the earth's surface. But whether it is to our liking or not will not change the fact. When General Marshall got to China the Generalissimo was impotent in North China. The record is clear on that fact. It is an interesting fact that some of the highest of our military officials advised Marshall that an effort should be made to work out a coalition between the Nationalist Chinese and the Communists. That fact cannot be successfully disputed. It is a matter of written record which was submitted to us in black and white when I was on the Armed Services Committee. Yet this great American, George Marshall, has been subjected to vicious attacks over what happened in China when he was up against these hard, cold realities.

The fact is that to have placed the Generalissimo in control in North China would have required thousands of American marines, and the Generalissimo would have stayed in control just so long as American marines were maintained there to keep him in control. The Generalissimo would not have been kept in control in North China by conducting Chinese tea parties, either. It would have been necessary to keep him there with guns of marines, because the Northern Chinese would have had none of it.

The trouble many Americans have about that problem is that they do not even understand the geography of China. They do not understand the great geographical differences between the northern and southern provinces of China, and the differences geography has made in the people of China over the centuries. As one moves from one Chinese province to another, in many respects he actually moves from one country to another. Yet the American people were ready to believe this Chinese leader was the leader of all China. He never was.

We became very much disturbed about what was happening to our aid to China. We became very much disturbed here in the Congress, and there are men now sitting within my view in this Chamber who were greatly disturbed at the time about what was happening to American supplies which went to China, because the briefings we received from the State Department and the Pentagon Building at that time—and do not forget that John Foster Dulles was in the State Department under a bipartisan policy—were that great quantities of those supplies were going directly over to the Communists because of the corruption, bribery, and malfeasance which characterized the regime of the Nationalist Chinese.

Mr. President, I do not like to have to say these things, but let me tell my colleagues I am not going to gild the lily when it comes to the Nationalist Chinese, because too much is at stake so far as my country is concerned.

Here in the Congress we kept asking why something was not done to stop the flow of American military goods into Communist hands in North China. What does history show? We lost faith in the Generalissimo. It became pretty well established around the halls of this great legislative body and on the floor of the Senate that the Generalissimo was not doing a good job, and the evidence kept pouring in that he was not going to be accepted at any time in North China, and the number of dissidents in South China increased.

That tiny civil war at first had been limited pretty much to the so-called North China provinces. Only by way of argument or by analogy, Mr. President, do I draw this description, but it may help some persons who may read my remarks. Territorially the situation was something like that which would have prevailed if, for instance, Canada had represented North China and the United States had represented South China.

At no time, under my argument by analogy, did the Generalissimo control that part of China which, for purposes of illustration, I have described as the part controlled by Canada. The Generalissimo soon lost more and more control over the territory of South China. That tiny little war blazed more fiercely, and finally turned into a holocaust, and the Generalissimo was driven off the mainland of China. There was no doubt about the fact that the Chinese people wanted no more of him, and he took refuge on the islands near the coast and on Formosa.

There then developed among free nations and in world public opinion the great split over the Nationalist Chinese. We stood with the Generalissimo, although there was a general loss of confidence in him in places of high position in the United States. We decided to give him some aid and we poured millions and millions of dollars into Formosa for Chiang Kai-shek. We continued to recognize the Generalissimo, but some of our allies did not share our confidence in him.

Of course, there are many reasons why some of our allies recognized the Communist regime on the mainland of China. I think some of the reasons are pretty reprehensible. I have spoken about many of the actions in regard to this matter, and I incorporate everything and anything I have ever said on the floor of the Senate on Asiatic policy into my statement this afternoon. The senior Senator from Oregon can incorporate in his remarks today every statement on Asiatic policy he has made on the floor of the Senate since 1945 and not have to take back a single word, because they represent a consistent line of pleading with the people of the United States to watch out and not to follow, in Asia, a course of diplomatic action which might get us involved in an all-out war there. I take that position because I happen to believe—as General Bradley believed, and as he used to testify before the Armed Services Committee—that that is not the place to fight Russia, if we have to fight her; that if we have to fight Russia, we had better pick out our own battleground, and not get sucked into a war on the mainland of China.

Mr. President, some of my colleagues have said to me, today, "Wayne, I am disturbed about what you may say this afternoon on the floor of the Senate, because a great emotional, hysteric opinion is sweeping the country as a result of what happened yesterday in Moscow. Don't let yourself be maneuvered into a position in which you will be charged with following the 'Commie' line."

Well, Mr. President, I appreciate the devoted interest of such friends. However, my record will stand as one who is unalterably opposed to the "Commie" line and is unalterably opposed to everything the Communists stand for. Mr. President, because I am that kind of a patriot, I am opposing, this afternoon, a treaty which, in my judgment, may cause our country to get sucked in by the "Commie" line in Asia. I say that because I happen to believe—to turn the table on the argument that was made about me on the floor of the Senate a few days ago, when I opposed the joint resolution—that, in my judgment, this treaty will strengthen the "Commie" line in Asia, because the treaty will be used to add strength to the communistic propaganda. Those who wish to try to explain it away by means of committee reports, may do so all they wish; but what will the Communists not do with the language of this treaty, or so-called treaty, unless clarifying provisions are written into it?

Mr. President, I am opposed to the treaty, because I think it is a great aid to the Communists. I have said a great many times that there is no doubt in my mind that the Communists will try to destroy us if we ever allow ourselves to become so weak that they can destroy us. I do not propose to help weaken my country, through this treaty; and the treaty will, I believe, have a weakening effect on our country, for reasons which I shall develop in the course of these remarks.

I have said these things about my deep conviction regarding the importance of our defense of Formosa and the Pescadores within our legal rights because I think we must defend them, not only in our own best interests, but also in the best interests of our allies, inasmuch as under the United Nations we owe a tremendous obligation to our allies. Many of them are weak, and many of them falter. Many of them are timid and uncertain, and have to lean on the backbone of America. I am in favor of helping them lean on it, and I am in favor of giving them the benefit of our strength, because we have a common interest in this great battle of the century for peace. One hundred years is the length of time it will take—at least 100 years, Mr. President; and truly it is the battle of the century, for we are not going to win the peace in less than 100 years. In fact, if we become involved in a third world war, we will not win the peace in 100 years. In that case, I think it will take longer than 100 years, because such a war will leave the world in chaos for so long a time.

Mr. President, our allies need to have us defend Formosa and the Pescadores because—as has been pointed out by my opposition in the course of this debate—they are in the chain of American defense running from the Aleutians, through Japan, to Australia, and New Zealand. However, that line of defense is not our line of defense alone; it is freedom's line of defense in the Pacific; and every free nation in the world has an interest in that line. We need the reinforcement and the support of that line by the other free nations of the world.

However, Mr. President, that line cannot be extended to the Quemoys and the Matsus, if the other free nations are to lend their support to that line. In that event, they will not come to its support; and they have told us so. I do not know how they could more clearly say so. They have said plainly that they will not stand behind and support that line unless we make it a line which runs through and includes Formosa and the Pescadores, but stays away from the mainland of China.

In terms of history, I do not think we can defend that line alone, because there is something strange about attrition; there is something strange about shrinkage; there is something strange about the deterioration of support: It shrivels the parent body. If we lose, through attrition and deterioration, the support of our allies behind a line in the Pacific, we will be there all alone; and then we shall have neutralism behind us and neutralism in front of us, plus opposition in the mass of the mainland of China and the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, the change in Russia yesterday did not cause me to quake at my knees. I am not filled with any convictions of certainty—as I have heard expressed today, off the floor, by some of my colleagues—that this change means war. It can mean war. But, Mr. President, let me tell you what I believe it means, more than anything else, or what we ought to do more than anything else. We should consolidate the allies, and we should follow a course of action which will make very clear to the Kremlin and to Red China that all the allies are together, and are not divided.

As I said once before, let us remember the historic speeches made by Arthur Vandenberg, when—in speaking on the floor of the Senate—he used to warn us not to follow a course of action which would result in division among the allies. He took that position because the creation of such a division is the Russian game; it is what the Russians want. That is Russia's best hope of success, in any aim on her part to destroy America.

In this case we are dealing with an agreement which I do not believe deserves the legal title of "treaty." We are dealing with an agreement which involves the protection of a Nationalist Chinese regime which many of our allies fear, which they do not trust, and which they believe will try to lead the free world into a war on the mainland of China.

As I said yesterday, when I spoke in the Foreign Relations Committee, it was just yesterday morning that we heard over the radio the statement from Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, to the effect that his redeployment of troops off the Tachens was merely a military maneuver in preparation for a war on the mainland of China.

Do we want an agreement with a man who is making such a threat? I do not like his threat any more than I like the threats of the Reds. They both threaten war, not peace. I say that this treaty is not following the calculated risks of peace, but increasing the calculated risks of war. We are placing the sanction of approval upon a Chinese leader who is bent on reestablishing himself on the mainland of China, which he cannot do in any other way than through war; and he cannot conduct such a war without our being involved in it. I am for protecting him on Formosa, because we have the legal right and authority to protect Formosa, and because I do not think the fact can be disputed that it is our Christian, humanitarian, moral obligation to protect him on Formosa. But I will not be a party to creating a division of opinion between us and our allies over the Nationalist Chinese.

I have heard a great deal of talk about the 600,000 trained soldiers on Formosa. I happen to be one who believes that if they were ever transported to the mainland of China they would turn the situation into a military track meet. Thousands of them would vanish. It was not so long ago—and I can say this now because it became a matter of public property—that high military experts in this country testified that the combat efficiency of the Nationalist Chinese Army was 18 percent. Let us assume that in

the very brief time which has intervened it has doubled, which would be a military miracle.

It is not a military machine or force which fills me with very much enthusiasm as to what it could do militarily if it were confronted with strong military opposition; and if those forces are placed on the mainland of China they will be so confronted, because of the godless lack of value placed upon human life by the Communists. We experienced in Korea a part of their military strategy. Wave upon wave upon wave of human beings are thrown against an opposition force until they finally overpower it. In fact, their opposition is sometimes overpowered due to the sheer exhaustion of killing Communist hordes. That is what we are dealing with if we are talking about any possibility of the Nationalist Chinese regaining the mainland of China. If they regain it, it will be with the aid of American forces.

On the basis of such military facts as I have ever heard discussed, I am not enthusiastic about the argument as to what these great allies of ours, the Nationalist Chinese, will do if we become involved in war. I think the chief thing they will do will be to run. However, they will not be able to run as fast as they ran off the mainland of China, because they are older. I know the significance of that statement.

I dissent from the point of view being expressed to the American people that this is an effective military force. I think it would collapse, unless we were to fill its ranks with thousands of American marines and other foot soldiers and bring in the Navy and American air pilots to fight the battle. I do not wish to become involved in any agreement with a Nationalist Chinese leader with such a record of ineffectiveness as that of the Generalissimo, so far as being a military leader is concerned.

To come back to my point as to whether this is or is not a treaty, I refer Senators to the legal definition to be found in any reputable law dictionary, as to what a treaty is. I respectfully submit that we are going along on the assumption that there is no question that this document is a treaty. I do not think it is. The law dictionary says:

Treaty: A compact made between two or more independent nations with a view to the public welfare. (Quoted in *Altman & Co.* v. *U. S.* (224 U. S. 583, 32 Sup. Ct. 593, 56 L. ed. 894).) Treaties are for a perpetuity, or for a limited time. Those matters which are accomplished by a single act and are at once perfected in their execution are called agreements, conventions, and pactions, but the distinction in name is not always observed.

* * * * *

On the part of the United States treaties are made by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur. (Const., art. 2, sec. 2, no. 2.)

* * * * *

A treaty is declared to be the supreme law of the land and is, therefore, obligatory on courts, whenever it operates of itself without the aid of the legislative provision; *U. S.* v. *Peggy* (1 Cra. (U. S.) 103 2 L. ed. 49); *Whitney* v. *Robertson* (124 U. S. 190, 8 Sup. Ct. 456, 31 L. ed. 386); *U. S.* v. *Rauscher* (119 U. S. 407, 7 Sup. Ct. 234, 30 L. ed. 425); *Maiorano* v. *R. Co.* (213 U. S. 268, 29 Sup. Ct. 424, 53 L. ed. 792); but when the terms of the stipulation import a contract, and either of the parties engages to perform a particular act, the treaty addresses itself to the political, not to the judicial department, and the legislature must execute the contract before it can become a rule of the court; *Foster* v. *Neilson* (2 Pet. (U. S.) 314, 7 L. ed. 451). A treaty is a law of the land whenever its provisions prescribe a rule by which the rights of the private citizen or subject may be determined; *In re Cooper* (143 U. S. 472, 12 Sup. Ct. 453, 36 L. ed. 232). So an award by arbitrators under a treaty between the United States and another nation, by which the contracting nations agree that the decision of the tribunal of arbitration shall be a final settlement of all questions submitted, becomes the supreme law of the land and is as binding on the courts as an act of Congress; *Whitelaw* v. *U. S.* (75 Fed. 513, 21 C. C. A. 434, reversing *The La Ninja* (49 Fed. 575).

Later in my argument I shall discuss the point about a treaty, once ratified, being the supreme law of the land and a legal obligation resting upon the Nation. I shall discuss that point when we come to the interpretation of the treaty.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. No. I stated at the beginning that I would not yield until I finished, and I do not wish to begin making exceptions.

Reading again from the legal text:

It need hardly be said that a treaty cannot change the Constitution or be held valid if it be in violation of that instrument. A treaty may supersede a prior act of Congress, and an act of Congress may supersede a prior treaty; and this is true both of treaties with Indians and foreign nations; *Cherokee Tobacco* (11 Wall. (U. S.) 620, 20 L. ed. 227); *U. S.* v. *Old Settlers* (148 U. S. 427, 13 Sup. Ct. 650, 37 L. ed. 509); *Fong Yue Ting* v. *U. S.* (149 U. S. 698, 13 Sup. Ct. 1016, 37 L. ed. 905). A treaty is of like obligation as an act of legislation; both are the supreme law of the land, and no supreme efficacy is given to the one over the other; *Whitney* v. *Robertson* (124 U. S. 190, 8 Sup. Ct. 456, 31 L. ed. 386). As between the statute and the treaty, if the 2 are found to conflict, the 1 last in time must control; *Ribas y Hijo* v. *U. S.* (194 U. S. 315, 24 Sup. Ct. 727, 48 L. ed. 994); *Sanchez* v. *U. S.* (216 U. S. 167, 30 Sup. Ct. 361, 54 L. ed. 432); as far as this country is concerned; *U. S.* v. *Lee Yen Tai* (185 U. S. 221, 22 Sup. Ct. 629, 46 L. ed. 878).

When a treaty is inconsistent with a subsequent act of Congress, the latter will prevail. The Constitution does not declare that the law established by a treaty shall never be altered or repealed by Congress; and while good faith may cause Congress to refrain from making any change in such a law, if it does so, its enactment becomes the law. No person acquires any vested right to the continued operation of a treaty. Although the other part to the treaty may have ground of complaint, still everyone is bound to obey the latest law passed; *Rainey* v. *U. S.* (232 U. S. 310, 34 Sup. Ct. 429, 58 L. ed. —).

A collector of customs cannot refuse to follow the directions of a statute because it is in conflict with a prior treaty; *Bartram* v. *Robertson* (122 U. S. 116, 7 Sup. Ct. 1115, 30 L. Ed. 1118). A treaty is a part of the law of every State; *Cherokee Tobacco* (11 Wall. (U. S.) 616, 21 L. Ed. 227); *Huenstein* v. *Lynham* (100 U. S. 483, 25 L. Ed. 628). A treaty may remove the disability of aliens under State laws to inherit lands; *Bahuad* v. *Bize* (105 Fed. 485); *Geofrey* v. *Riggs* (133 U. S. 258, 10 Sup. Ct. 295, 33 L. Ed. 642); *Opel* v. *Shoup* (100 Ia. 407, 69 NW 560, 37 L. R. A. 583); *Succession of Rixner* (48 La. Ann. 552, 19 South. 597, 32 L. R. A. 177, with full note). A treaty binds the courts as fully as an act of Congress; *U. S.* v. *Peggy* (1 Cra. (U. S.) 103, 2 L. Ed. 49); but it cannot deprive a citizen of a constitutional right; *The Neck* (138 Fed. 144). See also, Burr, The Treaty-Making Power of the United States and the Methods of Its Enforcement as Affecting the Police Power of the States. The question whether the United States is justified in disregarding its engagements with another nation is not one for the determination of the courts; *The Chinese Exclusion* case (130 U. S. 581, 9 Sup. Ct. 623, 32 L. Ed. 1068).

Treaties should be liberally construed so as to carry out the apparent intention of the parties to secure equality and reciprocity between them; *Geofroy* v. *Riggs* (133 U. S. 258, 10 Sup. Ct. 295, 33 L. Ed. 642). Where concessions are made, the treaty is to be construed most favorably to the conceding nation; *U. S.* v. *De la Maza, Arredondo* (6 Pet. (U. S.) 691, 8 L. Ed. 547).

So far as a treaty can be made the subject of judicial cognizance in the courts of this country, it is subject to such acts as Congress may pass for its enforcement, modification, or repeal; *Whitney* v. *Robertson* (124 U. S. 190, 8 Sup. Ct. 456, 31 L. Ed. 386); *The Chinese Exclusion* case (130 U. S. 581, 9 Sup. Ct. 623, 32 L. Ed. 1068); *Horner* v. *U. S.* (143 U. S. 570, 12 Sup. Ct. 522, 36 L. Ed. 266).

Treaties are agreements between nations of a general nature bearing upon political or commercial questions, and are distinguished from conventions which are agreements relating to minor or specific subjects, such as consular conventions and postal conventions.

The right to negotiate treaties is one of the tests of sovereignty.

I emphasize that statement.

Because that legal doctrine goes to the heart of this part of my argument, it is my rebuttal to the point being made by my opposition in the debate that we are not recognizing a doctrine of sovereignty. Of course we are.

The right to negotiate treaties is one of the tests of sovereignty.

There are negotiations on both sides of this agreement, Mr. President.

A treaty with a state is considered by the United States as abrogated when such state is conquered by or incorporated into another state.

We could have a very interesting argument on that point, as to whether or not, in fact, so far as China is concerned, when the Generalissimo was driven off the mainland of China onto the territory to which he has no rights—nor do we, except the caretaker right to protect it—he was conquered.

If anyone thinks he was not conquered, let him try to send the Generalissimo back to the mainland of China. Therefore I repeat the legal rule:

A treaty with a state is considered by the United States as abrogated when such state is conquered by or incorporated into another state. But England has taken an opposite position.

However, England did so for different reasons.

I do not believe the document before us meets the legal tests of a treaty. It is not a treaty with a sovereign power. We do not make it a sovereign power by saying it is. We do not make it a sovereign power by a so-called act of diplomatic recognition.

It is very dangerous to follow a course of action which can be interpreted by the Communists as recognizing that the Na-

tionalist Chinese have sovereign rights over Formosa. Of course, the argument can be made that we do not do so, because we say in the committee report we do not do so. If that be the case, why do we not say so in the treaty? It is the treaty that will rule. It is the language of the treaty that will control. It makes no difference how many so-called fine intentions we write into the fine print of the committee report; no world court, if we ever get into an international judicial tribunal dispute over this treaty, will pay any attention to the fine print in a Senate committee report.

It is elementary in legislative construction that there is no need to worry about the alleged intent of the passers of legislation if the document can speak for itself. Lawyers appearing before a court are not allowed to create an ambiguity by argument. Of course, the court must listen to them. After the court has listened to them, what does the court say? The court says, in effect, that the court can read and that the court reads the language, and the language raises no ambiguity. That is the rule even in a stronger case than my opposition raises, when it comes to the interpretation of domestic law by a domestic court. The courts in such instances are very liberal in listening to counsel's efforts to convince the court that there is an ambiguity. But, when the language is as crystal clear as is the language in this agreement the courts say, "The language speaks for itself. We can do nothing but follow the language and apply it."

Therefore, in my judgment, the so-called qualifying or conditioning or limiting language in the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations is not worth the paper it is written on so far as its legal effect before a world court is concerned. It does not change the treaty. The treaty, in my judgment, seeks to give the world the impression that the Nationalist Chinese have sovereign rights in Formosa. I do not believe we can escape that deduction.

I point out that Formosa and the Pescadores have changed hands many times in the past. Prior to 1895 Formosa and the Pescadores had a semiautonomous status, and were repeatedly used by political factions from the Chinese mainland as a place of last refuge. The Generalissimo is not the only Chinese leader who escaped into exile on Formosa, in terms of ancient Chinese history.

Chinese claims to the island have differed from time to time, but, in the main—indeed, I believe, for the most part—we can say they have been nominal.

Whatever their claims, they were relinquished to Japan in 1895. It is said they were relinquished with a pistol held to the head of China. That may be, but they were relinquished in a solemn treaty which was entered into between China and Japan. There can be no doubt about the fact that Japan entered into a treaty with the sovereign power that controlled the mainland of China in 1895, although a defeated sovereignty.

As happens in the settlement of wars, as a part of the spoils of war, Formosa was ceded to Japan. Surely it was done at pistol point. In international law, however, that did not make it an illegal cession. It made it a perfectly lawful cession, sanctioned by a treaty between two sovereign nations.

Japan exercised control over Formosa until 1945, and no one questioned that control. The legal status of Formosa and the Pescadores as a part of Japan was established. Japan, in turn, relinquished control over the islands by treaty in 1951, but the legal control of the islands remained unsettled.

In the debate much has been said about the legal status of Formosa. The legal status of the island was not settled by the Japanese peace treaty; nor was it settled by the Cairo agreement. The legal status of Formosa is in suspense. In my judgment it must eventually be determined by the juridical processes of the United Nations, if we are to have a peaceful settlement of the question.

The Red Chinese have no legal title to Formosa; neither have the Nationalists; neither have we. However, we have a caretaker right to Formosa until there is an eventual juridical determination of its title. We have a duty to protect it as one of the aftermaths of the unsettled World War II. It is easy to make the assumption that World War II is settled, but there is still much to be settled about it, and Formosa is one of the problems.

If this treaty fixed the legal status, insofar as the United States is concerned, it would make clear that we recognize beyond the shadow of a doubt that Formosa and the Pescadores are a part of China. I think that is the interpretation which will be made. We walk right into it, and in my opinion that is one of the reasons why the treaty should not be ratified. It is not in the national interest for us to recognize Formosa at the present time as a part of the territory of China.

So, Mr. President, I raise this question: Is such a recognition the way to keep the islands in friendly hands? The argument may be made that it is the way, since Formosa is controlled by the Nationalist Government. But what are Chiang Kai-shek's claims to the island? Has he ever been chosen by popular vote on the island? Does his regime enjoy popular support? How did his regime get to Formosa in the first place?

These are some questions which we had better ponder before we vote to ratify this treaty, because I submit, respectfully, that when we ratify the treaty we, to all intents and purposes, recognize the claim of the Generalissimo to the island. Does anyone doubt that he is claiming it and that we are entering into an agreement with the man who claims it?

As the record of the committee will show, I asked the Secretary of State, able international lawyer that he is, if, at some subsequent date in his capacity as international lawyer, he should be representing the Nationalist Chinese Government before the World Court, he would introduce as an exhibit in evidence the treaty between the United States and the Nationalist Chinese as some proof of the claim of the Nationalist Chinese to sovereignty over Formosa. We parried a bit, but I insisted on an answer to the question as to whether in an issue involving their sovereignty this treaty would not inevitably be stressed before the World Court by the Nationalist Chinese as some evidence of their sovereign rights. The Secretary of State could not and did not deny it.

There can be no doubt, Mr. President, that by this treaty we are creating evidence that will strengthen the claims of the Nationalist Chinese of sovereignty over Formosa. When we do that, I think we make trouble for the United States. When we do that, I believe we strengthen the Communist propaganda against us.

How did the Nationalist regime ever get planted on Formosa? The Nationalist Chinese Government was ordered to take the Japanese surrender on behalf of the Allied Powers in 1945 by General MacArthur. The Chinese Nationalists constituted an army of occupation, nothing more, the same as ours or the Russians or the French or the British in Germany. The Chinese Nationalist Government had no more legal right unilaterally to make Formosa and the Pescadores a part of China than we would have to make Germany a part of the United States.

Oh, it is said, "Wait a minute; what about the Cairo agreement?" The Cairo agreement gave no right to the Nationalist Chinese fleeing from the mainland of China to take sovereign control of Formosa. That is my answer. At the time of the Japanese Treaty the Nationalist Chinese were an army of occupation. They still are. The Chinese Nationalist Government, with our help, has undone some of the early damage caused by opposition within Formosa, but it can hardly claim to represent the people of Formosa. It has become less representative, year by year, with the passing of time.

We do not hear very much about the Formosans, Mr. President. It will not look well on the pages of American history that we have superimposed over several million people, natives of Formosa—the estimate varying from 4 million to 7 million—a military occupation force and required them to "take it and like it." We cannot reconcile that with our dedicated devotion to democratic processes. The Formosans did not elect Chiang Kai-shek. They never have. The average American has not the slightest idea about what the government of Formosa is under the Nationalist Chinese. The Generalissimo has been painted to the American people as a leader of democracy. He is a leader of democracy just about as much as is any dictator.

I say solemnly on the floor of the Senate, Mr. President, that we in the United States had better stop supporting police states and dictatorships around the world if we want to win the world for freedom in the areas where it must be won. We had better insist upon giving our support to democracy. That is one of the best ways we can win the fight against the dictatorship and police-state methods of the Communists.

One of the reasons, I am told by many reliable authorities, why we have not

been doing so well in India and in a great many of the other parts of Asia and elsewhere in the world, including some of the areas to the south of us, in South America, is that they give us the horse laugh when we talk about advocating the spread of democratic processes. The Generalissimo is not a very good exhibit to offer to bolster the argument that we support democratic processes.

It has been said that Chiang Kai-shek was reelected not very long ago for another term of 6 years as President. Who reelected him? The people of Formosa? Not at all. A puppet legislature which he brought with him from the mainland of China. There is just about as much democracy in that process as there is when the head of the Russian Soviet Union is elected in the Kremlin. Many of Chiang's former leaders are telling us so, because some of them are now in refuge in our own country. Some examples are T. V. Soong, President Li Tsung-jen, and K. C. Wu.

They are pretty good witnesses for me. These and others who had spent the better part of their lives in the Nationalist movement in China were finally forced to quit it. What do they tell us? They tell us that this Nationalist Chinese Government with which it is proposed that we enter into a solemn treaty, or that which some call a treaty, is no regime of democracy. There have been in this country for some years forces which have been doing everything in their power to get us involved as a nation with the Generalissimo and his regime and make the very serious mistake of backing him up on the false assumption that he is a democratic leader, and that when we back him we are backing a democratic leader for China. One of the reasons why he was driven out of China was that millions in China would not accept him as a leader because they knew how dictatorial his policies were.

When I make this argument in committee or in conference, someone may ask, "Well, would you rather have the present regime in China?" The answer is "No." Do you know why, Mr. President? Because, as I always tried to instill in the minds of my law students, there is an axiom that good lawyers never accept the argument that two wrongs make a right. That is pretty elementary.

If it is to win the fight for freedom in Asia, I say it is dangerous for my country to enter into an alleged treaty with a dictator who subsequently will use the treaty as an exhibit in support of his argument that he has sovereign rights over Formosa. Is that legalistic? It is merely sound international law doctrine; that is all; because when treaties are entered into with a government, that government's claims to sovereignty are strengthened. We shall not help our country by acting outside the framework of international law.

There must be two parties to a treaty. Who ratified this treaty for the Nationalist Chinese? The legislature; and that legislature was not elected or otherwise chosen by the people of Formosa. It is the remnant of a legislature selected at Nanking, on the mainland, before the Nationalist Government retreated to Formosa. Yet this is the Government with which the United States is now asked to conclude a solemn treaty of mutual defense.

I am urging that we defend Formosa and that we protect Chiang and his forces in the process of doing so. But that can be done without strengthening his claim to sovereign rights over Formosa.

I have pointed out that the people of Formosa did not have anything to say about this treaty. They have not had anything to say about the legislative processes generally of the Nationalist Chinese in Formosa, because the Nationalist Government has not been a democratic regime.

I have said that different figures have been given as to the number of native Formosans, ranging from 4 million to 7 million. But let us engage in a known understatement and assume only 3 million, which is lower than any figure which has been cited to me, either by the Library of Congress or the professional staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Those people have some rights, too. When we begin to deal with a treaty, so-called, relating to the territory of Formosa, we should not forget that there are on Formosa natives of that island, and that our agreement in the last analysis will affect them.

I have in my hand an interesting letter which I received from a Formosan leader. I cannot disclose his name, for the reason which he sets forth in the last paragraph of the letter—and the reason is a commentary, I may say. I shall give the last quotation first, and then go to the body of his letter. He writes:

> I hope you will understand me and judge the issue by right wisdom and justice.
>
> I will appreciate if you will consider the safety of my family in Formosa in regard to dealing with this letter.

He is scared stiff that if his criticisms of the Nationalist Chinese become known in Formosa, his family would not be safe. This letter is no exception. Other Senators have had communications from leaders in Formosa who have no representation in the Nationalist Chinese Government, and who complain that we imposed an army of military occupation upon them, which constitutes, in fact, a military government, not a democratic form of government.

What does my correspondent say? He says many things, but I shall burden the RECORD with only this quotation from his letter:

> Since we Formosans with our peace-loving and hearty attachment to democracy and freedom we oppose communism and control of the island by the Chinese Communists. Therefore, we all appreciate protection of the island by the United States 7th Fleet from any possible attack by the Reds. However, while keeping Formosa free from Communist invasion is one thing, putting Formosa under the totalitarian despotism of the Chinese Nationalists is the other. I like you to know that it is long-seeking desire of all native Formosans to be free from both Chinese Nationalists and Communists. I would also like you to investigate what has been doing on the island of Formosa where even people's minimum right and freedom have been deprived by the Nationalist regime.

Shall we enter into a treaty with that regime? Not with my vote, because I do not think such a regime is deserving of the sanctity which would be accorded it by the ratification of a treaty. If it be given, it will strengthen its claim of sovereignty over the island, and we shall not be writing into the treaty any reservation about that; we shall simply be writing into a committee report some legally worthless fine print which does not change one iota the legal import and effect of the treaty.

As I said yesterday, it represents but a confession that we do not mean what we say and do not say what we mean in the treaty. I think that when the Senate writes and ratifies a treaty, we should mean every word we say in the treaty, and we ought to say everything we mean in the treaty, no matter how many reservations it may take, and no matter what delay may be involved.

My next argument is in the form of a question: Is it in the interests of the United States to conclude a treaty with the Nationalist Government of China controlling some 6 or 7 million people, among whom they and their soldiers are practically aliens? Have the Formosans ever had an opportunity to express their sentiments about this Government? Is it in the interests of this country to substantiate the legal claim of the Chinese Communists to Formosa and the Pescadores by making this treaty which would clearly recognize the islands as a part of China, and thus subject them to the outcome of the Chinese civil war? Is this the way to keep Formosa and the Pescadores in friendly hands? I do not think so. That is why I think the treaty is a mistake.

Along that line, I offer as opinion evidence some of the comments contained in an article entitled "Questions on the Formosa Treaty," written by Herbert Elliston, and published in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald. Mr. Elliston and I, as the debate has shown in recent days, disagree on many aspects of Asiatic problems as they have been raised both by the resolution and the treaty; but we do agree on many. We certainly share the fears in regard to the threat to peace the islands of Quemoy and Matsu constitute in that area. We now find ourselves in agreement, as represented by Mr. Elliston's article this morning, on the point I have just been discussing. Listen to his concluding paragraph:

> What I suggest is a reservation of some kind, saying that it is the sense of the Senate that the sovereignty over Formosa is still vested in the Allies for disposition in conformity with all the interests and parties concerned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article by Mr. Elliston printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUESTIONS ON THE FORMOSA TREATY

(By Herbert Elliston)

Since more than a few Senators voted for the joint resolution on Formosa with some misgiving, and since the same Senators have

been holding their breath with apprehension over the possibility of an armed collision in the straits, it behooves them to take a close look at the mutual defense treaty with Chiang Kai-shek's regime prior to ratification.

Secretary Dulles takes issue with the view that this treaty would confer sovereignty over Formosa on the National Government headed by Chiang Kai-shek. The view has been put in memorandum form by Benjamin Cohen, and circulated, though not sponsored, by the Democratic National Committee.

To the layman the Cohen thesis looks incontrovertible. How can you sign a treaty with a government without recognizing that it has a habitation as well as a name? There were the emigre governments in wartime, of course; yet we maintained our recognition of the sovereignty of which Hitler had deprived them. This, you may say, is how we regard what Mr. Dulles, in his exchange with Foreign Minister George Yeh, calls Free China. Yes, but this particular treaty has nothing to do with mainland China and, indeed, is intended (as everybody knows) to disengage us from Chiang Kai-shek's ambitions on the mainland. The treaty refers only to Formosa and the Pescadores. Surely, then, it implies an extension of Free China's sovereignty to Formosa.

There's the snag—implies. Secretary Dulles by way of answer to this point says that nowhere in the treaty is the word sovereignty used, and that the text, moreover, does not carry that implication. That is true enough. On this reasoning, granted the purpose is to wind up Chiang Kai-shek's counterrevolution or liberation (or our connection with it), we have made a solemn compact with a government-in-the-sky, a government with no legitimate site on the mainland or in Formosa.

Here is a reductio ad absurdum. Clearly the Nationalist authorities in Formosa would never have signed the present instrument if they shared Mr. Dulles' interpretation of it.

Sophistry has long been the complaint about Mr. Dulles. He put the idea in the heads of most of the correspondents at the 1951 peace conference with Japan at San Francisco that Japan would recognize the Chiang regime as representing all China. I made a bet (unpaid) with several of the correspondents that this was not so. At the same time the British contend they were assured that the Japanese were left perfectly free to do what they liked about Chiang Kai-shek. To this day Herbert Morrison, the then British Foreign Minister, thinks he was "had." Both the correspondents and the British were misled. All the time in San Francisco Dulles was carrying in his pocket an exchange of letters with former Premier Yoshida pledging recognition of Chiang Kai-shek only over the territory he controlled.

In a recent book on 19th century diplomacy, A. J. P. Taylor says "diplomacy is an art which, despite its subtlety, depends on the rigid accuracy of all who practice it." The practitioner of a different art is bound to lose influence. Mr. Dulles is so legalistic that none can split a finer hair than he. To the layman this kind of negotiation comes perilously close to the disingenuous. It is wrong in every sense of the word if the parties to a transaction are not at one over the meaning of it. And, if Mr. Dulles says that the Mutual Defense Treaty does not concede sovereignty over Formosa to Chiang's regime, he will be gravely deluding the only other party to the compact.

We shall be grossly unfair to Chiang Kai-shek if we allow him to be deluded. And we shall be inviting trouble if we do not tell him. Nor will the trouble be limited to the outraged Nationalists. Throughout the world our diplomacy will be attended with suspicion. So as to avoid all this, the meaning we attach to this treaty ought to be made clear. The Senate can see to it that what according to Mr. Dulles is implicit in the treaty is made explicit in words.

What I suggest is a reservation of some kind, saying that it is the sense of the Senate that the sovereignty over Formosa is still vested in the allies for disposition in conformity with all the interests and parties concerned.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I say for the record that I completely agree with Mr. Elliston's conclusion. He does not accept, and I think rightly so, the rationalization that this very troublous problem can be covered by writing some fine print in a committee report which is not a part of the treaty. He suggests that our action ought to be by way of reservation, and I am going to submit such a reservation later.

I respectfully urge, Mr. President, as my next point, that the argument that this treaty does not affect the legal status of Formosa will not face analysis. The committee majority senses the implications of this treaty with respect to the legal status of Formosa. That is why they saw fit to include in the report the following statement:

> It is the understanding of the Senate that nothing in the treaty shall be construed as affecting or modifying the legal status or sovereignty of the territories to which it applies.

That is highly unusual procedure. I am advised, from the study which has been made for me of Senate procedures, that not many precedents for such an understanding can be found. The place to indicate an understanding on the part of the Senate is hardly in a committee report; the place to indicate it is in the resolution for ratification.

Why not indicate it there? I will tell my colleagues why it is not indicated there. The precedents of the Senate for the most part have been along the line of indicating an understanding in the body of the treaty rather than in the resolution for ratification, and the precedents of the Senate were followed, the argument might be made that the Senate would be faced with a prolonged, acrimonious debate, and that the Senate would be greatly split, which would reveal a lack of unity. I do not know whether we would be helping our country at all by endeavoring to cover up indications of disunity with some fine print in the committee report. There is no unity in the Senate on the point of sovereignty over the territory covered by the treaty. What exists in the Senate is a point of view that we are confronted with a serious reality. The fat is in the fire. That fire is not going to be put out by pouring gallons of gasoline on it in the form of language which does not say what we mean, where it ought to be said, in the language of the treaty itself.

Of course there is disunity in the Senate. If there should be included in the treaty language which would strengthen the claim of the Generalissimo to sovereign rights over Formosa, there would be strong opposition by Senators who believe it would be a mistake to do anything to strengthen that claim, and the Senate would split wide open. That is what many of my colleagues personally believe, and I guess they think I am politically foolish to stand on the floor of the Senate and make this fight for what I believe. I think they ought to be agreeing with me on the floor of the Senate, as well as in the cloakroom.

That is why I say, Mr. President, that the place to indicate that we do not intend to strengthen the claims of sovereign rights of the Generalissimo over Formosa is in the body of the treaty. I think it belongs in the body of the treaty rather than in the resolution of ratification.

Even if a reservation were added, the legal effect of the reservation would be dubious unless it were subsequently accepted by the Chinese Nationalist Government. That is where the shoe starts to pinch, because my colleagues who believe with me that we ought to make it very clear to the world that we are not recognizing any sovereign rights of the Nationalist Chinese over Formosa know that if language to that effect were put into the treaty we would have trouble in getting the Generalissimo to accept the treaty. That is the test of the pudding. That is what we ought to find out. If anyone has a question as to what the Generalissimo thinks his soverign rights are, offer him a treaty which says in effect that we do not recognize any sovereign rights of his in Formosa.

What does this argument of mine mean, Mr. President? It means that if we were to "rope" what is contained in the committee report into the body of the treaty, we would not get the Nationalist Chinese to accept the treaty. I simply ask: Is that fair dealing either with the Nationalist Chinese or with the American people? I do not think it is. To sum it all up, I cannot square up with principles of right dealing the writing into a committee report of language which we know we could not get the other party to the treaty to accept if that language were written into the body of the treaty.

Whom are we trying to kid? We will not kid the American people once they come to understand the significance of this argument, because the average American citizen is going to agree that every treaty ought to say what it means that mean what it says. If it be true that recognition or nonrecognition of any sovereign rights of the Generalissimo over Formosa is what is being endeavored to be protected, we ought to say that both to the Generalissimo and to the American people in the treaty. The treaty is what is going to become the law, not the committee report.

Without such a reservation, however, the Senate is going on record in international law as recognizing finally and indisputably that Formosa and the Pescadores are a part of China. If tomorrow the Chinese hands that hold Formosa are unfriendly rather than friendly, we will have no one to blame but ourselves for accepting the treaty without a reservation as to the legal title to Formosa.

If that question should be placed before the World Court for juridical determination, let me predict that there would be a unanimous decision against us on

the part of any man who is entitled to be called an international judge. Control could change in Formosa. God forbid that it will. I believe we have the power to prevent such a change and I am for using the power to prevent it. But we are still talking in terms of a hypothesis. If that should happen, I respectfully submit that this so-called treaty would be a recognition on our part that Formosa belongs to Nationalist China. We have no legal right to do that, as I said before.

Much has been said about the three understandings included in the committee report. I am convinced that in any case before an international court these so-called understandings would have absolutely no legal effect. They may represent the views of the committee, but they have no validity in international law.

One of the arguments made by my opposition in this debate is that the treaty is necessary to sustain the morale of the Nationalist Chinese. The way to sustain the morale of an ally is not by pampering him, but by calling on him to face realities and helping him to meet those realities.

Those who argue for this treaty contend, in effect, that the morale of the Chinese Nationalists will be destroyed if we do not make it clear that Formosa and the Pescadores are a part of China. That is the same argument which was made in favor of including the offshore islands in Public Law 4. It is the same argument which is made in favor of including in this treaty the phrase "such other territories as may be determined by mutual agreement."

Mr. President, let me make clear that I have as much sympathy as does anyone else for the sincere Chinese Nationalists who have suffered because of Chinese Communist tyranny. The Nationalists fought with us in World War II, and many of them believe in the same form of government in which we believe. But they have not been given by their leaders an opportunity to enjoy that form of government.

Let me make clear, also, that during and after World War II they fought for their own interests, not for ours. If we must fight, I say it is better that we fight for our own interests, not for theirs. Which would be worse for the morale of the Chinese Nationalists—to hold out false hopes to them or to ask them to face the realities?

If our purpose is to keep Formosa and the Pescadores in friendly hands, and if, at the same time, we do not intend to become involved in the Chinese civil war—or do we?—then we should say in this treaty—or else have no treaty at all—that the Chinese Nationalists do not have sovereign rights in Formosa. Furthermore, if they are not false hopes, then the language of the treaty can only mean that we intend to put Chiang Kai-shek back on the mainland of China and to expend the blood and effort which it will be necessary for us to expend in order to keep him there.

In my opinion, the treaty, as presently phrased, does not constitute the way to peace in the Far East or the way to keep Formosa and the Pescadores in friendly hands. There is a way to do that, and that is to make clear the following points:

First, our national policy must not be to covet Formosa and the Pescadores for ourselves, but to remain steadfast in the determination to keep Formosa and the Pescadores in friendly hands, and away from the Communists. Let us use whatever weapons we must to maintain that policy, and let us give the President our full backing in their use.

Second, our national policy must be to encourage a cease-fire in the Formosa Straits on terms which will insure the achievement of that kind of a solution.

Third, our policy must be one which will keep faith with the traditions of our country. This calls for an open, aboveboard, direct, honest policy and I believe it offers the best hope for peace in Asia.

Mr. President, the last point I wish to cover in this argument, before I offer my two reservations, deals with article VI of the treaty, which provides that—

> For the purposes of articles II and V, the terms "territorial" and "territories" shall mean in respect of the Republic of China, Taiwan and the Pescadores; and in respect of the United States of America, the island territories in the West Pacific under its jurisdiction. The provisions of articles II and V will be applicable to such other territories as may be determined by mutual agreement.

The last sentence is the one which disturbs a great many of us. It is the sentence which has given rise to the so-called discussion of the Cohen argument which was referred to by Mr. Ellis-ton, in his article which appeared in the press this morning, and which I have already introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point the two memoranda Mr. Cohen prepared, which were used as a basis for discussion by a number of Senators. I do not agree with the memoranda in their totality—as is shown by a good many of my arguments on both the joint resolution and the treaty. However, I do agree with the thesis of the memoranda, in respect to the matter of sovereignty and in respect to the last sentence of article VI of the treaty.

So, Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have the two memoranda printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the memoranda were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON THE PROPOSED MUTUAL DEFENSE TREATY WITH THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

1. This memorandum raises some questions concerning the desirability of the ratification of the recently negotiated Mutual Defense Treaty with the Republic of China.

It should be stated at the outset that this memorandum does not question (1) the vital importance to the United States of having Formosa and the Pescadores remain in friendly hands, or (2) the policy of defending these islands from unprovoked armed attack. The purpose of the memorandum is to consider whether the proposed Mutual Defense Treaty on balance will aid or embarrass the United States in protecting its vital interests in Formosa and the Pescadores, in deterring any armed attack on those islands, and in opposing such attack if it occurs.

2. The proposed Mutual Defense Treaty, if ratified, would for the first time constitute a formal recognition of Formosa and the Pescadores as territories of the Republic of China. Heretofore, the United States has been careful to avoid any formal recognition of the transfer of these islands to China and to reserve a high degree of freedom in regard to its position on the future status of these islands. Under the Japanese Peace Treaty, Japan gave up all claim to these islands but no attempt was made to define their present or future status.

It is true that the Cairo declaration which was reaffirmed in the Potsdam proclamation, asserted the purpose of the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, and Nationalist China to restore Formosa and the Pescadores to the Republic of China. But such purpose has not yet been carried out by any duly ratified peace treaty, and much has happened in the meanwhile. The situation has been so altered on the mainland of China as to raise grave doubt whether that purpose can now be carried out, as it was assumed it could be, with due regard to the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the Charter of the United Nations. The mainland of China has become involved in civil war and revolution, and the involvement of Formosa and the Pescadores in that civil war and revolution was neither foreseen nor contemplated at the time of the Cairo declaration. Such enforced involvement without regard to the wishes and interests of the people of these islands could not be reconciled with the principles of self-determination.

3. The formal recognition of Formosa and the Pescadores as territories of the Republic of China would give substance to the claim of the Chinese Communists that an armed attack on these islands is not international aggression on their part but civil war in which the right and purpose of other nations forcibly to intervene would be open to serious doubt and question. Formosa and the Pescadores are in fact at present separate and independent of the mainland of China. It would seem to be very definitely not only in the interest of the United States but in the interest of peace to keep them separate and independent and not to enmesh them inextricably with the rights and claims of the mainland of China. It has been stated in the press that Chiang Kai-shek has given assurances that he would not engage in provocative attacks on the mainland, but such assurances are not found in the text of the treaty. Indeed it would be very awkward by treaty to impose restraints on the exercise of sovereign rights in China proper by any government claiming to be the lawful government of all China. Assurances outside the text of the treaty will be subject to debate, shifting executive interpretations and waivers. A China whose rights to Formosa and the Pescadores are recognized, cannot be expected to forswear its rights to the mainland of China. But what is more important, a China which controls the mainland will most assuredly assert its rights to Formosa and the Pescadores if those islands are formally recognized as territories of China. What we recognize as territories of Chiang's China, other countries including our allies which recognize Mao's China, may feel compelled to recognize as territories of Mao's China.

4. The formal recognition of Formosa and the Pescadores as territories of the Republic of China will gravely embarrass, if not preclude, efforts by the United States and by the United Nations to consider in the future any status for Formosa and the Pescadores other than as territories of the Republic of China. But it would seem very unwise for

the United States at this time, with the mainland of China under Communist control, to tie its hands so that it would not be free to consider an independent status or possibly even a United Nations trusteeship for these islands if such alternatives should prove feasible and advantageous. Since Communist control of the mainland of China is not likely to be broken for some time, it would seem to be in the interest of the United States to favor and work for the separation of Formosa and the Pescadores from the mainland, at least for the time being. Any treaty which inseparably ties these islands to the mainland would seem to be detrimental to the interests of the United States in this area.

5. Most of our friends and allies want to have peace, not war, in the Straits of Formosa. It would probably be possible to evoke wide support in the United Nations and throughout the free world for the calling of a cease-fire by the United Nations in the Straits of Formosa. Many nations, including nations which have recognized Red China, probably could be induced to support a cease-fire which would preclude the uniting of Formosa and the Pescadores with the mainland by force. It would, therefore, seem to be in the interest of the United States to separate Formosa and the Pescadores from the power struggle for control of the mainland of China and to base our position on the United Nations Charter which forbids the use of force in international relations and calls for peaceful settlement of international disputes and the right of self-determination of peoples. This would seem to be the best, if not the only, way of harmonizing our positions and that of our friends and allies and of avoiding grave risks of becoming involved in war without their support and assistance. This would not involve the dispossession of Chiang from Formosa unless the people of Formosa insisted on it. It would seem that Chiang would have a better chance to retain the favor of the people of Formosa if he did not involve them in war with the mainland.

6. In his statements in support of the proposed mutual defense treaty with the Republic of China (Department of State, press release No. 686, December 1, 1954), Mr. Dulles contends that this treaty is similar to the defense treaties made with the Republic of Korea, Japan, the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand, and he particularly stresses the similarity between the Korean treaty and the proposed treaty. But there are vital differences in the situations with which the two treaties deal.

Our recognition of the Republic of Korea on January 1, 1949, was based on the United Nations General Assembly resolution of December 12, 1948, which declared "that there has been established a lawful Government (the Government of the Republic of Korea) having effective control and jurisdiction over that part of Korea where the temporary Commission was able to observe and consult and in which a great majority of the people of all Korea reside; that this Government is based on elections which were a valid expression of the free will of the electorate of that part of Korea and which was observed by the temporary Commission; and that this is the only such Government in Korea."

Mr. Dulles does not mention the practical limitations which we have placed on our recognition of the Republic of Korea when he states that "we recognize the Republic of China as the only lawful Government of China, just as we recognize, and the United Nations recognizes, the Government of the Republic of Korea as the only lawful Government in Korea." We and the United Nations have never recognized the right of the Republic of Korea to extend its effective control and jurisdiction by force to other parts of Korea, and it is clear, therefore, that any attempt on the part of the Republic of Korea to do so by force would be contrary to article 1 of the mutual defense treaty which forbids the use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

It is not at all clear that any attempt by the Republic of China to extend its effective control and jurisdiction from Formosa to the mainland of China would be contrary to article 1 of the mutual defense treaty with the Republic of China.

Asked whether the treaty recognized on our behalf the claim of the Republic of China to sovereignty over the mainland, Mr. Dulles replied that "it does not deal specifically with that matter one way or another." Asked whether there is any understanding in connection with this treaty that the Chinese Nationalists before attacking the mainland must consult with us and act only by agreement with us, Mr. Dulles replied that "we expect that there will be worked out practical arrangements so that neither will take action in this area which would jeopardize the other and that we would generally act in an agreed pattern of conduct. Having undertaken to defend the islands, we would not expect, nor would the Chinese Nationalists expect to act rashly in a way to jeopardize the islands. We anticipate that under the operation clause of the treaty there will be a good deal of consultation and agreement as to just how the situation is to be handled."

Mr. Dulles' remarks in no way suggest that an attack on the mainland by the Chinese Nationalists from Formosa would be contrary to article I of the treaty. Mr. Dulles' remarks in no way suggest that the policy announced in the state of the Union message of 1953 regarding noninterference by the 7th Fleet with attacks on the mainland by the Chinese Nationalists from Formosa has in principle been abandoned.

To make the proposed treaty at all comparable with the Korean Treaty it would have to be amended, or subjected to reservations, to make clear that the Republic of China in Formosa and the Pescadores would not attempt to extend its effective control and jurisdiction by the use of force from areas now thereunder to areas not now thereunder, and that any such attempt would be regarded as contrary to article I of the treaty.

7. While there may be countervailing arguments, the above considerations would seem to suggest that the proposed Mutual Defense Treaty with the Republic of China, in its present form, would on balance embarrass rather than aid the United States in protecting its vital interests in Formosa and the Pescadores and in avoiding war in that area. It would seem that the treaty as presented would be more of an obstacle than a help in working for a peaceful settlement in the Formosan Straits in the interests of the United States, the United Nations, the inhabitants of the islands, and world peace. It would seem highly desirable before attempting to agree on any mutual defense treaty for this disturbed area to seek through the United Nations to obtain a cessation of armed hostilities in the waters between the mainland of China and Formosa and the Pescadores, so that it will be clear that we are seeking peace and not trying to shield Formosa and the Pescadores while attacks on the mainland are in course of preparation there.

NOTE TO EARLIER MEMORANDUM ON THE PROPOSED MUTUAL DEFENSE TREATY WITH THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

(Prepared by Benjamin V. Cohen)

The joint resolution passed by the Congress for the defense of Formosa reenforces the validity of the contention that a treaty is neither necessary nor helpful to the defense of Formosa. Certainly it would be unwise to tie our hands by a treaty which might stand in the way of our giving the fullest cooperation to the efforts of the United Nations to obtain a cease-fire and a peaceful settlement in this troubled area of the world.

If there should be further efforts to secure the ratification of the treaty, there should be, particularly in light of the recent debate on the joint resolution, thorough consideration and discussion of the last sentence of article VI of the treaty which reads:

"The provisions of articles II and V will be applicable to such other territories as may be determined by mutual agreement."

This provision would enable the President by agreement with the Republic of China to extend the scope of the principal articles of the treaty to any or all of the islands off the shore of the mainland of China and even to the mainland of China itself without the advice and consent of the Senate or the approval of Congress. Any such extension of the treaty could radically change and transform the nature of the treaty and impose new and grave responsibilities on the United States. The provision is a dangerous and unprecendented delegation of the treaty-ratifying power of the Senate, without specification of any standards to govern the exercise of the delegated power. The President, for example, could extend the treaty to the islands off the mainland or the mainland itself even in the absence of, or unrelated to, any immnent attack on Formosa.

This provision underlines the danger pointed out in the earlier memorandum of tying the defense of Formosa by treaty with a state whose claims to the mainland and islands off the shore thereof may involve us in war not in defense of Formosa but in defense of that state's claims to the mainland.

It may possibly be urged by the proponents of the treaty that this provision was inserted in the treaty only to reassure the Republic of China that the specification of certain territories in the treaty did not preclude its claims to other territories—that is, the mainland and the offshore islands—and that the President has no intention of enlarging the territorial scope of the treaty under existing circumstances. But if it is unreasonable to expect that the President would extend the treaty under present or immediately foreseeable circumstances, it is equally unreasonable, and unwise and unnecessary, to delegate to him any such power. If there should be a radical change in the situation not presently foreseeable, certainly the scope of the treaty should not be extended and the defense responsibilities of the United States enlarged, without the advice and consent of the Senate or without the approval of the Congress.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before the Cohen memoranda, not a word was heard about having to bring back to the Senate, for its advice and consent, any agreements made under this article. When the State Department released its first memorandum on the treaty, it did not say so. But after Mr. Cohen—who, as we in the Senate know, was formerly a legal counsel in the State Department—prepared his first memorandum, the State Department then for the first time took the position, through the Secretary of State, that any such mutual agreements would have to be considered an extension of the treaty, and would constitute, in effect, a new treaty, and would have to come to the Senate for its advice and consent.

Then why is that sentence in the treaty? The major argument, which has been advanced—and I have studied their arguments and their transcript and their memoranda—is that it is in other treaties. But it was in other treaties when there was no question about the sovereign rights of the party on the

other side. It has been in other treaties with governments which were not involved in civil wars. It has been in other treaties with governments which did not raise the great concern that the Nationalist Chinese raise all over Asia, within the boundaries of the countries friendly to us. And that sentence is just so much surplusage in all those treaties, as it is in this one, too.

I am told that we should include that agreement in this treaty because it is in other treaties. I am told, "If it is not included in this treaty, we might hurt the feelings of Chiang Kai-shek."

Well, Mr. President, the State Department would leave that language in the treaty, although the treaty does not include clear language by way of a reservation requiring the advice and consent of the Senate. Furthermore, that language would not stifle the fears of the Asians, to whom we could not very well explain the situation about our processes in connection with treaty formation and ratification. I say that because their spokesman then would say, "The United States has entered into a treaty with Chiang, not only covering the territories included in article V and article II, but in article VI, the United States has said that the provisions of the treaty could be extended to such other territories as may be determined by mutual agreement."

That language scares them; they are afraid of it. They are as worried about that language as they are about the ambiguous language in the joint resolution which is Public Law 4, authorizing the President of the United States to take such other measures as in his judgment he decides to be necessary.

I think we should either make that language clear in the body of the treaty or we should remove it from the treaty, because in this case the situation is different; an agreement with the Government of Nationalist China is different from agreements with recognized sovereign powers which our friends do not fear, whereas so many of our friends fear what Chiang Kai-shek may do, insofar as concerns the potentialities or the probabilities of his getting us involved in armed warfare on the mainland of China.

Our friendly allies in Asia are going to ask the question, "Does it mean the Quemoys and the Matsus? Is this simply another case of dangling at the end of a diplomatic string a concealed threat or promise on the part of the United States that it is going to back up Chiang if he makes an effort to retake the mainland of China?"

I should like to have the proponents of this treaty pause long enough in the rush to get it through the Senate to let the American people take a poll on whether or not they think we ought to support the Generalissimo in any attempt to retake the mainland of China. They would be snowed under in such a poll. The American people are not in favor of supporting the Generalissimo in any attempt to regain the mainland of China. I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of the American people are not in favor of our becoming involved in a war between the Generalissimo and the Chinese Reds on the mainland of China. I think we would better protect the calculated risks of peace by taking that langauge out than by leaving it in. I so proposed in the committee, and I was voted down overwhelmingly. However, some fine print was written into the committee report.

The proponents of the treaty know that my argument is troublesome. It is not answered by categorical denial. They know also that it is not answered by saying, "But we have it in some other treaties." It was just so much surplusage in those treaties, if the State Department means what it now says about this language, as it is in this treaty. I think we ought to stop writing surplus language into treaties.

Mr. President, I appreciate very much the consideration of the Senate in permitting me to make this record of my position on the pending treaty. I am willing to be judged by history and future events, as to the soundness of my argument. I would that we all could come back some 50 years hence and sit as observers at a session of the World Court and hear its judgment in a case involving an interpretation of the language to which I am taking exception in my argument this afternoon. I think we would hear at that time a judgment which would represent a finding that this treaty is outside the framework of existing international law.

I have opposed the treaty because I believe it increases the danger of war. I have opposed the treaty because I believe it complicates the final determination of juridical rights to Formosa. I have opposed the treaty because I think it indirectly places in the Nationalist Chinese a sanction upon the sovereign rights over Formosa. I have opposed the treaty because I do not think we should enter into a so-called treaty with a government in Formosa which is a government of military occupation, which we, in effect, have helped to impose upon millions of native Formosans, without their having any right to self-government in connection with such imposition.

I have opposed the treaty because I think it is not good international law, and is not, in fact, a treaty at all, but an agreement of military alliance with a Chinese leader who is involved in a civil war in China.

In closing, I send to the desk, to be brought up at the appropriate time, two reservations. I understand that the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] would like to be a cosponsor with me of these reservations.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very glad indeed to join as a cosponsor.

Mr. MORSE. I am proud to accept his cosponsorship, because I consider the Senator from New York one of the most courageous statesmen living in America today. He has stood shoulder to shoulder with me in a difficult debate, in which it has not been easy to participate. He has been motivated by the same dedicated purpose, believing that it is our duty to represent our constituences in the Senate in accordance with the dictates of our conscience and what we believe is in the best interests of our country.

The first reservation reads as follows:

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of this treaty with the understanding that the last sentence of article VI of the treaty shall have no force or effect.

The second reservation goes to the matter of sovereignty.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish, first of all, to say that the Senator from Oregon has made, in my opinion, a great speech—a very great speech. He has laid down, with his usual cogency and clarity, the basic arguments against this treaty. I would like also, Mr. President, to express my appreciation to my friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon, for his very generous comments with regard to me.

I am very proud, indeed, not only to be a cosponsor with him of the reservations he has submitted, but to have had the opportunity of working closely with him over the years in what we believe to be the best interests of the people. Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle well recognize the patriotic service rendered to all the people of the Nation by the distinguished Senator from Oregon—his brilliance of mind and his courageous patriotism and dedication to the national interest.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from New York that nothing could be said about me by anyone in America that I would appreciate more than what he has just said. It is a statement which I shall always be very proud to have my descendants read.

As I read the second reservation, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] to give consideration to the question whether or not he wishes to join in cosponsoring these two reservations. The second reservation reads as follows:

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of this treaty with the understanding that nothing in the treaty shall be construed as affecting or modifying the legal status or sovereignty of the territories to which it applies.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I join in the sponsorship of the reservations which the Senator from Oregon has submitted. We have discussed this question previously.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let the RECORD show that the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] join in the cosponsorship of both reservations.

Let me say to the Senator from North Dakota, as I said to the Senator from New York, that it has been a matter of pride with me to be associated with him as a very small minority in our fight both against the joint resolution and the treaty because of the fact that he, too, joins with us in our belief that it is not in the public interest to have the treaty or agreement ratified.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I join in everything the distinguished Senator from New York has said about the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is very kind, and I thank him.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say, first, that I have heard many Members of the Senate, without regard to partisan division, express sentiments very similar to those which have already been made a part of the RECORD today. The Senator from Oregon enjoys throughout the Senate a reputation for veracity, ability, and patriotism which is unexcelled.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I did not rise, however, to ask the Senator to yield in order to pay that feeble compliment. I asked the Senator to yield during the course of his remarks when he was discussing the nature of the treaty. I have found two definitions of a treaty which I think might be appropriate at that particular point.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to have the benefit of the legal research of one of the ablest lawyers in the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator. I should like to read from a decision of a great Chief Justice, John Marshall, in the case of Foster and Elam against Neilson, reported in volume 2, Peters, at page 314:

A treaty is in its nature a contract between two nations.

A few years after the decision by Chief Justice Marshall, Associate Justice Miller, of the Supreme Court, stated, in one of the Head Money cases:

A treaty is primarily a compact between independent nations.

That quotation is found in One Hundred and Twelfth United States Reports, at page 598.

The nature of a treaty could not be more explicitly stated than it is in the words of those two great Justices of the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I completely agree with the Senator from Wyoming. It is an excellent documentation for the first point I made in my argument this afternoon. I do not believe the so-called treaty meets the test of a treaty, and does not come within the definition of a treaty.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I see no reason why the Senate should pretend to the people of the country that it is a treaty.

Mr. MORSE. Neither do I.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, a letter I have received from one of the cochairmen of the Brown County Young Republican League, of Aberdeen, S. Dak., supporting my position on the Asiatic issue.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROWN COUNTY YOUNG REPUBLICAN LEAGUE,
Aberdeen, S. Dak., February 4, 1955.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In regard to your actions concerning the Formosan resolution. It is men like you, sir, that preserve the sanity of our Government, and give me a sense of security in these trying times.

Never lose your determination to be righteous, and above all your sense of conviction. You, sir, are an individual, and a tribute to the fundamentals which has made your country and my country great. You are a check, and a balance, against the rashness of less sensible men.

Very sincerely,

CY D. RICHARDS.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I rise to state that I shall vote for the treaty. I shall do so even though I realize it is not perfect. I shall do so without the conviction or statement that it cannot be improved upon. I shall do so, Mr. President, because I believe it is the best alternative available to us at this time. I believe it is a declaration of the foreign policy of the President of the United States, who is the only identity who can formulate and carry out a foreign policy for the United States.

I shall vote for the treaty because I think it is consistent with the foreign policy of our Government for a number of years. I shall do so because I think it is consistent with the declaration of the position of this Government, made by statements of the Chief Executive—both the present one and the one preceding him—and because it is consistent with the statements of most of the leaders of the legislative branch of the Government.

I shall vote for the treaty because I believe failure to ratify it would amount to a repudiation of statements which have assumed the dignity of commitments, and of actions by the Congress of the United States in support of those statements. I shall vote for the treaty because I believe that under all the circumstances it will add to the security of our country.

THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN TO IMPROVE EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES

However, in doing so, I am aware of the fact that there are many things which I believe our country must do to add to its security and to insure its survival.

I was glad that on yesterday the President of the United States sent a message to Congress on the subject of education. I do not believe there is any effort which the Government and the people of this country can make which is more necessary to insure the security and welfare and survival of this Nation than the effort to meet the needs for better educational opportunities of the youth of our country. I do not believe that there is a more important element in an overall and sufficient program of national defense than a program that will provide the opportunity for a better educational privilege for all the children of all our people.

In his message the President set forth some lofty and eloquent language. After he advocated giving to the schoolchildren of the country, as quickly as possible, the classrooms they must have, he used the following language:

Because of the magnitude of the job, but more fundamentally because of the undeniable importance of free education to a free way of life, the means we take to provide our children with proper classrooms must be weighed most carefully. The phrase "free education" is a deliberate choice. For unless education continues to be free—free in its response to local community needs, free from any suggestion of political domination, and free from impediments to the pursuit of knowledge by teachers and students—it will cease to serve the purposes of freemen.

* * * * *

The American idea of universal public education was conceived as necessary in a society dedicated to the principles of individual freedom, equality, and self-government.

Mr. President, I wish that the program given us by the Chief Executive as a means of achieving those lofty aims had the same high quality as his statements of the aims themselves. However, such is not the case.

I believe the President's message is one that is easily misunderstood. It should be made certain, and the confusion should be dispelled.

As illustrative of the confusion, one of the great newspapers of the United States, the New York Times, in its issue of today, has this headline on the front page: "Eisenhower Asks $7 Billion Program to Build Schools—Message to Congress Urges Federal-State-Local Plan for Grants and Loans."

Many persons reading that headline will get the impression that the President has asked Congress to provide a $7 billion program to aid in the construction of public schools. No greater error than that could be made, Mr. President. As I read the President's message, the only request I can find for a grant by the Federal Government to help in providing public schools is contained in this sentence:

I recommend that the Congress authorize the appropriation of $200 million for a 3-year program.

As I read the message, Mr. President, I am persuaded that its entire purport and the proposals made therein are as inadequate to meet the needs to which it refers and which it describes as would be his requested authorization of $200 million in meeting the program the necessities of which have a minimum requirement of $7 billion.

Mr. President, I appreciated the editorial in today's issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald. The editorial is headed "Half a Loaf." I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks the editorial may be set forth as it appears on the editorial page of the Washington Post and Times Herald.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HALF A LOAF

The President's education message is an attempt to apply a poultice to a cancer. It recognizes the disease—"a deficit," as the President put it, "of more than 300,000 classrooms" in the physical facilities for learning available to the Nation's children. This recognition is a significant step forward and renders a most valuable service to the Nation. But the remedy proposed by the President seems to us hesitant, temporizing and inadequate.

Mr. Eisenhower's hesitation grows out of a fundamental misapprehension. He fears that Federal aid to State public school systems may introduce an element of national interference in local activities which ought to be kept resolutely independent. But the fear is an unreal one. The

proposals for Federal aid put forward by the appropriate committees of the House and the Senate obviate any danger of Federal control. They offer financial assistance from the Nation because the problem is a national one and because the States lack the resources to meet it; but they carefully preserve local responsibility and local independence.

Instead of a program of direct and simple financial aid to the States, Mr. Eisenhower has proposed a complicated system under which the States and the Federal Government cooperatively would purchase school bonds issued by local communities. He acknowledges, however, that restrictive debt limits forbid many school districts to borrow in this fashion and that in many others "the amount of taxable property and local income is so low as to make it impossible for the district either to repay borrowed money or rent a satisfactory school building." To the impoverished districts he would make Federal grants in conjunction with the States, thus breaching, so far as they are concerned, the wall he had previously erected against Federal intervention. If direct Federal aid will not imperil the independence of communities unable to borrow, it will not imperil the independence of more solvent communities.

We think the President has balked at a bugbear. The condition of the schools as he has pictured it constitutes a national crisis. Congress now has before it carefully considered bills which will meet this crisis more quickly, more generously, and more effectively than the President's plan. We hope it will enact one of them soon.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I am sure that statement was written to show the inadequacy of and, therefore, as a criticism of, the President's proposal. Actually, I think when it indicates the President has proposed half a loaf it is complimenting his program, because I cannot find even 5 percent of a loaf in the program recommended by the President.

As I think of the security of our country, as I think of its defense, as I think of the comparative strength of Soviet Russia and her allies on the one hand and our country and the free world on the other hand, I am persuaded that we can outproduce them on the farms, in the factories, and in the mills to the degree that we can have and continue to maintain a decided edge or advantage over them. I know that our gallant fighting men can outfight theirs on the ground, in the air, and on the sea. Yet, Mr. President, the conflict may not be determined on those grounds alone. Our ability to outproduce on the land, in the factories, and in the mills, the ability of our sons to outfight others on the land, on the sea, and in the air, may not be sufficient, because we are in an age, Mr. President, when this struggle may be determined by the products of science. We are in a struggle the outcome of which may depend upon which nation has the greatest stockpile of trained manpower, of educated brains, of scientific ability. I believe it is an undisputed fact that Communist Russia and her allies today have more trained engineers and scientists than has the free world. I believe she is now training more engineers and more scientists annually than are we and our friends. Would it not be a tragedy, Mr. President, if a hundred years from now historians should write that America and her allies lost the cold war or the world conflict that came out of it because Russia and her allies won the struggle to develop a greater stockpile of trained scientific brains and ability?

Yet, Mr. President, the undisputed fact is that as of today America and her allies are behind in that phase of the struggle.

Molotov told the world yesterday that we in America are in the back seat insofar as atomic and hydrogen bombs are concerned. I hope that is not true. I do not believe it is true. But I am convinced that Russia and her allies are building a greater stockpile of technically trained scientific brains than we are. I know that our hope of survival depends in part upon our changing that condition.

How can that be done? It can de done only through a greater program of education whereby opportunity for better education will be afforded all the children and all the people of America. Therefore, Mr. President, when the Chief Executive sent to the Congress yesterday his message on education he was talking about national defense just as much as we are talking about national defense as we discuss the ratification of the pending treaty.

An inadequate approach to meet what is now generally acknowledged as a necessary objective would put us in the posture of too little and too late, just as certainly in the field of education as it would in the field of atomic or hydrogen bombs, trained fighting men, planes, ships, tanks, and guns.

As I read the President's message, I find it has one similarity to Caesar's Commentaries with reference to Gaul. I believe he started in with the statement that "All Gaul is divided into three parts." As I read the President's proposal, I find that local school districts are divided into three parts. First, he proposes to make eligible one group with these specifications: Those districts which have necessities for school buildings and some borrowing leeway left under their State laws, but with doubtful credit ratings.

He says that if a school district, under the laws of the State in which it is located, has a legal right to borrow money, but finds itself unable to do so, then it would be eligible as one group, under his proposal.

But, Mr. President, in order that they may take advantage of that help, they must start in by penalizing themselves. How? By paying a higher rate of interest on their borrowings.

I find an amazing thing about this message. While they would have to pay a higher rate of interest on their borrowings than would districts with a better credit rating, their borrowings would be guaranteed by the Federal Government.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Would the bonds be tax exempt?

Mr. KERR. As I read the message, I do not find that point specifically covered.

Mr. LONG. Is it not true that the bonds of a municipality and the bonds of a State are tax exempt?

Mr. KERR. They can be; they are not necessarily so. As to whether or not the proposed bonds could be tax exempt would depend, I am certain, upon the language of the law which Congress might pass, if it should pass one.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Would it not seem odd that a bond should have a Federal guaranty and that such a bond should bear an even higher interest rate than a municipal bond which did not have a Federal guaranty?

Mr. KERR. It not only would seem strange to me, but also ridiculous. It simply goes to show that this bill was conceived by investment bankers and dedicated to the money lenders of the country.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Can the Senator indicate to some of us where we might purchase such a bond as that, having a higher interest rate than other municipal bonds and a Federal guaranty to go along with it?

Mr. KERR. I know of none now available; but if we were to enact this bill for the necessities of the local school districts and were to compel them to take advantage of it, there would be an abundance of such bonds available.

Yes, Mr. President, the bonds of this particular class of districts would carry a special bonus, and the purchasers know that they would be issued at rates of interest higher than the rates at which other school districts have issued bonds. Yet the interest rates would be guaranteed by the Federal Government.

There is a second group of districts which would be eligible, and that is a group of districts which have necessities for school buildings, but which do not have a legal borrowing limit available to them. This particular recommendation would remove that barrier, provided such a school district could take money from its current income to make annual payments of principal and interest on the borrowings it would have to make in order to construct the school buildings which the necessities of its children required. But that district also, even though in an economic condition less favorable than that of the first group, would likewise be penalized by having to pay a higher interest rate. Ah, but this bond also would be guaranteed by the Federal Government, so the purchaser of the bond would likewise get a premium over and above the interest rates which other school districts have had to pay.

But here comes the other penalty to that district. I have tried to figure out how a school district could meet an annual payment on a bond if it were already bonded to its legal limit, and were already borrowing on a basis which was the limit of its ability to carry. Do you know how it could meet the payment, Mr. President? It could charge its pupils tuition. Yes, it could do that. Although it would be among the second poorest group of school districts in the Nation, it could get its annual require-

ments for interest and principal by charging tuition to its children.

It could meet those requirements in another way. It could meet them by compelling its teachers, already woefully underpaid, to take a reduction in their salaries, and to let that amount of revenue or income of the district theretofore being used to pay teachers their inadequate salaries, be used to meet its annual requirements. It could do that.

But the penalty of this program, if enacted, would fall heavily not only upon the shoulders of those two groups of districts; it would likewise fall upon every school district in the country which is sufficiently prosperous as not to be included in one of these groups. Why? Because the bonds issued for those districts, having both principal and interest guaranteed by the Federal Government, and being at higher interest rates than the bonds of other districts, would of necessity bring about a condition whereby the other districts also would have to pay higher interest rates.

Under the proposal there is yet another group. That is the group which is so poor that not only is it without borrowing power, but also it is so poor that it cannot, under any circumstances, make any annual payment on the principal and interest. School districts in that group would have to establish themselves with a form of pauper's oath, following which they would be eligible to participate in a program whereby the Federal Government would provide a third of $200 million a year for 3 years, provided the State in which the pauper district was located supplied sufficient funds to match, according to the formula, the amount of money provided by the Federal Government.

I can imagine the pride in the hearts of thousands of youths in the pauper districts, and can see them holding their heads up and proclaiming in free America, "I am a student in a pauper's oath district. I am a citizen of the richest country on earth, but of the poorest group of school districts in that country. We are just as proud of our pauperism as we are of our freedom."

Yet that is contained in a message which has this noble language:

> Because of the magnitude of the job, but more fundamentally because of the undeniable importance of free education to a free way of life.

And this language:

> The American idea of universal public education was conceived as necessary in a society dedicated to the principles of individual freedom, equality, and self-government.

The Cherokee Indian Nation, more than a hundred years ago, put into operation a program of free public education for every youth in that nation; and even in that age, in the pioneer days of the Republic, it never entered into the minds of those rugged individualists to require a district to make and establish a pauper's oath in order to become the recipient of the public educational program of that great tribe of Indians.

Yes, I repeat that this bill, in my judgment, was conceived by investment bankers and dedicated to the moneylenders. It talks about a present emergency; then it sets forth a program which could not be implemented in 3 years, because it would not become operative until it had been acted upon by the legislatures of the States.

Forty-four of the States will have legislative sessions this year; 14 legislatures are scheduled to meet next year. Those sessions will have become history before the proposed law could be put into operation. If passed as recommended, the law not only would be inadequate in that it would provide woefully and pitifully small sums, but it would be tragically late, since it could not be implemented until the legislatures of the States had acted upon it. In the meantime the critical shortage of educational opportunities for youth, a million of whom as of now, Mr. President, have to go to school on a part-time basis, if at all, would become even more critical. So far as the principle enunciated by the President in this noble language, "The American idea of universal public education" is concerned, the proposal has neither benefit of ancestry nor hope of beneficial posterity.

The message makes a prima facie case for Federal aid, and then tells the Congress how to avoid giving it.

It condemns Federal control of local public education, and then describes a perfect method of how to achieve it.

It would make annual rental or educational sharecroppers out of millions of the schoolchildren of the Nation, and it would do likewise to any State that had to bow in shame to accept the third proposal outlined in the program.

It would compel thousands—yes, hundreds of thousands—of underpaid schoolteachers to further cut their salaries in order that their pauperized districts might qualify under the program, if all the other requirements could be and were met.

Mr. President, the opportunity for free education, available to all the children of all our citizens, is part and parcel of the heritage of a free people. The time has now arrived when it has become an absolute necessity to insure the survival of a free people. Therefore, Mr. President, I hope the Congress will take the spirit of the President's message to the Congress, wherein he makes plain the necessity and sets forth in eloquent language the worthy program of helping to insure universal public education for all the children of all the people, and then I hope it will ignore the pitiful program which he suggests and enact one of its own that will meet the great national emergency and necessity now facing us in a way that will be commensurate with the position, the wealth, the ideals, and the way of life of our blessed country, by providing an amount sufficient to help us insure our survival, and on a basis that will make every American youth who takes advantage of or has the opportunity to be benefited by the program proud of his country, of his Government, and of his district, rather than one which will make him bow his head in shame as he contemplates the inadequate provisions recommended in the President's proposal.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. First, I should like to commend the able Senator from Oklahoma for bringing this matter up for discussion. I think it is a subject which warrants a great deal of discussion and consideration, and I am sure it will receive much attention.

I have been somewhat troubled by the proposal to grant Federal aid to our schools when I consider some of the provisions and some of the means by which it is sought to extend such aid. A question comes to my mind, and I should like to have the comment of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma on it. Let us take the case of my own State, with which I am most familiar. I think statistics show that the State of Alabama is exerting just about as great an effort as is any other State of the Union toward the support of our schools, school teachers, and public education generally. The effort takes just about all we can rake and scrape up to operate our school system. We are running constantly behind, so far as the need for adequate school facilities is concerned. Is there anything in the bill which would make it easier for us to get adequate school facilities or to operate our schools more economically, more efficiently, and more effectively, by utilizing the aid which is held forth in the bill?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I tried to say in my earlier remarks that the program proposed would do the least for those who need aid the most, and would do that on the basis of humiliation and shame to them, and in a manner that would penalize them if they participated in the program.

No; I do not think it would begin to catch up the slack that now exists in Alabama, in Oklahoma, and in most of the other 48 States. Certainly it would not even approach the much desired objective of placing our country on a current basis in the matter of meeting the need for an adequate educational opportunity for all the children of all the people.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As I understand, there are only two ways by which aid could be obtained under the proposed program. One of them would be by a person's taking the pauper's oath, to which the Senator referred as the humiliating course, and even in that case I believe that all groups would have to take the oath—the district, the county, and the State, all the way up. Is that not true?

Mr. KERR. As I understand the proposal, the beneficiaries would be divided into three groups. One would be the group which still has some borrowing capacity not taken up under the State law——

Mr. SPARKMAN. The upper stratum.

Mr. KERR. That would be the upper stratum of the three groups. The second would be the group in the middle, which would have no borrowing capacity left, but which might, by some manner or means, squeeze out of current operating income sufficient money to make annual payments on interest and principal.

The third group would be the one, to which I referred, which would have to take the pauper's oath and prove its necessity. That group would come in for grants out of $60 million——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Sixty-five million dollars.

Mr. KERR. Or about $67 million, from the Federal Government, provided the States matched the funds for the local districts.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. If a school district, county, or State, whatever the unit may be, is already using the fullest resources of which it is capable, in the way of taxes and revenue, in order to operate its schools, how will it get by under the debt it is encouraged to enter into?

Mr. KERR. It could do so only as I outlined, namely, either by charging tuition to its pupils, in order to obtain additional revenue, or by cutting the already inadequate salaries of its teachers in order to have some income available to meet the requirements of principal and interest.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly the Senator from Oklahoma does not think either of those would contribute to spreading universal or general education in the United States, does he?

Mr. KERR. If we imposed that kind of a program upon America, I think we not only would heap shame upon the people, but we would have to share and bow our heads under the same shame.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I appreciate the answer of the Senator from Oklahoma to these questions, because, I say frankly, the program has seemed to me to be so empty, that I was afraid I did not understand it. When I try to analyze it, it seems to me as if it is a hoax; I see in it nothing to aid those who need aid.

Mr. KERR. Let me say to the Senator from Alabama that I am afraid the President does not understand it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is why I say I cannot believe that he can understand what seems to me to be a hoax on the people of the country.

Mr. KERR. I do not believe the President can understand the part of his message in which he sets forth the lofty aim of giving aid to the people, and then indicates that that could be met with the pitiful proposal he makes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yet it is the proposal which is before us; is it not?

Mr. KERR. Yes; it is the proposal which is before us. The Senator from Alabama is eminently correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Would the Senator from Oklahoma care to comment on this point: Has any impression been created on him because of the extent to which proposals are coming before us to issue bonds, issue bonds, issue bonds, and go in debt deeper and deeper? Of course, the transaction is not carried in the Government bookkeeping as a Federal debt; but it is a debt of the people, just the same. I refer to the road bonds and the school bonds.

Mr. KERR. Yes. I wish to remind the Senator from Alabama of the fact that, in the first place, they would be issued by an administration which is dedicated, or is said to be dedicated, to what it conceives to be the lofty aims of free enterprise; and, in the second place, they would be a bonanza to the investment bankers of the country, and would give them a way to profit on the bonds in a manner unparalleled in our history. I must say that I conceive it possible that those two virtues give them merit in the minds of those who proposed them.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I must remind the Senator from Oklahoma that this is not the first case of that kind. In that connection, I may refer to the fiasco, as the New York Times called it, of the 3¼-percent bond issue of a few years ago.

Mr. KERR. Oh, yes; I remember that fiasco.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder whether the Senator from Oklahoma remembers that that high-interest rate, hard-money policy remained in effect for about 30 days—from May 1 until June 6, to be exact; and that on June 3—3 days before that policy was reversed—the interest charged to the veterans of the country rose by one-half of 1 percent, namely, from 4 percent to 4½ percent. Whereas on June 6, nearly 2 years ago, the administration eased that burden. and yet the interest rate charged to the veterans, and which the veterans had to pay, stayed up.

Mr. KERR. Not only that, but also the premium the veteran has to pay in order to have his loan discounted still prevails in every mortgage money market I know of in this country.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the Senator from Oklahoma know at what price those 3¼-percent bonds are selling today?

Mr. KERR. They are selling at a very high premium.

But the President says that the bonds which the districts otherwise unable to borrow would issue would carry a rate, at this time, of 3⅛ percent, and would be insured by the Federal Government. However, this authorization would leave it wide open for the Secretary of the Treasury to fix the rate on these bonds at one-half of 1 percent above the current Government long-term interest rate, whatever it might be.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The latest announcement was 3 percent, on the 40-year bonds.

Mr. KERR. Yes; on the 40-year bonds. But under the formula I have indicated, as stated in the proposal and in the President's conclusion, we find that now the interest rate on them would be 3⅛ percent. As I understand the action of the Treasury in offering the 3-percent long-term bonds, the rate would have to be 3½ percent.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That would be under the power of the Secretary of the Treasury to raise the rate to one-half of 1 percent above the current rate; is that correct?

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And certainly the most recent current rate is 3 percent.

Mr. KERR. Not only is it the most recent, but it has to be the current one because the offer by the Treasury of that vast amount of long-term bonds has not expired, but is still in effect and available.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma for throwing this additional light upon the proposal.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. As I have listened to the eloquent and able speech the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma has been making, and as I have listened to his colloquy with the able junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I have wondered whether the able Senator from Oklahoma sees emerging, as he contemplates the partnership power program, the road program, and the so-called school-construction program, a prime policy of the Administration to bring about high-interest-rate investment opportunities for really big money in the country, with a Government guaranty.

Mr. KERR. There can be no doubt about it; there can be no doubt that it adds up to a program of giving special-privilege interest rates and income to the few, at the expense of the many, in programs clothed in the window dressing of being set up to meet the necessities of the people. I remind my able and distinguished colleague that more roads and better schools are necessities for all the people, but I say that the Government fails in meeting its responsibility—rather than in living up to it—when it proceeds in such a way that the only way those necessities of all the people can be met is in a manner which penalizes them and enriches a few.

Mr. GORE. We are referring to the necessity of the country for roads and the necessity of our children for schools.

Mr. KERR. And also the necessity for power.

Mr. GORE. Both in homes and in industry.

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. GORE. Plus government guaranties, which indeed would make safe investments and enormous opportunities for investment.

Mr. KERR. Oh, Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee is correct. That is why I have said I am convinced that this proposal was conceived by the investment bankers and dedicated to the money lenders.

Mr. GORE. How does the Senator from Oklahoma explain this proposal's finding its way to the United States Senate?

Mr. KERR. Oh, it came in the regularly approved and available avenue of transportation, in the form of a Presidential message. While I have with sincerity and frankness discussed it, I recognize the adequacy of the avenue which is available and open to the Chief Executive, so as to permit him to transmit the proposal.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the able junior Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I appreciate the answer of the able Senator from Oklahoma. But, as I recall, during the 1952 campaign this administration was

in favor of doing away with Government subsidies, whereas now the administration proposes subsidies in a more enormous way than ever before.

Mr. KERR. I remind the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that, in my judgment, he labors under a misunderstanding. The present administration is not against Government subsidies. It is just opposed to having any of them made available in such a way as to possibly be taken advantage of by, or to be beneficial to, the rank and file of the people.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The treaty is before the Senate.

Mr. LEHMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield, in order to permit me to propound a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, in view of the small number of Senators who are in the Chamber at this time, I ask unanimous consent that, without prejudice to the right of the Senator from New York to the floor, I may suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana. The Chair hears none.

Mr. LONG. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the sense of public danger is upon us all.

With each passing day the concern of our fellow citizens with developments abroad deepens and rises. Happenings of the most tremendous significance occupy the headlines and the airways. There is a spreading atmosphere, a growing awareness, that the world is on the threshhold of events whose course may suddenly pass beyond our control. We are deeply involved in this tide of affairs. Our Government gives spur to some of these events. Others, such as yesterday's thunderclap from Moscow, we know to be somehow related, but our understanding of them is far from clear.

Twice within a space of 2 weeks, the administration has called upon the Senate to assert its high prerogatives with action which must inevitably affect—and has affected and involved—the security of the United States and the peace of the world.

I do not doubt that each Member of this body faces the question that is before us today—the pending treaty with Chiang Kai-shek's China—with a full appreciation of the gravity of what we shall do or fail to do.

On Tuesday afternoon, Secretary of State Dulles told a closed session of the Foreign Relations Committee considering this treaty—and that statement was issued to the press and printed in every newspaper of the land—that "failure to conclude this treaty would have the gravest consequences." The import was that if the Senate failed to give its consent and approval to the pending treaty, our vital interests would be threatened. The threat, he indicated, was imminent. Contrarily, he strongly suggested that the approval of this treaty would somehow stay the threat to our vital interests and hold back the tide of aggression and war.

Mr. President, this statement by Secretary Dulles deserves, of course, our respectful attention and consideration. But it seems to me, certainly, to beg for facts to support these sweeping conclusions. I looked in the press and elsewhere for such facts. I read carefully the released text of Secretary Dulles' statement before the Foreign Relations Committee. The statement contained no supporting facts.

Secretary Dulles said that the ratification of the pending treaty, together with the Formosa resolution which we passed on January 28, 12 days ago, "will create a situation in which the present warlike mood of the Chinese Communists may subside."

I cannot help but ask, Mr. President—I have asked privately, without receiving a satisfactory answer, and now I ask publicly—what precisely does the treaty add to the position and posture we took in the Formosa resolution? What contribution is made, what strength is taken on, what further pause is given to the Chinese Communists by virtue of this treaty?

We are officially told, indeed, that the resolution went further, in respect to commitments of defensive force, than this treaty. That resolution was passed not only by the Senate but by the House. It was an act of the Congress. Why do we need to approve this treaty, binding our country not only for the present, to meet the present situation, but binding us with the bands of constitutional strength far into the indefinite future, to meet situations which we cannot possibly foresee today?

Mr. President, the questions raised by this treaty are of such grave import and tremendous consequence, that I would judge it our duty and responsibility to examine with scrupulous care every phase and implication of this binding commitment. Our Constitution so requires of us.

I was one of those who most strongly opposed the Bricker resolution which would have tied the hands of the President in conducting our foreign relations and which, in major respects, would have impaired the binding quality of treaties approved by us. I argued at the time—and I will argue again if another version of the Bricker resolution comes to the floor of the Senate—that the Senate can be trusted to give every treaty the deliberate study and consideration merited by such a contractual obligation.

I do not believe, Mr. President, that the pending treaty has been given anything like the study and reflection it requires.

Submitted for our consideration by the President on January 6, brought up in the Foreign Relations Committee on February 7, only 2 days ago, and reported yesterday, we are being urged to act in haste, to vote perhaps today, with 1 day's study and debate. The report of the Foreign Relations Committee on this vital undertaking was placed on our desks only a few hours ago.

Mr. President, I recall that the Versailles Treaty was submitted to the Senate on July 10, 1919. The Foreign Relations Committee studied it for months. A great national debate, the like of which had never been known before, took place while the treaty was being considered by the committee. It was finally reported on November 6. There followed two long weeks of debate, and the Senate finally acted on November 19.

The North Atlantic Treaty of 1949, to cite another instance, was reported by the Foreign Relations Committee after lengthy hearings and consideration, on June 8, 1949. It was approved by the Senate on July 21, again after full and extended debate.

I judge the Formosa Treaty to contain implications of comparable importance to the NATO accord, although, in my opinion, of an opposite character and disposition.

Why should we ratify the Formosa Treaty in such haste, after only 2 days' consideration by the Foreign Relations Committee, and 1 day's debate by the Senate as a whole?

I know that many of my Republican colleagues are eager to be off on their circuit of political meetings and speeches to celebrate the virtues and achievements of the Republican Party.

I do not grudge them this political exservice and indeed the majority party in the Senate is pleased to accommodate our colleagues on the other side of the aisle with a sufficient recess and suspension of important business to permit them to attend to the political business of the coming week.

But, Mr. President, shall we, for this reason and with this justification, rush this treaty through to approval, with 1 day's debate, after the Foreign Relations Committee has heard only one witness, the Secretary of State? That witness, of course, was favorable. No opposition witness was heard.

There is opposition to this treaty—strong opposition. More than a third of the Foreign Relations Committee voted for important reservations to this treaty, even without having given occasion for opposition witnesses to appear and to testify.

Mr. President, in my almost 6 years in the Senate, I have given my vote and my wholehearted support to every defense treaty which has come before us.

I have supported every authorization and every appropriation bill for defense purposes, for the building up of our own Armed Forces, and for giving aid to the military and economic buildup of our allies.

Included among the measures I have supported have been numerous provisions and appropriations for military aid to the Chiang Kai-shek regime. I willingly supported those provisions and appropriations. I fought against attempts to reduce the authorizations and

appropriations. I supported every attempt to increase them.

But this, Mr. President, is a different kind of undertaking, in a different kind of situation.

Here today we are being asked to rush approval of a defense treaty, of a defensive alliance, with one day's debate. We are being asked to approve the establishment of a permanent military tie with a regime that is undeniably weak and, according to my information, steadily growing weaker.

It is whispered that this treaty is necessary to shore up that regime, to strengthen it, to prevent it from toppling over. And it is indicated that haste is necessary for this purpose.

Since when, Mr. President, did we start entering treaties of military alliance with other nations for the purpose of giving strength to their regimes, and to build up their morale and their prestige? Is this a proper function of treaties, of solemn covenants which bind the United States for all time to come, unless we repudiate them?

Mr. President, the Far East is a tinderbox, threatening momentarily to explode. While the Secretary of State was telling the Foreign Relations Committee that he doubts that the Chinese Communists intend or are prepared to wage war against the United States, another spokesman for the administration was telling the Armed Services Committee of the House, where a proposal to extend the selective service was under consideration, that a shooting war may not be far off.

Setting aside the question of the contradiction, I want to know why, when we are confronting a situation of such complexity, danger and uncertainty, we must rush headlong into a binding treaty of alliance with one of the weakest and most uncertain regimes in that entire area? It is a regime whose international status is certainly in grave doubt.

Mr. President, a treaty of alliance must not and should not be regarded as a substitute for strong action by the Executive to do whatever is necessary to protect and advance the vital interests of the United States in foreign affairs.

It may be necessary—I agree it is necessary—to support, at this time and at this moment, the regime of Chiang Kai-shek in Formosa. I agree without question, and with all my heart, that it is desirable for the United States to act—in concert with the rest of the free world—to keep Formosa and the Pescadores from falling into unfriendly hands.

Pending action by the United Nations, we must act to keep Formosa and the Pescadores from being seized by the Chinese Communists by force of arms. Communist aggression against Formosa and the Pescadores must be resisted with every force at our command. I have stated that time and time again. I know when I make that statement I am speaking for everyone of my 95 colleagues in the Senate. The joint resolution passed by Congress on January 28 gave full assent to that policy.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I gladly yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. What benefits will we get from the Chiang Kai-shek regime if we ratify this treaty?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad indeed that my distinguished colleague from New Mexico raised that point. I am convinced that we will get absolutely no benefit, but that we will subject ourselves and the free world to great risks. It is my opinion that instead of lessening the likelihood of war, it may increase it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I recall the part taken by General Stilwell during the time he was dealing with Burma and China, as compared with the person who now leads the Government in Formosa, Chiang Kai-shek. General Stilwell stated, after observation of the activities of the Chinese Army against the Japanese, that they would not fight against the Japanese, that the situation was being used only to get something from the United States in the way of funds. It seems to me that everyone connected with the State Department likes Chiang Kai-shek, but the Chinese people do not seem to like him. I think it should be decided, as was done 70 years ago, as to what should now be done to keep the people of China united.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator for his very wise observation.

If further action is necessary to let the Communists know that we intend to defend Formosa and the Pescadores, I do not know what it is. But whatever it is, the President surely has that power. He can proclaim it from the housetops. He can send whatever force is available and is necessary to show the Communists that we mean business.

I suggest, Mr. President, that it would be far more useful, and more impressive to the Communists, and less damaging to the long-range interests of the United States, if the administration would try to lead the United Nations into action, rather than the Senate of the United States.

Yesterday there took place in Moscow an event of far-reaching implications. A new leader—Marshal Bulganin—took the reins of power in that nation which Winston Churchill once described as a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma.

That nation, Soviet Russia, is the seat and center of the aggressive threat which confronts us and the entire free world. There is our enemy. There is the headquarters of the international conspiracy. There is the nerve center of the far-flung assault upon the bastions of freedom.

Who knows for sure the implications of Malenkov's so-called resignation and Bulganin's so-called election? No one knows. We were told by our official evaluators of Soviet policy after Stalin's death and Malenkov's assumption of power that this development meant no basic change in Soviet policy. Now, as Malenkov steps down, we are told that whereas Malenkov was inclined to be somewhat accommodating to the West, Bulganin is likely to be more aggressive and menacing. I do not think any one knows for sure.

All the more reason, then, in this time of flux and crisis, of doubt and uncertainty, for us to remain fluid and flexible, ready to move into whatever posture is best adapted to serve the interests of the United States and of the free world.

All the more reason to avoid permanent and inflexible commitments like the one here proposed to be made with Chiang Kai-shek. I see no justification for it, no adequate benefit for our own country.

Mr. President, when this treaty was first announced as having been negotiated, and its terms became known, there were experts and authorities on foreign policy and international affairs, outside our Government, who immediately perceived in the treaty great disadvantages to the United States, and to the cause of free world unity and of peace.

One of the most eminent of those was and is the Honorable Benjamin V. Cohen, whose warrant to the title of an expert and an authority can scarcely be challenged. Mr. Cohen, one of the chief draftsmen of the Dumbarton Oaks plan, was one of the architects of the United Nations. He occupied the high post of Counselor of the Department of State under two Secretaries of State, James F. Byrnes and Gen. George C. Marshall. He was for many years thereafter a member of the United States delegation to the General Assembly of the United Nations. He was the chief American representative on the United Nations Disarmament Commission of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador. Beyond that, he is one of our Nation's most widely accepted authorities on questions of international law and relations.

Ambassador Cohen wrote a memorandum on the so-called Formosa Treaty, analyzing it and raising fundamental questions concerning it. That memorandum, which has since become known as the Cohen memorandum, was circulated among Members of the Senate. It was submitted to the Secretary of State and was intensively studied in the Department. It was widely commented upon in the press. It served the vital function of focusing attention upon the unwise and dangerous implications of this treaty both for the immediate objectives of the United States and for the long-range purposes of American policy. That memorandum raised, in clear perspective, fundamental questions: as to whether the pending treaty serves the cause of peace and security or whether it actually increases the danger of war; and whether the treaty does not, in fact, involve us in unnecessary and unjustifiable conflicts with our allies, and thus threaten the unity of the free world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this almost historic memorandum be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON THE PROPOSED MUTUAL DEFENSE TREATY WITH THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

(Prepared by Benjamin V. Cohen)

1. This memorandum raises some questions concerning the desirability of the ratification of the recently negotiated mutual defense treaty with the Republic of China.

It should be stated at the outset that this memorandum does not question (1) the vital importance to the United States of having Formosa and the Pescadores remain in friendly hands, or (2) the policy of defending these islands from unprovoked armed attack. The purpose of the memorandum is to consider whether the proposed mutual defense treaty on balance will aid or embarrass the United States in protecting its vital interests in Formosa and the Pescadores, in deterring any armed attack on these islands, and in opposing such attack if it occurs.

2. The proposed mutual defense treaty, if ratified, would for the first time constitute a formal recognition of Formosa and the Pescadores as territories of the Republic of China. Heretofore, the United States as been careful to avoid any formal recognition of the transfer of these islands to China and to reserve a high degree of freedom in regard to its position on the future status of these islands. Under the Japanese Peace Treaty Japan gave up all claim to these islands but no attempt was made to define their present or future status.

It is true that the Cairo declaration, which was reaffirmed in the Potsdam proclamation, asserted the purpose of the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, and Nationalist China to restore Formosa and the Pescadores to the Republic of China. But such purpose has not yet been carried out by any dutly ratified peace treaty, and much has happened in the meanwhile. The situation has been so altered on the mainland of China as to raise grave doubt whether that purpose can now be carried out, as it was assumed it could be, with due regard to the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the Charter of the United Nations. The mainland of China has become involved in civil war and revolution, and the involvement of Formosa and the Pescadores in that civil war and revolution was neither foreseen nor contemplated at the time of the Cairo declaration. Such enforced involvement without regard to the wishes and interests of the people of these islands could not be reconciled with the principles of self-determination.

3. The formal recognition of Formosa and the Pescadores as territories of the Republic of China would give substance to the claim of the Chinese Communists that an armed attack on these islands is not international aggression on their part but civil war in which the right and purpose of other nations forcibly to intervene would be open to serious doubt and question. Formosa and the Pescadores are in fact at present separate and independent of the mainland of China. It would seem to be very definitely not only in the interest of the United States but in the interest of peace to keep them separate and independent and not to enmesh them inextricably with the rights and claims of the mainland of China. It has been stated in the press that Chiang Kai-shek has given assurances that he would not engage in provocative attacks on the mainland, but such assurances are not found in the text of the treaty. Indeed it would be very awkward by treaty to impose restraints on the exercise of sovereign rights in China proper by any government claiming to be the lawful government of all China. Assurances outside the text of the treaty will be subject to debate, shifting executive interpretations and waivers. A China whose rights to Formosa and the Pescadores are recognized, cannot be expected to forswear its rights to the mainland of China. But what is more important, a China which controls the mainland will most assuredly assert its rights to Formosa and the Pescadores if those islands are formally recognized as territories of China. What we recognize as territories of Chiang's China, other countries including our allies which recognize Mao's China, may feel compelled to recognize as territories of Mao's China.

4. The formal recognition of Formosa and the Pescadores as territories of the Republic of China will gravely embarrass if not preclude efforts by the United States and by the United Nations to consider in the future any status for Formosa and the Pescadores other than as territories of the Republic of China. But it would seem very unwise for the United States at this time, with the mainland of China under Communist control, to tie its hands so that it would not be free to consider an independent status or possibly even a United Nations trusteeship for these islands if such alternatives should prove feasible and advantageous. Since Communist control of the mainland of China is not likely to be broken for some time, it would seem to be in the interest of the United States to favor and work for the separation of Formosa and the Pescadores from the mainland at least for the time being. Any treaty which inseparably ties these islands to the mainland would seem to be detrimental to the interests of the United States in this area.

5. Most of our friends and allies want to have peace, not war, in the Strait of Formosa. It would probably be possible to evoke wide support in the United Nations and throughout the free world for the calling of a cease-fire by the United Nations in the Strait of Formosa. Many nations, including nations which have recognized Red China, probably could be induced to support a cease-fire which would preclude the uniting of Formosa and the Pescadores with the mainland by force. It would, therefore, seem to be in the interest of the United States to separate Formosa and the Pescadores from the power struggle for control of the mainland of China and to base our position on the United Nations Charter which forbids the use of force in international relations and calls for peaceful settlement of international disputes and the right of self-determination of peoples. This would seem to be the best, if not the only, way of harmonizing our positions and that of our friends and allies and of avoiding grave risks of becoming involved in war without their support and assistance. This would not involve the dispossession of Chiang from Formosa unless the people of Formosa insisted on it. It would seem that Chiang would have a better chance to retain the favor of the people of Formosa if he did not involve them in war with the mainland.

6. In his statements in support of the proposed mutual-defense treaty with the Republic of China (Department of State, press release No. 686, December 1, 1954), Mr. Dulles contends that this treaty is similar to the defense treaties made with the Republic of Korea, Japan, the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand, and he particularly stresses the similarity between the Korean Treaty and the proposed treaty. But there are vital differences in the situations with which the two treaties deal.

Our recognition of the Republic of Korea on January 1, 1949, was based on the United Nations General Assembly resolution of December 12, 1948, which declared "that there has been established a lawful government (the Government of the Republic of Korea) having effective control and jurisdiction over that part of Korea where the temporary Commission was able to observe and consult and in which great majority of the people of all Korea reside; that the Government is based on elections which were a valid expression of the free will of the electorate of that part of Korea and which was observed by the temporary Commission; and that this is the only such government in Korea."

Mr. Dulles does not mention the practical limitations which we have placed on our recognition of the Republic of Korea when he states that "we recognize the Republic of China as the only lawful government of China, just as we recognize, and the United Nations recognizes, the Government of the Republic of Korea as the only lawful government in Korea." We and the United Nations have never recognized the right of the Republic of Korea to extend its effective control and jurisdiction by force to other parts of Korea, and it is clear, therefore that any attempt on the part of the Republic of Korea to do so by force would be contrary to article 1 of the mutual-defense treaty which forbids the use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

It is not at all clear that any attempt by the Republic of China to extend its effective control and jurisdiction from Formosa to the mainland of China would be contrary to article 1 of the mutual-defense treaty with the Republic of China.

Asked whether the treaty recognized on our behalf the claim of the Republic of China to sovereignty over the mainland, Mr. Dulles replied that "it does not deal specifically with that matter one way or another." Asked whether there is any understanding in connection with this treaty that the Chinese Nationalists before attacking the mainland must consult with us and act only by agreement with us, Mr. Dulles replied that "we expect that there will be worked out practical arrangements so that neither will take action in this area which would jeopardize the other and that we would generally act in an agreed pattern of conduct. Having undertaken to defend the islands, we would not expect, nor would the Chinese Nationalists expect to act rashly in a way to jeopardize the islands. We anticipate that under the operation clause of the treaty there will be a good deal of consultation and agreement as to just how the situation is to be handled.

Mr. Dulles' remarks in no way suggests that an attack on the mainland by the Chinese Nationalists from Formosa would be contrary to article I of the treaty. Mr. Dulles' remarks in no way suggest that the policy announced in the state of the Union message of 1953 regarding noninterference by the Seventh Fleet with attacks on the mainland by the Chinese Nationalists from Formosa has in principle been abandoned.

To make the proposed treaty at all comparable with the Korean treaty it would have to be amended, or subjected to reservations, to make clear that the Republic of China in Formosa and the Pescadores would not attempt to extend its effective control and jurisdiction by the use of force from areas now thereunder to areas not now thereunder, and that any such attempt would be regarded as contrary to article I of the treaty.

7. While there may be countervailing arguments, the above considerations would seem to suggest that the proposed mutual defense treaty with the Republic of China, in its present form, would on balance embarrass rather than aid the United States in protecting its vital interests in Formosa and the Pescadores and in avoiding war in that area. It would seem that the treaty as presented would be more of an obstacle than a help in working for a peaceful settlement in the Formosan Straits in the interests of the United States, the United Nations, the inhabitants of the islands, and world peace. It would seem highly desirable before attempting to agree on any mutual defense treaty for this disturbed area to seek through the United Nations to obtain a cessation of armed hostilities in the waters between the mainland of China and Formosa and the Pescadores so that it will be clear that we are seeking peace and not trying to shield Formosa and the Pescadores while attacks on the mainland are in course of preparation there.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, following the circulation and public discussion of the Cohen memorandum, there

appeared to develop a considerable resistance, both in public circles and in the Senate, to fundamental aspects of the treaty.

Then, suddenly, President Eisenhower sent the Congress a message proposing the passage of a resolution affirming congressional support for the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores. That resolution was overwhelmingly adopted, although there were some, including myself, who had strong reservations concerning the predated blank-check aspects of that resolution. I voted against it for that reason.

It was my belief—and that belief was rather widely held—that the passage of the resolution certainly eliminated the necessity of a treaty with the Chiang Kai-shek regime. The Congress had clearly stated its support for the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores, and the use of all-out force to resist aggression against Formosa and the Pescadores, a position to which I subscribe wholly and without reservation. It was only because the resolution went further—too much further in my judgment—that I voted against the resolution.

But, Mr. President, despite the passage of this resolution, whose language commits us to the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores—and possibly to a very much wider area—the administration suddenly renewed the pressure for the approval of the treaty. Why, I do not know. I wish I understood. What purpose does it serve?

It is full of dangers—so full, that the Secretary of State has been kept busy issuing explanations and interpretations, which are quite at variance with the plain language of the treaty.

It is so full of dangers that, the day after the treaty was negotiated, the Secretary of State felt impelled to issue a formal statement of clarification and, a week later, to enter into an exchange of diplomatic memorandums with the Foreign Minister of China. While neither the Dulles statement to the press of December 1 nor the Chinese-American exchange of memorandums of December 10 have any binding nature in international law, and do not comprise part of the treaty, they purport, in effect, to modify the treaty.

And in very recent days, there has been a whole series of explanations, culminating finally in the statements as to the intent of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, contained in the report of the committee.

These statements do not, of course, become part of the treaty. They do not have the force of treaty law. They merely state the interpretation and opinion of the Senate committee. These statements do not affect the treaty itself nor even officially convey the attitude of the Senate as a whole. I repeat, Mr. President, these statements do not have any force and effect, but, unfortunately, they may confuse the people of the United States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield further?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not a fact that statements made by members of the committee have no force of law, but that interpretations will be made by the State Department?

Mr. LEHMAN. They will be made by the State Department. But, also, they may serve to confuse the people of the United States. I think even now they have very greatly confused some of the most responsible and intelligent members of the press, including editorial writers.

That is one of the very great dangers inherent in this situation. I am glad the Senator has raised the question, because I was about to say that even now, as I read the editorials and news reports, I find a most distressing confusion and misinterpretation of the provisions of the treaty.

The language of the treaty is plain. It is clear for all to read. It states that this treaty is between the Republic of China and the United States of America. It states, in so many words, that the territories of the Republic of China which are to be defended, under the terms of the military alliance, consist of Formosa and the Pescadores.

Thus this treaty seems to recognize officially that Formosa and the Pescadores belong to the Republic of China. This would be our first official recognition of the sovereignty of China over Formosa. I am not at all convinced that the statement to the contrary, contained in the Senate committee report, is valid in any way, in view of the plain language of the treaty. Certainly it can have no force and effect upon the treaty.

As I am not convinced, I certainly do not think the Chinese Communists will be convinced. It is a fact that the Communist regime is recognized as the government of the Republic of China by many, if not most, of the free nations of the world.

My colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], earlier this afternoon spent a great deal of time in a most interesting, convincing, and useful discussion of the position, under international law, of the islands of Formosa and the Pescadores. He pointed out that what we are doing now might unquestionably seriously affect the future determination of the status of those islands. I am in full agreement with what he has said. I think his was a most valuable discussion. We are proposing to go ahead and virtually recognize those islands as a part of the Chinese Republic. That is shown very clearly even in the caption of the treaty.

And here we are, seeming to recognize by treaty law that Formosa and the Pescadores belong to and are a part of the Republic of China. What dangers we invite. What troubles we store up for ourselves. Will not Communist China now claim legal justification for aggression against Formosa and the Pescadores? Will the Communists not say: "We are merely putting down an insurrection in a territory which even the United States recognizes as being a part of China proper"? I do not care what the Communists say, but I do care what Great Britain and France will say. What can they say? What can they feel but suspicion and apprehension.

The statement on sovereignty in the Senate committee report is possibly a way out of this dangerous situation, but it is at best a slim and doubtful way out. I agree with the thesis which was so ably expounded by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon during the course of the debate this afternoon.

I do not see why we should have to walk this tightrope. If the statement contained in the Senate report means anything, it means that the Senate committee regards the Chiang Kai-shek regime as a sort of government in exile, located at the present time in Formosa and the Pescadores, with effective control over those territories.

But I say again that the language of the treaty itself seems to be in plain conflict with this interpretation contained in the Senate report.

Mr. President, if this treaty must be approved at all—and I hope it will not be—we should attach a formal reservation as to the sovereignty of Formosa and the Pescadores.

This same comment goes for the committee statement about that portion of article 6 which permits this treaty to be radically enlarged in its scope and extent by mutual agreement between the United States Government and the Chiang Kai-shek government.

The committee report states its understanding that any such enlargement will be submitted to the Senate for its consent and approval. Why should this reservation not be attached to the treaty?

Finally, Mr. President, as to the third committee statement, regarding the right of Chiang Kai-shek to launch an attack against the mainland of China—and thus plunge the United States into a catastrophic war with Communist China, on the mainland of China—this statement in the committee report says that Chiang Kai-shek cannot launch such an attack—without our consent. It must be by joint agreement.

Again, this is not in the treaty. It is covered only by an exchange of notes between our Secretary of State and Chiang's Foreign Minister; and by this statement in the Senate report.

Why should the Senate not adopt a reservation on this point—if the treaty is to be adopted at all?

What a danger we run, and why should we run it? The idea of negotiating a military alliance with a weak and unstable regime which can, to save itself, plunge us into world war III. It is incredible. History will, I believe, say that it was incredible.

While Secretary Dulles and the President of the United States are saying that this treaty is a defensive alliance only, and that it is not designed to help Chiang reconquer the mainland of China, Chiang himself is saying publicly that during 1955 he proposes to do exactly that—to launch an attack on the Chinese mainland—with American planes, ships, guns—and men.

I wish to repeat very briefly a statement by Chiang Kai-shek reported by the Associated Press from Taipei on February 7. I quote from the dispatch in part, as follows:

Chinese Nationalist President Chiang Kai-shek said today the evacuation and redeployment of his Tachen Island troops were "posi-

tive preparations for the counterattack (against the Red mainland) and not a negative stand."

General Chiang, in a written statement, said evacuation was a "painful decision," but the latest military developments had made the Tachens lose their military value.

"The most important task of the government forces is to counterattack the Communists and recover the mainland," General Chiang said.

"Under the present military situation our government forces, in order to conserve their counterattack potential, should under no circumstances be allowed to be dissipated at such a time and place as the enemy might choose.

"To insure victory * * * our first duty should be to consolidate Taiwan (Formosa), Penghu (the Pescadores), and the other islands that shield them, such is Kinmen (Quemoy), Matsu, etc."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHIANG CALLS MOVE FROM TACHENS STEP FOR COUNTERATTACK—MOST IMPORTANT TASK IS TO RECOVER MAINLAND, SAYS NATIONALIST CHIEF

TAIPEI, February 7.—Chinese Nationalist President Chiang Kai-shek said today the evacuation and redeployment of his Tachen Island troops were "positive preparations for the counterattack (against the Red mainland) and not a negative stand."

General Chiang, in a written statement said evacuation was a "painful decision," but the latest military developments had made the Tachens lose their military value.

"The most important task of the Government forces is to counterattack the Communists and recover the mainland," General Chiang said. "Under the present military situation our Government forces, in order to conserve their counterattack potential, should under no circumstance be allowed to be dissipated at such a time and place as the enemy might choose.

"To insure victory * * * our first duty should be to consolidate Taiwan (Formosa), Penghu (the Pescadores) and the other islands that shield them, such as Kinmen (Quemoy), Matsu, etc."

General Chiang's pronouncement was the first he has made on the offshore island crisis since the Reds invaded Yikiangshan January 18.

It was read to a crowded news conference by Wu Nan-ju, director of the Government information office.

General Chiang said from a strategic viewpoint he had but little regret for the transfer of Nationalist forces from the Tachens.

He said every one of the 17,000 local population had petitioned the Government "not to leave them behind to the cruelty of the Communists."

The Generalissimo expressed gratitude for "the broad assistance and protective cover in the execution of our evacuation plan so generously rendered us by the United States Government."

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to point out and to emphasize that the statement which I quoted was issued by Chiang Kai-shek only 2 days ago, on February 7.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If, as stated by the State Department, this is a defensive proposition, and is not for the purpose of carrying out the ideas of Chiang Kai-shek, as quoted in his statement of February 7, does that not make it more necessary that a reservation to the treaty be adopted, in order to make it known to the world that that is exactly what it means?

Mr. LEHMAN. I think the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has put his finger on the crux of the situation. Unless we make such reservations, then, if the treaty is ratified, we shall be bound by the exact words of the treaty. All the statements by some of the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations will have absolutely no effect whatsoever with regard to the observance or the implementation of the treaty. I think that the very existence of those statements, which are alleged to be reservations, instead of helping the situation, actually may make the situation more perilous.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have the greatest respect for the personnel of the Committee on Foreign Relations, from the senior member, the chairman, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], down to the member having the least seniority, who I believe is the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I have the greatest respect for them, but I also know that, whether it be the State Department or another department concerned with appropriations, all that a department desires is to have the Senate authorize the department to do something. After that, the department regards the committee, whether it be the Committee on Foreign Relations or the Committee on Appropriations, as nothing but a nuisance. That has been my experience with the departments.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think the Senator from New Mexico is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Once the departments get what they want, they do not care for the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think that is true. I should like to join my colleague from New Mexico in expressing my highest regard and respect for all the members of the Foreign Relations Committee. I am glad to have the opportunity to state that the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], is not only one of the greatest Members of the Senate, but also one of the greatest Americans. I have not the slightest doubt of his ability, and I certainly do not have any doubt with regard to the full measure of his intellectual integrity, good faith, and good will. I can say the same about President Eisenhower, so far as his honesty is concerned, but what he does not seem to understand at this time, and what I think many Members of the Senate do not understand, is that the interests of the United States and the interests of Chiang Kai-shek may very readily be at complete variance, and in all probability will be. Therefore, I think the treaty in its present form constitutes a very great peril to the United States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am really sincere and serious when I say that I cannot see what benefit would accrue to the United States from the treaty with Chiang Kai-shek. May the Lord, with all his mysterious mercies, have pity on us if we have to depend for our defense on the forces occupying Formosa; excluding, of course, our own forces.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator is absolutely and completely correct in that observation.

Mr. President, what we may need to do with Chiang is not to unleash him or releash him, but rather to muzzle him. That might serve the cause of peace and free-world unity.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a supplementary memorandum prepared by Ambassador Cohen, after the passage of the Formosa resolution, taking cognizance of that action, and analyzing the Formosa treaty in the light of that action.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOTE TO EARLIER MEMORANDUM ON THE PROPOSED MUTUAL DEFENSE TREATY WITH THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

(Prepared by Benjamin V. Cohen)

The joint resolution passed by the Congress for the defense of Formosa reenforces the validity of the contention that a treaty is neither necessary nor helpful to the defense of Formosa. Certainly it would be unwise to tie our hands by a treaty which might stand in the way of our giving the fullest cooperation to the efforts of the United Nations to obtain a cease-fire and a peaceful settlement in this troubled area of the world.

If there should be further efforts to secure the ratification of the treaty, there should be, particularly in light of the recent debate on the joint resolution, thorough consideration and discussion of the last sentence of article VI of the treaty which reads:

"The provisions of articles II and V will be applicable to such other territories as may be determined by mutual agreement."

This provision would enable the President by agreement with the Republic of China to extend the scope of the principal articles of the treaty to any or all of the islands off the shore of the mainland of China and even to the mainland of China itself without the advice and consent of the Senate or the approval of Congress. Any such extension of the treaty could radically change and transform the nature of the treaty and impose new and grave responsibilities on the United States. The provision is a dangerous and unprecedented delegation of the treaty-ratifying power of the Senate, without specification of any standards to govern the exercise of the delegated power. The President, for example, could extend the treaty to the islands off the mainland or the mainland itself even in the absence of, or unrelated to, any imminent attack on Formosa.

This provision underlines the danger pointed out in the earlier memorandum of tying the defense of Formosa by treaty with a state whose claims to the mainland and islands off the shore thereof may involve us in war not in defense of Formosa but in defense of that state's claims to the mainland.

It may possibly be urged by the proponents of the treaty that this provision was inserted in the treaty only to reassure the Republic of China that the specification of certain territories in the treaty did not preclude its claims to other territories—that is, the mainland and the offshore islands—and that the President has no intention of enlarging the territorial scope of the treaty under existing

circumstances. But if it is unreasonable to expect that the President would extend the treaty under present or immediately foreseeable circumstances, it is equally unreasonable, and unwise and unnecessary, to delegate to him any such power. If there should be a radical change in the situation not presently foreseeable, certainly the scope of the treaty should not be extended and the defense responsibilities of the United States enlarged, without the advice and consent of the Senate or without the approval of the Congress.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an article entitled "Questions on the Formosa Treaty," written by Herbert Elliston, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of this morning.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUESTIONS ON THE FORMOSA TREATY

(By Herbert Elliston)

Since more than a few Senators voted for the joint resolution on Formosa with some misgiving, and since the same Senators have been holding their breath with apprehension over the possibility of an armed collision in the straits, it behooves them to take a close look at the mutual-defense treaty with Chiang Kai-shek's regime prior to ratification.

Secretary Dulles takes issue with the view that this treaty would confer sovereignty over Formosa on the Nationalist Government headed by Chiang Kai-shek. The view has been put in memorandum form by Benjamin Cohen, and circulated, though not sponsored, by the Democratic National Committee.

To the layman the Cohen thesis looks incontrovertible. How can you sign a treaty with a government without recognizing that it has a habitation as well as a name? There were the emigre governments in wartime, of course; yet we maintained our recognition of the sovereignty of which Hitler had deprived them. This, you may say, is how we regard what Mr. Dulles, in his exchange with Foreign Minister George Yeh, calls Free China. Yes, but this particular treaty has nothing to do with mainland China, and, indeed, is intended (as everybody knows) to disengage us from Chiang Kai-shek's ambitions on the mainland. The treaty refers only to Formosa and the Pescadores. Surely, then, it implies an extension of Free China's sovereignty to Formosa.

There's the snag—"implies." Secretary Dulles by way of answer to this point says that nowhere in the treaty is the word "sovereignty" used, and that the text, moreover, does not carry that implication. That is true enough. On this reasoning, granted the purpose is to wind up Chiang Kai-shek's counterrevolution or liberation (or our connection with it), we have made a solemn compact with a government in the sky, a government with no legitimate site on the mainland or in Formosa.

Here is a reductio ad absurdum. Clearly the Nationalist authorities in Formosa would never have signed the present instrument if they shared Mr. Dulles' interpretation of it.

Sophistry has long been the complaint about Mr. Dulles. He put the idea in the heads of most of the correspondents at the 1951 peace conference with Japan at San Francisco that Japan would recognize the Chiang regime as representing all China. I made a bet (unpaid) with several of the correspondents that this was not so. At the same time the British contend they were assured that the Japanese were left perfectly free to do what they liked about Chiang Kai-shek. To this day Herbert Morrison, the then British Foreign Minister, thinks he was "had." Both the correspondents and the British were misled. All the time in San Francisco Dulles was carrying in his pocket an exchange of letters with former Premier Yoshida pledging recognition of Chiang Kai-shek only over the territory he controlled.

In a recent book on 19th century diplomacy, A. J. P. Taylor says "diplomacy is an art which, despite its subtlety, depends on the rigid accuracy of all who practice it." The practitioner of a different art is bound to lose influence. Mr. Dulles is so legalistic that none can split a finer hair than he. To the layman this kind of negotiation comes perilously close to the disingenuous. It is wrong in every sense of the word if the parties to a transaction are not at one over the meaning of it. And, if Mr. Dulles says that the Mutual Defense Treaty does not concede sovereignty over Formosa to Chiang's regime, he will be gravely deluding the only other party to the compact.

We shall be grossly unfair to Chiang Kai-shek if we allow him to be deluded. And we shall be inviting trouble if we do not tell him. Nor will the trouble be limited to the outraged Nationalists. Throughout the world our diplomacy will be attended with suspicion. So as to avoid all this, the meaning we attach to this treaty ought to be made clear. The Senate can see to it that what according to Mr. Dulles is implicit in the treaty is made explicit in words.

What I suggest is a reservation of some kind, saying that it is the sense of the Senate that the sovereignty over Formosa is still vested in the Allies for disposition in conformity with all the interests and parties concerned.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point two very fine commentaries by Mr. Walter Lippmann on the general subject of Formosa and the situation in the Far East which we confront as a result of recent developments in that troubled and critical area.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 7, 1955]

A MAIN CLUE

(By Walter Lippmann)

In calculating the risks and in estimating the probabilities in the Far East, we need an explanation of the fact that both Peking and Washington talk as if the struggle to seize Formosa were a near possibility. Yet, except for the lone voice of Joseph Alsop who thinks that the intelligence estimates of Chinese power may be unreliable, the general assumption is that the Red Chinese do not have the military means needed to conquer Formosa. They have no navy and the hundred miles of water in the Formosa Strait are guarded by the most powerful navy in the world. Yet, as Mr. Alsop says, "The Peking government has been promising its people to take Formosa this year at the top of its voice," and "it is really hard to see why the brilliant Chou En-lai should have engaged Peking's prestige to the very hilt, if the threat to Formosa is a mere vainglorious maneuver.

Mr. Alsop's point is, I believe, well taken. The question then is why Chou En-lai, who has no navy, can afford to talk about conquering an island 100 miles out at sea? How does he think he can capture Formosa this year, or even next year? The answer to this question, and the answer to many of the obscurities and ambiguities in the whole problem, is that Chou En-lai is counting upon the instability of Chiang Kai-shek's regime in Formosa. He could not be promising to liberate Formosa soon unless he hoped and believed that the Chinese army and officials might do on Formosa what was done so often during the civil war on the mainland—that is to say, to change sides and to make peace.

If this is the basis of Chou En-lai's hope, it is the basis of Washington's underlying fears. No doubt we believe that Chiang's regime is more solid than Chou En-lai is assuming it to be. But a dominating consideration in our whole Chinese policy is the knowledge that the regime at Formosa is fragile and that to keep it going everything must be done to bolster its morale. If the administration felt sure that Chiang's regime in Formosa were solid, it would not hesitate much longer to recognize it for what it really is—as the government not of China but of Formosa. The block to that policy is the well-grounded fear that the Chinese in Formosa would not settle down peacefully as exiles but would come to terms with the mainland Chinese.

The Chinese on Formosa tell us, and Americans who are in close touch with them believe, that Chiang's regime would crumble in disaffection and intrigue if there were cut off the practical hope of a return to the mainland. Whether or not this is the fact, the Formosan Chinese insist on it and their supporters in Washington agree with it. Yet the fact of the matter is that the United States Government has not only abandoned hope of a restoration but has put its decision in this matter in writing in connection with the proposed Formosa pact.

Nevertheless, in Formosa the decision is not regarded as final and conclusive. The speculation is still alive that the United States will be and can be drawn into a great war in which Chiang might be able to return to the mainland. The administration, afraid that morale might crumble, has allowed the government in Formosa to nourish this hope. It has at least refrained from dashing it conclusively. This desire to keep up Chiang's spirits by letting him go on hoping for war is almost surely the real reason for the costly and dangerous fuzziness about the offshore islands. These islands are not part of the strategic defense of Formosa. They are symbols of a conceivable return to the mainland.

The administration does not have a clear policy. There is in it a basic contradiction which will in one form or another have to be resolved.

On the other hand, there is the decision not to support an attempt by Chiang to return to the mainland. This decision carries with it the unavoidable conclusion that Chiang's government in Formosa is not the Government of China, and that it is not entitled to the Chinese seat in the United Nations.

On the other hand, there is the desire to keep Formosa out of Red Chinese control, and the assumption that the only way to do this is by supporting the Chinese Government in Formosa.

The combination of these two decisions would be the policy of the two Chinas, and it would be a feasible policy if only one uncertainty could be removed. That is whether the Chinese in Formosa would stay in Formosa and would not make their peace with Peking. If we could be sure of that, which we cannot be, the defense of Formosa ought to be quite feasible.

Chou En-lai's hopes are based on the belief that the Chinese in Formosa can be inducted to come over to his side. We are not sure that they cannot be induced to do that. It is not a comfortable situation and that is why everyone who is serious about this business feels that he is standing on very uncertain ground.

We have staked a lot on the reliability of Chiang's regime. Yet in deciding, as our own vital interest required, against supporting his return to the mainland, we have done what is most likely to sow fatal doubts within his regime. To offset these doubts, to preserve the morale of the Chinese of Formosa, we have felt compelled to become entangled in the Chinese civil war on the offshore islands. So we find ourselves unable to draw a clear line or to take an intelligent position that can command the support of world opinion.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 8, 1955]

TOWARD A CEASE-FIRE

(By Walter Lippmann)

The evacuation of the Tachens has now begun, and if it is successful, which we need not doubt, the position will be stronger and safer than it was before.

A great deal has been said and written about how important it is to hold positions of strength. The Tachens were not a position of strength. They were a military and political liability. They could not be defended except at the risk of a general war which no one in his senses would undertake for such unimportant territory. The Chinese Nationalist troops on them had nothing useful to do, and they were in a military trap—like the French at Dien Bien Phu. Had they been lost, instead of being evacuated, Chiang would have made the same military error as the French made when they locked up a garrison at Dien Bien Phu, locked it up in an outpost of no decisive importance which could not be defended. The story in Indochina might well have been different from what it is today if a policy of evacuation from indefensible outposts to concentrated strong points had been carried out.

These considerations apply to the other offshore islands, and the sound American policy would be to follow up what is being done in the Tachens by doing the same thing in Quemoy and Matsu. This is the surest way to carry out the policy which the President laid down in his message to Congress. The policy is to keep Formosa and the Pescadores out of unfriendly hands, and to bring about a cease-fire in the Formosa Strait. There is one way by which at present Formosa can be defended. That is by American military power. But there are two ways in which the policy of the cease-fire can be put into effect. The one—which we have been attempting—is to negotiate a cease-fire with Peiping. If they would agree to it, they would tacitly assent not to attack Formosa and we—so it is generally understood—would in return bring about either the neutralization or the evacuation of the offshore islands.

This way of arriving at a cease-fire has been rebuffed angrily by Chou En-lai. We ought not to be surprised. It was wishful thinking to suppose that the Chinese Government, which has won the civil war on the mainland, would appear as a nonmember before the Security Council in which China is represented by a faction that is no longer on the Chinese mainland. It was no less wishful to suppose that the Red Chinese would publicly sign a cease-fire which meant that they had renounced the right to complete the defeat of Chiang and to recover by force the island of Formosa.

It is most improbable that the cease-fire can be obtained by public agreement either in the U. N. or in any other kind of conference.

There is, however, another way to bring about the cease-fire for which the United States national policy calls. It can be done by direct American action, and it does not depend upon the negotiation of an agreement with Peiping. This is to do in Quemoy and Matsu what we are doing in the Tachens—to evacuate them not as the result of a bargain but as a strategic measure to liquidate a position of weakness, and to fall back on Formosa, which is a genuine position of strength.

Once that is done, there will be in fact, whatever Peiping may or may not agree to, a practical cease-fire in the Formosa Strait. Pin-prick bombing and shooting and raiding, which the Nationalists do from these offshore islands, will stop. There will be a hundred miles of blue water between Red China, which has no navy, and Formosa, which we are defending. In a military sense this will be for all practical purposes a cease-fire between the two Chinas—as there is between the whales and the elephants who cannot get at one another. Formosa will not be in Peiping's military orbit. The fantasy of putting Chiang back on the mainland by an all-out American war will have been dissipated. The risk of a great war over trifling islands will have been greatly reduced. We shall have protected our genuine, as distinguished from our fictitious interests, and we shall have the moral and political support of our allies.

It will be said by some that to evacuate the islands is appeasement. But if we are talking about appeasement and about prestige, which is the firmer American policy: to sell these islands for a cease-fire, treating them as pawns in a bargain, or get rid of them as military and political legal liabilities, and to take a stand on a line—that of Formosa and the Pescadores—which is a defensible legal line, a defensible strategical line, which is a sound political line in that it has the support of our allies?

I think it is more dignified to evacuate the islands for our own reasons than to sell them to obtain the benefits of a truce. We can have the benefits of the truce without bargaining and by our own voluntary action.

There is only one considerable doubt about this policy. It is whether Chiang can be induced to agree to it without demoralizing his army and his officialdom. There is no denying that that could happen. But we have to remember that if it is going to happen because of the evacuation of the offshore islands, it is going to happen anyway. For the administration has taken the fundamental decision not to support a war for the reconquest of the mainland. It cannot be sound policy to use Quemoy and Matsu as a way of allowing the Formosan Chinese to deceive themselves into thinking that the administration does not mean what it says. It cannot be sound policy to use these islands as bait to the Formosan Chinese, as a way of causing them to keep on thinking that the United States can be pushed, pulled, ensnared, and entangled into the kind of war that the United States has decided not to wage.

We cannot go on forever, or for long, sacrificing the national interests of the United States to our fears and to our guesses of what will and what will not happen to the morale of Chiang's regime. If our true interest is to evacuate the offshore islands and to stand on the legal line of Formosa and the Pescadores, then we owe it to the people of this country to follow our true interest, refusing to let high policy be controlled by the internal politics of the Formosa regime.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a speech on this subject, delivered by Hon. Thomas K. Finletter, former Secretary of the Air Force, on this general subject—a speech containing some very constructive suggestions as to what we ought to do about Formosa—be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THOMAS K. FINLETTER AT ROOSEVELT DAY DINNER, WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 5, 1955, UNDER AUSPICES OF AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

It is now nearly 10 years since the death of the great President whose memory and achievements we honor tonight.

It is often said that one of these great achievements—the New Deal—has had its day; and that the Democratic Party had better stop thinking of the old policies of the 1930's and 1940's and of the coalition of groups of voters which brought it the victories of those days.

This attitude misunderstands what Franklin D. Roosevelt did for the Democratic Party and for the country from 1933 on. For, while it is true that the Roosevelt revolution is now a part of our accepted social fabric and that a party cannot live on the remembrance of things past, there is one part of the New Deal that still lives on with continued, dynamic vitality. That is its deeply felt concern for the just and right, and its spirit of adventure in seeking the good.

I am not speaking, of course, of the aggregation of policies of the 1933–40 period. Nor do I mean the result of those New Deal policies—the coalition of groupings of voters which kept the Democratic Party in power for 20 years.

I mean the spirit which motivated these policies, a spirit whose great quality is a willingness to make a change, to try the untried, if doing so will help satisfy a deeply-felt urge to defeat injustice, illiteracy, ill health and poverty, and to see to it that the people of America have full access to the privileges of freemen.

It is important that this spirit be kept alive and vigorous. Important to the Democratic Party. Important to all the people of the country.

I do not believe that the Democratic Party can win the votes of the American people unless it keeps this sense of adventure for the good. The one thing the Democratic Party has which the Republican Party has not, is this spirit.

The reason the country went normally Democratic in 1933 and has stayed that way is because after their experience with Presidents Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman the people came to believe in the Democratic Party. The reason they believed in it was that they were right in believing it. The party was not fooling them; it was not trying to win votes with favors and promises of favors. This was not circuses and bread. It was the real thing.

I do not mean that the Democratic Party was not trying to win the votes of the people during the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. Of course it was. But it was the way it sought the votes that was important. It sought them by offering the best merchandise for the money. It did not offer shoddy goods. It did not offer goods that looked well on the surface but were intended to wear out so that replacements would have to be bought. It did not rely on advertising, packaging, or merchandising. It offered the best it could make, the goods which would serve the customer best.

Of course there were failures, of course there were exceptions to this high-minded New Deal standard. The Democratic Party being part of the human race is not perfect. But I do think that this description I have just given rightly describes the spirit which dominated the Roosevelt and Truman administrations.

At the moment temptation is in the air. For there is another way of appealing for the votes of the people and it seems to be mighty effective with so many of the voters. This

other way is the opposite of what I have described as the New Deal way. It is the way of salesmanship, of the bad kind of salesmanship, the kind that does not concern itself with the quality of what it sells. It is a political salesmanship which seeks to keep the people's mind off the issues that are important, the issues on which we Democrats know the people would support us if it were possible to have a debate on the merits. This political salesmanship is a short-term operation. It uses gadgets and tricks whose impact is immediate, violent, and effective. It focuses on getting those votes in that next election. It relies heavily on the techniques of advertising. It sometimes—too often, alas—relies on falsehoods. Worst of all, on issues of great importance it often puts the interests of the party above those of the country. This political salesmanship is in a deep sense unconstitutional. For unless we use restraint in our struggles between the two great parties, unless we mark a boundary beyond which it is not permissible to go, no matter how close the election and how much either party wants to win it, our constitutional system will not stand the strain upon it. All Americans know or should know where this boundary is, in any given circumstance. It is where the politicking begins to harm the interests of the country. And all Americans know or should know that this boundary has been badly violated in the recent past.

There is a real problem for the Democratic Party how to meet this kind of political campaigning. It is all very well to say, let us believe in and practice the right, and right will triumph. But it is understandable that men in the Democratic Party should think: Let us fight fire with fire, we can have our ideals (to be put into practice when we get into power) but there is this important preliminary business of getting elected. Let us fight this battle with the weapons, however illegitimate they may be, which now seems to be the customary ones. Then, having beaten our opponents at their own game, we can go back to being what we really are.

Fortunately, for its own sake and for the country's, the Democratic Party has no intention of meeting fire with fire in this way.

The Democratic Party can defend itself against the techniques of salesmanship only by having confidence in the American people and by doing what it can to unmask the slogans and the advertising, and the falsehoods, so that the voters will be able to judge the two parties on the merits of their intentions and their acts.

But at the same time, the Democratic Party must continue to be better than the Republican Party on the merits. This it will not do unless it keeps up that readiness to explore and that concern with the well-being and the individual rights of human beings which are the substance and the soul of the New Deal.

It is not only of the political fortunes of the Democratic Party, of which I am speaking. For as goes this struggle between political salesmanship on the one hand and the spirit of responsibility and concern for the right on the other, so will go the future of the American ideal of individual liberty under law. Unless the spirit of adventure in method and of idealism in substance wins out, liberalism in the United States will not come safely through the crisis in which we now are.

May I digress to defend that word "liberalism"? I might have used the word "freedom," and that would have been unexceptionable. But it is high time that we reject the slurs that have been put on the words "liberal" and "liberalism" and restore them to the high estate to which they are entitled. Liberalism is the method of freedom. If we let slander take that word away from us we shall have lost something of priceless worth. And slander is the way our opponents often take to try to make us give up the principles in which we believe.

May I add, too, that Americans for Democratic Action, now, and particularly now, has an important role in this struggle. The fundamental rights of freemen for which this country fought the Revolutionary War, and for which it has battled ever since, are under attack. Liberalism and idealism, and the organizations that stand for liberalism and idealism, as does the ADA, are the targets. Liberalism and those who support it are the bulwarks of the rights of freedom. They must not yield; they must be brought through the crisis in which they are now, to their old high place of prestige and honor in our great country.

It is for these things, for the substance of freedom and the method of liberalism, that we are now fighting. It is not alone, or even I think primarily, our physical safety which is threatened by Russia and its evil creed of communism. Of equal importance with our hides are our souls. And so far it is the latter which have received the worst wounds and are the most threatened, not, tragically enough, by our enemies but by ourselves.

This integrity of the creeds and of methods of freedom is an end, indeed the greatest of political ends, in itself. So I could stop this argument at this point, and say that the end of freedom and the means of liberalism must be defended for their own sake against these improper and unconstitutional attacks that are being made upon them.

But there is one more point that is important and should be said. It is that unless we show considerably more respect for the proper limits of political debate on matters affecting our foreign policy, if we continue this idea that anything goes in politics so long as it wins votes, regardless of what harm it may do to our efforts to defend ourselves in the world and to seek peace, then we cannot possibly have a proper foreign policy and cannot possibly defend ourselves adequately in the dangerous world in which we live.

Already our failure to respect the proper limits of political debate, our injection of domestic political considerations into our national policies, have harmed us grievously in many ways.

It has harmed us in the image which we project of ourselves abroad. Our failure to stand by our principles of freedom and of liberalism at home have worried our friends in Europe and have discredited us in Asia.

Our use of slogans and catchwords has impaired our military strength. Slogans have actually cut into our military striking power, slogans such as the curious notion that cutting the military budget will give us more military strength than we had when we spent more money under the Democratic administrations; that a new magic efficiency will give us, in the words of that inelegant slogan, "more bang for a buck"; the talk of "paper wings" in the Air Force under the Democrats; and by those who put budget balancing above the Nation's safety, the line that the Russians are plotting to trick us into spending ourselves into bankruptcy.

Slogans such as these have cut our military budget below the safe level, and similar slogans have weakened our foreign policy or led it into dangerous paths in Europe and in Asia.

As a result our prestige and our influence are at new lows in Europe and in the world outside of Europe.

We used to say, somewhat immodestly, that we, the United States, were the leaders of the free world. We do not hear so much of this talk now, not since the British and French took over the responsibilities of the free world at the Geneva Conference last November, after the Chinese had defied all our threats of massive violence and, disregarding the large chip on our shoulder, conquered Dien Bien Phu and all of northern Vietnam. Nor was our talk of our world leadership stimulated by the French rejection of the European Defense Community in the face of the most awesome warnings from us that we would massively withdraw from Europe unless she signed the EDC treaty promptly.

At the moment it is in Asia where we are in special trouble, with the dangerous crisis of Formosa, the second such we have had within a year. First it was in Indochina where threats by the United States clashed with Chinese aggression, and we came close to war. Now it is in the Formosa Straits.

This is not the time, unfortunately, to talk about how we got into our present position of defending Formosa and the Pescadores, alone, without allies, and not as part of an agreed United Nations position. Nor is this the time to discuss the merits, or lack of merits, of the foreign policies, and of the domestic political partisanship which brought this about. The critical nature of our position in the Formosa area, and the truculence of the Red Chinese, put upon all of us the obligation to support the President unitedly if the Red Chinese try to take Formosa and the Pescadores by war.

At some later date, when the situation, let us hope, will have become less dangerous, we must discuss this Far Eastern policy of the administration, and particularly how it is that we got ourselves into the position of being alone the defenders of Formosa, and why we have failed to try to internationalize our position of trusteeship in the area. For the present we must be restrained in our debate so that the Chinese and the Russians will have no grounds at all for doubting of our unity and our determination.

But this is not to say that there shall be no debate at all upon our Formosan policy. As long as we make clear to the Chinese and the Russians that we are united to resist any attempt by them to take Formosa and the Pescadores by war we may properly question various aspects of our policies in that area. The Chinese and the Russians will understand that debate in a free democracy is a proof and a source of strength, not of weakness.

The debate of this issue has already clarified and improved our agreed national policy. We have been assured by the President that he alone and not his military or his other advisers, especially the less temperate ones, will make the decisions where and how we are to fight if we are to. And we have been assured too that the President will allow our Armed Forces to be used for defensive purposes only.

I say our Armed Forces, for no one can be sure that once the fighting starts it can be limited to air and sea forces alone, or that it can be surely confined to the area of Formosa and the adjacent mainland, or even to the continent of China itself. Let us not delude ourselves with the notion which has been so prevalent in much of our Far Eastern policy, that if we do have to fight we can do so cheaply, as the West used to do during the weak period of China under the Manchus and the Republic of 1912. There is no sure foreseeable limit to the fighting once it may start in the Formosa Straits.

So, in our constructive debate on the Formosa policy we may ask some questions. We may question whether it is a good practice to give warnings to our enemies, in advance, of just what we will and will not do with respect to this and that area of the world, and whether these warnings should be made by the executive branch alone or in the form of a joint resolution submitted to the Congress for its action. My own view is that as a general matter this policy of specific warnings should be applied only in exceptional cases; but that in the present instance it was necessary to use it. This, for the reason that our failure to follow through in Indochina on our warnings to the Chinese Reds about

massive retaliation if they advanced farther into Vietnam might have given the Red Chinese the idea, unless we had fortified our warnings about Formosa by the debate in Congress on the joint resolution, that we would also fail to react if they attacked Formosa and the Pescadores.

We may also ask whether the administration still wishes to press for a ratification of the United States-Nationalist China Defense Treaty, or whether events have not so changed that this treaty would now run counter to the prospects of internationalizing Formosa and the Pescadores.

And, in this connection, we may ask for a clarification of the reasons for our position in Formosa. During the course of the tough line we have been following, alone, in the Far East recently we took on some serious moral commitments, including this commitment to Formosa and the Pescadores to defend them if they were attacked by the Red Chinese. But it is not clear whether this moral commitment is the basis for the action we have taken in the recent joint resolution or whether the basis for it is the military importance to the United States of Formosa and the Pescadores. The joint resolution itself seems to indicate that the reason is that "the secure possession by a friendly government of the western Pacific island chain, of which Formosa is a part, is essential to the vital interests of the United States." If this is true, the situation is very serious indeed. The word vital means necessary to life, the life that is, of the United States. This premise, it seems to me, needs some examination.

Particularly, too, may we ask about this question of the internationalization of the islands, of our giving up our go-it-alone policy there. Why is it that the policy of internationalization of Formosa, which had been begun at the time of the Korean war, has been neglected?

You will remember that shortly after the Korean war President Truman announced that the future of Formosa and the Pescadores would be decided in the Japanese Peace Treaty or by the United Nations. Later in the same year 1950, in a note to Russia, the United States proposed a peace treaty with Japan which would have the four major powers concerned, Russia, China, Britain, and the United States, decide the future of these islands; or if they failed to agree within 1 year, would have the matter settled by the General Assembly of the United Nations where, it will be noted, there is no veto.

The Japanese Peace Treaty was finally signed, not just by the United States alone, but by 48 other nations. Certain areas not including Formosa and the Pescadores, were trusteed with the United Nations, with the United States as the sole administering authority; but the future of Formosa and the Pescadores was left open. Japan relinquished her claims to them, but where the title went to was not clear. If it went anywhere it would seem to have gone to the 48 nations which signed the peace treaty with Japan, as trustees, and with the duty to turn over their trust responsibilities to the United Nations just as soon as that body would accept them.

Clearly this Formosa-Pescadores problem is no longer a matter for the United States alone. It is for the United States to insist not only that the United Nations resist any aggression by the Red Chinese and do its best to arrange a cease-fire, but also that it relieve the United States from the go-it-alone responsibility which the United States has assumed for the protection of these islands, and further, that the United Nations take over the juridical duty of adjudicating the future of the inshore islands and of Formosa and the Pescadores as well.

The United States, I believe, should give up entirely this go-it-alone policy in Formosa and the rest of the Far East and should substitute for it a policy founded on juridical commitments and juridical principles. If we stop showing how tough we are and start showing how lawful we are we may have success and peace in our policy in the Far East.

Admittedly, we are dealing with a truculent and difficult enemy in that part of the world, who is not concerned with law, an enemy who has little interest in juridical principles. But if we, the United States, show that our concern is to do what is right and lawful, we may be sure of two things. First, that our national security will not be thereby impaired; on the contrary, it will be strengthened. And, second, that world opinion will support us and not the Red Chinese.

If we follow the opposite course, if we purport to act as the go-it-alone arbiter of much of the world, we shall imperil our politico-military security and we shall not have the support of world opinion.

Thus, because of the dangerous importance to the American people of the Formosan question, one is justified I believe, in suggesting that our policy there follow certain lines. For example:

1. The country will support the administration in the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores if the Red Chinese make war to conquer them.

2. We should quickly liquidate the position we find ourselves in of being alone, without allies, and not as a part of the United Nations, in defending Formosa and the Pescadores. We should quickly, wholeheartedly, and forcefully submit to the United Nations that the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores be internationalized; that those who, under international principles and international commitments are responsible with us for this defense, join fully in it; and that the responsibility for deciding the juridical status of Formosa and the Pescadores, and of the inshore islands as well, be internationalized. These tasks should, most preferably, be undertaken by the United Nations. The solitary, go-it-alone position of the United States should be liquidated as rapidly as it can be.

3. The Armed Forces of the United States must be used only and strictly only for defensive purposes. The Commander in Chief will decide what that requires. But it is of the highest importance that our United States forces be so deployed and employed as to avoid any legitimate charge that they have been provocative. It must be very plain, for world opinion and more importantly for United States opinion, that if shooting starts in this area it will be unmistakably the result of Red Chinese initiative.

The United States, which Franklin Delano Roosevelt did so much to build, is in a dangerous crisis. We must pray, devoutly and more solemnly than we may have for a long time, that we shall come safely through it, with honor, and with peace.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I see absolutely no need for this treaty. If it is to be approved, it should be approved with the reservations indicated in the committee report, formally attached to the treaty by vote of the Senate.

I am very glad indeed and proud to have been able to associate myself with the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and other Senators in the submission to this body of amendments to the resolution which make it very clear that the reservations do not represent merely opinions of the Committee on Foreign Relations, but the actual decisions and viewpoints and agreement of the Senate as a whole.

But even with the reservations, Mr. President, the treaty would be of dubious advantage to the United States under present circumstances. I can see no benefit from it. But without the reservations, the treaty, in my judgment, is a menace to free-world unity, to our own security, and the cause of peace. I shall certainly vote against it.

Moreover, and finally, Mr. President, I see no reason why the United States should tie its hands under the terms of this treaty and enter into an alliance of indefinite duration with the Chiang regime. We have nothing to gain. We have peace and free-world unity to lose.

The goal of peace, with honor and security, beckons to us. The prospect is dim, shrouded over by an almost impenetrable haze of uncertainty and arduous difficulty. Yet we dare not be disheartened or discouraged. We dare not tarry or dally, or take any side roads or detours skirting the dangerous realm of unprovoked war.

Mr. President, and my colleagues in the Senate, let us put aside this treaty. Let us think and reflect upon it. Let us rely on strength and firmness, patience and reasonableness, backed up by a resolve to explore every avenue that leads to peace, meanwhile making clear our firm intention to act in concert with the other free nations of the world to resist unprovoked aggression and the Communist conspiracy against the sacred cause of freedom.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is one of the reservations offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] pending at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no reservation pending at this time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may announce my intentions?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I intend to offer first two amendments to the treaty. Then I intend to offer two reservations to the resolution of ratification. When the debate progresses to the point where I can offer my first amendment, which is now in the process of drafting, I shall do so. I have no desire but to cooperate in getting the earliest possible vote on this matter consonant with the right of all my colleagues to be heard and to express their views on the issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The treaty is in the Committee of the Whole and open to amendment. Reservations will be in order on the submission of the question, Will the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the treaty, which is a subsequent question, after amendments, if any, are proposed to the treaty.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I shall have to vote against the proposed treaty. I shall do so with reluctance, but I do not believe that the proposed

treaty is in the interest of peace. I can see no reason for having our Nation enter into treaty obligations with the government of Chiang Kai-shek.

By joint resolution which the Senate passed only a short time ago, the Senate and the House of Representatives agreed to do all that the pending treaty would do. I voted reluctantly and against my better judgment for the joint resolution, in order to support the President. But, much as we wish to support the President in matters of foreign relations, there comes a time when I feel each Senator must follow his honest convictions.

Mr. President, one reason why I voted for the joint resolution which was before the Senate on January 28 was that prior to the vote on the joint resolution being taken, I was given to understand—and I think most other Senators so understood—that a resolution would be considered and agreed to by the Senate on Tuesday or some other day early in the week following the passage of the Formosa joint resolution. The resolution to which I refer appears on pages 990–991 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 28. I ask unanimous consent that that resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. J. Res. 55) favoring action by the United Nations to terminate hostilities between Communist China and Nationalist China, submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. HILL), was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the President of the United States on January 19, 1955, stated that he would "like to see the United Nations attempt to exercise its good offices" with respect to arranging a cease-fire between Communist China and Nationalist China;

Whereas the President in his message of January 24 stated that the situation in the Pacific area "is one for appropriate action of the United Nations under its charter"; and

Whereas House Joint Resolution 159 provides that it shall expire when he determines that peace in the area is "reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United States or otherwise": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that it would be in the interest of the United States and of world peace for the United Nations to take prompt action to bring about a cease-fire in the area of hostilities off the coast of China and in the Formosa Strait, and the President is requested to take appropriate steps to achieve that objective.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the general provision of that resolution is that it is the sense of the Senate that the Formosa problem should be submitted vigorously by the United States to the United Nations, with the request that the United Nations use its best offices to bring about a cease-fire and to take other steps in an effort to stabilize conditions and bring about peace in that part of the world.

It was my understanding that that resolution would be considered favorably by the Foreign Relations Committee. Question was asked of the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. GEORGE]—as appears on page 990 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and he said that, so far as he knew, there was no opposition to that resolution.

At that time, apparently, the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the former chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], were present. Yet for some reason, that resolution has not come from the committee. I know that the Senator from Georgia was stating the situation just as he saw it when he said he knew of no opposition to the resolution. I have been advised that some minority members later objected to it in the Foreign Relations Committee and it was killed.

Had I not felt the resolution would be considered promptly and promptly agreed to by the Senate, I would have voted against the Formosa joint resolution.

Mr. President, my position on this entire matter is set forth in an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the joint resolution, which I submitted and which was voted on at the same time, namely, on January 28, when the Formosa joint resolution was before the Senate. The amendment I submitted appears on page 981 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 28. I now ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the primary purpose of the United States in its relations with all other nations is to develop and sustain a just and enduring peace; and, in conformity with that purpose, has undertaken as a member of the United Nations to be ready to settle its international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered; and

Whereas the treaty of peace between the Allied Powers and Japan, signed September 8, 1951, under which Japan renounced all right, title, and claim to Formosa and the Pescadores, did not specify the ultimate disposition of such islands; and

Whereas the United States has recognized and assumed a responsibility for the peace and security of Formosa and the Pescadores pending definitive settlement of their future status, and pending such settlement has recognized the jurisdiction of the Republic of China over these islands; and

Whereas in China or certain areas thereof there is armed conflict between the Republic of China and the Chinese Communists, and the Chinese Communists are threatening to extend that conflict and endanger international peace by armed attacks on Formosa and the Pescadores; and

Whereas the situation is one appropriate for action by the United Nations for the purpose of ending the present hostilities off the coast of China and their threatened extension in the Formosan Strait which clearly endanger international peace and threaten seriously to dislocate the existing, if unstable, balance of moral, economic, political, and military power upon which the peace of the Pacific depends; and

Whereas the United States would welcome intervention by the United Nations to bring about a cessation of hostilities off the coast of China and in the Formosan Strait, and it is in the interest of the United States and of world peace to facilitate efforts toward peaceful settlement, including a definitive settlement of the future status of Formosa and the Pescadores in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter; and

Whereas, pending action by the United Nations, the United States has a responsibility to protect and defend the peace and security of Formosa and the Pescadores from armed attack, since the peace and security of these islands are essential to the peace and security of the United States and other nations with vital interests in the west Pacific: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That it is the sense of the Congress—in light of the above-described situation and so long as it continues, pending effective action by the United Nations to maintain peace and security in the Formosan Strait and the waters surrounding Formosa and the Pescadores—the President has authority to employ the Armed Forces of the United States if and as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of defending and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores from armed attack. Such authority would include the taking of such other measures consistent with international law and our obligations under the United Nations Charter as he judges necessary to appropriate militarily in the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in referring to that amendment I particularly desire to call attention to the proposal that the matter of a cease-fire be submitted to the United Nations, and that the Congress of the United States ask the United Nations to try to perfect a settlement of this whole troublesome issue. Of course, my amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected; but I think our best chance of avoiding war in that area of the world—and certainly no one wishes to have war in the Far East or anywhere else, if we can honorably avoid it—is to get behind the expression in the amendment I submitted, and which was also contained in the resolution which was submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], which I felt would be favorably acted upon by the Senate, and try to see whether we can back up the United Nations efforts not only to secure a cease-fire, but also to settle this entire problem.

In my substitute I was willing to have our forces used to defend Formosa and the Pescadores, but I did not want our country to become involved with Chiang Kai-shek over the coastal islands. Also I wished the Government of the United States to make an even more vigorous effort to secure United Nations assistance looking to a peaceful settlement.

Mr. President, I do not wish to give the color of sovereignty and permanency to the government of Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa and the Pescadores. I think by inferentially agreeing in this treaty that he has vested title or sovereignty to these two islands we would be faced with many, many difficulties in the days to come. Such an inferential agreement might make it impossible for the United Nations to work out any solution of this problem. Chiang Kai-shek's forces are there by our tolerance, and they do not represent by any stretch of the imagination a permanent solution of the future of Formosa. We should not ratify an unnecessary treaty which may be interpreted by much of the world as giving permanency to that arrangement.

I do not see how this treaty accomplishes anything not accomplished by the joint resolution we have already passed, and it has many foggy, if not evil, implications. The world knows and Chiang Kai-shek knows that we are committed to the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores. I regret that the previous joint resolution included some coastal islands. We must try in every way not to be drawn into a war over these islands.

But, Mr. President, what more can this treaty do? The only thing further that this treaty can do is to muddy the water—rather than to make it clear—regarding the position we have before the world, insofar as the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores is concerned.

As I see it, we have no right to give permanency to Chiang Kai-shek or to acknowledge his ownership of the island of Formosa. It also seems to me that the treaty would tie our hands in trying to secure United Nations action on this very important problem. If we are going to take the position that Chiang Kai-shek is there by some right of sovereignty, then there is not very much use in trying to have the United Nations undertake to negotiate in connection with that question.

Furthermore, Mr. President, if we limit our position to the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores, without a treaty, then we have a sound right, it seems to me, to call upon all our allies who were engaged with us in World War II, as a result of which Japan relinquished these islands, for their help in the event of war. They have an interest there, because they, too, are interested in seeing that these islands are in friendly hands. They have a moral and a legal obligation to back up our position, because they, too, were fellow combatants against Japan in that war. Mr. President, if we act unilaterally and if we ourselves, acting alone, try to settle the future of Formosa and the Pescadores—as this treaty at least inferentially would do—then I think we might thereby release them from any obligation to stand with us if things in that part of the world were to go to the bad.

Mr. President, I have a firm conviction that, insofar as action by the United Nations is concerned, we did not act wisely in connection with the resolution which we passed on January 28. I think the step now proposed will be an even more important and perhaps disastrous one, and will make our position such that there will be little leeway and little opportunity for negotiation. I cannot see that the ratification of the pending treaty will help us. I am not in favor of tying our future with the future of Chiang Kai-shek. We have gone along far enough with him.

Whether we agree to it or not, by entering into a treaty of this kind with him, we more or less underwrite other actions he may take in connection with the coastal islands or even with the mainland of China, even though we might object to that.

The distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has pointed out most forcefully, in the course of his remarks as they were printed in the RECORD, that Chiang Kai-shek's motives and aims are diverse from ours. That being true, I think we would make a mistake by tying up ourselves with him in the pending treaty. This treaty is not the road to peace.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The treaty is before the Senate as in the Committee of the Whole, and is open to amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Flanders	McNamara
Allott	George	Millikin
Anderson	Gore	Monroney
Barkley	Green	Morse
Barrett	Hayden	Mundt
Beall	Hennings	Murray
Bender	Hickenlooper	Neely
Bennett	Hill	Pastore
Bible	Holland	Payne
Bricker	Humphrey	Potter
Butler	Ives	Robertson
Byrd	Jackson	Russell
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Scott
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Smathers
Chavez	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Clements	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Langer	Sparkman
Daniel	Lehman	Stennis
Douglas	Long	Thurmond
Duff	Magnuson	Thye
Dworshak	Mansfield	Wiley
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Ervin	McClellan	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of article VIII it is proposed to add a new sentence as follows:

This treaty does not affect or modify and shall not be interpreted as affecting or modifying the legal status or sovereignty of the territories to which it applies.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on the amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I join in the request for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from West Virgina [Mr. KILGORE], would each vote "nay."

I announce also that if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], would vote "yea."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senators from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business, and if present and voting, each would vote "nay."

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is necessarily absent, and if present and voting, would vote "nay."

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] is necessarily absent because of illness and if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are also absent on official business.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Alabama is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Alabama is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Michigan is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Would it be in order to request a recapitulation of the vote at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that that would not be in order until after the result is announced.

Mr. RUSSELL. Under what rule, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is impossible to recapitulate until the result of the vote is known.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KERR. Could a recapitulation be had by unanimous consent, and would such a request be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. KERR. I so request.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I would have to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent request made by the senior Senator from Oklahoma is that the vote be recapitulated at this time. The senior Senator from California rises.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from California withhold his objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall be glad to withhold my objection.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recorded as having voted in the negative.

The result was announced—yeas 11, nays 57, as follows:

YEAS—11

Chavez	Kefauver	Morse
Gore	Langer	Murray
Hill	Lehman	Stennis
Johnston, S. C.	Magnuson	

NAYS—57

Aiken	Dworshak	McNamara
Allott	Elender	Millikin
Anderson	Ervin	Monroney
Barkley	Flanders	Mundt
Barrett	George	Neely
Beall	Green	Pastore
Bender	Hayden	Payne
Bennett	Hennings	Potter
Bible	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Bricker	Holland	Russell
Butler	Humphrey	Scott
Byrd	Ives	Smathers
Carlson	Jackson	Smith, Maine
Case, N. J.	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Clements	Knowland	Sparkman
Curtis	Long	Thurmond
Daniel	Mansfield	Thye
Douglas	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Duff	McClellan	Williams

NOT VOTING—28

Bridges	Hruska	O'Mahoney
Bush	Jenner	Purtell
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Cotton	Kilgore	Symington
Dirksen	Kuchel	Watkins
Eastland	Malone	Welker
Frear	Martin, Pa.	Young
Fulbright	McCarthy	
Goldwater	Neuberger	

So Mr. MORSE'S amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The treaty is still open to amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2, and ask that it be read. Before it is read, I ask for the yeas and nays on it.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out the last sentence in article VI, as follows:

> The provisions of articles II and V will be applicable to such other territories as may be determined by mutual agreement.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall be very brief in my explanation. As I said earlier this afternoon, there is no doubt that a majority of the Committee on Foreign Relations is in unanimous agreement that it is the intention of the committee that any proposal to extend the territory covered by the treaty would have to come back to the Senate.

In view of the particular situation existing in Formosa, and what I think are our great obligations as caretaker, I think we should not include a provision in the treaty as surplusage; I think the treaty ought to say exactly what we mean. I believe there is danger that the present wording will give some false impressions to Asiatic countries as to what we mean. Therefore, I think the language I have indicated should be stricken.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I believe in full hearings. This identical amendment was offered in committee. It was rejected by a vote of 11 to 2.

In the report is the specific statement, based upon the specific testimony of the Secretary of State, that if any agreement extended the provisions of the treaty to areas other than Formosa and the Pescadores, such agreement would have to come back to the Senate and be passed upon again by the Senate.

Have we no confidence in anybody? The Committee on Foreign Relations gave this question earnest consideration, and I think there was no reasonable doubt about it; otherwise more than two members of the committee would not have voted in favor of the resolution of ratification.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is it not a fact that since this is a bilateral treaty, if we were to strike the language from the treaty itself, that would necessarily mean a renegotiation with the Republic of China, and a delay at a time when the administration and the committee feel a delay would be undesirable?

Mr. GEORGE. Beyond all doubt.

No Secretary of State, Mr. President, so long as I am chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, will make a positive statement in the record that any extension of this territory would be a change or an amendment to the treaty which would come back to the Senate, without having that course followed.

This is in our report. It is specifically in the report, and is specifically in the testimony of the Secretary of State.

It would be true if no one had said it, because there can be no enlargement of a treaty unless the proposed enlargement is submitted to the Senate and agreed to by the Senate.

Why should the Senate make itself ridiculous? Why should it attach this sort of amendment to the treaty? To do so would be beyond my comprehension.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my reply will be very brief. I make two points. First, there is nothing in the record with respect to this treaty which would lead anyone to believe that Chiang Kai-shek had any such understanding when he negotiated the treaty. I think it ought to be made very clear to Chiang, in the language of the treaty.

Second, I respectfully differ with the distinguished Senator from Georgia in regard to whether or not such power could be authorized in the treaty without its coming back to the Senate.

This treaty must be read also in the light of the action taken recently by the Senate on House Joint Resolution 159. The Senate authorized very broad power in that resolution, which should cover possible defense in futuro.

There is nothing ridiculous about striking from a treaty language which might very well be interpreted by a future President or a future Secretary of State as authorizing an agreement to cover other territories, and then to rely upon the language of the treaty alone.

Not a word written in the committee report will become a part of the treaty. It will not be recognized as a part of the treaty by any world court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Texas

[Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] would each vote "nay."

I announce also that if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] would vote "yea."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senators from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], are absent on official business, and if present and voting, each would vote "nay."

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is necessarily absent and, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] is necessarily absent because of illness and, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are also absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 10, nays 60, as follows:

YEAS—10

Byrd	Langer	Murray
Chavez	Lehman	Stennis
Hennings	Long	
Kefauver	Morse	

NAYS—60

Aiken	Ervin	McNamara
Allott	Flanders	Millikin
Anderson	Frear	Monroney
Barkley	George	Mundt
Barrett	Gore	Neely
Beall	Green	Pastore
Bender	Hayden	Payne
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Potter
Bible	Hill	Robertson
Bricker	Holland	Russell
Butler	Humphrey	Scott
Carlson	Ives	Smathers
Case, N. J.	Jackson	Smith, Maine
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Kerr	Sparkman
Daniel	Knowland	Symington
Douglas	Magnuson	Thurmond
Duff	Mansfield	Thye
Dworshak	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Ellender	McClellan	Williams

NOT VOTING—26

Bridges	Hruska	Neuberger
Bush	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Purtell
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Cotton	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Kuchel	Watkins
Eastland	Malone	Welker
Fulbright	Martin, Pa.	Young
Goldwater	McCarthy	

So Mr. MORSE's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The treaty is still open to amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be offered, without objection, the pending treaty will be considered as having been passed through its various parliamentary stages up to the point of the consideration of the resolution of ratification, which the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive A, 84th Congress, 1st session, the Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of China, signed at Washington on December 2, 1954.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to advise the leadership that I shall not call for a yea-and-nay vote on the two reservations I have to offer because there have been yea-and-nay votes on the substance of the reservations as they were offered as amendments. However, I wish to complete the record. There is pending at the desk the reservation to the resolution of ratification which covers the matter of sovereignty, in which I seek to make crystal clear that the treaty in no way changes the status of sovereignty over Formosa, which, of course, is the same purpose as that which I had in mind in offering my amendment to the body of the treaty.

Mr. President, I call up my reservation on the question of sovereignty, and ask that the clerk read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Reservation proposed by Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. CHAVEZ) to the resolution of ratification of the Mutual Defense Treaty with the Republic of China, signed at Washington on December 2, 1954: "The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of this treaty with the understanding that nothing in the treaty shall be construed as affecting or modifying the legal status or sovereignty of the territories to which it applies."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the reservation submitted by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for himself and other Senators. [Putting the question.]

The reservation was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now call up my second reservation, which proposes to make it perfectly clear that the last sentence of article VI of the treaty shall have no force or effect, and I ask that the clerk read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Reservation proposed by Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. CHAVEZ) to the resolution of ratification of the Mutual Defense Treaty with the Republic of China, signed at Washington on December 2, 1954:

"The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of this treaty with the understanding that the last sentence of article VI of the treaty shall have no force or effect."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the reservation submitted by the Senator from Oregon for himself and other Senators. [Putting the question.]

The reservation was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

I further announce that on this vote the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] if present would vote "yea."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senators from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business; and, if present and voting, each would vote "yea."

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is necessarily absent; and, if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] is necessarily absent because of illness; and, if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are also absent on official business.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 65, nays 6, as follows:

YEAS—65

Aiken	Curtis	Holland
Allott	Daniel	Humphrey
Anderson	Douglas	Ives
Barkley	Duff	Jackson
Barrett	Dworshak	Johnston, S. C.
Beall	Ellender	Kerr
Bender	Ervin	Knowland
Bennett	Flanders	Long
Bible	Frear	Magnuson
Bricker	George	Mansfield
Butler	Green	Martin, Iowa
Byrd	Hayden	McClellan
Carlson	Hennings	McNamara
Case, N. J.	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Clements	Hill	Monroney

Mundt	Robertson	Stennis
Murray	Russell	Symington
Neely	Scott	Thurmond
O'Mahoney	Smathers	Thye
Pastore	Smith, Maine	Wiley
Payne	Smith, N. J.	Williams
Potter	Sparkman	

NAYS—6

Chavez	Kefauver	Lehman
Gore	Langer	Morse

NOT VOTING—25

Bridges	Hruska	Neuberger
Bush	Jenner	Purtell
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Cotton	Kilgore	Watkins
Dirksen	Kuchel	Welker
Eastland	Malone	Young
Fulbright	Martin, Pa.	
Goldwater	McCarthy	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I move that the President be immediately notified of the vote just taken on the treaty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION TO FILE REPORTS DURING ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration may file reports on resolutions while the Senate is in adjournment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand adjourned until noon, on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, February 11, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 9, 1955.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations, effective date of acceptance:

To be senior assistant surgeon

Jacob A. Haller, Jr.

To be assistant surgeons

Jack Durell
John R. Moran
Donn E. Leuzinger

To be senior assistant dental surgeon

James J. Kennedy

To be assistant dental surgeons

L. Charles Larsen
Charles H. Davis
George E. Garrington

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 9, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last week it was my privilege to address an all-university convocation of students at the University of Cincinnati on the subject of American foreign policy.

I send to the desk now the text of my speech, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY AND THE PROBLEM OF COMMUNISM

(Address by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, at all-university convocation of students, University of Cincinnati, February 4, 1955)

I am delighted to have the opportunity to address this distinguished and learned audience. I always regard it an honor to address an academic group of this kind. It is a special honor to appear before such an audience in this great State which has given our Nation one of its foremost families: I speak of the Tafts of Ohio.

THE RESOLUTION ON FORMOSA

I speak to you at a critical juncture in the affairs of this Nation. Last week the United States Congress with only 6 dissenting votes authorized the President of the United States to use our Armed Forces to protect the islands of Formosa and the Pescadores from possible attack by Communist China. The facts are relatively simple, but the possible consequences are great.

Every competent military man I have talked with in recent years including General MacArthur, General Marshall, General Bradley, General Wedemeyer, Admiral Radford, Admiral Carney, and General Ridgway, to name but a few, agree that if Formosa were to fall into unfriendly hands it would seriously jeopardize the security interests of this Nation. Our great base at Okinawa would be flanked. Attack on the Philippine Republic would be threatened. Japan would be exposed to Communist military threat. And the whole of southeast Asia might eventually be in danger of falling like a ripe plum into the maw of communism.

It was the purpose of President Eisenhower, supported by a nearly unanimous Congress, to draw a line, to make it clear to Communist China that this Nation felt that its self-preservation would be endangered by further Communist expansion in the western Pacific.

Wars have resulted in the past from misjudgments as to when a Nation believes its vital interests are endangered. The resolution passed last week will make it crystal clear to Communist China that we believe our vital interests would be endangered if Formosa and the Pescadores are threatened by military force.

In order to understand the need for this action, I propose to review with you tonight the threat to freemen which is posed by communism and then to examine what we are doing about it internally and externally. I then will consider some of the attitudes which we as Americans must cultivate and develop so that we may be true to the heritage of freedom to which we are heir.

POSSIBILITY OF A CEASE-FIRE

First, however, let me refer briefly to the possibility of a cease-fire in the Formosa area. The resolution which the Congress passed contains a very significant provision. It provides that the authority granted the President is to expire when the peace and security of the area are assured by, and I quote, "international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise."

Last Monday the Security Council of the United Nations met to begin discussion of some method to bring hostilities in the Formosa area to an end. It will be necessary, if these negotiations are to be successful, for Communist China to participate. Indeed, the charter requires that parties to disputes considered by the United Nations are not to be excluded.

During the past few days, a good many people have indicated their fear that if Communist China participates in negotiations for a cease-fire, this will be the first step toward admitting Communist China to the United Nations. I cannot share these fears. Our negotiations through the United Nations are designed to stop the fighting, because as long as shooting is going on in this area there is a very real danger that hostilities may spread. I am confident that our negotiators at the United Nations, led by former Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, under the guidance of President Eisenhower, will not be parties to any cease-fire arrangement which would involve a surrender of the basic principles for which we stand. I am not nearly as fearful of what might happen as the result of negotiations in the United Nations to bring about a cease-fire, as I am fearful of possible consequences of failure to stop the shooting. It seems essential to me that if the American people, through their representatives in Congress, have been willing to give President Eisenhower broad authority to use our Armed Forces to protect Formosa, we must also be willing to rely on his good sense and ability to negotiate a cease-fire without imperiling our vital interests.

EXPANSION OF COMMUNISM

For many of us communism is nothing new. We have been living with it for a long time—since 1918, to be exact. We have watched it grow in four decades from a small band of Petrograd revolutionaries led by Lenin to a force enveloping some 800 million people and extending over 14½ million square miles of the earth's surface. Little did we realize in 1918 that communism would today be so extensive and so menacing a threat to our free civilization.

Soviet territorial aggrandizement, which began with the conquest of Russia herself, has continued with unrelenting drive. Much of Eastern Europe is under Soviet control. And in the Far East, communism has enveloped China, North Korea, and North Vietnam, while in other areas of Asia and the Western Pacific communism has mounted strong forces of infiltration and envelopment.

NATURE OF COMMUNISM, THE PROBLEM OF OUR TIME

Fundamentally, communism is hostile to everything we stand for. It is hostile to democracy; to our economic system; and to

our religious and cultural values. It seeks to destroy the humane ideals inherent in democratic doctrine. It thrives on the miseries of mankind. Its gospel is one of hatred, fear, and distrust. It is nourished by poverty, disharmony, and discord. A dangerous force inspired by false messianic hopes, communism teaches deceit, treachery, and terrorism and seeks totality of conquest in the realm of both the physical and the spirtual. Its methods are criminal; its philosophy is godless; its way of life is a way of death for mankind. Communism professes to give man a paradise on earth; but instead it gives man only the chains of slavery, an eternity of human bondage.

The threat of communism is the problem we Americans must face today. There is no easy solution. There is no panacea; no patent cure. There is no escape to isolationism.

I am reminded of a cartoon appearing in a New York magazine a few years ago. It depicted a rather rotund, middle-class gentleman of 50, reclining in a comfortable hammock suspended between two trees behind his comfortable suburban home. In his one hand he had a drink and in the other a newspaper. This man could have been a happy man relaxing there on a delightful summer's day. But obviously he was not, for he remarked, in a note of resigned exasperation: "What a great world this would be if it weren't for the Russians."

We cannot wish away our troubles. We have to face up to the great challenge of our day. I am happy to say that we have, and we shall continue to do so. We must, because our own lives, the life of our Nation, and even the life of western civilization depend on it.

AMERICAN APPROACH TO THE PROBLEM OF COMMUNISM: INTERNAL

The American approach to the problem of communism has been a dual approach. It has been internal and external; and necessarily so, because rarely if ever is foreign policy something separate and distinct from domestic affairs. In the realm of domestic affairs we have met the Communist menace in a variety of ways. We have taken steps to preserve the internal security of our Nation against Communist subversion. We have met the internal Communist problem by the continued maintenance of a free, vigorous, expanding, and prosperous economy.

I want to emphasize particularly the importance of this factor. Basic to the whole structure of our foreign policy is the economic strength of our Nation. It is upon the economic foundation of our Nation that there has been built a foreign policy the main features of which have required vast outlays of capital and goods in foreign aid and vast expenditures for national defense. Were it not for the strength, vitality and expansiveness of our economy it would not have been possible to sustain the global political commitments which we have assumed.

A final factor in the domestic aspects of our effort to meet the problem of communism is the dedication and resolution of our great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, to maintain the high standard of progress achieved by America in the past decades. Communism is nourished by poverty and misery—the twin cancers which can destroy a vigorous and free society. But so long as we are motivated by the desire to insure freedom from want for all of our citizens we have little to fear from domestic communism.

AMERICAN APPROACH TO THE PROBLEM OF COMMUNISM: EXTERNAL

In the external aspects of our approach to the Communist problem we must continue to be guided by basic principles which to my mind are vital to the ultimate success of our foreign policy.

In the first place, it should always be our fixed policy to secure and maintain world peace. That is basic to our action last week regarding Formosa. To be sure, world peace is a difficult goal to achieve; but we must never diminish our zeal or falter in our resolve to accomplish that objective, whatever the obstacles. We are not a warlike people; we are a peace-loving people who have only engaged in wars of self defense and then only after grave provocation.

We have demonstrated our interest in world peace by our participation in the United Nations. There are many who would find flaws in the United Nations. It is my conviction that the United Nations is a vital instrumentality for world peace—if the members would only use it. The fault lies with the member states and not with the United Nations.

Personally, I am proud of our role in helping to build the United Nations and in supporting it. It is the best instrument through which we may seek to fulfill our policy of assuring world peace.

In the second place, our foreign policy must continue to be based upon a global concept. Our interests and our commitments are global. So are the interests and commitments of our Communist adversaries. This means we must keep ourselves constantly in a position to give the uncommitted people of this earth a chance to contrast the Communist way of life with the free way of life.

The third principle for the success of our foreign policy is the continued emphasis upon collective security. We cannot go it alone in any vigorous effort to checkmate Communist expansion. Basic to our foreign policy is the support of our allies, in NATO, ANZUS, SEATO, and the other pacts of collective security such as the Rio Pact. We must maintain the strength and vitality of this network of engagements, bearing in mind in all diplomatic conduct the need for solidarity among our friends.

Bipartisanship, or nonpartisanship as I call it, is another principle that must be maintained if we are to be successful in our foreign policy. I do not mean that there should be no criticism of foreign policy. On the contrary, when criticism is warranted and where it will be constructive, it should be made without hesitation. Our democracy thrives on the free interplay of ideas so that out of the clash of conflicting views carried on in statesmanlike debate the most reasonable course of action will emerge.

It is the duty, indeed, the moral obligation, of every legislator, whatever his party, to voice dissent when in his conscience a given policy is open to criticism. If criticism is to be made, however, it ought to be constructive, statesmanlike, and patriotically inspired. In the realm of foreign affairs there is no room for irresponsible charges, demagogic exhortations, and petty carping that exploits the fears of a people, sows discord, and creates doubt where there should be courage, unity and confidence.

UNITY IS NECESSARY

I have said time and again that partisan politics should stop at the water's edge. The eyes of the politician should not be fixed upon the next election but rather upon the next generation. I would like to say emphatically that I am confident that the American people have nothing to fear on this score. I feel sure President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles will establish and maintain a system of real and meaningful consultation with both parties on major issues that arise in the conduct of our foreign policy.

The passage of the resolution on Formosa demonstrated once again this kind of solidarity. Many people, I know, argued that President Eisenhower already possessed ample authority under the Constitution to use our Armed Forces in defense of Formosa and the Pescadores without the consent of the Congress.

But that was not the real issue. The real issue was whether the President and the Congress would join hands and display the kind of unity that gives weight and substance to American policy. The Senate vote of 85 to 3—together with a similarly heavy House vote—let the Communists know in no uncertain terms exactly how America feels about the defense of Formosa.

A STRONG MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

In addition to the guiding principles of foreign policy which I have mentioned it is necessary that we continue to maintain a strong military establishment if we are to succeed in our struggle against communism. Military and foreign policy are inextricably interrelated; they cannot be separated; they must be designed to work in concert with one another. More than ever before the success of American foreign policy without power is meaningless.

The world today is divided into armed camps, and however much we may wish to ignore the realities of tension and struggle, we cannot do so. Our diplomatic commitments are many; they are far reaching; they are global in scope. To support these commitments we must maintain a strong defense structure. Our commitments must square with the realities of our national interest; our military establishment must be maintained in proper proportion to the extension of our political commitments.

Thus, we must continue to maintain a strong Navy, Air Force, and Army, however great the personal sacrifice for each one of us. We must have a trained and ready Reserve upon which to draw in time of emergency. We must maintain a strong continental-defense system. In this day of A-bombs, H-bombs, intercontinental ballistic missiles, and supersonic air speed we cannot quibble about cost of such a defense. The stake is great; it may well be our national existence.

We ought never to forget that the countries of the Communist bloc have a standing armed force of over 11 million men, with a great manpower potential held in reserve. We ought never to forget that Soviet Russia has a first-rate air force with intercontinental bombers. We ought never to forget that Soviet Russia has a navy second only to the United States Navy. We ought never to forget that Soviet Russia, too, has weapons of mass destruction. We must be on our guard; we must be vigilant.

I have often said—and I repeat now—that if our foreign policy is to be respected, our Armed Forces must be kept in balance with our security commitments throughout the world. I wonder, therefore, whether we are not making a serious mistake by reducing our Armed Forces at the very time we are taking on additional commitments in the Pacific.

A final factor in the determination of the external aspects of our approach to the Communist problem is the vital need to maintain limited amounts of foreign economic aid, especially in the Far East. Much can be done, especially in underdeveloped areas, through programs of technical assistance to build the elements of resistance to Communist aggression. We must have military bases abroad—no one doubts that; but we must also seek bases in the hearts of men. That we can do at least in one way by carrying on—yes, even extending—our program of technical assistance.

SOME REQUIREMENTS FOR EFFECTIVE FOREIGN RELATIONS

Such is the problem facing us today, and such are the ways of facing up to this problem. This is indeed a time of trouble for all of us. The demands upon all of us are far greater than ever before in our national history. What, then, are some of the requirements for carrying on effective foreign relations?

In the first place, we must be mindful of the innate prejudices that we ourselves have and also the prejudices that foreign people have toward us. Knowing these prejudices we must counteract them with reason, and thus seek to establish a better bond of relations. It is well known that foreign folk, especially Europeans, think that we are a headstrong, impulsive, and sometimes irresponsible people. We are an energetic, optimistic, confident people—that we shall never deny. Unfortunately our critics abroad do not differentiate between official irresponsibility and individual irresponsibility. Too often are they led to believe that the irresponsible comment of one American represents the true attitude of the American people and even the Government and administration itself. The press, foreign and domestic, thrives on news especially of an irregular and sensational nature. And more often than not the minority—even individual—opinion is represented as being the prevailing thought, which is in fact far from the truth.

Our friends abroad must realize that despite some outward manifestations of excitability, we Americans are at bottom a conservative people. We are not precipitate in our actions. Rather we are cautious, generally slow to anger, and sometimes even slow to act. Certainly in our relations with the Soviet Union we have displayed a remarkable, if not heroic, amount of self-restraint.

AMERICAN EXPERIENCE AND RESPONSIBILITY

Some of our friends abroad also believe that in matters of foreign affairs we are inexperienced—a child with a new and dangerous toy. Perhaps, if centuries of diplomatic history are to be the criterion, we are indeed inexperienced. The older powers of the world have lived with their problems for a long time. For us, it has not been so long. However, it seems to me that experience in foreign affairs is measured not by time but by action. With this as a criterion I believe we can conclude that we are not without experience in diplomacy.

Since 1898, America has been an active participant upon the state of world affairs. During that period we have matured and our diplomatic abilities have sharpened. We have played a role in the great diplomatic crises of the century; we have adjusted ourselves to the demands of our national interests and responsibility. We have produced outstanding diplomats, many of whom stand in the forefront of the world's greatest. But more important, it seems to me, the American people have been willing to accept the responsibility of world leadership which has been thrust upon them. Experience should be equated with knowledge and maturity. Certainly the realization of our new role in world affairs and the acceptance of it are truly marks of great maturity.

Undoubtedly, one of the gravest misconceptions colonial peoples have about us concerns colonialism. There is a misconception in Asia that we support colonialism. The very existence of this misconception is a measure of the success of Communist propaganda. America does not sustain colonialism. Our Secretary of State has made this abundantly clear by such statements as: "We do not seek to perpetuate western colonialism": and "The United States will never fight for colonialism." We ourselves are a former colonial people. We threw off the bonds of colonialism over 175 years ago. The underlying concept of our democracy is the right of self-determination of people. These are facts, I believe, that the Asians must be helped to understand because this is the true spirit of America. Moreover, we must help them see that the attitude of the Communists on the colonial question is a contradiction: On the one hand they denounce imperialism and colonialism; and yet communism is the greatest force of imperialism and colonialism in modern times.

THE NEED FOR SELF-EXAMINATION

Americans, too, have innate prejudices that must be overcome in our relations with people in foreign lands. We must be tolerant of those unlike ourselves. Deep in the American consciousness is a trace of antiforeignism which has been nourished by the effects of our historic concept of "no entangling alliances." We must accept foreign folk on their own terms and not expect from them the same customs, likes and dislikes, beliefs and standards of behavior as ourselves. We are all brothers under the Fatherhood of God. Fortunately, as a Nation derived from numerous nationalities, we have demonstrated that we know the secret of how different peoples can get along together.

Clearly associated with the cultivation of a proper attitude toward other peoples is the need for self-examination—that is, to see ourselves as others see us. If we want peoples in foreign lands to respect our way of life and to be influenced by it, we must do all in our power to be an example before the world. Self-criticism is in many ways a noble practice; but it is still a nobler virtue to practice what one preaches.

Perhaps one of the great fears of our foreign friends is the fear that America will withdraw into herself, donning the cloak of isolation and rejecting the role of world leadership. Certainly among us there is sometimes a longing to return to the less turbulent days of the 19th and early 20th centuries. Life was peaceful, relatively easy-going and uncomplicated then. But the fears that there will rise a neoisolationism as manifested in the fortress-of-America concept are groundless. Americans have accepted their role of world leadership—perhaps the greatest diplomatic revolution of modern times. We have set our hand to the plow, and we shall never turn back

PATIENCE IS NECESSARY

A second requirement for the success of our foreign relations especially today is the need for patience and forbearance. We are an energetic people; we are a dynamic, vigorous people who are used to seeking quick results from our work. We have never known what it is to wait patiently in an atmosphere highly charged with emotion. In foreign affairs especially we must display a type of Galilean forbearance never before demanded of us. We must always bear in mind the larger problem rather than the purely localized one. We must take the large view; weigh the consequences; and above all else, we must be patient.

Diplomacy, it has been said, is the art of letting the other fellow have your way. It is the art of achieving in a realistic world what is possible and practicable. Seldom does the diplomat obtain solutions in an absolute sense. Solutions, such as they are, come only after painstaking negotiations, and with many disappointments, setbacks, and frustrations. And then these negotiations may well result in something far less than the original objective. If this were a perfect world, solutions would be as we desired them. But the world is far from perfect. Patience is, therefore, highly important, especially in a democracy where public opinion determines so much the course of diplomacy. Patience and forbearance are not necessarily elements of weakness. There can be and there often is courage in patience; resolution in forbearance; and wisdom in self-restraint.

AN INFORMED PUBLIC

Then, my friends, to maintain an effective foreign policy there is the need for informed opinion. In the conduct of foreign relations and in the laying down of policy there is no substitute for clarity of thought, soundness of judgment, intelligence, and knowledge. Knowledge dispels fear, combats irresponsibility, sobers the excited and the impatient, and lights the path before us. In our Government, in the executive departments, and in Congress we must always have well-trained, intelligent people, informed in the complexities of world affairs and capable of coping with the many problems that arise from them.

And among our people there must be an informed public opinion. This is very important. It was William Henry Seward, a founder of the Republican Party and one of our greatest Secretaries of State, who said, "The policy of the United States is not a creature of the Government, but it is an inspiration of the people."

Our foreign policy is an inspiration of the people. It behooves us, therefore, to have an informed public opinion; for the quality of our foreign policy can rise no higher than the level of our people, their intelligence, their interests, and their willingness to participate in world affairs. We must have a citizenry aware of the pitfalls in foreign affairs; conscious of our own limitations; and fully cognizant of the depth and breadth of our problems in the world.

Here I want to emphasize the importance of our instruments of communications in relation to foreign affairs. The responsibility of our newspapers, magazines, learned periodicals, and especially the radio and television media is considerable in the formation of an informed opinion. In a democracy a responsible press and a public-minded radio-television network play a role of inestimable value in contributing to the success of foreign policy.

The greatest source of an informed public is, however, our educational system. Destroy our schools, close our universities, exile our teachers and professors, interdict communication of knowledge, and our great Nation would disintegrate and perish. Conversely, if we are to fulfill our destiny as a great nation, if we are to have an informed public and able leadership; and if we are to have a sound structure of government, we must have a vigorous and expanding educational system. Our Nation depends on it; our Government depends on it; the free world depends on it.

It is axiomatic to say that our schools, colleges, and universities give us our future leaders. But the obligations and duties of our educational institutions go beyond that because they are beacons of enlightenment for our Nation as a whole. They are the real foundations of an intelligent public opinion upon which the direction of our foreign policy depends so much.

THE DANGERS OF COEXISTENCE

Let me illustrate one point. Today we hear Moscow sounding the soft and gentle chords of peaceful coexistence. That message has attracted much attention throughout the world and well it should because it comes from the world's principal aggressor and because it might appear to some to promise what the world desires most: Peace. However, if we analyze this theme carefully in the light of past experience and present world conditions; if we analyze this theme in terms of communistic philosophy, we can only come to the conclusion that peaceful coexistence is purely a ruse, a clever propaganda device intended to disarm the vigilant, to undermine the vitality and destroy the cohesion of the anti-Communist world. It is not peaceful coexistence the Soviets want; it is peaceful infiltration.

Let it never be forgotten that the present rulers of Moscow are not only the heirs but they are the students, the coworkers of Stalin. It was they who labored with Stalin to make the Soviet Union what it is today, and with some minor exceptions the course of their policy and their ultimate objective are no different from Stalin's.

This theme of peaceful coexistence cannot be combated with guns, warships, air-

planes, A-bombs, or H-bombs. It can only be combated with knowledge; knowledge of the Soviet Union; knowledge of the strategy and tactics of communism; knowledge of world affairs today within the context of the East-West power struggle.

THE NEED FOR FAITH AND CONFIDENCE

The final factor in determining the requirements for effective foreign relations is the need for faith and confidence. I believe that one of the greatest cohesive forces in a democracy is faith and confidence. To the working of a democratic system of government faith and confidence are fundamental; for they establish a bond of affection without which there can be no unity of purpose, nor can there be efficient government, marked national progress or success in foreign relations. In a democracy we must put into practice the simple doctrine of the Master to love thy neighbor. Upon this simple but monumental doctrine rests the requirements for success in a democracy. If ever our Republic shall come upon unhappy times, it will be because we have lost our faith and lost our confidence. Fear of our neighbor, distrust of our own abilities, suspicion of those who govern us, disbelief in a Supreme Being—they are the heresies that lead to destruction. If they consumed us, they could destroy the foundation of our Nation.

We must have faith in our President. We must rely upon his good judgment as Chief Executive and as representative of all the people. We must have faith and confidence in our elected representatives in Congress. We must likewise have faith and confidence in our Government as a whole, our leaders in defense and diplomacy, our men and women in the Foreign Service, and our leaders in State and local government.

Most of all we must have faith and confidence in our neighbors, and faith and confidence in ourselves. We are by nature an optimistic people and in our zeal we must guard against the excesses of exaggerated self-confidence. Our limitations we must know; and in all our actions we must be guided by a sense of high moral purpose and also by a reverence for reason.

America is a nation whose roots are embedded in the 18th century age of reason. Its roots are likewise embedded in the rich religious traditions of the Old World. Our forefathers were men born into these traditions, and we are their children. Let us find inspiration and guidance in their moral outlook; let us find inspiration and guidance in their reverance for reason; for with reason as our guide and their moral virtue as our inspiration, we shall never fear for the future. And with faith and confidence in ourselves and in our national destiny, we shall meet successfully all challenges, however great and from whatever quarter.

Address by Hon. John W. Bricker, of Ohio, Before the Edison Pioneers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 9, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] before the Edison Pioneers, in New York City on February 5, 1955, in observance of the 108th anniversay of Thomas E. Edison's birth.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDISON, SON OF OHIO

(Address by Senator JOHN W. BRICKER before the Edison Pioneers, New York, N. Y., February 5, 1955)

It is a real pleasure for me to join with the Edison Pioneers in observing the 108th anniversary of Thomas A. Edison's birth. With Mr. Edison's birthday being February 11 and Abraham Lincoln's the day following, we are naturally led to compare the influences shaping the lives of these two great Americans.

Thomas A. Edison was born at Milan, Ohio, on February 11, 1847. Although Edison, like Lincoln, belongs to the ages, Ohioans take special pride in the fact that his formative years were spent in the Buckeye State. Having had Edison, we in Ohio understand the sentiment which leads the people of Illinois to describe their State as the "Land of Lincoln."

No generation is an island unto itself. Edmund Burke developed the best definition on the nature of civilized society when he said:

"As the ends of such a partnership cannot be obtained in many generations, it becomes a partnership not only between those who are living, but between those who are dead, and those who are to be born."

And so, we cannot know all about Lincoln or Edison or anyone else if we merely begin our study at the date of birth. All men are molded to some degree by local civil, political, and cultural traditions. One of the most important factors in the development of those traditions in the Northwest Territory was the ordinance of 1787.

The Northwest Ordinance was passed by the Confederate Congress on July 13, 1787, almost 2 years before ratification of the Constitution. Provision was made for representative government whenever a prospective State should have 5,000 male inhabitants. This farsighted legislation provided for the admission of States into the Union on an equal footing with the Original States whenever any State should reach a population of 60,000. Article II of the Northwest Ordinance recognized many fundamental rights which were not in the original Constitution but added later as the Bill of Rights. Slavery in the Northwest Territory was prohibited. Article III of the Northwest Ordinance provided: "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

A frontier territory divorced from tradition or run as a dependent colony from Washington could not have produced so soon after statehood such men as Lincoln and Edison. Today the Articles of Confederation and the Confederate Congress are commonly presented as horrible examples of political impotence. Yet I venture to suggest that no Congress under the Constitution has enacted into law a more beneficent piece of legislation than the Northwest Ordinance.

Neither Lincoln nor Edison had much formal schooling. This is a fact which the taxpayers of today must view with ever-increasing amazement. No responsible person, of course, advocates going back to the little red schoolhouse. We all recognize the need for more and better schools. There is no point in laboring the obvious. But regardless of the excellence of our educational plant and even if illiteracy is completely abolished, modern education will have failed unless it produces a few men of the stature of Lincoln and Edison. Who can set a price on the value of their services to the Nation?

Though formal education did not appeal to Edison, he was not anti-intellectual. At the age of 11, for example, he had read such books as Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. I suspect that not many of the current crop of 11-year-olds have tasted such intellectual fare.

Mr. Edison's recognition of the value of education was evidenced in ways too numerous to mention. He was unyielding in his insistence on concentrated thought. Framed on his laboratory wall was this quotation from Sir Joshua Reynolds: "There is no expedient to which man will not resort to avoid the real labor of thinking."

Commenting on this quotation, Edison said: "Thinking is the hardest thing in the world for those to do who have not formed the habit."

In the scientific world the mind has many mansions. Thomas Edison was primarily an inventor rather than a discoverer. Curiously enough, it was Abraham Lincoln who best explained the difference between discovery and invention. In a lyceum lecture delivered in 1860, Mr. Lincoln said: "All creation is a mine, and every man a miner. In the beginning the mine was unopened and the miner stood naked and knowledgeless upon it. * * * Man is not the only animal that labors, but he is the only one that improves his workmanship."

And then Lincoln remarked how strange it was that the discovery of steam power preceded by 2,000 years its useful application.

Eleven hundred patents resulted from Mr. Edison's research in applied science. It has been said that he kept the path to the Patent Office hot with his footsteps. For me to enumerate for the Edison Pioneers his more important inventions would indeed be carrying coals to Newcastle.

We can recall with profit, however, the principal ingredients of Mr. Edison's astounding success. We might start with the three qualities which Mr. Edison on his 67th birthday cited as the secret of his success. These qualities, said Edison, were a will to work, imagination, and ambition.

A will to work marked Edison's life from boyhood. Unquestionably the industry and ingenuity of his father set the example. Samuel Edison had developed a successful business making shingles in Milan, Ohio. But when the railroad linking Toledo and Buffalo through Norwalk and Sandusky doomed Milan as a world port, Samuel Edison moved on to Port Huron. Similarly, Thomas Edison never hesitated to move to greener economic pastures.

Certainly no teen-age boy ever had more entrepreneurial experience than young Edison. After his remarkable boyhood experience he could never have had any illusions about the ability of government to produce wealth. A socialistic government, as Edison knew, could redistribute wealth but not create it. And, it may be added a socialistic economy will never produce an Edison.

Thomas Edison's imagination is to me the most fascinating aspect of his personality. Mr. Edison himself gave us a good insight on the quality of his imagination with this story:

"Have you seen that big electric engine on the New York Central Railroad—how the power is coupled to the wheels? No? I'll tell you a story about it to show what happens to any of us when we get in a rut from knowing too much about the difficulties. Those engineers had finished the engine, all but one detail. They couldn't think of a proper way to get the power down to the wheels. That silly problem has bothered engineers all over the world. You will see if you look in how many different ways they have solved it. Well, these engineers were stuck, all in a rut. They had looked at the thing so long and knew so much about it that they couldn't see it. So they posted a notice. Five hundred dollars to anyone who could make a working suggestion. Weeks passed. Still nobody could think of a way to couple the power to the wheels.

"One day a boy from the drafting room stopped at the chief engineer's desk and made a little scrawl of a pencil sketch. 'I don't know anything about it,' he said, 'but would this work?' The engineer looked at it and said he believed it might—and it did. You will see it working the next time you leave the Grand Central Terminal. That boy wasn't in a rut. He didn't know what the difficulties were. He just looked at the thing."

And so, Edison approached all problems with an open mind, taking nothing for granted. This does not mean, however, that Edison's inventions sprung from some spontaneous mental combustion. Edison, as you know, defined genius as 2 percent inspiration and 98 percent perspiration.

About 12 years ago the Supreme Court of the United States held that an invention within the meaning of the patent laws must be the result of a "flash of genius." This "flash of genius" test for inventions was a judicial aberration which the Congress later corrected. The most telling argument against the "flash of genius" test was that few, if any, of Thomas Edison's inventions would have been patentable. Almost as important as Edison's inventions was his method of inventing. Instead of waiting for genius to flash, he experimented endlessly, at first alone and later with a staff of competent men with whom he worked in a well-equipped laboratory.

The intensity of Edison's ambition accounts for his almost superhuman energy. He was not interested in money except as a means to an end. That end he described as follows:

"My desire is to do everything within my power to further free the people from drudgery, and create the largest possible measure of happiness and prosperity."

It is most fitting and proper that we acknowledge each year about this time the priceless gifts resulting from Mr. Edison's fertile imagination and his indefatigable labors. America is prone, however, to accept Mr. Edison's contributions without recognizing any corresponding obligation. Unless we recognize those obligations, Mr. Edison's marvelous inventions will contribute not to happiness but to despair.

Consider, for example, the highways to knowledge and understanding opened by invention of the incandescent lamp. However, the value of Edison's greatest invention depends finally on the way we use it. Today, we can hardly imagine how difficult it was to read before Edison gave his light to the world. Nevertheless, many of the contemporaries of Lincoln and Edison read the Bible and other great literature by candlelight. It was not uncommon to read aloud in the intimacy of the family circle. When parents today read Mickey Spillane and their children read horror comics, they depreciate Edison's great gift.

Mr. Edison was well aware of the degrading uses to which his inventions could be put. He was one of the first to protest sex and "white slave" motion pictures. He said on one occasion: "Those we make here can be witnessed by any child. If white slave pictures are to be made, I will let the other fellow make them."

We can handle the problem of obscenity without undue difficulty. However, the vulgarity and the mediocrity present in so many forms of communication is producing a mass culture which increasing numbers of thoughtful Americans view with alarm and dismay.

More than any man in history, Edison succeeded in freeing the people from drudgery. At the same time, however, he created a problem of leisure which Americans have not yet solved. Edison's inventions did not give us leisure. They merely created the opportunity for leisure. And we cannot solve the problem of leisure without a clear understanding of what the word means.

Leisure is not mere idleness. It is not the insatiable pursuit of new sensations nor a state of voluptuous sloth. No Communist understands true leisure. It is either regarded as the luxurious idleness of privileged classes, or as Karl Marx described the leisure of Communist society wherein all men would "hunt in the morning, fish in the afternoon, and make love in the evening." As Mr. Russell Kirk explains in his book, A Program for Conservatives:

"If true leisure, as distinguished from the boredom of idleness, is to be restored to the mass of men, we must relate our opportunities for leisure to the ends of life that men have pursued since time out of mind. We must remember that the Christian idea of leisure is expressed in the holy day. We must remind ourselves that a chief practical object of leisure is self-improvement, or emulation of the highest types of humanity. We must relate our leisure hours to the concerns of family, the welfare of our children, and the improvement of our homes. We ought to recall that one form of leisure is to turn from our accustomed work to another sort of work, equally productive, but less monotonous and employing individual skills."

Without the inventions of Mr. Edison most men would still be chained to their work for so long as to make true leisure impossible. But if mankind does not employ the time made available by Edison and others in meaningful leisure, it will sink into a boredom more oppressive than tyranny.

Mr. Edison had political convictions. He did not, however, trade on his reputation as a great scientist to influence public opinion on foreign or defense policy or on other political matters outside his field of special competence. In that, of course, he was not like some present-day scientists. I do not recall, for example, that he broadcast to the Nation advice on how to rewrite the immigration laws. He had none of the egotism which leads some scientists to equate scientific wisdom and wisdom in all the other affairs of life. Perhaps he knew the story about the French butcher who became involved in litigation, and not knowing any lawyer in Paris, called on each one, finally selecting the fattest to represent him.

Also unlike many scientists, Thomas Edison set up no opposition between science and religion. Edison said, for example: "Too many people have a microscopic idea of the Creator. If they would study His wonderful works as I have spent my life in doing, in the natural laws of the universe; if they would but look, they would have a much broader idea of the Great Engineer and His divine power."

We all know in a general way what happens when we snap the light switch at home. We do not know as much about the force of electromagnetism as Mr. Edison. But in the last analysis neither Mr. Edison nor anyone else has known precisely what that force is.

All of you know the Negro spiritual:

"Ezekiel saw the wheel
Way up in the middle of the air.
Little wheel run by faith,
Big wheel run by the grace of God,
Way up in the middle of the air."

The late Garet Garrett in his book, The American Omen, observed with reference to this Negro spiritual:

"Here, besides the rare aesthetic perception to make poetical use of a mechanical image, is a profound truth. Every wheel we have is a wheel within a wheel. Every wheel that runs does run by faith, though you take it to be only the faith implicit among us that the big cosmic wheel will run true and not fail. And what makes the big wheel run at all nobody knows."

So long as we retain our faith in that big cosmic wheel directed by a divine providence, the contributions of Edison and other great men of science will facilitate man's progress toward enlightenment. Without such faith the contributions of science will accelerate the speed of progress toward barbarism. In deciding between religious faith and secular knowledge as the ultimate value in life, we will fulfill or repudiate our obligation to Thomas A. Edison.